



Males respond to substrate-borne, not airborne, female chemical cues in the jumping spider, *Habronattus pyrrithrix* (Araneae: Salticidae)

Authors: Humbel, Ellen A., Kimball, Rebecca T., and Taylor, Lisa A.

Source: The Journal of Arachnology, 49(2) : 262-267

Published By: American Arachnological Society

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1636/JoA-S-20-055>

BioOne Complete (complete.BioOne.org) is a full-text database of 200 subscribed and open-access titles in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences published by nonprofit societies, associations, museums, institutions, and presses.

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Complete website, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at www.bioone.org/terms-of-use.

Usage of BioOne Complete content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non - commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

BioOne sees sustainable scholarly publishing as an inherently collaborative enterprise connecting authors, nonprofit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, and research funders in the common goal of maximizing access to critical research.

SHORT COMMUNICATION

Males respond to substrate-borne, not airborne, female chemical cues in the jumping spider, *Habronattus pyrrithrix* (Araneae: Salticidae)

Ellen A. Humbel^{1,2}, Rebecca T. Kimball¹, and Lisa A. Taylor^{2,3}: ¹Department of Biology, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611 USA; E-mail: ellenhumbel@gmail.com; ²Entomology and Nematology Department, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611 USA; ³Florida Museum of Natural History, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611 USA

Abstract. Jumping spiders are known for complex courtship displays with both visual and vibratory components, but increasing evidence shows they also use chemoreception in intraspecific communication. We conducted two experiments using *Habronattus pyrrithrix* (Chamberlin, 1924) to assess male response to substrate-borne or airborne chemical cues produced by virgin females. First, we tested the effect of substrate-borne cues by allowing males to inspect two pieces of filter paper that had either been exposed to a female (thus covered in silk and/or excreta) or not (control). Second, we used a Y-tube olfactometer to test male response to female airborne cues versus a no-odor control in the absence of substrate-borne cues. Males responded to substrate-borne cues (spending more time traversing and palpating female-treated filter paper compared with the control) but did not respond to airborne cues alone. Together, these experiments suggest male *H. pyrrithrix* may use contact chemical cues from female silk to locate or assess females.

Keywords: Salticidae, chemical ecology, sexual selection, mate searching

<https://doi.org/10.1636/JoA-S-20-055>

The study of animal sensory systems has long been susceptible to the bias of human perception, as evidenced by a widespread focus on animal vision and visual traits (Caves et al. 2019). While visual systems are crucial for survival and reproduction in many animals, other sensory modalities are often pivotal to an animal's success. One especially important but relatively understudied sensory modality is chemoreception (Yarmolinsky et al. 2009; Wyatt 2014; Li & Liberles 2015). Chemical ecology is a growing field of research that aims to elucidate the role of chemical interactions between organisms and their environment. Myriad animals use chemical cues in foraging, mate detection, mate attraction, and predator avoidance (Eisner & Meinwald 1996). Many of these animals have excellent vision or use other sensory modalities such as mechanoreception (auditory or vibratory) to perform some of the above functions yet also use chemoreception (Eisner & Meinwald 1996).

In species where males face the acute risk of pre-copulatory sexual cannibalism, such as many spiders (Elgar & Schneider 2004; Gavín-Centol et al. 2017), males might benefit from assessing female cues, as a female could be either a prospective mate or a potential predator. Thus, male spiders should be somewhat choosy if it means reducing the risk of being cannibalized before they can reproduce. It has been demonstrated that chemical cues produced by female spiders can contain information about female physiological state, which sometimes corresponds with female aggression (Roberts & Uetz 2005; Stoltz et al. 2007; Perampaladas et al. 2008; Johnson et al. 2011; Thomas 2011; Gavín-Centol et al. 2017). Thus, chemical cues could be one way for males to assess the likelihood of female aggression prior to approach. Supporting this idea, some male spiders alter their courtship behavior in response to chemical cues carried by air and/or in association with a mature female's silk (Schulz & Toft 1993; Aisenberg et al. 2010; Baruffaldi & Costa 2010, 2014; Johnson et al. 2011). It is possible that chemical cues play an important role in sexually cannibalistic spiders, even in species that largely rely on vision in courtship and foraging.

