The effect of summer temperature on the distribution of *Ceramica pisi* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in Iceland
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**ABSTRACT**

The distribution of *Ceramica pisi* has been expanding in Iceland after 1990, concurrent with a recent rise in mean annual temperature. A previous study showed that the winter survival of *C. pisi* is primarily related to pupal mass. We monitored the development of *C. pisi* larvae over cool, mild, and warm summers in southern Iceland and calculated the total mass-related survival of *C. pisi* larvae/pupae through pupation and winter. A significant positive relationship was found between a) summer growing degree days and the proportion of larvae that reached critical mass for winter survival, and b) larval mass and likelihood of pupation. We conclude that increased summer temperature is the primary cause of the distribution range shift of *C. pisi* in Iceland, and this has facilitated increased population density of the species, in combination with increased availability of food resources due to host shift over to Nootka lupin.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Climate change is expected to be a significant driver in northward range shifts in species distribution in the northern hemisphere (Parmesan et al. 1999). Insects can respond rapidly to changes in temperature (Ayers & Lombardero 2000, Logan et al. 2003), which can affect their distribution range, development rate, survival rate, and the length of growing season (Parmesan et al. 1999, Bale et al. 2002, Crozier 2004, Pureswaran et al. 2018). Low winter temperatures often limit the northward distribution of insects, especially for species that are active during cold periods (Ungerer et al. 1999, Sinclair et al. 2003, Battisti et al. 2005). However, cold-hardy insect species are more likely to benefit from longer and warmer
summers during their larval development, rather than milder winters, as they often overwinter in the diapause stage (Bale & Hayward 2010).

Increasing temperature in low-temperature climates generally increases the speed of larval development (Bale 2002). The rate of development has often been shown to be connected to the accumulation of heat, frequently called growing degree days (GDD), rather than chronological time (Zalom & Wilson 1982, Cayton et al. 2015). The GDD metric is widely used to predict phenological events in the life history of plants and insects (Herms 2004) and has been shown to perform significantly better than date in predicting the emergence of Lepidoptera species (Cayton et al. 2015). Using GDD has also been an effective way to predict insect response to climate change, for example that of butterfly species (Hodgson et al. 2011, Cayton et al. 2015).

*Ceramica pisi* Linnaeus. (Lepidoptera, Noctuidae) is a native species in Iceland. It occurs throughout northern Scandinavia, south to the Mediterranean Sea, and east to Japan (Wolff 1971). In Iceland *C. pisi* overwinters as pupae. The adults start to emerge in early May. Egg laying is primarily in June. Larvae emerge from late June until late July and pupate in late August to early September (Ólafsson 2009, Hrafnkelsdóttir & Oddsdóttir 2010, Hrafnkelsdóttir et al. 2012). Before 1990, its main distribution area in Iceland was the lowlands of the southern part of the country (Figure 1; Wolff 1971, Ólafsson & Björnsson 1997), which coincides with the area with the highest degree-day summation for Iceland during 1961-1990 (Figure 1; Björnsson et al. 2007). The mean temperature in Iceland has increased by 0.47°C per decade during the period 1980-2015 (Björnsson et al. 2018). Since 1990, the distribution range of *C. pisi* has been expanding north, primarily in the lowlands of western Iceland, but a minor expansion has also been observed in southeast Iceland (Figure 1; Hrafnkelsdóttir 2020). This coincides with the recent increase in mean annual temperature since 1990, which has been most pronounced in western Iceland (Björnsson et al. 2018). The first recorded outbreak of *C. pisi* in Iceland was in 1991 on *Lupinus nootkatensis* in Skaftafell,

![Figure 1. GDD map (threshold value 5°C) for the period of 1961-1990 (redrawn from Björnsson et al., 2007) and distribution of *Ceramica pisi* in Iceland before 1990 (triangles) and new records during 2009-2018 (squares) (Hrafnkelsdóttir, 2020). Dark grey area <500 GDD, light grey 500-600 GDD white 600-800 GDD.](image-url)
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Southeast Iceland (Sigurðsson et al. 2003). Subsequently, many extensive outbreaks have occurred on lupin as well as young tree plantations in South Iceland (Sigurðsson et al., 2003, Halldórsson et al. 2013).

