

Research



**Cite this article:** Anderson JA *et al.* 2022

Distinct gene regulatory signatures of dominance rank and social bond strength in wild baboons. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **377**: 20200441.

<https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0441>

Received: 31 May 2021

Accepted: 19 August 2021

One contribution of 19 to a theme issue ‘The centennial of the pecking order: current state and future prospects for the study of dominance hierarchies’.

**Subject Areas:**

genomics, ecology, behaviour

**Keywords:**

social status, social integration, gene expression, *Papio cynocephalus*

**Author for correspondence:**

Jenny Tung  
e-mail: [jt5@duke.edu](mailto:jt5@duke.edu)

Electronic supplementary material is available online at <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.c.5736428>.

# Distinct gene regulatory signatures of dominance rank and social bond strength in wild baboons

Jordan A. Anderson<sup>1</sup>, Amanda J. Lea<sup>2,3,4</sup>, Tawni N. Voyles<sup>1</sup>, Mercy Y. Akinyi<sup>5</sup>, Ruth Nyakundi<sup>5</sup>, Lucy Ochola<sup>5</sup>, Martin Omondi<sup>5</sup>, Fred Nyundo<sup>5</sup>, Yingying Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Fernando A. Campos<sup>6</sup>, Susan C. Alberts<sup>1,2</sup>, Elizabeth A. Archie<sup>7</sup> and Jenny Tung<sup>1,2,8,9</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Evolutionary Anthropology, and <sup>2</sup>Department of Biology, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708, USA

<sup>3</sup>Lewis-Sigler Institute for Integrative Genomics, Carl Icahn Laboratory, and <sup>4</sup>Department of Ecology and Evolution, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

<sup>5</sup>Institute of Primate Research, National Museums of Kenya, Nairobi 00502, Kenya

<sup>6</sup>Department of Anthropology, University of Texas at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX 78249, USA

<sup>7</sup>Department of Biological Sciences, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA

<sup>8</sup>Duke Population Research Institute, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708, USA

<sup>9</sup>Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, Toronto, Canada M5G 1M1

FAC, 0000-0001-9826-751X; SCA, 0000-0002-1313-488X; JT, 0000-0003-0416-2958

The social environment is a major determinant of morbidity, mortality and Darwinian fitness in social animals. Recent studies have begun to uncover the molecular processes associated with these relationships, but the degree to which they vary across different dimensions of the social environment remains unclear. Here, we draw on a long-term field study of wild baboons to compare the signatures of affiliative and competitive aspects of the social environment in white blood cell gene regulation, under both immune-stimulated and non-stimulated conditions. We find that the effects of dominance rank on gene expression are directionally opposite in males versus females, such that high-ranking males resemble low-ranking females, and vice versa. Among females, rank and social bond strength are both reflected in the activity of cellular metabolism and proliferation genes. However, while we observe pronounced rank-related differences in baseline immune gene activity, only bond strength predicts the fold-change response to immune (lipopolysaccharide) stimulation. Together, our results indicate that the directionality and magnitude of social effects on gene regulation depend on the aspect of the social environment under study. This heterogeneity may help explain why social environmental effects on health and longevity can also vary between measures.

This article is part of the theme issue ‘The centennial of the pecking order: current state and future prospects for the study of dominance hierarchies’.

## 1. Introduction

Many animal species, including humans, live the majority of their lives as part of a larger group of conspecifics. Social group living provides a number of benefits, including protection from predators, improved territory and resource defense, and access to potential mates [1–4]. At the same time, it also generates competition for resources among group members. For many group-living species, the outcome of competitive interactions is at least partially predictable, giving rise to an observable social dominance hierarchy in which high-status animals are consistently able to displace lower-status animals [5–7]. Due to correlated differences in resource access, energy expenditure and/or psychosocial stress, high-ranking and low-ranking animals are frequently behaviourally and

physiologically distinct. For example, across social mammals, low-status individuals often have elevated glucocorticoid levels or exhibit signs of glucocorticoid resistance [8–12].

However, correlations between social status and physiological measures are highly heterogeneous across species or between sexes, and sometimes even directionally inconsistent [8,13–18]. This heterogeneity is likely explained in part by differences in how status is attained and maintained—variation that has been best studied in social mammals, particularly among group-living species where status is not determined in early development. In some cases, social status depends on individual characteristics, such as the ability to physically dominate competitors (e.g. male bottlenose dolphins, male red deer, female meerkats: [19–21]). By contrast, other types of social hierarchies are determined via nepotism, and do not strongly covary with individual phenotype (e.g. female spotted hyenas, some female cercopithecine primates: [22,23]). Hierarchies that are largely determined by physical condition are often dynamic, whereas nepotistic hierarchies can remain highly stable over time, and even extend across generations [24–26]. Consequently, while rank is an important predictor of fitness in both types of hierarchies [27–31], its physiological signatures may differ. For example, while high rank predicts lower glucocorticoid levels in female blue monkeys and naked mole-rats of both sexes [10,32,33], glucocorticoid levels tend to be higher in high-ranking female ring-tailed lemurs, female meerkats and male chimpanzees [18,34,35]. Even when glucocorticoid levels are correlated with rank in both sexes, they may do so in opposite directions, potentially owing to differences in how hierarchies are determined (table 1 in [11]). In the baboons that are the subjects of the current study, for instance, low rank predicts higher glucocorticoid levels in females, where rank attainment is nepotistic [13]. By contrast, male social status is determined by physical condition, and alpha males exhibit the highest glucocorticoid levels in their hierarchies (although very low-ranking males also have high values) [14].

In addition to the competitive interactions that structure social hierarchies, group-living animals can also form individually differentiated, affiliative social bonds. The affiliative behaviours that give rise to social bonds (e.g. proximity or contact in cetaceans and ungulates, grooming and proximity in primates) are often patterned, at least in part, by social status [36–42]. For example, in cooperatively breeding meerkats, dominant males groom dominant females more often than they groom subordinate females [43]. Similarly, attraction to high-ranking individuals commonly structures grooming patterns in social primates [40]. However, rank is not the sole determinant of affiliative behaviour and social bond formation. In female yellow baboons, for instance, a measure of female social connectedness to other females is better predicted by the presence of maternal kin than by rank (although rank, not the presence of maternal kin, predicts female social connectedness to males; [44]). Recent evidence also indicates that the fitness effects of affiliative social relationships are also partially independent of rank. Stronger social relationships predict natural lifespan in members of at least five mammalian orders, and this relationship often persists after controlling for variation in rank or other measures of social status [38,45–52]. Indeed, in yellow baboons, social relationships predict lifespan even when rank does not [51].

Social status and social integration are therefore connected dimensions of the social environment that nevertheless can have distinct fitness consequences. This observation presents a puzzle about the mechanisms that make their consequences for health, physiology and survival distinct. To date, far more work has focused on the physiological and molecular correlates of social status than of affiliative social bonds in natural animal populations. However, four lines of evidence argue that differences in affiliative social interactions should also be reflected in physiological or molecular variation. First, such changes are implied by cross-taxon support for an association between lifespan and social integration [53], suggesting at least a partial basis in physical condition. Second, studies in a small set of natural populations have already identified links between affiliative relationships and biomarkers of stress, especially glucocorticoid levels. For example, urinary glucocorticoids are lower in chimpanzees sampled while interacting with closely bonded social partners than in those interacting with non-bonded partners [54], and male rhesus macaques and female chacma baboons with stronger social bonds show reduced glucocorticoid responses to environmental stressors [55–57]. Third, social isolation and loneliness are associated with changes in human biology, including increased proinflammatory activity [58–60], hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal axis activation [61,62], and risk for cardiovascular disease [63,64]. Finally, studies in captive rodents show that manipulation of social integration and social support can causally alter glucocorticoid regulation and increase the risk of cancer metastasis [65,66].

Despite these findings, most studies consider either the physiological signature of social status or of affiliative social relationships, not both. Furthermore, those studies that incorporate both dimensions often measure only a single outcome variable in one type of social status hierarchy (i.e. physical competition-based or nepotistic). Because single measures vary along only one dimension, they have limited ability to distinguish shared versus unique signatures of competitive and affiliative interactions. Thus, it is possible that physiological changes in response to the social environment converge on a generalized signature of stress and adversity, in which low status and weak social bonds produce undifferentiable responses (e.g. the ‘conserved transcriptional response to adversity’: [67]). Alternatively, different facets of the social environment may be reflected in different biological pathways. If so, higher dimensional measures of physiological or molecular state may be informative about multiple aspects of an animal’s social experience, and help uncover why social status and social affiliation can be related, yet have distinct effects on fitness.

