



Warning signals are under positive frequency- dependent selection in nature

Mathieu Chouteau, Mónica Arias, Mathieu Joron

► To cite this version:

Mathieu Chouteau, Mónica Arias, Mathieu Joron. Warning signals are under positive frequency-dependent selection in nature. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2016, 10.1073/pnas.1519216113 . hal-02401851

HAL Id: hal-02401851

<https://hal.science/hal-02401851>

Submitted on 10 Dec 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.

Warning signals are under positive frequency-dependent selection in nature

Mathieu Chouteau^{a,b,1}, Mónica Arias^b, and Mathieu Joron^a

^aCentre d'Ecologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive, UMR 5175 CNRS - Université de Montpellier - EPHE - Université Paul Valéry, 34293 Montpellier 5, France; and
^bInstitut de Systématique, Evolution, Biodiversité, UMR 7205 CNRS MNHN UPMC EPHE, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 75005 Paris, France

Edited by Hanna Kokko, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland, and accepted by the Editorial Board January 19, 2016 (received for review September 28, 2015)

Positive frequency-dependent selection (FDS) is a selection regime where the fitness of a phenotype increases with its frequency, and it is thought to underlie important adaptive strategies resting on signaling and communication. However, whether and how positive FDS truly operates in nature remains unknown, which hampers our understanding of signal diversity. Here, we test for positive FDS operating on the warning color patterns of chemically defended butterflies forming multiple coexisting mimicry assemblages in the Amazon. Using malleable prey models placed in localities showing differences in the relative frequencies of warningly colored prey, we demonstrate that the efficiency of a warning signal increases steadily with its local frequency in the natural community, up to a threshold where protection stabilizes. The shape of this relationship is consistent with the direct effect of the local abundance of each warning signal on the corresponding avoidance knowledge of the local predator community. This relationship, which differs from purifying selection acting on each mimetic pattern, indicates that predator knowledge, integrated over the entire community, is saturated only for the most common warning signals. In contrast, among the well-established warning signals present in local prey assemblages, most are incompletely known to local predators and enjoy incomplete protection. This incomplete predator knowledge should generate strong benefits to life history traits that enhance warning efficiency by increasing the effective frequency of prey visible to predators. Strategies such as gregariousness or niche convergence between mimics may therefore readily evolve through their effects on predator knowledge and warning efficiency.

Müllerian mimicry | aposematism | warning signal | predation | butterflies

Frequency-dependent selection (FDS) occurs when the fitness of a phenotype depends on its frequency in the population (1). Under negative FDS, the fitness of a phenotype will decrease as its frequency increases. This supposedly common mechanism (2) maintains adaptive polymorphism and has been documented in a variety of natural systems, ranging from foraging behavior (2, 3) and pollination syndromes (4) to predator-prey (5–7) and parasite-host coevolution (8). On the other hand, positive FDS is a selection regime where the fitness of a phenotype increases with its frequency and does not readily maintain polymorphism. However, positive FDS is thought to be a mechanism central to the evolution of a large diversity of adaptive strategies. Notably, traits used in signaling and communication, where efficiency depends on local frequency, such as languages and social signals (9), flower coloration for pollinator attraction (10), and warning signals of prey unpalatability (11), should be subjected to positive FDS. However, although the principles of positive FDS may be well understood from a theoretical point of view, the extent to which it is operating in nature remains largely unknown.

Warning coloration advertising prey defenses is a textbook example of a trait under positive FDS, and is thought to be responsible for the remarkable convergence among defended prey species known as Müllerian mimicry (11, 12). The theory developed by Müller (11) posits that naive predators learn to avoid warningly colored prey after a given number of attacks, conferring

improved survival to individuals bearing resemblance to a locally abundant signal. The efficiency of Müllerian mimicry is well-supported by empirical evidence. Experiments in the laboratory (13, 14) and in natural contexts (15–18) have demonstrated that naive predators have the cognitive capabilities to associate conspicuous signals with toxicity, and to avoid them later. Transplant experiments with live prey or artificial prey models performed in the field have shown increased survival for prey matching the locally abundant warning signal and lower fitness for prey with exotic or novel signals, explaining the stable geographic mosaic of locally uniform warning signals observed (16, 17, 19–21).

