

1 **Macroevolutionary trade-offs in plant-feeding insects**

2 Daniel A. Peterson,^{1,2} Nate B. Hardy,³ and Benjamin B. Normark¹

3

4 ¹Department of Biology and Graduate Program in Organismic and Evolutionary Biology, University of
5 Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts

6 ²E-mail: dapeters@cns.umass.edu

7 ³Department of Entomology and Plant Pathology, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama

8

9 **Summary**

10 Most plant-feeding insects are ecological specialists restricted to one or a few closely related
11 host-plant species (Forister et al. 2015). A long-standing hypothesis asserts that natural selection favors
12 host specialization because trade-offs between performance on alternative host species limit the fitness
13 of generalists, yet empirical evidence for such trade-offs is scarce (Futuyma and Moreno 1988; Forister
14 et al. 2012). Here we show that trade-offs between adaptations to alternative hosts occur over both
15 long- and short-term macroevolutionary timescales, but positive associations between host-use traits
16 are also abundant. Host-use records of 1604 caterpillar (Lepidoptera) species revealed negative
17 associations between adaptations to two diverse groups of host-plant taxa over 150 million years
18 (Misof et al. 2014) of caterpillar evolutionary history, but a different division between use of
19 angiosperm and pine hosts among closely related caterpillars. In contrast, host-use records of 955 true
20 bug (Hemiptera) species suggested uniformly positive associations between adaptations to the same
21 host taxa both over the 300-million-year (Misof et al. 2014) evolutionary history of true bugs and
22 among closely related species. The lack of consistent patterns across insect orders and timescales
23 suggests that host-use trade-offs are historically contingent rather than universal constraints, reflecting
24 the diversity of mechanisms driving host-specialization in plant-feeding insects.

25

26 **Main Text**

27 The ubiquity of ecological specialists (Forister et al. 2012, 2015) is often attributed to
28 evolutionary constraints on generalism (Futuyma and Moreno 1988; Futuyma et al. 1995). Adaptations
29 to one environment may come at the cost of performance in other environments (Futuyma and Moreno
30 1988; Forister et al. 2012), and such trade-offs are crucial elements of most theoretical models of the
31 evolution of specialization (Ravigné et al. 2009). In many biological systems, trade-offs are implied by
32 negative correlations between traits (Shoval et al. 2012), but performance measures on alternative host
33 species are most often uncorrelated or positively correlated in wild and experimentally selected
34 populations of plant-feeding insects (Futuyma 2008; Forister et al. 2012). In fact, although plant-
35 feeding insects are a model system for the study of ecological specialization (Futuyma and Moreno
36 1988; Forister et al. 2012), the role of trade-offs in the evolution of insect host-specialization remains
37 generally unsupported.

38 However, trade-offs that drive specialization in plant-feeding insects may be difficult to detect
39 within species (Joshi and Thompson 1995). Host-use traits are phylogenetically conserved in many
40 insect groups (Futuyma and Agrawal 2009), and genetic variation for use of novel hosts is often absent
41 within a single population (Futuyma et al. 1995). These constraints likely stem from the fact that
42 resource use is a complex trait involving multiple interacting genetic loci (Remold 2012), so the
43 evolutionary trajectories that lead to high fitness on alternative resources may be mutually exclusive.
44 For example, the evolution of improved performance on one host can select for a preference for that
45 host, driving a positive feedback loop of further specialization (Fry 1996). When epistatic interactions
46 are strong, the greatest variation in host-use strategies will evolve between reproductively isolated
47 lineages over long time scales (Satterwhite and Cooper 2015), with trade-off outcomes determined by
48 each lineage's evolutionary history (Rodriguez-Verdugo et al. 2014). Analogous macroevolutionary
49 trade-offs have been described in plants; the presence of alternative defensive strategies are negatively
50 correlated over plant evolutionary history (Campbell and Kessler 2013). However, it remains unknown

51 whether this functional diversification across hosts has created macroevolutionary trade-offs for plant-
52 feeding insects; performance on alternative hosts may instead be positively associated if generalist
53 adaptations have been prevalent during the evolution of insect herbivores (Peterson et al. 2015).

