1-1-2017

Does cold activate the *Drosophila melanogaster* immune system?

Golnaz Salehipour-Shirazi

Laura V Ferguson

Brent J Sinclair

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/biologypub>

Part of the [Biology Commons](#)

Citation of this paper:

Salehipour-Shirazi, Golnaz; Ferguson, Laura V; and Sinclair, Brent J, "Does cold activate the *Drosophila melanogaster* immune system?" (2017). *Biology Publications*. 84.
<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/biologypub/84>

Does cold activate the *Drosophila melanogaster* immune system?

Golnaz Salehipour-shirazi*, Laura V. Ferguson*, Brent J. Sinclair†

Department of Biology, The University of Western Ontario, London, ON, Canada N6A 5B7

*Contributed equally

†Author for correspondence: bsincla7@uwo.ca

Department of Biology, University of Western Ontario, London, ON, Canada N6A 5B7. Phone:

1-519-661-2111x83138. Fax 1-519-661-3935

Abstract

Cold exposure appears to activate aspects of the insect immune system; however, the functional significance of the relationship between cold and immunity is unclear. Insect success at low temperatures is shaped in part by interactions with biotic stressors, such as pathogens, thus it is important to understand how and why immunity might be activated by cold. Here we explore which components of the immune system are activated, and whether those components differ among different kinds of cold exposure. We exposed *Drosophila melanogaster* to both acute (2h, -2°C) and sustained (10h, -0.5°C) cold, and measured potential (antimicrobial peptide expression, phenoloxidase activity, haemocyte counts) and realised (survival of fungal infection, wound-induced melanisation, bacterial clearance) immunity following recovery. Acute cold increased circulating haemocyte concentration and the expression of *Turandot-A* and *diptericin*, but elicited a short-term decrease in the clearance of gram-positive bacteria. Sustained cold increased the expression of *Turandot-A*, with no effect on other measures of potential or realised immunity. We show that measures of potential immunity were up-regulated by cold, whereas realised immunity was either unaffected or down-regulated. Thus, we hypothesize that cold-activation of potential immunity in *Drosophila* may be a compensatory mechanism to maintain stable immune function during or after low temperature exposure.

Key Words: thermal biology, immune system, trade-off, cross-talk, damage

1. Introduction

Understanding how the physiological responses by animals to multiple biotic and abiotic stressors are linked through cross-talk or cross-tolerance is key to understanding the multidimensional impacts of a changing climate (Kaunisto et al., 2016; Sinclair et al., 2013). For example, insects appear to increase immune activity after cold exposure (Marshall and Sinclair, 2011; Zhang et al., 2011), which could modify host-pathogen relationships with changing winters (Williams et al., 2015). However, it is unclear whether these putatively-linked responses to distinct stressors are non-adaptive by-products of a generalised stress response, or the result of a functional coadaptation reflecting a link between pathogens and cold (Sinclair et al., 2013).

There are several, non-mutually exclusive hypotheses to explain why cold exposure might increase immune activity in insects. Cold exposure may non-adaptively activate immunity through activation of pathways shared with the stress response (Sinclair et al., 2013); however, recovery from cold exposure is already energetically costly (MacMillan et al., 2012), and it should be selectively disadvantageous to increase the cost associated with cold exposure by unnecessarily increasing resistance to pathogens. Instead, cold-induced immune activity may be an adaptive response to immune stress associated with cold (Sinclair et al., 2013). Among adaptive responses, immune processes could be required for repair of damage from cold exposure, or the presence of cold-active pathogens may have selected for increased immune activity following exposure to low temperatures (Sinclair et al., 2013).

To begin to understand the functional significance of cold-induced immunity, we can explore the effects of cold exposure on multiple components of the immune system. Measures of

potential immunity (*sensu* Fedorka et al., 2007), such as gene expression, provide insight into affected pathways (e.g. Toll vs. IMD), and the potential for shared responses between the immune system and the stress response. Measures of realised immunity (*sensu* Fedorka et al., 2007) provide insight into whether or not the ability to fight or survive pathogen infection is affected by cold exposure, and thus whether immune activation may be a response to pathogen threat at low temperatures.

The physiological responses to cold differ among insects and kinds of cold exposure (Zachariassen, 1985). Specifically, brief exposure to intense cold (e.g. 2 h at -5 °C in *D. melanogaster*) is thought to cause cold shock injury, such as membrane phase transition (Drobnis et al., 1993) or initiation of apoptosis (Yi et al., 2007), while longer cold exposures appear to cause stress by disrupting ion and water balance (MacMillan et al., 2012). We can use these differences in the physiological response to different types of cold exposure to further explore the function of cold-induced up-regulation of immunity. For example, in *Drosophila melanogaster*, short, prolonged, and repeated cold exposures elicit unique transcriptomic profiles including of the expression of genes associated with immunity (Zhang et al., 2011), which suggests that the relationship between cold and immunity depends on the physiological response to a particular type of cold exposure. Therefore, if a suite of immune responses is specific to a particular type of cold exposure, we can begin to infer how this activity is linked to the physiological response to cold, and thus why immune activity might be activated.

