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Abstract: We determined how conidia of entomopathogenic fungi on leaves affected the behavior of two different predators (*Orius majusculus* [Hemiptera: Anthocoridae] and *Phytoseiulus persimilis* [Acari: Phytoseiidae]) when offered a choice between preying on two spotted spider mites (*Tetranychus urticae* [Acari: Tetranychidae]) in the presence or absence of infective conidia of *Metarhizium brunneum* (Ascomycota: Hypocreales) and *Neozygites floridana* (Entomophthoromycota: Neozygitaceae). The results indicate no significant relation between the presence of conidia and predator behavior. The only indication of interference is between the generalists; *O. majusculus* and *M. brunneum*, with a trend towards more time spent feeding and more prey encounters turning into feeding events on leaf discs with no conidia compared to leaf discs with conidia of *M. brunneum*. Our results show that the presence of fungal conidia do not alter the preying behavior of predators, and a use in combination is initially not limited by any interferences between organisms.
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Introduction

Arthropod predators and arthropod-pathogenic fungi are important natural enemies of pests and are used in biological pest control (Hajek and Eilenberg 2018). Arthropod predators encounter arthropod-pathogenic fungi while foraging on plants for prey (Roy and Pell 2000) or when searching for mates (Trandem et al., 2015). Such fungi can affect predators directly through infection or indirectly by competition for prey (Roy and Pell 2000) or by reducing prey quality (Seiedy et al. 2012). Predator behavior can possibly be affected by the perceived threat from a fungus present as conidia on infected, dead target arthropods or as conidia on leaves.

Detailed studies on behavioral effects in systems combining one fungus species and one predator species have shown interesting results. The two-spotted spider mite, *Tetranychus urticae* (Acari: Tetranychidae), infected with its specialist biotrophic fungus *Neozygites floridana* (Entomophthoromycota: Neozygitaceae), can induce behavioral responses in predators (Trandem et al. 2016; Wekesa et al. 2007). This is also possible of prey infected with generalist fungal species, where avoidance often have been reported (Alma et al. 2010; Meyling and Pell 2006; Roy et al. 1998; Wu et al. 2016). Seiedy et al. (2012) showed that prey handling time in the Tetranychid specialist predator *Phytoseiulus persimilis* (Acari: Phytoseidae) (McMurtry and Croft 1997) increased, while feeding rate decreased when the predator was presented with their target prey, *T. urticae*, infected with mesotrophic generalist entomopathogenic fungus *Beauveria bassiana* (Ascomycota: Hypocreales). The generalist predator *Orius albidipennis* (Hemiptera: Anthocoridae) responded in a similar way to *Thrips tabaci* (Thysanoptera: Thripidae) infected with the mesotrophic generalist entomopathogenic fungus *Metarhizium anisopliae* sensu lato (Ascomycota: Hypocreales); their searching time increased and their feeding time decreased (Pourian et al. 2011). The outcome of predator-fungus interactions in a more natural environment may be significant for successful biological control. Fischhoff et al. (2017) and Rauch et al. (2017) documented in their field studies that the mesotrophic generalist *Metarhizium brunneum* (Ascomycota: Hypocreales) (Boomsm et al. 2014) aimed for pest control, did not reduce non-target arthropod abundance and diversity significantly. Actually, the interactions between a predator and a fungus...
may even prove beneficial for biological control attempts. A study by Azevedo et al. (2017) revealed that the
combined use of *M. brunneum* and the specialist predatory gall midge, *Aphidoletes aphidimyza* (Diptera:
Cecidomyiidae) positively influenced aphid control compared to when either natural enemy was used alone.
Though the combined use significantly reduced the number of predatory midges, the same treatment still
suppressed the aphid population more than either control agent used alone.

Entomopathogenic fungi and arthropod predators are now often combined to control a complex of pests in a
crop. It is therefore important to understand whether their biology and behavior will have a synergistic,
antagonistic or indifferent effect on each other. We therefore performed a comparative study on fungus
induced behavioral changes in predator behavior and chose the entomopathogenic fungi *M. brunneum* and *N.
floridana* that belong to different orders of arthropod pathogenic fungi and are very different in their biology
(Boomsma et al. 2014). *Metarhizium brunneum* is a mesotrophic fungus in the Hypocreales that produce
large quantities of small, dry conidia in long chains, which are passively detached from dead hosts and can
be readily suspended in water. *Metarhizium brunneum*, which can be grown on artificial media (sabouraud
dextrose agar (SDA), rice etc.), is produced commercially in large quantities and used as the active
ingredient in several microbial control products and, it may be used against *T. urticae*. *Neozygites floridana*
is a biotrophic fungus in the Entomophthoromycota and a specialist on *T. urticae*. It actively discharges
larger non-infective primary conidia. These primary conidia then produce secondary sticky infective conidia
on long capillary tubes, so called capilliconidia (Keller 1997). It only takes one capilliconidium to kill a
spider mite (Oduor et al. 1995), and one *Tetranychus* cadaver may throw more than 2000 primary conidia
(Wekesa et al. 2010) which germinate into infective secondary capilliconidia. *Neozygites floridana* is an
important natural enemy of *T. urticae* and may be produced *in vivo* on *T. urticae* but not yet for commercial
use, though there has been some success of *in vitro* production by Leite et al. (2000) and an *in vivo*
production patent was also made several years ago (Kennedy and Smitley 1988). We chose to expose these
two very different fungal species to the specialist spider mite-predator *P. persimilis* and the generalist
predator *Orius majusculus* (Hemipter: Anthocoridae) (Fathipour and Maleknia 2016) to evaluate their
behavioral changes in searching and feeding time of prey when presented to the following leaf disc choice combinations: 1) *M. brunneum* conidia vs no conidia, 2) *N. floridana* conidia vs no conidia. As target prey for predators we used the pest mite *T. urticae*.

