



The neuroplasticity of division of labor: worker polymorphism, compound eye structure and brain organization in the leafcutter ant *Atta cephalotes*

Sara Arganda^{1,2,3} · Andrew P. Hoadley¹ · Evan S. Razdan¹ · Isabella B. Muratore¹ · James F. A. Traniello^{1,4}

Received: 1 March 2020 / Revised: 23 April 2020 / Accepted: 14 May 2020
© Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2020

Abstract

Our understanding of how sensory structure design is coupled with neural processing capacity to adaptively support division of labor is limited. Workers of the remarkably polymorphic fungus-growing ant *Atta cephalotes* are behaviorally specialized by size: the smallest workers (minims) tend fungi in dark subterranean chambers while larger workers perform tasks outside the nest. Strong differences in worksite light conditions are predicted to influence sensory and processing requirements for vision. Analyzing confocal scans of worker eyes and brains, we found that eye structure and visual neuropils appear to have been selected to maximize task performance according to light availability. Minim eyes had few ommatidia, large interommatidial angles and eye parameter values, suggesting selection for visual sensitivity over acuity. Large workers had larger eyes with disproportionately more and larger ommatidia, and smaller interommatidial angles and eye parameter values, indicating peripheral sensory adaptation to ambient rainforest light. Optic lobes and mushroom body collars were disproportionately small in minims. Within the optic lobe, lamina and lobula relative volumes increased with worker size whereas medulla volume decreased. Visual system phenotypes thus correspond to task specializations in dark or light environments and illustrate a functional neuroplasticity underpinning division of labor in this socially complex agricultural ant.

Keywords Task performance · Optic lobe · Compound eye · Ommatidia · Social brain

Dedicated to the memory of Eldridge Adams, brilliant behavioral ecologist, colleague, and friend.

Sara Arganda and Andrew P. Hoadley contributed equally to the study.

Electronic supplementary material The online version of this article (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00359-020-01423-9>) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

Sara Arganda
sara.arganda@urjc.es

¹ Department of Biology, Boston University, Boston, USA

² Research Center on Animal Cognition (CRCA), Center for Integrative Biology (CIBI), Toulouse University, CNRS, UPS, 31062 Toulouse, France

³ Departamento de Biología y Geología, Física y Química Inorgánica, Área de Biodiversidad y Conservación, Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Madrid, Spain

⁴ Graduate Program for Neuroscience, Boston University, Boston, MA 02215, USA

Introduction

Morphology, behavior, and nervous system structure appear to be adaptively integrated (Corral-López et al. 2017; Gordon et al. 2017; Iglesias et al. 2018). For example, body size correlates with optical sensitivity and resolution in insect vision (Spaethe and Chittka 2003; Rutowski et al. 2009; Palavalli-Nettimi and Narendra 2018; Taylor et al. 2019) and social insect compound eyes and visual information processing neuropils enable behavioral performance according to the cognitive challenges of navigation and ambient light levels (Jander and Jander 2002; Mares et al. 2005; Kapustjanskij et al. 2007; Warrant 2008; Narendra et al. 2011, 2016a; Streinzer et al. 2013; Yilmaz et al. 2014; Bulova et al. 2016). Ants are an ideal model system to examine relationships among behavior, body size, and neuroanatomy because workers have evolved as task specialists in several clades (Hölldobler and Wilson 1990). Eye size and ommatidia number correlate with worker size in ants, including polymorphic species, and may be associated with task performance (Menzel and Wehner 1970; Klotz et al.

1992; Schwarz et al. 2011). Scaling patterns of brain size and brain compartment substructure among polymorphic workers, moreover, appear to correspond to foraging ecology and the sensory and high-order processing demands of task performance (Gronenberg 2008; Muscedere and Tranquillo 2012; Gordon et al. 2017). Although olfactory inputs are principal information sources in ants (Hölldobler and Wilson 1990; Czaczkes et al. 2015), vision can be significant in foraging ecology and navigation (Knaden and Graham 2016; Narendra et al. 2017). To return home, foragers may use a celestial compass (Wehner 2003; Müller and Wehner 2006), optic flow (Ronacher and Wehner 1995), visual cues and landmark panoramas (Graham and Cheng 2009; Müller and Wehner 2010; Schwarz et al. 2011; Huber and Knaden 2015; Freas et al. 2018), polarized light (Zeil et al. 2014), and canopy patterns (Hölldobler 1980; Beugnon et al. 2005; Rodrigues and Oliveira 2014). Additionally, visual navigation has been associated with peripheral receptor structure, and primary and higher-order processing brain centers (Gronenberg and Hölldobler 1999; Wehner 2003; Ehmer and Gronenberg 2004; Müller and Wehner 2006; Knaden and Graham 2016), and worker behavioral development may be associated with light-exposure and cued neuroanatomical reorganization in the visual system (Stieb et al. 2010, 2012; Yilmaz et al. 2016; Kamhi et al. 2017).

The ommatidia of the ant compound eye are photoreceptive units that may change in number and structure according to visual needs (Moser et al. 2004; Narendra et al. 2016a). Ommatidia structure affects visual capacity: larger ommatidia enhance light sensitivity, ommatidia number determine image resolution, and lower interommatidial angle improves acuity (Land 1997). Reproductive and worker division of labor in social insects may have selected for differences in compound eye structure (Schwarz et al. 2011; Streinzer et al. 2013). In some ant species, ommatidia number and size scale with worker body size (Menzel and Wehner 1970; Bernstein and Finn 1971; Klotz et al. 1992; Baker and Ma 2006; Schwarz et al. 2011), vary in males and females (Narendra et al. 2016b), and scale differently among polymorphic workers within individual compound eyes and between colonies (Perl and Niven 2016a, 2016b). In bull ants (Greiner et al. 2007; Narendra et al. 2011), bees (Jander and Jander 2002; Greiner et al. 2004; Somanathan et al. 2009) and dung beetles (McIntyre and Caveney 1998) photoreceptor diameter and eye area increase in nocturnal species in comparison to diurnal species, enhancing visual sensitivity. Ommatidia facet diameter is generally smaller in diurnal than nocturnal ants (Narendra et al. 2017), but eye size patterns vary. Eye size is typically larger in nocturnal ants, although eyes are larger in some diurnal *Camponotus* species (Menzi 1987).

Visual input from the compound eyes travels to the optic lobes (OL) for primary processing (Gronenberg and Hölldobler 1999). OL investment reflects visual ecology in social

insects: in subterranean species, workers are eyeless and OLs are absent, whereas diurnal solitary foragers have enormous eyes and OLs occupying 33% of their brains (Gronenberg and Hölldobler 1999). In paper wasps, queens remain inside the nest and have smaller OLs than foraging workers (O'Donnell et al. 2014), and in the weaver ant *Oecophylla smaragdina*, minor workers nurse brood, rarely leave the nest, and have disproportionately smaller OLs than majors, which forage and defend territory (Kamhi et al. 2017).

