1   **Original Article**
2
3   **Title**
4   Worker-behavior and behavior-behavior interaction networks in the trap-jaw ant *Odontomachus*
5   *chelifer* (Latreille, 1802)
6
7   **Names of authors**

8   Felipe Marcel Neves[1], Marcelo Eduardo Borges[2] and Marcio R. Pie[1]
9
10   [1]Departamento de Zoologia, Universidade Federal do Paraná, 81531-980, Curitiba, PR, Brazil
11   [2]Laboratório de Ecologia e Evolução das Interações – LEEI, Setor de Ciências Biológicas, Universidade
12   Federal do Paraná, 80050-540, Curitiba, PR, Brazil
13   Author for correspondence: Felipe M. Neves, email: fmarcelneves@gmail.com. Departamento de
14   Zoologia, Universidade Federal do Paraná, Caixa Postal 19020, 81531-980, Curitiba, PR, Brazil. Phone:
15   +55(41) 9290 1060.

16
17   Number of pages: 17
18   Number of figures: 8
19   Number of tables: 5
20
21
22
23
24
25
26   **Abstract**

27   Division of labor is among the main factors to explain the evolutionary success of social systems, from the
28   origins of multicellularity to complex animal societies. The remarkable ecological success of social insects
29   seems to have been largely driven by ergonomic advantages stemming from the behavioral specialization
30   of workers. However, little is known about how individuals and their correspondent behavioral repertoire
31   are related to each other within a division of labor context, as this relationship can be viewed as a complex
32   network. Applications of network theory in the study of social insects are almost exclusively used to
33   analyze behavioral interactions between individuals, rather than to the study of relations among
34   individuals and behaviors. Here, we use a new approach to the study of the organization of the behavioral
35   repertoire of ant colonies, which consider both individual-task interactions and task-task interactions,
36   besides colony time budgets. Our study investigates for the first time the organization of division of labor
37   in colonies of the trap-jaw ant *Odontomachus chelifer* (Latreille 1802). Data from all the behavioral acts
38   (including inactivity) performed within three queenright colonies of different sizes (n = 7, 30, and 60
39   workers) were studied under controlled laboratory conditions. Each ant within the colonies was
40   individually marked and observed by scan sampling in 10 min intervals for 10 h each (n = 5820 behavioral
41   acts). We describe the network topologies in terms of centrality, specialization, modularity, and
42   nestedness. This study shows that workers of *O. chelifer* interact in structured networks composed of
43   specialists and generalists with consistent organization, even across colonies of different sizes. Our results
44   underscore the potential of the use of complex networks in order to discover and study novel
45   organizational patterns of social groups in animal behavior.
46
47   Keywords: Division of labor, polyethism, task allocation, Formicidae, Ponerinae.
48
49
50

Introduction

Division of labor is a property of social systems thought to have been favored by natural selection that occurs in a variety of phenomena, from subcellular level to complex animal societies (Maynard Smith & Szathmáry 1997). In particular, the remarkable ecological success of social insects seems to have been largely driven by the ergonomic advantages stemming from division of labor, such as individual specialization and parallel task execution (Oster & Wilson 1978, Robinson 1992, Traniello & Rosengaus 1997, Beshers & Fewell 2001, Rocha & al. 2014, Avril & al. 2016). Division of labor in social insects can be broadly defined as "any behavioral pattern that results in some individuals in a colony performing different functions from others" (Michener 1974). Uncovering general principles of the division of labor requires the estimation of the contribution from individual workers toward the completion of colony tasks (Beshers & Fewell 2001). Therefore, insights about the organization of the division of labor in social insects might be obtained through the view of the relationship between workers and their corresponding behavioral performance, or between tasks, as a complex network.

A complex network is described as a system of interacting nodes (within a social insect colony, workers or tasks connected by links), that communicate with each other, displaying patterns of connection that are neither purely regular nor purely random (Newman 2003). In social insects, the network concept itself has been present in the literature for a long time, especially considering the interaction between individuals, i.e. social interactions (Gordon 2010). Even then, empirical data that explicitly describe interaction networks in social insect colonies have been only recently studied (e.g., Bhadra & al. 2009, Naug 2008, 2009, Sendova-Franks & al. 2010, Pinter-Wollman & al. 2011, Waters & Fewell 2012, Mersch & al. 2013). While social interaction networks are an interesting approach to understand the behavioral influence of one individual on another, it does not reflect explicitly how workers interact with the tasks performed by it. In the literature there are several theories and evidence of the division of labor exhibited by ant colonies, yet there is still a lack of studies that reflect the empirical complexity exhibited by the interactions of workers and tasks within a colony. This lack of knowledge may hinder the understanding of the organization of division of labor, and even the extent to which several mechanisms proposed to explained division of labor are consistent. In order to fulfill this gap, one could use a framework considering networks in different ways. For instance, we could envision tasks as nodes and individual workers as links (such as symbolic dynamics) (Fewell 2003). Charbonneau & al. (2013) presented one empirical analysis of task-task interaction networks (unipartite networks) in order to identify dynamics of task switching within a colony of the ant *Temnothorax rugatalus* using betweenness centrality, to measure how central is the role of one task compared to others. The results showed that ants wander throughout the nest between tasks rather than directly switch among the other tasks. Recently, Pasquaretta & Jeanson (2018) proposed the use of bipartite networks to represent interactions between workers and tasks. Moreover, the authors quantified the bipartite network in the context of division of labor, using specialization and modularity measures, which consider the specialization of nodes and the strength of division of a network into groups, respectively.

Here, we use a new approach beyond interaction social networks, which consider both workers-task interactions and task-task interactions, besides usual colony time budgets. Such an integrative approach offers results that are complementary to each other, showing possible hidden pattern dynamics in the formation of complex behavioral interactions. For instance, the degree of specialization observed in the worker-task network could derive groups to be compared (e.g. specialists and generalists) in the task-task networks. Besides the network metrics used in the previously mentioned studies, we also considered new theoretical concepts developed in community ecology, such as nestedness, and expanding the use of modularity for task-task interactions. A nested network structure is observed when specialists mainly interact with a proper subset of the nodes of generalists. Nested networks are generally robust against random node loss (i.e., loss of workers or tasks, depending on the type of network) (Thébault & al. 2010), while networks with a high degree of specialization are more vulnerable (Kaiser-Bunbury & al. 2017). Regarding modularity in task-task networks, the division of the network in groups that are more related to each other (modules) is similar to the concept of roles developed by Hölldobler & Wilson (1990), stated as a "set of behavioral acts, linked by relatively high transition probabilities".

102 Inactivity may occur as a result of time delays associated with searching for or switching tasks (Leighton
103 & al. 2017). Thus, we also use inactivity as links in the task-task networks to quantify its influence.
104   Our study uses the trap-jaw ant *Odontomachus chelifer* (Latreille 1802) as a model organism. We
105 investigate the organization of division of labor in colonies of *O. chelifer*. In the congener *O. brunneus,*
106 dominant ant individuals are more likely to reside in the central areas of the nest, where they take care
107 of the brood, while subordinate individuals are pushed towards the edge, where they are more likely to
108 forage (Powell & Tschinkel 1999). This process of division of labor has been called "Interaction-based task
109 allocation" (Powell & Tschinkel 1999). Similarly, the division of labor in *O. chelifer* could be based on
110 interactions between workers resulting in spatial fidelity and we take this into account. Thus, we address
111 the following questions: (1) Is the division of labor in *O. chelifer* also derived from "Interaction-based task
112 allocation"? (2) What is the individual role of the behaviors and workers described by the network analysis
113 (i.e., specialization, centrality, modularity and nestedness)? (3) What is the difference between the task
114 interactions of specialists and generalists?
115

116 **Methods**

117 **Field Collection and Culture Methods**: The species chosen for this study is the ant *Odontomachus chelifer*
118 (Latreille 1802). The genus *Odontomachus* (Ponerinae) is characterized by large body size (≈ 12-15 mm in
119 length) and a powerful articulated jaw, usually forming small colonies (Latreille 1804, Patek & al. 2006,
120 Spagna & al. 2008). The species is distributed from Mexico to the northeast of Argentina (Brown 1976)
121 and it has a generalist diet (Raimundo & al. 2009, Núñez & al. 2011). In our study, five colonies of
122 *Odontomachus chelifer* were collected in forest fragments at the campus of the Universidade Federal do
123 Paraná and the Museu de História Natural do Capão da Imbuia, Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil. The colonies
124 usually had less than 100 workers (mean ± sd: 38 ± 24). In the laboratory, colonies were transferred to
125 artificial plaster nests, where they were kept under stable environmental conditions (20^0C under constant
126 light with 600≈lux and humidity at 60%). Internal dimensions of the cavity were 19.5 x 15 x 2 cm (width x
127 depth x height) divided in two chambers. All the colonies were supplied with water *ad libitum*, pieces of
128 mealworms and an artificial diet (Bhatkar & Whitcomb 1970). In all colonies, ants arranged themselves in
129 a pattern similar to that observed by Powell & Tschinkel (1999) for *O. brunneus*, where the chamber
130 furthest from the entrance contained the brood and queen, creating three distinct zones: the "brood
131 zone", "broodless zone" (all the other areas within the nest), and "foraging zone" (area outside the nest).
132 These three artificial delimited zones were used to record the general location of each individual. Colonies
133 were allowed to adjust within laboratory conditions for one month before the beginning of observations.
134 All workers were marked individually with combinations of oil-based Testors® paint (one spot on the head,
135 one on the mesosoma, and two on the gaster) for individual worker recognition. All colonies were allowed
136 to adjust to laboratory conditions for at least one month before any focal workers were marked, and the
137 colonies were left for an additional week after marking before observations began.

138   **Behavioral observations:** Three queenright monogynous colonies of the five collected in the field
139 were chosen for observation based upon their apparent health and status (i.e., a large brood pile and the
140 presence of a queen). Each worker from the three colonies (n = 60, 30, and 7 workers, henceforth colonies
141 A, B, and C, respectively) was observed through scan sampling at 10-min intervals for ten hours, divided
142 into two observations by an interval of two days (five hours each; between 09:00 and 19:00 *per* trial). In
143 each trial, we systematically scanned each zone chamber, noting the behavioral state and location of each
144 marked worker in order to assure the correct behavioral notation of all the ants. The observations were
145 recorded with a digital camcorder (JVC GZ-HM320SUB) placed above the colonies. After the videos were
146 analyzed, all the recorded behaviors (11,633 recorded activities) were double-checked by a second person
147 to ensure accurate recordings of ant identities across the observations. Individual behavioral repertoires
148 were created and classified across the spatial zones (see Tab. 1 for a complete list of the behavioral acts
149 and definitions). Furthermore, some behavioral acts that could be classified as dominance interactions

3

150 were observed but given that they were uncommon (n < 10), such behaviors were not included in the
151 behavioral categories considered but were briefly described in the results.

