



AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Interspecific shape divergence in Aphodiini dung beetles: the case of Amidorus obscurus and A. immaturus (Coleoptera: Scarabaeoidea)

This is the author's manuscript Original Citation: Availability: This version is available http://hdl.handle.net/2318/108283 since Published version: DOI:10.1007/s13127-011-0055-1 Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

The final publication is available at Springer via <u>http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs13127-011-0055-1</u>

1	Interspecific shape divergence in Aphodiini dung beetles: the case of Amidorus obscurus and A.				
2	immaturus (Coleoptera: Scarabaeoidea)				
3					
4	Claudia Tocco, Angela Roggero*, Antonio Rolando and Claudia Palestrini				
5	Dipartimento di Biologia Animale e dell'uomo, Via Accademia Albertina 13 – I-10123 Torino, Italy				
6					
7	* Corresponding author: Angela Roggero, Dpt. of Biologia Animale e dell'uomo, University of				
8	Torino, I-10123 Torino, Italy. E-mail: angela.roggero@unito.it				
9					
10					
11	Abstract The dung beetles Amidorus obscurus and A. immaturus are nearly indistinguishable, being				
12	characterized by a marked constancy in external morphological traits and little sexual dimorphism in				
13	adults. We studied two syntopic populations from the Italian Alps by means of geometric				
14	morphometric analyses. To identify eventual undetected shape differences between species, we				
15	focused upon the head, pronotum and scutellum (three external traits) and the epipharynx. Results				
16	indicate that the external traits are rather similar in the two species, whereas the epipharynx is clearly				
17	different. Interspecific differences in the aedeagus were also taken into account; they are noteworthy				
18	because parametes of A. immaturus are different in shape and at least three times longer than those of				
19	A. obscurus. If it is assumed that the diversification of the two species took place during quaternary ice				
20	ages, A. immaturus would have evolved marked differences rather quickly, in keeping with the				
21	hypothesis of rapid genital evolution. In an ontogenetic trajectory framework, we also considered the				
22	morphology of larvae. Interspecific divergence in the shape of the epipharynx is already evident at the				
23	preimaginal stage, whereas that of the genital disc is not. Accordingly, we hypothesise that feeding				
24	and reproductive traits of the two species diverge morphologically when they become functional.				
25	Finally, by considering recent advances in ecological and evolutionary knowledge of dung beetles, the				
26	pattern of relative constancy in external morphology exhibited by the tribe Aphodiini, and that of great				
27	morphological diversification displayed by Onthophagini, were compared and hypotheses about the				
28	origins of these differences discussed.				
29					
30	Keywords: constancy in external morphology; divergent evolution; larval instars; geometric				

31 morphometrics; trait functionality.

33 Introduction

- 34 The subfamily Aphodiinae is a very speciose group (about 2000 species) that includes the dung beetle
- tribe Aphodiini, which, with about a thousand species being described so far (Scholtz et al. 2009), is
- 36 characterized by a worldwide distribution, with a focus on temperate regions. Aphodiini display a
- 37 rather uniform foraging behaviour, with both adults and preimaginal instars of most species being
- 38 coprophagous and dung-dwelling (Dellacasa and Dellacasa 2006).
- 39 The remarkable taxonomic diversity of Aphodiini shows a certain constancy in the phenotypes of
- 40 adults, which are characterized by a small body size (2-20 mm), a rather extended clypeus which
- 41 covers the mouthparts, a pygidium largely overlapped by the elytra, untrimmed basal margins of
- 42 elytra, nine-segmented antennae and the posterior tibiae with two apical spurs (Dellacasa and
- 43 Dellacasa 2006). A previous phylogenetic analysis based on morphology suggested that in this group
- 44 variation in morphological characters is small (Cabrero-Sañudo 2006). Aphodiini lack evident sexual
- dimorphism and alternative phenotypes in males, both potentially promoting diversification and
- 46 speciation, and which are widespread in other dung beetle groups (Moczek 2008, 2010; Pfennig et al.
- 47 2010). In the subfamily Scarabaeinae, the tribe Onthophagini (2500 taxa or species, Scholtz et al.
- 48 2009, Philips 2011), for instance, displays a tremendous diversity of horn structures with many species
- 49 developing horns or horn-like structures of some kind, which represent evolutionary modification of
- 50 the same, original ancestral structure (Moczek 2005, 2008, 2011). In many species of the genus
- 51 *Onthophagus,* there are large *major* males producing horns and smaller *minor* males which are
- bornless (a case of male polyphenism; Emlen et al. 2005; Macagno et al. 2009; Tomkins and Moczek
- 53 2009, Knell 2011). Phylogenetically close species with similar horns may diverge in static allometries,
- 54 males of each species developing horns at different body sizes (Emlen et al. 2005; Lukasik et al. 2006;
- 55 Moczek 2002; Tomkins and Simmons 2002).
- 56 In the pattern of uniformity of phenotypes exhibited in Aphodiini, interspecific differences in external
- 57 morphology may be very subtle and certain species pairs may be virtually indistinguishable. To
- 58 overcome these difficulties, a geometric morphometric approach can be employed. Geometric
- 59 morphometrics has proved to be a useful technique for solving a variety of biological problems, and is
- 60 more powerful than traditional morphometrics, having the ability to identify very subtle differences in
- 61 shape (Lawing and Polly 2010; Slice 2007).
- 62 In northern Europe, dung beetle communities are dominated by Aphodiinae (Errouissi et al. 2004; Jay-
- Robert et al. 1997, 2008) and the same is true for high-altitude communities of the Alps and Pyrenees
- 64 (Cabrero-Sañudo and Zardoya 2004; Cabrero Sañudo 2006; Cabrero Sañudo and Lobo 2006).
- 65 In the present study, we focused upon two species of the genus *Amidorus* (systematics according to
- 66 Dellacasa and Dellacasa 2006 used), inhabiting high-altitude alpine pastures of the Ferret Valley
- 67 (north western Italian Alps): Amidorus obscurus (Fabricius, 1792) and A. immaturus (Mulsant, 1842).
- Both species are Palaearctic (Dellacasa and Dellacasa 2006; Palestrini et al. 2008; Tagliaferri 2000,

Tarasov 2008), although *A.obscurus* is widespread from Spain to Syria and Transcaucasus, whereas *A. immaturus* is restricted to a smaller area (SE France, NW Italy and Austria), included within the range of *A. obscurus*.