The larvae of *C. pisi* are polyphagous, but species of the Fabaceae genus are known to be favored (Cindea 1979). Wolff (1971) reviewed the distribution and biology of Lepidoptera in Iceland, based on earlier reports and his own findings. He listed *Comarum palustre*, *Rhinanthus minor*, *Parnassia palustris* and *Rumex* sp. as host plants of *C. pisi*. More recently Ölafsson & Björnsson (1997) and Sigurðsson et al. (2003) added to the host plant list *Juncus arcticus*, *Lathyrus maritimus*, *Lupinus nootkatensis*, *Salix* spp., *Betula pubescens*, *Populus trichocarpa*, *Pinus contorta*, *Picea sitchensis*, and *P. engelmannii*. Presently, *C. pisi* in Iceland is primarily found on *L. nootkatensis*, which was first introduced in 1885 as an ornamental plant and again in 1945 for land reclamation (Schierbeck 1886, Bjarnason 1957). It invades native ecosystems readily and is considered an invasive species in Iceland (Magnússon 2010). Presently it covers around 300 km² (Guðjohnsen & Magnússon 2019).

The causes of the ongoing changes in the distribution of *C. pisi* in Iceland are not known. Keena and Moore (2010) found that temperature had a clear effect on larval development, the likelihood of pupation, and the potential spatial distribution of *Anoplophora glabripennis* (Coleoptera: Cerambycidae) in the United States. Studies have shown that insect size can be important for winter survival (Hokkanen 1993, Liu et al. 2007) and Hrafnkelsdóttir et al. (2019) found that winter survival of *C. pisi* pupae in Iceland was positively correlated with pupal mass, but not related to subzero temperatures.

In the present study, we examined the hypotheses that the recent increase in summer temperature caused the observed changes in the distribution of *C. pisi* in Iceland and facilitated changes in the population dynamics of the species. We monitored the development of *C. pisi* larvae at three locations at different times (dates and years) and compared the proportion of larvae that had reached the critical mass for winter survival to summer GDD. We also collected larvae and observed them undergoing pupation under outdoor conditions to establish the relationship between larval mass and the likelihood of pupation, as well as the ratio between larval and pupal mass. Our hypotheses were: (a) that increased summer temperatures after 1990 increased the likelihood of larvae reaching the critical mass for successful pupation and winter survival, (b) the likelihood of successful pupation is positively correlated to larval mass, and (c) total mass-related survival through pupation and winter is positively related to the GDD during the egg and larval development in the preceding summer.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

*Study sites and monitoring of larval development*

Larval development was monitored by sampling larvae from three separate *L. nootkatensis* fields (sampling locations) in southern Iceland with different elevations and distances from the sea. The sampling was conducted over four summers of different temperature profiles. The average June-August temperature for each sampling year and sampling location is shown in Table 1. Temperature data for sampling locations were gathered from the nearest weather station (The Icelandic Meteorological Office, personal communication). The geographical coordinates, the elevation of each sampling location and the nearest weather station are shown in Table 2. The placement of sampling locations is shown in Figure 2.

