Kin structure and roost fidelity in greater noctule bats

João D. Santos^{a,b,*}, Christoph F.J. Meyer^{a,c}, Carlos Ibáñez^d, Ana G. Popa-Lisseanu^d & Javier Juste^{d,e}

^a Centre for Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Changes (cE3c), Faculty of Sciences, University of Lisbon, 1749-016 Lisbon, Portugal

^b Center for Desert Agriculture, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology, Thuwal, 23955, Saudi Arabia.

^c School of Science, Engineering and Environment, University of Salford, Salford, M5 4WT, United Kingdom

^d Department of Evolutionary Ecology, Estación Biológica de Doñana (CSIC), Avenida Américo Vespucio 26, 41092 Seville, Spain

^e Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Epidemiología y Salud Pública, CIBERESP, Spain

Running Header: Kin structure of the greater noctule

---

* Correspondent: João Santos, present address: Life Sciences C, 427 East Tyler Mall, Tempe, AZ 85281; E-mail: dourado.jns@gmail.com, Tel: +1 (602)-653-631

Abstract

Roost fidelity is an important aspect of mammalian biology. Studying the mechanisms underlying philopatry can help us understand a species' energetic requirements, ecological constraints and social organisation. Temperate bat species notably exhibit a high degree of female philopatry considering their size, resulting in maternity colonies segregated at the mitochondrial level. We focus on the greater noctule, *Nyctalus lasiopterus*, to study this behaviour in more depth. We make use of microsatellite data for 11 markers across 84 individuals residing in Maria Luisa Park in Seville, Spain. At the time of sampling this urban park boasted the highest number of bats of any known colony of this species, among which three social groups were observed to segregate spatially. We studied the distribution of pairs of individuals across filial relationship categories and relatedness estimates relative to the social group of each individual. This analysis was complemented by information on roost-use frequency among a subset of genotyped bats. We found no significant relationship between roost use and genetic distance, but there was evidence that more closely related bats are more likely to be found in the same social group. Mother-daughter pairs shared the same group more often than expected, as did pairs of individuals of relatedness above 0.43. We discuss the implications of these results in terms of the behavioural ecology of temperate bats and for conservation efforts aimed at preserving them.

Keywords: philopatry, genetic structure, microsatellites, relatedness, *Nyctalus lasiopterus*, Chiroptera

23

24

Introduction

25 Female philopatry, or fidelity to a birth site or region, is a common trait among mammals
26 (Greenwood, 1980; Clutton-Brock & Lukas, 2012), including bats (Burland & Wilmer, 2001).
27 Bats display an exceptionally high degree of female philopatry and colony fidelity (Kerth et al.,
28 2008). While this can be partly explained by the temporal stability and sparse distribution of the
29 roosts used by cave-dwelling species (Lewis, 1995; Kerth, 2008), it is still common in tree- and
30 foliage-roosting bats, for which roost availability may not constitute a limiting factor (Kerth,
31 2008). Philopatry in female temperate tree-roosting bats has thus been attributed to familiarity
32 with the natal area, roost and foraging locations, or the maintenance of social relationships
33 (Kerth, 2008; Olivera-Hyde et al., 2019).

34 Reported interactions among females of bat colonies include communal nursing
35 (Wilkinson, 1992), social grooming (Wilkinson, 1986; Kozhurina, 1993; Kerth 2008), food
36 sharing (Carter & Wilkinson, 2013) and information transfer about roost sites and foraging
37 locations (Wilkinson & Boughman, 1998; Kerth & Reckardt, 2003; Chaverri et al., 2010). Strong
38 female-biased philopatry together with high longevity in bats (Barclay & Harder, 2003) should
39 lead to the formation of matrilineal societies and open the door for the fixation of cooperative
40 behaviours through kin selection (Hamilton 1964; Emlen & Oring, 1977; Clutton-Brock, 2009).
41 However, the extent to which these interactions are maintained by kin selection is unknown. For
42 example, food sharing in *Desmodus rotundus* was reported to be more dependent on reciprocity
43 than relatedness (Carter & Wilkinson, 2013). Likewise, information transfer in both the evening
44 and Bechstein's bats showed no evidence of kin discrimination (Wilkinson, 1992; Kerth &

Reckardt, 2003). For other behaviours, such as association and grooming, empirical support for different species is incongruent (Metheny *et al.*, 2008; Patriquin *et al.*, 2013).

Studies monitoring roost associations have shown females will roost preferentially with some females rather than others, resulting in a non-random association pattern within the colony (e.g. Willis & Brigham, 2004; Metheny *et al.*, 2008; Patriquin *et al.*, 2013; Nad’o *et al.*, 2017). Because tree-roosting bats occupy hollows not large enough for more than a small number of individuals, regular fission and fusion of subgroups could help maintain larger social groups spread over a given area (O’Donnell, 2000; Patriquin *et al.*, 2016). A recent review of studies reporting pairwise association and genetic relatedness data across nine species of bats spanning four families found no correlation between the strength of associations between kin and the occurrence of complex cooperative behaviours (Wilkinson *et al.*, 2019). Rather, the authors observed that species that switched roosts often tended to present stronger associations between relatives. Understanding the causes underlying philopatry in this context is rendered particularly difficult. The kind of philopatry at play – to the natal area (which may not necessarily relate to social behaviour) or to the natal colony, becomes elusive.

