Western University [Scholarship@Western](https://ir.lib.uwo.ca?utm_source=ir.lib.uwo.ca%2Fbiologypub%2F87&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

[Biology Publications](https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/biologypub?utm_source=ir.lib.uwo.ca%2Fbiologypub%2F87&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages) **[Biology Department](https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/biology?utm_source=ir.lib.uwo.ca%2Fbiologypub%2F87&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)**

10-1-2016

Can we predict the effects of multiple stressors on insects in a changing climate?

Sirpa Kaunisto

Laura V Ferguson

Brent J Sinclair

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/biologypub](https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/biologypub?utm_source=ir.lib.uwo.ca%2Fbiologypub%2F87&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages) Part of the [Biology Commons](http://network.bepress.com/hgg/discipline/41?utm_source=ir.lib.uwo.ca%2Fbiologypub%2F87&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

Citation of this paper:

Kaunisto, Sirpa; Ferguson, Laura V; and Sinclair, Brent J, "Can we predict the effects of multiple stressors on insects in a changing climate?" (2016). *Biology Publications*. 87. [https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/biologypub/87](https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/biologypub/87?utm_source=ir.lib.uwo.ca%2Fbiologypub%2F87&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

Can we predict the effects of multiple stressors on insects in a changing climate?

Sirpa Kaunisto^{1,2}, Laura V. Ferguson¹ and Brent J. Sinclair¹

Addresses

- ¹ Department of Biology, The University of Western Ontario, London, ON, N6A 5B7, Canada
- ² Department of Environmental and Biological Sciences, The University of Eastern Finland,
- P.O. Box 111, FI-80101 Joensuu, Finland
-
-
- Corresponding author: Sirpa Kaunisto (sirpa.kaunisto@uef.fi)

Abstract

 The responses of insects to climate change will depend on their responses to abiotic and biotic stressors in combination. We surveyed the literature, and although synergistic stressor interactions appear common among insects, the thin taxonomic spread of existing data means that more multi-stressor studies and new approaches are needed. We need to move beyond descriptions of the effects of multiple stressors to a mechanistic, predictive understanding. Further, we must identify which stressor interactions, and species' responses to them, are sufficiently generalizable (i.e. most or all species respond similarly to the same stressor combination), and thus predictable (for new combinations of stressors, or stressors acting via known mechanisms). We discuss experimental approaches that could facilitate this shift towards predictive understanding.

Introduction

 Insects and other organisms must simultaneously respond to various, natural abiotic and biotic stressors, as well as to an increasing array of novel anthropogenic environmental stressors. It is often difficult to distinguish the origin of stress because natural abiotic or biotic stressors can be exacerbated by anthropogenic influences. Some of the most important human-induced or -accelerated environmental stressors include climate change, habitat fragmentation, chemical pollution and introduction of invasive species [1,2]. Different stressors will interact in various possible ways under climate change, and the responses and resistance of organisms to climate change will depend on their responses to combinations of stressors, which may or may not reflect responses to single stressors in isolation. Multiple stressors have been studied systematically in aquatic ecosystems for non-insect 36 organisms, especially in ecotoxicology $[3-6]$ $[7^{\bullet}]$, where it appears that synergistic interactions (resulting in a greater-than-expected impact) among stressors may be the norm. Here we show that multiple stressor studies on insects are still relatively rare, and discuss best practices in experimental design for multiple stressor studies that aim to characterise

 responses and identify underlying mechanisms, with an overall goal of predicting *a priori* the outcomes of interacting stressors.

What do we study when we study multiple stressors?

