OPEN ACCESS

University of BRISTOL

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
10.1098/rspb.2018.1384

Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research
PDF-document

## University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research
### General rights

PROCEEDINGS OF
THE ROYAL SOCIETY B

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

# Behavioural Evidence for Polychromatic Ultraviolet Sensitivity in Mantis Shrimp

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1    **Behavioural Evidence for Polychromatic Ultraviolet Sensitivity in Mantis Shrimp**

2    **AUTHORS:** Michael J. Bok[1*], Nicholas W. Roberts[1], & Thomas W. Cronin[2]

3    [1] School of Biological Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 1TQ, UK

4    [2] Department of Biological Sciences, University of Maryland Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD 21250, USA.

5    [*] Corresponding author: mikebok@gmail.com

6

7    **POPULAR SUMMARY**

8         Mantis shrimp have spectacularly sophisticated eyes, with a number of unique elaborations

9    that stretch their visual capabilities far beyond our own, including deep into the ultraviolet (UV)

10   range. Bok *et al.*, 2018 uses trained and innate behavioural response experiments to show that mantis

11   shrimp are able to detect and discriminate various UV stimuli. Most notably, they respond

12   differentially to stimuli in the near-UVB (< 315 nm in wavelength) versus longer-wavelength UVA

13   stimuli. These UVB cues lie outside the discriminable range of most other animals and could afford

14   the mantis shrimp yet another covert visual signalling domain.

15

16   **KEYWODS:** Ultraviolet vision, Visual ecology, Mantis shrimp, Colour vision

17
18   **ABSTRACT**

19        Stomatopod crustaceans are renowned for their elaborate visual systems. Their eyes contain a plethora

20   of photoreceptors specialized for chromatic and polarization detection, including several that are sensitive to

21   varying wavelength ranges and angles of polarization within the ultraviolet (UV) range (< 400 nm).

22   Behavioural experiments have previously suggested that UV photoreception plays a role in stomatopod

23   communication, but these experiments have only manipulated the entire UV range. Here, using a behavioural

24   approach, we examine UV vision in the stomatopod *Haptosquilla trispinosa*. Using binary trained choice

25   assays as well as innate burrow choice experiments, we assessed the ability of *H. trispinosa* to detect and

26   respond to narrow-band LED stimuli peaking near 314 nm (UVB) versus 379 nm (UVA) in wavelength. We

27   find that *H. trispinosa* can discriminate these stimuli, and appears to display an aversive reaction to UVB

28   light, suggesting segregated behavioural responses to stimuli within the UV range. Furthermore, we find that

29    *H. trispinosa* can discriminate stimuli peaking near 379 nm versus 351 nm in wavelength, suggesting that

30    their wavelength discrimination in the UV is comparable to their performance in the human-visible range.

31

32    **BACKGROUND**

33          Stomatopods, or mantis shrimp, are well known for their aggressive predatory behaviour,

34    sophisticated social interactions, and colourful markings (**Figure 1A**) [1]. However, they have drawn the most

35    extensive scientific interest for their unusual and complex visual systems. Their eyes are modified from

36    typical malacostracan dichromatic, apposition compound eyes by a midband of specialized ommatidia that

37    horizontally bisects each eye (**Figure 1B**). Within this midband region, the photoreceptors are structurally and

38    physiologically adapted for the detection and discrimination of eight colour bands within the human-visible

39    range (400-700 nm), as well as linearly- and circularly-polarized light [2-5]. Furthermore, the midband

40    contains up to five types of ultraviolet (UV) photoreceptors, maximally sensitive to various wavelength ranges

41    of light below 400 nm [6-8], including a pair of UV-linear-polarization-sensitive photoreceptors [9]. These

42    UV photoreceptors are uniquely tuned to narrow wavelength ranges of UV light by filtering pigments in the

43    optical elements of the ommatidia derived from biological sunscreen compounds [10-12], suggesting the

44    potential for chromatic discrimination in the UV range.

45          Despite a robust understanding of stomatopod retinal physiology, little is known about how visual

46    information is processed and employed to initiate or mediate behavioural responses. Behavioural trained

47    choice foraging experiments have been performed at human-visible wavelengths in order to demonstrate

48    sensitivity to colour [13, 14], linear polarization [15, 16], and circular polarization [5]. Furthermore, results of

49    burrow-choice experiments have suggested that sensitivity to circularly polarized light may play a role in in

50    intraspecific communication [17]. Behavioural assays that test the UV range (< 400 nm) are thus far limited to

51    antagonistic encounter experiments that suggest stomatopods assess UV cues in territorial contests [18].

