The payoffs and tradeoffs of hygienic behavior: A large-scale field study on a local population of honey bees.

Rya Seltzer^{1,2}, Paz Kahanov^{1,3}, Yosef Kamer¹, Amots Hetzroni¹, Małgorzata Bieńkowska⁴, Abraham Hefetz^{2,5}, and Victoria Soroker¹.

¹ Agricultural Research Organization, The Volcani Center, Rishon LeZion, Israel.

² School of Zoology, George S. Wise Faculty of Life Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Ramat Aviv, Israel.

³ The Mina and Everard Goodman Faculty of Life Sciences, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel.

⁴ Research Institute of Horticulture in Skierniewice, Apiculture Division, 24-100 Pulawy, Poland.

⁵ Faculty of Marine Sciences, Ruppin Academic Center, Mikhmoret, Israel.

Abstract

Honey bees (*Apis mellifera*) are exposed to a variety of risk factors, but the ectoparasitic mite *Varroa destructor* and its associated viruses are considered to be the most significant problem worldwide. It has been widely recognized that honey bee stocks resistant to the mites are an essential part of any sustainable long-term management of *Varroa*. The aim of this study was to evaluate the efficacy of hygienic behavior in a local population of honey bees in order to reduce *Varroa* infestation. A bi-directional selection for high and low rates of hygienic behavior was carried out in Israel using either queen artificially inseminated or naturally mated. Colonies were screened for performance: population size, honey production, control of *Varroa* infestation, and the level of hygienic behavior. Furthermore, we examined the costs and benefits of selection using measurements of colony performance. Either way, selected lines should be tested for trade-offs and benefits to ensure their productivity. The selection process revealed that the trait is heritable. Maternal phenotype has a significant effect on *Varroa* load, as colonies founded by hygienic daughter queens showed a significantly lower parasite load. No major trade-offs were found between

the rate of hygienic behavior, honey yield, and population size. Measuring the direct benefits of hygienic behavior through colony performance suggests that breeding for this trait makes bees more resistant to *Varroa destructor*. These results are promising for our successful local bee breeding programs in a Mediterranean climate.

Keywords: *Apis mellifera*/ breeding/ *Varroa* mite/ integrated pest management/ honey production

Introduction

The Western honey bee, *Apis mellifera*, is the main pollinator of agricultural crops globally (Delaplane and Mayer 2000; Klein et al. 2007; Dolezal et al. 2016). Over time, honey bee colonies have been selected for commercially important traits such as productivity (i.e., honey yields), colony strength, low swarming, and gentle temperament. High colony losses in the last two decades have raised awareness of declining honey bee health and scientific efforts to determine and mitigate the causes of colony loss have been initiated (VanEngelsdorp and Meixner 2010; www.coloss.org). Although honey bees are exposed to a variety of risk factors, infestation by the ecto-parasitic mite, *Varroa destructor*, is considered to be the most significant health problem of *A. mellifera* worldwide (Genersch et al. 2010; Plettner et al. 2016). The *Varroa* mite is a highly specialized parasite on pupae and adult honey bees, feeding on their fat body (Ramsey et al. 2019). Beside its direct harm to the bees, it transmits about 18 different pathogenic viruses that are practically “injected” into the bees during mite's feeding. (Rosenkranz et al., 2010). These viruses weaken the bees, and cripple them, as in case of deformed wing virus (DWV) (Francis et al. 2013; Mondet et al. 2014; Zioni et al. 2011), as well as causing immunosuppression

(Gregory et al. 2005; Ryabov et al. 2014; Zanni et al. 2017) and learning disabilities (Rosenkranz et al., 2010). The devastating impact of these viruses is further synergized by various agrochemicals (Simon-Delso et al. 2014; Steinhauer et al., 2018; Yang and Cox-Foster 2005).

In order to fight this parasite, beekeepers have used a variety of mite control methods, none of which proved fully satisfactory (Soroker et al., 2018). Moreover, the extensive use of synthetic acaricides, especially in large beekeeping operations, may leave residues that are toxic to bees and the consumers of hive products (Mullin et al. 2010). Furthermore, over time the mites develop resistance to all synthetic acaricides available on the market, which renders its control critical (Sammataro et al. 2005; Rosenkranz et al. 2010). For example in Israel, following years of successful use of Fluvalinate and Coumaphos for mite control, their efficacy diminished and these products are no longer in use (Afik, Ministry of Agriculture Extension Services, personal communication). As an alternative, local Amitraz-based products are currently used, but their efficacy against *Varroa* is declining (Zarchi, Ministry of Agriculture Extension Services, personal communication). This situation necessitates the development of a sustainable strategy for *Varroa* management that integrates a number of approaches. Development of mite resistant honey bee stocks is widely recognized as an essential part of any sustainable integrated *Varroa* management (Dietemann et al. 2012; Sammataro and Avitabile 2011; Spivak and Gilliam 1998).

Social insects, including honey bees, display natural resistance mechanisms against pests and pathogens, which involve both physiological and behavioral traits (Evans and Spivak 2010). While *Varroa* infestation typically leads to colony failure within one to two years (Rosenkranz et al. 2010), some colonies of *Apis mellifera* from different parts of the world survive without being chemically treated (Büchler et

77 al. 2010). Although the mechanisms leading to such resistance are not entirely clear,
 78 behavioral traits are likely to play a role in these naturally resistant genotypes (Locke
 79 2016). Several stocks of honey bees have been selectively bred for resistance to
 80 *Varroa* by phenotypic selection. The most prominent of these stocks in the USA are
 81 the Minnesota Hygienic Bees (Spivak and Euter 2001), the USDA-bred “Russian”
 82 bees (Rinderer et al. 2001), and the Varroa-Sensitive Hygiene (VSH) stock that was
 83 recently transitioned into the “Pol” line (Danka et al. 2016). Breeding efforts
 84 elsewhere include, but are not limited to, breeding program in Canada (Guarna et al.
 85 2015), selection programs in Germany (Gempe et al. 2016), France (Le Conte et al.
 86 2011) as well as in other countries as recently reviewed by Le Conte et al. (2020).

