



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

When sexual signallers are choosers too

Zweerus, N.L.

Publication date
2022

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Zweerus, N. L. (2022). *When sexual signallers are choosers too*.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

1 | General introduction

Naomi L. Zweerus

Sexual selection is a potent evolutionary force

Sexual selection is a strong evolutionary force and comprises any selection that results from fitness differences associated with non-random mating success (reviewed in Shuker & Kvarnemo, 2021). The concept of sexual selection was proposed by Darwin because the evolution of exaggerated sexual ornaments, like the peacocks' tail and the long tails of male widowbirds (Andersson, 1982, 1994), could not be explained by natural selection alone (Darwin, 1871). Only a preference and thus selection for such extreme sexual signals can explain their evolution (Fisher, 1930; Majerus, 1986). However, it is not only selection for extremes but also the selection for intermediate trait values that can impact signal evolution. If the risk of hybridization between populations with similar sexual signals is high, the average signal of the population should be preferred. Stabilizing selection drives populations towards a mean trait value and increases the difference between populations with similar sexual signals. This results in divergence of sexual signals which may cause reproductive isolation between populations. Closely related species indeed often differ strongly in their sexual traits, suggesting that sexual selection may drive speciation (Price, 1998; Ritchie, 2007). Two main mechanisms underlie this potent evolutionary force: competition and mate choice.

The two mechanisms of sexual selection**Competition (within sexes)**

Individuals of the same sex may compete for partners. Male traits involved in competition that have evolved into elaborate ornaments provide some popular examples of sexual selection. Examples of these traits can be found in the antlers of male deer, the horns of beetles, or the proboscis of male elephant seals. Winners of inter-male competition obtain access to fertile females and thus can reproduce (Andersson, 1994). While combat between males for access to females (contest competition) is probably the most illustrative example, competition can also relate to locating prospective mates fastest (scramble competition) and/or to enduring prolonged reproductive activity (endurance rivalry) (Andersson, 1994; Shuker & Kvarnemo, 2021). Selection for traits occurs whenever they confer a competitive advantage.

Mate choice (between sexes)

When potential partners vary in quality, mating investment is high, and/or there is a chance of attracting alternative partners, individuals can benefit from selecting mating partners (Parker, 1983; Kokko & Johnstone, 2002). These benefits may affect immediate reproductive success (direct benefits), for instance by influencing access to territories, resources, or parental care (Andersson, 1994), or the genetic quality of offspring (indirect benefits) (Fisher, 1930; Møller & Jennions, 2001; Kokko et al., 2003; Andersson & Simmons, 2006). In general, mate choice is the "process that occurs whenever the effects of traits expressed in one sex leads to non-random allocation of reproductive investment with members of the opposite sex" (Edward, 2015). The expressed traits are sexual signals and provide information about the sender. Signals underlying mate choice can be behavioural, morphological, or physiological traits (or a combination thereof) that comprise an individual's attractiveness to the opposite sex. Attractive signals can indicate good quality of the sender (sometimes referred to as honest signals (Zahavi, 1977; Grafen, 1990;

Johnstone, 1995)). Variation in quality, related to genetic quality and/or physiological condition, therefore leads to variation in sexual signals and allows receivers of the signal to differentially assess partners.

Two signallers and two choosers

Communication is key to the process of selection by mate choice; the chosen sex signals to the choosing sex, who responds to the sexual advertisement in discriminative manner. The conventional perspective on mate choice is that one sex signals while the other sex responds. However, males and females within a species can both be reciprocal signallers and responders. Thus, both sexes send sexual signals and both sexes choose partners. Such mutual mate choice can be expected when both sexes invest in mating and show similar variance in reproductive success (Trivers, 1972), and when both sexes vary in quality (Parker, 1983; Johnstone et al., 1996; Bergstrom & Real, 2000). Mate choice by both sexes has been mostly recognised in birds (Kraaijeveld et al., 2007) and is most often observed in mating systems with biparental care (e.g., Zebra finches *Poephilia guttata* (Burley, 1986)), but might be more common than originally thought (e.g., Bonduriansky, 2001; Cotton et al., 2006; Edward & Chapman, 2011; Rosenthal, 2017). When males and females are mutual choosers, selection by both sexes can significantly increase the number and interactions of selective forces on sexual signals.

