**Population-specific patterns of toxin sequestration in monarch butterflies from around the world**

\*Micah G. Freedman1,2, Sue-Ling Choquette2, Santiago R. Ramírez1,2, Sharon Y. Strauss1,2, Mark D. Hunter3, Rachel L. Vannette1,4

1. Center for Population Biology, University of California, Davis
2. Department of Evolution and Ecology, University of California, Davis
3. Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Michigan
4. Department of Entomology and Nematology, University of California, Davis

\*Present address: Department of Ecology & Evolution, University of Chicago

**Abstract**

Monarch butterflies are one of the preeminent examples of a toxin-sequestering animal, gaining protection against predators via cardenolides obtained from their milkweed host plants. Although cardenolide sequestration by monarchs has been studied in ecological, physiological, and phylogenetic contexts, relatively little research has surveyed genetic variation in the ability to sequester, nor has monarch sequestration been studied in relation to divergent host plant assemblages or variation in exposure to predation. Here, we use the monarch’s recent global range expansion to test hypotheses about how cardenolide sequestration evolves over relatively contemporary time scales. First, we test for local adaptation in sequestration by rearing six geographically disparate monarch populations on six associated milkweed host species and measuring levels of sequestered cardenolides in a set of 440 adult butterflies. Second, we use monarchs from Guam—an oceanic island where birds have been functionally extirpated for approximately 40 years—to test hypotheses about how exposure to avian predation affects cardenolide sequestration. We find little overall evidence for local adaptation in sequestration ability. However, one monarch population (Puerto Rico) shows strong support for cross-host tradeoffs in sequestration ability, primarily driven by an inability to sequester polar cardenolides from two temperate North American milkweeds (*Asclepias syriaca* and *A. speciosa*). Monarchs from Guam show some evidence for reduced cardenolide sequestration in both a cross-island comparison of wild-caught butterflies as well as population-level comparisons of greenhouse-reared butterflies. Our results suggest that there is substantial genetic variation in sequestration ability (both within and between monarch populations) and that evolutionary history and contemporary species interactions may influence patterns of cardenolide sequestration.

**Introduction**

Plant-feeding insects comprise the vast majority of described terrestrial biodiversity (Futuyma and Agrawal 2009; Wiens et al. 2015), with most species showing a high degree of host plant specialization and feeding exclusively from single host plant families, genera, or species (Forister et al. 2015). Host plant specialization is often explained in terms of cross-host performance tradeoffs (Rausher 1984; Futuyma and Moreno 1988), though other explanations involving enemy-free space and selection by predators have also been invoked (Gilbert and Singer 1975, Bernays and Graham 1988, Petschenka and Agrawal 2016). One way in which herbivores may gain protection from their predators and other natural enemies is through sequestration, defined as the selective uptake, transport, modification, storage, and deployment of plant secondary compounds (Heckel 2014). Sequestration as a defense against higher trophic levels is common across the tree of life (Brodie 2009) and has been documented in taxa as diverse as snakes (Hutchinson et al. 2007), poison dart frogs (Santos et al. 2003), and African crested rats (Kingdon et al. 2012).

Monarch butterflies (*Danaus plexippus*) are perhaps the single best-studied example of a toxin-sequestering animal. Monarch larvae feed on milkweeds (Apocynaceae: Asclepiadoideae) and incorporate toxic cardiac glycosides (cardenolides) from these hosts that remain in their tissue throughout development (Brower et al. 1967, Reichstein et al. 1968, Roeske et al. 1976). The toxicity of monarchs and other Danaine butterflies has been the subject of intense speculation and research dating back to the late 1800s (Trimen 1887; Poulton 1914; Reichstein et al. 1968), and the physiological and biochemical basis of this behavior has been studied in considerable detail (e.g. Duffey 1980, Seiber et al. 1980, Frick and Wink 1995, Agrawal et al. 2021). Cardenolide sequestration in monarchs is thought to reflect a combination of passive and active processes: nonpolar cardenolides passively diffuse across the membrane of the monarch midgut, while active transport is likely required for the transmembrane movement of polar cardenolides and subsequent deposition in storage tissues (Frick and Wink 1995; Agrawal et al. 2012, Groen et al. 2017). Cardenolides sequestered by monarchs confer protection against bird predators, as demonstrated in the iconic series of experiments by Lincoln Brower and colleagues (Brower et al. 1968; Brower et al. 1972; Brower and Moffitt 1974) and the associated image of a “barfing” blue jay. Sequestered cardenolides also deter invertebrate predators (Rayor et al. 2004) and parasitoids (Stenoien et al. 2019), and dietary cardenolides are likewise associated with resistance to the protozoan parasite *Ophryocystis elektroscirrha* (de Roode et al. 2008; Sternberg et al. 2012; Gowler et al. 2015).

Early studies of sequestration in monarchs focused on characterizing differences in the amount and composition of cardenolides across a variety of milkweed species (Brower et al. 1982, Brower et al. 1984, Malcolm and Brower 1989), partly with the goal of informing studies that used “cardenolide fingerprinting” to identify the natal origins of migratory monarchs (Seiber et al. 1986, Malcolm et al. 1989, Dockx et al. 2004). Results from these studies showed that sequestration is highly variable across milkweed species, with more than 20-fold variation in the amount of cardenolide sequestered (Malcolm and Brower 1989). Likewise, sequestration efficiency seems to be highest on milkweed species with low to intermediate levels of cardenolides, including common milkweed (*Asclepias syriaca*) (Malcolm and Brower 1989). More recently, phylogenetic comparative studies have placed monarchs’ ability to sequester cardenolides into a broader evolutionary context (Aardema et al. 2012; Zhen et al. 2012; Petschenka et al. 2013; Karageorgi et al. 2019). Monarchs are part of a relatively small clade of milkweed butterflies (Nymphalidae: Danaini) that sequester cardenolides, and the stepwise evolution of cardenolide target site insensitivity in monarchs appears to be a byproduct of selection for sequestration ability, rather than dietary specialization (Petschenka and Agrawal 2015).

Despite research into variation in sequestration across monarch tissues (Brower and Glazier 1975, Frick and Wink 1995), across their ontogeny (Jones et al. 2019), and throughout their migratory cycle (Malcolm and Brower 1989), little is known about how natural selection shapes sequestration strategies over contemporary time scales. It is also unclear whether monarchs show genotypic tradeoffs in sequestration ability across host plants with divergent secondary chemistry: does the ability to sequester cardenolides on a focal host plant come at a cost to sequestering from an alternative host? Recent evidence suggests that even though monarchs are highly insensitive to the effects of many cardenolide compounds, other compounds still exhibit potent inhibitory effects (Petschenka et al. 2018, Züst et al. 2019) and may incur substantial physiological costs during processing and storage (Agrawal et al. 2021). Thus, it follows that cardenolide sequestration may involve balancing the costs (e.g. prolonged development, compromised nervous system function) and benefits (protection from natural enemies) of this process.