152 **Networks:** Networks were depicted as adjacency matrices, in which an element within the matrix
153 a_{ij} with a value equal to zero means the absence of interaction, and any value ≥ 1 indicates the number
154 of interactions between the elements of the network. Two different kinds of networks were considered
155 in this study: worker-task networks (WTNs) and task-task networks (TTNs). WTNs characterizes the
156 relationship between two sets of nodes; workers and their respective task repertoires. It is an undirected
157 bipartite graph, in which links (edges) are defined whenever an individual performs a specific task.
158 Differently, TTNs connects every task to the one performed immediately after it, with workers as links. It
159 is a unipartite di-graph, representing temporal and directional interaction between each task. Networks
160 were analyzed considering all the tasks observed as nodes, excluding inactivity behavior. Inactivity is not
161 a task, so it was disregarded as a node. Also, when inactivity was maintained as a node it had a high
162 recurrence of the interaction with tasks, which could make the detection and understanding of the
163 network patterns harder to interpret. Nevertheless, we quantified inactivity influence in two ways. The
164 first one was calculated as the normalized proportion of the raw inactivity for each ant (named *Ii*) during
165 behavioral observations. The second one is a variation of the TTNs, where tasks were linked by the
166 frequency of inactivity behaviors between them (i.e., TTNs of inactivity). Thus, the link between two nodes
167 (tasks) of the TTNs of inactivity was quantified as the presence (1) or absence (0) of the behavioral
168 interaction, and inactivity was the additional (1 + *n*) or the only weight of the link.

169 **Network metrics:** We tested a series of measures from network analysis in the WTNs and TTNs,
170 all analyses were performed using R 3.6.0 (R Development Core Team 2019). Graph visualization was
171 created using both the IGRAPH and BIPARTITE packages (Csardi & Nepusz 2006, Dormann & al. 2009). We
172 explored the organization within the networks, i.e., the roles of individual nodes (node-level metrics), as
173 well as on a global scale (network-level metrics). Each metric had its values compared to the ones obtained
174 from random networks generated by a specific null model (each null model used in our study is explained
175 in another section). The chosen metrics could be divided into five categories: Specialization (only for
176 WTNs), centrality (only for TTNs), modularity and nestedness (for both WTNs and TTNs).
177 **1) Specialization:** We used two specialization network measures based on interaction frequencies
178 in the WTNs: the *d'* and H_2' metrics (Blüthgen & al. 2006), which represents scale-independent indices to
179 characterize specialization in ecological networks at node and group-levels, respectively. Originally, both
180 measures were proposed to quantify specialization in ecological plant-pollinator networks. The *d'* index
181 is derived from Kullback-Leibler distance (such as Shannon's diversity index) and quantifies how strongly
182 a task (or worker) deviates from a null model which assumes task allocation in proportion to the workers
183 and tasks available (more details; Blüthgen & al. 2006). The *d'* index ranges from 0 (no specialization) to 1
184 (full specialization) and can be calculated at worker level (*d'$_{indv}$*) or task level (*d'$_{task}$*). For the entire network,
185 the degree of specialization considering both parties (e.g. tasks and workers) can be determined with the
186 H_2' index (Blüthgen & al. 2006, 2008). H_2' was used in the context of division of labor for the first time by
187 Pasquaretta & Jeanson (2018). It describes to which extent the worker-task interactions deviate from
188 those that would be expected from a neutral configuration given the workers and tasks marginal totals.
189 H_2' ranges between 0 (no specialization) to 1 (specialization). The *d'* and H_2' measures were calculated by
190 the R package BIPARTITE in R (Dormann & al. 2008). Furthermore, we distinguished specialists from
191 generalists, where individuals with *d'*$_{indv}$ values above the median of the colony were considered
192 specialists, and below it, generalists. Thus, we create TTNs of specialists and generalists with similar size
193 for each colony. Here, we used the term specialists to mean simply "concentrate on," without requiring
194 that it be accompanied by increased performance efficiency or an implicit reason to occur (as suggested
195 by Jeanne 2016). Furthermore, Gorelick et al. (2004) created two indices based on normalized mutual
196 entropy, which have been used in several empirical and theoretical studies of division of labor (e.g.
197 Jeanson & al. 2007, Dornhaus 2008, Santoro & al. 2019). While they were not created in the context of
198 network theory, they are implemented in adjacent matrices such as graphs. These metrics quantify

199   specialization from individuals and tasks and were named DOL_{indv} and DOL_{task}, respectively. The two
200   indices range between 0 (no division of labor) to 1 and were indirectly compared to the H_2' index.

201   **2) Centrality:** We used betweenness centrality and degree centrality to study the patterns of flow
202   information across tasks (TTNs). Betweenness centrality is a measure of how often a node is located on
203   the shortest path (geodesic) between other nodes in the network (Freeman 1979). Thus, it measures the
204   degree to which the node (task) functions as a potential point of control of communication (i.e., bridge)
205   among the other nodes within a network. In unweighted networks (where the original betweenness
206   centrality was proposed), all links have the same weight, thus the shortest path for interaction between
207   two nodes is through the smallest number of intermediate nodes. Differently, most of the new centrality
208   measures proposed for weighted networks have been solely focused on edge weights, and not on the
209   number of links, a central component of the original measure. Due to this issue, we use the betweenness
210   centrality proposed by Opsahl & al. (2010), which considers both the number and the strength of links
211   (weight). The relative importance of these two aspects in the metric is controlled by the tuning parameter
212   (α), which goes from 0 to 1. We set alpha to 0.5 to consider both factors with the equal proportions. In
213   order to differentiate nodes with higher betweenness centrality from the others, tasks with a
214   betweenness centrality above the third quartile of the data (<75%) were considered bridges. Degree
215   centrality was applied to the TTNs of inactivity and used to describe the latency of the activity among the
216   tasks, i.e., the higher the degree centrality of a node, the higher the latency (inactivity) around it.
217   Originally, degree centrality is simply the count of how many connections (i.e., links) a node has in a binary
218   network. The degree has generally been extended to the sum of weights in weighted networks (Barrat &
219   al. 2004, Newman 2004, Opsahl & al. 2008) and labeled node strength. In order to combine both degree
220   and strength, we used the degree centrality metric proposed by Opsahl & al. (2010), which as the
221   betweenness centrality proposed by the same authors, uses a tuning parameter (α) to set the relative
222   importance of the number of ties compared to link weights. The α tuning parameter was set to 0.5 to
223   consider both factors with equal proportions. Degree centrality was divided as in and out-degree
224   centrality for directed graphs (such as TTNs of inactivity). As the names imply, in-degree point toward and
225   out-degree away from the given node. Tasks with an in-degree and out-degree centrality above the third
226   quartile of the data (<75%) were regarded as inactivity hubs (i.e., with inactivity converging to the node)
227   or inactivity spreaders (i.e., with inactivity leaving the node), respectively. While we computed centrality
228   measures for all observed tasks and compared each of them with a null model (Tab. 3, 4 and 5), in our
229   results we only report tasks considered bridges, inactivity hubs and spreaders. Betweenness centrality
230   and degree centrality were calculated using the R package TNET (Opsahl 2009).

231   **3) Modularity:** Modularity was proposed by Newman (2006) to compute the strength and number
232   of modules within a network, and it has been studied across different biological scales (Lorenz & al.
233   2011). Modules can be defined as groups of tightly connected nodes that are sparsely connected to other
234   nodes in the network (Newman 2006). The modularity (Q) ranges from 0 (community structure not
235   different from random) to 1 (complete separation between modules). There are different algorithms
236   available to detect modules in weighted bipartite and unipartite networks (Clauset & al. 2008, Dormann
237   & Strauss 2014, Beckett 2016). In the WTNs, the DIRTLPAwb+ algorithm for optimizing bipartite
238   modularity was used (Beckett 2016) and implemented in the R package BIPARTITE (Dormann & al. 2008).
239   We normalized the bipartite modularity values following Pasquaretta & Jeanson (2018). The algorithm
240   used to search for modules in the TTNs is the Louvain method developed by Clauset & al. (2008) and
241   implemented in the R package IGRAPH (Csardi & Nepusz 2006).

242   **4) Nestedness:** We used two different metrics to estimate nestedness of the WTNs and TTNs. The
243   first metric was the weighted nestedness metric based on overlap and decreasing fill (WNODF), which is
244   a modified version of the nestedness metric based on overlap and decreasing fill (NODF) that consider
245   weighted bipartite networks instead of only binary ones (Almeida-Neto & al. 2008, Almeida-Neto & Ulrich
246   2011). WNODF nestedness score ranges from 0 (non-nested) to 100 (perfectly nested) and it was applied
247   to the WTNs. The nestedness in the TTNs was quantified by the UNODF, the unipartite version of the
248   NODF metric (Cantor & al. 2017). In completely non-nested networks, UNODF = 0, while in perfectly
249   nested networks UNODF tends towards 1. Directed networks (such as the ones of this study) will have

5

250   two different UNODF values (and interpretations), because the interactions in matrix elements a_{ij} and
251   a_{ij} represent different things. These two different UNODF values could be divided in nestedness among
252   rows (UNODFr) and nestedness among columns (UNODFc). UNODFr measures nestedness computing the
253   pairwise overlap among rows and UNODFc the pairwise overlap among columns. Since the calculation of
254   UNODF is made through binary networks, we measured the UNODF index for different cut-off values (such
255   as Cantor & al. 2017). The metric was calculated without a cut-off to include all data (named UNODF 1),
256   but also considering a cut-off of 10% of the data (named UNODF 2), in order to exclude tasks which were
257   not so frequent considering all others. WNODF and UNODF were calculated using the R packages BIPARTITE
258   and UNODF, respectively (Dormann & al. 2009, Cantor & al. 2017).

259   **Statistical analysis and comparison with nulls models:** G-test goodness of fit (including post-hoc
260   pairwise comparisons) was used to compare the frequency of behavioral acts (Sokal & Rohlf 1981). The
261   statistical null hypothesis considers that the number of observations in each task is equal to that predicted
262   by a uniform discrete distribution of the data, and the alternative hypothesis is that the observed numbers
263   differ from this expected distribution. No correction for the multiple comparisons was applied (Rothman
264   1990, Saville 1990). Correlation between *d'* and *Ii* was tested (Spearman correlation). There are several
265   null models to generate random networks, simpler or more sophisticated (Farine 2017). The Paterfield's
266   algorithm was used in the WTNs, as suggested by Pasquaretta & Jeanson (2018) for the division of labor
267   for bipartite networks. This model generates random networks constraining the marginal sums (i.e.,
268   worker performance and behavior need are maintained), but links are randomly assigned between
269   workers and behaviors. There is no null model recommended in the literature for unipartite networks
270   (TTNs) in a division of labor context, thus we considered three different null models extensively used in
271   the literature and that had important properties to be considered in our work. To compare the values of
272   modularity and betweenness centrality obtained in the original TTNs with the ones obtained from random
273   networks, we used the link and weight reshuffling null model developed by Opsahl & al. 2008. Such model
274   consists of reshuffling the network topology while preserving degree distribution. The importance of
275   maintaining the network degree distribution is that most real-world degree distributions are naturally
276   skewed rather than having a uniform or Poisson distribution. Thus, preserving the same degree
277   distribution of the original network makes the null model more realistic and comparable to the original
278   network. In order to compare degree centrality, we used the weight reshuffling null model, also developed
279   by Opsahl & al. (2008). The weight reshuffling procedure consists of reshuffling the weights globally in the
280   network (Opsahl & al. 2008). This null model maintains the topology of the observed network. Therefore,
281   the number of ties originating from a node does not change. The null models used to verify nestedness
282   were first developed for bipartite networks, so we used an adapted version of a model widely used in
283   bipartite biological networks, named null model 2 (Bascompte & Jordano 2007) for unipartite binary
284   networks (in our study, modified versions of the weighted TTNs; Cantor & al. 2017). In this null model, the
285   probability that a link connects two nodes is proportional to their corresponding degree. A conveniently
286   property of this model is that it preserves key network features, such as the network size, connectance
287   and degree distribution. The statistical significance of all the network measures compared to the random
288   networks was evaluated based on the *Z*-score:

$$Z = \frac{X_{emp} - X_{rand}}{SD_{rand}},$$

290   where X_{emp} is a metric extracted from the empirical networks (n = 1000), X_{rand} is the average value of the
291   same metric obtained from random networks and SD_{rand} is the standard deviation of the metric obtained
292   from the randomized networks. The *p* values from all the analyses were considered significant at $p \leq 0.05$,
293   but also described at different levels as well when necessary (i.e., ≤ 0.01 and ≤ 0.001). All the statistical
294   analyses and null models were performed by the R software 3.6.0 (R Core Team 2019). The R packages
295   RVAIDEMEMOIRE and STATS were used to compute the G-test and Spearman correlation, respectively (R Core
296   Team 2019, Hervé 2020). The null models for WTNs were created by the R package BIPARTITE (Dormann &

297 al. 2008). Two packages were used to create null models for TTNs, the TNET package was used to create
298 the link and weight reshuffling model, and the weight reshuffling model (Opsahl 2009), the UNODF package
299 was used to create the adapted null model 2 (Cantor & al. 2017).

