**Title**

Breeding outcomes and carcass use of a burying beetle (*Nicrophorus nepalensis*) depend on carcass weight but not carcass source

**Author names and affiliations**

Gen-Chang Hsu1,Syuan-Jyun Sun2 (add other authors)

1Department of Entomology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, USA

2International Degree Program in Climate Change and Sustainable Development, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan

**ORCID iD**

Gen-Chang Hsu: 0000-0002-6607-4382

Syuan-Jyun Sun: 0000-0002-7859-9346

**Corresponding author**

Name: Syuan-Jyun Sun

Email: sjs243@ntu.edu.tw

**Abstract**

**Keywords**

**Introduction**

[General opening]

[Background and knowledge gap 1]

[Background and knowledge gap 2]

[Background and knowledge gap 3]

[Study aims, questions, hypotheses, and predictions]

To XXX, we XXX

Specifically, we asked XXX

Specifically, we hypothesized that XXX

We predicted that XXX

Our aims are to XXX

* Compare the breeding outcomes between lab vs. wild carcasses
* Examine the carcass use patterns between lab vs. wild carcasses
* Examine the offspring quality vs. quantity trade-off between lab vs. wild carcasses

**Materials and Methods**

*Study organism*

* A brief introduction of *Nicrophorus nepalensis*
* The sources of the beetles in the study

*Experimental design*

* The details of the breeding experiments: carcass sources and taxa, pairing each wild carcass with a lab carcass of similar weight and parents from the same family lines, growth chamber settings, duration of the experiments (five rounds of experiments with a total of 123 lab-wild carcass pairs)
* Measurement: clutch size, number of larvae, larval mass, carcass use, etc.

*Nutritional analysis and larval feeding experiment*

* Nutritional analysis of the liver and muscle tissues of lab and wild carcasses
* Larval feeding experiment

*Statistical analyses*

To examine XXX, we fit a generalized linear mixed effects model (GLMM) with XXX as the response, YYY as the fixed effects, and ZZZ as the random effects. We use a XXX distribution with a YYY link function because the response is XXX.

The GLMM is fitted via the glmmtmb() function in the R “glmmTMB” package (citation).

We check the model assumptions using quantile residuals generated from the function “simulateResiduals()” in the R “DHARMa” package (citation).

We use the likelihood ratio test to assess predictor significance using the “Anova()” function in the R “car” package (citation).

We also perform pairwise comparisons of the estimated marginal means between treatment levels with XXX multiplicity adjustments using the R “emmeans” package (citation).

All analyses are performed in R version XXX (citation).

**Results**

*Breeding outcomes and carcass use*

The clutch size, the number of larvae, and the average larval mass all showed a hump-shaped relationship with carcass weight (clutch size: *P* < 0.001; number of larvae: *P* < 0.001; average larval mass: *P* < 0.001) but did not differ between lab and wild carcasses (clutch size: *P* = 0.40; number of larvae: *P* = 0.78; average larval mass: *P* = 0.39) (Table 1; Fig. 1a–c). The larval density decreased with carcass weight (*P* < 0.001) but did not differ between lab and wild carcasses (*P* = 0.80; Table 1; Fig. 1d).

The proportion of carcass used decreased with carcass weight (*P* < 0.001) but did not differ between lab and wild carcasses (*P* = 0.96; Table 1; Fig. 2).

*Nutritional composition and feeding experiment*

Nutritional composition of lab vs. wild carcasses and larval growth (Fig. 3)?

*Larval quality-quantity trade-off*

The average larval mass decreased with the larval density in both lab and wild carcasses (*P* < 0.001; Fig. 4).

**Discussion**

[Summary of the main findings]

[Main finding 1 and discussion]

[Main finding 2 and discussion]

[Main finding 3 and discussion]

*Larval quality-quantity trade-off*

There was a negative relationship between the average larval mass and larval density for both lab and wild carcasses, indicating a larval quality-quantity trade-off for both carcass types. Moreover, the average larval mass increased with carcass weight (for small- and mid-sized carcasses), whereas the larval density decreased. This suggests that female beetles invest more in offspring quantity in smaller carcasses (higher larval density) and more in quality in larger carcasses (higher average larval mass).

[Limitations and potential caveats]

[Conclusions]
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**Tables and Figures**

Table 1. A summary of the GLMM results for the breeding outcomes and carcass use of the burying beetle. The pronotum widths of male and female parent were included as the covariates in all models.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model response | *n* | *P* | | |
| Carcass weight | Carcass source | Weight × Source |
| Clutch size | 212 | < 0.001 | 0.40 | 0.22 |
| Number of larvae | 240 | < 0.001 | 0.78 | 0.12 |
| Average larval mass | 128\* | < 0.001 | 0.39 | 0.28 |
| Larval density | 139\* | < 0.001 | 0.80 | 0.47 |
| Proportion of carcass used | 95† | < 0.001 | 0.96 | 0.60 |

\*Observations without any larva were excluded from the analysis.

†Carcass use was not measured in the first two rounds of the breeding experiment. Observations without any larva were excluded from the analysis.

Figure 1. four panels

Figure 2. one panel

Figure 3. two panels

Figure 4. one panel