

1 **Small and large bumblebees invest differently when learning about flowers**

2

3 Elisa Frasnelli^{1,2,7}, Théo Robert^{1,3,7}, Pizza Ka Yee Chow^{1,4}, Ben Scales¹, Sam Gibson¹,
4 Nicola Manning¹, Andrew O. Philippides⁵, Thomas S. Collett^{6,8}, Natalie Hempel de Ibarra^{1,8,}
5 ⁹

6

7 ¹ Centre for Research in Animal Behaviour, Psychology, University of Exeter, Washington
8 Singer Laboratories, Perry Road, Exeter EX1 4QG, UK

9 ² Current address: School of Life Sciences, Lincoln University, Joseph Banks Laboratories,
10 Green Lane, Lincoln LN6 7TS, UK

11 ³ Current address: Centre for Behaviour and Evolution, Biosciences Institute, Newcastle
12 University, Henry Wellcome Building, Framlington Place, Newcastle upon Tyne NE2 4HH,
13 UK

14 ⁴ Current address: Comparative Cognition Research Group, Max Planck Institute for
15 Ornithology, Eberhard Gwinner Strasse, 82319 Seewiesen, Germany

16 ⁵ School of Engineering and Informatics, University of Sussex, Chichester building, Falmer,
17 Brighton BN1 9QJ, UK

18 ⁶ School of Life Sciences, University of Sussex, John Maynard Smith Building, Falmer,
19 Brighton BN1 9QG, UK

20 ⁷ These authors contributed equally.

21 ⁸ Correspondence to: N.Hempel@exeter.ac.uk, T.S.Collett@sussex.ac.uk

22 ⁹ Lead contact: Natalie Hempel de Ibarra (N.Hempel@exeter.ac.uk)

23

24 **Summary**

25 Honeybees [1] and bumblebees [2] perform learning flights on leaving a newly discovered
26 flower. During these flights, bees spend a portion of the time turning back to face the flower
27 when they can memorise views of the flower and its surroundings. In honeybees, learning
28 flights become longer, when the reward offered by a flower is increased [3]. We show here
29 that bumblebees behave in a similar way and we add that bumblebees face an artificial flower
30 more when the concentration of the sucrose solution that the flower provides is higher. The
31 surprising finding is that a bee's size determines what a bumblebee regards as a 'low' or a
32 'high' concentration and so affects its learning behaviour. The larger bees in a sample of
33 foragers only enhance their flower facing when the sucrose concentration is in the upper
34 range of the flowers that are naturally available to bees [4]. In contrast, smaller bees invest
35 the same effort in facing flowers, whether the concentration is high or low, but their effort is

36 less than that of larger bees. The way in which different sized bees distribute their effort
37 when learning about flowers parallels the foraging behaviour of a colony. Large bumblebees
38 [5, 6] are able to carry larger loads and explore further from the nest than smaller ones [7].
39 Small ones with a smaller flight range and carrying capacity cannot afford to be as selective
40 and so accept a wider range of flowers.

41

42

43 **Results and Discussion**

44 Bumblebees forage individually for flowers that can supply nectar and pollen. In contrast to
45 honeybees, which communicate the location of rewarding flowers to each other within the
46 hive [8], each bumblebee keeps the results of its exploration to itself [9]. On encountering a
47 flower, honeybees and bumblebees decide for themselves whether the flower is worth
48 exploiting, and, if it is, they learn the flower's appearance and location. Some features of the
49 flower and its surroundings are learnt during the bee's approach [10, 11], but whether this
50 information is worth retaining can only be determined after the bee has sampled what the
51 flower offers. The bee's assessment of the flower influences the learning flights that occur in
52 both honeybees and bumblebees after leaving a flower. Bumblebees during these learning
53 flights turn back to face the flower [1, 2, 12, reviewed by 13]. From this vantage point they
54 can record views of the flower's appearance and the flower's visual surroundings for
55 guidance on their return to it [14]. Honeybees [3], perform longer learning flights for greater
56 rewards. The situation in bumblebees turns out to be complex in that the bee's size
57 determines how it responds to flowers offering different rewards.

58 The size of *Bombus terrestris* workers varies considerably (thorax width: 2.5-6.9mm
59 [6]), with bees of different sizes operating within different constraints [reviewed by 15].
60 Small bees tend to be involved more with tasks inside the nest [16-18]. Those that do forage
61 return to the nest with lighter loads than do larger bees [6] and have on average a lower nectar
62 foraging rate than that of larger ones [5]. Estimates of flight capacity across different species
63 of bees indicate that larger bees have a larger foraging range and can home from greater
64 distances than smaller ones [7]. It is likely that the same holds true across foraging
65 bumblebees of different sizes. Larger bumblebees also have the benefits of resisting the cold
66 better [19] than small ones, and of bigger and more sensitive eyes [20, 21], which improves
67 the visual range over which they can detect floral patches and individual flowers [22, 23].
68 Potentially, these attributes also allow large bees to forage early in the day, at low light
69 levels, and exploit the abundant nectar to be found then [24, 25]. Taken together, these

70 attributes mean that large bumblebees are predisposed to be the main contributors to a
71 colony's store of nectar, thus outweighing the costs to the colony of raising them [26]. The
72 data presented here argue that large bees learn the locations and features of highly rewarding
73 flowers, but tend to ignore less profitable ones. In contrast, small bees learn equally well
74 about flowers of varying profitability, but expend less effort when doing so than large bees.

75

76 **Learning flights and flower facing of bumblebees sampling different concentrations of** 77 **sucrose**

78 Experiments were conducted in a greenhouse [2] on bees that left their nest for the first time.
79 After bees had performed a learning flight at the nest they were caught and placed on an
80 artificial flower that contained sucrose of one of four concentrations (10%, 20%, 30% or 50%
81 w/w). The bees' learning flights when they left the flower after drinking from it were
82 recorded with a downward-facing video camera that captured a scene comprising the bees,
83 the flower and three black cylinders that marked the flower's position. These recordings
84 focus on the initial part of a learning flight when bees are likely to memorise the appearance
85 of an individual flower and its immediate surroundings [12]. Outside the recording area bees,
86 fly much further and higher and may record the broader surroundings of a flower patch at
87 which they have foraged [27].