In the pattern of uniformity of phenotypes exhibited in Aphodiini, interspecific differences in external 72 73 morphology may be very subtle and certain species pairs may be virtually indistinguishable. Amidorus 74 obscurus and A. immaturus provide just such an example of strong morphological uniformity due to 75 low phenotypic plasticity. The two species (and the two sexes) are almost indistinguishable on the 76 basis of the external morphology, and the external traits typically employed in taxa identification (e.g., 77 the clypeal margin of head, the pronotum punctuation, the elytral striae and interstices, the scutellum 78 features) are in fact virtually useless. Instead, males of the two species can be identified on the basis of 79 the shape of the aedeagus, which shows clear differences in the two species (Dellacasa 1983). (It must 80 be underlined, however, that females of both species cannot be identified on the basis of genitalia 81 (Dellacasa and Dellacasa 2006).) As a consequence, the taxonomic history of A. immaturus has been 82 troubled (Tagliaferri 2000), being correctly identified only in recent times (Nicolas and Riboulet 83 1967). This may partly explain why the state of the knowledge of the life history of the two species is 84 insufficient. It is only known that their general ecological habits are alike: both species are montane, oligotopic, with a preference for exposed pastures, and may be collected from spring to autumn in 85 different types of dung (Dellacasa and Dellacasa 2006). 86 87 To identify eventual undetected shape differences between species, we focused at first on adults and took into account three external traits (head, pronotum, scutellum) and two internal traits (epipharynx 88 89 and male genitalia). We examined the overall shape variation of the anatomical parts listed above 90 (with the exception of the male genitalia, see Method for justification) using geometric 91 morphometrics. This method has proven to be a useful technique that is more powerful than traditional 92 morphometrics in identifying very subtle differences in shape (Lawing and Polly 2010; Slice 2007) and is a robust and reliable technique to study morphological variation in invertebrates (Andrade et al. 93 2009; Becerra and Valdecasas 2004; Crews 2009; Holwell and Herberstein 2010; Holwell et al. 2010). 94 To detect the developmental origin of interspecific differentiation, two larval stages (1st instar and 2nd 95 instar) were also examined by geometric morphometrics, focusing on the shape of the larval 96 97 epipharynx and on the male genital disc (a precursor of male genitalia). 98 The pattern of relative constancy in external morphology exhibited by Aphodiini was compared with the pattern of great morphological diversification exhibited by the Onthophagini, which we also 99 100 studied using geometric morphometrics (Macagno et al. 2009; Pizzo et al. 2006, 2008), with the main

aim to identify possible determinants of the evolution of the two divergent morphological patterns.

102

- 103
- 104

105 Material and Methods

106 Sampling

- 107 About two hundred (N= 242) unidentified and unsexed *Amidorus* adults were collected in the Ferret
- 108 Valley, an alpine valley on the Italian side of the Monte Bianco massif, at the top end of the Aosta
- 109 Valley, north-western Italy (45°50'60" N; 7°01'00"), in summer 2008. Individuals were reared in
- isolation in covered plastic containers (9.5 cm diameter, 12.5 cm height) under laboratory conditions
- 111 for about two months. Then, they were dissected and unequivocally assigned to one species using the
- aedeagus (males) and the epipharynx (both sexes) as specific diagnostic characters (Roggero, Tocco
- and Palestrini, unpublished results). Larvae found in the containers of females were therefore
- 114 identified *a posteriori*, i.e. after the identification of their mothers.
- 115

116 Morphological preparations

117 Adults and larvae were cleaned in 70% ETOH, stored in vials filled with 99% ETOH and dissected

- 118 without boiling.
- **119** *a) Adults*
- 120 For morphological analyses, we used all *A. immaturus* we collected (N= 24, i.e. 9 males and 15
- 121 females) and only a part of the *A. obscurus* sample (N= 66, 32 males and 34 females, randomly
- 122 chosen). Preparations of male genitalia and epipharynges followed the well known, standardized
- methods usually employed for Coleoptera (Dellacasa 1983; Dellacasa et al. 2010; Skelley 1993).
- 124 The aedeagus of the two species diverges in the shape of the apices of paramers. However, as pointed
- 125 out by Nicolas and Riboulet (1967), the apices of paramers are membranous and their definite shape
- 126 can be fully appreciated only when preparations are re-hydrated; this prevented us from using
- 127 geometric morphometric analysis on this trait.
- 128 The epipharynx of adults is a complex, asymmetrical structure on the inner surface of the clypeus with
- a pubescence that is variously-shaped and developed. It is constituted by a membranous lamina and
- 130 many sclerotized support structures (Dellacasa 1983; Dellacasa and Dellacasa 2006; Dellacasa et al.
- 131 2010), which we used for the geometric morphometric analyses.
- 132 Epipharynx, head, scutellum and pronotum images were taken using a stereoscopic dissecting
- 133 microscope Leica Z16Apo (Leica Microsystems AG, Wetzlar, Germany).
- 134 b) Larvae
- 135 For the analysis of the epipharynx we used 40 individuals of *A. immaturus* (i.e. 12 male and 7 female
- 136 1^{st} instar larvae; 8 male and 13 female 2^{nd} instar larvae) and 38 of *A. obscurus* (i.e. 8 male and 10
- 137 female 1st instar larvae; 9 male and 11 female 2nd instar larvae).
- 138 In coleopteran larvae, the epipharynx is an external, relatively simple structure (Steinmann and
- 139 Zombori 1984), in which certain parts (i.e. the tormae) are not entirely developed as in adults. Unlike
- adults, in the larvae the epipharynx surface is glabrous for the most part.

- 141 To identify the preimaginal instars, we used the measures of head width as proposed by Daly (1985),
- 142 the 1^{st} instar being smaller than the 2^{nd} instar.
- 143 To identify the sex of the larvae, we used the genital disc, an unpaired embryonic structure located on
- the ventral side of the abdomen, which is well-developed and evident in males only (Martinez and
- Lumaret 2003, 2005; Moczek and Nijhout 2002; Roggero, Tocco and Palestrini, unpublished results.).
- 146 For the analysis of the genital disc we employed 33 larvae of *A. immaturus* (i.e., 18 individuals of 1st
- 147 instar and 15 individuals of 2^{nd} instar) and 41 larvae of A. *obscurus* (19 individuals of 1^{st} instar and 22
- 148 individuals of 2^{nd} instar).

149 Landmarks and measurements

- 150 In landmark-based morphometric analyses, the morphology of an object is represented by coordinates
- 151 of sets of landmarks (Bookstein 1991). The landmark points (as defined in Appendix 1) were chosen
- 152 for their ease of identification, homology in the two species and ability to capture the general shape of
- each morphological structure, and were digitized using tpsDig 2.16 (Rohlf 2010a).
- 154 In adults, landmarks on the head (N = 6), scutellum (N = 5), and epipharynx (N = 9) were digitized as
- shown in Fig. 1. For the pronotum (N = 16) we used the sliding semi-landmarks method (Bookstein
- 156 1997; Perez et al. 2006; Mitteroecker & Gunz 2009), as implemented in tpsRelw v1.49 (Rohlf 2010b)
- 157 (Fig. 1). In larval instars, landmarks were digitized on the epipharynx (N = 9) and genital disc (N = 7),
- as shown in Fig. 2.

