Plant-derived CO$_2$ mediates long-distance host location and quality assessment by a root herbivore

Carla C. M. Arce[2+], Vanitha Theepan[1+], Bernardus C. J. Schimmel[1], Geoffrey Jaffuel[2], Matthias Erb[1*], Ricardo

A. R. Machado[1,2*]

[1] Institute of Plant Sciences, University of Bern, 3013 Bern, Switzerland

[2] Institute of Biology, University of Neuchâtel, 2000 Neuchâtel, Switzerland

*Correspondence: ricardo.machado@unine.ch, matthias.erb@ips.unibe.ch

[+]Equal contribution

Summary

Insect herbivores can use volatile and visual cues to locate and select suitable host plants from a distance. The

importance of CO$_2$, arguable the most conserved volatile marker of metabolic activity, is not well understood in

this context, even though many herbivores are known to respond to minute differences in CO$_2$ concentrations. To

address this gap of knowledge, we manipulated CO$_2$ perception of the larvae of the western corn rootworm

(*Diabrotica virgifera virgifera*; WCR) through RNA interference and studied how CO$_2$ perception impacts their

interaction with their host plant, maize (*Zea mays*). We show that the expression of a putative Group 2 carbon

dioxide receptor, *DvvGr2*, is specifically required for dose-dependent larval responses to CO$_2$ in the ppm range.

Silencing *DvvGr2* has no effect on the ability of WCR larvae to locate host plants at short distance (<9 cm), but

impairs host location at greater distances. Using soil arenas and olfactometer experiments in combination with

DvvGr2 silencing and CO$_2$ scrubbing, we demonstrate that WCR larvae use CO$_2$ as a long-range host plant finding

cue, but employ other volatiles for short-range host location. We furthermore show that the larvae use CO$_2$ as a

fitness-relevant long-distance indicator of plant nutritional status: Maize plants that are well-fertilized emit more

CO$_2$ from their roots and are better hosts for WCR than plants that are nutrient-deficient, and the capacity of WCR

larvae to distinguish between these plants depends exclusively on their capacity to perceive CO$_2$ through *DvvGr2*.

This study unravels how CO$_2$ can mediate plant-herbivore interactions by serving as a distance-dependent host

location and quality assessment cue.

Keywords: Plant-herbivore interactions, foraging, volatile perception, behaviour, host location.

Introduction

Insect herbivores can use both visual and olfactory cues to locate suitable host plants from a distance. Volatile cues in particular can convey information about the identity and physiological status of a host plant and are integrated by herbivores to locate host plants for oviposition and feeding (***Visser and Avé, 1978***). Over the years, many attractive and repellent plant volatiles were identified (***Bruce et al., 2005; Späthe et al., 2013; Webster and Cardé, 2017***), and the importance of individual compounds and volatile blends was documented using synthetic chemicals (***Bruce and Pickett, 2011; Carrasco et al., 2015; Fraenkel, 1959; Natale et al., 2003; Visser and Avé, 1978***). More recently, molecular manipulative approaches were used to manipulate plant volatile production and herbivore perception *in vivo (**Fandino et al., 2019; Halitschke et al., 2008; Robert et al., 2013**)*, thus confirming the important role of plant volatiles in plant-herbivore interactions.

While the role of plant volatiles such as green-leaf volatiles, aromatic compounds and terpenes is well understood, much less is known about the role of plant-derived carbon dioxide (CO_2) in plant-herbivore interactions. CO_2 is a ubiquitous primary product of oxidative metabolism that is produced through the citric acid cycle (***Krebs and Johnson, 1937***), and is thus arguably the most conserved volatile marker of biological activity on the planet. Although plants are net sinks of CO_2 due to their ability to fix carbon in the dark reactions of photosynthesis, they also release CO_2 through respiration from metabolically active heterotrophic tissues such as flowers and roots, and autotrophic tissues such as leaves that operate below the light compensation point (e.g. at night). CO_2 may thus be integrated into herbivore foraging activities as a marker of plant metabolic activity. *Datura wrightii* flowers for instance emit the highest levels of CO_2 during times of high nectar availability; as hawkmoth pollinators are attracted to CO_2, they may thus use this cue to locate rewarding flowers (***Goyret et al., 2008; Guerenstein et al., 2004; Guerenstein and Hildebrand, 2008; Stange, 1996; Stange, 1999; Stange and Stowe, 1999; Thom et al., 2004***). Similarly, lesions in apples result in high CO_2 release and attract *Bactrocera tryoni* fruit flies. As CO_2 at corresponding concentrations is attractive to the flies, it has been suggested that they may use plant-derived CO_2 to locate suitable oviposition sites (**Stange, 1998**).

Root feeding insects are also highly attracted to CO_2 *in vitro* (***Bernklau and Bjostad, 1998a, 1998b; Eilers et al., 2012; Hibbard and Bjostad, 1988; Jones and Coaker, 1978; Klingler, 1966; Nicolas and Sillans, 1989; Rogers et al., 2013; Strnad et al., 1986; Strnad and Dunn, 1990***). Given that CO_2 is produced and released by plant roots and diffuses relatively well through the soil, a likely explanation for this phenomenon is that root herbivores use CO_2 as a host location cue (***Bernklau and Bjostad, 1998a, 1998b; Doane et al., 1975; Erb et al., 2013; Johnson and Gregory, 2006; Johnson and Nielsen, 2012***), However, the reliability of CO_2 as a host-location cue for root feeders has been questioned due to a number of reasons: i) CO_2 can be emitted by many other sources apart from host plant roots, including decaying organic matter, microorganisms, and non-host plants, ii) there is a strong diurnal fluctuation in plant CO_2 emissions that does not necessarily match with insect foraging habits and iii) other plant-released chemicals can be used by root herbivores for host location within a CO_2 background (***Agus et al.,***

2010; Eilers et al., 2012; Erb et al., 2013; Hansen, 1977; Hibbard and Bjostad, 1988; Hiltpold and Turlings,

2012; Johnson and Nielsen, 2012; Reinecke et al., 2008; Weissteiner et al., 2012). A model that may reconcile

these different views is that CO_2 may be used as an initial cue at long-distances, while other, more host specific

volatiles may be used at shorter distances (***Erb et al., 2013; Johnson et al., 2006; Johnson and Nielsen, 2012***).

So far, this model has not been experimentally validated, and the precise role of plant-derived CO_2 as a host

location cue by herbivores in general, and root herbivores in particular, remains unclear (***Eilers et al., 2016***). To

the best of our knowledge, no studies so far have investigated the role of plant-derived CO_2 in plant-herbivore

interactions *in vivo* using molecular manipulative approaches.

The larvae of *Diabrotica virgifera virgifera* (western corn rootworm, WCR) feed exclusively on maize roots and

cause major yield losses in the US and Eastern Europe (***Ciosi et al., 2008; Gray et al., 2009; Meinke et al., 2009;***

Toepfer et al., 2015). The larvae rely on a number of volatile and non-volatile chemicals to identify and locate

host plants, distinguish between suitable and less-suitable maize plants and forage within the maize root system

(***Hiltpold et al., 2013; Johnson and Gregory, 2006; Johnson and Nielsen, 2012; Robert et al., 2012c; Schumann***

et al., 2018). Non-volatile primary metabolites such as sugars and fatty acids as well as secondary metabolites

such as benzoxazinoids and phenolic acid conjugates modulate larval behaviour (***Bernklau et al., 2011; Bernklau***

et al., 2015; Bernklau et al., 2016a; Bernklau et al., 2018b; Erb et al., 2015b; Hu et al., 2018; Huang et al.,

2017; Robert et al., 2012c). Volatiles including (E)-β-caryophyllene, ethylene and CO_2 attract the larvae

(***Bernklau and Bjostad, 1998a, 1998b; Robert et al., 2012b; Robert et al., 2012a***), while methyl anthranilate

repels them (***Bernklau et al., 2016b***). Based on the finding that high CO_2 levels can outweigh the attractive effects

of other maize volatiles, it was suggested that CO_2 may be the only relevant volatile attractant for WCR larvae

(***Bernklau and Bjostad, 1998b***). However, under conditions where CO_2 levels are similar, WCR larvae reliably

choose between host plants of different suitability using other volatile cues (***Erb et al., 2011; Erb et al., 2015a;***

Huang et al., 2017; Lu et al., 2016; Robert et al., 2012b; Robert et al., 2012a). The demonstrated ability of WCR

larvae to respond to different volatile cues and the recent identification of putative CO_2 receptors from

transcriptomic data (***Rodrigues et al., 2016***) makes this species a suitable model system to investigate the role of

CO_2 in plant-herbivore interactions. Ongoing efforts to use CO_2 as a bait to control WCR in the field (***Bernklau***

et al., 2004; Schumann et al., 2014b; Schumann et al., 2014a) provide further motivation to assess the importance

of this volatile for WCR foraging.

To understand the importance of CO_2 for WCR foraging in the soil, we manipulated the insect's capacity to

perceive CO_2. We reduced the expression levels of three putative WCR CO_2 receptor-encoding genes through

RNA interference (RNAi), resulting in the identification of *DvvGr2* as an essential gene for CO_2 perception. Using

DvvGr2-silenced larvae in combination with CO_2-removal, we then assessed the importance of CO_2 perception for

WCR behaviour and foraging in olfactometers and soil arenas. Our experiments reveal how root-derived CO_2

modulates the interaction between maize and its economically most damaging root pest and expand the current

repertoire of adaptive explanations for the attraction of insect herbivores to CO_2.

Results

The western corn rootworm (WCR) genome encodes three putative CO_2 receptors

To identify genes encoding putative CO_2 receptors in WCR, we used known CO_2 receptor-encoding gene

sequences as queries against the WCR genome (available from the National Center for Biotechnology Information

(NCBI)). Three putative carbon dioxide receptor candidates, *DvvGr1, DvvGr2,* and *DvvGr3*, were identified,

matching three candidate genes that were found in previous transcriptome analyses (Rodrigues *et al.*, 2016).

Phylogenetic reconstruction based on *in silico* predicted protein sequences revealed orthologous relationships for

the three WCR candidate receptors and the receptors of several other insects (Fig. 1A). Consistent with their

taxonomy, we observed close homology between the protein sequences of the CO_2 receptors of WCR and the

protein sequences of other coleopteran insects such as *Tribolium castaneum* (Fig. 1A). Expression levels of

DvvGr1 and *DvvGr2* were found to be significantly higher in the head than in the rest of the body (torax and

abdomen) of 2nd instar WCR larvae (Figs. 1B, C). A similar trend was observed for *DvvGr3* (Fig. 1D). Protein

tertiary structure and topology models indicated that all three genes encode for 7-transmembrane domain proteins,

which is consistent with their roles as receptors (Fig. 1B-D).

