Geographical co-occurrence of butterfly species: The importance of niche filtering by host plant species

Ryosuke Nakadai^{12*†}, Koya Hashimoto^{1*}, Takaya Iwasaki³, Yasuhiro Sato¹⁴

¹Center for Ecological Research, Kyoto University, Hirano 2-509-3, Otsu, Shiga, 520-2113 Japan

²Current address: Faculty of Science, University of the Ryukyus, Senbaru 1, Nishihara, Okinawa, 903-0213 Japan.

³Department of Biological Sciences, Faculty of Science, Kanagawa University, Tsuchiya 2946, Hiratsuka, Kanagawa 259-1293 Japan

⁴Current address: Department of Plant Life Sciences, Faculty of Agriculture, Ryukoku University, Yokotani 1-5, Otsu, Shiga 520-2194 Japan.

*Equal contribution

[†]*Author Correspondence:* R. Nakadai

Faculty of Science, University of the Ryukyus, Senbaru 1, Nishihara, Okinawa 903-0213, Japan.

E-mail: r.nakadai66@gmail.co.jp

Author contributions: RN and KH conceived and designed the study; KH and RN collected the data from the literature; TI conducted the analysis of ecological niche modeling; YS and RN performed the statistical analyses; and RN, KH, YS, and TI wrote the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

25 **Abstract**

26 The relevance of interspecific resource competition in the context of community
 27 assembly by herbivorous insects is a well-known topic in ecology. Most previous
 28 studies focused on local species assemblies, that shared host plants. Few studies
 29 evaluated species pairs within a single taxon when investigating the effects of host plant
 30 sharing at the regional scale. Herein, we explore the effect of plant sharing on the
 31 geographical co-occurrence patterns of 232 butterflies distributed across the Japanese
 32 archipelago; we use two spatial scales (10×10 km and 1×1 km grids) to this end. We
 33 considered that we might encounter one of two predictable patterns in terms of the
 34 relationship between co-occurrence and host sharing among butterflies. On the one hand,
 35 host sharing might promote distributional exclusivity attributable to interspecific
 36 resource competition. On the other hand, sharing of host plants may promote
 37 co-occurrence attributable to filtering by resource niche. At both grid scales, we found
 38 significant negative correlations between host use similarity and distributional
 39 exclusivity. Our results support the hypothesis that the butterfly co-occurrence pattern
 40 across the Japanese archipelago is better explained by filtering via resource niche rather
 41 than interspecific resource competition.

42 **Keywords:** Climatic niche, dispersal ability, herbivorous insect, Japanese archipelago,
 43 taxonomic relatedness

44

45 **Introduction**

46 Efforts to understand community assembly processes are of major importance in
 47 ecological research for obtaining past, current, and future biodiversity information.
 48 Dispersal limitations, environmental filtering via both abiotic and biotic niches, and
 49 interspecific interactions are thought to sequentially determine local community
 50 structures (reviewed by Cavender-Bares et al. 2009). Of the various relevant factors, the
 51 significance of interspecific interaction has often been assessed by examining how
 52 different species co-occur spatially even when they share similar resource niches
 53 (Diamond 1975; Gotelli and McCabe 2002). As different species with similar niches
 54 likely prefer similar environmental habitats, but may compete strongly, recent studies
 55 have often compared the significance of interspecific interactions (in terms of
 56 community assembly patterns) from the viewpoint of niche filtering, which indicates
 57 species sorting via performance and survival rates of each species against both abiotic
 58 (e.g., climate) and biotic (e.g., resource) properties from the species pool (Webb et al.
 59 2002; Mayfield and Levine 2010).

60 In terrestrial ecosystems, many plant species are used by various herbivorous
 61 insects as both food resources and habitats; however, the importance of interspecific
 62 resource competition among herbivorous insects was once largely dismissed (reviewed
 63 by Kaplan and Denno 2007). Although some earlier studies described niche partitioning
 64 between co-occurring herbivores and considered that partitioning was attributable to
 65 interspecific competition (Ueckert and Hansen 1971; Benson 1978, Waloff 1979), other
 66 studies have observed frequent co-occurrence of multiple herbivorous insect species on
 67 shared host plants despite the fact that their niches extensively overlapped (Ross 1957;
 68 Rathcke 1976; Strong 1982; Bultman and Faeth 1985). Several authors have even
 69 argued that interspecific competition among herbivorous insects is too rare to structure
 70 herbivore communities (Lawton and Strong 1981; Strong et al. 1984). In subsequent
 71 decades however, many experimental ecological studies revealed that herbivorous

72 insects do compete with one another, often mediated by plastic changes in plant defense
 73 traits following herbivory (Faeth 1986; Harrison and Karban 1986; Brown and Weis
 74 1995; Agrawal 1999; Agrawal 2000; Viswanathan et al. 2005). These findings have
 75 prompted insect ecologists to revisit exploring the prevalence of interspecific resource
 76 competition in structuring herbivore communities (Kaplan and Denno 2007). Also,
 77 evolutionary studies have pointed out that interspecific resource competition may have
 78 regulated speciation and species diversification of herbivorous insects (Ehrlich and
 79 Raven 1964; Rabosky 2009; Nosil 2012; Thompson 2013). For example, rapid
 80 diversification after host shift to distant relative plants (Fordyce 2010) was recognized
 81 as indirect evidence of diversity regulation by interspecific competition (Ehrlich and
 82 Raven 1964; Rabosky 2009; Nakadai 2017), because the release from diversity
 83 regulation by host shift (i.e., a key innovation and ecological release; Yoder et al. 2010)
 84 may cause following specialization and diversification of herbivorous insects. In this
 85 context, the co-occurrence pattern, especially on a large spatial scale and not within the
 86 local community, is an important indicator for revealing the effects of interspecific
 87 resource competition in herbivore diversification, which eventually feeds back to their
 88 species pool as a bottom-up process (Loreau 2000). However, very little is known about
 89 the extent to which the results of the cited studies can be extrapolated to describe
 90 patterns, at the regional scale, of the distribution of herbivorous insects within a single
 91 taxon.

