Relationship between weapon size and six key behavioural and physiological traits in males of the European earwig

Samantha E.M. Blackwell[1], Laura Pasquier[1], Simon Dupont[1], Séverine Devers[1], Charlotte Lécureuil[1], Joël Meunier[1*]

[1]Institut de Recherche sur la Biologie de l'Insecte (IRBI), UMR CNRS 7261, Université de Tours, France.

ORCID numbers :

- L Pasquier : 0009-0000-1346-2069
- S Dupont : 0000-0003-4760-6811
- C Lécureuil : 0000-0002-7339-9185
- J Meunier : 0000-0001-6893-2064

*Corresponding author: J Meunier, joel.meunier@univ-tours.fr

SUMMARY

In many animals, male weapons are large and extravagant morphological structures that typically enhance fighting ability and reproductive success. It is generally assumed that growing and carrying large weapons is costly, thus only males in the best condition can afford it. In the European earwig, males carry weapons in the form of forceps-like cerci, which can vary widely in size within populations. While long forceps appear to increase male's access to females, it is unknown whether it also correlates with other important male life-history traits. This information is important, however, in determining the potential reliability of forceps length as an indicator of male quality and the stability of this signalling system. Here, we tested whether forceps length is associated with six important behavioural and physiological traits in males of the European earwig. We sampled hundreds of males from two populations, selected 60 males with the longest and shortest forceps from each population, and then measured locomotor performance, boldness, aggregation behaviour, survival under harsh conditions, sperm storage, and survival after pathogen exposure. Contrary to our predictions, we detected no main association between forceps length and the traits measured. This lack of association was consistent between the two populations, although there were population-specific levels of boldness, aggregation and survival in harsh conditions (for long-forceps males only). Overall, these results challenge our current understanding of the function and quality signal of forceps length in this species and raise questions about the evolutionary drivers that could explain the maintenance of weapon size diversity within and between populations.

Keywords: Behaviour; Insect; Metarhizium; Ornament; Sexual selection; Weapons

INTRODUCTION

Animal reproduction often requires males to engage in physical competition and courtship to attract females in search of mates (Davies et al., 2012). From vertebrates to arthropods, these two needs have often led to the evolution of male weapons and ornaments through sexual selection (Emlen, 2008; Goldberg et al., 2019; McCullough et al., 2016). These weapons and ornaments are typically large and extravagant morphological structures that can grow on different parts of the male's body, take a variety of forms (such as antlers, horns, spurs, fangs and tusks), and work to enhance the male's fighting ability and/or attractiveness to females (Emlen, 2008). Textbook examples of this enhancement can be found in the white-tailed deer *Odocoileus virginianus*, where males growing the largest antlers are more likely to win fights with other males and have higher annual breeding success (Newbolt et al., 2017), and in the stalk-eyed flies *Cyrtodiopsis whitei* and *C. dahnanni*, where females prefer to mate with males exhibiting the longest eye stalks (Wilkinson et al., 1998).

However, not all males display extravagant weapons or ornaments (Emlen, 2008; Goldberg et al., 2019; McCullough et al., 2016), as the development and maintenance of these sexually selected traits often comes at a cost to males. This cost can arise from the fact that carrying heavy, bulky weapons (or ornaments) makes males less mobile and more visible to both predators and prey (Oufiero & Garland, 2007). For example, males with experimentally-enlarged wing spots have lower survival rates due to increased conspicuity to both visually orienting predators and visually orienting prey in the rubyspot damselfly *Hetaerina americana* (Grether, 1997). The cost of carrying large morphological structures can also arise because it may impose investment trade-offs with physiological functions ranging from metabolism to muscle development and spermatogenesis,

which can be crucial for male fitness and survival (Emlen, 2001). For example, males with the largest hind leg weapon pay the highest resting metabolic rate and energy costs in the Hemiptera *Leptoscelis tricolor* (Somjee et al., 2018). Similarly, growing large mandibles come with low flight-muscle mass in the stag beetle *Cyclommatus metallifer* (Mills et al., 2016), and males who invest in extravagant sexual displays show a more rapid decline in spermatogenesis than males who invest less in these displays in the houbara bustard *Chlamydotis undulata* (Preston et al., 2011). As a result, only the males in the very best condition are expected to possibly afford the development and maintenance of extravagant weapons and ornaments (Otte & Stayman, 1979; Emlen & Nijhout, 2000). Determining the reliability of these morphological structures as indicators of the male quality is therefore crucial to understanding the stability of these signalling systems (Berglund et al., 1996).

Earwigs (Dermaptera) are textbook examples of insects with males displaying a sexually selected weapon. In this taxonomical group, females have relatively short, straight and hardened forceps-like cerci typically used to defend the clutch against predators (Meunier, 2024), whereas males display elongated, curved and hardened forceps-like cerci (hereafter referred to as forceps) involved in mating courtship and fights against other males (Briceño & Eberhard, 1995; Kamimura, 2014; Walker & Fell, 2001). There are several lines of evidence to suggest that long forceps provide males with benefits in terms of mating success (Eberhard & Gutierrez, 1991; Kamimura, 2014; Tomkins & Brown, 2004). For example, males with long forceps are more likely to win fights with other males by squeezing them between their cerci, and thus gain better access to females in the toothed earwig *Vostox apicedentatus* (Moore & Wilson, 1993). In the European earwig *Forficula auricularia,* male forceps are also used in male-male contests as a weapon to deter competitors

prior to mating (Styrsky & Rhein, 1999) or to interrupt mating individuals by non-copulating males (Forslund, 2000, 2003; Walker & Fell, 2001). Long-forceps males are also generally more aggressive, more readily accepted by females for mating and copulate longer compared to short-forceps males (reviewed in Kamimura, 2014). Although forceps are involved in male courtship (Walker & Fell, 2001), females do not seem to select their mate exclusively on the basis of forceps length (Forslund, 2000, 2003; Radesäter & Halldórsdóttir, 1993; Walker & Fell, 2001).

