

Natal host plants can alter herbivore competition

Huipeng Pan, Evan Preisser, Qi Su, Xiaoguo Jiao, wen xie, shaoli wang, qingjun wu, youjun zhang

Interspecific competition between herbivores is widely recognized as an important determinant of community structure. Although researchers have identified a number of factors capable of altering competitive interactions, few studies have addressed the influence of neighboring plant species. If adaptation to/ epigenetic effects of an herbivore's natal host plant alter its performance on other host plants, then interspecific herbivore interactions may play out differently in heterogeneous and homogenous plant communities. We tested the impact of natal host plants on interactions between the Middle-east Asia Minor 1 (MEAM1) and Mediterranean (MED) cryptic species of the whitefly *Bemisia tabaci* by rearing the offspring of a cabbage-derived MEAM1 population and a poinsettia-derived MED population together on three different host plants: cotton, poinsettia, and cabbage. We found that MED excluded MEAM1 on poinsettia and that MEAM1 excluded MED on cabbage, results consistent with previous research. MED also excluded MEAM1 when reared together on cotton, however, a result at odds with multiple otherwise-similar studies that reared both species on the same natal plant. Our work provides evidence that natal plants affect competitive interactions on another plant species, and highlights the potential importance of neighboring plant species on herbivore community composition.

1 **Authors:** Huipeng Pan¹, Evan L. Preisser², Qi Su¹, Xiaoguo Jiao¹, Wen Xie¹, Shaoli Wang¹,
2 Qingjun Wu¹, Youjun Zhang^{1*}

3 *¹Department of Plant Protection, Institute of Vegetables and Flowers, Chinese Academy*
4 *of Agricultural Sciences, Beijing 100081, China*

5 *²Biological Sciences Department, University of Rhode Island, Kingston RI 02881 USA*

6 -----

7 * Corresponding Author:

8 Dr. Youjun Zhang

9 Department of Entomology, Institute of Vegetables and Flowers

10 Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences

11 12 Zhongguancun Nandajie, Haidian District Beijing 100081, China

12 Phone: 86-10-82109518 Fax: 86-10-82109518

13 Email: zhangyoujun@caas.cn

14 Abstract: 195 words

15 **Introduction**

16 What determines the outcome of herbivore competition? As interspecific herbivore
17 competition became recognized as both widespread and important (e.g., Denno *et al.*, 1995),
18 ecologists identified a number of potentially influential factors. Within a trophic level, the ability
19 to survive on lower-quality resources, grow more quickly on a given resource, or decrease
20 resource quantity/quality for a later-arriving competitor are important; across trophic levels, the
21 role of predator-mediated apparent competition or induced plant defenses can also be critical
22 (reviewed in Price *et al.*, 2011). Such plant-mediated interactions yield competition between
23 herbivores feeding on different plant structures: there is now abundant evidence, for instance, that
24 foliar- and root-feeding species can affect each other's growth and survival (Masters *et al.*, 1993,
25 Bezemer & van Dam 2005).

26 While controlled experiments are necessary to identify the mechanisms driving
27 interspecific herbivore competition, such approaches necessarily involve manipulating a few
28 causative factors while holding others constant. Because even polyphagous herbivores exhibit
29 host plant preferences, for example, experiments seeking to assess interspecific competition on a
30 given host plant generally rear both herbivore species on that plant before allowing them to
31 compete (e.g., Crowder *et al.*, 2010a, Wu *et al.*, 2010). While such a protocol facilitates a 'clean'
32 comparison of herbivores' competitive interactions, it excludes the possibility that nearby plant
33 species influence the outcome (a point discussed in Karban, 2010). Such 'neighborhood' effects
34 have been found to affect herbivores in a number of ways. Associational susceptibility or
35 resistance, for example, occur when plants growing near another plant species experience more or
36 less herbivory, respectively (Barbosa *et al.*, 2009). This can occur by both altered apparency as
37 well as defenses induced by another species' volatile cues (Karbon, 2010).

38 Despite our rapidly-growing appreciation of neighboring species' importance to focal
39 plant fitness, there has been relatively little exploration of how such effects might affect

40 herbivores. To give one example, the offspring of a polyphagous herbivore feeding on one host
41 might settle on another nearby plant species and compete with its resident herbivores; would the
42 herbivores' origin influence their growth, survival, and interspecific interactions? There is
43 evidence that the offspring of herbivores reared on different varieties of a particular host plant
44 can do better on that variety, either via adaptation to that host or a phenomena referred to as
45 'transgenerational acclimatization'. The offspring of *Coenonympha pamphilus* butterflies reared
46 on low-nitrogen *Festuca rubra*, for instance, did better on these hosts than larvae whose parents
47 were reared on high-nitrogen *F. rubra* (Cahenzli & Erhardt 2013). More generally, maternal
48 effects are well known to affect offspring fitness via epigenetic or other mechanisms (Bernardo,
49 1996), and their impact can extend across two or even three generations (Miao *et al.*, 1991, Dunn
50 & Bale 2011, Herman *et al.*, 2012). Although the adaptive advantages accruing to parents capable
51 of 'optimizing' their lineages for survival on a particular host plant are clear, either adaption or
52 transgenerational acclimatization may also improve performance on other host species.