88 A sample flight from a bee that drank 50% sucrose solution (Figure 1A) shows the
89 bee turning back and flying towards and facing the flower several times before leaving the
90 area surveyed by the camera. In this flight, most flower facing occurred close to the flower,
91 when the bee was flying directly towards it. Frames during which the body is facing within \pm
92 10° of the centre of the flower, which we term 'flower facing', are emphasised by yellow
93 circles in plots of the bee's trajectory (Figure 1A), and in plots of its body orientation relative
94 to the flower and its distance from the flower (Figures 1B, C).

95 The duration of the bees' learning flights increased with the concentration of the
96 sucrose that the bees drank (Spearman Ranks, $\rho = 0.24$, $p = 0.009$, $n = 115$). The proportion
97 of a learning flight in which bees faced the flower also increased with the concentration of
98 sucrose, as we show by plotting for each concentration the distributions of the bees' body
99 orientation relative to the centre of the flower (Figure 2A). Flower facing was greatest when
100 bees had drunk 50% sucrose solution and dropped at lower sucrose concentrations. To
101 prevent later confusion, we note that we avoided using small bees in this initial experiment.

102 After additional experiments had alerted us to the significance of bee size, we
103 explored the details of flower facing more fully using just two sucrose concentrations (20%

104 and 50%), but with a larger sample of bees of varying sizes, as measured by the width of the
105 bee's thorax. As in Figure 2A, the pattern of flower facing varied with sucrose concentration
106 (Figure 2B). There was a prominent peak in the direction of the flower when bees had drunk
107 50% sucrose solution, but a broad plateau instead of a peak after drinking 20% solution.
108 Despite this striking visual difference, bees were too variable for the difference to be
109 significant when each bee provided one data point for each bin (Figure 2B).

110 This larger data set also confirmed the indication from the example flight (Figure 1A)
111 that most flower facing occurs when the bees are close to the flower. Irrespective of sucrose
112 concentration, the frequency of flower facing was high when bees were within 10 cm of the
113 flower and then fell steeply (Figure 2C). This clustering reassures us that the video records
114 capture most of the flower facing. Flower facing increased with learning flight duration, but
115 the relationships were similar for 20% and 50% sucrose solutions (Figure S1, Table S1).

116 Differences in the bees' responses to sucrose concentration emerged when we
117 segregated bees according to their size (Figure 3A). Bees were classified as 'small' or 'large'
118 according to whether they were below or above the midpoint of the species size range (4.5
119 mm thorax width) [6]. Learning flights are longer (Wilcoxon Rank Sum test, $z = -2.71$, $p =$
120 0.007) and flower facing is more frequent in large bees that drank 50% sucrose solution than
121 in large bees that drank 20% ($z = -2.64$, $p = 0.0083$, Figure 3A). There is no difference
122 between small bees that drank 50% sucrose solution and those that drank the lower
123 concentration (flight duration $z = 1.55$, $p = 0.12$, flower facing $z = 1.195$, $p = 0.232$, Figure
124 3A).

125 In the example flight (Figure 1A) most flower facing occurs in bouts during which the
126 bee pivots around or approaches the flower. Each bout provides a separate opportunity for a
127 bee to record views of the flower. Since the duration and number of bouts (see Methods) may
128 be more closely related to learning performance than raw flower facing, we analysed the
129 properties of bouts across the four groups. Unsurprisingly, the pattern of bout duration and
130 number resembled the differences in the number of flower facing frames (Figure 3B). They
131 are greater in large bees drinking 50% sucrose than in those drinking 20% sucrose (Wilcoxon
132 Rank Sum, bout duration $z = -3.32$, $p = 0.001$, bout number $z = -2.80$, $p = 0.005$), but do not
133 differ between small bees drinking the two concentrations (bout duration $z = 1.59$, $p = 0.11$,
134 bout number $z = 1.36$, $p = 0.17$). These distributions of bouts emphasise one significant
135 difference between the small and large bees: bout length and number are significantly smaller
136 for small bees drinking 50% sucrose than for large bees drinking that concentration (bout
137 duration $z = -2.68$, $p = 0.007$, bout number $z = -2.60$, $p = 0.009$). This difference suggests

138 that, although small bees spend similar amounts of time facing flowers dispensing 20% and
139 50% sucrose solution, overall they spend less effort in this endeavour than do large bees
140 drinking 50% sucrose.

141 A further question is which of the four groups (20% small, 50% small, 20% large,
142 50% large) face the flower more than would be expected by chance, given the length of their
143 learning flight. The four histograms (Figure 3C), one for each group, show the proportion of
144 the flight that each bee spent facing the flower ($\pm 10^\circ$). With no preference for flower facing,
145 the expected proportion is 20/360, as shown by the vertical dotted line. Large bees drinking
146 20% sucrose solution were the only group in which the proportion of flower facing did not
147 exceed chance, emphasising that larger bees were less likely to invest in learning about a
148 flower of low value.

149 Finally, we asked whether increasing the duration of learning flights does in fact
150 improve learning. For several reasons (see caption to Figure S2), this question is best
151 answered by examining the flights of bees leaving their nest for the first time. Analogous to
152 learning flights from flowers, the amount of nest facing increases with flight duration
153 (Spearman Rank, $\rho = 0.81$, $p < 0.001$). We found that the bees' precision in locating their
154 nest site on their return is correlated positively both with the length of their previous learning
155 flight ($n = 17$ bees, Spearman Rank, one-tailed, $\rho = -0.542$, $p = 0.013$) and with the number
156 of nest facing frames in the learning flight ($\rho = -0.646$, $p = 0.0025$, Figure S2).

157

158 **Interactions of bumblebee size, sucrose concentration, drinking volume and learning** 159 **flights**

160 The previous section shows what can be learnt from classifying bees as small and large, but
161 in reality there is a continuous gradation in the size of bees and we wanted to see both how
162 the gradient of bee size is related to learning flights when bees drink different concentrations
163 of sucrose and how drinking volume varies with bee size and sucrose concentration. To get
164 this information, we performed several supplementary experiments to work out how drinking
165 time, which is easy to record, is related to drinking volume. For that we needed to know a
166 bee's drinking speed and how that speed varied with sucrose of differing viscosities and with
167 proboscis length [28] (see Methods and Figure S3).