Jumping spiders (family Salticidae) often display colorful scales during energetic courtship dances, which are important in mate choice

in some species (Li et al. 2008; Lim et al. 2008), but other sensory modalities are known to be involved in salticid courtship. In some species, females use mechanoreception to assess unique vibrations produced by males (Elias et al. 2004, 2005). Chemoreceptive capacity has been established in several salticid species (Jackson 1987; Clark & Jackson 1995; Clark et al. 2000; Hoefler 2007; Jackson & Cross 2011) but its behavioral role in courtship has been demonstrated most clearly in *Evarcha culicivora* Wesolowska & Jackson, 2003, a Kenyan mosquito specialist. *Evarcha culicivora* females prefer males that have recently fed on blood-filled female mosquitoes and are able to use airborne chemical cues to identify both mosquitoes that have recently ingested a blood meal and male conspecifics who have eaten such mosquitoes (Cross & Jackson 2009; Cross et al. 2009). *Evarcha culicivora* females appear to be unique in their reliance on male chemical cues; female salticids, in general, are less responsive to chemical cues produced by males than males are to chemical cues produced by females in most other species studied (Jackson 1987; Nelson et al. 2012). The predominance of chemical cue responsiveness in males suggests that most male salticids are not using chemical cues to attract mates but are perceiving and potentially using chemical cues produced by females during courtship.

The genus *Habronattus* F.O. Pickard-Cambridge, 1901 is one of the most speciose genera of salticids and is known for its wide array of elaborate courtship displays (Maddison & Hedin 2003a). Visual and vibratory signaling has been well-explored in *Habronattus* (Elias et al. 2004, 2005, 2012; Taylor et al. 2011, 2014), but so far there has been no work on chemoreception in this genus. We conducted two experiments in *Habronattus pyrrithrix* (Chamberlin, 1924) by assessing male response to chemical cues from virgin females. We designed these experiments to determine whether males respond to chemical cues at all and, if so, how these stimuli may be transmitted through the environment (e.g., whether they are airborne vs. substrate-borne). This information will serve as the foundation for future work on more biologically interesting questions, such as male preference for – or ability to distinguish between – chemical cues from different spider sources. Here, we first tested whether males responded to substrate-borne cues, such as may be detected from physically




Figure 1.—(a) Experiment 1 arena used to test male *H. pyrithrix* response to female chemical cues on filter paper vs. a no-odor control. Male shown in starting position in small 3 cm dish within large 9 cm dish; note that the placement (left vs. right) of the control and female-treated filter paper was randomized for each trial; (b) Results of Experiment 1 showing male response to virgin female chemical cues measured by time males spent (mean \pm SE) on female-treated filter paper vs. untreated (control) filter paper; and (c) the number of male palpation behaviors (mean \pm SE) on female-treated filter paper vs. untreated (control) filter paper. Asterisks indicate significant differences between treatment groups.

contacting female silk or excreta. Second, we tested whether males responded to airborne cues.

Because the role of chemoreception is not known in this genus, we began with an approach to determine whether males responded to substrate-borne chemical cues produced by virgin females (Experiment 1). We first provided male spiders with a surface they could traverse, half of which had previously been occupied by a virgin female; the other half, untreated. Because we could not disentangle the role of substrate-borne cues from airborne cues using this method, we then narrowed our scope to determine whether males could detect chemical cues via airborne cues exclusively. Our second experiment (Experiment 2) was performed using an olfactometer to test male response to virgin female airborne cues alone. Both experiments were conducted using different groups of *H. pyrithrix* collected in Queen Creek, Arizona ($n = 223$; 138 females, 85 males). All females used in these experiments were captured as juveniles or penultimates and maintained in the lab until maturity, thus ensuring their status as virgins. Virgin females were used in experiments when their ages ranged from 7–14 days post-maturity, as this appears to be the period in which females of this species are highly receptive (L. Taylor; M. Ihle, unpublished data). We chose to use virgin females in both experiments because virgin female cues have been shown to elicit the strongest male response in other salticid species when tested against other spider-produced chemical cues (Jackson 1987; Clark & Jackson 1995; Hoefler 2007; Cross & Jackson 2009). It should be noted that the video analyses for both experiments were conducted blind, as trial identifiers contained no information to reveal the treatment of each side, and treatments were randomly assigned to each side when

