Journal Pre-proof

Root cropping by pocket gophers

Veronica Selden, Francis E. Putz

PII: \$0960-9822(22)00915-0

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2022.06.003

Reference: CURBIO 18526

To appear in: Current Biology



Please cite this article as: Selden V, Putz FE, Root cropping by pocket gophers, *Current Biology* (2022), doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2022.06.003.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2022 Elsevier Inc.

1 Root cropping by pocket gophers

- 2 Veronica Selden¹ and Francis E. Putz^{1*}
- 3 **Affiliations:**
- 4 Veronica Selden¹
- ¹Department of Biology, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32641
- 6 Orcid: 0000-0002-0339-3204
- 7 Francis E. Putz^{1,*}
- 8 ¹Department of Biology, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32641
- 9 Orcid: 0000-0003-0051-6675
- 10 **Corresponding author**. Email: fep@ufl.edu

eTOC

11

12

- Roots grow into the humid interiors of *Geomys pinetis* tunnels where they benefit from nutrients
- from gopher wastes. Cropping these roots supplies G. pinetis with an average of 21% but up to
- 15 62% of their daily basal metabolic needs. This behavior may qualify these fossorial rodents as
- the first non-human mammalian farmers.

17

- 18 Pocket gophers (Geomys spp.) are solitary, root-eating fossorial rodents native to North and
- 19 Central American grasslands presumed to acquire most of their food through excavation of
- 20 tunnels maintained as part of tunnel systems up to 160 m long^{1,2}. Given that burrowing is 360-
- 21 3400 times more energetically costly than surface walking, pocket gophers have high energy
- requirements³. Roots are scarce at the depths of their tunnels in the sandy soil of our study site
- 23 (20-64 cm), but here we describe a novel food source for southeastern pocket gophers (Geomys

24 pinetis, hereafter gophers): roots that grow into their tunnels. These roots could supply an 25 average of 21% but up to 62% of their daily basal energetic needs. We worked in a pasture being restored to longleaf pine (*Pinus palustris*) savanna in North 26 27 Florida where gophers were abundant (Figure 1A). Based on the bulk density of the sandy soil $(\text{mean} = 1.46 \text{ g} \cdot \text{cm}^{-3}, \text{ sd} = 0.07, \text{ N} = 12), \text{ mean tunnel radius of } 3.8 \text{ cm (sd} = 0.40, \text{ N} = 12), \text{ and}$ 28 29 mean tunnel depth of 38.6 cm (sd = 12.6, N = 12), the average energetic cost of tunnel excavation is 17 kJ·m⁻¹ when soil is discarded in surface mounds⁴. Based on fine root (<2 mm 30 31 diameter) samples from soil adjacent to the tunnels, gophers encounter an average of 1.37 g (dry 32 weight) of roots (sd = 1.05, N = 12) per meter of excavated tunnel of average radius, but with a large range (0.25-4.01 g·m⁻¹). Assuming a fine root energy content of 18.39 kJ·g⁻¹, 56% energy 33 digestibility and 54% assimilation efficiency⁶, a gopher would suffer an average deficit of 9.1 kJ 34 35 per meter of tunnel excavated (sd = 7.46 kJ, N = 12). It should be noted that this estimate, like the others that follow, are quite variable; one tunnel yielded an energy surplus due to a locally 36 high concentration of roots. 37 38 After excluding gophers from 57 cm long sections of tunnel for 17-44 days (Figures 1B 39 and 1C), root growth into and within 0.4 cm of the tunnel circumference was equivalent to 0.076 g per meter of tunnel per day (sd = 0.055, N = 12, range = 0.021-0.174 g·m⁻¹·day⁻¹; Figure 1D 40 41 and 1E). In-growing roots provide an extra 0.42 kJ per meter per day (sd = 0.306, N = 12, range = $0.116-0.967 \text{ kJ}\cdot\text{m}^{-1}\cdot\text{day}^{-1}$), or 18.6 kJ per day for a tunnel network of average length $(44.2 \text{ m})^1$. 42 Based on an estimated basal metabolic rate of 106 kJ·day⁻¹, this average amount of energy from 43

root ingrowth provides 21% of a gopher's daily basal caloric needs.

We argue that by promoting root growth in their tunnels and then cropping those roots,

southeastern pocket gophers are employing a low-level food production system that may qualify

44

45

46

as farming. Root growth is promoted by soil aeration, which increases rates of nutrient mineralization and locally reduces soil bulk density². Also, unlike other pocket gopher species that use dedicated food and fecal storage chambers, southeastern pocket gophers scatter their wastes in their tunnels, which fertilizes the soil¹. Root cropping may also provide a short-term stimulus of root growth; root ingrowth rates declined with duration of tunnel isolation (r = -0.76, p = 0.004). Root farming would also help explain why each gopher maintains and defends an extensive and exclusive tunnel system¹. Unlike fungus-growing insects⁸, gophers neither sow nor weed their crops, which may disqualify them as farmers, but if accepted, they would represent the first farming non-human mammal.

