

1 **Replicated radiations in the South American Marsh Pitcher Plants (*Heliamphora*)**
2 **lead to convergent carnivorous trap morphologies**

3 Sukuan Liu and Stacey D. Smith

4 Author for correspondence: Sukuan Liu, sukuan.liu@colorado.edu

5 Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Colorado Boulder, 1900 Pleasant Street, Boulder, Colorado 80309, U.S.A.

6

7 **Abstract**

8 **Premise:** The evolution of carnivorous pitcher traps across multiple angiosperm lineages
9 represents a classic example of morphological convergence. Nevertheless, no comparative study
10 to-date has examined pitcher evolution from a quantitative morphometric perspective.

11 **Methods:** In the present study, we used comparative morphometric approaches to quantify the
12 shape space occupied by *Heliamphora* pitchers and to trace evolutionary trajectories through this
13 space to examine patterns of divergence and convergence within the genus. We also investigated
14 pitcher development, and in particular, how the packing of pitchers is affected by crowding, a
15 common condition in their natural environments.

16 **Key Results:** Our results showed that *Heliamphora* pitchers have diverged along three main
17 axes in morphospace: pitcher curvature, nectar spoon elaboration, and pitcher stoutness. Both
18 curvature and stoutness are correlated with pitcher size, suggesting structural constraints in
19 pitcher morphological evolution. Among the four traits (curvature, spoon elaboration, stoutness
20 and size), all but curvature lacked phylogenetic signal and showed marked convergence across
21 the phylogeny. We also observed tighter packing of pitchers in crowded conditions, and this
22 effect was most pronounced in curved, slender pitchers.

23 **Conclusions:** Overall, our study demonstrates that diversification and convergent evolution of
24 carnivory-related traits extends to finer evolutionary timescales, reinforcing the notion that
25 ecological specialization may not necessarily be an evolutionary dead end.

26 **摘要 (Simplified Chinese)**

27 食虫植物的瓶状捕虫器在不同被子植物谱系中的演化是形态趋同进化的经典案例。然而，
28 迄今为止还没有研究使用系统发育比较分析法与计量方法来研究瓶状捕虫器的演化。本研
29 究使用了上述手段来研究南美沼泽瓶子草 (*Heliamphora*) 的瓶状捕虫器是如何占据形态
30 空间，并在捕虫器的形态空间内追踪它们的演化轨迹，以研究沼泽瓶子草属捕虫器的趋异
31 与趋同的演化模式。同时，本研究还探讨了沼泽瓶子草属植株 (捕虫瓶) 的发育模式，特
32 别是在沼泽瓶子草在原生地的发育是如何受到种群密度过高 (拥挤) 的影响。本研究的结
33 果表明，沼泽瓶子草属捕虫瓶在形态空间里沿着三个主要形态轴分化：捕虫瓶的弯曲度、
34 蜜匙的精细程度和捕虫瓶的粗壮程度。捕虫瓶的弯曲度和粗壮度均与瓶子的大小相关，表
35 明捕虫瓶在形态进化中存在结构约束。在这四个形态特征中 (捕虫瓶曲率、蜜匙精细程
36 度、捕虫瓶粗壮度与大小)，除了捕虫瓶曲率，其他的形态特征都没有显示系统发育信

37 号。在南美沼泽瓶子草属的进化中，蜜匙精细程度、捕虫瓶粗壮度与大小都显示了趋同演
38 化。本研究还阐明了瓶子草植株在拥挤条件下，捕虫瓶会更加紧密地排列，而且这种效应
39 在有着弯曲、细长的捕虫瓶的物种中最为显著。总体来说，本研究显示与食肉有关的特征
40 的趋异和趋同演化发生在更微观的时间尺度上，也表明了生态专化或许并不是生物进化的
41 死胡同。

42 Keywords: Sarraceniaceae, carnivorous plants, pitcher plants, morphological evolution, phylogenetic comparative
43 methods

44 **Introduction**

45 Pitcher plants are one of the most dramatic examples of convergent evolution in carnivorous
46 plants, with at least 6 independent origins in angiosperms (Fleischmann et al. 2018). The pitchers
47 are specialized leaves that form cavities filled with an often viscous liquid containing a suite of
48 digestive enzymes (Adlassnig, Peroutka, and Lendl 2011). Pitcher plants utilize these pitchers to
49 attract, drown, and consume small animal prey in order to obtain nutrients not available from the
50 abiotic environment (Juniper, Robins, and Joel 1989; Givnish et al. 2018).

51 Among the independently evolved pitcher plant lineages, *Nepenthes* (Caryophyllales),
52 Sarraceniaceae (Ericales), and *Cephalotus follicularis* (Oxalidales) are commonly considered as
53 the true pitcher plants due to their highly specialized carnivorous pitchers. Moreover, the true
54 pitcher plants are considerably older (all emerged during the Cretaceous) as compared to the
55 more recently evolved (< 3 mya) pitcher lineages in Poales (e.g. *Brocchinia reducta* and
56 *Paepalanthus bromelioides*), which have structurally simpler pitchers morphologically similar to
57 their tank forming relatives (Magallón et al. 2015; Cross et al. 2018). With the exception of the
58 monotypic Australian pitcher plant *C. follicularis*, *Nepenthes* (the tropical pitcher plants) and
59 Sarraceniaceae (the American pitcher plants) both represent true pitcher lineages with high
60 species diversity, together comprising more than 98% of all extant pitcher plant taxa (McPherson
61 et al. 2011; McPherson and Schnell 2011; Fleischmann et al. 2018; Murphy et al. 2020).

62 In addition to dispersal and vicariance (Ellison et al. 2012; Naczi 2018; Murphy et al. 2020),
63 adaptive radiation played an important role in the diversification of *Nepenthes* and
64 Sarraceniaceae (Pavlovic 2012; Clarke et al. 2018; Thorogood, Bauer, and Hiscock 2018). The
65 emergence of pitcher traps has likely facilitated the diversification in *Nepenthes* and
66 Sarraceniaceae by allowing them to adapt to new ecological niches, resulting in dramatic
67 morphological variations in pitcher traps (Pavlovic 2012; Clarke et al. 2018; Thorogood, Bauer,
68 and Hiscock 2018). Many *Nepenthes* species have diversified and further modified their pitcher
69 traps to specialize in novel symbiotic relationships (e.g. ant-mutualism in *N. bicalcarata*) or
70 novel nutrient acquisition strategies (e.g. detritus-feeding in *N. ampullaria*, fecal-feeding in *N.*
71 *lowii*, and subterranean-feeding in *N. pudica*) (Thornham et al. 2012; Moran et al. 2012; Gilbert
72 et al. 2022; Dančák et al. 2022). A similar radiation has occurred across Sarraceniaceae lineages,
73 giving rise to many species with novel trap types (e.g. lobster traps of *Darlingtonia californica*
74 and *Sarracenia psittacina*), trapping mechanisms (e.g. superhydrophilic hairy surface of
75 *Heliamphora nutans*), symbiotic relationship (e.g. *S. purpurea* and commensal *Wyeomyia*
76 *smithii*), and nutrient specializations (Jaffe et al. 1992; Peterson et al. 2008; McPherson et al.
77 2011; Bauer et al. 2013; Naczi 2018). Pitcher morphology in Sarraceniaceae and *Nepenthes* is
78 also plastic to varying degree, affected by both biotic (e.g. crowding or competition from

79 neighboring plants) and abiotic factors (e.g. extreme microclimate) (Brewer 1999; McPherson et
80 al. 2011; McPherson and Schnell 2011; Clarke et al. 2018).