52    However, these experiments manipulated the entire UV range and did not examine the contribution of

53    individual UV receptor spectral types to stomatopod behavioural responses. It is not known whether the

54    multiple UV photoreceptor classes found in the stomatopod eye are used to make spectral discriminations.

55          The stomatopod *Haptosquilla trispinosa* has at least three spectral classes of UV-sensitive

56    photoreceptors located in the eighth retinular cells (R8s) of the midband (**Figure 1C-D**) [14]. Two of these

57    photoreceptor classes have segregated spectral sensitivity curves, with one photoreceptor class responding to

58　　light primarily in the UVA range (315-400 nm), and a second absorbing light strongly in the UVB range ($\leq$

59　　315 nm). Based upon these electrophysiological spectral sensitivity measurements, we hypothesized that *H.*

60　　*trispinosa* would be capable of detecting and discriminating UVA versus UVB stimuli. Here we present the

61　　results of trained predatory choice and innate burrow preference behavioural experiments in *H. trispinosa*. We

62　　show that these stomatopods are able to discriminate and behaviourally respond to UVA and near-UVB

63　　stimuli. Furthermore, our results suggest spectrally distinct roles for UVA versus UVB cues in stomatopod

64　　behaviour, possibly related to intraspecific communication.

65

66　　**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

67　　*Animals*

68　　　　　*Haptosquilla trispinosa* individuals were collected at the Lizard Island Research Station (Queensland,

69　　Australia, 14°40'43.9"S, 145°26'47.9"E) at 1 meter depth in May and June of 2012 (for trained choice tests)

70　　and in June 2014 (for the innate burrow preference tests). The individuals used in the trained choice

71　　experiments ranged in length from 23-36 mm, with a mean of 28.9 mm. The individuals used in the innate

72　　burrow choice experiments ranged in length from 21-37 mm, with a mean of 28.7 mm. They were kept for 1-5

73　　days in individual cups with daily water changes and regular feeding with small pieces of snail or crustacean

74　　meat until they were moved to the training or experimental setups.

75

76　　*Trained Choice Tests*

77　　　　　The trained choice test followed a similar approach to that of Thoen et al. [14]. The animals were

78　　housed in individual aquaria with artificial burrows constructed from plastic vials positioned in a sand bed and

79　　with constant seawater flow-through. The training and experimental apparatus was custom constructed by

80　　John Cataldi at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County MME Technical Service Center Machine Shop.

81　　It consisted of pair of submersible targets with a 3 mm hole in the centre connected to an above-water light

82　　emitting diode (LED) mount and controller by a pair of 10-cm-long, 3 mm diameter optical guides in

83　　blackened brass tubes (**Figure 1E, S1**). The stimuli were generated using one of three LEDs with maximum

84　　emission ($\lambda_{max}$) at 314.3 nm (UVB), 378.3 nm (UVA) and 351.1 nm (UVA-351) (**Figure 1E, inset**). Note that

85　　UVA refers to the 378.3 nm LED stimulus unless otherwise indicated. Wavelengths of light beyond 400 nm

86　　were blocked by a UV bandpass filter in the target head. Refer to **Figure S1** for diagrammatic representations

87  and technical details of the testing apparatus and the stimuli. The brightness of the LEDs were modulated by a

88  custom controller (**Figure S1E, S2A-B**).

89  The trained choice test exploited an innate predatory behaviour where *H. trispinosa* will lunge from

90  its burrow to attack a target. In the choice test trials, the animals were presented with a pair of targets and

91  trained to associate a food reward (shrimp or mollusc meat) with a UVA or UVB stimulus. Possible

92  confounds in brightness were controlled for by modulating the relative intensities of the two LED stimuli in

93  the trials. The intensity of each LED was randomized between five intensity settings in the UVA vs. UVB

94  experiments (Figure S2A) and between four settings in the UVA vs. UVA-351 experiment (Figure S2B).

95  Prior to the trials, individuals were first made accustomed to feeding from a single practice target,

96  presented alone and without any emitted UV stimuli. The underside of these training targets had a small

97  groove, not visible from the front, that a small piece of snail meat could be affixed to. The choice trial targets

98  used in the subsequent experimental rounds did not have this groove and never came in contact with food.

99  Individuals that learned to feed from the single training target were then split into cohorts of initially 12

100 randomized individuals, roughly balanced for even distributions of gender and size, to begin choice training.

101 The animals in each cohort were trained to associate a particular stimulus with a reward in a randomized

102 binary choice context against a second alternate stimulus. For training, a piece of food was affixed to the

103 underside of the correct training target. The two targets were positioned in the water, at a distance from the

104 burrow necessitating the animal to lunge fully from the burrow in order to collect the food. Once the animals

105 were feeding from the correct stimulus consistently, choice test trials were initiated.

