

1 **Ambient light and mimicry as drivers of wing transparency in Lepidoptera**

2 Mónica Arias^{1,2}, Jérôme Barbut³, Rodolphe Rougerie², Manon Dutry¹, Mireia Kohler¹,

3 Baptiste Laulan¹, Caroline Paillard¹, Serge Berthier⁴, Christine Andraud⁵, Marianne

4 Elias², Doris Gomez^{1,4}

5

6 **Affiliations**

7 ¹CEFE, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, EPHE, IRD, Univ Paul Valéry Montpellier 3,
8 Montpellier, France

9 ²Institut de Systématique, Evolution, Biodiversité, CNRS, MNHN, Sorbonne
10 Université, EPHE, Université des Antilles, 45 rue Buffon CP50, Paris, France

11 ³MNHN, Direction des collections, 45 rue Buffon CP50, Paris, France

12 ⁴INSP, Sorbonne Université, CNRS, Paris, France

13 ⁵CRC, CNRS, MNHN, Paris, France

14 **Corresponding author email:** moarias@gmail.com

15 **Abstract**

16 Transparency reduces prey detectability by predators. While the proportion of
17 transmitted light in aquatic species is higher as light availability increases, less is
18 known about such variation in terrestrial species. Transparency has evolved several
19 times in the typically opaque winged Lepidoptera order (moths and butterflies),
20 displaying a large diversity of degrees. Using two complementary approaches, we
21 explore how the evolution of the differences in light transmittance relates to habitat
22 openness, daytime activity and mimicry syndrome (bee/wasp versus dead-leaf
23 mimic). First, by exposing artificial moth-like prey to wild avian predators in open
24 and closed habitats, we show that survival increases at higher proportions of
25 transmitted light in open habitats. Second, by analysing the evolution of wing

26 features and ecological traits in 107 clearwing species, we confirm that diurnal open-
 27 habitat species show higher light transmittances than diurnal closed-habitat species.
 28 Additionally, bee/wasp mimics are more often diurnal and have higher and less
 29 variable light transmittances than dead-leaf mimics, which are more often nocturnal.
 30 Bright conditions, such as open habitats during the day, and mimicry of insects with
 31 transparent wings seem to promote high light transmittance. Habitat openness,
 32 daytime activity and species interactions play a crucial role in determining
 33 transparency design.

34

35 **Keywords:** transparency, irradiance, mimicry, nocturnality, Lepidoptera, Batesian
 36 mimicry, habitat openness

37

38 Introduction

39 Transparency is common in aquatic environments where it reduces detectability by
 40 predators, especially in the pelagic environment where there is nowhere to hide
 41 (Johnsen 2014). However, the amount of light that is transmitted by transparent
 42 tissues varies between organisms. Based on the observation of 29 zooplankton
 43 species, Johnsen and Widder (1998), found that light transmittance could range from
 44 50 to 90%, with the most transparent species living in lighter, shallower places. In a
 45 theoretical approach, they show that efficiency at detecting transparent species
 46 depends on visual performance (for instance, minimum contrast that predator can
 47 detect, also known as contrast threshold), which varies with ambient light
 48 conditions: in shallow places with bright light conditions, high visual performance
 49 (low contrast threshold values) selects for high transmittance, and only highly
 50 transparent organisms are effectively undetected. Instead, at deeper areas with
 51 dimmer light conditions, visual systems are less performing (high contrast threshold
 52 values), thus organisms can be poorly transparent and be effectively undetected
 53 (Ruxton et al. 2018, Figure S1). On land, studies in primates have also shown higher
 54 visual performance at brighter light conditions as the retinal cells increase their
 55 neural response more strongly when mean luminance is higher (Purpura et al. 1988;
 56 Ghim and Hodos 2006). Similarly, visual performance increases with ambient light
 57 luminance in other terrestrial vertebrates such as birds (Hodos et al. 1976; Kassarov
 58 2003; Lind et al. 2013). Given the pervasive property of variation of visual
 59 performance with light availability, selection should favour different transmittance
 60 levels in different light environments on land.

61 On land, transparency is present in only a handful of lineages, including
 62 Centrolenidae frogs, *Gaeotis* semi-slugs, and insects, where transparent wings are

63 common. Transparency also reduces detectability of prey on land (Arias et al. 2019,
64 2020; Mcclure et al. 2019). Recently, Gomez et al (2020) reported that transparency
65 has evolved multiple times independently in Lepidoptera (butterflies and moths),
66 order of mostly opaque winged species, where it is produced by a large diversity of
67 structures and configurations conferring different transmittance levels. Although
68 this study did not investigate the links between transparency and habitat, it
69 suggested in several aspects an important role of visual predators in driving the
70 evolution of transparency (for instance diurnal species were reported to transmit
71 more light than nocturnal species). Hence, we expect diurnal terrestrial transparent
72 species that live in more open habitats - with brighter light conditions - to transmit
73 more light compared to species flying at night and/or living in more closed habitats -
74 with dimmer light conditions-. In addition, at low light availability, different levels of
75 transmittance can confer similar protection against predators. Therefore, nocturnal
76 and/or closed-habitat species might show larger variation in light transmittance, as
77 neither high nor low transmittance levels are strongly selected.

78 Predation risk can be reduced not only by reducing detectability, but also by
79 mimicking inedible elements such as leaves (masquerade, Skelhorn et al. 2010) or
80 unprofitable prey (batesian mimicry, Bates 1862), and transparency might help
81 achieving such mimicry. Several clearwing Lepidoptera exhibit brownish colorations
82 that combined with transparent surfaces that presumably perceived as “holes” can
83 resemble dead leaves (example of a potential dead-leaf mimic in Fig. 1a). Other small
84 clearwing moths and butterflies exhibit yellow and dark stripes on their bodies and
85 highly transparent wings (example in Fig. 1b), resembling harmful species for
86 predators, such as bees and wasps. Mimicry syndrome could concur in driving
87 transmittance differences to have different optima in bee/wasp and leaf mimics, but

88 whichever factor (light availability versus mimicry) is driving its evolution is still
 89 unknown. Bees and wasps often live in open habitats (Grundel et al. 2010; Yamaura
 90 et al. 2012), and their mimics should do as well. High light transmittance should be
 91 selected in bees, wasps and their mimics because the reduction of detectability
 92 already conferred by their small body sizes, can be enhanced by higher levels of
 93 transparency (Gomez et al. 2020), and because light conditions are brighter in open
 94 habitats. By contrast, dead-leaf mimics might show a larger variation in body size,
 95 may more often live in closed habitats, where more leaves fall down and should
 96 therefore exhibit a broader diversity of light transmittance, as a range of
 97 transmittance levels can contribute to mimic leaves in decomposition and confer
 98 similar protection against predators. The expected differences in light transmittance
 99 should also be associated to variations in morphology and coloration of wing scales,
 100 with absent or reduced scales for bee/wasp mimics and classically shaped scales for
 101 leaf mimics.