81 Despite the wide variety of morphologies associated with pitcher traps, few comparative studies
82 have focused on the morphological evolution of carnivorous traps, and none with quantitative
83 methods. Morphometric analyses allow us to define the spaces occupied by phenotypic
84 combinations as well as those that are empty (Stayton 2019; Segall et al. 2020; Jardine et al.
85 2022) and, in the context of well supported phylogenies (Givnish et al. 1997), identify instances
86 of morphological convergence (Papadopulos et al. 2013; Smith and Kriebel 2018). This
87 quantitative shape information also sets the stage for rigorous testing of ecological and
88 evolutionary hypotheses (Smith and Kriebel 2018; Dellinger et al. 2019; Kriebel et al. 2022).

89 Here we focus on the evolution of pitcher morphologies in the South American marsh pitcher
90 plants *Heliamphora* (Sarraceniaceae). This genus is endemic to the Guiana Highlands, and is the
91 most species-rich genus in the family, with 23 extant species and several yet to be described
92 (McPherson et al. 2011). The major clades are thought to have emerged through both vicariance
93 and dispersal during the Miocene with more recent diversification in each clade driven by
94 vertical displacement during the Pleistocene glacial-interglacial cycles (Liu and Smith 2021).
95 The adult pitchers vary dramatically in pitcher shape, size, nectar spoon structure and many other
96 taxonomically important characters across species (Figure 1) (McPherson et al. 2011). It has
97 been suggested these diverse morphologies may relate to differences in microclimate (Nerz
98 2004), prey attraction strategies (Wistuba, Harbarth, and Carow 2001; Wistuba, Carow, and
99 Harbarth 2002), and/or shifts in prey composition (Jaffe et al. 1992). Furthermore, structural
100 stability of the pitcher could impose constraints on the morphological evolution of *Heliamphora*
101 pitchers, limiting available pitcher morphospace.

102 In the present study, we used comparative morphometric approaches to quantify the shape space
103 occupied by *Heliamphora* pitchers and to trace evolutionary trajectories through this space.
104 Building on previous phylogenetic work in *Heliamphora* (Liu and Smith 2021), we also tested
105 for phylogenetic signal in pitcher shape and investigated how pitcher shape evolution may be
106 related to pitcher size. In particular, we hypothesize that aspects of shape evolution may be
107 tightly correlated with height given the structural constraints imposed by supporting high volume
108 of pitcher fluid. In light of the dense packing in many natural populations (McPherson et al.
109 2011), we also considered how pitcher development responded to crowding and tested the
110 hypothesis that pitcher angle (the angle between two most recently developed pitchers) shrinks in
111 crowded conditions to allow for tighter packing. In interpreting these results, we discuss the
112 potential ecological significance of *Heliamphora*'s diverse pitcher morphologies and ability to
113 modify pitcher development in response to varying conditions.

114

115 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

116 **Taxon sampling and phylogenetic framework**

117 We sampled 23 described and 2 additional yet to be described taxa of *Heliamphora* for this study
118 (Appendix S1, Table S1; see the Supplementary Data with this article). All specimens were

119 grown under controlled environmental conditions [photoperiod 15hr per day (full sun);
120 temperature range 12–25 °C; relative humidity > 80%], resembling the climate of their native
121 habitats (Jaffe et al. 1992; Adlassnig, Pranjic, et al. 2010). Species determinations of the living
122 collections were confirmed by comparing their morphological traits to the original descriptions
123 (Bentham 1840; Nerz and Wistuba 2000; Carow, Wistuba, and Harbarth 2005; Fleischmann,
124 Wistuba, and Nerz 2009; McPherson et al. 2011).

125 We used the recently published phylogeny of 24 of the 25 *Heliamphora* taxa (Liu and Smith
126 2021) to reconstruct the evolution of adult pitcher shape, maximum adult pitcher size and pitcher
127 angle. This phylogeny lacks *H. macdonaldae*, which is thought to be sister to *H. tatei* based on
128 similarities in pitcher morphology and distributional range (Maguire 1978; McPherson et al.
129 2011; Liu and Smith 2021). We manually included this species in the tree (Figure 1) by placing it
130 sister to *H. tatei* and setting their split to 0.75 mya, which is the average node depth of other
131 sister pairs in the W lineage, i.e., (*H. ceracea*, *H. hispida*) and (*H. neblinae*, *H. parva*).

132 **Morphometric analysis of pitcher shapes**

133 Data for maximum pitcher size (i.e. the maximum length of adult pitchers observed growing
134 under optimal conditions, *in situ*) were obtained from the monograph of *Heliamphora*
135 (McPherson et al. 2011). Adult pitcher shape was characterized using images of fully opened and
136 matured pitchers taken from living individuals. For each taxon, a single adult pitcher from the
137 individual sampled for the phylogeny was photographed in a lateral view, providing a two-
138 dimensional representation of the adult pitcher shape along the proximal-distal axis. The lateral
139 view captured shape variation among major structural components involved in carnivorous
140 functions, such as the shapes of nectar spoon and pitcher body associated with prey attraction
141 and prey capture/retention, respectively (Figure 2). These images were converted into silhouettes
142 in Affinity Designer 1.10.5, which were then transformed into outlines using the R package
143 Momocs (Bonhomme et al. 2014). Also using Momocs, the outlines were converted into lists of
144 two-dimensional coordinates describing the polygons and then centered.

