

**Resource overlap and dilution effects shape host plant use
in a myrmecophilous butterfly**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Animal Ecology</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Valdés, Alicia; Stockholm University, Department of Ecology, Environment and Plant Sciences; Stockholm University, Bolin Centre of Climate Research Ehrlén, Johan; Stockholm University, Department of Ecology, Environment and Plant Sciences; Stockholm University, Bolin Centre of Climate Research
Key-words:	butterflies, flowering phenology, myrmecophily, plant-herbivore interactions, resource use, spatial variation

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1 TITLE: Resource overlap and dilution effects shape host plant use in a myrmecophilous butterfly

2 Running head: Resource use in a consumer butterfly

3 AUTHORS: Valdés, Alicia*,^{a, b} and Ehrlén, Johan^{a, b}

4

5 ^a Department of Ecology, Environment and Plant Sciences, Stockholm University, SE-106 91

6 Stockholm, Sweden

7 ^b Bolin Centre of Climate Research, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden

8 *Corresponding author: aliciavaldes1501@gmail.com

9

10 Authors' Contributions: AV and JE designed the study. AV collected and analysed the data with

11 inputs from JE. AV and JE wrote the manuscript. Both authors gave final approval for

12 publication.

13

14

15 ABSTRACT

- 16 1. The effects of consumers on fitness of resource organisms are a complex function of the
17 spatio-temporal distribution of the resources, consumer functional responses and trait
18 preferences, and availability of other resources.
- 19 2. The ubiquitous variation in the intensity of species interactions has important
20 consequences for the ecological and evolutionary dynamics of natural populations.
21 Nevertheless, little is known about the processes causing this variation and their
22 operational scales. Here, we examine how variation in the intensity of a consumer-
23 resource interaction is related to resource traits, resource density and abundance of other
24 resources.
- 25 3. Using the butterfly consumer *Phengaris alcon* and its two sequential resources, the host
26 plant *Gentiana pneumonanthe* and the host ants *Myrmica* spp., we investigated how
27 butterfly egg-laying depended on focal host plant quality, density and quality of
28 neighboring host plants and host ant abundance.
- 29 4. Butterflies preferred plants that simultaneously maximized the availability of both larval
30 resources, i.e., they chose higher-quality early-flowering plants where host ants were
31 abundant. Both the probability of oviposition and the number of eggs were lower in plant
32 individuals with a high neighbor density than in more isolated plants, and this dilution
33 effect was stronger when neighbors flowered early and thus were of high quality.
- 34 5. Our results show that plant-herbivore interactions simultaneously depend on the spatio-
35 temporal distribution of a focal resource, and on the small-scale spatial variation in the
36 abundance of other herbivore resources. Given that consumers have negative effects on

37 fitness and prefer certain traits of the resource organisms, this implies that processes
38 acting at the levels of individuals, populations and communities simultaneously
39 contribute to variation in consumer-mediated natural selection.

40

41 Keywords: butterflies, flowering phenology, myrmecophily, plant-herbivore interactions,
42 resource use, spatial variation

43

44 INTRODUCTION

45 Resource-consumer interactions often have important effects on the performance of both partners
46 and the distribution and abundance of consumers is expected to match the spatio-temporal
47 distribution of their resources. Resource use by insect herbivores is often conditioned by
48 oviposition site selection by females. As larval stages usually show low mobility, insect
49 oviposition preferences are predicted to match the spatial and temporal distribution of host plants
50 suitable for offspring development (Gripenberg, Mayhew, Parnell, & Roslin, 2010; Jaenike,
51 1978; Scheirs & De Bruyn, 2002). The suitability of host plants, in turn, might depend on factors
52 such as host plant nutritional quality (Chen, Lin, Wang, Yeh, & Hwang, 2004), size (Rabasa,
53 Gutiérrez, & Escudero, 2005), microclimatic conditions (Eilers, Pettersson, & Öckinger, 2013) or
54 enemy-free space (Ballabeni, Włodarczyk, & Rahier, 2001). Most consumers depend on multiple
55 resources throughout their life cycle, e.g. different sources of food, shelter and resting sites
56 (Dennis, Shreeve, & Van Dyck, 2003, 2006). The availability of one resource might thus
57 influence the use of other resources. For example, the availability of nectar resources for adults
58 (Öckinger, 2008) or secondary hosts for larvae (Wynhoff, Bakker, Oteman, Arnaldo, & van
59 Langevelde, 2015) might determine host plant choices in butterflies.

60 The quantitative relationship between the abundance of consumers and the abundance of
61 resource organisms, and thus resource exploitation, will depend both on the birth and death
62 processes and on consumer behavior. Consumer behavior may specifically cause consumer
63 density and resource exploitation to increase (cf. resource concentration hypothesis, e.g.
64 Hambäck & Englund, 2005; Root, 1973; Stephens & Myers, 2012) or decrease (cf. resource
65 dilution, e.g. Otway, Hector, & Lawton, 2005) with increasing patch size and resource

66 abundance. Observed differences in the relationships between resource exploitation and patch
67 size or patch density among different consumers have been suggested to be the result of
68 differences in how emigration and immigration rates depend on patch size and patch density, and
69 on the scale of consumer selection (Andersson, Löfstedt, & Hambäck, 2013; Hambäck &
70 Englund, 2005). For example, a strong negative relationship between consumer density and
71 patch area observed in visual searchers like butterflies might be the result of that immigration is
72 diameter-dependent while emigration is perimeter-dependent. Not only should the abundance of
73 the resource organism be important for consumer responses, but also its quality. For example, in
74 herbivores that depend on a specific developmental stage of their host plant, the density of plants
75 in suitable developmental stages rather than the overall density is expected to influence host use.
76 Although the effects of resource density on plant-insect interactions (Kim & Underwood, 2015;
77 Kula, Castillo, Dudash, & Fenster, 2014; Verschut, Becher, Anderson, & Hambäck, 2016;
78 Yamamura, 2002) are well studied, the role of resource quality and the effects of the availability
79 of other resources have rarely been considered in these studies. Moreover, while the ecological
80 and evolutionary effects of variation in consumer-resource interaction intensities have been
81 documented for many systems (e.g. Chamberlain, Bronstein, & Rudgers, 2014; Kolb, Ehrlén, &
82 Eriksson, 2007; Vanhoenacker, Ågren, & Ehrlén, 2013), the simultaneous effects of factors at
83 different levels: individuals (e.g. traits), populations (e.g. resource density), and communities
84 (e.g. availability of other resources) have rarely been explored. This is particularly true for small
85 spatial scales, such as variation in the intensity of herbivory among individuals within plant
86 populations.

