

A Review on Dispersal Polymorphism in Wing-Dimorphic, Mono-Morphic, Wingless, and Range-Expanding Insects, and Experimental Designs for Sorting out Resident and Disperser Phenotypes

RENAULT David^{1,2}

¹ Univ Rennes, CNRS, ECOBIO [(Ecosystèmes, biodiversité, évolution)] - UMR 6553, F-35000 Rennes, France

² Institut Universitaire de France, 1 Rue Descartes, 75231 Paris cedex 05, France

Corresponding author :

Postal address: David RENAULT, Université de Rennes 1, UMR CNRS 6553 EcoBio, Campus de Beaulieu, 263 Avenue du Gal Leclerc, CS 74205, 35042 Rennes, France.

Email : david.renault@univ-rennes1.fr

Phone : + 33 2 23 23 66 27

Abstract

Dispersal represents a key life-history trait with several implications for the fitness of organisms, population dynamics and resilience, local adaptation, meta-population dynamics, range shifting and biological invasions. Plastic and evolutionary changes of dispersal traits have been intensively studied over the past decades in entomology, in particular in wing-dimorphic insects for which literature reviews are available. Importantly, dispersal polymorphism also exists in wing-monomorphic and wingless insects, and except for butterflies, fewer syntheses are available. In this perspective, by integrating the very last research in the fast moving field of insect dispersal ecology, this review article provides an overview of our current knowledge of dispersal polymorphism in insects. After having provided a definition of the main terms characterising insects' movements, some of the most often used experimental methodologies for the separation of dispersers and residents in wing-monomorphic and wingless insects are presented. The existing knowledge on the morphological and life-history trait differences between resident and disperser phenotypes is then synthesized. The fourth part examines the effects of range expansion on dispersal traits and performance, in particular for insects from range edges and invasion fronts. Finally, some research perspectives are proposed in the last part of the review.

Keywords

Entomology; Foraging; Movement; Migration; Behaviour; Morphology; Mating; Reproduction; Fecundity; Range expansion

Contents

1. Introduction

2. The different terminologies used for describing the movements of insects

3. Experimental methods for separating resident from dispersers in wing monomorphic or wingless insects by direct observations

3.1 Assessing dispersal polymorphism under controlled conditions: photos and videos

3.2 Assessing dispersal polymorphism under controlled conditions: experimentally connected patches in the absence of hostile conditions

3.3 Assessing dispersal polymorphism under controlled conditions: experimental systems incorporating hostile conditions

3.4 Standardization of the experimental systems with an emphasis of some important parameters affecting dispersal results

4. Main characteristics of disperser and resident insects

4.1 Flight-fecundity trade-offs in wing dimorphic insects

4.2 Effects of dispersal polymorphism on mating success and movement characteristics in wing-dimorphic insects

4.3 Phenotypic differences in dispersers and residents from wing-monomorphic and wingless insects: morphology and behaviour

4.4 Phenotypic differences in dispersers and residents from wing-monomorphic and wingless insects: reproduction and fecundity

5. Range expanding populations

6. Conclusion and perspectives

7. References

1. Introduction

Dispersal corresponds to the movement of individuals or populations from the natal (natal or postnatal dispersal, see [1-2] for examples) or breeding (breeding dispersal, see [3] for example) habitat to another breeding habitat [4-5]. This type of animal movement is of particular importance for the stabilization of population demography and dynamics, by balancing the departure of individuals with arrival of other conspecifics (reviewed in [6]). Variations in dispersal success and rates are common among individuals and species, and plastic and evolutionary changes of dispersal traits are often the consequence of spatio-temporal variations in the fitness performance [7]. Variability of dispersal traits can result from different mechanisms, including the risk of inbreeding, which can be deleterious for fitness performance ([8]; Inbreeding depression: [9]), decreases kin competition [10] or competition for resources [5]. Dispersal also shapes the spatio-temporal distribution of the genetic diversity of species, in parallel to increasing the proportion of the total genetic diversity of populations [11]. Of note, by reducing genetic drift, dispersal may save populations from local extinction [12], and allow the survival of low density populations (Rescue effect: [13]).

Dispersal capacities are of significant importance for setting and reshuffling the geographic distribution of species. Nowadays, climate change has led to poleward shifts across many taxonomic groups, both on land and in the oceans [14-15], and upwards range shifts within montane ecosystems [16-17]. The extents of these shifts are, at least partially, strongly supported by dispersal capacities of individuals [18-19]. In addition, dispersal enhances the persistence of populations thriving in fluctuating environments [20], and is expected to be more frequent in disturbed or stochastically variable habitats [21-22]. This can be illustrated by the propensity for ballooning dispersal of spider mites, which is increased 5.5 times in specimens from disturbed habitats as compared with their relatives from stable habitats [23]. Importantly, as the increased gene flow allowed by individual dispersal can be random or non-random (see for instance [24]), this can have significant cascading effects on local adaptations of populations. For instance, immigration of insecticide-resistant mosquitoes increases the frequency of resistant alleles within the population, while influxes of susceptible or less adapted mosquitoes would decrease their frequencies (see the review of Miller and Sappington [25]), in turn lowering the resilience of the population. Finally, the ecological importance of insect fluxes also scales up to higher organizational levels, by having for instance significant positive consequences for ecosystem services [26].

All animal species can disperse, but the dispersal rate, the frequency of this event, and the geographical distances that can be covered, can greatly vary among individuals, populations and species. For instance, individuals of a population of the damselfly *Coenagrion mercuriale* can exhibit either short- or long-distance dispersal strategies [27]. Often in animal populations, several individuals remain at their natal site (i.e. philopatric individuals), and a decreasing number of individuals successfully settles outside their natal habitat or home range (i.e. dispersers). Maintaining high dispersal capacity performance can be costly for individuals, and dispersal should be advantageous if benefits (increased fitness of the individual) in the new breeding habitat

exceed the costs resulting from dispersal thus conferring a selective advantage [22] (reviewed in Bonte et al. [28]; but see [29] who suggested that benefits could be null for dispersing individuals, and only in favour of residents). Consistently, it is often assumed that individuals having the highest dispersal capacities should benefit from the weaker competition in their new breeding habitat [30-31], thus favouring a higher reproduction, growth and developmental performance.

Given the importance of dispersal in driving the ecology and evolution of organisms and populations in the ever-changing environmental conditions, the causes, mechanisms, consequences and costs of dispersal have been studied in a variety of insect models [3, 28, 32-35]. Several literature reviews have been published in this field in entomology; yet, these valuable studies are most often species or genus specific [36-37], or focus on the costs of dispersal [28], on trade-offs with reproductive traits [38], or on available methods for the monitoring of insect dispersal [39]. Moreover, since the publication of the book '*Dispersal in ecology and evolution*' [6], several new studies have been conducted on this fast moving topic. Thus, the present review, which integrates the more recent advances in the field of insect dispersal ecology, aims at giving an overview of our current knowledge of dispersal polymorphism in wing-dimorphic, monomorphic, wingless, and range-expanding insects. By focusing on active dispersal, i.e. insects dispersing by walking, flying, or swimming, the first part of the article briefly summarizes the different wording and definitions used for defining insects' dispersal. While working with wing-dimorphic insects eases the differentiation of disperser versus resident individuals, this distinction is less obvious for wing monomorphic insects, and can be even more difficult for non-flying (or poorly flying) ones. The different experimental systems that have been designed for separating disperser and resident insects are thus reviewed, and this second part includes some suggestions of the parameters that could be considered in future studies for manipulating dispersal propensity, rate and success. As insect dispersers are not a random subset of their population, and rather exhibit a suite of traits which offset dispersal costs and increase the probability of dispersal being successful [28, 41], the existing knowledge on the morphological and life-history trait differences between resident and disperser phenotypes is synthesized in a third part of the article. Finally, dispersal is studied extensively in the context of range-expanding insects, including biological invasions, and there is supporting evidence that spatial sorting may contribute selecting dispersive phenotypes at the front distribution margins. The knowledge of these ecological differences, possibly related to enhanced dispersal capacities at range edges, is discussed in a fourth part.

2. The different terminologies used for describing the movements of insects

The geographical scale at which dispersal occurs can be highly variable, and greatly varies among populations and species. The large variation of dispersal distances has often made it difficult to clearly define dispersal from other types of movements [22]. In the literature, different terms are found for describing the main movements of animals, including insects, the most frequent ones being (i) dispersal, (ii) migration, and (iii) movement (see Holyoak et al. [41] for a review). For movement types that do not correspond to dispersal or migration, the following terms are frequently used: foraging [42-43], homing [44], home range [45], nomadism [46], routine

movements [47], or searching behaviour [48]. A valuable example of the methodological procedures that can be used for separating the different types of movements can be found in Singh et al. [49].

For insects, migration is often defined according to Kennedy [50], i.e. '*migratory behaviour is persistent and straightened-out movement effected by the animal's own locomotory exertions or by its active embarkation on a vehicule. It depends on some temporary inhibition of station-keeping responses, but promotes their eventual disinhibition and recurrence*'. Dingle and Drake [51] have completed this definition by summarizing the different migratory patterns that can be observed for different types of organisms (obligate versus facultative migration, timing of the migration, and spatial patterns). Of note, partial migration, i.e. the migration of a portion of the population while the other part of the population remains resident, also exists in insects [52-53]. In a recent review on partial migration of insects, many of the examples used by the authors correspond to dispersal [54], an aspect that the authors recognized themselves ('*Other movement ecology researchers might categorize some of the examples we provide in our review as dispersal instead of migration*'); this suggests that the definition of migration in entomological studies is not yet clearly fixed.

Dispersal movements can be separated into extra-range dispersal and dispersal. Extra-range dispersal corresponds to '*Movement of propagules to regions beyond the boundaries of their [species distribution] range occupied over ecological time*' and encompasses six main categories (Leading edge dispersal, corridor, jump dispersal, extreme long-distance dispersal, mass dispersal, and cultivation; [55]). Regarding dispersal, either short or long-distance dispersal [27], several definitions can be found in the literature. Former definitions proposed by Andrewartha and Birch [56] and Southwood [57] posit that dispersal is an individual or a populational diffusion from a source population, which results in an increase of the distance among organisms and lowers aggregation of individuals [58]. Osborne et al. [39] further described dispersal as an '*intergenerational spatial movement*'. In several studies, the definition and use of the terms dispersal and migration is debated. To try to solve the inconsistent use of these two terms, Dingle [59] suggested the use of 'ranging' instead of 'dispersal', and defined 'ranging' as '*movement over a habitat to explore it, and movement ceases when a suitable home range is located*'. However, despite this suggestion, and even if there is no simple definition of dispersal, the most often adopted one in entomological studies presents dispersal as '*any movement of individuals or propagules with potential consequences for gene flow across space*' [4], thus corresponding to insects moving beyond their neighbourhood. In this line, Renault et al. [40] also suggested that dispersal can be functionally discriminated from the two other forms of movement, i.e. routine/home range movements and migration. Specifically, these authors reported that dispersal is being characterised by a distinct frequency over the life of an organism, as compared with the two other movement types, has an effect on gene flow (as defined by Ronce [4]), little link with seasonality, and moderate preparatory physiological changes.

Two main types of dispersal can be observed, as mentioned in the introduction: (a) natal or pre-breeding dispersal, when the insect leaves its birth habitat to reach a distinct habitat for

reproduction (new breeding site) [1-2], and (b) (post)breeding dispersal, when the individual leaves the habitat where it was reproducing and reached another reproduction site (movement from one breeding site to another) [3], thus resulting in a relocation of the reproductive habitat of the individual [60]. In both cases, truly active dispersal encompasses three main phases : (i) departure (or emigration), i.e. the decision of the insect to leave a patch, (ii) the transfer phase, corresponding to the path taken by the individual, with the mosaic of biotic and abiotic parameters it will encounter, and (iii) the settlement (or immigration) phase in which the new habitat of the individual is determined [5, 40].

3. Experimental methods for separating resident from dispersers in wing-monomorphic or wingless insects by direct observations

In many populations, most individuals of the population remain at their natal site (philopatric insects), and few insects successfully move and establish outside their natal (or former breeding) habitat or home range (i.e. dispersers) [4, 22]. Dispersal polymorphism has thus been commonly observed in insects, enhancing the performance of (a) fecundity and growth (philopatric insects) or (b) dispersal capacities (dispersers), in turn resulting into dispersal-related life-history trade-offs (see the example of the butterfly *Melitaea cinxia*, [61], and see [28, 62] for reviews).

In wing-dimorphic insects, dispersing and resident phenotypes can be easily separated (dispersers are winged, or they are long-winged, while residents are unwinged, or they are short-winged). Conversely, the distinction of disperser and resident phenotypes, or highly mobile versus less mobile insects, is less evident in wing monomorphic or wingless insect species. As a result, different techniques have been elaborated for their separation, both in the field (landscape scale studies) and under controlled conditions [39]. An overview of the field techniques for measuring insect dispersal can be found in [Feldhaar and Schauer \[63\]](#), with saproxylic species as insect models. Indirect observations can be conducted with molecular techniques, as for instance done by [Suchan et al. \[64\]](#) who undertook a metabarcoding work on pollen collected from butterflies to determine the source origin of the individuals according to the patches they visited before they were sampled. For experiments under controlled conditions, the methodology based on tethered flight mills, a system that is used for measuring flight behaviour and dispersal capacities in insects, has been recently reviewed (see [65-66]). In the below sections, the article will rather focus on the other experimental systems allowing the assessment of insect dispersal propensity and polymorphism in the laboratory at small spatial scales.

