1 GENERAL INFORMATION

2

3 Article Type:

4 Research Article

5

6 Title:

7 Multidimensional plasticity in the Glanville fritillary butterfly: larval performance curves are
8 temperature, host and family specific.

9

10 Authors:

11 Nadja Verspagen^{1,2,3*}, Suvi Ikonen³, Marjo Saastamoinen^{1,2} and Erik van Bergen^{1,2}

12

13 Affiliations:

14 ¹ *Helsinki Institute of Life Science, University of Helsinki, Finland*

15 ² *Research Centre of Ecological Change, Faculty of Biological and Environmental Sciences,
16 University of Helsinki, Finland.*

17 ³ *Lammi Biological Station, University of Helsinki, Finland.*

18 Corresponding author:

19 * Correspondence to Nadja Verspagen (Nadja.verspagen@helsinki.fi)

20

21 Abstract word count: 200

22 Total word count: 4207

ABSTRACT

Variation in environmental conditions during development can lead to changes in life-history traits with long-lasting effects. Here, we study environmentally induced variation, i.e. the consequences of potential maternal oviposition choices, in a suite of life-history traits in pre-diapause larvae of the Glanville fritillary butterfly. We focus on offspring survival, early growth rates and relative fat reserves, and pay specific attention to intraspecific variation in the responses (GxExE). Globally, we found that thermal performance and survival curves varied between diets of two host plants, suggesting that host modifies the temperature impact, or *vice versa*. Additionally, we show that the relative fat content has a host-dependent, discontinuous response to developmental temperature. This implies that a potential switch in resource allocation, from more investment in growth at lower temperatures to storage at higher temperatures, is dependent on other environmental variables. Interestingly, we find that a large proportion of the variance in larval performance is explained by differences among families, or interactions with this variable. Finally, we demonstrate that these family-specific responses to the host plant remain largely consistent across thermal environments. Altogether, the results of our study underscore the importance of paying attention to intraspecific trait variation in the field of evolutionary ecology.

Keywords: developmental plasticity – GxExE – intraspecific variation – temperature – nutrition – multidimensional plasticity

43 1. INTRODUCTION

44 Species can cope with environmental change by avoiding stressful conditions, by producing
45 phenotypes better adjusted to the new environmental conditions through plasticity, or by adapting to
46 the novel conditions through evolutionary change [1, 2]. Even though the avoidance of environmental
47 stress is an effective strategy, e.g. through tracking favourable conditions by expanding to higher
48 latitudes or altitudes [3], it is often limited by factors such as the distribution of resources, the structure
49 of the landscape and/or the dispersal ability of the species. Moreover, when environmental changes
50 are rapid, adaptive evolution may not occur fast enough. In those cases, plasticity can enable species
51 to persist under the novel conditions, allowing more time for mutations to arise and selection to occur
52 [4, 5]. Assessing a species' ability to respond plastically to environmental change, and evaluating its
53 performance when exposed to conditions that are beyond or at the limit of the normal range, could
54 therefore shed light on whether organisms will be able to persist future conditions.

55 Developmental plasticity is defined as the process through which external conditions, such as
56 nutrition and temperature, can influence developmental trajectories and lead to irreversible changes
57 in the adult phenotype [1]. This phenomenon is ubiquitous in nature, especially among taxa that have
58 sessile life-styles [6-8]. The environmental regulation of development has been studied extensively
59 using insects, whose pre-adult stages are often immobile and thus must cope with local environmental
60 conditions. In general, when exposed to higher temperatures, insect larvae tend to grow faster [9, 10]
61 and the body size of the emerging adults is smaller [9, 11, 12], which might alter performance later
62 in life. Likewise, nutrition is known to regulate development in insects through nutrient balance [13-
63 15] and/or the concentration of secondary metabolites in the diet [16].

64 When assessing responses to changes in environmental conditions, it is important to recognise
65 that the environmental factors that affect the phenotype typically occur simultaneously and
66 interactively [17]. Hence, plastic responses to one type of environmental stress may be dependent on
67 the state of another external factor. Such non-additive multidimensional plasticity, in response to
68 combinations of thermal and nutritional environments, has been demonstrated in moths [14],

69 butterflies [18] and fruit flies [19]. For example, Singh et al. showed that poor host plant quality
70 mainly influenced development at intermediate temperatures the tropical butterfly *Bicyclus anynana*
71 [18]. Moreover, significant genetic variation for (multidimensional) plasticity is known to exist in
72 both natural and laboratory populations [20-22]. This intraspecific variation in the ability to respond
73 to an environmental cue (GxE), or combinations of cues (GxExE), is hypothesised to be beneficial in
74 the light of climate change since it facilitates the evolution of wider ranges of environmental tolerance
75 [23, 24].

76 In this study we focus on environmentally induced variation in a suite of life-history traits in the
77 Glanville fritillary butterfly (*Melitaea cinxia*). The species occurs at its northern range margin on the
78 Åland archipelago (SW Finland) where it inhabits a highly fragmented network of habitat patches
79 that are defined by the presence of at least one of two available host plant species; *Plantago lanceolata*
80 and *Veronica spicata*, hereafter referred to as *Plantago* and *Veronica*, respectively [25]. Adult
81 females produce large egg clutches, and the selection of suitable oviposition sites is known to be a
82 hierarchical process [26, 27]. In the field, gravid females of the Glanville fritillary appear to first
83 choose habitats that are hot, dry and sunny [28, 29]. Host plant discrimination, with individuals
84 typically preferring one host species over the other, occurs subsequently [30, 31]. Therefore, selective
85 mothers can influence the developmental trajectories of their offspring through oviposition site
86 selection, which in turn may affect offspring performance and fitness [32].

87 Using a full-factorial split-brood design, we explore the consequences of these maternal
88 oviposition choices for the pre-diapause larvae of *Melitaea cinxia*. We aim to research the (combined)
89 effects of developmental temperature and host plant on pre-diapause larvae of this species. We
90 measure the survival, early growth rates and relative fat content of offspring reared at four different
91 temperatures and on two different host plants, and pay attention to intraspecific variation in the
92 responses by using individuals from different genetic backgrounds (i.e. families). As shown in other
93 insects, we expect a large positive effect of developmental temperature on growth rate. Furthermore,
94 in the scenario of additive multidimensional plasticity, we expect larvae to grow faster and have

95 higher survival on *Veronica* within each thermal environment, as this has previously been
 96 demonstrated under laboratory conditions [16, 33]. Individuals that develop fast, and thus will be
 97 diapausing for longer, are predicted to allocate relatively more resources to fat storage, which is
 98 thought to be the primary fuel for overwintering and post-winter activities. Finally, given that the
 99 natural habitat of this species is heterogeneous and fragmented, we expect family-specific responses
 100 to the environmental factors (GxE, GxExE) to be important determinants of the phenotype.

