

Controlling invasive ant species: theoretical background for efficient monitoring in the early stage of invasion

Shumpei Ujiyama^{1,*} and Kazuki Tsuji²

¹Innovation Science Course, School of Environment and Society, Tokyo Institute of Technology, 2-12-1 Ookayama, Meguro-ku, Tokyo, 152-8550, Japan

²Department of Subtropical Agro-Environmental Sciences, University of the Ryukyus, Senbaru 1, Nishihara, Okinawa, 903-0213, Japan

*ujiyama.s.aa@m.titech.ac.jp

ABSTRACT

Invasion of the red imported fire ant *Solenopsis invicta* Buren causes destructive effects to native biodiversity, agriculture, and public health. Due to its aggressive foraging behavior and high reproductive capability, the fire ant has established wild populations in most of the imported regions. The key to successful eradication is thorough monitoring and destruction of the nests in the early stage of invasion to prevent its range expansion. Here the question is, how intense in temporal and spatial scale should monitoring be to eradicate the fire ant? Assuming that the fire ant was introduced to a region, and monitoring was conducted immediately after a nest was detected in order to detect all other potentially established nests, we developed a mathematical model to investigate the detection rate. Setting the limit to three years, the detection rate is maximized when monitoring was conducted twice devising the location of traps while setting them at intervals of 30 m in each monitoring. Monitoring should be conducted at least 4 km round the source nest, and wider depending on how late a nest was found. The minimum trap interval required in an arbitrary environment for thorough monitoring in the early stage of invasion is also shown.

Invasive ants cause destructive effects to native biodiversity, agriculture and public health¹⁻⁷. One of the most harmful amongst is the red imported fire ant *Solenopsis invicta* Buren, which is highly aggressive and is known to sting human, producing increasing number of subjects with sting sequelae^{8,9}. Left aside the public health concerns, fire ant interfere with mechanical devices and cause short circuits, resulting in malfunction of the equipment¹⁰. The economic impact of fire ant infestations is growing along with their range expansion, with current estimated costs of control, medical treatment, and damage to property in the United States exceeding \$1 billion annually¹¹.

The fire ant was inadvertently introduced into the United States approximately 80-90 years ago^{12,13}, and rapidly spread throughout the southern United States. More recently, it has been introduced to other regions of the world including the Caribbean, Australia, New Zealand, China and others. With its aggressive foraging behavior and high reproductive capability^{7,14}, the fire ant has established wild populations in all the imported regions, except for New Zealand, Japan and South Korea. Since 2001, the fire ant was imported to New Zealand at least twice^{15,16}, and was successfully eradicated. More recently, in 2017 the fire ant was discovered in ports of Japan and South Korea¹⁷ and the nests were immediately destroyed. It was detected in containers and within container yards, and no other wild colony has been found in these two countries. The fact implies that these two countries are in an initial stage of invasion. However, the opportunity of species introduction is increasing driven by the recent global economy¹⁸, therefore, it is not surprising to find wild colonies in these and other countries at the present moment.

The key to successful eradication is thorough monitoring and destruction of the nests in the early stage of invasion, to prevent its range expansion¹⁹. Then, once a nest was found, how intense in spatio-temporal scale should monitoring be in order to detect all the nests that could have simultaneously been established? And how could we minimize the monitoring cost? In order to answer these questions, a spatially explicit model that incorporates fire ant's existence probability distributions, the width of monitoring area, and spatio-temporal frequency of monitoring is in need.

In this paper, we develop a mathematical model that incorporates these parameters, and investigate the efficiency of monitoring strategies for detecting introduced fire ants in the early stage of invasion. The focus of this paper is to investigate the detection rate when varying monitoring area and spatio-temporal intensity of monitoring, and not the efficiency of specific traps utilized. In other words, we will assume that the rate of ant caught by a trap if passing over it is 1, and focus on what

spatio-temporal interval should traps be set (see Supplementary Information (SI) section 1 for further explanation).

