Food-derived volatiles enhance consumption in
Drosophila melanogaster

Carolina E. Reisenman[1,2,*] and Kristin Scott[1,3]

[1] Department of Molecular and Cell Biology, University of California Berkeley, CA, United States of America

[2] Essig Museum of Entomology, University of California, Berkeley, CA, United States of America

[3] Helen Wills Neuroscience Institute, University of California, Berkeley, CA, United States of America

* To whom correspondence should be address
creisenman@berkeley.edu

SUMMARY STATEMENT

This work shows that fruit flies integrate diverse olfactory and gustatory cues to guide feeding decisions, including situations in which animals are confronted with stimuli of opposite valence.

ABSTRACT

Insects use multiple sensory modalities when searching for and accepting a food source, in particular odor and taste cues. Food-derived odorants are generally involved in mediating long-and short-range attraction. Taste cues, on the other hand, act directly by contact with the food source, promoting the ingestion of nutritious food and the avoidance of toxic substances. It is possible, however, that insects integrate information from these sensory modalities during the process of feeding itself. Here, using a simple feeding assay, we investigated whether odors modulate food consumption in the fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster*. We found that the presence of both single food-derived odorants and complex odor mixtures enhanced consumption of an appetitive food. Feeding enhancement depended on the concentration and the chemical identity of the odorant. Volatile cues alone were sufficient to mediate this effect, as feeding was also increased when animals were prevented from contacting the odor source. Both males and females, including virgin females, increased ingestion in the presence of food-derived volatiles. Moreover, the presence of food-derived odorants significantly increased the consumption of food mixtures containing aversive bitter compounds, suggesting that flies integrate diverse olfactory and gustatory cues to guide feeding decisions, including in situations in which animals are confronted with stimuli of opposite valence. Overall, these results show that food-derived olfactory cues directly modulate feeding in *D. melanogaster*, enhancing ingestion.

INTRODUCTION

Insects, as all animals, use sensory cues of different modalities to find food, mates, con-specifics, shelters, and to avoid predators. In particular, the chemosensory cues, olfaction and taste, play critical roles during seeking and identifying food, ultimately allowing insects to distinguish nutritious from potentially toxic food sources.

Although there is great variation in feeding habits and lifestyles, all insects have highly developed sensory structures that detect volatile (i.e., odors) or non-volatile (i.e., tastants) chemical cues. Odors are detected via specialized olfactory receptor neurons (ORNs) located on the antenna and in some insects also in the maxillary (in Diptera) or labial (in Lepidoptera) palps (Chapman, 1998; Hansson, 1995; Stocker, 1994). Many ORNs respond to only one or a few chemically related odorants, particularly when tested at behaviorally relevant and naturally-occurring concentrations (Hallem and Carlson, 2006; Hansson et al., 1999; Hillier and Vickers, 2007; Rostelien et al., 2000; Stranden et al., 2003), while others are more broadly tuned (de Bruyne et al., 1999; Hallem and Carlson, 2006; MacKay et al., 2015; Yao et al., 2005).

Food tastants, on the other hand, are detected by contact with gustatory receptor neurons (GRNs) found on several appendages and body parts including the proboscis labella, leg tarsi, pharynx, ovipositor and margin of the wings (Chapman, 1998; Falk et al., 1976; Montell, 2009; Stocker, 1994). GRNs respond to different taste qualities, named as such by analogy with human perception, including sweet, bitter, salt and water (Cameron et al., 2010; Hallem et al., 2006; Liman et al., 2014; Scott, 2018; Weiss et al., 2011).

Hungry insects, like all animals, are highly motivated to eat and actively search for food sources. Food-derived olfactory signals initiate the process of food search and mediate long-distance attraction and orientation. For instance, pollinators follow floral odor plumes to locate distant flowers (Carde and Willis, 2008; Riffell et al., 2014); mosquitoes and other blood-sucker insects come into the vicinity of a host solely attracted by skin-derived odors and CO_2 (Guerenstein and Lazzari, 2010; Lehane, 2005; Ray, 2015; Takken and Knols, 1999). Once insects locate a potential food source, however, taste cues act by contact mediating the recognition, and ultimately promoting and sustaining the ingestion, of appropriate substances. In general, activation of sweet GRNs signals the presence of nutritious, caloric food, and starts a feeding program which involves proboscis extension and ingestion (Dethier, 1976; Gordon and Scott, 2009). Bitter substances are in general toxic and/or noxious (Chapman, 2003; Glendinning, 2002), and activation of bitter GRNs produces

proboscis retraction, preventing the consumption of harmful substances (Dethier, 1976; French et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2004).

Olfactory and taste cues are not only used sequentially during food search and finding, but insects can also integrate information from these two sensory modalities at or near the food source for learned associations. For instance, insects such as bees, moths and flies can readily learn to associate a neutral odor with a food reward (Bitterman et al., 1983; Chabaud et al., 2006; Daly and Smith, 2000; Giurfa and Sandoz, 2012; Kim et al., 2007). Thus, when the association is formed, the sole presentation of the odor stimulus elicits proboscis extension (Bitterman et al., 1983), a behavioral readout of feeding initiation. In addition to behaviors mediated by experience, proboscis extension can be innately enhanced by the presence of both odors and taste cues. For example, in the blowfly *Phormia regina*, the probability of proboscis extension upon contact with an appetitive food source increases in the presence of appetitive odors (Maeda et al., 2014) and can be affected by prior olfactory experience (Maeda et al., 2015). Similarly, in the fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster*, odorants detected through the maxillary palps can enhance proboscis extension (Shiraiwa, 2008). Although these studies show that taste and olfactory information is integrated when animals attempt to eat, it is not known whether odors directly influence food consumption. Thus, in this work, using a simple behavioral assay, we test whether the presence of food-derived odors modulates food consumption in *D. melanogaster*. Moreover, by pairing aversive taste cues with attractive olfactory cues, we examined how animals process such conflicting information to guide feeding decisions.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Animals

Drosophila melanogaster, strain Canton-S, was used throughout. *D. melanogaster* strain 14021-0231.199, obtained from the University of California San Diego stock center, was also used in one experiment. Flies were grown on standard fly food at room temperature, in absence of any of the odors used in experiments described below. Flies were 2-3 days old at the time of the experiments.

Proboscis extension response (PER) assay

The PER of starved mated female flies was tested in the presence or absence of banana volatiles. After 22 hours of wet starvation, flies were gently anesthetized under CO_2 and

singly glued by their dorsal thorax onto a wooden toothpick using clear nail polish, and then transferred to humid chamber for 2 hours at room temperature. Individual toothpicks with glued flies were mounted on a piece of plasticine under the dissecting microscope; each fly was water-satiated prior to testing.