54 We investigated trade-offs between adaptations to diverse host taxa over long- and short-term
55 macroevolutionary timescales in two orders of plant-feeding insects: Lepidoptera (caterpillars) and
56 Hemiptera (true bugs). Assuming that trade-offs should produce negative correlations between recorded
57 presence on alternative host taxa for individual insect species (Peterson et al. 2015), we quantified the
58 macroevolutionary relationships between use of the most common host-plant orders for North
59 American insects (Figure 1). Long- and short-term effects were partitioned by estimating separate
60 correlation parameters for phylogenetic and residual effects (Figure 2) in a phylogenetic mixed model.
61 We assembled the pairwise correlations between use of all focal hosts to produce network graphs of
62 host-use relationships, revealing overall patterns of host-use evolution in each insect order. Specifically,
63 we investigated two potential trade-off scenarios: segregation of hosts into discrete clusters and
64 isolation of individual host orders.

65 We found that the network of long-term evolutionary relationships between lepidopteran use of
66 the focal host orders was significantly structured ($P < 0.01$), revealing two large clusters of host taxa
67 (Figure 3a). Clustering is a common feature of ecological networks (Olesen et al. 2007) that implies
68 functional relationships between organisms which often correlate with phylogenetic distances (Krasnov
69 et al. 2012; Hadfield et al. 2014). However, cluster membership in our results was surprising: the
70 gymnosperm Pinales (pines) and monocot Poales (grasses) were each affiliated with a different set of
71 eudicot orders. Instead of host-insect coevolution, long-term evolutionary trade-offs experienced by
72 lepidopteran lineages appear to reflect a broad-scale ecological division between plant hosts. The
73 relevant ecological traits that differ between the two host clusters are not obvious, but may correspond
74 to the habitat types where those hosts are found (Futuyma 1976).

75 Short-term correlations between lepidopteran use of the focal host taxa also showed significant

76 network structure ($P < 0.01$) but use of all angiosperm hosts formed a single cluster of mostly positive
77 associations (Figure 3b). The disappearance over short evolutionary timescales of the trade-off between
78 angiosperm hosts suggests that individual generalist species have overcome the constraints of historical
79 contingency rather than merely maximizing host breadth within their lineage's niche. On the other
80 hand, we do not account for differences in fecundity between specialist and generalist insects on
81 particular hosts; it may be that generalists usually have lower fitness – i.e. they are jacks of all trades
82 but masters of none (Futuyma and Moreno 1988). However, costs of generalism have been difficult to
83 document (Forister et al. 2012; Gompert et al. 2015), so the positive residual correlations we observed
84 may instead represent evolutionary breakthroughs made possible by novel mechanisms of phenotypic
85 plasticity or other generalist adaptations (Barrett and Heil 2012).

86 Nevertheless, although we observed few constraints to short-term evolution of lepidopteran
87 host-use within the focal angiosperm taxa, we did find evidence for a short-term evolutionary trade-off
88 between use of angiosperms and Pinales (pines). Lepidopteran presence on pines and many of the focal
89 angiosperm taxa were positively correlated over long timescales, yet individual lepidopteran species
90 found on pines were less likely to use all other focal host taxa (mean pairwise correlation -0.23, $P <$
91 0.01). This pattern suggests that although pines and some angiosperms are used by insects with similar
92 evolutionary backgrounds, a trade-off between evolutionarily labile traits tends to prevent the
93 simultaneous use of those host taxa by individual caterpillar species. Such trade-offs between labile but
94 mutually exclusive host-use traits may be particularly significant because they can promote rapid
95 speciation (Nosil et al. 2002), driving the adaptive radiations that have produced much of the plant-
96 feeding insect diversity on earth (Farrell 1998; Janz et al. 2006).

97 In contrast to the observed patterns in the Lepidoptera, hemipteran host-use showed no evidence
98 of trade-offs over long or short evolutionary timescales. Associations between hemipteran presence on
99 all focal host orders were uniformly positive (Figure 3c,d) and network structure showed significant
100 support for a single host-use cluster encompassing all focal hosts for both phylogenetic ($P < 0.01$) and

101 residual correlations ($P < 0.01$). These results suggest that generalist adaptations that increase fitness
102 across multiple hosts have been more important for Hemiptera than specialist adaptations to particular
103 hosts (Peterson et al. 2015). Moreover, hemipteran generalism appears completely unrestrained by host
104 taxonomy even over long time scales, leading to the evolution of both super-generalist species and
105 clades (Normark and Johnson 2011). The trade-offs observed in lepidopteran host-use are therefore not
106 universal to plant-feeding insects; they depend on evolutionary context.