The OL is comprised of three regions: the lamina (contrast detection), medulla (color vision processing and small field motion), and lobula (color vision processing, wide field motion detection, and shape and panorama construction) (Strausfeld 1989; Gronenberg 2008; Dyer et al. 2011). OL interneurons project to the collar of the mushroom body (MB) calyx for higher-order processing (Gronenberg 2001; Farris 2016). In ants, males, queens and worker brains show differential investment in the medulla, lobula and MB collar (Ehmer and Gronenberg 2004), reflecting different visual ecologies. Peripheral sensory structure should correlate with higher-order processing ability in task-specialized workers, but this linkage is not well understood.

Visual phenotypes, especially those concerning variability in eye structure, have been extensively examined in social insect species that range from diurnal to nocturnal activity patterns. However, few studies focus on intraspecific plasticity in visual capabilities related to worker division of labor, which may be associated with task performance in environments that vary in light level. To investigate visual phenotypes within the worker caste, we analyzed variation in the structure of the compound eyes, OL, and MB collar in morphologically and behaviorally differentiated workers of the fungus-growing ant *Atta cephalotes*. *A. cephalotes* workers perform tasks in the complete darkness of fungal comb chambers and in the filtered light epigaeic environment beneath rainforest canopy. *A. cephalotes* workers forage day and night (Hodgson 1955; Cherrett 1968), using trail pheromones, but also vision during orientation along trails (Vilela et al. 1987; Vick 2005). Although olfaction appears to be the dominant sensory modality for foraging in many ants, visual information facilitates trail-following in *Atta laevigata* (Jaffé et al. 1990), and other ant species alter their use of chemicals or vision depending on light conditions (Beugnon and Fourcassié 1988). In *A. cephalotes*, improved forager visual ability may enable flexibility in the use of orientation cues and social signals as ambient light levels change. Worker head widths (HW) range from 0.6 to 4.5 mm; this striking polymorphism is associated with the frequency (Wilson 1980) and efficiency (Wetterer 1991; van Breda and Stradling 1994) of leaf harvesting, fungal comb maintenance, brood care, hygienic behaviors, and colony defense. The smallest workers (minims, HW < 1.2 mm) primarily tend brood and the fungal comb

in dark underground chambers (Wilson 1980) whereas media workers (HW = 1.2–3.0 mm) harvest plant material, traveling along foraging trails beneath rainforest canopy, and the largest workers (majors, HW > 3.0 mm), are responsible for defense (Powell and Clark 2004; Hölldobler and Wilson 2010). Size-variable workers thus have different social roles and experience environments strongly differing in ambient light intensity and visual complexity. It is unlikely that a single eye structure and sensory processing ability has evolved in all workers. We hypothesized that *A. cephalotes* visual system organization is associated with the visual ecology of size-related division of labor and has resulted from selection for adaptive plasticity in ommatidia structure, OL organization and MB collar investment. Specifically, we predicted that workers engaging in within-nest or outside-nest activities (in darkness or light, respectively) would vary in compound eye structure and relative investment in the OL and its constituent parts, and in the MB collar to support the requirements of vision associated to task performance.

Methods

Laboratory cultures

Queenright *A. cephalotes* incipient colonies (~100 workers total) were collected in Trinidad in July 2014 and maintained in a Harris environmental chamber (25 °C, 50% relative humidity, 12:12 h photoperiod [white fluorescent tube, 4100 K, 273 ± 67 lx (avg ± std), approx. 400–700 nm wavelength]). Artificial nests were constructed from multiple plastic boxes (11 cm × 18 cm × 13 cm each) connected by plastic tubing (ID = 2.5 cm). Boxes housing fungal combs had dental stone floors with embedded pebbles to provide air circulation for the fungus. Colonies were fed locally collected leaves free of chemicals and organic produce on alternate days, supplemented with rolled oats, apple, and orange mesocarp.

Worker size variation and tissue sampling

After approximately 10 months in the laboratory, we sampled adult polymorphic workers, based on cuticle pigmentation, from three colonies that had mature to sizes of more than 2000 workers (Ac09, Ac20, and Ac21). *A. cephalotes* appears to exhibit triphasic allometry, with three worker size classes (subcastes): minims (HW across the eyes < 1.2 mm), medias (HW 1.2–3.0 mm) and major workers (HW > 3.0 mm). Each worker was anesthetized on ice and brains were dissected in ice-cold HEPES buffered saline. Compound eyes were removed and stored in 70% ethanol for processing. Because dissection is delicate, we

were not always able to preserve the brain and eyes of the same individual.

Compound eye imaging and structural measurements


Ninety-two intact compound eyes were imaged to create 3D stacks (Fig. 1a) to measure ommatidia number (ON), average ommatidial diameter (D), and interommatidial angle ($\Delta\phi$). Eyes were stored in 70% ethanol, washed in 100% ethanol (3 × 10 min) before mounting. We measured one eye (the one better preserved) per worker. Extraneous cuticle was removed to allow eyes to lie flat and were then mounted in methyl salicylate between coverslips and imaged using a Fluoview 1 confocal microscope ($\lambda = 488$ nm, step size = 3.1 μm) with a 20× air objective (NA = 0.5, CA = 2). Cuticle has natural fluorescence. Eye data were recorded blind to subcaste by randomly assigning identification numbers to eyes. To quantify ommatidia number, image stacks were flattened in ImageJ (Abràmoff et al. 2004) and facets were counted using the Cell Counter plugin. Volume renderings were viewed in Amira 6.0 to verify counts.

Mean ommatidial diameter was calculated from the average diameter of 5 or 10 randomly selected ommatidia, which were non-adjacent and from all regions of the compound eye and eye surface area was calculated from the mean ommatidial diameter (surface area = $ON \times \pi \times [0.5 \times D]^2$). This method for calculating eye surface area has approximately an average error of only 7% in comparison with measuring all the ommatidia in the eye (see Supplementary Material). Ommatidial density (number of ommatidia per surface area unit) was calculated by dividing the number of ommatidia by eye surface area (Yilmaz et al. 2014). To quantify interommatidial angle ($\Delta\phi$), image stacks were re-sectioned in the yz plane to obtain a virtual cross section of the eye. ImageJ was used to estimate local eye radius R (Schwarz et al. 2011), which together with the mean ommatidial diameter (D , in μm) for that eye, interommatidial angle (in radians) was estimated as $\Delta\phi = D/R$ (Land 1997; Schwarz et al. 2011). Eye parameter (P), which indicates the extent of trade-offs between sensitivity and resolution, was calculated as $\Delta\phi \times D$ (Snyder 1977; Rutowski et al. 2009); lower values of P indicate enhanced acuity, while compromising sensitivity.

