Published in final edited form as:

Physiol Behav. 2015 November 01; 151: 246–251. doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2015.07.034.

Strongly bonded family members in common marmosets show synchronized fluctuations in oxytocin

Christa Finkenwirth^{a,*}, Carel van Schaik^a, Toni E. Ziegler^b, and Judith M. Burkart^a

^aAnthropological Institute and Museum, University of Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zurich, Switzerland ^bWisconsin National Primate Research Center, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53715, USA

Abstract

Oxytocin is a key regulator of social bonding and is positively linked to affiliation and prosocial behavior in several mammal species. In chimpanzees, this link is dyad-specific as affiliative interactions only elicit high oxytocin release if they involve strongly bonded individuals. These studies involved isolated dyads and sampling events. Little is known about the role of oxytocin in affiliation and social bonding, and about potential long-term patterns of bonding-related and dyad-specific oxytocin effects within highly affiliative and cooperative social groups. Our aim was to investigate whether bonding-related oxytocin signatures linked to dyadic affiliation are present in family groups of cooperatively breeding marmoset monkeys (*Callithrix jacchus*) that show high levels of cohesion and cooperation. In 30 dyads from four family groups and one pair, we measured urinary baseline oxytocin over six weeks and analyzed the link to bond strength (mean dyadic affiliation). Strongly bonded dyads showed synchronized longitudinal fluctuations of oxytocin, indicating that dyad-specific oxytocin effects can also be traced in the group context and in an interdependent species. We discuss these results in light of the potential function of differentiated relationships between marmoset dyads other than the breeding pair, and the role of oxytocin as a mediator for social bonding.

Keywords

Oxytocin synchrony; Social bonding; Group-living; Affiliation; Marmoset monkeys

1. Introduction

The neurohormone oxytocin (OT) plays an important role in the regulation of mammalian social bonds and bonding related behaviors [1–7]. Its functions presumably have been expanded from the more ancient mother–infant and sexual bonds to a wider range of relationships in highly social species, including primates [8,9]. A broad body of evidence suggests a positive link between OT and affiliative or prosocial interactions, as for example

*Corresponding author at: Anthropological Institute and Museum, Winterthurerstr. 190, CH-8057 Zurich, Switzerland. christa.finkenwirth@uzh.ch (C. Finkenwirth).

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2015.07.034>.

in rats [10], meerkats [11], and humans [12]. In the latter, elevated peripheral OT levels correspond with increased trust, and intranasal OT administration facilitates social perception and trust [13–16].

In non-human primates, OT correlates have been mainly studied in callitrichid monkeys and chimpanzees. Increased urinary OT concentrations accompany socio-sexual and affiliative interactions in both species [17,18] and food sharing events in chimpanzees [19]. The results in chimpanzees have shown that such effects can be dyad-specific, in that increased urinary OT levels were detected only after affiliative interactions between socially bonded individuals, but not between non-bonded individuals [18,19]. Individuals in chimpanzee societies form strong and long-lasting social bonds that are thought to entail direct and indirect fitness benefits [20,21], and OT responses related to specific group members have been suggested to facilitate non-cognitive book-keeping of social relationships [18].

The bonding-dependent release of OT during affiliative interactions is also consistent with experimental results. Intranasal and intracerebral OT administration affects partner preference [22,23] and paternal food transfer in marmosets [24]. The experimental increase in OT thus mimics the effect of affiliative interactions with bonded individuals. As a result, subjects treat the experimental partners like stronger bonded individuals. The effects of OT application in humans can also be interpreted this way [13–16].

Crockford et al. [18] showed that OT secretion following dyadic affiliation is higher in strongly bonded dyads compared to interactions in less bonded dyads. Consequently, an individual's OT profile should be particularly determined by its affiliative events with strongly bonded group members, whereas interactions with other group members should influence its OT profile less. Over time, this should lead to temporal correlations in the OT profiles of bonded dyads, i.e. synchronized peaks and troughs of baseline OT, reflecting how much the bonded individuals are engaging in affiliative behavior with each other. No such tendency toward synchronized changes over time should occur in non-bonded dyads, because affiliative interactions in such dyads are expected to have no or a much smaller effect on OT. The aim of our study was to investigate the degree of dyadic OT synchrony in family groups of cooperatively breeding marmoset monkeys, in which affiliative interactions are frequent among all group members and some individuals form strong dyadic relationships [25,26]. Marmoset groups are typically composed of a dominant breeding pair, several adult helpers, and immatures [27,28]. Relationships between breeding pairs involve intense partner-directed affiliative and sexual behavior [17,25,26,29,30], and are characterized as socially monogamous [30–37]. The relationships between other group members are mostly peaceful and cooperative [26], even though punctual events of severe aggressions occur, in particular related to competition for breeding positions [38].

Specifically, we investigated the link between urinary baseline OT and dyadic affiliation in family groups of common marmosets (*Callithrix jacchus*) in order to test whether dyad-dependent OT response patterns are traceable within the family environment in this species, and whether temporal changes in baseline OT are synchronized in dyads, depending on their bond strength. If so, OT synchronization was expected to be most pronounced in stronger bonded marmoset dyads (estimated based on mean dyadic affiliation). This should especially

apply to breeding pairs where specific monogamous bonds are accompanied by high levels of affiliation and socio-sexual behavior [25,30], but it may also occur in non-breeding individuals, whose relationships with other group members have barely been studied so far.