Two approaches that could improve our understanding of selective forces operating on sequestration in monarchs involve (1) using geographically disparate populations of monarch butterflies with divergent host plant assemblages to test for local adaptation in sequestration ability and (2) using naturally occurring gradients of predation intensity to understand whether predators exert selection on cardenolide sequestration. For the first point, monarch populations around the world show some evidence for local adaptation to their available host plants (Freedman et al. 2020a), as well as subtle variation in the terminal domain sequences of cardenolides’ target enzyme (the sodium-potassium pump, Na+/K+-ATPase) (Pierce et al. 2016). It seems reasonable to expect that sequestration ability might also vary across these monarch populations. For the second point, sequestration could conceivably be disfavored in areas where predation intensity of monarchs is reduced or absent, especially if there is an underlying physiological cost to target site insensitivity (Dalla et al. 2017) or the process of sequestration (Agrawal et al. 2021).

In this study, we report the results of two experiments aimed at understanding variation in sequestration ability across monarch butterflies. In the first experiment, we conduct a fully reciprocal rearing experiment using six monarch populations and six associated host plant species from around the world and measure cardenolide sequestration in a set of 440 butterflies. We test for local adaptation and tradeoffs in sequestration ability across hosts, as well as inherent variation in sequestration among monarch populations and host plants. In the second experiment, we focus on a monarch population from an oceanic island (Guam) that has lost its bird predators. We compare sequestration in wild-caught butterflies from Guam and a nearby island (Rota) that has an intact bird assemblage. We also use the results from the first experiment to compare sequestration ability across host plants in reared monarchs from Guam versus other locations around the world.

**Methods**

*Study system*

Monarch butterflies are best-known from their ancestral range in North America, where they migrate seasonally and feed on more than 40 milkweed host species (Malcolm and Brower 1986, Xerces Society 2018). Over recent evolutionary history, monarchs have greatly expanded their geographic range and are now established in locations throughout Central and South America, the Caribbean, the Pacific, and the Atlantic (Vane-Wright et al. 1993, Pierce et al. 2014; Zhan et al. 2014), with Pacific and Atlantic populations likely becoming established in the last ~180 years (Zalucki and Clarke 2004, Freedman et al. 2020b). Nearly all recently-established monarch populations are non-migratory and breed year-round on restricted assemblages of host plants (Pierce et al. 2016, Freedman et al. 2020a). Monarchs have little coevolutionary history with many of their host plants in their introduced range, and host plant species available to monarch in locations throughout the Pacific and Atlantic—primarily *A. curassavica*, but also *Gomphocarpus spp.* and *Calotropis spp.*—are themselves recent introductions from subtropical Africa, India, and the Neotropics. For a list of monarch populations and their associated host plants used in this study, see Figure 1A.

*Experimental approach*

Over the course of two years, we conducted a fully factorial rearing experiment using six populations of monarchs from around the world and their associated host plants. We used the following six host plant species: *A. curassavica* (ASCU), *A. incarnata* (AINC), *A. fascicularis* (ASFA), *A. speciosa* (ASPEC), *A. syriaca* (ASYR), and *G. physocarpus* (GOPH). Host plants were grown from seed in 1-gallon pots in two greenhouses. Monarchs were collected in the field (typically as gravid adult females) and returned to UC Davis, where females laid eggs on cut stems of *A. curassavica*. Within 12 hours of hatching, we transferred neonate larvae onto a randomly assigned host plant using a paintbrush, typically adding 5 larvae per plant. When possible, we used a balanced design that assigned larvae from a single maternal family to all possible host plants (Table S1). We then used mesh sleeves to restrict larvae to a single live host plant. For each caterpillar, we recorded its mass after 8 days, the number of days until pupation, and the number of days until eclosion. After pupation, monarchs were transferred into individually labeled plastic containers. Full rearing details, including host plant provenance, are provided in Freedman et al. (2020a).

To study patterns of sequestration in relation to bird predation, we compared wild-caught monarchs from Guam—an oceanic island where birds have been functionally extirpated since the 1980s (Savidge 1987)—to the nearby island of Rota, which still has a mostly intact community of insectivorous birds and bird densities that are orders of magnitude higher than on Guam (Camp et al. 2015). We generated sequestration data for 54 wild-caught monarchs from Guam and 27 wild-caught monarchs from Rota (collected in 2015), all of which had cardenolide fingerprints consistent with feeding on *A. curassavica* (Figure S1). We also collected leaf tissue from *A. curassavica* in both locations and seed for use in greenhouse experiments (see above). Over the course of six days of observation on Rota and nine days on Guam, we did not record any predation attempts by birds on monarchs on either island. However, introduced black drongos (*Dicrurus macrocercus*) on Rota were observed pursuing and catching another aposematic species of Danaine butterfly (*Euploea eunice*) that sequesters pyrrolizidine alkaloids (Ackery and Vane-Wright 1984), suggesting that avian predation attempts likely do occur on Rota.

*Tissue collection and processing*

For leaf tissue, we collected 12 leaf discs from three pairs of opposite leaves using a ¼ inch diameter hole punch. Six discs were placed into 1 mL of 95% methanol and were held at 4°C until processing. The remaining six discs were placed into a coin envelope and were dried at 60°C, then weighed. For monarch wing tissue, butterflies were given ~6 hours for their wings to fully expand and dry post-eclosion. They were then placed into glassine envelopes and frozen at -20°C until processing. After approximately 2 months at -20°C, each of the four monarch wings was removed from the thorax, and the right hindwing was placed into a coin envelope and dried for ~48 hours at 60°C, then weighed. In total, we collected data from 183 leaf samples and 451 wing samples (Table S2).

