

The puzzle of sub-maximal resource use by a parasitoid wasp

Kathryn J. Montovan^{1,2}, Christelle Couchoux³, Laura E. Jones^{1,4}, H. Kern Reeve⁵, Saskya van Nouhuys^{3,4}

¹Center for Applied Math, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853, USA

² Current address: Bennington College, One College Drive, Bennington, VT 05201, USA

³ Department of Biosciences, PO Box 65 (Viikinaari 1), University of Helsinki, 00014, Helsinki, Finland

⁴ Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Corson Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca New York, 14853, USA

⁵Department of Neurobiology and Behavior, Mudd Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853, USA

Keywords: *Hyposoter horticola*, *Melitaea cinxia*, optimal foraging theory, predator prey interactions, population dynamics

Manuscript type: Article

Elements in expanded online edition: Appendix A - General experimental procedures, Appendix B - Experiment 2: Åland, Estonia, Morocco population comparison study, Appendix C - Probing efficiency, Appendix D - Experiment 6: Detecting previous parasitism

Color figures: Figure 2: Decreasing efficiency due to superparasitism, Figure 3: Frequency of superparasitism of *M. cinxia* by *H. horticola*, Figure 4: Optimal foraging model

Sub-maximal resource use comes at a cost to resource-limited individuals. We consider a situation in which, in spite of strong intraspecific competition, resources are consistently left unexploited by a parasitoid wasp. The wasp is known to find virtually all hosts on a landscape scale but parasitize only about a third of the eggs in any given host egg cluster. We first test and reject a series of system-specific simple physiological constraints such as egg limitation of the wasp. We then consider classical mechanisms of individual behavioral restraint. Prudent predation and bet-hedging fail as explanations because the wasp lives as a large well-mixed population. The host caterpillars live gregariously, and we find no individual benefits for the parasitoid of living in a sparsely parasitized nest. We next build an optimal foraging model with and without 1) a penalty for superparasitism, and 2) avoidance of density-dependent hyperparasitism. Search time is modified by strength of competition, increasing with the number of individuals monitoring host egg clusters. The model explains both sub-maximal resource use and deterrent marking behavior of the parasitoid when there is a cost to superparasitism and the search time to find the next egg cluster is short.

Introduction

Under strong resource competition a limiting resource should become entirely depleted. However, this does not generally occur, especially in persistent predator-prey or host-parasite interactions [1]. In these cases the resource may become too scarce to be exploited at low density. Alternatively spatial, temporal or phenological asynchrony between an exploiter and its prey may limit resource use [26, 33, 16, 39], or a resource may be protected or be physiologically resistant [68]. Finally the exploiter may practice sub-maximal resource consumption as an evolved behavior. For instance, a predator might increase its lifetime fitness through prudent resource use [72, 91, 38], individuals might use bet-hedging strategies to increase geometric mean fitness [15, 41], or a predator could be selective in its choice of prey [5].

We examine sub-maximal resource use by a parasitoid wasp, *Hyposoter horticola* (Hymenoptera: Ichneumonidae) which is an egg-larval parasitoid of the butterfly *Melitaea cinxia* (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae) in Åland, Finland [51, 69]. The wasp locates host egg clusters in the landscape during the weeks before they are ready to be parasitized [80], and monitors the egg cluster, using visual landmarks to remember cluster locations [82]. When the host eggs near hatching they become susceptible, and the wasp parasitizes about a third of hosts in each egg cluster. The wasp then applies a deterrent marker around the host egg cluster that other females respect [12]. In this way, *H. horticola* parasitizes a portion of nearly every host cluster in the landscape [81] with the great majority of the parasitism in a cluster the result of one female [12]. In this paper we address the problem of why *H. horticola*, which is clearly resource limited, parasitizes such a low fraction of the hosts available to it, marks the clusters it parasitizes, and, when considering a new cluster, respects the deterrent markings left by others.

We consider nine potential mechanisms for sub-maximal parasitism (Table 1) using a combination of theoretical, empirical, and modeling

methods. Such an exhaustive analysis of sub-maximal resource use has not been attempted in a single research system before. Presumably this is because there is insufficient data in most systems for testing multiple hypotheses, or because interactions between species of interest are too complex. The *M. cinxia* – *H. horticola* system is suitable because the interaction between the species is simple, with a parasitoid supported by a single host species, and has been extensively studied [51, 82, 57]. Detailed understanding of sub-maximal resource use in this system advances understanding of the evolution and maintenance of behavioral restraint in resource exploitation generally.

Research System

The host of the parasitoid *H. horticola* is the butterfly *M. cinxia* which has a Eurasian distribution. In the Åland islands of Finland it lives in small, extinction-prone local populations within networks of dry meadows. The landscape in Åland contains about 4000 suitable habitat patches within an area of 3500 km² that are surveyed annually. Three to five hundred of the patches are occupied by the butterfly in any given year [29, 57].

Individual butterflies lay clusters of 150-200 eggs on the leaves of the host plants (*Plantago lanceolata* and *Veronica spicata*) in June [49]. The eggs take two to three weeks to develop, but shortly before hatching most of the egg clusters in virtually all of the local host populations in Åland are parasitized by *H. horticola* [81, 80]. *Hyposoter horticola* is a mobile [47] and solitary egg-larval endoparasitoid wasp that has no hosts other than *M. cinxia* in Finland, and is not known to use other hosts elsewhere [69]. Females typically spend 20 to 60 minutes at each host cluster, parasitize roughly a third of the eggs, and mark the leaves around the egg cluster in the process. The mark deters conspecific wasps from parasitizing the remaining eggs [80, 13, 12].

Host eggs then hatch into caterpillars, some of which contain a parasitoid larva. The caterpillars develop through the summer in a communal

silken web on the food plant. During this time a hyperparasitoid, *Mesochorus stigmaticus* (Hymenoptera: Ichneumonidae) parasitizes some of the *H. horticola* larvae within the caterpillars. At the end of the summer the caterpillars diapause through the winter in a dense silken nest. In the spring they continue to develop and then disperse to pupate for 2-3 weeks. Just before pupation of the caterpillar, the parasitoid and hyperparasitoid consume the host and pupate. The adult butterflies and wasps emerge in early June [48, 51, 80].

Plausible explanations for submaximal resource use

Physical limitations to parasitism

Multiple physical and physiological limitations might restrict the wasp's ability to parasitize hosts (see table 1). These are listed below:

- The wasp may be egg-limited, with only enough eggs available at a given time to parasitize a fraction of a host egg cluster. Alternatively over the course of its reproductive life, a wasp may only have enough eggs to parasitize a small fraction of encountered hosts, which can lead to choosiness [5, 64, 34].
- The eggs themselves may not all be accessible: the butterfly deposits its eggs in a pile and the inner eggs may be physically inaccessible to the parasitoid ovipositor [35, 88, 40].
- Host eggs may also have immune defenses that kill the wasp egg or larva [50].
- Individual eggs are only susceptible to parasitism for a short period of time, and it takes some time to parasitize each. Depending on egg-development rate, only a fraction of asynchronously-developing eggs might be susceptible while the wasp is present [27, 26, 6]. Alternatively, if the eggs mature synchronously the wasp may only have

enough time to parasitize a small fraction of the hosts while they are susceptible.

One feature of the physical/physiological constraints listed above is that while each of them may explain fractional parasitism, none of them explain why a wasp applies deterrent marking to host egg clusters it has used, or why other individuals respect the deterrent marking.

Behavioral limitations to parasitism

In addition to the above physical or physiological mechanisms, we also investigate why a wasp that is capable of parasitizing an entire host egg cluster might parasitize only a small fraction of the available hosts. We therefore consider evolutionary scenarios that lead to individual behavioral restraint. Sub-maximal exploitation in other resource-exploiter systems is supported by a number of classical ecological or evolutionary explanations: prudent predation [71, 73, 90], bet-hedging [24, 41], cooperative benefits, and optimal foraging [76] in accordance with the marginal value theorem [9]. See Table 1 for a list all nine scenarios considered.

Prudent predation (parasitism). This explanation is based on the idea that restrained harvesting strategies increase resource availability for future generations. For this to benefit individuals, the species must live in small subpopulations with extremely limited mixing [73, 90]. The ideal scenario for such a mechanism is a territorial predator consuming a stationary resource that is renewed from within the predator's range [54], with a small cost of for exercising restraint [78]. Prudence has been used to explain reduced predation in some predator-prey systems [91], but does not work in many systems because of the strict requirements for territoriality and resource renewal [31], and the relative delay in and weakness of the benefit compared to other factors such as increased number of offspring resulting from increased resource use [54].

The *M. cinxia* - *H. horticola* system does not meet the requirements of group selection. While the host butterfly does live as networks of local populations in a fragmented landscape [29], individual wasps are dispersive [81], with overlapping ranges, a small number of distinct populations, and a reactively large number of wasps in each [47, 14]. Thus, in spite of the fine structure of the host population, the parasitoid is not suited to the evolution of prudent predation because of its dispersiveness.

Bet-hedging. Another possible mechanism for sub-maximal resource use is reduced variability in the expected number of surviving offspring by parasitizing only a fraction of each host egg cluster, and instead spreading offspring over multiple locations. Bet-hedging (risk aversion) can be an advantageous strategy if offspring survival is variable. In temporally varying environments, behaviors that reduce the year-to-year variability in survival increase geometric mean fitness [24]. Seed banks are an example of this type of risk spreading [10, 87]. However, *H. horticola* has a single generation per host generation so such temporal risk spreading is not relevant.

In spatially structured environments individuals may increase fitness by spreading offspring over the landscape. This form of bet-hedging can be advantageous for extremely small populations because it decreases the probability of extinction of a particular genotype from the whole population. However, the risk-averse behaviors do not increase the expected fitness of a genotype in large populations [23, 41].