To begin to understand why the immune system is linked to cold exposure, and what the consequences of this relationship may be, we quantified multiple components of both potential

and realised immunity (Fedorka et al., 2007) in *Drosophila melanogaster* following two cold exposures that differed in both duration and temperature, and which are likely to provoke different physiological responses to cold, and which have previously been shown to elicit upregulation of immune-related genes (Zhang et al., 2011): acute (2h at -2°C) and sustained (10h at -0.5°C). Overall, we aim to use cold-activation of insect immunity as a system in which to tease apart the links between responses to abiotic and biotic stressors, and highlight the importance of considering the physiological connections between different stressors in insects.

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Rearing and cold exposures

An outbred mass-reared population of wild-type *Drosophila melanogaster* collected in London and Niagara-on-the-Lake, ON, Canada, in 2008 (described by (Marshall and Sinclair, 2010) was reared on a banana-cornmeal-agar medium at 21.5°C, 60% RH, under 14L:10D. Before beginning the experiment, we reared flies for several generations on a medium containing tetracycline and methylparaben (to eliminate *Wolbachia* sp., confirmed with PCR) (Carrington et al., 2010); flies used in experiments were then reared for at least four generations on banana-cornmeal-agar medium without antibiotics or antifungals. We collected newly-eclosed virgin females under CO₂, and allowed them to recover for seven days to minimise the physiological effects of anaesthesia (Nilson et al., 2006). Flies were exposed to cold in groups of 10 in food vials (3-15 vials per experiment/exposure/treatment) in aluminium blocks cooled from refrigerated circulators (c.f. Nyamukondiwa et al., 2011); flies were in darkness during the cold exposure, thus cold exposures were performed during the hours in which flies would usually experience darkness. We exposed groups of flies to acute (-2°C, 2h) or sustained (-0.5°C, 10h)

cold in vials with food to maintain high humidity. Controls were handled identically to their corresponding cold-exposed group, but maintained at 21.5°C. After cold exposure, we returned flies to rearing conditions for 2-6h [depending on the immune response to be measured, and based on previous (Zhang et al., 2011) or preliminary experiments], during which time all flies recover, and then measured immune activity.

2.2 Potential immunity

To determine the effect of cold exposure on potential immunity, we measured circulating haemocyte concentration (CHC) and phenoloxidase activity (PO) in haemolymph samples, and mRNA abundance of immune-related genes (IMD pathway: *attacin*, *cecropin*, *dipteracin*; Toll pathway: *drosocin*, *drosomycin*; IMD and Toll: *defensin* and *metchnikowin*; Jak-STAT pathway: *Turandot-A* and *virus-induced RNA 1*). Statistical analyses were performed in SPSS. We used t-tests (CHC and mRNA abundance) or ANOVA (PO activity) to compare differences in potential immunity among treatments.

2.2.1 Circulating haemocyte counts

To estimate CHC, we collected haemolymph (n = 10 per treatment) following MacMillan and Hughson (2014), diluted haemolymph in anticoagulant buffer [0.55 % W/V cresyl violet, 0.5 % ethylene-diamine-tetraacetic acid in phosphate buffered saline (PBS)] and counted haemocytes in a Neubauer improved haemocytometer at 400× magnification.

2.2.2 PO activity

We collected haemolymph following MacMillan and Hughson (2014) and pooled haemolymph from 8-10 flies under oil, for a final volume of 0.1 μ L (n = 3-5 pooled samples per treatment). We diluted the haemolymph in 10 μ L of PBS, snap-froze the samples in liquid nitrogen, and stored them at -80°C until use. We measured PO activity spectrophotometrically using L-dihydroxyphenylalanine (L-DOPA; 4 mg/mL) as the substrate. We expressed phenoloxidase activity as change in absorbance at 492 nm /min / μ L, obtained during the linear portion of the reaction (Wilson et al., 2001).

