

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Use of substrate-borne vibrational signals to attract the Brown Marmorated Stink Bug, *Halyomorpha halys* / Mazzone, Valerio; Polajnar, Jernej; Baldini, Marta; Rossi Stacconi, Marco Valerio; Anfora, Gianfranco; Guidetti, Roberto; Maistrello, Lara. - In: JOURNAL OF PEST SCIENCE. - ISSN 1612-4758. - 90:4(2017), pp. 1219-1229. [10.1007/s10340-017-0862-z]

Terms of use:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

13/12/2025 23:19

(Article begins on next page)

Journal of Pest Science

Use of substrate-borne vibrational signals to attract the Brown Marmorated Stink Bug, *Halyomorpha halys* --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	PEST-D-17-00023R1	
Full Title:	Use of substrate-borne vibrational signals to attract the Brown Marmorated Stink Bug, <i>Halyomorpha halys</i>	
Article Type:	S.I. : <i>Halyomorpha Halys</i>	
Keywords:	Biotremology; acoustic traps; integrated pest management; behavioral bioassays; Hemiptera	
Corresponding Author:	Valerio Mazzoni, Ph.D. Fondazione Edmund Mach San Michele all'Adige, Trento ITALY	
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:		
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Fondazione Edmund Mach	
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:		
First Author:	Valerio Mazzoni, Ph.D.	
First Author Secondary Information:		
Order of Authors:	Valerio Mazzoni, Ph.D. Jernej Polajnar Marta Baldini Marco Valerio Rossi Stacconi Gianfranco Anfora Roberto Guidetti Lara Maistrello	
Order of Authors Secondary Information:		
Funding Information:	Fondazione Cassa di Risparmio di Modena (2013.065)	Prof Lara Maistrello
Abstract:	<p>Despite the increasing number of studies on the use of acoustic stimuli to control agricultural pests, this approach is still theoretical. Many insect pests, in particular hemipterans, use vibrational signals for mating communication and therefore the application of a control strategy based on acoustic interference is a promising option. The Brown Marmorated Stink Bug, <i>Halyomorpha halys</i>, is causing severe economic damage on many crops in the USA and Italy. We tested a female vibrational signal, Female Signal 2 (FS2), to attract males in different settings, such as natural substrate, arenas and a cage representing an acoustic trap. We used video tracking analysis and described the vibrational amplitude field around the individuals to study the male behavior. We found that FS2 can attract more than 50% of males to the source point and has a strong "loitering" effect on searching males that tend to remain in the stimulated area. We concluded that FS2 exhibits good attractiveness to <i>H. halys</i> males and that its potential use as a tool integrated in the currently existing pheromone traps should be tested in the field.</p>	
Response to Reviewers:	Reviewer #1: In this manuscript Polajnar and co-workers investigated the possibility of using substrate vibrations to upgrade the existing pheromone traps in order to trap the <i>Halyomorpha halys</i> males. The study is well-designed and executed and its findings should be of interest not only to practitioners working with <i>H. halys</i> , but also with other	

[Click here to view linked References](#)

1 Journal of Pest Science
2 Special Issue: *Halyomorpha halys*
3 Research Article

4
5
6

7 **Use of substrate-borne vibrational signals to attract the Brown Marmorated**
8 **Stink Bug, *Halyomorpha halys***

9
10

11 Valerio Mazzoni¹, Jernej Polajnar^{1,2}, Marta Baldini³, Marco Valerio Rossi Stacconi¹, Gianfranco
12 Anfora^{1,4}, Roberto Guidetti³, Lara Maistrello³

13

14

15 ¹ Fondazione Edmund Mach, San Michele all'Adige, TN, Italy

16 ² National Institute of Biology, Ljubljana, Slovenia

17 ³ University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Reggio Emilia, Italy

18 ⁴ Center Agriculture Food Environment (CAFE), University of Trento, Italy

19

20

21 Corresponding authors:

22 Valerio Mazzoni: valerio.mazzoni@fmach.it, +39 0461 615143

23

24 **Abstract**

25

26 Despite the increasing number of studies on the use of acoustic stimuli to control agricultural pests,
27 this approach is still theoretical. Many insect pests, in particular hemipterans, use vibrational signals
28 for mating communication and therefore the application of a control strategy based on acoustic
29 interference is a promising option. The Brown Marmorated Stink Bug, *Halyomorpha halys*, is
30 causing severe economic damage on many crops in the USA and Italy. We tested a female
31 vibrational signal, Female Signal 2 (FS2), to attract males in different settings, such as natural
32 substrate, arenas and a cage representing an acoustic trap. We used video tracking analysis and
33 described the vibrational amplitude field around the individuals to study the male behavior. We
34 found that FS2 can attract more than 50% of males to the source point and has a strong “loitering”
35 effect on searching males that tend to remain in the stimulated area. We concluded that FS2 exhibits
36 good attractiveness to *H. halys* males and that its potential use as a tool integrated in the currently
37 existing pheromone traps should be tested in the field.

38

39 **Keywords:** biotremology, acoustic traps, integrated pest management, behavioral bioassays,

40 Hemiptera

41

42 **Key message:**

- 43 • *A Halyomorpha halys* female vibrational signal type, FS2, played back into natural or
44 artificial substrates is significantly attractive to males.
- 45 • Once attracted to the source point, males remain near the vibrational source for many
46 minutes.
- 47 • FS2 looks promising for the development of an acoustic method to trap the Brown
48 Marmorated Stink Bug in the field.

49

50 **Author Contribution Statement:**

51 VM, LM, JP, GA and RG conceived and designed research. VM, MB, JP and MVRS conducted
52 experiments. VM and MVRS analyzed data. VM, LM and JP wrote the manuscript. All authors read
53 and approved the manuscript.

54

55 **Introduction**

56

57 Application of integrated pest management strategies to control insect pests is achievable if there is
58 adequate knowledge of the ecology and biology of the target species (Pedigo and Rice 2014; Pertot

59 et al. 2016). In particular, the species behavior and the exact role and characteristics of all
60 associated signals must be well understood for setting an efficient method of behavioral
61 manipulation. For example, methods based on communication interference aim at altering a species
62 behavior (i.e. attracting, disrupting, repelling, etc.) by releasing more or less specific stimuli into the
63 environment. The strategies based on pheromones and kairomones operate in this way, as do the
64 strategies that rely on visual stimuli such as light traps and colored sticky panels (Foster and Harris
65 1997). In theory, thanks to the identification and characterization of key stimuli (e.g. odors, sounds,
66 colors) that trigger specific reactions in individuals it would be feasible to ideate associated control
67 strategies. It follows that the more a signal, or better a sensory mode, is important for guiding a
68 relevant behavioral task, the better candidate it is for developing behavioral manipulation
69 techniques. In biotremology, this was done for the leafhopper, *Scaphoideus titanus* Ball, a species in
70 which vibrational signals are crucial for both identification and location of the potential partner as
71 well as for courtship (Mazzoni et al. 2009). In this case, the interference with the pest's mating
72 behavior was achieved by transmitting a specific disturbance noise into the plant tissues to
73 overpower (= mask) the substrate-borne vibrational signals emitted by duetting couples. In semi-
74 field trials, these signals were sufficient enough to interfere with mating signal reception by
75 individuals and blocked mating (Eriksson et al. 2012; Polajnar et al. 2016a).