53 We report the results of work demonstrating that an herbivore's host plant can alter the
54 outcome of interspecific competition. Specifically, we find that the result of interspecific
55 competition between herbivores can be reversed when two cryptic species (MEAM1 and MED)
56 of the whitefly *Bemisia tabaci* are reared on natal host plants different than the plant species on
57 which they compete. Because many natural systems contain a mixture of plant species, this
58 finding may have widespread implications.

59 **Materials and Methods**

60 ***Natural history of the system***

61 The sweetpotato whitefly *Bemisia tabaci* (Gennadius) is a globally-distributed
62 polyphagous herbivore that includes a number of genetically divergent but morphologically
63 indistinguishable species (De Barro *et al.*, 2011). The various *B. tabaci* species differ in a number
64 of important aspects such as their host range, feeding behavior, vector competence, insecticide

65 resistance, and endosymbiont community structure (Liu *et al.*, 2009, Jiao *et al.*, 2012, Liu *et al.*,
66 2012, Pan *et al.*, 2012a, Pan *et al.*, 2012b, Liu *et al.*, 2013a). Two of these species, MEAM1
67 (formerly biotype 'B') and MED (formerly biotype 'Q'), are major agricultural pests of
68 agricultural ecosystems (Brown, 1994) found in over 60 countries worldwide (De Barro *et al.*,
69 2011).

70 The highly-invasive nature of both MEAM1 and MED, and their overlapping
71 distributions, has led to numerous investigations of their competitive interactions (e.g., Crowder
72 *et al.*, 2010a, Wu *et al.*, 2010, Sun *et al.*, 2013, Pan *et al.*, 2015). Interest in this topic has been
73 heightened by the fact that lab experiments yield results different from those seen in the field:
74 MEAM1 generally excludes MED in laboratory settings but has been excluded by MED in China
75 and other Asian countries (Chu *et al.*, 2010, Park *et al.*, 2012). Factors such as differential
76 insecticidal resistance (Crowder *et al.*, 2010a, Sun *et al.*, 2013, Pan *et al.*, 2015) and varying host
77 plant preferences (Chu *et al.*, 2012, Liu *et al.*, 2012) have been identified as possible non-
78 exclusive explanations for this disparity.

79 ***Whitefly populations and ancestral host plants***

80 MEAM1 was originally collected in 2004 from cabbage, *Brassica oleracea* cv. Jingfeng1,
81 growing in the Haidian District of Beijing, China. The MED population was originally collected
82 in 2009 from poinsettia, *Euphorbia pulcherrima* Willd. ex Klotz., growing in the same region.
83 Populations of each species were reared in separate screen cages under natural lighting and
84 ambient temperature (26±2°C) in a glasshouse. To ensure that each population consisted of a
85 single species, we sequenced the mitochondrial cytochrome oxidase 1 (*mtCOI*) gene marker
86 (Chu *et al.*, 2010) of 15 adults per generation per population.

87 MEAM1 and MED populations were maintained on potted cabbage and poinsettia,
88 respectively. Plants were cultivated singly in a 1.5L pot filled with potting mix (peat moss,
89 vermiculite, organic fertilizer, and perlite in a 10:10:10:1 ratio by volume). Prior to their exposure

90 to whiteflies, all plants were held in whitefly-proof screen cages in a greenhouse under natural
91 lighting and controlled temperature ($26\pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$). Cabbage (*B. oleracea*, cv. Jingfeng 1) and cotton
92 (*G. hirsutum* cv. DP99B) plants were used in the experiment when they had 5-7 fully-expanded
93 true leaves; poinsettias were used when they were 25-30cm high.

94 ***Experimental design***

95 To test the impact of ancestral host plant on MEAM1-MED competition, we inoculated
96 cabbage, cotton, and poinsettia with MEAM1 reared on cabbage and MED reared on poinsettia.
97 Each experimental replicate consisted of a single whitefly-proof, ventilated cage (0.6m x 0.4m x
98 0.8m) containing two individually-potted host plants. Each replicate was inoculated with 20 pairs
99 of MEAM1 and 20 pairs of MED. The experiment was replicated four times using cabbage, three
100 times using cotton, and five times using poinsettia. Each cage was then placed in a larger screen
101 cage (to minimize the risk of cross-contamination) and held in a glasshouse under natural lighting
102 and ambient temperature ($26\pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$). Both the inner and outer cages of each replicate were kept
103 sealed except when plants were watered or whitefly populations sampled (detailed below).

