Food odours associated with conspecific corpses cause food
avoidance in an invasive ant

Thomas Wagner[1],* and Tomer J. Czaczkes[1]

[1] Animal Comparative Economics laboratory, Faculty of Biology and Preclinical Medicine,

University of Regensburg, Universitaetsstrasse 31,93053 Regensburg, Germany

* Corresponding author, email: t.wagner.science@gmail.com

Abstract

Invasive ants, such as *Linepithema humile* (the Argentine ant), pose a global threat,

necessitating a better understanding of their behaviour in order to improve management

strategies. Traditional eradication methods, including baiting, have had limited success, but

the causes of control failure are not always clear. Here we propose that ants may learn to

avoid toxic baits in part due to their association with ant corpses. Ants were tested on a Y-

maze after exposure to scented corpses or dummies. 69% (n = 64) of ants avoided branches

bearing the scent of scented corpses. At a collective level, colonies neglected food sources

associated with scented ant corpses in favour of a food source with a novel odour, with only

42% (n = 273) of foragers feeding from the corpse-scent associated food source. However, if

corpses were produced by feeding ants scented toxicant, focal ants encountering these ants

did not avoid the corpse-associated scent on a Y maze (53%, n = 65). Moreover, in a dual-

feeder test, ants did not avoid feeding at food sources scented with an odour associated with

conspecific corpses. The study demonstrates that conspecific corpses can act as a negative

stimulus for *Linepithema humile*, leading to avoidance of odours associated with corpses,

which can lead to potential avoidance of toxic baits. Why the more realistic Y-maze trial with

corpses of ants that had ingested the toxicant elicited no avoidance is unclear: it may be due

to weaker odour cues from ingested food, or a counterbalancing of the negative corpse

stimulus by the positive presence of food remains on the corpse. Nonetheless, this study

demonstrates that conspecific corpses act as a negative stimulus for ants, and this should be

kept in mind when planning control efforts. A simple solution to this issue would be adding

odours to baits, and cycling baits between treatments, or including multiple bait odours in one

treatment round.

Keywords:

Bait avoidance – learning – negative stimulus – odour association – corpse avoidance

Introduction

Invasive ant species can wreak havoc on ecosystems and economies alike, making it crucial to understand their behaviour and find effective management strategies for them (1–3). *Linepithema humile* (Mayr, 1868), commonly known as the Argentine ant, is a highly destructive ant species that causes significant ecological and economic damage globally (4), and is the most widely distributed invasive ant species in Europe (5). Invasion by *L. humile* leads to a significant reduction in invertebrate diversity, and can also have an impact on vertebrates (6–8). In addition, *L. humile* can be an important agriculture pest by enhancing Hemipteran populations, which then increases the likelihood of fungal and viral infections (9).

Effective management of invasive ants can have large beneficial environmental outcomes, especially in terms of restoring arthropod biodiversity (10). Unfortunately, invasive ants are difficult to control: two-thirds of *L. humile* eradication attempts have failed (10). The current gold standard approach for eradication or control of ants is to use baits with a slow-acting toxicant, which workers return to the brood and the queen (10). Even so, the success rate of eradication attempts is low (10,11). It has been shown in Argentine ant that foraging choices reflect the nutritional need within the colony over the year, leading to a higher protein-rich diet intake in summer and a reduction of it in winter (12,13). Consequently, if the food used for baits doesn't match the colony's nutritional needs during the current season and when high-quality natural food is readily available, ants may ignore the bait (14), resulting in low bait consumption rates and challenges in achieving eradication. While poor bait uptake is often suspected, the specific reasons behind such poor uptake are still poorly explored in the literature. In laboratory settings, ants have been observed to switch foraging preferences after satiating on one type of favoured food, leading them to seek alternative food sources (13). The presence of other ant species can also cause a swift abandonment of food sources (15,16). However, *L. humile* is an aggressive and dominant species, and is rarely reported to be successfully driven away from resources (5,16), but see also (17).

We propose an alternative hypothesis, not mutually exclusive to those discussed above: that ants learn to avoid bait-associated cues because they are also associated with ant

corpses, created during control efforts. This hypothesis assumes that nestmate corpses act as an *unconditional negative stimulus* (18,19). It has been shown that the scent of food which ants have consumed can be detected by nestmates which encounter them, even without active food sharing (20–23). The scent of a toxicant-laced bait, remaining on ants after they have died, may lead to an aversion to the bait among the living ants which encounter these corpses, causing them to avoid the scent or taste of the bait. Ant corpses are a potential threat to the survival of colonies due to the possibility of infection (24). To protect a colony from pathogens, it is crucial for ants to distinguish between living and dead ants. Recognition of corpses is likely based on olfactory cues (25). In *L. humile*, the presence of iridomyrmecin and dolichodial (ant-produced compounds that adhere to the cuticle) on live ants disappears within 40 minutes of death, which then triggers necrophoresis behaviour from nestmates (26). Studies have demonstrated that ant corpses can inhibit foraging or nesting. For example, it was shown that the presence of nestmate corpses can cause ants to reject otherwise suitable nesting sites (27,28) and refuse dumps can deter ants from foraging (29,30).