3.1 Assessing dispersal polymorphism under controlled conditions: photos and videos

The movements of insects, either they are corresponding to foraging, dispersal or migration, can be observed by visual monitoring, including photos, or by videos. These experiments allow assessing dispersal tracks by regular records of the position of the insect. For instance, video records have been realized for measuring the movements of nymphs and adults of the brown marmorated stink bug *Halyomorpha halys* in Petri dish arenas (diameter: 10 cm) at 25 °C in the dark (fluorescent lights were used for facilitating the records) over a period of 1h [67]. A similar

design has been used by [Socha and Zemek \[34\]](#) who investigated the walking patterns of the bug *Pyrhocoris apterus*, except that the arena consisted of a white formica cylinder having a diameter of 125 cm and a height of 62 cm; in addition, each insect was allowed to acclimate for 10 min before the record started for 1h at 26 °C. [Matsumura and Miyatake \[68\]](#) compared the walking activity of *Tribolium castaneum* by recording the movements of the insects placed in a Petri dish of 35 mm diameter and 10 mm height over 30 min at 25 °C; before each record, the individual was acclimated for 2h.

There are two possible issues with these direct observations. First, by manipulating the insects when they are transferred to the arenas, their subsequent movement behaviour may be altered (the same remark applies to the experimental designs presented below). Second, when working with photos and videos, our capacity to (automatically) discriminate individuals from their medium can be a technical issue. Contrasting coloured substrate / medium can be used to ease the discrimination, but this procedure is then likely to overstimulate insects' movements.

3.2 Assessing dispersal polymorphism under controlled conditions: experimentally connected patches in the absence of hostile conditions

By browsing the available literature, it appears that we are missing a consensus regarding the type of apparatus that is being used for separating dispersers and residents, in particular when different studies are working with the same genus or species, as for example in *Tribolium* sp. [\[69-73\]](#). An experimental system for investigating the movement of adult *Tribolium castaneum*, which flies but also moves by walking [\[74\]](#), was designed by [Prus \[69\]](#): two containers (A and B) were bridged with a plastic tube of 4.5 mm inner diameter (ID); container A contained medium, while no medium was added to container B. The distance of the connecting tube from the bottom of container B made it impossible for the insects to move again to container A. Dispersal was checked every 24h over 10 days at 29 °C. Later, [Łomnicki \[75\]](#) worked with a chain of five containers, four of them consisted of 157 mL glass bakery (A to D, A containing an old medium with eggs; C a new fresh medium, and no medium in containers B and D), and the terminal one (E, containing fresh medium) being a 50 mL plastic beaker. This suite of containers was connected with a glass tube of 4 mm I.D., and the experiment lasted five weeks, i.e. the time necessary to obtain imagoes that could disperse. After the seventh generation, and thus the seventh dispersal assay, the proportion of red flour beetles that dispersed from beaker A ranged from 0.60 to 0.95 in dispersing insects, and from 0.05 to ca. 0.60 in their resident relatives [\[75\]](#).

Working with the fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster*, [Edelsparre et al. \[76\]](#) used a container-to-container system consisting of two 50 mL containers filled with 2 mL of rearing media or agar, joined by a 1 mL tip which prevented the flies to return to the former container, and maintained at 24 °C. Dispersal was assessed after 6h in 32 5- to 7-day-old flies for each assay. [Tung et al. \[77\]](#) also used two containers (1.5 L each) system; the source container was empty, and the destination one contained wet cotton. The containers were connected by a 2 m-long tube (transparent plastic tube of 1 cm I.D.) whose length was progressively increased so that it reached 10 m at the 33rd fly generation. The system was designed to limit as much as possible the backflow of the flies. At the

start of the experiment, 2400 flies were placed in the source container, and the assay was run for 6h at 25 °C. In *D. melanogaster*, dispersal seems to be linear over time, as [Tung et al. \[77\]](#) reported that ca. 25% of the flies dispersed after 3h, and 50% after 6h, a conclusion which is also in line with the results obtained by [Arnold et al. \[72\]](#) on *T. castaneum*. Importantly, photoperiod, which is not always reported in dispersal studies, may have a significant role on flight initiation in *T. castaneum*, as shown by [Drury et al. \[74\]](#) who tested the effect of light on the propensity of the beetles to fly.

3.3 Assessing dispersal polymorphism under controlled conditions: experimental systems incorporating hostile conditions

In natural environments, dispersers will likely have to cross physical barriers (climb, obstacles, wind, etc...), and will have to deal with different soil substrates that could make walking more difficult. The introduction of a hostile matrix in the dispersal path connecting the two containers (patches) has thus been considered some experimental systems (see [\[78\]](#)), as it increases the likelihood that movement among patches is indeed dispersal (and not foraging). In this perspective, the selection of an adequate hostile matrix should be supported by the existing knowledge of the biology and ecology of the tested organisms.

Working with *T. castaneum*, [Arnold et al. \[72\]](#) used three containers (A, B, C) of 70 mL sequentially connected with a flexible tube of 4 mm I.D. Containers A and C were filled with 15g of flour, and container B had a filter paper only. These authors then designed five experiments, differing in terms of distance among the containers (70, 120, 165, 310 or 620 mm), and angle made by the flexible tube connecting the containers (angle of the tube of 4, 8, 16, 24 or 55° in between two containers), so that the dispersal difficulty was increased. Dispersal assessment was monitored twice a day over four days; the temperature was not mentioned, but was most probably the one that was used for insect rearing (29.5 ± 1 °C). For each experiment, 50 adults (males or females) aged of three days were used. The main findings of this study were: (a) a higher angle of the connecting tube, i.e. a more difficult dispersal path, lowered the dispersal success of males and females of *T. castaneum*, and (b) the increased length of the tubes connecting the containers increased the duration necessary for reaching the terminal container. [Morrison et al. \[79\]](#) modified the [Arnold's et al. \[72\]](#) system by working with two containers separated by 25, 75 or 175 cm, and connected by PVC pipes of 5 mm I.D.; the first container had no food, whereas the second one was filled with 20g of organic flour. The experiment was run with 20 insects of a single sex for the beetle *T. castaneum* or of mixed sex for the beetle *Rhyzopertha dominica* for 48h at 30 °C. In this study, mainly designed for investigating the effects of short exposures to pyrethroid (long-lasting insecticide-incorporated netting), the authors reported a lower dispersal ability of the treated insects in comparison with control ones.

In addition to the creation of a hostile matrix connecting the two patches, some studies may require the introduction of biotic cues that will also increase ecological realism. In their study, [Fronhofer et al. \[78\]](#) added a visual, chemical or auditory cue as a proxy of predation risk. For the butterfly *P. brassicae*, the cages were connected by a S-shaped corridor having hostile conditions

for the insect (dark, warm, and poorly vegetated); the presence of two toads in the pond of the departure cage created visual and olfactory predatory cues, in addition to the presence of two crushed butterflies in a tube. The same cages and hostile matrix was used for the damselfly *Platycnemis pennipes*, but the predatory cue was obtained by adding two frogs which created auditive, chemical and visual signals for the insects. In these two experiments, the dispersal was monitored daily over 4 and 5 days, and the temperature of the experiment was not mentioned [78]. In the same study, the dispersal of the marsh cricket *Pteronemobius heydenii* was also assessed with an initial and a destination patch consisting plastic containers (130 L), connected with a narrow plastic pipe of 4 cm I.D. covered by a thin layer of soil (hostile matrix). Lizard olfactory cues were used for simulating predation risk, and the dispersal was monitored over five days at 16 -25 °C with daily observations. In the three experiments, the authors also tested the effect of the availability of trophic resources on dispersal propensity, by having a low and a high resource treatments [78].

Finally, the assessment of the flight endurance of the insects subjected to stressful conditions has been measured with a vortex system in butterflies, [80-81]. In this procedure, butterflies are assessed individually for mobility performance in a 250 x 100 x 100 mm plastic container; they were acclimated for 30 s before being vortexed for 60 s at 25 °C. The time spent flying for each individual during this stressful minute was recorded, and represents a good correlate of dispersal ability, i.e. dispersers are characterized with good abilities to maintain flight in these stressful conditions, while residents have a lower flying performance [82].

3.4 Standardization of the experimental systems with an emphasis of some important parameters affecting dispersal results

The investigations conducted on the beetle *T. castaneum* and on the fly *D. melanogaster* (see sections 3.2 and 3.3) example the lack of consensus regarding the different experimental systems employed in entomological studies in the topic of dispersal ecology. While the use of a source container (patch), a dispersal path (corridor), and a destination container (patch) are all components of the experimental dispersal apparatus under controlled conditions, the number of destination containers, the length of the dispersal path and its degree of hostility for the tested insect, the number of insects in the source container, the duration of the assay, and the presence / absence of food / medium in the containers can greatly vary among studies, in spite of the critical effect these factors can have on dispersal propensity and success.

In order to get a first overview of the variables of potential interest when designing an experimental system assessing dispersal propensity and performance in entomological studies, a short experiment was conducted for the purpose of this review. The biological model for this trial was the tenebrionid beetle *Alphitobius diaperinus*. Two containers (patches) of 110 mL were used, connected by a 1.6 m long plastic tube of 13 mm I.D. making an angle of 15 ° from the source container (containing wheat bran and one piece of carrot - used as an oviposition site for the species) to the destination container (containing a layer of 0.5 cm of sand at the bottom of the container). Before the containers were connected, the beetles were acclimated for 24h in the

source container at 18 °C. Then, the assay was run for 24h at 18 °C, and 19-20 unsexed insects were placed in the source container. In this experiment, the numbers of dispersing, in transit, and resident individuals were 32 ± 5 , 24 ± 5 , and 43 ± 6 % (the proportions were marginally significantly, $\chi^2=5.37$; 2 ddl ; N=213 ; P=0.07). In another test, the angle in between the two containers was removed, the effects of temperature (18 versus 25 °C), duration of the assay (24 versus 8h), nature of the medium (sand versus wheat bran) and number of insects (20 versus 40 adults) in the source container were assessed. As expected, temperature had a prominent effect on the dispersal propensity, with almost 100 % of the 20 beetles that dispersed at 25 °C, and many of them (about 16 insects over the 20) reached the destination container in all replicates (N = 7) after 24h; by reducing the duration of the assay to 8h, the number of beetles that reached the destination container was around 10 in all replicates. When assessing the effects of the number of beetles in the source container, we found that the proportion of dispersing insects was two times higher in assays that contained 40 beetles as compared with those having 20 beetles (note that in this assay, the distance in between the container was 2.4 m). Importantly, the nature of the medium used in the source container made no differences in dispersal rates.

In sum, the results available from the literature and the complementary tests conducted for this review indicate that it would be valuable to get additional methodological information in the published literature. Some of the parameters that should be mentioned and that can be manipulated, together with their possible effects on dispersal, are presented in **Table 1**. Particular attention should be given to the distance among the source and destination container, as this dispersal path distance and the duration of the assay contribute to determine if the insects will be sorted out according to their mobility (foraging movement, vagrancy) or according to their dispersal capacities (movements that drive gene flow, as defined by [Ronce \[4\]](#)). Moreover, the harshness (permeability) of the dispersal path (or matrix) is an important factor that can modulate both dispersal success and dispersal syndrome characteristics of dispersers versus resident organisms, as recently reported in ciliates [\[102\]](#). The hostile matrix can be of different nature: absence of (trophic) resources, low to null humidity conditions, shaded / exposed / dark dispersal paths, temperature lower / higher than the thermal preferendum of the species, olfactory cues repulsive / attractive for the species, angle and length of the tubes connecting the containers, internal diameter of the connecting tube. A primary 'control quality' of the experimental systems designed for sorting out dispersers and residents can be obtained by observing dispersal rates (propensity). In order to increase the ecological realism of the study, the dispersal propensity should range from 10 to 50% of the individuals leaving the initial container / patch; in butterflies [Stevens et al. \[103\]](#) reported that dispersal propensity had an average of 34%.

