

# The parasitoid *Ooencyrtus nezarae* (Hymenoptera: Encyrtidae) prefers hosts parasitized by conspecifics over unparasitized hosts

### Keiji Takasu\* and Yoshimi Hirose

Division of Insect Natural Enemies, Institute of Biological Control, Faculty of Agriculture, Kyushu University, Fukuoka 812, Japan

Received January 28, 1991 / Accepted in revised form April 9, 1991

Summary. Two laboratory experiments were conducted to examine the ovipositional preferences of the egg parasitoid Ooencyrtus nezarae Ishii (Hymenoptera: Encyrtidae) for parasitized and unparasitized Megacopta punctatissimum Montandon (Hemiptera: Plataspidae). Females that had never oviposited or that had not oviposited for 3 days preferred recently parasitized hosts more than unparasitized hosts. The preference for recently parasitized hosts appeared to be mediated by the punctures in already parasitized hosts made by the ovipositor of the first female. Survival of the parasitoid progeny was lower in recently parasitized hosts than in unparasitized hosts. However, handling time of parasitized hosts was extremely short relative to that of unparasitized hosts, because the superparasitizing female could use the punctures made by the previous females. It is concluded that the females preferred the parasitized hosts over unparasitized hosts because the benefit of saving time and energy for drilling was more than the cost of progeny survival.

Key words: Ooencyrtus nezarae – Parasitoid – Optimal foraging – Host discrimination – Handling time

Optimal foraging theory predicts that parasitoid females should exhibit preferences for the more profitable hosts (Charnov and Skinner 1985; Pak 1986). Although the females usually prefer unparasitized hosts to hosts parasitized by conspecifics (van Lenteren 1976, 1981), a preference for parasitized hosts could arise if parasitized hosts were more profitable. However, it has never been shown that parasitoid females have a preference for parasitized hosts over unparasitized hosts, except for aphelinids which hyperparasitize their own or another species (Flanders 1936, 1953). Ocencyrtus nezarae is an egg parasitoid of several phytophagous bugs including Megacopta punctatissimum in Japan (Takasu and Hirose 1985). Although this parasitoid is gregarious in a large host, such as Riptortus clavatus Thunberg, it is usually solitary in eggs of M. punctatissimum. In the course of a study on host discrimination by O. nezarae attacking M. punctatissimum eggs, we observed that parasitoid females that had never oviposited before or had not oviposited for a long time showed a preference for hosts parasitized recently by conspecifics over unparasitized hosts. In this paper, we describe this unusual behavior, and discuss its ecological significance.

#### Materials and methods

*M. punctatissimum* adults were collected from several communities of kudzu, *Pueraria lobata* (Willd.) near Fukuoka in April and May 1987. The bugs were kept in cages  $(22 \times 16 \times 20 \text{ cm})$  at 25° C and 16 L:8 D, and provided with kudzu vines. Pieces of polyester organdy were introduced into the cages every day, and *M. punctatissimum* laid their egg masses on these ovipositional substrates. *O. nezarae* females were obtained from a laboratory culture maintained at the Institute of Biological Control, Faculty of Agriculture, Kyushu University (Takasu and Hirose 1988).

The following two laboratory experiments were carried out at 25° C, using 3-day-old hosts and 4-day-old, mated parasitoid females. The first experiment was designed to determine whether O. nezarae females preferred unparasitized or parasitized eggs in a host egg mass. The interior of parasitized hosts changes after parasitism, and thus it was suspected that the behavior of parasitoid females toward parasitized hosts might also change with increasing host age. Thus, we examined the behavior of females on two types of host egg masses: Type A, an egg mass consisting of unparasitized eggs and eggs that had been parasitized 1 h previously; and Type B, an egg mass consisting of unparasitized eggs and eggs that had been parasitized 24 h previously. To make these two types of host egg masses, an egg mass consisting of 10 unparasitized eggs fastened with a vinyl-acetate glue on a piece of filter paper  $(3 \times 2 \text{ cm})$  was exposed to a female in a test tube  $(20 \times 3 \text{ cm})$ . After the female had oviposited in 5 of the 10 eggs, the egg mass was removed and held at 25° C until use in an experiment. Oviposition was verified by the presence of egg stalks protruding from the host chorion (Takasu and Hirose 1988). To examine the behavior of females with different