87 Most of the above programs relied on the improvement of brood-targeted
 88 hygienic behavior, the impact of which has been extensively investigated (Leclercq et
 89 al. 2017). It has been described as a complex behavior involving the detection,
 90 uncapping, and removal of damaged brood (Spivak and Gilliam 1998). In case of
 91 *Varroa* infestation, this behavior apparently interferes with the reproduction of the
 92 mite (Arathi and Spivak 2001; Zakar et al. 2014). Between-generation, comparisons
 93 of hygienic behavior performance demonstrated a significant genetic component for
 94 this behavior (Scannapieco et al. 2017;). In addition, several studies reported that the
 95 value of hygienic behavior heritability is as high as 0.65 (Boecking et al. 2000; Oxley
 96 and Oldroyd 2010).

97 Research that compared performance of local and imported honey bees
 98 indicated that breeding programs should rely on local populations, which are already
 99 adapted to the immediate environment. Such local breeding efforts may prevent
 100 diseases from spreading among populations while preserving global genetic diversity
 101 (Büchler et al. 2014; Meixner et al. 2014; Uzunov et al. 2014). This is a strong

102 argument against the exportation of queens from all over the world. Moreover,
 103 practical success of a local breeding program must take into account possible
 104 tradeoffs with other commercially desired traits, e.g., productivity, colony strength,
 105 and gentle temperament. These may affect acceptance of selected resistant lines by
 106 beekeepers (Uzunov et al. 2017; Leclercq et al. 2017). Trade-offs and benefits
 107 between traits could be the result of pleiotropy, linkage between traits, or a genetic
 108 correlation resulting from the selection on specific individuals which carry several
 109 unrelated traits. While beekeepers often advocate importing superior stocks, a recent
 110 multinational study showed that local stocks display significant advantages over
 111 imported ones (Uzunov et al. 2014; Büchler et al. 2010; Niño and Cameron Jasper
 112 2015, and Uzunov and Brascamp 2017).

113 More than 50 years ago in Israel, the local honey bee race *A. mellifera syriaca*
 114 was actively displaced by *A. mellifera ligustica* that was also mixed over the years
 115 with other races mainly, *A. mellifera caucasica* and Buckfast (Soroker et al. 2018).
 116 However, we believe that over time the majority of the population had gradually
 117 adapted to the local conditions of the region. This environment is characterized by hot
 118 dry summers and cold rainy winters with a tendency towards drought years where the
 119 colony loss occurs mostly in the summer. *Varroa* infestation further exacerbates
 120 summer colony loss in Israel, where a 10-15% loss was recorded in the last decade
 121 due to extreme dry and hot weather conditions (V. Soroker, unpublished data). We
 122 therefore assume that in the Mediterranean region, social immunity against the
 123 *Varroa* mite expressed as hygienic behavior is most crucial when forage is scarce and
 124 the population size is in decline.

125 The aim of this study was to screen the local honey bees in Israel for the level
 126 of hygienic behavior and to evaluate its impact on *Varroa* infestation. While most

breeding programs are carried out in Europe and North America (Doke et al. 2015), our experimental program took place in Israel's Mediterranean climate. In order to quantify the apicultural costs and the benefits of the trait as well as the commercial applicability of selected lines under the conditions of obligatory regular chemical treatment against *Varroa*, we conducted bidirectional selection for high and low hygienic behavior.

Materials & Methods

The study was conducted at the breeding apiary of the Volcani Center, Agricultural Research Organization (ARO), Israel comprising local bee colonies that had been previously selected for honey yield. The colonies had not received any queens from an alien source since 2008. During 2012-2017, we performed a bi-directional selection program based on queens reared from genetically unrelated colonies that exhibited high or low hygienic phenotype. All selected colonies, regardless of their hygienic performance, had honey production that was above average. Each year, six to ten naturally-mated queens were selected based on their maternal lines (high and low), according to the rate of hygienic behavior and honey production of their colony. Ten to 15 colonies were established for each maternal line. In addition, in 2016 and 2017, artificially inseminated queens with sperm from 8-10 drones from either high or low source colonies were used. The daughters of these queens were naturally mated and used to establish new colonies that were assessed as described below.

The colonies and their subsequent generations in this project were distributed within the apiary area and were assessed for honey yield, hygienic behavior, and colony size. Colonies in which the queen superseded were excluded from analyses. In total, this project included 437 colonies over the years, of which 112 were assessed

151 for *Varroa* infestation (see Table 1). We built a data base containing the pedigree and
 152 all the hive assessment data including their maternal phenotype (high or low hygienic
 153 behavior) from 2012-2017. To prevent heavy loss, we treated all the colonies twice a
 154 year against *Varroa* mite with Amitraz loaded strips (Galbitraz), in accordance with
 155 guidelines from the Ministry of Agriculture Extension Service, first during July-
 156 August and the second time during November-December.

157 Table 1: Summary of the types of colonies assessed throughout the study by year, according to
 158 their maternal lines and mating techniques.

Year	Maternal phenotype (number of maternal lines)	Maternal mating techniques	N of colonies tested for honey yield and hygienic behaviour	Seasonal assessments (number per season)	Varroa assessments
2012	general population (14)	naturally-mated	69	beginning, middle, and end (once a season)	_____
2013	general population (9)	naturally-mated	50	beginning, middle, and end (once a season)	_____
2014	general population(1), high (4)and low(2) hygienic behavior	naturally-mated	73	beginning, middle, and end (three times in the season)	April until end of July (25 colonies)
2015	general population (1), high (2)and low (2) hygienic behavior	naturally-mated	98	beginning, and middle (once a season)	April until end of July (16 colonies)
2016	high (3) and low (2) hygienic behavior	naturally-mated and artificially inseminated	69	beginning, middle, and end (once a season)	April until end of July (37 colonies)
2017	high (4) and low (1) hygienic behavior	naturally-mated and artificially inseminated	73	beginning (once a season)	April until end of July (34 colonies)

Population size and hygienic behavior were evaluated three times a year according to colony development and seasons. The early season occurs after winter *Varroa* treatment. In our local conditions, this period is typified in by an exponential increase in hive population and nectar flow, and takes place during the end of February until mid-March. The second assessment is referred to as the mid-season, and it occurs just after the spring honey harvest during May and June. The third assessment is referred to as the late season, and it takes place following summer honey extraction and prior to the second *Varroa* treatment during July and August. This period is characterized by a population decline, which remains at a low level until after rain has fallen and some flowering has occurred in October. In 2015, hygienic behavior was evaluated three times in each season, in other words, nine times a year for each colony. This was performed in order to determine the seasonal effect on hygienic behavior.