300

Results

302 Our results are divided in the data originated from the behavioral repertoire (colony time budgets) and
303 the information extracted from network analyses (WTNs and TTNs). We analyzed 5748 behavioral acts
304 (10400 including inactivity), WTNs (Fig. 1) resulting in 5816 interactions, and TTNs (Fig. 2, 3, and 4)
305 resulting in 5917 interactions.

306 **Behavioral repertoire:** The behavioral repertoire performed by the workers was composed of 11
307 tasks (Tab. 2), inactivity, and dominance interactions (which will be described in the following section).
308 The frequency of inactivity compared to the tasks was significantly higher across all colonies. Over the
309 observation period, 81% of workers were inactive in colony A ($G_{(59)}$ = 650; $P < 0.001$), 83% in colony B ($G_{(29)}$
310 = 243; $P < 0.001$) and 61% in colony C ($G_{(6)}$ = 26.9; $P < 0.001$). Among the tasks, walking and self-grooming
311 had frequencies significantly higher considering all the colonies (colony A, $G_{(10)}$ = 747.03, $P < 0.001$; colony
312 B, $G_{(8)}$ = 233.96; $P < 0.001$; colony C, $G_{(6)}$ = 138.78; $P < 0.001$). Brood care also had a higher frequency than
313 the other tasks but limited to the colony A and B, and feeding and foraging/patrolling only in colony C.
314 **Description of dominance interactions:** We observed three rare behaviors (n < 10) that could be
315 characterized as dominance interactions, which are named as rapid antennation, aggressive grooming,
316 and aggressive contact. Rapid antennation began with 'antennal dueling', where two workers met head-
317 on and displayed rapid antennal striking behavior for approximately 5 s. Rapid antennation also occurred
318 in a side-on form, in which one worker rapidly antennated the thorax or gaster of another one, often
319 leading to antennal drumming. Aggressive grooming consisted of a dominant worker grooming a
320 subordinate one, with rapid antennation directed to the head and thorax of the subordinate worker,
321 whilst maintaining a raised body posture, similarly to the "aggressive interaction" described for *O.
322 brunneus* (Powell & Tschinkel 1999). Aggressive contact started with rapid antennation between two
323 workers (≈ 5s) and evolved into an interaction where a dominant worker physically carries a subordinate
324 one through the jaws for a few minutes (≈ 5min). During the aggressive contact, the dominant worker
325 repeatedly tries to bite the subordinate, but no injury or deaths resulted from such behavior where
326 observed.
327 **Task Performance and Spatial zones:** As expected, brood care (including carrying brood) was
328 exclusively limited to the brood zone and foraging/patrolling behavior was exclusively limited to the
329 foraging zone. In general, all the other behaviors, including the dominance interactions were performed
330 in every zone.
331 **Specialization:** We found that H_2' values in the colonies were significantly higher than the H_2'
332 obtained from random networks (Fig. 5, Colony A, Z = 29.3, $P < 0.0001$; Colony B, Z = 15.8, $P < 0.0001$;
333 Colony C, Z = 10, $P < 0.0001$). The DOL_{indv} values in the colonies (Fig. 6) were also significantly higher than
334 the correspondent ones obtained from random networks (Colony A, Z = 28.9, $P < 0.0001$; Colony B, Z =
335 15.4 $P < 0.0001$; Colony C, Z = 9.8, $P < 0.0001$). Following the same trend, DOL_{task} values (Fig. 6) were higher
336 than the ones from random networks (Colony A, Z = 3.2, $P < 0.0001$; Colony B, Z = 2.8 $P = 0.005$; Colony C,
337 Z = 9.8, $P = 0.001$). The distribution of d'_{indv} and d'_{task} values, as well as the Ii index were clearly skewed
338 (Fig. 7), with similar median values between the colony A and B, and lower values in colony C. There was
339 no observed correlation between the d'_{indv} and the correspondent Ii values from each colony (Colony A,
340 r_s: -0.03, $P = 0.76$; Colony B, r_s: -0.35, $P = 0.06$; Colony C, r_s: 0.57, $P = 0.10$).
341 **Centrality:** The centrality measures allowed us to identify the influence of each task (i.e., bridges,
342 inactivity hubs and spreaders) within TTNs. In colony A, walking and self-grooming were bridges when
343 considering either all workers, generalists and specialists. Brood care was also a bridge behavior when

7

344 considering all workers and generalists, but not specialists (Fig. 2A). In colony B, self-grooming and
345 grooming were bridge behaviors for all workers and specialists, while self-grooming and brood-care were
346 the bridges for generalists (Fig. 2B). Differently, feeding was the only bridge behavior in colony C for all
347 workers and specialists, while walking and foraging/patrolling were bridges for the generalists (Fig. 2C).
348 The bridge behaviors of self-grooming (colony A and B), walking (colony A), and feeding (colony C) had
349 betweenness centrality values significantly different from the ones obtained by the null model (among
350 specialists; Fig. 2 and Tab. 3).
351   In colony A, walking was the only common inactivity hub when considering all workers, generalists
352 and specialists (Fig. 3A). In addition, self-grooming was also an inactivity hub for all workers and
353 generalists and grooming was only an inactivity hub for all workers. In colony B, self-grooming and
354 grooming were inactivity hubs considering all workers and specialists, and brood care was an inactivity
355 hub for the generalists (Fig. 3B). In colony C, walking and feeding were common inactivity hubs for all
356 workers and specialists, and generalists had walking and foraging/patrolling as inactivity hubs. Also, in this
357 colony self-grooming was a hub for the specialists (Fig. 3C). In colony A, the inactivity hubs, self-grooming
358 (for generalists) and walking (for specialists) were significantly different when compared to random
359 networks (Fig. 3 and Tab. 4). In colony B, all the inactivity hubs from generalists and specialists, along with
360 the grooming behavior for all workers, were significantly higher than the expected from random networks
361 (Fig. 3 and Tab. 4). In colony C, the identified inactivity hubs were not statistically different than the
362 random networks, except for walking among generalists (Fig. 3 and Tab. 4).
363   Self-grooming was an inactivity spreader present in all workers, generalists, and specialists in
364 colony A (Fig. 4A). In addition, brood care and feeding were inactivity hubs from all workers and
365 generalists, while walking and grooming were inactivity hubs among specialists (Fig. 4A). In colony B,
366 grooming and brood care were inactive spreaders for all workers and generalists, and grooming only for
367 specialists (Fig. 4B). In colony C, foraging/patrolling and feeding were inactivity spreaders among all
368 workers and generalists, and specialists had walking and feeding behaviors as spreaders (Fig. 4C). In colony
369 A, self-grooming and feeding among all workers and generalists were significant inactivity spreaders
370 compared to random networks. In addition, brood care was a significant inactivity spreader for generalists
371 and walking for specialists (Fig. 4 and Tab. 5). In colony B, the brood-care behavior when considering all
372 workers and generalists, and grooming behavior for the specialists, were the inactivity spreaders
373 significantly different from the null model (Fig. 4 and Tab. 5). In colony C, feeding for the specialists was
374 the inactivity spreader statistically higher than random networks (Fig. 4 and Tab. 5).
375   **Modularity:** Modularity values for the WTNs (Q_{norm}) in all the colonies (Fig. 5) were significantly
376 higher than the Q_{norm} obtained from random networks (Colony A, $Z = 29.7$, $P < 0.0001$; Colony B, $Z = 12.54$,
377 $P < 0.0001$; Colony C, $Z = 6.25$, $P < 0.0001$). WTNs were organized into four modules in colony A and C and
378 six modules in colony B, and the composition of the modules (number of individuals and tasks interacting)
379 differed between all colonies (Fig. 1). TTNs modularity values were not significantly higher compared to
380 those obtained from random networks in colony A and C, but significant in colony B for all workers,
381 generalists, and specialists (Fig. 8). TTNs in colony A were organized into three modules in all workers and
382 generalists, with only two modules in specialists (Fig. 2). All TTNs were organized in two modules in colony
383 B and C (Fig. 2). The composition of the modules (the interacting tasks) within each colony differs with
384 each worker composition (all workers, generalists, and specialists).
385   **Nestedness:** Nestedness (WNODF) value was significantly lower than the ones obtained from
386 random networks (also known as an anti-nested pattern, but there are criticism about using this term, see
387 Almeida-Neto & al. 2006) in colony A, while the values in colony B and C were not statistically significant
388 (Fig. 5, Colony A, $Z = -5$, $P < 0.0001$; Colony B, $Z = -1.64$, $P < 0.0001$; Colony C, $Z = -1.65$, $P < 0.0001$).
389 Nestedness (UNODF) values revealed that in general, the colonies did not have a nested structure in both
390 the cut-off conditions considered from TTNs. However, a nested structure was significantly present when
391 considering all workers in colony A (UNODFc 1, $Z = 2.59$, $P < 0.009$) and C (UNODFr 1, $Z = 2.39$, $P < 0.01$).
392 TTNs were significantly less nested than randomized networks for specialists in colony B (UNODFr 1, $Z = -$
393 2.48, $P < 0.01$ and UNODFr 2, $Z = -2.23$, $P < 0.01$) and C (UNODFc 1, $Z = -2.93$, $P = 0.003$ and UNODFc 2, Z
394 $= -2.8$, $P = 0.005$).
395

Discussion

This study shows that colonies of *Odontomachus chelifer* interact in structured networks with consistencies even across colonies of different sizes. In short, inactivity is the most performed behavior in *O. chelifer*, where the performance of some tasks such as walking and self-grooming is more frequently observed than the others. Dominance interactions are present but rarely observed, despite the presence of a few tasks specific to certain spatial locations. Specialists diverged significantly from generalists, with self-grooming and feeding having a distinct role as bridges across the colonies. Complex patterns such as modularity, nested and significantly not nested structures were observed in WTNs and TTNs. Our results are manifold and will be discussed with detail in turn.

