The inheritance of alternative nest architectural traditions in stingless bees
Peer-reviewed author version

Di Pietro, Viviana; Menezes, Cristiano; Frediani, Maria Giulia de Britto; Pereira, David Jos; FAJGENBLAT, Maxime; Ferreira, Helena Mendes; Wenseleers, Tom & Oliveira, Ricardo Caliari (2024) The inheritance of alternative nest architectural traditions in stingless bees. In: Current biology, 34 (9) , p. 1996 -2001.e3.

1 **Inheritance of Behavioral Traditions underlying Nest Architecture in Stingless Bees**

2 Viviana Di Pietro[1,7*], Cristiano Menezes[2], Maria Giulia de Britto Frediani[2], David José

3 Pereira[2], Maxime Fajgenblat[3,4], Helena Mendes Ferreira[1], Tom Wenseleers[1,6**], Ricardo Caliari

4 Oliveira[1,5,6***]

5 [1]Laboratory of Socioecology and Social Evolution, Department of Biology, KU Leuven, Naamsestraat 59, 3000

6 Leuven, Belgium

7 [2]Embrapa Environment, Laboratory of Entomology and Phytopathology, SP-340 road, 13918-110, Jaguariúna,

8 Brazil

9 [3]Laboratory of Freshwater Ecology, Evolution and Conservation, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

10 [4]Data Science Institute, I-BioStat, Hasselt University, Diepenbeek, Belgium

11 [5]Departament de Biologia Animal, de Biologia Vegetal i d'Ecologia - Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193

12 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain

13 [6]These authors contributed equally

14 [7]Lead contact

15 [*,**,***]Correspondence: viviana.dipietro@kuleuven.be (V.D.P.), tom.wenseleers@kuleuven.be (T.W.) ,

16 ricardo.oliveira@uab.cat (R.C.O)

17 ORCID: 0000-0003-1116-9795 (V.D.P.); 0000-0002-8473-6298 (C.M.); 0000-0002-2233-1527 (M.F.); 0000-

18 0003-2090-4528 (H.M.F); 0000-0002-1434-861X (T.W.); 0000-0002-8996-1291 (R.C.O.)

19

20 **Summary**

21 The transmission of complex behavior and culture in humans has long been attributed to

22 advanced forms of social learning[1,2], which play a crucial role in our technological

23 advancement[3]. While similar phenomena of behavioral traditions and cultural inheritance have

24 been observed in animals[1,2,4-6], including in primates[7], whales[8], birds[9], and even insects[10], the

25 underlying mechanisms enabling the persistence of such animal traditions, particularly in

26 insects, are less well understood. This study introduces pioneering evidence of enduring

27 architectural traditions in the stingless bee *Scaptotrigona depilis*, which are maintained without

28 any evidence for social learning. We demonstrate that *S. depilis* exhibits two distinct nest

29 architectures, comprising either helicoidal or flat, stacked horizontal combs, which are

30 transmitted across generations through stigmergy[11-17] – an environmental feedback mechanism

31 whereby the presence of the existing comb structures guides subsequent construction

32 behaviors, thereby leading to a form of environmental inheritance[18-20]. Cross-fostering

33 experiments further show that genetic factors or prior experience do not drive the observed

34 variation in nest architecture. Moreover, the experimental introduction of corkscrew

35 dislocations within the combs prompted helicoidal building, confirming the use of stigmergic

36   building rules. At a theoretical level, we establish that the long-term equilibrium of building in
37   the helicoidal pattern fits with the expectations of a two-state Markov chain model. Overall,
38   our findings provide compelling evidence for the persistence of behavioral traditions in an
39   insect based on a simple mechanism of environmental inheritance and stigmergic interactions,
40   without requiring any sophisticated learning mechanism, thereby expanding our understanding
41   of how traditions can be maintained in non-human species.
42
43   **Keywords**: animal traditions; environmental inheritance; stigmergy; nest architecture;
44   stingless bees
45

Results and discussion

47   The progress and prosperity of human civilizations have been significantly influenced by our
48   ability to learn from others and accumulate knowledge, leading to technological progress and
49   innovation that is stably transmitted through cultural mechanisms[21]. While long perceived to
50   be exclusive to humans, behavioral traditions and social information transmission across
51   generations have also been observed in a variety of non-human species[1,2,4-6,22]. In particular,
52   primates[7], cetaceans[8], birds[9], and even insects[10] have all demonstrated the capacity to maintain
53   and transmit complex behaviors or structures across generations. High cognitive skills and
54   advanced forms of social learning have long been thought to be required for the stable
55   maintenance of behavioral traditions and culture[7-9,23,24]. However, the persistence of distinct
56   traditions also in species with simpler cognitive capacities, like insects[10,25], challenges the
57   conventional understanding of cultural transmission, suggesting that alternative, less complex
58   mechanisms might sometimes be at play[10,25-28].

59   Recent insights into the architectural diversity of stingless bee colonies hint at the existence of
60   behavioral traditions that might not rely on direct social learning or high cognitive abilities[25].
61   In this case, it is likely that variation in nest architecture could be propagated based on the
62   comb structure itself, whereby the current building style guides the building by later
63   generations of bees. Such a process could lead to environmental and behavioral inheritance[18-
64   20,27,28], even in the absence of any direct form of social learning. To test this theory, we here
65   present the first study of behavioral innovation and social transmission of alternative nest
66   architecture building patterns in a neotropical stingless bee, *Scaptotrigona depilis*. This species
67   is one of 10 known stingless bee species that exhibit significant intraspecific variation in nest
68   architecture[29], building its brood combs in either a helicoidal shape built continuously without

69 the support of a central pillar, or as horizontally stacked parallel layers, supported by a central

70 pillar[12,14] (Figure 1A,B). Given that stingless bees generate perennial colonies and reproduce

71 through swarming or managed splitting, we hypothesized that the observed architectural

72 variation might be maintained over periods of time extending beyond the lifespan of individual

73 worker cohorts.

