The price of defence: toxins, visual signals and oxidative state in an aposematic butterfly

Jonathan D. Blount [1]*[†], Hannah M. Rowland[2][†], Christopher Mitchell[1], Michael P. Speed[3], Graeme D. Ruxton[4], John A. Endler[5], Lincoln P. Brower[6]

[1] Centre for Ecology & Conservation, College of Life & Environmental Sciences, University of Exeter, Penryn Campus, Cornwall TR10 9FE, UK

[2]Max Planck Institute for Chemical Ecology, Hans-Knöll-Straße 8, Jena, 07745, Germany

[3] Institute of Systems, Molecular and Integrative Biology, University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 7BE, UK

[4]School of Biology, Sir Harold Mitchell Building, Greenside Place, St Andrews, United Kingdom

[5]Centre for Integrative Ecology, School of Life & Environmental Sciences, Deakin University, Waurn Ponds VIC 3216, Australia

[6]Department of Biology, Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar VA 24595, USA

* Authors for correspondence: j.d.blount@exeter.ac.uk and hrowland@ice.mpg.de

[†] Joint first authors

Running headline: Oxidative stress and warning signal honesty

SUMMARY

In a variety of aposematic species, the conspicuousness of an individual's warning signal and

the quantity of its chemical defence are positively correlated. This apparent honest signalling

is predicted by resource competition models which assume that the production and

maintenance of aposematic defences compete for access to antioxidant molecules that have

dual functions as pigments and in protecting against oxidative damage. We raised monarch

butterflies (*Danaus plexippus*) on their milkweed host-plants (Apocynaceae) with increasing

quantities of cardenolides to test whether (1) the sequestration of secondary defences is

associated with costs in the form of oxidative lipid damage and reduced antioxidant defences;

and (2) that reduced oxidative state can decrease the capacity of individuals to produce

aposematic displays. In male monarchs conspicuousness was explained by an interaction

between oxidative damage and sequestration: males with high levels of oxidative damage

become less conspicuous with increased sequestration of cardenolides, whereas those with

low oxidative damage become more conspicuous with increased levels of cardenolides. There

was no significant effect of oxidative damage or concentration of sequestered cardenolides on

female conspicuousness. Our results demonstrate a physiological linkage between the

production of coloration and protection from autotoxicity, and differential costs of signalling

in monarch butterflies.

Introduction

Many species of animals, plants and micro-organisms possess chemical defences that reduce

the likelihood of their being eaten [1]. Aposematic species, such as the monarch butterfly

(*Danaus plexippus*), signal their chemical defences to predators with conspicuous warning

colours [2]. In some species, the conspicuousness of the warning signal and the quantity of

chemical defence are positively correlated, for example in some dendrobatid frogs [3-5],

marine opisthobranchs [6], ladybird beetles [7, 8], and paper wasps *Polistes dominula* [9].

The identification of these relationships has led to renewed interest in the idea that warning

signals may inform predators about levels of prey defence and that such signals are honest

indicators of defensive capability [10]. Several theoretical studies have, however, predicted

the opposite: that well defended prey should reduce investment in signals, because signalling

carries an additional conspicuousness cost, and such prey stand a good chance of surviving

any attack unharmed [11-13]. Negative signal-defence correlations have been reported across

some Dendrobatid poison frogs [14] including *Dendrobates granuliferus* [15]. Using a novel

theoretical model, Blount et al [16] could explain both the positive and negative correlations

between warning colours and chemical defences if these two traits are linked through the

competitive use of a shared resource. One possible shared resource is energy, which can be

limiting for the sequestration or biosynthesis of toxins [17]. Alternatively, sequestration of

toxins could impose metabolic costs in terms of oxidative lipid damage and reduced

antioxidant defences – an idea that has received limited empirical attention in regard to

warning signals.

Many plant allelochemicals are powerful pro-oxidants, which, when ingested, can cause

oxidative lipid damage [18]. In their resource competition framework, Blount et al [16]

envisaged that pigments used in prey warning signals (e.g., carotenoids, flavonoids, melanins,

and pteridines) might play a dual role imparting colour as well as acting as antioxidants that

prevent self-damage when storing toxins. In their model, if antioxidants are required to

enable high levels of toxicity, signal reliability can be explained if the brightest and most

toxic species gain access to more of the limiting resource than those that are less bright and

less toxic (figure 1a, c). The prediction of signal honesty breaks down in their model when

prey have very abundant resources, in which case it pays to divert these resources

increasingly into toxins and not into warning signals, because less conspicuous but highly

toxic prey encounter predators less often and have higher chances of surviving attacks (figure

1b, d [16]). Directly controlling antioxidant availability is challenging experimentally,

consequently it is unclear whether or not colour-toxin relationships are influenced by the

resource state of prey [14, 15], and has not yet been examined experimentally [11, 12, 16, 17,

19].

We manipulated diet-derived toxins available to an individual to test whether toxin

sequestration and the production and maintenance of warning signals are linked via oxidative

state. We achieved this by using a model aposematic system, the monarch butterfly (*Danaus*

plexippus), that selectively metabolises cardenolides present in its host-plants and stores them

in its body [20, 21]. We used the known inter- and intraspecific variability in cardenolide

concentration and cardenolide polarity of the monarch's larval milkweed host-plants

(Asclepiadaceae; [21, 22]) to manipulate the toxins available for an individual to sequester.

We test whether (i) the quantity of sequestered secondary defence by caterpillars is associated

with levels of oxidative lipid damage and antioxidant defences in adults; and (ii) whether

oxidative lipid damage incurred during sequestration affects the capacity of adult butterflies

to produce aposematic displays.

Because there is substantial genetic variation in sequestration ability, and because

evolutionary history and contemporary species interactions may influence patterns of

cardenolide sequestration [23] we used monarchs from a single population. We reared them

on four milkweed species (see table 1) that show within- and between-species, and among-

population variation in cardenolide concentration, diversity, and polarity [22, 24-26]. Based

on the published records of biological activity and chromatic quantification (e.g., HPLC and

thin layer chromatography) of cardenolides of milkweeds in different populations/latitudes

[27, 28], our four plant species were used to represent a gradient of low to high cardenolide

defences, with the aim to create different costs of sequestration. We predicted that

concentrations of cardenolides in the body and wings of newly eclosed adults would differ

according to the cardenolides of the host-plant on which they were reared (see methods): *A.*

curassavica (*Ac*) $\geq$ *A. syriaca* (*As*) > *A. incarnata* (*Ai*) $\geq$ *A. tuberosa* (*At*).