Population size was estimated by measuring the sealed brood area by counting the number of decimeters containing pupae in each of the frames, according to Büchler et al. (2013).

Hygienic behavior was measured using the “pin test” involving 100 cells containing red eye pupae (Spivak and Gilliam 1998) as described in detail in Beebook (Büchler et al. 2013). This entailed marking 100 cells and piercing them with an entomological pin #2. The proportion of uncapped and cleaned cells (brood removal) was calculated by comparing pictures taken immediately after pinning, and 24 hours thereafter. The proportions of uncapped and cleaned cells per colony was the basis for the bi-directional selection for high and low hygienic behavior. Selection, however, was based on uncapping behavior only, which was better distributed within the time frame of the test. Consistently, extreme colonies were selected to establish the next generation. Throughout, high hygienic colonies were defined if more than 75%

185 uncapping occurred, and low hygienic colonies were defined if less than 45%
186 uncapping occurred, of all pinned brood cells after 24 hours in three independent
187 tests.

188 Honey yield was assessed by weighing honey supers in the spring and summer, while
189 subtracting ten kilograms, the weight of an empty super.

190 Varroa infestation was measured weekly, during April and July for four out of the six
191 years of this experiment. In total, we measured infestation in 25 colonies in 2014; 16
192 colonies in 2015; 37 colonies in 2016; and 34 colonies in 2017, using the method of
193 free-falling *Varroa* on a bottom tray (Dietemann et al. 2013). These colonies were all
194 located in one area of the apiary, and they represented similarly high and low hygienic
195 lines. Hives were placed on a 0.5 x 0.5 cm. screen board floor, and an oiled metal tray
196 was placed under it to record *Varroa* mites that die and/or fall to the bottom within 24
197 hours. For each colony, the number of mites caught on the trays after 24 hours served
198 as a measure of infestation level. The rate of increase in *Varroa* load over time was
199 estimated and the *Varroa* parasite load (measured as parasite x days) was calculated
200 based on the area under the curve, as a function of time from the first measurement. In
201 particular we calculated the value for each adjacent time points based on the formula
202 for trapeze area (S) calculation, when one of the trapeze bases is *Varroa* number at
203 time t and the other base is its value at t+1, while the height of the trapeze is the time
204 between the measurements in days. We subsequently summed all the S values to
205 calculate the *Varroa* load over the entire period.

206 Statistical analysis was performed on seasonal and annual measurements of several
207 dependent variables for the same colony. These measurements were taken throughout
208 the year and analyzed in a compatible model. We analyzed how the selection process
209 affected hygienic behavior of the progeny using a three-way ANOVA with repeated

210 measurements. For this, we took into consideration the following variables: maternal
 211 mating type, maternal phenotype, assessment season, and all their interactions. The
 212 variables were: seasonal measurements of hygienic behavior (proportions of
 213 uncapping and cleaning) and colony size (sealed brood area). The fixed effects
 214 analyzed were mating type, maternal phenotype, assessment season and all their
 215 interactions. Random effects were year of testing and colony number nested within
 216 mating type and maternal phenotype. Significant main effects were examined by the
 217 Tukey HSD test. A two-way ANOVA model was applied for annual measurements of
 218 spring, summer, annual honey yield, and *Varroa* infestation. The fixed effects that
 219 were analyzed were maternal phenotype, year of testing and their interactions.
 220 Pairwise association between hygienic behavior (uncapping and cleaning) and honey
 221 yield were tested by Pearson Correlation. Significance was set at $\alpha=0.05$. All
 222 statistical tests were carried out using the JMP 14 Statistical Program (SAS, USA).

Results

We tested the relationship between uncapping and cleaning behaviors. Figure 1 represents the data assembled over the five years of the study. We found a significant and highly positive correlation between the two components of hygienic behavior: uncapping and cleaning (Pearson, $r = 0.87$, $p < 0.0001$). Still, the very high rate of uncapping was not always followed by the high rate of cleaning.

Fig. 1: The correlation between the rates of uncapping and cleaning behavior along the tested years. Each dot indicates a hygienic test, and r and p are values of Pearson correlation.

Colony size as assessed by sealed-brood area was affected by the maternal phenotype ($F_{(1,4)} = 4.4$, $p = 0.03$). Progeny of low hygienic colonies had more sealed brood on average (39.4 ± 5.3 dm ($\pm$ SE)) than progeny of high hygienic colonies (36.6 ± 5.2 dm ($\pm$ SE)). Maternal mating type did not have a significant effect on sealed-brood area ($F_{(1,14)} = 0.09$, $p = 0.75$).

However, as expected, there was a significant effect of seasonality on colony population size ($F_{(2,662)} = 559$, $p < 0.0001$, Fig. 2). In early season the average sealed brood area was 46 ± 3.6 dm ($\pm$ SE); in mid-season it was almost the same with an

average of 47.2 ± 3.7 dm ($\pm$ SE); in late season, however, it dropped significantly to an average 24.5 ± 3.7 dm ($\pm$ SE). Despite these seasonal fluctuations in population size, we found no significant effect of seasonality on uncapping: ($F_{(2,836)} = 1, p = 0.34$, Fig.2). Cleaning behavior was significantly higher in mid-season (0.57 ± 0.03 ($\pm$ SE)) compared to late season (0.52 ± 0.03 ($\pm$ SE)) ($F_{(2,836)} = 1.05, p = 0.01$, Fig.2).

Fig. 2: Seasonal changes in sealed brood area and in rate of hygienic behavior. The bars represent sealed brood area (average $\pm$ SE) and lines represent hygienic behavior: proportion of uncapping (solid line) or cleaning (dashed line) at different times of the year. The values of average rate of seasonal performances are presented in parentheses. The x-axis represents time of assessment relative to the honeybee season: early season, mid-season, and late season. Significant differences between the seasonal measurements (population size and hygienic behavior) are labeled by different letters (post-hoc Tukey's HSD, $p < 0.05$). The average seasonal performance is presented in parentheses.

