In sickness and in health: RNA-Seq finds viruses associated with mutualist quality in the

Amazonian plant-ant *Allomerus octoarticulatus*

María C. Tocora[1,2], Christopher Reid[1], Jesse Huisken[1,3], Haoran Xue[1,4], Megan E. Frederickson[1]

1.   Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON M5S 3B2, Canada

2.   Department of Biological Sciences, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX, USA

3.   Department of Biology, York University, Toronto, ON M3J 1P3, Canada

4.   Institute for Biochemistry and Biology, University of Potsdam, 14476, Potsdam-Golm, Germany

Keywords: ant behavior, ant-plant mutualism, symbiosis, transcriptomics, viral infection

Abstract

Ant-plant symbioses are classic examples of mutualism in which ant "bodyguards" defend

myrmecophytic plants against enemies in exchange for nest sites and often food. We used RNA-

Seq to profile the transcriptomes of *Allomerus octoarticulatus* ant workers, which aggressively

defend the Amazonian plant *Cordia nodosa* against herbivores, but to varying degrees. Field

behavioral assays with herbivores in the Peruvian Amazon showed striking variation among

colonies in the relative zeal with which *A. octoarticulatus* workers defend their host plant.

Highly effective and ineffective bodyguards differed in their gene expression profiles, which

revealed viral infections significantly associated with ant bodyguarding behavior. Transcripts

from eight new positive-sense single-stranded RNA viruses were differentially expressed

between colonies with high- or low-quality bodyguards. Colonies of high- and low-quality

bodyguards were infected by distinct viruses, including viruses clustering phylogenetically with

viruses known to cause aggression or reduced locomotion, respectively, in bees. Gene

expression, including of immunity-related genes, also differed between broodcare workers and

bodyguard ants, suggesting bodyguarding is a distinct worker task. Ant colony health and viral

infections may influence ant cooperation with plants in ant-plant mutualisms.

Significance statement

Many animals have evolved to cooperate with plants in plant-animal mutualisms, including in

pollination, seed dispersal, and defensive ant-plant interactions. Although the ecology of these

interactions is well studied, little is known about the molecular mechanisms involved in animal

cooperation with plants. Studying an Amazonian ant-plant symbiosis, we combined field assays

of ant behavior with RNA-Seq to profile the transcriptomes of ants that vary in their quality as

defensive plant "bodyguards." Bodyguard ants that effectively defended plants against

herbivores expressed different genes than both ineffective bodyguards and broodcare workers.

Surprisingly, many genes differentially expressed between high- and low-quality bodyguards

were from viruses, and not ants. Thus, we linked viral infections to mutualist quality in this ant-

plant symbiosis.

Introduction

Most plants and animals are involved in at least one mutualism; they depend on other species for

nutrition, protection, or dispersal (Bronstein, 2015). Yet how mutualism evolves remains poorly

understood, especially in insects, as we know little about the genes that encode mutualistic

behaviors, or how these behaviors are regulated at the molecular level and evolve in insect

genomes. In insects and many other animals, cooperation is typically a behavioral trait, and

many studies have explored the molecular basis of social behavior (i.e., within-species

cooperation) in insects such as ants (Kohlmeier et al., 2019; Manfredini et al., 2013) and bees

(Jones et al., 2020). In contrast, very little is known about the molecular mechanisms that give

rise to cooperative animal behaviors directed at other species in mutualisms. Here, we take a

transcriptomic approach to understand the defensive "bodyguard" behavior of symbiotic ants that

defend their myrmecophytic hosts against herbivores.

Many theoretical models explore mutualism evolution, often with the goal of explaining how

mutualism originates and persists despite the potential for underlying fitness conflicts between

partners (Sachs & Simms, 2006). Nonetheless, in plants and microbes, where research has made

great strides towards unraveling the "molecular dialogue" between partners, the evolution of

genes known to encode mutualistic traits does not always match theoretical predictions (e.g.,

Epstein et al., 2023). For example, theory predicts that fitness conflicts select for "cheaters" that

drive the breakdown or dissolution of mutualisms, but cheating is unlikely to be an important

source of variation in mutualist quality in many systems (Frederickson, 2013). Instead,

symbionts often vary in effectiveness because they are mismatched to their host's genotype

(Batstone et al., 2020) or environment (Kiers et al., 2007). Failure to cooperate might also occur

because of stress or illness. Disease might trigger a decrease in mutualistic behavior, making

symbiotic partners "defective, but not defectors" (Friesen, 2012; Riehl & Frederickson, 2016).

Although many studies have explored how pathogens modulate host behavior to increase parasite

fitness and transmission (de Bekker, et al., 2018), how parasites or pathogens impact the

beneficial behaviors of mutualists has received little attention outside of pollination mutualisms

(Gillespie & Adler, 2013).

Approximately 4,000 species of angiosperms interact mutualistically with ants (Weber &

Keeler, 2013). These associations are classic examples of defensive mutualisms, in which plants

provide food or housing to "bodyguard" ants that defend them against herbivores or other

enemies. Macroevolutionary analyses suggest that ant-plant mutualisms spurred plant

diversification (Weber & Agrawal, 2014). However, despite ample ecological study (Mayer et

al., 2014), few studies have applied 'omics approaches to ant-plant interactions. On the plant

side, metabolomic and transcriptomic comparisons have assessed the effects of ant colonization

on *Tococa* ant-plants (Müller et al., 2022). On the ant side, Malé et al. (2017) suggested that the

cGMP-PKG signaling pathway modulates ant protection of plants, while Rubin and Moreau

(2016) found higher rates of molecular evolution genome-wide in mutualistic acacia-ants

compared to their non-mutualistic close relatives, but there has been little additional research.

Here, we studied the mutualism between the ant species *Allomerus octoarticulatus* and the

Amazonian myrmecophyte *Cordia nodosa* (Fig. 1A). *Cordia nodosa* has hollow stem swellings

called domatia where ants nest, with a single *A. octoarticulatus* colony nesting across many

domatia on a single *C. nodosa* tree. We combined bioassays in the field with transcriptomics to

unravel the molecular mechanisms underlying mutualistic outcomes. We first characterized

bodyguard behavior in ant colonies in the Peruvian Amazon by placing herbivores

(grasshoppers) on plants and monitoring worker recruitment (Supplementary Video 1 and Fig. 1).