Urinary OT levels provide a proxy for peripheral OT, and have the advantage that they can be repeatedly sampled noninvasively, and thus without interrupting the social dynamics within the groups through invasive handling. The relevance of peripheral OT measures for studying the dynamics of social relationships has been recently reviewed and discussed by Crockford et al. [39]. OT is produced in various peripheral organs as well as in the hypothalamus, from where it is released peripherally and centrally [40,41]. Several studies suggest a direct link [1,11, 42,43] as well as coordination between both systems based on neuroanatomical and physiological evidence [44–46]. This link is probably also triggered indirectly, for example via steroid hormones [47–49] and bidirectional feedback mechanisms with peripheral organs and body states [41], but the topic remains debated [5,50]. Whereas cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) and plasma OT levels are positively correlated in humans [51], no such link was found in goats [52], pig-tail macaques [53], and lactating rhesus monkeys [54], suggesting independent control mechanisms of central and peripheral OT secretion. However, whether the release of central and peripheral OT is coordinated, seems to also depend on the involved stimulating brain regions (e.g. in the paraventricular nucleus) [55]. This indicates high flexibility and context-dependent activation of central and peripheral OT pathways. Several clearance studies support a correlation between systemic and urinary OT changes [56–58]. In various species, including humans and non-human primates, both plasma and urinary OT levels have been found to correspond with social environmental stimuli [5–7,17–19,56,58–60] or physiological and psychological states [59,61–63]. In contrast to short-term OT fluctuations in plasma and saliva, urinary OT concentrations, especially detected from the first morning void, result from the net effect of accumulation and excretion of systemic OT over several hours. Morning urine should thus also be relevant for monitoring baseline OT levels as the summed excretion of elevated OT responses related to dyadic affiliative behavior [39] in callitrichid monkeys. In combination with behavioral data, this sampling method allows looking at the integration of social interactions with different partners at the hormonal level over time.

2. Methods

2.1. Subjects and housing

The study was performed using four common marmoset family groups (N= 3 to 5 individuals) and one male–female pair, amounting to a total of 19 adult individuals (9 females and 10 males, Table S1 in Supporting information), aged between 2.3 to 9.5 years. No dependent offspring (nursing and being carried) were present at any time during the study. All groups were housed in standardized enclosures (depending on group size, one or multiple basic cage units; each measuring 2.4 m height × 1.5 m depth × 0.8 m width, with max. 3 animals per cage unit) at the Primate Station of the Anthropological Institute and Museum, University of Zurich. Each enclosure had a spacious outdoor area (measuring 2.4 m height × 2.7 m depth × 2.5 m width) and was equipped with a sleeping box, a water dispenser, several wooden climbing structures, an infrared lamp, and a mulch floor. The

animals were housed under natural light with additional artificial light on a 12 h/12 h light–dark cycle and UV light (300 W). Their diet consisted of a vitamin and calcium-enriched porridge in the morning, fresh fruits and vegetables over midday, as well as gum and mealworms in the afternoon, and water was available ad libitum. A special cage unit for urine collection was attached to each home cage and only accessible in the morning during urine collection [64]. On urine sampling days, mealworms were fed in the urine cages in the morning instead of afternoon.

2.2. Urine sampling and OT analysis

For OT detection, morning urine samples of all 19 individuals were collected two to three times a week (alternating groups between 2 and 3 sampling days per week) over six consecutive weeks (total N = 275 samples). The sampling was restricted to morning void urine, in order to measure hormonal baseline values and to minimize confounding effects of circadian rhythms. This was done non-invasively either in a urine cage or with a plastic cup in the home cage, as described elsewhere [64]. Urine cages were made of transparent plastic panels and separated into six compartments with individual trap doors and access to a feeding trough at the backside. A wire-mesh and a metal panel with drains and adjustable vessels under each compartment allowed the collection of individual samples without contamination. Before the sampling period, animals were habituated over several weeks to enter and feed in the cage voluntarily. After awakening the group in the morning, animals were allowed to access the urine cage and kept in separate compartments until after urinating, but no longer than 15 min in total. The urine cages were rinsed carefully after each usage. Urine samples were labeled right after collection and stored immediately at -20°C in 1 ml portions until analysis.

OT was detected using ELISA technique in the Assay Services Unit of the Wisconsin National Primate Research Center in Madison, Wisconsin, according to the protocol by Seltzer and Ziegler [56] and Snowdon et al. [17]. Urine samples were run in duplicates at a volume of 200 μl . Prior to OT detection, samples were thawed, centrifuged, and extracted using solid phase extraction columns (Macherey-Nagel, 55–150 mm, WAT023501). Extraction columns were conditioned with 1 ml 100% methanol and 1 ml purified water. Samples were added (0.5 ml urine), washed with 1 ml 10% acetonitrile and 1% TFA (trifluoroacetic acid) in water, and eluted with 1 ml 80% acetonitrile in water. Samples were dried, reconstituted in 250 μl assay buffer, and added to the microtiter plates according to the directions provided with the assay kit (Assay Designs, Cat no. 901-153). The assay standard curve ranged from 6 to 1000 pg/ml and assay sensitivity was 6 pg/ml. Mean intraassay coefficients of variation and inter-assay coefficients of variation were 5.85% and 16.11%, respectively. All OT concentrations were corrected for creatinine levels to control for variable urine concentration and log-transformed (log pg OT/mg Cr) to reach normal distribution prior to statistical analysis (Kolmogorov–Smirnov test for normality: $D(275) = 0.037$, $p = 0.33$).

