



Multimodal weighting differences by bats and their prey: probing natural selection pressures on sexually selected traits



D. G. E. Gomes ^{a, b, *}, W. Halfwerk ^{a, c}, R. C. Taylor ^{a, d}, M. J. Ryan ^{a, e}, R. A. Page ^a

^a Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Balboa, Panama

^b Max Planck Institute for Ornithology, Seewiesen, Germany

^c Department of Ecological Science, VU University, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

^d Department of Biology, Salisbury University, Salisbury, MD, U.S.A.

^e Department of Integrative Biology, University of Texas, Austin, TX, U.S.A.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 27 March 2017

Initial acceptance 16 June 2017

Final acceptance 23 August 2017

MS. number: A17-00270R

Keywords:

eavesdropping
fringe-lipped bat
multimodal communication
sensory modality
signal evolution
túngara frog

Multimodal communication has received increasing attention in recent years. While much is understood about how intended receivers (such as potential mates) respond to multimodal displays, less is known about how eavesdropping predators perceive and interpret these cues. The male túngara frog, *Physalaemus pustulosus*, is a neotropical anuran that attracts females with an acoustic call and a dynamically inflating/deflating vocal sac. However, the túngara frog's multimodal courtship display also attracts eavesdropping predators, such as fringe-lipped bats, *Trachops cirrhosus*. We utilized robotic frog models to expose fringe-lipped bats to multimodal túngara frog courtship displays. The models varied in call amplitude and/or the presence of vocal sac cues. In a two-choice test, we show that fringe-lipped bats more often attack higher-amplitude calls. Additionally, coupling the inflating vocal sac cues to the lower-amplitude frog call increased the probability that a bat would attack this less attractive call. Previous studies have demonstrated that vocal sac cues do not increase the attractiveness of low-amplitude calls to female *P. pustulosus*. Thus, although natural selection, through the bats, and sexual selection, through the female frogs, exert counter-selection forces on the male's sexual display, the strength of these forces are not symmetrical. We discuss possible explanations for why this might be the case. This study underlines the importance of understanding the contribution of both intended and unintended receivers on signal evolution, and it helps explain how selection pressures might vary across sensory modalities.

© 2017 The Association for the Study of Animal Behaviour. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Courting animals often exhibit elaborate multimodal displays that increase signal detection and attractiveness to mates (Hebets & Papaj, 2005; Partan & Marler, 2005). Some female frogs, for example, attend to the male's body movements while listening to his calls (Preininger, Boeckle, Sztatecsny, & Hodl, 2013; Taylor, Buchanan, & Doherty, 2007). However, mate attraction can be costly, as multimodal displays can also increase detection by eavesdropping predators (Halfwerk, Dixon, et al., 2014; Rhebergen, Taylor, Ryan, Page, & Halfwerk, 2015).

While single-modality mating signals between a signaller and its intended receivers (mates) is well understood, few studies have attempted to understand how multimodal displays are perceived by eavesdropping predators (Halfwerk & Slabbekoorn, 2015; Hebets et al., 2016). Furthermore, it is unclear how predators use

prey cues, especially since they not only attend to the same cues as mates, but can also perceive display components via different sensory modalities (Halfwerk, Dixon, et al., 2014; Halfwerk, Jones, Taylor, Ryan, & Page, 2014). Additionally, multiple cues often interact, which can alter a receiver's behavioural response to a single cue presented alone (Partan & Marler, 1999; Partan, 2013). For example, poison-dart frogs modulate their response to acoustic cues of intruding frogs in the presence of visual cues (Narins, Grabul, Soma, Gaucher, & Hodl, 2005; Narins, Hodl, & Grabul, 2003). However, cues do not necessarily interact in the same way. Thus, determining the relevance of multimodal display components can be difficult. Rather than assigning 'absolute' values to cues, receivers have evolved ways to compare cues with one another (Bateson & Healy, 2005; Lea & Ryan, 2015) and assign 'relative' values to them. This process, termed 'signal weighting', allows receivers to compare multiple cues among signalling individuals and make decisions based on cue importance.

* Correspondence: D. G. E. Gomes, Department of Biological Sciences, Boise State University, Boise, ID 83725, U.S.A.

E-mail address: dylangomes@u.boisestate.edu (D. G. E. Gomes).

The fringe-lipped bat, *Trachops cirrhosus*, is a predator that eavesdrops on mating calls of frog and insect prey (Tuttle & Ryan, 1981). One of its preferred prey species, the male túngara frog, *Physalaemus pustulosus*, often calls in large choruses. When choruses are loud, males increase the amplitude of their calls (Halfwerk, Lea, Guerra, Page, & Ryan, 2016), which makes them more attractive to both female frogs and bat predators (Tuttle & Ryan, 1981). During call production, male frogs inflate and deflate their vocal sacs as a by-product of recycling air. These dynamically moving vocal sacs make males more visually attractive to females (Taylor & Ryan, 2013; Taylor, Klein, Stein, & Ryan, 2008, 2011) and more echo-acoustically attractive to frog-eating bats (Halfwerk, Dixon, et al., 2014). However, for female frogs, the visual cue increases attractiveness only when differences in male call amplitude are miniscule. In other words, amplitude is more important in female decision making than the perception of an inflating vocal sac (Stange, Page, Ryan, & Taylor, 2016). While bat predators are more attracted to calling frogs when inflating vocal sac cues are perceptually available (Halfwerk, Dixon, et al., 2014), it is unclear how this cue interacts with call amplitude, and what importance bats place on each of these cues during foraging.

