

2 TITLE

Between semelparity and iteroparity: empirical evidence for a continuum of modes of

4 parity

6

8 AUTHOR

P. William Hughes

10 Max Planck Institute for Plant Breeding Research

Carl-von-Linné-Weg 10

12 50829 Köln

Email: whughes@mpipz.mpg.de

14

ABSTRACT

The number of times an organism reproduces (i.e. its mode of parity) is a fundamental life-history character, and evolutionary and ecological models that compare the relative fitness of strategies are common in life history theory and theoretical biology. Despite the success of mathematical models designed to compare intrinsic rates of increase between annual-semelparous and perennial-iteroparous reproductive schedules, there is widespread evidence that variation in reproductive allocation among semelparous and iteroparous organisms alike is continuous. This paper reviews the ecological and molecular evidence for the continuity and plasticity of modes of parity—that is, the idea that annual-semelparous and perennial-iteroparous life histories are better understood as endpoints along a continuum of possible strategies. I conclude that parity should be understood as a continuum of different modes of parity, which differ by the degree to which they disperse or concentrate reproductive effort in time. I further argue that there are three main implications of this conclusion: (1) That seasonality should not be conflated with parity; (2) that mathematical models purporting to explain the evolution of semelparous life histories from iteroparous ones (or vice versa) should not assume that organisms can only display either an annual-semelparous life history or a perennial-iteroparous one; and (3) that evolutionary ecologists should examine the physiological or molecular basis of traits underlying different modes of parity, in order to obtain a general understanding of how different life history strategies can evolve from one another.

KEY WORDS

Parity; semelparity; iteroparity; life history; reproduction; phenology; annual; perennial

CONTENTS

38	I. Introduction
	II. The discrete conception of parity
40	(1) ‘Cole’s Paradox’ and the development of the discrete conception of parity
	(2) Further theoretical work on parity as a discrete trait
42	(3) Empirical support for the discrete conception of parity
	III. The continuous conception of parity
44	(1) From uniparity to continuous reproduction
	(2) Empirical support for the continuous conception of parity
46	(a) Facultative iteroparity
	(b) Facultative semelparity
48	(c) Phenotypically plastic parity
	(3) Evolutionary transitions between modes of parity are ubiquitous
50	IV. Understanding the evolution of parity as a continuous trait
	(1) Seasonality and mode of parity
52	(2) Mathematical models of parity
	(3) Molecular regulation of parity
54	V. Conclusions
	VI. Acknowledgements
56	VII. Tables
	VIII. References

58 I. INTRODUCTION

Semelparity (and the related botanical term “monocarpy”) describes the life history defined by a single, highly fecund bout of reproduction, and can be contrasted with iteroparity (“polycarpy”), the life history defined by repeated (i.e. “iterative”) bouts of reproduction throughout life. Identifying the reasons why organisms adopt either mode of parity is one of life history theory’s oldest problems, having been considered by both Aristotle (*History of Animals*, BkIX, 622 1-30, trans. Thompson, 1907) and Linnaeus (Linnaeus, 1744). In contemporary evolutionary ecology, this problem has been formalized by age-structured demographic models that seek to explain the eco-evolutionary dynamics of reproductive patterns by comparing the intrinsic rates of increase of reproductive strategies (Cole, 1954; Bryant, 1971; Charnov and Schaffer, 1973; Young, 1981; Omielan, 1991; Su and Peterman, 2012; Javoš, 2013; Vaupel et al., 2013; Cushing, 2015). In such models, two modes of parity are considered, classified by whether they express all reproductive effort in a single year (semelparity), or in more than one (iteroparity). I refer to this simplified conception as the “discrete conception of parity”. The main advantage of the discrete conception of parity is its analytical simplicity; given population growth data, intrinsic rates of increase can be easily computed and directly compared. Some intraspecific comparisons between phenotypically similar semelparous and iteroparous congeners conform to the predictions of demographic models based on the discrete conception of parity (e.g. Fritz et al., 1982; Young, 1984, 1990; Iguchi and Tsukamoto, 2001).

However, in this review I will argue that despite the modest successes—both

theoretical and empirical—of evolutionary explanations rooted in the discrete conception of parity, sufficient evidence has been accumulated to make it clear that, like many other life-history traits, parity is a continuous variable, and that semelparity and iteroparity are the endpoints of a continuum of possible strategies that define the distribution of reproductive effort through time, rather than simple alternatives describing whether an organism fatally reproduces in a given year or not. On this account, semelparity can be understood as the strategy defined by concentrating reproductive effort in time, and iteroparity as the strategy defined by distributing reproductive effort over longer timescales. I refer to this idea hereafter as the “continuous conception of parity”. It is important to note that the continuous conception of parity should not be conflated with the related terms “annuality” and “perenniality”. These terms specify strategies defined by the “digitization” of reproduction in response to seasonal effects supervening on the process of reproduction, rather than describing how concentrated reproductive effort is in time. This distinction is further discussed later.

The idea that parity itself is continuous and not discrete is not new (see: Hughes and Simons, 2014c; Kirkendall and Stenseth, 1985; Unwin, Kinnison and Quinn, 1999; Roff, 1992), but to date no systematic exposition of the empirical evidence supporting the different conceptions of parity has yet been undertaken. Furthermore, evolutionary explanations of life-history differences between clades with differing modes of parity continue to rely on the discrete conception of parity (e.g. Lopes and Leiner, 2015), and mathematical models based on the formalization of this assumption continue to be produced (e.g. Benton and Grant, 1999, Davydova et al., 2005; Vaupel et al., 2013). However, because of the ubiquity of evolutionary transitions from iteroparity to

semelparity (Table 1), understanding parity as a continuous trait is important for

understanding the underlying eco-evolutionary dynamics that affect the fitness of life-history strategies.

In this review I begin by reviewing the development of both the discrete and continuous conceptions of parity as evolutionary hypotheses and/or models. Next, I review empirical work that highlights the existence of natural variation in reproduction along a semelparity-iteroparity continuum, focusing on three distinct strategies: facultative iteroparity, facultative semelparity, and phenotypically plastic parity. I conclude by exploring the implications of the continuous conception of parity for: (1) the study of seasonality as a “digitization” of reproduction, (2) the process of mathematically modelling life-history optimization, and (3) the study of the molecular regulation of reproductive traits linked to parity.

II. The Discrete Conception of Parity

(1) ‘Cole’s Paradox’ and the development of the discrete conception of parity

Although the first mathematical model of the intrinsic rate of increase of annual plants was constructed by Linnaeus (1744), Lamont Cole (1954) was the first to categorize life histories into dichotomous “semelparous” and “iteroparous” groups: a semelparous organism is one that “dies upon producing seed” and therefore “potential population growth may be considered on the assumption that generations do not overlap” (p. 109), while iteroparous organisms include a variety of cases, from those where “only

two or three litters of young are produced in a lifetime” as well as “various trees and tapeworms, where a single individual may produce thousands of litters” (p. 118). Thus, Cole created, and contemporary theorists have inherited, a conception of parity as a discrete variable: an organism either reproduces more than once or it doesn’t.

Cole also identified “the paradox of semelparity”, and wrote that “for an annual species, the absolute gain in intrinsic population growth which could be achieved by changing to the perennial reproductive habit would be exactly equivalent to adding one individual to the average litter size” (Cole 1954, p. 118). Consequently, according to the model he developed, a semelparous or iteroparous strategy evolves in response to strong directional selection for trait-values that: (1) maximize the annual rate of intrinsic increase; and (2) are subject to tradeoffs, since reproductive effort is always limited by resource availability. The “paradox of semelparity” is that the relative intrinsic rates of increase for semelparous and iteroparous strategies are very similar (i.e. they differ only by one individual—the mother), which suggests that iteroparity, not semelparity, should be rare, while in nature, iteroparous life histories are generally more common than semelparous ones. Cole’s articulation of the paradox of semelparity motivated many studies searching for theoretical selective advantages of traits linked to discrete semelparous and iteroparous strategies (Murdoch, 1966; Murphy, 1968; Omielan, 1991; Su and Peterman, 2012; Vaupel et al., 2013; Cushing, 2015), as well as attempts to detect these selective advantages in natural systems (Murphy and Rodhouse, 1999; Kaitala et al., 2002; Kraaijeveld et al., 2003; Franklin and Hogarth, 2008; Gagnon and Platt, 2008; Fisher and Blomberg, 2011). Following Cole, semelparous strategies considered in later life history models were usually also annual (although empirical data on long-lived

semelparous organisms was also collected, e.g. Young and Augspurger, 1991; García,
 148 2003), and thus the primary goal of many models purporting to explain the evolution of
 semelparity was to provide reasons why a perennial-iteroparous strategy might confer
 150 higher fitness than an annual-semelparous one.

Cole's "paradox of semelparity" was resolved by acknowledging that differences
 152 in age-specific rates of mortality affect the relative fitness of semelparous and iteroparous
 habits. Building on prior analytical work (see: Murphy, 1968; Emlen, 1970; Gadgil and
 154 Bossert, 1970; Bryant, 1971), Charnov and Schaffer (1973) and Schaffer (1974b) noted
 that the expected fitness value of individuals at juvenile (i.e. prereproductive) and adult
 156 (i.e. reproductively mature) developmental stages often differed. They then argued that
 when the survival of adults was more assured than the survival of juveniles, an
 158 iteroparous habit would have a growth advantage over a semelparous one. Thus, their
 model emphasized that the value of the age class with a lower age- or stage-specific rate
 160 of mortality was—assuming equal fitness across age classes—greater than the value of
 the age class with a higher rate of mortality. Young (1981) extended this insight into a
 162 more general model of intrinsic rates of increase, which incorporated not only differences
 in age-specific survivorship, but also differences in prereproductive development time
 164 and time between reproductive episodes. This model provided three major reasons why
 semelparity might be favoured by natural selection. First, high adult mortality—or the
 166 early onset of reproductive senescence—might prevent iteroparous species from accruing
 fitness gains from established parents over long timescales. Second, a high population
 168 growth rate should favour semelparity outright. Third, when the marginal cost of
 additional offspring is inversely proportional to the number of offspring produced,

fecundity is maximized by investing all reproductive effort into a single episode, i.e. adopting an extreme annual-semelparous life history—see also Schaffer (1974) and Schaffer and Gadgil (1975).

(2) Further theoretical work on parity as a discrete trait

Given that earlier work sought to explain the prevalence of semelparous and iteroparous strategies by identifying differences in age-specific mortality, recent work has sought to explain why differences in age-specific mortality persist, as well as how varying environmental conditions facilitate the co-existence of different modes of parity. Bulmer (1985, 1994) incorporated a model that incorporated density-dependence, a model that was generalized by Ranta et al. (2002). Another common approach has been to use simulations, based on comparisons between discrete strategies, to argue that spatial heterogeneity and stochastic events (i.e. demographic disasters and windfalls) influence the evolutionary stability of each mode of parity over small spatial scales (e.g. Ranta et al., 2001). Similarly, Zeineddine and Jansen (2009) examined the role that discrete modes of parity may play in evolutionary tracking, suggesting that species adopting an annual-semelparous strategy may have an evolvability advantage over perennial-iteroparous congeners. Moreover, considerable evidence now supports two general conclusions: (1) that theoretically optimal life history strategies strongly depend on optimizing parity (Maltby and Calow, 1986; Keeley and Bond, 1999; Iguchi and Tsukamoto, 2001; Stegmann and Linsenmair, 2002; Kraaijeveld et al., 2003; Leiner et al., 2008; Trumbo, 2013), but also (2) that parity is especially important for predicting reproductive

scheduling (Schaffer and Gadgil, 1975; Kozłowski and Wiegert, 1986; Iwasa, 1991; Kozłowski, 1992; McNamara, 1997; Cooke et al., 2004; Miller et al., 2012; Vaupel et al., 2013; Oizumi, 2014), and/or the optimal allocation of reproductive effort to offspring (Cohen, 1966; Smith and Fretwell, 1974; Winkler and M., 2002; Einum and Fleming, 2007; Gremer and Venable, 2014; Mironchenko and Kozłowski, 2014). Thus the current theoretical life history literature is replete with papers discussing the knock-on effects of the assumption that modes of parity are discrete rather than continuous.

(3) Empirical support for the discrete conception of parity

Empirical support for the discrete model of parity is strongest where perennial-iteroparous and annual-semelparous (or, rarely, perennial-semelparous) congeneric species have starkly different life histories. For instance, in a comparison of Mount Kenya species of the genus *Lobelia*, Young (1984) found that juvenile and adult mortality of the annual-semelparous species *L. telekii* were higher than in the closely related perennial-iteroparous species *Lobelia keniensis*. Young concluded that the difference in age-specific rates of mortality would strongly influence the expected value of future reproduction for each species, leading to perennial-iteroparity in one species and annual-semelparity in the other (Young, 1990). Similar comparisons between semelparous and iteroparous congeners or confamilials have been conducted in insects (Fritz et al., 1982; Stegmann and Linsenmair, 2002), salmon (Dickhoff, 1989; Unwin et al., 1999; Crespi and Teo, 2002; Kindsvater et al., 2016), snakes (Bonnet, 2011), algae (De Wreede and Klinger, 1988) and dasyurid marsupials (Kraaijeveld et al., 2003; Mills et al., 2012).

Other studies have focused on reproductive effort, since a declining marginal cost of offspring in terms of reproductive effort should select for an annual- or perennial-semelparous life history over an perennial-iteroparous one. This is the cited cause of the evolution of semelparity in *Digitalis purpurea* (Sletvold, 2002), and in *Antechinus agilis* (Smith and Charnov, 2001; Fisher and Blomberg, 2011). Growth rate is also important; in two subspecies of *Yucca whipplei*, the semelparous variant showed higher viability and faster time to germination than the iteroparous variant did (Huxman and Loik, 1997). Further studies highlight the mortality differences between juveniles and adults, which explains the evolution of semelparity in a variety of long-lived semelparous plants (Foster, 1977; Kitajima and Augspurger, 1989; Young and Augspurger, 1991), as well as in salmonids (Fleming, 1998; Crespi and Teo, 2002; Hendry et al., 2004; Sloat et al., 2014).

Models have been developed that use demographic parameters to predict age and size at first flowering for semelparous (monocarpic) plants; however, these models have been found to be more appropriate for long-lived than short-lived species (Metcalf et al 2003, Rees and Rose 2002). More recently, mathematical modelling of evolutionary responses to discrete semelparous and iteroparous strategies has focused on whether the maintenance of both modes of parity can be a consequence of stochasticity in the ratio of juvenile to adult mortality (Murphy, 1968; Ranta et al., 2002), of differences in the effects of density on age-specific mortality (Bulmer, 1985), or as a consequence of population instability (Ranta et al., 2000).

236 **III – The continuous conception of parity**

(1) From uniparity to continuous reproduction

238 However, in many cases substantial unexplained variation in parity exists even
 240 after factors such as age-specific mortality, density dependence, and environmental
 242 effects are taken into account. For this reason it seems as though models based on the
 244 discrete conception of parity describe a limited range of special cases and not the
 246 majority of systems with congeneric or confamilial species with different reproductive
 248 strategies. This problem arises because theoretical models of the discrete conception of
 250 parity make two characteristic assumptions. First, these models assume that reproductive
 252 output is allocated among cycles (typically seasons or years) rather than expressed
 continuously. This means that offspring produced at two different times within a single
 season are “counted” as being part of the same reproductive episode, while offspring
 produced at two different times in two different seasons are counted as part of
 categorically different reproductive episodes. This permits the calculation of threshold
 values (e.g. of size or age) beyond which selection should begin to favour one mode of
 parity or the other, but is based on a distinction that is arbitrary. Second, each individual
 is assumed to express a single reproductive strategy; models do not predict
 phenotypically plastic modes of parity, or facultative switching between modes.

254 These assumptions do not hold in many cases. The fact that semelparous
 reproduction rarely occurs “once”—i.e. in exactly one place, at exactly one time—has led
 256 to a new treatment of parity as continuously varying between extremes of “pure”
 semelparous and iteroparous reproduction. This approach has gained traction because

there is considerable ambiguity in “breeding once” (Kirkendall and Stenseth, 1985). Moreover, “annuality” and “perenniality”—terms that refer to the number of years in which organisms reproduce—cannot be used interchangeably with “semelparity” and “iteroparity”, which refer to the number of reproductive episodes organisms have (Fritz et al., 1982; Kirkendall and Stenseth, 1985). In “The Evolution of Life Histories”, Roff (1992) noted that, “if we consider our unit of time to be a single year, annuals can be termed semelparous and perennials iteroparous. A further division is possible within annuals, for some reproduce once and are, therefore, semelparous within any time scale, while others flower repeatedly throughout the summer and, hence, are iteroparous with respect to annuals that flower only once, but semelparous with respect to perennials” (p. 248). That is, it is the simultaneity and the finality of the reproductive episode (i.e. the concentration of reproductive effort) that defines perfect semelparity. Therefore, the continuous conception characterizes “extreme” semelparity to be a single, complete, and exhaustive reproductive episode where all reproductive effort is invested at once. Examples of this strategy—which Kirkendall and Stenseth (1985) termed “uniparity”—include mayflies and mites of the genus *Adactylidium* (Edmunds et al., 1976; Corkum et al., 1997). Both male and female mayflies die shortly after mating and dispersing fertilized eggs. In *Adactylid* mites, offspring devour the mother from the inside out, and are thus obligately annual-semelparous (Elbadry and Tawfik, 1966; Goldrazena et al., 1997). The correspondingly “extreme” perennial-iteroparous strategy is a long-lived perennial strategy that spreads reproductive effort out evenly among a very large number of reproductive cycles. Many species, including bristlecone pine, many deep-sea zoanthids, and other supercentennial species that reproduce regularly show such a habit

(Baker, 1992; Druffel et al., 1995; Finch, 1998; Rozas, 2003). Intermediate strategies

complete reproduction over a shorter timescale than bristlecone pine, but over a longer timescale than Adactylid mites.

The continuous conception of parity is therefore very simple: parity is a trait like any other, and continuous variation in factors affecting reproduction (e.g. resource availability, timing of reproduction, etc.), where subject to evolution by natural selection, should result in continuous variation in reproductive strategy (see: Salguero-Gómez et al., 2016). Furthermore, rather than considering only whether organisms complete reproduction within a given year, and making no finer distinction, life history strategies should be compared by the degree to which they concentrate or disperse reproductive effort—and hence risk of reproductive failure—in time. For example, a mature biennial strategy (where an organism reproduces once per year in two consecutive years) distributes reproductive effort over a shorter timescale than does a long-lived perennial congener (where an organism reproduces once per year in many years); although the biennial strategy is not semelparous, it is further toward the “uniparous” end of the continuum of modes of parity than is the perennial strategy. Similarly, an annual-semelparous life history that reproduces rapidly lies further toward this end of the continuum than does an annual-semelparous life history in which reproduction is spread over a longer period of time.

(2) Empirical support for the continuous conception of parity

There is considerable empirical support, from lab and field studies alike, for the notion that parity varies continuously. These results have made it increasingly clear that demographic explanations rooted in the discrete model of parity fail to provide an universal evolutionary explanation for the appearance of different modes of parity. The most obvious objections to the universal applicability of this theory come from species that are facultatively semelparous, from species that reproduce irregularly or opportunistically, or from comparisons between related iteroparous and semelparous species that do not show measurable differences in factors affecting intrinsic rates of increase, including age-specific rates of mortality. These situations are not uncommon in nature. The problem they present is significant because the evolutionary transition from semelparity to iteroparity (and back) is ubiquitous, and has occurred in a wide variety of taxa (see Table 1 for an example using data from angiosperm orders).

There are important consequences for adopting the continuous conception of parity as a starting point for modelling the evolution of different modes of parity. Mathematical models based on the discrete conception of parity often predict threshold values—in mortality rate, size at initiation of reproduction, or expected growth rate—that do not agree with empirical observation (Omielan, 1991; Lessells, 2005; Piñol and Banzon, 2011; Su and Peterman, 2012; Trumbo, 2013; Vaupel et al., 2013). In particular, ESS models derived from assumptions rooted in the discrete conception of parity frequently underestimate the adaptive value of semelparous reproductive strategies; even after accounting for the effects of environmental stochasticity and density-dependence, ESS models predict that semelparous strategies should be less abundant—and less fit—than they have been found to be (Benton and Grant, 1999). In addition, there are

empirical cases that explicitly do not conform to the predictions of the discrete model.

For example, an analysis of 12 winter-establishing primrose species (*Oenothera*:
Onagraceae) found no significant differences in mortality estimates or in environmental
determinants of fitness for semelparous and iteroparous species (Evans et al., 2005). In
some cases, the problem may be that life histories are too complex for organisms to
follow discrete strategies; many salmon species also do not fit neatly into “classical”
annual- or perennial-semelparous and perennial-iteroparous classifications (Unwin et al.,
1999; Hendry et al., 2004). Other research has suggested that deterministic models of
investment may better fit long-lived than short-lived semelparous species, given that
many annual semelparous species (usually plants) show substantial phenotypic plasticity
in phenology (e.g. size at first flowering), offspring quality and overall fecundity (Burd et
al., 2006).