76
77 Our hypothesis is that the Brown Marmorated Stink Bug (BMSB) *Halyomorpha halys* Stål
78 (Hemiptera: Pentatomidae) is susceptible to vibration-based behavioral manipulation. This insect,
79 originating from Asia, is highly polyphagous and can cause severe economic damage on different
80 crops in the United States (Rice et al. 2014) and Italy (Maistrello et al. 2016) where it was
81 accidentally introduced. Like in other stink bugs, the long range mating communication of BMSB is
82 mediated by male emitted aggregation pheromones (Aldrich 1988; Khrimian et al. 2014) and the
83 short- to mid- range (meant as same plant range) also by the exchange of vibrational signals
84 between potential mates (Čokl and Virant-Doberlet 2003; Virant-Doberlet and Čokl 2004).
85 Although the same approach as in *S. titanus* – mating disruption – is likely not feasible because of
86 BMSB extreme polyphagy and rapid reproduction, attraction for the purpose of mass trapping is an
87 option. The mating process is started by a male call to which females reply with their own
88 vibrational signals, thus triggering male searching (Polajnar et al. 2016b). It is known that
89 searching in pentatomid males is directional (i.e. non-random) and based on perception of regularly
90 repeated female signals (Čokl et al. 1999). Therefore, we hypothesized that the BMSB female
91 signal, previously termed FS2, might be attractive to males as observed in mating trials (Polajnar et
92 al. 2016b). Given that the orientation towards a pheromone is not precise in stink bugs (James et al.

93 1996; Aldrich et al. 2009), we believe that the continuous emission of FS2 played back into plant or
94 artificial substrates can drive BMSB males to the source. If confirmed, this knowledge could greatly
95 contribute to the development of more efficient pheromone traps complemented with acoustic
96 signals (Nielsen et al. 2011; Leskey et al. 2012; Joseph et al. 2013; Lee et al. 2013). To assess our
97 main hypothesis, we performed four sets of experiments that were designed to prove that FS2 can
98 attract and drive males to the playback source, independently from the substrate (either natural, like
99 plant tissues, or artificial, like plastic). We also tested whether the playback perception caused males
100 to modify the dynamic behavior (i.e. males arrest or loiter nearby the playback source) and if visual
101 cues (i.e. dummy females) could improve or interfere with the playback performance.

102

103 **Materials and Methods**

104

105 **Insect rearing**

106

107 Colonies of BMSB were initiated from adults and nymphs collected in the Province of Reggio
108 Emilia, North Italy (44° 41'50" N, 10°37'53"E), during spring and summer 2015. Insects were
109 reared at the Laboratory of Entomology, Dept. of Life Sciences, University of Modena and Reggio
110 Emilia in transparent plastic boxes under controlled conditions (23±0.5°C, 70±10% RH, 16L: 8D).
111 Nymphs and adults were kept in separate containers on a diet of fresh beans, carrots and raw
112 peanuts, with water supplied as soaked cotton, renewed at least twice weekly. Rearing containers
113 were changed and cleaned once per week. Each individual was tested only once.

114

115 **Signal Playback, Audio/Video Recording and Vibrational Amplitude Field**

116

117 All tests were conducted in the laboratory of Bioacoustics of Fondazione Edmund Mach (Trentino,
118 Italy) on an anti-vibration table (Astel s.a.s., Ivrea, Italy) within an acoustically insulated chamber
119 kept at 24±1°C, in artificial lighting conditions (50 lux). Individuals (adult virgin males, body
120 length 1.4-1.5 cm, used after at least seven days from the emergence) were stimulated in different
121 contexts (see below) with a playback of a pre-recorded natural BMSB signal that was continuously
122 looped for the total trial time into a substrate using an electromagnetic mini-shaker (mod. 4810,
123 Bruel and Kjaer, Naerum, Denmark). A conical rod was screwed on the top of the mini-shaker and
124 covered with a small amount of blue-wax (Surgident Periphery Wax, Australia) to ensure the stable
125 contact with the substrate. The mini-shaker was physically separated from the anti-vibration table
126 with a prong clamp standing on a nearby table. The female playback (pbFS; Fig. 1) tested to assess
127 attractiveness towards males was made of a 11.5 s long BMSB female pulse train (12 pulses,

128 dominant frequency: 80.0 ± 0.6 Hz, recorded from a plant bean leaf), type FS2 (Polajnar et al.
129 2016b).

130 The correct transmission of the playback was adjusted to not exceed the insect natural
131 amplitude (max value 1.7 mm/s as substrate vibration velocity; Polajnar et al. 2016b). It was
132 constantly monitored with a laser vibrometer (Ometron[®] VQ-500-D-V, Brüel and Kjær) and
133 digitized with 48 kHz sample rate and 16-bit resolution, then stored directly onto a hard drive
134 through the LAN XI data acquisition device (Brüel and Kjær Sound & Vibration A/S, Nærum,
135 Denmark). The spectral analysis was performed with the software PULSE 14.0 (Brüel and Kjær
136 Sound & Vibration A/S) after applying fast Fourier transform (FFT) with the Blackman–Harris
137 window of length 400 points and 66.7% overlap. This setup was used for describing the vibrational
138 amplitude field (see below) of plants, arenas and cages.

139 To assess possible differences in the behavior of males stimulated with pbFS in Tests 2 and
140 3, trials were monitored with the video-tracking tool Ethovision XT (Ver. 7.0, Noldus Information
141 Technologies, Wageningen, Netherlands).

142

143 **Definitions**

144

145 *Active males*: those individuals that left the release point after the acclimation period.

146 *Activation time*: from the end of the acclimation period to the moment individuals left the release
147 point.

148 *Audio Sampling Point (ASP)*: a point on a surface from which the pbFS was recorded with laser
149 vibrometer.

150 *Searching time*: from the activation time to the moment a male reached the stimulation point.

151 *Acclimation period*: period of 2 minutes from the male release during which the playback was off.

152 *Stimulation Point (SP)*: point on the substrate in physical contact with the mini-shaker. In Test 1, the
153 SP coincided with the whole vibrated leaf; in Tests 2 and 3 with the associated VSA (SP-VSA).

154 *Vibrational amplitude field*: the complex of ASP taken from a substrate (i.e. plant, arena, cage) from
155 which we measured the signal amplitude as substrate velocity ($\mu\text{m/s}$) at the peak frequency (Hz).

156 The protocol consisted of measuring five randomly chosen pulses of pbFS which was played back
157 for 10 seconds per ASP.

158 *Video Sampling Area (VSA)*: circular areas ($\varnothing = 3$ cm and 5 cm in Tests 2 and 3, respectively) on the
159 arena surface used for video track analysis with Ethovision.

160

161 **Tests**

162

163 The experimental design was built on four different scenarios: potted bean plants (Test 1), arenas
164 (Tests 2 and 3) and a cage (Test 4). The variability of substrates aimed at assessing the level of
165 efficiency of the playbacks to attract and direct males independently from the system/substrate they
166 were applied to. For each scenario, we measured the vibrational amplitude field to assess whether
167 amplitude gradients towards the SP occurred or not and thus if amplitude could be the cue used by
168 males to find the vibrational source. Furthermore, in test 1, 2 and 3 we also measured the “loitering
169 effect” of the FS2 playback. According to preliminary observations, males did not stop once
170 reaching the SP, but kept circling around it, which we dubbed “loitering effect”. This term was
171 borrowed from military jargon and means “circling around the battlefield, waiting for a moment to
172 strike”. In test 2, we used a dummy (i.e. a dead female) to assess the possible role of visual cues, in
173 presence or absence of playback stimulation. Finally, in test 2 and 3 we used the software
174 Ethovision to measure possible male behavioural responses related to movements (i.e. tendency to
175 loiter around the playback source, speed and distance moved).

176

177 *Test 1: Attractiveness on the plant – From leaf to leaf*

178

179 Test 1 was conceived, primarily, to ascertain whether the pbFS was able alone to attract BMSB
180 males to the SP over the host plant surface. Secondly, we aimed at assessing the loitering effect of
181 pbFS (i.e. to keep BMSB males in the vicinity of the SP, once it was localized). Males (n = 30) were
182 released from a glass vial over a leaf of a potted bean plant (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) composed of
183 two leaves (height: 10-15 cm). A second plant, grown from the same pot, was leaned against the
184 first one, the stems being in contact 2-3 cm below the leaf junction (Fig. 2). The playback
185 stimulation was transmitted from a bean leaf (the SP, which was different from the one on which the
186 male was released) after the acclimation period. After each trial, the mini-shaker was randomly
187 moved to another leaf. As a whole, three pots of beans were used to conduct the trials. The trial was
188 discarded if the male left the release leaf during the acclimation period. Males were given 10
189 minutes to reach the SP. To assess the pbFS loitering effect, these males were further observed for 5
190 minutes to see whether they stayed on the SP or left it. As a control, we performed trials (n = 23)
191 with identical set-up and protocol but in absence of playback (mini-shaker turned off). The
192 vibrational amplitude field was measured from a total of eight ASPs: the four leaves (on the lamina,
193 at mid leaf length) and the two stems (two points for each stem, above and under the junction
194 point). Video analysis was not performed in Test 1.