In our study, we used robotic frog models to investigate how a bat predator weights individual cues of a multimodal frog mating display. Because bats and frogs use different sensory modalities to perceive the male frogs' vocal sac inflation, we hypothesized that predators and mates would also differ in their weighting of male cues. Teasing apart the influences that multimodal display cues have on bat predators is important in our understanding of how natural selection pressures have shaped the evolution of the male frog's sexual display.

METHODS

Animal Care

Fringe-lipped bats ($N = 16$) were caught in Soberanía National Park, Panamá, between September 2014 and May 2015 with mist nets set in the forest or near known roosts. The bats were caught 0–4 h after sunset and were housed in an outdoor flight cage ($5 \times 5 \times 2.5$ m) in Gamboa, Panamá, where they had access to water ad libitum. The bats were given at least one night to acclimate to the flight cage and, on subsequent nights, training and testing took place in this same flight cage. Bats began to exhibit natural foraging behaviour very quickly (generally by the night after capture), suggesting they were comfortable with our experimental set-up and initial handling. Furthermore, animals were handled as minimally as possible; once they were placed in the flight cage, they were not caught or moved by researchers for the duration of the experiment, and thus, were only handled during initial catching and final release back into the wild. Prior to release, each bat was injected with a subcutaneous passive integrative transponder (Trovan, Ltd, <http://www.trovan.com>) to prevent the retesting of wild individuals. All necessary permits were obtained from the Government of Panamá (ANAM SE/A-86-14), and all research complied with the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC 2014-0101-2017, 2015-0209-2018) protocols from the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute (STRI).

Experimental Set-up

Two frog models (a robotic model and a control model) were used in a two-choice test (Klein, Stein, & Taylor, 2012; Taylor et al., 2008). Each frog model was placed on the centre of a smooth-surfaced Plexiglas circular platform (height = 9 cm, diameter = 33 cm) that echo-acoustically mimics a water surface

(Siemers, Stiltz, & Schnitzler, 2001). Speakers (Tymphany Peerless, 6 cm; powered by a Pyle PCA2 Stereo Power Amplifier 2×40 W) were placed directly below each platform to broadcast a synthetic túngara frog whine plus one chuck call (for details on the creation of the synthetic whine-chuck call see Ryan & Rand, 2003). Holes were drilled into the Plexiglas below the frog model to allow for sound propagation from the speaker directly below.

Frog models had an inflatable silicon balloon in front of the frogs (which mimicked a frog vocal sac), and an air tube that ran under the Plexiglas and through the wall to an adjacent room (refer to Gomes et al., 2016; Laird, Clements, Hunter, & Taylor, 2016 for more details on vocal sac construction). One of the models (hereafter referred to as the robotic model) had connection to a gas-relay station via the air tube, which allowed for vocal sac inflation. The air tube for the control model ended after ~1 m and was not connected to the gas-relay station.

The two frog models were always placed 0.8 m from each other (on centre), and the pair of models were set 2.4 m, 3.2 m or 4 m from the perched bat on any given trial. Both frog models were placed randomly in an array of nine paired positions, resulting in a total of six possible locations for the pair of platforms (i.e. positions 1 and 2, 2 and 3, etc.). Two additional Plexiglas platforms, which lacked frog models, were placed randomly in one of the remaining seven positions (for an illustration of the platform array, see supplementary methods in Gomes et al., 2016).

Speakers from both frog models simultaneously broadcast synthetic túngara frog calls on a 2 s cycle (Ryan & Rand, 2003). The silicon vocal sac on the robotic model inflated in synchrony with the túngara frog call via a 19 kHz actuation signal (sent from a laptop, Dell Latitude E4300, via Adobe Audition to the gas-relay station). All three audio channels (control model speaker, robotic model speaker and 19 kHz inflation signal) came from the same laptop and were split to independent outputs using a multichannel set-up (Edirol FA-101).

The control frog model always broadcast the túngara frog call at 76 dB SPL (re. 20 μ Pa; at 1 m; C weighting; set to Max and Fast), while the robotic model played back at 76 dB, 73 dB, 70 dB or 67 dB, corresponding to an amplitude difference of 0 dB, –3 dB, –6 dB or –9 dB, respectively. While the control model did not have an inflating vocal sac (only a deflated, stationary one), the robotic model had the option of having the inflating vocal sac turned off (similar to the control model; unimodal trials) or turned on (multimodal trials) by muting the 19 kHz channel on Adobe Audition. This allowed for eight robotic model treatments (vocal sac inflation: on/off; playback amplitude difference: 0 dB, –3 dB, –6 dB, –9 dB), which were repeated four times per bat, resulting in 32 total trials per bat. The robotic frog treatments were randomly presented throughout the duration of the experiment to control for effects of learning and habituation.

In each trial, bats made a choice between the control model (amplitude always 76 dB; no vocal sac inflation) and the robotic model, which was either unimodal (amplitude varying across trials; no vocal sac inflation) or multimodal (amplitude varying across trials; with the dynamically inflating vocal sac). Thus, when the robotic model was played back at 76 dB (0 dB difference) and had the inflating vocal sac turned off (unimodal), it was equal, in all ways, to the control model. This treatment served as an additional control, in which we would expect 50% of the attacks to be to either model (random attacks; see Fig. 1).

Behavioural Observations

In all trials, bats were initially perched in a 60×60 cm roost made of black cloth that was located in one corner of the flight cage. Túngara frog call playbacks (and the inflation of the vocal sac) were

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8488783>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8488783>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)