168 The estimated volume that bees drank increased with their size and the slope was
169 significantly steeper at the higher concentration (Figure 4A, Table S1). This plot shows once
170 more the preference of larger bees for 50% sucrose over 20% sucrose. If size is ignored, then
171 the average amount that bees drank was about the same for the two concentrations of (20%

172 median volume 54.1 μ l, IQR 31.2 μ l, n = 95 bees; 50% median volume 59.0 μ l, IQR 41.0 μ l, n
173 = 84; Wilcoxon Rank Sum, z = 1.218, p = 0.223). The volume that bees drank in these
174 experiments is consistent with that reported for naturally foraging bumblebees when they
175 return to the nest after a foraging trip [5, 6]. This similarity is striking since drinking patterns
176 in the two cases are quite distinct, with bumblebees visiting perhaps a hundred or more
177 flowers during a normal foraging trip [27] and in this experiment consuming the sucrose in
178 one sitting.

179 A bee's size had a strong effect on the amount of flower facing during learning
180 flights. When the sucrose concentration was 20%, the length of learning flights and the
181 amount of flower facing tended to drop with increasing bee size (Figures 4B, S4A). This
182 trend reversed at the higher concentration: the length of learning flights and the amount of
183 flower facing increased with the bee's size. The regression coefficients differ significantly
184 between the two concentrations (Table S1). Again, we find that as size increases bees spend
185 more time learning about flowers dispensing 50% sucrose than they do about flowers with the
186 lower concentration and that smaller sized bees spend similar times learning about flowers
187 dispensing the two concentrations. The drinking data (Figure 4A) also indicate that the value
188 that both smaller and larger bees assign to a flower depends more on the content of the nectar
189 than the amount of nectar that the bees consume. We also examined the relation between
190 drinking volume and learning flight duration for each of the four groups considered in the
191 previous section (small 20% sucrose, large 20% sucrose, small 50% sucrose, large 50%
192 sucrose). There was no systematic relation between learning flight duration and drinking
193 volume in the groups (Figure S4B). Foraging honeybees are similar in that the value
194 honeybees give to a visited flower depends on the rate of sucrose intake rather than the
195 volume that they collect [29].

196
197 Taken as a whole, the upshot of this analysis is that smaller bees invest equally in learning
198 about relatively low and highly rewarding flowers, whereas larger bees focus primarily on
199 highly rewarding flowers and may learn little about flowers delivering sucrose of low
200 concentration. To make sense of these data in ecological terms, it helps to know the
201 concentration of sugars in the nectar of flowers that *B terrestris* commonly visit. A large scale
202 review [4] of the sucrose strength of the different flowers from which bees forage gives 40%
203 w/w sucrose as the median concentration with 50% as an optimal level and 20% just
204 adequate. The low value that larger bees assign to flowers delivering 20% is likely to be a
205 reflection of their propensity to explore for very high yielding flowers. Even if it takes larger

206 bees longer to find such flowers on the first occasion, the cost of initial exploration is met by
207 the greater amount that they can harvest when they find suitable flowers. The benefit-to-cost
208 energy balance will improve on the bees' subsequent visits as, with no need to explore, the
209 trip to the flower patch is shorter. In natural foraging, each flower generally holds a tiny
210 fraction of a full load, so that carrying capacity is not lost by drinking a little (e.g. Figure 4A)
211 on encountering a weakly rewarding flower and then exploring further to find flowers worth
212 revisiting.

213 Small bees are less discriminating than large ones, but are still likely to have a
214 threshold below which they are reluctant to feed from a flower. Individual honeybees differ
215 in the lowest concentration of sucrose that they accept. Bees that forage primarily for pollen
216 have a lower threshold than those that forage for nectar [30-32]. Bumblebees may also have
217 varying sensitivity to sucrose with small bees having lower thresholds than large ones, as an
218 adaptation to their more limited carrying capacity, flight range and ability to explore. Perhaps
219 an additional reason for smaller bees to accept a wider range of flowers and to invest less in
220 learning about them is that they are more prone than large ones to switch back to performing
221 tasks within the hive. In this case they would be unable to recoup the costs of exploration or
222 learning through further visits to those flowers. It seems that the effort that small and large
223 bees expend in learning about flowers providing different rewards matches closely the
224 diverse foraging strategies of differently sized bees.

225

226 **Acknowledgements**

227 The research was supported by a research grant (RPG-2012-677) to N.H.I. and T.S.C. and an
228 Emeritus Fellowship (EM-2016-066) to T.S.C., both from the Leverhulme Trust. We would
229 like to thank the University of Exeter Grounds team for their support.

230

231 **Author contributions**

232 T.S.C. and N.H.I. conceived the project and acquired funding. E.F., T.R., P.K.Y.C., N.H.I.
233 developed the methodology and provided supervision. E.F., T.R., P.K.Y.C., B.S., S.G., N.M.
234 planned the experiments, collected the data and conducted initial analysis, with inputs from
235 T.S.C. and N.H.I. and using code written by A.P. Data were curated by E.F., T.R., P.K.Y.C.
236 and N.H.I. Further analysis and statistical testing were carried out by T.R., T.S.C. and N.H.I.
237 T.S.C. and N.H.I. wrote the original draft. All authors reviewed and discussed the
238 manuscript.

239

240 **Declaration of interests**

241 The authors declare no competing interests.

242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Learning flight of a bumblebee after drinking 50% sucrose from an artificial flower.

A. Trajectory showing bee's position (o) and body orientation (|) every 20 ms frame of the recorded flight. Grey disks represent cylinders that help bees locate the 5 cm diameter flower (+).

B. Time course of bee's body orientation relative to the flower during the flight.

C. Time course of bee' distance from the flower during the flight. In A-C, yellow circles mark frames in which the bee's body faced the flower ($\pm 10^\circ$).

Figure 2. Some properties of learning flights after drinking from flowers of different concentrations.

A. Flower facing during learning flights from four samples of bees. The bees in each sample had drunk the same concentration of sucrose solution (10% n = 27 bees, 20% n = 31 bees, 30% n = 33 bees or 50% n = 24 bees). For each concentration, frames from all the bees are pooled and the bees' body orientation relative to the centre of the flower is expressed as the mean number of frames per bee in each 40° bin.