preparing each trial. When data were input during video analysis, each observation was recorded as ‘right’ or ‘left’ rather than ‘female’ or ‘control’. Only after all videos were analyzed did we sync the individual observations to the database metadata and generate totals for each treatment by trial.

In Experiment 1, we conducted trials to test male response to substrate-borne chemical cues produced by virgin females vs. a no-odor control. Male spiders ($n = 34$) were placed in the center of a 9 cm petri dish with two half-pieces of filter paper (one female-treated and one control) (Fig. 1a). The female-treated paper was prepared by placing a virgin female spider ($n = 17$) in a clean, unused petri dish lined with filter paper upon which she could deposit silk and other excreta for 24 hours (following methods in Persons et al., 2001). Immediately after the filter paper was removed from the female’s dish, it was cut in half and divided between two clean, unused 9 cm petri dishes and paired with a piece of clean filter paper (no-odor control). The two halves of filter paper were separated by 2–4 mm to ensure female chemical cues were not transferred to the no-odor control paper. Each of these new 9 cm dishes constituted a test arena. Each female provided treated paper for two trials, but because each male was only used for one trial, no male-female pairing was repeated. The side of the dish (left vs. right in relation to the camera) to which each paper treatment was assigned was randomized in each trial to ensure there was no side bias. Trials were conducted within 5 minutes of arena preparation. A male spider was placed in a smaller 3 cm lidded petri dish which was then placed in the center of the larger petri dish, allowed 1 minute for acclimation, and released. The bottom of the 3




Figure 2.—(a) Experiment 2 olfactometer (not drawn to scale) used to test male *H. pyrithrix* response to airborne female chemical cues vs. a no-odor control. Male is shown in the starting position in the holding chamber before the removable screen was raised to release male into the test arm. Asterisks indicate a visually identifiable boundary at which the spider was considered to have entered the female arm or control arm. Note that the position of the stimulus (female) and control chambers were randomized for each trial; (b) Results of Experiment 2 showing the time males spent (mean \pm SE) in the female-treated stimulus arm vs. the no-odor control arm of a Y-tube olfactometer. NS indicates no significant difference between the two arms.

cm petri dish remained in the center of the larger one, providing a cue-free starting point (Fig. 1a).

These tests were recorded for video analysis to determine whether males responded to chemical cues produced by females. A trial began once the spider left the 3 cm petri dish and touched either piece of filter paper (Fig. 1a). Videos were analyzed for 30 minutes after that time point. We measured the total time that males spent on each filter paper treatment and the instances of palpating behavior per paper treatment to determine male preference. An instance of palpating behavior was recorded each time the male used both pedipalps (which are known to possess sensory hairs (Gaskett 2007)) to probe the substrate, and typically involved the male alternating between pedipalps for 1–3 seconds before moving to a new location. This behavior has been observed by males in relation to female nest silk in other salticid species (Jackson 1987; Jackson & Macnab 1989), lycosids (Hebets et al. 1996), and several other taxa (reviewed in Gaskett 2007). Once a male ceased palpation or changed location, any subsequent palpation was recorded as a separate instance. There was no evidence of male courtship behavior observed during trials. The time males spent on the rim or lid of the arena was not recorded, as female spiders had never contacted these surfaces.

