

1 Morphological determinants of carrier frequency signal
2 in katydids (Orthoptera): a comparative analysis using
3 biophysical evidence

4

5 Fernando Montealegre-Z^{1*}, Jessica Ogden¹, Thorin Jonsson¹, & Carl D. Soulsbury¹

6

7 ¹University of Lincoln, School of Life Sciences, Joseph Banks Laboratories

8 Green Lane, Lincoln, LN6 7DL, United Kingdom

9

10 * Corresponding author: fmontealegrez@lincoln.ac.uk

11

12

13

14

15

Abstract

17 Male katydids produce mating calls by stridulation using specialized structures on the
18 forewings. The right wing (RW) bears a scraper connected to a drum-like cell known as the
19 mirror and a left wing (LW) that overlaps the RW and bears a serrated vein on the ventral
20 side, the stridulatory file. Sound is generated with the scraper sweeping across the file,
21 producing vibrations that are amplified by the mirror. Using this sound generator, katydids
22 exploit a range of song carrier frequencies (CF) unsurpassed by any other insect group, with
23 species singing as low as 600 Hz and others as high as 150 kHz. Sound generator size has
24 been shown to scale negatively with CF, but such observations derive from studies based on
25 few species, without phylogenetic control, and/or using only the RW mirror length. We
26 carried out a phylogenetic comparative analysis involving 94 species of katydids to study the
27 relationship between LW and RW components of the sound generator and the CF of the
28 male's mating call, while taking into account body size and phylogenetic relationships. The
29 results showed that CF negatively scaled with all morphological measures, but was most
30 strongly related to components of the sound generation system (file, LW and RW mirrors).
31 Interestingly, the LW mirror (reduced and non-functional) predicted CF more accurately than
32 the RW mirror, and body size is not a reliable CF predictor. Mathematical models were
33 verified on known species for predicting CF in species for which sound is unknown (e.g.
34 fossils or museum specimens).

35 **Keywords:** Stridulation, sound production, insect, bioacoustics, fossil, body size.

36

37 **Introduction**

38 Tettigoniidae, more commonly known as katydids or bush crickets, are insects known
39 for their acoustic communication. Males produce calling songs to attract a mate using
40 specialized structures on their forewings (Stumpner *et al.*, 2013). This sound production
41 system comprises a serrated vein, also known as the stridulatory file, on the ventral part of
42 the left wing (LW), which is passed across a sharp lobe or scraper on the anal margin of the
43 right wing (RW) producing vibrations that are amplified by a membrane on the RW known as
44 the mirror (Bailey, 1970; Morris, 1999; Heller & Hemp, 2014). The mirror is a delicate
45 membrane stretched between a closed section of raised veins, which helps to radiate and
46 amplify the sounds produced by the scraper and the file (Fig. 1) (Broughton, 1964; Bailey,
47 1967; Montealegre-Z & Postles, 2010). Katydid males possess mirror cells on both wings
48 however, while the mirror on the RW is functional in most species, the LW mirror (the wing
49 where the active file resides) is usually atrophied and damped to vibrations (Montealegre-Z &
50 Postles, 2010; Montealegre-Z, 2012; Sarria-S *et al.*, 2016; Chivers *et al.*, 2017). Although, in
51 some species, small wing cells associated with the mirror do exhibit vibrational properties
52 during sound production (Sarria-S *et al.*, 2016).

53 Using this sound generating mechanism, the range of song carrier frequencies
54 produced by tettigoniid species ranges from as low as 600 Hz (in *Tympanophyllum*
55 *arcuifolium*) to as high as 150 kHz (*Supersonus aequoreus*) (Heller, 1988; Morris *et al.*, 1994;
56 Heller, 1995; Montealegre-Z *et al.*, 2006; Sarria-S *et al.*, 2014). Across insects, no other
57 group produces such a wide range of acoustic communication signals using a single
58 mechanism.

59 The structures specialized for sound production in animals usually scale with body
60 size and with sound carrier frequency (CF) (Irschick *et al.*, 2014). CF is defined as the centre

61 frequency at which spectral energy reaches its maximum. This relationship can also be
62 observed in the sound generator apparatus of katydids where it was shown that any linear
63 dimension of the structures involved in sound production (e.g., the RW mirror, and the
64 stridulatory file) scales with the CF of the male's call (Morris & Pipher, 1967; Bailey, 1970;
65 Sales & Pye, 1974; Heller, 1995; Montealegre-Z, 2009). Although the LW mirror is usually
66 reduced and non-functional, in some species certain small wing cells associated to this mirror
67 vibrate in some species (Sarria-S et al., 2016).

68 Researchers have studied various forms of morphological scaling of the stridulatory
69 apparatus to identify the factors that affect the CF in singing katydids. Using two species of
70 katydid, Morris & Pipher (1967), based on Broughton's (1964) analysis suggested that the
71 RW mirror frame in the katydid tegmina could be modeled as vibrating cantilever to predict
72 CF. Bailey (1970) included the mirror measurements of two more species of Conocephalinae,
73 which he fitted in Morris & Pipher (1967) linear model, and concluded that the mirror frame
74 dimensions of the species he studied (*Ruspolia nitidula*) fitted this plot despite the fact that it
75 differed substantially from the *Conocephalus* species used by Morris & Pipher. Sales & Pye
76 (1974) in a larger review reinforced these two previous studies adding data for 15 more
77 species. Bailey's (1970) and Sales & Pye's (1974) analyses showed that most of the points
78 (originated from mirror frame length) fell close to Morris & Pipher's (1967) fitted line. Any
79 change in CF is explained by a significant amount of mirror dimension ($R^2=0.99$, $P<0.01$,
80 $\text{Ln}f_0 = 0.49 \text{Ln}l^2$, regression obtained from extrapolated data points in Sales & Pye plotted
81 chart). Sales & Pye (1974) concluded that Morris & Pipher's assumption on similar physical
82 properties of the mirror, was likely to be true. In a different approach, Rust et al. (1999)
83 studied 11 species of katydid to investigate the relationship of the entire stridulatory field of
84 the LW, including mirror and surrounding areas, and the CF of the song to predict the
85 frequency that an extinct katydid would sing at. They found a negative correlation between

86 the stridulatory area and CF. None of the above analyses, however, took into account
87 phylogenetic correction of the data, because such methods were not available at the time.
88 Montealegre-Z (2009) produced a first comparative analysis across 58 species of katydids,
89 reporting allometric correlations between several calling song acoustic parameters and
90 morphological structures, including body size based on the method of Independent Contrast
91 (Garland *et al.*, 1992). However, more rigorous phylogenetic comparative methods have not
92 been applied, and a larger dataset is now available.