101 2. METHODS

102 *Study system*

103 *Melitaea cinxia* is a univoltine species and on the Åland islands adults emerge from their pupae
 104 in June, after which females lay several clutches of 100 – 200 eggs [34]. The sessile pre-diapause
 105 larvae hatch in late June and early July and live gregariously on the host plant of their mothers' choice.
 106 In the beginning of autumn the larvae spin a communal web in which they diapause until spring.
 107 Overwinter survival is impacted by multiple factors, among which body size, with larger larvae
 108 having a higher chance to survive [35]. After diapause, larvae become solitary and can move over
 109 longer distances in search of resources and/or suitable microhabitats [36]. The laboratory population
 110 of *M. cinxia* used in this study was established in 2015 from 136 post-diapause larvae (consisting of
 111 105 unique families) collected from 34 habitat patches across the large network of habitat patches on
 112 the Åland islands.

113 *Experimental design*

114 In the spring of 2019, diapausing larvae of the laboratory stock were stimulated to recommence
 115 development, reared to adulthood in small transparent plastic containers, and mated with an unrelated
 116 individual. Subsequently, the gravid females were provided with a single *Plantago* plant for
 117 oviposition, and the host plant was checked daily for newly produced egg clutches. Clutches were
 118 carefully removed, placed in individual petri-dishes, and transferred to a climate-controlled cabinet
 119 set to 28:15 °C and a 12L:12D cycle.

120 Egg clutches of 15 females were divided over eight experimental treatments in two steps, yielding
 121 a full-factorial split-brood design with two diets of different host plants (*Plantago* and *Veronica*) and
 122 four developmental day temperatures (28 °C, 30 °C, 32 °C and 34 °C). First, to ensure the utilization
 123 of a single host plant species throughout development, egg clutches were divided into two equal
 124 groups 3-5 days after oviposition. One of these groups was provided with fresh leaves of *Plantago*
 125 while the other received fresh *Veronica* leaves. All plants were reared under standard conditions

(28:15 °C). Second, when approximately 90% of the larvae within each group transitioned from the first to the second instar, we generated experimental cohorts of 15 siblings. These cohorts were randomly divided over four climate-controlled chambers (28:15 °C, 30:15 °C, 32:15 °C and 34:15 °C, all with a 12L:12D cycle, and using a Sanyo MLR-350 for the 32 °C treatments and a Sanyo MLR-351 for the others).

Throughout the experiment, larvae were inspected every morning and fresh leaves were provided to ensure *ad libitum* feeding conditions. For five families, individuals from a second clutch (from the same parents) were used to complete all experimental treatments. One female did not produce enough offspring to complete all treatments and these data have been excluded from further analyses. A schematic representation of the experimental design is given in Figure S1. For further information on the background of larvae used in the experiment see Table S1.

Life-history traits

We studied environmentally induced variation in a suite of life-history traits and focussed on offspring survival, early growth rates, and the relative amount of fat reserves accumulated during early development. To assess offspring survival, the larvae within each cohort were counted every fourth day, and on these days the entire cohort was also weighed to the nearest 0.01 mg (Mettler Toledo XS105 DualRange) to trace overall mass gain during early development. This procedure was continued until the first individual of the cohort entered the diapause stage, which can be recognised by a change in body colour (from pale-brown to black), an increase in larval body hair density, and the presence of red eyes. From this date forward individual data was collected by recording the day of entering diapause and the body mass of each diapausing larvae. Subsequently, larvae were frozen to -80 °C, and stored in eppendorf tubes until further processing.

The individual growth rates were calculated according to the formula

$$\text{Growth rate} = [\ln(\text{diapause mass}) - \ln(2^{\text{nd}} \text{ instar mass})] / \text{development time}$$

where 2nd instar mass (i.e. mass at the start of the experiment) was estimated by dividing the mass of the entire cohort by the number of individuals, and development time was computed as the time between the start of the experiment and the day the individual entered diapause [37].

Relative fat content at diapause was determined for seven randomly chosen individuals per cohort. These larvae were dried to constant mass (60 °C for 24 h) and weighed to the nearest 0.01 mg, yielding initial dry mass. Triglyceride and free fatty acids were extracted by incubating the dried body at room temperature in 1:2 (v/v) methanol:dichloromethane for 72 h, followed by drying and re-weighing, yielding fat-free dry mass [38]. The relative fat content was calculated according to the formula

$$\text{Relative fat content} = (\text{initial dry mass} - \text{fat-free dry mass}) / \text{initial dry mass}$$

Statistical analyses

Interval-censored survival curves were fitted using the *survival* package [39] and plotted using the *survminer* package [40]. Log-rank tests were performed to determine the influence of temperature and host plant on survival using the *interval* package [41]. A linear model was fitted to estimate the effect of temperature and host on the mean amount of body mass gained during early development. Cohort mass was divided by the number of surviving individuals and log-transformed to improve normality. The day of the experiment, temperature and host plant (and all interactions) were included in the full model. Two additional linear models were fitted to estimate the effect of family, temperature and host (and all interactions) on individual growth rate and relative fat content. For all models described above, step-wise model selection based on AIC values was performed using the *step()* function. Post hoc pairwise comparisons (Tukey's HSD; $\alpha = 0.05$) were performed using the *emmeans* package [42].

Intraspecific variation in the responses to the host plant is explored by extracting the slope of a linear model – with individual growth rate as dependent and host plant as independent variable – for each family and within each thermal environment. These slopes describe both the magnitude and the

175 direction of the response to the host plant [20]. Using Pearson correlations we test whether host-
176 induced responses (i.e. the slopes) are family-specific and consistent across thermal environments.
177 All statistical analyses were performed in R [43].

178 3. RESULTS

179 *Pre-diapause survival and clutch mass*

180 Probability of survival was generally high but dropped considerably for larvae with long
181 development times (i.e. those that enter diapause in the upper percentiles of the distribution of
182 development times, Figure 1). The probability of survival was not affected by temperature
183 (asymptotic logrank two-sample t-test, $P = 0.3968$ for individuals reared on *Plantago*, and $P = 0.8678$
184 for individuals reared on *Veronica*). Survival was significantly lower for larvae that were reared on
185 *Plantago*, but only for the two highest temperatures (P-values given in Figure 1).

186 We found that both the thermal environment and the host plant interacted with time to affect
187 mean clutch mass. The effect of temperature on mean clutch mass increases with time
188 (time:temperature, $F = 10.5182$, $P < 0.001$), with larvae reared at 28 °C being significantly smaller
189 than those reared at higher temperatures from day 8 onward (Figure 2A). The mean clutch mass of
190 cohorts reared on *Veronica* increased faster over time compared to those reared on *Plantago*
191 (time:plant, $F = 3.9190$, $P = 0.0089$). Cohorts using *Veronica* were smaller than those using *Plantago*
192 at the start of the experiment (day 0; Figure 2A) but larger at the final time point (day 16).

193

194 *Individual growth rates and allocation to fat reserves*

195 For both life-history traits (growth rate and fat content) we found that all main effects and all
196 interaction terms were statistically significant (see Tables S3 and S4). Averaged over the families,
197 model-estimated marginal means for the individual growth rates revealed that individuals achieve
198 higher growth rates on *Veronica*, except for those reared at 34 °C (Figure 2B, Table S3C). Growth
199 rate increased with temperature until a maximum at 32 °C. At an even higher temperature of 34 °C
200 growth rate dropped significantly compared to that at 32 °C for larvae fed with *Veronica* (pairwise
201 comparison: $P < 0.001$). In contrast, the growth rates of larvae reared at 34 °C on *Plantago* were not
202 significantly different from those of individuals reared at 32 °C (pairwise comparison: $P = 0.5213$).

