FULL PAPER



Herpetological Journal

Sexual dimorphism in the limb muscles of the darkspotted frog, *Pelophylax nigromaculata*

Min Mao^{1,2*}, Zhi Ping Mi^{1,2*}, Zhi Song Yang^{1,2} & Cai Quan Zhou^{1,2}

¹Key Laboratory of Southwest China Wildlife Resources Conservation (Ministry of Education), China West Normal University, Nanchong, 637009, P.R. China

²Institute of Rare Animals and Plants, China West Normal University, Nanchong, 637009, P.R. China

*Min Mao and Zhi Ping Mi contributed equally to the paper.

It has been shown in many anurans that males with larger body size have a mating advantage. However, robust forelimb muscles rather than large body size per se might increase the likelihood of mating. To this end, we investigated sexual dimorphism of nine forelimb muscles and nine hindlimb muscles of *Pelophylax nigromaculata*. We found that three forelimb muscles involved in axillary amplexus were heavier in males compared to females, whereas five forelimb muscles not involved in axillary amplexus showed no sexual differences in muscle mass. The observed muscle dimorphism was allometric, and could be the result of sexual selection. The analysis on hindlimb muscle mass revealed a largely female-biased sexual dimorphism, likely related to females being heavier. There was a positive correlation between forelimb and hindlimb muscle mass and SVL for both sexes. There was no significant sexual difference in the contents of water in musculature except for the extensor carpi radialis.

Key words: muscles, Pelophylax nigromaculata, sex selection, sexual dimorphism

INTRODUCTION

exual dimorphism in size and morphology is Jwidespread in the animal kingdom, and has attracted considerable attention from evolutionary biologists (Darwin, 1874; Ralls, 1976; Hedrick & Temeles, 1989; Andersson, 1994; Abouheif & Fairbairn, 1997; Bonnet et al., 1998; Liao & Chen, 2012; Liao & Lu, 2012; Liao, 2013). Three major hypotheses have been proposed to explain the evolution of dimorphism in secondary sexual characters: mechanisms of sexual selection, intersexual food competition and reproductive role division (Hedrick & Temeles, 1989; Shine, 1988; Andersson, 1994). In amphibians, females attain larger body size than males in 61% of urodeles and 90% of anuran species (Shine, 1979; Monnet & Cherry, 2002). In addition to body size, sexual dimorphism has been described with regard to vocal sacs and nuptial pads (Duellman & Trueb, 1986; Glaw & Vences, 2006), structures used as weapons for male-male combat (Katsikaros & Shine, 1997; Tsuji & Matsui, 2002), colour and pattern (Buchanan, 1994), as well as some muscles with specific functions (Sassoon et al., 1987).

The amplexus is an important stage of the reproductive process in many frogs and toads (Clark & Peters, 2006). Clasping usually lasts for hours, days or even weeks until spawning occurs (Duellman, 1992; Peters & Aulner,

2000). The ability to perform amplexus suggests the presence of specialisations in the male's forelimbs. Some forelimb muscles involved in amplexus have been found to be larger, heavier and less fatigable in males than in females (Oka et al., 1984; Yekta & Blackburn, 1992; Peters & Aulner, 2000; Clark & Peters, 2006; Navas & James, 2007; Liao et al., 2012b; Mi, 2012). Larger and less fatigable forelimb muscles in males are normally assumed to produce and maintain a relatively larger force, which is advantageous to clasp the females or repel other rivals (Peters & Aulner, 2000). It is thought that the amplexus had resulted in the evolution of sexual dimorphism in forelimb muscles (Oka et al., 1984; Clark & Peters, 2006). However, not all muscles involved in clasping action are dimorphic in mass between the sexes, and there are further interspecific differences in muscle dimorphism (Oka et al., 1984; Yekta & Blackburn, 1992; Mi, 2012). Mi (2012) found that some antagonistic muscles required for axillary amplexus are also sexually dimorphic, with muscle mass of males exceeding that of females.

The hindlimbs of frogs and toads are mainly responsible for hopping, kicking and swimming (Peters et al., 1996). So far, little attention has been paid to sexual dimorphism of hindlimb muscles (Lee & Corrales, 2002; Liao et al., 2012a; Mi, 2013). Lee and Corrales (2002, in *Bufo marinus*) and Mi (2013, in *Bufo gargarizans*) found certain hindlimb muscles of males being heavier than

those of females, whereas Liao et al. (2012a, with *Bufo andrewsi*) discovered that the homologous muscles of females were significantly larger than that of males.