While the relationship between male forceps length and mating success has been well documented in earwigs (reviewed in Kamimura, 2014), it remains unclear whether having long or short forceps is associated with other important life-history traits in these males. However, this is important information to determine the potential reliability of forceps length as an indicator of male quality and the stability of this possible signalling system. The very few studies that have addressed this question focused on male immunity in the European earwig *F. auricularia* (Körner et al., 2017; Rantala et al., 2007). On the one hand, they show that males with long forceps have lower basal levels of certain components of the immune system, such as lysozyme activity and hemocyte concentrations. This suggests that having long forceps comes with an immune cost for males. On the other hand, they show no association between forceps length and other components of the immune response, such as encapsulation rate and phenoloxidase activity. Taken together, these findings suggest that the immune costs of having long forceps may be relatively limited and raise the question of whether other important life-history traits can be associated with forceps length.

Here, we investigated whether long and short forceps are associated with six important behavioural and physiological traits in males of the European earwig. We sampled hundreds of

100 males in two natural populations of earwigs separated by 400 km and in each population, we
101 selected the 30 males with the longest and the 30 males with the shortest forceps. We then
102 measured their level of expression of three important behaviours, their survival rate in two distinct
103 harsh conditions and their sperm quantity. The first behaviour was their locomotor performance
104 (Cheutin et al., 2024), which reflects the ability of males to walk long distances (to forage, hide or
105 find a mate) while carrying long and heavy (or short and light) appendages. The second behaviour
106 was their likelihood to flee after a physical disturbance (i.e., boldness), which shows how males
107 react when disturbed by a predator attack (Thesing et al., 2015). The third behaviour was their
108 propensity to aggregate with conspecifics. This is an important parameter in this gregarious
109 species, as adults typically live in groups of up to several hundred individuals and social isolation
110 can have detrimental effects on their physiology (Kohlmeier et al., 2016; Van Meyel & Meunier,
111 2022). We also measured their survival rate in a harsh condition where they were isolated with no
112 access to a food source for 31 days, and then their survival rate after exposure to the common
113 entomopathogenic fungus *Metarhizium brunneum* (Vogelweith et al., 2017). Finally, we measured
114 the level of sperm storage in seminal vesicles of each male, a parameter that is often important in
115 the context of male-male competition for mating (Shuker & Simmons, 2014). If forceps length is a
116 reliable signal of good quality, we predict that long forceps males would 1) have higher locomotor
117 performance, 2) be bolder and thus less likely to flee after a simulated attack, 3) be more social
118 and thus more likely to aggregate with conspecifics, 4) be more resilient to harsh environmental
119 conditions and thus have a higher survival rate after 31 days of starvation, and/or would 5) have
120 higher immune defences and thus survive better after a pathogen infection than short-forceps
121 males. We also predict that 6) long-forceps males would produce more sperm and contain more

122 sperm in their seminal vesicles than short forceps males. This last prediction would be consistent
123 with the longer duration of copulation reported for the long-forceps males (Kamimura, 2014),
124 even if this longer duration may also reflect other male mating strategies, such as mate guarding.
125

126 MATERIAL AND METHODS

127 Animal rearing and selection

128 In July 2022, we field sampled 3000 males and females in a cultivated peach orchard near Valence,
129 France (Lat 44.9772790, Long 4.9286990) and 400 males and females in a non-cultivated area at
130 the edge of a forest near Cinais, France (Lat 47.1606970, Long 0.1763663). All these individuals
131 belong to *Forficula auricularia* Linneaus, 1758, also called *Forficula auricularia* clade A (González-
132 Miguéns et al., 2020). Immediately after field sampling, we distributed them by population of
133 origin into 50 plastic terrariums (37 × 22 × 25 cm, balanced sex ratio) to homogenize nutrition,
134 habitation, and access to mates for the males (Körner et al., 2017). Three months later (i.e., at the
135 end of the reproductive season), we removed the females from all the terrariums to mimic their
136 natural dispersal. One month later, for each population, we visually selected the 30 males with the
137 longest forceps and the 30 males with the shortest forceps (Körner et al., 2017) and isolated them
138 in individual Petri dishes (diameter 5 cm) for later use in behavioural and physiological
139 measurements (A timeline of the experimental design and the detailed sample sizes can be found
140 in Figure 1). Two days after isolation, we confirmed the robustness of our two forceps categories
141 by measuring the mean of the left and right outer forceps of the 120 males. These measurements
142 were done to the nearest 0.001 mm using the Leica Application Suite 4.5 software (Leica

143 Microsystems, Wetzlar, Germany) on pictures taken under a binocular scope (Leica, MZ 12.5).
144 These measurements confirmed that there was no overlap between the two male categories
145 (Figure 2). All the remaining males and females that were not used in this experiment were
146 involved in other experiments that are not presented here.

147 From field sampling to isolation, we fed animals with artificial food containing mostly
148 pollen, carrots, and cat food (see details in Kramer et al. 2015). During these three months, we
149 offered this food *ad libitum* to homogenise the nutritional condition of the males when we started
150 our measurements. We then kept the isolated males without access to food from the day they
151 were isolated until 31 days after their isolation (Figure 1) to test whether resistance to both
152 starvation and social isolation (i.e., harsh environmental conditions) were population and/or
153 forceps-length specific, while ensuring that good rearing conditions did not mask any potential
154 investment trade-offs between forceps length and other life history traits. We then provided food
155 to males after day 31 to measure their survival following pathogen exposure. We kept all animals
156 on a 12h:12h light:dark schedule at 18°C, and both the terrarium and Petri dishes contained a layer
157 of moist sand.

158

159 Behavioural measurements

160 From the 5th to the 24th day after isolation, we measured three behaviours in the 120 isolated
161 males: the locomotor performance, the likelihood of fleeing after a physical disturbance, and the
162 level of aggregation. All these measurements followed standard protocols for earwigs (Honorio et
163 al., 2023; Merleau et al., 2022).

