



Transparency reduces predator detection in mimetic clearwing butterflies

Mónica Arias, Johanna Mappes, Charlotte Desbois, Swanne Gordon, Melanie Mcclure, Marianne Elias, Ossi Nokelainen, Doris Gomez

► To cite this version:

Mónica Arias, Johanna Mappes, Charlotte Desbois, Swanne Gordon, Melanie Mcclure, et al.. Transparency reduces predator detection in mimetic clearwing butterflies. *Functional Ecology*, 2019, 33 (6), pp.1110-1119. 10.1111/1365-2435.13315 . hal-02168624

HAL Id: hal-02168624

<https://hal.science/hal-02168624>

Submitted on 28 Jun 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Transparency reduces predator detection in mimetic clearwing butterflies

Mónica Arias¹, Johanna Mappes², Charlotte Desbois³, Swanne Gordon², Melanie McClure³,
Marianne Elias^{3*}, Ossi Nokelainen^{2*}, Doris Gomez^{1,4*}

¹CEFE, Univ Montpellier, Univ Paul Valéry Montpellier 3, EPHE, IRD, Montpellier, France

²Department of Biological and Environmental Science, Centre of Excellence in Biological Interactions, University of Jyväskylä, P.O. Box 35, 40014 Jyväskylä, Finland

³Institut de Systématique, Evolution, Biodiversité (ISYEB), CNRS, MNHN, Sorbonne Université, EPHE, Université des Antilles. 45 rue Buffon CP50, F-75005 Paris, France

⁴INSP, Sorbonne Université, CNRS, Paris, France

*co-last authors

Correspondence author email: moarias@gmail.com

Keywords: aposematic, bird, citizen science, crypsis, detectability, experiment, Ithomiini, vision modelling

Abstract

1. Predation is an important selective pressure and some prey have evolved conspicuous warning signals that advertise unpalatability (i.e. aposematism) as an antipredator defence. Conspicuous colour patterns have been shown effective as warning signals, by promoting predator learning and memory. Unexpectedly, some butterfly species from the unpalatable tribe Ithomiini possess transparent wings, a feature rare on land but common in water, known to reduce predator detection.

2. We tested if transparency of butterfly wings was associated with decreased detectability by predators, by comparing four butterfly species exhibiting different degrees of transparency, ranging from fully opaque to largely transparent. We tested our prediction using both wild birds and humans in behavioural experiments. Vision modelling predicted butterfly detectability to be similar for these two predator types.
3. In concordance with predictions, the most transparent species were almost never found first and were detected less often than the opaque species by both birds and humans, suggesting that transparency enhances crypsis. However, humans were able to learn to better detect the more transparent species over time.
4. Our study demonstrates for the first time that transparency on land likely decreases detectability by visual predators.

Introduction

Predation is an important selective pressure and a strong evolutionary force shaping prey colouration. Some prey have evolved colours and textures that mimic those of the background, hence rendering them cryptic (Endler, 1988) and reducing predator detection. In midwater environments, where there is nowhere to hide, crypsis can be achieved by different means, including transparency (Johnsen, 2014). Transparency is common in aquatic organisms where it has been shown to decrease detectability by visual predators, enabling prey to blend in with their environment (Kerfoot, 1982; Langsdale, 1993; Tsuda, Hiroaki, & Hirose, 1998; Zaret, 1972). By contrast, transparency is generally rare in terrestrial organisms, except for insect wings, which are made of chitin, a transparent material. However, Lepidoptera (named after ancient Greek words for scale – *lepis* – and wing – *pteron*) are an exception as their wings are generally covered with colourful scales that are involved in intraspecific communication (Jiggins, Estrada, & Rodrigues, 2004), thermoregulation (Miaoulis & Heilman, 1998), water repellence (Wanasekara & Chalivendra,

2011), flight enhancement (Davis, Chi, Bradley, & Altizer, 2012), and antipredator adaptations such as crypsis (Stevens & Cuthill, 2006), masquerade (Suzuki, Tomita, & Sezutsu, 2014) and aposematism (i.e. advertisement of unpalatability by the means of conspicuous colouration, Mallet & Singer, 1987).

Ithomiini (Nymphalidae: Danainae), also known as clearwing butterflies, are some of the most abundant butterflies in Neotropical forests (Willmott, Willmott, Elias, & Jiggins, 2017). Ithomiini species are considered to be unpalatable to some extent due to the accumulation of pyrrolizidine alkaloids collected from Asteraceae, Boraginaceae and Apocynaceae plants (Brown, 1984, 1985). Pyrrolizidine alkaloids, naturally present in Ithomiini butterflies, *Oreina* beetles, or artificially added to mealworms, have been reported to effectively deter predation by birds (Brown & Neto, 1976). Many Ithomiini represent classic examples of aposematic prey, whereby bright wing colour patterns – including orange, yellow and black - advertise their unprofitability to predators (Mappes, Marples, & Endler, 2005; Nokelainen, Hegna, Reudler, Lindstedt, & Mappes, 2011; Poulton, 1890). Ithomiini butterflies are also involved in mimicry with other aposematic species such as several *Heliconius* butterflies (Beccaloni, 1997). Bright contrasting and aposematic colouration is likely to be the ancestral state in the group, since most species in sister lineages (Tellerveni and Danaini) are opaque and aposematic (Freitas & Brown, 2004). However, transparency has evolved to some degree in approximately 80% of clearwing butterfly species, even though many retain minor opaque and colourful wing elements (Beccaloni, 1997; Elias, Gompert, Jiggins, & Willmott, 2008; Jiggins, Mallarino, Willmott, & Bermingham, 2006). Similarly to cicadas and damselflies, transparency in these butterfly wings is sometimes enhanced by anti-reflective nanostructures (Siddique, Gomard, & Hölscher, 2015; Watson, Myhra, Cribb, & Watson, 2008; Yoshida, Motoyama, Kosaku, & Miyamoto, 1997). Since transparency is often associated with crypsis,

for example in aquatic organisms (Johnsen, 2014), transparency in these butterfly may decrease detectability by predators.

To determine if transparency in clearwing butterflies decreases detectability by visual predators, we compared predator detection of four Ithomiini species that differ in the amount of transparency of their wings (Fig 1): *Hypothyris ninonia* (largely opaque and brightly coloured), *Ceratinia tutia* (brightly coloured and translucent), *Ithomia salapia* (transparent with a pale yellow tint and an opaque contour) and *Brevioleria seba* (transparent without colouration other than a white band in the forewing and an opaque contour). Given the proportion of light that is transmitted through the butterfly wing of the different species (Fig S1), we predicted that the opaque species *Hypothyris ninonia* should be the easiest to detect, followed by the translucent species *Ceratinia tutia*. Finally, the more transparent butterfly species *Ithomia salapia* and *Brevioleria seba* should be the least detectable. However, it is also possible that the coloured opaque elements of the transparent species, such as the white band in *B. seba* and the opaque contour found in most of these species, enhance detection. We tested our predictions using two complementary behavioural experiments involving birds and humans, and further supported by a vision modelling approach.

Detectability of butterflies was first tested using wild great tits (*Parus major*) as model bird predators. Great tits are sensitive to UV wavelengths (UVS vision in Ödeen, Håstad, & Alström, 2011). Their vision is similar to that of naturally occurring Ithomiini predators such as the houtouc motmot (*Momotus momota*, Pinheiro et al., 2008), the fawn-breasted tanager (*Pipraeidea melanonota*, Brown & Neto, 1976) or the rufous-tailed tanager (*Ramphocelus carbo*, Brower et al., 1963). However, unlike Neotropical insectivorous birds, great tits are naïve to ithomiine butterflies and have not learned to associate their colour patterns to

toxicity. As a bird's propensity to attack prey is the result of both prey detection and motivation to attack the prey, we also performed behavioural experiments using human participants, which can be useful in disentangling these two factors. Differences in colour perception between great tits and humans include the presence of a fourth single cone type receptor (instead of three cones in humans) that extend the great tits' sensitivity into the UV light spectrum (Hart, 2001), and oil droplets that refine colour discrimination in birds (Vorobyev, 2003). However, neither humans or birds are able to detect linear polarization, which excludes the use of polarization cues to detect and discriminate between butterfly species (Foster et al., 2018; Greenwood, Smith, Church, & Partridge, 2003; Melgar, Lind, & Muheim, 2015; Montgomery & Heinemann, 1952). Moreover, humans have been found to be good predictors of insect prey survival in the wild (Penney, Hassall, Skevington, Abbott, & Sherratt, 2012). Finally, models of predator vision (both for birds and humans) were used to complement behavioural experiments and infer the relative detectability of each butterfly species based on their contrast against the background.

Materials and Methods

Butterflies used for the behavioural experiments

Specimens of the four Ithomiini species used in both experiments – which, in order of increasing transparency are *Hypothyris ninonia*, *Ceratinia tutia*, *Ithomia salapia aquina*, *Brevioleria seba* (see Figs 1 and S1) – were collected in Peru in 2016 and 2017, along the Yurimaguas - Moyobamba road (-6.45°, -76.30°). Butterflies were kept dry in glassine envelopes until use. In behavioural experiments, a single real hindwing and a single real forewing were assembled into artificial butterflies using glue and a thin copper wire to attach the artificial butterfly to a substrate (see Fig S2 for an example). These artificial butterflies

124 mimicked real Ithomiini butterflies at rest, with wings closed and sitting on plant leaves (a
125 typical posture for resting butterflies).

126 **Behavioural experiments using wild birds**

127 Behavioural experiments took place in August and September 2017 at the Konnevesi
128 Research Station (Finland). Thirty wild-caught great tits (*Parus major*) were used. Birds were
129 caught using spring-up-traps and mist-nets, individually marked with a leg band and used
130 only once. Each bird was housed individually in an indoor cage (65x65x80 cm) and were fed
131 with seeds and water *ad libitum*, except during training and experiments. During training,
132 birds were given mealworms attached to butterfly wings (see Training section). Birds were
133 deprived of food for up to 2 hours before the experiment to increase their motivation to hunt.

