Host-tree selection by the ant garden-initiating arboreal ponerine Neoponera goeldii

Alain Dejean ^{1,2}, Vivien Rossi ^{3,4}, Frédéric Azémar ¹, Arthur Compin ¹, Frédéric Petitclerc ², Stanislas Talaga ⁵, Bruno Corbara ⁶

¹ Laboratoire écologie fonctionnelle et environnement, Université de Toulouse, CNRS,

Toulouse INP, Université Toulouse 3 – Paul Sabatier (UPS), Toulouse, France.

² UMR EcoFoG, AgroParisTech, CIRAD, CNRS, INRAE, Université des Antilles, Université de Guyane, Kourou, 97310 France.

³ Plant Systematic and Ecology Laboratory (LaBosystE), Department of Biology, Higher Teachers' Training College, University of Yaoundé I, PO Box 047, Yaoundé, Cameroon.

Corresponding Author: Alain Dejean. E-mail: alain.dejean@wanadoo.fr

Key words: ant gardens, ant-plant relationships, conservation, French Guiana, host trees

Open research statement: Data (Dejean et al. 2022) are available in Figshare at

https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.20154404.v4

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1002/ecy.3843

⁴ RU Forests and Societies, CIRAD Yaoundé, Cameroon.

⁵ MIVEGEC, Univ. Montpellier, CNRS, IRD, Montpellier, France.

⁶ Université Clermont-Auvergne, CNRS, LMGE, Clermont-Ferrand, France

From the Equator to subpolar areas, ants are very abundant, diverse, and ecologically dominant, occupying terrestrial environments from the soil to the crowns of large trees. They appeared 158-139 Mya (i.e., end of the Jurassic, 201.3-145 Mya; early Cretaceous, 145-66 Mya), and later diversified from ground-dwelling predatory taxa, alongside the rise of angiosperms (Brady et al., 2006; Moreau et al., 2006). About 130-125 Mya, while foraging for prey on vegetation, some ant species incorporated plant-based food (e.g., sap, resin, gums, mucilage and oils) into their diet, all while protecting the plants they patrolled through their aggressiveness and predatory behavior towards other animals ("dynastic-succession hypothesis"; Wilson and Höldobler, 2005). This was the prelude to the establishment of diffuse defensive mutualisms such as the evolution of extrafloral nectar (i.e., a sugary-rich ant reward offered by plants for biotic protection) that took place between the mid-Cretaceous (≈106 Mya) and the Neogene (23.03-2.58 Mya) (Lucky et al., 2013).

Arboreal nesting evolved first via arboreal nests made of carton or silk that appeared at the end of the Cretaceous (\approx 66 Mya). Later, plant cavities developed specifically for ants, called domatia, characterize myrmecophytes that appeared in Australasia and the Neotropics \approx 19 Mya (Miocene), and later, \approx 5 Mya, in Africa. In exchange for providing ants a nesting place, myrmecophytes are protected from phytophagous animals, competitors and pathogens, and/or obtain nutrients via the ant wastes that accumulate in certain domatia (Chomicki and Renner, 2015).

Ant gardens, known from the Neotropics and South-East Asia, are mutualist associations between a few arboreal ant and epiphyte plant species. Their initiation was first described for the Neotropical ponerine ant *Neoponera goeldii*: a group of founding queens builds in a sunexposed area of a host tree a small carton nest and then incorporates the seeds of certain epiphytes into the nest walls. After germination, the seedlings develop into mature epiphytes whose roots stabilize the nest carton, some of them also providing a food reward for the ants

(e.g., extrafloral nectar, food bodies and fruits). In turn, ant garden ants protect their epiphytes from herbivores and enrich the nest carton with nutrients. The most frequently selected epiphyte plants are *Aechmea mertensii* (Bromeliaceae), *Codonanthe calcarata* (Gesneriaceae), and *Anthurium gracile* (Araceae) (Corbara and Dejean, 1996). Furthermore, the selective attractiveness of volatiles released by the seed coat of the ant garden epiphytes is determinant, even though the seeds of some of these epiphytes have elaiosomes (i.e., food rewards mediating dispersal by ants) (Youngstead et al., 2008).

Because ant gardens represent one of the most unique forms of an ant-plant association, they need to be preserved as the epiphytes benefit from the three main advantages of ant-plant mutualisms (i.e., dispersion, protection from enemies and food), while the ant nest is structurally secured. Ant gardens also contribute to canopy diversity through their ants and the epiphytes that are incorporated into ant nests, their commensals and parasites, and the aquatic organisms living in the tanks of bromeliads (Youngstead et al., 2008; Orivel and Leroy, 2011; Corbara, 2020).