All 34 males contacted both pieces of filter paper at some point during the 30-minute trials; 32 (94%) did so within the first 15 minutes. Males spent significantly more time on the female-treated paper (7.7 ± 0.61 minutes) versus the no-odor control (1.1 ± 0.14 minutes; paired t-test, $t_{33} = 10.9$, $P < 0.0001$; Fig. 1b). Males also exhibited more instances of palpating behavior on the female-treated paper (26 ± 2.3 palpations) than they did on the control paper (0.82 ± 0.23 palpations; paired t-test, $t_{33} = -11$, $P < 0.0001$; Fig. 1c). This suggests that males were able to detect and were motivated to explore chemical cues laid down in female silk and excreta.

In light of the finding that female silk and/or excreta elicited a significant male response, we proceeded to examine the role of airborne cues in a second experiment (Experiment 2) using a new group of *H. pyrithrix*. We used a Y-tube olfactometer (Fig. 2a) similar to those used in previous salticid studies (e.g., Jackson et al.

2005; Cerveira & Jackson 2011) set at a flow rate of 1.2 L/minute (CADS-4Push 4-Port Clean Air Delivery System, Sigma Scientific LLC, Micanopy, FL, USA). This flow rate did not appear to disrupt normal spider behavior or locomotion. All olfactometer components were connected by ¼-inch polyethylene tubing. We used transparent casing from universal clear-view in-line fuel filters (Part # 33318-10, Moeller Marine Products, Inc., Sparta, TN, USA) as stimulus and control chambers, as these are hollow, airtight, and could be easily removed, disassembled for cleaning, and replaced using push-to-connect ¼-inch tube fittings. We used a smoke wick to visually confirm that airflow was lamellar, and that the apparatus was free of leaks. Clean, filtered air was pushed through two separate flowmeters into a stimulus chamber and a control chamber, then into the corresponding source arms of the Y-tube and down into the central test arm. This airflow was maintained for one minute prior to introducing a spider to ensure that air entering the Y-tube at the onset of trials had been exposed to the source chambers.

We prepared stimulus chambers by placing adult virgin female spiders ($n = 29$) inside with a strip of filter paper one week prior to tests to allow sufficient time and surface area for nest-building and the accumulation of chemical cues. We fed females twice during this preparation phase, briefly removing them from chambers each time to prevent the introduction of prey odors. Their diet consisted of newly emerged crickets (*Gryllosid sigillatus*) amounting to each spider's approximate mass. Control chambers contained a strip of filter paper only (with no spider). We connected each chamber to a flowmeter and a source arm of the Y-tube one minute prior to each trial. These chambers were hidden behind an opaque barrier to block them from the test spider's view. We placed one male spider ($n = 29$) in a glass holding chamber fitted with screens to allow airflow while preventing escape and placed this at the stem end of the Y-tube (test arm). Treatment and control arms were randomly assigned in each trial to ensure there was no side bias. No males or females were used more than once in Experiment 2.

The trial began once we removed the screen barrier between the test arm and the holding chamber to release the spider after a one-minute

acclimation period. We recorded each trial for 30 minutes, after which the entire apparatus was dismantled and cleaned with deionized water and 80% ethanol (per Jackson & Cross, 2011) to ensure residual chemical cues did not interfere with future trials. We then analyzed the videos to determine the total time each male spent in the stimulus (female) arm vs. the control (odorless) arm. The time a spider spent in an arm was recorded from the moment it crossed a visually identifiable boundary located at a ground glass joint 2.5 inches up the length of the arm (62.5% total length of arm) (Fig. 2a). One trial was omitted because the spider did not enter either source arm. Because it is uncertain how accurately jumping spiders can detect and trace an odor source, we ran two separate paired t-tests, one including all spiders and one which only included spiders that entered each source arm at least once. We did this to ensure that males had sampled both options in case they were unable to follow the scent up the Y-tube into the corresponding arm and were entering the first arm at random and staying there.