Mutual mate choice can be on the same type or on different types of signals

If males and females are reciprocal signallers, their signals can be the same type or different types of signals. The same types of signals have the same sensory modality and share an underlying biosynthetic pathway. Mutual mate choice on the same type of signal has been found in birds (Kraaijeveld et al., 2007), where both sexes may select partners based on plumage colouration (Amundsen et al., 1997), crests (Jones & Hunter, 1993, 1999), or sexually monomorphic songs (Langmore, 1998). Some insects also produce monomorphic acoustic signals to attract partners (Henry et al., 2002, 2013).

Different types of sexual signals operate via different sensory modalities, do not share an underlying biosynthetic pathway and/or are produced by different tissues. For instance, female mantids attract males from a distance using sex pheromones (Hurd et al., 2004; Holwell et al., 2007; Maxwell et al., 2010; Mahmudunnabi & Barry, 2019), while males rely on visual cues for mate choice (Roeder, 1935; Edmunds, 1975; Maxwell, 1999; Barry et al., 2015). Evidence is also accumulating to show that birds may use different signal types for mate choice. For example, male ducks impress with their colourful plumage while several lines of evidence show that females emit chemical signals, although their function as sexual signals is controversial (Wyatt, 2003; Caro & Balthazart, 2010). Signals that are derived through different biosynthetic pathways have been found in chemical signals. For example, in arctiid moths, females synthesise a sex pheromone in a pheromone gland or in specialised cells (oenocytes) (Conner et al., 1980; Bendib & Minet, 1998), while males produce a different sex pheromone consisting of derivatives of ingested secondary plant metabolites (Nishida, 2002; Henneken et al., 2017).

Evolutionary consequences of mutual mate choice depend on whether the choice is based on the same or different signals

When mutual mate choice is based on the same signal, then selection pressure operates from (at least) two sides. Sexual selection theory predicts stabilizing selection for traits used in species recognition, whereas directional selection can be expected for traits that are used to assess mate quality (Fisher, 1930; Johansson & Jones, 2007). Mutual mate choice may thus lead to both directional and stabilizing selection when acting on the same type of sexual signal produced by both sexes and interaction effects may occur. However, mutual mate choice may also target different traits in which case the evolution of each signal needs to be considered separately. Female and male sexual signals and preferences may evolve independently depending on whether the traits are correlated, either biosynthetically and/or genetically (Kirkpatrick & Hall, 2004; Sæther et al., 2007). To identify the direction and strength of sexual selection on sexual signals, it is necessary to determine a) whether there is mutual mate choice, and b) whether the same or different types of signals are used by each sex for mate choice.

Sexual signals can be under sexual and natural selection

Sexual and natural selection are not mutually exclusive. While sexually selected traits create a mating advantage, they can have a survival disadvantage. Hence, natural selection will affect the elaboration of these traits, as elaboration is associated with costs. Costs can be related to higher resource investment for developing the trait (e.g., bigger size (e.g. Chown & Gaston, 2010) or more intense colouration (e.g., Hill, 1996; Kodric-Brown, 1998)) but also increased mortality. Predation risk may increase because predators use the signal to locate the prey and parasitoids may follow the hosts' sexual signal (e.g., Zuk & Kolluru, 1998; Rosenthal et al., 2001; Woods et al., 2007; Johnson & Candolin, 2017). In the example of male widowbirds, the long tails come at a cost, as they require resources to develop and make it harder for males to fly (Andersson, 1994). However, such costly ornaments can indicate quality and are therefore sexually selected (Zahavi, 1975). These signals evolve under opposing selection pressures of natural and sexual selection.

A scenario where natural and sexual selection act in concert is when pre-existing sensory systems become attuned to sexual signals (sensory bias). For example, if a female preference initially developed in the context of food preference, while the male traits that developed later are attuned to the same stimulus (reviewed in Andersson & Simmons, 2006). In this case, natural selection precedes sexual selection. Depending on the context, natural and sexual selection pressures may act in the same or opposite direction and ultimately shape sexual communication.