87 Myrmecophilous butterflies of the genus *Phengaris* need two sequential hosts to

88 complete their development: the caterpillars are predispersal seed predators during their first
89 instars and parasitize ant nests (*Myrmica* spp.) during later stages. Butterflies are very specific
90 regarding both host plant and host ant species and the developmental stage of host plants (G. W.
91 Elmes et al., 1998; Thomas & Elmes, 2001; Valdés & Ehrlén, 2017). Female butterflies oviposit
92 preferentially on buds in early phenological stages, probably because these constitute higher-
93 quality food; the developing seeds might become tougher, drier and more difficult to digest as
94 buds develop into flowers and fruits (Arnaldo, Gonzalez, Oliveira, Langevelde, & Wynhoff,
95 2014). In some species, the presence of the preferred bud developmental stages has been shown
96 to overlap more with the period of butterfly oviposition in early- than in late-flowering plants,
97 and individuals flowering early in the season receive more eggs (Valdés & Ehrlén, 2018).
98 Moreover, the mobility of caterpillars after leaving their host plants is low (Hayes, 2015), and
99 further development is possible only if the foraging range of suitable host ants is sufficiently
100 close to the host plant individual (usually a few meters). Butterflies are therefore expected to
101 oviposit on host plants in suitable development stages only if plants occur at micro-sites where
102 ant hosts are present (Wynhoff, Grutters, & Langevelde, 2008; Wynhoff & van Langevelde,
103 2017).

104 In this study, we investigated how the quality, in terms of the developmental stage of the
105 reproductive structures, of one resource, the focal host plant *Gentiana pneumonanthe*, the density
106 and quality of neighboring conspecific plants, and the abundance of host ants influence resource
107 use, in terms of egg-laying, by the consumer butterfly *Phengaris alcon*. We used an extensive
108 field data set to test two hypotheses: (1) Effects of plant quality and ant abundance on egg
109 distribution patterns are interdependent: butterflies choose plants for oviposition that

110 simultaneously maximize the availability of both resources, i.e. they have a stronger preference
111 for high-quality early-flowering host plants where host ants are abundant, and (2) The probability
112 of a plant receiving at least one egg, as well as the number of eggs in oviposited plants, decreases
113 with increasing conspecific neighbor density (i. e. a dilution effect), and this decrease is stronger
114 when neighbors are of high quality.

115 MATERIALS AND METHODS

116 Study system

117 The marsh gentian (*Gentiana pneumonanthe* L.) is a rare, long-lived perennial herb, occurring in
118 open habitats, such as wet heathlands and grasslands (Simmonds, 1946). Plants can have one to
119 many, up to 45 cm high, shoots and produce deep blue flowers that are pollinated by
120 bumblebees. The species is self-compatible and flowers in July and August in the study area (SW
121 Sweden). Fruits are capsules containing a high number of minute, wind-dispersed seeds (mean
122 seed number per fruit \pm SD = 490 ± 243 , mean seed weight = 0.041 mg, authors' unpublished
123 data). *Gentiana pneumonanthe* is the host plant of the Alcon Blue butterfly (*Phengaris alcon*), a
124 specialist predispersal seed predator which oviposits on young flower buds in July and August
125 (Appelqvist & Bengtsson, 2007). During an oviposition event, adult female butterflies usually
126 lay more than one egg on the same plant and even on the same bud, and there is no evidence of
127 avoiding plants that already carry eggs (Van Dyck & Regniers, 2010). The caterpillars feed
128 inside the capsule until they reach the fourth instar, when they drop to the ground to be picked up
129 by *Myrmica* ants. Caterpillars mimic the surface chemistry of the ant brood (Nash, Als, Maile,
130 Jones, & Boomsma, 2008) and the acoustic signals of queen ants (Sala, Casacci, Balletto,
131 Bonelli, & Barbero, 2014), and these features cause ants to carry them to their nest, where they

132 spend the rest of their larval period as brood parasites. Females of *Phengaris* detect host ant
133 presence through plant chemicals produced by ants or by plants in response to root tissue damage
134 caused by ants (Patricelli et al., 2015; van Dyck et al., 2000; Wynhoff & van Langevelde, 2017).
135 Contrary to the majority of *Phengaris* species, which prey on ant brood, *P. alcon* is a “cuckoo”
136 species (Als et al., 2004), and caterpillars feed primarily on regurgitants from ant workers,
137 trophic eggs (i.e. nutritious, infertile eggs which are fed to the queens and ant larvae) and prey
138 items brought to the nest by ants. Only ants belonging to *Myrmica* sp. can act as hosts of *P.*
139 *alcon*. In Sweden, *M. rubra* is considered to be the most common host ant species (Graham W.
140 Elmes et al., 1994).