Functional genomic analyses of gene regulation provide an opportunity to differentiate these hypotheses. Importantly, previous work demonstrates the sensitivity of gene regulation to the social environment. For example, competitive interactions to establish dominance rapidly alter DNA methylation, histone marks and gene expression across multiple vertebrate and social insect species [68–74]. Affiliative interactions can also be reflected in altered gene expression patterns. For example, experimental social isolation in piglets results in increased plasma cortisol and altered glucocorticoid and mineralocorticoid receptor expression in stress-related regions of the brain [75]. However, the species that have been central to understanding the genomic signatures of social status and social competition (e.g. cichlid fish, mice) tend not to be the same

ones developed as models for social affiliation (e.g. voles, titi monkeys). Additionally, few studies of social interactions and gene regulation have focused on species that establish both clear social dominance hierarchies and long-term social bonds outside the mating pair-bond.

To begin addressing this gap, this study draws on data and samples from a five decade-long field study of wild baboons in Kenya, in which the fitness consequences of both social status and social relationships have been extensively investigated in prior work [29,44,51,76–79]. Gene regulatory signatures of the social environment have also been detected in this population [15,80]. Most relevant to this work, high-ranking baboon males exhibit elevated expression of inflammation-related genes both at baseline and upon stimulation with lipopolysaccharide (LPS; a pathogen-associated molecular pattern associated with Gram-negative bacteria, and a strong driver of the innate inflammatory response: [15]). By contrast, little signature of rank was detectable in females [15]. This result is consistent with findings that high rank in males (but not females) may incur costs due to the demands of maintaining high physical condition, including accelerated epigenetic ageing, elevated glucocorticoid and testosterone levels, and, to a lesser extent, higher mortality rates [14,51,81]. However, it contrasts with the hypothesis of a highly consistent gene regulatory response to the social environment [67].

Together, these observations raise key questions about the extent to which the links between social experience and gene regulation are sex- and/or context-specific. To address them here, we expand on our previous white blood cell gene expression datasets by 64% (from  $n = 119$  to  $n = 195$  samples, including paired baseline and LPS-stimulated samples from nearly all individuals; electronic supplementary material, table S1). We also generated ATAC-seq data on chromatin accessibility in a separate set of baseline and LPS-stimulated samples ( $n = 6$ ) to infer the transcription factor binding events that explain social environment associations with gene expression. Our results indicate even more substantial sex differences in the signature of dominance rank than was apparent in previous work. We also identify, for the first time in any natural vertebrate population, a strong signal of social bond strength on gene regulation. Although several of the major pathways associated with rank and social bond strength overlap, their signatures are clearly distinct, and only social bond strength predicts the gene expression *response* to pathogen stimulation (i.e. the difference between baseline and LPS-stimulated cells from the same individual). Together, this work emphasizes the strong relationship between the social environment and gene regulation in the immune system in wild social mammals. It thus deepens our understanding of how fitness-relevant social experiences ‘get under the skin’ to affect health and fitness outcomes.

## 2. Results


### (a) Directionally opposite gene expression signatures of dominance rank in male and female baboons

We used RNA-seq to measure genome-wide gene expression levels in white blood cells from 97 unique adult baboons (45 females, 52 males; electronic supplementary material, table S1). For each animal, we collected RNA from paired baseline (unstimulated cells cultured in media) and LPS-

stimulated samples that were cultured in parallel for 10 h (figure 1a; following [15]). Following quality control, our dataset consisted of RNA-seq data from 195 samples (119 samples from previously published work and an additional 76 samples that are newly reported here; 97 unique individuals total, with 3 individuals represented by more than one blood draw; electronic supplementary material, table S1). Samples were sequenced to a mean coverage of 17.4 million reads  $\pm$  7.7 million s.d. (electronic supplementary material, table S1). After filtering for genes that were detectably expressed in one or both conditions (median reads per kilobase of transcript per million mapped reads (RPKM) greater than 2 in either condition), we retained 10 281 genes for downstream analysis.

We first investigated the signature of dominance rank separately in each sex. Consistent with our earlier work [15], we found widespread associations between male ordinal dominance rank and gene expression levels. 2345 genes were significantly associated with male rank in baseline samples and 2996 in LPS-stimulated samples (22.8% and 29.1% of genes tested, respectively; i.e.  $\beta_{\text{rank}} \neq 0$  in a linear mixed effects model controlling for technical covariates, age and treatment effects, 10% false discovery rate (FDR); electronic supplementary material, table S2). An elastic net model relating gene expression to dominance rank thus predicted male rank with moderately high accuracy (Pearson’s  $R = 0.449$ ,  $p = 8.46 \times 10^{-4}$ ; figure 1b; electronic supplementary material, figure S1). In females, gene expression data were also significant predictors of dominance rank (Pearson’s  $R = 0.656$ ,  $p = 1.31 \times 10^{-6}$ ; figure 1c; electronic supplementary material, table S3). However, the elastic net analysis for females revealed one female (AMB\_2) who was high-ranking at the time of sampling (ordinal rank 3) but was predicted to be very low-ranking in both baseline and LPS samples (predicted ordinal rank 17.7 and 19.4, respectively; electronic supplementary material, figure S1). By substantially increasing our sample size and excluding AMB\_2, we were able to identify female dominance rank–gene expression associations that were undetectable in previous work [15], including 1285 rank-associated genes at baseline and 221 rank-associated genes after LPS stimulation (12.5% and 2.1% of genes tested, respectively; 10% FDR; electronic supplementary material, table S2). Because AMB\_2 was a clear outlier in our sample, we report analyses excluding her in the remainder of our results; however, our comparisons are qualitatively unchanged if AMB\_2 is included (electronic supplementary material, figure S2).

In both males and females, the second principal component (PC2) of the overall gene expression data was correlated with rank (males:  $p = 1.68 \times 10^{-4}$ ; females:  $p = 0.013$ ; note that PC1 splits baseline from LPS-stimulated cells). However, while high-ranking males tended to project onto positive values of PC2, high-ranking females tended to project onto negative values (electronic supplementary material, figure S3). Effect size estimates for individual genes were also anti-correlated by sex, such that genes that were more highly expressed in high-ranking females tended to be more lowly expressed in high-ranking males (Pearson’s  $R = -0.536$ ,  $p < 10^{-50}$ ; figure 1d; electronic supplementary material, figure S4). As a result, genes with increased activity in high-ranking males and low-ranking females were both enriched for inflammatory and type I interferon pathways (all  $p_{\text{adj}} < 0.005$ ; figure 1e; electronic supplementary material, table S4) [82]. Meanwhile, genes with increased activity in



**Figure 1.** Strong, sex-specific signatures of dominance rank in white blood cell gene expression. (a) Study design: dominance rank (males and females) and social bond strength (females only) were evaluated for their relationship with white blood cell gene expression, generated from samples cultured for 10 h in the absence (baseline) or presence of lipopolysaccharide (LPS). (b,c) A gene expression-based elastic net model accurately predicts dominance rank for male (b; Pearson's  $R = 0.449$ ,  $p = 8.46 \times 10^{-4}$ ) and female (c; Pearson's  $R = 0.656$ ,  $p = 1.31 \times 10^{-6}$ ) baboons. The dashed circle denotes the outlier female AMB\_2. (d) The effect estimates for the rank–gene expression association are negatively correlated in males versus females (Pearson's  $R = -0.536$ ,  $p < 10^{-50}$ ). Purple, green and yellow points correspond to genes passing a 10% false discovery rate for the male rank effect, female rank effect, or both, respectively. (e) Gene sets enriched for higher expression in high-ranking males are enriched for lower expression in high-ranking females, and vice versa. Enrichment in males is shown in purple; enrichment in females is shown in green. For all gene sets, enrichment score Bonferroni-corrected  $p$ -values are  $< 0.005$ . Photo credits in (a): Elizabeth Archie (females) and Courtney Fitzpatrick (males). Stock images of LPS and blood draw tubes courtesy of BioRender.com. (Online version in colour.)

low-ranking males and high-ranking females were both enriched for key metabolic and cell cycle-related pathways, including oxidative phosphorylation and MYC signalling (all  $p_{\text{adj}} < 0.005$ ; electronic supplementary material, table S4). Thus, the same genes and pathways were sensitive to rank dynamics in males and females, but in opposing directions. Indeed, when applying the predictive model trained for male rank to gene expression data from females, the model predictions were negatively correlated with the observed female ranks (Pearson's  $R = -0.339$ ;  $p = 0.023$ ), and vice

versa (correlation between female-trained model predictions and observed male rank: Pearson's  $R = -0.339$ ,  $p = 0.014$ ). Similarly, accessible binding sites for many immune response-related transcription factors (e.g. ISL1, KLF3, defined based on increased chromatin accessibility after LPS stimulation: see electronic supplementary material, methods and tables S5 and S6) were over-represented near genes upregulated in high-ranking males and near genes upregulated in low-ranking females (electronic supplementary material, figure S5 and table S7).

