

24 **Abstract**

25 Most ectotherms show an inverse relationship between developmental
26 temperature and body size, a phenomenon known as the temperature size rule
27 (TSR). Several competing hypotheses have been proposed to explain its
28 occurrence. According to one set of views, the TSR results from inevitable
29 biophysical effects of temperature on the rates of growth and differentiation,
30 whereas other views suggest the TSR is an adaptation that can be achieved by a
31 diversity of mechanisms in different taxa. Our data reveal that the fruit fly,
32 *Drosophila melanogaster*, obeys the TSR using a novel mechanism: reduction of
33 critical size at higher temperatures. In holometabolous insects, attainment of
34 critical size initiates the hormonal cascade that terminates growth, and hence,
35 *Drosophila* larvae appear to instigate the signal to stop growth at a smaller size
36 at higher temperatures. This is in contrast to findings from another
37 holometabolous insect, *Manduca sexta*, in which the TSR results from the effect
38 of temperature on the rate and duration of growth. This contrast suggests that
39 there is no single mechanism that accounts for the TSR. Instead, the TSR
40 appears to be an adaptation that is achieved at a proximate level through
41 different mechanisms in different taxa.

42

43

44

45 **Introduction**

46 Body size is a major organismal trait that affects multiple aspects of an animal's
47 biology, from its anatomy and physiology, to its behavior and ecology [1-3]. Body
48 size also shows high levels of plasticity in response to the developmental
49 environment [4-8]. One environmental factor that has a particularly dramatic
50 effect on body size, at least in ectotherms, is temperature: in almost all
51 ectotherms an increase in developmental temperature leads to a decrease in final
52 adult size [9, 10]. The phenomenon is so general that it has been dubbed the
53 *temperature size rule* (TSR) [9] although, as with all 'rules', there are some
54 exceptions [11, 12]. Nevertheless, despite the near-ubiquity of the phenomenon,
55 an explanation for the TSR remains elusive, with multiple hypotheses proposed
56 [13-15]. Problematically, the physiological processes that regulate body size with
57 respect to temperature are largely unknown, an important first-step for generating
58 a mechanistic understanding of the TSR.

59 A number of mechanistic hypotheses have been proposed to explain the TSR [8,
60 13-19] and each differ in how temperature is thought to affect the developmental
61 and physiological processes that regulate body size. For example, the van der
62 Have and de Jong model of TSR [18] proposes that temperature directly
63 regulates the rate and duration of growth, but the rate of growth is less thermally
64 sensitive than the rate of differentiation, which controls the duration of
65 development and growth. Consequently, as temperature increases, the duration
66 of growth decreases more than the increase in the rate of growth, resulting in an

67 overall reduction in final body size. In contrast, the von Bertalanffy/Perrin model
68 of TSR proposes that temperature directly regulates final body size and growth
69 rate, but not growth duration [20, 21]. Under this hypothesis, the cessation of
70 growth occurs at a size where the rate of anabolism (energy acquisition)
71 balances the rate of catabolism (energy loss). If an increase in temperature
72 enhances catabolism more than anabolism, then this balance will be achieved at
73 a smaller size at higher temperatures. At the same time an increase in
74 temperature increases growth rate. The result is that at elevated temperatures,
75 growth duration is reduced because animals grow more quickly to a smaller final
76 size.

77 Under both the van der Have and de Jong model and the von Bertalanffy/Perrin
78 model, the observed effect of temperature on final size, growth rate and duration
79 is the same. What is different is the proposed locus of regulatory control.
80 Nevertheless, both models are based on ostensibly general thermodynamic
81 features of specific cellular and physiological processes. Implicit in these models
82 are two assumptions. First, thermal plasticity of body size is a result of
83 unavoidable effects of temperature on growth and differentiation, that is, the
84 response of body size to temperature represents a biophysical constraint [*sensu*
85 14-16, 18]. Second, the thermal reaction norm of size at the whole organismal
86 level can be entirely explained by the thermal sensitivity of processes that occur
87 at the level of cellular biochemistry.

88 Alternative views suggest the TSR is an adaptation and does not represent a
89 biophysical constraint [8, 13-16]. Natural populations show the same trend as

90 TSR: that is, individuals from populations found in colder climates are typically
91 larger than individuals from populations found in warmer environments, a
92 phenomenon commonly known as the Bergmann's rule [22]. This is not simply a
93 phenotypically plastic response, as the size difference is maintained even when
94 individuals from different geographic populations are reared at the same
95 developmental temperature [23, 24]. Bergmann's rule has been observed
96 repeatedly in both endotherms (for which it was originally formulated) and
97 ectotherms, while laboratory selection experiments have also demonstrated that
98 populations evolved in colder temperatures have larger body size than those
99 evolved in warmer temperatures [25-27]. Although the selective advantage of a
100 small body size at higher temperatures remains unclear, these observations do
101 suggest that the TSR is an adaptive response. If it is an adaptation, the
102 mechanistic regulation of the TSR need not be the same in different taxa, in
103 contrast to a biophysical constraint that is expected to be uniform across all
104 organisms [13-16]. Assuming that, in ectotherms, growth rate increases with
105 temperature, a reduction in body size can then be mechanistically achieved
106 either by reducing the duration of growth, or by triggering the cessation of growth
107 at a smaller body size.

108

109 A resolution to the TSR debate may be achieved through a better understanding
110 of the proximate mechanisms of body size regulation and how these
111 mechanisms are influenced by temperature. However, there has been
112 surprisingly little research to elucidate the developmental mechanisms that

113 regulate body size with respect to temperature, and even less work linking these
114 mechanisms to adaptive theories of the TSR [28]. The mechanistic details of size
115 regulation have perhaps been best elucidated in the holometabolous insects,
116 such as the tobacco hornworm *Manduca sexta* and the fruitfly *Drosophila*
117 *melanogaster* [4-6, 29]. Holometabolous insects grow through a series of larval
118 molts before metamorphosing into their final adult form. Because growth of the
119 adult is constrained by a stiff exoskeleton, final adult size is regulated by the size
120 at which the larva stops growing and initiates metamorphosis. Although the
121 cessation of growth is caused by an increase in the level of circulating
122 ecdysteroids, the decision to metamorphose is made much earlier in the final
123 instar, at the attainment of a critical size [5, 30-32]. Attainment of critical size is
124 associated with the initiation of a hormonal cascade that ultimately leads to an
125 increase in the level of circulating ecdysteroids, which causes the cessation of
126 growth and the beginning of metamorphosis. Maximum larval size in
127 holometabolous insects is therefore regulated by the critical size, plus the
128 amount of growth that is achieved between attainment of critical size and the
129 cessation of growth [29, 33]. This period is called the terminal growth period
130 [TGP] in *Drosophila* [33, 34] and the interval to cessation of growth [ICG] in
131 *Manduca* [4, 29]. Temperature could therefore affect final body size by
132 influencing the critical size, the duration of the TGP/ICG and/or the rate of growth
133 during the TGP/ICG. Further, although peak larval mass is regulated by critical
134 size and growth during the TGP/ICG, there is considerable mass loss during

135 metamorphosis [35, 36], providing an additional mechanism by which
136 temperature could affect final body size.