134
135 *Training.* In indoor cages, birds were taught that all four species of butterflies were similarly
136 palatable by offering them laminated wings of four butterflies (one of each species) with a
137 mealworm attached to the copper wire. Wings were laminated during training only, using
138 transparent thin plastic so as to minimize damage and enabling us to re-use the wings
139 between trials. Butterflies were presented to the birds in the absence of vegetation during
140 training so as to enhance the association between butterfly colour patterns and fully edible
141 prey. When birds had eaten all four prey items (one of each species), a new set was presented.
142 Training ended when birds had eaten 3 sets of butterflies. No time constraint was imposed for
143 training and most birds completed it in less than 4 hours.

144
145 In order to familiarise birds with the experimental set-up, which was novel to them, they were
146 released in the experimental cage by groups of two to four birds for approximately one hour
147 the day before the experiment. Oat flakes, seeds and mealworms were dispersed over leaves

and vegetation so as to encourage searching for edible items in locations similar to where butterflies would be placed during the experiment.

Experiments. The experimental set-up consisted of a 10m x 10m cage that had tarpaulin walls and a ceiling of whitish dense net that let in natural sunlight. Butterflies were disposed in a 5 x 5 grid, delimited by poles all around the borders and a rope defining rows and columns (see Fig S3). Five specimens of each species (20 specimens in total) were placed in the grid, one per cell. Before each trial, butterflies were photographed over graph paper, used as a scale to measure butterfly size on Image J (Rueden et al., 2017). Butterflies were pinned on top of meadowsweet leaves (*Filipendula ulmaria*) that had naturally grown in the outdoor cages. Butterflies were always put in similar places within the cell and could be easily seen from a nearby pole. Butterfly position was randomized but care was taken in 1) leaving the 5 cells closest to the observer empty as birds tended to avoid this area, 2) avoiding having more than two specimens of the same species in the same row or column, and 3) having two specimens of the same species in neighbouring cells. This ensured that all species were evenly represented along the grid. This random configuration was reshuffled between trials.

For each trial, an observer, hidden to the birds, watched from outside the cage through a small window and took notes of which butterfly species were attacked and in which order. A GoPro camera also recorded the experiments. A butterfly was considered detected only if a bird directly approached to attack it, including when the attack failed. No bird was seen hesitating during an attack once it had initiated it. Experiments took place between 9 am and 5 pm. Before each trial, the radiance of ambient light (coming from the sun and sky) was taken by spectrophotometry in the same location. We computed the total radiance (TR) over the bird's spectral sensitivity, which range from 300-700 nm, to account for the intensity of

ambient light associated to each experimental trial in the statistical analyses. Further information on weather conditions (cloudy, sunny, etc) was also recorded. Experiments ended when a bird had eaten half of the available butterflies (ie. 10 butterflies) or after 2 hours, whichever happened first. Wings were occasionally re-used if they had not been damaged.

To control for any positional effect on overall species detection, we computed the probability of a bird being present in a given grid area. To do so, a 10-minute interval of each recorded trial was selected and revised to calculate the proportion of time birds spent on the different poles. The time intervals were possible for all trials as they all lasted at least 10 minutes and were selected either as a result of the birds actively attacking prey or actively exploring the cage during that time, based on notes taken by the observer. These probabilities were later used to divide the grid into four main areas according to bird occupancy: furthest and closest corner to the observer, grid border and grid centre (Fig S4a). Most birds fed willingly on all butterflies located on the borders of the grid. Given that butterfly species distribution was random and reshuffled between trials, the four species were similarly represented throughout the grid (Fig S4b), so no bias was expected. For more details about permits, husbandry conditions, training and experiments, see Supplementary Material.

Behavioural experiments using human participants

Between mid-November and early December 2017, visitors of the Montpellier botanical garden (France) were invited to take part in an experiment where they searched for artificial butterflies. Before each trial, participants were shown pictures of various ithomiine butterfly species, both transparent and opaque, different from those used in the experiments to familiarize them with what they would be searching for. Anonymous personal data was collected from each participant, including gender, age group (A1: <10 years, A2: 11-20 y,

A3: 21-30 y, A4: 31-40 y, A5: 41-50 y and A6: >51 years), and vision problems. Each participant attempted the experiment only once.

Experimental set-up. As with the behavioural bird experiments, artificial butterflies (N=10 of each of the four species, for a total of 40 butterflies) consisted of one real forewing and one real hindwing assembled with copper wire and placed on leaves, but without the mealworm used in the bird experiments. These butterflies were set-up along two corridors in a forest-like understory habitat of similar vegetation and light conditions. Butterfly order followed a block randomisation, with five blocks each consisting of eight butterflies (i.e. two of each species; see Fig S5). This ensured that observers were similarly exposed to the four species all throughout the experimental transect. Whether a butterfly was placed on the left or right side of the corridor was also randomised and both order and corridor side were changed daily. Participants could start the path from either end of the set-up and were given unlimited time to complete the trial. However, they could only move forward on the path. Only one participant was allowed in the path at any given time, and they were accompanied by an observer who recorded which butterflies were found. Trials ended when the participant had completed both corridors.

Statistical analyses.

Experiments using birds and humans were analysed independently. Differences in the total number of butterflies of each species that were attacked by predators (for the sake of simplicity we use ‘attacked’ hereafter for both birds and humans) were compared by fitting generalised linear mixed effect models (GLMM), with bird/human identity as a random factor. A binomial distribution was used for the response variable (attacked or not). For the experiments using birds, butterfly species, butterfly size, trial duration, age and sex of the

bird, time to first attack, first butterfly species attacked, butterfly position on the grid (corner –furthest or closest to the observer-, grid border, grid centre), weather (as a qualitative variable), and total radiance (TR), as well as their interactions, were all included as explanatory variables. For human trials, butterfly species, first species attacked, butterfly position, corridor, left or right side of the path, time of day, gender and age of the participant, duration of the experiment, and their interactions, were all used as explanatory variables. In each case, the best fitting model was selected based on minimization of Akaike’s Information Criteria (AIC), assuming that models differing by two units or less were statistically indistinguishable (Anderson, Burnham, & White, 1998). Coefficients and standard errors were computed using a restricted maximum likelihood approach and a Wald z test was used to test for factor significance.

In addition to the total number of butterflies attacked per species, an “inconspicuousness” rank was calculated for each butterfly species, as done in a previous study (Ihalainen, Rowland, Speed, Ruxton, & Mappes, 2012). This ranking takes into consideration both the specimens that were attacked and those that were not for each species. Lower values are assigned to those specimens that were attacked (from 1 to 10, according to the sequence of overall prey discovery), and higher values are given to those specimens that were not attacked (all unnoticed specimens are given a value of 11: the maximum number of butterflies that could be attacked before the experiment ended + 1). For example, if a bird captures two *H. ninonia* second and fifth in the sequence of captured prey, leaving three specimens unnoticed (out of a total of 5 placed in the cage), this species gets a rank value of $2+5+(3 \times 11)=40$ for that trial. This inconspicuousness rank distinguishes species attacked first and in higher numbers (lower values of inconspicuousness) from those attacked last and in lower numbers (higher values of inconspicuousness). We fitted a linear mixed effect model to

test for differences in rank for each species, assuming a normal distribution, with rank as the response variable. We fitted independent models for birds and human experiments. For bird experiments, bird individual was considered a random factor, and butterfly species, age and sex of the bird, date, time until first attack, first butterfly species attacked, weather as a qualitative variable, and total radiance (TR) were explanatory variables. For humans, participant identity was a random factor, and butterfly species, first species attacked, time of day, gender and age of the participant, duration of the experiment, and their interactions, were all explanatory variables. Again, the best fitting model was selected using AIC minimization. GLMMs were fitted using *nlme* (Pinheiro, Bates, DebRoy, Sarkar, & R Core team, 2009) and *lme4* (Bates, Maechler, Bolker, & Walker, 2015, p. 4) packages for R. Moreover, whether specific species were more frequently detected first by either birds or humans was tested using a χ^2 test.

Additionally for birds, we tested whether butterfly location in the grid could explain differences in the overall species' detection, i.e. whether species more likely to be attacked were more often placed on areas more likely to be visited. To do so, the frequency per species on the four different grid zones was compared using a χ^2 .

Finally, we tested whether birds and humans created a “search image” (i.e. improved ability in finding butterflies of a given species after encountering a similar one) by counting the number of butterflies of each species attacked consecutively. Results were compared among butterfly species using a χ^2 test. Additionally, whether finding some species improved a bird's or a human's ability to find others was also tested. For each combination of two species, we calculated how many times a butterfly of species 1 was found after a butterfly of species 2. Differences between combinations of butterfly species found by birds were tested

using a χ^2 test. For humans, observed results and the frequency at which each possible pair of species was placed consecutively in the original experimental setup were compared using a χ^2 test. All analyses were performed in R (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2014).

Colour measures and vision modelling

Finally, models of predator vision (both for birds and humans) were used to complement behavioural experiments and infer the relative detectability of each butterfly species based on their contrast against the background. First, we measured colour (i.e. reflectance) and transmission properties (i.e. transmittance of transparent wing areas) using spectrophotometry. Vorobyev & Osorio's discriminability model (1998) was then used to calculate the contrast between butterfly and background for birds and humans. Detailed methods for measurements and vision modelling can be found in the electronic supplementary material (additional materials and methods).

Results

Behavioural experiments using wild birds

The model that best explained whether butterflies were attacked or not included only the time required before the first attack and the cage area in which the butterfly was located (Table S1). Butterflies were most likely to be attacked when located in the furthest corners and in the borders than in the rest of the cage ($z = 9.13$, $p < 0.001$). By contrast, the inconspicuousness rank of a butterfly species was best explained by a model including butterfly species as an explanatory variable (Table S2). Which species was attacked first closely matched wing transmission properties: *H. ninonia*, the fully opaque species, followed by the translucent *C. tutia*, the transparent and yellow-tinted *I. salapia* and the most transparent species in our study, *B.seba* ($X^2 = 11.07$, $df = 3$, $p = 0.011$; Table S3). *Hypothyris ninonia*, which was the

most colourful species, was usually the first species attacked ($t = -3.15$, $p = 0.002$, Fig 2a; Tables S2 and S3). Species distribution along the four different grid zones was similar ($X^2 = 6.19$, $df = 9$, $p = 0.72$; Fig. S4b).