145 A set of six landmarks were placed on each outline to delineate pitcher functional zones (Figure 2)
146 according to McPherson et al. (2011). In *Heliamphora* pitchers, Zone 1 (landmarks 2-4)
147 corresponds to the nectar spoon, which is responsible for attracting prey. Zone 2 (landmarks 1, 2,
148 4, 5) represents the upper section of the pitcher above the narrow band and plays a role in prey
149 capture and retention. Zone 3 (landmarks 1, 5) consists of a narrow restriction of the pitcher
150 interior, located close to the waterline of the pitcher fluid. The position of the drainage hole
151 (indicated by landmark 1; the drainage hole is further adapted into drainage slit in E1 clade)
152 determines the maximal level of pitcher fluid in the pitcher (landmarks 1, 5), which is crucial in
153 maintaining carnivorous and other ecological functions in *Heliamphora* (see discussion). Zone 4
154 (landmarks 1, 5, 6) comprises the bottom part of the pitchers and is involved in prey digestion as
155 well as nutrient absorption. Despite morphological diversity, these functional zones are
156 homologous and easily identifiable across *Heliamphora* species, making them reliable reference
157 points for the landmarks and preventing any distortion of the outlines.

158 Using the landmarks, shape variation of adult pitchers was quantified using elliptical Fourier
159 analysis (EFA) that decomposed the outlines into 21 harmonics, each with four coefficients.
160 After aligning the outlines using Full Generalized Procrustes alignment in Momocs, a principal

161 component analysis (PCA) was used to summarize the 84 coefficients resulting from the EFA.
162 Taxa were plotted along the PC axes to illustrate their distribution in morphospace. Blomberg's
163 K (Blomberg, Jr, and Ives 2003) for the shape PCs (PC1, PC2, and PC3) and adult pitcher size
164 were estimated to infer phylogenetic signals in pitcher shapes and size by using 1000
165 randomizations of the data across the phylogeny to test if the value was significantly different
166 from K=0 (no phylogenetic signal).

167 Finally, we used ancestral state estimation to visualize the expected ancestral pitcher shape in
168 *Heliamphora*. We estimated the ancestral values for each of the three shape PCs and for
169 maximum pitcher size using the 'fastAnc' function in R package phytools (Revell 2012). We
170 visualized the reconstructed shape given the estimated ancestral PC values using Momocs, and
171 scaled the size of the pitcher based on the estimated ancestral size.

172 **Effects of crowding on pitcher angle**

173 We used living collections of *Heliamphora* species to characterize the angle of pitcher
174 emergence and examine the effect of crowding on this angle. Depending on the availability of
175 material, we sampled 3 to 63 individuals per taxon for all 25 taxa. These individuals were
176 sampled from our collections and those of G. Pipis; in possessing adult pitchers, these plants
177 were three or more years of age. For each sampled individual, images were taken directly above
178 each growing point, i.e., where new pitchers are constantly produced (Appendix S2, Figure S1).
179 For each growing point, a line was drawn from the growing point (rosette center) to the tip of the
180 nectar spoon of the youngest (the most recently fully developed) pitcher. Similarly, a second
181 line was drawn for the second youngest pitcher. Pitcher angle (PA) was measured as the angle
182 between the two straight lines using the software ImageJ (Schneider, Rasband, and Eliceiri
183 2012). We replicated these measurements for both juvenile and adult pitchers, since pitchers are
184 dimorphic in *Heliamphora* (McPherson et al. 2011) and may respond differently to crowding. To
185 test whether PA is affected by the presence of neighboring individuals (i.e., if crowding reduces
186 PA), phylogenetic paired t-tests were performed for both adult and juvenile pitchers using the
187 'phyl.pairedttest' function in R package phytools (Revell 2012). Similarly, the effect of
188 developmental stage on PA was also tested with phylogenetic paired t-tests. In addition to
189 phylogenetic t-tests, regular t-tests were also conducted for each comparison. An additional chi-
190 squared test was performed to test whether the drastic bending observed in juvenile pitchers was
191 associated with the presence of neighbors. Similar to the PCs, we computed Blomberg's K for
192 PA in adult and juvenile individuals growing with and without neighbors, and then tested if the
193 value was significantly different from zero.

194 **Model testing for correlations among morphological traits**

195 We used phylogenetic generalized linear models (PGLM) (Paradis and Claude 2002) to test the
196 relationship between shape variation and maximum pitcher size in adult pitchers. For some
197 combinations of shape PCs and size, we predicted a non-linear relationship. Thus, we compared
198 linear and quadratic models for each pair and present results for the best-fitting model (that with
199 the lowest AIC score). We fit these models using the R package 'phylolm' with 1000 bootstraps
200 (Ho and Ane 2014). We assumed a correlation structure based on the Brownian motion (BM)
201 process, which models stochastic evolution in those traits. Similarly, the relationships between
202 shape variation and pitcher angle were also tested using PGLM in adult pitchers growing singly

203 and ones growing with neighbors present. Assuming BM process, the PCs were regressed against
204 pitcher angle with PGLM. Taxa with incomplete pitcher angle data due to sampling limitations
205 were dropped from the analysis.

206 **RESULTS**

207 **Morphospace of *Heliamphora* Pitchers**

208 The PCA of harmonic coefficients from the elliptic Fourier analysis captured 79% of shape
209 variation (SV) of adult pitchers in the first three PCs (Figure 3). PC1, accounting for 33.4% of
210 SV, describes pitcher body curvature or concavity. While the negative and positive PC1 values
211 described concave and convex pitcher shapes, respectively, PC1 values closer to zero represented
212 pitchers with straighter bodies. PC2, comprising 29.5% of SV, describes the elaboration (shape,
213 relative size, and position) of nectar spoon with negative and positive values representing erect
214 vs. and elaborated structures, respectively. PC3, explaining 16.1% of SV, is related to pitcher
215 stoutness, or the general pitcher body length-to-width ratio. On the PC3 axis, negative values
216 described more slender pitcher body shapes whereas positive values corresponded to bulkier
217 body shapes.

218 All of the measured pitcher traits, except for curvature, lacked a significant phylogenetic signal.
219 Specifically, we found Blomberg's K was not significantly different from zero for nectar spoon
220 elaboration (PC2, $K = 0.06$, $p = 0.886$), pitcher stoutness (PC3, $K = 0.09$, $p = 0.391$), or
221 maximum pitcher size ($K = 0.12$, $p = 0.198$), consistent with the frequent patterns of
222 convergence across the phylogeny (Figure 4). By contrast, significant phylogenetic signal was
223 detected in pitcher curvature (PC1, $K = 0.18$, $p = 0.018$) (Figure 4). Looking at the phylogeny,
224 pitcher curvature appears to be conserved in the W+E1 and E2a clades but not in other lineages.
225 In the W+E1 clade, all species were associated with convex pitcher bodies to varying degrees
226 ($PC1 > 0.02$), with the exception of *H. chimantensis*, which was associated with a straighter
227 pitcher body ($PC1 = -0.00321$). In E2a, all adult pitchers were associated with very concave
228 pitcher body shapes ($PC1 < -0.04$).