A 1 ml plastic syringe coupled to Tygon tubing (3.2 mm internal diameter), with its outlet approximately 2 cm from the fly's head, delivered a constant flow of air. A piece of banana (1.5 grams, or 1.5 grams of wet cotton as control) was placed in a 5 ml syringe with a needle, and its tip was inserted inside the constant air stream tubing. Fifteen seconds after the constant airstream was turned on, the odor or control stimulus was injected into the airstream using manifold valves. After 30 seconds the fly's tarsi were stimulated three times with increasing concentrations of Sucrose solution (10, 50, 100 and 250 mM; 20 second interval between concentrations). Each fly was stimulated with either odorous or clean air, and we recorded whether the fly extended or not the proboscis to each sucrose concentration (only full extensions were recorded). An inverted computer fan was placed near and behind the preparation to generate a steady air current over the fly, and for removing odors at the end of each trial.

Feeding consumption assay

Groups of two-days old mated female flies (n=11-15 per vial) were wet-starved for 24 hours by placing each group in a fly vial containing two pieces of water-saturated Kim wipes. Flies were then transferred to a vial containing a piece of filter paper (2.7 cm diameter, Whatman, cat. No 1001 125) impregnated with food solution (180 µl of 50 mM D-glucose) dyed blue with Erioglaucine (0.25 mg/ml, Sigma-Aldrich) (Fig. 1A). To facilitate feeding, vials were flipped upside down so that the filter paper impregnated with food solution faced up (Fig. 1A) (Jourjine et al., 2016). Flies were allowed to feed for ten minutes and then vials were frozen for at least 60 minutes. After freezing, food consumption was measured by individually examining flies under a dissecting microscope and scoring them according to the relative amount of blue dye (i.e. food) in their abdomen (see data analysis section below; Fig. 1B). All experiments and scoring were conducted blind to treatment.

In the first set of experiments, mated female flies were transferred to food vials containing an odor source. The odor source consisted of a small strip of filter paper (0.25 cm wide x 1.5 cm long) impregnated with either 10 µl of an odor solution or 10 µl of the solvent (mineral oil, Sigma, 8042-47-5), placed 7 cm from the food source (Fig. 1A). The odor solution was loaded onto the filter paper 5-10 minutes before flies were transferred to the vial

to allow volatile diffusion and stabilization. The odors used were ethyl acetate (Fisher Scientific, CAS 141-78-6), isoamyl acetate (MP Biomedicals, CAS # 123-92-2), and methyl hexanoate (Sigma Aldrich, CAS #106-7-7). All odors were diluted 1:10 and 1:20 (vol/vol) in mineral oil. Apple cider volatiles were also used in one experiment (20 µl of vinegar loaded in filter paper, or 20 µl of distilled water as a control).

To prevent animals from contacting the odor source, a piece of filter paper impregnated with either 10 µl of mineral oil or 10 µl of odor solution was placed inside a 1.5 ml Eppendorf tube with its bottom cut and replaced with a piece of plastic mesh affixed to the vial flug (Fig. 1A).

The consumption of food containing the aversive bitter compounds berberine (Sigma, CAS # 633-65-8) or L-canavanine (Sigma, CAS # 543-39-4) was tested in the presence or the absence of odorant volatiles. Flies were offered the following food mixtures (180 µl of food dyed blue loaded in filter paper): (1) 50 mM glucose only (control); (2) 50 mM glucose + 1 mM berberine; and (3) 50 mM glucose + 10 mM L-canavanine. All three mixtures were offered in the presence or absence of isoamyl acetate 1:20 vol/vol or the solvent (mineral oil) control. As before, flies were not allowed to contact the odor source. These bitter compounds were chosen because they cause feeding aversion and/or strongly activate bitter receptors in *D. melanogaster* (French et al., 2015; Mitri et al., 2009; Weiss et al., 2011). All six groups of flies were tested with overlapping cohorts to allow direct comparisons between treatments.

For all experiments, control tests (i.e., in absence of odors) were always conducted in parallel with experimental tests to control for day-to-day variations in feeding; excess control data was pseudo-randomly eliminated.

Data analysis and statistics

PER experiments

The number of animals showing proboscis extension for each sugar concentration in the presence or absence of banana volatiles was compared using Fisher's Exact tests (Zar, 1999).

Feeding assay

After feeding and freezing, flies in each vial were individually scored using the following five-point scale based on the relative amount of food, visualized as blue dye in the abdomen: 0 (no dye = no food), 0.25 ("trace" of blue dye = "taste" of food), 0.5 (up to ¼ of the abdomen dyed blue = some feeding), 1 (more than ¼ but less than ½ of the abdomen dyed blue = moderate feeding), and 2 (more than ½ of the abdomen died blue = large feeding)

(Fig. 1B). For each vial a single feeding score value was calculated as: ($0 \times n_0 + 0.25 \times n_{0.25} + 0.5 \times n_{0.5} + 1 \times n_1 + 2 \times n_2$)/ N, where $n_{(0-2)}$ denotes the number of flies in each score category, and N the total number of flies per vial. This feeding score was modified from a previous published one (Jourjine et al., 2016) and provided higher sensitivity and resolution.

Data from each day was normalized (feeding in presence of odor/ feeding in absence of odor) for comparisons involving flies from different cohorts and sexes (Figs. 4B, 5B). Control data for each day and condition was averaged and this average value was used for normalization.

Data from the first experiment was initially analyzed using two-way ANOVAs, but the interaction between factors (odorant and concentration) was significant, thus precluding interpretation of the main factor effects (Zar, 1999). Therefore, data from this experiment was analyzed using Kruskal-Wallis tests for each of the two concentrations used. Significant results were followed by Dunnett (for comparisons involving equal sample sizes) or Dunn's tests (for comparisons involving unequal sample sizes) to compare control vs. experimental groups. The effect of concentration for each odor was analyzed using two-tailed Mann-Whitney tests. In most cases, sample sizes were increased in tests with non-significant results to achieve enough statistical power (Zar, 1999). In other experiments, Mann-Whitney tests (two-tailed) or Kruskal-Wallis tests were used for respectively comparing two or more than two means (Zar, 1999). Statistical analysis were conducted using Sigma Plot v.13 (Systat).