2.2.3 Measurement of relative mRNA abundance with qPCR

To investigate the expression of genes associated with Toll, IMD, and JAK/STAT pathways, we quantified the expression of genes related to products or intermediate components of pathways by quantitative real-time polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) (Bing et al., 2012). For each cold exposure treatment, we snap-froze flies in liquid nitrogen 6 h following cold exposure (Zhang et al., 2011) and extracted and pooled RNA from 30 frozen flies per sample (n = 5 pooled samples per treatment) using Trizol Reagent. We dissolved the extracted RNA pellet in 60 μ L RNasefree water and determined the total RNA concentration and purity ratio at 260 and 280 nm absorbance using a NanoDrop 2000 spectrophotometer and associated software. Only samples with a 260/280 ratio of 1.98 or more were used. To remove DNA contaminants, we treated the RNA samples with DNase. We mixed one microgram RNA from each sample with 1 μ L of DNase I Amp Grade and 1 μ L of 10X DNase I Reaction Buffer. After incubation at room temperature for 15 min, we added 1 μ L of 25 mM EDTA incubated the samples at 65°C for 5 min to inactivate the DNase. We cooled the samples on ice before using them for cDNA synthesis. To synthesize cDNA, we added 2 μ L of oligodT, 4 μ L qScript Flex Reaction Mix (5 $\times$)

and 1 µl qScript Reverse Transcriptase to 1 µg RNA of each sample. We then treated the samples at 42 °C for 75 min and 85 °C for 5 min. To amplify the cDNA, we used SYBR Green Master Mix. To normalize the data obtained from the target genes, we used *Rpl-32* as a reference gene (Zaidman et al., 2011). To determine the efficiency of primers at different cDNA concentrations, we created standard curves of target genes and the reference gene using seven different concentrations of mixed cDNA samples (0, 4, 16, 64, 256, 1024 and 4096-fold dilution). We calculated threshold cycle (Ct) values using CFX Manager Software ver. 2.1 (Bio-Rad) and we calculated and normalised the expression ratio of target genes relative to controls. We standardised all values to *Rpl-32* as a housekeeping gene, and to controls using $\Delta\Delta C_t$ (Pfaffl, 2001).

2.3 Realised immunity

To examine the effect of cold exposure on realised immunity, we measured survival after topical application of the fungus *Metarhizium anisopliae* (Le Bourg et al., 2009), wound-induced melanisation, and the ability to clear gram-positive (*Bacillus subtilis*) and gram-negative (*Escherichia coli*) bacteria from the haemolymph (McKean and Nunney, 2001). Flies were briefly anaesthetized with CO₂ prior to all measures. Statistical analyses were performed in R (R Development Core Team, 2010). We used a linear mixed-effects model (fungal infections; “vial” as a covariate), a general linear model (wounding response) and a three-way ANOVA (bacterial clearance) to compare differences in realised immunity among treatments.

2.3.1 Wounding response

Immediately after cold exposure, we pierced flies on the dorsal surface using a sterilized No. 000 insect pin (Figure S1). We photographed the pierced area of ten flies from each treatment group at 6, 12, and 24h post-cold-exposure. We then quantified melanisation by measuring the mean gray value of the pierced area using Image J software. To compare piercing-induced melanisation between cold-treated and control flies, we recorded the gray value of the pierced area of treated and control flies at specific time points (0, 6, and 12 h and after cold exposure). Darker colors with lower gray values indicated more piercing-induced melanisation.

2.3.2 Fungal infection

We obtained the broadly entomopathogenic fungus *Metarhizium anisopliae* (strain 2575, USDA, Ithaca, NY, USA) from Dr. Michael Bidochka (Brock University, St. Catharine's, ON, Canada). *Metarhizium anisopliae* is commonly isolated from temperate soils and the overwintering habitats of insects (Bidochka et al., 1998), and we performed preliminary experiments to ensure that the fungus was lethal to flies at their rearing temperature of 21.5 °C. Following 6 h of recovery from cold exposure, we used the method of Le Bourg et al. (2009) for infecting flies by shaking them on an agar plate (30 s) with sporulating fungus. Non-infected controls of each group were shaken on a sterile plate. We returned groups of flies to vials (n = 8-10 per vial; 5-7 vials per treatment) at 21.5 °C and monitored survival every 24 h for 16 d.

2.3.3 Bacterial clearance

To compare the ability of control and cold-exposed flies to clear bacteria from the haemolymph, we injected flies (n = 4-9 per infection, per treatment) with streptomycin-resistant gram-positive (*B. subtilis*) and streptomycin-resistant gram-negative (*E. coli*) bacteria suspended in PBS,

following (McKean and Nunney, 2001), with some modifications. We selected flies haphazardly from each treatment group and injected 105nL ($\sim 1 \times 10^4$ CFU) into the thorax through a glass capillary needle attached to a hydraulic manual microinjector (Sutter Instrument, Novato, CA, USA) 2 h or 6 h post-cold-exposure. We homogenized whole flies in 90µL PBS 30s post-injection (to confirm the concentration of injection), or after 5h or 12h recovery at 21.5°C. We diluted and plated 10µL of each homogenate in four replicated spots on Luria broth agar containing streptomycin (25 µg/mL), incubated the plates (37°C, 24h) and counted the number of colony-forming units.