 We define a 'stressor' as any environmental or biotic factor with the potential to disrupt homeostasis, performance or fitness [8]. The consequences of exposure to multiple stressors are usually separated by ecologists and ecotoxicologists into additive and non-additive (synergistic or antagonistic) effects [3,9–12]. In this review, we use the terms "synergism" and "antagonism" as a convenient way to indicate stressor interactions that result in greater or

 lesser effects than the additive sum of effects produced by the stressors acting in isolation, respectively [see 5]. A range of statistical models have been used to identify non-additive effects, and, as a consequence, the strength and basis of conclusions may depend on the experimental context [9,12,13]. Some authors advocate using 'synergism' and 'antagonism' only to refer to effects detected by means of additive ANOVA models in a full-factorial design [3,9,10,13,14]. By contrast, in some disciplines, for example toxicology, the mode of actions of multiple toxicants (stressors) are always assumed to be different, leading to multiplicative (rather than additive) effects, which therefore requires appropriate statistical analysis and terminology [9,15,16].

 We informally surveyed the Anglophone insect literature (see supplementary material for details of the studies we identified). To narrow our criteria we focused on studies that manipulated different classes of stressors (e.g. temperature and pathogens) in full-factorial designs that allow estimation of non-additive results. A full-factorial two-stressor study would thus include four treatments; (1) neither treatment (control), (2) stressor A alone, (3) stressor B alone, and (4) both stressors, A and B, in combination. Despite the prevalence of multiple, interacting, stressors in nature, most insect studies explore effects of one stressor in isolation. At least 210 studies applying two stressors were not full-factorial in study design (e.g. lacking a stressor-free control or an individual stressor treatment). Some of those studies (e.g. those exploring interactions between temperature and pathogens and temperature and atmospheric gases) use an additional stressor to enhance the impact of a stressor of primary 70 interest [17[°]], and do not use a full-factorial experimental design. Such studies cannot predict the range of non-additive responses and do not provide material for future meta-analyses on stressor interactions. We found 133 full-factorial studies (listed in Supplementary Word file), covering 24 stressor pairs (Table S1; Table S2). Fewer than ten studies included three-

 stressor combinations, and we found none including more than three stressors. The two- stressor studies were spread across 12 insect orders, 51 families and 100 species (Fig. S1). This coverage of insects is still low for making far-reaching generalisations, especially when the stressor outcomes are split among many stressor pairs.

 The choice of endpoints in multiple stressor studies can substantially influence the 80 conclusions [18^{*},19]. Many studies used mortality as an endpoint, for example those that explored the combined lethality of chemical and pathogen/temperature exposures. Although these studies can reveal non-additive stressor interactions, in our opinion they cannot reveal their underlying mechanisms. Many two-stressor studies used sub-lethal, fitness-related, 84 endpoints, such as growth or fecundity (Fig. S1), which likely reflect diversion of energy to repair stress damage and re-establish homeostasis [2,20,21]. We suggest that fitness-related endpoints can shed light on underlying mechanisms of ecologically-relevant interactions among stressors.

 Although the studies we included were full-factorial in design, many were unable to directly identify synergy or antagonism because of the selected statistical approach (e.g. comparing combined effects only to the univariate effects of one stressor, but not both). Thus, the results 92 can provide only the presumption of non-additive interactions between stressors (Fig. S1; Table S2). However, studies incorporating chemical stressors (especially chemical- temperature and chemical-pathogen interactions) more routinely used full-factorial statistical models. These studies reveal that chemicals, such as pesticides, often interact synergistically with temperature or pathogen stress. For example, in the blue-tailed damselfly *Ischnura elegans,* acetylcholinesterase inhibition by the pesticide chlorpyrifos was synergistically 98 magnified when combined with heat stress $[18[•]]$. This possible predominance of synergistic

 interactions is consistent with observations for other animals [3,5]. We argue that the thin taxonomic spread of existing data makes the insect literature currently unsuitable for formal meta-analyses, but the accumulating number of primary full-factorial studies will eventually be useful to identify large-scale patterns in non-additive effects among insect species and stressors.

Accounting for the multiple scales of multiple stressors

 The timing, intensity, duration, frequency and spatial distribution of stressor exposure will vary among stressors and among stressor events, complicating their inclusion when predicting organismal responses to multiple stressors and global change [2,22], particularly when complex systems can give rise to emergent phenomena [23]. Including all possible stressor combinations (and durations, sequences and intensities of stressor exposures) will rapidly become intractable, but the spatio-temporal complexity of multiple stressors can be reduced for experimental purposes by selecting combinations on the basis of their (co-) occurrence dynamics in nature, for example, using the fractional factorial approach espoused 114 by Porter et al. (1984) [24^{**}].

