Variable costs and benefits of eavesdropping a green leaf volatile on two plant species in a common garden

Grace E. Freundlich and Christopher J. Frost*

Department of Biology, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, USA 40292

*Corresponding author

Christopher Frost

Phone: (502) 852-7997

Email addresses:

Grace Freundlich grace.freundlich@louisville.edu

Christopher Frost chris.frost@louisville.edu

Total figures: 6

Supplemental Figures: 3

Supplemental Tables: 6

Word Count: 4,243

Running Title: Costs of HIPV-mediated eavesdropping

Highlight: Long-term exposure to a ubiquitous herbivore-associated volatile cue results in species-specific fitness effects. Differential cue-mediated growth/defense tradeoffs have important implications for plant-herbivore interactions.

Abstract

Herbivore-induced plant volatile (HIPV)-mediated eavesdropping is a well-documented, inducible phenomenon that should—like any inducible phenomenon—incur fitness costs. Yet, ecological costs associated with volatile exposure alone are unclear. In a common garden experiment, we tested the hypothesis that exposure to a single HIPV would decrease herbivore damage at the cost of reduced plant growth and reproduction. Lima bean (*Phaseolus lunatus*) and pepper (*Capsicum annuum*) plants were exposed to a persistent, low-dose (~10ng/hour) of the green leaf volatile *cis*-3-hexenyl acetate (z3HAC), a ubiquitous HIPV. z3HAC-treated pepper plants were shorter, had less aboveground and belowground biomass, and produced fewer flowers and fruits relative to controls while z3HAC-treated lima bean plants were taller and produced more leaves and flowers than did controls. Natural herbivory was reduced in z3HAC-exposed lima bean plants, but not in pepper. Cyanogenic potential, a putative defense mechanism in lima bean, was lower in z3HAC-exposed leaves, suggesting a growth-defense tradeoffs from z3HAC exposure alone. Plant species-specific responses to an identical priming cue have important implications for ecological costs and benefits of volatile-mediated inter-plant communication under field conditions.

Key Words - *cis*-3-hexenyl acetate, eavesdropping, lima bean, pepper, plant fitness, plant volatiles

Abbreviations used- *cis*-3-hexenyl acetate (z3HAC), Herbivore-induced plant volatile (HIPV), Green-leaf volatile (GLV)

Introduction

Production and utilization of airborne chemical cues is prevalent within the plant kingdom. Plants depend on airborne chemical signaling for pollination (Muhlemann *et al.*, 2014), indirect defense (Mumm and Dicke, 2010), protection from pathogens (Farag *et al.*, 2013), and herbivore resistance (Frost *et al.*, 2008c). Volatile communication is also pivotal for plant-plant signaling, and selection for such signaling depends on honest cues that reliably confer ecologically relevant information. For example, herbivory is a fundamental ecological interaction that impacts plant fitness, and many plants increase the production and emission of volatile compounds in response to herbivore damage (Turlings *et al.*, 1995). Such herbivore-induced plant volatiles (HIPVs) are potentially reliable cues around which plant-plant eavesdropping could be evolutionarily adaptive (Rodriguez-Saona and Frost, 2010). Undamaged plants (or parts of the same plant (Frost *et al.*, 2007; Heil and Silva Bueno, 2007)) eavesdropping on HIPVs from a plant experiencing herbivory may directly trigger stress responses (Arimura *et al.*, 2002; Heil and Karban, 2010; Pearse *et al.*, 2013), or alternatively prime responses for future potential herbivory (Frost and Hunter, 2008).

HIPV-mediated signaling appears to be a common phenomenon. For example, HIPVs prime or induce corn (Erb *et al.*, 2015; Farag *et al.*, 2005), tomato (Farag and Paré, 2002), poplar (Frost *et al.*, 2007; Frost *et al.*, 2008c), blueberry (Rodriguez-Saona *et al.*, 2009) and lima bean (Arimura *et al.*, 2008; Sarai Giron-Calva *et al.*, 2012) against herbivory. HIPVs can be diverse and taxa-specific (Arimura *et al.*, 2009; Copolovici *et al.*, 2011), but are often comprised of monoterpenes, sesquiterpenes, benzenoids and green leaf volatiles GLVs (Boggia *et al.*, 2015; Engelberth *et al.*, 2004). In contrast to volatile terpenes and benzenoids (Arimura *et al.*, 2009; Paschold *et al.*, 2006), GLVs are immediately released into the airspace whenever leaves are

mechanically damaged (Matsui *et al.*, 2012) serving as early indicators of wounding. GLV exposure alters gene expression profiles related to specialized metabolite production and accumulated secondary metabolite precursors in preparation for inducing resistance (Pastor *et al.*, 2014). For example, the GLV *cis*-3-hexenyl acetate (z3HAC) induces transcriptional changes in poplar (Frost *et al.*, 2008c) and maize (Engelberth *et al.*, 2004) that prime oxylipin signaling and induced resistance. Among the GLVs, z3HAC may represent a reliable cue because it is typically released from herbivore-damaged leaves and not by mechanically damaged leaves in a variety of species (Matsui *et al.*, 2012), including tomato (Farag and Paré, 2002), maize (Engelberth *et al.*, 2004), Arabidopsis (D'Auria *et al.*, 2007), lima bean (Arimura *et al.*, 2008; Heil and Silva Bueno, 2007), pepper (Addesso *et al.*, 2011; Cardoza and Tumlinson, 2006), and poplar (Frost *et al.*, 2008c; McCormick *et al.*, 2014).

Costs incurred by plants exposed to HIPV cues alone are largely unknown. Ecological theory posits that induced resistance by plants against herbivores is a cost-savings strategy to restrict the deployment of costly specialized defensive metabolites until necessary (Accamando and Cronin, 2012; Cipollini *et al.*, 2003). However, inducible resistance generates a period of vulnerability between the time of attack and the upregulation of resistance (Cipollini and Heil, 2010). Perception of early reliable cues may overcome such a vulnerability by allowing a plant to anticipate a probable attack. Since priming is an inducible phenomenon, theory predicts that responding to reliable cues alone should incur costs that outweigh and select against maintaining a “primed state” (Douma *et al.*, 2017; Frost *et al.*, 2008b). In other words, perception of a priming stimulus, such as an HIPV, may induce physiological changes that incur costs that are less expensive than induced resistance itself. Non-volatile priming agents β -amino butyric acid (BABA) (van Hulten *et al.*, 2006) and snail mucus (Orrock, 2018) both support this prediction.

Similarly, costs associated with volatile perception alone that initiate priming should be less severe than costs of induced resistance to actual herbivory (Martinez-Medina *et al.*, 2016). Yet there is currently limited experimental evidence of such costs with respect to anti-herbivore volatile cues. For example, whereas bacterial-derived volatiles 3-pentanol and 2-butanone decrease reproductive output in field-grown *Cucumis sativa* (Song and Ryu, 2013), wild tobacco (*Nicotiana attenuata*) exposed to airspace of experimentally clipped sagebrush produce more seeds (i.e., higher presumptive fitness) relative to control plants (Karban and Maron, 2002). These results suggest that ecological costs of exposure to volatile cues may be context dependent, but comparative cost/benefit tradeoffs for perception of HIPVs alone among sympatric field-grown plants is currently lacking.