Because sequestration, modification, and storage of allelochemicals are believed to be

oxidatively stressful for many chemically defended organisms [18], we predicted that body

levels of oxidative lipid peroxidation would differ amongst individuals according to host-

plant, as follows: *Ac$\geq$As>Ai$\geq$At*. In turn, we predicted that survival to eclosion would differ

according to host-plant as follows: *At$\geq$Ai>As$\geq$Ac*, and that the redness, luminance, and

conspicuousness of the warning signals would differ: *Ac$\geq$As>Ai$\geq$At*. In addition to testing for

treatment effects, we examined associations between individual levels of cardiac glycosides

(CGs), oxidative state, and warning signal redness, luminance, and conspicuousness. We

predicted a positive association between levels of CGs and lipid peroxidation, a negative

association of CGs with antioxidant defences, and that highly toxic prey will be the most

conspicuous [16].

Materials and methods

(a) Milkweed plants

Milkweeds (*A. incarnata, A. tuberosa, A. curassavica, and A. syriaca*) were locally sourced

in Amherst, Virginia, USA. We did not measure cardenolide content in the leaves of the

plants used in the experiment, but used published records about the spatial repeatability of

cardenolide defences that take into account latitudinal clines [27-29]. From these records we

predicted that for milkweeds grown in Mid-Atlantic and Southeastern regions of the United

States, total cardenolide content would vary in the order *A. curassavica* (*Ac*) $\geq$ *A. syriaca* (*As*)

> *A. incarnata* (*Ai*) $\geq$ *A. tuberosa* (*At*). The plants were grown without the use of pesticides as

described previously [30]. All plants were healthy with undamaged leaves at the start of the

experiment.

(b) *Milkweed Feeding Assay and preparation of samples*

Eggs were obtained from wild caught Monarch females in Virginia (USA) that were kept in

captivity until they laid eggs following previous methods [31]. Larvae were reared by LPB on

single plants under the same conditions. All larvae had abundant food during the experiment.

Larvae were monitored daily for pupation starting at Day 12.

Upon eclosion, the date and the individual's sex were recorded. Adults were placed in

glassine envelopes and frozen on dry ice until dead, then stored in a freezer at -80°C before

being shipped to the UK on dry ice. Adults were stored at -80°C in JDB's laboratory until

they were analysed.

For analysis, the gut was removed, and the head, thorax and abdomen (hereafter, 'body')

were bisected longitudinally. One half of the body was returned to storage at -80°C for later

analysis of cardenolides. The other half of the body was immediately homogenised in ice-

cold phosphate-buffered saline (PBS; 5 % w/v), for analyses of oxidative stress. The wings

were removed using dissecting scissors and shipped on dry ice to HMR's laboratory for

analyses of colouration (see below). Wings were then returned (on dry ice) to JDB's

laboratory for cardenolide analysis.

(c) Determination of oxidative stress and cardenolide concentration

Determining oxidative state requires a range of assays including antioxidant defences and

oxidative damage. We assayed three such components: total superoxide dismutase (SOD),

which are metalloenzymes that catalyse the dismutation of superoxide into oxygen and

hydrogen peroxide and form a crucial part of intracellular antioxidant defences; total

antioxidant capacity (TAC), which measures the activity of low molecular weight chain-

breaking antioxidants including ascorbate, a-tocopherol, carotenoids and flavonoids, and

therefore gives an overview of the antioxidant status of individuals (including diet-derived

antioxidants); and malondialdehyde (MDA), which is formed by the β-scission of peroxidised

polyunsaturated fatty acids, and therefore is a definitive marker of oxidative damage.

(i)   Total superoxide dismutase (SOD)

Total SOD was assayed by measuring the dismutation of superoxide radicals generated by

xanthine oxidase and hypoxanthine. We followed the instructions of the kit (#706002;

Cayman Chemical, Michigan, USA), except that tissue homogenates were further diluted

with the supplied sample buffer (1:100 v/v) to ensure that SOD activity fell within the range

of the standard curve. Samples were assayed in duplicate and are reported as units of SOD

activity (U) per mg tissue.

(ii)   Total antioxidant capacity (TAC)

TAC was assayed by measuring the capacity of tissue homogenate to inhibit the oxidation of

2,2'-azino-di-[3-ethylbenzthiazoline sulphonate] (#709001; Cayman Chemical). The

homogenate was further diluted with sample buffer (1:5 v/v) to bring the absorbance values

139 within the range of the standard curve. Samples were assayed in duplicate, as per the kit

140 instructions. Data are reported as nmols of TAC activity (Trolox equivalents) per g tissue.

141 *(iii) Malondialdehyde (MDA)*

142 MDA was measured using HPLC with fluorescence detection as described previously for

143 tissue homogenates (e.g. [32]). All chemicals were HPLC grade, and chemical solutions were

144 prepared using ultra pure water (Milli-Q Synthesis; Millipore, Watford, UK). Samples were

145 derived in 2 mL capacity polypropylene screw-top microcentrifuge tubes. For tissue

146 homogenates and for the standard (1,1,3,3-tetraethoxypropane, TEP; see below) a 20 µl

147 aliquot was added to 20 µl butylated hydroxytoluene solution (BHT; 0.05% w/v in 95 %

148 ethanol), 160 µl phosphoric acid solution (H_3PO_4; 0.44 *M*), and 40 µl thiobarbituric acid

149 solution (TBA; 42 m*M*). Samples were capped, vortex mixed for 5 s, then heated at 100 °C

150 for 1 h in a dry bath incubator to allow formation of MDA-TBA adducts. Samples were then

151 cooled on ice for 5 min, before 80 µl *n*-butanol was added and tubes were vortex mixed for

152 20s. Tubes were centrifuged at 12,000 x g and 4 °C for 3 min, before the upper (*n*-butanol)

153 phase was collected and transferred to an HPLC vial for analysis. Samples (10 µl) were

154 injected into a Dionex HPLC system (Dionex Corporation, California, USA) fitted with a

155 5µm ODS guard column and a Hewlett-Packard Hypersil 5µ ODS 100 x 4.6 mm column

156 maintained at 37 °C. The mobile phase was methanol-buffer (40:60, v/v), the buffer being a

157 50 m*M* anhydrous solution of potassium monobasic phosphate at pH 6.8 (adjusted using 5 *M*

158 potassium hydroxide solution), running isocratically over 3.5 min at a flow rate of 1 ml min^{-1}.