Most measured variables, including herbivore size, age, and species (Supplementary Fig. 1), did

not significantly affect worker recruitment, but ant activity in these bioassays did significantly

predict herbivory on young *C. nodosa* leaves. We then identified transcriptional signatures of

mutualist quality by analyzing differential gene expression between high- and low-quality ant

bodyguards. We also used RNA-Seq on broodcare workers and bodyguards to identify task-

specific transcripts that vary between ants working inside and outside the nest. Our results show

that highly effective ant bodyguards express different genes than both ineffective ant bodyguards

in other colonies and broodcare workers from the same nest. We also found underlying viral

infections and variation in the expression of immunity-related genes that correlated with

bodyguarding activity, suggesting that ant pathogens can affect not only the degree of

cooperation exhibited by workers, but also the fitness of the host plants that they inhabit. Finally,

we investigated the phylogenetic placement of eight new positive-sense single-stranded RNA

viruses that were differentially associated with illness-related behavioral changes in bodyguard

ants.

Results

Ant colonies vary in their effectiveness as plant bodyguards

To characterize the bodyguarding behavior of *Allomerus octoarticulatus* colonies, we conducted

behavioral bioassays on 60 naturally occurring colonies nesting in *C. nodosa* at the Los Amigos

Biological Station (12°34'9" S, 70°6'0.40" W) in Madre de Dios, Peru from December 2018 to

January 2019. Ant colonies varied considerably in bodyguarding behavior, from almost no ants

attacking herbivores (even though all plants were occupied by *A. octoarticulatus* colonies) to

sustained high recruitment to herbivores (Fig. 1, Supplementary Video 1). The ambient

temperature, plant size (a proxy for ant colony size, Frederickson et al., 2012), and herbivore age

(e.g., juvenile or adult), herbivore species, and herbivore size all had non-significant effects on

bodyguarding behavior, but significantly fewer ants attacked herbivores in the afternoon than in

the morning (Supplementary Fig. 1). The mean number of ants that attacked herbivores in

bioassays significantly predicted herbivory over three weeks on the associated young leaves;

plants with more active ant bodyguards experienced less herbivory (Fig. 1, linear regression, R^2

$= 0.094$, $p = 0.019$).

Gene expression correlates with variation in ant bodyguarding behavior across colonies

We used RNA-Seq to assemble a *de novo* transcriptome for *A. octoarticulatus* (see Methods) and measured gene expression in ant bodyguards from 14 colonies, seven colonies each of high-quality bodyguards and low-quality bodyguards. For six colonies (Supplementary Table 1), we also generated RNA-Seq data from both ant bodyguards attacking herbivores on leaves and broodcare workers collected from inside the nearest domatium (i.e., ant nest).

We found 40 genes that were differentially expressed between high- and low-quality bodyguards, comprising 15 genes upregulated in low-quality bodyguards and 25 genes upregulated in high-quality bodyguards (Fig. 2). These genes have expression patterns correlated with better or worse ant defense of plants, meaning that their expression either generates or responds to changes in the mutualistic behavior of ants towards their host plants. Only one sample (s8), characterized as highly aggressive (average activity of 27.2 attacks/min), did not show the same expression pattern for most genes as the rest of the high-activity bodyguards (Fig. 2A). At the transcript level, we found 13 genes with differential transcript usage (DTU) between high- and low-quality bodyguards participating in different metabolic pathways (Supplementary Fig. 2, Supplementary Table 2). Manual annotation revealed only a few DEGs with functions studied in other insects, including cytoskeleton proteins and protease genes overexpressed in low-activity bodyguards (Fig. 2B and 2C, Supplementary Table 3). We used Gene Set Enrichment Analysis (GSEA) (FDR < 0.05) to test for gene sets that differed between high- and low-activity bodyguards, but we did not find any statistically significant gene sets (Supplementary Table 4). However, we would not necessarily expect GSEA to identify distinct expression profiles between high- and low-quality bodyguards if the behavioral differences among bodyguard ants result from other factors such as viral infections.

Viral infections are associated with mutualistic behavior

Eight of the 40 genes differentially expressed between high- and low-activity bodyguards were

viral sequences, suggesting that viral infection may influence *A. octoarticulatus* behavior, or *vice*

versa. These transcripts came from eight new positive-sense single-stranded RNA (+ssRNA)

viruses, one matching homologous sequence from the family Picornaviridae, three matching

Iflaviridae, and three others matching Dicistroviridae viruses (Supplementary Table 5). We also

identified one virus in the family Narnaviridae (Supplementary Table 6).

To further examine the evolutionary history of these potential new Picorna-like and

Narna viruses, we reconstructed a phylogeny comparing their RNA-dependent RNA polymerase

(RdRp) sequences, a highly conserved viral domain, against RdRp regions of representative

viruses within every known viral family (Fig. 3, Supplementary Tables 7 and 8). Phylogenetic

analyses supported the placement of these viruses within the picorna- and narna-like clades.

However, the viruses associated with *A. octoarticulatus* appear to be unique lineages that may

represent new taxa. DGE analyses revealed different levels of viral expression between high- and

low-activity bodyguards (Fig. 4A-H).

Gene expression correlates with ant task within colonies

We found 155 DEGs between broodcare workers and high-activity bodyguards; 133 were

upregulated in brood-care workers and 22 were upregulated in high-activity bodyguards (Fig.

5A, Supplementary Table 9). We observed similar patterns of gene expression when comparing

broodcare workers and low-activity bodyguards, which identified 197 DEGs, 144 upregulated in

broodcare workers and 53 genes upregulated in low-activity bodyguards (Fig. 5B,

Supplementary Table 10). Seventy-eight genes were shared between these two comparisons

(Supplementary Table 11). However, none of those genes were viral transcripts, unlike in the

high- versus low-activity bodyguard comparison. At the transcript level, we obtained 28 genes

with significant DTU between broodcare workers and high-activity bodyguards, and 40 DTU

genes between broodcare workers and low-activity bodyguards (Supplementary Table 2). Finally,

we compared the DEGs obtained in every comparison and found that most of the genes are

uniquely highly expressed in broodcare workers in comparison to low- and high-activity

bodyguards (Fig. 2D and Supplementary Fig. 3).