Variable of interest	For the insect, the variable has an effect on	Expected effects on dispersal
Manipulation of the social environment		
Sex ratio in the initial container (patch)	Likelihood to find a mate, likelihood of sexual reproduction	Effects on dispersal propensity and emigration rate [83]
Number of insects in the initial container (patch), population density	Level of intraspecific competition	Effects on dispersal propensity and emigration rate (density-dependent dispersal) [84]; Increased dispersal distance [85]
Reproductive status, age of the insects	Motivation to find a mate, behaviour of males and females, deterioration of the physiological condition with aging	Effects on dispersal distances [86], effects on emigration rate (but also depends on the availability of trophic resources) [87], effects on successful immigration [88]
Level of relatedness, consanguinity	Kin competition, inbreeding avoidance	Increased dispersal distance [4, 85]
Manipulation of the biotic environment		
Presence of predatory cues (chemical, visual, olfactory)	Behaviour, personality	Effects on dispersal propensity and emigration rate (but may depend on the population density and body condition) [89-90]; Increased dispersal distance [91]
Quality of the trophic resources in the initial container (patch)	Fecundity, longevity, resistance to environmental stress	Effects on dispersal propensity and emigration rate [92] Effects on dispersal (flight) performance [93]
Manipulation of the abiotic environment		
Rearing temperature of the insects (Natal habitat effect)	Development, growth, and body size of the adult (smaller size of the dispersal appendices, lower amount of body reserves)	Effects on mobility; Lower temperatures may increase dispersal propensity (temperature gives information of the thermal environment that would be encountered by the adult) [94]
Resource quality when rearing the strain (Natal habitat effect)	Development growth, body size and physiological condition of the adult	Decreased dispersal distances and decreased immigration success as insects are more susceptible to dispersal mortality [95]; Decreased emigration rate [96]; Condition-dependent dispersal [60]
Temperature of the dispersal assay	Aerobic metabolism (energy production)	Depending on the temperature, increased or decreased dispersal speed [97]
Manipulation of the dispersal System		

Size of the containers	Increased likelihood of tactile stimulation when using containers of small size	Increases dispersal propensity [98]
Nature of the hostile matrix (shaded, dark, slippery, colder/warmer than the patch, S-shaped, angle) (can also be referred to as 'matrix permeability')	Increases dispersal cost and difficulty → selects insect with specific behavioural, morphological, and physiological features allowing to overcome the hostility of the matrix	Increases dispersal difficulty during the transience phase [72, 77, 99] Effects on dispersal capacity and success [77, this article]
Length of the dispersal corridor (tubes connecting the containers), simulates fragmentation of available patches	Increases dispersal cost → selection of insects having the physiological features allowing to cover the inter-patch distance; Over time, progressive increased reluctance of individuals to disperse	Effects on dispersal capacity and success (emigration and mortality during transience should be higher when the length of the dispersal path is increased) [88, 100]
Duration of the dispersal assay	Less mobile and foraging insects which may reach the destination container	Effects on amount of individuals that emigrate [72, 77]
Habitat quality (Presence of oviposition sites in the initial container (patch), nature of the medium, etc..)	Poor reproductive values	Effects on emigration rate [101]

Table 1: Overview of potential manipulations of the environment of interest in experimental studies of insects' dispersal. Some of the conditions can be manipulated to test the effects of prenatal and postnatal habitat conditions. For the tested insects, the knowledge of the foraging distance / area that are being currently visited for routine movements by the insect would be particularly interesting, even if this information might be difficult to obtain. Tentative predictions of possible effects of the conditions on individuals' phenotypes and dispersal are illustrated with published examples.

4. Ronce, O. How does It feel to be like a rolling stone? Ten Questions about dispersal evolution. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **2007**, *38*, 231-253.
72. Arnold, P.A.; Rafter, M.A.; Malekpour, R.; Cassey, P.; Walter, G.H.; White, C.R. Investigating movement in the laboratory: dispersal apparatus designs and the red flour beetle, *Tribolium castaneum*. *Entomol. Exp. Appl.* **2017**, *163*, 93-100.
77. Tung, S.; Mishra, A.; Shreenidhi, P.M.; Sadiq, M.A.; Joshi, S.; Sruti, V.R.S.; Dey, S. Simultaneous evolution of multiple dispersal components and kernel. *Oikos* **2018**, *127*, 34-44.
83. Trochet, A.; Legrand, D.; Larranaga, N.; Ducatez, S.; Calvez, O.; Cote, J.; Clobert, J.; Baguette, M. Population sex ratio and dispersal in experimental, two-patch metapopulations of butterflies. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **2013**, *82*, 946-955.
84. Nowicki, P.; Vravec, V. Evidence for positive density-dependent emigration in butterfly metapopulations. *Oecologia* **2011**, *167*, 657-665.
85. Bitume, E.V.; Bonte, D.; Ronce, O.; Bach, F.; Flaven, E.; Olivieri, I.; Nieberding, C.M. Density and genetic relatedness increase dispersal distance in a subsocial organism. *Ecol. Letters* **2013**, *16*, 430-437.

86. Bellamy, D.E.; Byrne, D.N. Effects of gender and mating status on self-directed dispersal by the whitefly parasitoid *Eretmocerus eremicus*. *Ecol. Entomol.* **2001**, *26*, 571–577.
87. Simon, J.C.; Dickson, W.B.; Dickinson, M.H. Prior Mating experience modulates the dispersal of *Drosophila* in males more than in females. *Behav. Genet.* **2011**, *41*, 754–767.
88. Bowler, D.E.; Benton, T.G. Variation in dispersal mortality and dispersal propensity among individuals: the Effects of age, sex and resource availability. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **2009**, *78*, 1234–41.
89. Baines, C.B.; McCauley, S.; Rowe, L. The interactive effects of competition and predation risk on dispersal in an insect. *Biol. Lett.* **2014**, *10*.
90. Baines, C.B.; McCauley, S.J.; Rowe, L. Dispersal depends on body condition and predation risk in the semi-aquatic insect, *Notonecta undulata*. *Ecol. Evol.* **2015**, *5*, 2307–2316.
91. Alcalay, Y.; Tsurim, I.; Ovadia, O. Female mosquitoes disperse further when they develop under predation risk. *Behav. Ecol.* **2018**, *29*, 1402–1408.
92. Reim, E.; Baguette, M.; Gunter, F.; Fischer, K. Emigration propensity and flight performance are decoupled in a butterfly. *Ecosphere* **2018**, *9*, e02502.
93. Lebeau, J.; Wesselingh, R.A.; van Dyck, H. Nectar resource limitation affects butterfly flight performance and metabolism differently in intensive and extensive agricultural landscapes. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **2016**, *283*, 20160455.
94. Prasad, R.P.; Roitberg, B.D.; Henderson, D. The Effect of rearing temperature on flight initiation of *Trichogramma sibiricum* Sorkina at ambient temperatures. *Biol. Control* **1999**, *16*, 291–298.
95. Benard, M.F.; McCauley, S.J. Integrating across life-history stages: consequences of natal habitat effects on dispersal. *Am. Nat.* **2008**, *171*, 553–567.
96. Baines C.B.; McCauley, S.J. 2018. Natal habitat conditions have carryover effects on dispersal capacity and behaviour. *Ecosphere* **2018**, *9*, e02465.
97. Jourdan, J.; Baranov, V.; Wagner, R.; Plath, M.; Haase, P. Elevated temperatures translate into reduced dispersal abilities in a natural population of an aquatic insect. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **2019**, *88*, 1498–1509.
98. Müller, C.B.; Williams, I.S.; Hardie, J. The role of nutrition, crowding and interspecific interactions in the development of winged aphids. *Ecol. Entomol.* **2001**, *26*, 330–340.
99. Eycott, A.E.; Stewart, G.B.; Buyung-Ali, L.M.; Bowler, D.E.; Watts, K.; Pullin, A.S. A meta-analysis on the impact of different matrix structures on species movement rates. *Landscape Ecol.* **2012**, *27*, 1263–1278.
100. Schtickzelle, N.; Mennechez, G.; Baguette, M. Dispersal depression with habitat fragmentation in the bog fritillary butterfly. *Ecology* **2006**, *87*, 1057–1065.
101. Baguette, M.; Clobert, J.; Schtickzelle, N. Metapopulation dynamics of the bog fritillary butterfly: experimental changes in habitat quality induced negative density-dependent dispersal. *Ecography* **2011**, *34*, 170–176.

4. Main characteristics of disperser and resident insects

Dispersing insects are not a random subset from the population [24, 33, 60], and these individuals exhibit a suite of morphological, physiological and behavioural traits which offset dispersal costs and increase the probability of successful dispersal [28]. In almost all taxonomic groups that have been studied so far, phenotypic differences between dispersing and resident individuals have been reported, from single-celled organisms to insects to mammals [22, 78, 104-107]. Dispersal polymorphism, and more particularly the phenotypic differences between residents and dispersers, largely results from the value of the traits that enable (for instance: presence of wings, dispersal behaviour such as ballooning), enhance (for instance: lower metabolic rate, higher body size, in particular higher legs and wings) and drive (for instance: fitness performance in the considered abiotic environment) dispersal [108]. Enabling traits are not necessarily restricted to the presence / absence of dispersal structures as in the case of wing dimorphic insects, and can result from the development of the appendices associated with individual's movements.

Enabling and enhancing traits related to physiological, biochemical, or energy budget aspects, and molecular mechanisms of wing polymorphism, and the genetic basis of insect dispersal have been reviewed by several authors [37, 109-113]. Yet, even if these aspects are not considered in this article, it should be kept in mind that behaviour, physiology and life-history are covarying traits which have been unified under the concept of pace-of-life-syndrome [114-115].

4.1 Flight-fecundity trade-offs in wing-dimorphic insects

There are several famous examples of dispersal polymorphism related to wing differences in different insect groups, including Coleoptera, Heteroptera, Hemiptera, or Orthoptera, with several species exhibiting a sedentary (resident) and a dispersing morph [109]. In these insects, macropterous (long-winged) individuals generally represent the dispersal morph, as compared with brachypterous (short-winged) individuals. Some examples include *Pyrrhocoris apterus* (Heteroptera: Pyrrhocoridae) [34], *Metrioptera bicolor* (Orthoptera: Tettigoniida) [116] or aphids (Hemiptera) [117]. Importantly, macropterous insects, which thus have the largest wings, will not obligatorily disperse.

As dispersal incurs costs (reviewed in Bonte [28]), the development of dispersal capacities often has counter-effects on other fitness traits. These costs and trade-offs have been particularly studied in wing-dimorphic insects, as they may be easier to report by taking place before the initiation of dispersal movement (cost of the 'winged' phenotype). They are thus known as 'pre-departure' costs. In winged insects, the higher musculature of the dispersing individuals, in addition to the energy necessary for fuelling the cost of the dispersal flight, may come at the expense of reproduction [118-120]. Interestingly, flight muscles can be histolized after the onset of oviposition in the new breeding patch [38], as reported in the beet webworm, *Loxostege sticticalis* Lezed, and resources from histolysis are reused to sustain fecundity [121].

43 Several studies reported the existence of a trade-off in between reproduction and flight
44 in wing-polymorphic insects [62, 122-124]. In the locust *Gryllus firmus*, which represents one of
45 the model insect often used for running investigations on dispersal costs, small-winged insects
46 produce 60% more eggs than their large-winged counterparts over a period of six weeks [125-126].
47 This author also reported the existence of a negative correlation between flight efficiency and the
48 number of eggs carried by females, in addition to delayed age at the first reproduction in the
49 dispersing phenotypes of the locusts. In the green lacewing *Chrysoperla sinica*, Khuhro et al. [127]
50 found that females' flight affected longevity and their subsequent fecundity, and potential
51 fecundity of females of *Choristoneura conflictana* was also reduced after a flight, possibly because
52 of egg resorption [128]. The frequent observations of the oogenesis-flight syndrome in wing-
53 polymorphic insects may be partly explained by the fact that dispersal (flying activity) occurs
54 before the start of reproduction in these animals. Of note, the conclusion drawn from other
55 studies were more equivocal. For instance, no trade-off between reproductive output and flight
56 was found in the navel orangeworm, *Amyelois transitella* (Walker) (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae,
57 Phycitini) [129]. An opposite pattern, i.e. increased investment into reproduction after the
58 dispersal event, has even been observed in macropterous beetles [62], or could be expected from
59 insects whose flight muscles are histolized. In males, a trade-off with mating activity has been
60 reported in the meta-analysis of Guerra [62].

61

62 4.2 Effects of dispersal polymorphism on mating success and movement characteristics in wing- 63 dimorphic insects

64

65 The presence and / or size of the wings can affect mating success, by altering the degree of
66 attractiveness of the individual towards its sexual partner [130]. Dispersal morphs, i.e. large-
67 winged insects, of locusts [131-134] and aphids [118] have lower mating frequencies and success
68 than their short-wing relatives. In the dimorphic thrips species *Hoplothrips pedicularis*, wingless
69 males have longer forelegs (measured as the length of fore-femora) than winged males, and this
70 confers a significant advantages during fights [135], allowing them to secure more mating with
71 females. In *Aquarius remigis*, wingless males mate more often than winged males [136], and the
72 reduction of the wings in males of *Cavelerius saccharivorus* leads to fitness advantages [137],
73 partly because it reduces the time necessary to reach sexual majority, thus enhancing mating
74 opportunities for small-winged males. Similarly, in the beetle *Callosobruchus maculatus*, most
75 copulations take place between short-winged males and females [138]. However, there are
76 exceptions to these observations, as for instance in *Ptinella aptera*, *Ptinella errabunda* and *Orgyia*
77 *thyllina* for which macropterous individuals produce more eggs than their wingless counterparts
78 [139].

79

80 Energetic requirements for flight can also have transgenerational fitness costs, by affecting
81 the quality of the progeny, whose physical condition partly depends on the resource allocation
82 towards reproduction. In *Lygaeus equestris*, winged individuals produce smaller eggs than
83 wingless ones, which results in transgenerational fitness costs, as the progeny of winged
84 individuals are more sensitive to environmental stress, such as starvation [140].