2.3. Behavioral observations and analysis

In order to investigate the link between bond strength and OT synchrony, marmoset groups were observed for affiliative behavior along with the urine sampling over six weeks. We

observed the groups 2–3 times per week on alternating days and recorded all social interactions based on continuous sampling in 10-minute focal observations for each individual within its group. Affiliative behaviors, including allogrooming (defined as using hand and/or mouth to pick through fur, face or mouth of another individual) and huddling (defined as sitting or lying in body contact with another individual), were used to estimate bond strength (the average over all dyadic affiliative events). Agonistic behavior was very rare and therefore not included in the analysis. All observations were performed by the same observer using an established protocol (see also Koski and Burkart [65]; a test for interobserver reliability with an independent observer resulted in 0.89% of agreement). An average of 173 ± 3.48 observation minutes was available for each individual. Urine samples were always collected the next morning, following observation days.

2.4. Statistical data analysis

Dyadic bond strength was estimated based on dyadic affiliation – mean rates of mutual grooming and huddling – for all 30 dyads, i.e. 5 breeder–breeder (mates), 18 breeder–helper (parent–adult offspring) and 7 helper–helper (siblings) dyads (Table S2 in Supporting information). Durations of affiliative behaviors were corrected for observation time and combined into one log-transformed value ($\log[s \text{ grooming} + s \text{ huddling}] / s \text{ observed}$). Dyadic OT synchrony was calculated as the Pearson correlation coefficient of the longitudinal OT fluctuations of two partners ($N=8$ to 13 OT values per dyad), resulting in one synchrony value per dyad (Table S2).

First, we analyzed variation of individual urinary OT levels between sex-status groups (female and male breeders and helpers) and variation of dyadic bond strength (mean dyadic affiliation) between breeder–breeder, breeder–helper and helper–helper dyads, using analysis of variance (R: one-way ANOVA; completely randomized design). Post-hoc tests between groups and effect sizes for ANOVA results were calculated using Scheffe's test and eta square, respectively.

Second, we tested whether strongly bonded dyads showed higher OT synchrony and whether this relationship was affected by dyad type, using a permutation-based linear model (R version 3.0.3: lmp, exact permutation analysis). The permutation step was included (i) to compensate for small sample size, and (ii) to control for dependencies due to individuals participating in multiple dyads in a group, by randomly resampling dyadic OT synchrony and affiliation values across groups. Dyadic OT synchrony was the dependent variable and dyadic bond strength, dyad type, and the interaction dyadic bond strength * dyad type were included as factors.

3. Results

Mean individual baseline OT levels ($\text{mean} \pm \text{SE}$) of female breeders, male breeders, female helpers, and male helpers were 2.99 ± 0.24 , 2.85 ± 0.26 , 2.53 ± 0.16 , and 2.74 ± 0.25 ($\log \text{ pg OT/mg Crt}$), respectively. Differences between sex-status groups were non-significant (one-way ANOVA: $F(3, 15) = 0.84$, $p = 0.49$, $h^2 = 0.14$), but OT levels tended to be highest in female breeders.

Dyadic bond strength (rates of mutual dyadic affiliation) varied widely across all dyad types. Mean $\pm$ SE values for breeder–breeder, breeder–helper and helper–helper dyads were 0.087 ± 0.016 , 0.026 ± 0.004 and 0.017 ± 0.006 (log s/s observed), respectively, and dyadic bond strength was significantly higher in breeder dyads than in the two other dyad types (one-way ANOVA and post-hoc Scheffe's test: $F(2, 27) = 18.43$; $p < 0.001$, $h^2 = 0.58$) (Fig. 1).

Dyadic OT synchrony values, calculated as the Pearson correlation coefficient for each dyad, varied between $r = -0.55$ and 0.82 with five significant correlations (16.6% of the total 30 dyads). The permutation ANOVA on dyadic OT synchrony revealed an effect of dyadic bond strength (mean dyadic affiliation), and dyad type, whereas the interaction dyadic bond strength * dyad type had no effect (Table 1). Fig. 2 illustrates longitudinal OT levels and OT synchrony of two strongly (A) and two weakly (B) bonded individuals. The link between dyadic bond strength and OT synchrony was significant across all dyad types (Table 1, linear model estimate=10.14, $p < 0.01$). It was equally strong in breeder–breeder and helper–helper dyads, but weaker in mixed breeder–helper dyads, where variation was broader (Fig. 3).

Fig. 3 shows the relationship between dyadic OT synchrony and dyadic bond strength. The right shift of the regression line in breeder–breeder dyads (solid red regression line) compared to other dyads reflects the relatively higher levels of dyadic affiliation in breeders. However, this shift did not affect the significant link between OT and bond strength across dyad types, as indicated by the non-significant interaction between dyadic bond strength and dyad type (Table 1). The residual distribution of the linear model was normal (Shapiro–Wilk normality test: $W = 0.97$, $p = 0.46$), suggesting a good model fit to the data.

