

Micro- and Macroevolutionary Trade-Offs in Plant-Feeding Insects

Daniel A. Peterson,^{1,*} Nate B. Hardy,² and Benjamin B. Normark¹

1. Department of Biology and Graduate Program in Organismic and Evolutionary Biology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003; 2. Department of Entomology and Plant Pathology, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama 36849

Submitted May 25, 2016; Accepted July 17, 2016; Electronically published September 16, 2016

Online enhancements: appendix. Dryad data: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5061/dryad.m0n46>.

ABSTRACT: A long-standing hypothesis asserts that plant-feeding insects specialize on particular host plants because of negative interactions (trade-offs) between adaptations to alternative hosts, yet empirical evidence for such trade-offs is scarce. Most studies have looked for microevolutionary performance trade-offs within insect species, but host use could also be constrained by macroevolutionary trade-offs caused by epistasis and historical contingency. Here we used a phylogenetic approach to estimate the micro- and macroevolutionary correlations between use of alternative host-plant taxa within two major orders of plant-feeding insects: Lepidoptera (caterpillars) and Hemiptera (true bugs). Across 1,604 caterpillar species, we found both positive and negative pairwise correlations between use of 11 host-plant orders, with overall network patterns suggesting that different host-use constraints act over micro- and macroevolutionary timescales. In contrast, host-use patterns of 955 true bug species revealed uniformly positive correlations between use of the same 11 host plant orders over both timescales. The lack of consistent patterns across timescales and insect orders indicates that host-use trade-offs are historically contingent rather than universal constraints. Moreover, we observed few negative correlations overall despite the wide taxonomic and ecological diversity of the focal host-plant orders, suggesting that positive interactions between host-use adaptations, not trade-offs, dominate the long-term evolution of host use in plant-feeding insects.

Keywords: ecological specialization, herbivory, host range, polyphagy.

Introduction

Most plant-feeding insects are ecological specialists restricted to a small number of host-plant species (Forister et al. 2015). The prevalence of specialization is surprising given the advantages of being a generalist (including greater resource and refuge availability), and many researchers have therefore suggested that the evolution of generalism must be constrained

(Futuyma and Moreno 1988; Futuyma et al. 1995; Scriber 2010). This constraint is usually imagined as a trade-off between adaptations to alternative hosts, whereby an increase in performance on one host comes at the cost of decreased performance on another host (Agrawal et al. 2010; Forister et al. 2012). Such trade-offs are crucial elements of most theoretical models of the evolution of specialization (Ravigné et al. 2009; Nurmi and Parvinen 2011; Remold 2012) and are often assumed to arise as consequences of the genetic architecture of host use. One frequently invoked genetic model involves antagonistic pleiotropy, in which distinct alleles at a single locus have opposite fitness effects on alternative hosts (Futuyma and Moreno 1988; Scheirs et al. 2005; Scriber 2010; Gompert et al. 2015). For example, small changes to an enzyme could make it more efficient at detoxifying the secondary compounds of one plant species and less efficient at detoxifying the secondary compounds of another plant species (e.g., Li et al. 2003). Despite the intuitive appeal of antagonistic pleiotropy, however, empirical studies have generally failed to find evidence for negative genetic correlations between performance on alternative hosts within insect species (Futuyma 2008; Forister et al. 2012; Gompert et al. 2015). Nevertheless, antagonistic pleiotropy may be difficult to detect within species because its effects can be obscured by segregating fitness variation at non-host-specific loci (Joshi and Thompson 1995). Moreover, genetic variation for use of novel hosts is often absent within a single population (Futuyma et al. 1995), and host use is phylogenetically conserved in many insect groups (Futuyma and Agrawal 2009). Therefore, we cannot rule out the possibility that historical antagonistic pleiotropy drove the evolution of specialization in ancestral lineages of plant-feeding insects.

Although the prevalence of host-use specialization is often attributed to adaptive trade-offs, some theoretical models suggest that specialization can evolve even when adaptations to one host do not decrease performance on other hosts. Most insect species can choose which host plant they will feed on, so evolutionary feedback between the evolu-

* Corresponding author; e-mail: dapeters@cns.umass.edu.

ORCID: Peterson, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3024-3068>; Hardy, <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6133-7086>; Normark, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6267-9552>.

Am. Nat. 2016. Vol. 188, pp. 640–650. © 2016 by The University of Chicago. 0003-0147/2016/18806-5701\$15.00. All rights reserved.

DOI: 10.1086/688764

tion of host choice and host performance could drive behavioral specialization (Ravigné et al. 2009; Nurmi and Parvinen 2011). For example, if a particular adaptation increases fitness on one host more than on another, individuals may evolve to feed preferentially on the host that gives them higher fitness (Fry 1996). If a nonpreferred host is rarely used, selection for performance on that host will be weak, and mutation and genetic drift may eliminate the genetic tools required to use it (Whitlock 1996). In general, over long timescales, the selective environment will shape a lineage's genome, and epistatic interactions between new mutations and their genetic background will determine whether adaptations to novel hosts are possible (Weinreich et al. 2005; Remold 2012). We therefore expect that the evolution of host use is constrained by historical contingency and the complexity of genetic interactions. In fact, the importance of historical contingency and epistasis for the evolution of specialization has been demonstrated empirically by experimental evolution in microbial systems: trade-offs between environments can appear after significant periods of cost-free adaptation (Satterwhite and Cooper 2015), and realized trade-offs can differ between replicate lineages (Rodríguez-Verdugo et al. 2014). On a rugged adaptive landscape, evolutionary trajectories to alternative resource-use strategies may be mutually exclusive, and the direction taken by each lineage can depend on stochastic factors such as mutation order (Elena and Lenski 2003).

