

1 Can monophagous specialists mediate host plant choices in generalist planthoppers (Hemiptera:
2 Delphacidae)?

3 Dittrich ADK* and Helden AJ

4 *Corresponding author

6 **Abstract.** 1. A preference experiment was set up with two planthopper species (Hemiptera:
7 Delphacidae) to test the influence of competition on host plant choice.

8 2. The delphacid *Javesella pellucida* was chosen as a generalist, and the rarer *Ribautodelphax imitans*
9 as a monophagous specialist, which feeds on the grass, tall fescue *Schedonorus arundinaceus*.

10 3. In the absence of the specialist, the generalist showed a marked preference for tall fescue. In some
11 experiments however, the introduction of the specialist resulted in a shift of preference to an alternative
12 plant, if the specialist was established prior to the introduction of the generalist.

13 4. This experiment supports the hypothesis that, specialist herbivores can potentially alter the host
14 plant choices of generalists. Which may lead to differing host plant use patterns in insect communities.

15 **Keywords**

16 Insect plant interactions, Auchenorrhyncha, rarity, planthopper, competition

18 **Introduction**

19 Interspecific interactions are important because they mediate community composition and have far
20 reaching impacts on the long term stability of complex insect-plant networks, and how they are
21 structured (Frank van Veen *et al.*, 2005; Denno & Kaplan, 2007; Kaplan & Denno, 2007). Studies of
22 direct competition, particularly among phytophagous groups, have largely been focussed on fitness,
23 fecundity rates, growth and survival (reviewed by: Denno *et al.*, 1995; Kaplan & Denno, 2007).
24 Competition however, can affect factors not solely attributed to community and population fitness, such
25 as host plant and microhabitat use, and position on plants (Ferrenberg & Denno, 2003).

26 Within phytophagous insect communities, generalists and specialists coexist (Bernays, 1998),
27 with the majority of species being specialist (Tallamy, 2004). Moreover, most studies of competition
28 between species, specialist or generalist, centre on those directly sharing resources (Denno & Kaplan,
29 2007; Kaplan & Denno, 2007; Ali & Agrawal, 2012); with little work carried out on how competition
30 affects host plant utilisation. The majority of previous work focussed on host displacement, where non-

native species have displaced their native counterparts (Kenis *et al.*, 2009) or where there is resulting niche shift or death of an outcompeted species under experimental conditions (Kaplan & Denno, 2007). In order to understand other aspects of the roles that specialists have on generalists, there is a need for more experimental work.

Two-species experiments are useful models because they can elucidate, potential community effects, at a level more accurately measured under controlled conditions, rather than more observational field based studies (Kaplan & Denno, 2007). This paper looks at one such system, an interaction between two co-occurring grass feeding planthopper species (Hemiptera: Auchenorrhyncha: Delphacidae), and the influence of one species feeding on the other's preferred host within mesocosms. The species used were a generalist *Javesella pellucida* (Fab.) (Nickel & Remane, 2002) and a specialist, *Ribautodelphax imitans* (Ribaut.) which is only known to feed on tall fescue *Schedonorus arundinaceus* (Schreb.) (den Bieman, 1987; Nickel & Remane, 2002; JNCC, 2010; Dittrich, 2016; Dittrich & Helden, 2016). It was hypothesised, that because the specialist was adapted to utilising one grass species efficiently it would drive a host plant shift in the generalist. Thus, testing the paradigm that there is a potential trade-off between using many resources adequately, and being able to move between them and avoid competition, versus being able to use one resource better than all others, thus outcompeting any potential competitors (McPeck, 1996; Noriyuki & Osawa, 2012). We tested this with experiments in which we observed the host choice of the two delphacid species in single and mixed species culture.

Methods

In order to determine the life cycles and abundance of the test specialist *R. imitans* and the test generalist *J. pellucida* bi-monthly randomised suction samples were taken on Coe Fen, Cambridge, UK (52.198885, 0.118247) April – October 2011, consisting of 40 x 10 local subsamples each (full details can be found in Dittrich, 2016; Dittrich & Helden, 2016). Each sub sample consisted of one full power 16 second suck with a Vortis™ suction sampler (Arnold, 1994; Brook *et al.*, 2008). The catch was emptied into a canvas sweep net and all adult Auchenorrhyncha (both Cicadellidae and Delphacidae) were removed by pooter for later identification. Throughout 2011 live specimens were also obtained for insect cultures, and the offspring following the F2 generation used in these experiments.