This decrease in growth rate at 34 °C was mainly caused by an increase in development time rather than a decrease in body mass (Figure S2).

The relative fat content showed a discontinuous change to the temperature gradient on both hosts (Figure 2B, Table S4C). For individuals reared on *Plantago*, development at the two higher temperatures resulted in significantly higher relative amounts of fat reserves. The thermal threshold at which change in relative fat content occurs was higher for individuals reared on *Veronica*, where only development at the highest temperature lead to an increase in relative fat content. As a result of the difference in threshold we only observed a significant effect of host plant at 32 °C (pairwise comparison: $P < 0.001$), with larvae utilizing *Plantago* having a higher relative fat content on average.

Family-specific responses to the host plant

Our results demonstrate that intraspecific variation for multidimensional phenotypic plasticity (GxExE) is large in this system. For both life-history traits, but especially for the individual growth rates, the (interactive) effects of environmental cues were highly dissimilar across families. About 12% of the total phenotypic variance (V_P) in individual growth rates was explained by the interaction between the family and the host plant (family:host plant, $F = 32.2507$, $P < 0.001$; see table S3B). In other words, family-specific responses to the host were an important determinant of the phenotype. Indeed, some families used in the experiment achieved the highest growth rates on *Veronica* while individuals from other families grew consistently faster on *Plantago* (Figure 3). These family-specific reaction norm slopes were positively correlated across thermal environments (*Pearson's r* 0.4-0.8; Figure S3). Moreover, utilising *Plantago* as a host plant resulted in higher variance in larval growth rates across families (and not within families; Figure S4).

4. DISCUSSION

Using a full factorial design, with fourteen genetic backgrounds (families), four developmental temperatures and two host plant species, we explored the relative contributions of different sources of phenotypic variance across a suite of life-history traits in the Glanville fritillary butterfly. We start this section by describing the general patterns observed in our data, and then discuss how the developmental trajectories of pre-diapause larvae could be influenced by maternal oviposition site selection in the wild. Subsequently, we go into the variation in environmental responses observed among families in our study, and discuss how this genetic variation for (multidimensional) plasticity may impact the population's ability to persist environmental heterogeneity.

In ectotherms, temperature can affect developmental processes directly through changes in chemical reaction kinematics and the physical properties of membranes [44, 45], which in turn can impact organismal performance and fitness. Some developing individuals are able to manipulate their thermal environment, for example by relocating to warmer microhabitats. Alternatively, when immature life-stages are largely immobile, such as in the case of the Glanville fritillary butterfly, the optimal thermal environment for development can be realized through selective oviposition choices of the female. As is true for many butterfly species, Glanville fritillary mothers could regulate the thermal environment of their offspring by preferring sunny or shady environments for oviposition [28, 29]. Averaged over the families, our data showed a clear initial increase in growth rate with increasing temperature, with an optimum around 32 °C. At higher temperatures the growth rate decreased for larvae reared on *Veronica* and stabilised for those reared on *Plantago*.

Maternal preferences to oviposit in sunny habitats, thereby increasing the developmental temperatures of their offspring, are therefore intuitively considered to be adaptive. However, even though the average ambient day temperatures on Åland are well below 32 °C during the end of summer, when pre-diapause larvae are developing (Figure S5), sunshine creates thermal stratification which can cause the temperatures close to the ground to rise to be between 12 and 20 °C above ambient temperature [46, 47]. This suggests that the maternal preference for sunny habitat could be

maladaptive when the ambient day temperatures on Åland are above 20 °C (see also Salgado, 2020). In this scenario developmental temperatures in sunny microclimates may rise well above the observed optimal temperature of 32 °C for larval growth, and potentially even exceed the thermal tolerance limits of the larvae. It was recently shown that the summer of 2018 was an anomaly in terms of precipitation, temperature and vegetation productivity across the habitats of the Glanville fritillary butterfly in Åland, and that this extreme climatic event was associated with a 10-fold demographic decline of the metapopulation [48]. Though this dramatic decline has been attributed to severe water deficits during May and July, the record-breaking temperatures observed for July (above 25 °C; figure S5) could have exceeded the thermal tolerance limits of pre-diapause larvae developing in sunny environments.

In addition to an effect of temperature on growth rates, our data also reveal a general trend in the relative fat content of the larvae. This physiological trait is important for butterfly life-history [49] and was quantified for the first time in this species. Relative fat content increases significantly between 30 and 32 °C for larvae reared on *Plantago*, and between 32 and 34 °C for larvae reared on *Veronica*. Previous research has shown similar increases in relative fat content with increasing temperature in other insects [e.g. 50, 51, 52], while other studies have described the opposite pattern [e.g. 38, 53]. Our hypothesis, stating that individuals predicted to spend more time in diapause, i.e. those with shorter development times, accumulate more fat during development was therefore falsified. In fact, the cohorts with the largest relative fat reserves also demonstrated the longest development times and thus shortest time in diapause (i.e. those reared at 34 °C). Instead, variation in relative fat content seemed to be associated with the relative investment in growth. Individuals reared at 32 °C allocated more resources to their fat reserves when they utilized *Plantago* instead of *Veronica*. At this temperature we also observed the largest difference in host-specific growth rates, with individuals utilizing *Plantago* demonstrating reduced investment in growth compared to their siblings reared on *Veronica*. This suggests that individuals of this species trade-off growth for

increased investment in fat storage at higher temperatures, and that the thermal threshold for this switch in life history strategies is influenced by the larval diet.

Within the preferred sunny habitats, mothers select one of two available host plants which may differ in their suitability for larval development. Overall, and in concordance with our hypothesis and earlier reports [16, 33], we found that pre-diapause larvae perform better on *Veronica* than on *Plantago*. Though survival in the first instars was high on both plant species, the probability of survival to diapause was higher for larvae that were reared on *Veronica*, particularly in the two hottest environments. In addition, individuals on this host achieved higher average growth rates in most thermal environments. Finally, the larval performances of the families used in this study were very uniform when utilizing *Veronica*, which was in stark contrast to the high variance in growth rates observed among families on *Plantago*.

Since females can maximize their fitness by laying their eggs on host plants on which the performance of their offspring is maximized (preference–performance hypothesis), Glanville fritillary mothers are predicted to prefer *Veronica* when both hosts are available. Interestingly, it has been shown that females of this species do not necessarily prefer the host plant that is most abundant in their local environment, but that this preference depends on which host is more abundant at a larger regional scale [30, 54, 55]. This local adaptation is attributed to the spatial distribution of the two hosts in the field, with *Plantago* being omnipresent and *Veronica* mainly occurring in habitat patches in the north-western part of the archipelago. Females from regions where *Veronica* is an abundant and therefore reliable host plant were observed to prefer *Veronica* when offered a binary choice, while butterflies in regions where *Veronica* is less reliable preferred to oviposit on *Plantago* [30, 55].