If historical contingency and epistasis constrain the evolution of host use in plant-feeding insects, adaptations to one set of hosts may reduce the probability of adapting to another set of hosts, driving specialization over long evolutionary timescales. Analogous macroevolutionary trade-offs have been described in plants; alternative defensive strategies tend to be negatively correlated over plant evolutionary history (Campbell and Kessler 2013; Johnson et al. 2014). It remains unknown, however, whether the diversification of host-plant defenses has created trade-offs for plant-feeding insects.

Although trade-offs could arise from either genetic architecture or historical contingency, each of these mechanisms could instead produce positive interactions between use of distinct hosts. A single mutation might improve performance on multiple hosts, for instance, by improving an effector protein that inhibits a defensive pathway conserved across multiple plant species (Barrett and Heil 2012). Similarly, the appearance of a new enzyme class could create short-term trade-offs as the enzyme is calibrated to different hosts but long-term performance benefits across multiple hosts after gene duplication (e.g., cytochrome P450 monooxygenases; Li et al. 2003). It is also possible that the genetic factors affecting performance on alternative hosts are independent, experiencing purely neutral interactions on both micro- and macroevolutionary timescales.

One way to investigate the importance of evolutionary interactions between traits is to map the traits onto empirical phylogenies of extant species and ask whether the traits are correlated over the evolutionary history of the focal group (Maddison and FitzJohn 2015). Negative correlations across species suggest trade-offs (Shoval et al. 2012), although correlations alone cannot distinguish between mechanistic constraints and associations shaped by selection pressure (Agrawal et al. 2010). However, recently developed statistical methods allow the partitioning of correlations between species traits into phylogenetic and residual components (Hadfield and Nakagawa 2010). Macroevolutionary interactions driven by historical contingency in ancestral lineages should be apparent in correlations between traits over phylogenetic timescales, while microevolutionary interactions should be captured by residual variation—the evolution that has happened independently of the species' shared ancestry. Phylogenetic analyses, therefore, allow characterization of positive, negative, and neutral interactions between traits over both short and long evolutionary timescales (fig. 1).

Here we used phylogenetic methods to investigate interactions between adaptations to diverse host taxa over micro- and macroevolutionary timescales in two orders of plant-feeding insects: Lepidoptera (caterpillars) and Hemiptera (true bugs). Using digitized insect host-use records from North America, we estimated pairwise evolutionary correlations between use of common host-plant orders across hundreds of species in each insect order. We then combined the pairwise correlations into network graphs, revealing overall patterns of host-use evolution. We expected that use of the focal hosts would be mostly negatively correlated or clustered into discrete functional groups if specialization in plant-feeding insects is driven by widespread trade-offs between adaptations to different hosts. A distinction between micro- and macroevolutionary trade-offs could be made by asking whether the negative correlations appeared in the insects' residual or phylogenetic host-use variation. On the other hand, if specialization is not caused by trade-offs between adaptations to alternative hosts, we expected that correlations between host-use traits would be neutral or positive, with little overall network structure.

Material and Methods

Data Collection

Lepidopteran host-use data were downloaded from the HOSTS database (<http://nhm.ac.uk/hosts>; Robinson et al. 2015), a worldwide collection of published records of caterpillars successfully reared on host plants. Hemipteran host-use data were downloaded from the Tri-Trophic Thematic Collection Network database (<http://tcn.amnh.org>), a catalog of field-collected insect specimens and their associ-




Figure 1: Phylogenetic and residual evolutionary correlations between traits. Hypothetical scenarios of evolutionary correlation between herbivore presence on two hosts: negative phylogenetic correlation (A), positive phylogenetic correlation (B), negative residual correlation (C), positive residual correlation (D), negative phylogenetic and positive residual correlations (E), and positive phylogenetic and negative residual correlations (F). In each example, black squares on the left indicate which species in the herbivore phylogeny are present on host 1, and gray squares on the right indicate which species are present on host 2.

ated host plants at academic museums in the United States. These data sets differ in the nature of the host-use records (published rearing records vs. field observations), but each represents the best available host-use data for that insect order. For both data sets, we restricted our analysis to records from North America (all localities labeled USA, Canada, Mexico, or Nearctic). All plant taxonomic names were standardized with the Taxonomic Name Resolution Service (<http://tnrs.iplantcollaborative.org>; Boyle et al. 2013), while insect taxonomic names were standardized with the python package *TaxonNamesResolver* and the following reference databases: Aphid Species File (Favret 2015), Integrated Taxonomic Information System (<http://www.itis.gov>), and Catalogue of Life (<http://catalogueoflife.org>). We created binary presence/absence matrices of lepidopteran and hemipteran species by host-plant order, with insects considered present on all hosts for which they had at least one host-use record. To verify that potentially erroneous single observations of insect-by-host-order interactions were not driving our results, we also analyzed a second set of presence/absence matrices in which insects were considered present on a host-plant order only if they were observed feeding on at least two genera in that order.