Results

Assumptions

Assume the red imported fire ant was introduced to a region and settled in the wild²⁰. The nest was found some time after the nest started producing alate queens, and monitoring started then. We assume that monitoring is conducted utilizing highly attractive bait traps, such as soybean-oil-absorbed corn grits and hotdogs^{21,22}. We also assume that with such a bait trap, a fire ant nest is detected at 100% probability when the bait was put on the foraging territory of the fire ant nest except when the nest is at an incipient stage, see later for details. For ease of application, bait traps are set in lattice patterns. Set the origin of the coordinate axes to the location where the first-generation nest (we will call it the *source nest*) was found. And assume that the existence probability distribution of a next-generation nest at location (x,y) varies depending on the dispersal capability of an alate queen, i.e. location of a nest is determined solely at the time of the independent founding after the nuptial flight, and relocation of nests thereafter is not considered. It is known that the fire ant has two social forms, monogyne and polygyne, and that a long-distance nuptial flight followed by independent colony founding take place only in the monogynous form²³. In this study we assume the monogynous form, because it expands the range faster thus is more difficult to detect in monitoring than the polygynous form.

Cases considered: the optimistic and pessimistic case

We will consider two cases: the optimistic case, which the source nest was found instantly after it started producing queens and second-generation alate queens were dispersed only for a short period (Figure 1a); and the pessimistic case, which detection of the source and second-generation nest was delayed such that the second-generation nest started producing queens and third-generation alate queens were dispersed for a short period (Figure 1b). The optimistic case corresponds to a situation, which the source nest was undetected for a while and the nest matured to form a mound where someone discovered it by chance. The pessimistic case corresponds to a situation, which the source and second-generation nests were undetected for a while and the second-generation nests matured to form mounds, one of which was noticed by someone. The source nest is assumed to be found approximately simultaneously, since the size is large and is easy to detect once a warning is given. Note that the monitoring period could be no more than 2-3 years in both cases, since the next- generation nests will become sexually mature in 2-3 years²⁴ depending on food density²⁵. In other words, monitoring has to be intense enough to be able to detect all the dispersed nest within 2-3 years.

Dispersal of alate queens

Alate queens are known to disperse within 5 km in the absence of wind²⁶. It is reasonable to assume that a wind strong enough to carry queens over 5 km would likely hinder their mating and insemination. Thus, in this study, we assume that inseminated queens disperse less than 5 km, i.e. second-generation nests are distributed within 5 km from the source nest, and third-generation nests in the pessimistic case are distributed within 10 km from the source nest. Monitoring 5 or 10 km round the source nest could be a costly task, thus we will consider cases in which the monitoring area does not fully cover the area where fire ants are distributed. The detection rate is expected to increase by devising bait locations in a repeated monitoring (see later), thus we shall consider this case also.

Definition of the detection rate

Given the above assumptions, the *detection rate* $D(t)$ is defined as following,

$$D(t) = A_m \times O(t), \quad (1)$$

where $A_m(0 \leq A_m \leq 1)$ and $O(t)(0 \leq O(t) \leq 1)$ denote thoroughness and effectiveness of monitoring respectively (see SI section 3 for derivation), and time starts when monitoring starts.

A_m is the ratio of monitoring area compared to the entire area where second- and/or third- generation nests may exist.

$$A_m = \iint_{-r_m \leq x,y \leq r_m} P(x,y) dx dy, \quad (2)$$

where $P(x,y)$ is the existence probability distribution of second- and third- generation nests, and r_m is the *monitoring range* in the direction of the x- and y- axis from the origin, i.e. monitoring area is the square of monitoring range. $P(x,y)$ denotes the probability that a second or third- generation queen establishes a nest at location (x,y) , which is equivalent to the dispersal kernel of a nuptial flight (Figure 2).