Sexual communication in moths is relevant for species recognition

Moths are famous for their chemical sexual communication and are among the most diverse group of animals with about 120.000 species identified (Bazin et al., 2013). Every species has its own sexual communication channel. Sexual communication of moths has been well studied but mostly in terms of species-specific long-range female sex pheromone blends to attract males (Vickers & Baker, 1997; Baker & Vickers, 1997; Wyatt, 2003; Cardé & Haynes, 2004; El-Sayed, 2011). Females emit a sex pheromone from an everted ovipositor in a behaviour termed 'calling'

(Gaston & Shorey, 1964; Gentry et al., 1964; Tumlinson et al., 1975; McNeil, 1991; Wedell, 2005). Males navigate to conspecific females in a characteristic zig-zag flight (Baker, 1986; Vickers & Baker, 1997; Vickers, 2002). Mate choice for species recognition is a crucial and well-studied aspect in species where mate signals overlap between closely related species (Löfstedt, 1993; Price, 1998; Cardé & Haynes, 2004; Symonds & Elgar, 2008). Since hybrids are sterile (Harrison & Doncaster, 1914; Pair et al., 1977; Laster, 1972; Laster & Hardee, 1995; Wang & Dong, 2001), errors in species-recognition are selected against. The mean signal is preferred to minimize interspecific attraction, which leads to stabilizing selection (Paterson, 1985; Löfstedt, 1993; Linn et al., 1997; Zhu et al., 1997; Droney et al., 2012). However, stabilizing selection cannot explain the high diversity of sexual signals in moths (Greenfield, 1981; Löfstedt, 1993; Symonds & Elgar, 2008).

Moth sexual communication includes long-range females signals and short-range male signals

A central paradox in evolutionary biology is how within-species variation in sexual signals is maintained when strong stabilizing selection should deplete variation in these traits. Different selection pressures than those which are generally assumed must be the reason that intraspecific variation in these traits is maintained (De Pasqual et al., 2021). So far, our understanding of sexual selection pressures on moth sexual signals has been predominantly based on the male preference for the female sex pheromone. Despite the fact that males of many moths possess elaborate scent structures (androconia or hairpencils) and emit volatiles at close range (Grant, 1970; Teal & Tumlinson, 1989; Birch et al., 1990), female mate choice in moths has been neglected (but see Iyengar & Eisner, 1999). If both sexes execute mate choice, selection pressures may be fundamentally different than when only one sex chooses. Male and female behaviours combined might explain how variation is maintained, because mutual mate choice is likely to result in selection pressures that can maintain variation (Jennions & Petrie, 1997; Pryke & Griffith, 2007). Establishing the existence of female mate choice and deciphering the effect of selection by female mate choice, and eventually mutual mate choice, is thus the first step to a better understanding of sexual signal evolution. We can hypothesize that by shifting the focus to female mate choice and male sexual signals (i.e., the male hairpencil pheromone), we can unravel how intraspecific variation in sexual signals can be maintained.

Are both sexes of the tobacco budworm *Chloridea (Heliothis) virescens* (Fabricius, 1777) signallers and responders?

Chemical sexual communication of the tobacco budworm *Chloridea (Heliothis) virescens* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) has been extensively studied, with a focus on the female sex pheromone. Females emit a species-specific pheromone blend to attract males (Löfstedt, 1993; Cardé & Haynes, 2004) (Fig. 1). Both males and females mate only once a night, but several times over multiple nights (Flint & Kressin, 1968; Raulston et al., 1975; Pair et al., 1977; Gao et al., 2020). This polygamous mating pattern benefits both sexes as offspring number increases with multiple matings (Gao et al., 2020). During mating, which generally lasts 2-3 hours (Pair et al., 1977; Blanco et al., 2009; Hosseini et al., 2016), the male ejaculate transforms into a spermatophore (LaMunyon, 2000; Blanco et al., 2009). A spermatophore can weigh up to 5% of

the male's body weight (LaMunyon, 2000; Blanco et al., 2009). When females mate with different males, sperm from various males fertilizes eggs (LaMunyon & Eisner, 1993; LaMunyon, 2000; Blanco et al., 2008).