RESULTS

Effects of odors on PER

A previous study reported that odors increase PER in *D. melanogaster*, but only animals with their antennae or maxillary palps severed were tested (Shiraiwa, 2008). Therefore, we first confirmed that under our experimental conditions the presence of food-derived odors increase the probability of PER in intact animals. We observed a significant enhancement of PER in the presence of banana volatiles (Fig. 2) only at the 50 mM concentration, consistent with previous reports (Shiraiwa 2008). We therefore choose this sugar concentration for all feeding assays.

Effects of odors and odor-derived volatiles on glucose consumption

In order to test whether odors increase consumption we selected compounds which are known attractants of *D. melanogaster*, are found within food sources, and elicit strong

responses from ORNs (Christiaens et al., 2014; de Bruyne et al., 2001; Faucher et al., 2013; Hallem and Carlson, 2006; Pelz et al., 2006; Schubert et al., 2014; Stensmyr et al., 2003). Overall, we found that flies ate more in the presence than in the absence of food-related odors, and that the enhancing effect of odors depended both on the identity of the odorant and its concentration (Fig. 3). Flies ate significantly more in the presence of ethyl acetate at the 1:10 vol/vol concentration, and in the presence of either isoamyl acetate or methyl hexanoate at the 1:20 vol/vol concentration (Fig. 3, Kruskal Wallis tests followed by post-hoc tests). Isoamyl acetate at 1:20 vol/vol had the largest effect on food consumption, with a median feeding score 2.4 times higher than that of control flies. Feeding scores were significantly affected by the concentration of both ethyl acetate and isoamyl acetate (Fig. 3, $p < 0.05$, Mann-Whitney tests) but not of methyl hexanoate ($p > 0.05$).

To test whether contact with the odor is required for increased consumption, we exposed animals to odor volatiles but prevented them from contacting the odor source. We used isoamyl acetate 1:20 vol/vol as this odorant/concentration produced the strongest effect (Fig. 3). Flies ate significantly more in the presence than in the absence of isoamyl acetate (Fig. 4A; Mann-Whitney tests, $p < 0.05$). In addition, the normalized feeding scores of flies that could contact the odor source (data from the previous experiment) were not different from those of flies that were not allowed to do so (Fig. 4B; Mann-Whitney test, $p > 0.05$). Thus, these results demonstrate that volatile (i.e. olfactory) cues are necessary and sufficient to enhance feeding, and that contact with the odor does not significantly contribute to this effect. Moreover, we found that volatile cues increased food consumption in a different strain of *D. melanogaster* (Fig. 4C).

We also studied whether enhancement of feeding by volatiles is affected by other important variables such as sex, the female mating status, and odor complexity. As observed in mated females, mated males ate significantly more in the presence than in the absence of volatile cues (Fig. 5A, Mann-Whitney tests, $p < 0.05$). Although males ate significantly more than females whether in the presence or absence of volatiles (Mann-Whitney tests, $p < 0.05$), their normalized feeding scores were not statistically different from each other (Fig. 5B; Mann-Whitney test, $p > 0.05$), indicating that food-derived olfactory cues similarly enhance feeding in both sexes. Odor-derived volatiles also increased food consumption in virgin females. The median feeding scores of virgin females fed in the presence of isoamyl acetate volatiles were 1.5 times (at 1:10 vol/vol) and 1.3 times (at 1:20 vol/vol) higher than those of control flies (Fig. 5C). This increase was statistically significant only at the 1:10 vol/vol concentration (Kruskal-Wallis test followed by Dunnett's tests, $p < 0.05$). Control (i.e. tested

in presence of mineral oil) mated and virgin females ate similar amounts of food (Mann-Whitney test, p>0.05). In presence of isoamyl acetate 1:20 vol/vol, their normalized feeding scores were not statistically different (Mann Whitney test, p>0.05; Figure 5D). Mated females offered glucose in the presence of apple cider volatiles ate significantly more than control flies (Mann-Whitney test, p<0.05; Fig. 4D), indicating that odorant mixtures enhanced feeding as well.

Effect of volatiles in the consumption of aversive food mixtures

Under natural situations, animals are often confronted with stimuli of conflicting valence that predict opposite behavioral outcomes (e.g. Klappenbach et al., 2017; Lewis et al., 2015). In particular, natural food sources are mixtures which might contain substances which are not appetitive by themselves, including bitter compounds, such as alkaloids in nectar from some flowers (Adler, 2000) and glucosinolates in Brassica (Cartea and Velasco, 2008). Thus, a plausible hypothesis is that odorants promote, to some extent, ingestion of such food mixtures. We tested this idea by investigating whether the presence of food-derived volatiles enhances feeding of food sources which are normally rejected or less accepted, such as sweet-bitter mixtures (Chapman et al., 1991; French et al., 2015; Meunier et al., 2003). Mated females were offered 50 mM glucose alone, 50 mM glucose + 1 mM berberine, or 50 mM glucose + 10 mM L-canavanine, in the presence or absence of isoamyl acetate volatiles. These two bitter compounds were selected because they have different influences on GRN activity: berberine activates bitter GRNs and inhibits sugar GRNs, whereas L-canavanine activates bitters GRNs but does not inhibit sugar GRNs (French et al., 2015; Jeong et al., 2013). Food mixtures containing either bitter substance significantly reduced feeding (Fig. 6; p<0.05 in both cases, Kruskal-Wallis tests followed by Tukey tests).

In order to directly test the effect of volatiles on the consumption of food containing bitter compounds, we compared consumption of each food source in the presence or absence of the odor. As before, the presence of isoamyl acetate significantly increased consumption of glucose (Fig. 6; Mann-Whitney test; p<0.05): the median feeding score of flies in the presence of isoamyl acetate was 2.1 times higher than that of flies fed in the presence of the solvent control. The feeding enhancement effect of isoamyl acetate was even stronger when flies were offered food mixtures containing bitter substances. The presence of isoamyl acetate significantly increased the median consumption of food mixtures containing berberine or L-canavanine 3.1 and 5.5 times, respectively (Fig. 6; Mann-Whitney tests, p<0.05 in both

cases). Overall, these results show that odors increase food consumption, both for appetitive food as well as for food mixtures containing bitter compounds.

DISCUSSION

We investigated the effect of attractive food-derived volatiles on food consumption in *D. melanogaster*. We found that the presence of food-derived volatiles increased ingestion in a concentration and odorant-dependent manner, and that contact with the odor source is not required to produce this enhancement. When flies were offered food mixtures containing bitter compounds they consumed less, but such mixtures were more readily accepted in the presence of odorant volatiles. Overall, these results indicate that flies integrate diverse olfactory and gustatory cues to guide food consumption.