 The intensity (loosely, 'dose') of stressors can determine the outcome of interactions. This is best exemplified in the concept of hormesis, wherein small doses of stress can be beneficial, but large doses damaging [25]. This effect of intensity is prevalent in responses to many kinds of physical, chemical or biological stressors, for example, the heat shock response is induced at a threshold temperature [26], which can then substantially modify responses to other stressors; however, exposure below that threshold will have minimal effect, and exposure to higher temperatures may be lethal. Thus, identifying the minimum 'dose' required to elicit a stress response (or an interaction – which may be a higher or lower dose)

 must be included in the design of experiments and choice of stressors. One approach to this is to standardise the impact of stressors (the 'toxic unit approach' of ecotoxicology) to allow interactions to be explored under conditions where each stressor has similar impact [cf. 27]. However, this standardisation may only be ecologically-relevant if the stressors in nature are expected to co-occur at similar intensities.

 The mechanisms underlying the physiological responses to stress can be tightly linked to the spatio-temporal dynamics of co-occurring stressors. For example, the physiological responses to thermal, drought or starvation stress, which often co-occur, are similar in insects [28–30]. By contrast, insects may experience other stressors together for the first time under global change; for example, neonicotinoid insecticides and invasive pathogens [31]. Further, changing climates could change the timing and severity of overlapping interacting stressors 136 [28[°]]. If a change in the sequence of two stressors does not affect the outcome and the result is repeatable in one or several species, or when additional stressors are present, then the responses may have underlying shared mechanisms, and thus mutually-predictable responses, even if they have not previously co-occurred in nature [32,33].

Mechanisms underlying insect responses to multiple stressors

 Identifying the mechanisms underlying stressor interactions could help us to predict *a priori* the effects of novel combinations of stressors, or to generalise the effects of multiple stressors among taxa [2]. This is especially challenging when our understanding of the mechanistic basis for insects' responses to even simple single stressors is incomplete. Predictable and generalizable responses to multiple stressors could arise through cross-tolerance – shared mechanisms of stress response that impart protection against multiple stressors once activated – or through cross-talk, whereby signaling responses to the first stress also activate resistance

149 to other stressors [28[°]]. These underlying processes are generally conceived as adaptive, leading to antagonistic effects of combined stressors, to the benefit of the insect. For example, prior exposure to dehydration improves subsequent tolerance to (i.e. reduces the impact of) cold or heat in the Antarctic midge *Belgica antarctica,* the cross-tolerance facilitated by accumulation of trehalose [29]. In addition, cross-tolerance between low temperature and hypoxia (or other controlled atmospheres), and their underlying physiological and molecular mechanisms have been studied to some extent in insects 156 [17[°],34–36]. For example, in the false codling moth *Thaumatotibia leucotreta* mild pre- treatments with chilling and hypoxia increased resistance to low temperatures and these responses were correlated with increased membrane fluidity and/or alterations in heat shock protein (HSP70) [36]. The antagonistic effects of cross-tolerance or cross talk are conceptually (and likely mechanistically) related to hormesis [25].

 However, this adaptive framework based on shared responses to stressors predicts antagonistic responses to multiple stressors and thus appears to be at odds with the preponderance of synergistic effects of multiple stressors that we observed in our literature survey (Fig. S1). Synergistic stressor interactions in insects have been most commonly reported for chemical-temperature and chemical-pathogen pairs and the effects of other stressor pairs have been little-studied. Thus, we lack both either the breadth of descriptive data or (for many stressors) the mechanistic understanding of their mode of action necessary to make predictions within this framework. However, mechanism can predict synergistic responses to combined stressors, as in a scarabaeid beetle in which application of an insecticide weakens the immune system, leading to a synergistic interaction when the insecticide is applied in concert with a fungal pathogen [37]. These mechanism-based non-additive interactions can easily yield both synergistic and antagonistic results. For example,

 cell membrane fluidity can determine cold tolerance in the collembolan *Folsomia candida*, so lipophilic contaminants can either increase or reduce cold tolerance, depending on each contaminants' impact on the phospholipid membrane – a property that can be predicted in 177 advance [38[°]]. Thus, predicting the impacts of multiple stressors based on mechanism may be primarily hampered by a lack of understanding of the mechanisms underlying the impact of each stressor in isolation.

