



# UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

***This is an author version of the contribution published on:***

*Questa è la versione dell'autore dell'opera:*

*[Animal Behaviour, online first, 10.1016/j.anbehav.2016.10.031]*

***The definitive version is available at:***

*La versione definitiva è disponibile alla URL:*

*[<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003347216302822>]*

14 **Acoustic communication within ant societies and its mimicry by**  
15 **mutualistic and socially parasitic myrmecophiles**

16  
17 K Schönrogge<sup>1\*</sup>, F. Barbero<sup>2</sup>, L.P. Casacci<sup>2</sup>, J Settele<sup>3</sup>, JA Thomas<sup>4</sup>  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 1. Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, MacLean Building, Benson Lane, Wallingford, OX10  
23 8BB, UK

24  
25 2. Department of Life Sciences and Systems Biology, University of Turin, Via Academia  
26 Albertina, 10123, Turin, Italy

27  
28 3. UFZ, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Department of Community Ecology,  
29 Theodor-Lieser-Str. 4, 06120 Halle, Germany

30  
31 4. Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Oxford, South Parks Rd, OX1 3PS, United  
32 Kingdom  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41  
42 \* Corresponding author:

43 K. Schönrogge ([ksc@ceh.ac.uk](mailto:ksc@ceh.ac.uk)), Tel: +44 (0)1491 838800, Fax: +44 (0)1491 692424  
44

45 Running title: Acoustic communication in ant – non-ant interactions  
46

47 Word Count: 5390 (excl. references)  
48

49 Abstract:

50 This review focusses on the main acoustic adaptations that have evolved to enhance social  
51 communication in ants. We also describe how other invertebrates mimic these acoustic  
52 signals in order to coexist with ants in the case of mutualistic myrmecophiles, or, in the case  
53 of social parasites, corrupt them in order to infiltrate ant societies and exploit their resources.  
54 New data suggest that the strength of each ant-myrmecophile interaction leads to distinctive  
55 sound profiles and may be a better predictor of the similarity of sound between different  
56 myrmecophilous species than their phylogenetic distance. Finally, we discuss the  
57 evolutionary significance of vibrations emitted by specialised myrmecophiles in the context of  
58 ant multimodal communication involving the use of chemical and acoustic signals in  
59 combination and identify future challenges for research including how new technology might  
60 allow a yet better understanding of the study systems.

61

62

63 Keywords: Acoustic communication, ants, mutualists, social parasites, social structure

64

65 Introduction

66 Efficient communication to coordinate the actions of up to a million specialised nestmates is  
67 fundamental to the success of social insects, especially ants. Various modes of signalling  
68 have been identified, including the release of semio-chemicals, visual behavioural displays  
69 involving movement or posture, tactile interactions, and the comparatively poorly studied use  
70 of acoustic signals (Hölldobler & Wilson, 1990, 2009). As hotspots of resources in their  
71 environment, ants fiercely defend their colonies using a wide range of weapons (e.g. gland  
72 secretions, mandibles, sting), which are deployed in the manner of co-ordinated attacks by  
73 legions of intercommunicating workers. Nevertheless, ant nests are also magnets for other  
74 organisms that have evolved means to overcome the hostility of the host ants. Thus, an  
75 estimated ~10,000 invertebrate species live as obligate social parasites of ants, able to  
76 penetrate and exploit the resources within host colonies in order to complete their life-cycle  
77 (Thomas, Schönrogge, Elmes, 2005). The large majority of these adaptations evolved in  
78 many separate lines, especially among Coleoptera, Diptera, Lepidoptera and other  
79 Hymenoptera, from a ten-times greater number of commensals or mutualists (Fiedler, 1998;  
80 Hölldobler & Wilson, 1990; Nash & Boomsma, 2008; Pierce et al., 2002; Thomas,  
81 Schönrogge et al., 2005). All these myrmecophiles show morphological, behavioural,  
82 chemical or acoustic adaptations to interact with ants (Cottrell, 1984; Donisthorpe, 1927;  
83 Hinton, 1951; Lenoir, D'Ettorre, Errard, & Hefetz, 2001; Malicky, 1969; Wasmann, 1913;  
84 Wheeler, 1910; Witek, Barbero, & Marko, 2014). Armour, stealth and the secretion of  
85 attractive food rewards are frequently sufficient for unspecific or facultative myrmecophiles to  
86 access the enemy-free spaces of ants. However, the subversion of the ants' chemical and/or  
87 acoustic signalling is generally required to enable true social parasites (*sensu* Nash &  
88 Boomsma, 2008) to live for long periods as undetected intruders in close contact with their  
89 hosts.

90 A key element of successful co-habitation in ant nests is to circumvent the host's ability to  
91 differentiate between nestmates and intruders. Nestmate recognition is a dynamic process,  
92 primarily based on the detection of distinctive species- or colony-specific cocktails of  
93 cuticular hydrocarbons (CHC) covering the surface of all individuals (Hölldobler & Wilson,  
94 1990; Howard, 1993; vander Meer & Morel, 1998; Winston, 1992). Social interactions such  
95 as allogrooming ensure an exchange between the CHC mixtures among nestmates and give  
96 rise to a shared CHC *gestalt* odour (vander Meer & Morel, 1998). The role that chemical  
97 communication and nestmate recognition have in maintaining the cohesion of ant societies  
98 and those of other social insects has been subject to extensive study, with excellent recent  
99 reviews, for example by Martin & Drijfhout (2009) and van Wilgenburg, Symonds, & Elgar  
100 (2011): The deployment of chemical communication by obligate social parasites to subvert  
101 host recognition systems is equally well reviewed (e.g. Lenoir et al., 2001; von Thienen,  
102 Metzler, Choe, & Witte, 2014).

103 In contrast, the function, the origin and role of acoustic signals in ants and their corruption by  
104 social parasites are much less well studied. In this review, we therefore focus on the state of  
105 the art concerning acoustic signaling in ants, and then consider the acoustic signaling of  
106 obligate and facultative myrmecophiles. In both cases we emphasize the insights that have  
107 resulted from recent technological advances that allow unalarmed ants and their guests to  
108 be recorded and to receive broadcasts of their acoustic signals under semi-natural  
109 conditions (Barbero, Thomas, et al., 2009; Riva, Barbero, Bonelli, Balletto, Casacci, in  
110 press).

111 We first examine ant sound producing organs and convergent adaptations that allow non-ant  
112 organisms to mimic and subvert ant–ant communications, focussing on advances in  
113 knowledge since the reviews by Hölldobler & Wilson (1990), Fiedler (1998), Pierce and  
114 colleagues (2002), Thomas and colleagues (2005) and Nash & Boomsma (2008), or covered  
115 cursorily by Witek and colleagues (2014). We then review recent insights concerning the ant  
116 acoustic signals themselves and their corruption by social parasites. This includes both the

117 morphological adaptations to produce acoustic signals, the behavioural responses to them,  
118 and thus the impact on ant – social parasite/guest interactions. Much of this builds on the  
119 pioneering work of Markl (1965, 1967), DeVries (1991a, 1991b), Hölldobler, Braun,  
120 Gronenberg, Kirchner, & Peeters (1994) and Kirchner (1997). Finally we present new data  
121 relating the intimacy of interactions of lycaenid butterfly larvae to phylogeny and the similarity  
122 of acoustic signalling.