It is thus reasonable to expect that conspecific corpses may represent an unconditional negative stimulus. *L. humile* has a formidable olfactory memory and is able to rapidly form long-lasting associations between odours or flavours and a food reward (31–33). Nevertheless, it is not clear how well *L. humile* learns negative associations. Wagner et al. (32) showed that using quinine as a negative stimulus does not reinforce learning when a positive stimulus (sucrose reward) was already presented. However, *L. humile* preferred to choose "low-risk" paths to food sources after they discovered a competitor species or formic acid on a "high risk" path (34), and other ant species rapidly form negative olfactory associations, and avoid odours associated with, for example, a bitter quinine solution (35).

To the best of our knowledge, no previous studies have investigated whether exposure to conspecific corpses affects the feeding preferences and decision-making of foraging ants. We hypothesize that *L. humile* workers can form a negative association between the odour of a food source and the presence of conspecific corpses which fed on the same food source, or died in the food source´s vicinity, and hence have the food scent on their bodies. Specifically, we investigated the impact of exposure to scented nestmate corpses on foraging behavior,

94 and to determine whether this exposure leads to avoidance of high-quality food sources or
95 areas.
96

Materials and Methods

<u>Colony maintenance</u>

Linepithema humile ants were collected in 2021 from Girona, Spain and were all part of the
same main European supercolony (36). Colony fragments (henceforth colonies), consisting of
one or more queens and 300-800 workers, were kept in plastic foraging boxes (32.5 x 22.2 x
11.4cm) with plaster of Paris on the bottom. No aggression between ants from different
colonies was observed. The walls were coated in fluon to prevent escape. Each box contained
several 15mL plastic tubes, covered in transparent red foil, partly filled with water and plugged
with cotton, for use as nests. The ants were maintained on a 12:12 light:dark cycle at room
temperature (21-25 °C) and provided with water *ad libitum*. Colonies were fed for three days
with *ad libitum* 0.5M sucrose solution and freeze-killed *Drosophila melanogaster*, and
deprived of food for four days prior to testing. All experiments were conducted between
October 2021 and June 2022.
110

<u>Solutions and odours</u>

1M sucrose solutions (Südzucker AG, Mannheim, Germany), were used as a reward during
training for all experiments. Scented paper overlays, used during experiments to provide
environmental odours, were stored for at least 1 week prior to the experiments in airtight
plastic boxes (19.4 x 13.8 x 6.6cm) containing a glass petri dish with 500µL of either strawberry
or apple food flavouring, or blackcurrent and orange food flavouring (Seeger, Springe,
Germany). For experiments where flavoured food was used, 1µL of the respective flavouring
was added per 1mL of 1M sucrose solution.
119

<u>Corpses and dummies</u>

One day prior to the start of experiments, 24 ants were frozen for 60 min in a -20°C freezer.
These ant corpses were scented by placing them into an airtight petri dish (80x15mm, sealed
with Parafilm©) containing a small metal plate with 200µL of strawberry or apple food
flavouring, or with blackcurrent or orange flavouring. The container was stored at room
temperature for 24 hours. *L. humile* can identify dead ants as being dead within 40 minutes of

death (26). 24 hours is more than sufficient for corpses to be identified as such by nestmates.

Note that we did not attempt to test ants only with corpses from their own fragments.

However, all colony fragments were sourced from the same location at the same time, and

showed no aggression between each other.

24 dummies were created by cutting black electrical wire (mm diameter and 2.0-2.5mm

length) to visually simulate corpses, and provide a similar obstacle to movement. Dummies

were scented identically to the corpses. We chose to use plastic-coated wire, rather than glass

beads, as we considered plastic to be more similar to the ants' surface in terms of how readily

it would absorb odours. Note that the corpses and the dummies had no physical contact with

the food flavourings but were exposed to the scented air in the sealed petri dish.

Experiment 1 – Testing the effect of corpse-scent association on odour preference using

scented corpses

Here we investigate whether ants are capable of forming an association between an odour

and dead nestmates (corpses) in a Y-maze test setting. We predicted that ants exposed to

scented corpses would avoid the smell associated with the corpses, but ants exposed to

scented dummies would not.

12 corpses (treatment) or dummies (control) were placed onto a round plastic arena

surrounded by a water moat (arena: 7cm diameter, inner platform: 4cm diameter, see figure

1A) using clean soft forceps. A colony was connected via a drawbridge to the round arena and

a single ant was allowed to enter the platform in the arena via the drawbridge. The drawbridge

was then removed, trapping the ant in the arena together with the scented corpses or scented

dummies (e.g. orange). After 90 seconds, or at least 10 contacts between the ant and the

corpses or dummies, a second drawbridge was added to let the ant leave the arena and enter

a Y-maze (see fig. 1B).

The stem of the Y-maze (i.e. the part through which the ant enters the Y-maze) was

covered in an unscented paper overlay while one arm (e.g. left past the bifurcation point) was

covered in a scented overlay, with the scent matching the scent of the corpses/dummies (e.g.

orange), while the other arm was covered in a neutral-scented overlay (novel associated

odour e.g. blackcurrent). We recorded the ant's initial and final decision (crossing a line 8cm

from the bifurcation, 2cm from the arm end, see fig. 1B). The position of the odour associated

with the corpses or dummies was systematically varied between ants. The Y-maze was cleaned

with ethanol after each ant. 16 ants were tested sequentially using the same ant corpses, followed by 16 tested with dummies of the same smell. The next day, the same procedure was performed with the opposite odour (e.g. blackcurrent). The negative-associated odour, and the sequence of corpses/dummies were switched alternately. 32 ants were tested per day, testing in total 128 ants from 4 colonies.