102 Here, we investigate whether differences in transmittance found in
 103 Lepidoptera clearwing species are related to light availability and/or mimicry using
 104 two complementary approaches. First, we tested whether the efficiency of different
 105 transmittance levels at reducing detectability changes according to light availability
 106 in terrestrial environments, by carrying out a fieldwork experiment with artificial
 107 moth-like prey. Second, using actual specimens of butterflies and moths, we tested
 108 whether differences in the proportion of transmitted light could be explained by
 109 species daytime rhythm, habitat and/or mimicry, by conducting comparative
 110 analyses at broad interspecific level. We took advantage of the large dataset of
 111 Lepidoptera species analysed by Gomez et al (2020) to add species ecological traits
 112 (habitat, daytime rhythm and mimicry, known for 107 species) and relate them to

113 clearwing optical and structural traits. Together, these analyses help understanding
114 the evolution of interspecific differences in the proportion of transmitted light on
115 land.

116

117 **Material and Methods**

118 1. Field experiment

119 1.a. Artificial butterfly Elaboration

120 To test for the efficiency of light transmittance at reducing detectability in habitats
121 with different light availability, we elaborated plain grey artificial butterflies with
122 paper wings and a malleable edible body. Following the general methodology
123 described in Arias *et al* (2020), butterflies did not replicate any real local butterfly,
124 but mimicked a general grey moth with closed wings (i. e., a triangular shape). The
125 rather cryptic butterfly colour was chosen based on 120 reflectance measures of
126 green oak *Quercus ilex* trunks. Reflectance measurements were taken using a
127 spectrophotometer (Starline Avaspec-2048 L, Avantes) and a deuterium halogen
128 lamp (Avalight DHS, Avantes) emitting in the 300-700 nm range, including UV, to
129 which some predators of butterfly and moths, such as birds, are sensitive (Chen and
130 Goldsmith 1986). Measurements were done relative to a white reference (lights
131 turned on with no sample) and a dark reference (light turned off with no sample).
132 For reflectance measurements, we used an optic probe (FC-UV200-2-1.5 x 100,
133 Avantes) merging illumination and collection angles. Grey wings (R=155, G=155,
134 B=155) were printed on sketch paper Canson using a HP Officejet Pro 6230 printer.
135 Paper wings were laminated with a Polyester Opale Mat 75µm poach. Four forms of
136 artificial butterflies were used, here listed in order of increasing proportion of light
137 transmittance: completely opaque butterfly “C”; poorly transparent butterfly with 6

138 layers of transparent film “T6”; highly transparent butterfly with a single layer of
139 transparent film “T1”; and fully transparent butterfly with no film in the transparent
140 zones “T0”. For the butterflies that included transparent elements, triangular
141 windows of 234mm² were cut down from the grey triangle and the remaining part
142 was put on top of one or six layers of transparency film 3M for inkjet printing. This
143 transparent film was chosen as it is highly transparent, even in the UV range of the
144 spectrum, and going from 1 to 6 transparent layers permitted a reduction of 50% of
145 the transmittance between treatments (Fig. S2). Such transparent layer was coated
146 with a transparent mate varnish to reduce its shininess. For transparency
147 measurements, we measured specular transmittance from 300 to 1100nm, using a
148 deuterium-halogen lamp (Avalight DHS, Avantes), optical fibres (FC-UV200-2-1.5 x
149 100, Avantes) and a spectrometer (Starline Avaspec-2048 L, Avantes). Fibres were
150 separated, aligned and 5mm apart and the wing sample was placed perpendicular
151 between them at equal distance (light spot of 1mm diameter). Spectra were taken
152 relative to a dark (light off) and to a white reference (no sample between the fibres)
153 measurement. On top of butterfly wings, we added an artificial grey body. Butterfly
154 bodies were prepared with flour (428 g), lard (250 g) and water (36 g), following
155 Carrol & Sherratt (2013). Yellow, red and blue food edible colourings were used to
156 dye the pastry in grey, imitating artificial wing colour. Such malleable mix permits to
157 register and distinguish marks made by bird beaks from insect jaws. Both paper
158 wings and artificial bodies were measured in spectrometry, similarly to how trunk
159 reflectance was measured (Fig. S2). Bodies could attract predator attention, but it
160 has been previously shown that wingless bodies had the same attractiveness as that
161 of butterflies with large transparent elements (Arias et al. 2020). Artificial butterflies
162 and bodies were pinned to green oak *Quercus ilex* trunks. To avoid ant attacks,

163 Vaseline and a piece of highly sticky double-faced transparent tape were stuck in
164 between the wings and the trunk.

165

166 1.b. Experimental set up

167 Predation experiments were performed in May and June 2018 at the zoological park
168 of Montpellier (43.64°, 3.87°) and at La Rouvière forest (close to Montarnaud city
169 43.65°, 3.64°). This experiment overlapped with the breeding season of local great
170 (*Parus major*) and blue tit (*Cyanistes caeruleus*) populations, when birds are
171 intensively looking for food, which can maximise the number of attacks on our
172 artificial prey. Artificial prey items were pinned every 10 metres on oak trunks of at
173 least 10 cm of diameter and with few or no moss cover. Prey order was randomized
174 by blocks of eight items, two per treatment, before starting the experiment. Initially,
175 prey were evenly disposed in closed and open areas. However, throughout the
176 experiment a stronger predation rate was detected in open areas (see Results
177 section). Therefore, we increased the number of artificial prey released on closed
178 areas to compensate for the differential predation pressure and try to get more
179 similar numbers of attacked prey items in closed and open habitats. We analysed
180 results for both the whole dataset, including larger sample size in closed habitats,
181 and 20 reduced datasets, including each time a different random subset of the closed
182 habitat of the same amount of artificial prey as for the open habitat. Prey were
183 mostly disposed facing north and as perpendicular to the floor as possible, to reduce
184 direct sunlight reflection on them. Prey were checked every 24h. After 96h all prey
185 were removed. When V- or U- marks were detected, or when the body was missing
186 without signals of invertebrate attacks (i.e. no body scraps left on the wings or
187 around the butterfly on the trunk) prey were considered as attacked and wings or

188 pins where removed. Instead, if invertebrate attacks were detected, or when prey
189 was missing, it was replaced. Non-attacked prey were considered as censored data.

190 Canopy cover was used to classify places in open and closed habitat. We took
191 pictures each 20 meters in the trails that were used for the experiment (at forest
192 edges for the open habitat, inside the forest for the closed habitat, examples Fig. S3),
193 using a Canon EOS 550D camera and a fisheye lens. Canopy cover was further
194 quantified using Fiji software (Schindelin et al. 2012). Although canopy cover
195 distribution is unimodal (Hartigans' dip test: $D = 0.01$, $p\text{-value} = 0.6$), we used a
196 discrete classification, comparable to the one used for real species in the second part
197 of our study. We assumed that places with cover larger than the mean were closed
198 habitats and places with lower covers were open habitats (see Fig. S3 for the
199 distribution of canopy cover in the experimental sites).

200 To test how different treatments survive along the experiment on both open and
201 closed habitats, Cox proportional hazard regression (Cox 1972) were applied, first
202 for all data points including form, habitat openness and their interaction as
203 explanatory variables, and then, Cox regression were independently applied for each
204 habitat using the different treatments as factors, to further explore the effect of form
205 within each habitat. Overall significance was measured using a Wald test. Statistical
206 analyses were performed in R (R Foundation for Statistical Computing 2014) using
207 the *survival* package (Therneau and Lumley 2009).