Can this mechanism explain the behavior of the wasp? Host nest mortality varies spatially due to geographic and microhabitat differences in summer precipitation, winter severity, and predation [85, 30]. For a wasp individual in a large population, dividing her offspring between multiple host clusters might reduce the variance in offspring survival, but the fitness of the genotype in the whole population remains the same or is lowered by these risk averse behaviors [42]. Since the population of *H. horti-*

cola wasps is large [47, 14] the expected fitness would remain virtually the same regardless of how individuals spread their offspring. Thus, selection would not favor bet-hedging behavior. Furthermore, risk-aversion would not explain why deterrent marking is employed and respected. Since we rule out both prudence and bet hedging, neither are further considered in this study.

Cooperative benefits. A third hypothesis hinges on the fitness of the cooperatively feeding gregarious host caterpillars. Many insect species, even those that are not social as adults, benefit from living gregariously during development [11]. For *M. cinxia*, the host of *H. horticola*, caterpillar group size is positively associated with development rate, foraging success, and overwintering survival [85, 49]. In a cooperative group the performance of each individual contributes to the fitness of the group. Parasitized insects that continue growing after parasitism may perform poorly due to the cost of harboring the developing parasitoid larva [7, 58]. If a parasitized host is frail it may not contribute sufficiently to the group, and individual fitness of all members of highly parasitized groups could decline. This reduced fitness could favor the evolution of restraint in oviposition by adult females.

Optimal Foraging. The final hypothesis for evolution of behavioral restraint is optimal foraging, where, according to the marginal value theorem, individuals maximize fitness by optimizing the balance between time spent at a given resource patch, and time or energy spent searching for or traveling to a new resource patch [9, 43, 59, 76]. As a forager depletes a resource patch it experiences diminished efficiency. At some point, the expected gain of leaving to find a new patch will exceed the reward obtained by staying in the current patch, and the forager should leave. Optimal foraging models require that an individual's fitness depends on its foraging behavior, is heritable, and evolves more quickly than relevant conditions

change [59]. There are many examples of consumers leaving a resource patch before resources are depleted because of diminished foraging efficiency relative to travel time or effort [70, 62, 55, 17]. Foraging individuals may make decisions about how to optimize resource acquisition on a landscape scale in response to resource availability, both in terms of absolute resource abundance and competition with other foragers.

We first consider a basic optimal foraging model that assumes *H. horticola* experiences decreasing efficiency with increased time at a host egg cluster (resource patch): the longer it stays, the more likely it is to encounter host eggs that it has already parasitized. Superparasitism, or parasitizing a host multiple times, is costly in this system because only one parasitoid successfully develops within a host larva. We then add to the model two density-dependent costs that might favor low rates of per cluster parasitism: first, we explore the possibility that superparasitism causes mortality of all eggs laid in the host. Secondly, if a hyperparasitoid of *H. horticola* responds positively to local parasitoid density within a host cluster, then *H. horticola* would benefit by parasitizing at a reduced rate.

Methods and Results

In the following sections we present both the experimental tests of and results for each hypothesis for sub-maximal parasitism except prudent parasitism and bet-hedging (Table 1). We start by considering four biological explanations of why a wasp might not physically or physiologically be able to parasitize all of the host eggs in a cluster: wasp egg limitation, host egg cluster architecture (Experiment 1), host egg defense (Experiment 2), and Ephemeral resource availability (Experiments 3 and 4). We next address behavioral explanations for sub-maximal parasitism. The plausibility of the first hypothesis, cooperative benefits of unparasitized hosts, is evaluated by conducting an experiment (Experiment 5) to test the prerequisite that host group performance decreases as parasitism rate increases.

Finally we build an optimal foraging model. We use experimental data in our parameter estimates for probing efficiency (appendix C), and super-parasitism rate (Experiment 6). One potential component of the optimal foraging model is an incentive for *H. horticola* to reduce its parasitism rates in order to avoid hyperparasitism by a positively density dependent hyperparasitoid. To assess this possibility, we determine patterns of hyperparasitism from field data (Experiment 7), and incorporate these into the model. We also address the possibility of an evolutionary response to hyperparasitism comparatively (Experiment 2), by contrasting the behavior of wasps from populations with and without a history of hyperparasitism.

Wasp egg limitation

Egg-limited parasitoids do not produce sufficient eggs to parasitize all of the hosts they encounter in a patch or during their lifetime. They may thus be choosy about the hosts they accept [5, 45]. If *H. horticola* females do not have enough eggs at any one time to parasitize a full host egg cluster then the observed fractional parasitism rate would be expected. Couchoux and van Nouhuys (2014) found that mature female *H. horticola* contain $\bar{x} = 550$ (± 173 SD) mature eggs in their oviducts. *Melitaea cinxia* egg clusters contain $\bar{x} = 150$ (± 60 SD) eggs [65]. Thus, each wasp generally has plenty of mature eggs to parasitize all of the host eggs in multiple clusters. Not also that this mechanism would not explain their deterrent marking behavior.

Host Egg Cluster Architecture (Experiment 1)

Some insects protect their eggs from parasitism by mounding them so that inner eggs are inaccessible to the parasitoid ovipositor [35, 88, 40]. Up to half of the eggs can be protected in the inner layers of an optimally shaped pile [21]. *Melitaea cinxia* lay their eggs in mounds. We tested whether inner eggs were afforded protection from parasitism by comparing parasitism rates in eggs from inner and outer layers of parasitized clusters.

Eleven host egg clusters were laid on plants by laboratory-reared butterflies under laboratory conditions and exposed to parasitism by *H. horticola* (see Appendix A for more details). Seven wasps were used for this experiment, with three each parasitizing a single cluster and the other four parasitizing two clusters each. Immediately after parasitism the outer layer of eggs was separated from the rest of the cluster. Both groups were then dissected to determine the parasitism level. The overall mean parasitism frequency for the clusters was 46% ($\pm 18\%$ SD). The difference between the mean parasitism frequency of the two groups was -5.2% ($\pm 14.6\%$ SD) with inner and outer eggs being parasitized equally. There is thus no evidence that mounding protects the inner host eggs from parasitism by *H. horticola*.

Host egg immunological defense (Experiment 2)

Insects can defend themselves against endoparasitoids by encapsulating or otherwise preventing the development of parasitoid eggs or larvae [50]. If this were the case for *H. horticola* then the wasp may actually parasitize at a high rate, but only be successful about a third of the time. Though *M. cinxia* is able to encapsulate another parasitoid species [83], it has not been observed to encapsulate *H. horticola* (van Nouhuys, personal observation). Generally the immune response of very young insects is weak [25, 19]. However, it is possible that if some parasitoid eggs are killed at a very early stage they would not be detected upon dissection. Such an early investment in immune response, which comes at a cost [67, 2] might only persist in *M. cinxia* populations that have *H. horticola* parasitoids.

To address this idea we compared the rate of parasitism by *H. horticola* from Åland presented with egg clusters from Åland and Morocco (experiment 2). *Hyposoter horticola* is not present in the Moroccan population of *M. cinxia*. The only known larval parasitoid of that population is *Cotesia melitaearum* (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) (van Nouhuys, personal observation), which is also present in Åland, and which parasitizes older *M. cinxia*

larvae [84], and is encapsulated at a high rate [83]. Moroccan *M. cinxia* would not benefit from investment in early defense against *H. horticola*, so they may be more susceptible than *M. cinxia* from Åland.

Caterpillars were collected from several nests in the Moroccan highlands and also Åland, and reared under laboratory conditions to pupation (see details in Appendices A and B). Butterflies from both origins were mated with non-sibs from the same origin and allowed to lay eggs on potted host plants. When the egg clusters were about two weeks old and nearly ready to hatch, we exposed them to parasitism in the laboratory, each by a single *H. horticola* from Åland. We dissected the host caterpillars to determine the parasitism frequency in each host egg cluster. In total 26 egg clusters (11 from Åland and 15 from Morocco) were parasitized, each by a different wasp from Åland (see Table 2 for summary results).

We compared the fraction of *M. cinxia* eggs parasitized in clusters from Åland and Morocco by wasps from Åland using a t-test. The wasp parasitized eggs from both origins at the same frequency ($28\% \pm 17\%$ SD, $t = -0.0047$, $df = 19.458$, $p = 0.9963$). Thus, we do not find evidence that there is locally evolved resistance in Åland diminishing successful parasitism by *H. horticola*.

Ephemeral resource use (Experiments 3 and 4)

Temporal asynchrony of the adult parasitoid with the susceptible stage of the host can create a short window of opportunity for parasitism [27, 26, 6]. The window of time a wasp has to parasitize eggs within a host egg cluster depends on the length of time individual eggs are susceptible, and on the degree of synchrony of hatching within a cluster.

For example, if it takes a wasp one minute to parasitize an egg, and the eggs mature synchronously and are only available for 30 minutes each, then a wasp would be able to parasitize only 30% of a 100 egg cluster before the entire cluster hatches. Alternatively, host eggs may develop at slightly different times, so if the wasp spent only a limited amount of time

at a cluster, only a fraction would be available for parasitism. Once a wasp had parasitized all of the susceptible eggs, it would have to wait for others to develop or leave.

Melitaea cinxia eggs start out as bright yellow, and at that stage the wasps cannot (or will not) parasitize them. After 10 to 14 days the eggs change to a creamy color, then develop dark specks, then the top of the egg turns grey and later, just before the caterpillar hatches, the top of the egg is nearly black. The wasp does not probe in clusters of bright yellow eggs, and once the larvae start to hatch, the wasps are no longer interested in it [8]. In order to determine if the wasps are limited by the developmental rate and synchrony of development of the host eggs, we observed which visible phases of egg development are parasitized by the wasp (Experiment 3). Thirty four host egg clusters of different stages of maturity (starting with all of the eggs creamy) were exposed to parasitism in the laboratory, each by a single wasp. see Appendix A for details on how the wasps and host egg clusters were obtained and maintained. Eleven wasps were used for the experiment, each between two and seven times. Directly after parasitism the eggs within each cluster were separated based on visual appearance into four groups: creamy, speckled, grey-topped, and black-topped, and then dissected to determine parasitism.

