



Title	Host defense in <i>Nicrophorus quadripunctatus</i> against brood parasitism by <i>Ptomascopus morio</i> (Coleoptera: Silphidae: Nicrophorinae)
Author(s)	Suzuki, Seizi; Nagano, Masahiro
Citation	Population Ecology, 48(2), 167-171 <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s10144-005-0245-9">https://doi.org/10.1007/s10144-005-0245-9</a>
Issue Date	2006-04
Doc URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2115/8452">http://hdl.handle.net/2115/8452</a>
Rights	The original publication is available at <a href="http://www.springerlink.com">www.springerlink.com</a>
Type	article (author version)
File Information	PopulEcol48_p167.pdf



[Instructions for use](#)

Host defense in *Nicrophorus quadripunctatus* against brood parasitism by *Ptomascopus morio* (Coleoptera: Silphidae: Nicrophorinae)

Seizi Suzuki<sup>1\*</sup> and Masahiro Nagano<sup>2</sup>

1: Seizi Suzuki (correspondence author)

Ecology & Systematics

Graduate School of Agriculture,

Hokkaido University, Sapporo, 060-8589 Japan

E-mail: seizi@res.agr.hokudai.ac.jp

Tel: +81-(0)11-706-2486

Fax: +81-(0)11-706-4939

2: Masahiro Nagano

Echigo-Matsunoyama Museum of Natural Science

712-2, Matsukuchi, Matsunoyama-machi, Niigata, 942-1411 Japan.

Host defense in *Nicrophorus quadripunctatus* against brood parasitism by *Ptomascopus morio* (Coleoptera: Silphidae: Nicrophorinae)

Seizi Suzuki and Masahiro Nagano

Abstract

Few studies have been conducted on the host defenses of insects against brood parasitism. We investigated whether the silphid beetle *Ptomascopus morio*, a brood parasite of related silphid species *Nicrophorus concolor*, can also parasitize another silphid species *N. quadripunctatus* and the manner in which *N. quadripunctatus* defends itself against parasitism. Successful brood parasitism under natural conditions was not observed at the time of year when *P. morio* and *N. quadripunctatus* are both reproductively active. Follow-up experiments revealed that *P. morio* attempts to oviposit near *N. quadripunctatus* nests, but is rarely successful if adult hosts are present. When *P. morio* larvae were experimentally introduced to *N. quadripunctatus* broods, some *P. morio* larvae survived when the host and parasite larvae were at the same stage. We concluded that *N. quadripunctatus* defends itself against brood parasitism in two ways: potential brood parasites are repelled, thus limiting their access to the resource, and the young of the parasitic species are killed.

Key word: host rejection, facultative brood parasitism

Introduction

The relationship between host and parasite has been extensively studied in birds (Rothstein 1990) and eusocial hymenopterans (Wilson 1971; Sledge et al. 2001; Cervo et al. 2004). For example, parasitic cuckoos lay their eggs in the nest of the host species that incubate and rear the parasitic offspring; thereby, the hosts suffer severe reductions in reproductive success (Payne 1998; Soler et al. 2001). Parasitism favors the evolution of host defenses such as egg rejection (Soler and Soler 2000). Such host defense mechanisms may be specific to changes in parasitic behavior and may lead to an evolutionary arms race (Rothstein 1990). In contrast to the studies of birds and eusocial

hymenopterans (Davies and de Brooke 1998; Soler et al. 2001), little research has been conducted on brood parasitism in noneusocial insects (Rasa and Heg 2004) and there is even less research on host defenses.