141 **Data collection**

142 The study was carried out in a population of *G. pneumonanthe*, where the butterfly *P.*
143 *alcon* was present, located in Tånga Hed nature reserve in the county of Västra Götaland, SW
144 Sweden (58°01'40.0"N 12°49'47.0"E). Field work was conducted between 9 July and 3
145 September 2016. The plant population occupies a fenced meadow that is grazed by cattle at the
146 end of the summer every year. A study plot measuring 69 m × 45 m was established in the
147 meadow. This plot was further divided into a grid comprising 345 3 m × 3 m subplots with
148 corners permanently marked by wooden poles (Fig. 1A). In 154 of the subplots where *G.*
149 *pneumonanthe* was present, all reproductive shoots of *G. pneumonanthe* were mapped (Fig. 1B),
150 and their phenology and the number of eggs of *P. alcon* were recorded between 29 July and 5
151 August (18 additional occupied subplots were not possible to fully survey due to time
152 constraints). Shoots were mapped by recording their coordinates within subplots. We mapped
153 shoots rather than plant individuals (that may have one or several shoots) because we judged that

154 individual shoots are the relevant unit for the butterfly to assess the food resource quality and
155 because individual shoots act as the unit of attraction for butterfly females. For each shoot,
156 phenology was recorded as the developmental stage of the most advanced bud, according to six
157 ordinal categories: (1) the sepals covering the bud completely, (2) bud becoming visible, (3) bud
158 growing over the sepals, (4) bud turning blue, (5) flower opening, and (6) flower showing signs
159 of wilting (Valdés & Ehrlén, 2017). Each stage corresponds to a time interval of flower
160 development, with higher values indicating a more advanced floral development at the day of
161 recording, i.e. an earlier flowering phenology. The number of eggs was counted on the whole
162 shoot.

163 The ant community was sampled at each corner of the occupied subplots (a total of 254
164 points) at two occasions, 14 July and 3 September (Fig. 1B). Baits consisted of a 50-ml plastic
165 tube in which we placed a sugar cube. The tubes were left open on the ground in the evening, and
166 collected the next morning. Ants collected were transferred to 70° ethanol and the number of ants
167 of different *Myrmica* species were counted in the lab (using Douwes, Abenius, Cederberg, &
168 Wahlstedt, 2012 for identification). Ants belonging to other genera where not identified to
169 species, but counted as “other ants”.

170 **Interpolations of ant abundances**

171 We also incorporated the locations of the 254 points where the ant community was sampled into
172 the GIS. We used inverse distance weighted interpolation (Pebesma, 2004) based on the values at
173 the sampling points to generate values of the abundance of ant species over the surface of all
174 occupied subplots. A maximum distance of 3 m was used because it represents the ground
175 foraging distance of most investigated *Myrmica* species (G. W. Elmes et al., 1998). From these

176 interpolated surfaces (see Figs. S1-S5), we extracted values of abundance of the different ant
177 species for each of the mapped shoots.

178 **Calculation of neighborhood measures**

179 Field maps were digitized using a Geographic Information System (GIS) created with
180 ArcGIS 10.3.1, assigning relative coordinates to each recorded reproductive shoot of *G.*
181 *pneumonanthe* (Fig. 1B). For each shoot, we defined a buffer zone with a 3-m radius, centered at
182 the focal shoot (see example in Fig. 1B), and calculated the number of reproductive shoots of *G.*
183 *pneumonanthe* per m² within this buffer zone (hereafter, “neighbor density”) as well as the mean
184 phenology of these shoots (hereafter, “neighbor phenology”), excluding in each case the focal
185 shoot.

186 **Statistical analyses**

187 The effects of shoot phenology, host ant abundance, neighbor density and neighbor phenology on
188 *P. alcon* egg distribution were examined using two Generalized Linear Models (GLMs). Effects
189 on the probability of a shoot having at least one egg were evaluated using a binomial GLM, and
190 effects on the number of eggs in shoots with at least one egg were evaluated using a negative
191 binomial GLM. Both models included also the effects of three interactions. First, we included the
192 interaction between shoot phenology and ant abundance in order to test if the effects of the two
193 resources on egg distribution patterns are interdependent. Second, we included the interaction
194 between neighbor density and neighbor phenology in order to test if the effect of host plant
195 density depends on phenology of neighboring host plants. Third, we included the interaction
196 between shoot phenology and neighbor phenology to account for the fact that the relationship
197 between egg distribution and phenology of the focal plant might depend on the phenology of

198 neighboring host plants. As a measure of host ant abundance, we used the summed abundances
199 of *M. rubra* and *M. schencki* (hereafter, “ant abundance”). *M. rubra* is considered to be the most
200 common host ant species of *P. alcon* in Sweden (Graham W. Elmes et al., 1994), and *M. schencki*
201 has been cited as host in several places in Europe (Vilbas, Esperk, & Teder, 2016). Our data
202 agreed with this previous knowledge, as the combined abundance of *M. rubra* and *M. schencki*
203 had the strongest positive effect on the probability of host plants receiving eggs (Table S1).

204 All predictors were standardized by subtracting the mean and dividing by the standard
205 deviation before the analyses. We checked for spatial autocorrelation in the residuals of models
206 by plotting spatial correlograms and by calculating global Moran's I with a permutation test
207 (1000 random permutations). Moran's I was calculated based on a connectivity matrix of
208 pairwise Euclidean distances among the shoots up to a distance of 30 m. Residual spatial
209 autocorrelation could lead to biased model estimates and invalid statistical inference (Dormann
210 et al., 2007). A significant spatial autocorrelation was found in the residuals of the binomial
211 GLM, but not for the negative binomial GLM (global Moran's I = 0.0150, $p < 0.001$ and global
212 Moran's I = 0.0023, $p = 0.613$, respectively, Figs. S6-S7). We therefore applied Moran's
213 eigenvector mapping (MEM), which translates the spatial arrangement of data points into
214 explanatory variables (eigenvectors) that capture spatial effects, to the binomial model
215 examining effects on the probability of a shoot having at least one egg (Dray, Legendre, & Peres-
216 Neto, 2006; Thayn & Simanis, 2013). The model was refitted including two eigenvectors issued
217 from MEM as spatial predictors, and this strongly reduced the residual spatial autocorrelation
218 (global Moran's I = 0.0003, $p = 0.03297$, Fig. S6). Although residual spatial autocorrelation was
219 still significant, the low value of Moran's I and visual inspection of the spatial correlogram (Fig.