74 To investigate the inheritance and prevalence of the two alternative nest architectural building

75 patterns, we surveyed 413 *S. depilis* colonies in Jaguariúna, São Paulo State, Brazil, and

76 monitored the incidence and changes in nest architecture over one-month periods in 2022 and

77 2023 (see STAR Methods). We hypothesized that the prevailing comb configuration would

78 guide the construction of successive worker cohorts[25], with the frequencies of helicoidal and

79 parallel architectures reflecting the stable equilibrium of a two-state continuous time Markov

80 chain model. Specifically, if a and b represent the monthly transition rates to helicoidal and

81 parallel comb structures, each occurring at frequencies H and P, we predicted the dynamics to

82 adhere to the following system of ordinary differential equations:

83
$$\frac{dH}{dt} = aP - bH$$

84
$$\frac{dP}{dt} = bH - aP$$

85 At equilibrium ($dH/dt = 0$ and $dP/dt = 0$), and given that $H + P = 1$, the expected equilibrium

86 proportion building in the helicoidal configuration is $H^* = a/(a + b)$, while for the parallel

87 configuration it is $P^* = b/(a + b)$. Our empirical data show that parallel-building colonies (n

88 $= 398$) transitioned to a helicoidal architecture at a rate of $a = 4.5\%$ per month (binomial 95%

89 CrI 2.8-6.9% per month), while helicoidal-building colonies ($n = 15$) switched to parallel at a

90 rate $b = 87\%$ per month (binomial 95% CrI 64-97% per month). These rates did not differ

91 significantly between the study years, supporting the Markov chain model's assumption of

92 constant transition rates (binomial GLM, posthoc tests, z ratio = -1.53, $p = 0.13$ and z ratio =

93 0.32, $p = 0.75$ for contrasts in switching rates a and b between years).

94 The calculated equilibrium frequency of the helicoidal architecture H^* of 5.0% (parametric

95 bootstrapping 95% CI: 2.9-7.6%, $n = 15$) aligns with the observed average frequency over both

96 years (binomial GLM, 4.3% with 95% CI 2.7-6.7%, $n = 413$, z ratio = -0.652, $p = 0.51$) and

97 was also not significantly impacted by season or year (Jan.-Febr. 2022 vs. Aug.-Sept. 2023),

98   hive entrance orientation, or position within the bee yard (Figure S1 & Table S1). It has been
99   suggested that a helicoidal nest architecture could be a thermoregulatory adaptation helping to
100   maintain the brood area at an optimum temperature[30,31]. Nevertheless, our results indirectly
101   dismiss this hypothesis, since we would then have expected the helicoidal building type to be
102   spatially clustered or to be more common in the warm season (Jan.-Feb.), which was not the
103   case (Table S1). The inclination of the hives also did not impact the frequency of both types.
104   When 10 colonies were tilted, none of them switched to building helicoidal combs within 2
105   weeks, and on a per-month basis the rate of switching to the helicoidal type was not
106   significantly elevated compared to 2022 parallel-building control colonies ($n = 299$) (Firth's
107   penalized logistic regression, z ratio $= 0.66$, $p = 0.51$). The lack of any significant
108   environmental effects argues against variation in nest architecture being driven by changes in
109   the external environment[30,31]. Our results confirm the long-term persistence of both
110   architectural phenotypes, but with the helicoidal form continuing for a shorter average duration
111   ($T_H = 1/b = 1.2$ months, 1.0-1.5 95% CI) than the parallel form ($T_P = 1/a = 23.4$ months, 14.7-
112   39.8 95% CI). Yet, the average duration of building in the helicoidal pattern still surpassed the
113   typical comb-building period of a single worker cohort, which transitions to other tasks after
114   approximately two to three weeks[29]. Consequently, our results imply that information on how
115   combs are constructed is transmitted across different worker cohorts and hence that some form
116   of environmental and behavioral inheritance is going on[18-20,27,28].

117   To investigate the specific mechanism by which this transmission occurs, we carried out a full
118   factorial cross-fostering experiment in which we provided experienced workers sourced from
119   colonies building in either the helicoidal or parallel pattern with a comb lattice structure from
120   a genetically unrelated colony that was matching or was opposite to their own (see STAR
121   Methods, Figure 1, $n = 6$ replicates per treatment combination). According to our stigmergy-
122   based environmental inheritance hypothesis, the expectation was that presenting an altered
123   comb structure in itself should cause the experienced workers to switch to a new building style,
124   merely by being guided by the comb structure itself. In that case, social information on how
125   combs are built would be socially transmitted across worker cohorts, but it would be based on
126   environmental inheritance driven by stigmergy, whereby the change in the structure of the
127   environment – the change in the comb lattice structure – would act as a stimulus for continued
128   construction in a manner consistent with the existing architecture[11-17]. This form of social
129   transmission emphasizes the role of the artifacts themselves – in this case, the comb structure
130   – as repositories and conduits of social information, thereby bypassing the need for direct

131 observation of behavior or instruction. By contrast, if the experienced workers were
132 predisposed towards building in a particular style, based on their genetic makeup or prior
133 experience, the expectation was that they should continue to do so even when provided with a
134 comb template of the alternative type.