It is important to place the observed effects of the host plant on larval performance in the context of our experimental design; while temperature interacted with the host plant at the level of the insect herbivore, direct effects of temperature on the host were not assessed. The plants used in the study were cultivated and kept under greenhouse conditions throughout the experiment, and thus

represented a high quality diet for the developing larvae. In nature, the two host plants themselves may differ in their responses to variation in temperature, and this interspecific variation may affect the nutritional quality of the available hosts for example in terms of primary nutrients. Additionally, the two host plants used in this study both produce iridoid glycosides [56] — defence chemicals known to deter feeding by generalist insect herbivores [57, 58]. Interestingly, these iridoids can also act as feeding stimulants in specialist butterfly larvae [59, 60], such as *M. cinxia*, and the concentrations of these secondary compounds are known to be susceptible to variability in precipitation and temperature in *Plantago* [61]. Thus, in the field, when potential effects of temperature on the host plant are present, the interacting effects of temperature and host on insect development demonstrated here could be different.

In addition to the more general patterns described above, we found significant genetic variation for (multidimensional) plasticity in this system. In other words, the phenotypic responses to the (combination of) environmental variables were highly dissimilar across families (i.e. significant GxE and GxExE interactions). For example, the interaction between the family and the host plant explained a large proportion of the variance in individual growth rates, and these family-specific responses to the host were largely consistent cross thermal environments. While most families grew faster on *Veronica* (e.g. family 5), others consistently achieved their highest growth rates on *Plantago* (e.g. family 42). Such intraspecific variation, or in this case variation within the meta-population, for plasticity is common in both natural and laboratory populations [e.g. 20, 62] and hypothesised to be beneficial for insects exposed to climate change [63, 64] because it increases their evolutionary potential [24].

As a final note we would like to emphasize that the general patterns described in studies like the one presented here (i.e. using a relatively small number of families), may be susceptible to bias when phenotypes vary strongly across genetic backgrounds. For example, using fourteen families we describe that larvae of *M. cinxia* in general perform better on *Veronica* than on *Plantago*, while this

is in fact not the case for all families. Therefore, with a different and/or smaller subset of families we could potentially have observed different general patterns.

In conclusion, we demonstrated that larval performance curves in the Glanville fritillary butterfly are family-specific and interactively mediated by the thermal and nutritional environment. The results of our study therefore underscore the importance of studying the multidimensionality of environmental effects on phenotype expression. In addition, our work demonstrates that intraspecific variation is likely an important determinant of population-level responses to environmental change in this system.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to Heini Karvinen for practical assistance during the experiments, and Wilco Verberk for suggestions that greatly improved earlier versions of our manuscript. Financial support was provided by European Research Council (independent starting grant no. 470 637412 ‘META-STRESS’ to MS). NV was supported by the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union and a Lammi Biological Station’s Environmental Research Foundation (LBAYS) grant.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

NV, SI, MS and EvB conceived and designed the experiments. NV performed the experiments. NV and EvB analysed the data and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors provided critical feedback and helped to shape the research, analyses and manuscript.

DATA ACCESSIBILITY

Raw data will be archived in the Dryad Digital Repository upon acceptance of the manuscript.

350 REFERENCES

- 351 1. Beldade P., Mateus A.R.A., Keller R.A. 2011 Evolution and molecular mechanisms of
352 adaptive developmental plasticity. *Molecular Ecology* **20**(7), 1347-1363. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-
353 294X.2011.05016.x).
- 354 2. Hoffmann A.A., Sgrò C.M. 2011 Climate change and evolutionary adaptation. *Nature*
355 **470**(7335), 479-485. (doi:10.1038/nature09670).
- 356 3. Parmesan C., Yohe G. 2003 A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts
357 across natural systems. *Nature* **421**(6918), 37.
- 358 4. Corl A., Bi K., Luke C., Challa A.S., Stern A.J., Sinervo B., Nielsen R. 2018 The genetic
359 basis of adaptation following plastic changes in coloration in a novel environment. *Current Biology*
360 **28**(18), 2970-2977.e2977. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2018.06.075).
- 361 5. Ghalambor C.K., McKay J.K., Carroll S.P., Reznick D.N. 2007 Adaptive versus non-
362 adaptive phenotypic plasticity and the potential for contemporary adaptation in new environments.
363 *Functional Ecology* **21**(3), 394-407. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2007.01283.x).
- 364 6. Franks S.J., Weber J.J., Aitken S.N. 2014 Evolutionary and plastic responses to climate
365 change in terrestrial plant populations. *Evolutionary Applications* **7**(1), 123-139.
366 (doi:10.1111/eva.12112).
- 367 7. Sultan S.E. 2000 Phenotypic plasticity for plant development, function and life history.
368 *Trends in Plant Science* **5**(12), 537-542. (doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1360-1385\(00\)01797-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1360-1385(00)01797-0)).
- 369 8. Telesca L., Michalek K., Sanders T., Peck L.S., Thyrring J., Harper E.M. 2018 Blue mussel
370 shell shape plasticity and natural environments: a quantitative approach. *Scientific Reports* **8**.
371 (doi:10.1038/s41598-018-20122-9).
- 372 9. Atkinson D. 1994 Temperature and organism size: a biological law for ectotherms?
373 *Advances in Ecological Research* **25**, 1-58.
- 374 10. Atkinson D. 1996 Ectotherm life-history responses to developmental temperature. *Animals*
375 *and temperature: Phenotypic and evolutionary adaptation*, 183-204.

- 376 11. Angilletta M.J., Dunham A.E. 2003 The temperature-size rule in ectotherms: simple
377 evolutionary explanations may not be general. *The American Naturalist* **162**(3), 332-342.
- 378 12. Dixon A.F.G., Chambers R.J., Dharma T.R. 1982 Factors affecting size in aphids with
379 particular reference to the black bean aphid, *Aphis fabae*. *Entomologia experimentalis et applicata*
380 **32**(2), 123-128.
- 381 13. Gray L.J., Simpson S.J., Polak M. 2018 Fruit flies may face a nutrient-dependent life-history
382 trade-off between secondary sexual trait quality, survival and developmental rate. *Journal of Insect*
383 *Physiology* **104**, 60-70. (doi:10.1016/j.jinsphys.2017.11.010).
- 384 14. Lee K.P., Roh C. 2010 Temperature-by-nutrient interactions affecting growth rate in an
385 insect ectotherm. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata* **136**(2), 151-163. (doi:10.1111/j.1570-
386 7458.2010.01018.x).
- 387 15. Silva-Soares N.F., Nogueira-Alves A., Beldade P., Mirth C.K. 2017 Adaptation to new
388 nutritional environments: larval performance, foraging decisions, and adult oviposition choices in
389 *Drosophila suzukii*. *BMC Ecology* **17**. (doi:10.1186/s12898-017-0131-2).
- 390 16. Saastamoinen M., van Nouhuys S., Nieminen M., O'Hara B., Suomi J. 2007 Development
391 and survival of a specialist herbivore, *Melitaea cinxia*, on host plants producing high and low
392 concentrations of iridoid glycosides. In *Annales Zoologici Fennici* (pp. 70-80, JSTOR).
- 393 17. Westneat D.F., Potts L.J., Sasser K.L., Shaffer J.D. 2019 Causes and consequences of
394 phenotypic plasticity in complex environments. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **34**(6), 555-568.
395 (doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2019.02.010>).
- 396 18. Singh P., van Bergen E., Brattström O., Osbaldeston D., Brakefield P.M., Oostra V. 2019
397 Complex multi-trait responses to multivariate environmental cues in a seasonal butterfly. *bioRxiv*,
398 772749. (doi:10.1101/772749).
- 399 19. Kutz T.C., Sgrò C.M., Mirth C.K. 2019 Interacting with change: Diet mediates how larvae
400 respond to their thermal environment. *Functional Ecology* **33**(10), 1940-1951. (doi:10.1111/1365-
401 2435.13414).