$O(t)$ is the ratio of the *detectable area* compared to a square region surrounded by four baits (see Supplementary Fig. S2). A detectable area is an area where fire ants inside them may be caught and detected should a nest exist inside them. It is an area inside a circle, whose center has the same position as baits and the radius $r(t)$ is $r(t) = r_c(t) + r_s(t)$, where $r_c(t)$ is the *radius of a nest* (or nest mound), and $r_s(t)$ is the *radius of a foraging territory* (see SI section 3 for full explanation). $O(t)$ increases if $r(t)$ increases, and decreases if *spatial interval of baits* l_b increases. Thus, the second term in equation (1) denotes the radius- and bait interval- dependent probability that a fire ant nest would be detected at time t .

Monitoring small area via densely set baits means low thoroughness (A_m) and high effectiveness ($O(t)$), which would result in low $D(t)$. Similarly, monitoring wide area via sparsely set baits means high thoroughness and low effectiveness, which would also result in low $D(t)$. See Table 1 for the summary of parameters and constants.

3 years detection rate when not devising trap location

First, we will assume that location of baits is not devised. $O(t)$ logistically increases until the value reaches 1 (Figure 3c), since it is dependent on the radius of a nest and the radius of a territory, and both radiuses are dependent on the nest size which logistically increases.

The detection rate at $t = 3$ years (the *three years detection rate*) is plotted as a function of monitoring area and spatial interval of baits (Figure 4). Note that monitoring is conducted r_m round the source nest, and $D(t) = 1$ implies that should fire ants have dispersed from the source nest, then they will all be detected.

Expanding monitoring area results in an increase of detection rate, especially until 3 km. The rate of increase gradually saturates since the existence probability of fire ants become low over 3 km in the optimistic case (Figure 2a) and 5 km in the pessimistic case (Figure 2b). Note that the detection rate becomes strictly 1 only when 5 or 10 km round the nest is monitored in the optimistic and pessimistic case respectively, and narrower than that may allow spread of fire ants. However, detection rates when monitoring range exceeds 6 km are omitted in the pessimistic case since they were approximately 1.

When monitoring the entire area where fire ants may exist, it is only when the bait interval l_b is 20 m that the detection rate becomes 1 within three years (Figure 4). The fact implies that bait interval has to be short to completely detect fire ants. Furthermore, when narrowing down the monitoring area to cope with the requirement of lower cost, the three years detection rate would be as low as 31% and 17% in the lowest case (Figure 4, $l_b = 20$ m, monitoring 1 km round the source nest).

Comparing the result of optimistic and pessimistic case shows that even when investing the same amount of monitoring cost, i.e. same monitoring range and bait interval, the difference in three years detection rate amounts to 24% (Figure 4, $l_b = 20$ m, monitoring 2 km round the source nest). This suggests that early detection of the source and/or second-generation nest is vital.

3 years detection rate when devising trap location

Now we will assume that location of baits are devised: baits are located at $(x_i^t, y_j^t) = (i \times l_b, j \times l_b)$ ($i, j = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots, \pm 2 \times r_m/l_b$) on the first monitoring at time t , and at $(x_i^{t+t_{\text{int}}}, y_j^{t+t_{\text{int}}}) = (x_i^t + l_b/2, y_j^t + l_b/2)$ in the following monitoring conducted some time interval t_{int} after the first (see Supplementary Fig. S3). In other words, shift the location of baits half the bait interval to the direction of x- and y- axes. When shifting the location of baits, detectable area through repeated monitoring would expand (Figure 5), resulting in improvement of the detection rate.

Remarkably, bait interval could be expanded 1.5 times longer by devising the location of baits, i.e. cutting the monitoring cost roughly by half, while maintaining the detection rate to 1 (Compare Fig. 4a to Fig. 6a, or Fig. 4b to Fig. 6b).

Discussion

We studied the efficiency of monitoring strategies via mathematical modeling, for the purpose of detecting and eradicating invasive ants in the early stage of their invasion. Setting the time limit to 3 years, the most efficient monitoring strategy is to conduct monitoring twice devising the location of traps while setting them at intervals of 30 m in each monitoring (Table 2).