The selection according to the maternal phenotype was successful (Table 2). Throughout the duration of the research, the high hygienic progeny colonies had significantly higher levels of both uncapping and cleaning behaviors compared to the

259 low hygienic progeny colonies (high and low respectively, for uncapping 0.8 ± 0.01 vs.
260 0.6 ± 0.01 (mean $\pm$ SE) $p < 0.0001$, and for cleaning 0.6 ± 0.03 and 0.4 ± 0.03 (mean $\pm$ SE)

	Response
--	----------

261 $p < 0.0001$). The maternal mating type had a significant effect on the cleaning
262 behavior, but not on the uncapping behavior (Table 2). In progeny that were tested for
263 two generations, there was a significant interaction between the maternal phenotype
264 and mating type for both uncapping and cleaning (Table 2), accentuating the
265 differences between the high and low selection lines. Progeny of high hygienic queens
266 that were artificially inseminated had average uncapping behavior of 0.75 ± 0.04 and
267 average cleaning behavior of 0.59 ± 0.04 . By comparison, progeny of low hygienic
268 queens that were artificially inseminated had an average uncapping behavior of
269 0.4 ± 0.03 and average cleaning behavior of 0.26 ± 0.04 . On the other hand, for the
270 progeny of the naturally-mated queens, the difference between the two phenotypes
271 were more moderate. Progeny of the naturally-mated high hygienic queens had an
272 average of uncapping and cleaning behaviors of 0.77 ± 0.04 of 0.62 ± 0.02 , respectively.
273 Progeny of naturally-mated low hygienic queens seem to have lost their low parental
274 phenotype and showed an average of 0.70 ± 0.03 and 0.55 ± 0.02 uncapping and
275 cleaning behaviors, respectively. Regarding the random variables, colony identity
276 was the only parameter that was significant in our model (uncapping: $F_{(261,477)} = 2.66$,
277 $p < 0.0001$ and cleaning: $F_{(261,477)} = 2.2$, $p < 0.0001$ (Table 2)).

278

Variables	Proportion of uncapped cells	Proportion of cleaned cells
Maternal phenotype	$F_{(1,7)}=35$, $p < 0.0001^*$	$F_{(1,7)}=36$, $p < 0.0001^*$
Maternal mating type	$F_{(1,7)}=35$, $p = 0.95$	$F_{(1,16)}=5$, $p = 0.02^*$
Maternal phenotype x Maternal mating type	$F_{(1,7)}=5.8$, $p < 0.0001^*$	$F_{(1,7)}=8.8$, $p = 0.003^*$
Colony (Random)	$F_{(261,477)}=2.66$, $p = 0.0001^*$	$F_{(261,477)}=2.2$, $p < 0.0001^*$
Year (Random)	$F_{(3,14)}=1.37$, $p = 0.29$	$F_{(3,17)}=2.18$, $p = 0.12$

Table 2: The effect of maternal phenotype (high or low hygienic behavior), maternal mating type (naturally-mated or artificially inseminated), and the interaction among them on hygienic parameters (cell uncapping and cell cleaning). Significant differences in two-way ANOVA among tested groups are marked by an asterisk (colony identity and the year of measurement were taken into consideration in our model as random effects).

Varroa infestation: The parasite seasonal load was assessed using the *Varroa-days* formula, which calculates the level of infestation throughout the tested period. Maternal phenotype had a significant effect on parasite load ($F_{(1,120)}=123$, $p = 0.0007$). We found the value of this variable to be significantly lower in high hygienic colonies derived from a high hygienic maternal source (1305 ± 283) compared to the low hygienic colonies (2858 ± 275). The year of testing had also a significant effect on *Varroa* infestation ($F_{(3,120)}=23.4$, $p < 0.0001$). The extreme fluctuation in *Varroa* infestation was exemplified between the years 2016 and 2015. In 2016, we had the lowest *Varroa* infestation, with an average of 477 ± 333 per colony. Conversely, the maximum infestation was measured in 2015, with an average of 5005 ± 453 .

295 The interaction between maternal phenotype and the year was also found to be
296 significant ($F_{(3,120)}=2.7$, $p = 0.047$). We found that in the years with heavy *Varroa*

297 infestation, maternal phenotype had a significant effect (in 2014, $F_{(1,120)}=11.4$, $p =$
298 0.001 and in 2015, $F_{(1,120)}=4.6$, $p = 0.033$, Fig. 3). Obviously in years with low
299 *Varroa* infestation, the secondary effect of maternal phenotype did not have a
300 significant Impact on the parasite load (in 2016, $F_{(1,120)}=0.0031$, $p = 0.95$ and in
301 2017, $F_{(1,120)}=0.9$, $p = 0.34$, Fig. 3).

302 Fig 3: Differences in *Varroa* infestation between high and low hygienic maternal lines during four
303 years of testing. *Varroa* infestation is presented in high hygienic (white bar) and low hygienic
304 (black bar) progeny. The data are: average $\pm$ SE. The asterisks indicate significant differences in
305 *Varroa* load between the two groups (post-hoc Tukey's HSD, $p < 0.05$).

306

307 Honey production: A two-way ANOVA analysis of honey yield was
308 performed in order to determine the benefits and identify possible tradeoffs of the
309 selected lines. No significant effect of maternal phenotype was found on honey yields
310 in both seasons (Table 3). In particularly, spring honey yields averaged $\pm$ SE: 21.3
311 ± 3.6 kg for high hygienic maternal lines and 21.5 ± 3.6 kg for low hygienic lines;
312 summer honey yields averaged: 14.4 ± 2.3 kg for high hygienic maternal lines and

13.8±2.3 kg for low hygienic lines. Annual honey yields averaged 35.2±3.5 kg for high hygienic maternal lines and 34.6±3.5 kg for low hygienic lines. Maternal mating type also had no significant effect on honey yields in both seasons (Table 3). For spring honey yields, artificially inseminated queens' progeny had on average, 22±3.8 kg while progeny of naturally mated queens had on average 20.8 ±3.5 kg. For summer honey yields, artificially inseminated queens' progeny had 13.8±2.8 kg while progeny of naturally mated queens had 14.4±2 kg (Table 3). For annual honey yields artificially inseminated queens' progeny had on average 35.5±4 kg and naturally mated queens' progeny had 34.3±3 kg ($F_{(1,11)}=0.2$, $p=0.8$ (Table 3). We found that the year of testing (taken into consideration as a random effect) had a significant effect on honey yield. This is a well-known phenomenon which is mainly explained by the differences in environmental conditions between years.