106 Trials were carried out by first blocking the burrow entrance with an opaque plastic sheet so that

107 enthusiastic individuals were prevented from leaving the burrow until the targets were positioned properly.

108 Once the targets were in place, seawater that had contained thawing reward food (shrimp or snail muscle) was

109 poured broadly over the front of the sheet to alert and stimulate the animals with an odorant cue. The plastic

110 sheet was then lifted, and the animals were given two minutes to make a choice. Choices were scored when an

111 animal fully exited the burrow and touched one of the targets. Correct choices were rewarded by giving the

112 animal a piece of food on a feeding stick. Incorrect choices terminated the trial for that individual and the

113 targets were removed. If no choice was made, it was noted whether the animal extended its head from the

114 burrow to assess the target but never attacked, or did not emerge at all (**Figure S1B**). The experimenter

115 observed the trials on a camera viewscreen from behind masking material mounted on the LED controller.

116    Ambiguous responses were not rewarded, but were reviewed and scored from the recorded video. If the

117    animal did not clearly hit a target, or if it lunged between the targets, it was scored as a failure to participate.

118        Trials were carried out three to five times per day until each cohort reached 30 trials. Intermittent

119    binary training rounds were performed (as described above) once or twice a day, usually before the first trial

120    round of the day, in order to motivate and reinforce the behaviour. The cohort that was trained to choose UVA

121    from UVB was used for control experiments where they were presented with two identical UVA stimuli. This

122    same cohort was then used in an additional 30 trial experiment that asked the individuals to continue choosing

123    the UVA stimulus, but now against the UVA-351 stimulus. The initial experiments involving cohorts 1, 2, and

124    3 (UVA vs. UVB, UVB vs. UVA, and UVB vs. dark) were carried out simultaneously.  A second set of

125    experiments involving cohorts 4 and 1 (dark vs. UVB, and UVA vs. UVA-351) were performed

126    simultaneously following the initial three.  During the experiments, trials were performed throughout the day

127    and we alternated from one cohort to another after each trial round.

128        Upon the completion of the trials, correct, incorrect, and non-participatory outcomes were collated for

129    each individual (Table S1). An individual did not participate (DNP) if it assessed the targets but made no

130    choice. All individuals who never made a choice in a trial were removed from the dataset. In some cohorts,

131    this created the gender ratio imbalance reported in Table S1. The percent correct choices and percent

132    participation values for each individual were then averaged within each experimental cohort in order to

133    preform statistical analysis without pseudoreplication (**Table 1**, see additional details about statistical analysis

134    below).

135

136    *Innate Burrow Preference Tests*

137        The second set of experiments exploited innate cover-seeking behaviour in *H. trispinosa*. Naive

138    animals, assorted into four groups with roughly equivalent gender and body length distributions, were

139    introduced into the centre of a circular arena facing a pair of artificial burrows that emitted either UVA ($\lambda_{max}$ =

140    379.1 nm), UVB ($\lambda_{max}$ = 317.4 nm), or no light stimuli (**Figure 1G**).  Note that these stimuli differ slightly in

141    spectral properties from those in the trained choice tests despite being generated by the same LEDs because of

142    different optical components in their respective setups (**Figure S1, S2**).  In the experiment that tested UVA

143    versus UVB preference, the LEDs were modulated in order to produce stimuli of equivalent sum radiance

144    (**Figure S2C**). The stimuli were again generated by a pair of LEDs which illuminated a diffuser at the back of

145     the burrow, and passed through a 1 cm hole covered by a UV bandpass filter into the burrow. The stimuli

146     were randomized between the two burrows for each trial. The arena had a sand bottom and continuous water

147     flow-through entering from behind the animals and exiting through blackened air line tubes emerging through

148     the bottoms of the two artificial burrows. Refer to **Figure S1F-H and S2C** for diagrammatic representations

149     and technical details of the testing apparatus and the stimuli.

150         For each trial, an animal was loaded into a stoppered clear glass flask and introduced into the centre of

151     the arena with the flask's opening facing the two burrow options. The stopper was removed, and the animal

152     was given up to two minutes to make a choice (it typically required much less time).  Trials were observed by

153     the experimenter, positioned outside of the view of the arena, via a camera viewscreen. Choices were counted

154     when an individual moved directly from the flask into one of the burrows. In the event that the animal never

155     left the flask, never entered a burrow, or moved to an adjacent side of the arena before entering one of the

156     burrows, the trial was scored as a failure to participate. The sand at the bottom of the arena was stirred

157     between trials to obscure chemical cues.