Inactivity by a large margin is the most recurrent behavior observed in all the colonies of *O. chelifer*. High inactivity frequency among ant workers (< 50% *per* colony) is a very widespread phenomena observed in several ant species, both in field and laboratory studies (Lindauer 1952, Hölldobler & Wilson 1990, Herbers 1983, Herbers & Cunningham 1983, Cole 1986, Schmid-Hempel 1990, Dornhaus 2008, Dornhaus & al. 2008, Dornhaus & al. 2009, Charbonneau & Dornhaus 2015). However, the role of inactivity is rarely considered to comprehend task allocation strategies or colony organization (for exceptions, see Herbers 1981, Fresneau 1984, Cole 1986, Corbara & al. 1989, Retana & Cerdá 1990, Retana & Cerdá 1991, Charbonneau & Dornhaus 2015). It appears as already discussed in the literature, that inactivity could have larger importance in the context of division of labor, since it was observed that even some workers specialize in inactivity (Charbonneau & Dornhaus 2015). In *O. chelifer*, while some workers were clearly more inactive than others, the degree of inactivity performed by a worker did not directly influenced its specialization. This suggest that while inactivity is the most performed behavior, its influence on task allocation is not quantified by its simple execution. The role of inactivity as a link between task switching will be discussed further through the analysis of inactivity hubs and spreaders. Self-grooming and walking were the most performed tasks by the workers in all the colonies. Self-grooming is a self-maintenance (cleaning) task and a regulator of chemical signaling from hydrocarbons constituents (Soroker & al. 1998, Lahav & al. 1999). The hydrocarbon constituents of the postpharyngeal gland are sequestered by internal transport as well as from the body surface by self-grooming (Soroker & al. 1994, 1995a,b). Thus, the link between the postpharyngeal gland and body surface enables the ants continuously to refresh, and subsequently update their epicuticular hydrocarbons. The chemical signaling made by cuticular hydrocarbonates and enhanced by self-grooming is probably a mechanism to maintain reproductive skew within the colonies. The fertility signal from chemical signaling communicates information that increase the individuals' fitness (Keller & Nonacs 1993). Walking have innate importance in the performance of other tasks, based upon the consequent movement of the ant to a designated task outside its position (Charbonneau & al. 2013), so it is not surprising that is one of the most performed tasks by the workers. Moreover, brood-care had significant frequency in the larger colonies (A and B) and foraging/patrolling in the smaller one (C). Ants extensively present in the brood zone could have a higher reproductive status due to a close relationship with brood care and the production of eggs. This phenomenon is observed in *O. brunneus,* where social rank based on reproduction (proximity of allocated zone to the brood) is correlated to ovarian condition (Powell & Tschinkel 1999, Smith & al. 2012). In addition, a valid hypothesis for the significant frequency of foraging/patrolling behavior in colony C is that since this specific colony is smaller than the other ones, the activities of the colony are focused on food income in order to develop the colony ergonomically further. It is known that the capacity of flexibility in task allocation in ants appears to be very high, adjusting itself with the colony's needs (Robinson & al. 2009, Charbonneau & Dornhaus 2015). Colony size could influence this adaptation as evidenced in the literature, where smaller groups might be slower to answer to colony needs, and consequently the workforce gets more attached to a temporary task (such as foraging to supply food intake to the colony) than necessary (Pacala & al. 1996, Thomas & Elgar 2003, Jeanson & al. 2007, Holbrook & al. 2011). Moreover, the descriptions of the few dominant behaviors observed in *O. chelifer* are similar to the ones observed in *O. brunneus* (Powell & Tschinkel 1999). While dominance interactions could have a role in the division of labor (i.e., reinforcing dominance/submission among workers), they were rare and not extensively observed in *O. chelifer*, which suggests that dominant behaviors are not a crucial process or the only one responsible for the division of

447   labor in *O. chelifer.* Perhaps dominant interactions are important in a larger scale of time, or during few
448   exceptions that demand a kind of control within the colony between workers (such as sudden changes in
449   the food supply of the colony), or even in parallel with other kinds of behavioral control which do not
450   demand physical contact (e.g. self-grooming). In addition, aggression (dominance interactions) and
451   signaling by cuticular hydrocarbons enhanced by self-grooming are two possible modalities used to
452   regulate reproduction in *O. chelifer*. They are both strong indicators of reproductive capacity (for
453   aggression this was already discussed for vertebrates: Hrdy & Hrdy 1976; and insects: West-Eberhard
454   1967).
455   We observed that the division of labor of *O. chelifer* is organized through the significant presence
456   of specialization within all colonies studied. The connection between specialization and subsequent better
457   task performance is scarce and contradictory in the literature (O'Donnell & Jeanne 1992, Dornhaus 2008,
458   Russell & al 2017, Santoro & al. 2019), but specialization must be important for other reasons within the
459   colony organization. Specialization must be expected when you have interaction-based task allocation,
460   such as observed for *O. brunneus* (Powell & Tschinkell 1999) and possibly to some degree (as already
461   discussed) for *O. chelifer.* Behavioral roles are naturally restricted to particular zones of the colony,
462   therefore, allocation to a particular zone, through dominance interaction (or other processes, such as
463   fertility signaling by self-grooming), ensured role specialization. We hypothesized that the tasks which had
464   more specialization across the colonies (brood care and foraging/patrolling) are the most affected by this
465   kind of dynamics. Risky and costly tasks for social insects, such as solitary foraging/patrolling (O'Donnell
466   & Jeanne 1992, Perry & al. 2015) are made by specialists in *O. chelifer*, that inserted in the context of
467   interaction-based task allocation have a lower social rank (i.e., a higher distance of the brood zone). Brood
468   care specialization may also be the result of a reproductive hierarchy, differently than foraging/patrolling,
469   brood care and carrying brood are probably performed by workers with higher social rank (within the
470   brood zone). Moreover, the skewed distribution of d'_{indv} values clearly show that some workers are more
471   specialists than others, where the worker force of the colony is composed by a mix of generalists and
472   specialists, such pattern appears to be widespread in social insects (e.g., Jandt & al. 2009, Santoro & al.
473   2019). A partial division of labor, where generalists coexist with specialists could be structurally important
474   for the division of labor, for instance, such arrangement could generate more flexibility in the
475   performance of tasks (Jandt & al. 2009). A mathematical model developed by D'Orazio & Waite (2007)
476   demonstrates that errors committed by generalist workers are few compared with the success of the
477   group in general, thus the inefficiency and error-prone generalists may also be a fundamental feature of
478   many of the social insect systems, as observed in wasps (Forsyth 1978, Jeanne 1986, Karsai & Wenzel
479   2000) and stingless bees (Hofstede & Sommeijer 2006). Moreover, there is a lot of possible explanation
480   for the presence of specialization within colonies of eusocial insects, for instance, increased spatial
481   efficiency, as hypothesized for ants (Sendova & Franks 2005), or reduction of other switching costs
482   (Chittka & al. 1997). It is also possible that specialization optimizes material flow in multistep tasks,
483   (Jeanne 1986). Any of these processes may create colony-level fitness benefits the division of labor, and
484   even without improvement in individual efficiency.
485   While the interpretation of significance for the network-level metrics is quite intuitive, for instance,
486   a significant positive nestedness Z-score indicates that the network is nested, and a significant negative
487   one indicates a value less nested than randomized networks, this is not the case for node-level metrics,
488   such as the betweenness and degree centrality (in and out-degree) measures from tasks. A problem
489   observed for centrality measures is that even a node with a negative Z-score, still have a higher centrality
490   value than the other ones within the random network. Thus, we evaluate the significance of the
491   comparison of the empirical centrality values (which were classified as bridges, inactivity hubs, and
492   spreaders) to the random networks as simply a significant difference, rather than an attempt to interpret
493   a positive or negative z-score. Information flow across tasks was intermediated by a set of different nodes
494   (bridges), which varied accordingly to each colony. Self-grooming had a prominent role (i.e., bridge) in the
495   larger colonies (A and B), as well as feeding in the smaller colony (Colony C) considering all workers and
496   specialists, but only significant in the later ones. Differently, Charbonneau & al. 2013 observed that
497   walking had higher betweenness centrality compared to all other tasks for *Temnothorax regulatus* being
498   a significant bridge in our classification. This suggests that *O. chelifer* workers did not wander around the

10

499   nest as much to switching tasks (with exception of specialists in colony A, in which walking was a significant
500   bridge as well). Self-grooming as a bridge between tasks gives evidence to the already discussed
501   hypothesis of self-grooming as a reproductive regulator, with a crucial role for the maintenance of task
502   allocation of the colony. Thus, self-grooming could be performed between tasks to ensure reproductive
503   status between workers, for instance, maintaining nurses (i.e., workers performing brood care and
504   carrying brood) as nurses, and foragers as foragers. In colony C, however, feeding is a significant bridge.
505   This gives another perspective of the phenomena of higher food intake in colony C, which occur between
506   other tasks and that the bridge role is adjustable to the colony needs. Specialists caused a more significant
507   change in the dynamics of the colonies (compared to the random networks), which shows that specialists
508   were more responsible for the dynamic patterns of information flow observed across the tasks of the
509   colonies than generalists. Inactivity hubs and inactivity spreaders varied a lot across the colonies without
510   a visible pattern of occurrence of tasks. However, the significant nodes of generalists and specialists varied
511   greatly between them, and a pattern could not be observed. While such difference might not mean
512   something other than a random structural organization, it could be an implicit view of the inherent
513   difference between switching tasks by generalists and specialists.
514   Modularity analysis offers the great advantage of providing a quantitative method to identify
515   modules of preferentially interacting workers and tasks and among tasks. WTNs presented significant
516   modularity, which means the existence of exclusive interactions between workers and tasks. Modularity
517   is thought to increase stability in ecological communities (May 1972; Krause & al. 2003; Teng & McCann
518   2004; however, see Pimm 1979). The existence of modules in WTNs might generate stability as well: if a
519   worker is lost, another one from the same module could replace it minimizing the loss of a possible
520   specialist. Differently, TTNs presented mixed results, with only colony B showing significant modularity.
521   Among the modules of colony B, the association between them appears to be random, with the exception
522   of brood care and carrying brood. They are usually performed intermittently between each other,
523   frequently classified together as nursing behavior in the literature. The apparent randomness of the
524   modular composition within TTNs could indicate the capacity of task flexibilization across the colonies of
525   *O. chelifer*.
526   WTNs were not nested, and colony A even was significantly less nested than randomized networks.
527   The lack of a nested structure may indicate that the division of labor dynamics is vulnerable to worker
528   loss, although the relatively low degree of specialization present in the colonies (i.e., $H'_2 \leq 0.40$) might
529   increase robustness (Pocock & al. 2012) and the workers within modules might fulfill similar interaction
530   functions. Non-nested structures have been often observed in weighted ecological networks, and anti-
531   nested patterns while rarer in nature (Staniczenko & al. 2013), were observed in interactions between
532   fungi and plants (Bahram & al. 2014, Toju & al. 2014, 2015, Jacobsen & al. 2018), which could be explained
533   by competitive exclusion (Toju & al. 2015). While competitive exclusion does not make sense in the
534   context of division of labor, it could be analogous to the formation of strict modules without much
535   connection with other nodes, since colony A had higher modularity compared to the other colonies. Some
536   significant nested structures occurred in TTNs in colony A and C, considering all workers, while specialists
537   in colonies A and C significantly had less nested structures than randomized networks in both cut-off
538   conditions. Nestedness implies a hierarchy in the linking rules of the network system, so there is
539   heterogeneity in the number of interactions among its elements. Furthermore, in ecological systems a
540   nested structure is related to stability (e.g., Memmott & al. 2004, Burgos & al. 2007, Bastola & al. 2009).
541   The presence of nestedness in task allocation of ants could be viewed as a steady process, where
542   individual adaptation could slightly change due to the necessities of the colony at some specific interval
543   of time. Therefore, workers concentrate on some specific behaviors, but new ones could be performed
544   trough colonial necessity. This pattern is foreseen by some mathematical models in social insects (e.g.,
545   Wilson 1985, Robinson 1987a, 1987b, 1992, Robinson & Page 1988, Calabi 1988, Detrain & Pasteels 1991,
546   1992, Page & Robinson 1991, Bonabeau & al. 1996). However, when comparing specialists and generalists,
547   it is expected that the behavioral repertoire of specialists is less diversified than generalists due to its own
548   behavior (specialization in only certain tasks), which could be the reason for the existence of significant
549   anti-nested or non-nested patterns among them.