92 The effects of interspecific competition and filtering via resource niches on the
 93 co-occurrence patterns of herbivorous insects may be obscured by other potential
 94 factors. For example, climatic niches (often associated with differences in potential
 95 geographical distributions in the absence of interspecific interactions; Warren et al.
 96 2008; Takami and Osawa 2016) may drive niche filtering, which may in turn mediate
 97 the impact of host use on assembly patterns, because the distributions of host plants are
 98 also strongly affected by climate niches (Hawkins et al. 2014; Kubota et al. 2017). In

99 addition, taxonomic relatedness should reflect niche similarity; the niche of any
100 organism should be partly determined by its phylogenetic history (Webb et al. 2002).
101 For example, phylogenetic conservatism of host use (i.e., resource niche) in
102 herbivorous insects were often reported (Lopez-Vaamonde et al. 2003; Nyman et al.
103 2010; Jousselin et al. 2013; Doorenweerd et al. 2015). Thus, the outcomes of
104 competition within shared niches should reflect both resource and climatic factors
105 (Mayfield and Levine 2010; Connor et al. 2013). As such factors may correlate with
106 host use by individual species; any focus on host use alone may yield misleading results.
107 Furthermore, dispersal ability may complicate assembly patterns, often being associated
108 with both the extent of the geographical range and other factors (Kneitel and Chase
109 2004). A high dispersal ability may enhance the extent of co-occurrence. Thus, when
110 attempting to explore the effects of competition and filtering via resource niches on
111 distribution patterns, it is important to consider all of taxonomic relatedness, climatic
112 niche preferences, and dispersal ability.

113 In the present study, we explored whether interspecific competition or niche
114 filtering better explained the geographical co-occurrence of a group of herbivorous
115 butterflies. Given that the host specificity of butterflies is relatively high among
116 herbivorous insects (Novotny et al. 2010), butterflies that share a host plant are more
117 likely to be potential competitors for each other than other less specialized herbivores
118 are. Butterfly larvae often consume huge amounts of leaves in the larval stage, and even
119 eat whole material of plants in some cases (Inouye and Johnson 2005; Fei et al. 2016;
120 Hashimoto and Ohgushi 2017). Moreover, it is suggested that not all plants or parts of a
121 plant are suitable for butterfly larvae due to within- and among-individual variations in
122 plant quality (e.g., nutritional status and defensive traits such as secondary metabolites)
123 (Damman 1989; Dempster 1997; Van Zandt and Agrawal 2004). Hence, the observation
124 that most parts of terrestrial plants seem to remain unconsumed (Hairston et al. 1960;
125 Polis 1999) does not necessary mean that butterflies are not facing resource competition.

126 Several studies have examined butterfly–butterfly competition (Brower 1962; Millan et
127 al. 2013), and many have reported interspecific resource competition among
128 herbivorous insects that involved butterfly species (Agrawal 1999; Redman and Scriber
129 2000; Agrawal 2000; Van Zandt and Agrawal 2004; Prior and Hellman 2010). Thus,
130 resource-mediated competition is expected to be prevalent in herbivore butterflies. In
131 particular, we focused on herbivorous butterflies of the Japanese archipelago for the
132 following reasons. First, the Biodiversity Center of Japan has extensive records of
133 butterfly distribution. Second, forewing length (easily measured on photographs) is a
134 useful index of butterfly dispersal ability (Chai and Srygley 1990; Shirôzu 2006).
135 Finally, and most importantly, a great deal is known about the hosts used by butterfly
136 species (Saito et al. 2016). Thus, data on Japanese butterflies can be used to explore the
137 effects of host plant sharing and other factors on the co-occurrence patterns at regional
138 scales.

139 We expected to discern one of two patterns when evaluating the significance
140 of interspecific competition in terms of the geographical co-occurrence of herbivore
141 butterfly. If interspecific resource competition is sufficiently intense to cause
142 competitive exclusion with the precondition that intraspecific competition is
143 comparably low, sharing of host plants would be positively associated with exclusive
144 distribution (Hypothesis 1 in Table 1). Alternatively, if filtering via a resource niche is
145 relatively stronger than resource competition, sharing of host plants would promote
146 species co-occurrence (Hypothesis 2 in Table 1). To distinguish between these two
147 patterns, we examined the correlations between host use similarity (i.e., the extent of
148 sharing of host species) and the exclusiveness of geographical distribution among pairs
149 of entirely herbivorous Japanese butterflies. The former pattern predicts that a positive
150 correlation would be evident between host use similarity and the exclusiveness of
151 geographic distribution. The latter pattern predicts that the correlation would be
152 negative. Furthermore, we also considered taxonomic relatedness, climatic niche

similarities, and overall dispersal abilities in the course of our work as factors affecting the association between host sharing and geographical co-occurrence (major hypotheses are summarized in Table 1).

Materials and methods

Study area

The Japanese archipelago, including the Ryukyu Islands, forms a long chain of continental islands lying off the eastern coast of Asia. The Japanese archipelago was recognized as a hotspot of biodiversity (Gerardo and Brown 1995; Mittermeier et al. 2011) and insect diversity, with about 32,000 insect species recorded (Clausnitzer et al. 2009; Tojo et al. 2017). The latitudinal range of the archipelago (22°N to 45°N) embraces hemi-boreal, temperate, and subtropical zones. The mean temperatures in the coldest and warmest months are −19.0°C and 31.5°C, respectively; the annual precipitation ranges from 867 to 3,908 mm (Kubota et al. 2014).

Study organisms

The Japanese archipelago hosts over 280 species of butterflies of five families (the Papilionidae, Pieridae, Lycaenidae, Nymphalidae, and Hesperidae) (Shirôzu 2006). Over 95% of the larvae of Japanese butterflies feed on plants (Honda 2005). The host plants are diverse and include both dicots and monocots (Saito et al. 2016). Lycaenid butterflies include two non-herbivorous species, but all species of all other families are exclusively herbivorous.

Metadata compilation

Butterfly census data are available on the website of the Biodiversity Center of Japan, Ministry of the Environment (http://www.biodic.go.jp/index_e.html). We used the results of the fourth and fifth censuses (1988 to 1991 and 1997 to 1998, respectively) of

the National Survey of the Natural Environment in Japan
(http://www.biodic.go.jp/kiso/15/do_kiso4.html). This database includes records of 273 species/subspecies of butterflies from the entire Japanese archipelago, in grid cells of latitude 5 min and longitude 7.5 min (the Japanese Standard Second Mesh). These grid dimensions are about 10 km $\times$ 10 km, and this grid is described below as the “10-km grid.” Furthermore, the Biodiversity Center also contains records from grid cells of latitude 30 s and longitude 45 s (the Japanese Standard Third Mesh). These grid dimensions are about 1 km $\times$ 1 km, and this grid is described below as the “1-km grid.” As processes driving community assemblies may vary between spatial scales (Cavender-Bares et al. 2009), we evaluated data from both grids. We summarized data at the species level, and converted all records into the presence or absence (1/0) of a species in each grid. Finally, the number of records used in the study after summarizing the duplicate presence records was 79,003 and 165,102 for each 10-km grid and 1-km grid for targeted species, respectively. We used the taxonomy of Shirôzu (2006).