We observed no difference between the time males spent in the female arm (4.1 ± 0.99 minutes) versus the control arm (6.8 ± 1.2 minutes; paired t-test, $t_{28} = -1.5$, $P = 0.15$; Fig. 2b) when considering all males. Only 15 of 29 male spiders visited both arms during the 30-minute trials. Of the 15 males that visited both arms at least once, there was no difference in the time spent in the female arm (4.7 ± 0.91 minutes) and the control arm (7.05 ± 1.3 minutes; $t_{14} = -1.5$, $P = 0.17$). The first arm entered appeared to be random (Chi-square, goodness-of-fit, $\chi^2 = 0.31$; $P = 0.58$). This suggests that males did not respond to female airborne chemical cues in this context. This appears to be a true null result and not just an undetected weak effect, as they were in the direction opposite expectation (i.e., in the direction of more time in the control arm compared with the female arm). Moreover, our sample sizes matched or exceeded those used in many similar studies with highly significant results (Clark et al. 2000; Jackson & Cross 2011; Cerveira & Jackson 2013). Further, the manufacturer of the olfactometer (Sigma Scientific, LLC, Micanopy, FL, USA) reviewed the recording of the smoke test we performed and confirmed that the instrument exhibited proper lamellar flow, so this result is unlikely to be due to improper performance of the equipment.

Taken together, our findings from both experiments suggest that *H. pyrithrix* males were able to detect chemical cues produced by females, but that males did not respond to airborne cues alone. Other salticid species (e.g., *Portia fimbriata* (Doleschall, 1859), *Portia labiata* (Thorell, 1887), *Portia schultzi* Karsch 1878, *Lyssomanes viridis* (Walckenaer, 1837), *Cyrrba algerina* (Lucas, 1846)) have been shown to respond to airborne cues produced by conspecific females using methods similar to those used in our study (Jackson 1987; Pollard et al. 1987; Willey & Jackson 1993), so this result was unexpected. However, the taxa in which this response has been demonstrated are largely arboreal Old World species which tend to remain sessile and likely rely on airborne compounds to locate conspecifics from a distance (Nelson et al. 2012). Thus, it has been hypothesized that use of olfaction may be reduced in the roving Salticoid clade, of which *Habronattus* is a member (Nelson et al. 2012). We cannot conclude that male spiders responded solely to substrate-borne cues, as airborne cues were almost certainly present (and perhaps abundant) in the filter paper experiment (Experiment 1). Whether spiders responded to these airborne cues cannot be determined from these experiments, and it is possible that males responded to the combination of substrate-borne and airborne chemical cues rather than either in isolation.

The lack of male response in the olfactometer experiment is also consistent with an alternative hypothesis, which is that males responded to the physical structure of the silk itself rather than the chemical cues embedded therein. This tactile attraction to spider silk, known as sericophily (Fischer 2019), could be disentangled from chemoreception with additional behavioral assays, such as testing male response to female silk with or without chemical cues (i.e., unwashed silk vs. silk washed with a solvent to remove cues).

Alternatively, the possibility of sericophily might be addressed by testing male response to silk produced by females we would expect, *a priori*, to differ in attractiveness (e.g., conspecific vs. heterospecific, mated vs. virgin, etc.), though a positive response to both cues could be due to either sericophily or that both cues are perceived as equally attractive. Steps are being taken to determine which properties of female silk/excreta are relevant to males in a closely related congener, *Habronattus brunneus* (Peckham & Peckham, 1901). Initial tests indicate males can adeptly and consistently discriminate between two superficially similar silk samples produced by female spiders of different treatment groups (unpublished data). Although this finding concerns a different species, we submit that the close phylogenetic proximity of *H. brunneus* to *H. pyrithrix* allows us to say with some confidence that male *H. pyrithrix* in this study were likely responding to chemical cues produced by females.