**Material and methods**

**Fungi, plants and arthropods**

Colonies of *T. urticae* were obtained from a laboratory culture kept on strawberry plants in a plexiglass cage, in a climatically controlled room at 21 °C, 60% RH and 16 h L: 8 h D. The predatory bugs, *O. majusculus*, were provided by the company EWH Bioproduction (Denmark) in bottles containing 500 individuals of all stages mixed with buckwheat. The predatory mites, *P. persimilis*, were provided by LOG (Norway) and by EWH Bioproduction (Denmark) in 100 mL bottles containing 2000 adult mites mixed with vermiculite.

The *in vitro* culture of *M. brunneum*, isolate KVL 99-112 (i.e. F52, BIPESCO 5) was grown on Sabouraud Dextrose Agar (SDA) at room temperature in darkness for approximately 25 days before harvesting the conidia for the experiments.

The *in vivo* culture of *N. floridana*, Brazilian isolate ESALQ 1420, was produced as described in Castro et al. (2013). Similar leaf disc methods have also been used by Oduor et al. (1995). The following procedure was used: adult female *T. urticae* were inoculated with conidia of *N. floridana* on bean plants (*Phaseolus vulgaris* cv. Masai). After 8–9 days, *N. floridana* infected *T. urticae* had died and dry non-sporulating cadavers were collected, wrapped in a cotton cloth and stored in Eppendorf tubes at 5 °C until used in the experiment within 30 days.

**Preparation of leaf discs with fungal spores**
Leaf discs were made from strawberry leaves from the same plant for each observation day. Due to the
differences in biology between *M. brunneum*, and *N. floridana*, the preparation of leaf discs with fungal
conidia that was used in the choice experiment was conducted in two different ways.

For *M. brunneum*, leaf discs were inoculated by dipping them in a conidial suspension. This was done as
follows: the *M. brunneum* isolate was taken out of the freezer and transferred to sabouraud dextrose agar
(SDA), cultured for 19-25 days at ambient laboratory conditions (21-25 °C; 20-35% RH) placed in a plastic
box (22x16x7 cm) and wrapped with aluminum foil for darkness. Conidia of *M. brunneum* from SDA were
then harvested with a sterile spatula, in sterile water with 0.05% Tween 80 to make the hydrophilic fungal
conidia suspended in water. The resulting conidia suspension was filtered through a 3-layer cotton cloth and
adjusted to 1 x 10^7 conidia/mL by the use of a Neubauer Improved hemocytometer. Strawberry leaf discs
(diameter 15 mm) were then dipped in the *M. brunneum* conidial suspension before air-dried on a tissue
paper with the abaxial side up. Leaf discs with conidia were placed in Petri dishes with water agar (1.5%) at
6 °C overnight to be used in choice experiments the next day. Conidial viability of conidia suspensions were
established by a standard germination test (Inglis et al. 2012), and only suspensions with > 95% germinating
conidia were used in the experiment.

Since *N. floridana* is a biotrophic fungus it is difficult to produce conidia from other substrates than the host
(*T. urticae*) itself. Hence, a method taking this into account was used. Three *N. floridana*-killed *T. urticae*
cadavers, dorsal side up, were evenly distributed onto one strawberry leaf disc and placed in darkness for 24
h at 20 °C and 90% RH for primary conidia to discharge and germinating of primary conidia to form
infective capilliconidia (secondary conidia). For each leaf disc, sporulation of all cadavers and an even
distribution of conidia were assured by observing each leaf disc under a compound microscope (X80) prior
to the observations. Spore producing cadavers were carefully removed, to obtain similar conditions as for
leaf discs with *M. brunneum*, i.e. presence of conidia only, before the introduction of healthy *T. urticae* (see
below) and the predator species. All leaf discs were dipped in 0.05% Tween 80 as described for *M.
brunneum* prior to inoculation with *N. floridana* to ensure that a possible Tween 80 effect was similar for
both fungal treatments. Leaf discs with no fungal conidia (control) were also dipped in sterile water and 0.05% Tween 80.

