



Article (refereed)

Oliver, T.H.; Leather, S.R.; Cook, J.M.. 2008
Macroevolutionary patterns in the origin of mutualisms
involving ants. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 21 (6).
1597-1608. 10.1111/j.1420-9101.2008.01600.x

© 2008

This version available <http://nora.nerc.ac.uk/7872/>

NERC has developed NORA to enable users to access research outputs wholly or partially funded by NERC. Copyright and other rights for material on this site are retained by the authors and/or other rights owners. Users should read the terms and conditions of use of this material at <http://nora.nerc.ac.uk/policies.html#access>

This document is the author's final manuscript version of the journal article, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer review process. Some differences between this and the publisher's version remain. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from this article.

Contact CEH NORA team at
nora@ceh.ac.uk

1 **Macroevolutionary patterns in the origin of mutualisms**
2 **involving ants**

3
4 Thomas H Oliver^{1§}, Simon R Leather¹, James M Cook²

5 ¹ Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Biological Records Centre, Maclean Building,
6 Benson Lane, Crowmarsh Gifford, Wallingford, Oxfordshire, OX10 8BB, UK.

7 ² Division of Biology, Imperial College, Silwood Park, Buckhurst Rd, Ascot, SL5 7PY,
8 UK.

9 ³ School of Biological Sciences, University of Reading, RG6 6AS, UK.

10
11 [§]Corresponding author

12 Tom Oliver

13 Telephone: 00 44 207 5942534

14
15 Email addresses:

16 THO: toliver@ceh.ac.uk

17 JMC: james.cook@reading.ac.uk

18 SRL: s.leather@ic.ac.uk

19 **Running title: Macroevolutionary patterns in ant mutualisms**

1 **Abstract**

2
3 Ants are a diverse and abundant insect group that form mutualistic associations with a
4 number of different organisms from fungi to insects and plants. Here we use a
5 phylogenetic approach to identify ecological factors that explain macroevolutionary
6 trends in the mutualism between ants and honeydew-producing Homoptera. We also
7 consider association between ant-Homoptera, ant-fungi and ant-plant mutualisms.
8 Homoptera-tending ants are more likely to be forest dwelling, polygynous, ecologically
9 dominant and arboreal nesting with large colonies of $10^4 - 10^5$ individuals. Mutualistic
10 ants (including those that garden fungi and inhabit ant-plants) are found in under half of
11 the formicid subfamilies. At the genus level, however, we find a negative association
12 between ant-Homoptera and ant-fungi mutualisms, while there is a positive association
13 between ant-Homoptera and ant-plant mutualisms. We suggest that species can only
14 specialise in multiple mutualisms simultaneously when there is no trade-off in
15 requirements from the different partners and no redundancy of rewards.

16
17
18 **Keywords:** mutualism, Formicidae, Homoptera, myrmecophiles, species interactions,
19 dominant ants, coevolution.

1 Introduction

2 Mutualisms are common, fundamental interactions shaping species' communities and,
3 through coevolutionary adaptation, even changing species themselves (Herre et al.,
4 1999). Within a family that contains mixtures of mutualistic and non-mutualistic
5 species we can identify ecological factors that are associated with mutualism. These
6 factors may be preadaptations that predispose a lineage to mutualism or they may be the
7 selective consequences of mutualistic coevolution. Mutualisms are not always stable
8 over evolutionary time and may be lost and gained repeatedly (Sachs & Simms, 2006).
9 If a clade is involved in several different types of mutualism, these mutualisms may be
10 positively or negatively associated or show no association at all.

11 The ants (Family: Formicidae) engage in a broad range of mutualistic interactions
12 with many different organisms including plants, insects and fungi (Hölldobler &
13 Wilson, 1990). This diversity of mutualistic interaction may reflect the widespread
14 abundance and ecological dominance of ants. Alternatively, perhaps they are ideal
15 mutualistic partners because, compared with solitary living species, ant colonies are
16 able to provide a more efficient, non-localised defence for vulnerable species. Not all
17 ants are involved in mutualisms, however. By comparing the ecology of mutualistic
18 versus non-mutualistic ant taxa, we are able to characterise ecological traits that are
19 associated with mutualism. This allows insight into the origin of these mutualisms and
20 can also lead to speculation over how mutualisms can shape species. In this study we
21 focus primarily on the mutualism between ants and Homoptera (aphids, scales *etc.*). We
22 consider how various ecological traits correlate with the occurrence of this mutualism
23 in ant genera. In addition, we compare how the ant- Homoptera mutualism is associated
24 with mutualisms between ants and other organisms.

25 Many ants are well known to tend Homoptera for their sugary 'honeydew'; a

1 process known as *trophobiosis*. In addition, ants also visit lycaenid butterfly larvae and
2 the extrafloral nectaries of some plants to collect sugary secretions. These excretions/
3 secretions contain a variety of amino acids and carbohydrates which ant colonies use to
4 fuel foraging activity and feed developing brood. In return ants provide a wide range of
5 benefits to their partners including protection from predators and parasites (Jones,
6 1929, Stadler & Dixon, 2005), shelter (Way, 1963), transport (Collins & Leather, 2002)
7 and reduction of pathogen contamination (Fokkema et al., 1983, Way, 1954). The
8 mutualism between ants and Homoptera is economically important because Homoptera
9 are major agricultural pests worldwide and ants are ecologically dominant organisms
10 having widespread impacts on the community structure (Wimp & Whitham, 2001) and
11 nutrient cycling of ecosystems (Folgarait, 1998). There is broad diversity in the degree
12 of association between aphids and ants. For example, one aphid species may often be
13 tended by ants while a congener is not (Stadler & Dixon, 2005). Also, different aphids
14 sharing the same host plant may differ in their degree of trophobiosis with ants
15 (Bristow, 1991). A wide range of explanations have been suggested for the variation in
16 trophobiosis in ant-aphid interactions; however, it is useful to distinguish between
17 factors that promote variation in trophobiosis *within* species (i.e. across populations)
18 and those that cause differences between species. Within a single aphid species there
19 may be spatial and temporal variation in the degree of ant tending. Similarly, there will
20 be differences between ant colonies in their investment in Homoptera. This variation
21 across populations is characteristic of facultative mutualisms where both partners can
22 survive alone and do not exclusively require interspecific association. Obligate
23 mutualisms, in contrast, always find the two partner species in association. The
24 majority of ant-aphid and ant-lycaenid relationships are thought to be facultative
25 (Bristow, 1991, Pierce et al., 2002).