### 123 *Acoustic signalling in ants*

124 The use of acoustics, whether through receiving pressure waves through the air (i.e. sounds  
125 *stricto sensu*) or substrate vibrations, is a common means of communication in insects,  
126 whose functions include defence, displays of aggression, territorial signalling and mate  
127 attraction (Bennet-Clark, 1998; Gerhardt & Huber, 2002). Its advantage as a signal over  
128 chemical volatiles lies in instantaneous reception that pinpoints a distant, but exact, location  
129 to the receiver, for example in social insects to attract help (Markl, 1965, 1967; Roces,  
130 Tautz, & Hölldobler, 1993). The physics, use and effects of substrate-borne vibrations of  
131 ants and other insects are comprehensively reviewed by P.S. Hill (2009). A simple form  
132 involves “drumming”, where the substrate is tapped by part of the exoskeleton to produce  
133 vibrations. Drumming is employed by many ant taxa, but at least four of the eleven  
134 subfamilies also stridulate by rasping a ‘plectrum’ across a ‘file’ (*pars stridens*), both  
135 chitinous organs being located on opposite segments of the anterior abdomen (see Fig. 1 k-  
136 o, u-y) (Barbero, Thomas, Bonelli, Balletto, & Schönrogge, 2009b; Golden & P.S. Hill, 2016;  
137 Ruiz, Martinez, Martinez, & Hernandez, 2006). Although these stridulations produce air-  
138 borne (as well as substrate-borne) pressure waves that are audible to the human ear, it  
139 remains uncertain whether ants can perceive sound as pressure waves through the air  
140 (Hickling & Brown, 2000, 2001; Roces & Tautz, 2001). In contrast, there is no controversy  
141 about the ants’ ability to perceive substrate vibrations and two types of sensor have been  
142 proposed to receive substrate vibrations: campaniform sensilla measuring the tension in the

143 exoskeleton; and the subgenual organ, a spherical arrangement of sensory cells in the tibia,  
144 as described from *Camponotus ligniperda* (Gronenberg, 1996; Menzel & Tautz, 1994).

145 Most studies that measure insect acoustics have used accelerometers, moving coil- or  
146 particle velocity microphones, often with phase inversion focussing on the vibrational part of  
147 the signal rather than pressure waves through the air. Hereafter in this review we use the  
148 term “sound” *sensu lato* in its broadest sense, as we do the terms: calls, vibrations, vibro-  
149 acoustics and stridulations.

150 Early studies suggested that acoustic signals were a minor means of communication among  
151 ants, largely confined to activities outside the nest and mainly signalling alarm or calls for  
152 rescue, for instance when parts of nests collapse (Markl 1965, 1967). Due to a perceived  
153 preponderance of stridulatory organs among soil nesting ant species, Markl (1973)  
154 hypothesised that stridulation evolved initially as a burial/rescue signal when volatile  
155 chemicals would be ineffective, whereas substrate borne vibrations would at least travel  
156 short distances. However, this is not supported by Golden and P.S. Hill (2016), who showed  
157 that stridulation organs have evolved independently multiple times in ants. In addition,  
158 whereas Markl (1973) suggested that they would probably become vestigial over time in  
159 arboreal ant species, due to the rarity of burial by soil, there was instead a strong positive  
160 association between the presence of functional stridulation organs and the possession of an  
161 arboreal life–style (Golden & P.S. Hill, 2016).

162 Nestmate recruitment is the most frequently reported function for ant–ant acoustic signalling.  
163 For example, outside the nest, *Atta cephalotes* uses vibratory signals to attract foraging  
164 workers towards newly found food sources (Roces & Hölldobler 1995). The same authors  
165 also observed that in the presence of parasitic phorid flies, foragers used acoustics to recruit  
166 minor workers for defence, thus also employing vibrations as alarm signals (Roces &  
167 Hölldobler, 1995, 1996). Finally, although created by a scraper and file organ located on the  
168 first gastric tergite and the post-petiole, Tautz and colleagues (1995) observed that

169 vibrations travelled the length of the body to the mandibles, aiding the cutting of soft young  
170 leaf tissue by stiffening it. Behavioural experiments, however, suggest that this is a  
171 secondary effect and that communication is the main function for these vibrations (Roces &  
172 Hölldobler, 1996).

173 It has recently become clear that acoustic signals are also used to transmit more abstract  
174 information, including a species' identity or an individual's caste and status (Barbero,  
175 Thomas et al., 2009; Casacci et al., 2013; Ferreira, Cros, Fresneau, & Rybak, 2014). For  
176 example, modern molecular analyses revealed the neotropical ponerine ant species,  
177 *Pachycondyla apicalis*, to be a species complex of five cryptic lineages. The stridulations of  
178 three largely sympatric lineages are also distinctive, suggesting that morphological  
179 characters on the *pars stridens* differ in length, width and ridge gap in each lineage (Ferreira,  
180 Cros, Fresneau, & Rybak, 2014; Wild, 2005). By contrast, two allopatric lineages had very  
181 similar acoustics, suggesting disruptive selection on this trait where sympatric overlap is  
182 high.

183 Acoustic patterns also signal caste and hierarchical status in at least two genera of  
184 Myrmicinae ants: *Myrmica* (Barbero, Thomas et al., 2009) and *Pheidole* (Di Giulio et al.,  
185 2015). In both taxa, the queens produce distinctive stridulations which, when played back to  
186 kin workers, elicit additional 'royal' protective behaviours compared with responses to worker  
187 signals (Barbero, Bonelli, Thomas, Balletto, & Schönrogge, 2009; Barbero & Casacci, 2015;  
188 Barbero, Thomas et al., 2009; Casacci et al., 2013; Ferreira, Poteaux, Delabie, Fresneau, &  
189 Rybak, 2010). In addition, in *Pheidole pallidula* the soldier and minor worker castes also  
190 make distinctive vibroacoustic signals (Di Giulio et al., 2015). Unlike *Pachycondyla* species,  
191 little inter-specific variation was detected in either the queen- or worker-sounds made by  
192 closely-related sympatric species of *Myrmica* (Barbero et al., 2012; Barbero, Thomas et al.,  
193 2009; Thomas, Schönrogge, Bonelli, Barbero, & Balletto, 2010), which are instead clearly  
194 demarcated by unique hydrocarbon profiles (Elmes, Akino, Thomas, Clarke, & Knapp,



195 2002). Although the young stages of tested ants are mute (e.g. DeVries, Cocroft, & Thomas,  
196 1993), Casacci and colleagues (2013) found that acoustic signalling appears to act as a  
197 substitute for other forms of communication in developing *Myrmica* pupae. The various  
198 stages of ant brood, from egg to pupa, are afforded ascending levels of priority based on  
199 tactile and chemical cues (Brian, 1975). Most are mute, but the older “brown”, sclerotised  
200 pupae of *Myrmica* species produce calls, emitted as single pulses, similar to those of  
201 workers (Casacci et al. 2013). This coincides with a presumed reduced ability to secrete  
202 brood recognition pheromones during this period, and brown pupae that were experimentally  
203 silenced fell significantly behind their mute white siblings in social standing.

#### 204 *Acoustic signals of myrmecophiles*

205 Derived acoustic signals that enhance interactions with ants are increasingly being  
206 confirmed in both juvenile and adult stages of myrmecophiles. To date, most studies involve  
207 riodinid and, especially, lycaenid butterfly larvae and pupae (e.g. Barbero, Thomas et al.,  
208 2009; DeVries, 1990, 1991a; Pierce et al., 2002). However, similar phenomena were  
209 recently described from adults of a socially parasitic beetle, *Paussus favieri* (Di Giulio et al.,  
210 2015), where males and females emit mimetic stridulations using a row of scrapers on the  
211 proximal abdominal segment rasping across a file located on the hind femora (see Fig. 1p-t).