4. Discussion

In this study, we explored whether dyadic bond strength in group-living marmoset monkeys was linked to synchronized fluctuations in longitudinal OT levels. We found that strongly bonded dyads exhibit synchronized fluctuations of urinary baseline OT over time, both in breeder–breeder dyads and other dyad types. These findings are consistent with the dyad-specificity of OT responses to affiliative behavior in chimpanzees [18], because they suggest that an individual's OT profile is particularly determined by its affiliative interactions with strongly bonded group members, whereas interactions with other group members influence its OT profile less. Over time, this arguably leads to the reported temporal correlations and synchronization of OT profiles in bonded dyads, reflecting how much the individuals engaged in affiliative behavior with each other. Furthermore, the findings suggest the existence of differentiated dyadic relationships in marmosets, which is consistent with the species' characteristic stable and long-lasting relationships between mate pairs [26]. However, strongly bonded dyads with synchronized OT fluctuations were not exclusively found among breeding pairs, as the pattern also extended to breeder–helper and helper–helper dyads.

The relationships between callitrichid group members other than the breeding pair are mainly shaped by their cooperatively breeding lifestyle [66], but the function of differentiated relationships as described here remains to be established. Stronger relationships between same-sex helpers may provide benefits during dispersal [67], whereas

close breeder–helper relationships may result in increased future allomaternal care by helpers (in particular if breeders are more responsible for establishing and maintaining these relationships) or in longer periods of acceptance in the natal group (in particular if helpers are more responsible for establishing and maintaining these relationships). Alternatively, differentiated relationships between group members other than breeding pairs might simply reflect the extent to which an older individual was engaged in caring for a younger individual during infancy [68], or finally occur as a by-product of the mechanism that has evolved in this species to maintain stable and long lasting socially monogamous relationships between mates. Aggressive interactions were too rare to include them in our evaluation of dyadic relationships. However, earlier studies have shown that breeding competition among females, leading to severe aggression and occasional infanticide, is part of callitrichid group life, especially in the wild [69–72], and may thus also play a role in shaping dyadic relationships.

The link between dyadic OT synchrony and bond strength (affiliation) was found to be positive across all dyad types but it was strongest in breeder–breeder and helper–helper dyads, and, in breeder dyads, the correlation was relatively shifted to the right (Fig. 3). This pattern shift originated from the significantly higher levels of dyadic affiliation in breeders compared to other dyads, which are probably partly resulting from breeding pairs spending more time in proximity during periods of increased sexual activity during the female ovarian cycle [73]. Whether our dyadic proximity estimates for breeding pairs are comparable to those in more heterogeneous groups or in the wild, where the turnover for breeding positions is also faster [74], remains unknown. Compared to breeder–breeder and helper–helper dyads, the link between OT synchrony and affiliation was weaker in mixed breeder–helper dyads, possibly because breeder–helper relationships are more heterogeneous [71]. Importantly, we can rule out high relatedness as a factor driving OT levels or OT synchrony. All members of a group, except the breeding pairs, were directly related and our pattern does not indicate better synchronization between siblings (including twins) or parent–offspring dyads than between mates (Fig. 3).

A potential error source of variation in the observed link between synchronized longitudinal OT fluctuations and dyadic affiliation is sexual cycling in reproductively active females, since estrogen is known to have a stimulatory effect on OT [48,49]. This mainly pertains to breeding females but may also include subordinate female helpers. Sexual cycling in subordinate females is usually inhibited [75,76] but reproductive suppression occasionally fails in daughters after they reach puberty [35,76,77]. However, removing all dyads that contain breeding females from the data set does not erase the significant effect of dyadic bond strength in the linear model analysis (linear model estimate = 10.99, $p = 0.02$).

The pattern of dyadic synchronization as presented in our data is consistent with studies on marmoset dyadic behavioral synchrony [78] and on human parent–infant bonding: Human infants, whose fathers had been previously treated with exogenous OT, showed an indirect increase of peripheral OT levels after interaction with the father [5, 79] and longitudinal synchronization between individuals occurred on the behavioral level [5,80,81]. Finally, in humans, menstrual hormonal synchrony has been described among close friends and in families where mutual contact and exposure were high [82,83]. These analogous patterns

suggest that temporal coordination between individuals can occur on the behavioral as well as on the physiological level and might hence represent a more general functional mechanism in social bonding.

5. Conclusion and implications

Our results show that, in common marmosets who live in family groups, more strongly bonded dyads have more synchronized longitudinal fluctuations of urinary baseline OT levels compared to less strongly bonded dyads. This patterning indicates that, despite the high cohesiveness among marmoset groups, OT responses are to some extent dyad-specific. Our results are thus consistent with the positive link between dyadic affiliative behavior and elevated urinary OT in strongly bonded chimpanzees, and with a possible role of OT as a mediator of social interactions and bonding, as suggested by Crockford et al. [18] and Wittig et al. [19]. Between-individual OT effects may thereby be established and maintained via positive feedback mechanisms triggered by affiliative [18], but also gaze [60,84] or voice [7] interactions. Intriguingly, highly affiliative dyads with synchronized OT fluctuations were not exclusively found among breeding pairs, but also among breeder–helper and helper–helper dyads. The presence of differentiated relationships among non-breeding dyads raises the question about the ultimate function of such relationships.