229

230 **Relationships between Pitcher Shape and Size**

231 Model comparisons indicated a strong quadratic relationship between pitcher curvature (PC1)
232 and maximum pitcher size (Appendix S1, Table S2). As pitchers becomes straighter (i.e., less
233 concave or convex), the maximum pitcher size generally increases (Figure 5), consistent with the
234 expectation that more erect pitchers can accommodate more pitcher fluid (see discussion). A
235 strong linear relationship was found between pitcher stoutness (PC3) and maximum pitcher size,
236 with larger pitchers being stouter (Figure 5). No relationship was found between nectar spoon
237 elaboration (PC2) and maximum pitcher size (Figure 5).

238 **Relationship of pitcher angle to growth conditions and pitcher shape**

239 Our results show that *Heliamphora* growing in crowded conditions tend to put out new pitchers
240 at a tighter angle than those in isolated conditions. A significant difference in pitcher angle (PA)
241 was detected between adult pitchers growing in isolated vs. crowded conditions with both
242 phylogenetic and non-phylogenetic t-tests (phylogenetic mean difference [PMD] = 13.64° , $p =$

243 0.002; $p < 0.0001$ for regular t-test, Figure 6). In juveniles, a significant difference was detected
244 in regular t-test ($p < 0.0001$) but not in the phylogenetic t-test (PMD = 6.36° , $p = 0.199$).
245 Moreover, we found juvenile pitchers tend to bend unnaturally when their growth was obstructed
246 by neighboring pitchers (chi-squared test, $p < 0.001$), possibly due to the more slender and
247 parallel-to-ground body shape. No significant difference in PA was found between juvenile and
248 adult pitchers within each condition (crowded or not) using either t-test (Figure 6). Raw
249 measurements for all taxa, stages and conditions are shown in Appendix S2, Figure S2. No
250 phylogenetic signal was detected in PA across developmental stages and crowding conditions (K
251 = 0.12, $p = 0.481$ [juvenile, not crowded]; $K = 0.11$, $p = 0.353$ [juvenile, crowded]; $K = 0.10$, $p =$
252 0.494 [adult, not crowded], $K = 0.09$, $p = 0.597$ [adult, crowded]).

253 To investigate the association between pitcher shape and PA, similar PGLM analyses were
254 performed for each crowding condition using data for adult pitchers. The analyses indicated a
255 strong quadratic relationship between pitcher curvature and pitcher angle only in crowded
256 conditions (Appendix S1, Table S2). When crowded, species with straighter pitcher bodies
257 generally put out new pitchers at a wider angle than those with curvier bodies (Appendix S2,
258 Figure S3). Similarly, a strong linear relationship between pitcher stoutness and pitcher angle
259 was only found in crowded condition. No relationship was found between nectar spoon
260 elaboration (PC2) and pitcher angle in either condition, indicating that, in crowded conditions,
261 the degree of pitcher angle reduction depends on the morphology of the pitcher body rather than
262 the morphology of nectar spoon.

263

264 **DISCUSSION**

265 **Divergent and convergent evolution of pitcher morphologies**

266 Our morphospace analysis revealed three main shape axes across which *Heliamphora* pitchers
267 have diversified, namely in curvature (PC1), nectar spoon elaboration (PC2), and pitcher
268 stoutness (PC3). In accordance with the generally low phylogenetic signal in these traits, we
269 observed that most clades contain a diversity of shapes, e.g. curved and straight, with and
270 without elaborate spoons (Figure 1). *Heliamphora* pitchers also vary widely in size (almost five-
271 fold difference across the genus), even between closely related species (e.g., the sympatric *H.*
272 *chimantensis* at 35cm and *H. pulchella* at 10cm). Across these axes, *Heliamphora* species are
273 clustered in distinct regions of morphospace, e.g., curved with elaborate spoons or straight and
274 slender (Figure 3; Appendix S2, Figure S4; Appendices S3 and S4).

275 Accompanying these patterns of divergence in shape and size among close relatives, we also
276 documented frequent convergence across the phylogeny. For example, small pitchers (< 20 cm)
277 evolved convergently in three lineages (Figure 4). Interestingly, these small pitcher species can
278 be found across all major areas of distribution but none of them occur sympatrically (e.g. *H.*
279 *hispidula*, Neblina Massif; *H. puchella*, Chimantá Massif; *H. minor*, Auyán Tepui; *H. nutans* and
280 *H. arenicola*, different parts of Eastern Tepui Chain). Such widespread convergence is often
281 associated with adaptation to a common ecological niche (Donoghue et al. 2022), and previous
282 authors suggest that small pitchers may be favored in habitats with suboptimal growth
283 conditions, e.g., shallow or infertile substrates, heavy shade, and periodic drought or heat stress

284 (Wistuba, Carow, and Harbarth 2002; Givnish et al. 2018). Small pitchers impose lower
285 construction costs (Karagatzides and Ellison 2009; McPherson et al. 2011) and are more drought
286 and heat tolerant due to the reduced transpiration from the pitcher and evaporation from the
287 pitcher fluid (Adlassnig, Pranjic, et al. 2010).

288 Instances of small pitcher species occurring sympatrically with species of larger pitchers (e.g., *H.*
289 *hispida* and *H. ceracea*; *H. pulchella* and *H. chimantensis*; *H. nutans* and *H. glabra*) can be
290 found across all major distributional areas (McPherson et al. 2011), suggesting a potential case of
291 adaptive radiation into different ecological niches (Givnish et al. 1997). Sympatric pairs of small
292 and tall pitcher plant species may be associated with different capture strategies and,
293 consequently, prey composition (e.g. crawling insects like ants for short pitchers and flying
294 insects for tall pitchers), as has been shown in *Sarracenia* (Gibson 1983; Givnish 1989) and
295 *Brocchinia* (Givnish et al. 1997). Overall, the diversity of habitats and prey types provided by the
296 topologically complex Pantepui region combined with the geological isolation between tepuis
297 may account for the repeated diversification of pitcher size in each clade and the resulting
298 convergence across the genus.

299 Similarly marked convergence is also observed in aspects of pitcher shape, although the
300 underlying drivers are less clear. The degree of elaboration in the nectar spoon may relate the
301 available prey and the reward needed to attract them (Jaffé et al. 1995; Plachno, Swiatek, and
302 Wistuba 2007). Differences in shape have been related to the surrounding vegetation, for
303 example, with *Heliamphora* growing through dense vegetation tending to have straight pitchers
304 to protrude above the rest to capture prey (Brewer-Carias 1972; Jaffe et al. 1992; McPherson et
305 al. 2011). The stoutness of the pitcher may be more directly related to the overall size of the
306 pitcher and may represent a developmental constraint (see below).