104 Every 25-27 days (~1 generation), 100 haphazardly-selected whiteflies were collected
105 from each cage for species determination. Immediately after the 100 whiteflies were collected,
106 we removed one of the two whitefly-infested plants (and all the whiteflies on it) in the cage and
107 replaced it with a similarly-sized uninfested plant of the same species. This was done to prevent
108 overcrowding. Sampling ended when only a single whitefly species was in a given cage. The
109 genomic DNA was extracted from each whitefly according to White et al. (2009), and stored at
110 -20°C until analysis. The identity (MEAM1 or MED) of each individual was determined by the
111 CAPS of *mtCOI* with the restriction endonucleases *VspI* (Chu et al., 2010). We used this
112 information to determine the percentage of MED individuals for each cage*sample*plant species
113 combination.

114 ***Statistical analysis***

115 The unit of replication for all analyses was the percentage of MED per cage per sample
116 per plant species. Because cages were sampled repeatedly over time, an rm-ANOVA design was
117 used to analyze whether the percentage of MED changed over time in each of the three
118 treatments (=host plants). JMP v.9 was used for all analyses.

119 **Results**

120 The mean percentage of MED differed in each of the three treatments ($F_{2,9} = 829$, $p <$
121 0.001) and over time ($F_{8,2} = 938$, $p = 0.001$). There was also a significant treatment*time
122 interaction ($F_{16,4} = 487$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that MED percentages in the three treatments
123 changed differently over time.

124 When cabbage-derived MEAM1 and poinsettia-derived MED were reared together on
125 poinsettia, MED excluded MEAM1 by the ninth sampling period in all of the experimental
126 replicates (fig. 1A). When cabbage-derived MEAM1 and poinsettia-derived MED were reared
127 together on cotton, MED increased in abundance and excluded MEAM1 by the seventh sampling
128 period in all of the experimental replicates (fig. 1B). When cabbage-derived MEAM1 and
129 poinsettia-derived MED were reared together on cabbage, MEAM1 excluded MED by the third
130 sampling period (fig. 1C).

131 **Discussion**

132 We found that the offspring of poinsettia-derived MED competitively excluded the
133 offspring of cabbage-derived MEAM1 when reared together on poinsettia (fig. 1A) and on cotton
134 (fig. 1B). While ours is the first study to assess MEAM1-MED competition on poinsettia, the
135 results from cotton run counter to the findings of multiple studies (Horowitz *et al.*, 2005,
136 Crowder *et al.*, 2010a, Wu *et al.*, 2010, Sun *et al.*, 2013, Pan *et al.*, 2015) that evaluated
137 MEAM1-MED competition on cotton and found MEAM1 excluded MED. These studies are
138 virtually identical to ours except in the choice of natal host plant: four reared both species on
139 cotton beforehand (Horowitz *et al.*, 2005, Crowder *et al.*, 2010a, Wu *et al.*, 2010, Sun *et al.*,

140 2013), and the fifth reared them on tomato (Pan *et al.*, 2015). The disparity between our results
141 and theirs implicates our pre-experiment choice of natal host plant(s) as the factor responsible for
142 altering the outcome of herbivore competition., The fact that competitive exclusion of MEAM1
143 by MED occurred over an ~150-day period, even though the generation time of both MEAM1
144 and MED on *G. hirsutum* is 20-25 days (Wilson *et al.*, 2007, Guo *et al.*, 2013), suggests that this
145 result is most likely due to host plant adaptations on the part of one or both species. If this is not
146 the case, epigenetic changes linked to the whiteflies' original host plant would have to persist
147 across several generations. Although this possibility seems unlikely, it is worth noting that the
148 most rapid increase in MED frequency occurred within the first two generations of the
149 experiment (fig. 1B). This would be consistent with transgenerational effects that primarily affect
150 the first and second generations; although these effects may dissipate afterwards, MED may by
151 then possess such a large numerical advantage that it is able to displace the 'competitively
152 dominant' MEAM1 (e.g., Sun *et al.*, 2014).

153 While natal host plants altered the outcome of MEAM1-MED competition on cotton, it
154 did not have a similar effect in other host plant venues. When the offspring of poinsettia-derived
155 MED and cabbage-derived MEAM1 were reared together on cabbage, MEAM1 quickly excluded
156 MED (Fig. 1C). This result agrees with other work that reared both species pre-experiment on
157 cabbage (Sun *et al.*, 2013) or tomato (Pan *et al.*, 2015). Our findings thus demonstrate how
158 herbivore competition can be affected by each species' natal host plant(s), the plant on which the
159 species compete, and the interaction between these factors.