- 402 20. Lafuente E., Duneau D., Beldade P. 2018 Genetic basis of thermal plasticity variation in
403 *Drosophila melanogaster* body size. *PLOS Genetics* **14**(9), e1007686.
404 (doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1007686).
- 405 21. Mangin B., Casadebaig P., Cadic E., Blanchet N., Boniface M.-C., Carrère S., Gouzy J.,
406 Legrand L., Mayjonade B., Pouilly N., et al. 2017 Genetic control of plasticity of oil yield for
407 combined abiotic stresses using a joint approach of crop modelling and genome-wide association.
408 *Plant, Cell & Environment* **40**(10), 2276-2291. (doi:10.1111/pce.12961).
- 409 22. Nussey D.H., Postma E., Gienapp P., Visser M.E. 2005 Selection on heritable phenotypic
410 plasticity in a wild bird population. *Science* **310**(5746), 304-306. (doi:10.1126/science.11117004).
- 411 23. Kelly M. 2019 Adaptation to climate change through genetic accommodation and
412 assimilation of plastic phenotypes. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* **374**(1768),
413 20180176.
- 414 24. Oostra V., Saastamoinen M., Zwaan B.J., Wheat C.W. 2018 Strong phenotypic plasticity
415 limits potential for evolutionary responses to climate change. *Nature Communications* **9**(1), 1005.
416 (doi:10.1038/s41467-018-03384-9).
- 417 25. Ojanen S.P., Nieminen M., Meyke E., Pöyry J., Hanski I. 2013 Long-term metapopulation
418 study of the Glanville fritillary butterfly (*Melitaea cinxia*): survey methods, data management, and
419 long-term population trends. *Ecology and evolution* **3**(11), 3713-3737.
- 420 26. Friberg M., Olofsson M., Berger D., Karlsson B., Wiklund C. 2008 Habitat choice precedes
421 host plant choice – niche separation in a species pair of a generalist and a specialist butterfly. *Oikos*
422 **117**(9), 1337-1344. (doi:10.1111/j.0030-1299.2008.16740.x).
- 423 27. Refsnider J.M., Janzen F.J. 2010 Putting eggs in one basket: Ecological and evolutionary
424 hypotheses for variation in oviposition-site choice. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and*
425 *Systematics* **41**(1), 39-57. (doi:10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-102209-144712).
- 426 28. Rosa E. In preparation Male condition, microhabitat type and plant condition shape female
427 oviposition preference.

- 428 29. Salgado A.L., DiLeo M.F., Saastamoinen, M. 2020 Narrow oviposition preference of an
429 insect herbivore risks survival under conditions of severe drought. *BioRxiv*, 005686.
430 (doi:10.1101/2020.03.24.005686).
- 431 30. Kuussaari M., Singer M.C., Hanski I. 2000 Local specialization and landscape-level
432 influence on host use in an herbivorous insect. *Ecology* **81**(8), 2177-2187. (doi:10.2307/177106).
- 433 31. Singer M.C., Lee J.R. 2000 Discrimination within and between host species by a butterfly:
434 implications for design of preference experiments. *Ecology Letters* **3**(2), 101-105.
435 (doi:10.1046/j.1461-0248.2000.00121.x).
- 436 32. Gibbs M., van Dyck H. 2009 Reproductive plasticity, oviposition site selection, and
437 maternal effects in fragmented landscapes. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **64**(1), 1-11.
438 (doi:10.1007/s00265-009-0849-8).
- 439 33. van Nouhuys S., Singer M.C., Nieminen M. 2003 Spatial and temporal patterns of
440 caterpillar performance and the suitability of two host plant species. *Ecological Entomology* **28**(2),
441 193-202. (doi:10.1046/j.1365-2311.2003.00501.x).
- 442 34. Saastamoinen M. 2007 Life-history, genotypic, and environmental correlates of clutch size
443 in the Glanville fritillary butterfly. *Ecological Entomology* **32**(2), 235-242. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-
444 2311.2007.00865.x).
- 445 35. Saastamoinen M., Ikonen S., Wong S.C., Lehtonen R., Hanski I. 2013 Plastic larval
446 development in a butterfly has complex environmental and genetic causes and consequences for
447 population dynamics. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **82**(3), 529-539. (doi:
448 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12034>).
- 449 36. Kuussaari M., Van Nouhuys S., Hellmann J.J., Singer M.C. 2004 Checkerspot butterfly
450 larval biology. In *On the wings of checkerspots: A model system for population biology* (pp. 138-
451 160. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

- 452 37. Gotthard K., Nylin S., Wiklund C. 1994 Adaptive variation in growth rate: Life history costs
453 and consequences in the speckled wood butterfly, *Pararge aegeria*. *Oecologia* **99**(3-4), 281-289.
454 (doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00627740>).
- 455 38. van Bergen E., Osbaldeston D., Kodandaramaiah U., Brattström O., Aduse-Poku K.,
456 Brakefield P.M. 2017 Conserved patterns of integrated developmental plasticity in a group of
457 polyphenic tropical butterflies. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* **17**(1), 59. (doi:10.1186/s12862-017-
458 0907-1).
- 459 39. Therneau T.M., Lumley T. 2019 A Package for Survival Analysis in S. (2.44-1.1 ed.
- 460 40. Kassambara A., Kosinski M., Biecek P., Scheipl F. 2019 survminer: Drawing survival
461 curves using 'ggplot2'. (0.4.4 ed.
- 462 41. Fay M.P., Shaw P.A. 2010 Exact and asymptotic Weighted Logrank Tests for interval
463 censored data: The interval R Package. *Journal of Statistical Software* **36**(2), 1-34.
464 (doi:10.18637/jss.v036.i02).
- 465 42. Lenth R., Singmann H., Love J., Buerkner P., Herve M. 2019 Emmeans: Estimated marginal
466 means, aka least-squares means. (1.3.5.1 ed.
- 467 43. The R Core Team. 2019 R: A language and environment for statistical computing. (Vienna,
468 Austria, R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- 469 44. Hazel J.R. 1995 Thermal adaptation in biological membranes: is homeoviscous adaptation
470 the explanation? *Annual review of physiology* **57**(1), 19-42.
- 471 45. Somero G.N., Hochachka P.W. 1971 Biochemical adaptation to the environment. *American*
472 *Zoologist* **11**(1), 159-167. (doi:<https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/11.1.159>).
- 473 46. Bennett N.L., Severns P.M., Parmesan C., Singer M.C. 2015 Geographic mosaics of
474 phenology, host preference, adult size and microhabitat choice predict butterfly resilience to climate
475 warming. *Oikos* **124**(1), 41-53. (doi:10.1111/oik.01490).
- 476 47. Singer M.C., Parmesan C. 2018 Lethal trap created by adaptive evolutionary response to an
477 exotic resource. *Nature* **557**(7704), 238-241. (doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0074-6).