93 From the various morphological variables used by Montealegre-Z (2009), mirror
94 scaling was based on the length of the frame, as in the cantilever model (Morris & Pipher,
95 1967; Bailey, 1970; Sales & Pye, 1974). However, it was recently demonstrated in some
96 species that not only the RW mirror is involved in sound radiation, but two large cells
97 adjacent to the mirror (called the harp and the neck, Fig. 1), play a role as well (Montealegre-
98 Z & Postles, 2010; Sarria-S *et al.*, 2016; Chivers *et al.*, 2017). While the right mirror features
99 prominently in sound radiation, the neck and harp show a considerable influence, especially
100 when the handle (the vein connecting the mirror and harp) is thin, and must be taken into
101 account as active wing areas devoted to sound production (see Fig. 1). In fact, early work by
102 Bailey (1970) shows sound radiation maps of the wings of *Ruspolia nitidula*, which suggest
103 that the wing cells surrounding the mirror are acoustically active.

104 For different reasons researchers have been interested in the relation of body size and
105 CF. For example, in sexual selection studies of acoustic species, female can assess male
106 size/quality based on their carrier frequencies (Wedell & Sandberg, 1995). Many researchers
107 have reported that the frequency produced by katydids is inversely related to their body size
108 (Wedell & Sandberg, 1995; Morris, 2008; Anichini *et al.*, 2017) meaning as a katydid's size
109 increases the CF of its song will decrease. And recent work on katydids suggest that wing

110 area seems to be under positive sexual selection, as the relationship of wing size on male
111 body size proves to be positive (Anichini et al., 2017).

112 The aim of this research is to produce a comparative analysis between the morphology
113 of both the LW and RW mirrors (and, if applicable, the associated cells), the file, and the
114 male CF using a large data set of 94 tettigoniid species, while taking in to account body size
115 and phylogeny. We predict that both the left and right mirror area are predictors of the CF
116 and that a negative correlation exists between the area of the mirror and the frequency
117 produced, meaning that smaller mirror areas will be associated with higher CF and larger
118 mirrors to lower CF. Additionally, based on phylogenetically-corrected comparative methods,
119 this research aims to identify morphological parameters that can be used in the construction
120 of mathematical models to accurately predict CF. These models will enable researchers to
121 infer the calling song frequencies from species where the actual recording of living animals is
122 not possible, like in museum specimens or in extinct species only known from the fossil
123 record. A multi-parameter model to predict CF will prove to be particularly relevant to
124 palaeontology as fossil Orthoptera are rarely preserved in their complete form, often
125 consisting of only one wing or isolated body parts.

126

127 **Materials and Methods**

128 **Morphological data**

129 We examined the sound generator structures in males of 94 different species of the
130 family Tettigoniidae. Specimens belong to a research collection at the University of Lincoln,
131 UK and samples were a mixture of alcohol-preserved, dry, and pinned specimens. Dry
132 samples were re-hydrated in an insect-relaxing chamber (a hermetic plastic box filled with
133 wet sand) for 24 hours. The purpose of this step was to soften the specimens, allowing for

134 easier manipulation of the sample without risk of shattering. This allowed for the extension of
135 the wings (Gibb, 2014), making the forewing structures of both wings visible to be
136 photographed. Wings of some animals were difficult to extend or to position and were
137 removed using micro-scissors in order to get a clear picture of the mirror and therefore a
138 more accurate area measurement. Using a VMS-004-LCD digital USB microscope camera
139 (Veho Europe, Hampshire, UK), both the right and left forewings were photographed next to
140 a scale (planar to the wing surface) with 0.5 mm increments using the image capture program
141 Veho professional imaging (Veho Europe, Hampshire, UK). The surface area of the left and
142 right mirrors was extracted using ImageJ v1.50g (Rasband, W.S., U. S. National Institutes of
143 Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA, <https://imagej.nih.gov/ij/>). The wing vibrating areas
144 measured were the cell contained in the mirror ring (for species with reduced neck and harps,
145 e.g. most Pseudophyllinae, and Arachnoscelidina), and the area occupied by mirror-neck-
146 harp (e.g., most conocephaloids), as we have evidence that these areas are also active in
147 sound radiation in some species (see Fig. 1). The stridulatory file was measured as the length
148 between the first tooth in the anal end to the last tooth of in the basal end from SEM pictures
149 taken by the authors, except for those species indicated in Table S-1, which were obtained
150 from published literature or from specimens borrowed from collections.

151 Measurements of pronotum and mid femora length were taken as indicator of body
152 size and to control for body size effects (Gwynne & Bailey, 1988; Del Castillo & Gwynne,
153 2007; Montealegre-Z, 2009) using digital calipers (Poly-Cal Electronic Caliper W74-101-175,
154 Fowler High Precision, Newton, MA, USA). The mid femur was used here as this appendage
155 is not specialized for either sound production or sound reception, and will therefore not
156 constitute a potentially biased structure that naturally scales with acoustic parameters. For
157 *Chondroderella borneensis* and *Promeca* spp.), measurements were taken directly from
158 photographs provided by Dr. Klaus-G. Heller.

159

160 **Acoustic data**

161 The CF data was obtained from a variety of sources, including published and
162 unpublished data (see Table S1). CF is defined as the peak of dominant energy observed in a
163 spectrum. Previously unpublished data was collected and provided by members of the
164 bioacoustics lab at the University of Lincoln. All recordings were attained in lab conditions
165 and involved ultrasound-sensitive equipment, and were digitized using sampling rates of
166 either 256, 512 or 1024·kilosamples·s⁻¹. Insects were placed in a mesh cage, hung from the
167 ceiling of a soundproof room, >1 m below the ceiling and >1 m above the floor, hence
168 mitigating against potential reflections. Sound recordings were obtained using a 1/8" Brüel &
169 Kjær Type 4138 condenser microphone, connected to a Brüel & Kjær 2633 preamplifier
170 (Brüel & Kjær, Nærum, Denmark). Data were stored on a notebook computer using an NI
171 USB-6259 board (National Instruments, Austin, TX, USA) and LabVIEW version 9 (32 bit)
172 2009 software interface (National Instruments, Austin, TX, USA).