To focus computational resources on host taxa with enough statistical power to detect evolutionary host-use interactions, we restricted our main analyses to focal host

orders used by at least 100 insect species in one insect order (~10% of the total focal insect species per order). However, we also categorized host use among host-plant families that met the same cutoff to verify that any correlations we observed between use of the focal host orders were not artifacts created by lumping diverse plant families within order-level host-use traits.

We estimated timescaled phylogenies for the North American lepidopteran and hemipteran species in our host-use data set using a phyloinformatic approach (for details, see appendix, available online). Phylogenetic data were not available for all species in the host-use data set, but there was an overlap of host-use and phylogenetic data for 1,604 lepidopteran species and 955 hemipteran species. Phylogenies and host-use data sets for these species are available in the Dryad Digital Repository: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5061/dryad.m0n46> (Peterson et al. 2016).

Statistical Analysis

We used the insect-species-by-plant-order presence/absence data to investigate whether our focal host-use traits were positively or negatively correlated across the insect species. These correlations quantified whether insect species present on plant order A were more or less likely to be present on plant order B than expected by chance. For

each insect order (Hemiptera and Lepidoptera) and each pairwise comparison between host-use traits, we set up a phylogenetic mixed model (Hadfield and Nakagawa 2010) with a logit link function (to accommodate binary data) using the package MCMCglmm (Hadfield 2010) in the R statistical environment (R Core Team 2015). We estimated both phylogenetic and residual correlations between the two host-use traits using the `random = ~us(trait):insect` and `rcov = ~us(trait):units` syntax (Hadfield 2010). Prior parameter distributions were specified as `prior <- list(R = list(V = diag(2), nu = 2), G = list(G1 = list(V = diag(2), nu = 2)))`, and the mean of the posterior distribution was taken as the final estimate for each parameter. All Markov chain Monte Carlo chains ran for 10 million iterations with a burn-in of 1 million iterations, and we evaluated the convergence of 10 chains for each model. Gelman-Rubin convergence analysis of each model's 10 chains produced potential scale reduction factors under 1.10 in every case (96% were under 1.01), suggesting that all chains successfully converged (Gelman and Rubin 1992).

After separately estimating all pairwise evolutionary correlations between the focal host-use traits, we evaluated two emergent properties of the host-use network as a whole. First, we calculated the mean of all correlations involving each host-use trait to summarize whether presence on that host tended to be positively or negatively correlated with presence on all other hosts. Second, we asked whether the host-use traits could be grouped into clusters that had positive correlations within them and negative correlations between them. To identify the most strongly supported clusters, we used a distance matrix calculated from the pairwise correlations between host-use traits to produce a dendrogram of associations between the traits. Agglomerative hierarchical clustering was performed with the centroid method of the `hclust` function in the R package `fastcluster` (Müllner 2013). After obtaining the dendrogram, we evaluated all possible cluster divisions produced by pruning the dendrogram at a single level (from broadest, with all host-use traits in a single cluster, to narrowest, with each host-use trait in its own cluster). The support for a given set of clusters was defined as the sum of all correlations between host-use traits in the same cluster minus the sum of all correlations between host-use traits in different clusters. Thus, positive correlations within clusters and negative correlations between clusters increased the support score, while negative correlations within clusters and positive correlations between clusters reduced the support score. The set of cluster divisions with the highest support score was chosen as the best characterization of network structure.

We tested the statistical significance of the empirical mean host-use trait correlations and overall network structure scores by comparing them to those calculated for 100 null data sets. Each null data set was generated by simulating independent Brownian motion of a continuous char-

acter for performance on each focal host order along the insect phylogenies, plus an equal amount of normally distributed residual variation in the performance values. We converted the resulting continuous host performance values to a binary host presence/absence character by assuming that only the insect species with the highest performance values for each host taxon were present on that host, with the threshold set by matching the number of species using that host in the empirical data (Felsenstein 2012). We then calculated all pairwise correlations between the host-use traits, mean correlations per host-use trait, and whole-network structure, as we did for the empirical data. Empirical host-use trait mean correlations and network-structure scores were considered statistically significant when a *Z*-test indicated less than a 5% chance of a value as extreme as the empirical value being randomly sampled from the distribution of that parameter's null data set values (which were approximately normally distributed).


Results

Host Use in Lepidoptera and Hemiptera

We obtained North American host-use records and phylogenetic data for 1,604 caterpillar species and 955 bug species (fig. 2). Eleven host-plant orders met our prevalence cutoff of 100 species from one insect order, and each of them met the cutoff for both Hemiptera and Lepidoptera: Asterales, Caryophyllales, Ericales, Fabales, Fagales, Lamiales, Malpighiales, Pinales, Poales, Rosales, and Sapindales. Interactions with these focal host-plant orders accounted for 77% of all insect-species-by-plant-order interactions in the Lepidoptera data set and 57% in the Hemiptera data set. Fewer host-plant families met the 100-insect prevalence cutoff. For Lepidoptera, these were Asteraceae, Betulaceae, Ericaceae, Fabaceae, Fagaceae, Pinaceae, Poaceae, Rosaceae, Salicaceae, and Sapindaceae; for Hemiptera, Asteraceae, Fabaceae, Fagaceae, and Rosaceae.