**Table 1. Mean June-August temperature during larval sampling years (NS=no sampling).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geitasandur</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Þjórsárdalur</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ölfus</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(The Icelandic Meteorological Office, personal communication).*
Sampling dates and years varied between locations, as shown in Table 3. Four sampling sites were randomly selected at each sampling location. The distance between sampling sites ranged between 100 and 200 m. Five sampling plots (0.5 x 0.5 m) were selected within each sampling site, by randomly searching for plants infested by *C. pisi* larvae and by sampling the first encountered *C. pisi* infested plants. The distance between sampling plots therefore varied between sites and sampling times, but never less than 5-10 m. This approach was used as earlier observations had shown that the distribution of larvae is quite patchy. All lupin stems within each plot were cut at the base and carefully placed into a large plastic box in batches of ca. five stems. Only plots with less than 75% leaf defoliation were sampled to avoid the effects of food shortage on larval growth. Each batch of stems was then shaken/beaten thoroughly into the box until all larvae had detached from the vegetation and fallen into the box. The larvae were then put into small plastic containers with small holes for ventilation and labeled with the number of sampling site and plot.

**Larval measurements**

Larvae collected during regular sampling were kept under outdoor conditions in the shade and deprived of food for ca. 20 h to ensure that all gut content had emptied. After 20 h, larvae were weighed individually on a scale (AA-160; Denver Instrument Company, Arvada, Colorado) to the nearest 0.0001 g. The proportion of larvae that had reached the critical mass for winter survival was calculated for each sampling time and location. The critical mass for winter survival was set at 300 mg, as Hrafnkelsdottir et

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampling location/weather station</th>
<th>Sampling location</th>
<th>Nearest weather station</th>
<th>Altitude (m.a.s.l)</th>
<th>Dist. (km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geitasandur/Hella</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 63.809258</td>
<td>W -20.209994</td>
<td></td>
<td>N 63.8257</td>
<td>W -20.3654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Þjórsárdalur/Mörk á Landi</td>
<td>N 64.098077</td>
<td>W -19.955172</td>
<td>N 64.0293</td>
<td>W -20.0189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ölfus/Eyrarbakki</td>
<td>N 63.892431</td>
<td>W -21.305491</td>
<td>N 63.8692</td>
<td>W -21.1602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Overview of sampling dates of larvae at all three sampling sites. NS = no sampling.
al. (2019) showed that 5% winter survival of *C. pisi* pupae was at 157 mg, which is equivalent to 294 mg larval mass, according to the current pupation study.

**Pupation study**

For the pupation study, *C. pisi* larvae were collected in Ölfus on 31 August 2016 and kept in the shade under outdoor conditions. The larvae were deprived of food for 20h before weighing, then put into 13 mL (40 × 23 mm) plastic cups (1 larva per cup) and left for pupation under outdoor conditions. Pupation was monitored until 11 October 2016, when all pupae were weighed. Larvae that did not pupate were counted. This information was used to establish: (a) the ratio between larval and pupal mass, and (b) the pupation mass-related survival. Based on this, the likelihood of mass-related pupation survival for all larvae across each sampling location, year and sampling time was calculated. After transforming larval mass to pupal mass, the likelihood of mass-related winter survival for all potential pupae across all sampling locations, years, and sampling dates was calculated, based on Hrafnkelsdottir et al. (2019). Total mass-related survival was then calculated as pupation survival x winter survival.

*C. pisi* larvae were also sorted into different mass groups of 100mg intervals to analyze the minimum mass they must gain to be able to finish pupation.

**Calculation of Growing Degree Days**

Daily maximum and minimum temperature data from weather stations nearest to the larval sampling locations were obtained from the Icelandic Meteorological Office (personal communication). GDD for each day was calculated with the formula given below (Eq. A) (Herms 2004, Murray 2008) and summarized from 1 June to the relevant larval sampling date.

\[
\text{GDD} = \left( \frac{T_{\text{MAX}} + T_{\text{MIN}}}{2} \right) - T_{\text{BASE}}
\]

where \(T_{\text{MAX}}\) is the daily maximum temperature, \(T_{\text{MIN}}\) is the daily minimum temperature, and \(T_{\text{BASE}}\) is the base temperature for the lower development threshold of the larvae. As the lower development threshold is not known for *C. pisi*, 5°C was chosen as the base temperature, since it reflects the principal threshold for butterfly larvae growth (Hill et al., 2003) and is often used as the minimum threshold for insect development in northern Europe (Luoto et al. 2006, Ekholm et al. 2019). GDD from the beginning of April, May, June, and July until the relevant sampling date was calculated, as those months coincide with different stages of the life cycle of *C. pisi*. The GDD formula was applied for every day of the season that was tested and accumulated daily. The best fit between larval development and GDD was found to be cumulative GDD from 1 June, which coincides with the beginning of egg laying (Ólafsson 2009).