Thus, we sought to determine if *N. goeldii* founding queens select their host trees randomly or, alternatively, if these trees are selected in a non-random way.

This study was conducted in French Guiana in 1996 for Petit Saut and 2013 for Régina (see Dejean et al. 2022 for the high number of trees with ant gardens those years). Along the road leading to the Petit Saut dam (2,750-3,000 mm of yearly rainfall), between kilometric points 14 and 27 (5°6′10″N; 52°57′52″W - 5°3′43″N; 53°3′00″W), we searched for the presence of ant gardens on trees or vines more than 1.5 m in height located inside 250 (10 x 5 m) plots. The same approach was carried out near Régina (≈4,000 mm of yearly rainfall) along Route 2 around kilometric point 118 (4°13′8″N; 52°7′17″W) corresponding to 90 plots (details in "Host tree survey counts" available from Figshare). Note that these ant gardens are too light to break branches during storms and be overlooked.

To verify if these ants select their host plants, for each plant species sheltering an *N*. *goeldii*-initiated ant garden, we compared its proportion of plants to the same proportion for other species sheltering ant gardens using Pearson's *Chi*-squared test. To ensure that the test results were not due to a particular distribution of forest communities in certain parts of the study area, we used a bootstrap procedure from the function "prop.test" on the R software. Except for species with more than ten individuals (non-significant differences), we repeated the same proportion comparison tests 5,000 times on subsamples of plots randomly selected from all the survey plots. We varied the size of these subsamples between 50% and 100% of the total number of plots inventoried by increments of 5% (for details see Appendix S1: Figs. S1 and S2).

In both the Petit Saut and the Régina areas nine tree or vine species sheltered *N. goeldii*-initiated ant gardens out of 17 and 15 species, respectively (Table 1).

We saw a range of tree attractiveness, even for frequent species. First, *Davilla alata* and *D. rugosa* (Petit Saut), *Vismia guianensis* and *V. sessilifolia* were well represented in both areas (P < 0.05 in Appendix S1: Figs. S1 and S2; see also Table 1). Second, the results in Table 1 are non-significant when the P value was higher than 0.05 (e.g., *Bellucia grossularioides* and *Isertia coccinea* in Petit Saut). Third, although likely to shelter ant gardens, certain tree species are significantly less chosen than all others with ant gardens (e.g., *V. latifolia*: P < 0.05 in Petit Saut; Appendix S1: Fig. S1 and Table 1). Finally, there are trees that are not attractive to *N. goeldii* founding queens: *Astrocaryum sciophilum* (attractive to *Anochetus emarginatus*), *Clusia* spp. (attractive to social wasps), *Jacaranda copaia*, *Byrsonima aerugo*, *Passiflora coccinea* (which very rarely shelter ant nests, but foraging workers forage on them) and the myrmecophyte *Cecropia obtusa* (which shelters *Azteca* ants) (AD pers. comm.). Food rewards do not play a role in *N. goeldii* host-plant selection as, of the

11 plant species hosting ant gardens, only *Inga thibaudiana* and *Senna latifolia* produce extrafloral nectar (Table 1).

Thus, *N. goeldii* does not install its nests at random, but rather selects certain tree taxa in the two pioneer vegetal formations studied.

How can this be possible? Before their nuptial flight and then their nest-site selection *N. goeldii* queens, both at the larval and imaginal stages, are bred in contact with parts of host tree branches surrounded by the nest. Indeed, selective host tree attractiveness has been demonstrated for ants building their nests in contact with host tree leaves as winged queens select them rather than those from other plant species. Here, both "pre-imaginal learning" (during larval life) and "early learning" (the first days of adult life) combine to determine which trees to select (Djiéto-Lordon and Dejean, 1999; this also shows that ants can be experimentally conditioned to a non-attractive plant by breeding them in contact with this plant during larval and early learning). Thus, a "local tradition" of nest-tree selection has been noted for many arboreal ants (Gibernau et al., 2007; Dejean et al., 2008; Rocha et al., 2020 and papers cited therein).

Hence, young *N. goeldii* queens are first attracted by certain host trees, and then by ant garden epiphyte seeds thanks to a mixture of volatiles located on the seed surface; they then sow them into the nutrient-rich carton nest (later the workers take over). Shared by other ant garden ants, this behavior seems genetically determined as these compounds are not attractive to other ant species (Youngstead et al., 2008; Orivel and Leroy, 2011; Corbara, 2020). This unusual double attractiveness with different origins, larval and early learning *versus* genetic attractiveness likely occurs for other ant garden ants.