A host preference experiment was set up using two grass species, tall fescue *S. arundinaceus* and Yorkshire fog *Holcus lanatus* (L.) within mesocosms. The latter plant was chosen because it was the second most common plant on the study site (after tall fescue), and one to which the generalist had a strong positive response in laboratory trials (Dittrich, 2016). Tall fescue was chosen because of the host plant relationships with the specialist (Dittrich, 2016; Dittrich & Helden, 2016). Approximately 10 tall fescue and Yorkshire fog seeds were planted 3cm apart in round clear polyethylene terephthalate 900ml [60x150mm] containers with 5 micron mesh affixed to the top held in place with an elastic band,

preventing insect escape. Growth was thinned to a pair of plants, one of each species, and the experiments started when plants had three tillers of growth. There were two experimental treatments used; one where the specialist species were allowed to first settle on plants, before the generalist species was added, and one where the generalist species were allowed to establish on plants before the specialist was added.

In the first test (generalists established) eight mesocosms were set up; in each 10 generalists were allowed to establish themselves. After one week, 10 specialists were added to those mesocosms containing the generalists. The host plant choice of the generalists were recorded immediately before and 48 hours following this introduction. Planthoppers were observed to move quite readily between their feeding positions through the course of a day, so a period of 48 hours was considered a reasonable interval between recording.

For the second test (specialists established), eight mesocosms were set up, each with 10 specialists, which were allowed to establish for one week, after which 10 Generalists were then added. The host plant choices were recorded immediately before and 48 hours after introduction of the generalist.

A difference in the feeding preference of generalist was tested before and after the addition of the allospecific competitor within the same experimental mesocosm, and between tests where the generalist was added first and where it was added last [at equal density]. All statistics were performed using R (R Development Core Team, 2013). T-tests were used, assuming equal variance, with all effect sizes provided with 95% confidence intervals. An analysis of variance was used to check for differences in tall fescue preference between experiments in the absence of allospecifics between all tests.

Results

The numbers of adult generalist *J. pellucida* recorded at Coe Fen during 2011 followed an almost identical phenological pattern to the specialist *R. imitans*. However, as expected they were fewer in number (Figure 1).

In the absence of specialists, generalists showed an overall choice preference for tall fescue where a mean proportion of 0.66 (95% CI = 0.57, 0.75) of the individuals settled. The preference for tall fescue did not differ from this average, for generalists between experiments when allospecifics were absent ($F_{2,19} = 0.29$, $p = 0.972$). On Yorkshire fog mean proportions of 0.34 (95% CI = 0.25, 0.43) of individuals settled. A significant difference in proportions between host plants of 0.32 (95% CI = 0.26, 0.57; $t_{15} = 5.45$, $p < 0.001$; Figure 2a).

There was no difference in the proportion of generalists on alternate host plants, after the addition of the specialist to mesocosms where generalists were already established (non-significant

mean difference of 0.06, 95% CI = -0.12, 0.54; $t_{15} = 0.60$; $p = 0.559$). However overall preference for tall fescue changed, in experiments where specialists were established on plants prior to their introduction. When generalists were added to experimental arenas with specialists already established, there was a marked change in preference, with a mean proportion of 0.23 (95% CI = 0.09, 0.37) individuals found on tall fescue. A significant reduction in difference in proportions of 0.41 (95% CI = 0.35, 0.77; $t_{15} = 13.70$; $p < 0.001$).

Generalist feeding preference between conditions where they were established first versus last in the presence of the specialist (at equal density) demonstrated an overall proportional reduction in preference for tall fescue of 0.36 (95% CI = 0.15, 0.58, $t_{15} = 3.7982$, $p = 0.003$, figure 2b).

Discussion

When established before the generalist, the specialist planthopper *R. imitans* affected the host plant preference of the generalist *J. pellucida*, supporting our hypothesis. However, this pattern was not apparent if the generalist established first, where there was no change in preference. Both species adult phenology is similar, and adults are spatiotemporally sympatric in the field (Dittrich *et al.*, 2013; Dittrich & Helden, 2016), although the egg incubation periods for the specialist *R. imitans*, may be slightly quicker (Raatikainen & others, 1967; Dittrich, 2016). Faster development may lead to earlier establishment on food plants, and in some species is indicative of competitive advantage, or numerical dominance (Krijger *et al.*, 2001; Hunter & Yeargan, 2014). Specialist species dictating the specific feeding niches of others, based on their own feeding ecology however, may provide a broader explanation as to how generalists and specialists coexist within insect herbivore communities.

Host choice mediated by interspecific interactions, are not widely studied. However, it may have much farther-reaching implications for understanding how insect herbivore communities are constructed, and how generalist and specialist interactions help to shape them. Of the two study species *R. imitans* is rare, and *J. pellucida* common, and it stands to reason that where the two coexist the community position of *J. pellucida* may be different to sites where the two species do not coexist. Moreover due to the rarity of *R. imitans*, it is likely that the two species co-occur less frequently than when *J. pellucida* - the very widespread generalist - is found without *R. imitans* (Le Quesne, 1960; Gaston, 1994; Nickel, 2003). If most species in grassland communities are monophagous and rare, particularly in the case of the planthoppers (Delphacidae) (Gaston, 2010; Denno & Perfect, 2012), it is likely that these interactions play a part in shaping how communities of herbivorous insects differ from one location to the next, and between a range of different hosts.