Can we generalize multiple stressor effects to yield predictions?

 Currently, the insect literature is dominated by descriptive studies that characterise the responses of a specific taxon to a specific combination of (usually two) stressors. When designed well, these studies can identify non-additive interactions, and hint at underlying mechanisms or pathways shared among stressors. However, the millions of insect species and thousands of stressors mean there are trillions of potential stressor-taxon combinations, so such descriptive studies fall short if we wish to account generally for multiple interacting stressors in our understanding of climate change. To make *a priori* predictions about the consequences of multiple interacting stressors, we first need to determine if the responses to multiple stressors are predictable from an understanding of univariate or bivariate responses, and second, determine whether such predictions are generalizable among taxa. If responses to stressors are predictable, then we can draw larger conclusions about responses to novel combinations of stressors (Fig. 1). Such predictability will likely arise when there are shared mechanisms (or perhaps signaling pathways) underlying responses to those stressors. Thus, univariate studies of single stressors, and the physiological and molecular mechanisms underlying insect responses to them, are essential.

 We term responses to multiple stressors as 'generalizable' when most or all species exhibit broadly similar responses to the same stressor combination, but 'idiosyncratic' if different species respond differently or in a context-dependent manner (Fig. 2). The shared mechanisms that underlie many stress responses [29,36,39,40], and the associations of at least some stressors over evolutionary time [29] lead us to expect that at least some interactions among stressors will have impacts generalizable to higher taxonomic levels. There are well- established conceptual and analytical tools to assess physiological responses in a phylogenetic context [41,42]. Although these have largely been applied to individual stressors in insects [43–47], we expect that a phylogenetically-cogent approach, for example 207 with *Drosophila* [47[°]] will yield information on the prevalence of idiosyncratic vs. generalizable responses to multiple stressors.

 An alternative approach is to understand the structure of multiple stressor responses. When exposed to increasing numbers of combinations of stressors, it is possible for the cumulative effects to saturate or accelerate (Fig. 3). A saturation of responses would arise if there are a limited number of possible interaction mechanisms among stressors, such that additional stressors have limited additional impact after some threshold. By contrast, if synergistic interactions combine and become increasingly synergistic with additional stress (or there are emergent properties), the effect of additional stressors may continue to increase. Increasing number of stressors in the green alga *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* have limited impact on population growth after c. four stressors, suggesting a saturation structure to multiple 219 interacting stressors in this species [48^{*}], and saturation also appears to apply to toxicants 220 (the "funnel hypothesis") [49"]. However, such experiments have not, to our knowledge,

 been conducted in insects, and even the few three-stressor studies we identified do not have sufficient stressors to tease these two possible responses apart.

Conclusions

Although we know a lot about how insects respond to single stresses, few studies have

characterized responses to two stressors in combination, and studies that include three or

more stressors are rare. Similarly, although the mechanisms underlying responses to

univariate stressors have been explored, we cannot yet connect those mechanisms to the

responses to stressors in combination. We suggest that using these data in phylogenetic or

multiple stressor frameworks may allow determination of the predictability and

generalizability of responses to multiple stressors, and that determining this will improve our

ability to incorporate multiple stressors in more general models of global change.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Vladimir Koštál, Raine Kortet, and an anonymous reviewer for suggestions that

improved an earlier version of the manuscript. SK is supported by the European Union's

Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant

agreement No 661122; LVF by a Postgraduate Scholarship from the Natural Sciences and

Engineering Research Council of Canada.