159 Statistical analyses

- 160 To test whether the variation in shape in each dataset was small enough to have an adequate
- 161 approximation of the linear tangent space to the non-linear Kendall shape space, we employed
- tpsSmall v1.20 (Rohlf 2003) on the different landmark configurations.
- 163 Generalized Procrustes analysis (GPA) was performed by tpsRelw v1.49 (Rohlf 2010b), retaining the
- 164 centroid size and relative warp values for further analyses. For each anatomical structure, we drew
- scatterplots of the shape variation within the sample summarized by the relative warps (SPSS Statistics
 v18.0, SPSS[©] Inc.).
- 167 Significance of group membership of specimens for each configuration of points was tested by the
- 168 Multivariate Test of Significance (equivalent to the Hotelling Generalized T^2 test) as implemented by
- tpsRegr v1.37 (Rohlf 2009), in which the Goodall's F-test (Goodall 1991) is employed to test whether
- the mean shapes would differ more than expected by chance (Hallgrimsson et al. 2007). Goodall's F
- 171 test compares the difference in mean shape between two samples relative to the shape variation found
- 172 within the samples and is the most powerful approach to test whether the mean shapes differ more
- than expected by chance. The proportion of Goodall's F statistics from randomly permuted data sets (n
- 174 = 1000 here) as great or greater than the Goodall's statistic on the original data set is given as the
- significance probability. Use of the permutation test relaxes some of the restrictive assumptions of
- 176 Goodall's F test (Goodall 1991; Rohlf 2000). Goodall's F test only considers the total amount of shape

variation, and does not consider the directionality of the variation. With small samples (relative to thenumber of landmark coordinates), this is a useful property.

179 Discriminant Function Analysis was carried out on the whole data set of relative warp scores to obtain

a classification matrix based on shape variation (in keeping with Janžekovic and Kryštufek 2004;

181 Kryštufek and Janžekovic 2005; Pizzo et al. 2006, 2008) using SPSS v18. We used the percentage of

182 correct classifications of cross-validation to further evaluate interspecific differences in shape (in

183 cross-validation, each case is classified by the functions derived from all cases other than the case in

- 184 question).
- 185
- 186
- 187

188 **Results**

189 Adults

190 A very good correspondence between shape and tangent space was found for all anatomical traits

191 (slope = 0.99; correlation = 1.0), thus indicating that the geometrical heterogeneity of the sample was

small enough to allow subsequent analyses.

193 External traits

194 Plots of the first two RW scores (Fig. 3) suggested that external traits (head, pronotum and scutellum)

195 were rather similar in shape. Interspecific differences in the shape of the head, pronotum and

scutellum tested through the Multivariate Test of Significance are given in Table 1. Results of

197 permutation tests again suggested a poor interspecific differentiation in all the external anatomical

traits (Table 1). In the Discriminant Function Analysis, percentages of correct classification in cross-

validation were poor, all being below 70% (head: 64.4%; pronotum: 64.4%; scutellum: 65.6%).

200 Aedeagus and epipharynx

201 Interspecific differences in the shape of the aedeagus were visually apparent because of the peculiar

shape of the apices of paramers, that are unmistakably different in the two species (Nicolas and

203 Riboulet 1967; Dellacasa 1983). They are short, arched, tapered and pointed in A. obscurus, and at

least three times longer, mostly rectilinear, evenly broad and rounded distally in *A. immaturus*. The

205 interspecific difference in the shape of epipharynx was also highly significant (Table 1). The plot of

the first two RW scores confirmed this pattern because it displayed two distinct, non-overlapping,

207 clusters, clearly demonstrating this trait does vary between species (Fig. 3, bottom, on the right).

- 208 The results of the Generalized Goodall F-test and the Permutation Tests (Table 1) were significant,
- suggesting specimens can be correctly classified on the grounds of the shape of the epipharynx.
- 210 Finally, in the Discriminant Analysis most cross-validated grouped cases were correctly classified
- 211 (96.7%).
- 212 Larvae

- A very good correspondence between shape and tangent space was obtained for all traits (genital disc
- slope = 0.99, correlation = 0.99 for both instars; epipharynx slope = 0.99, correlation = 1.00 for both
- instars), thus indicating that the geometrical heterogeneity of the sample was small enough to allow
- subsequent analyses.
- 217 Genital disc
- 218 Plots of the RW values evidenced a marked superimposition of the two species (Fig. 4, top).
- 219 Interspecific differences in the shape of the genital discs tested through the Multivariate Test of
- 220 Significance confirmed a marked species similarity (Table 2), suggesting that they cannot be
- 221 distinguished by the genital disc in either preimaginal stage. The Discriminant Function Analysis
- correctly classified 64.9% (1st instar) and 75.7 % (2nd instar) of individuals, respectively.
- 223 Epipharynx
- Plots of the two first RW scores of the 1st instar showed a relative overlap between the two species,
- whereas that of 2nd instar displayed two distinct clusters, although partly superimposed (Fig. 4, bottom,
- 226 on the right). Interspecific differences in the shape of epipharynx, however, suggested differences
- 227 were significant in both larval instars (table 2). Discriminant analysis indicated interspecific
- differences were more conspicuous in the 2^{nd} instar (97.5%) than in the 1^{st} instar (89.5%).
- 229
- 230
- 231

232 Discussion

233 Interspecific divergence between A. obscurus and A. immaturus

- 234 Geometric morphometrics was used to describe interspecific morphological variation and to depict
- subtle interspecific differences. Plots of relative warp scores, Multivariate Tests of Significance and
- 236 Discriminant function analyses gave rise, generally, to complementary results: in adults, the shape of
- external traits (head, pronotum and scutellum) were rather similar in the two species, whereas the
- 238 epipharynx was clearly different. The aedeagus was not analysed morphometrically because
- 239 interspecific differences in shape and length of parameters were quite apparent. Therefore, the
- 240 interspecific shape divergence pattern evidenced in adults was similar to that observed in two
- 241 Onthophagus sister species (O. taurus and O. illyricus), which were poorly distinguishable on the
- basis of morphological external traits, but revealed significant differences in the aedeagus and
- 243 epipharynx (Pizzo et al. 2006, 2009).
- 244 The two species examined in this study are phylogenetically very closely related. Piau et al. (1999), on
- the grounds of the genetic differences observed through mtDNA and PCR-RFLP analyses, suggested
- the mitotypes of the two species derived from one common mitotype ancestor. Jay-Robert et al.
- 247 (1997), mostly on the grounds of the characteristic distribution of the two species of Amidorus,

