1 **Abstract**

2 1. Carcasses represent critical resources for many terrestrial organisms, including burying

3   beetles, which rely on carcasses for survival and breeding. Carcass attributes can strongly

4   influence the reproduction of burying beetles, yet most studies on their breeding ecology

5   have used laboratory-reared carcasses of limited sizes, raising questions about whether

6   these results are representative of natural patterns.

7 2. We conducted breeding and feeding experiments using a wide size range of lab (laboratory

8   mice) and wild carcasses (wild mammals, birds, and reptiles) to investigate how carcass

9   size, source, and taxon affect various breeding outcomes such as clutch size, brood size,

10   brood mass, and larval growth of the burying beetle *Nicrophorus nepalensis*.

11 3. Our results reveal a hump-shaped relationship between carcass size and breeding

12   performance, with optimal breeding outcomes occurring on medium-sized carcasses.

13   Furthermore, despite the variation in tissue nutritional composition, breeding outcomes and

14   larval growth did not differ between the lab and wild carcass sources or among the three

15   wild carcass taxa. Finally, we found a larval quality-quantity trade-off across the range of

16   carcasses examined, with carcass size shaping the larval life history traits.

17 4. Overall, these results elucidate how carcass resources may influence the breeding

18   performance of burying beetles. Importantly, our study provides solid evidence validating

19   decades of research using lab carcasses to study the reproductive ecology of burying beetles.

20

21 **Keywords**

22 breeding performance, brood size, burying beetle, carcass, clutch size, nutritional composition,

23 offspring quality-quantity trade-off, resource use efficiency

Introduction

Carcasses represent a rich resource for a wide variety of terrestrial organisms, including vertebrate scavengers, saprophagous invertebrates, and microbial decomposers (Barton et al., 2013; Rozen et al., 2008; Stiegler et al., 2020). These carcass-feeding organisms facilitate the recycling of carcass nutrients and make the resource available to other species (Tomberlin et al., 2017). For some species such as burying beetles (*Nicrophorus* spp.), carcasses are particularly important because they serve as not only food resource but also breeding sites where the offspring grow and develop under parental care (Scott, 1998). Carcass attributes, therefore, can strongly influence the reproduction of burying beetles.

Carcass size is a key factor for the reproductive success of burying beetles because it determines the amount of resource available for breeding. Brood size and brood mass are generally greater on larger (heavier) carcasses (Creighton, 2005; Scott, 1998; Scott & Traniello, 1990; Smiseth et al., 2014; Trumbo, 1992). Moreover, parents can adjust their reproductive investment based on carcass size (Hopwood et al., 2016). For example, females lay more eggs on larger carcasses within a certain carcass size range (Müller et al., 1990), and parents regulate the brood size via filial cannibalism when carcass resource is limited (Bartlett, 1987). However, despite the resource benefits, large carcasses can be more difficult to utilize (Trumbo, 1992), and the energetic costs of processing carcass tissue also increase with carcass size. Such cost-benefit trade-offs suggest that reproductive performance might not necessarily be greater on larger carcasses, yet no study has empirically examined whether there is an optimal carcass size for breeding.

Besides carcass size, the source of carcass can also influence the reproduction of burying beetles. Carcasses in the wild come from animals feeding on diverse diets in various environments. However, most breeding experiments use laboratory mice and chicks, which are

2

usually fed fixed diets and reared in a controlled environment. Consequently, lab and wild carcasses may have considerably different body compositions as well as skin and gut microbiomes (Weldon et al., 2015), and these differences can alter larval survival and growth (Rozen et al., 2008; Shukla et al., 2018). Therefore, experiments comparing the breeding outcomes of burying beetles on lab versus wild carcasses are essential for evaluating whether the results of past studies are representative of natural patterns. Furthermore, burying beetles have been documented to breed on carcasses from a variety of taxonomic groups (Hocking et al., 2006; Scott, 1998). Different carcass taxa can vary in their tissue nutritional composition (May & El-Sabaawi, 2022), which may influence larval growth and development (Scriber & Slansky Jr, 1981). However, it remains unknown how breeding outcomes and larval performance may vary among different groups of wild carcasses.

Studies have shown that brood size and larval mass of burying beetles are often negatively correlated with each other (Bartlett, 1987; Creighton, 2005; Monteith et al., 2012). Such a trade-off between larval quality and quantity may vary with carcass size (Bartlett & Ashworth, 1988; Smiseth et al., 2014) because resource quantity can shape the life history traits of organisms (Boggs, 2009; Richardson & Smiseth, 2020; Tessier & Consolatti, 1991). However, most studies on the offspring trade-off in burying beetles were conducted under a limited range of carcass sizes, and the results have been mixed because of the differential responses of brood size and larval mass to carcass size (Smiseth et al., 2014). Moreover, carcass sources with different quality can influence larval performance and thereby alter the trade-off patterns, yet few studies have examined this (but see Woelber et al., 2018). Therefore, examining breeding outcomes across a wide range of carcass sizes from different carcass sources (e.g., lab and wild carcasses) will help better understand how resource variation affects the offspring life history trade-off in burying beetles.