#### 212 *Stridulation organs*

213 With a few exceptions, an ability to produce calls occurs after the third larval moult in riodinid  
214 and lycaenid larvae, coinciding with the development of chemical ‘ant organs’, which  
215 perhaps suggests they act synergistically (DeVries, 1991a). In most riodinids, acoustic  
216 signals are generated by grooved vibratory papillae. These are typically found in pairs on the  
217 prothorax, and grate against specialised epicranial granulations when the larva rotates its  
218 head (see Fig 1a-e), especially when walking or under attack, generating low amplitude  
219 substrate-borne calls (DeVries, 1991a). The tribe Eurybiini lacks vibratory papillae; instead,

220 caterpillars generate calls by scraping teeth on a prothoracic cervical membrane against the  
221 epicranial granulations in at least some mutualists or entomophagous predators of ant-  
222 tended Homoptera (DeVries & Penz, 2002; Travassos, DeVries, & Pierce, 2008). The  
223 detection of dedicated organs in lycaenid larvae that produce calls has been elusive, apart  
224 from a file-and-scaper described between the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> abdominal segments of *Arhopala*  
225 *madytus* (C. J. Hill, 1993) and a putative organ in *Maculinea rebeli* larvae (see Fig.1fg). In  
226 other species strong substrate-borne vibrations (and apparently weak air-borne sounds) may  
227 be generated by muscular contractions of the abdomen, which compress air through the  
228 tracheae to produce distinctive rhythms and intensities in the manner of a wind instrument,  
229 as described by Schurian and Fiedler (1991) for *Polyommatus dezinus*. These vibroacoustic  
230 signals range from low background calls punctuated by pulses in mutualists (DeVries,  
231 1991a) to the grunts, drumming and hisses of the host-specific *Jalmenus evagoras*  
232 (Travassos & Pierce, 2000), to the mimetic calls of *Maculinea* larvae (Barbero, Bonelli et al.,  
233 2009; DeVries et al., 1993; Sala, Casacci, Balletto, Bonelli, & Barbero, 2014).

234 In contrast, the pupae of all lycaenids studied (Pierce et al., 2002) and a minority of riodinids  
235 (DeVries, 1991a; Downey & Allyn, 1973; 1978; Ross, 1966) have a well-developed file-and-  
236 scaper organ (two pairs in the case of riodinids) situated between opposite segments of the  
237 abdomen, that emit substrate- and air-borne calls often audible to humans (see Fig 1h-j). In  
238 lycaenids, the plate against which teeth are rubbed may be complex, consisting of tubercles,  
239 reticulations or ridges (Alvarez, Munguira, & Martinez-Ibanez, 2014).

#### 240 *Acoustic signalling in ant–myrmecophile interactions*

241 Evidence that the acoustics of myrmecophiles are adaptive to their interactions with ants has  
242 progressed from correlative studies to two experimental approaches: muting the  
243 myrmecophile or recording and playing back their calls to undisturbed ant colonies.

244 First, DeVries (1991c) showed that fewer ants attended larvae of the mutualistic riodinid  
245 *Thisbe irenea* that had been artificially silenced compared with controls that were able to

246 call, establishing that at least one function of riodinid calls is to attract ants. Similarly,  
247 Travassos and Pierce (2000) demonstrated that pupae of the lycaenid *Jalmenus evagoras*  
248 stridulated more frequently in the presence of *Iridomyrmex anceps* ants, and attracted and  
249 maintained a larger number of guards than muted ones. The calls convey the pupa's value  
250 as a provider of nutritious secretions to the ants, which does however, represent a significant  
251 cost to the pupae. Tended pupae have been shown to lose 25% of weight and take longer to  
252 eclose than untended ones (Pierce, Kitching, Buckley, Taylor, & Benbow, 1987). In further  
253 behavioural experiments Travassos and Pierce (2000) showed that pupae used acoustic  
254 signalling to adjust the number of attendant ants. They provided a path from an *I. anceps*  
255 nest to signalling pupae and scored the rate of worker movement in relation to signal  
256 strength once the pupa was discovered. This appears to be an important fitness component  
257 evolved to attract no more than an adequate number of ant guards against enemy attacks.  
258 The larvae of *J. evagoras* produce more varied acoustic signals than pupae - grunts, hisses  
259 and drumming – and are also heavily attended and guarded by their mutualist ant (Pierce et  
260 al., 2002). Hisses are emitted briefly after encountering a worker, whereas grunts are  
261 produced throughout ant attendance. The ability of *J. evagoras* juveniles to produce distinct  
262 vibrations, some probably with different functions, suggests the evolution of a finely-tuned  
263 acoustic system of communication with their hosts, which might be elucidated using play-  
264 back experiments.

265 In parasitic interactions with ant colonies, the clearest evidence to date that some acoustic  
266 signals are mimetic involves the highly specialized species of the *Myrmica* ant - *Maculinea*  
267 butterfly and *Pheidole* ant - *Paussus* beetle systems. Initially, DeVries and colleagues (1993)  
268 showed that the calls made by larvae of four *Maculinea* species differed from those of  
269 phytophagous lycaenids in showing distinctive pulses that resembled the stridulations of  
270 *Myrmica* worker ants. This was the first suggestion of mimicry of an adult host attribute by  
271 the caterpillars, which appeared to be genus- rather than species-specific. The insects in  
272 early experiments were unavoidably alarmed, being held with forceps during the recording,

273 but a similar genus-specific result was later obtained using modern equipment and  
274 unstressed ants and butterflies. Both the pupae and larvae of *Maculinea* species closely  
275 mimicked three attributes of their hosts' acoustic signals: dominant frequency, pulse length,  
276 pulse repetition frequency (Barbero, Bonelli et al., 2009, Barbero, Thomas et al., 2009).  
277 However, the calls of both stages were significantly more similar to queen ant calls than they  
278 were to worker calls, despite each being generated in a different way (see Fig.1f-j).  
279 Behavioural bioassays, where the calls of butterflies and ants were played back to  
280 unstressed *Myrmica* workers, revealed that the calls of juvenile *Maculinea*, especially those  
281 of pupae, caused workers to respond as they do to queen ant calls. Both types of acoustic  
282 stimuli caused worker ants to aggregate, antennate the source of sound, and show  
283 significantly higher levels of guarding behaviour than was elicited in response to worker ant  
284 calls (Barbero, Thomas et al., 2009).

285 Similar, but more sophisticated communication, was recently described between the carabid  
286 beetle *Paussus favieri*, an obligate social parasite in all stages of its life-cycle, and their host  
287 ant *Pheidole pallidula* (Di Giulio et al., 2015). Here the adult beetle can generate three types  
288 of call when it stridulates, which respectively mimic the calls made by the queens, the  
289 soldiers and the minor worker caste of its host. These calls elicit a range of responses when  
290 played back to worker ants, consistent with the intruder's more diverse activities (compared  
291 to juvenile *Maculinea*) in different parts of the host's society and nest. Thus *P. favieri*'s  
292 various stridulations can elicit recruitment, including digging (rescue) behaviour, as well as  
293 the enhanced level of 'royal' (queen ant) protection observed towards *Maculinea* pupae and  
294 larvae.

295 [insert Figure 1]

#### 296 *Larval acoustic signals and phylogeny in the Lycaenidae*

297 Various authors (e.g. DeVries, 1991a, 1991b; Fiedler, 1998; Pech, Fric, Konvicka, & Zrzavy,  
298 2004; Pellissier, Litsios, Guisan, & Alvarez, 2012; Pierce et al., 2002) have analysed the

299 evolution of myrmecophily in lycaenids and riodinids, including social parasitism in the  
300 Lycaenidae, and most concluded that it also provided a template for diversification and  
301 radiation in these species-rich families. Pierce and colleagues (2002) argued convincingly  
302 that social parasitism (including entomophagy of the domestic Hemiptera of ants) has  
303 evolved independently in at least 20 lineages.