164 First, we measured male's locomotor performance 5 days after isolation. On that day, we
165 transferred each male to a 3D-printed circular arena (Open field; diameter = 8 cm, height 0.4 cm)
166 with a cover made of glass, placed on an infrared table and kept in complete darkness. We then
167 video recorded males' locomotion for 20 minutes (Camera: BASLER BCA 1300, Germany; Media
168 Recorder v4.0, Noldus Information Systems, Netherland) and subsequently analyzed the resulting
169 videos with the software Ethovision XT 16 (Noldus Information Systems, Netherland). We defined
170 the locomotor performance of each male as the total distance he walked (in cm) during the entire
171 recording (Honorio et al., 2023; Merleau et al., 2022).

172 Second, we measured the likelihood of fleeing after a physical disturbance 10 days after
173 isolation. On that day, we carefully opened each Petri dish, pricked the male on the pronotum with
174 a glass capillary and then recorded whether or not the male's first reaction was to move more
175 than one body length away from its initial position (i.e., flee).

176 Finally, we measured the level of aggregation of each male 24 days after isolation. We
177 placed each male in a 3D-printed arena used in Van Meyel & Meunier, 2022, consisting of four
178 linearly aligned circular chambers (diameter 4 cm). Three of the chambers were connected by 0.5
179 cm wide corridors allowing earwigs to move between chambers. The width of the corridor
180 connecting to the fourth (outer) chamber was reduced to 0.15 cm, which prevented earwig
181 movement while allowing the circulation of odours and antennal contacts between individuals on
182 both sides (Van Meyel & Meunier, 2022). We started the experiment by placing two naive males
183 and one female from the same population (but not involved in any other experiment or
184 measurement) in this isolation chamber, and the tested male in one of the connected chambers.
185 We recorded whether the tested male was in the chamber next to the group of conspecifics (yes

186 or no) and repeated this measurement by taking pictures every hour for 48 hours using infrared
187 cameras and the software Pylon Viewer v5.1.0 (Basler©, Ahrensburg, Germany). For each tested
188 male, we thus obtained an aggregation score ranging from 0 to 48, which was defined as the total
189 number of pictures in which a male was in the chamber next to the group of conspecifics. After
190 the 48h of aggregation test, we returned each male to its Petri dish until its use for subsequent
191 measurements (see below). For ease of handling, all manipulated earwigs were anaesthetised with
192 CO_2 during the set-up of this last measurement.

193

194 Sperm storage measurement

195 Of the 91 males still alive on day 31 after isolation (Figure 1), we used a random subset of 39 to
196 measure sperm storage as the number of sperm present in their seminal vesicles (Figure 1). This
197 counting occurred about two months after the males were separated from the females, which is
198 probably long enough for the males to rebuild their sperm reserves, regardless of their previous
199 mating rate. We counted sperm numbers following the protocol detailed in Damiens et al. (2002).
200 In brief, we dissected each male under a dissecting microscope, placed their seminal vesicles on a
201 slide with 15 µL of 1x Phosphate Buffered Saline and then pierced it to release all the sperm. We
202 subsequently dried the plate on a heating block, after which the smear of sperm was sealed with
203 a 70% ethanol solution and allowed to dry again at ambient temperature. The slides were then
204 stored at 3°C. Two days later, we deposited 20µL of DAPI dye (concentration = 10 µmol/L) on the
205 smear, covered it with a small piece of plastic wrap to allow the dye to infiltrate the cells while not
206 drying out, and 10 minutes later, we replaced the plastic wrap with a glass slide cover. The slide
207 was then viewed under the microscope at 20x magnification, and we took pictures of 5 different

208 fields of the smear. Using an Olympus micrometre calibration slide and the software Image J
209 (Schneider et al., 2012), we then counted the number of spermatozoa in all 5 fields for each male.
210 Finally, we used all these numbers to calculate the number of spermatozoa per millimetre square
211 and multiplied this number by the total area of the smear to obtain the total number of sperm per
212 male. It should be noted that sperm storage was measured in males that survived 31 days in
213 isolation without access to food, so that this value represents the sperm storage of individuals best
214 adapted to these two stressful conditions.

215

216 Survival in harsh environments and after exposure to pathogens

217 We measured male survival under two types of harsh conditions. The first type of harsh condition
218 was the absence of any food source (starvation) combined with social isolation, which is known to
219 have detrimental effects on this gregarious species (Kohlmeier et al., 2016; Van Meyel & Meunier,
220 2022). We assessed the male survival rate under these conditions by recording whether each of
221 the 120 males tested was still alive on day 31 after isolation (Figure 1).

222 The second type of harsh condition was exposure to pathogens. We measured survival rate
223 after pathogen exposure in the 52 males that were still alive on day 31 and were not used to
224 measure sperm storage (Figure 1). We exposed each male to spores of the entomopathogenic
225 fungus *Metharizium brunneum* (formerly *M. anisopliae*). This fungus is a natural and lethal
226 pathogen of *F. auricularia* (Arcila & Meunier, 2020; Coulm & Meunier, 2021; Günther & Herter,
227 1974). The infection followed a standard protocol detailed in Kohlmeier et al. (2016). In brief, we
228 immersed each male in an Eppendorf tube containing 1.5 mL of a conidiospore suspension of *M.*

229 *brunneum* diluted in 0.05% Tween 20 (Sigma P-1379) at a concentration of 10^6 spores/mL. We
230 then gently swirled the tube from side to side for 4 seconds, removed the male and placed it back
231 in its original Petri dish with standard food (see above) that was changed twice a week. We then
232 kept the infected males at 20°C on a 12:12 light:dark schedule. We checked them daily for
233 mortality over the course of 45 days. As with sperm storage, survival after pathogen exposure was
234 measured in males that survived 31 days in isolation without access to food, so that it represents
235 the survival rate of individuals best adapted to these two stressful conditions.