Again, we used GSEA (FDR < 0.05) to reveal molecular functions that differ between

bodyguard and broodcare workers (Fig. 5C, and Supplementary Table 12). We found DEGs

upregulated in broodcare workers significantly enriched for two gene ontology (GO) terms or

gene functional categories involving chitin binding and structural molecule activity. Another

three GO terms were enriched in bodyguards (Fig. 5C). We manually verified the GO annotation

of every DEG (Supplementary Tables 9 and 10) and found genes associated with juvenile

hormone (JH) (Fig. 5D), vitellogenin pathways (Fig. 5E), and major royal jelly protein 1-like

(Fig. 5F) highly expressed in broodcare workers. Our results also revealed the overexpression of

serine-threonine protein kinase genes (Fig. 5). Phylogenetic analysis of those kinase genes

showed they cluster within the GATA zinc finger domain-containing protein (GATA) (Fig. 5G),

and dual-specificity tyrosine-phosphorylation-regulated kinase (DYRK1A) (Fig. 5H) clades

(Supplementary Fig. 3). Finally, we also identified genes known to be involved in insect

immunity against viruses that were differentially expressed between broodcare workers and

bodyguards (Fig. 4I-J).

Discussion

Using field behavioral assays and RNA-Seq, we explored gene expression associated with

bodyguarding behavior in *Allomerus octoarticulatus,* an obligately symbiotic ant species that

defends its hosts against herbivores. We found differentially expressed genes that either generate

or respond to variation in the quality of *A. octoarticulatus* colonies as plant mutualists. Many of

the DEGs were viral transcripts, suggesting that viral infections explain why some *A.*

octoarticulatus colonies are highly effective plant bodyguards, while others are slow to recruit to

herbivores, allowing damage to accumulate on their host plants.

The high expression of viral transcripts suggests that colonies had active viral infections

that modulated their bodyguarding behavior. Inactive bodyguards were infected by viruses

phylogenetically related to viruses causing poor locomotion and paralysis in Hymenoptera.

AOV-2, a picornavirus highly expressed in ineffective *A. octoarticulatus* bodyguards, is closely

related to viruses in the acute bee paralysis (ABP) viral complex, namely acute bee paralysis

virus (ABPV), Israeli acute paralysis virus (IAPV), and Kashmir bee virus (KBV). These viruses

are well-known and widespread honeybee RNA viruses that induce paralysis and increase bee

mortality (Amiri et al., 2019). We also identified AOV-1, a narna-like virus highly expressed in

low-activity bodyguards that belongs to the same family as another ant-associated virus,

Linepithema humile narna-like virus 1 (LhuNLV1), that has previously been described as

influencing *L. humile* immunity (Lester et al., 2019). These viruses might reduce ant foraging, as

previously observed in colonies of invasive fire ants infected with the dicistrovirus *Solenopsis*

invicta virus 1 (SINV-1) (Hsu et al., 2018). In other words, ineffective bodyguards might be poor

symbionts because they are sick.

However, we also found several viruses overexpressed in high-activity bodyguards

(AOV-3, AOV-4, AOV-5, AOV-6, AOV-7, and AOV-8), and these viruses could potentially be

inducing greater activity or aggression in their ant hosts to promote their own transmission. One

of the best-known examples of parasite manipulation of host behavior occurs in ("zombie") ants,

in which the fungal parasite *Ophiocordyceps* manipulates the behavior of its ant hosts to promote

its own onward transmission (de Bekker 2019). Similarly, Hsu et al. (2019) report aggressive

behavior in the ant *Anoplolepis gracilipes* being shaped by viral disease transmission triggered

by a dicistrovirus. In bees, iflaviruses such as Sacbrood virus and Deformed wing virus (DWV)

increase aggressiveness in infected colonies of *Apis cerana* (Hasegawa et al., 2023) and *A.*

mellifera (Fujiyuki et al., 2004; Terio et al., 2008, but see Rortais et al 2006). Thus, the viruses

that were highly expressed in very active *A. octoarticulatus* bodyguards may also be

manipulating the behavior of their ant hosts, with potential consequences for both their own

transmission and for the degree of protection afforded by the ants. The new viruses we identified

also increase the known viral diversity associated with ants (Baty et al., 2020).

Changes in aggressiveness might result from viral infections that trigger immune

responses in ant workers. As part of ants' humoral immunity, we found *hymenoptaecin* (*hym*)

genes highly expressed in low-activity bodyguards. Previous studies described high expression

of this infection-inducible antimicrobial peptide after ant workers are immune-challenged (Gupta

et al., 2015; Yek et al., 2013; Negroni et al., 2020; Von et al., 2016). Expression of *hym* genes in

ants has also been reported to be higher in foragers than in broodcare workers (Qui et al., 2017),

as the former are exposed to more viruses from spending more time outside the nest where they

may more regularly encounter viruses and their vectors. We also found higher expression of

genes encoding matrix metalloproteinases (MMPs) in ants that are poor plant bodyguards.

MMPs can be expressed in response to viral infections in Lepidoptera (Liu et al., 2022), and

participate in insect innate immune regulation (Vilcinskas, 2022). Finally, *chymotrypsin-1-like*, a

protease gene, was highly expressed in low-activity bodyguards. Proteolytic cascades are

pathogen-inducible enzymes participating in the immediate response of the innate immune

system in insects (Cerenius et al., 2010, Kanost & Jiang, 2015). These results further suggest that

low-activity workers might be diseased.

Comparing between bodyguards and broodcare workers in the same colony, we observed

patterns of task-specific gene expression that align with those previously reported in other social

insects (Buttstedt et al., 2014; Hawkings et al., 2019; Malé et al., 2017; Das & Bekker, 2022; Qiu

et al., 2022). We identified serine-threonine protein kinase (STK) genes over-expressed in

broodcare workers. Alleman et al. (2019) report STK genes involved in learning and memory

formation in ants. Previous research has also identified other kinase genes, especially cGMP-

dependent protein kinase (PKG) genes, that mediate behavioral shifts in ants (Lucas et al., 2009;

Ingram et al., 2011), including in *A. octoarticulatus* (Malé et al., 2017), although we did not find

PKGs among the DEGs in this study. Overall, some genes highly expressed in bodyguards also

follow previous reports of transcriptomic signatures of environmental stress in ants. For instance,

we found the accumulation of digestive enzymes in bodyguards, as previously reported in

foragers of other ant species exposed to temperature stress (Vatanparast et al., 2021).