References and recommended reading

Papers of particular interest, published within the period of review, have been highlighted as:

243 • of special interest

244 $\bullet\bullet$ of outstanding interest

- 7. Gunderson AR, Armstrong EJ, Stillman JH: **Multiple stressors in a changing world:**
- **The need for an improved perspective on physiological responses to the dynamic marine environment**. *Ann. Rev. Mar. Sci.* 2016, **8**:357–378.

 This review provides a physiological perspective towards understanding multiple stressor interactions in marine animals.

- 8. Schulte PM: **What is environmental stress? Insights from fish living in a variable environment.** *J. Exp. Biol.* 2014, **217**:23–34.
- 9. Folt CL, Chen CY, Moore MV, Burnaford J: **Synergism and antagonism among**

multiple stressors. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 1999, **44**:864–877.

- 10. Coors A, De Meester L: **Synergistic, antagonistic and additive effects of multiple**
- **stressors: Predation threat, parasitism and pesticide exposure in** *Daphnia magna*.
- *J. Appl. Ecol.* 2008, **45**:1820–1828.
- 11. Jorgensen SE: *Ecotoxicology*. Academic Press; 2010.
- 12. Piggott JJ, Townsend CR, Matthaei CD: **Reconceptualizing synergism and antagonism among multiple stressors**. *Ecol. Evol.* 2015, **5**:1538–1547.
- 13. Slinker BK: **The statistics of synergism.** *J. Mol. Cell. Cardiol.* 1998, **30**:723–731.
- 14. Greco WR, Bravo G, Parsons JC: **The search for synergy: A critical review from a response surface perspective.** *Pharmacol. Rev.* 1995, **47**:331–385.
- 15. Greco W, Unkelbach H-D, Pöch G, Sühnel J, Kundi M, Bödeker W: **Consensus on concepts and terminology for combined-action assessment: The Saariselkä Agreement**. *Arch. Complex Environ. Stud.* 1992, **4**:65–69.
- 16. Tang J, Wennerberg K, Aittokallio T: **What is synergy? The Saariselkä agreement revisited**. *Front. Pharmacol.* 2015, **6**:1–5.
- 17. Boardman L, Sørensen JG, Johnson SA, Terblanche JS: **Interactions between**

 controlled atmospheres and low temperature tolerance: A review of biochemical mechanisms. *Front. Physiol.* 2011, **2**:1–8. doi:10.3389/fphys.2011.00092.

 This paper derives mechanism-based predictions of the interactions between cold and atmospheric composition in insects in an applied context.

- 18. Arambourou H, Stoks R: **Combined effects of larval exposure to a heat wave and**
- **chlorpyrifos in northern and southern populations of the damselfly** *Ischnura elegans*. *Chemosphere* 2015, **128**:148–154.
- This paper uses a full-factorial design to explore non-additive stress responses in insects.
- 19. Janssens L, Stoks R: **Synergistic effects between pesticide stress and predator cues:**
- **Conflicting results from life history and physiology in the damselfly** *Enallagma cyathigerum*. *Aquat. Toxicol.* 2013, **132-133**:92–99. 20. Sokolova IM, Frederich M, Bagwe R, Lannig G, Sukhotin AA: **Energy homeostasis as an integrative tool for assessing limits of environmental stress tolerance in aquatic invertebrates**. *Mar. Environ. Res.* 2012, **79**:1–15. 21. Sokolova IM: **Energy-limited tolerance to stress as a conceptual framework to integrate the effects of multiple stressors**. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* 2013, **53**:597–608. 22. Todgham AE, Schulte PM, Iwama GK: **Cross-tolerance in the tidepool sculpin: The role of heat shock proteins.** *Physiol. Biochem. Zool.* 2005, **78**:133–144. 23. Woods HA, Martin LB, Ghalambor CK: **Conclusions: The Central Role of the**
- **Organism in Biology**. In *Integrative Organismal Biology*. Edited by Martin LB, Ghalambor CK, Woods HA. Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, USA; 2014:309–317.
- 24. Porter WP, Hinsdill R, Fairbrother A, Olson LJ, Jaeger J, Yuill T, Bisgaard S, Hunter
- WG, Nolan K: **Toxicant-disease-environment interactions associated with suppression of immune system, growth, and reproduction**. *Science* 1984, **224**:1014–1017.
- The little-used fractional factorial design applied in this paper is an efficient way to reduce the number of experiments required for multiple stressor studies.
- 25. Cutler GC: **Insects, insecticides and hormesis: Evidence and considerations for study**. *Dose-Response* 2013, **11**:154–177.
- 26. Feder ME, Roberts SP, Bordelon AC: **Molecular thermal telemetry of free-ranging adult** *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Oecologia* 2000, **123**:460–465.
- 27. Van Wijngaarden RPA, Brock TCM, Van Den Brink PJV: **Threshold levels for effects of insecticides in freshwater ecosystems: A review**. *Ecotoxicology* 2005, **14**:355–380.

