1   Effects of mesotocin on social bonding in pinyon jays

2   Juan F. Duque[1,2], Tanner Rasmussen[1], Anna Rodriguez[1], & Jeffrey R. Stevens[1]

3   [1] University of Nebraska-Lincoln

4   [2] Arcadia University

5   Author Note

6   Juan F. Duque, Tanner Rasmussen, Anna Rodriguez, Jeffrey R. Stevens, Department

7   of Psychology, Center for Brain, Biology & Behavior, University of Nebraska, Lincoln,

8   Lincoln, NE, USA 68588

9   Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Juan F. Duque, 450

10   South Easton Road, 125 Boyer Hall, Arcadia University, Glenside, PA 19038. E-mail:

11   jfduque89@gmail.com

Abstract

The neuropeptide oxytocin influences mammalian social bonding by facilitating the building and maintenance of parental, sexual, and same-sex social relationships. However, we do not know whether the function of the avian homologue mesotocin is evolutionarily conserved across birds. While it does influence avian prosocial behavior, mesotocin's role in avian social bonding remains unclear. Here, we investigated whether mesotocin regulates the formation and maintenance of same-sex social bonding in pinyon jays (*Gymnorhinus cyanocephalus*), a member of the crow family. We formed squads of four individually housed birds. In the first, 'pair-formation' phase of the experiment, we repeatedly placed pairs of birds from within the squad together in a cage for short periods of time. Prior to entering the cage, we intranasally administered one of three hormone solutions to both members of the pair: mesotocin, oxytocin antagonist, or saline. Pairs received repeated sessions with administration of the same hormone. In the second, 'pair-maintenance' phase of the experiment, all four members of the squad were placed together in a large cage, and no hormones were administered. For both phases, we measured the physical proximity between pairs as our proxy for social bonding. We found that, compared to saline, administering mesotocin or oxytocin antagonist did not result in different proximities in either the pair-formation or pair-maintenance phase of the experiment. Therefore, at the dosages and time frames used here, exogenously introduced mesotocin did not influence same-sex social bond formation or maintenance. Like oxytocin in mammals, mesotocin regulates avian prosocial behavior; however, unlike oxytocin, we do not have evidence that mesotocin regulates social bonds in birds.

Keywords: corvid, mesotocin, oxytocin, pinyon jay, social bond

34   Effects of mesotocin on social bonding in pinyon jays

Introduction

36   A group of young male pinyon jays fly from pine tree to pine tree consuming seeds as

37   they go. Two of the birds are inseparable, never straying more than a few feet from each

38   other. Other jays come and go from the group, but this dyad stays together for the season,

39   even though they are not related. This dyad shares a strong bond, and each member of the

40   dyad has weaker bonds with other individuals. Similar patterns occur in the interactions

41   when humans engage in social events. Although everyone is together, the sociality of

42   individuals varies. Some congregate in tight groups "catching up", while others remain

43   separate from groups, sticking near the food bar or off to the side of the room.

44   Having strong social connections is beneficial to survival and reproduction (Silk, 2007;

45   Clutton-Brock, 2016). For example, maternal behavior depends on the bond created after

46   birth and during nursing in mammals, particularly in species that give birth to a single

47   offspring at a time rather than a litter (Broad, Curley, & Keverne, 2006). Notably, the

48   maternal behaviors—nursing, grooming, and infant retrieval—are essential to the health and

49   survival of the offspring and thus reproductive success of the mother. Further, strong

50   female-female bonds often lead to maternal behavior by females other than the offspring's

51   mother, which are critical to the survival and reproduction of the offspring (Hrdy, 1999;

52   Broad, Curley, & Keverne, 2006). Long-term study of savannah baboons has shown sociality

53   and individual bonds between females to lead longer female longevity and increased infant

54   survival (Silk, Alberts, & Altmann, 2003; Silk, Beehner, Bergman, Crockford, Engh,

55   Moscovice, Wittig, Seyfarth, & Cheney, 2010). In feral horses, these female-female bonds

56   benefit both the survival of individual foals and overall fecundity of the mares involved. In

57   fact, these bonds seem to limit harmful behavior in the males, such as aggression toward

58   mares, harassment, and infantcide (Cameron, Setsaas, & Linklater, 2009).

Social bonds provide obvious adaptive benefits, but what physiological mechanisms underlie these bonds? The neuropeptide hormone oxytocin (OT) plays a key role in a range of social behaviors. For example, sharing food increases levels of oxytocin circulating in the body of chimpanzees (Wittig, Crockford, Deschner, Langergraber, Ziegler, & Zuberbühler, 2014), and administering oxytocin to dogs increases gazing behavior at owners (Nagasawa, Mitsui, En, Ohtani, Ohta, Sakuma, Onaka, Mogi, & Kikusui, 2015). Further, oxytocin regulates the development of pair bonds and mother-offspring bonds. In rats, maternal behaviors, such as nursing and infant retrieval, act as a positive feedback for both mother and pups, resulting in increasing levels of oxytocin that strengthen their attachment (Nagasawa, Okabe, Mogi, & Kikusui, 2012). Administering oxytocin can induce similar maternal behavior in sheep that do not have offspring (Costa, Guevara-Guzman, Ohkura, Goode, & Kendrick, 1996). In the prairie vole, a primarily monogamous species, administration of oxytocin to females can establish mating pair and maternal bonds, whereas administration of an oxytocin antagonist can hinder such bonds (Insel, Winslow, Wang, & Young, 1998). In female marmosets, oxytocin administration induces greater preference for the male they were previously paired with and seems to make individuals in established bonded-pairings less likely to form social bonds with opposite sex strangers (Cavanaugh, Mustoe, Taylor, & French, 2014).