3. Results

3.1 Potential immunity

Acute, but not sustained, cold, significantly increased CHC compared to controls (Fig. 1; Table 1). We did not detect any difference in PO activity among treatments ($F_{2,9} = 1.09$, $p = 0.38$). Expression of *diptericin* increased following acute cold, and expression of *Turandot-A* increased relative to controls following both acute and sustained exposures (Fig. 3; Table 1). Expression of *metchnikowin* was higher after acute than sustained cold exposure (Fig 3C; Table 1). No other changes in gene expression were observed (Table S2).

3.2 Realised immunity

Neither acute nor sustained cold changed the susceptibility of flies to fungal infection (Fig. 4; Table 1). Only one uninfected control died over the course of the experiment in both the acute and control treatments, and no mortality occurred in uninfected flies from the sustained cold treatment; we did not detect any significant difference in survival among uninfected controls

(sustained vs control: $t_9 = 0.92$, $p = 0.38$; acute vs control: $t_9 = 0.11$, $p = 0.91$). Wound-induced cuticle darkening was unchanged by either treatment (Fig. 5; Table 1). Clearance of gram-positive bacteria decreased in flies exposed to acute cold when measured within 2h of cold exposure (Fig 6; Table 1), but bacterial-clearance ability recovered rapidly: following 6h of recovery from cold, treatment did not affect clearance (Fig. 6; Table 1).

4. Discussion

We explored the effects of acute and sustained cold exposure on immune activity in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Acute cold exposure increased potential immunity (more circulating haemocytes and increased expression of *diptericin* and *TurandotA*), but decreased one measure of realised immunity (gram-positive bacterial clearance immediately after cold exposure). Sustained cold exposure also increased *Turandot-A* expression but did not affect realised immunity.

All cold-exposed flies were in chill coma (MacMillan et al., 2015), and these cold exposures have measurable non-lethal fitness impacts (Marshall and Sinclair, 2010), as well as transcriptomic profiles that suggest that they are both stressful exposures (Zhang et al., 2011). However, because sustained cold exposure did not elicit an increase in immune activity, whereas acute cold exposure increased potential immunity, it seems unlikely that cold-induced immune activity is a by-product of a general stress response. Instead, we suggest that acute cold led to increased cold shock injury [e.g. tissue damage associated with apoptosis (Yi et al., 2007) or membrane phase transitions (Lee et al., 2006)] relative to the sustained exposure, which signaled for an increase in potential immunity via direct signals from apoptotic or necrotic cells

(Maltzinger, 1998). For example, repeated cold exposure both increases tissue damage as well as resistance to fungal infection in *Pyrrharctia isabella*, (Marshall and Sinclair, 2011), suggesting that cold-induced immune activity is linked to cold injury. Because hemocytes are responsible for the phagocytosis of apoptotic and damaged cells (Marmaras and Lampropoulou, 2009) and increase in circulating concentration following tissue damage (Pastor-Pareja et al., 2008), increased CHC following acute cold could represent a direct immune response to chilling injury.

Although acute cold exposure increased some measures of potential immunity, flies also displayed a reduced ability to clear gram-positive bacteria, *B. subtilis*, shortly after acute cold exposure (2h). This contrast between potential and realised responses suggests that the increase in CHC and AMPs is concomitant with impairment of the immune system. If chilling injury includes damage to the hemocytes themselves, the circulating hemocytes we counted may include both functional and damaged cells (Yi and Lee, 2003); thus although more cells appear to be in circulation, immune function is either impaired or unchanged. Additionally, recovery from chilling injury is metabolically costly (MacMillan et al., 2012), as are immune responses (Freitak et al., 2003), and the initial decrease in bacterial clearance after acute cold could represent a trade-off between recovery from cold exposure and immune activity. For example, infected *Drosophila* take longer to recover from cold exposure (Linderman et al., 2012), suggesting that there is a conflict between the response to cold and the response to infection. In either the case of direct damage or trade-offs between immunity and recovery from cold, cold exposure appears to have the potential to impair immune activity.

256

257 Despite this initial impairment of immunity, activity appeared to have recovered by 6 h post
258 cold exposure, we did not observe an impaired response to gram-negative *E. coli*, and nor was
259 there a change in survival of fungal infection. The immune response (including rate of
260 phagocytosis, the role of hemocytes, and the timing of expression of AMPs) varies depending on
261 the type of pathogen encountered (Lemaitre and Hoffmann, 2007; Marmaras and Lampropoulou,
262 2009), thus it is possible that the mechanism for clearing *B. subtilis* is more affected by chilling
263 injury than the mechanisms for responding to *E. coli* or *M. anispoliae*. Alternatively, up-
264 regulation of *diptericin* through the IMD pathway (largely responsible for the response to gram-
265 negative bacteria) may have compensated for impaired immunity and allowed the flies to
266 maintain clearance of gram-negative *E. coli*. Similarly, recovery of the response to *B. subtilis*
267 suggests that the immune response compensates for this initial, cold-induced impairment of
268 activity.