Host-Use Correlations

We recovered both positive and negative correlations between use of the focal host orders in the Lepidoptera but mostly positive correlations in the Hemiptera (fig. 3). The network of phylogenetic correlations between lepidopteran use of the focal host orders was significantly structured ($Z = 7.08$, $P < .0001$), revealing two large clusters of host taxa (fig. 4A). Cluster membership was phylogenetically diverse: the gymnosperm order Pinales (conifers) and monocot order Poales (grasses) were each affiliated with a different set of eudicot orders. Residual correlations between lepidopteran use of the focal host taxa also showed significant network structure ($Z = 9.86$, $P < .0001$), but on this timescale,






Figure 3: Empirical phylogenetic correlation by residual correlation plots of all 55 pairwise combinations of the focal host orders for Lepidoptera (A) and Hemiptera (B).

use of all angiosperm hosts formed a single cluster of mostly positive associations (fig. 4B). Use of Pinales was isolated from the angiosperm cluster, exhibiting a statistically significant negative mean pairwise correlation with use of the other hosts (-0.22 , $Z = -3.17$, $P = .0015$). In contrast, hemipteran host-use correlations indicated significant support for a single host-use cluster encompassing all focal hosts over both phylogenetic ($Z = 11.90$, $P < .0001$; fig. 4C) and residual timescales ($Z = 23.18$, $P < .0001$; fig. 4D).

The patterns of host-use correlations found in the more conservative data set (with each insect observed using at least two genera in each host-plant order) produced results nearly identical to those of the original analysis, though statistical power was reduced (fig. A1; figs. A1, A2 available online). Moreover, our analysis of correlations between use of the focal host-plant families also corroborated the network of evolutionary host-use associations revealed at the host-order level (fig. A2).

Discussion

Most models of the evolution of ecological specialization assume negative interactions (trade-offs) between adaptations to different environments (Ravigné et al. 2009), but such interactions could also be neutral or positive (Gompert et al. 2015; Peterson et al. 2015). Here we used a statistical, phylogenetic approach to estimate the micro- and macroevolutionary correlations between use of 11 common

host-plant orders in both caterpillars and true bugs. Our results suggest that distinct micro- and macroevolutionary trade-offs constrain host use in caterpillars, but use of all focal hosts are positively correlated on both timescales in true bugs. Overall, positive interactions between host-use adaptations appear to be more common than trade-offs in these plant-feeding insects.

We found some support for the idea that microevolutionary constraints (e.g., antagonistic pleiotropy) can produce host-use trade-offs in plant-feeding insects: lepidopteran presence on angiosperms was negatively correlated with presence on conifers over a short-term, phylogenetically independent timescale. This pattern suggests that caterpillar species tend to be found on either angiosperm or conifer hosts (not both), yet they can shift between these alternative host-plant clades over relatively short evolutionary timescales. Such trade-offs between labile but mutually exclusive host-use traits are particularly significant because they can promote rapid speciation (Nosil et al. 2002) and adaptive radiations (Farrell 1998; Janz et al. 2006). In this case, microevolutionary constraints appear to reflect ancient phylogenetic divergence between host clades (Soltis et al. 2011). A similar pattern of microevolutionary trade-offs between use of phylogenetically distant hosts has been observed in networks of ecological interactions between fleas and their mammal hosts (Hadfield et al. 2014) and pollinators and their plant hosts (Rafferty and Ives 2013). Nevertheless, the prevalence of such constraints in plant-

Figure 2: Maps of host-use traits on insect phylogenies. For each host-plant order, colored blocks indicate which insect species have been observed on that host. Insect species with no hosts shown were observed only on nonfocal hosts or had no host-use information associated with their locality records (Hemiptera only). Insect families (and one superfamily) are indicated around the phylogenies as follows: A, Lepidoptera—1 = Noctuoidea; 2 = Nymphalidae; 3 = Lycaenidae; 4 = Hesperidae; 5 = Pyralidae; 6 = Sphingidae; 7 = Saturniidae; 8 = Geometridae; 9 = Tortricidae; 10 = Gracillariidae. B, Hemiptera—11 = Cicadellidae; 12 = Membracidae; 13 = Cicadidae; 14 = Miridae; 15 = Tingidae; 16 = Pentatomidae; 17 = Scutelleridae; 18 = Coreidae; 19 = Rhopalidae; 20 = Lygaeidae; 21 = Delphacidae; 22 = Fulgoridae; 23 = Flatidae; 24 = Aphididae; 25 = Diaspididae; 26 = Coccidae; 27 = Pseudococcidae; 28 = Psylloidea; 29 = Aleyrodidae.




Figure 4: Network graphs of pairwise host-use trait correlations. *A*, Lepidoptera—phylogenetic correlations. *B*, Lepidoptera—residual correlations. *C*, Hemiptera—phylogenetic correlations. *D*, Hemiptera—residual correlations. Each vertex represents a host order, with vertex area proportional to the number of insects that were observed on that host. Positive interactions between presence on a pair of hosts are represented by solid black lines and negative correlations by dashed red lines, with line thickness proportional to the magnitude of the correlation. Network spatial structure was determined using the Kamada-Kawai (1989) algorithm, a force-directed layout method in which repulsion between vertices was proportional to the inverse of one plus the correlation values between the respective hosts. Vertices are labeled as follows: Ast. = Asterales; Car. = Caryophyllales; Eri. = Ericales; Fab. = Fabales; Fag. = Fagales; Lam. = Lamiales; Mal. = Malpighiales; Pin. = Pinales; Poa. = Poales; Ros. = Rosales; Sap. = Sapindales. Vertices are colored by taxonomic group: eudicots = blue; monocots = yellow; conifers = green. Statistically significant clusters ($P < .05$) are indicated by gray shading. Individual host orders with mean correlations of significantly higher magnitude than expected ($P < .05$) are indicated by bold vertex outlines (black = positive means; red = negative means).

feeding insects—for instance, between alternative host genera or species—remains unclear given that the single microevolutionary trade-off observed here occurred over the largest phylogenetic distance present among our focal host-plant taxa.