135 Our cross-fostering experiment results confirm the environmental inheritance hypothesis.
136 When exposed to alternative architectural styles, experienced workers did not adhere to their
137 original construction patterns, thereby implying that nest architectural variation was not
138 controlled by genes of large effect or by prior experience. Instead, they promptly adjusted their
139 behavior to align with the provided comb structure, as evidenced by the rapid change in
140 building patterns observed within the first week – a change that remained constant for several
141 weeks (Figure 2). These results are consistent with the hypothesis that stigmergy underlies the
142 observed environmental inheritance and the persistence of distinct nest architectural behavioral
143 traditions. Nevertheless, over time, most colonies did eventually revert to building in the
144 parallel configuration, consistent with the dominance of this type in the wild. Given that the
145 observed changes in nest architecture were not affected by the original building style of the
146 experienced workers, our results clearly argue against genetic factors of large effects (e.g.
147 supergenes[32,33]) or direct social learning playing a significant role. Instead, our results support
148 the concept that behavioral traditions can be maintained through environmental cues and
149 stigmergic responses, aligning with the broader definition of traditions as patterns perpetuated
150 over time by mechanisms that do not require direct social learning[27,28].

151 To test if stigmergic building rules underpin the observed variation in nest architecture, we
152 carried out one final experiment in which we incised the top comb of parallel-building colonies
153 to mimic "corkscrew dislocations", which are known theoretical precursors to helicoidal comb
154 building[14]. In line with theoretical predictions[14], we found that this manipulation of the comb
155 substrate caused a marked increase in the transition to a helicoidal architecture compared to
156 control colonies (Figure 3). This result corroborates that the physical structure of the comb
157 itself can direct subsequent construction, in line with the concept of stigmergy[11,13,16].

158 Despite our clear conclusions on the mode of inheritance of alternative nest architectures in
159 this species, several important questions remain. It is unclear, for example, what factors cause
160 the actual transitions between building styles, and why helicoidal building tends to persist for
161 a much shorter time than parallel building. In all likelihood, transitions to parallel building are
162 initiated by the building of a central wax support pillar[12] (Figure 1A), while transitions to

163 helicoidal building are caused by occasional mistakes in the vertical alignment of newly built

164 cells[14]. If correct, this suggests that the parallel configuration is the default building pattern and

165 that switching to the helicoidal pattern could be regarded as an error-correction mechanism to

166 absorb occasional building mistakes and avoid costly interruptions in cell building. Similar

167 error-correction mechanisms during comb construction have previously been described in other

168 social insects[34-37]. Honeybees, for example, initiate comb building at multiple points within a

169 frame, and to be able to fuse those comb sections they occasionally switch to building

170 pentagonal or heptagonal cells instead of the standard hexagonal ones[36,37]. This adaptability

171 reflects a sophisticated combination of stigmergy and behavioral flexibility, where bees

172 respond dynamically to the challenges presented by their construction environment[36,37]. In any

173 case, our findings indicate no clear superiority of either architectural style, given that neither

174 significantly impacted cell construction rates (Figure S4). This absence of a distinct advantage

175 may explain the coexistence of both architectural styles in *S. depilis*, despite the exclusive

176 adoption of the helicoidal style in some other stingless bee species[12,14,29].

177 Another important outstanding question is if the persistence of distinct nest architectures in our

178 system could also involve more complex forms of social learning, which some authors take as

179 a defining characteristic of behavioral or cultural transmission[6,38,39]. Indeed, Chittka & Rossi[25]

180 suggested that stingless bees might to some extent be able to copy how to build their comb

181 merely by observing and being exposed to the existing comb structure, which would be akin to

182 an indirect form of social learning known as product learning[40]. At present, we cannot exclude

183 that the stigmergy we describe also involves such a learning process and is not just based on

184 innate responses, but conclusive evidence to support this theory is currently lacking.

185 Personally, we believe it is more likely that the stigmergic building rules are largely innate, and

186 that the same set of building rules produce different nest architectures depending on the initial

187 comb substrate, or that particular innate building rules are conditionally expressed in function

188 of the existing architecture.

189 Testing whether or not the inheritance of alternative nest architecture is purely innate remains

190 a task for future work and would require extensive and complex experiments. Establishing the

191 involvement of social learning would entail showing that prior exposure to a specific comb

192 structure affects the construction approach in subsequent generations, following swarming

193 events. Suggestive evidence for this has been collected in the honeybee, where colonies

194 maintain their original comb building orientation after swarming[41]. Nevertheless, as this study

did not use a cross-fostering setup, it could not preclude that the building style persisted merely as a result of varying genetic predispositions[41]. In addition, definite conclusions for our system might be precluded by the fact that colonies presumably have a propensity to revert back to parallel building when placed in an empty hive without any comb substrate.

In conclusion, our findings provide a compelling case for the role of stigmergy and environmental feedback in the transmission of nest-building traditions in stingless bees. This mechanism facilitates the persistence of distinct architectural styles within colonies, thereby producing behavioral traditions that persist across the lifespan of individual bees, even in the absence of any evidence for learning or advanced cognitive processing. Hence, our study strengthens the case that animal traditions and the non-genetic transmission of behavior can be based on cognitively simple processes[27,28], such as via stigmergy-mediated environmental feedback. Future research should aim to dissect the precise nature of these stigmergic interactions further and explore whether beyond innate responses, there might also be a layer of learning that influences these behaviours[25]. These investigations could shed light on the continuum between innate building rules and the potential for learning in shaping the cultural and behavioral landscapes of non-human societies. Our study not only advances our understanding of stingless bee behavior but also contributes to the broader discussion on the mechanisms of behavioral transmission and tradition maintenance in animal societies.

Author contributions

R.C.O. and T.W. conceived and supervised the study. V.D.P, C.M. and R.C.O.: experimental design. V.D.P, C.M., M.G.B.F. and D.J.P.: behavioral experiments. T.W.: theoretical modelling. V.D.P., M.F., R.C.O., T.W. and H.M.F.: data analysis. V.D.P and H.M.F wrote the

225   first draft of the manuscript. All authors contributed to revising and proofreading and approved
226   of the final version before submission.