- assumed that certain populations remained isolated within the Alps during quaternary glaciations andproduced local speciation in a mountain system.
- 250 If so, and with reference, in particular, to the last glaciation (15-20000 years ago), A. immaturus would
- 251 have developed an exaggerated trait, the elongated aedeagus, rather quickly. Within this framework,
- the evolution of an exaggerated and complex primary sexual trait may have been an adaptation to
- avoid hybridization during and after the speciation event. All the above is in keeping with the tenet
- which assumes reproductive organs evolve quickly in insects (rapid genital evolution), and also with
- the results of several studies regarding the role of genital divergence in speciation (Dapporto 2010a,
- 256 2010b; Gilligan and Wenzel 2008; House and Simmons 2003; Mutanen and Pretorius 2007, Mutanen
- 257 et al. 2007; Parzer and Moczek 2008; Pizzo et al. 2008).
- 258 After having detected this pattern in adults, we focused upon interspecific differences in the genital
- disc and epipharynx of larvae, looking for the ontogenetic stage at which interspecific differentiation
- arises. It worked out that the male genital disc is neither differentiated in 1^{st} nor in 2^{nd} instars, whereas
- 261 the epipharynx is significantly differentiated in the 2^{nd} , but not the 1^{st} , instar. It should be taken into
- account that early larval stages are smaller and therefore less differentiated than later ones, hence
- 263 probably making interspecific differences in shape morphology less apparent. We believe the low
- 264 morphological divergence in the epipharinx of the 1st instar (Multivariate Test of Significance gave
- significant results, Discriminant Function Analysis correctly classified 89.5% of individuals, but the
- 266 first two relative warp scores were largely overlapping) may be interpreted in this context. It can be
- 267 hypothesized that evolutionary changes that produced the great interspecific difference in the shape of
- the aedeagus discussed above took place in the latest preimaginal instar, as in most hemimetabolous
- 269 insects. The preimaginal instars, in fact, are more prone to changes than adult stages, whose
- 270 morphology is somehow frozen in the invariance of its exoskeleton (Minelli 2007).
- Finally, if we consider in the same context both the imaginal and the preimaginal data, a correlation
- 272 between interspecific divergence and functionality of the trait seems to arise. The adult male aedeagus
- is functional (adults are able to reproduce), whereas the larval male genital disc, an aggregate of
- undifferentiated cells that are the precursor of adult genitalia, is not. Accordingly, the former trait is
- different in the two species, while the latter is not (although it must be admitted that, at this stage, an
- eventual diverging trait may not have shown a size or a developmental status accessible to our
- 277 geometric morphometric analyses). In a similar way, the shape of the epipharynx is functional both in
- adults and in larvae (that, in fact, spend most of the time feeding on dung) and, accordingly, it is
- significantly divergent in the two species both in adults and in larvae (in the 2^{nd} instar at least). Our
- 280 results indicate that interspecific divergence in the shape of the trait may be correlated with its
- 281 reproductive or feeding functionality, i.e. feeding and reproductive traits of the two species diverge
- 282 morphologically when, during the ontogenetic development, they become functional.

- 283 This study focused on specimens from both species sampled from the same locality. In syntopic
- 284 conditions, in theory, there could either be hybridisation or increased contrast between species due to
- selection against hybridisation. However, the morphological differences of genitalia suggest the two
- species are now reproductively isolated and we are therefore confident the distinct inter-specific
- 287 divergence found here for some traits could also be recovered in populations where either of the
- 288 species occurs alone (Piau et al 1999).

289 Divergent patterns of evolution in Aphodiini and Onthophagini

- 290 Aphodiini and Onthophagini display dramatically divergent patterns of diversification in external
- 291 morphology. Against the relative constancy in external phenotype exhibited by the Aphodiini lineage
- 292 with lower levels of phenotypic plasticity, Onthophagini present a large interspecific diversity of
- external morphologies (Parzer and Moczek 2008; Tomkins and Moczek 2009). This diversification
- 294 pattern still holds at the intra-specific scale. Aphodiini do not exhibit sexual dimorphism, whereas
- 295 Onthophagini exhibit both sexual dimorphism and male polyphenism (Moczek 2010; Simmons et al.
- 296 2007).
- 297 Species ecology is known to influence the evolution of certain morphological traits. Stebnicka and
- Howden (1995), for instance, have identified two typologies of epipharynges in adults (divergent as
- for pubescence and general shape) that correspond to coprophagous and saprophagous beetles.
- 300 Aphodiini and Onthophagini display contrasting habitat/climate requirements, the former being typical
- 301 of habitats in cold/temperate climates whereas the latter is typical of habitats in warm/temperate
- 302 climates. Onthophagini, in fact, are mainly distributed in the Mediterranean and other temperate or
- 303 warm areas (Scholtz et al. 2009), whereas Aphodiini dominate northern European dung beetle
- 304 communities (Jay-Robert et al. 1997) as well as high-altitude communities of the Alps and the
- 305 Pyrenees (Cabrero-Sañudo and Zardoya 2004; Cabrero Sañudo 2006; Cabrero Sañudo and Lobo
- 2006). Most of Onthophaginae are considered to be warm-adapted, whereas many Aphodiinae are
- 307 considered to be cold-adapted (Lobo et al. 2007a, 2007b; Scholtz et al. 2009; Verdù et al. 2007). These
- 308 differences are reflected in the local distribution of species; in the Alps Scarabaeinae dominate during
- 309 spring and summer on south-facing slopes, whereas Aphodiinae dominate from spring to autumn on
- 310 north-facing slopes (Jay-Robert et al. 2008; Zamora et al. 2007).
- 311 We suggest habitat/climate factors have acted to set divergent breeding and thermoregulatory
- 312 strategies in the two groups. Within these different strategies, sexual selection (breeding strategies)
- and natural selection (thermoregulatory strategies) may have contributed to drive the divergent
- morphological evolution of the two groups producing medium-size horned species (Onthophagini) on
- the one hand and small-sized unhorned species (Aphodiini) on the other.
- 316