Experiment 2 – Testing the effect of corpse-scent association on odour preference using corpses killed with a scented toxicant

Experiment 1 found that the ants did indeed avoid the corpse-associated odour, but not the dummy associated odour. The aim of this experiment was to test whether the same applied when corpses were infused with scent from just feeding on a flavoured toxic food source.

Two days prior to start of the experiment hydrogel beads (16,37) were placed into a solution containing 7.6µl Spintor © (containing 44% Spinosad) and 200µl food flavour (either blackcurrent or orange) in 100ml 1M sucrose. One day prior the start of the experiment, 24 ants were fed on these hydrogel beads in a petri dish. After 8h all ants were dead, and the corpses were placed in a clean petri dish. The next day (~16h later) these ants were used as corpses in the behavioural trials. The procedure of the training and testing was otherwise identical to experiment 1. Note that a control treatment with dummy ants was not possible in this experiment, as consumption of the flavoured toxicant is required for odour presentation during the experiment. 16 ants were tested per day, testing in total 64 ants from 4 colonies over 4 days on corpses.

Experiment 3 – Testing the effect of corpse-associated odour on feeding preference

Here we asked whether ants respond differently to food flavoured to match the scented nestmates corpses or scented dummies. Furthermore, we tested if a lower starvation level (2 days) changed the response of the ants compared to the standard 4 days. The idea here was that extremely hungry ants may be too motivated to feed at the first food encountered to show preference between the two options.

Ants encountered corpses or dummies, scented by storing with food flavourings for 24 hours, in the round plastic arena as described in experiment 1. After this training the ant was allowed to enter a drawbridge leading to a two-choice 'dual-choice' feeder, made of 3D printed resin (see fig. 1C). This feeder consisted of two triangular wells, each filled with a different solution

(scented 1M sucrose). The tips of the wells were 0.5mm apart, smaller than the length of one

L. humile antenna. This ensured that, regardless of which solution is contacted first, the ant

will almost immediately also come into contact with the alternative solution, enabling an

informed choice between the two solutions (see figure 1C). We noted the time spent feeding

from each feeder.

The feeder side containing the corpse-associated flavoured food was systematically

varied between ants. 32 ants were tested per day, testing in total 127 ants from 4 colonies. 64

ants were trained on dummies and 63 on corpses. Tested ants were permanently excluded

from the colony, to prevent scented food being returned to their nestmates.

Figure 1: Setup used for experiments 1-3: A) Ants were confined to an encounter arena,

containing scented dummies or nestmate corpses (experiments 1 & 3), or corpses of ants that

had fed on scented toxicant (experiment 2). After 90s or 10 contacts, in experiments 1 & 2,

the ants' odour preference was then tested on a Y-maze with scented paper overlays, the

colour referring to the two different odours. We noted which decision line was crossed. In

experiment 3 ants were tested on a dual-choice feeder (C): Ants enter via a constriction,

encountering two adjacent wells, containing differently-flavoured sucrose solution. The ants

first choice, time to first feeding interruption, and total feeding time from each well was

tested. Note that the two well tips are so close as to ensure the ant contacts both wells (ant

image to scale).

<u>Experiment 4 – Can the presence of scented corpses drive collective food choice?</u>

The purpose of this experiment was to raise the results of the individual level experiments to

the collective level, quantifying collective foraging at a high resolution over the first hour of

feeding, and at a lower resolution over 24 hours. Data were split into the first 60min after food

presentation, and the following 23h. This is because in lab setting, satiation at ad libitum feeders often occurs within the first hour (38).

Hydrogel beads were prepared as in experiment 2, but without the toxicant.

A round platform (9cm diameter, 0.2cm thick), raised on 4 plastic pillars (0.3cm diameter, 5.5m height), connected to a raised a plastic bridge, was placed into the colony box. The pillars were coated in fluon to ensure that the only access to the platform was via the bridge. Two hydrogel beads, flavoured to match the scent of the corpses, were placed into a 0.1mm deep trough on one side of the round platform (see fig. 2) and two other hydrogel beads with the other flavour were placed on the other side. These beads were cut in half to prevent them rolling (16). 12 scented corpses, prepared as in experiment 1, were distributed over the bridge (see fig. 2). Ants were then allowed free access to the feeders via the bridge. The narrow bridge ensured that all ants encountered most of the corpses. Ants were allowed to recruit and feed on the hydrogel breads for 24h. Images were recorded automatically by an infrared-sensitive camera with infrared flash (Pi NoIR module 2) connected to a microcomputer (Raspberry Pi 4). An image was taken every 5 minutes for the first 60 minutes of the experiment (corresponding to the major feeding and recruitment stage) and thereafter every hour for 24h. From the images, we counted the number of ants within 5mm of each feeder. The feeder side and the flavour containing the negative associated hydrogel beads was systematically varied between colonies. We tested 16 colonies, and each colony was only tested once.