Fig. 1. Sexual communication in the tobacco budworm *C. virescens* depicted as a) female sex pheromone as a long-range attractant and b) male short-range signals during courtship. (Foto credits: Jan van Arkel, Naomi L. Zweerus)

Attracted males extrude their hairpencils upon arrival and emit a pheromone that is biosynthetically related to the female sex pheromone (Hendricks & Shaver, 1975; Teal et al., 1981; Teal & Tumlinson, 1989) (Fig. 1). Males perfume females with pheromone during copulation, which has anti-aphrodisiac effects on other males (Hosseini et al., 2016). Like males, females use the male hairpencil pheromone for species recognition (Hillier & Vickers, 2004). Whether these chemicals are also involved in female mate choice is unknown (Teal et al., 1981; Birch & Hefetz, 1987; Hillier & Vickers, 2004), and empirical support is, as yet, lacking. The main aim of this thesis was thus to determine if *C. virescens* females choose males and if so, to investigate the male signal underlying female mate choice.

Outline of the thesis

In chapter 2, I investigated whether female mate choice in *C. virescens* exists, and to what extent the male hairpencil pheromone affects female mating decisions. The study is to our knowledge the first comprehensive study on female mate choice in noctuid moths, and provides empirical evidence that also 'the other sex' (i.e., females) assess and discriminate among courters.

In chapter 3, I tested the extent to which female mating status affects female sexual behaviour and mate choice, in a species in which females are not only choosers but also signallers. By signalling, females can adjust the arrival rate of males and thus signalling increase the female's chance of mating. Theory predicts that non-signalling virgin females should not be choosy because the risk of remaining unmated is high, signalling virgins may be choosy since they can

actively attract males. I evaluated these predictions from theory on non-signalling females in signalling females.

In chapter 4, I deciphered if two newly described, nutrition-derived compounds of the *C. virescens* male hairpencil pheromone could underlie female mate choice. Males sequester these secondary metabolites after ingestion in the larval and adult stage. Since the amount of methyl salicylate (MeSA) and δ -decalactone (decalactone) both correlated positively with male pupal mass, I tested the hypothesis that female preference for larger males would result in more choices for males with higher amount of MeSA and/or decalactone.

In chapter 5, I looked at the chemical compounds on male and female legs of three closely-related moth species, and sought to identify the biological role of pheromone on moth legs. Since I determined tactile interactions during courtship (see chapter 2), I recognized a potential for alternative chemical communication. Furthermore, I explored whether the pheromone compounds on legs act as oviposition-detering signals, which does not seem to be the case. I then tested these chemicals for antimicrobial properties as an alternative function of pheromone compounds.

In chapter 6, I discuss the findings in relation to the main aim of the thesis and in a broader scientific context.