159 Data were collected using a fluorescence detector (RF2000; Dionex) set at 515 nm

160 (excitation) and 553 nm (emission). For calibration a standard curve was prepared using a

161 TEP stock solution (5 m*M* in 40 % ethanol) serially diluted using 40 % ethanol. Data are

162 presented as nmols MDA per g tissue.

163 *(iv) Cardenolide analysis*

For cardenolide analysis, samples (individual wings and the remaining half of the body) were

dried in an oven at 60 °C for 16 h. The dried material was ground to a fine powder using a

pestle and mortar, and weighed to the nearest 0.0001 g using a GR-202 electronic balance

(A&D Instruments Ltd., Abington, UK). The samples were placed in screw-top

polypropylene tubes for de-fatting and cardenolide extraction. To remove fats, 2 ml hexane

was added and samples were incubated at 35°C for 30 min, before being centrifuged at

10,000 x g and 4ºC for 5 min; the supernatant was collected and discarded. Ethanol (1.9 ml)

containing 20 µg digitoxin (#D5878; Sigma-Aldrich, Dorset, UK) as an internal standard

were added to the pellet and it was briefly vortexed to extract cardenolides (Ritland 1994).

Samples were placed in an XUB5 ultrasonic bath (Grant Instruments, Shepreth, UK) at 60°C

for 60 min, followed by further centrifugation (9,600 x g and 4ºC for 5 min). The supernatant

was removed and evaporated to dryness using a Savant ISS 110 SpeedVac Concentrator at

room temperature (Thermo Scientific, Altrincham, UK). Samples were then dissolved in 0.5

ml methanol by vortexing, and 50 µl of the solution was injected into a Dionex HPLC system

fitted with a Waters Spherisorb 5µm ODS2 column (150 x 4.6 mm) maintained at 20°C. A

multistep gradient of acetonitrile (ACN) and ultra pure water was used as the mobile phase,

as follows: initial concentration 20 % ACN held for 5 minutes, ramp to 70 % ACN at 20 mins

and held until 25 minutes, ramp to 95 % ACN at 30 mins and held until 35 mins, returning to

20 % ACN at 40 mins, with an end time of 50 mins. The flow rate was 0.7 ml min^{-1}. Peaks

were collected using a PDA-100 photodiode array detector (Dionex) at an absorbance value

of 218 nm. Spectral data between 200-400 nm were collected, and cardenolides were

identified as peaks with a symmetrical absorbance band with a maximum absorbance

between 217-222 nm [33, 34]. Data are presented as µg total cardenolides per 0.1 g tissue.

(d) Measurements and visual modelling of colouration

The reflectance of the forewings of each butterfly, and of four leaves from *Asclepias syriaca*

(as a representative background that the butterflies can rest on. Obtained from A. Agrawal),

were measured using an Ocean Optics USB2000 spectrophotometer, with specimens

illuminated at 45º to normal by a DH1000 balanced halogen deuterium light source. The

measuring spot diameter was 3 mm, with spectra recorded at 0.34nm intervals from 300 to

700nm and measured relative to a WS-1 reflectance standard. For each wing, 3-4 non-

overlapping measurements were taken per orange segment of the wing (figure s1; total

number of measurement spots per forewing = 13-14). For the leaves we took eleven non-

overlapping measurements. Spectrophotometry data were recorded using Ocean Optics

OOBase32.

To determine differences in chroma between treatments, we modelled the predicted photon

catches of a generalized passerine bird (passerines being the main avian predators of

monarchs [35]) for each spectrum following the Vorobyev-Osorio model [36], using the R

package PAVO [37]. We used the cone types of a blue tit, *Cyanistes caeruleus* [38],

longwave, LWS, λmax 563nm; mediumwave, MWS, λmax 503 nm; shortwave, SWS, λmax

448 nm ; ultraviolet, UVS, λmax 371 nm; and double dorsal, DD λmax 563 nm]. We

calculated redness as the ratio of long wave to medium wave cone responses. We also

calculated a measure of chromatic conspicuousness as ΔS between the mean colour of the

forewings of the butterflies and mean colour of the *A. syriaca* leaves using the Vorobyev-

Osorio colour discrimination model, which is based on evidence that colour discrimination is

determined by noise arising in the photoreceptors and is independent of light intensity. We

used a Weber fraction value of 0.05 for the most abundant cone type [39]. We calculated

luminance as the response of the dorsal double cone [40].

(e) Data analyses

Left- and right-wing cardenolide concentration (from here on CG) were significantly

positively correlated (r = 0.96, t = 20.75, df = 38, p = 2.2e-16). There was no significant

correlation between asymmetry in wing CG concentrations and the mean CG of the wings (r

= 0.10, t = 0.64, df = 38, P = 0.52), and so for each individual we calculated a mean wing CG

concentration. Left- and right-wing redness were significantly positive correlated (r = 0.85, t

=10.27, df = 38, P < 0.0001), as were left- and right-wing conspicuousness (r = 0.86, t = 0.33,

df = 38, P < 0.0001), and left- and right-wing luminance (r = 0.47, t = 3.32, df = 38, P =

0.002). For each individual we calculated a mean forewing redness, conspicuousness, and

luminance.

We log transformed malondialdehyde (MDA) and wing and body CG to normalise the

distribution of the residuals. We analysed the effect of foodplant on total CG content,

bodyCG and wingCG content using a GLM with a Gaussian distribution and identity link

function. We set *A. tuberosa* as the level with which we compared the other plants, because

of its low cardenolide content. Eclosion success or failure was analysed with a binomial

GLM. To analyse how cardenolides and oxidative stress affected colour metrics in the

butterflies we constructed a full model that included all pairwise interactions and a three-way

interaction between MDA x total CG concentration x sex and compared this to a simple

model that included only the fixed effects of MDA, total CG concentration and sex. We

compared the reduced model to the full model by using information criteria (AIC; see

supplementary tables s1-s13). We visualized the interaction between two continuous

variables using the rsm package in the R [41]. All data were analysed using R version 4.0.4.

Results

CG concentrations

In support of our first hypothesis, concentrations of cardenolides in the body and wings of

newly eclosed adults differed according to which host-plant species they were reared on

(Figure 2a; $F_{(4,36)}$ = 7.42, P = 0.0002). Monarchs reared on *Ac* and *As* sequestered

significantly more cardenolides in total than those reared on *At* (*Ac vs At:* estimate = 822.9 ±

184.3, t = 4.47, P = 7.6e-05; *As* vs *At*: estimate = 726.6 ± 187.1, t = 3.88, P =0.0004). Those

reared on *Ai* did not sequester significantly different total amounts of CGs to those on *At*

(estimate = 213.9 ± 189.2, t = 1.13, P = 0.27). Males tended to sequester more cardenolides in

total than females, but this was not significant at the alpha 0.05 level (estimate = 243.5 ±

133.4, t = 1.825, P = 0.076).