Figure 2: Collective decision-making experiment. A round plastic platform, supported by fluon-

coated pillars and reachable by a bridge, was placed in the colony box. Hydrogel beads soaked

in flavoured sucrose solution (apple and strawberry) were offered. 12 scented nestmate

corpses were placed on the bridge. Foraging ants had to pass the scented corpses to reach the

feeding platform. The number of ants within 0.5 cm of each food type were counted.

<u>Statistical analysis</u>

Data were analysed using generalized linear mixed-effect models (GLMM) (39) in R version

4.1.0 (R Core Team 2021). GLMMs were fitted using the lme4 package (40). Because the data

were binomial in experiments 1 & 2 (novel/corpse odour choice) and in experiment 3

(proportion drinking time on feeder A vs feeder B) a binomial error distribution was used. For

experiment 4, a Zero-Inflated Beta Model (for proportion data) and a glmm with a poisson

error distribution (for ant counts on different feeders over time) was used. Since multiple ants

were tested per colony, we included colony as random factor. The R package emmeans was

used for pairwise contrasts. It allows for the estimation and comparison of means across

different levels of categorical predictors in a model. Model fit was checked using the DHARMa

package (41). Results were plotted using the gglot2 package (42). The complete code and

analysis output is provided in supplements 1.

Results

Experiment 1 – Testing the effect of corpse-scent association on odour preference using scented corpses

Ants that had encountered scented corpses chose the Y-maze odour arm associated with the corpses significantly less often than the opposite scented arm (69% chose the novel odour arm, GLMM, z-ratio = 2.92, p = 0.003, see fig. 3A). By contrast, ants in the control group that experienced the odour associated with scented dummies showed no significant preference between the two scented arms (47% chose the novel-odour arm, GLMM, z-ratio = -0.5, p = 0.62, see fig.3A). The treatment groups differed significantly from each other (emmeans, z-ratio = 2.48, p = 0.013, see fig. 3A). The specific corpse/dummy odour (blackcurrent or orange) did not significantly affect choice (GLMM: z-ratio = 0.37, p = 0.71). Several focal ants were observed handling the corpses, or even beginning to dismember them. Ants, including *L. humile*, commonly handle and dismember nestmate corpses found in their colony boxes (TW & TJC, pers. obs.).

Figure 3: The response of ants to odours associated with nestmate corpses (experiments 1 & 2): A) Experiment 1: Proportion of choices for novel odour, per treatment group, corpses or dummies (control). B) Proportion of ants which encountered nestmate corpses killed by feeding on scented food choosing the novel scented Y-maze arm. Note that since experiment 2 relied on ants consuming the scented, toxic bait, no control was possible. Bars depict means, whiskers 95% confidence intervals derived from the fitted GLMM. The dotted horizontal line displays chance level of 50%. *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***p < 0.001.

<u>Experiment 2 – Testing the effect of corpse-scent association on odour preference using ants killed with scented toxicant</u>

 The ants showed no difference in their choice of odour arm (GLMM, z-ratio = 0.58, p = 0.56, fig.3B): 53% of the ants that were exposed to corpses fed with a flavoured toxicant chose the arm scented with the other odour. The specific odour associated with the corpses did not significantly affect arm choice (GLMM: z-ratio = -0.51, p = 0.61). Interestingly, focal ants were commonly observed to licks the mouths of the corpses.

<u>Experiment 3 – Testing the effect of corpse-associated odour on feeding preference</u>

Ants starved for two days did not feed significantly longer on either of the food sources, irrespective of their treatment (GLMM, dummy: z-ratio = 1.74, p = 0.08, 60% fed longer from the novel odour. Corpse: z-ratio = 0.51, p = 0.61, 53% fed for longer from the novel feeder, see fig. 4A). Odour did not significantly affect these measures (GLMM, feeding time, z-ratio = 0.55, p = 0.58). Similar outcomes were found for ants starved for 4 days feed (GLMM, dummy, z-ratio = -0.56, p = 0.58, 42% fed longer from the novel feeder, corpse, z-ratio = 0.87, p = 0.39, 55% fed longer from the novel feeder, see fig. 4B). Odour type did not significantly affect choice (GLMM, feeding time, z-ratio = -0.25, p = 0.80).

Figure 4: Effect of corpse-associated smell on feeding preference (exp 3): A) and B) show the

mean (±95% confidence intervals) proportion of time spent feeding at the feeder not scented

to match the corpses or dummies, by ants starved for 2 and 4 days respectively.

<u>Experiment 4 – Can the presence of scented corpses drive collective food choice?</u>

In the first 60 minutes significantly fewer ants (705/1769) fed on the hydrogel beads scented

to match the corpses (emmeans: t-ratio = -7.751 p < 0.0001, fig. 5A/B). Over the following 23h,

foraging levels were extremely low (mean 0.324 ants on each feeder at each timepoint per

colony). Over this 23 h period ants showed only a weak and non-significant trend towards the

novel feeder (67/111 (emmeans: t-ratio = -1.163, p = 0.2456, fig. 5D/E). The specific corpse

odour did not significantly affect their choice within 60 minute (GLMM: z-ratio = -5.407, p =

0.8669) nor the following 23 hours (GLMM: z-ratio = 1.203, p = 0.2291). Note that in our

analysis, we excluded four very small nests from the models (40 ants or less over 24 hours).