195

196 *Test 2: Attractiveness on the arena (1) – Drive them to the right spot*

197

198 The aim of Test 2 was to evaluate the influence of pbFS on BMSB male behavior on an artificial
199 substrate. The arena (Fig. 3A) was made with a circular base ($\varnothing = 30$ cm) of yellow cardboard
200 bordered with a 5 cm tall cardboard strip (“arena wall”) to prevent the individuals ($n = 20$) from
201 leaving the arena. The release point (RP) was inside a hole ($\varnothing = 3.5$ cm) in which a 50 ml falcon vial
202 cap (depth = 1 cm) was wedged. Before the beginning of a trial, an individual was put in the cap
203 and covered with another identical cap during the acclimation period. The SP was randomly
204 positioned 10 cm from the release point after each trial. Each individual was audio/video recorded
205 for 3 minutes. The video camera was placed exactly above the arena at a distance of 1 m. A prong
206 clamp was used to hold the arena suspended over the table on which the mini-shaker was placed.
207 The prong clamp and mini-shaker were placed on separate tables. We audio-video recorded the
208 males on the arena with (Pb₊) or without playback (Pb₋) and with (Dy₊) or without (Dy₋) a
209 “dummy”. The latter was a dead female, washed with dichloromethane to remove epicuticular
210 compounds, and placed next to the SP. We hypothesized that males could have been more attracted
211 by a synergy between vibrations and vision of a conspecific (Pb₊Dy₊) than by vibrations only
212 (Pb₊Dy₋). On the contrary, we did not expect any behavioral difference between vision only (Pb₋
213 Dy₊) and control (Pb₋Dy₋). We monitored four VSA, symmetrically placed on the arena floor, 10 cm
214 away from the center, one of which included the SP (SP-VSA). The vibrational amplitude field was
215 measured from five ASPs: four of them corresponding to the VSAs and one with the releasing
216 point.

217
218 *Test 3: Attractiveness on the arena (2) - An exit pathway*

219
220 This test was conceived to assess whether BMSB males ($n = 20$) could be driven out of the arena,
221 by stimulating the outer end of an exit pathway. Two rods (29.8x0.9 cm) made of red cardboard
222 were added to the arena used in Test 2. Red color was used to increase the contrast with the yellow
223 background. This expedient was necessary to facilitate the video analysis. The proximal end of the
224 two rods was in contact with the arena surface where we placed the two VSAs; the SP was at the
225 rod distal end which was laid on the tip of a mini-shaker. The second rod, not vibrated and used as
226 control, was laid on a second (inactive) mini-shaker. After each trial, vibrated and non-vibrated rods
227 were switched. The rods did not touch the arena wall. The vibrational amplitude field was measured
228 from 19 ASPs, also including the VSAs, the SP (SP-ASP) and the release point (for details see Fig.
229 3B).

230
231 *Test 4: The Acoustic Trap – Catch them all*

232

233 We simulated an acoustic trap in a no-choice scenario and long term stimulation (3 hrs). We used a
234 cubic net cage with 30 cm edge (bugdorm-43030, Megaview Science Co. Ltd, Taichung, Taiwan)
235 and a lateral net sleeve ($\varnothing = 18$ cm; $L = 10$ cm). We firmly tied a plastic cylinder ($\varnothing = 10$ cm; $L =$
236 13.5 cm) to the sleeve with some elastic gum. A funnel ($\varnothing_1 = 10$ cm; $\varnothing_2 = 1$ cm; $L = 7$ cm) was
237 applied between the sleeve and the cylinder, to prevent the individuals from exiting the cylinder
238 once they entered. The cylinder was held up by a metallic prong at the same height as the center of
239 the sleeve hole and was basally connected with the tip of the mini-shaker. Five males were
240 simultaneously released in the cage and four replications were performed. The pbFS was
241 transmitted for 3 hrs. A silent control was also included. The analysis of the vibrational amplitude
242 field was performed based on 45 ASPs, also including the SP (for details on the ASPs positions on
243 the trap see Fig. 4).

244 **Data Analysis**

245 In Tests 1-3, we counted the number of (1) active males and (2) males that reached the SP.
246 Additionally, in Test 2 with the dummy (Dy_+), we counted the males that touched it. In Test 1, we
247 measured the (3) activation time, (4) searching time and the (5) number of males that did not leave
248 the vibrated leaf within 5 minutes from the moment they walked on it, as a measure of the signal
249 loitering effect. In Tests 2-3, we counted the (6) number of males that remained in the arena. In
250 Tests 2-3, the video tracking analysis with Ethovision was used to measure the (7a) total distance
251 moved (cm) and (7b) mean velocity (cm/s). We also measured the (8) number of accesses and the
252 (9) time spent by males on each VSA. In Test 4, we counted the (10) males captured at the end of
253 the trials.

254
255
256
257 G-test in contingency tables (2×2 or 2×4), Williams corrected, was used to assess the
258 attractiveness of pbFS by comparing treatment (vibrations on) and control (vibration off) for (1),
259 (2), (6) and (10). The Kruskal-Wallis test followed by Mann-Whitney pairwise, Bonferroni
260 adjusted, was used to compare (3) among control and stimulated males that did and did not reach
261 the SP. The same test was used for (7). In particular, we merged all individuals that left the arena
262 and those of Dy_- that remained. The binomial distribution was used to assess differences in (5).
263 Since only one individual reached the target leaf in control trials, we did not perform any statistics
264 on (4). In Test 2, the Friedman test followed by Bonferroni post-hoc test was used to compare (8)
265 among treatments; in Test 3, the Wilcoxon T-test for paired datasets was used to compare (9) among
266 treatments.

267 As for the vibrational amplitude field, in Test 1, we randomly chose one leaf as SP and then
268 recorded the pbFS from all ASPs. We repeated this protocol for the three pots that were used for the
269 trials. Similarly, in Tests 2 and 3, we recorded all the ASPs and repeated the measurements by
270 transmitting the playback from three different SPs. In Test 4, we repeated the measurements of the
271 vibrational amplitude field three times, on three different days. For the analysis of the signal
272 amplitude, we made an average of the substrate velocity (in $\mu\text{m/s}$) at the peak frequency of three
273 pulses recorded from each ASP and calculated the mean ($\pm\text{SE}$) of the three replications. In Tests 1
274 and 2, differences among ASPs were assessed with the non-parametric (repeated measures)
275 Friedman's test with replication, followed by Bonferroni post hoc test. In Tests 3 and 4, we
276 provided only descriptive statistics, given the high number of ASPs. Figures describing the
277 vibrational amplitude field were created by hand with the freeware graphical software GIMP 2.8
278 (GNU Image Manipulation Program).

279 **Results**

280 *Test 1: Attractiveness on the plant – From leaf to leaf*

281
282 In Test 1 (Table 1), 77% of males were active ($n = 23$) in trials with pbFS stimulation, and 61% ($n =$
283 14) of which reached the SP. Among these, 70% ($n = 10$) loitered upon the leaf for a period of 5
284 minutes. The activation time of males (Fig. 5) that reached the SP was significantly lower than of
285 those males that did not reach it (Kruskal-Wallis test: $X^2 = 11.2$, $df = 2$; $p = 0.004$). In control trials,
286 we recorded a significantly lower percentage of active males (46%; $n = 12$) (G-test, $p = 0.014$) of
287 which only one reached the vibrated leaf (G-test, $p = 0.005$), without later loitering on it.