Data on host plants and forewing length were evaluated as possible variables explaining, respectively, host use and dispersal ability. The host plants of 278 butterfly species/subspecies (3,573 records in total, after excluding duplications) were obtained from data by Saito *et al.* (2016), and the host records were described in 8 major illustrated reference books, 2 checklists, and 14 other pieces of literature; the presence of larvae on plants, and the observations of larvae eating plants or insects in the field were considered host records. We used 2,939 records of targeted species in this study (Table S1). The datasets of Saito *et al.* (2016) included some incomplete records (e.g., *Asarum* sp. of *Luehdorfia japonica*, *Cotoneaster* spp. of *Acytolepis puspa*) including 34 records (about 1.14% of whole records) on targeted species; those incomplete records were excluded from our analyses. Dispersal ability was evaluated by reference to adult wing length. We compiled wing data on 284 species using published illustrations (Shirôzu 2006). We used Image J software (Abramoff et al. 2004) to extract forewing

lengths (in cm) from plates that included centimeter scale bars. Multiple forewing lengths were extracted when individual, sexual, and/or geographical variations were evident.

We assembled data on the distributions, host plants, climatic niches (described below), and forewing lengths of 232 butterfly species. Twenty-four species were excluded from the analysis, for the following reasons. First, the taxonomic status of three species (*Papilio dehaanii*, *Pieris dulcinea*, and *Eurema hecabe*) changed in the interval between the fourth and fifth biodiversity censuses (Inomata 1990; Shirôzu 2006). Thus, we excluded these species because identifications were unreliable. Second, we excluded three species of non-herbivorous butterflies (*Taraka hamada*, *Spindasis takanonis*, and *Niphanda fusca*). Finally, we excluded a further 18 species because the models used to evaluate their ecological niches failed to satisfy the criteria that we imposed (i.e., shortage of occurrence records for the niche modeling program or less than 0.7 of the values of area under the curve [AUC], the details are in Supplementary File 1).

Data analysis

Species distribution exclusiveness. We used the checkerboard scores (C-scores; Stone and Roberts 1990) to evaluate the exclusivity of distributions between each species pair. We set r_i and r_j as the numbers of grids in which species i and j , respectively, were present; the checker unit C_{ij} associated with the two species was defined as: $C_{ij} = (r_i - S_{ij}) \times (r_j - S_{ij})$, where S_{ij} indicates the extent of co-presence (i.e., the number of grid cells shared by the two species). Thus, the checker unit became larger as the two species occurred more commonly in different grid cells. We simulated null models to allow the observed checker units to be compared with stochastic distributions. We used the method of Jonsson et al. (2001) to maintain the observed frequencies of species occurrence and randomized the presence/absence matrices for each pair of butterfly

species. The null models were run 999 times for each species pair. C_{obs} and C_{null} were the checker units of the observed and null distributions, respectively; the checker unit was standardized as: $C_{std} = (C_{obs} - C_{null})/SD_{null}$, where SD_{null} indicates the standard deviation of all checker units of the null models. The checker unit of the null model, C_{null} , was the average checker unit of all null models. Thus, positive and negative values of C_{std} indicate that two species are allopatrically and sympatrically distributed, respectively, to extents greater than indicated by the null models. We also attempted to construct a more constrained null model by weighting each grid by its species richness to consider the potential size of the butterfly community as well as the observed frequency of each species. However, this weighted index was very highly correlated with C_{std} ($r = 0.97$, $n = 300$ randomly selected pairs); thus, we adopted Jonsson's method in this study. All statistical analyses were performed with the aid of R software version 3.2.0 (R Core Team 2015).

Climatic niche similarities. We used ecological niche modeling (ENM) (Franklin 2010) to evaluate climatic niche similarities among butterfly species (Warren et al. 2008). ENM associates distributional data with environmental characteristics, thus estimating the response functions of, and the contributions made by, environmental variables. Furthermore, potential distributional ranges may be obtained by projecting model data onto geographical space. In the present study, potential distributional ranges estimated by ENM should be influenced by abiotic environmental variables alone (climate and altitude); we did not consider interspecific interactions among butterflies or dispersal abilities in this context. Thus, comparisons of potential distribution patterns estimated by ENM allow evaluation of climatic niche similarities among butterfly species. The maximum entropy algorithm implemented in MaxEnt ver. 3.3.3e software (Phillips et al. 2006; Phillips and Dudík 2008) was employed in ENM analyses (Supplementary File 1 contains the details). The logistic outputs of MaxEnt analyses can be regarded as presence probabilities (Phillips and Dudík 2008). Finally, we then

used Schoener's (1968) D statistic to calculate climatic niche similarities between pairs of butterfly species, based on the MaxEnt outputs. $P_{x,i}$ and $P_{y,i}$ were the probabilities (assigned by MaxEnt) that species x and y would mesh to the extent of i on a geographic scale; the climatic niche similarity between the two species was defined as: $D_{\text{env}} = 1 - 0.5 \times \sum |P_{x,i} - P_{y,i}|$, where D_{env} ranged from 0 (no niche overlap) to 1 (completely identical niches). The probability assigned to the presence of species x in grid i was $P_{x,i} = p_{x,i} / \sum p_{x,i}$, where $p_{x,i}$ was the logistic Maxent output for species x in grid i .

Explanatory variables. We evaluated both host use similarity and other factors that might explain exclusive species distributions (i.e., taxonomic relatedness). We calculated the total dispersal abilities of species pairs and climatic niche similarities (as explained above). Host use similarity was calculated as 1 minus Jaccard's dissimilarity index (Koleff et al. 2003) when host plant species were shared by two butterflies. The taxonomic relatedness of each species pair was classified as: 2: in the same genus; 1: in the same family; and 0: in different families. The total dispersal ability was calculated as the sum of the $\ln$ (forewing lengths) of each species pair.

Statistical tests. We used the Mantel test, in which the response matrix yielded pairwise C_{std} data, and which included explanatory matrices, to examine the effects of host use similarity and other factors (i.e., taxonomic relatedness, climatic niche similarity, and total dispersal ability) on the exclusivity of butterfly distribution. We calculated Spearman's correlations because one of the explanatory variables (taxonomic relatedness) was a rank variable. P -values were determined by running 9,999 permutations. In addition, when analyzing correlations between host use similarity and other explanatory matrices, we ran Mantel tests with 9,999 permutations, and calculated Spearman's correlations. We used partial Mantel tests, in which the response matrix yielded pairwise C_{std} data, and in which a matrix of host use similarity including the other three explanatory matrices served as a co-variable, to evaluate the effects of confounding factors associated with host use similarity on the exclusivity of butterfly

distribution. We ran 9,999 permutations and calculated Spearman's correlations. We employed the `vegdist` function of the `vegan` package (Oksanen et al. 2015) and the `mantel` function of the `ecodist` package (Goslee and Urban 2007) implemented in R. We performed all analyses using data from both the 10-km and the 1-km grids. The same analysis was conducted for the datasets after excluding the species (the bottom 10% in the 10-km grid and 1-km grid scales, to reduce the bias of rare species in the analysis. The histogram of presence records for each butterfly species is shown in Figure S1.