307 **Gaps in pitcher morphospace due to evolutionary constraints**

308 Unoccupied regions in the space of possible phenotypes are often attributed to constraints on
309 evolution, be they structural, ecological or developmental [e.g. Vernescu and Ryser 2009;
310 Stayton 2019; Chitwood and Mullins 2022]. We observed several gaps in pitcher space
311 represented the absence of certain trait combinations, such as large and curvy pitchers or small
312 and slender pitchers. The strong correlations between size and shape, in particular curvature and
313 stoutness (Figure 5), are consistent with structural constraints, i.e., that stout and/or curved
314 pitchers are limited in height while straight, slender pitchers can remain erect at greater heights.
315 We postulate that, compared to species with straight body shapes, taxa with curvy shapes are less
316 structurally stable due to the center of their pitcher mass being further away from the growing
317 point on the rosette which provides structural support. Nevertheless, the potential structural
318 instability resulting from the curvy shape or large size can be mitigated through the provision of
319 structural support from nearby pitchers, vegetation, or organic debris [e.g. *H. ionasi* (McPherson
320 et al. 2011)].

321 This general trade-off between pitcher size and shape may allow some conservation of pitcher
322 volume, as pitchers can achieve similar volume by expanding laterally or vertically. Pitcher
323 volume is expected to be under strong selection as maintaining a high level of fluid is crucial to
324 carnivory in *Heliamphora* (Jaffe et al. 1992; Nerz 2004; Bauer et al. 2013). At a high level, the
325 pitcher fluid is able to effectively rise along the pubescent inner pitcher wall up to the rim by

326 capillary action, forming superhydrophilic (slippery) trapping surface that facilitates prey capture
327 (Jaffe et al. 1992; Bauer et al. 2013). The regulation and maintenance of the pitcher fluid level
328 might be important in other ecological functions, such as thermal regulation, water reservoir
329 during hot and dry periods, and microhabitat for commensal microbiomes to facilitate digestion
330 (Jaffe et al. 1992; Nerz 2004; Adlassnig, PrANJI, et al. 2010). We expect that there are also lower
331 limits on pitcher fluid level, bounded by the minimum volume needed to allow for carnivorous
332 functions.

333 **Plasticity in pitcher development**

334
335 Like all leaves, the pitcher development is plastic and can be affected by various environmental
336 factors (Brewer 1999; Ellison and Gotelli 2002; Fukushima et al. 2021). This is the first study to
337 examine plasticity in *Heliamphora* pitcher rosette development, specifically focusing on a
338 common natural condition — crowding due to the presence of neighboring plants. In nature,
339 *Heliamphora* populations are often crowded and restricted to habitats with suitable growth
340 conditions, such as small depressions on tepui summits and open clearings in the montane forests
341 (McPherson et al. 2011). Our study found that rosettes in such crowded conditions put out new
342 pitchers at tighter angle while those in growing without neighbors grow out at wider angle. This
343 effect is apparent in both juvenile and adult pitchers (Figure 6). In adult pitchers, the effect is
344 dependent on pitcher curvature and pitcher stoutness (Appendix S1, Table S2; Appendix S2,
345 Figure S3), suggesting the degree of angle reductions is further constrained by pitcher body
346 shape.

347 To visualize how the plastic differences in pitcher angle would translate to spacing of pitchers
348 and rosettes, we created two sets of diagrams based on two angles of emergence (140° and 125°,
349 Appendix S2, Figure S5). The wider angle, roughly the mean estimated in uncrowded conditions
350 (Figure 6), leads to evenly spaced pitchers in the mature rosette (Figure 7 A & B). Mature
351 rosettes typically comprise five active pitchers (e.g. Butschi, Huber, and Ammann 1989; Wistuba
352 et al. 2005; Wrazidlo 2019; Golos 2020), and we added a sixth pitcher to demonstrate how a new
353 pitcher would overlap with an older inactive pitcher (Figure 7 B). Furthermore, we envisioned
354 how a clonal cluster of rosettes emerging from the rhizomes of a single plant could fill a
355 confined space, such as a depression in the rock substrate (Figure 7 C). When we simulated the
356 same developmental process with the narrower pitcher angle observed under crowded conditions
357 (Figure 7), we found that individual pitchers on each rosette exhibited greater overlap (Figure 7
358 D & E), but more new rosettes could be packed into the confined space (Figure 7 F), resulting in
359 increased pitcher density. While these visual models are only hypothetical, they illustrate how
360 pitcher angle will have direct consequences for the packing of pitchers into confined spaces and
361 likely affect fitness through access to light, rainwater, and prey resources.

362 It is possible that the increased density of pitchers could lead to a decreased prey capture rate per
363 pitcher due to competition from surrounding pitchers, as evidenced in *Sarracenia* (Gibson 1983;
364 Givnish 1989). *Heliamphora* often form dense clonal populations, as they have a tendency to
365 produce new growing points (rosettes) along the rhizome of existing rosettes, whether in situ
366 (Wistuba, Carow, and Harbarth 2002; Fleischmann and Grande Allende 2011) or in cultivation
367 (Ziemer 1979; McPherson et al. 2011). Even if the individual pitchers receive less prey during
368 crowding, the entire clonal population may benefit from the tight packing of rosettes with higher
369 total prey capture and higher growth by maximizing area for photosynthesis.

370 While we chose to focus on the effects of crowding, other biotic and abiotic factors may
371 influence pitcher development and represent adaptive plasticity. For example, *Heliamphora*
372 grown under drought stress produce smaller pitchers, a response which may serve to minimize
373 transpiration (McPherson et al. 2011). Pitchers growing in heavy shade typically lose
374 carnivorous activity and primarily function as photosynthetic structures, as indicated by the
375 elongated pitcher bodies, and the absence of pitcher coloration, nectar spoon structure, or
376 attractants (McPherson et al. 2011). Similar plastic responses are found in *Darlingtonia*,
377 *Sarracenia* and all other pitcher plants, suggesting pitcher plasticity commonly associated with
378 trade-offs between carnivory and photosynthesis (Givnish et al. 1984; Ellison and Gotelli 2002;
379 Ellison and Farnsworth 2005; Pavlovič and Saganová 2015; Givnish et al. 2018; Fukushima et al.
380 2021). Further ecological studies should be conducted to investigate and better understand the
381 dynamic interplay of pitcher development, carnivory, and photosynthesis. Furthermore, it would
382 be interesting to investigate whether crowding has a similar effect on pitcher angle in the closely
383 related *S. purpurea* and *S. psittacina*, which also have a similar rosette growth form to
384 *Heliamphora*.