Declaration of interests

228   The authors declare no competing interests.

Figure 1. Cross-fostering experiment to study how intraspecific variation in nest architecture in the stingless bee _Scaptotrigona depilis_ is transmitted. Strikingly, workers in this species construct their brood combs either in a parallel arrangement (**A**) with a central support pillar from which the first cell of the comb is built (*) or in a helicoidal pattern (**B**), without any central pillar (+). To study the mechanism by which this variation in nest architecture is transmitted, we carried out a full factorial cross-fostering experiment (panels **C-F**), where we provided experienced workers (EW), deriving from colonies with either parallel (blue) or helicoidal building patterns (red), with a comb lattice structure that was either of the same type or the alternative type. The combs used as a template in the experiment contained late-stage genetically unrelated brood that was ready to emerge, to allow for interactions and potential social information exchange between experienced workers and naïve young workers (EW and YW).

243

Figure 2. Stigmergy, rather than genetics or prior experience, drives the inheritance of alternative nest architectures. Estimated changes in nest architecture over 7 weeks in our cross-fostering experiment ($n = 6$ replicates/treatment). When experienced workers (EW), with a history of building in either parallel or helicoidal styles, encountered the opposing comb structure, they immediately switched to building in the presented style (panels **C** and **D**). This swift change was likely driven by stigmergy, where the existing comb structure guided subsequent building. These results also clearly show that nest architecture was not determined by prior experience or genetic makeup. As the weeks progressed, most colonies eventually switched towards the parallel style (panels **A**-**D**), mirroring its dominance in the wild and the observed preferential switching to this building style. The presence of EWs from parallel-building colonies did not accelerate this shift (panels **B** and **D**), thereby implying that direct social learning did not significantly influence building patterns. The shaded areas denote 95% credible intervals from a Bayesian Gaussian process logistic regression model (see STAR Methods). For detailed results see Figures S2 & S3.

258

259

260

Figure 3. Stigmergy underlies the transition to helicoidal comb building. To investigate the role of stigmergy in the social transmission of helicoidal comb construction, we modified the top comb of colonies that were previously building in a parallel pattern by incising and tilting one side to simulate "screw dislocations", a theoretically identified initiator of helicoidal comb building[14] (**A,B**). With only the comb's lattice structure changed and all workers inexperienced in helicoidal building, a subsequent shift to this construction style would implicate stigmergy. Results confirmed this hypothesis: 43% of the manipulated colonies (9/21) transitioned to helicoidal building within one week (**c**, red line indicates initial incision, obscured by newly built helicoidal comb), which amounted to a monthly transition rate to helicoidal building of 75.0% [55.8-87.7] 95% CI ($n = 21$) compared to a mere 3.1% [1.5-6.3] 95% CI in the parallel-building 2022 controls ($n = 299$) (binomial GLM analysis, odds ratio to switch over one month: 95.1 [30.3-299.2] 95% CI, z ratio = 7.79, $p < 1E-14$).

STAR Methods

RESOURCE AVAILABILITY

Lead contact

Further information and requests for resources should be directed to and will be fulfilled by the lead contact, Viviana Di Pietro (viviana.dipietro@kuleuven.be).

280 *Materials availability*

281 This study did not generate new unique reagents.

282 *Data and code availability*

283 All datasets used for analysis in this study have been deposited at Mendeley Data
284 (10.17632/bhjp3m2sbp.1) and will be publicly available as of the date of publication.
285 Accession numbers are listed in the key resources table. For review the data can be downloaded
286 through   this   link   provided   by   Mendeley   Data:
287 https://data.mendeley.com/preview/bhjp3m2sbp?a=cd4b4d79-ba16-4248-8754-1af2f5eda915

288 All original code has been deposited at Mendeley Data and is publicly available as of the date
289 of publication. DOI is listed in the key resources table.

290 Any additional information required to reanalyze the data reported in this paper is available
291 from the lead contact upon request.

292 **EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND STUDY PARTICIPANT DETAILS**
293 Stingless bees, a group of more than 500 highly eusocial bees in the tribe of the Meliponini,
294 display an astounding diversity in terms of diet, behaviour and nest architecture, not only
295 between but also within species[29,42,43]. Unlike honeybees, which construct vertical parallel wax
296 combs and use them both for food storage and brood rearing[44], the nest building of stingless
297 bees is more complex and diverse[42]. They use a range of building materials, including soil
298 particles, resin, plant fibres, and even excrement[29,42,45,46] with food pots and brood combs being
299 spatially separated[42]. Nest architecture can vary both across and within species, with brood
300 cells being arranged either in horizontal combs, vertical combs, clustered cells or some
301 intermediates between these forms[29]. Our focus in this study is on *Scaptotrigona depilis*, a
302 Neotropical stingless bees and one of 10 species that are known to show large bimodal
303 intraspecific variation in nest architecture[29]. The species constructs nests with combs consisting
304 either of flat, stacked parallel combs, supported by a central pillar, or builds combs arranged in
305 a helicoidal configuration, in which case there is no central support pillar. Both forms of comb
306 can coexist within the same colony simultaneosly[47], suggesting that minor changes in building
307 behaviour can cause a switch between both configurations[14,48] and the switch from one
308 configuration to the other can occur at any stage during building. The precise trigger for such
309 transitions remains unknown. The colonies used for this study were kept at Embrapa Meio

310   Ambiente in Jaguariúna, São Paulo, Brazil. These colonies were housed in identical wooden

311   boxes (19 x 19 x 16 cm) and the bees were allowed to forage freely in their natural environment.