Body CG concentration tended to differ between food plants, but this was not significant at

the alpha 0.05 level (Figure 2b; $F_{(4,37)}$= 2.471, P = 0.061). Wing CG concentration

significantly varied between host-plants (Figure 1c; $F_{(4,36)}$= 19.25, P <0.001 ; Fig. 2c). Wing

CGs were significantly higher in *Ac* and *As* compared to At (*Ac* vs *At*: estimate = 1.59 ± 0.29,

t = 5.48, P < 0.0001; *As* vs *At*: estimate = 1.78 ± 0.30, t = 6.05, P = <0.001), but did not differ

significantly between *At* and *Ai* (estimate = -0.05 ± 0.29, τ = –0.18, p=0.38).

Survival to pupation and eclosion

We predicted that sequestration of cardenolides would impose a cost that would be associated

with reduced survivorship to eclosion. Successful eclosion was significantly higher in

monarchs reared on *At* (89%) compared with those reared on *As* (20%; estimate = -2.06 ±

0.751, t = 2.75, P = 0.009), while there was no significant difference between *Ai* (70%) and

At (89%, estimate = -0.696 ± 0.728, t = -0.956, P = 0.34) or *At* (89%) and *Ac* (62%; estimate

= -0.927 ± 0.690, t = -1.344, P = 0.19). Survival to pupation did not differ significantly

according to host-plant species (0% *At*, 23% *Ai*, 33% *As*, 27% *Ac*; Fisher's exact test P =

0.28).

CG and oxidative stress

Malondialdehyde (MDA)

Contrary to our prediction that oxidative lipid damage would differ by hostplant, we found no

significant effect of hostplant or sex on MDA (main effect $F_{4,\,37} = 0.77$, $P = 0.55$). In line

with our prediction of a positive association between concentration of sequestered CGs and

markers of oxidative damage, across all treatment groups individuals that sequestered higher

total concentrations of CGs had higher levels of MDA (figure 3; main effect: $F_{2,\,38} = 4.08$, $P =$

0.025; CG: estimate $= 0.0005 \pm 0.0002$, $t = 2.51$, $P = 0.016$). There was no significant

difference between the sexes (estimate $= -0.3097 \pm 0.198$, $t = -1.57$, $P = 0.13$).

Superoxide dismutase activity (SOD)

There was no significant effect of foodplant or sex on SOD activity (main effect $F_{4,\,37} = 0.28$,

$P = 0.89$). We found no significant effect of total CG concentration or sex on SOD activity

(main effect: $F_{2,38} = 0.52$, $P = 0.60$).

Total antioxidant capacity (TAC)

There was no significant effect of foodplant or sex on TAC (: $F_{(4,37)} = 0.42$, $P = 0.79$) or total

CG concentration ($F_{2,38} = 0.19$, $P = 0.83$).

Sequestration, oxidative stress and warning signals

Because malondialdehyde was the only marker associated with individual levels of

sequestration, we proceeded to analyse its association with warning signals, but did not

conduct analyses on superoxide dismutase activity or total antioxidant capacity effects on

warning signals. Monarchs varied significantly in conspicuousness (chroma (ΔS): $F_{3,35}$

$=17.85$ $P < 0.0001$). Males were significantly more conspicuous in chroma (ΔS) than females

(estimate $= 5.30 \pm 0.82$, $t = 6.49$, $P < 0.001$), and both sexes decreased in conspicuousness

with increasing MDA, though this was not significant at the alpha 0.05 level (estimate = -

1.26 ± 0.65, t = -1.95, p = 0.06). There was no significant effect of CG concentration on wing

conspicuousness (estimate = -0.00002 ± 0.0008, t = -0.03, P = 0.98). Because of the

significant sexual dimorphism in colour and sequestration, we separated the analysis by sex

and found a significant two way-interaction between MDA and total CG concentration on the

conspicuousness (chroma ΔS) of male forewings (main effect: $F_{3,21} = 8.54$, P = 0.0007; MDA

x CG: estimate = -0.003 ± 0.001, t = -3.24, P = 0.004) that is represented by a curved surface

(Figure 4). Males with the highest levels of sequestered cardenolides had the most

conspicuous warning signals when oxidative damage was lowest, and reduced their warning

signal conspicuousness as oxidative damage increased, while those that sequestered the

lowest levels of cardenolides showed no change in warning signal conspicuousness across all

levels of oxidative damage. The conspicuousness of males warning signals decreased with

increasing sequestration in males with high oxidative damage, whereas conspicuousness

increased in males with low oxidative damage with increasing sequestration. There was no

significant effect of oxidative damage or concentration of sequestered cardenolides on female

forewing conspicuousness ($F = _{3,10} = 0.06$, P = 0.9819).

Males also had significantly redder forewings than females (main effect: $F_{3,35} = 5.81$, P =

0.002; sex estimate = 0.24 ± 0.06 , t = 3.82, P = 0.0005), but there was no significant effect of

MDA or CG concentration on male and female redness (MDA: estimate = -0.04 ± 0.049, t = -

0.86, p = 0.40; CG concentration: estimate = 0.00001 ± 0.00006, t = 0.16, P = 0.87). We

found a significant difference in brightness of the monarchs ($F_{3, 35} = 10.19$, P = 0.00006).

Males were significantly brighter than females (estimate = 0.03 ± 0.007, t = 4.37, p = 0.0001)

and both sexes decreased in brightness with increasing MDA (estimate = -0.01 ± 0.005, t = -

2.40, p = 0.02). There was no significant effect of CG concentration on wing brightness

(estimate = 0.000003 ± 0.000007, t = 0.37, P = 0.70).