Results

The standardized checkerboard scores (C_{std} values) of most species pairs were negative, indicating that, in general, Japanese butterflies were more likely to co-occur than expected by chance (Fig. 1). The Mantel test showed that host use similarity was significantly and negatively correlated with the C_{std} values at both geographical scales (Fig. 1, Table 2a); all three explanatory variables exhibited significant negative correlations with the C_{std} values at both scales (Table 2a). Host use similarity was significantly and positively correlated with both taxonomic relatedness and climatic niche similarity, but we found no significant correlation with total dispersal ability (Table 2b). The partial Mantel tests showed negative correlations between the C_{std} values and host use similarity at both geographical scales when controlling both taxonomic relatedness and dispersal ability. The differences of the correlation coefficients from the results of Mantel tests were small, specifically less than 1% (Table 2c). In contrast, we found significant positive correlations when controlling for climatic niche similarity and all three factors in the 10-km grid dataset, in which the correlation coefficients between host use similarity and C_{std} score largely changed in the positive direction from the results of Mantel tests, but no significant correlation in the 1-km grid dataset (Table 2c). When we excluded rare species from the analyses, most of the results were consistent with the results of original datasets, except for the correlation

315 between the C_{std} values and host use similarity under the control of climatic niche
316 similarity in the 10-km grid dataset, which was not significant (Tables S5 and 6).

317

318 **Discussion**

319 Significant negative correlations were clearly evident between the C_{std} scores and host
320 use similarities at both grid scales (Fig. 1, Table 2a), indicating that a pair of Japanese
321 butterflies sharing host plants is more likely to co-occur (supporting Hypothesis 2).
322 Significant negative correlations between C_{std} scores and host use similarities were
323 evident after controlling for each of the other potentially confounding factors,
324 taxonomic relatedness, and total dispersal ability (Table 2c). The predicted pattern from
325 interspecific resource competition (i.e., positive correlations between the C_{std} score and
326 host use similarity) were confirmed only after controlling for the effects of climatic
327 niche similarity and all three factors in the 10-km grid data (supporting Hypothesis 6).
328 However, the correlation coefficient was low (Table 2c), and we could not confirm the
329 pattern in the analysis excluding rare species (Table S5c). Note that we need to interpret
330 the results carefully, as interspecific resource competition is not the only process that
331 generates negative correlations between C_{std} score and host use similarity (e.g.,
332 speciation, Warren et al. 2014). Our results are consistent with the idea that interspecific
333 resource competition is too weak to organize communities of herbivorous insects
334 effectively (Lawton and Strong 1981; Strong et al. 1984; Nakadai and Kawakita 2017).
335 Rather, our results suggest that the geographic pattern of species co-occurrence among
336 Japanese butterflies is better explained by niche filtering.

337 The most likely explanation of our data is that the relative strength of
338 structuring via resource competition may be weaker than that associated with niche
339 filtering. As the geographical distributions of host plants would be expected to be
340 strongly associated with the local climatic environment, the impacts of resource and
341 climatic niche filtering may combine to ensure that butterfly species sharing host plants

assemble in the same places. In addition, the dispersal of adult butterflies from the patches in which they were born may counteract the structuring force imposed by interspecific competition. However, although co-occurrence was facilitated by the overall total dispersal ability (Table 2a), the negative correlations between the C_{std} scores and host use similarity were evident even when we controlled for the effects of total dispersal ability (Table 2c). This means that dispersal alone may not explain the weak impact of resource competition on the co-occurrence patterns of Japanese butterflies. Other potential factors reducing the effects of interspecific resource competition may also be in play, although we did not address these topics in this study. For example, co-occurring butterfly species, which share their host plants, are also more likely to share their evolutionary histories. The accumulated time in which species co-occur (i.e., historical co-occurrence) may cause character displacement and reduce the effects of interspecific resource competition on the co-occurrence pattern after convergence (e.g., Germain et al. 2016). In the case of Japanese butterflies, there are differences in historical dispersal events, especially the timing and route to the Japanese archipelago, due to the repeated connections and disconnections between Eurasia continent and the Japanese archipelago (reviewed by Tojo et al. 2017). In addition, butterflies sharing host plants may experience similar historical dispersal events corresponding to the distribution changes of plant species. Such a historical process can generate faunal similarity along distance and climate (Nekola and White 1999; Kubota et al. 2017) and indirectly affect the pattern of herbivorous insects, which was also detected in our study (see the correlation between C_{std} and climate niche similarity in Table 2a). Therefore, the effects of historical co-occurrence on the patterns of current geographical co-occurrence may also occur, although we did not discuss the details here.

The negative correlation evident between taxonomic relatedness and the C_{std} scores (Table 2a) suggests that niche filtering is in play among Japanese butterflies,

369 given that taxonomic relatedness serves as a proxy of niche similarity including host use.
 370 Indeed, we found significant (positive) correlations between host use similarity and the
 371 taxonomic relatedness of Japanese butterflies (Table 2b), as has often been shown for
 372 other herbivorous insects (e.g., Nyman et al. 2010; Joussetin et al. 2013). These results
 373 reconfirm niche conservatism associated with host use, which were also reported in
 374 previous studies (Lopez-Vaamonde et al. 2003; Nyman et al. 2010; Joussetin et al.
 375 2013; Doorenweerd et al. 2015; Nakadai and Kawakita 2016). Moreover, when host use
 376 similarity was controlled using the partial Mantel test, taxonomic relatedness did not
 377 significantly affect co-occurrence at the 10-km grid scale (Table S4). These results
 378 suggest that, at least at the 10-km grid scale, the effects of taxonomic relatedness largely
 379 reflect host use similarity. Although we mainly discussed taxonomic relatedness as a
 380 niche similarity between species pairs throughout the manuscript, the correlation
 381 between geographical co-occurrence and taxonomic relatedness could also be
 382 interpreted as the imprint of allopatric speciation (Hypothesis 3-2, Barraclough et al.
 383 1998; Warren et al. 2014). In that context, we can also interpret our results as the
 384 imprint of allopatric speciation not being strong enough to construct the co-occurrence
 385 pattern at the regional scale.