72   In this study, we aimed to understand how various carcass attributes (size, source, and

73   taxon) influence the breeding outcomes, larval performance, and offspring quality-quantity

74   trade-off in burying beetles. We conducted breeding experiments on the species *Nicrophorus*

75   *nepalensis*, which has been shown to provide extensive parental care for offspring. First, we

76   examined how breeding outcomes (clutch size, brood size, brood mass, etc.) and carcass use

77   efficiency varied across a broad range of carcass size (weight was used as a proxy for size in

78   this study) on lab (laboratory mice) and wild carcasses (wild mammals, birds, and reptiles).

79   We further focused on the wild carcasses and compared the larval breeding outcomes and

80   carcass use efficiency of *N. nepalensis* on the three wild carcass taxa. We expected that there

81   would be an optimal carcass size for breeding, and the breeding outcomes may differ between

82   lab and wild carcasses as well as among different wild carcass taxa. We next quantified the

83   tissue nutritional composition of lab and wild carcasses and conducted a larval feeding

84   experiment using carcass tissues from different sources and taxa. We expected that the larvae

85   would perform better when feeding on diets with higher nutritional quality. Finally, we

86   examined the larval quality-quantity trade-off on lab and wild carcasses. We expected a trade-

87   off across a broad range of carcass sizes, and the trade-off pattern would differ between lab and

88   wild carcasses.

89

Materials and Methods

Breeding experiments

92   We conducted breeding experiments on *N. nepalensis* from the lab colony established in 2023.

93   Adult beetles were collected from Taipei and New Taipei City, Taiwan and reared in growth

94   chambers under a relative humidity of 70% and a 10:14 h light:dark cycle. The temperature

95   was set to mimic diurnal temperature fluctuation (mean: 17.8°C; range: 16–20°C). This

96   represents the natural temperature conditions during the breeding season (November–April) of

97   *N. nepalensis* in northern Taiwan. A male and a female were placed in a plastic breeding

98   container (14.2 cm in diameter and 6.3 cm in height) half-filled with moist commercial potting

99   mix (2 cm in depth, equivalent to 300 mL), and a defrosted carcass was then placed on the soil

100   surface. Frozen dead laboratory mice/rats were used as lab carcasses. Wild carcasses were

101   obtained from the Taiwan Roadkill Observation Network (https://roadkill.tw/eng/home) and

102   the Wild Bird Society of Taipei. These wild carcasses weighed from 1.6 to 99.5 grams and

103   consisted of small mammals, birds, and reptiles. The carcasses used for breeding experiments

104   were animals that had died within the past four months due to traffic collisions and other

105   accidental causes but not poisoning. Upon discovery, these carcasses were immediately

106   transferred to −20°C freezers for preservation. We paired each wild carcass with a lab carcass

107   of a similar weight (measured to the nearest 0.1 g using an electronic analytical balance

108   ATX224R, Shimadzu, Japan) and applied a sibship design where the two males and the two

109   females used in each lab-wild carcass were from the same family line, respectively, to control

110   for parental genotypes (the males and females came from genetically unrelated families). The

111   breeding containers were maintained under the same environmental conditions as those of the

112   lab colony. Five rounds of breeding experiments were conducted from May 2023 to March

113   2024 (each with a different beetle parent generation), consisting of a total of 121 lab-wild

114   carcass pairs (14, 76, and 31 wild mammal, bird, and reptile carcasses).

115   We recorded the clutch size of each breeding container at day 4 by counting the number

116   of eggs around the wall and at the bottom of the container from the outside. This minimized

117   the disturbance to the carcass and parents while providing an accurate estimate of the exact

118   clutch size ($r = 0.94$, $P < 0.001$, $n = 70$ broods) (Sun et al., 2020). Eleven days after beetle

119   pairing, we inspected the carcass to record the brood size (number of larvae) and brood mass

120   (total larval weight; measured to the nearest 0.0001 g). We calculated hatching success as brood

121   size divided by clutch size, average larval mass as brood mass divided by brood size, and larval

122   density as brood size divided by carcass weight. We also measured the total weight of breeding

123   containers at the beginning and at the end of the experiments to estimate the amount of carcass

124   tissue used by parents and larvae during the breeding process (larvae were removed from the

125   carcasses). Carcass use efficiency was calculated as the amount of carcass tissue used divided

126   by the initial carcass weight.