137 The observation that holometabolous insects initiate the cessation of growth well
138 before they actually stop growing suggests that the von Bertalanffy/Perrin [21]
139 model cannot explain the TSR in these animals. Evidence from *Manduca* does,
140 however, support the van der Have and de Jong model of the TSR [31, 37]. An
141 increase in temperature increases growth rate but more substantially decreases
142 the ICG, resulting in a reduction in peak larval mass and hence a smaller final
143 body size. Critical size is not affected by temperature in these insects.
144 Nevertheless, whilst thermal plasticity of body size appears to be mediated by
145 the differential effects of temperature on growth rate and duration, this need not
146 be because of underlying biophysical constraints. Rather it could be a result of
147 selection targeting the mechanisms that regulate the duration of the ICG and/or
148 growth rate. Importantly, if the adaptive hypothesis were correct, then we might
149 expect selection to target the thermal sensitivity of other size regulatory
150 mechanisms in other holometabolous insects, for example critical size or mass
151 loss during metamorphosis.

152 Here we test the hypothesis that the TSR is regulated by different developmental
153 mechanisms in different insects, by identifying these mechanisms in a second
154 holometabolous insect, *Drosophila melanogaster*. Our data indicate that unlike
155 *Manduca sexta*, temperature influences final body size primarily by regulating
156 critical size in *Drosophila*, that is the size at which larvae initiate the cessation of
157 growth. Collectively, our data do not support a common mechanism to explain

158 the TSR but suggest that the TSR reflects alternative developmental responses
159 to the same selective pressure.

160 **Methods**

161 *Fly stocks and rearing*

162 Flies were from an isogenic stock of the Samarkand strain (SAM). For the
163 measurement of larval growth trajectories at 25°C female larvae also carried a
164 ubi-GFP transgene (Bloomington Stock Center, 1681) that had been
165 backcrossed into SAM for five generations. This allowed us to conduct
166 experiments exploring the developmental regulation of sexual size dimorphism,
167 described elsewhere (Testa, Ghosh, Shingleton, *unpublished data*). All
168 experiments were conducted at constant-light regime and fly cultures were
169 maintained at low density (50-60 larvae per 6 mL food) on standard cornmeal-
170 molasses medium.

171 *Measurement of critical size*

172 Critical size was measured following the method used in Stieper et al. 2008 [38].
173 Female flies were allowed to oviposit on fresh plates (60×15 mm Petri dishes
174 filled with 10 ml of standard cornmeal/ molasses medium) at 25°C for 24 h. Eight
175 such plates were incubated to 17°C, and the remaining eight were kept at 25°C.
176 Each plate contained approximately 100 eggs. For 25°C, 3 days after the
177 endpoint of egg lay (AEL), individual third instar larvae (L3) were withdrawn from
178 food, weighed using Metler Toledo XP26 microbalance (d= 0.001 mg), and

179 placed in a 1.5ml microtube with a 10 x 50 mm strip of moist KimWipe. Larvae
180 were inspected for pupariation every 4h and re-weighed if pupariated. The
181 procedure was repeated for larvae reared at 17°C, 6 days AEL.

182 *Calculating critical size*

183 Critical size was calculated using the breakpoint method detailed in Stieper et al.
184 2008 [38] with some modifications. Third instar larvae smaller than critical size
185 show a delay in the initiation of the hormonal cascade that ends in
186 metamorphosis, compared to fed larvae of the same size [39]. In contrast,
187 starvation after critical size actually accelerates metamorphosis relative to larvae
188 that are allowed to continue feeding. Because of this change in response to
189 starvation, a plot of larval weight at starvation against time to pupariation (TTP)
190 shows a significant change in slope, or a breakpoint, at critical size (figure 3),
191 which can be detected using a bi-segmental linear regression. The performance
192 of the bi-segmental linear regression is improved if one plots the corresponding
193 pupal weight for a starved larva against TTP, and further improved if the data is
194 rotated 5 rad around the origin prior to analysis. We therefore (i) plotted the
195 relationship between pupal weight and TTP, (ii) rotated the plot by 5 rad around
196 the origin, (iii) detected the pupal weight and TTP at the breakpoint using the
197 *segmented* package in R [40], (iv) back-rotated these values by -5 rad, and (v)
198 converted the pupal weight to a larval weight using the parameters of a linear
199 regression of pupal weight against larval weight at starvation (here referred to as
200 the converted larval weight) for each temperature. We repeated the analysis on
201 1000 bootstrap data sets to generate 95% CI for the critical size and TTP at

202 critical size (TTP_{CS}). We used a permutation test with 1000 replicates to generate
203 a null distribution of the difference in critical size and TTP_{CS} at the two
204 temperatures, and used this distribution to estimate a P -value for the observed
205 differences.

206 *Measurement of growth curves*

207 Eggs were laid on 12 food plates for 4h at 25°C. Six plates were kept at 25°C
208 and the remaining six were incubated at 17°C. Approximately 35 larvae were
209 randomly sampled from the 25°C plates at 12h and 24h after hatching (AH), and
210 subsequently every 6h until 84h AH. Larvae were washed in distilled water, dried
211 on a KimWipe and weighed. The same approach was used to measure growth
212 rate at 17°C, except larvae were weighed every 8h from 8h AH to 200h AH. At
213 25°C, the first pupariations were observed at 84h AH and at 90h, the plates were
214 cleared of all pupae. A cohort of 24 pupae formed between 90 to 94h AH was
215 subsequently collected, cleaned and weighed, and each pupa was placed on a
216 moist piece of Kimwipe and kept inside a microtube. The pupae were weighed
217 every 24h until eclosion, and the wet weight of the emerging adults were
218 recorded. At 17°C, the plates were cleared of pupae at 212h, and 40 pupae were
219 collected at 216h AH; pupal and adult weights were measured following the
220 same methods as 25°C.

