**University of
Zurich^{UZH}**

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2017

**Critical weight mediates sex-specific body size plasticity and sexual
dimorphism in the yellow dung fly *Scathophaga stercoraria* (Diptera:
Scathophagidae)**

Rohner, Patrick T ; Blanckenhorn, Wolf U ; Schäfer, Martin A

Abstract: Ultimate factors driving insect body size are rather well understood, while—apart from a few model species—the underlying physiological and developmental mechanisms received less attention. We investigate the physiological basis of adaptive size variation in the yellow dung fly *Scathophaga stercoraria*, which shows pronounced male-biased sexual size dimorphism and strong body size plasticity. We estimate variation of a major physiological threshold, the critical weight, which is the mass at which a larva initiates pupariation. Critical weight was associated with sexual size dimorphism and sex-specific plasticity, and is thus a likely target of selection on adult size. Detailed larval growth trajectories derived from individuals raised at two food and temperature treatments further reveal that sex-specific size plasticity is mediated by faster initial growth of males that later becomes reduced by higher male weight loss during the wandering stage. We further demonstrate that integral growth rates, which are typically calculated as simple ratios of egg-to-adult development time and adult weight, do not necessarily well reflect variation in instantaneous growth rates. We illustrate the importance of detailed assessments of ontogenetic growth trajectories for the understanding of adaptive size variation and discuss the mechanistic basis of size determination in shaping sex-specific phenotypic plasticity.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ede.12223>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-137472>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

Originally published at:

Rohner, Patrick T; Blanckenhorn, Wolf U; Schäfer, Martin A (2017). Critical weight mediates sex-specific body size plasticity and sexual dimorphism in the yellow dung fly *Scathophaga stercoraria* (Diptera: Scathophagidae). *Evolution Development*, 19(3):147-156.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ede.12223>

**Critical weight mediates sex-specific body size plasticity and sexual dimorphism in the
yellow dung fly *Scathophaga stercoraria* (Diptera: Scathophagidae)**

Patrick T. Rohner^{1,2}, Martin A. Schäfer^{1,3}, Wolf U. Blanckenhorn^{1,4}

Institute of Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies, University of Zurich,
Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zurich, Switzerland

patrick.rohner@ieu.uzh.ch, martin.schaefer@ieu.uzh.ch, wolf.blanckenhorn@ieu.uzh.ch

Evolution & Development (2017) DOI: [10.1111/ede.12223](https://doi.org/10.1111/ede.12223)

Abstract

Ultimate factors driving insect body size are rather well understood, while - apart from a few model species - the underlying physiological and developmental mechanisms have received less attention. We investigate the physiological basis of adaptive size variation in the yellow dung fly *Scathophaga stercoraria*, which shows pronounced male-biased sexual size dimorphism and strong body size plasticity. We estimate variation in a major physiological threshold, the critical weight, which is the mass at which a larva initiates pupariation. Critical weight is associated with sexual size dimorphism and sex-specific plasticity, and is thus a likely target of selection on adult size. Detailed larval growth trajectories derived from individuals raised at two food and temperature treatments reveal that condition dependent sex-specific size plasticity is mediated by faster initial growth of males that later becomes reduced by higher male weight loss during the wandering stage. We further demonstrate that integral growth rates, which are typically calculated as simple ratios of egg-to-adult development time and adult weight, do not necessarily well reflect variation in instantaneous growth rates. We illustrate the importance of detailed assessments of ontogenetic growth trajectories for the understanding of adaptive size variation and discuss the mechanistic basis of size determination in shaping sex-specific phenotypic plasticity.

Introduction

Body size varies dramatically between and within species and contributes greatly to the phenotypic diversity observed across the tree of life. Evolutionary biologists have heavily scrutinized the ultimate drivers of body size variation, revealing an often tight relation of body size to fitness (reviewed in Andersson 1994; Blanckenhorn 2000; Chown and Gaston 2010). Large individuals often leave more offspring, are more successful in acquiring mates, and survive better (Clutton-Brock 1988; Shine 1989; Honěk 1993; Blanckenhorn 2000). While the ultimate causes of body size variation thus are relatively well understood, the proximate mechanisms determining body size remain poorly investigated apart from a few model species, despite their importance for understanding the evolutionary process (Badyaev 2002; Chown and Gaston 2010; Stillwell et al. 2010).

In insects, intraspecific body size variation is striking and plastic responses to the environment and sexual dimorphisms can be extreme, but the underlying causes have received surprisingly little attention (Blanckenhorn 2000; Badyaev 2002; Stillwell et al. 2010). As insect growth is determinate, all structural growth is restricted to the immature stages. It follows that adult size is a function of propagule (i.e. initial) size, growth rate, and the time over which juveniles grow. Nevertheless, body size may only indirectly depend on the rate or duration of growth. At least as important are the mechanisms that terminate growth at a particular size or point in time (Nijhout 2003; Nijhout and Davidowitz 2009; Davidowitz 2016, see below). Thus, when studying body size variation, be it caused by environmental or genetic processes, the consideration of the complexity of larval growth, as well as mechanisms of size determination, are crucial for the understanding of body size evolution.

Larval growth and the determination of adult size are best understood in *Manduca sexta* and *Drosophila melanogaster* (Nijhout 2003; Mirth et al. 2007; Nijhout et al. 2014). In *Drosophila*, after hatching from the egg, larvae start to feed and grow nearly exponentially, leading the larva to moult and expand its cuticle. In their 3rd instar, larvae reach a threshold size called the critical weight (or critical size in the *Drosophila* literature), at which well-described endocrine signalling cascades are set in motion that lead to the cessation of growth and the onset of pupariation to commence metamorphosis (reviewed by Mirth and Riddiford 2007; Nijhout et al. 2014). The removal of juvenile hormone (JH) by JH esterase disinhibits prothoracicotropic hormone (PTTH), and subsequently the release of ecdysteroids finally mediates the cessation of growth. Once the larva has stopped feeding, it enters the wandering stage, during which it empties its gut and prepares for metamorphosis while actively looking for a suitable location for pupariation. It follows that variation in critical weight, marking the start of hormonal interactions leading to metamorphosis, will strongly influence the size of the adult insect. However, since larvae continue to grow until ecdysteroids are secreted, environmental plasticity or sex-specific variation in the terminal growth period (TGP) and the rate of growth during TGP can influence size as well. Variation in adult size can thus arise from variation in critical weights, differences in the amount of growth during the TGP (which is affected by growth rate and duration), as well as disproportionate weight loss during the subsequent development. Critical weight variation has been shown to affect sexual size dimorphism (Testa et al. 2013) and underlies the temperature-size-rule in *D. melanogaster* (Ghosh et al. 2013). In *M. sexta*, in contrast, critical weight is unaffected by temperature (Davidowitz et al. 2003; Stillwell and Davidowitz 2010) but nevertheless influences SSD (eg. Stillwell et al. 2014). The extent to which these mechanisms apply to other insects is not yet fully clear (Parker and Johnston 2006). It seems likely, however, that critical weight (or a similar mechanism) is a key

