1 **Title:**

2 Adaptive divergence in brain composition between ecologically distinct
3 incipient species

4

5 **Authors:**

6 Stephen H. Montgomery^{1*}

7 Richard M. Merrill²

8

9 **Affiliations:**

10 ¹ Dept. Genetics, Evolution & Environment, University College London, Gower
11 Street, London, UK, WC1E 6BT

12 ² Dept. Zoology, University of Cambridge, Downing Street, Cambridge, UK, CB2
13 3EJ

14

15 * **Corresponding author:** Stephen.Montgomery@cantab.net

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34 **Abstract:**

35 During ecological speciation diverging populations are exposed to contrasting sensory
 36 and spatial information that present new behavioral and perceptive challenges. Here,
 37 we investigate how brain composition evolves during the early stages of speciation.
 38 The incipient species pair, *Heliconius erato cyrbia* and *H. himera*, have parapatric
 39 ranges across an environmental and altitudinal gradient. Despite continuing gene-
 40 flow, these species have divergent ecological, behavioral and physiological traits. We
 41 demonstrate that these incipient species also differ significantly in brain composition,
 42 especially in the size of sensory structures. *H. erato* has larger visual components
 43 whilst *H. himera* invests more heavily in olfaction. These differences are not
 44 explained by environmentally-induced plasticity, but reflect non-allometric shifts in
 45 brain structure. Our results suggest the adaptive evolution of brain structure and
 46 function play an important role in facilitating the emergence of ecologically distinct
 47 species, and imply that plasticity alone may be insufficient to meet the demands of
 48 novel environments.

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

Introduction

Local adaptation following the colonization of novel environments promotes the origin of new species^{1,2}. During the early stages of this process, diverging populations are exposed to contrasting sensory and spatial information that present new behavioral and perceptive challenges. These can be met by changes in brain function, often reflected in differential investment in brain components³. Analyses across phylogenetically disperse species suggest that adaptive changes in brain composition are driven by selection to meet the demands of a species' ecology^{4,5}. In contrast, recent intraspecific studies highlight the potential for neural plasticity to facilitate optimization of brain composition to local conditions⁶⁻⁹. Little is known about the role of brain evolution and plasticity at the intersection of these evolutionary scales when new species emerge from locally specialized populations.

The role of plasticity during ecological speciation continues to be controversial¹⁰. Plasticity can increase fitness in new environmental conditions^{7,8,11,12}, particularly after rapid environmental change¹³. Plasticity in trade-offs between sensory modalities could also facilitate rapid adaptation to contrasting niches without changing the energetic cost of sensory processing¹⁴. By promoting survival, adaptive plasticity could either facilitate speciation by enabling persistent exposure to contrasting environmental conditions, or inhibit speciation by facilitating local adaptation without the evolution of reproductive isolation^{8,12,15}. Plasticity can also be costly⁷, particularly for energetically expensive neural tissue¹⁶. The benefits of plasticity may therefore be absent or transient depending on population dynamics and fitness landscape^{17,18}. Indeed, plasticity may be maladaptive if populations are pushed further from fitness optima, increasing the strength of selection for heritable adaptations¹⁵. A shortage of case-studies has so far prohibited the resolution of this debate.

Here, we provide a novel case study focused on the roles of adaptation and plasticity in brain composition during the early stages of speciation in *Heliconius* butterflies. Speciation in *Heliconius* often involves selection favouring ecological divergence¹⁹ and a number of extant taxon-pairs provide 'snap-shots' of this process at different stages of completion^{20,21}. We studied one example involving two incipient species of *Heliconius* butterfly that have recently diverged across an environmental gradient, and reflect the transition from polymorphic races to species; *H. himera* and *H. erato cyrba*. *H. himera* is an incipient species emerging from within the *H. erato*

clade²². Unlike low altitude races of *H. erato*, which are typically found in large-leaved secondary wet forest, *H. himera* is endemic to high altitude dry forest in the western border of Ecuador and Peru²³. This parapatric distribution across an altitudinal gradient is maintained by strong selection²⁴, and exposes individuals to different environmental conditions, including the distribution and intensity of different wavelengths of light, average rainfall and daily temperature range^{25–27}. These contrasting abiotic conditions in turn shape differences in forest and foliage type, the ecological communities and predators individuals experience.

Adaptation to these contrasting environments has played a central role in driving speciation in these butterflies^{24–27}. In *H. erato* and *H. himera*, strong divergent ecological selection, imposed by frequency-dependent predation of rare *Heliconius* warning patterns^{28,29}, is augmented by assortative mating^{27,30,31}. Both migrant and hybrid individuals are thought to suffer fitness costs when poorly matched to their environment, due to behavioural or physiological divergence²⁷. This ecological specialization in habitat preference persists despite ongoing gene flow across a narrow contact zone, and in which 5–10% of individuals are of hybrid origin^{24,25}. High rates of hybridization emphasize the recent origin of *H. himera*. For example, the frequency of hybrids observed between the sympatric species pair *H. melpomene* and *H. cydno*, which diverged ~1 million years ago³², is less than 0.1%³³.

