| 1  | Digest: Environmental variability as a constraint on cognitive evolution in lizards           |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2  | Benjamin J. Ashton <sup>1</sup> and Simon Baeckens <sup>2,3</sup>                             |
| 3  | <sup>1</sup> Department of Biological Sciences, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW, Australia. |
| 4  | <sup>2</sup> Department of Biology, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium.                         |
| 5  |                                                                                               |
| 6  | <sup>3</sup> Email address contact person:                                                    |
| 7  | simon.baeckens@ugent.be                                                                       |
| 8  |                                                                                               |
| 9  | Footnote: This article corresponds to De Meester, G., L. Van Linden, J. Torfs, P. Pafilis, E. |
| 10 | Sunje, D. Steenssens, T. Zulcic, A. Sassalos, and R. Van Damme. 2022. Learning with           |
| 11 | lacertids: studying the link between ecology and cognition within a comparative               |
| 12 | framework. Evolution, 76: 2531-2552. https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.14618.                       |
| 13 |                                                                                               |
| 14 |                                                                                               |
| 15 | Abstract: How does ecology influence cognitive evolution in lizards? Taking a comparative     |
| 16 | approach, De Meester et al. (2022) discovered that species living in temporally fluctuating   |
| 17 | environments tend to perform relatively poorly on cognitive tasks associated with             |
| 18 | behavioral flexibility compared to species living in more climatically stable environments.   |
| 19 | The negative association between environmental variability and cognitive performance          |
| 20 | suggests that stochastic environments can hamper, rather than stimulate, the evolution of     |
| 21 | cognitive ability.                                                                            |
| 22 |                                                                                               |
| 23 | Main Text:                                                                                    |
| 24 | Despite more than a century of research, there is still considerable uncertainty over the     |
| 25 | factors governing cognitive evolution, and it remains one of the most intensely debated       |
| 26 | fields in biology. One popular school of thought reasons that non-social ecological           |
| 27 | challenges, such as predation pressure, food scarcity, and habitat complexity, are the        |

- 28 predominant drivers of cognitive evolution. Refining this theory, the "cognitive buffer
- 29 hypothesis" argues that cognition has evolved to buffer individuals against stochastic
- 30 environmental fluctuations (Sol 2009). Conversely, the "expensive-tissue hypothesis" claims

that energetic limitations in variable environments has selected for reduced investments in
costly brain tissue at the expense of cognitive ability (Aiello and Wheeler 1995). Yet, despite
the broad interest in cognitive evolution from scientists and the public alike, remarkably few
studies have simultaneously assessed the explanatory power of these competing
hypotheses, particularly in reptiles.

36 De Meester et al. (2022) took up this challenge and presented five cognitive tasks to 37 13 lacertid species, an Old World family of non-social lizards. The cognitive test battery consisted of an inhibitory control task, two problem-solving tasks, a spatial learning task, 38 39 and a spatial-reversal learning task. Inhibitory control (the ability to inhibit prepotent 40 responses), problem-solving performance, and reversal learning are often considered 41 important components of behavioral and cognitive flexibility, and are associated with a 42 number of fitness-related behaviors. Likewise, spatial memory is likely to underpin a 43 number of behaviors crucial to survival, such as remembering the location of resources and 44 shelters. Using environmental data from climate databases and literature records on life 45 history traits, the researchers investigated if cognitive performance was related to ecology.

46 Using modern tools in phylogenetic comparative statistics, De Meester et al. (2022) 47 found a significant link between environmental variability (i.e., Normalized Difference 48 Vegetation Index – an indicator of vegetation 'greenness' and thus plant growth – and 49 precipitation seasonality) and cognitive performance: lizard species inhabiting more 50 seasonal climates performed worse on cognitive tasks linked with behavioral flexibility – 51 specifically, solving new problems, reversing spatial associations, and inhibitory control (Fig. 52 1). However, it is worth noting that performance in the initial spatial learning task did not 53 differ across species. Interestingly, among-species variation in cognitive performance could 54 not be explained by life history variation or overall resource availability (as indicated by 55 average precipitation and temperature). Together, these findings suggest that 56 environmental variability may act as a constraint on the evolution of high (thus expensive) 57 cognitive abilities in lacertid lizards, thereby providing support for the expensive-tissue 58 hypothesis.

59 The study by De Meester et al. (2022) offers an important and novel contribution to 60 the field of cognitive evolution for at least four reasons. First, their results show how 61 cognition can vary among closely-related species and that a significant portion of that 62 variation can be explained by environmental variability, corroborating the findings of earlier 63 comparisons at the intraspecific level (De Meester et al. 2021). Second, this study is a rare 64 example of direct measures of cognition being used within a comparative framework. The 65 vast majority of studies investigating cognitive evolution use neuroanatomical proxies of 66 cognition — the relationship between neuroanatomy and cognition, and its use in 67 phylogenetic studies, is contentious (Hooper et al. 2022). Much like the "ManyPrimates" 68 and "ManyBirds" initiatives, this study sets an important precedent for future studies using 69 direct measures of cognition in phylogenetic comparisons. Third, De Meester et al. (2022) 70 set forth a highly replicable and simple protocol on how to measure cognition in other 71 reptile species, facilitating the possibility to extend their current dataset. Lastly, the 72 cognition literature is heavily biased toward mammals and birds (Szabo et al. 2021), thus 73 this study adds important insights into the causes of cognitive variation in taxa that are 74 traditionally underrepresented in the field. 75 76 77 78 References 79 Aiello, L. C., and P. Wheeler. 1995. The Expensive-Tissue Hypothesis: The Brain and the 80 Digestive System in Human and Primate Evolution. Current Anthropology 36:199-221. 81 82 De Meester, G., A. Sfendouraki-Basakarou, P. Pafilis, and R. van Damme. 2021. Dealing with 83 the unexpected: The effect of environmental variability on behavioural flexibility in a Mediterranean lizard. Behaviour 158:1193–1223. 84 85 De Meester, G., L. Van Linden, J. Torfs, P. Pafilis, E. Sunje, D. Steenssens, T. Zulcic, A. 86 Sassalos, and R. Van Damme. 2022. Learning with lacertids: studying the link 87 between ecology and cognition within a comparative framework. Evolution, 76: 2531-2552. https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.14618. 88 89 Hooper, R., B. Brett, and A. Thornton. 2022. Problems with using comparative analyses of 90 avian brain size to test hypotheses of cognitive evolution. PLoS ONE 17:e0270771.

- 91 Sol, D. 2009. Revisiting the cognitive buffer hypothesis for the evolution of large brains. Biol.
- 92 Lett. 5:130–133.
- 93 Szabo, B., D. W. A. Noble, and M. J. Whiting. 2021. Learning in non-avian reptiles 40 years
- 94 on: advances and promising new directions. Biological Reviews 96:331–356.
- 95