127

128   *Nutritional analysis of carcass tissue*

129   To quantify the nutritional composition of lab and wild carcasses, which is essential for

130   understanding how burying beetles use different types of carcasses, we estimated the protein

131   and fat content of carcass tissue by adopting a proximate analysis approach as described by Al

132   Shareefi and Cotter (2018). We dissected the carcasses by first skinning the animals and

133   retaining the trunks. Trunk tissue was then separated from the bones with a pair of fine tweezers

134   and a scalpel and divided into viscera (all organs inside the peritoneum) and muscles (all visible

135   muscle parts). We next used a meat tenderizer to pound the viscera and muscles evenly and

136   sampled three pieces of visceral and muscle tissue for each carcass for the analysis of

137   nutritional composition. A total of seven lab mice, seven wild mammals, seven wild birds, and

138   seven wild reptiles were dissected and analyzed.

139   For each tissue sample, we dried approximately 100 mg (106 ± 18 mg) of wet tissue in

140   a 40°C oven for 5 days until all water was removed. To determine the fat content, the dried

141   tissue was thoroughly mixed with 100 μl of −20°C acetone and vortexed for one minute. The

142   mixture was then placed in a −20°C fridge for a 30-minute reaction period (Saini et al., 2021).

143   After the extraction, the mixture was centrifuged to separate the components, and the acetone

144   was carefully removed. If the acetone appeared turbid after centrifugation, the solvent was

145   discarded and replaced with fresh acetone for further extraction. The process was repeated until

146   the solvent became clear. The residual solvent was then allowed to evaporate at room

147   temperature for 12 hours. After the fat removal process, the final product was weighed to

148   determine the protein content, and the fat content was determined by subtracting the protein

149   weight from the dry weight.

150

151   *Larval feeding experiments*

152   We conducted larval feeding experiments using the remaining dissected carcass tissue from the

153   nutritional composition analysis. We placed *ca.* 400 mg (401 ± 21 mg) of carcass tissue into

154   individual plastic containers filled with moist commercial potting mix (soil volume 3.2 × 3.2

155   × 2.7 cm). Newly hatched larvae (five days after female oviposition) were obtained from pairs

156   of breeding beetles (25 families) from the lab colony and one larva was introduced to each

157   container ($n = 188$). After five days of feeding, the larval mass at dispersal was recorded and

158   larval growth was measured as the larval weight gain during the experimental period.

159

160   *Data analyses*

161   1. Breeding outcomes and carcass use efficiency

162 To examine how clutch size, hatching success, brood size, brood mass, and carcass use

163 efficiency varied with carcass size on lab and wild carcasses, we fit generalized linear mixed

164 effects models (GLMMs) with each of the aforementioned breeding outcomes as the response,

165 carcass weight and carcass source as well as their interaction as the fixed effects, and lab-wild

166 carcass pair as the random effect. The pronotum widths of the parents and parent generation

167 were included as the covariates in the models. For clutch size and brood size, we used a

168 negative binomial error distribution with a log link function for model fitting to account for

169 data overdispersion; for hatching success, we used a binomial error distribution with a logit

170 link function; for brood mass, we used a Gaussian error distribution; for carcass use efficiency,

171 we used a beta error distribution with a logit link function. Because clutch size and brood size

172 contained many zero values, we additionally included a zero inflation structure in the models.

173 We determined whether a quadratic curve better described the relationship between each

174 response and carcass weight by comparing the GLMMs fitted with and without a quadratic

175 term for carcass weight via the likelihood ratio test. Results from the quadratic model were

176 reported if the test was significant ($\alpha = 0.05$).

177   To compare the brood size, brood mass, average larval mass, and carcass use efficiency

178 on wild mammal, bird, and reptile carcasses, we fit generalized linear models (GLMs) with

179 each of the aforementioned breeding outcomes as the response and wild carcass taxon as the

180 fixed effect. Carcass weight, pronotum widths of the parents, and parent generation were

181 included as the covariates in the models. The error distribution and link function for each of

182 the responses were the same as the GLMMs. Because the carcass range was considerably

183 smaller for reptiles (1.6–64.4 g) than for mammals (3.8–94.8 g) and birds (3.2–99.5 g), we

184 restricted the carcass weight range to that of reptiles (≤ 64.4 g) so that the results were more

185 comparable among the three wild taxa.

186

187   2.   Nutritional composition and larval growth

188   To compare the nutritional composition between the two carcass sources and the three wild

189   carcass taxa, we fit GLMMs with the proportion of protein/fat as the responses, carcass

190   source/taxon and tissue type (viscera vs. muscles) as the fix effects, and carcass ID as the

191   random effect (a total of four GLMMs). We used a beta error distribution with a logit link

192   function for model fitting in the GLMMs.

193   To compare the larval growth between the two carcass sources and the three wild

194   carcass taxa, we fit GLMMs with larval weight gain as the response, carcass source/taxon and

195   tissue type as the fix effects, and carcass ID and larval family as the random effects (a total of

196   two GLMMs). Larval mass at hatching was included in the models as a covariate. We used a

197   Gaussian error distribution for model fitting in the GLMMs. To further investigate the effect

198   of nutrient content on larval growth on both carcass sources and on wild carcasses only, we fit

199   GLMMs with larval weight gain as the response, proportion of protein, proportion of fat, and

200   tissue type as the fixed effects, and larval family as the random effects (a total of two GLMMs).