The preferred monitoring area differs depending on how early/late the source nest was found. In the optimistic case, i.e. the source nest was found immediately after starting to produce alate queens, the preferred monitoring area is 4 km round the source nest. While in the pessimistic case, i.e. the second-generation nest was found 3 years after starting to produce alate queens so that the third-generation nest was established, the preferred monitoring area is 6 km. Narrowing down the monitoring area below 3 and 5 km in the optimistic and pessimistic case respectively may allow fire ants to spread, thus shall be avoided (Figure 4).

Early detection of the first and/or second-generation nest is vital, since three years detection rate significantly differs between the optimistic and pessimistic case when same amount of monitoring cost is invested (Table 2).

We ignored the relocation of nests in this paper. However, when considering the relocation, devising trap locations will not be effective and for the efficiency of monitoring, the results in the case which trap locations are not devised shall be referred (Figure 4).

Results in this paper give theoretical background for the successful eradication of fire ants in New Zealand. In New Zealand, the fire ant was found in its early stage of invasion, and 5 km round the nest was monitored and/or watched as attention area for the following 3 years, resulting in successful eradication²⁷.

We assumed the utilization of bait traps in this study, however, the type of trap utilized should be varied depending on the object species. The actual detection rate is subject to the effectiveness of individual bait traps, thus, utilization of the proper trap becomes important when applying the results of this study to eradication programs. The effectiveness of traps for certain species is not the target of this paper, but is shown elsewhere^{28,29}.

Note that the average dispersal distance of fire ants depend on atmospheric temperature, i.e. the hotter the longer, thus monitoring area shall be expanded than is shown in this paper in tropical and subtropical regions. The colony growth rate also depends on temperature. We set the time limit of monitoring to 3 years assuming the climate of mainland Japan, because an independently found colony starts to produce alate queens in 3 years in a climatic condition that is near the northern end of potential distribution¹⁹. The time limit should be shorter in warmer regions such as Okinawa and Taiwan.

Detection of the source nest is crucial, since setting the center of monitoring area to the second- or third- generation nest would lead to low thoroughness (see SI section 5). To avoid this error, the age of nest shall be estimated before it is destroyed. Two parameters might be helpful in estimating the age of a nest, one is the nest size, and the other is the age of queen ant. Estimating the age from nest size requires numerous parameters to also be estimated, therefore the utilization of queen age is preferred (see³⁰). However, the collection of the queen in a monogynous field colony is also a difficult task, which requires professional skills.

To conduct monitoring more efficiently, it is vital to know the accurate and precise dispersal kernel of fire ants. We assumed a Gaussian distribution type of kernel, however if the actual kernel was more leptokurtic^{31,32}, average dispersal distance was shorter³³, and/or the dispersal dynamics was more complex³⁴, than the detection rate would be higher with narrower monitoring area.

The model presented in this paper is applicable not only to fire ants, but also for wide range of organisms that (i) establishes a colony, and (ii) their dispersal kernel along with their territorial area could be defined. We calculated the detection rate as a function of bait interval and other parameters in this paper, however it would be convenient to have an equation to derive the minimum l_b (spatial interval of traps such as baits) required for the detection rate to be 1 until an arbitrary time t . Following is the minimum trap interval when assuming that the entire area the object species may exist is monitored. Equation (3) is for the case of which the location of traps is not devised or the object species frequently relocates nests, whereas equation (4) is for when the location of traps is devised (see SI section 6 for derivation).

$$l_b = \sqrt{\frac{S(t)}{d} + \beta \cdot S(t - t_s) + 2\sqrt{\frac{\beta \cdot S(t) \cdot S(t - t_s)}{d}}}, \quad (3)$$

$$l_{b,\text{shift}} = r(t) + \sqrt{2 \cdot r(t + t_{\text{int}})^2 - r(t)^2}. \quad (4)$$

See Table 1 for the parameter list. Note that $t + t_{\text{int}} \leq 3$ if the object species was *S. invicta*, in order to avoid the next-generation queens to be produced. Substitute $d = 200$, $t_s = 0.1$, $\beta = 1/1000$, and assume $t = 3$ for equation (3), and $t = 2.5$ and $t_{\text{int}} = 0.5$ for equation (4). Then, $l_b = 27.9$ and $l_{b,\text{shift}} = 30.9$, which is confirmed reasonable from the fact that detection rate is 1 up to $l_b = 20$ and 30 m in Fig. 4 and Fig. 6 respectively. When applying these formula to species other than *S. invicta*, the species-specific function of $r(t)$ or $S(t)$ has to be empirically determined. The growth of the colony's territorial area rather than that of colony size may often be easier to monitor over time in practice.