288
289 The vibrational amplitude field analysis (Fig. 2) indicates a trend of increasing gradient of
290 amplitude towards the SP, on which the pbFS is significantly (Friedman test: $X^2 = 53.5$, $df = 7$;
291 $p < 0.001$) stronger than elsewhere on the plants. In particular, the signal was attenuated by more
292 than 3 dB immediately next to the vibrated leaf, on the upper stem of the vibrated plant, while
293 further losses were recorded from the other ASPs. As a general observation, signals recorded from
294 the leaves were stronger than those from the stems, and those recorded from the upper parts of the
295 plants were stronger than those from the lower ones.

296 297 *Test 2: Attractiveness on the arena (1) – Drive them to the right spot*

298
299 We did not observe significant differences among trials in terms of number of active males (G-test:
300 $G = 2.2$, $df = 3$; $p = 0.54$). In each of the two trials with pbFS (Pb+Dy+ and Pb+Dy.), 65% of males (n
301 $= 13$) remained on the arena for the total duration of the test. This value was significantly higher (G
302 $= 21.5$, $df = 3$; $p < 0.001$) than the number of males that remained on the arena without playback,

304 either in presence (Pb.Dy₊, 10%, n = 2) or absence (Pb.Dy₋, 25%, n =5) of a dummy (Tab. 2A).
305 Altogether (Tab 2B), males stimulated with playback (Pb₊) did not differ (G = 1.9, df = 1; p < 0.16)
306 from those not stimulated (Pb₋) in terms of number of active males but the number of individuals
307 that remained on the arena for the total trial duration was significantly higher for Pb₊ (G = 20.0, df
308 = 1; p < 0.001). On the contrary, when considering all trials in presence (Dy₊) and absence (Dy₋) of
309 a dummy female, they did not differ in either parameter (active males: G = 0.2, df = 1; p = 0.64;
310 remaining males: G = 0.2; df = 1; p = 0.62).

311 Using video analysis (Fig. 6A), we measured a significantly longer distance (Kruskal-Wallis
312 test: X² = 8.2, df = 2; p =0.016) traversed by males in Pb₊ trials (Pb₊Dy₊ and Pb₊Dy₋) and slower
313 walking velocity of Pb₋ males that remained on the arena (Kruskal-Wallis test: X² = 8.4, df = 2; p
314 =0.02). In the Pb₊Dy₊ trials, the time spent by males inside the SP-VSA was significantly longer
315 (Friedman test: X² = 9.8, df = 3; p =0.01), and in both Pb₊ trials the number of accesses to the SP-
316 VSA was significantly higher (Friedman test: X² = 12.5, df = 3; p =0.006) than the number of
317 accesses to other VSAs (Fig. 7). As for the vibrational amplitude field (Tab. 4), the amplitude
318 recorded from the SP-ASP (m±SD: 827.4 ± 16.6 μm/s) was significantly higher (Friedman test: X²
319 = 62.1, df = 4; p < 0.001) (difference over 10 db) than the other ASPs, among which the signal
320 amplitude recorded from the frontal ASP (40.5 ± 8.7 μm/s) was slightly stronger than the ones
321 recorded from the lateral ASPs (23.2 ± 0.4 and 19.9 ± 3.8 μm/s) and the releasing point (29.2 ± 4.7
322 μm/s).

323 324 *Test 3: Attractiveness on the arena (2) - An exit pathway*

325
326 As in Test 2, we did not find significant differences in the number of active males (G-test: X² = 3.8,
327 df = 1; p = 0.15), but differences were found in the number of individuals that remained on the
328 arena during the trials (G-test: X² = 27.1, df = 1; p < 0.001) between pbFS stimulation and the
329 control (Fig. 8). In trials with pbFS, 69% (n = 11) of males that remained in the arena reached the
330 SP located on the external end of the vibrated rod (Video 1), whereas none of them reached the
331 external end of the non-vibrated rod. A significantly (G-test: X² = 12.4, df = 1; p < 0.001) lower
332 number of males (n = 5) remained in the arena in control trials, and only 2 of them (G-test: X² =
333 8.0, df = 1; p = 0.004) walked to the external end of either rod (Tab. 3). The video analysis revealed
334 a significantly longer walking distance of males stimulated with pbFS, while no differences were
335 found in velocity (Fig. 6B). Males spent a significantly longer time (Wilcoxon T-test: W = 120, p
336 =0.007) in the VSA around the basal end of the vibrated rod, while in the silent control no
337 differences were found between the two VSAs (W = 72, p =0.49). The vibrational amplitude field
338 analysis based on 19 ASPs revealed a rather complex signal amplitude pattern (Fig. 9A, Tab. 4).

339 The ASP with the highest measured amplitude was that on the arena surface, in front of the internal
340 end of the rods (A1), which reached mean values even higher than the vibrated rod; surprisingly, we
341 measured stimulus amplitude values from the non-vibrated rod (B3, B4 and FR) higher than from
342 the vibrated rod (SP, B1 and B2).

343
344 *Test 4: The Acoustic Trap – Catch them all*

345
346 As a whole, 65% (13 out of 20) of the males released in the net cage were collected from the
347 acoustic trap after 3 hrs of trial with pbFS, significantly higher (G-test: $G = 17.2$, $p < 0.001$) than
348 the silent control ($n = 1$).

349 The vibrational amplitude field analysis (Fig. 9B, Tab. 5) revealed a clear gradient of
350 amplitude from the back to the front of the cage. The highest amplitude values, however, were
351 found on the sleeve and on the funnel, whereas on the plastic cylinder, which was in direct contact
352 with the mini-shaker, they were lower. We found a lack of homogeneity and of symmetry to such
353 extent that the amplitude recorded from one side of the cage was much different from the other.

354 355 **Discussion**

356
357 Our research demonstrated that: (1) the BMSB female signal (type 2 or FS2, Polajnar et al. 2016b),
358 which is naturally emitted by females during the process of pair formation, is attractive to males
359 when broadcasted with a mini-shaker; (2) FS2 has a relevant loitering effect as shown by the
360 tendency of males to keep searching in the close vicinity of stimulated areas, either leaves (Test 1)
361 or plastic surfaces (Tests 2 and 3), and by the repeated passages over the stimulation point (Test 2).

362
363 In general, males were able to localize the stimulation points both on plants and artificial
364 arenas. As previously observed (Polajnar et al. 2016b), males typically walked and stopped while
365 searching, stretching out the legs before continuing to walk. In Test 3, they used to walk in
366 concentric circles around the rod end and when they finally touched it with the anterior legs, they
367 mounted over it to reach the external end of the rod where the vibrational source was placed. On the
368 contrary, this behavior was not observed when males touched the non-vibrated rod, characterized by
369 vibration velocity values that were even higher than in the vibrated one. This indicates impaired
370 orientation on large flat (2D) surfaces, which raises the general issue of orientation towards
371 vibrational sources. Insects can conceivably use amplitude difference or time delay between sensory
372 inputs (legs) as cues to determine direction of the source. While a definite answer to this question
373 remains to be provided, time difference is a more likely candidate in pentatomids because of
374 unpredictable amplitude patterns associated with the narrow-band signals they use (Virant-Doberlet

375 et al. 2006; Polajnar et al. 2012). This variability is shown by results of the present study where we
376 found a general pattern of increasing amplitude towards the source, but with many exceptions,
377 especially in the arena, which nevertheless did not prevent the active males from locating the
378 source. We therefore assume that time delay was the cue they used, although precise analysis of
379 available cues was out of scope for the present study. Orientation on the basis of either amplitude
380 difference (Polajnar et al. 2016a) or time delay (Hager and Kirchner 2014) was demonstrated in
381 other insect groups, where the strategy of a particular group likely depends on various factors such
382 as body size, signal frequency and bandwidth, and the physical features of the acoustical
383 environment. Apart from that, orientation on a 2D surface would require triangulation regardless of
384 the cue, for which pentatomids are likely not adapted because their usual environment – a tangle of
385 plant branches, leaves and fruits – can be more accurately approximated as a web of 1D and small
386 2D surfaces (Mazzoni et al. 2014) where triangulation is not necessary. It is therefore not surprising
387 that difficulties were observed with locating a rod on the surface of an arena. Nevertheless, active
388 males did not give up searching despite prolonged search effort, indicating high motivation.