Figure 1 *The WCR genome contains three putative carbon dioxide (CO_2) receptors.* (A) Phylogenetic relationships between putative CO_2 receptors based on protein sequences of different insects. Dmel: *Drosophila melanogaster*, Dsim: *Drosophila simulans*, Dsec: *Drosophila sechellia*, Dyak: *Drosophila yakuba*, Dere: *Drosophila erecta*, Dana: *Drosophila ananassae*, Dper: *Drosophila persimilis*, Dpse: *Drosophila pseudoobscura*, Dwil: Drosophila willistoni, Dgri: *Drosophila grimshawi*, Dmoj: *Drosophila mojavensis*, Dvir: *Drosophila virilis*, Agam: *Aedes. gambiae*, Aaeg: *Aedes aegypti*, Cqui: *Culex quinquefasciatus*, Bmor: *Bombix mori*, Tcas *Tribolium castaneum,* Dvv*: Diabrotica virgifera virgifera* (Western corn rootworm, WCR). Mean (±SEM) relative gene expression levels of group 1 (*DvvGr1*) (B)*,* group 2 (*DvvGr2*)(C)*,* and group 3 (*DvvGr3*)(D) CO_2 receptors in the bodies (thorax and abdomen) or heads of 2nd instar WCR larvae (n=10). Asterisks indicate statistically significant differences between tissue types within genes (***: *p*<0.001 by one-way ANOVA with Holm's multiple comparisions test; n.s.: not significant). (B-E) Predicted protein tertiary structure (left) and transmembrane protein topology (right) of: (B) *DvvGr1*; (C) *DvvGr2*; and (D) *DvvGr3* according to the Phyre2 algorithm.

DvvGr2 expression is specifically required for behavioural responses of WCR larvae to CO_2

To determine the importance of *DvvGr1, DvvGr2,* and *DvvGr3* for the responsiveness of WCR larvae to CO_2, we knocked down the expression of each gene individually through double-stranded RNA (dsRNA)-mediated RNA interference (RNAi) and conducted initial behavioural experiments with carbonated water as a CO_2 source (Fig. 2). Oral administration of dsRNA targeting either *DvvGr1*, *DvvGr2*, or *DvvGr3* reduced the expression levels of these genes by 80%, 83% and 66% compared to WCR larvae fed with dsRNA of the green fluorescent protein (GFP) gene (herein referred as wild type, WT) (Fig. 2A). All RNAi constructs were confirmed to be gene specific (Fig 2B). Olfactometer arms containing carbonated water released approximately 100 ppm more CO_2 than their counterparts filled with distilled water (Fig. 2B, Fig. S1A) and were more attractive to WT larvae than arms containing distilled water (Fig 2C). Silencing *DvvGr1* or *DvvGr3* expression did not alter this behaviour. In contrast, *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae did not show any preference any more (Fig 2C). To further explore the role of *DvvGr2* in WCR behaviour, we conducted a series of additional experiments. First, we assessed the impact of silencing *DvvGr2* on the capacity of WCR larvae to respond to other volatile and non-volatile host cues. *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae responded similarly to the repellent volatile methyl anthranilate (***Bernklau et al., 2016b; Bernklau et al., 2018a***) as WT larvae (Fig. 2D). Responsiveness to non-volatile attractants, Fe(III)(DIMBOA)$_3$ and a blend of glucose, fructose and sucrose (***Bernklau et al., 2018b; Hu et al., 2018***) was also unaltered in *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae (Figs 2E, F), demonstrating that knocking down *DvvGr2* expression does not alter the capacity of WCR larvae to respond to other important chemical cues. Second, we assessed the contribution of *DvvGr2* to CO_2 responsiveness using synthetic CO_2 at different concentrations (Fig. 3, Fig. S1B). WT larvae showed characteristic dose-dependent behavioural responses to CO_2. While they did not respond to 22 ppm CO_2 above ambient CO_2 levels, they were attracted to CO_2 concentrations between 59-258 ppm above ambient, and repelled by CO_2-enriched air at 950 ppm above ambient CO_2 levels and above (Fig. 3). In contrast, *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae did not respond to CO_2 enrichment at any of the tested concentrations (Fig. 3). These experiments show that WCR larvae are attracted to CO_2 enriched environments within the physiological range of the maize rhizosphere (Fig. S1) and that *DvvGr2*-silencing fully and specifically suppresses CO_2 responsiveness in WCR larvae.

Figure 2 *The carbon dioxide group 2 receptor (DvvGr2) is specifically required for behavioural responses of WCR to* CO_2.
(A) Mean (±SEM) relative gene expression levels of group 1 (*DvvGr1*), group 2 (*DvvGr2*), and group 3 (*DvvGr3*) CO_2.
receptors after WCR larvae were fed with dsRNA-expressing bacteria targeting green fluorescent protein (GFP, herein
referred as WT), *DvvGr1*, *DvvGr2*, or *DvvGr3* genes (n=11-13). Different letters indicate significant differences of gene
expression levels ($p<0.05$ by one-way ANOVA with Holm's multiple comparisions test). (B) Mean (±SEM) CO_2 levels in
each arm of the two-arm belowground olfactometers used for behavioural experiments (n=4-8). Asterisk indicates significant
differences in CO_2 levels (*: $p<0.05$ by one-way ANOVA with Holm's multiple-comparisons test). Mean (±SEM) proportion
of WCR larvae observed in the olfactometer arms with higher CO_2 levels (carbonated water side) or in control arms (distilled
water side). Seven olfactometers with six larvae each were assayed (n=7). Mean (±SEM) proportion of WCR larvae observed
on roots or on roots placed next to filter paper discs impregnated with methyl anthranilate (D), on filter paper discs
impregnated with buffer or with Fe(III)(DIMBOA)$_3$ (E), and on filter paper discs impregnated with buffer or with a blend of
glucose, fructose, and sucrose (F). For panel D, ten choice arenas with five larvae each were assayed (n=10). For panels E
and F, twenty choice arenas with six larvae each were assayed (n=20). Asterisks indicate statistically significant differences
in larval choices between treatments (***: $p<0.001$ by two-way ANOVA followed by FDR-corrected post hoc tests). For *P*-
values of Generalized Linear Models (GLMs), refer to Table S1. Refer to Fig. S1A for quantities of CO_2 in each arm.

Figure 3 *DvvGr2 is required for dose-dependent behavioural responses of WCR to CO_2.* (A) Olfactometer setup used for behavioural experiments. (A) Mean (±SEM) CO_2 levels in each arm of the olfactometers (n=3). (B) Mean (±SEM) proportion of WCR larvae observed in each arm of the olfactometers. Three olfactometers with six larvae each were assayed (n=3). Asterisks indicate statistically significant differences between larval choices (*: $p<0.05$; **: $p<0.01$; ***: $p<0.001$ by three-way ANOVA followed by FDR-corrected post hoc tests). For P-values of Generalized Linear Models (GLMs), refer to Table S1. ΔCO_2 values are given for each level. Asterisks indicate significant differences between CO_2 levels in the two olfactometer arms (***: $p<0.001$ by three-way ANOVA followed by FDR-corrected post hoc tests). Refer to Fig. S1B for quantities of CO_2 in each arm.

DvvGr2 expression does not impair larval motility or short-range host location

To assess the impact of *DvvGr2* on larval motility, we followed the trajectories of individual larvae in Petri plates that were outfitted with a CO_2 point releaser (Fig. 4A-C). WT larvae made frequent turns, but consistently oriented themselves towards the CO_2 release point. Once they reached the CO_2 release point, they stopped moving (Fig. 4A). *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae exhibited similar turning behaviour as WT larvae, but did not move towards the CO_2 release point (Fig. 4B). WT larvae spend more time on CO_2 release point than *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae (Fig. 4C). During the movement phase, the mean speed of WT larvae and *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae was similar (Fig. 4C), but the distance covered by *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae was higher, as they did not stop at the CO_2 release point. In a second experiment, we followed the trajectories of individual larvae in Petri plates with maize roots (Fig. 4D, E). Speed and distance covered were similar between WT and *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae (Fig. 4F). Surprisingly, both WT and *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae oriented themselves towards the maize roots and reached the maize roots after a similar amount of time (Fig. 4F). This result shows that *DvvGr2* expression is required for the location and detection of CO_2, but does not influence WCR motility nor its ability to locate maize roots over short distances (i.e.: <9 cm).

Figure 4 *Silencing the carbon dioxide group 2 receptor (DvvGr2) impairs WCR responses to* CO_2 *without changing motility or search behavior.* (A-B) Trajectories of individual WT (A) and *DvvGr2*-silenced (B) WCR larvae in Petri plates with a CO_2 source. The blue circles represent larval release points. The red circles represent CO_2 sources consisting of a fine needle that releases CO_2 at 60 ppm above ambient. (C) Mean (±SEM) speed and distance covered during the movement phase, and time spent at the CO_2 source during the first 3 min of the experiment. (D-E) Trajectories followed by WT (D) and by *DvvGr2*-silenced (E) WCR larvae on Petri plates containing maize seedling roots. The blue circles represent larval release points. The yellow circles represent maize seedling roots. (F) Mean (±SEM) speed and distance covered during the movement phase, and time necessary to reach the maize root during the first 3 min of the experiment. (F). For both experiments, six Petri plates with one larva each were assayed (n=6). Asterisks indicate statistically significant differences between mobility parameters of WT and *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae (***: $p<0.001$ by one-way ANOVA followed by Holm's multiple-comparisons test).

DvvGr2-dependent CO_2 responsiveness mediates long-range host location

To further explore the role of CO_2 and *DvvGr2* in volatile-mediated host location, we performed a series of olfactometer experiments with maize plants grown in sand on one side and sand only on the other side. We varied the distance between the volatile sources and the release points of the larvae between 9 and 18 cm (Fig. 5). We also manipulated CO_2 emission of maize roots in a subset of olfactometers by adding a layer of CO_2-absorbing soda lime into the olfactometer arms. CO_2 measurements revealed that the presence of a host root system increased CO_2 concentrations by approx. 100 ppm above ambient CO_2 levels in the corresponding olfactometer arm (Fig. 5, Fig. S1C). The soda lime reduced ambient CO_2 concentrations in the olfactometer arms by approx. 100 ppm, and equalized CO_2 concentrations between arms with and without a host plant (Fig. 5), thus validating the CO_2 scrubbing approach. Larvae did not have direct access to the plant, the plant growth medium or the soda lime, and received no visual cues, and thus had to rely on host plant volatiles for orientation. When released at distance of 9 cm from the volatile sources, both WT and *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae showed a clear preference for the olfactometer arms leading to host plants (Fig. 5A). This preference was still intact in olfactometers outfitted with a soda lime filters, confirming that volatiles other than CO_2 are sufficient for volatile-mediated host location at a short distance. At a distance of 18 cm from the volatile sources, WT larvae showed a similarly strong preference for arms leading to host plants (Fig. 5B). By contrast, *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae did not exhibit any preference (Fig. 5B). In the presence of a soda lime filter, neither WT nor *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae were attracted to arms with a host plant (Fig. 5B). Taken together, these experiments demonstrate that WCR larvae require plant-derived CO_2 to locate host plants over longer distances in a *DvvGr2*-dependent manner.

