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Abstract

Social insects depend on communication to regulate social behaviour. This also applies to their larvae, which are commonly exposed to social interactions and can react to social stimulation. However, how social insect larvae sense their environment is not well understood. In particular, nothing is known about how larval sensory gene expression is affected by changes in the social environment, although individual recognition abilities may be primed during development (Isingrini et al., 1985; Signorotti et al., 2014). Here, we present the first characterization of sensory-related gene expression in larvae of a social insect. We use the common black ant, *Formica fusca*, a species that exhibits precise discrimination abilities (Helanterä and Sundström, 2007; Helanterä and Ratnieks, 2009; Pask et al., 2017; Slone et al., 2017).

Keywords: social insects, transcriptome, communication, chemosensory proteins, odorant binding proteins, odorant receptors.

Social insects rely on chemical communication to maintain colony cohesion and to manage cooperative tasks. They do this using signature mixtures on the cuticle (cuticular hydrocarbons, CHCs) (Sharma et al., 2015; Neupert et al., 2018; Ferguson et al., 2020), and gland secretions that act in specific contexts (Le Conte et al., 1990; Czaczkes et al., 2014). The major insect chemosensory gene families include odorant binding proteins (OBPs), chemosensory proteins (CSPs), olfactory receptors (ORs), gustatory receptors (GRs) and ionotropic receptors (IRs) (Sánchez-Gracia et al., 2009; Joseph and Carlson, 2015). OBPs and CSPs bind and carry odorants (Steinbrecht, 1998; Pelosi et al., 2005) whereas the receptors (ORs, GRs, IRs) detect odorants (Missbach et al., 2014; Fleischer et al., 2018). In ants, several chemosensory-related gene families have undergone large expansions (Engsontia et al., 2015; McKenzie et al., 2016; McKenzie and Kronauer, 2018) and some genes have evolved specific functions related to social behaviour. For example, CSPs play an important role in nestmate recognition (Ozaki et al., 2005; Kulmuni and Havukainen, 2013) and some ORs respond to specific CHCs (Pask et al., 2017; Slone et al., 2017).

The larvae of social insects are largely protected from environmental fluctuations and pressures such as foraging and predation, factors that shape the lives of solitary insect larvae. However, social insect larvae are constantly exposed to social interactions with adults and other developing individuals and can react to social stimulation by showing developmental responses or by adjusting their behaviour (Schultner et al., 2017). How social insect larvae sense their social environment is not well understood. In particular, nothing is known about how larval sensory gene expression is affected by changes in the social environment, although individual recognition abilities may be primed during development (Isingrini et al., 1985; Signorotti et al., 2014).

Here, we present the first characterization of sensory-related gene expression in larvae of a social insect. We use the common black ant, *Formica fusca*, a species that exhibits precise discrimination abilities (Helanterä and Sundström, 2007; Helanterä and Ratnieks, 2009;
Chernenko et al., 2011; Helanterä et al., 2011; Martin et al., 2011). In Formica ant colonies, brood (eggs, larvae, pupae) are kept in piles, which allows larvae to consume eggs. Surprisingly, egg consumption is not random: larvae consume foreign eggs more often than familiar eggs (Schultner et al., 2013; 2014), and social parasite eggs more often than nonparasite eggs (Pulliainen et al., 2019). As Formica eggs carry CHC odour profiles, which can vary depending on traits such as maternity, colony origin and species (Schultner et al., 2013; Helanterä and D'Etterre, 2014), it is likely that larvae use chemical information to adjust their egg consumption behaviour. The underlying recognition processes are predicted to be modulated by the expression of sensory genes. To address this question, we identified genes involved in larval sensory perception by comparing gene expression of larvae subjected to two social environments: isolation without contact to others and stimulation via the presence of other developing individuals. Gene expression was compared with particular focus on candidate sensory-related genes identified from the literature. We predict that ant larvae express many of the same sensory-related genes as adults, and that gene expression is affected by the social environment larvae encounter. In particular, we assume that expression of sensory-related genes is higher in larvae subjected to stimulation compared with larvae kept in isolation. Our results provide insights into the molecular machinery of social cue perception in social insect larvae.

Results

Across all samples, 13 169 unigenes were expressed. Of the 10 unigenes with the highest read count in each treatment, eight overlapped between the two treatments (Tables S3 and S4), and were enriched for the gene ontology (GO) terms ribosome, structural constituent of cuticle, structural constituent of ribosome and ribosomal small subunit assembly.