304 The analysis of acoustics as a parameter in evolutionary studies of these taxa was  
305 pioneered by DeVries (1991a, 1991b). In seminal early papers, DeVries (1991a, 1991b)  
306 found that only lycaenids and riodinids that interacted with ants produced calls, while several  
307 non myrmecophilous members of the tribe Eumaeini were silent. Subsequent studies and  
308 reviews confirmed this pattern (e.g. Fiedler, Seufert, Maschwitz, & Idris, 1995) and provided  
309 evidence of the use of lycaenid calls in enhancing the interaction with ants (Pierce et al.,  
310 2002; Barbero, Thomas et al., 2009, Sala et al. 2014). However, some lycaenid and riodinid  
311 larvae and pupae also emit sounds when disturbed by putative predators or parasitoids,  
312 even if ants are absent. In addition, other species classed as having no interaction with ants  
313 do emit sound (e.g. Alvarez et al., 2014; Downey & Allyn, 1973; 1978; Fiedler, 1992, 1994;  
314 Schurian & Fiedler, 1991). The most recent study, by Riva and colleagues (in press), found  
315 that lycaenid sounds are highly specific and are emitted by both non- and myrmecophilous  
316 species. Calls by species that are least associated with ants consist of shorter and more  
317 distant pulses relative to those of species that are highly dependent on them.

318 Here we further explore the hypothesis that the strength of ant-myrmecophile interactions  
319 (using Fiedler's 1991 definitions) leads to characteristic sound profiles that may be a better  
320 predictor of the similarity of sound between species than their phylogenetic distance. We  
321 present a new analysis of the acoustic profiles made by 13 species of European lycaenids,  
322 ranging from highly integrated 'cuckoo' social parasites (*Maculinea alcon*, *Ma. rebeli*) via one  
323 host-specific mutualist (*Plebejus argus*) and a spectrum of generalist myrmecophiles, to  
324 species for which little or no interaction is known (*Lycaena* spp.). The 13 species (see Fig. 2)  
325 are a subset of the commensal or mutualistic species used by Riva and colleagues (in

326 press), with three species of *Maculinea* added to represent the two levels of intimate  
327 integration found in this socially parasitic genus (Thomas, Schönrogge et al., 2005).

328 Fourth instar caterpillars were recorded using customized equipment, as described by Riva  
329 and colleagues (in press). We analyzed recordings of three individuals per species,  
330 randomly selecting two trains of five pulses in each trace. Fourteen sound parameters were  
331 measured using Praat v. 5.3.53 (Boersma & Weenink, 2013). These included the lower and  
332 higher quartiles of the energy spectrum (Hz), power (dB<sup>2</sup>), intensity (dB), the root-mean-  
333 square intensity level (dB) and the relation of the frequency peak energy to the call total  
334 energy (%). Two temporal variables were measured from the oscillogram: the duration of the  
335 pulse (s) and the Pulse Rate (calculated as  $1/t_{\text{start}(x)} - t_{\text{start}(x+1)}$ ; s-1). Six additional variables  
336 were estimated on each pulse by inspection of power spectra: the frequency of the first,  
337 second and third peak amplitudes (Hz), the intensity of the first two peaks (dB) and the  
338 center of gravity (Hz).

339 Hierarchical Cluster analyses was performed on a matrix of normalized Euclidean distances  
340 over sound parameters, averaged by individual using unweighted pair-group average  
341 (UPGMA) in Primer v. 6.1.12 (Primer-E Ltd.). A two-sample *t* - test was used to compare  
342 differences between group distances. To test whether species differences reflect degrees of  
343 myrmecophily, we used Phylogenetic Regression as implemented in the library “phyreg”  
344 (Grafen, 1989) using R (R Core Team, 2015). Principal components, derived by PCA on log-  
345 transformed sound parameters, were correlated with the degree of myrmecophily while  
346 controlling for phylogenetic relatedness among species. To assemble a working phylogeny,  
347 we used cytochrome oxidase subunit 1 (COI) sequences of the 13 lycaenid species from two  
348 recent studies on the Romanian and Iberian butterflies (Dinca et al., 2015; Dinca, Zakharov,  
349 Hebert, & Vila, 2011). Geneious Pro 4.7.5 (Biomatters, <http://www.geneious.com/>) was used  
350 to align COI sequences and to produce a neighbor-joining (NJ) tree. We also included in the  
351 phylogeny *Hamearis lucina* (Riodinidae) and *Pieris rapae* (Pieridae) as outgroups.

352 Two trees for species' phylogenetic distance and for the similarity of acoustic profiles are  
353 presented in Figure 2, together with the score for myrmecophily of each species. Similarities  
354 in sound profiles neatly match the spectrum of observed strengths and specificities in  
355 myrmecophily across the study species, much more closely than does phylogeny. Overall,  
356 PC1 of the acoustic parameters explained 56% and PC2 a further 27% of variation, and both  
357 were significantly correlated with the differences in myrmecophilous relationships (PC1:  $F_{1,13}$   
358 = 11.146,  $P = 0.005$ ; PC2:  $F_{1,13} = 6.959$ ,  $P = 0.020$ ) after accounting for phylogeny using  
359 phylogenetic regression.

360 It is apparent that the sound profiles of *Ma. rebeli* and *Ma. alcon* (average Euclidean  
361 distance ( $\pm 1SD$ ) between *Ma. rebeli* and *Ma. alcon* =  $1.65 \pm 0.14$ ) are far removed from all  
362 other species, including from their congeners *Ma. arion* and *Ma. teleius* (Barbero, Bonelli et  
363 al., 2009; Sala et al., 2014). Indeed, the mean Euclidean distances in the acoustic signals of  
364 *Ma. alcon* or *Ma. rebeli* from other lycaenid species are among the highest measured to date  
365 (mean Euclidean acoustic distance of *Ma. alcon* vs. lycaenids other than *M. rebeli*:  $7.41 \pm$   
366  $1.00$ ; *Ma. rebeli* vs lycaenids other than *Ma. alcon*:  $7.66 \pm 1.01$ ; see also Riva et al. in press).  
367 This is consistent with the intimate level of social integration these species achieve within  
368 host ant nests, an association that is so close that in times of shortage the ants kill their own  
369 brood to feed to these 'cuckoos' in the nest (Thomas, Elmes, Schönrogge, Simcox, &  
370 Settele, 2005). It is also notable that the acoustics of *Plebejus argus*, the only host-specific  
371 myrmecophile among the mutualistic species, is less similar to its nearest relative *Plebejus*  
372 *argyrognomon*, and appears to converge with the two 'predatory' *Maculinea* social parasites  
373 even though its 'host' ant, *Lasius niger*, has no known stridulation organs and belongs to a  
374 different subfamily to *Myrmica* (mean Euclidean acoustic distance of *P. argus* vs. *P.*  
375 *argyrognomon*:  $4.33 \pm 0.30$ ; *P. argus* vs *M. arion*:  $2.51 \pm 0.55$ ; paired  $t$  test:  $t_{16} = -8.723$ ,  $P <$   
376  $0.001$ ; distance of *P. argus* vs. *Ma. teleius*:  $3.79 \pm 0.28$ ; paired  $t$  test:  $t_{16} = -3.963$ ,  $P = 0.001$ ).  
377 *Scolitantides orion* perhaps represents selection in the opposite direction to *P. argus*, being  
378 less host specific than its ancestry or relatives might suggest, as, less convincingly, may

379 *Polyommatus icarus*. Yet despite *L. coridon* and *L. bellargus* being close congeners, sounds  
380 emitted by *L. bellargus* are much more similar to those produced by *P. argyrognomon*  
381 (belonging to the same myrmecophilous category - 3) rather than to *L. coridon* (mean  
382 Euclidean acoustic distance of *L. coridon* vs *L. bellargus*:  $3.87 \pm 0.15$ ; *P. argyrognomon* vs *L.*  
383 *bellargus*:  $1.54 \pm 0.20$ ; paired *t* test:  $t_{16} = 27.775$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). A possible, but untested,  
384 explanation is that this reflects a similar disruptive selection via acoustics to that described in  
385 sympatric lineages of the ant *Pachycondyla*, since the juveniles of these congeneric  
386 butterflies overlap largely in distribution, sharing the same single species of foodplant and  
387 often the same individual plant.