389
390 Regardless of the mechanism, males stimulated with pbFS were significantly attracted to the
391 signal source. In Test 4, playback allowed the capture of approximately 50% of released males
392 despite the high heterogeneity of the vibrational amplitude field measured on the acoustic trap. The
393 number of captured males is consistent with the number of males attracted to the SP in all the other
394 tests, which means that males, once stimulated with the female song, can find their way to the
395 source. This result would suggest that FS2 has a good potential to be used for field capturing.
396 Currently, commercial traps are based on two-component aggregation pheromone dispensers which
397 attract BMSB to the vicinity (Khrimian et al. 2014; Weber et al. 2014). The problem arises because
398 not all the individuals enter the traps, likely because the aggregation pheromones are efficient for
399 medium range attraction but much less for precise localization in stink bugs (James et al. 1996;
400 Aldrich et al. 2009). This constraint can cause a tricky contraindication if masses of bugs are
401 attracted to an orchard from outside without capturing many of them (Sargent et al. 2014).
402 Therefore, the use of attractive vibrational signals integrated into the existing trap designs could
403 provide an important synergistic effect, increasing the capture rate. The development of this type of
404 acoustic device would constitute an important innovation of traps based on specific, non-pheromone
405 sexual signals. Indeed, acoustic traps have already been proposed in the past, and some have been
406 recently developed to attract mosquito males (Johnson et al. 2016). Such traps, however, emit pure
407 tone airborne sound to mimic female flight noise. Although such a noise might be considered a
408 species and sexual identifier for males, the mosquito female sound is a constant, unstructured sound

409 and it is involuntary, being simply associated to the flying activity. The function of BMSB female
410 signals, on the other hand, is explicitly to attract males. Another option would be to interfere with
411 the species' sexual communication by blocking the vibrational communication channel with
412 disruptive noise. Signals involved in the mating duet carry information crucial for mate selection,
413 and thus by interfering with perception of vibrational signals in both males and females, would
414 disrupt not only the male search but also the correct identification of the sender. In *S. titanus*, the
415 transmission of a disruptive noise through the vineyard supporting wires let grapevine tissues
416 vibrate and occupy the frequency range used by duetting partners (Eriksson et al. 2012; Polajnar et
417 al. 2016a). However, this technique is not likely to be successful in the case of the BMSB. Unlike *S.*
418 *titanus* which is monophagous and monovoltine, the BMSB is widely polyphagous and
419 multivoltine. Therefore, to target one or several crops would not be sufficient since mating can
420 occur on a large variety of other hosts where the animals can multiply rapidly. Instead, we consider
421 promising the use of vibrational signals for monitoring and mass trapping by improving the existing
422 pheromone traps.

423
424 An important limit of this method is that FS2 can only attract males who are the more active
425 partner, searching for stationary females who do not exhibit any vibration-mediated tropotaxis
426 (Polajnar et al. 2016b). Despite this, a significant increase of the number of captured males would
427 alone represent an important improvement of the trap efficacy. Since both males and females mate
428 multiple times in their life (Lee et al. 2013; Rice et al. 2014), a considerable number of males
429 should be captured to have a measurable effect, but this is an issue shared with the pheromone-
430 based mating disruption methods targeting moths whose efficacy has nevertheless been
431 demonstrated in the field (Witzgall et al. 2010). The use of aggregative vibrational signals could
432 significantly increase the capture rate, also including females and nymphs, but no such signal has
433 been observed so far and pheromones appear to be the only signal covering this role in BMSB. We
434 do recognize, however, that much more research must be done to better characterize and understand
435 the proper function of all BMSB signals (Polajnar et al. 2016b).

436 We must also consider that a rather conspicuous part of males (from 30 to 50%) did not react
437 at all to vibrational stimulation. In Test 1, for example, 23 males out of 30 moved away from the
438 starting leaf and only 14 of them reached the vibrated leaf. The other nine individuals that did not
439 reach the goal exhibited longer activation time than the successful ones and did not differ in this
440 aspect from the silent control, which means that they probably were walking on the plant without
441 the intention to find the vibrational source. The reason for this low percentage of motivated males is
442 not yet clear, but could be due to either a certain physiological state, perhaps related to age (we did

443 not check the exact age of the tested males, but simply used individuals older than 7 days) or mating
444 history, or to the stimulus quality. In fact, as much as we tried to reproduce a “typical” female
445 signal, we do not know yet the exact spectral and temporal features that would make a female signal
446 more attractive to males. The study of the mating behavior of the planthopper, *Hyalesthes obsoletus*
447 Signoret, revealed that even slight manipulation of the spectral pattern of female pulses could
448 significantly alter the male responsiveness (Mazzoni et al. 2015), and in the case of stink bugs,
449 female signals emitted on different substrates were reported to differ in attractiveness to males of
450 *Nezara viridula* L. (Miklas et al. 2001). Signal quality is, in fact, a cue to males for identification, in
451 first instance, but also for increasing their motivation and thus investing time and energy in mating
452 (Kuhelj et al. 2015). Signaling and searching have a direct metabolic cost, but also incur risks
453 associated with eavesdropping from predators, parasitoids and rivals, so they should be well
454 balanced by any individual (Cocroft and Rodríguez 2005; Virant-Doberlet et al. 2011). Motivated
455 males in our trials were easily identifiable in that they used to remain in the arena, walking most of
456 the time at a relatively high speed, whereas unmotivated males either quickly left the arena or
457 stayed inside but without moving much. Therefore, it seems likely that the male decision to search
458 for the female was mostly, if not exclusively, based on perception of the female vibrational signal.
459 Vision appears to be much less important for this task, although the use of dummy females
460 substantially increased the loitering effect of the signal in Test 3. Males used to continuously enter
461 and exit the SP-VSA in absence of the dummy; on the contrary, the time of permanence in the SP-
462 VSA significantly increased in presence of the dummy. While light-based stimuli have been found
463 to be attractive to BMSB (Leskey et al. 2015), the role of vision (of another individual) during the
464 mating process seems limited to very short distances and thus not useful for improving field traps.
465 The effect of a vibrational stimulus is similar to what is commonly described as arrestant effect,
466 however, the definition of arrestant is “a stimulus that causes the insect to cease locomotion in
467 close contact with the apparent source” (Beck 1965). In the case of BMSB, males did not stop
468 walking, but remained actively moving around the SP, presumably because it lacked other key
469 stimuli provided by a live female. We therefore borrow from military terminology and propose the
470 phrase “loitering” to describe this phenomenon. This fits very well with the typical behavior of
471 insects which use vibrational signals as a cue to locate potential mates (Mazzoni et al. 2014;
472 Polajnar et al. 2014). As an obvious consequence, the loitering effect would eventually cause
473 aggregation and this would reinforce the role of FS2 as an attractant.

474
475 In conclusion, we think that the use of FS2 signals as a stimulus integrated into existing
476 pheromone traps could be an important innovation to the current state of BMSB management in the

477 field. By adding the vibrational stimulus, it would be possible to increase the trap efficacy by
478 attracting males inside the traps and thus considerably reducing the male population. However, even
479 without a trap design, the observed loitering effect of the vibratory stimulus might be useful in
480 push-pull strategies. More research is needed to define the signal characteristics which can further
481 improve its efficacy, especially in terms of spectral and temporal parameters that could motivate a
482 higher number of individuals, but also to define thresholds (i.e. of frequency or amplitude) of
483 efficacy. This knowledge is required to set up field experiments and to test acoustic traps.