Generally, birds did not attack several butterflies of the same species consecutively (Fig S6a). In the rare instances when they did, no differences between species was found ($X^2 = 0.6$, $df = 3$, $p = 0.90$) suggesting that birds did not form a “search image” for any of the butterfly species. No combination of species attacked consecutively at high frequencies were found either ($X^2 = 10.88$, $df = 11$, $p = 0.45$).

Behavioural experiments using human participants

Younger participants found more butterflies than older ones (number of butterflies: $z = -2.34$, $p = 0.019$; Fig S7a). Additionally, participants found more butterflies earlier than later in the afternoon (number of butterflies: $z = -2.80$, $p = 0.005$; Fig S7a). Generally, the more time participants spent on the experiment, the more butterflies they found (number of butterflies: $z = 5.21$, $p < 0.001$), although this was most significant for women (number of butterflies: $z = -2.96$, $p = 0.003$), Fig S7b). Participants found more butterflies on the corridor that had slightly larger vegetation cover (number of butterflies: $z = 3.14$, $p = 0.002$). Participants also found more butterflies at the end rather than at the start of the experiment (number of butterflies: $z = 3.70$, $p < 0.001$, Tables S4), most likely because they became accustomed to the set-up and what they were searching for.

Participants were more likely to find opaque butterflies than transparent ones, following the order *H. ninonia* (H), *C. tutia* (C), *B. seba* (B) and *I. salapia* (I) (H>C, I, B: number of butterflies: $z = 5.73$, $p < 0.001$; inconspicuousness rank: $t = -3.96$, $p < 0.001$; C>B:

inconspicuousness rank: $t = -4.81$, $p < 0.001$; B>I: inconspicuousness rank: $t = -1.325$, $p < 0.001$; Tables S4 and S5; Fig 2b). However, the gain in detection with increasing time spent searching was highest for the most transparent species ($z = -2.75$, $p = 0.006$, Fig S7c). *Hypothyris ninonia* was also the species most frequently found first, followed by *C. tutia*, *B. seba* and *I. salapia* ($X^2 = 19.5$, $df = 3$, $p < 0.001$, Table S3). More butterflies of each species were found when *C. tutia* was found first ($t = -3.96$, $p < 0.001$).

There were also differences in the consecutive order in which butterflies were found. Participants were more likely to find two consecutive butterflies of the same species when they were colourful (*H. ninonia* -50 times- and *C. tutia* -58 times) than when they were transparent (*B. seba* -32 times- or *I. salapia* -18 times; $X^2 = 29.14$, $df = 3$, $p < 0.001$). *Brevioleria seba* and *H. ninonia* were found consecutively up to four times in a single trial. Some species were also more likely to be found consecutively after another species. The two most opaque butterflies *H. ninonia* and *C. tutia* (found 278 times consecutively), and the two transparent species *B. seba* and *I. salapia* (found 186 times consecutively), were found consecutively more frequently than any of the other possible combinations after correcting for the number of butterflies found for each species ($X^2 = 170.95$, $df = 5$, $p < 0.001$). These observed frequencies differed significantly from expected as a result of their physical position along the path ($X^2 = 79.12$, $df = 11$, $p < 0.001$, Fig S6b).

Models of bird and human vision

The achromatic weighted contrast between butterfly colour patches and green-leaf background were similar for both birds and humans (mean achromatic contrast for birds: H=3.81, C= 3.15, I=2.31, B=2.11; for humans: H=5.25, C=4.35, I=3.58, B=3.86; Fig S8). For both observers, *H. ninonia* (the most colourful species) followed by *C. tutia* (colourful but

translucent species) contrasted the most against the leaves, while the transparent butterflies (*I. salapia* for humans and *B. seba* for birds) were the least contrasting. Butterflies seem to be more chromatically detectable by birds than for humans (mean chromatic contrast for humans: $H = 0.44$, $C = 0.37$, $I = 0.25$, $B = 0.22$). For the chromatic contrast seen by birds, *C. tutia*, followed by *H. ninona* were the most contrasting, whereas *B. seba* and *I. salapia* were the least contrasting (mean chromatic contrast for birds: $H = 2.02$, $C = 2.05$, $I = 1.30$, $B = 1.38$). For further details of the experiment results, see the Electronic Supplementary Material.

Discussion

Transparency reduces detectability

As initially predicted based on wing transmittance, and as demonstrated by our behavioural experiments and visual modelling results, transparency decreases butterfly detectability. Interestingly, detection by human participants was similar to that of naïve birds, as shown in other studies (Beatty, Bain, & Sherratt, 2005; Sherratt, Whissell, Webster, & Kikuchi, 2015), providing further support for using human participants to measure predator detection. Surprisingly, experimental results from the bird experiments differed slightly from predictions based on the measures of transmittance of transparent patches and results obtained from the vision models. For instance, according to the transmittance and the chromatic contrast measured between butterflies and their background, birds should have detected *C. tutia* more easily than the two more transparent species. Indeed, semi-transparent objects should be more easily detected than fully transparent objects at short distances and when more light is available (Johnsen & Widder, 1998), such as conditions present during our experiments. Yet this transparent but brightly coloured species was detected at rates similar to those of the most transparent species, perhaps because transparent butterflies were more easily detected and attacked by birds than we predicted (e. g., if an opaque contour

enhances detectability of otherwise transparent prey). Alternatively, the semi-transparent *C. tutia* could have been less detectable by birds, because it shows less strongly delimited contours than those of the most opaque species *H. ninonia*. Perhaps this hampered its detection as occurs in disruptively coloured prey (Honma, Mappes, & Valkonen, 2015; Stevens & Cuthill, 2006). These contradicting results highlight the importance of combining both modelling and behavioural experiments to better understand the evolution of transparency and other prey defences.

Transparency in potentially unpalatable butterflies?

Our results demonstrate that transparency can effectively reduce prey detectability in ithomiine butterflies, where several species have been experimentally demonstrated to be chemically-protected (Brown, 1985; Trigo et al., 1996). This is surprising as aposematic colour patterns, rather than inconspicuousness, are more common in toxic and unpalatable prey (Mappes et al., 2005; Poulton, 1890; Ruxton, Sherratt, & Speed, 2004). In fact, conspicuousness is positively correlated with toxicity or unpalatability in some species and can thus be an honest indicator of prey defences (Arenas, Walter, & Stevens, 2015; Blount, Speed, Ruxton, & Stephens, 2009; Maan & Cummings, 2012; Prudic, Skemp, & Papaj, 2007; Sherratt & Beatty, 2003). Moreover, predators learn more quickly to avoid unpalatable prey when colours are more conspicuous (Gittleman & Harvey, 1980; Lindstrom, Alatalo, Mappes, Riipi, & Vertainen, 1999). This might suggest that the evolution of transparency in these butterflies is the result of a loss or a reduction in unpalatability. If this is the case, the existence of mimicry rings of transparent clearwing butterflies remains unexplained, as this is usually the result of convergence of warning signals promoted by the positive frequency-dependent selection exerted by predators (Willmott et al., 2017). Alternatively, if defences are costly, prey may invest in either visual or chemical defences (Darst, Cummings, &

Cannatella, 2006; Speed & Ruxton, 2007; Wang, 2011), as such options have been shown to afford equivalent avoidance by predators (Darst et al., 2006). In which case, transparency should instead be associated with an increase in unpalatability. This relationship between transparency and chemical defences in clearwing butterflies remains to be explored.

Alternatively, transparency may lower detection and function as a primary defence, with aposematism taking over as a secondary defence if the prey is detected. Indeed, transparent butterflies were not completely cryptic for either birds or humans. In fact, although birds detected the most colourful species first, in total they found a similar number of both colourful and transparent butterflies. Moreover, humans appear to learn to detect and perhaps remember common elements between the more transparent species, which might be the result of a search image. As such, Ithomiini butterflies may be cryptic from afar, but perceived as conspicuous from up close. The combination of crypsis and conspicuousness has also been shown for other defended prey (Järvi, Sillén-Tullberg, & Wiklund, 1981; Sillén-Tullberg, 1985). For example, toxic salamanders of the genus *Taricha* are generally cryptic, only revealing their warning coloured underbelly when threatened (Johnson & Brodie, 1975). In Ithomiini, conspicuous elements such as opaque areas that delineate the edges and contrast with the background likely increase detection, as has been shown for artificial moths (Stevens & Cuthill, 2006). Furthermore, pigmentary or structurally produced opaque colours, such as the white band in *B. seba*, may also enhance butterfly detection. This suggests, as do our results and the occurrence of co-mimics in natural habitats, that these butterflies may reduce the cost of conspicuousness using transparency in addition to maintaining the benefits of detectable warning signals. Further behavioural experiments testing the distance at which Ithomiini butterflies are detected are needed to shed further light on the function of aposematism in less conspicuous prey.

423

424 Finally, transparency may have evolved as an additional protection against birds such as adult
425 kingbirds (*Tyrannus melancholicus*, Pinheiro, 1996) which are able to tolerate their chemical
426 defences. Indeed, both theoretical (Endler & Mappes, 2004) and experimental (Mappes,
427 Kokko, Ojala, & Lindström, 2014; Valkonen et al., 2012) studies have shown that weak
428 warning signals (not overtly conspicuous) can evolve and be maintained in communities
429 where predators vary in their probability of attacking defended prey. Larvae of *Dryas iulia*
430 butterflies, pine sawfly larvae (*Neodiprion sertifer* for example), and shield bugs
431 (Acanthosomatidae, Heteroptera) are only a few of the examples that exist of unpalatable
432 species that display weak visual warning signals (see Endler & Mappes, 2004). As in the
433 polymorphic poison frog *Oophaga granulifera*, clearwing species may reflect a continuum
434 between aposematism and crypsis, possibly shaped by differences in the strength of predator
435 selection as a result of the frequency of naïve predators and/or the variation in predator
436 sensitivities to chemical compounds (Willink, Brenes-Mora, Bolaños, & Pröhl, 2013). A
437 thorough characterization of unpalatability, microhabitat and predator communities would be
438 useful in better understanding conditions that promote the evolution of transparency.