All species of the genus *Nicrophorus* (Silphidae, Coleoptera) care their young such as prepare food (small vertebrate carrion), guard against intruders exclusively, and regurgitate their young (Scott 1998). The genus *Ptomascopus* is believed to be a sister group of *Nicrophorus* (Dobler and Müller 2000; Peck and Anderson 1985; Szalanski et al. 2000). *Ptomascopus morio* shows simple parental care (Suzuki and Nagano in press). Their larvae are able to grow without parents in laboratory condition (Peck 1982; Trumbo et al. 2001) but are difficult to grow without parents in field condition because of predation and competition (Suzuki and Nagano in press). At a study site near Kyoto, Japan, *Ptomascopus morio* Kraatz was found to be a brood parasite of *Nicrophorus concolor* Kraatz (Trumbo et al. 2001). Larvae of *P. morio* live in the broods of *N. concolor* and grow under the care by host parents though its range of care is undetermined (Trumbo et al. 2001; Suzuki, personal observation). *Ptomascopus morio* readily parasitized *N. concolor* in the field, and this parasitism reduced brood mass of *N. concolor* in the laboratory (Trumbo et al. 2001). Since *Nicrophorus* beetles eliminate intruders exclusively to their brood such as the fly, rove beetle, and other *Nicrophorus* (Müller and Eggert 1990; Scott 1990; Suzuki 2000), the *P. morio* larvae will have ways to deceive *N. concolor* parents in order to stay in the latter's broods.

In contrast, *P. morio* seldom parasitized another host species *Nicrophorus quadripunctatus* Kraatz at the same locality (Trumbo et al. 2001). Since the reproductive seasons of *N. quadripunctatus* and *P. morio* differ slightly in Honshu, Japan (Nagano and Suzuki 2003), whether the low frequency of the parasitism of *N. quadripunctatus* by *P. morio* was caused by host defenses or by seasonal segregation has not been established. However, phenology of *P. morio* in Otaru, Hokkaido is similar to that of *N. quadripunctatus* (Ohara 1995). Therefore, we intend to investigate the host defenses of *N. quadripunctatus* in Otaru where seasonal segregation between two species can be negligible.

The aims of this paper are as follows: first to confirm the presence or absence of *N. quadripunctatus* parasitization by *P. morio* in the condition in which *P. morio* is

expected to parasitize *N. concolor*, and second to investigate the mechanism by which *N. quadripunctatus* defends itself against parasitization by *P. morio*.

#### Materials and methods

All experiments were conducted in the forest of Naebo Forest Park in Otaru, which is near Sapporo, southwestern Hokkaido, north Japan.

#### Phenology of *N. quadripunctatus* and *P. morio*

Burying beetles were collected using hanging polyethylene traps (97-mm diameter, 166-mm depth), with pieces of chicken as bait. Three traps were installed at the site; they were arranged linearly at intervals of at least 5 m and were suspended from trees at a height of 1.5–2.0 m above the ground to prevent their removal by vertebrates. The sampling site was a natural mixed forest (*Fraxinus mandshurica* and *Ulmus davidiana* were common species). All traps were kept open for five days, and the beetles were collected on the last day. *Nicrophorus* and *Ptomascopus* were identified from among the collected beetles and were counted. Sampling was performed 1–2 times a month from May to September 2001.

#### Presence of brood parasitism

To assess brood parasitism under natural conditions, 36 pieces of chicken (15 g) were placed in soil-filled polyethylene bottles (90-mm diameter, 117-mm depth) that were suspended from trees at a height of 1.5–2.0 m. All bottles were open at the top to allow the beetles to freely enter and then colonize the resource. The containers were checked 10 days after baiting. Larvae and adult nicrophorines were morphologically identified, and adults with a brood were regarded as parents. The presence of *P. morio* larvae in the *Nicrophorus* brood can be regarded as evidence of brood parasitism.

A second experiment was conducted to determine the potential of *P. morio* to parasitize *N. quadripunctatus*. One pair each of *N. quadripunctatus* and *P. morio* and 15 g of chicken were placed in a polyethylene container (15 × 15 × 9 cm) that was half filled with soil; the container was covered to prevent further colonization by insects ( $n = 21$ ). All the containers were checked at 10 days after the introduction, and the larvae were

checked. The larvae were identified, and all adult beetles were checked for injuries to their legs and antennae. These containers were placed in scavenger-proof cages on the forest floor until the experiments were terminated.

All experiments were conducted between early- to mid-July 2002.