To extract cardenolides, we added two stainless steel grinding beads to tubes containing leaf tissue and methanol, or to a 1.5 mL tube containing an oven-dried hindwing. Wing tissue was ground at 50 Hz for 2 minutes using a tissue lyser (Qiagen: 69980), and then 1 mL of 95% methanol was added to each tube. Leaf and wing tissue in methanol was ground for an additional 2 minutes until thoroughly homogenized, after which samples were added to a sonicator (Thomas Scientific: 1207K36) for 1 hour. Next, samples were centrifuged at 14,000 RPM for 5 minutes, and 800 µL of the supernatant was pipetted into a new tube. These samples were then vacuum-evaporated for 3 hours or until dry and stored at -20°C until analysis. Samples were reconstituted in 500 µL of a 0.15 mg/mL solution of digitoxin (Sigma-Aldrich) in methanol, and 200 µL of each sample was added to a 96-well filter plate (AcroPrep™ Advance, 0.2 μm PFTE membrane), which was centrifuged at 1500 RPM for 1 minute. Samples were injected at a volume of 2 μL onto Accucore™ C18 column (2.6 μm x 2.1 mm x 30 mm) (ThermoFisher Scientific) and separated using high performance liquid chromatography on a Thermo (Dionex) UHPLC 3000 instrument. We used the following solvent gradient of acetonitrile (ACN) and methanol that separated cardenolides according to their polarity, with the most polar compounds eluting first: 15% ACN for 5 minutes, ramping linearly to 30% for 3.5 min, then to 55% for 3 min, then ramping to 100% for 1 minute with a hold at 100% ACN for 10 min, then equilibration at initial conditions (15% ACN) for 5 minutes. Peaks were quantified using a diode array detector (DAD).

For wild-caught butterflies from Guam and Rota, cardenolide extraction and quantification were conducted using the methods described in Zehnder and Hunter (2007) and were similar to the methods described above. However, because of differences between instruments and non-corresponding retention times between methods, we do not directly compare these datasets from greenhouse-reared butterflies versus wild-caught Guam and Rota butterflies.

*Cardenolide quantification*

A library of cardenolide peaks was established using ChromeleonTM software (Thermo-Fisher) by manually scanning chromatograms of each species and tissue type and selecting all peaks with absorbance spectra between 216-222 nm. This resulted in a library of 70 peaks, including the internal standard (digitoxin). We note that some of these peaks are likely constituent fragments of larger, more intact cardenolides; for example, the widespread cardenolides calotropin, calotoxin, calactin, and uscharin share a common aglycone precursor (calotropogenin). Total cardenolide concentrations (expressed in mg of cardenolide per g of dry tissue) were calculated by summing across all peak areas, dividing by the peak area for digitoxin (0.15 mg/mL), dividing by 0.8 to account for the fraction of cardenolide extract saved after centrifugation, and dividing by the corresponding dry tissue mass in grams. With the exception of the internal standard, we do not have definitive identities for any of the cardenolide peaks, although many peaks qualitatively match descriptions given in other papers for calotropin, calactin, frugoside, asclepiocide, and syribioside (Seiber et al. 1986, Malcolm et al. 1989, Malcolm 1990, Züst et al. 2019, Agrawal et al. 2021). For an example of chromatograms generated from wing tissue, see Figure 2A. We also note that we did not record voruscharin from leaf tissue of either *A. curassavica* or *G. physocarpus* (see Agrawal et al. 2021) because of its very late retention time and potential degradation under our storage conditions, although we did tentatively find its breakdown products calactin and calotropin in monarch wings.

*Analysis*

For each of the six milkweed species sampled, we calculated a sequestration ratio that corresponds to the average cardenolide concentration in monarch wings divided by the average cardenolide concentration from corresponding leaf tissue. We also plotted raw data to explore variation in patterns of sequestration across host plants and monarch species. For each sample, we generated a polarity index based on the retention times of cardenolide peaks (Rasmann and Agrawal 2011). We multiplied each retention time by its corresponding relative peak area (Xi = RTiAi) and then took the sum of these values (P1…n = for each wing sample. The resulting values (P1…n) were then scaled between 0 and 1 and subtracted from 1 so that higher polarity indices correspond to samples with higher relative proportions of polar cardenolides.

We visualized multivariate disparity in cardenolide profiles of wings and leaf tissue using non-metric multidimensional scaling implemented in the package ‘vegan’ (v2.5-7) (Oksanen et al. 2020). Next, we used PERMANOVA within each milkweed species to test for whether leaf and corresponding wing samples had significantly different cardenolide profiles.

To test for quantitative variation in cardenolide sequestration across host species and monarch populations, we used linear mixed models implemented in the lme4 package (Bates et al. 2015) in R version 4.0.3 (R Development Team). Since sequestration amounts were consistently low across all populations for two species (*A. fascicularis* and *A. incarnata*) (Figure 3A) (also see Malcolm 1994), we restricted these analyses to only wing tissue from monarchs reared on the remaining four milkweed species (n = 327). We first tested a model of the form:

1. **conc ~ species\*mon.pop + sex + (1|plant.pop/plant.ID) + (1|maternal.family)**

where conc is the cumulative total concentration of wing cardenolides, species is the natal milkweed species, and mon.pop is the monarch source population, with random intercepts for plant ID nested within plant population of origin as well as monarch maternal family. Here, the primary effect of interest is the interaction between milkweed species and monarch population, which reflects GxE interactions in sequestration ability but does not by itself imply local adaptation for sequestration. Model results were summarized using Type III ANOVAs implemented in the ‘car’ package (Fox and Weisberg 2019). We assessed post-hoc pairwise differences between monarch populations and milkweed species using TukeyHSD tests implemented in the ‘multcomp package’ (Hothorn et al. 2008). Next, to explicitly test for local adaptation, we also fit the model:

1. **conc ~ sym.allo + species + mon.pop + sex + (1|plant.pop/plant.ID) + (1|maternal.family)**

where the sym.allo term corresponds to whether a given monarch was reared on a sympatric or allopatric milkweed host. Here, a significant positive intercept for sympatric combinations is diagnostic of local adaptation (Blanquart et al. 2013, Freedman et al. 2020a).

For monarch samples collected in the field from Guam and Rota, we calculated total cardenolide concentrations for both wing and leaf samples. We then fit a basic linear model comparing wing concentrations between Guam and Rota, with sex as a covariate. Next, we tested a second model that used wing cardenolide concentrations adjusted for the average cardenolide concentrations in natural *A. curassavica* leaf samples from each location. Finally, we used pairwise comparisons of greenhouse-reared Guam butterflies and all other populations to provide broader context for the sequestration abilities of this population.

**Results**

Milkweed species varied greatly in their cardenolide composition (Figure 2A, 2B) as well as their average cardenolide concentration, ranging from as low as 0.11 ± 0.03 mg/g (*A. incarnata*) to as high as 7.86 ± 0.66 mg/g (*A. curassavica*). Monarchs, regardless of population of origin, had the highest levels of sequestered cardenolides on *A. curassavica* (12.11 ± 0.53 mg/g) and the lowest on *A. fascicularis* (0.31 ± 0.03 mg/g) (Figure 3). Sequestration efficiency differed strongly based on milkweed species: the sequestration ratio was highest in *A. syriaca* (12.78) and lowest in *G. physocarpus* (0.74) (Figure 3). The polarity index of sequestered cardenolides also differed strongly across species: in general, monarchs reared on *A. syriaca* and *A. speciosa* sequestered a high proportion of polar cardenolides, while the subset of sequestered cardenolides on other species was predominantly compounds with low to intermediate polarity (Figure 2A, 2C). Across all milkweed species, the composition of cardenolides present in leaves was significantly different from the composition of sequestered cardenolides (Table S3). Across all species and populations, female monarchs sequestered slightly more than males, although this difference was not significant (t = 1.688, p = 0.091). Maternal families within populations showed substantial variation in their propensity to sequester cardenolides (Figure S2). We did not find a strong correlation between development time and the total concentration of sequestered cardenolides (Figure S3).