The lottery hypothesis proposed by Chesson and Warner (1981) in which temporal environmental fluctuations leads to the coexistence of competing species, is supported here. In our paper the competing specialist is at an advantage if it arrives first. However, in systems where non-equilibrium

dynamics are at play, the recruits to vacant space may vary in time, and it is these fluctuations which enable coexistence (Munday, 2004). Similar colonisation competition trade-offs, where disturbances shape community structure may be common, such as in the heavily disturbed grasslands that our study species were found (Levins and Culver, 1971; Beisner *et al.*, 2003; Munday, 2004). Conversely, as grasslands are one of our most human impacted habitats, the interactions that are described within this paper may decrease in their frequency, together with insect biodiversity, as disturbance increases.

The importance of monophagous herbivore species within communities is not unstudied (e.g. Harrison *et al.*, 2008; Mouillot *et al.*, 2013). However, the range of roles that these species fill is not fully understood, as highlighted by the finding of our work. It may be the case that rarer insect specialists have an important role in modifying the host plant choices of generalists. The influence of one species on how others utilise feeding location on single hosts is known to some extent (Denno *et al.*, 2003; Ferrenberg & Denno, 2003), and how direct competition affects the fitness of species through direct plant mediated and indirect effects is also well studied (Denno *et al.*, 1995; Kaplan & Denno, 2007). This case of host-mediated choice, however, is unique and warrants further investigation, particularly in field studies and presents an interesting line of enquiry, that may enable a greater understanding of wider community effects.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Rodi Mackenzie, with help with the initial fieldwork that supported this study. Guy Belcher and the rest of the team at Cambridge City Council for endorsing and supporting the fieldwork and Dr Andy Chick FRES for his comments on this manuscript. The authors declare that there were no conflicts of interest in conducting the research.

References

Ali, J.G. & Agrawal, A.A. (2012) Specialist versus generalist insect herbivores and plant defense. *Trends in Plant Science*, **17**, 293–302.

Arnold, A.J. (1994) Insect sampling without nets, bags or filters. *Crop Protection*, **13**, 73–76.

~~Behmer, S.T. & Joern, A. (2008) Coexisting generalist herbivores occupy unique nutritional feeding niches. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **105**, 1977–1982.~~

Beisner, B.E., Haydon, D.T. & Cuddington, K. (2003) Alternative stable states in ecology. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, **1**, 376–382.

Bernays, E.A. (1998) Evolution of feeding behavior in insect herbivores. *Bioscience*, **48**, 35–44.

Bieman, C.F.M. den. (1987) Host plant relations in the planthopper genus *Ribautodelphax*

163 (Homoptera: Delphacidae). *Ecological Entomology*, **12**, 163–172.

164 Brook, A.J., Woodcock, B.A., Sinka, M. & Vanbergen, A.J. (2008) Experimental verification of
 165 suction sampler capture efficiency in grasslands of differing vegetation height and structure. *Journal*
 166 *of Applied Ecology*, **45**, 1357–1363.

167 Chesson, P.L. & Warner, R.R. (1981) Environmental variability promotes coexistence in lottery
 168 competitive systems. *The American Naturalist* **117**, 923–943.

169 Denno, R.F., Gratton, C., Døbel, H. & Finke, D.L. (2003) Predation risk affects relative strength of
 170 top-down and bottom-up impacts on insect herbivores. *Ecology*, **84**, 1032–1044.

171 Denno, R.F. & Kaplan, I. (2007) Plant-mediated interactions in herbivorous insects: mechanisms,
 172 symmetry, and challenging the paradigms of competition past. In (ed. by Ohgushi, T., Craig, T.P. &
 173 Price, P.W.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 19–50.

174 Denno, R.F., McClure, M.S. & Ott, J.R. (1995) Interspecific interactions in phytophagous insects:
 175 competition reexamined and resurrected. *Annual Review of Entomology*, **40**, 297–331.

176 Denno, R.F. & Perfect, J.R. (2012) *Planthoppers: their ecology and management*. Springer Science &
 177 Business Media.

178 Dittrich, A.D.K. (2016) *The ecology of Ribautodelphax imitans (Ribaut.) a seldom recorded*
 179 *planthopper in the UK*. PhD, Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge

180 Dittrich, A.D.K. & Helden, A.J. (2016) The community ecology of *Ribautodelphax imitans* (Ribaut.,
 181 1953) (Hemiptera: Delphacidae), a rare UK planthopper in a distinct grassland habitat. *Entomologica*
 182 *Austriaca*, **23**, 87–96.