The greater noctule, *Nyctalus lasiopterus* (Schreber, 1780), is one of the largest and rarest European vespertilionid bats (Ibáñez *et al.*, 2004). Greater noctules typically roost in large, old trees (Alcalde *et al.*, 2016). Only six breeding colonies of *N. lasiopterus* are known outside of the Iberian Peninsula (Uhrin *et al.*, 2006; Estók & Gombkötő, 2007; Dubourg-Savage *et al.*, 2013; Dombrovski *et al.*, 2016; Vlaschenko *et al.*, 2016; Kovalov *et al.*, 2018). The sparse number of existing records suggests that the species’ distribution is circum-Mediterranean and patchy from Morocco to Uzbekistan (Ibáñez *et al.*, 2004). Western Andalusia, Spain, is unique for harbouring several known maternity colonies of greater noctules in three main breeding areas

(Santos *et al.*, 2016). Females consolidate colonies in spring to breed, and remain until late August, when they disaggregate and disperse, presumably to mating and hibernation sites (Ibáñez *et al.*, 2009), although some cases of permanent residency have been observed (C. Ibáñez and J. Juste, unpublished data). Few adult males have been found in these colonies, contrasting with other sites in northern Spain and Europe (Ibáñez *et al.*, 2009).

In 2008, a study on the social structure of the greater noctule population of Maria Luisa Park (MLP) in Seville (Spain) revealed it to follow a fission-fusion structure, with bats switching roosts on average every three days and segregated in three spatially distinct social groups (9-17% overlap), whereby the same tree holes were rarely used by bats of different groups (Popa-Lisseanu *et al.*, 2008; Fortuna *et al.*, 2009). Moreover, the foraging areas of the three groups (extending over 40 km away from the park) overlapped almost completely. Popa-Lisseanu *et al.* (2008) further reported that females were loyal to their groups for at least five years, and that juvenile females returned to their natal roosting areas during the study period. The authors concluded that the three groups observed within the park could be considered independent maternity colonies, defined as groups of reproductive females roosting together. However, more recently, a genetic analysis encompassing the region of Andalusia, Spain, and including three maternity colonies apart from Seville (which was considered as a single population), found significant mitochondrial structure at the regional scale, but not within the park (Santos *et al.*, 2016). The authors also found no evidence of higher within-group relatedness during colonization, pointing to a migrant-pool model of colonization in this species.

In this study, we narrowed the geographic focus of our previous work on regional genetic structure (Santos *et al.*, 2016) to the urban park in Seville. Using bi-parentally inherited markers (microsatellites) to infer relatedness between individual bats, we asked whether the status of

colony attributed to the different groups within the park could be verified genetically. If the groups represent socially and demographically separated colonies, then we expect philopatry to lead to genetic structure, detectable as higher within- than between-group relatedness, conditional on the age of each group, since higher within-group relatedness was not observed during colonization (Santos *et al.*, 2016). Throughout the article, we refer to the groups within the park as groups or social groups, and to the Seville population as population or colony. However, genetic isolation alone leaves the mechanism of philopatry unexplained. Because groups are spatially defined, i.e. group assignments also correspond to non-overlapping areas of the park (Popa-Lisseanu *et al.* 2008), preference for certain roosts could be responsible for the females' return. Another hypothesis is that individuals chose to roost with kin. We make use of roost-use data to refine the scope of our study and to differentiate between three hypotheses: H0) group membership does not influence individual decisions to return to the Seville site; H1) group membership alone has inherent impact; H2) group membership impacts dyad structure because *N. lasiopterus* females chose to roost with relatives. In the case of H0, genetic structure should be absent and no association between roost-use and kinship should be observed; for H1, we predict higher within-group relatedness but no association between roost-use and kinship; H2 in turn suggests both genetic structure and an association between roost-use and kinship. H3, a hypothesis leading to the absence of genetic isolation in the presence of roosting and/or genetic association, is ruled out since physical and social groups overlap. Regarding our understanding of the philopatric behaviour of female giant noctules, H0 corresponds to a coarse site fidelity, and could be explained by the limited number of alternative roosting opportunities in the region. H1 implies a more specific preference for certain roosts or individuals, and H2 would indicate the maintenance of kin-relationships as the basis for the return.

114

115

Materials and methods

116

Study population and sampling

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

The study population is located in MLP, Seville (37°22'29"N, 5°59'19"W). The 122-year-old park extends over 38 ha and contains many large old trees that bear enough cavities to harbour the three distinct colonies. Most roost trees belong to *Platanus* spp., *Gleditsia triacanthos*, *Sophora japonica* and *Washingtonia filifera*. With a population previously estimated at ca. 500 individuals, but now in dramatic decline due to an invasive parakeet species (Hernández-Brito *et al.*, 2018) that is taking over the roosting holes, it was once the largest known breeding site of greater noctules (Popa-Lisseanu *et al.*, 2008).

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

We analysed biopsy samples of 84 adult female bats from MLP collected from 2004 to 2007. Each bat was assigned to one of three areas of the park identified by Popa-Lisseanu *et al.* (2008) as characteristic of different social groups. Assignment was based on the tree in which individuals roosted when captured. Group designations (I, II and III) were maintained from that earlier study. Twenty-eight individuals were sampled from each group. Samples included 15 individuals that were radio-tracked to study the roost-switching behaviour of the population that was used to identify and define the social group dynamics in the previous study (Popa-Lisseanu *et al.*, 2008).

Capture and handling was performed under permit of the Ethical Committee of EBD-CSIC and the techniques used meet the guidelines published by the American Society of Mammalogists (Gannon and Sikes, 2007) on the use of wild mammals in research.