We found strong support for GxE interactions in sequestration ability, with monarch populations varying substantially in their ability to sequester across milkweed species (χ2 = 77.6, d.f. = 15, p < 0.001) (Table S4). This pattern was driven most strongly by strong cross-host sequestration differences in monarchs from Puerto Rico. Puerto Rican monarchs sequestered 1.37 times more from *A. curassavica* and 1.46 times more from *G. physocarpus* than other populations, yet 4.96 times less from *A. speciosa* and 5.83 times less from *A. syriaca* (Figure 4A). The polarity index of cardenolides sequestered by Puerto Rican monarchs on *A. syriaca* and *A. speciosa* was significantly lower than for all other populations (t = -6.86, p < 0.001; Figure 4C). Despite the strong GxE pattern for sequestration in our data, there was no support for an overall pattern of local adaptation in sequestration ability (χ2 = 0.16, d.f. = 1, p = 0.687), with roughly equivalent levels of sequestration in sympatric and allopatric *population x host* combinations (Table S5).

Wild-caught monarchs from Guam, an island with no birds, had modestly lower cardenolide concentrations (2.24 ± 0.25 mg/g) than wild-caught monarchs from Rota (2.66 ± 0.36 mg/g) (t = -0.96, p = 0.340). After accounting for average cardenolide concentrations of field-sampled *A. curassavica* on each island, which were 31% higher from naturally occurring plants on Guam (3.96 ± 0.70 mg/g) than from Rota (2.72 ± 1.12 mg/g), monarchs from Guam sequestered significantly less than monarchs from Rota (t = -3.23, p = 0.002). Among all six monarch populations reared in the greenhouse, Guam had the lowest population-specific intercept for overall cardenolide sequestration (Figure S4); however, after correcting for multiple comparisons, no pairwise differences among populations were significant for overall cardenolide sequestration. The pattern of reduced sequestration by monarchs from Guam was most pronounced on *A. curassavica*, their sympatric host: Guam monarchs sequestered, on average, 33.1% fewer cardenolides on *A. curassavica* than other populations, and significantly less than populations from Australia, Eastern North America, and Puerto Rico on this host (Figure 5D; Figure S5).

**Discussion**

Monarch butterflies are well-known for their ability to sequester cardenolides from milkweed host plants, but little is known about genetic variation in sequestration ability and how natural selection influences sequestration. Here, we demonstrate that monarchs from Puerto Rico differ greatly in their ability to sequester across milkweed hosts compared to other populations, potentially reflecting physiological tradeoffs in sequestration efficiency and/or a lack of co-evolutionary history with temperate North American host plants. Despite strong host-specific patterns of sequestration in Puerto Rican monarchs, we did not find overall evidence for local adaptation in sequestration across our entire dataset. Finally, we show that monarchs from Guam, an island where monarchs have been functionally released from bird predation, sequester fewer cardenolides than monarchs from Rota, a nearby island with a mostly intact insectivorous bird community. Guam monarchs also sequestered significantly fewer cardenolides than three other populations when reared on their sympatric host plant, *A. curassavica*, potentially reflecting relaxed selection pressure for distastefulness.

We found strong evidence for GxE interactions in sequestration ability, although this pattern was primarily driven by a single monarch population from Puerto Rico. Puerto Rican monarchs contained higher cardenolide concentrations than all other populations when reared on *A. curassavica* and *G. physocarpus*, but substantially lower concentrations when reared on *A. syriaca* and *A. speciosa*. One possible explanation for the inability of Puerto Rican monarchs to efficiently sequester from *A. syriaca* and *A. speciosa* is a lack of evolutionary history with these hosts. Divergence times between Puerto Rican monarchs and their migratory North American ancestors are uncertain but likely occurred within the last 20,000 years (Zhan et al. 2014), whereas other non-migratory populations included in this study likely diverged in the last 150-200 years (Zalucki and Clarke 2004, Freedman et al. 2020b). Unlike other non-migratory populations included in this study, Puerto Rican larvae and adults are phenotypically very distinct from North American migrants (Figure S5, also see Freedman et al. 2020b). Thus, it is conceivable that the lineage of Caribbean and South American monarchs that includes Puerto Rico may have diverged prior to the onset of widespread adoption of *A. syriaca* and *A. speciosa* as hosts in North America, and this lineage may never have evolved the physiological capacity to efficiently sequester the primarily polar cardenolides from the temperate North American milkweed flora. Further research with additional monarch populations from the Caribbean and South America or additional North American milkweed species could help to resolve this question.

An alternative (but not mutually exclusive) explanation for the observed pattern of sequestration in Puerto Rican monarchs is a physiological tradeoff in sequestration efficiency, potentially driven by differences in the physical properties of cardenolides across milkweed host species. Puerto Rican monarchs sequestered high concentrations from *A. curassavica* and *G. physocarpus*, both of which are high cardenolide species and whose sequestration profiles are biased towards compounds with low to intermediate polarity (Roeske et al. 1976, Malcolm 1990). Interestingly, Puerto Rican monarchs sequestered higher cardenolide concentrations from *G. physocarpus* than any other population (Figure 4A), despite little apparent history of association with this species, suggesting that feeding on *A. curassavica* or other high cardenolide hosts may have pre-adapted them to sequestering from the chemically similar *G. physocarpus*. By contrast, Puerto Rican monarchs sequestered very low concentrations of polar cardenolides from *A. syriaca* and *A. speciosa* that were readily sequestered by other monarchs (also see Seiber et al. 1986, Malcolm et al. 1989), as indicated by the lower polarity index for Puerto Rican monarchs on these species (Figure 4C). Cardenolide polarity likely influences membrane permeability and consequently determines the need for transporters and efflux carriers for sequestration (Frick and Wink 1995, Agrawal et al. 2012), but there is currently no evidence that sequestration of polar cardenolides competitively inhibits sequestration of less polar compounds. More research into the biochemical basis of sequestration, as well as studies examining variation among monarch families in their ability to sequester, is needed to determine whether tradeoffs in sequestration ability across hosts are a viable explanation for the pattern observed here.