317 i) Breeding ecology

318 Except for a few cases, Aphodiini adults live and breed in the dung mass where they do not construct

- nests (dwellers) (Dellacasa and Dellacasa 2006; Hanski and Cambefort 1991). Conversely,
- 320 Onthophagini dig burrows under the dung mass that are provisioned with dung to form a ball (the
- brood ball, destined for larval food) where an egg is laid (tunnelers). In Onthophagini, horns of large
- males are used to defend the nest and prevent other males from copulating with females, which may
- 323 spend long periods underground caring for the brood (Hunt and Simmons 2002, Knell 2011).The
- 324 different expression of sexually dimorphic ornamentation is the major form of interspecific variation
- in Onthophagini. Aphodiini males do not need to defend the nest and, therefore, they do not need to
- develop horns. It has been suggested that nesting behavior has been mediated more by environmental
- conditions than phylogeny (Scholtz et al. 2009). We hypothesized therefore that these two divergent
 breeding strategies may have arisen as an answer to the different ecological and climatic conditions
- experienced. The non-nesting strategy, in particular, seems to be the best one for species living in cold
- 330 habitats by enabling individuals to breed several times within the short breeding period characteristic
- of the habitat (Scholtz et al. 2009).
- ii) Thermoregulatory ecology. Species of both Aphodiini and Onthophagini are usually smaller than
 the body size above which the regulation of body temperature through internal processes is thought to
 be physiologically possible (Bartholomew and Heinrich 1978; Prange 1996; Roxburgh et al. 1996,
 Chow and Klok 2011) and therefore have to rely on other mechanisms to respond to changes in
- external temperature. One mechanism to respond to such changes is to actively seek out locations with
- appropriate temperatures, or to move between warm and cold temperature locations so as to achieve a
- preferred average temperature. Shepherd et al. (2008) found that horn possession in two Onthophagini
- 339 species dramatically alters this thermal preference behavior. They also hypothesized that the formation
- 340 of long horns diverts resources away from structures crucial for active heat transfer, such as thoracic
- 341 muscles, and compromises the later ability to effectively thermoregulate in the face of temperature
- 342 fluctuations. To our knowledge, no thermoregulatory data are available for Aphodiini, but it is
- 343 reasonable to think that an efficient thermo-regulatory behavior is needed to secure survival in cold
- 344 climates. This might also explain why Aphodiini do not develop horns. Moreover, Shepherd et al.
- 345 (2008) also demonstrated that body size significantly affects thermoregulation and suggested that
- larger individuals, by virtue of their size, can operate at higher temperatures, whereas smaller
- 347 individuals prefer to operate at lower temperatures. This may also serve to explain why, as a rule,
- 348 Aphodiini are smaller than Onthophagini.
- 349 Summing up, we suggest habitat/climate factors may have underpinned divergent reproductive and
- thermoregulatory strategies in the two groups and that strategies of the Onthophagini enabled the
- development of horns (and other forms of sexual dimorphism), whereas those of Aphodiini were not.
- 352
- 353

354

355 Aknowledgements

356 The research was supported by funds from Turin University. Claudia Tocco was funded through a

- 357 grant from Dipartimento di Biologia Animale e dell'Uomo of Turin. Dan Chamberlain checked the
- English text.
- 359
- 360
- 361

362 **References**

- 363 Andrade, C. A. C., Vieira, R. D., Ananina, G., & Klaczko, L. B. (2009). Evolution of the male
- 364 genitalia: morphological variation of the aedeagi in a natural population of *Drosophila mediopunctata*.
- 365 Genetica, 135, 13–23.
- 366 Bartholomew, G. A. & Heinrich, B. (1978). Endothermy in African dung beetles during flight, ball
- 367 making, and ball rolling. Journal of Experimental Biology, 73, 65–83.
- Becerra, J. M., & Valdecasas, A. G. (2004). Landmark superimposition for taxonomic identification.
- Biological Journal of the Linnean Society, 81, 267–274.
- 370 Bookstein, F. L. (1991). Morphometric Tools for Landmark Data: Geometry and Biology. Cambridge:
- 371 Cambridge University Press.
- Bookstein, F. L. (1997). Landmark methods for forms without landmarks: morphometrics of group
- differences in outline shape. Medical Image Analysis, 1, 225–243.
- 374 Cabrero-Sañudo, F. J. (2006). The phylogeny of Iberian Aphodiini species (Coleoptera,
- 375 Scarabaeoidea, Scarabaeidae, Aphodiinae) based on morphology. Systematic Entomology, 32, 156–
 376 175.
- 377 Cabrero-Sañudo, F. J., & Lobo, J. M. (2006). Determinant variables of Iberian Peninsula Aphodiinae
- diversity (Coleoptera, Scarabaeoidea, Aphodiidae). Journal of Biogeography, 33, 1021–1043.
- 379 Cabrero-Sañudo, F. J., & Zardoya, R. (2004). Phylogenetic relationships of Iberian Aphodiini
- 380 (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae) based on morphological and molecular data. Molecular Phylogenetics and
- 381 Evolution, 31, 1084–1100.
- 382 Chown, S. L., & Gaston, K. J. (2010). Body size variation in insects: a macroecological perspective.
- 383 Biological Reviews, 85, 139–169.
- 384 Chow, S.L., & Klok, C.J. (2011). The ecological implications of physiological diversity in dung
- 385 beetles. In L. W.Simmons & T. J.Ridsdill-Smith (Eds.), Ecology and evolution of dung beetles (200-
- 386 219). Wiley-Blackwell.
- 387 Crews, S. C. (2009). Assessment of rampant genitalic variation in the spider genus Homalonychus
- 388 (Araneae, Homalonychidae). Invertebrate Biology, 128, 107–125.
- 389 Daly, H. V. (1985). Insect morphometrics. Annual Review of Entomology, 30, 415–438.