386 In the present study, we used ENM to evaluate the effects of climatic niche
 387 similarity on co-occurrence patterns. When we controlled for the effects of such niche
 388 similarity, the negative correlations between the C_{std} scores and host plant similarities
 389 disappeared at both spatial scales (Table 2c). This suggests that the explanatory power
 390 of climatic niche filtering is stronger than that of resource niche filtering. It is
 391 reasonable that host plants are also distributed in relation to climatic niches (Hawkins et
 392 al. 2014). Moreover, we also only found a positive correlation when controlling for the
 393 effects of climatic niche similarity in the 10-km grid data, which supports the
 394 hypothesis of interspecific resource competition (Hypothesis 6). This result suggests the
 395 possibility that the competitive exclusions of herbivorous insects do exist but usually

cannot be observed due to masking by climatic niche filtering and other effects (Table 2c). It should be noted that, although ENM has been widely used to quantify climatic niches (e.g., Kozak et al. 2008; Warren et al. 2008; Takami and Osawa 2016) when we interpret this result, ENM data should be treated with caution (Peterson et al. 2011; Warren 2012; Warren et al. 2014). For example, Warren et al. (2014) noted that ENM always includes non-targeted factors that limit real distributions if those distributions correlate spatially with environmental predictors. Such confounding effects may cause overestimation of any positive correlation between climatic niche similarity and butterfly co-occurrence, and may also cause the effects of host use similarity to be underestimated when controlling for the effects of climatic niche similarity. The use of ENM to study species co-occurrence patterns requires careful consideration; more case studies evaluating the relative importance of climatic niches are required.

Although a number of studies have reported that resource competition involving butterfly species occur (e.g., Redman and Scriber 2000; Prior and Hellman 2010), few studies have indicated competitive exclusion or resource partitioning due to resource competition involving butterflies (Blakley and Dingle 1978; Millan et al. 2013). Some authors have argued that reproductive interference among butterflies sharing similar niches is a more plausible mechanism causing resource or habitat niche displacement than resource competition (Jones et al. 1998; Friberg et al. 2008, 2013; reviewed in Noriyuki et al. 2015; Shuker and Burdfield-Steel 2017). Friberg *et al.* (2013) suggested that habitat separation of two congeners of wood white butterflies *Leptidea sinapis* and *L. juvernica* is caused by reproductive interference. Because habitat displacement by reproductive interference is more likely to work at the local scale (Friberg et al. 2013), its effects may be difficult to observe at the regional or broader spatial scale. This does not contradict our results in which robust evidence of negative co-occurrence among host-sharing species was not detected.

We focused on butterfly species, which is one of the best-studied herbivore

423 taxa in both ecology and evolution (Ehrlich and Raven 1964; Hanski and Singer 2001;
 424 Fordyce et al. 2010), as well as data on fundamental information (e.g., occurrence
 425 information and host use of each species) that are abundant in butterfly species. Our
 426 analysis relied on this advantage, enabling the use of huge datasets of butterfly species,
 427 and attempted to clarify the geographical co-occurrence on a larger scale. However, our
 428 study had several limitations. First, there was underrepresentation of rare species. The
 429 abundance and the range of distribution are different among butterfly species, and the
 430 records of rare species had some bias in our analysis using huge datasets. We
 431 additionally conducted analyses after excluding the species, which were confirmed in
 432 the lower number of grids, to eliminate the bias due to the unfounded presence records
 433 of rare species. As a result, most of the results showed the same trends as the results of
 434 the original datasets, so the bias of rare species may not be very large (Tables S5 and 6).
 435 The second issue was regarding the temporal fidelity of observations. We compiled
 436 datasets of field surveys over multiple years, but using single-year datasets, which are
 437 more appropriate for assessing the effects of interspecific resource competition on the
 438 patterns of geographical co-occurrence. If butterfly distributions largely change over the
 439 years, this approach would obscure the real patterns of resource-driven butterfly
 440 co-occurrence. Finally, we only used occurrence data with the accuracy of a large grid
 441 (10-km and 1-km squares); combining datasets of deferent resolution (grid-level and
 442 community-level data) may help to resolve co-occurrence patterns among herbivore
 443 butterflies (Cardillo and Warren 2016).

444

445 **Conclusions**

446 The significance of interspecific resource competition in terms of the structuring of
 447 herbivorous insect communities is a source of long-standing controversy. Many
 448 researchers have sought to explain the general patterns of relationships between the
 449 co-occurrence of, and the use of different niches by, herbivorous insects. However, the

450 data remain limited because most previous studies employed narrow taxonomic and
451 spatial scales. In this context, our study is the first to provide a comprehensive picture of
452 the co-occurrence patterns among a single taxonomic group over a large region.
453 Although co-occurrence of Japanese butterflies is more likely to be driven by niche
454 filtering than interspecific resource competition, it is essential to employ broad
455 taxonomic and spatial scales when attempting to reveal general patterns of community
456 assembly among herbivorous insects. Future studies should explore the relative
457 importance of each assembly stage not only ecologically but also over evolutionary time
458 (Rabosky 2009). Such work would answer the important question: “Why have
459 herbivorous insects become one of the most diverse groups of the natural world?”

460

461 **Acknowledgements**

462 We thank K. Kadowaki for his comments and advice on the original version of our
463 manuscript, M. U. Saito for giving us the detail information of collecting datasets of
464 host plants, the Biodiversity Center of Japan for allowing access to butterfly data at the
465 1-km grid scale, and the associate editor and three reviewers for their comments, which
466 improved our manuscript. We are particularly grateful to the entomologists and
467 naturalists who accumulated the information on butterflies used in this study. This work
468 was supported by a grant from the Grant-in-Aid Program for JSPS Fellows (Grant No.
469 15J00601).

470

471 **References**

- 472 Agrawal AA (1999) Induced responses to herbivory in wild radish: effects on several
473 herbivores and plant fitness. *Ecology* 80:1713–1723
- 474 Agrawal AA (2000) Specificity of induced resistance in wild radish: causes and
475 consequences for two specialist and two generalist caterpillars. *Oikos* 89:493–500
- 476 Abramoff MD, Magalhães PJ, Ram SJ (2004) Image processing with ImageJ. *Biophot*

477 inter 11:36–42

478 Barraclough TG, Vogler AP, Harvey PH (1998) Revealing the factors that promote

479 speciation. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 353:241–249

480 Benson WW (1978) Resource Partitioning in Passion Vine Butterflies. *Evolution*

481 32:493–518

482 Blakley NR, Dingle H (1978) Competition: butterflies eliminate milkweed bugs from a

483 Caribbean Island. *Oecologia* 37:133–136

484 Brower LP (1962) Evidence for interspecific competition in natural populations of the

485 Monarch and Queen butterflies, *Danaus plexippus* and *D. gilippus berenice* in

486 south central Florida. *Ecology* 43:549–552

487 Brown DG, Weis AE (1995) Direct and indirect effects of prior grazing of goldenrod

488 upon the performance of a leaf beetle. *Ecology* 76:426–436

489 Bultman TL Faeth SH (1985) Patterns of intra- and inter- specific association in

490 leaf-mining insects on three oak host species. *Ecol Entomol* 10:121–129

491 Cantor SB, Sun CC, Tortolero-Luna G, Richards-Kortum R, Follen M (1999) A

492 Comparison of C/B Ratios from studies using receiver operating characteristic

493 curve analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol* 52:885–892

494 Cardillo M, Warren DL (2016) Analysing patterns of spatial and niche overlap among

495 species at multiple resolutions. *Global Ecol Biogeogr* 25: 951-963

496 Cavender-Bares J, Kozak KH, Fine PVA, Kembel SW (2009) The merging of

497 community ecology and phylogenetic biology. *Ecol Lett* 12:693–715

498 Chai P, Srygley RB (1990) Predation and the flight, morphology, and temperature of

499 neotropical rainforest butterflies. *Am Nat* 135:748–765

500 Clausnitzer V, Kalkman VJ, Ram M, Collen B, Baillie JEM, Bedjanič M, Darwell WRT,

501 Dijkstra K-DB, Dow R, Hawking J, Karube H, Malikova E, Paulson D, Schütte K,

502 Suhling F, Villanueva RJ, Ellenrieder N, Wilson K (2009) Odonata enter the

503 biodiversity crisis debate: the first global assessment of an insect group. *Biol*

504 Conserv 142:1864–1869

505 Connor EF, Collins MD, Simberloff D (2013) The checkered history of checkerboard

506 distributions. Ecology 94:2403–2414.