Oxytocin also plays a key role in social bonds among unrelated individuals outside of the pair bond. In humans, oxytocin levels can affect trust between non-kin humans (Kosfeld, Heinrichs, Zak, Fischbacher, & Fehr, 2005, Baumgartner, Heinrichs, Vonlanthen, Fischbacher, and Fehr (2008)), though its effects depend on context (Bartz, Zaki, Bolger, & Ochsner, 2011; Nave, Camerer, & McCullough, 2015). In chimpanzees, oxytocin levels increase when socially bonded partners groom but not when non-bonded partners groom (Crockford, Wittig, Langergraber, Ziegler, Zuberbühler, & Deschner, 2013). Oxytocin plays a complicated role in capuchin monkey social proximity, with oxytocin administration actually increasing social distance rather than decreasing it (Brosnan, Talbot, Essler, Leverett,

86 Flemming, Dougall, Heyler, & Zak, 2015; Benítez, Sosnowski, Tomeo, & Brosnan, 2018). So,

87 it remains unclear how oxytocin regulates these bonds. Specifically, we do not understand

88 how oxytocin underlies the initial formation of the social bond itself and, then, once a bond

89 is established, the role that it plays in maintaining that social bond.

90 Here, we sought to assess the role of oxytocin in social bond formation and

91 maintenance. We investigated this in pinyon jays (*Gymnorhinus cyanocephalus*), a highly

92 social North American corvid. Like many social primates, pinyon jays have a

93 fission-fusion-like dynamic social system in which individuals are typically part of a small,

94 tight-knit sub-group of 5-20 individuals, but sub-groups often congregate, forming large

95 flocks of up to 500 individuals (Marzluff & Balda, 1992). Individual pinyon jays engage in

96 prosocial behavior, particularly through the sharing of food. Though food sharing between

97 same-sex pairs of birds is not dependent on reciprocity, more dominant birds may be more

98 likely to share with subordinate ones, which suggests sharers may be receiving social benefits

99 (Duque & Stevens, 2016). Moreover, administering mesotocin (MT), the avian homologue to

100 oxytocin, increases the likelihood that pinyon jays will voluntarily be generous to others. If

101 given an option between providing food for only itself or itself and another individual

102 (prosocial choice), mesotocin increases the preference for the prosocial action (Duque,

103 Leichner, Ahmann, & Stevens, 2018). Thus, the long-lived and highly social nature of pinyon

104 jays and evidence of mesotocin influencing their prosociality make them ideal candidates to

105 study how social bonds form.

106 Both oxytocin and mesotocin are nine amino acid peptides but mesotocin has a minor

107 amino acid substitution from leucine to iso-leucine in position 8 (Acher, Chauvet, &

108 Chauvet, 1970). Mesotocin seems to be a functional homologue to oxytocin in birds because

109 its administration increases preferences for larger over smaller social groups (Goodson,

110 Schrock, Klatt, Kabelik, & Kingsbury, 2009) and increases prosocial preferences (Duque,

111 Leichner, Ahmann, & Stevens, 2018), whereas administering an antagonist disrupts pair

bond formation (Pedersen & Tomaszycki, 2012). Therefore, we aimed to assess mesotocin's role in social bond formation and maintenance in birds.

Our first research question investigated whether mesotocin is critical to the formation of social bonds among unrelated, sames-sex pinyon jays. We tested this by administering mesotocin, an oxytocin antagonist, or saline to previously unfamiliar pairs of individuals in repeated interactions. The short-term effects of this hormone on social bonds were assessed by measuring the proximity between individuals and comparing these distances across hormone conditions. If mesotocin builds social bonds, repeated exposure to mesotocin when paired with a particular individual should create a strong bond as measured by proximity. Exposure to oxytocin antagonist or saline should produce weaker or no bonds.

Our second research question investigated whether mesotocin provides long-term social bond maintenance in a group. We tested this by placing the pairs in larger groups in the absence of further hormone administration and measuring proximity between all group members. If mesotocin enhances the initial formation of a relationship between two individuals, then those bonds should remain when multiple individuals are present in a group, even without further mesotocin administration. Conversely, pairs treated with either oxytocin antagonist or saline should show less social proximity in the group setting.

Methods

Subjects

We conducted two experiments with independent sets of adult pinyon jays: 12 birds (8 male, 4 female) in Experiment 1 from September to December 2015 and 24 birds (16 male, 8 female) in Experiment 2 from September to December 2017. Researchers captured all birds in either Arizona or California (USFW permit MB694205) between 1996 and 2011. All birds were housed in individual cages at 22° C in one of three rooms with a 14:10 h light:dark

136 cycle and were fed Lafeber's Cockatiel and Parrot Pellets, turkey starter, live mealworms,

137 pine nuts, and peanuts daily. The University of Nebraska-Lincoln IACUC approved this

138 project (protocols 834 and 1354) and all procedures conformed to the ASAB/ABS Guidelines

139 for the Use of Animals in Research.