Variation in gene expression has been associated with partner quality in pollination (Lüthi

et al., 2022) and insect-microbe interactions (Koga et al., 2022;), but it has not yet been explored

in defensive mutualisms. By combining field studies with transcriptomics, we report changes in

gene expression associated with how ants cooperate with plants and find that viral infections may

explain why some ants are better mutualists than others.

Methods

Field bioassays and sample collection

We measured bodyguard effectiveness in 60 naturally occurring colonies of *A. octoarticulatus* in the Peruvian Amazon. We collected live grasshoppers, almost entirely in the genus *Orphulella* (Supplementary Fig. 1)*,* at our field site and attached these grasshoppers to *C. nodosa* leaves at a consistent distance to the domatium (i.e., nest) entrance using entomological pins (Supplementary Video 1). To measure ant recruitment, we counted the number of ants interacting with (i.e., stinging, biting, or walking on) the grasshopper each minute for five minutes and then averaged these counts to get a measure of bodyguarding activity (Fig. 1B, Supplementary Table 1). We also measured many factors that could potentially influence ant behavior in the bioassay, including time of day, ambient temperature, herbivore size, age, and species, and host plant size (i.e., number of domatia, a proxy for ant colony size, Frederickson et al. 2012), but found that they mostly had non-significant effects on ant behavior (Supplementary Fig. 1). Only time of day significantly predicted ant recruitment, with fewer ants recruiting to grasshoppers in the afternoon than the morning (Supplementary Fig. 1). We also measured herbivory on each plant in the field; three weeks before the bioassays, we marked up to three domatia per plant that had attached leaves with minimal herbivore damage, and then after conducting the bioassays three weeks later, we collected all the leaves from the marked domatia, grouped them by plant, and ranked the plants in order of herbivore damage, with a rank of 1 indicating the least herbivore damage and a rank of 60 indicating the most damage (Fig. 1C).

We collected bodyguards and broodcare workers from 14 colonies for transcriptomic analyses, evenly split between colonies with high- and low-activity bodyguards (Supplementary

Table 1). Both high- and low-activity colonies were sampled in both the morning and the

afternoon (Supplementary Fig. 1). Immediately after each bioassay, we collected 10-15

bodyguard workers on or near the grasshopper bait. We also collected up to 15 broodcare

workers from six of these ant colonies by opening domatia with secateurs and extracting workers

tending brood. We collected specimens in 1.5ml RNase-free tubes with 1ml of RNAlater

Stabilization Solution (Thermo Fisher Scientific), transported them back to the University of

Toronto (Toronto, Canada), and stored them at -80ºC until RNA extractions. We obtained permits

for field sampling and experiments from Peru's Servicio Nacional Forestal y de Fauna Silvestre

(SERFOR, authorization N° AUT-IFS-2018-061).

RNA-Seq library construction and sequencing

We submitted samples for RNA-Seq to the Donnelly Sequencing Center at the University of

Toronto (Toronto, Canada). The samples had a median RNA Integrity Number (RIN) of 8.3. The

sequencing facility processed 500 ng per sample using the NEBNext Ultra II Directional RNA

Library Prep Kit for Illumina, including PolyA selection using the NEBNext Poly(A) mRNA

Magnetic Isolation. Fragmentation was 15 minutes at 94 °C and samples were amplified for 9

cycles. The facility ran 1 µL top stock of each purified final library on an Agilent Bioanalyzer

dsDNA High Sensitivity chip. The libraries were quantified using the Quant-iT High-Sensitivity

dsDNA Assay Kit and pooled at equimolar ratios after size adjustment. The final pool was run on

an Agilent Bioanalyzer dsDNA High Sensitivity chip and quantified using a NEBNext Library

Quant Kit for Illumina. The quantified pool was hybridized at a final concentration of 2.15 pM

and sequenced with 2x50 bp reads on the Illumina NovaSeq 6000 platform using an SP flowcell,

generating an average of 28.2 million read pairs per sample. Read quality scores were 36 and

sequence length after trimming ranged from 30 to 51 bp (Supplementary Table 13).

De novo *transcriptome assembly, validation, and completeness*

Because there was no reference genome or transcriptome for any *Allomerus* species before our

study, we generated a *de novo* transcriptome assembly for *Allomerus octoarticulatus.* We

removed low-quality sequences and adapters using Trimmomatic v0.39 (Bolger et al., 2014), and

assessed the quality of the trimmed reads with FastQC v0.11.2 (Supplementary Table 13). Using

the rnaSPAdes pipeline (Bushmanova et al., 2019) and CD-HIT (Li & Godzik, 2006; Huang et

al., 2010), we assembled the high-quality RNA-Seq reads into a transcriptome with 67,613

unigenes and 93,122 transcripts. Then we assessed the quality of the transcriptome with

rnaQUAST (Bushmanova, et al., 2019). The assembled transcripts had an average length of 1478

bp, and the N50 was 3232 bp (Supplementary Table 14). Assessed with BUSCO (Manni et al.,

2021), the transcriptome had completeness scores of 95.62% (using the Hymenoptera database)

and 99.34% (using the Insecta database). We deposited the *de novo* transcriptome assembly at

GenBank (NCBI database) under the submission number (available upon acceptance:

XXXXXXXXXX).

Differential expression analysis

For transcript quantification, we implemented the Salmon v1.9.0 pipeline (Patro et al., 2017). We

built a Salmon index based on a decoy-aware transcriptome to avoid false mapping (Srivastava et

al., 2020). We used the genome of a close relative of *A. octoarticulatus, Wasmannia*

auropunctata (GenBank: GCA_000956235.1) as the 'decoy.' Then we aligned the RNA-Seq

reads to the Salmon index. In this step, we implemented the Gibbs sampling option (--

numGibbsSamples 20) and reduced autocorrelation in the Gibbs samples (thinningFactor 100).

Finally, we obtained transcript-level counts for each sample with tximport (Soneson et al., 2015).