Of the 527 candidate sensory gene sequences identified from the literature, we found matches for 73 (13.8%). Seventeen sequences received single hits, whereas 15 sequences received hits from multiple candidate sequences (2–8 hits each, 56 candidate sequences in total). Of these 56 candidate sequences, 28 were copies or isoforms of the same gene and the remaining 27 represented genes from the same gene family with similar sequences. From the 15 sequences that received multiple hits, we picked the best hit according to match percentage and sequence length, resulting in 32 candidate sensory genes expressed in our samples (Fig. 1, Table S5).

**Figure 1.** Candidate sensory genes from five gene families expressed in *Formica lusca* ant larvae subjected to two social treatments. For better visualization, expression is given as log(fragment per kilobase million FPKM +1). CSP, chemosensory proteins; GR, gustatory receptors; OBP, odorant binding proteins; OR, odorant receptors; PPK, pickpocket proteins.
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Compared with the mean expression levels across all unigenes (isolation: mean = 26 FPKM, range = 0–34 178; stimulation: mean = 27, range = 0–50 142), the 32 candidate sensory genes were expressed at higher levels on average, but maximum expression levels were much lower (isolation: mean = 150, range = 0–6233; stimulation: mean = 192, range = 0–6011).

We found 448 unigenes that were differentially expressed (DEGs) between the two treatments at false discovery rate (FDR) < 0.05. This number changed marginally when applying more or less stringent statistical criteria and is thus representative for the data set (Fig. 2A). 19.9% (89/448) of DEGs were associated with genes of unknown function and 6.3% (23/448) received no significant BLAST hit. Of the 448 DEGs, 382 (2.9% of 13 169 total expressed unigenes) were overexpressed in stimulated larvae compared with isolated larvae while 66 unigenes (0.5%) were overexpressed in isolated larvae (see Table S6 for a full list of DEGs). Overexpressed unigenes in stimulated larvae were enriched for GO terms relating to chemosensory...
perception, including cellular response to chemical stimulus (Fig. 2C, see Table S7 for a full list of GO terms). GO terms of overexpressed genes in isolated larvae showed enrichment for lipid transport and RNA 5’-end processing (Fig. 2D).

Among the chemosensory unigenes overexpressed in stimulated larvae, we found three belonging to the CSP gene family (CSP5, CSP11precuror, probable CSP), one putative OR (putative odorant receptor 71a) and one putative GR (putative gustatory receptor 2a). Other unigenes that are known to be involved in sensory perception were also overexpressed in stimulated larvae, including apolipoprotein d, apolipoprotein d-like, Myosin-XV, probable cytochrome P450 303a1, protein artichoke and two protein takeout-like genes (Fig. 2B). Isolated larvae showed overexpression of one CSP (CSP6) and one OBP (OBP7) (Fig. 2B). Four of the differentially expressed sensory genes overlapped with those identified from the literature (CSP5, CSP6, OBP7, CSP11precuror).

Comparison of expression of 40 sensory genes across insects (Table S2) revealed that 45% (18/40) were exclusively expressed in F. fusca larvae. Conversely, 32.5% (13/40) were expressed in larvae of all three ant species, including four CSPs (CSP2, CSP5, CSP7, CSP11precuror), two OBPs (OBP7, OBP26), three GRs (GR1, GR87, GR202) and two ORs (OR170, ORCO). An additional five genes were commonly expressed in F. fusca and Monomorium pharaonis larvae, whereas four others were commonly expressed in both F. fusca and Cardiocondyla obscurior larvae. Only 10% (4/40) of genes were expressed across Hymenoptera and a single gene – ORCO – was expressed in larvae from all species.

Discussion

To date, few studies have investigated larval gene expression in ants. We found that F. fusca larvae express roughly the same number of genes as larvae of three other ant species [Camponotus floridanus: 15 631 genes (pooled adults and larvae), (Gupta et al., 2015); C. obscurior: 10 012 genes, (Schrader et al., 2015); M. pharaonis: 10 446 genes, (Warner et al., 2019)] and adult F. fusca ants [9859 genes, (Morandin et al., 2016)]. The most highly expressed genes across all samples were related to ribosome and cuticle structure and function, which agrees with results from other transcriptome studies of insect larvae (Harrison et al., 2015).