In order to provide a coherent exposition of the extensive body of recent work that
shows empirical support for the continuous conception of parity, in what follows I focus
on three “intermediate” life histories that are neither annual-semelparous nor perennial-
iteroparous, but express another mode of parity that falls somewhere in between. These
include: (1) facultative iteroparity; (2) facultative semelparity; and (3) phenotypically
plastic parity. Although these three examples are the most common modes of parity that
are neither classically (annual- or perennial-) semelparous nor iteroparous, other
intermediate strategies exist, particularly when species or clades have idiosyncratic life
histories. In addition, an individual population or species may itself express multiple
modes of parity. For instance, arctic cod (*Boreogadus saida*) are annual-semelparous in
nature, but can reproduce in two consecutive years in captivity, making them

facultatively iteroparous (Hop et al., 1995; Hop and Gjosaeter, 2013). However, males and females of this species also seem to have different life histories – males begin to reproduce at an earlier age, and can allocate extreme amounts of reproductive effort to a single instance of reproductive activity; semelparity in this species is thus also phenotypically plastic (Nahrgang et al., 2014). Although examples of each life history are provided below, many more have been added to Table 2, a list of species showing facultatively varying or plastic modes of parity.

(a) *Facultative Iteroparity*

Many semelparous species have shown the ability to facultatively reproduce one or more times after an initial bout of reproduction has begun and ended—this is termed “facultative iteroparity”. Facultative iteroparity can be adaptive when it either: (1) provides an opportunity to realize fitness gains from an unexpected abundance of resources, or (2) shifts reproductive effort from inopportune to opportune times. The first type of adaptive facultative iteroparity occurs when additional bouts of reproduction increase fitness by permitting unexpected “bonus” resources to be invested in new offspring. For example, mothers of the semelparous crab spider *Misumena vatia* (Araneae, Thomsidae) typically lay and provision a single brood of eggs (Gertsch, 1939; Morse, 1979), however in response to high food availability and/or usually warm environmental conditions, they are capable of laying and caring for a second brood if sperm supplies are not depleted (Morse, 1994). A similar facultative double-broodedness in response to unusually favourable environment has been observed in the green lynx spider *Peucetia*

viridans (Fink, 1986). In addition, a small proportion of Chinook salmon (*Onchorhynchus tshawytscha*), which typically reproduce only once, have been found to survive and reproduce in two or three additional seasons (Unwin et al., 1999). Tallamy and Brown (1999) showed that large, well-provisioned female burying beetles in multiple species in the genus *Nicrophorus* can reproduce more than once, despite the fact that small females can typically breed only once.

The second form of adaptive facultative iteroparity occurs when deferral of reproductive effort—from a primary reproductive episode to a secondary one—allows an organism to reproduce at a more opportune time. Reproduction is deferred to seek the highest marginal fitness return on invested reproductive effort. For example, when high organic pollution levels disrupt primary reproduction in the freshwater leech *Erpobdella octoculata*, reproduction ceases and remaining reproductive effort is deferred to a second reproductive bout produced the next year (Maltby and Calow, 1986). Similar behaviour has been seen in another Erpobdellid leech, *Erpobdella obscura* (Peterson, 1983; Davies and Dratnal, 1996) as well as in many cephalopods (Rocha et al., 2001). Adaptive deferral of reproductive effort is common in crab spiders. In *Lysiteles coronatus*, artificial brood reductions resulted in the production of a second brood, and the degree of deferral was proportional to the degree of the original reduction (Futami and Akimoto, 2005).

This was also observed in the field in Eresid spiders of the genera *Anelosimus* and *Stegodyphus*, both of which facultatively produce a second brood in response to nest predation (Schneider and Lubin, 1997; Schneider et al., 2003; Grinsted et al., 2014). Although the adaptive potential of facultative iteroparity is often apparent, facultative iteroparity may also be vestigial instead of adaptive. In this case, the organism's life

history merely reflects an ancestral state, and the second (or additional) bout of

reproduction should confer little or no adaptive value (Golding and Yuwono, 1994; Hughes and Simons, 2014b).

(b) Facultative Semelparity

Facultative semelparity occurs when species that are normally perennial-iteroparous—i.e. have multiple, discontinuous reproductive episodes that span more than one year—are capable of expressing only a single reproductive bout (Christiansen et al., 2008). This is a useful strategy for organisms to use to take advantage of unusually good environmental conditions for reproduction. For example, in the short-lived mustard *Boechera fecunda* (also known as *Arabis fecunda*; Brassicaceae), plants are capable of wide range of reproductive strategies, from near-instantaneous semelparity to multi-year iteroparity. This is because *B. fecunda* can produce many small axillary inflorescences in any given year, and their production does not preclude flowering by the same rosette in the subsequent year. However, plants can also produce large “terminal inflorescences” that exhaust remaining resources and lead to senescence and death. Although some plants produce axillary inflorescences for several years before a terminal inflorescence, others produce a terminal inflorescence in their first year (Lesica and Shelly, 1995; Lesica and Young, 2005). A similar system is seen in common foxglove, *Digitalis purpurea* (Scrophulariaceae), which is predominantly biennial or perennial-iteroparous, but can be facultatively semelparous if resource availability in the first year is high (Sletvold, 2002). Facultative semelparity has also been observed in capelin (Christiansen et al., 2008; Loïc

et al., 2012), squid, soil microarthropods (Siepel, 1994), dasyurid marsupials (Kraaijeveld

et al., 2003; Martins et al., 2006), and in the flowering plants *Ipomopsis aggregata* (Silvertown and Gordon, 1989) and *Cynoglossum officinale* (Williams, 2009). Some facultatively semelparous species show a continuous range of types of reproductive episode, rather than discretely fatal or non-fatal ones. *Erysimum capitatum* (Brassicaceae) produces multiple reproductive episodes in environments where water is plentiful; however, where water is scarce it expresses a semelparous strategy (Kim and Donohue, 2011).

(c) Phenotypically Plastic Parity

Like other traits, mode of parity can be phenotypically plastic. This occurs when different modes of parity are expressed by a single species in response to environmental cues. Different modes of parity can occur both: (1) among individuals; or (2) within the reproductive episode of a single individual. Phenotypically plastic mode of parity is common source of intraspecific variation in life history characters; thus this is a major source of confusion for mathematical models that predict a single optimal value for all semelparous and all iteroparous habits. Such differences need not be dramatic—for example, as a consistent response to environmental triggers, even small differences in the length of a semelparous reproductive episode may have significant effects on fitness.

Strong empirical evidence of phenotypically plastic mode of parity is found in sea beets (Beta spp., Amaranthaceae), which display reproductive strategies along “a gradient from pronounced iteroparity to pronounced semelparity” (Hautekèete et al., 2001, p. 796). Interestingly, the selective pressures faced by these species seem to elicit similar

plastic responses. Environmental stressors cause individuals to trade off future fecundity

for increased immediate reproductive effort, resulting in a parity gradient tending to semelparity when environmental stress becomes intense (Hautekèete et al., 2001, 2009).

This pattern is consistent with the prediction that higher current reproductive effort can prevent organisms from being exposed to uncertain or risky environments (Williams, 1966; Vahl, 1981; Rubenstein, 2011; Trumbo, 2013). Similar trade-offs were observed in *Yucca whipplei* (Huxman and Loik, 1997), *Chusquea ramosissima* (Montti et al., 2011), and *Onopordum illyricum* (Rees et al., 1999). *Lobelia inflata* is capable of producing different semelparous strategies, from a nearly instantaneous annual-semelparity, where plants produce many similar flowers quickly and simultaneously, to (nonadaptive) facultative biennial-iteroparity, where as much as half of all reproductive effort is invested in a second reproductive episode. The time of initiation of reproduction strongly predicted which of these strategies is realized (Hughes and Simons, 2014b; c).

Many insect species are also capable of displaying a range of modes of parity among individuals (Trumbo, 2013). In the assassin bug (*Atopozelus pallens*), females deposit eggs in small clutches, approximately every two days. However, the number of clutches—and hence how prolonged this reproductive episode is—varies substantially (Tallamy et al., 2004). Similarly, European earwigs (*Forficula auricularia*) show condition-dependent semelparity; females either deposit all eggs into a single clutch or lay two clutches (Meunier et al., 2012; Ratz et al., 2016). Most insects showing variation in the number of clutches produced do so in response to abiotic cues, particularly temperature and day length (Bradshaw, 1986). This behavior can also be found in ascidarians (Grosberg, 1988) and semelparous mammals (Wolfe et al., 2004; Mills et al.,

460 2012).

Phenotypic plasticity within a reproductive episode of a single individual is
 462 noticeable when a semelparous organism displays a changing reproductive strategy—
 varying along the continuum of parity—that cannot be attributed to developmental,
 464 environmental, or architectural constraints (Diggle, 1995, 1997). This pattern is more
 difficult to detect than phenotypically plastic strategies that differ between individuals,
 466 but in many systems observable differences exist between the “packaging” of
 reproductive effort, resulting in adaptive variation in phenology or offspring quality
 468 through time. This can be difficult, since because they reproduce only once, semelparous
 organisms are expected to show high reproductive effort (Bonser and Aarssen, 2006).
 470 However, the development of fruits of the semelparous plant *Lobelia inflata* varied
 continuously; in this system, late fruits showed accelerated phenology and higher
 472 offspring quality relative to early fruits. This pattern, which indicated that more
 reproductive effort was invested in later fruit, shows that *L. inflata* does not “reproduce
 474 once” but dynamically allocates reproductive effort throughout a sequence of repeated
 fruiting events ((Hughes and Simons, 2014a, 2015). Likewise, in populations of the
 476 semelparous plant *Centaurea corymbosa*, plants showed highly variable life cycles—
 dynamically varying the proportion of reproductive effort allocated to sequential
 478 flowers—depending on environmental conditions and crowding (Acker et al., 2014).

480 **(3) Evolutionary transitions between modes of parity are ubiquitous**

Transitions between different strategies along the semelparity-iteroparity

continuum are common throughout the tree of life. Furthermore, modes of parity appear to be evolutionarily labile within species, and many species show significant intraspecific differences in the expression of parity (e.g. Maltby and Calow, 1986; Hughes and Simons, 2014a; c). Thus while some clades consistently display a single mode of parity (e.g. most placental mammals are exclusively iteroparous), many clades show considerable variability (see Table 1 for data from plant orders). Among cephalopoda (Mollusca), *Loligo opalescens*, *Octopus vulgaris*, *O. mimus*, and *O. cyanea* display extreme semelparity (Ikeda et al., 1993; Rocha et al., 2001), while *Nautilus* spp. show extreme perennial-iteroparity (Ward, 1983, 1987). However, other cephalopods, including *Octopus chierchiae*, *Sthenoteuthis oualaniensis*, and *Dosidicus gigas* show varying degrees of facultative iteroparity (Nesis, 1996; Laptikhovsky, 1998, 1999; Rocha et al., 2001), while still others, including *Sepia officinalis*, *Loligo vulgaris*, *L. bleekeri*, *L. forbesi*, and *Ilex coindetii* show facultative semelparity, and, in the case of *S. officinalis*, a strikingly variable duration of reproduction (Boletzky, 1987, 1988; Baeg et al., 1993; Gonzalez, 1994; Gonzalez and Guerra, 1996; Rocha and Guerra, 1996; Melo and Sauer, 1999). Furthermore, in many of these species key traits—such as the timing and duration of reproduction—show substantial dependence on environmental effects (Rocha et al., 2001). Similar lability in these traits is also present in other clades, including both angiosperms and animals (see: Maltby and Calow, 1986; Tallamy and Brown, 1999; Hautekèete et al., 2001; Crespi and Teo, 2002; Varela-Lasheras and Van Dooren, 2014). Thus, because evolutionary change from one mode of parity to another is a ubiquitous life-history transition, accurately characterizing parity as a life-history variable of interest

may prove crucial to accounting for the adaptiveness of life-history strategies.

IV. UNDERSTANDING THE EVOLUTION OF PARITY AS A CONTINUOUS TRAIT

What changes should be made in light of the evidence that parity is a continuous trait? In this section I will focus on three main recommendations. First, I provide a short discussion of how seasonality should not be conflated with mode of parity. Second, I discuss the necessity of developing new mathematical modelling approaches that treat parity as a continuous variable. This is not simple, since parity itself is a composite trait, and relies on the coordination of many biological functions at once. Third, I discuss why ecologists should ground future studies of adaptive life history strategies in mechanistic details derived from genetic studies of continuously-varying life history traits underlying reproduction and, consequently, parity. These recommendations should improve both the validity and reliability of predictive models of life-history evolution, while simultaneously providing a framework for interpreting empirical findings regarding the expression of reproductive effort through time.

(1) – Seasonality and Mode of Parity

One major implication of treating parity as a continuous variable is that this reconception allows us to distinguish between parity and seasonality. Parity describes the

concentration or diffusion of reproductive effort in time, which is distinct from the question of seasonal reproduction—i.e. how organisms should distribute reproductive effort among seasons, when seasonal cycles determine the favourability of establishment, growth, and reproductive conditions (Cole, 1954; Charnov and Schaffer, 1973; Schaffer, 1974b; Schaffer and Gadgil, 1975; Calow, 1979; Young, 1981; Bulmer, 1994; Evans et al., 2005; Ranta et al., 2007). It is, of course, clear that seasonality is related to parity. Insofar as an annual-semelparous organism is defined by the fact that it has a single reproductive episode that occurs within one year, it is likely to experience selection for strategies that optimize its reproductive schedule relative to season-specific environmental effects; this means that an annual-semelparous organism is more likely to show predictable seasonal patterns than a perennial-iteroparous congener that can escape a poor season by overwintering. However, the explanatory power of such seasonal adaptations may be much weaker when we compare a fast-reproducing semelparous organism with a slower-reproducing semelparous congener, or when we compare an iteroparous strategy where reproductive effort is distributed over two seasons with another where reproductive effort is distributed among ten seasons. Seasonal effects are likely to supervene on reproduction whenever regular intervals occur that have an impact on the favourability of reproduction. Thus it may be more fruitful to understand annuality and perenniality as strategies defined by the “digitization” of reproduction in response to seasonality. The advantage of this approach is that it makes it easier to understand flexible life histories, regardless of whether a species is semelparous or iteroparous.

There is widespread empirical evidence that seasonality and parity can vary independently. One common pattern is integer changes in voltinism among organisms

that share a common mode of parity. For example, the Muga silkworm (*Antheraea*
548 *assamensis*) is semelparous and multivoltine throughout its natural range (from India to
Borneo). This species produces up to 6 generations per year, with the number of
550 reproductive cycles depending on length of the season (Singh and Singh, 1998; Ghorai et
al., 2009). However, the closely related Chinese tussar silkmoth, *Antheraea pernyi*, is
552 bivoltine at the southern margins of its range, but is univoltine in northern China and
Korea. Moreover, this continuous variation in voltinism along an ecological cline is due
554 to continuous variation in environment-dependent biogenic monoamine production in the
brains of diapause pupae (Fukuda, 1953; Matsumoto and Takeda, 2002; Liu et al., 2010).
556 Life histories also vary continuously among populations of the wild silkmoth (*Bombyx*
mandarina) and its domesticated counterpart (*Bombyx mori*), where populations in colder
558 climates (e.g. European Russia) are univoltine, whereas those in China and Korea are
bivoltine or multivoltine (Xia et al., 2009). Similar examples can also be found in
560 crucifers (Williams and Hill, 1986; Springthorpe and Penfield, 2015), orchids (Chase et
al., 2005), freshwater molluscs (Mackie and Flippance, 1983; McMahon and Bogan,
562 2001), and *Centaurea* (Asteraceae; Acker et al., 2014), among others. In each of these
systems, a distinct continuum of reproductive strategies despite the supervening effect of
564 seasonality is readily observable. Additionally, new models are being developed that
consider generation length independently from parity (Waples, 2016). Thus we can easily
566 tease apart the question of whether reproduction is concentrated in time—i.e. whether a
given species is semelparous—from the question of whether seasonality requires that, in
568 temperate climates, late-reproducing individuals should enter diapause rather than
reproduce immediately.

570

(2) Mathematical Models of Parity

572 A second problem facing life history theory is the challenge of making new
mathematical models that account for the continuity of modes of parity. Although
574 empirical studies of many taxa support the continuous conception of parity, the evolution
of different modes of parity from one another has generally been explained by
576 demographic models that compare the special case where annual-semelparous and
perennial-iteroparous strategies have different demographic implications. This means that
578 mathematical models that incorporate the assumption that there is a discrete difference
between semelparous and iteroparous strategies may not be able to account for the real
580 eco-evolutionary dynamics of the reproductive behaviour of many organisms that do not
show either annual-semelparous or perennial-iteroparous modes of parity, or the
582 reproductive behaviours of species or populations that display continuous differences in
parity. To develop a general model that can account for all modes of parity as adaptive
584 responses to environmental conditions should, as an axiom, treat parity as a continuous
trait, and should be able to explain both the evolution of semelparous strategies from
586 iteroparous ones (or vice versa) as well as the adaptive value of intermediate modes of
parity. In this section I argue that dynamic mathematical models that integrate molecular
588 data with demographic factors are the best candidates to explain the evolution of different
modes of parity. In addition, extant mathematical models used to explain the adaptive
590 differences between semelparous and iteroparous life histories—or to calculate “optimal”
trait values for distinct semelparous-annual and iteroparous-perennial strategies—can and

should be redesigned to incorporate a continuum of possible modes of parity.

These new models will have to build on and learn from a considerable body of existing models detailing the eco-evolutionary dynamics of semelparous and iteroparous life history strategies. Early conceptual and mathematical models of optimal semelparous reproduction were generally simple, deterministic, and were designed to predict a single “threshold” value that optimized life history characters such as size at first reproduction (Bell, 1980; Young, 1981). Threshold models of this type include senescence-threshold models based on the Penna aging model (Piñol and Banzon, 2011), as well as development-threshold models such as age-structured life history models. Age-structured models treat age at reproduction, and hence parity, as a discrete variable, and assess the evolutionary consequences of the degree of overlap between juvenile (i.e. prereproductive) and adult (reproductive) classes in a population (Wikan, 2012). Among the best known of these are Leslie models, which predict either few evolutionary stable states for semelparous organisms (Cushing, 2009, 2015; Cushing and Henson, 2012; Cushing and Stump, 2013) or even that populations should consist entirely of individuals of a given age class (Rudnicki and Wieczorek, 2014). Still other threshold models make similar predictions for survival traits (Da-Silva et al., 2008).

However, despite rare exceptions (e.g. Lesica and Young, 2005), threshold models generally fail to adequately predict reproductive phenotypes in field systems, prompting some authors to emphasize the importance of making fewer assumptions that contradict “real” life-history parameters—e.g. Burd et al. (2006) note that “empirical attention to norms of reaction across growth environments will be a more profitable

approach than investigation of size thresholds per se". That is, for short-lived semelparous species (and some long-lived semelparous species: see Rose et al., 2002), the impact of stochastic variation is substantial, and of equal or greater importance than the global optimum predicted by deterministic models (Rees et al., 1999). Furthermore, Rees et al. (1999) show that that deterministic age-structured models, which rest on the assumption that parity is discrete, consistently overestimate time at first reproduction in monocarpic plants. Empirical evidence showing a wide and highly variable range of reproductive phenotypes in natural populations (e.g. Marshall and Keough, 2007) has prompted the formulation of new modelling approaches that consider a range of semelparous strategies in response to environmental heterogeneity as a source of stochasticity that confounds threshold models that consider semelparous reproduction to be optimized for a given environmental (reviewed in Metcalf et al., 2003).

Recent mathematical models also fall into several types, each with a particular ecological focus. Integral projection models, which incorporate random fluctuations in environmental parameters related to reproduction, were developed to more accurately predict time to first reproduction and size at reproduction, both in iteroparous species (e.g. Kuss et al., 2008) and in semelparous species with a prolonged semelparous reproductive episode (e.g. Rees et al., 1999; Ellner and Rees, 2006; Rees et al. 1999; Sletvold 2005). Time-lagged models integral projection models attempt to account for the temporal discounting of reproductive value as well as size-specific effects on reproductive effort (Kuss et al., 2008). Newer age-structured stochastic models incorporate continuous variation in life history traits to predict optimal timing of reproduction; while these resemble earlier models that treat parity wholly as a discrete

variable, the life-history traits in these models are treated continuously (Oizumi and

638 Takada, 2013; Oizumi, 2014; Davison and Satterthwaite, 2016).

Several recent models have been developed to predict reproductive trait values
640 given other (measured or measurable) life history parameters. This modelling
methodology is intuitive and compatible with the idea that parity is a continuous trait. For
642 example, Kindsvater et al (2016) used a stage-structured model to assess the degree to
which trait covariation constrained life history adaptation in salmonids. Other kinds of
644 data-driven models fall into two main types: (1) models that highlight the importance of
phenotypically plastic reaction norms as maximizing fitness despite stochastic variability
646 in environment (e.g. Burd et al., 2006); and (2) models that emphasize the innate
variability in reproductive characters within species (e.g. Drouineau et al., 2014; Austen
648 et al., 2015). Both of these ideas may be useful in modelling selective pressures on a
continuum of modes of parity. Moreover, rather than using a single model to characterize
650 semelparous investment in flowers and offspring, authors are now proposing a ‘meta-
modelling’ approach to annual plant reproduction, recognizing that semelparous
652 reproduction can be fine-tuned by natural selection through phenotypic plasticity (Hughes
and Simons, 2014a). However, despite the success of some of these new models, as yet
654 they still suffer from a relative paucity of data relative to other areas of life-history
theory. When discussing models designed to predict the optimal timing of the initiation of
656 reproduction, Metcalf et al. (2003) wrote that, “a glaring inconsistency between the [life
history] models and the data is that all models predict a specific threshold flowering
658 condition...but data from natural population show a graded response”.