550   The view of the ant colony as a complex system is not something new (Gordon 2010), but such view
551   needs the use of a conceptual framework which capture simultaneously the complexity present within
552   patterns of the colony as well as provides tools to analytically interpret the observed behavioral processes.
553   The use of worker-task and task-task interactions constitute another layer of complexity for exploring the
554   mechanisms that underlie individual variation within a network. It should be emphasized that this not
555   exclude the assumption that interaction among workers (social interactions) are involved in task
556   allocation, which could be analyzed together with worker-task and task-task interactions. The use of
557   network concepts such as specialization, centrality, modularity and nestedness proved to be interesting
558   for the description of the roles of the behaviors and workers in the organization of the division of labor.
559   Furthermore, as previously suggested by Lewinsohn & al. (2006), simultaneously looking at several
560   network patterns can substantially advance our understanding of the architecture of networks as well. A
561   hindrance to the development of studies like this is the difficulty to account and quantify the real number
562   of the tasks displayed by all the workers of the colony. Our study is still based on manual annotation of
563   behaviors, while such approach is effective, it is time demanding and impractical for larger colonies or
564   periods of time. Clever approaches such as the use of spatial fidelity for the determination of task
565   performance (Mersch & al. 2013), while interesting to the study of several behavioral phenomena, it falls
566   short to determine correct task performance or include behaviors that probably have an impact in colony
567   organization (e.g., self-grooming, feeding). New improvements in approaches using automatic tracking
568   by machine learning (which could encode and quantify behaviors; see Hong & al. 2015) could provide
569   alternatives for this experimental gap. We expect even more holistic studies in the future, comparing
570   species with different colony sizes to help the description of individual differences between workers.
571

577   **References**
578   ALMEIDA-NETO, M., R. GUIMARÃES Jr, P. & M. LEWINSOHN, T. 2007: On nestedness analyses: rethinking matrix
579   temperature and anti-nestedness. Oikos, 116: 716-722.
580   ALMEIDA-NETO, M., GUIMARÃES, P., GUIMARÃES Jr, P.R., LOYLA, R.D. & ULRICH, W. 2008: A consistent metric for
581   nestedness analysis in ecological systems: reconciling concept and measurement. – Oikos 117: 1227-1239.
582   ALMEIDA-NETO, M. & ULRICH, W. 2011: A straightforward computational approach for measuring
583   nestedness using quantitative matrices. – Environmental Modelling & Software 26: 173-178.
584   AVRIL, A., PURCELL, J. & CHAPUISAT, M. 2016: Ant workers exhibit specialization and memory during raft
585   formation. – The Science of Nature 103: 5-6.
586   BAHRAM M, HAREND, H. & TEDERSOO, L. 2014: Network perspectives of ectomycorrhizal associations. –
587   Fungal Ecology 7: 70-77.
588   BARRAT, A., BARTHELEMY, M., PASTOR-SATORRAS, R. & VESPIGNANI, A. 2004: The architecture of complex
589   weighted networks. – Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 101: 3747-3752.
590   BASCOMPTE, J. & JORDANO, P. 2007: Plant-animal mutualistic networks: the architecture of biodiversity. –
591   Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 38: 567-593.
592   BASTOLLA, U., FORTUNA, M., PASCUAL-GARCÌA, A., FERRERA, A., LUQUE, B. & BASCOMPTE, J. 2009: The architecture
593   of mutualistic networks minimizes competition and increases biodiversity. – Nature 458: 1018-1020.
594   BECKETT, S.J. 2016: Improved community detection in weighted bipartite networks. – Royal Society Open
595   Science, 3: 140536.
596   BESHERS, S.N. & FEWELL, J.H. 2001: Models of division of labor in social insects. – Annual Review of
597   Entomology 46: 413-440.
598   BHADRA, A., JORDAN. F., SUMANA, A., DESHPANDE S.A. & GADAKAR R. 2009: A comparative social network
599   analysis of wasp colonies and classrooms: linking network structure to functioning. – Ecological
600   Complexity 6: 48-55.

601 BHATKAR, A. & WHITCOMB, W.H. 1970: Artificial diet for rearing various species of ants. – Florida
602 Entomologist 53: 229-232.

603 BLÜTHGEN, N., MENZEL, F. & BLÜTHGEN, N. 2006: Measuring specialization in species interaction networks.
604 – BMC Ecology 6: 9.

605 BLÜTHGEN, N., FRÜND, J., VÁSQUEZ, D.P. & MENZEL, F. 2008: What do interaction network metrics tell us about
606 specialization and biological traits. – Ecology 89: 3387-3399.

607 BONABEAU, E., THERAULAZ, G. & DENEUBOURG J.L. 1996: Quantitative study of the fixed threshold model for
608 the regulation of division of labour in insect societies. – Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series
609 B: Biological Sciences 263: 1565-1569.

610 BROWN, W.L. 1976: Contributions toward a reclassification of the Formicidae, Part VI: Ponerinae, tribe
611 Ponerini, subtribe Odontomachiti; Section A: Introduction, subtribal characters, genus *Odontomachus*. –
612 Studia Entomologica (N.S.) 19: 67-171.

613 BURGOS, E., CEVA, H., PERAZZO, R.P.J., DEVOTO, M., MEDAN D., ZIMMERMANN, M. & Delbue A.M. 2007: Why
614 nestedness in mutualistic networks? – Journal of Theoretical Biology 249: 307-313.

615 CALABI, P. 1988: Behavioral flexibility in Hymenoptera: a re-examination of the concept of caste. In Trager,
616 J.C. (Eds.): Advances in Myrmecology. – E. J Brill, Leiden, pp. 237-258.

617 CANTOR, M., PIRES, M.M., MARQUITT, F.M., RAIMUND, R.L., SEBASTIAN-GONZALEZ, E., COLTRI, P. P., ... & DAURA-
618 JORGE, F. G. 2017: Nestedness across biological scales. – PloS One 12: 2.

619 CHARBONNEAU, D., BLONDER, B. & DORNHAUS, A. 2013: Social insects: a model system for network dynamics.
620 In Temporal networks. – Springer, Berlin, pp. 217-244.

621 CHARBONNEAU, D. & DORNHAUS, A. 2015: Workers "specialized" on inactivity: Behavioral consistency of
622 inactive workers and their role in task allocation. – Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 69: 1459-1472.

623 CHITTKA, L., GUMBERT, A. & KUNZE, J. 1997: Foraging dynamics of bumble bees: correlates of movements
624 within and between plant species. – Behavioral Ecology 8: 239-249.

625 CLAUSET, A., MOORE, C. & NEWMAN, M.E. 2008: Hierarchical structure and the prediction of missing links in
626 networks. – Nature 453: 98-101.

627 COLE, B. 1986: The social behavior of *Leptothorax allardycei* (Hymenoptera, Formicidae): time budgets and
628 the evolution of worker reproduction. – Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 18: 165-173.

629 CORBARA, B., LACHAUD, J.P. & FRESNEAU, D. 1989: Individual variability, social structure and division of labour
630 in the ponerine ant *Ectatomma ruidum* Roger (Hymenoptera, Formicidae). Ethology 82: 89-100.

631 CSARDI, G. & NEPUSZ, T. 2006: The igraph software package for complex network research. – InterJournal,
632 Complex Systems 1695: 1-9.

633 DETRAIN, C. & PASTEELS, J.M. 1991: Caste differences in behavioral thresholds as a basis for polyethism
634 during food recruitment in the ant, *Pheidole pallidula* (Nyl) (Hymenoptera, Myrmicinae). – Journal of
635 Insect Behavior 4: 157-76.

636 DETRAIN, C. & PASTEELS, J.M. 1992: Caste polyethism and collective defense in the ant, *Pheidole pallidula*:
637 the outcome of quantitative differences in recruitment. – Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 29: 405-
638 412.

639 D'ORAZIO, A.E. & Waite T.A. 2007: Incomplete division of labor: Error-prone multitaskers coexist with
640 specialists. – Journal of Theoretical Biology 250: 449-460.

641 DORMANN, C.F., GRUBER, B. & FRÜND, J. 2008: Introducing the bipartite package: analyzing ecological
642 networks. – R news 8: 8-11.

643 DORMANN, C.F., FRÜND J. & BLÜTHGEN, N. B. GRUBER. 2009: Indices, graphs and null models: analyzing
644 bipartite ecological networks. – The Open Ecology Journal 2: 7-24

645 DORMANN, C. F. & STRAUSS, R. 2014: A method for detecting modules in quantitative bipartite networks. –
646 Methods in Ecology and Evolution 5: 90-98.

647 DORNHAUS, A. 2008: Specialization does not predict individual performance in an ant. – PloS Biology 6:
648 e285.

649 DORNHAUS, A., HOLLE, J. A., POOK, V., WORSWICK, G. & FRANKS, N. 2008: Why do not all workers work? Colony
650 size and workload during emigrations in the ant *Temnothorax albipennis*. –
651 Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 63: 43-51.

652 DORNHAUS, A., HOLLEY, J.A. & FRANKS, N.R. 2009: Larger colonies do not have more specialized workers in
653 the ant. – Behavioral Ecology 20: 922-929.

654 FARINE, D. 2017: The dynamics of transmission and the dynamics of networks. – Journal of Animal
655 Ecology 86: 415-418.

656 FEWELL, J.H. 2003: Social insect networks. – Science, 301: 1867-1870.

657 FORSYTH, A.B. 1978: Studies in the behavioral ecology of polygynous social wasps. – Ph.D. thesis, Harvard
658 University, Cambridge, 226 pp.