To identify DEGs, we used the DESeq2 workflow (Love et al., 2014) in v4.2.1 (R Core

Team, 2022). We extracted the final list of significant genes with the *results* function and set a

false discovery rate (FDR) < 0.01 and fold change (FD) > 1.5. We made heatmaps with the R

library *pheatmap.*

For the phylogenetic tree of serine-threonine protein kinase genes, we obtained

Formicidae orthologues of the GATA zinc finger domain-containing proteins (OrthoDB Group

32050at36668) and dual specificity tyrosine-phosphorylation-regulated kinases (OrthoDB Group

21499at36668). We also downloaded PKG orthologues for ants using OrthoDB (Group

EOG8PP0WX) and aligned those genes to PKG-encoding genes characterized in *A.*

octoarticulatus: *Aofor* (GenBank KX809576) and *Aopkg* (GenBank KX809574). We aligned

sequences using MAFFT v7.505 (Katoh, et al., 2005) with the algorithm L-INS-I and the default

scoring matrix (BLOSUM62) and gap penalty (1.53) values. We then generated a maximum

likelihood tree based on amino-acid sequences with IQ-Tree v1.6.12 software (Nguyen et al.,

2015) The amino acid substitution model implemented was JTT+F+G4 (Kalyaanamoorthy, et al.,

2017), and we evaluated node support with 1000 bootstrap replicates (Hoang, et al., 2017).

Differential transcript usage analysis

We implemented the Dirichlet-multinomial framework with the R library *DRIMSeq* (Nowicka &

Robinson, 2016) following Love et al (2018). First, we scaled transcripts-per-million (TPM)

abundance estimates per sample with the *scaledTPM* method to generate a final matrix with

count-scale data. Along with that matrix, we imported to *DRIMSeq* a transcript-to-gene mappings

file to create a *dmDSdata* object containing sample and count information. We filtered data to

minimal expression and proportion levels of 10 and 0.1, respectively. We used the functions

dmPrecision and *dmFit* for the precision and proportion estimations, and *dmTest* to test for DTU.

Finally, we performed two-stage testing with the R library *stageR* (Van den Berge et al., 2017) by

implementing screening and confirmation stages to identify the final list of genes participating in

DTU. For the latter stage, we used a target overall false discovery rate (OFDR) level of 5%

(alpha = 0.05).

Functional annotation and enrichment analysis

For annotation of the *de novo* reference transcriptome, we used the blastx function in Blast

v2.11.0 (Camacho et al., 2009). We used the *de novo* transcriptome as a query against a high-

quality manually annotated and non-redundant protein sequence database -UniProtKB (UniProt

Consortium, 2021), with an e-value cut-off of 1e-5. We then loaded this XML file into the

OmicsBox program v2.1 (OmicsBox, 2019) to perform GO mapping and annotation (Gotz et al.,

2018) against the Gene Ontology database implemented in the program. For GO assignment, we

set the annotation cut-off to 55 and the e-value hit filter to 1.0E-6. To obtain a more complete

functional annotation for the subset of DE genes obtained in the DEG and DTU analyses, we

used the software package InterProScan (Jones et al., 2014) in addition to BLAST (Altschul et

al., 1990) in OmicsBox. We implemented these annotation steps to allow for the sequences to be

screened against more databases. We performed sequence annotation with the public EMBL-EBI

InterPro web service by loading the fasta sequences and running the analysis under the default

setting. We then ran a blast search against the non-redundant NCBI database with an e-value of

1.0E-5. We then used the same previously described approach for GO annotation and mapping of

the DE genes. We also implemented Gene Set Enrichment Analysis (GSEA) in OmicsBox using

an FDR value of 0.05. Finally, we retrieved Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes

(KEGG) pathways (Kanehisa, 2000) by annotating and predicting orthologues with the tool

EggNOG-Mapper (Huerta-Cepas et al., 2019) in OmicsBox.

Virus characterization and phylogenetic analysis

We identified genes with GO terms corresponding to viral-related processes. The genes were

manually annotated by aligning them against the NCBI non-redundant protein sequence database

using blastx. We found eleven sequences of eight genes from picornavirales and Naranavirus that

were homologous to the viral genes we identified. We further extracted potential open reading

frames (ORF) and conserved domains by using those genes as queries on NCBI's ORF Finder

and Conserved Domain Database (CDD), respectively.

For phylogenetic reconstruction, we used the full-length amino acid sequences of the

non-structural RNA-dependent RNA polymerase (RdRp), a highly conserved gene suitable for

phylogenetic reconstructions of viruses (Venkataraman et al., 2018). We extracted RdRp

sequences from genes identified as viral from CDD. Unclassified and classified representative

amino acid sequences of species of each family were used in the phylogeny as suggested by

Xavier et al. (2021). We also included viral sequences with the most similar matches based on

the blastx search. We used noumavirus and three species in the family Secoviridae as outgroups

for the phylogenetic placement of picorna-like viruses and narna-like viruses, respectively. We

aligned viral protein sequences using MAFFT v7.505 (Katoh, et al., 2005). We generated a

maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree based on amino acid sequences with the software

program IQ-Tree v1.6.12 software (Nguyen et al., 2015), and the amino acid substitution model

Blosum62+R5 (Henikoff and Henikoff, 1992). Finally, we evaluated the support for each node

with 1000 bootstrap replicates.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the Centro de Investigación y Capacitación Río Los Amigos (CICRA) for their

support of the field research, especially station manager Arianna Basto Eyzaguirre. MEF

acknowledges funding from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada

(NSERC) Discovery Grant program, CR from a National Geographic Early Career Grant, a

Sigma Xi Grant in Aid of Research, and a University of Toronto Centre for Global Change

Science Graduate Scholarship, and MCT from a Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarship. We also

thank Alberto Escudero for his help with fieldwork, Ina Anreiter for helping with RNA

extractions, Kyle Turner and the Donnelly Sequencing Center for sequencing samples, Santiago

Sanchez and Pierre-Jean Malé for bioinformatic support, Gianpiero Fiorentino and Patricio Picon

for help with graphical design, and Naomi Pierce for feedback that improved the manuscript.

Author contributions

MCT, CR, JH, and MEF designed and performed the research. MCT, CR, HX, and MEF

analyzed the data. MCT wrote the article with input from all the authors.

Declaration of interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Data availability

Lists of DEGs and DTUs are available in the supplementary information. Raw sequencing and transcriptome assembly data will be deposited in NCBI databases. Field data and code will be archived on Dryad and Zenodo, respectively, on acceptance, as well as in the GitHub repository: https://github.com/mariatocora/Transcriptomic-analysis-ant-plant.

References

1. A. Alleman, M. Stoldt, B. Feldmeyer, S. Foitzik, Tandem-running and scouting behaviour are characterized by up-regulation of learning and memory formation genes within the ant brain. *Molecular Ecology* **28**, 2342–2359 (2019).

1. S. F. Altschul, W. Gish, W. Miller, E. W. Myers, D. J. Lipman, Basic local alignment search tool. *Journal of Molecular Biology* **215**, 403–410 (1990).