- 390 Dapporto, L. (2010a). Speciation in Mediterranean refugia and post-glacial expansion of Zerynthia
- 391 polyxena (Lepidoptera, Papilionidae) Journal of Zoological Systematics and Evolutionary Research,
- **392** 48, 229–237.
- 393 Dapporto, L. (2010b). Satyrinae butterflies from Sardinia and Corsica show a kaleidoscopic
- intraspecific biogeography (Lepidoptera, Nymphlidae). Biological Journal of the Linnean Society,
- **395** 100, 195–212.
- 396 Dellacasa, G. (1983). Sistematica e nomenclatura degli Aphodiini italiani (Coleoptera Scarabaeidae:
- 397 Aphodiinae). Torino: Museo Regionale di Scienze Naturali.
- 398 Dellacasa, G., & Dellacasa, M. (2006). Fauna d'Italia. XLI. Coleoptera. Aphodiidae, Aphodiinae.
- 399 Bologna: Calderini.
- 400 Dellacasa, G., Dellacasa, M., & Mann, D. J. (2010). The morphology of the labrum (epipharynx,
- 401 ikrioma and aboral surface) of adult Aphodiini (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae: Aphodiinae) and the
- 402 implications for systematics. Insecta Mundi, 132, 1–21.
- 403 Emlen, D. J., Hunt, J., & Simmons, L. W. (2005). Evolution of sexual dimorphism and male
- 404 dimorphism in the expression of beetle horns: phylogenetic evidence for modularity, evolutionary
- 405 lability, and constraint. American Naturalist, 166, 42–68.
- 406 Errouissi, F., Jay-Robert, P., Lumaret, J.-P., & Piau, O. (2004). Composition and Structure of Dung
- 407 Beetle (Coleoptera: Aphodiidae, Geotrupidae, Scarabaeidae) Assemblages in Mountain Grasslands of
- 408 the Southern Alps. Annals of the Entomological Society of America, 97,701–709.
- 409 Gilligan, T. M., & Wenzel, J. W. (2008). Extreme intraspecific variation in Hystrichophora
- 410 (Lepidoptera: Tortricidae) genitalia questioning the lock-and-key hypothesis. Annales Zoologici
- 411 Fennici, 45, 465–477.
- 412 Goodall, C. (1991). Procrustes Methods in the Statistical Analysis of Shape. Journal of the Royal
- 413 Statistical Society Series B (Methodological), 53, 285–339.
- 414 Hallgrimsson, B., Zelditch, M. L., Parsons, T. E., Kristensen, E., Young, N. M., & Boyd, S. K. (2007).
- 415 Morphometrics and Biological Anthropology in the Post-Genomic Age. In M. A. Katzenberg, & S. R.
- 416 Saunders (Eds.), Biological Anthropology of the Human Skeleton (pp. 207–235). Hoboken: Wiley &
- 417 Sons.
- 418 Hanski, I., & Cambefort, Y. (1991). Dung beetle Ecology. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 419 Holwell, G. I., & Herberstein, M. E. (2010). Chirally Dimorphic Male Genitalia in Praying Mantids
- 420 (*Ciulfina*: Liturgusidae). Journal of Morphology, 271, 1176–1184.
- 421 Holwell, G. I., Winnick, C., Tregenza, T., & Herberstein, M. E. (2010). Genital shape correlates with
- 422 sperm transfer success in the praying mantis *Ciulfina klassi* (Insecta: Mantodea). Behavioral Ecology
- 423 and Sociobiology, 64, 617–625.

- 424 House, C. M., & Simmons, L. W. (2003). Genital morphology and fertilization success in the dung
- 425 beetle *Onthophagus taurus*: an example of sexually selected male genitalia. Proceedings of the Royal
- 426 Society Series B, 270, 447-455
- 427 Hunt, J., & Simmons, L. W. (2002). Behavioural dynamics of biparental care in the dung beetle
- 428 *Onthophagus taurus*. Animal Behaviour, 64, 65–75.
- 429 Janžekovič, F., & Kryštufek, B. (2004). Geometric morphometry of the upper molars in European
- 430 wood mice *Apodemus*. Folia Zoologica, 53, 47–55.
- 431 Jay-Robert, P., Lobo, J. M., Lumaret, J.-P. (1997). Altutudinal Turnover and Species Richness
- 432 Variation in European Montane Dung Beetles Assemblages. Arctic and Alpine Research, 29, 196–205.
- 433 Jay-Robert, P., Errouissi, F., & Lumaret, J.-P. (2008). Temporal coexistence of dung-dweller and soil-
- 434 digger dung beetles (Coleoptera, Scarabaeoidea) in contrasting Mediterranean habitats. Bulletin of
- 435 Entomological Research, 98, 303–316.
- 436 Knell, R. (2011). Male contest competition and the evolution of weapons. In L. W.Simmons & T.
- 437 J.Ridsdill-Smith (Eds.), Ecology and evolution of dung beetles (47-65). Wiley-Blackwell.
- 438 Kryštufek, B., & Janžekovič, F. (2005). Relative warp analysis of cranial and upper molar shape in
- 439 rock mice Apodemus mystacinus sensu lato. Acta Theriologica, 50, 493–504.
- Lawing, A. M., & Polly, P. D. (2010). Geometric morphometrics: recent applications to the study of
 evolution and development. Journal of Zoology, 280, 1–7.
- 442 Lobo, J. M., Guéorguiev, B., & Chehlarov, E. (2007a). Convergences and divergences between two
- 443 European mountain dung beetle assemblages (Coleoptera, Scarabaeoidea). Animal Biodiversity and
- 444 Conservation, 30, 83–96.
- 445 Lobo, J. M., Baselga, A., Hortal, J., Jiménez-Valverde, A., & Gómez, J. F. (2007b). How does the
- 446 knowledge about the spatial distribution of Iberian dung beetle species accumulate over time?
- 447 Diversity and Distributions, 13, 772–780.
- 448 Lukasik, P., Radwan, J., & Tomkins, J. L. (2006). Structural complexity of the environment affects the
- survival of alternative male reproductive tactics. Evolution, 6, 399–403.
- 450 Macagno, A. L. M., Pizzo, A., Roggero, A., Rolando, A., & Palestrini, C. (2009). Horn polyphenism
- and related head shape variation in a single-horned dung beetle: *Onthophagus (Palaeonthophagus)*
- 452 *fracticornis* (Preyssler, 1790) (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae). Journal of Zoological Systematics and
- 453 Evolutionary Research, 47, 96–102.
- 454 Martinez, I. M., & Lumaret, J.-P. (2003). Dimorfismo sexual en larvas de Scarabaeoidea (Coleoptera).
- 455 In G. Onore, P. Reyes-Castillo, & M. Zunino (Eds), Monografías Tercer Milenio vol. 3. Escarabeidos
- 456 de Latinoamérica: Estado de conocimiento (pp. 15–18). SEA.
- 457 Martinez, I. M., & Lumaret, J.-P. (2005). Structure of the Terminal Ampulla in Male Larvae of
- 458 Canthon cyanellus LeConte (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae: Scarabaeinae). The Coleopterists Bulletin, 59,
- 459 35–39.