The dark spotted frog, Pelophylax nigromaculata, is a widespread species in temperate East Asia but has been classified as Near Threatened according to the IUCN Red List (Zhao & Adler, 1993; Fei, 1999). It inhabits river pools, channels, lakes, ponds, swamps, ditches and paddy fields (Zhao & Adler, 1993; Zhao, 1999). Pelophylax nigromaculata is regarded as an explosive breeder, with a breeding season lasting from late April to mid-May (Khonsue et al., 2001; Liao et al., 2010). Males use their forelimbs to clasp females by means of axillary amplexus. Dark spotted frogs were chosen due to previous work on the location, morphology and function of limbs muscles (Zhou, 1956). The purpose of the study was to describe sexual differences in forelimb and hindlimb muscle mass, and explore the evolution of sexual dimorphism in mass of limbs muscles in *P. nigromaculata*.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A total of 84 individuals (45 males and 39 females) of P. nigromaculata were collected in a suburb of Nanchong (30°50'N, 106°07'E, 338 m a.s.l.), northeastern Sichuan, China, in late April 2011 during the breeding season. Before dissecting these frogs, the snout-vent length (SVL) was measured with a digital vernier caliper to the nearest 0.1 mm. Nine forelimb muscles and nine hindlimb muscles on the left and right side of each individual were investigated (forelimb muscles: deltoideus, flexor carpi radialis, flexor carpi ulnaris, abductor indicis longus, triceps brachii, extensor carpi radialis, extensor carpi ulnaris, extensor figitorum communis, flexor figitorum communis; hindlimb muscles: sartorius, triceps femoris, rectus internus major, semimembranosus, adductor magnus, gastrocnemius, peroneus, tibialis anterior, extensor cruris). Because the dry/wet weight ratio of muscles represents the proportion of water in muscles, both wet weight and dry weight of each muscle were weighed. Firstly, we dissected and collected all selected muscles discreetly, then rolled them on a blotting paper to get rid of excess liquid and weighed to the nearest 0.1 mg using an electronic balance (wet weight). Secondly, we put these muscles into a thermostat drier (60°C) for



Fig. 1. Linear regression of total wet weight of forelimb muscles on SVL for males (solid circles, solid line) and females (open circles, broken line) of *Pelophylax nigromaculata*.

24 hours before re-weighing them (dry weight).

The data were tested for normal distribution by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov procedure. Snout-vent length (SVL) between sexes were examined using *t*-tests. Differences of muscle mass between the sexes were analysed by general linear models (GLMs) with muscles mass as dependent variables, sexes as a fixed factor, SVL as a covariate. We regressed the muscl mass on SVL for each muscle and total forelimb or hindlimb muscles, and compared regression coefficients between males and females with regression analysis for homogeneity. The experiment-wise error rate was set as 0.05, and data were given as means±SD.

RESULTS

We measured all muscles of 45 males (SVL ranging from 54.9 to 80.6 mm) and 39 females (SVL ranging from 56.1 to 88.9 mm). Average body size of females (69.8 ± 8.8 mm) was larger than that of males (66.9 ± 6.3 mm), but the difference did not reach significance (t=1.71, p=0.09).

After controlling for the influence of body size, three of nine forelimb muscles (flexor carpi radialis, flexor carpi ulnaris and abductor indicis longus) had a mean weight which was significantly larger (p<0.01) in males than in females (Table 1). For all forelimb muscles, wet and dry weight was correlated with SVL for both sexes (p<0.001, Table 3). Slopes were homogeneous (p>0.05) for all comparison except for the dry and wet mass of flexor carpi radialis and abductor indicus longus (p<0.001), as well as the dry mass of extensor figitorum communis (p<0.01, Table 3). Linear regression of the dry weight of nine forelimb muscles on SVL was highly significant for both sexes (p<0.001), and the slopes were not homogenous (p<0.01, Table 3); the same was the case for the wet weight of the nine forelimb muscles (Fig. 1, males: r²=0.858, F=259.05, p<0.001; females: r²=0.836, F=189.26, p<0.001). The dry/wet muscle weight ratio did not differ between the sexes except for the extensor carpi radialis (Table 1). The total dry/total wet weight ratio of the nine muscles highly correlated with SVL in both sexes (Fig. 3, males: r²=0.506, F=44.01, p<0.001; females: r²=0.164, F=7.28, p=0.01), and the slopes were not homogenous (p=0.01).



Fig. 2. Linear regression of total wet weight of hindlimb muscles on SVL for males (solid circles, solid line) and females (open circles, broken line) of *Pelophylax nigromaculata*.