Habronattus pyrithrix males may use substrate-borne chemical cues incorporated in the dragline silk deposited by females to locate potential mates, or even to assess characteristics of the female who deposited the silk, as has been observed in other spider taxa. Wolf spiders (Family: Lycosidae) use chemical cues from other spiders' dragline silk to identify conspecifics (Roberts & Uetz 2004), distinguish adult females from juvenile females and males (Bell & Roberts 2017), assess the feeding history of a predatory lycosid species (Searcy et al. 1999), and even determine whether a conspecific female had recently interacted with that predator (Sweger et al. 2010). Chemical cues allow males to discern coarse information such as the sex and species that produced the cues, but they could also allow males to assess a female's receptivity or other features of her physiology. This information could allow males to avoid courting females that are more likely to attack and potentially cannibalize them. Interestingly, male *Habronattus* have been observed to misdirect courtship toward heterospecific females in the lab and in the field (Taylor et al. 2017), yet it is unclear what sensory information is used to make these courtship decisions. The interaction of chemical cues with stimuli of other sensory modalities (e.g., female visual and/or vibratory cues) warrants further investigation. The finding that *H. pyrithrix* males can detect chemical cues produced by virgin females is the first step in understanding the role of chemoreception in this charismatic genus, which has recently become a well-studied model for understanding the evolution of multimodal courtship displays (Maddison & Hedin 2003b; Elias et al. 2005, 2006, 2012; Hebets & Maddison 2005; Taylor et al. 2011, 2014, 2017; Zurek et al. 2015; Leduc-Robert & Maddison 2018).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank J. Schwartz and L. Hagarty for their assistance in collecting spiders, S. Yang and B. Scott for their help with rearing spiders in the lab, and B. Kolbus for creating the lovely figures for this publication. We would also like to thank the editor, Rick Vetter, and the two anonymous reviewers for their valuable input in improving this article. This work was supported by funding from the National Science Foundation (IOS-1557867 and IOS-1831751 to LAT), the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture (Hatch project 1016166 and McIntire-Stennis project 1017978), the Florida Museum of Natural History, and the Entomology and Nematology Department at the University of Florida.

DATA AVAILABILITY

All raw data from this study are freely available on Dryad, online at <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.c59zw3r65>

LITERATURE CITED

Aisenberg A, Baruffaldi L, González M. 2010. Behavioural evidence of male volatile pheromones in the sex-role reversed wolf spiders