Molecular methods

DNA was extracted from 3 mm diameter wing punches using a modified version of the salt-based protocol developed by Aljanabi and Martinez (1997).

All individuals were genotyped at 11 nuclear microsatellite loci: Nle 2, 3 and 6-11 (developed for *Nyctalus leisleri*, see Boston *et al.*, 2008); EF4 (developed for *Eptesicus fuscus*, Vonhof *et al.*, 2002); P20 and P217 (developed for *Pipistrellus sp.* Kaňuch *et al.*, 2007). All were tested in muscle tissue prior to genotyping (see Appendix A: Methods, for a detailed description of DNA extraction, amplification, sequencing, and microsatellite genotyping) and successfully employed in our previous study (Santos *et al.*, 2016). Labelling followed Schuelke's procedure (2000).

Data analysis

All nuclear markers were in linkage equilibrium as assessed with FSTAT v. 2.9.3.2 (Goudet *et al.*, 1995). Using CERVUS, we estimated observed and expected heterozygosities, as well as deviations from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE). Of the 11 microsatellites, three (Nle6, P20 and P217) deviated significantly from HWE (see Appendix A: Table S1).

Pairwise and mean relatedness values (r) were estimated using ML-Relate (Kalinowski *et al.*, 2006), which implements a corrected maximum-likelihood method for estimating relatedness

that allows loci with null alleles to be incorporated into the analysis (Wagner et al., 2006). Three of the 11 loci used in this study showed high frequencies of null alleles (min=0.097, mean=0.187). Because this might have been the cause of the departure from HWE, as it would simulate a heterozygote deficiency, and in order to avoid losing the inferential power of three loci we resorted to the method by Wagner et al. (2006), implemented in ML-Relate, and kept all 11 loci. Using this software, we extracted relatedness estimates and relation classifications for each pair of individuals in the data set. ML-Relate classifies dyads as Parent-Offspring (PO), Full-Sibling (FS), Half-Sibling (HS), or Unrelated (U).

Genetic structure

With reference to the three groups within the park, pairwise relationships were classed according to whether or not both individuals had been captured within the same group. We tested the null hypothesis that each group presented the same mean relatedness as the whole population. Analysis of molecular variance (AMOVA) was conducted between global and within-group data sets of relatedness estimates, using the function ‘f_oneway’ of the python package ‘scipy.stats’ (Oliphant, 2007), and principal component analysis (PCA) was performed on the squared matrix of pairwise relatedness values.

We also compared within-group relatedness to relatedness across the park independently for each group using a randomization test. We relied on the Kruskal-Wallis H-test as implemented in the function ‘kruskal’ of the python package ‘scipy.stats’ (Oliphant, 2007). We compared the observed mean dyadic relatedness within each group to the expected values from randomly sampling individuals within and across groups. The procedure was repeated 1000 times for each group. The final *p*-value was calculated as the proportion of sampled statistics above that observed for each group.

178 *Relatedness and group sharing*

179   We explored the relation between group sharing, expressed in binary form (1 if
180 individuals were captured in the same area of the park, 0 if not), and genetic relatedness. We
181 began by characterizing the correlation between the respective squared matrices (**S** and **G**) using
182 a mantel randomization test (R package ade4, 9999 permutations). In a second approach, we
183 assumed as H0 that the probability of an individual choosing the same group as another
184 individual at random follows a binomial distribution. We further considered this probability to be
185 conditional on the relative size of the group, not the relative sample size. Then, the probability
186 $P(O)$ of pairs of individuals falling across groups was estimated as $P(O) = P_I(1 - P_I) +$
187 $P_{II}(1 - P_{II}) + P_{III}(1 - P_{III})$. The values P_I , P_{II} and P_{III} were estimated as the proportions of
188 individuals registered to roost in groups I, II and III at the time of sampling (81, 61 and 114 bats
189 respectively, Popa-Lisseanu *et al.* 2008), so that $P(O) = 0.644$. The probability $P(I)$ of two
190 individuals choosing the same group was estimated as $1 - P(O) = 0.356$. Assuming a binomial
191 probability $P(I)$, we estimated upper-tail p -values of the proportion of dyads falling within the
192 same group along windows of relatedness. Proportions were calculated among relationships
193 presenting values within a 0.15 window of relatedness around a central value ranging between
194 0.075 and 0.5, in increments of 0.01. Window size was selected based on the minimum of the
195 number of relationships across windows of a given size to ensure sufficient power to detect
196 deviations from the expected proportion while seeking to retain the smallest window size (see
197 Appendix A: Fig. S2).

198   We also compared the expected and observed proportions within the classes of relation
199 estimated by ML-relate. For this analysis, the likelihood of each classification was considered.

Dyads were excluded when the log-likelihood of their class assignment deviated from that class' distribution assuming normality (lower-tail $p < 0.01$).

Relatedness and roost use

To explore the relationship between genetic relatedness and roost use, we resorted to the matrix of pairwise roost-use similarity among 15 bats from across groups radio-tracked in 2004 and used by Popa-Lisseanu *et al.* (2008) to infer the existence of social groups within the park (Appendix A: Fig. S3) (roost number: group I = 29; group II = 27; group III = 34). Similarity was estimated using the Freeman-Tukey statistic (Krebs, 1989). All individuals considered in that study were genotyped. A Mantel test of the two distance matrices was performed using the `mantel.rtest` function of R package `ade4` (Dray & Dufour 2007) with 9999 permutations.