75 player in body size regulation of all holometabolous insects (Stieper et al. 2008; Callier and
76 Nijhout 2011). Alternatively, growth variation after attaining the critical weight could account
77 for SSD as well.

78 The complexity of the larval growth just described is often neglected in organismic
79 biology. This is not a matter of ignorance but rather a necessity given the efforts required in
80 estimating detailed growth trajectories, especially in comparative and field studies, as well as
81 a consequence of the necessary reductionism when studying life-history evolution
82 (Davidowitz 2016). Larval growth rate is then often approximated as the ratio of adult size and
83 egg-to-adult development time, thus assuming linear growth. While these estimates are
84 convenient and often the only available data, insect larvae neither grow continuously nor in a
85 linear fashion. Linear growth rates and egg-to-adult development times are therefore
86 compound traits that integrate the nonlinear, interactive nature of larval growth, and often the
87 biological meaning ascribed to these measures remains obscure (Tammaru et al. 2010). To
88 interpret such growth rate estimates (in the following referred to as “integral growth rates”;
89 Fig.1) in a biologically meaningful way, their comparison to detailed larval growth trajectories
90 is helpful, if not essential.

91 Here we study larval growth physiology in the yellow dung fly *Scathophaga stercoraria*
92 (Linnaeus, 1758) (Diptera: Scathophagidae). This large coprophilous fly shows strong body
93 size variation with male-biased sexual size dimorphism (SSD) (Simmons and Ward 1991), the
94 adaptive nature of which has been well scrutinized. Body size varies genetically across latitude
95 (Blanckenhorn and Demont 2004) and (somewhat) altitude (Blanckenhorn 1997). Plastic
96 responses to habitat depletion (by a “bail-out” response *sensu* Tobler & Nijhout 2010), which
97 is common because dung is ephemeral, as well as to seasonality and temperature are strong

(Blanckenhorn 1998, 1999, 2009). However, the underlying physiological and developmental mechanisms, the potential targets of selection, have received much less scrutiny (but see Blanckenhorn and Llaurens 2005; Blanckenhorn and Henseler 2005).

By estimating detailed, individual growth trajectories under different environmental conditions we here aim to reveal the proximate causes underlying sex-specific body size plasticity in the yellow dung fly. We estimate sex-specific critical weight, as opposed to the commonly investigated minimum viable weight, and expect this major size determinant to co-vary with adult body size variation. Additionally, we compare simple integral growth rates to the actual linearized weight increment with age during the initial, quasi-exponential growth phase (= quasi-instantaneous growth rate) to investigate whether the former estimates introduce systematic biases. We conclude by discussing the implications of growth and size determination for the evolution of body size plasticity and sexual size dimorphism.

Materials and methods

Adult *S. stercoraria* were captured on a cattle pasture in Zurich, Switzerland and used to establish an outbred laboratory culture under standard maintenance procedures (Blanckenhorn et al. 2010).

Individual larval growth trajectories

To estimate detailed larval growth trajectories, we followed individual flies throughout their immature stages. Eggs were collected from the laboratory culture and singly placed onto the surface of a small rectangular dish (22 x 22 mm²) filled with standardized, previously frozen cow dung. To prevent desiccation, the bottom of each dish was filled with a shallow layer of agar (3%). Larvae hatched within 24 hours and were recovered from the opaque

substrate with a spatula, rinsed with tap water, and dried on filter paper. Clean and dried larvae were then weighed twice to the nearest 0.01 mg and placed back into the same dish. The amount of dung supplied at the start of the experiment therefore represented the total amount available to a larva to complete its development. The weighing procedure was repeated every 24 hours until larvae underwent pupariation. (Pre)pupae were weighed and checked for adult eclosion every other day. Upon eclosion, adults were killed by freezing, sexed and weighed. The sex of individuals that died prior to adult eclosion or during the early pupal stages could not be assessed, so these individuals were removed from the data set. To assess plastic responses to environmental variation we used a two-factor design, crossing high and low temperatures (24°C vs. 18°C) with unlimited and limited amounts of food (2 vs. 0.7 grams of dung per individual). Dung amounts were chosen based on previous findings and personal experience (pers. obs. WUB). Under food limited conditions young larvae are still able to dwell in and feed on dung in a regular manner. At some point however, nutrients deplete and larvae rummage through an empty cellulose matrix, vainly searching for food.

To assess sex-specific larval growth we measured several parameters. To quantify the speed of growth during the initial, quasi-exponential growth period, we regressed cube-root-transformed weight against age, and calculated the linearized weight increase with time (slope of the regression in [$\text{mg}^{1/3}/\text{h}$]) for each individual separately. We refer to these estimates as (quasi-)instantaneous growth rates. To test for differences between groups, we used a mixed linear model of $\text{mass}^{1/3}$ as a function of age, sex, food quantity and temperature as fixed effects, their interactions, and the identity of each individual larva as random effect (cf. Blanckenhorn 1999; Teuschl et al. 2007). Non-significant interaction terms were subsequently removed. We additionally analyzed data for only the first 96 hours (which represents approximately 2/3rds of the growth period), during which growth definitely followed an exponential trend

irrespective of treatment or sex. To compare instantaneous growth rates to estimates of integral growth (= individual adult mass^{1/3} divided by egg-to-adult development time), we used both estimates simultaneously as dependent variables in a bivariate analysis with the type of growth rate (instantaneous or integral), sex, food quantity and temperature as explanatory factors and individual identity as random effect.