Muscles Males Females ANCOVA Males Muscles $(n=45)$ $(n=39)$ F p $(n=45)$ Deltoideus $(n=45)$ $(n=39)$ F p $(n=45)$ Deltoideus 34.8 ± 8.8 38.0 ± 13.0 0.13 0.72 165.6 ± 44.7 Triceps brachii 44.3 ± 12.2 46.5 ± 13.8 2.75 0.10 $200.757.4$ Extensor carpi radialis 8.6 ± 2.3 8.8 ± 3.0 2.15 0.10 $200.757.4$ Flexor carpi radialis 8.6 ± 2.3 8.8 ± 3.0 2.15 0.17 28.2 ± 6.9 Flexor carpi ulnaris 8.6 ± 2.3 8.8 ± 3.0 $2.14.1$ 122.3 ± 55.9 Extensor carpi ulnaris 8.1 ± 2.2 9.4 ± 3.1 1.88 0.17 32.8 ± 6.6 Flexor carpi ulnaris 5.5 ± 1.7 4.9 ± 1.3 11.29 0.001 23.0 ± 7.1 Flexor carpi ulnaris 5.5 ± 1.7 4.9 ± 1.3 11.29 0.001 23.0 ± 7.1 Flexor carpi ulnaris 5.5 ± 1.7	Dry weight (mg)			Wet weight	mg)		$100 \times$	ratio (dry/wet we	ght)
$(n=45)$ $(n=39)$ F p $(n=45)$ Deltoideus $34.848.8$ 38.0 ± 13.0 0.13 0.72 165.6 ± 44.7 Triceps brachii $34.848.8$ 38.0 ± 13.0 0.13 0.72 165.6 ± 44.7 Triceps brachii 44.3 ± 12.2 46.5 ± 13.8 2.75 0.10 200.7 ± 57.4 Extensor carpi radialis 8.6 ± 2.3 8.8 ± 3.0 2.15 0.10 200.7 ± 57.4 Flexor carpi radialis 8.6 ± 2.3 8.8 ± 3.0 2.15 0.17 28.2 ± 6.9 Flexor carpi radialis 30.8 ± 12.1 6.1 ± 1.6 240.19 <0.001 122.3 ± 55.9 Flexor carpi ulnaris 8.1 ± 2.2 9.4 ± 1.3 11.29 0.017 23.0 ± 7.1 Flexor carpi ulnaris 5.5 ± 1.7 4.9 ± 1.3 11.29 0.001 23.0 ± 7.1 Flexor digitorum communis 9.5 ± 2.3 9.9 ± 4.1 0.34 0.56 34.1 ± 8.9 Aductor indicic homus 16.6 ± 3.8 18.9 ± 5.8 1.66 0.20 63.1 ± 8.1	Males Females Al	NCOVA	Males	Females	ANC	OVA	Males	Females	d
Deltoideus 34.8±8.8 38.0±13.0 0.13 0.72 165.6±44.7 Triceps brachii 44.3±12.2 46.5±13.8 2.75 0.10 200.7±57.4 Triceps brachii 44.3±12.2 46.5±13.8 2.75 0.10 200.7±57.4 Extensor carpi radialis 8.6±2.3 8.8±3.0 2.15 0.15 28.2±6.9 Flexor carpi radialis 8.6±2.3 8.8±3.0 2.15 0.17 28.2±6.9 Flexor carpi radialis 30.8±12.1 6.1±1.6 240.19 <0.001 122.3±55.9 Extensor carpi ulnaris 8.1±2.2 9.4±3.1 1.88 0.17 32.8±9.6 Flexor carpi ulnaris 5.5±1.7 4.9±1.3 11.29 0.01 23.0±7.1 Extensor digitorum communis 9.5±2.3 9.9±4.1 0.34 0.56 34.1±8.9 Advictor idigitorum communis 16.6±3.8 18.9±5.8 1.66 0.20 63.1±18.1	(n=45) (n=39) F	d	(<i>n</i> =45)	(<i>n</i> =39)	F	d			
Triceps brachii 44.3±12.2 46.5±13.8 2.75 0.10 200.7±57.4 Extensor carpi radialis 8.6±2.3 8.8±3.0 2.15 0.15 28.2±6.9 Flexor carpi radialis 8.6±2.3 8.8±3.0 2.15 0.15 28.2±6.9 Flexor carpi radialis 30.8±12.1 6.1±1.6 240.19 <0.001	34.8±8.8 38.0±13.0 0.13	0.72	165.6±44.7	178.0±65.5	1.03	0.31	21.17±1.48	21.59±1.97	0.10
Extensor carpi radialis 8.6±2.3 8.8±3.0 2.15 0.15 28.2±6.9 Flexor carpi radialis 30.8±12.1 6.1±1.6 240.19 <0.001	44.3±12.2 46.5±13.8 2.75	0.10	200.7±57.4	214.5±68.9	1.28	0.26	22.21±1.61	21.90±1.67	0.65
Flexor carpi radialis 30.8±12.1 6.1±1.6 240.19 <0.001 122.3±55.9 Extensor carpi ulnaris 8.1±2.2 9.4±3.1 1.88 0.17 32.8±9.6 Flexor carpi ulnaris 5.5±1.7 4.9±1.3 11.29 0.001 23.0±7.1 Flexor carpi ulnaris 5.5±1.7 4.9±1.3 11.29 0.001 23.0±7.1 Extensor digitorum communis 9.5±2.3 9.9±4.1 0.34 0.56 34.1±8.9 Flexor digitorum communis 16.6±3.8 18.9±5.8 1.66 0.20 63.1±18.1	8.6±2.3 8.8±3.0 2.15	0.15	28.2±6.9	32.2±10.7	1.14	0.29	30.61±4.41	27.38±3.70	0.001
Extensor carpi ulnaris 8.1±2.2 9.4±3.1 1.88 0.17 32.8±9.6 Flexor carpi ulnaris 5.5±1.7 4.9±1.3 11.29 0.001 23.0±7.1 Extensor digitorum communis 5.5±2.3 9.9±4.1 0.34 0.56 34.1±8.9 Flexor digitorum communis 9.5±2.3 9.9±4.1 0.34 0.56 34.1±8.9 Adductor indicitorum communis 16.6±3.8 18.9±5.8 1.66 0.20 63.1±18.1	30.8±12.1 6.1±1.6 240.19) < 0.001	122.3±55.9	23.0±6.2	184.52	< 0.001	26.18±3.59	26.70±3.63	0.24
Flexor carpi ulnaris 5.5±1.7 4.9±1.3 11.29 0.001 23.0±7.1 Extensor digitorum communis 9.5±2.3 9.9±4.1 0.34 0.56 34.1±8.9 Flexor digitorum communis 9.5±2.3 9.9±4.1 0.34 0.56 34.1±8.9 Flexor digitorum communis 16.6±3.8 18.9±5.8 1.66 0.20 63.1±18.1	8.1±2.2 9.4±3.1 1.88	0.17	32.8±9.6	39.5±14.1	3.30	0.07	24.99±3.10	24.08±2.50	0.28
Extensor digitorum communis 9.5±2.3 9.9±4.1 0.34 0.56 34.1±8.9 Flexor digitorum communis 16.6±3.8 18.9±5.8 1.66 0.20 63.1±18.1 Abductors indicise longuts 14.6±4.4 2.6±4.3 2.2±1.3 0.21 0.52 63.1±18.1	5.5±1.7 4.9±1.3 11.29	0.001	23.0±7.1	22.0±6.8	6.60	0.01	24.11±4.32	23.07±4.21	0.40
Flexor digitorum communis 16.6±3.8 18.9±5.8 1.66 0.20 63.1±18.1 Abductor indicie longue 14.6±4.4 2.0±1.2 271.05 <0.001	9.5±2.3 9.9±4.1 0.34	0.56	34.1±8.9	37.0±14.5	0.00	0.99	28.36±3.71	26.85±3.62	0.13
Abdurctor indicis longue 14 6+4 4 3 0+1 3 371 05 7 0 001 58 7+10 1	16.6±3.8 18.9±5.8 1.66	0.20	63.1±18.1	71.5±23.3	0.43	0.52	27.01±5.13	26.89±4.11	0.43
	14.6±4.4 3.9±1.3 371.95	5 < 0.001	58.7±19.1	14.8 ± 4.0	320.50	< 0.001	25.27±3.77	26.84± 6.68	0.28
Total 172.7±41.2 146.3±41.7 111.00 < 0.001 728.7±199.2	172.7±41.2 146.3±41.7 111.00) < 0.001	728.7±199.2	632.5±196.2	77.47	< 0.001	23.98±1.37	23.34±1.40	0.19