208

209 2. Comparative analyses of museum specimens

210 2. a. Species selection and phylogeny

211 To explore the association of light transmittance with different conditions across
212 multiple species we performed phylogenetic comparative analyses, since species are

not independent. We used the phylogeny of clearwing species by Gomez et al. (2020). In our analyses we included 107 species out of the 123 species included by Gomez et al, for which information about the openness of their habitat was available. These species spanned 31 of the 124 existing Lepidoptera families.

2. b. Ecological data on species habitat, daytime activity and mimicry type

Ecological information was collected from the literature, Lepidoptera experts and our own knowledge for a total of 107 species for activity rhythm (57% of species are diurnal (day-active) species), habitat (56% of species living in open habitats), and mimicry status (14 species were bee/wasp mimics, 12 species were leaf mimics, while the remaining 81 did not fall in either of those categories (hereafter referred to as non-mimics, Table S1 and Fig S4). The selected 107 species do not include species that were reported to live in both open and closed habitats, or to fly at day and night. Visual predators are mostly active during the day and are supposed to be the main selective agents in the evolution of visual signals related to anti-predator defences (Ruxton et al. 2018), thus, nocturnal species are unlikely to face similar selective pressures as diurnal species although both could fly in similarly open habitats. Therefore, daytime rhythm and habitat were coded as a single variable with 4 states (diurnal open habitat, diurnal closed habitat, nocturnal open habitat and nocturnal closed habitat). Bee and wasp mimics were grouped together in the same mimicry category, as both exhibit the striped pattern with black and yellow that advertise their unpalatability (Plowright and Owen 1980) and they exhibit similar body sizes. Butterflies and moths mimicking bees and wasps have forewings longer than their hindwings, and often, strong delimitations of their wing borders and veins by dark coloration, as the hornet moth *Sesia apiformis* (*api* - bee, *formis* -shaped) or

the broad-bordered bee hawk-moth *Hemaris fuciformis* (Fig 1b). Dead-leaf mimics include brownish moths and butterflies with small or large transparent surfaces and that could touch or not the wing borders (Fig. 1a). *Rotschildia lebeau* has been proposed as a leaf mimic (Janzen 1984) but such mimicry is controversial (Hernández-Chavarría et al. 2004). *Rotschildia ericina* was therefore not considered as a leaf mimic for the analyses.

244

245 2. c. Wing structural and optical measurements

Wing structural and optical measurements were taken from Gomez et al, using the following methods. Museum specimens were photographed using a D800E Nikon camera equipped with a 60mm lens, placed on a stand with an annular light. Photos were then analysed using ImageJ (Schneider et al. 2012) to extract descriptors of wing macrostructure: wing length (mm), wing surface (mm²), and clearwing area (the surface of transparent area in mm²), for the forewing and hindwing separately. We defined and computed proportion of clearwing area as the ratio clearwing area/wing surface, i.e. the proportion of the total wing area occupied by transparency.

For optical measurements, we followed the same procedure described above for measuring transmittance in artificial prey. For each species and wing, we took five measurements in the transparent zone. We analysed spectral shape using Avicol v6 (Gomez 2006) to extract the mean transmittance over [300-700] nm, which described the level of transparency.

260

261 2. d. Physical properties of transparent wings

262 Gomez et al (2020) described a large diversity in transparent wing surface
263 characteristics. Using binocular imaging (Zeiss Stereo Discovery V20) and digital
264 microscopic imaging (Keyence VHX-5000), these authors found that transparency
265 could be achieved either with nude membranes or with membranes covered by
266 scales of various types (either classical scales, hair-like scales or both) that could be
267 coloured or transparent, and erected or flat according to their insertion on the wing
268 membrane. Different combinations of structures and configurations are related to
269 different light transmission levels. Therefore, we also explored the evolution of these
270 characteristics and their relationship with mimicry syndrome.

271

272 2. e. Analyses of transmittance differences between habitats and mimics

273 To explore whether differences in the proportion of transmitted light are related to
274 variation in habitat and mimicry we fitted both 1) a linear mixed model including
275 107 species for which we found data on habitat preference and 2) a Bayesian
276 phylogenetic mixed model, including the phylogeny of the 107 species. Comparisons
277 between the first and the second analysis allowed us to assess the influence, if any, of
278 phylogenetic relationships on the observed trends. Light availability, mimicry and
279 morphological traits were included as explanatory variables in our model. We
280 defined ActHab, a variable combining daytime activity and habitat openness with
281 four levels (diurnal open, diurnal closed, nocturnal open, nocturnal closed) and three
282 contrasts (diurnal vs. nocturnal, open vs. closed habitats, and diurnal open habitat
283 vs. diurnal closed habitat). The variable mimicry has three levels (bee-wasp mimics,
284 leaf mimics and non-mimics) and we tested two contrasts (bee/wasp mimics vs. all
285 other species, and leaf mimics vs. non- mimics). Other explanatory variables
286 included: wing length (as a proxy of butterfly size), proportion of clearwing surface

287 and fore-/hindwing, reported by Gomez et al (2020) as correlated to light
 288 transmittance. Wing transmittance, wing length and clearwing proportion were
 289 obtained from Gomez *et al* (2020). As five measurements per wing (fore- and
 290 hindwing), thus ten measurements per species were included in our dataset, wing
 291 measures nested in species was considered as a random effect. We fitted different
 292 models including different combinations of two- and three-factor interactions and
 293 we compared them using the AIC criterion to select the best model. To better
 294 understand the effect of each of the included variables, we reported and compared
 295 the full model without interactions and the best model including interactions (Table
 296 1). Additionally, we fitted Bayesian phylogenetic mixed models with Markov chain
 297 Monte Carlo analyses using the ‘mulTree’ R package (Guillerme and Healy 2014).
 298 Using the best formulated linear mixed model, uninformative priors were chosen,
 299 with variance and belief parameter set to 1 for random effects and 0.002 for residual
 300 variances (Hadfield 2010). Models were run using two chains of 600,000 iterations,
 301 a thinning interval of 300 and a burn-in of 10,000. Fixed effects were considered
 302 statistically significant when the probabilities in the 95% credible intervals did not
 303 include zero. As Bayesian phylogenetic mixed models consider no interactions
 304 between factor levels, several submodels were fitted to test the interactions from the
 305 best model obtained according to AIC criterion.