439

440 **Conclusions**

441 Our study, which combines behavioural experiments with different predators and vision
442 modelling, provides important insights into the complex role transparency may play in
443 predator defences of terrestrial aposematic organisms. We show for the first time that
444 transparency results in the reduction of detectability of terrestrial prey. We also demonstrate
445 that Ithomiini butterflies may in fact be decreasing the costs of conspicuousness, while still
446 retaining visual elements that are recognised as warning signals. Future studies exploring the

efficiency of combining transparency and warning signals in decreasing predation risk will further contribute to our understanding of the evolution of cryptic elements in aposematic prey.

Acknowledgments

We thank Tuuli Salmi and Tiffanie Kortenhoff for their invaluable help with behavioural experiments, Helinä Nisu for her advice on bird care, SERFOR, Proyecto Huallaga and Gerardo Lamas for providing research permits in Peru (collecting and exportation permit 002-2015-SERFOR-DGGSPFFS), as well as Corentin Clerc, Monica Monllor, Alexandre Toporov and Marc Toporov-Elias for help with collecting butterflies used in this study, Céline Houssin for calculations of wing surfaces for each butterfly colour pattern patch and for Ithomiini pictures, Konnevesi Research Station, which provided the facilities used for bird experiments, and visitors to Montpellier botanical garden for their enthusiastic contribution. We thank Marcio Cardoso and another anonymous reviewer for their helpful comments and suggestions. The study was funded by the Academy of Finland (Grants 2100000256 and 21000038821), the Clearwing ANR program (ANR-16-CE02-0012) and the Human Frontier Science Program grant (RGP 0014/2016).

Author contribution

DG, ME, JM and MA designed the study; ME, MM and DG collected the butterfly samples; MA, SG, ON, ME and JM performed the experiments; DG and CD did the optical measurements; MA, DG and ME analysed the data; MA, DG, MM, ME, ON, SG and JM wrote the manuscript. Authors have none conflict of interest to declare.

Data available from the Dryad Digital Repository (Arias *et al.* 2019).

472

473 **References**

- 474 Anderson, D., Burnham, K., & White, G. (1998). Comparison of Akaike information
475 criterion and consistent Akaike information criterion for model selection and
476 statistical inference from capture-recapture studies. *Journal of Applied Statistics*,
477 25(2), 263–282.
- 478 Arenas, L. M., Walter, D., & Stevens, M. (2015). Signal honesty and predation risk among a
479 closely related group of aposematic species. *Scientific Reports*, 5.
- 480
481 Arias, M., Mappes, J., Desbois, C., Gordon, S., McClure, M., Elias, M., ... Gomez, D.
482 (2019). Data from: Transparency reduces predator detection in mimetic clearwing butterflies.
483 Dryad Digital Repository. doi:10.5061/dryad.17pk7v8
- 484
485 Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). lme4: Linear mixed-effects models
486 using Eigen and S4. R package version 1.1–7. 2014.
- 487 Beatty, C. D., Bain, R. S., & Sherratt, T. N. (2005). The evolution of aggregation in profitable
488 and unprofitable prey. *Animal Behaviour*, 70(1), 199–208.
- 489 Beccaloni, G. (1997). Ecology, natural history and behaviour of the Ithomiinae Butterflies
490 and their mimics in Ecuador. *Tropical Lepidoptera*, 8, 103–124.
- 491 Blount, J. D., Speed, M. P., Ruxton, G. D., & Stephens, P. A. (2009). Warning displays may
492 function as honest signals of toxicity. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B:*
493 *Biological Sciences*, 276(1658), 871–877. doi:10.1098/rspb.2008.1407
- 494 Brower, L. P., Brower, J. V. Z., & Collins, C. T. (1963). *Experimental studies of mimicry:*
495 *Relative palatability and Müllerian mimicry among Neotropical butterflies of the*
496 *subfamily Heliconiinae*. New York Zoological Society.

497 Brown, K. S. J. (1985). Chemical ecology of dehydropyrrolizidine alkaloids in adult
 498 Ithomiinae (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae). *Rev. Bras. Biol.*, 44, 453–460.

499 Brown, K. S. J. (1984). Chemical ecology of dehydropyrrolizidine alkaloids in adult
 500 Ithomiinae (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae). *Revista Brasileira de Biologia*, 44(4), 435–
 501 460.

502 Brown, K. S. J., & Neto, J. V. (1976). Predation on aposematic ithomiine butterflies by
 503 tanagers (Pipraeidea melanonota). *Biotropica*, 136–141.

504 Brown, K. S. J. (1985). Chemical ecology of dehydropyrrolizidine alkaloids in adult
 505 Ithomiinae (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae). *Rev. Bras. Biol.*, 44, 453–460.

506 Darst, C. R., Cummings, M. E., & Cannatella, D. C. (2006). A mechanism for diversity in
 507 warning signals: conspicuousness versus toxicity in poison frogs. *Proceedings of the*
 508 *National Academy of Sciences*, 103(15), 5852–5857.

509 Davis, A. K., Chi, J., Bradley, C., & Altizer, S. (2012). The redder the better: wing color
 510 predicts flight performance in monarch butterflies. *PloS One*, 7(7), e41323.

511 Elias, M., Gompert, Z., Jiggins, C., & Willmott, K. (2008). Mutualistic interactions drive
 512 ecological niche convergence in a diverse butterfly community. *PLoS Biology*, 6(12),
 513 e300.

514 Endler, J. A. (1988). Frequency-dependent predation, crypsis and aposematic coloration.
 515 *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B*, 319(1196), 505–523.

516 Endler, J. A., & Mappes, J. (2004). Predator mixes and the conspicuousness of aposematic
 517 signals. *The American Naturalist*, 163(4), 532–547.

518 Foster, J. J., Temple, S. E., How, M. J., Daly, I. M., Sharkey, C. R., Wilby, D., & Roberts, N.
 519 W. (2018). Polarisation vision: overcoming challenges of working with a property of
 520 light we barely see. *The Science of Nature*, 105(3), 27. doi:10.1007/s00114-018-1551-
 521 3

522 Freitas, A. V. L., & Brown, K. S. J. (2004). Phylogeny of the Nymphalidae (Lepidoptera).
523 *Systematic Biology*, 53(3), 363–383.

524 Gittleman, J. L., & Harvey, P. H. (1980). Why are distasteful prey not cryptic? *Nature*,
525 286(5769), 149–150. doi:10.1038/286149a0

526 Greenwood, V. J., Smith, E. L., Church, S. C., & Partridge, J. C. (2003). Behavioural
527 investigation of polarisation sensitivity in the Japanese quail (*Coturnix coturnix*
528 japonica) and the European starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*). *Journal of Experimental*
529 *Biology*, 206(18), 3201–3210.

530 Hart, N. S. (2001). The visual ecology of avian photoreceptors. *Progress in Retinal and Eye*
531 *Research*, 20(5), 675–703.

532 Honma, A., Mappes, J., & Valkonen, J. K. (2015). Warning coloration can be disruptive:
533 aposematic marginal wing patterning in the wood tiger moth. *Ecology and Evolution*,
534 5(21), 4863–4874.

535

536 Ihalainen, E., Rowland, H. M., Speed, M. P., Ruxton, G. D., & Mappes, J. (2012). Prey
537 community structure affects how predators select for Mullerian mimicry. *Proceedings*
538 *of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, 279(1736), 2099–2105.
539 doi:10.1098/rspb.2011.2360

540 Järvi, T., Sillén-Tullberg, B., & Wiklund, C. (1981). The cost of being aposematic. An
541 experimental study of predation on larvae of *Papilio machaon* by the great tit *Parus*
542 major. *Oikos*, 267–272.

543 Jiggins, C. D., Estrada, C., & Rodrigues, A. (2004). Mimicry and the evolution of premating
544 isolation in *Heliconius melpomene* Linnaeus. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 17(3),
545 680–691. doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2004.00675.x

546 Jiggins, C. D., Mallarino, R., Willmott, K. R., & Bermingham, E. (2006). The phylogenetic
547 pattern of speciation and wing pattern change in neotropical *Ithomia* butterflies
548 (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae). *Evolution*, 60(7), 1454–1466.

549 Johnsen, S. (2014). Hide and seek in the open sea: pelagic camouflage and visual
550 countermeasures. *Annual Review of Marine Science*, 6, 369–392.

551 Johnsen, S., & Widder, E. A. (1998). Transparency and visibility of gelatinous zooplankton
552 from the northwestern Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. *The Biological Bulletin*, 195(3),
553 337–348.

554 Johnson, J. A., & Brodie Jr, E. D. (1975). The selective advantage of the defensive posture of
555 the newt, *Taricha granulosa*. *American Midland Naturalist*, 139–148.

556 Kerfoot, W. C. (1982). A question of taste: crypsis and warning coloration in freshwater
557 zooplankton communities. *Ecology*, 63(2), 538–554.

558 Langsdale, J. (1993). Developmental changes in the opacity of larval herring, *Clupea*
559 harengus, and their implications for vulnerability to predation. *Journal of the Marine*
560 *Biological Association of the United Kingdom*, 73(1), 225–232.