Figure 1. Schematic of pair formation and hormone conditions. Pinyon jays were repeatedly paired with every other bird from the same squad. We assigned every pair to a hormone condition: (a) Experiment 1 pairs received saline (SAL), mesotocin (MT), or oxytocin antagonist (OTA); (b) Experiment 2 pairs received SAL or MT.

Formation of squads and pairs

141 We assigned each bird to a same-sex squad of four individuals (three squads in

142 Experiment 1 and six squads in Experiment 2). During pair-formation phase sessions, we

143 paired each individual in a squad with every other individual in the same squad

144 (round-robin, six pairs per each squad); therefore, every bird had repeated experience with

145 the three other birds in its squad (see Figure 1). To distinguish individuals visually, we

146 placed a colored leg band (red, white, blue, or green) on each member of a squad. All birds

147 were individually housed when not being run through experimental sessions, thus birds only

148 had direct experience with squad members during experimental sessions.

149   Within a squad, we assigned each pair a hormone treatment consisting of either saline

150   (SAL), mesotocin (MT), or oxytocin antagonist (OTA; only Experiment 1). Every pair

151   always received the same hormone treatment throughout the duration of the experiment.

152   Because each bird was in three pairs, each bird experienced each hormone condition, albeit

153   with different partners. In Experiment 1, each individual was assigned one pair for each of

154   the three conditions. In Experiment 2, we simplified the hormonal manipulations by

155   removing the oxytocin antagonist condition, which resulted in each individual involved in

156   either two mesotocin and one saline pairs or one mesotocin and two saline pairs.

157   **Hormone preparation and administration**

158   We diluted mesotocin (Bachem H2505, Torrance, CA) and oxytocin antagonist (R&D

159   Systems L-368,899, Inc., Minneapolis, MN) to the necessary dose with sterile saline,

160   separated each solution (including the saline control) into individual doses by pipetting 120

161   microliters into individual microtubes, then froze all samples at -20° C. To ensure

162   experimenters were blind to what hormone corresponded to which condition, we coded all

163   samples as A, B, or C. Doses were calculated per 100 microliters and the additional 20

164   microliters accounted for any potential spillage. For Experiment 1, the mesotocin dose was

165   50 micrograms (approximately 24 IU) and oxytocin antagonist was 10 micrograms (based on

166   Smith, Ågmo, Birnie, & French, 2010). Though unclear if related to the mesotocin

167   administration, we observed some unintended side effects during Experiment 1 (e.g.,

168   motor-balance irregularities). Further, Duque, Leichner, Ahmann, and Stevens (2018) found

169   a behavioral influence of mesotocin administration using a lower dose, at 30 micrograms per

170   100 microliters (approximately 14 IU). For these reasons, we reduced the mesotocin dose to

171   30 micrograms in Experiment 2. To administer a dose, an experimenter used a needle-less

172   syringe to drip the respective solution into the birds' nostrils. Handling and administration

173   lasted approximately 10-15 seconds per bird.

Procedure

We sought to manipulate the formation of social bonds by repeatedly pairing birds following exposure to a specific hormone manipulation. Both experiments consisted of three phases: habituation to the testing environment and procedure, a pair-formation phase with repeated sessions of hormone/saline administration for all pairs, and a pair-maintenance phase with repeated sessions of no administration and all four birds together in a group. Prior to each pair-formation phase session, we administered to each member of a pair its assigned hormone condition (10 sessions for each pair), and all pairs within a squad were cycled through once before repeating any pairs.

Habituation. For habituation sessions, an experimenter transported an individual bird from its home cage to an experimental cage (minimum of $42 \times 42 \times 60$ cm) that had a cup containing the birds' typical diet. The experimental cage was in another room that was visually isolated from other birds and was the same cage that would later be used during the pair phase. Each habituation session lasted approximately 15 minutes, and birds were given one session daily for nine weekdays. Thus, birds were familiarized to the testing environment prior to beginning the experimental phases.

Pair-formation phase. Pair-formation phase sessions were similar to habituation, except that birds were run in pairs for 45 minutes, and both birds were intranasally administered their preassigned solution immediately prior to being placed in the experimental cage. Specifically, after transporting both birds to the testing room, the experimenter dripped 120 microliters of solution into the birds' nares, placed both birds in the cage, and immediately exited the room.

We tested each bird only once per day; therefore, a minimum of six days elapsed before the same pair was repeated (since there are six pairs per squad), and we randomized the order of pairs within each block. Each bird experienced 10 sessions for each of its three pairs,

199 totaling 30 sessions. Unlike habituation, we did not introduce food at the beginning of pair

200 phase sessions. However, halfway through Experiment 1 (pair phase sessions 6-10), we

201 introduced a food bowl after 30 minutes to promote interactions between the pair. We

202 discontinued this for Experiment 2 since we observed increased variability in the data

203 following the introduction of food.

204   **Pair-maintenance phase.**   Upon the completion of all pair-formation sessions, we

205 tested each squad in 10 30-minute pair-maintenance phase sessions. In these sessions, we did

206 not administer any solutions, and all four individuals were placed together in a larger cage

207 ($66 \times 74 \times 115$ cm). For Experiment 1 only, experimenters introduced two food bowls at the

208 15-minute mark. We did not introduce any food during Experiment 2 group sessions.