306 Additionally, we performed several phylogenetic generalised least square
 307 (PGLS) analyses (1 observation per species) to test for potential correlations
 308 between size, proportion of clearwing surface, daytime activity, habitat and mimicry,
 309 and between wing ratio (forewing length/hindwing length, usually high in bees and
 310 wasps) and mimicry. Using BayesTraits (Pagel and Meade 2013) we additionally
 311 explored character coevolution between mimicry and ActHab and between habitat

312 and daytime as well as between mimicry and scale characteristics:
313 absence/presence of scales, scale insertion (flat or erected), scale coloration
314 (coloured or transparent) and scale type (hair-like scales and classic scales). When
315 analysing physical wing properties and mimicry evolution, independent analyses
316 were performed for anterior and posterior wings, as differences between wings have
317 been reported by Gomez et al (2020). We calculated the likelihood of the dependent
318 and independent models of evolution of each pair of binary characters, using a
319 Markov-Chain Monte-Carlo approach. We then estimated the likelihood ratio test
320 between them and compared it to a chi-square distribution with 4 degrees of
321 freedom to obtain their statistical significance (Pagel 1994). As this approach can
322 only be applied to binary characters, and mimicry has three factors, models were run
323 including the different possible pairwise combinations to explore: a. evolution of
324 dead-leaf mimicry (including non-mimics and dead-leaf mimics); b. evolution of
325 bee/wasp mimics (including non-mimics and bee/wasp mimics) and c. differences in
326 the evolution of dead-leaf and bee/wasp- mimics (including bee/wasp and dead-leaf
327 mimics). Similarly, for the composed variable ActHab we compared (i) diurnal and
328 nocturnal species flying in open habitats, and (ii) nocturnal species flying in open
329 and in closed habitats. We calculated δ , a new metric inspired in the phylogenetic
330 analog of the Shannon entropy to measure phylogenetic signal in categorical non-
331 ordered data (Borges et al. 2019), for testing for phylogenetic signal in ActHab,
332 daytime activity and mimicry evolution. δ is useful to detect whether the coevolution
333 between traits are homologies (characteristics are shared within a clade) or
334 convergences (characteristics evolved independently but jointly and several times
335 along the phylogeny). For each trait, we compared its evolution in our data with the
336 evolution of a randomly sorted trait (assuming it has no phylogenetic signal), using

337 lambda = 0.1, standard deviation of 0.5, 10000 iterations, keeping the 10th iterate
338 and burning-in 100 iterates, parameters from the example script proposed by
339 Borges *et al* (2019). In case of homology, δ should be higher for the real data than for
340 the randomly sorted data.

341 Finally, we predicted higher variance in light transmittance for those
342 conditions where different levels of transparency might be equally efficient as would
343 be the case for butterflies and moths that are active during the night, that live in
344 closed habitats and/or that are dead-leaf mimics. We applied Fligner-Killeen tests of
345 homogeneity of variance in R to test for difference in variance between (i) diurnal
346 and nocturnal species living in open and in close habitats, and (ii) bee/wasp mimics,
347 leaf mimics and no mimic species. As Gomez et al (2020) reported that transmittance
348 is closely related to wing size, we also tested for differences in the variation of wing
349 length between habitat, daytime activity and mimicry using the test mentioned
350 above.

351

352 Results

353 Fieldwork experiment

354 In total, 1149 artificial butterflies were used during the experiment and 243 prey
355 were attacked (21.14 %). When data from both open and closed habitats were
356 analysed together, survival was lower in open than in closed areas. In closed areas
357 651 prey were released, 110 attacked, with an attack rate of 16.89% while in open
358 areas, 498 prey were released, 133 attacked, with an attack rate of 26.71% (Wald
359 test = 34.39, df = 7, p<0.001). Results are similar when including the “reduced”
360 datasets (random subsample of the closed habitat set and of the same sample size as
361 the set released in open habitats, Table S2). Additionally, in open habitats the opaque

form was more attacked than the other forms that had transparency ($z = 2.15$, $p = 0.031$), but when including the “reduced” dataset, such difference was only detected in 6 out of the 20 random subsets Table S2). When data was analysed independently in each habitat, all prey treatments were similarly attacked in closed areas (Fig. 2a, Wald test = 0.9, $df = 3$, $p = 0.825$, and for the reduced dataset Wald test = 0.5, $df = 3$, $p = 0.5$), in contrast to open areas (Fig. 2b, Wald test = 9.86, $df = 3$, $p = 0.02$). In open areas, opaque artificial butterflies were more attacked than all the other treatments ($z = 2.68$, $p = 0.007$, Fig. 2b); artificial butterflies with six layers of transparency were marginally more attacked than those with a single transparency layer ($z = 1.839$, $p = 0.066$, Fig. 2b), while artificial butterflies with or without a single transparent layer were similarly attacked and reported the lowest number of attacks ($z = -1.61$, $p = 0.11$, Fig. 2b).

Comparative analyses

Relationships between light transmittance, habitat and daytime activity

Habitat and daytime activity partly explain the variations found in light transmittance. Species flying in closed habitats transmit slightly more light than species flying in open habitats (model without interactions $t = -1.67$, $df = 101$, $p = 0.08$; model with interactions $t = -3.29$, $df = 101$, $p = 0.001$ Table 1). However, diurnal species flying in open habitats transmit more light than diurnal species flying in closed habitats (model with interactions $t = 2.05$, $df = 101$, $p = 0.043$, Table 1, Fig. 3). Transmittance decreases with wing length in diurnal species, but increases with wing length in nocturnal species (interactions between wing length and ActHab: DO>DC $t = -3.46$, $df = 484$, $p < 0.001$; D>N $t = -2.33$, $df = 484$, $p = 0.02$; O>C $t = 2.68$, $df = 484$, $p = 0.01$; Fig. 3). Transmittance increases with the proportion of clearwing

surface at a similar rate for both wings in most species (Interactions between proportion of clearwing surface and ActHab: $DO > DC$ $t = -2.55$, $df = 484$, $p = 0.01$; $D > N$ $t = 1.11$, $df = 484$, $p = 0.27$; $O > C$ $t = 3.51$, $df = 484$, $p = <0.001$). More results were significant when phylogenetic effect was excluded, suggesting some phylogenetic signal in open/close habitat. Results were similar for most Linear and Bayesian mixed models, but differed when testing transmittance in diurnal/nocturnal species (Table 1 for Linear mixed model results and Tables S2 for Bayesian mixed submodels testing interactions included in linear mixed models). Actually, daytime activity has some phylogenetic signal ($\delta = 0.58$ for real data vs. $\delta = 0.42$ for randomised data), but ActHab not ($\delta = 0.56$ for real data vs. $\delta = 0.57$ for randomised data). No difference in wing length or the proportion of clearwing surface was detected between diurnal and nocturnal species nor species flying in closed or open habitats (Table S3).

400

401 Relationships between light transmittance, transparency structural basis and 402 mimicry

Mimicry explains a large portion of the variation found in light transmittance. Bee/wasp mimics transmit more light than other clearwing species (model without interactions: $t = 1.77$, $df = 101$, $p = 0.08$; model with interactions: $t = 3.52$, $df = 101$, $p < 0.001$, Table 1, Fig. 4). Light transmittance for bee/wasp mimics is higher at larger proportions of clearwing surfaces ($t = 2.24$, $df = 484$, $p = 0.03$) and at smaller wing lengths ($t = -6.39$, $df = 484$, $p < 0.001$), in contrast to leaf mimics that exhibit higher transmittance at smaller proportions of clearwing surface ($t = 3.67$, $df = 484$, $p < 0.001$) and marginally, at larger wing lengths ($t = -1.88$, $df = 484$, $p = 0.06$, Table 1, Fig. 4).

Regarding the relationship between mimicry and wing characteristics, leaf mimics have smaller hindwings than non-mimics (PGLS forewing: $t=1.66$, $p = 0.1$; hindwing: $t=1.99$, $p = 0.05$, Figure 4b), and the length ratio forewing/hindwing is larger for bee/wasp mimics than for any other clearwing species (PGLS $t=4.51$, $p < 0.001$, Fig. 4e). Additionally, the proportion of clearwing surface is larger for non-mimics and for bee/wasp mimics (PGLS forewing: $t=4.005$, $p < 0.001$; hindwing: $t=2.86$, $p=0.005$, Fig. 4c). Mimicry syndrome and daytime have likely coevolved: most bee/wasp mimics are diurnal while most leaf mimics are nocturnal (BayesTraits daytime activity and bee/wasp or leaf mimics: LRT=9.5, $df = 4$, $p=0.05$, Table 2, Fig S4 & Fig S6).