173 **Statistical analysis**

174 To account for non-independence of residuals in models that include evolutionarily
175 related species (Felsenstein, 1985), we carried out a phylogenetic generalized least squares
176 approach (PGLS) between the log frequency and log morphology measurements (Pagel,
177 1999; Freckleton *et al.*, 2002). The `pglmEstLambda` function was used to identify the
178 maximum likelihood value of lambda, λ (Pagel, 1999; Orme *et al.*, 2009; Revell, 2010),
179 which measures the degree to which the covariance matrix (built as part of CAIC) follows a
180 Brownian model. λ can vary between 0 (no phylogenetic autocorrelation) and 1 (complete
181 phylogenetic autocorrelation). The phylogeny of the 94 species used was adapted from the
182 most recent katydid phylogeny (Mugleston *et al.*, 2013), which was built using molecular

183 sequence data for 6 genes from 135 taxa representing 16 of the 19 Tettigoniidae subfamilies
184 (see appendices 1 and 2).

185 All variables were log-transformed (using natural logarithm). We tested how CF
186 scaled with single morphological components (pronotum length, file length, right mirror area,
187 left mirror area and femur length). We present results from the PGLS along with results from
188 OLS (ordinary least squares) for comparison (Freckleton, 2009). Following this, we tested all
189 pair combinations of morphological variables. We assessed the best model based on AICc
190 values. Models with $\Delta\text{AICc} < 5$ were considered broadly equivalent. For all models, residuals
191 were examined for heteroscedasticity and outliers. Analysis was carried out using R code
192 kindly provided by R.P. Freckleton (University of Sheffield, UK). All models were carried
193 out in R version 3.2.1 (R Core Team, see the R homepage), see references.

194 **Testing the models on control Species**

195 The accuracy of the predictive models was tested using morphological measurements
196 of species not used to construct the phylogenetic regression, but for which reliable call
197 recordings exist in our collection or in the literature. In this case, the morphological structure
198 was entered into the PGLS regression equations and the difference between actual and
199 expected CF was calculated. All values were transformed to be positive, irrespective of
200 whether higher or lower values were calculated. Recent evidence (Chivers et al., 2017),
201 suggests a functional role for the harp area alongside the mirror region of the wing. Therefore,
202 we additionally calculated the difference between actual and predicted CF of the right and
203 left mirror, with and without the harp region included. Lastly, we tested whether difference
204 (irrespective of direction) was correlated with actual CF using Pearson's correlations.
205 Significant values would suggest systematic biases in CF prediction. The species used to test
206 the models are listed in Table S-2.

207 **Results**

208 We measured morphological structures (mirror area, file length) of the sound
209 generator in the left and right forewings coupled with pronotum and mid-femur lengths in 94
210 species of katydids to investigate allometric relations with calling song frequency. Log CF
211 scaled allometrically with all morphological measures (Table 1), but was most strongly
212 related to components of the sound generation system (file length, LW and RW mirrors; Fig.
213 2). Of these, LW and RW mirrors explained the greatest single amount of variation in the
214 data (Table 1; Figure 2CD).

215 Diagnostic plots show that one species (*Tympanophyllum arcuifolium*) was a
216 significant outlier in the analysis of log frequency and pronotum length. Exclusion of this
217 point changed the regression equations R^2 (Table 2), suggesting that pronotum length may be
218 the least reliable of parameters (Fig. 2A). Based on AIC values, three models had reasonable
219 support ($\Delta AIC_c < 5$; Table 2). Of these, the best model was the combination of file length and
220 left mirror (Table 2). Interestingly, this model was not phylogenetically dependent ($\lambda = 0$;
221 Table 2), whereas there was stronger phylogenetic dependence on the model containing the
222 right mirror.

223

224 **Testing the models on control species**

225 In order to establish which structure of the sound generator in the wings of katydids
226 predicts the CF with lower error, we calculated CF in species that were not used in the PGLS
227 analysis, for which CF values and wing anatomy were available (see Table 3). This analysis
228 suggests that the best predictors of CF were the file length (mean difference between actual
229 and predicted CF=1.83 kHz) and the left mirror area (mean difference between actual and
230 predicted CF=1.25 kHz; Figure 4). Interesting, the RW mirror area performed poorly as a

231 predictor of CF, though this improved when harp and neck cells areas were included (Fig 3C).
232 More specifically, it halved the mean estimated difference in real and predicted CF. Inclusion
233 of the LW harp area did not appreciably improve the prediction of CF (Figure 4).

234 The difference between actual and predicted CF was positively correlated for the RW
235 mirror ($r_p=0.52$, $p=0.041$) and the LW mirror + harp area ($r_p=0.63$, $p<0.001$), suggesting that
236 they become less reliable at high frequencies. In contrast, no other feature showed any
237 relationship (right mirror +harp: $r_p=0.23$, $p=0.384$; file length: $r_p=0.16$, $p=0.549$; left mirror:
238 $r_p=-0.34$, $p=0.197$)

239 Discussion

240 This research shows a high level of predictability of CF from the structure of the
241 stridulatory apparatus, even after correction for phylogenetic-dependence. Although all the
242 studied morphological structures of the stridulatory apparatus in both LW and RW could be
243 used to predict CF, those of the LW (mirror and stridulatory file) predict CF with a higher
244 level of accuracy than vibratory areas of the RW (Fig. 4, Table 3). This finding was
245 unanticipated because the right mirror has been traditionally known to be the main source of
246 sound radiation across species and the focus of attention of researchers working in katydid
247 stridulation (Broughton, 1964; Bailey, 1967; Morris & Pipher, 1967; Sales & Pye, 1974;
248 Morris *et al.*, 1975), whilst the left mirror is usually damped or atrophied (Montealegre-Z,
249 2005; Montealegre-Z & Mason, 2005; Montealegre-Z & Postles, 2010; Montealegre-Z, 2012;
250 Sarria-S *et al.*, 2014; Sarria-S *et al.*, 2016). This morphological asymmetry in the stridulatory
251 fields of the LW and RW is one of the synapomorphic features of the family Tettigoniidae
252 (Rust *et al.*, 1999; Montealegre-Z, 2005). Hemp *et al.* (2015) studied the scaling of length and
253 width of left (N=7 species) and right (N=4 species) mirrors as predictors of CF in
254 *Afroanthracites* and *Afroagraecia* species. They found a high correlation for the length of left

255 and right mirror but lower for the width. In particular, the left mirror width had a lower
256 correlation due to only one species with real asymmetrical tegmina *Afroagraecia brachyptera*.
257 In our study, we use mirror area to predict CF. In the case of species with reduced or
258 atrophied left mirrors, simple linear dimensions may not therefore capture accurately the
259 mirror shape or size. For example, in *Afroagraecia brachyptera* the left mirror is more
260 triangular in shape making width dimensions harder to measure compared to other species
261 (see Fig. 11: Hemp et al. 2015). Hence, we believe mirror area is a better measure to account
262 for shape variance in mirrors.