385

386

387 **CONCLUSION**

388

389 Both divergent and convergent evolution of *Heliamphora* pitcher morphologies was likely a
390 result of adaptive radiation across the dynamic Pantepui landscape over the last 20 million years
391 (Liu and Smith 2021). We observed repeated diversification of pitcher shape and size within
392 geographically structured clades as well as frequent convergence in form across the entire genus.
393 This convergence upon similar combinations of shapes and sizes suggest that these suites of
394 traits may be adaptive, as has been proposed for convergently evolved pitcher trait combinations
395 in other carnivorous plant lineages (Clarke et al. 2018; Thorogood, Bauer, and Hiscock 2018).
396 Many traits beyond shape and size contribute to pitcher function (e.g., volatiles, pigmentation,
397 external nectaries, pubescence), and we predict that these traits may show similar patterns of
398 convergence and correlated evolution. While many studies have demonstrated phenotypic and
399 even genomic convergence associated with carnivory across angiosperms (e.g. Givnish et al.
400 1997; Fukushima et al. 2017; Bittleston et al. 2018; Clarke et al. 2018), our study further
401 contributes to this understanding by demonstrating that the diversification and convergent
402 evolution of carnivory-related traits can occur on finer evolutionary timescales. The radiation of
403 pitcher forms in Sarraceniaceae, including *Heliamphora*, reinforces the notion that extreme
404 ecological specialization, such as the carnivorous lifestyle, may not necessarily be an
405 evolutionary dead end (Tripp and Manos 2008; Wim A. Ozinga 2012; Day, Hua, and Bromham
406 2016; Thorogood, Bauer, and Hiscock 2018).

407

408

409 **Acknowledgments**

410

411 We are grateful to the editor and the two reviewers that provided constructive comments for the
412 improvement of the paper. We thank Greg Papis for providing valuable comments on the
413 manuscript as well as providing living specimens for pitcher morphometric analysis and pitcher
414 angle measurements. We thank Donovan Seow for proofreading drafts as well as the
415 unconditional support during the research and writing process.

416
417 Funding: This work was supported by the University of Colorado Boulder [EBIO Graduate
418 Students Research Grants, 2017-2023; Beverly Sears Graduate Student Research Grant, 2018;
419 Museum of Natural History Research Grant, 2021] and American Society of Plant Taxonomists
420 [Graduate Research Grants, 2022] to S. Liu. S. D. Smith gratefully acknowledges funding from
421 NSF-DEB-1553114.

422

423 **Author Contributions**

424

425 **Sukuan Liu:** Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition,
426 Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Software, Validation,
427 Visualization, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Stacey Smith:**
428 Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration,
429 Resources, Supervision, Writing - review & editing.

430

431 **Data Availability**

432 Raw pitcher angle measurements, pitcher shape outlines, modified *Heliamphora* phylogeny, and
433 R Markdown file containing scripts used in this study can be accessed via “Figshare”
434 (<https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.23646414.v3>).

435

436 **Supporting Information**

437 Additional Supporting Information may be found online in the supporting information section at
438 the end of the article (Appendix S1, Table S1: Sampling information; Appendix S2, Table S2:
439 Model fit results; Appendix S2, Figure S1: Pitcher Angle Measurements; Appendix S2, Figure
440 S2: Pitcher Angle by Taxa; Appendix S2, Figure S3: Associations between Adult Pitcher Shapes
441 Variations and Pitcher Angle in Different Crowding Conditions; Appendix S2, Figure S4: Adult
442 Pitcher Morphospace of PC1 and PC3; Appendix S2, Figure S5: Developmental Timeline of
443 *Heliamphora* Adult Pitcher Rosettes Associated with Wider and Sharper Angles; Appendix S3:
444 Morphospace of PC1, PC2, and PC3; Appendix S4: Morphospace of PC1, PC3, and Maximum
445 Pitcher Size).