507 Damman H (1989) Facilitative interactions between two lepidopteran herbivores of

508 *Asimina*. Oecologia 78:214–219

509 Dempster JP (1997) The role of larval food resources and adult movement in the

510 population dynamics of the orange-tip butterfly (*Anthocharis cardamines*).

511 Oecologia 111:549–556

512 Diamond J (1975) Assembly of species communities. In: Cody ML, Diamond JM (eds)

513 Ecology and evolution of communities. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, pp

514 342–444

515 Doorenweerd C, van Nieukerken EJ, Menken SBJ (2015) A global phylogeny of

516 leafmining *Ectoedemia* moths (Lepidoptera: Nepticulidae): exploring host plant

517 family shifts and allopatry as drivers of speciation. PLoS One 10:e0119586

518 Ehrlich PR, Raven PH (1964) Butterflies and plants: a study in coevolution. Evolution

519 18:586–608

520 Fordyce JA (2010) Host shifts and evolutionary radiations of butterflies. Proc R Soc

521 Lond B Biol Sci 277:3735–3743

522 Faeth SH (1986) Indirect interactions between temporally separated herbivores

523 mediated by the host plant. Ecology 67:479–494

524 Fei M, Gols R, Zhu F, Harvey JA (2016) Plant quantity affects development and

525 survival of a gregarious insect herbivore and its endoparasitoid wasp. PLoS One

526 11:e0149539

527 Franklin J (2010) Mapping species distributions: spatial inference and prediction.

528 Cambridge University Press.

529 Friberg M, Bergman M, Kullberg J, Wahlberg (2008) Niche separation in space and

530 time between two sympatric sister species—a case of ecological pleiotropy. Evol

531 Ecol 22:1–18

532 Friberg M, Leimar O, Wiklund C (2013) Heterospecific courtship, minority effects and
533 niche separation between cryptic butterfly species. *J Evol Biol* 26:971–979

534 Gerardo C, Brown JH (1995) Global patterns of mammalian diversity, endemism, and
535 endangerment. *Conservation Biology* 9:559–568

536 Germain RM, Weir JT, Gilbert B (2016) Species coexistence: macroevolutionary
537 relationships and the contingency of historical interactions. *Proc R Soc B*
538 283:20160047

539 Goslee SC, Urban DL (2007) The ecodist package for dissimilarity-based analysis of
540 ecological data. *Journal of Statistical Software* 22:1–19

541 Gotelli NJ, McCabe DJ (2002) Species co-occurrence: A meta-analysis of J. M.
542 Diamond’s assembly rules model. *Ecology* 83:2091–2096

543 Hairston NG, Smith FE, Slobodkin LB (1960) Community structure, population control,
544 and competition. *Am Nat* 94:421–425

545 Harrison S, Karban R (1986) Effects of an early-season folivorous moth on the success
546 of a later-season species, mediated by a change in the quality of the shared host,
547 *Lupinus arboreus* Sims. *Oecologia* 69:354–359

548 Hashimoto K, Ohgushi T (2017) How do two specialist butterflies determine growth
549 and biomass of a shared host plant? *Popul Ecol* 59:17–27

550 Hawkins BA, Rueda M, Rangel TF, Field R, Diniz-Filho JAF (2014) Community
551 phylogenetics at the biogeographical scale: cold tolerance, niche conservatism and
552 the structure of North American forests. *J Biogeogr* 41:23–38

553 Honda K (2005) Larval feeding habit and host selection. In: Honda K, Kato Y (eds)
554 *Biology of butterflies*. University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, pp 255–301 (in
555 Japanese).

556 Inomata T (1990) Keys to the Japanese butterflies in natural color. Hokuryukan.

557 Inouye BD, Johnson DM (2005) Larval aggregation affects feeding rate in *Chlosyne*

558 *poecile* (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae). Florida Entomol 88:247–252

559 Jones MJ, Lace LA, Harrison EC, Stevens-Wood B (1998) Territorial behavior in the
560 speckled wood butterflies *Pararge xiphia* and *P. aegeria* of Madeira: a mechanism
561 for interspecific competition. Ecography 21: 297–305

562 Jonsson BG (2001) A null model for randomization tests of nestedness in species
563 assemblages. Oecologia 127:309–313

564 Jousselin E, Cruaud A, Genson G, Chevenet F, Footitt RG, Cœur d’acier A (2013) Is
565 ecological speciation a major trend in aphids? Insights from a molecular phylogeny
566 of the conifer-feeding genus *Cinara*. Front Zool 10:56

567 Kaplan I, Denno RF (2007) Interspecific interactions in phytophagous insects revisited:
568 a quantitative assessment of competition theory. Ecol Lett 10:977–994

569 Kneitel JM, Chase JM (2004) Trade-offs in community ecology: Linking spatial scales
570 and species coexistence. Ecol Lett 7:69–80

571 Koleff P, Gaston KJ, Lennon JJ (2003) Measuring beta diversity for presence-absence
572 data. J Ani Ecol 72:367–382

573 Kozak KH, Graham CH, Wiens JJ (2008) Integrating GIS-based environmental data
574 into evolutionary biology. Trends Ecol Evol 23:141–148

575 Kubota Y, Hirao T, Fujii S, Shiono T, Kusumoto B (2014) Beta diversity of woody
576 plants in the Japanese archipelago: the roles of geohistorical and ecological
577 processes. J Biogeogr 41:1267–1276

578 Kubota Y, Kusumoto B, Shiono T, Tanaka T (2017). Phylogenetic properties of Tertiary
579 relict flora in the East Asian continental islands: imprint of climatic niche
580 conservatism and in situ diversification. Ecography, 40:436–447

581 Lawton JH, Strong DR (1981) Community patterns and competition in folivorous
582 insects. Am Nat 118:317–338

583 Liu C, Berry PM, Dawson TP, Pearson RG (2005) Selecting thresholds of occurrence in
584 the prediction of species distributions. Ecography 28:385–393