209 **Quantifying pair proximity**

210   We video recorded all sessions to measure the distance between the pairs. Coders used

211 Meazure (version 2.0.1, C Thing Software, http://www.cthing.com/Meazure.asp) to capture

212 the coordinates of each bird. Specifically, starting at the 15 s mark and every minute

213 thereafter, we recorded the location of the top-center of each bird's head, then used those

214 coordinates to calculate the distance between birds for each minute of that session. To

215 account for differences in video size or the camera's distance from cage, the first recorded

216 point for each session was a fixed, known distance (a horizontal cage bar) which was used to

217 calibrate all following distances for that specific session.

218   After visualizing and analyzing a subset of Experiment 1 data, we determined that

219 pairs' mean proximity had stabilized within the first 25 min of each pair session and overall

220 results did not differ between when we analyzed all time points or merely the first 25. Thus,

221 to avoid the increased variability induced by human disturbance and the introduction of

222 food, we only used data from the first 25 min for pair-formation phase sessions. For

Experiment 1 pair-maintenance phase sessions, we omitted the proximity data for the minute before, during, and after the experimenter entered the room. Similarly, coders recorded a null measurement whenever the location of a bird's head was not visible or was unreliable, e.g., when a bird was in mid-flight. All data were scored by one of six coders and, prior to independently coding any sessions, each coder was extensively trained until they reached high reliability. Further, to quantify measurement differences between coders, all six coders scored the same 45 videos. These data were then used to calculate the intraclass correlation (ICC) as a measure of inter-rater reliability (Koo & Li, 2016). In an empty, random intercept model, 97.82% [95% CI: 96.44, 98.54] of the variation in pair proximity is accounted for by differences between different videos, suggesting that the different coders shared excellent agreement in quantifying proximities from the same video. We randomly selected one coder's data for each of the videos for our data analysis.

Data analysis

We analyzed the data using R (Version 3.5.3; R Core Team, 2019). Data, R code, and supplementary figures are available in the Supplementary Materials and at the Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/67ncp/). The manuscript was created using *rmarkdown* (Version 1.12; Allaire, Xie, McPherson, Luraschi, Ushey, Atkins, Wickham, Cheng, Chang, & Iannone, 2018) and *knitr* (Version 1.22; Xie, 2015), and the reproducible research materials are available from author JRS and at https://osf.io/67ncp/.

Model selection. We ran separate analyses of pair proximity for each phase for both experiments (four total datasets), using backward model selection to first find the best-fitting random effect structure, then tested various fixed effects to find the best-fitting model. For each analysis, we started with the full random effect structure including pair, squad, and a random slope for pairs across sessions (i.e., allowing pairs to change independently over time). We sequentially eliminated the weakest, non-significant effects,

248 then ran a nested model comparison (likelihood ratio test) to select the best-fitting random

249 effect structure. A full fixed effect model was then constructed by adding condition (Exp. 1:

250 SAL/MT/OTA; Exp. 2: SAL/MT), session (1-10; centered at final session), their interaction,

251 and the quadratic effect of session. The final best-fitting model was then selected by

252 sequential deletion and model comparison as detailed above. The significance of terms in all

253 final models was confirmed by Wald tests and non-0 overlapping confidence intervals.

254   We also calculated Bayes factors (BF) to compare the weight of evidence for

255 alternative models relative to the null (Wagenmakers, 2007). Specifically, we compared each

256 model containing fixed effects to the best-fitting random effect model. We calculated Bayes

257 factors by converting each model's Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) using BF =

258 $e^{(BIC_{null} - BIC_{alernative})/2}$ (Wagenmakers, 2007).

<div align="center">

Results

</div>

Pair-formation phase

261   In the pair-formation phase of Experiment 1, we measured the pair proximity for each

262 session and condition. The best-fitting random effect structure included a random intercept

263 for each unique pair and a random slope over sessions; i.e., allowing pairs to change

264 independently over time (random intercept model for pair with versus without random slope:

265 $\chi^2(2) = 18.53$, p < 0.001). However, a random intercept for each squad was not warranted

266 (full versus model without squad: $\chi^2(1) = 2.85$, p = 0.09). Inclusion of condition, session,

267 their interaction, or quadratic effect of session did not improve an empty model (same

268 random effects with no fixed effects, BFs < 0.01). Thus, hormone treatment did not

269 influence pair proximity (Figure 2a).

270   In Experiment 2, the best-fitting random effect structure included a random intercept

271 for each unique pair and a random slope over sessions (random intercept model for pair with

Figure 2. Pair-formation phase pair proximities for each condition for (a) Experiment 1 (6 pairs) and (b) Experiment 2 (12 pairs). Open circles represent individual pairs, horizontal bars represent medians, boxes represent interquartile ranges, whiskers represent full range, closed circles represent means, and error bars represent between-pair confidence intervals. SAL = saline, MT = mesotocin, and OTA = oxytocin antagonist.

versus without random slope: $\chi^2(2) = 22.31$, p < 0.001). However, a random intercept for each squad was not warranted (overfit full model versus model without squad: $\chi^2(1) = 0.00$, p > .99). Both linear and quadratic fixed effects of session were warranted (model including linear with versus without quadratic session: $\chi^2(1) = 8.16$, p = 0.004, indicating that pairs perched 0.37 ± 0.12 cm (mean $\pm$ standard error) closer each subsequent session, but the decrease in distance diminished by 0.04 ± 0.01 cm each session (Figure S1). That is, though pairs perched more closely over time, the reduction in distance was less pronounced as time progressed. The Bayesian analysis, however, found evidence for no session effect (BF = 0.27). Lastly, inclusion of condition was not warranted ($\chi^2(1) = 0.35$, p = 0.55; Figure 2b).