## (b) Distinct signatures of dominance rank and social bond strength in female baboons

To investigate whether genes that are sensitive to dominance rank (regardless of effect direction) also carry a signature of other aspects of the social environment, we next assessed the relationship between social bond strength and gene expression in the same sample. We focused exclusively on females ( $n=88$  samples from  $n=44$  unique individuals), using the ‘dyadic sociality index’ (DSI), a strong predictor of lifespan in our study population that captures an annual measure of the strength of a female’s bonds with her top three female partners [51]. Female-to-female DSI is uncorrelated with dominance rank in this dataset (Pearson’s  $R=0.13$ ,  $p=0.225$ ), allowing us to assess the overlap between DSI and rank associations with gene expression independently of a correlation between the predictor variables themselves. While male social bonds to females also predict male survival [51], our DSI dataset for males ( $n=30$  unique individuals) was too small to support a parallel analysis.

Controlling for dominance rank and other biological and technical sources of variance, we identified 527 DSI-associated genes (5.1% of genes tested) in female Amboseli baboons ( $\beta_{\text{DSI}} \neq 0$  in a linear mixed effects model; 10% FDR; electronic supplementary material, table S2). The vast majority of cases (520 genes, 98.7%) were specifically identified in the LPS-stimulated condition. However, gene-level DSI effect sizes are well-correlated between conditions (Pearson’s  $R=0.472$ ,  $p < 10^{-50}$ ), suggesting that DSI effects detectable after LPS exposure are also present at baseline, but more difficult to detect given our current level of power. Surprisingly, genes that were more highly expressed in females with strong social bonds (high DSI) also tended to be more highly expressed in low-ranking females, and vice versa, resulting in a positive correlation between the parameter estimates for rank and DSI (at baseline: Pearson’s  $R=0.543$ ; in LPS-stimulated samples:  $R=0.351$ ; electronic supplementary material, figure S6; note that the positive correlation arises because low ordinal rank values reflect high rank: i.e. the top-ranked female has an ordinal rank of 1 and lower-ranked females have ranks greater than 1).

This result was counterintuitive to us because strong social bonds predict longer lifespan in Amboseli baboon females [51], but the inflammation-related pathways associated with low female rank in this population are commonly thought to be costly to health [83,84]. We therefore investigated the pathways that account for the correlation in rank and DSI effect sizes at baseline. We found that this correlation is not, in fact, driven by immune process and inflammation-related genes: social environmental effects on these genes are specific to rank, and absent for social bond strength (figure 2a). Specifically, genes involved in the inflammatory response are highly enriched for upregulated expression in low-ranking females at baseline ( $p_{\text{adj}} < 0.005$ ) and the majority of genes in this set exhibit a positive effect size (i.e. increased expression with lower rank: binomial test  $p=2.35 \times 10^{-12}$ ). By contrast, there is no enrichment of inflammation-related genes for DSI ( $p_{\text{adj}} > 0.05$ ), nor any bias in the sign of the DSI effect ( $p=0.868$ ). Consistent with these observations, accessible binding sites for transcription factors active in the immune response (e.g. STAT5, Smad3, STAT3) are not enriched in or near DSI-upregulated genes (all  $p > 0.05$ ; electronic supplementary material, table S7). Instead,

the overall correlation in rank and DSI effect sizes is driven by genes involved in cellular metabolism and cell cycle control, particularly targets of the transcription factor MYC and genes that function in fatty acid metabolism and oxidative phosphorylation (both  $p_{\text{adj}} < 0.005$ ; figure 2a,b).


Notably, while genes involved in immune defense are not associated with DSI at baseline, a number of immune-related gene sets are significantly enriched for large DSI effects in the LPS-stimulated condition. After LPS stimulation, high social bond strength predicts higher expression of genes involved in the inflammatory response ( $p_{\text{adj}}=2.0 \times 10^{-2}$ ). Because these genes are not detectably associated with DSI in baseline samples, this observation suggests a potential interaction between social bond strength and the cellular environment after bacterial exposure. In support of this possibility, DSI predicts the magnitude of the response to LPS (i.e. the foldchange difference between LPS and baseline samples, within females) for 200 genes (10% FDR; figure 2c; electronic supplementary material, table S8). Females with strong social bonds nearly always exhibit a more dynamic response to LPS than those with weaker social bonds (binomial test for LPS-upregulated genes:  $p=1.55 \times 10^{-10}$ ; binomial test for LPS-downregulated genes:  $p=3.12 \times 10^{-12}$ ). By contrast, because dominance rank effects are highly consistent between baseline and LPS conditions, rank does not predict the magnitude of the response to LPS (1 rank-associated gene; 10% FDR; electronic supplementary material, table S8). While many of the associations between DSI and the LPS response occur in immune pathways (figure 2c), females with stronger social bonds also exhibit markedly stronger responses to LPS in key cellular metabolism genes, including a key enzyme that catalyses transitions through the Krebs cycle (FH:  $q=0.024$ ; figure 2d).

## (c) Gene expression patterns and multidimensional social advantage

To investigate the combined signatures of social status and social bond strength, we asked whether females that were relatively advantaged in both respects—and who therefore experienced advantages to both fertility and survival [44,51,76,85]—appeared physiologically distinct from other females. To do so, we binned females into four categories, corresponding to high rank/high DSI, high rank/low DSI, low rank/high DSI and low rank/low DSI (all females below the medians for rank and DSI in our sample were categorized in the ‘low’ set, and all females above these median values were categorized in the ‘high’ set). This classification reveals that, at baseline, high rank/high DSI females exhibited the lowest median expression values of genes in the Hallmark inflammatory response and IL6 signalling via JAK/STAT3 gene sets ( $p < 0.05$  for Wilcoxon summed ranks test of high rank/high DSI females against all three other categories, for both gene sets; figure 3). Thus, females with social capital in both dimensions—status and affiliation—present a distinct, potentially advantageous gene regulatory profile as well.

## 3. Discussion

Social interactions, both affiliative and competitive, determine much about the daily experience of group-living animals. Over the life course, these experiences compound to powerfully predict health, survival and reproductive




**Figure 2.** Social status and social bond strength predict distinct patterns of gene expression. (a) Distribution of DSI effects (left) and rank effects (right) on gene expression at baseline for genes within the MSigDB Hallmark gene sets labelled at left. Genes within immune-related pathways (red/orange) are polarized towards higher expression in low-ranking females (positive effect sizes, because low rank is represented by high ordinal rank values). By contrast, genes in the same pathways show no pattern for association with DSI (small effect sizes centred on zero). Cellular metabolism and cell cycle-related gene sets (blue) tended to be more highly expressed with high rank (negative effect sizes) and low DSI (negative effect sizes). Translucent density plots indicate no significant bias in the direction of effects (binomial test  $p > 0.05$ ). (b) Effect size bias for genes in the Hallmark inflammatory response and MYC (v1) target gene sets, for DSI and rank, respectively (binomial test for the inflammatory response: DSI  $p = 0.868$ ; rank  $p = 2.35 \times 10^{-12}$ ; MYC (v1): DSI  $p = 1.66 \times 10^{-14}$ ; rank  $p = 1.53 \times 10^{-20}$ ). (c) Gene set enrichment analysis results for female DSI (green) and rank (pink) effects on the foldchange response to LPS stimulation. Inset: QQ-plot of the  $-\log_{10}(p\text{-value})$  for DSI and rank effects on the LPS response, relative to a uniform null distribution. We observe strong evidence for associations between DSI and the LPS response, but not for rank. (d) Example of *FH*, a key enzyme in the Krebs cycle that responds more strongly to LPS in high DSI females than low DSI females. (Online version in colour.)

success. Our findings reinforce that the signature of the social environment is not only observable at the whole-organism level, but also in widespread differences in gene expression. They therefore contribute to a modest but expanding body of work linking gene expression variation to social experience in natural animal populations, in both the brain and the periphery [15,71]. Together, this work generalizes extensive research on social interactions and gene regulation in laboratory models [68,86–88] to freely interacting animals in the wild. It also argues that correlations between gene expression, social status and social integration

in humans capture a broader pattern of molecular sensitivity to the social environment that predates the evolution of our own lineage [67,89].

Our findings converge with much of the previous work in humans and captive primates to indicate that innate immune defense and cellular metabolism-related pathways are closely entwined with social experience [15,58,90–93]. However, the signature of social bond strength is much more apparent after immune stimulation than at baseline, and the signature of dominance rank is substantially stronger in male versus female baboons. Thus, the functional genomic signatures of



**Figure 3.** The gene expression signature of multidimensional social advantage. (a) Median gene expression for genes in the inflammatory response gene set illustrates that high-ranking animals exhibit lower inflammation-related gene expression regardless of social bond strength (main effect of rank =  $-0.65$ ,  $p = 0.028$ ). There is no main effect of DSI ( $p = 0.213$ ), but the difference between high- and low-ranking females is greater when high-ranking females also have strong social bonds. (b) Median, rescaled gene expression levels per individual in the Hallmark IL6 signalling via JAK/STAT3 and the inflammatory response gene sets. Each row represents a different female, with rows stratified by median dominance rank and median DSI. All gene expression values in figure 3 are based on baseline samples. (Online version in colour.)

different aspects of the social environment are themselves distinct. Our results are consistent with observations that the fertility and survival consequences of male rank, female rank and female social bond strength also differ in this population [29,44,51,76–79]. These results thus call the hypothesis of a strongly conserved signature of social disadvantage (largely based on results on social isolation and socio-economic status in humans) into question [67]. Tests for such a signature have particularly emphasized social disadvantage-linked increases in the expression of inflammation and interferon signalling-related genes. This prediction is supported for low rank in females but not for low social bond strength. Furthermore, it is directionally reversed in male baboons, despite the fact that low-ranking baboons of both sexes are harassed more often and lose competitive encounters more frequently than high-ranking animals.

