BEHAVIORAL RESPONSES BY TADPOLES OF SIX AUSTRALIAN SPECIES TO CHEMICAL CUES FROM OTHER TADPOLES

MATTIAS HAGMAN¹

School of Biological Sciences A08, University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia, e-mail: mattias.hagman@zoologi.su.se ¹Present Address: Department of Zoology, Stockholm University, 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden

Abstract.—Anuran tadpoles from a variety of phylogenetic lineages display strong responses to chemical cues from injured conspecifics. Some of these responses may simply involve attraction to a potential food source; whereas, others may reflect avoidance responses to potential presence of a predator. Australian anurans have received little attention in this respect. This study revealed significant behavioral responses (e.g., attraction, aggregation, movement) of six species of anuran larvae to chemical cues from injured conspecifics and, in at least two cases, from injured heterospecific tadpoles. None of the species that I tested showed dramatic aversion responses to chemical cues from other parts of the world.

Key Words .-- alarm pheromone; anti-predator behavior; chemical cues; tadpoles

INTRODUCTION

The larvae of a variety of amphibians react strongly chemical cues from injured conspecifics. to Presumably recognition of these cues communicates to the signal receiver that a predator is in the vicinity and risk of predation is high (Petranka 1989). Kin selection (i.e., acting for the benefit of relatives: Hamilton 1964; Harvey and Greenwood 1978) or selfish manipulation of group members (e.g., inducing protective aggregations: Hamilton 1971; Dawkins 1976; Harvey and Greenwood 1978; Mathis et al. 1995) can be important mechanisms for the evolution of such alarm signals. The exact nature of the behavioral response varies depending upon the stimulus and the study taxon, but may involve changing activity levels, increased shelter use, repulsion, or aggregation (Rajchard 2006). For example, tadpoles of the Common European Toad (Bufo bufo) typically flee when exposed to chemical cues from damaged or injured conspecifics ("Schreckstoff": Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1949; Hrbacek 1950; Kulzer 1954; Pfeiffer 1966). Predator-associated cues also may induce longer-term changes in morphology (e.g., body shape, coloration, growth rate: Rajchard 2006) or life-history traits (e.g., age and size at metamorphosis: Rajchard 2006).

Most of the scientific research on this topic has focused on anurans from North America and Europe, with species from other continents relatively neglected. Frogs are diverse and abundant over much of Australia, with up to 45 species occurring sympatrically in some areas (Slatyer et al. 2007). Most Australian anurans have an aquatic larval stage as part of their life cycle, and hence natural waterbodies often contain a phylogenetically diverse array of tadpoles (Lemckert et al. 2006). Although data are limited, it appears that Australian tadpoles are highly vulnerable to predation from a range of taxa, including (in some cases) conspecific and

heterospecific tadpoles as well as both invertebrates (e.g., insect larvae) and vertebrates (e.g., wading birds, snakes: Bridges 2002). Adult anurans often possess potent antipredator toxins in the skin, but such defense mechanisms seem to develop in the metamorphic stage and hence may be less common in the larvae of the same species (Duellman and Trueb 1986). Accordingly, intense selection on antipredator behavior of tadpoles likely exists, especially on detection of predators (Burger 2002).

Such responses to chemical cues from other species may allow the evolution of complex "biological warfare" within ponds (Mokany and Shine 2003a, b, c), with interspecific and intraspecific competition mediated via such chemical signals. For example, tadpoles of Rana sphenocephala can decrease growth rates and survival of Hyla cinerea tadpoles via chemical interference (Faragher and Jaeger 1998). Most chemical signals produced by tadpoles elicit responses in conspecifics, although heterospecifics can sometimes detect these messengers. Thus, tadpoles of the sympatric toad species Bufo bufo and B. calamita respond to each other's alarm pheromones (Pfeiffer 1966); whereas, no intergeneric communication occurs between tadpoles of *B. boreas* and *H. regilla* (Hews and Blaustein 1985). Intergeneric communication is an important phenomenon because it can shed light on potential homologies, and because some species can learn to detect alarm cues from heterospecifics.

Chemoreception can be an effective means of detecting predators in aquatic environments. An ability to perceive and respond to chemical cues may be more important in turbid water than in clear water, where visual detection of predators might be more efficient. To test this prediction, I explored behavioral responses to potential alarm cues in six Australian species of tadpoles that inhabit different aquatic environments, by exposing these animals to chemical cues from injured conspecific tadpoles. I also tested **TABLE 1.** Geographic locations of origin for tadpoles used in the present study. Collection locality for *Litoria infrafrenata* was unknown, because these were long-term captives for which original collection data had been lost. Similarly, elevational data are not available for most sites.

Species	Locality	State	GPS	Elevation (a.s.l.)
Limnodynastes peronii	Lane Cove, Sydney	New South Wales	33° 81' 42" S 151° 16' 98" E	
Litoria dentata	McPherson State Forest	New South Wales	33° 14' 24" S 151° 09' 23" E	235m
Litoria freycineti	Heathcote, Sydney	New South Wales	34° 08' 01" S 151° 00' 08" E	
Litoria infrafrenata	Unknown	Queensland		
Litoria verreauxii	Olney State Forest	New South Wales	33° 08' 05" S 151° 12' 18" E	365m
Pseudophryne coriacea	Chaelundi State Forest	New South Wales	30° 02' 26"S 152° 24' 33" E	700m

for cross-reactions between two of my study species to examine possible homology of alarm cues across taxa.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study species and animal husbandry.---I obtained four to seven egg clutches from each of six species (Limnodynastes peronii, Litoria dentata, L. freycineti, L. infrafrenata, L.verreauxii, Pseudophryne coriacea). Most of these originated from New South Wales and Queensland (Table 1). Two of these species (Limnodynastes peronii and Pseudophryne coriacea) frequently occur in murky waters and in muddy environments; whereas, the other four species more often inhabit clear waters (Anstis 2002; Mattias Hagman, pers. obs.). I transported the eggs to the University of Sydney where, after hatching, I separated the tadpoles into groups of 200-300 larvae housed in 30 L of water (pH = 7.5), conditioned with 1 ml of aquaria Water Ager (Pets Paradise, Pty Ltd, Hallam, Victoria, Australia) per 10 L of water I fed the tadpoles twice a week with boiled lettuce ad libitum and changed their water weekly. All tadpoles grew to Gosner stage 21-23 (Gosner 1960) before use in the experiment. The chemical cue stimulus consisted of an extract that I prepared by macerating (rapid crushing ensured that they were instantly killed) 0.2 g of tadpoles (of each species) in 50 ml of water, then diluted in 1 L of water and filtered through filter paper. For controls I used conditioned tap water. I also examined potential intergeneric effects by crossexposing a myobatrachid species (Limnodynastes peronii) and a hylid species (Litoria dentata). For logistical reasons I did not cross-expose all study species.

Experimental equipment and procedures.—I filled eight clear plastic tanks (each measuring 75 x 75 x 15 cm) with 6 cm (approximately 34 L) of water. I isolated each tank visually from the others by positioning opaque barriers between them. Under each tank I placed a white paper on which I had drawn a grid. Each grid consisted of a hundred squares (each square measuring 7.5 x 7.5 cm) that were visible from above through the water and the bottom of the tank. I mounted two S1 digital cameras (Canon, Pty Ltd, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia) at a height of 1.55 m above four adjoining tanks to record tadpole behavior. Each camera was equipped with a WC-DC52A, 0.7x wide-angle lens (Canon, Pty Ltd, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia) allowing me to photograph the four adjoining tanks in one frame (i.e., each camera simultaneously recorded a set of four tanks). For a trial, I placed a mixture of 50 kin and non-kin tadpoles in each tank and introduced the stimulus (either control or cues from injured tadpoles) into one corner of each tank via a gravity-fed intravenous infusion set (i.e., a tube connected to a reservoir, as used to perfuse hospital patients: Baxter Healthcare Pty Ltd, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia). Controlling for kinship is important because warning signals might function to warn relatives (Hamilton 1964). I conducted dye trials (using 0.5 ml of food dye per 1 L of water) that confirmed that the stimulus slowly perfused across the tanks. Each treatment had six replicate trials. I set the flow rate such that the one-liter reservoir emptied in six minutes. All treatments took place simultaneously, and I randomized successive trials of each stimulus type by haphazardly shifting the treatments among enclosures and between replicates. After each trial, I rinsed all tanks with dechlorinated tap water and dried them with paper towels before replacing the water containing chemical messengers with clean water. To assure independence of data values, I employed a tadpole only once against a single replicate treatment. I used a WL-DC100 remote control unit (Canon, Pty Ltd, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia) to take one photo with each camera before the addition of the stimulus, and then a photo at successive 5-min intervals for 1 hr. Water temperature was 29°C throughout this period.