- Allocosa brasiliensis* and *Allocosa alticeps*. *Naturwissenschaften* 97:63–70.
- Baruffaldi L, Costa FG. 2010. Changes in male sexual responses from silk cues of females at different reproductive states in the wolf spider *Schizocosa malitiosa*. *Journal of Ethology* 28:75–85.
- Baruffaldi L, Costa FG. 2014. Male reproductive decision is constrained by sex pheromones produced by females. *Behaviour* 151:465–477.
- Bell RD, Roberts JA. 2017. Trail-following behavior by males of the wolf spider, *Schizocosa ocreata* (Hentz). *Journal of Ethology* 35:29–36.
- Caves EM, Nowicki S, Johnsen S. 2019. Von Uexküll revisited: Addressing human biases in the study of animal perception. *Integrative and Comparative Biology* 59:1451–1462.
- Cerveira AM, Jackson RR. 2011. Interpopulation variation in kairomone use by *Cyrbia algerina*, an araneophagic jumping spider from Portugal. *Journal of Ethology* 29:121–129.
- Cerveira AM, Jackson RR. 2013. Love is in the air and on the ground: Olfactory and tactile cues elicit visual courtship behavior by *Cyrbia* males (Araneae: Salticidae). *Journal of Arachnology* 41:374–380.
- Clark RJ, Jackson RR. 1995. Dragline-mediated sex recognition in two species of jumping spiders (Araneae Salticidae), *Portia labiata* and *P. fimbriata*. *Ethology Ecology and Evolution* 7:73–77.
- Clark RJ, Jackson RR, Cutler B. 2000. Chemical cues from ants influence predatory behavior in *Habrocestum pulex*, an ant-eating jumping spider (Araneae, Salticidae). *Journal of Arachnology* 28:309–318.
- Cross FR, Jackson RR. 2009. Mate-odour identification by both sexes of *Evarcha culicivora*, an East African jumping spider. *Behavioural Processes* 81:74–79.
- Cross FR, Jackson RR, Pollard SD. 2009. How blood-derived odor influences mate-choice decisions by a mosquito-eating predator. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 106:19416–19419.
- Eisner T, Meinwald J. 1996. Chemical Ecology: The Chemistry of Biotic Interaction. The Quarterly Review of Biology. National Academies Press, Washington, D.C.
- Elgar MA, Schneider JM. 2004. Evolutionary significance of sexual cannibalism. *Advances in the Study of Behavior* 34:135–163.
- Elias DO, Hebets EA, Hoy RR. 2006. Female preference for complex/novel signals in a spider. *Behavioral Ecology* 17:765–771.
- Elias DO, Hebets EA, Hoy RR, Mason AC. 2005. Seismic signals are crucial for male mating success in a visual specialist jumping spider (Araneae: Salticidae). *Animal Behaviour* 69:931–938.
- Elias DO, Maddison WP, Peckmezian C, Girard MB, Mason AC. 2012. Orchestrating the score: Complex multimodal courtship in the *Habronattus coecatus* group of *Habronattus* jumping spiders (Araneae: Salticidae). *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 105:522–547.
- Elias DO, Mason AC, Hoy RR. 2004. The effect of substrate on the efficacy of seismic courtship signal transmission in the jumping spider *Habronattus dossenus* (Araneae: Salticidae). *Journal of Experimental Biology* 207:4105–4110.
- Fischer A. 2019. Chemical communication in spiders – a methodological review. *Journal of Arachnology* 47:1–27.
- Gaskett AC. 2007. Spider sex pheromones: Emission, reception, structures, and functions. *Biological Reviews* 82:27–48.
- Gavín-Centol MP, Kralj-Fišer S, De Mas E, Ruiz-Lupián D, Moya-Laraño J. 2017. Feeding regime, adult age and sexual size dimorphism as determinants of pre-copulatory sexual cannibalism in virgin wolf spiders. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 71.
- Hebets EA, Maddison WP. 2005. Xenophilic mating preferences among populations of the jumping spider *Habronattus pugillis* Griswold. *Behavioral Ecology* 16:981–988.
- Hebets EA, Stratton GE, Miller GL. 1996. Habitat and courtship behavior of the wolf spider *Schizocosa retrorsa* (Banks) (Araneae, Lycosidae). *Journal of Arachnology* 24:141–147.
- Hoefler CD. 2007. Male mate choice and size-assortative pairing in a jumping spider, *Phidippus clarus*. *Animal Behaviour* 73:943–954.
- Jackson RR. 1987. Comparative study of releaser pheromones associated with the silk of jumping spiders (Araneae: Salticidae). *New Zealand Journal of Zoology* 14:1–10.
- Jackson RR, Cross FR. 2011. Olfaction-based mate-odor identification by jumping spiders from the genus *Portia*. *Journal of Arachnology* 39:439–443.
- Jackson RR, Macnab AM. 1989. Display, mating, and predatory behaviour of the jumping spider *Plexippus paykulli* (Araneae: Salticidae). *New Zealand Journal of Zoology* 16:151–168.
- Jackson RR, Nelson XJ, Sune GO. 2005. A spider that feeds indirectly on vertebrate blood by choosing female mosquitoes as prey. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 102:15155–15160.
- Johnson JC, Trubl P, Blackmore V, Miles L. 2011. Male black widows court well-fed females more than starved females: Silken cues indicate sexual cannibalism risk. *Animal Behaviour* 82:383–390.
- Leduc-Robert G, Maddison WP. 2018. Phylogeny with introgression in *Habronattus* jumping spiders (Araneae: Salticidae). *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 18.
- Li J, Zhang Z, Liu F, Liu Q, Gan W, Chen J et al. 2008. UVB-based mate-choice cues used by females of the jumping spider *Phintella vittata*. *Current Biology* 18:699–703.
- Li Q, Liberles SD. 2015. Aversion and attraction through olfaction. *Current Biology* 25:120–129.
- Lim MLM, Li J, Li D. 2008. Effect of UV-reflecting markings on female mate-choice decisions in *Cosmophasis umbratica*, a jumping spider from Singapore. *Behavioral Ecology* 19:61–66.
- Maddison W, Hedin M. 2003a. Phylogeny of *Habronattus* jumping spiders (Araneae: Salticidae), with consideration of genital and courtship evolution. *Systematic Entomology* 28:1–22.
- Maddison WP, Hedin MC. 2003b. Jumping spider phylogeny (Araneae: Salticidae). *Invertebrate Systematics* 17:529–549.
- Nelson XJ, Warui CM, Jackson RR. 2012. Widespread reliance on olfactory sex and species identification by lyssomanine and spartaeine jumping spiders. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 107:664–677.
- Perampaladas K, Stoltz JA, Andrade MCB. 2008. Mated redback spider females re-advertise receptivity months after mating. *Ethology* 114:589–598.
- Persons MH, Walker SE, Rypstra AL, Marshall SD. 2001. Wolf spider predator avoidance tactics and survival in the presence of diet-associated predator cues (Araneae: Lycosidae). *Animal Behaviour* 61:43–51.
- Pollard SD, Macnab AM, Jackson RR. 1987. Communication with Chemicals: Pheromones and Spiders. Pp. 133–141. In *Ecophysiology of Spiders* (W. Nentwig, ed.). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Roberts JA, Uetz GW. 2004. Species-specificity of chemical signals: Silk source affects discrimination in a wolf spider (Araneae: Lycosidae). *Journal of Insect Behavior* 17:477–491.
- Roberts JA, Uetz GW. 2005. Information content of female chemical signals in the wolf spider, *Schizocosa ocreata*: Male discrimination of reproductive state and receptivity. *Animal Behaviour* 70:217–223.
- Schulz S, Toft S. 1993. Identification of a sex pheromone from a spider. *Science* 260:1635–1637.
- Searcy LE, Rypstra AL, Persons MH. 1999. Airborne chemical communication in the wolf spider *Pardosa milvina*. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* 25:2527–2533.
- Stoltz JA, McNeil JN, Andrade MCB. 2007. Males assess chemical