388 However, given the small number of species studied, we caution against over-interpreting  
389 the apparent patterns depicted in Figure 2, and suggest they be tested by comparative  
390 behavioural experimentation. We also recognise that vibrations of less- or non-  
391 myrmecophilous lycaenids (and other taxa) may have very different functions, such as  
392 repelling natural enemies (Bura, Fleming, & Yack, 2009; Bura, Rohwer, Martin, & Yack,  
393 2011). We tentatively suggest that ancestral species in the Lycaenidae were preadapted to  
394 myrmecophily through an ability to make sounds, and that once behavioural relationships  
395 with ants evolved, the selection regime changed resulting in adaptive mimetic sound profiles,  
396 at least among obligate myrmecophiles.

397 [insert Figure 2]

### 398 *Conclusions & Future Research*

399 Ants are known to sometimes use multiple cues to moderate kin behaviour, for example by  
400 combining posturing, tactile and chemical interactions to convey complex or sequential  
401 information and to elicit particular responses between members of their society (Hölldobler &  
402 Wilson, 1990). To date little is known of how acoustic signalling might interact with other



403 means of communication, and less still of whether myrmecophiles manipulate behaviour  
404 using multiple cues.

405 Sound may be used synergistically with other modes of signalling. Hölldobler and colleagues  
406 (1994) studied the role of audible vibrational signals made by the Ponerine ant *Megaponera*  
407 *foetens*, a raider of termite colonies, in the context of trail following and column building.  
408 They found that stridulations were emitted only during disturbances and for predator  
409 avoidance. It is also known that *M. foetens* has a distinctive pheromone to signal alarm  
410 (Janssen, Bestmann, Hölldobler, & Kern, 1995). These observations suggest that vibrations  
411 may be used to qualify a general alarm signal that is chemical, but again this requires formal  
412 testing. This is in contrast to the observations by Casacci and colleagues (2013) described  
413 above where acoustic signalling appears to replace chemical and tactile signal apparently  
414 with the same function of signalling rank, but this is not truly a case of multimodal  
415 communication.

416 To date, no direct evidence exists for the behavioural consequences of full synergistic  
417 multimodal communication involving acoustics. Yet the interactions of *Maculinea* butterfly  
418 larvae and their *Myrmica* host ant societies illustrate the importance of both chemical and  
419 acoustic mimicry. Here, the acceptance (or rejection) of larvae as members of their host  
420 colony appears to be based entirely on a mimetic mixture of chemical secretions, but on this  
421 cue alone intruders are treated simply like the low-ranking kin brood (Akino, Knapp, Thomas,  
422 & Elmes, 1999; Thomas et al., 2013; Thomas, Schönrogge et al., 2005). It is the ability  
423 simultaneously to emit acoustic calls that mimic adult hosts, and furthermore mimic queen  
424 sounds, that is believed to explain the observed priority 'royal' behaviour that workers  
425 regularly afford to social parasites, giving them a status that exceeds that of large ant larvae.  
426 Not only do these brood parasites gain priority in the distribution of food by nursery workers  
427 to the extent that workers feed younger kin ant brood to the *Maculinea* larvae when food is  
428 short, but they are also carried ahead of kin ant brood when moving nest or during rescues

429 (Elmes, 1989; Gerrish, 1994; Thomas, Schönrogge, et al., 2005). Anecdotal observations of  
430 the manipulation of *Paussus favieri* by the beetle *Pheidole pallidula* suggests a similar  
431 chemical-acoustic mechanism (Di Giulio et al., 2015), but as with ant-ant communication  
432 itself, the putative use of acoustics in multimodal communication requires rigorous testing.  
433 About 10,000 species of invertebrates from 11 orders are estimated have evolved  
434 adaptations to infiltrate ant societies and live as parasites inside nests (Hölldobler & Wilson,  
435 1990). Current studies have largely focussed on the family Lycaenidae among the  
436 Lepidoptera and a few selected species of Coleoptera. While the study systems used today  
437 provide some variety in the type of interactions with their host ants, there is clearly a vast  
438 variety still to be discovered to understand respective roles of signalling modes and the  
439 social interactions in ants and other social insects.

440 The important role that acoustic signalling has in ant- and other social insect societies is well  
441 established and it is perhaps unsurprising that other, interacting species show adaptations  
442 that relate to the hosts acoustic traits. In only a few cases, however, has the role of vibro-  
443 acoustics in mediating myrmecophile - host interactions been investigated experimentally.  
444 The modalities of signal production, transmission and reception remain largely unknown for  
445 most species of myrmecophiles or indeed their hosts, but the greatest future challenge is to  
446 understand how different modes of signalling interact. Social insects are well known to  
447 interpret stimuli in a context-dependent manner, where the same stimulus can trigger a  
448 different behaviour when encountered under different circumstances (Hölldobler & Wilson  
449 1990). Other aspects of insect social behaviour have been subject to sophisticated and  
450 successful experimentation, and it should be possible to unravel this essential aspect of  
451 communication. Hunt and Richards (2013) suggested that understanding the suites of  
452 modalities in signalling enables a clearer view of the adaptive role of multimodal  
453 communication, and while that has been true for rare examples such as the honey bee  
454 waggle dance, research into understanding the role of ant acoustics is in its infancy. With the  
455 development of recording equipment that is portable, affordable, which can focus on

456 individuals and record sound and behaviour at the same time, our understanding of social  
457 interactions should become more specific. Such instruments, laser-vibrometers and hand-  
458 held “noses” for acoustic and chemical analyses, are being developed for engineering  
459 applications and could be deployed to record acoustic and chemical signals in behavioural  
460 science in the near future. Technological developments in both recording equipment and  
461 behavioural experimentation will allow designing studies following the same principles to  
462 investigate synergistic effects of multiple chemical signals.

#### 463 Acknowledgments

464 The authors collaborated within the project CLIMIT (Climate Change Impacts on Insects and  
465 their Mitigation), funded by Deutsches Zentrum für Luft-und Raumfahrt-Bundesministerium  
466 für Bildung und Forschung (Germany); Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) and  
467 Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (UK); Agence nationale de la  
468 recherche (France); Formas (Sweden); and Swedish Environmental Protection Agency  
469 (Sweden) through the FP6 BiodivERsA Eranet. Part of the research was funded by the  
470 Italian Ministry of Education, University, and Research (MIUR) within the project “A multitaxa  
471 approach to study the impact of climate change on the biodiversity of Italian ecosystems.”

#### 472 Ethical Note

473 The authors confirm that their work adheres to the ASAB/ABS and ARRIVE Guidelines. The  
474 guide to ethical information required for papers published in the journal has been consulted  
475 as well. *Maculinea* caterpillars were collected under permit from The Italian Ministry for the  
476 Environment (protocol numbers: 446/05. DPN/2D/2005/13993 & 0012494/PNM/2015).  
477 The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

#### 478 References

479 Akino, T., Knapp, J. J., Thomas, J. A., & Elmes, G. W. (1999). Chemical mimicry and host  
480 specificity in the butterfly *Maculinea rebeli*, a social parasite of *Myrmica* ant colonies.