One class of model that may prove to be useful in modelling the allocation of reproductive effort over time are dynamic state variable models (DSVMs). DSVMs are powerful dynamic optimization models used to characterize mechanistic relationships in ecology, and have the benefit of being able to be solved computationally (Clark and Mangel, 2000). Developing a DSVM can offer insight into the relative impact of underlying causal processes (in this case, the underlying patterns of genetic regulation of reproductive traits) on a state variable of interest (in this case, total plant fitness). Because the model follows the value of a state variable, the effects of multiple fitness components can be considered at once. Moreover, by parameterizing a DVSM with phenotypic data, ecologists can determine the additive and multiplicative contributions of variation at different gene loci, or between related phenotypes of interest. This is an important advantage insofar as continuous models of parity should, where possible include mechanistic detail. DSVMs are compatible with this approach: they can integrate a wide range of functional, spatial, structural, behavioural, or environmental limitations constraining investment in reproduction, and can generate testable predictions by determining optimal reproductive decision schedules (e.g. Yerkes and Koops, 1999; Skubic et al., 2004; Peterson and Roitberg, 2010).

(3) - Molecular Regulation of Parity

The third implication of understanding parity as a continuously varying trait is that further study of parity should be rooted in mechanistic detail, and identifying the mechanistic basis of different modes of parity (e.g. the contributions of individual genes

and/or molecular pathways responsible for initiating and continuing reproduction) should

be an important priority for evolutionary ecology. Integrating theoretical ecology with molecular biological data was not possible when early life-history models were developed, but since parity is determined by the onset and completion of reproductive episodes, and recent advances in molecular ecology have made it possible to understand the physiological and genetic basis of these events in many systems, this is, in many systems, an achievable goal. Numerous examples of continuously-expressed physiological processes result in continuous patterns of reproduction, and hence support the continuous conception of parity (Table 3). In this section, I will explain how parsing out the contributions of a single gene can improve our understanding of how modes of parity can vary continuously. To do so, I will discuss an important example: the control of the initiation of flowering in response to vernalization as it is regulated by FLOWERING LOCUS C (*FLC*) and its orthologues in the Brassicaceae. I discuss two such cases: (1) *FLC* regulation of vernalization response in *Arabidopsis thaliana*, a semelparous annual; and (2) *PEP1* regulation of vernalization response in *Arabis alpina*, an iteroparous perennial.

In *Arabidopsis*, continuous variation in parity –i.e. the timing of floral initiation and the duration of flowering—is determined by continuous expression of flowering-time genes, including *FLOWERING LOCUS T* (*FT*) (Kardailsky, 1999; Yanovsky and Kay, 2002; Kotake et al., 2003; Imaizumi and Kay, 2006; Turck et al., 2008; Simon et al., 2015), *FRIGIDA* (*FRI*) (Johanson et al., 2000; Le Corre et al., 2002; Michaels et al., 2004; Stinchcombe et al., 2004; Shindo et al., 2005; Schläppi, 2006), *FLOWERING LOCUS C* (Coupland, 1995; Amasino, 1996; Michaels and Amasino, 1999; Sheldon et

al., 2000; Michaels et al., 2003, 2004; Bastow et al., 2004; Imaizumi and Kay, 2006; Kim et al., 2007; Chiang et al., 2009), *GIGANTEA (GI)* (Fowler et al., 1999; Mizoguchi et al., 2005; Jung et al., 2007), and *CONSTANS (CO)* (Redei, 1962; Putterill et al., 1995; Koornneef et al., 1998; Samach et al., 2000; Suárez-López et al., 2001; Valverde et al., 2004). Through different pathways, *GI* and *CO* activate the floral integrator gene *FLOWERING LOCUS T (FT)*, which transcribes a protein that activates floral identity genes in the shoot apical meristem (Turck et al., 2008; Tiwari et al., 2010). In contrast, *FLC*—along with *FRI*, which regulates *FLC* transcription—represses flowering in the absence of vernalization.

Although much is known about the complex question of how flowering is induced, here I concentrate on *FLC*, since continuous differences in *FLC* expression cause continuous variation in the duration and timing of semelparous reproduction (Wilczek et al., 2009; Burghardt et al., 2015). This variation causes continuous differences in parity. For instance, throughout Europe, parity in wild populations of *Arabidopsis* seems strongly determined by climate and/or latitude: toward the colder margins of its range, in northern Finland, plants show a fast-cycling summer semelparous annual life history, while populations near the Mediterranean show a winter annual life history, and populations in intermediate locations (e.g. the UK) display intermediate life histories (Thompson, 1994; Méndez-Vigo et al., 2011; Ågren and Schemske, 2012). Lab studies have identified *FLC* as the mechanism responsible for this life-history variation. For example, Wilczek et al. (2009) introgressed a functional *FRI* allele into *A. thaliana* ecotypes with nonfunctional alleles. They predicted that this genetic modification—which causes the upregulation of *FLC*—would see plants transition from a summer-

annual to winter-annual life history. Instead, plants with functional *FRI* alleles flowered
 728 only 10 days later than those with nonfunctional *FRI* alleles, causing the authors to note
 that their results “suggest that *A. thaliana* ecotypes cannot simply be divided into two
 730 discrete classes of winter-annual and rapid-cycling genotypes. Rather, most ecotypes may
 be capable of both life histories” (p. 933). This prediction is consistent with recent data
 732 from studies of the impact of *FLC* on the life histories of *A. thaliana* ecotypes sourced
 from different parts of its native range. While populations varying at the *FLC* locus show
 734 substantial local adaptation with respect to important life history traits—including those,
 such as length of duration of reproduction, which underlie mode of parity—most
 736 ecotypes adopt new life histories when translocated to radically different environments
 (Ågren and Schemske, 2012; Dittmar et al., 2014; Ågren et al., 2016; Postma and Ågren,
 738 2016).

Where the prevalence of different *FLC* alleles differs between populations,
 740 differential expression of *FLC* can result in different flowering phenologies, and even
 different modes of parity (Johanson et al., 2000; Michaels et al., 2004; Schläppli, 2006;
 742 Banta and Purugganan, 2011). This is likely an adaptive response; life-history models of
 the natural genetic variation at the *FLC* and *FRI* loci have shown that *FLC* expression
 744 explains a relatively high level of variation in fitness (Donohue et al., 2014; Burghardt et
 al., 2015; Springthorpe and Penfield, 2015). Moreover, empirical studies suggest that
 746 such fitness differences may account for the latitudinal cline in *Arabidopsis* life history
 found in natural populations (Caicedo et al., 2004). Thus it seems that local adaptation of
 748 different modes of parity result from populations experiencing stabilizing selection for
 climate-appropriate *FLC* alleles (Postma and Ågren, 2016).

While fitness differences are tightly linked to phenotypic variation, major plant phenotypes such as flowering phenology are highly plastic in *Arabidopsis*. The genetic and epigenetic regulation of *FLC* regulate the timing of important life-history transitions, determining a plant's reproductive schedule, and hence its mode of parity (Albani and Coupland, 2010; Turck and Coupland, 2014). However, environmental factors such as seed maturation and germination temperatures can interact with plant genotypes to produce “clusters” of phenotypically similar, yet genotypically distinct, plant phenologies (Burghardt et al., 2016). Environmental variation can therefore facilitate the adoption of multiple flowering phenologies (e.g. summer annual, winter annual, rapid cycling, etc.)—and thus modes of parity—from a single *Arabidopsis* ecotype (Simpson and Dean, 2002; Méndez-Vigo et al., 2011).

The relationship between *FLC* and variation in mode of parity is best understood in *Arabidopsis*, continuous variation in parity arising from response to vernalization has also been identified in the confamilial species *Arabis alpina*. *PERPETUAL FLOWERING 1 (PEP1)*, the orthologue of *FLC* in *A. alpina* (Wang, Farrona, Vincent, Joecker, et al., 2009), is responsible for regulating vernalization response. In *Arabidopsis*, *FLC* confers a obligate vernalization requirement on individuals; thus flowering is not possible until plants experience winter temperatures, which causes chromatin remodeling that prevents *FLC* transcription (Sheldon et al., 2000; Bastow et al., 2004). *PEP1* also confers an obligate vernalization requirement to *A. alpina*, however this effect is (seasonally) temperature-dependent. That is, in the Pajares ecotype, *PEP1* transcription is temporarily repressed by low temperatures, mediated by the continuous expression of *COOLAIR*-family antisense RNAs produced in response to cold (Wang, Farrona, Vincent, Joecker,

et al., 2009; Albani et al., 2012; Castaings et al., 2014a), and thus facilitating the regular
 774 alternation of vegetative and reproductive phases that characterize iteroparous-perennial
 life histories. Like *FLC*, considerable natural variation exists at the *PEP1* locus—most
 776 natural *A. alpina* ecotypes have a functional *PEP1* allele, and under controlled conditions
 restrict flowering duration, although some accessions lack a functional *PEP1* allele, and
 778 thus continuously flower without vernalization (Torang et al., 2015). That *PEP1* alone is
 responsible for this phenotype has been confirmed using mutant lines (Wang, Farrona,
 780 Vincent, Joecker, et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2011; Albani et al., 2012; Bergonzi et al.,
 2013). However, this transition is continuous rather than discrete, since the degree of
 782 *PEP1* suppression depends both on *PEP1* allele present in the accession as well as the
 duration of vernalization.

784 Thus, in both *Arabidopsis thaliana* and *Arabis alpina* (among other Brassicaceae
 spp.), parity is linked to genetic variation at the *FLC/PEP1* locus, and alleles from
 786 different, locally-adapted ecotypes show a range of distinct phenotypes (Aikawa et al.,
 2010; Kemi et al., 2013; Zhou et al., 2013). Moreover, *FLC* itself is subject to a number
 788 of regulatory mechanisms, some of which result in independent life history differences
 (Gazzani et al., 2003; Shindo et al., 2005, 2006). *FLC* example is not an isolated case, nor
 790 have genes linked closely to parity been discovered only in plant species; although a
 comprehensive description of all genes linked to parity in all species is beyond the scope
 792 of this article, a few notable examples from a variety of well-studied taxa are presented in
 Table 3. Genes linked to traits underlying parity, including reproductive maturation,
 794 stress response, reproductive phenology, and senescence, have been the subject of many
 informative reviews (see: McBlain et al., 1987; Finch and Rose, 1995; Tower, 1996;

Danon et al., 2000; Eulgem et al., 2000; Rion and Kawecki, 2007; Garcia De Leaniz et al., 2007; Hall et al., 2007; Schneider and Wolf, 2008; Xin et al., 2008; Costantini et al., 2008; Amasino, 2009; Thomas et al., 2009; Partridge, 2010; McCormick et al., 2011; Selman and Withers, 2011; Kenyon, 2011; Thomas, 2013; Blümel et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2015).

V. CONCLUSIONS

We still know far too little about why the evolutionary transition from semelparity to iteroparity (or vice versa) is as common as it is, or under which ecological conditions intermediate strategies—such as facultative semelparity—will thrive. While models rooted in the conception of parity as a binary trait do a good job of accounting for the fitness differences between discrete semelparous-annual and iteroparous perennial alternative strategies, systems characterized by only these possibilities—and no others—are special cases. In many cases the life history question at hand is more subtle: why does a given species evolve a facultative strategy, or why does another show intraspecific variation in the length of the semelparous reproductive episode? In such cases—which are not as rare as they were when the adaptiveness of parity was first being investigated—the discrete conception of parity is a impractical oversimplification.

Thus the main conclusion of this work is that parity should be treated as a continuous trait rather than a discrete one. This reconception of parity offers several notable advantages for life-history theory. First, treating parity as a continuous trait

allows us to treat parity as a distinct life history syndrome, itself the result of correlated
818 selection on a suite of traits, that may show finely-graded correlated variation within
species or populations. This is advantageous because parity is a composite trait, and the
820 act of reproducing at a given time, of a given duration, etc. involves the recruitment and
coordination of many independent parts, each of which may affect the expression of
822 others. An integrative approach has proven to be valuable in studying other multifactorial
composite traits (e.g. Buoro and Carlson, 2014). Furthermore, whether they share
824 common genetic basis or not, obvious or visible life history characters may not be
primary targets of selection, and evolution of such traits may occur as an epiphenomenon
826 of selection on (one or many) other apparent or non-apparent underlying traits. Second,
developing accurate mathematical and mechanistic models designed to explain fitness
828 differences between life histories—as well as to understand the nature of the costs and
trade-offs associated with initiating and completing reproductive episodes—will be best
830 understood by acknowledging that living systems show a continuum of reproductive
strategies between annual-semelparity and perennial-iteroparity. Considering only
832 annual-semelparity and perennial-iteroparity as discrete alternatives, although a useful
simplification for many models, is biologically accurate only in a limited number of
834 special cases, and the continuous conception of parity is more likely to approximate the
eco-evolutionary dynamics of natural systems that show intraspecific or plastic variation
836 in the expression of parity. Finally, treating parity as a continuous variable that represents
a syndrome of associated traits may make it easier to integrate life history studies with
838 mechanistic details deriving from molecular ecology, insofar as composite life history
traits such as parity are unlikely to be the result of a simple presence or absence of a

single gene or allele. Instead, parity is likely to be the product of complex systems of genetic, translational, and post-translational regulation.

There are important issues to consider for further work on a continuum of modes of parity. First, life-history theorists should make their language clearer and tighten definitions, in order to avoid confusion and improve the effectiveness of evolutionary explanations. Parity, the degree of temporal concentration or diffusion of reproductive effort in time, is a distinct evolutionary question from whether organisms reproduce in one year or in more than one year (“classic” semelparity and iteroparity), or whether or not organisms have a distinct life cycle that is completed according to an annual cycle or not (annuality and perenniality). Consider two annual plants as an example: the concentration of reproductive effort in time—i.e. realizing a hyper-semelparous (or uniparous) reproductive strategy—is a different strategy than spreading reproduction out over many months, even if both strategies are completed within a single year. Moreover, the evolutionary and mechanistic reasons that account for seasonal behaviours—e.g. annuality and perenniality—are distinct from those that account for the degree of parity. Making these distinctions clear, both in language and in predictive models, should be an important priority for evolutionary ecologists interested in the problem of parity.

Other important issues exist as well. A second question is that the extant body of theory—much of which describes various special cases in which demographic or environmental factors confer a fitness advantage on an annual-semelparous strategy over a perennial-iteroparous one (or vice versa)—should be preserved and reworked into a

more general explanation of how factors affecting fitness through time determine optimal patterns of the distribution of risk in and among seasons. More general models should consider a range of possible modes of parity. A third issue is that reproductive characters of long-lived semelparous species are generally easier to model than characters of short-lived species, and while environmental heterogeneity plays an important role determining the optimal allocation of reproductive effort in annual semelparous species, long-lived semelparous species can afford to be “choosier” about when they reproduce, and therefore have been shown to more closely approximate model predictions. This may be especially true when, as in many long-lived perennial-iteroparous species, the relationship between age and cost of reproduction is nonlinear. Thus, developing models that accurately model the fitness dynamics of short-lived semelparous species should be a priority. Fourth, intraspecific differences in life-history strategy, particularly between populations inhabiting dissimilar environments, can confound the degree to which empirical studies can test predictions of *a priori* models or parameterize them. Additional empirical comparisons of different modes of parity should therefore be as general as possible, and incorporate as many points along the continuum of modes of parity as possible, in order to maximize generalizability. Last, new models of modes of parity should, on a system-by-system basis, attempt to account for the underlying mechanisms that determine the timing and nature of the allocation of reproductive effort. Because modes are composite traits, integrating the molecular mechanisms that underlie many traits into a single model is not a simple task. Moreover, even orthologous genes with may have dramatically different effects in closely related species, and this unpredictability may considerably complicate the process of mechanistically modelling of

modes of parity. Despite the considerable challenge that it poses, integrating molecular
 886 ecological studies of the fitness consequences of different genotypes with theoretical
 mathematical models should be an important priority in the medium- to long-term future,
 888 and would represent an important area of consilience between molecular and theoretical
 ecology.

890

VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

892 I would like to thank Andrew Simons, Maria Albani, Wim Soppe, and Amanda Feeney
 for their assistance in developing the ideas in this manuscript. This work was supported
 894 by a Postdoctoral Fellowship from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research
 Council and a Humboldt Research Fellowship from the Alexander von Humboldt
 896 Foundation.

898 VII. TABLES

Plant Order	Families	Estimated Number of Species	Class	Exemplar Species	Semelparous Species Present	Iteroparous Species Present	Notes	Reference
Acorales	1	2	M	<i>Acorus calamus</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist)
Alismatales	13	4500	M	<i>Anthurium andraeanum</i>	x	x	facultative semelparity	(Haggard and Tiffney, 1997; Haston et al., 2009)
Amborellales	1	1	-	<i>Amborella trichopoda</i>	x		-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Apiales	7	5500	D	<i>Daucus carota</i>	x	x	facultative semelparity in <i>Heracleum</i> spp.	(Chandler and Plunkett, 2004; Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Aquifoliales	5	600	D	<i>Ilex aquifolium</i>	x	x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Arecales	1	2600	M	<i>Cocos nucifera</i>	x	x	facultative semelparity in <i>Rhopalostylis sapida</i>	(Silvertown et al., 1993)
Asparagales	14	36000	M	<i>Asparagus officinalis</i>	x	x	facultative semelparity in <i>Yucca whipplei</i>	(Keeley et al., 1986)
Asterales	11	27500	D	<i>Helianthus annuus</i>	x	x	facultative iteroparity in <i>Lobelia inflata</i>	(Hughes and Simons, 2014b; c)
Austrobaileyales	3	100	NA	<i>Illicium verum</i>		x	-	(Palmer et al., 2004)
Berberidopsidales	2	6	D	<i>Berberidopsis corallina</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Brassicales	17	4500	D	<i>Brassica oleracea</i>	x	x	"perpetual flowering" under genetic control (<i>Arabis alpina</i>); phenotypically plastic semelparity in <i>Brassica campestris</i>	(Biswas and Mandal, 1987; Wang, Farrona, Vincent, Fornara, et al., 2009; Kew World Checklist, 2017) Albani PEP1; 2: Biswas, A. K., and S. K. Mandal. "Regulation of monocarpic senescence of <i>Brassica campestris</i> by the developing pods." <i>Physiologia Plantarum</i> 71.1 (1987): 89-94.
Bruniales	2	80	D	<i>Desfontainia spinosa</i>	x	x	fire-dependent facultative parity (Bruniaceae spp.)	(van Wilgen and Forsyth, 1992) Van Wilgen and Forsyth (1992)
Buxales	3	120	D	<i>Buxus sempervirens</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)

Canellales	2	136	D	<i>Canella winteriana</i>	x	x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Caryophyllales	33	11000	D	<i>Silene dioica</i>	x	x	Plasticity of iteroparous reproduction in <i>Ferocactus wislizeni</i> ; variation in many long-lived Cactaceae perennial spp.; similar changes in Buckwheat (Polygonaceae)	(Bowers, 2000; Song et al., 2013)
Celastrales	2	1300	D	<i>Celastrus orbiculatus</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Ceratophyllales	1	10	-	<i>Ceratophyllum submersum</i>	x	x	plasticity of iteroparous life histories in European hornworts	(Bisang et al., 2008)
Chloranthales	1	75	-	<i>Sarcandra glabra</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Commelinales	5	850	M	<i>Commelina communis</i>	x	x	Phenotypically plastic semelparity in genus <i>Commelina</i> ; varies from near-uniparity to extended semelparity	(Faden, 1993, 2006)
Cornales	6	600	D	<i>Hydrangea macrophylla</i>	x	x	Facultative iteroparity in stickleaf spp.	(Keeler, 1987)
Crossosomatales	7	80	D	<i>Crossosoma bigelovii</i>		x		(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Cucurbitales	8	2600	D	<i>Begonia obliqua</i>	x	x	facultative iteroparity among cultivated begonias	(De Wilde, 2010)
Dilleniales	1	400	D	<i>Hibbertia stellaris</i>	x	x	facultative semelparity in <i>Hibbertia</i> spp	(Stebbins and Hoogland, 1976)
Dioscoreales	3	1050	M	<i>Dioscorea rotundata</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Dipsacales	2	1100	D	<i>Lonicera periclymenum</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)