Immunohistochemistry and confocal microscopy

After dissection, brains were placed in 16% Zn-formaldehyde (Ott 2008), fixed overnight at approximately 18 °C on a shaker, washed in HBS (6 × 10 min) and then fixed in Dent's Fixative (80% methanol, 20% DMSO) for minimally 1 h. Brains were next washed in 100% methanol and either stored at -17 °C or immediately processed. Brains

Fig. 1 Compound eye structure in polymorphic *A. cephalotes* workers. **a** Z-projections of confocal images of eyes from workers with variable HW (scale bar = 100 μ m). **b** Log–log plot of the ommatidia number as a function of worker HW showing a significant change of slope at 1.38 mm. **c** Log–log plot of average ommatidial diameter as a function of worker HW. **d** Log–log plot of the eye surface area (SA) as a function of worker HW showing a significant change of slope at 1.44 mm. **e** Log–log plot of ommatidia density (ommatidial number/eye SA) as a function of worker HW. **f** Log–log plot of the interommatidial angle (rad) as a function of worker HW showing a significant change of slope at 1.25 mm. **g** Log–log plot of the eye parameter as a function of worker HW (significant change of slope at 1.26 mm). **b–g** Each pink point represents a single eye. Solid (significantly different from isometry) or dashed (not significantly different from isometry) black lines show linear regression or piecewise linear regressions as appropriate. Purple patches represent 95% confidence intervals of regression lines. Dashed gray lines are the best-fitting isometric regression models. Patches of increasing shades of gray group minim, media and major worker values (as the increasing size head outlines at the bottom)



were washed in 0.1 M Tris buffer (pH = 7.4) and blocked in PBSTN (5% neutral goat serum, 0.005% sodium azide in 0.2% PBST) at 18 °C for 1 h before incubation for 3 days at room temperature in primary antibody (1:30 SYNORF

1 in PBSTN; monoclonal antibody 3C11 obtained from DSHB, University of Iowa, IA, USA). They were washed (6 × 10 min) in 0.2% PBST and incubated in secondary antibody (1:100 AlexaFluor 488 goat anti-mouse in PBSTN)

for 4 days at room temperature. Brains were then washed a final time (6×10 min in 0.2% PBST) and dehydrated in an ethanol series (10 min/step, 30/50/70/95/100/100% ethanol in 1×PBS), cleared with methyl salicylate, and mounted on stainless steel slides for imaging.

Sixty-three brains were imaged using an Olympus Fluoview 1 confocal microscope ($\lambda = 488$ nm, step size = 3.1 μm) with either a 10×air objective (NA = 0.3, CA = 1), or a 20×air objective (NA = 0.5, CA = 2). Voxel depth was multiplied by a factor of 1.59 to correct for axial shortening due to mounting in methyl salicylate (Bucher et al. 2000). Brain image stacks were manually segmented using Amira 6.0 and Amira 2019.2 software (brush, magic wand and blow tools) to quantify neuropil volumes (material statistics tool). Given their bilateral symmetry, we segmented one hemisphere per brain (the side best preserved), reporting half-brain volumes. Our study goal required that only the lamina, medulla and lobula of the OL and MB calyces (separating lip and collar) were segmented separately (Fig. 2a), the rest of the central brain regions and the suboesophageal ganglion were segmented as a whole. Brain data collection was blind to worker HW, although extreme size differences were obvious. Nevertheless, due to the randomized coding of brains, subcaste could not be determined with certainty by the annotator. We calculated the volume of the brain hemisphere, the absolute and relative volume of OL (relative to total brain volume), the absolute and relative volume of MB collar (relative to total brain volume), and the relative volumes of OL subregions (relative to total OL volume).

Statistical evaluation

Statistical evaluations were performed in R (version 3.3.0, Team 2016) using the ‘segmented’ package to analyze eye and brain metric scaling (Muggeo 2008). To assess allometries in eye structure and brain volumes in relation to worker size, least-squares means regression was used on log10-transformed values to estimate a and b in the scaling equation $y = aM^b$, as $\log(y) = \log(a) + b \times \log(M)$. To test the null hypothesis (H_0) of isometry, a separate linear model was calculated and tested against different slope values depending on the metric. The slope for H_0 were $b = 0.0$ (linear vs. constant values), $b = 1.0$ (linear vs. linear), $b = 2.0$ (linear vs. surface area) and $b = 3.0$ (linear vs. volume) (Kaspary and Weiser 1999).

The Davies test was used to detect a statistically significant change in slope or a ‘breakpoint’ in a linear relationship (Davies 2002). We observed that the significance of some changes in slope depended on a single data point; therefore, we accepted the change in slope only if its significance was always below 0.05 when removing any point from the dataset. The ‘segmented’ package was further used to estimate

the location of the breakpoint. If the Davies’ test revealed two piecewise linear relationships in a scaling relationship, least-squares means regression was calculated and tested against isometry independently.

To further explore whether increased investment in primary visual neuropil might have an impact in higher-order visual processing neuropil, we assessed allometry in the ratio of volumes of the optic lobes and MB collar according to HW. We also calculated a least-squares means regression on log10-transformed values and tested against isometry ($b = 0.0$).

Results

Eye structure


Larger workers had more ommatidia (Fig. 1b). The average number of ommatidia ($\pm \text{std}$) was 32.75 ± 17.88 in minims, 152.29 ± 61.17 in medias, and 354.70 ± 59.09 in majors. Our data showed a significant change in the scaling of ommatidia number and worker size (Davies test, $p < 0.001$) at a HW of 1.38 mm (95% CI 1.20–1.58 mm). Piecewise linear models calculated for both slopes were significant ($p < 0.001$, Multiple $R^2 = 0.989$) with a slope shift from 2.03 (95% CI 1.91–2.13) to 1.35 (95% CI 1.25–1.45). Piecewise linear models were also significantly different from isometry ($b = 0$; $p < 0.001$). Larger workers also had larger ommatidial diameter (Fig. 1c). The relationship between ommatidial diameter and worker size showed no significant breakpoint (Davies test, $p > 0.5$), and these variables were significantly correlated ($F_{(1,90)} = 1217$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.93$). The slope of the regression line was 0.25 (95% CI 0.24–0.27), which was significantly different from isometry ($b = 1.0$; $F_{(1,90)} = 1217$, $p < 0.001$).

Larger workers had larger eyes (Fig. 1d). Davies’ test showed a significant change in the scaling of total eye size (eye surface area) and worker size ($p < 0.001$) at a HW of 1.44 mm (95% CI 1.20–1.72 mm). Piecewise linear models calculated for both slopes were significant ($p < 0.001$, Multiple $R^2 = 0.988$) with a slope shift from 2.52 (95% CI 2.36–2.68) to 1.84 (95% CI 1.70–1.97). Piecewise linear models were significantly different from isometry ($b = 2.0$; $p < 0.001$), although the effect size was small.

Smaller workers had more densely packed ommatidia (Fig. 1e). The relationship between the density of ommatidia and worker size showed no significant breakpoint (Davies test, $p > 0.5$ and these variables showed a significant correlation ($F_{(1,90)} = 1217$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.93$). The slope was -0.50 (95% CI -0.53 to -0.48), also significantly different from isometry ($b = 0.0$; $F_{(1,90)} = 1217$, $p < 0.001$).