183 Dittrich, A.D.K., Helden, A.J., Mackenzie, R. & Belcher, G. (2013) The Hemiptera of Coe Fen,
 184 Cambridge. *Nature in Cambridgeshire*, **55**.

185 Ferrenberg, S.M. & Denno, R.F. (2003) Competition as a factor underlying the abundance of an
 186 uncommon phytophagous insect, the salt-marsh planthopper *Delphacodes penedetector*. *Ecological*
 187 *Entomology*, **28**, 58–66.

188 Frank van Veen, F.J., Morris, R.J. & Godfray, H.C.J. (2005) Apparent competition, quantitative food
 189 webs, and the structure of phytophagous insect communities. *Annual Review of Entomology*, **51**, 187–
 190 208.

191 Gaston, K.J. (1994) What is rarity? In *Rarity*. Springer, pp. 1–21.

192 Gaston, K.J. (2010) Valuing common species. *Science*, **327**, 154–155.

193 Harrison, S., Viers, J.H., Thorne, J.H. & Grace, J.B. (2008) Favorable environments and the
194 persistence of naturally rare species. *Conservation Letters*, **1**, 65–74.

195 Hunter, C.E. & Yeargan, K. V. (2014) Development, reproduction, and competitive interactions
196 between two sympatric leafhopper species (Homoptera: Cicadellidae) on redbud trees. *Environmental*
197 *entomology*, **18**, 127–132.

198 JNCC. (2010) UK species priority pages, version 2. *Ribautodelphax imitans* (Ribaut, 1953).

199 Kaplan, I. & Denno, R.F. (2007) Interspecific interactions in phytophagous insects revisited: a
200 quantitative assessment of competition theory. *Ecology Letters*, **10**, 977–994.

201 Kenis, M., Auger-Rozenberg, M.-A., Roques, A., Timms, L., Péré, C., Cock, M.J.W., *et al.* (2009)
202 Ecological effects of invasive alien insects. *Biological Invasions*, **11**, 21–45.

203 Krijger, C.L., Peters, Y.C. & Sevenster, J.G. (2001) Competitive ability of neotropical *Drosophila*
204 predicted from larval development times. *Oikos*, **92**, 325–332.

205 Munday, P.L. (2004) Competitive coexistence of coral-dwelling fishes: the lottery hypothesis
206 revisited. *Ecology*, **85**, 623–628.

207 McPeck, M.A. (1996) Trade-offs, food web structure, and the coexistence of habitat specialists and
208 generalists. *The American Naturalist*, **148**, S124–S138.

209 Mouillot, D., Bellwood, D.R., Baraloto, C., Chave, J., Galzin, R., Harmelin-Vivien, M., *et al.* (2013)
210 Rare species support vulnerable functions in high-diversity ecosystems. *PLoS biology*, **11**, e1001569.

211 Munday, P.L. (2004) Competitive coexistence of coral-dwelling fishes: the lottery hypothesis
212 revisited. *Ecology*, **85**, 623–628.

213 Nickel, H. & Remane, R. (2002) Checklist of the planthoppers and leafhoppers of Germany, with
214 notes on food plant, diet width, life cycles, geographic range, and conservation status (Hemiptera,
215 Fulgoromorpha and Cicadomorpha). *Beitrage zur Zikadenkunde*, **5**, 27–64.

216 Nickel, H. (2003) The leafhoppers and planthoppers of Germany (Hemiptera, Auchenorrhyncha):
217 Patterns and strategies in a highly diverse group of phytophagous insects. Pensoft, Sofia-Moscow.

218 Noriyuki, S. & Osawa, N. (2012) Intrinsic prey suitability in specialist and generalist H armonia
219 ladybirds: a test of the trade-off hypothesis for food specialization. *Entomologia Experimentalis et*
220 *Applicata*, **144**, 279–285.

221 Le Quesne, W.J. (1960) Hemiptera Fulgoromorpha. Handbooks for the Identification of British
222 Insects 2 (3). Royal Entomological Society of London, London.

223 Raatikainen, M. & others. (1967) Bionomics, enemies and population dynamics of *Javesella pellucida*
224 (F.)(Hom., Delphacidae).

225 ~~Prestidge, R.A. & McNeill, S. (1983) Auchenorrhyncha host plant interactions: leafhoppers and~~
226 ~~grasses. *Ecological Entomology*, 8, 331–339.~~

227 R Development Core Team. (2013) R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.

228 Tallamy, D.W. (2004) Do alien plants reduce insect biomass? *Conservation Biology*, **18**, 1689–1692.

229