85

86 Environmental conditions, either abiotic (temperature, trophic resources) or biotic
87 (predation, parasitism) can shape the production of winged offspring. In the pea aphids
88 *Acyrtosiphon pisum*, the proportion of winged offspring is increased when the population is
89 exposed to natural enemies; enemies can be predators (ladybird: [141]); or parasitoids (*Aphidius*
90 *ervi*: [142]). A similar pattern has also been reported when insects are subjected to increased
91 tactile stimulation with conspecifics or other insects [96]. In the tropical seed bug *Jadera aerola*
92 [143], short winged individuals are found during late dry season, and the seasonal wing
93 polymorphism in this species has been hypothesised to occur as a response to the shift from one
94 season to another and to the unpredictability of nutrient availability. The resulting increased
95 proportion of winged insects likely increases dispersal rate of the individuals in order to escape
96 from less favourable habitat conditions.

97
98 Finally, behavioural differences have also been reported. In the wing-dimorphic bugs *P.*
99 *apterus*, the macropterous insects exhibited a more efficient dispersal strategy. These insects have
100 straighter dispersal paths, higher mean dispersal speed, and lower exploration time, resulting in
101 higher distance moved as compared with brachypterous individuals [34]. In Gerridae, it has been
102 reported that winged individuals have a reduced ability to walk on the surface of the water, which
103 could affect their ability to eat and escape from predators [130]. These findings reinforce the need
104 to determine if there are stable associations of behavioural and life-history traits in these
105 individuals (pace-of-life syndrome theory; [114]). In particular, the existence of similar behaviour
106 among insects dispersing by hopping, walking, or flying would suggest that underpinning
107 physiological regulatory mechanisms have been evolutionary conserved.

108
109 *4.3 Phenotypic differences in dispersers and residents from wing-monomorphic and wingless*
110 *insects: morphology and behaviour*

111
112 Dispersal differences have been found in wing-monomorphic and wingless insects, in correlation
113 with a range of morphological, behavioural, physiological and genetic characteristics. For instance,
114 Steyn et al. [144] found that dispersers of the Mediterranean fruit fly *Ceratitis capitata* are
115 characterised by higher values of the ratios thorax to body mass as compared with their philopatric
116 (resident) relatives. Often, dispersal distances that can be covered correlate with dispersal
117 structures, as reported for Trichoptera species from the genus *Ecnomus* whose itinerant
118 specimens are characterised by higher wing size and shapes [145]. In the migratory monarch
119 butterfly, flight performance was associated with wing morphology in both males and females:
120 insects having longer wings, and larger wing areas, fly over longer distances, while aspect ratio
121 (length/width of the wing) was not discriminating the flying performance of the butterflies [146].
122 In the red flour beetle *T. castaneum*, while body size was not correlated with movement, leg length
123 of the insect correlates with movement ability, resulting in farther and fastest dispersal of the
124 beetle [147]. In this insect, longer legs are also associated with higher movement motivation and
125 dispersal distance [73]. As reported in wing polymorphic insects, movements of dispersers have a
126 tendency to be more straight during dispersal events, even if this pattern may depend on the
127 degree of fragmentation of habitats [148-149]. Importantly, landscape structure and habitat loss

128 may affect the proportion of disperser / resident phenotypes. Viljur et al. [150] suggested that all
129 of the butterflies they studied from a managed forest could represent dispersal phenotypes.

130

131 Interestingly, colour patterns of the wings have recently been reported as a morphological
132 proxy that could be used for sorting out noctuid moth populations with long dispersal distance
133 capacities (high variation in colour patterns among individuals) in comparison to their resident
134 conspecifics (little variation in wing colouration among individuals) [151]. As more variable colour
135 patterns has also been found to increase population abundance and stability in noctuid moths
136 [152], changes in colour pattern variability along an invasion gradient could strengthen the range
137 expansion dynamics of invasive insects. Additional observations of possible correlations among
138 wing colour patterns, thermal tolerance, dispersal motivation and success should be further
139 examined, as it could have several implications for improving our predictions of range expansion
140 in contexts of climate change and habitat fragmentation.

141

142 Differences in dispersal capacity may also be supported by distinct behaviours of the
143 insects according to the environmental conditions of their habitats. In a spider species, for
144 example, there is little or no detectable phenotypic difference between dispersers and residents,
145 but the conditions encountered in the natal patch during the juvenile stage influence the dispersal
146 strategy of the individuals. Specifically, some wolf spiders will disperse over long distances using
147 silk threads (dispersers) and others will remain relatively sedentary by only moving over short
148 distances while abseiling along the plants [153]. Social behaviour, in correlation with the
149 morphology of the insect, can also have links / consequences on dispersal patterns [154]. In the
150 beetle *Librodor japonicus*, there are three main body sizes in males (small, medium and large
151 males); large males disperse earlier from the patch than the two other morphs [155]. In parallel,
152 these males are more aggressive, i.e. they fight more frequently than males of smaller sizes who
153 are sneaking. The authors concluded that resources allocation differ among the three morphs,
154 with more investment into testes, wings, and mandibles for the small, medium and large *L.*
155 *japonicus* males, respectively [155]. A similar finding has been reported from the armed beetle
156 *Gnatocerus cornutus*, whose males having a smaller weapon size (lower enlargement of the
157 mandibles) dispersed more and have a higher spermatogeny expenditure than their counterparts
158 having enlarged mandibles [156]; in the latter phenotype, the rate of remating with the same
159 female is higher and likely explains this lower investment in testis size and volume of sperm
160 production.

161

162 4.4 Phenotypic differences in dispersers and residents from wing-monomorphic and wingless 163 insects: reproduction and fecundity

164

165 The mating latency (age at reproduction of males and females) and duration of copulation can be
166 affected by dispersal capacities, as reported in the butterfly *Pieris brassicae*: the measured values
167 for these two reproductive parameters are shorter in individuals having a high mobility (dispersers;
168 [82, 157]) as compared with those of low mobility [81]. While there is additional supporting
169 evidence for the oogenesis-flight syndrome in monomorphic insects [158], this pattern has also
170 been refuted in other studies [159]. This syndrome will not be extensively developed here, as it

171 has been discussed in another review of the special issue ‘The study of insect movement and
172 foraging strategies’ [160], and in the recent review of [Tigreros and Davidowitz \[38\]](#). Briefly, on
173 the 68 studies they analysed, covering 51 different insect species, [Tigreros and Davidowitz \[38\]](#)
174 reported an effect of flight on subsequent fecundity in 39 works, no effect in 16 studies, and a
175 positive effect of flight on fecundity in nine studies. Some of these incongruencies may partly
176 result from uncontrolled quality of the meals taken by the insects. Indeed, we are having growing
177 evidence that the nature of the available food resources can represent an important factor driving
178 the flight-fecundity trade-off [161]. Landscape structure, in particular path connectivity (different
179 among the studies), may also contribute driving the oogenesis-flight syndrome [158]. Moreover,
180 the quality of the diet can differentially affect the exploratory tendency of disperser and resident
181 phenotypes, and can even have reverse effects in males and females [162].

182

183 In a study carried out on the fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster*, [Roff et al. \[32\]](#) reported the
184 energetics cost of flight on the subsequent reproduction of the flies, i.e. egg production of the
185 females is reduced when the duration of the flight is increased. Similarly to wing-dimorphic insects,
186 a dispersal-fecundity trade-offs has been reported, with males of *T. castaneum* selected for higher
187 mobility exhibiting shorter copulation durations, lower stimulation of the females during mating
188 [163], and lower mating success [164]. In the same vein, the size of eggs was higher in females of
189 *T. castaneum* characterised by lower walking activities and lower dispersal distances, but no
190 difference was found for the number of egg laid (oviposition measured over 50d) as compared
191 with females having higher walking activities [165]. In the codling moth *Cydia pomonella*, the
192 fecundity and longevity were higher in the sedentary females as compared with those exhibiting
193 the mobile phenotype, resulting in a higher net reproductive rate [119]. The flight-fecundity trade-
194 off has also been reported between species having different dispersal capacities. For instance, the
195 aphid *Tuberculatus paiki*, which is a good disperser, has a lower wing loading as compared with
196 *Tuberculatus quercicola* (low level of dispersal in comparison to *T. paiki*); the higher body volume
197 of *T. quercicola* most probably contribute explaining the higher number embryos measured in this
198 species [166].

199

200 Finally, an important aspect that needs to be considered when regarding the dispersal-
201 reproduction trade-off is the nature of the factors that drive it. Indeed, this syndrome can result
202 from (i) pre-existing trade-offs at the individual level (pace-of-life syndrome theory, oogenesis-
203 flight syndrome) or from (ii) the energy consumed during dispersal (cost of dispersal). The origin
204 of the syndrome is likely to have important implications for the individual; in the first situation, a
205 part of the dispersal costs have been already ‘paid’, whereas in the second situation, dispersal
206 costs will only be paid if the insect effectively disperses.

207

208

209 **5. Range expanding populations**

210

211 The ongoing global changes, and more particularly the degradation of habitats and the warming
212 of many areas worldwide, have opened new ecological niches for many insect species that can for
213 instance move poleward and at higher altitudes in mountains. Dispersal and migration are

214 common responses adopted by animals to changing conditions of their habitats, including changes
215 in thermal conditions [167]. As a result, global changes have strengthened the interest for
216 dispersal studies [169], as the resulting knowledge improves our predictions of the future
217 distribution of species [18].

218

219 The rate and possibilities for geographic expansion is driven by the nature of the available
220 dispersal paths, the mobility of the considered individuals, and the availability of suitable habitats
221 for the settlement of the population. Generally, species who are highly mobile are more likely to
222 extend their range more consequently than specialist and less mobile ones. For instance, the two
223 butterfly species *Hesperia comma* and *Aricia agrestis*, and the two cricket species *Conocephalus*
224 *discolor* and *Metrioptera roeselii*, had a significant expansion of their range likely facilitated by the
225 high proportion of macropterous insects [30].

226

227 Range expansion and the evolution of dispersal of non-native insects along their invasion
228 gradient are being increasingly studied [40, 169-170]. When expanding their range, the few
229 individuals colonizing new habitats, whose distance from the main core population is being
230 progressively increased, should have direct fitness advantages. Indeed, recently established
231 individuals should benefit from decreased intra-specific competition. In the carabid beetle
232 *Merizodus soledadinus* invading the subantarctic Kerguelen Islands, populations with longer
233 residence times are characterized by a smaller body size as compared with insects sampled at the
234 invasion front [171-172]. Variations in the quality of quantity of trophic resources among localities
235 may partially drive this body pattern: at the invasion front, the voracious *M. soledadinus* colonists
236 would benefit from a larger - potentially unlimited - pool of preferred preys, authorizing the
237 production of offspring of larger sizes. Similar body size patterns have been observed from other
238 insect taxa [173-174].

239

240 Larger individuals are more likely to reach more distant localities during colonisation
241 events [175]. Increased movement performance is an explicit advantage for colonising individuals,
242 and can be particularly significant in successfully reaching more distant locations if individuals
243 disperse using straight trajectories [176-177]. Experimental manipulation of weight loaded by the
244 butterfly *Anartia Fatima* suggested that the higher mass allocation to the thorax during range
245 expansion may result from selection for increased dispersal capacities [178]. Overall, (non-
246 exhaustive list), longer legs, higher muscle mass, larger body reserves, lower competition in newly
247 colonised habitats should enhance dispersal performance [179-181], and should increase the
248 probability of dispersal events over higher geographic distances. This process repeats as the
249 invasion wave progresses, thus reinforcing the phenotypic distinction between front (disperser)
250 and core (resident) populations [169]. In controlled conditions, adults of *M. soledadinus* from
251 range margin populations exhibit higher locomotor activity [182]. In the invasive kudzu bugs
252 *Megacopta cribraria* in North America, dispersal, measured as the duration of the flight of the
253 individuals and the distance covered in 1h) first increases from the core population onwards the
254 invasion gradient, before decreasing in populations from the invasion frontlines of the species
255 [183]. This observation evidences the importance of the presence of suitable habitats for the range
256 expanding populations, in particular in terms of quality of resources, as this can significantly blur

257 any potential body size pattern along the invasion gradient. This is particularly true for insects
258 having a small diet breadth, as in the case of *M. cribraria* [183].

259

260 Founder individuals will further share and transmit their genetic background (assortative
261 mating). As this phenomenon repeats as the invasion front moves forward, dispersal traits should
262 be enhanced at the leading edge of the range expansion, generating phenotypic differentiation
263 between front and core individuals, also known as the Olympic village effect (see [Chuang and
264 Peterson \[181\]](#) for a review of the phenotypes that have been observed at invasion fronts in
265 insects and other animal models). The promotion of dispersal traits at the invasion has led to the
266 theory of spatial sorting [184]. Behind the front wave and in core populations, higher population
267 densities should favour competitive abilities of individuals, rather than biological traits enhancing
268 their dispersal capacities. In an experiment aiming at simulating the evolution of dispersal along
269 an invasion gradient, [Ochocki and Miller \[169\]](#) revealed that adult beetle *Callosobruchus*
270 *maculatus* were characterised by higher dispersal distances after 10 generations. Similarly, in adult
271 *T. castaneum* selected for dispersal capacities over eight generations, [Weiss-Lehman et al. \[185\]](#)
272 found that the intrinsic growth rate of the population was decreased, while dispersal ability was
273 increased, in addition to a slight increase of dispersal speed. This experimental study was
274 conducted to simulate the evolution of dispersal traits at invasion fronts, and allowed revealing
275 that variability of the measured traits was also increased in these individuals. These findings
276 suggest that spatial sorting, population density, gene surfing and patch connectivity represent
277 significant forces shaping the evolution of dispersal capacities in range expanding species.