484
485

486 **Acknowledgements**

487
488 This research was supported by the grant ‘Innovative tools and protocols for monitoring and
489 sustainable control of the alien stink bug *Halyomorpha halys*, a new phytosanitary threat, and of
490 other harmful heteropterans for the fruit crops of the territory of Modena’ (2013.065) of
491 ‘Fondazione Cassa di Risparmio di Modena’.

492

493 **Compliance with Ethical Standards**

494

495 There are no conflict of interest involving the authors.

496 All applicable international, national, and/or institutional guidelines for the care and use of animals
497 were followed.

498 This article does not contain any studies with human participants performed by any of the authors.

499

500 **References**

501

502 Aldrich JR (1988) Chemical ecology of the Heteroptera. *Annu Rev Entomol* 33:211–238. doi:
503 10.1146/annurev.ento.33.1.211

504 Aldrich JR, Khimian A, Chen X, Camp MJ (2009) Semiochemically based monitoring of the
505 Invasion of the Brown Marmorated Stink Bug and unexpected attraction of the native green
506 stink bug (Heteroptera: Pentatomidae) in Maryland. *Florida Entomol* 92:483–491. doi:
507 10.1653/024.092.0310

508 Beck SD (1965) Resistance of plants to insects. *Annu Rev Entomol* 10:207–232.

509 Cocroft RB, Rodríguez RL (2005) The behavioral ecology of insect vibrational communication.
510 *Bioscience* 55:323–334. doi: 10.1641/0006-3568(2005)055[0323:TBEOIV]2.0.CO;2

511 Čokl A, Virant-Doberlet M (2003) Communication with substrate-borne signals in small plant-
512 dwelling insects. *Annu Rev Entomol* 48:29–50. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ento.48.091801.112605

513 Čokl A, Virant-Doberlet M, McDowell A (1999) Vibrational directionality in the southern green

514 stink bug, *Nezara viridula* (L.), is mediated by female song. *Anim Behav* 58:1277–1283. doi:
515 10.1006/anbe.1999.1272

516 Eriksson A, Anfora G, Lucchi A, et al (2012) Exploitation of insect vibrational signals reveals a
517 new method of pest management. *PLoS One*. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0032954

518 Foster SP, Harris MO (1997) Behavioral manipulation methods for insect pest-management. *Annu*
519 *Rev Entomol* 42:123–146. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ento.42.1.123

520 Hager FA, Kirchner WH (2014) Directional vibration sensing in the termite *Macrotermes*
521 *natalensis*.

522 James DG, Heffer R, Amaike M (1996) Field attraction of *Biprorulus bibax* Breddin (Hemiptera:
523 Pentatomidae) to synthetic aggregation pheromone and (E)-2-hexenal, a pentatomid defense
524 chemical. *J Chem Ecol* 22:1697–1708 ST–Field attraction of *Biprorulus bib*. doi:
525 10.1007/bf02272408

526 Johnson BJ, Ritchie SA, Arthur BJ, et al (2016) The siren’s song: exploitation of female flight tones
527 to passively capture male *Aedes aegypti* (Diptera: Culicidae). *J Med Entomol* 53:245–8. doi:
528 10.1093/jme/tjv165

529 Joseph S V, Bergh JC, Wright SE, Leskey TC (2013) Factors affecting captures of brown
530 marmorated stink bug, *Halyomorpha halys* (Hemiptera: Pentatomidae), in baited pyramid traps.
531 *J Entomol Sci* 48:43–51.

532 Khrimian A, Zhang A, Weber DC, et al (2014) Discovery of the aggregation pheromone of the
533 Brown Marmorated Stink Bug (*Halyomorpha halys*) through the creation of stereoisomeric
534 libraries of 1-Bisabolen-3-ols. *J Nat Prod* 77:1708–1717. doi: 10.1021/np5003753

535 Kuhelj A, de Groot M, Pajk F, et al (2015) Energetic cost of vibrational signalling in a leafhopper.
536 *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 69:815–828. doi: 10.1007/s00265-015-1898-9

537 Lee D-H, Short BD, Joseph S V, et al (2013) Review of the biology, ecology, and management of
538 *Halyomorpha halys* (Hemiptera: Pentatomidae) in China, Japan, and the Republic of Korea.
539 *Environ Entomol* 42:627–41. doi: 10.1603/EN13006

540 Leskey TC, Hamilton GC, Nielsen AL, et al (2012) Pest status of the brown marmorated stink bug,
541 *Halyomorpha halys* in the USA. *Outlooks Pest Manag* 23:218–226. doi: 10.1564/23oct07

542 Leskey TC, Lee D-H, Glenn DM, Morrison WR (2015) Behavioral responses of the invasive
543 *Halyomorpha halys* (Stål) (Hemiptera: Pentatomidae) to light-based stimuli in the laboratory
544 and field. *J Insect Behav* 28:674–692. doi: 10.1007/s10905-015-9535-z

545 Maistrello L, Dioli P, Bariselli M, et al (2016) Citizen science and early detection of invasive
546 species: phenology of first occurrences of *Halyomorpha halys* in Southern Europe. *Biol*
547 *Invasions* 18:3109–3116. doi: 10.1007/s10530-016-1217-z

- 548 Mazzoni V, Eriksson A, Anfora G, et al (2014) Active space and the role of amplitude in plant-
549 borne vibrational communication. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp 125–145
- 550 Mazzoni V, Polajnar J, Virant-Doberlet M (2015) Secondary spectral components of substrate-
551 borne vibrational signals affect male preference. Behav Processes 115:53–60. doi:
552 10.1016/j.beproc.2015.02.019
- 553 Mazzoni V, Prešern J, Lucchi A, Virant-Doberlet M (2009) Reproductive strategy of the Nearctic
554 leafhopper *Scaphoideus titanus* Ball (Hemiptera: Cicadellidae). Bull Entomol Res. doi:
555 10.1017/S0007485308006408
- 556 Miklas N, Stritih N, Čokl A, et al (2001) The influence of substrate on male responsiveness to the
557 female calling song in *Nezara viridula*. J Insect Behav 14:313–332. doi:
558 10.1023/A:1011115111592
- 559 Nielsen AL, Hamilton GC, Shearer PW (2011) Seasonal phenology and monitoring of the non-
560 native *Halyomorpha halys* (Hemiptera : Pentatomidae) in soybean. Environ Entomol 40:231–
561 238. doi: 10.1603/EN10187
- 562 Pedigo LP, Rice ME (2014) Entomology and pest management, 6th Ed. Waveland Press, Long
563 Grove, Illinois
- 564 Pertot I, Caffi T, Rossi V, et al (2016) A critical review of plant protection tools for reducing
565 pesticide use on grapevine and new perspectives for the implementation of IPM in viticulture.
566 Crop Prot. doi: 10.1016/j.cropro.2016.11.025
- 567 Polajnar J, Eriksson A, Rossi Stacconi MV, et al (2014) The process of pair formation mediated by
568 substrate-borne vibrations in a small insect. Behav Processes. doi:
569 10.1016/j.beproc.2014.07.013
- 570 Polajnar J, Eriksson A, Virant-Doberlet M, Mazzoni V (2016a) Mating disruption of a grapevine
571 pest using mechanical vibrations: from laboratory to the field. J Pest Sci (2004) 89:909–921.
572 doi: 10.1007/s10340-015-0726-3
- 573 Polajnar J, Maistrello L, Bertarella A, Mazzoni V (2016b) Vibrational communication of the brown
574 marmorated stink bug (*Halyomorpha halys*). Physiol Entomol 41:249–259. doi:
575 10.1111/phen.12150
- 576 Polajnar J, Svensek D, Čokl A (2012) Resonance in herbaceous plant stems as a factor in
577 vibrational communication of pentatomid bugs (Heteroptera: Pentatomidae). J R Soc Interface
578 9:1898–1907. doi: 10.1098/rsif.2011.0770
- 579 Rice KB, Bergh CJ, Bergmann EJ, et al (2014) Biology, ecology, and management of Brown
580 Marmorated Stink Bug (Hemiptera: Pentatomidae). JIPM 5.3: A1-A13.
- 581 Sargent C, Martinson HM, Raupp MJ (2014) Traps and trap placement may affect location of