Here, we report a common garden field experiment with lima bean (*Phaseolus lunatus*) and chili pepper (*Capsicum annuum*) testing the hypothesis that field plants subject to a persistent dose of an ostensibly reliable volatile cue incur consistent costs reflected in reduced growth and reproduction. We treated individuals of both species to repeated low-dose applications of z3HAC and measured their growth, reproduction, and herbivore damage throughout the growing season. We predicted that exposure to z3HAC—regardless of plant species identity—would reduce growth and reproductive output, while also reducing natural herbivory.

Methods and Materials

Study Site and Plants

A common garden experiment was established on a 54m² plot within Blackacre Conservancy's community garden in Louisville, Kentucky (38°11'33.8"N 85°31'28.3"W; Supplemental Fig. 1).

The field site was enclosed in a mesh fence to exclude mammalian herbivores. *Phaseolus lunatus*, Fabaceae, variety Fordham Hook 242 ('lima bean') and the *Capsicum annuum*, Solanaceae, variety Cayenne pepper, Joe Red Long ('pepper') were chosen as phylogenetically distinct model plants with previously established defense profiles (Ballhorn *et al.*, 2008; Zachariah *et al.*, 2010). Seeds were purchased from the Louisville Seed Company (Louisville, KY, USA), and germinated in Metromix 510© in May 2016 in the Biology Department's greenhouse. After reaching ~20cm in height, 132 lima bean plants were transplanted to the field May 30, 2016, at 4 weeks old and 98 pepper plants at 8 weeks old were transplanted to the field June 28, 2016. While both species were started at the same time, peppers were placed in the field later than the lima beans because they needed additional maturation time before transferring to the field. Within the field site, plants were planted in alternating rows of twos of lima bean and pepper. Distance limitations exist regarding plant volatile perception (Frost *et al.*, 2008a) and consequent herbivore resistance (Dolch and Tschardtke, 2000; Frost *et al.*, 2007). Previous studies with sagebrush (Karban *et al.*, 2006) and lima bean (Heil and Adame-Alvarez, 2010) indicate that volatile cues are effective over relatively short distances of less than 100cm. Therefore, all plants in our experiment were spaced one meter apart from one another in all directions to reduce the risk of interplant communication and cue crossover.

Volatile exposure

Plants were acclimated to the field for one week after planting before volatile treatments began. To simulate a naturally occurring low dose (Engelberth *et al.*, 2007; Shiojiri *et al.*, 2012), plants were exposed to lanolin infused paste equivalent to 10ng/hr of z3HAC for seven days. This concentration is 25% of that which previously primed poplar (Frost *et al.*, 2008c) and maize

(Engelberth *et al.*, 2004). A treatment vial contained 50mg of a 30ng/ul z3HAC/lanolin, while a control vial contained 50mg of lanolin. Each glass vial had a 9mm aperture and was maintained at -80°C until use. Each week, both the z3HAC-infused lanolin vials and lanolin-only controls were placed at the bottom of their respective plants. Each vial was inverted and supported with a wire stand and each vial was wrapped in aluminum foil to reduce photo degradation (von Mery *et al.*, 2011) (Supplemental Fig. 2). Plants were randomly assigned to either z3HAC treatment (lima bean n=63; pepper n=35) or lanolin control (lima bean n=72; pepper n=43). The unit of replication was an individual plant and each plant received its own vial. Random assignment of treatments was made using blocks of 4 adjacent plants; block was included as a random factor in statistical models, and was not a significant factor in any of the models.

Growth, biomass, and reproduction measurements

We measured height and total leaf counts routinely on the experimental plants. Leaves were only counted if they were wider than 2cm across for both species while height measurements for both species were recorded from the base of the plant to the uppermost branching point. For lima bean, height was determined by measuring the longest runner within the bush, while pepper plants were measured from the base of the main stalk to the highest branching point. Along with height, the total number of leaves per plant was measured throughout the field season. A complete biomass harvest was conducted on pepper for leaves, roots, and stems at the end of the field season. All leaves and fruits were separated into paper bags before individual plants were extracted from of the ground. After removal, roots and stems were separated, roots were washed with water to remove dirt, and placed into separate paper bags. All materials were dried at 60°C for 24 hours and then weighed. A biomass harvest for lima bean was not performed because an

Epliachna varivestis (Mexican Bean Beetle) outbreak late in the season removed much of the leaf tissue before we could determine reliable biomass measurements.

We measured total flower and fruit production as proxies for reproductive fitness in both species. Flowers were recorded if they were true flowers with fully mature pistils and stamen. If a flower was not fully mature, it was recorded as a flower bud. Fruits were recorded as soon as fruit development was observed with either initial pod or exocarp development. Throughout the field season, fruit and flower counts per plant were recorded along with the number of mature and immature fruits.

From the fruits harvested from the final biomass harvest, ~10 randomly selected, mature fruits from each pepper plant were chosen for seed count analysis (188 fruits from z3HAC-treated plants and 210 fruits from controls). Dried fruits were dissected with a scalpel and all seeds were isolated and counted.

Herbivory

Leaf chewing damage was assessed for both pepper and lima bean as percent leaf area removed (LAR) using a visual estimation technique (Frost and Hunter, 2004, 2008) with the following damage categories: 0%, 0-5%, 5-15%, 15-30%, 30-50%, 50-70%, 70-90%, and >90%. For each damage assessment, every leaf on a plant was categorized into one of the damage categories, and an overall percent damage was determined as a weighted average of all leaves. Plants were also routinely monitored for the presence of naturally occurring chewing and piercing/sucking

herbivores. In particular, we noted a natural occurrence of the black bean aphid (*Aphis faba*), and recorded its presence/absence on lima bean plants in the field.

Leaf collections and cyanide measurements

Since cyanogenic potential (CP) is an inducible herbivore defense in lima bean (Ballhorn *et al.*, 2005; Gleadow and Moller, 2014), we used CP as a metric for induced responses in the presence of z3HAC. We collected source and sink leaves (Ochoa-Lopez *et al.*, 2015; Schultz *et al.*, 2013) on July 10, 2016, which was approximately 6 weeks into the field season. We modified a colorometric protocol (Brinker and Seigler, 1989; Gleadow *et al.*, 2011) for microscale measurements. Briefly, 5mg of lyophilized tissue was mixed with 200uL of citrate buffer (0.1 M, pH 5.5-6.5) in a 2mL centrifuge tube, into which a 200uL glass vial (Agilent part number 5183-2090) containing 100uL 1.0M NaOH was also placed. After 15 hours, 50uL of the 1.0M NaOH was diluted to 0.1M, and a 30uL aliquot was neutralized (30uL 0.5M acetic acid) and reacted with two reagents (A: 75 uL of $5.0 \times 10^{-3} \text{g mL}^{-1}$ succinimide and $5.0 \times 10^{-4} \text{g mL}^{-1}$ n-chlorosuccinimide; B: 30uL of 0.03g mL^{-1} barbituric acid in 30% pyridine). After 8 min, absorbance at 580nm was determined on a plate reader (SpectraMax M2). Quantification of CP was made against a standard curve of NaCN.