Finally, hormonal synchronization between two individuals may represent a hitherto neglected dimension in the establishment and maintenance of social relationships. It remains to be established in future studies whether such shared longitudinal fluctuations of OT also lead close individuals to share mood shifts and whether such a connection could provide a hormonal link to psychological and emotional consequences of bonding.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We thank H. Galli, T. Bischof, M. Schubiger, Z. Kosonen, and R. Richiger for assistance and urine collection in the Primate Station at the University of Zurich, E. Willems and K. Isler for statistical support, D. Wittwer for laboratory support in the Assay Services Unit of the Wisconsin National Primate Research Center (NIH NCRR000167), and the anonymous reviewers for valuable feedback on earlier versions of this manuscript. This study was funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation project 310030_130383 to J. B. and the protocol was approved by the Cantonal Commission for Animal Experiments of Canton Zurich, license nr. 150_210.

References

1. Witt DM, Carter CS, Walton DM. Central and peripheral effects of oxytocin administration in prairie voles (*Microtus ochrogaster*). *Pharmacol Biochem Behav.* 1990; 37:63–69. [PubMed: 2263668]
2. Williams JR, Insel TR, Harbaugh CR, Carter CS. Oxytocin administered centrally facilitates formation of a partner preference in female prairie voles (*Microtus ochrogaster*). *J Neuroendocrinol.* 1994; 6:247–250. [PubMed: 7920590]
3. Kendrick KM. Oxytocin, motherhood and bonding. *Exp Physiol.* 2000; 85:111s–124s. [PubMed: 10795913]

4. Kendrick KM, Keverne EB, Baldwin BA. Intracerebroventricular oxytocin stimulates maternal behaviour in the sheep. *Neuroendocrinology*. 1987; 46:56–61. [PubMed: 3614555]
5. Feldman R, Gordon I, Zagoory-Sharon O. Maternal and paternal plasma, salivary, and urinary oxytocin and parent–infant synchrony: considering stress and affiliation components of human bonding. *Dev Sci*. 2011; 14:752–761. [PubMed: 21676095]
6. Fries ABW, Ziegler TE, Kurian JR, Jacoris S, Pollak SD. Early experience in humans is associated with changes in neuropeptides critical for regulating social behavior. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2005; 102:17237–17240. [PubMed: 16303870]
7. Seltzer LJ, Ziegler TE, Pollak SD. Social vocalizations can release oxytocin in humans. *Proc R Soc B*. 2010; 277:2661–2666.
8. Broad KD, Curley JP, Keverne EB. Mother–infant bonding and the evolution of mammalian social relationships. *Philos Trans R Soc B*. 2006; 361:2199–2214.
9. Curley JP, Keverne EB. Genes, brains and mammalian social bonds. *Trends Ecol Evol*. 2005; 20:561–567. [PubMed: 16701435]
10. Ramos L, Hicks C, Kevin R, Caminer A, Narlawar R, Kassiou M, et al. Acute prosocial effects of oxytocin and vasopressin when given alone or in combination with 3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine in rats: involvement of the V1A receptor. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2013; 38:2249–2259. [PubMed: 23676791]
11. Madden JR, Clutton-Brock TH. Experimental peripheral administration of oxytocin elevates a suite of cooperative behaviours in a wild social mammal. *Proc R Soc B*. 2011; 278:1189–1194.
12. Zak PJ, Kurzban R, Matzner WT. The neurobiology of trust. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 2004; 1032:224–227. [PubMed: 15677415]
13. Baumgartner T, Heinrichs M, Vonlanthen A, Fischbacher U, Fehr E. Oxytocin shapes the neural circuitry of trust and trust adaptation in humans. *Neuron*. 2008; 58:639–650. [PubMed: 18498743]
14. Kosfeld M, Heinrichs M, Zak PJ, Fischbacher U, Fehr E. Oxytocin increases trust in humans. *Nature*. 2005; 435:673–676. [PubMed: 15931222]
15. Domes G, Heinrichs M, Michel A, Berger C, Herpertz SC. Oxytocin improves “mind-reading” in humans. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2007; 61:731–733. [PubMed: 17137561]
16. Bartz JA, Zaki J, Bolger N, Ochsner KN. Social effects of oxytocin in humans: context and person matter. *Trends Cogn Sci*. 2011; 15:301–309. [PubMed: 21696997]
17. Snowdon CT, Pieper BA, Boe CY, Cronin KA, Kurian AV, Ziegler TE. Variation in oxytocin is related to variation in affiliative behavior in monogamous, pair bonded tamarins. *Horm Behav*. 2010; 58:614–618. [PubMed: 20600045]
18. Crockford C, Wittig RM, Langergraber K, Ziegler TE, Zuberbühler K, Deschner T. Urinary oxytocin and social bonding in related and unrelated wild chimpanzees. *Proc R Soc B*. 2013; 280
19. Wittig RM, Crockford C, Deschner T, Langergraber KE, Ziegler TE, Zuberbühler K. Food sharing is linked to urinary oxytocin levels and bonding in related and unrelated wild chimpanzees. *Proc R Soc B*. 2014; 281
20. Langergraber K, Mitani J, Vigilant L. Kinship and social bonds in female chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *Am J Primatol*. 2009; 71:840–851. [PubMed: 19475543]
21. Mitani JC. Male chimpanzees form enduring and equitable social bonds. *Anim Behav*. 2009; 77:633–640.
22. Smith AS, Ågmo A, Birnie AK, French JA. Manipulation of the oxytocin system alters social behavior and attraction in pair-bonding primates, *Callithrix penicillata*. *Horm Behav*. 2010; 57:255–262. [PubMed: 20025881]
23. Cavanaugh J, Mustoe AC, Taylor JH, French JA. Oxytocin facilitates fidelity in well-established marmoset pairs by reducing sociosexual behavior toward opposite-sex strangers. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*. 2014; 49:1–10. [PubMed: 25038478]
24. Saito A, Nakamura K. Oxytocin changes primate paternal tolerance to offspring in food transfer. *J Comp Physiol A*. 2011; 197:329–337.
25. Evans S, Poole TB. Long-term changes and maintenance of the pair-bond in common marmosets, *Callithrix jacchus jacchus*. *Folia Primatol*. 1984; 42:33–41.