In flies, studies of taste and feeding have extensively used the proboscis extension response (PER) as a measure of taste palatability and appetite. When contact chemosensilla of either the tarsi or the proboscis are stimulated with an appetitive stimulus such as a sugar solution, insects extend their proboscis in an attempt to eat (Dethier, 1976). Thus, PER assesses the behavioral response to gustatory stimuli in the absence of consumption. In blowflies, the PER threshold to sucrose decreased in the presence of an odor positively associated with a food reward (Nisimura et al., 2005). Also, odors detected through the maxillary palp increased the probability of PER in starved animals (Maeda et al., 2014; Shiraiwa, 2008).

First, we confirmed that complex food derived volatiles increased the probability of PER in intact *D. melanogaster* (Fig. 2). We then directly tested whether food-derived odors increased food ingestion. All odorants tested enhanced feeding to different degrees, with isoamyl acetate having the strongest effect (Fig. 3). This odorant is prominent in the headspace of banana and elicits strong responses from antennal ORNs (Hallem and Carlson, 2006; Schubert et al., 2014). For a given odorant, the enhancing effect depended on the concentration, e.g. isoamyl acetate significantly increased feeding only at the lowest concentration tested, while ethyl acetate increased feeding only at the highest concentration (Fig. 3). This is in line with the fact that the same odorant or odor blend can trigger avoidance, indifference, or attraction, depending on the concentration (Semmelhack and Wang, 2009; Stensmyr et al., 2003). Collectively, these odorants strongly activate at least seven different olfactory receptors (OR) expressed in the antenna (Or22a, Or85b, Or47a, Or42b, Or43b, Or10a and Or98a) and one OR (Or42a) expressed in the maxillary palps (Galizia et al., 2010; Hallem and Carlson, 2006; Münch and Galizia, 2016; Pelz et al., 2006).

Our study does not allow us to infer which ORs mediate feeding enhancement, but two of the odorants tested (isoamyl acetate and methyl hexanoate) strongly activate both Or22a and Or85b, which are expressed in the antennae (Hallem and Carlson, 2006; Münch and Galizia, 2016; Pelz et al., 2006). Or22a may be of particular significance, as this olfactory receptor is activated by the natural hosts of *D. melanogaster* (Mansourian et al., 2018) and of its close relatives *D. sechellia* (Dekker et al., 2006) and *D. erecta* (Linz et al., 2013). These findings thus suggest that feeding enhancement may proceed through the antenna but do not preclude the possibility that odors enhance ingestion through the maxillary palps as well. *D. melanogaster* maxillary palps are highly sensitive to behaviorally relevant odorants and can mediate short- and long-range attraction (Dweck et al., 2016), and are involved in enhancing taste responses in this fly species (Shiraiwa, 2008).

We further confirmed that the enhancing effect of odors in food consumption is purely olfactory. Animals ingested significantly more in the presence than in the absence of isoamyl acetate volatiles (Fig. 4A) and consumed similar relative amounts of food with or without contact with the odor source (Fig. 4B). Thus, these results demonstrate that olfactory input is necessary and sufficient to increase ingestion. Odorant volatiles also enhanced feeding in a different strain of *D. melanogaster* (Fig. 4C), indicating that this effect is a generalized characteristic of this, and possible other, fruit fly species.

We found that volatiles from apple cider vinegar, a food source that is highly attractive to flies (Becher et al., 2010; Semmelhack and Wang, 2009), also enhanced ingestion (Fig. 4D). The headspace of apple cider vinegar contains a variety of carbonyls, esters and alcohols, including isoamyl acetate and ethyl acetate (Aurand et al., 1966), both of which are sufficient in themselves to enhance consumption (Figs. 3-4). Thus, it is possible that components of an odor mixture are exploited differentially during the processes of food search, finding and feeding. A blend of key odorants is usually required for long-distance orientation towards a food source (Becher et al., 2010; Riffell et al., 2009), although in a few cases single odorants maybe sufficient but much less effective (Becher et al., 2010; Dweck et al., 2016). Once insects are in the vicinity of the food source and contact an appetitive taste, single components within the odor mixture may be sufficient to enhance ingestion.

Certain odors and odorants, such as balsamic vinegar and ethyl acetate, induce stronger and longer olfactory responses in female than in male flies (Steck et al., 2012). We found, however, that isoamyl acetate similarly modulates feeding in both sexes (Figs. 5A-B). This is not surprising, given that single odorants evoke activity in multiple ORs and antennal lobe glomeruli (de Bruyne et al., 2001; Hallem and Carlson, 2006; Hallem et al., 2004; Wang

et al., 2003). Isoamyl acetate also enhanced feeding in virgin females but at a higher concentration than in mated females (Fig. 5C). A possible explanation for this is that virgin females maybe less sensitive to isoamyl acetate than mated females, although considerably variation exists regarding the odor context and biological significance of the odorants (Gadenne et al., 2016). Wind tunnel experiments in *D. melanogaster* showed similar levels of attraction to vinegar volatiles (Becher et al., 2010), a complex mixture that includes isoamyl acetate.

Taste cues evoke stereotypic attractive or aversive behavioral responses, albeit these responses can be modified by the behavioral context and the insect internal state. For instance, starved flies accept foods containing bitter compounds, a change that results from sensitization to sweet substances and desensitization to bitter compounds (Inagaki et al., 2014; LeDue et al., 2016; Meunier et al., 2003). Moreover, under natural situations, food sources maybe composed of multimodal sensory stimuli of conflicting valence. We thus tested whether appetitive food-derived odorants enhance ingestion of food sources which are normally rejected or less accepted, such as sweet-bitter mixtures (Chapman et al., 1991; French et al., 2015; Meunier et al., 2003). As expected, addition of a bitter compound to an appetitive sweet stimulus strongly reduced feeding (Fig. 6, white bars). However, we found that the presence of attractive volatiles (isoamyl acetate) significantly increased consumption of these food mixtures (Fig. 6, gray bars). This enhancing effect was observed whether mixtures included either of two different classes of bitter compounds, the alkaloid berberine, or the legume amino acid L-canavanine. These two bitter compounds differ in their mechanism of feeding suppression, with L-canavanine activating bitter-sensitive cells, and berberine shutting down taste responses in sugar-sensitive cells (French et al., 2015; Jeong et al., 2013). Although it remains to be investigated, these results, along with previous evidence (see discussion below), suggest that processing of such conflicting information, e.g. an aversive taste cue and an appetitive odor stimulus, likely occurs in higher order brain centers.