278

279 Individuals at the edge of the expansion range invest more into dispersal and reproduction,
280 most probably because of the lowest intraspecific competition in these populations still having
281 low densities. Moreover, because of this low population density in satellite populations,
282 individuals may remain more active, or should disperse, to mate. At there are fewer mates, these
283 insects must also be highly fertile. At the range edge of the distribution, the Allee effect may drive
284 the spreading rate of the populations [186-187]. In the main (core) populations, the
285 competitiveness may be a more important trait to be developed, and the performance of the
286 reproduction of the dispersers at the core should be lower as compared with the residents. In sum,
287 interactions among Allee effects, density-dependent dispersal propensity, and evolution of
288 dispersal capacities and competitiveness along the invasion gradient render the predictions of
289 invasion dynamics complex, but represent promising research avenues.

290

291

292 **6. Perspectives**

293

294 While organisms' dispersal is being increasingly studied, this review article also points out our lack
295 of knowledge of certain aspects of dispersal processes and mechanisms shaping the disperser and
296 resident phenotypes in insects. Personality-dependent dispersal may have several implications for
297 the successful range expansions of native and non-native insects. However, there are few studies
298 that examined insect personality, in terms of exploratory behaviour and aggressiveness for
299 instance, or behavioural polymorphism in correlation with dispersal capacities. Interesting

300 findings could emerge from such investigations, and aliment the idea that dispersal and habitat
301 establishment / colonisation could be a two steps process: individuals having a higher
302 aggressiveness establish populations, then followed by joiners with more social personalities [188].
303 Some examples of the traits that can be considered and the associated experimental designs can
304 be found in Labaude et al. [189] and Tremmel and Müller [190]. A review of the studies on
305 personality in invertebrates has been written by Kralj-Fiser and Schuett [191], and examples and
306 theory can be found in Spiegel et al. [192] and Dahirel et al. [193].

307

308 The reproductive status and the reproductive timing of males and females are associated
309 with distinct endocrine status and management of body energy use. The influence of mate
310 availability on dispersal propensity has already been tested in insects. Conversely, there are less
311 investigations that have been designed to compare the dispersal propensity and performance in
312 mated versus unmated adults, and the effects of reproductive timing on dispersal remains to be
313 explored [160]. Such comparisons may provide us with interesting insights into the possible
314 endocrine and physiological mechanisms triggering inter-individual dispersal variability, in
315 addition to get more information on the cascading effects on the subsequent management of
316 body reserves.

317

318 In many animals, including insects, the traits supporting dispersal success of the individual
319 are correlated to a series of other morphological, behavioural and physiological traits; this set of
320 covarying traits is known as a dispersal syndrome [60]. There are two main categories of dispersal
321 syndromes: the ones resulting from the divergent selection of resident and disperser individuals
322 that were not exposed to the same environmental factors, known as the adaptive dispersal
323 syndromes [6], and the dispersal syndromes that emerged as a result of the association of
324 different traits in relation with dispersal capacities, known as the dispersal syndrome trade-off [6].
325 Dispersal syndromes generally occur to enhance the chances of coping with environmental
326 constraints during dispersal events, as for instance thermal variability (see Colinet et al. [195] for
327 visualizing the effects of thermal variations on insects' ecology and physiology). Several authors
328 suggested the existence of different phenotypes among core and range populations [171-172,
329 195-196], in part resulting from the different ecological filters the insects encounter during
330 geographic expansion [40]. Yet, the association of traits which altogether form a dispersal
331 syndrome should be given more attention in the future, in particular for invasive insects along
332 their expansion gradients.

333

334 Even if we are starting to have a good knowledge of the factors that drive dispersal
335 propensity, we are now needing to increase our understanding of the effects of the landscape
336 structure [108] on dispersal syndromes, and more particularly improve our understanding of the
337 effects of connectivity of patches, including solitary sites, on these syndromes. In the field,
338 functional connectivity among habitats and the degree of habitat disturbance may shape dispersal
339 distances and performance. For instance, the models proposed by Karisto and Kisdi [197] suggest
340 that connectivity of suitable habitats for the insect determines the nature of the dispersal (local
341 versus global dispersal); future works should now examine how much connectivity could represent
342 an evolutionary force driving the suite of traits of resident and disperser phenotypes.

343 **Funding**

344 This research received no external funding.

345

346 **Acknowledgments**

347 I wish to thank Maxime Dahirel for helpful comments on an earlier version of this article, and for
 348 the insightful exchanges we are having on the topic of dispersal ecology. The idea of this review
 349 article has been stimulated by the researches we are conducting on dispersal ecology and range
 350 expansion within the framework of the Programme IPEV 136 'Subanteco' supported by the French
 351 Polar Institute Paul-Emile Victor (IPEV).

352

353 **7. References**

354

- 355 1. Johnson, D.M.; Horvitz, C.C. Estimating postnatal dispersal: tracking the unseen dispersers. *Ecology*
 356 **2005**, *86*, 1185–1190.
- 357 2. Ruf, D.; Dorn, S.; Mazzi, D. Females leave home for sex: Natal dispersal in a parasitoid with
 358 complementary sex determination. *Anim. Behav.* **2011**, *81*, 1083–1089.
- 359 3. McCauley, S.J. Body size and social dominance influence breeding dispersal in male *Pachydiplax*
 360 *longipennis* (Odonata). *Ecol. Entomol.* **2010**, *35*, 377–385.
- 361 4. Ronce, O. How does it feel to be like a rolling stone? Ten Questions about dispersal evolution. *Annu.*
 362 *Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **2007**, *38*, 231–253.
- 363 5. Matthysen, E. Multicausality of dispersal: a review. In *Dispersal ecology and evolution*; Clobert, J.;
 364 Baguette, M.; Benton, T.G.; Bullock, J.M., Eds.; Oxford University Press, UK, 2012; pp 3–18.
- 365 6. Clobert, J.; Baguette, M.; Benton, T.G.; Bullock, J.M. Dispersal ecology and evolution. Oxford
 366 University Press: Oxford, United Kingdom, 2012; 496 p.
- 367 7. Starrfelt, J.; Kokko, H. The theory of dispersal under multiple influences. In *Dispersal ecology and*
 368 *evolution*; Clobert, J.; Baguette, M.; Benton, T.G.; Bullock, J.M., Eds.; Oxford University Press,
 369 Oxford, United Kingdom, 2012; pp 19–28.
- 370 8. Fauvergue, X.; Vercken, E.; Malausa, T.; Hufbauer, R.A. The biology of small, introduced populations,
 371 with special reference to biological control. *Evol. Appl.* **2012**, *5*, 424–443.
- 372 9. Charlesworth, D.; Willis, J.H. The genetics of inbreeding depression. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **2009**, *10*, 783–
 373 796.
- 374 10. Poethke, H.J.; Pfenning, B.; Hovestadt, T. The relative contribution of individual and kin selection
 375 to the evolution of density-dependent dispersal rates. *Evol. Ecol. Res.* **2007**, *9*, 41–50.
- 376 11. Wright, S. The theory of gene frequencies. Chicago University Press, Chicago and London, United
 377 States and United Kingdom, 1969; Volume 2, 5119 p.
- 378 12. Brown, J.H.; Kodric-Brown, A. Turnover rates in insular biogeography: effect of migration on
 379 extinction. *Ecology* **1977**, *58*, 445–49.
- 380 13. Eriksson, A.; Elias-Wolff, F.; Mehlig, B.; Manica, A. The emergence of the rescue effect from explicit
 381 within- and between-patch dynamics in a metapopulation. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **2014**, *281*, 20133127.
- 382 14. Poloczanska, E.S.; Brown, C.J.; Sydeman, W.J.; Kiessling, W.; Schoeman, D.S.; Moore, P.J.; Brander,
 383 K.; Bruno, J.F.; Buckley, L.B.; Burrows, M.T.; Duarte, C.M.; Halpern, B.S.; Holding, J.; Kappel,
 384 C.V.; O'Connor, M.I.; Pandolfi, J.M.; Parmesan, C.; Schwing, F.; Thompson, S.A.; Richardson,
 385 A.J. Global imprint of climate change on marine life. *Nature Climate Change* **2013**, *3*, 919–925.
- 386 15. Pateman, R.M.; Thomas, C.D.; Hayward, S.A.; Hill, J.K. Macro- and microclimatic interactions can
 387 drive variation in species' habitat associations. *Glob. Change Biol.* **2016**, *22*, 556–566.
- 388 16. Norberg, J.; Urban, M.C.; Vellend, M.; Klausmeier, C.A.; Loeuille, N. Eco-evolutionary responses of
 389 biodiversity to climate change. *Nature Climate Change* **2012**, *2*, 747–751.
- 390 17. Rumpf, S.B.; Hülber, K.; Klöner, G.; Moser, D.; Schütz, M.; Wessely, J.; Willner, W.; Zimmermann,
 391 N.E.; Dullinger, S. Range dynamics of mountain plants decrease with elevation. *Proc. Nat. Acad.*
 392 *Sci.* **2018**, *115*, 1848–1853.

- 393 18. Berg, M.P.; Kiers, E.T.; Driessen, G.; Van Der Heijden, M.; Kooi, B.W.; Kuenen, F.; Liefjing, M.;
394 Verhoef, H.A.; Ellers, J. Adapt or disperse: understanding species persistence in a changing
395 world. *Glob. Change Biol.* **2010**, *16*, 587–598.
- 396 19. Årevall, J.; Early, R.; Estrada, A.; Wennergren, U.; Eklöf, A.C. Conditions for successful range shifts
397 under climate change: The role of species dispersal and landscape configuration. *Divers. Distrib.*
398 **2018**, *24*, 1598–1611.
- 399 20. Céré, J.; Vickery, W.L.; Dickman, C.R. 2015. Refugia and dispersal promote population persistence
400 under variable arid conditions: a spatio-temporal simulation model. *Ecosphere* **2015**, *6*, 225.
- 401 21. Armsworth, P.R.; Roughgarden, J.E. 2005. Disturbance induces the contrasting evolution of
402 reinforcement and dispersiveness in directed and random movers. *Evolution* **2005**, *10*, 2083–
403 2096.
- 404 22. Bowler, D.E.; Benton, T.G. Causes and consequences of animal dispersal strategies: relating
405 individual behaviour to spatial dynamics. *Biol. Rev.* **2005**, *80*, 205–225
- 406 23. Entling, M.H.; Stämpfli, K.; Ovaskainen, O. Increased propensity for aerial dispersal in disturbed
407 habitats due to intraspecific variation and species turnover. *Oikos* **2011**, *120*, 1099–1109.
- 408 24. Edelaar, P.; Bolnick, D.I. Non-random gene flow: an underappreciated force in evolution and
409 ecology. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **2012**, *27*, 659–665.
- 410 25. Miller, N.J.; Sappington, T.W. Role of dispersal in resistance evolution and spread. *Curr. Opin. Insect*
411 *Sci.* **2017**, *21*, 68–74.
- 412 26. Wotton, K.R.; Gao, B.; Menz, M.H.M.; Morris, R.K.A.; Ball, S.G.; Lim, K.S.; Reynolds, D.R.; Hu, G.;
413 Chapman, J.W. Mass seasonal migrations of hoverflies provide extensive pollination and crop
414 protection services. *Curr. Biol.* **2019**, *29*, 2167–2173.
- 415 27. Keller, D.; Holderegger, R. Damselflies use different movement strategies for short- and long-
416 distance dispersal. *Insect Conserv. Divers.* **2013**, *6*, 590–597
- 417 28. Bonte, D.; Van Dyck, H.; Bullock, J.M.; Coulon, A.; Delgado, M.; Gibbs, M.; Lehouck, V.; Matthysen,
418 E.; Mustin, K.; Saastamoinen, M., et al. Costs of dispersal. *Biol. Rev.* **2012**, *87*, 290–312.
- 419 29. Hamilton, W.D.; May, R.M. Dispersal in stable habitats. *Nature* **1977**, *269*, 578–581.
- 420 30. Thomas, C. D.; Bodsworth, E.J.; Wilson, R.J.; Simmons, A.D.; Davies, Z.G.; Musche, M.; Conradt, L.
421 Ecological and evolutionary processes at expanding range margins. *Nature* **2001**, *411*, 577–581.
- 422 31. Hughes, C.L.; Dytham, C.; Hill, J.K. Modelling and analysing evolution of dispersal in populations at
423 expanding range boundaries. *Ecol. Entomol.* **2007**, *32*, 437–445.
- 424 32. Roff, D.A. Dispersal in Dipterans: its costs and consequences. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **1977**, *46*, 443–456.
- 425 33. Harrison, R.G. Dispersal polymorphism in insects. *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **1980**, *11*, 95–118.
- 426 34. Socha, R.; Zemek, R. Wing morph-related differences in the walking pattern and dispersal in a
427 flightless bug, *Pyrrhocoris apterus* (Heteroptera). *Oikos* **2003**, *100*, 35–42.
- 428 35. Arnold, P.A.; Cassey, P.; White, C.R. Functional traits in red flour beetles: the dispersal phenotype
429 is associated with leg length but not body size nor metabolic rate. *Funct. Ecol.* **2017**, *31*, 653–
430 661.
- 431 36. Stevens, V.M.; Turlure, C.; Baguette, M. A meta-analysis of dispersal in butterflies. *Biol. Rev.* **2010**,
432 *85*, 625–642.
- 433 37. Zera, A.J. The biochemical basis of life history adaptation: *Gryllus* studies lead the way. In *The cricket*
434 *as a model organism*; Horch, H.; Mito, T.; Popadić, A.; Ohuchi, H.; Noji S. Ed.; Springer: Tokyo,
435 Japan, 2017; pp. 229–243.
- 436 38. Tigreros, N.; Davidowitz, G. Chapter One - Flight-fecundity tradeoffs in wing-monomorphic insects.
437 *Adv. Insect Physiol.* **2019**, *56*, 1–41.
- 438 39. Osborne, J.L.; Loxdale, H.D.; Woiwod I.P. Monitoring insect dispersal. In *Dispersal Ecology*; Bullock,
439 J.M.; Kenward, R.; Hails, R., Ed.; **2002**, Blackwell Science: Oxford, United Kingdom; pp. 24–49.
- 440 40. Renault, D.; Laparie, M.; McCauley, S.J.; Bonte D. Environmental adaptations, ecological filtering,
441 and dispersal central to insect invasions. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* **2018**, *63*, 345–368.
- 442 41. Holyoak, M.; Casagrandi, R.; Nathan, R.; Revilla, E.; Spiegel, O. Trends and missing parts in the study
443 of movement ecology. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **2008**, *105*, 19060–19065.