The association of parasitism with egg maturity category was analyzed using a standard least squares model with the statistical software package JMP [46]. The explanatory variable was egg maturity at the cluster level (yellow, creamy, speckled, grey-topped, and black-topped). Egg cluster ID and wasp ID were included as random factors. We found that parasitism differed with maturity level ($F = 5.2683$ $p = 0.0057$), with the only difference being that clusters made up of creamy eggs were unparasitized or parasitized at a very low rate (post hoc contrast; $F = 5.268311.7017$ $p = 0.0022$). There was also significant variation between clusters that was not attributable to egg maturity (variance component = 0.1786), but insignificant variation associated with wasp ID (variance component = 0.0144).

We then determined how synchronously eggs in a cluster developed through the susceptible phase, and the amount of time a cluster contained susceptible eggs. To do this we took hourly photographs of ten egg clusters over the last one to five days of development (experiment 4). For each cluster, we determined the number of hours that essentially all of the eggs in the cluster were in one of the last three visible phases of development (speckled, almost black topped, black topped). Based on this, the minimum interval of susceptibility of an egg cluster was approximately 28 hours $\bar{x} = 64 (\pm 38 \text{ SD})$. Since a wasp can probe approximately 1 egg per minute (computed in Appendix C), a two day window of opportunity is long enough for a wasp to parasitize much more than 30% of the host eggs. Thus, *H. horticola* is not constrained by rate or synchrony of egg development in a cluster.

In sum, *H. horticola* has enough mature eggs in its ovaries and oviducts to parasitize multiple whole clusters. All of the eggs in the cluster are physically accessible to the ovipositor, and the eggs are susceptible to parasitism for more time than the wasp attends to the cluster. Although it is conceivable that some other factor could keep females from parasitizing more hosts than they do, we have tested all the factors for which there is suggestive evidence in this system or others. The observed 30% frequency is then a behavioral trait rather than the result of physical/physiological constraint. In the following models we consider evolutionary explanations of behavioral restraint by the wasp.

Cooperative benefits of unparasitized hosts (Experiment 5)

In a cooperative group the performance of each individual contributes to the fitness of the group. Thus, if parasitized individuals perform poorly then the performance of all individuals in the group would be reduced with increasing rates of parasitism. We determined the effect of parasitism within a host group on individual and group performance by manipulating the fraction of larvae parasitized per nest in a replicated laboratory

experiment and measuring the rate of development, size at diapause, production of silk, and size at pupation of the host and parasitoid (experiment 5).

Parasitized and unparasitized caterpillars were obtained as described in Appendix A. To assess the effects on pre-diapause caterpillars (instars one to five), we put newly hatched caterpillars in 40 composite replicated groups of 40 larvae. To create a well-distributed range of parasitism frequencies, the groups were constructed by mixing caterpillars from field parasitized clusters (taken from the laboratory and placed in the field for parasitism) with caterpillars from the same laboratory origin that had not been exposed to parasitism. Aggregate groups were made of unparasitized caterpillars left undiluted, mixed 1:1 with caterpillars from nests exposed to parasitism, or made up entirely from caterpillars from field parasitized nests. Since young parasitized and unparasitized *M. cinxia* caterpillars are indistinguishable, the fraction parasitized within each constructed nest was not known until the end of the experiment. Caterpillars developed in these groups under laboratory conditions, making their silken winter nest, and going into diapause. To assess the quantity of winter silk, the groups of caterpillars were sorted (blind to the level of parasitism) into 5 groups based on the amount of silk produced. Then the larvae were weighed and dissected to determine which individuals were parasitized.

Post-diapause performance was assessed using a second set of 37 lab-reared and field-parasitized composite groups. These caterpillars were obtained as described above, and were reared until diapause in their original family groups. Upon breaking diapause families of parasitized larvae were mixed to avoid differences between families, and the composite groups were assembled. We then measured their growth rate until pupation, and the butterfly and wasp pupal weights.

We analyzed the association of pre-diapause and post-diapause growth rates, weight at diapause and weight at pupation for hosts and parasitoids

separately using standard least squares analysis of variance with JMP [46]. The explanatory variable was rate of parasitism of the group, and group ID was included as a random effect. We analyzed the association of mortality with rate of parasitism using logistic regression with individual survival (0/1) modeled as a function of rate of parasitism of the group and group ID. Finally, the association of rate of parasitism with amount of silk produced was analyzed using standard least squares analysis of variance with silk production (level 1 to 5) as an explanatory class variable and group ID as a random effect.

For the prediapause caterpillars, among the 30 groups that contained potentially parasitized larvae the rate of parasitism ranged from 12% to 65% ($\bar{x} = 0.36 (\pm 0.15 \text{ SD})$). Parasitized caterpillars developed from second instar to diapause in $\bar{x} = 29.28$ days ($\pm 2.82 \text{ SD}$). This differed among replicate groups, but was unrelated to the rate of parasitism in a group ($F = 0.0092, df = 24.72, p = 0.9242$). The pre-diapause development time of unparasitized caterpillars was about the same and also did not differ with rate of parasitism of the group ($F = 0.0110, df = 24.72, p = 0.9172$). The weight of parasitized caterpillars was $\bar{x} = 9.47 \text{ mg}$ ($\pm 5.93 \text{ SD}$), and did not differ among groups or in association with rate of parasitism ($F = 0.0152, df = 13.78, p = 0.9038$). Unparasitized caterpillars were slightly larger ($\bar{x} = 10.71 \text{ mg}$ ($\pm 2.28 \text{ SD}$)), but did also not vary with rate of parasitism ($F = 1.9877, df = 36.88, p = 0.1670$). Very few larvae died in this experiment so mortality was not analyzed.

Upon molting to diapause the caterpillars produced silk to make a winter nests. Interestingly, groups with a high rate of parasitism produced the most silk ($F = 8.9052, df = 34, p < 0.0001$). This effect was due the especially high production of silk by the most parasitized groups (post-hoc test $F = 32.51, df = 1, p < 0.0001$) (Fig 1). The amount of silk produced is likely to be associated with winter nest quality which is important for overwintering success of *M. cinxia* [49].

For the post-diapause caterpillars, among those groups containing par-

asitized larvae the rate of parasitism ranged from 5% to 61% ($\bar{x} = 32\%$ ($\pm 13\%$ SD)). There was nearly 30% mortality due to disease so we analyzed the pattern of mortality. Survival of parasitoids to pupation differed among replicate groups (maximum likelihood $X^2=70.6167, p = 0.0005$), but was unrelated to rate of parasitism ($X^2=0.00013, p = 0.09971$). Development time of both parasitized and unparasitized larvae from breaking diapause until pupation took about 27 days, and differed among groups. The development rate of parasitized caterpillars decreased marginally with increasing rate of parasitism ($F = 3.5813, df = 30.5, p = 0.0680$), but this was not the case for unparasitized caterpillars ($F = 1.1915, df = 21.36, p = 0.2872$). Parasitoid pupae weighed ($\bar{x} = 48.96$ mg (± 12.08 SD)), which differed among groups, but was unrelated to rate of parasitism. Butterfly pupae were larger than *H. horticola* pupae ($\bar{x} = 177.13$ mg (± 28.18 SD)). In contrast to the parasitoid, their weight decreased with increasing parasitism rate ($F = 5.5352, df = 26.94, p = 0.0262$).

Based on these experiments, we see no great cost of being in a highly parasitized nest for *H. horticola*. There was no effect of parasitism on most measures of parasitoid performance. Development rate of parasitized prediapause caterpillars increased (marginally significantly) by about one day between the highest and lowest parasitism. We do not believe this 3% difference in a one year lifecycle could have a large negative effect. There was also a positive association of parasitism with silk production which warrants further study, but is at least not likely to be detrimental to the wasp.

Optimal Foraging (Results from Modeling, Experiment 6)

While many consumers exhaust a resource patch before leaving, others leave a patch before it is depleted because of diminished foraging efficiency [9]. *Hyposoter horticola* probes host eggs within a cluster unsystematically, making haphazard passes across the cluster apparently without effort to avoid previously parasitized hosts [Montovan, Pers. Obs.]. Thus,

foraging efficiency diminishes over time at a host cluster as it increasingly encounters previously parasitized hosts, raising the risk of *superparasitism*, or multiply parasitizing the same host. Since only one *H. horticola* larva will develop within each host caterpillar, this simple manifestation of optimal foraging might explain the 30% parasitism frequency of *H. horticola* (Figure 2). In addition, excessive probing disrupts the host egg pile and can cause host (and parasitoid) mortality when eggs break off and fall to the ground. For our model we will ignore the additional costs from increased mortality.

Experiment 6. Observed superparasitism rates. To assess the actual frequency of superparasitism by *H. horticola*, we exposed host eggs to parasitism and dissected the caterpillars just after hatching to count the number of parasitoid eggs each contained. Host egg clusters were exposed to parasitism in the laboratory, and we also put host egg clusters in the field to be parasitized naturally. A total of 35 parasitized clusters were then dissected. These dissections show that although only one wasp reaches maturity within a given host, superparasitism does occasionally occur. We then compared observed superparasitism rates to expected rates under the assumptions of random oviposition with no avoidance of superparasitism (solid black line in Fig. 3) by fitting the data to a non-linear model of random probing with a probability z of detecting previous parasitism and avoiding superparasitism. The detection probability is significantly different than zero ($p < 0.001$). Therefore the wasp detects and successfully avoids superparasitism approximately 77% of the time (dotted grey line in Fig. 3). The strong avoidance of superparasitism suggests that it is costly. See Appendix D for details of the random probing model.

Mathematical Modeling. To understand whether optimal foraging coupled with an incentive to avoid superparasitism could theoretically explain the observed restraint in parasitism we created a mathematical model and used it to predict optimal parasitism rates.