Overall, our results show that food-derived odorants enhance food ingestion, although it remains to be investigated whether other meaningful odors increase consumption as well. What are the neural mechanisms underlying this effect? Importantly, the finding that odors increase the probability of proboscis extension in flies with intact olfactory organs indicates that the enhancement effect of odors on food consumption is independent of odor-evoked increases in locomotion activity (Jung et al., 2015). In blowflies, neuroanatomical evidence suggests that integration of taste and palp-mediated olfactory cues might take place in the suboesophageal ganglion, as the terminals of some palp ORNs overlaps with those of GRNs

in this region (Maeda et al., 2014). It is possible, however, that odors increase feeding possibly through neural circuits in higher brain areas in *D. melanogaster*. The lateral horn of the protocerebrum and the mushroom bodies are two good candidates, as these regions receive input from antennal lobe olfactory projection neurons (Marin et al., 2002; Wong et al., 2002). Furthermore, two classes of second order taste projection neurons project to the superior lateral protocerebrum (Kim et al., 2017), an area that provides inputs and outputs to the mushroom bodies (Ito et al., 1998), in close proximity to olfactory projection neurons in the lateral horn. The lateral horn of the protocerebrum is thought to mediate innate, stereotypic olfactory-driven behaviors, while the mushroom bodies are typically regarded as learning and memory centers (Heimbeck et al., 2001; Jefferis et al., 2007). The mushroom bodies have been extensively implicated in olfactory learning (Davis, 2005; de Belle and Heisenberg, 1994) but are also necessary for learned taste behaviors (Kirkhart and Scott, 2015; Masek and Keene, 2016); they are also involved in other complex functions including sensory integration (Balkenius and Balkenius, 2016; Farris, 2008; Yagi et al., 2016) and context recognition (e.g. Bräcker et al., 2013). Thus, a plausible hypothesis is that food odors enhance feeding through local circuits within these higher order brain regions. The mushroom bodies maybe also involved in the simultaneous evaluation of aversive taste and attractive odor cues in the feeding context, as previous studies have shown that specific local circuits within these brain structures are required to integrate information about olfactory appetitive and aversive sources (Bräcker et al., 2013; Lewis et al., 2015). In sum, our results demonstrate that food-derived odorants can enhance consumption of appetitive substances in *D. melanogaster*, and this, along with the powerful genetic techniques available in this fly species, offers an excellent opportunity for studying the neural mechanism underlying multisensory integration in the context of feeding.

REFERENCES

Adler, L. S. (2000). The ecological significance of toxic nectar. *Oikos* **91**, 409-420.

Aurand, L. W., Singleton, J. A., Bell, T. A., and Etchells, J. L. (1966). Volatile components in the vapors of natural and distilled vinegars. *Journal of Food Science* **31**, 172-177.

Balkenius, A. and Balkenius, C. (2016). Multimodal interaction in the insect brain. *BMC Neuroscience* **17**, 29.

Becher, Paul G., Bengtsson, M., Hansson, Bill S. and Witzgall, P. (2010). Flying the fly: long-range flight behavior of *Drosophila melanogaster* to attractive odors. *J. Chem. Ecol.* **36**, 599-607.

Bitterman, M. E., Menzel, R., Fietz, A. and Schäfer, S. (1983). Classical conditioning of proboscis extension in honeybees (*Apis mellifera*). *J. Comp. Psychol.* **97**, 107-119.

Bräcker, Lasse B., Siju, K. P., Varela, N., Aso, Y., Zhang, M., Hein, I., Vasconcelos, Maria L. and Grunwald Kadow, Ilona C. (2013). Essential role of the mushroom body in context-dependent CO_2 avoidance in *Drosophila*. *Current Biol.* **23**, 1228-1234.

Cameron, P., Hiroi, M., Ngai, J. and Scott, K. (2010). The molecular basis for water taste in *Drosophila*. *Nature* **465**, 91-95.

Carde, R. and Willis, M. (2008). Navigational strategies used by insects to find distant, wind-borne sources of odor. *J. Chem. Ecol.* **34**, 854-866.

Cartea, M. E. and Velasco, P. (2008). Glucosinolates in Brassica foods: bioavailability in food and significance for human health. *Phytochemical Reviews* **7**, 213-229.

Chabaud, M.-A., Devaud, J.-M., Pham-Delègue, M.-H., Preat, T. and Kaiser, L. (2006). Olfactory conditioning of proboscis activity in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *J. Comp. Physiol. A* **192**, 1335-1348.

Chapman, R. F. (1998). The insects: structure and function: Cambridge University Press.

Chapman, R. F. (2003). Contact chemoreception in feeding by phytophagous insects. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* **48**, 455-484.

Chapman, R. F., Ascoli-Christensen, A. and White, P. R. (1991). Sensory coding for feeding deterrence in the grasshopper *Schistocerca americana*. *J. Exp. Biol.* **158**, 241-259.

Christiaens, Joaquin F., Franco, Luis M., Cools, Tanne L., De Meester, L., Michiels, J., Wenseleers, T., Hassan, Bassem A., Yaksi, E. and Verstrepen, Kevin J. (2014). The fungal aroma gene ATF1 promotes dispersal of yeast cells through insect vectors. *Cell Reports* **9**, 425-432.

Daly, K. C. and Smith, B. H. (2000). Associative olfactory learning in the moth *Manduca sexta*. *J. Exp. Biol.* **203**, 2025-2038.

Davis, R. L. (2005). Olfactory memory formation in drosophila: from molecular to systems neuroscience. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* **28**, 275-302.

de Belle, J. and Heisenberg, M. (1994). Associative odor learning in *Drosophila* abolished by chemical ablation of mushroom bodies. *Science* **263**, 692-695.

de Bruyne, M., Clyne, P. J. and Carlson, J. R. (1999). Odor coding in a model olfactory organ: the *Drosophila* maxillary palp. *J. Neurosci.* **19**, 4520-4532.

de Bruyne, M., Foster, K. and Carlson, J. R. (2001). Odor coding in the *Drosophila* antenna. *Neuron* **30**, 537-552.

Dekker, T., I. Ibba, K. P. Siju, M. C. Stensmyr, and B. S. Hansson. 2006. Olfactory shifts parallel superspecialism for toxic fruit in *Drosophila melanogaster* sibling, *D. sechellia. Curr. Biol.* **16**, 101-109.

Dethier, V. G. (1976). The hungry fly: a physiological study of the behavior associated with feeding: Harvard University Press

Dweck, H. K. M., Ebrahim, S. A. M., Khallaf, M. A., Koenig, C., Farhan, A., Stieber, R., Weißflog, J., Svatoš, A., Grosse-Wilde, E., Knaden, M. et al. (2016). Olfactory channels associated with the *Drosophila* maxillary palp mediate short- and long-range attraction. *eLife* **5**, e14925.