B. Flower facing during learning flights from two samples of bees. Bees of different sizes (between 3.3 and 5.7 mm thorax width) performed a learning flight after drinking from the artificial flower (20% n = 69 bees, 50% n = 68 bees, see also Figures S1 and S2). The bees' body orientation relative to the flower is expressed as the median number of frames for each bee per 40° bin. The dotted lines give the interquartile range. Bees drinking 50% sucrose solution tended to face ($\pm 10^\circ$) the flower more often, but the difference was not statistically significant (Wilcoxon Rank Sum, $z = 1.11$, $p = 0.268$).

C. Distances from which bees face the flower. Frames in which bees face the flower ($\pm 10^\circ$) are collected in 5 cm bins from the learning flights of bees that had drunk 20% (n = 69 bees) and 50% sucrose solution (n = 68 bees).

Figure 3. Flower facing during learning flights

A. Median (\pm IQR) amount of flower facing of the small and large bees drinking 20% (n = 35, 34 bees) or 50% sucrose (n = 34, 34 bees).

275 **B.** Number of bouts of flower facing per bee vs bout duration for small and large bees
276 drinking 20% and 50% sucrose. A bout was defined as a sequence of at least 4 consecutive
277 frames of flower facing [12]. Where bouts were separated by ≤ 3 frames without flower
278 facing, they were merged.

279 **C.** Percent flower facing of small and large bees after drinking 20% or 50% sucrose solution.
280 For each bee in each category, the Y-axis gives the number of bees and the X-axis the percent
281 of flower facing during the learning flight. Dotted line (20/360) is the proportion of flower
282 facing on the assumption that flower facing is at chance level. Small bees emphasise flower
283 facing after drinking 20% and 50% sucrose. Large bees emphasise flower facing after
284 drinking 50% sucrose, but not after 20% sucrose (Wilcoxon one-sample test, $M_0 > 0.056$,
285 20% large $z = 0.759$, $p = 0.24$, 50% large $z = 3.26$, $p < 0.001$, 20% small $z = 2.429$, $p = 0.008$,
286 50% small $z = 1.825$, $p = 0.034$).

287

288 **Figure 4. The relation between bee size, sucrose concentration, drinking volume and**
289 **learning flights.**

290 **A.** Relation between drinking volume and bee size as given by thorax width for bees
291 drinking 20% ($n = 95$ bees) or 50% ($n = 84$ bees) sucrose solution (see also Figures S3 and
292 S4). Correlation is tighter when bees drink the more concentrated solution (Spearman Rank,
293 20% $\rho = 0.393$, $p < 0.0001$, 50% $\rho = 0.615$, $p < 0.0001$). A multiple regression analysis
294 performed to predict drinking volume based on sucrose concentration and body size
295 explained 28.4% of the variance ($F(3,175) = 24.51$, $p < 0.001$, Table S1), and the regression
296 slopes for the two concentrations differ significantly ($\beta_0 = 0.025$, $\beta_1 = -0.25$, $\beta_2 = 0.02$, $\beta_3 =$
297 0.018 , $t(3,175) = 2.86$, $p = 0.005$).

298 **B.** Relation between amount of flower facing and bee size for bees drinking 20% ($n = 69$
299 bees) or 50% ($n = 68$ bees) sucrose solution. The association between body size and the
300 amount of flower facing was significant for 50% but not for 20% sucrose solution (Spearman
301 Ranks 20% $\rho = -0.200$, $p = 0.099$, 50% $\rho = 0.338$, $p = 0.0049$). The interaction between
302 flower facing and body size was significant between the two concentrations (Hurdle model
303 with zero-truncated negative binomial regression with log link, $\beta_0 = 4.389$, $\beta_1 = -0.205$, $\beta_2 = -$
304 4.148 , $\beta_3 = 0.957$, $z = 3.34$, $p < 0.01$, Table S1).

305

306 **STAR METHODS**

307

308 **RESOURCE AVAILABILITY**

309

310 **LEAD CONTACT**

311

312 Further information and requests should be directed to and will be fulfilled by the Lead

313 Contact, Natalie Hempel de Ibarra (N.Hempel@exeter.ac.uk)

314

315 **MATERIALS AVAILABILITY**

316

317 This study did not generate unique reagents.

318

319 **DATA AND CODE AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

320

321 The research data supporting this publication are openly available from the University of

322 Exeter's institutional repository at: <https://doi.org/10.24378/exe.2864>

323

324 **EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND SUBJECT DETAILS**

325

326 The experiments were conducted in 2016 and 2017. Supplementary experiments and tests

327 took place in 2014-15 and 2018. In total, individual foragers from 17 commercially reared

328 colonies were tested (*Bombus terrestris audax*, Koppert UK). Where bees were not removed

329 after their first foraging flight, they were individually marked with numbered queen-marking

330 tags. Before and during the experiments, the experimental colony was provisioned with daily

331 rations of sugar syrup (Koppert UK) and honeybee-collected pollen (W. Seip, Germany)

332 inside the nest. Feeding took place in the evenings to encourage forager activity during the

333 day. Between experimental sessions the colony was kept in the lab. Bees could move freely in

334 and out of the colony experiencing daylight but were enclosed in the exit box that was

335 attached to the nest box.