#### Parasitism of undefended carcasses

The rarity of parasitism by *P. morio* could be either due to few attempts at parasitism or due to the successful host defenses of *N. quadripunctatus*. In order to distinguish between these two possibilities, a pair of *N. quadripunctatus* and a piece of chicken (15 g,  $n = 10$ ) were introduced into a soil-filled container ( $15 \times 15 \times 9 \text{ cm}^3$ ). After ensuring that the chicken was buried in the soil, the *N. quadripunctatus* pair was confined to a small, clear plastic cylinder (16-mm diameter, 39-mm depth) with many small holes to allow the passage of odor and sound; this cylinder was placed near the carcass. A *P. morio* female was introduced into the container and to undefended carcass. The container was checked for *P. morio* larvae 5–7-days later.

#### Host defense by *N. quadripunctatus*

To determine whether the presence of *N. quadripunctatus* adults prevented *P. morio* from oviposition near the carcasses, a pair each of *N. quadripunctatus* and *P. morio* and 15 g of chicken were introduced into a polyethylene container ( $15 \times 15 \times 9 \text{ cm}^3$ ) that was half filled with soil ( $n = 22$ ). After confirming oviposition by either species, all the adult beetles were removed. The larvae were identified after hatching.

To investigate whether *N. quadripunctatus* is capable of distinguishing and excluding parasitic larvae, a pair of *N. quadripunctatus* and 15 g of chicken were introduced into a soil-filled polyethylene container. When the hatched larvae appeared on the carcass, each brood was subjected to one of three treatments: The “same-stage treatment” ( $n = 14$ ): five of the *P. morio* first instar larvae were introduced to the brood when the *N. quadripunctatus* larvae were arriving on the carcass. The “different-stage treatment” ( $n = 12$ ): five of the *P. morio* first instar larvae were introduced to the brood when the *N. quadripunctatus* larvae had reached the second instar. The “parental-removal treatment” ( $n = 13$ ): the pair of *N. quadripunctatus* was removed when the *N.*

*quadripunctatus* larvae appeared onto the carcass and were introduced 5 first instar larvae of *P. morio*. Broods in all treatments conditions were checked 4 days after the introduction, and the number of surviving *P. morio* larvae were counted. In addition, 10 *N. quadripunctatus* broods were maintained for 4 days after the larvae appeared onto the carcass (no-parasite treatment), and the number of larvae were counted in order to compare the size of the parasitized and unparasitized *N. quadripunctatus* broods.

## Results

### Phenology of *N. quadripunctatus* and *P. morio*

Two species of *Nicrophorus* (*N. maculifrons* and *N. quadripunctatus*) and one species of *Ptomascopus* (*P. morio*) were trapped. Their phenology is shown in Fig. 1. A significant correlation ( $P < 0.001$ ,  $r = 0.98$ ) was observed between the numbers of *N. quadripunctatus* and *P. morio*; this indicates a large overlap in their respective seasonal activities.

### Presence of brood parasitism

In the field experiment in which carcasses were exposed to allow natural colonization, all carcasses were used by nicrophorine beetles ( $n=36$ ). *Nicrophorus quadripunctatus* was the most successful species (owned 25 carcasses). Eight of the remaining carcasses were colonized by *N. maculifrons*, 2 by an unknown *Nicrophorus* (with *Nicrophorus* larvae but no adults) and 1 by *P. morio*. No *P. morio* demonstrated parasitism.

Brood parasitism was rare when *P. morio* was experimentally introduced with *N. quadripunctatus*, to the carcasses that were kept in containers in the field ( $n=21$ ). Two broods were parasitized by *P. morio*, and only a few parasitic larvae were observed (1 and 3). Behavior of the parasitic larvae in *N. quadripunctatus* broods appeared not to be different from that in *N. concolor* broods. Although injury in *N. quadripunctatus* was rare (1 male), injuries were common in *P. morio* (3 males and 10 females). The injury rates of the two species differed significantly ( $P < 0.001$ , Fisher's exact test).

### Parasitism of undefended carcasses

*Ptomascopus morio* readily parasitized the broods of *N. quadripunctatus* on undefended carcasses. *Ptomascopus morio* larvae were present on 8 of 10 carcasses that were previously used for oviposition by *N. quadripunctatus*.

