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 corpses 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. This would disrupt the association between bait odour and corpses.

32   Keywords:

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

Introduction

Invasive ant species can have a significant impact on ecosystems and economies
alike, making it crucial to understand their behaviour and find effective management
strategies to reduce their consequences (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 toxicant that can be shared with the entire colony by the foragers before the effects
are realised, allowing toxicants to reach the brood and queen(s) (10). Even so, the success
rate of eradication attempts is low (10,11).

We propose that one reason for control failure may be 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 (12,13). It has been shown that the scent of food that ants have consumed can be
detected by nestmates that encounter them, even without active food sharing (14–17). 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 that 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 (18). 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 (19). 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 (20). 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 (21,22) and refuse dumps can deter ants from foraging (23,24).

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 (25–
27). Nevertheless, it is not clear how well *L. humile* learns negative associations. Wagner et
al. (26) 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 (28), and other ant species rapidly form negative olfactory
associations, and avoid odours associated with, for example, a bitter quinine solution (29).

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

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 (30). 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
colony fragments 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.

Solutions and odours

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.

Corpses and dummies

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 at air temperature for 24 hours 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. *L.*

humile can identify ants as being dead within 40 minutes of death (20), so 24 hours was

considered 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.

<u>Experiment 1 – Testing the effect of corpse-scent association on odour preference using</u>

<u>scented corpses</u>

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, 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), and the other arm was covered in a neutral-scented overlay (novel odour e.g.

blackcurrent). We recorded the ant's final decision (crossing a line 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.

<u>Experiment 2 – Testing the effect of corpse-scent association on odour preference using</u>

<u>corpses killed with a scented toxicant</u>

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 (31,32) 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 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.

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

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 '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

simultaneously (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 a laboratory setting, satiation at

ad libitum feeders often occurs within the first hour (33).

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 with 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 (32). 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) (34) in R version

4.1.0 (R Core Team 2021). GLMMs were fitted using the lme4 package (35). 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. Because

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 (36). Results were plotted using the gglot2 package (37). The

complete code and analysis output is provided in supplements 1.

Note that in our analysis, we excluded four very small nests from the models (40 ants or less

foraging 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.

Results

<u>Experiment 1 – Testing the effect of corpse-scent association on odour preference using</u>

<u>scented corpses</u>

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).

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.

Experiment 2 – Testing the effect of corpse-scent association on odour preference using ants

killed with scented toxicant

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). Unexpectedly, focal ants

were commonly observed to lick the mouths of the corpses.

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

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.

Experiment 4 – Can the presence of scented corpses drive collective food choice?

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), with no clear preference for the novel feeder (67/111 ants at the novel feeder,

emmeans: t-ratio = -1.163, p = 0.2456, fig. 5C/D. 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).

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, showing average number of ants within 1 cm of feeder, at 5 minute intervals for 60 minutes post food presentation. B) Bar plot, Mean (±SE) 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. N counted ants (60min) = 1769, N counted ants (23hours) =111. A total of 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, with ants avoiding Y-maze or T-maze arms scented with a bitter quinine solution
(29,38). Nestmate corpses have also been shown to be avoided by ants, even to the point
that potential nest sites containing foreign ant corpses were avoided by *Temnothorax*
albipennis (21). However, we note that ants can discriminate between foreign or nestmate
corpses (22). 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. Although 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 (21). We note that a certain willingness to approach
nestmate corpses is required, in order for the corpses to be cleared away, and indeed
observed several ants handling, moving, and even beginning to dismember corpses. Corpse
clearance has been shown to be an important hygienic response, preventing disease spread
(18). 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 (39), 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 ants that were used as corpse stimuli, died and
were stored. In the first experiment the ants were freeze-killed then stored for 24h in a Petri
dish containing food flavouring, whereas the ants in the second experiment were allowed to
feed on toxic, 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 test 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 (20), so toxicants with immediate lethal effects

may be more detectible, because bait odours may linger long enough on the corpses,

whereas toxicants at levels which cause delayed action may be less detectible. 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 (10,40–42). It is possible that such baits imbue ants

which fed on them with a long-lasting odour that 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 (14–16,43). 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 because we have previously (26) 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, have shown 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

(44). 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 corpse-associated hydrogel beads 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 to 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. 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 (45). 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 (14,15,26). 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 (33,46).

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
bait efficacy. 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 intervention
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 find. The commercial availability of cheap and environmentally
benign food flavourings makes such an 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 and Ben Hoffmann 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. 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).

13. 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.

14. 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.

15. 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.

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

17. 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.

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

19. 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.

20. 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.

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

22. 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.

23. 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.

24. 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.

25. 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.

26. 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

27. Galante H, Czaczkes TJ. Invasive ant learning is not affected by seven potential neuroactive
chemicals. Curr Zool. 2023 Feb;2023:zoad001.

28. 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.

29. 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.

30. 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.

31. 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.

32. 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.

33. 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.

34. 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.

35. 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

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

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

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

39. 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.

40. 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.

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

42. 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.

43. 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.

44. 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.

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

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