Discussion

We reared individual monarch caterpillars on whole plants from single plant populations of
four milkweed species with varying phytochemistry (*Asclepias tuberosa*, *A. incarnata*,
A.syriaca, and *A.curassavica*; [42]). Monarchs that sequestered higher concentrations of
cardenolides experienced higher levels of oxidative damage than those that sequestered lower
concentrations (measured as the concentration of malondialdehyde; MDA). Although there is
some evidence that cardenolides can be a burden for monarch caterpillars [22, 43], our results
are some of the first to show a potential physiological mechanism of oxidative damage as a
cost of sequestration for monarchs (see also [21, 29]). We found a trade-off between
sequestration and conspicuousness in male monarchs mediated by oxidative damage. Males
with high oxidative damage had decreasing conspicuousness with increasing sequestration,
whereas males with low oxidative damage showed increased conspicuousness with increasing
sequestration. This is the first evidence to support Blount et al's [16] resource allocation
trade-off model – prey with lower oxidative damage are able to allocate more resources to
colour and toxicity than prey with higher oxidative damage – and shows that an individual's
ability to deal with oxidative damage can result in colour-toxin correlations in monarch
butterflies.

Some authors [44] have rejected the idea that there can be a mechanistic link between
warning signals and chemical defences that involve intrinsic costs of production or
maintenance of defences because there was no clear mediator. However, condition-dependent
expression of colourful signals can arise when the underlying physiological pathways that
produce colouration are dependent on the same core cellular processes [16, 45]. We found
stable levels of antioxidant defences (superoxidase dismutase and total antioxidant capacity)
but increased oxidative damage was associated with reduced warning signal conspicuousness,
which suggests that the monarchs that are better able to control pro-oxidant levels can

sequester more cardenolides and still invest in warning signals [46]. Similar patterns are

observed in *Aristolochia*-feeding pipevine swallowtails butterflies (*Battus philenor*) that store

nitrophenanthrenes and have significantly higher tissue levels of carotenoids than related

species which mimic them in coloration but do not store toxins [47]. Similarly, the rank order

of body concentrations of carotenoids in three species of lepidoptera matches the rank order

of dietary exposure to the prooxidant toxin furanocoumarin (8-MOP) [Papilio polyxenes >

Spodoptera eridania > Trichoplusia ni; [18]]. Antioxidants are involved in detoxification

processes [48] as well as pigment synthesis pathways directly [49], or as cofactors of

enzymes [50]. Our results allow us to speculate that antioxidant availability has a role in the

biochemistry underlying the variations in warning colouration and toxicity in aposematic

animals. However, warning colours are usually regulated by more than one mechanism, and

we suggest that this area of research warrants further biochemical study.

It is likely that oxidative state depends on the combination of genetic, environmental and

gene by environment (GxE) interactions that determine an individual's condition. Monarchs

show patterns of local adaptation to their hostplants (based on larval growth rate [29]), and

also show GxE interactions in sequestration ability [23] which may reflect either a lack of

evolutionary history with different species of *Asclepias*, or a physiological trade-off in

sequestration ability. Our results suggest that populations of monarchs that are sympatric with

high cardenolide milkweeds could be less subject to oxidative damage, either because they

have evolved higher antioxidant efficiency, or because they are able to accumulate more

antioxidants to provide enhanced antioxidant protection. Further research on this topic could

have interesting implications for understanding host shifts and range expansions as well as

our understanding of automimicry (the occurrence of palatable 'cheaters' in a chemically

defended population). Whether automimicry in monarchs arises directly from a deficiency in

an individual's capacity to cope with reactive oxygen species warrants further study [51].

The resource competition model does not investigate or predict sex differences in resource

limitation. However, Blount et al [52] found that ladybird females (the larger sex) are more

susceptible to resource limitation than males, and hence more likely to signal honestly. In this

study we found costs of signalling in male monarchs. Males are slightly larger than females

and are the more active sex. Males also sequestered more cardenolides than females. This

behavioural difference between the sexes may increase their probability of detection and risk

of predation, and also increase their sensitivity to oxidative damage. If predators are sensitive

to the combined qualities of toxins and displays when they attack prey, this could mean they

avoid highly conspicuous prey and reject highly defended but less conspicuous prey, and

instead predate moderately defended and moderately conspicuous individuals, this could

maintain the signal variability we observe in males and in other aposematic prey.

Our results depend, to some extent, on the measure of signal conspicuousness measured

against the leaves of one of the four hostplants (*A. syriaca*). The differences in

conspicuousness of the forewings to the hostplant leaves range from (ΔS) 14 to 29. These

'suprathreshold' colour differences are often assumed to scale linearly with colour distance,

but this is not the case in some visual systems [53]. Future research could calculate

conspicuousness against a range of hostplant species and plant parts, as well as considering

predator visual acuity and the effects of increasing viewing distance on warning signal

conspicuousness. Experiments testing predator responses to the colour differences and the

consequences for prey survival will also be important for determining whether the levels of

measured conspicuousness are also perceived as visually distinct at a distance. The

relationship between visual signal strength, chemical defence, and predator response warrants

further study.

Although we did not measure cardenolide content in milkweed plants, our results confirm

previous research showing that the concentration of cardenolides in monarch butterflies

varies depending on host-plant chemistry [54, 55], and follows a standard approach to using

the natural between species and population variability in plant toxicity to test for costs of

sequestration [21, 27, 42]. However, it is methodologically difficult to separate the costs of

sequestration from other potential effects of plant allelochemicals [56]. Future work could

focus on comparative phytochemical profiles to understand resource availability, and

experiments that control nutritional content while manipulating toxin content [57].

In conclusion, our results support the proposal that oxidative state can be a key physiological

mechanism that links warning colours to sequestration costs [16], and that the contribution of

pigments to antioxidant activity for maintaining redox homeostasis is important [51]. Our

results show that specialist herbivores must balance the benefits of plant secondary

compounds for sequestration with the burden that these same compounds impose (though see

[42, 58]). Future research should examine the possibly of natural selection for oxidative

capacity, and whether aposematism evolves in species that have high antioxidant capacity.

These studies could provide new theories for understanding the evolution of aposematism

when coloration and toxicity do not coevolve. Documenting the costs associated with using

secondary defences in natural systems is important for our understanding of the ecology and

evolution of aposematism.

Acknowledgements

We thank Prof. Linda Fink for her support in drafting the manuscript following the death of

Prof. Lincoln Brower. We thank Alfonso Aceves for help with the PAVO coding for visual

modelling, and Prof. Anurag Agrawal for leaves of *Ascelpias syriaca*. JDB was supported by

a Royal Society University Research Fellowship. HMR, GDR and MPS were supported by

NERC (NE/D010 667/1) during data collection, and HMR was supported by a Junior

Author contributions

Jonathan D. Blount conceptualization, methodology, resources, data curation, writing -

original draft, project administration, funding acquisition.

Hannah M. Rowland methodology, formal analysis, investigation, data curation, writing -

original draft, visualization.