336

337 **METHODS DETAILS**

338

339 **Setup and experimental procedures**

340

341 Experiments were conducted in a greenhouse (8 by 12m floor area) on the University of
342 Exeter's Streatham Campus. A colony was placed beneath a table (1.5 x 1.8 m, 1.5 m height)
343 with the nest-box connected to a hole in the centre of the table via a series of tubes (see also
344 [12]). The arrangement allowed a controlled exit and re-entrance of individual bumblebees
345 and made it possible to reduce the chances that the bees would interfere with each other. Bees
346 fed at a second 'flower' table, about 5 m away. Both tables were covered with white gravel
347 that was frequently raked. The artificial flower from which bees drank consisted of a flat,
348 purple plastic ring (5 cm outer diameter) with, in the centre, a small transparent centrifuge
349 tube containing sucrose. This flower was placed on the gravel in the centre of the food table.
350 The flower was cleaned and filled with fresh sucrose solution just before a bee was released.
351 Three black cylinders (17 cm high x 5 cm wide) were placed equidistantly around the flower
352 in a 120° arc at a radial distance of 24.5 cm from the flower. A video camera (Panasonic HC-
353 V720, HD 1080p, 50 fps) was hung 1.35 m above the table to record a bee's drinking
354 behaviour and its learning flight on departure from the flower over an area of appx 60 by 100
355 cm on the table surface. The bees had never left the nest before to forage. After completing a
356 learning flight at the nest, they flew within the greenhouse until caught with a butterfly net.
357 They were then transferred into a tube and placed gently on the artificial flower. Most bees
358 started to drink within a few seconds of their placement and drank *ad libitum*. The moment
359 when drinking began was noted on the audio channel of the video. When a bee stopped
360 drinking, it started moving again. The camera above the flower recorded the bees' behaviour
361 throughout their time on the flower and when they left it and performed a learning flight. To
362 examine the relation between the sucrose concentration drunk and the subsequent learning
363 flights, the flower contained one of four concentrations (10%, 20%, 30% or 50% w/w) with a
364 different concentration chosen each day in varying order over a few weeks of experiments.
365 After each bee had completed its learning flight at the flower, it was caught and removed.
366 Five colonies were used in the first experiment.

367 Subsequently, bees from six more colonies were tested in the same way with 20% and
368 50% (w/w) solutions. In this experiment, we wished to have similar numbers of small and
369 large bees and selected the appropriate size as they emerged from the nest into a transparent
370 exit box before being allowed to walk through the transparent tubing from the nest to the exit
371 hole under the table. After bees had completed the procedure, the width of each bee's thorax
372 (intertegular span) was measured with digital callipers (Axminster, UK) under a dissecting

373 microscope. Intertegular span correlates well with other measures of body size in many
374 species of bees, including bumblebees [33, 34].

375

376 **Test after the first learning flight**

377

378 To test whether the duration of a learning flight influences the precision of a bee's search on
379 its return, we analysed data obtained in a separate, so far, unpublished experiment. Learning
380 flights at the nest are more suited to this question than those from flowers as they are longer
381 and more varied in duration and the bees' subsequent test searches are more persistent [2, 12].
382 We recorded learning flights, in the way described above, of individually marked bumblebees
383 from three further colonies on their first departure from the nest. The bees then had their first
384 opportunity to view three cylinders arranged in a 120° arc and 14.5 cm away from the nest
385 that marked the location of the nest hole.

386 After a bee had finished its flight and flew off, it was caught and placed on a sucrose
387 feeder, it could take several hours after feeding before the bee returned and searched for the
388 nest hole. This interval, during which the bee flew in the greenhouse or rested, is of
389 comparable length to the bee's first foraging flight that often follows its first learning flight
390 [9]. When a bee eventually decided to search for its nest, it found the array of cylinders
391 displaced a few cm from the nest position and the nest hole covered up with a plastic sheet
392 inserted under the gravel. The bee was allowed to search for several minutes until it gave up,
393 flying far away from the table. It was then caught and placed inside the nest. The distance of
394 its first landing relative to the virtual position of the nest was determined using custom-
395 written code in Matlab from video footage recorded at 50 fps (Fig S2).

396

397 **Supplementary experiments to translate drinking time into an estimate of drinking 398 volume**

399

400 In the first of these experiments, bees from a different colony were weighed before they had
401 drunk sucrose solution (20% or 50% w/w) from the standard artificial flower. Their drinking
402 time was recorded, and they were weighed again after they had performed a learning flight.
403 Each bee was tested only once. and its thorax width measured after the procedure. The
404 volume each bee drank was determined from the increase in its weight and the measured
405 density of the sucrose solution. From these data we plotted, for the two sucrose
406 concentrations, the relation between volume drunk and thorax width (Figure S3A).

407 Because the precision balance (Ohaus Pioneer TM, USA) for weighing bees could not
408 be used in the greenhouse, this experiment was performed in a laboratory room (3.5 x 5 m,
409 3.5 m height) lit with high frequency daylight-type fluorescent tubes. There was only space
410 for one table in the centre of the room. The table was covered with white cotton-loop bath
411 rugs. The artificial purple flower in the centre of the table was marked by the standard array
412 of three black cylinders. To provide a visual panorama and stabilise flight, the walls of the
413 room were covered with high-contrast patterns.

414 The colony was placed in one corner of the room, and as in the greenhouse
415 experiments, bees without any foraging experience were released individually. Each bee was
416 caught after its learning flight at the nest, carefully transferred into a tube and weighed. The
417 bee was then placed on the flower, and its behaviour recorded from above on video (50 fps)
418 to monitor its drinking duration and learning flight. The bee was weighed a second time after
419 it had drunk its fill and had performed a learning flight.

420 A second experiment was designed to measure how fast bees drink 20% and 50%
421 (w/w) sucrose solution (Figure S3B). We recorded individually-marked bees from two further
422 colonies in a small test chamber as they drank from a vertically-oriented conical tube (the
423 same as the one placed in the centre of the artificial flower). The tube containing sucrose was
424 removed and weighed before and after each bee was tested to determine the volume the bee
425 had drunk.

426 To give more detail: The tube was inserted from below into a tightly-fitting hole in
427 the floor of the chamber and raised about 1 mm above the floor. The tube was fixed in place
428 to avoid spillage. A small transparent box with one open side and an open floor was placed
429 over the tube, forcing the bee to approach the tube from one direction. The test chamber was
430 connected directly to the bee's nest box, with access to the chamber controlled by sliding
431 doors. In order to record proboscis movements, the video camera was positioned to face the
432 bee. After reaching the sucrose, bees drank continuously from it in a single bout, and then
433 stopped drinking. Thirteen of these bees were tested with both solutions, but on different days
434 and counterbalancing the sequence. Prior to and between test days the colony was fed with
435 commercially supplied syrup and pollen inside the colony. All the tested bees, apart from
436 two, gave reliable data ($n = 34$).

437 To relate drinking time to the volume drunk, we calculated each bee's drinking speed
438 for sucrose concentrations of 20% and 50% from the bee's first drinking test with each of the
439 two sucrose concentrations, excluding an outlier with a thorax width of only 3 mm. These
440 data show that there is a linear relation between bee size and drinking speed (Figure S3B).