Consequently, only female social status-related differences in gene expression recapitulate the pattern reported in studies of socio-economic status, loneliness and social integration in humans and experimental studies of dominance rank in captive female rhesus macaques [58,90,92,94–98]. Our results suggest that low social status in female baboons may therefore be a better model for social disadvantage in humans than low social status in male baboons—perhaps because social status in male baboons is driven almost entirely by fighting ability, which is not the primary determinant of social status in modern human societies. Indeed, social environment-associated gene expression signatures in humans are often interpreted through the lens of chronic psychosocial stress [89,97,99]. While the importance of chronic stress in natural animal populations remains an open question [11], low-ranking females in both this study population, wild blue monkeys and captive rhesus macaques do exhibit higher glucocorticoid levels and/or a blunted diurnal rhythm

[12,13,32,100], and see also table 1 in [11]. Psychosocial stress may therefore be the common explanatory factor underlying conserved signatures of social adversity, when they are observed. By contrast, high rank in baboon males imposes energetic stress due to competition with other males and the demands of mate-guarding [29,101], although males may experience forms of psychosocial stress as well. And while the stability of social hierarchies and experimental work in captive primates suggests that rank precedes the gene expression patterns we observe in females, males that achieve high rank may already be physiologically distinct [15].

This explanation does not, however, account for why social bond strength does not follow the same pattern as female dominance rank. Weak social bond strength in Amboseli baboon females is also correlated with elevated glucocorticoid levels, but this effect is modest in comparison to other predictors (e.g. early life adversity [102]). If glucocorticoids are a major determinant of social environment-associated variation in immune pathway gene expression, these observations may account for why (unlike rank) we did not observe a strong signature of social bond strength in immune genes at baseline. Instead, social bond strength is most consistently linked to oxidative phosphorylation and MYC signalling (a key regulator of cell growth, metabolism and apoptosis). Intriguingly, MYC activity has also been implicated in social regulation of brain gene expression in mice and as a mediator of social isolation-induced cancer susceptibility in mice and rats [65,103]. These observations suggest that social bond strength may be involved in altered energy metabolism and energetics in the baboons, as suggested in other studies of chronic and/or psychosocial stress [104].

Together, our findings emphasize substantial complexity in how the social environment is reflected at the molecular level. If we had focused only on an *a priori* subset of genes in the

genome, we could have concluded that social interactions do not predict gene expression levels at all; that social status, but not social affiliation, predicts gene expression; or that social status and social affiliation generate highly similar gene expression signatures. Similarly, if we had focused only on one sex, we would have missed the shared sensitivity, but reversed directionality, of status-related pathways in males versus females. Finally, if we had only measured gene expression levels at baseline, we would have inferred that social bond strength has little relevance to immune gene regulation, when in fact it is a much better predictor of variation in the response to immune stimulation than dominance rank. While this complexity presents a challenge—additional dimensions we did not explore, including developmental, tissue and cell type differences, are also likely to be important—it also illustrates the potential for high-dimensional genomic data to capture heterogeneity in the signature of social relationships that is impossible to infer from single measures. Indeed, our results suggest that, even in the blood, social regulation of gene expression must be the consequence of multiple upstream signalling pathways. Future studies thus have the opportunity both to test existing hypotheses about the role of glucocorticoids in social environment-associated gene regulation, and to identify alternative pathways that also play an important role.

## 4. Methods

### (a) Study subjects and samples

Study subjects were 97 adult baboons (52 males; 45 females) sampled from an intensively monitored population of hybrid yellow baboons (*Papio cynocephalus*) and anubis baboons (*Papio anubis*) in the Amboseli ecosystem of southern Kenya [105,106]. Individuals were members of one of 8 study groups that were sampled during the same months of the same years (i.e. 2013–2018, during the long dry season in May–August), while occupying overlapping home ranges (unlike some other social primates, baboons do not maintain and patrol clearly delineated territories). Genome-wide gene expression measures were generated from blood samples collected during opportunistic dartings. Data from samples collected in 2013–2016 were previously reported in [15], while the remaining 76 samples are newly reported here (electronic supplementary material, table S1). For all sampling efforts, subjects were anesthetized using Telazol-loaded darts and safely removed from their social groups for sample collection (as in [15,107,108]). Danted individuals were allowed to recover from anaesthesia and released to their social group the same day.

For each study subject, we drew 1 ml of blood directly into a sterile TruCulture tube (Myriad RBM) containing cell media only (the baseline sample), and another 1 ml of blood into a second TruCulture tube containing cell media plus 0.1  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$  lipopolysaccharide (LPS; figure 1a). Samples were incubated for 10 h at 37°C. Following incubation, white blood cells were extracted and stored in RNeasy Lysis Buffer at  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$  until further processing. To control for cell type composition, we also measured peripheral blood mononuclear cell type proportions for five major cell types, for each individual. To do so, we purified peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) from blood drawn into Cell Preparation Tubes (CPTs; BD Biosciences) and stained the PBMCs using fluorophore-conjugated antibodies to the cell surface markers CD3, CD14, CD16, CD8 and CD20, which together differentiate classical monocytes (CD3<sup>-</sup>/CD14<sup>+</sup>/CD16<sup>-</sup>), natural killer cells (CD3<sup>-</sup>/CD14<sup>-</sup>/CD16<sup>+</sup>), B-cells (CD3<sup>-</sup>/CD20<sup>+</sup>), helper T-cells (CD3<sup>+</sup>/CD4<sup>+</sup>/CD8<sup>-</sup>) and cytotoxic T-cells (CD3<sup>+</sup>/CD4<sup>-</sup>/CD8<sup>+</sup>) [15].

PBMC composition was then profiled on a BD FACS Calibur flow cytometer and analysed in FlowJo 10.7.1 (electronic supplementary material, table S1 with additional cell type discrimination based on cell size and granularity).

To measure chromatin accessibility, 50 ml of blood were drawn from three male anubis baboons housed at Texas Biomedical Research Institute's Southwest National Primate Research Center into CPT tubes (BD Biosciences), spun for 30 min at 1800 rcf and shipped to Duke University for PBMC isolation. 50 000 PBMCs from each individual were incubated for 10 h at 37°C and 5% CO<sub>2</sub> in either the presence or absence of LPS (0.1  $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$ , InvivoGen ultrapure LPS from *E. coli* strain 055:B5). We then generated ATAC-seq libraries from 50 000 cells per sample and sequenced them on a single lane ( $n = 6$  baseline and LPS-stimulated samples total from the 3 baboons; see electronic supplementary material Methods; [109]). Importantly, because the ATAC-seq data were generated from captive anubis males lacking the types of behavioural information we had for Amboseli animals, we did not use these data to investigate interindividual variability. Rather, we focused only on patterns of chromatin accessibility/inaccessibility that broadly characterize baboon PBMCs.

### (b) Dominance rank and social bond strength

Sex-specific dominance ranks are assigned each month for each social group in the study population based on the outcomes of dyadic agonistic interactions observed on a near-daily basis [105,110]. Dominance rank assignments produce a hierarchy structure that minimizes the number of cases in which higher-ranking individuals lose interactions to lower-ranking ones [111]. To investigate rank–gene expression associations, we extracted ordinal dominance rank values concurrent with blood sample collection, which represent rank as integer values where rank 1 denotes the top-ranking individual, rank 2 denotes the second highest-ranking individual, and so on. We note that previous analyses in this and other social mammals show that alternative rank metrics sometimes confer improved predictive power [111,112]. In the Amboseli baboon population, this is especially observable in females, where proportional rank (i.e. ordinal rank scaled by group size) is more closely associated with fecal glucocorticoid levels and injury risk than ordinal rank [111]. In this dataset, substituting ordinal rank for proportional rank produces highly concordant effect size estimates ( $R^2$  for baseline male, LPS male, baseline female and LPS female rank effects = 0.75, 0.79, 0.88, 0.85, respectively), so we reported the results for ordinal rank for both sexes.

To measure social bond strength, we used the dyadic sociality index (DSI, as in [51,81,102]). The DSI calculates the mean grooming-based bond strength between a focal female and her top three grooming partners in the year prior to sample collection, controlling for observer effort and dyad co-residency times (see details in the electronic supplementary material, Methods). High DSI values thus correspond to strong social bonds, and low DSI values correspond to weak social bonds.