269

270 We propose that the increase in potential immunity that we observed following acute cold
271 exposure is a compensatory response to immune impairment through direct damage to the
272 immune system or trades-off with the response to cold. This compensatory response may
273 manifest as reconfiguration of the immune system (Adamo, 2014), that allows *Drosophila* to
274 maintain responses to cold-induced tissue damage or pathogens in the environment. Overall, this
275 suggests that cold-induced increases in immune activity are adaptive, and that it is important to
276 maintain the ability to respond to pathogens following cold exposure. It will next be important to
277 determine if conflicts between cold and immunity are present in other insect taxa, if they vary

278 seasonally, and whether they affect the fitness of overwintering insects experiencing both cold
279 and pathogen stress.

280

281 In conclusion, we suggest that *Drosophila* have evolved immune activation by cold to
282 maintain the ability to respond to immune challenge to compensate for cold-induced damage to,
283 or trade-offs with, the immune system, but that this activation does not result in an increase in
284 realised activity. In the context of multiple stressors, this therefore demonstrates an evolved
285 resilience to the direct effect of an abiotic stressor on the ability to respond to pathogen stress,
286 and provides (another) warning about the importance of comparing multiple measures of the
287 immunity before drawing conclusions (Adamo, 2004).

288

289 **Acknowledgements**

290 Thanks to Drs. Jim Staples and Graham Thompson for equipment use, Ruth Jakobs and Calvin
291 Tsui for assistance in the laboratory, and Kurtis Turnbull and several anonymous reviewers for
292 comments that improved the ms. This work was supported by the Natural Sciences and
293 Engineering Research Council of Canada via a Discovery Grant to BJS and a Doctoral
294 scholarship to LVF.

295 **References**

- 296 Adamo, S.A., 2004. Estimating disease resistance in insects: phenoloxidase and lysozyme-like
297 activity and disease resistance in the cricket *Gryllus texensis*. *Journal of Insect Physiology*
298 50, 209-216.
- 299 Adamo, S.A., 2014. The effects of stress hormones on immune function may be vital for the
300 adaptive reconfiguration of the immune system during fight-or-flight behavior. *Integrative*
301 and *Comparative Biology* 54, 419-426.
- 302 Bidochka, M.J., Kasperski, J.E., Wild, G.A.M., 1998. Occurrence of the entomopathogenic fungi
303 *Metarhizium anisopliae* and *Beauveria bassiana* in soils from temperate and near-northern
304 habitats. *Canadian Journal of Botany* 76, 1198-1204.
- 305 Bing, X., Zhang, J., Sinclair, B.J., 2012. A comparison of Frost expression among species and
306 life stages of *Drosophila*. *Insect Molecular Biology* 21, 31-39.
- 307 Carrington, L.B., Hoffmann, A., Weeks, A.R., 2010. Monitoring long-term evolutionary changes
308 following *Wolbachia* introduction into a novel host: the *Wolbachia popcorn* infection in
309 *Drosophila simulans*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 277, 2059-2068.
- 310 Drobnis, E.Z., Crowe, L.M., Berger, T., Anchordoguy, T.J., Overstreet, J.W., Crowe, J.H., 1993.
311 Cold shock damage is due to lipid phase transitions in cell membranes: A demonstration
312 using sperm as a model. *Journal of Experimental Zoology* 265, 432-437.
- 313 Fedorka, K.M., Linder, J.E., Winterhalter, W., Promislow, D., 2007. Post-mating disparity
314 between potential and realized immune response in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proceedings*
315 of the *Royal Society B* 274, 1211-1217.
- 316 Freitak, D., Ots, I., Vanatoa, A., Horak, P., 2003. Immune response is energetically costly in
317 white cabbage butterfly pupae. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 270 Suppl 2, S220-222.
- 318 Kaunisto, S., Ferguson, L.V., Sinclair, B.J., 2016. Can we predict the effects of multiple stressors
319 on insects in a changing climate? *Current Opinion in Insect Science* 17, 55-61.
- 320 Le Bourg, E., Massou, I., Gobert, V., 2009. Cold stress increases resistance to fungal infection
321 throughout life in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Biogerontology* 10, 613-625.
- 322 Lee, R.E., Damodaran, K., Yi, S.X., Lorigan, G.A., 2006. Rapid cold-hardening increases
323 membrane fluidity and cold tolerance of insect cells. *Cryobiology* 52, 459-463.
- 324 Lemaitre, B., Hoffmann, J., 2007. The host defense of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Annual Review*
325 of *Immunology* 25, 697-743.
- 326 Linderman, J.A., Chambers, M.C., Gupta, A.S., Schneider, D.S., 2012. Infection-related declines
327 in chill coma recovery and negative geotaxis in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *PloS One* 7,
328 e41907.
- 329 MacMillan, H.A., Ferguson, L.V., Nicolai, A., Donini, A., Staples, J.F., Sinclair, B.J., 2015.
330 Parallel ionoregulatory adjustments underlie phenotypic plasticity and evolution of
331 *Drosophila* cold tolerance. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 218, 423-432.
- 332 MacMillan, H.A., Hughson, B.N., 2014. A high-throughput method of hemolymph extraction
333 from adult *Drosophila* without anesthesia. *Journal of Insect Physiology* 63, 27-31.
- 334 MacMillan, H.A., Williams, C.M., Staples, J.F., Sinclair, B.J., 2012. Reestablishment of ion
335 homeostasis during chill-coma recovery in the cricket *Gryllus pennsylvanicus*. *Proceedings*
336 of the *National Academy of Sciences USA* 109, 20750-20755.
- 337 Maltzinger, P., 1998. An innate sense of danger. *Seminars in immunology* 10, 399-415.
- 338 Marmaras, V.J., Lampropoulou, M., 2009. Regulators and signalling in insect haemocyte
339 immunity. *Cellular Signalling* 21, 186-195.