However, selection favoring mimicry in those studies takes on the pattern of purifying selection for local signals (15, 17, 20), so the role of positive FDS in the evolution of mimicry is unclear. Indeed, distinguishing the effect of positive FDS from local purifying selection is particularly challenging because the polymorphism necessary to distinguish between them is intrinsically unstable when the most common forms are favored (15–17, 20, 22). Both selection regimes lead to population monomorphism and interspecific phenotypic convergence, but they differ importantly in the role of local frequency in defining fitness optima. Purifying selection is expected to favor the highest quality warning signal independent of frequency, whereas FDS stems from the dependence of predator knowledge on the local frequency of warning signals across species in the prey community. Therefore, understanding how selection for mimicry truly operates and shapes prey communities with multiple coexisting mimicry rings requires confirming positive FDS and distinguishing the effect of frequency

Significance

Warning coloration and defensive mimicry are textbook examples of antipredator strategies under frequency-dependent selection (FDS), where predators avoid defended prey that are common but attack rarer ones. Whether the efficiency of mimicry truly derives from positive FDS remains unverified, yet assessing FDS is essential for understanding the diversity of warning signals observed. Using wing patterns found in natural communities of toxic butterflies, we demonstrate that warning signals are under strong, nonlinear, positive FDS. Predator knowledge is saturated and protection is optimal only for a few superabundant prey types. Most warning signals fall below optimal protection, limited by their local abundance. This potential for improved protection may explain the extraordinary efficiency of selection to drive convergence in morphology and life history in mimetic prey.

Author contributions: M.C. and M.J. designed research; M.C. and M.A. performed research; M.C. analyzed data; and M.C. and M.J. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

This article is a PNAS Direct Submission. H.K. is a guest editor invited by the Editorial Board.

¹To whom correspondence should be addressed. Email: mathieu.chouteau@cefe.cnrs.fr.

This article contains supporting information online at www.pnas.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.1073/pnas.1519216113/-DCSupplemental.

itself from the intrinsic qualities of the different warning signals involved.

Results

To test for positive FDS, we took advantage of the natural phenotypic diversity found within butterfly communities in the Peruvian Amazon basin, where the warning colors displayed by butterfly species are structured into multiple coexisting mimicry assemblages. The Müllerian mimicry communities formed by butterflies with so-called “tiger” wing patterns [e.g., *Heliconius numata*, *Melinaea* butterflies (23, 24)] provide multicomponent polymorphism with different warning signals coexisting at different frequencies in different localities. Each locality harbors a distinct combination of high-, intermediate-, and low-frequency signals (25) (Fig. 1), and thus enables us to investigate the effect of signal frequency on predation.

We quantified attack rates associated with five major tiger-patterned phenotypes in adjacent localities of northern Peru

(Fig. 1 and Fig. S1). We positioned artificial models built of malleable wax and photographic paper closely matching the local phenotypes along forest transects for 72 h (Fig. S2 and Table S1). Attacks were recorded as imprints left by predators (mostly avian predators, representing 69.9% of total attacks; Fig. S2), providing a measure of predation intensity on each wing pattern, and therefore a snapshot of predator avoidance knowledge for each locality (17, 19). Prey models bearing the different color patterns found in the locality, as well as exotic and control prey types, were placed in each locality, totaling 120 models per color pattern. To record predation across the natural morph frequency spectrum, we used models matching the distinct local wing patterns (two or more morphs found at different frequencies among local butterflies). To record predation on novel conspicuous prey unknown to local predators but known as an efficient warning signal elsewhere, we used models for one or two exotic phenotypes naturally absent from the locality but abundant in an adjacent locality (except in




Fig. 1. Relative frequency of warning signals displayed by tiger-patterned butterflies in the study localities in northern Peru. Temporally stable relative frequencies were obtained from exhaustive field collecting ($n = 1,873$ butterflies) performed between 1997 and 2013 for the warning signals displayed by comimics (Fig. S1), such as (1) *Melinaea marsaeus mothone*, *Heliconius numata bicoloratus*, and *Chetone hydra*; (2) *Melinaea menophilus* ssp. nov. 1, *Heliconius numata tarapotensis*, *Heliconius pardalinus sergestus*, and *Chetone histrio*; (3) *Melinaea marsaeus rileyi* and *Heliconius numata aurora*; (4) *Melinaea ludovica ludovica* and *Heliconius numata silvana*; (5) *Melinaea marsaeus phasiana* and *Heliconius numata arcuella*; and (6) other large sized tiger pattern signals such as those found in *Melinaea menophilus hictas*, *Melinaea satevis cydon*, *Heliconius numata elegans*, or *Heliconius numata timeus*.