Table 1. Difference in mass of forelimb muscles between sexes in *Pelophylax nigromaculata*.

Table 2. Difference in mass of hindlimb muscles between sexes in *Pelophylax nigromaculata*.

		Dry weight (mg)				Wet weight (mg)			100 × rī	atio (dry/wet we	ght)
Muscles	Males	Females	ANC	OVA	Males	Females	ANC	AVC	Males	Females	d
	(<i>n</i> =45)	(<i>n</i> =39)	F	d	(<i>n</i> =45)	(<i>n</i> =39)	F	d			
Sartorius	31.1±8.4	34.2±11.1	0.05	0.83	137.5± 40.5	149.7± 52.8	0.91	0.34	22.87±1.99	23.14±1.88	0.15
Triceps femoris	378.3±102.3	449.2±152.4	6.14	0.02	1656.3±477.6	1994.1± 712.7	6.65	0.01	22.98±1.02	22.72±1.29	0.70
Rectus internus major	153.3±43.0	178.8±63.2	2.11	0.15	640.1± 201.7	754.5± 287.1	1.69	0.20	24.24±1.37	24.02±1.55	0.79
Semimembranosus	172.5±52.0	205.9±70.1	5.17	0.03	740.5±236.2	897.8± 333.4	5.31	0.02	23.46±1.28	23.23±1.33	0.97
Adductor magnus	147.4±38.4	174.7±65.3	2.48	0.12	623.1± 168.1	771.2± 306.8	5.18	0.03	23.76±1.26	22.97±1.99	0.09
Gastrocnemius	221.9±65.3	262.7±96.4	3.12	0.08	932.4± 294.1	1127.2±428.5	4.70	0.03	24.04±2.04	23.51±1.46	0.36
Peroneus	71.4±18.2	82.3±29.4	1.29	0.26	300.3±86.0	355.1± 137.2	2.30	0.13	24.05±1.68	23.52±1.79	0.53
Tibialis anterior	20.9±5.1	22.4±7.3	0.58	0.45	73.4± 20.8	83.8± 29.5	0.53	0.47	29.13±3.73	27.21±3.44	0.07
Extensor cruris	23.7±5.0	25.6±7.2	0.002	0.96	87.5± 23.4	99.1± 37.4	0.20	0.65	27.65±3.23	26.94±4.37	0.84
Total	1220.5±325.1	1435.7±488.8	4.59	0.04	5191.0± 1494.2	6232.5± 2262.3	6.15	0.02	23.69 ± 1.11	23.27±1.19	0.39



Fig. 3. Linear regression of total dry/total wet weight ratio of forelimb muscles on SVL for males (solid circles, solid line) and females (open circles, broken line) of *Pelophylax nigromaculata*.