Statistical analyses

All statistical analyses were performed in R (version 3.4.2) with the lme4 and multcomp packages. Growth data, such as plant height, leaf area removed, and flower counts, were analyzed using repeated measures ANOVA with the aov function with a Gaussian distribution. For repeated measures analyses, we treated date as a within-subjects effect and treatment as a

between-subjects effect for all analyses. Differences between treatments at each individual time point, as well as all biomass data, were analyzed using one-way ANOVA (glmer function) followed by a Tukey's post hoc comparison. Cyanide measurements were normalized via log transform before running a glm model followed by a Tukey's post hoc comparison.

Results

Treatment with z3HAC differentially affected the growth of lima bean and pepper plants. On average, z3HAC-treated lima bean grew 11% taller compared to control plants throughout the field season (Fig.1A; $F_{2,927}=9.688$, $P=0.002$) and produced 17% more leaves overall than did controls (Fig.1B; $F_{1,571}=4.339$, $P=0.038$). In contrast, z3HAC-treated pepper plants were 12% shorter relative to controls (Fig.1C; $F_{1,48}=6.168$, $P=0.017$) and produced 23% fewer leaves over the field season (Fig.1D; $F_{1,237}=21.58$, $P<0.001$). Consistent with height and leaf counts, z3HAC treatment reduced overall biomass of pepper plants by 24% on average (Fig.2). When we destructively harvested all pepper plant biomass at the end of the season, z3HAC-treated pepper plants had lower leaf, stem, and root dry biomass by 21%, 31%, 29%, respectively (Fig.2A-C) ($Z=3.379$, $P<0.001$; $Z=-2.035$, $P=0.042$; $Z=-2.379$, $P=0.017$). Despite these z3HAC-mediated effects on biomass exposure, the aboveground-to-belowground biomass ratio was similar regardless of treatment (Fig.2D; $Z=0.31$, $P=0.757$). That is, pepper plants treated with z3HAC were smaller relative to control plants.

z3HAC treatment also differentially affected reproductive output between the two species, and lowered fruit output in pepper. Flower production was 30% higher in lima bean plants exposed to z3HAC (Fig.3A; $F_{1,576}=15.044$, $P<0.001$), while z3HAC-treated peppers produced 37% fewer flowers relative to control plants at the end of the field season (Fig.3B;

$F_{1,43}=14.48$, $P<0.001$). *z3HAC*-treated pepper plants also produced 23% fewer fruits overall relative to controls (Fig.4A; $Z=-2.035$, $P=0.042$), and the fruits that were produced by *z3HAC*-treated plants had lower wet and dry masses (Fig.4B-C; $Z=-2.88$, $P=0.004$; $Z=-2.439$, $P=0.015$), and 10% lower total seed counts (Fig.4D; $Z=3.524$, $P<0.001$) and total seed masses (Fig.4E; $Z=3.334$, $P<0.001$), relative to controls. Even though total fruit and seed production was reduced by *z3HAC* treatment, the ratio of seed mass to fruit mass was similar between *z3HAC*-treated and control plants (Fig.4F; $Z=0.588$, $P=0.807$). Moreover, the estimated mass of an individual seed was similar between *z3HAC*-treated plants and controls in pepper (Supplemental Fig.3). There was no apparent difference in lima bean pod production (Supplemental Fig.3). However, an unexpected field-wide premature pod drop that was independent of treatment prevented us from determining lima bean seed production with confidence.

z3HAC exposure reduced natural herbivory in lima bean but not pepper plants. Chewing herbivory on pepper plants was low throughout the season and statistically higher in *z3HAC*-treated plants; however, this effect was driven by only the first sampling date (Fig.5A, $F_{1,193}=5.627$, $P=0.019$). In contrast, chewing damage to lima bean leaves increased as the field season progressed, with *z3HAC*-treated plants having overall 26% less chewing damage than did control plants (Fig.5B; $F_{1,539}=21.745$, $P<0.001$). In addition to chewing herbivory, black bean aphids (*Aphis faba*) colonized 87% of the *z3HAC*-treated lima bean plants, compared with only 21% of control plants (Fig.5C; $\chi^2 = 50.11$, $df=1$, $P<0.001$). *A.faba* colonized early in the season and was only observed June 15-31 (Julian dates 166-181) because a heavy rainfall event reduced their population to undetectable levels. Piercing/sucking herbivores were rare for the remainder of the experiment.

Exposure to z3HAC reduced cyanogenic potential in lima bean plants. z3HAC exposure alone reduced cyanide concentration by 50% in sink leaves (Figure 6A; $Z = -0.3257$, $P = 0.003$), but not significantly in source leaves (Fig. 6C; $Z = -0.14387$, $P = 0.146$). Additionally, baseline levels of cyanide were nearly 2x greater in sink leaves compared to source leaves (Figure 6) regardless of z3HAC exposure.

Discussion

We show that a persistent, low-dose application of z3HAC differentially affects growth and reproduction in two plant species under identical field conditions. Based on previous work on plant and sensory perception of volatiles (Engelberth *et al.*, 2004; Frost *et al.*, 2007), we hypothesized z3HAC application would decrease growth and reproductive fitness in both plant species. The rationale for this hypothesis was a central assumption of induced resistance theory that ecological costs modulate the deployment particular defensive phenotypes until necessary (Agrawal, 1999; Baldwin, 1998; Cipollini and Heil, 2010; Cipollini *et al.*, 2003; Didiano *et al.*, 2014; Koricheva, 2002; Mauricio, 1998). Volatile-mediated priming, even if regulated by a different mechanism from resistance (Hilker *et al.*, 2016), is an inducible phenomenon that theoretically should incur such fitness costs (Martinez-Medina *et al.*, 2016). Yet, our results clearly indicate that pepper and lima bean had divergent fitness outcomes when subjected to a single GLV under identical field conditions. Whereas z3HAC-treated pepper plants had reduced growth (Fig. 1) and no effect on herbivore resistance (Fig. 5) relative to controls, z3HAC-treated lima bean plants grew more and produced more flowers (Fig. 1), and suffered less chewing herbivory (Fig. 5B) compared to controls. This result—that some plants experience costs while others have minimal or even positive effects when exposed to the same HIPV—has important

implications for how volatile cues may structure interspecific competition and ecological communities. HIPVs alone may be sufficient to result in differential fitness effects among species.

What might affect the response of plants to volatile exposure? One possibility is that the signal integrity of HIPVs varies among plant species, which influences plant sensory perception and the outcome of defense priming. Previous work on the role of HIPVs in plant anti-herbivore resistance focused on priming-mediated defense with consistent results in wheat (Ameye *et al.*, 2015; Walters *et al.*, 2008), corn (Engelberth *et al.*, 2007; Farag *et al.*, 2005), lima bean (Arimura *et al.*, 2002; Choh and Takabayashi, 2006; Heil and Silva Bueno, 2007), tomato (Acevedo *et al.*, 2017), blueberry (Rodriguez-Saona *et al.*, 2009), sagebrush (Karban *et al.*, 2006), Arabidopsis (Bissmeyer *et al.*, 2018) and poplar (Frost *et al.*, 2008c). In contrast, we specifically focused on indicators of plant fitness in lima bean and pepper in a common garden experiment. z3HAC treatment alone increased growth and flowering in lima bean, while reducing growth and reproductive output in pepper (Fig. 3 and 5). This long-term evidence illustrates that informational integrity varies among species. Such divergent fitness effects from exposure to a single ubiquitous herbivore-associated cue underscore the potential for functional similarity in the mechanisms by which plants modulate responses to herbivory and volatile indicators of herbivory.