Falk, R., Bleiser-Avivi, N. and Atidia, J. (1976). Labellar taste organs of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *J. Morphol.* **150**, 327-341.

Farris, S. M. (2008). Tritocerebral tract input to the insect mushroom bodies. *Arthropod Struct. Dev.* **37**, 492-503.

Faucher, C. P., Hilker, M. and de Bruyne, M. (2013). Interactions of carbon dioxide and food odours in *Drosophila*: olfactory hedonics and sensory neuron properties. *PLoS ONE* **8**, e56361.

French, A. S., Sellier, M.-J., Moutaz, A. A., Guigue, A., Chabaud, M.-A., Reeb, P. D., Mitra, A., Grau, Y., Soustelle, L. and Marion-Poll, F. (2015). Dual mechanism for bitter avoidance in *Drosophila*. *J. Neurosci.* **35**, 3990-4004.

Gadenne, C., Barrozo, R. B. and Anton, S. (2016). Plasticity in insect olfaction: to smell or not to smell? *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* **61**, 317-333.

Galizia, C. G., Münch, D., Strauch, M., Nissler, A. and Ma, S. (2010). Integrating heterogeneous odor response data into a common response model: a DoOR to the complete olfactome. *Chem. Senses* **35**, 551-563.

Giurfa, M. and Sandoz, J.-C. (2012). Invertebrate learning and memory: fifty years of olfactory conditioning of the proboscis extension response in honeybees. *Learn. Memory* **19**, 54-66.

Glendinning, J. I. (2002). How do herbivorous insects cope with noxious secondary plant compounds in their diet? *Entomol. Exp. Appl.* **104**, 15-25.

Gordon, M. D. and Scott, K. (2009). Motor control in a *Drosophila* taste circuit. *Neuron* **61**, 373-384.

Guerenstein, P. G. and Lazzari, C. R. (2010). The role of olfaction in host seeking of triatomine bugs. In *Ecology and Control of Vector-Borne Diseases vol 2: Olfaction in vector-host interactions* (ed. T. Knols), pp. 309-325: Wageningen Academic.

Hallem, E. A. and Carlson, J. R. (2006). Coding of odors by a receptor repertoire. *Cell* **125**, 143-160.

Hallem, E. A., Dahanukar, A. and Carlson, J. R. (2006). Insect odor and taste receptors. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* **51**, 113-135.

Hallem, E. A., Ho, M. G. and Carlson, J. R. (2004). The molecular basis of odor coding in the *Drosophila* antenna. *Cell* **117**, 965-979.

Hansson, B. S. (1995). Olfaction in Lepidoptera. *Experientia* **51**, 1003-1027.

Hansson, B. S., Larsson, M. C. and Leal, W. S. (1999). Green leaf volatile-detecting olfactory receptor neurons display very high sensitivity and specificity in a scarab beetle. *Physiol. Entomol.* **24**, 121-126.

Heimbeck, G., Bugnon, V., Gendre, N., Keller, A. and Stocker, R. F. (2001). A central neural circuit for experience-independent olfactory and courtship behavior in *Drosophila melanogaster. P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **98**, 15341.

Hillier, N. K. and Vickers, N. J. (2007). Physiology and antennal lobe projections of olfactory receptor neurons from sexually isomorphic sensilla on male *Heliothis virescens. J. Comp. Physiol. A* **193**, 649-663.

Inagaki, H. K., Panse, K. M. and Anderson, D. J. (2014). Independent, reciprocal neuromodulatory control of sweet and bitter taste sensitivity during starvation in *Drosophila*. *Neuron* **84**, 806-820.

Ito, K., Suzuki, K., Estes, P., Ramaswami, M., Yamamoto, D. and Strausfeld, N. J. (1998). The organization of extrinsic neurons and their implications in the functional roles of the mushroom bodies in *Drosophila melanogaster* Meigen. *Learn. Memory* **5**, 52-77.

Jefferis, G. S. X. E., Potter, C. J., Chan, A. M., Marin, E. C., Rohlfing, T., Maurer, Jr. and Luo, L. (2007). Comprehensive maps of drosophila higher olfactory centers: Spatially segregated fruit and pheromone representation. *Cell* **128**, 1187-1203.

Jeong, Y. T., Shim, J., Oh, S. R., Yoon, H. I., Kim, C. H., Moon, S. J. and Montell, C. (2013). An odorant-binding protein required for suppression of sweet taste by bitter chemicals. *Neuron* **79**, 725-737.

Jourjine, N., Mullaney, B. C., Mann, K. and Scott, K. (2016). Coupled sensing of hunger and thirst signals balances sugar and water consumption. *Cell* **166**, 855-866.

Jung, S.-H., Hueston, C. and Bhandawat, V. (2015). Odor-identity dependent motor programs underlie behavioral responses to odors. *eLife* **4**, e11092.

Kim, H., Kirkhart, C. and Scott, K. (2017). Long-range projection neurons in the taste circuit of *Drosophila*. *eLife* **6**, e23386.

Kim, Y.-C., Lee, H.-G. and Han, K.-A. (2007). Classical reward conditioning in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genes Brain Behav.* **6**, 201-207.

Kirkhart, C. and Scott, K. (2015). Gustatory learning and processing in the *Drosophila* mushroom bodies. *J. Neurosci.* **35**, 5950-5958.

Klappenbach, M., Nally, A. and Locatelli, F. F. (2017). Parallel memory traces are built after an experience containing aversive and appetitive components in the crab *Neohelice*. *P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **114**, E4666-E4675.

LeDue, Emily E., Mann, K., Koch, E., Chu, B., Dakin, R. and Gordon, Michael D. (2016). Starvation-induced depotentiation of bitter taste in *Drosophila*. *Current Biol.* **26**, 2854-2861.

Lehane, M. (2005). The biology of blood-sucking in insects. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, Laurence P. C., Siju, K. P., Aso, Y., Friedrich, Anja B., Bulteel, Alexander J. B., Rubin, Gerald M. and Grunwald Kadow, Ilona C. (2015). A higher brain circuit for immediate integration of conflicting sensory information in *Drosophila*. *Current Biol.* **25**, 2203-2214.

Liman, Emily R., Zhang, Yali V. and Montell, C. (2014). Peripheral coding of taste. *Neuron* **81**, 984-1000.

Linz, J., A. Baschwitz, A. Strutz, H. K. M. Dweck, S. Sachse, B. S. Hansson, and M. C. Stensmyr. 2013. Host plant-driven sensory specialization in *Drosophila erecta*. *P. Roy. Soc. Lon. B Bio* **280**, 20130626.