Most theoretical work on host-use evolution has focused on microevolutionary trade-offs, but we found that host-use constraints can also act over longer, macroevolutionary timescales. Over the phylogeny of the Lepidoptera, we observed a negative correlation between presence on

hosts in two large, taxonomically diverse clusters. Interestingly, the clusters appeared to be divided by morphology rather than phylogeny, with predominantly woody plant taxa (e.g., Pinales, Fagales) in one cluster and predominantly herbaceous taxa (e.g., Asterales, Poales) in the other. This pattern could reflect a long-term trade-off for lepidopteran lineages between use of alternative host growth forms or the habitats where those growth forms are found (Futuyma 1976; Janz and Nylin 1998). However, it is difficult to attribute macroevolutionary patterns to any particular mechanism. The phylogenetic correlations we detected here could be driven by any number of processes, including the accumulation of epistatic interactions (Weinreich et al. 2005; Remold 2012), evolutionary feedback between host performance and host choice (Whitlock 1996; Ravigné et al. 2009), or geographic specificity of plant and insect lineages (Hadfield et al. 2014). Regardless, host specificity in the Lepidoptera is clearly influenced by macroevolutionary processes that may be undetectable within a single insect population.

In contrast to the patterns observed in the Lepidoptera, the Hemiptera showed mostly positive associations between use of all focal host taxa over both micro- and macroevolutionary timescales. This surprising result suggests that adaptations to one host also increase fitness, on average, on all other hosts (Peterson et al. 2015). Moreover, hemipteran generalism appears completely unrestrained by host taxonomy even over very long timescales, leading to the evolution of both super-generalist species and clades where generalist strategies are common (Normark and Johnson 2011). However, we do not account for differences in fecundity between specialist and generalist insects on particular hosts; it may be that generalists usually have lower fitness—that is, they are jacks-of-all-trades, masters of none (Futuyma and Moreno 1988). Nevertheless, costs of generalism have been difficult to document (Forister et al. 2012; Gompert et al. 2015), so the positive residual correlations we observed may instead represent evolutionary breakthroughs made possible by novel mechanisms of phenotypic plasticity or other generalist adaptations (Barrett and Heil 2012).

There are many differences between Lepidoptera and Hemiptera (and between the two data sets analyzed here), but their fundamentally distinct relationships with host plants may be important to understanding why evolutionary interactions between host-use traits appear to be different in the two groups (Pires and Guimarães 2012). Hemiptera are sucking insects, while Lepidoptera are generally leaf chewers (Forister et al. 2015). These two feeding modes elicit different modes of plant defensive responses (Ali and Agrawal 2012), and sap sucking may be particularly amenable to generalist adaptations that circumvent host defenses (Barrett and Heil 2012). In contrast, Lepidoptera often rely on specialized enzymes to detoxify defensive chemicals

(Berenbaum and Feeny 2008), which may constrain the evolution of generalism, although generalist Lepidoptera do exist, possibly powered by phenotypic plasticity in enzyme expression (Yu et al. 1979; Li et al. 2002).

Overall, the relatively few broadscale trade-offs found here fail to explain the prevalence of specialization in plant-feeding insects, which are often restricted to hosts in a single plant family or genus (Forister et al. 2015). Our main analysis grouped hosts by order, obscuring potential variation within orders in defensive strategies; host-plant families or genera with strong or physiologically unique defenses may be more likely to produce trade-offs for plant-feeding insects than host-plant taxa with weaker or more common defenses. However, our analysis of evolutionary correlations between use of common host-plant families revealed results nearly identical to those for the focal host-plant orders. Moreover, a previous study of genus-level host use in the large hemipteran family Diaspididae found positive correlations between use of all hosts but one within a network of 64 taxonomically diverse host genera (Peterson et al. 2015), indicating that greater taxonomic resolution does not necessarily reveal trade-offs between host-use traits.

We also took a broad approach in looking for correlations between host-use traits across whole insect orders, thereby overlooking any idiosyncratic trade-offs that may arise from the unique natural history of individual insect species. Species-specific trade-offs have been documented (e.g., Nosil et al. 2002), yet our results suggest that few microevolutionary trade-offs constrain host use across large numbers of insect species. Thus, although trade-offs may emerge at any time due to novel epistatic interactions (Remold 2012; Satterwhite and Cooper 2015), the fact that generalist species frequently escape such trade-offs suggests that long-term evolutionary interactions between host-use traits are dominated by positively pleiotropic or neutral adaptations.