Flower and fruit production is a key component of plant fitness potential. We show that z3HAC treatment alone differentially affected flower production in lima bean and pepper (Fig. 3). Insect herbivory can increase or decrease floral production depending on the system and environmental conditions (Agrawal *et al.*, 1999; Lucas-Barbosa, 2016; Pashalidou *et al.*, 2013). Whereas increased flower production is a strategy assumed to ameliorate fitness losses in the

presence of an environmental stress (Agrawal, 1999, 2000), decreased flower production may be related to costs of chemically mediated defense (Heath *et al.*, 2014). Additionally, herbivory affects floral attractiveness (Halpern *et al.*, 2010; Hoffmeister and Junker, 2016), which may ultimately influence fitness (Kessler *et al.*, 2011). Our data indicate that a volatile cue alone is sufficient to trigger changes in floral biology, but the magnitude and direction of those changes are plant species-specific. Additionally, *z*3HAC-treated pepper produced fewer fruits (Fig. 4) but lima bean did not (Supplemental Fig. 3). The mechanisms underlying *z*3HAC-mediated effects on flower and fruit production are unknown, but may be similar to those induced by herbivory (Lucas-Barbosa, 2016).

Resource allocation between different tissues is pivotal for growth, reproduction, and defense, and can be influenced by environmental stress. For example, direct herbivory alters resource allocation between aboveground tissue and belowground tissue (Eichenberg *et al.*, 2015; Frost and Hunter, 2008; Machado *et al.*, 2013), as does application of the anti-herbivore phytohormone jasmonic acid (JA) (Gomez *et al.*, 2010; Schweiger *et al.*, 2014). Volatile cues can also affect biomass allocation. For example, barley exposed to volatiles from unwounded neighboring plants of different cultivars increases root and leaf biomass (Ninkovic, 2003), while exposure to volatiles decreases aboveground biomass in other systems (Cipollini, 2010; Lu *et al.*, 2017). In our case, volatile treatment reduced overall aboveground and belowground biomass in pepper, but did not appear to alter overall biomass allocation patterns. Simply put, *z*3HAC-treated pepper plants were smaller overall, and therefore produced fewer seeds.

Differential investment between growth and defense is vital for maximizing limited resources and, ultimately, fitness. Inducible defenses in plants against herbivores and pathogens modulate such growth/defense tradeoffs in a number of plant species (Cipollini and Heil, 2010).

In some cases, exposure to VOCs alone is sufficient to affect such tradeoffs. For example, sagebrush exposed to VOCs from damaged conspecifics had decreased growth (Karban, 2017), while HIPV-exposed tobacco had increased herbivore resistance but decreased seed set (Karban and Maron, 2002). In our experiment, z3HAC exposure decreased cyanogenic potential in sink leaves (Fig. 6), which were 20-30% higher than in source leaves. These results suggest that persistent exposure to z3HAC led to allocation shifts from cyanogenic potential (a putative defense) towards growth (Fig. 1 and 3), as well as supporting ontogeny-mediated cyanogenic potential (Ballhorn *et al.*, 2006; Ochoa-Lopez *et al.*, 2015).. That said, z3HAC-treated plants also experienced less natural damage primarily on mature source leaves than did controls (Fig. 5, personal observations), suggesting that the herbivory was deterred by defense mechanism other than cyanogenic potential in source leaves.

 Volatile cues may impact ecological communities in both expected and pleiotropic ways. HIPVs are well-established mediators of multi-trophic antagonistic and mutualistic interactions (Heil, 2008; Kessler and Baldwin, 2001; Peñaflor *et al.*, 2017), and manipulations of chemical signals and volatile blends have been used for biological control in a wide range of systems (Peñaflor and Bento, 2013; Stenberg *et al.*, 2015). For example, HIPV-infused sticky traps in a grape (*Vitis vinifera*) orchard differentially attracted lacewings, hoverflies, and parasitoids (Lucchi *et al.*, 2017). Exogenous GLV manipulation using “dispensers” under field conditions altered the arthropod community composition in maize (von Merrey *et al.*, 2011). In our study, *A.faba* were clearly and unexpectedly attracted to z3HAC-exposed plants (Fig. 5). Under glasshouse conditions, *A.faba* were repelled by z3HAC alone (Webster *et al.*, 2008), which suggests that the cue that mediated attraction was not our treatment alone. It is tempting to speculate that aphid attraction combined with reduced chewing herbivory in lima bean may be

reflective of z3HAC effects on JA and salicylic acid (SA) signaling, which would be consistent with a JA-SA tradeoff (Huot *et al.*, 2014; Wei *et al.*, 2014). Ultimately, however, the utility of GLVs (or other VOCs) in field applications will depend on understanding community-level effects of volatile exposure.

As a caveat, volatile identity, concentration, and duration may affect the reliability of a cue and therefore the costs associated with eavesdropping. Plants experiencing insect herbivory frequently generate species-specific blends of volatile compounds (Ameys *et al.*, 2017; Holopainen and Gershenzon, 2010), which can influence fitness in neighboring plants (Caparrotta *et al.*, 2018; Karban, 2017; Kessler *et al.*, 2006). Plant-derived compounds associated with herbivory include GLVs (Frag *et al.*, 2005; Frost *et al.*, 2008c; Lu *et al.*, 2017), phenylpropanoid derivatives (Erb *et al.*, 2015), and terpenes (Arimura *et al.*, 2012). However, individual compounds within a blend can affect plant defense and priming as much as the blend. We used z3HAC in this study because it is released primarily from herbivore-damaged leaves and not just wounded leaves (Engelberth *et al.*, 2004), which differs from other wound-released GLVs (Ameys *et al.*, 2017) (Matsui *et al.*, 2012) and ostensibly allows z3HAC to confer reliable ecological information. Moreover, plants detect and respond specifically to z3HAC (Frost *et al.*, 2008c), and the costs associated with that response were the focus of this investigation. Additionally, concentration of a cue may influence plant resistance (Bismeyer *et al.*, 2018; Lu *et al.*, 2017). For example, a repeated, low-dose exposure to a GLV blend enhances plant resistance compared to a single application (Shiojiri *et al.*, 2012) while z3HAC emissions can be as high as 66 ng/cm³ after herbivory (Boggia *et al.*, 2015). For these reasons, we chose to use a low-dose exposure to z3HAC (25% of the concentration that primed poplar (Frost *et al.*, 2008c) and maize

(Engelberth *et al.*, 2004), and still observed divergent fitness effects between the two plant species (Figs.1, 3, and 5).