659 FREEMAN, L. 1979: Centrality in social networks: conceptual clarification. – Social Networks 1: 215-239.

660 FRESNEAU, D. 1984: Développement ovarien et statut social chez une fourmi primitive *Neoponera*
661 *obscuricornis emery* (Hym. Formicidae, Ponerinae). – Insectes Sociaux 31: 387-402.

662 GORDON, D.M. 2010: Ant encounters: interaction networks and colony behavior. – Princeton University
663 Press, Princeton, 152 pp.

664 GORELICK, R, BERTRAM S. M, Killeen P. R, Fewell J. H. 2004: Normalized mutual entropy in biology:
665 quantifying division of labor. – American Naturalist 164: 677-682.

666 HERBERS, J. M. 1981: Time resources and laziness in animals. – Oecologia, 49: 252-262.

667 HERBERS, J.M. 1983: Social organization in Leptothorax ants: within and between species patterns. –Psyche
668 90: 361-386.

669 HERBERS, J.M. & CUNNINGHAM. 1983: Social organization in *Leptothorax longispinosus* Mayer. – Animal
670 Behaviour 31: 759-771.

671 HERVÉ, M. 2020: RVAideMemoire: Testing and Plotting Procedures for Biostatistics. R package version 0.9
672 -75. – <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=RVAideMemoire>, retrieved on 18 January 2020.

673 HOFSTEDE F.E. & SOMMEIJER, M.J. 2006: Influence of environmental and colony factors on the initial
674 commodity choice of foragers of the stingless bee *Plebeia tobagoensis* (Hymenoptera, Meliponini). –
675 Insectes Sociaux 53: 258-264.

676 HOLBROOK, C. T., BARDEN P. M. & FEWELL, J. H. 2011: Division of labor increases with colony size in the
677 harvester ant *Pogonomyrmex californicus*. – Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 22: 960-966.

678 HÖLLDOBLER, B. & WILSON E.O. 1990: The ants. – Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 746 pp.

679 HONG, W., KENNEDY, A., BURGOS-ARTIZZU, X.P., ZELIKOWSKY, M., NAVONNE, S.G., PERONA, P. & ANDERSON, D.J.
680 2015: Automated measurement of mouse social behaviors using depth sensing, video tracking, and
681 machine learning. – Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA 112: 5351-5360.

682 HRDY, S.B. & HRDY, D.B. 1976: Hierarchical relations among female Hanuman langurs (Primates: Colobinae,
683 Presbytis entellus). – Science, 193: 913-915.

684 JACOBSEN, R.M., SVERDRUP-THYGESON, A., KAUSERUD, H. & BIRKEMOE, T. 2018: Revealing hidden insect–fungus
685 interactions; moderately specialized, modular and anti-nested detritivore networks. – Proceedings of the
686 Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 285: 20172833.

687 JANDT J.M., HUANG, E. & DORNHAUS A. 2009: Weak specialization of workers inside a bumble bee (*Bombus*
688 *impatients*) nest. – Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 63: 1829-1836.

689 JEANNE, R.L. 1986: The organization of work in *Polybia occidentalis*: costs and benefits of specialization in
690 a social wasp. – Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 19: 333-341.

691 JEANNE, R.L. 2016: Division of labor is not a process or a misleading concept. – Behavioral Ecology and
692 Sociobiology 70: 1109-1112.

693 JEANSON, R., FEWELL, J.H., GORELICK, R. & BERTRAM, S.M. 2007: Emergence of increased division of labor as a
694 function of group size. – Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 62: 289-298.

695 KAISER-BUNBURY C. N., MOUGAL, J, WHITTINGTON A.E., VALENTIN, T., GABRIEL, R., OLESEN, J. M. & BLÜTHGEN, N.
696 2017: Ecosystem restoration strengthens pollination network resilience and function. – Nature 542: 223-
697 227.

698 KARSAI, I. & Wenzel, J.W. 2000: Organization of regulation of nest construction behavior in Metapolybia
699 wasps. – Journal of Insect Behavior 13: 111-140.

700 KRAUSE, A.E., FRANK, K.J., MASON, D.M, ULANOWIC, R.E. & Taylor, W.W. 2003: Compartments revealed in
701 food web structure. – Nature 426: 282-285.

702 LAHAV, S.V., SOROKER, A. HEFETZ, A. & VANDER MEER, R.K. 1999. Direct behavioral evidence for hydrocarbons
703 as ant recognition discriminators. – Naturwissenschaften 86: 246-249.

704 LATREILLE, P.A. 1804: Tableau méthodique des insectes. Classe huitième. Insectes, Insecta. – Nouveau
705 Dictionnaire d'Histoire Naturelle 24: 129-200.
706 LEIGHTON, G.M., CHARBONNEAU, D. & DORNHAUS, A. 2017: Task switching is associated with temporal delays
707 in *Temnothorax rugatulus* ants. – Behavioral Ecology 28: 319-327.
708 LEWINSOHN, T., PRADO P.I., JORDANO, P., BASCOMPTE, J. & OLESEN, J. 2006: Structure in plant–animal
709 interaction assemblages. – Oikos 113: 174-184.
710 LINDAUER M. 1952: Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Arbeitsteilung im Bienenstaat. Zeitschrift für vergleichende
711 Physiologie 36: 299-345.
712 Lorenz, D.M., Jeng, A. & Deem, M.W. 2011: The emergence of modularity in biological systems. – Physics
713 of life reviews 8: 129-160.
714 MAY, R. 1972: Will a large complex system be stable? – Nature 238: 413-414.
715 MAYNARD, SMITH J. & SZATHMÁRY, E. 1997: The Major Transitions in Evolution. – Oxford University Press,
716 New York, 360 pp.
717 MEMMOTT, J., WASER, N.M. & PRICE M.V. 2004: Tolerance of pollinator net- works to species extinctions. –
718 Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B 271: 2605-2611.
719 MERSCH, D.P., CRESPI A, KELLER L. 2013: Tracking individuals shows spatial fidelity is a key regulator of ant
720 social organization. – Science 340: 1090-1093.
721 MICHENER, C.D. 1974: The social behavior of the bees: A comparative study. – Harvard University Press,
722 Cambridge, 404 pp.
723 NAUG, D. 2008: Structure of the social network and its influence on transmission dynamics in a honeybee
724 colony. – Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 62: 1719-1725.
725 NAUG, D. 2009: Structure and resilience of the social network as a function of colony size in social insects.
726 – Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 63: 1023-1028.
727 NEWMAN, M.E. 2003: The structure and function of complex networks. – SIAM review 45: 167-256.
728 NEWMAN, M.E. 2004: Analysis of weighted networks. – Physical Review E 70: 056131
729 NEWMAN, M.E. 2006: Modularity and community structure in networks. – Proceedings of the national
730 academy of sciences 103: 8577-8582.
731 NÚÑEZ, J.L.Á., NAYA, M., CALGANO-PISSARELI, M.P. & Otero L.D. 2011: Behaviour of *Odontomachus chelifer*
732 (Latreille) (Formicidae: Ponerinae) feeding on sugary liquids. – Journal of Insect Behavior 24: 220-229.
733 O'DONNELL, S. & JEANNE, R.L. 1992: Lifelong patterns of forager behaviour in a tropical swarm-founding
734 wasp: effects of specialization and activity level on longevity. – Animal Behavior 44: 1021-1027.
735 OPSAHL, T., Colizza, V., PANZARASA, P. & Ramasco, J.J., 2008: Prominence and control: the weighted rich-
736 club effect. – Physical Review Letters 101: 168702.
737 OPSAHL, T. 2009: Structure and Evolution of Weighted Networks. –Ph.D. thesis, University of London (Que
738 en Mary College), London, pp. 104-122.
739 OPSAHL, T., AGNEESSENS, F. & SKVORETZ, J. 2010: Node centrality in weighted networks: Generalizing degree
740 and shortest paths. – Social Networks 32: 245-251.
741 OSTER G., & WILSON E.O. 1978: Caste and Ecology in the Social Insects. – Princeton University Press,
742 Princeton, 372 pp.
743 PACALA, S.W., GORDON, D.M. & GODFRAY, H.C.J. 1996: Effects of social group size on information transfer
744 and task allocation. – Evolutionary Ecology, 10: 127-165.
745 PAGE, R.E. & ROBINSON G.E. 1991: The genetics of division of labor in honey bee colonies. – Advances in
746 Insect Physiology 23: 118-163.
747 PASQUARETTA, C. & JEANSON, R. 2018: Division of labor as a bipartite network. – Behavioral ecology 29: 342-
748 352.
749 PATEK, S.N., BAIO, J.E, FISHER B.L. & SUAREZ, A.V. 2006: Multifunctionality and mechanical origins: ballistic
750 jaw propulsion in trap-jaw ants. – Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA 104: 12787-
751 12792.
752 PERRY, C. J., SØVIK, E., MYERSCOUGH, M. R. & BARRON, A. B. 2015: Rapid behavioral maturation accelerates
753 failure of stressed honey bee colonies. – Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA 112: 3427-
754 3432.
755 PIMM, S.L. 1979: The structure of food webs. – Theoretical population biology 16: 144-158.

756 PINTER-WOLLMAN, N., WOLLMAN, R., GUETZ, A., HOLMES, S. & GORDON, D.M. 2011: The effect of individual
757 variation on the structure and function of interaction networks in harvester ants. – Journal of the Royal
758 Society Interface 8: 1562-1573.

759 POCOCK M.J., EVANS D.M. & MEMMOTT, J. 2012: The robustness and restoration of a network of ecological
760 networks. – Science 335: 973-977.

761 POWELL S. & Tschinkel W.R. 1999: Ritualized conflict in *Odontomachus brunneus* and the generation of
762 interaction-based task allocation: a new organizational mechanism in ants. – Animal Behaviour 58: 965-
763 972.

764 R CORE TEAM 2019: R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical
765 Computing, Vienna, Austria; <http://www.R-project.org/>, retrieved on 12 December 2020.

766 RAIMUNDO R.L., FREITAS A.V. & OLIVEIRA P.S. 2009: Seasonal Patterns in Activity Rhythm and Foraging
767 Ecology in the Neotropical Forest-Dwelling Ant, *Odontomachus chelifer* (Formicidae: Ponerinae). –
768 Annals of the Entomological Society of America 102: 1151-1157.

769 RETANA, J. & CERDÁ, X. 1990: Social Organization of *Cataglyphis cursor* Ant Colonies (Hymenoptera,
770 Formicidae): Inter-, and Intraspecific Comparisons. – Ethology 84: 105-122.

771 RETANA, J. & CERDA, X. 1991: Behavioural variability and development of *Cataglyphis cursor* ant workers
772 (Hymenoptera, Formicidae) 1. – Ethology 89: 275-286.

773 ROBINSON, G.E. 1987[a]: Modulation of alarm pheromone perception in the honey bee - evidence for division
774 of labor based on hormonally regulated response thresholds. – The Journal of Comparative Physiology A
775 160: 613-19.

776 ROBINSON, G.E. 1987[b]: Regulation of honeybee age polyethism by juvenile hormone. – Behavioral Ecology
777 and Sociobiology 20: 329-338.

778 ROBINSON, G.E. & PAGE, R.E. 1988: Genetic determination of guarding and undertaking in honey-bee
779 colonies. – Nature, 333: 356-358.

780 ROBINSON, G.E. 1992: Regulation of division of labor in insect societies. – The Annual Review of Entomology
781 37: 637-665.