Recently, the size of brain components in *Heliconius* have been shown to have significant amounts of ontogenetic and environmentally-induced plasticity³⁴, which could potentially facilitate specialisation to contrasting habitats during the early stages of ecological speciation. Contrary to this hypothesis, we instead demonstrate that ecological divergence has favoured adaptive shifts in the relative size of multiple brain components between *H. himera* and *H. erato*. These species differences cannot be explained solely by environmentally induced plasticity, suggesting heritable adaptations in brain structure and function have contributed to the emergence of *H. himera*.

130
131

132 **Results and Discussion**

133 We collected *H. himera* and *H. erato cyrbia* from the forests around Vilcabamba and
134 Balsas Canton, respectively, in Southern Ecuador (Fig. 1). These populations lie
135 either side of a narrow hybrid zone and have previously been studied to demonstrate

divergence in habitat, ecology, behaviour and life history^{25–27,31}. We quantified variation in the size of 13 major brain components, or ‘neuropils’, along with the remaining volume of the central brain (henceforth rCBR) from 16 individuals of each species using immunofluorescence staining and 3D image segmentation³⁵. These include the major visual and olfactory neuropils, as well as the mushroom bodies, structures linked to learning and memory³⁶, and components of the central complex, a multimodal integration and action selection center^{37–39}.

143

144 *Divergence in brain composition*

Despite finding no significant differences between *H. himera* and *H. e. cyrbia* in the overall volume of the central brain ($t_{30} = 0.688$, $p = 0.497$) or total neuropil volume ($t_{30} = 0.705$, $p = 0.487$), a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) revealed marked divergence in brain composition between the two species. Using volumetric data for 13 neuropil and rCBR from 32 wild individuals, our PCA resulted in four major Principal Components (wPC), together explaining a total of 77.4% of the total variance. Of these, wPC2 (18.183% Var; $F_1 = 33.840$, $p < 0.001$) and wPC4 (8.182% Var; $F_1 = 9.691$, $p = 0.004$) were significantly associated with species identity (ANOVA controlling for sex) (Fig. 2A). This result is supported by a Discriminant Function Analysis (DFA), where the two species were separated along a single significant Discriminant Function (DF) (Wilks $\lambda = 0.165$, $\chi^2 = 39.664$, $p < 0.001$; Figure 2B) with 90% of individuals assigned to the correct species group with a high degree of confidence ($p < 0.05$). Re-analysis with four groups (species + sex), or on males and females separately, produced similar results (Supplemental Information). Across these multivariate analyses, components of the visual pathway including the medulla, lobula and lobula plate which are involved in processing of light, colour and movement, and the antennal lobe, the primary olfactory structure in the insect brain, had consistently strong contributions to PCs or DFs that separate *H. himera* and *H. e. cyrbia* (Supplemental Information).

To further explore how individual neuropil contribute to species differences in brain composition, we next examined the scaling relationship between each neuropil and an independent measure of overall brain size (the unsegmented central brain; rCBR). The standard allometric scaling relationship ($\log y = \beta \log x + \alpha$) provides a means to test for significant shifts in the allometric exponent (β) or scaling factor (α)

169 between species, which together describe the relationship between two traits.
 170 Conserved scaling relationships are typically interpreted as indicating the presence of
 171 some constraint that results in covariance between variables. This constraint may arise
 172 from shared developmental mechanisms (or pleiotropy), or be due to selective
 173 covariance to maintain a constant level of functional integration⁴⁰. Deviation from a
 174 shared scaling relationship can therefore indicate an adaptive change in the functional
 175 relationship between two phenotypes⁴¹.

176 The majority of neuropil in the optic lobes display non-allometric shifts in
 177 scaling with rCBR between species (Supplementary Information). After correcting for
 178 multiple tests using the false-discovery rate⁴² (for 13 neuropils), both the medulla
 179 (FDR-p < 0.001) and lobula plate (FDR-p = 0.026) show significant grade-shifts
 180 between species (difference in α), whilst the lobula shows a species difference in β
 181 (FDR-p = 0.026) (Fig. 2C-D). There is also some support for the accessory medulla
 182 displaying a grade-shift (nominal-p = 0.044). In all cases these differences result in an
 183 increase in the size of these structures in *H. e. cyrbia*. In contrast, we identified two
 184 central brain neuropil, the antennal lobe (FDR-p = 0.042) and the posterior optic
 185 tubercle (FDR-p < 0.001), which show grade-shifts towards larger volumes in *H.*
 186 *himera* (Fig. 2E-F). These differences in scaling relationships reflect substantial
 187 differences in volume. For example, for a given brain volume the medulla and lobula
 188 will be 12.3% and 18.2% larger in *H. e. cyrbia* respectively, whilst in *H. himera* the
 189 antennal lobe will be 14.5% larger and the posterior optic tubercle 22.6% larger.

190 The results of our scaling analyses are largely consistent regardless of whether
 191 sexes are pooled or considered separately, or whether rCBR or an alternative measure
 192 of overall size (total neuropil minus the neuropil of interest) is used (Supplemental
 193 Information). Importantly, because neither rCBR nor total brain size vary between
 194 species, these differences represent changes in the volume of individual neuropil, not
 195 a concerted size change affecting all neuropil, or a shift in rCBR volume.