263 The fact that the left mirror predicts CF more accurately than the right mirror could be
264 explained by the fact that although the right stridulatory field is heavily involved in sound
265 production, it exhibits more variation across species than the left stridulatory field. For
266 example, in several species not only does the right mirror radiate sound but also the adjacent
267 cells (the neck and the harp, Fig. 1AB) exhibit high levels of deformation during resonant
268 vibration (Montealegre-Z & Postles, 2010; Chivers et al., 2017; Jonsson *et al.*, 2017). In other
269 species (e.g., many Pseudophyllinae, Fig. 1C) the right stridulatory area is limited to the
270 mirror itself, while the neck and harps are atrophied or reduced to be acoustically inactive
271 (Montealegre-Z, 2005; Montealegre-Z, 2012) (see Fig 1C). Such reduction of the sound
272 radiating area to a single mirror ring seems to be associated with levels of sound purity or
273 tonality (narrow-band spectra). Species with pure tone calls usually have a single isolated
274 right mirror (Morris & Beier, 1982; Morris *et al.*, 1989; Montealegre-Z & Morris, 1999),
275 while those with more active sound radiating cells tend to emit more broadband frequency
276 calls (Montealegre-Z, 2005; Montealegre-Z & Mason, 2005; Gu *et al.*, 2012; Chivers et al.,
277 2017). The large amount of variation in spectral quality observed in Tettigoniidae, a family in
278 which many species are usually regarded as broadband sound emitters, may partly be
279 explained by multiple active sound radiating cells. Inclusion of the neck and harp areas plus

280 right mirror was found to provide a better prediction of CF than right mirror on its own,
281 perhaps emphasizing the importance of these relatively unexplored areas on CF production.

282 The left mirror on the other hand has maintained a more conservative structure than
283 the right mirror. While the left mirror is atrophied in most species studied so far
284 (Montealegre-Z & Postles, 2010; Montealegre-Z, 2012; Sarria-S et al., 2014; Sarria-S et al.,
285 2016; Chivers et al., 2017; unpublished data), the right mirror underwent selection pressures
286 for frequency diversity based on diversified resonances. Although some left mirrors do
287 contain extra vibrating areas, these remain small and inclusion of these has a minor impact on
288 CF. In the absence of a laser Doppler vibrometer, acoustically functional cells in the left
289 mirror could be identified usually by their level of transparency and by a conspicuous
290 reduction in cross veins. In general, it is relatively uncommon to observe functional left
291 mirrors, and even rarer to find an active left mirror, harp and neck across living katydid
292 species. Nevertheless, in most *Conocephalus* spp. *Orchellimum* spp. *Afroanthracites* spp.,
293 *Phlugis* spp., *Neduba* spp. *Acanthacara* spp., *Decticus* spp., *Platypleis* spp. or *Tettigonia* spp.,
294 and in many species of *Saginae*, for example, the left mirror exhibits some level of
295 specialization for sound radiation. Not surprisingly, males of these species tend to produce
296 broadband calling songs (Morris & Pipher, 1967; Morris & Pipher, 1972; Pipher & Morris,
297 1974; Morris et al., 1975; Heller, 1988; Jatho *et al.*, 1992; Jatho *et al.*, 1994; Morris & Mason,
298 1995; Hemp *et al.*, 2015; Lemonnier-Darcemont et al., 2016). Even when the left stridulatory
299 cell shows some levels of activity, high levels of mechanical asymmetry between both left
300 and right wings are observed, with maximum amplitude exhibited by the right stridulatory
301 area (Montealegre-Z & Mason, 2005; Montealegre-Z & Postles, 2010; Sarria-S et al., 2016;
302 Chivers et al., 2017; Jonsson et al., 2017). This wing asymmetry seems to have been selected
303 as a way to reduce acoustic interference between two wings and favoured the use of
304 ultrasonic frequencies (Montealegre-Z, 2005; Gu et al., 2012). We believe that the LW mirror

305 has been under relatively lower selection pressures than the RW mirror, which means that
306 although atrophied in many species, the left mirror has maintained a stronger allometric
307 relationship to the sound production unit as a whole and as a consequence is a better predictor
308 than the more variable right mirror.

309 The specific radiation resistance, and therefore its efficiency as a sound source,
310 depends on the ratio between its diameter and the sound wavelength. The minimum source
311 size for good source to-medium matching has a radius of about 1/4 of the fundamental
312 wavelength if it is a dipole source, below this size the specific radiation resistance decreases
313 more or less rapidly (Bennet-Clark, 1998). In almost all species of Tettigoniidae studied here,
314 the dimensions of the sound radiator are smaller than the optimal size for sound radiation
315 related to wavelength (see also Montealegre-Z, 2005); only in the species with the most
316 ultrasonic calls is the area of radiating surface optimal. Bennet-Clark (1998) discussed these
317 aspects and pointed out that it is difficult to study the problem of specific acoustic resistance
318 in tettigoniids because these animals could have evolved secondary resonators in their
319 forewings, pronotum and subalar spaces.

320 **Applications of the mathematical models**

321 The rationalization for this study was to produce predictive models that could
322 eventually help to calculate the CF in extinct katydids or museum specimens that we can no
323 longer determine the CF from (by either analysis of song recordings or from wing vibration
324 measurements). Fossils may only be partial (rely on single body part, usually the wings) and
325 the multiple models presented in this research allow a range of frequencies to be calculated,
326 with varying levels of accuracy.

327 Our results suggest that the CF from fossilized males could be recovered with high
328 degree of reliability using left mirror area and file length. However, our model of CF on file

329 length is reliable only in those species using CFs below 40 kHz (frequencies >40 kHz were
330 not included in the test, see Table S2), which is ideal for fossils because it has been shown
331 that Jurassic and Cretaceous species exploited low-frequency signals (Rust et al., 1999; Gu et
332 al., 2012). The length of the stridulatory file and the number of teeth a file holds scale
333 allometrically with body size, with larger files tending to possess more teeth (Montealegre-Z,
334 2005; Montealegre-Z, 2009; Anichini et al., 2017). Therefore it is not surprising that file
335 length and other file attributes correlate with CF. For example, pure-tone species use a 1:1
336 relation between tooth strikes and the number of oscillations produced, i.e., more densely
337 packed teeth in theory will produce more oscillations per unit time, thus higher frequencies.
338 However above 40 kHz this 1:1 relationship between oscillations and teeth is not valid any
339 more. At such elevated CFs species use discrete tooth-strikes delivered at elevated rates and
340 speeds by scraper elasticity. The stridulatory file should have a minimum size to host the
341 necessary number of teeth for paused discrete tooth strikes and produce a pulse train of
342 decent duration (extreme high frequencies). Therefore, for extreme ultrasonic species it is
343 more important to evolve files of effective lengths to host teeth with particular distribution to
344 facilitate scraper deformation and elevated rates of tooth strikes. For instance, if the file of the
345 highest frequency species (*Supersonus aequoreous*, singing at 150 kHz) is used to predict CF,
346 the value obtained will be ca 60 kHz. For the reason, the mirrors are better predictors of CF
347 in this case.