1 Population level variation in trophobiosis between ants and aphids can be
2 satisfactorily explained by two hypotheses. One is that, although relationships may be
3 mutually beneficial, ants and aphids are limited in their ability to encounter one
4 another. Ants are not omnipresent and their colony territories do not encompass the
5 entire landscape. Similarly, there is no evidence that alate aphid dispersal is directed to
6 patches with ants, even though apterous aphid dispersal may be limited by ant
7 semiochemicals (Oliver et al., 2007b). The second explanation is context dependent
8 fitness, whereby the costs and benefits of an interspecific association depend on a
9 multitude of biotic and abiotic factors which vary in time and space (Cushman &
10 Whitham, 1989). Thus, the net effect of an interaction on each partner may change in
11 magnitude and even sign (Bronstein, 1994, Thompson, 1994). For example, in cases
12 where costs exceed benefits, aphids will profit from leaving the association with ants.
13 This can be achieved through selection for traits that prevent ant tending e.g.
14 sequestering plant toxins in honeydew (Buckley, 1987). If the interaction frequently
15 fluctuates between mutualism and parasitism then natural selection can optimise
16 benefits by evolving phenotypically plastic traits that facilitate association only when
17 conditions are favourable e.g. increasing honeydew quality in the presence of ants (Yao
18 & Akimoto, 2002). A wide variety of ecological factors have been proposed to account
19 for population level variation in ant-aphid interactions including local species
20 composition and abundance of ants (Horvitz & Douglas, 1984, Oliver et al., 2007a) or
21 aphids (including competing mutualistic species) (Addicott, 1978); seasonal change in
22 ant nutritional requirements (Sudd & Sudd, 1983); presence of alternative sugar sources
23 (Offenberg, 2001) and host plant quality (Cushman, 1991, Auclair, 1963).

24 Variation in trophobiosis between ant and aphid *species*, however, can encompass
25 additional explanations. For example, morphological differences between ant species

1 in the development of the proventriculus can affect their ability to gather large
2 quantities of honeydew in the crop and thus affect suitability for trophobiosis
3 (Davidson et al., 2004). Factors, such as morphological change, operate on
4 evolutionary timescales and can shape species level variation. Evolution of third-party
5 antagonists can also disrupt mutualisms (Sachs & Simms, 2006). For example,
6 specialised parasitoids may arise which are able to subvert ant defences and because of
7 the enemy free space they find there, develop specially to exploit ant attended aphids
8 (Völkl 1992). Furthermore, mutualistic aphids may find themselves in competition with
9 other aphids which are attractive to ants (Addicott, 1978, Cushman & Addicott, 1989,
10 Cushman & Whitham, 1989). Dynamic indirect coevolution (mediated through the ant
11 mutualist) may ensue, in order to ‘win’ the attention of ants.

12 Generally, past attention has focused on aphids, with attempts to predict factors that
13 explain their association with ants. Reduced alternative defences, such as cornicles
14 releasing waxy secretions and saltatorial legs for escape, have been hypothesised to
15 characterise ant attended aphid species, although evidence is equivocal (Bristow,
16 1991). Bottom-up effects of the type of host plant may go some way towards explaining
17 variation, with certain plant families (e.g Anacardaceae, 100%) supporting
18 considerably higher proportions of ant-tended aphids than others (e.g. Fagaceae, 2%)
19 (Bristow, 1991). Association with ants could also potentially be limited by aphid
20 phylogenetic constraints; however this does not appear to be the case (Bristow, 1991).
21 Indeed, there is evidence that association with ants is a highly labile trait that has
22 evolved and been lost multiple times in aphids (Shingleton & Stern, 2003). Feeding
23 location has been shown to predict some variation in ant attendance (Shingleton et al.,
24 2005). The most comprehensive analysis to date identifies feeding on woody plant
25 parts, non- mobile aphids, non- alate adults and aggregated colonies as traits that are

1 significantly associated with ant attendance (Stadler et al., 2003).

2 In comparison, there has been little attention given to factors that explain variation
3 between ant species in their association with aphids. Indeed, it is not even known
4 roughly what percentage of ants practice aphid tending. Only one study to date (ant
5 proventriculus development (Davidson et al., 2004)), links an ant trait to interspecific
6 association with trophobionts. The current study addresses this paucity of knowledge
7 by identifying several ecological factors that are characteristic of homopteran-tending
8 ants. We specifically test three *a priori* hypotheses, two of which have been suggested
9 by previous researchers:

10

- 11 a) Ecologically dominant and polygynous ants are more likely to monopolise
12 resources and thus form close associations with sugar-producing insects
13 (Blüthgen et al., 2004, Fiedler, 1991, Eastwood & Fraser, 1999, Davidson,
14 1998).
- 15 b) Ant- Homoptera, ant- lycaenid and ant- extrafloral nectary plant mutualisms
16 will be positively associated. Ant species that visit Homoptera and lycaenids
17 appear to be a subset of those that visit extrafloral nectaries (Blüthgen et al.,
18 2004, Fiedler, 2001). Liquid-feeding adaptations in ants may create
19 opportunities to engage in all three mutualisms simultaneously.
- 20 c) Fungus gardening will be negatively correlated with trophobiosis because there
21 is a trade-off preventing specialisation in two very different types of mutualism.
22 In contrast, there will be a positive association with domatia- bearing plants as
23 these have similar requirements to Homoptera (protection), yet provide
24 different rewards.

1 **Materials and methods**

2 **Data collection and analysis**

3 Data on the ecological traits of 139 ant genera were collated from primary literature
4 sources. The genera selected (139 of a possible 288 extant described genera (Moreau et
5 al., 2006)) were those used by Moreau et al. (2006) in a large scale molecular
6 phylogeny of the Formicidae. Binary ecological traits (see Table 1) were scored as
7 positive if at least one species in the genus showed the trait. A similar approach has
8 been used by Koh (2004) to model extinction risk in tropical butterflies. An obvious
9 caveat with this approach is that, by chance, large genera are more likely to contain
10 species with the trait. The sampling effort devoted to a genus may also have a similar
11 effect, with the trait more likely to be found for well studied genera. To overcome this,
12 we have included the log number of species in each genus and log sampling effort
13 (number of hits on ISI Web of Knowledge) as explanatory variables to account for
14 variation caused by these effects.

15 Most phylogenetic comparative analyses are usually conducted with species-level
16 data, although genus-level data have also been used (Koh et al., 2004). In this case, the
17 very large number of species in the Formicidae (~10,000) (Hölldobler & Wilson, 1990)
18 and limited knowledge of many of these species makes any large scale analysis at the
19 species level impossible. However, although there may exist polymorphism of a trait
20 within a genus, such polymorphisms at the tips of a phylogenetic tree are a problem for
21 any comparative analysis; species are assumed to have a certain trait yet in reality there
22 may be intraspecific variation within the trait. Thus the question is not necessarily
23 whether data is collected at genus level or species level, but rather are the proposed
24 traits truly representative enough of the taxa? Although trait polymorphism within
25 terminal taxa may present problems in the reconstruction of ancestral nodes and related

1 comparative methods that use such an approach e.g. phylogenetically independent
2 contrasts (Felsenstein, 1985), comparative methods that do not rely on ancestral state
3 reconstruction, but rather use a correlation matrix to weight non-independence, should
4 be suitable to model such traits. Despite this, for the majority of traits we have tested if
5 a trait is scored as a positive for a genera then it is likely that most species share the trait.
6 The two traits most likely to have higher degrees of polymorphism within genera are
7 polygyny and invasiveness.

8
9 To account for autocorrelation from phylogenetic non-independence we used
10 generalised estimating equations (GEE), which are similar to the GLS (generalised
11 least squares) approach (Grafen, 1989), except that non-normal errors in response
12 variables can be modelled (Paradis & Claude, 2002). They are suitable for data with
13 discrete response variables, through the specification of binomial, rather than Gaussian,
14 error structures, and also allow the exploration of interaction effects between
15 explanatory variables (Paradis, 2006, Paradis & Claude, 2002). We tested interaction
16 effects chosen only from *a priori* hypotheses (see Table 2).