- 444 42. Pervez, A.; Yadaz, M. Foraging behaviour of predaceous ladybird beetles: A review. *Eur. J. Environ.*
445 *Sci.* **2018**, *8*, 102–108.
- 446 43. Anreiter, I.; Sokolowski, M.B. The foraging gene and its behavioral effects: Pleiotropy and plasticity.
447 *Annu. Rev. Genet.* **2019**, *53*, 373–392.
- 448 44. Waiker, P.; Baral, S.; Kennedy, A.; Bhatia, S.; Rueppell, A.; Le, K.; Amiri, E.; Tsuruda, J.; Rueppell, O.
449 Foraging and homing behavior of honey bees (*Apis mellifera*) during a total solar eclipse. *The*
450 *Science of Nature* **2019**, *106*, 4.
- 451 45. Dolný, A.; Harabiš, F.; Mižičová, H. Home range, movement, and distribution patterns of the
452 threatened dragonfly *Sympetrum depressiusculum* (Odonata: Libellulidae): A thousand times
453 greater territory to protect? *PLoS ONE* **2014**, *9*, e100408.
- 454 46. Teitelbaum, C.S.; Mueller, T. Beyond migration: Causes and consequences of nomadic animal
455 movements. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **2019**, *34*, 569–581.
- 456 47. van Dyck, H.; Baguette, M. Dispersal behaviour in fragmented landscapes: Routine or special
457 movements? *Basic Appl. Ecol.* **2005**, *9*, 535–545.
- 458 48. Bell, W.J. Searching behavior patterns in insects. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* **1990**, *35*, 447–467.
- 459 49. Singh, N.J.; Börger, L.; Dettki, H.; Bunnefeld, N.; Ericsson, G. From migration to nomadism:
460 movement variability in a northern ungulate across its latitudinal range. *Ecol. Appl.* **2012**, *22*,
461 2007–2020.
- 462 50. Kennedy, J.S. Migration, behavioural and ecological. In *Migration: Mechanisms and Adaptive*
463 *Significance*, Contributions in Marine Science; Rankin, M.A., Ed.; Austin: Marine Science
464 Institute, University of Texas, USA, 27 (suppl.), 1985; pp. 5–26.
- 465 51. Dingle, H.; Drake, V.A. What is migration? *BioScience* **2007**, *7*, 113–121.
- 466 52. Slager, B.H.; Malcolm, S.B. Evidence for partial migration in the southern monarch butterfly,
467 *Danaus erippus*, in Bolivia and Argentina. *Biotropica* **2015**, *47*, 355–362.
- 468 53. Dällenbach, L.J.; Glauser, A.; Lim, K.S.; Chapman, J.W.; Menz, M.H.M. Higher flight activity in the
469 offspring of migrants compared to residents in a migratory insect. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **2018**, *285*,
470 20172829.
- 471 54. Menz, M.H.M.; Reynolds, D.R.; Gao, B.; Hu, G.; Chapman, J.W.; Wotton, K.R. Mechanisms and
472 consequences of partial migration in insects. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* **2019**, *7*, 403.
- 473 55. Wilson, J.R.U.; Dormontt, E.E.; Prentis, P.J.; Lowe, A.J.; Richardson, D.M. Something in the way you
474 move: dispersal pathways affect invasion success. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **2009**, *24*, 136–144.
- 475 56. Andrewartha, G.G.; Birch, L.C. The distribution and abundance of animals. University of Chicago
476 Press: Chicago, USA, 1954; 793 p.
- 477 57. Southwood, T.R.E. Migration of terrestrial arthropods in relation to habitats. *Biol. Rev.* **1962**, *37*,
478 171–214.
- 479 58. Southwood, T.R.E. Ecological aspects of insect migration. In *Animal Migration*; Aidley, D.J., Ed.;
480 Cambridge University Press: London, United Kingdom, 1981; pp. 197–208.
- 481 59. Dingle, H. Migration: The biology of life on the move (second edition). Oxford University
482 Press: Oxford, United Kingdom, 2014, 352 p.
- 483 60. Clobert, J.; Le Galliard, J.-F.; Cote, J.; Meylan, S.; Massot, M. Informed dispersal, heterogeneity in
484 animal dispersal syndromes and the dynamics of spatially structured populations. *Ecol. Lett.*
485 **2009**, *12*, 197–209.
- 486 61. Hanski I.; Saastamoinen, M.; Ovaskainen, O. Dispersal-related life-history trade-offs in a butterfly
487 metapopulation. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **2006**, *75*, 91–100.
- 488 62. Guerra, P.A. Evaluating the life-history trade-off between dispersal capability and reproduction in
489 wing dimorphic insects: a meta-analysis. *Biol. Rev.* **2011**, *86*, 813–835.
- 490 63. Feldhaar, H.; Schauer, B. Dispersal of saproxylic insects. In: *Saproxylic insects, diversity, ecology and*
491 *conservation*; Ulyshen, M.D., Ed.; Springer: Heidelberg, Germany, 2018; pp. 515–546.
- 492 64. Suchan, T.; Talavera, G.; Sáez, L.; Ronikier, M.; Vila, R. Pollen metabarcoding as a tool for tracking
493 long-distance insect migrations. *Mol. Ecol. Res.* **2019**, *19*, 149–162.

- 494 65. Minter, M.; Pearson, A.; Lim, K.S.; Wilson, K.; Chapman, J.W.; Jones, C.M. The tethered flight
495 technique as a tool for studying life-history strategies associated with migration in insects. *Ecol.*
496 *Entomol.* **2018**, *43*, 397–411.
- 497 66. Naranjo, S.E. Assessing insect flight behavior in the laboratory: A primer on flight mill methodology
498 and what can be learned. *Ann. Entomol. Soc. Am.* **2019**, *112*, 182–199.
- 499 67. Lee, D-H.; Nielsen, A.L.; Leskey, T.C. Dispersal capacity and behavior of nymphal stages of
500 *Halyomorpha halys* (Hemiptera: Pentatomidae) evaluated under laboratory and field
501 conditions. *J. Insect Behav.* **2014**, *27*, 639–651.
- 502 68. Matsumura, K.; Miyatake, T. Costs of walking: differences in egg size and starvation resistance of
503 females between strains of the red flour beetle (*Tribolium castaneum*) artificially selected for
504 walking ability. *J. Evol. Biol.* **2018**, *31*, 1632–1637.
- 505 69. Prus, T. Search for methods to investigate mobility in *Tribolium*. *Ecology* **1963**, *44*, 801–803.
- 506 70. Ritte, U.; Lavie, B. The genetic basis of dispersal behavior in the flour beetle, *Tribolium castaneum*.
507 *Canad. J. Genet. Cytol.* **1977**, *19*, 717–722.
- 508 71. Mulder, G.D. An ecological study of a natural population of *Tribolium brevicornis* Le Conte
509 (Coleoptera, Tenebrionidae). *Theses Digitization Project* **1978**, 180.
- 510 72. Arnold, P.A.; Rafter, M.A.; Malekpour, R.; Cassey, P.; Walter, G.H.; White, C.R. Investigating
511 movement in the laboratory: dispersal apparatus designs and the red flour beetle, *Tribolium*
512 *castaneum*. *Entomol. Exp. Appl.* **2017**, *163*, 93–100.
- 513 73. Matsumura, K.; Miyatake, T. Lines selected for different durations of tonic immobility have
514 different leg lengths in the red flour beetle *Tribolium castaneum*. *Behaviour* **2019**, *157*, 17–31.
- 515 74. Drury, D.W.; Whitesell, M.E.; Wade, M.J. The effects of temperature, relative humidity, light, and
516 resource quality on flight initiation in the red flour beetle, *Tribolium castaneum*. *Entomol. Exp.*
517 *Appl.* **2016**, *158*, 269–274.
- 518 75. Łomnicki, A. Population regulation by dispersal under selection pressure for and against dispersal:
519 an experimental test with beetles, *Tribolium confusum*. *Evol. Ecol. Res.* **2006**, *8*, 63–73.
- 520 76. Edelsparre, A.H.; Vesterberg, A.; Lim, J.H.; Anwari, M.; Fitzpatrick, M.J. Alleles underlying larval
521 foraging behaviour influence adult dispersal in nature. *Ecol. Letters* **2014**, *17*, 333–339.
- 522 77. Tung, S.; Mishra, A.; Shreenidhi, P.M.; Sadiq, M.A.; Joshi, S.; Sruti, V.R.S.; Dey, S. Simultaneous
523 evolution of multiple dispersal components and kernel. *Oikos* **2018**, *127*, 34–44.
- 524 78. Fronhofer, E.A.; Legrand, D.; Altermatt, F.; Ansart, A.; Blanchet, S.; Bonte, D.; Chaine, A.; Dahirel,
525 M.; De Laender, F.; De Raedt, J.: et al. Bottom-up and top-down control of dispersal across
526 major organismal groups. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **2018**, *2*, 1859–1863.
- 527 79. Morrison, W.R.; Wilkins, R.V.; Gerken, A.R.; Scheff, D.S.; Zhu, K.Y.; Arthur, F.H.; Campbell, J.F.
528 Mobility of Adult *Tribolium castaneum* (Coleoptera: Tenebrionidae) and *Rhyzopertha*
529 *dominica* (Coleoptera: Bostrichidae) after exposure to long-lasting insecticide-incorporated
530 netting. *J. Econ. Entomol.* **2018**, *111*, 2443–2453.
- 531 80. Ducatez, S.; Legrand, D.; Chaput-Bardy, A.; Stevens, V.M.; Fréville, H.; Baguette, M. Inter-individual
532 variation in movement: is there a mobility syndrome in the large white butterfly *Pieris*
533 *brassicae*? *Ecol. Entomol.* **2012**, *37*, 377–385.
- 534 81. Larranaga, N.; Baguette, M.; Calvez, O.; Legrand, D. Mobility affects copulation and oviposition
535 dynamics in *Pieris brassicae* in seminatural cages. *Insect Science* **2019**, *26*, 743–752.
- 536 82. Legrand, D.; Trochet, A.; Moulherat, S.; Calvez, O.; Stevens, V.M.; Ducatez, S.; Clobert, J.; Baguette,
537 M. Ranking the ecological causes of dispersal in a butterfly. *Ecography* **2015**, *38*, 822–831.
- 538 83. Trochet, A.; Legrand, D.; Larranaga, N.; Ducatez, S.; Calvez, O.; Cote, J.; Clobert, J.; Baguette, M.
539 Population sex ratio and dispersal in experimental, two-patch metapopulations of butterflies.
540 *J. Anim. Ecol.* **2013**, *82*, 946–955.
- 541 84. Nowicki, P.; Vravec, V. Evidence for positive density-dependent emigration in butterfly
542 metapopulations. *Oecologia* **2011**, *167*, 657–665.
- 543 85. Bitume, E.V.; Bonte, D.; Ronce, O.; Bach, F.; Flaven, E.; Olivieri, I.; Nieberding, C.M. Density and
544 genetic relatedness increase dispersal distance in a subsocial organism. *Ecol. Letters* **2013**, *16*,
545 430–437.