26. Schaffner, CM., Caine, NG. The peacefulness of cooperatively breeding primates. Aureli, F., FFBd, W., editors. Natural Conflict Resolution, University of California Press; Berkely and Los Angeles California: 2000.
27. Rothe, H., Wolters, H-J., Hearn, JP. Biology and Behaviour of Marmosets: Proceedings of the Marmoset Workshop. Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft; Göttingen: 1977.
28. Hubrecht R. Field observations on group size and composition of the common marmoset (*Callithrix jacchus jacchus*), at Tapacura, Brazil. Primates. 1984; 25:13–21.
29. Anzenberger G, Falk B. Monogamy and family life in callitrichid monkeys: deviations, social dynamics and captive management. Int Zoo Yearb. 2012; 46:109–122.
30. Evans S. The pair-bond of the common marmoset, *Callithrix jacchus jacchus*: an experimental investigation. Anim Behav. 1983; 31:651–658.
31. Rothe H. Some aspects of sexuality and reproduction in groups of captive marmosets (*Callithrix jacchus*). Z Tierpsychol. 1975; 37:255–273. [PubMed: 821267]
32. Epplé G. Reproductive and social behavior of marmosets with special reference to captive breeding. Primates Med. 1977; 10:50–62.
33. Savage A, Ziegler TE, Snowdon CT. Sociosexual development, pair bond formation, and mechanisms of fertility suppression in female cotton-top tamarins (*Saguinus oedipus oedipus*). Am J Primatol. 1988; 14:345–359.
34. Schaffner CM, Shepherd RE, Santos CV, French JA. Development of heterosexual relationships in wied's black tufted-earmarmosets (*Callithrix kuhli*). Am J Primatol. 1995; 36:185–200.
35. Digby L. Infant care, infanticide, and female reproductive strategies in polygynous groups of common marmosets (*Callithrix jacchus*). Behav Ecol Sociobiol. 1995; 37:51–61.
36. Ferrari SF, Lopes Ferrari MA. A re-evaluation of the social organisation of the Callitrichidae, with reference to the ecological differences between genera. Folia Primatol. 1989; 52:132–147. [PubMed: 2515129]
37. Ferrari SF, Digby LJ. Wild callitrich groups: stable extended families? Am J Primatol. 1996; 38:19–27.
38. Digby, LJ., Ferrari, SF., Saltzman, W. Primates in Perspective. Oxford University Press; New York: 2006. The role of competition in cooperatively breeding species; p. 85–106.
39. Crockford C, Deschner T, Ziegler TE, Wittig RM. Endogenous peripheral oxytocin measures can give insight into the dynamics of social relationships: a review. Front Behav Neurosci. 2014; 8:68. [PubMed: 24672442]
40. Lim MM, Young LJ. Neuropeptidergic regulation of affiliative behavior and social bonding in animals. Horm Behav. 2006; 50:506–517. [PubMed: 16890230]
41. Goodson JL, Thompson RR. Nonapeptide mechanisms of social cognition, behavior and species-specific social systems. Curr Opin Neurobiol. 2010; 20:784–794. [PubMed: 20850965]
42. Ayers LW, Missig G, Schulkin J, Rosen JB. Oxytocin reduces background anxiety in a fear-potentiated startle paradigm: peripheral vs central administration. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2011; 36:2488–2497. [PubMed: 21796104]
43. O'Byrne KT, Lunn SF, Coen CW. Central oxytocin stimulates luteinizing hormone release in the marmoset, a primate which fails to show lactationally-induced infertility. J Neuroendocrinol. 1990; 2:419–421. [PubMed: 19215367]
44. Wotjak CT, Ganster J, Kohl G, Holsboer F, Landgraf R, Engelmann M. Dissociated central and peripheral release of vasopressin, but not oxytocin, in response to repeated swim stress: new insights into the secretory capacities of peptidergic neurons. Neuroscience. 1998; 85:1209–1222. [PubMed: 9681958]
45. Carter CS, Pournajafi-Nazarloo H, Kramer KM, Ziegler TE, White-Traut R, Bello D, et al. Behavioral associations and potential as a salivary biomarker. Ann N Y Acad Sci. 2007; 1098:312–322. [PubMed: 17435137]
46. Ross HE, Young LJ. Oxytocin and the neural mechanisms regulating social cognition and affiliative behavior. Front Neuroendocrinol. 2009; 30:534–547. [PubMed: 19481567]
47. Bos PA, Panksepp J, Bluthé R-M, van Honk J. Acute effects of steroid hormones and neuropeptides on human social-emotional behavior: a review of single administration studies. Front Neuroendocrinol. 2012; 33:17–35. [PubMed: 21256859]