We first assume that each probe by the wasp is independent and random. Then, each time the wasp probes, the probability that a specific egg is hit is $1/N$, where N is the number of eggs in a cluster. Then, since N is large, we use a poisson process approximation. The expected number of eggs parasitized singly or multiple times is

$$Ng_1(t) = N(1 - e^{-bt/N}) \quad (1)$$

where b is the probing efficiency (rate of probing eggs) taken from laboratory data (see Appendix C for details), and t is the time spent probing.

The parasitism frequency function (1) assumes that only one wasp parasitizes each cluster [12] and that if an egg is parasitized multiple times (superparasitized) only one wasp larva survives, which is what has been observed [84]. In this case, wasps might avoid superparasitizing because it is potentially risky to their offspring [79, 22]. Indeed, if superparasitism kills all the wasp larvae in a host, then there would be strong selection for individuals that avoid it (via host checking and/or reduced parasitism rates).

To address the possibility that wasp modifies its behavior to avoid superparasitism, we consider two extremes. In (Eqn. 1) we defined the fraction parasitized ($g_1(t)$) according to the assumption that each (multiply or singly) parasitized host supports only one wasp larva. We next consider the scenario that multiply parasitized hosts yield no wasp adults. For this we define a parasitism frequency function $g_2(t)$ (Eqn. 2) to be the fraction of the host cluster that is parasitized exactly once.

According to the poisson distribution with an additional probability of detecting previous parasitism (z), the fraction parasitized once is $g_2(t) = \frac{e^{-\lambda}}{z}(e^{z\lambda} - 1)$ where $\lambda = bt/N$ (see more details about how we derived this expression in Appendix D). The expected number of host eggs parasitized

exactly once is then

$$Ng_2(t) = \frac{Ne^{-bt/N}}{z}(e^{btz/N} - 1) \quad (2)$$

We determined the expected number of hosts parasitized per unit time under both scenarios ($g_1(t)$ and $g_2(t)$). Parasitism efficiency $w_1(t)$ is defined as the number of eggs parasitized in each cluster ($Ng_1(t)$ or $Ng_2(t)$) divided by the time the wasp spends searching for (t_s) and parasitizing (t) a cluster. The search time t_s is the time it takes the wasp to locate the next available cluster. Search time depends on both the host and parasitoid density and will be greater when there is more competition over host clusters. Natural selection acts upon the wasp decision variable t , or time spent probing each cluster. We write the parasitism efficiencies under the assumption of superparasitism yielding only one ($w_1(t)$) or zero ($w_2(t)$) wasp larvae as follows:

$$w_1(t) = \frac{Ng_1(t)}{t_s + t} = \frac{N(1 - e^{-bt/N})}{t_s + t} \quad (3)$$

$$w_2(t) = \frac{Ng_2(t)}{t_s + t} = \frac{Ne^{-bt/N}(e^{btz/N} - 1)}{z(t_s + t)} \quad (4)$$

where again $w_1(t)$ (Eqn. 3) is the the efficiency of parasitism without mortality of multiply parasitized eggs, and $w_2(t)$ (Eqn. 4) is parasitism efficiency assuming complete mortality of multiply parasitized eggs.

We use these models to predict optimal parasitism frequencies as follows. To maximize the fitness ($w(t)$) with respect to time spent parasitizing, t , we differentiated $w(t)$ and solved for t when $\frac{dw(t)}{dt} = 0$, and $\frac{d^2w(t)}{dt^2} < 0$, finding the optimal value of t numerically and then employing this value in our expressions for $g_1(t)$ and $g_2(t)$. Figure 4 shows the resulting optimal fraction parasitized for both parasitism functions, $g_1(t)$ (solid blue lines) and $g_2(t)$ (dashed lines), over realistic ranges of N (Fig. 4a) and b (Fig. 4b). When super parasitism kills all wasp larvae (red dashed lines) the optimal

parasitism rate is lower and approaches 62.8% for large t_s . The model predicts that as host clusters get larger (increasing N), the fraction parasitized should decrease slightly and if the wasp probing efficiency b increases, the fraction parasitized should also increase slightly. We see that the optimal fraction parasitized is fairly robust to changes in the number of eggs (N) or the probing efficiency (b).

Since the expected time it takes a wasp to locate a available host egg cluster (t_s) is unknown, we tested the model over short and long searching times (Fig. 4c1,c2). For small values of t_s and realistic values of N and b , both models predict an optimal fraction parasitized close to the observed 30%. However, the optimum fraction parasitized increases greatly with increased searching time. Including mortality due to superparasitism in our model (red dashed lines) lowers the optimal parasitism rates and creates a larger range of search times, t_{sr} , for which we would expect to see the wasp parasitize close to 30% for each cluster. Thus, optimal foraging with decreasing efficiency due to random probing can explain the observed sub-maximal parasitism frequencies if the wasp's searching time is relatively short. If superparasitism kills all wasp larvae contained in the host caterpillar then slightly longer search times could also result in parasitism frequencies close to 30%.

Avoiding Hyperparasitism (Experiments 2 and 7)

Resource acquisition, in this case successfully parasitizing hosts, is a central component of parasitoid fitness. However some parasitoid behaviors might be related to minimizing the risk of mortality imposed by ones own natural enemies [3, 18, 32]. One possibility is that *H. horticola* parasitize at a low rate in order to avoid positively density dependent hyperparasitism. The hyperparasitoid *Mesochorus stigmaticus* is a main mortality source for *H. horticola*. This solitary hyperparasitoid probes second to fourth instar *M. cinxia* caterpillars, laying eggs in the *H. horticola* larva within. Multi-

ple *M. stigmaticus* females visit caterpillar nests over several weeks during the summer, spending minutes to hours exploring and parasitizing the wasp larvae inside caterpillar hosts [63]. Host clusters are hyperparasitized with the frequency ranging from 0% (very rarely) to 50% [51]. We first determine if *H. horticola* experience a positive density-dependent risk of hyperparasitism due *M. stigmaticus*, that might provide an incentive for a lower optimal parasitism rate (experiment 7). Then we combine effects of observed density-dependent hyperparasitism with our optimal foraging model (Eqn. 3) from section to determine how large an effect this additional factor might have on the wasp's behavior. Last, we compare the parasitism frequencies of *H. horticola* from populations with (Åland) and without (Estonia) *M. stigmaticus* to see if the population has an evolved lower parasitism frequency in the presence of the hyperparasitoid (experiment 2).

We determined the hyperparasitism frequency for a range of parasitism frequencies using two different data sets. The first is comprised of 16 field-collected naturally parasitized and hyperparasitized nests, collected in the autumn of 2007 and kept in the laboratory for winter diapause, and then reared in the spring until they became adult *M. cinxia*, *H. horticola*, and *M. stigmaticus*. Second, to extend the observed levels of parasitism and standardize for nest size and location, in the summer of 2009 we constructed nests of 60 *M. cinxia* pre-diapause caterpillars that ranged in fraction parasitized from approximately ten to sixty percent. We then placed the nests in the field to be naturally hyperparasitized by *M. stigmaticus*. As in experiment 5 above, the composite groups were constructed by mixing caterpillars from egg clusters placed in the field to be parasitized naturally by *H. horticola* with caterpillars from egg clusters of the same laboratory origin, but unexposed to parasitism. Nests containing naturally parasitized caterpillars were left undiluted (N= 7), diluted 1:1 (N= 7), and diluted 2:1 (N=7). The nests were randomized and placed in natural locations in five different habitat patches. After three weeks in

July, when *M. stigmaticus* is active, the nests were brought back into the laboratory and the caterpillars were reared. The number of caterpillars that became adult butterflies, *H. horticola* or *M. stigmaticus*, were recorded the following spring.

Experimental results suggest that wasps suffer higher hyperparasitism losses for parasitizing more hosts (Fig 5a). To understand the effects of hyperparasitism on the expected number of wasp offspring, we consider $H(p)$, the fraction of hosts within each cluster that were parasitized by *H. horticola* but not hyperparasitized by *M. stigmaticus* as a function of the initial fraction parasitized by *H. horticola*, p (Fig 5b). We fit a second order polynomial curve with a intercept at $(0, 0)$ to determine whether rate of hyperparasitism is a linear or nonlinear (second order) function of parasitism rate, p . The second order term was not significant ($p = 0.29$). Thus, the best fit for the *H. horticola* offspring production as a function of the frequency (p) is the line $y = 0.4573331p$ (shown in Fig 5b, $p < 0.001$). The expected fraction of hosts that yield *H. horticola* is then the fraction that emerge from non-hyperparasitized clusters plus the fraction that emerge from hyperparasitized clusters.

$$H(p) = 0.278p + 0.722(0.457p) = 0.608p \quad (5)$$

The data supports a hyperparasitism function that linearly decreases the benefits of high parasitism frequencies to the wasp. This would affect the population sizes, but would not change the predicted optimal foraging strategy of a wasp. We show this by demonstrating how hyperparasitism ($H(p)$) would fit into the optimal foraging model presented earlier (Eqn. 3). For this model the fraction of the cluster that becomes *H. horticola* is modified by $H(p)$.

$$w_3(t) = \frac{NH(p)}{t_s + t} = \frac{NH(1 - e^{-bt/N})}{t_s + t} = \frac{.608N(1 - e^{-bt/N})}{t_s + t} = 0.608w_1(t)$$

Because the fitness function for optimal foraging with density dependent hyperparasitism, $w_3(t)$, is a scalar multiple of the earlier fitness function, $w_1(t)$, the predicted optimal foraging rate will be the same as predicted in the basic optimal foraging model. This is because $H(p)$ is a linear function. We would only expect the hyperparasitism function to affect the optimal parasitism rate if $H(p)$ is a non-linear function of p .