- 546 86. Bellamy, D.E.; Byrne, D.N. Effects of gender and mating status on self-directed dispersal by the
547 whitefly parasitoid *Eretmocerus eremicus*. *Ecol. Entomol.* **2001**, *26*, 571–577.
- 548 87. Simon, J.C.; Dickson, W.B.; Dickinson, M.H. Prior Mating experience modulates the dispersal
549 of *Drosophila* in males more than in females. *Behav. Genet.* **2011**, *41*, 754–767.
- 550 88. Bowler, D.E.; Benton, T.G. Variation in dispersal mortality and dispersal propensity among
551 individuals: the Effects of age, sex and resource availability. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **2009**, *78*, 1234–41.
- 552 89. Baines, C.B.; McCauley, S.; Rowe, L. The interactive effects of competition and predation risk on
553 dispersal in an insect. *Biol. Lett.* **2014**, *10*.
- 554 90. Baines, C.B.; McCauley, S.J.; Rowe L. Dispersal depends on body condition and predation risk in the
555 semi-aquatic insect, *Notonecta undulata*. *Ecol. Evol.* **2015**, *5*, 2307–2316.
- 556 91. Alcalay, Y.; Tsurim, I.; Ovadia, O. Female mosquitoes disperse further when they develop under
557 predation risk. *Behav. Ecol.* **2018**, *29*, 1402–1408.
- 558 92. Reim, E.; Baguette, M.; Gunter, F.; Fischer, K. Emigration propensity and flight performance are
559 decoupled in a butterfly. *Ecosphere* **2018**, *9*, e02502.
- 560 93. Lebeau, J.; Wesselingh, R.A.; van Dyck, H. Nectar resource limitation affects butterfly flight
561 performance and metabolism differently in intensive and extensive agricultural landscapes.
562 *Proc. R. Soc. B* **2016**, *283*, 20160455.
- 563 94. Prasad, R.P.; Roitberg, B.D. Henderson, D. The Effect of rearing temperature on flight initiation of
564 *Trichogramma sibiricum* Sorkina at ambient temperatures. *Biol. Control* **1999**, *16*, 291–298.
- 565 95. Benard, M.F.; McCauley, S.J. Integrating across life-history stages: consequences of natal habitat
566 effects on dispersal. *Am. Nat.* **2008**, *171*, 553–567.
- 567 96. Baines C.B.; McCauley, S.J. 2018. Natal habitat conditions have carryover effects on dispersal
568 capacity and behaviour. *Ecosphere* **2018**, *9*, e02465.
- 569 97. Jourdan, J.; Baranov, V.; Wagner, R.; Plath, M.; Haase, P. Elevated temperatures translate into
570 reduced dispersal abilities in a natural population of an aquatic insect. *J. Anim.*
571 *Ecol.* **2019**, *88*, 1498–1509.
- 572 98. Müller, C.B.; Williams, I.S.; Hardie, J. The role of nutrition, crowding and interspecific interactions
573 in the development of winged aphids. *Ecol. Entomol.* **2001**, *26*, 330–340.
- 574 99. Eycott, A.E.; Stewart, G.B.; Buyung-Ali, L.M.; Bowler, D.E.; Watts, K.; Pullin, A.S. A meta-analysis on
575 the impact of different matrix structures on species movement rates. *Landscape Ecol.* **2012**,
576 *27*, 1263–1278.
- 577 100. Schtickzelle, N.; Mennechez, G.; Baguette, M. Dispersal depression with habitat fragmentation in
578 the bog fritillary butterfly. *Ecology* **2006**, *87*, 1057–1065.
- 579 101. Baguette, M.; Clobert, J.; Schtickzelle, N. Metapopulation dynamics of the bog fritillary butterfly:
580 experimental changes in habitat quality induced negative density-dependent dispersal.
581 *Ecography* **2011**, *34*, 170–176.
- 582 102. Jacob, S.; Laurent, E.; Morel-Journel, T.; Schtickzelle, N. Fragmentation and the context-
583 dependence of dispersal syndromes: matrix harshness modifies resident-disperser phenotypic
584 differences in microcosms. *Oikos* **2019**, *00*: 1-12.
- 585 103. Stevens, V.M.; Trochet, A.; Blanchet, S.; Moulherat, S.; Clobert, J.; Baguette, M. Dispersal
586 syndromes and the use of life-histories to predict dispersal. *Evol. Appl.* **2013**, *6*, 630–642.
- 587 104. Legrand, D.; Larranaga, N.; Bertrand, R.; Ducatez, S.; Calvez, O.; Stevens, V.M.; Baguette, M.
588 Evolution of a butterfly dispersal syndrome. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **2016**, *283*, 20161533.
- 589 105. Grant, A.H.; Liebgold, E.B. Color-biased dispersal inferred by fine-scale genetic spatial
590 autocorrelation in a color polymorphic salamander. *Journal of Heredity* **2017**, *108*, 588–593.
- 591 106. Camacho, C.; Martínez-Padilla, J.; Canal, D.; Potti, J. 2019 Long-term dynamics of phenotype-
592 dependent dispersal within a wild bird population. *Behav. Ecol.* **2019**, *30*, 548–556.
- 593 107. Pennekamp, F.; Clobert, J.; Schtickzelle, N. The interplay between movement, morphology and
594 dispersal in *Tetrahymena* ciliates. *PeerJ* **2019**, *7*, e8197.
- 595 108. Cote, J.; Bestion, E.; Jacob, S.; Travis, J.; Legrand, D.; Baguette, M. Evolution of dispersal strategies
596 and dispersal syndromes in fragmented landscapes. *Ecography* **2017**, *40*, 56–73.

- 597 109. Zera, A.J.; Denno, R.F. Physiology and ecology of dispersal polymorphism in insects. *Annu. Rev.*
598 *Entomol.* **1997**, *42*, 207–230.
- 599 110. Zera, A.J.; Harshman, L.G.; Williams, T.D. Evolutionary endocrinology: The developing synthesis
600 between endocrinology and evolutionary genetics. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **2007**, *38*, 793–
601 817.
- 602 111. Asplen, M.K. Dispersal strategies in terrestrial insects. *Curr. Opin. Insect Sci.* **2018**, *27*, 16–20.
- 603 112. Lin, X.; Lavine, L.C. Endocrine regulation of a dispersal polymorphism in winged insects: a short
604 review. *Curr. Opin. Insect Sci.* **2018**, *25*, 20–24.
- 605 113. Zhang, C-X.; Brisson, J.A.; Xu, H-J. Molecular mechanisms of wing polymorphism in insects. *Annu.*
606 *Rev. Entomol.* **2019**, *64*, 297–314.
- 607 114. Réale, D.; Garant, D.; Humphries, M.M.; Bergeron, P.; Careau, V.; Montiglio, P-O. Personality and
608 the emergence of the pace-of-life syndrome concept at the population level. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc.*
609 *B.* **2010**, *365*, 4051–4063.
- 610 115. Campos-Candela, A.; Palmer, M.; Balle, S.; Álvarez, A.; Alós, J. A mechanistic theory of personality-
611 dependent movement behaviour based on dynamic energy budgets. *Ecol. Lett.* **2019**, *22*, 213–
612 232.
- 613 116. Heidinger, I.M.M.; Hein, S.; Feldhaar, H.; Poethke, H-J. Biased dispersal of *Metrioptera bicolor*, a
614 wing dimorphic bush-cricket. *Insect Science* **2018**, *25*, 297–308.
- 615 117. Brisson, J.A. Aphid wing dimorphisms: linking environmental and genetic control of trait variation.
616 *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **2010**, *365*, 605–616.
- 617 118. Langellotto, G.A. ; Denno, R.F.; Ott, J.R. A trade-off between flight capability and reproduction in
618 males of a wing-dimorphic insect. *Ecology* **2000**, *81*, 865–875.
- 619 119. Gu, H.N. ; Hughes, J. ; Dorn, S. Trade-off between mobility and fitness in *Cydia pomonella* L.
620 (Lepidoptera : Tortricidae). *Ecol. Entomol.* **2006**, *31*, 68–74.
- 621 120. Saglam, I.K.; Roff, D.A.; Fairbairn, D.J. Male sand crickets tradeoff flight capability for reproductive
622 potential. *J. Evol. Biol.* **2008**, *21*, 997–1004.
- 623 121. Cheng, Y.; Luo, L.; Sappington, T.W.; Jiang, X.; Zhang, L.; Frolov, A.N. Onset of oviposition triggers
624 abrupt reduction in migratory flight behavior and flight muscle in the female beet webworm,
625 *Loxostege sticticalis*. *PLoS One* **2016**, *11*, e0166859.
- 626 122. Mole, S.; Zera, A.J. Differential allocation of resources underlies the dispersal-reproduction trade-
627 off in the wing-dimorphic cricket, *Gryllus rubens*. *Oecologia* **1993**, *93*, 121–127.
- 628 123. Guerra, P.A.; Pollack, G.S. Flight behaviour attenuates the trade-off between flight capability and
629 reproduction in a wing polymorphic cricket. *Biol. Lett.* **2008**, *5*, 229–231.
- 630 124. Steenman, A.; Lehmann, A.W.; Lehmann, G.U.C. Life-history trade-off between macroptery and
631 reproduction in the wing-dimorphic pygmy grasshopper *Tetrix subulata* (Orthoptera
632 Tetrigidae). *Ethol. Ecol. Evol.* **2015**, *27*, 93–100.
- 633 125. Roff, D.A. The cost of being able to fly: A study of wing polymorphism in two species of crickets.
634 *Oecologia* **1984**, *63*, 30–37.
- 635 126. Roff, D.A. Exaptation and the evolution of dealation in insects. *J. Evol. Biol.* **1989**, *2*, 109–123.
- 636 127. Khuhro, N.H.; Biondi, A.; Desneux, N. ; Zhang, L. ; Zhang, Y. ; Chen, H. Trade-off between flight
637 activity and life-history components in *Chrysoperla sinica* . *BioControl* **2014**, *59*, 219–227.
- 638 128. Elliot, C.G.; Evenden, M.L. The effect of flight on reproduction in an outbreaking forest
639 lepidopteran. *Physiol. Entomol.* **2012**, *37*, 219–226.
- 640 129. Rovnyak, A.M.; Burks, C.; Gassmann, A.J.; Sappington, T.W. Interrelation of mating, flight, and
641 fecundity in navel orangeworm females. *Entomol. Exp. Appl.* **2018**, *166*, 304–315.
- 642 130. Goodwyn, P.P.; Fujisaki, K. Sexual conflicts, loss of flight, and fitness gains in locomotion of
643 polymorphic water striders. *Entomol. Exp. Appl.* **2007**, *124*, 249–259.
- 644 131. Crnokrak, P.; Roff, D.A. 1995. Fitness differences associated with calling behaviour in the two wing
645 morphs of male sand crickets, *Gryllus firmus*. *Anim. Behav.* **1995**, *50*, 1475–1481.
- 646 132. Roff, D.A.; Crnokrak, P.; Fairbairn, D.J. The evolution of trade-offs: geographic variation in call
647 duration and flight ability in the sand cricket, *Gryllus firmus*. *J. Evol. Biol.* **2003**, *16*, 744–753.