220 S7) indicated that almost all of the residual spatial autocorrelation was removed by the spatial
221 predictors. The results of this model were similar to the results of the binomial GLM not
222 including the spatial predictors (Table S2). Statistical analyses were carried out in R 3.4.0 (R
223 Core Team 2017).

224 RESULTS

225 Eggs of *P. alcon* were found on 731 (8.3%) of 8848 reproductive shoots of *G.*
226 *pneumonanthe* recorded in 154 subplots. On shoots with at least one egg, the mean number of
227 eggs was 5.03 ± 0.20 SE.

228 The effects of shoot phenology and ant abundance on *P. alcon* oviposition were
229 interdependent. The probability of a shoot of *G. pneumonanthe* having at least one egg increased
230 with an earlier phenology (i.e. with a more advanced floral development at the day of recording,
231 Table 1, Fig. 2A). This increase was stronger in shoots where host ants were more abundant
232 (significant effect of the interaction shoot phenology \times ant abundance, Table 1, Fig. 2A). The
233 number of *P. alcon* eggs on individuals with at least one egg increased with an earlier shoot
234 phenology and with a higher host ant abundance, but there was no significant effect of the
235 interaction between phenology and ant abundance (Table 1, Fig. 2B and C).

236 High densities of host plant shoots resulted in a dilution effect, and the strength of this
237 effect depended on the quality of neighboring plants. Both the probability of having at least one
238 egg and the number of eggs on shoots with at least one egg decreased with the overall density of
239 neighboring host plant shoots (Table 1, Fig. 3). In both cases, the decrease was stronger when
240 neighboring host plants were of higher quality, i.e. had an earlier phenology (significant effect of
241 the interaction neighbor density \times neighbor phenology, Table 1, Fig. 3).

242 DISCUSSION

243 The results of this study show that resource use in the myrmecophilous butterfly *P. alcon*
244 is shaped by both the spatial overlap of the two key larval resources and by a dilution effect.
245 Specifically, we found that butterflies prefer to oviposit on early-flowering plants that have a
246 high abundance of host ants, that plants surrounded by many conspecific neighbors receive fewer
247 eggs, and that the dilution effect is stronger when neighbors are of a high quality.

248 We found that both the probability of *P. alcon* butterflies laying at least one egg on a host
249 plant as well as the number of eggs increased with an earlier phenology of its host plant *G.*
250 *pneumonanthe*. This agrees with previous studies showing that insects usually prefer plants with
251 a particular phenology (Elzinga et al., 2007), and more specifically, that antagonists
252 preferentially attack early-flowering plants (König, Wiklund, & Ehrlén, 2015; Parachnowitsch &
253 Caruso, 2008; Valdés & Ehrlén, 2017, 2018). Interestingly, in our study the strength of this
254 preference for an early plant phenology did depend on the abundance of the antagonist's second
255 resource, i.e. the two host ant species *Myrmica rubra* and *M. schencki*. The preference of *P.*
256 *alcon* for early-flowering host plants was stronger at locations where the host ants were more
257 abundant. For example, the probability of a shoot with the earliest possible phenology receiving
258 at least one egg was 0.07 at sites where host ants were absent, and 0.40 at sites with the
259 maximum ant abundance observed ($n = 34$ ants). This indicates that the butterflies are able to
260 simultaneously track the distribution of the two resources, and to preferentially oviposit on plants
261 where both the availability of high-quality food for the caterpillars and the probability of
262 adoption by the right species of *Myrmica* are higher. When suitable host ants were absent or very
263 scarce, host plant phenology did not seem to affect egg-laying, and the probability that early-

264 flowering plants should receive eggs was very low. Spatial overlap between the distribution of
265 host plants and host ant nests at larger scales has previously been shown to increase the density
266 and population persistence of the congeneric species *P. arion* (Casacci et al., 2011; Thomas,
267 Simcox, & Clarke, 2009). Other studies with *Phengaris* butterflies have demonstrated effects of
268 host plant phenology (Thomas & Elmes, 2001; Valdés & Ehrlén, 2017, 2018), host ant presence
269 (van Dyck et al., 2000; Wynhoff et al., 2008; Wynhoff & van Langevelde, 2017) or both of these
270 factors (Casacci et al., 2011) for oviposition site selection. Our study shows that the spatial
271 overlap between these two resources also at the scale of the host plant individual is associated
272 with butterfly oviposition preference, and that the effects of plant phenology and ant abundance
273 are interactive. An important general implication of these findings is that differences in
274 availability of a resource over very small spatial scales can influence the use of other resource by
275 consumers that depend on multiple resources. The results also provide evidence of that the
276 effects of factors at the levels of the individual (plant phenology) and the community
277 (availability of the ant resource) on small-scale spatial variation in consumer-resource
278 interactions are interactive.

279 Our results show both that there is a dilution effect of local host plant density on butterfly
280 resource use, and that the strength of this effect depends on the quality of neighboring plants.
281 Higher densities of neighboring host plants were associated with both a decreasing probability of
282 a focal plant receiving at least one egg and a lower number of eggs in plants with eggs, i.e. a
283 lower consumer pressure. The results of previous studies with this species (Van Dyck &
284 Regniers, 2010) suggest that females usually lay more than one egg on the same plant, and that
285 they do not avoid oviposition on plants that already carry eggs. If this is true also in our study,

286 then the eggs observed on an individual plant correspond to the offspring of either a single or
287 several females (but this is something we cannot determine because oviposition was not directly
288 observed in this study). Because we cannot be sure whether the lower number of eggs was the
289 result of fewer females visiting the plant, or of each visiting female laying fewer eggs, it is more
290 appropriate here to talk about “consumer pressure” than about “consumer abundance”. In any
291 case, the observed negative relationship between consumer pressure and overall resource
292 abundance was stronger when the neighbors represented high-quality resources during the period
293 of butterfly flight, i.e. when surrounding plants flowered early in the season. In other words, at a
294 given conspecific density more eggs were found in *G. pneumonanthe* plants surrounded by non-
295 attractive, low-quality neighbors (i.e. late-flowering plants). In our study, plant phenology thus
296 influences butterfly oviposition not only because the phenology of a focal plant interacts with
297 host ant availability to determine plant suitability for oviposition, but also because the phenology
298 of neighbors modulates the strength of host plant density effects on oviposition. Therefore, not
299 only factors at the levels of individuals and communities, but also at the level of the plant
300 population, drive variation in resource use.