48. Ochedalski T, Subburaju S, Wynn PC, Aguilera G. Interaction between oestrogen and oxytocin on hypothalamic–pituitary–adrenal axis activity. *J Neuroendocrinol.* 2007; 19:189–197. [PubMed: 17280592]
49. McCarthy M. Estrogen modulation of oxytocin and its relation to behavior. *Adv Exp Med Biol.* 1995; 395:235–245. [PubMed: 8713972]
50. Veening JG, de Jong T, Barendregt HP. Oxytocin-messages via the cerebrospinal fluid: behavioral effects; a review. *Physiol Behav.* 2010; 101:193–210. [PubMed: 20493198]
51. Carson, DS., Berquist, SW., Trujillo, TH., Garner, JP., Hannah, SL., Hyde, SA., et al. Cerebrospinal fluid and plasma oxytocin concentrations are positively correlated and negatively predict anxiety in children. *Mol Psychiatry.* 2014. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/mp.2014.132>
52. Seckl JR, Lightman SL. Diurnal rhythm of vasopressin but not of oxytocin in the cerebrospinal fluid of the goat: lack of association with plasma cortisol rhythm. *J Endocrinol.* 1987; 114:477–482. [PubMed: 3668436]
53. Rosenblum LA, Smith E, Altemus M, Scharf BA, Owens MJ, Nemeroff CB, et al. Differing concentrations of corticotropin-releasing factor and oxytocin in the cerebrospinal fluid of bonnet and pigtail macaques. *Psychoneuroendocrinology.* 2002; 27:651–660. [PubMed: 12084658]
54. Amico JA, Challinor SM, Cameron JL. Pattern of oxytocin concentrations in the plasma and cerebrospinal fluid of lactating rhesus monkeys (*Macaca mulatto*): evidence for functionally independent oxytocinergic pathways in primates. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism.* 1990; 71:1531–1535. [PubMed: 2229310]
55. Martínez-Lorenzana G, Espinosa-López L, Carranza M, Aramburo C, Paz-Tres C, Rojas-Piloni G, et al. PVN electrical stimulation prolongs withdrawal latencies and releases oxytocin in cerebrospinal fluid, plasma, and spinal cord tissue in intact and neuropathic rats. *Pain.* 2008; 140:265–273. [PubMed: 18823708]
56. Seltzer LJ, Ziegler TE. Non-invasive measurement of small peptides in the common marmoset (*Callithrix jacchus*): a radiolabeled clearance study and endogenous excretion under varying social conditions. *Horm Behav.* 2007; 51:436–442. [PubMed: 17292369]
57. Amico JA, Ulbrecht JS, Robinson AG. Clearance studies of oxytocin in humans using radioimmunoassay measurements of the hormone in plasma and urine. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 1987; 64:340–345. [PubMed: 3793853]
58. Mitsui S, Yamamoto M, Nagasawa M, Mogi K, Kikusui T, Ohtani N, et al. Urinary oxytocin as a noninvasive biomarker of positive emotion in dogs. *Horm Behav.* 2011; 60:239–243. [PubMed: 21689655]
59. Moscovice LR, Ziegler TE. Peripheral oxytocin in female chacma baboons relates to estrus and maintenance of sexual consortships. *Horm Behav.* 2012; 62
60. Nagasawa M, Kikusui T, Onaka T, Ohta M. Dog's gaze at its owner increases owner's urinary oxytocin during social interaction. *Horm Behav.* 2009; 55:434–441. [PubMed: 19124024]
61. Mitchell M, Kraemer D, Brennecke S, Webb R. Pulsatile release of oxytocin during the estrous cycle, pregnancy and parturition in sheep. *Biol Reprod.* 1982; 27:1169–1173. [PubMed: 7159660]
62. Tops M, Van Peer JM, Korf J, Wijers AA, Tucker DM. Anxiety, cortisol, and attachment predict plasma oxytocin. *Psychophysiology.* 2007; 44:444–449. [PubMed: 17371496]
63. Cyranowski JM, Hofkens TL, Frank E, Seltman H, Cai H-M, Amico JA. Evidence of dysregulated peripheral oxytocin release among depressed women. *Psychosom Med.* 2008; 70:967–975. [PubMed: 19005082]
64. Anzenberger G, Gossweiler H. How to obtain individual urine samples from undisturbed marmoset families. *Am J Primatol.* 1993; 31:223–230.
65. Koski SE, Burkart JM. Common marmosets show social plasticity and group-level similarity in personality. *Sci Rep.* 2015; 5
66. Snowdon CT, Cronin KA. Cooperative breeders do cooperate. *Behav Process.* 2007; 76:138.
67. Monteiro da Cruz, M. PhD Thesis. São Paulo: 1998. Dinâmica reprodutiva de uma população de saguis-donordeste (*Callithrix jacchus*) na estação ecológica de Tapacurá, PE.
68. Kostan KM, Snowdon CT. Attachment and social preferences in cooperatively-reared cotton-top tamarins. *Am J Primatol.* 2002; 57:131–139. [PubMed: 12111679]