17 For GEEs, a phylogeny is required to produce a correlation matrix derived from the
18 distances between terminal taxa in a tree, which is then used to weight variances in a
19 generalised modelling framework. We used a recent phylogeny of ants resolved to the
20 genus level by Moreau *et al.* (2006). GEEs were carried out using the ‘compar.gee’
21 function in the ‘ape’ package (Paradis *et al.*, 2004) of the program ‘R 2.6.1’ (Ihaka &
22 Gentleman, 1996, R.Development.Core.Team, 2007). The binary response variable
23 was the occurrence of homopteran tending (trophobiosis) in the genus and thus
24 binomial, rather than Gaussian, errors were specified with either logit or
25 complementary log-log links, depending on whichever minimised residual variance.

1 Computational iterations often diverged when both species count and sampling effort
2 were included as blocking explanatory variables as these two are highly correlated
3 (Pearson's product moment correlation: $t = 8.61$, $d.f. = 145$, $p < 0.001$). Therefore, only
4 sampling effort was included. After testing each potential trait singly for an association
5 with trophobiosis (Table 1), pairwise interactions were tested (Table 2), again with
6 sampling effort as a blocking factor.

7

8 In addition to the GEE analysis, we also carried out an additional binary logistic
9 regression analysis that does not account for relatedness between taxa. This analysis
10 indicates association between ant traits, independent of shared evolutionary history
11 between taxa, *i.e.* it simply asks: which traits best describe ant genera that tend aphids?
12 If we then want to ask whether this association implies some kind of causal linkage
13 between the traits rather than simply association through shared evolutionary history,
14 we can then refer to the GEE analysis that takes phylogenetic non-independence of taxa
15 into account. For the non-phylogenetic comparative analysis, binary logistic
16 regressions specified with binomial errors were carried out with sampling effort and
17 species count as additional explanatory variables.

18 Comparisons of the proportion of ant genera that are nomadic and/or tend
19 Homoptera, and a similar comparison between dominance and trophobiosis were
20 carried out using a binomial test calculating a Chi-squared statistic. The same test was
21 used for the comparison between small and large dominant ants for the proportions of
22 genera with certain other ecological traits (Table 5).

23

24

25

1 Results

2 Taxonomic distribution

3 Thirty seven percent of ant genera contained species that engage in trophobiosis with
4 Homoptera. The taxonomic distribution was uneven with certain subfamilies more
5 likely to contain mutualistic ant species (deviance = 52.195, d.f. = 18,119, $p < 0.001$)
6 (Fig. 1). At the subfamily level there is a positive association between ant-trophobiont,
7 ant fungi and ant-plant mutualisms (trophobiont-fungi: dev = 5.99, d.f. = 1,17, $p =$
8 0.014; trophobiont-plant: dev. = 4.11, d.f. = 1,17, $p = 0.043$; plant-fungi: dev. = 9.84,
9 d.f. = 1,17, $p = 0.002$). Ant-fungi mutualisms always occur in subfamilies that also have
10 mutualisms with plants and trophobiotic insects. For fungi, however, this positive
11 association does not carry down to genus level and the trend becomes reversed (see
12 next section). Over half of ant subfamilies do not engage in any known mutualisms with
13 Homoptera, fungi or domatia bearing plants.

14 Ecological correlates of trophobiosis with Homoptera

15 Without controlling for phylogenetic non-independence there were a number of
16 ecological traits significantly associated with trophobiosis (Table 3).
17 Homopteran-tending ants are more likely to be dominant, polygynous, arboreal nesters
18 with large colonies of 10^4 - 10^5 workers. Furthermore, invasive ants and ants that are
19 found in disturbed habitats are more likely to be trophobiotic. There was a positive
20 association between trophobiosis mutualisms and mutualisms between ants and
21 domatia-bearing plants. Ninety four percent of the ant genera with species that live in
22 plant domatia also contain trophobiotic species. In addition, ant-trophobiont and
23 ant-plant mutualisms also co-occur at species level. For example most *Crematogaster*
24 species that inhabit domatia of the ant-plant *Macaranga* keep scale insects
25 (Homoptera) inside the plant chambers (Heckroth et al., 1998).

1

2 Using the GEE method to account for phylogenetic non-independence, many of these
3 significant associations drop out (Table 4). This suggests a shared evolutionary history
4 is responsible for the association in many of the cases. In contrast, those traits that are
5 still significant after the GEE analysis are likely to have some causal relationship with
6 trophobiosis because across the whole phylogeny they are repeatedly associated on
7 many occasions. These associated traits include the other ‘trophobiosis-like’
8 mutualisms: feeding at extrafloral nectaries and the tending of lycaenid larvae, and also
9 fungus gardening (a negative association). Six ant genera contain species that engage in
10 symbiotic mutualism with fungi. Five of these six genera are attine ants (tribe Attini)
11 that grow nutritional fungi in gardens and do not engage in trophobiotic mutualisms
12 with Homoptera. The sixth genus, *Lasius* (subfamily Formicinae) is somewhat of an
13 exception as only one species shares a mutualism with fungi. *Lasius fuliginosus*
14 associates with an ascomycete fungi which grows in the walls of its carton nests and
15 strengthens them structurally (Hölldobler & Wilson, 1990). Thus, in this trophobiotic
16 genus there is an isolated occurrence of an ant-fungus mutualism, but it is not one in
17 which ants derive nutrition from fungi.

18 There was a positive association between dominance of ant genera and trophobiosis
19 (Table 4). Sixty seven percent of ant genera with ecologically dominant species contain
20 homoptera-tending species, compared with only 23% of genera without ecological
21 dominants. Interestingly, a significant association between nomadism and trophobiosis
22 also emerged from the GEE analysis, whilst the effect was only close to significance in
23 the binary logistic regression. Nomadic ants are less likely to tend Homoptera than
24 non-nomadic genera. As with all comparative analyses, we can infer only association,
25 not the direction of causality (nor whether it is direct or mediated through some other

1 trait); thus, whether these traits are a cause or consequence of trophobiosis is unknown.
2 In the absence of a species level phylogeny (onto which the origin of traits could be
3 more accurately mapped), one crude method to give a suggestion of the direction of
4 causality is to consider the proportions of genera (e.g. nomadic or trophobiotic) in each
5 group (e.g. trophobionts or nomadic ants, respectively). For example, if becoming
6 nomadic tends to cause ants to relinquish trophobiotic relationships then we would
7 expect the majority of nomadic ants to be non-trophobionts (lack of trophobiosis is
8 necessary for nomadism). In contrast, if not tending Homoptera caused ants to live a
9 nomadic lifestyle then we would expect most non-trophobiotic ants to become nomadic
10 (nomadism is necessary for non-trophobiosis). Considering the data, we find that a
11 significantly higher proportion of nomadic ants do not tend Homoptera (10/13, 77%),
12 compared with only a small minority of non-trophobiotic ants that happen to be
13 nomadic (10/84, 12%) ($\chi^2 = 25.2$, d.f. = 1, $p < 0.001$). This suggests that nomadism is a
14 precursor to the loss of the trophobiosis mutualism, and, thus, that relinquishing
15 trophobiosis is a consequence of being nomadic (but with many exceptions to this rule,
16 or reversions from trophobiosis after nomadism has developed, because only 77%
17 rather than a 100% of nomadic ant genera do not tend Homoptera). A similar
18 comparison for dominance and trophobiosis traits is less conclusive. Sixty two percent
19 of trophobiotic ant genera are dominant, compared with 76% of dominant ants that are
20 trophobiotic, the difference being non-significant ($\chi^2 = 1.69$, d.f. = 1, $p = 0.193$).