Despite finding evidence for unique sequestration behavior in monarchs from Puerto Rico, we did not find general evidence for a pattern of local adaptation in sequestration ability, with no overall support for greater sequestration from sympatric host plants across monarch populations. One possible reason for this pattern is that larval performance—including the process of sequestration—may be correlated across chemically similar host plants, even if they are geographically disparate and phylogenetically distant (e.g. Pearse and Hipp 2009). Notably, we did not find evidence that monarchs from Hawaii or Australia had a sequestration advantage on *G. physocarpus*, despite apparently having >100 years of association with this host (Nelson 1993, Malcolm 1994). All derived Pacific Island populations (Hawaii, Australia, Guam) also retained their ability to sequester from ancestral North American hosts (*A. syriaca*, *A. speciosa*), despite spending as many as 1,500 generations in isolation. The intact sequestration ability of Pacific but not Puerto Rican monarchs supports the notion that Puerto Rican monarchs diverged from North American migratory monarchs substantially before other non-migratory populations (Figure 1B).

Our overall results generally corroborate earlier studies of monarch sequestration. For example, we found that sequestration ratios were high for monarchs reared on *A. syriaca* and *A. speciosa*, consistent with many other studies (Malcolm and Brower 1989, Malcolm 1994, Decker et al. 2019). Likewise, we found barely detectable levels of sequestered cardenolides from monarchs reared on *A. fascicularis*, as previously reported by Malcolm (1994), as well as relatively inefficient sequestration from *G. physocarpus* (Figure 3B), as previously reported by Roeske et al. (1976). Interestingly, variation in sequestration from *G. physocarpus* and *A. curassavica* was low relative to other species (Figure 4A; Table S7). The low level of variation in sequestration from *A. curassavica* likely stems from the fact that just two compounds—the stereoisomers calactin and calotropin—comprise >50% of the total cardenolides sequestered (Agrawal et al. 2021). A qualitatively similar pattern was observed in *G. physocarpus*, suggesting a relatively simple and conserved biochemical process underlying sequestration from these species.

We found modest evidence for reduced cardenolide sequestration in monarchs from Guam, where birds have been functionally extirpated for the last ~40 years. Sequestration in wild-caught Guam monarchs was significantly lower than sequestration in Rota monarchs, but only after accounting for differences in *A. curassavica* cardenolide concentrations on each island. Despite their proximity, monarchs from Guam and Rota are genetically distinct (Hemstrom et al., submitted), indicating that adaptive divergence between these island populations is possible. However, we were unable to rear monarchs from Guam and Rota side-by-side under controlled conditions, which makes it difficult to ascribe the differences in cardenolides between wild-caught butterflies strictly to differences in bird predation. Furthermore, all comparisons using Guam necessarily involve a functional sample size of n=1, as it is the only location where it is tractable to assess the impact of long-term bird removal on monarch sequestration.

When we reared monarchs from Guam under controlled conditions and compared them to other populations, we found that Guam monarchs had the lowest population-specific intercept for total cardenolide sequestration. Notably, Guam monarchs sequestered significantly less from their local host plant (*A. curassavica*) than three other monarch populations, whereas sequestration was comparable across other hosts. This pattern is consistent with selection against the specific processes involved with sequestration from *A. curassavica* (e.g. the conversion of voruscharin into calotropin [Agrawal et al. 2021]), but not against other processes involved in the broader context of sequestration (e.g. multidrug transporter activity [Groen et al. 2017]). The observation of reduced sequestration on a sympatric host, but only in the absence of bird predation, highlights the importance of considering higher trophic levels when forming predictions about the outcomes of evolutionary interactions between plants and their specialized herbivores (Bernays and Graham 1988).

While avian predation of adult monarchs has long been suggested to be a major selective force influencing sequestration (Brower et al. 1967, Brower and Calvert 1985, Brower 1988), it is unlikely that birds are the only agents of selection on larval sequestration. Many invertebrate predators also feed on monarch larvae under natural (Koch et al. 2003, Rafter et al. 2013, Baker and Potter 2020) and artificial (Rayor et al. 2004, Mebs et al. 2017) conditions. The extirpation of bird predators from Guam has altered the island’s trophic ecology (Rogers et al. 2012) and may be associated with a proliferation of mesopredators (Ritchie and Johnson 2009) such as wasps, which can be major predators of monarch larvae (Baker and Potter 2020), even when larvae are consuming high-cardenolide hosts (Rayor et al. 2004, McGruddy et al. 2021). Thus, an alternative to reduced sequestration due to relaxed selection by bird predators is a trophic cascade that has increased larval predation by invertebrates. Invertebrate predation on monarch larvae could indirectly favor faster development, which may be associated with reduced sequestration (Agrawal et al. 2021).


In conclusion, we have shown that monarch butterflies show substantial genetic variation within and between populations for cardenolide sequestration. Despite decades of research, our understanding of the biochemical and physiological processes involved in cardenolide metabolism, transport, and deposition is still quite crude and will need refining to help explain some of the patterns observed here. Finally, our research highlights the utility of “natural experiments”—both the monarch’s recent global range expansion and the recent extirpation of birds from Guam—for testing fundamental hypotheses in ecology and evolution.

**Acknowledgments**


We thank Asia Jones, Evan Jordan, and especially Christopher Jason for assistance with rearing monarchs used in this study. Hillary Streit assisted with generating chemical data for monarchs from Guam, and Ivan Munkres assisted with generating all other chemical data. Myron Zalucki provided Australian monarchs. MGF, RLV, SYS, and SRR conceived of the study. MGF and SC performed caterpillar rearing. MGF, MDH, and RLV generated chromatograms used for chemical analysis. MGF performed all data analysis and wrote the first draft. Funding to MGF was provided through the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship, National Geographic Society, and the Center for Population Biology. Add other funding information here.