**Statistical analysis**

Data were analyzed with SAS enterprise guide (Davis 2007) and Sigmaplot (Systat Software Inc 2008). The correlation between sampling dates and relative larval catches was examined with polynomial quadratic regression analysis. Linear regression analysis was used to examine the relationship between GDD and larval mass, the relationship between larval and pupal mass, and the relationship between GDD and total (pupation x winter) survival. The effect of larval size on pupation survival and total survival was examined with a nonlinear regression analysis. The Kruskal-Wallis test was used to examine differences in larval mass between sites and years.

**RESULTS**

**Larval sampling**

A total of 5084 larvae was collected and weighed over the sampling period, 182 on average at each sampling time. The number of larvae varied greatly across sampling sites, dates, and years (Figure 3, Table 3). The number of larvae ranged between 27 and 354 in Geitasandur, 57 and 237 in Þjórsárdalur, and 29 and 553 in Ölfus.

The analysis showed a significant polynomial (quadratic model) regression
Figure 3. The relationship between relative catches of *Ceramica pisi* larvae (catches/average catches per sampling location per year) on different sampling dates at the three sampling locations: ● Geitasandur (2014, 2016-2018), ■ Þjórsárdalur (2017), and ▲ Ölfus (2014, 2016). Colors represent different sampling years: 2014 (dark grey), 2016 (white), 2017 (black) and 2018 (light grey).

Figure 4. The relationship between GDD and the proportion of *Ceramica pisi* larvae that had reached ≥ 300 mg larval mass for each sampling location, across all years and sampling dates. Sampling locations were: ● Geitasandur (2014, 2016-2018), ■ Þjórsárdalur (2017), and ▲ Ölfus (2014, 2016). Colors represent different sampling years: 2014 (dark grey), 2016 (white), 2017 (black) and 2018 (light grey).
between relative catches and sampling dates across all sampling years and locations (d.f.=27; P = 0.002) (Figure 3). The \( r^2 \) of the relationship was 0.4044, indicating that up to 41% of the variability in relative catches could be explained by sample date. In Geitasandur and Ölfus, a marked decrease in the number of caught larvae was observed after the middle of August, which most likely indicated the beginning of pupation. In Þjórsárdalur in 2017 a general decrease in the number of larvae from the beginning of sampling was observed (Figure 3).

**Larval measurements**
The average mass of larvae ranged from 49 to 533mg across all sampling locations, dates, and years. The larval mass ranged between 6 to 743mg in Geitasandur, 4 to 772mg in Þjórsárdalur and 7 to 833mg in Ölfus. The lowest single larval mass observed was 4mg at Þjórsárdalur on 9 August 2017, and the highest mass observed was 833mg in Ölfus on 14 August 2014.

**Summer GDD and larval growth**
In order to establish the effect of summer temperature on the proportion of larvae potentially ready to survive the following winter, we compared the proportion of larvae that had reached larval mass \( \geq 300 \) mg to June GDD across all sampling years and dates. A highly significant positive relation was found between GDD and the proportion of larvae that had reached larval mass \( \geq 300 \) mg in all sampling locations (P=0.001; Figure 4). The \( r^2 \) of the relationship was 0.81 (d.f.=71) in Geitasandur, 0.79 (d.f.=15) Þjórsárdalur and 0.63 (d.f.=31) in Ölfus, indicating that GDD explained up to 81%, 79% and 61% of the proportion of larvae with mass \( \geq 300 \) mg. At 470 GDD, which was the GDD summation in the beginning of September 2018, the proportion of larvae \( \geq 300 \) mg ranged between 34.2 – 41.7%, but was nearly 100% at 600 GDD, which was the GDD summation by the end of August in 2014 and 2016 (Table 4).