107 There are many differences between Lepidoptera and Hemiptera, but their fundamentally
108 distinct relationships with host plants may be particularly important to understanding why the role of
109 trade-offs appears to be very different in the two groups. Hemiptera are sucking insects, while
110 Lepidoptera are generally leaf-chewers (Forister et al. 2015). These two feeding modes elicit different
111 modes of plant defensive responses (Ali and Agrawal 2012), and sap-sucking may be particularly
112 amenable to generalist adaptations that circumvent host defenses (Barrett and Heil 2012). In contrast,
113 Lepidoptera often rely on specialized enzymes to detoxify defensive chemicals, which may constrain
114 the evolution of generalism, although super-generalist Lepidoptera do exist, possibly powered by
115 phenotypic plasticity in enzyme expression (Li et al. 2002).

116 Overall, we found strong evidence that both labile traits and long-term, historically contingent
117 evolutionary processes produce important host-use constraints in plant-feeding insects. Nevertheless,
118 the relatively few, broad-scale trade-offs found here fail to explain the observation that a vast majority
119 of plant-feeding insects are restricted to a single host family (Forister et al. 2015). It is clear that trade-
120 offs can vary based on genetic context (Rodriguez-Verdugo et al. 2014), so we cannot rule out the
121 hypothesis that species-specific, idiosyncratic trade-offs drive ecological specialization. Nevertheless,
122 although individual species-specific trade-offs have been documented (Nosil et al. 2002), our results
123 suggest that most microevolutionary trade-offs do not persist over macroevolutionary timescales.
124 Trade-offs play an intuitive and possibly inescapable role in constraining performance across multiple
125 tasks (Shoval et al. 2012), yet host-specialization in plant-feeding insects is not necessarily driven by

126 host-specific limitations on survival and growth. Alternative factors, such as neural constraints
127 (Bernays 2001), mate-finding (Hawthorne and Via 2002), or genetic drift (Gompert et al. 2015) may
128 ultimately shape the evolution of each species' ecological niche.

129

130 **Figure Legends**

131 **Figure 1 | Mapping host-use traits on insect phylogenies.** For each host-plant order, colored blocks
132 indicate which insect species have been observed on that host. Insect species with no hosts shown were
133 observed only on non-focal hosts or had no host-use information associated with their locality records
134 (Hemiptera only). Insect families are indicated around the phylogenies as follows: **a**, Lepidoptera – 1:
135 Noctuoidea, 2: Nymphalidae, 3: Lycaenidae, 4: Hesperidae, 5: Pyralidae, 6: Sphingidae, 7:
136 Saturniidae, 8: Geometridae, 9: Tortricidae, 10: Gracillariidae. **b**, Hemiptera – 11: Cicadellidae, 12:
137 Membracidae, 13: Cicadidae, 14: Miridae, 15: Tingidae, 16: Pentatomidae, 17: Scutelleridae, 18:
138 Coreidae, 19: Rhopalidae, 20: Lygaeidae, 21: Delphacidae, 22: Fulgoridae, 23: Flatidae, 24: Aphididae,
139 25: Diaspididae, 26: Coccidae, 27: Pseudococcidae, 28: Psylloidea, 29: Aleyrodidae.

140

141 **Figure 2 | Hypothetical scenarios of evolutionary correlation between presence on two hosts. a**,
142 Negative phylogenetic correlation. **b**, Positive phylogenetic correlation. **c**, Negative residual
143 correlation. **d**, Positive residual correlation. **e**, Negative phylogenetic and positive residual correlations.
144 **f**, Positive phylogenetic and negative residual correlations. In each example, filled red squares on the
145 left indicate which species in the phylogeny are present on host 1, and filled blue squares on the right
146 indicate which species are present on host 2.