561 Lindstrom, L., Alatalo, R. V., Mappes, J., Riipi, M., & Vertainen, L. (1999). Can aposematic
562 signals evolve by gradual change? *Nature*, 397(6716), 249–251. doi:10.1038/16692

563 Maan, M. E., & Cummings, M. E. (2012). Poison frog colors are honest signals of toxicity,
564 particularly for bird predators. *The American Naturalist*, 179(1), E1–E14.
565 doi:10.1086/663197

566 Mallet, J., & Singer, M. C. (1987). Individual selection, kin selection, and the shifting
567 balance in the evolution of warning colours: the evidence from butterflies. *Biological*
568 *Journal of the Linnean Society*, 32(4), 337–350.

569 Mappes, J., Kokko, H., Ojala, K., & Lindström, L. (2014). Seasonal changes in predator
570 community switch the direction of selection for prey defences. *Nature*
571 *Communications*, 5.

572 Mappes, J., Marples, N., & Endler, J. A. (2005). The complex business of survival by
573 aposematism. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 20(11), 598–603.
574 doi:10.1016/j.tree.2005.07.011

575 Melgar, J., Lind, O., & Muheim, R. (2015). No response to linear polarization cues in operant
576 conditioning experiments with zebra finches. *Journal of Experimental Biology*,
577 218(13), 2049–2054.

578 Miaoulis, I. N., & Heilman, B. D. (1998). Butterfly thin films serve as solar collectors.
579 *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, 91(1), 122–127.

580 Montgomery, K., & Heinemann, E. G. (1952). Concerning the ability of homing pigeons to
581 discriminate patterns of polarized light. *Science*.

582 Nokelainen, O., Hegna, R. H., Reudler, J. H., Lindstedt, C., & Mappes, J. (2011). Trade-off
583 between warning signal efficacy and mating success in the wood tiger moth.
584 *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, rspb20110880.

585 Ödeen, A., Håstad, O., & Alström, P. (2011). Evolution of ultraviolet vision in the largest
586 avian radiation - the passerines. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, 11(1), 313.
587 doi:10.1186/1471-2148-11-313

588 Penney, H. D., Hassall, C., Skevington, J. H., Abbott, K. R., & Sherratt, T. N. (2012). A
589 comparative analysis of the evolution of imperfect mimicry. *Nature*, 483(7390), 461–
590 464.

591 Pinheiro, C. E. G. (1996). Palatability and escaping ability in neotropical butterflies: Tests
592 with wild kingbirds (*Tyrannus melancholicus*, Tyrannidae). *Biological Journal of the*
593 *Linnean Society*, 59(4), 351–365. doi:10.1111/j.1095-8312.1996.tb01471.x

594 Pinheiro, C. E., Medri, Í. M., & Salcedo, A. K. M. (2008). Why do the ithomiines
 595 (Lepidoptera, Nymphalidae) aggregate? Notes on a butterfly pocket in central Brazil.
 596 *Revista Brasileira de Entomologia*, 52(4), 610–614.

597 Pinheiro, J., Bates, D., DebRoy, S., Sarkar, D., & R Core team. (2009). nlme: Linear and
 598 nonlinear mixed effects models. R package version 3.1-93. Retrieved from
 599 <http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/nlme/>

600 Poulton, E. B. (1890). *The colours of animals: their meaning and use, especially considered*
 601 *in the case of insects*. D. Appleton.

602 Prudic, K. L., Skemp, A. K., & Papaj, D. R. (2007). Aposematic coloration, luminance
 603 contrast, and the benefits of conspicuousness. *Behavioral Ecology*, 18(1), 41–46.
 604 doi:10.1093/beheco/arl046

605 R Foundation for Statistical Computing, R. C. (2014). *R: A language and environment for*
 606 *statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria.

607 Rueden, C. T., Schindelin, J., Hiner, M. C., DeZonia, B. E., Walter, A. E., Arena, E. T., &
 608 Eliceiri, K. W. (2017). ImageJ2: ImageJ for the next generation of scientific image
 609 data. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 18(1), 529.

610 Ruxton, G. D., Sherratt, T. N., & Speed, M. P. (2004). *Avoiding attack: the evolutionary*
 611 *ecology of crypsis, warning signals and mimicry*. Oxford University Press.

612 Sherratt, T. N., & Beatty, C. D. (2003). The evolution of warning signals as reliable
 613 indicators of prey defense. *The American Naturalist*, 162(4), 377–389.

614 Sherratt, T. N., Whissell, E., Webster, R., & Kikuchi, D. W. (2015). Hierarchical
 615 overshadowing of stimuli and its role in mimicry evolution. *Animal Behaviour*, 108,
 616 73–79.

617 Siddique, R. H., Gomard, G., & Hölscher, H. (2015). The role of random nanostructures for
618 the omnidirectional anti-reflection properties of the glasswing butterfly. *Nature*
619 *Communications*, 6, 6909.

620 Sillén-Tullberg, B. (1985). Higher survival of an aposematic than of a cryptic form of a
621 distasteful bug. *Oecologia*, 67(3), 411–415. doi:10.1007/BF00384948

622 Speed, M. P., & Ruxton, G. D. (2007). How bright and how nasty: explaining diversity in
623 warning signal strength. *Evolution*, 61(3), 623–635.

624 Stevens, M., & Cuthill, I. C. (2006). Disruptive coloration, crypsis and edge detection in early
625 visual processing. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*,
626 273(1598), 2141. doi:10.1098/rspb.2006.3556

627 Suzuki, T. K., Tomita, S., & Sezutsu, H. (2014). Gradual and contingent evolutionary
628 emergence of leaf mimicry in butterfly wing patterns. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*,
629 14(1), 229. doi:10.1186/s12862-014-0229-5

630 Trigo, J. R., Brown Jr, K. S., Witte, L., Hartmann, T., Ernst, L., & Barata, L. E. S. (1996).
631 Pyrrolizidine alkaloids: different acquisition and use patterns in Apocynaceae and
632 Solanaceae feeding ithomiine butterflies (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae). *Biological*
633 *Journal of the Linnean Society*, 58(1), 99–123.

634 Tsuda, A., Hiroaki, S., & Hirose, T. (1998). Effect of gut content on the vulnerability of
635 copepods to visual predation. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 43(8), 1944–1947.

636 Valkonen, J. K., Nokelainen, O., Niskanen, M., Kilpimaa, J., Björklund, M., & Mappes, J.
637 (2012). Variation in predator species abundance can cause variable selection pressure
638 on warning signaling prey. *Ecology and Evolution*, 2(8), 1971–1976.

639 Vorobyev, M. (2003). Coloured oil droplets enhance colour discrimination. *Proceedings of*
640 *the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 270(1521), 1255–1261.

641 Vorobyev, M., & Osorio, D. (1998). Receptor noise as a determinant of colour thresholds.
642 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, 265(1394), 351–8.

643 Wanasekara, N. D., & Chalivendra, V. B. (2011). Role of surface roughness on wettability
644 and coefficient of restitution in butterfly wings. *Soft Matter*, 7(2), 373–379.

645 Wang, I. J. (2011). Inversely related aposematic traits: reduced conspicuousness evolves with
646 increased toxicity in a polymorphic poison-dart frog. *Evolution: International Journal*
647 *of Organic Evolution*, 65(6), 1637–1649.

648 Watson, G. S., Myhra, S., Cribb, B. W., & Watson, J. A. (2008). Putative functions and
649 functional efficiency of ordered cuticular nanoarrays on insect wings. *Biophysical*
650 *Journal*, 94(8), 3352–3360.

651 Willink, B., Brenes-Mora, E., Bolaños, F., & Pröhl, H. (2013). Not everything is black and
652 white: color and behavioral variation reveal a continuum between cryptic and
653 aposematic strategies in a polymorphic poison frog. *Evolution*, 67(10), 2783–2794.

654 Willmott, K. R., Willmott, J. C. R., Elias, M., & Jiggins, C. D. (2017). Maintaining mimicry
655 diversity: optimal warning colour patterns differ among microhabitats in Amazonian
656 clearwing butterflies (Vol. 284, p. 20170744). Presented at the Proc. R. Soc. B, The
657 Royal Society.

658 Yoshida, A., Motoyama, M., Kosaku, A., & Miyamoto, K. (1997). Antireflective
659 nanoprotuberance array in the transparent wing of a hawkmoth, *Cephonodes hylas*.
660 *Zoological Science*, 14(5), 737–741.

661 Zaret, T. M. (1972). Predators, invisible prey, and the nature of polymorphism in the
662 cladocera (class Crustacea). *Limnology and Oceanography*, 17(2), 171–184.
663 doi:10.4319/lo.1972.17.2.0171
664
665

Figures




Figure 1. Dorsal (top row) and ventral (bottom row) view of butterfly species used in the study (photographed against a black and a white background to show the location and degree of transparency in the wings). Wing transparency (transmission and area occupied by transparent patches) increases from left (most opaque) to right (most transparent): *Hypothyris ninonia* (largely opaque), *Ceratinia tutia* (translucent but brightly coloured), *Ithomia salapia* (transparent with a pale yellow tint and black wing contour), *Brevioleria seba* (transparent without colouration other than a white band in the forewing and a black wing contour). © Céline Houssin




Figure 2. Sum of the inconspicuousness rank for each butterfly species calculated from the behavioural experiments using **a)** great tits and **b)** humans. Species for which butterflies were detected first and most often by birds or humans have lower values of “inconspicuousness”

683 rank". Butterfly transparency increases from left to right: *H. ninonia* (H), *C. tutia* (C), *I.*
684 *salapia* (I), and *B. seba* (B). Letters above the bars mean significant differences below 0.05.
685

Electronic supplementary Material

Additional materials and methods and results.