We also took a second entirely different approach to the question by comparing the behavior of *H. horticola* from Åland with those from an area free of *M. stigmaticus* (experiment 2). In Estonia, the parasitoid *H. horticola* is present but *M. stigmata*, the hyperparasitoid, is absent (van Nouhuys, personal observation). We collected *M. cinxia* from an Estonian population that is 250 km by sea from Åland and well outside of the distance that *H. horticola* can travel over water. There, the butterfly feeds on *Veronica spicata*, and live in a climate similar to Åland, though landscape structure is less fragmented [53]. If *H. horticola* has evolved to parasitize at a low frequency to avoid a density dependent hyperparasitoid in Åland, then we might expect individuals from the Estonian population not to exhibit restraint, and to parasitize a larger fraction of the hosts in each cluster.

We collected 11 post diapause *M. cinxia* nests from Estonia in spring 2012. The larvae were reared into butterflies or wasps. The rearing and experimental protocol are described in Appendix B. In the fully crossed experiment, *H. horticola* from Åland were offered *M. cinxia* eggs from Åland ($n = 11$) and Estonia ($n = 10$). Wasps from Estonia were offered *M. cinxia* eggs from Åland eggs ($n = 14$) and from Estonia ($n = 14$). A different wasp was used to parasitize each egg cluster. We compared the frequency of parasitism using a generalized linear model in the R [61] programming language. The frequency of parasitism of the egg cluster was modeled as a function of egg cluster origin (Åland, Estonia), wasp origin (Åland, Estonia) and the interaction between wasp and egg origin. See table 2 for the mean and standard deviation of the fraction parasitized for each treatment.

On average the fraction parasitized was 36% of the eggs in a cluster. This ranged from 0.08 to 0.74, which is a larger spread than we usually find because the egg clusters were relatively small and the weather was cloudy so the wasps did not behave consistently under the laboratory conditions. There was no difference in the frequency of parasitism between egg origins or between wasp origins, and no interaction between egg and wasp origin (Fig. 6). The data do not support the hypothesis that *H. horticola* from Åland have evolved restrained parasitism behavior because of pressure from the hyperparasitoid *M. stigmaticus*.

Discussion

In tightly coupled host-parasitoid relationships the interacting species exert strong selective forces on one another. These antagonistic interactions lead to diverse mechanisms of defense and virulence, both simple and complex. At a population level these mechanisms must result in only some of the prey being successfully parasitized in order for the interaction to persist over time [33]. Yet since the fitness of parasitoid individuals increases with each host they successfully parasitize, we might expect a resource-limited individual to parasitize every host that it encounters. *H. horticola* is a clearly resource-limited parasitoid that appears to practice submaximal host use, in that it parasitizes only about 30% of each available host cluster. In order to discover what might be driving this behavior, we conducted a thorough study of sub-maximal host use by *H. horticola*, approaching the question through experiments, comparative studies and mathematical modeling.

Simple biological and physiological constraints

We would expect simple biological limitations to be effective constraints only if the parasitoid were poorly adapted to the host. Since *H. horticola* has an extremely narrow host range, probably entirely limited to *M. cinxia*

[69] and certainly limited to *M. cinxia* in the study area, it is not surprising that the wasp is not physically limited. That is, *H. horticola* is not limited by egg cluster architecture, short window of susceptibility or asynchrony in the development of eggs within each cluster, and successful parasitism is not diminished by the early immune response of the host. The wasp also has many more eggs in its ovaries than needed to parasitize a host egg cluster so it is not egg limited in the short term. It could however still be egg limited over its lifetime. Lifetime egg limitation can cause some parasitoids to be selective [5, 34]. However, *H. horticola* is large compared with the host eggs and parasitizing happens haphazardly so it is unlikely that wasp chooses among eggs within each host cluster. The wasps could be reserving eggs for better egg clusters, but we do not think that this is the case because most egg clusters get parasitized, and *H. horticola* treats large and small clusters (within a normal range) equally [12]. Furthermore, choosiness due to lifetime egg limitation would not motivate wasps to leave a deterrent marking that other individuals respect.

Behavioral restraint: Prudent parasitism, risk spreading, cooperative benefits

It has previously been shown that most egg clusters are found by the wasp [81, 80], and we have shown above that parasitism rate is not limited by simple physiological mechanisms. Behavioral restraint is therefore the most likely explanation for why the wasp does not fully parasitize each cluster. As explained above, behavioral restraint through prudence and risk-aversion are not plausible because in Åland, *H. horticola* has large population sizes and is reasonably well-mixed across the landscape [47, 14]. We also found that wasps don't benefit from avoiding heavily parasitized nests: although *M. cinxia* caterpillars live gregariously and rely on cooperative behavior to survive, the fraction parasitized did not affect the pre-diapause or post-diapause developmental rates or weights of the *M. cinxia* caterpillars or wasps. The lack of a measurable cost of parasitism on group behavior is not surprising because the parasitoid larvae

stay extremely small (1st instar) within the host caterpillar for almost an entire year, and then grow rapidly, consuming the entire host just before it would have pupated in the spring [84]. A surprising result of this experiment and one that warrants further study, is that highly parasitized host groups produced significantly more silk for their winter nests. This suggests that the parasitoid might induce the host to invest more into nest building than it would otherwise. Parasitoids are known to induce host behaviors that benefit the parasitoid [28]. In this case, the induced behavior could increase the chance that the caterpillars survive winter, at some energy/resource cost.

Behavioral restraints: Optimal foraging

Unlike the previous scenarios, optimal foraging shows promise as an explanation for sub-maximal resource use by *H. horticola*. In the most basic model, efficiency at a host egg cluster decreases solely because the wasp probes randomly and only one larva can develop within each host. As the wasp spends more time at the cluster it finds fewer and fewer unparasitized eggs and thus benefits from leaving to secure another host egg cluster. The basic model predicts sub-maximal parasitism close to the observed 30% when the searching time required to find the next susceptible cluster is short (around 30 minutes). As the search time increases the optimal parasitism rate will also increase, eventually reaching very close to 100%. When we add the assumption that all wasp larvae die in multiply parasitized hosts, then the optimal parasitism rate lowers, with 30% parasitism for search times around 45 minutes per cluster and a maximum optimal parasitism rate of approximately 63% for very long search times.

The predictions of the optimal foraging models are very sensitive to local density of hosts and wasps. Since only one wasp parasitizes each cluster, the time it spends checking clusters before finding a susceptible, unparasitized cluster will depend on densities of both host egg clusters and foraging wasps. On the one hand, competition for egg clusters must

be quite strong, so it is not clear that a wasp should even expect to find a second host egg cluster if it leaves the first. The observation that almost every host cluster is parasitized even though it is available for a relatively short period of time (one to several days in a one year life cycle) [81, 80] is evidence of strong competition between foraging wasps. Secondly, *H. horticola* locate host clusters in advance, remember their locations, and monitor them as they develop [82], and multiple individuals know about and compete for each cluster [82, 13]. However, in spite of this competition, analysis of sibling relationships using molecular markers in the natural population show that on average, a successful mother parasitizes more than one egg cluster [14]. We can thus assume the wasp is not limited to just one host egg cluster.

As a last potential component of the optimal foraging model we addressed the idea that the amount of time a wasp should spend at a cluster could be further decreased if higher rates of parasitism increased the risk of hyperparasitism. This is a compelling multitrophic behavioral explanation [77], but we found insufficient evidence to support it. Experimental results suggest that wasps may suffer higher hyperparasitism losses for parasitizing more hosts, but this potential small effect contributes little to the optimal foraging model. Furthermore, there is no indication that *H. horticola* from Åland parasitize at a lower rate than *H. horticola* from Estonia, which lacks the hyperparasitoid. While *H. horticola* from Estonia could have the same rate of parasitism because the hyperparasitoid was present there in the past, there would be strong selection to increase rate of parasitism in its absence.

Behavioral restraint: Deterrent marking

After *H. horticola* has finished parasitizing it applies a chemical mark on the leaves around the cluster that acts as a deterrent [12]. Other parasitoid species are known to mark individual hosts or clusters and modify their search behavior in response their own marking or the marks of con-

specifics [37, 4, 56, 20, 75]. Based on optimal foraging theory it is intuitively clear why a wasp should respect a deterrent mark left by another wasp. If the first wasp leaves when additional parasitism would reduce its expected fitness, a second wasp that approaches the same, now parasitized, cluster, will also maximize its fitness by leaving to search for another cluster.

Explaining why a wasp applies deterrent markings is less straightforward. It could be that a wasp leave the marking for itself, and that others pay attention to it because it benefits them too [36]. Further, if superparasitism causes mortality, then a deterrent mark is beneficial to both the first and subsequent wasps. For other species of parasitoids, avoidance of multiply parasitizing hosts is associated with changes in patch exploitation strategy [52, 86]. We know that only one *H. horticola* can develop within each host, and that the wasp is partially able to avoid superparasitism. But it is unknown what happens within multiply parasitized hosts. There are a few distinct options: a) only the first parasitoid larva survives, b) one of the parasitoid larvae survives, c) both/all parasitoids die and the host survives, or d) the host and parasitoids all die. If the first parasitoid larva kills all additional larvae, then there would be less motivation to mark the cluster. It is more likely that one of the later three options actually occurs, and that parasitism by another wasp would kill some (or all) of the first wasp's larvae, providing pressure for avoiding superparasitism [74, 60, 44] by both applying and respecting deterrent markings. A final way that marking could benefit the first wasp is related to the fragile architecture of the host egg cluster. As probing increases the cluster is broken apart and some of the eggs fall to the ground. This disruption causes mortality. We have not tested this idea, but we note that the wasps apply the marking, which is quite rough, to the leaves around the cluster, not the egg cluster itself, perhaps to avoid further contact with the fragile cluster.