Figure 5 *Plant-derived CO_2 mediates DvvGr2-dependent long-distance host location.* (A, B) Choice (mean±SEM) of WCR
larvae in two-arm olfactometers. Control olfactometers allowed for plant-derived CO_2 to diffuse into the choice chamber,
while CO_2 scrubber olfactometers were outfitted with soda lime to suppress CO_2 diffusion. ΔCO_2 represents the difference in
CO_2 in the arms with plants compared to arms without plants (***$p<0.001$). For detailed data on CO_2 levels, refer to Fig. S1C.
Olfactometer arms were either 9 cm (A) or 18 cm (B) in length. Four olfactometers with six larvae each were assayed using
WT or *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae (n=4). Asterisks indicate statistically significant differences between treatments (**: $p<0.01$
by four-way ANOVA followed by FDR-corrected post hoc tests). For *P*-values of Generalized Linear Models (GLMs), refer
to Table S1.

Root-derived CO$_2$ enhances volatile-mediated host location over longer distances

WCR larvae can move up to 1 m in the soil. Second and third instar larvae in particular are known to move between maize plants across rows in maize fields (***Hibbard et al., 2003***). To test whether *DvvGr2*-mediated CO$_2$ responsiveness mediates host location over longer distances in a soil context, we planted maize plants in soil-filled plastic trays, released WCR larvae at distances of 16, 32, 48 or 64 cm from the maize plants and evaluated larval positions after 8 h (Fig. 6). This time point was chosen based on preliminary observations showing that larvae take approx. 8 h to cross the soil arenas. The CO$_2$ emitted by maize roots formed a gradient in the soil, starting at about 506 ppm in the rhizosphere (Zone 1), and 430 ppm at distances of 16-32 cm from the plant (Zone 2) (Fig. 6B, Fig. S1F). At distances of more than 32 cm from the plant, the CO$_2$ levels were around 400 ppm and statistically indistinguishable from soil without plants or ambient air (Fig. S1F). To confirm that larval motility is not altered by *DvvGr2*-silencing in a soil context, we first released WT and *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae into the middle of a set of arenas without a host plant and evaluated larval positions after 8 h. We found that the larvae dispersed equally across the arenas, without any difference between WT and *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae (Fig. 6A). Eight hours after releasing the larvae into arenas that included host plants on one side, 53% of WT larvae that were released at 64 cm from the plant were retrieved from the rhizosphere, i.e.: in Zone 1 (Fig. 6C). In contrast, only 33% of the *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae that were released at the same distance were recovered from the maize rhizosphere (Fig. 6C). Significantly more *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae were recovered further away from the plants, in zones 3 and 4 (Fig 6C). The number of WT and *DvvGr2*-silenced WCR larvae found close to the host plant increased with decreasing release distance, as did the difference between WT and *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae (Fig. 6C-F). At a release distance of 16 cm, only slightly more WT than *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae were found close to the plant roots (Fig 6F). To further confirm the role of *DvvGr2* in mediating host plant location over long distances in the soil, we performed a time-course experiment where we released WT and *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae in Zone 5 (64 cm away from the host plant) and then recorded how rapidly they reached Zone 1 containing host plants (Fig. S2). The capacity of the larvae to directly feed on the host roots was impeded using a volatile-permeable root barrier (Fig. S2A). Within 10 h, 36% of the released WT larvae were found in Zone 1, and within 32 h, this number had increased to 90% (Fig. S2B). By contrast, only 24% of the released *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae were found in Zone 1 after 10 h, and after 32 h, this value had only increased to 56% (Fig. S2B). Thus, the capacity to detect CO$_2$ gradients contributes to successful host location by WCR larvae in a distance specific manner in the soil.

Figure 6 *Root-derived CO_2 enhances WCR host location over long distances in the soil.* (A) Mean (±SEM) proportion of WT (dark green) or *DvvGr2*-silenced (light green) WCR larvae observed in the different tray zones eight hours after releasing the larvae in the centre of soil-filled trays without plants. Three trays per larval type with twenty larvae each were assayed (n=3). (B) Schematic representation (photomontage) of experimental setup used for behavioural experiments depicting mean (±SEM) CO_2 levels detected in the soil gas phase of each tray zone (n=3-4). Different letters indicate significant differences in CO_2 levels ($p<0.05$ by one-way ANOVA with Holm's multiple-comparisons test). (C-F) Mean (±SEM) proportion of WT (dark green) or *DvvGr2*-silenced (light green) WCR larvae observed in the different tray zones eight hours after releasing the larvae at distances of 64 cm (C), 48 cm (D), 32 cm (E), or 16 cm (F) from the plants. Six trays per larval type and distance combination with twenty larvae each were assayed (n=6). Asterisks indicate statistically significant differences in the proportion of WT and *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae found in each tray zone (*: $p<0.05$; **: $p<0.01$ by three-way ANOVA followed by FDR-corrected post hoc tests). For *P*-values of Generalized Linear Models (GLMs), refer to Table S1. For detailed data on CO_2 levels, refer to Fig. S1E.

Root-derived CO_2 is used for host quality assessment by WCR larvae

Plant nutritional status determines plant growth and defense, and can thus modulate plant-herbivore interactions (*Wetzel et al., 2016*). To test for a possible connection between plant nutritional status, host suitability and CO_2-dependent herbivore attraction, we varied the nutrient supply of maize plants and then carried out CO_2 measurements, and behavioural and insect performance experiments (Fig. 7). Plants that were well fertilized released higher levels of CO_2 into the soil than did plants that received a medium (50 % of optimally fertilized plants) or low (10% of optimally fertilized plants) dose of fertilizer (Fig 7A, B). As observed before, soil CO_2 levels decreased with increasing distance from the plants and were lowest in the middle of the experimental trays (Fig. 7A, B). In choice experiments with maize plants planted approx. 50 cm apart, which corresponds to row spacing used for high planting densities in maize cultivation, WT larvae showed a significant preference for well-fertilized over medium- or low-fertilized plants (Fig 7C, D). *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae did not distinguish between plants subjected to the different fertilizer regimes (Fig. 7C, D). In no-choice experiments, WCR larvae gained most weight on well-fertilized maize plants than on plants treated with medium or low doses of fertilizer (Fig. 7E). Hence, intact CO_2 perception is required for WCR larvae to express host quality related preferences for maize plants growing at agriculturally relevant distances.

Figure 7 *Root-derived* CO_2 *is used for host quality assessment by WCR larvae in the soil.* Schematic representation (photomontage) of experimental set up used to evaluate insect preference for plants fertilized with low or optimum fertilizer doses (A), and for plants fertilized with medium or optimum fertilizer doses (B) depicting mean (±SEM) CO_2 levels detected in the soil gas phase of each tray zone (n=10). Different letters indicate statistically significant differences in CO_2 levels (*p*<0.05 by one-way ANOVA with Holm's multiple comparisions test). (C, D) Mean (±SEM) proportion of WCR larvae recovered from the rhizosphere (either Zone 1, or Zone 5) in choice assays contrasting larval preference for plants fertilized with low or optimum fertilizer doses (C), and for plants fertilized with medium or optimum fertilizer doses (D) eight hours after releasing the larvae. Six trays with twenty larvae per tray were assayed (n=6). Different letters indicate statistically significant differences in larval preferences (*: *p*<0.05; **: (*: *p*<0.01 by two-way ANOVA followed by FDR-corrected post hoc tests). (E) Mean (±SEM) weight of WCR larvae after 7d feeding on plants fertilized with low, medium or optimum fertilizer doses. Twenty solo cups with 4 to 7 larvae each were assayed (n=20). Different letters indicate statistically significant differences in larval mass (*p*<0.05 by one-way ANOVA followed by Holm's multiple comparisions tests). For *P*-values of Generalized Linear Models (GLMs), refer to Table S1. For detailed data on CO_2 levels, refer to Fig. S1D.

Discussion

Volatile chemicals have a strong impact on the behaviour and performance of organisms across the tree of life (*Arce et al., 2017; Bentley and Day, 1989; Gang and Hallem, 2016; Hansson and Stensmyr, 2011; Johnson and Gregory, 2006; Miller and Strickler, 1984; Veyrat et al., 2016; Webster and Cardé, 2017; Ye et al., 2018*). Many organisms, including bacteria, fungi, nematodes, plants, insects, fish and mammals respond to CO_2, for instance (*Bahn and Mühlschlegel, 2006; Cummins et al., 2014; Eilers et al., 2012; Hallem and Sternberg, 2008; Hester et al., 2012; Huckstepp and Dale, 2011; Jones et al., 2007; Perry and Abdallah, 2012; Raguso et al., 2005; Stange and Stowe, 1999*). However, the role of CO_2 in plant-herbivore interactions is poorly understood and has not been studied *in vivo* through molecular manipulation approaches.