In summary, our key finding is that persistent application of a low dose of a single volatile compound z3HAC, a common HIPV and GLV, in field conditions leads to divergent growth and reproductive fitness effects between two plant species. This result underscores the variable nature of HIPV-eavesdropping, and that plants may have evolved species-specific mechanisms for responding to volatile cues. Given natural variation among species, future work must assess costs with other species as well as within ascensions and landraces of our model plants over multiple years. Ultimately, the adaptive significance of eavesdropping for enhancing plant immunity will depend on plant life history, physiology, and other ecological factors to determine whether a plant will benefit from eavesdropping VOCs or not, and therefore what impact priming might have on plant communities.

Description of Supporting Information.

Fig. S1. An aerial view of the field site.

Fig. S2. Volatile administration setup.

Fig. S3. Estimated individual seed mass in pepper and total pod production in lima bean.

Table S1-S6 describe the complete statistics for their corresponding figures.

Acknowledgments - We are grateful to Allie Peot and Abhinav Maurya for field assistance, and to A.Peot for assistance processing the plant materials in the laboratory. Comments from Heidi Appel and Amy Austin greatly improved the manuscript. We are grateful to A. Dale Josey and

401 Susan Ballerstedt for permission and logistical support to work in the community gardens at
 402 Blackacre Conservancy.

403

404 **Funding Sources-** This work was supported by the National Science Foundation grant IOS-
 405 1656625 to C.J.F.

406

References

- Accamando AK, Cronin JT.** 2012. Costs and Benefits of Jasmonic Acid Induced Responses in Soybean. *Environmental Entomology* **41**, 551-561.
- Acevedo FE, Peiffer M, Tan CW, Stanley BA, Stanley A, Wang J, Jones AG, Hoover K, Rosa C, Luthe D, Felton G.** 2017. Fall Armyworm-Associated Gut Bacteria Modulate Plant Defense Responses. *Molecular Plant-Microbe Interactions* **30**, 127-137.
- Addesso KM, McAuslane HJ, Alborn HT.** 2011. Attraction of pepper weevil to volatiles from damaged pepper plants. *Entomologia Experimentalis Et Applicata* **138**, 1-11.
- Agrawal AA.** 1999. Induced responses to herbivory in wild radish: Effects on several herbivores and plant fitness. *Ecology* **80**, 1713-1723.
- Agrawal AA.** 2000. Overcompensation of plants in response to herbivory and the by-product benefits of mutualism. *Trends in Plant Science* **5**, 309-313.
- Agrawal AA, Strauss SY, Stout MJ.** 1999. Costs of induced responses and tolerance to herbivory in male and female fitness components of wild radish. *Evolution* **53**, 1093-1104.
- Ameys M, Allmann S, Verwaeren J, Smagghe G, Haesaert G, Schuurink RC, Audenaert K.** 2017. Green leaf volatile production by plants: a meta-analysis. *New Phytologist*, 1-18.
- Ameys M, Audenaert K, De Zutter N, Steppe K, Van Meulebroek L, Vanhaecke L, De Vleeschauwer D, Haesaert G, Smagghe G.** 2015. Priming of Wheat with the Green Leaf Volatile Z-3-Hexenyl Acetate Enhances Defense against *Fusarium graminearum* But Boosts Deoxynivalenol Production. *Plant Physiology* **167**, 1671-1684.
- Arimura G, Matsui K, Takabayashi J.** 2009. Chemical and Molecular Ecology of Herbivore-Induced Plant Volatiles: Proximate Factors and Their Ultimate Functions. *Plant and Cell Physiology* **50**, 911-923.
- Arimura G, Muroi A, Nishihara M.** 2012. Plant-plant-plant communications, mediated by (E)-beta-ocimene emitted from transgenic tobacco plants, prime indirect defense responses of lima beans. *Journal of Plant Interactions* **7**, 193-196.
- Arimura G, Ozawa R, Nishioka T, Boland W, Koch T, Kuhnemann F, Takabayashi J.** 2002. Herbivore-induced volatiles induce the emission of ethylene in neighboring lima bean plants. *Plant Journal* **29**, 87-98.
- Arimura GI, Kopke S, Kunert M, Volpe V, David A, Brand P, Dabrowska P, Maffei ME, Boland W.** 2008. Effects of feeding *Spodoptera littoralis* on lima bean leaves: IV. Diurnal and nocturnal damage differentially initiate plant volatile emission. *Plant Physiology* **146**, 965-973.
- Baldwin IT.** 1998. Jasmonate-induced responses are costly but benefit plants under attack in native populations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **95**, 8113-8118.
- Ballhorn DJ, Heil M, Lieberei R.** 2006. Phenotypic plasticity of cyanogenesis in lima bean *Phaseolus lunatus* - Activity and activation of beta-glucosidase. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **32**, 261-275.
- Ballhorn DJ, Lieberei R, Ganzhorn JU.** 2005. Plant cyanogenesis of *Phaseolus lunatus* and its relevance for herbivore-plant interaction: The importance of quantitative data. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **31**, 1445-1473.
- Ballhorn DJ, Schiwy S, Jensen M, Heil M.** 2008. Quantitative Variability of Direct Chemical Defense in Primary and Secondary Leaves of Lima Bean (*Phaseolus lunatus*) and Consequences for a Natural Herbivore. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **34**, 1298-1301.

