Plant viruses alter insect behavior to enhance their spread
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Pathogens and parasites can induce changes in host or vector behavior that enhance their transmission. In plant systems, such effects are largely restricted to vectors, because they are mobile and may exhibit preferences dependent upon plant host infection status. Here we report the first evidence that acquisition of a plant virus directly alters host selection behavior by its insect vector. We show that the aphid *Rhopalosiphum padi*, after acquiring *Barley yellow dwarf virus* (BYDV) during *in vitro* feeding, prefers noninfected wheat plants, while noninfective aphids also fed *in vitro* prefer BYDV-infected plants. This behavioral change should promote pathogen spread since noninfective vector preference for infected plants will promote acquisition, while infective vector preference for noninfected hosts will promote transmission. We propose the “Vector Manipulation Hypothesis” to explain the evolution of strategies in plant pathogens to enhance their spread to new hosts. Our findings have implications for disease and vector management.

Pathogenic and parasitic organisms interact with their hosts on a variety of cellular and organismal levels that potentially cause changes in host behavior leading to enhanced transmission. This phenomenon led to the emergence of the “Host Manipulation Hypothesis” (HMH). The HMH and its synonyms the adaptive manipulation hypothesis and behavioral manipulation hypothesis posit that natural selection on the parasite or pathogen has favored the capacity to elicit host behavior that enhances their transmission. Although examination of the HMH has progressed from descriptive studies to investigations of the mechanisms through which parasites affect host behavior and their consequences for parasite spread, the field remains predominantly focused on animal pathosystems.

Pathogens or parasites can influence the behavior not only of their primary hosts, but also of their vectors. Arthropods are important vectors of both animal and plant pathogens, transmitting thousands of species of pathogens, including viruses, bacteria, phytoplasmas, trypanosomes and Plasmodia. The effects of pathogens on vector biology and behavior have been documented in several pathosystems, including those associated with important human diseases such as malaria, leishmaniasis and sleeping sickness. The observed changes in vector behavior include those related to pathogen transmission. For example, mosquitoes infected with the malaria parasite exhibit increased biting frequency and increased attraction to humans infected with the gametocytes of the parasite compared to noninfected humans.

In contrast to animal pathosystems, plant pathosystems have been less well studied for evidence of host or vector manipulation by pathogens. While animal pathogens can alter the behavior of both hosts and vectors in ways that increase frequency of host–host or host–vector encounters, in plant pathosystems the host is sessile, so the potential for behavioral manipulation is restricted to the vector, the mobile component in these systems. Furthermore, unlike animal pathogens most plant pathogens, including the majority of plant viruses, do not replicate within the vector, so these vectors are not pathogen hosts, *sensu stricto*.

We previously demonstrated that *Barley yellow dwarf virus* (BYDV) infecting wheat and *Potato leafroll virus* (PLRV) infecting potato indirectly induce changes in the host selection behavior of their respective principal aphid vectors, *Rhopalosiphum padi* and *Myzus persicae*. We also have shown that plants infected with these viruses have altered volatile organic compound profiles that elicit greater settling of or arrestment by their noninfective vectors. Luteoviruses (viruses in the family Luteoviridae), including BYDV and PLRV are persistently transmitted. They are ingested and pass through the midgut or hindgut into the hemocoel, eventually associating with the accessory salivary glands of the vector. These viruses rely almost exclusively on insect vectors for transmission and require sustained feeding by the vector for their successful acquisition and transmission. After acquisition, the insect remains a vector for life. Although they do not replicate within the vector, persistently-transmitted viruses interact with the vector at the cellular level during movement among tissues and organs, with the potential to directly alter vector physiology and behavior.
Preferential settling by vectors onto infected plants, as occurs for BYDV and PLRV, could contribute to enhanced pathogen spread. Models indicate that a preference for infected plants will accelerate pathogen spread, but only when infected plants are rare, not when they are prevalent in a plant population\(^{19}\). Conditional vector preference, however, could enhance pathogen spread regardless of the prevalence of infected plants. Specifically, if noninfective vectors prefer infected plants thereby promoting acquisition, and infective vectors prefer noninfected hosts promoting transmission, overall spread would be accelerated. The possibility of conditional vector preference for pathogen-infected plants has hardly been examined despite its potential importance. Changes in vector behavior that occur after feeding on virus-infected plants could be attributed to direct effects of the acquired virus on the vector, but such direct effects are difficult to distinguish from indirect ones associated with feeding on virus-infected plants. Here we test the hypothesis that a change in host plant selection behavior by an insect vector is the direct result of virus acquisition by the vector. We provide the first experimental evidence that acquisition of a plant virus through \textit{in vitro} feeding, which eliminates indirect effects of an infected plant host, directly alters subsequent host plant selection behavior of its vector. These findings enhance our understanding of how plant viruses spread to new hosts, with implications for disease and vector management.