Of the nine hindlimb muscles, the triceps femoris and semimembranosus significantly differed between the sexes in wet and dry weight (p<0.05). The adductor magnus and gastrocnemius were only significantly differed in their dry weight (p < 0.05), with muscle mass in females being heavier than in males independent of SVL (Table 2). When the nine hindlimb muscles were considered together, females had overall significantly higher muscle mass than males (p<0.05, Table 2). No significant intersexual difference was found in other hindlimb muscles in dry mass and/or wet mass (Table 2). The mass of all hindlimb muscles was correlated with SVL in both sexes (p<0.001); the slopes were homogenous (p>0.05) except for wet mass of the adductor magnus (p=0.04) and dry mass of peroneus (p=0.04), Table 4). Total dry and wet mass of the nine hindlimb muscles also regressed significantly on SVL within each sex (Table 4, Fig. 2, for total wet weight: males, r^2 =0.844, F=232.77, p<0.001; females, r²=0.905, F=351.56, p<0.001), at homogenous slopes (dry: p=0.143, wet: p=0.167). The dry/wet weight ratio did not significantly differ between



Fig. 4. Linear regression of total dry/total wet weight ratio of hindlimb muscles on SVL for males (solid circles, solid line) and females (open circles, broken line) of *Pelophylax nigromaculata*.

sexes (Table 2). The total dry/total wet weight ratio was correlated with SVL for males and females (Fig. 4, males: r^2 =0.294, F=17.87, p<0.001; females: r^2 =0.236, F=11.42, p=0.002), and the slopes were homogenous (p=0.329).

DISCUSSION

Previous studies had found that female *P. nigromaculata* are larger than males (Khonsue et al., 2001; Liao et al., 2010; Mao et al., 2012), in agreement with the present study. Sexual size dimorphism is widespread among anurans (Shine, 1979; Liao et al., 2010; Chen et al., 2011; Liao, 2011; Liao et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2012; Lou et al., 2012; Li et al., 2013), and linked to intersexual differences in growth rate, time of sexual maturation, age structure and mortality schedules (Halliday & Tejedo, 1995; Lee, 2001; Mao et al., 2012; Liao et al., 2012; Liao et al., 2013, b). With respect to *P. nigromaculata*, females usually reach sexual maturity later than males, and adult males are younger than females (Khonsue et al., 2001; Liao et al., 2010; Mao et al., 2012). Individuals will devote most energy to

Table 3. Linear regression analysing of forelimb muscle dry mass (mg) on SVL (mm) and slopes comparison between the sexes of *Pelophylax nigromaculata*. *p*<0.001 for all linear regressions.

	Males	(<i>n</i> =45)		Femal	slope homogeneity			
Muscle	Equation	r ²	F	Equation	<i>r</i> ²	F	t	Р
Deltoideus	Y=1.181x-44.213	0.730	116.511	Y=1.274x-50.959	0.743	107.161	0.543	0.59
Triceps brachii	Y=1.696x-69.144	0.776	148.784	Y=1.400x-51.275	0.805	152.628	-1.641	0.11
Extensor carpi radialis	Y=0.249x-8.098	0.478	39.407	Y=0.258x-9.227	0.588	52.865	0.149	0.88
Flexor carpi radialis	Y=1.448x-66.053	0.572	57.524	Y=0.114x-1.896	0.420	26.796	-7.468	<0.001
Extensor carpi ulnaris	Y=0.206x-5.663	0.359	24.125	Y=0.269x-9.419	0.593	53.914	1.131	0.26
Flexor carpi ulnaris	Y=0.149x-4.527	0.301	18.479	Y=0.120x-3.452	0.633	63.952	-0.801	0.43
Extensor digitorum communis	Y=0.112x-2.065	0.095	4.524	Y=0.320x-12.464	0.484	34.719	2.690	0.01
Flexor digitorum communis	Y=0.334x-5.794	0.304	18.784	Y=0.539x-18.114	0.645	67.365	1.932	0.06
Abductor indicis longus	Y=0.568x-23.460	0.666	85.626	Y=0.095x-2.670	0.411	25.790	-7.823	<0.001
Total	Y=5.943x-224.886	0.834	216.291	Y=4.379x-159.476	0.856	220.150	-3.140	<0.01

Table 4. Linear regression analysing of hindlimb muscle dry mass (mg) on SVL (mm) and slopes comparison between the sexes of *Pelophylax nigromaculata*. *p*<0.001 for all linear regressions.