Smaller workers had larger interommatidial angles (Fig. 1f). Average ($\pm \text{std}$) interommatidial angle was

Fig. 2 Volumes of polymorphic *A. cephalotes* worker brains and brain compartments. **a** 3D reconstruction of the brain hemisphere of an *A. cephalotes* worker (HW ~ 4 mm) [LA = lamina, ME = medulla, LO = lobula, CO = collar, MB-CA = mushroom body calyx, MB-PE = mushroom body peduncle, CX = central complex, SEZ = subesophageal zone, AL = antennal lobe]. **b** Log–log plot of hemisphere brain volume as a function of worker HW. **c** Log–log plot of relative optic lobe (OL) volume as a function of worker HW. **d** Log–log plot of relative volume of OL lamina (LA) as a function of worker HW. **e** Log–log plot of relative volume of OL medulla (ME) as a function of worker HW. **f** Log–log plot of relative volume of OL lobula (LO) as a function of worker HW. **g** Log–log plot of relative MB collar volume (CO) as a function of worker HW. **h** Log–log plot of MB collar: OL volume ratio (CO/OL) as a function of worker HW. **b–e** Legend as in Fig. 1



0.81 ± 0.19 radians for minims, 0.44 ± 0.07 for medias, and 0.34 ± 0.05 for majors. The Davies' test for a change in slope showed a significant change in the scaling relationship between interommatidial angle and worker size ($p < 0.001$) at a HW of 1.25 mm (95% CI 1.03–1.51 mm). Piecewise linear models were calculated for both slopes and found to be significant ($p < 0.001$, Multiple $R^2 = 0.84$), with a slope shift from -0.98 (95% CI -1.21 to -0.76) to -0.33 (95% CI -0.43 to -0.23). Piecewise linear models were also significantly different from isometry ($b = 0$; $p < 0.001$).

Eye parameter decreased with worker size in minims, but was low and showed high similarity among different size medias and majors (Fig. 1g). A significant change (Davies' test, $p < 0.001$) in the scaling relationship between eye parameter and worker size was found at a HW of 1.26 mm (95% CI 1.01–1.57 mm). Piecewise linear models were calculated for both slopes and found to be significant ($p < 0.001$, Multiple $R^2 = 0.588$) with a slope shift from -0.73 (95% CI -0.95 to -0.51) to -0.07 (95% CI -0.20 to 0.05). The first segment of the piecewise linear models was significantly different from isometry ($b = 0$; $p < 0.001$), but the second segment was not ($b = 0$; $p = 0.205$).

Brain structure

Larger workers had significantly larger brains (Fig. 2b). The relationship between brain volume and worker size showed no significant breakpoint (Davies test, $p > 0.05$) and these variables showed a significant positive correlation ($F_{(1,61)} = 13.91$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.18$) with a slope of 0.37 (95% CI 0.17 – 0.56) significantly different from isometry ($b = 3.0$; $F_{(1,61)} = 13.91$, $p < 0.001$). Larger workers had disproportionately larger OL (Fig. 2c). Relative OL volume and worker size showed a significant positive correlation ($F_{(1,61)} = 271.2$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.81$) with no significant breakpoint (Davies test, $p = 1$). The slope of the regression line was 0.76 (95% CI 0.67 – 0.85) significantly different from isometry ($b = 0.0$; $F_{(1,61)} = 271.2$, $p < 0.001$).

Within the OL, larger workers invested disproportionately more in the lamina (Fig. 2d). Relative lamina volume and HW showed a significant positive correlation ($F_{(1,61)} = 37.77$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.37$) with no significant breakpoint (Davies test, $p > 0.05$). The slope of the regression line was 0.64 (95% CI 0.43 – 0.85) and significantly different from isometry ($b = 0.0$; $F_{(1,61)} = 37.77$, $p < 0.001$). In contrast, smaller workers invested disproportionately more in the medulla (Fig. 2e). Relative medulla volume and HW showed a significant negative correlation ($F_{(1,61)} = 51.1$, $p < 0.001$, R^2 of 0.45) with no significant breakpoint (Davies test, $p > 0.05$) and a slope of -0.17 (95% CI -0.21 to -0.12), significantly different from isometry ($b = 0.0$; $F_{(1,61)} = 51.1$, $p < 0.001$). Finally, as for the lamina, larger workers invested disproportionately more in lobula (Fig. 2f). Relative lobula volume and HW

showed a significant positive correlation ($F_{(1,61)} = 13.43$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.17$) and no significant breakpoint (Davies test, $p = 0.362$). The slope of the regression line was 0.21 (95% CI: 0.10 to 0.32) significantly different from isometry ($b = 0.0$; $F_{(1,61)} = 13.43$, $p < 0.001$).

Larger workers also invested relatively more in the MB collar (Fig. 2g). Relative collar volume and worker size showed a significant positive correlation ($F_{(1,61)} = 13.03$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.16$) and no significant breakpoint (Davies test, $p = 0.42$). The slope of the regression line was 0.19 (95% CI 0.08 – 0.29), which was significantly different from isometry ($b = 0.0$; $F_{(1,61)} = 13.03$, $p < 0.001$). Despite investing more in the MB collar, larger workers had a lower collar:OL volume ratio (Fig. 2h). The relationship between this ratio and worker size showed a significant negative correlation ($F_{(1,61)} = 67.17$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.52$), no significant breakpoint (Davies test, $p = 0.69$), and a slope of -0.57 (95% CI -0.71 to -0.43), significantly different from isometry ($b = 0.0$; $F_{(1,61)} = 67.17$, $p < 0.001$).

Discussion

Our results show that differences in worksite sensory ecology appear to select for visual system polyphenism in the polymorphic leafcutter ant *A. cephalotes*. Division of labor in this species is associated with variation in light levels and is strongly correlated with worker body size: minims tend fungi deep underground, medias harvest leaves from their habitat and labor inside the nest, and majors appear to exclusively perform defense and trail maintenance outside the nest. We found that compound eye structure and visual neuropil scaling vary with worker size according to demands for adaptive behavior in relation to worksite light availability.

Division of labor and eye structure in *A. cephalotes*

Given the variation in the spatial distribution of workers and their tasks, we expected the eyes of minims to structurally enable light sensitivity over resolution, whereas larger worker eyes were predicted to favor spatial resolution over sensitivity. It is unclear how minims make use of visual information and what level of spatial resolution and sensitivity is needed to work effectively on the fungal comb. Minims, however, perform some tasks outside the nest, “hitch-hiking” on transported leaves during day and night to defend against fly parasites (Linksvayer et al. 2016). We found that the number and size of ommatidia and eye surface area were significantly smaller in minims, suggesting less capacity to capture light and less reliance on vision to perform their tasks. The larger ommatidia of media and major workers indicate greater sensitivity to light. However, ommatidia size increased hypometrically with body size: although the

ommatidia of minims were the smallest, relative ommatidia size was greater in minims than in medias and majors. This may enable minim worker eyes to collect more light than expected from their size, suggesting adaptation to darkness and light (Greiner 2006; Yilmaz et al. 2014). Alternatively, the small size of minim worker eyes and ommatidia may be due to a body size constraint: eye size is as large as developmentally possible to ensure at least a marginal ability to capture light, which may be needed to detect and defend against parasitic flies. Minims also showed a higher density of ommatidia than media and majors. When compared with other ant species that overlap in body size (*Temnothorax rugulatus*, *Solenopsis invicta*, *S. richteri*), the eyes of size-matched *A. cephalotes* workers showed slightly larger but considerably fewer ommatidia (Baker and Ma 2006; Ramirez-Esquivel et al. 2017), and larger interommatidial angles (Ramirez-Esquivel et al. 2017). Although this suggests a greater light sensitivity in *A. cephalotes* minims, additional research is needed for confirmation.