221 *Calculation of growth parameters*

222 We used the mean mass of larvae/pupae within each age-cohort to generate
223 growth curves at 17°C and 25°C and to calculate key growth parameters. We

224 define the TGP as the interval between attainment of critical size and the age at
225 which the larva ceases to grow further, which coincides with the start of
226 wandering behavior. We used our larval growth curves and calculation of the
227 critical size to determine the age at which larvae achieve critical size. We
228 calculated the age at which the cessation of growth occurs by using multiple
229 comparisons (Hsu's MCB test) to identify the age-cohort at which mean larval
230 mass was not significantly different from the age-cohort with the greatest mean
231 mass ($P>0.05$). Subtracting the age at which larvae attain critical size from the
232 age at growth cessation gave the duration of the TGP. Subtracting critical size
233 from the individual larval masses within the age-cohort at growth cessation gave
234 the amount of mass gained during the TGP, which was compared between
235 temperatures using a t-test. Logarithmic growth rate during the TGP was
236 calculated by regressing (log) larval mass against age and comparing between
237 temperatures using an ANCOVA. Mass lost during larval wandering and
238 metamorphosis was calculated by comparing the masses of individuals in the
239 age-cohort at the cessation of larval growth with the masses of individuals in the
240 age-cohort at the end of pupation, which was then compared between
241 temperatures using an ANOVA.

242 We used nominal logistic regression to predict the age and mass at which 50% of
243 larvae have transitioned to the next developmental stage at each temperature,
244 allowing us to match growth with development. Finally, we measured 3rd instar
245 mouth-hooks in 10 larvae reared at 17°C and 25°C: larval mouth-hooks reflect
246 the larval size at the previous molt and larval growth achieved through the

247 preceding instar [41].

248 *Statistical analysis*

249 Statistical analyses were conducted using R (www.r-project.org) and JMP (SAS
250 Institute). Data were tested to confirm normality of error, linearity and
251 homogeneity of variance where necessary [42].

252 **Results**

253 As with other insects, *Drosophila* larvae grow significantly larger when reared at
254 lower temperatures. Newly eclosed adults weigh 1.00 mg (95% CI, 0.92-1.08mg)
255 when reared at 17°C but only 0.88 mg (95% CI, 0.80-0.96 mg) when reared at
256 25°C (figure 1, figure 2F) (t-test, $P < 0.05$). This difference in final body size is
257 reflected in a significant difference in critical size, which is 1.10 mg at 17°C (95%
258 CI: 1.03-1.17 mg) and 0.87 mg at 25°C (95% CI: 0.83-0.9 mg) (permutation test,
259 $P < 0.001$) (figure 2A).

260 The duration of each larval instar is, as expected, significantly longer at 17°C
261 than at 25°C (figure 1) (nominal logistic regression, $P < 0.001$ for timing of 1st-2nd
262 instar ecdysis and 2nd-3rd instar ecdysis). However, the mass of larvae at the end
263 of the first- and second-larval instar is not significantly different at the two
264 temperatures (nominal logistic regression, $P = 1.00$ for 1st-2nd instar molt, $P = 0.21$
265 2nd-3rd instar molt). This suggests that the size difference between larvae reared
266 at the two temperatures do not appear until they reach the third and final instar.
267 Consistent with this, we found that the third instar mouth-hook size, which

268 indicates the size of the larva at the previous molt, is not significantly different
269 between temperatures (t-test, $P=0.2718$).

270 The shapes of the growth curves appear ostensibly similar at 25°C and 17°C as
271 depicted in figure 1, except that the duration of development is much longer at
272 17°C. Larvae grow significantly more rapidly at 25°C than 17°C, with logarithmic
273 growth rates during the TGP of $0.037\text{mg}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$ and $0.013\text{mg}\cdot\text{h}^{-1}$, respectively
274 (ANCOVA, $P=0.0148$) (figure 2B). Higher temperature, however, greatly shortens
275 the duration of TGP from 48 h at 17°C to 18 h at 25°C (figure 1,2C). Our data do
276 not allow us to statistically compare the length of TGP at the two temperatures.
277 As an alternative we can use the time to pupariation from critical size (TTP_{CS}),
278 which we measured in our critical size assay, as a proxy for TGP. TTP_{CS} is
279 significantly shorter at 25°C compared to 17°C (permutation test, $p < 0.001$)
280 (figure 2C). Interestingly, the net effect of temperature on the growth rate during
281 the TGP and the duration of the TGP are such that the mass gained during the
282 TGP is not significantly different at the two temperatures (figure 2D) (t-test, $P =$
283 0.098).

284 After reaching peak larval mass, larvae start wandering and lose mass during
285 pupariation and metamorphosis. The average mass loss between peak larval
286 mass and adult eclosion is 0.8 mg at 25°C (95% CI: 0.68-0.92 mg), and 0.83 mg
287 at 17°C (95% CI: 0.72-0.95 mg), which is not significantly different (figure 2E)
288 (ANOVA, $P = 0.70$).

289 Not only are the mass gained post critical size and subsequent mass loss the

290 same across the two treatment temperatures 25°C and 17°C, but the two
291 processes largely cancel each other for any given temperature. As a result, the
292 thermal plasticity of adult weight largely reflects the thermal differences in critical
293 size (figure 2A,F).

294 The effect of temperature on critical size is clearly evident from the plots of larval
295 mass at starvation against time to pupariation: the breakpoint in the plots is at a
296 greater mass for 17°C larvae compared to 25°C larvae (figure 3). This breakpoint
297 indicates a change in the relationship between larval mass at starvation and the
298 subsequent time to pupariation, which arises because starvation before
299 attainment of critical weight delays the initiation of the hormonal changes that
300 cause pupariation, while starvation after critical weight does not. The slopes of
301 the relationship before and after the breakpoint reflect, in part, larval growth rate.
302 It is possible that the difference in the position of the breakpoint at 17°C and
303 25°C is largely a consequence of differences in the slopes either side of the
304 breakpoint, which in turn reflects the differences in larval growth rate at the two
305 temperatures. To confirm this was not the case, we re-analyzed our data using
306 time in degree-days (DD) rather than hours (see electronic supplementary
307 material for details). This has the effect of equalizing larval logarithmic growth
308 rate and TTP_{CS} at the two temperatures (electronic supplementary figure 1A,B).
309 Nevertheless, the critical sizes is unchanged and remains significantly different at
310 the two temperatures: 1.07 mg at 17°C (95% CI: 0.96-1.13 mg) and 0.86 mg at
311 25°C (95% CI: 0.81-0.90 mg) (permutation test, $P < 0.001$) (electronic
312 supplementary figure 1C,D).