REFERENCES

- Ache BW, Young JM. Olfaction: diverse species, conserved principles. *Neuron*. 2005;48(3):417–30.
- Amundsen T, Forsgren E, Hansen LT. On the function of female ornaments: male bluethroats prefer colourful females. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*. 1997;264(1388):1579–86.
- Andersson M. Female choice selects for extreme tail length in a widowbird. *Nature*. 1982;299(5886):818–20.
- Andersson M. *Sexual selection*. Vol. 72. Princeton University Press; 1994.
- Andersson M, Simmons LW. Sexual selection and mate choice. *Trends in ecology & evolution*. 2006;21(6):296–302.
- Baker T. Pheromone-modulated movements of flying moths. *Mechanisms in insect Olfaction*. 1986;39–48.
- Baker TC, Vickers NJ. Pheromone-mediated flight in moths. In: *Insect Pheromone Research*. Springer; 1997. p. 248–64.
- Bargmann CI. Comparative chemosensation from receptors to ecology. *Nature*. 2006;444(7117):295–301.
- Barry KL, White TE, Rathnayake DN, Fabricant SA, Herberstein ME. Sexual signals for the colour-blind: cryptic female mantids signal quality through brightness. *Functional Ecology*. 2015;29(4):531–9.
- Bazinet AL, Cummings MP, Mitter KT, Mitter CW. Can RNA-Seq resolve the rapid radiation of advanced moths and butterflies (Hexapoda: Lepidoptera: Apoditrysia)? An exploratory study. *PloS one*. 2013;8(12):e82615.
- Bendib A, Minet J. Female pheromone glands in Arctiidae (Lepidoptera). Evolution and phylogenetic significance. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences-Series III-Sciences de la Vie*. 1998;321(12):1007–14.
- Bergstrom CT, Real LA. Toward a theory of mutual mate choice: Lessons from two-sided matching. *Evolutionary Ecology Research*. 2000;2:493–508.
- Birch MC, Hefetz A. Extrusible organs in male moths and their role in courtship behavior. *Bulletin of the ESA*. 1987;33(4):222–9.
- Birch M, Poppy G, Baker TC. Scents and eversible scent structures of male moths. *Annual review of entomology*. 1990;35(1):25–54.
- Blanco CA, Perera OP, Groot A, Hernández G, Terán-Vargas AP. Paternity Allocation in a Mutant *Heliothis virescens* Colony. *Southwestern entomologist*. 2008;33(4):253–63.
- Blanco CA, Rojas MG, Groot AT, Morales-Ramos J, Abel CA. Size and chemical composition of *Heliothis virescens* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) spermatophores. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*. 2009;102(4):629–37.
- Bonduriansky R. The evolution of male mate choice in insects: a synthesis of ideas and evidence. *Biological Reviews*. 2001;76(3):305–39.
- Burley N. Sexual selection for aesthetic traits in species with biparental care. *The American Naturalist*. 1986;127(4):415–45.
- Cardé RT, Haynes KF. Structure of the pheromone communication channel in moths. In: Cardé RT, Millar JG, editors. *Advances in insect chemical ecology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press; 2004. p. 283–332.
- Caro SP, Balthazart J. Pheromones in birds: myth or reality? *Journal of Comparative Physiology A*. 2010;196(10):751–66.
- Chown SL, Gaston KJ. Body size variation in insects: a macroecological perspective. *Biological reviews*. 2010;85(1):139–69.
- Conner WE, Eisner T, Vander Meer RK, Guerrero A, Ghiringelli D, Meinwald J. Sex attractant of an arctiid moth (*Utetheisa ornatrix*): a pulsed chemical signal. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*. 1980;7(1):55–63.
- Cotton S, Small J, Pomiankowski A. Sexual selection and condition-dependent mate preferences. *Current Biology*. 2006;16(17):R755–65.
- Darwin C. *The descent of man and selection in relation to sex*. Vol. 1. London, England UK: John Murray; 1871.
- De Pasqual C, Groot AT, Mappes J, Burdfield-Steel E. Evolutionary importance of intraspecific variation in sex pheromones. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*. 2021;
- Droney DC, Musto CJ, Mancuso K, Roelofs WL, Linn CE. The response to selection for broad male response to female sex pheromone and its implications for divergence in close-range mating behavior in the European corn borer moth, *Ostrinia nubilalis*. *Journal of Chemical Ecology*. 2012;38(12):1504–12.
- Edmunds M. Courtship, mating and possible sex pheromones in three species of *Mantodea* (Ghana). *Entomologist's Monthly Magazine*. 1975;(111):53–7.
- Edward DA. The description of mate choice. *Behavioral Ecology*. 2015;26(2):301–10.
- Edward DA, Chapman T. The evolution and significance of male mate choice. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*. 2011;26(12):647–54.