Detailed behavioural experiments

Behavioural experiments using wild birds

Behavioural experiments took place in August and September 2017 at the Konnevesi Research Station (Finland) under permit from the National Animal Experiment Board (ESAVI/9114/04.10.07/2014) and the Central Finland Regional Environment Centre (VARELY/294/2015). Thirty wild-caught great tits (*Parus major*) were used, including 3 juveniles and 10 adult females, and 8 juveniles and 9 adult males. Birds were caught using spring-up-traps and mist-nets, individually marked with a leg band and used only once. Each bird was housed individually in an indoor cage (65x65x80 cm), with a 12:12 photoperiod. Birds were fed with peanuts, sunflower seeds, oat flakes and water *ad libitum*, except during training and experiments. During training, birds were given mealworms attached to butterfly wings (see Training section). Birds were deprived of food for up to 2 hours before the experiment to increase their motivation to hunt. Most birds were kept in captivity for less than a week, after which they were released at their capture site.

Training. In indoor cages, birds were taught that all four species of butterflies were similarly palatable by offering them laminated wings of four butterflies (one of each species) with a mealworm attached to the copper wire. Wings were laminated during training only, using transparent thin plastic so as to minimize damage and enabling us to re-use the wings between trials. Butterflies were presented to the birds in the absence of vegetation during training so as to enhance the association between butterfly colour patterns and fully edible prey. When birds had eaten all four of the prey items (one of each species), a new set was presented. Training

ended when birds had eaten 3 sets of butterflies. No time constraint was imposed for training and most birds completed it in less than 4 hours.

In order to familiarise birds with the experimental set-up, which was novel to them, they were released in the experimental cage by groups of two to four birds for approximately one hour the day before the experiment. Oat flakes, seeds and mealworms were dispersed over leaves and vegetation to encourage searching for edible items in locations similar to where butterflies would be placed during the experiment. After an hour, no visible oat flakes, seed or mealworms could be found in the cage.

Experiments. The experimental set-up consisted of a 10m x 10m cage that had tarpaulin walls and a ceiling of whitish dense net that let in natural sunlight. Butterflies were dispersed in a 5 x 5 grid, delimited by poles all around the borders and a rope defining rows and columns (see Fig S3). Two extra poles were placed in the grid centre to increase the appeal of this area for birds. Five specimens of each species (20 specimens in total) were placed in the grid, one per cell. Butterflies were pinned to the top of meadowsweet leaves (*Filipendula ulmaria*) that had naturally grown in the outdoor cages. Butterflies were always put in similar places within the cell and could be easily seen from a nearby pole. Before the experiment, butterflies were photographed over graph paper, used as a scale to measure butterfly size on Image J (Rueden et al., 2017). Butterfly position was randomized but care was taken in 1) leaving the 5 cells closest to the observer empty as birds tended to avoid this area, 2) avoiding having more than two specimens of the same species in the same row or column, and 3) having two specimens of the same species in neighbouring cells. This ensured that all species were evenly represented along the grid. This random configuration was reshuffled between trials.

For each trial, an observer, hidden to the birds, watched from outside the cage through a small window and took notes of which butterfly species were attacked and in which order. A GoPro camera also recorded the experiments. A butterfly was considered detected only if a bird directly approached to attack it, including when the attack failed. No bird was seen hesitating during an attack once it had initiated it. Experiments took place between 9 am and 5 pm. Before each trial, the radiance of ambient light (coming from the sun and sky) was measured using an Ocean Optics spectrophotometer in the same location. We computed the total radiance (TR) over the bird's spectral sensitivity, which range from 300-700 nm, to account for the intensity of ambient light associated with each experimental trial in the statistical analyses. Further information on weather conditions (cloudy, sunny, etc) was also recorded. Experiments ended when a bird had eaten half of the available butterflies (ie. 10 butterflies) or after 2 hours, whichever happened first. Wings were occasionally re-used if they had not been damaged.

63

To control for any positional effect on overall species detection, we computed the probability of a bird being present in a given grid area. To do so, a 10-minutes interval of each recorded trial was selected and revised to calculate the proportion of time birds spent on the different poles. The time intervals were possible for all trials as they all lasted at least 10 minutes and were selected either as a result of the birds actively attacking prey or actively exploring the cage during that time, based on notes taken by the observer. A total of 87% of all attacks started from the pole closest to the grid cell, while all other attacks were initiated from a pole situated only one grid cell further away. Thus, the probability of visiting a given cell was calculated based on the amount of time spent by the bird on each pole, the number of "close" (immediately next to) or "distant" (one grid cell removed) poles and the probability of visiting

them (0.87 for close grid cells and 0.13 for distant grid cells). These probabilities were later used to divide the grid into four main areas according to bird occupancy: furthest and closest corner to the observer, grid border and grid centre (Fig S4a). Most birds fed willingly on all butterflies located on the borders of the grid. Given that butterfly species distribution was random and reshuffled between trials, the four species were similarly represented in those cells (Fig S4b), so no bias was expected.

Colour and optical measurements

Both the transmittance and reflectance of the transparent and opaque wing elements respectively, were measured using spectrophotometry. All measurements were taken using a spectrophotometer (Starline Avaspec-2048 L, Avantes) and a deuterium halogen lamp (Avalight DHS, Avantes) emitting in the 300-700 nm range, including UV, to which birds but not humans are sensitive (Chen & Goldsmith, 1986). To measure transmittance, illumination and collection fibres were separated (FC-UV200-2-1.5 x 100, Avantes), aligned, and the wing held perpendicularly at an equal distance of ~2mm from each fibre. Measurements were done relative to a white reference (lights turned on with no sample) and a dark reference (light turned off with no sample).

To measure reflectance, an optic probe (FC-UV200-2-1.5 x 100, Avantes) merging illumination and collection angles was used. The fibre was kept in place with a small black chamber that allowed measurements of reflection at 0°, perpendicularly to wing surface. Samples were again placed at ~2mm from the fibre in front of a light trap to avoid parasitic illumination and reflection. Measurements were relative to a white reference (WS2, Avantes) and a dark reference (light on with the light trap in front). Measurements of both the forewing and the hindwing were taken for one individual of each species. For each wing, 5 measures of

transmittance in different transparent areas and 1 measure of reflectance for each colourful patch were taken. Values of transmittance were averaged, and both values of reflectance and transmittance were used to predict butterfly detectability, as a result of the wings' optical properties, by the "predators" used in the two different behavioural experiments.

Models of bird and human vision

We used vision modelling to predict detectability of butterfly species for both birds and humans. Birds and humans are unable to detect linear polarization, and to form spatial images of this property as they do with brightness or colour (Foster et al., 2018; Greenwood, Smith, Church, & Partridge, 2003; Melgar, Lind, & Muheim, 2015; Montgomery & Heinemann, 1952); hence, birds and humans can use only brightness and colour to detect specimens and discriminate between butterfly species.

The contrast perceived by birds and humans for each element of the butterfly colour pattern was calculated using Vorobyev & Osorio's discriminability model (1998). As butterflies were placed on leaves of living plants for all behavioural experiments, they all had green leaves as background. The reflectance of an average green leaf (calculated using the average of 86 different leaves from tropical species (Gomez & Théry, 2007)) transmitted through the transparent wing patches was therefore used. For behavioural experiments using birds as predators, butterflies were seen against leaves in open habitat conditions (under direct sunlight). Hence, for the bird vision model, we used open habitat ambient light conditions (large gaps where sun is visible, similar to conditions present in the outdoor aviaries where we performed bird experiments, Gomez & Théry, 2007), and blue tit photoreceptors, including oil droplets that enhance colour discrimination (Misha Vorobyev, 2003), with relative cone densities of 1: 1.92: 2.68: 2.7 for UVS:SWS:MWS:LWS (Hart, Partridge, Cuthill, & Bennett,

2000). We used a Weber fraction of 0.1 for the chromatic response (as reported for Pekin robin *Leiothrix lutea* in (Maier & Bowmaker, 1993)) and 0.2 for the brightness response (as the average reported values for known bird species (Lind, Karlsson, & Kelber, 2013)). In behavioural experiments with humans, we used forest shade ambient light conditions (the forest path we used for the experiment was typical of forest understorey, Gomez & Théry, 2007), and human photoreceptors (www.cvrl.org ; interpolated every nm) with relative cone densities of 1:16:32 for SWS:MWS:LWS (Walraven, 1974). We also used a Weber fraction of 0.018 for LWS in chromatic vision (Wyszecki & Stiles, 1982), and 0.11 for brightness (Scholtyssek, Kelber, & Dehnhardt, 2008).

Colour and brightness contrast of butterflies resting on leaves were modelled for both bird and human vision. For transparent wing areas (transparent patches for *I. salapia* and *B. seba*), the ambient light was assumed to be transmitted by the wing, reflected on the leaf, and again transmitted by the wing to reach the eye of the observer (see Fig S2). For opaque wing areas (all coloured patches of *H. ninonia* and *C. tutia*, and the colourful opaque elements found in the two transparent species), the ambient light had to be reflected by the wing to reach the eye of the observer (see Fig S2). All contrasts were computed using the *pavo* package (Maia, Eliason, Bitton, Doucet, & Shawkey, 2013) in R (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2014). Standardized weighed averages across all areas, weighed for the patch size and standardized for the size of the individuals, were then calculated for chromatic and achromatic contrast between species and green-leaf background.

Detailed statistical analyses and results

Behavioural experiments using wild birds

Birds took anywhere between 1 and 37 minutes (average: 7.54 ± 8.96 min) after release into the experimental cage before initiating an attack. For three of the birds, the experiment ended without having eaten 10 butterflies in the allocated 2 hours. The other 27 birds took between 11 and 112 minutes to attack all 10 butterflies (mean time to attack 10 butterflies: 40.76 ± 26.23 min). For all the trials combined, birds attacked 54% of the *H. ninonia* butterflies (the most colourful species), 48.7% of the *C. tutia* (colourful but transparent species), 46.7% of the *I. salapia* (transparent yellow-tinted butterfly) and 49.3% of the *B. seba* butterflies (most transparent species).