- 478 48. van Bergen E., Dallas T., DiLeo M.F., Kahilainen A., Mattila A.L.K., Luoto M.,
479 Saastamoinen M. 2020 The effect of summer drought on the predictability of local extinctions in a
480 butterfly metapopulation. *Conservation Biology* (doi:10.1111/cobi.13515).
- 481 49. Boggs C.L., Freeman K.D. 2005 Larval food limitation in butterflies: effects on adult
482 resource allocation and fitness. *Oecologia* **144**(3), 353-361. (doi:10.1007/s00442-005-0076-6).
- 483 50. Fischer K., Karl I. 2010 Exploring plastic and genetic responses to temperature variation
484 using copper butterflies. *Climate Research* **43**(1-2), 17-30. (doi:10.3354/cr00892).
- 485 51. Karl I., Stoks R., de Block M., Janowitz S.A., Fischer K. 2011 Temperature extremes and
486 butterfly fitness: conflicting evidence from life history and immune function. *Global Change*
487 *Biology* **17**(2), 676-687. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2010.02277.x).
- 488 52. Krenkel S., Stangl G.I., Brandsch C., Freier B., Klose T., Moll E., Kiowski A. 2012 A
489 comparative study on effects of normal versus elevated temperatures during preimaginal and young
490 adult period on body weight and fat body content of mature *Coccinella septempunctata* and
491 *Harmonia axyridis* (Coleoptera: Coccinellidae). *Environmental Entomology* **41**(3), 676-687.
492 (doi:<https://doi.org/10.1603/EN11267>).
- 493 53. Kooi R.E., Bergshoeff C., Rossie W., Brakefield P.M. 1997 *Bicyclus anynana* (Lepidoptera:
494 *Satyrinae*): *Comparison of fat content and egg-laying in relation to dry and wet season*
495 *temperatures* 17-22 p.
- 496 54. Hanski I. 2011 Eco-evolutionary spatial dynamics in the Glanville fritillary butterfly.
497 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **108**(35), 14397-14404.
498 (doi:10.1073/pnas.1110020108).
- 499 55. Hanski I., Singer M.C. 2001 Extinction-colonization dynamics and host-plant choice in
500 butterfly metapopulations. *The American Naturalist* **158**(4), 341-353. (doi:10.1086/321985).
- 501 56. Suomi J., Wiedmer S.K., Jussila M., Riekkola M.-L. 2002 Analysis of eleven iridoid
502 glycosides by micellar electrokinetic capillary chromatography (MECC) and screening of plant

- 503 samples by partial filling (MECC)—electrospray ionisation mass spectrometry. *Journal of*
- 504 *Chromatography A* **970**(1), 287-296. (doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9673\(02\)00381-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9673(02)00381-3)).
- 505 57. Biere A., Marak H.B., van Damme J.M.M. 2004 Plant chemical defense against herbivores
- 506 and pathogens: generalized defense or trade-offs? *Oecologia* **140**(3), 430-441. (doi:10.1007/s00442-
- 507 004-1603-6).
- 508 58. Pankoke H., Dobler S. 2015 Low rates of iridoid glycoside hydrolysis in two *Longitarsus*
- 509 leaf beetles with different feeding specialization confer tolerance to iridoid glycoside containing
- 510 host plants. *Physiological Entomology* **40**(1), 18-29. (doi:10.1111/phen.12085).
- 511 59. Bowers M.D. 1983 The role of iridoid glycosides in host-plant specificity of checkerspot
- 512 butterflies. *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **9**(4), 475-493. (doi:10.1007/BF00990220).
- 513 60. Bowers M.D. 1984 Iridoid glycosides and host-plant specificity in larvae of the buckeye
- 514 butterfly, *Junonia coenia* (Nymphalidae). *Journal of Chemical Ecology* **10**(11), 1567-1577.
- 515 (doi:10.1007/BF00988425).
- 516 61. Orians C.M., Schweiger R., Dukes J.S., Scott E.R., Müller C. 2019 Combined impacts of
- 517 prolonged drought and warming on plant size and foliar chemistry. *Annals of Botany* **124**(1), 41-52.
- 518 (doi:10.1093/aob/mcz004).
- 519 62. Nokelainen O., Bergen E., Ripley B., Brakefield P. 2018 Adaptation of a tropical butterfly
- 520 to a temperate climate. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **123**, 279-289.
- 521 (doi:10.1093/biolinnean/blx145).
- 522 63. Sgro C.M., Terblanche J.S., Hoffmann A.A. 2016 What can plasticity contribute to insect
- 523 responses to climate change? *Annu Rev Entomol* **61**, 433-451. (doi:10.1146/annurev-ento-010715-
- 524 023859).
- 525 64. Williams S.E., Shoo L.P., Isaac J.L., Hoffmann A.A., Langham G. 2008 Towards an
- 526 integrated framework for assessing the vulnerability of species to climate change. *PLoS biology*
- 527 **6**(12), 2621-2626. (doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0060325).

529 FIGURE LEGENDS

530 **Figure 1** Kaplan-Meier survival probability over time for larvae reared on *Plantago* (green) and
531 *Veronica* (purple), at four different day temperatures. Shaded area represents the 95% confidence
532 interval. Grey lines show the mean day of diapause, and the distribution of diapausing day is given
533 in the upper panels. The probability of survival is not affected by temperature, but, at the two highest
534 day temperatures, survival is significantly lower for larvae that were reared on *Plantago* (P-values
535 given in the figure).

536

537 **Figure 2** Environmentally induced variation in life-history traits. **A)** Dots depict the mean clutch
538 mass, log-transformed and corrected for number of individuals, in each thermal environment (x-axis),
539 for *Plantago* (green) and *Veronica* (purple), on four assessment days (from left to right: day 0 [i.e.
540 2nd instar mass], day 4, day 8 and day 12). Significant differences between thermal treatments
541 (Tukey's HSD, $\alpha = 0.05$) are indicated by different letters. Details of the statistical test can be found
542 in Table S2. **B)** Model-estimated marginal means for the individual growth rates (left; $R^2 = 0.5964$)
543 and the relative fat content (right; $R^2 = 0.4992$). Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals and
544 significant differences between groups (Tukey's HSD, $\alpha = 0.05$), averaged over the families, are
545 indicated by different letters. Details of statistical tests can be found in Tables S3 and S4.

546

547 **Figure 3** Host-induced responses in growth rates vary across families, but are consistent across
548 thermal environments. **A)** Panels demonstrate the individual growth rates on *Plantago* and *Veronica*
549 of three representative families. Siblings of some families consistently achieve higher growth rates
550 on *Veronica* (upper panels; yellow), while individuals from other families demonstrate an equal
551 performance on each host plant (central panels; orange) or even grow faster on *Plantago* (lower
552 panels; red). **B)** Norms of reaction to the host plant for all families included in the experiment,
553 coloured families correspond to those given in panel A. The reaction norm slopes, describing both the

554 magnitude and the direction of the response, are family-specific and correlate strongly across thermal
555 environments (for details see Figure S3A). Utilising *Plantago* leads to higher between-family
556 variance in growth rates (for details see Figure S3B).