**Pupation study**
To establish the ratio between final larval mass and pupal mass for *C. pisi*, we compared the mass of larvae collected in Ölfus on 31 August 2016 to their pupal mass. The analysis showed a highly significant regression between larval and pupal mass across all sampled larvae (d.f.=5; P<0.001). The \( r^2 \) of the relationship was 0.682, indicating that up to 68% of the variability of pupal mass observed could be explained by larval mass.

Some larvae did not pupate but died or transformed into intermediates retaining larval characteristics. This was true of 100% of 100-300 mg larvae, 48% of 300-500 mg larvae, and 12% of the 500-700 mg larvae. A test using the same methodology, except that the larvae were set for pupation in batches of different mass intervals, gave similar results: 88% of <300mg larvae, 33% of 300-500mg larvae and 13 % of 500-700mg larvae did not pupate.

*C. pisi* larvae were sorted into different mass groups of 100mg intervals to analyze the minimum mass they must gain to be able to finish pupation. There was a significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampling location</th>
<th>Proportion of larvae ≥300 mg (%)</th>
<th>Ratio of larvae ≥300 mg between:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>470 GDD</td>
<td>560 GDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geitasandur</td>
<td>41,7</td>
<td>82,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ölfus</td>
<td>52,7</td>
<td>85,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Þjórsárdalur</td>
<td>34,2</td>
<td>61,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4. The proportion of larvae ≥300 mg (%) after a cool summer (470 GDD) as in 2018, mild summer (560 GDD) as in 2017, and warm summer (600 GDD) as in 2014 and 2016. Also shown is the ratio of larvae ≥300 mg, comparing mild summer vs cool summer, warm summer vs mild summer, and warm summer vs cool summer.*
correlation between the pupation rate of different mass groups and a sigmoid curve fitted to the pupation of different mass groups \((P = 0.005, r^2 = 0.93)(\text{Figure 5}).\)

The sigmoid model was:

\[
\text{Spupation} = \frac{S_{\text{max}}}{1 + \exp\left(\frac{x - \text{LT50}}{b}\right)}
\]

Where \(\text{Spupation}\) is larval pupation, \(x\) is the larval mass (mg), \(S_{\text{max}}\) (maximum size-related pupation) is 87.1 %, \(b\) (a constant) is 62 and LT50 (50% likelihood of pupation) is 383 mg.

The Sigmoid curve of pupation rate of different larval mass groups showed that the LT50 occurred at 383 mg larval mass, and that the larval mass-related pupation was as high as 95% at 650 mg but only 5% at 191 mg (Figure 5).

**Figure 5.** The relationship between pupation success and mass of *Ceramica pisi* larvae (collected on 31 August, 2016). Each point represents a 100-mg interval in larval mass. The line represents the fitted sigmoid pupation curve (Eqn B). Also shown are \(r^2\) adjusted and \(P\) values from the fitted sigmoid survival curve along with \(S_{\text{max}}\) (maximum size-related survival) and LT50 (50% likelihood of pupation related to mass). Vertical bars show the SE of larval mass. As collecting time was late in the growing season, no larvae collected were under 100 mg, so the black triangle does represent assumed pupation (%).

**Figure 6.** The relationship between GDD and total expected mass-related total survival of *Ceramica pisi* larvae/pupae (pupation survival * winter survival) for each sampling location, across all years and sampling dates. Sampling locations were: ● Geitasandur (2014, 2016-2018), ■ bjórsárdalur (2017), and ▲ Ölfus (2014, 2016). Colors represent different sampling years; 2014 (dark grey), 2016 (white), 2017 (black) and 2018 (light grey).
The Sigmoid model further predicted that other unexplained reasons accounted for 12.9% ($100 - S_{\text{max}}$) of non-pupation.