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462 Literature Cited

- 463
464 Adlassnig, W., K. Pranjic, E. Mayer, G. Steinhäuser, F. Hejjas, and I. K. Lichtscheidl. 2010. 'The Abiotic
465 Environment of *Heliamphora nutans* (Sarraceniaceae): Pedological and Microclimatic Observations on
466 Roraima Tepui', *Brazilian Archives of Biology and Technology*, 53: 425-30.
- 467 Adlassnig, Wolfram, Marianne Peroutka, and Thomas Lendl. 2011. 'Traps of carnivorous pitcher plants as
468 a habitat: composition of the fluid, biodiversity and mutualistic activities', *Annals of Botany.*, 107: 181–
469 94.
- 470 Bauer, Ulrike, Mathias Scharmann, Jeremy Skepper, and Walter Federle. 2013. 'Insect aquaplaning ' on a
471 superhydrophilic hairy surface: how *Heliamphora nutans* Benth. pitcher plants capture prey', *Proceedings*
472 *of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 280: 20122569.
- 473 Bentham, George. 1840. 'XXV. On the *Heliamphora nutans*, a new Pitcher-plant from British Guiana',
474 *Transactions of the Linnean Society of London*, 18: 429-33.
- 475 Bittleston, L. S., C. J. Wolock, B. E. Yahya, X. Y. Chan, K. G. Chan, N. E. Pierce, and A. Pringle. 2018.
476 'Convergence between the microcosms of Southeast Asian and North American pitcher plants', *Elife*, 7.
- 477 Blomberg, Simon P, Theodore Garland Jr, and Anthony R Ives. 2003. 'Testing for phylogenetic signal in
478 comparative data: behavioral traits are more labile', *Evolution*, 57: 717-45.
- 479 Brewer, J. S. 1999. 'Short-term effects of fire and competition on growth and plasticity of the yellow
480 pitcher plant, *Sarracenia alata* (Sarraceniaceae)', *American Journal of Botany*, 86: 1264-71.
- 481 Brewer-Carias, Charles. 1972. 'Observation on the ecological niche of *Heliamphora*', *NATURA*, 48-49.
- 482 Butschi, Lorenz, Dorothea Huber, and Klaus Ammann. 1989. 'Carnivorous plants of Auyantepui in
483 Venezuela. Part 2.', *Carnivorous plant newsletter*, 18: 47-51.
- 484 Carow, Thomas, Andreas Wistuba, and Peter Harbarth. 2005. '*Heliamphora sarracenioides*, a New
485 Species of *Heliamphora* (Sarraceniaceae) from Venezuela', *Carnivorous plant newsletter*, 34: 4 - 6.
- 486 Chitwood, Daniel H., and Joey Mullins. 2022. 'A predicted developmental and evolutionary morphospace
487 for grapevine leaves', *Quantitative Plant Biology*, 3: 1-10.
- 488 Clarke, Charles, Jan Schlauer, Jonathan Moran, and Alastair Robinson. 2018. 'Systematics and evolution
489 of *Nepenthes*.' in Aaron Ellison and Lubomir Adamec (eds.), *Carnivorous Plants Physiology, ecology,*
490 *and evolution* (Oxford University Press).
- 491 Cross, Adam T., Maria Paniw, André Vito Scatigna, Nick Kalfas, Bruce Anderson, Thomas J. Givnish,
492 and Andreas Fleischmann. 2018. 'Systematics and evolution of small genera of carnivorous plants.' in
493 Aaron Ellison and Lubomir Adamec (eds.), *Carnivorous Plants Physiology, ecology, and evolution*
494 (Oxford University Press).
- 495 Dančák, Martin, Ľuboš Majeský, Václav Čermák, Michal R. Golos, Bartosz J. Płachno, and Wewin
496 Tjiasmanto. 2022. 'First record of functional underground traps in a pitcher plant: *Nepenthes pudica*
497 (*Nepenthaceae*), a new species from North Kalimantan, Borneo', *PhytoKeys*, 201: 77-97.
- 498 Day, E. H., X. Hua, and L. Bromham. 2016. 'Is specialization an evolutionary dead end? Testing for
499 differences in speciation, extinction and trait transition rates across diverse phylogenies of specialists and
500 generalists', *Evolutionary Biology*, 29: 1257-67.
- 501 Dellinger, Agnes S., Silvia Artuso, Susanne Pamperl, Fabián A. Michelangeli, Darin S. Penneys, Diana
502 M. Fernández-Fernández, Marcela Alvear, Frank Almeda, W. Scott Armbruster, Yannick Staedler, and
503 Jürg Schönenberger. 2019. 'Modularity increases rate of floral evolution and adaptive success for
504 functionally specialized pollination systems', *Communications Biology*, 2.
- 505 Donoghue, Michael J., Deren A. R. Eaton, Carlos A. Maya-Lastra, Michael J. Landis, Patrick W.
506 Sweeney, Mark E. Olson, N. Ivalú Cacho, Morgan K. Moeglein, Jordan R. Gardner, Nora M. Heaphy,
507 Matiss Castorena, Alí Segovia Rivas, Wendy L. Clement, and Erika J. Edwards. 2022. 'Replicated
508 radiation of a plant clade along a cloud forest archipelago', *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 6: 1318–29.
- 509 Ellison, Aaron M., Elena D. Butler, Emily Jean Hicks, Robert F. C. Naczi, Patrick J. Calie, Charles D.
510 Bell, and Charles C. Davis. 2012. 'Phylogeny and Biogeography of the Carnivorous Plant Family
511 Sarraceniaceae', *PLOS ONE*, 7.

512 Ellison, Aaron M., and Elizabeth J. Farnsworth. 2005. 'The cost of carnivory for *Darlingtonia californica*
513 (Sarraceniaceae): evidence from relationships among leaf traits', *American Journal of Botany*, 92: 1085-
514 93.

515 Ellison, Aaron M., and Nicholas J. Gotelli. 2002. 'Nitrogen availability alters the expression of carnivory
516 in the northern pitcher plant, *Sarracenia purpurea*', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 99:
517 4409-12.

518 Fleischmann, Andreas, and José Ramón Grande Allende. 2011. 'Taxonomía de *Heliamphora minor*
519 Gleason (Sarraceniaceae) del Auyán-Tepuí, incluyendo una nueva variedad', *Acta Botánica Venezolana*,
520 34: 1-11.

521 Fleischmann, Andreas, Jan Schlauer, Stephen A. Smith, and Thomas J. Givnish. 2018. 'Evolution of
522 carnivory in angiosperms.' in Aaron Ellison and Lubomir Adamec (eds.), *Carnivorous Plants Physiology,*
523 *ecology, and evolution* (Oxford University Press).

524 Fleischmann, Andreas, Andreas Wistuba, and Joachim Nerz. 2009. 'Three new species of *Heliamphora*
525 (Sarraceniaceae) from the Guayana Highlands of Venezuela', *Willdenowia*, 39: 273-83.

526 Fukushima, Kenji, Xiaodong Fang, David Alvarez-Ponce, Huimin Cai, Lorenzo Carretero-Paulet, Cui
527 Chen, Tien-Hao Chang, Kimberly M. Farr, Tomomichi Fujita, Yuji Hiwatashi, Yoshikazu Hoshi,
528 Takamasa Imai, Masahiro Kasahara, Pablo Librado, Likai Mao, Hitoshi Mori, Tomoaki Nishiyama,
529 Masafumi Nozawa, Gergő Pálfalvi, Stephen T. Pollard, Julio Rozas, Alejandro Sánchez-Gracia, David
530 Sankoff, Tomoko F. Shibata, Shuji Shigenobu, Naomi Sumikawa, Taketoshi Uzawa, Meiyang Xie,
531 Chunfang Zheng, David D. Pollock, Victor A. Albert, Shuaicheng Li, and Mitsuyasu Hasebe. 2017.
532 'Genome of the pitcher plant *Cephalotus* reveals genetic changes associated with carnivory', *Nature*
533 *Ecology & Evolution*, 1.

534 Fukushima, Kenji, Hideki Narukawa, Gergo Palfalvi, and Mitsuyasu Hasebe. 2021. 'A discordance of
535 seasonally covarying cues uncovers misregulated phenotypes in the heterophyllous pitcher plant
536 *Cephalotus follicularis*', *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 288: 20202568.

537 Gibson, T. C. 1983. *Competition, disturbance, and the carnivorous plant community in the southeastern*
538 *United States* (University of Utah: Provo, UT).

539 Gilbert, Kadeem J., Thibaut Goldsborough, Weng Ngai Lam, Felicia Leong, and Naomi E. Pierce. 2022.
540 'A semi-detritivorous pitcher plant, *Nepenthes ampullaria* diverges in its regulation of pitcher fluid
541 properties', *Journal of Plant Interactions*, 17: 956-66.

542 Givnish, T. J., E. L. Burkhardt, R. E. Happel, and J. D. Weintraub. 1984. 'Carnivory in the Bromeliad
543 *Brocchinia reducta*, with a Cost/Benefit Model for the General Restriction of Carnivorous Plants to
544 Sunny, Moist, Nutrient-Poor Habitats', *The American Naturalist*, 124: 479-97.

545 Givnish, Thomas J. 1989. 'Ecology and evolution of carnivorous plants.' in Warren G. Abrahamson, II
546 (ed.), *Plant-animal interactions* (McGraw-Hill: New York).