582 brown marmorated stink bug (Hemiptera: Pentatomidae) and increase injury to tomato fruits in
583 home gardens. *Environ Entomol* 43:432–8. doi: 10.1603/EN13237

584 Virant-Doberlet M, Čokl A (2004) Vibrational communication in insects. *Neotrop Entomol* 33:121–
585 134. doi: 10.1590/S1519-566X2004000200001

586 Virant-Doberlet M, Čokl A, Zorovič M (2006) Use of substrate vibrations for orientation: from
587 behaviour to physiology. In: Drosopoulus S, Claridge MF (eds) *Insect sounds and*
588 *communication : physiology, bahaviour, ecology and evolution*. Taylor & Francis, New York,
589 pp 81–97

590 Virant-Doberlet M, King RA, Polajnar J, Symondson WOC (2011) Molecular diagnostics reveal
591 spiders that exploit prey vibrational signals used in sexual communication. *Mol Ecol* 20:2204–
592 2216. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-294X.2011.05038.x

593 Weber DC, Leskey TC, Walsh GC, Khrimian A (2014) Synergy of aggregation pheromone with
594 methyl (E,E,Z)-2,4,6-decatrienoate in attraction of *Halyomorpha halys* (Hemiptera:
595 Pentatomidae).

596 Witzgall P, Kirsch P, Cork A (2010) Sex pheromones and their impact on pest management. *J*
597 *Chem Ecol* 36:80–100. doi: 10.1007/s10886-009-9737-y

598

599 **Figure captions**

600

601 **Fig. 1** Oscillogram (above) and spectrogram (below) of the female signal playback (PbFS) used to
602 stimulate the males in all tests. The pbFS, consisting of 12 female pulses, type FS2, was
603 continuously looped for the full duration of each trial

604

605 **Fig. 2** Scheme and vibrational amplitude field of the bean plants used in Test 1. Two bean plants
606 were grown together in one pot having only one contact point at approximately mid stem length.
607 The mini-shaker (SH) was moved after each trial and thus the stimulated leaf (e.g. Lf1-SP) was
608 randomly changed. The male releasing point was randomized among the non stimulated leaves.
609 The Audio Sampling Points (ASPs) are indicated with black dots. Four of them were placed on the
610 leaves (Lf1-Lf4) and other four on the stems (St1-St4). The mean (\pm SD) amplitude of the playback
611 signal (as substrate velocity in $\mu\text{m/s}$) is reported. Different letters indicate significant differences
612 between amplitude values recorded from the ASPs ($p < 0.05$) after Friedman's test with replication
613 followed by Bonferroni post hoc test

614

615 **Fig. 3** Scheme of the arenas used in Test 2 (A) and Test 3 (B). (A) In Test 2, the mini-shaker was
616 placed in direct contact with the arena surface. Four different Video Sampling Areas (VSA-T2),
617 corresponding with as many Audio Sampling Points (ASP) were defined, one of them at the
618 Stimulation Point (SP) and the others opposite (FR) and laterally (L1 and L2) to it. An additional
619 ASP was placed on the Releasing Point (RP). (B) In Test 3, the SP was set at the external end of a
620 paperboard rod and only two VSAs (VSA-T3) were defined, around the internal ends of the SP and
621 FR rods, respectively. As a whole, the vibrational amplitude field was measured from 19 ASPs, 12
622 of them on the arena surface (a1-a8 plus L1, L2 and two inside each VSA) and six of them on the
623 rods (SP, b1 and b2 on the vibrated rod, and b3, b4 and FR on the non-vibrated one). In (A),
624 amplitude values (as substrate mean \pm SD velocity in $\mu\text{m/s}$) are reported for each ASP; different
625 letters indicate significant differences between amplitude values recorded from the ASPs ($p < 0.05$)
626 after Friedman's test with replication, followed by Bonferroni post hoc test

627

628 **Fig. 4** Scheme (3D, above, and flattened diagram, below) of the acoustic trap used in Test 4. As a
629 whole, 45 Audio Sampling Points (ASPs) were placed: 36 ASPs on the upper (Ceiling), lateral
630 (Sides 1 and 2) and back (Back) faces (nine per face) of the net cage. Other four ASPs were placed
631 on the Front face, two on the net Sleeve, one on the plastic Plastic funnel and two on the Cylinder,
632 including the Stimulation Point (SP). Males were released inside the net cage

633

634 **Fig. 5** Box-plot graph of the activation time of males stimulated with pbFS (Pb₊) in Test 1. Pb.
635 indicates the control trials. Stimulated males were further divided into those that reached (Pb₊SP)
636 and those who did not reach (Pb₊no) the leaf with the Stimulation Point (SP). Different letters
637 indicate significant differences ($p < 0.05$) after Kruskal-Wallis followed by Steel-Dwass multiple
638 comparison test. Plots show median (center line), 75th percentiles (top of box), 25th percentiles
639 (bottom of box), and whiskers connect the largest and smallest values within 1.5 interquartile ranges
640

641 **Fig. 6** Mean (\pm SE) distance walked by BMSB males (blue) and their walking velocity (red) in the
642 different trials. (A) In Test 2, the trials were done with both playback and dummy female (Pb₊Dy₊),
643 with only playback (Pb₊Dy₋) and in absence of playback, taking together with and without a dummy
644 (Pb₋). (B) In Test 3, all trials were done in absence of a dummy. “Out” are those individuals that left
645 the arena before the end of the trial time, regardless of the treatment. Numbers in brackets (n)
646 indicate the replications for each treatment. When present, different letters on the same line indicate
647 significant differences after Kruskal-Wallis test followed by Mann-Whitney pairwise post hoc test
648 ($p < 0.05$)


649
650 **Fig. 7** Mean (\pm SE) time spent inside (A) and number of accesses to (B) the arena Video Sampling
651 Areas (VSAs) by males in Test 2. The four VSAs are: the vibrated VSA (SP), the one opposite to it
652 (FR) and the lateral ones (L1 and L2). Treatments (Pb = playback; Dy = dummy female; + = on; - =
653 off) and numbers of active males (in brackets) are reported on the X-axis. Different letters indicate
654 significant differences ($p < 0.05$) after Friedman test followed by Bonferroni pairwise post hoc test
655


656 **Fig. 8** Mean (\pm SE) time spent inside (A) and number of accesses (B) to the two VSAs by the males
657 in Test 3: the vibrated VSA (SP, white) and the one opposite to it (FR, black). Treatments (Pb₊ =
658 playback on; Pb₋ = playback off) and number of active males are reported on the X-axis. ** indicate
659 significant differences after Wilcoxon T test. ns = not significant ($p > 0.05$)

660
661 **Fig. 9** Vibrational amplitude field of the Test 3 arena (A) and the Test 4 cage (B). The analysis is
662 based on 19 and 41 Audio Sampling Points (ASPs), respectively (see Fig. 3 and 4). SP =
663 Stimulation Point; FR = Frontal (non-stimulated) Rod.