	males (<i>n</i> =45)			female	Slo homog	pe geneity		
Muscle	Equation	<i>r</i> ²	F	Equation	r ²	F	t	р
Sartorius	Y=1.136x-44.901	0.728	115.159	Y=1.160x-46.783	0.842	197.589	0.183	0.86
Triceps femoris	Y=14.783x-610.898	0.837	221.312	Y=16.423x-697.503	0.902	339.475	1.212	0.23
Rectus internus major	Y=6.060x-252.260	0.798	170.033	Y=6.734x-291.383	0.883	280.241	1.085	0.28
Semimembranosus	Y=7.263x-313.502	0.781	153.690	Y=7.593x-324.305	0.912	382.525	0.475	0.64
Adductor magnus	Y=4.402x-147.110	0.526	47.667	Y=6.159x-255.250	0.692	83.107	1.838	0.07
Gastrocnemius	Y=9.208x-394.226	0.798	170.141	Y=10.381x-462.063	0.901	338.138	1.293	0.20
Peroneus	Y=2.552x-99.395	0.787	159.218	Y=3.145x-137.306	0.890	299.364	2.149	0.04
Tibialis anterior	Y=0.656x-22.969	0.653	80.777	Y=0.710x-27.187	0.743	107.042	0.526	0.60
Extensor cruris	Y=0.631x-18.509	0.636	75.231	Y=0.680x-21.914	0.701	86.777	0.469	0.64
Total	Y=46.692x-1903.771	0.827	204.988	Y=52.984x-2263.692	0.913	388.402	1.480	0.14

reproduction rather than growth after reaching sexual maturity, resulting in decreased growth (Hemelaar, 1988). Earlier time of maturation and younger ages of male *P. nigromaculata* are the likely underlying reasons for their smaller body size. Individuals from our study population reach maturity at the age of 2–3 years (unpublished data). The lack of a statistically significant size dimorphism may be due to the lack of old individuals in our sample.

Comparisons between sexes based on dry muscle mass were largely in line with those based on wet muscle mass. The three dimorphic muscles all participate in the action of clasping females during amplexus (the flexor carpi radialis and flexor carpi ulnaris are flexing the wrist, and the abductor indicis longus is abducting the second digit). Moreover, the five muscles not involved in amplexus (triceps brachii, extensor carpi radialis, extensor carpi ulnaris, extensor figitorum communis and flexor figitorum communis being antagonistic muscles of axillary amplexus) were non-dimorphic. Since robust forelimb muscles are important for males to grasp females firmly and to resist take-over attempts from competitors, and because there is a positive correlation between robust forelimbs and reproductive success of males (Wells, 1977; Howard, 1984; Lamb, 1984; Howard & Kluge, 1985), it was suggested that the sexual dimorphism of forelimb muscles could be the results of sexual selection and male-male competition (Lee, 2001; Navas & James 2007; Liao et al., 2012b; Mi, 2012). Our findings largely confirm this evidence, although we failed to find intersexual differences in the deltoideus, which adducts upper limbs (Mi, 2012). This may imply that the deltoideus of P. nigromaculata does not play an important role for the axillary amplexus.

For the nine forelimb muscles, wet or dry mass highly correlated with SVL in both sexes. The slopes were not homogenous between sexes for two of the three dimorphic muscles (exception: flexor carpi ulnaris), with the regression coefficients of males exceeding that of females. The slopes were however homogenous for the six non-dimorphic muscles. This finding may indicate that certain muscles grow in an allometric way (faster in males than females), perhaps in line with increased androgens and their receptors in male muscles.

Lee & Corrales (2002, in *B. marinus*) and Mi (2013, in *B. gargarizans*) found that males surpassed females in hindlimb muscle mass, and that hindlimb muscle mass was related to male reproductive success. In *P. nigromaculata*, however, female muscle mass was overall higher than that of males. Although in some hindlimb muscles, no statistically significant intersexual differences were found, despite a mean which was larger in females than males, similar to the case of *B. andrewsi* (Liao et al., 2012a). This suggests that male-male competition and maintenance of amplexus in *P. nigromaculata* might not rely on the hindlimb muscle mass of males (Liao et al., 2012a). As for females, robust hindlimbs may be related to a heavier body.

The dry/wet weight ratio, a measurement of the proportion of water in muscles (Slack et al., 1973; Lipar & Ketterson, 2000), is responsible for the intracellular and intercellular differences in ionic concentrations (Hamon et al., 1976). The dry/wet weight ratio was indifferent across sexes except for the extensor carpi radialis. Our results suggest that there is no difference in ionic concentration between males and females, also implying that either dry or wet mass can be used to study sexual dimorphism in muscle size. The proportionally higher water content of muscles by larger individuals might be linked to higher levels of metabolism in bigger individuals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank two anonymous reviewers for critical comments on the earlier draft of this manuscript. We appreciate the improvements in English language style made by Dr. Robert Jehle. Financial support was provided by the follow-up grants program for the outstanding young foregoer of academic and technology of Sichuan Province (2011JQ0056), the key laboratory program of Sichuan Province Education Department (10ZX007) and the Innovative Team Foundation of China West Normal University. We declare that all animals used in the study were treated humanely and ethically following all applicable institutional Animal Care guidelines in China.