481 *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B-Biological Sciences*, 266,  
482 1419-1426.

483 Alvarez, M., Munguira, M. L., & Martinez-Ibanez, M. D. (2014). Comparative study of the  
484 morphology of stridulatory organs of the Iberian lycaenid butterfly pupae  
485 (Lepidoptera). *Journal of Morphology*, 275, 414-430.

486 Barbero, F., Bonelli, S., Thomas, J. A., Balletto, E., & Schönrogge, K. (2009a). Acoustical  
487 mimicry in a predatory social parasite of ants. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 212,  
488 4084-4090.

489 Barbero, F., & Casacci, L. P. (2015). Butterflies that trick ants with sound. *Physics Today*,  
490 68, 64-65.

491 Barbero, F., Patricelli, D., Witek, M., Balletto, E., Casacci, L. P., Sala, M., & Bonelli, S.  
492 (2012). *Myrmica* ants and their butterfly parasites with special focus on the acoustic  
493 communication. *Psyche: A Journal of Entomology*, 2012, 1-11.

494 Barbero, F., Thomas, J. A., Bonelli, S., Balletto, E., & Schönrogge, K. (2009). Queen ants  
495 make distinctive sounds that are mimicked by a butterfly social parasite. *Science*,  
496 323, 782-785.

497 Bennet-Clark, H. C. (1998). Size and scale effects as constraints in insect sound  
498 communication. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 353, 407 - 419.

499 Boersma, P., & Weenink, D. (2013). Praat: Doing phonetics by computer [Computer  
500 program]. Version 5.3.53. (2013) retrieved from <http://www.praat.org>.

501 Brian, M. V. (1975). Larval recognition by workers of the ant *Myrmica*. *Animal Behaviour*, 23,  
502 745 - 756.

503 Bura, V. L., Fleming, A. J., & Yack, J. E. (2009). What's the buzz? Ultrasonic and sonic  
504 warning signals in caterpillars of the great peacock moth (*Saturnia pyri*).  
505 *Naturwissenschaften*, 96, 713-718.

506 Bura, V. L., Rohwer, V. G., Martin, P. R., & Yack, J. E. (2011). Whistling in caterpillars  
507 (*Amorpha juglandis*, Bombycoidea): sound-producing mechanism and function. *The*  
508 *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 214, 30-37.

509 Casacci, L. P., Thomas, J. A., Sala, M., Treanor, D., Bonelli, S., Balletto, E., & Schönrogge,  
510 K. (2013). Ant Pupae Employ Acoustics to Communicate Social Status in Their  
511 Colony's Hierarchy. *Current Biology*, 23, 323-327.

512 Cottrell, C. B. (1984). Aphytophagy in Butterflies - Its Relationship to Myrmecophily.  
513 *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 80, 1-57.

514 DeVries, P. J. (1990). Enhancement of symbioses between butterfly caterpillars and ants by  
515 vibrational communication. *Science*, 248, 1104-1106.

516 DeVries, P. J. (1991a). Call production by myrmecophilous riodinid and lycaenid butterfly  
517 caterpillars (Lepidoptera): morphological, acoustical, functional, and evolutionary  
518 patterns. *American Museum Novitates*, 3025, 1-23.

519 DeVries, P. J. (1991b). Evolutionary and Ecological Patterns in Myrmecophilous-Riodinid  
520 Butterflies. In C. R. Huxley & D. F. Cutler (Eds.), *Ant - Plant Interactions* (pp. 143-  
521 156). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

522 DeVries, P. J. (1991c). Mutualism between *Thisbe irenae* butterflies and ants, and the role of  
523 ant ecology in the evolution of larval - ant associations. *Biological Journal of the*  
524 *Linnean Society*, 43, 179 - 195.

525 DeVries, P. J., Cocroft, R. B., & Thomas, J. A. (1993). Comparison of acoustical signals in  
526 Maculea butterfly caterpillars and their obligate host *Myrmica* ants. *Biological*  
527 *Journal of the Linnean Society*, 49, 229-238.

528 DeVries, P. J., & Penz, C. M. (2002). Early stages of the entomophagous metelmark  
529 butterfly *Alesa amesis* (Riodinidae: Eurybiini). *Journal of the Lepidopterist's Society*,  
530 56, 265 - 271.

531 Di Giulio, A., Maurizi, E., Barbero, F., Sala, M., Fattorini, S., Balletto, E., & Bonelli, S. (2015).  
532 The Pied Piper: A Parasitic Beetle's Melodies Modulate Ant Behaviours. *PLoS One*,  
533 10, e0130541. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0130541

534 Dinca, V., Montagud, S., Talavera, G., Hernandez-Roldan, J., Munguira, M. L., Garcia-  
535 Barros, E., Hebert, P.D.N, & Vila, R. (2015). DNA barcode reference library for

536 Iberian butterflies enables a continental-scale preview of potential cryptic diversity.  
537 *Scientific Reports*, 5.

538 Dinca, V., Zakharov, E. V., Hebert, P. D. N., & Vila, R. (2011). Complete DNA barcode  
539 reference library for a country's butterfly fauna reveals high performance for  
540 temperate Europe. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, 278,  
541 347-355.

542 Donisthorpe, H. S. J. K. (1927). *The Guests of British Ants*. London: Routledge.

543 Downey, J. C., & Allyn, A. C. (1973). Butterfly ultrastructure: 1. Sound production and  
544 associated abdominal structures in pupae of Lycaenidae and Riodinidae. *Bulletin of*  
545 *the Allyn Museum*, 14, 1-47.

546 Downey, J. C., & Allyn, A. C. (1978). Sounds produced in pupae of Lycaenidae. *Bulletin of*  
547 *the Allyn Museum*, 48, 1-14.

548 Elmes, G. W. (1989). The effect of multiple queens in small groups of *Myrmica rubra* L.  
549 *Actes colloquia. Insectes Sociaux*, 5, 137 - 144.

550 Elmes, G. W., Akino, T., Thomas, J. A., Clarke, R. T., & Knapp, J. J. (2002). Interspecific  
551 differences in cuticular hydrocarbon profiles of *Myrmica* ants are sufficiently  
552 consistent to explain host specificity by *Maculinea* (large blue) butterflies. *Oecologia*,  
553 130, 525-535.

554 Ferreira, R. S., Cros, E., Fresneau, D., & Rybak, F. (2014). Behavioural Contexts of Sound  
555 Production in *Pachycondyla* Ants (Formicidae: Ponerinae). *Acta Acustica united with*  
556 *Acustica*, 100, 739-747.

557 Ferreira, R. S., Poteaux, C., Delabie, J. H., Fresneau, D., & Rybak, F. (2010). Stridulations  
558 reveal cryptic speciation in neotropical sympatric ants. *PLoS One*, 5, e15363.

559 Fiedler, K. (1991). Systematic, evolutionary, and ecological implications of myrmecophily  
560 within the Lycaenidae (Insecta: Lepidoptera: Papilionoidea). *Bonner Zoologische*  
561 *Monographien*, 31, 1-210

562 Fiedler, K. (1992). Notes on the biology of *Hypolycaena otbona* (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae) In  
563 West Malaysia. *Nachrichten des entomologischen Vereins Apollo, Frankfurt. NF*, 13,  
564 65-92.