348 Recent robust molecular phylogeny suggests the Tettigoniidae could have emerged in
349 late Jurassic (Song et al., 2015). However, modern forms of Tettigoniidae with differentiated
350 mirrors and asymmetric stridulatory fields as one of the major features distinguishing them
351 from other Ensifera, appear in the fossil record some 60 mya (Heads & Leuzinger, 2011; Rust
352 et al., 1999; Greenwalt & Rust, 2014). This wing anatomy facilitates inferring CF from
353 equations presented in Table 1. In fact, using the morphological features of the extinct

354 *Pseudotettigonia amoena* described in Rust et al. (1999), (only LW anatomy are reported),
355 we predict CFs of a) 10.5kHz (using file length), b) 12.6kHz (using LW mirror area only),
356 and c) 9.12 kHz (using LW mirror plus harp area) (Table 3). In this situation the CF values
357 obtained in a and c are very close; these results suggest that this species used a CF of about
358 10 kHz. But why did we use the mirror/harp and not the sole mirror as in the calculation?
359 Rust et al. (1999) reported that the wings of *P. amoena* seemed to have been more
360 symmetrical than those of modern forms, it is thus likely that the stridulatory field (mirror
361 and harp) of the LW was very active in sound production. This is supported by the wing
362 anatomy, which shows large mirror and harps, both connected by a thin handle vein,
363 characteristic of large functional stridulatory areas (as shown in Fig. 1B). Consequently,
364 using the entire area of mirror and harp is recommended here; in addition, the predicted CF
365 is in agreement with that obtain using the file. The envisaged CF (ca 10 kHz) is indeed about
366 3 kHz higher than the 7 kHz originally anticipated by Rust et al. (1999). Similar results were
367 obtained for *P. leona*, 11.0 kHz (using file length), 16.2 kHz (using LW mirror area only) and
368 11.1 kHz (using LW mirror plus harp area) (Table 3). CF inferred from file, and that inferred
369 from and mirror plus harp match at ~11 kHz. The predicted CF of 11 kHz is about 3.5 kHz
370 higher than originally calculated (6.5 kHz) by Greenwalt & Rust (2014). We also recalculated
371 CF in *Archaboilus musicus*, another extinct species from the middle Jurassic for which the
372 calling song was reconstructed a few years ago based on comparative methods and
373 phylogenetic control of 59 species, and mechanical principles of stridulation (Gu et al., 2012).
374 The original reconstruction by Gu et al. (2012) anticipated a CF of 6.4 kHz (Table 3), with
375 our new mathematical models, based on file dimension the CF dropped by 1.4 kHz to ca. 5.0
376 kHz, a CF used by most field crickets today (Michelsen, 1998; Bennet-Clark, 2003).

377 In extinct hagloids (including Haglidae and Prophalangopsidae) the mirrors on left
378 and right tegmina are not as well defined as in modern tettigonids and vibratory patterns of

379 the wings are variable (Chivers et al., 2017). Hence, using mirror dimension to estimate CF
380 proves challenging. In circumstances like this, a combination of inferred CFs based on file
381 length and vibrating areas (inferred from LDV recordings or by identifying cells without
382 cross veins as potential vibrating areas) could be useful. An example is shown using the relic
383 species *Cyphoderris monstrosa* (a Prophalangopsidae). Using the entire vibrating areas
384 (mirror plus harp and neck), and the stridulatory file, the anticipated CF closely matches the
385 call CF. The left mirror predicts a relatively accurate CF value of 13.6 kHz against 13.1 kHz,
386 Table 3). The wings of *Cyphoderris* are highly symmetrical, as in their extinct ancestors, and
387 in theory left and right wing anatomy should predict CF similarly. However, we noted that
388 using only the equation of CF on left mirror to extrapolate values of either left or right
389 mirrors, will produce better results. For more recent forms of katydids (e.g., Cenozoic) we
390 recommend using the mathematical models for left and right mirrors and file, when
391 applicable.

392 In summary, here we present different solutions to infer the carrier frequencies used
393 by extinct fossilized ensiferan specimens. Orthopteran fossils are not always available with
394 the entire body preserved, but certainly the wings are one of the body structures that
395 preserves with good detail; and fossilized wings are not always found in pairs or complete.
396 We provide mathematical models (Table 1) that could be used for specific situations to
397 satisfy the needs imposed by available incomplete specimens.

398 **Acknowledgments**

399 This project was fully funded by the Leverhulme Trust (grant RPG-2014-284). We thank
400 Klaus-G. Heller for providing photographs and morphological data for specimens not
401 available in our collections, and valuable comments to improve the manuscript. We are also
402 grateful of two anonymous reviewers.

403 **Conflict of interest**

404 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

405 **Supporting information**

406 Additional Supporting Information may be found online in the supporting information tab for
407 this article:

408 **Table S1** Morphological and acoustic data of 94 species of Tettigoniidae used in the analysis.

409 **Table S2** Testing the mathematical models proposed in this research.

410 **Appendix S1:** Text form of the phylogenetic tree 94 species of katydid used in this research.

411 **Appendix S2:** Phylogenetic tree 94 species of katydid used in this research.