313 To confirm that the difference in critical size across temperatures is biologically
314 accurate rather than a consequence of our method of analysis, we also
315 calculated the minimal viable weight for pupariation, MVW[P], which has been
316 used as a proxy for critical size in *Drosophila* [43-45]. MVW[P] is defined as the
317 minimal weight at which 50% of larvae survive to pupariation when starved [41,
318 44], and is attained approximately the same time as critical size in *Drosophila*
319 [32, 41]. We used a nominal logistic regression to predict the weight at which the
320 probability that a starved larva survives to pupariation is 0.5. The MVW[P] is 1.10
321 mg at 17°C (95% CI: 1.05-1.15 mg) and 0.84 mg at 25°C (95% CI: 0.80-0.89
322 mg), thus supporting our hypothesis that critical size in *Drosophila* indeed
323 changes with temperature.

324 **Discussion**

325 Our data indicate a novel mechanism for the regulation of the temperature-size
326 rule in *D. melanogaster*; that is, the TSR results from the thermosensitivity of the
327 critical size. Critical size is a 'decision point' when larvae commit to
328 metamorphosis and its attainment initiates an endocrine cascade that eventually
329 results in the cessation of growth [30]. Reduced critical size at a higher
330 temperature therefore suggests that larvae instigate the signal to stop growth at a
331 smaller size. Although larvae accumulate additional mass between critical size
332 and the cessation of growth, followed by mass loss during wandering and
333 metamorphosis, the change of mass during these phases does not vary across

334 temperature. As a result, smaller adult size at a higher temperature in flies arises
335 solely from the thermal reduction in critical size.

336 It is possible that the thermal regulation of adult weight by critical size may be
337 specific for the genotype of flies we used (Samarkand strain, SAM), and the
338 thermal range used in the study (17°C and 25°C). However, published and
339 unpublished data from our laboratory show that critical size for SAM and a
340 second wild-type strain, OreR, is the same at 25°C and significantly lower at
341 29°C in OreR [37, Shingleton *unpublished data*). Thus critical size appears to be
342 the locus of thermal regulation of adult size in flies of different genotypes across
343 a broad thermal range.

344 *Regulation of critical size*

345 Our data indicate that the critical size is temperature sensitive in *Drosophila* and
346 that it underlies the developmental basis of the TSR. It is, however, unclear how
347 this sensitivity is achieved mechanistically. Work over the last decade has
348 indicated that critical size is regulated by at least two signaling pathways; the
349 insulin/IGF-signaling pathway and the PTTH/Ras/Raf signaling pathway [41, 45,
350 46-49]. Both appear to control the timing of ecdysteroid synthesis by the
351 prothoracic gland and the cessation of growth: insulin/IGF signaling apparently in
352 response to nutritional status [41, 46, 47]; PTTH/Ras/Raf signaling in response to
353 temporal information [45, 48]; and both insulin/IGF and PTTH/Ras/Raf signaling
354 in response to the developmental status of the growing organs [32, 50-52].

355 However, it is unclear whether these or some other pathway mediates the effects
356 of temperature on critical size.

357 Recently, an additional regulator of critical size has been proposed – oxygen
358 level [53]. In all holometabolous insects, tracheal volume is largely fixed within an
359 instar and only expands at each larval molt. Consequently, as a larva grows its
360 tracheal system becomes limiting for oxygen delivery, and in *Manduca sexta* this
361 is evident as a leveling off of whole-animal respiration rates midway through each
362 larval instar. Intriguingly, in the final instar this plateau is reached at critical size,
363 suggesting that *Manduca* larvae sense their size and attainment of critical size
364 through a decline in oxygen availability. This is supported by evidence that critical
365 size is reduced in *Manduca sexta* larva reared in low oxygen conditions. Because
366 an increase in temperature increases metabolic rate [54], the size at which
367 oxygen becomes limiting should be lower at higher temperatures, assuming
368 tracheal volume does not change. Although we do not know the effect of
369 temperature on tracheal volume in *Drosophila* larvae, our finding that larvae
370 reared at 17°C and 25°C are the same size at ecdysis to the third instar suggest
371 that tracheal volume is unaffected by temperature. An intriguing hypothesis,
372 therefore, is that *Drosophila* larvae exploit the effects of temperature on the
373 timing of oxygen limitation as a mechanism to adjust their critical size, and hence
374 body size, with temperature. Effect of oxygen level on adult size in *Drosophila* is
375 more pronounced at higher temperatures supporting the view that oxygen supply
376 may play a role in thermal regulation of size in flies [54].

377

378 *Diverse modes of achieving the TSR*

379 Our observations of the thermal regulation of body size in flies are in contrast to
380 previous findings in another holometabolous insects, the tobacco hornworm *M.*
381 *sexta* [4, 31, 37]. As discussed above, in *Manduca sexta* critical size does not
382 change with temperature [31]. Rather, the effect of temperature on final body size
383 is mediated by the amount of growth achieved during the TGP/ICG, which is
384 reduced at higher temperatures because the increased growth rate cannot
385 compensate for the shortened TGP/ICG [4, 29]. Thus the TSR appears to be
386 achieved using different mechanisms in the two species.

387 It is important to note, however, that in contrast to our experiment, the effects of
388 temperature on the mechanisms that regulate body size in *M. sexta* were
389 assayed in larvae reared at the same temperature until the final instar, and then
390 moved to different temperatures for the rest of development [31]. It is possible,
391 therefore, that the thermal plasticity of *M. sexta* is also regulated solely by critical
392 size in larvae reared at a single temperature for the duration of development.
393 This seems unlikely. In *M. sexta*, early developmental temperature influences the
394 size of larvae entering their final instar [55], which we did not observe in
395 *Drosophila*. Further, in *M. sexta* larvae reared at a constant higher temperature,
396 there is still a lack of compensation between a decreased growth period and an
397 increased growth rate during the final instar [55], which we did not observe in
398 *Drosophila*.