21

22 Finally, considering potential interaction effects between ecological factors (Table
23 2), there was a significant interaction between ecological dominance and mean ant
24 body size on the occurrence of trophobiosis with Homoptera (Binary log. reg.: Dev =
25 6.01, d.f. = 1,128, $p = 0.014$; GEE: $t = 4.29$, d.f. = 27.0, $p < 0.001$). Size had a

1 significant effect on the occurrence of trophobiosis only in dominant ant genera. The
2 direction of effect was opposite to that predicted, however: dominant ants tending
3 Homoptera are on average much smaller than dominants that do not (mean size
4 trophobionts(\pm SE) = 4.53 ± 0.14 mm, mean size non-trophobionts = 8.20 ± 1.40 mm;
5 Dev = 6.213, d.f. = 1,35, $p = 0.013$). Thus dominant ants fall into two distinct groups,
6 those that tend Homoptera and those that do not, and several other ecological factors
7 also differ markedly between these two types of ant. Small, dominant ants that tend
8 Homoptera are more likely to be polygynous, invasive and thrive in disturbed habitats.
9 Furthermore, they are less likely to be nomadic or have polymorphic workers (Table 4).

10 There was no significant interaction between polygyny and colony size on
11 trophobiosis (Binary log. reg: Dev = 1.817, d.f. = 3, 69, $p = 0.61$; GEE: $t = 1.163$, d.f. =
12 15.7, $p = 0.284$). Finally, consideration of an interaction effect between arboreal nesting
13 and latitude was not applicable as there were no arboreal nesting genera that occurred
14 only in temperate regions. For ants found solely in the tropics, 72 % of genera (18 out of
15 25) that tended Homoptera nested in trees. For ants found only in temperate zones, zero
16 out of nine genera that tended Homoptera nested in trees.

17

18 **Phylogeny**

19 The presence or absence of trophobiosis with Homoptera can be mapped onto a
20 phylogeny of the Formicidae (Fig. 2). With data collated at the genus level however,
21 ancestral state reconstructions can be inaccurate if there is considerable polymorphism
22 for the trait at the species level. Thus Figure 2 is an accurate reflection of the evolution
23 of trophobiosis given the assumption that, if trophobiosis is scored as positive for a
24 genus, then the majority of the species in the genus are trophobionts. If this assumption
25 is violated then there may be differences in the evolutionary history of trophobiosis

1 from what is shown here. For the trophobiosis trait, we believe that this assumption is
2 reasonable. For example, in the recently resolved genus *Linepithema*, Homoptera
3 tending is ubiquitous across all 19 species (Wild, 2007). Also, we have refrained from
4 estimating the relative rates of transition between trophobiosis states, although it is
5 reasonable to use the phylogeny to calculate the minimum number of state changes.
6 Using the program PAUP (Swofford, 2000) the most parsimonious number of changes
7 is an impressive 31. This figure is likely to be highly conservative as the phylogeny is
8 resolved only to genus level and there may be many transitions at the species level.
9 There may also be under-reporting in the literature which could lead to trophobiosis
10 being incorrectly assumed to be absent in poorly sampled genera. This may slightly
11 inflate or decrease the number of changes depending on whether it occurs in mutualistic
12 or autonomous clades. Regardless, trophobiosis in ants appears to be a highly
13 evolutionarily labile trait.

14

15 **Discussion**

16 The tending of homopteran and lycaenid insects by ants occurs on a broad taxonomic
17 scale, with 45% of ant genera containing trophobiotic species. The taxonomic
18 distribution is uneven, however, with certain subfamilies specialising in trophobiosis
19 (e.g. the Aenictinae, Aneuritinae and Pseudomyrmicinae and of the larger subfamilies:
20 the Dolichoderinae and Formicinae), while trophobiosis is entirely absent in others (e.g.
21 the Ecitoninae). We have identified a number of ecological traits that are correlated
22 with the occurrence of trophobiosis in ant genera. Thus, species most likely to tend
23 Homoptera are ants that are polygynous, dominant in their community, arboreal
24 nesting, with large colonies of $10^4 - 10^5$ individuals, and those that can occupy
25 disturbed habitats. Several ecological factors, such as latitude and worker

1 polymorphism, did not correlate with trophobiosis. This could indicate these factors
2 have little influence on the evolution of trophobiosis. It is also possible however, that
3 they are important, but are simply not detected in a genus level analysis.

4 The association between dominance, polygyny and trophobiosis has been noted by
5 a number of researchers (Blüthgen et al., 2004, Fiedler, 1991, Eastwood & Fraser,
6 1999, Fiedler, 2001, Davidson, 1998). Dominant ant species can monopolise honeydew
7 producing resources by excluding subdominant species. Subdominant and specialised
8 ants tend to have smaller colonies and as such may be confined to peripheral ecological
9 niches where resources are more scarce. Thus a few key Homopteran species
10 colonising certain host plants can contribute to shaping the ant community of an
11 ecosystem (Blüthgen et al., 2004). At this point, however, we are unable to determine
12 which trait, dominance or trophobiosis, precedes which. Dominant ants may be more
13 able to outcompete others to obtain resources, but the converse is also possible whereby
14 the evolution of adaptations to exploit new resources allows ants to become dominant
15 (Davidson, 1998). Honeydew is a profitable, renewable source of carbohydrates as well
16 as essential amino acids (Völkl et al., 1999, Fischer & Shingleton, 2001). With access
17 to such food, ant colonies may be able to forage wider areas (Stadler & Dixon, 2005)
18 and support larger populations of vigorous workers able to outcompete other ants
19 (Davidson, 1997). Modification of the proventriculus is one such adaptation that
20 facilitates the trophobiont-ant relationship by allowing large amounts of liquid food to
21 be carried back to the nest. This may allow ants to increase numbers and achieve
22 dominance (Davidson et al., 2004). There may also be covariance in some of the
23 ecological traits important in trophobiosis. For example, polygynous ant colonies tend
24 to be large and polydomous (Hölldobler & Wilson, 1990); attributes which no doubt
25 help them to achieve ecological dominance and exclude competitors from sugar

1 producing resources (Davidson, 1998). Polygyny also breaks down within-colony
2 relatedness and so may also facilitate the formation of ‘unicoloniality’, very large
3 cooperative entities of ants that exclude competing species (Davidson, 1998).
4 Alternatively, Rosengren et al. (1993) have instead suggested that polygyny may result
5 *from* trophobiosis as the relative benefit of long distance dispersal by the female
6 reproductive class declines compared with remaining with the native colony in
7 competition-free, resource rich areas. Our study shows a positive association between
8 polygyny and trophobiosis with Homoptera, but this relationship disappears after
9 accounting for phylogenetic non-independence using the GEE method.