The analysis showed a highly significant regression between GDD and total mass-related survival across all sampling years and dates ($P<0.001$; Figure 6). The $r^2$ of the relationship was 0.65 (d.f. = 71) in 2014, 0.69 (d.f. = 15) in 2016, 0.67 (d.f. = 31) in 2017, indicating that up to 65%, 69% and 67% of the variability of survival could be explained by GDD from June 1 (Figure 6). At 470 GDD the total mass-related survival ranged between 8.1-18.9%, but between 30.6-37.6 at 600 GDD (Table 5).

A sigmoid curve was fitted to the total mortality of different mass groups ($P < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.99$) (Fig. 7) according to eq.B, where $S_{\text{total}}$ is the total expected mass related survival, $x$ is the larval mass (mg), $S_{\text{max}}$ (maximum total expected mass related survival) is 65.10%, $b$ (a constant) is 48 and LT50 (50% likelihood of pupation) is 553.42 mg.

### DISCUSSION

Earlier findings of Hrafnkelsdottir et al. (2019) showed that winter survival is strongly linked to pupal mass. Our results were linked to those findings to establish the total mass-related survival across pupation and overwintering. In the present study, we found a significant correlation between June GDD and the proportion of larvae that had reached the critical mass for winter survival, between larval mass and the likelihood of pupation, and between June GDD and total mass-related survival through pupation and winter. The proportion of larvae that had reached the critical mass for winter survival and total mass-related survival was found to be greatly increased after warm summers compared to cool summers (Table 4; Table 5). Increased summer temperature would
therefore be expected to facilitate the northward distribution of \textit{C. pisi}, especially in the northern part of West Iceland, where the warming after 1990 has been most intense (Figure 1).

Several studies show that the northern distribution of insects is limited by temperature (f.ex. Cannon 1998, Parmesan et al. 1999) and frequently by the thermal summation during the insects’ developing stage (Ayres & Scriber 1994, Bale et al. 2002). A northward spread of Lepidoptera species on birch has recently been observed in northern Scandinavia (Jepsen et al. 2013). The historical distribution of \textit{C. pisi} in Iceland was confined to areas with the highest GDD (Wolff 1971, Ölaflsson & Björnsson 1997, Björnsson et al. 2018), which indicates that the species is near its thermal range limits in Iceland. Its recent spread has been into areas where warming after 1990 has been greatest. This indicates strongly that the northward distribution of \textit{C. pisi} in Iceland is linked to the warming after 1990. It could be argued that the historical distribution of \textit{C. pisi} was limited by lack of suitable host plants outside its former range. However, as all host plants of \textit{C. pisi} reported by Wolff (1971) are native species common all over Iceland, especially in the lowlands (Kristinsson 2010), this is clearly not the case.

The average temperature in Iceland is expected to rise by 1.3–2.3°C by the middle of this century, compared to the period 1986–2005 (Björnsson et al. 2018). According to our results, this is likely to enhance the distribution and population density of \textit{C. pisi} in Iceland. Increased damage by \textit{C. pisi} in young tree plantations can therefore be expected, as well as increased pressure on \textit{Lupinus nootkatensis}, which might reduce its invasiveness. Hrafnkelsdottir et al. (2020) showed that three years of defoliation on the lupin can reduce seed production and thereby the potential spread of the plant. Svavarsdottir et al. (2016) showed that cutting in July during 2011-2015 had a significant negative effect on the density and cover of lupin. Repeated insect outbreaks may have similar effects.

Our study indicates strongly that the recent northward expansion and changes in the population dynamics of \textit{C. pisi} in Iceland have been driven by climate change, the latter concurrent and in combination with host shift over to the Nootka lupin. This may have a substantial effect on lupin ecosystems and pose a new threat to afforestation efforts in Iceland.
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