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

TITLE:

Multidimensional plasticity in the Glanville fritillary butterfly: larval performance curves are temperature, host and family specific.

AUTHORS:

Nadja Verspagen, Suvi Ikonen, Marjo Saastamoinen and Erik van Bergen.

CONTENTS

Figure S1: Experimental design.

Figure S2: Mean development time and diapause mass per developmental temperature and host plant.

Figure S3: Family specific responses to host plant.

Figure S4: Minimum, mean and maximum temperatures in Åland.

Table S1: Background of larvae used in the experiment.

Table S2: Linear model for mean clutch mass.

Table S3: Linear model for individual growth rates.

Table S4: Linear model for individual fat content.

Table S5: Linear model for individual development time.

Table S6: Linear model for individual diapause mass.

Figure S1: Schematic outline of the experimental design. The egg clutch of one female (A + B) was split over two host plants (C), and further divided over four temperature treatments upon transitioning to the second instar (15 larvae per treatment, D). This was done for offspring of 15 females from different families.

Figure S2: Environmentally induced variation in life history traits. Model-estimated marginal means for the individual **A)** development time ($R^2 = 0.3941$) and **B)** diapause mass ($R^2 = 0.5283$). Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals and significant differences between groups (Tukey's HSD, $\alpha = 0.05$), averaged over the families, are indicated by different letters. Details of statistical tests can be found in Tables S5 and S6.

Figure S3: Family-specific responses to the host plant. **A)** Some families consistently achieve higher growth rates on *Veronica* while other families, regardless of the thermal environment, grow consistently faster on *Plantago*. The size of the symbol depicts the magnitude of the host-induced response, with steeper reaction norm slopes represented by larger symbols. The direction of the response to the host plant is represented by the colour of the symbol, with higher growth rates on *Veronica* depicted in purple and higher growth rates on *Plantago* in green. Highlighted families correspond to those given in figure 3A of the main text. **B)** Pearson's correlation coefficients among the host-induced reaction norm slopes were positive and ranged between 0.4 and 0.8. The host-induced responses are therefore family-specific and largely consistent across thermal environments.

Figure S4: A) Variance in larval growth rates within families (CV; standard deviation divided by the mean for each family) was similar between host treatments. **B)** Utilising *Plantago* as a host plant resulted in higher variance in larval growth rates across families (CV; standard deviation of family means divided by the global mean growth rate, calculated for each temperature treatment separately)

Figure S5: Minimum, mean and maximum temperatures in Åland in the months April until August for years between 1958 and 2018. Symbol colour gradient indicates temperature, with cold temperatures represented by blue and warm temperatures indicated by red. The pictures above the panels show the presence of butterfly life-stages per time period, with post diapause larvae being present in April and May, after which they pupate and emerge as adults who lay their eggs in June. Pre-diapause larvae then develop in July and August. Temperature data was derived from the Jomala climate station database in Åland. Illustrations courtesy of Luisa Woestmann.

Table S1: Background of larvae used in the experiment including family of the mother and the clutch number. Larvae printed in italics were not included in the data analysis. Abbreviation Vs stands for host plant *Veronica spicata*, Pl for host plant *Plantago lanceolata*.

Mother	Clutch number							
	28 °C		30 °C		32 °C		34 °C	
	Vs	Pl	Vs	Pl	Vs	Pl	Vs	Pl
1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	<i>1</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	2
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
12	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
22	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
27	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
36	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
42	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
44	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
46	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table S2: Linear model for mean clutch mass (related to Figure 2A in the main text). **A)** Minimum adequate model (in bold) was obtained using the *step()* function, starting from the full model. **B)** Anova table for the minimum adequate model. **C)** Model-estimated marginal means, as well as upper and lower confidence limits, for all experimental treatments. Significant differences experimental groups (Tukey's HSD, $\alpha = 0.05$), averaged over the families and host plants, were obtained using the package *emmeans* and are indicated by different letters.

A		AIC
M _{full}	Ln(mass) ~ t * T * HP	-1162.5
M ₁	Ln(mass) ~ t + T + HP + t:T + t:HP + T:HP	-1177.6
M_{final}	Ln(mass) ~ t + T + HP + t:T + t: HP	-1179.8
M ₃	Ln(mass) ~ t + T + HP + t:T + T:HP	-1171.2
M ₄	Ln(mass) ~ t + T + HP + t:HP + T:HP	-1107.7
M ₅	Ln(mass) ~ t + T + HP + t:T	-1173.6
M ₆	Ln(mass) ~ t + T + HP + t: HP	-1111.8

t = time-point; T = temperature; HP = host plant.

B	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	P value	% exp
Time-point	3	615.2663	205.0888	3768.1423	< 0.0001	94.9792
Temperature	3	5.2870	1.7623	32.3799	< 0.0001	0.8162
Plant	1	0.1098	0.1098	2.0169	0.1564	0.0169
Time-point:Temperature	9	5.1522	0.5725	10.5182	< 0.0001	0.7954
Time-point:Plant	3	0.6399	0.2133	3.9190	0.0089	0.0988
Residuals	392	21.3354	0.0544			3.2936

C	Temperature	Time-point	Mean	LCL	UCL	Group
	28 °C	0	-1.0789	-1.16619	-0.99152	a
	30 °C	0	-1.0636	-1.15095	-0.97628	a
	32 °C	0	-1.0795	-1.16684	-0.99217	a
	34 °C	0	-1.0926	-1.17996	-1.00529	a
	28 °C	4	0.1221	0.03477	0.20944	a
	30 °C	4	0.2316	0.14423	0.31890	a
	32 °C	4	0.2416	0.15425	0.32891	a
	34 °C	4	0.2509	0.16352	0.33819	a
	28 °C	8	1.1837	1.09635	1.27102	b
	30 °C	8	1.4689	1.38152	1.55619	bc
	32 °C	8	1.5895	1.50220	1.67687	cg
	34 °C	8	1.4655	1.37820	1.55287	cd
	28 °C	12	1.7373	1.63179	1.84272	g
	30 °C	12	2.2997	2.16625	2.43306	e
	32 °C	12	2.5193	2.41542	2.62313	fe
	34 °C	12	2.4235	2.32922	2.51788	e

Table S3: Linear model for individual growth rates (related to Figure 2B in the main text). **A)** Minimum adequate model (in bold) was obtained using the *step()* function, starting from the full model. **B)** Anova table for the minimum adequate model. **C)** Model-estimated marginal means, as well as upper and lower confidence limits, for all experimental treatments. Significant differences experimental groups (Tukey's HSD, $\alpha = 0.05$), averaged over the families, were obtained using the package *emmeans* and are indicated by different letters.

A		AIC
M_{full}	Growth rate ~ F * T * HP	-11924.0
M ₂	Growth rate ~ F + T + HP + F:T + F:HP + T:HP	-11812.0

F = family; T = temperature; HP = host plant.