160 Our finding that MED excluded MEAM1 on poinsettia is consistent with previous
161 research showing it is a much better host plant for MED than for MEAM1. Scientists
162 investigating the poinsettia-driven 'Christmas invasion' of *B. tabaci* found that this plant often
163 introduces MED into MEAM1-colonized areas (Dalton, 2006), while populations of MEAM1 do
164 better on vegetables than on poinsettia or other ornamental plants (Qiu *et al.*, 2011). In a

165 comparative study, Liu et al. (2012) found that MED feeding on poinsettia had longer probe
166 durations and ingested more phloem than MEAM1. When MEAM1 and MED were reared on
167 *Cucumis sativa* and allowed to choose between host plants, MED preferred to settle and oviposit
168 on poinsettia and cotton over cabbage, while MEAM1 preferred cabbage over poinsettia and
169 cotton (Jiao *et al.*, 2013). A subsequent no-choice experiment found that MED survival and
170 fecundity was greater on poinsettia and cotton than cabbage, but that the opposite was true for
171 MEAM1 (Jiao *et al.*, 2013).

172 Studies documenting the competitive exclusion of MED by MEAM1 on cotton have
173 identified two factors as being primarily responsible for this outcome. First, MEAM1 appears to
174 grow better on cotton than MED. A study comparing the two species' performance found that
175 while their fecundity and survival was similar, the developmental period of MEAM1 was several
176 days shorter than that of MED (Crowder *et al.*, 2010a). This provided MEAM1 a numerical
177 advantage that helped it exclude MED over the course of several generations. Second, several
178 studies have documented asymmetric reproductive interference between MEAM1 and MED
179 (Crowder *et al.*, 2010b, Sun *et al.*, 2014). Although MEAM1-MED crosses produce virtually no
180 viable offspring (Sun *et al.*, 2011), MEAM1 males are more aggressive than MED males in
181 courting females of both species; as a result, MEAM1 males interfere more with intra-specific
182 mating attempts by MED than vice versa (Crowder *et al.*, 2010b). While the behavior of MED
183 females is unaffected by the presence of MEAM1 males, MEAM1 females mate more quickly
184 with their own species when MED males are present. Because *B. tabaci* is haplodiploid, fertilized
185 eggs become female and unfertilized eggs become male; the inability of MED females to
186 compensate for reproductive interference by MEAM1 males yields a male-skewed sex ratio that
187 decreases MED population growth (Crowder *et al.*, 2010b, Sun *et al.*, 2014). Laboratory-
188 parameterized simulations of MEAM1-MED competition reveal that while MEAM1's growth

189 and reproductive advantages are both important, the asymmetric impact of MEAM1's
190 reproductive interference on MED can itself produce competitive exclusion.

191 There are several ways in which our results and the findings described in the previous
192 paragraph can be reconciled. Specifically, the competitive exclusion of MEAM1 by MED on
193 cotton in our experiment could result from (1) the 'performance' (i.e., reproduction and/or
194 development time) of MED on cotton being improved by long-term rearing on poinsettia; and/or
195 (2) the performance of MEAM1 (in general, or on cotton specifically) being degraded by long-
196 term rearing on cabbage. While we cannot definitively rule out any of these mechanisms, there
197 are several reasons why the latter 'general degradation' explanation appears unlikely. Cabbage is
198 a preferred host for MEAM1 (Jiao *et al.*, 2013), which feeds better than MED on cabbage (Liu *et*
199 *al.*, 2012); when both were reared on cabbage, MEAM1 had a higher egg hatching rate, shorter
200 development time, and higher survival rate (Iida *et al.* 2009). Consistent with this, our work and
201 other studies (fig. 1C; Sun *et al.*, 2013, Pan *et al.*, 2015) find MEAM1 is competitively dominant
202 on cabbage. This occurs irrespective of whether both species are reared beforehand on cotton
203 (Sun *et al.*, 2013), tomato (Pan *et al.*, 2015), or different host plants (this study). If long-term
204 rearing on cabbage had a generally negative effect on MEAM1, we would expect to see less-rapid
205 competitive exclusion of MED; instead, our work found cabbage-derived MEAM1 competitively
206 excluded MED in 75-100 days. By comparison, the five studies listed in Fig. 1b found
207 competitive exclusion of MED on cotton in ~155 days.