312

313   **METHOD DETAILS**

314   *Observational data collection*

315   To determine the frequency of helicoidal and parallel comb building in the stingless bee

316   *Scaptotrigona depilis* and determine the rate of switching between both types within the same

317   colony, we recorded the nest architecture of 413 colonies at one month intervals, in January-

318   February 2022 ($n = 241$), and August-September 2023 ($n = 172$). Hive entrance orientation and

319   position in the bee yard (placed individually on a stand or placed on the upper or lower shelf

320   under a shelter) were noted to evaluate environmental influences on nest architecture.

321   *Cross-fostering experiment*

322   Our factorial cross-fostering experiment involved four groups with six colonies each: two

323   control groups with congruent comb structures and worker backgrounds, and two treatment

324   groups with mismatched comb structures and worker backgrounds (Figure 1). Standardized

325   hives (19 x 19 x 16 cm) were populated with three to four layers of brood combs from which

326   bees where ready to emerge, the original mother queen and approximately 600 genetically

327   unrelated bees of varying ages, from the youngest to foragers, of a given nest architectural

328   background. After a one-week acclimation period during which colonies were kept closed and

329   where they were provided with wax, pollen and honey, we tracked nest architecture weekly for

330   seven weeks, in a blinded manner, between February and March 2022.

331   *Stigmergy experiment and hive inclination effect*

332   To investigate the role of stigmergy in the social transmission of helicoidal comb building, we

333   experimentally manipulated small newly built brood comb layers (diameter ca. 5 cm) of 21

334   parallel-building colonies by making an incision and tilting up one side to mimic "screw

335   dislocations", which theoretically have been posited to initiate helicoidal comb building[14]

336   (Figure 3). After seven days, we recorded the nest architecture to check if helicoidal comb

337   building had stably persisted.

338   In a similar fashion, we examined whether inclination had any impact on nest configuration by

339   selecting 10 colonies that were building in parallel and tilting them at an angle of 20 degrees.

340   Following a two-week interval, we examined these colonies to determine if any of them had

341   transitioned to helicoidal architecture.

Colony performance analysis

343 To test if nest architecture affected colony performance, six free-foraging observation hives

344 (three per nest architecture) of similar colony size were set up and videotaped to allow us to

345 measure and compare cell building rates. The brood combs were exposed by removing the

346 involucrum, and colony temperature was maintained with halogen lights. The number of newly

347 built cells over 5 subsequent days were measured from the video footage using ImageJ's "Cell

348 Counter" plugin[49]. Colony size was controlled for by using that same plugin to count the

349 average number of workers visible in 20 video frames collected at 30-second intervals for a

350 period of 10 minutes.

351

352 **QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

353 *Observational data collection*

354 Bayesian binomial credible intervals for the frequency of each nest architecture and the

355 monthly transition rates were estimated under a Jeffrey's prior using the *propCI* function from

356 the *prevalence* package[50] in R. We employed binomial generalized linear models (GLM) with

357 a logit link function to test for annual and environmental variations in architecture switching

358 rates, using the *glm* function in R and carried out two-sided Sidak posthoc comparisons with

359 the *emmeans* package[51] (Figure S1). To derive confidence intervals for the equilibrium

360 frequency of helicoidal types and the expected duration of architectural forms, we applied

361 parametric bootstrapping with one million replicates. All statistical analyses were performed

362 in R v. 4.2.2[52].

363 *Cross-fostering experiment*

364 We employed a Bayesian Gaussian process logistic regression model[53], fit using the *brms*

365 package[54], to analyses the change in nest architecture over time. This approach allowed us to

366 model time series data flexibly, accounting for potential autocorrelations and inter-colony

367 variability by including a random intercept for each colony. We assumed an exponentiated

368 quadratic covariance function to describe the covariance between two time points as a function

369 of the number of weeks that separates them. We selected weakly informative zero-centered

370 normal priors for intercepts and scales (with a *SD* of 3), and a moderately informative inverse

371 gamma prior (with a shape and scale of 5) for length scales. We ran four MCMC chains of

372 2,000 iterations each, of which the first 1,000 iterations were discarded as warmup.

373 Convergence diagnostics included inspection of traceplots and calculation of the Potential

374 Scale Reduction Factor (R-hat), which for all parameters was smaller than 1.01[55]. To visualize

375 the effects of time and treatment on the outcome type, we plotted the conditional temporal

376 trajectory of each treatment along with 95% equal-tailed credible intervals (Figure 2). We also

377 performed a prior sensitivity analysis to ascertain that our findings were robust against

378 alternative prior specifications (Figure S2). In addition, we visualized the posterior

379 distributions of the estimated fraction of parallel comb architecture for each treatment group at

380 each week using the *ggdist* package[56] (Figure S3). Posterior estimates were compared pairwise

381 among treatments and weeks.

382 *Stigmergy experiment and hive inclination effect*

383 A logit link binomial GLM was used to compare the rate of switching to helicoidal comb

384 building in manipulated colonies ($n = 21$) vs. in unmanipulated parallel-building control

385 colonies observed over the same time period (February 2022, $n = 299$). Differences in the

386 period over which switching was observed, i.e. one week versus one month, were adjusted by

387 including log(period) as a model offset. To facilitate comparison, switching rates were

388 expressed on a fixed per month basis.

389 A binomial GLM with logit link function was employed to compare the rate of transitioning to

390 helicoidal comb construction in tilted colonies ($n = 10$) with that in unmanipulated control

391 colonies that naturally built parallel combs during the same observation period (February 2022,

392 $n = 299$). Given that there was separation, this model was fitted using the *brglm2* package[57]

393 using a Jeffrey's prior. To account for differences in the observation period in the manipulated

394 vs. in the control colonies (two weeks versus one month), we made adjustments by including

395 log(period) as a model offset.

396 *Colony performance analysis*

397 The data were then analyzed using a Poisson GLMM with a log link function fitted using the

398 *lme4* package[58]. The model included time, nest architecture, and their interaction as fixed

399 effects, log(colony size) as a model offset and colony ID as a random intercept. Overdispersion

400 was addressed by incorporating an observational-level random effect. Two-sided Sidak post-

401 hoc pairwise comparisons and estimation of marginal means were performed with the *emmeans*

402 package[51].