- Bissmeyer S, Freundlich G, Frost C.** 2018. The influence of dose of a plant-derived volatile cue on *Arabidopsis thaliana* resistance against insect herbivores. *Kentucky Journal of Undergraduate Research* **2**, 84-95.
- Boggia L, Sgorbini B, Berteau CM, Cagliero C, Bicchi C, Maffei ME, Rubiolo P.** 2015. Direct Contact-Sorptive Tape Extraction coupled with Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry to reveal volatile topographical dynamics of lima bean (*Phaseolus lunatus* L.) upon herbivory by *Spodoptera littoralis* Boisd. *Bmc Plant Biology* **15**, 1-13.
- Brinker AM, Seigler D.** 1989. Methods for the detection and quantitative determination of cyanide in plant materials. *Phytochemical Bulletin* **21**, 24-31.
- Caparrotta S, Boni S, Taiti C, Palm E, Mancuso S, Pandolfi C.** 2018. Induction of priming by salt stress in neighboring plants. *Environmental and Experimental Botany* **147**, 261-270.
- Cardoza YJ, Tumlinson JH.** 2006. Compatible and incompatible *Xanthomonas* infections differentially affect herbivore-induced volatile emission by pepper plants. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **32**, 1755-1768.
- Choh Y, Takabayashi J.** 2006. Herbivore-induced extrafloral nectar production in lima bean plants enhanced by previous exposure to volatiles from infested conspecifics. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **32**, 2073-2077.
- Cipollini D.** 2010. Constitutive expression of methyl jasmonate-inducible responses delays reproduction and constrains fitness responses to nutrients in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Evolutionary Ecology* **24**, 59-68.
- Cipollini D, Heil aM.** 2010. Costs and benefits of induced resistance to herbivores and pathogens in plants. *CAB International* **5**, 1-25.
- Cipollini D, Purrington CB, Bergelson J.** 2003. Costs of induced responses in plants. *Basic and Applied Ecology* **4**, 79-89.
- Coplovici L, Kannaste A, Remmel T, Vislap V, Niinemets U.** 2011. Volatile Emissions from *Alnus glutinosa* Induced by Herbivory are Quantitatively Related to the Extent of Damage. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **37**, 18-28.
- D'Auria JC, Pichersky E, Schaub A, Hansel A, Gershenzon J.** 2007. Characterization of a BAHD acyltransferase responsible for producing the green leaf volatile (Z)-3-hexen-1-yl acetate in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Plant Journal* **49**, 194-207.
- Didiano TJ, Turley NE, Everwand G, Schaefer H, Crawley MJ, Johnson MTJ.** 2014. Experimental test of plant defence evolution in four species using long-term rabbit exclosures. *Journal of Ecology* **102**, 584-594.
- Dolch R, Tschardt T.** 2000. Defoliation of alders (*Alnus glutinosa*) affects herbivory by leaf beetles on undamaged neighbours. *Oecologia* **125**, 504-511.
- Douma JC, Vermeulen PJ, Poelman EH, Dicke M, Anten NPR.** 2017. When does it pay off to prime for defense? A modeling analysis. *New Phytologist* **216**, 782-797.
- Eichenberg D, Purschke O, Ristok C, Wessjohann L, Bruelheide H.** 2015. Trade-offs between physical and chemical carbon-based leaf defence: of intraspecific variation and trait evolution. *Journal of Ecology* **103**, 1667-1679.
- Engelberth J, Alborn HT, Schmelz EA, Tumlinson JH.** 2004. Airborne signals prime plants against insect herbivore attack. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **101**, 1781-1785.
- Engelberth J, Seidl-Adams I, Schultz JC, Tumlinson JH.** 2007. Insect elicitors and exposure to green leafy volatiles differentially upregulate major octadecanoids and transcripts of 12-oxo phytodienoic acid reductases in *Zea mays*. *Molecular Plant-Microbe Interactions* **20**, 707-716.

- Erb M, Veyrat N, Robert CAM, Xu H, Frey M, Ton J, Turlings TCJ.** 2015. Indole is an essential herbivore-induced volatile priming signal in maize. *Nature communications*, 1-10.
- Farag MA, Fokar M, Zhang HA, Allen RD, Pare PW.** 2005. (Z)-3-Hexenol induces defense genes and downstream metabolites in maize. *Planta* **220**, 900-909.
- Farag MA, Paré PW.** 2002. C6-Green leaf volatiles trigger local and systemic VOC emissions in tomato. *Phytochemistry* **61**, 545-554.
- Farag MA, Zhang HM, Ryu CM.** 2013. Dynamic Chemical Communication between Plants and Bacteria through Airborne Signals: Induced Resistance by Bacterial Volatiles. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **39**, 1007-1018.
- Frost C, Mescher M, Carlson J, De Moraes C.** 2008a. Why do distance limitations exist on plant-plant signaling via airborne volatiles? *Plant signaling & behavior* **3**, 466-468.
- Frost CJ, Appel M, Carlson JE, De Moraes CM, Mescher MC, Schultz JC.** 2007. Within-plant signalling via volatiles overcomes vascular constraints on systemic signalling and primes responses against herbivores. *Ecology Letters* **10**, 490-498.
- Frost CJ, Hunter MD.** 2004. Insect canopy herbivory and frass deposition affect soil nutrient dynamics and export in oak mesocosms. *Ecology* **85**, 3335-3347.
- Frost CJ, Hunter MD.** 2008. Herbivore-induced shifts in carbon and nitrogen allocation in red oak seedlings. *New Phytologist* **178**, 835-845.
- Frost CJ, Mescher MC, Carlson JE, De Moraes CM.** 2008b. Plant defense priming against herbivores: Getting ready for a different battle. *Plant Physiology* **146**, 818-824.
- Frost CJ, Mescher MC, Dervinis C, Davis JM, Carlson JE, De Moraes CM.** 2008c. Priming defense genes and metabolites in hybrid poplar by the green leaf volatile cis-3-hexenyl acetate. *New Phytologist* **180**, 722-733.
- Gleadow R, Bjarnholt N, Jørgensen K, Fox J.** 2011. Cyanogenic Glycosides. In: Narwal SS, ed. *Soil Allelochemicals*, Vol. 1: Studium Press LLC, 283-310.
- Gleadow RM, Moller BL.** 2014. Cyanogenic Glycosides: Synthesis, Physiology, and Phenotypic Plasticity. *Annual Review of Plant Biology*, Vol 65 **65**, 155-185.
- Gomez S, Ferrieri RA, Schueller M, Orians CM.** 2010. Methyl jasmonate elicits rapid changes in carbon and nitrogen dynamics in tomato. *New Phytologist* **188**, 835-844.
- Halpern SL, Adler LS, Wink M.** 2010. Leaf herbivory and drought stress affect floral attractive and defensive traits in *Nicotiana quadrivalvis*. *Oecologia* **163**, 961-971.
- Heath JJ, Kessler A, Woebbe E, Cipollini D, Stireman JO.** 2014. Exploring plant defense theory in tall goldenrod, *Solidago altissima*. *New Phytologist* **202**, 1357-1370.
- Heil M.** 2008. Indirect defence via tritrophic interactions. *New Phytologist* **178**, 41-61.
- Heil M, Adame-Alvarez RM.** 2010. Short signalling distances make plant communication a soliloquy. *Biology Letters* **6**, 843-845.
- Heil M, Karban R.** 2010. Explaining evolution of plant communication by airborne signals. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **25**, 137-144.
- Heil M, Silva Bueno JC.** 2007. Within-plant signaling by volatiles leads to induction and priming of an indirect plant defense in nature. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **104**, 5467-5472.
- Hilker M, Schwachtje J, Baier M, Balazadeh S, Baurle I, Geiselhardt S, Hinch DK, Kunze R, Mueller-Roeber B, Rillig MG, Rolff J, Romeis R, Schmulling T, Steppuhn A, van Dongen J, Whitcomb SJ, Wurst S, Zuther E, Kopka J.** 2016. Priming and memory of stress responses in organisms lacking a nervous system. *Biological Reviews* **91**, 1118-1133.