**References**

1. Aardema, M. L., Y. Zhen, and P. Andolfatto. 2012. The evolution of cardenolide-resistant forms of Na+,K+-ATPase in Danainae butterflies. Molecular Ecology 21:340–349.
2. Ackery, P. R., R. I. Vane-Wright, and Others. 1984. Milkweed butterflies, their cladistics and biology, being an account of the natural history of the Danainae, a subfamily of the Lepidoptera, Nymphalidae. British Museum (Natural History), London, UK.
3. Agrawal, A. A., G. Petschenka, R. A. Bingham, M. G. Weber, and S. Rasmann. 2012. Toxic cardenolides: chemical ecology and coevolution of specialized plant-herbivore interactions. The New Phytologist 194:28–45.
4. Agrawal, A. A., K. Böröczky, M. Haribal, A. P. Hastings, R. A. White, R.-W. Jiang, and C. Duplais. 2021. Cardenolides, toxicity, and the costs of sequestration in the coevolutionary interaction between monarchs and milkweeds. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 118.
5. Baker, A. M., and D. A. Potter. 2020. Invasive paper wasp turns urban pollinator gardens into ecological traps for monarch butterfly larvae. Scientific Reports 10:9553.
6. Bates, D., M. Mächler, B. Bolker, and S. Walker. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. Journal of Statistical Software, Articles 67:1–48.
7. Bernays, E., and M. Graham. 1988. On the evolution of host specificity in phytophagous arthropods. Ecology 69:886–892.
8. Blanquart, F., O. Kaltz, S. L. Nuismer, and S. Gandon. 2013. A practical guide to measuring local adaptation. Ecology Letters 16:1195–1205.
9. Brodie, E. D. 2009. Toxins and venoms. Current Biology: 19:931–935.
10. Brower, L. P. 1988. Avian predation on the monarch butterfly and its implications for mimicry theory. American Naturalist 131:S4–S6.
11. Brower, L. P., and W. H. Calvert. 1985. Foraging dynamics of bird predators on overwintering monarch butterflies in Mexico. Evolution 39:852–868.
12. Brower, L. P., J. van Brower, and J. M. Corvino. 1967. Plant poisons in a terrestrial food chain. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 57:893–898.
13. Brower, L. P., and S. C. Glazier. 1975. Localization of heart poisons in the monarch butterfly. Science 188:19–25.
14. Brower, L. P., W. N. Ryerson, L. L. Coppinger, and S. C. Glazier. 1968. Ecological chemistry and the palatability spectrum. Science 161:1349–1350.
15. Brower, L. P., P. B. McEvoy, K. L. Williamson, and M. A. Flannery. 1972. Variation in cardiac glycoside content of monarch butterflies from natural populations in eastern North America. Science 177:426–428.
16. Brower, L. P., and C. M. Moffitt. 1974. Palatability dynamics of cardenolides in the monarch butterfly. Nature 249:280–283.
17. Brower, L. P., J. N. Seiber, C. J. Nelson, S. P. Lynch, and P. M. Tuskes. 1982. Plant-determined variation in the cardenolide content, thin-layer chromatography profiles, and emetic potency of monarch butterflies, *Danaus plexippus* reared on the milkweed, *Asclepias eriocarpa* in California. Journal of Chemical Ecology 8:579-633.
18. Brower, L. P., J. N. Seiber, C. J. Nelson, S. P. Lynch, M. P. Hoggard, and J. A. Cohen. 1984. Plant-determined variation in cardenolide content and thin-layer chromatography profiles of monarch butterflies, *Danaus plexippus* reared on milkweed plants in California. Journal of Chemical Ecology 10:1823-1857.
19. Camp, R. J., K. W. Brinck, P. M. Gorresen, F. A. Amidon, P. M. Radley, S. P. Berkowitz, and P. C. Banko. 2015. Current land bird distribution and trends in population abundance between 1982 and 2012 on Rota, Mariana Islands. Journal of Fish and Wildlife Management 6:511–540.
20. Dalla, S., M. Baum, and S. Dobler. 2017. Substitutions in the cardenolide binding site and interaction of subunits affect kinetics besides cardenolide sensitivity of insect Na,K-ATPase. Insect Biochemistry and Molecular Biology 89:43–50.
21. Decker, L. E., A. J. Soule, J. C. de Roode, and M. D. Hunter. 2019. Phytochemical changes in milkweed induced by elevated CO 2 alter wing morphology but not toxin sequestration in monarch butterflies. Functional Ecology 33:411–421.
22. De Roode, J. C., A. B. Pedersen, M. D. Hunter, and S. Altizer. 2008. Host plant species affects virulence in monarch butterfly parasites. The Journal of Animal Ecology 77:120–126.
23. Dockx, C., L. P. Brower, L. I. Wassenaar, and K. A. Hobson. 2004. Do North American monarch butterflies travel to Cuba? Stable isotope and chemical tracer techniques. Ecological Applications 14:1106–1114.
24. Duffey, S. S. 1980. Sequestration of plant natural products by insects. Annual Review of Entomology 25:447–477.
25. Forister, M. L., V. Novotny, A. K. Panorska, L. Baje, Y. Basset, P. T. Butterill, L. Cizek, et al. 2015. The global distribution of diet breadth in insect herbivores. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 112:442–447.
26. Fox, W. and S. Weisberg. 2019. An {R} Companion to Applied Regression, Third Edition. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publishing.
27. Freedman, M. G., C. Jason, S. R. Ramírez, and S. Y. Strauss. 2020. Host plant adaptation during contemporary range expansion in the monarch butterfly. Evolution 74:377–391.
28. Freedman, M. G., H. Dingle, S. Y. Strauss, and S. R. Ramírez. 2020. Two centuries of monarch butterfly collections reveal contrasting effects of range expansion and migration loss on wing traits. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 117:28887–28893.
29. Frick, C., and M. Wink. 1995. Uptake and sequestration of ouabain and other cardiac glycosides in *Danaus plexippus* (Lepidoptera: Danaidae): Evidence for a carrier-mediated process. Journal of Chemical Ecology 21:557–575.
30. Futuyma, D. J., and A. A. Agrawal. 2009. Macroevolution and the biological diversity of plants and herbivores. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 106:18054–18061.
31. Futuyma, D. J., and G. Moreno. 1988. The evolution of ecological specialization. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 19:207–233.
32. Gilbert, L. E., and M. C. Singer. 1975. Butterfly ecology. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics.
33. Gowler, C. D., K. E. Leon, M. D. Hunter, and J. C. de Roode. 2015. Secondary defense chemicals in milkweed reduce parasite infection in monarch butterflies, *Danaus plexippus*. Journal of Chemical Ecology 41:520–523.
34. Groen, S. C., E. R. LaPlante, N. M. Alexandre, A. A. Agrawal, S. Dobler, and N. K. Whiteman. 2017. Multidrug transporters and organic anion transporting polypeptides protect insects against the toxic effects of cardenolides. Insect Biochemistry and Molecular Biology 81:51–61.
35. Heckel, D. G. 2014. Insect Detoxification and Sequestration Strategies. Pages 77–114 *in* C. Voelckel and G. Jander, eds. Annual Plant Reviews (Vol. 23). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, UK.
36. Hothorn, T., F. Bretz, and P. Westfall. 2008. Simultaneous inference in general parametric models. Biometrical Journal 50:346–363.
37. Hutchinson, D. A., A. Mori, A. H. Savitzky, G. M. Burghardt, X. Wu, J. Meinwald, and F. C. Schroeder. 2007. Dietary sequestration of defensive steroids in nuchal glands of the Asian snake *Rhabdophis tigrinus*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 104:2265–2270.
38. Jones, P. L., G. Petschenka, L. Flacht, and A. A. Agrawal. 2019. Cardenolide intake, sequestration, and excretion by the monarch butterfly along gradients of plant toxicity and larval ontogeny. Journal of Chemical Ecology 45:264–277.
39. Karageorgi, M., S. C. Groen, F. Sumbul, J. N. Pelaez, K. I. Verster, J. M. Aguilar, A. P. Hastings, et al. 2019. Genome editing retraces the evolution of toxin resistance in the monarch butterfly. Nature 574:409-412.
40. Kingdon, J., B. Agwanda, M. Kinnaird, T. O’Brien, C. Holland, T. Gheysens, M. Boulet-Audet, et al. 2012. A poisonous surprise under the coat of the African crested rat. Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society 279:675–680.
41. Koch, R. L., W. D. Hutchison, R. C. Venette, and G. E. Heimpel. 2003. Susceptibility of immature monarch butterfly, *Danaus plexippus* (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae: Danainae), to predation by *Harmonia axyridis* (Coleoptera: Coccinellidae). Biological Control 28:265–270.