399

400 *Implications for the evolution of the TSR*

401 A central issue in explaining the temperature size rule and its ubiquity is
402 distinguishing between proximate (mechanistic) and ultimate (evolutionary)
403 causes. Non-adaptive explanations for the TSR explicitly deny an evolutionary
404 explanation and propose that thermal plasticity in body size is a result of
405 biophysical constraints imposed by temperature on developmental and
406 physiological processes. The thermal sensitivities of anabolism versus
407 catabolism [20, 21], and developmental rate versus growth rate [18, 19] have
408 both been proposed as general non-adaptive explanations of the proximate TSR
409 mechanisms. However, the observation that natural and experimentally evolved
410 populations show the same trend as the TSR argues strongly that the TSR is an
411 evolved response to selection for a reduced body size at higher temperatures.
412 Further, many of the details of the biophysical models do not appear to be
413 sufficiently general to act as proximate regulators of body size in animals with
414 diverse modes of development [14, 15, 56, 57]. Finally, non-adaptive biophysical
415 explanations for the TSR imply that the effects of temperature on body size are
416 mediated at the level of cellular and sub-cellular processes [18, 27, 58, 59].
417 However, our data indicate that, in *Drosophila* at least, the TSR is achieved
418 through a physiological mechanism (attainment of critical size) that acts at the
419 level of the whole organism.

420 If the TSR is an adaptation, what developmental mechanisms have been
421 targeted by selection to generate the appropriate thermal plasticity in body size?
422 In ectotherms there is a general trend that growth rate increases with

423 temperature and this is thought to be due to biophysical kinetics of the enzymatic
424 reactions that regulate metabolism [60]. If there is selection for ectotherms to be
425 smaller at higher temperatures and they are constrained to grow faster at higher
426 temperatures, then it follows that there will be selection to reduce their duration of
427 growth at higher temperatures. Crucially, this reduction in growth duration must
428 be greater than the coincidental increase in growth rate. There are two ways an
429 animal can reduce the duration of growth at higher temperatures. Either the
430 molecular and physiological processes that control development can progress at
431 a faster rate, or an animal can stop growing at a smaller size. Problematically, at
432 the level of whole-animal growth trajectories these two mechanisms appear
433 identical and can only be distinguished through elucidation of the mechanisms
434 that regulate the rate and duration of development.

435 Our data suggest that *D. melanogaster* and *M. sexta* utilize different mechanisms
436 to regulate the duration of growth at different temperatures and control thermal
437 plasticity of body size. In *M. sexta*, elevated temperature reduces the duration of
438 the TGP/ICG more than it increases growth rate, so that while critical size is
439 temperature insensitive, the amount of mass gained during the TGP/ICG is
440 reduced at higher temperatures. In *Drosophila*, the amount of mass gained
441 during the TGP/ICG is temperature insensitive, but the critical size is reduced at
442 higher temperatures. Consequently, in both groups, the total growth duration is
443 more sensitive to temperature than growth rate, but in the latter this is because
444 larvae initiate the cessation of growth at a smaller size at higher temperatures.
445 The effect of temperature on critical size in *D. melanogaster* larvae is unlikely to

446 be a consequence of development progressing at a higher rate relative to the
447 rate of growth at higher temperatures. This is because larvae molt to the second
448 and third larval instars at the same size at both 17°C and 25°C. Rather, we
449 predict that the thermal plasticity of critical size reflects the effect of temperature
450 on the mechanisms fly larvae use to assess their size.

451 While our data suggest that *D. melanogaster* and *M. sexta* have evolved to obey
452 the TSR using different mechanisms, it is not possible to say which of the
453 physiological processes that control body size (critical size, growth rate, duration
454 of TGP, and weight loss post TGP) were the proximate target of selection.
455 Temperature affects myriad physiological processes in developing ectotherms,
456 and just because a physiological process is thermosensitive does not mean that
457 this thermosensitivity is an adaptation. Selection for the TSR in holometabolous
458 insects may modify the thermosensitivity of one process, for example growth
459 rate, to accommodate the response of another process to temperature, for
460 example the duration of the TGP. It is possible, therefore, that thermal sensitivity
461 of critical size in *Drosophila* is not an adaptation *sensu stricto* but a biophysical
462 consequence of how temperature affects the mechanisms larvae use to assess
463 their size. Under this hypothesis, selection may have targeted thermosensitivity
464 of the processes that regulate mass gain during the TGP to ensure that body size
465 correctly matches developmental temperature. Nevertheless, the observation
466 that critical size is temperature sensitive in *Drosophila* but temperature
467 insensitive in *Manduca* suggests that selection has targeted the response of

468 critical size to temperature in at least one of these species, although it does not
469 tell us which one.

470 Our findings support the hypothesis that the TSR is adaptive, but do not address
471 the question of what it is an adaptation to. There are several adaptive models to
472 explain the ubiquity of the TSR [14, 61]. In general, these adaptive models take a
473 'top-down' approach, starting by hypothesizing the selective pressures that
474 generate the TSR. The selective forces include: optimizing resource allocation
475 between growth and reproduction [62]: optimizing the timing of maturation [61,
476 see discussion in 14]: optimizing the oxygen delivery in case of aquatic species
477 [63]; or maximizing starvation resistance [64]. Nevertheless, a universal adaptive
478 explanation remains elusive. Indeed, there are arguments against the concept
479 that there is a unifying explanation for the existence of the TSR across taxa [15,
480 65]. An alternative approach is to start by elucidating the proximate
481 developmental mechanisms that regulate the TSR, which will allow elucidation of
482 the focal traits on which selection acts to generate the TSR. This in turn
483 facilitates identification of what these underlying selective pressures are.
484 Consequently, we propose that a 'bottom-up' approach is likely to provide a
485 fruitful and complementary approach to understand the adaptive nature of the
486 TSR.