196

197 *Covariance and composite adaptations*

198 Our analyses demonstrate that at least three of the six neuropil in the optic lobes are
 199 larger in *H. erato*. These neuropil process visual information and are both functionally
 200 interdependent and physically connected by projection neurons^{43,44}. It is therefore
 201 likely that if one component expands, this would have knock-on effects on other
 202 neuropils. We analysed patterns of covariance between visual neuropils using linear

multiple regressions (controlling for species and sex) to assess whether the change in scaling relationships for multiple individual optic lobe neuropils reflect independent adaptations. This revealed that the six neuropil form a co-varying network (Fig. 2G), partially reflecting patterns of connectivity⁴³. Correcting for this covariance, the association with species only remains significant for the medulla. This suggests changes in medulla size may be driving changes elsewhere in optic lobe. For example, medulla volume strongly co-varies with lobula plate volume ($p = 0.003$), but also shows some evidence of co-variance with lobula volume ($p = 0.069$; Supplemental Information).

We further investigated this possibility by examining the pairwise scaling relationships between medulla, lobula, lobula plate and accessory medulla. Consistent with the conclusion that variation in the size of the medulla drives changes in lobula plate size these neuropil show a major-axis shift between species along a conserved scaling relationship (Wald $\chi^2 = 5.105$, $p = 0.024$). However, there is also evidence of species differences in scaling exponent between the lobula and both the medulla and lobula plate (Likelihood Ratio = 12.275, $p < 0.001$ and LR = 5.039, $p = 0.025$ respectively). The accessory medulla volume shows a grade-shift in scaling with the medulla, lobula and lobula plate, consistent with a lesser effect of species identity on this neuropil (all $p < 0.001$; Supplemental Information). These analyses suggest that the species differences in size of the medulla and lobula plate may constitute a concerted adaptation, maintaining but expanding their functional relationship, whilst altering their functional association with the lobula.

We identify one co-varying network amongst components of the central brain; between antennal lobe volume, the mushroom body lobes and the mushroom body calyx. This may reflect the well-established role of the mushroom bodies in olfactory learning⁴⁵. We found no significant association between antennal lobe and posterior optic tubercle volume, or between either of these neuropils and medulla (Supplementary Information), indicating that these may reflect functionally independent adaptations.

Plasticity does not explain species differences

Plasticity in the neural development and behavior has been implicated in facilitating local adaptation and catalyzing speciation by promoting survival in novel habitats^{7,8,18,46}. Several recent studies suggest plasticity in the development of brain

composition contributes to locally adapted ecological morphs within species^{6,9}. However, plasticity has significant costs⁷ and the net benefits may therefore be transitory¹⁸.

Heliconius brains show significant amounts of environment-dependent and independent post-eclosion growth³⁴. To test whether plasticity explains the differences we observe between *H. erato* and *H. himera*, we obtained data for an additional 10 individuals of each species reared in a common environment and repeated the analyses described above. These individuals were the progeny of females collected at the same populations as our wild individuals. First, a PCA of all neuropil volumes separated the variance across 4 PCs (iPC). Of these, iPC1 (35.068% Var, $F_1 = 9.887$, $p = 0.006$) and iPC2 (17.672% Var, $F_1 = 17.672$, $p = 0.001$) were significantly associated with species identity. Similar results were obtained when wild and insectary reared individuals were analysed together (Fig. 3; Supplemental Information).

We assessed whether the neuropils contributing to these iPCs were the same as those contributing to wPC2 and wPC4 in the wild caught samples by using a regression analysis of the loading coefficients for each neuropil. Loadings of neuropil on iPC1 from the insectary-reared analysis were significantly associated with loadings on both PCs associated with species from the wild analyses (wPC2: $t_9 = 3.438$, $p = 0.007$; wPC4: $t_9 = 2.440$, $p = 0.037$). Loadings on iPC2 are also significantly associated with loadings on wPC2 (wPC2: $t_9 = -1.309$, $p = 0.223$; wPC4: $t_9 = -3.223$, $p = 0.001$). Neither iPC1 or iPC2 show any association with wPC1 or wPC3 which do not vary between species (all $p > 0.100$). A DFA also shows strong support for species differences (Wilks $\lambda = 0.028$, $\chi^2 = 39.456$, $p < 0.001$) and correctly assigns 100% of insectary-reared individuals to the correct species group with a high degree of confidence ($p < 0.001$). The DF coefficients again implicate the visual neuropil and posterior optic tubercle as potential contributors to this difference (Supplemental Information). Together these collective results strongly imply that the relative contribution of each neuropil to the species differences in brain composition in the comparison between insectary-reared individuals is similar to that between wild individuals.

Further analyses of the scaling relationships between each neuropil and rCBR largely confirm this conclusion. We identify the same grade-shifts towards larger

volumes in *H. e. cyrbia* in medulla, lobula and lobula plate, and also in two further neuropil in the optic lobes; the lamina and ventral lobula (all FDR-p < 0.05; Supplemental Information). However, grade-shifts against central brain volume are not found for the antennal lobe or posterior optic tubercle. Although these are recovered using total neuropil volume as an alternative variable, this may indicate some contribution of species differences in plasticity to the results uncovered in wild individuals (Supplemental Information).

