

## The effects of disturbance threat on leaf-cutting ant colonies: a laboratory study

Article (Supplemental Material)

Norman, V C, Pamminger, T and Hughes, W O H (2017) The effects of disturbance threat on leaf-cutting ant colonies: a laboratory study. *Insectes Sociaux*, 64 (1). pp. 75-85. ISSN 0020-1812

This version is available from Sussex Research Online: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/63178/>

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies and may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the URL above for details on accessing the published version.

### **Copyright and reuse:**

Sussex Research Online is a digital repository of the research output of the University.

Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable, the material made available in SRO has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

# **ESM: The effects of disturbance threat on leaf-cutting ant colonies: a laboratory study**

Victoria Norman<sup>a\*</sup>, Tobias Pamminer<sup>a</sup> and William O. H. Hughes<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>School of Life Sciences, University of Sussex, Brighton, East Sussex, BN1 9QG, UK

\*Author for correspondence: ([V.Norman@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:V.Norman@sussex.ac.uk)), telephone number: +44(0) 1273 872761, fax number : 01273 877586.

**Fig. S1** Mean  $\pm$  s.e A) proportion of positive mandible opening responses (MORs) to four different threat stimuli for all 260 ants from both long term (17 month) disturbed and undisturbed colonies, B) length of MOR to four different threat stimuli for all ants . The latter treatment was designed to simulate a vertebrate predation threat, which should be a specific stimulus for defensive workers to respond to. Different letters above columns indicate significant differences between MOR stimuli at  $P < 0.05$  based on pairwise comparisons following GLMM analysis with P values adjusted using the sequential Bonferonni method.

**Fig. S2** Mean  $\pm$  s.e A) proportion of positive mandible opening responses (MORs) to two different threat stimuli for all 252 ants from both short term (3 week) threat disturbed and control sub-colonies, and B) proportion of positive mandible opening responses (MORs) to

two different stimuli for 252 ants from both threat disturbed and control sub-colonies two weeks after the end of the short term disturbance treatment. Asterisks indicate significant differences between MOR stimuli (\* =  $P < 0.05$ , \*\* =  $P < 0.01$ , \*\*\* =  $P < 0.001$ ).

**Fig. S3** Mean  $\pm$  s.e. sizes (ml of fungus garden) over a 17 month period of leaf-cutting ant colonies that were either disturbed or undisturbed. The sizes of disturbed and undisturbed colonies did not differ significantly over the course of the experiment (repeated measures GLM:  $F_{1,131} = 0.880$ ,  $P = 0.350$ )

**Fig S4** Mean  $\pm$  s.e counts of large workers observed during a 17 month period where leaf-cutting ant colonies were either disturbed or undisturbed once colonies started to produce larger workers. The number of large workers produced over this time period did not differ significantly between disturbed and undisturbed colonies (repeated measures GLM  $F_{1,79} = 0.596$ ;  $P = 0.442$ ).

**Fig S5** Schematic of how leaf-cutting ant colonies were housed in the laboratory. Fungus gardens were housed in clear plastic boxes, covered with a flower pot lid to keep the fungus humid and in the dark. Both the transparent box and the flower pot had a small hole at the base to allow ants to move freely between the nest environments and outside. These were then placed inside a larger box coated with fluon. Inside the box, water (in a falcon tube plugged with cotton wool) and leaves (placed in a foraging box as illustrated by the green rectangle) were available *ad libitum*.

**Fig. S1**





Fig. S2





Fig. S3





Fig. S4



**Fig. S5**