Table 3: The effects of maternal phenotype type (high or low hygienic behavior) and maternal mating type (naturally-mated or artificially inseminated), and their interaction on honey yields. Significant differences in two-way ANOVA between tested groups are marked with an asterisk. The years of measurement were considered as random effects.

Variables	Response		
	Spring honey yield	Summer honey yield	Annual honey yield
Maternal phenotype	$F_{(1,4)}=0.01$, $p=0.9$	$F_{(1,4)}=1.4$, $p=0.22$	$F_{(1,5)}=0.2$, $p=0.75$
Maternal mating type	$F_{(1,14)}=0.004$, $p=0.52$	$F_{(1,9)}=0.34$, $p=0.54$	$F_{(1,11)}=0.24$, $p=0.62$
Maternal phenotype x Maternal mating type	$F_{(1,4)}=1.2$, $p=0.26$	$F_{(1,4)}=0.2$, $p=0.63$	$F_{(1,5)}=0.8$, $p=0.35$
Year (Random)	$F_{(2,19)}=27$, $p=0.04^*$	$F_{(2,3)}=11$, $p=0.03^*$	$F_{(2,3)}=5.2$, $p=0.09$

In general, the maternal phenotype, mating technique, and the interaction between them did not have a significant effect on honey yield or on the sealed brood area (Tables 2 and 3). A very low but nonetheless significant negative correlation between uncapping and spring honey yields, was found (Fig. 4A: Pearson, $r = -0.137$,

334 $p = 0.0093$), but practically no correlation regarding cell cleaning (Fig 4B: $r = -0.09$, p
 335 $= 0.07$). In contrast, there was a low but positive and significant correlation between
 336 summer yields and both measurements of hygienic behavior (Fig. 4C: $r = 0.172$, p
 337 $= 0.003$; and Fig. 4D: $r = 0.147$ $p = 0.0061$). Overall, there was no correlation between
 338 the annual yield (sum of spring and summer yields) and hygienic behavior (Fig 4E: r
 339 $= -0.014$ $p = 0.78$ and Fig. 4F: $r = 0.008$ $p = 0.87$). Taking all of this into consideration,
 340 we believe that the correlation was significant, mainly due to a large sample size. This
 341 is evident in the pattern of scattered points around the line.

342 Fig 4: Correlations between uncapping and cleaning of pin damaged brood and colony honey
 343 production. Each point represents a different colony. Axis X represents rate of hygienic behavior
 344 (proportion of uncapped or cleaned brood cells) and the Y axis represents honey yield in kg.
 345

346 Spring honey yields (A and B), Summer honey yields (C and D) and Annual honey yields (E and
347 F) are shown in the figures. The Pearson correlation is represented by r and p values.

348 Discussion

349 Advanced and sustainable management of *Varroa* infestation must include the
350 selection of honeybee lines that show some degree of resistance to the parasite. Here,
351 we evaluated the feasibility of breeding for hygienic behavior as part of *Varroa*
352 management strategy. Our breeding program is unique in that it was carried out in a
353 Mediterranean climate, where colony loss occurs primarily in the summer as opposed
354 to colder regions, where it is most common in winter (Doke et al. 2015). It is well
355 known that there is huge variability in climatic zones and diverse habitats in which
356 honey bees are found. Therefore, we based our hygienic selection on bees that were
357 already adapted to local environmental conditions. This approach supports the
358 preservation of locally-adapted honey bees (Costa et al. 2012; Uzunov et al. 2014).
359 First, we examined the characteristics of hygienic behavior in our study population,
360 namely uncapping and cleaning. As expected, in our study, these hygienic associated
361 behaviors were strongly correlated. Although it is clear that cleaning behavior
362 depends on uncapping, the two together are a prerequisite for successful pest and
363 pathogen control including *Varroa* (Spivak and Danka 2021). Next, we analyzed
364 seasonal effects on hygienic behavior. Seasonality is linked to environmental changes
365 (e.g., temperature, humidity and precipitation), and thus leads to dramatic fluctuations
366 in honey bee population size. The sealed brood area is an indicator of population size,
367 and as a result, it also represents the number of bees at the age of performing hygienic
368 behavior. Some previous studies have suggested an association between the rate of
369 hygienic behavior and seasonal fluctuation in colony size (Uzunov et al. 2014), as
370 well as environmental factors that affect hygienic behavior (Güler and Toy 2013). In

371 contrast, both our results and those of Bigio et al. (2013) demonstrate that hygienic
372 behavior is rather stable along the season and is independent of the population size.
373 We found that in our conditions hygienic behavior is rather stable along the season
374 and fluctuates very little in comparison to the dramatic fluctuations of population size
375 between the seasons.

376 In agreement with previous research (e.g., Spivak and Reuter 1998; Fly et al.
377 2014; Zakour and Bienefeld 2014; Danka et al. 2016; de Jesus et al. 2017;
378 Scannapieco et al. 2017), we have found that maternal colony phenotype has a
379 significant effect on hygienic behavior, which emphasizes the potential of breeding
380 for this trait in the local population. We also found a significant interaction between
381 maternal phenotype and mating technique, indicating that artificially inseminated
382 daughters preserve the maternal phenotype better than daughters of naturally-mated
383 daughter queens. This contradicts Bigio et al. (2014a), who claim that there are no
384 advantages in using artificially inseminated queens while breeding for hygienic
385 behavior. Our results indicate that selection based solely on queens is not enough. In
386 fact, the model published by Plate et al. (2019) that simulated the power of selection
387 in a drone controlled set-up, clearly shows that the selection based solely on queens in
388 a large non-selected population is insufficient.