#### Host defense by *N. quadripunctatus*

When *N. quadripunctatus* and *P. morio* were both allowed to oviposit for 2 days (adults were subsequently removed), the *P. morio* larvae hatched and emerged onto 8 of 22 carcasses. On an average,  $3.5 \pm 1.3$  (mean  $\pm$  SE) *P. morio* larvae were found on these 8 carcasses. This means that, some *P. morio* females succeeded in ovipositing in the presence of *N. quadripunctatus*.

When *P. morio* larvae were introduced to *N. quadripunctatus* broods, it was clear that *N. quadripunctatus* had the ability to eliminate the *P. morio* young (Fig. 2). Most of the introduced *P. morio* larvae survived in the parent removal treatment group. However, when the *N. quadripunctatus* pair was present, only a small number of *P. morio* larvae survived in both the same- and different-stage treatments. The number of surviving larvae in the two treatment conditions differed significantly ( $P < 0.01$ , Steel-Dwass test). The *N. quadripunctatus* brood size in the same-stage treatment was  $11.7 \pm 1.3$  and smaller than that in the no-parasite treatment was  $15.2 \pm 0.9$  ( $P = 0.03$ ,  $t = 2.26$ ,  $t$  test).

#### Discussion

Trumbo et al. (2001) reported that *P. morio* from Kyoto (Honshu) successfully parasitized *N. concolor* broods in the field, and that *P. morio* derived from an Otaru population could parasitize *N. concolor* in the laboratory. However, the *P. morio* from Otaru could seldom parasitize the *N. quadripunctatus* broods. These results suggest that while *N. concolor* is susceptible to parasitism, *N. quadripunctatus* has developed defense mechanisms against brood parasitism by *P. morio*.

Trumbo et al. (2001) suggested that *P. morio* is an obligate brood parasite since few *P. morio* reproduces on their own in the field. However, in Hokkaido, the susceptible populations of *N. concolor* are quite small. Further, the ecologically dominant *N. quadripunctatus* (Katakura et al. 1986; Ohkawara et al. 1998) can successfully prevent brood parasitism. It appears to be difficult for *P. morio* to reproduce by brood parasitism



alone in Hokkaido. Therefore, the interaction between adult *P. morio* and *N. quadripunctatus* may be competition rather than host-parasite interaction. However, females of *P. morio* try to deposit eggs near the brood of *N. quadripunctatus*, larvae of *P. morio* try to parasitize, and parasitism by *P. morio* larvae is deleterious for the reproduction in *N. quadripunctatus*. Thus, it may be advantageous for *N. quadripunctatus* parents must defense to brood parasitism irrespective of its frequency.

Intra- and inter-specific brood parasitism has been reported within the genus *Nicrophorus* (Müller et al. 1990; Trumbo 1994). The host species of *Nicrophorus* have two defense mechanisms against a brood parasite—they either repel it, thus limiting access to the resource, or kill the parasitic young (Trumbo 1994). Adults of *N. quadripunctatus* appear to use both these mechanisms. The low oviposition success of *P. morio* was likely due to by direct attacks by *N. quadripunctatus*; this was indicated by the high number of injuries observed in *P. morio* that were sustained while attempting to parasitize *N. quadripunctatus*. *N. quadripunctatus* also kill parasitic larvae. *Nicrophorus* does not have an absolute mechanism that discriminates against congeneric larvae; however, it indirectly discriminates by killing the young that do not come to the carcass at the expected time (Müller and Eggert 1990). Similarly, in our experiments, the parasitic young at a different stage of larval development than the host young were killed at a higher rate than the young at the same stage (Fig. 2). In our experiments, many *P. morio* larvae were killed by *N. quadripunctatus* even if they were at the same developmental stage as the host larvae. *Nicrophorus quadripunctatus* appears to have an additional mechanism that discriminates against *P. morio* larvae. *Ptomascopus morio* larvae usually remain under the carcass (Peck 1982), whereas *Nicrophorus* larvae congregate at the top of the carcass (Eggert and Müller 1997). It is possible that this behavioral difference contributes to the ability of *N. quadripunctatus* to distinguish between the host and parasitic young.