Experimental set-up of choice experiment

The experimental set-up is shown in Fig. 1. One strawberry leaf disc with fungal conidia and one strawberry leaf disc with no fungal conidia were placed with a small gap between them, onto 1.5% water agar in a Petri dish (diameter 5 cm). The leaf discs were connected by a bridge of Parafilm (10x10 mm) as described by Asalf et al. (2011). Six *T. urticae* adults (for *O. majusculus* choice) or deutonymphs (for *P. persimilis* choice) were transferred to each leaf disc approximately one h before predators (one per dish) were introduced. During the observation time, *T. urticae* remained on the leaf disc, no webbing was observed, and only on rare occasions did they lay eggs. In such cases, eggs were removed before the introduction of the predator.

The set up of the choice experiments was as follows: *O. majusculus* or *P. persimilis* choosing between a leaf disc with 1) *M. brunneum* conidia vs no conidia, or 2) *N. floridana* vs no conidia. Petri dishes with two leaf discs without any fungal conidia served as the control. Young adult of *T. urticae* females were used as prey for fourth and fifth stage nymphs of *O. majusculus* while smaller *T. urticae* female deutonymphs were used as prey for adult females of *P. persimilis*. All predators were starved individually in plastic vials, with moist filter paper in a climate cabinet at 23 °C, 16 h L: 8 h D and 70% RH for 24 h prior to the start of the experiment.

Observation of behavior

Each predator was placed in the middle of the Parafilm bridge, allowing it to choose between the two leaf discs. The observation time per treatment was 15 min, starting immediately after the predator was released on the bridge. During the observation, the following five behaviors were recorded: 1) walking (searching), 2)
encountering prey (number of events, when prey was within a body length of the predator and reacted to the presence of the prey), 3) feeding, 4) resting, 5) grooming. If feeding continued after the observation time of 15 min, observation continued until feeding stopped to obtain total feeding time per prey. Furthermore, the number of prey encounters were used to assess the success rate. Searching, resting and grooming time was recorded as it affects predation, especially if conidia attach to the body and legs of the predators.

Observations were made under an even light source. All treatments were replicated three times a day, between 9 am and 4 pm, with the sequence of treatments rotated between observation days (n=9). Each observation was conducted in a new petri dish with new leaf discs and a new predator. The position of the treated leaf disc (left/right of predator) was randomized. Observations with no feeding events were discarded and the experiment was continued until at least 20 replicates were achieved for each treatment. An average of four observations per day were discarded, mainly due to predator inactivity or it was disturbed by the water barrier surrounding the leaf discs.

Statistical analysis

Three response variables were analyzed separately for the two predators. 1) Number of prey encounter was analyzed in a Poisson regression with log-link including the logarithm of time spent searching as offset in order to correct for searching time. 2) Success of prey encounter turning into a feeding event was analyzed in a binomial regression with logit-link. 3) Feeding time per prey was analyzed in a normal regression after log-transformation. All analyses were done with conidia (none / N. floridana / M. brunneum) as fixed effect, and with arthropod id as random effect to take into account of arthropods that searched on both leaves. If overall effect of conidia was found, then pairwise comparisons of the three levels were done with a Tukey correction for multiple testing. The statistical analyses were done in R v.3.2.2 (R core Team 2015).
Results

Of the total observation time, both predators spent the majority of the observation time feeding, followed by time spent searching (Table 1). Little time were invested in resting (0.1-1.5% of total observation time) and grooming (0.1-1.1% of total observation time), and are therefore not considered further as behaviors of significance in the present study.

For both predators no significant relations were found between conidia and number of prey encountered, success of prey encounters turning into a feeding event, and time spent feeding per prey. However, for *O. majusculus*, there was a borderline influence of the presence of conidia on the success rate of the predators (p=0.10), and time spent feeding per prey (p=0.06). The odds ratio for a successful feeding event was 3.5 times larger (95% CI: 0.9–13.2) on leaf discs with no conidia relative to leaf discs with *M. brunneum* (adjusted p=0.07). The feeding time per prey was 1.8 times longer (95% CI: 1.0–3.2) on leaf discs with no conidia compared to leaf discs with *M. brunneum* (adjusted p=0.06). As expected, no differences were found between control treatments.

Discussion

The presence of entomopathogenic fungal conidia did not affect the behavior of either predator species. As described above, the conidia of the generalist fungus *M. brunneum* and the specialist fungus *N. floridana* both have the potential to influence predator behavior in different ways due to their very different biological characteristics.