Figure 3. Pair-maintenance phase pair proximities for each condition for (a) Experiment 1 (6 pairs) and (b) Experiment 2 (12 pairs). Open circles represent individual pairs, horizontal bars represent medians, boxes represent interquartile ranges, whiskers represent full range, closed circles represent means, and error bars represent between-pair confidence intervals. SAL = saline, MT = mesotocin, and OTA = oxytocin antagonist.

Pair-maintenance phase

In the pair-maintenance phase of Experiment 1, the best-fitting random effect structure included only a random intercept for each unique pair (against null model with no random effects; $\chi^2(1) = 5.05$, p = 0.025). A linear fixed effect of session was warranted (against empty model; $\chi^2(1) = 6.12$, p = 0.013), indicating that pairs perched 1.40 ± 0.56 cm closer in each subsequent session (Figure S2). The Bayesian analysis, however, did not find evidence for a session effect (BF = 1.59). No other fixed effects tested (condition or quadratic effect of session) were warranted (Figure 3a).

In Experiment 2, the best-fitting random effect structure included a random intercept for each unique pair and group but not a random slope (full model with versus without

291 random slope: $\chi^2(1) = 5.62$, p = 0.018). Inclusion of condition, session, their interaction, or

292 quadratic effect of session did not significantly improve an empty model (same random

293 effects with no fixed effects, BFs < 0.09; Figure S2). Thus, hormone condition was not

294 warranted in the best-fitting model (Figure 3b).

Discussion

296   Our analysis of same-sex pinyon jay pairs showed no influence of mesotocin or oxytocin

297 antagonist administration on the proximity of paired birds. Although there was a small

298 effect of session in some models, hormone condition did not influence the proximity of birds

299 for the pair-formation phase or the pair-maintenance phase.

300   Oxytocin has been implicated in a wide range of social behaviors in mammals (Insel &

301 Young, 2000; Donaldson & Young, 2008), as has isotocin, the oxytocin homologue found in

302 fish (Godwin & Thompson, 2012; Reddon, O'Connor, Marsh-Rollo, Balshine, Gozdowska, &

303 Kulczykowska, 2015) and mesotocin in reptiles (Kabelik & Magruder, 2014). Mesotocin also

304 plays a role in avian maternal care (Chokchaloemwong, Prakobsaeng, Sartsoongnoen,

305 Kosonsiriluk, El Halawani, & Chaiseha, 2013), mating pair bond formation (Pedersen &

306 Tomaszycki, 2012; Klatt & Goodson, 2013), flocking behavior (Goodson, Schrock, Klatt,

307 Kabelik, & Kingsbury, 2009), and prosociality (Duque, Leichner, Ahmann, & Stevens, 2018).

308 Here, we do not demonstrate evidence that mesotocin shapes social bond formation or

309 maintenance in pinyon jays, raising the possibility that mesotocin may function differently

310 than oxytocin. That is, social bonding could be affected differently by mesotocin compared

311 to oxytocin. Though we do not show an effect of mesotocin on bonding in our study, we do

312 not believe that it provides strong evidence against the possibility of mesotocin regulating

313 social bonds in birds for a number of reasons.

314   Many of the functions of the oxytocin family of peptides are quite evolutionarily

315 conserved, from fish and reptiles to chimpanzees and humans. Though it is possible that

316 functionality may occur in the other species and not birds, this seems unlikely. However, few

317 studies have directly investigated the role of oxytocin-family hormone on social bonds

318 outside of the mating and parenting context. Chimpanzees have higher levels of urinary

319 oxytocin following grooming bouts with socially bonded partners compared to non-bonded

320 grooming partners (Crockford, Wittig, Langergraber, Ziegler, Zuberbühler, & Deschner,

321 2013; Wittig, Crockford, Deschner, Langergraber, Ziegler, & Zuberbühler, 2014). Yet, this is

322 correlational and only focused on bond maintenance not formation. Administering oxytocin

323 to dogs increases affiliative behaviors to other dogs and humans, but it does not influence

324 spatial proximity and these effects are acute and not long lasting enough to qualify as social

325 bonding (Romero, Nagasawa, Mogi, Hasegawa, & Kikusui, 2014). Female meadow voles do

326 show stronger preferences for familar partners over unfamilar partners after oxytocin

327 administration compared to saline, but this effect was measured after only 24 hours (Beery

328 & Zucker, 2010). Though administering oxytocin or mesotocin influences the formation of

329 mating pair bonds (Witt, Carter, & Walton, 1990; Insel & Hulihan, 1995; Pedersen &

330 Tomaszycki, 2012), we do not have strong evidence of these hormones directly shaping

331 formation of same-sex social bonds over time. So it is possible that oxytocin-family

332 hormones facilitate same-sex social bond maintenance but not formation.

333   It is also possible that mesotocin does facilitate social bond formation, but we simply

334 did not detect it. Though social proximity is generally a good indicator of relationship

335 quality (Croft, Krause, & James, 2008), it may not be a good indicator of the social impact

336 mesotocin has on pinyon jays. It is also possible that behaviors other than proximity are

337 better indicators of social bonds. For pinyon jay mating pairs, proximity is a clear indicator

338 of a pair bond, along with additional behaviors such as begging, allopreening, food sharing,

339 and coordinated displays and calls (Marzluff & Balda, 1992). Though we recorded a few

340 instances of begging, allopreening, aggression, and even mounting, we did not notice any

341 consistent changes in other behaviors, but a more detailed analysis of more subtle behaviors

342 may reveal differences across hormonal conditions. Thus, it is possible our manipulations

343 impacted birds in ways not captured by our measures and study design.