In this study, we conducted gene sequence similarity analyses, phylogenetic relationship reconstructions, RNA interference and behavioural experiments with different setups to explore the biological relevance of root-derived CO_2 for plant-herbivore interactions. We found that the WCR genome contains at least three putative CO_2 receptor-encoding genes: *DvvGr1*, *DvvGr2*, and *DvvGr3*, which is consistent with previous transcriptomic-based studies (*Rodrigues et al., 2016*). Protein tertiary structure and topology prediction models show that the identified genes code for proteins that contain seven transmembrane domains, which is consistent with the protein topology of gustatory and odor receptors (*Dahanukar et al., 2005; Hallem et al., 2006*). Larval behaviour and gene silencing based-functional characterization of the three identified WCR putative CO_2 receptor genes revealed that the intact expression of *DvvGr2*, is essential for the attractive effects of CO_2 to WCR larvae. Knocking down *DvvGr2* rendered larvae fully unresponsive to synthetic and plant-derived CO_2. In *Aedes aegypti, Helicoverpa armigera* and *Drosophila melanoganster*, both carbon dioxide receptors *Gr1* and *Gr3* are required for CO_2 detection (*Erdelyan et al., 2012; Jones et al., 2007; Kwon et al., 2007; McMeniman et al., 2014; Ning et al., 2016; Suh et al., 2004*). In *Culex quinquefasciatus*, both *Gr2* and *Gr3* carbon dioxide receptors are required, while *Gr1* act as a modulator (*Xu et al., 2020*). In *Aedes aegypti,* the involvement of *Gr2* in carbon dioxide responsiveness is still under debate (*Erdelyan et al., 2012; Kumar et al., 2019*). Taken together, the molecular elements required for carbon dioxide perception may be species-specific. Our results support this notion, as *DvvGr2,* but not *DvvGr1* and *DvvGr3*, are crucial for CO_2 responsiveness. The role of *DvvGr1* and *DvvGr3* for WCR remains to be determined, but their presence and expression may hint at additional complexity in developmental and/or tissue-specific patterns of CO_2 responsiveness in this species.

Despite the inability of *DvvGr2*-silenced WCR larvae to respond to differences in CO_2 levels, the larvae were still able to orient towards maize roots at short distances of 8-10 cm. Olfactometer experiments in combination with a CO_2 scrubber that removes plant-derived CO_2 demonstrates that other volatile cues can be used by WCR larvae to locate maize plants at short distances. Earlier studies found that (E)-β-caryophyllene, which is emitted from the roots of certain maize genotypes when they are attacked by root herbivores, attracts second and third instar WCR larvae and allows them to aggregate on maize plants and thereby enhance their fitness (*Robert et al., 2012b*), while

neonate larvae are not attracted to this volatile (**Hiltpold and Hibbard, 2016**). Ethylene has also been shown to attract WCR larvae (**Robert et al., 2012a**), and MBOA or its breakdown products have also been proposed as volatile attractants (**Bjostad and Hibbard, 1992**). Methyl anthranilate on the other hand has been shown to repel WCR larvae (**Bernklau et al., 2016b; Bernklau et al., 2018a**). Many other leaf- and root feeding herbivores are known to respond to plant volatiles other than CO_2 (**Bruce et al., 2005**). Given the low reliability of CO_2 as a host-specific cue, it is probably not surprising that WCR, as a highly specialized maize feeder, can use other volatile cues to locate host plants. Integrating other volatile cues likely allows WCR larvae to locate maize plants even in the absence of reliable CO_2 gradients in the soil, thus increasing the robustness of its foraging behaviour at short distances. An intriguing result in this context is the fact that WCR larvae show the same efficiency in locating maize roots at short distances in the absence of a CO_2 gradient, suggesting that this volatile may not play a role as a cue at close range.

Although intact CO_2 perception was not required for host location at short distances, it had a strong impact on the capacity of WCR larvae to reach the maize rhizosphere at long distances. The advantages of CO_2 are that it is abundantly produced through respiration by most organisms, that it is relatively stable (**Jones and Coaker, 1977; Li et al., 2016**), and that it diffuses rapidly in air, water and soil (**Hashimoto and Suzuki, 2002; Ma et al., 2013**). CO_2 may thus be a suitable long-range cue to locate organisms with high respiratory rates, such as mammals and heterotroph plant parts, including roots (**Johnson and Nielsen, 2012**). Aboveground insects can be attracted to CO_2 traps located as far away as 10 m, and it is estimated that this distance could even be as long as 60 m under optimal environmental circumstances (**Guerenstein and Hildebrand, 2008; Zollner et al., 2004**). For belowground insects, this distance is hypothesized to be within the lower cm-range as CO_2 diffusion is substantially decreased within the soil matrix compared to the air (**Bernklau et al., 2005; Doane et al., 1975; Doane and Klingler, 1978; Klingler, 1966**). Other volatiles that are less abundant and diffuse even less well through the soil such as (E)-β-caryophyllene are unlikely to be detectable at distances of more than 10 cm (**Chiriboga et al., 2017; Hiltpold and Turlings, 2008**). In support of this, we did not succeed in the past to detect maize volatiles in the soil at distance of more than 10 cm, even using a highly sensitive combination of solid-phase microextraction (SPME) and gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (GC/MS). These volatiles are thus likely useful host location cues at short, but not long distances in the soil. The finding that WCR integrates CO_2 perception with other environmental cues and that attraction to CO_2 is context dependent is in line with patterns reported for other insects such as mosquitoes, whose response to stimuli such as color, temperature and human body odors is enhanced by CO_2 (**McMeniman et al., 2014; van Breugel et al., 2015**), and pollinating hawkmoths, that use CO_2 as a redundant volatile distance stimulus in a sex-specific manner (**Goyret et al., 2008**).

A recent study shows that a CO_2 receptor in *Drosophila* flies is also involved in the detection and behavioral responses to other volatiles (**MacWilliam et al., 2018**). We observed that *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae were repelled by methyl anthranilate, a potent maize root repellent, to a similar extent than WT larvae, suggesting that their

sensitivity to other plant volatiles is unchanged (**Bernklau et al., 2016b**). In *Drosophila* flies, the CO_2 receptor

Gr63a is required for spermidine attractiveness over short time spans, i.e.: less than 1 min, but not over longer

time spans (hours), when other receptors likely become more important (**MacWilliam et al., 2018**). In the present

experiments, WCR behaviour was evaluated after one or more hours. The CO_2 scrubber experiment provides

further evidence that the foraging patterns observed in this study are not due to different sensitivity of *DvvGr2*-

silenced larvae to other root volatiles.

Apart from acting as a long-distance host location cue, CO_2 also links plant fertilization to herbivore behaviour by

guiding WCR to well fertilized plants. As WCR larvae are resistant to root defenses of maize (**Robert et al., 2012b**),

it is likely to benefit from increased fertilization, independently of the plant's defensive status. As the plant

nutritional status and host quality for WCR larvae is associated with higher CO_2 release from the roots, following

the highest concentrations of CO_2 in the soil may be adaptive for the herbivore, as it may increase its chance not

only to find a maize plant *per se*, but also to identify a plant that has the resources to grow vigorously and that is

a better host. WCR larvae are specialized maize pests that have evolved with intense maize cultivation in the corn

belt of the US (**Gray et al., 2009**) and are resistant to maize defense metabolites (**Robert et al., 2012b**). Following

the strongest CO_2 gradient in an equally spaced maize monoculture may indeed be a useful strategy for this root

feeder to locate suitable food sources. An association between CO_2 emission and food-source profitability was

also suggested for *Datura* flowers, that emit the highest level of CO_2 in times when nectar is most abundant

(**Guerenstein et al., 2004; Thom et al., 2004**). These findings support the hypothesis that CO_2 is used as a marker

of metabolic activity that allows for an assessment of the vigour and profitability of a wide variety of hosts.

In summary, this work demonstrates how an herbivore uses its capacity to perceive CO_2 to locate host plants and

to distinguish plants of different quality. Volatiles other than CO_2 are also integrated into host finding behaviour

in the soil, but their effects are more important at shorter distances. Thus, evidence is now accumulating that CO_2

acts as a fitness-relevant host location cue in different insects, likely because of its unique role as a highly

conserved long-range marker of metabolic activity within complex sensory landscapes.

Materials and Methods

Plants and planting conditions

Maize seeds (*Zea mays* L., var. Akku) were provided by Delley Semences et Plantes SA (Delley, CHE). Seedlings

were grown under greenhouse conditions (23 ± 2°C, 60% relative humidity, 16:8 h L/D, and 250 mmol/m^2/s[1]

additional light supplied by sodium lamps). Plantaaktiv® 16+6+26 Typ K fertilizer (Hauert HBG Dünger AG,

Grossaffoltern, Switzerland) was added twice a week after plant emergence following the manufacturer's

recommendations. The composition of the fertilizer is: total nitrogen (N) 16%, nitrate 11%, nmmonium 5%,

phosphate (P_2O_5) 6%, potassium oxide (K_2O) 26%, magnesium oxide (MgO) 3.3%, borum (B) 0.02%, cooper (Cu,

EDTA-chelated) 0.04%, iron (Fe, EDTA-chelated) 0.1%, manganese (Mn, EDTA-chelated) 0.05%, molybdenum

(Mo) 0.01%, and zink (Zn, EDTA-chelated) 0.01%. When plants were used as insect food, seedlings were

germinated in vermiculite (particle size: 2-4 mm; tabaksamen, Switzerland) and used within 4 days after

germination.

Insects and insect rearing

400 *Diabrotica virgifera virgifera* (Western corn rootworm, WCR) insects used in this study were derived from a non-

401 diapausing colony reared at the University of Neuchâtel. The eggs used to establish the colony were originally

402 supplied by USDA-ARS-NCARL, Brookings, SD. Upon hatching, insects were maintained in organic soil

403 (Selmaterra, Bigler Samen AG, Thun, Switzerland) and fed freshly germinated maize seedlings (var. Akku).

Identification of CO_2 receptor genes

To identify CO_2 receptor orthologues in WCR, we used CO_2 receptor-encoding gene sequences of *Tribolium*

castaneum and several sequences from other insects as queries against publicly available WCR genome sequences

(NCBI accession: PXJM00000000.2) using the National Center for Biotechnology Information Basic Local

Alignment Search Tool (NCBI BLAST)(***Robertson and Kent, 2009; Wang et al., 2013; Xu and Anderson, 2015***).

The full gene sequences can be retrieved from the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) data

bank using the following accession numbers: XM_028276483.1 (*DvvGr1*), XM_028280521.1 (*DvvGr2*), and

XM_028272033.1 (*DvvGr3*). These gene sequences were translated to obtain protein sequences. The obtained

protein sequences and the protein sequences of CO_2 receptors from different insects were used to infer evolutionary

relationships using the Neighbor-Joining method in MEGA 7 (***Kumar et al., 2016; Robertson and Kent, 2009;***

Rodrigues et al., 2016; Saitou and Nei, 1987). The optimal tree with the sum of branch length = 4.44068889 is

provided in Fig 1a. The percentage of replicate trees in which the associated taxa clustered together in the bootstrap

test (100 replicates) are shown next to the branches (***Felsenstein, 1985***). The tree is drawn to scale, with branch

lengths in the same units as those of the evolutionary distances used to infer the phylogenetic tree. The evolutionary

distances were computed using the Poisson correction method (***Zuckerkandl and Pauling, 1965***) and are in the

units of the number of amino acid substitutions per site. A total of 242 amino acid positions were included in the

final dataset. Graphical representation and edition of the phylogenetic tree were performed with the Interactive

Tree of Life (version 3.5.1)(***Letunic and Bork, 2016***). Protein tertiary structures and topologies were predicted

using Phyre2 (***Kelley et al., 2015***).