208 The second possibility is while that long-term rearing of MEAM1 on cabbage did not
209 affect (and may well have improved) its performance on this plant, it did decrease its
210 performance on cotton, and perhaps other, host plants. This scenario seems more likely than the
211 previous one: similar negative cross-host correlations in performance have been observed in
212 aphids (Via & Hawthorne 2002) and a range of other insect species (reviewed in Price *et al.*,
213 2011). Whiteflies reared long-term on cabbage may, for example, improve their ability to

214 circumvent *Brassica* defenses at the cost of reduced performance on non-*Brassica* hosts. The
215 possibility of negative cross-host performance correlations in *Bemisia* was addressed by Liu et al.
216 (2013b), who isolated cabbage-feeding MEAM1 on three host plants (*B. oleracea*, *C. sativus*, and
217 *L. esculentum*) for 80 generations and then examined each subpopulation's feeding performance
218 on all three hosts. They found that the performance of the *oleracea*-specific MEAM1
219 subpopulation equaled or exceeded that of the *sativus*-specific and *esculentum*-specific
220 subpopulations on all three host plants; in addition, neither the *sativus*-specific or *esculentum*-
221 specific subpopulations had the best feeding performance on their natal hosts (Liu *et al.*, 2013b).
222 Although this work did not find negative cross-host performance correlations, it only addressed
223 feeding and would not have detected tradeoffs manifested in growth, development time, or
224 survival.

225 In addition to the possibility that long-term rearing on cabbage reduced the tendency of
226 MEAM1 towards polyphagy, long-term rearing on poinsettia might have provided MED several
227 adaptive or epigenetic advantages over other host plants. One potential advantage might involve
228 increased tolerance of phenolic-based plant defenses (reviewed in Medina-Ortega, 2011).
229 Whitefly fitness negatively correlates with phenolic levels in both tomato (Inbar et al. 2001) and
230 cotton (Butter *et al.*, 1992), and phenols are the only secondary compound found in poinsettia
231 phloem (Calatayud *et al.*, 1994). Although poinsettia and cotton both invest in phenolic defenses,
232 a comparative analysis found that total phenols were 6x greater in poinsettia than cotton (Jiao *et*
233 *al.*, 2012). Long-term rearing on a high-phenol host plant like poinsettia may select for (or
234 produce epigenetic changes resulting in; Youngson & Whitelaw 2008) whiteflies tolerant of
235 phenolic concentrations far higher than those typically found in cotton, helping to improve their
236 performance on this host plant.

237 Long-term rearing on poinsettia may also select for whiteflies with high rates of phloem
238 consumption. Poinsettia is a relatively low-quality host plant, with foliar C:N ratios substantially

239 higher than those of cotton (Jiao *et al.*, 2012). *Bemisia* population growth is positively correlated
240 with plant nutritional quality even though phloem consumption rates are higher on low-nitrogen
241 plants across a range of host plant species (reviewed in Medina-Ortega, 2011). If poinsettia does
242 select for individuals with that rapidly feed on and process phloem, this adaptation may prove
243 beneficial on a range of host plants. Given the role played by asymmetric reproductive
244 interference in the MEAM1-MED interaction on cotton (Crowder *et al.*, 2010b, Sun *et al.*, 2014),
245 it is also possible that poinsettia-derived MED differ in some aspect of their mating behavior.
246 Long-term rearing on poinsettia might select for MED males that are particularly aggressive in
247 their courting behavior, for instance, or might favor MED females with a stronger preference for
248 males of their own species. These latter possibilities are intriguing; there is no evidence for them,
249 however, and no apparent rationale for why such changes would occur specifically on poinsettia.

250 Regardless of which species (MEAM1 or MED) was responsible for our results, or
251 whether adaptation or epigenetic changes underlies them, we found that the outcome of
252 interspecific herbivore competition can be altered by the natal host plants of one or both
253 herbivore species. The host plant on which an interaction occurs is well-known to affect the
254 outcome of competition, and it has recently been shown that the offspring of herbivores reared on
255 different host plant varieties do better on ‘their’ variety (Cahenzli & Erhardt 2013). By contrast,
256 we find evidence for altered performance on a different host plant species that persists over
257 several generations. This result, although novel, may be predictable: offspring are affected by
258 parental food quality even when the two generations are reared on different host plants (Rossiter,
259 1991). Although host plant adaptation is the most logical explanation for our results, it is worth
260 noting that research in both plants (Miao *et al.*, 1991, Herman *et al.*, 2012, Verhoeven & van
261 Gulp 2012) and animals (Dunn & Bale 2011) has found that maternal effects can persist into at
262 least the third generation. Our work lends further support to research showing how an organism’s
263 ‘neighborhood’ can affect its interactions with other species (Barbosa *et al.*, 2009, Karban, 2010),

264 and suggests that these neighborhood effects may be wider-ranging, longer-lasting, and more
265 consequential than previously anticipated.