Christopher Mitchell investigation, data curation.

Michael P. Speed conceptualization, methodology, writing - review & editing.

Graeme D. Ruxton conceptualization, methodology, writing - review & editing.

John A. Endler conceptualization, writing - review & editing, visualization.

Lincoln P. Brower conceptualization, methodology, investigation, resources.

References

[1] Blum, M.S. 1981 *Chemical Defenses of Arthropods*. New York, Academic Press.

[2] Ruxton, G.D., Allen, W.L., Sherratt, T.N. & Speed, M.P. 2018 *Avoiding Attack. The*
Evolutionary Ecology of Crypsis, Aposematism, and Mimicry. Oxford, UK., Oxford
University Press.

[3] Summers, K. & and Clough, M.E. 2001 The evolution of coloration and toxicity in the
poison frog family (Dendrobatidae). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **98**,
6227-6232.

[4] Santos, J.C. & Cannatella, D.C. 2011 Phenotypic integration emerges from aposematism
and scale in poison frogs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **108**, 6175-6180.
(doi:10.1073/pnas.1010952108).

[5] Maan, M.E. & Cummings, M.E. 2009 Sexual dimorphism and directional sexual selection
on aposematic signals in a poison frog. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
106, 19072-19077. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0903327106).

[6] Cortesi, F. & Cheney, K.L. 2010 Conspicuousness is correlated with toxicity in marine
opisthobranchs. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **23**, 1509-1518. (doi:doi:10.1111/j.1420-
9101.2010.02018.x).

[7] Bezzerides, A., L., McGraw, K.J., Parker, R.S. & Husseini, J. 2007 Elytra color as a
signal of chemical defense in the Asian ladybird beetle Harmonia axyridis. *Behavioral*
Ecology and Sociobiology **61**, 1401-1408. (doi:10.1007/s00265-007-0371-9).

[8] Winters, A.E., Stevens, M., Mitchell, C., Blomberg, S.P. & Blount, J.D. 2014 Maternal
effects and warning signal honesty in eggs and offspring of an aposematic ladybird beetle.
Functional Ecology **28**, 1187-1196. (doi:doi:10.1111/1365-2435.12266).

[9] Vidal-Cordero, J.M., Moreno-Rueda, G., López-Orta, A., Marfil-Daza, C., Ros-Santaella,
J.L. & Ortiz-Sánchez, F.J. 2012 Brighter-colored paper wasps (Polistes dominula) have larger
poison glands. *Frontiers in Zoology* **9**, 20. (doi:10.1186/1742-9994-9-20).

[10] Summers, K., Speed, M.P., Blount, J.D. & Stuckert, A.M.M. 2015 Are aposematic
signals honest? A review. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, n/a-n/a. (doi:10.1111/jeb.12676).

[11] Leimar, O., Enquist, M. & Sillentullberg, B. 1986 Evolutionary Stability of Aposematic
Coloration and Prey Unprofitability - a Theoretical-Analysis. *American Naturalist* **128**, 469-
490.

[12] Speed, M.P. & Ruxton, G.D. 2007 How bright and how nasty: Explaining diversity in
warning signal strength. *Evolution* **61**, 623-635.

[13] Ruxton, G.D., Speed, M.P. & Broom, M. 2009 Identifying the ecological conditions that
select for intermediate levels of aposematic signalling. *Evolutionary Ecology* **23**, 491-501.
(doi:10.1007/s10682-008-9247-3).

[14] Darst, C.R., Cummings, M.E. & Cannatella, D.C. 2006 A mechanism for diversity in
warning signals: Conspicuousness versus toxicity in poison frogs. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.*
A. **103**, 5852-5857.

[15] Wang, I.J. 2011 Inversely related aposematic traits: reduced conspicuousness evolves
with increased toxicity in a polymorphic poison-dart frog. *Evolution* **65**, 1637-1649.
(doi:doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2011.01257.x).

[16] Blount, J.D., Speed, M.P., Ruxton, G.D. & Stephens, P.A. 2009 *Warning displays may*
*function as honest signals of toxicity*871-877 p.

[17] Holloway, G.J., de Jong, P.W., Brakefield, P.M. & de Vos, H. 1991 Chemical defence in
ladybird beetles (Coccinellidae). I. Distribution of coccinelline and individual variation in
defence in 7-spot ladybirds (Coccinella septempunctata). *CHEMOECOLOGY* **2**, 7-14.
(doi:10.1007/bf01240660).

[18] Ahmad, S. 1992 Biochemical defence of pro-oxidant plant allelochemicals by
herbivorous insects. . *Biochemical Systematics and Ecology* **20**, 269-296.

[19] Holen, O.H. & Svennungsen, T.O. 2012 Aposematism and the Handicap Principle. *The*
American Naturalist **180**, 629-641. (doi:10.1086/667890).

[20] Malcolm, S.B. & Brower, L.P. 1989 Evolutionary and Ecological Implications of
Cardenolide Sequestration in the Monarch Butterfly. *Experientia* **45**, 284-295.

[21] Agrawal, A.A., Böröczky, K., Haribal, M., Hastings, A.P., White, R.A., Jiang, R.-W. &
Duplais, C. 2021 Cardenolides, toxicity, and the costs of sequestration in the coevolutionary
interaction between monarchs and milkweeds. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
Sciences **118**, e2024463118. (doi:doi:10.1073/pnas.2024463118).

[22] Tao, L., Berns, A.R. & Hunter, M.D. 2014 Why does a good thing become too much?
Interactions between foliar nutrients and toxins determine performance of an insect herbivore.
Functional Ecology **28**, 190-196. (doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12163).

[23] Freedman, M.G., Choquette, S.-L., Ramírez, S.R., Strauss, S.Y., Hunter, M.D. &
Vannette, R.L. 2021 Population-specific patterns of toxin sequestration in monarch butterflies
from around the world. *bioRxiv*, 2021.2010.2015.464593. (doi:10.1101/2021.10.15.464593).

[24] Brower, L.P. 1969 Ecological chemistry. *Scientific American* **220**, 22-29.

[25] Brower, L.P. 1972 Ecological Chemistry of Palatability Cardiac Glycoside Spectrum in
Monarch Butterflies, Danaus-Plexippus, and Asclepias Milkweeds. *American Zoologist* **12**,
712-713.

[26] Züst, T., Petschenka, G., Hastings, A.P. & Agrawal, A.A. 2019 Toxicity of Milkweed
Leaves and Latex: Chromatographic Quantification Versus Biological Activity of
Cardenolides in 16 Asclepias Species. *J Chem Ecol* **45**, 50-60. (doi:10.1007/s10886-018-
1040-3).