 cross-talk in the cold: Relating low temperatures to desiccation and immune stress in insects. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* 2013, **53**:545–556.

 This review presents a cross-tolerance/cross-talk framework for understanding insect responses to interacting stressors, using low temperatures and immune and desiccation stress as case studies.

- 29. Benoit JB, Lopez-Martinez G, Elnitsky MA, Lee RE, Denlinger DL: **Dehydration- induced cross tolerance of** *Belgica antarctica* **larvae to cold and heat is facilitated by trehalose accumulation**. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol. A.* 2009, **152**:518–523.
- 30. Le Bourg É: **Fasting can protect young and middle-aged** *Drosophila melanogaster* **flies against a severe cold stress**. *Biogerontology* 2013, **14**:513–529.
- 31. Doublet V, Labarussias M, de Miranda JR, Moritz RFA, Paxton RJ: **Bees under stress: Sublethal doses of a neonicotinoid pesticide and pathogens interact to elevate honey bee mortality across the life cycle**. *Environ. Microbiol.* 2015, **17**:969– 983.
- 32. Baldwin WF: **Combined effects of heat and radiation on the frequency of eye colour mutations and malformations in Dahlbominus**. *Mutat. Res.* 1975, **27**:143– 145.
- 33. Bitsadze N, Jaronski S, Khasdan V, Abashidze E, Abashidze M, Latchininsky A, Samadashvili D, Sokhadze I, Rippa M, Ishaaya I, et al.: **Joint action of** *Beauveria bassiana* **and the insect growth regulators diflubenzuron and novaluron, on the migratory locust,** *Locusta migratoria*. *J. Pest Sci.* 2013, **86**:293–300.
- 34. Deutsch C, Ferrel A, Seibel B, Pörtner H-O, Huey RB: **Climate change tightens a metabolic constraint on marine habitats**. *Science* 2015, **348**:1132–1135.
- 35. Verberk WCEP, Overgaard J, Ern R, Bayley M, Wang T, Boardman L, Terblanche JS:
- **Does oxygen limit thermal tolerance in arthropods? A critical review of current evidence**. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol. A.* 2016, **192**:64–78. 36. Boardman L, Sørensen JG, Terblanche JS: **Physiological and molecular mechanisms associated with cross tolerance between hypoxia and low temperature in** *Thaumatotibia leucotreta*. *J. Insect Physiol.* 2015, **82**:75–84. 37. Hiromori H, Nishigaki J: **Factor analysis of synergistic effect between the entomopathogenic fungus** *Metarhizium anisopliae* **and synthetic insecticides**. *Appl. Entomol. Zool.* 2001, **36**:231–236. 38. Holmstrup M, Bouvrais H, Westh P, Wang C, Slotsbo S, Waagner D, Enggrob K, Ipsen JH: **Lipophilic contaminants influence cold tolerance of invertebrates through changes in cell membrane fluidity.** *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2014, **48**:9797– 9803. This paper is an excellent example of taking a mechanistic approach to stressor interactions in soil animals. 39. Levis NA, Yi S-X, Lee RE: **Mild desiccation rapidly increases freeze tolerance of the goldenrod gall fly,** *Eurosta solidaginis***: evidence for drought-induced rapid cold-hardening**. *J. Exp. Biol.* 2012, **215**:3768–3773. 40. Terhzaz S, Teets NM, Cabrero P, Henderson L, Ritchie MG, Nachman RJ, Dow JAT, Denlinger DL, Davies S-A: **Insect capa neuropeptides impact desiccation and cold tolerance**. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA.* 2015, **112**:2882–2887. 41. van Kleunen M, Dawson W, Bossdorf O, Fischer M: **The more the merrier: Multi- species experiments in ecology**. *Basic Appl. Ecol.* 2014, **15**:1–9. 42. Garland T, Bennett AF, Rezende EL: **Phylogenetic approaches in comparative**
- 43. Strachan LA, Tarnowski-Garner HE, Marshall KE, Sinclair BJ: **The evolution of cold**