High Pongo, where all warning signals co-occur). Finally, as a general predation control, we used models resembling a common palatable brown butterfly (i.e., *Pierella hyceta*). Predation rate on the palatable butterfly models revealed some variation in predation intensity between localities ($\chi^2_5 \geq 12.07$, $P = 0.033$), with high predation intensity in Moyobamba, Ahuashiyacu, and Low Pongo and lower predation intensity in the remaining localities.

In all localities, predation attempts decreased steeply but steadily as the local frequency of the warning signal increased from exotic to dominant ($R^2 \leq 0.876$, $P \leq 0.031$ in the three localities

with high predation intensity and $R^2 \leq 0.652$, $P \leq 0.201$ in the three others). The most frequently encountered warning signal enjoyed the highest protection from predators ($P \leq 0.05$ in the three localities with high predation intensity and $P \leq 0.10$ in the three others), whereas exotic signals suffered up to nine times more attacks (average of 4.7 ± 2.6 -fold more attacks). All local signals found at intermediate frequencies suffered intermediate predation attempts (Fig. 2A and Table S2). Because a given morph was strongly protected when locally abundant, but increasingly attacked when frequency decreased only a few kilometers away,




Fig. 2. Predator avoidance knowledge as a function of warning signal frequency. (A) For each of the six localities, phenotypes (numbered as in Fig. 1) are ordered from left to right according to their relative frequencies within the locality (E = exotic, I = intermediate abundance, C = most common, with the frequency indicated in brackets). Within a given locality, FTs identify which model phenotype suffered significantly more ($++P < 0.05$; $+P < 0.10$) or fewer ($--P < 0.05$; $-P < 0.10$) predation attempts. (B) Entire study system with normalization of phenotype frequency and predation intensities between localities. The color of data points identifies the exotic (black), intermediate (gray), and most common (white) warning signals within each locality. The dotted line indicates the predation intensity on the "palatable" butterfly model.

and *Chetone* sp. comimics) was calculated yearly for collections occurring between 1997 and 2013, and averaged between years for data analysis.

To compare warning signal abundance between localities, the average number of individuals bearing the signals of interest ($Abun_{Loc}$) collected over 8–10 sunny days, always by the same two collectors, throughout 2013 was calculated for each locality. The frequency of each warning signal per locality ($Freq_{Loc}$) was then normalized to between-locality frequency ($Freq_{Norm}$) using the previously assessed abundance ($Abun_{Loc}$). For instance, the normalized frequency of signal A found in locality 1 is defined as $Freq_{Norm A1} = Freq_{Loc A1} \times Abun_{Loc} / Abun_{Loc Max}$, where the $Abun_{Loc Max}$ is the highest abundance coefficient obtained (i.e., Moyobamba). The abundance obtained from collecting efforts for each locality ($Abun_{Loc}$) is as follows: Moyobamba = 14.1, Shilcayo = 5.6, Ahuashiyacu = 6.9, Tunel = 11.4, High Pongo = 5.4, and Low Pongo = 7.