Production of double stranded RNA

Escherichia coli HT115 were transformed with recombinant L4440 plasmids that contained a 211-240 bp long

gene fragment targeting one of the three CO_2 receptors. Cloned nucleotide sequences were synthetized *de novo*

(Eurofins, Germany). To induce the production of dsRNA, an overnight bacterial culture was used to inoculate

fresh Luria-Berthani broth (25 g/L, Luria/Miller, Carl Roth GmbH, Karlsruhe, Germany). Once the bacterial

culture reached an OD_{600} of 0.6-0.8, it was supplemented with isopropyl β-D-1-thiogalactopyranoside, IPTG)

(Sigma-aldrich, Switzerland) at a final concentration of 2mM. Bacterial cultures were incubated at 37°C in an

orbital shaker at 130 rpms for 16 additional hours. Bacteria were harvested by centrifugation and stored at -20°C

for further use (***Kim et al., 2015***).

Gene silencing experiments

To induce gene silencing in WCR, six to ten second instar WCR larvae were released in solo cups (30 mL, Frontier

Scientific Services, Inc., Germany) containing approx. 2g of autoclaved soil (Selmaterra, Bigler Samen AG, Thun,

Switzerland) and 2-3 freshly germinated maize seedlings. Maize seedlings were coated with 1 ml of bacterial

solution containing approximately 200-500 ng of dsRNA, targeting the different CO_2 receptor genes. As controls,

larvae were fed with bacteria producing dsRNA targeting green fluorescent protein genes (GFP), which are absent

in the WCR genome (***Rodrigues et al., 2016***). Fresh bacteria and seedlings were added to solo cups every other

day for three consecutive times. Two days after the last dsRNA/bacteria application, larvae were collected and

used for experiments.

Gene expression measurements

Total RNA was isolated from approximately 10 mg of frozen, ground and homogenized WCR larval tissue (3-7

larvae per biological replicate, n=8) using the GenElute Universal Total RNA Purification Kit (Sigma-Aldrich, St.

Louis, MO, USA). A NanoDrop spectrophotometer (ND-1000, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA)

was used to estimate RNA purity and quantity. DNase-treated RNA was used as template for reverse transcription

and first strand cDNA synthesis with PrimeScript Reverse Transcriptase (Takara Bio Inc., Kusatsu, Japan). DNase

treatment was carried out using the gDNA Eraser (Perfect Real Time) following manufacturer's instructions

(Takara Bio Inc.). For gene expression analysis, 2 μl of undiluted cDNA (i.e. the equivalent of 100 ng total RNA)

served as template in a 20 μl qRT-PCR using the TB Green Premix Ex Taq II (Tli RNaseH Plus) kit (Takara Bio

Inc.) and the Roche LightCycler 96 system (Roche, Basel, Switzerland), according to manufacturer's instructions.

Transcript abundances of the following WCR genes were analysed: *DvvGr1, DvvGr2, and DvvGr3* (***Rodrigues et***

al., 2016). *Actin* was used as reference gene to normalize expression data across samples. Relative gene expression

levels were calculated by the $2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$ method (***Livak and Schmittgen, 2001***). The following primers were used:

DvvGr1-F   CGTTAATTTAGCTGCTGTGG,   DvvGr1-R   GTTTTCTGTTGCTAGAGTTGC,   DvvGr2-F

GAACTAAGCGAGCTCCTCCA,   DvvGr2-R   CAGAAGCACCATGCAATACG,   DvvGr3-F

GCAACGCTTTCAGCTTTACC,   DvvGr3-R   GTGCATCGTCATTCATCCAG,   DvvActin-F

TCCAGGCTGTACTCCTTG, and DvvActin-R CAAGTCCAAACGAAGGATTG.

Belowground olfactometer experiments with *DvvGr1*-, *DvvGr2*-, *DvvGr3*-silenced WCR larvae

To determine whether silencing putative CO_2 receptor genes impairs the ability of WCR larvae to behaviourally respond to CO_2, we silenced *DvvGr1*, *DvvGr2*, and *DvvGr3* as described above and conducted behavioural experiments using belowground olfactometers. Larvae that were fed bacteria expressing dsRNA targeting green fluorescent protein (GFP) were used as controls (herein referred as wild type larvae; WT). We conducted choice experiments using two-arm belowground olfactometers with carbonated water as a CO_2 source (***Bernklau and Bjostad, 1998a; Huang et al., 2017; Jewett and Bjostad, 1996***). For this, a plastic cup containing 50 ml of carbonated water was placed in one arm of the olfactometer and a plastic cup containing 50 ml of distilled water was placed in the opposite arm (Fig. 2B). Five larvae were released in the middle of the olfactometer (indicated by a red arrow) and their positions were recorded 1h after their release. Seven olfactometers per larval type and experiment were assessed. The experiment was repeated twice. CO_2 levels on each arm of the olfactometer were measured by gas chromatography coupled to a flame ionization detector (GC-FID) as described (***Zhang et al., 2019***).

Insect behavioural experiments

To determine larval responses to plant volatile organic compounds other than CO_2, we evaluated insect behaviour to methyl anthranilate. For this, we evaluated insect preferences for seedling roots or for seedling roots placed next to a filter paper disc treated with methyl anthranilate in choice experiments following a similar experimental procedure as described (***Bernklau et al., 2018a***). To this end, five 2nd-3rd instar WCR larvae were released in the middle of a sand-filled petri plate (9 cm diameter, Greiner Bio-One GmbH, Frickenhausen, DE) where they encountered seedling roots in one side or seedlings roots and a filter paper disc treated with 10 µl of methyl anthranilate solution (10 mg/ml of water) in the other side. Ten Petri plates per larval type with five larvae each were evaluated (n=10). Methyl anthranilate was purchased from Sigma (CAS: 134-20-3; Sigma Aldrich Chemie, CHE). Larval preferences were recorded 1h after releasing the larvae.

To investigate larval responses to non-volatile root chemicals, we tested two well established attractants, Fe(III)(DIMBOA)$_3$ and a sugar blend (***Bernklau et al., 2018b; Hu et al., 2018***). To evaluate the attractive effects of Fe(III)(DIMBOA)$_3$, we released six 2nd-3rd instar WCR larvae in the middle of a moist sand-filled Petri plate (6 cm diameter, Greiner Bio-One GmbH, Frickenhausen, DE) where they had a choice between a filter paper disc treated with 10 µl of Fe(III)(DIMBOA)$_3$ (1 µg/ml of water) or, on the opposite side, a filter paper disc treated with water only. Twenty Petri plates with six larvae each were evaluated (n=20). Fe(III)(DIMBOA)$_3$ was prepared fresh by mixing FeCl$_3$ and DIMBOA at a 1:2 ratio as described. Larval preferences were recorded 1h after releasing the larvae. To evaluate attractive effects of soluble sugars for WCR larvae, we followed the procedure described by (***Bernklau et al., 2018b***). Briefly, we released six 2nd-3rd instar WCR larvae in the middle of a moist sand-filled petri plate (6 cm diameter, Greiner Bio-One GmbH, Frickenhausen, DE) where they had a choice between a filter

paper disc treated with 10 µl of a mixture of glucose, fructose, and sucrose (30 mg/ml of each sugar), or, on the

opposite side, a filter paper treated with water only. Twenty Petri plates with six larvae each were assayed (n=20).

Larval preferences were recorded 3h after release.

To evaluate the attractiveness of CO_2 for WCR larvae, we conducted choice experiments using two-arm

belowground olfactometers. CO_2 levels were increased in one arm of the olfactometer by delivering CO_2-enriched

synthetic air (1% CO_2, Carbagas, Switzerland). Olfactometer arms were closed on top using parafilm during CO_2

delivery. A manometer connected to the synthetic air bottle allowed to fine-tune CO_2 delivery rates. CO_2 levels

were measured using a gas analyzer (Li7000, Li-Cor Inc., Lincoln, Nebraska, USA). CO_2 levels were increased at

different levels from 22 to 1832 ppm above ambient CO_2 levels. Once the desired CO_2 concentrations were

reached, CO_2 delivery was terminated, olfactometer arms were connected to olfactometer central connectors and

six 2nd-3rd instar WCR larvae were release immediately, and their choice were evaluated within ten minutes of

release. Three olfactometers per larval type were assayed (n=3).

To assess the impact of *DvvGr2* on larval motility, we followed the trajectories of individual larvae in Petri plate

that were outfitted with a CO_2 point releaser. For this, Petri plates (9 cm diameter, Greiner Bio-one, Austria) were

pierced in their centers to allow the insertion of a needle that released CO_2 at 60 ppm above ambient level. Larvae

were released at the rim of the Petri plates (4.5 cm apart from CO_2 source). Petri plates were overlaid with moist

filter paper (9cm diameter, GE Healthcare, UK). Insect behavior was observed for three minutes. Six Petri plates

with one larva each were assayed (n=6). In a second experiment, we followed the trajectories of individual larvae

in Petri plate with maize roots. For this, two root pieces (3-4 cm long) of four-day-old maize seedlings were placed

at the rim of a Petri plate overlaid with moist filter paper. Then, on the opposite rim (9cm apart), we released one

2nd-3rd instar WCR larva and followed their trajectories during three minutes. Six Petri plates with one larva each

were assayed (n=6). Crawled distances were measured using ImageJ 1.53a.

Host location experiments

To determine the importance of plant-derived CO_2 for distance-dependent host-location by WCR larvae, we used

two experimental setups: two-arm belowground olfactometers and soil-filled trays (Fig. 5, Fig. 6). For behavioural

experiments using belowground olfactometers, we used two types of olfactometers: one with short arms that

allowed for the release of larvae at 9 cm (Fig. 5A) from plant volatile sources, and one with long arms that allow

to release the larvae at 18 cm (Fig. 5B) from plant volatiles sources. To specifically investigate the importance of

plant derived CO_2, we contrasted insect behavioural responses to intact plant odours and to plant odours without

CO_2. CO_2 was experimentally removed using soda lime (Carl Roth, Karlsruhe, Germany). For this, a layer of 5g

of soda lime granules (2-4mm) were placed between Teflon connectors and sand 30 min before the experiments.