Ericales	25	11000	D	<i>Vaccinium macrpacaron</i>	x	x	Facultative semelparity and facultative iteroparity in <i>Impatiens</i> spp.	(Vervoort et al., 2011)
Escalloniales	1	130	D	<i>Escallonia bifida</i>	x	x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Fabales	4	20000	D	<i>Pisum sativum</i>	x	x	facultative iteroparity in many spp.	(Nichols et al., 2007)
Fagales	7	2000	D	<i>Quercus alba</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Garryales	2	18	D	<i>Garrya congdonii</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Gentianales	5	16000	D	<i>Gentiana verna</i>	x	x	plasticity of iteroparous reproduction in long lived perennial <i>Frasera caroliniensis</i>	(Threadgill et al., 1981)
Geraniales	5	900	D	<i>Geranium rotundifolium</i>	x	x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Gunnerales	2	55	D	<i>Gunnera manicata</i>	x	x	facultative semelparity in <i>Gunnera herteri</i>	(Wanntorp et al., 2002)
Huerteales	4	20	D	<i>Huertia cubensis</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Lamiales	20	24000	D	<i>Lamium purpureum</i>	x	x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Laurales	7	2500	D	<i>Laurus nobilis</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Liliales	10	1300	M	<i>Lilium candidum</i>	x	x	Many perennial Agave spp. have substantial phenotypic plasticity in parity	(Nobel, 1977; Arizaga and Ezcurra, 1995; Rocha et al., 2005)
Magnoliales	6	5000	-	<i>Magnolia virginiana</i>	x	x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Malpighiales	35	16000	D	<i>Malpighia glabra</i>	x	x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Malvales	9	6000	D	<i>Malva sylvestris</i>	x	x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Myrtales	9	11000	D	<i>Myrtus communis</i>	x	x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Nymphaeales	3	70	-	<i>Nymphaea lotus</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Oxalidales	7	1800	D	<i>Oxalis acetosella</i>	x	x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Pandanales	5	1300	M	<i>Pandanus utilis</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)

Paracryphiales	1	36	D	<i>Paracryphia alticola</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Petrosaviales	1	5	M	<i>Petrosavia sakuraii</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Picramniales	1	65	D	<i>Picramnia xalapensis</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Piperales	4	4000	-	<i>Piper nigrum</i>	x	x	facultative semelparity in <i>Piper pellucida</i>	(Wanke et al., 2006)
Poales	16	18000	M	<i>Zea mays</i>	x	x	facultative iteroparity and variable iteroparity in bamboo, wheat	(Franklin, 2004; Montti et al., 2011; Baum et al., 2013)
Proteales	3	1000	D	<i>Protea caffra</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Ranunculales	7	2800	D	<i>Ranunculus occidentalis</i>	x	x	phenotypically plastic parity in many <i>Meconopsis</i> spp.	(Sulaiman and Babu, 1996)
Rosales	9	7700	D	<i>Rosa blanda</i>	x	x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Sabiales	1	100	D	<i>Sabia campanulata</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Santalales	7	1000	D	<i>Santalum ellipticum</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Sapindales	9	5700	D	<i>Acer saccharum</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Saxifragales	16	2500	D	<i>Saxifraga stellaris</i>	x	x	<i>Saxifraga longifolia</i> shows phenotypically plastic parity	(García, 2003)
Solanales	5	4000	D	<i>Solanum tuberosum</i>	x	x	plasticity of long-term monocarpic reproduction in <i>Petunia</i> spp.	(Laroche and Bousquet, 1999)
Trochodendrales	1	2	D	<i>Trochodendron aralioides</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Vitales	1	770	D	<i>Vitis vinifera</i>		x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)
Zingiberales	8	2100	D	<i>Zingiber officinale</i>	x	x	plasticity of mode of parity in <i>Ensete</i> spp.	(Kirchoff, 1992; Birmeta et al., 2004)
Zygophyllales	2	300	D	<i>Zygophyllum album</i>	x	x	-	(Kew World Checklist, 2017)

Table 1. Angiosperm orders show substantial diversity in mode of parity. Data is shown for all 59 plant orders from the APG III system. Class = (M) monocot or (D) dicot. Marks indicate whether the indicated reproductive strategy is present in that order.

Focal Species	Clade	Continuously varying traits identified	Facultative Iteroparity	Facultative Semelparity	Continuous Variation in Parity	Phenotypically Plastic Parity	Reference
<i>Acer negundo</i>	Angiosperm	timing of reproduction				x	(Lamarque et al., 2015)
<i>Agave celsii</i> , <i>Agave difformis</i>	Angiosperm	timing of reproduction; reproductive effort			x	x	(Rocha et al., 2005)
<i>Allogamus uncatus</i>	Insect	timing of reproduction; duration of reproduction			x	x	(Shama and Robinson, 2009)
<i>Alosa sapidissima</i>	Fish	timing of reproduction; clutch size		x	x	x	(Leggett and Carscadden, 1978)
<i>Amblyrhynchus cristatus</i>	Reptile	timing of reproduction			x	x	(Vitousek et al., 2010)
<i>Antechinus stuartii</i>	Mammal	adult mortality	x		x		(Fisher and Blomberg, 2011)
<i>Arabidopsis lyrata</i>	Angiosperm	timing of reproduction; duration of reproduction			x		(Remington et al., 2015)
<i>Arabis fecunda</i>	Angiosperm	reproductive effort			x	x	(Lesica and Shelly, 1995)
<i>Bambusa narnhemica</i>	Angiosperm	timing of reproduction			x		(Franklin, 2004)
<i>Beta vulgaris</i>	Angiosperm	reproductive effort				x	(Letschert, 1993; Hautekèete et al., 2001, 2002, 2009)
<i>Boreogadus saida</i>	Fish	adult mortality; reproductive effort			x		(Nahrgang et al., 2014)
<i>Botryllus sclosseri</i>	Tunicate	timing of reproduction, clutch size	x		x	x	(Grosberg, 1988; Harvell and Grosberg, 1988)
<i>Bradybaena pellucida</i>	Gastropod	duration of reproduction			x	x	(Nyumura and Asami, 2015)

<i>Cynodonichthys brunneus</i> , <i>Cynodonichthys magdalenae</i> , <i>Cynodonichthys kuelpmanni</i> , <i>Anablepsoides immaculatus</i> , and <i>Laimosemion frenatus</i>	Fish	timing of reproduction; diapause length		x	x	x	(Varela-Lasheras and Van Dooren, 2014)
<i>Daphnia galeata</i>	Crustacean	timing of reproduction			x	x	(Henning-Lucass et al., 2016)
<i>Daucus carota</i>	Angiosperm	timing of reproduction			x	x	(Lacey, 1988)
<i>Digitaria californica</i>	Angiosperm	juvenile mortality			x		(Smith et al., 2000)
<i>Dosidicus gigas</i>	Mollusc	timing of reproduction; duration of reproduction	x		x	x	(Hoving et al., 2013)
<i>Emoia atroscostata</i>	Reptile	timing of reproduction			x		(Alcala and Brown, 1967)
<i>Erpobella octoculata</i>	Leech	adult mortality; reproductive effort	x		x	x	(Maltby and Calow, 1986)
<i>Erysimum capitatum</i>	Angiosperm	timing of reproduction		x	x		(Kim and Donohue, 2011)
<i>Eulamprus tympanum</i>	Reptile	clutch size; timing of reproduction			x	x	(Doughty and Shine, 1997)
<i>Forficula auricularia</i>	Insect	timing of reproduction				x	(Meunier et al., 2012)
<i>Fucus serratus</i> ; <i>Himanthalia elongata</i>	Algae	duration of reproduction			x		(Brenchley et al., 1996)
<i>Gaimardia bahamondei</i>	Bivalve	timing of reproduction; duration of reproduction	x		x	x	(Chaparro et al., 2011)
<i>Galaxias maculatus</i>	Fish	timing of reproduction	x			x	(Stevens et al., 2016)
<i>Gasterosteus aculeatus</i>	Stickleback	timing of reproduction; reproductive effort		x	x	x	(Snyder, 1991; Bell and Foster, 1994; Baker et al., 2008, 2015)
<i>Gracilinanus microtarsus</i>	Mammal	male adult mortality	x		x	x	(Kraaijeveld et al., 2003; Martins et al., 2006)
<i>Idiosepius pygmaeus</i>	Cephalopod	timing of reproduction	x		x		(Lewis and Choat, 1993; Nesis, 1996)
<i>Ligia cinerascens</i>	Crustacean	adult mortality; timing of reproduction	x	x	x	x	(Furota and Ito, 1999)

<i>Lobelia inflata</i>	Angiosperm	timing of reproduction; duration of reproduction	x		x	x	(Hughes and Simons, 2014 a,b,c)
<i>Loligo vulgaris</i>	Cephalopod	timing of reproduction; clutch size	x		x		(Melo and Sauer, 1999; Sauer et al., 1999)
<i>Mallotus villosus</i>	Fish	adult mortality; timing of reproduction		x	x	x	(Christiansen et al., 2008)
<i>Marmosops paulensis</i>	Mammal	female adult mortality	x		x	x	(Leiner et al., 2008)
<i>Mimulus guttatus</i>	Angiosperm	duration of flowering			x	x	(Van Kleunen, 2007)
<i>Misumena vatia</i>	Arachnid	juvenile mortality			x	x	(Morse, 1994; Morse and Stephens, 1996)
<i>Nautilus</i> spp.	Cephalopod	timing of reproduction; timing of senescence	x		x	x	(Ward, 1983, 1987)
<i>Oenothera deltoides</i> ; <i>Oenothera pallida</i>	Angiosperm	timing of reproduction; adult mortality	x	x	x		(Evans et al., 2005)
<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>	Fish	reproductive effort	x		x	x	(Seamons and Quinn, 2010)
<i>Oncorhynchus nerka</i>	Fish	timing of reproduction				x	(Hendry et al., 2004)
<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	Fish	adult mortality	x			x	(Unwin et al., 1999)
<i>Onopordum illyricum</i>	Angiosperm	timing of reproduction		x			(Rees et al., 1999)
<i>Opisthoteuthis agassizii</i> , <i>Opisthoteuthis grimaldii</i> and <i>Grimpoteuthis glacialis</i>	Cephalopod	timing of reproduction; reproductive effort			x		(Aldred et al., 1983; Villanueva, 1992; Vecchione et al., 1998)
<i>Panicum bisulcatum</i> , <i>Cyperus michelianus</i> , <i>Fimbristylis miliacea</i> , and <i>Eclipta prostrata</i>	Angiosperm	timing of reproduction; duration of reproduction			x	x	(Song et al., 2015)
<i>Parantechnius apicalis</i>	Mammal	adult mortality		x		x	(Wolfe et al., 2004)
<i>Plecoglossus altivelis</i>	Fish	timing of reproduction; reproductive effort	x		x	x	(Iguchi, 1996; Iguchi and Tsukamoto, 2001)
<i>Puya raimondii</i>	Angiosperm	reproductive effort		x	x		(Jabaily and Sytsma, 2013)
<i>Rana arvalis</i>	Frog	timing of reproduction				x	(Richter-Boix et al., 2014)
<i>Sasa senanensis</i> , <i>Sasa kurilensis</i> , and <i>Sasa palmata</i>	Angiosperm	timing of reproduction; reproductive effort	x	x		x	(Mizuki et al., 2014)

<i>Sepia officinalis</i>	Cephalopod	adult mortality; timing of reproduction; clutch size; timing of senescence	x		x	x	(Boletzky, 1988; Rocha et al., 2001)
<i>Stegodyphus lineatus</i>	Arachnid	adult mortality; timing of reproduction			x	x	(Schneider and Lubin, 1997)
<i>Sthenoteuthis oualaniensis</i>	Cephalopod	timing of reproduction	x				(Rocha et al., 2001)
<i>Strix uralensis</i>	Bird	timing of reproduction				x	(Brommer et al., 2012)
<i>Uta stansburiana</i>	Reptile	duration of reproduction,		x	x	x	(Tinkle, 1969)
<i>Verbascum thapsis</i>	Angiosperm	timing of reproduction			x		(Reinartz, 1984)
<i>Wyeomyia smithii</i>	Angiosperm	timing of reproduction			x	x	(Bradshaw, 1986)
<i>Xerolenta obvia</i>	Gastropod	timing of reproduction	x		x	x	(Lazaridou and Chatziioannou, 2005)
<i>Xeropicta derbentina</i>	Gastropod	timing of reproduction	x		x	x	(Aubry et al., 2005; Kiss et al., 2005)
<i>Yucca whipplei</i>	Angiosperm	reproductive effort		x	x		(Huxman and Loik, 1997)

902 Table 2. Species known to display facultative semelparity, facultative iteroparity, a continuum of modes of parity, or phenotypic plasticity with respect to mode of parity.

Study Organism	Clade	Gene /QTL	Traits	Reference
<i>Actinidia chinensis</i>	Angiosperm	carotenoid cleavage dioxygenase 8 (CCD8)	branch development; timing of senescence	(Ledger et al., 2010)
<i>Aedes aegypti</i> , <i>A. albopictus</i>	Insect	cytochrome P450 gene 6Z6 (CYP6Z6), 6N12 (CYP6N12), and M9 (CYP9M9)	juvenile mortality	(Kim and Muturi, 2012)
<i>Arabidopsis lyrata</i>	Angiosperm	LG3, LG4	developmental timing of reproductive transitions; branchiness	(Leinonen et al., 2013; Remington et al., 2013, 2015)
<i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i>	Angiosperm	Early day-length insensitive (EDI)	response to vernalization; timing of flowering	(Alonso-Blanco et al., 1998)
<i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i>	Angiosperm	FLC	timing of initiation of reproduction	(Bastow et al., 2004; Caicedo et al., 2004; Kim et al., 2007; Aikawa et al., 2010; Deng et al., 2011)
<i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i>	Angiosperm	FRI	timing of initiation of reproduction	(Le Corre et al., 2002; Stinchcombe et al., 2004; Shindo et al., 2005; Méndez-Vigo et al., 2011)
<i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i>	Angiosperm	DOG1	seed dormancy; timing of initiation of reproduction	(Chiang et al., 2011, 2013)
<i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i> ; <i>Pisum sativum</i>	Angiosperm	More axillary growth (MAX4); Ramosus1 (RMS1)	axillary shoot outgrowth; timing of outgrowth	(Sorefan et al., 2003)
<i>Arabis alpina</i>	Angiosperm	PEP1	timing of initiation of reproduction; perenniality	(Wang, Farrona, Vincent, Fornara, et al., 2009; Albani et al., 2012; Castaings et al., 2014b)
<i>Brachionus plicatilis</i>	Rotifer	small heat shock protein 1 (shsp-1), shsp-2, shsp-3, shsp-4	dormancy; juvenile mortality	(Denekamp et al., 2011)
<i>Colias eutytheme</i> , <i>C. philodice</i>	Insect	phosphoglucose isomerase (PGI)	lifespan, fecundity	(Watt, 1983; Watt et al., 1983)
<i>Conregonus clupeaformis</i>	Fish	<i>Salmo salar</i> zonadhesin-like	fecundity	(Nolte et al., 2009)
<i>Drosophila melanogaster</i>	Insect	Met	fecundity, timing of initiation of reproduction	(Flatt and Kawecki, 2004)

<i>Drosophila melanogaster</i>	Insect	Juvenile hormone (JH), TOR	lifespan, timing of transition to adulthood	(Tatar et al., 2001, 2003; Kapahi et al., 2004; Katewa and Kapahi, 2011)
<i>Gadus morhua</i>	Fish	Growth hormone 1	timing of juvenile maturation	(Hemmer-Hansen et al., 2014)
<i>Gryllus firmus</i>	Insect	Juvenile hormone (JH)	fecundity	(Zera and Huang, 1999; Zhao and Zera, 2002)
<i>Haliotis refescens</i>	Mollusc	engrailed, aragonite protein 24k Da (ap24)	juvenile mortality	(Zippay et al., 2010)
<i>Heliocidaris erythrogamma</i>	Echinoderm	Abopec, Brn1, Brn2, Brn4	feeding behaviour; timing of initiation of reproduction	(Israel et al., 2016)
<i>Hordeum vulgare</i>	Angiosperm	QSD1	seed dormancy	(Sato et al., 2016)
<i>Ichthyomyzon castaneus, I. fossor</i>	Lamprey	insulin-like growth factor 1 receptor (igf1r), cytochrome c oxidase subunit III (coIII)	fecundity	(Spice et al., 2014)
<i>Lactuca sativa</i>	Angiosperm	DOG1	seed dormancy; timing of initiation of reproduction	(Huo et al., 2016)
<i>Miletaea cinxia</i>	Insect	phosphoglucose isomerase (PGI)	lifespan, fecundity	(Klemme and Hanski, 2009; Saastamoinen et al., 2009)
<i>Miletaea cinxia</i>	Insect	troponin-t (TNT)	timing of transition to adulthood	(Marden et al., 2008)
<i>Mimulus guttatus</i>	Angiosperm	More axillary growth (MAX)	axillary shoot outgrowth; timing of outgrowth	(Baker et al., 2012)
<i>Mimulus guttatus; M. nasutus</i>	Angiosperm	-	timing of reproduction; reproductive allocation	(Hall et al., 2006)
<i>Oncorhynchus kisutch, O. keta, O. gorbuscha</i>	Fish	Clock, Cytochrome	timing of juvenile maturation	(O'Malley et al., 2010)
<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>	Fish	Omy5 loci, including OC6, OC8, OC14, OC20, OC21, and OC30	anadromy, timing of smoltification	(Nichols et al., 2008; Pearse et al., 2014)
<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>	Fish	Clock	spawning time	(Leder et al., 2006)

<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>	Fish	One3ASC, One19ASC	biannual spawning	(Colihueque et al., 2010)
<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i> , <i>Oncorhynchus kitsuch</i>	Fish	17a,20b-dihydroxy-4-pregnene-3-one	timing of senescence	(Barry et al., 2010)
<i>Petromyzon marinus</i> , <i>Lampetra appendix</i>	Lamprey	Gonadotropin-releasing hormone-I (GnRH-I) and -III (GnRH-III)	timing of transition to adulthood	(Youson et al., 2006)
<i>Petunia hybrida</i>	Angiosperm	Decreased apical dominance 1 (DAD1), MAX1, MAX2, CCD7, CCD8	axillary shoot outgrowth; timing of and reproductive effort allocated to floral development	(Snowden, 2005; Drummond, 2012)
<i>Rhagoletis pomonella</i>	Insect	jetlag (jet), clockwork orange (cwo), PAR- domain protein 1 (Pdp1)	timing of diapause termination	(Ragland et al., 2011)
<i>Sarcophaga crassipalpis</i>	Insect	heat shock protein 23 (Hsp23), Hsp70, Hsp90, lipid storage protein (LSP)-1, LSP-2	timing of diapause termination; timing of reproduction; reproductive effort	(Rinehart et al., 2000, 2007; Hahn et al., 2008)
<i>Thlaspi caerulescens</i>	Angiosperm	Thlc1, Thlc2, Thlc3	fecundity, timing of initiation of reproduction	(Jiménez-Ambríz et al., 2007)

Table 3. Genes and QTLs regulating continuously-expressed traits linked to parity.

VIII. REFERENCES

- 908 ACKER, P., A. ROBERT, R. BOURGET, and B. COLAS. 2014. Heterogeneity of reproductive
age increases the viability of semelparous populations. *Functional Ecology* 28: 458–
910 468.
- ÅGREN, J., C.G. OAKLEY, S. LUNDEMO, and D.W. SCHEMSKE. 2016. Adaptive divergence
912 in flowering time among natural populations of *Arabidopsis thaliana*: estimates of
selection and QTL mapping. *Evolution* Early Article Proof. 1–15.
- 914 ÅGREN, J., and D.W. SCHEMSKE. 2012. Reciprocal transplants demonstrate strong
adaptive differentiation of the model organism *Arabidopsis thaliana* in its native
916 range. *New Phytologist* 194: 1112–1122.
- AIKAWA, S., M. KOBAYASHI, A. SATAKE, K. SHIMIZU, and H. KUDOH. 2010. Robust
918 control of the seasonal expression of the *Arabidopsis FLC* gene in a fluctuating
environment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107: 11632–11637.
- 920 ALBANI, M.C., L. CASTAINGS, S. WÖTZEL, J.L. MATEOS, J. WUNDER, R. WANG, M.
REYMOND, and G. COUPLAND. 2012. *PEP1* of *Arabis alpina* Is Encoded by Two
922 Overlapping Genes That Contribute to Natural Genetic Variation in Perennial
Flowering. *PLoS Genetics* 8: 1–14.
- 924 ALBANI, M.C., and G. COUPLAND. 2010. Comparative analysis of flowering in annual and
perennial plants. In M. Timmermans [ed.], *Plant Development*, 323–348. Elsevier
926 Inc.
- ALCALA, A.C., and W.C. BROWN. 1967. Population ecology of the tropical seinoïd lizard,
928 *Emoia atrocostata*, in the Philippines. *Copeia* 3: 596–604.