We found that transmittance varies less in bee/wasp mimics than in leaf-mimics (Fligner-Killeen test for forewing: 15.6, $df= 1$, $p<0.001$, for hindwing: 36.14, $df = 1$, $p<0.001$), or in other clearwing species (Fligner-Killeen test for forewing: 16.38, $df=1$, $p<0.001$; for hindwing: 36.34, $df = 1$, $p<0.001$), but there is no difference in the transmittance variation in leaf mimics and non-mimic species (Fligner-Killeen test for forewing: 2.02, $df=1$, $p= 0.155$; for hindwing: 0.00005, $df = 1$, $p=0.995$). Likewise, wing length varies less in bee/wasp mimics than in leaf mimics (Fligner-Killeen test for forewing: 18.91, $df=1$, $p<0.001$; for hindwing: 39.86, $df = 1$, $p<0.001$) or in other clearwing species (Fligner-Killeen test for forewing: 39.06, $df=1$, $p<0.001$; for hindwing: 59.15, $df = 1$, $p<0.001$). Leaf and non-mimics show similar variations in wing length (Fligner-Killeen test for forewing: 0.58, $df=1$, $p=0.447$; for hindwing: 2.46, $df = 1$, $p=0.117$).

Some scale characteristics are correlated to mimicry evolution. Scales are more often absent and less often coloured when present in hindwings of bee/wasp mimics in comparison to non-mimics wings (BT LRT presence = 24.55, $df=4$,

437 $p < 0.001$, Table S4 & Fig S7; BT LRT colour = 16.14, $df = 4$, $p = 0.003$, Table S4 & Fig S7).
 438 Similarly, leaf mimics have less often coloured scales in comparison to non-mimics
 439 both in forewing (BT LRT = 11.62, $df = 4$, $p = 0.02$) and hindwing (LRT = 12.87, $df = 4$,
 440 $p = 0.012$, Table S4 & Fig S7). Moreover, leaf mimics only exhibit classic scales in
 441 contrast to bee/wasp mimics and non-mimics (LRT = 9.33, $df = 4$, $p = 0.053$, Table S4 &
 442 Fig S7). These similarities are likely to be evolutionary convergences as mimicry has
 443 no phylogenetic signal ($\delta = 0.99$ for real data vs. $\delta = 1.002$ for randomised data).

444

445 Discussion

446 Fieldwork experiments using artificial prey that differed in their proportion of
 447 transmitted light suggest that variation in transparency can be detected only in
 448 brighter light conditions, similar to what has been suggested for aquatic
 449 environments (Johnsen and Widder 1998). Poorly transparent prey types survived
 450 less than highly transparent ones in open environments, while they performed
 451 similarly in closed areas. Additionally, less artificial moths were attacked in closed
 452 habitats, even after increasing the number of artificial prey in closed habitats to
 453 compensate for the higher predation rate often reported for open habitats such as
 454 forest edges (Barbaro et al. 2014). By controlling for differences in predation rate
 455 between habitats by increasing the number of prey placed in closed habitat our
 456 results suggest that selective pressure towards an increase in transmittance is
 457 higher in open than in closed habitats.

458 Our experimental results suggest that if transparency has mostly evolved as a
 459 detectability reducer, high transmittance should be more common in open habitats.
 460 In comparative analyses, when analysing only diurnal species, clearwing species
 461 flying in open habitats transmit indeed more light than species flying in closed

462 habitats, in agreement to what would be selected according to the high visual
 463 performance of visual predators under bright conditions (Johnsen and Widder
 464 1998). However, overall butterflies and moths living in closed habitats (including
 465 both diurnal and nocturnal) transmit similar to slightly more light than species living
 466 in open habitats. Gomez et al (2020) reported that poor light transmittance is
 467 associated to small proportions of clearwing surface and large wing sizes. Diurnal
 468 species flying in closed habitats show higher proportion of clearwing surface than
 469 those living in open habitats (Table 1, Fig. 3), probably contributing to the
 470 similar/slightly higher values of light transmittance in closed habitats in comparison
 471 to the open habitats. Species living in open habitats undergo higher risks of tissue
 472 damage by higher exposure to UV light, more wind or higher exposure to direct
 473 rainfall, conditions that have been reported as important at shaping moth and
 474 butterfly segregation in different habitats (Brown Jr and Hutchings 1997). In case
 475 transparency entails costs related to one or several of these factors, selection may
 476 promote lower proportions of clearwing surfaces in open habitats, decreasing the
 477 vulnerability of clearwing Lepidoptera species to these abiotic effects.

478 Transparency can decrease prey detectability but it is also involved in
 479 mimicry of bees or wasps, and differences in light transmittance seem to be closely
 480 associated to mimicry evolution. When mimicry is included in the analysis, we found
 481 that bee/wasp mimics have higher transmittance levels, frequently associated to the
 482 absence of scales in their wings, and are more often restricted to open habitats, in
 483 agreement to our fieldwork results and confirming that high transmittance in open
 484 habitats can be a visual optimum in terrestrial environments. As this is not the case
 485 for all clearwing species, this highlights the strong effect of biotic and abiotic

486 interactions in shaping adaptive peaks, thus the segregation of species under
487 different conditions and the evolution of different features.

488 We also found that bee/wasp mimics are diurnal (similar to most bees,
489 Somanathan et al. 2009), and have smaller wing sizes and smaller hindwings in
490 comparison to their forewings (as has been reported for wasps and bees, Wootton
491 1992; Lindauer 2019). Insects that mimic bees or wasps resemble their harmful
492 counterparts in body colour, body shape and flight pattern (for butterflies (Skowron
493 Volponi et al. 2018)) but also in activity patterns (for Diptera (Howarth et al. 2004)).
494 Convergence in high light transmittance along with reduction in variation in wing
495 size and the presence of long and narrow forewings and small hindwings (large
496 fore/hindwing ratio) can contribute to such multicomponent mimicry, that improves
497 prey chances at deceiving a larger set of predators, in case several traits are similarly
498 salient for them (Kazemi et al. 2015) or when different predator species find
499 different cues as salient (Kikuchi et al. 2016). As chitin, primary component of
500 insects exoskeleton, is transparent, clearwings in insects are likely the basal state in
501 absence of selection for colour evolution. However, the evolution of highly
502 transparent wings in diurnal and very active insects, such as pollinators could have
503 been driven by their higher mobility and the openness of the habitat where the
504 majority of nectar sources frequently occurs (van Halder et al. 2011; Baude et al.
505 2016). This suggest that bees, wasps and their Batesian mimics combine highly
506 transparent wings as they can enhance their crypsis while being highly mobile and
507 also exhibit warning colours that advertise their (potential) harmfulness once they
508 are detected/approached by predators, similar to unpalatable clearwing Ithomiini
509 species (Mcclure et al. 2019). In aquatic environment, transparent forms of *Hippolyte*
510 *obliquimanus* shrimps are more mobile and exploit a larger diversity of habitats,

probably because they are cryptic on several backgrounds (Duarte et al. 2016). Whether transparency is also related to higher mobility in insects remains to be properly tested.