The primary conidium of *N. floridana* germinates into an infective sticky capilliconidium on a long capillary that will rise 60–100 μm (Keller, 1997) above the leaf surface (Trandem et al, 2015). Capilliconidia easily break off and can attach to the body and legs of host and non-host arthropods (Delalibera et al. 2003). Specialist fungi cannot infect the predators and do therefore not pose a threat to them as such. This being
said, we considered the physical presence of *N. floridana* conidia as likely to disturb the preying behavior of the predator, but this showed not to be the case. A longer observation time would perhaps reveal an interference between the specialist fungal conidia and the predators, as found by Wekesa et al. (2007).

*M. brunneum* produces smaller conidia (length 5.0-7.0 µm (Bischoff et al. 2009)), and can as other generalist entomopathogens induce avoidance responses, by being perceived as a threat by predators that encounter them (Alma et al. 2010; Meyling and Pell 2006; Ormond et al 2011). Previous studies with generalist entomopathogenic fungi have shown behavioral changes in predators (Pourian et al. 2011; Seiedy et al. 2012), but unlike in the present study, previous studies have been conducted with inoculated prey. Infected prey are likely inducing a stronger volatile profile, ultimately increasing the likelihood of an altered predator response. Both situations are relevant and important for the understanding of the interactions between natural enemies, and both must be considered when developing strategies for pest control.

No differences found in behavioral allocation by fungal conidia can also be a response of low conidial concentration. Because of distinct differences in life styles of the two fungal species, it was necessary to utilize two methods of applying fungal inoculum. The presence of fungal inoculum was established by agar imprints and visual observations in the microscope throughout the experiment, while the specific concentrations on the leaf discs was not known and not comparable between species.

There was a trend towards an influence of *M. brunneum* conidia, on the behavior of *O. majusculus*. *Orius majusculus* spent more time feeding and had more prey encounters turned into feeding events on leaf discs with no conidia than on leaf discs with *M. brunneum*, i.e. where there was no risk for the predator to engage in these behaviors. This trend may be confirmed with a longer observation time. If that is the case, this would support the findings from other studies (Alma et al. 2010; Meyling and Pell 2006; Ormond et al 2011).

Three of the four organisms used in the present study (not *N. floridana*) are commonly used individually in augmentative biological control against various pests (Eilenberg et al. 2001; Gacheri et al. 2015; Gerson and Weintraub 2007; van Lenteren 2012). The outcome of such augmentative releases would be affected by the
interaction between the released organisms. This study shows that the combined use of these natural
enemies, of taxonomically remote groups, in augmentative releases will not initially interfere with each
other. We can hereby not confirm our initial expectations; that the presence of entomopathogenic fungal
conidia would alter the preying behavior of predators. Considering beyond this point, inoculated prey and
risk of infection of predators should be investigated further as it may have long-term negative or positive
effects on pest control.
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Figure captions:

Fig. 1 Set-up of the experimental arena. White leaf disc (left) = no fungal conidia, grey leaf disc (right) = with fungal conidia. The Petri dish contained water agar with healthy *Tetranychus urticae* on strawberry leaf discs. The leaf discs were connected by a Parafilm bridge where the predator was released.
Table 1. Predator searching time, feeding time and prey encounters by *O. majusculus* and *P. persimilis*. Each treatment consists of one fungal species and one predator species given a choice between a leaf disc with fungal conidia (+) and a leaf disc without fungal conidia (-).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fungus</th>
<th>Predator</th>
<th>+/- conidia</th>
<th>Searching</th>
<th>Feeding</th>
<th>Prey encounters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(% of total observation time)</td>
<td>(no. of events)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>M. brunneum</em></td>
<td><em>O. majusculus</em></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>7.7 ±2.5</td>
<td>24.4 ±7.9</td>
<td>1.0 ±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.2 ±1.7</td>
<td>46.3 ±8.6</td>
<td>1.0 ±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>P. persimilis</em></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>5.3 ±1.7</td>
<td>31.0 ±8.5</td>
<td>1.1 ±0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.7 ±2.5</td>
<td>51.6 ±8.7</td>
<td>1.2 ±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>N. floridana</em></td>
<td><em>O. majusculus</em></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>8.1 ±2.1</td>
<td>48.5 ±8.1</td>
<td>1.3 ±0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.8 ±1.5</td>
<td>29.1 ±8.5</td>
<td>0.6 ±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>P. persimilis</em></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>12.2 ±3.2</td>
<td>42.0 ±8.2</td>
<td>0.8 ±0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.1 ±1.4</td>
<td>37.0 ±9.2</td>
<td>0.5 ±0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The values are calculated averages of searching time and feeding time as a ratio (percent) of the total observation time (excluding time spent on the platform). Prey encounters are the average number of prey encounters per observation (no. of events). ± standard error.