147

148 **Figure 3 | Network graphs of inferred pairwise host-use correlations. a**, Lepidoptera – phylogenetic
149 correlations. **b**, Lepidoptera – residual correlations. **c**, Hemiptera – phylogenetic correlations. **d**,
150 Hemiptera – residual correlations. Each vertex represents a host order, with vertex area proportional to

151 the number of insects that were observed on that host. Positive interactions between presence a pair of
152 hosts are represented by solid, black lines and negative correlations by dashed, red lines, with line
153 thickness proportional to the magnitude of the correlation. Network spatial structure was determined
154 using the Kamada-Kawai algorithm (Kamada and Kawai 1989), a force-directed layout method in
155 which “repulsion” between vertices was proportional to the inverse of one plus the correlation values
156 between the respective hosts. Vertices are labelled with the following abbreviations – Ast: Asterales,
157 Car: Caryophyllales, Eri: Ericales, Fab: Fabales, Fag: Fagales, Lam: Lamiales, Mal: Malpighiales, Pin:
158 Pinales, Poa: Poales, Ros: Rosales, Sap: Sapindales. Vertices are colored by taxonomic group –
159 Eudicots: blue, Monocots: yellow, Conifers: green. Statistically significant modules ($P < 0.05$) are
160 indicated by grey bubbles. Individual host orders with mean correlations of significantly higher
161 magnitude than expected ($P < 0.05$) are indicated by bold vertex outlines (black for positive means, red
162 for negative means).

163

164 **Supplementary Information** is available in the online version of the paper.

165

166 **Acknowledgements** We thank D. Moen, L. Doubleday, and S. Noda for comments that improved the
167 manuscript. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation (EF-1115191 and DEB-
168 1258001)

169

170 **Author Contributions** All authors were involved in the study design and wrote the manuscript. D.A.P.
171 and N.B.H. analysed the data.

172

173 **Author Information** The authors declare no competing financial interests. Correspondence and
174 requests for materials should be addressed to D.A.P. (dapeters@cns.umass.edu)

175

176 **Materials and Methods**

177 **Data.** Lepidopteran host-use data were downloaded from the HOSTS database (nhm.ac.uk/hosts)
178 (Robinson et al. 2015), a collection of published records of worldwide caterpillar host-plants.
179 Hemipteran host-use data were downloaded from the Tri-Trophic Thematic Collection Network
180 database (tcn.amnh.org), a compilation of insect collection records from academic and governmental
181 museums in the United States. For both datasets, we restricted our analysis to records from North
182 America (all localities labelled USA, Canada, Mexico or Nearctic). All plant taxonomic names were
183 standardized with the Taxonomic Name Resolution Service (Boyle et al. 2013) and insect taxonomic
184 names with the python package TaxonNamesResolver and the following reference databases: Aphid
185 Species File (Favret 2015), Integrated Taxonomic Information System (itis.gov), and Catalogue of Life
186 (catalogueoflife.org).

187 We created binary presence/absence matrices of lepidopteran and hemipteran species by host
188 plant taxon, with insects considered present on all hosts for which they had at least one host-use record.
189 To focus computational resources on host taxa with enough statistical power to detect evolutionary
190 host-use interactions, we restricted our analyses to focal host orders used by at least 100 insect species
191 in one insect order (~10% of the total focal insect species per order). Eleven host orders met this cut-
192 off, and each of these met the cut-off for both Hemiptera and Lepidoptera: Asterales, Caryophyllales,
193 Ericales, Fabales, Fagales, Lamiales, Malpighiales, Pinales, Poales, Rosales, and Sapindales.
194 Interactions with these focal orders accounted for 77% of total interactions in the Lepidoptera dataset
195 and 57% of total interactions in the Hemiptera dataset.

196 We characterized shared ancestry among the North American lepidopteran and hemipteran
197 species in our host-use dataset by estimating time-scaled phylogenies using a phyloinformatic approach
198 (see Supplemental Materials for details). Phylogenetic data were not available for all species in the
199 host-use dataset, but there was an overlap of host-use and phylogenetic data for 1604 lepidopteran
200 species and 955 hemipteran species. Phylogenies and host-use matrices for these species will be

201 available on Dryad (datadryad.org) upon publication.