Conclusion

Any time an individual exercises restraint in the use of an apparently available yet limiting resource, we wonder why. This paper illustrates that while there are multiple potential explanations for the evolution and maintenance of sub-maximal resource use, many turn out to be implausible under further examination. We conclude that *H. horticola* practices sub-maximal parasitism and deterrent marking as a way to forage optimally for hosts, but recognize that the plausibility of this hypothesis is dependent on the expectation that the wasp will relatively quickly find another suitable host egg cluster in a setting that is known to be strongly competitive. There are other parasitoids, especially egg parasitoids, that use just a small fraction of available hosts [15, 40, 36, 66, 89]. It is likely that some of these as well as many others have similar evolutionary explanations. The conceptual model of host-parasitoid dynamics that has driven host-parasitoid mathematical modeling over the last decades, one based solely on density-dependent linked fluctuation of host and parasitoid population sizes [33], may not be generally applicable. This work uses a novel combination of experimental and comparative approaches in combination with a classical optimal foraging model to identify the limitations of accepted theories for sub-maximal resource use. In this, as in many circumstances, individual selection is a stronger force than bet-hedging (risk-aversion) or prudence through group selection, and should be carefully disentangled when thinking about the evolutionary causes of any sub-maximal resource use.

Acknowledgements

We thank D. Muru for help in the group fitness study, L. Salvaudon for help in the egg cluster architecture study, and S. Ikonen, T. Lahtinen, M. Brunfeldt and E. Metsovouri for laboratory help. T. Collet, X. Fauvergue and I. Hanski made helpful comments on the manuscript. Funding came

from the Academic academy of Finland grant numbers 250444, 213547, 125553 to S. van Nouhuys, and a travel grant for K. Montovan from Cornell University Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology.

Tables and Figures

Hypothesis	Short Explanation	Test
Wasp egg limitation	A parasitoid may have too few eggs to parasitize an entire host egg cluster. The wasp may be limited by cost or phylogenetic constraint.	Data from [13]
Host egg cluster architecture	The host eggs are laid in mounds. The wasp may not have access to the inner eggs. Response to selection for longer ovipositors, may be phylogenetically constrained.	Experiment 1
Host egg defense	A fraction of the host eggs/larvae may be immunologically protected against parasitism by <i>H. horticola</i>	Experiment 2
Ephemeral resource	The host eggs are susceptible to parasitism for a short time. If only a fraction of the eggs are available at a time, or they mature synchronously the wasp cannot parasitize them all.	Experiments 3 and 4
Prudent parasitism	Restrained host use by the wasp could increase resource availability for future generations. This group selection argument depends on small population sizes with little genetic mixing.	Genetic population structure [47, 13]
Bet-hedging	A wasp may reduce the risk of offspring mortality by spreading its eggs over multiple locations. The benefit of spatial bet hedging would only out-weight the cost at very low effective population sizes.	Genetic population structure, as above
Cooperative benefits	The gregarious caterpillars depend on group cooperation for foraging, development, and nest building. If parasitism decreases individual host performance, then the whole group will suffer if too many caterpillars are parasitized.	Experiment 5
Optimal foraging	Over time the wasp experiences decreasing parasitism efficiency at an egg cluster, in part because of the cost of superparasitism. Eventually it may be beneficial for the wasp to find another host cluster.	Model results and experiment 6
Avoiding Hyperparasitism	The wasp might parasitize a small fraction of the cluster to avoid positively density-dependent hyperparasitism.	Experiments 2 and 7

Table 1: Hypotheses for sub-maximal parasitism.

Host origin	Wasp origin	n	$\mu_p \pm \sigma_p$
Åland	Åland	11	28% \pm 21%
Åland	Estonia	14	35% \pm 18%
Estonia	Åland	10	43% \pm 17%
Estonia	Estonia	14	38% \pm 18%
Morocco	Åland	15	28% \pm 18%

Table 2: Summary of results from the Åland, Estonia, and Morocco parasitism comparison studies. n is the number of host clusters parasitized and dissected for that group. μ_p is the mean fraction parasitized for each group, and σ_p is the standard deviation of the fractions parasitized for each group.

Parameter	Estimate	Source
b , probing efficiency	0.81 – 1.12 eggs/minute	Appendix C
N , number of eggs per cluster	100 – 200 eggs	[49]
t , time at cluster (min)	20 – 60 min	[12]
t_s , searching time between clusters (min)	best guess: > 30 min	

Table 3: Parameter estimates from the literature or experimental data.




Figure 1: A box plot of the distribution of parasitism rates that result in each index of winter silk production. Silk production is measured on a scale of 1 (least silk) to 5 (most silk). The group with the highest amount of silk production (5) is significantly different from the 4 lesser categories ($p < 0.001$) according to ANOVA analysis in R [61].




Figure 2: For any process of random selection with replacement (as probing by *H. horticola*) there is a growing chance that the same item will be encountered multiple times. In this schematic the green line shows the number of times a wasp probes the cluster, while the red line shows the total number of eggs probed (at least once). We assume that the wasp lays an egg every time it probes. As the wasp parasitizes more eggs in the cluster the number of singly parasitized hosts increases to a maximum at N/d , and then decreases as these hosts become multiply parasitized. This causes decreasing parasitism efficiency (number of hosts parasitized per unit time spent).




Figure 3: Frequency of *M. cinxia* host larvae containing multiple *H. horticola* eggs from a lab study with a single parasitoid (blue triangles), and field parasitism in Åland, Finland (orange diamonds). The solid black line is the expected fraction containing multiple eggs if oviposition happens randomly and the wasp does not check eggs for prior parasitism. The dotted grey line shows the best fit line for the data, where the fitted parameter (z) is the expected probability of detecting a previous parasitism and not laying an egg (here $z = 0.77313$, $p < 0.001$).





Figure 4: Numerically determined optimal values for t (amount of time spent probing each host egg cluster) over a range of realistic parameter values for the optimal foraging model $w_1(t)$ with parasitism function $g_1(t)$ (Eqn. 3) shown as a solid line, and model $w_2(t)$ with parasitism function $g_2(t)$ (Eqn. 4) shown as a dashed line. For each graph one variable was varied and the rest were held constant at $N = 200$ eggs, $b = 0.9$ eggs per minute, $t_s = 0.5$ hours. These plots show how the optimal parasitism frequency changes with a) N , b) b , and c1) the searching time for the next cluster, t_s , when searching times are fairly short and c2) much longer time-frames.



(a) Fraction of *H. horticola* hyperparasitized

(b) Fraction of hosts parasitized and not hyperparasitized

Figure 5: a) The fraction of *H. horticola* hyperparasitized by *M. stigmatiscus* as a function of the cluster parasitism frequency. Hyperparasitism is density-dependent and increases with p , the fraction parasitized by *H. horticola*. Gray circles show clusters that were not hyperparasitized. b) The fraction of each cluster that is parasitized by *H. horticola* and not hyperparasitized as a function of the fraction originally parasitized by *H. horticola*. Two functions were tested for goodness of fit (linear and second order polynomials with (0,0) intercepts). The best fit function is $y = 0.4573x$ ($R^2 = 0.8198$).




Figure 6: The fraction parasitized by *H. horticola* from Åland and Estonia of *M. cinxia* egg clusters from Åland and Estonia. In an analysis of variance there are no significant differences between treatments.




Figure 7: Plot of the fraction of each cluster parasitized as a function of the average time per egg (t/N) that the wasp spent at the cluster. The black curve is the best fit line with $b = 0.96$ eggs per minute, and the grey lines correspond to the curves bounding the 95% confidence interval for b ($b = .81$ and $b = 1.12$).

References

- [1] P. A. Abrams. The evolution of predator-prey interactions: theory and evidence. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 31:79–105, 2000.
- [2] D. R. Ardia, J. E. Gantz, B. C. Schneider, and S. Strebel. Costs of immunity in insects: an induced immune response increases metabolic rate and decreases antimicrobial activity. *Functional Ecology*, 26:732–739, 2012.
- [3] Y. Ayal and R. F. Green. Optimal egg distribution among host patches for parasitoids subject to attack by hyperparasitoids. *The American*

Naturalist, 141:120–138, 1993.

- [4] C. Bernstein and G. Driessen. Patch-marking and optimal search patterns in the parasitoid *Venturia canescens*. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 65(2):211–219, 1996.
- [5] A. Bouskila, I. C. Robertson, M. E. Robinson, B. D. Roitberg, B. Tenhumberg, A. J. Tyre, and E. van Randen. Submaximal oviposition rates in a myramid parasitoid: Choosiness should not be ignored. *Ecology*, 76(6):1990–1993, 1995.
- [6] C. J. Briggs and J. Latto. The window of vulnerability and its effect on relative parasitoid abundance. *Ecological Entomology*, 21(2):128–140, 1996.
- [7] J. Brodeur and G. Boivin. Functional ecology of immature parasitoids. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 49:27–49, 2004.
- [8] M. K. Castelo, S. van Nouhuys, and J. C. Corley. Olfactory attraction of the larval parasitoid, *Hyposoter horticola*, to plants infested with eggs of the host butterfly, *Melitaea cinxia*. *Journal of Insect Science*, 10(53), 2010.
- [9] E. L. Charnov. Optimal foraging, the marginal value theorem. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 9(2):129–136, April 1976.
- [10] D. Cohen. Optimizing reproduction in a randomly varying environment. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 12(1):119, 1966.
- [11] J. T. Costa. *The other insect societies*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006.
- [12] C. Couchoux, P. Seppä, and S. van Nouhuys. Effectiveness of deterrent marking by a parasitoid wasp: Behavioral and genetic approaches. *In prep for Behavioral Ecology*, 2014.