782 ROCHA, F.H., LAUCHAUD J-P., Valle-Mora J., Pérez-Lachaud, G. & Zeh D. 2014: Fine individual specialization
783 and elitism among workers of the ant *Ectatomma tuberculatum* for a highly specific task: intruder
784 removal. – Ethology 120: 1185-1198.

785 ROTHMAN, K.J. 1990: No adjustments are needed for multiple comparisons. – Epidemiology, 43-46.

786 RUSSELL, A.L., MORRISON, S.J., MOSCHONAS, E.H. & PAPAJ, D.R. 2017: Patterns of pollen and nectar foraging
787 specialization by bumblebees over multiple timescales using RFID. – Scientific reports 7: 1-13.

788 SANTORO, D., HARTLEY, S. & LESTER, P.J. 2019: Behaviourally specialized foragers are less efficient and live
789 shorter lives than generalists in wasp colonies. – Scientific reports 9: 1-10.

790 SCHMID-HEMPEL, P. 1990: Reproductive competition and the evolution of work load in social insects. –
791 American Naturalist 135: 501-526.

792 SAVILLE, D.J. 1990: Multiple comparison procedures: the practical solution. – The American Statistician 44:
793 174-180.

794 SENDOVA-FRANKS, A.B. & FRANKS, N.R. 1995: Spatial relationships within nests of the ant *Leptothorax
795 unifasciatus* (Latr.) and their implications for the division of labour. – Animal Behaviour 50: 121-136.

796 SENDOVA-FRANKS, A.B., HAYWARD, R.K., WULF, B., Klimek, T., James, R., Planqué, R., ... & Franks, N.R. 2010:
797 Emergency networking: famine relief in ant colonies. – Animal Behaviour 79: 473-485.

798 SMITH, A.A., MILLAR, J.G., HANKS, L.M. & SUAREZ, A.V. 2012. Experimental evidence that workers recognize
799 reproductives through cuticular hydrocarbons in the ant *Odontomachus brunneus*. – Behavioral Ecology
800 and Sociobiology 1-10.

801 SOKAL, R.R. & ROHL, F.J. 1981: Biometry: The principles and practices of statistics in biology research. – WH
802 Freeman & Company, 2nd Edition, New York, pp. 859.

803 SOROKER, V., VIENNE, C., HEFETZ, A. & NOWBAHARI, E. 1994: The postpharyngeal gland as a "Gestalt" organ
804 for nestmate recognition in the ant *Cataglyphis niger*. – Naturwissenschaften 81: 510-513.

805 SOROKER, V., VIENNE, C. & HEFETZ, A. 1995a: Hydrocarbon dynamics within and between nestmates in
806 *Cataglyphis niger* (Hymenoptera: Formicidae). – Journal of Chemical Ecology 21: 365-378.

807   SOROKER, V., HEFETZ, A., COJOCAR, M., Billen, J., Franke, S. & Francke, W. 1995b: Structural and chemical
808   ontogeny of the postpharyngeal gland in the desert ant *Cataglyphis niger*. – Physiological Entomology 20:
809   323-329.
810   SOROKER, V., Fresneau, D. & HEFETZ, A. 1998: Formation of colony odor in ponerine ant *Pachycondyla*
811   *apicalis*. – Journal of Chemical Ecology 24: 1077-1090.
812   SPAGNA, J.C., VAKIS, A.I., SCHMIDT, C. A., PATEK S. N., TSUTSUI, N.D. & SUAREZ, A.V. 2008: Phylogeny, scaling,
813   and the generation of extreme forces in trap-jaw ants. – The Journal of Experimental Biology
814   211: 2358-2368.
815   STANICZENKO, P.P., KOPP, J.C. & ALLESINA, S. 2013: The ghost of nestedness in ecological networks. Nature
816   communications 4:1-6.
817   TENG, J. & MCCANN, K.S. 2004: Dynamics of compartmented and reticulate food webs in relation to
818   energetic flow. – American Naturalist 164: 85-100.
819   THÉBAULT, E. & FONTAINE, C. 2010: Stability of ecological communities and the architecture of mutualistic
820   and trophic networks. – Science 329: 853-856.
821   THOMAS, M.L., & ELGAR, M.A. 2003: Colony size affects division of labour in the ponerine ant *Rhytidoponera*
822   *metallica*. – Naturwissenschaften 90: 88-92.
823   TOJU, H., GUIMARÃES P.R., OLESEN, J.M. & THOMPSON, J.N. 2014: Assembly of complex plant – fungus
824   networks. – Nature Communications 5: 5273.
825   TOJU, H., GUIMARÃES P.R., OLESEN, J.M. & THOMPSON, J.N. 2015: Below-ground plant–fungus network
826   topology is not congruent with above-ground plant – animal network topology. – Science Advances 1:
827   e1500291.
828   TRANIELLO, J.F.A. & ROSENGAUS R.B. 1997: Ecology, evolution and division of labour in social ants. – Animal
829   Behavior 53: 209-213.
830   WATERS, J.S. & FEWELL, J.H. 2012: Information processing in social insect networks. – PloS one, 7: e40337.
831   WEST-EBERHARD, M.J. 1967: Dominance hierarchies and the evolution of social behaviour. – Science 157:
832   1585-1595.
833   WILSON E.O. 1985: The sociogenesis of insect colonies. – Science 228: 1489-1495.
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858

859 Tab. 1: List of possible behavioral acts observed in the colonies (divided in two classes; tasks and
860 inactivity), the acronym used in the figures and tables, and detailed descriptions of each behavior.

Class	Behavioral acts	Acronym	Description
Task	Antennation	at	Contact with another worker with the antenna
	Brood care	bc	Manipulating brood
	Carrying brood	cb	Moving brood
	Carrying debris	cd	Carrying/manipulating a stone within the nest in any way
	Carrying food	cf	Manipulating food inside and outside the nest
	Feeding	fd	Feeding inside nest (brought back by foragers)
	Foraging/Patrolling	fp	Located outside of the nest (foraging)
	Grooming	g	Grooming another ant
	Be groomed	bg	Be groomed by another ant
	Self-grooming	sg	Grooming itself
	Walking	wl	Walking within the nest
Inactivity	Inactivity	in	When the ant is immobile within the nest (more than 10s)

861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894

18

Tab 2. Frequencies of the tasks observed in the colonies (A, B and C). The value (represented in %) is followed by the *P*-value (expressed as significant in bold) of the specific post-hoc *G-test*.

Tasks	Colony A (*N*= 3605)	*P-values*	Colony B (*N*= 1775)	*P-values*	Colony C (*N*= 368)	*P-Values*
wl	18.4% (N=122)	**P<0.001**	22.7% (N=66)	**P<0.001**	43.6% (N=62)	**P<0.001**
sg	23.5% (N=156)	**P<0.001**	27.6% (N= 80)	**P<0.001**	22% (N= 31)	**P<0.001**
at	1.5% (N=10)	ns	4% (N= 11)	ns	2.1% (N= 3)	ns
bg	1.6% (N=11)	ns	12.4% (N= 36)	ns	-------------------	-----------
fd	21.7% (N=144)	**P<0.001**	-------------------	-----------	14.8% (N= 21)	**P<0.001**
g	4% (N=26)	ns	6% (N= 17)	ns	-------------------	-----------
bc	23.2% (N=154)	**P<0.001**	19.3% (N= 56)	**P<0.001**	0.7% (N= 1)	ns
cb	2% (N=13)	ns	7% (N= 22)	ns	-------------------	-----------
cd	1.6% (N=11)	ns	0.3% (N= 1)	ns	-------------------	-----------
fp	1.6% (N=11)	ns	0.3% (N= 1)	ns	14.8% (N= 21)	**P<0.001**
cf	0.09% (N=6)	ns	-------------------	-----------	0.2% (N= 3)	ns

19

932 Tab 3. Betweenness centrality values from the TTNs of all the colonies (A, B and C). The tasks (nodes) of
933 all workers, generalists and specialists are considered. The tasks considered bridges due to betweenness
934 centrality values above the third quartile of the data (<75%), The Z-score and *P*-values (expressed as
935 significant in bold) are also exposed.

All workers	A	Z-score	*P*-values	B	Z-score	*P*-values	C	Z-score	*P*-values
wl	**14**	-1.49	0.13	0	-0.62	0.53	5	1.19	0.23
sg	**36**	0.91	0.36	**17**	1.03	0.29	0	0	1
g	0	0	1	**8**	**0.05**	0	---	---------	----------
bg	0	0	1	5	-0,14	0.88	---	---------	----------
bc	**14**	1.92	**0.05**	2	0	0.99	0	0	1
cb	0	0	1	3	1.77	0.07	---	---------	----------
fd	0	0	1	---	---------	-----------	**6**	-0,93	0.35
cf	0	0	1	---	---------	-----------	0	---------	----------
fp	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	-1,26	0.20
cd	0	0	1	---	---------	-----------	---	---------	----------
at	---	---------	-----------	0	0	1	0	0	1
Generalists	A	Z-score	*P*-values	B	Z-score	*P*-values	C	Z-score	*P*-values
wl	**6**	-1.15	0.24	0	0	1	**9**	-0.53	0.58
sg	**23**	0.85	0.39	**20**	0	1	0	0	1
g	0	0	1	0	0	1	---	---------	----------
bg	0	0	1	0	0	1	---	---------	----------
bc	**11**	0	1	**9**	0	1	0	0	1
cb	0	0	1	0	0	1	---	---------	----------
cd	0	0	1	---	---------	-----------	---	---------	----------
cf	0	0	1	---	---------	-----------	0	0	1
fd	0	0	1	---	---------	-----------	2	-0,65	0.51
fp	---	---------	-----------	---	---------	-----------	**13**	1.50	0.13
at	---	---------	-----------	---	---------	-----------	0	0	1
Specialists	A	Z-score	*P*-values	B	Z-score	*P*-values	C	Z-score	*P*-values
wl	**3**	-3.35	**0.0007**	0	-0,9	0.36	4	0.38	0.70
sg	**4**	-2.7	**0.006**	**16**	4.24	***P*<0.0001**	3	0.06	0.95
g	0	0	1	**14**	1.12	0.25	---	---------	----------
bc	0	-0.65	0.51	0	0	1	---	---------	----------
cb	0	-0.67	0.50	13	1.52	0.12	---	---------	----------
fp	0	-1.16	0.24	0	0	1	4	1	**0**
fd	0	-1.83	**0.05**	---	---------	-----------	**7**	1	**0**
bg	---	---------	-----------	5	-0,94	0.34	---	---------	----------
at	---	---------	-----------	0	0	1	0	1	1
cf	---	---------	-----------	---	---------	-----------	3	1	**0**

936
937
938
939
940

Tab 4. Degree centrality values (In-degree) from the TTNs of all the colonies (A, B and C). The tasks (nodes) of all workers, generalists and specialists are considered. The tasks considered inactivity hubs due to in-degree centrality values above the third quartile of the data (<75%), The Z-score and *P*-values (expressed as significant in bold) are also exposed.