- Marshall, K.E., Sinclair, B.J., 2010. Repeated stress exposure results in a survival-reproduction trade-off in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 277, 963-969.
- Marshall, K.E., Sinclair, B.J., 2011. The sub-lethal effects of repeated freezing in the woolly bear caterpillar *Pyrrharctia isabella*. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 214, 1205-1212.
- McKean, K.A., Nunney, L., 2001. Increased sexual activity reduces male immune function in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 98, 7904-7909.
- Nilson, T.N., Sinclair, B.J., Roberts, S.P., 2006. The effects of carbon dioxide anesthesia and anoxia on rapid cold-hardening and chill coma recovery in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *J Insect Physiol* 52, 1027-1033.
- Nyamukondiwa, C., Terblanche, J.S., Marshall, K.E., Sinclair, B.J., 2011. Basal cold but not heat tolerance constrains plasticity among *Drosophila* species (Diptera: Drosophilidae). *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 24, 1927-1938.
- Pastor-Pareja, J.C., Wu, M., Xu, T., 2008. An innate immune response of blood cells to tumors and tissue damage in *Drosophila*. *Disease Models and Mechanisms* 1, 144-154.
- R Development Core Team, 2010. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Sinclair, B.J., Ferguson, L.V., Salehipour-shirazi, G., MacMillan, H.A., 2013. Cross-tolerance and cross-talk in the cold: relating low temperatures to desiccation and immune stress in insects. *Integrative and Comparative Biology* 53, 545-556.
- Williams, C.M., Henry, H.A., Sinclair, B.J., 2015. Cold truths: how winter drives responses of terrestrial organisms to climate change. *Biological Reviews* 90, 214-235.
- Yi, S.-X., Lee, R.E., 2003. Detecting freeze injury and seasonal cold-hardening of cells and tissues in the gall fly larvae, *Eurosta solidaginis* (Diptera: Tephritidae) using fluorescent vital dyes. *Journal of Insect Physiology* 49, 999-1004.
- Yi, S.X., Moore, C.W., Lee, R.E., Jr., 2007. Rapid cold-hardening protects *Drosophila melanogaster* from cold-induced apoptosis. *Apoptosis* 12, 1183-1193.
- Zachariassen, K.E., 1985. Physiology of cold tolerance in insects. *Physiological Reviews* 65, 799-832.
- Zhang, J., Marshall, K.E., Westwood, J.T., Clark, M.S., Sinclair, B.J., 2011. Divergent transcriptomic responses to repeated and single cold exposures in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 214, 4021-4029.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Circulating haemocyte concentration of *Drosophila melanogaster* following cold exposure. Flies were exposed to acute (-2 °C, 2 h) or sustained (-0.5 °C, 10 h) cold; n=10 per treatment. Mean ± SEM is shown; asterisks indicate significant differences (p<0.05) between cold-exposed and control flies (see Table 1 for statistics).

Figure 2. Haemolymph phenoloxidase activity of *Drosophila melanogaster* following cold exposure. Flies were exposed to acute (-2 °C, 2 h) or sustained (-0.5 °C, 10 h) cold; n=3-5 per treatment (8-10 flies pooled per replicate). Mean ± SEM is shown.

Figure 3. Relative mRNA abundance of genes related to *Drosophila melanogaster* immune pathways measured by real-time qPCR, following cold exposure. Flies were exposed to acute (-2 °C, 2 h) or sustained (-0.5 °C, 10 h) cold; n=5/gene/treatment (30 flies pooled per replicate). *dros*=*drosomycin*, *def*=*defensin*, *mtk*=*metchnikowin*, *atta*=*attacin*, *cec*=*cecropin*, *dipt*=*dipteracin*, *dro*=*drosocin*, *TotA*=*Turandot A* and *vir*=*vir-I*. Mean ± SEM is shown; asterisks indicate significant differences (p<0.05) between cold-exposed and control flies; different lower-case letters indicate significant differences between flies exposed to acute and sustained cold (see Table 1 for statistics).