Interommatidial angle decreased with worker size, indicating greater visual acuity in larger workers. Eye parameter values were significantly larger for minims, but for larger workers, values were lower and not correlated with size. This suggests minim worker eyes are adapted to enhance sensitivity rather than acuity, whereas larger worker eyes structure has been selected for sensitivity and acuity. Higher acuity is adaptive outside the nest, allowing the resolution of more distant objects. The significant breakpoints (HW 1.0–1.8 mm) found in the linear regressions for ommatidia number, eye surface area, interommatidial angle and eye parameter suggest structural changes to accommodate the body size-associated transition between inside and outside nest division of labor in *A. cephalotes*. Comparisons of eye structure between diurnal, cathemeral, and nocturnal ant (Greiner et al. 2007; Narendra et al. 2013; Yilmaz et al. 2014; Ogawa et al. 2019) and bee species (Greiner et al. 2004) are generally consistent with our findings.

Although lens size and number determine light sensitivity and visual acuity, variations in the size of rhabdomeres (Greiner et al. 2004; Gonzalez-Bellido et al. 2011; Narendra et al. 2017), microsaccadic rhabdomere contractions and microvilli refractory time (Juusola et al. 2016) or, pupillary systems mediated by pigment ommatidial cells (Narendra et al. 2013, 2016a) modify visual abilities. Detailed visual adaptations in *A. cephalotes* polymorphic workers remain to be studied.

Division of labor and visual neuropil size and structure

In ant species characterized by morphological differentiated subcastes, workers are predicted to vary neurobiologically to support the sensory demands of specialized tasks

(Muscadere and Traniello 2012; Kamhi et al. 2015; Gordon et al. 2019). If metabolic costs associated with brain production and maintenance is high, then selection should favor the reduction of neuropil size (e.g. Aiello and Wheeler 1995; Niven and Laughlin 2008). We found that brain volume increased with worker size, but larger workers had brains smaller than expected from their body size. We expected *A. cephalotes* workers would invest differentially in brain compartments due to their body size-related task repertoires. Age and experience are associated with changes in volume and synaptic structure in ant brain neuropils (Gronenberg et al. 1996; Kühn-Bühlmann and Wehner 2006; Stieb et al. 2010; Muscadere and Traniello 2012; Falibene et al. 2015; Kamhi et al. 2017; Yilmaz et al. 2019). In our study worker age was unlikely to affect our results, because we consistently sampled mature, fully pigmented workers across the size distribution. Nevertheless, visual experience likely differs among workers that perform tasks inside or outside the nest, and we anticipate additional neurobiological correlates will be identified in future studies. We found that larger workers had larger eyes and an allometric increase in OL volume. Conversely, some diurnal moths have smaller eyes but larger optic lobes than nocturnal species (Stöckl et al. 2016), a pattern also found in visual brain regions in teleost fishes (Iglesias et al. 2018). *A. cephalotes* OL were disproportionately larger in larger workers, and consistent with our prediction, minims showed disproportionately less OL investment. This suggests a task-related increasing need for primary visual information processing in larger workers.

Our analysis revealed that lamina, medulla and lobula increased with worker size (Fig. S1), perhaps due to higher exposure to light in larger workers active outside the nest (Yilmaz et al. 2016). Within the OLs, larger workers possessed disproportionately larger lamina and lobula, but a disproportionately smaller medulla. These OL subregion allometries suggest that minims might be better at detecting small-field motion whereas larger workers might be better at processing contrast, wide-field motion, shape, and panorama information. This neuroplasticity seems to adaptively support *A. cephalotes* worker task specialization inside and outside the nest. We also found disproportional investment in the MB collar in larger workers. Enlarged MBs in social hymenopterans might be the result of ancestral neuroanatomical adaptations to process novel visual information (Farris 2016). This evolutionary scenario across phylogenetically diverse ant species appears to be reflected in *A. cephalotes* subcastes that vary in visual ecologies. Our results suggest that the increased need for visual cognition in larger workers is greater for primary processing than for higher-order processing. In *Myrmecia* species, nocturnal workers invested relatively less in OL but relatively more in the MB, including the collar, than diurnal workers (Sheehan et al. 2019). Our results show that minims had the highest collar:optic

lobe ratio, apparently as an adaptation to performing tasks in darkness. Collaterally, studies of gene expression differences in whole brains of *A. cephalotes* subcastes revealed a significant worker size-related increase in the level of a gene associated with rod cell development, mirroring the higher demand for visual acuity and larger eye structures in larger workers (Muratore et al., unpublished data). This trend was also true for a gene associated with growth factor activity, potentially contributing to the allometric OL enlargement and other brain regions.

Conclusion

We found optical and neural plasticity are associated with the complex agrarian division of labor of *A. cephalotes* workers. Previous studies have described differences in worker eye structure (Menzel and Wehner 1970; Bernstein and Finn 1971; Klotz et al. 1992; Baker and Ma 2006; Schwarz et al. 2011) or visual neuropil investment (O'Donnell et al. 2018). Our results advance our understanding of ant visual system structure and function by demonstrating worker subcaste-related compound eye and brain plasticity in response to different worksite light levels. Worker polymorphism has been shown to be correlated with patriline in the several leafcutting ant species (Hughes et al. 2003; Evison and Hughes 2011), suggesting a potential link between genetic variation and the neuroanatomical patterns described here. Division of labor underpinning the fungicultural habits of *A. cephalotes* appears to have played an important selective role in worker visual system evolution. Worker behavior in this species, however, depends on visual and olfactory information that likely varies with the cognitive requirements of tasks. The influence of these factors on the spatial resolving power and sensitivity of eyes and macroscopic and cellular structure of *A. cephalotes* brains requires further study.