- 648 133. Zeng, Y ; Zhu, D-H. Trade-off between flight capability and reproduction in male *Velarifictorus*
649 *asperses* crickets. *Ecol. Entomol.* **2012**, *37*, 244-251.
- 650 134. Zhao, L.; Chai, H.; Zhu, D. Potential reproductive advantage of short-over long-winged adult males
651 of the cricket *Velarifictorus ornatus*. *Evol. Biol.* **2017**, *44*, 91–99.
- 652 135. Crespi, B.J. Territoriality and fighting in a colonial thrips, *Hoplothrips pedicularius*, and sexual
653 dimorphism in Thysanoptera. *Ecol. Entomol.* **1986**, *11*, 119–130.
- 654 136. Kaitala, A. ; Dingle, H. Wing dimorphism, territoriality and mating frequency of the waterstrider
655 *Aquarius remigis* (Say). *Annales Zoologici Fennici* **1993**, *30*, 163–168.
- 656 137. Fujisaki, K. A male fitness advantage to wing reduction in the oriental chinch bug, *Cavelerius*
657 *saccharivorus* Okajima (Heteroptera: Lygaeidae). *Researches on Population Ecology* **1992**, *34*,
658 173–183.
- 659 138. Utida, S. Density dependent polymorphism in the adult of *Callosobruchus maculatus* (Coleoptera,
660 Bruchidae). *J. Stored Prod. Res.* **1972**, *8*, 111–126
- 661 139. Taylor, V.A. A winged elite in a subcortical beetle as a model for a prototermite. *Nature* **1978**, *276*,
662 73–75.
- 663 140. Solbreck, C. ; Sillentullberg, B. Population-dynamics of a seed feeding bug, *Lygaeus equestris*.1.
664 Habitat patch structure and spatial dynamics. *Oikos* **1990**, *58*, 199–209.
- 665 141. Weisser, W.W.; Braendle, C.; Minoretti, N. Predator-induced morphological change in the pea
666 aphid. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* **1999**, *266*, 1175–1181.
- 667 142. Sloggett, J.J.; Weisser, W.W. Parasitoids induce production of the dispersal morph of the pea
668 aphid, *Acyrtosiphon pisum*. *Oikos* **2002**, *98*, 323–333.
- 669 143. Tanaka, S. ; Wolda, H. Seasonal wing length dimorphism in a tropical seed bug - ecological
670 significance of the short-winged form. *Oecologia* **1987**, *73*, 559–565.
- 671 144. Steyn, V.M.; Mitchell, K.A.; Terblanche, J.S. Dispersal propensity, but not flight performance,
672 explains variation in dispersal ability. *Proc R Soc B* **2016**, *283*, 20160905.
- 673 145. Lancaster, J.; Downes, B.J. Dispersal traits may reflect dispersal distances, but dispersers may not
674 connect populations demographically. *Oecologia* **2017**, *184*, 171-182.
- 675 146. Flockhart, D.T.T.; Fitz-gerald, B.; Brower, L.P.; Derbyshire, R.; Altizer, S.; Hobson, K.A.; Wassenaar,
676 L.I.; Norris, D.R. Migration distance as a selective episode for wing morphology in a migratory
677 insect. *Movement Ecology* **2017**, *5*,7.
- 678 147. Arnold, P.A.; Cassey, P.; White, C.R. Functional traits in red flour beetles: the dispersal phenotype
679 is associated with leg length but not body size nor metabolic rate. *Funct. Ecol.* **2017**, *31*, 653–
680 661.
- 681 148. Schtickzelle, N. ; Joiris, A. ; Van Dyck, H. ; Baguette, M. Quantitative analysis of changes in
682 movement behaviour within and outside habitat in a specialist butterfly. *BMC Evolutionary*
683 *Biology* **2007**, *7*, 1–15.
- 684 149. Chapman, D.S., Dytham, C.; Oxford, G.S. Landscape and fine-scale movements of a leaf beetle:
685 the importance of boundary behaviour. *Oecologia* **2007**, *154*, 55–64.
- 686 150. Viljur, M.; Relve, A.; Gimbutas, M.; Kaasik, A.; Teder, T. Dispersal of open-habitat butterflies in
687 managed forest landscapes: are colonisers special? *J. Insect Conserv.* **2019**, *23*, 259–267.
- 688 151. Betzholtz, P-E.; Forsman, A.; Franzén, M. Inter-individual variation in colour patterns in noctuid
689 moths characterizes long-distance dispersers and agricultural pests. *Journal of Applied*
690 *Entomology*, **2019**, *143*, 992-999.
- 691 152. Forsman, A.; Betzholtz, P-E; Franzen, M. Variable coloration is associated with dampened
692 population fluctuations in noctuid moths. *Proc. R. Soc. B*, **2015**, *282*, 20142922.
- 693 153. Bonte, D.; Bossuyt, B. ; Lens, L. Aerial dispersal plasticity under different wind velocities in a salt
694 marsh wolf spider. *Behav. Ecol.* **2007**, *18*, 438–443.
- 695 154. Okada, K.; Nomura, Y.; Miyatake, T. 2007 Relations between allometry, male–male interactions
696 and dispersal in a sap beetle, *Librodor japonicus*. *Anim. Behav.* **2007**, *74*, 749–755.
- 697 155. Okada, K.; Miyatake, T. ; Nomura, Y.; Kuroda, K. Fighting, dispersing, and sneaking: body-size
698 dependent mating tactics by male *Librodor japonicus* beetles. *Ecol. Entomol.* **2008**, *33*, 269–
699 275.

- 700 156. Yamane, T.; Okada, K.; Nakayama, S.; Miyatake, T. Dispersal and ejaculatory strategies associated
701 with exaggeration of weapon in an armed beetle. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **2010**, *277*, 1705–1710.
- 702 157. Legrand, D.; Guillaume, O.; Baguette, M.; Cote, J.; Trochet, A.; Calvez, O.; Zajitschek, S.; Zajitschek,
703 F.; Lecomte, J.; Bénard, Q.; Le Galliard, J-F.; Clobert, J. The Metatron: an experimental system
704 to study dispersal and metaecosystems for terrestrial organisms. *Nat. Methods* **2012**, *9*, 828–
705 833.
- 706 158. Gibbs, M.; van Dyck, H. Butterfly flight activity affects reproductive performance and longevity
707 relative to landscape structure. *Oecologia* **2010**, *163*, 341–350.
- 708 159. Jiang, X.F.; Luo, L.Z.; Sappington, T.W. Relationship of flight and reproduction in beet armyworm,
709 *Spodoptera exigua* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae), a migrant lacking the oogenesis-flight syndrome.
710 *J. Insect Physiol.* **2010**, *56*, 1631–1637.
- 711 160. Asplen, M.K. Proximate drivers of migration and dispersal in wing-monomorphic insects. *Insects*
712 **2020**, *11*, 61.
- 713 161. Niitepõld, K.; Boggs, C.L. Effects of increased flight on the energetics and life history of the
714 butterfly *Speyeria mormonia*. *PLoS ONE* **2015**, *10*, e0140104.
- 715 162. Mishra, A.; Tung, S.; Shreenidhi, P.M.; Aamir Sadiq, M.; Shree Sruti, V.R.; Chakraborty, P.P.; Dey,
716 S. Sex differences in dispersal syndrome are modulated by environment and evolution. *Phil.*
717 *Trans. R. Soc. B* **2018**, *373*, 20170428.
- 718 163. Matsumura, K.; Archer, C.R.; Hosken, D.J.; Miyatake, T. Artificial selection on walking distance
719 suggests a mobility-sperm competitiveness trade-off. *Behav. Ecol.* **2019**, *30*, 1522–1529.
- 720 164. Matsumura, K.; Miyatake, T. 2015. Differences in attack avoidance and mating success between
721 strains artificially selected for dispersal distance in *Tribolium castaneum*. *PLoS One* **2015**, *10*,
722 e0127042.
- 723 165. Matsumura, K.; Miyatake, T. Effects of artificial selection for walking movement on reproductive
724 traits in the red flour beetle, *Tribolium castaneum*. *BIRD'19*, International Workshop on
725 Behavior analysis and Recognition for knowledge Discovery **2019**, 712–714.
- 726 166. Yao, I.; Katagiri, C. Comparing wing loading, flight muscle and lipid content in ant-attended and
727 nonattended *Tuberculatus* aphid species. *Physiol. Entomol.* **2011**, *36*, 327–334.
- 728 167. Parmesan, C. Ecological and evolutionary responses to recent climate change. *Annu. Rev. Ecol.*
729 *Evol. Syst.* **2006**, *37*, 637–669
- 730 168. Hargreaves, A.L.; Eckert, C.G. Climate change and species range shifts. Evolution of dispersal and
731 mating systems along geographic gradients: implications for shifting ranges. *Funct. Ecol.* **2014**,
732 *28*, 5–21.
- 733 169. Ochocki, B.M.; Miller, T.E.X. Rapid evolution of dispersal ability makes biological invasions faster
734 and more variable. *Nature Comm.* **2017**, *8*, 14315.
- 735 170. Chabrierie, O.; Massol, F.; Facon, B.; Thevenoux, R.; Hess, M.; Ulmer, R.; Pantel, J.H.; Braschi, J.;
736 Amsellem, L.; Baltora-Rosset, S.; et al. Biological invasion theories: merging perspectives from
737 population, community and ecosystem scales. *Preprints* **2019**, 2019100327.
- 738 171. Laparie, M.; Lebouvier, M.; Lalouette, L.; Renault, D. Variation of morphometric traits in
739 populations of an invasive carabid predator (*Merizodus soledadinus*) within a sub-Antarctic
740 island. *Biol. Invasions* **2010**, *12*, 3405–3417.
- 741 172. Laparie, M.; Renault, D.; Lebouvier, M.; Delattre T. Is dispersal promoted at the invasion front?
742 Morphological analysis of a ground beetle invading the Kerguelen Islands, *Merizodus*
743 *soledadinus* (Coleoptera, Carabidae). *Biol. Invasions* **2013**, *15*, 1641–1648.
- 744 173. Hill, J.K.; Thomas, C.D.; Blakeley, D.S. Evolution of flight morphology in a butterfly that has recently
745 expanded its geographic range. *Oecologia* **1999**, *121*, 165–170.
- 746 174. Abril, S.; Díaz, M.; Enríquez, M.L.; Gómez, C. More and bigger queens: A clue to the invasive
747 success of the Argentine ant (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) in natural habitats. *Myrmecol. News*
748 **2013**, *18*, 19–24.
- 749 175. Hemptinne, J.; Magro, A.; Evans, E.W.; Dixon, A.F.G. Body size and the rate of spread of invasive
750 ladybird beetles in North America. *Biol. Invasions* **2012**, *14*, 595–605.

- 751 176. Conradt, L.; Roper, T.J. Nonrandom movement behavior at habitat boundaries in two butterfly
752 species: Implications for dispersal. *Ecology* **2006**, *87*, 125–132.
- 753 177. Delattre, T.; Burel, F.; Humeau, A.; Stevens, V.M.; Vernon, P.; Baguette, M. Dispersal mood
754 revealed by shifts from routine to direct flights in the meadow brown butterfly *Maniola jurtina*.
755 *Oikos* **2010**, *119*, 1900–1908.
- 756 178. Srygley, R.B. Experimental manipulation of dispersal ability in a neotropical butterfly *Anartia*
757 *fatima* (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae). *Insects* **2018**, *9*, 107.
- 758 179. Hudina, S.; Hock, K.; Žganec K. The role of aggression in range expansion and biological invasions.
759 *Curr. Zool.* **2014**, *60*, 401–409.
- 760 180. Therry, L.; Zawal, A.; Bonte, D.; Stoks, R. What factors shape female phenotypes of a poleward-
761 moving damselfly at the edge of its range? *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* **2014**, *112*, 556–568.
- 762 181. Chuang, A.; Peterson, C.R. Expanding population edges: theories, traits, and trade-offs. *Global*
763 *Change Biol.* **2016**, *22*, 494–512.
- 764 182. Ouisse, T. Phenotypic and genetic characterisation of the carabid beetle *Merizodus soledadinus*
765 along its invasion gradient at the subantarctic Kerguelen Islands. PhD Thesis, University of
766 Rennes 1, Rennes, France, December 19th, 2016.
- 767 183. Merwin, AC. Flight capacity increases then declines from the core to the margins of an invasive
768 species' range. *Biol. Lett.* **2019**, *15*, 20190496.
- 769 184. Shine, R.; Brown, G.P.; Phillips, B.L. An evolutionary process that assembles phenotypes through
770 space rather than through time. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2011**, *108*, 5708–5711.
- 771 185. Weiss-Lehman, C.; Hufbauer, R.A.; Melbourne, B.A. Rapid trait evolution drives increased speed
772 and variance in experimental range expansions. *Nature Comm.* **2017**, *8*, 14303.
- 773 186. Robinet, C.; Lance, D.R.; Thorpe, K.W.; Onufrieva, K.S.; Tobin, P.C.; Liebhold, A.M. Dispersion in
774 time and space affect mating success and Allee effects in invading gypsy moth populations. *J.*
775 *Anim. Ecol.* **2008**, *77*, 966–973.
- 776 187. Contarini, M.; Onufrieva, K.S.; Thorpe, K.W.; Raffa, K.F.; Tobin, P.C. 2009. Mate-finding failure as
777 an important cause of Allee effects along the leading edge of an invading insect population.
778 *Entomol. Exp. Appl.* **2009**, *133*, 307–314.
- 779 188. Rehage, J.S.; Cote, J.; Sih, A. The role of dispersal behaviour and personality in post-establishment
780 spread. In: *Biological invasions and animal behaviour*; Weis, J.S.; Sol, D., Eds.; Cambridge
781 University Press, Cambridge, UK, **2016**, pp. 96-115.
- 782 189. Labaude, S.; O'Donnell, N.; Griffin, C.T. Description of a personality syndrome in a common and
783 invasive ground beetle (Coleoptera: Carabidae). *Scientific reports* **2018**, *8*, 17479.
- 784 190. Tremmel, M.; Müller, C. Insect personality depends on environmental conditions. *Behav. Ecol.*
785 **2013**, *24*, 386–392.
- 786 191. Kralj-Fiser, S.; Schuett, W. Studying personality variation in invertebrates: Why bother? *Anim.*
787 *Behav.* **2014**, *91*, 41e52.
- 788 192. Spiegel, O.; Leu, S.T.; Bull, C.M.; Sih, A. What's your move? Movement as a link between
789 personality and spatial dynamics in animal populations. *Ecol. Lett.* **2017**, *20*, 3–18.
- 790 193. Dahirel, M.; Vong, A.; Ansart, A.; Madec, L. Individual boldness is life stage-dependent and linked
791 to dispersal in a hermaphrodite land snail. *Ecol. Res.* **2017**, *32*, 751–755.
- 792 194. Colinet, H.; Sinclair, B.J.; Vernon, P.; Renault D. Insects in fluctuating thermal environments. *Annu.*
793 *Rev. Entomol.* **2015**, *60*, 123–140.
- 794 195. Lombaert, E.; Estoup, A.; Facon, B.; Joubard, B.; Grégoire, J.-C.; Jannin, A.; Blin, A.; Guillemaud, T.
795 Rapid increase in dispersal during range expansion in the invasive ladybird *Harmonia axyridis*.
796 *J. Evol. Biol.* **2014**, *27*, 508–517.
- 797 196. Therry, L.; Bonte, D.; Stoks, R. Higher investment in flight morphology does not trade off with
798 fecundity estimates in a poleward range-expanding damselfly. *Ecol. Entomol.* **2015**, *40*, 133–
799 142.
- 800 197. Karisto, P.; Kisdi, E. Joint evolution of dispersal and connectivity. *Evolution* **2019**, *73*, 2529–2537.
- 801
- 802

803
804
805