### (c) Genomic data generation

For gene expression measurements, RNA was extracted from each sample ( $n = 195$  from  $n = 97$  unique baboons) using the Qiagen RNeasy kit, following the manufacturer's instructions (mean RIN = 9.19 in a random subset of  $n = 21$  samples). We constructed indexed RNA-seq libraries using the NEBNext Ultra I or II library prep kits, followed by paired-end sequencing on an Illumina HiSeq 2500 (for samples collected from 2013–2016) or single-end on a HiSeq 4000 (for samples collected after 2016) to a mean depth of 17.4 million reads ( $\pm 7.7$  million s.d.; electronic supplementary material, table S1). Trimmed reads were mapped to the *Panubis 1.0* genome (GCA\_008728515.1) using the STAR 2-pass aligner [113,114]. Finally, we generated gene-level counts



using *HTSeq* and the *Panubis1.0* annotation (GCF\_008728515.1) [115]. We retained genes with median RPKM greater than 2 in the baseline samples, LPS samples, or both for downstream analysis ( $n = 10\,281$  genes).

For chromatin accessibility estimates, ATAC-seq libraries were sequenced on a HiSeq 2500 to a mean depth of 40.0 million paired-end reads ( $\pm 13.7$  million s.d.; electronic supplementary material, table S5). Trimmed reads were mapped to the *Panubis 1.0* genome using *BWA* [116]. We then combined mapped reads across samples in the same condition (baseline or LPS) and called chromatin accessibility peaks for each condition separately using *MACS2* (see electronic supplementary materials, methods; [117]).

#### (d) Gene expression analysis

To identify social environment associations with gene expression, we first normalized the gene expression dataset using *voom* [118] to control for differences in sequencing depth and regressed out year of sampling (the primary source of batch effects in our dataset) and the first three principal components summarizing cell type composition using *limma* [119]. For each gene, we then modelled the resulting residuals as the response variable in a sex-specific linear mixed model including the fixed effects of treatment (LPS or baseline), dominance rank, DSI (for females only), age, and a random effect that controls for kinship, population structure and repeated samples from the same individuals [120]. We nested age, rank and DSI within treatment condition to evaluate condition-specific versus shared effects. To estimate genetic covariance between individuals, which is required for the random effect estimates, we genotyped samples from the RNA-seq data using the Genome Analysis Toolkit (see electronic supplementary material; [121]). To control for multiple hypothesis testing, we calculated FDRs using the R package *qvalue* after verifying the empirical null was uniformly distributed [122].

To investigate how social interactions influence the response to LPS treatment, we calculated an equivalent to the fold-change in residual gene expression between paired LPS and baseline samples in the 44 females with both samples available. We then modelled this response using a mixed effects model, with fixed effects of age, dominance rank and DSI, and a random effect to control for genetic relatedness/population structure. To test for enrichment of specific gene sets among rank- or DSI-associated genes, we used Gene Set Enrichment Analysis (GSEA; [123]) across the 50 Hallmark gene sets in the Molecular Signatures Database (MSigDB; [82]). We assessed the significance of pathway enrichment scores via comparison to 10 000 random permutations of gene labels across pathways, and controlled for multiple hypothesis testing using a Bonferroni correction. Note that unlike contingency table-based overrepresentation analyses, GSEA does not require setting a threshold for defining significant genes; rather, enrichment reflects non-random clustering of genes within a given gene set towards large effect sizes (either positive or negative, which is reflected in the sign of the enrichment score).

All statistical analyses in this section and below were performed in R (R v. 3.6.1; [124]).

#### (e) Elastic net rank predictions

To generate predictive models for rank, we used the elastic net approach implemented in the R package *glmnet* [125], applied to data from all genes (independent of significant differential expression in individual gene-level mixed effects models). For within-sex predictions, samples from the same treatment condition (baseline or LPS) were iteratively removed from the training set. An elastic net model was then trained using  $N$ -fold internal cross-validation on the remaining samples, and rank was predicted from the normalized gene expression data for the left-out test sample (see electronic supplementary

material, methods). To predict across sex, we trained a single model on all samples from a single treatment–sex combination, and used the model to predict rank for all samples from animals of the other sex, collected in the same treatment condition.

#### (f) Transcription factor binding motif enrichment

To investigate transcription factor binding motif (TFBM) enrichment, we focused on the 5 kb sequence upstream of rank or DSI-associated genes. We intersected these regions with areas of open chromatin called from the ATAC-seq samples, merged within treatment (e.g. the combined baseline or combined LPS samples). We then performed TFBM enrichment analysis in these regions for rank- or DSI-associated genes relative to the background set of all expressed genes using *Homer* (see electronic supplementary material) [126].

**Ethics.** Research on the Amboseli baboons is approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees (IACUC) at Duke University and the University of Notre Dame. We adhere to all the laws and guidelines of Kenya, and to the Guidelines for the Treatment of Animals in Behavioural Research and Teaching established by the Animal Behaviour Society (2012, *Animal Behaviour* v. 83(1), 301–309).

**Data accessibility.** The sequencing data analysed here have been deposited in the NCBI Short Read Archive under BioProject PRJNA480672 for previously published data, PRJNA731520 for newly generated RNA-seq data, and PRJNA731674 for baboon PBMC ATAC-seq data. Data analysis and figure code are deposited at [https://github.com/janderson94/Anderson\\_et\\_al\\_distinct\\_social\\_signatures](https://github.com/janderson94/Anderson_et_al_distinct_social_signatures).

The data are provided in the sequencing repositories listed above or as metadata in the electronic supplementary material [127].

**Authors' contributions.** All authors gave final approval for publication and agreed to be held accountable for the work performed therein.

**Competing interests.** We declare we have no competing interests.

**Funding.** We gratefully acknowledge the support provided by the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health for the majority of the data represented here, currently through NSF IOS 1456832, NIH R01AG053308, R01AG053330, R01HD088558 and P01AG031719. J.A.A. was supported by a Triangle Center for Evolutionary Medicine Graduate Student Award and by National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program no. 2018264636. A.J.L. was supported by a postdoctoral fellowship from the Helen Hay Whitney Foundation. L.O. is funded by the African Research Network for Neglected Tropical Diseases (ARNTD) SGPIII/0210/351. We also acknowledge support from Duke University (including an Undergraduate Research Support grant to Y.Z.) and the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research (Child & Brain Development Program) and support for high-performance computing resources from the North Carolina Biotechnology Center (grant no. 2016-IDG-1013).

**Acknowledgements.** We thank members of the Amboseli Baboon Research Project for collecting the data presented here, especially J. Altmann for her foundational role in establishing the study population and these datasets. We also thank J. Gordon, N. Learn and K. Pinc for managing the database; R.S. Mututua, S. Sayialel, I.L. Siodi and J. K. Warutere for data collection in the field; T. Wango and V. Oudu for their assistance in Nairobi; and two anonymous reviewers for constructive comments on a previous version of this manuscript. Our research was approved by the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS), the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) and the National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA) in Kenya. We also thank the University of Nairobi, the Institute of Primate Research (IPR), the National Museums of Kenya, the members of the Amboseli-Longido pastoralist communities, the Enduimet Wildlife Management Area, Ker & Downey Safaris, Air Kenya and Safarilink for their cooperation and assistance in the field. This research was approved by the IACUC at Duke University and University of Notre Dame, and adhered to all the laws and guidelines of Kenya. For a complete set of acknowledgements of funding sources, logistical assistance and data collection and management, please visit <http://amboselibaboons.nd.edu/acknowledgements/>.