441

442 **QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

443

444 Videos were examined with video-editing software (Adobe CS6) to determine the durations
445 of the bees' learning flights and their drinking behaviour. We discarded the few flights in
446 which bees landed during the learning flight or flew directly away from the flower.

447 To analyse the details of the learning flights, the positions and orientations of the
448 bees' body were extracted from the videos using custom-written code in Matlab. Most of the
449 flights were recorded at 50fps (n = 137 bees), but on two experimental days the camera was
450 mistakenly reset to 25fps. These slower recordings (n = 13 bees) could not be included in
451 some of the comparisons but were included in Fig 3C.

452 A particularly significant part of these learning flights is when bees orient their body
453 to face the flower ($\pm 10^\circ$). This flower facing mostly happens in bouts of several frames. We
454 defined as a bout a sequence of at least 4 consecutive frames of flower facing [12] and
455 merged bouts that were separated by ≤ 3 frames without flower facing,

456 Drinking volumes of bees of known size were estimated from the video recordings of
457 the duration of drinking and a calibration curve (see Figure S3B) that gave the drinking speed
458 of different sized bees. The duration of drinking was taken to be the interval between the
459 audio record of the start of drinking and the bees' first movement on the flower.

460 Statistical tests on the data were performed in Matlab and R (version 3.6.1) for
461 comparisons of medians, regression and correlation analyses. R packages 'pscl' [35] and
462 'betareg' [36] were used to run hurdle models [37, 38] as data for flower facing were
463 overdispersed and contained zeros.

464

465

466

467 **References**

468

- 469 1. Lehrer, M. (1993). Why do bees turn back and look? *J. Comp. Physiol. A* *172*, 549-
470 563.
- 471 2. Robert, T., Frasnelli, E., Collett, T.S., and Hempel de Ibarra, N. (2017). Male
472 bumblebees perform learning flights on leaving a flower but not when leaving their
473 nest. *J. Exp. Biol.* *220*, 930-937.
- 474 3. Wei, C.A., and Dyer, F.C. (2009). Investing in learning: why do honeybees, *Apis*
475 *mellifera*, vary the durations of learning flights? *Anim. Behav.* *77*, 1165-1177.

- 476 4. Pamminger, T., Becker, R., Himmelreich, S., Schneider, C.W., and Bergtold, M.
477 (2019). The nectar report: Quantitative review of nectar sugar concentrations offered
478 by bee visited flowers in agricultural and non-agricultural landscapes. PeerJ 7, e6329.
479 5. Spaethe, J., and Weidenmüller, A. (2002). Size variation and foraging rate in
480 bumblebees (*Bombus terrestris*). *Ins. Soc.* 49, 142-146.
481 6. Goulson, D., Peat, J., Stout, J.C., Tucker, J., Darvill, B., Derwent, L.C., and Hughes,
482 W.O. (2002). Can alloethism in workers of the bumblebee, *Bombus terrestris*, be
483 explained in terms of foraging efficiency? *Anim. Behav.* 64, 123-130.
484 7. Greenleaf, S.S., Williams, N.M., Winfree, R., and Kremen, C. (2007). Bee foraging
485 ranges and their relationship to body size. *Oecolog.* 153, 589-596.
486 8. Frisch, K.v. The dance language and orientation of bees (Harvard University Press).
487 9. Goulson, D. (2010). Bumblebees: behaviour, ecology, and conservation (Oxford
488 University Press).
489 10. Menzel, R., Erber, J., and Masuhr, T. (1974). Learning and memory in the honeybee.
490 In *Experimental analysis of insect behaviour.* (Springer), pp. 195-217.
491 11. Lehrer, M., and Collett, T. (1994). Approaching and departing bees learn different
492 cues to the distance of a landmark. *J. Comp. Physiol. A* 175, 171-177.
493 12. Robert, T., Frasnelli, E., Hempel de Ibarra, N., and Collett, T.S. (2018). Variations on
494 a theme: bumblebee learning flights from the nest and from flowers. *J. Exp. Biol.* 221,
495 jeb172601.
496 13. Collett, T.S., and Zeil, J. (2018). Insect learning flights and walks. *Curr. Biol.* 28,
497 R984-R988.
498 14. Hempel de Ibarra, N., Philippides, A., Riabinina, O., and Collett, T.S. (2009).
499 Preferred viewing directions of bumblebees (*Bombus terrestris* L.) when learning and
500 approaching their nest site. *J. Exp. Biol.* 212, 3193-3204.
501 15. Chole, H., Woodard, S.H., and Bloch, G. (2019). Body size variation in bees:
502 regulation, mechanisms, and relationship to social organization. *Curr. Op. Ins. Sci.*
503 16. Cumber, R. (1949). The biology of humble-bees, with special reference to the
504 production of the worker caste. *Trans. Roy. Entomol. Soc. Lond.* 100, 1-45.
505 17. Yerushalmi, S., Bodenheimer, S., and Bloch, G. (2006). Developmentally determined
506 attenuation in circadian rhythms links chronobiology to social organization in bees. *J.*
507 *Exp. Biol.* 209, 1044-1051.
508 18. Jandt, J.M., and Dornhaus, A. (2009). Spatial organization and division of labour in
509 the bumblebee *Bombus impatiens*. *Anim. Behav.* 77, 641-651.
510 19. Heinrich, B., and Heinrich, M.J. (1983). Heterothermia in foraging workers and
511 drones of the bumblebee *Bombus terricola*. *Physiolog. Zool.* 56, 563-567.
512 20. Taylor, G.J., Tichit, P., Schmidt, M.D., Bodey, A.J., Rau, C., and Baird, E. (2019).
513 Bumblebee visual allometry results in locally improved resolution and globally
514 improved sensitivity. *eLife* 8, e40613.
515 21. Macuda, T., Gegear, R., Laverty, T., and Timney, B. (2001). Behavioural assessment
516 of visual acuity in bumblebees (*Bombus impatiens*). *J. Exp. Biol.* 204, 559-564.
517 22. Wertlen, A.M., Niggebrügge, C., Vorobyev, M., and de Ibarra, N.H. (2008).
518 Detection of patches of coloured discs by bees. *J. Exp. Biol.* 211, 2101-2104.
519 23. Spaethe, J., and Chittka, L. (2003). Interindividual variation of eye optics and single
520 object resolution in bumblebees. *J. Exp. Biol.* 206, 3447-3453.
521 24. Whitham, T.G. (1977). Coevolution of foraging in *Bombus* and nectar dispensing in
522 *Chilopsis*: a last dreg theory. *Science* 197, 593-596.
523 25. Corbet, S.A. (1978). Bee visits and the nectar of *Echium vulgare* L. and *Sinapis alba*
524 L. *Ecol. Entomol.* 3, 25-37.