If excavation and root ingrowth do not supply gophers with all their energetic needs, how do they satisfy their metabolic demands? We see three possibilities: they concentrate foraging in areas of high root density, they rely heavily on tubers, or they utilize aboveground food sources. Other species of gopher concentrate their excavation in root-dense areas⁹ such as we encountered in one soil sample in which, if extrapolated to a 1 m tunnel, would have supplied enough calories to cover most of a gopher's daily basal caloric requirement. Although wefound only fine roots in our samples, we encountered thick and succulent *Cnidoscolus urens* taproots at the same depths as gopher tunnels. These and many other species in the savanna we studied produce tuberous roots, bulbs, corms, and rhizomes that are rich in non-structural carbohydrates¹⁰. While root proliferation in tunnels does not supply gophers with all their food needs, it more than covers the energy deficits incurred by digging 1 m. Perhaps this energy helps them dig further in search of root-rich areas and tubers. Furthermore, we assumed that gophers obtain most of their energy from roots, but they are known to pull entire plants down into their tunnels by the roots (Video S1) and occasionally forage on the surface, although only within one body length of their tunnel

___ Journal Pre-proof

opening while mounding ³ . In most cases, we encountered little evidence of surface foraging;
ample vegetation was covered by their mounds. In one tunnel we did find a stolon of Paspalum
notatum (Bahiagrass) and leaves of an unidentified herbaceous plant, which suggests that
aboveground food sources do contribute to gopher energy budgets. Regardless of how they meet
all their daily energetic needs, southeastern pocket gophers clearly benefit from root growth into
the tunnel systems that they excavate, defend, and maintain at great energetic expense.
Further study may reveal whether gophers eat fungi and how seasonal variation in the
energetic contributions of roots growing into tunnels relates to their activity cycles. Also,
although gophers are known promote soil heterogeneity by burying organic matter and bringing
mineral soil to the surface ² , it is not known how repeated root herbivory in gopher tunnels affects
vegetation. Whether or not they qualify as farmers, root cultivation is worth further investigation.
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION Supplemental Information includes a study site description, experimental procedures, details
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION Supplemental Information includes a study site description, experimental procedures, details
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION Supplemental Information includes a study site description, experimental procedures, details about calculations and one video and can be found with this article online at
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION Supplemental Information includes a study site description, experimental procedures, details about calculations and one video and can be found with this article online at https://doi.org/xxxxxx .
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION Supplemental Information includes a study site description, experimental procedures, details about calculations and one video and can be found with this article online at https://doi.org/xxxxxx . ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION Supplemental Information includes a study site description, experimental procedures, details about calculations and one video and can be found with this article online at https://doi.org/xxxxxx ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS We thank B. McNab for his advice and encouragement. K. Ewel, J. Gillooly, S. Gazda, and D.
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION Supplemental Information includes a study site description, experimental procedures, details about calculations and one video and can be found with this article online at https://doi.org/xxxxxx . ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS We thank B. McNab for his advice and encouragement. K. Ewel, J. Gillooly, S. Gazda, and D. Julian provided feedback on earlier drafts of the manuscript; K. Fickett provided the cut barrels.
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION Supplemental Information includes a study site description, experimental procedures, details about calculations and one video and can be found with this article online at https://doi.org/xxxxxx . ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS We thank B. McNab for his advice and encouragement. K. Ewel, J. Gillooly, S. Gazda, and D. Julian provided feedback on earlier drafts of the manuscript; K. Fickett provided the cut barrels. N. Douglas provided the video footage. We also thank owners of the Flamingo Hammock Land

Journal Pre-proof

- V.S. and F.E.P conceptualized the study, carried out the fieldwork, and drafted the manuscript
- based on data analyzed principally by V.S.
- 95 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS
- 96 The authors declare no competing interests.
- 97 Figure 1. Tunnelling energetics of *Geomys pinetis* (southeastern pocket gophers), roots
- 98 encountered, and roots growing into their tunnels.
- 99 (A) Pocket gopher in tunnel with roots. (B) An open-ended barrel, diameter = 57 cm,
- inserted into ground to keep gophers out of sections of tunnel. (C) Tunnel before isolation.
- 101 (D) Tunnel after isolation. (E) Based on 12 tunnels, the cost of digging 1 m of tunnel, energy
- gained from roots during initial excavation of tunnel, and energy gained from daily root
- ingrowth into a 44.2 m long gopher tunnel system, accounting for energy digestibility and
- assimilation efficiency. Means represented by the "x" and medians represented by the
- middle lines. Photographs and drawing by VS.
- 106 **REFERENCES**
- 107 1. L. Brown, L. G. Hickman, G. (1973). Tunnel system structure of the southeastern pocket
- gopher. Florida Scientist 36, 97-103.
- 109 2. Reichman, O.J., Seabloom, E.W. (2002). The role of pocket gophers as subterranean
- ecosystem engineers. Trends Ecol. Evol. 17, 44–49.
- 3. Vleck, D. (1979). The energy cost of burrowing by the pocket gopher *Thomomys bottae*.
- 112 Physiol. Zool. 52, 122–136.
- 4. Vleck, D. (1981). Burrow structure and foraging costs in the fossorial rodent, *Thomomys*
- 114 *bottae*. Oecologia 49, 391-396.

Journal Pre-proof

- 5. Wiegert, R., Evans, F. (1964). Primary production and the disappearance of dead vegetation
- on an old field in southeastern Michigan. Ecology 45, 49-63.
- 6. Gettinger, R. (1984). Energy and water metabolism of free-ranging pocket gophers,
- 118 *Thomomys bottae*. Ecology 65, 740-751.
- 7. Ross, J.P. (1980). Seasonal variation of thermoregulation in the Florida pocket gopher,
- 120 Geomys pinetis. Comp. Biochem. Physiol. Part A: Physiol. 66, 119-125.
- 8. Mueller, U. Gerardo, N. Aanen, D., Six, D., Schultz, T. (2005). The evolution of agriculture
- in insects. Ann. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 36, 563-595.
- 9. Andersen, D.C. (1988). Tunnel-construction methods and foraging path of a fossorial
- herbivore, *Geomys bursarius*. J. Mammalogy 69, 565–582.
- 125 10. Diaz-Toribio, M., Putz, F.E. (2020). Below-ground carbohydrate stores and storage organs in
- fire-maintained longleaf pine savannas in Florida, USA. Amer. J. Bot. 108, 1-11.