- Hoffmeister M, Junker RR.** 2016. Herbivory-induced changes in the olfactory and visual display of flowers and extrafloral nectaries affect pollinator behavior. *Evolutionary Ecology*, 1-16.
- Holopainen JK, Gershenzon J.** 2010. Multiple stress factors and the emission of plant VOCs. *Trends in Plant Science* **15**, 176-184.
- Huot B, Yao J, Montgomery BL, He SY.** 2014. Growth-Defense Tradeoffs in Plants: A Balancing Act to Optimize Fitness. *Molecular Plant* **7**, 1267-1287.
- Karban R.** 2017. Tradeoff between resistance induced by volatile communication and overtopping vertical growth. *Plant signaling & behavior* **12**.
- Karban R, Maron J.** 2002. The fitness consequences of interspecific eavesdropping between plants. *Ecology* **83**, 1209-1213.
- Karban R, Shiojiri K, Huntzinger M, McCall AC.** 2006. Damage-induced resistance in sagebrush: Volatiles are key to intra- and interplant communication. *Ecology* **87**, 922-930.
- Kessler A, Baldwin IT.** 2001. Defensive function of herbivore-induced plant volatile emissions in nature. *Science* **291**, 2141-2144.
- Kessler A, Halitschke R, Diezel C, Baldwin IT.** 2006. Priming of plant defense responses in nature by airborne signaling between *Artemisia tridentata* and *Nicotiana attenuata*. *Oecologia* **148**, 280-292.
- Kessler A, Halitschke R, Poveda K.** 2011. Herbivory-mediated pollinator limitation: negative impacts of induced volatiles on plant-pollinator interactions. *Ecology* **92**, 1769-1780.
- Koricheva J.** 2002. Meta-analysis of sources of variation in fitness costs of plant antiherbivore defenses. *Ecology* **83**, 176-190.
- Lai D, Picmanova M, Abou Hachem M, Motawia MS, Olsen CE, Moller BL, Rook F, Takos AM.** 2015. *Lotus japonicus* flowers are defended by a cyanogenic beta-glucosidase with highly restricted expression to essential reproductive organs. *Plant Molecular Biology* **89**, 21-34.
- Lu HB, Xu SY, Zhang WJ, Xu CM, Li BX, Zhang DX, Mu W, Liu F.** 2017. Nematicidal Activity of trans-2-Hexenal against Southern Root-Knot Nematode (*Meloidogyne incognita*) on Tomato Plants. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* **65**, 544-550.
- Lucas-Barbosa D.** 2016. Integrating Studies on Plant-Pollinator and Plant-Herbivore Interactions. *Trends in Plant Science* **21**, 125-133.
- Lucchi A, Loni A, Gandini LM, Scaramozzino P, Ioriatti C, Ricciardi R, Shearer PW.** 2017. Using herbivore-induced plant volatiles to attract lacewings, hoverflies and parasitoid wasps in vineyards: achievements and constraints. *Bulletin of Insectology* **70**, 273-282.
- Machado RAR, Ferrieri AP, Robert CAM, Glauser G, Kallenbach M, Baldwin IT, Erb M.** 2013. Leaf-herbivore attack reduces carbon reserves and regrowth from the roots via jasmonate and auxin signaling. *New Phytologist* **200**, 1234-1246.
- Martinez-Medina A, Flors V, Heil M, Mauch-Mani B, Pieterse CMJ, Pozo MJ, Ton J, van Dam NM, Conrath U.** 2016. Recognizing Plant Defense Priming. *Trends in Plant Science* **21**, 818-822.
- Matsui K, Sugimoto K, Mano Ji, Ozawa R, Takabayashi J.** 2012. Differential Metabolisms of Green Leaf Volatiles in Injured and Intact Parts of a Wounded Leaf Meet Distinct Ecophysiological Requirements. *Plos One* **7**.
- Mauricio R.** 1998. Costs of resistance to natural enemies in field populations of the annual plant *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *American Naturalist* **151**, 20-28.
- McCormick AC, Irmisch S, Reinecke A, Boeckler GA, Veit D, Reichelt M, Hansson BS, Gershenzon J, Kollner TG, Unsicker SB.** 2014. Herbivore-induced volatile emission in black

poplar: regulation and role in attracting herbivore enemies. *Plant Cell and Environment* **37**, 1909-1923.

Muhlemann JK, Klempien A, Dudareva N. 2014. Floral volatiles: from biosynthesis to function. *Plant Cell and Environment* **37**, 1936-1949.

Mumm R, Dicke M. 2010. Variation in natural plant products and the attraction of bodyguards involved in indirect plant defense. *Canadian Journal of Zoology-Revue Canadienne De Zoologie* **88**, 628-667.

Ninkovic V. 2003. Volatile communication between barley plants affects biomass allocation. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **54**, 1931-1939.

Ochoa-Lopez S, Villamil N, Zedillo-Avelleyra P, Boege K. 2015. Plant defence as a complex and changing phenotype throughout ontogeny. *Annals of Botany* **116**, 797-806.

Orrock J, Connolly, B., Choi, W., Guiden, P., Swanson, S., & Gilroy, S. . 2018. Plants eavesdrop on cues produced by snails and induce costly defenses that affect insect herbivores. *Oecologia* **186**, 703-710.

Paschold A, Halitschke R, Baldwin IT. 2006. Using 'mute' plants to translate volatile signals. *Plant Journal* **45**, 275-291.

Pashalidou FG, Lucas-Barbosa D, van Loon JJA, Dicke M, Fatouros NE. 2013. Phenotypic plasticity of plant response to herbivore eggs: effects on resistance to caterpillars and plant development. *Ecology* **94**, 702-713.

Pastor V, Balmer A, Gamir J, Flors V, Mauch-Mani B. 2014. Preparing to fight back: generation and storage of priming compounds. *Frontiers in Plant Science* **5**.

Pearse IS, Hughes K, Shiojiri K, Ishizaki S, Karban R. 2013. Interplant volatile signaling in willows: revisiting the original talking trees. *Oecologia* **172**, 869-875.

Peñaflor MFGV, Bento JMS. 2013. Herbivore-induced plant volatiles to enhance biological control in agriculture. *Neotropical Entomology* **42**, 331-343.

Peñaflor MFGV, Gonçalves FG, Colepicolo C, Sanches PA, Bento JMS. 2017. Effects of single and multiple herbivory by host and non-host caterpillars on the attractiveness of herbivore-induced volatiles of sugarcane to the generalist parasitoid *Cotesia flavipes*. *Entomologia Experimentalis Et Applicata* **165**, 83-93.

Rodriguez-Saona CR, Frost CJ. 2010. New evidence for a multi-functional role of herbivore-induced plant volatiles in defense against herbivores. *Plant signaling & behavior* **5**, 58-60.

Rodriguez-Saona CR, Rodriguez-Saona LE, Frost CJ. 2009. Herbivore-induced volatiles in the perennial shrub, *Vaccinium corymbosum*, and their role in inter-branch signaling. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **35**, 163-175.

Sarai Giron-Calva P, Molina-Torres J, Heil M. 2012. Volatile dose and exposure time impact perception in neighboring plants. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **38**, 226-228.

Schultz JC, Appel HM, Ferrieri AP, Arnold TM. 2013. Flexible resource allocation during plant defense responses. *Frontiers in Plant Science* **4**.

Schweiger R, Heise AM, Persicke M, Muller C. 2014. Interactions between the jasmonic and salicylic acid pathway modulate the plant metabolome and affect herbivores of different feeding types. *Plant Cell and Environment* **37**, 1574-1585.

Shiojiri K, Ozawa R, Matsui K, Sabelis MW, Takabayashi J. 2012. Intermittent exposure to traces of green leaf volatiles triggers a plant response. *Scientific Reports* **2**.

Song GC, Ryu CM. 2013. Two volatile organic compounds trigger plant self-defense against a bacterial pathogen and a sucking insect in cucumber under open field conditions. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* **14**, 9803-9819.