As predicted, overexpressed genes in stimulated larvae were enriched for GO terms relating to chemosensory perception. Three genes from the CSP gene family, known to bind odorant compounds in social insects (Ishida et al., 2002; Kulmuni and Havukainen, 2013; McKenzie et al., 2014; Hojo et al., 2015), were overexpressed in stimulated larvae (CSP5, CSP11precuror, probable CSP). CSP5 is expressed in the antennae of Oocerea biroi ants (McKenzie et al., 2014) but its chemosensory functions are debated (Kulmuni and Havukainen, 2013). The specific functions of CSP11precuror and probable CSP are not known, but since CSP11precuror expression was not consistent across samples from the stimulation treatment, we cannot be sure that it plays a role in larval chemosensory perception. We also found overexpression of genes belonging to the OR and GR gene families, as well as two protein takeout-like genes that were overexpressed under stimulation. In adult blowflies and silkworm larvae, a takeout-like gene is expressed in chemosensory organs (Fujikawa et al., 2006; Yoshizawa et al., 2011). Similarly, protein artichoke, a gene which is required for normal morphology and function of sensory organs in Drosophila embryos (Andrés et al., 2014) was overexpressed in stimulated larvae.

Several other sensory genes were overexpressed in stimulated larvae, including apolipoprotein d, apolipoprotein d-like, probable cytochrome P450 303a1 and Myosin XV. Apolipoprotein d and apolipoprotein d-like were among the most overexpressed genes in stimulated larvae, and act in lipid binding and transport, both of which are crucial steps in the chemosensory process. The related apolipoprotein apolipophorin III is a major antennal protein in the fire ant (Guntur et al., 2004), and apolipophorin I and apolipophorin II carry CHCs in termites (Sevala et al., 2000). Probable cytochrome P450 303a1 codes for a cytochrome P450, a protein that is expressed in sensory bristles in Drosophila melangaster (Willingham and Keil, 2004). We found differential expression in eight other cytochrome P450 genes, which are known to be expressed in insect sensory organs and are related to odorant detection (Wang et al., 1999; Malbèche-Coisne et al., 2002; 2005) and maintenance of olfactory sensitivity (Wang et al., 2008). Finally, Myosin XV is associated with sound perception in mammals (Libby and Steel, 2000), and a homologue in D. melanogaster, Sisyphus, transports key sensory proteins (Liu et al., 2008). Albeit speculative, these results suggest a possible role in acoustic communication, a widespread phenomenon in ants (Hunt and Richard, 2013; Schönrogge et al., 2017). Overall, the increase in expression of genes with putative sensory functions following manipulation of social environment appear to validate their role in sensory perception in ants, but whether these genes also act in other biological processes in larvae remains to be studied.

Compared with stimulated larvae, fewer genes were overexpressed in isolated larvae, which may be indicative of a transcriptional shutdown due to the stress of isolation. Indeed, isolation is not a natural state for ant larvae, and stress of isolation has been shown to cause changes in gene expression in adult fruit flies (Zhou et al., 2009). At the same time, overexpressed genes in isolated larvae
were enriched for GO terms related to RNA processing, suggesting increased transcriptional activity. In addition, isolated larvae expressed roughly the same number of genes as stimulated larvae, and the most highly expressed genes showed significant overlap between treatments, confirming that isolation did not have significant negative effects on larval gene expression. Finally, the chemosensory genes CSP6 and OBP7 were overexpressed in isolated larvae. CSP6 is also expressed in adult ant antennae (McKenzie et al., 2014), and is likely to bind CHCs. Thus, while our data do not allow us to discern whether changes in gene expression reflect a transcriptional response to stimulation, or rather a response to lack of stimulation, they clearly show that social environment influences larval gene expression.

*F. fusca* ant larvae expressed some of the same sensory-related genes as adult ants and other insect larvae. For example, larvae expressed eight CSPs, whereas 12 CSPs (six of which overlapped with our data) are expressed in adults and pupae of the closely related ant *Formica exsecta* (Dhaygude et al., 2017). Similarly, six ORs were expressed in larvae; orthologs of five of these ORs have been shown to respond to odors in antennae of *Harpegnathos saltator* worker ants (Pask et al., 2017; Slone et al., 2017). The sixth gene, ORCO, is a conserved, insect-specific odorant coreceptor subunit necessary for the function of the OR complex (Brand et al., 2018), which plays a critical role in social behavior in ants (Trible et al., 2017; Yan et al., 2017). We also detected expression of 11 OBPs, whereas only three OBPs were expressed in *F. exsecta* pupae (Dhaygude et al., 2017). This indicates development-stage specificity in sensory gene expression, as has been found in *D. melanogaster* (Fishilevich and Vosshall, 2005; Zhou et al., 2009). We furthermore detected five GRs, which encode gustatory receptors in *Drosophila* larvae (Scott et al., 2001), as well as two pickpocket genes (PPKs): PPK19 and PPK28. The *D. melanogaster* homologues PPK23 and PPK29 modulate responses to larval aggregation pheromones, and knockdown prevents larvae from detecting social cues (Mast et al., 2014). PPKs have not been studied in ants, but our results suggest that they may play a role in larval chemosensory perception.