158

159     *Statistical Analysis*

160         All statistical analyses were conducted in R (version 3.3.2 [19]). In the trained choice tests, correct,

161     incorrect, and non-participatory outcomes were recorded for each individual trial and were analysed using

162     generalized linear mixed model (GLMM) (lme4 package [20]). To assess the influence of the wavelength and

163     stimulus brightness on the choice of the individual, a single model was conducted on the binary response

164     variable using the fixed factors of wavelength, relative brightness level, and the interaction between these two

165     factors. We included the individual animal identity as a random term to control of the repeated measures per

166     animal. Single term deletions were used to reduce the model to its minimum form.

167         As brightness changes were found not to influence the choice of the animals, further analyses for

168     assessing the effect of the wavelength on choices were conducted using a one-sample Wilcoxon test. In each

169     experiment, the repeated results from the multiple trails per individual were averaged to provide a mean

170     proportion for a measure of successes for each individual (**Table S1**). These data were then compared for each

171     experiment against an expected mean of 0.5 (50% correct choices) based on a null hypothesis of the animals

172     not having the capability to differentiate between the different spectral contents of the stimuli (**Table 1**).

173           For the burrow preference tests, singe naïve individuals were tested once in each trial and a binomial

174   test was used to analyse if their pooled innate responses differed due to the different burrow illumination

175   stimuli.

176

177   **RESULTS**

178   *Trained Choice Tests*

179           Six experiments were performed testing the ability of *H. trispinosa* to learn to discriminate and

180   choose UVA ($\lambda_{max}$ = 378.3 nm) and UVB ($\lambda_{max}$ = 314.3 nm) stimuli (**Table 1, Figure 1F**). We found that

181   while Cohort 1 was able to choose the UVA versus the UVB stimulus at a significant rate (89.5% success;

182   Wilcoxon, V = 28, d.f. = 1, p = 0.022), Cohorts 2 and 3 were unable to differentiate between the UVB

183   stimulus versus the UVA stimulus (65.1% success; Wilcoxon, V = 25, d.f. = 1, p = 0.341), or versus a dark

184   stimulus (41.3% success; Wilcoxon, V = 10, d.f. = 1, p = 0.291). Attempts to train Cohort 4 to choose a dark

185   stimulus versus a UVB stimulus were also unsuccessful (58.8% success; Wilcoxon, V = 27, d.f. = 1, p =

186   0.234). Cohort 1 was then used in a control experiment where the stomatopods were presented with an

187   identical pair of UVA stimuli. The cohort's preference for the two stimuli was identical (46.1% preference for

188   the left target; Wilcoxon, V = 12, d.f. = 1, p = 0.799). Finally, Cohort 1 was tested to again choose UVA

189   versus a UVA-351 ($\lambda_{max}$ = 351.1) stimulus, only 27.2 nm apart in maximum emission. The cohort remained

190   able to choose the UVA stimulus at a significant rate (64.1% success; Wilcoxon, V = 35, d.f. = 1, p = 0.015).

191   See **Table S1** for choice and participation data for each individual in these experiments. Over all the tests, the

192   relative brightness of the stimuli did not have any effect on the choice of stimulus (GLMM, $\chi^2$ = 1.2552, d.f. =

193   2, p = 0.534), however there was a clear difference in how the animals responded to the spectral pairs

194   (GLMM, $\chi^2$ = 16.913, d.f. = 2, p < 0.001) (**Figure S3**). The full dataset used in the GLMM analysis can be

195   found in Supplementary Data File 1, with an explanation of its contents in the Supplemental Materials

196   document.

197           In the trained choice assays we observed a trend in participation related to the UVB stimuli.

198   Participation was markedly reduced in experiments where we attempted to train the stomatopods to choose the

199   UVB stimulus (UVB vs. UVA, 22.3% participation; UVB vs. dark, 45.3% participation) (**Table 1**). A similar

200   effect was also noted when a UVB stimulus was present as an alternative target stimulus (UVA vs. UVB,

201   56.5% participation, dark vs. UVB, 46.2% participation). When there was no UVB stimulus presented in the

202     experiment, the animals displayed an elevated rate of participation (UVA vs. UVA control, 95.7%

203     participation; UVA vs. UVA-351, 69.9% participation).