301 Our results suggest that oviposition decisions in myrmecophilous butterflies are taken at
302 two levels. When flying over an area populated with host plants, females might primarily use
303 visual cues (Van Dyck & Regniers, 2010) to evaluate host plant availability (i.e. density) and
304 identify high-quality (i.e. early-flowering) host plants. When butterflies approach host plants, or
305 after alighting on a plant, females may use both visual cues to evaluate plant quality and
306 chemical cues to detect ant presence (Patricelli et al., 2015; Wynhoff et al., 2015; Wynhoff & van
307 Langevelde, 2017), thereby evaluating the spatial overlap of the two resources needed by their

308 offspring. If females use plant developmental stage as a cue indicating plant quality, host plants
309 surrounded by low-quality neighbors would be more attractive to butterflies than host plants
310 surrounded by high-quality neighbors. Negative density-dependence in antagonists has been
311 documented also in other systems, where egg clumping on plants with few conspecific neighbors
312 was explained by a disproportionate attraction of insect herbivores to more isolated host plants
313 (Hasenbank & Hartley, 2015; Shea, Smyth, Sheppard, Morton, & Chalimbaud, 2000). For
314 herbivores feeding on several plant species, associational effects linked to the surrounding plant
315 community have been documented more frequently (e.g. Bergvall, Rautio, Kesti, Tuomi, &
316 Leimar, 2006; Hjältén, Danell, Lundberg, & Hjalten, 1993). Our study shows that associational
317 effects are present also for a specialized herbivore using a single host species, and that the
318 strength of these density-dependent effects depends on the quality of conspecific neighboring
319 host plants.

320 Our results are important to understand the factors causing variation in the intensity of
321 interactions between consumers and their resources. Given that consumers often have important
322 effects on fitness in the consumed organisms and that they show preferences for traits of the
323 resource organisms, identifying the factors that influence the intensity of interactions is also
324 important to understand the mechanisms underlying variation in natural selection. In our study
325 system, the butterfly seed predator has strong negative effects on plant fitness and shows a
326 preference for plants with an early flowering phenology, leading to butterfly-mediated selection
327 for later flowering (Valdés & Ehrlén, 2017). The results of the current study show that the
328 strength of butterfly preferences for early-flowering plants is influenced by both population
329 context, in terms of population density and the trait distribution with the population, and by

330 community context in terms of the abundance of the ant species that function as the second host
331 of butterfly caterpillars. Taken together, these findings illustrate that observed spatial variation in
332 intensities of interactions and consumer-mediated selection on traits of the resource organisms
333 can be the result of processes acting at the levels of individuals, populations and communities.

334 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

335 We thank Annelie Jörgensen for helping with fieldwork, Daniela Guasconi for lab assistance and
336 Peter Hambäck and Christer Wiklund for comments on a previous version of the manuscript. We
337 acknowledge funding from the Swedish Research Council (VR) to JE and from the “Clarín”
338 postdoctoral program (FICYT, Gobierno del Principado de Asturias, Spain, and Marie Curie-
339 Cofund Actions, EU) to AV.

340 REFERENCES

Als, T. D., Vila, R., Kandul, N. P., Nash, D. R., Yen, S.-H., Hsu, Y.-F., ... Pierce, N. E. (2004).

The evolution of alternative parasitic life histories in large blue butterflies. *Nature*,
432(7015), 386–390. doi:10.1038/nature03020

Andersson, P., Löfstedt, C., & Hambäck, P. A. (2013). How insects sense olfactory patches – the
spatial scaling of olfactory information. *Oikos*, 122(7), 1009–1016. doi:10.1111/j.1600-
0706.2012.00037.x

Appelqvist, T., & Bengtsson, O. (2007). *Åtgärdsprogram för alkonblåvinge och klockgentiana*
2007-2011: *Maculinea alcon och Gentiana pneumonanthe*. Stockholm, Sweden:
Naturvårdsverket.

Arnaldo, P. S., Gonzalez, D., Oliveira, I., Langevelde, F. van, & Wynhoff, I. (2014). Influence of
host plant phenology and oviposition date on the oviposition pattern and offspring
performance of the butterfly *Phengaris alcon*. *Journal of Insect Conservation*, 18(6),
1115–1122. doi:10.1007/s10841-014-9721-x