Acknowledgements We are very grateful for the assistance of Dr. Darcy Gordon (study design, scaling analysis, and statistics), Dr. Christopher Starr and Ricardo “Monkey” Pillai (colony collection), Dr. Todd Blute (confocal microscopy), Dr. Alfonso Pérez-Escudero (data analysis and interpretation), Dr. J. Frances Kamhi (insightful comments on the manuscript), and two anonymous reviewers (constructive and expert comments). This research was supported by National Science Foundation grant IOS 1354291 to JFAT, a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Individual Fellowship BrainiAnts-660976 and Ayudas destinadas a la atracción de talento investigador a la Comunidad de Madrid en centros de I+D to SA, the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program at Boston University to ESR, and a National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship (DGE-1247312) to APH. Ant colonies were collected and exported in compliance with the laws of Trinidad and Tobago2, imported to USA with a global ant import permit (USDA APHIS P526P-18-02405), and maintained in the laboratory under optimal conditions for growth.

Author contributions APH and ESR prepared brains for imaging and registered images; APH, ESR and SA analyzed neuropil volumes; ESR initiated and designed the eye metric imaging protocol, registered eye

images, and measured eye structure; APH and SA performed statistical analysis; APH collected ant colonies; IBM analyzed confocal images and contributed to manuscript content; ESR and APH prepared the first draft of the manuscript; JFAT, APH, ESR, and SA conceptualized and designed the study. JFAT secured funding for the study; JFAT and SA wrote the manuscript. All authors edited and approved the final content of the manuscript.

Funding National Science Foundation grant IOS 1354291, a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Individual Fellowship BrainiAnts-660976, Ayudas destinadas a la atracción de talento investigador a la Comunidad de Madrid en centros de I+D, the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program at Boston University, and a National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship (DGE-1247312).

Data availability Data available in figshare <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.11829564>.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

- Abràmoff MD, Hospitals I, Magalhães PJ, Abràmoff M (2004) Image processing with ImageJ. *Biophotonics Int* 11:36–42
- Aiello L, Wheeler P (1995) The expensive-tissue hypothesis: the brain and the digestive system in human and primate evolution. *Curr Anthropol* 36:199–221
- Baker GT, Ma PWK (2006) Morphology and number of ommatidia in the compound eyes of *Solenopsis invicta*, *Solenopsis richteri*, and their hybrid (Hymenoptera: Formicidae). *Zool Anz* 245:121–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcz.2006.06.001>
- Bernstein S, Finn C (1971) Ant compound eye: size-related ommatidium differences within a single wood ant nest. *Experientia* 27:708–710. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02136977>
- Beugnon G, Fourcassié V (1988) How do red wood ants orient during diurnal and nocturnal foraging in a three dimensional system? II. Field experiments. *Insectes Soc* 35:106–124
- Beugnon G, Lachaud JP, Chagné P (2005) Use of long-term stored vector information in the neotropical ant *Gigantiops destructor*. *J Insect Behav* 18:415–432. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10905-005-3700-8>
- Bucher D, Scholz M, Stetter M et al (2000) Correction methods for three-dimensional reconstructions from confocal images: I. Tissue shrinking and axial scaling. *J Neurosci Methods* 100:135–143. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0270\(00\)00245-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0270(00)00245-4)
- Bulova SJ, Purce K, Khodak P, Obermayerb K, Pflügera H-J (2016) Into the black and back: the ecology of brain investment in Neotropical army ants (Formicidae: Dorylinae). *Sci Nat* 103:31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00114-016-1353-4>
- Cherrett JM (1968) The foraging behaviour of *Atta cephalotes* L. (Hymenoptera, Formicidae). *J Anim Ecol* 37:387. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2955>
- Corral-López A, Garate-Olaizola M, Buechel SD, Kolm N, Kotrschal A (2017) On the role of body size, brain size, and eye size in visual acuity. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 71:179. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-017-2408-z>
- Czaczkes TJ, Grüter C, Ratnieks FLW (2015) Trail pheromones, an integrative view of their role in social insect colony organization.

Annu Rev Entomol 60:581–599. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-010814-020627>

Davies R (2002) Hypothesis testing when a nuisance parameter is present only under the alternative: linear model case. Biometrika 89:484–489

Dyer AG, Paulk AC, Reser DH (2011) Colour processing in complex environments: insights from the visual system of bees. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci 278:952–959. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2010.2412>

Ehmer B, Gronenberg W (2004) Mushroom body volumes and visual interneurons in ants: comparison between sexes and castes. J Comp Neurol 469:198–213. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cne.11014>

Evanson S, Hughes WO (2011) Genetic caste polymorphism and the evolution of polyandry in *Atta* leaf-cutting ants. Naturwissenschaften 98:643–649. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00114-011-0810-3>

Falibene A, Roces F, Rössler W (2015) Long-term avoidance memory formation is associated with a transient increase in mushroom body synaptic complexes in leaf-cutting ants. Front Behav Neurosci 9:1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2015.00084>

Farris SM (2016) Insect societies and the social brain. Curr Opin Insect Sci. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cois.2016.01.010>

Freas CA, Wystrach A, Narendra A, Cheng K (2018) The view from the trees: nocturnal bull ants, *Myrmecia midas*, use the surrounding panorama while descending from trees. Front Psychol 9:1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00016>

Gonzalez-Bellido PT, Wardill TJ, Juusola M (2011) Compound eyes and retinal information processing in miniature dipteran species match their specific ecological demands. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 108:4224–4229. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1014438108>

Gordon DG, Ilieş I, Traniello JFA (2017) Behavior, brain, and morphology in a complex insect society: trait integration and social evolution in the exceptionally polymorphic ant *Pheidole rhea*. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 71:166. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-017-2396-z>

Gordon DG, Zelaya A, Arganda-Carreras I, Arganda S, Traniello JFA (2019) Division of labor and brain evolution in insect societies: neurobiology of extreme specialization in the turtle ant *Cephalotes varians*. PLoS ONE 14:1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0213618>

Graham P, Cheng K (2009) Ants use the panoramic skyline as a visual cue during navigation. Curr Biol 19:R935–R937. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2009.08.015>

Greiner B (2006) Adaptations for nocturnal vision in insect apposition eyes. Int Rev Cytol 250:1–46. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0074-7696\(06\)50001-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0074-7696(06)50001-4)

Greiner B, Ribi WA, Warrant EJ (2004) Retinal and optical adaptations for nocturnal vision in the halictid bee *Megalopta genalis*. Cell Tissue Res 316:377–390. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00441-004-0883-9>

Greiner B, Narendra A, Reid SF, Dacke M, Ribi WA, Zeil J (2007) Eye structure correlates with distinct foraging-bout timing in primitive ants. Curr Biol 17:879–880. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2007.08.015>

Gronenberg W (2001) Subdivisions of hymenopteran mushroom body calyces by their afferent supply. J Comp Neurol 435:474–489. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cne.1045>

Gronenberg W (2008) Structure and function of ant (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) brains: strength in numbers. Myrmecol News 11:25–36

Gronenberg W, Hölldobler B (1999) Morphologic representation of visual and antennal information in the ant brain. J Comp Neurol 412:229–240. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1096-9861\(19990920\)412:2%3c229:AID-CNE4%3e3.0.CO;2-E](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1096-9861(19990920)412:2%3c229:AID-CNE4%3e3.0.CO;2-E)