344   Additionally, insufficient dosage or sub-optimal timing of the dosage may have

345 interfered with the establishment of the social bonds. We used dosages based on our

346 previous study showing acute effects of mesotocin on prosocial food sharing (Duque,

347 Leichner, Ahmann, & Stevens, 2018). However, it is possible that different dosages are

348 required to induce the longer-term effects on social bonds. It is also possible that the

349 immediate time course of administration and behavioral testing did not match that needed

350 to establish the bonds. In our design, birds received one hormone dose and were placed

351 together in a cage for 45 minutes. For a given pair, this occurred roughly every six days.

352 Thus, the duration and frequency of social interactions experienced in the lab likely differ

353 from those needed to form new bonds in the wild. Finally, each pair experienced ten sessions

354 with each partner. Some of the statistical models showed effects of sessions on proximity,

355 with pairs getting closer over time. Though they did not differ across hormone treatment, it

356 is possible that we did not give the bonds enough time to form, and additional treatments

357 and sessions are needed to build the bonds.

358   While we chose to investigate the effects of mesotocin, it is plausible that other

359 hormones may play a stronger role in avian social bonding. For instance, both

360 administration of vasotocin (the avian homologue of the mammalian arginine vasopressin) as

361 well as neural vasotocin activity is related to gregariousness in zebra finch, but the effect is

362 most evident in males (Goodson, Lindberg, & Johnson, 2004; Goodson, Schrock, Klatt,

363 Kabelik, & Kingsbury, 2009). Importantly, vasotocin promoted a preference for a larger flock

364 size in male zebra finch, but did not impact the amount of time spent in close proximity

365 (Kelly, Kingsbury, Hoffbuhr, Schrock, Waxman, Kabelik, Thompson, & Goodson, 2011).

366 Thus, the role of vasotocin in pinyon jay social behavior warrants investigation. Further, low

367 sample size prevents our testing of sex differences, but it is possible that mesotocin or

368 vasotocin impacts the sexes differently.

369   Lastly, the level of circulating hormones is only one way in which hormones might

370 regulate social bond formation. It is unclear how measurements and adminstration of

371 oxytocin-family hormones outside of the brain relate to levels in the brain (McCullough,

372 Churchland, & Mendez, 2013; Evans, Dal Monte, Noble, & Averbeck, 2014), particularly in

373 corvids, among which relatively little mesotocin research has been conducted (Duque,

374 Leichner, Ahmann, & Stevens, 2018). Nevertheless, there is evidence in other species of

375 peripheral levels correlating with social behavior (Crockford, Wittig, Langergraber, Ziegler,

376 Zuberbühler, & Deschner, 2013; Wittig, Crockford, Deschner, Langergraber, Ziegler, &

377 Zuberbühler, 2014) and peripheral administration influencing social behavior (Smith, Ågmo,

378 Birnie, & French, 2010; Romero, Nagasawa, Mogi, Hasegawa, & Kikusui, 2014). Yet,

379 individuals also vary in their underlying sensitivity to those hormones, primarily determined

380 by the number and distribution of the receptors to which those hormones bind. For example,

381 differences in the density of oxytocin/vasopresson neurons in the brain underlie whether a

382 prairie vole will form a monogamous bond with its partner, or be polygamous (Insel,

383 Winslow, Wang, & Young, 1998). Thus, it would be highly informative to analyze the

384 localization of mesotocin receptors across the pinyon jay brain to shed light on what makes

385 this particular species remarkably social, as compared to even its closest sister species

386 (Marzluff & Balda, 1992).

387   Here, we find that administration of mesotocin or oxytocin antagonist did not impact

388 how closely two previously unfamiliar birds perched next to one another. However, future

389 investigations are warranted to clarify whether mesotocin influences (1) other forms of

390 behaviors during bond formation and the time course of those effects, (2) the relationship

391 between administered mesotocin and circulating levels in the brain, (3) the role of related

392 hormones (e.g., vasotocin), and (4) the role of mesotocin on social behaviors in other corvid

393 species. Given the variation in levels of sociality and cooperation across corvids, exploring

the hormonal and neural underpinning of these behaviors could provide valuable insights into the evolution and mechanisms of social behavior.

Acknowledgments

References

Acher, R., Chauvet, J., & Chauvet, M.-T. (1970). Phylogeny of the neurohypophysial hormones. *European Journal of Biochemistry*, *17*(3), 509–513. doi:10.1111/j.1432-1033.1970.tb01193.x.

Allaire, J., Xie, Y., McPherson, J., Luraschi, J., Ushey, K., Atkins, A., Wickham, H., Cheng, J., Chang, W., & Iannone, R. (2018). *rmarkdown: Dynamic documents for R.* https://rmarkdown.rstudio.com.

Bartz, J. A., Zaki, J., Bolger, N., & Ochsner, K. N. (2011). Social effects of oxytocin in humans: Context and person matter. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *15*(7), 301–309. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2011.05.002.

Baumgartner, T., Heinrichs, M., Vonlanthen, A., Fischbacher, U., & Fehr, E. (2008). Oxytocin shapes the neural circuitry of trust and trust adaptation in humans. *Neuron*, *58*(4), 639–650. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2008.04.009.