For statistical information on all colonies, see supplement 2. Therein we also provide a

complete analysis of the dataset including the four excluded colonies. The results of that analysis show the same patterns as those presented here. We also analyse the data in terms of proportion of ants on each food type, rather than raw count. Again, the results are similar, and are presented in supplement 2.

Figure 5: Collective foraging effort on feeders scented to match either nestmate-corpses encountered en-route to the feeder, or scented with a novel odour (exp 4): A) Dual-curve plot, average number of ants sticking 1 cm or closer to a feeder, 60 minutes post food presentation per 5 minutes intervals. B) Bar plot, average number of ants sticking 1 cm or closer to a feeder over the first 60 minutes. C/D) corresponding to A/B but 23 hours post food presentation in 1 hour intervals. Bars depict means, whiskers 95% confidence intervals derived from the fitted GLMM or Zero-Inflated Beta Model. Note the different scales of figures A/B and C/D. N counted ants (60min) = 1769, N counted ants (23hours) =111. All in all 12 trials were conducted.

Discussion

Our study strongly suggests that nestmate corpses are a negative stimulus for the ant *Linepithema humile.* The implication is that corpses may drive toxic bait avoidance at an individual and collective level, by causing the ants to avoid odours associated with them (experiments 1 and 4). However, under conditions more relevant to ant control efforts – the consumption of scented toxicant-laced food (experiment 2) no avoidance was found. Similarly, in the dual-feeder experiment (experiment 3), ants did not feed less from the solution scented to match the odour of scented corpses.

Avoidance of the scented Y-maze arms associated with nestmate corpses (experiment 1) demonstrates that corpses can act as a negative stimulus for *L. humile*. Avoidance of cues associated with negative consequences has been demonstrated in ants previously: Ants avoid Y-maze or T-maze arms scented with an odour associated with a bitter quinine solution (35,43). Nestmate corpses have also been shown to be avoided by ants: potential nest sites containing foreign ant corpses were avoided by *Temnothorax albipennis* (27). However, we note that ants can discriminate between foreign or nestmate corpses (28). It is thus unclear if the reason for avoidance in the nest site avoidance study was to avoid a confrontation with a foreign ant colony, or for hygienic reasons, or both. However, given that all the ants in our study stemmed from the same supercolony, and showed no avoidance or aggression between colony fragments, it is unlikely that non-nestmate avoidance plays a large role in the results. While our study showed a relatively high avoidance rate (69%), it is not clear why avoidance was not higher, such as for avoidance of nests containing corpses (27). We note that a certain willingness to approach nestmate corpses is required, in order for the corpses to be cleared away. Corpse clearance has been shown to be an important hygienic response, preventing disease spread (24). It was even shown in Argentine ants that some workers have to apply regular pygidial gland secretions on corpses to prevent growth of pathogenic fungi (44), which requires the corpses to be approached.

Surprisingly, our second experiment, which had the same setup as the first experiment, found no avoidance of the corpse-associated odour. The key difference between these experiments was how the ant, used as corpse stimuli, died and were stored. While in the first experiment the ants were freeze-killed then stored for 24h in a Petri dish containing food

flavouring, the ants in the second experiment were allowed to feed on poisoned, flavoured hydrogel beads, subsequently died within 8h, and were then stored for a further 16h in a Petri dish without any food flavour. It is possible that in this second method the focal ants might have not perceived the flavour of the poisoned food on the corpses, because it was too subtle or disappeared after 24 hours. Ants can identify nestmates as corpses within 1 hour of death (26), so toxicants with immediate lethal effects may be more affected by this association mechanism, as bait odours may linger long enough on the corpses, while toxicants with delayed action may be less impacted. We also note that many commercial baits are composed of a matrix with a potentially longer-lasting odour profile e.g. fat or protein-rich pastes (10,45–47). It is possible that such baits imbue ants which fed on them with a long-lasting odour which could drive future rejection when these ants finally die. The water-soluble odour we used in the current study may not have lasted long enough to be detectable by other ants 16-24 hours after feeding.

Interestingly, we observed that most test ants licked the mouths of the dead ants, possibly tasting the food consumed by the poisoned nestmates. They thus might have formed a direct positive association between the odour of the food and it's sweetness, which may have interfered with, or counterbalanced, any negative stimulus created by the corpses. Ants have been demonstrated to learn food-related odour cues from returning foragers, even without active food sharing (20–22,48). The results of this experiment thus do not rule out that corpses act as a negative stimulus in these ants, but imply that perhaps this effect will not strongly drive behaviour in a real-world ant control situation using sucrose-based baits. However, other commonly-used bait types based on fat or protein pastes may have elicited an effect (see below).