- ALDRED, R., M. NIXON, and J. YOUNG. 1983. *Cirrothauma murrayi* Chun, a finned
930 octopod. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* 301: 1–54.
- ALONSO- BLANCO, C., S. EL-ASSAL, G. COUPLAND, and M. KOORNNEEF. 1998. Analysis
932 of Natural Allelic Variation at Flowering Time Loci in the Landsberg erecta and
Cape Verde Islands Ecotypes of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Genetics* 149: 749–764.
- 934 AMASINO, R. 2009. Floral induction and monocarpic versus polycarpic life histories.
Genome Biology 10: 228.
- 936 AMASINO, R.M. 1996. Control of flowering time in plants. *Current Opinion in Genetics
& Development* 6: 480–487.
- 938 ARIZAGA, S., and E. EZCURRA. 1995. Insurance against reproductive failure in a
semelparous plant: bulbil formation in *Agave macroacantha* flowering stalks.
940 *Oecologia* 101: 329–334.
- AUBRY, S., C. LABAUNE, F. MAGNIN, and L. KISS. 2005. Habitat and integration within
942 indigenous communities of *Xeropicta derbentina* (Gastropoda: Hygromiidae) a
recently introduced land snail in south-eastern France. *Diversity and Distributions*
944 11: 539–547.
- AUSTEN, E.J., J.R.K. FORREST, and A. E. WEIS. 2015. Within-plant variation in
946 reproductive investment: consequences for selection on flowering time. *Journal of
Evolutionary Biology* 28: 65–79. Available at:
948 <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/jeb.12538>.
- BAEG, G., Y. SAKURAI, and K. SHIMAZAKI. 1993. Maturation processes in female *Loligo*
950 *bleekeri* Keferstein (Mollusca :Cephalopoda). *Veliger* 36: 228–235.

- BAKER, J., D. HEINS, S. FOSTER, and R. KING. 2008. An overview of life history variation
952 in threespine stickleback. *Behaviour* 145: 579–602.
- BAKER, J., M. WUND, D. HEINS, R. KING, M. REYES, and S. FOSTER. 2015. Life-history
954 plasticity in female threespine stickleback. *Heredity* 115: 322–334.
- BAKER, R.L., L.C. HILEMAN, and P.K. DIGGLE. 2012. Patterns of shoot architecture in
956 locally adapted populations are linked to intraspecific differences in gene regulation.
New Phytologist 196: 271–281.
- 958 BAKER, W. 1992. Structure, disturbance, and change in the bristlecone pine forests of
Colorado, USA. *Arctic and Alpine Research* 24: 17–26.
- 960 BANTA, J., and M. PURUGGANAN. 2011. The genetics and evolution of flowering time
variation in plants: Identifying genes that control a key life history transition. *In*
962 *Mechanisms of Life History Evolution: the Genetics and Physiology of Life History*
Traits and Trade-offs, 114–126. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- 964 BARRY, T.P., A. MARWAH, and S. NUNEZ. 2010. Inhibition of cortisol metabolism by 17-
alpha, 20-beta-P: mechanism mediating semelparity in salmon? *General and*
966 *Comparative Endocrinology* 165: 53–9.
- BASTOW, R., J.S. MYLNE, C. LISTER, Z. LIPPMAN, R. A MARTIENSSEN, and C. DEAN.
968 2004. Vernalization requires epigenetic silencing of *FLC* by histone methylation.
Nature 427: 164–167.
- 970 BAUM, B.R., T. EDWARDS, D.A. JOHNSON, and J.P. GUSTAFSON. 2013. What does the 5S
rRNA multigene family tell us about the origin of the annual Triticeae (Poaceae)?
972 *Genome* 56: 245–266.

- BELL, G. 1980. The Costs of Reproduction and Their Consequences. *The American*
974 *Naturalist* 116: 45–76.
- BELL, M., and S. FOSTER. 1994. Introduction to the evolutionary biology of the threespine
976 stickleback. In M. Bell, and S. Foster [eds.], *The Evolutionary Biology of the*
Threespine Stickleback, 1–27. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- 978 BENTON, T.G., and A. GRANT. 1999. Optimal Reproductive Effort in Stochastic, Density-
Dependent Environments. *Evolution* 53: 677–688.
- 980 BERGONZI, S., M.C. ALBANI, E. VER LOREN VAN THEMAAT, K.J. V NORDSTRÖM, R.
WANG, K. SCHNEEBERGER, P.D. MOERLAND, and G. COUPLAND. 2013. Mechanisms
982 of Age-Dependent Response to Wwinter Temperature in Perennial Flowering of
Arabis alpina. *Science*. 340: 1094–7.
- 984 BIRMETA, G., H. NYBOM, and E. BEKELE. 2004. Distinction between wild and cultivated
enset (*Ensete ventricosum*) gene pools in Ethiopia using RAPD markers. *Hereditas*
986 140: 139–148.
- BISANG, I., L. LIENHARD, and A. BERGAMINI. 2008. Fördert die Ökologisierung der
988 Landwirtschaft die Hornmoose im Schweizer Mittelland? Swiss Association of
Bryology.
- 990 BISWAS, A.K., and S.K. MANDAL. 1987. Regulation of monocarpic senescence of
Brassica campestris by the developing pods. *Physiologia Plantarum* 71: 89–94.
- 992 BLÜMEL, M., N. DALLY, and C. JUNG. 2015. Flowering time regulation in crops-what did
we learn from Arabidopsis? *Current Opinion in Biotechnology* 32: 121–129.
- 994 BOLETZKY, S.V. 1988. A new record of long-continued spawning in *Sepia officinalis*

(Mollusca, Cephalopoda). *Rapp Comm Int Mer Médit* 31: 257.

- 996 BOLETZKY, S.V. 1987. Fecundity variation in relation to intermittent or chronic spawning
in the cuttlefish, *Sepia officinalis* L. (Mollusca, Cephalopoda). *Bulletin of Marine*
998 *Science* 40: 382–387.
- BONNET, X. 2011. The Evolution of Semelparity 17.1. In R. Aldridge, and D. Sever
1000 [eds.], *Reproductive Biology and Phylogeny of Snakes*, 645–672. CRC Press, Boca
Raton, FL, USA.
- 1002 BONSER, S.P., and L.W. AARSEN. 2006. Meristem allocation and life-history evolution in
herbaceous plants. *Canadian Journal of Botany* 84: 143–150.
- 1004 BOWERS, J.E. 2000. Does *Ferocactus wislizeni* (Cactaceae) have a between-year seed
bank? *Journal of Arid Environments* 45: 197–205.
- 1006 BRADSHAW, W. 1986. Variable Iteroparity as a Life-History Tactic in the Pitcher-Plant
Mosquito *Wyeomyia smithii*. *Evolution* 40: 471–478.
- 1008 BRENCHLEY, J.L., J. RAVEN, and A.M. JOHNSTON. 1996. A comparison of reproductive
allocation and reproductive effort between semelparous and iteroparous fucoids
1010 (Fucales, Phaetophyta). *Hydrobiologia* 326/327: 185–190.
- BROMMER, J.E., P. KONTIAINEN, and H. PIETÄINEN. 2012. Selection on plasticity of
1012 seasonal life-history traits using random regression mixed model analysis. *Ecology*
and Evolution 2: 695–704.
- 1014 BRYANT, E. 1971. Life-history consequences of natural selection: Cole’s result. *American*
Naturalist 105: 75–76.
- 1016 BULMER, M. 1985. Selection for iteroparity in a variable environment. *American*

Naturalist 126: 63–71.

- 1018 BULMER, M. 1994. Theoretical Evolutionary Ecology. Sinauer Associates, Boston, USA.
- BUORO, M., and S.M. CARLSON. 2014. Life-history syndromes: Integrating dispersal
1020 through space and time. *Ecology Letters* 17: 756–767.
- BURD, M., J. READ, G. SANSON, T. JAFFRE, and T. JAFFRÉ. 2006. Age-Size Plasticity for
1022 Reproduction in Monocarpic Plants. *Ecology* 87: 2755–2764.
- BURGHARDT, L., J.C. METCALF, A. WILZCEK, J. SCHMITT, and K. DONOHUE. 2015.
1024 Modeling the influence of genetic and environmental variation on the expression of
plant life cycles across landscapes. *American Naturalist* 185: 212–227.
- BURGHARDT, L.T., B.R. EDWARDS, and K. DONOHUE. 2016. Multiple paths to similar
1026 germination behavior in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *New Phytologist* 209: 1301–1312.
- 1028 CAICEDO, A.L., J.R. STINCHCOMBE, K.M. OLSEN, J. SCHMITT, and M.D. PURUGGANAN.
2004. Epistatic interaction between *Arabidopsis FRI* and *FLC* flowering time genes
1030 generates a latitudinal cline in a life history trait. *Proceedings of the National
Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 101: 15670–5.
- 1032 CALOW, P. 1979. The cost of reproduction--a physiological approach. *Biological Reviews*
54: 23–40.
- 1034 CASTAINGS, L., S. BERGONZI, M.C. ALBANI, U. KEMI, O. SAVOLAINEN, and G.
COUPLAND. 2014. Evolutionary conservation of cold-induced antisense RNAs of
1036 *FLOWERING LOCUS C* in *Arabidopsis thaliana* perennial relatives. *Nature
Communications* 5: 1–9.
- 1038 CHANDLER, G.T., and G.M. PLUNKETT. 2004. Evolution in Apiales: nuclear and

- chloroplast markers together in (almost) perfect harmony. *Botanical Journal of the*
1040 *Linnean Society* 144: 123–147.
- CHAPARRO, O.R., A.J. SCHMIDT, L.M. PARDO, P. V. ANDRADE, C.E. WAGNER, and V.M.
1042 CUBILLOS. 2011. Reproductive strategy of the semelparous clam *Gaimardia*
bahamondei (Bivalvia, Gaimardiidae). *Invertebrate Biology* 130: 49–59.
- 1044 CHARNOV, E., and W. SCHAFFER. 1973. Life-History Consequences of Natural Selection:
Cole’s Result Revisited. *American Naturalist* 107: 791–793.
- 1046 CHASE, M., L. HANSON, V. ALBERT, W. WHITTEN, and N. WILLIAMS. 2005. Life history
evolution and genome size in subtribe Oncidiinae (Orchidaceae). *Annals of Botany*
1048 95: 191–199.
- CHIANG, G.C.K., M. BARTSCH, D. BARUA, K. NAKABAYASHI, M. DEBIEU, I. KRONHOLM,
1050 M. KOORNNEEF, ET AL. 2011. DOG1 expression is predicted by the seed-maturation
environment and contributes to geographical variation in germination in *Arabidopsis*
1052 *thaliana*. *Molecular Ecology* 20: 3336–3349.
- CHIANG, G.C.K., D. BARUA, E. DITTMAR, E.M. KRAMER, R.R. DE CASAS, and K.
1054 DONOHUE. 2013. Pleiotropy in the wild: The dormancy gene *dog1* exerts cascading
control on life cycles. *Evolution* 67: 883–893.
- 1056 CHIANG, G.C.K., D. BARUA, E.M. KRAMER, R.M. AMASINO, and K. DONOHUE. 2009.
Major flowering time gene, *flowering locus C*, regulates seed germination in
1058 *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*
United States of America 106: 11661–11666.
- 1060 CHRISTIANSEN, J.S., K. PRÆBEL, S.I. SIIKAVUOPIO, and J.E. CARSCADDEN. 2008.

- Facultative semelparity in capelin *Mallotus villosus* (Osmeridae)-an experimental
1062 test of a life history phenomenon in a sub-arctic fish. *Journal of Experimental
Marine Biology and Ecology* 360: 47–55.
- 1064 CLARK, C., and M. MANGEL. 2000. Dynamic State Variable Models in Ecology: Methods
and Applications. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- 1066 COHEN, D. 1966. Optimizing reproduction in a randomly varying environment. *Journal of
Theoretical Biology* 12: 119–129.
- 1068 COLE, L. 1954. The Population Consequences of Life History Phenomena. *The Quarterly
Review of Biology* 29: 103–137.
- 1070 COLIHUEQUE, N., R. C??RDENAS, L. RAM??REZ, F. ESTAY, and C. ARANEDA. 2010.
Analysis of the association between spawning time QTL markers and the biannual
1072 spawning behavior in rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *Genetics and
Molecular Biology* 33: 578–582.
- 1074 COOKE, S., S. HINCH, A. FARRELL, M. LAPOINTE, S. JONES, J. MACDONALD, D.
PATTERSON, ET AL. 2004. Abnormal migration timing and high en route mortality of
1076 sockeye salmon in the Fraser River, British Columbia. *Fisheries* 29: 22–33.
- CORKUM, L., J. CIBOROWSKI, and R. POULIN. 1997. Effects of emergence date and
1078 maternal size on egg development and sizes of eggs and first-instar nymphs of a
semelparous aquatic insect. *Oecologia* 111: 69–75.
- 1080 LE CORRE, V., F. ROUX, and X. REBOUD. 2002. DNA polymorphism at the *FRIGIDA*
gene in *Arabidopsis thaliana*: extensive nonsynonymous variation is consistent with
1082 local selection for flowering time. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 19: 1261–71.

COSTANTINI, L., J. BATTILANA, F. LAMAJ, G. FANIZZA, and M.S. GRANDO. 2008. Berry
1084 and phenology-related traits in grapevine (*Vitis vinifera* L.): from quantitative trait
loci to underlying genes. *BMC Plant Biology* 8: 1–17.

1086 COUPLAND, G. 1995. Genetic and environmental control of flowering time in
Arabidopsis. *Trends in Genetics* 11: 393–397.

1088 CRESPI, B., and R. TEO. 2002. Comparative phylogenetic analysis of the evolution of
semelparity and life history in salmonid fishes. *Evolution* 56: 1008–1020.

1090 CUSHING, J.M. 2015. On the Fundamental Bifurcation Theorem for Semelparous Leslie
Models. *In Dynamics, Games, and Science*, 215–251. Springer International
1092 Publishing, New York, USA.

CUSHING, J.M. 2009. Three stage semelparous Leslie models. *Journal of Mathematical*
1094 *Biology* 59: 75–104.

CUSHING, J.M., and S.M. HENSON. 2012. Stable bifurcations in semelparous Leslie
1096 models. *Journal of Biological Dynamics* 6: 80–102.

CUSHING, J.M., and S.M. STUMP. 2013. Darwinian Dynamics of a Juvenile-Adult Model.
1098 *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering* 10: 1017–1044.

DA-SILVA, C., E. MARTINS, V. BONATO, and S. DOS REIS. 2008. Bayesian capture-
1100 recapture analysis: An application in modeling semelparity of a neotropical
didelphid marsupial. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation* 37:
1102 816–828.

DANON, A., V. DELORME, N. MAILHAC, and P. GALLOIS. 2000. Plant programmed cell
1104 death: A common way to die. *Plant Physiology and Biochemistry* 38: 647–655.

- DAVIES, R.W., and E. DRATNAL. 1996. Differences in energy allocation during growth and
1106 reproduction by semelparous and iteroparous *Nephelopsis obscura* (Erpobdellidae).
Archiv für Hydrobiologie 138: 45–55.
- 1108 DAVISON, R., and W. SATTERTHWAITE. 2016. Use of Age- and Stage-structured Matrix
Models to Predict Life History Schedules for Semelparous Populations. *Natural*
1110 *Resource Modeling* 29: 538–558.
- DAVYDOVA, N.V., O. DIEKMANN, and S. A. VAN GILS. 2005. On circulant populations. I.
1112 The algebra of semelparity. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 398: 185–243.
- DENEKAMP, N.Y., R. REINHARDT, M.W. ALBRECHT, M. DRUNGOWSKI, M. KUBE, and E.
1114 LUBZENS. 2011. The expression pattern of dormancy-associated genes in multiple
life-history stages in the rotifer *Brachionus plicatilis*. *Hydrobiologia* 662: 51–63.
- 1116 DENG, W., H. YING, C.A. HELLIWELL, J.M. TAYLOR, W.J. PEACOCK, and E.S. DENNIS.
2011. FLOWERING LOCUS C (FLC) regulates development pathways throughout
1118 the life cycle of Arabidopsis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108:
6680–6685.
- 1120 DICKHOFF, W.W. 1989. Salmonids and annual fishes: death after sex. *In* Development,
maturation, and senescence of neuroendocrine systems: a comparative approach,
1122 253–266. Academic Press, New York, USA.
- DIGGLE, P.K. 1995. Architectural effects and the interpretation of patterns of fruit and
1124 seed development. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 26: 531–552.
- DIGGLE, P.K. 1997. Ontogenetic contingency and floral morphology: the effects of
1126 architecture and resource limitation. *International Journal of Plant Sciences* 158:

S99–S107.

- 1128 DITTMAR, E.L., C.G. OAKLEY, J. ÅGREN, and D.W. SCHEMSKE. 2014. Flowering time
QTL in natural populations of *Arabidopsis thaliana* and implications for their
1130 adaptive value. *Molecular Ecology* 23: 4291–4303.
- DONOHUE, K., L.T. BURGHARDT, D. RUNCIE, K.J. BRADFORD, and J. SCHMITT. 2014.
1132 Applying developmental threshold models to evolutionary ecology. *Trends in
Ecology & Evolution* 30: 66–77.
- 1134 DOUGHTY, P., and R. SHINE. 1997. Detecting life history trade-offs: Measuring energy
stores in “capital” breeders reveals costs of reproduction. *Oecologia* 110: 508–513.
- 1136 DROUINEAU, H., C. RIGAUD, F. DAVERAT, and P. LAMBERT. 2014. EvEel (evolutionary
ecology-based model for eel): a model to explore the role of phenotypic plasticity as
1138 an adaptive response of three temperate eels to spatially structured environments.
Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 71: 1561–1571.
- 1140 DRUFFEL, E., S. GRIFFIN, A. WITTER, E. NELSON, J. SOUTHON, M. KASHGARIAN, and J.
VOGEL. 1995. Gerardia - Bristlecone Pine of the Deep Sea. *Geochimica et*
1142 *Cosmochimica Acta* 59: 5031–5036.
- DRUMMOND, R. 2012. The expression of petunia strigolactone pathway genes is altered as
1144 part of the endogenous developmental program. *Frontiers in Plant Science* 2: 1–14.
- EDMUNDS, G.F., S.L. JENSEN, and L. BERNER. 1976. The mayflies of north and central
1146 America. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- EINUM, S., and I. FLEMING. 2007. Of chickens and eggs: diverging propagule size of
1148 iteroparous and semelparous organisms. *Evolution* 61: 232–238.

- ELBADRY, E., and M. TAWFIK. 1966. Life cycle of the mite *Adactylidium* sp. (Acarina: Pyemotidae), a predator of thrips eggs in the United Arab Republic. *Annals of the Entomological Society* 59: 458–461.
- ELLNER, S., and M. REES. 2006. Integral projection models for species with complex demography. *American Naturalist* 167: 410–428.
- EMLEN, J. 1970. Age specificty and ecological theory. *Ecology* 51: 588–601.
- EULGEM, T., P.J. RUSHTON, S. ROBATZEK, and I.E. SOMSSICH. 2000. The WRKY superfamily of plant transcription factors. *Trends in Plant Science* 5: 199–206.
- EVANS, M., D.D. HEARN, W.W. HAHN, J. SPANGLE, D. VENABLE, and L. VENABLE. 2005. Climate and life-history evolution in evening primroses (Oenothera, Onagraceae): a phylogenetic comparative analysis. *Evolution* 59: 1914–1927.
- FADEN, R.B. 2006. Commelina. In F. of N. A. E. Committee [ed.], Flora of North America, 22. Oxford University Press, New York, USA.
- FADEN, R.B. 1993. The misconstrued and rare species of Commelina (Commelinaceae) in the eastern United States. *Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden* 80: 208–218.
- FINCH, C. 1998. Variations in senescence and longevity include the possibility of negligible senescence. *Journals of Gerontology Series A - Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences* 53: 235–239.
- FINCH, C.E., and M.R. ROSE. 1995. Hormones and the Physiological Architecture of Life History Evolution. *The Quarterly Review of Biology* 70: 1–52.
- FINK, L.S. 1986. Costs and benefits of maternal behaviour in the green lynx spider (Oxyopidae, *Peucetia viridans*). *Animal Behaviour* 34: 1051–1060.

FISHER, D.O., and S.P. BLOMBERG. 2011. Costs of reproduction and terminal investment

1172 by females in a semelparous marsupial. *PloS one* 6: e15226.

FLATT, T., and T.J. KAWECKI. 2004. Pleiotropic effects of methoprene-tolerant (Met), a

1174 gene involved in juvenile hormone metabolism, on life history traits in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetica* 122: 141–160.

1176 FLEMING, I. 1998. Pattern and variability in the breeding system of Atlantic salmon, with comparisons to other salmonids. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic*

1178 *Sciences* 55: 59–76.

FOSTER, R. 1977. *Tachigalia versicolor* is a suicidal neotropical tree. *Nature* 268: 624–

1180 626.

FOWLER, S., K. LEE, H. ONOUCHI, A. SAMACH, K. RICHARDSON, B. MORRIS, G.