- signals to discriminate just-mated females from virgins in redback spiders. *Animal Behaviour* 74:1669–1674.
- Sweger AL, Marr M, Satteson A, Rypstra AL, Persons MH. 2010. The effects of predation risk on female silk deposition and male response to predator-cued conspecifics in the wolf spider, *Pardosa milvina* (Araneae: Lycosidae). *Journal of Arachnology* 38:393–397.
- Taylor LA, Clark DL, McGraw KJ. 2011. Condition dependence of male display coloration in a jumping spider (*Habronattus pyrrithrix*). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 65:1133–1146.
- Taylor LA, Maier EB, Byrne KJ, Amin Z, Morehouse NI. 2014. Colour use by tiny predators: Jumping spiders show colour biases during foraging. *Animal Behaviour* 90:149–157.
- Taylor LA, Powell EC, McGraw KJ. 2017. Frequent misdirected courtship in a natural community of colorful *Habronattus* jumping spiders. *PLoS ONE* 12.
- Thomas ML. 2011. Detection of female mating status using chemical signals and cues. *Biological Reviews* 86:1–13.
- Willey MB, Jackson RR. 1993. Olfactory cues from conspecifics inhibit the web-invasion behavior of *Portia*, web-invading araneophagic jumping spiders (Araneae: Salticidae). *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 71:1415–1420.
- Wyatt TD. 2014. *Pheromones and Animal Behavior: Chemical Signals and Signatures*. 2nd edition. Cambridge University Press.
- Yarmolinsky DA, Zuker CS, Ryba NJP. 2009. Common sense about taste: From mammals to insects. *Cell* 139:234–244.
- Zurek DB, Cronin TW, Taylor LA, Byrne K, Sullivan MLG, Morehouse NI. 2015. Spectral filtering enables trichromatic vision in colorful jumping spiders. *Current Biology* 25:R403–R404.

Manuscript received 30 June 2020, revised 3 December 2020.