<sup>\*</sup> Present address and address for offprint requests: Insect Biology & Population Management Research Laboratory, USDA-ARS, Tifton, GA 31793, USA

oviposition experience, egg masses of each type were presented to females that had: (1) not oviposited previously (inexperienced females), (2) oviposited 1 h previously into 3-5 unparasitized hosts, or (3) not oviposited for 3 days after oviposition into 3-5 unparasitized hosts. After a female encountered a host egg mass, her behavior toward parasitized and unparasitized eggs was observed until she laid 5 eggs. In the case of inexperienced females, time taken for each behavioral event during oviposition was also measured with a stop watch. For every combination of the three types of females and the two types of egg masses, 20 females were tested.

Because the available data indicated that inexperienced females or females that had not oviposited for 3 days preferred to oviposit in hosts parasitized 1 h earlier, a second experiment was designed to determine if their preference was due to the presence of oviposition punctures. Two unparasitized hosts that had been contiguous to each other were fastened on a piece of filter paper  $(1 \times 1 \text{ cm})$ . These two hosts were exposed to a female in a petri dish (6 cm in diameter) under the binocular microscope. O. nezarae females usually feed on host fluid exuded from punctures on the host chorion before laying their eggs into the hosts. When the female finished drilling one of the two hosts and began to feed on its fluid, she was removed. This host did not contain any parasitoid egg but had been punctured by the female's ovipositor. The piece of filter paper with punctured host and unparasitized host was exposed to an inexperienced female or a female that had not oviposited for 3 days. Her behavior toward these two types of hosts was observed until she oviposited in one of the two. For each of the two types of females, 15 females were tested.

### Results

On encountering host egg masses of type A in the first experiment, inexperienced females and females that had not oviposited for 3 days oviposited significantly more frequently in parasitized hosts than in unparasitized hosts (Table 1). Immediately after encountering host egg masses, the female mounted the egg masses and walked over several eggs while drumming. When a female came into contact with a parasitized host in the course of drumming, she usually stopped and drummed the host surface near the protruding egg stalks for 1–3 sec. She then inserted her ovipositor into the puncture made by the previous female and fed on the fluid of the parasitized host. She then laid an egg in the host through the puncture.

In contrast, when a female that had laid 1 h previously encountered the egg masses of type A, she usually rejected the parasitized hosts, and oviposited significantly more frequently in unparasitized hosts (Table 1). Before rejecting the parasitized hosts, she drummed the stalks or the host surface near the stalks for a few seconds.

On encountering the egg masses of type B, inexperienced females and females that had not oviposited for 3 days oviposited in unparasitized hosts as often as in parasitized hosts. For both types of females, there was no significant difference in the number of parasitized and unparasitized hosts attacked (Table 1). When a female oviposited in the 24-h parasitized host, she did not use the punctures made by previous females. Instead she drilled the hosts in the same manner as unparasitized hosts. When females that had oviposited 1 h previously encountered the egg masses of type B, they rejected 24-h parasitized hosts and oviposited significantly more frequently in unparasitized hosts (Table 1).

To determine whether females changed their ovipositional preference after oviposition on the egg masses, the host preference of females with oviposition experience on type A or B egg masses was examined (Tables 2, 3). These two tables include only data from 10 or more females in each type of oviposition experience, because the data from less than 10 females could not be statistically analyzed. On egg masses of type A, after ovipositing in one parasitized host, inexperienced females often oviposited in parasitized hosts. The frequency of oviposition in parasitized hosts by this type of female differed significantly from the frequency that would have been expected if the wasps had no ovipositional preference for unparasitized hosts or parasitized hosts. However, after ovipositing in two parasitized hosts, this type of female oviposited in parasitized hosts significantly less frequently than would have been expected if they had no preference for any type of host (Table 2). Females that had not oviposited for 3 days at the start of the experiment also sometimes rejected parasitized hosts after ovipositing in one parasitized host. The frequency of oviposition in parasitized hosts by this type of female did not differ significantly from the frequency that would have been expected if they had no preference for any type of host (Table 2).