266 **Acknowledgements**

267 Comments by D. Crowder and J. Lau greatly improved this manuscript.

268 **Literature Cited**

- 269 Barbosa, P., J. Hines, I. Kaplan, H. Martinson, A. Szczepaniec, and Z. Szendrei. 2009.
270 Associational resistance and associational susceptibility: having right or wrong neighbors. Annual
271 Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics **40**:1-20.
- 272 Bernardo, J. 1996. Maternal effects in animal ecology. American Zoologist **36**:83-105.
- 273 Bezemer, T. and N. van Dam. 2005. Linking aboveground and belowground interactions via
274 induced plant defenses. Trends in Ecology & Evolution **20**:617-625.
- 275 Brown, J. 1994. The status of *Bemisia tabaci* (Genn.) as a pest and vector in world
276 agroecosystems. FAO Plant Protection Bulletin **42**:3-32.
- 277 Butter, N. S., B. K. Vir, K. Gurdeep, T. H. Singh, and R. K. Raheja. 1992. Biochemical basis of
278 resistance to whitefly *Bemisia tabaci* Genn. (Aleyrodidae: Hemiptera) in cotton. Tropical
279 Agriculture **69**:119-122.
- 280 Cahenzli, F. and A. Erhardt. 2013. Transgenerational acclimatization in an herbivore–host plant
281 relationship. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences **280**:20122856.
- 282 Calatayud, P. A., Y. Rahbé, W. F. Tjallingii, M. Tertuliano, and B. Le Rü. 1994. Electrically
283 recorded feeding behaviour of cassava mealybug on host and non-host plants. Entomologia
284 Experimentalis et Applicata **72**:219-232.
- 285 Chu, D., Y. L. Tao, and H. Chi. 2012. Influence of plant combinations on population
286 characteristics of *Bemisia tabaci* biotypes B and Q. Journal of Economic Entomology **105**:930-
287 935.
- 288 Chu, D., F. Wan, Y. Zhang, and J. Brown. 2010. Change in the biotype composition of *Bemisia*

289 *tabaci* in Shandong Province of China from 2005 to 2008. *Environmental Entomology* **39**:1028-
290 1036.

291 Crowder, D. W., A. R. Horowitz, P. J. De Barro, S. S. Liu, A. M. Showalter, S. Kontsedalov, V.
292 Khasdan, A. Shargal, J. Liu, and Y. Carrière. 2010a. Mating behaviour, life history and adaptation
293 to insecticides determine species exclusion between whiteflies. *Journal of Animal Ecology*
294 **79**:563-570.

295 Crowder, D. W., M. I. Sitvarin, and Y. Carrière. 2010b. Plasticity in mating behaviour drives
296 asymmetric reproductive interference in whiteflies. *Animal Behaviour* **79**:579-587.

297 Dalton, R. 2006. Whitefly infestations: the Christmas invasion. *Nature* **443**:898-900.

298 De Barro, P., S. Liu, L. Boykin, and A. Dinsdale. 2011. *Bemisia tabaci*: A statement of species
299 status. *Annual Review of Entomology* **56**:1-19.

300 Denno, R., M. McClure, and J. Ott. 1995. Interspecific interactions in phytophagous insects:
301 competition reexamined and resurrected. *Annual Review of Entomology* **40**:297-331.

302 Dunn, G. A. and T. L. Bale. 2011. Maternal high-fat diet effects on third-generation female body
303 size via the paternal lineage. *Endocrinology* **152**:2228-2236.

304 Guo, J. Y., G. Wu, and F. H. Wan. 2013. Effects of high-gossypol cotton on the development and
305 reproduction of *Bemisia tabaci* (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae) MEAM1 cryptic species. *Journal of*
306 *Economic Entomology* **106**:1379-1385.

307 Herman, J. J., S. E. Sultan, T. Horgan-Kobelski, and C. Riggs. 2012. Adaptive transgenerational
308 plasticity in an annual plant: grandparental and parental drought stress enhance performance of
309 seedlings in dry soil. *Integrative and Comparative Biology* **52**:77-88.

310 Horowitz, A. R., S. Kontsedalov, V. Khasdan, and I. Ishaaya. 2005. Biotypes B and Q of *Bemisia*
311 *tabaci* and their relevance to neonicotinoid and pyriproxyfen resistance. *Archives of Insect*
312 *Biochemistry and Physiology* **58**:216-225.

313 Iida, H., T. Kitamura, and K. Honda. 2009. Comparison of egg-hatching rate, survival rate and

314 development time of the immature stage between B- and Q-biotypes of *Bemisia tabaci*
315 (Gennadius) (Homoptera: Aleyrodidae) on various agricultural crops. Applied Entomology &
316 Zoology **44**:267-273.

317 Inbar, M., H. Doostdar, and R. T. Mayer. 2001. Suitability of stressed and vigorous plants to
318 various insect herbivores. Oikos **94**:228-235.