Predation Tests. To assess predation rates, artificial models were built to resemble the local morphs of *H. numata* (mimetic with species of the genus *Melinaea*, *Chetone* sp., and other *Heliconius* sp.) and a model of a palatable brown butterfly, *Pierella hyceta* (Fig. S2). These artificial models were made by printing standardized high-resolution photographs of the ventral and dorsal butterfly wings on two-sided matte photographic paper (Epson C135041569 paper and Epson L110 printer). Colors of printed wings were compared with colors of actual *H. numata* wings by measuring the reflectance spectra of yellow, black, and orange patches using a spectrophotometer (AvaSpec-3648; Avantes) and a deuterium-halogen light source (DH-2000; Avantes) connected to a 1.5-mm diameter sensor (FCR-7UV200-2-1.5x100; Avantes) inserted in a miniature black chamber. Reflectance spectra were taken at a 90° incidence relative to a 99% reflectance standard (300–700 nm; Spectralon) and to dark current. Spectra were recorded with Avasoft 7.0 software (Avantes) using an average of five measures with an integration time of 23 ms. Color spectra were then analyzed applying the method described by Vorobyev and Osorio (36) performed in Avicol v.6 (37). We contrasted black, orange, and yellow (when naturally present in the wings) on printed vs. actual wings, under two main avian vision systems. We used blue tit (*Parus caeruleus*) for UV vision, with cone proportion and sensitivity as described by Hart et al. (38), and peafowl (*Pavo cristatus*) (39) for violet (V) vision, as described by Hart (40). Photoreceptor activity is characterized by the signal-to-noise ratio, which is generally computed from its inverse, the Weber fraction (36), and which was set to 0.05 for all models in this study. Small gap light conditions from French Guiana (41) were included for all calculations. The difference in contrast was below the just noticeable threshold for both the UV-sensitive and V-sensitive avian visual systems, confirming the high color accuracy of our printed wings (Table S1). Model wings were assembled to a small galvanized wire, which provided both reinforcement for the body and a 20-cm-long anchor to facilitate positioning of the models in the habitats. Bodies were made of black-colored paraffin wax heated and molded, using a custom-made silicon mold, over the thorax portions of the wings and wire. Before positioning the models in the habitats, a 4% (vol/vol) permethrin solution was sprayed on the models to reduce destruction by invertebrates. In each locality, between 480 and 600 models (i.e., 120 models for each phenotype, four to five phenotypes per habitat) were placed following the same phenotype sequence over a 6- to 8-km transect (Table S2). Models were positioned at least at 10-m intervals to provide a uniform distribution of artificial warning signals and anchored on twigs, tree trunks, lianas, or leaf petioles, such that the models appeared to be perched on a tiny twig. Doing so enabled the models to be readily detectable

to avian predators, as sun-basking butterflies would be, while preventing ground-dwelling nonpredatory animals (roaches, ants, and rodents) from damaging the models.

In all localities, models were left in the habitat for 72 h before collection. Predation marks on the malleable wax were categorized as “avian” when they showed a distinctive U- or V-shaped mark or large indentation or puncture marks (17, 19) and as “unknown vertebrate predator” when showing no such distinctive marks on the damaged area, or when the attacked parts of the model had been removed or torn by the predator (17). Models not recovered, or destroyed by ants or crickets, were scored as missing and excluded from the analysis ($n = 229$ models).

In an effort to control for variations in predation intensity between localities so as to analyze all localities combined, predation attempts on the different warningly colored models of a given locality were divided by the attack rate on the palatable butterfly model in that same locality.

Data Analysis. We used a χ^2 test of independence to assess variation in predation pressure between the different artificial models for each locality. When significant, the Freeman–Tukey deviate (FT) was compared with an $\alpha = 0.10$ and 0.05 criterion, and corrected for multiple comparisons using the Bonferroni correction, to identify which artificial model phenotype suffered significantly more or fewer predation attempts, as shown by the sign of the FT, than expected under the null hypothesis of equal attack probability.

To describe the relationship between predation and abundance across all localities using normalized data (Fig. 2B), we compared four candidate models: a flat model (constant predation) as predicted by Müller (11), a linear model (linear decrease in predation), an exponential decay model (asymptotic decrease of predation), and a linear-lower plateau model (linear decrease in predation followed by a plateau at a given abundance threshold). A parameter search for both exponential decay and linear-lower plateau models was done using the solver function in Excel (Microsoft Corp.) using a least-squares optimality criterion and using the generalized reduced gradient nonlinear algorithm with default parameters. To evaluate which of the four models was a better fit to the data, we calculated Akaike information criterion corrected for small sample sizes (AICc) for each of the four models and compared them using Akaike model comparison differences ($\Delta AICc$) and Akaike weights (42) using the residual sum of squares divided by the sample size as the likelihood criterion (Table S3). The best fit was found for the linear-lower plateau model with the equation $y = ax + b$ if $x < x_0$ and $y = y_0$ if $x \geq x_0$, where $x_0 = 0.188$ is the breakpoint for the relative abundance, $y_0 = 0.372$ is the basal predation rate, $a = -6.619$, and $b = 1.613$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. We thank R. Mori-Pezo for his invaluable help with field work; D. Marina, V. Llaurens, and Y. Le Poul for the design of artificial butterflies; and J. Mallet, M. McClure, M. Elias, V. Llaurens, T. Aubier, A. Evin, and A. Whibley for their comments on manuscript drafts. We also thank the Peruvian government for providing the necessary research permits (236-2012-AG-DGFFS-DGEFFS and 201-2013-MINAGRI-DGFFS/DGEFFS). This research was supported by fellowships from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council and from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under Marie Skłodowska-Curie Grant Agreement N 655857 (to M.C.), by a studentship provided by the Labex Biological and Cultural Diversities (LabEx ANR-10-LABX-0003-BCD) (to M.A.), and by grants from the European Research Council (Grant ERC-StG-243179-MimEvol) and the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (Grant ANR-12-JSV7-0005-01-Hybevol) (to M.J.).