- [13] C. Couchoux and S. van Nouhuys. Effects of intraspecific competition and host-parasitoid developmental timing on foraging behaviour of a parasitoid wasp. *Journal of Insect Behavior*, 2014.
- [14] C. Couchoux, S. van Nouhuys, and P. Seppä. Spatial genetic structure of a parasitoid wasp matches the structure of its butterfly host. *In prep for Molecular Ecology*, 2014.
- [15] J. Cronin and D. Strong. Substantially submaximal oviposition rates by a mymarid egg parasitoid in the Laboratory and field. *Ecology*, 74(6):1813–1825, 1993.
- [16] L. B. Crowder and W. E. Cooper. Habitat structural complexity and the interaction between bluegills and their prey. *Ecology*, 63(6):1802–1813, 1982.
- [17] T. Doniol-Valcroze, V. Lesage, J. Giard, and R. Michaud. Optimal foraging theory predicts diving and feeding strategies of the largest marine predator. *Behavioral Ecology*, 22:880–888, 2011.
- [18] G. Driessen and C. Bernstein. Patch departure mechanisms and optimal host exploitation in an insect parasitoid. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 68(3):445–459, 1999.
- [19] P. Eslin and G. Prevost. Racing against host’s immunity defenses: a likely strategy for passive evasion of encapsulation in *Asobara tabida* parasitoids. *Journal of Insect Physiology*, 46(8):1161–1167, 2000.
- [20] S. A. Field and M. A. Keller. Short-term host discrimination in the parasitoid wasp *Trissolcus basalis* Wollaston (hymenoptera: Scelionidae). *Australian Journal of Zoology*, 47(1):19–28, 1999.
- [21] T. P. Friedlander. Egg mass design relative to surface-parasitizing parasitoids, with notes on *Asterocampa clyton* (lepidoptera: Nymphalidae). *Journal of Research on the Lepidoptera*, 24:250–257, 1985.

- [22] S. Gandon, A. Rivero, and J. Varaldi. Superparasitism evolution: adaptation or manipulation. *American Naturalist*, 167:E1–E22, 2005.
- [23] J. H. Gillespie. Natural selection for within-generation variance in offspring number. *Genetics*, 76(3):601–609, 1974.
- [24] J. H. Gillespie. Natural selection for variances in offspring numbers: A new evolutionary principle. *The American Naturalist*, 111(981):1010–1014, 1977.
- [25] J. P. Gillespie, M. R. Kanost, and T. Trenczek. Biological mediators of insect immunity. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 42:611–643, 1997.
- [26] H. C. J. Godfray, M. P. Hassell, and R. D. Holt. The population dynamic consequences of phenological asynchrony between parasitoids and their hosts. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 63:1–10, 1994.
- [27] K. J. Griffiths. The importance of coincidence in the functional and numerical responses of two parasites of european pine sawfly, *Neodiprion sertifer*. *Canadian Entomologist*, 101:673–713, 1969.
- [28] A. H. Grossman, A. Janssen, E. F. de Brito, E. G. Cordeiro, J. O. Fonseca, E. R. Lima, A. Pallini, and M. W. Sabelis. Parasitoid increases survival of its pupae by inducing hosts to fight predators. *PLoS ONE*, 3(6):e2276, 2008.
- [29] I. Hanski. Eco-evolutionary spatial dynamics in the glanville fritillary butterfly. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(35):14397–14404, 2011.
- [30] I. Hanski and E. Meyke. Large-scale dynamics of the Glanville fritillary butterfly: landscape structure, population processes, and weather. *Annales Zoologici Fennici*, 42:379–395, 2005.

- [31] D. D. Hart, S. L. Kohler, and R. G. Carlton. Harvesting of benthic algae by territorial grazers: The potential for prudent predation. *Oikos*, 60(3):329–335, 1991.
- [32] J. A. Harvey, M. Kos, Y. Nakamatsu, T. Tanaka, M. Dicke, L. E. M. Vet, J. Brodeur, and T. M. Bezemer. Do parasitized caterpillars protect their parasitoids from hyperparasitoids? a test of the 'usurpation hypothesis'. *Animal Behaviour*, 76:701–708, 2008.
- [33] M. P. Hassell. *The spatial and temporal dynamics of host-parasitoid interactions*. Oxford University Press, 2000.
- [34] G. E. Heimpel, J. A. Rosenheim, and M. Mangel. Egg limitation, host quality, and dynamic behavior by a parasitoid in the field. *Ecology*, 77:2410–2420, 1996.
- [35] S. W. Hitchcock. Number of fall generations of *Ooencyrtus kuwanai* (how.) in gypsy moth eggs. *Journal of Economic Entomology*, 52(4):764–765, 1959.
- [36] T. S. Hoffmeister and B. D. Roitberg. To mark the host or the patch: Decisions of a parasitoid searching for concealed host larvae. *Evolutionary Ecology*, 11:145–168, 1997.
- [37] C. Höller and R. Hörmann. Patch marking in the aphid hyperparasitoid, *Dendrocerus carpenteri*: the information contained in patch marks. *Oecologia*, 94(1):128, 1993.
- [38] J. C. Holms. *Coevolution*, chapter Evolutionary relationships between parasitic helminths and their hosts, pages 161–185. Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- [39] R. D. Holt. Food webs in space: On the interplay of dynamic instability and spatial processes. *Ecological Research*, 17:261–273, 2002.

- [40] M. T. Hondo, T. Onodera, and N. Morimoto. Parasitoid attack on a pyramid shaped egg mass of the peacock butterfly *Inachis io geisha* (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae). *Applied Entomology and Zoology*, 30(2):271–276, 1995.
- [41] K. R. Hopper. Risk-spreading and bet-hedging in insect population biology. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 44:535–560, 1999.
- [42] K. R. Hopper and J. A. Rosenheim. Within-generation bet hedging: a seductive explanation. *Oikos*, 101:219–222, 2003.
- [43] S. F. Hubbard and R. M. Cook. Optimal foraging by parasitoid wasps. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 47(2):593–604, 1978.
- [44] S. F. Hubbard, G. Marris, A. Reynolds, and G. W. Rowe. Adaptive patterns in the avoidance of superparasitism by solitary parasitic wasps. *The Journal of Animal Ecology*, 56(2):387–401, 1987.
- [45] M. A. Jervis, G. E. Heimpel, P. N. Ferns, J. A. Harvey, and N. A. C. Kidd. Life-history strategies in parasitoid wasps: a comparative analysis of 'ovigeny'. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 70:442–458, 2001.
- [46] JMP. *JMP PRO, 64 bit Edition*. SAS Institute, Cary, NC, 2012.
- [47] M. Kankare, S. van Nouhuys, O. Gaggiotti, and I. Hanski. Metapopulation genetic structure of two coexisting parasitoids of the Glanville fritillary butterfly. *Oecologia*, 143:77–84, 2005.
- [48] M. Kuussaari, M. Nieminen, J. Pyry, and I. Hanski. Life history and distribution of the glanville fritillary *Melitaea cinxia* (Nymphalidae) in Finland. *Baptria*, 20:167–180, 1995.
- [49] M. S. Kuussaari, J. Hellmann, and M. C. Singer. *On the wings of checkerspots: A model system for population biology*, chapter Larval biology of checkerspot butterflies, pages 138 – 160. Oxford University Press, 2004.

- [50] M. D. Lavine and M. R. Strand. Insect hemocytes and their role in immunity. *Insect Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*, 32(10):1295–1309, 2002.
- [51] G. C. Lei, V. Vikberg, and M. Kuussaari. The parasitoid complex attacking Finnish populations of the Glanville fritillary *Melitaea cinxia*, an endangered butterfly. *Journal of Natural history*, 31:635–648, 1997.
- [52] M. Mangel. An evolutionary interpretation of the motivation to oviposit. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 2(3):157–172, 1989.
- [53] A. L. Mattila, A. Duploux, M. Kirjokangas, R. Lehtonen, P. Rastas, and I. Hanski. High genetic load in an old isolated butterfly population. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(37):E2496–E2505, 2012.
- [54] J. C. Munger. Long-term yield from harvester ant colonies: Implications for horned lizard foraging strategy. *Ecological Society of America*, 65(4):1077–1086, 1984.
- [55] B. Naef-Danzenzer. Patch time allocation and patch sampling by foraging great and blue tits. *Animal Behavior*, 59:989–999, 1999.
- [56] C. R. Nufio and D. R. Papaj. Host marking behavior in phytophagous insects and parasitoids. *Entomologia Experimentalist et Applicata*, 99:273–293, 2001.
- [57] S. P. Ojanen, M. Nieminen, E. Meyke, J. Pyry, and I. Hanski. Long-term metapopulation study of the glanville fritillary butterfly (*Melitaea cinxia*): survey methods, data management, and long-term population trends. *Ecology and Evolution*, 3:3713–3737, 2013.
- [58] F. Pennacchio and M. R. Strand. Evolution of developmental strategies in parasitic hymenoptera. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 51:233–258, 2006.

- [59] G. H. Pyke. Optimal foraging theory: a critical review. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 15:523–575, 1984.
- [60] D. L. J. Quicke. *Parasitic Wasps*. London Chapman and Hall, 1997.
- [61] R Development Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2011.
- [62] K. H. Redford. Feeding and food preference in captive and wild giant anteaters (*Myrmecophaga tridactyla*). *Journal of Zoology*, 205:559–572, 1985.
- [63] A. Reichgelt. Density-dependent aggregation of hyperparasitoid *Mesochorus stigmaticus*. Master’s thesis, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, 2007.
- [64] J. A. Rosenheim. Stochasticity in reproductive opportunity and the evolution of egg limitation in insects. *Evolution*, 65(8):2300–2312, 2011.
- [65] M. Saastamoinen. Evolutionary ecology of insect immune defenses. *Ecological Entomology*, 32:235–242, 2007.
- [66] N. E. Sanchez, P. C. Pereyra, and M. G. Luna. Spatial patterns of parasitism of the solitary parasitoid *Pseudapanteles dignus* (hymenoptera: Braconidae) on *Tuta absoluta* (lepidoptera: Gelechiidae). *Environmental Entomology*, 38(2):365–374, 2009.
- [67] P. Schmid-Hempel. Variation in immune defense as a question of evolutionary ecology. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B*, 270(1513):357–366, 2003.
- [68] P. Schmid-Hempel. Evolutionary ecology of insect immune defenses. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 50:529–551, 2005.