1. Rubenstein DI. 1978 On predation, competition, and the advantages of group living. In *Social behavior*, pp. 205–231. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
2. Wilson EO. 2000 *Sociobiology: The new synthesis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
3. Krause J, Ruxton GD, Ruxton G, Ruxton IG. 2002 *Living in groups*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
4. Van Schaik CP. 1983 Why are diurnal primates living in groups? *Behaviour* **87**, 120–144. (doi:10.1163/156853983X00147)
5. Schjelderup-Ebbe T. 1922 Contributions to the social psychology of the domestic chicken. *Repr from Zeitschrift fuer Psychol.* **88**, 225–252.
6. Sapolsky RM. 2004 Social status and health in humans and other animals. *Annu. Rev. Anthr.* **33**, 393–418. (doi:10.1146/annurev.anthro.33.070203.144000)
7. Holekamp KE, Strauss ED. 2016 Aggression and dominance: an interdisciplinary overview. *Curr Opin Behav Sci.* **12**, 44–51. (doi:10.1016/j.cobeha.2016.08.005)
8. Abbott DH *et al.* 2003 Are subordinates always stressed? A comparative analysis of rank differences in cortisol levels among primates. *Horm. Behav.* **43**, 67–82. (doi:10.1016/S0018-506X(02)00037-5)
9. Cavigelli SA, Caruso MJ. 2015 Sex, social status and physiological stress in primates: the importance of social and glucocorticoid dynamics. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **370**, 20140103. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2014.0103)
10. Creel S. 2005 Dominance, aggression, and glucocorticoid levels in social carnivores. *J. Mammal.* **86**, 255–264. (doi:10.1644/BHE-002.1)
11. Beehner JC, Bergman TJ. 2017 The next step for stress research in primates: to identify relationships between glucocorticoid secretion and fitness. *Horm. Behav.* **91**, 68–83. (doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2017.03.003)
12. Kohn JN, Snyder-Mackler N, Barreiro LB, Johnson ZP, Tung J, Wilson ME. 2016 Dominance rank causally affects personality and glucocorticoid regulation in female rhesus macaques. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* **74**, 179–188. (doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2016.09.005)
13. Levy EJ *et al.* 2020 Higher dominance rank is associated with lower glucocorticoids in wild female baboons: a rank metric comparison. *Horm. Behav.* **125**, 104826. (doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2020.104826)
14. Gesquiere LR, Learn NH, Simao MCM, Onyango PO, Alberts SC, Altmann J. 2011 Life at the top: rank and stress in wild male baboons. *Science* **333**, 357–360. (doi:10.1126/science.1207120)
15. Lea AJ, Akinyi MY, Nyakundi R, Mareri P, Nyundo F, Kariuki T, Alberts SC, Archie EA, Tung J. 2018 Dominance rank-associated gene expression is widespread, sex-specific, and a precursor to high social status in wild male baboons. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **115**, E12 163–E12 171. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1811967115)
16. Bergman TJ, Beehner JC, Cheney DL, Seyfarth RM, Whitten PL. 2005 Correlates of stress in free-ranging male chacma baboons, *Papio hamadryas ursinus*. *Anim. Behav.* **70**, 703–713. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2004.12.017)
17. Rubenstein DR, Shen S-F. 2009 Reproductive conflict and the costs of social status in cooperatively breeding vertebrates. *Am. Nat.* **173**, 650–661. (doi:10.1086/597606)
18. Carlson AA, Young AJ, Russell AF, Bennett NC, McNeilly AS, Clutton-Brock T. 2004 Hormonal correlates of dominance in meerkats (*Suricata suricatta*). *Horm. Behav.* **46**, 141–150. (doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2004.01.009)
19. Kruuk LEB, Slate J, Pemberton JM, Brotherstone S, Guinness F, Clutton-Brock T. 2002 Antler size in red deer: heritability and selection but no evolution. *Evolution* **56**, 1683–1695. (doi:10.1111/j.0014-3820.2002.tb01480.x)
20. Samuels A, Gifford T. 1997 A quantitative assessment of dominance relations among bottlenose dolphins. *Mar. Mammal Sci.* **13**, 70–99. (doi:10.1111/j.1748-7692.1997.tb00613.x)
21. Hodge SJ, Manica A, Flower TP, Clutton-Brock TH. 2008 Determinants of reproductive success in dominant female meerkats. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **77**, 92–102. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2007.01318.x)
22. Strauss ED, Holekamp KE. 2019 Social alliances improve rank and fitness in convention-based societies. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **116**, 8919–8924. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1810384116)
23. Lea AJ, Learn NH, Theus MJ, Altmann J, Alberts SC. 2014 Complex sources of variance in female dominance rank in a nepotistic society. *Anim. Behav.* **94**, 87–99. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2014.05.019)
24. Hausfater G, Altmann J, Altmann S. 1982 Long-term consistency of dominance relations among female baboons (*Papio cynocephalus*). *Science* **217**, 752–755. (doi:10.1126/science.217.4561.752)
25. Holekamp KE, Smale L. 1991 Dominance acquisition during mammalian social development: the ‘inheritance’ of maternal rank. *Am. Zool.* **31**, 306–317. (doi:10.1093/icb/31.2.306)
26. Holekamp KE, Smith JE, Strelloff CC, Van Horn RC, Watts HE. 2012 Society, demography and genetic structure in the spotted hyena. *Mol. Ecol.* **21**, 613–632. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-294X.2011.05240.x)
27. Wroblewski EE, Murray CM, Keele BF, Schumacher-Stankey JC, Hahn BH, Pusey AE. 2009 Male dominance rank and reproductive success in chimpanzees, *Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii*. *Anim. Behav.* **77**, 873–885. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2008.12.014)
28. Altmann J, Alberts SC. 2003 Variability in reproductive success viewed from a life-history perspective in baboons. *Am. J. Hum. Biol.* **15**, 401–409. (doi:10.1002/ajhb.10157)
29. Alberts SC, Watts HE, Altmann J. 2003 Queuing and queue-jumping: long-term patterns of reproductive skew in male savannah baboons, *Papio cynocephalus*. *Anim. Behav.* **65**, 821–840. (doi:10.1006/anbe.2003.2106)
30. Cowlshaw G, Dunbar RIM. 1991 Dominance rank and mating success in male primates. *Anim. Behav.* **41**, 1045–1056. (doi:10.1016/S0003-3472(05)80642-6)
31. Clutton-Brock T. 2016 *Mammal societies*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
32. Foerster S, Cords M, Monfort SL. 2011 Social behavior, foraging strategies, and fecal glucocorticoids in female blue monkeys (*Cercopithecus mitis*): potential fitness benefits of high rank in a forest guenon. *Am. J. Primatol.* **73**, 870–882. (doi:10.1002/ajp.20955)
33. Solomon NG, French JA. 1997 *Cooperative breeding in mammals*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
34. Cavigelli SA, Dubovick T, Levash W, Jolly A, Pitts A. 2003 Female dominance status and fecal corticoids in a cooperative breeder with low reproductive skew: ring-tailed lemurs (*Lemur catta*). *Horm. Behav.* **43**, 166–179. (doi:10.1016/S0018-506X(02)00031-4)
35. Muller MN, Enigk DK, Fox SA, Lucore J, Machanda ZP, Wrangham RW, Thompson ME. 2021 Aggression, glucocorticoids, and the chronic costs of status competition for wild male chimpanzees. *Horm. Behav.* **130**, 104965. (doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2021.104965)
36. Dunbar RIM. 1991 Functional significance of social grooming in primates. *Folia Primatol.* **57**, 121–131. (doi:10.1159/000156574)
37. Mann J. 1999 Behavioral sampling methods for cetaceans: a review and critique. *Mar. Mammal Sci.* **15**, 102–122. (doi:10.1111/j.1748-7692.1999.tb00784.x)
38. Stanton MA, Mann J. 2012 Early social networks predict survival in wild bottlenose dolphins. *PLoS ONE* **7**, e47508. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0047508)
39. Sundaresan SR, Fischhoff IR, Dushoff J, Rubenstein DI. 2007 Network metrics reveal differences in social organization between two fission–fusion species, Grevy’s zebra and onager. *Oecologia* **151**, 140–149. (doi:10.1007/s00442-006-0553-6)
40. Schino G. 2007 Grooming and agonistic support: a meta-analysis of primate reciprocal altruism. *Behav. Ecol.* **18**, 115–120. (doi:10.1093/beheco/arl045)
41. Seyfarth RM, Cheney DL. 1984 Grooming, alliances and reciprocal altruism in vervet monkeys. *Nature* **308**, 541–543. (doi:10.1038/308541a0)
42. Snyder-Mackler N, Kohn JN, Barreiro LB, Johnson ZP, Wilson ME, Tung J. 2016 Social status drives social relationships in groups of unrelated female rhesus macaques. *Anim. Behav.* **111**, 307–317. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2015.10.033)
43. Kutsukake N, Clutton-Brock TH. 2010 Grooming and the value of social relationships in cooperatively breeding meerkats. *Anim. Behav.* **79**, 271–279. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2009.10.014)
44. Archie EA, Tung J, Clark M, Altmann J, Alberts SC. 2014 Social affiliation matters: both same-sex and opposite-sex relationships predict survival in wild