- El-Sayed AM. The pherobase: database of insect pheromones and semiochemicals. 2011. Available from: <http://www.pherobase.com>
- Fisher RA. The genetical theory of natural selection. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press; 1930.
- Flint HM, Kressin EL. Gamma irradiation of the tobacco budworm: sterilization, competitiveness, and observations on reproductive biology. *Journal of Economic Entomology*. 1968;61(2):477–83.
- Gao K, van Wijk M, Clement Z, Egas M, Groot AT. A life-history perspective on sexual selection in a polygamous species. *BMC evolutionary biology*. 2020;20:1–10.
- Gaston LK, Shorey H. Sex pheromones of noctuid moths. IV. An apparatus for bioassaying the pheromones of six species. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*. 1964;57(6):779–80.
- Gentry CR, Lawson F, Hoffman DJ. A sex attractant in the tobacco budworm. *Journal of Economic Entomology*. 1964;57(6):819–21.
- Grafen A. Biological signals as handicaps. *Journal of theoretical biology*. 1990;144(4):517–46.
- Grant G. Evidence for a male sex pheromone in the noctuid, *Trichoplusia ni*. *Nature*. 1970;227(5265):1345–6.
- Greenfield MD. Moth sex pheromones: an evolutionary perspective. *The Florida Entomologist*. 1981;64(1):4–17.
- Harrison J, Doncaster L. On hybrids between moths of the geometrid sub-family Bistoninae, with an account of the behaviour of the chromosomes in gametogenesis in *Lycia (Biston) hirtaria*, *Ithysia (Nyssla) zonaria* and in their hybrids. *Journal of Genetics*. 1914;3(4):229–48.
- Hendricks D, Shaver T. Tobacco budworm: male pheromone suppressed emission of sex pheromone by the female. *Environmental Entomology*. 1975;4(4):555–8.
- Henneken J, Goodger JQ, Jones TM, Elgar MA. Diet-mediated pheromones and signature mixtures can enforce signal reliability. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*. 2017;4:145.
- Henry CS, Brooks SJ, Duelli P, Johnson JB, Wells MM, Mochizuki A. Obligatory duetting behaviour in the *Chrysoperla carnea*-group of cryptic species (Neuroptera: Chrysopidae): its role in shaping evolutionary history. *Biological Reviews*. 2013;88(4):787–808.
- Henry CS, Martínez Wells ML, Holsinger KE. The inheritance of mating songs in two cryptic, sibling lacewing species (Neuroptera: Chrysopidae: Chrysoperla). In: *Genetics of Mate Choice: From Sexual Selection to Sexual Isolation*. Springer; 2002. p. 269–89.
- Hill GE. Redness as a measure of the production cost of ornamental coloration. *Ethology Ecology & Evolution*. 1996;8(2):157–75.
- Hillier N, Vickers N. The role of heliothine hairpencil compounds in female *Heliothis virescens* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) behavior and mate acceptance. *Chemical Senses*. 2004;29(6):499–511.
- Holwell G, Barry KL, Herberstein M. Mate location, antennal morphology, and ecology in two praying mantids (Insecta: Mantodea). *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*. 2007;91(2):307–13.
- Hosseini SA, Van Wijk M, Ke G, Goldansaz SH, Schal C, Groot AT. Experimental evidence for chemical mate guarding in a moth. *Scientific reports*. 2016;6(1):1–6.
- Hurd LE, Prete FR, Jones TH, Singh TB, Co JE, Portman RT. First identification of a putative sex pheromone in a praying mantid. *Journal of chemical ecology*. 2004;30(1):155–66.
- Iyengar VK, Eisner T. Female choice increases offspring fitness in an arctiid moth (*Utetheisa ornatrix*). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 1999;96(26):15013–6.
- Jennions MD, Petrie M. Variation in mate choice and mating preferences: a review of causes and consequences. *Biological Reviews*. 1997;72(2):283–327.
- Johansson BG, Jones TM. The role of chemical communication in mate choice. *Biological Reviews*. 2007;82(2):265–89.
- Johnson S, Candolin U. Predation cost of a sexual signal in the threespine stickleback. *Behavioral Ecology*. 2017;28(4):1160–5.
- Johnstone RA. Sexual selection, honest advertisement and the handicap principle: reviewing the evidence. *Biological Reviews*. 1995;70(1):1–65.
- Johnstone RA, Reynolds JD, Deutsch JC. Mutual mate choice and sex differences in choosiness. *Evolution*. 1996;50(4):1382–91.
- Jones IL, Hunter FM. Mutual sexual selection in a monogamous seabird. *Nature*. 1993;362(6417):238–9.
- Jones IL, Hunter FM. Experimental evidence for mutual inter- and intrasexual selection favouring a crested auklet ornament. *Animal Behaviour*. 1999;57(3):521–8.
- Kirkpatrick M, Hall DW. Sexual selection and sex linkage. *Evolution*. 2004;58(4):683–91.
- Kodric-Brown A. Sexual dichromatism and temporary color changes in the reproduction of fishes. *American Zoologist*. 1998;38(1):70–81.