Beery, A. K., & Zucker, I. (2010). Oxytocin and same-sex social behavior in female meadow voles. *Neuroscience*, *169*(2), 665–673. doi:10.1016/j.neuroscience.2010.05.023.

Benítez, M. E., Sosnowski, M. J., Tomeo, O. B., & Brosnan, S. F. (2018). Urinary oxytocin in capuchin monkeys: Validation and the influence of social behavior. *American Journal of Primatology*, *80*(10), e22877. doi:10.1002/ajp.22877.

Broad, K., Curley, J., & Keverne, E. (2006). Mother–infant bonding and the evolution of mammalian social relationships. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *361*(1476), 2199–2214. doi:10.1098/rstb.2006.1940.

Brosnan, S. F., Talbot, C. F., Essler, J. L., Leverett, K., Flemming, T., Dougall, P., Heyler, C., & Zak, P. J. (2015). Oxytocin reduces food sharing in capuchin monkeys by

modulating social distance. *Behaviour, 152*(7–8), 941–961.
doi:10.1163/1568539X-00003268.

Cameron, E. Z., Setsaas, T. H., & Linklater, W. L. (2009). Social bonds between unrelated females increase reproductive success in feral horses. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA, 106*(33), 13850–13853. doi:10.1073/pnas.0900639106.

Cavanaugh, J., Mustoe, A. C., Taylor, J. H., & French, J. A. (2014). Oxytocin facilitates fidelity in well-established marmoset pairs by reducing sociosexual behavior toward opposite-sex strangers. *Psychoneuroendocrinology, 49*, 1–10. doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2014.06.020.

Chokchaloemwong, D., Prakobsaeng, N., Sartsoongnoen, N., Kosonsiriluk, S., El Halawani, M., & Chaiseha, Y. (2013). Mesotocin and maternal care of chicks in native Thai hens (*Gallus domesticus*). *Hormones and Behavior, 64*(1), 53–69. doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2013.04.010.

Clutton-Brock, T. (2016). *Mammal societies.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Costa, A. P. C. D., Guevara-Guzman, R. G., Ohkura, S., Goode, J. A., & Kendrick, K. M. (1996). The role of oxytocin release in the paraventricular nucleus in the control of maternal behaviour in the sheep. *Journal of Neuroendocrinology, 8*(3), 163–177. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2826.1996.04411.x.

Crockford, C., Wittig, R. M., Langergraber, K., Ziegler, T. E., Zuberbühler, K., & Deschner, T. (2013). Urinary oxytocin and social bonding in related and unrelated wild chimpanzees. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series B, 280*(1755), 20122765. doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.2765.

Croft, D. B., Krause, J., & James, R. (2008). *Exploring animal social networks.* Princeton,

NJ: Princeton University Press.

Donaldson, Z. R., & Young, L. J. (2008). Oxytocin, vasopressin, and the neurogenetics of sociality. *Science*, *322*(5903), 900–904. doi:10.1126/science.1158668.

Duque, J. F., & Stevens, J. R. (2016). Voluntary food sharing in pinyon jays: The role of reciprocity and dominance. *Animal Behaviour*, *122*, 135–144. doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2016.09.020.

Duque, J. F., Leichner, W., Ahmann, H., & Stevens, J. R. (2018). Mesotocin influences pinyon jay prosociality. *Biology Letters*, *14*(4), 20180105. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2018.0105.

Evans, S. L., Dal Monte, O., Noble, P., & Averbeck, B. B. (2014). Intranasal oxytocin effects on social cognition: A critique. *Brain Research*, *1580*, 69–77. doi:10.1016/j.brainres.2013.11.008.

Godwin, J., & Thompson, R. (2012). Nonapeptides and social behavior in fishes. *Hormones and Behavior*, *61*(3), 230–238. doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2011.12.016.

Goodson, J. L., Lindberg, L., & Johnson, P. (2004). Effects of central vasotocin and mesotocin manipulations on social behavior in male and female zebra finches. *Hormones and Behavior*, *45*(2), 136–143. doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2003.08.006.

Goodson, J. L., Schrock, S. E., Klatt, J. D., Kabelik, D., & Kingsbury, M. A. (2009). Mesotocin and nonapeptide receptors promote estrildid flocking behavior. *Science*, *325*(5942), 862–866. doi:10.1126/science.1174929.

Hrdy, S. B. (1999). *Mother nature: A history of mothers, infants, and natural selection.* New York: Pantheon.

Insel, T. R., & Hulihan, T. J. (1995). A gender-specific mechanism for pair bonding: Oxytocin and partner preference formation in monogamous voles. *Behavioral*

473   *Neuroscience, 109*(4), 782–789. doi:10.1037/0735-7044.109.4.782.

474   Insel, T. R., & Young, L. J. (2000). Neuropeptides and the evolution of social behavior.

475   *Current Opinion in Neurobiology, 10*(6), 784–789.

476   doi:10.1016/S0959-4388(00)00146-X.

477   Insel, T. R., Winslow, J. T., Wang, Z., & Young, L. J. (1998). Oxytocin, vasopressin, and

478   the neuroendocrine basis of pair bond formation. In H. H. Zingg, C. W. Bourque, &

479   D. G. Bichet (Eds.), *Vasopressin and oxytocin: Molecular, cellular, and clinical*

480   *advances* (pp. 215–224). Boston, MA: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4615-4871-3_28.