As they also develop well in riparian areas, in terms of conservation, *N. goeldii*-initiated ant gardens are not at risk in Amazonia where climate change translates into heavier rainy seasons, ensuring the presence of streams and rivers (Dejean et al., 2022). Furthermore, they

abound in the scarce Guianese citrus tree orchards, showing that these trees, introduced into the Neotropics, contain adequate attractive compounds (Corbara et al., 1999). Attraction to introduced trees (e.g., citrus and mango trees) has been noted for the ant garden ant *Azteca gnava* (Dolichoderinae) (Morales-Linares et al., 2016). For *N. goeldii*, this is propitious on the condition that farmers do not use insecticides. Indeed, this ant species exerts biotic protection over its host plants by eliminating defoliators through its territoriality and predatory behavior, whereas it does not attend hemipterans, some being agricultural pests (Orivel and Leroy, 2011; AD, BC pers. obs.).

Trees are characterized, among other traits, by their architecture, size and chemical compounds (e.g., involved in plant defense from enemies). Architecture and size triggered a difference in habitat preferences between ant garden ants with some repercussions for epiphytes. For instance, as *N. goeldii* nests in sun-exposed areas, its associated tank bromeliads *A. mertensii* are small with an amphora shape to limit light incidence, whereas those associated with *Camponotus femoratus*, which nests in shady areas, are larger and wider. For attraction based on chemical compounds, we show here a vast selection of trees and vines from attractive to non-selected trees and vines and all intermediate cases. Thus *N. goeldii* falls between the case of *A. gnava* with no specificity or *C. femoratus* (Formicinae) with a certain preference among canopy trees, and the case of two species of *Crematogaster* (Myrmicinae) that build their nests exclusively on giant bamboos in Malaysia. (Orivel and Leroy, 2011; Morales-Linares et al., 2016; Dejean et al., 2022; this study).

In conclusion, we show that the different types of interactions with plants influence the environment of an insect through the selection of its host tree and a multi-specific mutualistic association with epiphytes. This results in ecosystem engineering where nest construction involves complex associations with epiphytes that are selected, sown, grown and preserved

from enemies. Here, the selected host tree species, including pioneer, riparian and introduced cultivars, should likely permit this association to survive global climate change.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to the *Laboratoire Environnement Hydreco* (Petit Saut) for its logistical assistance and Andrea Yockey for proofreading the manuscript.

CONFLIC OF INTERETS

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

LITERATURE CITED

- Brady, S. G., T. R. Schultz, B. L. Fisher, and P. S. Ward. 2006. Evaluating alternative hypotheses for the early evolution and diversification of ants. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA 103:18172–18177.
- Chomicki, G., and S. S. Renner. 2015. Phylogenetics and molecular clocks reveal the repeated evolution of ant-plants after the late Miocene in Africa and the early Miocene in Australasia and the Neotropics. New Phytologist 207:411–424.
- Corbara, B. 2020. Ant Gardens. In: Starr C. editor, *Encyclopedia of Social Insects*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90306-4_7-1.
- Corbara, B., and A. Dejean. 1996. Arboreal-nest building and ant-garden initiation in a ponerine ant. Naturwissenschaften 83:227-230.
- Corbara, B., A. Dejean, and J. Orivel. 1999. Les "jardins de fourmis", une association plantesfourmis originale. L'Année Biologique 38:73–89.

- Dejean, A., J. Grangier, C. Leroy, J. Orivel, and M. Gibernau. 2008. Nest-site selection and induced response in a dominant arboreal ant species. Naturwissenschaften 95:885–889.
- Dejean, A., F. Petitclerc, A. Compin, F. Azémar, S. Talaga, and B. Corbara. 2022. Climate change impact on Amazonian ant gardens. Basic and Applied Ecology 62:61-69.
- Dejean, A., V. Rossi, F. Azémar, A. Compin, F. Petitclerc, S. Talaga, and B. Corbara. 2022.

 Host-tree selection by the ant garden-initiating arboreal ponerine *Neoponera goeldii*.

 figshare. Dataset. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.20154404.v4
- Djiéto-Lordon, C., and A. Dejean. 1999. Tropical arboreal ant mosaic: innate attraction and imprinting determine nesting site selection in dominant ants. Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 45:219–225.
- Gibernau, M., J. Orivel, J. H. C. Delabie, D. Barabé, and A. Dejean. 2007. An asymmetrical relationship between an arboreal ponerine ant and a trash-basket epiphyte (Araceae).