Olfactometers without soda lime served as controls. Olfactometer arms were filled with sand 48h before the

experiment and one three-week-old maize plant was transplanted to one arm of the olfactometer. Four

olfactometers with six larvae each were assayed (n=4). CO_2 levels were measured using a gas analyzer (Li7000,
Li-Cor Inc., Lincoln, Nebraska, USA). For behavioural experiments using soil-filled trays, second instar WCR
larvae were released at 16, 32, 48, or 64 cm from four or five 2-to 3-week-old maize plants. Larval release points
are indicated by colour arrows (Fig. 6B). Plants were planted in plastic trays (80cmx15cmx4.5cm)(Migros do it +
garden, Switzerland) filled with soil. Eight h after releasing the larvae, their positions were recorded. Six trays per
larval type and distance with twenty larvae each were assayed (n=6). CO_2 levels in the soil gas phase of each tray
zone were measured by GC-FID as described (***Zhang et al., 2019***).

Host finding behavioural experiments with nutrient-deficient plants

Optimally fertilized plants emit higher levels of respiratory CO_2 than sub-optimally fertilized plants (***Zhu and***
Lynch, 2004). To test whether WCR larvae orients towards and prefer optimally fertilized maize plants and to
evaluate the importance of CO_2 detection through *DvvGr2* in this context, we silenced this gene and conducted
choice experiments to contrast larval preference for plants that were differentially fertilized. To this end, we
fertilized maize plants with three doses of fertilizer: 0.1% (optimally fertilized), 0.05% (medium fertilized), or
0.01% (low fertilized). Plantaaktiv® 16+6+26 Typ K fertilizer (Hauert HBG Dünger AG, Grossaffoltern,
Switzerland) was dissolved to the abovementioned concentrations and applied following manufacture's
indications. Fertilizer macro- and micronutrient composition are described above (Plants and planting conditions).
For the choice experiments, plants were grown under the different fertilizer regimes. 24 hr before the choice
experiment, five 15-day-old, optimally fertilized plants were transferred and re-planted in one corner of an 80 cm
long plastic tray (Migros do it + garden, Switzerland) filled with soil (Figs 5a, b). At the opposite side, plants
grown either under low or medium fertilizer regimes were equally transferred and re-planted (Figs 7A, B). Then,
twenty 2th instar WCR larvae were released in the middle of the tray (Zone 3, Fig 6A, B, red arrows). Six
independent trays per larval type and fertilizer regime pair were evaluated (n=6). Eight hours after releasing the
larvae, larval positions were recorded.

Effect of plant nutritional status on larval growth

To test whether larval preference for optimally fertilized plants is reflected in their growth, we measured larval
weights of larvae feeding on roots of plants that were grown under the different fertilizer regimes. Fertilizer
regimens are described above. For this, seven 1th instar larvae were released into solo cups (30 mL, Frontier
Scientific Services, Inc., DE) containing approx. 2g of organic soil (Selmaterra, Bigler Samen AG, Thun, CHE).
Fresh roots of 15-day old plants were provided everyday *ad libitum*. Roots were washed thoroughly to remove
fertilizer traces from the root surface. Twenty solo cups per treatment were included (n=20). Eight days after the
beginning of the experiment, larvae were weighed using a micro balance. Four to seven larvae were recovered per
experimental unit at the end of the experiment.

Statistical analyses

Differences in gene expression levels, carbon dioxide concentrations, and larval performance were analysed by analysis of variance (ANOVA) using Sigma Plot 12.0 (SystatSoftware Inc., San Jose, CA, USA). Normality and equality of variance were verified using Shapiro–Wilk and Levene's tests, respectively. Holm–Sidak post hoc tests were used for multiple comparisons. Datasets from experiments that did not fulfill the assumptions for ANOVA were natural log-, root square-, or rank-transformed before analysis. The differences in larval preference were assessed using Generalized Linear Models (GLM) under binomial distribution and corrected for overdispersion with quasi-binomial function when necessary followed by analysis of variance (ANOVA) and FDR-corrected post hoc tests. All analyses were followed by residual analysis to verify the suitability of the error distribution and model fitting. All The above analyses were conducted using R 3.2.2 (43) using the packages "lme4", "car", "lsmeans" and "RVAideMemoire" (*Bates et al., 2014; Fox and Weisberg, 2011; Herve, 2015; Lenth, 2016; Team, 2014*).

Acknowledgements

We thank Evangelia Vogiatzaki and Celine Terrettaz for technical assistance, the members of the Research Section Biotic Interactions of the Institute of Plant Sciences of the University of Bern, Switzerland for their support and helpful discussions. This project was supported by the University of Bern, a European Union Horizon 2020 Marie Sklodowska-Curie Action (MSCA) Individual Fellowship (Grant Nr. 794947 to B.C.J.S.), and the Swiss National Science Foundation (Grant Nr. 155781 to M.E., Grant Nr. 186094 to R.A.R.M).

Author contributions

Conceptualization, M.E. and R.A.R.M.; Methodology, R.A.R.M. and M.E.; Formal analysis, R.A.R.M., M.E., and C.C.M.A.; Investigation, R.A.R.M., C.C.M.A., V.T., B.C.J.S., and G.J.; Visualization, R.A.R.M.; Supervision, R.A.R.M. and M.E.; Funding Acquisition, M.E., and R.A.R.M Writing – original draft, R.A.R.M. and M.E.; Writing – review & editing, R.A.R.M., M.E., B.C.J.S., and C.C.M.A.

Declaration of interests

The authors declare no competing interests

Data availability

All data sets are available from Dryad (to be added at a later stage).

Supplementary Figures

Figure S1 *Carbon dioxide measurements for the different experiments.* Mean (±SEM) CO_2 levels measured in behavioural experiments of Figure 2 (A), Figure 3 (B), Figure 5 (C), Figure 7 (D, E), Figure 6 (F). Different letters indicate significant differences in CO_2 levels ($p<0.05$ by one-way ANOVA with Holm's multiple-comparisons test). Asterisks indicate significant differences in CO_2 levels (***: $p<0.001$ by ANOVA with Holm's multiple-comparisons test). Gr2: *DvvGr2*-silenced larvae. For details on CO_2 sampling points, refer to the main figures.

Figure S2 *Root-derived CO_2 is required for host location by WCR larvae at long distances.* (A) Schematic representation (photomontage) of experimental set up used. (B) Mean (±SEM) proportion of WCR larvae retrieved at close vicinity of root systems (i.e.: on root barriers). Twenty-five larvae were released at 64cm from the plants and five arenas were assayed (n=5). Soil surrounding root barriers (indicated by dashed red lines) were carefully inspected and the observed larvae were collected and counted regularly. Asterisks indicate statistically significant differences in the proportion of larvae retrieved at each time point (**: $p<0.01$; ***: $p<0.001$ by two-way repeated measures ANOVA with Holm's multiple comparisions test). For *P*-values of the different factors and their interactions, refer to Table S1.

References

Agus F, Handayani E, van Noordwijk M, Idris K, Sabiham S, eds. 2010. *Root respiration interferes with peat CO_2 emission measurement.*

Arce CCM, Machado RAR, Ribas NS, Cristaldo PF, Ataíde LMS, Pallini Â, Carmo FM, Freitas LG, Lima E. 2017. Nematode root herbivory in tomato increases leaf defenses and reduces leaf miner oviposition and performance. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **43**:120–128.

Bahn Y-S, Mühlschlegel FA. 2006. CO_2 sensing in fungi and beyond. *Current opinion in microbiology* **9**:572–578.

Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. 2014. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.5823*.

Bentley MD, Day JF. 1989. Chemical ecology and behavioral aspects of mosquito oviposition. *Annual review of entomology* **34**:401–421.

Bernklau EJ, Bjostad LB. 1998a. Behavioral responses of first-instar western corn root worm (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae) to carbon dioxide in a glass bead bioassay. *Journal of Economic Entomology* **91**:444–456.

Bernklau EJ, Bjostad LB. 1998b. Reinvestigation of host location by western corn rootworm larvae (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae): CO2 is the only volatile attractant. *Journal of Economic Entomology* **91**:1331–1340.

Bernklau EJ, Bjostad LB, Hibbard BE. 2011. Synthetic feeding stimulants enhance insecticide activity against western corn rootworm larvae, *Diabrotica virgifera virgifera* (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae). *Journal of Applied Entomology* **135**:47–54.

Bernklau EJ, Fromm EA, Bjostad LB. 2004. Disruption of host location of western corn rootworm larvae (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae) with carbon dioxide. *Journal of Economic Entomology* **97**:330–339.

Bernklau EJ, Fromm EA, Judd TM, Bjostad LB. 2005. Attraction of subterranean termites (Isoptera) to carbon dioxide. *Journal of Economic Entomology* **98**:476–484.

Bernklau EJ, Hibbard BE, Bjostad LB. 2016a. Toxic and behavioural effects of free fatty acids on western corn rootworm (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae) larvae. *Journal of Applied Entomology* **140**:725–735.

Bernklau EJ, Hibbard BE, Bjostad LB. 2018a. Repellent effects of methyl anthranilate on western corn rootworm larvae (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae) in soil bioassays. *Journal of Economic Entomology* **112**:683–690.

Bernklau EJ, Hibbard BE, Bjostad LB. 2018b. Sugar preferences of western corn rootworm larvae in a feeding stimulant blend. *Journal of Applied Entomology* **142**:947–958.

Bernklau EJ, Hibbard BE, Dick DL, Rithner CD, Bjostad LB. 2015. Monogalactosyldiacylglycerols as host recognition cues for western corn rootworm larvae (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae). *Journal of Economic Entomology* **108**:539–548.

Bernklau EJ, Hibbard BE, Norton AP, Bjostad LB. 2016b. Methyl anthranilate as a repellent for western corn rootworm
larvae (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae). *Journal of Economic Entomology* **109**:1683–1690.

Bjostad LB, Hibbard BE. 1992. 6-Methoxy-2-benzoxazolinone: a semiochemical for host location by western corn rootworm
larvae. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **18**:931–944.

Bruce TJA, Pickett JA. 2011. Perception of plant volatile blends by herbivorous insects–finding the right mix. *Phytochemistry*
72:1605–1611.

Bruce TJA, Wadhams LJ, Woodcock CM. 2005. Insect host location: a volatile situation. *Trends in plant science* **10**:269–
274.

Carrasco D, Larsson MC, Anderson P. 2015. Insect host plant selection in complex environments. *Current Opinion in Insect*
Science **8**:1–7.

Chiriboga X, Campos-Herrera R, Jaffuel G, Röder G, Turlings TCJ. 2017. Diffusion of the maize root signal (E)-β-
caryophyllene in soils of different textures and the effects on the migration of the entomopathogenic nematode
Heterorhabditis megidis. *Rhizosphere* **3**:53–59.