204          Males and females did not differ markedly in the percent correct choices in any of these experiments

205     (**Figure 2A**).  However, males invariably showed much lower participation than females when there was a

206     UVB stimulus present (**Figure 2B)** (males, 26.3% participation, n=17; females, 57.3% participation, n=17;

207     Wilcoxon, $W = 55.5$, d.f. = 1, $p < 0.001$).

208

209     *Innate Burrow Preference Tests*

210          In the innate burrow choice tests, *H. trispinosa* showed significant aversion both to UVA ($\lambda_{max}$ =

211     379.1 nm) and UVB ($\lambda_{max}$ = 317.4 nm) stimuli (**Figure 1H, Table 2**). When presented with a choice between

212     UV emitting burrows and a dark burrow, they chose the dark burrow at a significant rate: 83.3% preference

213     versus UVB (Binomial test, number of dark burrow choices = 35, number of choices = 42, $p < 0.001$), and

214     74.4% preference versus UVA (Binomial test, number of dark burrow choices = 32, number of choices = 43, p

215     $< 0.001$). Based on the apparently greater aversion to UVB stimuli observed in the trained choice tests, we

216     hypothesized that when given an intensity-matched choice between burrows emitting UVA versus UVB light,

217     *H. trispinosa* would prefer UVA emitting burrows. However, we found no significant preference in this case

218     (54.2% preference for UVB; Binomial test, number of UVB burrow choices = 13, number of choices = 24, p =

219     0.838). When both burrows were dark, *H. trispinosa* showed no significant side preference (55.0% preference

220     for the left burrow; Binomial test, number of left burrow choices = 11, number of choices = 20, p = 0.824).

221     We also observed depressed participation in the UVA versus UVB experiment (52.2%) compared to

222     experiments with a dark burrow option (UVA vs. dark, 80.8%; UVB vs. dark, 75.4%; and dark vs. dark,

223     74.1%).

224

225     **DISCUSSION**

226          The behavioural experiments demonstrate spectral discrimination within the UV range in the

227     stomatopod species *Haptosquilla trispinosa*, regardless of brightness cues (consistent with previous

228     experiments at human visible wavelengths showing that this species does not appear to use brightness cues

229     when making colour discriminations [14]). The results of the trained choice experiments demonstrated that *H.*

230     *trispinosa* could learn to choose a UVA stimulus against a UVB stimulus, but not *vice versa* (**Figure 1F,**

231    **Table 1**). This result could be interpreted as *H. trispinosa's* simply being unable to detect UVB light.

232    However, the experiments also revealed a depressed participation rate when we attempted to train the

233    stomatopods to choose a UVB stimulus, or simply when a UVB stimulus was presented as an alternate target

234    choice (**Figure 1F**). This observation led us to hypothesize that *H. trispinosa* could discriminate the UVB and

235    UVA stimuli from one another, but innately treated the UVB stimulus as an aversive cue and could therefore

236    not learn to associate it with a food reward. We confirmed the ability of *H. trispinosa* to detect UVB by the

237    innate burrow choice experiments, where we found that individuals consistently chose a dark burrow over a

238    UVB-emitting burrow (**Figure 1H, Table 2**). We further hypothesized that when given the choice of a UVA-

239    versus UVB-emitting burrow, the stomatopods would prefer the UVA-emitting burrow.  However, we instead

240    found that they had no preference and diminished participation in this case, suggesting that they simply do not

241    like any brightly lit burrows. Taken together, these experiments show that *H. trispinosa* can discriminate UVA

242    and UVB cues. However, they appear to treat the cues differently in the two behavioural contexts; being

243    averse to the UVB stimulus in predatory behaviours and avoiding both UVA and UVB in shelter seeking

244    behaviours. Furthermore, the depressed participation by males in the trained choice tests when the UVB

245    stimulus was present suggests at a sexually dimorphic response to UVB cues (**Figure 2**).

246         UV sensitivity and UV-cue-driven behaviours are common amongst animals (reviewed in [21]), but

247    the majority of examples involve UVA photoreception. Recently, behaviourally relevant UVB sensitivity has

248    begun to receive some attention [22-24]. For instance, thrips display a UVB-specific phototactic response for

249    an unknown purpose [22], and jumping spiders use UVA and UVB reflective patches in conjunction as sexual

250    signalling cues [23, 24]. Our results offer an aquatic example of UVB behavioural sensitivity, which is

251    somewhat surprising since UVB light is rapidly attenuated in water [21]. However, many stomatopods,

252    including *H. trispinosa*, live in shallow, clear tropical waters with abundant UVB irradiance.