We constructed network graphs of roosting associations and parent-offspring dyads. Roosting association edges were created as dyads presenting a similarity value above 0.05 (Freeman-Tukey statistic). Networks were constructed using the Fruchterman-Reingold algorithm as implemented in the Networkx python package (Aric *et al.*, 2008).

Results

Genetic structure

We first evaluated genetic structure across the park considering its known subdivisions. No genetic structure was observed through PCA (Appendix A: Fig. S1A), and one-way AMOVA of within-group relatedness estimates did not reveal significant differences between within-group relatedness estimates and the population mean ($p = 0.160$, d.f. = 1133). We then considered the

interplay of group assignment and genetic relatedness. Of the total number of possible associations within the park and groups (every female paired with every other female), the percentage of those exceeding a relatedness degree of 0.25 accounted for 6% of the total (Table 1). However, around 81% of females had at least one close relative ($r > 0.25$) captured within the same park area (Table 1), while 95% had at least one close relative within the data set (considering close relatives found in both the same and different groups). We focused on each group to ascertain whether mean relatedness exceeded expectations under randomness. The Kruskal-Wallis test of pairwise relatedness means between colony and groups did not reveal any significant differences (Fig. 1, Appendix A: Fig. S1B).

Relatedness and group sharing

The result of the Mantel randomization test of matrices S and G indicated a significant correlation between group-sharing and genetic relatedness ($p = 0.00034$). Focusing on pairs of individuals within a moving window of relatedness (size= 0.15, step= 0.01), assuming a binomial distribution of $p = P(I)$, the proportion of dyads captured within the same area of the park becomes significant above a relatedness level of 0.435 (Fig. 2B).

We also looked at the impact of group-sharing on relationship categories. The proportion of parent-offspring pairs that shared the same area of the park differed significantly ($p < 0.001$) from random expectations (Fig. 3). The same proportions for FS, HS and U pairs did not deviate significantly from the expected proportions.

Relatedness and roost use

Finally, we assessed the effect of roosting association on genetic relatedness. A Mantel test revealed no significant association between the two variables ($r = 0.06$, simulated p -value = 0.27). This subset of individuals represented 37 half-sibling relationships, 2 full-sibs, 1 parent-offspring pair and 65 unrelated dyads. Roost association between the mother-daughter pairs was above average, but not significantly so ($p = 0.09$).

Discussion

Female fidelity to breeding colonies has been reported in a number of temperate bat species (Rossiter *et al.*, 2002; Castella *et al.*, 2008; Juste *et al.*, 2009), leading, in the extreme, to the formation of closed societies as in *Myotis bechsteinii* (Kerth *et al.*, 2000). The existence of among-colony mitochondrial structure at the regional level supports a certain degree of philopatry among female *N. lasiopterus* (Santos *et al.*, 2016). Our results indicate that this behaviour extends to the spatially segregated social groups within the population of Seville. We found group sharing to be significantly correlated with genetic relatedness and that the proportion of female pairs sharing the same group increases with relatedness, with strongly related pairs ($r > 0.435$) significantly more likely to share the same group under the assumption of random group choice. The same trend was observed among relation classes identified using ML-relate, with a substantial proportion of mother-daughter pairs (62.5%, 25 / 40) found to share the same group (Fig. 3, Appendix A: Fig. S4). While this value is below that observed for the strictly philopatric Bechstein's bat (75 %; Kerth *et al.*, 2002), it is considerably higher than reported for big brown bats (9%; Vonnhoff *et al.*, 2008). Interestingly, tests focusing on group vs. colony-wide genetic relatedness revealed no significant differences. Together with the fact that

the deviation in group sharing proportions drops quickly with relatedness, this could indicate that fidelity to park areas is on average short-lived. Alternatively, this could be explained if these groups were recent, since group formation in this species was not found to be dependent on kin (Santos *et al.*, 2016). Regardless of the long-term stability of this behaviour, these results indicate a degree of year-to-year fidelity to park areas on the part of adult females accompanied by a tendency of first years to return to their natal park areas.

The reasons for philopatric behaviour have been widely discussed (Moussy *et al.*, 2013), and generally attributed to the females' acquaintance with their natal area to facilitate access to foraging and roosting sites, and to the benefits they might derive from social relationships and cooperative behaviours with conspecifics (Kerth, 2008; Kerth *et al.*, 2011). We tested for the effect of roosting associations, previously shown to follow the same park sub-sections, and found a lack of correlation between roost use and genetic relatedness. Despite the limited power of this analysis due to small sample sizes, our results thus seem to refute our initial hypotheses H0 and H2 in favour of H1: females tend to return to natal roosting areas, but this choice is not driven by a desire to roost with kin. We can also discard explanations based on facilitated access to roosts; we are not aware of differences in roost characteristics between the three areas of the park that could account for the patterns observed, and the three groups have completely overlapping foraging areas (Popa-Lisseanu *et al.*, 2009). Philopatric behaviour in Seville can thus be explained either by familiarity with the natal area, or the maintenance of social relationships that are not kin-based. Associative learning is the imprinting of roosts by non-volant young when being carried by their mothers between day roosts (O'Donnell, 2000). Based on reports of observational learning, O'Donnell (2000) reasoned that if young *Chalinolobus tuberculatus* could have their mother's social group pool of favourite roost trees imprinted through repetitive

roost switching, group structure would be maintained. The same mechanism could be at play in *N. lasiopterus*.