481   Kabelik, D., & Magruder, D. (2014). Involvement of different mesotocin (oxytocin

482   homologue) populations in sexual and aggressive behaviours of the brown anole.

483   *Biology Letters, 10*(8), 20140566. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2014.0566.

484   Kelly, A. M., Kingsbury, M. A., Hoffbuhr, K., Schrock, S. E., Waxman, B., Kabelik, D.,

485   Thompson, R. R., & Goodson, J. L. (2011). Vasotocin neurons and septal V1a-like

486   receptors potently modulate songbird flocking and responses to novelty. *Hormones*

487   *and Behavior, 60*(1), 12–21. doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2011.01.012.

488   Klatt, J. D., & Goodson, J. L. (2013). Oxytocin-like receptors mediate pair bonding in a

489   socially monogamous songbird. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series B,*

490   *280*(1750), 20122396. doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.2396.

491   Koo, T. K., & Li, M. Y. (2016). A guideline of selecting and reporting intraclass correlation

492   coefficients for reliability research. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine, 15*(2), 155–163.

493   doi:10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012.

494   Kosfeld, M., Heinrichs, M., Zak, P. J., Fischbacher, U., & Fehr, E. (2005). Oxytocin

increases trust in humans. *Nature, 435*(7042), 673–676.

Marzluff, J. M., & Balda, R. P. (1992). *The pinyon jay: Behavioral ecology of a colonial and cooperative corvid.* London: A&C Black.

McCullough, M. E., Churchland, P. S., & Mendez, A. J. (2013). Problems with measuring peripheral oxytocin: Can the data on oxytocin and human behavior be trusted? *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 37*(8), 1485–1492. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.04.018.

Nagasawa, M., Mitsui, S., En, S., Ohtani, N., Ohta, M., Sakuma, Y., Onaka, T., Mogi, K., & Kikusui, T. (2015). Oxytocin-gaze positive loop and the coevolution of human-dog bonds. *Science, 348*(6232), 333–336. doi:10.1126/science.1261022.

Nagasawa, M., Okabe, S., Mogi, K., & Kikusui, T. (2012). Oxytocin and mutual communication in mother-infant bonding. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 6*, 31. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2012.00031.

Nave, G., Camerer, C., & McCullough, M. (2015). Does oxytocin increase trust in humans? A critical review of research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 10*(6), 772–789. doi:10.1177/1745691615600138.

Pedersen, A., & Tomaszycki, M. (2012). Oxytocin antagonist treatments alter the formation of pair relationships in zebra finches of both sexes. *Hormones and Behavior, 62*(2), 113–119. doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2012.05.009.

R Core Team. (2019). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing.* Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. https://www.R-project.org/.

Reddon, A. R., O'Connor, C. M., Marsh-Rollo, S. E., Balshine, S., Gozdowska, M., & Kulczykowska, E. (2015). Brain nonapeptide levels are related to social status and

518   affiliative behaviour in a cooperatively breeding cichlid fish. *Royal Society Open*

519   *Science*, *2*(2), 140072. doi:10.1098/rsos.140072.

520   Romero, T., Nagasawa, M., Mogi, K., Hasegawa, T., & Kikusui, T. (2014). Oxytocin

521   promotes social bonding in dogs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*

522   *USA*, *111*(25), 9085–9090. doi:10.1073/pnas.1322868111.

523   Silk, J. B. (2007). The adaptive value of sociality in mammalian groups. *Philosophical*

524   *Transactions of the Royal Society of London, Series B*, *362*, 539–559.

525   Silk, J. B., Alberts, S. C., & Altmann, J. (2003). Social bonds of female baboons enhance

526   infant survival. *Science*, *302*(5648), 1231–1234. doi:10.1126/science.1088580.

527   Silk, J. B., Beehner, J. C., Bergman, T. J., Crockford, C., Engh, A. L., Moscovice, L. R.,

528   Wittig, R. M., Seyfarth, R. M., & Cheney, D. L. (2010). Strong and consistent social

529   bonds enhance the longevity of female baboons. *Current Biology*, *20*(15), 1359–1361.

530   doi:10.1016/j.cub.2010.05.067.

531   Smith, A. S., Ågmo, A., Birnie, A. K., & French, J. A. (2010). Manipulation of the oxytocin

532   system alters social behavior and attraction in pair-bonding primates, *Callithrix*

533   *penicillata*. *Hormones and Behavior*, *57*(2), 255–262.

534   doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2009.12.004.

535   Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2007). A practical solution to the pervasive problems of p values.

536   *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *14*(5), 779–804. doi:10.3758/BF03194105.

537   Witt, D. M., Carter, S. C., & Walton, D. M. (1990). Central and peripheral effects of

538   oxytocin administration in prairie voles (*Microtus ochrogaster*). *Pharmacology*

539   *Biochemistry and Behavior*, *37*(1), 63–69. doi:10.1016/0091-3057(90)90042-G.

540   Wittig, R. M., Crockford, C., Deschner, T., Langergraber, K. E., Ziegler, T. E., &

541   Zuberbühler, K. (2014). Food sharing is linked to urinary oxytocin levels and bonding

542   in related and unrelated wild chimpanzees. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of*

543   *London, Series B, 281*(1778), 20133096. doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.3096.

544 Xie, Y. (2015). *Dynamic documents with R and knitr* (2nd ed.). Boca Raton, FL: CRC

545   Press.