236

237 Statistical analyses

238 We conducted all statistical analyses using the software R v4.3.2 (https://www.r-project.org/)
239 loaded with the packages *DHARMa* (Hartig, 2020), *car* (Fox & Weisberg, 2019), *survival* (Therneau,
240 2020) and *emmeans* (Lenth, 2022). We analysed locomotor performance, sperm count and
241 aggregation score using three general linear models (*lm* in R), while we analysed the likelihood to
242 flee (yes or no) and whether males were dead 31 days after isolation (yes or no) using two
243 generalized linear model (*glm* in R) with binomial error distributions. Finally, we analysed the
244 survival rate of the pathogen-exposed males using a Cox proportional hazard regression model
245 allowing for censored data (*Coxph* in R), i.e., males still alive 45 days after exposure to the
246 pathogen. In these six models, we entered the type of forceps length (long or short), the
247 population of origin of the males (Cinais or Valence) and the interaction between these two
248 variables as explanatory factors. Overall, we checked that all model assumptions were met (e.g.,
249 homoscedasticity and normality of residuals) using the *DHARMa* package. To this end, we log-
250 transformed male locomotor performance and log+1-transformed the aggregation scores. In the

251 model where we found a significant interaction, we conducted pairwise comparisons using the
252 estimated marginal means of the models and we corrected P values for multiple testing using the
253 Tukey method, as implemented in the *emmeans* R package. Finally, we conducted power analyses
254 for each of our statistical models using the packages *pscl* (Jackman et al., 2024), *pwr* (Champely et
255 al., 2020) and *powerSurvEpi* (Qiu et al., 2021).

256

257 ## RESULTS

258 Overall, we detected no main association between forceps length and the six traits measured
259 (Table 1). This applied to male locomotor performance, likelihood of fleeing after a physical
260 disturbance, aggregation score, sperm storage and survival after pathogen infection (Figure 3;
261 Table 1). There was also no difference between males with short and long forceps in terms of
262 survival under harsh environmental conditions, although males with long forceps survived better
263 when they came from Valence compared to Cinais (this trend was not present in males with short
264 forceps; Figure 3; interaction in Table 1; pairwise comparisons: Long forceps Cinais vs Valence: Z =
265 -3.311; P = 0.005; Short forceps Cinais vs Valence: Z = -0.611; P = 0.929). Regardless of forceps
266 length, males from Valence were overall more likely to flee after a physical disturbance and less
267 gregarious than males from Cinais (Table 1). These differences between the two populations were
268 absent for all other traits measured (Table 1). There was no interaction between the population
269 of origin and forceps length for any of the traits measured, except for survival under harsh
270 environmental conditions (Table 1). The statistical power of each analysis ranges from 0.155
271 (sperm count) to 0.447 (survival in harsh environments; Table 1). These values suggest that the

272 likelihood of detecting statistically significant effects based on the values reported in this study
273 was sometimes relatively low, particularly given the large variance obtained for certain traits.
274 Larger sample sizes, particularly for sperm count, may therefore be needed to confirm the absence
275 of effects more robustly.

276

277 DISCUSSION

278 The display of large, extravagant weapons often comes at a cost to the males (Emlen, 2008;
279 Goldberg et al., 2019; McCullough et al., 2016). It is therefore expected that only males in the best
280 condition can afford them and thus that these large weapons signal good male quality (Emlen &
281 Nijhout, 2000; Otte & Stayman, 1979). Here, we tested this prediction in the European earwig by
282 investigating whether male forceps length is associated with six important behavioural and
283 physiological traits. Contrary to predictions, our experiment did not allow us to detect an
284 association between forceps length and locomotor performance, boldness (i.e., likelihood to flee
285 after a physical disturbance), aggregation behaviour, sperm production, and male survival after
286 pathogen infection. These findings were consistent between the two populations, although some
287 of the traits measured were population specific: males from Cinais were generally bolder, less
288 gregarious and (only if they carried long-forceps) had a better chance of surviving in harsh
289 conditions than males from Valence.

290 Our results contrast with much of the literature reporting associations between sexually
291 selected male attributes and physiological, behavioural or immunological traits in arthropods
292 (Emlen, 2008; Goldberg et al., 2019; McCullough et al., 2016). However, the European earwig is

293 not the only case where such associations appear to be lacking (Emlen, 2008; Swallow & Husak,
294 2011). For example, carrying giant claw is not associated with the efficiency of escape behavior
295 and the level of metabolic costs in two fiddler crabs (Pena & Levinton, 2021; Tullis & Straube,
296 2017). Similarly, bearing large horns does not reflect male growth, mobility, or immunity in the
297 rhinoceros beetle *Trypoxylus dichotomus* (McCullough & Emlen, 2013; McCullough & Tobalske,
298 2013). It has been suggested that this apparent lack of general association may be due to the fact
299 that the performance of each weapon size depend on the environment in which the weapons are
300 used and/or because weapon sizes reflect alternative reproductive tactics (McCullough et al.,
301 2016; McCullough & Emlen, 2013). This could be the case with the European earwig (Tomkins et
302 al., 2005). In this species, males with large forceps have been suggested to be more active in
303 guarding of females, while males with small forceps are more active in sneaking into copulations
304 (Kamimura, 2014; Tomkins & Brown, 2004). Having long forceps should therefore be rewarded
305 more frequently when the encounter rate between competitors is high (Hunt & Simmons, 2001),
306 such as in high population densities. Consistent with this prediction, Tomkins & Brown (2004)
307 found that the proportion of long forceps males increased with population densities across 46
308 island and mainland sites in the UK. Another possible explanation for our results is that the
309 association between male forceps length and the six traits measured could have been masked by
310 differences in the amount of resources available to each male and/or used by each male for these
311 traits (van Noordwijk & de Jong, 1986). In our study, all males were kept under identical laboratory
312 conditions and fed *ad libitum* for three months prior to our measurement. This explanation would
313 therefore suggest that the variation in resources influencing investment decisions is determined
314 prior to field sampling, e.g. during development or early adulthood. Previous data suggest that it

315 could be the case in the European earwig. In this species, early life conditions have long-term
316 effects on the physiology and behaviour of adults (Raveh et al., 2016; Thesing et al., 2015; Wong
317 & Kölliker, 2014) and inter-individual variation in female condition can mask investment trade-off
318 between egg quantity and quality (Koch & Meunier, 2014). Overall, our findings call for future
319 studies to confirm whether males with short or long forceps have alternative reproductive tactics,
320 whether their reproductive success depends on population densities and whether early life
321 conditions can affect the likelihood to detect the association between forceps length and the six
322 traits measured. They also call for further research to quantify other potential costs of carrying
323 long forceps in this species, for example in terms of predation rates and ability to fly (Crumb &
324 Eide, 1941). These notwithstanding, our findings emphasize that forceps size is not a good
325 predictor of the six behavioural and physiological traits measured in males.