1182 COUPLAND, ET AL. 1999. *GIGANTEA*: a circadian clock-controlled gene that regulates photoperiodic flowering in Arabidopsis and encodes a protein with several possible membrane-spanning domains. *The EMBO Journal* 18: 4679–4688.

FRANKLIN, D., and N. HOGARTH. 2008. Flowering and flooding: Factors influencing

1186 shoot production in a semelparous bamboo. *Journal of Tropical Forest Science* 20: 188–192.

1188 FRANKLIN, D.C. 2004. Synchrony and asynchrony: observations and hypotheses for the flowering wave in a long-lived semelparous bamboo. *Journal of Biogeography* 31:

1190 773–786.

FRITZ, R., N. STAMP, and T. HALVERSON. 1982. Iteroparity and semelparity in insects.

1192 *American Naturalist* 120: 264–268.

- FUKUDA, S. 1953. Determination of voltinism in the univoltine silkworm. *Proceedings of the Japan Academy* 29: 381–384.
- FUROTA, T., and T. ITO. 1999. Life Cycle and Environmentally Induced Semelparity in the Shore Isopod *Ligia cinerascens* (Ligiidae) on a Cobble Shore along Tokyo Bay, Central Japan. *Journal of Crustacean Biology* 19: 752–761.
- FUTAMI, K., and S.I. AKIMOTO. 2005. Facultative second oviposition as an adaptation to egg loss in a semelparous crab spider. *Ethology* 111: 1126–1138.
- GADGIL, M., and W.H. BOSSERT. 1970. Life historical consequences of natural selection. *American Naturalist* 104: 1–24.
- GAGNON, P., and W. PLATT. 2008. Reproductive and seedling ecology of a semelparous native bamboo (*Arundinaria gigantea*, Poaceae). *The Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society* 135: 309–316.
- GARCÍA, M.B. 2003. Sex Allocation in a Long-Lived Monocarpic Plant. *Plant Biology* 5: 203–209.
- GARCIA DE LEANIZ, C., I.A. FLEMING, S. EINUM, E. VERSPOOR, W.C. JORDAN, S. CONSUEGRA, N. AUBIN-HORTH, ET AL. 2007. A critical review of adaptive genetic variation in Atlantic salmon: Implications for conservation. *Biological Reviews* 82: 173–211.
- GAZZANI, S., A.R. GENDALL, C. LISTER, and C. DEAN. 2003. Analysis of the Molecular Basis of Flowering Time Variation in Arabidopsis Accessions. *Plant Physiology* 132: 1107–1114.
- GERTSCH, W. 1939. A revision of the typical crab-spiders (Misumeninae) of America

north of Mexico. *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History* 76: 277–442.

- 1216 GHORAI, R., N. CHAUDHURI, and S. SENAPATI. 2009. Impact of food plant and weather
parameters on longevity of female muga silkworm *Antheraea assama* Westwood.
1218 *Indian Journal of Agricultural Research* 43: 303–306.
- GOLDING, D.W., and E. YUWONO. 1994. Latent capacities for gametogenic cycling in the
1220 semelparous invertebrate Nereis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences
of the United States of America* 91: 11777–11781.
- 1222 GOLDRAZENA, A., R. JORDANA, and Z. ZHANG. 1997. Adactylidium moundi and A.
costarricensis, two new species of Acarophenacidae (Acari: Tarsonemida) parasitic
1224 on Thysanoptera. *International Journal of Acarology* 23: 261–268.
- GONZALEZ, A. 1994. Bioecologia de *Illex coindetii* (Verany, 1839) (Cephalopoda,
1226 Ommastrephidae) de las aguas de Galicia. University of Vigo.
- GONZALEZ, A., and A. GUERRA. 1996. Reproductive biology of the short-finned squid
1228 *Illex coindetii* (Cephalopoda: Ommastrephidae) of the northeastern Atlantic. *Sarsia*
81: 107–118.
- 1230 GREMER, J.R., and D.L. VENABLE. 2014. Bet hedging in desert winter annual plants:
Optimal germination strategies in a variable environment. *Ecology Letters* 17: 380–
1232 7.
- GRINSTED, L., C.J. BREUKER, and T. BILDE. 2014. Cooperative breeding favors maternal
1234 investment in size over number of eggs in spiders. *Evolution* 68: 1961–73.
- GROSBERG, R. 1988. Life-history variation within a population of the colonial ascidian
1236 *Botryllus schlosseri*. I. The genetic and environmental control of seasonal variation.

Evolution 42: 900–920.

- 1238 HAGGARD, K., and B. TIFFNEY. 1997. The flora of the early Miocene Brandon Lignite,
Vermont, USA. VIII. *Caldesia* (Alismataceae). *American Journal of Botany* 84:
1240 239–252.
- HAHN, D.A., L.N. JAMES, K.R. MILNE, and J.D. HATLE. 2008. Life-history plasticity after
1242 attaining a dietary threshold for reproduction is associated with protein storage in
flesh flies. *Functional Ecology* 22: 1081–1090.
- 1244 HALL, D., V. LUQUEZ, V.M. GARCIA, K.R. ST ONGE, S. JANSSON, and P.K. INGVARSSON.
2007. Adaptive population differentiation in phenology across a latitudinal gradient
1246 in European aspen (*Populus tremula*, L.): A comparison of neutral markers,
candidate genes and phenotypic traits. *Evolution* 61: 2849–2860.
- 1248 HALL, M.C., C.J. BASTEN, and J.H. WILLIS. 2006. Pleiotropic quantitative trait loci
contribute to population divergence in traits associated with life-history variation in
1250 *Mimulus guttatus*. *Genetics* 172: 1829–1844.
- HARVELL, C., and R. GROSBERG. 1988. The Timing of Sexual Maturity in Clonal
1252 Animals. *Ecology* 69: 1855–1864.
- HASTON, E., J.E. RICHARDSON, P.F. STEVENS, M.W. CHASE, and D.J. HARRIS. 2009. The
1254 Linear Angiosperm Phylogeny Group (LAPG) III: a linear sequence of the families
in APG III. *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* 161: 128–131.
- 1256 HAUTEKÈETE, N., H. VAN DIJK, Y. PIQUOT, and A. TERIOKHIN. 2009. Evolutionary
optimization of life-history traits in the sea beet *Beta vulgaris* subsp. *maritima*:
1258 Comparing model to data. *Acta Oecologica* 35: 104–116.

- HAUTEKÈETE, N., Y. PIQUOT, and H. VAN DIJK. 2001. Investment in survival and
1260 reproduction along a semelparity-iteroparity gradient in the Beta species complex.
Journal of Evolutionary Biology 14: 795–804.
- 1262 HAUTEKÈETE, N., Y. PIQUOT, and H. VAN DIJK. 2002. Life span in *Beta vulgaris* spp.
maritima: the effects of age at first reproduction and disturbance. *Journal of Ecology*
1264 90: 508–516.
- HEMMER-HANSEN, J., N.O. THERKILDSSEN, D. MELDRUP, and E.E. NIELSEN. 2014.
1266 Conserving marine biodiversity: insights from life-history trait candidate genes in
Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*). *Conservation Genetics* 15: 213–228.
- 1268 HENDRY, A.P., Y.E. MORBEY, O.K. BERG, and J.K. WENBURG. 2004. Adaptive variation
in senescence: reproductive lifespan in a wild salmon population. *Proceedings of the*
1270 *Royal Society B*. 271: 259–66.
- HENNING-LUCASS, N., M. CORDELLIER, B. STREIT, and K. SCHWENK. 2016. Phenotypic
1272 plasticity in life-history traits of *Daphnia galeata* in response to temperature - a
comparison across clonal lineages separated in time. *Ecology and Evolution* 6: 881–
1274 891.
- HOP, H., and G. H. 2013. Polar cod (*Boreogadus saida*) and capelin (*Mallotus villosus*) as
1276 key species in marine food webs of the Arctic and Barents Sea. *Marine Biology*
Research 9: 878–894.
- 1278 HOP, H., V. TRUDEAU, and M. GRAHAM. 1995. Spawning energetics of Arctic cod
(*Boreogadus saida*) in the northwest Atlantic during 1959-1978. *Canadian Journal*
1280 *of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 52: 541–550.

HOVING, H.-J.T., W.F. GILLY, U. MARKAIDA, K.J. BENOIT-BIRD, Z.W. -BROWN, P.

1282 DANIEL, J.C. FIELD, ET AL. 2013. Extreme plasticity in life-history strategy allows a
migratory predator (jumbo squid) to cope with a changing climate. *Global Change*
1284 *Biology* 19: 2089–2103.

HUGHES, P.W., and A.M. SIMONS. 2014a. Changing reproductive effort within a
1286 semelparous reproductive episode. *American Journal of Botany* 101: 1323–31.

HUGHES, P.W., and A.M. SIMONS. 2015. Microsatellite evidence for obligate autogamy,
1288 but abundant genetic variation in the herbaceous monocarp *Lobelia inflata*
(Campanulaceae). *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 28: 2068–2077.

1290 HUGHES, P.W., and A.M. SIMONS. 2014b. Secondary reproduction in the herbaceous
monocarp *Lobelia inflata*: Time-constrained primary reproduction does not result in
1292 increased deferral of reproductive effort. *BMC Ecology* 14: 1–10.

HUGHES, P.W., and A.M. SIMONS. 2014c. The continuum between semelparity and
1294 iteroparity: plastic expression of parity in response to season length manipulation in
Lobelia inflata. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 14: 90.

1296 HUO, H., S. WEI, and K.J. BRADFORD. 2016. DELAY OF GERMINATION1 (DOG1)
regulates both seed dormancy and flowering time through microRNA pathways.
1298 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113: 1–8.

HUXMAN, T.E., and M.E. LOIK. 1997. Reproductive patterns of two varieties of *Yucca*
1300 *whipplei* (Liliaceae) with different life histories. *International Journal of Plant*
Sciences 158: 778–784.

1302 IGUCHI, K. 1996. Size-specific spawning pattern in ayu, *Plecoglossus altivelis*.

Ichthyological Research 43: 193–198.

- 1304 IGUCHI, K., and Y. TSUKAMOTO. 2001. Semelparity or iteroparity: resource allocation tactics in the ayu, an osmenid fish. *Journal of Fish Biology* 58: 520–528.
- 1306 IKEDA, D., Y. SAKURAI, and K. SHIMIZAKI. 1993. Maturation process of the Japanese common squid *Todarodes pacificus* in captivity. In T. Okutani, R. O’Dor, and T. Kubodera [eds.], Recent Advances in Cephalopod Fisheries Biology, 179–187. Tokai University Press, Tokyo, Japan.
- 1308
- 1310 IMAIZUMI, T., and S. KAY. 2006. Photoperiodic control of flowering: not only by coincidence. *Trends in Plant Science* 11: 550–8.
- 1312 ISRAEL, J.W., M.L. MARTIK, M. BYRNE, E.C. RAFF, R.A. RAFF, D.R. MCCLAY, and G.A. WRAY. 2016. Comparative Developmental Transcriptomics Reveals Rewiring of a Highly Conserved Gene Regulatory Network during a Major Life History Switch in the Sea Urchin Genus *Heliocidaris*. *PLOS Biology* 14: e1002391.
- 1314
- 1316 IWASA, Y. 1991. Pessimistic plant: optimal growth schedule in stochastic environments. *Theoretical Population Biology* 40: 246–268.
- 1318 JABAILY, R., and K. SYTSMA. 2013. Historical biogeography and life-history evolution of Andean *Puya* (Bromeliaceae). *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* 173: 201–224.
- 1320
- JAVOIS, J. 2013. A two-resource model of terminal investment. *Theory in Biosciences* 132: 123–132.
- 1322
- JIMÉNEZ-AMBRIZ, G., C. PETIT, I. BOURRIÉ, S. DUBOIS, I. OLIVIERI, and O. RONCE. 2007. Life history variation in the heavy metal tolerant plant *Thlaspi caerulescens* growing
- 1324

- in a network of contaminated and noncontaminated sites in southern France: Role of
1326 gene flow, selection and phenotypic plasticity. *New Phytologist* 173: 199–215.
- JOHANSON, U., J. WEST, C. LISTER, S. MICHAELS, R. AMASINO, and C. DEAN. 2000.
1328 Molecular analysis of *FRIGIDA*, a major determinant of natural variation in
Arabidopsis flowering time. *Science* 290: 344–7.
- 1330 JUNG, J.-H., Y.-H. SEO, P.J. SEO, J.L. REYES, J. YUN, N.-H. CHUA, and C.-M. PARK. 2007.
The *GIGANTEA*-Regulated *MicroRNA172* Mediates Photoperiodic Flowering
1332 Independent of *CONSTANS* in Arabidopsis. *The Plant Cell* 19: 2736–2748.
- KAITALA, V., D. TESAR, and E. RANTA. 2002. Semelparity versus iteroparity and the
1334 number of age groups. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* 4: 169–179.
- KAPAH, P., B. ZID, T. HARPER, D. KOSLOVER, V. SAPIN, and S. BENZER. 2004.
1336 Regulation of Lifespan in *Drosophila* by Modulation of Genes in the *TOR* Signaling
Pathway. *Current Biology* 14: 885–890.
- 1338 KARDAILSKY, I. 1999. Activation Tagging of the Floral Inducer *FT*. *Science* 286: 1962–
1965.
- 1340 KATEWA, S.D., and P. KAPAH. 2011. Role of *TOR* signaling in aging and related
biological processes in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Experimental Gerontology* 46:
1342 382–390.
- KEELER, K.H. 1987. Survivorship and Fecundity of the Polycarpic Perennial *Mentzelia*
1344 *nuda* (Loasaceae) in Nebraska Sandhills Prairie. *American Journal of Botany* 74:
785.
- 1346 KEELEY, J., and W. BOND. 1999. Mast Flowering and Semelparity in Bamboos: The

Bamboo Fire Cycle Hypothesis. *The American Naturalist* 154: 383–391.

- 1348 KEELEY, J.E., S.C. KEELEY, and D.A. IKEDA. 1986. Seed Predation by *Yucca* Moths on
Semelparous, Iteroparous and Vegetatively Reproducing Subspecies of *Yucca*
1350 *Whipplei* (Agavaceae). *American Midland Naturalist* 115: 1–9.
- KEMI, U., A. NIITTYVUOPIO, T. TOIVAINEN, A. PASANEN, B. QUILOT-TURION, K. HOLM, U.
1352 LAGERCRANTZ, ET AL. 2013. Role of vernalization and of duplicated *FLOWERING*
LOCUS C in the perennial *Arabidopsis lyrata*. *New Phytologist* 197: 323–335.
- 1354 KENYON, C. 2011. The first long-lived mutants: discovery of the insulin/*IGF-1* pathway
for ageing. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B,*
1356 *Biological Sciences* 366: 9–16.
- Kew WORLD CHECKLIST (VARIOUS AUTHORS). 2017. “World Checklist of Selected Plant
1358 Families.” *Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew*.
- KIM, C.-H., and E.J. MUTURI. 2012. Relationship between leaf litter identity, expression
1360 of cytochrome P450 genes and life history traits of *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes*
albopictus. *Acta Tropica* 122: 94–100.
- 1362 KIM, E., and K. DONOHUE. 2011. Demographic, developmental and life-history variation
across altitude in *Erysimum capitatum*. *Journal of Ecology* 99: 1237–1249.
- 1364 KIM, S.-Y., B.-S. PARK, S.-J. KWON, J. KIM, M.-H. LIM, Y.-D. PARK, D.Y. KIM, ET AL.
2007. Delayed flowering time in *Arabidopsis* and *Brassica rapa* by the
1366 overexpression of *FLOWERING LOCUS C (FLC)* homologs isolated from Chinese
cabbage (*Brassica rapa* L. ssp. *pekinensis*). *Plant Cell Reports* 26: 327–336.
- 1368 KINDSVATER, H.K., D.C. BRAUN, S.P. OTTO, and J.D. REYNOLDS. 2016. Costs of

reproduction can explain the correlated evolution of semelparity and egg size: theory
and a test with salmon. *Ecology Letters* 19: 687–696.

KIRCHOFF, B.K. 1992. Ovary structure and anatomy in the Heliconiaceae and Musaceae
(Zingiberales). *Canadian Journal of Botany* 70: 2490–2508.

KIRKENDALL, L.R., and N.C. STENSETH. 1985. On Defining “Breeding Once.” *American
Naturalist* 125: 189–204.

KISS, L., G. LABAUNE, F. MAGNIN, and S. AUBRY. 2005. Plasticity of the life history of
Xeropicta derbentina (Krynicky, 1836), a recently introduced snail in Mediterranean
France. *Journal of Molluscan Studies* 71: 221–231.

KITAJIMA, K., and C. AUGSPURGER. 1989. Seed and seedling ecology of a monocarpic
tropical tree, *Tachigalia versicolor*. *Ecology* 70: 1102–1114.

KLEMM, I., and I. HANSKI. 2009. Heritability of and strong single gene (*Pgi*) effects on
life-history traits in the Glanville fritillary butterfly. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*
22: 1944–1953.

VAN KLEUNEN, M. 2007. Adaptive genetic differentiation in life-history traits between
populations of *Mimulus guttatus* with annual and perennial life-cycles. *Evolutionary
Ecology* 21: 185–199.

KOORNNEEF, M., C. ALONSO- BLANCO, A. PEETERS, and W. SOPPE. 1998. Genetic
control of flowering time in Arabidopsis: the late-flowering mutant gigantea is
tolerant to paraquat. *Annual Review of Plant Physiology and Plant Molecular
Biology* 49: 345–370.

KOTAKE, T., S. TAKADA, K. NAKAHIGASHI, M. OHTO, and K. GOTO. 2003. Arabidopsis

- Terminal Flower 2* gene encodes a heterochromatin protein 1 homolog and represses both *FLOWERING LOCUS T* to regulate flowering time and several floral homeotic genes. *Plant and Cell Physiology* 44: 555–564.
- 1392
- 1394 KOZŁOWSKI, J. 1992. Optimal allocation of resources to growth and reproduction: Implications for age and size at maturity. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 7: 15–9.
- 1396 KOZŁOWSKI, J., and R.G. WIEGERT. 1986. Optimal allocation of energy to growth and reproduction. *Theoretical Population Biology* 29: 16–37.
- 1398 KRAAIJEVELD, K., F.J.L. KRAAIJEVELD-SMIT, and G.J. ADCOCK. 2003. Does female mortality drive male semelparity in dasyurid marsupials? *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*. 270 Suppl: S251-3.
- 1400
- KUSS, P., M. REES, H. AEGISDOTTIR, S. ELLNER, and J. STOCKLIN. 2008. Evolutionary demography of long-lived monocarpic perennials: a time-lagged integral projection model. *Journal of Ecology* 96: 821–832.
- 1402
- 1404 LACEY, E.P. 1988. Latitudinal Variation in Reproductive Timing of a Short-Lived Monocarp , *Daucus carota* (Apiceae). *Ecology* 69: 220–232.
- 1406 LAMARQUE, L.J., C.J. LORTIE, A.J. PORTÉ, and S. DELZON. 2015. Genetic differentiation and phenotypic plasticity in life-history traits between native and introduced populations of invasive maple trees. *Biological Invasions* 17: 1109–1122.
- 1408
- LAPTIKHOVSKY, V. 1998. Differentiation of reproductive strategies within a taxon, as exemplified by octopods. *Ruthenica* 8: 77–80.
- 1410
- LAPTIKHOVSKY, V. 1999. Fecundity and reproductive strategy of three species of octopods from the northwest Bering Sea. *Russian Journal of Marine Biology* 25:
- 1412

342–346.

- 1414 LAROCHE, J., and J. BOUSQUET. 1999. Evolution of the mitochondrial *rps3* intron in
perennial and annual angiosperms and homology to *nad5* intron 1. *Molecular*
1416 *Biology and Evolution* 16: 441–52.
- LAZARIDOU, M., and M. CHATZIOANNOU. 2005. Differences in the life histories of
1418 *Xerolenta obvia* (Menke, 1828) (Hygromoodae) in a coastal and a mountainous area
of northern Greece. *Journal of Molluscan Studies* 71: 247–252.
- 1420 LEDER, E.H., R.G. DANZMANN, and M.M. FERGUSON. 2006. The candidate gene, *Clock*,
localizes to a strong spawning time quantitative trait locus region in rainbow trout.
1422 *The Journal of Heredity* 97: 74–80.
- LEDGER, S.E., B.J. JANSSEN, S. KARUNAIRETNAM, T. WANG, and K.C. SNOWDEN. 2010.
1424 Modified *CAROTENOID CLEAVAGE DIOXYGENASE-8* expression correlates with
altered branching in kiwifruit (*Actinidia chinensis*). *New Phytologist* 188: 803–813.
- 1426 LEGGETT, W.C., and J.E. CARSCADDEN. 1978. Latitudinal Variation in Reproductive
Characteristics of American Shad (*Alosa sapidissima*): Evidence for Population
1428 Specific Life History Strategies in Fish. *Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of*
Canada 35: 1469–1478.
- 1430 LEINER, N., E. SETZ, and W. SILVA. 2008. Semelparity and factors affecting the
reproductive activity of the Brazilian slender opossum (*Marmosops paulensis*) in
1432 Southeastern Brazil. *Journal of Mammalogy* 89: 153–158.
- LEINONEN, P.H., D.L. REMINGTON, J. LEPPÄLÄ, and O. SAVOLAINEN. 2013. Genetic basis
1434 of local adaptation and flowering time variation in *Arabidopsis lyrata*. *Molecular*

Ecology 22: 709–723.