Only few of the chemosensory genes identified in our study were commonly expressed across ant, honeybee and fruit fly larvae. This is probably due to sequence divergence between lineages, as most of the sequences were identified from studies on ant gene expression, and insects are known to vary widely in the number and sequence divergence of genes from gene families involved in sensory perception (Robertson and Wanner, 2006; Engsontia et al., 2008; Brand and Ramírez, 2017; Slone et al., 2017; McKenzie and Kronauer, 2018). This study is therefore only a first step in understanding larval perception in social insects, with three potential avenues for future research. First, the whole-body transcriptomes generated for this study do not allow inference about the localization of chemosensory gene expression. Ant larvae have two antennae, each of which possesses 1–5 olfactory sensillae (Wheeler and Wheeler, 1976). Whether sensory gene expression in ant larvae is restricted to these sensillae, or also occurs in sensory-specific organs similar to those found in *Drosophila* larvae (Joseph and Carlson, 2015), remains to be shown. Second, individual larval traits such as development stage, caste and sex may influence perception abilities. In *Formica* ants, male larvae are more likely to cannibalize related eggs than female larvae (Schultzner et al., 2013; 2014), but it is unknown whether this is linked to differences in egg recognition abilities. While we could not confirm the sex of individual larvae from our data as this requires information about sex-specific gene expression, sex ratio estimates from previous studies were female-biased (Schultzner et al., 2014; Pulliainen et al., 2019). We thus assume that the samples used in this study included no or few males, and that the results are not influenced by sex-specific differences in larval perception. Understanding how perception varies with larval sex will require separate testing of male and female larvae. Finally, species-level traits are likely to be associated with larval perception abilities. For instance, plasticity of gene expression can be expected to differ between ants, bees and wasps because bee and wasp larvae are reared in individual cells, while ants rear brood in piles. As a result, ant larvae are in close contact with nestmates, providing ample opportunities for social interactions (Schultzner et al., 2017), which likely shape larval sensory biology. Comparative studies across a range of social life histories will reveal how social environment influences the sensory biology of larvae. Together, this will shed new light on the evolution of communication in social insects.

**Experimental procedures**

**Collection and experimental setup**

We collected colonies of *F. fusca* ants (n = 6) containing one queen and workers (>200) in southwestern Finland (59°540.46.30 N, 23°150.55.90 E) in April 2016, coinciding with the end of hibernation. Colonies were transferred to nest boxes and kept in the dark at +4 °C for ~10 days, a well-established procedure used to synchronize the onset of egg laying [Ozan et al., 2013]. Nests were then brought to room temperature, and fed with a diet based on honey and eggs adapted from (Bhatkar and Whitcomb, 1970) and watered daily.

We monitored egg laying and hatching, removed young larvae (1–3 days post hatching) from nests, and size-matched them visually. The number of larval instars in *F. fusca* is unknown, but related species exhibit 3–4 instars (Solis et al., 2010). Based on visual inspection of larvae, only young, ie, first or second instar larvae, were included in the experiments. Each larva was placed on a Petri dish lined with sponge cloth to maintain moisture. Larvae...
were either isolated without contact to others (‘isolation’) or kept in a pile with four size-matched nestmate larvae and five nestmate eggs (‘stimulation’). To avoid sampling effects, treatments were set up in parallel with size-matched larvae over 3 days. To avoid potential effects of starvation on larval gene expression, larvae were isolated for 24 h in accordance with a previous study showing that Formica larvae isolated with five eggs survived for \( \sim 2.5 \) days when starved (Schultner et al., 2013). After 24 h, six larvae from each treatment were placed in individual Epipendorf tubes with 200 \( \mu \)l Trisure (Bioline) and stored at \(-80^\circ C\) until RNA extraction. As \( F. \text{fusca} \) larvae are known to cannibalize eggs (Schultner et al., 2014; Pulliainen et al., 2019), we only sampled larvae for the stimulation treatment if all nestmate larvae and eggs could be accounted for after the 24 h period. To minimize effects caused by inter-colony variation, we aimed to collect colony-matched lar-vae, ie, larvae from the same colonies, for the two treatments. In addition, we attempted to avoid pseudo-replication by sampling larvae from independent colonies. As this was not always possible, the final sampling included larvae from five colonies in the isolation treatment and larvae from four colonies in the stimulation treat-ment, with three colonies overlapping between treatments (Table S1). We checked whether pseudo-replication affected the results but found no obvious effect of colony origin (Figure S1) and the logFC values of all colonies were highly correlated, mean-ning that they had the same effects overall.