We further analyzed larval peak mass (= maximum weight of the larva), the subsequent weight loss during the wandering phase (difference between larval peak mass and pupal mass), the mass at pupariation, and adult mass using type III ANOVAs with sex, food quantity, temperature and their interactions as explanatory variables. Measurements of mass were always cube-root transformed, and non-significant interactions were removed. Using analogous type III ANOVAs we also analyzed the duration of the exponential growth period (estimated graphically from the individual growth trajectory), the age at which growth stopped (= age at which a larva reaches its peak mass), the duration of the wandering stage (difference between the age at larval peak mass and age at pupariation), and the ages at pupariation and adult eclosion.

Critical weight

In *M. sexta* the critical weight is defined by the minimum mass of a larva at which starvation does no further prolong pupariation and is usually estimated by comparing the time to metamorphosis of starved and fed larvae of different weight classes (Nijhout and Williams 1974). The effect of starvation on the time to pupariation (TTP) is however not universal. Especially in insects inhabiting ephemeral habitats, metamorphosis is induced prematurely under starvation (Blanckenhorn 1998, 1999; Shafiei *et al.* 2001; Stieper *et al.* 2008, Teder *et al.*,

2014). These alternative life history strategies therefore require alternative procedures to identify the weight at which a larva initiates pupariation. In *D. melanogaster*, an alternative, “break-point” approach is commonly applied: following the prediction that critical weight should alter the relationship between mass at starvation and the time to pupariation (TTP), plotting the latter two against each other should result in a segmented relationship with a pronounced break-point at the critical weight (due to a change in reaction). Larvae that have not yet reached their critical weight are expected to continue larval development, while larvae that passed their critical weight should be unaffected or show a so-called “bail-out” response (Tobler & Nijhout 2010). Crucially, critical weight is different from the minimum viable weight (Davidowitz et al. 2003; Stieper et al. 2008), which is more often reported and sometimes used as a proxy for the critical weight; however, the minimum viable weight refers to the minimum amount of resources necessary to reach the next life stage (Mirth and Riddiford 2007) and is not directly related to the induction of metamorphosis *per se*.

Since *S. stercoraria* shortens its development time when food is limited (Blanckenhorn 1998, 1999), we here apply the break-point method. Analogous to the aforementioned rearing protocol, individual larvae were placed into small dishes with either limited or unlimited cow dung in a 18°C climate chamber. Over the course of several days, haphazardly chosen 3rd instar larvae (according to the cephaloskeleton morphology: Ferrar 1987) were removed from their dish, weighed and placed individually into an empty dish equipped only with a thin layer of agar to prevent desiccation. Larvae that underwent such a starvation treatment were monitored every 12 hours to record the timing of either death or pupariation. If larvae successfully pupariated, their time to pupariation (TTP) was calculated as the time between the start of starvation and pupariation. Of the 1150 larvae starved, only 700 made it to the adult or late pupal stage and so could be sexed; data on all other individuals were discarded.

We plotted the time to pupariation (TTP) of each individual larva against its mass at starvation (Fig. 2). If larvae have not yet passed their critical weight, pupariation has not yet been induced and larvae may try to forage more in order to reach their critical weight. This prolongs their TTP. Only after a certain time lag will these larvae eventually pupariate (possibly adjusting their target size to the new environment by modifying their critical weight). In contrast, the TTP of larvae that have passed their critical weight and already induced metamorphosis should not be affected by starvation, as JH is already being depleted and ecdysone secretion will inevitably kick in. The reaction of a larva in terms of TTP should thus vary according to its weight at starvation. Prior to reaching their critical weight, larvae are expected to prolong their TTP, which should not happen thereafter. Plotting TTP against larval mass at starvation resulted in an angular relationship with a break point, suggesting the existence of a *Drosophila*-like critical weight. We then fitted a segmented regression to this relationship (using the R-package *segmented*: Muggeo (2008), which also supplies confidence intervals), the break point of which indicates the critical weight (the weight at which the reaction to starvation changes). This was done separately for males and females in both limited and unlimited food conditions (Fig. 2).

Results

Plastic responses to temperature and food manipulation

Larvae raised at 24°C eclosed earlier than those raised at 18°C, but individuals did not significantly differ in their adult mass. In the high temperature treatment, larvae had higher instantaneous growth rates (age*temperature: $F_{1,196} = 64.78$, $P < 0.001$), but the duration of the exponential growth phase was shorter (main effect: $F_{1,63} = 106.38$, $P < 0.001$). Consequently, 24°C larvae reached their peak mass sooner (age at peak mass, main effect: $F_{1,63} = 13.53$, $P < 0.001$,

Fig. 1) and showed a shorter wandering stage (main effect: $F_{1,62} = 42.32$, $P < 0.001$), thus pupariating earlier (main effect: $F_{1,62} = 105.00$, $P < 0.001$, Fig. 1), and the duration of their pupal stage was shorter than that of larvae raised at 18°C (main effect: $F_{1,63} = 77.27$, $P < 0.001$, Fig. 1).

Food quantity had somewhat similar effects: instantaneous growth rates were lower under food limitation (age*food limitation: $F_{1,196} = 13.59$, $P < 0.001$) and larvae terminated their exponential growth phase earlier ($F_{1,63} = 5.21$, $P = 0.026$). Food limitation had no effect on the timing of growth cessation, but it did affect larval peak mass ($F_{1,63} = 27.90$, $P < 0.001$). The wandering stage of food limited larvae was shorter ($F_{1,63} = 5.67$, $P = 0.020$; corrected for body size) and, as a result, they pupariated earlier. Weight loss during the wandering stage was independent of food quantity, but the lower peak weight of food-limited larvae resulted in lighter puparia ($F_{1,63} = 7.55$, $P = 0.008$). Finally, the duration of the pupal stage did not depend on food limitation, but larger individuals took longer to eclose ($F_{1,62} = 28.15$, $P < 0.001$).