Behavioral variables measured.—Using the photographs and the grids, I scored three behavioral variables as follows:

(1) *Direction of movement.*—I obtained this score by calculating the numbers of tadpoles within each tank in

TABLE 2. Results of statistical tests of data on behavioral responses of anuran larvae to chemical cues from injured tadpoles of their own				
or other species. See text for descriptions of how I calculated indices of repulsion, aggregation, and movement. The table shows degrees				
of freedom (df), F, and P values for the overall treatment effect from single-factor repeated-measures ANOVAs comparing responses in				
the presence vs. absence of chemical cues from injured tadpoles. The first part of the table lists responses to conspecific cues, and the two				
later parts list responses to heterospecific cues. Boldface font shows significant results ($P < 0.05$).				

Species	Repulsion	Aggregation	Movement	
Limnodynastes peronii	$F_{1,10} = 6.22; P = 0.01$	$F_{1,10} = 63.36; P < 0.0001$	$F_{1,10} = 59.02; P < 0.0001$	
Litoria dentata	$F_{1,10} = 0.23; P = 0.63$	$F_{1,10} = 1.13; P = 0.29$	$F_{1,10} = 0.31; P = 0.58$	
Litoria freycineti	$F_{1,10} = 1.97; P = 0.16$	$F_{1,10} = 22.20; P < 0.0001$	$F_{1,10} = 0.60; P = 0.44$	
Litoria infrafrenata	$F_{1,10} = 0.002; P = 0.96$	$F_{1,10} = 4.97; P = 0.03$	$F_{1,10} = 11.37; P = 0.001$	
Litoria verreauxii	$F_{1,10} = 0.89; P = 0.35$	$F_{1,10} = 0.38; P = 0.54$	$F_{1,10} = 7.70; P = 0.006$	
Pseudophryne coriacea	$F_{1,10} = 5.73; P = 0.02$	$F_{1,10} = 93.96; P < 0.0001$	$F_{1,10} = 19.82; P < 0.0001$	
Limnodynastes peronii	E = 10.49 $B < 0.0001$	E = 0.16; $D = 0.60$	$E = -1.92 \cdot D = 0.19$	
vs injured Litoria dentata	$F_{1,10} = 18.48, F < 0.0001$	$F_{1,10} = 0.10, F = 0.09$	$F_{1,10} = 1.83, P = 0.18$	
Litoria dentata	E = 0.04; B = 0.84	E = 256, D = 0.11	E = -8.06, $D = 0.005$	
vs injured Limnodynastes peronii	$F_{1,10} = 0.04$; $P = 0.84$	$F_{1,10} - 2.50; P = 0.11$	$F_{1,10} - 8.00, F = 0.005$	

each of 10 zones. Zone 1 consisted of the corner gridsquare into which the stimulus was introduced, zone 2 consisted of all squares in contact with zone 1, zone 3 consisted of all squares in contact with zone 2, and so forth to form an expanding array of grid-cells at increasing distances from the stimulus source. I determined the direction of movement by calculating the average number of tadpoles per square in each zone at each 5-min interval and then computing the slope of the linear regression between zone number and mean number of tadpoles per square. A positive regression slope indicates repulsion (i.e., tadpole densities are higher as one moves further from the stimulus); whereas, a negative slope suggests attraction (more tadpoles close to the stimulus source).

(2) Degree of aggregation.—I scored aggregation via a standardized Morisita's index and computed this index using PopTools version 2.7.1 (CSIRO Org. Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia. Available from http://www.cse.csiro.au/poptools [Accessed 23 June 2008]). This index ranges from -1 to +1 with 95% confidence limits at +0.5 and -0.5. A zero indicates a random distribution with clustering increasing as scores become more positive and overdispersion increasing as scores become more negative. I calculated the index on counts of tadpoles in each grid square.

(3) Overall movement.—I scored this variable by calculating changes in numbers of tadpoles within each grid-cell through time, and summing those changes. Hence, the movement score represented the total number of times that tadpoles migrated from one cell to another during the observation period; the score did not take into account the distances moved, nor cases in which tadpole movements in opposite directions cancelled each other out.

Statistical analysis.—For each of the three behavioral variables, I first conducted a two-factor repeated-measures ANOVA with study species and treatment (control vs. conspecific and heterospecific cues) as the factors, and tadpole location in successive 5-minute intervals as the repeated measure. In each case, these analyses revealed highly significant interaction terms, precluding simple interpretation.

Thus, I divided the data set by species, and examined each species' response separately, against the concurrently-run controls. To compare overall response levels among species, I calculated the difference between treatment and control responses for each time period for each trial involving conspecific cues. These contrasts were used as the dependent variable in a repeated-measures ANOVA with species as the factor and tadpole location as the repeated measure. For all ANOVAs, $\alpha = 0.05$.

RESULTS

Of the six species I examined, two (Limnodynastes peronii and Pseudophryne coriacea) responded significantly in terms of all three of the behavioral variables that I measured. Tadpoles of L. peronii were slightly attracted to cues from injured conspecifics and tended to aggregate and move about more (Table 2. Fig. 1). Tadpoles of P. coriacea similarly responded with slight attraction and clustering, but decreased rather than increased their movements in response to cues from injured conspecifics (Table 2, Fig. 1). Three of the four hylids that I examined showed significant behavioral responses when exposed to cues from injured conspecifics: L. freycineti clustered together (Table 2, Fig. 2b), L. infrafrenata became overdispersed (Table 2, Fig. 2b), and both L. infrafrenata and L. verreauxii exhibited increased levels of movement (Table 2, Fig. 2c). One species, L. dentata, showed no significant responses in terms of any of the three behavioural variables that I measured when exposed to cues from injured conspecifics (Table 2). However, when I cross-exposed cues from injured Limnodynastes peronii and Litoria dentata, both species responded significantly: L. peronii tadpoles were attracted to cues from injured L. dentata (Table 2, Fig. 3a), while tadpoles of the latter species became more active (Table 2, Fig. 3b).

The repeated-measures ANOVA on contrast scores (treatment minus control for each time period) showed no significant interspecific variation in the degree of repulsion to chemical cues from injured conspecifics ($F_{5,29} = 0.47$, P = 0.79). Species differed significantly in movement patterns ($F_{5,29} = 6.29$, P < 0.0005),

Herpetological Conservation and Biology





FIGURE 1. Behavioral responses (means and standard error of treatment, T, and control, C) of tadpoles of three species of Australian anurans to chemical cues from conspecific tadpoles. The upper graph (a) shows an index of repulsion, calculated as the slope of the linear regression between distance from the stimulus origin and mean number of tadpoles per square. A positive regression slope indicates repulsion (i.e., tadpole densities are higher as one moves further from the stimulus) whereas a negative slope suggests attraction (more tadpoles close to the stimulus source). The middle graph (b) shows an index of aggregation (Morisita's index) and the lower graph (c) an index of movement.

however. Post-hoc PLSD tests (Fisher's PLSD) showed that conspecific cues elicited more movement by tadpoles of Limnodynastes peronii than by Litoria dentata, L. freycineti, L.infrafrenata or Pseudophryne coriacea. The latter species also moved significantly less than did either L. infrafrenata or L. verreauxii (post-hoc tests, all P < 0.05). The degree of aggregation also differed among species ($F_{5.29} = 4.96$, P < 0.003), with post-hoc tests showing that conspecific cues induced higher levels of aggregation in tadpoles of Limnodynastes peronii than those of Litoria dentata, L. freycineti, or L. verreauxii. Tadpoles of P. coriacea also aggregated significantly less in response to chemical cues than did those of L. dentata, L. freycineti, L. infrafrenata or L. verreauxii.

FIGURE 2. Behavioral responses (means and standard error of treatment, T, and control, C) of tadpoles of three species of Australian anurans to chemical cues from conspecific tadpoles. The upper graph (a) shows an index of repulsion, calculated as the slope of the linear regression between distance from the stimulus origin and mean number of tadpoles per square. A positive regression slope indicates repulsion (i.e., tadpole densities are higher as one moves further from the stimulus) whereas a negative slope suggests attraction (more tadpoles close to the stimulus source). The middle graph (b) shows an index of aggregation (Morisita's index) and the lower graph (c) an index of movement.