42. Malcolm, S. B. 1990. Chemical defence in chewing and sucking insect herbivores: Plant-derived cardenolides in the monarch butterfly and oleander aphid. Chemoecology 1:12–21.
43. Malcolm, S. B. 1994. Milkweeds, monarch butterflies and the ecological significance of cardenolides. Chemoecology 5:101–117.
44. Malcolm, S. B., and L. P. Brower. 1986. Selective oviposition by monarch butterflies (*Danaus plexippus* L.) in a mixed stand of *Asclepias curassavica* L. and *A. incarnata* L. in south Florida. Journal of the Lepidopterists’ Society 40:255–263.
45. Malcolm, S. B., and L. P. Brower. 1989. Evolutionary and ecological implications of cardenolide sequestration in the monarch butterfly. Experientia 45:284-295.
46. Malcolm, S. B., B. J. Cockrell, and L. P. Brower. 1989. Cardenolide fingerprint of monarch butterflies reared on common milkweed, *Asclepias syriaca* L. Journal of Chemical Ecology 15:819–853.
47. McGruddy, R. A., M. W. F. Howse, J. Haywood, C. J. I. Ward, T. B. Staufer, M. Hayek-Williams, R. J. Toft, et al. 2021. Invasive paper wasps have strong cascading effects on the host plant of monarch butterflies. Ecological Entomology 46:459–469.
48. Mebs, D., C. Wunder, W. Pogoda, and S. W. Toennes. 2017. Feeding on toxic prey. The praying mantis (Mantodea) as predator of poisonous butterfly and moth (Lepidoptera) caterpillars. Toxicon 131:16–19.
49. Nelson, C. J. 1993. A model for cardenolide and cardenolide glycoside storage by the monarch butterfly. Biology and Conservation of the Monarch Butterfly. Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, Los Angeles.
50. Oksanen, J., F. G. Blanchet, M. Friendly, R. Kindt, P. Legendre, D. McGlinn, P. R. Minchin, et al. 2020. vegan: Community Ecology Package. R package version 2.5-5. 2019.
51. Pearse, I. S., and A. L. Hipp. 2009. Phylogenetic and trait similarity to a native species predict herbivory on non-native oaks. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 106:18097–18102.
52. Petschenka, G., S. Fandrich, N. Sander, V. Wagschal, M. Boppré, and S. Dobler. 2013. Stepwise evolution of resistance to toxic cardenolides via genetic substitutions in the Na+/K+ -ATPase of milkweed butterflies (Lepidoptera: Danaini). Evolution 67:2753–2761.
53. Petschenka, G., and A. A. Agrawal. 2015. Milkweed butterfly resistance to plant toxins is linked to sequestration, not coping with a toxic diet. Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society 282:20151865.
54. Petschenka, G., and A. A. Agrawal. 2016. How herbivores coopt plant defenses: natural selection, specialization, and sequestration. Current Opinion in Insect Science 14:17-24.
55. Petschenka, G., C. S. Fei, J. J. Araya, S. Schröder, B. N. Timmermann, and A. A. Agrawal. 2018. Relative selectivity of plant cardenolides for Na+/K+-ATPases from the monarch butterfly and non-resistant insects. Frontiers in Plant Science 9:1424.
56. Pierce, A. A., M. P. Zalucki, M. Bangura, M. Udawatta, M. R. Kronforst, S. Altizer, J. F. Haeger, et al. 2014. Serial founder effects and genetic differentiation during worldwide range expansion of monarch butterflies. Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society 281.
57. Pierce, A. A., J. C. de Roode, and L. Tao. 2016. Comparative genetics of Na+/K+-ATPase in monarch butterfly populations with varying host plant toxicity. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society 119:194–200.
58. Poulton, E. B. 1914. Mimicry in North American Butterflies: A Reply. Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia 66:161–195.
59. R Core Team (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
60. Rafter, J. L., A. A. Agrawal, and E. L. Preisser. 2013. Chinese mantids gut toxic monarch caterpillars: avoidance of prey defence? Ecological Entomology 38:76–82.
61. Rasmann, S., and A. A. Agrawal. 2011. Latitudinal patterns in plant defense: evolution of cardenolides, their toxicity and induction following herbivory. Ecology Letters 14:476–483.
62. Rausher, M. D. 1984. Tradeoffs in performance on different hosts: evidence from within-and between-site variation in the beetle *Deloyala guttata*. Evolution 38:582–595.
63. Rayor, L. S. 2004. Effects of monarch larval host plant chemistry and body size on *Polistes* wasp predation. The monarch butterfly: Biology and conservation. Cornell University Press, Ithaca NY 39–46.
64. Reichstein, T., J. von Euw, J. A. Parsons, and M. Rothschild. 1968. Heart poisons in the monarch butterfly. Science 161:861–866.
65. Ritchie, E. G., and C. N. Johnson. 2009. Predator interactions, mesopredator release and biodiversity conservation. Ecology Letters 12:982–998.
66. Roeske, C. N., J. N. Seiber, L. P. Brower, and C. M. Moffitt. 1976. Milkweed Cardenolides and Their Comparative Processing by Monarch Butterflies (Danaus plexippus L.). Pages 93–167 *in* J. W. Wallace and R. L. Mansell, eds. Biochemical Interaction Between Plants and Insects. Springer US, Boston, MA.
67. Rogers, H., J. Hille Ris Lambers, R. Miller, and J. J. Tewksbury. 2012. “Natural experiment” demonstrates top-down control of spiders by birds on a landscape level. PloS One 7:e43446.
68. Santos, J. C., L. A. Coloma, and D. C. Cannatella. 2003. Multiple, recurring origins of aposematism and diet specialization in poison frogs. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 100:12792–12797.
69. Savidge, J. A. 1987. Extinction of an island forest avifauna by an introduced snake. Ecology 68:660–668.
70. Seiber, J. N., P. M. Tuskes, L. P. Brower, and C. J. Nelson. 1980. Pharmacodynamics of some individual milkweed cardenolides fed to larvae of the monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus* L.). Journal of Chemical Ecology 6:321–339.
71. Seiber, J. N., L. P. Brower, S. M. Lee, M. M. McChesney, H. T. A. Cheung, C. J. Nelson, and T. R. Watson. 1986. Cardenolide connection between overwintering monarch butterflies from Mexico and their larval food plant, *Asclepias syriaca*. Journal of Chemical Ecology 12:1157-1170.
72. Stenoien, C. M., R. A. Meyer, K. R. Nail, M. P. Zalucki, and K. S. Oberhauser. 2019. Does chemistry make a difference? Milkweed butterfly sequestered cardenolides as a defense against parasitoid wasps. Arthropod-Plant Interactions 13:835–852.
73. Sternberg, E. D., T. Lefèvre, J. Li, C. L. F. de Castillejo, H. Li, M. D. Hunter, and J. C. de Roode. 2012. Food plant derived disease tolerance and resistance in a natural butterfly-plant-parasite interactions. Evolution 66:3367–3376.
74. Trimen, R. 1887. South African Butterflies: a monograph of the extratropical species. Vols. I-III. London, UK.
75. Vane-Wright, R. I. 1993. The Columbus hypothesis: an explanation for the dramatic 19th century range expansion of the monarch butterfly. Biology and conservation of the monarch butterfly 179.
76. Wiens, J. J., R. T. Lapoint, and N. K. Whiteman. 2015. Herbivory increases diversification across insect clades. Nature Communications 6:8370.
77. Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation. 2018. Milkweeds: A conservation practitioner’s guide. https://www.xerces.org/sites/default/files/2018-05/17-031\_02\_XercesSoc\_Milkweeds-Conservation-Guide\_web.pdf.
78. Zalucki, M. P., and A. R. Clarke. 2004. Monarchs across the Pacific: the Columbus hypothesis revisited. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society 82:111–121.
79. Zehnder, C. B., and M. D. Hunter. 2007. Interspecific variation within the genus *Asclepias* in response to herbivory by a phloem-feeding insect herbivore. Journal of Chemical Ecology 33:2044–2053.
80. Zhan, S., W. Zhang, K. Niitepõld, J. Hsu, J. F. Haeger, M. P. Zalucki, S. Altizer, et al. 2014. The genetics of monarch butterfly migration and warning colouration. Nature 514:317–321.
81. Zhen, Y., M. L. Aardema, E. M. Medina, M. Schumer, and P. Andolfatto. 2012. Parallel molecular evolution in an herbivore community. Science 337:1634–1637.
82. Züst, T., G. Petschenka, A. P. Hastings, and A. A. Agrawal. 2019. Toxicity of milkweed leaves and latex: Chromatographic quantification versus biological activity of cardenolides in 16 *Asclepias* species. Journal of Chemical Ecology 45:50–60.