If *P. morio* is difficult to reproduce by brood parasitism, how can this *P. morio* population persists? The spatio-temporal distributions of *N. concolor* and *P. morio* largely overlap (Nagano and Suzuki 2003), but those of *N. quadripunctatus* and *P. morio* can either be similar (Ohara 1995), as they were in the present study, or very different (Katakura et al. 1986; Nagano and Suzuki 2003). Most facultative brood parasitism in

birds occurs among independent breeders that are occasionally parasitic (Payne 1998). We hypothesize that brood parasitism by *P. morio* is facultative and that when rejected by a host, *P. morio* will reproduce in a place inhabited by few competing *Nicrophorus*. Previous studies have shown the niche difference between a *Nicrophorus* species and *P. morio* in habitat (Katakura and Ueno 1985) and in season (Nagano and Suzuki 2003; Trumbo et al. 2001). However, we did not observe any niche difference between *N. quadripunctatus* and *P. morio* in Otaru. Sometimes different *Nicrophorus* species coexist without any apparent difference in spatio-temporal distribution (Ohkawara et al. 1998). This observation warrants further investigation; unknown niche difference between *N. quadripunctatus* and *P. morio* may exist.

Why do *N. quadripunctatus* and *N. concolor* differ so markedly in their respective abilities to defend themselves against brood parasitism by *P. morio*? Since parasitism is typically deleterious to the host's reproductive success (Trumbo et al. 2001; this paper), we expected the hosts to develop counter-adaptations. Winfree (1999) noted that there is often a bimodal distribution of rejection frequencies among host species in birds, with each species rejecting close to either 0% or 100%. There are several hypotheses for such bimodality, including evolutionary lags and cost-benefit equilibria, but all models suggest that intermediate rejection rates are unstable (Winfree 1999). Trumbo et al. (2001) noted that *N. tomentosus* distributed in North America was parasitized despite being completely allopatric to *P. morio*. We conclude that *P. morio* will attempt to parasitize any brood of a *Nicrophorus* species and that the degree of success of the host defense will vary among the species' and/or populations of *Nicrophorus*.

#### Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Dr. S. T. Trumbo for reading the manuscript and making a number of helpful suggestions. This study was supported by a grant from Research Fellowship of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science for Young Scientist (Postdoctoral Fellow).

#### References

- Cervo R, Stemmer C, Castle W, Queller D, Strassmann JE (2004) Social parasitism of *Polistes dominulus* by *Polistes nimphus* (Hymenoptera, Vespidae). *Ins Soc* 51:101–108
- Davies NB, de Brooke ML (1998) Cuckoos versus hosts: experimental evidence for coevolution. In: Rothstein SI, Robinson SK (eds) *Parasitic birds and their host: Studies in coevolution*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp 59–79
- Dobler S, Müller JK (2000) Resolving phylogeny at the family level by mitochondrial cytochrome oxidase sequences: Phylogeny of Carrion beetles (Coleoptera: Silphidae). *Mol Phylogenet Evol* 15:390–402
- Eggert AK, Müller JK (1997) Biparental care and social evolution in burying beetles: lessons from the larder. In: Choe JC, Crespi BJ (eds) *The evolution of Social Behavior in Insects and Arachnids*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 216–236
- Katakura H, Sonoda M, Yoshida N (1986) Carrion beetle (Coleoptera, Silphidae) fauna of Hokkaido University Tomakomai experiment forest, Northern Japan, with a note on the habitat preference of a Geotrupine species, *Geotrupes laevistriatus* (Coleoptera, Scarabaeidae). *Res Bull Coll Exp for Fac Agr Hokkaido Univ* 43:43–56
- Katakura H, Ueno R (1985) A primary study on the faunal make-up and spatio-temporal distribution of carrion beetles (Coleoptera, Silphidae) on Ishikari Coast, Northern Japan. *Jpn J Ecol* 35:461–468
- Müller JK, Eggert AK (1990) Time-dependent shifts between infanticidal and parental behavior in female burying beetles: a mechanism of indirect mother-offspring recognition. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 27:11–16
- Müller JK, Eggert AK, Dressel J (1990) Intraspecific brood parasitism in the burying beetle, *Necrophorus vespilloides*. *Anim Behav* 40:491–499
- Nagano M, Suzuki S (2003) Phenology and habitat use among Nicrophorine beetles of the genus *Nicrophorus* and *Ptomascopus* (Coleoptera: Silphidae). *Edaphologia* 73:1–9
- Ohara M (1995) Notes on insect fauna of the Nagahashi Naebo area, Otaru, central