Divergence in neuropil volume suggests a shift in the importance of sensory modalities

Our results imply a shift in investment in different sensory modalities in *H. e. cyrbia* and *H. himera* that may relate to their preferred habitat type. *H. e. cyrbia* invests in larger visual neuropil than *H. himera*, most notably the medulla, lobula and lobula plate. These neuropil have specific roles in processing visual information. In other insects the medulla plays a role in the parallelization of photoreceptor signals⁴³ but also contains many processing elements with dual roles in colour-vision and motion detection pathways^{47–49}. The lobula and lobula plate integrate visual information to extract abstract features such as shape and motion; for example the lobula plate is the primary site for motion computation in insects and tracking in the optic lobe, whilst the lobula has been linked to escape and chasing behavior⁵⁰. Notably, the cellular architecture of the lobula plate is known to vary extensively across species in association with differences in flight behavior⁵¹. Given the difference in forest type inhabited by *H. himera* and *H. e. cyrbia* the volumetric difference in these components may reflect contrasting demands of visual and/or spatial information related to the density of vegetation or leaf size, and subsequent changes in light intensity and polarization.

In contrast, *H. himera* has higher levels of relative investment in the primary olfactory neuropil, the antennal lobe. Antennal lobes are comprised of glomeruli that are innervated by axons from olfactory sensory neurons in the antennae, which expresses olfactory receptors⁵². These glomeruli are arranged around the antennal lobe hub where information from different glomeruli are integrated to create a combinatorial code for odour cues⁵³. The number of glomeruli is relatively constant across Lepidoptera⁵⁴, including *Heliconius*³⁴. Across more distantly related butterflies variation in antennal lobe size is disproportionately due to variation in the volume of

the antennal lobe hub³⁴. This suggests the complexity of neuronal branching in the antennal lobe hub, which likely reflects the complexity of the combinatorial code, dominates over changes in odour sensitivity, which is reflected by the volume of glomeruli³⁴. Relative to central brain size, both the antennal lobe glomeruli (Wald $\chi^2 = 5.674$, $p = 0.017$) and hub (Wald $\chi^2 = 11.106$, $p < 0.001$) are expanded in wild *H. himera*, whilst maintaining a constant scaling relationship (β -shift LR < 0.001 , $p = 0.991$; α -shift Wald $\chi^2 = 0.940$, $p = 0.330$). This may suggest the foraging or reproductive behavior of *H. himera* has a greater reliance on olfactory sensitivity, without changes in the complexity of olfactory repertoire utilized. The second striking expansion in *H. himera* is in one of the smallest components of the central complex, the posterior optic tubercle. In other insects, this neuropil receives a variety of inputs, including visual information from the accessory medulla, as well as mechanosensory and chemosensory information from the antennal lobes and other body parts³⁷. Although we did not find statistical support for covariation in antennal lobe and posterior optic tubercle volume, the expansion of the posterior optic tubercle could conceivably reflect an increased input from the antennal lobe.

Finally, we note that our results mirror those found across more distantly related Lepidoptera with more extreme differences in ecology. For example, nocturnal moths and diurnal butterflies can be distinguished on the basis of differential expansion of the antennal lobe or medulla and lobula system^{34,54}. Similarly, the Neotropical diurnal butterfly *Godyris zavaleta*, which is found in dark inner-forest has increased investment in the antennal lobe relative to *Heliconius* or *Danaus* which occupy habitats with greater light intensity^{34,54}. This suggests similar selective pressures associated with divergent sensory environments may be shaping Lepidopteron brain composition across short and long evolutionary time-scales.

Conclusion

Speciation across environmental gradients demands local adaptation to distinct environments^{1,2}. By focusing on a pair of incipient species we have demonstrated that this exerts selective pressure on brain composition, resulting in significant non-allometric shifts in a specific suite of brain components. Under the assumption that scaling relationships reflect stabilising selection to maintain developmental or functional associations, these non-allometric changes are likely to be driven by selection for adaptive divergence, rather than being the result of phenotypic drift.

Although plasticity may facilitate ecological divergence initially⁶⁻⁹, especially where continued gene flow prevents the build up of adaptive alleles, the costs of plasticity are predicted to render this a transitory phase^{7,18}. Our results demonstrate that even at the early stages of speciation, where gene flow persists^{22,24}, plasticity alone cannot explain these species differences. We suggest selection on brain structure and function may commonly play a role in facilitating the early stages of ecological speciation, and that heritable divergence will quickly outweigh the contribution of plasticity.

Experimental Procedures

Animals

Brains of wild-caught individuals were fixed within 5 hours of collection, sampling eight individuals of each sex for both species. Insectary-reared individuals were bred from wild-caught parents and raised on a common hostplant (*Passiflora biflora*) in controlled conditions in cages (c. 1 × 2 × 2 m) of mixed sex and equal densities. Five individuals of each sex were sampled for both species, aged to 10-14 days, when both sexes are sexually mature.