DISCUSSION

Tadpoles in my study displayed significant behavioral responses to chemical cues from injured conspecifics, and in some cases at least, to heterospecifics (logistical difficulties prevented me from testing for cross-reactions between all my study species). Although the responses that I elicited varied widely among species, the adaptive significance of those responses remains unclear.

Overall, my results suggest that water-body attributes may influence the probability of chemoreception evolving in tadpoles: two species that frequently inhabit murky waters showed significant responses across all behavioural variables that I measured; whereas, clear-water species were less

Hagman.-Chemical Cue Detection by Some Australian Tadpoles

Bufondia: Pertanka 1989 Bigh mericanus Avoid, increase activity None Bigh mericanus Avoid, increase activity None Bigh migh Avoid, increase activity None Bigh migh Avoid, increase activity None Bigh migh Flight None Bigh migh Reduce activity None Bigh migh Reduce activity None Bigh migh Reduce activity None Bigh migh Avoid None Bigh migh Avoid None Bigh might Avoid None Bigh marinus Reduce activity, swin to bottom None Bigh merinus Avoid - Alyce observations None Specifier all finamerini 1998 Bigh merinus Avoid - Hagman and Shine 2008b Bigh terrestris None - Heiffer 1966 Discoglossubar - Increase activity - Alyce observations None - Flight	Taxa	Response to crushed conspecifics	Response to crushed congenerics	Reference
Big on proceedApproach, feeding responsePermins 1989Big bu forAvoid-Eib/Eib/sield 1985; Hews 1988Big bu forAvoid-Eib/Eib/sield 1985; Hews 1988Big bu forFlighNoneHintack 1950Big bu forReduce activityNonePiair 1966Big bu forReduce activity-Margins et al 2004Big bu forReduce activityNonePiair 1966Big bu forAvoidNonePiair 1966Big bu forAvoidNonePiair 1966Big maximaReduce activity, segregationNoneSpeler and Losenmair 1999Big maximaReduce activity, segregationNoneSpeler and Losenmair 1999Big marinsAvoid-Hagman and Shine 2008Big marinsAvoid-Hagman and Shine 2008Big marinsAvoid-Hagman and Shine 2008Big marinsAvoid-Hagman and Shine 2008Big marinsNone-Piair 1966Big marinsNone-Hagman and Sh	Bufonidae			
Bigb bigb Bigb bigb Bigb bigbAvoid-EibErEibStelic 1949Bigb bigb Bigb bigbNome None, AvoidanceKulzer 1954Bigb bigb Bigb bigb Bigb bigbReduce activity-Marquis et al. 2004Bigb bigb Bigb bigb Bigb bigbReduce activity-Marquis et al. 2004Bigb bigb Bigb bigb Bigb bigb Bigb bigbAvoid, swim to the bottomNonePfeiffer 1966Bigb calamina Bigb marinusReduce activity, swim to bottomNoneSpatier and Linssemmair 1999Bigb marinus Bigb marinusReduce activity, swim to bottomNoneSpatier and Linssemmair 1999Bigb marinus Bigb marinus Avoid-Hagman and Shine 2008aBigb marinus Bigb marinus Avoid-Hagman and Shine 2008aBigb marinus Bigb terreartsNone-Pfeiffer 1966Sobsericars Discoglossus Discoglossus pictusNonePfeiffer 1966None Discoglossus pictusNone-Pfeiffer 1966Discoglossus pictusNone-Instrumey RelativityHyla arbore Discoglossus pictusNone-Pfeiffer 1966Discoglossus pictusNone-Instrumey RelativityHyla arbore Discoglossus pictusNone-Pfeiffer 1966Discoglossus pictusNone-Instrumey RelativityHyla arbore Discoglossus pictusNone-Pfeiffer 1966Discoglossus pictusNone-Pfeiffer 1966Discoglossus pictusNone-No	Bufo americanus Bufo boreas	Avoid Avoid, increase activity	Approach, feeding response None	Petranka 1989 Hews and Blaustein 1985; Hews 1988
Bulp bulp Bulp bulp Bulp bulp Bulp bulp Bulp bulp Bulp bulp Bulp bulp Bulp bulp Bulp bulp Bulp bulp 	Bufo bufo Bufo bufo	Avoid Flight	- None, Avoidance	Eibl-Eiblsfeldt 1949 Hrbacek 1950
Bado badoReduce activityNonePferffer 1966Bado badoAvoid-Marquis et al. 2004Bado badoAvoid-Marquis et al. 2004Bado badoAvoid-Pferffer 1966Bado marinaAvoid, AgeregationNoneSpieler and Lineannair 1999Bado marinaReduce activity, AgeregationNoneSpieler and Lineannair 1999Bado marinaAvoid-Hagman and Shine 2008aBado marinaAvoid-Hagman and Shine 2008bBado marinaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Bado marinaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Borna MarinaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Discoglossus pictusFlight-Reduce activityHylanePfeiffer 1966Discoglossus pictusNone-Present studyLioria dentaia-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLioria dirigreginatiReduce activity-Present studyLioria dirigreginatiAggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLioria dirigreginati-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLioria dirigreginati-AggregationHagman and Shi	Bufo bufo	Swim to bottom	-	Kulzer 1954
Bufo bufoReduce activity-Marquis et al. 2004Bufo bufoAvoid-Manteifel 2001Bufo calamitaReduce activity, servin to bottomNoneSpieler and Linsemmir 1999Bufo marinusReduce activity, servin to bottomNoneSummey and Mathis 1998Bufo marinusAvoid-Hagman and Shine 2008aBufo marinusAvoid-Hagman and Shine 2008bBufo marinusAvoid-Hagman and Shine 2008bBufo terrestrisNone-Pfeiffer 1966Bornotania variegariNone-Pfeiffer 1966Bornotania variegariNone-Pfeiffer 1966DiscoglossitasFlight-Pfeiffer 1966Hylar softentrasNone-Pfeiffer 1966Hylar softentrasNone-Pfeiffer 1966Hylar softentrasNone-Pfeiffer 1966Hylar softentrasNone-Pfeiffer 1966Hylar softentrasNone-Pfeiffer 1966Litoria dentataNoneIncrease activityPresent studyLitoria dentataNoneNoneHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria foreyinetiAggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infrafrentaLitoria infrafrentaDisperse, Increase activity-Present studyLitoria infrafrentaDisperse, Increase activity-Present studyLitoria infrafrentaDisperse, Increase activity-Present studyLitoria infrafrenta-None<	Bufo bufo	Reduce activity	None	Pfeiffer 1966
Bufo bufo Bufo calamita Avoid-Manterial 2001 Picifier 1066Bufo calamita Bufo calamita Bufo maritus Bufo maritus Reduce activity, Aggregation NoneNoneSpieler and Linsemair 1999Bufo maritus Bufo maritus Reduce activity, Aggregation Bufo maritus Avoid-Hagman and Shine 2008aBufo maritus 	Bufo bufo	Reduce activity	-	Marquis et al. 2004
Bafe Bafe DeclamitaAvoid, swin to be bottomNonePfeiffer 1966 Spieler and Linsemmir 1999 Bufe marinusBafe Bafe marinusReduce activity, gregationNoneSummey and Mathis 1998 Hagman and Shine 2008aBafe Bafe marinusAvoid-Hagman and Shine 2008bBafe Bafe marinusAvoid-Hagman and Shine 2008bBafe Bafe marinusAvoid-Hagman and Shine 2008bBafe Bafe marinusNone-Herffer 1966Discoglossidae Discoglossidae-Pfeiffer 1966Alyze sobstetricamsNone-Pfeiffer 1966Discoglossidae Discoglossida pictusFlight-Eibl-Eiblesfeld 1962Hylidae Litoria dentata-Pfeiffer 1966Discoglossida pictusFlight-Eibl-Eiblesfeld 1962Hylida regula Litoria dentataNone-Pfeiffer 1966Litoria dentataNone-Pfeiffer 1966Litoria dentataNoneIncrease activityPresent studyLitoria dentataNoneNoneHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria diregricati-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infredenata-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria verreauxii-Present studyLitoria verreauxii-Present studyLitoria verreauxii-Present studyCoracea-Present studyCoracea-Present studyPresent-Present study <td>Bufo bufo</td> <td>Avoid</td> <td>-</td> <td>Manteifel 2001</td>	Bufo bufo	Avoid	-	Manteifel 2001
Bafe marculatus Reduce activity, Aggregation None Spieler and Linsenmair 1999 Bafe marinus Reduce activity, Aggregation None Spieler and Linsenmair 1999 Bafe marinus Avoid - Hagman and Shine 2008b Bafe marinus Avoid - Hagman and Shine 2008b Bafe terrestris None - Lefcort 1998 Discoglossidae - - Lefcort 1998 Discoglossidae - - Eibleffer 1966 Bombina variegata None - Eibleffer 1966 Discoglossus pictus Flight - Eibleffer 1966 Hylidae - - Increase activity - Hyla arborea None - Pfeiffer 1966 Hyla arborea None - Present study Litoria dentata - Aggregation Hagman and Shine 2008b Litoria dentata - Aggregation Hagman and Shine 2008b Litoria informata Ipsperse, Increase activity - Present study Litoria informata Ipsperse, Increase activity - Present study Litoria informata - Aggregation Hagman and Shine 2008b Smilisca None None Summey	Bufo calamita	Avoid, swim to the bottom	None	Pfeiffer 1966
Bado marinusReduce activity, swim to bottomNoneSummey and Mathis 1998Bado marinusAvoid-Hagman and Shine 2008bBado marinusAvoid-Hagman and Shine 2008bBado marinusNone-Lefcort 1998Bado marinusNone-Lefcort 1998Discoglossidae-Pfeiffer 1966Bornbina variegataNoneNonePfeiffer 1966DiscoglossipricaFlight-Pfeiffer 1966Hyla araboreaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Hyla araboreaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Hyla araboreaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Hyla regillaReduce activity-In: Summey & Mathis 1998Litoria dentataNoneIncrease activityPresent studyLitoria dentataNoneIncrease activityPresent studyLitoria freycineti-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infrafrenataDisperse, Increase activity-Present studyLitoria infrafrenata-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infrafrenata-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infrafrenata-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infrafrenata-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infrafrenataPresent studyLitoria infrafrenataPresent studyLitoria infrafrenataPresent studyLitoria verreauct	Bufo maculatus	Reduce activity, Aggregation	None	Spieler and Linsenmair 1999
Bujo marnus Bujo marnus Avoid-Hagman and Shine 2008b Hagma and Shine 2008b EBujo marnus Bujo terrestrisNone-Lefcort 1998Discoglosidae MarnusPfeiffer 1966 Borbina variegata None-Discoglosidae Discoglosuss pictusPfeiffer 1966 Borbina variegata None-Hylas obstetricans Discoglosuss pictusNone-Pfeiffer 1966 Borbina variegata None-Hyla Hyla robora Litoria dentata Litoria dentataPresent studyLitoria dentata Litoria dentata-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008b Hagman and Shine 2008bLitoria dentata Litoria dentata-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infrafrenata Litoria infrafrenata Disperse, Increase activity Litoria infrafrenata-Present studyLitoria infrafrenata Litoria infrafrenata Disperse, Increase activity Litoria infrafrenata-Present studyLitoria infrafrenata Litoria infrafrenata Present study-Present studyLitoria verreauxii Increase activity-Present studySmilisca NoneNoneNoneSummey and Mathis 1998Smilisca Peronti Peronti Persunt study-Present studySmilisca Persundiphryne Persunt study-Present studyPresent study Persunt study-Present studyPresent study Persunt study-Present studyPresent study Perotini Persunt study-Presen	Bufo marinus	Reduce activity, swim to bottom	None	Summey and Mathis 1998