389 Although pin-killed assays for hygienic behavior is not specific to *Varroa*
390 infected brood (Spivak and Danka 2021) and it is preferable to test such resistance
391 directly by challenging colonies with a parasite, our results clearly showed that lines
392 derived from a high hygienic maternal source, based on pin killed brood assay, also
393 demonstrated a lower parasite load when compared to low hygienic progeny colonies.
394 Moreover, lower loads of *Varroa* mites could result in lower virus infestation (Locke
395 2012; Kuster et al. 2014; Mondet et al. 2014), which most likely leads to lower virus

transmission and improved colony health. Nevertheless, this notion has been questioned by Geffre et al. (2020) as viruses can alter honeybee social behavior. Since this behavior increases contact between the workers and infected brood, the implication of hygienic behavior on viral transmission within and between the colonies as well as the association between *Varroa* infestation, viral load, and social and individual immunity remain to be thoroughly investigated.

Lastly, the feasibility of implementation of honey bees' hygienic lines in a commercial apiary is tightly linked to the apicultural costs maintaining such lines and whether selection for hygienic trait compromises other desired traits. Seeley (1985) raised a concern about a high cost for hygienic behavior due to the inadvertent removal of healthy brood from the colony. In fact, in our study we found that progeny of low hygienic colonies had more sealed brood, but this could suggest that colonies kept the unhealthy brood rather than the hygienic colonies unintentionally removed the healthy brood. Unfortunately, in our experiments we have not compared the brood quality between the genotypes to test this hypothesis and it should be tested in the future studies. Anyhow, several studies have already shown that hygienic behavior is specifically directed towards damaged brood (Bigio et al. 2014b; Mondet et al. 2016). Potential payoffs and tradeoffs of hygienic behavior with respect to honey yield, propolis production, royal jelly, aggressive behavior, and swarming tendency were reviewed in Leclercq et al. (2017). They concluded that there were no major tradeoffs associated with hygienic behavior. Yet every local breeding program should test the payoffs and tradeoffs of their selected lines, since the latter could carry undesired additional traits. Our analyses of selected lines revealed no impact on annual honey yield or population size except for a small significant negative correlation with uncapping behavior and spring honey yield. There may, however, be a benefit to the

trait, supported by the positive correlation between summer honey yield and hygienic performance. The advantage of high hygienic lines was reflected in the strength of the colony during the summer peak of *Varroa* infestation. We hypothesize that this trend would be of great importance due to the ever-growing abundance of acaricide resistant mites in intensive commercial beekeeping.

In conclusion, our results show that not only the hygienic trait exists in a local population bred for years for honey production, but that selection for this trait reduced *Varroa* infestation without negative impacts on colony size and honey production. Therefore, it is safe to recommend its introduction into local breeding programs as a basis for future integrated *Varroa* management. Moreover, since the literature demonstrates that hygienic behavior is efficient against several bee diseases, such as American foulbrood and chalkbrood (Spivak and Reuter 2001; Leclercq et al. 2017), it will be interesting to test the impact of our selection program on the management of these two diseases in a Mediterranean climate, as well as on the spread of other bee viral diseases.

Authors' Contribution

RS, AHefetz and VS designed the experiments. RS, PK, YK, and VS performed the experiments. MB performed and instructed the process of artificial insemination. A Hetzroni constructed the database, and RS analyzed the data. RS, MB, AHefetz and VS wrote the manuscript. All authors agreed to the final version of publication and its content.

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank the beekeeper Ilia Zaidman for technical assistance with colonies, Dr. Hillary Voet for her help with statistical analysis, Dr. Beatrice Nganso for her critical review on the draft of this manuscript and BARD Binational Foundation grant IS-5078-18 to VS for funding final stages of this research.

References

- Arathi HS, Spivak M (2001) Influence of colony genotypic composition on the performance of hygienic behaviour in the honeybee, *L. Anim Behav* 62:57–66. doi: 10.1006/anbe.2000.1731
- Bigio G, Al Toufaily H, Hughes WOH, Ratnieks FLW (2014a) The effect of one generation of controlled mating on the expression of hygienic behaviour in honey bees. *J Apic Res* 53:563–568. doi: 10.3896/IBRA.1.53.5.07
- Bigio G, Al Toufaily H, Ratnieks FLW (2014b) Honey bee hygienic behaviour does not incur a cost via removal of healthy brood. *J Evol Biol* 27:226–230. doi: 10.1111/jeb.12288
- Bigio G, Schürch R, Ratnieks FLW (2013) Hygienic Behavior in Honey Bees (Hymenoptera: Apidae): Effects of Brood, Food, and Time of the Year. *J Econ Entomol* 106:2280–2285
- Boecking O, Bienefeld K, Dreschner W (2000) Heritability of the Varroa-specific hygienic behaviour in honey bees (Hymenoptera: Apidae). *J Anim Breed Genet* 117:417–424. doi: 10.1046/j.1439-0388.2000.00271.x
- Büchler R, Andonov S, Bienefeld K, et al (2013) Standard methods for rearing and selection of *Apis mellifera* queens. *J Apic Res* 52:1–30. doi: 10.3896/IBRA.1.52.1.07
- Büchler R, Berg S, Le Conte Y, et al (2010) Breeding for resistance to *Varroa destructor* in Europe. *Apidologie* 41:393–408. doi: 10.1051/apido/2010011
- Büchler R, Costa C, Hatjina F, et al (2014) The influence of genetic origin and its interaction with environmental effects on the survival of *Apis mellifera* L. colonies in Europ. *J Apic Res* 53:205–214. doi: 10.3896/IBRA.1.53.2.03
- Costa C, Büchler R, Berg S, et al (2012) A europe-wide experiment for assessing the impact of genotype-environment interactions on the vitality and performance of honey bee colonies: experimental design and trait evaluation. *J Apic Sci* 56:147–158. doi: 10.2478/v10289-012-0015-9
- Danka RG, Harris JW, Dodds GE (2016) Selection of VSH-derived “Pol-line” honey bees and evaluation of their Varroa-resistance characteristics. *Apidologie* 47:483–490. doi: 10.1007/s13592-015-0413-7
- de Jesus JN, Chambó ED, da Silva Sodré G, et al (2017) Hygienic behavior in *Melipona quadrifasciata anthidioides* (Apidae, Meliponini). *Apidologie* 48:504–512. doi: 10.1007/s13592-017-0495-5
- Delaplane and Mayer (2000) Crop pollination by bees. *Design* 99:127–129. doi: 10.1046/j.1570-7458.2001.00810.x
- Dietemann V, Nazzi F, Martin SJ, et al (2013) Standard methods for varroa research.