403 **Supplemental Information figures and tables**

Figure S1. The frequency of the helicoidal nest architecture was consistent across time and space and not significantly affected by environmental factors. The frequency of the helicoidal nest architecture in *Scaptotrigona depilis* was not significantly affected by season & year (January-February 2022, $n = 241$ colonies, vs. August-September 2023, $n = 172$ colonies), hive entrance orientation (facing north, east, south or west) or position in the apiary (placed individually on a stand, or on the bottom or top shelf in the apiary) (main effects logistic regression, anova Type III likelihood-ratio tests, effect for year/season: $\chi^2_1 = 0.095$, $p = 0.76$, effect for hive entrance orientation: $\chi^2_3 = 2.65$, $p = 0.45$, effect for position in the apiary: $\chi^2_2 = 0.23$, $p = 0.89$). Plots show the expected marginal means and Sidak adjusted 95% confidence intervals, calculated using the *emmeans* package. As each colony was observed twice per year with a one month interval, we used prior observation weights of 0.5 in our logistic regression to avoid pseudoreplication.

417

Figure S2. Prior sensitivity analysis of nest architecture change over time in the cross-fostering experiment. Plots show the estimated percentage of colonies building parallel combs through time for the four treatment groups (n = 6 replicates per treatment combination, Figures 1 & 2) under five different prior specifications for a Gaussian process logistic regression fitted using *brms*, in which colony was included as a random intercept (n = 6 colony replicates per treatment combination, data were collected weekly). Full lines indicate posterior mean trajectories, while dashed lines and the shaded zones show 95% credible intervals. The regular prior specification (a Normal (0, 3) prior on the model intercept, an Inv-Gamma (5, 5) prior on the Gaussian process' length scale, a Normal (0, 3) prior on the Gaussian process' marginal scale and a Normal (0, 3) prior on the random intercepts' scale), used for the main analysis (Figure 2), is shown in blue. Results of an alternative model in which the Gaussian process' length scale is replaced by an Inv-Gamma (18.5, 10) prior, favoring slower temporal changes, is shown in red. Results of a model in which the Gaussian process' length scale is replaced by an Inv-Gamma (18.5, 5) prior, favoring faster temporal changes, is shown in green. A model in which wider Normal (0, 9) priors on the model intercept, the Gaussian process' marginal scale and the random intercepts' scale are used, is shown in orange. Finally, a model in which tighter Normal (0, 1) priors on the model intercept, the Gaussian process' marginal scale and the random intercepts' scale are used, is shown in purple. The prior sensitivity analysis reveals that alternative prior specifications do not affect the general patterns and qualitative conclusions presented in the main analysis, and only lead to minor changes in the width of the credible intervals.

Figure S3. Weekly estimates of nest architecture variation in transplant experiment. The figure presents the model's predicted probabilities of colonies building in the parallel pattern across different treatments plus their uncertainty at 1 to 7 weeks after the start of the experiment (points and line ranges show median posteriors plus 95% credible intervals, $n = 6$ replicates per treatment combination). Treatments show the combinations of the provided comb lattice template (parallel or helicoidal) and the origin of the experienced old workers (from colonies that previously built in the parallel or helicoidal arrangement), i.e. "par-par", "hel-par", "par-hel" or "hel-hel" (cf. Figures 1 & 2). The estimates are derived from a Bayesian Gaussian process logistic regression model, which incorporated random intercepts for individual bee colonies. The colors distinguish between treatments, with blue and red indicating the architecture of the provided comb lattice structure (parallel or helicoidal).

452

Figure S4. Mean cell building rates in colonies with parallel and helicoidal nest architectures. This figure illustrates the average number of new cells constructed per day over a period of 5 days in colonies kept in observation hives that were constructing their combs in either a parallel or a helicoidal arrangement ($n = 6$ colony replicates for each). The plotted estimates show marginal means and 95% confidence intervals derived from a Poisson generalized linear mixed model (GLMM), calculated using the *emmeans* package (for details see Table S1). No significant differences were found at any observation day, which shows that nest architecture did not significantly affect colony performance.

461

462

Table S1. Analysis of cell building rates in colonies with parallel and helicoidal nest architectures. (A) Model coefficients of a Poisson generalized linear mixed model (GLMM) in which we compared the number of new cells built per day, measured at 24-hour intervals for a period of five days in function of nest architecture ($n = 6$ colony replicates per type). The model accounts for fixed effects time (day of observation) and nest architecture plus their interaction, and included the natural logarithm of colony size as a model offset (average count of workers visible in 20 video frames collected at 30-second intervals for a period of 10 minutes). Colony ID was included as a random intercept and an observation-level random effect was included to take into account overdispersion. (B) Pairwise contrasts in daily cell building rates between the two nest architectures show no significant differences in building efficiency (ratio in the number of new cells built per day for colonies of average size) at any of the observation days. The table shows coefficients, standard errors (*SE*), lower and upper 95% confidence intervals (*LCL* and *UCL*), *z* values and *p* values (*NS* = not significant, i.e. $p > 0.05$).