The alternative hypothesis is that roost fidelity functions to maintain social bonds, helping returning females reconnect with acquaintances made at specific roosts. Studying the social organization of a maternity colony of noctule bats *Nyctalus noctula* in captivity, Kozhurina (1993) reported the best predictors of close association to be age and sex (92.6 % classification accuracy for each versus 29.6 % for family membership) and that the disparity between age classes remained over time. It is important to add that occasions of social grooming occurred strictly among members of the same social groups (Kozhurina, 1993). A more recent study of the temporal and genetic components of associative dynamics in *Nyctalus leisleri* also found a stronger impact of cohort year on the composition of social groups inferred through network analysis (Nad'o et al., 2017). As pointed out by the authors, although genetic relatedness was also observed to significantly impact association between dyads, this could be the result of different genetic profiles between cohorts due to male-biased gene flow. Cooperative behaviours and long-term associations among colony members, sometimes spanning several years, have been described in several bat species (Wilkinson & Boughman, 1998; Carter & Wilkinson, 2013 and references therein). Kozhurina (1993) further observed that noctule bats start forming associations in their first year. If this is true for greater noctules, maintaining these bonds, either for the comfort derived from familiarity and predictability (e.g. reduced aggression, reduced demands on limited attention capacity already strained by pup-rearing), or the increased likelihood of reciprocal cooperative behaviour such as described above, could explain why individuals tend to return to the area of the park where they were born. This theory has the

310 advantage of providing an explanation for the formation of social groups, which are a pre-
311 requisite for the associative learning hypothesis.

312   In summary, we found that female *N. lasiopterus* will seek to return to the specific areas
313 or social groups they were born in, not just the region or breeding area, more often than expected
314 by chance. We further found that roost associations are not kin-based. While these findings
315 support the hypothesis that group structure is maintained through philopatry (Popa-Lisseanu et
316 al., 2008), it is likely that neither associative learning nor sociality account for this behaviour
317 entirely, but that instead both play a role. Both hypotheses explain the specificity of natal
318 philopatry in greater noctules. Associative learning has the obvious adaptive advantage of
319 allowing young adult females to benefit from their mothers' successful choice of colony. Strong
320 social bonds leading to cooperative behaviours, such as allo-nursing or information sharing
321 (Kerth, 2008), bring fitness benefits to nursing mothers with already high energy expenditures,
322 an explanation which seems particularly plausible for females of this species in light of their
323 challenging carnivorous habits during part of the year (Dondini & Vergari, 2000; Ibáñez et al.,
324 2001; Popa-Lisseanu et al., 2007). While both hypotheses seem plausible, each rests on certain
325 assumptions regarding roosting behaviour or social interactions that lack confirmation in this
326 species. There is one case of reported co-operative nursing in captivity (Kozhurina, 1993), but no
327 study to date has captured roosting associations or behaviours with enough precision to infer the
328 correlates of social organization in maternity colonies of *N. lasiopterus*. Likewise, insufficient
329 information is available on roost fidelity to assess how it correlates with breeding status or to
330 verify roost reuse. Popa-Lisseanu et al. (2008) did report a decrease in roost switching during
331 lactation, an observation that perhaps failed to reach significance due to lack of statistical power.
332 Repeating this experiment with a larger sample size could be informative since a significant

reduction in roost switching would render the associative learning hypothesis less likely. In the meantime, regardless of the mechanism involved, we argue that in light of our results, and those of previous studies in this park, it is safe to re-classify the social groups in MLP as separate colonies.

Determining the relative importance of associative learning and social bonds in this species is crucial, as it could direct future conservation efforts regarding the few known maternity colonies. In order to discriminate between these two hypotheses, future studies should focus on roost fidelity and roosting patterns as well as on long-term associations. Evidence of roost reuse by individual females, as well as varying roost fidelity according to breeding status would point to associative learning. These will have to be compared with the frequency of long-term associations within the same colonies in order to determine the relative importance of social bonds. More generally, discovering the mechanism behind philopatry represents an important step in our understanding of the processes behind the individual decisions that structure mammalian societies, and has implications for conservation policies aimed at preserving healthy populations.

Acknowledgements

J. Nogueras and C. Ruiz helped collecting bat samples. We particularly thank J.L. García-Mudarra and J.M. Arroyos-Salas for valuable advice and their technical insight. We also acknowledge the staff of the Servicio de Parques y Jardines de Sevilla for their help and continuous support of our research. Logistical support was provided by the Laboratorio de Ecología Molecular, Estación Biológica de Doñana, CSIC (LEM-EBD). The regional

government of Andalusia provided permits for collecting samples and handling of bats. This study was partially funded by the Spanish MICINN CGL 2009- 12393, the PPNN 021/2002 and 1981/2010. JDS would like to acknowledge support from the Erasmus Student Mobility program. We thank Nicolas Fasel and two anonymous reviewers for valuable feedback on an earlier version of the manuscript.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at XXXXX.

Data accessibility

Microsatellite genotypes, sample ID and location were deposited in the Dryad Digital Repository (doi: 10.5061/dryad.rc504). All data analysis scripts are accessible in the GitHub repository (doi: 10.5281/zenodo.2653473).

Conflicts of interest

None declared

References

- Aljanabi, S.M. & Martinez, I. (1997). Universal and rapid salt-extraction of high quality genomic DNA for PCR-based techniques. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **25**, 4692–3.
- Alcalde, J., Juste, J. & Paunović, M. (2016). *Nyctalus lasiopterus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016: e.T14918A22015318.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-2.RLTS.T14918A22015318.en>. Downloaded on 24 November 2018.