Methods

In equation (1), when bait location is not devised, $O(t)$ is given as following (see SI section 4 for the case of which bait location is devised),

$$O(t) = \pi \left(\frac{r_c(t) + r_s(t)}{l_b} \right)^2, \quad (5)$$

here, l_b is the spatial interval of baits. The radius of nests and foraging territories, i.e. $r_c(t)$ and $r_s(t)$ respectively, are defined as functions of size $S(t)$ as following.

$$r_c(t) = \sqrt{\frac{S(t)}{\pi d}}, \quad (6)$$

$$r_s(t) = \sqrt{\frac{\beta \cdot S(t - t_s)}{\pi}}, \quad (7)$$

$$S(t) = \frac{220000}{1 + 83e^{-1.26t}}, \quad (8)$$

here, $S(t)$ is obtained empirically²⁵. See Table 1 for parameter values. d is deduced from an assumption that the radius of a mature nest could amount to be 15 to 20 m including the underground tunnels depending on the soil condition, whereas the territorial area is known to be approximately 1/1000 m² of the size³⁵, and worker ants are known to start searching 2 to 4 weeks after the nest was established thus roughly 1/10 of a year.

References

1. Porter, S. D. & Savignano, D. A. Invasion of polygyne fire ants decimates native ants and disrupts arthropod community. *Ecol.* **71**, 2095–2106 (1990).
2. Allen, C. R., Demarais, S. & Lutz, R. S. Red imported fire ant impact on wildlife: an overview. *The Tex. J. Sci.* **46**, 51–59 (1994).
3. Gotelli, N. J. & Arnett, A. E. Biogeographic effects of red fire ant invasion. *Ecol. Lett.* **3**, 257–261 (2000).
4. Wojcik, D. P. *et al.* Red imported fire ants: impact on biodiversity. *Am. Entomol.* **47**, 16–23 (2001).
5. Holway, D. A., Lach, L., Suarez, A. V., Tsutsui, N. D. & Case, T. J. The causes and consequences of ant invasions. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **33**, 181–233 (2002).
6. Morrison, L. W. Long-term impacts of an arthropod-community invasion by the imported fire ant, *Solenopsis invicta*. *Ecol.* **83**, 2337–2345 (2002).
7. Allen, C. R., Epperson, D. M. & Garmestani, A. S. Red imported fire ant impacts on wildlife: a decade of research. *The Am. Midl. Nat.* **152**, 88–103 (2004).
8. Rhoades, R. B., Stafford, C. T. & James, F. K. Survey of fatal anaphylactic reactions to imported fire ant stings. *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* **84**, 159–162 (1989).
9. Kemp, S. F., deShazo, R. D., Moffitt, J. E., Williams, D. F. & Buhner II, W. A. Expanding habitat of the imported fire ant (*Solenopsis invicta*): A public health concern. *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* **105**, 683–691 (2000).
10. MacKay, W. P., Majdi, S., Irving, J., Vinson, S. B. & Messer, C. Attraction of ants (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) to electric fields. *J. Kansas Entomol. Soc.* **65**, 39–43 (1992).
11. Pimentel, D., Zuniga, R. & Morrison, D. Update on the environmental and economic costs associated with alien-invasive species in the United States. *Ecol. Econ.* **52**, 273–288 (2005).
12. Buren, W. F. Revisionary studies on the taxonomy of the imported fire ants. *J. Ga. Entomol. Soc.* **7**, 1–27 (1972).
13. Buren, W. F., Allen, G. E., Whitcomb, W. H., Lennartz, F. E. & Williams, R. N. Zoogeography of the imported fire ants. *J. New York Entomol. Soc.* **82**, 113–124 (1974).
14. Tschinkel, W. R. The reproductive biology of fire ant societies. *BioScience* **48**, 593–605 (1998).
15. Bissmire, S. Red imported fire ants found at Whirinaki. *Biosecurity* **69**, 9 (2006).
16. Christian, S. Red imported fire ants eradicated from Napier. *Biosecurity* **92**, 28–29 (2009).
17. Lee, K. M. Venomous fire ants found for first time. (2017). URL http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2017/10/119_237251.html. [Online; Updated : 2017-10-02 16:25].
18. Bertelsmeier, C., Ollier, S., Liebhold, A. & Keller, L. Recent human history governs global ant invasion dynamics. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **1**, 0184EP– (2017).
19. Morrison, L. W., Porter, S. D., Daniels, E. & Korzukhin, M. D. Potential global range expansion of the invasive fire ant, *Solenopsis invicta*. *Biol. Invasions* **6**, 183–191 (2004).
20. Richardson, D. M. *et al.* Naturalization and invasion of alien plants: concepts and definitions. *Divers. Distributions* **6**, 93–107 (2000).
21. Lofgren, C. S., Banks, W. A. & Glancey, B. M. Biology and control of imported fire ants. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* **20**, 1–30 (1975).