412

413

421

422 **References**

- 423 Anichini, M., Kuchenreuther, S. & Lehmann, G. U. C. 2017. Allometry of male sound-pro
424 structures indicates sexual selection on wing size and stridulatory teeth density
425 bushcricket. *J. Zool.* **301**: 271-279.
- 426 Bailey, W. J. 1967. Further investigations into function of mirror in Tettigonioidae (Ortho
427 *Nature* **215**: 762-&.
- 428 Bailey, W. J. 1970. The mechanics of stridulation in bush crickets (Tettigonioidae, Ortho
429 Tegminal Generator. *J. Exp. Biol.* **52**: 495-505.
- 430 Bennet-Clark, H. C. 1998. Size and scale effects as constraints in insect sound communic
431 *Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* **353**: 407-419.
- 432 Bennet-Clark, H. C. 2003. Wing resonances in the Australian field cricket *Teleogryllus oc*
433 *Biol.* **206**: 1479-1496.
- 434 Broughton, W. B. 1964. Function of the mirror in Tettigoniidae Orthoptera. *Nature* **201**:
435 Chivers, B. D., Béthoux, O., Sarria-S, F. A., Jonsson, T., Mason, A. C. & Montealegre-Z, F.
436 Functional morphology of tegmina-based stridulation in the relict species *Cypho*
437 *monstrosa* (Orthoptera: Ensifera: Prophalangopsidae). *J. Exp. Biol.* **220**: 1112-11
438 Del Castillo, R. C. & Gwynne, D. T. 2007. Increase in song frequency decreases spermatoc
439 correlative evidence of a macroevolutionary trade-off in katydids (Orthoptera :
440 *J. Evol. Biol.* **20**: 1028-1036.
- 441 Felsenstein, J. 1985. Phylogenies and the comparative method. *Am. Nat.* **125**: 1-15.
- 442 Freckleton, R. P. 2009. The seven deadly sins of comparative analysis. *J. Evol. Biol.* **22**: 1
443 Freckleton, R. P., Harvey, P. H. & Pagel, M. 2002. Phylogenetic analysis and comparative
444 and review of evidence. *Am. Nat.* **160**: 712-726.
- 445 Garland, T., Harvey, P. H. & Ives, A. R. 1992. Procedures for the analysis of comparative
446 independent contrasts. *Syst. Biol.* **41**: 18-32.
- 447 Gibb, T. J. 2014. *Contemporary insect diagnostics: The art and science of practical Entomology*
448 Academic Press., United Kingdom.
- 449 Greenwalt, D. E. & Rust, J. E. S. 2014. A new species of *Pseudotettigonia* Zeuner (Orthoptera:
450 Tettigoniidae) with an intact stridulatory field and reexamination of the subfamily
451 Pseudotettigoniinae. *Syst. Entomol.* **39**: 256-263.
- 452 Gu, J.-J., Montealegre-Z, F., Robert, D., Engel, M. S., Qiao, G.-X. & Ren, D. 2012. Wing stridulation in
453 Jurassic katydid (Insecta, Orthoptera) produced low-pitched musical calls to attract
454 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **109**: 3868-3873.
- 455 Gwynne, D. T. & Bailey, W. J. 1988. Mating system, mate choice and ultrasonic calling in
456 Zaprochiline katydid (Orthoptera, Tettigoniidae). *Behaviour* **105**: 202-223.
- 457 Heads, S. W. & Leuzinger, L. 2011. On the placement of the Cretaceous Orthopteran *Bracon*
458 *groeningae* from Brazil, with notes on the relationships of Schizodactylidae (Orthoptera:
459 Ensifera). *Zookeys* **77**: 17-30.
- 460 Heller, K. -G. 1988. *Bioakustik der Europäischen Laubheuschrecken*. Verlag Josef Margraf
461 Weikersheim.
- 462 Heller, K.-G. 1995. Acoustic signalling in Palaeotropical bush-crickets (Orthoptera, Tettigoniidae:
463 Pseudophyllidae): does predation pressure by eavesdropping enemies differ in
464 Palaeotropics and Neotropics. *J. Zool. (Lond.)* **237**: 469-485.
- 465 Heller, K. -G. & Hemp, C. 2014. Fiddler on the Tree - A Bush-cricket species with unusual
466 organs and song. *Plos One* **9**: e92366.
- 467 Hemp, C., Heller, K. -G., Warchalowska-Sliwa, E., Grzywacz, B. & Hemp, A. 2015. Ecology
468 and chromosomes of the East African genus *Afroanthracites* Hemp & Ingrisch (Orthoptera:
469 Tettigoniidae, Conocephalinae, Agraeciini) with the description of new species. *Evol. Biol.* **15**: 351-368.

- 471 Irschick, D. J., Briffa, M. & Podos, J. 2014. *Animal signaling and function: An integrative approach*, 1st
472 ed. John Wiley, Canada.
- 473 Jatho, M., Schul, J., Stiedl, O. & Kalmring, K. 1994. Specific differences in sound production and
474 pattern-recognition in Tettigoniids. *Behav. Processes* **31**: 293-300.
- 475 Jatho, M., Weidemann, S. & Kretzen, D. 1992. Species-specific sound production in 3 Ephippigerine
476 bush-crickets. *Behav. Processes* **26**: 31-42.
- 477 Jonsson, T., Chivers, B. D., Robson Brown, K. A., Sarria-S, F. A., Walker, M. A. & Montealegre-Z, F.
478 2017. Chamber music - An unusual Helmholtz resonator for song amplification in a
479 Neotropical bush-cricket (Orthoptera, Tettigoniidae). *J. Exp. Biol.* **220**: in press.
480 doi:10.1242/jeb.160234
- 481 Lemonnier-Darcemont M., Darcemont C., Heller K.-G., Dutrillaux A.-M. & Dutrillaux B. 2016. Saginae
482 of Europe. Edition G.E.E.M., Cannes, France. 208 pp. ISBN 978-2-9537533-9-4
- 483 Michelsen, A. 1998. The tuned cricket. *News Physiol. Sci.* **13**: 32-38.
- 484 Montealegre-Z, F. 2005. Biomechanics of musical stridulation in katydids (Orthoptera: Ensifera:
485 Tettigoniidae): an evolutionary approach. Ph.D. Dissertation. *Department of Zoology*.
486 University of Toronto, Toronto. pp. 328.
- 487 Montealegre-Z, F. 2009. Scale effects and constraints for sound production in katydids (Orthoptera:
488 Tettigoniidae): generator morphology constrains signal parameters. *J. Evol. Biol.* **22**: 355–366.
- 489 Montealegre-Z, F. 2012. Reverse stridulatory wing motion produces highly resonant calls in a
490 neotropical katydid (Orthoptera: Tettigoniidae: Pseudophyllinae). *J. Insect Physiol.* **58**: 116-24.
- 491 Montealegre-Z, F. & Mason, A. C. 2005. The mechanics of sound production in *Panacanthus*
492 *pallicornis* (Orthoptera : Tettigoniidae : Conocephalinae): the stridulatory motor patterns. *J.*
493 *Exp. Biol.* **208**: 1219-1237.
- 494 Montealegre-Z, F. & Morris, G. K. 1999. Songs and Systematics of some Tettigoniidae from Colombia
495 and Ecuador, part I. Pseudophyllinae (Orthoptera). *J. Orthoptera Res.* **8**: 163-236.
- 496 Montealegre-Z, F., Morris, G. K. & Mason, A. C. 2006. Generation of extreme ultrasonics in rainforest
497 katydids. *J. Exp. Biol.* **209**: 4923-4937.
- 498 Montealegre-Z, F. & Postles, M. 2010. Resonant sound production in *Copiphora gorgonensis*
499 (Tettigoniidae: Copiphorini), an endemic species from Parque Nacional Natural Gorgona,
500 Colombia. *J. Orthoptera Res.* **19**: 347-355.
- 501 Morris, G. K. (1999) Song in arthropods. In: *Encyclopedia of Reproduction*, Vol. 4 (Davey, K. G., ed.).
502 pp. 508–517. Academic Press, San Diego.
- 503 Morris, G. K. 2008. Size and carrier in the bog katydid, *Metrioptera sphagnum* (Orthoptera:
504 Ensifera, Tettigoniidae). *J. Orthoptera Res.* **17**: 333–342.
- 505 Morris, G. K., Aiken, R. B. & Kerr, G. E. 1975. Calling songs of *Neduba macneilli* and *Neduba sierranus*
506 (Orthoptera-Tettigoniidae-Decticinae). *J. N. Y. Entomol. Soc.* **83**: 229-234.
- 507 Morris, G. K. & Beier, M. B. 1982. Song structure and description of some Costa Rican katydids
508 (Orthoptera: Tettigoniidae). *Trans. Am. Entomol. Soc. (Phila.)* **108**: 287–314.
- 509 Morris, G. K., Klimas, D. E. & Nickle, D. A. 1989. Acoustic signals and systematics of false-leaf katydids
510 from Ecuador (Orthoptera, Tettigoniidae, Pseudophyllinae). *Trans. Am. Entomol. Soc. (Phila.)*
511 **114**: 215-263.
- 512 Morris, G. K. & Mason, A. C. 1995. Covert Stridulation - Novel sound generation by a South-American
513 Katydid. *Naturwissenschaften* **82**: 96-98.
- 514 Morris, G. K., Mason, A. C., Wall, P. & Belwood, J. J. 1994. High ultrasonic and tremulation signals in
515 neotropical katydids (Orthoptera, Tettigoniidae). *J. Zool. (Lond.)* **233**: 129-163.
- 516 Morris, G. K. & Pipher, R. E. 1967. Tegminal amplifiers and spectrum consistencies in *Conocephalus*
517 *nigropleurum* (Bruner), Tettigoniidae. *J. Insect Physiol.* **13**: 1075-1085.
- 518 Morris, G. K. & Pipher, R. E. 1972. The relation of song structure to tegminal movement in
519 *Metrioptera sphagnum* (Orthoptera : Tettigoniidae). *Can. Entomol.* **104**: 977-985.
- 520 Mugleston, J. D., Song, H. & Whiting, M. F. 2013. A century of paraphyly: A molecular phylogeny of
521 katydids (Orthoptera: Tettigoniidae) supports multiple origins of leaf-like wings. *Mol.*
522 *Phylogenet. Evol.* **69**: 1120-1134.