It is important to note that our conclusions reflect the particular data we analyzed. Research and publication biases have undoubtedly influenced the insect species that appear in our host-use databases, as well as those for which genetic sequences are available. It may be that insect pests, which are often polyphagous, are overrepresented, which could bias our analyses in favor of positive correlations. Moreover, our analyses are restricted to North American insects, which tend to be more polyphagous than tropical insects (Dyer et al. 2007; Forister et al. 2015; but see Hardy et al. 2015 for a counterexample in the Hemiptera). Another limitation of our approach is that we could only analyze host-use trait relationships between host-plant taxa used by at least 10% of the insect species present in our databases. Thus, we were not able to look for trade-offs between hosts that are used by few Hemiptera and Lepidoptera. Ultimately, we can conclude that persistent trade-offs between

taxonomically broad host groups do not appear to be the most important factor limiting host breadth in North American Lepidoptera or Hemiptera, but more focused studies of well-characterized insect families or genera will be necessary to evaluate whether trade-offs act over taxonomic scales or ecological axes not considered here.

Trade-offs play an intuitive and possibly inescapable role in constraining performance across multiple tasks (Shoval et al. 2012), but performance limits may not define the ecological niches of plant-feeding insects. Alternative factors, such as mate finding (Hawthorne and Via 2002), natural enemies (Singer and Stireman 2005), or neural constraints in host identification (Bernays 2001), may shape the evolution of each species' ecological niche. Host range may also be limited by genetic drift even if adaptive interactions between host-use traits are positive or neutral (Gompert et al. 2015). Specialization by drift might be particularly significant in a geographical context, as interactions between host range and geographical range can strongly affect the host-use selection pressures experienced by an insect lineage (Janz and Nylin 2008). In the absence of much evidence for negative interactions between host-use adaptations in plant-feeding insects, we should consider neutral models both for the structure of ecological networks (Canard et al. 2014) and for how those networks evolve over time.

Acknowledgments

We thank L. Doubleday, S. Heard, D. Moen, S. Noda, S. Nylin, A. Porter, and anonymous reviewers for comments that improved the manuscript. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation (EF-1115191 and DEB-1258001).

Literature Cited

- Agrawal, A. A., J. K. Conner, and S. Rasmann. 2010. Tradeoffs and negative correlations in evolutionary ecology. Pages 243–268 in Michael A. Bell, Douglas J. Futuyma, Walter F. Eanes, and Jeffrey S. Levinton, eds. *Evolution since Darwin: the first 150 years*. Sinauer, Sunderland, MA.
- Ali, J. G., and A. A. Agrawal. 2012. Specialist versus generalist insect herbivores and plant defense. *Trends in Plant Science* 17: 293–302.
- Barrett, L. G., and M. Heil. 2012. Unifying concepts and mechanisms in the specificity of plant-enemy interactions. *Trends in Plant Science* 17:282–292.
- Berenbaum, M. R., and P. P. Feeny. 2008. Chemical mediation of host-plant specialization: the papilionid paradigm. Pages 3–19 in Kelley J. Tilmon, ed. *Specialization, speciation, and radiation: the evolutionary biology of herbivorous insects*. University of California Press, Oakland.
- Bernays, E. A. 2001. Neural limitations in phytophagous insects: implications for diet breadth and evolution of host affiliation. *Annual Review of Entomology* 46:703–727.
- Boyle, B., N. Hopkins, Z. Lu, J. A. Raygoza Garay, D. Mozzherin, T. Rees, N. Matasci, et al. 2013. The taxonomic name resolution service: an online tool for automated standardization of plant names. *BMC Bioinformatics* 14:16.
- Campbell, S. A., and A. Kessler. 2013. Plant mating system transitions drive the macroevolution of defense strategies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* 110:3973–3978.
- Canard, E. F., N. Mouquet, D. Mouillot, M. Stanko, D. Miklisova, and D. Gravel. 2014. Empirical evaluation of neutral interactions in host-parasite networks. *American Naturalist* 183:468–479.
- Dyer, L. A., M. S. Singer, J. T. Lill, J. O. Stireman, G. L. Gentry, R. J. Marquis, R. E. Ricklefs, et al. 2007. Host specificity of Lepidoptera in tropical and temperate forests. *Nature* 448:696–699.
- Elena, S. F., and R. E. Lenski. 2003. Evolution experiments with microorganisms: the dynamics and genetic bases of adaptation. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 4:457–469.
- Farrell, B. D. 1998. “Inordinate fondness” explained: why are there so many beetles? *Science* 281:555–559.
- Favret, C. 2015. Aphid species file. <http://aphid.speciesfile.org>.
- Felsenstein, J. 2012. A comparative method for both discrete and continuous characters using the threshold model. *American Naturalist* 179:145–156.
- Forister, M. L., L. A. Dyer, M. Singer, J. O. Stireman, and J. T. Lill. 2012. Revisiting the evolution of ecological interactions. *Ecology* 93:981–991.
- 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 USA* 112:442–447.
- Fry, J. 1996. The evolution of host specialization: are trade-offs overrated? *American Naturalist* 148(suppl.):S84–S107.
- Futuyma, D. J. 1976. Food plant specialization and environmental predictability in Lepidoptera. *American Naturalist* 110:285–292.
- . 2008. Sympatric speciation: norm or exception? Pages 136–147 in Kelley J. Tilmon, ed. *Specialization, speciation, and radiation: the evolutionary biology of herbivorous insects*. University of California Press, Oakland.
- 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 USA* 106:18054–18061.
- Futuyma, D. J., M. Keese, and D. J. Funk. 1995. Genetic constraints on macroevolution: the evolution of host affiliation in the leaf beetle genus *Ophraella*. *Evolution* 49:797–809.
- Futuyma, D. J., and G. Moreno. 1988. The evolution of ecological specialization. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 19:207–233.
- Gelman, A., and D. B. Rubin. 1992. Inference from iterative simulation using multiple sequences. *Statistical Science* 7:457–472.
- Gompert, Z., J. P. Jahner, C. F. Scholl, J. S. Wilson, L. K. Lucas, V. Soria-Carrasco, J. A. Fordyce, C. C. Nice, C. A. Buerkle, and M. L. Forister. 2015. The evolution of novel host use is unlikely to be constrained by trade-offs or a lack of genetic variation. *Molecular Ecology* 24:2777–2793.
- Hadfield, J. D. 2010. MCMC methods for multi-response generalized linear mixed models: the MCMCglmm R package. *Journal of Statistical Software* 33:1–22.
- Hadfield, J. D., B. R. Krasnov, R. Poulin, and S. Nakagawa. 2014. A tale of two phylogenies: comparative analyses of ecological interactions. *American Naturalist* 183:174–187.