Immunocytochemistry and imaging

Brains were fixed in-situ using a Zinc-Formaldehyde solution, following a published protocol³⁵. Further methodological details and anatomical descriptions of the *Heliconius* brain are available in Montgomery et al.³⁴. Neuropil structure was revealed using immunofluorescence staining against a vesicle-associated protein at presynaptic sites, synapsin (anti-SYNORF1; obtained from the Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank, University of Iowa, Department of Biological Sciences, Iowa City, IA 52242, USA; RRID: AB_2315424) and Cy2-conjugated affinity-purified polyclonal goat anti-mouse IgG (H+L) antibody (Jackson ImmunoResearch Laboratories, West Grove, PA), obtained from Stratech Scientific Ltd., Newmarket, Suffolk, UK (Jackson ImmunoResearch Cat No. 115-225-146, RRID: AB_2307343).

All imaging was performed on a confocal laser-scanning microscope (Leica TCS SP8, Leica Microsystem, Mannheim, Germany) using a 10× dry objective with a numerical aperture of 0.4 (Leica Material No. 11506511), a mechanical z-step of 2 μm and an x-y resolution of 512 × 512 pixels. The z-dimension was scaled 1.52× to

correct the artifactual shortening³⁴. We assigned image regions to brain components using the Amira 5.5 *labelfield* module and defining outlines based on the brightness of the synapsin immunofluorescence. We reconstructed total central brain volume (CBR), six paired neuropils in the optic lobes, six paired and one unpaired neuropils in the central brain (CBR), and measured their volume using the *measure statistics* module. The total volume of segmented structures in the CBR was subtracted from total CBR volume to obtain a measure of unsegmented CBR (rCBR). Due to the lack of volumetric asymmetry in *Heliconius* neuropil³⁴ we measured the volume of paired neuropil from one hemisphere, chosen at random, and multiplied the measured volume by two.

Statistical analyses

Multivariate analyses were performed in SPSS v. 22 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL). Principal Component Analyses (PCA) were performed using segmented structures and rCBR. Species differences in PC values were analyzed using an ANOVA, including species and sex as binary cofactors, in R⁵⁵. We complemented this analysis with a Discriminant Function Analysis (DFA) to test how reliably individuals can be assigned to their respective groups on the basis of their volumetric differences in neuropil. In this analysis, Wilks' λ provides a measure of the proportion of total variance not explained by group differences, and the χ^2 statistic provides a test for significant group differences.

We further explored whether the scaling relationships between each component and rCBR were conserved across *H. himera* and *H. erato cyrbia* using major axis regressions in SMATR v.3.4-3⁵⁶. Using the standard allometric scaling relationship: $\log y = \beta \log x + \alpha$, we performed tests for significant shifts in the allometric slope (β) between the species. This was followed by two further tests which assume a common slope: 1) for differences in α that suggest discrete 'grade-shifts' in the relationship between two variables, 2) for major axis-shifts along a common slope. Covariance between neuropils was investigated using multiple regression. All volumes were log₁₀-transformed before data analysis.

Author Contributions

403 Study conception and fieldwork: SHM and RMM. Insectary rearing: RMM.
404 Dissections, acquisition of image data, analysis, interpretation and initial manuscript
405 draft: SHM. Final interpretation and drafting: SHM and RMM.

406

407 **Acknowledgements**

408 We thank the Ministerio del Ambiente del Ecuador for permission to collect
409 butterflies. SHM was supported by research fellowships from the Royal Commission
410 for the Exhibition of 1851 and the Leverhulme Trust, a Royal Society Research Grant
411 (RG110466) and a British Ecological Society Early Career Project Grant. RMM was
412 supported by a Junior Research Fellowship at King's College, Cambridge, and
413 funding from the Bedford Fund. We are also grateful to Chris Jiggins for providing
414 insectary space and Swidbert Ott for discussions on insect brain evolution.