- 523 Orme, D., Freckleton, R. P., Thomas, G., Petzoldt, T. & Fritz, S. (2009) CAIC: comparative analysis
 524 using independent contrasts. pp. Available at: <http://R-Forge.R-project.org/projects/caic/>.
- 525 Pagel, M. 1999. Inferring the historical patterns of biological evolution. *Nature* **401**: 877-884.
- 526 Pipher, R. E. & Morris, G. K. 1974. Frequency Modulation in *Conocephalus nigropleurum*, Black-sided
 527 meadow katydid (Orthoptera-Tettigoniidae). *Can. Entomol.* **106**: 997-1001.
- 528 Revell, L. J. 2010. Phylogenetic signal and linear regression on species data. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **1**:
 529 319-329.
- 530 Rust, J., Stumpner, A. & Gottwald, J. 1999. Singing and hearing in a Tertiary bushcricket. *Nature* **399**:
 531 650-650.
- 532 Sales, G. D. & Pye, J. D. 1974. *Ultrasonic communication in animals*. Chapman and Hall, London.
- 533 Sarria-S, F. A., Buxton, K., Jonsson, T. & Montealegre-Z, F. 2016. Wing mechanics, vibrational and
 534 acoustic communication in a new bush-cricket species of the genus *Copiphora* (Orthoptera:
 535 Tettigoniidae) from Colombia. *Zool. Anz.* **263**: 55-65.
- 536 Sarria-S, F. A., Morris, G. K., Windmill, J. F. C., Jackson, J. & Montealegre-Z, F. 2014. Shrinking wings
 537 for ultrasonic pitch production: hyperintense ultra-short-wavelength calls in a new genus of
 538 Neotropical katydids (Orthoptera: Tettigoniidae). *Plos One* **9**.
- 539 Song, H., Amédégnato, C., Cigliano, M. M., Desutter-Grandcolas, L., Heads, S. W., Huang, Y., Otte, D.
 540 & Whiting, M. F. 2015. 300 million years of diversification: elucidating the patterns of
 541 orthopteran evolution based on comprehensive taxon and gene sampling. *Cladistics* **31**: 621-
 542 651.
- 543 Stumpner, A., Dann, A., Schink, M., Gubert, S. & Hugel, S. 2013. True katydids (Pseudophyllinae) from
 544 Guadeloupe: acoustic signals and functional considerations of song production. *J. Insect Sci.*
 545 **13**: 157.
- 546 Team, R. C. (2016) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. pp. R Foundation for
 547 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 548 Wedell, N. & Sandberg, T. 1995. Female preference for large males in the bushcricket *Requena* sp. 5
 549 (Orthoptera: Tettigoniidae). *J. Insect Behav.* **8**: 513-522.

550

551


552 Figure captions


553 **Fig. 1.** Wing vibration maps of different species showing the major deflection areas of both
 554 wings (RW=right wing, LW= left wing) at the carrier frequency of the calling song. (a)
 555 *Cyphoderris monstrosa* (Prophalangopsidae). (b) *Copiphora vigorosa* (Conocephalinae). (c)
 556 *Nastonotus foreli* (Pseudophyllinae). Left column (dorsal view) shows the deflection maps of
 557 the wings highlighting the vibrational contribution of the wing cells named as ‘neck’ and
 558 ‘harp’ (a and b). Note that in c the mirror frame completely isolates the vibrations and
 559 deflections of the mirror membrane from the rest of the wing. The right column (dorso-
 560 anterior view) shows the 3D vibration of the wings to illustrate the connection between mirror
 561 and harp). In some species the elasticity of a thin vein known as the handle (a and b) extend
 562 vibration beyond the mirror frame. Such elasticity and thin connection between mirror and
 563 harp does not occur in c. The mirror frame is shown with a red dashed outline. a modified
 564 from Chivers et al. (2017); b modified from Sarria et al. (2016), c unpublished data).