202

203 **Statistical Analysis.** We used a phylogenetic meta-analysis approach to test for evolutionary
204 correlations between insect use of the focal host-plant orders (Hadfield and Nakagawa 2010). Treating
205 each pairwise comparison between host taxa individually, we set up a phylogenetic mixed model for
206 each insect order using the package MCMCglmm (Hadfield 2010) in the R statistical framework (R
207 Core Team 2015). We estimated the evolutionary interaction between the pair of host traits using the
208 “`random=~us(trait):Insect`” and “`rcov=~us(trait):units`” syntax to capture both
209 phylogenetic and residual effects. Prior parameter distributions were specified as “`prior<-`
210 `list(R=list(V=diag(2),nu=2), G=list(G1=list(V=diag(2),nu=2)))`”. All
211 chains were run for 10 million iterations with a burn-in of 1 million iterations, and we ran ten MCMC
212 chains for each model to test for convergence. Gelman-Rubin convergence analysis of the ten chains
213 for each model produced potential scale reduction factors under 1.05 in every case (99% were under
214 1.01), suggesting that all chains successfully converged (Gelman and Rubin 1992).

215 We were interested in evaluating two potential trade-off scenarios: isolation of individual host-
216 use traits, and divisions of host-use traits into clusters (characterized by positive interactions within
217 clusters and negative interactions between them). To characterize isolation of individual host-use traits,
218 we calculated the mean correlation of the ten pairwise comparisons involving each host-use trait
219 (separately for phylogenetic and residual correlations). To characterize associations among groups of
220 host-use traits, we found the network structure that maximized the structure score for the entire network
221 of host-use traits, defined as the sum of all pairwise correlations between host-use traits in the same
222 cluster minus the sum of all pairwise correlations between host-use traits in different clusters (See
223 Supplementary Materials for details). We tested the statistical significance of the resulting values by
224 producing a series of 100 null datasets that simulated independent Brownian motion of a continuous
225 character for performance on each host order along the insect phylogenies, plus additional normally

226 distributed residual variation. We converted the resulting continuous host performance values to a
227 binary host presence/absence character by assuming that only the insect species with the highest
228 performance values for each host taxon were present on that host, with the threshold set by matching
229 the number of species using that host in the empirical data. We then calculated all pairwise correlations
230 between use of the focal hosts, mean correlations per host-use trait, and whole-network structure as we
231 did for the empirical data. Empirical individual host-use trait mean correlations were considered
232 statistically significant when their absolute values exceeded the maximum absolute values of any
233 individual mean in 95% of null datasets. Empirical network structures was considered statistically
234 significant when their scores exceeded the network structure scores of 95% the null datasets.

235


236 **Literature Cited**

- 237 Ali, J. G., and A. A. Agrawal. 2012. Specialist versus generalist insect herbivores and plant defense.
238 *Trends Plant Sci.* 17:293–302.
- 239 Barrett, L. G., and M. Heil. 2012. Unifying concepts and mechanisms in the specificity of plant-enemy
240 interactions. *Trends Plant Sci.* 17:282–292.
- 241 Bernays, E. A. 2001. Neural limitations in phytophagous insects: implications for diet breadth and
242 evolution of host affiliation. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* 46:703–727.
- 243 Boyle, B., N. Hopkins, Z. Lu, J. A. Raygoza Garay, D. Mozzherin, T. Rees, N. Matasci, M. L. Narro,
244 W. H. Piel, S. J. McKay, S. Lowry, C. Freeland, R. K. Peet, and B. J. Enquist. 2013. The taxonomic
245 name resolution service: an online tool for automated standardization of plant names. *BMC*
246 *Bioinformatics* 14:16.
- 247 Campbell, S. A., and A. Kessler. 2013. Plant mating system transitions drive the macroevolution of
248 defense strategies. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 110:3973–3978.
- 249 Farrell, B. D. 1998. “Inordinate fondness” explained: why are there so many beetles? *Science* 281:555–
250 559.
- 251 Favret, C. 2015. Aphid species file. <http://aphid.speciesfile.org>
- 252 Forister, M. L., L. A. Dyer, M. Singer, J. O. Stireman, and J. T. Lill. 2012. Revisiting the evolution of
253 ecological interactions. *Ecology* 93:981–991.
- 254 Forister, M. L., V. Novotny, A. K. Panorska, L. Baje, Y. Basset, P. T. Butterill, L. Cizek, P. D. Coley, F.
255 Dem, I. R. Diniz, P. Drozd, M. Fox, A. E. Glassmire, R. Hazen, J. Hreck, J. P. Jahner, O. Kaman, T. J.