1. Ayala FJ, Campbell CA (1978) Frequency-dependent selection. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* 5:115–138.
2. Fitzpatrick MJ, Feder E, Rowe L, Sokolowski MB (2007) Maintaining a behaviour polymorphism by frequency-dependent selection on a single gene. *Nature* 447(7141):210–212.
3. Benkman CW (1996) Are the ratios of bill crossing morphs in crossbills the result of frequency-dependent selection? *Evol Ecol* 10(1):119–126.
4. Subramaniam B, Rausher MD (2000) Balancing selection on a floral polymorphism. *Evolution* 54(2):691–695.
5. Fitzpatrick BM, Shook K, Izally R (2009) Frequency-dependent selection by wild birds promotes polymorphism in model salamanders. *BMC Ecol* 9:12.
6. Hori M (1993) Frequency-dependent natural selection in the handedness of scale-eating cichlid fish. *Science* 260(5105):216–219.
7. Olendorf R, et al. (2006) Frequency-dependent survival in natural guppy populations. *Nature* 441(7093):633–636.
8. Conway DJ (1997) Natural selection on polymorphic malaria antigens and the search for a vaccine. *Parasitol Today* 13(1):26–29.
9. Cartwright RA (2011) Bards, poets, and cliques: frequency-dependent selection and the evolution of language genes. *Bull Math Biol* 73(9):2201–2212.
10. Epperson BK, Clegg MT (1987) Frequency-dependent variation for outcrossing rate among flower-color morphs of *Ipomoea purpurea*. *Evolution* 41(6):1302–1311.
11. Müller F (1878) Über die vorteile der mimicry bei schmetterlingen. *Zool Anz* 1:54–55. German.
12. Sherratt TN (2008) The evolution of Müllerian mimicry. *Naturwissenschaften* 95(8):681–695.
13. Miller AM, Pawlik JR (2013) Do coral reef fish learn to avoid unpalatable prey using visual cues? *Anim Behav* 85(2):339–347.
14. Rowland HM, Ihalainen E, Lindström L, Mappes J, Speed MP (2007) Co-mimics have a mutualistic relationship despite unequal defences. *Nature* 448(7149):64–67.
15. Kapan DD (2001) Three-butterfly system provides a field test of müllerian mimicry. *Nature* 409(6818):338–340.
16. Mallet J, Barton NH (1989) Strong natural-selection in a warning-color hybrid zone. *Evolution* 43(2):421–431.
17. Chouteau M, Angers B (2011) The role of predators in maintaining the geographic organization of aposematic signals. *Am Nat* 178(6):810–817.
18. Langham GM (2004) Specialized avian predators repeatedly attack novel color morphs of *Heliconius* butterflies. *Evolution* 58(12):2783–2787.
19. Noonan BP, Comeault AA (2009) The role of predator selection on polymorphic aposematic poison frogs. *Biol Lett* 5(1):51–54.
20. Borer M, Van Noort T, Rahier M, Naisbit RE (2010) Positive frequency-dependent selection on warning color in Alpine leaf beetles. *Evolution* 64(12):3629–3633.
21. Chouteau M, Angers B (2012) Wright's shifting balance theory and the diversification of aposematic signals. *PLoS One* 7(3):e34028.
22. Comeault AA, Noonan BP (2011) Spatial variation in the fitness of divergent aposematic phenotypes of the poison frog, *Dendrobates tinctorius*. *J Evol Biol* 24(6):1374–1379.