- 377 Aric, A.H., Daniel, A.S., Pieter J. S. (2008). Exploring network structure, dynamics, and function
378 using NetworkX. in Proceedings of the 7th Python in Science Conference (SciPy2008).
379 Gäel, V., Travis, V., and Jarrod, M. (Eds). Pasadena, CA USA.
- 380 Barclay, R.M.R. & Harder, L.D. (2003). Life histories of bats: life in the slow lane. In *Bat*
381 *Ecology*: 209–253. Kunz, T.H. & Fenton, M.B. (Eds.). University of Chicago Press.
- 382 Boston, E., Montgomery, I. & Prodöhl, P.A. (2008). Development and characterization of 11
383 polymorphic compound tetranucleotide microsatellite loci for the Leisler's bat, *Nyctalus*
384 *leisleri* (Vespertilionidae, Chiroptera). *Conserv. Genet.* **10**, 1501–1504.
- 385 Burland, T.M. & Wilmer, J.W. (2001). Seeing in the dark: molecular approaches to the study of
386 bat populations. *Biol. Rev.* **76**, 389–409.
- 387 Carter, G.G. & Wilkinson, G.S. (2013). Food sharing in vampire bats: reciprocal help predicts
388 donations more than relatedness or harassment. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **280**, 2012-2573.
- 389 Castella, V., Ruedi, M. & Excoffier, L. (2008). Contrasted patterns of mitochondrial and nuclear
390 structure among nursery colonies of the bat *Myotis myotis*. *J. Evol. Biol.* **14**, 708–720.
- 391 Chaverri, G., Gillam, E.H. & Vonhof, M.J. (2010). Social calls used by a leaf-roosting bat to
392 signal location. *Biol. Lett.* **6**, 441–444.
- 393 Clutton-Brock, T. (2009). Cooperation between non-kin in animal societies. *Nature* **462**, 51–57.
- 394 Clutton-Brock, T. & Lukas, D. (2012). The evolution of social philopatry and dispersal in female
395 mammals. *Mol. Ecol.* **21**, 472–492.
- 396 Dombrovski, V., Fenchuk, V. & Zhurauliou, D. (2016). New occurrence and the first breeding
397 record of *Nyctalus lasiopterus* in Belarus. *Vespertilio*, **18**: 55-59.
- 398 Dondini, G. & Vergari, S. (2000). Carnivory in the greater noctule bat (*Nyctalus lasiopterus*) in
399 Italy. *J. Zool.* **251**, 233–236.
- 400 Dubourg-Savage, M.J., Bec, J. & Gaches, L. (2013). First roosts of *Nyctalus lasiopterus* breeding
401 females in France. *Barbastella* **6**, 44–50.
- 402 Dray, S. & Dufour A. (2007). The ade4 Package: Implementing the Duality Diagram for
403 Ecologists. *J. Stat. Softw.* **22**, 1-20. doi: 10.18637/jss.v022.i04.
- 404 Emlen, S.T. & Oring, L.W. (1977). Ecology, sexual selection, and the evolution of mating
405 systems. *Science* **197**, 215–223.
- 406 Estók, P. & Gombkötő, P. (2007). Review of the Hungarian data of *Nyctalus lasiopterus*
407 (Schreber, 1780). *Fol. Hist. Nat. Mus. Matraensis* **31**, 167-172.

- 408 Fortuna, M.A., Popa-Lisseanu, A.G., Ibáñez, C. & Bascompte, J. (2009). The roosting spatial
409 network of a bird-predator bat. *Ecology* **90**, 934-944.
- 410 Gannon WL, Sikes RS. Guidelines of the American Society of Mammalogists for the Use of
411 Wild Mammals in Research. *J. Mamm.* (2007). **88**, 809–823. doi:10.1644/06-MAMM-F-
412 185R1.1
- 413 Goudet, J. (1995). FSTAT (version 1.2): a computer program to calculate F-statistics. *J. Hered.*
414 **86**, 485–486.
- 415 Greenwood, P.J. (1980). Mating systems, philopatry and dispersal in birds and mammals. *Anim.*
416 *Behav.* **28**, 1140–1162.
- 417 Hamilton, W.D. (1964). The genetical theory of kin selection. *J. Theor. Biol.* **7**, 1-52.
- 418 Hernández-Brito, D., Carrete, M., Ibáñez, C., Juste, J. & Tella, J.L. (2018). Nest-site competition
419 and killing by invasive parakeets cause the decline of a threatened bat population. *R. Soc.*
420 *Open Sci.* **5**, 172477.
- 421 Ibáñez, C., Juste, J., Garcia-Mudarra, J.L. & Agirre-Mendi, P.T. (2001). Bat predation on
422 nocturnally migrating birds. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **98**, 9700–9702.
- 423 Ibáñez, C., Guillén, A. & Bogdanowicz, W. (2004). *Nyctalus lasiopterus* — Riesenabendsegler.
424 In *Handbuch der Säugetiere Europas*: 695–715. Krapp, F. (Ed.). Wiebelsheim: Aula-
425 Verlag.
- 426 Ibáñez, C., Guillén, A., Agirre-Mendi, P.T., Juste, J., Schreur, G., Cordero, A.I., Popa-Lisseanu,
427 A.G. (2009). Sexual segregation in Iberian noctule bats. *J. Mammal.* **90**, 235–243.
- 428 Juste, J., Bilgin, R., Muñoz, J. & Ibáñez, C. (2009). Mitochondrial DNA signatures at different
429 spatial scales: from the effects of the Straits of Gibraltar to population structure in the
430 meridional serotine bat (*Eptesicus isabellinus*). *Heredity* **103**, 178–187.
- 431 Kalinowski, S.T., Wagner, A.P. & Taper, M.L. (2006). ML-Relate: a computer program for
432 maximum likelihood estimation of relatedness and relationship. *Mol. Ecol. Notes* **6**, 576–
433 579.
- 434 Kaňuch, P., Fornůsková, A., Bartonička, T. & Bryja, J. (2007). Multiplex panels of polymorphic
435 microsatellite loci for two cryptic bat species of the genus *Pipistrellus*, developed by cross-
436 species amplification within the family Vespertilionidae. *Mol. Ecol. Notes* **7**, 871-873.
- 437 Kerth, G. (2008). Causes and consequences of sociality in bats. *Bioscience* **58**, 737.
- 438 Kerth, G., Mayer, F. & König, B. (2000). Mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) reveals that female
439 Bechstein's bats live in closed societies. *Mol. Ecol.* **9**, 793–800.