10 A novel finding in this paper is that dominant ants appear to fall into two categories:
11 small dominant ants that tend Homoptera and larger dominant ants that do not. A
12 number of other ecological traits also differ significantly between the two groups
13 (Table 5), supporting this grouping of dominant ants on the basis of homopteran
14 tending. Small ants may be more able to match worker allocation to resource value and
15 allow a continuous, steady flow of resources to the nest. In addition they may provide a
16 more effective, non-localised defence force through increased sensitivity (greater
17 number of- and more widely dispersed ‘receptors’), followed by pheromone-mediated
18 mass recruitment towards targeted threats. Polygyny and polydomy can further aid this
19 resource monopolisation (Davidson, 1998) and invasiveness of ants may be an
20 emergent trait facilitated by a combination of small size, polygyny and homopteran
21 tending (Ness & Bronstein, 2004). Large dominant ants, in contrast, include ants such
22 as the Ponerines which tend adopt a more solitary mode of foraging. Also, on average,
23 large dominants have a greater degree of worker polymorphism which is also
24 associated with nomadic lifestyles.

25 It is noteworthy that trophobiosis was positively associated with invasiveness. This

1 could be due to traits that covary with trophobiosis, for example dominance.
2 Regardless, it highlights that the trophobiotic association with Homoptera is very
3 flexible. Invading ants can easily adopt new partners in a novel habitat. It may be that
4 general exaptations (preadaptations) of the ant-Homoptera mutualism allow easy
5 transfer to new partners (Mondor & Addicott, 2007) and a dynamic flux in mutualist
6 identity. Partner switching may occur not just with different congeneric species, but
7 across large taxonomic divides, such as the exploitation, by a single ant colony, of
8 many different Homoptera, lycaenid and extrafloral nectar-bearing plant species. This
9 may be especially useful if a partner's range and abundance is limited and also in novel
10 habitats where a previous partner is absent. Such partner switching may give facultative
11 mutualisms an advantage over obligate pairwise mutualisms. Although interactions
12 between ants and domatia-bearing plants (Beattie, 1985) or fungi (Mueller et al., 2005)
13 are often obligate and specialised, those between ants and sugar-producing
14 trophobionts are most often not (Pierce et al., 2002, Bristow, 1991). Rather than some
15 kind of clade selection promoting facultative mutualism over pairwise obligate
16 specialisation, however, in ant-Homoptera interactions we predict that facultative
17 mutualisms are more prevalent due to the dynamic metapopulation structure of
18 Homoptera combined with the by-product nature of rewards. Dynamic
19 metapopulations make reciprocal interactions between the same genotypes less
20 persistent thereby reducing partner fidelity. General by-product rewards (honeydew is a
21 waste product for Homoptera and ants, by nature, guard all types of food resource)
22 facilitate easy partner switching.

23
24 Finally, it may be intuitive to expect that close coevolution with a mutualistic
25 partner limits the extent to which a species can participate in other coevolutionary

1 relationships. Strong directional or balancing selection imposed by one coevolutionary
2 partner may limit the degree to which a trait can be selected by another partner. We
3 find, however, that trophobiotic ants are able to maintain several mutualisms
4 simultaneously. Species that tend Homoptera are also highly likely to be those which
5 tend lycaenids and feed at extrafloral nectaries. Ants provide similar benefits to each of
6 these groups (primarily defence against enemies), and receive similar rewards (sugary
7 secretions). Thus, general adaptations may facilitate all three mutualisms. For example,
8 effective resource defence abilities, group recruitment and a modified proventriculus
9 allow exploitation of these similar resources. In addition to maintaining mutualisms
10 with trophobionts, ants can also simultaneously engage in mutualisms with
11 domatia-bearing plants. A similar pattern of association has been found for plants with
12 extrafloral nectaries: there is a positive association between extrafloral nectary bearing
13 plants and ant-tended aphids (Offenberg, 2000). Ants that inhabit plant domatia often
14 bring their Homopteran mutualists with them and use plant shelters to farm their herds.
15 Similar to trophobionts, domatia-bearing plants require an effective defence force. By
16 moving mutualistic partners together, ants can achieve this and reap the rewards from
17 both (shelter from plants and food from Homoptera).

18 When requirements from mutualistic partners diverge, however, it appears ants may
19 be required to specialise in one type of mutualism. Ants that garden fungi, for example,
20 do not engage in trophobiotic interactions with Homoptera. Fungi require the gathering
21 of growth substrates and maintenance of ideal conditions, Homoptera require a
22 patrolling defence. Hoeksema *et al.* (2000) suggest that there may be allocation
23 trade-offs in mutualisms, where limiting resources are allocated to traits associated with
24 different partners. We suggest that foraging time and energy of ants may also be viewed
25 as limiting resources, which trade off between potentially mutualistic partners such as

1 fungi and Homoptera. Over evolutionary time this partner choice becomes cemented by
2 the evolution of specialised traits that maximise benefits from a specific partner type,
3 but reduce the ability to exploit other partners. For example, each partner offers a
4 different type of food as a reward to ants, that may require different physiological
5 adaptations to consume and digest. Where fungi can offer non-food rewards however,
6 (*e.g.* as a structural building tool in *L. fuliginosus* nests), then ants seem to be able to
7 adopt both Homoptera and fungi as mutualistic partners. Thus, from these observations
8 we propose as a general hypothesis that *species can specialise in multiple types of*
9 *mutualism simultaneously only when there is no redundancy of rewards and no*
10 *trade-off in requirements* (Fig. 3). In cases such as the ant mutualisms with Homoptera,
11 lycaenids and extrafloral nectaries there appears to be redundancy of rewards (all offer
12 sugary secretions) but no trade off in requirements (all require protection), a somewhat
13 ‘halfway house’ satisfaction of the above criteria. In these cases we predict that the
14 species can maintain multiple *unspecialised facultative* mutualisms but specialised
15 obligate relationships will not develop. Conversely, for the other halfway house
16 possibility, when there is no redundancy of rewards but there is a trade-off in
17 requirements, we predict that there will be no multiple mutualisms maintained
18 whatsoever. Thus, the trade-off in requirements can be viewed as the most important
19 criterion in determining multiple mutualisms, with redundancy of rewards secondarily
20 determining whether the mutualisms are facultative or specialised obligate
21 relationships.

22 **Conclusion**

23 To summarise, we have identified a number of ecological traits that characterise
24 homopteran tending ants. Trophobiotic ants are more likely to be forest dwelling,
25 polygynous, ecologically dominant and arboreal nesting with large colonies of 10^4 –

1 10⁵ individuals. Some of these associations remain even after accounting for
2 phylogenetic non-independence, suggesting causal relationships. For example, it is
3 highly likely that ecological dominance in ants is either responsible for- or a
4 consequence of- the maintenance of trophobiotic mutualism. We are not yet in a
5 position, however, to predict the direction of causality. We have also found that
6 dominant ants fall into two distinct groups depending on whether they tend Homoptera,
7 and these groups also differ in several related ecological traits, such as invasiveness,
8 polygyny and polymorphism. Finally, we observe that ants appear to specialise in
9 multiple mutualisms only when partners offer different types of reward and there is no
10 trade-off in requirements from the ants. We propose this as a general rule that may
11 govern the formation of multiple mutualisms by any species.