487 *Conclusion*

488 Our findings suggest *Drosophila melanogaster* uses a novel mechanism for the
489 regulation of the TSR. In flies, individuals reared at higher temperature initiate the

490 signals to stop growing at a smaller size, which is different from the mechanism
491 used to generate the TSR in the moth, *Manduca sexta*. This suggests selection
492 for the TSR targets different developmental mechanisms in different taxa.
493 Because *Drosophila* is such a tractable model for studying the molecular-genetic
494 basis of development, this study is foundational to elucidating the proximate
495 details of the TSR. This elucidation is essential for the complete understanding of
496 the adaptive significance of the TSR.

497

498 **Acknowledgements**

499 We are grateful to Viviane Callier for comments on early drafts of this manuscript.
500 We thank Austin Dreyer, Rewatee Gokhale, Nathan Parker and Johnathan
501 Constan for assisting in data collection. This work was supported by the National
502 Science Foundation (Grant No. IOS-0845847).

503 **Author Contributions**

504 Conceived and designed the experiments: SMG AWS. Performed the
505 experiments: SMG NDT. Analyzed the data: SMG NDT AWS. Contributed
506 reagents/materials/analysis tools: AWS. Wrote the paper: SMG AWS.

507

508 **References**

509 1. Roff D. A. 1992 *The evolution of life histories: Theory and analysis*. New York,
510 Chapman & Hall.

- 511 2. Stearns S. C. 1992 *The evolution of life histories*. Oxford, Oxford University
512 Press.
- 513 3. Naganuma K. H., Roughgarden J. D. 1990 Optimal body size in lesser
514 Antillean *Anolis* lizards—a mechanistic approach. *Ecol. Monogr.* **60**(2), 239-
515 256. (doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1943046>).
- 516 4. Davidowitz G., D'Amico L. J., Nijhout H. F. 2004 The effects of environmental
517 variation on a mechanism that controls insect body size. *Evol. Ecol. Res.* **6**(1),
518 49-62.
- 519 5. Mirth C. K., Shingleton A. W. 2012 Integrating body and organ size in
520 *Drosophila*: recent advances and outstanding problems. *Front. Endocrinol.*
521 (*Lausanne*) **3**, 49. (doi:10.3389/fendo.2012.00049).
- 522 6. Shingleton A. W. 2010 The regulation of organ size in *Drosophila*: physiology,
523 plasticity, patterning and physical force. *Organogenesis* **6**(2), 76-87.
- 524 7. Schlichting C. D., Pigliucci M. 1998 *Phenotypic evolution - A reaction norm*
525 *perspective*. Sunderland, MA, Sinauer.
- 526 8. Chown S. L., Gaston K. J. 2010 Body size variation in insects: a
527 macroecological perspective. *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.* **85**(1), 139-169.
- 528 9. Atkinson D. 1994 Temperature and organism size—a biological law for
529 ectotherms? *Adv. Ecol. Res.* **25**, 1-58.
- 530 10. Ray C. 1960 The application of Bergmann's and Allen's rules to the
531 poikilotherms. *J. Morphol.* **106**(1), 85-108. (doi:10.1002/jmor.1051060104).
- 532 11. Atkinson D. 1995 Effects of temperature on the size of aquatic ectotherms:
533 Exceptions to the general rule. *J. Therm. Biol.* **20**(1-2), 61-74.

- 534 12. Kammenga J. E., Doroszuk A., Riksen J. A., Hazendonk E., Spiridon L.,
535 Petrescu A. J., Tijsterman M., Plasterk R. H., Bakker J. 2007 A
536 *Caenorhabditis elegans* wild type defies the temperature-size rule owing to a
537 single nucleotide polymorphism in *tra-3*. *PLoS Genet.* **3**(3), e34. (doi:
538 10.1371/journal.pgen.0030034).
- 539 13. Atkinson D., Sibly R. M. 1997 Geometrical constraints on body size Reply
540 from D. Atkinson and R. M. Sibly. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **12**(11), 442-443. (doi:
541 S01695347(97)85746-1).
- 542 14. Angilletta M. J., Jr., Steury T. D., Sears M. W. 2004 Temperature, growth
543 rate, and body size in ectotherms: fitting pieces of a life-history puzzle. *Integr.*
544 *Comp. Biol.* **44**(6), 498-509. (doi: 10.1093/icb/44.6.498).
- 545 15. Angilletta M. J., Jr., Dunham A. E. 2003 The temperature-size rule in
546 ectotherms: simple evolutionary explanations may not be general. *Am Nat*
547 **162**(3), 332-342.
- 548 16. Walters R. J., Hassall M. 2006 The temperature-size rule in ectotherms: may
549 a general explanation exist after all? *Am. Nat.* **167**(4), 510-523. (doi:
550 10.1086/501029).
- 551 17. Makarieva A. M., Gorshkov V. G., Bai-Lian L. 2005 Temperature-associated
552 upper limits to body size in terrestrial poikilotherms. *Oikos* **111**, 425-436.
- 553 18. van der Have T. M., de Jong G. 1996 Adult size in ectotherms: temperature
554 effects on growth and differentiation. *J. Theo. Biol.* **183**(3), 329-340.
555 (doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jtbi.1996.0224).

- 556 19. Zuo W., Moses M. E., West G. B., Hou C., Brown J. H. 2012 A general model
557 for effects of temperature on ectotherm ontogenetic growth and development.
558 *Proc. R. Soc. B* **279**(1734), 1840-1846. (doi: 10.1098/rspb.2011.2000).
- 559 20. Von Bertalanffy L. 1960 *Principles and theory of growth*. Amsterdam,
560 Elsevier.
- 561 21. Perrin N. 1995 About Berrigan and Charnov's life history puzzle. *Oikos* **73**(1),
562 137-139.
- 563 22. Bergmann C. 1847 Über die Verhältnisse der Wärmeökonomie der Thiere zu
564 ihrer Grösse. *Gött. Stud.* **3**(1), 595-708.
- 565 23. De Moed G. H., De Jong G., Scharloo W. 1997 The phenotypic plasticity of
566 wing size in *Drosophila melanogaster*: the cellular basis of its genetic
567 variation. *Heredity (Edinb)* **79** (Pt 3), 260-267.
- 568 24. James A. C., Partridge L. 1995 Thermal evolution of rate of larval
569 development in *Drosophila melanogaster* in laboratory and field populations. .
570 *J. Evol. Biol.* **8**, 315-330.
- 571 25. Cavicchi S., Guerra D., Giorgi G., Pezzoli C. 1985 Temperature-related
572 divergence in experimental populations of *Drosophila melanogaster*. I. genetic
573 and developmental basis of wing size and shape variation. *Genetics* **109**(4),
574 665-689.
- 575 26. Huey R. B., Partridge L., Fowler K. 1991 Thermal sensitivity of *Drosophila*
576 *melanogaster* responds rapidly to laboratory natural selection. *Evolution*
577 **45**(3), 751-756.