- 256 Kozubowski, T. a Kursar, O. T. Lewis, J. Lill, R. J. Marquis, S. E. Miller, H. C. Morais, M. Murakami,
257 H. Nickel, N. a Pardikes, R. E. Ricklefs, M. S. Singer, A. M. Smilanich, J. O. Stireman, S. Villamarín-
258 Cortez, S. Vodka, M. Volf, D. L. Wagner, T. Walla, G. D. Weiblen, and L. a Dyer. 2015. The global
259 distribution of diet breadth in insect herbivores. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 112:442–7.
- 260 Fry, J. 1996. The evolution of host specialization: are trade-offs overrated? *Am. Nat.* 148:S84–107.
- 261 Futuyma, D. J. 1976. Food plant specialization and environmental predictability in Lepidoptera. *Am.*
262 *Nat.* 110:285–292.
- 263 Futuyma, D. J. 2008. Sympatric speciation: norm or exception? Pp. 136–147 *in* Specialization,
264 Speciation, and Radiation: The Evolutionary Biology of Herbivorous Insects.
- 265 Futuyma, D. J., and A. A. Agrawal. 2009. Macroevolution and the biological diversity of plants and
266 herbivores. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 106:18054–18061.
- 267 Futuyma, D. J., M. Keese, and D. J. Funk. 1995. Genetic constraints on macroevolution: the evolution
268 of host affiliation in the leaf beetle genus *Ophraella*. *Evolution* 49:797–809.
- 269 Futuyma, D. J., and G. Moreno. 1988. The evolution of ecological specialization. *Annu. Rev. Ecol.*
270 *Syst.* 19:207–233.
- 271 Gelman, A., and D. B. Rubin. 1992. Inference from iterative simulation using multiple sequences. *Stat.*
272 *Sci.* 7:457–472.
- 273 Gompert, Z., J. P. Jahner, C. F. Scholl, J. S. Wilson, L. K. Lucas, V. Soria-Carrasco, J. A. Fordyce, C. C.
274 Nice, C. A. Buerkle, and M. L. Forister. 2015. The evolution of novel host use is unlikely to be
275 constrained by tradeoffs or a lack of genetic variation. *Mol. Ecol.* 24:2777–2793.
- 276 Hadfield, J. D. 2010. MCMC methods for multi-response generalized linear mixed models: The
277 MCMCglmm R package. *J. Stat. Softw.* 33:1–22.
- 278 Hadfield, J. D., B. R. Krasnov, R. Poulin, and S. Nakagawa. 2014. A tale of two phylogenies:
279 comparative analyses of ecological interactions. *Am. Nat.* 183:174–87.
- 280 Hadfield, J. D., and S. Nakagawa. 2010. General quantitative genetic methods for comparative biology:
281 Phylogenies, taxonomies and multi-trait models for continuous and categorical characters. *J. Evol.*
282 *Biol.* 23:494–508.
- 283 Hawthorne, D. J., and S. Via. 2002. The genetic architecture of ecological specialization: correlated
284 gene effects on host use and habitat choice in pea aphids. *Am. Nat.* 159:S76–S88.
- 285 Janz, N., S. Nylin, and N. Wahlberg. 2006. Diversity begets diversity: host expansions and the
286 diversification of plant-feeding insects. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 6:4.
- 287 Joshi, A., and J. N. Thompson. 1995. Trade-offs and the evolution of host specialization. *Evol. Ecol.*
288 9:82–92.
- 289 Kamada, T., and S. Kawai. 1989. An algorithm for drawing general undirected graphs. *Inf. Process.*