319 Jiao, X. G., W. Xie, S. L. Wang, Q. J. Wu, H. P. Pan, B. M. Liu, and Y. J. Zhang. 2013.
320 Differences in host selection and performance between B and Q putative species of *Bemisia*
321 *tabaci* on three host plants. Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata **147**:1-8.

322 Jiao, X. G., W. Xie, S. L. Wang, Q. J. Wu, L. Zhou, H. P. Pan, B. M. Liu, and Y. J. Zhang. 2012.
323 Host preference and nymph performance of B and Q putative species of *Bemisia tabaci* on three
324 host plants. Journal of Pest Science **85**:423-430.

325 Karban, R. 2010. Neighbors affect resistance to herbivory – a new mechanism. New Phytologist
326 **186**:564-566.

327 Liu, B. M., E. L. Preisser, D. Chu, H. P. Pan, W. Xie, S. L. Wang, Q. J. Wu, X. G. Zhou, and Y. J.
328 Zhang. 2013a. Multiple forms of vector manipulation by a plant-infecting virus: *Bemisia tabaci*
329 and *tomato yellow curl leaf virus*. Journal of Virology **87**:4929-4937.

330 Liu, B. M., E. L. Preisser, X. Jiao, H. Pan, W. Xie, S. L. Wang, Q. Wu, and Y. J. Zhang. 2013b.
331 Plant-mediated changes in the feeding behavior of an invasive whitefly. Environmental
332 Entomology **42**:980-986.

333 Liu, B. M., F. M. Yan, D. Chu, H. P. Pan, X. G. Jiao, W. Xie, Q. J. Wu, S. L. Wang, B. Y. Xu, X.
334 G. Zhou, and Y. J. Zhang. 2012. Difference in feeding behaviors of two invasive whiteflies on
335 host plants with different suitability: Implication for competitive displacement. International
336 Journal of Biological Sciences **8**:697-706.

337 Liu, J., H. Zhao, K. Jiang, X. P. Zhou, and S. S. Liu. 2009. Differential indirect effects of two
338 plant viruses on an invasive and an indigenous whitefly vector: implications for competitive

339 displacement. *Annals of Applied Biology* **155**:439-448.

340 Masters, G. J., V. K. Brown, and A. C. Gange. 1993. Plant mediated interactions between
341 aboveground and belowground insect herbivores. *Oikos* **66**:148-151.

342 Medina-Ortega, K. J. 2011. Poinsettia (*Euphorbia pulcherrima* Willd. ex Klotzsch:
343 Euphorbiaceae) resistance mechanisms against the silverleaf whitefly, *Bemisia tabaci* (Gennadius)
344 (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae) biotype B. Ohio State University, Columbus OH.

345 Miao, S. L., F. A. Bazzaz, and R. B. Primack. 1991. Persistence of maternal nutrient effects in
346 *Plantago major*: the third generation. *Ecology* **72**:1634-1642.

347 Pan, H. P., D. Chu, W. Q. Yan, Q. Su, B. M. Liu, S. L. Wang, Q. J. Wu, W. Xie, X. G. Jiao, R. Li,
348 N. Yang, X. Yang, B. Y. Xu, J. K. Brown, X. G. Zhou, and Y. J. Zhang. 2012a. Rapid spread of
349 *tomato yellow leaf curl virus* in China is aided differentially by two invasive whiteflies. *PLoS*
350 *ONE* **7**:e34817.

351 Pan, H. P., X. C. Li, D. Q. Ge, S. L. Wang, Q. J. Wu, W. Xie, X. G. Jiao, D. Chu, B. M. Liu, B. Y.
352 Xu, and Y. J. Zhang. 2012b. Factors affecting population dynamics of maternally transmitted
353 endosymbionts in *Bemisia tabaci*. *PLoS ONE* **7**:e30760.

354 Pan, H. P., E. L. Preisser, D. Chu, S. L. Wang, Q. J. Wu, Y. Carriere, X. G. Zhou, and Y. J. Zhang.
355 2015. Insecticides promote viral outbreaks by altering herbivore competition. *Ecological*
356 *Applications*:in press.

357 Park, J., S. M. H. Jahan, W. G. Song, H. Lee, Y. S. Lee, H. S. Choi, K. S. Lee, C. S. Kim, S. Lee,
358 and K. Y. Lee. 2012. Identification of biotypes and secondary endosymbionts of *Bemisia tabaci*
359 in Korea and relationships with the occurrence of TYLCV disease. *Journal of Asia-Pacific*
360 *Entomology* **15**:186-191.

361 Price, P. W., R. F. Denno, M. D. Eubanks, D. L. Finke, and I. Kaplan. 2011. *Insect Ecology*:
362 *Behavior, Populations and Communities*. Cambridge University Press.