- 578 27. Partridge L., Barrie B., Fowler K., French V. 1994 Evolution and development
579 of body size and cell size in *Drosophila melanogaster* in response to
580 temperature. *Evolution* **48**(4), 1269-1276.
- 581 28. Chown S. L., Gaston K. J. 2010 Body size variation in insects: a
582 macroecological perspective. *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.* **85**(1), 139-169.
583 (doi: 10.1111/j.1469-185X.2009.00097.x).
- 584 29. Davidowitz G., Nijhout H. F. 2004 The physiological basis of reaction norms:
585 The interaction among growth rate, the duration of growth and body size.
586 *Integr. Comp. Biol.* **44**(6), 443-449.
- 587 30. Nijhout H. F., Williams C. M. 1974 Control of moulting and metamorphosis in
588 the tobacco hornworm, *Manduca sexta*(L.): growth of the last-instar larva and
589 the decision to pupate. *J. Exp. Biol.* **61**(2), 481-491.
- 590 31. Davidowitz G., D'Amico L. J., Nijhout H. F. 2003 Critical weight in the
591 development of insect body size. *Evol. Dev.* **5**(2), 188-197.
- 592 32. Stieper B. C., Kupershtok M., Driscoll M. V., Shingleton A. W. 2008 Imaginal
593 discs regulate developmental timing in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Dev. Biol.*
594 **321**(1), 18-26.
- 595 33. Shingleton A. W., Frankino W. A., Flatt T., Nijhout H. F., Emlen D. J. 2007
596 Size and shape: The developmental regulation of static allometry in insects.
597 *BioEssays* **29**(6), 536-548.
- 598 34. Shingleton A. W., Mirth C. K., Bates P. W. 2008 Developmental model of
599 static allometry in holometabolous insects. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **275**(1645), 1875-
600 1885.

- 601 35. Bakker K. 1959 Feeding period, growth, and pupation in larvae of *Drosophila*
602 *melanogaster*. *Entomol. Exp. Appl.* **2**, 171-186.
- 603 36. Williams-Boyce P. K., Jungreis A. M. 1980 The larval-pupal transformation of
604 *Manduca sexta*: changes in body and tissue weights and amount of
605 hemolymph contaminating the tissues. *Ann. Entomol. Soc. Am.* **73**, 602-608.
- 606 37. Davidowitz G., Nijhout H. F. 2004 The physiological basis of reaction norms:
607 the interaction among growth rate, the duration of growth and body size.
608 *Integr. Comp. Biol.* **44**(6), 443-449. (doi: 10.1093/icb/44.6.443).
- 609 38. Stieper B.C., Kupershtok M., Driscoll M.V., Shingleton A.W. 2008 Imaginal
610 discs regulate developmental timing in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Dev. Biol.*
611 **321**(1), 18-26. (doi: 10.1016/j.ydbio.2008.05.556).
- 612 39. Nijhout H. F., Williams C. M. 1974 Control of moulting and metamorphosis in
613 the tobacco hornworm, *Manduca sexta* (L.): cessation of juvenile hormone
614 secretion as a trigger for pupation. *J. Exp. Biol.* **61**(2), 493-501.
- 615 40. Muggeo V. M. R. 2008 Segmented: an R Package to Fit Regression Models
616 with Broken-Line Relationships. *R News* **8**(1), 20-25.
- 617 41. Mirth C., Truman J. W., Riddiford L. M. 2005 The role of the prothoracic
618 gland in determining critical weight for metamorphosis in *Drosophila*
619 *melanogaster*. *Curr. Biol.* **15**(20), 1796-1807.
620 (doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2005.09.017).
- 621 42. Sokal R. R., Rohlf F. J. 2012 *Biometry: the principles and practice of*
622 *statistics in biological research*. 4th ed. New York, H. Freeman & Co.

- 623 43. Partridge L., Barrie B., Fowler K., French V. 1994 Thermal evolution of pre-
624 adult life history traits in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *J. Evol. Biol.* **7**(6), 645-663.
625 (doi:10.1046/j.1420-9101.1994.7060645.x).
- 626 44. De Moed G. H., Kruitwagen C. L. J. J., De Jong G., Scharloo W. 1999 Critical
627 weight for the induction of pupariation in *Drosophila melanogaster*: genetic
628 and environmental variation. *J. Evol. Biol.* **12**(5), 852-858.
629 (doi:10.1046/j.1420-9101.1999.00103.x).
- 630 45. Mcbrayer Z., Ono H., Shimell M., Parvy J., Beckstead R., Warren J.,
631 Thummel C., Dauphinvillemant C., Gilbert L., O'connor M. 2007
632 Prothoracicotropic Hormone Regulates Developmental Timing and Body Size
633 in *Drosophila*. *Dev. Cell* **13**(6), 857-871. (doi:10.1016/j.devcel.2007.11.003).
- 634 46. Caldwell P. E., Walkiewicz M., Stern M. 2005 Ras activity in the *Drosophila*
635 prothoracic gland regulates body size and developmental rate via ecdysone
636 release. *Curr. Biol.* **15**(20), 1785-1795.
- 637 47. Colombani J., Bianchini L., Layalle S., Pondeville E., Dauphin-Villemant C.,
638 Antoniewski C., Carré C., Noselli S., Léopold P. 2005 Antagonistic actions of
639 Ecdysone and Insulins determine final size in *Drosophila*. *Science* **310**, 667-
640 670.
- 641 48. Rewitz K. F., Yamanaka N., Gilbert L. I., O'Connor M. B. 2009 The insect
642 neuropeptide PTTH activates receptor tyrosine kinase torso to initiate
643 metamorphosis. *Science* **326**(5958), 1403-1405.
644 (doi: 10.1126/science.1176450).