253         It is not well understood how stomatopods process colour information, or whether UV photoreceptors

254    are integrated into the longer-wavelength colour processing system. The subset of photoreceptors responsible

255    for UV sensitivity (the R8s) project directly to the medulla, bypassing the lamina where the projections of the

256    R1-7 receptors (maximally sensitive to wavelengths of light between 400 and 700 nm) terminate, and where

257    spectral comparison is thought to be initiated [25].  Interestingly, we found that stomatopods could

258    discriminate cues within the UVA range that emitted light maximally at 378.3 nm (UVA) and 351.1 nm

259    (UVA-351), only 27.2 nm apart in maximum emission (**Figure 1F, Table 1**). This spectral discrimination

260   performance is comparable to the capabilities of this species at human-visible wavelengths [14]. Since only

261   the midband row 1 R8 absorbs strongly in this region, it is likely that this discrimination is facilitated in

262   conjunction with the third R8 receptor (maximally sensitive around 325 nm, **Figure 1C**, dashed grey line) or

263   the R1-7 receptors. One of these R1-7 receptors, the midband row 4 distal main rhabdom receptor, is

264   maximally sensitive at 420 nm but overlaps significantly in sensitivity with the row 1 R8, down to around 370

265   nm [8].  This suggests the potential for spectral comparison between the R8s and main rhabdom receptors in

266   the midband.

267         Recent wavelength discrimination experiments in *H. trispinosa* at human-visible wavelengths (400-

268   700 nm) have implied that stomatopods may be using a novel form of chromatic processing, recognizing

269   narrow bins of wavelengths in a manner that can be likened to a spectral barcode scanner [14]. Such a system

270   could rapidly encode and assess specific colour patterns, such as the resplendent markings found on many

271   species of mantis shrimp. It remains to be seen how the UV-sensitive photoreceptors would contribute to such

272   a chromatic processing system.  However, our results demonstrating UV discrimination and UVB-specific

273   aversion raises the exciting potential for the presence of UVB-encoded aggression cues on stomatopods that

274   could serve as a robust and covert means of identifying one another's intentions before coming to blows.

275

276   **ETHICS STATEMENT**

277         Research using *Haptosquilla trispinosa* was carried out under the supervision of the staff of Lizard

278   Island Research Station and with the following requisite permits: Australian Marine Parks (GBRMPA) permit

279   nos. G12/35005.1, G14/36625.1 and Fisheries Act no. 140763.

280   **DATA ACCESSIBILITY STATEMENT**

281         The datasets supporting this article have been uploaded as part of the supplementary material.

282   **COMPETING INTERESTS**

283         We have no competing interests.

284

285   **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

286   MJB designed the project, carried out the experiments, analyzed the data, and edited the manuscript. NWR

287   analyzed the data and edited the manuscript. TWC assisted in experiments, supervised the project, and edited

288   the manuscript.

289

303

304    **REFERENCES**

305    1.   Schram, F. R., S. T. Ahyong, S. N. Patek, P. A. Green, M. V. Rosario, M. J. Bok, T. W. Cronin, K. S.

306         Mead-Vetter, R. L. Caldwell, G. Scholtz, K. D. Feller, P. Abello. 2013. Subclass Hoplocarida

307         Calman, 1904: order stomatopoda Latreille, 1817) In: J. C. Von Vaupel Klein, M. Charmantier-

308         Daures, F. R. Schram, eds. *Treatise on zoology—anatomy, taxonomy, biology. The Crustacea*. Leiden:

309         Brill. 179-355.

310    2.   Cronin, T. W. and N. J. Marshall. 1989a. A retina with at least ten spectral types of photoreceptors in

311         a mantis shrimp. *Nature* **339**, 137–140.

312    3.   Cronin, T. W. and N. J. Marshall. 1989b. Multiple spectral classes of photoreceptors in the retinas of

313         gonodactyloid stomatopod crustaceans. *J. Comp. Physiol. A* **166**, 261–275.

314    4.   Marshall, J., T. W. Cronin and S. Kleinlogel. 2007. Stomatopod eye structure and function: a review.

315         *Arthropod Struct. Dev.* **36**, 420–448.

316    5.   Chiou, T.-H., S. Kleinlogel, T. Cronin, R. Caldwell, B. Loeffler, A. Siddiqi, et al. 2008. Circular

317         polarization vision in a stomatopod crustacean. *Curr. Biol.* **18**, 429–434.

318    6.  Cronin, T. W., N. J. Marshall, C. A. Quinn and C. A. King. 1994. Ultraviolet photoreception in mantis

319         shrimp. *Vis. Res.* **34**, 1443–1452.

320    7.  Marshall, J. and J. Oberwinkler. 1999. The colourful world of the mantis shrimp. *Nature* **401**, 873–

321         874.

322    8.  Thoen, H. H., T.-H. Chiou and N. J. Marshall. 2017. Intracellular Recordings of Spectral Sensitivities

323         in Stomatopods: a Comparison Across Species. *Int. Comp. Biol.* **57**, 1117-1129.

324    9.  Kleinlogel, S. and N. J. Marshall. 2009. Ultraviolet polarisation sensitivity in the stomatopod

325         crustacean *Odontodactylus scyllarus*. *J. Comp. Physiol. A* **195**, 1153–1162.