- Kokko H, Brooks R, Jennions MD, Morley J. The evolution of mate choice and mating biases. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B: Biological Sciences*. 2003;270(1515):653–64.
- Kokko H, Johnstone RA. Why is mutual mate choice not the norm? Operational sex ratios, sex roles and the evolution of sexually dimorphic and monomorphic signalling. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B: Biological Sciences*. 2002;357(1419):319–30.
- Kraaijeveld K, Kraaijeveld-Smit FJ, Komdeur J. The evolution of mutual ornamentation. *Animal Behaviour*. 2007;74(4):657–77.
- LaMunyon CW. Sperm storage by females of the polyandrous noctuid moth *Heliothis virescens*. *Animal behaviour*. 2000;59(2):395–402.
- LaMunyon CW, Eisner T. Postcopulatory sexual selection in an arctiid moth (*Utetheisa ornatrix*). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 1993;90(10):4689–92.
- Langmore NE. Functions of duet and solo songs of female birds. *Trends in ecology & evolution*. 1998;13(4):136–40.
- Laster M, Hardee D. Interbreeding compatibility between north American *Helicoverpa zea* and *Heliothis armigera* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) from Russia. *Journal of Economic Entomology*. 1995;88(1):77–80.
- Laster M. Interspecific hybridization of *Heliothis virescens* and *H. subflexa*. *Environmental Entomology*. 1972;1(6):682–7.
- Linn CE, Young MS, Gendle M, Glover TJ, Roelofs WL. Sex pheromone blend discrimination in two races and hybrids of the European corn borer moth, *Ostrinia nubilalis*. *Physiological Entomology*. 1997;22(3):212–23.
- Löfstedt C. Moth pheromone genetics and evolution. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B*. 1993;340(1292):167–77.
- Logsdon Jr JM. Evolutionary genetics: sex happens in *Giardia*. *Current biology*. 2008;18(2):R66–8.
- Mahmudunnabi M, Barry KL. Mantid sex pheromones: female calling behaviour and male responses in the Australian false garden mantid, *Pseudomantis albofimbriata* (Dictyoptera: Mantidae). *Journal of Natural History*. 2019;53(3–4):171–83.
- Majerus ME. The genetics and evolution of female choice. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*. 1986;1(1):1–7.
- Maxwell MR. Mating behaviour. In: Prete FR, Wells PH, Hurd LE, editors. *The Praying Mantises*. The Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, MD; 1999. p. 69–89.
- Maxwell MR, Barry KL, Johns PM. Examinations of female pheromone use in two praying mantids, *Stagmomantis limbata* and *Tenodera aridifolia sinensis* (Mantodea: Mantidae). *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*. 2010;103(1):120–7.
- McNeil JN. Behavioral ecology of pheromone-mediated communication in moths and its importance in the use of pheromone traps. *Annual Review of Entomology*. 1991;36(1):407–30.
- Møller A, Jennions M. How important are direct fitness benefits of sexual selection? *Naturwissenschaften*. 2001;88(10):401–15.
- Nishida R. Sequestration of defensive substances from plants by Lepidoptera. *Annual review of entomology*. 2002;47(1):57–92.
- Pair S, Laster M, Martin D. Hybrid sterility of the tobacco budworm: effects of alternate sterile and normal matings on fecundity and fertility. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*. 1977;70(6):952–4.
- Parker G. Mate choice. In: Bateson P, editor. *Mate quality and mating decisions*. Cambridge University Press; 1983. p. 141–66.
- Paterson HE. The recognition concept of species. In: Ereshefsky M, editor. *The Units of Evolution: essays on the nature of species*. Cambridge Massachusetts: The MIT Press; 1985.
- Price T. Sexual selection and natural selection in bird speciation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B: Biological Sciences*. 1998;353(1366):251–60.
- Pryke S, Griffith S. The relative role of male vs. female mate choice in maintaining assortative pairing among discrete colour morphs. *Journal of evolutionary biology*. 2007;20(4):1512–21.
- Ramesh MA, Malik S-B, Logsdon Jr JM. A phylogenomic inventory of meiotic genes: evidence for sex in *Giardia* and an early eukaryotic origin of meiosis. *Current biology*. 2005;15(2):185–91.
- Raulston J, Snow J, Graham H, Lingren P. Tobacco budworm: effect of prior mating and sperm content on the mating behavior of females. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*. 1975;68(4):701–4.
- Ritchie MG. Sexual selection and speciation. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst*. 2007;38:79–102.
- Roeder K. An experimental analysis of the sexual behavior of the praying mantis (*Mantis religiosa* L.). *The Biological Bulletin*. 1935;69(2):203–20.
- Rosenthal GG. *Mate choice: the evolution of sexual decision making from microbes to humans*. Princeton University Press; 2017.