All workers	A	Z-score	*P*-values	B	Z-score	*P*-values	C	Z-score	*P*-values
wl	**37**	1.58	0.11	13.5	-0.56	0.56	**11.9**	0.71	0.47
sg	**36.3**	1.33	0.18	**27.2**	1.25	0.20	8.9	0.03	0.97
at	3.3	-1.81	0.06	13.6	-0.59	0.55	2.9	-1.64	0.09
g	**18.2**	0.28	0.77	**17.6**	**0.001**	0.99	-----	----------	------------
bg	12.6	-0.42	0.57	10.3	-0.68	0.49	-----	----------	------------
bc	18.1	0.31	0.75	17.3	-0.13	0.88	0	0	1
cb	11.7	-0.81	0.41	7.3	0.89	0.37	-----	----------	------------
cd	4.3	-1.29	0.19	2.1	-0.7	0.48	-----	----------	------------
fp	4.5	-1.23	0.21	3.2	0.19	0.84	8.8	0.006	0.99
cf	2.8	-0.47	0.63	-----	----------	------------	7.3	0.70	0.48
fd	-----	----------	------------	-----	----------	------------	**8.8**	0.006	0.99
Generalists	A	Z-score	*P*-values	B	Z-score	*P*-values	C	Z-score	*P*-values
wl	**16.3**	0.58	0.56	11.5	-0.01	0.98	**7.4**	0.31	0.75
sg	**27.1**	-3.11	**0.001**	11.5	0.03	0.96	5.5	0.10	0.91
g	16.2	1.87	0.06	9.2	-0.89	0.37	-----	----------	------------
bg	8.1	-0.46	0.63	4.2	-0.42	0.67	-----	----------	------------
bc	16.1	0.42	0.66	**12.3**	2.36	**0.01**	0	0	1
cb	8.3	-2.88	**0.003**	6	-2.3	**0.02**	-----	----------	------------
cd	4.1	-1.24	0.21	-----	----------	------------	-----	----------	------------
cf	2.5	-0.42	0.67	-----	----------	------------	2.1	0.71	0.47
fd	15.1	0.01	0.98	-----	----------	------------	5.1	-4.61	*P<0.0001*
fp	-----	----------	------------	-----	----------	------------	**6.9**	-1.54	0.12
at	3.2	-1.73	0.08	2.8	-1.81	0.07	-----	----------	------------
Specialists	A	Z-score	P-values	B	Z-score	P-values	C	Z-score	*P-values*
wl	**26.5**	2.13	**0.03**	13.2	-3.49	**0.0004**	**6.9**	1.53	0.12
sg	18.3	0.98	0.32	**22.7**	2.92	**0.003**	**8**	0.45	0.64
g	3.3	-1.56	0.11	**17.2**	8.78	*P<0.0001*	-----	----------	------------
bc	7.3	-0.47	0.63	13.1	3.18	0.001	-----	----------	------------
cb	5.7	-1.44	0.34	7.1	-0.62	0.53	-----	----------	------------
fp	4.1	-0.99	0.31	-----	----------	------------	3.1	-1.02	0.30
fd	14.4	0.43	0.66	3.2	-5.25	*P<0.0001*	**7.5**	-0.11	0.90
bg	4.4	-0.69	0.48	10.1	3.56	0.003	-----	----------	------------
at	1.2	-1.55	0.11	13.4	11	*P<0.0001*	2.8	-1.44	0.14
cf	0	0	1	-----	----------	------------	4	5.17	*P<0.0001*

Tab 5. Degree centrality values (Out-degree) from the TTNs of all the colonies (A, B and C). The tasks (nodes) of all workers, generalists and specialists are considered. The tasks considered inactivity spreaders due to out-degree centrality values above the third quartile of the data (<75%), The Z-score and *P*-values (expressed as significant in bold) are also exposed.

| All workers	A	Z-score	*P*-values	B	Z-score	*P*-values	C	Z-score	*P*-values
wl	13.5	-4,64	*P<0.0001*	6.5	-3,39	*P<0.0001*	6.5	0.64	0.51
sg	**24.5**	-2,49	**0.01**	11.1	-2,58	**0.009**	7	0.08	0.92
at	9.3	-0,44	0.65	9.4	-1,14	0.25	4.1	-1,61	0.10
g	17.5	0.05	0.95	**20.3**	-0,1	0.91	-----	----------	------------
bg	11.7	0.58	0.56	17.5	1.17	0.24	-----	----------	----------
bc	**21.5**	1.48	0.14	**20**	2.18	**0.02**	2.5	-3,34	**0.0008**
cb	14.1	1.45	0.14	17.8	17.8	0.20	-----	----------	------------
cd	9.9	-0,17	0.85	4.7	1.59	0.11	-----	----------	------------
fp	10.3	-0,007	0.99	4.8	1.73	0.08	**11**	0.01	0.98
cf	10.7	1.89	**0.05**	-----	---------	------------	6.9	0.62	------------
fd	**22.6**	3.47	**0.0005**	-----	---------	------------	**12.6**	1.67	0.09
Generalists	A	Z-score	P-values	B	Z-score	P-values	C	Z-score	*P*-values
wl	11.6	-4.21	*P<0.001*	6.5	-3.39	*P<0.0001*	3.6	-2.54	**0.01**
sg	**18**	-4.34	*P<0.001*	11.1	-2.58	**0.009**	4.5	-1.28	0.19
g	12.2	0.03	0.96	**12**	0.35	0.72	-----	----------	------------
bg	10.2	0.61	0.53	11.4	1.61	0.10	-----	----------	------------
bc	**19**	1.61	0.10	**13**	2.88	**0.003**	1.8	0.01	0.99
cb	12.6	-1.05	0.29	3.5	-4.16	*P<0.0001*	-----	----------	------------
cd	4.4	1.27	0.20	-----	---------	------------	-----	----------	------------
cf	4.5	1.27	0.20	-----	---------	------------	1.7	-0.22	0.82
fd	**19**	3.21	**0.001**	-----	---------	------------	**7.2**	-1.3	0.19
fp	-----	----------	------------	-----	---------	------------	**8.2**	1.33	0.18
at	5.5	-0.36	0.71	-----	---------	------------	-----	----------	------------
Specialists	A	Z-score	P-values	B	Z-score	P-values	C	Z-score	P-values
wl	**11.6**	-4.17	*P<0.0001*	6.5	-3.48	**0.0005**	**6.5**	1.57	0.11
sg	**15.4**	-1.53	0.12	11.1	-2.6	**0.01**	5.1	-0.45	0.64
g	**11.8**	0.56	0.57	**20.3**	-2.54	**0.01**	-----	----------	------------
bc	7.1	1.30	0.19	15.4	2.05	**0.03**	-----	----------	------------
cb	3.7	-1.28	0.19	17	2.76	**0.005**	-----	----------	------------
fp	7.9	1.78	0.07	-----	---------	------------	4.7	-3.25	**0.001**
fd	8.5	2.30	**0.02**	-----	---------	------------	**7.8**	7.80	*P<0.0001*
bg	9.9	1.11	0.26	13.8	1.21	0.12	-----	----------	------------
at	5.3	-0.08	0.93	9.4	-1	0.30	3.9	4.94	*P<0.0001*
cf	4.1	1.37	0.16	-----	---------	------------	4.3	5.88	*P<0.0001*

Fig. 1: TWNs graphs from colony A, colony B and colony C. Upper and lower rectangles represent workers and tasks, respectively. The width of each rectangle is proportional to the number of acts and the width of link indicates the frequency of interactions between tasks and workers. For each network, numbers in

23

971 upper rectangles represent worker identities. For each network, the value of H_2', Q, and $Qnorm$ are given.
972 The different modules of workers and tasks are identified in different colors.
973
974

975
976 Fig. 2: TTNs graphs from colony A, colony B and colony C. The nodes represent tasks and the links between
977 them the interactions between tasks from the workers. The width of each link indicates the frequency of
978 interactions between tasks and workers. The size of the nodes represents the betweenness centrality
979 values of the nodes (the larger the node, the higher the betweenness centrality value obtained), nodes
980 colored as green are bridges (i.e. nodes with betweenness centrality above the third quartile of the data,
981 <75%). Bridges signaled with a red asterisk (*) are statistically significant compared to the random
982 networks. The different modules of tasks are identified in different colors.
983
984
985
986
987
988
989

24

Fig. 3: TTNs inactivity in-degree graphs from colony A, colony B and colony C. The nodes represent tasks and the links between them the inactivity between tasks from the workers. The width of each link indicates the frequency of inactivity between tasks and workers. The size of the nodes represents the in-degree centrality values of the nodes (the larger the node, the higher the in-degree centrality value obtained), nodes colored as green are inactivity hubs (i.e. nodes with betweenness centrality above the third quartile of the data, <75%). Bridges signaled with a red asterisk (*) are statistically significant compared to the random networks. The different modules of tasks are identified in different colors.

25

Fig. 4: TTNs inactivity out-degree graphs from colony A, colony B and colony C. The nodes represent tasks and the links between them the inactivity between tasks from the workers. The width of each link indicates the frequency of inactivity between tasks and workers. The size of the nodes represents the out-degree centrality values of the nodes (the larger the node, the higher the out-degree centrality value obtained), nodes colored as green are bridges (i.e. nodes with betweenness centrality above the third quartile of the data, <75%). Bridges signaled with a red asterisk (*) are statistically significant compared to the random networks. The different modules of tasks are identified in different colors.

Fig. 5: Network specialization (H_2'), modularity (Q) and weighted nestedness (WNODF) for WTNs from the colonies (A, B and C). Black bars represent the original networks, while grey bars represent networks randomized and the respective standard deviation (SD). The significant statistical differences (Z-score) were signaled by *, ** and *** (p values less than 0.05, 0.01 and 0.001, respectively), non-statistical values were signaled by ns (i.e. non-significant). The asterisks (*) above the bars mean significant differences between the original and the randomized networks or vice and versa.

Fig. 6: Network DOL index (DOL_{indv} or DOL_{task}) for WTNs from the colonies (A, B and C). Black bars represent the original networks, while grey bars represent networks randomized and the respective standard deviation (SD). The significant statistical differences (Z-score) were signaled by *, ** and *** (p values less than 0.05, 0.01 and 0.001, respectively), non-statistical values were signaled by ns (i.e. non-significant). The asterisks (*) above the bars mean significant differences between the original and the randomized networks or vice and versa.

Fig. 7: Data distribution (empirical cumulative distribution) of d'$_{indv}$, d'$_{task}$ and *li* values for WTNs from the colonies (A, B and C) fr each correspondent worker or task. The results were indicated with the median and interquartile range (IQR) of each metric. The numeric values in the d'$_{task}$ are followed by each specific acronym representing the tasks considered (presented in the Tab. 1).

Aw: All workers

Esp: Specialits

Gen: Generalists

Fig. 8: Network modularity (Q) and weighted nestedness (UNODF) for TTNs from the colonies (A, B and C). Black bars represent the original networks, while grey bars represent networks randomized and the respective standard deviation (SD). UNODF 1 is the metric calculated without a cut-off and UNODF 2 is the metric calculated with a cut-off of 10%. The significant statistical differences (Z-score) were signaled by *, ** and *** (p values less than 0.05, 0.01 and 0.001, respectively), non-statistical values were signaled by ns (i.e. non-significant). The asterisks (*) above the bars mean significant differences between the original and the randomized networks or vice and versa.