Ontogeny of sexual size dimorphism

Overall, the larger males had a higher instantaneous growth rate than females (GLM; age*sex interaction: $F_{1,64} = 17.05$, $P < 0.001$), and they also grew for longer in an exponential fashion (sex effect: $F_{1,63} = 20.71$, $P < 0.001$; sex*temperature interaction: $F_{1,63} = 24.72$, $P < 0.001$). This resulted in a much greater peak mass of males than females once larvae stopped feeding (larval peak mass: $F_{1,63} = 11.09$, $P = 0.001$, Fig. 1). SSD at larval peak mass was more pronounced at unlimited food (larval peak mass, sex*food interaction: $F_{1,63} = 4.96$, $P = 0.029$, Fig. 1). Surprisingly, independently of body mass, temperature and food (marginally non-significant), males lost a disproportionate amount of their mass during the wandering stage (weight loss, sex effect: $F_{1,63} = 12.5$, $P = 0.001$), resulting in less pronounced SSD in the pupal (pupal mass, sex effect: $F_{1,63} =$

32.90, $P < 0.001$, Fig. 1) and adult stages (adult mass, sex effect: $F_{1,62} = 7.98$, $P = 0.006$, Fig. 1). Even though at peak mass SSD was pronounced in all treatment combinations, adult SSD was only significant at unlimited food conditions (adult mass, sex*food limitation interaction: $F_{1,62} = 9.80$, $P = 0.003$, Fig. 1). Males took overall longer to reach the adult stage (age at eclosion, sex effect: $F_{1,62} = 19.53$, $P < 0.001$) due to longer pupal development. Males were also more strongly affected by temperature than females (age at eclosion, sex*temperature interaction: $F_{1,62} = 4.01$, $P = 0.050$), because they spent more time in the larval stage (age at pupariation, sex effect: $F_{1,62} = 5.64$, $P = 0.021$) and their pupal stages were more susceptible to temperature (duration of pupal stage, sex effect: $F_{1,62} = 19.66$, $P < 0.001$; sex*temperature: $F_{1,62} = 5.85$, $P = 0.019$).

Expectedly, instantaneous growth rates were always higher than calculated integral growth rates. Both estimates of biological growth correlate strongly ($r = 0.74$, $P < 0.001$), however. When analyzing instantaneous growth rates, differences between sexes and temperature treatments were more pronounced (sex*type interaction: $F_{1,62} = 32.61$, $P < 0.001$; temperature*type interaction: $F_{1,62} = 74.34$, $P < 0.001$), but surprisingly food quantity affected the instantaneous growth rate less (type*food quantity: $F_{1,62} = 17.10$, $P < 0.001$). Food quantity only had an effect on instantaneous growth at the high temperature (24°C), whereas integral growth rates were always lower at limited food, irrespective of temperature (type*food quantity*temperature: $F_{1,62} = 28.03$, $P < 0.001$, Fig. 4).

Critical weight

At limited as well as unlimited food, males had a larger critical weight than females (Fig. 2). While the sexes did not significantly differ in their critical weight at limited food (females: 18.66 mg [15.15, 21.05], males: 21.17 mg [17.35, 23.50]; [2.5th and 97.5th] percentiles are given), males had a higher critical weight at unlimited food (males: 32.67 mg [26.43, 39.98], females:

23.40 mg [19.39, 25.82]). That confidence limits overlap at limited but not at unlimited food in Fig. 3 (center) suggests an interaction between sex and environmental conditions.

Apart from critical weight, we could not address the role of the ensuing terminal growth phase due to measurement interval and sample size limitations. In fact, some estimates of critical weight exceeded the maximal larval peak weight of the averaged trajectory, likely an experimental artifact since critical weight and the growth trajectories were estimated in blocks given the amount work. Also, individual larvae might have been physically stressed by the daily measurements, potentially diminishing size increments. We are however confident in our estimates of growth trajectories, as they are very similar to those of earlier studies not tracking individuals (Blanckenhorn 1999; Teuschl et al. 2007).

Discussion

Scathophaga stercoraria larvae respond to starvation depending on their weight, suggesting a *Drosophila*-like critical weight mechanism (cf. Stieper et al. 2008). Their critical weight, at which pupariation is initiated, was clearly associated with sexual size dimorphism and condition dependent body size plasticity in response to food availability (and temperature ??) (Figs. 1-3). Therefore, plasticity in critical weight likely plays a major role in generating sex-specific body size variation of adult yellow dung flies. The detailed larval growth trajectories documented here reveal that even when adults do not differ in their body size, male and female larvae have dissimilar larval growth schedules. Thus, sexual size dimorphism varies greatly in its extent throughout juvenile development, and the sexes are likely exposed to different selective pressures during the larval stages. In the following, we discuss the

implications of size determination mechanisms and detailed larval growth assessments for the understanding of intraspecific body size variation and sexual size dimorphism.

The universal mechanism initiating metamorphosis, and thus terminating growth in all insects, is an increase in ecdysone titer during the final instar (Nijhout et al. 2014). In *Manduca*, *Bombyx* and *Drosophila*, intraspecific adult size variation has been attributed in large parts to variation in critical weight, which is the weight (or an unknown correlate thereof; see below) at which a larva initiates ecdysone release (Nijhout et al. 2014). The commonness of the critical weight mechanism in insects is generally assumed, although empirical data are scarce. Our findings in *Scathophaga* advocate in favor of its prevalence. The mere phenotypic presence of a physiological switch-point does however not necessarily imply identical size-sensing mechanisms or homologous endocrine signals. Cuticle tension has been identified as a size-sensing mechanism in two hemipterans (Wigglesworth 1940; Nijhout 1984), but holometabolous insects appear to use different triggers. Studies on *D. melanogaster* found that the insulin-dependent growth of the prothoracic gland is associated with critical weight sensing (Mirth et al. 2005), while in *M. sexta* oxygen limitation due to the pre-assigned size of the tracheal system has been identified as a major driver in determining critical weight (Callier & Nijhout 2011; but see Helm & Davidowitz 2013). In contrast to the actual size-sensing triggers, the consequent endocrine cascades are much better resolved, although the effects of hormones can also vary between species, for example the role of JH and ecdysone in *Manduca* versus *Drosophila* (Mirth et al. 2014).