- Hadfield, J. D., and S. Nakagawa. 2010. General quantitative genetic methods for comparative biology: phylogenies, taxonomies and multi-trait models for continuous and categorical characters. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 23:494–508.
- Hardy, N. B., D. A. Peterson, and B. B. Normark. 2015. Scale insect host ranges are broader in the tropics. *Biology Letters* 11:20150924.
- Hawthorne, D. J., and S. Via. 2002. The genetic architecture of ecological specialization: correlated gene effects on host use and habitat choice in pea aphids. *American Naturalist* 159(suppl.):S76–S88.
- Janz, N., and S. Nylin. 1998. Butterflies and plants: a phylogenetic study. *Evolution* 52:486–502.
- . 2008. The oscillation hypothesis of host-plant range and speciation. Pages 203–215 in Kelley J. Tilmon, ed. *Specialization, speciation, and radiation: the evolutionary biology of herbivorous insects*. University of California Press, Oakland.
- Janz, N., S. Nylin, and N. Wahlberg. 2006. Diversity begets diversity: host expansions and the diversification of plant-feeding insects. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 6:4.
- Johnson, M. T. J., A. R. Ives, J. Ahern, and J. P. Salminen. 2014. Macroevolution of plant defenses against herbivores in the evening primroses. *New Phytologist* 203:267–279.
- Joshi, A., and J. N. Thompson. 1995. Trade-offs and the evolution of host specialization. *Evolutionary Ecology* 9:82–92.
- Kamada, T., and S. Kawai. 1989. An algorithm for drawing general undirected graphs. *Information Processing Letters* 31:7–15.
- Li, W., M. A. Schuler, and M. R. Berenbaum. 2003. Diversification of furanocoumarin-metabolizing cytochrome P450 monooxygenases in two papilionids: specificity and substrate encounter rate. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* 100:14593–14598.
- Li, X., M. A. Schuler, and M. R. Berenbaum. 2002. Jasmonate and salicylate induce expression of herbivore cytochrome P450 genes. *Nature* 419:712–715.
- Maddison, W. P., and R. G. FitzJohn. 2015. The unsolved challenge to phylogenetic correlation tests for categorical characters. *Systematic Biology* 64:127–136.
- Müllner, D. 2013. *fastcluster*: fast hierarchical, agglomerative clustering routines for R and Python. *Journal of Statistical Software* 53:1–18.
- Normark, B. B., and N. A. Johnson. 2011. Niche explosion. *Genetica* 139:551–564.
- Nosil, P., B. J. Crespi, and C. P. Sandoval. 2002. Host-plant adaptation drives the parallel evolution of reproductive isolation. *Nature* 417:440–443.
- Nurmi, T., and K. Parvinen. 2011. Joint evolution of specialization and dispersal in structured metapopulations. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 275:78–92.
- Peterson, D. A., N. B. Hardy, G. E. Morse, I. C. Stocks, A. Okusu, and B. B. Normark. 2015. Phylogenetic analysis reveals positive correlations between adaptations to diverse hosts in a group of pathogen-like herbivores. *Evolution* 69:2785–2792.
- Peterson, D. A., N. B. Hardy, and B. B. Normark. 2016. Data from: Micro- and macroevolutionary trade-offs in plant-feeding insects. *American Naturalist*, Dryad Digital Repository, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5061/dryad.m0n46>.
- Pires, M. M., and P. R. Guimarães. 2012. Interaction intimacy organizes networks of antagonistic interactions in different ways. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, rsif20120649.
- Rafferty, N. E., and A. R. Ives. 2013. Phylogenetic trait-based analyses of ecological networks. *Ecology* 94:2321–2333.
- Ravnigné, V., U. Dieckmann, and I. Olivieri. 2009. Live where you thrive: joint evolution of habitat choice and local adaptation facilitates specialization and promotes diversity. *American Naturalist* 174:E141–E169.
- R Core Team. 2015. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Remold, S. 2012. Understanding specialism when the jack of all trades can be the master of all. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 279:4861–4869.
- Robinson, G. S., P. R. Ackery, I. J. Kitching, G. W. Beccaloni, and L. M. Hernández. 2015. HOSTS: a database of the world's lepidopteran hostplants. Natural History Museum, London.
- Rodriguez-Verdugo, A., D. Carrillo-Cisneros, A. Gonzalez-Gonzalez, B. S. Gaut, and A. F. Bennett. 2014. Different tradeoffs result from alternate genetic adaptations to a common environment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* 111:12121–12126.
- Satterwhite, R. S., and T. F. Cooper. 2015. Constraints on adaptation of *Escherichia coli* to mixed-resource environments increase over time. *Evolution* 69:2067–2078.
- Scheirs, J., K. Jordaens, and L. De Bruyn. 2005. Have genetic trade-offs in host use been overlooked in arthropods? *Evolutionary Ecology* 19:551–561.
- Scriber, J. M. 2010. Integrating ancient patterns and current dynamics of insect-plant interactions: taxonomic and geographic variation in herbivore specialization. *Insect Science* 17:471–507.
- Shoval, O., H. Sheftel, G. Shinar, Y. Hart, O. Ramote, A. Mayo, E. Dekel, K. Kavanagh, and U. Alon. 2012. Evolutionary trade-offs, Pareto optimality, and the geometry of phenotype space. *Science* 336:1157–1160.
- Singer, M. S., and J. O. Stireman. 2005. The tri-trophic niche concept and adaptive radiation of phytophagous insects. *Ecology Letters* 8:1247–1255.
- Soltis, D. E., S. A. Smith, N. Cellinese, K. J. Wurdack, D. C. Tank, S. F. Brockington, N. F. Refulio-Rodriguez, et al. 2011. Angiosperm phylogeny: 17 genes, 640 taxa. *American Journal of Botany* 98:704–730.
- Weinreich, D. M., R. A. Watson, and L. Chao. 2005. Perspective: sign epistasis and genetic constraint on evolutionary trajectories. *Evolution* 59:1165–1174.
- Whitlock, M. C. 1996. The red queen beats the jack-of-all-trades: the limitations on the evolution of phenotypic plasticity and niche breadth. *American Naturalist* 148(suppl.):S65–S77.
- Yu, S. J., R. E. Berry, and L. C. Terriere. 1979. Host plant stimulation of detoxifying enzymes in a phytophagous insect. *Pesticide Biochemistry and Physiology* 12:280–284.