- 460 Minelli, A. (2007). The insect biological cycle as evolutionary arena: a short account of insect
- 461 diversity from an evo-devo point of view. Tavola Rotonda XVI "Significato naturale della biodiversità
- 462 degli insetti" 2007: 17–20.
- 463 Mitteroecker, P., & Gunz, P. (2009). Advances in Geometric Morphometrics. Evolutionary Biology,
- 464 36, 235–247.
- 465 Moczek, A. P. (2002). Allometric plasticity in a polyphenic beetle. Ecological Entomology, 27, 58–67.
- 466 Moczek, A. P. (2005). The evolution and development of novel traits, or how beetles got their horns.
- 467 BioScience, 11, 935–951.
- 468 Moczek, A. P. (2008). On the origin of novelty in development and evolution. Bioessays, 5, 432-447.
- 469 Moczek, A. P. (2010). Phenotypic plasticity and diversity in insects. Philosophical Transactions of the
- 470 Royal Society B, 365, 593–603.
- 471 Moczek, A. (2011). Evolution and development: Onthophagus beetles and evolutionary development
- 472 geneticts of innovation, allometry and plasticity. In L. W.Simmons & T. J.Ridsdill-Smith (Eds.),
- 473 Ecology and evolution of dung beetles (126-151). Wiley-Blackwell.
- 474 Moczek, A. P., & Njhout, H. F. (2002). A method for sexing final instar larvae of the genus
- 475 *Onthophagus* Latreille (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae). The Coleopterists Bulletin, 56, 279–284.
- 476 Mutanen, M., & Pretorius, E. (2007). Subjective visual evaluation vs. traditional and geometric
- 477 morphometrics in species delimitation: a comparison of moth genitalia. Systematic Entomology, 32,
- **478** 371–386.
- 479 Mutanen, M., Rytkonen, S., Linden, J., & Sinkkonen, J. (2007). Male genital variation in a moth
- 480 *Pammene luedersiana* (Lepidoptera: Tortricidae). European Journal of Entomology, 104, 259–265.
- 481 Nicolas, J.-L., & Riboulet, R. (1967). Les *Aphodius* Ill. français du groupe *obscurus* (F.). Le cas
- 482 d'immature Muls. (Col. Scarabaeidae). Bulletin mensuel de la Société linnéenne de Lyon, 36, 113–
 483 117.
- 484 Palestrini, C., Roggero, A., Gorret, R., Tocco, C., Negro, M., & Barbero, E. (2008). Scarabaeoidea
- 485 coprofagi della Val Veni e della Val Ferret (Valle d'Aosta, Italia). Revue Valdôtaine d'Histoire
- 486 Naturelle, 61-62, 241–253.
- 487 Parzer, H. F., & Moczek, A. P. (2008). Rapid Antagonistic Coevolution Between Primary and
- 488 Secondary Sexual Characters in Horned Beetles. Evolution, 62, 2423–2428.
- 489 Perez, S. I., Bernal, V., Gonzalez, P. N. (2006). Differences between sliding semi-landmark methods
- 490 in geometric morphometrics, with an application to human craniofacial and dental variation. Journal of
- 491 Anatomy, 208, 769–784.
- 492 Pfennig, D., Wund, M. A., Snell-Rood, E. C., Cruickshank, T., Schlichting, C. D., & Moczek, A. P.
- 493 (2010). Phenotypic plasticity's impacts on diversification and speciation. Trends in Ecology and,
- 494 Evolution, 25, 459-467.

- 495 Piau, O., Lumaret, J.-P., & De Stordeur, E. (1999). Diversité et divergence de l'ADN mitochondrial
- 496 d'*Aphodius obscurus* et *Aphodius immaturus* de France (Coleoptera: Aphodiidae). Annales de la
- 497 Société entomologique de France, 35 (suppl.), 117–123.
- 498 Pizzo, A., Roggero, A., Palestrini, C., Cervella, P., Del Pero, M., & Rolando, A. (2006). Genetic and
- 499 morphological differentiation patterns between sister species: the case of Onthophagus taurus and
- 500 Onthophagus illyricus (Coleoptera, Scarabaeidae). Biological Journal of the Linnean Society, 89, 197-
- 501 211.
- 502 Pizzo, A., Roggero, A., Palestrini, C., Moczek, A., & Rolando, A. (2008). Rapid shape divergences
- between natural and introduced populations of a horned beetle partly mirror divergences between
 species. Evolution & Development, 10, 166–175.
- 505 Pizzo, A., Macagno, A. L. M., Roggero, A., Rolando, A., & Palestrini, C. (2009). Epipharynx shape as
- a tool to reveal differentiation patterns between insect sister species: insights from *Onthophagus*
- 507 *taurus* and *O. illyricus* (Coleoptera, Scarabaeidae). Organisms Diversity and Evolution, 9, 189–200.
- 508 Philips, T. K. (2011). The evolutionary history and diversification of dumg beetles. In L. W.Simmons
- 509 & T. J.Ridsdill-Smith (Eds.), Ecology and evolution of dung beetles (21-46). Wiley-Blackwell.
- 510 Prange, H. D. (1996). Evaporative cooling in insects. Journal of Insect Physiology, 42, 493-499.
- 511 Rohlf, F. J. (2000). Statistical Power Comparisons Among Alternative Morphometric Methods.
- 512 American Journal of Physical Anthropology, 111, 463–478.
- 513 Rohlf, F. J. (2003). tpsSmall v1.20. Available at: http://life.bio.sunysb.edu/morph/morphmet.html
- 514 (Free software).
- Rohlf, F. J. (2009). tpsRegr v1.37. Available at: http://life.bio.sunysb.edu/morph/morphmet.html (Free
 software).
- 517 Rohlf, F. J. (2010a). tpsDig v2.16. Available at: http://life.bio.sunysb.edu/morph/morphmet.html (Free
 518 software).
- Rohlf, F. J. (2010b). tpsRelw v1.49. Available at: http://life.bio.sunysb.edu/morph/morphmet.html
 (Free software).
- 521 Roxburgh, L., Pinshow, B., & Prange, H. D. (1996). Temperature regulation by evaporative cooling in
- 522 a desert grasshopper *Calliptamus barbarus* Ramme 1951. Journal of Thermal Biology, 21, 331–337.
- 523 Scholtz, C. H., Davis, A. L. V., & Kryger, U. (2009). Evolutionary biology and conservation of dung
- 524 beetles. Sofia and Moscow: Pensoft Publishers.
- 525 Shepherd, B., Prange, H. D., & Moczek, A. P. (2008). Some like it hot: Body and weapon size affect
- thermoregulation in horned beetles. Journal of Insect Physiology, 54, 604–611.
- 527 Simmons, L. W., Emlen, D. J., & Tomkins, J. L. (2007). Sperm competition games between sneaks
- 528 and guards: a comparative analysis using dimorphic male beetles. Evolution, 61, 2684–2692.
- 529 Skelley, P. E. (1993). A method of genitalia preparation and dry preservation for Coleoptera.
- 530 Proceedings of the Entomological Society of Washington, 95, 131–138.