585 Lopez-Vaamonde, C, Godfray HCJ, Cook JM (2003) Evolutionary dynamics of
586 host-plant use in a genus of leaf- mining moths. *Evolution* 57:1804–1821

587 Loreau M (2000). Are communities saturated? On the relationship between α , β and γ
588 diversity. *Ecol Lett* 3:73-76

589 Mayfield MM, Levine JM (2010) Opposing effects of competitive exclusion on the
590 phylogenetic structure of communities. *Ecol Lett* 13:1085–1093

591 Millan C, Borges SS, Rodrigues D, Moreira GRP (2013) Behavioral and life-history
592 evidence for interspecific competition in the larvae of two heliconian butterflies.
593 *Naturwissenschaften* 100:901–911

594 Mittermeier RA, Turner WR, Larsen FW, Brooks TM, Gascon C (2011) Global
595 biodiversity conservation: the critical role of hotspots. In: Zachos FE, Habel JC
596 (eds) *Biodiversity hotspots*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp 3–22

597 Nakadai R (2017) Species diversity of herbivorous insects: a brief review to bridge the
598 gap between theories focusing on the generation and maintenance of diversity.
599 *Ecol Res*

600 Nakadai R, Kawakita A (2016) Phylogenetic test of speciation by host shift in leaf cone
601 moths (*Caloptilia*) feeding on maples (*Acer*). *Ecol Evol* 6:4958–4970

602 Nakadai R, Kawakita A (2017) Patterns of temporal and enemy niche use by a
603 community of leaf cone moths (*Caloptilia*) coexisting on maples (*Acer*) as revealed
604 by metabarcoding. *Mol Ecol* 26:3309–3319

605 Nekola JC, White PS (1999) The distance decay of similarity in biogeography and
606 ecology. *J Biogeogr* 26:867-878

607 Noriyuki S (2015) Host selection in insects: reproductive interference shapes behavior
608 of ovipositing females. *Popul Ecol* 57:293-305

609 Nosil P (2012) *Ecological speciation*. Oxford University Press, New York

610 Novotny V, Miller SE, Baje L, Balagawi S, Basset Y, Cizek L, Craft KJ, Dem F, Drew
611 RAI, Hulcr J, Leps J, Lewis OT, Pokon R, Stewart AJA, Samuelson GA, Weiblen

612 GD (2010) Guild-specific patterns of species richness and host specialization in
613 plant-herbivore food webs from a tropical forest. *J Ani Ecol* 79:1193–1203

614 Nyman T, Vikberg V, Smith DR, Boevé J-L (2010) How common is ecological
615 speciation in plant-feeding insects? A “Higher” Nematinae perspective. *BMC Evol*
616 *Biol* 10:266

617 Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Kindt R, Legendre P, Minchin PR, O’Hara RB (2015) Vegan:
618 community ecology package
619 [<https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/vegan/index.html>].

620 Peterson AT, Soberon J, Pearson RG, Anderson RP, Martinez-Meyer E, Nakamura M,
621 Araújo MB (2011) Ecological niches and geographic distributions. Monographs in
622 Population Biology. Princeton University Press. Princeton. New Jersey, USA

623 Phillips SJ, Anderson RP, Schapire RE (2006) Maximum entropy modeling of species
624 geographic distributions. *Ecol Model* 190:231–259

625 Phillips SJ, Dudík M (2008) Modeling of species distributions with Maxent: new
626 extensions and a comprehensive evaluation. *Ecography* 31:161-175

627 Prior KM, Hellmann JJ (2010) Impact of an invasive oak gall wasp on a native
628 butterfly: a test of plant-mediated competition. *Ecology* 91:3284–3293

629 Polis GA (1999) Why are parts of the world green? Multiple factors control productivity
630 and the distribution of biomass. *Oikos* 86:3–15

631 Rabosky DL (2009) Ecological limits and diversification rate: alternative paradigms to
632 explain the variation in species richness among clades and regions. *Ecol Lett* 12:
633 735– 743

634 Rathcke BJ (1976) Competition and co-existence within a guild of herbivorous insects.
635 *Ecology* 57:76–87

636 R Core Team (2015). R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R
637 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <http://www.R-project.org/>

638 Redman A, Scriber J (2000) Competition between the gypsy moth, *Lymantria dispar*,

639 and the northern tiger swallowtail, *Papilio canadensis*: interactions mediated by
640 host plant chemistry, pathogens, and parasitoids. *Oecologia* 125:218–228

641 Ross HH (1957). Principles of natural coexistence indicated by leafhopper populations.
642 *Evolution* 11:113–129

643 Saito MU, Jinbo U, Yago M, Kurashima O, Ito M (2016) Larval host records of
644 butterflies in Japan. *Ecol Res* 31:491–491

645 Schoener TW (1968) The anolis lizards of bimini: Resource partitioning in a complex
646 fauna. *Ecology* 49:704–726

647 Shirôzu T (2006) The butterflies of Japan in color. In Japanese. Gakken Holdings,
648 Tokyo, Japan.

649 Shuker DM, Burdfield-Steel ER (2017) Reproductive interference in insects. *Ecol*
650 *Entomol* 42:65–75

651 Stone L, Roberts A (1990) The checkerboard score and species distributions. *Oecologia*
652 85:74–79

653 Strong DR (1982) Harmonious coexistence of *Hispine* beetles on *Heliconia* In
654 experimental and natural communities. *Ecology* 63:1039–1049

655 Strong DR, Lawton JH, Southwood SR (1984) Insects on plants. Community patterns
656 and mechanisms. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

657 Takami Y, Osawa T (2016) Ecological differentiation and habitat unsuitability
658 maintaining a ground beetle hybrid zone. *Ecol Evol* 6:113–124

659 Thompson JN (2013) Relentless Evolution. University of Chicago Press.

660 Tojo K, Sekiné K, Takenaka M, Isaka Y, Komaki S, Suzuki T, Schoville SD (2017)
661 Species diversity of insects in Japan: Their origins and diversification processes.
662 *Entomol Sci* 20:357–381

663 Ueckert DN, Hansen RM (1971) Dietary overlap of grasshoppers on sandhill rangeland
664 in northeastern Colorado. *Oecologia*, 8:276-295

665 Van Zandt PA, Agrawal AA (2004) Specificity of induced plant responses to specialist

herbivores of the common milkweed *Asclepias syriaca*. *Oikos* 104:401–409

Viswanathan D V, Narwani AJT, Thaler JS (2005) Specificity in induced plant responses shapes patterns of herbivore occurrence on *Solanum dulcamara*. *Ecology* 86:886–896

Waloff N (1979) Partitioning of resources by grassland leafhoppers (Auchenorrhyncha, Homoptera). *Ecol Entomol* 4:379–385