(A) Model coefficients	term	coefficient	*SE*	*z* value	*p* value	
fixed effect	(Intercept)	-0.15	0.19	-0.80	0.42	
fixed effect	scale(time)	0.03	0.05	0.57	0.57	*NS*
fixed effect	nest_architecture1	-0.04	0.19	-0.23	0.82	*NS*
fixed effect	scale(time):nest_architecture1	-0.08	0.05	-1.54	0.12	*NS*
random intercept: observation	*SD*(Intercept)	0.19				
random intercept: colony ID	*SD*(Intercept)	0.46				
(B) Contrast (day)	**ratio**	*LCL*	*UCL*	*z* ratio	*p* value	
helicoidal / parallel (1)	0.95	0.43	2.09	-0.12	0.90	*NS*
helicoidal / parallel (2)	1.04	0.49	2.24	0.11	0.91	*NS*
helicoidal / parallel (3)	1.14	0.54	2.43	0.35	0.73	*NS*
helicoidal / parallel (4)	1.26	0.58	2.69	0.58	0.56	*NS*
helicoidal / parallel (5)	1.38	0.62	3.04	0.79	0.43	*NS*

References

1. van Schaik, C.P. (2010). Social learning and culture in animals. In Animal behaviour: Evolution and mechanisms, P. Kappeler, ed. (Springer), pp. 623-653.
2. Whiten, A., and Van Schaik, C.P. (2007). The evolution of animal 'cultures' and social intelligence. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. *362*, 603-620.
3. Basalla, G. (1988). The evolution of technology (Cambridge University Press).
4. Avital, E., and Jablonka, E. (2000). Animal traditions: Behavioural inheritance in evolution (Cambridge University Press).
5. Laland, K.N., and Galef, B.G. (2009). The question of animal culture (Harvard University Press).
6. Fragaszy, D., and Perry, S. (2003). The biology of traditions: models and evidence (Cambridge University Press).

491   7.   Whiten, A. (2017). Social learning and culture in child and chimpanzee. Annual Review
492   of Psychology *68*, 129-154.
493   8.   Whitehead, H., and Rendell, L. (2014). The cultural lives of whales and dolphins
494   (University of Chicago Press).
495   9.   Aplin, L.M., Farine, D.R., Morand-Ferron, J., Cockburn, A., Thornton, A., and Sheldon,
496   B.C. (2015). Experimentally induced innovations lead to persistent culture via
497   conformity in wild birds. Nature *518*, 538-541.
498   10.   Danchin, E., Nöbel, S., Pocheville, A., Dagaeff, A.-C., Demay, L., Alphand, M., Ranty-
499   Roby, S., Van Renssen, L., Monier, M., and Gazagne, E. (2018). Cultural flies:
500   Conformist social learning in fruitflies predicts long-lasting mate-choice traditions.
501   Science *362*, 1025-1030.
502   11.   Bonabeau, E., Dorigo, M., and Theraulaz, G. (1999). Swarm intelligence: from natural
503   to artificial systems (Oxford university press).
504   12.   Brito, R.M., Schaerf, T.M., Myerscough, M.R., Heard, T.A., and Oldroyd, B.P. (2012).
505   Brood comb construction by the stingless bees *Tetragonula hockingsi* and *Tetragonula*
506   *carbonaria*. Swarm Intelligence *6*, 151-176. 10.1007/s11721-012-0068-1.
507   13.   Camazine, S., Deneubourg, J.-L., Franks, N.R., Sneyd, J., Theraula, G., and
508   Bonabeau, E. (2020). Self-organization in biological systems (Princeton university
509   press). 10.1515/9780691212920.
510   14.   Cardoso, S.S., Cartwright, J.H., Checa, A.G., Escribano, B., Osuna-Mascaró, A.J., and
511   Sainz-Díaz, C.I. (2020). The bee *Tetragonula* builds its comb like a crystal. Journal of
512   the Royal Society Interface *17*, 20200187.
513   15.   Theraulaz, G., and Bonabeau, E. (1995). Coordination in distributed building. Science
514   *269*, 686-688. 10.1126/science.269.5224.686.
515   16.   Theraulaz, G., and Bonabeau, E. (1999). A brief history of stigmergy. Artificial life *5*,
516   97-116. 10.1162/106454699568700.
517   17.   Khuong, A., Gautrais, J., Perna, A., Sbaï, C., Combe, M., Kuntz, P., Jost, C., and
518   Theraulaz, G. (2016). Stigmergic construction and topochemical information shape ant
519   nest architecture. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences *113*, 1303-1308.
520   18.   Laland, K.N., and O'brien, M.J. (2011). Cultural niche construction: An introduction.
521   Biological Theory *6*, 191-202.
522   19.   Laland, K.N., and Feldman, M.W. (2003). Niche construction: The neglected process
523   in evolution (Princeton University Press).
524   20.   Lewontin, R.C. (2000). The triple helix: Gene, organism, and environment (Harvard
525   University Press).
526   21.   Henrich, J. (2016). The secret of our success: How culture is driving human evolution,
527   domesticating our species, and making us smarter (princeton University press).
528   22.   Whiten, A., Ayala, F.J., Feldman, M.W., and Laland, K.N. (2017). The extension of
529   biology through culture. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences *114*, 7775-
530   7781.
531   23.   Krützen, M., Mann, J., Heithaus, M.R., Connor, R.C., Bejder, L., and Sherwin, W.B.
532   (2005). Cultural transmission of tool use in bottlenose dolphins. Proceedings of the
533   National Academy of Sciences *102*, 8939-8943.
534   24.   McComb, K., Moss, C., Durant, S.M., Baker, L., and Sayialel, S. (2001). Matriarchs as
535   repositories of social knowledge in African elephants. Science *292*, 491-494.
536   25.   Chittka, L., and Rossi, N. (2022). Social cognition in insects. Trends in Cognitive
537   Science *26*, 578-592. 10.1016/j.tics.2022.04.001.
538   26.   Leadbeater, E., and Chittka, L. (2007). Social learning in insects—from miniature
539   brains to consensus building. Curr. Biol. *17*, R703-R713.
540   27.   Donaldson, Z.R., and Grether, G.F. (2007). Tradition without social learning: scent-
541   mark-based communal roost formation in a Neotropical harvestman (Prionostemma
542   sp.). Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol. *61*, 801-809.
543   28.   Street, S.E., and Laland, K.N. (2016). Social learning, intelligence, and brain evolution.
544   The Wiley Handbook of Evolutionary Neuroscience, 495-513.