- Rosenthal GG, Flores Martinez TY, García de León FJ, Ryan MJ. Shared preferences by predators and females for male ornaments in swordtails. *The American Naturalist*. 2001;158(2):146–54.
- Rosenthal GG, Ryan MJ. Sexual selection and the ascent of women: Mate choice research since Darwin. *Science*. 2022;375(6578):eabi6308.
- Sæther SA, Sætre G-P, Borge T, Wiley C, Svedin N, Andersson G, et al. Sex chromosome-linked species recognition and evolution of reproductive isolation in flycatchers. *Science*. 2007;318(5847):95–7.
- Shuker DM, Kvarnemo C. The definition of sexual selection. *Behavioral Ecology*. 2021;32(5):781–94.
- Steiger S, Schmitt T, Schaefer HM. The origin and dynamic evolution of chemical information transfer. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2011;278(1708):970–9.
- Symonds MR, Elgar MA. The evolution of pheromone diversity. *Trends in ecology & evolution*. 2008;23(4):220–8.
- Teal P, McLaughlin J, Tumlinson J. Analysis of the reproductive behavior of *Heliothis virescens* (F.) under laboratory conditions. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*. 1981;74(3):324–30.
- Teal P, Tumlinson J. Isolation, identification, and biosynthesis of compounds produced by male hairpencil glands of *Heliothis virescens* (F.) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). *Journal of chemical ecology*. 1989;15(1):413–27.
- Trivers R. Parental investment and sexual selection. In: Campbell B, editor. *Sexual Selection & the Descent of Man*. Chicago: Aldine; 1972. p. 136–79.
- Tumlinson J, Hendricks D, Mitchell E, Doolittle R, Brennan M. Isolation, identification, and synthesis of the sex pheromone of the tobacco budworm. *Journal of Chemical Ecology*. 1975;1(2):203–14.
- van Schooten B, Meléndez-Rosa J, Van Belleghem SM, Jiggins CD, Tan JD, McMillan WO, et al. Divergence of chemosensing during the early stages of speciation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2020;117(28):16438–47.
- Vickers NJ. Defining a synthetic pheromone blend attractive to male *Heliothis subflexa* under wind tunnel conditions. *Journal of chemical ecology*. 2002;28(6):1255–67.
- Vickers NJ, Baker TC. Chemical communication in heliothine moths. VII. Correlation between diminished responses to point-source plumes and single filaments similarly tainted with a behavioral antagonist. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A*. 1997;180(5):523–36.
- Wang C, Dong J. Interspecific hybridization of *Helicoverpa armigera* and *H. assulta* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae). *Chinese Science Bulletin*. 2001;46(6):489–91.
- Wedell N. Female receptivity in butterflies and moths. *Journal of Experimental Biology*. 2005;208(18):3433–40.
- Woods Jr WA, Hendrickson H, Mason J, Lewis SM. Energy and predation costs of firefly courtship signals. *The American Naturalist*. 2007;170(5):702–8.
- Wyatt TD. *Pheromones and animal behaviour*. Vol. 626. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; 2003.
- Zahavi A. Mate selection—a selection for a handicap. *Journal of theoretical Biology*. 1975;53(1):205–14.
- Zahavi A. The cost of honesty (further remarks on the handicap principle). *Journal of theoretical Biology*. 1977;67(3):603–5.
- Zhu J, Chastain BB, Spohn BG, Haynes KF. Assortative mating in two pheromone strains of the cabbage looper moth, *Trichoplusia ni*. *Journal of Insect Behavior*. 1997;10(6):805–17.
- Zuk M, Kolluru GR. Exploitation of sexual signals by predators and parasitoids. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*. 1998;73(4):415–38.