- 440 Kerth G, Mayer F, Petit E. 2002. Extreme sex-biased dispersal in the communally breeding,
441 nonmigratory Bechstein's bat (*Myotis bechsteinii*). *Mol. Ecol.* 11:1491–1498. doi:
442 10.1046/j.1365-294X.2002.01528.x.
- 443 Kerth, G., Perony, N. & Schweitzer, F. (2011). Bats are able to maintain long-term social
444 relationships despite the high fission-fusion dynamics of their groups. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol.*
445 *Sci.* **278**, 2761–2767.
- 446 Kerth, G. & Reckardt, K. (2003). Information transfer about roosts in female Bechstein's bats: an
447 experimental field study. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **270**, 511–515.
- 448 Kovalov, V., Hukov, V. & Rodenko, O. (2019). New record of *Nyctalus lasiopterus* (Schreber,
449 1780) in Ukraine with a new confirmation of carnivory. *North-West. J. Zool.* **15**, 91-95.
- 450 Kozhurina, E.I. (1993). Social organization of a maternity group in the noctule bat, *Nyctalus*
451 *noctula* (Chiroptera : Vespertilionidae). *Ethology* **93**, 89–104.
- 452 Krebs, C.J. (1989). *Ecological methodology*. Harper & Row New York.
- 453 Lewis, S.E. (1995). Roost fidelity of bats: a review. *J. Mammal.* **76**, 481–496.
- 454 Metheny, J.D., Kalcounis-Rueppell, M.C., Willis, C.K.R., Kolar, K.A. & Brigham, R.M. (2007).
455 Genetic relationships between roost-mates in a fission–fusion society of tree-roosting big
456 brown bats (*Eptesicus fuscus*). *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **62**, 1043–1051.
- 457 Moussy, C., Hosken, D.J., Mathews, F., Smith, G.C., Aegerter, J.N. & Bearhop, S. (2013).
458 Migration and dispersal patterns of bats and their influence on genetic structure. *Mamm.*
459 *Rev.* **43**, 183–195.
- 460 Nad'o, L., Chromá, R. & Kaňuch, P. (2017). Structural, temporal and genetic properties of social
461 groups in the short-lived migratory bat *Nyctalus leisleri*. *Behaviour* **154**, 785-807.
- 462 O'Donnell, C.F.J. (2000). Cryptic local populations in a temperate rainforest bat *Chalinolobus*
463 *tuberculatus* in New Zealand. *Anim. Conserv.* **3**, 287–297.
- 464 Oliphant, T.E. (2007). Python for scientific computing. *Comput. Sci. Eng.* **9**, 10–20.
- 465 Olivera-Hyde, M.O., Silvis, A., Hallerman, E.M., Ford, M. & Britzke, E. (2019). Relatedness
466 within and among *Myotis septentrionalis* colonies at a local scale. *Can. J. Zool.* **97**, 724–
467 735.
- 468 Patriquin, K.J., Palstra, F., Leonard, M.L. & Broders, H.G. (2013). Female northern myotis
469 (*Myotis septentrionalis*) that roost together are related. *Behav. Ecol.* **24**, 949–954.