Figure 4. Survival of cold-exposed *Drosophila melanogaster* infected with *Metarhizium anisopliae* (n=8-10 flies in 5-7 vials/treatment). Flies were exposed to acute (-2 °C, 2 h) or sustained (-0.5 °C, 10 h) cold and topically infected with *M. anisopliae* following recovery from cold. Mean ± SEM is shown (see Table 1 for statistics).

Figure 5. Wounding response in *Drosophila melanogaster* measured as cuticle melanisation (grey value) following cold exposure. Flies were exposed to acute (-2 °C, 2 h) or sustained (-0.5 °C, 10 h) cold and pierced in the thorax with an insect pin following recovery from cold. n = 10 per treatment, per time point (see Table 1 for statistics).

Figure 6. *In vivo* clearance of *Escherichia coli* and *Bacillus subtilis* from the hemolymph of *Drosophila melanogaster* following cold exposure. Flies were exposed to acute (-2 °C, 2 h) or sustained (-0.5 °C, 10 h) cold and injected with a suspension of bacteria 2 h or 6 h following recovery from cold. The proportion of bacteria cleared from the hemolymph was assessed either 5 h or 12 h following injection; (n=4-9/treatment/infection). Lower-case letters indicate significant differences (p<0.05) between acute cold-exposed, sustained cold-exposed, and control flies (see Table 1 for statistics).

417 **Table 1.** Effects of acute (2 h, -2 °C) or sustained (10 h, -0.5 °C) cold exposure on potential and realised immunity of female
418 *Drosophila melanogaster*. Cold refers to both acute and sustained exposures, compared to controls. P-values in bold indicate
419 significant differences. PC = post-cold exposure; PI = post-infection

Measure	Term(s)	Statistic	p
Potential immunity			
Circulating haemocyte counts	Acute vs control	t ₁₅ = 3.51	<0.05
	Sustained vs control	t ₁₆ = 0.87	0.39
mRNA abundance	Acute vs control (<i>diptericin</i>)	t ₄ = 7.10	<0.01
	Acute vs control (<i>Turandot-A</i>)	t ₄ = 3.43	<0.001
	Sustained vs control (<i>Turandot-A</i>)	t ₄ = 11.95	<0.001
	Acute vs sustained (<i>Metchnikowin</i>)	t ₄ = 8.54	0.046
Realised immunity			
Fungal infection	Infected vs uninfected	t ₂₅₂ = 34.37	<0.001
	Acute vs control	t ₁₄ = 1.17	0.26
	Sustained vs control	t ₁₄ = 1.72	0.11
Melanisation	Acute vs control	t ₉₀ = 1.76	0.08
	Sustained vs control	t ₉₀ = 1.21	0.23
Bacterial clearance			
2 h PC; 5 h PI	Treatment	F _{2,23} = 9.10	<0.01
	Bacteria	F _{1,23} = 13.26	<0.001
	Treatment × Bacteria	F _{2,23} = 3.37	0.067
6 h PC, 5 h PI	Treatment	F _{2,22} = 0.50	0.61
	Bacteria	F _{1,22} = 7.82	0.01
	Treatment × Bacteria	F _{2,22} = 0.93	0.93
6 h PC; 12 h PI	Treatment	F _{2,17} = 0.89	0.92
	Bacteria	F _{1,17} = 0.511	0.03
	Treatment × Bacteria	F _{2,17} = 0.892	0.43

420

421

422

423 Figure 1

424

425

429 Figure 3

430

431

433 Figure 4

434

435

436

437 Figure 5

438

439

440

Supplemental methods and results

Table S1: Primers used to measure expression of genes related to Toll, IMD, and Jak/STAT pathways in *Drosophila melanogaster* using q-PCR. The reference gene is Rpl32. T_m indicates the melting temperature. References are noted for primers derived from literature. When designed in-house, Primer3 was used to design primers with amplicons of less than 250 bp long and GC content of 45-65% with no self-complementarity. Amplification efficiency of the primers was checked to be more than 95% using calibration curves of serially diluted concentration of the primers and the specificity of the primers was verified by PCR.