**Figure 1** – (**Top**) Monarch populations and their associated host plants. Arrows indicate the direction of expansion out of the ancestral North American range. Pacific Island populations are part of a single westward expansion event, while Puerto Rican monarchs are part of an independent southward expansion event. Selected hosts for each population are treated as sympatric. (**Bottom**) Phylogram showing relatedness among populations and approximate dates of major events discussed throughout the manuscript. Note that timeline is not calibrated.



**Figure 2** – **(A)** Example of chromatograms showing sequestered cardenolides in monarch wings. Each panel reflects a butterfly from one of the six milkweed species used during rearing. Retention times correspond to compound polarity, with more polar compound eluting first and less polar compounds eluting last. Note that the y-axis is truncated and does not show the true values for the internal standard (digitoxin – 0.15 mg/mL), which elutes around 10.8 minutes and was generally the largest peak in each sample. **(B)** NMDS plot of leaf and wing tissue. Note the similarity in the profiles of sequestered compounds from *A. curassavica* and *G. physocarpus*, as well as *A. speciosa* and *A. syriaca*. **(C)** Polarity index of sequestered cardenolides in monarch wings. Here, values closer to 1 correspond to sequestration profiles biased towards polar compounds. Note the high polarity indices for monarchs reared on *A. syriaca* and *A. speciosa*, also visible in panel A.



**Figure 3** – **(A)** Boxplots showing cardenolide concentrations (expressed as milligrams of cardenolide per gram of oven-dried leaf or wing tissue) for leaf and wing tissue of each milkweed species. Note that y-axes differ substantially between species. **(B)** Mean cardenolide concentrations (± MSE) and sample sizes for leaf and wing samples. The sequestration ratio reflects wing divided by leaf tissue.



**Figure 4** – **(A)** Boxplots showing wing cardenolide concentrations across the four primary milkweed species of interest, separated by monarch population of origin. Note the substantially lower concentrations of cardenolides in Puerto Rican monarchs from *A. syriaca* and *A. speciosa*. **(B)** Reaction norm plot showing sequestration difference between Puerto Rican and Eastern North American monarchs on their respective host plants (*A. curassavica*, *A. syriaca*). Solid black lines connect mean values for each combination. Faint lines in the background correspond to individual monarch families reared on each host. **(C)** Polarity indices for Puerto Rican versus all other population when reared on *A. syriaca* and *A. speciosa*. Puerto Rican monarchs had significantly lower polarity scores on these species, suggesting comparatively poor sequestration of polar cardenolides.

**Figure 5** – **(A)** Map of the Mariana Islands, located in the western Pacific Ocean. Birds have been functionally extirpated from Guam for the last approximately 40 years, while the other islands in the archipelago still have largely intact bird assemblages. **(B)** Wing cardenolide concentrations of wild-caught monarchs from Guam (birds absent) and Rota (birds present) were not significantly different. **(C)** After accounting for the concentration of cardenolides in naturally occurring A. curassavica from each island, monarchs from Rota had significantly higher wing cardenolide concentrations. **(D)** When reared under controlled conditions on their sympatric host *A. curassavica*, monarchs from Guam sequestered lower concentrations of cardenolides than other monarch populations. In panels C and D, an adjusted cardenolide concentration of 1 means that wing and associated leaf tissue had equivalent concentrations.