To test whether birds detected different numbers of butterflies per species, a linear mixed model, including bird ID as a random factor, was fitted. A binomial distribution was used for the response variable (attacked or not), and the butterfly species, butterfly size, trial duration, age and sex of the bird, time to first attack, first butterfly species found, butterfly position on the grid (corner –furthest or closest to the observer-, grid side, grid centre), weather (as a qualitative variable), and total radiance (TR), as well as their interactions, were all selected as explanatory variables. The best fitting model was selected based on minimization of Akaike's Information Criteria (AIC), assuming that models differing by two units or less were statistically indistinguishable (Anderson, Burnham, & White, 1998). The best fitted model, shown in Table S1, included time to first attack, and the position of the butterfly on the grid (furthest or closest corner, border, centre. Fig. S3). According to the results, butterflies were more likely to be attacked when they were in grid zones with a higher probability of a predator being present, when a predator initiated attacks earlier in the experimental trial, and when butterflies were located in the furthest corners from the observer. Thus, similar numbers of butterflies were attacked between species (as species was not part of the best fitting model).

We also calculated an “inconspicuousness rank” that included the order in which butterflies were found and the number of butterflies that were not attacked for each species (i.e. inconspicuousness rank: Ihalainen, Rowland, Speed, Ruxton, & Mappes, 2012). For example, if a bird captured two *H. ninonia* second and fifth in the sequence of captured prey, this species gets a rank value of $2+5+3 \times 11=40$ for that trial. Therefore, highly conspicuous species are characterized by lower inconspicuous rank values. We fitted a linear mixed effect model to test for differences in rank for each species, assuming a normal distribution, with rank as the response variable, bird individual as a random factor and butterfly species, age and sex of the bird, date, time until first attack, first butterfly species found, weather as a qualitative variable, and total radiance (TR) as explanatory variables. Again, the best fitting model was selected using AIC minimization. According to the best fitted generalised linear mixed model, butterfly species explained the variation in inconspicuous rank (Table S2). Butterflies were more conspicuous when they were opaque, such as those belonging to the *H. ninonia* species. In addition to the strong spatial distribution effect on butterfly attacks (detected on the number of butterflies found), transparency was found to decrease butterfly detection.

Behavioural experiments using human participants

A total of 102 volunteers participated in the experiment (63 men and 39 women, with 10:11:21:18:31:11 in the A1 (<10): A2 (11-20): A3 (21-30): A4 (31-40): A5 (41-50): A6 (>51) age classes). Of these, 19 volunteers did the experiment before 13h30, 35 between 13h30 and 16h, and 48 after 16h. Participants found between 5 and 28 of the 40 butterflies (12.75 ± 4.68 butterflies found per participant) and took between 7.5 and 37 minutes to complete both corridors (18.04 ± 6.5 minutes spent in average per participant). For all the trials combined, participants found 42.5% of the *H. ninonia* butterflies (the most colourful species), 38% of the *C. tutia* (colourful but translucent species), 23.54% of the *I. salapia*

(transparent yellow-tinted butterfly) and 28.63% of the *B. seba* butterflies (most transparent species).

Similar statistical analyses were performed for human experiments. First, a linear mixed model was fitted to test for differences in the total number of butterflies per species that were found, assuming a binomial distribution for the response variable (either found or not) and including participant's ID as random factor. Butterfly species, first species found, butterfly position, corridor, left or right side of the path, time of day, gender and age of the participant, duration of the experiment, and their interactions, were all used as explanatory variables. A minimization of Akaike's Information Criteria (AIC) was used to select the best model, assuming that models differing by two units or less were statistically indistinguishable (Anderson et al., 1998). According to the best fitted model (Table S3), participants found more opaque butterflies (*H. ninonia*) than any other species ($z = 5.73$, $p < 0.001$). More butterflies were found earlier than later in the day ($z = -2.80$, $p = 0.005$), by men ($z = 3.40$, $p < 0.001$) and by younger participants ($z = -0.237$, $p = 0.019$). Smaller but significant effects were found for: trial duration, the order in which butterflies were found, and the interactions between species and trial duration, trial duration and gender, and time of day, age and gender.

As in the bird experiments, we also tested whether the order in which butterflies were found, and the number of butterflies that were missed for each species, were related to differences in transparency (i.e. inconspicuousness rank), assuming a Gaussian distribution for the inconspicuousness rank, participant ID as a random factor, and butterfly species, first species found, time of day, gender and age of the participant, duration of the experiment, and their interactions, were all used as explanatory variables. The best fitted linear mixed model (Table S5) shows that the most opaque butterfly species, *H. ninonia*, was the most conspicuous followed by *C. tutia* and *B. seba*. More butterflies were detected when transparent butterflies,

especially *B. seba* and *I. salapia*, were detected first ($t = -12.085$, $p = 0.004$). Fewer butterflies were missed in trials that were done on the second day ($t = -1.98$, $p = 0.05$). As for birds, transparency decreases butterfly detection by humans.

References

Anderson, D., Burnham, K., & White, G. (1998). Comparison of Akaike information criterion and consistent Akaike information criterion for model selection and statistical inference from capture-recapture studies. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 25(2), 263–282.

Chen, D.-M., & Goldsmith, T. H. (1986). Four spectral classes of cone in the retinas of birds. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A*, 159(4), 473–479.

Foster, J. J., Temple, S. E., How, M. J., Daly, I. M., Sharkey, C. R., Wilby, D., & Roberts, N. W. (2018). Polarisation vision: overcoming challenges of working with a property of light we barely see. *The Science of Nature*, 105(3), 27. doi:10.1007/s00114-018-1551-3

Gomez, D., & Théry, M. (2007). Simultaneous crypsis and conspicuousness in color patterns: comparative analysis of a neotropical rainforest bird community. *The American Naturalist*, 169(S1), S42–S61.

Greenwood, V. J., Smith, E. L., Church, S. C., & Partridge, J. C. (2003). Behavioural investigation of polarisation sensitivity in the Japanese quail (*Coturnix coturnix japonica*) and the European starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*). *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 206(18), 3201–3210.

Hart, N., Partridge, J., Cuthill, I., & Bennett, A. (2000). Visual pigments, oil droplets, ocular media and cone photoreceptor distribution in two species of passerine bird: the blue tit

243 (Parus caeruleus L.) and the blackbird (Turdus merula L.). *Journal of Comparative*
 244 *Physiology A*, 186(4), 375–387.

245 Ihalainen, E., Rowland, H. M., Speed, M. P., Ruxton, G. D., & Mappes, J. (2012). Prey
 246 community structure affects how predators select for Mullerian mimicry. *Proceedings*
 247 *of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, 279(1736), 2099–2105.
 248 doi:10.1098/rspb.2011.2360

249 Lind, O., Karlsson, S., & Kelber, A. (2013). Brightness discrimination in budgerigars
 250 (Melopsittacus undulatus). *PLoS One*, 8(1), e54650.

251 Maia, R., Eliason, C. M., Bitton, P., Doucet, S. M., & Shawkey, M. D. (2013). pavo: an R
 252 package for the analysis, visualization and organization of spectral data. *Methods in*
 253 *Ecology and Evolution*, 4(10), 906–913.

254 Maier, E., & Bowmaker, J. (1993). Colour vision in the passeriform bird, *Leiothrix lutea*:
 255 correlation of visual pigment absorbance and oil droplet transmission with spectral
 256 sensitivity. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A*, 172(3), 295–301.

257 Melgar, J., Lind, O., & Muheim, R. (2015). No response to linear polarization cues in operant
 258 conditioning experiments with zebra finches. *Journal of Experimental Biology*,
 259 218(13), 2049–2054.

260 Montgomery, K., & Heinemann, E. G. (1952). Concerning the ability of homing pigeons to
 261 discriminate patterns of polarized light. *Science*.

262 R Foundation for Statistical Computing, R. C. (2014). *R: A language and environment for*
 263 *statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria.

264 Rueden, C. T., Schindelin, J., Hiner, M. C., DeZonia, B. E., Walter, A. E., Arena, E. T., &
 265 Eliceiri, K. W. (2017). ImageJ2: ImageJ for the next generation of scientific image
 266 data. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 18(1), 529.

267 Scholtyssek, C., Kelber, A., & Dehnhardt, G. (2008). Brightness discrimination in the harbor
 268 seal (*Phoca vitulina*). *Vision Research*, 48(1), 96–103.
 269 Vorobyev, M., & Osorio, D. (1998). Receptor noise as a determinant of colour thresholds.
 270 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, 265(1394), 351–8.
 271 Vorobyev, Misha. (2003). Coloured oil droplets enhance colour discrimination. *Proceedings*
 272 *of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 270(1521), 1255–1261.
 273 Walraven, P. (1974). A closer look at the tritanopic convergence point. *Vision Research*,
 274 14(12), 1339-1344.
 275 Wyszecki, G., & Stiles, W. S. (1982). *Color science* (Vol. 8). Wiley New York.
 276

Electronic supplementary Material

Figures





Figure S1. Average transmittance values per butterfly species: the lower the value, the more opaque the wing. The least detectable species are therefore expected to be the most transparent *I. salapia* (I) and *B. seba* (B), as they have the highest transmittance values.

285



286

287 Figure S2. Diagram of how reflectance and transmittance were calculated for vision models.

288 Light reflection of opaque wing elements, as seen on the left of the figure, assumes only

289 reflection of the wing surface. Light transmission of transparent wing elements, as seen on the

290 right of the figure, assumes that light is transmitted through the wing, reflected by the leaves


291 and transmitted again through the wing before reaching the observer's eye. Butterflies shown

292 were those used in behavioural experiments and consisted of real natural wings attached

293 together in the appropriate position with a thin wire. A mealworm was attached to those

294 artificial butterflies that were used for the experiments with birds (shown on the left).