326    10. Bok, M. J., M. L. Porter, A. R. Place and T. W. Cronin. 2014. Biological Sunscreens Tune

327         Polychromatic Ultraviolet Vision in Mantis Shrimp. *Curr. Biol.* **24**, 1636–1642.

328    11. Bok, M. J., M. L. Porter and T. W. Cronin. 2015. Ultraviolet filters in stomatopod crustaceans:

329         diversity, ecology and evolution. *J. Exp. Biol.* **218**, 2055–2066.

330    12. Cronin, T. W., M. J. Bok, N. J. Marshall and R. L. Caldwell. 2014. Filtering and polychromatic vision

331         in mantis shrimps: themes in visible and ultraviolet vision. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci.*

332         **369**, 20130032.

333    13. Marshall, N. J., J. P. Jones and T. W. Cronin. 1996. Behavioural evidence for colour vision in

334         stomatopod crustaceans. *J. Comp. Physiol. A* **179**, 473–481.

335    14. Thoen, H. H., M. J. How, T.-H. Chiou and J. Marshall. 2014. A different form of color vision in

336         mantis shrimp. *Science* **343**, 411–413.

337    15. Marshall, J., T. W. Cronin, N. Shashar and M. Land. 1999. Behavioural evidence for polarisation

338         vision in stomatopods reveals a potential channel for communication. *Curr. Biol.* **9**, 755–758.

339    16. How, M. J., M. L. Porter, A. N. Radford, K. D. Feller, S. E. Temple, R. L. Caldwell, et al. 2014. Out

340         of the blue: the evolution of horizontally polarized signals in *Haptosquilla* (Crustacea, Stomatopoda,

341         Protosquillidae). *J. Exp. Biol.* **217**, 3425-3431.

342    17. Gagnon, Y. L., R. M. Templin, M. J. How and N. J. Marshall. 2015. Circularly Polarized Light as a

343         Communication Signal in Mantis Shrimps. *Curr. Biol.* **25**, 3074-3078.

344    18. Franklin, A. M., N. J. Marshall and S. M. Lewis. 2016. Multimodal signals: ultraviolet reflectance and

345         chemical cues in stomatopod agonistic encounters. *Royal Soc. Open Sci.* **3**, 160329.

346    19. R Core Team, R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing (R Foundation for

347        Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2013); www.R- project.org.

348    20. Bates, D., M. Maechler, B. Bolker and S. Walker (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using

349        lme4. *J. Stat. Softw.* **67**, 1-48.

350    21. Cronin, T. W. and M. J. Bok. 2016. Photoreception and vision in the ultraviolet. *J. Exp. Biol.* **219**,

351        2790–2801.

352    22. Mazza, C. A., M. M. Izaguirre, J. Curiale and C. L. Ballaré. 2010. A look into the invisible:

353        ultraviolet-B sensitivity in an insect (*Caliothrips phaseoli*) revealed through a behavioural action

354        spectrum. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **277**, 367–373.

355    23. Li, J., Z. Zhang, F. Liu, Q. Liu, W. Gan, J. Chen, et al. 2008. UVB-based mate-choice cues used by

356        females of the jumping spider *Phintella vittata*. *Curr. Biol.* **18**, 699–703.

357    24. Painting, C. J., G. Rajamohan, Z. Chen, H. Zeng and D. Li. 2016. It takes two peaks to tango: the

358        importance of UVB and UVA in sexual signalling in jumping spiders. *Animal Behaviour* 113: 137–

359        146.

360    25. Thoen, H. H., N. J. Strausfeld and J. Marshall. 2017b. Neural organization of afferent pathways from

361        the stomatopod compound eye. *J. Comp. Neurol.* 525: 3010–3030.

362    26. Bok, M. J. 2013. The Physiological, Ecological, and Evolutionary Basis of Polychromatic Ultraviolet

363        Sensitivity in Stomatopod Crustaceans. PhD thesis, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, USA.

364

365    **TABLES**

366

367    **Table 1. *Haptosquilla trispinosa* trained choice results.** The "exp. stimuli" column indicates the wavelength

368    that each cohort was trained to choose listed first. UVA, $\lambda_{max}$ = 378.3 nm; UVB, $\lambda_{max}$ = 314.3 nm; UVA-351,

369    $\lambda_{max}$ = 351.1 nm. *N*, number of individuals in each cohort. Percent participation (% part.) and percent correct

370    choices (% cor.) are calculated by averaging the percent participation and percent correct choices for each

371    individual in each experiment (see **Table S1** for full choice results for all individuals). P-values are calculated