The timing of metamorphosis induction in *S. stercoraria* is environmentally plastic and its degree varies between the sexes, which produces severe fitness consequences in the adult stage. In *S. stercoraria* males are the larger sex, which is in stark contrast to *Manduca* and

306 *Drosophila*, which show female-biased SSD. The male-biased size dimorphism in the yellow
307 dung fly is ultimately driven by stronger selection on male size relative to female size
308 (Blanckenhorn 2007, 2009). At the proximate level, we here demonstrated that males induce
309 pupariation at a larger size than females (i.e. at a larger critical weight), in correspondence
310 with the adult SSD. *Scathophaga* further shows an adaptive bail-out response to food limitation
311 (Blanckenhorn 1999), meaning that larval growth is accelerated yet shortened in order to reach
312 the pupal stage prior to complete habitat depletion. Our data suggest that this response to food
313 depletion is caused by a combination of heightened instantaneous growth rates and a lowered
314 critical weight, which - all else being equal - reduce the larval period as well as peak weight.
315 In addition, we found sex-specific plasticity in critical weights: males initiate pupariation at a
316 larger size than females at unlimited food only, while the sexes did not differ in their critical
317 weights under food limitation. This again corresponds well to the sex-specific plasticity in
318 adult body size, with males being the more plastic sex (Teuschl *et al.* 2007; Fig. 1 & 3). Females
319 thus seem to have a lower target size in good environments, in accordance with the existing
320 SSD and the putative selection pressures leading to it (Blanckenhorn 2007, 2009), implying that
321 their size is more canalized than that of the males. Critical weight and its plasticity thus
322 account to a significant extent for the adaptive body size variation displayed by *S. stercoraria*
323 (Blanckenhorn 1998; Fig. 3), and is therefore a likely target of sexual selection on male size as
324 well as fecundity selection on female size. Recent findings in *D. melanogaster* suggest that
325 variation in critical weight between the sexes is linked to the insulin/insulin-like growth factor
326 signaling pathway (Testa *et al.* 2013; Rideout *et al.* 2015). Given that insulin is influenced by
327 nutrition (Shingleton *et al.* 2005; Emlen *et al.* 2006), mediates growth and size, and also
328 interacts with JH and ecdysone (Edgar 2006), the insulin signaling pathway is a good candidate
329 linking (sex-specific) plasticity to condition in *S. stercoraria*. Nevertheless, its impact on larval

growth trajectories requires explicit investigation, as *Drosophila* and *Scathophaga* diverged about 50 mya (Wiegmann et al. 2011).

In insects, the evolution of sexual size dimorphism and body size plasticity are primarily studied in adults even though structural body size variation must be induced before the adult cuticle is fully sclerotized. Potential costs of adult size variation thus already arise during the larval or nymphal stages, which is why the mechanisms are crucial to understand the evolution of sexual size dimorphisms and body size in general (Tammaru and Esperk 2007; Testa et al. 2013; Stillwell et al. 2014; Vendl et al. 2016). SSD has been attributed to variation in the number of instars between the sexes (Esperk et al. 2007), sex-specific growth rates (Blanckenhorn et al. 2007; Rohner et al. 2016; Vendl et al. 2016), variation in development time (Teder 2014; Rohner et al. 2016), or unequal (post-eclosion) weight loss (Molleman *et al.* 2011; Testa et al. 2013; see below). We found that in *S. stercoraria* sexual dimorphism in larval peak mass arises due to unequal rates and durations of the initial instantaneous growth, with males growing faster and for a prolonged period. Males were always larger than females prior to the wandering stage. Interestingly however, males also lost significantly more weight after growth ceased (on average: 24.6 % in males vs. 21.6 % in females: Fig. 1). This loss was independent of their body size and especially striking at limited food conditions, with larvae showing strongly male-biased SSD whereas the emerged adults were monomorphic in size, reaffirming that larval growth trajectories differ between the sexes. Since adult size is under strong selection in males, this weight loss is doubtlessly costly and begs for scrutiny. Most of this weight loss is certainly due to the purging of gut content, but further metabolic costs and the continued development during the wandering stage certainly add to it (Reim et al. 2009). Testa et al. (2014) found that female *Drosophila* larvae, which are larger than males, also lost more weight during the wandering stage. The authors hypothesized that the instantaneous growth rate

differences of male and female larvae might be linked to the growth of the imaginal discs, which continue to develop during the wandering stage. If this holds true, imaginal discs of the faster growing sex would generally deplete a larger amount of stored resources. Indeed, on average *S. stercoraria* males grow faster than females. However, weight loss neither correlated with the instantaneous growth rate nor with peak mass in our study, suggesting a different mechanism. Alternatively, sexually dimorphic timing of growth and development of imaginal discs could be responsible for the unequal weight loss of the sexes documented here. Although in *Drosophila* male gonads grow slower than their female counterparts during the late larval stage (Kerkis 1931), it remains possible that male *S. stercoraria* invest more in growth and development of imaginal tissue during the late larval stages, which could explain why males spend less energy during the pupal stage (Reim et al. 2009).

As demonstrated here and elsewhere (Blanckenhorn 1999; Tammaru & Esperk 2007; Tammaru et al. 2010; Teuschl *et al.* 2007), detailed individual growth trajectories harbor great potential in untangling variation in larval growth. Such assays demand tremendous efforts and may not be applicable in some taxa or certain environments. As a result, integral growth rates estimated from final body sizes and the corresponding egg-to-adult development times are widely in use (Fig. 1). Instantaneous growth rates were on average 6.7 ± 0.2 (SE) times higher than integral rates in females and 7.9 ± 0.3 times higher in males. We further found that the two types of growth rates differ in their response to food limitation. Instantaneous growth rates reacted much more strongly to food shortage at high than at low temperatures. This (significant three-way) interaction was absent when analyzing integral growth rates (Fig. 4). This is not an issue of statistical power; rather, the two estimates greatly differ in their conceptual and biological meaning. While instantaneous growth rates estimate the speed of growth during the more or less continuous quasi-exponential initial growth phase, integral

378 growth rates integrate not only the total amount of gained weight but also the amount of mass
379 lost throughout juvenile development, including the process of inter-instar molting.
380 Nevertheless, the two measures correlate quite strongly ($r = 0.7$), which implies that the initial
381 rate of growth scales roughly with the subsequently realized growth. However, as
382 demonstrated here, the shape of growth trajectories can differ consistently between sexes and
383 environments, consequently introducing potentially systematic biases when analyzing
384 integral estimates. Obviously this can, but must not necessarily be problematic. Special caution
385 is surely appropriate if integral growth rates are compared among species, especially if taxa
386 differ in their ecology. Our main point here is that integral growth rates clearly depict a
387 different biological property than instantaneous growth rates, and this inequality may not
388 always be appreciated sufficiently (Tammaru and Esperk, 2007; Esperk et al., 2013).