363 Qiu, B. L., F. Dang, S. J. Li, M. Z. Ahmed, F. L. Jin, S. X. Ren, and A. G. S. Cuthbertson. 2011.

364 Comparison of biological parameters between the invasive B biotype and a new defined Cv
365 biotype of *Bemisia tabaci* (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae) in China. Journal of Pest Science **84**:419-
366 427.

367 Rossiter, M. C. 1991. Environmentally-based maternal effects: a hidden force in insect population
368 dynamics? *Oecologia* **87**:288-294.

369 Sun, D. B., J. Li, Y. Q. Liu, D. W. Crowder, and S. S. Liu. 2014. Effects of reproductive
370 interference on the competitive displacement between two invasive whiteflies. Bulletin of
371 Entomological Research **104**:334-346.

372 Sun, D. B., Y. Q. Liu, L. Qin, J. Xu, F. F. Li, and S. S. Liu. 2013. Competitive displacement
373 between two invasive whiteflies: insecticide application and host plant effects. Bulletin of
374 Entomological Research **103**:344-353.

375 Sun, D. B., J. Xu, J. B. Luan, and S. S. Liu. 2011. Reproductive incompatibility between the B
376 and Q biotypes of the whitefly *Bemisia tabaci* in China: genetic and behavioural evidence.
377 Bulletin of Entomological Research **101**:211-220.

378 Verhoeven, K. J. F. and T. P. van Gorp. 2012. Transgenerational effects of stress exposure on
379 offspring phenotypes in apomictic dandelion. PLoS ONE **7**:e38605.

380 Via, S. and D. J. Hawthorne. 2002. The genetic architecture of ecological specialization:
381 correlated gene effects on host use and habitat choice in pea aphids. *The American Naturalist*
382 **159**:S76-S88.

383 White, J. A., S. E. Kelly, S. J. Perlman, and M. S. Hunter. 2009. Cytoplasmic incompatibility in
384 the parasitic wasp *Encarsia inaron*: disentangling the roles of *Cardinium* and *Wolbachia*
385 symbionts. *Heredity* **102**:483-489.

386 Wilson, M., P. Moshitzky, E. Laor, M. Ghanim, A. R. Horowitz, and S. Morin. 2007. Reversal of
387 resistance to pyriproxyfen in the Q biotype of *Bemisia tabaci* (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae). *Pest*
388 *Management Science* **63**:761-768.

- 389 Wu, S. W., Z. Y. Wang, and Y. D. Wu. 2010. Competition between the B and Q biotypes of
390 *Bemisia tabaci* and its relevance to insecticide resistance. Chinese Bulletin of Entomology
391 **47**:1118-1121.
- 392 Youngson, N. A. and E. Whitelaw. 2008. Transgenerational epigenetic effects. Annual Review of
393 Genomics and Human Genetics **9**:233-257.

394 **Figure Legend**

395 **Figure 1A (top panel):** Percentage of MED on *E. pulcherrima*. *E. pulcherrima*-derived
396 MED is competing with *B. oleracea* cv. Jingfeng 1-derived MEAM1; see text for treatment
397 details. Values are mean (\pm SE) of the percentage of MED per replicate (N = 5).

398 **1B (middle panel):** Percentage of MED on *G. hirsutum* cv. DP99B. Large red circles:
399 data from this study on *E. pulcherrima*-derived MED competing with *B. oleracea* cv. Jingfeng 1-
400 derived MEAM1; values are mean (\pm SE) of the percentage of MED per replicate (N = 3). Small
401 circles: data from five studies in which MED and MEAM1 were reared on the same host plant
402 and allowed to compete on *G. hirsutum*. In Horowitz et al (2005; figure 5 in Crowder et al. 2010),
403 both MEAM1 and MED were reared and experimented on cv. Atala.; in Crowder et al (2010a),
404 on cv. DP5415; in Wu et al (2010), on cv. Simian-8; in Sun et al (2013), on cv. Zhe-Mian 1793; in
405 Pan et al (2015), both MEAM1 and MED were reared on *L. esculentum* cv. Zhongza 9 and
406 experimented on cv. DP99B.

407 **1C (bottom panel):** Percentage of MED on *B. oleracea* cv. Jingfeng 1. Large red circles:
408 data from this study on *E. pulcherrima*-derived MED competing with *B. oleracea*-derived
409 MEAM1; values are mean (\pm SE) of the percentage of MED per replicate (N = 4). Small circles:
410 Data from two additional studies in which MEAM1 and MED were reared on the same host plant
411 and allowed to compete on *B. oleracea* cv. Jingfeng 1. In Sun et al (2013), both were reared on
412 *G. hirsutum* cv. Zhe-Mian 1793; in Pan et al (2015), both were reared on *L. esculentum* cv.
413 Zhongza 9.

Figure 1