**Results**

We first examined host plant selection preferences of infective (reared on virus-infected plants) and noninfective (reared on virus-free plants) \textit{R. padi}. In dual-choice bioassays using an arena in a platform\(^{22}\) (Fig. 1) infective or noninfective insects were allowed to select BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated wheat plants as their hosts. Sham-inoculated plants are noninfected plants previously fed upon by noninfective aphids and are utilized in our bioassays to account for potential aphid feeding-induced changes in plants\(^{23}\). Infective and noninfective insects were tested simultaneously in separate platforms. Each platform contained a leaf from each plant treatment, BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated, onto which aphids could settle and feed throughout the bioassay. We compared the responses of infective and noninfective aphids by examining the proportion of aphids that settled on BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated plants every 12 h for 72 h. A 72-h time period is sufficiently long for virus acquisition by noninfective aphids to occur when exposed to BYDV-infected plants, while a 12-h time period is unlikely to result in noninfective aphids becoming infective due to the latent period of the virus\(^{24,25}\). We therefore compared aphid responses at the first 12-h observation, and after 72 h when responses were pooled over time. The 12-h observation occurs before additional virus acquisition was expected while the 72-h comparison is more powerful statistically and incorporates a time period more meaningful for transmission dynamics in the field. Noninfective aphids significantly preferred to settle on BYDV-infected wheat compared to infective aphids at the first 12-h observation point (generalized linear model; \(\chi^2 = 3.12, p = 0.0774\), marginally significant) (Fig. 2a, Supplementary Table S1a) and throughout the duration of the experiment (generalized linear model; \(\chi^2 = 19.33, p < 0.0001\)) (Fig. 2b, Supplementary Table S2a). In contrast, infective aphids significantly preferred to settle on sham-inoculated wheat

**Figure 1** | Diagrammatic illustration of the dual-choice bioassay arena used in experiments. Adapted from Castle et al.\(^{22}\). 1, BYDV-infected wheat; 2, sham-inoculated wheat; 3, vial (5.5 x2.5 cm; Lx D) initially containing 50 aphids; 4, tube (16x2.5 cm; LxD); 5, platform (15 cm; D); 6, lid enclosing the arena.

**Figure 2** | Mean proportion of infective and noninfective aphids responding in a dual-choice bioassay examining host plant selection preferences to BYDV-infected and sham-inoculated wheat (noninfected plants previously fed upon by noninfective aphids) as influenced by indirect effects of feeding on virus-infected plants. Each replicate \((n = 12)\) consisted of one arena with noninfective aphids paired with one arena of infective aphids, randomized in a complete block design over time. Statistical analyses compared the response of infective and noninfective aphids to the BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated plant treatment. (a) Aphid responses at the first observation point made 12 h after release. Noninfective aphids preferred BYDV-infected wheat compared to infective aphids (generalized linear model; \(\chi^2 = 3.12, p = 0.0774\), marginally significant). Infective aphids preferred sham-inoculated plants compared to noninfective aphids (generalized linear model; \(\chi^2 = 3.12, p = 0.0774\), marginally significant). (b) Aphid responses pooled over time (6 observations). Noninfective aphids significantly preferred BYDV-infected wheat compared to infective aphids (generalized linear model; \(\chi^2 = 19.33, p < 0.0001\)). Infective aphids significantly preferred sham-inoculated plants compared to noninfective aphids (generalized linear model; \(\chi^2 = 20.14, p < 0.0001\)). Data are means ± SE following logit transformation. Errors bars are s.e.m.
compared to noninfective aphids at the first observation point (generalized linear model; $\chi^2 = 3.12, p = 0.0774$, marginally significant) (Fig. 2a, Supplementary Table S1b) and throughout the duration of the experiment (generalized linear model; $\chi^2 = 20.14, p < 0.0001$) (Fig. 2b, Supplementary Table S2b). The time at which the observations were made was not a significant factor when examining the response to BYDV-infected wheat (generalized linear model; $\chi^2 = 4.96, p = 0.04203$) (Supplementary Table S2a) or sham-inoculated wheat (generalized linear model; $\chi^2 = 2.15, p = 0.8282$) (Supplementary Table S2b). The results suggest that virus acquisition changes vector host plant selection behavior to favor noninfective plants rather than infected plants.