- female baboons. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **281**, 20141261. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.1261)
45. Barocas A, Ilany A, Koren L, Kam M, Geffen E. 2011 Variance in centrality within rock hyrax social networks predicts adult longevity. *PLoS ONE* **6**, e22375. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0022375)
46. Nuñez CMV, Adelman JS, Rubenstein DL. 2015 Sociality increases juvenile survival after a catastrophic event in the feral horse (*Equus caballus*). *Behav. Ecol.* **26**, 138–147. (doi:10.1093/beheco/aru163)
47. Ellis S, Franks DW, Natrass S, Cant MA, Weiss MN, Giles D, Balcomb KC, Croft DP. 2017 Mortality risk and social network position in resident killer whales: sex differences and the importance of resource abundance. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **284**, 20171313. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2017.1313)
48. Holt-Lunstad J, Smith TB, Layton JB. 2010 Social relationships and mortality risk: a meta-analytic review. *PLoS Med.* **7**, e1000316. (doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000316)
49. Vander Wal E, Festa-Bianchet M, Réale D, Coltman DW, Pelletier F. 2015 Sex-based differences in the adaptive value of social behavior contrasted against morphology and environment. *Ecology* **96**, 631–641. (doi:10.1890/14-1320.1)
50. Silk JB, Beehner JC, Bergman TJ, Crockford C, Engh AL, Moscovice LR, Wittig RM, Seyfarth RM, Cheney DL. 2010 Strong and consistent social bonds enhance the longevity of female baboons. *Curr. Biol.* **20**, 1359–1361. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2010.05.067)
51. Campos FA, Villavicencio F, Archie EA, Colchero F, Alberts SC. 2020 Social bonds, social status and survival in wild baboons: a tale of two sexes. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **375**, 20190621. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2019.0621)
52. Kajokaite K, Whalen A, Koster J, Perry S. 2020 Fitness benefits of providing services to others: Sociality predicts survival in a neotropical primate. *bioRxiv*. (doi:10.1101/2020.08.04.235788)
53. Snyder-Mackler N *et al.* 2020 Social determinants of health and survival in humans and other animals. *Science* **368**, aax9553. (doi:10.1126/science.aax9553)
54. Wittig RM, Crockford C, Weltring A, Langergraber KE, Deschner T, Zuberbühler K. 2016 Social support reduces stress hormone levels in wild chimpanzees across stressful events and everyday affiliations. *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 1–8. (doi:10.1038/ncomms13361)
55. Crockford C, Wittig RM, Whitten PL, Seyfarth RM, Cheney DL. 2008 Social stressors and coping mechanisms in wild female baboons (*Papio hamadryas ursinus*). *Horm. Behav.* **53**, 254–265. (doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2007.10.007)
56. Wittig RM, Crockford C, Lehmann J, Whitten PL, Seyfarth RM, Cheney DL. 2008 Focused grooming networks and stress alleviation in wild female baboons. *Horm. Behav.* **54**, 170–177. (doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2008.02.009)
57. Young C, Majolo B, Heistermann M, Schülke O, Ostner J. 2014 Responses to social and environmental stress are attenuated by strong male bonds in wild macaques. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **111**, 18 195–18 200. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1411450111)
58. Cole SW, Hawley LC, Arevalo JM, Sung CY, Rose RM, Cacioppo JT. 2007 Social regulation of gene expression in human leukocytes. *Genome Biol.* **8**, 1–13. (doi:10.1186/gb-2007-8-9-r189)
59. Yang YC, McClintock MK, Kozloski M, Li T. 2013 Social isolation and adult mortality: the role of chronic inflammation and sex differences. *J. Health Soc. Behav.* **54**, 183–203. (doi:10.1177/0022146513485244)
60. Smith KJ, Gavey S, Riddell NE, Kontari P, Victor C. 2020 The association between loneliness, social isolation and inflammation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **112**, 519–541. (doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2020.02.002)
61. Adam EK, Hawley LC, Kudielka BM, Cacioppo JT. 2006 Day-to-day dynamics of experience–cortisol associations in a population-based sample of older adults. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **103**, 17 058–17 063. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0605053103)
62. Steptoe A, Owen N, Kunz-Ebrecht SR, Brydon L. 2004 Loneliness and neuroendocrine, cardiovascular, and inflammatory stress responses in middle-aged men and women. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* **29**, 593–611. (doi:10.1016/S0306-4530(03)00086-6)
63. Valtorta NK, Kanaan M, Gilbody S, Ronzi S, Hanratty B. 2016 Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for coronary heart disease and stroke: systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal observational studies. *Heart* **102**, 1009–1016. (doi:10.1136/heartjnl-2015-308790)
64. Reynolds P, Kaplan GA. 1990 Social connections and risk for cancer: prospective evidence from the Alameda County Study. *Behav. Med.* **16**, 101–110. (doi:10.1080/08964289.1990.9934597)
65. Hermes GL, Delgado B, Tretiakova M, Cavigelli SA, Krausz T, Conzen SD, McClintock MK. 2009 Social isolation dysregulates endocrine and behavioral stress while increasing malignant burden of spontaneous mammary tumors. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **106**, 22 393–22 398. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0910753106)
66. Sloan EK *et al.* 2010 The sympathetic nervous system induces a metastatic switch in primary breast cancer. *Cancer Res.* **70**, 7042–7052. (doi:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-10-0522)
67. Cole SW. 2019 The conserved transcriptional response to adversity. *Curr. Opin. Behav. Sci.* **28**, 31–37. (doi:10.1016/j.cobeha.2019.01.008)
68. Renn SCP, Aubin-Horth N, Hofmann HA. 2008 Fish and chips: functional genomics of social plasticity in an African cichlid fish. *J. Exp. Biol.* **211**, 3041–3056. (doi:10.1242/jeb.018242)
69. Schumer M, Krishnakant K, Renn SCP. 2011 Comparative gene expression profiles for highly similar aggressive phenotypes in male and female cichlid fishes (*Julidochromis*). *J. Exp. Biol.* **214**, 3269–3278. (doi:10.1242/jeb.055467)
70. Renn SCP, O'Rourke CF, Aubin-Horth N, Fraser EJ, Hofmann HA. 2016 Dissecting the transcriptional patterns of social dominance across teleosts. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* **56**, 1250–1265. (doi:10.1093/icb/icw118)
71. Bentz AB, George EM, Wolf SE, Rusch DB, Podicheti R, Buechlein A, Nephew KP, Rosvall KA. 2021 Experimental competition induces immediate and lasting effects on the neurogenome in free-living female birds. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **118**, e2016154118. (doi:10.1073/pnas.2016154118)
72. Greenwood AK, Wark AR, Fernald RD, Hofmann HA. 2008 Expression of arginine vasotocin in distinct preoptic regions is associated with dominant and subordinate behaviour in an African cichlid fish. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **275**, 2393–2402. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2008.0622)
73. Rittschof CC *et al.* 2014 Neuromolecular responses to social challenge: common mechanisms across mouse, stickleback fish, and honey bee. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **111**, 17 929–17 934. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1420369111)
74. Saul MC *et al.* 2019 Cross-species systems analysis of evolutionary toolkits of neurogenomic response to social challenge. *Genes, Brain Behav.* **18**, e12502. (doi:10.1111/gbb.12502)
75. Kanitz E, Puppe B, Tuchscherer M, Heberer M, Viergutz T, Tuchscherer A. 2009 A single exposure to social isolation in domestic piglets activates behavioural arousal, neuroendocrine stress hormones, and stress-related gene expression in the brain. *Physiol. Behav.* **98**, 176–185. (doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2009.05.007)
76. Lea AJ, Altmann J, Alberts SC, Tung J. 2015 Developmental constraints in a wild primate. *Am. Nat.* **185**, 809–821. (doi:10.1086/681016)
77. Altmann J, Alberts SC. 2005 Growth rates in a wild primate population: ecological influences and maternal effects. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **57**, 490–501. (doi:10.1007/s00265-004-0870-x)
78. Onyango PO, Geschiere LR, Altmann J, Alberts SC. 2013 Puberty and dispersal in a wild primate population. *Horm. Behav.* **64**, 240–249. (doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2013.02.014)
79. Charpentier MJE, Tung J, Altmann J, Alberts SC. 2008 Age at maturity in wild baboons: genetic, environmental and demographic influences. *Mol. Ecol.* **17**, 2026–2040. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-294X.2008.03724.x)
80. Runcie DE, Wiedmann RT, Archie EA, Altmann J, Wray GA, Alberts SC, Tung J. 2013 Social environment influences the relationship between genotype and gene expression in wild baboons. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **368**, 20120345. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2012.0345)
81. Anderson JA, Johnston RA, Lea AJ, Campos FA, Voyles TN, Akinyi MY, Alberts SC, Archie EA, Tung J. 2021 High social status males experience accelerated epigenetic aging in wild baboons. Perry GH, editor. *Elife* **10**, e66128. (doi:10.7554/eLife.66128)
82. Liberzon A, Birger C, Thorvaldsdóttir H, Ghandi M, Mesirov JP, Tamayo P. 2015 The molecular signatures database hallmark gene set collection. *Cell Syst.* **1**, 417–425. (doi:10.1016/j.cels.2015.12.004)