Warren DL, Cardillo M, Rosauer DF, Bolnick DI (2014) Mistaking geography for biology: inferring processes from species distributions. *Trends Ecol Evol* 29:572–580

Warren DL, Glor RE, Turelli M (2008) Environmental niche equivalency versus conservatism: Quantitative approaches to niche evolution. *Evolution* 62:2868–2883

Warren DL (2012) In defense of ‘niche modeling’. *Trends Ecol Evol* 27:497–500

Webb CO, Ackerly DD, McPeck MA, Donoghue MJ (2002) Phylogenies and community ecology. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* 33:475–505

Yoder JB, Clancey E, Des Roches S, Eastman JM, Gentry L, Godsoe W, Hagey TJ, Jochimsen D, Oswarld BP, Robertson J, Sarver BAJ, Schenk JJ, Spear SF, Harmon LJ (2010) Ecological opportunity and the origin of adaptive radiations. *J Evol Biol* 23:1581–1596

Supporting Materials

Table S1. Japanese butterfly species analyzed in this study.

Table S2. Summary of the MaxEnt data at the 10-km grid scale.

Table S3. Summary of the MaxEnt data at the 1-km grid scale.

Table S4. Correlations among host use similarity (Host), taxonomic relatedness (Taxon), climate niche similarity (Climate), and total dispersal ability (Dispersal), at two spatial scales. (a) Summary of Mantel test data on pairwise correlations between the

693 explanatory matrices. (b) Summary of partial Mantel test data on standardized C_{std}
694 scores between pairs of butterfly species. The “Taxon-Dispersal” data (b) were obtained
695 using the datasets at either grid mesh scale.

696 **Table S5.** Results using the datasets that excluded rare species. This table corresponds
697 to Table 2.

698 **Table S6.** Results using the datasets that excluded rare species. This table corresponds
699 to Table S4.

700 **Figure S1** Histogram of the number of observed grids for each butterfly species at both
701 10-km and 1-km grid scales: (a) all targeted butterfly species at the 10-km grid scale,
702 (b) butterfly species at the 10-km grid scale, with an observed grid number less than 50,
703 (c) all targeted butterfly species at the 1-km grid scale, and (d) butterfly species at the
704 1-km grid scale, with an observed grid number less than 50.

705 **Supplementary File 1.** Details of the methods used for ecological niche modeling.
706
707

708 **Figure Legends**

709 **Figure 1.** The relationships between C_{std} scores and host use similarities (10-km grid
 710 scale: Spearman $\rho = -0.128$, $P = 0.0001$; 1-km grid scale: Spearman $\rho = -0.130$, $P =$
 711 0.0001 ; Mantel test).
 712

713 **Figure 1.**

Table 1 Major hypotheses and predictions tested in this study, associated with host use similarity (Host), taxonomic relatedness (Taxon), climate niche similarity (Climate), and total dispersal ability (Dispersal).

Variables	Hypotheses	Predictions
Host	Resource competition is sufficiently intense to cause competitive exclusion (1).	Positive correlation between host use similarity and C_{std} score (exclusiveness of distribution).
Host	Niche filtering through sharing host plants is relatively stronger than resource competition (2).	Negative correlation between host use similarity and C_{std} score.
Host-Taxon	Taxonomic relatedness reinforces resource competition, increasing competitive exclusion (3-1). Imprint of allopatric speciation reinforces exclusive distribution among close relatives, which share host plants because of niche conservatism (3-2)*.	Correlation between host use similarity and C_{std} score would be changed in the negative direction when controlling for taxonomic relatedness.
Host-Taxon	Taxonomic relatedness, which indicates a niche filter due to niche conservatism including host use, acts counteracting competitive exclusion (4).	Correlation between host use similarity and C_{std} score would be changed in the positive direction when controlling for taxonomic relatedness.
Host-Climate	Filtering through climate niche reinforces resource competition, increasing competitive exclusion (5).	Correlation between host use similarity and C_{std} score would be changed in the negative direction when controlling for climate niche similarity.

Host-Climate	Filtering through climate niche acts counteracting competitive exclusion or jointly with the host plant niche filter (6).	Correlation between host use similarity and C_{std} score would be change in the positive direction when controlling for climate niche similarity.
Host-Dispersal	Higher dispersal ability promotes distribution overlapping, thereby counteracting local assembling processes such as competitive exclusion (7).	Correlation between host use similarity and C_{std} score would change in the negative direction when controlling for total dispersal ability.
Host-Dispersal	Higher dispersal ability promotes distribution overlapping, thereby niche filtering through sharing host plants (8).	Correlation between host use similarity and C_{std} score would change in the positive direction when controlling for total dispersal ability.

The bracketed number following each hypothesis only indicates the number of each hypothesis for descriptive purposes.

*Hypothesis 3-2 has a slightly different perspective from the others, because it is mainly based on the background of speciation history.

Table 2. Correlations among host use similarity (Host), taxonomic relatedness (Taxon), climate niche similarity (Climate), and total dispersal ability (Dispersal), at two spatial scales. (a) Summary of Mantel test data on standardized C_{std} scores between pairs of butterfly species. (b) Summary of Mantel test data on pairwise correlations between host use similarity and the data of other explanatory matrices. (c) Summary of partial Mantel test data on standardized C_{std} scores between pairs of butterfly species. The “Host-Taxon” and “Host-Dispersal” data (b) were analyzed using the same datasets between two grid scales.

(a)		10-km grid		1-km grid	
Factor		Mantel ρ	<i>P</i> -values	Mantel ρ	<i>P</i> -values
Host		−0.128	0.0001	−0.130	0.0001
Taxon		−0.025	0.0093	−0.036	0.0009
Climate		−0.718	0.0001	−0.631	0.0001
Dispersal		−0.045	0.0125	−0.073	0.0008

(b)		10-km grid		1-km grid	
Factor		Mantel ρ	<i>P</i> -values	Mantel ρ	<i>P</i> -values
Host-Taxon		0.098	0.0001	0.098	0.0001
Host-Climate		0.209	0.0001	0.225	0.0001
Host-Dispersal		0.061	<u>0.0947</u>	0.061	<u>0.0947</u>

(c)		10-km grid		1-km grid	
Factor	Covariate	Mantel ρ	<i>P</i> -values	Mantel ρ	<i>P</i> -values
Host	Taxon	−0.126	0.0001	−0.127	0.0001
Host	Climate	0.033	0.0044	0.016	0.1889
Host	Dispersal	−0.125	0.0001	−0.126	0.0001
Host	All three	0.036	0.0021	0.021	<u>0.0890</u>

Spearman's correlation coefficients (ρ values) are shown for all four factors.

Bold: $P < 0.05$; Underlined: $0.05 < P < 0.1$ after 9,999 permutations.

(a) 10km grid scale

(b) 1km grid scale