- Hokkaido, Japan, No. 9—Survey of the research in 1992 and 1993, and on the beetles collected by bait trap with dead chicken. *Bull Otaru Mus* 8:19–42
- Ohkawara K, Suzuki S, Katakura H (1998) Competitive interaction and niche differentiation among burying beetles (Silphidae, *Nicrophorus*) in Northern Japan. *Entomol Sci* 1:551–559
- Payne RB (1998) Brood parasitism in birds: strangers in the nest. *Bioscience* 48:377–390
- Peck SB (1982) The life history of the Japanese carrion beetle *Ptomascopus morio* and the origins of parental care in *Nicrophorus* (Coleoptera, Silphidae, Nicrophorini). *Phyche* 89:107–111
- Peck SB, Anderson RS (1985) Taxonomy, phylogeny, and biogeography of the carrion beetles of Latin America (Coleoptera: Silphidae). *Quaest Entomol* 21:247–317
- Rasa OAE, Heg D (2004) Individual variation and prior experience affect the discrimination of a brood-parasite by its subsocial beetle host. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 57:155–163
- Rothstein SI (1990) A model system for coevolution: avian brood parasitism. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* 21:481–508
- Scott MP (1990) Brood guarding and the evolution of male parental care in burying beetles. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 26: 31-39
- Scott MP (1998) The ecology and behavior of burying beetles. *Annu Rev Entomol* 43: 595-618
- Sledge MF, Dani FR, Cervo R, Dapporto L, Turillazzi S (2001) Recognition of social parasites as nest-mates: adoption of colony-specific host cuticular odours by the paper wasp parasite *Polistes sulcifer*. *Proc R Soc Lond B* 268:2253–2260
- Soler JJ, Martinez JG, Soler M, Møller AP (2001) Coevolutionary interactions in host-parasite system. *Ecol Lett* 4:470–476
- Soler JJ, Soler M (2000) Brood-parasite interactions between great spotted cuckoos and magpies: a model system for studying coevolutionary relationships. *Oecologia* 125:309–320
- Suzuki, S (2000) Carrion burial by *Nicrophorus vespilloides* (Coleoptera: Silphidae) prevents fly infestation. *Entomol Sci* 3:269–273
- Suzuki S, Nagano M (in press) Resource guarding by *Ptomascopus morio*: simple

- parental care in the Nicrophorinae (Silphidae: Coleoptera). Eur J Entomol
- Szalanski AL, Sikes DS, Bischof R, Fritz M (2000) Population genetics and phylogenetics of the endangered American burying beetle, *Nicrophorus americanus* (Coleoptera: Silphidae). Ann Entomol Soc Amer 93:589–594
- Trumbo ST (1994) Interspecific competition, brood parasitism and the evolution of biparental cooperation in burying beetles. Oikos 69:241–249
- Trumbo ST, Kon M, Sikes D (2001) The reproductive biology of *Ptomascopus morio*, a brood parasite of *Nicrophorus*. J Zool Lond 255:543–560
- Wilson EO (1971) The Insect Societies. Harvard University Press, Cambridge
- Winfree R (1999) Cuckoos, cowbirds and the persistence of brood parasitism. Trends Ecol Evol 14:338–342

## Figure legends

Fig. 1

Phenology of Nicrophorinae in Otaru

Fig. 2

Mean (+ SE) number of surviving *P. morio* larvae following parent removal treatment (hatched bar), same-stage treatment (solid bars), and different-stage treatment (open bars)  
Bars with the same letter are not significantly different ( $P < 0.01$ , Steel-Dwass test).




Fig.1




Fig.2