MacKay, C. A., Sweeney, J. D. and Hillier, N. K. (2015). Olfactory receptor neuron responses of a longhorned beetle, *Tetropium fuscum* (Fabr.) (Coleoptera: Cerambycidae), to pheromone, host, and non-host volatiles. *J. Insect Physiol.* **83**, 65-73.

Maeda, T., Tamotsu, M., Yamaoka, R. and Ozaki, M. (2015). Effects of floral scents and their dietary experiences on the feeding preference in the blowfly, *Phormia regina. Front. Integ. Neurosci.* **9**, 59.

Maeda, T., Tamotsu, S., Iwasaki, M., Nisimura, T., Shimohigashi, M., Hojo, M. K. and Ozaki, M. (2014). Neuronal projections and putative interaction of multimodal inputs in the subesophageal ganglion in the blowfly, *Phormia regina. Chem. Senses* **39**, 391-401.

Mansourian, S., A. Enjin, E. V. Jirle, V. Ramesh, G. Rehermann, P. G. Becher, J. E. Pool, and M. C. Stensmyr. 2018. Wild african *Drosophila melanogaster* are seasonal specialists on *Marula* fruit. *Curr. Biol.* **28**, 3960-3968.e3.

Marin, E. C., Jefferis, G. S. X. E., Komiyama, T., Zhu, H. and Luo, L. (2002). Representation of the glomerular olfactory map in the *Drosophila* brain. *Cell* **109**, 243-255.

Masek, P. and Keene, A. C. (2016). Gustatory processing and taste memory in *Drosophila. J. Neurogenet.* **30**, 112-121.

Meunier, N., Marion-Poll, F., Rospars, J.-P. and Tanimura, T. (2003). Peripheral coding of bitter taste in *Drosophila. J. Neurobiol.* **56**, 139-152.

Mitri, C., Soustelle, L., Framery, B., Bockaert, J., Parmentier, M.-L. and Grau, Y. (2009). The plant insecticide L-canavanine repels *Drosophila* via the insect orphan GPCR DmX. *PLOS Biol.* **7**, e1000147.

Montell, C. (2009). A taste of the *Drosophila* gustatory receptors. *Current Op. Neurobiol.* **19**, 345-353.

Münch, D. and Galizia, C. G. (2016). DoOR 2.0 - Comprehensive mapping of *Drosophila melanogaster* odorant responses. *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 21841.

Nisimura, T., Seto, A., Nakamura, K., Miyama, M., Nagao, T., Tamotsu, S., Yamaoka, R. and Ozaki, M. (2005). Experiential effects of appetitive and nonappetitive odors on feeding behavior in the blowfly, *Phormia regina*: a putative role for tyramine in appetite regulation. *J. Neurosci.* **25**, 7507-7516.

Pelz, D., Roeske, T., Syed, Z., de, B. M. and Galizia, C. G. (2006). The molecular receptive range of an olfactory receptor in vivo (*Drosophila melanogaster* Or22a). *J Neurobiol.* **66**, 1544-1563.

Ray, A. (2015). Reception of odors and repellents in mosquitoes. *Current Op. Neurobiol.* **34**, 158-164.

Riffell, J. A., Lei, H. and Hildebrand, J. G. (2009). Neural correlates of behavior in the moth *Manduca sexta* in response to complex odors. *P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **106**, 19219-19226.

Riffell, J. A., Shlizerman, E., Sanders, E., Abrell, L., Medina, B., Hinterwirth, A. J. and Kutz, J. N. (2014). Flower discrimination by pollinators in a dynamic chemical environment. *Science* **344**, 1515-1518.

Rostelien, T., Borg-Karlson, A. K. and Mustaparta, H. (2000). Selective receptor neurone responses to E-β-ocimene, β-myrcene, E,E-α-farnesene and homo-farnese in the moth *Heliothis virescens*, identified by gas chromatography linked to electrophysiology. *J. Comp. Physiol. A* **186**, 833-847.

Schubert, M., Hansson, B. and Sachse, S. (2014). The banana code -natural blend processing in the olfactory circuitry of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Front. Physiol.* **5**.

Scott, K. (2018). Gustatory Processing in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* **63**, 15-30.

Semmelhack, J. L. and Wang, J. W. (2009). Select *Drosophila* glomeruli mediate innate olfactory attraction and aversion. *Nature* **459**, 218-223.

Shiraiwa, T. (2008). Multimodal chemosensory integration through the maxillary palp in *Drosophila*. *PLoS ONE* **3**, e2191.

Steck, K., Veit, D., Grandy, R., Badia, S. B. I., Mathews, Z., Verschure, P., Hansson, B. S. and Knaden, M. (2012). A high-throughput behavioral paradigm for *Drosophila* olfaction - The Flywalk. *Sci. Rep.* **2**, 361-361.

Stensmyr, M., Giordano, E., Balloi, A., Angioy, A. M. and Hansson, B. S. (2003). Novel natural ligands for *Drosophila* olfactory receptor neurons. *J. Exp. Biol.* **206**, 715-724.

Stocker, R. F. (1994). The organization of the chemosensory system in *Drosophila melanogaster*: a review. *Cell Tiss. Res.* **275**, 3-26.

Stranden, M., Rostelien, T., Liblikas, I., Almaas, T. J., Borg-Karlson, A. K. and Mustaparta, H. (2003). Receptor neurons in three heliothine moths responding to floral and inducible plant volatiles. *Chemoecology* **13**, 143-154.

Takken, W. and Knols, B. G. (1999). Odor-mediated behavior of afrotropical malaria mosquitoes. *Ann. Rev. Entomol.* **44**, 131-157.

Wang, J. W., Wong, A. M., Flores, J., Vosshall, L. B. and Axel, R. (2003). Two-photon calcium imaging reveals an odor-evoked map of activity in the fly brain. *Cell* **112**, 271-282.

Wang, Z., Singhvi, A., Kong, P. and Scott, K. (2004). Taste representations in the *Drosophila* brain. *Cell* **117**, 981-991.

Weiss, L. A., Dahanukar, A., Kwon, J. Y., Banerjee, D. and Carlson, J. R. (2011). The molecular and cellular basis of bitter taste in *Drosophila*. *Neuron* **69**, 258-272.

Wong, A. M., Wang, J. W. and Axel, R. (2002). Spatial representation of the glomerular map in the *Drosophila* protocerebrum. *Cell* **109**, 229-241.