REFERENCES

- Abouheif, E. & Fairbairn, D.J. (1997). A comparative analysis of allometry for sexual size dimorphism: assessing Rensch's rule. *The American Naturalist* 149, 540–562.
- Andersson, M. (1994). *Sexual selection*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Bonnet, X., Shine, R., Naulleau, G. & Vacher-Vallas, M. (1998). Sexual dimorphism in snakes: different reproductive roles favor different body plans. *Proceedings of the Royal Society London B* 265, 179–183.
- Buchanan, B.W. (1994). Sexual dimorphism in *Hyla squirella*: chromatic and pattern variation between the sexes. *Copeia* 1994, 797–802.
- Chen, B.Y., Liao, W.B. & Mi, Z.P. (2011). Body size and age of the China wood frog (*Rana chensinensis*) in northeastern China. *North-Western Journal of Zoology* 7, 236–242.
- Clark, D.L. & Peters, S.E. (2006). Isometric contractile properties of sexually dimorphic forelimb muscles in the marine toad *Bufo marinus* Linnaeus 1758: functional analysis and implications for amplexus. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 209, 3448–3456.
- Darwin, C. (1874). *The descent of man and selection in relation to sex*. Humboldt, New York.
- Duellman, W.E. (1992). Reproductive strategies of frogs. Scientific American 267, 80–87.
- Duellman, W.E. & Trueb L. (1986). *Biology of amphibians*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Fei, L. (1999). *The illustrated handbook of amphibians in China*. Henan Publishing House of Science and Technology, Zhenzhou, China.
- Glaw, F. & Vences, M. (2006). Phylogeny and genus-level classification of mantellid frogs (Amphibia, Anura). Organisms Diversity and Evolution 6, 236–253.
- Halliday, T. & Tejedo, M. (1995). Intrasexual selection and alternative mating behaviour. In Heatwole, H. & Sullivan, B.K. (Eds.). *Amphibian Biology 2, In Social Behaviour,* pp. 419–468. Surrey Beatty and Sons, Chipping Norton, New South Wales, Australia.
- Hamon, G., Papadimitriou, A. & Worcel, M. (1976). Ionic fluxes in rat uterine smooth muscle. *The Journal of Physiology* 254, 229–243.
- Hedrick, A.V. & Temeles, E.J. (1989). The evolution of sexual dimorphism in animals: hypotheses and tests. <u>Trends in</u> <u>Ecology and Evolution 4</u>, 136–138.
- Hemelaar, A.S.M. (1988). Age, growth and other population characteristics of *Bufo bufo* from different latitudes and altitudes. *Journal of Herpetology* 22, 369–388.
- Howard, R.D. (1984). Alternative mating behaviors of young male bullfrogs. *American Zoologist* 24, 397–406.
- Howard, R.D. & Kluge, A.G. (1985). Proximate mechanisms of

sexual selection in wood frogs. Evolution 39, 260–277.

- Katsikaros, K. & Shine, R. (1997). Sexual dimorphism in the tusked frog, Adelotus brevis (Anura: Myobatrachidae): the roles of natural and sexual selection. <u>Biological Journal of</u> the Linnean Society 60, 39–51.
- Khonsue, W., Matsui, M., Hirai, T. & Misawa, Y. (2001). A comparison of age structure in two population of a pond frog *Rana nigromaculata* (Amphibia: Anura). *Zoological Science* 18, 597–603.
- Lamb, T. (1984). Amplexus displacement in the southern toad, *Bufo terrestris. Copeia* 1984, 1023–1025.
- Lee, J.C. (2001). Evolution of a secondary sexual dimorphism in the toad, *Bufo marinus. Copeia* 2001, 928–935.
- Lee, J.C. & Corrales, A.D. (2002). Sexual dimorphism in hind-limb muscle mass is associated with male reproductive success in *Bufo marinus*. *Journal of Herpetology* 36, 502–505.
- Li, S.T., Wu, X., Li, D.Y., Lou, S.L., et al. (2013). Body size variation of odorous frogs (*Odorrana grahami*) across altitudinal gradients. *Herpetological Journal* 23: 187-192.
- Liao, W.B. (2011). A skeletochronlogical estimate of age in a population of the Siberian wood frog, *Rana amurensis*, from northeastern China. *Acta Herpetologica* 6, 237–245.
- Liao, W.B. (2013). Evolution of sexual size dimorphism in a frog obeys the inverse of Rensch's rule. *Evolutionary Biology* 40, 493–499.
- Liao, W.B. & Chen, W. (2012). Inverse Rensch-rule in a frog with female-biased sexual size dimorphism. *Naturwissenschaften* 99, 427–431.
- Liao, W.B. & Lu, X. (2012). Adult body size=f (initial size + growth rate x age): explaining the proximate cause of Bergman's cline in a toad along altitudinal gradients. *Evolutionary Ecology* 26, 579– 590.
- Liao, W.B., Zhou, C.Q., Yang, Z.S., Hu, J.C. & Lu, X. (2010). Age, size and growth in two populations of the dark-spotted frog *Rana nigromaculata* at different altitudes in southwestern China. *Herpetological Journal* 20, 77–86.
- Liao, W.B., Lu, X., Shen, Y.W. & Hu, J.C. (2011). Age structure and body size of two populations of the rice frog *Rana limnocharis* from different altitudes. *Italian Journal of Zoology* 78, 215–221.
- Liao, W.B., Liao, Y.M., Chen, W., Mi, Z.P. & Li, C. (2012a). Sexual dimorphism in hind limb muscle mass of the Andrew's toad (*Bufo andrewsi*) in relation to sexual selection. *North-Western Journal of Zoology* 8, 252–256.
- Liao, W.B., Wu, Q.G. & Barrett, K. (2012b). Evolution of sexual dimorphism in the forelimb muscles of Andrew's toad (*Bufo andrewsi*) in response to putative sexual selection. <u>Animal Biology</u> 62, 83–93.
- Liao, W.B., Zeng, Y., Zhou, C.Q. & Jehle, R. (2013a). Sexual size dimorphism in anurans fails to obey Rensch's rule. *Frontiers in Zoology* 10, 10.
- Liao, W.B., Zeng, Y. & Yang, J.D. (2013b). Sexual size dimorphism in anurans: roles of mating system and habitat types. *Frontiers in Zoology* 10, 65.
- Lipar, J.L. & Ketterson, E.D. (2000). Maternally derived yolk testosterone enhances the development of the hatching muscle in the red-winged blackbird Agelaius phoeniceus. Proceedings of the Royal Society London B 267, 2005–2010.
- Liu, Y.H., Liao, W.B., Zhou, C.Q. & Mi, Z.P. (2012). Altitudinal variation in body size in the rice frog (*Rana limnocharis*) in southwestern China. *Acta Herpetologica* 7, 57–68.