22. Williams, D. F., Collins, H. L. & Oi, D. H. The red imported fire ant (Hymenoptera: Formicidae): An historical perspective of treatment programs and the development of chemical baits for control. *Am. Entomol.* **47**, 146–159 (2001).
23. Tschinkel, W. R. *The fire ants*. (Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 2006).
24. Markin, G. P., Dillier, J. H. & Collins, H. L. Growths and development of colonies of the red imported fire ant, *Solenopsis invicta* 1. *Annals Entomol. Soc. Am.* **66**, 803–808 (1973).
25. Tschinkel, W. R. Distribution of the fire ants *Solenopsis invicta* and *S. geminata* (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) in northern Florida in relation to habitat and disturbance. *Annals Entomol. Soc. Am.* **81**, 76–81 (1988).
26. Vogt, J. T., Appel, A. G. & West, M. S. Flight energetics and dispersal capability of the fire ant, *Solenopsis invicta* Buren. *J. Insect Physiol.* **46**, 697–707 (2000).
27. Audit-Office, N. Z. Response to the Incursion of the Red Imported Fire Ant. In *Management of biosecurity risks: case studies/ Report of the Controller and Auditor-General Tumuaki o te Mana Arotake*, chap. 5, 95–112 (Controller and Auditor-General, Wellington, N.Z., 2002), 2 edn. [ISBN 0-477-02899-3].
28. Greenslade, P. & Greenslade, P. J. M. The use of baits and preservatives in pitfall traps. *Aust. J. Entomol.* **10**, 253–260 (1971).
29. Romero, H. & Jaffe, K. A comparison of methods for sampling ants (Hymenoptera, Formicidae) in Savannas. *Biotropica* **21**, 348–352 (1989).
30. Tschinkel, W. R. Fire ant queen longevity and age: Estimation by sperm depletion. *Annals Entomol. Soc. Am.* **80**, 263–266 (1987).
31. Kot, M., Lewis, M. A. & van den Driessche, P. Dispersal data and the spread of invading organisms. *Ecol.* **77**, 2027–2042 (1996).
32. Clobert, J., Baguette, M., Benton, T. G. & Bullock, J. M. *Dispersal Ecology and Evolution*. (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2012).
33. Markin, G. P., Dillier, J. H., Hills, S. O., Blum, M. S. & Hermann, H. R. Nuptial flight and flight ranges of the imported fire ant, *Solenopsis saevissima richteri* (Hymenoptera: Formicidae). *J. Ga. Entomol. Soc.* **6**, 145–156 (1971).
34. Hastings, A. *et al.* The spatial spread of invasions: new developments in theory and evidence. *Ecol. Lett.* **8**, 91–101 (2005).
35. Tschinkel, W. R., Adams, E. S. & Macom, T. Territory area and colony size in the fire ant *Solenopsis invicta*. *J. Animal Ecol.* **64**, 473–480 (1995).