23. Laursen V, Joron M, Théry M (2014) Cryptic differences in colour among Müllerian mimics: How can the visual capacities of predators and prey shape the evolution of wing colours? *J Evol Biol* 27(3):531–540.
24. Joron M (2005) Polymorphic mimicry, microhabitat use, and sex-specific behaviour. *J Evol Biol* 18(3):547–556.
25. Joron M, Wynne IR, Lamas G, Mallet J (1999) Variable selection and the coexistence of multiple mimetic forms of the butterfly *Heliconius numata*. *Evol Ecol* 13(7–8):721–754.
26. Elias M, Gompert Z, Jiggins C, Willmott K (2008) Mutualistic interactions drive ecological niche convergence in a diverse butterfly community. *PLoS Biol* 6(12):2642–2649.
27. Beccaloni GW (1997) Vertical stratification of ithomiine butterfly (Nymphalidae: Ithomiinae) mimicry complexes: The relationship between adult flight height and larval host-plant height. *Biol J Linn Soc Lond* 62(3):313–341.
28. Mallet J (1999) Causes and consequences of a lack of coevolution in mullerian mimicry. *Evol Ecol* 13(7–8):777–806.
29. Brower LP, Ryerson WN, Coppinger LL, Glazier SC (1968) Ecological chemistry and the palatability spectrum. *Science* 161(3848):1349–1350.
30. Skelhorn J, Rowe C (2007) Predators' toxin burdens influence their strategic decisions to eat toxic prey. *Curr Biol* 17(17):1479–1483.
31. Speed MP (2001) Can receiver psychology explain the evolution of aposematism? *Anim Behav* 61(1):205–216.
32. Speed MP (1999) Batesian, quasi-Batesian or Mullerian mimicry? Theory and data in mimicry Research. *Evol Ecol* 13(7–8):755–776.
33. Mallet J (2001) Mimicry: An interface between psychology and evolution. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 98(16):8928–8930.
34. Mallet J, Joron M (1999) Evolution of diversity in warning color and mimicry: Polymorphisms, shifting balance, and speciation. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* 30(7):201–233.
35. Chouteau M, Summers K, Morales V, Angers B (2011) Advergence in Müllerian mimicry: The case of the poison dart frogs of Northern Peru revisited. *Biol Lett* 7(5):796–800.
36. Vorobyev M, Osorio D (1998) Receptor noise as a determinant of colour thresholds. *Proc R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 265(1394):351–358.
37. Gomez D (2006) AVICOL, a program to analyse spectrometric data. Available at <https://sites.google.com/site/avicolprogram/>. Accessed December 11, 2013.
38. Hart NS, Partridge JC, Cuthill IC, Bennett ATD (2000) Visual pigments, oil droplets, ocular media and cone photoreceptor distribution in two species of passerine bird: The blue tit (*Parus caeruleus* L.) and the blackbird (*Turdus merula* L.). *J Comp Physiol A Neuroethol Sens Neural Behav Physiol* 186(4):375–387.
39. Hart NS (2002) Vision in the peafowl (*Aves: Pavo cristatus*). *J Exp Biol* 205(Pt 24):3925–3935.
40. Hart NS (2001) Variations in cone photoreceptor abundance and the visual ecology of birds. *J Comp Physiol A Neuroethol Sens Neural Behav Physiol* 187(9):685–697.
41. Thery M, Pincebourde S, Feer F (2008) Dusk light environment optimizes visual perception of conspecifics in a crepuscular horned beetle. *Behav Ecol* 19(3):627–634.
42. Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2002) *Model Selection and Multimodel Inference: A Practical Information-Theoretic Approach* (Springer, New York).

Supporting Information

Chouteau et al. 10.1073/pnas.1519216113




Fig. S1. Yearly relative frequency of each studied aposematic phenotype (i.e., *Heliconius numata*, *Heliconius pardalinus*, *Melineae sp.*, and *Chetone sp.* comimics) for each locality. Gray areas represent years for which no abundance data are available.




Fig. S2. (A) Four aposematic phenotypes of *Heliconius numata* (*H. n.*) (Left to Right: *H. n. silvana*, *H. n. bicoloratus*, *H. n. tarapotensis*, and *H. n. aurora*) and a nonconspicuous palatable butterfly, *Pierella hyceta* (Top), and their respective artificial models (Bottom) used to measure predation rates. Distinctive marks on the artificial models (white arrows) resulting from attacks by avian predators (B), unknown predators (C), and invertebrates (D) are shown.

