

## Corrections & Clarifications for *Sex Allocation*, 2009, Princeton University Press

- (1) Page 10. In section 1.5, I should have clarified that when I said Charnov's 1982 monograph gave an excellent overview of when different sex determination systems are favoured, I meant in terms of, for example, simultaneous hermaphrodite versus dioecy. I should have also added that the actual evolution of the mechanisms for sex determination was covered in Bull's 1983 monograph – an excellent book that is sadly extremely hard to find these days, especially at a less than astronomical price.
- (2) Pages 3, 16 & 35, 75, 110, 204, 226, 267, 276, 316 & 356. It should be “*evolutionarily stable strategy*”, not “*evolutionary stable strategy*”.
- (3) Chapter 2. Alan Grafen has convinced me that I should give stronger affirmation of Fisher's role. Dusing's model gives the right answer, and uses the Shaw-Mohler equation, but this was without knowledge of mendelian genetics and reproductive value. In contrast, Fisher was the first to get to the right answer, for the right reasons.
- (4) Page 41. Table 3.1. Should be “white-throated magpie jays”.
- (5) Page 80. Figure 4.2. In part (b) the relatedness between a female and her daughter should be “ $r=0.75$ ” not “ $r=0.5$ ”; as described in the (correct) legend.
- (6) P. 135, Fig. 5.10. Redrawn from Charnov 1987b not 1987a.
- (7) P. 145, section 5.9.2. Equation  $s^* > 1/(c+1)$  is repeated.
- (8) P. 233, equation 7.7,  $P/(1-P)=0$  if  $W_2 > 1/2$ .
- (9) P. 279, fig. 9.1. Dotted line represents mother, and solid line represents offspring.
- (10) P. 293, second paragraph: “and colonies with a relatively high relatedness to female (relatively high relatedness asymmetry) should produce females.”
- (11) P. 307. I misspelled an ant name – should be *Pheidole pallidula* not *Pheidole pallidulam*.
- (12) P. 313, 6<sup>th</sup> line, should be “11.3.1.1” not “11.2.1.1”.
- (13) P. 342. I mixed up Southeast Asia and Polynesia. This paragraph should read: “Evidence for male killer suppression has recently been obtained from the long-term research on the *Wolbachia* male killer in the butterfly *H. bolina* by G. Hurst and colleagues. In Polynesia, high prevalence of this male killer has been observed, with an infection rate of  $>70\%$  in some populations (Dyson and Hurst 2004; Charlat et al. 2005). In contrast, while populations from areas in Southeast Asia, such as Thailand and the Philippines, contain the same *Wolbachia* strain, it does not lead to male killing (Charlat et al. 2005). A possible role of nuclear suppressors was tested for by examining the phenotype of *Wolbachia* isolates from Southeast Asia (Thailand and the Philippines) and Polynesia when paired with a nuclear genetic background from Polynesia and the Southeast Asia, respectively (Hornett et al. 2006). Crossing experiments showed that the nuclear background played the key role—*Wolbachia* from both Polynesia and Southeast Asia caused male killing when on a nuclear genetic background from the Philippines, but not when on a nuclear genetic background from Southeast Asia. The data suggest that this is due to a single locus dominant suppressor of male killing in Southeast Asia. A suppressor such

as this would be predicted to spread rapidly through a population—historical data suggest that it has spread through Southeast Asia relatively recently (Charlat et al. 2005), and field observations have shown it spread from negligible to fixation in <10 generations (Charlat et al. 2007b).”

(14) P. 371, second paragraph, “compared with a population without radio-collars”.

Please email me any errors that you spot. Many thanks to Ali Duncan, Berti Fisher, Alan Grafen, Paul Harvey, Laurent Keller and Shan Sun for doing so.

Stuart West, 19<sup>th</sup> September 2013