389 In summary, we here shed light on the physiological and developmental underpinnings
390 of condition dependent sex-specific body size plasticity and showed that critical weight, a
391 major size determinant, is likely a major driver responsible for sex-specific plasticity and
392 ultimately sexual dimorphism in the yellow dung fly and, probably, insects in general. Our
393 study further suggests that critical weight(–like) mechanisms are indeed common in insects.
394 We also demonstrated the usefulness of detailed larval growth trajectories for the
395 understanding of the ontogeny of sex-specific plasticity in growth, as opposed to simpler
396 estimates of integral growth. Future research should aim at uncovering the proximate (genetic)
397 causes and the evolvability of sex-specific plasticity in other non-model species in order to
398 obtain a more general understanding of how adult body size variation arises.

400 **Acknowledgements**

401 P.T.R. acknowledges PhD funding by the Swiss National Science Foundation and the
402 Forschungskredit of the University of Zurich (grant no. FK-15-090). We thank Goggy
403 Davidowitz, Toomas Tammaru and an anonymous reviewer for helpful discussions and
404 comments.

405

406 **References**

- 407 Andersson, B. 1994. Sexual Selection. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 408 Badyaev, A. V. 2002. Growing apart: an ontogenetic perspective on the evolution of sexual size
409 dimorphism. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 17: 369–378.
- 410 Blanckenhorn, W.U. 1997. Altitudinal life history variation in the dung flies *Scathophaga*
411 *stercoraria* and *Sepsis cynipsea*. *Oecologia* 109: 342–352.
- 412 Blanckenhorn, W.U. 1998. Adaptive phenotypic plasticity in growth, development, and body
413 size in the yellow dung fly. *Evolution* (N. Y). 52: 1394–1407.
- 414 Blanckenhorn, W.U. 1999. Different growth responses to temperature and resource limitation
415 in three fly species with similar life histories. *Evol. Ecol.* 13: 395–409.
- 416 Blanckenhorn, W.U. 2000. The evolution of body size: what keeps organisms small? *Q. Rev.*
417 *Biol.* 75: 385–407.
- 418 Blanckenhorn, W.U. 2007. Case studies of the differential-equilibrium hypothesis of sexual size
419 dimorphism in two dung fly species. In *Sex, Size and Gender Roles*, (Oxford University Press),

420 pp. 106–114.

421 Blanckenhorn, W.U. 2009. Causes and consequences of phenotypic plasticity in body size: the
 422 case of the yellow dung fly *Scathophaga stercoraria* (Diptera: Scathophagidae). In Phenotypic
 423 plasticity of insects: mechanisms and consequences, Whitman, and Anathakrishnan, eds. pp.
 424 369–422.

425 Blanckenhorn, W.U., and Demont, M. 2004. Bergmann and converse Bergmann latitudinal
 426 clines in arthropods: two ends of a continuum? *Integr. Comp. Biol.* 44: 413–424.

427 Blanckenhorn, W.U., Dixon, A.F.G., Fairbairn, D.J., Foellmer, M.W., Gibert, P., van der Linde,
 428 K., Meier, R., Nylin, S., Pitnick, S., Schoff, C., et al. 2007. Proximate causes of Rensch’s rule:
 429 does sexual size dimorphism in arthropods result from sex differences in development time?
 430 *Am. Nat.* 169: 245–257.

431 Blanckenhorn, W.U., and Henseler, C. 2005. Temperature-dependent ovariole and testis
 432 maturation in the yellow dung fly. *Entomol. Exp. Appl.* 116: 159–165.

433 Blanckenhorn, W.U., and Llaurens, V. 2005. Effects of temperature on cell size and number in
 434 the yellow dung fly *Scathophaga stercoraria*. *J. Therm. Biol.* 30: 213–219.

435 Blanckenhorn, W.U., Pemberton, A.J., Bussière, L.F., Roembke, J., and Floate, K.D. 2010. A
 436 review of the natural history and laboratory culture methods for the yellow dung fly,
 437 *Scathophaga stercoraria*. *J. Insect Sci.* 10: 11.

438 Callier, V., and Nijhout, H.F. 2011. Control of body size by oxygen supply reveals size-
 439 dependent and size-independent mechanisms of molting and metamorphosis. *Proc. Natl. Acad.*
 440 *Sci.* 108: 14664–14669.

441 Chown, S.L., and Gaston, K.J. 2010. Body size variation in insects: A macroecological

442 perspective. *Biol. Rev.* 85: 139–169.

443 Clutton-Brock, T.H. 1988. Reproductive success. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

444 Davidowitz, G. 2016. Endocrine proxies can simplify endocrine complexity to enable
 445 evolutionary prediction. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* 56: 198–206.

446 Davidowitz, G., D’Amico, L.J., and Nijhout, H.F. 2003. Critical weight in the development of
 447 insect body size. *Evol. Dev.* 5: 188–197.

448 Edgar, B. 2006. How flies get their size: genetics meets physiology. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 7: 907–916.

449 Emlen, D.J., Szafran, Q., Corley, L.S., and Dworkin, I. 2006. Insulin signaling and limb-
 450 patterning: candidate pathways for the origin and evolutionary diversification of beetle
 451 “horns.” *Heredity.* 97: 179–191.

452 Esperk, T., Stefanescu, C., Teder, T., Wiklund, C., Kaasik, A., and Tammaru, T. 2013.
 453 Distinguishing between anticipatory and responsive plasticity in a seasonally polyphenic
 454 butterfly. *Evol. Ecol.* 27: 315–332.

455 Esperk, T., Tammaru, T., Nylin, S., and Teder, T. 2007. Achieving high sexual size dimorphism
 456 in insects: Females add instars. *Ecol. Entomol.* 32: 243–256.