The third experiment showed that ants did not feed less from a food source flavoured to match the scented corpses than from a neighbouring food source offering a novel flavour, irrespective of whether the ants were starved for 2 or 4 days. It is unlikely that the ants were unable to associate the odour impregnated onto the corpses with the taste of the flavoured sucrose feeder: we previously (32) demonstrated that Argentine ants can learn to associate a flavoured food reward with the corresponding environmental odour after only one exposure. Further experiments with this assay offering 1M vs 0.5M sucrose, or 1M vs 1M sucrose + a low level of bitter quinine, show that this method is effective at uncovering food preference

(unpublished data). A more likely reason for this unexpected result was the overwhelming

drive to feed under even moderate starvation conditions: The ants simply continued feeding

at the first food source they encountered, and any potential negative stimulus associated with

the food flavour was not sufficiently strong to override ongoing feeding. Individual *L. humile*

workers are unusually motivated feeders (49). Alternatively, ants may only show avoidance in

terms of orientation, not food rejection once the food is encountered. In other words, the ants

might only avoid going towards areas scented to match the scent of corpses, but do not avoid

feeding at similarly-flavoured food sources.

The fourth experiment tested colony-level preference, by examining collective

foraging choices. Collectively, over the first hour of foraging where the vast majority of

foraging occurred, the ants avoided the hydrogel beads containing flavoured sucrose

corresponding to the corpses scent and preferred to feed on the alternative beads. The

proximate mechanism driving this pattern is unclear: ants may have avoided approaching the

corpse-associated bead, may have left the bead before feeding fully, may have down-

modulated their recruitment from the bead, or any combination of these options.

Unfortunately, we lack detailed information on the behaviour of the individual ants in the

collective foraging assay, especially the first few foragers, which would be needed to

distinguish these mechanisms. Casual observations over the first 10 minutes suggested that

ants accepted the first bead they contacted, regardless of whether it was the corpse- or

control bead. This fits well with the results from experiment 3, and makes at least the taste-

and-reject hypothesis unlikely. Due to the positive feedback inherent in ant mass-recruitment

systems, the behaviour of the first ants in such experiments has a decisive influence on the

final collective outcome (50). Thus, if the first few ants tended to preferentially approach the

novel bead, and laid the first pheromone trail in that direction, this would bias all future

choices towards that bead. This effect would compound the tendency of the ants to avoid

approaching the corpse-associated odour. Finally, a second positive-feedback process may

well be in place: The first ants to feed may have encountered naïve outgoing ants on their

return journey, and certainly shared food via trophallaxis with other ants in the nest. Such on-

trail and within-nest encounters could have created a positive association to the smell of the

bead area, causing these newly recruited ants to preferentially choose that area – as has

already been shown in this and other species (20,21,32). Note that in systems characterised

by strong positive feedback, such as this one, stochasticity can play a very large role. It is thus

not surprising that in a subset of experiments the corpse-associated bead was chosen, as even

weaker options, if discovered first, can rapidly outcompete stronger options discovered later

(38,51).

Our study demonstrates that *Linepithema humile* can form negative associations with a scent

associated with "nestmate" corpses, which leads them to avoid areas with the corresponding

odour. However, this aversion may not be strong enough to override positive stimuli, such as

the presence of a desired food. These findings have important implications for ant control

strategies, as they suggest that the presence of nestmate corpses may reduce poison bait

efficiency. The formation of a negative association between a bait and affected nestmates

may negatively impact the efficacy of control efforts. However, given the lack of effect found

in experiment 2, which used more field-realistic methods, it is unclear whether this effect plays

a major role in real-world control efforts. Nevertheless, if this association-driven avoidance of

baits is indeed impacting control efforts, a straightforward solution suggests itself: baits can

be scented with distinct odours, and odours can be either cycled between treatments, or

multiple odours can be deployed simultaneously. Both interventions should reduce the ability

of ants to form firm associations between the bait odour and the odour of killed ants. This

approach may well have other benefits as well, such as making the baits easier for ants to

location. The commercial availability of cheap and environmentally benign food flavourings,

makes this intervention easily and broadly deployable.

Declaration of Interest

None.

Author contribution:

T. Wagner and T. J. Czaczkes designed the study. T. Wagner collected the data. T. Wagner

analysed the data and wrote the manuscript. T. J. Czaczkes edited the manuscript. All authors

read and approved the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Silvia Abril and Eduardo Sequeira for providing ant colonies and Roxana Josens for advice on the manuscript. Thomas Wagner was supported by an ERC starter grant (Cognitive control: 948181) to Tomer J. Czaczkes. Tomer J. Czaczkes was supported by a Heisenberg fellowship from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (CZ 237 / 4-1).

References

1. Marbuah G, Gren IM, McKie B. Economics of Harmful Invasive Species: A Review. Diversity. 2014 Jul 15;6(3):500–23.

2. Escobar LE, Mallez S, McCartney M, Lee C, Zielinski DP, Ghosal R, et al. Aquatic Invasive Species in the Great Lakes Region: An Overview. Rev Fish Sci Aquac. 2018 Jan 2;26(1):121–38.