326 While we found no overall difference between short- and long-forceps males, our data
327 reveal population differences in terms of males' boldness, aggregation level and resistance to
328 starvation. Cinais had males that were generally bolder, more gregarious, as well as males with
329 long forceps that survived food deprivation less well than Valence. These effects are unlikely to
330 reflect a plastic response to the direct environment of the males tested (e.g. population
331 differences in terms of nutritional status), as they were all reared under common laboratory
332 conditions for months prior to the start of our experiments. Instead, it could reflect population
333 idiosyncrasies that have affected their development, such as climatic conditions (Valence is
334 warmer than Cinais), environmental conditions and/or exposure to phytosanitary products (e.g.
335 Valence is a cultivated orchard, whereas Cinais is an uncultivated forest edge), or population-
336 specific genetic background. In line with this hypothesis, several life history traits of the European

earwig are known to be shaped by the duration of cold during egg development, the level of warm temperatures during nymph development and, more generally, by seasonal parameters encountered by offspring during development (Coulm & Meunier, 2021; Körner et al., 2018; Tourneur & Meunier, 2020). Similarly, recent studies have shown that the European earwig can be sensitive to exposure to even low levels of pesticides, which can lead to populations specificities in terms of earwig physiology, morphology and behaviour (Fricaux et al., 2023; Le Navenant et al., 2019; Malagnoux, Capowiez, et al., 2015; Malagnoux, Marliac, et al., 2015; Mauduit et al., 2021; Meunier et al., 2020). Regardless of the nature of these population idiosyncrasies, our study shows that they do not affect the (lack of) association between forceps length and the six traits measured.

Overall, our findings questions the robustness of our understanding of forceps length diversity in terms of function, maintenance and use as a possible quality signal in the European earwig (McCullough et al., 2016). To date, our knowledge of these questions is exclusively based on laboratory experiments in which females were presented to one or two males (reviewed in Kamimura, 2014). While the results of these studies suggest that males can gain fitness benefit from growing longer forceps (Forslund, 2000, 2003; Radesäter & Halldórsdóttir, 1993; Styrsky & Rhein, 1999; Walker & Fell, 2001), they contain two important limitations. First, they considered mating success (i.e., success in gaining copulation) and not reproductive success (i.e. success in producing offspring). As these two parameters are not necessarily related (Thompson et al., 2011), it cannot be excluded that short forceps males have a similar or even higher reproductive output than their counterparts. This could be because mating is more efficient in short compared to long forceps males (Brown, 2006), or because short forceps males have alternative reproductive tactics to long forceps males (see above; Tomkins & Brown, 2004). One study used a genetic approach to

study reproductive success and found no association between male forceps length and the number of offspring sired (Sandrin et al., 2015). However, this study only focused on length variation within short forceps males. The second limitation is that all these studies have examined mating success in groups of a maximum of two males. This number is far less than the hundreds of individuals that typically constitute earwig aggregates (Meunier, 2024) and thus cannot rule out the possibility that the apparent advantage of long-forceps males in pairs or trios may disappear or even become a disadvantage under different demographic conditions (Hunt & Simmons, 2001; Oliveira et al., 2008; Tomkins & Brown, 2004). Hence, our current understanding of the relationship between forceps length and male fitness should be treated with caution in the European earwig. Our results thus call for future studies to determine the function and reliability of male forceps length under natural conditions, and the evolutionary drivers that explain the maintenance of its diversity within and between populations.

Acknowledgments

We thank Lucas Marie-Orléach for his comments on a previous version of this manuscript. We also thank Jean-Christophe Lenoir and Armand Guillermin for their help with field sampling, and the INRAE unité expérimentale Recherche Intégrée Gotheron for giving us access to their orchards for earwig field sampling. Finally, we thank the two anonymous reviewers, Luna Grey and Olivier Roux for their comments on this manuscript.

Funding

This project has been funded by the French National Research Agency (ANR-20-CE02-0002 to J.M).

Data, script and code availability

All data and R script are available online: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11469628

Conflict of interest disclosure

The authors declare that they have no financial conflict of interest with the content of this article.

J.M is a recommender for PCI Zoology.

References

Arcila, F., & Meunier, J. (2020). Friend or foe? The apparent benefits of gregarine (Apicomplexa: Sporozoa) infection in the European earwig. *International Journal for Parasitology*, *50*(6–7), 461–469. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpara.2020.01.007

Berglund, A., Bisazza, A., & Pilastro, A. (1996). Armaments and ornaments: An evolutionary explanation of traits of dual utility. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, *58*(4), 385–399. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8312.1996.tb01442.x

Briceño, R. D., & Eberhard, W. G. (1995). The functional morphology of male cerci and associated characters in 13 species of tropical earwigs (Dermaptera: Forficulidae, Labiidae, Carcinophoridae, Pygidicranidae). *Smithsonian Contributions to Zoology*, *555*, 1–63. https://doi.org/10.5479/si.00810282.555

Brown, G. S. (2006). *Sperm competition and male forceps dimorphism in the European earwig* Forficula auricularia *(Dermaptera: Forficulina)* [PhD thesis]. University of St. Andrews.