Ciosi M, Miller NJ, Kim KS, Giordano R, Estoup A, Guillemaud T. 2008. Invasion of Europe by the western corn rootworm,
Diabrotica virgifera virgifera: multiple transatlantic introductions with various reductions of genetic diversity. *Molecular*
Ecology **17**:3614–3627.

Cummins EP, Selfridge AC, Sporn PH, Sznajder JI, Taylor CT. 2014. Carbon dioxide-sensing in organisms and its
implications for human disease. *Cellular and Molecular Life Sciences* **71**:831–845.

Dahanukar A, Hallem EA, Carlson JR. 2005. Insect chemoreception. *Current opinion in neurobiology* **15**:423–430.

Doane JF, Klingler J. 1978. Location of CO2-receptive sensilla on larvae of the wireworms *Agriotes lineatus-obscurus* and
Limonius californicus. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America* **71**:357–363.

Doane JF, Lee YW, Klingler J, Westcott ND. 1975. The orientation response of *Ctemcera destructor* and other wire worms
(Coleoptera: Elateridae) to germinating grain and to carbon dioxide. *The Canadian Entomologist* **107**:1233–1252.

Eilers EJ, Talarico G, Hansson BS, Hilker M, Reinecke A. 2012. Sensing the underground–ultrastructure and function of
sensory organs in root-feeding *Melolontha melolontha* (Coleoptera: Scarabaeinae) larvae. *PloS one* **7**:e41357.

Eilers EJ, Veit D, Rillig MC, Hansson BS, Hilker M, Reinecke A. 2016. Soil substrates affect responses of root feeding
larvae to their hosts at multiple levels: orientation, locomotion and feeding. *Basic and Applied Ecology* **17**:115–124.

Erb M, Huber M, Robert CAM, Ferrieri AP, Machado RAR, Arce CCM. 2013. The role of plant primary and secondary
metabolites in root-herbivore behaviour, nutrition and physiology. In: *Advances in insect physiology*. Elsevier.

Erb M, Robert CAM, Hibbard BE, Turlings TCJ. 2011. Sequence of arrival determines plant-mediated interactions between
herbivores. *Journal of Ecology* **99**:7–15.

Erb M, Robert CAM, Marti G, Lu J, Doyen GR, Villard N, Barrière Y, French BW, Wolfender J-L, Turlings TCJ. 2015a. A
physiological and behavioral mechanism for leaf herbivore-induced systemic root resistance. *Plant physiology* **169**:2884–
2894.

Erb M, Robert CAM, Marti G, Lu J, Doyen GR, Villard N, Barrière Y, French BW, Wolfender J-L, Turlings TCJ. 2015b. A
physiological and behavioral mechanism for leaf herbivore-induced systemic root resistance. *Plant physiology* **169**:2884–
2894.

Erdelyan CNG, Mahood TH, Bader TSY, Whyard S. 2012. Functional validation of the carbon dioxide receptor genes in
Aedes aegypti mosquitoes using RNA interference. *Insect molecular biology* **21**:119–127.

Fandino RA, Haverkamp A, Bisch-Knaden S, Zhang J, Bucks S, Nguyen TAT, Schröder K, Werckenthin A, Rybak J, Stengl
M. 2019. Mutagenesis of odorant coreceptor Orco fully disrupts foraging but not oviposition behaviors in the hawkmoth
Manduca sexta. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116**:15677–15685.

Felsenstein J. 1985. Confidence limits on phylogenies: an approach using the bootstrap. *Evolution* **39**:783–791.

Fox J, Weisberg S. 2011. An R companion to applied regression. Sage Publications. *Los Angeles, USA*.

Fraenkel GS. 1959. The raison d'etre of secondary plant substances. *Science* 1466–1470.

Gang SS, Hallem EA. 2016. Mechanisms of host seeking by parasitic nematodes. *Molecular and biochemical parasitology*
208:23–32.

Goyret J, Markwell PM, Raguso RA. 2008. Context-and scale-dependent effects of floral CO_2 on nectar foraging by *Manduca*
sexta. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **105**:4565–4570.

Gray ME, Sappington TW, Miller NJ, Moeser J, Bohn MO. 2009. Adaptation and invasiveness of western corn rootworm:
intensifying research on a worsening pest. *Annual review of entomology* **54**:303–321.

Guerenstein PG, Hildebrand JG. 2008. Roles and effects of environmental carbon dioxide in insect life. *Annual review of*
entomology **53**:161–178.

Guerenstein PG, Yepez EA, van Haren J, Williams DG, Hildebrand JG. 2004. Floral CO_2 emission may indicate food
abundance to nectar-feeding moths. *Naturwissenschaften* **91**:329–333.

Halitschke R, Stenberg JA, Kessler D, Kessler A, Baldwin IT. 2008. Shared signals–'alarm calls' from plants increase
apparency to herbivores and their enemies in nature. *Ecology Letters* **11**:24–34.

Hallem EA, Dahanukar A, Carlson JR. 2006. Insect odor and taste receptors. *Annual review of entomology* **51**:113–135.

Hallem EA, Sternberg PW. 2008. Acute carbon dioxide avoidance in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Proceedings of the National*
Academy of Sciences **105**:8038–8043.

Hansen GK. 1977. Adaption to photosynthesis and diurnal oscillation of root respiration rates for *Lolium multiflorum*.
Physiologia Plantarum **39**:275–279.

Hansson BS, Stensmyr MC. 2011. Evolution of insect olfaction. *Neuron* **72**:698–711.

Hashimoto S, Suzuki M. 2002. Vertical distributions of carbon dioxide diffusion coefficients and production rates in forest
soils. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* **66**:1151–1158.

Herve M. 2015. *Package 'RVAideMemoire', diverse basic statistical and graphical functions. Version 0.9–52 (The*
Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN), Vienna, Austria).

Hester SE, Lui M, Nicholson T, Nowacki D, Harvill ET. 2012. Identification of a CO_2 responsive regulon in *Bordetella*. *PloS*
one **7**:e47635.

Hibbard BE, Bjostad LB. 1988. Behavioral responses of western corn rootworm larvae to volatile semiochemicals from corn
seedlings. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **14**:1523–1539.

Hibbard BE, Duran DP, Ellersieck MR, Ellsbury MM. 2003. Post-establishment movement of western corn rootworm larvae
(Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae) in Central Missouri corn. *Journal of Economic Entomology* **96**:599–608.

Hiltpold I, Bernklau E, Bjostad LB, Alvarez N, Miller-Struttmann NE, Lundgren JG, Hibbard BE. 2013. Nature, evolution
and characterisation of rhizospheric chemical exudates affecting root herbivores. In: *Advances in insect physiology*.
Elsevier.

Hiltpold I, Hibbard BE. 2016. Neonate larvae of the specialist herbivore *Diabrotica virgifera virgifera* do not exploit the
defensive volatile (E)-β-caryophyllene in locating maize roots. *Journal of pest science* **89**:853–858.

Hiltpold I, Turlings TCJ. 2008. Belowground chemical signaling in maize: when simplicity rhymes with efficiency. *Journal*
of Chemical Ecology **34**:628–635.

Hiltpold I, Turlings TCJ. 2012. Manipulation of chemically mediated interactions in agricultural soils to enhance the control
of crop pests and to improve crop yield. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **38**:641–650.

Hu L, Mateo P, Ye M, Zhang X, Berset JD, Handrick V, Radisch D, Grabe V, Köllner TG, Gershenzon J. 2018. Plant iron
acquisition strategy exploited by an insect herbivore. *Science* **361**:694–697.

Huang W, Robert CAM, Hervé MR, Hu L, Bont Z, Erb M. 2017. A mechanism for sequence specificity in plant-mediated
interactions between herbivores. *New Phytologist* **214**:169–179.

Huckstepp RTR, Dale N. 2011. Redefining the components of central CO_2 chemosensitivity–towards a better understanding
of mechanism. *The Journal of physiology* **589**:5561–5579.

Jewett DK, Bjostad LB. 1996. Dichloromethane attracts diabroticite larvae in a laboratory behavioral bioassay. *Journal of*
Chemical Ecology **22**:1331–1344.

Johnson SN, Gregory PJ. 2006. Chemically-mediated host-plant location and selection by root-feeding insects. *Physiological*
Entomology **31**:1–13.

Johnson SN, Nielsen UN. 2012. Foraging in the dark–chemically mediated host plant location by belowground insect
herbivores. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **38**:604–614.

Johnson SN, Zhang XX, Crawford JW, Gregory PJ, Hix NJ, Jarvis SC, Murray PJ, Young IM. 2006. Effects of carbon dioxide
on the searching behaviour of the root-feeding clover weevil *Sitona lepidus* (Coleoptera: Curculionidae). *Bulletin of*
entomological research **96**:361–366.

Jones OT, Coaker TH. 1977. Oriented responses of carrot fly larvae, *Psila rosae*, to plant odours, carbon dioxide and carrot
root volatiles. *Physiological Entomology* **2**:189–197.

Jones OT, Coaker TH. 1978. A basis for host plant finding in phytophagous larvae. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*
24:472–484.

Jones WD, Cayirlioglu P, Kadow IG, Vosshall LB. 2007. Two chemosensory receptors together mediate carbon dioxide
detection in *Drosophila*. *Nature* **445**:86.

Kelley LA, Mezulis S, Yates CM, Wass MN, Sternberg MJE. 2015. The Phyre2 web portal for protein modeling, prediction
and analysis. *Nature Protocols* **10**:845 EP -. doi: 10.1038/nprot.2015.053.