3. Tercel MPTG, Cuff JP, Symondson WOC, Vaughan IP. Non-native ants drive dramatic declines in animal community diversity: A meta-analysis. Insect Conserv Divers [Internet]. [cited 2023 Aug 2];n/a(n/a). Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/icad.12672

4. Angulo E, Hoffmann BD, Ballesteros-Mejia L, Taheri A, Balzani P, Bang A, et al. Economic costs of invasive alien ants worldwide. Biol Invasions [Internet]. 2022 Apr 25 [cited 2022 May 31]; Available from: https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10530-022-02791-w

5. Rowles AD, O'Dowd DJ. Interference competition by Argentine ants displaces native ants: implications for biotic resistance to invasion. Biol Invasions. 2006 Dec 28;9(1):73–85.

6. Wetterer JK, Wetterer AL, Hebard E. Impact of the Argentine Ant, Linepithema humile on the Native Ants of Santa Cruz Island, California. 2001;38(3):13.

7. Suarez AV, Yeh P, Case TJ. Impacts of Argentine ants on avian nesting success. Insectes Sociaux. 2005 Nov;52(4):378–82.

8. Alvarez-Blanco P, Cerdá X, Hefetz A, Boulay R, Bertó-Moran A, Díaz-Paniagua C, et al. Effects of the Argentine ant venom on terrestrial amphibians. Conserv Biol. 2021;35(1):216–26.

9. Wetterer JK, Wild AL, Suarez AV, Roura-Pascual N, Espadaler X. Worldwide spread of the Argentine ant, Linepithema humile (Hymenoptera: Formicidae). 2009;8.

10. Hoffmann BD, Luque GM, Bellard C, Holmes ND, Donlan CJ. Improving invasive ant eradication as a conservation tool: A review. Biol Conserv. 2016 Jun;198:37–49.

11. Silverman J, Brightwell RJ. The Argentine Ant: Challenges in Managing an Invasive Unicolonial Pest. Annu Rev Entomol. 2008 Jan 1;53(1):231–52.

12. Rust MK, Reierson DA, Paine E, Blum LJ. Seasonal Activity and Bait Preferences of the
Argentine Ant (Hymenoptera: Formicidae). 2000;17(4).

13. Nondillo A, Ferrari L, Lerin S, Bueno OC, Botton M. Foraging Activity and Seasonal Food
Preference of <I>Linepithema micans</I> (Hymenoptera: Formicidae), a Species
Associated With the Spread of <I>Eurhizococcus brasiliensis</I> (Hemiptera:
Margarodidae). J Econ Entomol. 2014 Aug 1;107(4):1385–91.

14. Baker TC, Van Vorhis Key SE, Gaston LK. Bait-preference Tests for the Argentine Ant
(Hymenoptera: Formicidae). J Econ Entomol. 1985 Oct 1;78(5):1083–8.

15. Fellers JH. Interference and Exploitation in a Guild of Woodland Ants. Ecology. 1987
Oct;68(5):1466–78.

16. Cabrera E, Rivas Fontan I, Hoffmann BD, Josens R. Laboratory and field insights into the
dynamics and behavior of Argentine ants, Linepithema humile, feeding from hydrogels.
Pest Manag Sci. 2021;77(7):3250–8.

17. Cordonnier M, Blight O, Angulo E, Courchamp F. The Native Ant Lasius niger Can Limit
the Access to Resources of the Invasive Argentine Ant. Animals. 2020 Dec
21;10(12):2451.

18. Pavlov IP. Conditioned reflexes: an investigation of the physiological activity of the
cerebral cortex. Oxford, England: Oxford Univ. Press; 1927. xv, 430 p. (Conditioned
reflexes: an investigation of the physiological activity of the cerebral cortex).

19. Rescola AR, Wagner RA. A theory of Pavlovian conditioning: Variations in the
effectiveness of reinforcement and nonreinforcement. Classical conditioning: current
research and theory. Appleton-Century-Crofts; 1972.

20. Czaczkes TJ, Beckwith JJ, Horsch AL, Hartig F. The multi-dimensional nature of
information drives prioritization of private over social information in ants. Proc R Soc B
Biol Sci. 2019 Aug 28;286(1909):20191136.

21. Josens R, Mattiacci A, Lois-Milevicich J, Giacometti A. Food information acquired socially
overrides individual food assessment in ants. Behav Ecol Sociobiol. 2016
Dec;70(12):2127–38.

22. Roces F. Olfactory conditioning during the recruitment process in a leaf-cutting ant.
Oecologia. 1990 Jun;83(2):261–2.

23. Sorvari J, Theodora P, Turillazzi S, Hakkarainen H, Sundström L. Food resources, chemical
signaling, and nest mate recognition in the ant Formica aquilonia. Behav Ecol. 2008
Mar;19(2):441–7.

24. Diez L, Lejeune P, Detrain C. Keep the nest clean: survival advantages of corpse removal
in ants. Biol Lett. 2014 Jul;10(7):20140306.

25. Diez L, Moquet L, Detrain C. Post-mortem Changes in Chemical Profile and their
Influence on Corpse Removal in Ants. J Chem Ecol. 2013 Dec;39(11–12):1424–32.

26. Choe DH, Millar JG, Rust MK. Chemical signals associated with life inhibit necrophoresis
in Argentine ants. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2009 May 19;106(20):8251–5.

27. Franks NR, Hooper J, Webb C, Dornhaus A. Tomb evaders: house-hunting hygiene in
ants. Biol Lett. 2005 Jun 22;1(2):190–2.