415

416 **References**

- 417 1. Nosil, P. *Ecological speciation*. (Oxford University Press, 2012).
- 418 2. Rice, W. R. Speciation via habitat specialization: the evolution of reproductive isolation as a
419 correlated character. *Evol. Ecol.* **12**, 301–314 (1987).
- 420 3. Striedter, G. F. *Principles of brain evolution*. (Sinauer Associates, 2005).
- 421 4. de Winter, W. & Oxnard, C. E. Evolutionary radiations and convergences in the structural
422 organization of mammalian brains. *Nature* **409**, 710–4 (2001).
- 423 5. Barton, R. a & Harvey, P. H. Mosaic evolution of brain structure in mammals. *Nature* **405**,
424 1055–8 (2000).
- 425 6. Gonda, A., Herczeg, G. & Merilä, J. Population variation in brain size of nine-spined
426 sticklebacks (*Pungitius pungitius*)-local adaptation or environmentally induced variation? *BMC*
427 *Evol. Biol.* **11**, 75 (2011).
- 428 7. Snell-Rood, E. C. An overview of the evolutionary causes and consequences of behavioural
429 plasticity. *Anim. Behav.* **85**, 1004–1011 (2013).
- 430 8. Pfennig, D. W. *et al.* Phenotypic plasticity's impacts on diversification and speciation. *Trends*
431 *Ecol. Evol.* **25**, 459–467 (2010).
- 432 9. Eifert, C. *et al.* Brain size variation in extremophile fish: local adaptation versus phenotypic
433 plasticity. *J. Zool.* **295**(2), 143–153 (2011).
- 434 10. Fitzpatrick, J. L. *et al.* Sexual selection uncouples the evolution of brain and body size in
435 pinnipeds. *J. Evol. Biol.* **25**, 1321–1330 (2012).
- 436 11. West-Eberhard, M. J. *Developmental plasticity and evolution*. (Oxford University Press, 2003).
- 437 12. Price, T. D., Qvarnstrom, A. & Irwin, D. E. The role of phenotypic plasticity in driving genetic
438 evolution. *Proc. Roy. Soc. B.* **270**(1523) 1433–1440 (2003).
- 439 13. Lande, R. Adaptation to an extraordinary environment by evolution of phenotypic plasticity
440 and genetic assimilation. *J. Evol. Biol.* **22**, 1435–1446 (2009).
- 441 14. Niven, J. E. & Laughlin, S. B. Energy limitation as a selective pressure on the evolution of
442 sensory systems. *J. Exp. Biol.* **211**(11), 1792–1804 (2008).
- 443 15. Ghalambor, C., McKay, J., Carroll, S. & Reznick, D. Adaptive versus non-adaptive phenotypic
444 plasticity and the potential for contemporary adaptation in new. *Funct. Ecol.* **21**, 394–407

- 445 (2007).
- 446 16. Herculano-Houzel, S. Scaling of brain metabolism with a fixed energy budget per neuron:
447 Implications for neuronal activity, plasticity and evolution. *PLoS One* **6**, (2011).
- 448 17. Ancel, L. W. Undermining the Baldwin expediting effect: Does phenotypic plasticity
449 accelerate evolution? **319**, 307–319 (2000).
- 450 18. Thibert-Plante, X. & Hendry, A. P. The consequences of phenotypic plasticity for ecological
451 speciation. *J. Evol. Biol.* **24**, 326–342 (2011).
- 452 19. Merrill, R. The diversification of *Heliconius* butterflies: what have we learned in 150 years? *J.*
453 *Evol. Biol.* **28**(8), 1417–1438 (2015).
- 454 20. Merrill, R. M. *et al.* Mate preference across the speciation continuum in a clade of mimetic
455 butterflies. *Evolution* **65**, 1489–500 (2011).
- 456 21. Mallet, J., Beltrán, M., Neukirchen, W. & Linares, M. Natural hybridization in heliconiine
457 butterflies: the species boundary as a continuum. *BMC Evol. Biol.* **7**, 28 (2007).
- 458 22. Supple, M. A., Papa, R., Hines, H. M., Mcmillan, W. O. & Counterman, B. A. Divergence with
459 gene flow across a speciation continuum of *Heliconius* butterflies. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 1–12
460 (2015).
- 461 23. Descimon, H. & Mast de Maeght, J. Semispecies relationships between *Heliconius erato*
462 *cyrba* Godt. and *H. himera* Hew. in Southwestern Ecuador. *J. Res. Lepid.* **22**, 229–237 (1983).
- 463 24. Jiggins, C. D., Mcmillan, W. O., King, P. & Mallet, J. The maintenance of species differences
464 across a *Heliconius* hybrid zone. **79**, 495–505 (1997).
- 465 25. Jiggins, C. D., Macmillan, W. O., Neukirchen, W. & Mallet, J. What can hybrid zones tell us
466 about speciation? The case of *Heliconius erato* and *H. himera* (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae).
467 *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* **59**, 221–242 (1996).
- 468 26. Davison, A., Mcmillan, W. O., Griffin, A. S., Jiggins, C. D. & Mallet, J. L. B. Behavioral and
469 physiological differences between two parapatric *Heliconius* Species. *Biotropica* **31**, 661–668
470 (1999).
- 471 27. Mcmillan, W. O., Jiggins, C. D. & Mallet, J. What initiates speciation in passion-vine
472 butterflies? *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **94**, 8628–8633 (1997).
- 473 28. Mallet, J. The genetics of warning colour in Peruvian hybrid zones of *Heliconius erato* and *H.*
474 *melpomene*. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **236**, 163–185 (1989).
- 475 29. Merrill, R. M. *et al.* Disruptive ecological selection on a mating cue. *Proc. Roy. Soc. B*
476 **279**(1749): 4907–4913 (2012).
- 477 30. Mallet, J., Mcmillan, W. O. & Jiggins, C. D. Estimating the mating behavior of a pair of
478 hybridizing *Heliconius* species in the wild. *Evolution* **52**, 503–510 (1998).
- 479 31. Merrill, R. M., Chia, A. & Nadeau, N. J. Divergent warning patterns contribute to assortative
480 mating between incipient *Heliconius* species. *Ecol. Evol.* **4**, 911–917 (2014).
- 481 32. Kozak, K. M., Wahlberg, N., Neild, A. F. E. & Dasmahapatra, K. K. Multilocus species trees
482 show the recent adaptive radiation of the mimetic *Heliconius* butterflies. *Syst. Biol.* **64**, 505–
483 524 (2015).
- 484 33. Mallet, J., McMillan, W. O. & Jiggins, C. D. in *Endless forms species Speciat.* (Howard, D. J.
485 & Berlocher, S. H.) 390–403 (Oxford University Press, 1988).
- 486 34. Montgomery, S. H., Merrill, R. M. & Ott, S. R. Brain composition in *Heliconius* butterflies,
487 post-eclosion growth and experience dependent neuropil plasticity. *J. Comp. Neurol.* in press.
488 See: *bioRxiv* 017913 (2015).
- 489 35. Ott, S. R. Confocal microscopy in large insect brains: zinc-formaldehyde fixation improves
490 synapsin immunostaining and preservation of morphology in whole-mounts. *J. Neurosci.*
491 *Methods* **172**, 220–30 (2008).
- 492 36. Zars, T. Behavioral functions of the insect mushroom bodies. *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* **10**, 790–
493 795 (2000).
- 494 37. Pfeiffer, K. & Homberg, U. Organization and functional roles of the central complex in the
495 insect brain. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* **59**, 165–84 (2014).