Bago marmus Bagio terrestrix Bagio terrestrix <br< td=""><td>Bufo marinus</td><td>Avoid</td><td>-</td><td>Hagman and Shine 2008a</td></br<>	Bufo marinus	Avoid	-	Hagman and Shine 2008a
Daylo entrestrikNone-Lettori 1993Discoglossidae Alytes obstatricamsNone-Pfeiffer 1966Bombina variegata Bombina variegataNoneNonePfeiffer 1966Discoglossus pictusFlight-Elb-Eiblesfeldt 1962Hylad Hyla arboreaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Hylar arboreaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Hyla arboreaNone-Present studyLitoria dentata-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria dentata-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria deriveriniAggregate-Present studyLitoria infrafrentataDisperse, Increase activity-Present studyLitoria infrafrentata-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infrafrentataPresent studyLitoria infrafrentataPresent studyLitoria infrafrentataPresent studyLitoria infrafrentataPresent studyLitoria verreauxiiIncrease activity-Present studyLitoria verreauxiiIncrease activity-Present studyLitoria verreauxiiPresent studyJumodynastes-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bSmiliscaNoneNoneHagman and Shine 2008bSmiliscaNone-Present studyLimodynastes-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bSenticata-None	Bufo marinus	Avoid	-	Hagman and Shine 2008b
Discoglosside.Prefifter 1966Alytes obstetricansNoneNonePrefifter 1966Discoglossus pictusFlight-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962HylaFlight-Prefifter 1966Hylar sejldaReduce activity-In: Summey & Mathis 1998Hylar activation dentataNone-Noreace activityHylar sejldaReduce activity-In: Summey & Mathis 1998Litoria dentataNoneNone-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008b-Litoria dentataNoneAggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria diritafernataDisperse, Increase activity-Present studyLitoria infrafernataDisperse, Increase activity-Present studyLitoria infrafernataIncrease activity-Present studyLitoria verreauxiiIncrease activity-Present studyLitoria verreauxii-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bcyanosticta-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bveronistactivity-Present studyLitoria verreauxii-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bcyanosticta-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bcyanosticta-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bcyanosticta-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bcyanosticta-NonePresent studycoracea-Present studypresontiactivity-PseudophryneApp	Bujo terrestris	None	-	Lefcort 1998
Afges observationsNone-Pfeiffer 1966Bombina variegataNoneNonePfeiffer 1966Bombina variegataNoneNonePfeiffer 1966Discoglossas pictusFight-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Hylar geillaReduce activity-In: Summery & Mathis 1998Litoria dentataNone-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008b-Present studyLitoria dentata-AggregationLitoria freycinetiAggregate-Litoria freycineti-Present studyLitoria infrafrenataDisperse, Increase activity-Present study-Present studyLitoria infrafrenataDisperse, Increase activity-Present study-Present studyLitoria infrafrenataDisperse, Increase activity-Present study-Present studyLitoria infrafrenataNoneNoneHagman and Shine 2008bSimiliscaSimiliscaNoneNoneMyobatrachidae-NoneLimodynastes-NonePresent study-Present study- <t< td=""><td>Discoglossidae</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Discoglossidae			
B biscoglossus pictusNonePiciffer 1966 Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Hyla cyla arboreaNone-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Hyla regiltaReduce activity-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Hyla arboreaNone-Piciffer 1966 In: Summey & Mathis 1998Hyla arboreaNone-Piciffer 1966Hyla arboreaNone-Piciffer 1966Litoria infrafrenta-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infrafrentaDisperse, Increase activity-Present studyLitoria infrafrentaNoneHagman and Shine 2008bSimilacaLitoria verreauxiiIncrease activity-Present studyLitoria verreauxiiNoneNoneHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria verreauxiiApproach, Aggregate, IncreaseApproachPresent studyLimmodynastes-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPersontiApproach, Aggregate, IncreaseApproachPresent studyCrinacea-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPresonti-Approach, Aggregate, Decrease-PseudophryneNoneHagman and Shine 2008b <td>Alytes obstetricans</td> <td>None</td> <td>-</td> <td>Pfeiffer 1966</td>	Alytes obstetricans	None	-	Pfeiffer 1966
Discoglossus pictusFlight-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Hylidae-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1966Hylar regilaReduce activity-In: Summey & Mathis 1998Litoria dentataNoneIncrease activityPresent studyLitoria dentataNoneIncrease activityPresent studyLitoria dentataNoneIncrease activityPresent studyLitoria dentataNoneAggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria freycineriAggregate-Present studyLitoria infrafrentaa-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infrafrentaa-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infrafrentaa-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria verreauxiiIncrease activity-Present studyLitoria verreauxiiIncrease activity-Present studyLitoria verreauxii-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bSmiliscaNoneHagman and Shine 2008bSmiliscaNoneHagman and Shine 2008bSmiliscaApproach, Aggregate, IncreaseApproachPresent studyJernondynastes-Proach, Aggregate, IncreaseApproachPresent studyJernoniactivity-Present study-Present study-Present studyPresentaAugregate, Decrease-Present studyJernoniactivity-Present studyPresentaNone-Present study <td>Bombina variegata</td> <td>None</td> <td>None</td> <td>Pfeiffer 1966</td>	Bombina variegata	None	None	Pfeiffer 1966
Hylia arboreaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Hyla arboreaNoneIn: Summey & Mathis 1998Hyla arboreaNoneIn: Crease activityPresent studyLitoria dentata-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria deritata-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria freycineti-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infrafrenataDisperse, Increase activity-Present studyLitoria infrafrenataAggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infrafrenataAggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infrafrenataNoneHagman and Shine 2008bSmiliscaNoneNoneHagman and Shine 2008bSmiliscaNoneNoneSummey and Mathis 1998Synthis expression-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bSmiliscaNoneNoneHagman and Shine 2008bSmiliscaNoneNoneHagman and Shine 2008bSmiliscaApproach, Aggregate, IncreaseApproachPresent studyeronitiactivity-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bperonitactivity-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPresent-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bcriacea-Present study-Pseudophryne-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bCriacea-Present study-Pseudophryne-Aproach, Aggregate, Decrease-<	Discoglossus pictus	Flight	-	Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962
Hyla arboreaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Hyla arboreaNoneIncrease activityPresent StudyLitoria dentataNoneIncrease activityPresent studyLitoria dentata-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria freycinetiAggregate-Present studyLitoria infrafrenataDisperse, Increase activity-Present studyLitoria infrafrenataDisperse, Increase activity-Present studyLitoria infrafrenata-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infrafrenataDisperse, Increase activity-Present studyLitoria verreauxiiIncrease activity-Present studyLitoria verreauxii-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bSmiliscaNoneNoneSummey and Mathis 1998cyanosticta-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPeronii-Present studycyanosticta-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPeroniiPresent studyperoniiPresent studyperoniiPresent studycoriacea-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bperoniiPresent studycoriaceaPresent studycoriaceaPresent studycoriaceaPresent studycoriaceaNone-Present studyKanopus laevisNone-Present study<	** ** 1			
Typical and the second secon	Hylidae Hyla arborea	None	_	Pfeiffer 1066
Type TermNoneIncrease activityPresent studyLitoria dentata-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria dentata-Present studyLitoria freycineti-Present studyLitoria freycineti-AggregationLitoria freycineti-AggregationLitoria freycineti-AggregationLitoria infrafrenata-AggregationLitoria infrafrenata-AggregationLitoria infrafrenata-NoneLitoria verreauxiiIncrease activity-Present study-Present studyLitoria verreauxiiIncrease activity-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bSimilicaNoneNoneSummey and Mathis 1998cyanosticta-Present studyPeroniiactivity-Limodynastes-Present studyPeronii-NonePeronii-NonePeronii-Present studyPeroniiPeronii-Present studyPeroniiPeronii-Present studyPeroniiPeroniiPeroniiPeroniiPeroniiPeroniiPeroniiPeroniiPeroniiPeronii <tr< td=""><td>Hyla regilla</td><td>Reduce activity</td><td></td><td>In: Summey & Mathis 1998</td></tr<>	Hyla regilla	Reduce activity		In: Summey & Mathis 1998
Litoria dintataLitoriaAggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria freycineti-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria freycineti-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infrafrenataDisperse, Increase activity-Present studyLitoria infrafrenataIncrease activity-Present studyLitoria infrafrenataIncrease activity-Present studyLitoria verreauxiiIncrease activity-Present studyLitoria verreauxii-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bSmiliscaNoneNoneSummey and Mathis 1998cyanosticta-NoneSummey and Mathis 1998Myobatrachidae-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bLimnodynastesApproach, Aggregate, IncreaseApproachPresent studyeronitiactivityNoneHagman and Shine 2008bPersonitiactivityNoneHagman and Shine 2008bPersonitiactivityNoneHagman and Shine 2008bPresent study-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPresent study-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPresent study-Approach, Aggregate, Decrease-Present study-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bCoriaceaactivity-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bPipidaePresent studyXenopus laevisNone-Pieffer 1966Rana brownorumNone-Pieffer 1966	Litoria dentata	None	Increase activity	Present study