On the egg masses of type B, inexperienced females often rejected parasitized hosts after ovipositing in one parasitized host. The frequency of oviposition in parasitized hosts by this type of female differed significantly

**Table 1.** Ovipositional preference for unparasitized and parasitized hosts by parasitoid females in two egg mass types: A, an egg mass consisting of unparasitized eggs and eggs that had been parasitized 1 h previously; and B, an egg mass consisting of unparasitized eggs and eggs that had been parasitized 24 h previously

Type of females	Type of hosts	No. females that first oviposited in unparasitized or parasitized hosts on a host egg mass of		
		Type A	Туре В	
Inexperienced	Unparasitized	3ª	8ª	
	Parasitized	17 <sup>b</sup>	12ª	
Oviposited 1 h	Unparasitized	16ª	19ª	
previously	Parasitized	4 <sup>6</sup>	1 <sup>b</sup>	
Not oviposited	Unparasitized	4ª	11ª	
for 3 days	Parasitized	16 <sup>b</sup>	9ª	

<sup>a, b</sup> For each type of female, figures followed by different superscript letters in the same column differed significantly (P < 0.05);  $\chi^2$ 

**Table 2.** The effect of oviposition experi-ence of parasitoid females on their hostpreference on egg masses of type A

at start	Oviposition experience during experiment on egg	No. of females examined	% females ovipositing in parasitized hosts	
of experiment	masses <sup>a</sup>		Observed	Expected <sup>b</sup>
Inexperienced	P P-P	17 13	76.5* 15.4*	50.0 50.0
Oviposited 1 h previously	U U–U	16 15	6.2* 0*	60.0 70.0
Not oviposited for 3 days	Р	10	41.2	50.0

<sup>a</sup> P and U show oviposition in a parasitized and an unparasitized host, respectively. P–P and U–U show successive oviposition in two parasitized and two unparasitized hosts, respectively <sup>b</sup> Percentages expected if parasitoid females had no ovipositional preference for unparasitized or parasitized hosts

\* Significantly (P < 0.05) different from expected percentages,  $\chi^2$ 

**Table 3.** The effect of oviposition experience of parasitoid females on theirhost preference on egg masses of type B

Table 4. Mean time taken for each behavioral event of an inexperienced parasitoid

female attacking a host

at start	Oviposition experience during experiment on egg	No. of females examined	% females ovipositing in parasitized hosts	
of experiment	masses <sup>a</sup>		Observed	Expected <sup>b</sup>
Inexperienced	Р	12	25.0*	50.0
Oviposited 1 h previously	U U–U	19 17	10.5* 0*	60.0 70.0
Not oviposited for 3 days	U U–U	14 13	7.7* 0*	60.0 70.0

<sup>a, b</sup> see Table 2

\* Significantly (P < 0.05) different from expected percentages,  $\chi^2$ 

Type of hosts	No. of hosts examined	Mean time (sec) taken for indicated behavioral events*				
		Drum- ming	Drilling	Host feeding	Ovipo- siting	Total
Unparasitized	30	51.5ª	624.6ª	385.3ª	94.0ª	1159.3ª
Parasitized 1 h previously	18	25.0ь	42.6ъ	361.2ª	111.0ª	539.8 <sup>6</sup>
Parasitized 24 h previously	10	43.2ª	561.3ª	330.7ª	98.4ª	1033.6ª

\* Figures followed by the different superscript letters in the same column differed significantly (P < 0.05) by Kruskal-Wallis test

from what would have been expected if they had no preference for any type of host (Table 3). Similar findings were obtained from females that had oviposited 1 h previously and females that had not oviposited for 3 days (Table 3).

The mean time for drumming or drilling by inexperienced females was significantly shorter in hosts that were parasitized 1 h previously than in unparasitized hosts or hosts parasitized 24 h previously, because the female inserted her ovipositor through the puncture made by a previous female. As a result, the mean time for oviposition by an inexperienced female on a host parasitized 1 h previously was significantly shorter than that for unparasitized hosts or hosts parasitized 24 h previously (Table 4).