- 496 38. Strauss, R. The central complex and the genetic dissection of locomotor behaviour. *Curr. Op.*
497 *Neurobiol.* **12**(6) 633–638 (2002).
- 498 39. Bender, J. A., Pollack, A. J. & Ritzmann, R. E. Neural activity in the central complex of the
499 insect brain is linked to locomotor changes. *Curr. Biol.* **20**, 921–926 (2010).
- 500 40. Armbruster, W. S. & Schwaegerle, K. E. Causes of covariation of phenotypic traits among
501 populations. *J. Evol. Biol.* **9**, 261–276 (1996).
- 502 41. Montgomery, S. H. The human frontal lobes: Not relatively large but still disproportionately
503 important A commentary on Barton and Venditti. *Brain. Behav. Evol.* **82**, 147–149 (2013).
- 504 42. Benjamini, Y. & Hochberg, Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: a practical and powerful
505 approach to multiple testing. *J R Stat Soc Series B* **57**, 289–300 (1995).
- 506 43. Borst, A. *Drosophila*'s view on insect vision review. *Curr. Biol.* **19**, R36–R47 (2009).
- 507 44. Kinoshita, M., Shimohigashi, M., Tominaga, Y., Arikawa, K. & Homberg, U.
508 Topographically distinct visual and olfactory inputs to the mushroom body in the Swallowtail
509 butterfly, *Papilio xuthus*. *J. Comp. Neurol.* **182**, 162–182 (2015).
- 510 45. Heisenberg, M. Mushroom body memoir: from maps to models. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **4**, 266–75
511 (2003).
- 512 46. Sol, D. Revisiting the cognitive buffer hypothesis for the evolution of large brains. *Biol. Lett.* **5**,
513 130–133 (2009).
- 514 47. Morante, J. & Desplan, C. Building a projection map for photoreceptor neurons in the
515 *Drosophila* optic lobes. *Sem. Cell. Biol.* **15**, 137–143 (2004).
- 516 48. Rister, J. *et al.* Dissection of the peripheral motion channel in the visual system of *Drosophila*
517 *melanogaster*. *Neuron* **56**(1); 155–170 (2007). d
- 518 49. Paulk, A. C., Dacks, A. M. & Gronenberg, W. Color processing in the medulla of the
519 bumblebee (Apidae: *Bombus impatiens*). *J. Comp. Neurol.* **513**, 441–456 (2009).
- 520 50. Hausen, K. The lobula-complex of the fly: structure, function and significance in visual
521 behaviour. In *Photoreception Vis. Invertebr.* 523–559 (Springer US, 1984).
- 522 51. Buschbeck, E. K. & Strausfeld, N. J. The relevance of neural architecture to visual
523 performance□: phylogenetic conservation and variation in Dipteran visual aystems. *J. Comp.*
524 *Neruol.* **304**, 282–304 (1997).
- 525 52. Hansson, B. S. & Stensmyr, M. C. Evolution of insect olfaction. *Neuron* **72**, 698–711 (2011).
- 526 53. Malnic, B., Hirono, J., Sato, T., Buck, L. B. & Hughes, H. Combinatorial receptor codes for
527 odors. *Cell* **96**, 713–723 (1999).
- 528 54. Montgomery, S. H. & Ott, S. R. Brain composition in *Godyris zavaleta*, a diurnal butterfly,
529 reflects an increased reliance on olfactory information. *J. Comp. Neurol.* **523**, 869–891 (2015).
- 530 55. R Development Team: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
531 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0. URL <http://www.R-project.org>.
532 (2008).
- 533 56. Warton, D. I., Duursma, R. a., Falster, D. S. & Taskinen, S. smatr 3- an R package for
534 estimation and inference about allometric lines. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **3**, 257–259 (2012).
- 535 57. Rosser, N., Phillimore, A. B., Huertas, B., Willmott, K. R. & Mallet, J. Testing historical
536 explanations for gradients in species richness in heliconiine butterflies of tropical America.
537 *Biol. J. Linn. Soc* **105**(3); 479–497 (2012).