295



296

297 Figure S3. Top view of the experimental arena in the outdoor cage used for the bird
 298 experiments. This arena was located within a cage made of tarpaulin walls and a ceiling
 299 consisting of a whitish dense net. The cage had a door to access the arena, which was closed
 300 during the experiment, and a small opening from which birds were released and where the
 301 observer could monitor the experiment (its location is indicated as “observer” in the diagram).
 302 Dots correspond to poles, which delimited the experimental arena, and rope was used to
 303 create the grid layout. Two additional poles were placed in the centre of the arena. A total of
 304 20 artificial butterflies (5 per species) were placed on the green squares (one per square), and
 305 never on the “empty” cells, which were avoided by birds, likely due to the proximity of the
 306 observer. Cells were divided into four main categories, according to a decreasing probability
 307 of being visited by a bird: FC (corner furthest to the observer), grid border, CC (corner closest
 308 to the observer) and grid centre. We used a camera, located opposite the observer, to record
 309 the experiment.

310



311

312 Figure S4. Probability of a bird occupying different grid zones (a) and distribution of butterfly
313 specimens in the different zones (b).

314

315




Figure S5. Example of an experimental trial with human participants. Numbers represent the order in which butterflies were distributed. The colours of the numbers represent the blocks that were randomised, and consisted of two butterflies of each species. Participants could start from either the first or the second corridor (the latter is shown on the diagram).




Figure S6. Frequency of pairs of butterflies of the same (left side of the dash line) or different species (right side of the dash line) found consecutively by a) birds and b) human participants. Dark bars represent pairs of the most colourful species (H and C), lighter bars represent pairs of the most transparent species (I and B) and light coloured bars with dashes represent pairs made up of one highly colourful and one highly transparent butterfly. The frequency with which butterfly pairs of the same species were found by both observers, and for pairs of different species found by birds, were compared using a chi-square test. The frequency with which pairs of butterflies of different species were found consecutively by human participants (bars on the right side of the dash line), were compared against the frequency of placing those different species consecutively in the experimental set-up. Butterfly species, from most opaque to most transparent, are (*H. ninonia* (H) > *C. tutia* (C) > *I. salapia* (I) ~ *B. seba* (B)).






Figure S7. Correlation between the proportion of butterflies found by human participants and

a) their age and the time of day at which trials were done (both shown as categorical data);

and b) the duration of the experiment and gender. c) The number of butterflies found for each

species according to the time spent completing the experiment by human participants. Factor

interactions that affected the total number of butterflies found (see Table S4) and butterfly

inconspicuousness rank (see Table S5) were also plotted. As such, regression lines shown in

panel **a** are for the proportion of butterflies found as a function of age for each interval of the

time of day (values for these intervals, and p-values testing for slopes different from zero, are:

<13.5h: $r^2 = 0.04$, $p = 0.206$; 13.6h-15.9h: $r^2 = 0.314$, $p = 0.75$; >16h: $r^2 = -0.013$, $p = 0.54$).

Regression lines shown in panel b are for the proportion of butterflies found as a function of

time spent by each gender (Women: $r^2 = 0.25$, $p < 0.001$; Men: $r^2 = 0.022$, $p = 0.12$).

Regression lines shown in panel c show that time spent on the experiment resulted in higher


numbers of butterflies found, especially for the transparent species (H: estimate slope= 0.043,

$r^2 = 0.014$, $p = 0.12$; C: estimate slope= 0.03, $r^2 = 0.005$, $p = 0.22$; I: estimate slope= 0.090, r^2

= 0.12, $p < 0.001$; B: estimate slope= 0.08, $r^2 = 0.07$, $p = 0.003$). Letters in the legend of panel

c stand for species names: *H.ninonia* (H), *C.tutia* (C), *I. salapia* (I), and *B. seba* (B). Butterfly

transparency increases from top to bottom of the legend (i.e. H<C<I<B).



361

362 Figure S8. Chromatic (DS, plots on the left) and achromatic (DQ, plots on the right) contrasts
 363 (expressed in just noticeable difference units, JNDs) between butterfly wing colour patches
 364 and a green-leaf background for blue tit vision under large gap light conditions (top) and for
 365 humans under forest shade light conditions (bottom). Light conditions used in the models
 366 were those present during each behavioural experiment. Each dot corresponds to the contrast
 367 calculated between each given colour and the green-leaf background. Horizontal lines
 368 represent a standardized weighed average across all areas, weighed by patch size and
 369 standardized for butterfly size. Transparent parts were assumed to transmit leaf colour.
 370 Opaque patches for all species were always considered in reflectance. *H. ninonia* (H) and *C.*
 371 *tutia* (C) were modelled under the “reflectance” scenario, while *I. salapia* (I) and *B. seba* (B),
 372 the transparent species, were modelled under the “transmittance” scenario (see materials and
 373 methods).

Tables

Table S1. Generalised linear mixed model (GLMM) results for the best-fitting model explaining the likelihood of butterflies being attacked in the bird experiments (binomial distribution).

Explanatory Variables	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(> z)
Intercept	0.443	0.16	2.76	0.006 *
Time of first attack	-0.03	0.01	-2.32	0.020 *
FurthestCorner&Border>all	1.24	0.14	9.13	<0.001 ***
FurthestCorner>Border	0.48	0.21	2.23	0.026 *
ClosestCorner >Centre	0.36	0.17	2.15	0.031 *

Explanatory variables are the time before the first attack and the general position on the grid (see Fig. S3). Comparisons correspond to: 1) more attacks on the grid borders and the corners located furthest from the observer than on the rest of the grid, 2) more attacks in corners than on the grid borders, 3) more attacks on corners located closest to the observer than in the centre of the grid. z corresponds to the values from the Wald z test used to test for factor significance. Symbols: *** $p < 0.001$, * $p < 0.05$.

Table S2. Linear mixed model (LMM) results for the best-fitting model explaining the inconspicuousness rank for each species used in the bird experiments.

Explanatory Variables	Estimate	Std Error	t value	<i>p</i>
Intercept	41.775	0.539	77.53	<0.001 ***
Species.H>C,I,B	-0.981	0.311	-3.15	0.002 **
Species.C>B	0.411	0.880	0.47	0.641
Species.I>B	-0.455	0.880	-0.52	0.606

Butterfly species was the explanatory variable. Species from most opaque to most transparent are *H. ninonia* (*H*)> *C. tutia* (*C*) > *I. salapia* (*I*)~ *B. seba* (*B*). Symbols: ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

Table S3. The number of times a species was found first in a given trial, either by birds or humans.

Species	Birds	Humans
<i>H. ninonia</i>	15	43
<i>C. tutia</i>	7	27
<i>I. salapia</i>	5	14
<i>B. seba</i>	3	18

407
 408 Table S4. GLMM results for the best-fitting model explaining the number of butterflies found
 409 by human observers (binomial distribution).

Explanatory variables	Estimate	Std. Error	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	-1.311	0.380	-3.45	<0.001 ***
Corridor	0.223	0.071	3.14	0.002 **
Species. H > C, I, B	0.616	0.108	5.73	<0.001 ***
Species. C > B	0.004	0.141	0.03	0.976
Species. B > I	0.221	0.162	1.37	0.171
Time of day	-0.416	0.149	-2.80	0.005 **
Gender M	1.031	0.304	3.40	<0.001 ***
Age Group	-0.237	0.101	-2.34	0.019 *
Time spent (min)	0.056	0.011	5.21	<0.001 ***
Butterfly block	0.092	0.025	3.70	<0.001 ***
Species. H > C, I, B: Time spent	-0.015	0.005	-2.75	0.006 **
Species. C > B: Time spent	0.005	0.007	0.69	0.488
Species. I > B: Time spent	0.004	0.008	0.56	0.573
Time spent : Gender M	-0.043	0.014	-2.96	0.003 **
Time of day: Gender F: Age Group	0.097	0.043	2.27	0.023 *
Time of day: Gender M: Age Group	0.047	0.039	1.22	0.223

410 Explanatory variables are: corridor, species, time of day, participant age and gender, order of
 411 butterfly position in the experimental sequence (butterfly block), time spent on the
 412 experiment, and the following interactions: species and time spent on the experiment, time of
 413 day, and participant age and gender, and time of day and gender. Butterfly species, from most
 414 opaque to most transparent are (H > C > I ~ B or *H. ninonia* > *C. tutia* > *I. salapia* ~ *B. seba*).
 415 *z* corresponds to the values from the Wald *z* test used to test for factor significance. Symbols:
 416 * *p* < 0.05, ** *p* < 0.01, *** *p* < 0.001.

417
 418

419 Table S5. LMM results for the best-fitting model explaining inconspicuousness rank for each
 420 species used in the experiments with human participants (Gaussian distribution).

Explanatory variables	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	<i>p</i>
Intercept	108.24	43.681	2.48	0.014 *
Species. H > C, I, B	-1.467	0.370	-3.96	<0.001***
Species. C > B	-5.042	1.048	-4.81	<0.001***
Species. I > B	5.114	1.048	4.88	<0.001***
First Found. C > H, I, B	-6.425	1.832	-3.51	0.0007 *
First Found. H > I, B	1.532	2.344	0.65	0.515
First Found. I > B	-2.761	5.687	-0.485	0.628
Date. Day1	10.782	12.894	0.836	0.405
Date. Day2	-20.890	10.527	-1.984	0.050 *
Date. Day3	-7.925	13.382	-0.592	0.555
Date. Day4	28.553	15.919	1.794	0.076
Date. Day5	-9.695	10.883	-0.891	0.375
Date. Day6 > Day 7	-5.428	33.586	-0.162	0.872
Time of day	4.554	11.226	0.406	0.686
Gender M	16.048	24.819	0.646	0.520
Age Group	6.552	7.436	0.88	0.381
Time of day: GenderM	-3.684	10.135	-0.363	0.717
Time of day: Age Group	-3.184	3.017	-1.05	0.294
GenderM: Age Group	-3.944	4.590	-0.86	0.392

421 Explanatory variables are: butterfly species, time of day, participant age and gender, first
 422 butterfly species found, date, and the interactions between: time of day and gender, time of
 423 day and age, gender and age. Butterfly species, from most opaque to most transparent are (H
 424 > C > I ~ B or *H. ninonia* > *C. tutia* > *I. salapia* ~ *B. seba*). t corresponds to the values from
 425 the t-test used to test for factor significance. Symbols: * $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.001$.

426

427