201   Larval mass at hatching was included as a covariate. Dead larvae were excluded from the

202   analysis.

203

204   3.   Larval quality-quantity trade-off

205   To evaluate the trade-off between offspring quality and quantity on lab and wild carcasses, we

206   fit a linear model with average larval mass as the response and larval density, carcass source,

207   and their interaction as the predictors. A significant negative slope indicates a larval quality-

208   quantity trade-off.

209

210   We fit all aforementioned models using the glmmtmb() function in the R "glmmTMB"

211   package (Brooks et al., 2017). Model assumptions were checked via the quantile residuals

212   generated from the simulateResiduals() function in the R "DHARMa" package (Hartig, 2022).

213   Predictor significance was assessed with the Wald chi-square test via the Anova() function

214   (type II sums of squares) in the R "car" package (Fox & Weisberg, 2019). Post-hoc pairwise

215   comparisons among carcass taxa with the Tukey multiplicity adjustment were conducted via

216   the emmeans() function in the R "emmeans" package (Lenth, 2024). All analyses were

217   performed in R version 4.3.3 (R Core Team, 2024).

Results

Breeding outcomes and carcass use efficiency

Clutch size, hatching success, brood size, and brood mass all showed a quadratic relationship with carcass weight (clutch size: $\chi^2_2 = 44.6$, $P < 0.001$; hatching success: $\chi^2_2 = 32.1$, $P < 0.001$; brood size: $\chi^2_2 = 63.3$, $P < 0.001$; brood mass: $\chi^2_2 = 91.9$, $P < 0.001$; Table 1) and peaked on medium-sized carcasses (Fig. 1). Moreover, these breeding outcomes did not differ between lab and wild carcasses (clutch size: $\chi^2_1 = 1.4$, $P = 0.39$; hatching success: $\chi^2_1 = 0.8$, $P = 0.37$; brood size: $\chi^2_1 = 0.009$, $P = 0.93$; brood mass: $\chi^2_1 = 0.001$, $P = 0.99$; Table 1; Fig. 1). Carcass use efficiency decreased with carcass weight ($\chi^2_2 = 64.5$, $P < 0.001$) but did not differ between lab and wild carcasses ($\chi^2_1 = 0.003$, $P = 0.96$; Table 1; Fig. 2).

Brood size, brood mass, average larval mass, and carcass use efficiency did not differ among wild mammal, bird, and reptile carcasses (brood size: $\chi^2_2 = 0.6$, $P = 0.75$; brood mass: $\chi^2_2 = 3.6$, $P = 0.17$; average larval mass: $\chi^2_2 = 3.3$, $P = 0.19$; carcass use efficiency: $\chi^2_2 = 0.4$, $P = 0.81$; Fig. 3).

Nutritional composition of carcasses

Protein content was similar between lab and wild carcasses (mean proportion: lab = 25.5%, wild = 27.9%; $\chi^2_1 = 3.5$, $P = 0.06$; Fig. 4a) but differed among wild carcass taxa (mean proportion: mammal = 28.7%, bird = 30.6%, reptile = 24.3%; $\chi^2_2 = 26.6$, $P < 0.001$; Fig. 4b). Specifically, reptile carcasses had significantly lower protein content than mammal and bird carcasses (Fig. 4b). Fat content was similar between lab and wild carcasses (mean proportion: lab = 4.0%, wild = 3.7%; $\chi^2_1 = 1.1$, $P = 0.29$; Fig. 4c) and among wild carcass taxa (mean proportion: mammal = 4.4%, bird = 4.4%, reptile = 2.1%; $\chi^2_2 = 3.5$, $P = 0.18$; Fig. 4d).

241

Larval growth

243　Growth was similar for larvae feeding on tissue from lab and wild carcasses ($\chi^2_1 = 0.1$, $P =$

244　0.74; Fig. 4e). Similarly, larval growth did not differ significantly among the three wild carcass

245　taxa ($\chi^2_2 = 5.2$, $P = 0.07$; Fig. 4f), although larvae feeding on wild bird carcasses tended to gain

246　more weight compared to those feeding on wild mammals and reptiles (Fig. 4f). When lab and

247　wild carcasses were combined, larval growth was not associated with either tissue protein

248　content ($\chi^2_1 = 0.9$, $P = 0.34$) or fat content ($\chi^2_1 = 0.05$, $P = 0.83$) (Fig. S2a and b). On the other

249　hand, larvae feeding on wild carcass tissue with higher fat content ($\chi^2_1 = 5.2$, $P = 0.02$), but not

250　protein content ($\chi^2_1 = 0.01$, $P = 0.92$), did grow better (Fig. S2c and d).