Litoria freycineti Litoria freycinetiAggregate -Present study -Litoria infrafrenta 	Litoria dentata	-	Aggregation	Hagman and Shine 2008b
Litoria frycineti Litoria infrafrenataDisperse, Increase activity Disperse, Increase activityAvoidHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria infrafrenata Litoria infrafrenataDisperse, Increase activity-Present studyLitoria verreauxii Litoria verreauxiiIncrease activity-Present studyLitoria verreauxii SmiliscaNoneHagman and Shine 2008bSmilisca vanostictaNoneHagman and Shine 2008bMyobatrachidae Linnodynastes-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bLinnodynastes peronii activityApproach, Aggregate, IncreaseApproachPresent studyLinnodynastes peronii activity-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPisten peronii Pseudophryne coriaceaApproach, Aggregate, IncreaseApproachPresent studyPisten Seudophryne coriacea-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPipidae Kanopus laevis None-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bPipidae Rana darora Reduce activity-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bRana darora Rana carora Reduce activity-VeridPresent studyRana carora Rana carora Rana carora Rana carora None-Vilson and Lefcort 1993Rana brownorum Rana cascadae Increase activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana cascadae Rana cascadae Increase activity-PresentRana terporaria Rana terporaria Rana terporaria None-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporaria Rana terporaria None </td <td>Litoria frevcineti</td> <td>Aggregate</td> <td>-</td> <td>Present study</td>	Litoria frevcineti	Aggregate	-	Present study
Litoria infrafrenata Litoria infrafrenataDisperse, Increase activity-Present studyLitoria verreauxii Litoria verreauxiiIncrease activity-Present studyLitoria verreauxii Litoria verreauxii-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bSmilisca cyanostictaNoneNoneSummey and Mathis 1998Myobatrachidae peronii activity-NoneSummey and Mathis 1998Linnodynastes peronii seronii Peronii Activity-Present studyLinnodynastes peronii seronii Persudphryne coriacea-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPisidae coriacea activity-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPisudophryne coriacea activity-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPisudophryne coriacea activity-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPisudophryne coriacea activity-Present study-Approach, Aggregate, Decrease activity-Present study-Aproach, Aggregate, Decrease activity-Present study-Aproach Approach activity-Present study-Aproach activity-Present studyAvoidHagman and Shine 2008bPresent studyPresent studyPresent studyPresent studyPresent studyEibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962P	Litoria frevcineti	-	Avoid	Hagman and Shine 2008b
Litoria infrafrenata Litoria verreauxii-AggregationHagman and Shine 2008bLitoria verreauxiiIncrease activity-Present studyLitoria verreauxii-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bSmiliscaNoneNoneSummey and Mathis 1998SmiliscaNoneSummey and Mathis 1998cyanosticta-NonePresent studyLinnodynastesApproach, Aggregate, IncreaseApproachPresent studyLinnodynastes-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bperoniiactivity-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bJinnodynastes-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bperoniiactivity-Present studySeudophryne-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bProceaactivity-Present studySeudophryne-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bCoriacea-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPipidaePresent studyXenopus laevisNone-Piciffer 1966Rana auroraReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana auroraReduce activityNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana acculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana acculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana acculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana acculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana heckscheriNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana	Litoria infrafrenata	Disperse, Increase activity	-	Present study
Litoria verreauxiiIncrease activity-Present studyLitoria verreauxii-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bSmiliscaNoneNoneSummey and Mathis 1998cyanosticta-NoneSummey and Mathis 1998MyobatrachidaeLinnodynastesApproach, Aggregate, IncreaseApproachPresent studyperoniiactivity-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bperonii-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPseudophryneApproach, Aggregate, Decrease-Present studyocriaceaactivity-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bPseudophryne-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bcoriacea-Present study-Senopus laevisNone-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Xenopus laevisNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana duroraReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana auroraReduce activityNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana acscadaeIncrease activityNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana acscadaeNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana neckscheriNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana heckscheriNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966<	Litoria infrafrenata	-	Aggregation	Hagman and Shine 2008b
Litoria verreauxii Smilisca-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bSmiliscaNoneNoneSummey and Mathis 1998cyanostictaNoneSummey and Mathis 1998Myobatrachidae-Summey and Mathis 1998Linnodynastes peroniiApproach, Aggregate, Increase activityApproachPresent studyLinnodynastes peronii-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPseudophryne Approach, Aggregate, Decrease activity-Present studyPseudophryne coriacea activity-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bPiptidae Xenopus laevis None-Present studyZenopus laevis Rana aurora Reduce activity-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Rana aurora Rana aucora Rana cascadae Increase activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana acsculenta Rana esculenta None-Present studyNone-Present studyRana heckscheri Rana heckscheriNone-None-Present studyRana temporaria Rana temporariaNone-Rana temporaria Rana temporariaNone-Rana temporaria Rana temporariaNone-Linceta Rana temporaria-Present studyNone-Present studyLinceta Rana temporariaNone-Linceta Rana temporariaNone-Linceta Rana temporariaNone-Linceta Rana temporariaNone-Linceta Rana te	Litoria verreauxii	Increase activity	-	Present study
Smilisca cyanostictaNoneSummey and Mathis 1998Swinitsca cyanostictaNoneSummey and Mathis 1998Myobatrachidae Linnodynastes peroniiApproach, Aggregate, Increase activityApproachPresent studyLinnodynastes peronii-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPseudophryne coriacea activityApproach, Aggregate, Decrease activity-Present studyPseudophryne coriacea activity-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bPipidae Xenopus laevis None-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bPipidae RanidaeEibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Ranidae Rana acroscadaePfeiffer 1966Rana acroscadaeIncrease activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana accascadaeIncrease activityNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana acsculenta None-Pfeiffer 1966Rana heckscheri Rana heckscheriNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporaria Rana temporariaNone-Mathis 1998Rona temporaria Reduce activity-Marquis et al. 2004Roma uteringtain NoneNone-Marquis et al. 2004	Litoria verreauxii	-	None	Hagman and Shine 2008b
cyanostictaMyobatrachidaeLimnodynastesApproach, Aggregate, IncreaseApproachPresent studyperoniiactivityImnodynastes-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bperonii-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bperonii-Present study-PseudophryneApproach, Aggregate, Decrease-Present studycoriaceaactivity-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bPseudophryne-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bcoriaceaactivity-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962PseudophryneEibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962coriacea-Pfeiffer 1966Randae-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana auroraReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana cascadaeIncrease activityNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana acsudetaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana asculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana heckscheriNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaReduce activity-Marquis et al. 2004Rana temporariaRone-Marquis et al. 2004	Smilisca	None	None	Summey and Mathis 1998
Myobatrachidae Linnodynastes peroniiApproach, Aggregate, Increase activityApproachPresent studyLinnodynastes peronii-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPeronii-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPseudophryne coriaceaApproach, Aggregate, Decrease activity-Present studyPseudophryne coriacea-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bPipidae Xenopus laevis-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bPipidae Xenopus laevisEibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Rana aurora Rana auroraReduce activity-Vilson and Lefcort 1993Rana aurora Rana cascadaeIncrease activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana cascadae Rana esculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana cascadae Rana esculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana heckscheri Rana pipiensNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporaria Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporaria Rana temporariaNone-Marquis et al. 2004	cyanosticta			