12

13

14 **Acknowledgements**

15 Many thanks to Corrie Saux Moreau for supplying the ant phylogeny, to
16 Konrad Fiedler, Karsten Schonrogge and Tony Dixon for helpful discussion and
17 revision of the manuscript and to Andy Purvis, Andrew Meade and Gavin Thomas for
18 assistance with analysis techniques. Also, thanks to anonymous reviewers whose
19 comments led to improvements on earlier versions of the manuscript. THO was
20 gratefully in receipt of a BBSRC studentship.

21

22

1 **References**

- 2 Addicott, J. F. 1978. Competition for mutualists: aphids and ants. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **56**:
3 2093-2096.
- 4 Auclair, J. L. 1963. Aphid feeding and nutrition. *Annual Review of Entomology* **8**: 439-490.
- 5 Beattie, A. J. 1985. *The Evolutionary Ecology of Ant-Plant Mutualisms*. Cambridge University Press,
6 Cambridge.
- 7 Blüthgen, N., Stork, N. E. & Fiedler, K. 2004. Bottom-up control and co-occurrence in complex
8 communities: honeydew and nectar determine a rainforest ant mosaic. *Oikos* **106**: 344-358.
- 9 Bristow, C. M. (1991) Why are so few aphids ant- tended? In: *Ant- Plant Interactions*, (Huxley, C. R. &
10 Cutler, D. F., eds.). pp. 101-119. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- 11 Bronstein, J. L. 1994. Conditional outcomes in mutualistic interactions. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*
12 **9**: 214-217.
- 13 Buckley, R. C. 1987. Interactions involving plants, Homoptera and ants. *Annual Review of Ecology and*
14 *Systematics* **18**: 111-135.
- 15 Collins, C. M. & Leather, S. R. 2002. Ant-mediated dispersal of the black willow aphid *Pterocomma*
16 *salicis* L.; does the ant *Lasius niger* L. judge aphid-host quality? *Ecological Entomology* **27**:
17 238-241.
- 18 Cushman, J. H. 1991. Host-plant mediation of insect mutualisms: variable outcomes in herbivore-ant
19 interactions. *Oikos* **61**: 138-143.
- 20 Cushman, J. H. & Addicott, J. F. 1989. Intra- and interspecific competition for mutualists: ants as a
21 limited and limiting resource for aphids. *Oecologia* **79**: 315-321.
- 22 Cushman, J. H. & Whitham, T. G. 1989. Conditional mutualism in a membracid-ant association:
23 temporal, age-specific and density dependent effects. *Ecology* **70**: 1040-1047.
- 24 Davidson, D. W. 1997. The role of resource imbalances in the evolutionary ecology of tropical arboreal
25 ants. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **61**: 153-181.
- 26 Davidson, D. W. 1998. Resource discovery versus resource domination in ants: a functional mechanism
27 for breaking the trade-off. *Ecological Entomology* **23**: 484-490.
- 28 Davidson, D. W., Cook, S. C. & Snelling, R. 2004. Liquid-feeding performances of ants (Formicidae):
29 ecological and evolutionary implications. *Oecologia* **139**: 255-266.
- 30 Eastwood, R. & Fraser, A. 1999. Associations between lycaenid butterflies and ants in Australia.

- 1 *Australian Journal of Ecology* **24**: 503-537.
- 2 Felsenstein, J. 1985. Phylogenies and the comparative method. *American Naturalist* **125**: 1-15.
- 3 Fiedler, K. 1991. Systematic, evolutionary and ecological implications of myrmecophily within the
4 Lycaenidae (Insecta: Lepidoptera: Papilioniodae). *Bonner Zoologische Monographien* **31**:
5 1-210.
- 6 Fiedler, K. 2001. Ants that associate with Lycaeninae butterfly larvae: diversity, ecology and
7 biogeography. *Diversity and Distributions* **7**: 45-60.
- 8 Fischer, M. K. & Shingleton, A. W. 2001. Host plant and ants influence the honeydew sugar composition
9 of aphids. *Functional Ecology* **15**: 544-550.
- 10 Fokkema, N. J., Riphagen, I., Poot, R. J. & deJong, C. 1983. Aphid honeydew, a potential stimulant of
11 *Cochliobolus satirus* and *Septoria nodorum* and the competitive role of saprophytic mycoflora.
12 *Transaction of the British Mycological Society* **81**: 355-363.
- 13 Folgarait, P. J. 1998. Ant biodiversity and its relationship to ecosystem functioning: a review.
14 *Biodiversity and conservation* **7**: 1221-1244.
- 15 Grafen, A. 1989. The phylogenetic regression. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of*
16 *London B* **326**: 119-156.
- 17 Heckroth, H.-P., Fiala, B., Gullan, P. J., Idris, A. H. J. & Maschwitz, U. 1998. The soft scale (Coccidae)
18 associates of Malaysian ant-plants. *Journal of Tropical Ecology* **14**: 427-443.
- 19 Herre, E. A., Knowlton, N. & Mueller, U. G. 1999. The evolution of mutualisms: exploring the paths
20 between conflict and cooperation. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **14**: 49-53.
- 21 Hoeksema, J. D. & Bruna, E. M. 2000. Pursuing the big questions about interspecific mutualism: a
22 review of theoretical approaches. *Oecologia* **125**: 321-330.
- 23 Hölldobler, B. & Wilson, E. O. 1990. *The Ants*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 24 Horvitz, C. C. & Douglas, W. S. 1984. Effects of ants and an ant-tended herbivore on seed production of
25 a neotropical herb. *Ecology* **65**: 1369-1378.
- 26 Ihaka, R. & Gentleman, R. 1996. R: A language for data analysis and graphics. *Journal of Computational*
27 *and Graphical Statistics* **5**: 299-314.
- 28 ISI ISI Web of Science search engine. Vol. 2006. pp.
- 29 Jones, C. R. 1929. Ants and their relation to aphids. *Colorado Agricultural Experiment Station. Bulletin*.
30 **341**: 5-96.