251

Larval quality-quantity trade-off

253　Average larval mass decreased with larval density on both lab and wild carcasses ($\beta = -0.096$,

254　$\chi^2_1 = 74.7$, $P < 0.001$; Fig. 5). The interaction between larval density and carcass source was

255　not significant ($\chi^2_1 = 1.2$, $P = 0.28$), indicating that the trade-off did not differ between lab and

256　wild carcasses (Fig. 5).

257

Discussion

We examined how breeding outcomes and carcass use efficiency of the burying beetle *N. nepalensis* varied with carcass size on lab and wild carcasses. Clutch size, hatching success, brood size, and brood mass all exhibited a quadratic relationship with carcass size, whereas carcass use efficiency decreased with carcass size. Furthermore, these breeding outcomes and carcass use efficiency did not differ between lab and wild carcasses. Despite the variation in tissue nutritional composition (protein content) among wild mammal, bird, and reptile carcasses, larval traits (brood size, brood mass, and average larval mass), carcass use efficiency, and larval growth did not differ among the three wild carcass taxa. Finally, a negative relationship existed between larval density and average larval mass on both lab and wild carcasses, suggesting a trade-off between offspring quality and quantity. Taken together, our results indicate that carcass size, but not carcass source or carcass taxon, is the main determinant for the breeding performance and carcass resource use of burying beetles.

As expected, clutch size, hatching success, brood size, and brood mass all showed a quadratic relationship with carcass size, with optimal breeding outcomes occurring on medium-sized carcasses. The increase in breeding performance from small to medium carcasses is consistent with previous studies on other burying beetle species (Creighton, 2005; Eggert & Müller, 1992; Hopwood et al., 2016). Interestingly, when the parents bred on large carcasses, their breeding performance decreased, along with a reduction in carcass use efficiency. This may be because large carcasses are more energetically costly to process and females may lay fewer eggs as a result of lower energy storage. In fact, Müller et al. (1990) found that clutch size levels off beyond a certain carcass weight threshold, suggesting an energetic or physiological constraint on beetles breeding on larger carcasses. Parents breeding on large carcasses also face stronger competition with microbes, which can reduce the usable resource

282   for breeding (Scott, 1998) or produce compounds harmful to eggs and larvae (Rozen et al.,

283   2008).

284   Contrary to our prediction, we found no major difference in the breeding outcomes and

285   carcass use efficiency of *N. nepalensis* on lab versus wild carcasses. A potential explanation is

286   that the parents manipulated the carcasses (e.g., by secreting antimicrobial compounds) such

287   that the eggs and larvae experienced similar growing environments regardless of carcass source.

288   Studies have shown that parental care is crucial for larval performance in burying beetles

289   (Eggert et al., 1998; Rozen et al., 2008), and we speculate that parental food preparation and

290   regurgitation may offset the difference between the two carcass sources. Further experiments

291   comparing breeding outcomes on lab and wild carcasses with versus without parents will help

292   verify our speculation. The analyses did reveal an interaction between carcass size and carcass

293   source for brood mass. In fact, the patterns were mostly similar between lab and wild carcasses

294   on small and medium carcasses, whereas the difference on large carcasses was mainly driven

295   by two observations on large wild carcasses (the interaction became non-significant when these

296   two observations were removed; $P = 0.38$, Fig. S3). Overall, our results support the validity of

297   research using lab-reared organisms as breeding carcasses to study the reproductive biology of

298   burying beetles.

299   Our tissue nutritional analysis showed that protein content was higher in wild mammal

300   and bird carcasses than in wild reptile carcasses, whereas fat content was similar among these

301   taxa. Yet, despite the variation in tissue protein content, larval growth in the feeding

302   experiments did not vary significantly among the wild carcass taxa. In fact, we found that it

303   was fat content, not protein content, that affected larval growth on wild carcasses. Since fat

304   content did not vary among the three wild carcass taxa, we did not observe major difference in

305   larval growth. This may also partially explain why larval traits and carcass use efficiency were

306   similar among the three wild carcass taxa in our breeding experiments. Interestingly, larvae did

14

307 tend to grow better on bird carcasses in the feeding experiments without parents. This suggests

308 that parental care in burying beetles (e.g., carcass preparation and food provisioning) may help

309 maintain breeding performance on a variety of carcasses in the wild. But without parental care,

310 carcass taxon may potentially influence individual larval performance.

311   The negative relationship between average larval mass and larval density on both lab

312 and wild carcasses indicates a trade-off between offspring quality and quantity regardless of

313 carcass source. Similar trade-off patterns have been shown in previous studies (Bartlett &

314 Ashworth, 1988; Trumbo, 1990) and can arise from both larval competition and brood

315 regulation by parents (Trumbo, 1990). Stronger interspecific competition under a higher larval

316 density may reduce individual larval growth, leading to lower average larval mass. On the other

317 hand, parents may regulate brood size by culling excess larvae to reduce larval competition

318 (Trumbo, 2006), thereby leading to greater larval growth and higher average biomass.