- Ballabeni, P., Włodarczyk, M., & Rahier, M. (2001). Does enemy-free space for eggs contribute to a leaf beetle's oviposition preference for a nutritionally inferior host plant? *Functional Ecology*, 15(3), 318–324. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2435.2001.00529.x
- Bergvall, U. A., Rautio, P., Kesti, K., Tuomi, J., & Leimar, O. (2006). Associational effects of plant defences in relation to within- and between-patch food choice by a mammalian herbivore: neighbour contrast susceptibility and defence. *Oecologia*, 147(2), 253–260. doi:10.1007/s00442-005-0260-8
- Casacci, L. P., Witek, M., Barbero, F., Patricelli, D., Solazzo, G., Balletto, E., & Bonelli, S. (2011). Habitat preferences of Maculinea arion and its Myrmica host ants: implications for habitat management in Italian Alps. *Journal of Insect Conservation*, 15(1–2), 103–110. doi:10.1007/s10841-010-9327-x
- Chamberlain, S. A., Bronstein, J. L., & Rudgers, J. A. (2014). How context dependent are species interactions? *Ecology Letters*, 17(7), 881–890. doi:10.1111/ele.12279
- Chen, Y.-Z., Lin, L., Wang, C.-W., Yeh, C.-C., & Hwang, S.-Y. (2004). Response of two Pieris (Lepidoptera: Pieridae) species to fertilization of a host plant. *Zoological Studies*, 43(4), 778–786.
- Dennis, R. L. H., Shreeve, T. G., & Van Dyck, H. (2006). Habitats and resources: the need for a resource-based definition to conserve butterflies. *Biodiversity & Conservation*, 15(6), 1943–1966. doi:10.1007/s10531-005-4314-3
- Dennis, R. L. H., Shreeve, T. G., & Van Dyck, H. (2003). Towards a functional resource-based concept for habitat: a butterfly biology viewpoint. *Oikos*, 102(2), 417–426.
- Dormann, C. F., M. McPherson, J., B. Araújo, M., Bivand, R., Bolliger, J., Carl, G., ... Wilson, R. (2007). Methods to account for spatial autocorrelation in the analysis of species distributional data: a review. *Ecography*, 30(5), 609–628. doi:10.1111/j.2007.0906-7590.05171.x

- Douwes, P., Abenius, J., Cederberg, B., & Wahlstedt, U. (2012). *Steklar: Myror-getingar: Hymenoptera: Formicidae-Vespidae*. ArtDatabanken, Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet.
- Dray, S., Legendre, P., & Peres-Neto, P. R. (2006). Spatial modelling: a comprehensive framework for principal coordinate analysis of neighbour matrices (PCNM). *Ecological Modelling*, 196, 483–493.
- Eilers, S., Pettersson, L. B., & Öckinger, E. (2013). Micro-climate determines oviposition site selection and abundance in the butterfly *Pyrgus armoricanus* at its northern range margin. *Ecological Entomology*, 38(2), 183–192. doi:10.1111/een.12008
- Elmes, G. W., Thomas, J. A., Wardlaw, J. C., Hochberg, M. E., Clarke, R. T., & Simcox, D. J. (1998). The ecology of *Myrmica* ants in relation to the conservation of Maculinea butterflies. *Journal of Insect Conservation*, 2(1), 67–78. doi:10.1023/A:1009696823965
- Elmes, Graham W., Hammersted, O., Martin, J., Thomas, J. A., Van Der Made, J. G., & others. (1994). Differences in host-ant specificity between Spanish, Dutch and Swedish populations of the endangered butterfly, *Maculinea alcon* (DENIS at SHIFF>)(Lepidoptera). *Memorabilia Zoologica*, (48), 55–68.
- Elzinga, J. A., Atlan, A., Biere, A., Gigord, L., Weis, A. E., & Bernasconi, G. (2007). Time after time: flowering phenology and biotic interactions. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 22(8), 432–439. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2007.05.006
- Gripenberg, S., Mayhew, P. J., Parnell, M., & Roslin, T. (2010). A meta-analysis of preference–performance relationships in phytophagous insects. *Ecology Letters*, 13(3), 383–393. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01433.x
- Hambäck, P. A., & Englund, G. (2005). Patch area, population density and the scaling of migration rates: the resource concentration hypothesis revisited. *Ecology Letters*, 8(10), 1057–1065. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00811.x
- Hasenbank, M., & Hartley, S. (2015). Weaker resource diffusion effect at coarser spatial scales

- observed for egg distribution of cabbage white butterflies. *Oecologia*, 177(2), 423–430. doi:10.1007/s00442-014-3103-7
- Hayes, M. P. (2015). The biology and ecology of the large blue butterfly *Phengaris* (Maculinea) arion: a review. *Journal of Insect Conservation*, 19(6), 1037–1051. doi:10.1007/s10841-015-9820-3
- Hjältén, J., Danell, K., Lundberg, P., & Hjalten, J. (1993). Herbivore avoidance by association: vole and hare utilization of woody plants. *Oikos*, 68(1), 125. doi:10.2307/3545317
- Jaenike, J. (1978). On optimal oviposition behavior in phytophagous insects. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 14(3), 350–356. doi:10.1016/0040-5809(78)90012-6
- Kim, T. N., & Underwood, N. (2015). Plant neighborhood effects on herbivory: damage is both density and frequency dependent. *Ecology*, 96(5), 1431–1437. doi:10.1890/14-1097.1
- Kolb, A., Ehrlén, J., & Eriksson, O. (2007). Ecological and evolutionary consequences of spatial and temporal variation in pre-dispersal seed predation. *Perspectives in Plant Ecology, Evolution and Systematics*, 9(2), 79–100.
- König, M. A. E., Wiklund, C., & Ehrlén, J. (2015). Timing of flowering and intensity of attack by a butterfly herbivore in a polyploid herb. *Ecology and Evolution*, 5(9), 1863–1872. doi:10.1002/ece3.1470
- Kula, A. A. R., Castillo, D. M., Dudash, M. R., & Fenster, C. B. (2014). Interactions between a pollinating seed predator and its host plant: the role of environmental context within a population. *Ecology and Evolution*, 4(14), 2901–2912. doi:10.1002/ece3.1134
- Nash, D. R., Als, T. D., Maile, R., Jones, G. R., & Boomsma, J. J. (2008). A mosaic of chemical coevolution in a Large Blue butterfly. *Science*, 319(5859), 88–90. doi:10.1126/science.1149180
- Öckinger, E. (2008). Distribution of burnet moths (*Zygaena* spp.) in relation to larval and adult resources on two spatial scales. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, 1(1), 48–54.

doi:10.1111/j.1752-4598.2007.00007.x

Otway, S. J., Hector, A., & Lawton, J. H. (2005). Resource dilution effects on specialist insect herbivores in a grassland biodiversity experiment. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 74(2), 234–240. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2005.00913.x

Parachnowitsch, A. L., & Caruso, C. M. (2008). Predispersal seed herbivores, not pollinators, exert selection on floral traits via female fitness. *Ecology*, 89(7), 1802–1810.
doi:10.1890/07-0555.1

Patricelli, D., Barbero, F., Occhipinti, A., Berte, C. M., Bonelli, S., Casacci, L. P., ... Balletto, E. (2015). Plant defences against ants provide a pathway to social parasitism in butterflies. *Proc. R. Soc. B*, 282(1811), 20151111. doi:10.1098/rspb.2015.1111

Pebesma, E. J. (2004). Multivariable geostatistics in S: the gstat package. *Computers & Geosciences*, 30(7), 683–691.