References Cited Only in the Online Appendixes

- Kononova, E. L. 1977. New aphid species (Homoptera, Aphidinea) from the Upper Cretaceous deposits of the Taymyr. *Revue d'Entomologie de l'URSS* 56:588–600.
- Kristensen, N. P., and A. W. Skalski. 1998. Phylogeny and palaeontology. Pages 7–25 in N. P. Kristensen, ed. *Lepidoptera, moths and butterflies*. Vol. 1. Evolution, systematics, and biogeography. *Handbook of zoology*. Vol. IV. Arthropoda: insecta, part 35. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Labandeira, C. C., D. L. Dilcher, D. R. Davis, and D. L. Wagner. 1994. Ninety-seven million years of angiosperm-insect association: paleobiological insights into the meaning of coevolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* 91:12278–12282.

- Misof, B., S. Liu, K. Meusemann, R. S. Peters, A. Donath, C. Mayer, P. B. Frandsen, et al. 2014. Phylogenomics resolves the timing and pattern of insect evolution. *Science* 346:763–767.
- Popov, Y. A. 1971. Historical development of the infraorder Nepomorpha (Heteroptera). *Trudy Paleontologicheskogo Instituta Akademii Nauk SSSR* 129:1–121.
- Smith, S. A., J. M. Beaulieu, and M. J. Donoghue. 2009. Mega-phylogeny approach for comparative biology: an alternative to supertree and supermatrix approaches. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 9:37.
- Smith, S. A., and B. C. O'Meara. 2012. treePL: divergence time estimation using penalized likelihood for large phylogenies. *Bioinformatics* 28:2689–2690.
- Sohn, J.-C., C. Labandeira, D. Davis, and C. Mitter. 2012. An annotated catalog of fossil and subfossil Lepidoptera (Insecta: Holometabola) of the world. *Zootaxa* 3286:1–132.
- Stamatakis, A. 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of large phylogenies. *Bioinformatics* 30:1312–1313.
- Szwedo, J., and A. Nel. 2011. The oldest aphid insect from the Middle Triassic of the Vosges, France. *Acta Palaeontologica Polonica* 56:757–766.
- Vea, I. M., and D. A. Grimaldi. 2015. Diverse new scale insects (Hemiptera: Coccoidea) in amber from the Cretaceous and Eocene with a phylogenetic framework for fossil Coccoidea. *American Museum Novitates* 3823:1–15.
- Wahlberg, N., C. W. Wheat, and C. Peña. 2013. Timing and patterns in the taxonomic diversification of Lepidoptera (butterflies and moths). *PLoS ONE* 8:1–8.

Associate Editor: Stephen B. Heard
Editor: Yannis Michalakis



Haplophlebiium Barnesii. A curious neuropterous insect, of large size, probably allied to our May-flies; taken by Mr. Barnes from the coal of Cape Breton." From "The Insects of Ancient America" by S. H. Scudder (*The American Naturalist* 1868, 1:625–631).