- 525 26. Kerr, N.Z., Crone, E.E., and Williams, N.M. (2019). Integrating vital rates explains
526 optimal worker size for resource return by bumblebee workers. *Funct. Ecol.* *33*, 467-
527 478.
- 528 27. Heinrich, B. (1979). *Bumblebee economics* (Harvard University Press).
- 529 28. Kim, W., Gilet, T., and Bush, J.W. (2011). Optimal concentrations in nectar feeding.
530 *PNAS* *108*, 16618-16621.
- 531 29. Núñez, J.A. (1966). Quantitative Beziehungen zwischen den Eigenschaften von
532 Futterquellen und dem Verhalten von Sammelbienen. *Z. Vgl. Physiol.* *53*, 142-164.
- 533 30. Pankiw, T., and Page Jr, R.E. (2000). Response thresholds to sucrose predict foraging
534 division of labor in honeybees. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* *47*, 265-267.
- 535 31. Pankiw, T., Tarpy, D.R., and Page Jr, R.E. (2002). Genotype and rearing environment
536 affect honeybee perception and foraging behaviour. *Anim. Behav.* *64*, 663-672.
- 537 32. Tsuruda, J.M., and Page Jr, R.E. (2009). The effects of foraging role and genotype on
538 light and sucrose responsiveness in honey bees (*Apis mellifera* L.). *Behav. Brain Res.*
539 *205*, 132-137.
- 540 33. Cane, J.H. (1987). Estimation of bee size using intertegular span (Apoidea). *J. Kansas*
541 *Entomol. Soc.*, 145-147.
- 542 34. Hagen, M., and Dupont, Y. (2013). Inter-tegular span and head width as estimators of
543 fresh and dry body mass in bumblebees (*Bombus* spp.). *Ins. Soc.* *60*, 251-257.
- 544 35. Jackman, S. (2020). *pscl: Classes and methods for R*. Developed in the Political
545 Science Computational Laboratory, Stanford University. Department of Political
546 Science, Stanford University, Stanford, CA. R package version 1.5. 5.
547 (<https://github.com/atahk/pscl>).
- 548 36. Cribari-Neto, F., and Zeileis, A. (2010). Beta Regression in R. *J. Stat. Software* *34*,
549 24.
- 550 37. Zeileis, A., Kleiber, C., and Jackman, S. (2008). Regression models for count data in
551 R. *J. Stat. Software* *27*, 1-25.
- 552 38. Cragg, J.G. (1971). Some statistical models for limited dependent variables with
553 application to the demand for durable goods. *Econometrica: J. Econometric Soc.*, 829-
554 844.

555

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3





Figure 4






Figure S1. Flower facing *versus* flight duration. Related to Figure 2.

The relation between the duration of an individual's learning flight and the number of its flower facing frames for bees that drank 20% ($n = 69$ bees) or 50% sucrose solution ($n = 68$ bees). The regression coefficients between the duration of the flight and the number of flower facing frames are significant ($z = 7.496$, $p < 0.001$, Table S1) but there is no difference between coefficients of the two concentrations ($z = 0.78$, $p = 0.436$) and no difference between the intercepts ($z = -0.517$, $p = 0.605$).




Figure S2. Landing precision on a bee's first return after the first learning flight.

Related to Figure 2.

A. Arrangement of cylinders during the learning flight when the bee departed the nest (left). When it returned (right), the nest entrance was covered and the whole cylinder array shifted in different directions.

B. Correlation between first landing distance relative to the cylinder-defined position of the nest and the duration of its first learning flight prior to the test.

C. Correlation between first landing distance and number of frames facing the nest ($\pm 10^\circ$) during its first learning flight.

Bumblebee's learning flight on leaving its nest for the first time gives the bee its first view of the surroundings of its nest. This first learning flight, which is typically much longer than learning flights from flowers [S1, S2], is often followed by a long foraging trip [S3, S4] so that the bee's ability to find its nest depends in large measure on the efficacy of its learning

flight. Learning flights on first leaving a flower have several functions. Foraging bees mostly visit multiple flowers within a patch and several patches before filling their crop. Honeybees are known to learn the colour and shape of flowers during their learning flights as well as the flower's surroundings [S5, S6]. It is hard to guess which of the memories of these properties improves most from longer flights. Given this uncertainty and the greater range in duration of learning flights from the nest, we analysed pre-existing data to determine whether a bee's precision in localising its nest improves with the duration of its learning flight.

The video recordings of the bee's return were examined to find the first time that the bee landed relative to the fictive nest position specified by the displaced cylinders. One bee initially landed very far away ($> 60\text{cm}$), therefore its second landing was included.

There is a clear relation between the duration of the learning flight and the proximity of a bee's landing distance position from the nest ($n = 17$ bees, Spearman Rank Spearman Rank, one-tailed, $\rho = -0.542$, $p = 0.013$). A similar relation is found between the number of nest-facing frames in the flight and the bee's landing position (Spearman $\rho = -0.646$, $p = 0.0025$).




Figure S3. Drinking behaviour of differently sized bees. Related to Figure 4.

A. Relation between imbibed volume and thorax size. Most bees fell in the large category (> 4.5 mm, 20% $n = 23$ out of 23 bees, 50% $n = 16$ out of 18 bees). Bees drank similar volumes when the sucrose solution was 20% (Spearman Ranks, $\rho = 0.02$, $p = 0.45$), but larger bees drank more 50% sucrose solution than smaller ones ($\rho = 0.69$, $p < 0.0001$) ($t(3,37) = 2.03$, $p < 0.05$, Table S1).