When inexperienced females were provided with a host with a puncture made by a previous female and an unparasitized host in the second experiment, 14 of the 15 females first oviposited in the hosts with the punctures. In the case of females that had not oviposited for 3 days, 13 of the 15 females also oviposited in punctured hosts. For both types of females, there was a significant difference (P < 0.01,  $\chi^2$  test) in the number of ovipositing females between the two types of hosts. On encountering the two types of hosts, both types of females mounted and drummed the hosts before they discovered the punc-

tures. Then, they fed on host fluid exuded from the punctures and thereafter oviposited in the hosts in the same manner as in recently parasitized hosts.

## Discussion

In the first experiment, an inexperienced female or a female that had not oviposited for 3 days preferred to oviposit in recently parasitized hosts over unparasitized hosts immediately after encountering an egg mass consisting of both host types. Unmated females of certain aphelinid species oviposit only in hosts parasitized by its own or another species (Flanders 1936, 1953). The unmated females of these species lay only male eggs in the parasitized hosts, because males can develop only as hyperparasitoids of the larvae of their own or another species. Except for such hyperparasitoids, this is the first report of a parasitized hosts.

The preference for parasitized hosts by *O. nezarae* females is a result of a laboratory experiment, but it is probably shown in the field. *M. punctatissimum* females usually lay egg masses consisting of 20–50 eggs. In the laboratory, *O. nezarae* females each leave the egg mass consisting of 20 or more eggs before they completely oviposit in all the eggs in it (Takasu and Hirose in prep.). Thus, in the field the females are more likely to encounter host egg masses consisting of unparasitized and parasitized eggs.

In the second experiment, inexperienced females or females that had not oviposited for 3 days preferred hosts with punctures from previously attempted oviposition. This result suggests that the preference for recently parasitized hosts by these two types of females is due to the presence of punctures made by previous females on the parasitized hosts. Such a hypothesis is also supported by the fact that in the first experiment, inexperienced females or females that had not oviposited for 3 days showed no ovipositional preference for hosts 24 h after parasitism. They could not use the punctures in ovipositing on the hosts 24 h after parasitism, probably because the punctures on the parasitized hosts are sealed up by the exudate from the punctures. It was observed that host fluid exudes from the punctures after oviposition.

Inexperienced females at the start of the experiment ceased preferring to oviposit in recently parasitized hosts after ovipositing in two parasitized hosts. Females that had not oviposited for 3 days at the start of the experiment also did so after oviposition in one parasitized host. The loss of the preference for parasitized hosts by these females is because they discriminate between parasitized and unparasitized hosts on the basis of a stalk protruding from host chorion (Takasu and Hirose 1988). Shortly after oviposition in unparasitized hosts, O. nezarae females reject parasitized hosts though the inexperienced females readily oviposited in parasitized hosts. In the present study, after inexperienced females or females that had not oviposited for 3 days had oviposited in two or one parasitized hosts, respectively, they also tended to reject parasitized hosts. This suggests that females that

have oviposited in parasitized hosts also discriminate between parasitized and unparasitized hosts due to the stalk.

Although solitary parasitoids should avoid ovipositing in parasitized hosts containing their own eggs, they could benefit by ovipositing in parasitized hosts containing other female's eggs under certain conditions (van Alphen and Nell 1982; Bakker et al. 1985). A recently parasitized host which an inexperienced female first encounters clearly contains other females' eggs. Likewise, for females that have not oviposited for a long time, recently parasitized hosts could be hosts containing other females' eggs. Optimal foraging theory predicts that parasitoids should have a preference for the more profitable hosts to maximize the rate of gain of fitness with time (Charnov and Skinner 1985). Since these recently parasitized hosts are more profitable for inexperienced females and females that had not oviposited for 3 days than unparasitized hosts, these two types of females might prefer the recently parasitized hosts. Profitability of a host for parasitoids depends on the number and quality of parasitoid progeny that host sustains and handling time of the parasitoids (Pak 1986). For O. nezarae females, profitability of a M. punctatissimum egg mainly depends on survival of parasitoid progeny and the handling time associated with oviposition. An adult of O. nezarae usually emerges from a host egg even if two or more parasitoid eggs are laid, and the size of the emergent adults do not vary with number of parasitoid eggs laid per host (Takasu and Hirose unpublished). In M. punctatissimum eggs, survival of O. nezarae progeny is lower in recently parasitized hosts than in unparasitized hosts: 75% and 95% in hosts parasitized 1 h previously and unparasitized hosts respectively (Takasu and Hirose unpublished). However, handling time of O. nezarae females was much shorter on recently parasitized hosts than on unparasitized hosts. It took over 10 min for each female to drill the chorion of a M. punctatissimum egg (Table 4). This drilling time is much longer than that for other solitary egg parasitoids, such as *Allophanurus* indicus Subba Rao et Chacko (Subba Rao and Chacko 1961), Telenomus heliothidis Ashmead (Strand and Vinson 1983), Trichogramma embryophagum Htg. (Klomp et al. 1980) and Trissolcus plautiae (Watanabe) (Ohno 1987). The use of the punctures by O. nezarae females on parasitized hosts would save more time and energy for drilling. So, the benefit from a reduction in handling time could be more than the cost of progeny survival.