2. E. Amiri, *et al.*, Israeli Acute Paralysis Virus: Honey Bee Queen–Worker Interaction and Potential Virus Transmission Pathways. *Insects* **10**, 9 (2019).

3. R. T. Batstone, L. T. Burghardt, K. D. Heath, Phenotypic and genomic signatures of interspecies cooperation and conflict in naturally occurring isolates of a model plant symbiont. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* **289**, 20220477 (2022).

4. R. T. Batstone, A. M. O'Brien, T. L. Harrison, M. E. Frederickson, Experimental evolution makes microbes more cooperative with their local host genotype. *Science* **370**, 476–478 (2020).

5. BioBam Bioinformatics, OmicsBox – Bioinformatics Made Easy, BioBam (2019).

6. A. M. Bolger, M. Lohse, B. Usadel, Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 2114–2120 (2014).

7. Bronstein, JL, *Mutualism.* (Oxford University Press, New York., 2015).

8.   E. Bushmanova, D. Antipov, A. Lapidus, A. D. Prjibelski, rnaSPAdes: a de novo transcriptome

assembler and its application to RNA-Seq data. *GigaScience* **8**, giz100 (2019).

9.   A. Buttstedt, R. F. A. Moritz, S. Erler, Origin and function of the major royal jelly proteins of the

honeybee (*Apis mellifera*) as members of the *yellow* gene family: Honeybee's major royals. *Biol*

Rev **89**, 255–269 (2014).

10.   C. Camacho, *et al.*, BLAST+: architecture and applications. *BMC Bioinformatics* **10**, 421 (2009).

11.   L. Cerenius, S. Kawabata, B. L. Lee, M. Nonaka, K. Söderhäll, Proteolytic cascades and their

involvement in invertebrate immunity. *Trends in Biochemical Sciences* **35**, 575–583 (2010).

12.   B. Das, C. De Bekker, Time-course RNASeq of Camponotus floridanus forager and nurse ant

brains indicate links between plasticity in the biological clock and behavioral division of labor.

BMC Genomics **23**, 57 (2022).

13.   C. De Bekker, Ophiocordyceps–ant interactions as an integrative model to understand the

molecular basis of parasitic behavioral manipulation. *Current Opinion in Insect Science* **33**, 19–

24 (2019).

14.   de Bekker, C, Will, I, Das, B, Adams, R.M.M, The ants (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) and their

parasites: effects of parasitic manipulations and host responses on ant behavioral ecology. **28**, 1–

24 (2018).

15.   B. Epstein, *et al.*, Combining GWAS and population genomic analyses to characterize

coevolution in a legume-rhizobia symbiosis. *Molecular Ecology* **32**, 3798–3811 (2023).

16.   M. E. Frederickson, Rethinking Mutualism Stability: Cheaters and the Evolution of Sanctions.

The Quarterly Review of Biology **88**, 269–295 (2013).

17.   M. E. Frederickson, *et al.*, The Direct and Ecological Costs of an Ant-Plant Symbiosis. *The*

American Naturalist **179**, 768–778 (2012).

18.   M. L. Friesen, Widespread fitness alignment in the legume–rhizobium symbiosis. *New*

Phytologist **194**, 1096–1111 (2012).

19.   T. Fujiyuki, *et al.*, Novel Insect Picorna-Like Virus Identified in the Brains of Aggressive Worker

Honeybees. *J Virol* **78**, 1093–1100 (2004).

20.   S. D. Gillespie, L. S. Adler, Indirect effects on mutualisms: parasitism of bumble bees and

pollination service to plants. *Ecology* **94**, 454–464 (2013).

21.   S. Gotz, *et al.*, High-throughput functional annotation and data mining with the Blast2GO suite.

Nucleic Acids Research **36**, 3420–3435 (2008).

22.   S. K. Gupta, *et al.*, Scrutinizing the immune defence inventory of Camponotus floridanus

applying total transcriptome sequencing. *BMC Genomics* **16**, 540 (2015).

23.   N. Hasegawa, *et al.*, Evolutionarily diverse origins of deformed wing viruses in western honey

bees. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **120**, e2301258120 (2023).

24.   C. Hawkings, T. L. Calkins, P. V. Pietrantonio, C. Tamborindeguy, Caste-based differential

transcriptional expression of hexamerins in response to a juvenile hormone analog in the red

imported fire ant (Solenopsis invicta). *PLoS ONE* **14**, e0216800 (2019).

25.   S. Henikoff, J. G. Henikoff, Amino acid substitution matrices from protein blocks. *Proc. Natl.*

Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **89**, 10915–10919 (1992).

26.   D. T. Hoang, O. Chernomor, A. Von Haeseler, B. Q. Minh, L. S. Vinh, UFBoot2: Improving the

Ultrafast Bootstrap Approximation. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **35**, 518–522 (2018).

27.   H.-W. Hsu, M.-C. Chiu, C.-C. Lee, C.-Y. Lee, C.-C. S. Yang, The Association between Virus

Prevalence and Intercolonial Aggression Levels in the Yellow Crazy Ant, *Anoplolepis gracilipes*

(Jerdon). *Insects* **10**, 436 (2019).

28.   H.-W. Hsu, M.-C. Chiu, D. Shoemaker, C.-C. S. Yang, Viral infections in fire ants lead to

reduced foraging activity and dietary changes. *Sci Rep* **8**, 13498 (2018).

29.   Y. Huang, B. Niu, Y. Gao, L. Fu, W. Li, CD-HIT Suite: a web server for clustering and

comparing biological sequences. *Bioinformatics* **26**, 680–682 (2010).

30.   J. Huerta-Cepas, *et al.*, eggNOG 5.0: a hierarchical, functionally and phylogenetically annotated

488   orthology resource based on 5090 organisms and 2502 viruses. *Nucleic Acids Research* **47**,

489   D309–D314 (2019).

490   31.   K. K. Ingram, L. Kleeman, S. Peteru, Differential regulation of the foraging gene associated with

491   task behaviors in harvester ants. *BMC Ecol* **11**, 19 (2011).

492   32.   James W. Baty, Mariana Bulgarella, Jana Dobelmann, Antoine Felden, Philip J. Lester, Viruses

493   and their effects in ants (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) *Myrmecol News* **30**, 213-228 (2020).