- [69] M. R. Shaw, C. Stefanescu, and S. van Nouhuys. *Ecology of Butterflies of Europe*, chapter 11: Parasitoids of European Butterflies, pages 130–156. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [70] A. Sih. Optimal foraging: partial consumption of prey. *American Naturalist*, 116:281–289, 1980.
- [71] L. B. Slobodkin. *Growth and Regulation of Animal Populations*. International Thomson Publishing, 1961.
- [72] L. B. Slobodkin. Prudent predation does not require group selection. *The American Naturalist*, 108:665 – 678, 1974.
- [73] M. J. Smith. Group selection and kin selection. *Nature*, 201:1145–1147, 1964.
- [74] D. C. Speirs, T. N. Herratt, and S. F. Hubbard. Parasitoid diets: Does superparasitism pay? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 6(1):22–25, 1991.
- [75] L. L. Stelinski, R. Oakleaf, and C. Rodriguez-Saona. Oviposition-detering pheromone deposited on blueberry fruit by the parasitic wasp, *Diachasma alloeum*. *Behaviour*, 144:429–445, 2007.
- [76] D. W. Stephens and J. Krebs. *Foraging theory*. Princeton University Press, 1986.
- [77] D. J. Sullivan and W. Völkl. Hyperparasitism: Multitrophic ecology and behavior. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 44:291–315, 1999.
- [78] A. Traulsen and M. A. Nowak. Evolution of cooperation by multilevel selection. *PNAS*, 103(29):190952–10955, 2006.
- [79] J. J. M. van Alphen and M. E. Visser. Superparasitism evolution: adaptation or manipulation. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 35:59–79, 1990.

- [80] S. van Nouhuys and J. Ehrnsten. Wasp behavior leads to uniform parasitism of host available only a few hours per year. *Behavioral Ecology*, 15(4):661–665, 2004.
- [81] S. van Nouhuys and I. Hanski. Colonization rates and distances of a host butterfly and two specific parasitoids in a fragmented landscape. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 71:639–650, 2002.
- [82] S. van Nouhuys and R. Kaartinen. A parasitoid wasp uses landmarks while monitoring potential resources. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 275:377–385, 2008.
- [83] S. van Nouhuys, S. Niemikapee, and I. Hanski. Variation in a host - parasitoid interaction across independent populations. *Insects*, 4:1236–1256, 2012.
- [84] S. van Nouhuys and E. Punju. Coexistence of competing parasitoids: which is the fugitive and where does it hide? *Oikos*, 119:61–70, 2010.
- [85] S. van Nouhuys, M. C. Singer, and M. Nieminen. Spatial and temporal patterns of caterpillar performance and the suitability of two host plant species. *Ecological Entomology*, 28:193–202, 2003.
- [86] J. Varaldi, P. Fouillit, M. Boulétreau, and F. Fleury. Superparasitism acceptance and patch-leaving mechanisms in parasitoids: a comparison between two sympatric wasps. *Animal Behaviour*, 69(6):1227–1234, 2005.
- [87] D. L. Venable. Bet hedging in a guild of desert annuals. *Ecology*, 88(5):1086–1090, 2007.
- [88] R. M. Weseloh. Influence of gypsy moth egg mass dimensions and microhabitat distribution on parasitism by *Ooencyrtus kuwanai*. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, 65:64–69, 1972.

- [89] R. M. Weseloh. Spatial distribution of the gypsy moth [Lepidoptera: Lymantriidae] and some of its parasitoids within a forest environment. *Entomophaga*, 17:339–351, 1972.
- [90] G. C. Williams. *Adaptation and natural selection: a critique of some current evolutionary thought*. Princeton University Press, 1966.
- [91] D. S. Wilson. Prudent predation: a field study involving three species of tiger beetles. *Oikos*, 31:128–136, 1978.

A General Experimental procedures

Unless noted otherwise, the hosts used in experiments came from a laboratory population of *M. cinxia* which is augmented each year with *M. cinxia* collected from the wild. *Hyposoter horticola* were obtained by placing unparasitized hosts in natural populations to be parasitized. After parasitism they were brought back into the laboratory and reared under the same conditions as the unparasitized hosts.

After adults emerge, the female *H. horticola* were maintained in the laboratory, fed honey water (3:1), until they were needed for the experiment (at least two weeks). The adult butterflies were fed honey water (3:1), mated, and allowed to lay egg clusters on potted plants (*Veronica spicata*). To do this adults were placed in cages (3 females + 8 non-sibling males) for one day to mate. After mating, two females were put in a cage with a host plant to lay eggs. When an egg cluster was laid, the plant with the egg cluster was stored until the eggs were close to susceptible. Depending on the experiment, they were then exposed to parasitism in the laboratory or placed in a habitat patch in the field to be parasitized by *H. horticola*.

For parasitism in the laboratory a female wasp was placed in a 40 by 40 by 50 cm cage containing a plant with susceptible butterfly eggs on it and allowed to parasitize the egg cluster. We observed all of the laboratory parasitism events. After the wasp had parasitized and had left the host egg

cluster, we moved the egg cluster to a Petri dish and waited 1 to 3 days for the host eggs to hatch. Host larvae were then dissected to determine the parasitism rate in each host egg cluster.

B Experiment 2: Åland, Estonia, Morocco Population comparison study

For this study host caterpillars were collected from several nests of each of two populations in the Moroccan highlands in autumn 2011, and several populations throughout Åland. They were kept in diapause under laboratory conditions until spring 2012. In the spring of 2012, we collected 11 post-diapause *M. cinxia* nests from Paldiski, Estonia. We then reared all the caterpillars in the laboratory until they pupated. This produced adult *M. cinxia* from Åland, Morocco and Estonia, adult *H. horticola* from Åland and Estonia, and adult *M. stigmaticus* from Åland.

To obtain host egg clusters from all three origins, *M. cinxia* butterflies from each region were allowed to mate and oviposit in the lab as explained above. Each female was mated to a non-sibling male from its own origin. The adult *M. stigmaticus* were not used in this experiment. For each trial of the experiment, a female wasp was put in a 40 by 40 by 50 cm cage containing a plant with susceptible butterfly eggs on it, and allowed to parasitize the egg cluster. We used a different wasp for each host cluster and observed each parasitism. When the host larvae were 1-2 weeks old, we dissected them to determine the parasitism rate in each host egg cluster. In total 64 egg clusters were parasitized, each by a different wasp. See table 2 for more details and summary results.

C Probing efficiency

Probing efficiency (b) is an important parameter for the optimal foraging model. It is not possible to calculate this parameter directly because of the tiny size of the eggs, mounded host egg architecture, our inability to distinguish between probing and ovipositing. Instead, we assume that the number of eggs parasitized at least once follows a poisson process and use the model $p = 1 - e^{-bt/N}$ to relate the total time spent probing a single cluster (t) and number of eggs in the cluster (N) to the fraction of eggs parasitized (p).

We observed Åland *H. horticola* wasps probing and ovipositing into 36 host egg clusters under laboratory conditions. The total time spent probing the eggs (t) was recorded for each cluster. After the caterpillars hatched, they were counted and dissected to determine the number parasitized in each cluster. We performed logistic regression using GLM with a binomial error function and logit link function in the statistical package R [61]. We fit a model that predicts the parasitism of individual egg based on the average time per egg (t/N) spent at the cluster. We found that the best estimate for b is 0.96 eggs per minute ($p < 0.001$), and the 95% confidence interval for b is [0.81, 1.12].

D Experiment 6: Detecting previous parasitism

To calculate the expected probability of multiply parasitized hosts we first consider the expectations according to the poisson process. The probability that a host is probed k times is

$$P(n = k) = \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} e^{-\lambda}$$

where $\lambda = \frac{bt}{N}$ is the mean number of probes per host.

If the wasp is unable to detect prior parasitism in a host, then the prob-

ability that a host egg is parasitized exactly once is

$$P(n = 1) = \lambda e^{-\lambda}.$$

If the wasp instead detects the prior parasitism with probability z and does not lay an egg when prior parasitism is detected, then the probability that a host egg is parasitized only once is

$$\begin{aligned} P(n = 1) &= \lambda e^{-\lambda} + z \frac{\lambda^2}{2!} e^{-\lambda} + z^2 \frac{\lambda^3}{3!} e^{-\lambda} + \dots \\ &= \lambda e^{-\lambda} \left(1 + \frac{z\lambda}{2!} + \frac{(z\lambda)^2}{3!} + \dots \right) \\ &= \frac{\lambda e^{-\lambda}}{z\lambda} \left(z\lambda + \frac{(z\lambda)^2}{2!} + \frac{(z\lambda)^3}{3!} + \dots \right) \\ &= \frac{e^{-\lambda}}{z} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(z\lambda)^j}{j!} \\ &= \frac{e^{-\lambda}}{z} (e^{z\lambda} - 1) \end{aligned}$$

For our models we assume that the fraction of the cluster parasitized is $p = 1 - e^{-\lambda}$. We can then rewrite the above probabilities of superparasitism in terms of p .

$$P(n = 1) = \frac{1 - p}{z} ((1 - p)^{-z} - 1) \quad (6)$$

Then the probability that an egg is multiply parasitized is

$$P(n > 1) = p - \frac{1 - p}{z} ((1 - p)^{-z} - 1) \quad (7)$$

We determine the parameter z using the nonlinear (weighted) least-squares estimates to fit our data on the frequency of superparasitism to our model (the data are shown in Figure 3). We find that z is significantly different from zero indicating that the wasps do detect previously parasitized

hosts and effectively avoid superparasitism some of the time ($p < 0.0001$). The estimate is $z = 0.77313$, *i.e.* the wasps detect previous parasitism approximately 77% of the time.