On the other hand, we found that leaf mimics are larger, are more often found in closed habitats and in contrast to the trends for all other clearwing species, transmit more light at larger wing sizes and lower proportions of clearwing surfaces. Some fully opaque fallen leaf mimic species, such as the comma butterfly (*Polygonia c-album*) exhibit a distinctive pale mark that might decrease their predation by being perceived as ‘distractive marks’ preventing predators from recognise the prey, thus enhancing background matching (Dimitrova et al. 2009; Olofsson et al. 2013), although it is controversial (Troschianko et al. 2018). Either way, reduced and highly transparent zones as those found in *Orthogonioptilum violascens* might produce a similar appearance to those markings given their high transmittance that might be highly reflective and be perceived as a white mark, conferring thus the potential benefits of the “comma mark” when seen for a given angle, as well as the full crypsis, when no reflections can be perceived. Whether highly transparent windows work as other highly visible elements displayed in cryptic species such as eyespots that deter predators (Stevens et al. 2008, 2009) and that are also important in mate choice (Robertson and Monteiro 2005) remains to be tested.

Other dead-leaf mimics include large transparent surfaces that can expand to the wings edges, as for *Bertholdia* species, or not, as for *Pseudasellodes fenestraria*. In both cases, transparency surfaces are likely disrupting prey shape (as in the first case) and/or prey surface (as in the second example (Costello et al. 2020)), thereby reducing their detectability. Disruptive coloration, especially when touching prey borders, has been broadly studied as it is common in fully opaque cryptic species

(Cuthill et al. 2005; Schaefer and Stobbe 2006; Stevens and Cuthill 2006; Fraser et al. 2007). Whether transparent surfaces touching wing edges, work as disruptive marks regardless of their transmittance, decreasing even more prey detectability remains to be tested.

540

541 **Conclusion**

542 Both light availability (daytime activity and habitat openness) and mimicry can
543 concur to fostering variations in light transmittance on land. Our results opens up
544 new questions that need to be investigated in the future, in particular the eventual
545 cost of transparency regarding irradiance, wind and direct rainfall, needed to better
546 understand the evolution and the constraints imposed on transparency on land.

547 **Acknowledgments**

548 This work was funded by Clearwing ANR project (ANR-16-CE02-0012), HFSP project
549 on transparency (RGP0014/2016). We warmly thank Jacque Pierre for help with
550 species choice, identification, and information on species ecology, Edgar Attivissimo
551 for contributing to Keyence imaging, Thibaud Decaëns, Daniel Herbin and Claude
552 Tautel for species selection and identification, Charles Perrier for fruitful discussions
553 on statistical analyses and Adrian Hoskins and Tony Pittaway for permitting using
554 their photos for Figure 1.

555 **References**

556 Arias, M., M. Elias, C. Andraud, S. Berthier, and D. Gomez. 2020. Transparency
557 improves concealment in cryptically coloured moths. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*
558 33:247–252.

559 Arias, M., J. Mappes, C. Desbois, S. Gordon, M. McClure, M. Elias, O. Nokelainen, et al.
560 2019. Transparency reduces predator detection in mimetic clearwing butterflies.
561 Functional Ecology 33:1110–1119.

562 Barbaro, L., B. Giffard, Y. Charbonnier, I. van Halder, and E. G. Brockerhoff. 2014. Bird
563 functional diversity enhances insectivory at forest edges: a transcontinental
564 experiment. Diversity and Distributions 20:149–159.

565 Bates, H. W. 1862. XXXII. Contributions to an Insect Fauna of the Amazon Valley.
566 Lepidoptera: Heliconidæ. Transactions of the Linnean Society of London 23:495–
567 566.

568 Baude, M., W. E. Kunin, N. D. Boatman, S. Conyers, N. Davies, M. A. Gillespie, R. D.
569 Morton, et al. 2016. Historical nectar assessment reveals the fall and rise of floral
570 resources in Britain. Nature 530:85–88.

571 Borges, R., J. P. Machado, C. Gomes, A. P. Rocha, and A. Antunes. 2019. Measuring
572 phylogenetic signal between categorical traits and phylogenies. Bioinformatics
573 35:1862–1869.

574 Brown Jr, K. S., and R. W. Hutchings. 1997. Disturbance, fragmentation, and the
575 dynamics of diversity in Amazonian forest butterflies. Tropical forest remnants:
576 ecology, management, and conservation of fragmented communities. University of
577 Chicago Press, Chicago 632.

578 Carroll, J., and T. Sherratt. 2013. A direct comparison of the effectiveness of two
579 anti-predator strategies under field conditions. Journal of Zoology 291:279–285.

580 Chen, D.-M., and T. H. Goldsmith. 1986. Four spectral classes of cone in the retinas of
581 birds. Journal of Comparative Physiology A 159:473–479.

582 Costello, L. M., N. E. Scott-Samuel, K. Kjærsmo, and I. C. Cuthill. 2020. False holes as
583 camouflage. Proceedings of the Royal Society B 287:20200126.

584 Cox, D. R. 1972. Models and life-tables regression. JR Stat. Soc. Ser. B 34:187–220.

585 Cuthill, I. C., M. Stevens, J. Sheppard, T. Maddocks, C. A. Párraga, and T. S. Troscianko.
586 2005. Disruptive coloration and background pattern matching. *Nature* 434:72.

587 Dimitrova, M., N. Stobbe, H. M. Schaefer, and S. Merilaita. 2009. Concealed by
588 conspicuousness: distractive prey markings and backgrounds. *Proceedings of the*
589 *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 276:1905–1910.

590 Duarte, R. C., M. Stevens, and A. A. Flores. 2016. Shape, colour plasticity, and habitat
591 use indicate morph-specific camouflage strategies in a marine shrimp. *BMC*
592 *evolutionary biology* 16:218.

593 Fraser, S., A. Callahan, D. Klassen, and T. N. Sherratt. 2007. Empirical tests of the role
594 of disruptive coloration in reducing detectability. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of*
595 *London B: Biological Sciences* 274:1325–1331.

596 Ghim, M. M., and W. Hodos. 2006. Spatial contrast sensitivity of birds. *Journal of*
597 *Comparative Physiology A* 192:523–534.

598 Gomez, D. 2006. AVICOL, a program to analyse spectrometric data. Free executable
599 available at <http://sites.google.com/site/avicolprogram/> or from the author at
600 dodogomez@yahoo.fr. Last update october 2011.

601 Gomez, D., C. Pinna, J. Pairraire, M. Arias, J. Barbut, A. Pomerantz, C. Nous, et al. 2020.
602 Transparency in butterflies and moths: structural diversity, optical properties and
603 ecological relevance. *bioRxiv*.

604 Grundel, R., R. P. Jean, K. J. Frohnapple, G. A. Glowacki, P. E. Scott, and N. B. Pavlovic.
605 2010. Floral and nesting resources, habitat structure, and fire influence bee
606 distribution across an open-forest gradient. *Ecological applications* 20:1678–1692.

607 Guillerme, T., and K. Healy. 2014. mulTree: a package for running MCMCglmm
608 analysis on multiple trees. *Zenodo*.(doi: 10.5281/zenodo. 12902).