Acknowledgments. We thank Dr. M.R. Strand for his critical reading of the manuscript. This work was supported in part by the Japan Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries.

#### References

- Bakker K, Alphen JJM van, Batenburg FHD van, Hoeven N van der, Nell HW, Strien-van Liempt WTFH van, Turlings TCJ (1985) The function of host discrimination and superparasitization in parasitoids. Oecologia 67:572–576
- Charnov EL, Skinner SW (1985) Complementary approaches to the understanding of parasitoid oviposition decisions. Env Entomol 14: 383–391

- Flanders SE (1936) A biological phenomenon affecting the establishment of Aphelinidae as parasites. Ann Entomol Soc Am 29:251–255
- Flanders SE (1953) Aphelinid biologies with implications for taxonomy. Ann Entomol Soc Am 46:84–94
- Klomp H, Teerink BJ, Ma WC (1980) Discrimination between parasitized and unparasitized hosts in the egg parasite *Trichogramma embryophagum* (Hym: Trichogrammatidae): a matter of learning and forgetting. Neth J Zool 30:254–277
- Ohno K (1987) Effect of host age on parasitism by *Trissolcus* plautiae (Watanabe) (Hymenoptera: Scelionidae), an egg parasitoid of *Plautia stali* Scott (Heteroptera: Pentatomidae). Appl Entomol Zool 22:646–648
- Pak GA (1986) Behavioural variations among strains of *Tricho-gramma* spp.: a review of the literature on host-age selection. J Appl Entomol 101:55-64
- Strand MR, Vinson SB (1983) Host acceptance behaviour of the parasitoid *Telenomus heliothidis* (Hymenoptera: Scelionidae) toward *Heliothis virescens* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). Ann Entomol Soc Am 76:781–785

- Subba Rao BR, Chacko MJ (1961) Studies on Allophanurus indicus n. sp., an egg parasite of Bagrada cruciferarum Kirkaldy (Hymenoptera: Scelionidae). Beitr Entomol 11:812-824
- Takasu K, Hirose Y (1985) Seasonal egg parasitism of phytophagous stink bugs in a soybean field in Fukuoka (In Japanese with English summary). Proc Assoc Pl Prot Kyushu 31:127– 131
- Takasu K, Hirose Y (1988) Host discrimination in the parasitoid Ooencyrtus nezarae: the role of the egg stalk as an external marker. Ent Exp Appl 47:45–48
- Van Alphen JJM, Nell HW (1982) Superparasitism and host discrimination by Asobara tabida Nees (Braconidae: Alysiinae), a larval parasitoid of Drosophilidae. Neth J Zool 32:232–260
- Van Lenteren JC (1976) The development of host discrimination and the prevention of superparasitism in the parasite *Pseudeucoila bochei* Weld (Hym.: Cynipidae). Neth J Zool 26:1–83
- Van Lenteren JC (1981) Host discrimination by parasitoids. In: Nordlund DA, Jones RL, Lewis WJ (eds) Semiochemicals: their role in pest control. John Wiley & Sons, New York, pp 153– 179