- 645 49. Gibbens Y. Y., Warren J. T., Gilbert L. I., O'Connor M. B. 2011
646 Neuroendocrine regulation of *Drosophila* metamorphosis requires
647 TGFbeta/Activin signaling. *Development* **138**(13), 2693-2703. (doi:
648 10.1242/dev.063412).
- 649 50. Halme A., Cheng M., Hariharan I. K. 2010 Retinoids regulate a
650 developmental checkpoint for tissue regeneration in *Drosophila*. *Curr. Biol.*
651 **20**(5), 458-463. (doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2010.01.038).
- 652 51. Garelli A., Gontijo A. M., Miguela V., Caparros E., Dominguez M. 2012
653 Imaginal discs secrete insulin-like peptide 8 to mediate plasticity of growth
654 and maturation. *Science* **336**(6081), 579-582. (doi:
655 10.1126/science.1216735).
- 656 52. Colombani J., Andersen D. S., Leopold P. 2012 Secreted peptide Dilp8
657 coordinates *Drosophila* tissue growth with developmental timing. *Science*
658 **336**(6081), 582-585. (doi: 10.1126/science.1216689).
- 659 53. Callier V., Nijhout H. F. 2011 Control of body size by oxygen supply reveals
660 size-dependent and size-independent mechanisms of molting and
661 metamorphosis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **108**(35), 14664-14669. (doi:
662 10.1073/pnas.1106556108).
- 663 54. Frazier M. R., Woods H. A., Harrison J. F. 2001 Interactive effects of rearing
664 temperature and oxygen on the development of *Drosophila melanogaster*.
665 *Physiol. Biochem. Zool.* **74**(5), 641-650. (doi: 10.1086/322172).

- 666 55. Reynolds S. E., Nottingham S. F. 1985 Effects of temperature on growth and
667 efficiency of food utilization in fifth-instar caterpillars of the tobacco hornworm,
668 *Manduca sexta*. *J. Insect Physiol.* **31**(2), 129-134.
- 669 56. Atkinson D., Morley S. A., Hughes R. N. 2006 From cells to colonies: at what
670 levels of body organization does the 'temperature-size rule' apply? *Evol. Dev.*
671 **8**(2), 202-214. (doi: 10.1111/j.1525-142X.2006.00090.x).
- 672 57. Kingsolver J. G., Huey R. B. 2008 Size, temperature, and fitness: three rules.
673 *Evol. Ecol. Res.* **10**, 251-268.
- 674 58. Atkinson D., Sibly R. M. 1996 On the solutions to a major life-history puzzle.
675 *Oikos* **77**(2), 359-365.
- 676 59. Van Voorhies W. 1996 Bergmann size clines: A simple explanation for their
677 occurrence in ectotherms. *Evolution* **50**, 1259-1264.
- 678 60. Gillooly J. F., Brown J. H., West G. B., Savage V. M., Charnov E. L. 2001
679 Effects of size and temperature on metabolic rate. *Science* **293**(5538), 2248-
680 2251. (doi:10.1126/science.1061967).
- 681 61. Atkinson D., Sibly R. M. 1997 Why are organisms usually bigger in colder
682 environments? Making sense of a life history puzzle. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **12**(6),
683 235-239.
- 684 62. Kozlowski J., Czarnoleski M., Danko M. 2004 Can optimal resource allocation
685 models explain why ectotherms grow larger in cold? *Integr. Comp. Biol.* **44**(6),
686 480-493. (doi: 10.1093/icb/44.6.480).

- 687 63. Forster J., Hirst A. G., Atkinson D. 2012 Warming-induced reductions in body
688 size are greater in aquatic than terrestrial species. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U S*
689 *A* **109**(47), 19310-19314. (doi: 10.1073/pnas.1210460109).
- 690 64. Cushman J. H., Lawton J. H., Manly B. F. J. 1993 Latitudinal patterns in
691 European ant assemblages: variation in species richness and body size.
692 *Oecologia* **95**(1), 30-35.
- 693 65. Angilletta M. J. 2009 *Thermal Adaptation: A Theoretical and Empirical*
694 *Synthesis*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

695

696 **Figure legends**


697 Figure 1: Complete growth curves from larval hatching to adult eclosion at 25°C
698 (black curve) and 17°C (gray curve). Circles are larval and pupal masses and
699 squares are final adult masses. The difference between final pupal mass and
700 adult mass is due to loss of pupal case. Error bars are standard errors and are
701 obscured by the markers in some cases. Upper panels show duration of each
702 developmental stage at the two temperatures, with vertical lines indicating when
703 50% of larvae have made the developmental transition (L1 = 1st larval instar, L2 =
704 2nd larval instar, L3 = 3rd larval instar).







705 Figure 2: Effect of temperature on key size-regulating developmental parameters.
706 Black bars depict values for 25°C, grey bars depict 17°C. (A) Critical size
707 calculated using the breakpoint method (B) Logarithmic growth rate during TGP.
708 (C) Duration of TGP and TTP_{CS}. (D) Mass gained during TGP. (E) Mass loss


709 during pupariation and metamorphosis. (F) Wet weight at eclosion. All error bars
710 are 95% confidence intervals. See text for details of statistical comparisons.

711 Figure 3: Time to pupariation as a function of converted larval weight at
712 starvation. The broken lines show the breakpoint in the data and indicate the
713 critical size at 25°C (black) and 17°C (gray and black).

714
715







Electronic Supplementary Material:




Figure 1: Effect of temperature on key size-regulating developmental parameters calculated using degree-days (DDs). DD is a measure of heat accumulation above a minimal temperature (T_0), and was calculated as $(T_r - T_0)n_r$, where T_r is the developmental temperature and n_r is time (days) maintained at T_r . We calculated the value of T_0 (9.27°C) such that the total developmental development time in DD from hatching to adult eclosion was the same at 17°C and 25°C (136.8 DD)[1]. All measures of larval age and TTP at starvation were

then converted into DD. Black bars depict values for 25°C, grey bars depict 17°C. (A) Logarithmic growth rate in DD during TGP. (B) Duration of TTP_{CS} in DD. (C) Time to pupariation in DD plotted against converted larval weight at starvation. The broken lines show the breakpoint in the data and indicate the critical size at 25°C (black) and 17°C (gray and black). (D) Critical size calculated using the breakpoint method. All error bars are 95% confidence intervals.

1 Shingleton, A. W., Das, J., Vinicius, L. & Stern, D. L. 2005 The temporal requirements for insulin signaling during development in *Drosophila*. *PLoS Biol* **3**, e289. (doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0030289)