Transcriptome assembly

The samples were sequenced on five lanes of an Illumina HiSeqTM 2500 2 \( \times \) 100 bp (\(~400\) M paired-end reads for each lane). Detailed descriptions of the RNA extraction and library construction protocols, and the de novo transcriptome assembly and annotation pipelines can be found in (Morandin et al., 2018). In brief, after reads were checked for quality, we used Trinity (Grabherr et al., 2013) with a combination of de novo assembly and genome-guided assembly to construct the de novo transcriptome. Contigs were filtered to keep only coding sequences, to obtain a set of nonredundant contigs and to remove low-quality contigs and probable exogenous RNAs known to be abundant in social insect de novo transcriptomes (Johansson et al., 2013). The final assembly included 24765 unigenes. The paired-end reads were mapped to the final assembly using RSEM (Li and Dewey, 2011), and Bowtie2 (Langmead and Salzberg, 2012).

Differential gene expression and GO term enrichment analysis

Read counts were used in differential gene expression analysis with EdgeR (Robinson et al., 2009). For comparison of the two treatments, we filtered out transcripts with very low read counts by removing loci with reads <1 per kilobase of exons per million fragments (FPKM) mapped in at least half of the sequenced libraries. We found 23149 unigenes expressed in stimulated larvae, 13440 (58\%) of which had a FPKM count >1 in at least half of the samples. In isolated larvae, 21919 unigenes were expressed, 14493 (66\%) of which had a FPKM count >1 in at least half of the samples. TMM normalization was applied to account for compositional differences between libraries, and expression differences were considered significant at a FDR < 0.05. GOstat (Befiå®arth and Speed, 2004) was used for gene ontology (GO) term enrichment analysis on differentially expressed gene sets, using all genes with GO terms as the universe. GO terms were plotted in a scatterplot with semantic space, clustering semantically similar GO terms after reducing redundant terms with REVIGO (Supek et al., 2011) (displaying terms with dispensability of <0.15).

Candidate sensory genes

From the literature on insect chemosensory biology (Scott et al., 2001; Ishida et al., 2002; Fishilevich et al., 2005; Kreher et al., 2005; Ozaki et al., 2005; Kulmuni and Havukainen, 2013; Mast et al., 2014; McKenzie et al., 2014; Hojo et al., 2015; De Carvalho et al., 2017; Pask et al., 2017; Slone et al., 2017), we chose candidate sensory genes, ie, genes we suspected a priori to be expressed in lar-vae, because they have been identified in ants or other insect larvae (File S1). We identified 527 sequences representing 371 genes (sev-eral isoforms were included and/or sequences from several species were used), which belong to gene families associated with sensory perception: chemosensory proteins (CSPs), odorant binding proteins (OBPs), odorant receptors (ORs), gustatory receptors (GRs), ionotro-pic receptors (IRs) and pickpocket proteins (PPKs). We searched for these genes in the larval transcriptomes using BLAST and visualized their expression in the two treatments.

Larval sensory gene expression across species

We compared the transcriptomes of \( F. \text{fusca} \) larvae with larval transcriptomes from two ants [\( C. \text{obscurior} \), (Schrader et al., 2015); \( M. \text{phaoraonis} \) (Warner et al., 2017)], the honey bee \( A. \text{mellifera} \) (Cameron et al., 2013; Ashby et al., 2016), and the fruit fly \( D. \text{melanogaster} \) (extracted from the GEO Profiles data-base (Barrett et al., 2013), accession GSM3285207). We focused on the candidate sensory genes identified from the literature that were expressed in our data (8.6\%, 32 of 371 genes), as well as on a subset of eight unigenes identified from the differential expression analysis (see Table S2 for all genes used in species comparison) and searched for these 40 genes in all transcriptomes using BLAST. To estimate how conserved larval sensory gene expression is across insects, we calculated the proportion of com-monly expressed genes in Formicidae (\( F. \text{fusca}, C. \text{obscurior}, M. \text{phaoraonis} \)), Hymenoptera (Formicidae + \( A. \text{mellifera} \)) and Holometabola (Hymenoptera + \( D. \text{melanogaster} \)).
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