- Lou, S.L., Jin, L., Liu, Y.H., Mi, Z.P., et al. (2012). Altitudinal variation in age and body size in Yunnan pond frog (*Pelophylax pleuraden*). *Zoological Science* 29, 493–498.
- Mao, M., Huang, Y., Mi, Z.P., Liu, Y.H. & Zhou, C.Q. (2012). Skeletochronological study of age, longevity and growth in a population of *Rana nigromaculata* (Amphibia: Anura) in Sichuan, China. *Asian Herpetological Research* 3, 258–264.
- Mi, Z.P. (2012). Sexual dimorphism in the forelimb muscles of the Asiatic toad *Bufo gargarizans. Herpetological Journal* 22, 219–224.
- Mi, Z.P. (2013). Sexual dimorphism in the hindlimb muscles of the Asiatic toad (*Bufo gargarizans*) in relation to male reproductive success. *Asian Herpetological Research* 4, 56–61.
- Monnet, J.M. & Cherry, M.I. (2002). Sexual size dimorphism in anurans. *Proceedings of the Royal Society London B* 269, 2301–2307.
- Navas, C.A. & James, R.S. (2007). Sexual dimorphism of extensor carpi radialis muscle size, isometric force, relaxation rate and stamina during the breeding season of the frog *Rana temporaria* Linnaeus 1758. *The Journal of Experimental Biology* 210, 715–720.
- Oka, Y., Ohtani, R., Satou, M. & Ueda, K. (1984). Sexual dimorphic muscles in the forelimb of the Japanese toad, *Bufo japonicus. Journal of Morphology* 180, 297–308.
- Peters, S.E. & Aulner, D.A. (2000). Sexual dimorphism in forelimb muscles of the bullfrog, *Rana catesbeiana*: a functional analysis of isometric contractile properties. *The Journal of Experimental Biology* 203, 3639–3654.
- Peters, S.E., Kamel, L.T. & Bashor, D.P. (1996). Hopping and swimming in the leopard frog, *Rana pipiens*: 1. Step cycles and kinematics. *Journal of Morphology* 230, 1–16.

- Ralls, K. (1976). Mammals in which females are larger than males. *The Quarterly Review of Biology* 51, 245–276.
- Sassoon, D., Grey, G. & Kelley, D.B. (1987). Androgen regulation of muscle fiber type in the sexually dimorphic larynx of *Xenopus laevis. Journal of Neuroscience* 7, 3198–3206.
- Shine, R. (1979). Sexual selection and sexual dimorphism in the amphibian. *Copeia* 1979, 297–306.
- Shine, R. (1988). Constraints on reproductive investment: a comparison between aquatic and terrestrial snakes. *Evolution* 42, 17–27.
- Slack, C., Warner, A.E. & Warren, R.L. (1973). The distribution of sodium and potassium in amphibian embryos during early development. *Journal of Physiology* 232, 297–312.
- Tsuji, H. & Matsui, M. (2002). Male-male combat and head morphology in a fanged frog (*Rana kuhlii*) from Taiwan. *Journal of Herpetology* 36, 520–526.
- Wells, K.D. (1977). The social behaviour of anuran amphibians. Animal Behaviour 25, 666–693.
- Yekta, N. & Blackburn, D. (1992). Sexual dimorphism in mass and protein content of the forelimb muscles of the northern leopard frog *Rana pipiens*. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 70, 670–674.
- Zhao, E.M. (1999). Distribution patterns of amphibians in temperate eastern Asia. In Duellman, W.E. (Ed.) Patterns of Distribution of Amphibians: A Global Perspective, pp. 421–443. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Zhao, E.M. & Adler, K. (1993). *Herpetology of China*. Society for the Study of Amphibians and Reptiles, Oxford, Ohio.
- Zhou, B.X. (1956). *The systematic dissection of frogs*. Science Press, Beijing, China.

Accepted: 22 January 2014