Champely, S., Ekstrom, C., Dalgaard, P., Gill, J., Weibelzahl, S., Anandkumar, A., Ford, C., Volcic, R., & Rosario, H. D. (2020). *pwr: Basic Functions for Power Analysis* (1.3-0) [Computer software]. https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/pwr/index.html

Cheutin, M.-C., Leclerc, B., & Meunier, J. (2024). With or without you: Gut microbiota does not predict aggregation behavior in European earwig females. *Behavioral Ecology*, *35*(3), arae022. https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arae022

Coulm, M., & Meunier, J. (2021). Effects of temperature, fungal infection and weight on intermoult duration and survival of starving larvae in the European earwig. *Journal of Insect Physiology*, *132*, 104262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinsphys.2021.104262

Crumb, S. E., & Eide, P. M. (1941). The European earwig. *United State Department of Agriculture. Technical Bulletin*, *766*, 1–73.

Damiens, D., Bressac, C., Brillard, J.-P., & Chevrier, C. (2002). Qualitative aspects of sperm stock in males and females from Eupelmus orientalis and Dinarmus basalis (Hymenoptera: Chalcidoidea) as revealed by dual fluorescence. *Physiological Entomology*, *27*(2), 97–102. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3032.2002.00274.x

Davies, N. B., Krebs, J. R., & West, S. A. (2012). *An introduction to behavioural ecology*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Eberhard, W. G., & Gutierrez, E. E. (1991). Male dimorphisms in beetles and earwigs and the question of developmental constraints. *Evolution*, *45*(1), 18–28. https://doi.org/10.2307/2409478

Emlen, D. J. (2001). Costs and the diversification of exaggerated animal structures. *Science*, *291*(5508), 1534–1536. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.291.5508.1534

Emlen, D. J. (2008). The evolution of animal weapons. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, *39*(1), 387–413. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.39.110707.173502

Emlen, D. J., & Nijhout, H. F. (2000). The development and evolution of exaggerated morphologies in insects. *Annual Review of Entomology*, *45*, 661–708. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ento.45.1.661

Forslund, P. (2000). Male-male competition and large size mating advantage in European earwigs, *Forficula auricularia*. *Animal Behaviour*, *59*(4), 753–762. https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.1999.1359

Forslund, P. (2003). An experimental investigation into status-dependent male dimorphism in the European earwig, *Forficula auricularia*. *Animal Behaviour*, *65*(2), 309–316. https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.2003.2046

Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. (2019). *An {R} Companion to Applied Regression.* Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Fricaux, T., Le Navenant, A., Siegwart, M., Rault, M., Coustau, C., & Le Goff, G. (2023). The molecular resistance mechanisms of European earwigs from apple orchards subjected to different management strategies. *Insects*, *14*(12), 944. https://doi.org/10.3390/insects14120944

Goldberg, D. L., Landy, J. A., Travis, J., Springer, M. S., & Reznick, D. N. (2019). In love and war: The morphometric and phylogenetic basis of ornamentation, and the evolution of male display behavior, in the livebearer genus *Poecilia*. *Evolution*, *73*(2), 360–377. https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.13671

González-Miguéns, R., Muñoz-Nozal, E., Jiménez-Ruiz, Y., Mas-Peinado, P., Ghanavi, H. R., & García-París, M. (2020). Speciation patterns in the *Forficula auricularia* species complex: Cryptic and not so cryptic taxa across the western Palaearctic region. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society*, *190*(3), 788–823. https://doi.org/10.1093/zoolinnean/zlaa070

Grether, G. F. (1997). Survival cost of an intrasexually selected ornament in a damselfly. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, *264*(1379), 207–210. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1997.0029

Günther, K., & Herter, K. (1974). Dermaptera (Ohrwürmer). In J. G. Helmcke, D. Starck, & H. Wermuth (Eds.), *Handbuch der Zoologie*.

Hartig, F. (2020). *DHARMa: Residual diagnostic for hierarchical (Multi-level / mixed) regression models.* (p. v 0.3.3.0). http://florianhartig.github.io/DHARMa/

Honorio, R., Moreau, S., Lécureuil, C., & Meunier, J. (2023). Cadmium does not affect post-hatching maternal care or early offspring development in earwigs. *Behavioral Ecology*, *34*(3), 399–407. https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arad011

Hunt, J., & Simmons, L. W. (2001). Status-dependent selection in the dimorphic beetle *Onthophagus taurus*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, *268*(1484), 2409–2414. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2001.1758

Jackman, S., Tahk, A., Zeileis, A., Maimone, C., Fearon, J., & Meers, Z. (2024). *pscl: Political Science Computational Laboratory* (1.5.9) [Computer software]. https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/pscl/index.html

Kamimura, Y. (2014). Pre- and postcopulatory sexual selection and the evolution of sexually dimorphic traits in earwigs (Dermaptera). *Entomological Science*, *17*(2), 139–166. https://doi.org/10.1111/ens.12058

Koch, L. K., & Meunier, J. (2014). Mother and offspring fitness in an insect with maternal care: Phenotypic trade-offs between egg number, egg mass and egg care. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, *14*(1), 125. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2148-14-125

Kohlmeier, P., Holländer, K., & Meunier, J. (2016). Survival after pathogen exposure in group-living insects: Don't forget the stress of social isolation! *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, *29*(9), 1867–1872. https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.12916

Körner, M., Foitzik, S., & Meunier, J. (2018). Extended winters entail long-term costs for insect offspring reared in an overwinter burrow. *Journal of Thermal Biology*, *74*, 116–122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtherbio.2018.03.021

Körner, M., Vogelweith, F., Foitzik, S., & Meunier, J. (2017). Condition-dependent trade-off between weapon size and immunity in males of the European earwig. *Scientific Reports*, *7*(1), 7988. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-08339-6