- 290 Lett. 31:7–15.
- 291 Krasnov, B. R., M. A. Fortuna, D. Mouillot, I. S. Khokhlova, G. I. Shenbrot, and R. Poulin. 2012.
292 Phylogenetic signal in module composition and species connectivity in compartmentalized host-
293 parasite Networks. *Am. Nat.* 179:501–511.
- 294 Li, X., M. A. Schuler, and M. R. Berenbaum. 2002. Jasmonate and salicylate induce expression of
295 herbivore cytochrome P450 genes. *Nature* 419:712–715.
- 296 Misof, B., S. Liu, K. Meusemann, R. S. Peters, A. Donath, C. Mayer, P. B. Frandsen, J. Ware, T. Flouri,
297 R. G. Beutel, O. Niehuis, M. Petersen, F. Izquierdo-Carrasco, T. Wappler, J. Rust, A. J. Aberer, U.
298 Aspöck, H. Aspöck, D. Bartel, A. Blanke, S. Berger, A. Böhm, T. R. Buckley, B. Calcott, J. Chen, F.
299 Friedrich, M. Fukui, M. Fujita, C. Greve, P. Grobe, S. Gu, Y. Huang, L. S. Jermini, A. Y. Kawahara, L.
300 Krogmann, M. Kubiak, R. Lanfear, H. Letsch, Y. Li, Z. Li, J. Li, H. Lu, R. Machida, Y. Mashimo, P.
301 Kapli, D. D. McKenna, G. Meng, Y. Nakagaki, J. L. Navarrete-Heredia, M. Ott, Y. Ou, G. Pass, L.
302 Podsiadlowski, H. Pohl, B. M. von Reumont, K. Schütte, K. Sekiya, S. Shimizu, A. Slipinski, A.
303 Stamatakis, W. Song, X. Su, N. U. Szucsich, M. Tan, X. Tan, M. Tang, J. Tang, G. Timelthaler, S.
304 Tomizuka, M. Trautwein, X. Tong, T. Uchifune, M. G. Walz, B. M. Wiegmann, J. Wilbrandt, B.
305 Wipfler, T. K. F. Wong, Q. Wu, G. Wu, Y. Xie, S. Yang, Q. Yang, D. K. Yeates, K. Yoshizawa, Q.
306 Zhang, R. Zhang, W. Zhang, Y. Zhang, J. Zhao, C. Zhou, L. Zhou, T. Ziesmann, S. Zou, X. Xu, H.
307 Yang, J. Wang, K. M. Kjer, and X. Zhou. 2014. Phylogenomics resolves the timing and pattern of insect
308 evolution. *Science* 346:763–767.
- 309 Normark, B. B., and N. A. Johnson. 2011. Niche explosion. *Genetica* 139:551–564.
- 310 Nosil, P., B. J. Crespi, and C. P. Sandoval. 2002. Host-plant adaptation drives the parallel evolution of
311 reproductive isolation. *Nature* 417:440–3.
- 312 Olesen, J. M., J. Bascompte, Y. L. Dupont, and P. Jordano. 2007. The modularity of pollination
313 networks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 104:19891–6.
- 314 Peterson, D. A., N. B. Hardy, G. E. Morse, I. C. Stocks, A. Okusu, and B. B. Normark. 2015.
315 Phylogenetic analysis reveals positive correlations between adaptations to diverse hosts in a group of
316 pathogen-like herbivores. *Evolution* 69:2785–2792.
- 317 R Core Team. 2015. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
318 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 319 Ravnigné, V., U. Dieckmann, and I. Olivieri. 2009. Live where you thrive: joint evolution of habitat
320 choice and local adaptation facilitates specialization and promotes diversity. *Am. Nat.* 174:E141–E169.
- 321 Remold, S. 2012. Understanding specialism when the jack of all trades can be the master of all. *Proc.*
322 *R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 279:4861–4869.
- 323 Robinson, G. S., P. R. Ackery, I. J. Kitching, G. W. Beccaloni, and L. M. Hernández. 2015. HOSTS - a
324 database of the world's Lepidopteran hostplants.
- 325 Rodriguez-Verdugo, A., D. Carrillo-Cisneros, A. Gonzalez-Gonzalez, B. S. Gaut, and A. F. Bennett.




- 326 2014. Different tradeoffs result from alternate genetic adaptations to a common environment. Proc.
327 Natl. Acad. Sci. 111:12121–12126.
- 328 Satterwhite, R. S., and T. F. Cooper. 2015. Constraints on adaptation of *Escherichia coli* to mixed-
329 resource environments increase over time. *Evolution* 69:2067–2078.
- 330 Shoval, O., H. Sheftel, G. Shinar, Y. Hart, O. Ramote, A. Mayo, E. Dekel, K. Kavanagh, and U. Alon.
331 2012. Evolutionary trade-offs, Pareto optimality, and the geometry of phenotype space. *Science*
332 336:1157–1160.
- 333



- Asterales
- Caryophyllales
- Ericales
- Fabales
- Fagales
- Lamiales
- Malpighiales
- Pinales
- Rosales
- Sapindales



a**b****c****d****e****f**

a**b****c****d**