Linnodynastes Approach, Aggregate, Increase Approach Present study peronii activity Linnodynastes - None Hagman and Shine 2008b peronii Pseudophryne Approach, Aggregate, Decrease - Present study coriacea activity Pseudophryne - Present study coriacea - Present study Avoid Hagman and Shine 2008b coriacea Present study Pseudophryne - Present study Pseudophryne - Present study Pseudophryne - Present study Avoid Hagman and Shine 2008b coriacea Present study Pseudophryne - Present study Rana aurora Reduce activity - Present study Rana cascadae Increase activity None Hews and Blaustein 1985 Rana cascadae Increase activity None Hews and Blaustein 1985 Rana cascadae Increase activity None Hews and Blaustein 1985 Rana cascadae Increase activity None Altig and Christensen 1981 Rana pipiens None - Preiffer 1966 Rana temporaria Reduce activity - Marquis et al. 2004 Marquis et al. 2004 Marquis et al. 2004	Mvobatrachidae			
peroniiactivityLinnodynastes-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bperoniiPseudophryneApproach, Aggregate, Decrease-Present studyPseudophryne-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bcoriaceaactivity-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bPipidae-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bCoriacea-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Yenopus laevisNone-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Kenopus laevisNone-Pfeiffer 1966Ranidae-Summey & Mathis 1998Rana auroraReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana brownorumNoneNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana esculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana esculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana heckscheriNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaReduce activity-Marquis et al. 2004Rena tericulariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana tericulariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana tericulariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana tericulariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana tericulariaNone-Marquis et al. 2004Reduce	Limnodynastes	Approach, Aggregate, Increase	Approach	Present study
Limnodynastes peronii-NoneHagman and Shine 2008bPrevudophryne coriaceaApproach, Aggregate, Decrease activity-Present studyPseudophryne coriacea-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bPipidae Xenopus laevis-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bPipidae Xenopus laevisNone-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Ranidae Rana aurora-Pfeiffer 1966Rana aurora Rana brownorumReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993NoneNoneNoneSummey & Mathis 1998Rana cascadae Rana esculenta None-Pfeiffer 1966Rana heckscheri Rana pipiensNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporaria Rana temporaria Reduce activity-Altig and Christensen 1981Rana temporaria Rana temporaria Rone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporaria Rone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporaria Rone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporaria Rone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporaria Rone-Pfeiffer 1966 <td>peronii</td> <td>activity</td> <td></td> <td></td>	peronii	activity		
peroniiPseudophryneApproach, Aggregate, Decrease-Present studycoriaceaactivityAvoidHagman and Shine 2008bPseudophryne-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bcoriacea-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962PipidaeEibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Xenopus laevisNone-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Kana auroraReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana auroraReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana cascadaeIncrease activityNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana esculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana heckscheriNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966	Limnodynastes	-	None	Hagman and Shine 2008b
Present studyApproach, Aggregate, Decrease-Present studycoriaceaactivityAvoidHagman and Shine 2008bPseudophryne coriacea-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bPipidae Xenopus laevisNone-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Ranidae Rana auroraReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana auroraReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana auroraReduce activity-Preisfer 1966Rana cascadaeIncrease activityNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana esculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana pipiensNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporar	peronii Davidarilari	Annuash Assussed Desmass		Dressent study
Pseudophryne coriacea-AvoidHagman and Shine 2008bPipidae Xenopus laevis-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Xenopus laevisNone-Pfeiffer 1966Ranidae Rana auroraReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana auroraReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana cascadaeIncrease activityNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana esculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana pipiensNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Marquis et al. 2004Rana temporariaNoneNoneLefcort 1996	r seudophryne coriacea	activity	-	Flesent study
coriaceaPipidaeXenopus laevisNone-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Xenopus laevisNone-Pfeiffer 1966Ranidae-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana auroraReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana brownorumNoneNoneSummey & Mathis 1998Rana cascadaeIncrease activityNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana esculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana pipiensNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone- <td>Pseudophrvne</td> <td>-</td> <td>Avoid</td> <td>Hagman and Shine 2008b</td>	Pseudophrvne	-	Avoid	Hagman and Shine 2008b
PipidaeXenopus laevisNone-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Xenopus laevisNone-Pfeiffer 1966RanidaeRana auroraReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana brownorumNoneNoneSummey & Mathis 1998Rana cascadaeIncrease activityNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana esculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana heckscheriNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaReduce activity-Marquis et al. 2004Rana temporariaNone-Marquis et al. 2004	coriacea			
PripidaeXenopus laevisNone-Eibl-Eiblesfeldt 1962Xenopus laevisNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana auroraReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana brownorumNoneNoneSummey & Mathis 1998Rana cascadaeIncrease activityNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana esculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana heckscheriNone-Altig and Christensen 1981Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Marquis et al. 2004Rana temporariaNoneNoneLefcort 1996	D: . 1			
Xenopus laevisNone-Elor-Eloresteur 1902Xenopus laevisNone-Pfeiffer 1966Ranidae-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana auroraReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana brownorumNoneNoneSummey & Mathis 1998Rana cascadaeIncrease activityNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana esculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana heckscheriNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaReduce activity-Marquis et al. 2004Rana temporariaReduce activity-Marquis et al. 2004	Pipidae Vanopus laguis	None		Fibl Fiblesfeldt 1962
RanidaeFonceFonceFonceRana auroraReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana brownorumNoneNoneSummey & Mathis 1998Rana cascadaeIncrease activityNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana esculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana pipiensNone-Altig and Christensen 1981Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaReduce activity-Marquis et al. 2004Rana temporariaNone-Lefcort 1996	Xenopus laevis	None	-	Pfeiffer 1966
RanidaeRana auroraReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana brownorumNoneNoneSummey & Mathis 1998Rana cascadaeIncrease activityNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana esculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana heckscheriNone-Altig and Christensen 1981Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaReduce activity-Marquis et al. 2004Rana temporariaNone-Lefcort 1996	Xenopus idevis	None		Tienier 1966
Rana auroraReduce activity-Wilson and Lefcort 1993Rana brownorumNoneNoneSummey & Mathis 1998Rana cascadaeIncrease activityNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana esculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana heckscheriNone-Altig and Christensen 1981Rana pipiensNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaReduce activity-Marquis et al. 2004Rana temporariaNoneI effort 1996	Ranidae			
Rana brownorumNoneNoneSummey & Mathis 1998Rana cascadaeIncrease activityNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana esculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana heckscheriNone-Altig and Christensen 1981Rana pipiensNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaReduce activity-Marquis et al. 2004Rana temporariaNone-Lefcort 1996	Rana aurora	Reduce activity	-	Wilson and Lefcort 1993
Rana cascadaeIncrease activityNoneHews and Blaustein 1985Rana esculentaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana heckscheriNone-Altig and Christensen 1981Rana pipiensNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaReduce activity-Marquis et al. 2004Rana temporariaNoneLefcort 1996	Rana brownorum	None	None	Summey & Mathis 1998
Kana esculentaNone-Pfeitfer 1966Rana heckscheriNone-Altig and Christensen 1981Rana pipiensNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaReduce activity-Marquis et al. 2004Rana temporariaNoneLefcort 1996	Rana cascadae	Increase activity	None	Hews and Blaustein 1985
Kana neckscneriNone-Altig and Christensen 1981Rana pipiensNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaNone-Pfeiffer 1966Rana temporariaReduce activity-Marquis et al. 2004Rana trigulariaNoneLefcort 1996	Rana esculenta	None	-	Pteitter 1966
Kana pipiens None - Pfeiffer 1966 Rana temporaria None - Pfeiffer 1966 Rana temporaria Reduce activity - Marquis et al. 2004 Rana trigularia None Lefcort 1996	Kana heckscheri	None	-	Altig and Christensen 1981
Rana temporaria None - Preinfer 1966 Rana temporaria Reduce activity - Marquis et al. 2004 Rana utricularia None Lefcost 1996	Kana pipiens	None	-	Pieiffer 1966
Rana utricularia None None Lefcort 1996	капа temporaria Pana temporaria	Deduce activity	-	Fielifier 1900 Morquis et al. 2004
	Rana utricularia	None	None	Lefcort 1996