- 1 Koh, L. P., Sodhi, N., S. & Brook, B. W. 2004. Ecological correlates of extinction proneness in tropical
2 butterflies. *Conservation Biology* **18**: 1571-1578.
- 3 McGlynn, T. P. 1999. The worldwide transfer of ants: geographical distribution and ecological
4 invasions. *Journal of Biogeography* **26**: 535-548.
- 5 Mondor, E. B. & Addicott, J. F. 2007. Do exaptations facilitate mutualistic associations between invasive
6 and native species? *Biological Invasions* **9**: 623-628.
- 7 Moreau, C. S., Bell, C. D., Vila, R., Archibald, B. & Pierce, N. E. 2006. Phylogeny of the ants:
8 diversification in the age of angiosperms. *Science* **312**: 101-104.
- 9 Mueller, U. G., Gerardo, N. M., Aanen, D. K., Six, D. L. & Schultz, T. R. 2005. The evolution of
10 agriculture in insects. *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics* **36**: 563-595.
- 11 Ness, J. H. & Bronstein, I. L. 2004. The effects of invasive ants on prospective ant mutualists. *Biological*
12 *Invasions* **6**: 445-461.
- 13 Offenberg, J. 2000. Correlated evolution of the association between aphids and ants and the association
14 between aphids and plants with extrafloral nectaries. *Oikos* **91**: 146-152.
- 15 Offenberg, J. H. 2001. Balancing between mutualism and exploitation: the symbiotic interaction between
16 *Lasius* ants and aphids. *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology* **49**: 304-310.
- 17 Oliver, T. H., Cook, J. M. & Leather, S. R. 2007a. When are ant-attractant devices a worthwhile
18 investment? *Vicia faba* extrafloral nectaries and *Lasius niger* ants. *Population Ecology* **49**:
19 265-273.
- 20 Oliver, T. H., Mashanova, A., Leather, S. R., Cook, J. M. & Jansen, V. A. A. 2007b. Ant semiochemicals
21 limit apterous aphid dispersal. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **274**:
22 3127-3131.
- 23 Paradis, E. 2006. *Analysis of Phylogenetics and Evolution with R*. Springer, Baltimore.
- 24 Paradis, E. & Claude, J. 2002. Analysis of comparative data using generalised estimating equations.
25 *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **218**: 175-185.
- 26 Paradis, E., Claude, J. & Strimmer, K. 2004. APE: analyses of phylogenetics and evolution in R
27 language. *Bioinformatics* **20**: 289-290.
- 28 Pierce, N. E., Braby, M. F., Heath, A., Lohman, D. J., Mathew, J., Rand, D. B. & Travassos, M. A. 2002.
29 The ecology and evolution of ant association in the Lycaenidae (Lepidoptera). *Annual Review of*
30 *Entomology* **47**: 733-771.

- 1 R.Development.Core.Team (2007) R: A language and environment for statistical computing.,
2 (Computing, R. F. f. S., ed.). pp., Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0, URL
3 <http://www.R-project.org>.
- 4 Rosengren, R., Sundström, L. & Fortelius, W. (1993) Monogyny and polygyny in *Formica* ants: the
5 result of alternative dispersal tactics. In: *Queen Number and Sociality in Insects*, (Keller, L.,
6 ed.). pp. 308-333. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- 7 Sachs, J. L. & Simms, E. L. 2006. Pathways to mutualism breakdown. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*
8 **21**: 585-592.
- 9 Shingleton, A. W. & Stern, D. L. 2003. Molecular phylogenetic evidence for multiple gains or losses of
10 ant mutualism within the aphid genus *Chaitophorous*. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*
11 **26**: 26-35.
- 12 Shingleton, A. W., Stern, D. L. & Foster, W. A. 2005. The origin of a mutualism: a morphological trait
13 promoting the evolution of ant aphid mutualisms. *Evolution* **59**: 921-926.
- 14 Species 2000 Database. Annual Checklist 2007., Vol. 2007. pp.
- 15 Stadler, B. & Dixon, A. F. G. 2005. Ecology and evolution of aphid- ant interactions. *Annual Review of*
16 *Ecology and Systematics* **36**: 345-372.
- 17 Stadler, B., Kindlmann, P., Šmilauer, P. & Fiedler, K. 2003. A comparative analysis of morphological
18 and ecological characters of European aphids and lycaenids in relation to ant attendance.
19 *Oecologia* **135**: 422-430.
- 20 Sudd, J. H. & Sudd, M. E. 1983. Seasonal changes in the response of wood-ants (*Formica lugubris*) to
21 sucrose baits. *Ecological Entomology* **10**: 89-97.
- 22 Swofford, D. L. (2000) PAUP*. Phylogenetic Analysis Using Parsimony (*and Other Methods), Version
23 4. pp. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts.
- 24 Thompson, J. N. 1994. *The Coevolutionary Process*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- 25 Völkl, W. 1992. Aphids or their parasitoids: Who acutally benefits from ant attendance? *Journal of*
26 *Animal Ecology* **61**: 272-281.
- 27 Völkl, W., Woodring, J., Fischer, M., Lorenz, M. W. & Hoffman, K. H. 1999. Ant-aphid mutualisms:
28 the impact of honeydew production and honeydew sugar composition on ant preferences.
29 *Oecologia* **118**: 483.
- 30 Way, M. J. 1954. Studies on the association of the ant *Oecophylla longinoda* (Latr.) with the scale insect

1 *Saissetia zanzibarensis* (Williams). *Bulletin of Entomological Research* **45**: 113-134.

2 Way, M. J. 1963. Mutualism between ants and honeydew producing Homoptera. *Annual Review of*
3 *Entomology* **8**: 307-343.

4 Wild, A. (2007) Taxonomic revision of the ant genus *Linepithema* (Hymenoptera: Formicidae). In:
5 *Entomology Vol. 126*. pp. University of California Press Publications, California.

6 Wimp, G. M. & Whitham, T. G. 2001. Biodiversity consequences of predation and host plant
7 hybridization on an aphid- ant mutualism. *Ecology* **82**: 440-452.

8 Yao, I. & Akimoto, S. 2002. Flexibility in the composition and concentration of amino acids in
9 honeydew of the drepanosiphid aphid *Tuberculatus quercicola*. *Ecological Entomology* **27**:
10 745-752.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Tables

Ecological trait	Description	Factor type
Dominance	One or more species in the genus reported to have attained numerical dominance in their native community	Binary
Polygyny	One or more species reported as polygynous at least 6 months after colony founding	Binary
Polymorphic workers	One or more species have differentiated worker castes	Binary
Invasiveness	One or more species is an 'invasive' or 'tramp' species (McGlynn, 1999)	Binary
Arboreal nesting	One or more species of the genus nests in trees	Binary
Nomadism	One or more species have distinct nomadic phases with frequent daily colony movement	Binary
Trophobiosis with Lycaenidae	Species of ants in the genus also tend lycaenid caterpillars	Binary
Feed at extrafloral nectaries	Species of ants in the genus also feed at extrafloral nectaries	Binary
Latitude	The majority of species in the genus occur in temperate regions, tropical or both	Categorical
Colony size	Average colony size of the genus is small (0-200 workers), medium (200-10,000), large (10,000-100,000) or very large (100,000+)	Categorical
Body size	Mean body size of ants in the genus	Continuous
Habitat types	The number of different habitat types species of the genera occupy from a list of: forest, grassland, scrub, arid, wetland, disturbed	Continuous
Geographical range	The number of different biogeographic realms species of the genus occur in from a list of: Nearctic, Neotropic, Palearctic, Afrotropic, Oriental, Indomalay, Australasia	Continuous
Fungus gardening	One or more species grows fungus in gardens within the nest	Binary
Ant-plant mutualism	One or more species live in specialised plant domatia (Hölldobler and Wilson, 1990)	Binary
Blocking factor		
Subfamily	Subfamily of the genus (Moreau <i>et al.</i> , 2006)	Categorical
Species number	The number of species in the genus, obtained from the Species 2000 database	Continuous
Sampling effort	The number of hits for the genus on ISI Web of Science (ISI) search engine	Continuous

Table 1 Methods used for scoring ecological traits.