Kramer, J., Thesing, J., & Meunier, J. (2015). Negative association between parental care and sibling cooperation in earwigs: A new perspective on the early evolution of family life? *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, *28*(7), 1299–1308. https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.12655

Le Navenant, A., Siegwart, M., Maugin, S., Capowiez, Y., & Rault, M. (2019). Metabolic mechanisms and acetylcholinesterase sensitivity involved in tolerance to chlorpyrifos-ethyl in the earwig *Forficula auricularia*. *Chemosphere*, *227*, 416–424. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2019.04.065

Lenth, R. V. (2022). *Emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means. R package version 1.7.2. Https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=emmeans* [Computer software]. https://cran.r-project.org/package=emmeans

Malagnoux, L., Capowiez, Y., & Rault, M. (2015). Impact of insecticide exposure on the predation activity of the European earwig *Forficula auricularia*. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *22*(18), 14116–14126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-015-4520-9

Malagnoux, L., Marliac, G., Simon, S., Rault, M., & Capowiez, Y. (2015). Management strategies in apple orchards influence earwig community. *Chemosphere*, *124*(1), 156–162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2014.12.024

Mauduit, E., Lécureuil, C., & Meunier, J. (2021). Sublethal exposure to deltamethrin stimulates reproduction and has limited effects on post-hatching maternal care in the European earwig. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *28*(29), 39501–39512. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-13511-7

McCullough, E. L., & Emlen, D. J. (2013). Evaluating the costs of a sexually selected weapon: Big horns at a small price. *Animal Behaviour*, *86*(5), 977–985. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.08.017

McCullough, E. L., Miller, C. W., & Emlen, D. J. (2016). Why sexually selected weapons are not ornaments. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *31*(10), 742–751. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2016.07.004

McCullough, E. L., & Tobalske, B. W. (2013). Elaborate horns in a giant rhinoceros beetle incur negligible aerodynamic costs. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *280*(1758), 20130197. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.0197

Merleau, L.-A., Larrigaldie, I., Bousquet, O., Devers, S., Keller, M., Lécureuil, C., & Meunier, J. (2022). Exposure to pyriproxyfen (juvenile hormone agonist) does not alter maternal care and reproduction in the European earwig. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *29*(48), 72729–72746. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-20970-z

Meunier, J. (2024). The biology and social life of earwigs (Dermaptera). *Annual Review of Entomology*, *69*, 259–276. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-013023015632

Meunier, J., Dufour, J., Van Meyel, S., Rault, M., & Lécureuil, C. (2020). Sublethal exposure to deltamethrin impairs maternal egg care in the European earwig *Forficula auricularia*. *Chemosphere*, *258*, 127383. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2020.127383

Mills, M. R., Nemri, R. S., Carlson, E. A., Wilde, W., Gotoh, H., Lavine, L. C., & Swanson, B. O. (2016). Functional mechanics of beetle mandibles: Honest signaling in a sexually selected system. *Journal of Experimental Zoology Part A: Ecological Genetics and Physiology*, *325*(1), 3–12. https://doi.org/10.1002/jez.1961

Moore, A. J., & Wilson, P. (1993). The evolution of sexually dimorphic earwig forceps: Social interactions among adults of the toothed earwig, *Vostox apicedentatus*. *Behavioral Ecology*, *4*(1), 40–48. https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/4.1.40

Newbolt, C. H., Acker, P. K., Neuman, T. J., Hoffman, S. I., Ditchkoff, S. S., & Steury, T. D. (2017). Factors influencing reproductive success in male white-tailed deer: Male breeding success in deer. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, *81*(2), 206–217. https://doi.org/10.1002/jwmg.21191

Oliveira, R. F., Taborsky, M., & Brockmann, H. J. (2008). *Alternative reproductive tactics: An integrative approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Otte, D., & Stayman, B. (1979). Beetle horns: Some patterns in functional morphology. In M. Blum & N. Blum (Eds.), *Sexual selection and reproductive competition in insects* (Academic Press, pp. 259–292).

Oufiero, C. E., & Garland, T. (2007). Evaluating performance costs of sexually selected traits. *Functional Ecology*, *21*(4), 676–689. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2007.01259.x

Pena, R. C., & Levinton, J. (2021). Two species of fiddler crab show no cost of bearing a sexually selected giant claw in predator escape behaviors. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, *541*, 151570. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2021.151570

Preston, B. T., Jalme, M. S., Hingrat, Y., Lacroix, F., & Sorci, G. (2011). Sexually extravagant males age more rapidly: Sexually extravagant males age rapidly. *Ecology Letters*, *14*(10), 1017–1024. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01668.x

Qiu, W., Chavarro, J., Lazarus, R., Rosner, B., & Ma, J. (2021). *powerSurvEpi: Power and Sample Size Calculation for Survival Analysis of Epidemiological Studies* (0.1.3) [Computer software]. https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/powerSurvEpi/index.html

Radesäter, T., & Halldórsdóttir, H. (1993). Two male types of the Common earwig: Male-male competition and mating success. *Ethology*, *95*(2), 89–96. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0310.1993.tb00460.x

Rantala, M. J., Roff, D. a, & Rantala, L. M. (2007). Forceps size and immune function in the earwig *Forficula auricularia* L. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, *36*, 331–332. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8312.2007.00741.x

Raveh, S., Vogt, D., & Kölliker, M. (2016). Maternal programming of offspring in relation to food availability in an insect (*Forficula auricularia*). *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, *283*(1828), 20152936. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.2936

Sandrin, L., Meunier, J., Raveh, S., Walser, J.-C., & Kölliker, M. (2015). Multiple paternity and mating group size in the European earwig, *Forficula auricularia*. *Ecological Entomology*, *40*(2), 159–166. https://doi.org/10.1111/een.12171

Schneider, C. A., Rasband, W. S., & Eliceiri, K. W. (2012). NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of image analysis. *Nature Methods*, *9*(7), 671–675. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2089

Shuker, D. M., & Simmons, L. W. (2014). *The evolution of insect mating systems*. Oxford University Press.