Acknowledgements

None of the authors had a personal or financial conflict of interest.

Author Contributions

S.U. performed the research with input from K.T., and S.U and K.T. wrote and reviewed the manuscript.

Additional Information

Supplementary information accompanies this paper.

Competing financial interests: The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Table 1. Table of parameters and constants.

Parameters and Constants	Symbol	Value	Dimension
Parameters			
Monitoring range	r_m	-	(m)
Radius of a nest or nest mound	$r_c(t)$	-	(m)
Radius of foraging territory from the edge of a nest	$r_s(t)$	-	(m)
Radius of detectable area, i.e. $r_c(t) + r_s(t)$	$r(t)$	-	(m)
Nest size, number of adults in a nest	$S(t)$	-	(-)
Spatial interval of traps such as baits	l_b	-	(m)
Constants			
Age of a nest when it is fully sexually mature	$t_{1mat}, t_{2mat}, t_{3mat}$	3	(year)
Temporal interval of the first and second monitoring	t_{int}	0.5	(year)
Number of adults per square meter in a nest	d	200	(m ⁻²)
Ratio to convert $S(t)$ to $r_s(t)$	β	1/1000	(m ²)
Age of a nest when adults start searching for resource	t_s	0.1	(year)

Table 2. Number of traps required when conducting monitoring twice. "-" shows the parameter set which three years detection rate would be below 1.

Bait Interval (m)	Monitoring Range (m)		
	4000	5000	6000
Not shifting baits			
Detected in the early stage of invasion			
20	321602	502002	722402
30	-	-	-
Detected in the late stage of invasion			
20	-	-	722402
30	-	-	-
Shifting baits			
Detected in the early stage of invasion			
20	321602	502002	722402
30	143291	223558	321602
Detected in the late stage of invasion			
20	-	-	722402
30	-	-	321602




Figure 1. Monitoring period in the optimistic and pessimistic case. Horizontal and vertical axes denote time and nest size, respectively. Black, gray, and light gray curves show the size transition of the source, second-generation, and third-generation nest respectively. t_{1mat} , t_{2mat} , and t_{3mat} are the time when the source, second-generation, and third-generation nest become fully sexually mature, respectively. Black dots mean that the focal nest was detected and destroyed. Region in light red denotes the monitoring period. (a) Optimistic case. (b) Pessimistic case.




Figure 2. Dispersal kernel $P(x,y)$. The horizontal and depth direction axes denote distance from the origin, and vertical axis denotes the existence probability of fire ant nest at coordinate (x,y) . The square area filled in dark gray denotes the monitoring area, which is r_m round the origin. Above figures show the example of $r_m = 3$ km. (a) Distribution of second-generation nests in the optimistic case. (b) Distribution of third-generation nests in the pessimistic case (see SI section 2 for derivation).





Figure 3. Characteristic traits of a nest. (a) Nest size $S(t)$. (b) Radius of a nest $r_c(t)$ (black line) and radius of a foraging territory $r_s(t)$ (gray line). (c) Observable ratio $O(t)$.

a



b




Figure 4. Three years detection rate as a function of monitoring range and bait interval. The horizontal and depth direction axes denote monitoring range and bait interval, respectively, and the vertical axes denotes detection rate. (a) Optimistic case. (b) Pessimistic case.




Figure 5. Overall detectable area when monitoring is conducted twice. The black dots denote baits. Detectable areas in first (light gray) and second (dark gray) monitoring are superimposed to show the overall detectable area. (a) Not shifting baits. (b) Shifting baits.




Figure 6. Three years detection rate when shifting baits. The horizontal and depth direction axes denote monitoring range and bait interval, respectively, and the vertical axes denotes detection rate. (a) Optimistic case. (b) Pessimistic case.