TABLE 3. Behavioral responses of anuran tadpoles to chemical cues from other tadpoles.

responsive to chemical stimulus. However, this ecological comparison is confounded by phylogeny: the clear-water species belong to the family Hylidae, which suggests a phylogenetic constraint on the ability to respond to chemical stimuli (Relyea 2007).

Although the ability of anuran larvae to produce and detect chemical signals may be an important facet of their biology, data on this topic are few for the diverse Australian frog fauna. Instead, most published studies of chemical communication in anurans have involved only three anuran families from America and Europe (Table 3). This bias is highlighted in a recent review, which also calls for more studies on a broader range of species (Relyea 2007).



FIGURE 3. Behavioural responses (means and standard error of treatment, T, and control, C) of tadpoles of two species of Australian anurans exposed to heterospecific scent cues. The upper graph (a) shows an index of repulsion, calculated as the slope of the linear regression between distance from the stimulus origin and mean number of tadpoles per square. A positive regression slope indicates repulsion (i.e., tadpole densities are higher as one moves further from the stimulus) whereas a negative slope suggests attraction (more tadpoles close to the stimulus source). The lower graph (b) shows an index of movement.

What is the ecological significance of the responses that I elicited? The responses broadly resemble those recorded from previous studies (Table 3), although differences in experimental protocols make it difficult to draw direct comparisons. For example, strong repulsion or attraction is likely to result in aggregation in small containers, because all tadpoles that flee or approach the stimulus end up concentrated in one corner of the enclosure (Hagman and Shine 2008a). Thus, laboratory studies may detect aggregation as well as repulsion, even in cases where field studies on much larger natural waterbodies report only repulsion (Hagman and Shine 2008a). The ability to produce and detect chemical signals is common in many anuran lineages (Table 3). Such chemicals presumably induce behaviors that reduce the risk of being eaten by a predator, and thus have adaptive value (Petranka 1989). Although tadpoles in my study were not noticeably alarmed by cues from injured conspecifics. the responses I observed may simply reflect alternative strategies for predator avoidance rather than lack of it. For example, tadpoles of P. coriacea may reduce their activity to avoid detection by a visually orientated predator. Alternatively, decreasing activity levels in response to a scent cue that signals predation may reduce the risk of encountering the predator in murky Such responses may vary depending on water. environmental conditions (e.g., flight response in clear water vs. decreased activity in murky water): this possibility warrants further testing. Two of my study species, Litoria peronii and L. infrafrenata, tended to cluster together and move around as a group when exposed to chemical cues from injured tadpoles, suggesting a form of anti-predator behavior (e.g., safety in numbers, selfish herd: Hamilton 1971). Perhaps chemicals are the most efficient way of transferring information in aquatic environments and in large groups? This theory predicts that chemoreception should be more widespread among aquatic organisms that live in schools. At least one species in my study can significantly change both body shape and time to metamorphosis in response to predation (Kraft et al. 2005, 2006). This ability suggests that responses to predator cues might be manifested in phenotypic plasticity rather than behaviour.

An alternative explanation is that the tadpoles in my study were attracted to a potential food source, rather than being repulsed by a cue that predicts predator danger (Fig. 1-3). High levels of movement might, for example, be used by feeding tadpoles to stir up food particles from the bottom of ponds (Richmond 1947; Bragg 1954; Spieler and Linsenmair 1999). In support of this deduction, many tadpoles feed on dead conspecifics (Tyler 1999; Mattias Hagman, pers. obs.). However, I emphasise that my study does not show that Australian tadpoles lack behavioural responses to predators. For example, it is possible that additional stimuli, such as visual evidence of a predator's presence and cues from injured conspecifics, might be needed to elicit antipredator responses in my study species.

Why do some species respond to chemical cues from other species? The most plausible scenario is that such interspecific communication is an evolutionary response to predation, under which individuals that respond to other species' alarm signals will suffer lower rates of mortality. Thus, if a common predator preys upon two or more species, then it should be adaptive for those species to respond to each other's alarm signals. Results from behavioural studies on a wide range of typical "preyspecies" accord well with this theory. For example, interspecific communication is common in mixed herds of antelope (Bertram 1978) as well as in mixed flocks of birds (Goodale and Kotagama 2005), and schools of multiple fish species (Mathis and Smith 1993; Ward et al. 2003). The results of my study suggest that such interspecific sociality occurs in anuran larvae, also. Chemically based interspecific communication of predators is a poorly studied topic in larval ecology. Cross-exposing multiple species to each other's alarm pheromones might therefore be worthwhile.

Finally, understanding why species should evolve to respond to alarm signals seems straightforward, but why do individuals produce those signals? There is no obvious value in warning conspecifics about a predator, particularly if the sender of the signal is the one that is falling prey (Mathis et al. 1995). Likewise, sending a warning signal at the sight of a predator might expose the sender of the signal and attract the attention of the predator (Harvey and Greenwood 1978; Mathis et al. 1995). Perhaps relatedness among group members can explain the evolution of this seemingly non-adaptive behavior. It makes sense in evolutionary terms that the sender of an alarm signal would warn relatives about potential dangers (kin selection: Hamilton 1964; Smith 1977). According to this theory, alarm signalling should evolve in species that associate with relatives. Tadpoles of the genus Bufo meet these criteria well; most species live in large sibling groups (Lever 2001; Duellman and Trueb 1986) and consistently flee when exposed to chemical cues from injured conspecifics.