Somjee, U., Woods, H. A., Duell, M., & Miller, C. W. (2018). The hidden cost of sexually selected traits: The metabolic expense of maintaining a sexually selected weapon. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *285*(1891), 20181685. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.1685

Styrsky, J. D., & Rhein, S. V. (1999). Forceps size does not determine fighting success in European earwigs. *Journal of Insect Behavior*, *12*(4), 475–482.

Swallow, J., & Husak, J. (2011). Compensatory traits and the evolution of male ornaments. *Behaviour*, *148*(1), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1163/000579510X541265

Therneau, T. M. (2020). *A Package for Survival Analysis in R* [Computer software]. https://cran.r-project.org/package=survival

Thesing, J., Kramer, J., Koch, L. K., & Meunier, J. (2015). Short-term benefits, but transgenerational costs of maternal loss in an insect with facultative maternal care. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, *282*(1817), 20151617. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.1617

Thompson, D. J., Hassall, C., Lowe, C. D., & Watts, P. C. (2011). Field estimates of reproductive success in a model insect: Behavioural surrogates are poor predictors of fitness. *Ecology Letters*, *14*(9), 905–913. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01655.x

Tomkins, J. L., & Brown, G. S. (2004). Population density drives the local evolution of a threshold dimorphism. *Nature*, *431*, 1099–1103. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02936.1.

Tomkins, J. L., Kotiaho, J. S., & LeBas, N. R. (2005). Matters of scale: Positive allometry and the evolution of male dimorphisms. *American Naturalist*, *165*(3), 389–402. https://doi.org/10.1086/427732

Tourneur, J.-C., & Meunier, J. (2020). Variations in seasonal (not mean) temperatures drive rapid adaptations to novel environments at a continent scale. *Ecology*, *101*(4), e02973. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.2973

Tullis, A., & Straube, C. H. T. (2017). The metabolic cost of carrying a sexually selected trait in the male fiddler crab *Uca pugilator*. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, *220*, 3641–3648. https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.163816

Van Meyel, S., & Meunier, J. (2022). Costs and benefits of isolation from siblings during family life in adult earwigs. *Animal Behaviour*, *193*, 91–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2022.09.003

van Noordwijk, A. J., & de Jong, G. (1986). Acquisition and allocation of resources: Their influence on variation in life history tactics. *The American Naturalist*, *128*(1), 137–142.

Vogelweith, F., Foitzik, S., & Meunier, J. (2017). Age, sex, mating status, but not social isolation interact to shape basal immunity in a group-living insect. *Journal of Insect Physiology*, *103*, 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinsphys.2017.10.007

Walker, K. A., & Fell, R. D. (2001). Courtship roles of male and female European earwigs, *Forficula auricularia* L. (Dermaptera: Forficulidae), and sexual use of forceps. *Journal of Insect Behavior*, *14*(1), 1–17.

Wilkinson, G. S., Kahler, H., & Baker, R. H. (1998). Evolution of female mating preferences in stalk-eyed flies. *Behavioral Ecology*, *9*(5), 525–533. https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/9.5.525

Wong, J. W. Y., & Kölliker, M. (2014). Effects of food restriction across stages of juvenile and early adult development on body weight, survival and adult life history. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, *27*(11), 2420–2430. https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.12484

605 **Table 1** – Effects of male forceps length and population of origin of the three physiological and

606 three behaviours measured in this study. Significant p-values are in bold.

607

	Population of origin	Forceps length	Interaction	Statistical power
Locomotor performance	$F_{1,115} = 0.21$ P = 0.648	$F_{1,115} = 1.14$ P = 0.287	$F_{1,115} = 1.25$ P = 0.265	0.241
Likelihood of fleeing away after a physical disturbance	LR $\chi^2_1 = 8.74$ P = **0.003**	LR $\chi^2_1 = 1.06$ P = 0.303	LR $\chi^2_1 = 0.57$ P = 0.450	0.239
Aggregation score	$F_{1,88} = 3.83$ P = **0.054**	$F_{1,88} = 0.004$ P = 0.948	$F_{1,88} = 0.02$ P = 0.878	0.347
Survival rate under harsh environmental conditions	LR $\chi^2_1 = 7.88$ P = **0.005**	LR $\chi^2_1 = 0.02$ P = 0.885	LR $\chi^2_1 = 4.22$ P = **0.039**	0.447
Sperm count	$F_{1,35} = 0.42$ P = 0.522	$F_{1,35} = 0.19$ P = 0.667	$F_{1,35} = 0.75$ P = 0.391	0.155
Survival rate after infection	LR $\chi^2_1 = 0.02$ P = 0.891	LR $\chi^2_1 = 0.15$ P = 0.695	LR $\chi^2_1 = 0.46$ P = 0.496	0.432

608

609 **Figure 1** – Timeline of the experimental design and evolution of sample size over the course of the

610 experiment. The observed decrease in sample size over time reflects their mortality during

611 isolation and in the absence of any food source. Males are distributed according to their forceps

612 length category and population of origin.



		D0 Isolation	D5 Locomotor performance	D10 Response to disturbance	D24 Aggregation	D31 Sperm count	D31 Survival to infection
Long forceps	Cinais	N=30	30	30	18	9	8
	Valence	N=30	29	29	28	10	18
Short forceps	Cinais	N=30	30	30	22	10	12
	Valence	N=30	30	30	24	10	14

613

614 **Figure 2** – Forceps length distribution of the 120 selected males with short (orange) and long (blue)

615 forceps in Cinais (A) and Valence (B) populations. Dashed lines show the mean values per forceps

616 category for each population.



617

618 **Figure 3** – Association between forceps length and male (A) locomotor performance, (B) likelihood

619 of fleeing after a physical disturbance, (C) propensity to aggregate with conspecifics, (D) likelihood

620 of being alive after 31 days in social isolation and without food access, (E) sperm storage in the

621 vesicle and (F) survival rate after pathogen infection. Different letters *P* <0.05.



622