- 470 Patriquin, K.J., Leonard, M.L., Broders, H.G., Ford, W.M., Britzke, E.R. & Silvis, A. (2016).
471 Weather as a proximate explanation for fission–fusion dynamics in female northern long-
472 eared bats. *Anim. Behav.* **122**, 47–57.
- 473 Popa-Lisseanu, A.G., Bontadina, F., Mora, O. & Ibáñez, C. (2008). Highly structured fission–
474 fusion societies in an aerial-hawking, carnivorous bat. *Anim. Behav.* **75**, 471–482.
- 475 Popa-Lisseanu, A. G., Bontadina, F. & Ibáñez, C. (2009). Giant noctule bats face conflicting
476 constraints between roosting and foraging in a fragmented and heterogeneous landscape. *J.*
477 *Zool.* **278**, 126–133.
- 478 Popa-Lisseanu, A. G., Delgado-Huertas, A., Forero, M. G., Rodríguez, A., Arlettaz, R. & Ibáñez,
479 C. (2007). Bats' conquest of a formidable foraging niche: the myriads of nocturnally
480 migrating songbirds. *PLoS One* **2**, e205.
- 481 Rossiter, S., Jones, G., Ransome, R. & Barratt, E. (2002). Relatedness structure and kin-biased
482 foraging in the greater horseshoe bat (*Rhinolophus ferrumequinum*). *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.*
483 **51**, 510–518.
- 484 Santos, J.D., Meyer, C.F.J., Ibáñez, C., Popa-Lisseanu, A.G. & Juste, J. (2016). Dispersal and
485 group formation dynamics in a rare and endangered temperate forest bat (*Nyctalus*
486 *lasiopterus*, Chiroptera: Vespertilionidae). *Ecol. Evol.* **6**, 8193–8204.
- 487 Schuelke, M. (2000). An economic method for the fluorescent labeling of PCR fragments. *Nat.*
488 *Biotechnol.* **18**, 233.
- 489 Uhrin, M., Kaňuch, P., Benda, P., Hapl, E., Verbeek, H. J., Krištín, A., Krištofik, J., Mašán, P. &
490 Andreas, M. (2006). On the greater noctule (*Nyctalus lasiopterus*) in central Slovakia.
491 *Vespertilio* **9**, 183–192.
- 492 Vlaschenko, A., Kravchenko, K., Prylutska, A., Ivancheva, E., Sitnikova, E. & Mishin, A.
493 (2016). Structure of summer bat assemblages in forests in European Russia. *Turkish J. Zool.*
494 **40**, 876–893.
- 495 Vonhof, M.J., Davis, C.S., Fenton, M.B. & Strobeck, C. (2002). Characterization of dinucleotide
496 microsatellite loci in big brown bats (*Eptesicus fuscus*), and their use in other North
497 American vespertilionid bats. *Mol. Ecol. Notes* **2**, 167–169.
- 498 Vonhof MJ, Strobeck C, Fenton MB. 2008. Genetic Variation and Population Structure in Big
499 Brown Bats (*Eptesicus fuscus*): Is Female Dispersal Important? *J. Mammal.* 89:1411–1420.
500 doi: 10.1644/08-MAMM-S-062.1.
- 501 Wagner, A.P., Creel, S. & Kalinowski, S.T. (2006). Estimating relatedness and relationships
502 using microsatellite loci with null alleles. *Heredity* **97**, 336–45.

- 503 Wilkinson, G.S. (1986). Social grooming in the common vampire bat, *Desmodus rotundus*.
504 *Anim. Behav.* **34**, 1880–1889.
- 505 Wilkinson, G.S. (1992). Communal nursing in the evening bat, *Nycticeius humeralis*. *Behav.*
506 *Ecol. Sociobiol.* **31**, 225–235.
- 507 Wilkinson, G.S. & Boughman, J.W. (1998). Social calls coordinate foraging in greater spear-
508 nosed bats. *Anim. Behav.* **55**, 337–350.
- 509 Wilkinson, G.S., Carter, G., Bohn, K.M., Caspers, B., Chaverri, G., Farine, D., Günther, L.,
510 Kerth, G., Knörnschild, M., Mayer, F., Nagy, M., Ortega, J. & Patriquin, K. (2019).
511 Kinship, association, and social complexity in bats. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **73**, 7.
- 512 Willis, C.K.R. & Brigham, R.M. (2004). Roost switching, roost sharing and social cohesion:
513 forest-dwelling big brown bats, *Eptesicus fuscus*, conform to the fission–fusion model.
514 *Anim. Behav.* **68**, 495–505.
- 515
- 516
- 517
- 518
- 519
- 520
- 521
- 522
- 523
- 524
- 525

Tables

Table 1. Mean relatedness estimates within groups and across the whole colony in Maria Luisa Park, Seville, percentage of associations with $r > 0.25$ (close relatives) among total possible associations, and percentage of females with close relatives within their groups as well as the whole colony. The total sample consists of 84 individuals, 28 from each group, resulting in a total of 3486 possible dyads.

Group	<i>Mean r</i>	<i>SE</i>	% associations	
			<i>r>0.25</i>	%
I.	0.056	±0.106	6.3	89.2
II.	0.050	±0.099	5.6	75.0
III.	0.051	±0.099	5.6	78.6
Colony	0.059	±0.098	5.7	95.2

Figures

Fig. 1. Pairwise relatedness between adult female *Nyctalus lasiopterus* within and among social groups in Maria Luisa Park, Seville, Spain. Violin plots of pairwise relatedness across the pooled data set and within each social group. t-tests were calculated for group and colony sample means for each of the three groups (p -values shown above).

Fig. 2. Proportion of group sharing as a function of pairwise relatedness. Pairs of individuals were classified according to whether both were captured in the same area of Maria Luisa Park. This classification was then studied in relation to the estimated relatedness of each pair. The proportion of dyads that shared the same group (filled circles) was calculated within relatedness windows (window size= 0.15 r , step= 0.01 r) and the upper 95% CI of expected values (dotted line) was estimated from a binomial distribution of $p = (I)$. A cubic savgol filter was used to smooth the data (solid line). The dashed horizontal line indicates the expected proportion $P(I)$ of within-group pairs.

Fig. 3. Percentage of pairwise relations within and among social groups across relatedness categories. Dyads were classed into relation groups using ML-Relate. Individual dyads were further classed according to whether they were caught within the same areas of Maria Luisa Park. Grey: proportions of dyads between individuals from different groups; black: proportion of dyads between individuals from the same group. P -values of observed proportion of pairs from the same group for each class shown in bold. Categories PO, FS, HS and U consisted of 40, 47, 441 and 2958 dyads respectively. P -values were derived assuming a binomial probability of two individuals sharing the same group $P(I) = 0.356$.

Fig. 1.

Fig. 2.

Fig. 3.