372    using percent correct choices for each individual within each experiment in a Wilcoxon signed rank test with

373    continuity correction ($P_0$ = 0.5, $\alpha$ = 0.05).

| exp. stimuli | cohort | *N* | % part. | % cor. | Wilcoxon p-value | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| UVA vs. UVB | 1 | 7 | 56.5 | 89.5 | **0.0215** | * |
| UVB vs. UVA | 2 | 9 | 22.3 | 65.1 | 0.3411 | *ns* |
| UVB vs. dark | 3 | 8 | 45.3 | 41.3 | 0.2912 | *ns* |
| dark vs. UVB | 4 | 10 | 46.2 | 58.8 | 0.2340 | *ns* |
| UVA vs. UVA[a] | 1 | 7 | 95.7 | 46.1 (L) | 0.7988 | *ns* |
| UVA vs. UVA-351 | 1 | 8 | 69.9 | 64.1 | **0.0156** | * |

374    [a] In control experiments the same cue is present at both targets. "L" or "R" denote if the animal chose the left or right option.

375

376    **Table 2. *Haptosquilla trispinosa* burrow preference experimental results.** UVA, $\lambda_{max}$ = 379.1 nm; UVB,

377    $\lambda_{max}$ = 317.4 nm; P-values are calculated with a binomial test ($P_0$ = 0.5, $\alpha$ = 0.05).

| exp. stimuli | preferred | alternate | choices | DNP [b] | trials | % part. | % pref. | p-value | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| UVB vs. dark | 35 (dark) | 7 (UVB) | 42 | 10 | 48 | 80.8 | 83.3 | **1.51x10$^{-5}$** | * |
| UVA vs. dark | 32 (dark) | 11 (UVA) | 43 | 14 | 54 | 75.4 | 74.4 | **1.91x10$^{-3}$** | * |
| UVB vs. UVA | 13 (UVB) | 11 (UVA) | 24 | 22 | 46 | 52.2 | 54.2 | 0.838 | *ns* |
| dark vs. dark [a] | 11(L) | 9 (R) | 20 | 7 | 35 | 74.1 | 55.0 | 0.824 | *ns* |

378    [a] In control experiments the same dark cue is present at both burrow options. "L" or "R" denote if the animal chose the left or right option.

379    [b] Did not participate: Did not directly enter one of the choice burrows within the experimental period.

380

381    **FIGURES LEGENDS**

382

383    **Figure 1. *Haptosquilla trispinosa* UV behavioural assays.**

384    **(A)** *H. trispinosa* pictured in a natural burrow. Photo: Roy Caldwell. **(B)** An *H. trispinosa* eye with the dorsal

385    hemisphere (DH), ventral hemisphere (VH), and midband (MB) labelled. **(C)** Spectral sensitivities of the three

386    *H. trispinosa* UV sensitive photoreceptors, adapted from electrophysiological recordings in Thoen et al. [14].

387    UVA and UVB regions of the spectrum are indicated. **(D)** A diagrammatic cross section through the midband

388    of the eye. Ommatidial components: R1-7, retinular cells 1-7; R8s, retinular cell 8; CC, crystalline cone; Co,

389    cornea. R8 cell colour corresponds to spectral sensitivities in C, and their locations are inferred from typical

390    opsin expression patterns [10, 26] and UV filter pigment localization [11]. **(E-H)** Results of trained predatory

391    choice (E-F) and innate burrow preference (G-H) behavioural assays. E and G show simplified diagrams of

392    the respective experimental setups with normalized radiance spectra of their stimuli displayed to the left. Full

393    schematics and additional details can be found in **Figure S1**. Shaded colour regions correspond to R8 spectral

394    sensitivities in C. The bar graphs display average correct choice percent in the trained choice tests (**F**, black

395    bars) and burrow preference percent (**H**, black bars), as well as respective percent participation (thin, white

396    bars). Both bar graphs are labelled with circles indicating their respective stimuli corresponding to the spectral

397    plots in E and H. Black circles indicate a dark stimulus. Trained choice significance in E is calculated using a

398    Wilcoxon signed rank test with continuity correction from the percent correct choices for each individual in

399    the cohort ($P_0 = 0.5$, $\alpha = 0.05$; Table 1). Innate burrow preference significance in H is calculated with a

400    binomial test ($P_0 = 0.5$, $\alpha = 0.05$; Table 2).

401

402    **Figure 2. Male (blue bars) and female (red bars) correct choices (A) and participation (B) in trained**

403    **choice experiments from Figure 1F.** Symbol circles for tests are as in Figure 1F. Percentages are derived

404    from pooled choice data for each gender (Table S1).

405