Gronenberg W, Heeren S, Hölldobler B (1996) Age-dependent and task-related morphological changes in the brain and the mushroom bodies of the ant *Camponotus floridanus*. J Exp Biol 199:2011–2019

Hodgson ES (1955) An ecological study of the behavior of the leaf-cutting ant *Atta cephalotes*. Ecology 36:293–304. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1933235>

Hölldobler B (1980) Canopy orientation: a new kind of orientation in ants. Science 210:86–88

Hölldobler B, Wilson EO (1990) The ants. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA

Hölldobler B, Wilson EO (2010) The leafcutter ants: civilization by instinct. WW Norton & Company, New York

Huber R, Knaden M (2015) Egocentric and geocentric navigation during extremely long foraging paths of desert ants. J Comp Physiol A Neuroethol Sens Neural Behav Physiol 201:609–616. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00359-015-0998-3>

Hughes WO, Sumner S, Van Borm S, Boomsma JJ (2003) Worker caste polymorphism has a genetic basis in *Acromyrmex* leaf-cutting ants. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 100:9394–9397. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1633701100>

Iglesias TL, Dornburg A, Warren DL, Wainwright PC, Schmitz L, Economo EP (2018) Eyes wide shut: the impact of dim-light vision on neural investment in marine teleosts. J Evol Biol 31:1082–1092. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.13299>

Jaffé K, Ramos C, Lagalla C, Parra L (1990) Orientation cues used by ants. Insectes Soc 37:101–115. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF0224024>

Jander U, Jander R (2002) Allometry and resolution of bee eyes (Apoidea). Arthropod Struct Dev 30:179–193. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1467-8039\(01\)00035-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1467-8039(01)00035-4)

Juusola M, Dau A, Song Z, Solanki N, Rien D, Jaciuch D, Dongre S, Blanchard F, de Polavieja GG, Hardie RC, Takalo J (2016) Micro-saccadic information sampling provides *Drosophila* hyperacute vision. Elife 6:e26117. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.26117>

Kamhi JF, Nunn K, Robson SKA, Traniello JFA (2015) Polymorphism and division of labour in a socially complex ant: neuromodulation of aggression in the Australian weaver ant *Oecophylla smaragdina*. Proc Biol Sci 282:20150704. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.0704>

Kamhi JF, Sandridge-Gresko A, Walker C, Robson SKA, Traniello JFA (2017) Worker brain development and colony organization in ants: does division of labor influence neuroplasticity? Dev Neurobiol 77:1072–1085. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dneu.22496>

Kapustjanskij A, Streinzer M, Paulus HF, Spaethe J (2007) Bigger is better: implications of body size for flight ability under different light conditions and the evolution of alloethism in bumblebees. Funct Ecol 21:1130–1136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2007.01329.x>

Kaspari M, Weiser MD (1999) The size-grain hypothesis and interspecific scaling in ants. Funct Ecol 13:530–538. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2435.1999.00343.x>

Klotz JH, Reid BL, Gordon WC (1992) Variation of ommatidia number as a function of worker size in *Camponotus pennsylvanicus* (DeGeer) (Hymenoptera: Formicidae). Insectes Soc 39:233–236. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01249297>

Knaden M, Graham P (2016) The sensory ecology of ant navigation: from natural environments to neural mechanisms. Annu Rev Entomol 61:63–76. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-010715-023703>

Kühn-Bühlmann S, Wehner R (2006) Age-dependent and task-related volume changes in the mushroom bodies of visually guided desert ants, *Cataglyphis bicolor*. J Neurobiol 66:511–521. <https://doi.org/10.1002/neu.20235>

Land MF (1997) Visual acuity in insects. Annu Rev Entomol 42:147–177. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ento.42.1.147>

Linksvayer TA, Mccall AC, Jensen RM, Marshall CM, Miner JW, McKone MJ (2016) The function of hitchhiking behavior in the leaf-cutting ant *Atta cephalotes*. Biotropica 34:93–100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7429.2002.tb00245.x>

Mares S, Ash L, Gronenberg W (2005) Brain allometry in bumblebee and honey bee workers. *Brain Behav Evol* 66:50–61. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000085047>

McIntyre P, Caveney S (1998) Superposition optics and the time of flight in onitine dung beetles. *J Comp Physiol A* 183:45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s003590050233>

Menzel R, Wehner R (1970) Augenstrukturen bei verschiedenen großen Arbeiterinnen von *Cataglyphis bicolor* Fabr. (Formicidae, Hymenoptera). *Z Vgl Physiol* 68:446–449. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00297741>

Menzi U (1987) Visual adaptation in nocturnal and diurnal ants. *J Comp Physiol A* 160:11–21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00613437>

Moser JC, Reeve JD, Bento JMS, Della Lucia TMC, Scott Cameron R, Heck NM (2004) Eye size and behaviour of day- and night-flying leafcutting ant alates. *J Zool* 264:69–75. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0952836904005527>

Muggeo VRM (2008) segmented: an R package to fit regression models with broken-line relationships. *R News* 3:343–344. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000323281>

Muller M, Wehner R (2006) The significance of direct sunlight and polarized skylight in the ant's celestial system of navigation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 103:12575. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0604430103>

Müller M, Wehner R (2010) Path integration provides a scaffold for landmark learning in desert ants. *Curr Biol* 20:1368–1371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2010.06.035>

Muscedere ML, Traniello JFA (2012) Division of labor in the hyperdiverse ant genus *Pheidole* is associated with distinct subcaste- and age-related patterns of worker brain organization. *PLoS ONE* 7:e31618. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0031618>

Narendra A, Reid SF, Greiner B, Peters RA, Hemmi JM, Ribi WA, Zeil J (2011) Caste-specific visual adaptations to distinct daily activity schedules in Australian *Myrmecia* ants. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 278:1141–1149. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2010.1378>

Narendra A, Alkaladi A, Raderschall CA, Robson SKA, Ribi WA (2013) Compound eye adaptations for diurnal and nocturnal lifestyle in the intertidal ant *Polyrhachis sokolova*. *PLoS ONE* 8:e76015. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0076015>

Narendra A, Greiner B, Ribi WA, Zeil J (2016a) Light and dark adaptation mechanisms in the compound eyes of *Myrmecia* ants that occupy discrete temporal niches. *J Exp Biol* 219:2435–2442. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.142018>

Narendra A, Ramirez-Esquivel F, Ribi WA (2016b) Compound eye and ocellar structure for walking and flying modes of locomotion in the Australian ant, *Camponotus consobrinus*. *Sci Rep* 6:1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep22331>

Narendra A, Kamhi JF, Ogawa Y (2017) Moving in dim light: behavioral and visual adaptations in nocturnal ants. *Integr Comp Biol* 57:1104–1116. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icx096>

Niven JE, Laughlin SB (2008) Energy limitation as a selective pressure on the evolution of sensory systems. *J Exp Biol* 211:1792–1804. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.017574>