Gene	Nucleotide sequence (5' to 3')	T _m	Reference
<i>Rpl32</i>	5'-GACGCTTCAAGGGACAGTATCTG-3'	62	[1]
	5'-AAACGCGGTTCTGCATGAG-3'	62	
<i>attacin-B</i>	5'-GGCCCATGCCAATTTATTCA-3'	63	[2]
	5'-CATTGCGCTGGAACCTCGAA-3'	63	
<i>cecropin-A</i>	5'-TCTTCGTTTTTCGTCGCTCTC-3'	61	[2]
	5'-CTTGTTGAGCGATTCCCAGT-3'	60	
<i>defensin</i>	5'-GCCAGAAGCGAGCCACAT-3'	63	[2]
	5'-CGGTGTGGTTCCAGTTCCA-3'	63	
<i>dipteracin-A</i>	5'-AGGTGTGGACCAGCGACAA-3'	63	[2]
	5'-TGCTGTCCATATCCTCCATTCA-3'	63	
<i>drosocin</i>	5'-CCACCACTCCAAGCACAATG-3'	60	
	5'-TGAGTCAGGTGATCCTCGATGG-3'	58	
<i>drosomycin-B</i>	5'-CTCCGTGAGAACCTTTTCCA-3'	60	[2]
	5'-GTATCTTCCGGACAGGCAGT-3'	59	
<i>metchnikowin</i>	5'-CTACATCAGTGCTGGCAGAG-3'	60	
	5'-CGGTCTTGGTTGGTTAGGATTG-3'	58	
<i>PGRP-LB</i>	5'-TGTGGCCGCTTTAGTGCTT-3'	62	[2]
	5'-TCAATCTGCAGGGCATTGG-3'	63	
<i>PGRP-LC</i>	5'-ACGGAATCCAAGCGTATCAG-3'	60	[2]
	5'-GGCCTCCGAATCACTATCAA-3'	60	
<i>PGRP-SB</i>	5'-CTGCGGCTGTTATCAGTGAA-3'	60	[2]
	5'-TGATGGAATTTCCGCTTTTC-3'	60	
<i>PGRP-SD</i>	5'-CCTTGCCACGTGCTGTGA-3'	63	[2]
	5'-TGTAACATCATCCGCACAAGCT-3'	63	
<i>relish</i>	5'-GTGGAGTTGGACCTAAGTAGTGG-3'	55	
	5'-TGATTCAGCAGCGAACAGAGC-3'	59	
<i>toll</i>	5'-AACTTGGGCAACCTTGTGAC-3'	60	[2]
	5'-GTAACCAAACGGGGAGTTGA-3'	60	
<i>TotA-1</i>	5'-TGAGGAACGGGAGAGTATCG-3'	60	[2]
	5'-GCCCTTCACACCTGGAGATA-3'	60	
<i>vir-1</i>	5'-TGTGCCCATTGACCTATCCA-3'	62	[2]
	5'-GATTACAGCTGGGTGCACAA-3'	60	

Table S2. Statistical analyses of the effect of acute and chronic cold on expression level of immune genes of *Drosophila melanogaster* females. The data shows the relative abundance of the immune genes mRNA (normalized to Rpl-32) after acute cold exposure (2h, -2 °C) and chronic cold exposure (10h, -0.5 °C).

Gene	Treatment	Test value	P-value	Adjusted P
<i>attacin-B</i>	Acute	2.56	0.063	0.13
	Chronic	2.65	0.057	0.13
<i>cecropin-A</i>	Acute	2.11	0.102	0.13
	Chronic	2.64	0.058	0.14
<i>defensin</i>	Acute	2.35	0.078	0.13
	Chronic	0.46	0.67	0.75
<i>diptericin-A</i>	Acute	7.10	<0.01	0.09
	Chronic	2.578	0.061	0.13
<i>drosocin</i>	Acute	2.66	0.056	0.13
	Chronic	1.66	0.172	0.22
<i>drosomycin-B</i>	Acute	0.41	0.701	0.75
	Chronic	2.42	0.072	0.13
<i>metchnikowin</i>	Acute	2.66	0.046	0.13
	Chronic	0.33	0.756	0.76
<i>PGRP-LB</i>	Acute	2.47	0.069	0.13
	Chronic	2.47	0.070	0.13
<i>PGRP-LC</i>	Acute	2.60	0.060	0.13
	Chronic	1.69	0.166	0.22
<i>PGRP-SB</i>	Acute	2.26	0.086	0.13
	Chronic	2.59	0.060	0.13
<i>PGRP-SD</i>	Acute	1.46	0.22	0.26
	Chronic	0.32	0.76	0.76
<i>relish</i>	Acute	2.44	0.071	0.13
	Chronic	2.57	0.061	0.13
<i>toll</i>	Acute	1.05	0.352	0.40
	Chronic	1.45	0.220	0.26
<i>TotA-1</i>	Acute	3.43	<0.001	0.01
	Chronic	11.59	<0.001	0.01
<i>vir-1</i>	Acute	2.40	0.074	0.13
	Chronic	0.06	0.0956	0.14

Figure S1. Location of piercing for wound-induced melanisation. Flies were pierced in the right thoracic vertical cleft along the notopleural suture until it reached the humeral callus, as indicated by the black arrow.