494   33.   B. M. Jones, *et al.*, Individual differences in honey bee behavior enabled by plasticity in brain

495   gene regulatory networks. *eLife* **9**, e62850 (2020).

496   34.   P. Jones, *et al.*, InterProScan 5: genome-scale protein function classification. *Bioinformatics* **30**,

497   1236–1240 (2014).

498   35.   S. Kalyaanamoorthy, B. Q. Minh, T. K. F. Wong, A. Von Haeseler, L. S. Jermiin, ModelFinder:

499   fast model selection for accurate phylogenetic estimates. *Nat Methods* **14**, 587–589 (2017).

500   36.   M. Kanehisa, KEGG: Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes. *Nucleic Acids Research* **28**,

501   27–30 (2000).

502   37.   M. R. Kanost, H. Jiang, Clip-domain serine proteases as immune factors in insect hemolymph.

503   *Current Opinion in Insect Science* **11**, 47–55 (2015).

504   38.   K. Katoh, MAFFT version 5: improvement in accuracy of multiple sequence alignment. *Nucleic

505   Acids Research* **33**, 511–518 (2005).

506   39.   E. T. Kiers, M. G. Hutton, R. F. Denison, Human selection and the relaxation of legume defences

507   against ineffective rhizobia. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* **274**, 3119–3126 (2007).

508   40.   R. Koga, *et al.*, Single mutation makes Escherichia coli an insect mutualist. *Nat Microbiol* **7**,

509   1141–1150 (2022).

510   41.   P. Kohlmeier, A. R. Alleman, R. Libbrecht, S. Foitzik, B. Feldmeyer, Gene expression is more

511   strongly associated with behavioural specialization than with age or fertility in ant workers.

512   *Molecular Ecology* **28**, 658–670 (2019).

513   42.   P. J. Lester, K. H. Buick, J. W. Baty, A. Felden, J. Haywood, Different bacterial and viral

514   pathogens trigger distinct immune responses in a globally invasive ant. *Sci Rep* **9**, 5780 (2019).

515   43.   W. Li, A. Godzik, Cd-hit: a fast program for clustering and comparing large sets of protein or

516   nucleotide sequences. *Bioinformatics* **22**, 1658–1659 (2006).

517   44.   T. Liu, *et al.*, The dual roles of three MMPs and TIMP in innate immunity and metamorphosis in

518   the silkworm, *Bombyx mori*. *The FEBS Journal* **289**, 2828–2846 (2022).

519   45.   M. I. Love, W. Huber, S. Anders, Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-

520   seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol* **15**, 550 (2014).

521   46.   M. I. Love, C. Soneson, R. Patro, Swimming downstream: statistical analysis of differential

522   transcript usage following Salmon quantification. *F1000Res* **7**, 952 (2018).

523   47.   C. Lucas, M. B. Sokolowski, Molecular basis for changes in behavioral state in ant social

524   behaviors. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **106**, 6351–6356 (2009).

525   48.   M. N. Lüthi, A. E. Berardi, T. Mandel, L. B. Freitas, C. Kuhlemeier, Single gene mutation in a

526   plant MYB transcription factor causes a major shift in pollinator preference. *Current Biology* **32**,

527   5295-5308.e5 (2022).

528   49.   P.-J. G. Malé, *et al.*, An ant–plant mutualism through the lens of cGMP-dependent kinase genes.

529   *Proc. R. Soc. B.* **284**, 20170896 (2017).

530   50.   F. Manfredini, *et al.*, Sociogenomics of Cooperation and Conflict during Colony Founding in the

531   Fire Ant Solenopsis invicta. *PLoS Genet* **9**, e1003633 (2013).

532   51.   M. Manni, M. R. Berkeley, M. Seppey, E. M. Zdobnov, BUSCO: Assessing Genomic Data

533   Quality and Beyond. *Current Protocols* **1**, e323 (2021).

534   52.   V. E. Mayer, M. E. Frederickson, D. McKey, R. Blatrix, Current issues in the evolutionary

535   ecology of ant–plant symbioses. *New Phytologist* **202**, 749–764 (2014).

536   53.   A. T. Müller, *et al.*, Combined –omics framework reveals how ant symbionts benefit the

537   Neotropical ant-plant Tococa quadrialata at different levels. *iScience* **25**, 105261 (2022).

538   54.   M. A. Negroni, F. H. I. D. Segers, F. Vogelweith, S. Foitzik, Immune challenge reduces gut

539   microbial diversity and triggers fertility-dependent gene expression changes in a social insect.

540   *BMC Genomics* **21**, 816 (2020).

541   55.   L.-T. Nguyen, H. A. Schmidt, A. Von Haeseler, B. Q. Minh, IQ-TREE: A Fast and Effective

542   Stochastic Algorithm for Estimating Maximum-Likelihood Phylogenies. *Molecular Biology and*

543   *Evolution* **32**, 268–274 (2015).

544   56.   M. Nowicka, M. D. Robinson, DRIMSeq: a Dirichlet-multinomial framework for multivariate

545   count outcomes in genomics. *F1000Res* **5**, 1356 (2016).

546   57.   R. Patro, G. Duggal, M. I. Love, R. A. Irizarry, C. Kingsford, Salmon provides fast and bias-

547   aware quantification of transcript expression. *Nat Methods* **14**, 417–419 (2017).

548   58.   B. Qiu, *et al.*, Canalized gene expression during development mediates caste differentiation in

549   ants. *Nat Ecol Evol* **6**, 1753–1765 (2022).

550   59.   R Core Team, R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing (2017).

551   60.   C. Riehl, M. E. Frederickson, Cheating and punishment in cooperative animal societies. *Phil.*

552   *Trans. R. Soc. B* **371**, 20150090 (2016).

553   61.   A. Rortais, *et al.*, Deformed wing virus is not related to honey bees' aggressiveness. *Virol J* **3**, 61

554   (2006).

555   62.   B. E. R. Rubin, C. S. Moreau, Comparative genomics reveals convergent rates of evolution in

556   ant–plant mutualisms. *Nat Commun* **7**, 12679 (2016).

557   63.   J. Sachs, E. Simms, Pathways to mutualism breakdown. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **21**, 585–

558   592 (2006).

559   64.   C. Soneson, M. I. Love, M. D. Robinson, Differential analyses for RNA-seq: transcript-level

560   estimates improve gene-level inferences. *F1000Res* **4**, 1521 (2015).