[27] Soule, A.J., Decker, L.E. & Hunter, M.D. 2020 Effects of diet and temperature on
monarch butterfly wing morphology and flight ability. *Journal of Insect Conservation* **24**,
961-975. (doi:10.1007/s10841-020-00267-7).

[28] Woods, E.C., Hastings, A.P., Turley, N.E., Heard, S.B. & Agrawal, A.A. 2012 Adaptive
geographical clines in the growth and defense of a native plant. *Ecological Monographs* **82**,
149-168. (doi:https://doi.org/10.1890/11-1446.1).

[29] Freedman, M.G., Jason, C., Ramírez, S.R. & Strauss, S.Y. 2020 Host plant adaptation
during contemporary range expansion in the monarch butterfly. *Evolution* **74**, 377-391.
(doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.13914).

[30] Pocius, V.M., Debinski, D.M., Pleasants, J.M., Bidne, K.G., Hellmich, R.L. & Brower,
L.P. 2017 Milkweed Matters: Monarch Butterfly (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae) Survival and
Development on Nine Midwestern Milkweed Species. *Environ. Entomol.* **46**, 1098-1105.
(doi:10.1093/ee/nvx137).

[31] Zalucki, M.P. & Brower, L.P. 1992 Survival of first instar larvae ofDanaus plexippus
(Lepidoptera: Danainae) in relation to cardiac glycoside and latex content ofAsclepias
humistrata (Asclepiadaceae). *CHEMOECOLOGY* **3**, 81-93. (doi:10.1007/BF01245886).

[32] Blount, J.D. & Pike, T.W. 2012 Deleterious effects of light exposure on immunity and
sexual coloration in birds. *Functional Ecology* **26**, 37-45. (doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-
2435.2011.01926.x).

[33] Malcolm, S.B. & Zalucki, M.P. 1996 Milkweed latex and cardenolide induction may
resolve the lethal plant defence paradox. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Symposium*
on Insect-Plant Relationships (eds. E. Städler, M. Rowell-Rahier & R. Bauer), pp. 193-196.
Dordrecht, Springer Netherlands.

[34] Rasmann, S., Agrawal, A.A., Cook, S.C. & Erwin, A.C. 2009 Cardenolides, induced
responses, and interactions between above- and belowground herbivores of milkweed
(Asclepias spp.). *Ecology* **90**, 2393-2404. (doi:10.1890/08-1895.1).

[35] Fink, L.S., Brower, L.P., Waide, R.B. & Spitzer, P.R. 1983 Overwintering Monarch
Butterflies as Food for Insectivorous Birds in Mexico. *Biotropica* **15**, 151-153.

[36] Vorobyev, M. & Osorio, D. 1998 Receptor noise as a determinant of colour thresholds.
Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. B-Biol. Sci. **265**, 351-358.

[37] Maia, R., Gruson, H., Endler, J.A. & White, T.E. 2019 pavo 2: New tools for the spectral
and spatial analysis of colour in r. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **10**, 1097-1107.
(doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13174).

[38] Hart, N.S., Partridge, J.C., Cuthill, I.C. & Bennett, A.T.D. 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-*
Sens. Neural Behav. Physiol. **186**, 375-387.

[39] Silvasti, S.A., Valkonen, J.K. & Nokelainen, O. 2021 Behavioural thresholds of blue tit
colour vision and the effect of background chromatic complexity. *Vision Research* **182**, 46-
57. (doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2020.11.013).

[40] Osorio, D. & Vorobyev, M. 2005 Photoreceptor spectral sensitivities in terrestrial
animals: adaptations for luminance and colour vision. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of*
London, Series B **272**, 1745-1752.

[41] Lenth, R.V. 2009 Response-Surface Methods in R, Using rsm. *Journal of Statistical*
Software **32**, 1 - 17. (doi:10.18637/jss.v032.i07).

[42] Erickson, J.M. 1973 The Utilization of Various Asclepias Species by Larvae
of the Monarch Butterfly, Danaus Plexippus. *Psyche* **80**, 028693.
(doi:10.1155/1973/28693).

[43] Zalucki, M.P., Brower, L.P. & Alonso, A. 2001 Detrimental effects of latex and cardiac
glycosides on survival and growth of first-instar monarch butterfly larvae Danaus plexippus
feeding on the sandhill milkweed Asclepias humistrata. *Ecological Entomology* **26**, 212-224.

[44] Guilford, T. & Dawkins, M.S. 1993 Are warning colors handicaps? *Evolution* **47**, 400.

[45] Hill, G.E. 2011 Condition-dependent traits as signals of the functionality of vital cellular
processes. *Ecol Lett* **14**, 625-634. (doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01622.x).

[46] Costantini, D., Fanfani, A. & Dell'omo, G. 2008 Effects of corticosteroids on oxidative
damage and circulating carotenoids in captive adult kestrels (Falco tinnunculus). *J Comp*
Physiol B **178**, 829-835. (doi:10.1007/s00360-008-0270-z).

[47] Harborne, J.B. & Williams, C.A. 2001 Anthocyanins and other flavonoids. *Natural*
product reports, **18**, 310-333.

[48] Enayati, A.A., Ranson, H. & Hemingway, J. 2005 Insect glutathione transferases and
insecticide resistance. *Insect Mol Biol* **14**, 3-8. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-2583.2004.00529.x).

[49] Ito, S. & Prota, G. 1977 A facile one-step synthesis of cysteinyldopas using mushroom
tyrosinase. *Experientia* **33**, 1118-1119. (doi:10.1007/bf01946005).

[50] SHAMIM, G., RANJAN, K.S., PANDEY, M.D. & RAMANI, R. 2014 Biochemistry
and biosynthesis of insect pigments. *EJE* **111**, 149-164.

[51] Costantini, D. & Verhulst, S. 2009 Does high antioxidant capacity indicate low oxidative
stress? *Functional Ecology* **23**, 506-509. (doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-
2435.2009.01546.x).

[52] Blount, J.D., Rowland, H.M., Drijfhout, F.P., Endler, J.A., Inger, R., Sloggett, J.J.,
Hurst, G.D.D., Hodgson, D.J. & Speed, M.P. 2012 How the ladybird got its spots: effects of
resource limitation on the honesty of aposematic signals. *Functional Ecology* **26**, 334-342.
(doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2012.01961.x).