319 Furthermore, the slope of the negative relationship between average larval mass and larval

320 density did not depend on carcass source, agreeing with our findings that brood size and brood

321 mass did not differ between lab and wild carcasses. Interestingly, we found that the average

322 larval mass increased with carcass size for small and medium carcasses, whereas larval density

323 decreased (Fig. S1). This suggests that the larval life history traits of burying beetles can shift

324 depending on breeding resource availability, with smaller carcasses favoring larval quantity

325 (per capita carcass resource) and larger carcasses favoring larval quality.

326   Our results illustrate the role of carcass size in the breeding outcomes of a single parent

327 pair. This is the most common breeding system in burying beetles on small- and medium-sized

328 carcasses (Scott, 1998). However, multiple males and females may engage in cooperative

329 breeding to better utilize large carcasses in the wild (Scott et al., 2007), although past results

330 for the reproductive benefits of cooperation are mixed (Eggert & Sakaluk, 2000; Komdeur et

331 al., 2013; Müller et al., 2007). Additionally, burying beetles in nature may face carcass

15

332   competition not only from microbes but also from various vertebrate scavengers and

333   invertebrate carcass feeders (Chen et al., 2020; DeVault et al., 2003), and such interspecific

334   competition can interact with carcass size to influence breeding success (Scott, 1994). Field

335   experiments using a wide range of carcass sizes will help elucidate how intraspecific and

336   interspecific interactions as well as the interplay between biotic interactions and carcass size

337   jointly shape the breeding performance of burying beetles.

338   Using a broad range of carcass sizes from both lab and wild sources, our study revealed

339   for the first time the quadratic relationship between breeding performance and carcass size in

340   burying beetle, with optimal breeding outcomes occurring on medium-sized carcasses.

341   Breeding outcomes did not differ between lab and wild carcasses. Furthermore, despite the

342   variation in tissue nutritional composition (particularly protein content) among wild mammal,

343   bird, and reptile carcasses, larval traits, carcass use efficiency, and larval growth were generally

344   similar among these wild carcass taxa. Finally, the larval quality-quantity trade-off existed

345   across the range of lab and wild carcass sizes, and larval life history traits may shift depending

346   on carcass size, with smaller carcasses favoring larval quantity and larger carcasses favoring

347   larval quality. Taken together, our study confirms that previous results from lab carcasses are

348   fairly representative of natural patterns and provides a more complete picture of how carcass

349   resources shape the breeding performance of burying beetles.

350

351 **References**

352 Al Shareefi, E. & Cotter, S.C. (2018). The nutritional ecology of maturation in a carnivorous

353   insect. *Behavioral Ecology*, 30, 256-266.

354 Bartlett, J. (1987). Filial cannibalism in burying beetles. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*,

355   21, 179-183.

356 Bartlett, J. & Ashworth, C. (1988). Brood size and fitness in Nicrophorus vespilloides

357   (Coleoptera: Silphidae). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 22, 429-434.

358 Barton, P.S., Cunningham, S.A., Lindenmayer, D.B. & Manning, A.D. (2013). The role of

359   carrion in maintaining biodiversity and ecological processes in terrestrial ecosystems.

360   *Oecologia*, 171, 761-772.

361 Boggs, C.L. (2009). Understanding insect life histories and senescence through a resource

362   allocation lens. *Functional Ecology*, 23, 27-37.

363 Brooks, M.E., Kristensen, K., van Benthem, K.J., Magnusson, A., Berg, C.W., Nielsen, A. et

364   al. (2017). glmmTMB Balances Speed and Flexibility Among Packages for Zero-

365   inflated Generalized Linear Mixed Modeling. *The R Journal*, 9, 378-400.

366 Chen, B.F., Liu, M., Rubenstein, D.R., Sun, S.J., Liu, J.N., Lin, Y.H. et al. (2020). A chemically

367   triggered transition from conflict to cooperation in burying beetles. *Ecology Letters*, 23,

368   467-475.

369 Creighton, J.C. (2005). Population density, body size, and phenotypic plasticity of brood size

370   in a burying beetle. *Behavioral Ecology*, 16, 1031-1036.

371 DeVault, T.L., Rhodes, J., Olin E & Shivik, J.A. (2003). Scavenging by vertebrates: behavioral,

372   ecological, and evolutionary perspectives on an important energy transfer pathway in

373   terrestrial ecosystems. *Oikos*, 102, 225-234.

374 Eggert, A.-K. & Müller, J.K. (1992). Joint breeding in female burying beetles. *Behavioral*

375   *Ecology and Sociobiology*, 31, 237-242.