565 **Fig. 2.** Morphological predictors of carrier frequency. (a) Pronotum length as indicative of
566 body size. (b) Stridulatory file length as predictor of CF. The functional file was used in
567 katydids. However, for species with symmetric wings and two active stridulatory files (e.g.
568 *Cyphoderris monstrosa*) any of the two files could be used. (c-d) Right mirror and left mirror
569 areas as predictor of CF, respectively. All plots show both the regression lines of the Ordinary
570 Least Squares (OLS) and Phylogenetic Generalized Least Squares (PGLS).


571 **Fig. 3.** Validation of the PGLS models using extant species not included in the analysis for
572 which calling song CF and wing anatomy were available. (a) Song CF on CF predicted from
573 file dimension. (b) Song CF on left stridulatory field area, using mirror area only (red trace)
574 and the areas occupied by the mirror and adjacent harp (black outline, as shown in figure 1AB.
575 (c) Song CF on right stridulatory field only (blue outline) and the area occupied by mirror and
576 harp.

577 **Fig. 4.** Corroboration of the models. The plot shows the difference between predicted
578 frequency and real CF using species not included in the comparative analysis. No difference
579 (zero) indicated the predicted and real values are the same and the model is highly accurate.
580 Fl= File length, Rm= Right mirror, RmH= Right mirror plus harp, Lm= Left mirror, LmH=
581 Left mirror plus harp. The plot shows that the best predictors are Fl and Lm.









582

414 **Table 1:** PGLS model outputs comparing log frequency in relation to different morphological features. Models show phylogenetically-correct
 415 estimates and OLS estimates, Pagel's λ and R^2 for the models. * includes removal of single outlier

416

Model	Parameter	λ	R^2	Phylogenetically-controlled			Non-phylogenetically controlled		
				B \pm SE	t	p	B \pm SE	t	p
Midfemur length	Intercept	1.00	0.18	4.74 \pm 0.50	9.49	<0.001	4.33 \pm 0.46	9.49	<0.001
	Log midfemur length			-0.95 \pm 0.20	-4.68	<0.001	-0.58 \pm 0.21	-2.76	<0.001
Pronotum length	Intercept	1.00	0.31	5.00 \pm 0.44	11.38	<0.001	5.17 \pm 0.34	15.08	<0.001
	Log pronotum			1.32 \pm 0.20	-6.55	<0.001	-1.13 \pm 0.18	-6.21	<0.001
Left mirror area	Intercept	0.70	0.61	3.53 \pm 0.18	20.04	<0.001	3.86 \pm 0.05	69.74	<0.001
	Log left mirror			-0.54 \pm 0.06	-12.03	<0.001	-0.54 \pm 0.03	-15.67	<0.001
Right mirror area	Intercept	0.92	0.62	3.91 \pm 0.22	17.41	<0.001	3.72 \pm 0.06	60.36	<0.001
	Log right mirror			-0.62 \pm 0.05	-12.38	<0.001	-0.59 \pm 0.04	-15.27	<0.001
File length	Intercept	0.86	0.52	3.74 \pm 0.23	16.05	<0.001	3.83 \pm 0.07	51.75	<0.001
	Log file length			-0.97 \pm 0.10	-10.05	<0.001	-1.04 \pm 0.08	-13.49	<0.001
Pronotum length*	Intercept	0.98	0.47	5.00 \pm 0.33	15.10	<0.001	5.23 \pm 0.29	18.14	<0.001

417

418 **Table 2:** PGLS model outputs comparing log frequency in relation to pairs of morphological characters, of the three best models. Models show
419 phylogenetically-correct estimates and OLS estimates, Pagel's λ and R^2 for the models.

Parameter	λ	R^2	Phylogenetically-controlled			Non-phylogenetically controlled			
			AICc	B \pm SE	t	p	B \pm SE	t	p
Intercept	0	0.76	107.76	3.61 \pm 0.06	59.38	<0.001	3.60 \pm -0.07	49.98	<0.001
Left mirror				-0.36 \pm 0.05	-7.18	<0.001	-0.36 \pm 0.06	-6.29	<0.001
File length				-0.46 \pm 0.09	-5.14	0.002	0.44 \pm 0.11	-3.87	0.002
Intercept	0.91	0.66	109.15	4.54 \pm 0.29	15.52	<0.001	4.25 \pm 0.22	18.92	<0.001
Right mirror				-0.53 \pm 0.05	-3.19	<0.001	0.53 \pm 0.04	-12.26	<0.001
Pronotum length				0.53 \pm 0.16	-9.77	0.017	-0.32 \pm 0.13	-2.44	0.017
Intercept	0.77	0.66	112.26	3.92 \pm 0.18	21.78	<0.001	3.81 \pm 0.07	58.52	<0.001
Right mirror				-0.46 \pm 0.08	-6.08	<0.001	-0.39 \pm 0.07	-5.33	<0.001
File length				-0.36 \pm 0.13	-2.75	0.002	-0.42 \pm 0.13	-3.12	0.002

Table 3. Testing the mathematical models proposed in this research on fossils. We venture CF inference from published fossil material, where authors tried to infer CF from using various allometry methods. †= extinct species. ‡= two values from LW and RW files, respectively. (*) CF inferred without phylogenetic control. (**) CF calculated controlling for phylogeny. (?) Unknown data. Tett.=Tettigoniidae. Proph.=Prophalangopsidae. RM= Right mirror, LM= Left mirror

Species	Family	CF of male's call (kHz)	File length (mm)	RM area (mm ²)	RM & harp area (mm ²)	LM area (mm ²)	LM & harp area (mm ²)	CF (kHz) from file	CF (kHz) from RM	CF (kHz) from RM & harp	CF (kHz) from LM	CF (kHz) from LM & harp	Source
<i>Cyphoderris monstrosa</i>	Proph.	13.1	3.14/3.3 ‡	9.76	9.76	9.77	9.77	13.9/13.2 ‡	24	16	19.3	13.6	(Chivers et al., 2017)
<i>Pseudotettigonia amoena</i> †	Tett.	7.0*	4.2	?	?	6.35	11.5	10.5	N/A	N/A	12.6	9.12	(Rust et al., 1999)
<i>Pseudotettigonia leona</i> †	Tett.	6.5*	4.2	?	?	3.96	8.13	11	N/A	N/A	16.22	11.1	(Greenwalt & Rust, 2014)
<i>Archaboilus musicus</i> †	Proph.	6.4**	9.34	?	?	?	?	4.99	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	(Gu et al., 2012)