O'Donnell S, Clifford MR, Bulova SJ, DeLeon S, Papa C, Zahedi N (2014) A test of neuroecological predictions using paperwasp caste differences in brain structure (Hymenoptera: Vespidae). *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 68:529–536. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-013-1667-6>

O'Donnell S, Bulova S, Barrett M, Von Beeren C (2018) Brain investment under colony-level selection: soldier specialization in *Ectiton* army ants (Formicidae: Dorylinae). *BMC Zool* 3:1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40850-018-0028-3>

Ogawa Y, Ryan LA, Palavalli-Nettimi R, Seeger O, Hart NS, Narendra A (2019) Spatial resolving power and contrast sensitivity are adapted for ambient light conditions in Australian *Myrmecia* ants. *Front Ecol Evol* 7:1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2019.00018>

Ott SR (2008) Confocal microscopy in large insect brains: zinc-formaldehyde fixation improves synapsin immunostaining and preservation of morphology in whole-mounts. *J Neurosci Methods* 172:220–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2008.04.031>

Palavalli-Nettimi R, Narendra A (2018) Miniaturisation decreases visual navigational competence in ants. *J Exp Biol* 221:jeb177238. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.177238>

Perl CD, Niven JE (2016a) Colony-level differences in the scaling rules governing wood ant compound eye structure. *Sci Rep* 6:1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep24204>

Perl CD, Niven JE (2016b) Differential scaling within an insect compound eye. *Biol Lett*. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2016.0042>

Powell S, Clark E (2004) Combat between large derived societies: a subterranean army ant established as a predator of mature leaf-cutting ant colonies. *Insectes Soc* 51:342–351. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s0040-004-0752-2>

Ramirez-Esquivel F, Leitner NE, Zeil J, Narendra A (2017) The sensory arrays of the ant, *Temnothorax rugatulus*. *Arthropod Struct Dev* 46:552–563. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asd.2017.03.005>

Rodrigues PAP, Oliveira PS (2014) Visual navigation in the Neotropical ant *Odontomachus hastatus* (Formicidae, Ponerinae), a predominantly nocturnal, canopy-dwelling predator of the Atlantic rainforest. *Behav Process* 109:48–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2014.06.007>

Ronacher B, Wehner R (1995) Desert ants *Cataglyphis fortis* use self-induced optic flow to measure distances travelled. *J Comp Physiol A* 177:21–27. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00243395>

Rutowski RL, Gislén L, Warrant EJ (2009) Visual acuity and sensitivity increase allometrically with body size in butterflies. *Arthropod Struct Dev* 38:91–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asd.2008.08.003>

Schwarz S, Narendra A, Zeil J (2011) The properties of the visual system in the Australian desert ant *Melophorus bagoti*. *Arthropod Struct Dev* 40:128–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asd.2010.10.003>

Sheehan ZBV, Kamhi JF, Seid MA, Narendra A (2019) Differential investment in brain regions for a diurnal and nocturnal lifestyle in Australian *Myrmecia* ants. *J Comp Neurol* 527:1261–1277. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cne.24617>

Snyder AW (1977) Acuity of compound eyes: physical limitations and design. *J Comp Physiol A* 116:161–182. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00605401>

Somanathan H, Kelber A, Borges RM, Wallén R, Warrant EJ (2009) Visual ecology of Indian carpenter bees II: adaptations of eyes and ocelli to nocturnal and diurnal lifestyles. *J Comp Physiol A* 195:571–583. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00359-009-0432-9>

Spaethe J, Chittka L (2003) Interindividual variation of eye optics and single object resolution in bumblebees. *J Exp Biol* 206:3447–3453. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.00570>

Stieb SM, Muenz TS, Wehner R, Rössler W (2010) Visual experience and age affect synaptic organization in the mushroom bodies of the desert ant *Cataglyphis fortis*. *Dev Neurobiol* 70:408–423. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dneu.20785>

Stieb SM, Hellwig A, Wehner R, Rössler W (2012) Visual experience affects both behavioral and neuronal aspects in the individual life history of the desert ant *Cataglyphis fortis*. *Dev Neurobiol* 72:729–742. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dneu.20982>

Stöckl A, Heinze S, Charalabidis A, El Jundi B, Warrant E, Kelber A (2016) Differential investment in visual and olfactory brain areas reflects behavioural choices in hawk moths. *Sci Rep* 6:1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep26041>

Strausfeld NJ (1989) Beneath the compound eye: neuroanatomical analysis and physiological correlates in the study of insect vision. *Facets of Vision*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp 317–359

Streinzer M, Brockmann A, Nagaraja N, Spaethe J (2013) Sex and caste-specific variation in compound eye morphology of five honeybee species. *PLoS ONE* 8:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0057702>

Taylor GJ, Tichit P, Schmidt MD, Bodey AJ, Rau C, Baird E (2019) Bumblebee visual allometry results in locally improved resolution and globally improved sensitivity. *Elife* 8:1–32. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.40613>

Team RC (2016) R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R. Found. Stat. Comput., Vienna

van Breda JM, Stradling DJ (1994) Mechanisms affecting load size determination in *Atta cephalotes* L. (Hymenoptera, Formicidae). *Insectes Soc* 41:423–435. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01240645>

Vick K (2005) Use of multiple cues for navigation by the leaf-cutter ant *Atta cephalotes*. University of Maryland, College Park, MD

Vilela EF, Jaffé K, Howse PE (1987) Orientation in leaf-cutting ants (Formicidae: Attini). *Anim Behav* 35:1443–1453. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472\(87\)80017-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(87)80017-9)

Warrant EJ (2008) Seeing in the dark: vision and visual behaviour in nocturnal bees and wasps. *J Exp Biol* 211:1737–1746. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.015396>

Wehner R (2003) Desert ant navigation: how miniature brains solve complex tasks. *J Comp Physiol A* 189:579–588. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00359-003-0431-1>

Wetterer JK (1991) Allometry and the geometry of leaf-cutting in *Atta cephalotes*. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 29:347–351. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00165959>

Wilson EO (1980) Caste and division of labor in leaf-cutter ants (Hymenoptera: Formicidae: *Atta*): II. The ergonomic optimization of leaf cutting. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 7:57–165

Yilmaz A, Aksoy V, Camlitepe Y, Giurfa M (2014) Eye structure, activity rhythms, and visually-driven behavior are tuned to visual niche in ants. *Front Behav Neurosci* 8:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2014.00205>

Yilmaz A, Lindenberg A, Albert S (2016) Age-related and light-induced plasticity in opsin gene expression and in primary and secondary visual centers of the nectar-feeding ant *Camponotus rufipes*. *Dev Neurobiol* 76:1041–1057. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dneu.22374>

Yilmaz A, Grübel K, Spaethe J, Rössler W (2019) Distributed plasticity in ant visual pathways following colour learning. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci*. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.2813>

Zeil J, Ribi WA, Narendra A (2014) Polarisation vision in ants, bees and wasps. In: *Polarized Light and Polarization Vision in Animal Sciences*, 2nd edn, pp 41–60

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.