- 531 Slice, D. E. (2007). Geometric Morphometrics. Annual Review of Anthropology, 36, 261–281.
- 532 Stebnicka, Z. T., & Howden, H. F. (1995). Revision of Australian Genera in the Tribes Aphodiini,
- 533 Aegialiini and Proctophanini (Coleoptera: Scarabaeoidea: Aphodiinae). Invertebrate Taxonomy, 9,
- 534 709–766.
- Steinmann, H., & Zombori, L. (1984). A Morphological Atlas of Insect Larvae. Budapest: Akadémiai
 Kiadó.
- 537 Tagliaferri, F. (2000). Una specie nuova per la fauna italiana: *Aphodius (Amidorus) immaturus*.
- 538 Rivista Piemontese di Storia Naturale, 21, 239–243.
- 539 Tarasov, S. I. (2008). A revision of *Aphodius* Illiger, 1798 subgenus *Amidorus* Mulsant et Rey, 1870
- with description of the new subgenus *Chittius* (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae). Russian EntomologicalJournal, 17, 177-192.
- 542 Tomkins, J. L., & Moczek, A. P. (2009). Patterns of threshold evolution in polyphenic insects under
- 543 different developmental models. Evolution, 62, 459–468.
- 544 Tomkins, J. L, & Simmons, L. W. (2002). Measuring relative investment: a case study of testes
- 545 investment in species with alternative male reproductive tactics. Animal Behaviour, 63, 1009–1016.
- 546 Verdù, J., Arellano, L., Numa, C., & Amico, E. (2007). Roles of endothermy in niche differentiation
- 547 for ball-rolling dung beetles (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae) along an altitudinal gradient. Ecological
- 548 Entomology, 32, 544–551.
- 549 Zamora, J., Verdù, J. R., & Galante, E. (2007). Species richness in Mediterranean agroecosystems:
- 550 Spatial and temporal analysis for biodiversity conservation. Biological Conservation, 134, 113–121.
- 551

552 Appendix 1.

- 553 Landmark setting. Nomenclature of the different parts of traits where landmarks were set follow
- 554 Dellacasa and Dellacasa 2006, and Steinmann and Zombori 1984.

Epipha	rynx
1	Along midline, on tylus
2	Apex of left chaetoparia
3	At proplegmatium
4	At base of laeotorma
5	On first apex of crepis
6	On longer apex of crepis
7	At midline, on nesium
8	At joining point of proplegmatium and left chaetoparia
9	Apex of left apotorma
Pronotu	IM
1	Along midline, on fore margin
2-3	Semilandmarks
4	At base of lateral angle of fore margin
5	At side angle of fore margin
6-10	Semilandmarks
11	On hind side angle of pronotum
12-15	Semilandmarks
16	Along midline, on hind margin
Head	
1	Midline, on fore margin
2	Lateral apex of fore margin
3	Lateral carina, on margin
4	Anterior base of left gena
5	Apex of gena
6	Posterior base of gena
Scutellu	im
1	Left apex
2	Right apex
3	Medial point of right side
4	Hind apex
5	Medial point of left side
ARVA	
Epipha	cynx
1	Midline, on fore margin
2	On left clythra
3	Un side margin of left lobe
4	At superior margin of laeotorma
5	At inner base of laeotorma
6 -	At base of anterior epitorma
7	At base of apotorma
8	At apex of apotorma
9	At apex of anterior epitorma
Genital	Disc Diskt have of disc
1	Right base of disc. anterior angle
2	Right base of disc, allerior alight
3	Night apex of this
4	Infrance, allerior margin
5	Left apex of disc
6 -	Lett base of disc, anterior angle
	Left base of disc

Table 1. Results of Multivariate Test of Significance regarding external traits (head, pronotum and

scutellum) and the epipharynx in adults of *A. immaturus* and *A. obscurus*. The proportion of Goodall's

559 F statistics from randomised data sets as great or greater than the Goodall's statistic from the original

- 560 data set is given as the significance probability (1000 random permutations were used).
- 561

	Ge	Generalized Goodall F-test		
	F	df	Р	tests*
Head	2.2128	8, 680	0.0248	5.30%
Pronotum	1.8078	28, 2464	0.0059	12.90%
Scutellum	1.1568	8,704	0.3230	31.60%
Epipharynx	33.8985	20, 1760	0.0000	0.10%

*Percent of Goodall F values ≥observed

562

- 563
- 564

Table 2. Results of Multivariate Tests of Significance regarding the genital disc and the epipharynx in
larvae of *A. immaturus* and *A. obscurus*. The proportion of Goodall's F statistics from randomised data
sets as great or greater than the Goodall's statistic from the original data set is given as the significance
probability (1000 random permutations were used).

569

		Generalized Goodall F-test			
	Instar	F	df	Р	tests
Conital disa	1	2.0632	10, 350	0.0268	11.0%
Genitai uisc	2	1.1339	10, 350	0.3357	33.70%
Epiphorypy	1	3.1417	14, 504	0.0001	0.10%
Epipitaryitx	2	5.6075	14, 532	0.0000	0.10%

*Percent of Goodall F values \geq observed

570

572 Figures



573

Fig. 1. *Amidorus obscurus*, for each anatomical structure the number (N_L) and position of landmarks

are shown. A: Epipharynx, scale bar = 2 mm. On the left: the acronyms of the parts of the structure.

576 On the right: the position of the chosen landmarks ($N_L = 9$); on left the acronyms of the different parts

are shown: tylus (Ty), chaetopariae (Ch),epitorma (Ep), proplegmatium (Pr), apotorma (Ap),

578 dexiotorma (De), nesium (Ne), crepis (Cr), and pternotorma (Pt). **B**: Pronotum ($N_L = 16$), scale bar = 2

579 mm. C: Head ($N_L = 6$), scale bar = 1 mm. D: Scutellum ($N_L = 5$), scale bar = 1 mm. In the pronotum

configuration (B), the points 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14 and 15 were treated as semi-landmarks, the

- 581 others as landmarks.
- 582



584 Fig. 2. Epipharynx of the larval instars with 9 landmarks (A), and male genital disc with 7 landmarks







Fig. 3. Scatterplots of the first two relative warp scores obtained from the Relative Warps Analysis of the head (**A**, percentages of the explained variance: $RW_1 = 35.39\%$, $RW_2 = 25.63\%$,), pronotum (**B**,

- 590 $RW_1 = 69.64\%$, $RW_2 = 12.32\%$), scutellum (C, $RW_1 = 30.58\%$, $RW_2 = 19.91\%$) and
- epipharynx (\mathbf{D} , $\mathbf{RW}_1 = 37.27\%$, $\mathbf{RW}_2 = 10.49\%$) of adults of *A. immaturus* (black symbols) and *A*.
- *obscurus* (grey symbols). The number of relative warps obtained was 8, 28, 8 and 20 for the head,
- 593 pronotum, scutellum and epipharynx, respectively.
- 594
- 595



596

Fig. 4. Scatterplots of the first two relative warp scores obtained from the Relative Warps Analysis of male genital discs and epipharynges of larvae of *A. immaturus* (black symbols) and *A. obscurus* (grey symbols). Genital disc: 1st instar (**A**, percentages of the explained variance: $RW_1 = 60.93\%$, $RW_2 =$ 15.19%) and 2nd instar (**B**, $RW_1 = 64.08\%$, $RW_2 = 16.37\%$). Epipharynx:1st instar (**C**, $RW_1 =$ 28.40%, $RW_2 = 17.72\%$) and 2nd instar (**D**, $RW_1 = 25.60\%$ and by $RW_2 = 20.41\%$). The number of relative warps obtained was 10 for genital discs and 14 for epipharynges of both instars.