B. Relation between a bee's body size and its speed of drinking 20% ($n = 22$ bees) or 50% ($n = 24$ bees) sucrose solution. Drinking speed was significantly higher in larger bees (Spearman, 20% $\rho = 0.61$, $p = 0.0028$, 50%, $\rho = 0.64$, $p < 0.001$). The rate of increase was $0.5 \mu\text{l/s}$ per mm of thorax width (20% $\beta = 0.00048$, $\text{SE} = 0.0001$, $t(20) = 4.72$, $p < 0.001$, 50% $\beta = 0.00051$, $\text{SE} = 0.0001$, $t(22) = 5.06$, $p < 0.001$). This relationship accounts for a

significant proportion of the variance in speed for each concentration (20% $R^2 = 0.53$, $F(1,20) = 22.3$, $p < 0.001$, 50% $R^2 = 0.54$, $F(1,22) = 25.6$, $p < 0.0001$). These data allowed us to estimate drinking volumes from the duration of drinking that was recorded on video.




Figure S4. Learning flight duration, bee size and sucrose concentration. Related to Figure 4.

A. Duration of learning flights in different-sized bees. After drinking 20% sucrose solution, the duration of learning flights reduced a little with bee size ($n = 95$ bees, Spearman Rank, $\rho = -0.216$, $p = 0.035$). The relation reversed with 50% ($n = 84$ bees, $\rho = 0.331$, $p = 0.0021$). The two regression coefficients differ significantly ($p = 0.001$, Table S1). As expected, this pattern is similar to that in Figure 4B.

B. Drinking volume and flight duration in small and large bees. The volume of sucrose drunk had little effect on the duration of the subsequent learning flights. In small bees (thorax width < 4.5 mm) drinking 20% sucrose solution, there is no association between learning flight

duration and volume drunk ($n = 43$ bees, Spearman Rank, $\rho = 0.038$, $p = 0.807$). When small bees drank 50% sucrose solution, learning flight duration increased slightly with volume drunk ($n = 46$ bees, $\rho = 0.222$, $p = 0.138$). The situation reversed in large bees (thorax width ≥ 4.5 mm). There was a slight increase in learning flight duration with increased drinking volume after drinking 20% sucrose solution ($n = 52$ bees, $\rho = 0.282$, $p = 0.043$) but no change in duration with increasing volume after drinking 50% ($n = 38$ bees, $\rho = 0.0056$, $p = 0.974$).

Figure	Dependent variable Model	Predictors Parameters	Coefficients	Error	z	F/t	df	P
4A	<u>Drinking volume</u> Linear model	<u>Thorax width</u> Adj R ² Intercept 20% 50% 20% : 50%	0.284 -0.025 0.018 -0.074 0.018	0.02 0.004 0.03 0.01		24.51 -1.42 4.67 -2.57 2.86	3,175	<0.001 0.157 <0.001 0.011 0.005
4B	<u>Flower facing</u> Hurdle model Count model (Zero-truncated negative binomial with log link) Zero model (Binomial with logit link)	<u>Thorax width</u> Log-likelihood Intercept 20% 50% 50% : 20% Intercept 20% 50% 50% : 20%	-609.9 4.389 -0.205 -4.148 0.957 7.017 -1.011 5.562 -0.941	0.84 0.19 1.28 0.29 3.73 0.78 9.05 1.87	5.24 -1.10 -3.24 3.34 1.88 -1.3 0.61 -0.50		8,128	<0.001 0.273 0.001 0.001 0.060 0.196 0.539 0.615
S1	<u>Flower facing</u> Hurdle model Count model (Zero-truncated negative binomial with log link) Zero model (Binomial with logit link)	<u>Flight duration</u> Log-likelihood Intercept 20% 50% 20% : 50% Intercept 20% 50% 20% : 50%	-550.2 2.228 0.131 -0.122 0.019 -2.813 1.372 1.526 -0.076	0.17 0.02 0.24 0.02 1.56 0.53 3.45 1.26	13.45 7.5 -0.52 0.78 -1.80 2.58 0.44 -0.06		8, 128	<0.001 <0.001 0.605 0.436 0.072 0.010 0.658 0.952
S3A	<u>Drinking volume</u> Linear model (50% vs 20%)	<u>Thorax width</u> Adj R ² Intercept 20% 50% 20% : 50%	0.257 0.065 -0.005 -0.231 0.050	0.10 0.02 0.12 0.02		5.62 0.64 -0.25 -1.90 2.03	3,37	0.003 0.527 0.808 0.066 0.0495
S4A	<u>Flight duration</u> GLM Gamma family (log link)	<u>Thorax width</u> Intercept 20% 50% 20% : 50%	2.626 -0.141 -2.766 0.649	0.55 0.12 0.90 0.20		4.77 -1.18 -3.06 3.24	3,175	<0.001 0.239 0.003 0.001

Table S1. Statistical analysis. Related to Figure 4.

Results are shown for multiple regression and hurdle models with interactions. All models were validated.

Supplemental references

- S1. Robert, T., Frasnelli, E., Hempel de Ibarra, N., and Collett, T.S. (2018). Variations on a theme: bumblebee learning flights from the nest and from flowers. *J. Exp. Biol.* *221*, jeb172601.
- S2. Robert, T., Frasnelli, E., Collett, T.S., and Hempel de Ibarra, N. (2017). Male bumblebees perform learning flights on leaving a flower but not when leaving their nest. *J. Exp. Biol.* *220*, 930-937.
- S3. Hempel de Ibarra, N., Philippides, A., Riabinina, O., and Collett, T.S. (2009). Preferred viewing directions of bumblebees (*Bombus terrestris* L.) when learning and approaching their nest site. *J. Exp. Biol.* *212*, 3193-3204.
- S4. Osborne, J.L., Smith, A., Clark, S.J., Reynolds, D.R., Barron, M.C., Lim, K.S., and Reynolds, A.M. (2013). The ontogeny of bumblebee flight trajectories: from naïve explorers to experienced foragers. *PloS ONE* *8*, e78681.
- S5. Lehrer, M., and Collett, T. (1994). Approaching and departing bees learn different cues to the distance of a landmark. *J. Comp. Physiol. A* *175*, 171-177.
- S6. Lehrer, M. (1993). Why do bees turn back and look? *J. Comp. Physiol. A* *172*, 549-563.