484 J Apic Res 52:. doi: 10.3896/IBRA.1.52.1.09
485 Dietemann V, Pflugfelder J, Anderson D, et al (2012) *Varroa destructor*: research
486 avenues towards sustainable control. J Apic Res 51:125–132. doi:
487 10.3896/IBRA.1.51.1.15
488 Doke MA, Frazier M, Grozinger CM (2015) Overwintering honey bees: biology and
489 management. Curr Opin Insect Sci 10:185–193. doi: 10.1016/j.cois.2015.05.014
490 Dolezal AG, Carrillo-Tripp J, Miller WA, et al (2016) Intensively cultivated
491 landscape and varroa mite infestation are associated with reduced honey bee
492 nutritional state. PLoS One 11:1–13. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0153531
493 Evans JD, Spivak M (2010) Socialized medicine: Individual and communal disease
494 barriers in honey bees. J Invertebr Pathol 103:S62–S72. doi:
495 10.1016/j.jip.2009.06.019
496 Fly MF, Capitata C, Khlaywi SA, et al (2014) Hygienic behavioural mechanism of
497 resistance to diseases and parasites in west african honey bee colonies *Apis*
498 *mellifera* *adansonii* (Hymenoptera: apidae) aakinwande. Int J Entomol Res
499 02:169–173
500 Francis RM, Nielsen SL, Kryger P (2013) Varroa-Virus Interaction in Collapsing
501 Honey Bee Colonies. PLoS One 8:. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0057540
502 Geffre AC, Gernat T, Harwood GP, et al (2020) Honey bee virus causes context-
503 dependent changes in host social behavior. Proc Natl Acad Sci 117:1–8. doi:
504 10.1073/pnas.2002268117
505 Gempe T, Stach S, Bienefeld K, et al (2016) Behavioral and molecular studies of
506 quantitative differences in hygienic behavior in honeybees. BMC Res Notes 1–8.
507 doi: 10.1186/s13104-016-2269-y
508 Genersch E, Von Der Ohe W, Kaatz H, et al (2010) The German bee monitoring
509 project: A long term study to understand periodically high winter losses of honey
510 bee colonies. Apidologie 41:332–352. doi: 10.1051/apido/2010014
511 Gregory PG, Evans JD, Rinderer T, de Guzman L (2005) Conditional immune-gene
512 suppression of honeybees parasitized by varroa mites. J Insect Sci 5:1–5. doi:
513 10.1673/031.005.0701
514 Guarna M, Melathopoulos AP, Huxter E, et al (2015) A search for protein biomarkers
515 links olfactory signal transduction to social immunity. BMC Genomics 16:63.
516 doi: 10.1186/s12864-014-1193-6
517 Güler A, Toy H (2013) Relationship between dead pupa removal and season and
518 productivity of honey bee (*Apis mellifera*, Hymenoptera: Apidae) colonies.
519 Turkish J Vet Anim Sci 37:462–467. doi: 10.3906/vet-1205-48
520 Klein A-M, Vaissiere BE, Cane JH, et al (2007) Importance of pollinators in changing
521 landscapes for world crops. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci 274:303–313. doi:
522 10.1098/rspb.2006.3721
523 Kuster RD, Boncristiani HF, Rueppell O (2014) Immunogene and viral transcript
524 dynamics during parasitic *Varroa destructor* mite infection of developing honey
525 bee (*Apis mellifera*) pupae. J Exp Biol 217:1710–1718. doi: 10.1242/jeb.097766
526 Le Conte Y, Alaux C, Martin JF, et al (2011) Social immunity in honeybees (*Apis*
527 *mellifera*): Transcriptome analysis of varroa-hygienic behaviour. Insect Mol Biol
528 20:399–408. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2583.2011.01074.x
529 Le Conte Y, Meixner MD, Branndt A., et al (2020) Geographical distribution and
530 selection of European honey bees resistant to *Varroa destructor*. Insects, 11
531 doi: 10.3390/insects11120873
532 Leclercq G, Pannebakker B, Gengler N, et al (2017) Drawbacks and benefits of
533 hygienic behavior in honey bees (*Apis mellifera* L.): a review. J. Apic. Res.

534 56:366–375

535 Locke B (2016) Natural varroa mite-surviving *Apis mellifera* honeybee populations.

536 Apidologie 47:467–482. doi: 10.1007/s13592-015-0412-8

537 Locke B (2012) Host-parasite adaptations and interactions between honey bees,

538 varroa mites and viruses

539 Meixner MD, Büchler R, Costa C, et al (2014) Honey bee genotypes and the

540 environment. J Apic Res 53:183–187. doi: 10.3896/IBRA.1.53.2.01

541 Mondet F, de Miranda JR, Kretzschmar A, et al (2014) On the front line: quantitative

542 virus dynamics in honeybee (*Apis mellifera* L.) colonies along a new expansion

543 front of the parasite *Varroa destructor*. PLoS Pathog 10:e1004323. doi:

544 10.1371/journal.ppat.1004323

545 Mondet F, Kim SH, de Miranda JR, et al (2016) Specific cues associated with honey

546 bee social defence against *Varroa destructor* infested brood. Sci Rep 6:25444.

547 doi: 10.1038/srep25444

548 Mullin CA, Frazier M, Frazier JL, et al (2010) High levels of miticides and

549 Agrochemicals in North American Apiaries: Implications for Honey Bee Health.

550 PLoS One 5:e9754. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0009754

551 Niño EL, Cameron Jasper W (2015) Improving the future of honey bee breeding

552 programs by employing recent scientific advances. Curr Opin Insect Sci 10:163–

553 169. doi: 10.1016/j.cois.2015.05.005

554 Oxley PR, Oldroyd BP (2010) The genetic architecture of honeybee breeding.

555 Advances in Insect Physiology 39:83-118. DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-12-381387-

556 9.00003-8

557

558 Plate M, Bernstein R, Hoppe A, Bienefeld K (2019) The importance of controlled

559 mating in honeybee breeding. Genet Sel Evol 51:74. doi: 10.1186/s12711-019-

560 0518-y

561 Plettner E, Eliash N, Singh NK, et al (2016) The chemical ecology of host-parasite

562 interaction as a target of *Varroa destructor* control agents. Apidologie 48:78–92.