physiology. *J. Exp. Biol.* 2005, **208**:3015–3035.

tolerance in *Drosophila* **larvae.** *Physiol. Biochem. Zool.* 2011, **84**:43–53.

- 44. Nyamukondiwa C, Terblanche JS, Marshall KE, Sinclair BJ: **Basal cold but not heat**
- **tolerance constrains plasticity among** *Drosophila* **species (Diptera: Drosophilidae)**. *J. Evol. Biol.* 2011, **24**:1927–1938.
- 45. Mitchell KA, Sinclair BJ, Terblanche JS: **Ontogenetic variation in cold tolerance plasticity in** *Drosophila***: Is the Bogert effect bogus?** *Naturwissenschaften* 2013, **100**:281–284.
- 46. MacMillan HA, Ferguson L V, Nicolai A, Donini A, Staples JF, Sinclair BJ: **Parallel ionoregulatory adjustments underlie phenotypic plasticity and evolution of** *Drosophila* **cold tolerance.** *J. Exp. Biol.* 2015, **218**:423–432.
- 47. Kellermann V, Loeschcke V, Hoffmann AA, Kristensen TN, Fløjgaard C, David JR,
- Svenning JC, Overgaard J: **Phylogenetic constraints in key functional traits behind species' climate niches: Patterns of desiccation and cold resistance across 95** *Drosophila* **species**. *Evolution* 2012, **66**:3377–3389.
- This paper is an outstanding example of understanding univariate stress responses in the phylogenetic framework we recommend for examining multiple stressors.
- 48. Brennan G, Collins S: **Growth responses of a green alga to multiple environmental**
- **drivers**. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* 2015, **5**:892–897.

 This landmark paper describes the architecture of responses to large numbers of combined stressors in marine algae. We believe that this approach could be readily applied in insects.

- 49. Warne MSJ, Hawker DW: **The number of components in a mixture determines**
- **whether synergistic and antagonistic or additive toxicity predominate: The funnel**
- **hypothesis.** *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.* 1995, **31**:23–28.
- This paper includes a theoretical treatment of the saturation response to multiple toxicants.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1

 Shared response mechanisms can hypothetically be used to predict responses to novel stressor combinations. Stressor pairs P+Q and P+R share same mechanism (X) resulting in a shared response or outcome (O1). In this example, the new stressor pair T+S also share response mechanism X, so we predict the O1 -response.

Figure 2

 Responses to interacting stressors can be generalizable or idiosyncratic. This may be evident when responses are compared across a phylogeny (A), where a strong phylogenetic constraint can imply a generalizable response. We speculate that generalizable responses arise when mechanisms are shared (Figure 1), but idiosyncratic, if the same mechanisms yield different responses (B), or if the mechanisms themselves are context-dependent (C).

Figure 3

 When exposed to increasing numbers of combinations of stressors, it is possible for the cumulative effects to saturate (A) because many stressors use same mechanism, or accelerate if synergistic interactions combine and become increasingly synergistic with additional stressors (B). In the case of saturation the number of tractable multi-stressor experiments could be reduced. In the negative scenario, increasing number of stressors result in acceleration of stress responses with high diversity of mechanisms and accumulation of synergism making the number of required experiments intractable.

A)

Idiosyncratic

Phylogenetic constraint - generalisable

B)

 $A)$

 $B)$