These behavioral changes could result either from direct effects of acquired virus particles on the aphid, or from insect exposure to cues from virus-infected host plants. To isolate potential direct effects of virus acquisition on the vector we conducted a similar experiment using in vitro feeding to obtain infective and noninfective aphids. Insects were first reared on virus-free plants and subsequently transferred to membrane feeding chambers (Fig. 3) that contained artificial phloem with either purified BYDV particles or no virus. Host plant selection preferences of infective and noninfective insects were examined every 12 h for 72 h using an arena as described above. Observation time was not a significant factor when examining the response to BYDV-infected wheat (generalized linear model; $\chi^2 = 2.41, p = 0.7906$) (Supplementary Table S2c) or sham-inoculated wheat (generalized linear model; $\chi^2 = 3.66, p = 0.5995$) (Supplementary Table S2d). We present the results of the aphid responses at the first 12-h observation point as well as the responses pooled over time. Noninfective aphids significantly preferred BYDV-infected wheat compared to infective aphids at the first observation point (generalized linear model; $\chi^2 = 4.24, p = 0.0394$) (Fig. 4a, Supplementary Table S1c), and throughout the duration of the experiment (generalized linear model; $\chi^2 = 16.18, p < 0.0001$) (Fig. 4b, Supplementary Table S2c). Similar to the patterns obtained using aphids that acquired virus from plants, infective aphids significantly preferred sham-inoculated wheat compared to noninfective aphids at the first observation point (generalized linear model; $\chi^2 = 5.64, p = 0.0176$) (Fig. 4a, Supplementary Table S1d), and throughout the duration of the experiment (generalized linear model; $\chi^2 = 16.32, p < 0.0001$) (Fig. 4b, Supplementary Table S2d).

Results from RT-PCR tests verified that our inoculation and acquisition methods were successful (See Supplementary Figure S1). All plants used in the dual choice tests were tested via RT-PCR immediately after the bioassays. Sham-inoculated plants remained virus-free and infected plants remained BYDV-infected, indicating that during the bioassays (72 h) the plant treatments were stable, despite being exposed to potential feeding by infective aphids. Tests of aphids using RT-PCR revealed that infective aphids remained BYDV-infected subsequent to the bioassay, while 25% of noninfective aphids acquired BYDV during the 72-h bioassay when they had access to BYDV-infected plants in the bioassay arena.

Although the bioassay design unavoidably results in virus acquisition by some noninfective aphids, the result is a more conservative test of our hypothesis since within-bioassay virus acquisition should tend to diminish detectable differences between the aphid treatments.

**Figure 3** | Diagrammatic illustration of a membrane feeding chamber. 1, artificial diet solution (100 μl); 2, upper layer of Parafilm®; 3, bottom layer of Parafilm®; 4, humid chamber; 5, petri dish (5.5 cm; D); 6, moist filter paper.

**Figure 4** | Mean proportion of infective and noninfective aphids responding in a dual-choice bioassay examining host plant selection preferences to BYDV-infected and sham-inoculated wheat plants as influenced by direct effects of virus acquisition following membrane feeding. Each replicate (n = 12) consisted of one arena with noninfective aphids paired with one arena of infective aphids, randomized in a complete block design over time. Statistical analyses compared the response of infective and noninfective aphids to the BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated plant treatment. (a) Aphid responses at the first observation point made 12 h after release. Noninfective aphids significantly preferred BYDV-infected wheat compared to infective aphids (generalized linear model; $\chi^2 = 4.24, p = 0.0394$). Infective aphids significantly preferred sham-inoculated wheat compared to noninfective aphids (generalized linear model; $\chi^2 = 5.64, p = 0.0176$). (b) Aphid responses pooled over time (6 observations). Noninfective aphids significantly preferred BYDV-infected wheat compared to infective aphids (generalized linear model; $\chi^2 = 16.18, p < 0.0001$). Infective aphids significantly preferred sham-inoculated wheat compared to noninfective aphids (generalized linear model; $\chi^2 = 5.64, p = 0.0176$). Data are means ± SE following logit transformation. Errors bars are s.e.m.

Furthermore, the aphid responses after 72 h in the bioassay arena are consistent with the preferences observed after 12 h, during which time noninfective aphids almost certainly remained noninfective. The lack of BYDV infection of the sham-inoculated plants after 72 h of exposure to initially noninfective aphids in an arena with BYDV-infected plants also indicates that these aphids did not become infective during the bioassay.