Rabasa, S. G., Gutiérrez, D., & Escudero, A. (2005). Egg laying by a butterfly on a fragmented host plant: a multi-level approach. *Ecography*, 28(5), 629–639. doi:10.1111/j.2005.0906-7590.04229.x

Root, R. B. (1973). Organization of a plant-arthropod association in simple and diverse habitats: the fauna of Collards (*Brassica oleracea*). *Ecological Monographs*, 43(1), 95–124.
doi:10.2307/1942161

Sala, M., Casacci, L. P., Balletto, E., Bonelli, S., & Barbero, F. (2014). Variation in butterfly larval acoustics as a strategy to infiltrate and exploit host ant colony resources. *PLoS ONE*, 9(4), e94341. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0094341

Scheirs, J., & De Bruyn, L. (2002). Integrating optimal foraging and optimal oviposition theory in plant-insect research. *Oikos*, 96(1), 187–191. doi:10.1034/j.1600-0706.2002.960121.x

Shea, K., Smyth, M., Sheppard, A., Morton, R., & Chalimbaud, J. (2000). Effect of patch size and plant density of Paterson's curse (*Echium plantagineum*) on the oviposition of a

- specialist weevil, *Mogulones larvatus*. *Oecologia*, 124, 615–621.
- Simmonds, N. W. (1946). *Gentiana pneumonanthe* L. *Journal of Ecology*, 33(2), 295–307.
- Stephens, A. E. A., & Myers, J. H. (2012). Resource concentration by insects and implications for plant populations. *Journal of Ecology*, 100(4), 923–931. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2745.2012.01971.x
- Thayn, J. B., & Simanis, J. M. (2013). Accounting for spatial autocorrelation in linear regression models using spatial filtering with eigenvectors. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 103(1), 47–66. doi:10.1080/00045608.2012.685048
- Thomas, J. A., & Elmes, G. W. (2001). Food–plant niche selection rather than the presence of ant nests explains oviposition patterns in the myrmecophilous butterfly genus *Maculinea*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 268(1466), 471–477. doi:10.1098/rspb.2000.1398
- Thomas, J. A., Simcox, D. J., & Clarke, R. T. (2009). Successful conservation of a threatened *Maculinea* butterfly. *Science*, 325(5936), 80–83. doi:10.1126/science.1175726
- Valdés, A., & Ehrlén, J. (2017). Caterpillar seed predators mediate shifts in selection on flowering phenology in their host plant. *Ecology*, 98(1), 228–238. doi:10.1002/ecy.1633
- Valdés, A., & Ehrlén, J. (2018). Direct and plant trait-mediated effects of the local environmental context on butterfly oviposition patterns. *Oikos*, 127(6), 825–833. doi:10.1111/oik.04909
- van Dyck, H., Oostermeijer, J. G. B., Talloen, W., Feenstra, V., Hidde, A. van der, & Wynhoff, I. (2000). Does the presence of ant nests matter for oviposition to a specialized myrmecophilous *Maculinea* butterfly? *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 267(1446), 861–866. doi:10.1098/rspb.2000.1082
- Van Dyck, H., & Regniers, S. (2010). Egg spreading in the ant-parasitic butterfly, *Maculinea alcon*: from individual behaviour to egg distribution pattern. *Animal Behaviour*, 80(4), 621–627. doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2010.06.021

Vanhoenacker, D., Ågren, J., & Ehrlén, J. (2013). Non-linear relationship between intensity of plant–animal interactions and selection strength. *Ecology Letters*, 16(2), 198–205.
doi:10.1111/ele.12029

Verschut, T. A., Becher, P. G., Anderson, P., & Hambäck, P. A. (2016). Disentangling associational effects: both resource density and resource frequency affect search behaviour in complex environments. *Functional Ecology*, 30(11), 1826–1833.
doi:10.1111/1365-2435.12670

Vilbas, M., Esperk, T., & Teder, T. (2016). Host ant use of the Alcon blue butterfly at the northern range margin. *Journal of Insect Conservation*, 20(5), 879–886.
doi:10.1007/s10841-016-9921-7

Wynhoff, I., Bakker, R. B., Oteman, B., Arnaldo, P. S., & van Langevelde, F. (2015). Phengaris (Maculinea) alcon butterflies deposit their eggs on tall plants with many large buds in the vicinity of Myrmica ants. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, 8(2), 177–188.
doi:10.1111/icad.12100

Wynhoff, I., Grutters, M., & Langevelde, F. van. (2008). Looking for the ants: selection of oviposition sites by two myrmecophilous butterfly species. *Animal Biology*, 58(4), 371–388. doi:10.1163/157075608X383683

Wynhoff, I., & van Langevelde, F. (2017). Phengaris (Maculinea) teleius butterflies select host plants close to Myrmica ants for oviposition, but *P. nausithous* do not. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*, 165(1), 9–18. doi:10.1111/eea.12624

Yamamura, K. (2002). Biodiversity and stability of herbivore populations: influences of the spatial sparseness of food plants. *Population Ecology*, 44(1), 33–40.
doi:10.1007/s101440200004

Table 1: Results of the GLMs of the effects on the probability of a flowering shoot of *Gentiana pneumonanthe*

341 *pneumonanthe* receiving at least one egg from the butterfly *Phengaris alcon* (binomial GLM)
 342 and the number of eggs in shoots with at least one egg (negative binomial GLM), of shoot
 343 phenology, ant abundance, neighbor density and neighbor phenology, as well as three two-way
 344 interactions of these predictors. In the binomial GLM, two eigenvectors issued from Moran's
 345 eigenvector mapping (MEM) are also included as predictors, in order to reduce residual spatial
 346 autocorrelation (see details in the text).