538
539
540
541
542

543 **Figures Legends:**

544

545 **Figure 1: Distribution and ecology of *H. erato cyrbia* and *H. himera*.** A) Colour
546 patterns and key distinguishing features of the habitats of *H. e. cyrbia* (left) and *H.*
547 *himera* (right). B) Approximate distribution of *H. e. cyrbia* (blue) and *H. himera* (red)
548 in southern Ecuador showing the two sample localities, Balsas Canton and
549 Vilcabamba, and the location of the hybrid zone south of Buenavista (Bv) and
550 Chaguarpamba (Cp), but north of Zambi (Za). Geographic ranges are based on
551 published data from Rosser et al.⁵⁷ C) Variation in altitude across a transect illustrated
552 by the grey dashed line in B. D) 3D volumetric models of the neuropil measured in *H.*
553 *e. cyrbia* (left) and *H. himera* (right) viewed from the anterior (top row) and posterior
554 (bottom row). VN: visual neuropil, AL: Antennal Lobe, CC: Central Complex, MB:
555 Mushroom Body.

556

557 **Figure 2: Divergence in brain composition in wild *H. e. cyrbia* and *H. himera*.** A)
558 Biplot between PC2 and PC4, which are both significantly different between species.
559 *H. erato* are in blue, *H. himera* in red. Males are filled circles, females unfilled. B)
560 Separation of species by Discriminant Function Analysis. Asterisks denote group
561 means. C-F) Scaling relationships for all individuals between the central brain (rCBR)
562 and the medulla (ME) (C), lobula (LOB) (D), antennal lobes (AL) (E) and posterior
563 optic tubercle (POTU) (F). G) Patterns of covariance between neuropils in the optic
564 lobe. Significant covariance is shown by solid black lines, with those neuropil with
565 significantly different scaling relationships with rCBR between species shown above
566 (interspecific allometric shifts), and those associated with species in the multiple
567 regression shown below (LMM ~ species). * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

568

569 **Figure 3: Consistent signal of divergence between wild and reared individuals.**
570 A) Biplot of PC2 and PC3 from a pooled analysis of wild (filled circles) and reared
571 individuals (unfilled circles). *H. erato* are in blue, *H. himera* in red. Both PC2
572 (15.230%; Var; $F_1 = 70.670$, $p < 0.001$) and PC3 (13.336%; Var; $F_1 = 26.384$, p
573 < 0.001) show significant differences between species. Asterisks denote group means.
574 B-C) Regressions between the loadings of the measured neuropil on iPCs explaining
575 species differences in reared individuals (x-axis) and wPCs explaining species
576 differences in wild individuals (y-axis; wPC2 = green, wPC4 = grey).

577 **Tables:**

578 **Table 1**

Location ¹	Fig. 1D Key ¹	Neuropil	Allometric scaling						Multivariate analyses (wild)		
			β (slope)		α (y-intercept)		major-axis shift		PCA Loadings		DFA Coefficient
			LR	FDR-p	Wald χ^2	FDR-p	Wald χ^2	FDR-p	PC2	PC4	DF1
OL	VN	Lamina	3.622	0.247	0.386	0.746	0.514	0.653	0.590	-0.117	-0.570
OL	VN	Medulla	0.010	0.922	22.800	<0.001	0.805	0.653	0.608	0.039	2.161
OL	VN	Accessory medulla	2.199	0.359	4.052	0.095	2.917	0.572	-0.466	-0.109	0.254
OL	VN	Lobula	9.959	0.026	11.157	0.004	1.251	0.653	0.774	0.123	0.768
OL	VN	Lobula plate	0.132	0.846	7.034	0.026	1.161	0.653	0.457	0.165	0.267
OL	VN	Ventral lobula	0.281	0.814	0.325	0.746	0.000	0.999	-0.244	0.506	-0.142
CBR	VN	Anterior optic tubercle	2.299	0.359	5.837	0.042	1.766	0.653	-0.052	0.684	-0.251
CBR	AL	Antennal lobes	7.704	0.039	0.210	0.765	0.000	0.999	-0.241	-0.214	-0.968
CBR	MB	Lobes and peduncle	0.371	0.814	0.608	0.746	0.512	0.653	-0.244	0.058	1.005
CBR	MB	Calyx	0.288	0.814	0.027	0.869	0.175	0.799	-0.118	-0.107	-1.181
CBR	CC	Central body	0.238	0.814	0.132	0.777	0.450	0.653	-0.626	0.256	0.904
CBR	CC	Protocerebral bridge	1.463	0.490	0.316	0.746	0.529	0.653	-0.019	-0.201	-0.647
CBR	CC	Posterior optic tubercle	0.012	0.922	13.841	<0.001	5.031	0.325	-0.397	-0.365	-0.032
CBR	-	rCBR	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.243	-0.230	-1.315

579

580 ¹ OL: Optic Lobes, CBR: Central Brain, VN: visual neuropil, AL: Antennal Lobe, MB: Mushroom Body, CC: Central Complex

A

H. erato cyrbia *H. himera*

2 cm

Low altitude
Wet, secondary forest
Large leaved vegetation

High altitude
Dry, semi-arid forest
High T° fluctuations

B

C

D

G