B	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	P value	% exp
Family	13	0.2363	0.0182	41.6611	< 0.0001	15.1482
Temperature	3	0.3266	0.1089	249.5829	< 0.0001	20.9423
Plant	1	0.0279	0.0279	63.9802	< 0.0001	1.7895
Family:Temperature	39	0.0664	0.0017	3.9012	< 0.0001	4.2555
Family:Plant	13	0.1829	0.0141	32.2507	< 0.0001	11.7265
Temperature:Plant	3	0.0086	0.0029	6.5948	0.0002	0.5534
Family:Temperature:Plant	39	0.0815	0.0021	4.7893	< 0.0001	5.2243
Residuals	1443	0.6295	0.0004			40.3603

C	Temperature	Plant	Mean	LCL	UCL	Group
	28 °C	Pl	0.1800	0.1770	0.1830	e
	30 °C	Pl	0.2067	0.2038	0.2097	c
	32 °C	Pl	0.2172	0.2141	0.2202	b
	34 °C	Pl	0.2129	0.2098	0.2160	bc
	28 °C	Vs	0.1897	0.1868	0.1926	d
	30 °C	Vs	0.2145	0.2116	0.2174	b
	32 °C	Vs	0.2320	0.2291	0.2349	a
	34 °C	Vs	0.2156	0.2127	0.2185	b

Pl = *Plantago*; Vs = *Veronica*

Table S4: Linear model for individual fat content (related to Figure 2B in the main text). **A)** Minimum adequate model (in bold) was obtained using the *step()* function, starting from the full model. **B)** Anova table for the minimum adequate model. **C)** Model-estimated marginal means, as well as upper and lower confidence limits, for all experimental treatments. Significant differences experimental groups (Tukey's HSD, $\alpha = 0.05$), averaged over the families, were obtained using the package *emmeans* and are indicated by different letters.

A		AIC
M_{full}	Fat content ~ F * T * HP	184.1
M ₂	Fat content ~ F + T + HP + F:T + F:HP + T:HP	236.5

F = family; T = temperature; HP = host plant.

B	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	P value	% exp
Family	13	175.3395	13.4877	12.1996	< 0.0001	11.4766
Temperature	3	95.9078	31.9693	28.9162	< 0.0001	6.2775
Plant	1	33.0864	33.0864	29.9267	< 0.0001	2.1656
Family:Temperature	39	204.0132	5.2311	4.7315	< 0.0001	13.3534
Family:Plant	13	102.8951	7.9150	7.1591	< 0.0001	6.7349
Temperature:Plant	3	16.7780	5.5927	5.0586	0.0018	1.0982
Family:Temperature:Plant	39	134.7115	3.4541	3.1243	< 0.0001	8.8174
Residuals	692	765.0626	1.1056			50.0763

C	Temperature	Plant	Mean	LCL	UCL	Group
	28 °C	Pl	7.0044	6.8002	7.2086	a
	30 °C	Pl	7.1823	6.9734	7.3912	a
	32 °C	Pl	7.6754	7.4670	7.8838	b
	34 °C	Pl	7.8885	7.6758	8.1012	b
	28 °C	Vs	6.7918	6.5859	6.9977	a
	30 °C	Vs	6.7932	6.5857	7.0007	a
	32 °C	Vs	6.7812	6.5715	6.9909	a
	34 °C	Vs	7.7098	7.5061	7.9136	b

Pl = *Plantago*; Vs = *Veronica*

Table S5: Linear model for individual development time (related to Figure S1A in the supplementary materials). **A)** Minimum adequate model (in bold) was obtained using the step() function, starting from the full model. **B)** Anova table for the minimum adequate model. **C)** Model-estimated marginal means, as well as upper and lower confidence limits, for all experimental treatments. Significant differences experimental groups (Tukey's HSD, $\alpha = 0.05$), averaged over the families, were obtained using the package emmeans and are indicated by different letters.

A		AIC
M_{full}	Development time ~ F * T * HP	1417.6
M ₂	Development time ~ F + T + HP + F:T + F:HP + T:HP	1477.7

F = family; T = temperature; HP = host plant.

B	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	P value	% exp
Family	13	734.6413	56.5109	24.338672	< 0.0001	13.2852
Temperature	3	185.8150	61.9383	26.676229	< 0.0001	3.3603
Plant	1	13.3771	13.3771	5.7614	0.0165	0.2419
Family:Temperature	39	361.1477	9.2602	3.988275	< 0.0001	6.5309
Family:Plant	13	566.0942	43.5457	18.754705	< 0.0001	10.2372
Temperature:Plant	3	7.2857	2.4286	1.045963	0.3712	0.1318
Family:Temperature:Plant	39	310.9925	7.9742	3.434394	< 0.0001	5.6239
Residuals	1443	3350.4369	2.3219			60.5889

C	Temperature	Plant	Mean	LCL	UCL	Letter
	28 °C	PI	15.749	15.5310	15.9677	bcd
	30 °C	PI	15.297	15.0809	15.5122	c
	32 °C	PI	15.326	15.1041	15.5487	c
	34 °C	PI	16.098	15.8717	16.3241	ad
	28 °C	Vs	15.875	15.6611	16.0883	db
	30 °C	Vs	15.492	15.2816	15.7014	bc
	32 °C	Vs	15.337	15.1255	15.5479	c
	34 °C	Vs	16.393	16.1801	16.6061	a

PI = *Plantago*; Vs = *Veronica*

Table S6: Linear model for individual diapause mass (related to Figure S1B in the supplementary materials). **A)** Minimum adequate model (in bold) was obtained using the *step()* function, starting from the full model. **B)** Anova table for the minimum adequate model. **C)** Model-estimated marginal means, as well as upper and lower confidence limits, for all experimental treatments. Significant differences experimental groups (Tukey's HSD, $\alpha = 0.05$), averaged over the families, were obtained using the package *emmeans* and are indicated by different letters.

A		AIC
M_{full}	Diapause mass ~ F * T * HP	2891.9
M ₂	Diapause mass ~ F + T + HP + F:T + F:HP + T:HP	2938.8

F = family; T = temperature; HP = host plant.

B	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	P value	% exp
Family	13	3564.6910	274.2070	45.7602	< 0.0001	19.4455
Temperature	3	3797.6067	1265.8689	211.2507	< 0.0001	20.7160
Plant	1	169.6805	169.6805	28.3166	< 0.0001	0.9256
Family:Temperature	39	758.5425	19.4498	3.2458	< 0.0001	4.1379
Family:Plant	13	608.4506	46.8039	7.8107	< 0.0001	3.3191
Temperature:Plant	3	63.2488	21.0829	3.5184	0.0146	0.3450
Family:Temperature:Plant	39	722.6794	18.5302	3.0924	< 0.0001	3.9422
Residuals	1443	8646.8305	5.9923			47.1687

C	Temperature	Plant	Mean	LCL	UCL	Letter
	28 °C	Pl	6.8730	6.5222	7.2238	e
	30 °C	Pl	9.0712	8.7248	9.4176	d
	32 °C	Pl	10.0496	9.6925	10.4067	bc
	34 °C	Pl	10.6042	10.2408	10.9677	bf
	28 °C	Vs	7.1585	6.8154	7.5016	e
	30 °C	Vs	9.5695	9.2323	9.9067	cd
	32 °C	Vs	11.3837	11.0444	11.7230	a
	34 °C	Vs	11.2182	10.8760	11.5603	af

Pl = *Plantago*; Vs = *Veronica*