Table S2. Summary data and statistics for each studied locality

Phenotype [†]	<i>aurora</i>	<i>silvana</i>	<i>tarapotensis</i>	<i>bicoloratus</i>	<i>arcuela</i>	<i>inconspicuous</i>
<i>Moyobamba</i>						
Relative frequency [‡]	0.00 ± 0.00	0.00 ± 0.00	0.07 ± 0.01	0.93 ± 0.01	0 ± 0	N.A.
Attacked/unattacked [§]	20/94	23/96	17/100	5/113	—	18/101
FT statistic [¶]	1.25	1.36	0.10	3.61**	—	0.26
<i>Shilcayo</i>						
Relative frequency [‡]	0.00 ± 0.00	0.02 ± 0.02	0.55 ± 0.17	0.37 ± 0.17	0.04 ± 0.08	N.A.
Attacked/unattacked [§]	11/96	—	4/101	5/101	—	6/98
FT statistic [¶]	1.55*	—	−0.95	−0.52	—	−0.06
<i>Ahuashiyacu</i>						
Relative frequency [‡]	0.00 ± 0.00	0.06 ± 0.02	0.34 ± 0.06	0.51 ± 0.04	0.03 ± 0.02	N.A.
Attacked/unattacked [§]	28/92	21/96	7/112	3/117	—	13/105
FT statistic [¶]	2.98**	1.67*	2.18**	3.96**	—	−0.28
<i>Tunel</i>						
Relative frequency [‡]	0.00 ± 0.00	0.11 ± 0.06	0.18 ± 0.12	0.61 ± 0.09	0.07 ± 0.04	N.A.
Attacked/unattacked [§]	10/81	—	5/94	4/92	—	7/98
FT statistic [¶]	1.71*	—	−0.28	−0.65	—	−0.72
<i>High Pongo</i>						
Relative frequency [‡]	0.32 ± 0.11	0.18 ± 0.09	0.08 ± 0.02	0.13 ± 0.08	0.22 ± 0.18	N.A.
Attacked/unattacked [§]	4/105	—	9/92	—	5/113	6/94
FT statistic [¶]	−1.09	—	1.60*	—	−0.77	0.21
<i>Low Pongo</i>						
Relative frequency [‡]	0.47 ± 0.07	0.21 ± 0.05	0.04 ± 0.02	0.01 ± 0.01	0.05 ± 0.04	N.A.
Attacked/unattacked [§]	5/114	15/101	22/95	30/89	—	18/100
FT statistic [¶]	3.90**	−0.61	0.97	2.46**	—	0.05

N.A., relative abundance has not been measured.

[†]For simplicity, only the name of the *Heliconis numata* morph is used to describe the aposematic phenotypes.

*The relative frequency (Freq_{Loc}) of an aposematic signal in a given locality is presented as a yearly mean and its associated SD.

⁵For the 120 artificial models used, "attacked" represent models that were recovered with marks left due to predation attempts from avian and unknown assailants; "unattacked" is the number of models without any marks, when both missing models and models destroyed by invertebrates are removed from the equation. A one-em dash (—) was used when predation was not measured for a given aposematic phenotype.

†Test of FTs in individual cells of contingency tables with the number of predation attacks for each site. Absolute values larger than the criterion with Bonferroni correction for simultaneous tests are shown in bold. These values identify the cells for which the number of observations significantly ($*P < 0.10$; $**P < 0.05$) differs (is either higher or lower as shown by the sign) from the corresponding expected frequencies.

Table S3. Results for the model fit for each of four candidate models describing the relationship between predation and abundance in the study system

Model	Equation	AICc	Δ AICc	AIC weight
Flat	$y = a$ ($a = 0.97$)	-20.42	34.76	0.00
Linear	$y = a + bx$ ($a = 1.28, b = 1.77$)	-32.52	22.66	0.00
Exponential decay	$y = a + 1/bx$ ($a = -0.10, b = 1.61$)	-53.34	1.84	0.29
Linear decrease plateau	$y = a + bx$ if $x < x_0$ and $y = a + bx_0$ if $x \geq x_0$ ($a = 1.61, b = 6.62, x_0 = 0.188$)	-55.18	0.00	0.71

The best supported model (as indicated by AICc) is shown in bold. AICc, Akaike information criterion corrected for small sample sizes; Δ AICc, Akaike models comparison difference; AIC weight, Akaike weight.