69. Digby, L., Saltzman, W. Balancing cooperation and competition in callitrichid primates: examining the relative risk of infanticide across species. In: Ford, SM.Porter, LM., Davis, LC., editors. *The Smallest Anthropoids*. Springer; US: 2009. p. 135-153.
70. Yamamoto, ME., Arruda, MF., Alencar, AI., Sousa, MBC., Araújo, A. Mating systems and female–female competition in the Common marmoset, *Callithrix jacchus*. In: Ford, SM.Porter, LM., Davis, LC., editors. *The Smallest Anthropoids*. Springer; US: 2009. p. 119-133.
71. Yamamoto ME, Araujo A, Arruda MdF, Lima AK, Siqueira JdO, Hattori WT. Male and female breeding strategies in a cooperative primate. *Behav Process*. 2014; 109(Part A):27–33.
72. French JA, Inglett BJ. Female–female aggression and male indifference in response to unfamiliar intruders in lion tamarins. *Anim Behav*. 1989; 37(Part 3):487–497.
73. Stevenson MF, Poole TB. An ethogram of the commonmarmoset (*Callithrix jacchus jacchus*): general behavioural repertoire. *Anim Behav*. 1976; 24:428–451. [PubMed: 820223]
74. Lazaro-Perea C, Castro CSS, Harrison R, Araujo A, Arruda MF, Snowdon CT. Behavioral and demographic changes following the loss of the breeding female in cooperatively breeding marmosets. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol*. 2000; 48:137–146.
75. Barrett J, Abbott DH, George LM. Extension of reproductive suppression by pheromonal cues in subordinate female marmoset monkeys, *Callithrix jacchus*. *J Reprod Fertil*. 1990; 90:411–418. [PubMed: 2250240]
76. Abbott DH. Behavioral and physiological suppression of fertility in subordinate marmoset monkeys. *Am J Primatol*. 1984; 6:169–186.
77. Ziegler TE, Sousa MBC. Parent–daughter relationships and social controls on fertility in female common marmosets, *Callithrix jacchus*. *Horm Behav*. 2002; 42:356–367. [PubMed: 12460595]
78. Melo P, Gonçalves B, Menezes A, Azevedo C. Socially adjusted synchrony in the activity profiles of common marmosets in light–dark conditions. *Chronobiol Int*. 2013; 30:818–827. [PubMed: 23767997]
79. Weisman O, Zagoory-Sharon O, Feldman R. Oxytocin administration to parent enhances infant physiological and behavioral readiness for social engagement. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2012; 72:982–989. [PubMed: 22795645]
80. Feldman R. Parent–infant synchrony: biological foundations and developmental outcomes. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci*. 2007; 16:340–345.
81. Feldman R. Bio-behavioral synchrony: a model for integrating biological and microsocial behavioral processes in the study of parenting. *Parent Sci Pract*. 2012; 12:154–164.
82. Weller L, Weller A, Avinir O. Menstrual synchrony: only in roommates who are close friends? *Physiol Behav*. 1995; 58:883–889. [PubMed: 8577884]
83. Weller L, Weller A, Roizman S. Humanmenstrual synchrony in families and among close friends: examining the importance of mutual exposure. *J Comp Psychol*. 1999; 113:X261–X268.
84. Nagasawa M, Mitsui S, En S, Ohtani N, Ohta M, Sakuma Y, et al. Oxytocin–gaze positive loop and the coevolution of human–dog bonds. *Science*. 2015; 348:333–336. [PubMed: 25883356]

HIGHLIGHTS

- We investigate urinary oxytocin as a function of bond strength in marmoset dyads.
- Strongly bonded dyads show synchronized oxytocin fluctuations over time.
- Dyad-specific effects occur independently of dyad composition.
- Oxytocin synchrony may be associated with psychological consequences of bonding.

Fig. 1.

Bond strength in different dyad types. Variation in mean dyadic levels of affiliation (dyadic bond strength) in 5 breeder–breeder, 18 breeder–helper, and 7 helper–helper dyads. Mean dyadic affiliation is significantly higher in breeder–breeder dyads compared to the other dyad types.

Fig. 2.

Temporal correlation of urinary OT in two dyads. OT levels (log pg OT/mg Crt) in a strongly bonded (A) and a weakly bonded (B) dyad; both dyads are composed of a female breeder (solid lines) and a male helper (dashed lines). Dyadic OT synchrony values for A and B are 0.79 and -0.41 , respectively.

Fig. 3.

Positive link between dyadic bond strength and OT synchrony. The pattern shows a similarly strong trend for breeder–breeder (dots, solid red line; R^2 linear=0.582) as well as helper–helper dyads (squares, dashed green line; R^2 linear = 0.713), but a weaker trend for mixed breeder–helper dyads (triangles, dotted purple line; R^2 linear= 0.170).

Table 1

Permutation-based linear model results table. Analysis of the influence of dyadic bond strength (mean dyadic affiliation) and dyad type on dyadic OT synchrony in group-living marmoset dyads. Dyad type levels are coded as BB (breeder–breeder), BH (breeder–helper), and HH (helper–helper). Parameter estimates: factor levels with 0 are compared with remaining factor levels. Bold: $p < 0.05$.

Model factor	F	df	p-Value	Factor level	Estimate	p
Dyadic bond strength	9.84	1	0.004		10.14	0.004
Dyad type	2.90	2	0.075	BH	-0.39	0.024
				HH	0.03	0.361
				BB	0	0
Dyadic bond strength * dyad type	0.89	2	0.424	BH	-2.90	0.322
				HH	-4.24	0.286
				BB	0	0