545 29. Grüter, C. (2020). Stingless Bees: Their Behaviour, Ecology and Evolution (Springer
546   Charm). 10.1007/978-3-030-60090-7.
547 30. Engels, W., Rosenkranz, P., and Engels, E. (1995). Thermoregulation in the nest of
548   the Neotropical stingless bee *Scaptotrigona postica* and a hypothesis on the evolution
549   of temperature homeostasis in highly eusocial bees. Studies on Neotropical Fauna and
550   Environment *30*, 193-205.
551 31. Fletcher, D., and Crewe, R. (1981). Nest structure and thermoregulation in the
552   stingless bee *Trigona* (*Plebeina*) *denoiti* Vachal (Hymenoptera: Apidae). Journal of the
553   Entomological Society of Southern Africa *44*, 183-196.
554 32. Linksvayer, T.A., Busch, J.W., and Smith, C.R. (2013). Social supergenes of
555   superorganisms: do supergenes play important roles in social evolution? Bioessays
556   *35*, 683-689. 10.1002/bies.201300038.
557 33. Schwander, T., Libbrecht, R., and Keller, L. (2014). Supergenes and complex
558   phenotypes. Curr. Biol. *24*, R288-294. 10.1016/j.cub.2014.01.056.
559 34. Krishna, S., Gopinath, A., and Bhattacharjee, S.M. (2022). Ordering and topological
560   defects in social wasps' nests. Scientific Reports *12*, 12901.
561 35. Sen, R., Malhotra, K., Gupta, M., Kaur, R., Bawa, D., Duhan, M., Sandhi, S., Songara,
562   P., Nain, D., and Raychoudhury, R. (2022). Coping with the 'Indian summer': unique
563   nesting cycle and nest architecture of the paper wasp, *Polistes wattii*. The Science of
564   Nature *109*, 31.
565 36. Gallo, V., and Chittka, L. (2021). Stigmergy versus behavioral flexibility and planning
566   in honeybee comb construction. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences
567   *118*, e2111310118.
568 37. Smith, M.L., Napp, N., and Petersen, K.H. (2021). Imperfect comb construction reveals
569   the architectural abilities of honeybees. Proceedings of the National Academy of
570   Sciences *118*, e2103605118.
571 38. Galef, B.G. (2012). Social learning and traditions in animals: evidence, definitions, and
572   relationship to human culture. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science *3*,
573   581-592.
574 39. Hoppitt, W., and Laland, K.N. (2013). Social learning: an introduction to mechanisms,
575   methods, and models (Princeton University Press).
576 40. Guillo, D., and Claidière, N. (2020). Do guide dogs have culture? The case of indirect
577   social learning. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications *7*, 1-9.
578 41. De Jong, D. (1982). Orientation of comb building by honeybees. Journal of
579   comparative physiology *147*, 495-501.
580 42. Roubik, D.W. (2006). Stingless bee nesting biology. Apidologie *37*, 124-143.
581 43. Michener, C.D. (1974). The social behavior of the bees: a comparative study (Belknap
582   Press of Harvard University Press).
583 44. Camazine, S. (1991). Self-organizing pattern formation on the combs of honey bee
584   colonies. Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol. *28*, 61-76.
585 45. Shanahan, M., and Spivak, M. (2021). Resin use by stingless bees: A review. Insects
586   *12*, 719.
587 46. Rasmussen, C., and Camargo, J.M.F. (2008). A molecular phylogeny and the evolution
588   of nest architecture and behavior in *Trigona* s.s. (Hymenoptera: Apidae: Meliponini).
589   Apidologie *39*, 102-118. 10.1051/apido:2007051.
590 47. Schwarz, H.F. (1948). Stingless bees (Meliponinae) of the western hemisphere.
591   Bulletin American Museum Natural History *90*, 1-546.
592 48. Oldroyd, B.P., and Pratt, S.C. (2015). Comb architecture of the eusocial bees arises
593   from simple rules used during cell building. In Adv. Insect Physiol., (Elsevier), pp. 101-
594   121. 10.1016/bs.aiip.2015.06.001.
595 49. Schneider, C.A., Rasband, W.S., and Eliceiri, K.W. (2012). NIH Image to ImageJ: 25
596   years of image analysis. Nat. Methods *9*, 671-675.
597 50. Devleesschauwer, B., Torgerson, P.R., Charlier, J., Levecke, B., Praet, N., Dorny, P.,
598   Berkvens, D., and Speybroeck, N. (2013). Package 'prevalence'.
599 51. Lenth, R. (2023). emmeans: Estimated marginal means, aka Least-Squares Means.

600 52. R Development Core Team (2021). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical
601 Computing (R Foundation for Statistical Computing).
602 53. Rasmussen, C.E., and Williams, C.K. (2006). Gaussian processes for machine
603 learning (Springer).
604 54. Bürkner, P.-C. (2017). brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan.
605 Journal of statistical software *80*, 1-28.
606 55. Vehtari, A., Gelman, A., Simpson, D., Carpenter, B., and Bürkner, P.-C. (2021). Rank-
607 normalization, folding, and localization: An improved Rˆfor assessing convergence of
608 MCMC (with discussion). Bayesian analysis *16*, 667-718.
609 56. Kay, M. (2023). ggdist: Visualizations of Distributions and Uncertainty.
610 57. Kosmidis, I. (2020). brglm2: Bias reduction in generalized linear models.
611 58. Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., and Walker, S. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects
612 Models Using lme4. Journal of Statistical Software *67*, 1-48. 10.18637/jss.v067.i01.

613