561   65.   A. Srivastava, *et al.*, Alignment and mapping methodology influence transcript abundance

562   estimation. *Genome Biol* **21**, 239 (2020).

66. V. Terio, *et al.*, Detection of a honeybee iflavirus with intermediate characteristics between

kakugo virus and deformed wing virus. *New Microbiol* **31**, 439–444 (2008).

67. The UniProt Consortium, *et al.*, UniProt: the universal protein knowledgebase in 2021. *Nucleic*

Acids Research **49**, D480–D489 (2021).

68. K. Van Den Berge, C. Soneson, M. D. Robinson, L. Clement, stageR: a general stage-wise

method for controlling the gene-level false discovery rate in differential expression and

differential transcript usage. *Genome Biol* **18**, 151 (2017).

69. M. Vatanparast, Y. Park, Comparative RNA-Seq Analyses of Solenopsis japonica (Hymenoptera:

Formicidae) Reveal Gene in Response to Cold Stress. *Genes* **12**, 1610 (2021).

70. S. Venkataraman, B. Prasad, R. Selvarajan, RNA Dependent RNA Polymerases: Insights from

Structure, Function and Evolution. *Viruses* **10**, 76 (2018).

71. A. Vilcinskas, Matrix metalloproteinases and their inhibitors – pleiotropic functions in insect

immunity and metamorphosis. *The FEBS Journal* **289**, 2805–2808 (2022).

72. K. Von Wyschetzki, H. Lowack, J. Heinze, Transcriptomic response to injury sheds light on the

physiological costs of reproduction in ant queens. *Mol Ecol* **25**, 1972–1985 (2016).

73. M. G. Weber, A. A. Agrawal, Defense mutualisms enhance plant diversification. *Proc. Natl.*

Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **111**, 16442–16447 (2014).

74. M. G. Weber, K. H. Keeler, The phylogenetic distribution of extrafloral nectaries in plants.

Annals of Botany **111**, 1251–1261 (2013).

75. C. A. D. Xavier, M. L. Allen, A. E. Whitfield, Ever-increasing viral diversity associated with the

red imported fire ant Solenopsis invicta (Formicidae: Hymenoptera). *Virol J* 18, 5 (2021).

76. S. H. Yek, J. J. Boomsma, M. Schiøtt, Differential gene expression in *Acromyrmex* leaf-cutting

ants after challenges with two fungal pathogens. *Mol Ecol* **22**, 2173–2187 (2013)

Figures

Figure 1. A. Summary of a typical ant-plant defensive mutualism. (1) Host plants produce

specialized structures (domatia) that (2) attract ants that benefit from the food and shelter the

plant provides. (3) As they forage for food, ant "bodyguards" defend the plant against attacking

herbivores and other enemies. (4) This reduces the frequency and duration of herbivore visits to

the host plant, and (5) ultimately benefits the plants by reducing tissue damage caused by

herbivory. **B.** Spaghetti plot of behavioral trials across all 60 colonies. Blue and pink lines show

colonies used for RNA-Seq. Grey lines indicate additional colonies that were measured but not

used in transcriptomic analyses. **C.** Linear model of herbivory vs. bodyguard activity. Herbivory

was measured by ranking plants based on estimated leaf area missing after three weeks in the

599   field (here, higher numbers represent greater herbivory). **D.** Herbivory on plants occupied by the

600   low-activity (pink) and high-activity (blue) bodyguards used for RNA-Seq.

Figure 2. A. Heatmap showing 40 DEGs, with 15 genes upregulated in low-activity bodyguards

and 25 genes upregulated in high-activity bodyguards. Comparison of **B.** Metalloproteinase and

C. Chymotrypsin 1−like gene expression between low- and high-activity bodyguards. **D.** Venn

diagram illustrating DEGs shared among workers doing different tasks. Most genes are uniquely

highly expressed in broodcare workers.

Figure 3. Phylogenetic reconstructions of new viruses associated with *A. octoarticulatus* based

on comparisons of RNA-dependent RNA polymerase (RdRp) sequences of **A.** a narna-like virus

(AOV-1, in bold) from *A. octoarticulatus* and representative species within the family

Narnaviridae (order Wolframvirales), and **B.** other viruses (AOV-2 to AOV-8, in bold) from *A.*

octoarticulatus, and representative species within the families Dicistroviridae, Picornaviridae,

and Iflaviridae in the order Picornavirales. Three species of the family Secoviridae and an

ourmiavirus are the outgroups of the trees in **B** and **A**, respectively. Ultrafast bootstrap (ufBS)

support values are indicated by colored circles on respective nodes.

Figure 4. Differences in viral transcript expression between high- and low-activity bodyguards.

A. The narnavirus: *A. octoarticulatus* virus 1 (AOV-1). **B.** A picorna-like virus highly expressed

in low-activity bodyguards: *A. octoarticulatus* virus 2 (AOV-2). **C-H.** Picorna-like viruses highly

expressed in high-activity bodyguards: *A. octoarticulatus* virus 3 (AOV-3), *A. octoarticulatus*

virus 4 (AOV-4), *A. octoarticulatus* virus 5 (AOV-5), *A. octoarticulatus* virus 6 (AOV-6), *A.*

octoarticulatus virus 7 (AOV-7), and *A. octoarticulatus* virus 8 (AOV-8). **I-J.** Expression of two

623   immunity-related genes among broodcare workers, low-activity bodyguards, and high-activity

624   bodyguards.

Figure 5. A. Heatmap showing 155 DEGs between broodcare workers (133 genes upregulated)

and high-activity bodyguards (22 genes upregulated). **B.** Heatmap comparing 197 DEGs between

broodcare workers (144 genes upregulated) and low-activity bodyguards (53 genes upregulated).

C. Gene Set Enrichment Analysis (GSEA) results show three GO terms (in bold) overrepresented

in bodyguards, and two in broodcare workers (FDR < 0.05). Ontologies: Biological Process

(BP), Cellular Component (CC), and Molecular Function (MF). Gene number is number of genes

in gene set. **D.** A subset of genes differentially expressed between workers performing different

tasks, including juvenile hormone (JH) biosynthesis, vitellogenin, and major royal jelly protein

1-like (MRJP1). **E.** Serine-threonine protein kinase genes highly expressed in broodcare workers,

including dual specificity tyrosine-phosphorylation-regulated kinase (DYRK1A) and GATA zinc

finger domain-containing protein (GATA).