83. Medzhitov R. 2008 Origin and physiological roles of inflammation. *Nature* **454**, 428–435. (doi:10.1038/nature07201)
84. Franceschi C, Campisi J. 2014 Chronic inflammation (inflammaging) and its potential contribution to age-associated diseases. *J. Gerontol. Ser. A Biomed. Sci. Med. Sci.* **69**(Suppl\_1), S4–S9. (doi:10.1093/gerona/glu057)
85. Gesquiere LR, Altmann J, Archie EA, Alberts SC. 2018 Interbirth intervals in wild baboons: environmental predictors and hormonal correlates. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* **166**, 107–126. (doi:10.1002/ajpa.23407)
86. Hammels C *et al.* 2015 Defeat stress in rodents: from behavior to molecules. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.* **59**, 111–140. (doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2015.10.006)
87. Alaux C *et al.* 2009 Honey bee aggression supports a link between gene regulation and behavioral evolution. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **106**, 15 400–15 405. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0907043106)
88. Robinson GE, Grozinger CM, Whitfield CW. 2005 Sociogenomics: social life in molecular terms. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **6**, 257–270. (doi:10.1038/nrg1575)
89. Cole SW. 2014 Human social genomics. *PLoS Genet.* **10**, e1004601. (doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1004601)
90. Sanz J *et al.* 2020 Social history and exposure to pathogen signals modulate social status effects on gene regulation in rhesus macaques. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **117**, 23 317–23 322. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1820846116)
91. Snyder-Mackler N, Sanz J, Kohn JN, Voyles T, Pique-Regi R, Wilson ME, Barreiro LB, Tung J. 2019 Social status alters chromatin accessibility and the gene regulatory response to glucocorticoid stimulation in rhesus macaques. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **16**, 1219–1228. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1811758115)
92. Snyder-Mackler N *et al.* 2016 Social status alters immune regulation and response to infection in macaques. *Science* **354**, 1041–1045. (doi:10.1126/science.aah3580)
93. Bartolomucci A. 2007 Social stress, immune functions and disease in rodents. *Front Neuroendocrinol.* **28**, 28–49. (doi:10.1016/j.yfrne.2007.02.001)
94. Tung J, Barreiro LB, Johnson ZP, Hansen KD, Michopoulos V, Toufexis D, Michelini K, Wilson ME, Gilad Y. 2012 Social environment is associated with gene regulatory variation in the rhesus macaque immune system. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **109**, 6490–6495. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1202734109)
95. Stringhini S *et al.* 2015 Life-course socioeconomic status and DNA methylation of genes regulating inflammation. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **44**, 1320–1330. (doi:10.1093/ije/dyv060)
96. Miller GE, Chen E, Fok AK, Walker H, Lim A, Nicholls EF, Cole S, Kobor MS. 2009 Low early-life social class leaves a biological residue manifested by decreased glucocorticoid and increased proinflammatory signaling. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **106**, 14 716–14 721. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0902971106)
97. Powell ND *et al.* 2013 Social stress up-regulates inflammatory gene expression in the leukocyte transcriptome via  $\beta$ -adrenergic induction of myelopoiesis. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **110**, 16 574–16 579. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1310655110)
98. Cole SW, Conti G, Arevalo JMG, Ruggiero AM, Heckman JJ, Suomi SJ. 2012 Transcriptional modulation of the developing immune system by early life social adversity. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **109**, 20 578–20 583. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1218253109)
99. Thames AD, Irwin MR, Breen EC, Cole SW. 2019 Experienced discrimination and racial differences in leukocyte gene expression. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* **106**, 277–283. (doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2019.04.016)
100. Qin D-D, Rizak JD, Feng X-L, Chu X-X, Yang S-C, Li C-L, Lv LB, Ma YY, Hu XT. 2013 Social rank and cortisol among female rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*). *Zool. Res.* **34**(E2), E42–E49. (doi:10.3724/SP.J.1141.2013.E02E42)
101. Hausfater G. 1975 Dominance and reproduction in Baboons (*Papio cynocephalus*). *Contrib. Primatol.* **7**, 1–150.
102. Rosenbaum S, Zeng S, Campos FA, Gesquiere LR, Altmann J, Alberts SC, Li F, Archie EA. 2020 Social bonds do not mediate the relationship between early adversity and adult glucocorticoids in wild baboons. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **117**, 20 052–20 062. (doi:10.1073/pnas.2004524117)
103. Resende LS, Amaral CE, Soares RBS, Alves AS, Alves-Dos-Santos L, Britto LRG, Chiavegatto S. 2016 Social stress in adolescents induces depression and brain-region-specific modulation of the transcription factor MAX. *Transl. Psychiatry.* **6**, e914. (doi:10.1038/tp.2016.202)
104. Picard M, McEwen BS, Epel ES, Sandi C. 2018 An energetic view of stress: focus on mitochondria. *Front Neuroendocrinol.* **49**, 72–85. (doi:10.1016/j.yfrne.2018.01.001)
105. Alberts SC, Altmann J. 2012 The Amboseli Baboon Research Project: 40 years of continuity and change. In *Long-term field studies of primates* (eds PM Kappeler, DP Watts), pp. 261–287. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
106. Wall JD, Schlebusch SA, Alberts SC, Cox LA, Snyder-Mackler N, Nevenon KA, Carbone L, Tung J. 2016 Genomewide ancestry and divergence patterns from low-coverage sequencing data reveal a complex history of admixture in wild baboons. *Mol. Ecol.* **25**, 3469–3483. (doi:10.1111/mec.13684)
107. Tung J, Zhou X, Alberts SC, Stephens M, Gilad Y. 2015 The genetic architecture of gene expression levels in wild baboons. *Elife* **4**, e04729. (doi:10.7554/eLife.04729)
108. Altmann J *et al.* 1996 Behavior predicts genes structure in a wild primate group. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **93**, 5797–5801. (doi:10.1073/pnas.93.12.5797)
109. Buenostro JD, Giresi PG, Zaba LC, Chang HY, Greenleaf WJ. 2013 Transposition of native chromatin for fast and sensitive epigenomic profiling of open chromatin, DNA-binding proteins and nucleosome position. *Nat. Methods.* **10**, 1213. (doi:10.1038/nmeth.2688)
110. Altmann J. 1974 Observational study of behavior: sampling methods. *Behaviour* **49**, 227–266. (doi:10.1163/156853974X00534)
111. Levy EJ *et al.* 2020 A comparison of dominance rank metrics reveals multiple competitive landscapes in an animal society. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **287**, 20201013. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2020.1013)
112. Strauss ED, Holekamp KE. 2019 Inferring longitudinal hierarchies: framework and methods for studying the dynamics of dominance. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **88**, 521–536. (doi:10.1111/1365-2656.12951)
113. Dobin A, Gingeras TR. 2015 Mapping RNA-seq reads with STAR. *Curr. Protoc. Bioinforma* **51**, 11.14.1–11.14.19. (doi:10.1002/0471250953.bi1114s51)
114. Batra SS *et al.* 2020 Accurate assembly of the olive baboon (*Papio anubis*) genome using long-read and Hi-C data. *Gigascience* **9**, gjaia134. (doi:10.1093/gigascience/gjaa134)
115. Anders S, Pyl PT, Huber W. 2015 HTSeq—a Python framework to work with high-throughput sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* **31**, 166–169. (doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btu638)
116. Li H. 2013 Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM. *arXiv: Genomics.* (doi:10.6084/M9.FIGSHARE.963153.V1).
117. Zhang Y *et al.* 2008 Model-based analysis of ChIP-Seq (MACS). *Genome Biol.* **9**, 1–9. (doi:10.1186/gb-2008-9-9-r137)
118. Law CW, Chen Y, Shi W. 2014 Smyth GK. voom: precision weights unlock linear model analysis tools for RNA-seq read counts. *Genome Biol.* **15**, R29. (doi:10.1186/gb-2014-15-2-r29)
119. Ritchie ME, Phipson B, Wu DI, Hu Y, Law CW, Shi W, Smyth GK. 2015. *limma* powers differential expression analyses for RNA-sequencing and microarray studies. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **43**, e47. (doi:10.1093/nar/gkv007)
120. Akdemir D, Okeke UG. 2015 EMMREML: Fitting mixed models with known covariance structures. *R Packag version.* 3. (See <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/EMMREML/index.html>.)
121. Poplin R *et al.* 2018 Scaling accurate genetic variant discovery to tens of thousands of samples. *BioRxiv.* 201178. (doi:10.1101/201178)
122. Dabney A, Storey JD, Warnes GR. 2010 qvalue: Q-value estimation for false discovery rate control. *R Packag version.* 1. (See <https://www.bioconductor.org/packages/release/bioc/html/qvalue.html>.)
123. Subramanian A *et al.* 2005 Gene set enrichment analysis: a knowledge-based approach for interpreting genome-wide expression profiles. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **102**, 15 545–15 550. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0506580102)
124. Team RC. 2013 R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. (See <https://www.R-project.org/>.)
125. Friedman J, Hastie T, Tibshirani R. 2010 Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent. *J. Stat. Softw.* **33**, 1. (doi:10.18637/jss.v033.i01)
126. Heinz S *et al.* 2010 Simple combinations of lineage-determining transcription factors prime cis-regulatory elements required for macrophage and B cell identities. *Mol. Cell* **38**, 576–589. (doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2010.05.004)
127. Anderson JA *et al.* 2022 Distinct gene regulatory signatures of dominance rank and social bond strength in wild baboons. FigShare. (<https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.c.5736428>)