- 1436 LESICA, P., and J. SHELLY. 1995. Effects of reproductive mode on demography and life
history in *Arabis fecunda* (Brassicaceae). *American Journal of Botany* 82: 752–762.
- 1438 LESICA, P., and T.P. YOUNG. 2005. A demographic model explains life-history variation
in *Arabis fecunda*. *Functional Ecology* 19: 471–477.
- 1440 LESSELLS, C.M. 2005. Why are males bad for females? Models for the evolution of
damaging male mating behavior. *American Naturalist* 165 Suppl: S46-63.
- 1442 LETSCHERT, J. 1993. Beta section Beta: biogeographical patterns of variation and
taxonomy. *Wageningen Agricultural University Papers* 93: 1–155.
- 1444 LEWIS, A., and J. CHOAT. 1993. Spawning mode and reproductive output of the tropical
cephalopod *Idiosepius pygmaeus*. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic*
1446 *Sciences* 50: 20–28.
- LINNAEUS, C. 1744. Oratio de telluris habitabilis incremento. Cornelium Haak, Leyden.
- 1448 LIU, Y., Y. LI, X. LI, and L. QIN. 2010. The Origin and Dispersal of the Domesticated
Chinese Oak Silkworm, *Antheraea pernyi*, in China: a Reconstruction Based on
1450 Ancient Texts. *Journal of Insect Science* 10: 1–10.
- LOÏC, B., H. MIKKO, G. HARALD, L. BAULIER, M. HEINO, and H. GJØSÆTER. 2012.
1452 Temporal stability of the maturation schedule of capelin *Mallotus villosus* in the
Barents Sea. *Aquatic Living Resources* 161: 151–161.
- 1454 LOPES, G.P., and N.O. LEINER. 2015. Semelparity in a population of *Gracilinanus agilis*
(Didelphimorphia: Didelphidae) inhabiting the Brazilian cerrado. *Mammalian*
1456 *Biology - Zeitschrift für Säugetierkunde* 80: 1–6.

- MACKIE, G., and L. FLIPPANCE. 1983. Life history variations in two populations of
1458 *Sphaerium rhombiodeum* (Bivalvia: Pisidiidae). *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 61:
860–867.
- 1460 MALTBY, L., and P. CALOW. 1986. Intraspecific life-history variation in *Erpobdella*
 octoculata (Hirudinea: Erpobdellidae). II. Testing theory on the evolution of
1462 semelparity and iteroparity. *The Journal of Animal Ecology* 55: 739–750.
- MARDEN, J.H., H.W. FESCEMYER, M. SAASTAMOINEN, S.P. MACFARLAND, J.C. VERA,
1464 M.J. FRILANDER, and I. HANSKI. 2008. Weight and nutrition affect pre-mRNA
 splicing of a muscle gene associated with performance, energetics and life history.
1466 *The Journal of Experimental Biology* 211: 3653–60.
- MARSHALL, D., and M. KEOUGH. 2007. The evolutionary ecology of offspring size in
1468 marine vertebrates. *Advances in Marine Biology* 53: 1–60.
- MARTINS, E., V. BONATO, C. DA SILVA, and S. DOS REIS. 2006. Partial Semelparity in the
1470 Neotropical Didelphid Marsupial *Gracilinanus microtarsus*. *Journal of Mammalogy*
87: 915–920.
- 1472 MATSUMOTO, M., and M. TAKEDA. 2002. Changes in brain dopamine contents in
 diapause pupae of *Antheraea pernyi* when activated under long-day and by chilling.
1474 *Journal of Insect Physiology* 48: 765–771.
- MCBLAIN, B.A., J.D. HESKETH, and R.L. BERNARD. 1987. Genetic Effects on
1476 Reproductive Phenology in Soybean Isolines Differing in Maturity Genes. *Canadian*
 Journal of Plant Science 67: 105–115.
- 1478 McCORMICK, M.A., S.Y. TSAI, and B.K. KENNEDY. 2011. TOR and ageing: a complex

pathway for a complex process. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 366: 17–27.

McMAHON, R., and A. BOGAN. 2001. Mollusca: bivalvia. In J. Thorp, and A. Covich [eds.], *Ecology and Classification of North American Freshwater Invertebrates*, 1056. Academic Press, New York, USA.

McNAMARA, J.M. 1997. Optimal Life Histories for Structured Populations in Fluctuating Environments. *Theoretical Population Biology* 51: 94–108.

MELO, Y., and W. SAUER. 1999. Confirmation of serial spawning in the chokka squid *Loligo vulgaris reynaudii* off the coast of South Africa. *Marine Biology* 135: 307–313.

MÉNDEZ-VIGO, B., F.X. PICÓ, M. RAMIRO, J.M. MARTÍNEZ-ZAPATER, and C. ALONSO-BLANCO. 2011. Altitudinal and climatic adaptation is mediated by flowering traits and *FRI*, *FLC*, and *PHYC* genes in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Physiology* 157: 1942–55.

METCALF, J.C., K.E. ROSE, and M. REES. 2003. Evolutionary demography of monocarpic perennials. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 18: 471–480.

MEUNIER, J., J.W.Y. WONG, Y. GÓMEZ, S. KUTTLER, L. RÖLLIN, D. STUCKI, and M. KÖLLIKER. 2012. One clutch or two clutches? Fitness correlates of coexisting alternative female life-histories in the European earwig. *Evolutionary Ecology* 26: 669–682.

MICHAELS, S.D., and R.M. AMASINO. 1999. FLOWERING LOCUS C encodes a novel MADS domain protein that acts as a repressor of flowering. *Plant Cell* 11: 949–956.

MICHAELS, S.D., I.C. BEZERRA, and R.M. AMASINO. 2004. FRIGIDA-related genes are

required for the winter-annual habit in Arabidopsis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 101: 3281–5.

MICHAELS, S.D., Y. HE, K.C. SCORTECCI, and R.M. AMASINO. 2003. Attenuation of *FLOWERING LOCUS C* activity as a mechanism for the evolution of summer-annual flowering behavior in Arabidopsis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 100: 10102–10107.

MILLER, T., J. WILLIAMS, E. JONGEJANS, R. BRYN, and H. JACQUEMYN. 2012. Evolutionary demography of iteroparous plants: incorporating non-lethal costs of reproduction into integral projection models. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 279: 2831–40.

MILLS, H.R., F.J. BRADSHAW, C. LAMBERT, S.D. BRADSHAW, and R. BENCINI. 2012. Reproduction in the marsupial dibbler, *Parantechinus apicalis*; differences between island and mainland populations. *General and Comparative Endocrinology* 178: 347–54.

MIRONCHENKO, A., and J. KOZŁOWSKI. 2014. Optimal allocation patterns and optimal seed mass of a perennial plant. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 354: 12–24.

MIZOGUCHI, T., L. WRIGHT, S. FUJIWARA, F. CREMER, K. LEE, H. ONOUCHI, A. MOURADOV, ET AL. 2005. Distinct Roles of *GIGANTEA* in Promoting Flowering and Regulating Circadian Rhythms in Arabidopsis. *The Plant Cell* 17: 2255–2270.

MIZUKI, I., A. SATO, A. MATSUO, Y. SUYAMA, J.-I. SUZUKI, and A. MAKITA. 2014. Clonal Structure, Seed Set, and Self-Pollination Rate in Mass-Flowering Bamboo Species during Off-Year Flowering Events. *PLoS ONE* 9: e105051.

- MONTTI, L., P.I. CAMPANELLO, and G. GOLDSTEIN. 2011. Flowering, die-back and
1524 recovery of a semelparous woody bamboo in the Atlantic Forest. *Acta Oecologica*
37: 361–368.
- 1526 MORSE, D. 1994. Numbers of broods produced by the crab spider *Misumena vatia*
(Araneae, Thomisidae). *Journal of Arachnology* 22: 195–199.
- 1528 MORSE, D. 1979. Prey capture by the crab spider *Misumena calycina* (Araneae:
Thomisidae). *Oecologia* 39: 309–319.
- 1530 MORSE, D., and E. STEPHENS. 1996. The consequences of adult foraging success on the
components of lifetime fitness in a semelparous, sit and wait predator. *Evolutionary*
1532 *Ecology* 10: 361–373.
- MURDOCH, W. 1966. Population stability and life history phenomena. *American*
1534 *Naturalist* 100: 5–11.
- MURPHY, E., and P. RODHOUSE. 1999. Rapid selection effects in a short-lived
1536 semelparous squid species exposed to exploitation : inferences from the optimisation
of life-history functions. *Evolutionary Ecology* 13: 517–537.
- 1538 MURPHY, G. 1968. Pattern in life history and the environment. *American Naturalist* 102:
391–403.
- 1540 NAHRGANG, J., O. VARPE, E. KORSHUNOVA, S. MURZINA, I.G. HALLANGER, I. VIEWEG,
and J. BERGE. 2014. Gender specific reproductive strategies of an arctic key species
1542 (*Boreogadus saida*) and implications of climate change. *PLOS ONE* 9: e98452.
- NESIS, K. 1996. Mating, spawning, and death in oceanic cephalopods: a review.
1544 *Ruthenica* 6: 23–64.

- NICHOLS, K.M., A.F. EDO, P.A. WHEELER, and G.H. THORGAARD. 2008. The Genetic
1546 Basis of Smoltification-Related Traits in *Oncorhynchus mykiss*. *Genetics* 179: 1559–
1575.
- 1548 NICHOLS, P.G.H., A. LOI, B.J. NUTT, P.M. EVANS, A.D. CRAIG, B.C. PENGELLY, B.S.
DEAR, ET AL. 2007. New annual and short-lived perennial pasture legumes for
1550 Australian agriculture—15 years of revolution. *Field Crops Research* 104: 10–23.
- NOBEL, P.S. 1977. Water Relations of Flowering of *Agave deserti*. *Botanical Gazette*
1552 138: 1–6.
- NOLTE, A.W., S. RENAUT, and L. BERNATCHEZ. 2009. Divergence in gene regulation at
1554 young life history stages of whitefish (*Coregonus* sp.) and the emergence of
genomic isolation. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 9: 59.
- 1556 NYUMURA, N., and T. ASAMI. 2015. Synchronous and Non-Synchronous Semelparity in
Sibling Species of Pulmonates. *Zoological Science* 32: 372–377.
- 1558 O’MALLEY, K.G., M.J. FORD, J.J. HARD, F.W. ALLENDORF, G.H. THORGAARD, A.M.
ARNESEN, H. TAFTEN, ET AL. 2010. Clock polymorphism in Pacific salmon: evidence
1560 for variable selection along a latitudinal gradient. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*
B: Biological Sciences 277: 3703–3714.
- 1562 OIZUMI, R. 2014. Unification Theory of Optimal Life Histories and Linear Demographic
Models in Internal Stochasticity. *PLoS ONE* 9: e98746.
- 1564 OIZUMI, R., and T. TAKADA. 2013. Optimal life schedule with stochastic growth in age-
size structured models: Theory and an application. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*
1566 323: 76–89.

- OMIELAN, J. 1991. Modeling of semelparous/iteroparous polymorphism in *Botryllus*
1568 *schlosseri*. University of British Columbia.
- PALMER, J.D., D.E. SOLTIS, and M.W. CHASE. 2004. The plant tree of life: an overview
1570 and some points of view. *American Journal of Botany* 91: 1437–1445.
- PARTRIDGE, L. 2010. The new biology of ageing. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*
1572 *Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences* 365: 147–54.
- PEARSE, D.E., M.R. MILLER, A. ABADIA-CARDOSO, and J.C. GARZA. 2014. Rapid parallel
1574 evolution of standing variation in a single, complex, genomic region is associated
with life history in steelhead/rainbow trout. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*
1576 *Biological Sciences* 281: 20140012–20140012.
- PETERSON, D. 1983. Life cycle and reproduction of *Nephelopsis obscura* (Hirudinea:
1578 Erpobdellidae) in permanent ponds of northwestern Minnesota. *Freshwater*
Invertebrate Biology 2: 165–172.
- PETERSON, J.H., and B. ROITBERG. 2010. Egg maturation, nest state, and sex ratios: a
1580 dynamic state variable model. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* 12: 347–361.
- PIÑOL, C.M., and R. BANZON. 2011. Catastrophic senescence and semelparity in the
1582 Penna aging model. *Theory in Biosciences - Theorie in den Biowissenschaften* 130:
1584 101–6.
- POSTMA, F.M., and J. ÅGREN. 2016. Early life stages contribute strongly to local
1586 adaptation in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
Sciences of the United States of America 113: 201606303.
- PUTTERILL, J., F. ROBSON, K. LEE, R. SIMON, and G. COUPLAND. 1995. The CONSTANS
1588

gene of arabidopsis promotes flowering and encodes a protein showing similarities

1590 to zinc finger transcription factors. *Cell* 80: 847–857.

RAGLAND, G.J., S.P. EGAN, J.L. FEDER, S.H. BERLOCHER, and D. A. HAHN. 2011.

1592 Developmental trajectories of gene expression reveal candidates for diapause
termination: a key life-history transition in the apple maggot fly *Rhagoletis*

1594 *pomonella*. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 214: 3948–3960.

RANTA, E., V. KAITALA, S. ALAJA, and D. TESAR. 2000. Nonlinear Dynamics and the

1596 Evolution of Semelparous and Iteroparous Reproductive Strategies. *American*
Naturalist 155: 294–300.

1598 RANTA, E., D. TESAR, S. ALAJA, and V. KAITALA. 2007. Does evolution of iteroparous
and semelparous reproduction call for spatially structured systems? *Evolution* 54:

1600 145–150.

RANTA, E., D. TESAR, and V. KAITALA. 2002. Environmental variability and semelparity

1602 vs. iteroparity as life histories. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 217: 391–396.

RANTA, E., D. TESAR, and V. KAITALA. 2001. Local extinctions promote co-existence of

1604 semelparous and iteroparous life histories. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* 3: 759–
766.

1606 RATZ, T., J. KRAMER, M. VEUILLE, and J. MEUNIER. 2016. The population determines
whether and how life-history traits vary between reproductive events in an insect

1608 with maternal care. *Oecologia* 182: 443–452.

REDEI, G. 1962. Supervital mutants of Arabidopsis. *Genetics* 47: 443–460.

1610 REES, M., A. SHEPPARD, D. BRIESE, and M. MANGEL. 1999. Evolution of size-dependent

flowering in *Onopordum illyricum*: A quantitative assessment of the role of
 1612 stochastic selection pressures. *The American Naturalist* 154: 628–651.

REINARTZ, J.A. 1984. Life History Variation of Common Mullein (*Verbascum*
 1614 *Thapsus*): I . Latitudinal Differences in Population Dynamics and Timing of
 Reproduction. *Journal of Ecology* 72: 897–912.

REMINGTON, D.L., J. FIGUEROA, and M. RANE. 2015. Timing of shoot development
 1616 transitions affects degree of perenniality in *Arabidopsis lyrata* (Brassicaceae). *BMC*
 1618 *Plant Biology* 15: 226.

REMINGTON, D.L., P.H. LEINONEN, J. LEPPÄLÄ, and O. SAVOLAINEN. 2013. Complex
 1620 genetic effects on early vegetative development shape resource allocation
 differences between *Arabidopsis lyrata* populations. *Genetics* 195: 1087–1102.

RICHTER-BOIX, A., G. ORIZAOLA, and A. LAURILA. 2014. Transgenerational phenotypic
 1622 plasticity links breeding phenology with offspring life-history. *Ecology* 95: 2715–
 1624 2722.

RINEHART, J.P., A. LI, G.D. YOCUM, R.M. ROBICH, S.A.L. HAYWARD, and D.L.
 1626 DENLINGER. 2007. Up-regulation of heat shock proteins is essential for cold survival
 during insect diapause. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*
 1628 *United States of America* 104: 11130–7.

RINEHART, J.P., G.D. YOCUM, and D.L. DENLINGER. 2000. Developmental upregulation
 1630 of inducible *hsp70* transcripts, but not the cognate form, during pupal diapause in the
 flesh fly, *Sarcophaga crassipalpis*. *Insect Biochemistry and Molecular Biology* 30:
 1632 515–521.

RION, S., and T.J. KAWECKI. 2007. Evolutionary biology of starvation resistance: What

1634 we have learned from *Drosophila*. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 20: 1655–1664.

ROCHA, F., and A. GUERRA. 1996. Signs of an extended and intermittent terminal

1636 spawning in the squid *Loligo vulgaris* Lamarck and *Loligo forbesi* Steenstrup
(Cephalopoda:Loliginidae). *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*

1638 207: 177–189.

ROCHA, F., A. GUERRA, and A.F. GONZÁLEZ. 2001. A review of reproductive strategies in

1640 cephalopods. *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 76: 291–
304.

1642 ROCHA, M., A. VALERA, and L.E. EGUIARTE. 2005. Reproductive ecology of five

sympatric *Agave littaea* (Agavaceae) species in central Mexico. *American Journal of*
1644 *Botany* 92: 1330–1341.

ROFF, D.A. 1992. The evolution of life histories: theory and analysis. Chapman and Hall,

1646 New York.

ROSE, K.E., M. REES, and P. GRUBB. 2002. Evolution in the real world: stochastic

1648 variation and the determinants of fitness in *Carlina vulgaris*. *Evolution* 56: 1416–
1430.

1650 ROZAS, V. 2003. Tree age estimates in *Fagus sylvatica* and *Quercus robur*: testing

previous and improved methods. *Plant Ecology* 167: 193–212.

1652 RUBENSTEIN, D.R. 2011. Spatiotemporal environmental variation , risk aversion , and the
evolution of cooperative breeding as a bet-hedging strategy. *Proceedings of the*

1654 *National Academy of Sciences* 108: 10816–10822.

- RUDNICKI, R., and R. WIECZOREK. 2014. On a nonlinear age-structured model of semelparous species. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems-Series B* 19: 2641–2656.
- SAASTAMOINEN, M., S. IKONEN, and I. HANSKI. 2009. Significant effects of *Pgi* genotype and body reserves on lifespan in the Glanville fritillary butterfly. *Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society* 276: 1313–1322.
- SALGUERO-GÓMEZ, R., O.R. JONES, E. JONGEJANS, S.P. BLOMBERG, D.J. HODGSON, C. MBEAU-ACHE, P.A. ZUIDEMA, ET AL. 2016. Fast–slow continuum and reproductive strategies structure plant life-history variation worldwide. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113: 230–235.
- SAMACH, A., H. ONOUCHI, S.E. GOLD, G.S. DITTA, Z. SCHWARZ-SOMMER, M.F. YANOFSKY, G. COUPLAND, ET AL. 2000. Distinct roles of *CONSTANS* target genes in reproductive development of *Arabidopsis*. *Science* 288: 1613–6.
- SATO, K., M. YAMANE, N. YAMAJI, H. KANAMORI, A. TAGIRI, J.G. SCHWERDT, G.B. FINCHER, ET AL. 2016. Alanine aminotransferase controls seed dormancy in barley. *Nature Communications* 7: 11625.
- SAUER, W., Y. MELO, and W. DE WET. 1999. Fecundity of the chokka squid *Loligo vulgaris reynaudii* on the southeastern coast of South Africa. *Marine Biology* 135: 315–319.
- SCHAFFER, W. 1974a. Optimal reproductive effort in fluctuating environments. *American Naturalist*.
- SCHAFFER, W. 1974b. Selection for optimal life histories: the effects of age structure.

Ecology 55: 291–303.

1678 SCHAFFER, W., and M. GADGIL. 1975. Selection for optimal life histories in plants. In M.
Cody, and J. Diamond [eds.], *Ecology and Evolution of Communities*, Belknap
1680 Press, Cambridge, MA, USA.

SCHLÄPPI, M.R. 2006. *FRIGIDA LIKE 2* is a functional allele in *Landsberg erecta* and
1682 compensates for a nonsense allele of *FRIGIDA LIKE 1*. *Plant Physiology* 142:
1728–38.

1684 SCHNEIDER, J., and Y. LUBIN. 1997. Does high adult mortality explain semelparity in the
spider *Stegodyphus lineatus* (Eresidae)? *Oikos* 79: 92–100.

1686 SCHNEIDER, J., M. SALOMON, and Y. LUBIN. 2003. Limited adaptive life-history
plasticity in a semelparous spider, *Stegodyphus lineatus* (Eresidae). *Evolutionary*
1688 *Ecology Research* 5: 731–738.

SCHNEIDER, M.R., and E. WOLF. 2008. The epidermal growth factor receptor and its
1690 ligands in female reproduction: insights from rodent models. *Cytokine & Growth*
Factor Reviews 19: 173–81.

1692 SEAMONS, T.R., and T.P. QUINN. 2010. Sex-specific patterns of lifetime reproductive
success in single and repeat breeding steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*).
1694 *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 64: 505–513.