376 Eggert, A.-K., Reinking, M. & Müller, J.K. (1998). Parental care improves offspring survival

377   and growth in burying beetles. *Animal Behaviour*, 55, 97-107.

378 Eggert, A.K. & Sakaluk, S.K. (2000). Benefits of communal breeding in burying beetles: a

379   field experiment. *Ecological Entomology*, 25, 262-266.

380 Fox, J. & Weisberg, S. (2019). *An R Companion to Applied Regression*. Third edn. Sage,

381   Thousand Oaks CA.

382 Hartig, F. (2022). DHARMa: Residual Diagnostics for Hierarchical (Multi-Level / Mixed)

383   Regression Models.

384 Hocking, M., Ring, R. & Reimchen, T. (2006). Burying beetle Nicrophorus investigator

385   reproduction on Pacific salmon carcasses. *Ecological Entomology*, 31, 5-12.

386 Hopwood, P.E., Moore, A.J., Tregenza, T. & Royle, N.J. (2016). Niche variation and the

387   maintenance of variation in body size in a burying beetle. *Ecological Entomology*, 41,

388   96-104.

389 Komdeur, J., Schrama, M.J., Meijer, K., Moore, A.J. & Beukeboom, L.W. (2013). Cobreeding

390   in the burying beetle, Nicrophorus vespilloides: tolerance rather than cooperation.

391   *Ethology*, 119, 1138-1148.

392 Lenth, R.V. (2024). emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means.

393 May, E.M. & El-Sabaawi, R.W. (2022). Life stage and taxonomy the most important factors

394   determining vertebrate stoichiometry: A meta-analysis. *Ecology and Evolution*, 12,

395   e9354.

396 Monteith, K.M., Andrews, C. & Smiseth, P.T. (2012). Post-hatching parental care masks the

397   effects of egg size on offspring fitness: a removal experiment on burying beetles.

398   *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 25, 1815-1822.

399   Müller, J.K., Braunisch, V., Hwang, W. & Eggert, A.-K. (2007). Alternative tactics and

400   individual reproductive success in natural associations of the burying beetle,

401   Nicrophorus vespilloides. *Behavioral Ecology*, 18, 196-203.

402   Müller, J.K., Eggert, A.-K. & Furlkröger, E. (1990). Clutch size regulation in the burying beetle

403   Necrophorus vespilloides Herbst (Coleoptera: Silphidae). *Journal of Insect Behavior*,

404   3, 265–270.

405   R Core Team (2024). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna,

406   Austria.

407   Richardson, J. & Smiseth, P.T. (2020). Effects of variation in resource acquisition during

408   different stages of the life cycle on life-history traits and trade-offs in a burying beetle.

409   *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 32, 19-30.

410   Rozen, D., Engelmoer, D. & Smiseth, P.T. (2008). Antimicrobial strategies in burying beetles

411   breeding on carrion. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105, 17890-

412   17895.

413   Saini, R.K., Prasad, P., Shang, X. & Keum, Y.-S. (2021). Advances in lipid extraction

414   methods—a review. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, 22, 13643.

415   Scott, M.P. (1994). Competition with flies promotes communal breeding in the burying beetle,

416   Nicrophorus tomentosus. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 34, 367-373.

417   Scott, M.P. (1998). The ecology and behavior of burying beetles. *Annual Review of*

418   *Entomology*, 43, 595-618.

419   Scott, M.P., LEE, W.J. & Van Der Reijden, E. (2007). The frequency and fitness consequences

420   of communal breeding in a natural population of burying beetles: a test of reproductive

421   skew. *Ecological Entomology*, 32, 651-661.

422   Scott, M.P. & Traniello, J.F. (1990). Behavioural and ecological correlates of male and female

423   parental care and reproductive success in burying beetles (Nicrophorus spp.). *Animal*

424   *Behaviour*, 39, 274-283.

425   Scriber, J. & Slansky Jr, F. (1981). The nutritional ecology of immature insects. *Annual Review*

426   *of Entomology*, 26, 183-211.

427   Shukla, S.P., Plata, C., Reichelt, M., Steiger, S., Heckel, D.G., Kaltenpoth, M. et al. (2018).

428   Microbiome-assisted carrion preservation aids larval development in a burying beetle.

429   *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115, 11274-11279.

430   Smiseth, P.T., Andrews, C.P., Mattey, S.N. & Mooney, R. (2014). Phenotypic variation in

431   resource acquisition influences trade-off between number and mass of offspring in a

432   burying beetle. *Journal of Zoology*, 293, 80-83.

433   Stiegler, J., Von Hoermann, C., Müller, J., Benbow, M.E. & Heurich, M. (2020). Carcass

434   provisioning for scavenger conservation in a temperate forest ecosystem. *Ecosphere*,

435   11, e03063.