- Stenberg JA, Heil M, Ahman I, Bjorkman C.** 2015. Optimizing crops for biocontrol of pests and disease. *Trends in Plant Science* **20**, 698-712.
- Turlings TCJ, Loughrin JH, McCall PJ, Rose USR, Lewis WJ, Tumlinson JH.** 1995. How caterpillar-damaged plants protect themselves by attracting parasitic wasps. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **92**, 4169-4174.
- van Hulten M, Pelser M, van Loon LC, Pieterse CMJ, Ton J.** 2006. Costs and benefits of priming for defense in *Arabidopsis*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **103**, 5602-5607.
- von Merey G, Veyrat N, Mahuku G, Valdez RL, Turlings TCJ, D'Alessandro M.** 2011. Dispensing synthetic green leaf volatiles in maize fields increases the release of sesquiterpenes by the plants, but has little effect on the attraction of pest and beneficial insects. *Phytochemistry* **72**, 1838-1847.
- Walters DR, Paterson L, Walsh DJ, Havis ND.** 2008. Priming for plant defense in barley provides benefits only under high disease pressure. *Physiological and Molecular Plant Pathology* **73**, 95-100.
- Webster B, Bruce T, Dufour S, Birkemeyer C, Birkett M, Hardie J, Pickett J.** 2008. Identification of volatile compounds used in host location by the black bean aphid, *Aphis fabae*. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **34**, 1153-1161.
- Wei J, van Loon JJA, Gols R, Menzel TR, Li N, Kang L, Dicke M.** 2014. Reciprocal crosstalk between jasmonate and salicylate defence-signalling pathways modulates plant volatile emission and herbivore host-selection behaviour. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **65**, 3289-3298.
- Zachariah TJ, Safeer AL, Jayarajan K, Leela NK, Vipin TM, Saji KV, Shiva KN, Parthasarathy VA, Mammooty KP.** 2010. Correlation of metabolites in the leaf and berries of selected black pepper varieties. *Scientia Horticulturae* **123**, 418-422.

Figure Captions

Fig. 1. Height measurements and leaf counts for *Phaseolus lunatus* (lima bean) and *Capsicum annuum* (pepper) grown in a common garden field experiment. Height for (A) lima bean was measured from the base of the longest runner to the uppermost branching point; (C) pepper height was measured from the base of the main stalk to the uppermost branching point. Leaf counts for (B) lima bean and (D) pepper included all mature leaves on each plant. Open circles represent control plants (receiving lanolin-filled vials); filled squares represent plants receiving a persistent application of vials containing 10ng/hr *cis*-3-hexenyl acetate (z3HAC) dissolved in lanolin. Dropdown lines indicate the initial application of z3HAC treatment: lima bean and pepper plants were first exposed on June 10, 2016 (Julian date 161) and July 11, 2016 (Julian date 192), respectively. Points represent averages $\pm$ SE. Repeated measures ANOVAs (aov in R) were followed by one-way ANOVAs at each time-point. Asterisks (*) represent $P < 0.05$ between treatment and control at each time point. See Supplemental Table 1 for complete statistics.

Fig. 2. Biomass measurements of field-grown *Capsicum annuum* (pepper) plants. (A) Leaf, (B) stem, (C) root biomass, and (D) the aboveground:belowground biomass ratio in *C. annuum* plants were determined at the end of the field season following destructive harvest. Box plots represent the raw data ranging from the upper to the lower quartiles and the median. Error bars represent the 5% and 95% of the data, and individual dots are observations that fell outside of those parameters. P -values represent Tukey's HSD comparisons. See Supplemental Table 2 for complete statistics.

Fig. 3. Total flower production in (A) *Phaseolus lunatus* (lima bean) and (B) *Capsicum annuum* (pepper). Open circles represent control plants (receiving lanolin-only vials); filled squares represent plants receiving a persistent application of vials containing 10ng/hr *cis*-3-hexenyl acetate (z3HAC) dissolved in lanolin. Dropdown lines indicate the initial application of z3HAC treatment: lima bean and pepper plants were first exposed on June 10, 2016 (Julian date 161) and July 11, 2016 (Julian date 192), respectively. Points represent averages $\pm$ SE. Asterisks (*) represent $P < 0.05$ between treatment and control at each time point. See Supplemental Table 3 for complete statistics.

Fig. 4. Fruit and seed production in *Capsicum annuum* (pepper) plants grown in a common garden experiment treated with a persistent application of the green leaf volatile *cis*-3-hexenyl acetate (z3HAC). The (A) total number of fruits were counted in the field, and (B) wet and (C) dry masses fruit masses were determined in the lab. (D) The total number of seeds per fruit and (E) the estimated mass per seed were determined from a subset of the fruits produced. (F) The ratio of seed mass to fruit mass was calculated to assess the efficiency of seed production. Box plots represent the raw data ranging from the upper to the lower quartiles and the median. White boxes represent control plants; gray boxes represent plants treated with z3HAC. Error bars represent the 5% and 95% of the data, and individual dots are observations that fell outside of those parameters. P -values represent Tukey's HSD comparisons. See Supplemental Table 4 for complete statistics.

Fig. 5. Herbivore damage on *Capsicum annuum* (pepper) and *Phaseolus lunatus* (lima bean) plants in a common garden field experiment. Chewing damage on (A) pepper and (B) lima bean plants was determined using a visual estimation technique (see Methods). Open circles represent control plants (receiving lanolin-filled vials); filled squares represent plants receiving a persistent application 10ng/hr *cis*-3-hexenyl acetate (z3HAC) dissolved in lanolin. Dropdown lines indicate the initial application of z3HAC treatment. Points represent averages $\pm$ SE. Repeated measures ANOVAs (aov in R) were followed by one-way ANOVAs at each time-point. Asterisks (*) represent $P < 0.05$ between treatment and control at each time point. See Supplemental Table 5 for complete statistics. (C) *Aphis faba* colonization on lima bean plants. Bars represent the percentage of plants in each group where *A.faba* were observed ($\chi^2 = 50.11$, $df=1$, $P < 0.001$).

Fig. 6. Cyanide induction in *Phaseolus lunatus* (Lima bean) as affected by z3HAC exposure. Cyanide concentration was determined by trapping volatile HCN in 1.0M NaOH followed by colorimetric quantification. Sink leaves (A) and source leaves (B) were exposed long-term exposure of 10ng/hour z3HAC or left as a control. Points represent averages $\pm$ SE and * indicate a p-value < 0.05 .

Supplemental Figure 1. Aerial view of the field site within the Blackacre Community Garden. The research area is outlined and the original picture was acquired from Google Earth.

Supplemental Figure 2. Volatile administration setup. Each 2mL glass vial was inverted and supported by wire stands to prevent rain water accumulation. Additionally, each vial was wrapped in aluminum foil to prevent photodegradation (von Mery *et al.*, 2011).

Supplemental Figure 3. Calculated individual seed mass for *C.annuum* (A) and total pod production for *P.lunatus* (B). Box plots represent the raw data ranging from the upper to the lower quartiles and the median. White boxes represent control plants; gray boxes represent plants treated with z3HAC. Error bars represent the 5% and 95% of the data, and individual dots are observations that fell outside of those parameters. *P*-values represent Tukey's HSD comparisons.

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6