**Discussion**

Assays utilizing membrane-fed infective aphids yielded results similar to those obtained using aphids that acquired BYDV from infected plants, confirming our hypothesis that changes in host plant selection by the vector are mediated by direct effects of virus acquisition, rather than indirect effects of feeding on infected host plants.
Direct effects of virus acquisition on the vector host plant selection behavior in a manner that will promote the spread of the virus is consistent with an evolved strategy in the pathogen of manipulation of its vector. We propose the "Vector Manipulation Hypothesis (VMH)" to explain the evolution of strategies in plant pathogens that enhance their spread to new hosts through their effects on mobile vectors. Selection should favor both direct and indirect mechanisms producing such effects. Vectors that feed on virus-infected host plants exhibit faster growth rates, higher fecundity, greater longevity and/or enhanced production of alate forms of the vector24–33, which can lead to increased virus spread and are typically attributed to indirect effects of virus infection on host quality. Virus-infection-mediated alterations of the host plant's secondary chemistry can affect vector behavior. Evidence for such indirect effects of pathogens on vector behavior continues to accumulate and is consistent with the VMH19–26. We provide the first evidence for a direct effect of a plant virus on its vector consistent with the VMH, specifically by influencing the vector's host selection behavior to maximize pathogen spread. In our model pathosystem, a noninfective vector is attracted to virus-infected host plants, which is beneficial as it increases vector fitness22. After virus acquisition virus vector preferences shift to noninfected hosts, maximizing pathogen transmission potential by promoting the movement of infective aphids onto noninfected host plants. Our results offer a specific example of a plant virus directly manipulating its vector in a manner that is likely to maximize pathogen transmission potential between hosts, providing support for the VMH.

Results supportive of the VMH also have been reported from work on nonpersistently-transmitted plant viruses examining effects on noninfective vector behavior. Non-persistently transmitted viruses bind transiently to insect mouthparts20 and interactions in these noninfective vector behaviors. Non-persistently transmitted viruses play in natural settings39, including their effects on plants39, influencing the vector's host selection behavior to maximize pathogen transmission potential between hosts, providing support for the VMH.

Our findings highlight the ecological and evolutionary significance of vector manipulation by pathogens and parasites. Effects like those we document for a plant virus, consistent with the VMH, may be widespread since direct and indirect mechanisms that enhance the spread of plant viruses should be favored by natural selection. Furthermore, similar patterns in behavioral changes among vectors of other plant pathogens, such as bacteria and phytoplasmas, which are limited to sessile plant hosts, might also occur. Although our results do not address the specific cellular and molecular mechanisms mediating direct plant virus effects on their vectors, they offer strong quantitative evidence for the VMH, providing a foundation upon which to base further studies of pathogen-mediated manipulation of their vectors and the identification of underlying mechanisms. The evolution of host-vector interactions has recently been suggested to be in part, mediated by virus transmission mechanisms34 underlying the importance of studying such interactions. Greater understanding of host plant-virus-vector interactions has the potential to improve management of vectors and plant diseases in agricultural settings and enhance our understanding of the role plant viruses play in natural settings34, including their effects on ecological processes at the community and ecosystem levels34.
Bioassays to assess aphid preferences. Dual-choice bioassays were performed 40–46 days after plant inoculation, utilizing an arena adapted from Castle et al. (Fig. 1). The base of the arena was glazed into the lid portion of a 15 cm diam petri dish. The platform of the arena consisted of the inverted bottom of the petri dish with a 2.5 cm diam hole cut in the center. A clear plastic tube (16.25 cm; LxD) was inserted into the bottom of the dish and secured with glue. The arena was wrapped in a heavy weight mylar frame (30.5x46.1 cm; WxL) to add stability to the structure. Holes were cut in the mylar four (2 cm; D) equally spaced around the top and two (8x8 cm) in the bottom to access the arena. One leaf still attached to the plant from each treatment (BYDV-infected and sham-inoculated) was inserted through holes on either side of the arena and held in place with a cotton seal. A vial (5.5x2.5 cm; LxD) containing 50 aphids, starved for one hour, was inserted into the bottom of the plastic tube leading to the arena. Apterous infective and noninfective aphids were released simultaneously into separate arenas. Aphids crawled up the tube and emerged onto a platform with one leaf from each treatment on either side (3 cm on either side of where aphids entered the arena). Aphids were able to settle on, feed and move between the two leaves. Aphids were released at the start of a dark period and monitored every 12 h (alternating dark and light times) for a 72 h period. The number of aphids on each leaf was counted at each observation, using a red light when monitoring during the dark cycles. Assays were conducted in a growth room (14:3°C:12 h light photoperiod). One replicate consisted of an arena containing infective aphids paired with another arena containing noninfective aphids, constituting a single block. Twelve replicates were performed across time in a randomized complete block repeated measures design.