 Biological Journal of the Linnean Society 91:341–346.
- Lucky, A., M. D. Trautwein, B. S. Guénard, M. D. Weiser, and R. R. Dunn. 2013. Tracing the rise of ants: out of the ground. PLoS ONE 8:e84012.
- Morales-Linares, J., J. G. García-Franco, A. Flores-Palacios, J. E. Valenzuela-González, M. Mata-Rosas, and C. Díaz-Castelazo. 2016. Vascular epiphytes and host-trees of ant-gardens in an anthropic landscape in southeastern Mexico. The Science of Nature 103:96.
- Moreau, C. S., C. D. Bell, R. Vila, S. B. Archibald, and N. E. Pierce. 2006. Phylogeny of the ants: diversification in the age of angiosperms. Science 312:101–104.
- Orivel, J., and C. Leroy. 2011. The diversity and ecology of ant gardens (Hymenoptera: Formicidae; Spermatophyta: Angiospermae). Myrmecological News 14:73–85.
- Rocha, F. H., J.-P. Lachaud, Y. Hénaut, C. Pozo, and G. Pérez-Lachaud. 2020. Nest-site selection during colony relocation in Yucatan peninsula populations of the ponerine ants *Neoponera villosa* (Hymenoptera: Formicidae). Insects 11:200.

Youngstead, E., S. Nojima, C. Harbelein, S. Schultz, and C. Schal. 2008. Seed odor mediates an obligate ant-plant mutualism in Amazonian rainforest. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA 105:4571–4575.

Table 1. Plant species recorded in the Petit Saut and Régina areas. For each species sheltering an ant garden we compared the proportion of individuals with a *Neoponera goeldii* ant garden to the same proportion for other species sheltering them. /: no individual sheltering an ant garden. *: results significantly lower than for all other trees with ant gardens. †: plants bearing extrafloral nectaries. §: myrmecophyte.

Region and tree family	Tree species	No. individuals	% individuals	No. With ant gardens	% with Ant gardens	Statistic
Petit Saut						
Arecaceae	Astrocaryum sciophilum	38	1.74	0	0	/
Calophyllaceae	Mahurea palustris	42	1.93	0	0	/
Clusiaceae	Clusia grandiflora	45	2.06	0	0	/
	Clusia cuneata	51	2.34	0	0	/
Dilleniaceae	Davilla alata (vine)	56	2.57	24	42.86	P<0.05
	Davilla rugosa (vine)	24	1.10	11	45.83	P<0.05
Euphorbiaceae	Croton matourensis	5	0.23	1	20.00	NS
	Croton nuntiens	3	0.14	0	0	/
Fabaceae	Inga edulis [†]	3	0.14	0	0	/
	Inga thibaudiana †	10	0.46	3	30.00	NS
Hypericaceae	Vismia guianensis	493	22.62	142	28.80	P<0.01
	Vismia latifolia *	627	28.77	8	1.27	P<0.01 *
	Vismia sessilifolia	338	15.51	88	26.35	P<0.01
Melastomataceae	Bellucia grossularioides	210	9.64	25	11.90	NS
Rubiaceae	Isertia coccinea	79	3.62	8	10.12	NS
Selastraceae	Goupia glabra	44	2.02	0	0	/
Urticaceae	Cecropia obtusa §	61	2.80	0	0	/
	Total	2179	/	310	14.2	/
Régina						
Bignoniaceae	Jacaranda copaia	5	1.05	0	0	/
Clusiaceae	Clusia grandiflora	25	5.25	0	0	/
Dilleniaceae	Davilla alata (vine)	23	4.83	15	65.22	NS
Diffemaceae	Davilla rugosa (vine)	1	0.21	1	100.00	NS
Fabaceae	Senna latifolia (vine) †	8	1.68	3	37.50	NS
Hypericaceae	Vismia guianensis	209	43.91	126	60.29	P<0.01
11)pe110me0me	Vismia latifolia	66	13.87	23	34.89	NS
	Vismia sessilifolia	31	6.51	25	80.65	P<0.05
Malpighiaceae	Byrsonima aerugo	9	1.89	0	0	/
Melastomataceae	Bellucia grossularioides *	35	7.35	4	11.43	P<1e-3 *
	Clidemia sp.	1	0.21	0	0	/
	Miconia sp. *	13	2.73	1	7.69	P<0.02 *
Passifloraceae	Passiflora coccinea (vine) †	2	0.42	0	0	/
Selastraceae	Goupia glabra	26	5.46	7	26.92	NS
Urticaceae	Cecropia obtusa [§]	22	4.62	ó	0	/
	Total	476	/	205	43.07	/

Fig. 1. A *Neoponera goeldii* ant garden with the tank bromeliad *Aechmea mertensii* in bloom; several seedlings are visible on the spherical nest which is installed on a top branch of a *Vismia guianensis* (photo Jean-François Carrias).



ECY_3843_Figure 1 AGs host tree selection Dejean.jpg