Yagi, R., Mabuchi, Y., Mizunami, M. and Tanaka, N. K. (2016). Convergence of multimodal sensory pathways to the mushroom body calyx in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 29481.

Yao, C. A., Ignell, R. and Carlson, J. R. (2005). Chemosensory coding by neurons in the coeloconic sensilla of the *Drosophila* antenna. *J. Neurosci.* **25**, 8359-8367.

Zar, J. H. (1999). Biostatistical analysis. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Figures

Figure 1: Behavioral assay used to quantify feeding in the presence or absence of odors.
A: Groups of 10-15 flies wet-starved flies were transferred to a vial containing a disk of filter paper impregnated with food solution dyed blue and a strip of filter paper impregnated with an odorant or the solvent control; vials were immediately flipped upside down to facilitate feeding. Flies could contact the odor source (left) or not (right). **B:** Pictures show representative examples of flies which consumed different amounts of food, visualized as blue dye. Consumption was quantified using a five-point scale ranging from 0 to 2 (numbers), as explained in the main text. Flies in each vial were scored blind to treatment, and a single score per vial was calculated and used for analysis.

Figure 2: Food-derived odors increase the probability of proboscis extension. Data show the percentage of animals that extend their proboscis for each sucrose concentration (log units) in absence (white bars, n=104) or presence (gray bars, n=100) of banana volatiles. Each animal was tested with all sugar concentrations but with either the control or odor stimuli. The asterisk indicates significant differences (Fisher Exact test, p<0.05).

Figure 3: Food-derived volatiles enhance food consumption. Feeding scores of flies offered 50 mM glucose in the presence or absence of ethyl acetate, isoamyl acetate and methyl hexanoate at 1:10 vol/vol and 1:20 vol/vol concentration. Boxplots indicate the median feeding score (horizontal line within the box), the 25th and 75th percentiles (lower and upper margins of the box), and the 10th and 90th percentiles (whiskers); circles show individual data points. Control flies (n=40 vials randomly divided in two groups) were offered food in the presence of the mineral oil solvent. Flies could contact the odor source (as shown in Fig. 1A, left); all groups were tested with overlapping cohorts of flies. Numbers between parentheses indicate the number of vials tested for each odor and concentration. Data for each odor concentration was analyzed using Kruskal-Wallis tests (d.f.=3); significant results were followed by Dunn's test for comparing each odor with the mineral oil control group (black asterisks; * $p<0.05$, **** $p<0.001$). For each odor, the effect of concentration was analyzed using two-tailed Mann-Whitney tests (red horizontal lines and asterisks; * $p<0.05$, ****$p<0.001$). All odors enhanced feeding above the control level at one or the other concentration used. Isoamyl acetate at 1:20 vol/vol had the strongest effect on feeding enhancement.

Figure 4: Contact with the odor source is not required to enhance food consumption. A: Feeding score of mated female flies offered 50 mM glucose in the presence or absence of isoamyl acetate (IA) 1:20 (vol/vol loaded on filter paper), *i.e.* flies could smell but could not contact the odor source (as shown in Fig. 1A, right). Differences were statistically significant (p<0.005, two-tailed Mann-Whitney test). **B:** Relative feeding scores of flies offered food in the presence of contact cues (left) or no-contact cues only (right). For each vial, the relative feeding score was calculated by dividing the feeding score in the presence of the odor by the average feeding score of control flies (two-tailed Mann-Whitney test, p>0.05). **C:** Feeding scores of mated females from a different strain of *D. melanogaster* (14021-0231.199, abbreviated as 199) offered 50 mM glucose in the presence or absence of isoamyl acetate volatiles (* p<0.05, two-tailed Mann-Whitney test). As with Canton-S flies, volatile cues were sufficient to enhance feeding. **D:** Feeding scores of mated Canton-S flies offered 50 mM glucose in the presence or absence of apple cider volatiles (40 µl loaded in filter paper or

40 µl of water). As with single odorants, complex odor mixtures can also enhance feeding. In all cases boxplots indicate the median feeding score (horizontal line within the box), the 25th and 75th percentiles (lower and upper margins of the box), and the 10th and 90th percentiles (whiskers); circles show individual data points. M oil: m oil.

Figure 5: Odorant volatiles enhance feeding in mated males and virgin females. A: Feeding scores of mated male flies offered 50 mM glucose in the presence or absence of isoamyl acetate (IA) volatiles (1:20 vol/vol loaded on filter paper) (*** $p<0.005$, two-tailed Mann-Whitney test). **B:** Relative feeding scores of mated females (from Fig. 4A) and mated males (from Fig. 5A). For each vial, the relative feeding score was calculated by dividing the feeding score in presence of the odor by the average feeding score of control flies from the same cohort. Differences were not statistically significant (two-tailed Mann-Whitney test, $p=0.08$). **C:** Odor volatiles enhanced feeding in virgin female flies at the 1:10 vol/vol concentration (Kruskal-Wallis test followed by Dunnett tests, * $p<0.05$). **D:** Isoamyl acetate 1:20 vol/vol similarly enhance feeding in mated and virgin females (Mann-Whitney test, $p>0.05$). Only flies from the same cohort were included in this analysis. In all cases boxplots indicate the median feeding score (A, C) or normalized feeding score (B, D) (horizontal line within the box), the 25th and 75th percentiles (lower and upper margins of the box), and the 10th and 90th percentiles (whiskers); circles show individual data points. M oil: mineral oil.

Figure 6: Odorant volatiles enhance feeding of food sources containing bitter compounds. Feeding scores of flies offered 1) 50 mM glucose, 2) 50 mM glucose + 1 mM berberine, or 3) 50 mM glucose + 10 mM L-canavanine in absence (white boxes) or presence (gray boxes) of isoamyl acetate volatiles (1:20 vol/vol loaded on filter paper). All six groups of flies (n=20 vials in each group) were tested with overlapping cohorts of flies. As shown before, volatiles enhanced feeding of appetitive (glucose only) food sources (p<0.05, two-tailed Mann-Whitney test). Whether in the presence or absence of volatiles, food mixtures containing either bitter compound significantly reduced feeding (Kruskal-Wallis tests followed by Dunnett tests, black asterisks; **** p<0.001). However, isoamyl acetate volatiles significantly increased the feeding scores of flies fed food mixtures containing the bitter compounds (two-tailed Mann-Whitney tests, red horizontal lines with asterisks; *** p<0.005, **** p<0.001). Boxplots indicate the median feeding score (horizontal line within the box), the 25th and 75th percentiles (lower and upper margins of the box), and the 10th and 90th percentiles (whiskers); circles show individual data points.