457 Ferrar, P. 1987. A guide to the breeding habits and immature stages of Diptera Cyclorrhapha.
 458 Leiden: E.J. Brill.

459 Ghosh, S.M., Testa, N.D., and Shingleton, A.W. 2013. Temperature-size rule is mediated by
 460 thermal plasticity of critical size in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proc. R. Soc. B* 280: 20130174.

461 Helm, B.R., and Davidowitz, G. 2013. Mass and volume growth of an insect tracheal system
 462 within a single instar. *J. Exp. Biol.* 216: 4703–4711.

463 Honěk, A. 1993. Intraspecific variation in body size and fecundity in insects: A general
 464 relationship. *Oikos* 66: 483-492.

465 Kerkis, J. 1931. The growth of the gonads in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 16: 212-224.

466 Mirth, C., Truman, J.W., and Riddiford, L.M. 2005. The role of the prothoracic gland in
 467 determining critical weight for metamorphosis in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Curr. Biol.* 15: 1796-
 468 1807.

469 Mirth, C.K., and Riddiford, L.M. 2007. Size assessment and growth control: how adult size is
 470 determined in insects. *BioEssays* 29: 344-355.

471 Mirth, C.K., Tang, H.Y., Makohon-Moore, S.C., Salhadar, S., Gokhale, R.H., Warner, R.D.,
 472 Koyama, T., Riddiford, L.M., and Shingleton, A.W. 2014. Juvenile hormone regulates body size
 473 and perturbs insulin signaling in *Drosophila*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 111: 7018-7023.

474 Molleman, F., Javoi, J., Esperk, T., Teder, T., Davis, R.B., and Tammaru, T. 2011. Sexual
 475 differences in weight loss upon eclosion are related to life history strategy in Lepidoptera. *J.*
 476 *Insect Physiol.* 57: 712-722.

477 Muggeo, V.M.R. 2008. segmented: An R package to fit regression models with broken-line
 478 relationships. *R News* 8: 20-25.

479 Nijhout, H.F. 1984. Abdominal stretch reception in *Dipetalogaster maximus* (Hemiptera:
 480 Reduviidae). *J. Insect Physiol.* 30: 629-633.

481 Nijhout, H.F., and Davidowitz, G. 2009. The developmental-physiological basis of phenotypic
 482 plasticity. In Phenotypic plasticity of insects: Mechanisms and consequences, D. Whitman, and
 483 T. Anathakrishnan, eds. p. 589-608.

484 Nijhout, H.F., Riddiford, L.M., Mirth, C., Shingleton, A.W., Suzuki, Y., and Callier, V. 2014.
 485 The developmental control of size in insects. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Dev. Biol.* 3: 113–134.
 486 Nijhout, H.F., and Williams, C.M. 1974. Control of moulting and metamorphosis in the tobacco
 487 hornworm, *Manduca sexta* (L.): growth of the last-instar larva and the decision to pupate. *J.*
 488 *Exp. Biol.* 61: 481–491.
 489 Nijhout, H.F.F. 2003. The control of body size in insects. *Dev. Biol.* 261: 1–9.
 490 Parker, J., and Johnston, L. a 2006. The proximate determinants of insect size. *J. Biol.* 5: 1–4.
 491 Reim, C., Kaufmann, C., and Blanckenhorn, W.U. 2009. Size-dependent energetics of
 492 metamorphosis in the yellow dung fly, *Scathophaga stercoraria*. *Evol. Ecol. Res.* 11: 1111–1130.
 493 Rideout, E.J., Narsaiya, M.S., and Grewal, S.S. 2015. The sex determination gene transformer
 494 regulates male-female differences in *Drosophila* body size. *PLoS Genet.* 11: 1–23.
 495 Rohner, P.T., Blanckenhorn, W.U., and Puniamoorthy, N. 2016. Sexual selection on male size
 496 drives the evolution of male-biased sexual size dimorphism via the prolongation of male
 497 development. *Evolution* 70: 1–11.
 498 Shafiei, M., Moczek, a P., and Nijhout, H.F. 2001. Food availability controls the onset of
 499 metamorphosis in the dung beetle *Onthophagus taurus* (Coleoptera : Scarabaeidae). *Physiol.*
 500 *Entomol.* 26: 173–180.
 501 Shine, R. 1989. Ecological causes for the evolution of sexual dimorphism: A review of the
 502 evidence. *Q. Rev. Biol.* 64: 419–461.
 503 Shingleton, A.W., Das, J., Vinicius, L., and Stern, D.L. 2005. The temporal requirements for
 504 insulin signaling during development in *Drosophila*. *PLoS Biol.* 3: 1607–1617.

505 Simmons, L.W., and Ward, P.I. 1991. The heritability of sexually dimorphic traits in the yellow
506 dung fly *Scathophaga stercoraria* (L.). *J. Evol. Biol.* 4: 593–601.

507 Stieper, B.C., Kupershtok, M., Driscoll, M. V., and Shingleton, A.W. 2008. Imaginal discs
508 regulate developmental timing in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Dev. Biol.* 321: 18–26.

509 Stillwell, R.C., Blanckenhorn, W.U., Teder, T., Davidowitz, G., and Fox, C.W. 2010. Sex
510 differences in phenotypic plasticity affect variation in sexual size dimorphism in insects: from
511 physiology to evolution. *Annu Rev Entomol* 55: 227–245.

512 Stillwell, R.C., and Davidowitz, G. 2010. Sex differences in phenotypic plasticity of a
513 mechanism that controls body size: implications for sexual size dimorphism. *Proc. Biol. Sci.*
514 277: 3819–3826.

515 Stillwell, R.C., Daws, A., and Davidowitz, G. 2014. The ontogeny of sexual size dimorphism of
516 a moth: When do males and females grow apart? *PLoS One* 9: 1–7.

517 Tammaru, T., and Esperk, T. 2007. Growth allometry of immature insects: larvae do not grow
518 exponentially. *Funct. Ecol.* 21: 1099–1105.

519 Tammaru, T., Esperk, T., Ivanov, V., and Teder, T. 2010. Proximate sources of sexual size
520 dimorphism in insects: locating constraints on larval growth schedules. *Evol. Ecol.* 24: 161–175.