563 doi: 10.1007/s13592-016-0452-8

564 Ramsey SD, Ochoa R, Bauchan G, et al (2019) *Varroa destructor* feeds primarily on

565 honey bee fat body tissue and not hemolymph. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A

566 116:1792–1801. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1818371116

567 Rosenkranz P, Aumeier P, Ziegelmann B (2010) Biology and control of *Varroa*

568 *destructor*. J Invertebr Pathol 103:S96–S119. doi: 10.1016/j.jip.2009.07.016

569 Ryabov E V., Wood GR, Fannon JM, et al (2014) A Virulent Strain of Deformed

570 Wing Virus (DWV) of Honeybees (*Apis mellifera*) Prevails after *Varroa*

571 *destructor*-mediated, or *in vitro*, transmission. PLoS Pathog 10:e1004230. doi:

572 10.1371/journal.ppat.1004230

573 Sammataro D, Avitabile A (2011) The beekeeper's handbook, 4th ed. Comstock Pub.

574 Associates, Ithaca

575 Sammataro D, Untalan P, Guerrero F, Finley J (2005) The resistance of varroa mites

576 (Acari: Varroidae) to acaricides and the presence of esterase. Int J Acarol 31:67–

577 74. doi: 10.1080/01647950508684419

578 Scannapieco AC, Mannino MC, Soto G, et al (2017) Expression analysis of genes

579 putatively associated with hygienic behavior in selected stocks of *Apis mellifera*

580 L. from Argentina. Insectes Soc 64:485–494. doi: 10.1007/s00040-017-0567-6

581 Seeley TD (1985) Honeybee Ecology. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New

582 Jersey

583 Simon-Delso N, Martin GS, Bruneau E, et al (2014) Honeybee Colony Disorder in

584 Crop Areas: The Role of Pesticides and Viruses. PLoS One 9:e103073. doi:
585 10.1371/journal.pone.0103073

586 Soroker V, Slobezki Y, Chejanovsky N (2018) Apiculture in Israel. Asian Beekeeping
587 in 21st Century 95–109. doi: 10.1007/978-981-10-8222-1_4

588 Soroker V, Singh, KN, Eliash, N, Plettner, E. (2019) Olfaction as a target for control
589 of honeybee parasitic mite *Varroa destructor*. Ch. 6 in: Olfactory concepts of
590 pest control. J-F. Picimbon ed. Springer (2019).

591 Spivak M, Danka RG (2021) Perspectives on hygienic behavior in *Apis mellifera* and
592 other social insects. Apidologie 52:1–16. doi: 10.1007/s13592-020-00784-z

593 Spivak M, Gilliam M (1998) Hygienic behaviour of honey bees and its application for
594 control of brood diseases and varroa. Bee World 79:169–186. doi:
595 10.1080/0005772X.1998.11099394

596 Spivak M, R.Euter GS (2001) Resistance to American foulbrood disease by honey
597 bee colonies *Apis mellifera* bred for hygienic behavior. Apidologie 32:555–565.
598 doi: 10.1051/apido:2001103

599 Spivak M, Reuter GS (1998) Performance of hygienic honey bee colonies in a
600 commercial apiary. Apidologie 29:291–302. doi: 10.1051/apido

601 Steinhauer, N, Kulhanek K., K, Antúñez, et al (2018) Drivers of colony losses,
602 Current Opinion in Insect Science26: 142-148,
603 /doi:10.1016/j.cois.2018.02.004.Thomas E. Rinderer, Lilia I. de Guzman, G.T.
604 Delatte, et al (2001) Resistance to the parasitic mite *Varroa destructor* in honey
605 bees from far-eastern Russia. Apidologie 32:381–394. doi:
606 10.1051/apido:2001138

607 Uzunov A, Brascamp EW, Büchler R (2017) The basic concept of honey bee breeding
608 programs. Bee World 94:84–87. doi: 10.1080/0005772x.2017.1345427

609 Uzunov A, Cost C, Panasiuk B, et al (2014) Swarming , defensive and hygienic
610 behaviour in honey bee colonies of different genetic origin in a pan-European
611 experiment. J Apic Res 53:248–260. doi: 10.3896/IBRA.1.53.2.06

612 VanEngelsdorp D, Meixner MD (2010) A historical review of managed honey bee
613 populations in Europe and the United States and the factors that may affect them.
614 J Invertebr Pathol 103:S80–S95. doi: 10.1016/j.jip.2009.06.011

615 Yang X, Cox-Foster DL (2005) Impact of an ectoparasite on the immunity and
616 pathology of an invertebrate: evidence for host immunosuppression and viral
617 amplification. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 102:7470–7475. doi:
618 10.1073/pnas.0501860102

619 Zakar E, Javor A, Kusza S (2014) Genetic bases of tolerance to *Varroa destructor* in
620 honey bees (*Apis mellifera* L.). Insectes Soc 61:207–215. doi: 10.1007/s00040-
621 014-0347-5

622 Zakour MK, Bienefeld K (2014) Basic considerations in the development of breeding
623 plans for honey bees, illustrated by data on the native Syrian honey bee (*Apis*
624 *mellifera syriaca*). doi: 10.3896/IBRA.1.53.2.13

625 Zanni V, Galbraith DA, Annoscia D, et al (2017) Transcriptional signatures of
626 parasitization and markers of colony decline in Varroa-infested honey bees (*Apis*
627 *mellifera*). Insect Biochem Mol Biol 87:1–13. doi: 10.1016/j.ibmb.2017.06.002

628 Zioni N, Soroker V, Chejanovsky N (2011) Replication of *Varroa destructor* virus 1
629 (VDV-1) and a *Varroa destructor* virus 1-deformed wing virus recombinant
630 (VDV-1-DWV) in the head of the honey bee. Virology 417:106–112. doi:
631 10.1016/j.virol.2011.05.009

632