[53] Santiago, C., Green, N.F., Hamilton, N., Endler, J.A., Osorio, D.C., Marshall, N.J. &
Cheney, K.L. 2020 Does conspicuousness scale linearly with colour distance? A test using
reef fish. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **287**, 20201456.
(doi:doi:10.1098/rspb.2020.1456).

[54] Jones, P.L., Petschenka, G., Flacht, L. & Agrawal, A.A. 2019 Cardenolide Intake,
Sequestration, and Excretion by the Monarch Butterfly along Gradients of Plant Toxicity and
Larval Ontogeny. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **45**, 264-277. (doi:10.1007/s10886-019-
01055-7).

[55] Brower, L.P., Nelson, C.J., Seiber, J.N., Fink, L.S. & Bond, C. 1988 Exaptation as an
alternative to coevolution in the cardenolide-based chemical defense of monarch butterflies
(*Danaus plexippus L.*) against avian predators. In *Chemical mediation of coevolution* (ed.
K.C. Spencer). London, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

[56] Bowers, M.D. 1992 The evolution of unpalatability and the cost of chemical defense in
insects. . In *Insect chemical ecology: an evolutionary approach. Chapman & Hall, New York,*
New York, USA. (eds. B.D. Roitberg & M.B. Isman), pp. 216–244.

[57] Pokharel, P., Steppuhn, A. & Petschenka, G. 2021 Dietary cardenolides enhance growth
and change the direction of the fecundity-longevity trade-off in milkweed bugs (Heteroptera:
Lygaeinae). *Ecology and evolution* **11**, 18042-18054. (doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.8402).

[58] Petschenka, G. & Agrawal, A.A. 2015 Milkweed butterfly resistance to plant toxins is
linked to sequestration, not coping with a toxic diet. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*
Biological Sciences **282**. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2015.1865).

[59] Seiber, J.N., Benson, J.M., Roeske, C.A. & Brower, L.P. 1975 Qualitative and
Quantitative Aspects of Milkweed Cardenolide Sequestering by Monarch Butterflies.
Abstracts of Papers of the American Chemical Society **170**, 103-103.

[60] Roeske, C.N., Seiber, J.N., Brower, L.P. & Moffitt, C.M. 1976 Milkweed Cardenolides
and Their Comparative Processing by Monarch Butterflies (Danaus plexippus L.). In
Biochemical Interaction Between Plants and Insects (eds. J.W. Wallace & R.L. Mansell), pp.
93-167. Boston, MA, Springer US.

[61] Faldyn, M.J., Hunter, M.D. & Elderd, B.D. 2018 Climate change and an invasive,
tropical milkweed: an ecological trap for monarch butterflies. *Ecology* **99**, 1031-1038.
(doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.2198).

[62] Agrawal, A. 2017 *Monarchs and Milkweed*
A Migrating Butterfly, a Poisonous Plant, and Their Remarkable Story of Coevolution,
Princeton University Press.

[63] Geest, E.A., Wolfenbarger, L.L. & McCarty, J.P. 2019 Recruitment, survival, and
parasitism of monarch butterflies (Danaus plexippus) in milkweed gardens and conservation
areas. *Journal of Insect Conservation* **23**, 211-224. (doi:10.1007/s10841-018-0102-8).

[64] Malcolm, S.B., Cockrell, B.J. & Brower, L.P. 1989 Cardenolide Fingerprint of Monarch
Butterflies Reared on Common Milkweed, Asclepias-Syriaca-L. *Journal of Chemical*
Ecology **15**, 819-853.

[65] Brower, L.P., Brower, J.V.Z. & Corvino, J.M. 1967 Plant poisons in terrestrial food
chain. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **57**, 893-898.
606

Figure 1. The resource allocation trade off model by Blount et al (2009) predicts that

individual prey acquire antioxidant resources from their environment (represented by the

circle resource pool), which they divide via genetically or physiologically controlled flow

rates (f) between sequestering defensive toxins (red circle) and in using antioxidant to

producing pigments used for warning signals (orange circle). Each individual or population

has access to a given level of resources (represented by the size of the circle) that they

allocate to each defence type. In scenario (a) prey allocate resources equally to colour and

toxicity. Those with more resources are able to allocate more resources than prey with a

smaller resource pool which results in (c) a positive correlation between colour and toxicity,

with only the most resource rich prey having the most colourful and toxic defences. In

scenario (b) resource availability is very high for some prey (represented by the largest circle

resource pool) and, in this situation, those prey with excess resources invest more in toxins

than warning signals (represented by the larger f and red circle), and results in (d) a negative

correlation between colour and toxicity. Blount et al (2009) suggest that this is because

highly toxic prey can protect themselves sufficiently even with low levels of warning

colours.

Figure 2. cardenolide sequestration by monarchs feeding on *Ascelpias tuberosa* (AT), *A.*

Incarnata (AI), *A. Syriaca* (AS), and *A. curassavica* (AC); a) total cardenolide (µg total

cardenolides per 0.1 g tissue) measured in the wings and bodies, b) body cardenolide content,

c) wing cardenolide content. Boxplots show the median, interquartile range, and the whiskers

represent the largest and smallest value within 1.5 times the 25th and 75th percentile. Outliers

are represented by small black dots. The mean cardenolide concentration is represented by

the larger black dot.

Figure 3. Total cardenolide concentration for males (filled triangle) and females (open circle)

and Malondialdehyde (MDA) concentration. Line is the smoothed conditional mean with

95% confidence intervals.

Figure 4. Three-dimensional surface (perspective) plot for the response surface predicting

the relationship between the conspicuousness of the male monarch's forewing, oxidative

damage measured as malondialdehyde (MDA), and total cardenolide concentration.

Table 1 The four species of Asclepias used in thh rearing experiments with descriptions of

their use by monarchs and phytochemistry.

Ascelpias species	Description and cardenolide content
Ascelpias curassavica	A critical hostplant worldwide and contains a diversity of cardenolides, including apolar voruscharin which is detrimental to monarch performance [21, 59-62]
A. syriaca (common milkweed)	Principal native food plant of the monarch east of the Rocky Mountains and is characterized by more polar cardenolides though also contains the apolar labriformin [63, 64]
A. incarnata (swamp milkweed)	Preferred hostplant in the Midwest USA and has low concentrations of cardenolides [58];

A. tuberosa (butterfly milkweed)	An occasional native foodplant in the wild with low concentrations of cardenolides [21, 65]

639   Figure 1

644   Figure 2a, b, c.

646   Figure 3

648   Figure 4

650