565 Fiedler, K. (1994). Lycaenid butterflies and plants: is myrmecophily associated with amplified  
566 hostplant diversity? *Ecological Entomology*, 19, 79-82.

567 Fiedler, K. (1998). Geographical patterns in life-history traits of Lycaenidae butterflies -  
568 ecological and evolutionary patterns. *Zoology*, 100, 336 - 347.

569 Fiedler, K., Seufert, P., Maschwitz, U., & Idris, A. H. J. (1995). Notes on larval biology and  
570 pupal morphology of Malaysian *Curetis* butterflies(Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae).  
571 *Transactions of the Lepidopterological Society of Japan*, 45, 287-299.

572 Gerhardt, H. C., & Huber, F. (2002). *Acoustic communication in insects and anurans:*  
573 *common problems and diverse solutions*: University of Chicago Press.

574 Gerrish, A. R. (1994). *The influence of relatedness and resource investment on the*  
575 *behaviour of worker ants towards brood*. PhD, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK.

576 Golden, T. M. J., & Hill, P. S. (2016). The evolution of stridulatory communication in ants,  
577 revisited. *Insectes Sociaux*, 63, 309-319.

578 Grafen, A. (1989). The Phylogenetic Regression. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*  
579 *Society of London Series B-Biological Sciences*, 326, 119-157. doi:  
580 10.1098/rstb.1989.0106

581 Gronenberg, W. (1996). Neuroethology of ants. *Naturwissenschaften*, 83, 15-27.

582 Hickling, R., & Brown, R. L. (2000). Analysis of acoustic communication by ants. *Journal of*  
583 *the Acoustical Society of America*, 108, 1920-1929.

584 Hickling, R., & Brown, R. L. (2001). Response to "Ants are deaf". *Journal of the Acoustical*  
585 *Society of America*, 109, 3083.

586 Hill, C. J. (1993). The myrmecophilous organs of *Arhopala madytus* Fruhstorfer  
587 (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae). *Australian Journal of Entomology*, 32, 283-288.

588 Hill, P. S. (2009). How do animals use substrate-borne vibrations as an information source?  
589 *Naturwissenschaften*, 96, 1355-1371.

590 Hinton, H. E. (1951). Myrmecophilous Lycaenidae and other Lepidoptera - a summary.  
591 *Proceedings & Transactions of the South London Entomological and Natural History*  
592 *Society*, 1949-50, 111 - 175.

593 Hölldobler, B., Braun, U., Gronenberg, W., Kirchner, W. H., & Peeters, C. (1994). Trail  
594 Communication in the Ant *Megaponera foetens* (Fabr) (Formicidae, Ponerinae).  
595 *Journal of Insect Physiology*, 40, 585-593.

596 Hölldobler, B., & Wilson, E. O. (1990). *The ants*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer Verlag.

597 Hölldobler, B., & Wilson, E. O. (2009). *The superorganism: the beauty, elegance, and*  
598 *strangeness of insect societies*. London: WW Norton & Company.

599 Howard, R. W. (1993). Cuticular Hydrocarbons and Chemical Communication. In D. W.  
600 Stanley-Samuelson & D. R. Nelson (Eds.), *Insect Lipids: Chemistry, Biochemistry*  
601 *and Biology* (pp. 179 - 226). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

602 Hunt, J. H., & Richard, F.-J. (2013). Intracolony vibroacoustic communication in social  
603 insects. *Insectes Sociaux*, 60, 403-417.

604 Janssen, E., Bestmann, H. J., Hölldobler, B., & Kern, F. (1995). N,N-dimethyluracil and  
605 actinidine, two pheromones of the ponerine and *Megaponera foetens* (Fab.)  
606 (Hymenoptera: Formicidae). *Journal of Chemical Ecology*, 21, 1947 - 1955.

607 Kirchner W. H. (1997) Acoustical communication in social insects. In: M. Lehrer (ed)  
608 *Orientation and communication in arthropods* (pp. 273 – 300). Basel: Birkhäuser

609 Lenoir, A., D'Ettorre, P., Errard, C., & Hefetz, A. (2001). Chemical ecology and social  
610 parasitism in ants. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 46, 573-599.

611 Malicky, H. (1969). Versuch einer Analyse der ökologischen Beziehungen zwischen  
612 Lycaeniden (Lepidoptera) und Formiciden (Hymenoptera). *Tijdschrift voor*  
613 *Entomologie*, 112, 213 - 298.

614 Markl, H. (1965). Stridulation in Leaf-Cutting ants. *Science*, 149, 1392 - 1393.

615 Markl, H. (1967). Die Verständigung durch Stridulationssignale bei Blattschneiderameisen: I  
616 Die biologische Bedeutung der Stridulation. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Physiologie*,  
617 57, 299 - 330.



618 Markl, H. (1973, September). The evolution of stridulatory communication in ants.  
619 In *Proceedings of the International Congress IUSSI, London* (Vol. 7, pp. 258-265).

620 Martin, S. J., & Drijfhout, F. P. (2009). A review of ant cuticular hydrocarbons. *Journal of*  
621 *Chemical Ecology*, 35, 1151-1161.

622 Menzel, J. G., & Tautz, J. (1994). Functional morphology of the subgenual organ of the  
623 carpenter ant. *Tissue and Cell*, 26, 735 - 746.

624 Nash, D. R., & Boomsma, J. J. (2008). Communication between hosts and social parasites.  
625 In P. d'Ettore & D. P. Hughes (Eds.), *Sociobiology of Communication* (pp. 55 - 79).  
626 Oxford: Oxford University Press.

627 Pech, P., Fric, Z., Konvicka, M., & Zrzavy, J. (2004). Phylogeny of Maculinea blues  
628 (Lepidoptera : Lycaenidae) based on morphological and ecological characters:  
629 evolution of parasitic myrmecophily. *Cladistics-the International Journal of the Willi*  
630 *Hennig Society*, 20, 362-375.

631 Pellissier, L., Litsios, G., Guisan, A., & Alvarez, N. (2012). Molecular substitution rate  
632 increases in myrmecophilous lycaenid butterflies (Lepidoptera). *Zoologica Scripta*,  
633 41, 651-658

634 Pierce, N. E., Braby, M. F., Heath, A., Lohman, D. J., Mathew, J., Rand, D. B., & Travassos,  
635 M. A. (2002). The ecology and evolution of ant association in the Lycaenidae  
636 (Lepidoptera). *Annual Review of Entomology*, 47, 733-771.

637 Pierce, N. E., Kitching, R. L., Buckley, R. C., Taylor, M. F. J., & Benbow, K. F. (1987). The  
638 Costs and Benefits of Cooperation between the Australian Lycaenid Butterfly,  
639 *Jalmenus evagoras*, and Its Attendant Ants. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*,  
640 21, 237-248.

641 R Core Team. (2015). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna,  
642 Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from [https://www.R-](https://www.R-project.org)  
643 [project.org](https://www.R-project.org)

644 Riva, F., Barbero, F., Bonelli, S., Balletto, E., & Casacci, L. P. (in press). The acoustic  
645 repertoire of lycaenid butterfly larvae. *Bioacoustics*.

646 Roces, F., & Hölldobler, B. (1995). Vibrational communication between hitchhikers and  
647 foragers in leaf-cutting ants (*Atta cephalotes*). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*,  
648 37, 297-302.

649 Roces, F., & Hölldobler, B. (1996). Use of stridulation in foraging leaf cutting ants:  
650 Mechanical support during cutting or short range recruitment signal? *Behavioral*  
651 *Ecology and Sociobiology*, 39, 293-299.

652 Roces, F., & Tautz, J. (2001). Ants are deaf. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*,  
653 109, 3080-3083.