Kim E, Park Y, Kim Y. 2015. A transformed bacterium expressing double-stranded RNA specific to integrin β1 enhances Bt
toxin efficacy against a polyphagous insect pest, Spodoptera exigua. *PloS one* **10**:e0132631.
Klingler J. 1966. Über den Sitz der CO_2-Rezeptoren bei der Larve von *Otiorrhynchus sulcatus*. *Entomologia Experimentalis*
et Applicata **9**:271–277.
Krebs HA, Johnson WA. 1937. The role of citric acid in intermediate metabolism in animal tissues. *Enzymologia* **4**:148–156.
Kumar A, Tauxe GM, Perry S, Scott CA, Dahanukar A, Ray A. 2019. Contributions of the conserved insect carbon dioxide
receptor subunits to odor detection. *bioRxiv* 803270.
Kumar S, Stecher G, Tamura K. 2016. MEGA7: molecular evolutionary genetics analysis version 7.0 for bigger datasets.
Molecular biology and evolution **33**:1870–1874.
Kwon JY, Dahanukar A, Weiss LA, Carlson JR. 2007. The molecular basis of CO2 reception in *Drosophila*. *Proceedings of*
the National Academy of Sciences **104**:3574–3578.
Lenth RV. 2016. *Least-squares means: the R package lsmeans. J Stat Sofw 69: 1–33.*
Letunic I, Bork P. 2016. Interactive tree of life (iTOL) v3: an online tool for the display and annotation of phylogenetic and
other trees. *Nucleic acids research* **44**:W242-W245.
Li T, Blande JD, Holopainen JK. 2016. Atmospheric transformation of plant volatiles disrupts host plant finding. *Scientific*
reports **6**:33851.
Livak KJ, Schmittgen TD. 2001. Analysis of relative gene expression data using real-time quantitative PCR and the 2− ΔΔCT
method. *methods* **25**:402–408.
Lu J, Robert CAM, Lou Y, Erb M. 2016. A conserved pattern in plant-mediated interactions between herbivores. *Ecology*
and evolution **6**:1032–1040.
Ma J, Wang Z-Y, Stevenson BA, Zheng X-J, Li Y. 2013. An inorganic CO_2 diffusion and dissolution process explains
negative CO_2 fluxes in saline/alkaline soils. *Scientific reports* **3**:2025.
MacWilliam D, Kowalewski J, Kumar A, Pontrello C, Ray A. 2018. Signaling mode of the broad-spectrum conserved CO_2
receptor is one of the important determinants of odor valence in *Drosophila*. *Neuron* **97**:1153–1167.
McMeniman CJ, Corfas RA, Matthews BJ, Ritchie SA, Vosshall LB. 2014. Multimodal integration of carbon dioxide and
other sensory cues drives mosquito attraction to humans. *Cell* **156**:1060–1071.
Meinke LJ, Sappington TW, Onstad DW, Guillemaud T, Miller NJ, Komáromi J, Levay N, Furlan L, Kiss J, Toth F. 2009.
Western corn rootworm (*Diabrotica virgifera virgifera* LeConte) population dynamics. *Agricultural and Forest*
Entomology **11**:29–46.
Miller JR, Strickler KL. 1984. Finding and accepting host plants. In: *Chemical ecology of insects*. Springer.
Natale D, Mattiacci L, Hern A, Pasqualini E, Dorn S. 2003. Response of female *Cydia molesta* (Lepidoptera: Tortricidae) to
plant derived volatiles. *Bulletin of entomological research* **93**:335–342.
Nicolas G, Sillans D. 1989. Immediate and latent effects of carbon dioxide on insects. *Annual review of entomology* **34**:97–
116.
Ning C, Yang K, Xu M, Huang L-Q, Wang C-Z. 2016. Functional validation of the carbon dioxide receptor in labial palps of
Helicoverpa armigera moths. *Insect biochemistry and molecular biology* **73**:12–19.
Perry SF, Abdallah S. 2012. Mechanisms and consequences of carbon dioxide sensing in fish. *Respiratory physiology &*
neurobiology **184**:309–315.
Raguso RA, LeClere AR, Schlumpberger BO. 2005. Sensory flexibility in hawkmoth foraging behavior: lessons from
Manduca sexta and other species. *Chemical senses* **30**:i295-i296.
Reinecke A, Müller F, Hilker M. 2008. Attractiveness of CO_2 released by root respiration fades on the background of root
exudates. *Basic and Applied Ecology* **9**:568–576.
Robert CAM, Erb M, Duployer M, Zwahlen C, Doyen GR, Turlings TCJ. 2012a. Herbivore-induced plant volatiles mediate
host selection by a root herbivore. *New Phytologist* **194**:1061–1069.
Robert CAM, Erb M, Hibbard BE, French BW, Zwahlen C, Turlings TCJ. 2012b. A specialist root herbivore reduces plant
resistance and uses an induced plant volatile to aggregate in a density-dependent manner. *Functional Ecology* **26**:1429–
1440.
Robert CAM, Erb M, Hiltpold I, Hibbard BE, Gaillard MDP, Bilat J, Degenhardt J, Cambet-Petit-Jean X, Turlings TCJ,
Zwahlen C. 2013. Genetically engineered maize plants reveal distinct costs and benefits of constitutive volatile emissions
in the field. *Plant Biotechnology Journal* **11**:628–639.
Robert CAM, Veyrat N, Glauser G, Marti G, Doyen GR, Villard N, Gaillard MDP, Köllner TG, Giron D, Body M. 2012c.
A specialist root herbivore exploits defensive metabolites to locate nutritious tissues. *Ecology Letters* **15**:55–64.

Robertson HM, Kent LB. 2009. Evolution of the gene lineage encoding the carbon dioxide receptor in insects. *Journal of*
Insect Science **9**.
Rodrigues TB, Moriyama EN, Wang H, Khajuria C, Siegfried BD. 2016. Carbon dioxide receptor genes and their expression
profile in *Diabrotica virgifera virgifera*. *BMC research notes* **9**:18.
Rogers CD, Evans KA, Parker J, Pappa VA. 2013. Behavioural response of wheat bulb fly (*Delia coarctata*, Diptera:
Anthomyiidae) larvae to the primary plant metabolite carbon dioxide. *Bulletin of entomological research* **103**:675–682.
Saitou N, Nei M. 1987. The neighbor-joining method: a new method for reconstructing phylogenetic trees. *Molecular biology*
and evolution **4**:406–425.
Schumann M, Ladin ZS, Beatens JM, Hiltpold I. 2018. Navigating on a chemical radar: Usage of root exudates by foraging
Diabrotica virgifera virgifera larvae. *Journal of Applied Entomology* **142**:911–920.
Schumann M, Patel A, Vemmer M, Vidal S. 2014a. The role of carbon dioxide as an orientation cue for western corn
rootworm larvae within the maize root system: implications for an attract-and-kill approach. *Pest management science*
70:642–650.
Schumann M, Patel A, Vidal S. 2014b. Soil application of an encapsulated CO_2 source and its potential for management of
western corn rootworm larvae. *Journal of Economic Entomology* **107**:230–239.
Späthe A, Reinecke A, Olsson SB, Kesavan S, Knaden M, Hansson BS. 2013. Plant species-and status-specific odorant
blends guide oviposition choice in the moth *Manduca sexta*. *Chemical senses* **38**:147–159.
Stange G. 1996. Sensory and behavioural responses of terrestrial invertebrates to biogenic carbon dioxide gradients. In:
Advances in Bioclimatology_4. Springer.
Stange G. 1999. Carbon dioxide is a close-range oviposition attractant in the Queensland fruit fly *Bactrocera tryoni*.
Naturwissenschaften **86**:190–192.
Stange G, Stowe S. 1999. Carbon-dioxide sensing structures in terrestrial arthropods. *Microscopy research and technique*
47:416–427.
Strnad SP, Bergman MK, Fulton WC. 1986. First-instar western corn rootworm (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae) response to
carbon dioxide. *Environmental entomology* **15**:839–842.
Strnad SP, Dunn PE. 1990. Host search behaviour of neonate western corn rootworm (*Diabrotica virgifera virgifera*).
Journal of Insect Physiology **36**:201–205.
Suh GSB, Wong AM, Hergarden AC, Wang JW, Simon AF, Benzer S, Axel R, Anderson DJ. 2004. A single population of
olfactory sensory neurons mediates an innate avoidance behaviour in *Drosophila*. *Nature* **431**:854.
Team RC. 2014. *A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical*
Computing. ISBN 3-900051-07-0. http://www. R-project. org.
Thom C, Guerenstein PG, Mechaber WL, Hildebrand JG. 2004. Floral CO_2 reveals flower profitability to moths. *Journal of*
Chemical Ecology **30**:1285–1288.
Toepfer S, Zellner M, Szalai M, Kuhlmann U. 2015. Field survival analyses of adult *Diabrotica virgifera virgifera*
(Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae). *Journal of pest science* **88**:25–35.
van Breugel F, Riffell J, Fairhall A, Dickinson MH. 2015. Mosquitoes use vision to associate odor plumes with thermal
targets. *Current Biology* **25**:2123–2129.
Veyrat N, Robert CAM, Turlings TCJ, Erb M. 2016. Herbivore intoxication as a potential primary function of an inducible
volatile plant signal. *Journal of Ecology* **104**:591–600.
Visser JH, Avé DA. 1978. General green leaf volatiles in the olfactory orientation of the Colorado beetle, *Leptinotarsa*
decemlineata. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata* **24**:738–749.
Wang X, Zhong M, Liu Q, Aly SM, Wu C, Wen J. 2013. Molecular characterization of the carbon dioxide receptor in the
oriental latrine fly, *Chrysomya megacephala* (Diptera: Calliphoridae). *Parasitology research* **112**:2763–2771.
Webster B, Cardé RT. 2017. Use of habitat odour by host-seeking insects. *Biological Reviews* **92**:1241–1249.
Weissteiner S, Huetteroth W, Kollmann M, Weißbecker B, Romani R, Schachtner J, Schütz S. 2012. Cockchafer larvae smell
host root scents in soil. *PLoS one* **7**:e45827.
Wetzel WC, Kharouba HM, Robinson M, Holyoak M, Karban R. 2016. Variability in plant nutrients reduces insect herbivore
performance. *Nature* **539**:425.
Xu P, Wen X, Leal WS. 2020. CO_2 per se activates carbon dioxide receptors. *Insect biochemistry and molecular biology*
117:103284.
Xu W, Anderson A. 2015. Carbon dioxide receptor genes in cotton bollworm *Helicoverpa armigera*. *Naturwissenschaften*
102:11.

Ye M, Veyrat N, Xu H, Hu L, Turlings TCJ, Erb M. 2018. An herbivore-induced plant volatile reduces parasitoid attraction
by changing the smell of caterpillars. *Science advances* **4**:eaar4767.

Zhang X, Machado RAR, van Doan C, Arce CCM, Hu L, Am Robert C. 2019. Entomopathogenic nematodes increase
predation success by inducing cadaver volatiles that attract healthy herbivores. *eLife* **8**.

Zhu J, Lynch JP. 2004. The contribution of lateral rooting to phosphorus acquisition efficiency in maize (*Zea mays*) seedlings.
Functional Plant Biology **31**:949–958.

Zollner GE, Torr SJ, Ammann C, Meixner FX. 2004. Dispersion of carbon dioxide plumes in African woodland: implications
for host-finding by tsetse flies. *Physiological Entomology* **29**:381–394.

Zuckerkandl E, Pauling L. 1965. Evolutionary divergence and convergence in proteins. In: *Evolving genes and proteins*.
Elsevier.