609 Hadfield, J. D. 2010. MCMC Methods for Multi-Response Generalized Linear Mixed
610 Models: The MCMCglmm R Package. *Journal of Statistical Software* 33.

611 Hernández-Chavarría, F., A. Hernández, and A. Sittenfeld. 2004. The " windows",
612 scales, and bristles of the tropical moth Rothschildia lebeau (Lepidoptera:
613 Saturniidae). Revista de biología tropical 52:919–926.

614 Hodos, W., R. W. Leibowitz, and J. C. Bonbright Jr. 1976. Near-field visual acuity of
615 pigeons: Effects of head location and stimulus luminance. Journal of the
616 Experimental Analysis of Behavior 25:129–141.

617 Howarth, B., M. Edmunds, and F. Gilbert. 2004. Does the abundance of hoverfly
618 (Syrphidae) mimics depend on the numbers of their hymenopteran models?
619 Evolution 58:367–375.

620 Janzen, D. H. 1984. Weather-related color polymorphism of Rothschildia lebeau
621 (Saturniidae). Bulletin of the ESA 30:16–21.

622 Johnsen, S. 2014. Hide and seek in the open sea: pelagic camouflage and visual
623 countermeasures. Annual review of marine science 6:369–392.

624 Johnsen, S., and E. A. Widder. 1998. Transparency and visibility of gelatinous
625 zooplankton from the northwestern Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. The Biological
626 Bulletin 195:337–348.

627 Kassarov, L. 2003. Are birds the primary selective force leading to evolution of
628 mimicry and aposematism in butterflies? An opposing point of view. Behaviour
629 140:433–451.

630 Kazemi, B., G. Gamberale-Stille, and O. Leimar. 2015. Multi-trait mimicry and the
631 relative salience of individual traits. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological
632 Sciences 282:20152127.

633 Kikuchi, D. W., J. Mappes, T. N. Sherratt, and J. K. Valkonen. 2016. Selection for
634 multicomponent mimicry: equal feature salience and variation in preferred traits.
635 Behavioral Ecology 27:1515–1521.

636 Lind, O., S. Karlsson, and A. Kelber. 2013. Brightness discrimination in budgerigars
637 (Melopsittacus undulatus). PLoS One 8:e54650.

638 Lindauer, M. 2019. Hymenopteran. Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia
639 Britannica, inc.

640 McClure, M., C. Clerc, C. Desbois, A. Meichanetzoglou, M. Cau, L. Bastin-Héline, J.
641 Bacigalupo, et al. 2019. Why has transparency evolved in aposematic butterflies?
642 Insights from the largest radiation of aposematic butterflies, the Ithomiini.
643 Proceedings of the Royal Society B 286:20182769.

644 Olofsson, M., M. Dimitrova, and C. Wiklund. 2013. The white ‘comma’ as a distractive
645 mark on the wings of comma butterflies. Animal behaviour 86:1325–1331.

646 Pagel, M. 1994. Detecting correlated evolution on phylogenies: a general method for
647 the comparative analysis of discrete characters. Proceedings of the Royal Society of
648 London. Series B: Biological Sciences 255:37–45.

649 Pagel, M., and A. Meade. 2013. Bayes Traits V2. Computer program and
650 documentation. Available at: <http://www.evolution.rdg.ac.uk/BayesTraits.html>
651 (accessed 12 July 2013).

652 Plowright, R., and R. E. Owen. 1980. The evolutionary significance of bumble bee
653 color patterns: a mimetic interpretation. Evolution 622–637.

654 Purpura, K., E. Kaplan, and R. Shapley. 1988. Background light and the contrast gain
655 of primate P and M retinal ganglion cells. Proceedings of the National Academy of
656 Sciences 85:4534–4537.

657 R Foundation for Statistical Computing, R. C. 2014. R: A language and environment
658 for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria.

659 Robertson, K. A., and A. Monteiro. 2005. Female *Bicyclus anynana* butterflies choose
660 males on the basis of their dorsal UV-reflective eyespot pupils. Proceedings of the
661 Royal Society of London Series B-Biological Sciences 272:1541–1546.

662 Ruxton, G. D., Allen, William L., T. N. Sherratt, and M. P. Speed. 2018. Avoiding attack:
663 the evolutionary ecology of crypsis, warning signals and mimicry (Second.). Oxford
664 University Press.

665 Schaefer, H. M., and N. Stobbe. 2006. Disruptive coloration provides camouflage
666 independent of background matching. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B:*
667 *Biological Sciences* 273:2427–2432.

668 Schindelin, J., I. Arganda-Carreras, E. Frise, V. Kaynig, M. Longair, T. Pietzsch, S.
669 Preibisch, et al. 2012. Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-image analysis.
670 *Nature methods* 9:676.

671 Schneider, C. A., W. S. Rasband, and K. W. Eliceiri. 2012. NIH Image to ImageJ: 25
672 years of image analysis. *Nature Methods* 9:671–675.

673 Skelhorn, J., H. M. Rowland, M. P. Speed, and G. D. Ruxton. 2010. Masquerade:
674 camouflage without crypsis. *Science* 327:51–51.

675 Skowron Volponi, M. A., D. J. McLean, P. Volponi, and R. Dudley. 2018. Moving like a
676 model: mimicry of hymenopteran flight trajectories by clearwing moths of Southeast
677 Asian rainforests. *Biology letters* 14:20180152.

678 Somanathan, H., A. Kelber, R. M. Borges, R. Wallén, and E. J. Warrant. 2009. Visual
679 ecology of Indian carpenter bees II: adaptations of eyes and ocelli to nocturnal and
680 diurnal lifestyles. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A* 195:571–583.

681 Stevens, M., A. Cantor, J. Graham, and W. I.S. 2009. The function of animal “eyespot”:
682 conspicuousness but not eye mimicry is key. *Current Zoology* 55:319–326.

683 Stevens, M., and I. C. Cuthill. 2006. Disruptive coloration, crypsis and edge detection
684 in early visual processing. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*
685 273:2141.

686 Stevens, M., C. L. Stubbins, and C. J. Hardman. 2008. The anti-predator function of
687 “eyespot” on camouflaged and conspicuous prey. *Behavioral Ecology and*
688 *Sociobiology* 62:1787–1793.

689 Therneau, T., and T. Lumley. 2009. *Survival: Survival analysis, including penalised*
690 *likelihood*. R package version 2.35-7. R foundation for Statistical Computing 2011.

691 Troschianko, J., J. Skelhorn, and M. Stevens. 2018. Camouflage strategies interfere
692 differently with observer search images. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*
693 *Biological Sciences* 285:20181386.

694 van Halder, I., L. Barbaro, and H. Jactel. 2011. Conserving butterflies in fragmented
695 plantation forests: are edge and interior habitats equally important? *Journal of*
696 *Insect Conservation* 15:591–601.

697 Wootton, R. J. 1992. Functional morphology of insect wings. *Annual review of*
698 *entomology* 37:113–140.

699 Yamaura, Y., J. A. Royle, N. Shimada, S. Asanuma, T. Sato, H. Taki, and S. Makino. 2012.
700 Biodiversity of man-made open habitats in an underused country: a class of
701 multispecies abundance models for count data. *Biodiversity and Conservation*
702 21:1365–1380.