SELMAN, C., and D.J. WITHERS. 2011. Mammalian models of extended healthy lifespan.
1696 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological*
Sciences 366: 99–107.

1698 SHAMA, L.S., and C.T. ROBINSON. 2009. Microgeographic life history variation in an

alpine caddisfly: plasticity in response to seasonal time constraints. *Freshwater*
1700 *Biology* 54: 150–164.

SHELDON, C.C., D.T. ROUSE, E.J. FINNEGAN, W.J. PEACOCK, and E.S. DENNIS. 2000. The
1702 molecular basis of vernalization: the central role of *FLOWERING LOCUS C (FLC)*.
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America
1704 97: 3753–3758.

SHINDO, C., M.J. ARANZANA, C. LISTER, C. BAXTER, C. NICHOLLS, M. NORDBORG, and
1706 C. DEAN. 2005. Role of *FRIGIDA* and *FLOWERING LOCUS C* in determining
variation in flowering time of *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Physiology* 138: 1163–1173.

SHINDO, C., C. LISTER, P. CREVILLEN, M. NORDBORG, and C. DEAN. 2006. Variation in
1708 the epigenetic silencing of *FLC* contributes to natural variation in *Arabidopsis*
1710 vernalization response. *Genes & Development* 20: 3079–3083.

SIEPEL, H. 1994. Life-history tactics of soil microarthropods. *Biology and Fertility of*
1712 *Soils* 18: 263–278.

SILVERTOWN, J., M. FRANCO, I. PISANTYT, and A. MENDOZA. 1993. Comparative plant
1714 demography - relative importance of life-cycle components to the finite rate of
increase in woody and herbaceous perennials. *Journal of Ecology* 81: 465–476.

SILVERTOWN, J., and D.D.M. GORDON. 1989. A framework for plant behavior. *Annual*
1716 *Review of Ecology and Systematics* 20: 349–366.

SIMON, S., M. RÜHL, A. DE MONTAIGU, S. WÖTZEL, and G. COUPLAND. 2015. Evolution
1718 of *CONSTANS* Regulation and Function after Gene Duplication Produced a
1720 Photoperiodic Flowering Switch in the Brassicaceae. *Molecular Biology and*

Evolution 32: 2284–301.

1722 SIMPSON, G.G., and C. DEAN. 2002. Arabidopsis, the Rosetta Stone of Flowering Time?

Science 296: 285–289.

1724 SINGH, K.C., and N.I. SINGH. 1998. Biology and ecology of temperate tasar silkmths,

Antheraea proylei Jolly and *Antheraea pernyi* Guerin-Meneville (Saturiniidae): a

1726 review. *Indian Journal of Sericulture* 37: 89–100.

SKUBIC, E., M. TABORSKY, J.M. MCNAMARA, and A.I. HOUSTON. 2004. When to

1728 parasitize? A dynamic optimization model of reproductive strategies in a

cooperative breeder. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 227: 487–501.

1730 SLETVOLD, N. 2002. Effects of plant size on reproductive output and offspring

performance in the facultative biennial *Digitalis purpurea*. *Journal of Ecology* 90:

1732 958–986.

SLOAT, M.R.M., D.D.J. FRASER, J.B.J. DUNHAM, J. A. FALKE, C.E. JORDAN, J.R.

1734 McMILLAN, and H. A. OHMS. 2014. Ecological and evolutionary patterns of

freshwater maturation in Pacific and Atlantic salmonines. *Reviews in Fish Biology*

1736 and *Fisheries* 24: 689–707.

SMITH, C., and S. FRETWELL. 1974. The optimal balance between size and number of

1738 offspring. *American Naturalist* 108: 499–506.

SMITH, F., and E. CHARNOV. 2001. Fitness trade-offs select for semelparous reproduction

1740 in an extreme environment. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* 3: 595–602.

SMITH, S.E., E. RILEY, J.L. TISS, and D.M. FENDENHEIM. 2000. Geographical variation in

1742 predictive seedling emergence in a perennial desert grass. *Journal of Ecology* 88:

139–149.

- 1744 SNOWDEN, K.C. 2005. The Decreased apical dominance1/*Petunia hybrida* *CAROTENOID*
1746 *CLEAVAGE DIOXYGENASE8* Gene Affects Branch Production and Plays a Role in
1752 Leaf Senescence, Root Growth, and Flower Development. *The Plant Cell* 17: 746–
759.
- 1748 SNYDER, R. 1991. No Quantitative genetic analysis of life histories in two freshwater
populations of threespine stickleback. *Copeia* 1991: 526–529.
- 1750 SONG, B., Z.-Q. ZHANG, J. STÖCKLIN, Y. YANG, Y. NIU, J.-G. CHEN, and H. SUN. 2013.
Multifunctional bracts enhance plant fitness during flowering and seed development
1752 in *Rheum nobile* (Polygonaceae), a giant herb endemic to the high Himalayas.
Oecologia 172: 359–370.
- 1754 SONG, Y., X. KE, W. LIU, A.J. DAVY, and G. LIU. 2015. Life-History Plasticity of
Riparian Annual Plants Adapted to Extreme Variations in Water Level: Mesocosm
1756 Experiments. *River Research and Applications* 31: 1311–1318.
- 1758 SOREFAN, K., J. BOOKER, K. HAUROGNÉ, M. GOUSSOT, K. BAINBRIDGE, E. FOO, S.
CHATFIELD, ET AL. 2003. *MAX4* and *RMS1* are orthologous dioxygenase-like genes
that regulate shoot branching in Arabidopsis and pea. *Genes & Development* 17:
1760 1469–1474.
- SPICE, E.K., S. WHYARD, and M.F. DOCKER. 2014. Gene expression during ovarian
1762 differentiation in parasitic and non-parasitic lampreys: Implications for fecundity
and life history types. *General and Comparative Endocrinology* 208: 116–125.
- 1764 SPRINGTHORPE, V., and S. PENFIELD. 2015. Flowering time and seed dormancy control se

external coincidence to generate life history strategy. *eLife* 4: 1–17.

1766 STEBBINS, G.L., and R.D. HOOGLAND. 1976. Species diversity, ecology and evolution in a
primitive Angiosperm genus: *Hibbertia* (Dilleniaceae). *Plant Systematics and*
1768 *Evolution* 125: 139–154.

STEGMANN, U., and K. LINSSENMAIR. 2002. Assessing the Semelparity Hypothesis: Egg-
1770 guarding and Fecundity in the Malaysian Treehopper *Pyrgauchenia tristaniopsis*.
Ethology 108: 857–869.

1772 STEVENS, J., M. HICKFORD, and D. SCHIEL. 2016. Evidence of iteroparity in the widely
distributed diadromous fish inanga *Galaxias maculatus* and potential implications
1774 for reproductive output. *Journal of Fish Biology* 89: 1931–1946.

STINCHCOMBE, J.R., C. WEINIG, M. UNGERER, K.M. OLSEN, C. MAYS, S.S.
1776 HALLDORSDDOTTIR, M.D. PURUGGANAN, and J. SCHMITT. 2004. A latitudinal cline in
flowering time in *Arabidopsis thaliana* modulated by the flowering time gene
1778 *FRIGIDA*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 101: 4712–4717.

SU, Z., and R.M. PETERMAN. 2012. Performance of a Bayesian state-space model of
1780 semelparous species for stock-recruitment data subject to measurement error.
Ecological Modelling 224: 76–89.

1782 SUÁREZ-LÓPEZ, P., K. WHEATLEY, F. ROBSON, H. ONOUCHI, F. VALVERDE, and G.
COUPLAND. 2001. *CONSTANS* mediates between the circadian clock and the control
1784 of flowering in *Arabidopsis*. *Nature* 410: 1116–1120.

SULAIMAN, I.M., and C.R. BABU. 1996. Ecological studies on five species of endangered
1786 Himalayan poppy, *Meconopsis* (Papaveraceae). *Botanical Journal of the Linnean*

Society 121: 169–176.

1788 TALLAMY, D., E. WALSH, and D. PECK. 2004. Revisiting paternal care in the assassin bug,
Atopozelus pallens (Heteroptera: Reduviidae). *Journal of Insect Behavior* 17: 431–
 1790 436.

TALLAMY, D.W., and W.P. BROWN. 1999. Semelparity and the evolution of maternal care
 1792 in insects. *Animal Behaviour* 57: 727–730.

TATAR, M., A. BARTKE, and A. ANTEBI. 2003. The endocrine regulation of aging by
 1794 insulin-like signals. *Science* 299: 1346–1351.

TATAR, M., S. CHIEN, and N. PRIEST. 2001. Negligible senescence during reproductive
 1796 diapause in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *American Naturalist* 158: 248–258.

THOMAS, H. 2013. Senescence , ageing and death of the whole plant. *New Phytologist*
 1798 197: 696–711.

THOMAS, H., L. HUANG, M. YOUNG, and H. OUGHAM. 2009. Evolution of plant
 1800 senescence. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 9: 163.

THOMPSON, D.W. 1907. *The History of Animals* (Aristotle). John Bell, London, UK.

1802 THOMPSON, L. 1994. The Spatiotemporal Effects of Nitrogen and Litter on the Population
 Dynamics of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Journal of Ecology* 82: 63–68.

1804 THREADGILL, P.F., J.M. BASKIN, and C.C. BASKIN. 1981. The Ecological Life Cycle of
Frasera caroliniensis, a Long-lived Monocarpic Perennial. *American Midland*
 1806 *Naturalist* 105: 277–289.

TINKLE, D.W. 1969. The Concept of Reproductive Effort and Its Relation to the
 1808 Evolution of Life Histories of Lizards. *The American Naturalist* 103: 501–516.

- TIWARI, S.B., Y. SHEN, H.-C. CHANG, Y. HOU, A. HARRIS, S.F. MA, M. MCPARTLAND, ET
 1810 AL. 2010. The flowering time regulator *CONSTANS* is recruited to the *FLOWERING*
LOCUS T promoter via a unique cis-element. *The New Phytologist* 187: 57–66.
- 1812 TORANG, P., J. WUNDER, J. OBESO, M. HERZOG, G. COUPLAND, and J. AGREN. 2015.
 Large-scale adaptive differentiation in the alpine perennial herb *Arabis alpina*. *New*
 1814 *Phytologist* 206: 459–470.
- TOWER, J. 1996. Aging mechanisms in fruit flies. *BioEssays* 18: 799–807.
- 1816 TRUMBO, S.T. 2013. Maternal Care, Iteroparity and the Evolution of Social Behavior: A
 Critique of the Semelparity Hypothesis. *Evolutionary Biology* 40: 613–626.
- 1818 TURCK, F., and G. COUPLAND. 2014. Natural variation in epigenetic gene regulation and
 its effects on plant developmental traits. *Evolution* 68: 620–31.
- 1820 TURCK, F., F. FORNARA, and G. COUPLAND. 2008. Regulation and Identity of Florigen:
FLOWERING LOCUS T Moves Center Stage. *Annual Review of Plant Biology* 59:
 1822 573–594.
- UNWIN, M., M.T. KINNISON, and T.P. QUINN. 1999. Exceptions to semelparity:
 1824 postmaturation survival, morphology, and energetics of male chinook salmon
 (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*
 1826 56: 1172–1181.
- VAHL, O. 1981. Age-specific residual reproductive value and reproductibve effort in the
 1828 Iceland Scallop, *Chlamys islandica*. *Oecologia* 51: 53–56.
- VALVERDE, F., A. MOURADOV, W. SOPPE, D. RAVENSCROFT, A. SAMACH, and G.
 1830 COUPLAND. 2004. Photoreceptor regulation of *CONSTANS* protein in photoperiodic

flowering. *Science* 303: 1003–6.

- 1832 VARELA-LASHERAS, I., and T.J. VAN DOOREN. 2014. Desiccation plasticity in the
embryonic life histories of non-annual rivulid species. *EvoDevo* 5: 16.
- 1834 VAUPEL, J.W., T.I. MISOV, and C.J.E. METCALF. 2013. Optimal semelparity. C. M.
Aegerter [ed.], *PloS one* 8: e57133.
- 1836 VECCHIONE, M., U. PIATKOWSKI, and A. ALLCOCK. 1998. Biology of the cirrate octopod
Grimpoteuthis glacialis (Cephalopoda; Opisthoteuthidae) in the South Shetland
1838 Islands, Antarctica. *South African Journal of Marine Science* 20: 421–428.
- VERVOORT, A., V. CAWOY, and A.-L. JACQUEMART. 2011. Comparative Reproductive
1840 Biology in Co-Occurring Invasive and Native *Impatiens* Species. *International
Journal of Plant Sciences* 172: 366–377.
- 1842 VILLANUEVA, R. 1992. Continuous spawning in the cirrate octopods *Opisthoteuthis
agassizii* and *O. vossi*: features of sexual maturation defining a reproductive strategy
1844 in cephalopods. *Marine Biology* 114: 265–275.
- VITOUSEK, M.N., M.A. MITCHELL, L.M. ROMERO, J. AWERMAN, and M. WIKELSKI. 2010.
1846 To breed or not to breed: Physiological correlates of reproductive status in a
facultatively biennial iguanid. *Hormones and Behavior* 57: 140–146.
- 1848 WANG, R., M.C. ALBANI, C. VINCENT, S. BERGONZI, M. LUAN, Y. BAI, C. KIEFER, ET AL.
2011. Aa TFL1 confers an age-dependent response to vernalization in perennial
1850 *Arabis alpina*. *Plant Cell* 23: 1307–1321.
- WANG, R., S. FARRONA, C. VINCENT, F. FORNARA, A. JOECKER, H. SCHOOF, F. TURCK, ET
1852 AL. 2009. Control of perennial flowering and perenniality in *Arabis alpina*, a relative

of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A:*

1854 *Molecular & Integrative Physiology* 153: S195–S196.

WANG, R., S. FARRONA, C. VINCENT, A. JOECKER, H. SCHOOF, F. TURCK, C. ALONSO-

1856 BLANCO, ET AL. 2009. PEP1 regulates perennial flowering in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Nature*
459: 423–427.

1858 WANG, Y., L. CHENG, J. LENG, C. WU, G. SHAO, W. HOU, and T. HAN. 2015. Genetic
analysis and quantitative trait locus identification of the reproductive to vegetative
1860 growth period ratio in soybean (*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.). *Euphytica* 201: 275–284.

WANKE, S., M.-S. SAMAIN, L. VANDERSCHAEVE, G. MATHIEU, P. GOETGHEBEUR, and C.

1862 NEINHUIS. 2006. Phylogeny of the Genus *Peperomia* (Piperaceae) Inferred from the
trnK/matK Region (cpDNA). *Plant Biology* 8: 93–102.

1864 WANNTORP, L., H. WANNTORP, and M. KÄLLERSJÖ. 2002. Phylogenetic relationships of
Gunnera based on nuclear ribosomal DNA ITS region, *rbcL* and *rps16* intron
1866 sequences. *Systematic Botany* 27: 512–521.

WAPLES, R.S. 2016. Life-history traits and effective population size in species with

1868 overlapping generations revisited: the importance of adult mortality. *Heredity* 117:
241–250.

1870 WARD, P.D. 1983. *Nautilus macromphalus*. In P. R. Boyle [ed.], *Cephalopod Life Cycles*
Vol. 1, 11–28. Academic Press, London, UK.

1872 WARD, P.D. 1987. *The natural history of Nautilus*. Allen & Unwin Inc., Boston, USA.

WATT, W.B. 1983. Adaptation at Specific Loci. II. Demographic and Biochemical

1874 Elements in the Maintenance of the *Colias Pgi* Polymorphism. *Genetics* 103: 691–

724.

- 1876 WATT, W.B., R.C. CASSIN, and M.S. SWAN. 1983. Adaptation at Specific Loci. III. Field
Behavior and Survivorship Differences among *Colias Pgi* Genotypes Are
1878 Predictable from in Vitro Biochemistry. *Genetics* 103: 725–739.
- WIKAN, A. 2012. Age or Stage Structure? A Comparison of Dynamic Outcomes from
1880 Discrete Age- and Stage-Structured Population Models. *Bulletin of Mathematical
Biology* 74: 1354–1378.
- 1882 DE WILDE, J. 2010. Begoniaceae. In *Flowering Plants: Eudicots*, 56–71. Springer, Berlin.
- VAN WILGEN, B.W., and G.G. FORSYTH. 1992. Regeneration Strategies in Fynbos Plants
1884 and Their Influence on the Stability of Community Boundaries After Fire. In 54–80.
Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- 1886 WILLIAMS, G. 1966. Natural selection, the costs of reproduction, and a refinement of
Lack’s principle. *The American Naturalist* 100: 687–690.
- 1888 WILLIAMS, J.L. 2009. Flowering life-history strategies differ between the native and
introduced ranges of a monocarpic perennial. *American Naturalist* 174: 660–672.
- 1890 WILLIAMS, P., and C. HILL. 1986. Rapid-cycling populations of Brassicaceae. *Science*
232: 1385–1389.
- 1892 WILZCEK, A., J. ROE, M. KNAPP, C. COOPER, L. MARTIN, C. MUIR, S. SIM, ET AL. 2009.
Effects of genetic perturbation on seasonal life history. *Science* 323: 930–935.
- 1894 WINKLER, E., and F. M. 2002. The role of vegetative spread and seed dispersal for
optimal life histories of clonal plants: a simulation study. *Evolutionary Ecology* 15:
1896 281–301.

- WOLFE, K., H. MILLS, M. GARKAKLIS, and R. BENCINI. 2004. Post-mating survival in a
1898 small marsupial is associated with nutrient inputs from seabirds. *Ecology* 85: 1740–
1746.
- 1900 DE WREEDE, R., and T. KLINGER. 1988. Reproductive strategies in algae. Oxford
University Press, New York, USA.
- 1902 XIA, Q., Y. GUO, Z. ZHANG, D. LI, Z. XUAN, Z. LI, F. DAI, ET AL. 2009. Complete
Resequencing of 40 Genomes Reveals Domestication Events and Genes in
1904 Silkworm (*Bombyx*). *Science* 326: 433–436.
- XIN, D.W., H.M. QIU, D.P. SHAN, C.Y. SHAN, C.Y. LIU, G.H. HU, C. STAEHELIN, and
1906 Q.S. CHEN. 2008. Analysis of quantitative trait loci underlying the period of
reproductive growth stages in soybean (*Glycine max* [L.] Merr.). *Euphytica* 162:
1908 155–165.
- YANOVSKY, M., and S. KAY. 2002. Molecular basis of seasonal time measurement in
1910 *Arabidopsis*. *Nature* 419: 308–312.
- YERKES, T., and M. KOOPS. 1999. Redhead reproductive strategy choices: a dynamic
1912 state variable model. *Behavioral Ecology* 10: 30–40.
- YOUNG, T. 1981. A General Model of Comparative Fecundity for Semelparous and
1914 Iteroparous Life Histories. *American Naturalist* 118: 27–36.
- YOUNG, T.P. 1990. Evolution of semelparity in Mount Kenya lobelias. *Evolutionary*
1916 *Ecology* 4: 157–171.
- YOUNG, T.P., and C.K. AUGSPURGER. 1991. Ecology and evolution of long-lived
1918 semelparous plants. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 6: 285–9.

- 1920 YOUNG, T.P.T. 1984. The Comparative Demography of Semelparous *Lobelia telekii* and Iteroparous *Lobelia keniensis* on Mount Kenya. *Journal of Ecology* 72: 637–650.
- 1922 YOUSON, J.H., J.A. HEINIG, S.F. KHANAM, S.A. SOWER, H. KAWAUCHI, and F.W. KEELEY. 2006. Patterns of proopiomelanotropin and proopiocortin gene expression and of immunohistochemistry for gonadotropin-releasing hormones (lGnRH-I and III) during the life cycle of a nonparasitic lamprey: Relationship to this adult life history type. *General and Comparative Endocrinology* 148: 54–71.
- 1924
- 1926 ZEINEDDINE, M., and V.A. JANSEN. 2009. To age, to die: parity, evolutionary tracking and Cole’s paradox. *Evolution* 63: 1498–507.
- 1928 ZERA, A., and Y. HUANG. 1999. Evolutionary endocrinology of juvenile hormone esterase: functional relationship with wing polymorphism in the cricket, *Gryllus firmus*. *Evolution* 53: 837–847.
- 1930
- 1932 ZHAO, Z., and A. ZERA. 2002. Differential lipid biosynthesis underlies a trade-off between reproduction and flight capability in a wing-polymorphic cricket. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 99: 16829–16834.
- 1934 ZHOU, C., T. ZHANG, X. WANG, S. YU, H. LIAN, H. TANG, Z. FENG, ET AL. 2013. Molecular basis of age-dependent vernalization in *Cardamine flexuosa*. *Science* 340: 1097–1100.
- 1936
- 1938 ZIPPAY, M.L., G.E. HOFMANN, and G.E. HOFMAN. 2010. Effect of pH on gene expression and thermal tolerance of early life history stages of red abalone (*Haliotis rufescens*). *Journal of Shellfish Research* 29: 429–439.
- 1940