Data analysis. The response of aphids responding to either the BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated plant treatment was compared using a generalized linear model assuming a binomial distribution and logit transformation (SAS, Proc Genmod). Logit transformation was performed to stabilize the variance and meet the assumptions of normality for analysis. Aphids not located on either plant leaf in an arena were considered non responsive and excluded from the analysis. The partial proportion of aphids responding to either the BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated plants (Supplemental Table S1a-b) and the direct effects experiment (aphids fed on membrane chambers with or without virus) (Supplemental Table S1c-d). The full model examined the main effects of replicate (blocks; n = 12) and aphid treatment (infective or noninfective). The analysis was conducted separately four times, once for each plant treatment (BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated) for the indirect effects experiment (aphids reared on noninfected plants or virus-infected plants) (Supplemental Table S1a-b). The direct effects experiment (aphids fed on membrane chambers with or without virus) (Supplemental Table S1c-d). The full model examined the main effects of replicate (blocks; n = 12) and aphid treatment (infective or noninfective). The analysis was conducted separately four times, once for each plant treatment (BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated) for the indirect effects experiment (aphids reared on noninfected plants or virus-infected plants) (Supplemental Table S1a-b). The direct effects experiment (aphids fed on membrane chambers with or without virus) (Supplemental Table S1c-d). The full model examined the main effects of replicate (blocks; n = 12) and aphid treatment (infective or noninfective). The analysis was conducted separately four times, once for each plant treatment (BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated) for the indirect effects experiment (aphids reared on noninfected plants or virus-infected plants) (Supplemental Table S1a-b). The direct effects experiment (aphids fed on membrane chambers with or without virus) (Supplemental Table S1c-d). The full model examined the main effects of replicate (blocks; n = 12) and aphid treatment (infective or noninfective). The analysis was conducted separately four times, once for each plant treatment (BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated) for the indirect effects experiment (aphids reared on noninfected plants or virus-infected plants) (Supplemental Table S1a-b). The direct effects experiment (aphids fed on membrane chambers with or without virus) (Supplemental Table S1c-d). The full model examined the main effects of replicate (blocks; n = 12) and aphid treatment (infective or noninfective). The analysis was conducted separately four times, once for each plant treatment (BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated) for the indirect effects experiment (aphids reared on noninfected plants or virus-infected plants) (Supplemental Table S1a-b). The direct effects experiment (aphids fed on membrane chambers with or without virus) (Supplemental Table S1c-d). The full model examined the main effects of replicate (blocks; n = 12) and aphid treatment (infective or noninfective). The analysis was conducted separately four times, once for each plant treatment (BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated) for the indirect effects experiment (aphids reared on noninfected plants or virus-infected plants) (Supplemental Table S1a-b). The direct effects experiment (aphids fed on membrane chambers with or without virus) (Supplemental Table S1c-d). The full model examined the main effects of replicate (blocks; n = 12) and aphid treatment (infective or noninfective). The analysis was conducted separately four times, once for each plant treatment (BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated) for the indirect effects experiment (aphids reared on noninfected plants or virus-infected plants) (Supplemental Table S1a-b). The direct effects experiment (aphids fed on membrane chambers with or without virus) (Supplemental Table S1c-d). The full model examined the main effects of replicate (blocks; n = 12) and aphid treatment (infective or noninfective). The analysis was conducted separately four times, once for each plant treatment (BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated) for the indirect effects experiment (aphids reared on noninfected plants or virus-infected plants) (Supplemental Table S1a-b). The direct effects experiment (aphids fed on membrane chambers with or without virus) (Supplemental Table S1c-d). The full model examined the main effects of replicate (blocks; n = 12) and aphid treatment (infective or noninfective). The analysis was conducted separately four times, once for each plant treatment (BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated) for the indirect effects experiment (aphids reared on noninfected plants or virus-infected plants) (Supplemental Table S1a-b). The direct effects experiment (aphids fed on membrane chambers with or without virus) (Supplemental Table S1c-d). The full model examined the main effects of replicate (blocks; n = 12) and aphid treatment (infective or noninfective). The analysis was conducted separately four times, once for each plant treatment (BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated) for the indirect effects experiment (aphids reared on noninfected plants or virus-infected plants) (Supplemental Table S1a-b). The direct effects experiment (aphids fed on membrane chambers with or without virus) (Supplemental Table S1c-d). The full model examined the main effects of replicate (blocks; n = 12) and aphid treatment (infective or noninfective). The analysis was conducted separately four times, once for each plant treatment (BYDV-infected or sham-inoculated) for the indirect effects experiment (aphids reared on noninfected plants or virus-infected plants) (Supplemental Table S1a-b). The direct effects experiment (aphids fed on
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