703

704

Figures and tables





Figure 2. Survival of artificial prey in (a.) closed and (b.) open areas, without any transparent area (C), and with transparent elements covered by 6 (T6), 1 (T1) or non (T0) transparent film layers. Prey placed on tree trunks were monitored for 'survival' every day for 4 days.




Figure 3: Variation between diurnal/open (yellow), diurnal/closed (green), nocturnal/open (blue) and nocturnal/closed (purple) in a) mean light transmittance, b) wing length, c) proportion of clearwing surface; and the relationship between transmittance, wing (forewing: square/dashed and hindwing: circle/plain) and d) proportion of clearwing surface or e) wing length. Plotted lines in d. and e. correspond to linear regressions per wing and ActHab level. Values larger than 60 mm were not plotted for clarity reasons but were included in the analyses.




Figure 4: Variation between bee/wasp mimics (red), leaf mimics (purple) and no mimics (blue) in a) mean light transmittance, b) wing length, c) proportion of clearwing surface, d) Ratio between length of forewing and hindwing per mimicry group and e) in the relationship between wing size and mean light transmittance. Plotted lines in e. correspond to linear regressions per wing and mimicry level.

Table 1. Variation of mean proportion of transmitted light according to mimicry, habitat, daytime activity, wing size, wing and proportion of clearwing surface excluding (in the left) or including interactions between them (in the right). For Bayesian estimations see Tables S2 a, b, c and d.

	Estimate ± se	DF	t		Estimate ± se	DF	t		
Single factors	(Intercept)	48.36±3.03	502	15.97	***	42.77±4.47	484	9.56	***
	% clearwing	0.27±0.02	502	10.91	***	0.27±0.08	484	3.57	***
	Mimicry:bee/wasp>leaf+non-mimics	16.39±5.55	101	2.95	**	31.14±6.7	101	4.65	***
	Mimicry:leaf<non-mimics	9.8±6.15	101	1.59		8.09±7.96	101	1.02	
	Wing length	-0.43±0.07	502	-6.6	***	-0.07±0.14	484	-0.5	
	ActHab (DayOpen>DayClosed)	3.18±3.78	101	0.84		16.18±7.89	101	2.05	*
	ActHab (Day>Night)	1.68±1.99	101	0.84		6.63±4.13	101	1.61	
	ActHab (Open>Closed)	-4.62±2.77	101	-1.67	~	-17.26±5.24	101	-3.29	**
	Wing (Forewing>Hindwing)	3.67±0.39	502	9.45	***	1.23±0.66	484	1.87	~
Interactions	Mimicry (bw>l+n.m): % clearwing	-	-	-		0±0.07	484	-0.06	
	Mimicry (leaf<n.m): % clearwing	-	-	-		-0.37±0.1	484	-3.72	***
	Mimicry (bw>l+n.m):W.length	-	-	-		-0.87±0.15	484	-5.85	***
	Mimicry (leaf<n.m):W.length	-	-	-		0.33±0.19	484	1.76	~
	ActHab (DO>DC): % clearwing	-	-	-		-0.36±0.14	484	-2.55	**
	ActHab (D>N): % clearwing	-	-	-		0.08±0.07	484	1.11	
	ActHab (O>C): % clearwing	-	-	-		0.31±0.09	484	3.51	***
	ActHab (DO>DC):Wing length	-	-	-		-0.89±0.26	484	-3.46	***
	ActHab (D>N):Wing length	-	-	-		-0.32±0.14	484	-2.33	*
	ActHab (O>C):Wing length	-	-	-		0.54±0.2	484	2.68	**
	% clearwing surf.:Wing length	-	-	-		0±0	484	-0.5	
	Wing length:Wing (F>H)	-	-	-		0.05±0.02	484	1.91	~
	ActHab (DO>DC):Wing (F>H)	-	-	-		0.55±0.93	484	0.58	
	ActHab (D>N):Wing (F>H)	-	-	-		2.31±0.48	484	4.83	***
	ActHab (O>C):Wing (F>H)	-	-	-		0.02±0.76	484	0.02	
	ActHab (DO>DC): % clearw :W. length	-	-	-		0.02±0.01	484	4	***
	ActHab (D>N): % clearw :W. length	-	-	-		0±0	484	-0.48	
ActHab (O>C): % clearw :W. length	-	-	-		-0.01±0	484	-2.99	**	

Linear mixed model with transmittance as dependent variable and the following explanatory variables: the combination between daytime activity and habitat type (ActHab: nocturnal-open/nocturnal-closed/diurnal-open/diurnal-closed), wing length in mm, proportion of clearwing area (% clearwing), mimicry syndrome (bee/wasp -, leaf - or non-mimics), wing (fore-/hindwing) and the interactions: mimicry syndrome and proportion of clearwing area, mimicry syndrome and wing size, proportion of clearwing area and habitat type, wing size and habitat type, wing size and proportion of clearing area, wing and wing length and proportion of clearwing area, wing length and habitat as explanatory variables. Wing measurements nested in species was considered as random effect. LMM p values below 0.05 are statistically significant. *** stands for p<0.001, ** for p<0.01, * for p<0.05 and ~ for p<0.1.

Table 2. Results of coevolution tests between habitat, mimicry and daytime activity

Tested characters	Mimicry levels included	L.Dep.	L.Indep.	LR	df	p	
daytime activity/ mimicry	bee/wasp & leaf mimics	-29.13	-33.88	9.5	4	0.05	*
	No- & leaf mimics	-91.21	-98.19	13.96	4	0.01	***
	No- & bee/wasp mimics	-100.85	-100.86	0.02	4	1	
habitat / mimicry	bee/wasp & leaf mimics	-34.86	-36.78	3.85	4	0.43	
	No- & leaf mimics	-102.27	-102.34	0.13	4	1	
	No- & bee/wasp mimics	-99.73	-101.26	3.05	4	0.55	
habitat/daytime activity	No-, bee/wasp- & leaf mimics	-142.49	-145.1	5.22	4	0.26	
day.open vs night.open /mimicry	bee/wasp & leaf mimics	-17.57	-21.17	7.2	4	0.12	
	No- & leaf mimics	-45.89	-49.05	6.32	4	0.18	
	No- & bee/wasp mimics	-57.48	-57.82	0.68	4	0.95	
night.open vs night.closed /mimicry	bee/wasp & leaf mimics	-19.5	-19.52	0.04	4	1	
	No- & leaf mimics	-50.56	-50.57	0.02	4	1	
	No- & bee/wasp mimics	-36.86	-36.87	0.02	4	1	

Log-likelihood of dependent (L. Dep. Coevolution, 4 parameters estimated) and independent (L. Indep. 8 parameters estimated) evolution models between pairs of binary characters obtained from BayesTraits, log-likelihood ratio (LR), associated degree of freedom (df: difference in number of parameters) and corresponding p-value of the Likelihood Ratio Test. Because BayesTraits only take binary characters, when factors have more than 2 levels (mimicry and the composed character ActHab), we implemented pairwise comparisons of level. Coevolution between mimicry and diurnal species flying either in open or in closed habitats was not tested as no bee/wasp mimic is simultaneously diurnal and closed habitat dweller (Fig S4). A significant p-value means that the dependent model is significantly better than the independent model, indicating a correlated evolution between the traits. ** stands for statistical significance below 0.01 and * for significance values below 0.05.