Acknowledgments.—I thank the University of Sydney, The Swedish Research Council, and the Australian Department of Education, Science and Training for funding. Rick Shine provided helpful comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript. Frank Lemckert and Kris Rogers helped me collect frog eggs. Travis Child, Melanie Elphick and Sam Ruggeri provided technical assistance and help with animal husbandry. Isabel Walter translated papers from German. The study was approved by the University of Sydney Animal Care and Ethics Committee (approval number L04/5-2004/3/3908),

LITERATURE CITED

- Altig, R., and M.T. Christensen. 1981. Behavioral characteristics of the tadpoles of *Rana heckscheri*. Journal of Herpetology 15:151-154.
- Anstis, M. 2002. Tadpoles of South-eastern Australia – A Guide with Keys. Reed New Holland, Pty Ltd, Sydney, Australia.
- Bertram, B.C.R. 1978. Living in groups: predator and prey. Pp. 64-96 *In* Behavioural Ecology – An Evolutionary Approach. Krebbs, J.R., and N.B. Davies (Eds.). Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford, UK.
- Bragg, A.N. 1954. Aggregation behavior and feeding reactions in tadpoles of the Savannah Spadefoot. Herpetologica 10:97-102.
- Bridges, C.M. 2002. Tadpole balance foraging and predator avoidance: effects of predation, pond drying, and hunger. Journal of Herpetology 3:627-634.
- Burger, J. 2002. Vigilance and escape behavior in Marine Toad tadpoles in Peru. Herpetological Natural History 9:63-68.
- Dawkins, R. 1976. The Selfish Gene. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Duellman, W. E., and L. Trueb. 1986. Biology of Amphibians. McGraw-Hill. New York, New York, USA.

- Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I. 1949. Uber das vorkommen von schreckstoffen bei erdkrotenquappen. Experientia 5:236.
- Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I. 1962. Die verhaltensentwicklung des Krallenfrosches (*Xenopus laevis*) und des Scheibenzunglers (*Discoglossus pictus*) unter besonderer Berucksichtigung der Beutefanghandlung. Zhurnal der Tierspychologie 19:385-393.
- Faragher, S.G., and R.G. Jaeger. 1998. Tadpole bullies: examining mechanisms of competition in a community of larval anurans. Canadian Journal of Zoology 76:144-153.
- Goodale, E., and S.W. Kotagama. 2005. Alarm calling in Sri Lankan mixed-species bird flocks. Auk 122:108-120.
- Gosner, K.L. 1960. A simplified table for staging anuran embryos and larvae with notes on identification. Herpetologica 16:183-190.
- Hagman, M., and R. Shine. 2008a. Understanding the toad code: behavioural responses by Cane Toad (*Chaunus marinus*) larvae and metamorphs to chemical cues. Austral Ecology 33:37-44.
- Hagman, M., and R. Shine 2008b. Australian tadpoles do not avoid chemical cues from invasive Cane Toads (*Bufo marinus*). Wildlife Research 35:59-64.
- Hamilton, W.D. 1964. The Genetical Evolution of Social Behaviour. Journal of Theoretical Biology 7:1-52.
- Hamilton, W.D. 1971. Geometry for the selfish herd. Journal of Theoretical Biology 31:295-311.
- Harvey, P.H., and P.J. Greenwood. 1978. Antipredator defence strategies: some evolutionary problems. Pp.129-151 *In* Behavioural Ecology – An Evolutionary Approach. Krebbs, J.R. and N.B. Davies (Eds.). Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford, UK.
- Hrbacek, I. 1950. On the flight reaction of tadpoles of the Common Toad caused by chemical substances. Experientia 6:100-101.
- Hews, D.K. 1988. Alarm response in larval Western Toads, *Bufo boreas*: release of larval chemicals by a natural predator and its effect on predator capture efficiency. Animal Behaviour 36:125-133.
- Hews, D.K., and A.R. Blaustein. 1985. An investigation of the alarm response in *Bufo boreas* and *Rana cascadae*. Behavioural and Neural Biology 43:47–57.
- Kraft, P.G., R.S. Wilson, and C.E. Franklin. 2005. Predator-mediated phenotypic plasticity in tadpoles of the Striped Marsh Frog, *Limnodynastes peronii*. Austral Ecology 30:558-563.
- Kraft, P.G., C.E. Franklin, and M.W. Blows. 2006. Predator-induced phenotypic plasticity in tadpoles: extension or innovation? Journal of Evolutionary Biology 19:450-458.
- Kulzer, E. 1954. Untersuchungen uber die schreckreaktion der erdkrotenkaulquappen (*Bufo bufo*). Zhurnal der Vergleichen Physiologie 36:443-463.

- Lefcort, H. 1996. Adaptive, chemically mediated fright response in tadpoles of the Southern Leopard Frog, *Rana utricularia*. Copeia 2:455-459.
- Lefcort, H. 1998. Chemically mediated fright response in Southern Toad (*Bufo terrestris*) tadpoles. Copeia 2:445-450.
- Lemckert, F., A. Haywood., T. Brassil., and M. Mahony. 2006. Correlations between frogs and pond attributes in central New South Wales, Australia: what makes a good pond? Applied Herpetology 3:67-81.
- Lever, C. 2001. The Cane Toad. The History and Ecology of a Successful Colonist. Westbury Scientific Publishing, Otley, West Yorkshire, UK.
- Manteifel, Y.B. 2001. Avoidance of alarm pheromone by tadpoles of the Common Toad, *Bufo bufo*, in nature. Zoologichesky Zhurnal 80:67-70.
- Marquis, O., P. Saglio., and A. Neveu. 2004. Effects of predators and conspecific chemical cues on the swimming activity of *Rana temporaria* and *Bufo bufo* tadpoles. Archiv fur Hydrobiologie 160:153-170.
- Mathis, A., and R.J.F. Smith. 1993. Intraspecific and cross-superorder responses to chemical alarm signals by Brook Stickleback. Ecology 74:2395-2404.
- Mathis, A., P. Douglas, R. Chivers, and R.J.F. Smith. 1995. Chemical alarm signals: predator deterrents or predator attractants? American Naturalist 145:994-1005.
- Mokany, A., and R. Shine. 2003a. Biological warfare in the garden pond: tadpoles suppress the growth of mosquito larvae. Ecological Entomology 28:102-108.
- Mokany, A., and R. Shine. 2003b. Competition between tadpoles and mosquito larvae. Oecologia 135:615-620.
- Mokany, A., and R. Shine. 2003c. Oviposition site selection by mosquitoes is affected by cues from conspecific larvae and anuran tadpoles. Austral Ecology 28:33-37.
- Petranka, J.W. 1989. Response of toad tadpoles to conflicting chemical stimuli: predator avoidance versus optimal foraging. Herpetologica 45:283-292.
- Pfeiffer, W. 1966. Die verbreitung der schreckreaktion bei kaulquappen und die herkunft des schreckstoffes. Journal of Comparative Physiology A. 52:79–98.
- Rajchard, J. 2006. Antipredator pheromones in amphibians: a review. Veterinari Medici 51:409-413.
- Relyea, R.A. 2007. Getting out alive: how predators affect the decision to metamorphose. Oecologia 152:389-400.
- Richmond, N.D. 1947. Life history of *Scaphiopus holbrooki holbrooki* (Harlan). Part 1: Larval development and behaviour. Ecology 28:53-67.
- Slatyer, C., D. Rosauer., and F. Lemckert. 2007. An assessment of endemism and species richness patters

in the Australian Anura. Journal of Biogeography 34:583-596.

- Smith, R.J.F. 1977. Chemical communication as adaptation: alarm substance of fish. Pp. 303-320 *In* Chemical Signals in Vertebrates. Müller-Schwarze, D., and M.M. Mozell (Eds.). Plenum, New York, New York, USA.
- Spieler, M., and K.E. Linsenmair. 1999. Aggregation behaviour of *Bufo maculatus* as an antipredator mechanism. Ethology 105:665–686.
- Summey, M.R., and A. Mathis. 1998. Alarm responses to chemical stimuli from damaged conspecifics by larval anurans: tests of three neotropical species. Herpetologica 54:402-408.
- Tyler, M.J. 1999. Australian Frogs. A Natural History. Cornell University Press. New York, New York, USA.
- Ward, A.J.W., S. Axford, and J. Krause. 2003. Crossspecies familiarity in shoaling fishes. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B 270:1157-1161.
- Wilson, D.J., and H. Lefcort. 1993. The effect of predator diet on the alarm response of Red-legged Frog, *Rana aurora*, tadpoles. Animal Behaviour 46:1017-1019.



MATTIAS HAGMAN is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow in The Department of Zoology at Stockholm University, Sweden. He received his PhD in 2007 from The University of Sydney, where he was a student in Rick Shine's laboratory. Mattias's research on the evolutionary ecology of reptiles and amphibians has included studies of Australian death adders (*Acanthophis praelongus*), cane toads, and frogs (e.g. Dendrobatid frogs and various Australian species). He likes to travel and has conducted much of his research in the wet tropics of Australia and Latin America.