28. Renucci M, Tirard A, Provost E. Complex undertaking behavior in Temnothorax
lichtensteini ant colonies: from corpse-burying behavior to necrophoric behavior.
Insectes Sociaux. 2011 Feb;58(1):9–16.

29. Farji-Brener AG, Sasal Y. Is dump material an effective small-scale deterrent to herbivory
by leaf-cutting ants? Écoscience. 2003 Jan;10(2):151–4.

30. Ballari SA, Farji-Brener AG. Refuse dumps of leaf-cutting ants as a deterrent for ant
herbivory: does refuse age matter? Entomol Exp Appl. 2006 Dec;121(3):215–9.

31. Rossi N, Pereyra M, Moauro MA, Giurfa M, d'Ettorre P, Josens R. Trail pheromone
modulates subjective reward evaluation in Argentine ants. J Exp Biol. 2020 Sep
1;223(17):jeb230532.

32. Wagner T, Galante H, Josens R, Czaczkes TJ. A systematic examination of learning in the
invasive ant *Linepithema humile* reveals very rapid development of short and long-term
memory [Internet]. Animal Behavior and Cognition; 2022 Apr [cited 2022 Nov 11].
Available from: http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2022.04.12.487867

33. Galante H, Czaczkes TJ. Invasive ant learning is not affected by seven potential
neuroactive chemicals. 2023;

34. Lessig EK, Nonacs P. Ant foraging path use responds to different types of risk and their
encounter probabilities. Insectes Sociaux. 2021 Aug;68(2–3):173–80.

35. Wenig K, Bach R, Czaczkes TJ. Hard limits to cognitive flexibility: ants can learn to ignore
but not avoid pheromone trails. J Exp Biol. 2021 Jun 1;224(11):jeb242454.

36. Giraud T, Pedersen JS, Keller L. Evolution of supercolonies: The Argentine ants of
southern Europe. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2002 Apr 30;99(9):6075–9.

37. Rust MK, Soeprono A, Wright S, Greenberg L, Choe DH, Boser CL, et al. Laboratory and
Field Evaluations of Polyacrylamide Hydrogel Baits Against Argentine Ants
(Hymenoptera: Formicidae). J Econ Entomol. 2015 Jun 1;108(3):1228–36.

38. Czaczkes TJ, Salmane AK, Klampfleuthner FAM, Heinze J. Private information alone can
trigger trapping of ant colonies in local feeding optima. J Exp Biol. 2016 Mar;219(5):744–
51.

39. Bolker BM, Brooks ME, Clark CJ, Geange SW, Poulsen JR, Stevens MHH, et al. Generalized
linear mixed models: a practical guide for ecology and evolution. Trends Ecol Evol. 2009
Mar;24(3):127–35.

40. Bates D, Kliegl R, Vasishth S, Baayen H. Parsimonious Mixed Models [Internet]. arXiv;
2018 [cited 2023 May 19]. Available from: http://arxiv.org/abs/1506.04967

41. Hartig F. Residual Diagnostics for Hierarchial (Multi-Level/Mixed) Regression Models
[Computer software manual] [Internet]. 2021. Available from:
http://florianhartig.github.io/DHARMa/

42. Wickham H. . Package ggplot2: create elegant data Visualisations using the grammar of
graphics. 2016.

43. Czaczkes TJ. Using T- and Y-mazes in myrmecology and elsewhere: a practical guide.
Insectes Sociaux. 2018 May;65(2):213–24.

44. Kesäniemi J, Koskimäki JJ, Jurvansuu J. Corpse management of the invasive Argentine ant
inhibits growth of pathogenic fungi. Sci Rep. 2019 Dec;9(1):7593.

45. Lofgren CS, Bartlett FJ, Stringer CE. Imported Fire Ant Toxic Bait Studies: The Evaluation
of Various Food Materials1. J Econ Entomol. 1961 Dec 1;54(6):1096–100.

46. Klotz JH. Urban Ants of North America and Europe: Identification, Biology, and
Management. Cornell University Press; 2008. 224 p.

47. Terayama M, Sunamura E, Fujimaki R, Ono T, Eguchi K. A Surprisingly Non-attractiveness
of Commercial Poison Baits to Newly Established Population of White-Footed Ant,
Technomyrmex brunneus (Hymenoptera: Formicidae), in a Remote Island of Japan.
Sociobiology. 2021 Mar 26;68(1):5898.

48. Provecho Y, Josens R. Olfactory memory established during trophallaxis affects food
search behaviour in ants. J Exp Biol. 2009 Oct 15;212(20):3221–7.

49. Sola F, Falibene A, Josens R. Asymmetrical Behavioral Response Towards Two Boron
Toxicants Depends on the Ant Species (Hymenoptera: Formicidae). J Econ Entomol. 2013
Apr 1;106(2):929–38.

50. Sumpter DJT, Beekman M. From nonlinearity to optimality: pheromone trail foraging by
ants. Anim Behav. 2003 Aug;66(2):273–80.

51. Beckers R, Deneubourg JL, Goss S, Pasteels JM. Collective decision making through food
recruitment. Insectes Sociaux. 1990 Sep;37(3):258–67.