521 Teder, T. 2014. Sexual size dimorphism requires a corresponding sex difference in
522 development time: A meta-analysis in insects. *Funct. Ecol.* 28: 479–486.

523 Teder, T., Vellau, H., and Tammaru, T. 2014. Age and size at maturity: A quantitative review
524 of diet-induced reaction norms in insects. *Evolution.* 68: 3217–3228.

525

526 Testa, N.D., Ghosh, S.M., and Shingleton, A.W. 2013. Sex-specific weight loss mediates sexual
527 size dimorphism in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *PLoS One* 8: e58936.

528 Teuschl, Y., Reim, C., and Blanckenhorn, W.U. 2007. Correlated responses to artificial body
529 size selection in growth, development, phenotypic plasticity and juvenile viability in yellow
530 dung flies. *J. Evol. Biol.* 20: 87–103.

531 Tobler, A., and Nijhout, H.F. 2010. A switch in the control of growth of the wing imaginal disks
532 of *Manduca sexta*. *PLoS One* 5: e10723.

533 Vendl, T., Kratochvíl, L., and Šípek, P. 2016. Ontogeny of sexual size dimorphism in the
534 hornless rose chafer *Pachnoda marginata* (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae: Cetoniinae). *Zoology*.

535 Wiegmann, B.M., Trautwein, M.D., Winkler, I.S., Barr, N.B., Kim, J.-W., Lambkin, C., Bertone,
536 M.A., Cassel, B.K., Bayless, K.M., Heimberg, A.M., et al. 2011. Episodic radiations in the fly
537 tree of life. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 108: 5690–5695.

538 Wigglesworth, V.B. 1940. the determination of characters at metamorphosis in *Rhodnius*
539 *prolixus* (Hemiptera). *J. Exp. Biol.* 17: 180–200.

540

Figures & Tables

Figure 1: Sex-specific larval growth trajectories in various environments characterized by dung availability and temperature. Points ($\pm$ 95% CI) represent the mean mass of individually-weighted larvae at a given age. Sex-specific mean adult mass is indicated at the mean age at eclosion (isolated points to the right). During early larval development (first ~4 days), larval mass increases nearly exponentially. Eventually, larval growth ceases and individuals enter the wandering stage during which weight is lost. Males (indicated in orange) grow faster but reach their peak weight at the same time as females (black dots). Sexual size dimorphism is always present at the larval peak weight, but adults are monomorphic under food limitation due to a higher weight loss of males. Broken grey lines indicate integral growth rates derived from adult mass and egg-to-adult development times, illustrating the conceptual difference between instantaneous and integral growth rate estimates.

Figure 2: Plotting the time to pupariation (TTP) against the mass at which larvae were starved results in an angular relationship. This suggests that larvae change their reaction to starvation depending on their size. The break-points of the segmented regressions thus denote the critical weights. These vary between sexes and food quantity treatments, suggesting a role for critical weights in shaping sex-specific plasticity (see also Fig. 3).

Figure 3: Adult body mass (left panel) and critical weight estimates (middle panel) show condition dependent sex-specific plasticity in response to food availability. Critical weights and body size do not differ at limited food, but males can increase their body size and critical weight more strongly than females with increasing food supply. Adult mass and critical weights correlate strongly ($R^2 > 0.95$, $n = 4$), suggesting that critical weight is a major driver of intraspecific body size variation (log-log plot; right panel).

567

568

569 Figure 4: Integral growth rates are affected by temperature and food treatments, but there
 570 is no interactive effect. Similarly, instantaneous growth rates increase with temperature and
 571 food quantity, but in contrast to integral growth rates, instantaneous growth rates react more
 572 strongly to food limitation at high (24°C) than at low (18°C) temperature. These contrasting
 573 patterns demonstrate that the two measures can differ substantially across environments such
 574 that caution is advised in choosing the appropriate measure when investigating insect growth.

575

576

577

578

579 Supplementary Table 1: The various estimates used to characterize larval growth trajectories
580 were analyzed using (type III SS) ANOVAs. Non-significant interactions were removed.
581 Significant effects are in bold. ANOVA tables for the remaining variables are very similar and
582 can be found in the Supplementary Files (Table S1)

	larval peak mass ^{1/3}				weight loss ^{1/3}				pupal mass ^{1/3}				adult mass ^{1/3}	
ANOVA (type III)	SS	Df	F	Pr(>F)	SS	Df	F	Pr(>F)	SS	Df	F	Pr(>F)	SS	Df
Intercept	5.13	1	176.988	0.000	0.47	1	7.974	0.006	10.29	1	191.906	0.000	2.65	1
sex	0.32	1	11.087	0.001	0.73	1	12.520	0.001	1.76	1	32.892	0.000	0.31	1
temperature	0.07	1	2.254	0.138	0.06	1	1.006	0.320	0.02	1	0.306	0.582	0.09	1
food quantity	0.81	1	27.904	0.000	0.23	1	3.869	0.054	0.40	1	7.546	0.008	0.27	1
Larval peak mass ^{1/3}					0.01	1	0.113	0.738						
sex*temperature	0.13	1	4.387	0.040									0.13	1
sex*food quantity									0.35	1	6.553	0.013	0.38	1
Residuals	1.83	63			3.70	63			3.38	63			2.39	62

583

Supplementary Table 2: To test for differences in instantaneous growth rates between treatments and sexes we used linear mixed models. In these models, weight data collected throughout the period of “free growth” (first 96 hours) were used as dependent variable and age, food treatment and sex as independent variables while accounting for fly identity as random effect. The effect of age thus measures the overall speed of growth (unit [mg^{1/3}/h]), while interactions with age suggest differences in growth rates between groups.

Larval mass^{1/3}			
GLM	den df	F-value	Pr(>F)
intercept	1,196	15491	<0.001
age	1,196	3042.9	<0.001
sex	1,64	17.049	<0.001
temperature	1,64	125.66	<0.001
food quantity	1,64	14.198	<0.001
age * sex	1,196	13.050	<0.001
age * temperature	1,196	64.781	<0.001
age * food quantity	1,196	13.585	<0.001
temperature * food quantity	1, 1,64	10.778	<0.002
age * temperature * food quantity	196	13.563	<0.001