	Probability of having at least one egg (n = 8848, R ² = 0.45)		Number of eggs (n = 731, R ² = 0.22)	
	Estimate	SE	Estimate	SE
Shoot phenology	1.462 ***	0.079	0.257 ***	0.036
Ant abundance	-0.017	0.052	0.089 **	0.031
Neighbor density	-1.691 ***	0.102	-0.368 ***	0.067
Neighbor phenology	-1.150 ***	0.124	-0.121 **	0.041
Shoot phenology × Ant abundance	0.132 *	0.062	0.004	0.031
Shoot phenology × Neighbor phenology	0.068	0.074	0.014	0.035
Neighbor density × Neighbor phenology	-0.500 ***	0.087	-0.100 *	0.042
MEM Vector 1	0.289 ***	0.030		
MEM Vector 2	0.324 ***	0.052		

***P < 0.001; **P < 0.01; *P < 0.05

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1: Sampling design. A) Study plot ($69 \times 45 \text{ m}^2$), comprising 345 3 m^2 subplots. B) Detail of several occupied subplots with reproductive shoots of *Gentiana pneumonanthe* and sampling points for ants. Shoots are represented by points, and colored according to shoot phenology. Numbers indicate the number of *Phengaris alcon* eggs found on the shoot. An example of a 3-m buffer used for neighbor measures on a focal shoot (represented by a star) is shown.

Figure 2: Effects of shoot phenology and host ant abundance on the distribution of *Phengaris alcon* eggs on its host plant *Gentiana pneumonanthe*. A) Effects on the probability of a shoot having at least one egg, the relationship between the probability of having at least one egg and shoot phenology shown for different ant abundances. B) Effects of shoot phenology on the number of eggs in shoots with at least one egg. Higher values of shoot phenology indicate earlier flowering. C) Effects of ant abundance on the number of eggs in shoots with at least one egg. In A), binomial GLM fit lines are represented with a color gradient for a continuous increment in ant abundance within the range of observed values. In B) and C), negative binomial GLM fit lines and confidence intervals are shown.

Figure 3: Effects of the interaction between neighbor density and neighbor phenology on the probability of a flowering shoot of *Gentiana pneumonanthe* having at least one egg of the butterfly *Phengaris alcon* (A) and the number of eggs in shoots with at least one egg (B). The relationships with neighbor density are shown for different values of neighbor phenology. Binomial (A) or negative binomial (B) GLM fit lines are represented with a color gradient for a continuous increment in neighbor phenology within the range of observed values. Higher values of neighbor phenology indicate earlier flowering.

Figure 1




Figure 2





Figure 3



347

Supporting Information

Table S1: Coefficients from univariate GLMs relating the probability of having eggs (A, binomial model) and the number of eggs in plants with at least one egg (B, negative binomial model) to the abundance of different ant species.

	A) Probability of having eggs (n = 8848)	B) Number of eggs (n = 731)
All <i>Myrmica</i>	-0.522 ***	-0.006
<i>M. rubra</i>	0.174 ***	0.137 ***
<i>M. scabrinodis</i>	-1.364 ***	-0.120 ***
<i>M. ruginodis</i>	-0.215 ***	-0.016
<i>M. schencki</i>	0.358 ***	0.006
Other ants	-0.403 ***	-0.061
<i>M. rubra + M. schencki</i>	0.360 ***	0.115 ***

***P < 0.001; **P < 0.01; *P < 0.05

Table S2: Results of the binomial GLM ($n = 8848$, $R^2 = 0.42$) relating the probability of a shoot of *G. pneumonanthe* having eggs of *P. alcon* to shoot phenology, ant abundance, neighbor density and neighbor phenology, and to three different two-way interactions of these predictors.

	Estimate	SE
Shoot phenology	1.384 ***	0.077
Ant abundance	0.061	0.051
Neighbor density	-1.943 ***	0.092
Neighbor phenology	-1.014 ***	0.120
Shoot phenology x Ant abundance	0.120 *	0.058
Shoot phenology x Neighbor phenology	-0.022	0.071
Neighbor density x Neighbor phenology	-0.650 *	0.084

***P < 0.001; **P < 0.01; *P < 0.05

Figure S1: Result of the inverse distance weighted interpolation for abundance of *Myrmica rubra* based on abundance values (sum of individuals collected in 2 sampling sessions) at 254 sampling points. The color scale indicates the interpolated abundance values.




Figure S2: Result of the inverse distance weighted interpolation for abundance of *Myrmica scabrinodis* based on abundance values (sum of individuals collected in 2 sampling sessions) at 254 sampling points. The color scale indicates the interpolated abundance values.




Figure S3: Result of the inverse distance weighted interpolation for abundance of *Myrmica ruginodis* based on abundance values (sum of individuals collected in 2 sampling sessions) at 254 sampling points. The color scale indicates the interpolated abundance values.




Figure S4: Result of the inverse distance weighted interpolation for abundance of *Myrmica schencki* based on abundance values (sum of individuals collected in 2 sampling sessions) at 254 sampling points. The color scale indicates the interpolated abundance values.




Figure S5: Result of the inverse distance weighted interpolation for abundance of non-*Myrmica* ants based on abundance values (sum of individuals collected in 2 sampling sessions) at 254 sampling points. The color scale indicates the interpolated abundance values.




Figure S6: Spatial correlogram of the residuals of the binomial GLMs for the probability of a shoot having eggs before (red) and after (blue) including the two eigenvectors issued from MEM.




Figure S7: Spatial correlogram of the residuals of the negative binomial GLM for the number of eggs in shoots with at least one egg.