Interaction effect	Hypothesis
Arboreal nesting and latitude	Both temperate and tropical ants tend Homoptera, yet arboreal nesting species are generally found only in the tropics.
Polygyny and colony size	Polygyny may allow dispersed nests (polydomy), facilitating homopteran tending. Colony size is likely to covary with polygyny, but very small ant colonies are unlikely to be able to defend homopteran resources, even if polygynous.
Dominance and body size	Ants may need to attain a certain body size before becoming dominant enough to monopolise Homoptera.

Table 2 Hypotheses for pairwise interaction effects of ant ecological factors on the occurrence of trophobiosis with Homoptera

Ecological trait	Dev	df	P	Association	
Dominance	8.82	1,133	0.003	positive	**
Polygyny	7.02	1,93	0.008	positive	**
Polymorphic workers	1.01	1,114	0.315	none	
Invasiveness	4.28	1,136	0.039	positive	*
Arboreal nesting	10.34	1,130	0.001	positive	**
Nomadism	3.19	1,131	0.074	none	
Trophobiosis with Lycaenidae	85.22	2,135	<0.001	positive	***
Feeding at extrafloral nectaries	74.88	2,135	<0.001	positive	***
Latitude	3.02	2,134	0.221	none	
Colony size	4.84	1,92	0.027	large colonies	*
Body size	8.83	1,135	0.003	negative	
# Habitat types	4.92	1,131	0.027	positive	*
# Geographical Realms	0.14	1,135	0.709	none	
Fungus gardening	4.90	1,135	0.027	negative	*
Ant-plant mutualism	12.46	1,135	<0.001	positive	***
Habitat	Dev	d.f.	P	Association	
Forest	0.67	1,130	0.413	none	
Grassland	0.01	1,130	0.972	none	
Scrub	1.45	1,130	0.228	none	
Disturbed	5.45	1,130	0.020	positive	*
Wetland/ Heath	2.9	1,130	0.088	none	
Arid	0.56	1,130	0.453	none	

Table 3 Association between ecological traits or habitat types on the occurrence of trophobiosis with Homoptera.

The method involved binary logistic regressions with species number in genus and sampling effort as blocking factors.

Asterisks are significance codes for each ecological trait: *0.01<p<0.05, **0.001<p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

Ecological trait	t	df_p	P	Association	
Dominance	2.10	27.00	<0.001	positive	***
Polygyny	1.64	17.54	0.123	none	
Polymorphic workers	0.25	19.91	0.800	none	
Invasiveness	1.76	27.11	0.089	none	
Arboreal nesting	-	-	-	-	
Nomadism	2.11	21	0.049	negative	*
Trophobiosis with Lycaenidae	3.43	21.61	<0.001	positive	***
Feeding at extrafloral nectaries	3.57	21.61	<0.001	positive	***
Latitude	0.28	21.61	0.783	none	
Colony size	0.67	17.47	0.516	none	
Body size	0.04	20.84	0.967	none	
# Habitat types	0.58	22.12	0.56	none	
# Geographical Realms	1.73	21.61	0.101	none	
Fungus gardening	2.74	21.61	0.014	negative	*
Ant-plant mutualism	1.46	21.61	0.161	none	
Habitat	t	df_p	P	Association	
Forest	0.62	26.42	0.389	none	
Grassland	0.13	26.42	0.896	none	
Scrub	0.12	26.42	0.909	none	
Disturbed	1.35	26.42	0.191	none	
Wetland/ Heath	0.4	26.42	0.695	none	
Arid	0.91	26.42	0.373	none	

Table 4 Association between ecological traits or habitat types on the occurrence of trophobiosis with Homoptera, controlling for shared evolutionary history.

The method involved phylogenetic generalised estimating equations with sampling effort as a blocking factor. Phylogenetic degrees of freedom (df_p) are residual number of degrees of freedom corrected to account for branch length distances, to prevent inflated type I error rates (Paradis, 2006). Asterisks are significance codes for each ecological trait: *0.01<p<0.05, **0.001<p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

Characteristic	Small dominants	Large dominants	
Mean body size:	4.53mm	8.20mm	**
Tend Homoptera?:	Y	N	*
Polygynous	86%	36%	**
Invasive:	48%	0%	**
Disturbed habitats:	48%	12.5%	*
Polymorphic workers:	39%	80%	*
Nomadic:	6%	38%	*

Table 5 Characteristics of small dominant and large dominant ants.

Percentages given are of genera scoring positive for each trait. Asterisks are significance codes for each ecological trait: *0.01<p<0.05, **0.001<p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

Figures




Fig. 1 Ant subfamilies engaging in different mutualisms

The percentage of ant genera that contain mutualistic species in each subfamily. Subfamilies are in order of occurrence of trophobiosis with Homoptera, but also included are percentages engaging in mutualisms with plants and fungi.

Fig. 2 Cladogram of the Formicidae showing trophobiosis with Homoptera

- please see attached PDF.




Fig. 3 Multiple mutualisms cannot occur if there is a trade-off in requirements and redundancy of rewards

Ants simultaneously maintain specialised mutualisms with Homoptera (A) and domatia bearing plants (B). In contrast, there is a negative correlation between ant- Homoptera (A) and ant –fungi (C) mutualisms.

Figure Legends

Fig. 1 Ant subfamilies engaging in different mutualisms

The percentage of ant genera that contain mutualistic species in each subfamily. Subfamilies are in order of occurrence of trophobiosis with Homoptera, but also included are percentages engaging in mutualisms with plants and fungi.

Fig. 2 Cladogram of the Formicidae showing trophobiosis with Homoptera

Trophobiosis occurring within a genus is shown in black. The six bottom-most genera are vespoid and sphecoid outgroups.

Fig. 3 Multiple mutualisms cannot occur if there is a trade-off in requirements and redundancy of rewards

Ants simultaneously maintain specialised mutualisms with Homoptera (A) and domatia bearing plants (B). In contrast, there is a negative correlation between ant- Homoptera (A) and ant –fungi (C) mutualisms.

Table Legends

Table 1 Methods used for scoring ecological traits

Table 2 Hypotheses for pairwise interaction effects of ant ecological factors on the occurrence of trophobiosis with Homoptera

Table 3 Association between ecological traits or habitat types on the occurrence of trophobiosis with Homoptera.

The method involved binary logistic regressions with species number in genus and sampling effort as blocking factors.

Asterisks are significance codes for each ecological trait: * $0.01 < p < 0.05$, ** $0.001 < p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

Table 4 Association between ecological traits or habitat types on the occurrence of trophobiosis with Homoptera, controlling for shared evolutionary history.

The method involved phylogenetic generalised estimating equations with sampling effort as a blocking factor.

Phylogenetic degrees of freedom (df_p) are residual number of degrees of freedom corrected to account for branch length distances, to prevent inflated type I error rates (Paradis, 2006). Asterisks are significance codes for each ecological trait: * $0.01 < p < 0.05$, ** $0.001 < p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

Table 5 Characteristics of small dominant and large dominant ants.

Percentages given are of genera scoring positive for each trait. Asterisks are significance codes for each ecological trait: * $0.01 < p < 0.05$, ** $0.001 < p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