436   Sun, S.-J., Catherall, A.M., Pascoal, S., Jarrett, B.J., Miller, S.E., Sheehan, M.J. et al. (2020).

437   Rapid local adaptation linked with phenotypic plasticity. *Evolution Letters*, 4, 345-359.

438   Tessier, A.J. & Consolatti, N.L. (1991). Resource quantity and offspring quality in Daphnia.

439   *Ecology*, 72, 468-478.

440   Tomberlin, J.K., Barton, B.T., Lashley, M.A. & Jordan, H.R. (2017). Mass mortality events

441   and the role of necrophagous invertebrates. *Current Opinion in Insect Science*, 23, 7-

442   12.

443   Trumbo, S.T. (1990). Regulation of brood size in a burying beetle, Nicrophorus tomentosus

444   (Silphidae). *Journal of Insect Behavior*, 3, 491-500.

445   Trumbo, S.T. (1992). Monogamy to communal breeding: exploitation of a broad resource base

446   by burying beetles (Nicrophorus). *Ecological Entomology*, 17, 289-298.

447 Trumbo, S.T. (2006). Infanticide, sexual selection and task specialization in a biparental

448   burying beetle. *Animal Behaviour*, 72, 1159-1167.

449 Weldon, L., Abolins, S., Lenzi, L., Bourne, C., Riley, E.M. & Viney, M. (2015). The gut

450   microbiota of wild mice. *PLoS One*, 10, e0134643.

451 Woelber, B.K., Hall, C.L. & Howard, D.R. (2018). Environmental cues influence parental

452   brood structure decisions in the burying beetle Nicrophorus marginatus. *Journal of*

453   *Ethology*, 36, 55-64.

454

455 **Figures**

456 Figure 1

457

458

459   Figure 2

460

461

462   Figure 3

463

464

465   Figure 4

466

467

468   Figure 5

469

Figure 1. The relationship between carcass weight and clutch size (a), hatching success (b), brood size (c), and brood mass (d) on lab and wild carcasses. Note that the observations without any larva were excluded from the brood mass analysis. Lines represent the statistically significant relationships predicted from GLMMs ($\alpha = 0.05$); shaded areas represent the 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 2. The relationship between carcass weight and carcass use efficiency on lab and wild carcasses. Note that the observations without any larva were excluded from the analysis. Lines represent the statistically significant relationships predicted from GLMMs ($\alpha = 0.05$); shaded areas represent the 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 3. Brood size (a), brood mass (b), average larval mass (c), and carcass use efficiency (d) on wild mammal, bird, and reptile carcasses. Points represent the means and error bars represent the standard errors. Note that the observations without any larva were excluded from the brood mass analysis.

Figure 4. Tissue protein and fat content (a–d) and larval growth (e and f) on lab and wild carcasses as well as on wild mammal, bird, and reptile carcasses. Points represent the means and error bars represent the standard errors. Letters denote significant difference with Tukey multiplicity adjustment ($\alpha = 0.05$).

492   Figure 5. The relationship between larval density and average larval mass on lab and wild

493   carcasses. Lines represent the statistically significant relationships predicted from GLMMs (α

494   $= 0.05$); shaded areas represent the 95% confidence intervals.

495

496 **Tables**

497 Table 1. A summary of the GLMM results for the breeding outcomes and carcass use efficiency

498 of *Nicrophorus nepalensis*. The pronotum widths of the parents and parent generation were

499 included as the covariates in all models.

Model response	n	Predictor		
		Carcass weight	Carcass source	Weight $\times$ Source
Clutch size	210*	$\chi^2_2 = 44.6$, $P < 0.001$	$\chi^2_1 = 1.4$, $P = 0.39$	$\chi^2_2 = 1.9$, $P = 0.24$
Hatching success	176†	$\chi^2_2 = 32.1$, $P < 0.001$	$\chi^2_1 = 0.8$, $P = 0.37$	$\chi^2_2 = 0.3$, $P = 0.88$
Brood size	238	$\chi^2_2 = 63.3$, $P < 0.001$	$\chi^2_1 = 0.009$, $P = 0.93$	$\chi^2_2 = 3.5$, $P = 0.17$
Brood mass	129‡	$\chi^2_2 = 91.9$, $P < 0.001$	$\chi^2_1 = 0.001$, $P = 0.99$	$\chi^2_2 = 11.0$, $P = 0.004$
Carcass use efficiency	95§	$\chi^2_1 = 64.5$, $P < 0.001$	$\chi^2_1 = 0.003$, $P = 0.96$	$\chi^2_1 = 0.3$, $P = 0.57$

500 *Clutch size was not recorded in the first round of breeding experiments.

501 †Observations with a zero clutch size were excluded from the analysis.

502 ‡Observations with a zero brood size were excluded from the analysis.

503 §Carcass use was not measured in the first and second round of the breeding experiments; observations with a

504 zero brood size were excluded from the analysis.

505