654 Roces, F., Tautz, J., & Hölldobler, B. (1993). Stridulations in leaf-cutting ants.  
655 *Naturwissenschaften*, 80, 521 - 524.

656 Ross, G. N. (1966). Life history studies on Mexican butterflies. IV. The ecology and ethology  
657 of *Anatole rossi*, a myrmecophilous metalmark (Lepidoptera: Riodinidae). *Annals of*  
658 *the Entomological Society of America*, 59, 985 - 1004.

659 Ruiz, E., Martinez, M. H., Martinez, M. D., & Hernandez, J. M. (2006). Morphological study of  
660 the Stridulatory Organ in two species of *Crematogaster* genus: *Crematogaster*  
661 *scutellaris* (Olivier 1792) and *Crematogaster auberti* (Emery 1869) (Hymenoptera :  
662 Formicidae). *Annales De La Societe Entomologique De France*, 42, 99-105.

663 Sala, M., Casacci, L. P., Balletto, E., Bonelli, S., & Barbero, F. (2014). Variation in butterfly  
664 larval acoustics as a strategy to infiltrate and exploit host ant colony resources. *PLoS*  
665 *One*, 9, e94341. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0094341

666 Schurian, K. G., & Fiedler, K. (1991). Einfache Methoden zur Schallwahrnehmung bei  
667 Bläulings-Larven (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae). *Entomologische Zeitschrift*, 101, 393-  
668 412.

669 Tautz, J., Roces, F., & Hölldobler, B. (1995). Use of a sound based vibratome by leaf-cutting  
670 ants. *Science*, 267, 84 - 87.

671 Thomas, J. A., Elmes, G. W., Schönrogge, K., Simcox, D. J., & Settele, J. (2005). Primary  
672 hosts, secondary hosts and 'non-hosts': common confusions in the interpretation of  
673 host specificity in *Maculinea* butterflies and other social parasites of ants. In J.

674 Settele, E. Kühn & J. A. Thomas (Eds.), *Studies on the ecology and conservation of*  
675 *butterflies in Europe, vol. 2.* (pp. 99 – 104). Sofia: Pensoft.

676 Thomas, J. A., Elmes, G. W., Sielezniew, M., Stankiewicz-Fiedurek, A., Simcox, D. J.,  
677 Settele, J., & Schönrogge, K. (2013). Mimetic host shifts in an endangered social  
678 parasite of ants. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, 280,  
679 20122336. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2012.2336> .

680 Thomas, J. A., Schönrogge, K., Bonelli, S., Barbero, F., & Balletto, E. (2010). Corruption of  
681 ant acoustical signals by mimetic social parasites: Maculinea butterflies achieve  
682 elevated status in host societies by mimicking the acoustics of queen ants.  
683 *Communicative & Integrative Biology*, 3, 169-171.

684 Thomas, J. A., Schönrogge, K., & Elmes, G. W. (2005). Specializations and Host  
685 Associations of Social Parasites of Ants. In M. D. E. Fellowes, G. J. Holloway & J.  
686 Rolff (Eds.), *Insect Evolutionary Ecology* (pp. 475 - 514). London: Royal  
687 Entomological Society.

688 Travassos, M. A., DeVries, P. J., & Pierce, N. E. (2008). A novel organ and mechanism for  
689 larval sound production in butterfly caterpillars: *Eurybia elvina*. *Tropical Lepidoptera*  
690 18, 20-23.

691 Travassos, M. A., & Pierce, N. E. (2000). Acoustics, context and function of vibrational  
692 signalling in a lycaenid butterfly-ant mutualism. *Animal Behaviour*, 60, 13-26.

693 van Wilgenburg, E., Symonds, M. R., & Elgar, M. A. (2011). Evolution of cuticular  
694 hydrocarbon diversity in ants. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 24, 1188-1198.

695 vander Meer, R. K., & Morel, L. (1998). Nestmate Recognition in Ants. In R. K. vander Meer,  
696 M. D. Breed, M. L. Winston & K. E. Espelie (Eds.), *Pheromone Communication in*  
697 *Social Insects* (pp. 79 - 103). Oxford: Westview Press.

698 von Thienen, W., Metzler, D., Choe, D.-H., & Witte, V. (2014). Pheromone communication in  
699 ants: a detailed analysis of concentration-dependent decisions in three species.  
700 *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 68, 1611-1627.

701 Wasmann, E. (1913). The ants and their guests. *Smithsonian Rep*, 1912, 455 - 474.

- 702 Wheeler, W. M. (1910). *Ants: their structure, development and behavior* (Vol. Vol. 9). New  
703 York: Columbia University Press.
- 704 Wild, A. L. (2005). Taxonomic revision of the *Pachycondyla apicalis* species complex  
705 (Hymenoptera: Formicidae). *Zootaxa*, 834, 1 - 25.
- 706 Winston, M. L. (1992). Semiochemicals and insect sociality. In B. D. Roitberg & M. B. Isman  
707 (Eds.), *Insect Chemical Ecology and Evolutionary Approach* (pp. 315 - 333). London:  
708 Chapman & Hall.
- 709 Witek, M., Barbero, F., & Marko, B. (2014). *Myrmica* ants host highly diverse parasitic  
710 communities: from social parasites to microbes. *Insectes Sociaux*, 61, 307-323.

711 Figures

712 Figure 1. The comparative morphology of sound production organs in myrmecophiles and  
713 host ants. (a-e) the riodinids *Synargis gela* and *Thisbe irenea* (Riodinidae); larva (f, g) and  
714 pupa (h-j) of the obligate lycaenid social parasite *Maculinea rebeli* and its adult host ant  
715 *Myrmica schencki* (k-o); the adult beetle *Paususs favieri* (p-t) and its host *Pheidole pallidula*  
716 (u-y). (a) Frontal view of *Synargis gela* head showing typical position of the riodinid vibratory  
717 papillae; (b) general view of *Thisbe irenea* anterior edge of segment T-1 showing a vibratory  
718 papilla (arrow) and the surface of the epicranium where the vibratory papilla strikes; (c) detail  
719 of the vibratory papilla showing the annulations on its shaft and the epicranial granulations;  
720 (d) enlarged view of the epicranial granulation and vibratory papilla; (e) details showing two  
721 sizes of epicranial granulations. (f) Position of (g) the presumed sound producing organ of  
722 *Maculinea rebeli* caterpillars and of its pupa (h), formed by a stridulatory plate (*pars stridens*)  
723 placed on the fifth abdominal segment and a file (*plectrum*) in the sixth abdominal segment.  
724 (k,p,u) Respective positions of the stridulatory organs of *Myrmica schencki*, *Paussus favieri*  
725 and *Pheidole pallidula*; the organs are composed of suboval *pars stridens* (l,q,v) with minute  
726 ridges (m,r,w) and a plectrum (n, x) consisting of a medial cuticular prominence (t,y) that  
727 originates from the posterior edge of the postpetiole in the two ant species or of a curved row  
728 of small cuticular spines in *P. favieri* (s,t). (a, modified by De Vries 1991; b-e modified by  
729 DeVries 1988; p-y modified by Di Giulio et al. 2015).

730

731 Figure 2. A diagram of the phylogeny (left) and the cluster analysis constructed from a matrix  
732 of pairwise normalized Euclidean distances of the sound profiles from three caterpillars of 13  
733 species of lycaenid. Symbols and values refer to the intensity of interaction of the lycaenid  
734 species with their host ants (0 = none; 4 = social parasite), following Fiedler (1991).


735

736

737

738

739 Figure 1:



740

741

742

743

744

745


746

747

748

749

750 Figure 2:



751