664
665
666
667



Figure 1









A - Test 2

















Tables

Table 1 Results of Test 1 (attractiveness on the plant) for treatment (pbFS stimulation, Pb_+) and control (Pb_-) trials. The number of active males (Active ♂), of males that reached the Stimulation Point leaf (SP Leaf), that loitered on it for 5 minutes (Loitering) and the male searching time (Search t: $m \pm SD$) are reported together with results of G-test (G and p) in a contingency table (2x2)

	Pb_+	Pb_-	G	p
n	30	23		
Active ♂	23	10	6.0	0.014
SP Leaf	14	1	7.7	0.005
Search t	245	499		
Loitering	10	0		

Table 2 Results of Test 2 (attractiveness on the arena – spot attraction). In (A), data are divided by treatment (pbFS stimulation, Pb_+) and control (Pb_-), and by presence (Dy_+) and absence (Dy_-) of a dummy female. In (B), Pb and Gy data are pooled. The number of active males (Active ♂) and of males that remained (Remained ♂) on the arena for the full trial duration are reported together with results of G-test (G and p) in a contingency table (4x2 and 2x2 in (A) and (B) respectively)

(A)	Pb_+		Pb_-		G	p
	Dy_+	Dy_-	Dy_+	Dy_-		
n	20	20	20	20		
Active ♂	14	15	11	12	2.2	0.54
Remained ♂	13	13	2	5	21.5	<0.001

(B)	Pb_+	Pb_-	G	p	Dy_+	Dy_-	G	p
n	40	40			40	40		
Active ♂	29	23	1.9	0.16	25	27	0.2	0.64
Remained ♂	26	7	20.0	<0.001	15	18	0.2	0.62

Table 3 Results of Test 3 (attractiveness on the arena – exit path attraction). The number of active males (Active ♂), of males that reached the rod end and of those that remained (Remained ♂) on the arena for the full trial duration and those that reached the external end of the vibrated rod (Rod end) are reported together with results of G-test (G and p) in a contingency table (2x2). Data are divided by vibrated (Pb+) and silent (Pb-) trials. In the case of Pb-, the rod end value refers to the number of individuals that reached either of the two rod ends

	<i>Pb+</i>	<i>Pb-</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>p</i>
n	20	20		
Active ♂	18	15	3.8	0.15
Remained ♂	16	5	12.4	<0.001
Rod end	11	2	8.0	0.004

[Click here to view linked References](#)

Use of substrate-borne vibrational signals to attract the Brown Marmorated Stink Bug, *Halyomorpha halys*

Online Resource 1, Journal of Pest Science

Valerio Mazzoni*, Jernej Polajnar, Marta Baldini, Marco Valerio Rossi Stacconi, Gianfranco Anfora, Roberto Guidetti, Lara Maistrello

*Fondazione Edmund Mach, e-mail: valerio.mazzoni@fmach.it

The vibrational amplitude field (mean \pm SD of amplitude as substrate velocity, in $\mu\text{m/s}$, measured at the peak of dominant frequency (DF), in Hz) of the Test 3 arena, measured by recording the pbFS from 19 Audio Sampling Points (ASPs). SP = Stimulation Point; B1-B4 = central and internal ASPs on the vibrated rod; FR = external ASP on the non-vibrated rod; A1-A8 = ASPs on the arena surface; VSA-SP and VSA-FR = ASPs included in the Visual Sampling Areas (VSA) on the arena surface, around the basal tip of the two rods, vibrated (VSA-SP) and not vibrated (VSA-FR)

ASP	Amplitude	DF (Hz)	ASP	Amplitude	DF (Hz)
SP	1275.8 \pm 165.2	77.3 \pm 5.8	RP	303.3 \pm 23.2	88.7 \pm 1.2
B1	1175.0 \pm 61.1	78.7 \pm 8.1	A1	2800 \pm 66.1	88.0 \pm 0.0
B2	1086.7 \pm 65.2	75.0 \pm 1.7	A2	604.2 \pm 51.0	88.7 \pm 1.2
B3	1553.3 \pm 137.8	74.0 \pm 0.0	A3	216.0 \pm 1.1	72.0 \pm 0.0
B4	1258.3 \pm 154.2	74.0 \pm 0.0	A4	39.8 \pm 4.6	72.7 \pm 1.2
FR	2579.2 \pm 243.8	74.7 \pm 1.2	A5	645.0 \pm 71.4	71.3 \pm 1.2
VSA-SP	869.2 \pm 99.5	74.0 \pm 0.0	A6	1389.2 \pm 118.4	88.7 \pm 1.2
VSA-FR	185.5 \pm 5.3	72.0 \pm 0.0	A7	515.8 \pm 61.8	72.7 \pm 1.2
L1	413.3 \pm 35.1	89.3 \pm 1.2	A8	936.7 \pm 152.0	88.7 \pm 1.2
L2	321.7 \pm 51.4	72.0 \pm 0.0			

[Click here to view linked References](#)

Use of substrate-borne vibrational signals to attract the Brown Marmorated Stink Bug, *Halyomorpha halys*

Online Resource 2, Journal of Pest Science

Valerio Mazzoni*, Jernej Polajnar, Marta Baldini, Marco Valerio Rossi Stacconi, Gianfranco Anfora, Roberto Guidetti, Lara Maistrello

*Fondazione Edmund Mach, e-mail: valerio.mazzoni@fmach.it

The (A) vibrational amplitude field (mean \pm SD of amplitude as substrate velocity, in $\mu\text{m/s}$, measured at the peak frequency (Hz), which is reported in (B)) of the Test 4 cage/trap arena. Values were measured by recording the pbFS from the 45 Audio Sampling Points (ASPs) on the Test 4 acoustic trap (see Fig. 4 for more details on the ASPs positions on the trap).

A	<i>Back</i>	<i>Side 1</i>	<i>Side 2</i>	<i>Ceiling</i>	<i>Front</i>	<i>Sleeve</i>	<i>Funnel</i>	<i>Cylinder</i>
1	102.8 \pm 9.0	103.7 \pm 10.3	110.7 \pm 3.8	115.3 \pm 5.1	428.0 \pm 18.7	599.0 \pm 5.3	753.0 \pm 67.0	143.3 \pm 6.7
2	45.8 \pm 5.1	193.3 \pm 17.2	103.7 \pm 1.2	88.5 \pm 2.7	209.7 \pm 22.1	1173.3 \pm 95.0		139.7 \pm 14.2
3	35.3 \pm 3.8	407.3 \pm 49.1	27.8 \pm 1.0	104.2 \pm 9.3	298.7 \pm 7.2			
4	39.3 \pm 0.9	182.0 \pm 12.1	31.5 \pm 7.9	77.4 \pm 6.9	1150.0 \pm 130.8			
5	62.4 \pm 1.5	99.3 \pm 14.7	93.0 \pm 13.9	64.0 \pm 5.0				
6	126.7 \pm 13.5	65.3 \pm 3.2	140.0 \pm 1.7	70.9 \pm 3.3				
7	25.0 \pm 2.9	70.4 \pm 7.3	117.7 \pm 2.5	100.9 \pm 6.3				
8	105.4 \pm 13.4	190.0 \pm 23.1	88.3 \pm 6.3	53.8 \pm 2.8				
9	35.1 \pm 2.3	285.7 \pm 1.5	60.9 \pm 1.7	104.2 \pm 9.3				

A	<i>Back</i>	<i>Side 1</i>	<i>Side 2</i>	<i>Ceiling</i>	<i>Front</i>	<i>Sleeve</i>	<i>Funnel</i>	<i>Cylinder</i>
1	82.7 \pm 5.8	80.0 \pm 0.0	80.7 \pm 1.2	80.0 \pm 0.0	86.7 \pm 1.2	80.7 \pm 1.2	88.0 \pm 0.0	86.7 \pm 2.3
2	78.7 \pm 8.1	77.5 \pm 0.0	80.0 \pm 0.0	77.0 \pm 5.8	74.7 \pm 1.2	80.7 \pm 5.8		86.0 \pm 2.0
3	90.0 \pm 0.0	145.0 \pm 0.0	86.7 \pm 1.2	80.0 \pm 0.0	88.0 \pm 0.0			
4	75.3 \pm 1.2	82.0 \pm 0.0	52.7 \pm 32.3	75.0 \pm 1.2	75.3 \pm 1.2			
5	74.0 \pm 0.0	160.7 \pm 3.1	76.7 \pm 1.2	78.0 \pm 0.0				
6	80.7 \pm 1.2	160.8 \pm 2.9	80.0 \pm 0.0	81.0 \pm 2.3				
7	62.7 \pm 25.0	78.0 \pm 0.0	75.3 \pm 1.2	77.0 \pm 1.2				
8	73.3 \pm 1.2	83.3 \pm 1.4	81.3 \pm 1.2	89.0 \pm 1.2				
9	131.4 \pm 37.6	86.0 \pm 2.0	82.7 \pm 3.1	80.0 \pm 0.0				