547 Givnish, Thomas J., K. William Sparks, Steven J. Hunter, and Andrej Pavlovič. 2018. 'Why are plants
548 carnivorous? Cost/ benefit analysis, whole-plant growth, and the context-specific advantages of botanical
549 carnivory.' in Aaron Ellison and Lubomir Adamec (eds.), *Carnivorous Plants Physiology, Ecology, and*
550 *Evolution* (Oxford University Press).

551 Givnish, Thomas J., Kenneth J. Sytsma, James F. Smith, William J. Hahn, David H. Benzing, and
552 Elizabeth M. Burkhardt. 1997. 'Molecular Evolution and Adaptive Radiation in *Brocchinia*
553 (Bromeliaceae: Pitcairnioideae) Atop vesus of the Guyana Shield.' in Thomas J. Givnish and Kenneth J.
554 Sytsma (eds.), *Molecular Evolution and Adaptive Radiation* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge).

555 Golos, Michal R. 2020. 'First observations of UV-induced fluorescence in *Heliamphora* (Sarraceniaceae)
556 and other tepui flora', *Carnivorous plant newsletter*, 49: e1-31.

557 Ho, Ls, and C. Ane. 2014. 'A linear-time algorithm for Gaussian and non-Gaussian trait evolution
558 models', *Systematic Biology*, 63: 397-408.

559 Jaffé, Klaus, Murray S. Blum, Henry M. Fales, Robert T. Mason, and Aivlé Cabrera. 1995. 'On insect
560 attractants from pitcher plants of the genus *Heliamphora* (sarraceniaceae)', *Journal of Chemical Ecology*,
561 21: 379-84.

562 Jaffe, Klaus, Fabian Michelangeli, Jorge M. Gonzalez, Beatriz Miras, and Marie Christine Ruiz. 1992.
563 'Carnivory in pitcher plants of the genus *Heliampora* (Sarraceniaceae)', *The New Phytologist*, 122: 733-
564 44.

565 Jardine, Phillip E., Luis Palazzesi, M. Cristina Tellería, and Viviana D. Barreda. 2022. 'Why does pollen
566 morphology vary? Evolutionary dynamics and morphospace occupation in the largest angiosperm
567 order (Asterales)', *New Phytologist*, 234: 1075-87.

568 Juniper, Barrie E., Richard J. Robins, and Daniel M. Joel. 1989. *The Carnivorous Plants* (Academic Press
569 Ltd: London).

570 Karagatzides, Jim D., and Aaron M. Ellison. 2009. 'Construction costs, payback times, and the leaf
571 economics of carnivorous plants', *American Journal of Botany*, 96: 1612-9.

572 Kriebel, Ricardo, Bryan T Drew, Jesús G González-Gallegos, Ferhat Celep, Guilherme M Antar, José
573 Floriano Barêa Pastore, Rolando Uría, and Kenneth J Sytsma. 2022. 'Stigma shape shifting in sages
574 (*Salvia*: Lamiaceae): hummingbirds guided the evolution of New World floral features', *Botanical
575 Journal of the Linnean Society*, 199: 428–48.

576 Liu, Sukuan, and Stacey D Smith. 2021. 'Phylogeny and biogeography of South American marsh pitcher
577 plant genus *Heliampora* (Sarraceniaceae) endemic to the Guiana Highlands', *Molecular Phylogenetics
578 and Evolution*, 154.

579 Magallón, Susana, Sandra G Omez-Acevedo, Luna L. Sanchez-Reyes, and Tania Hernandez-Hern
580 andez. 2015. 'A metacalibrated time-tree documents the early rise of flowering plant phylogenetic
581 diversity', *New Phytologist*, 207: 437-53.

582 Maguire, Bassett. 1978. 'Botany of the Guayana Highland: Sarraceniaceae', *Memoirs of The New York
583 Botanical Garden*, 29: 26-62.

584 McPherson, Stewart, and Donald Schnell. 2011. *Sarraceniaceae of North America* (Redfern Natural
585 History Productions: Poole, United Kingdom).

586 McPherson, Stewart, Andreas Wistuba, Andreas Fleischmann, and Joachim Nerz. 2011. *Sarraceniaceae
587 of South America* (Redfern Natural History Productions: Poole, United Kingdom).

588 Moran, Jonathan A., Charles Clarke, Melinda Greenwood, and Lijin Chin. 2012. 'Tuning of color contrast
589 signals to visual sensitivity maxima of tree shrews by three Bornean highland *Nepenthes* species', *Plant
590 Signaling & Behavior*, 7: 1267-70.

591 Murphy, B., F. Forest, T. Barraclough, J. Rosindell, S. Bellot, R. Cowan, M. Golos, M. Jebb, and M.
592 Cheek. 2020. 'A phylogenomic analysis of *Nepenthes* (Nepenthaceae)', *Molecular Phylogenetics and
593 Evolution*, 144: 106668.

594 Naczi, Robert F. C. 2018. 'Systematics and evolution of Sarraceniaceae.' in Aaron Ellison and Lubomir
595 Adamec (eds.), *Carnivorous Plants Physiology, ecology, and evolution* (Oxford University Press).

596 Nerz, Joachim. 2004. '*Heliampora elongata* (Sarraceniaceae), a new species from Ilu Tepui',
597 *Carnivorous plant newsletter*, 33: 111-16.

598 Nerz, Joachim, and Andreas Wistuba. 2000. '*Heliampora hispida* (Sarraceniaceae), a new species from
599 Cerro Neblina, Brazil-Venezuela', *Carnivorous plant newsletter*, 29: 37-41.

600 Papadopulos, A. S., M. P. Powell, F. Pupulin, J. Warner, J. A. Hawkins, N. Salamin, L. Chittka, N. H.
601 Williams, W. M. Whitten, D. Loader, L. M. Valente, M. W. Chase, and V. Savolainen. 2013. 'Convergent
602 evolution of floral signals underlies the success of Neotropical orchids', *Proceedings of the Royal Society
603 B: Biological Science*, 280: 20130960.

604 Paradis, E., and J. Claude. 2002. 'Analysis of comparative data using generalized estimating equations',
605 *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 218: 175-85.

606 Pavlovic, A. 2012. 'Adaptive radiation with regard to nutrient sequestration strategies in the carnivorous
607 plants of the genus *Nepenthes*', *Plant Signaling & Behavior*, 7: 295-7.

608 Pavlović, Andrej, and Michaela Saganová. 2015. 'A novel insight into the cost–benefit model for the
609 evolution of botanical carnivory', *Annals of Botany*, 115: 1075–92.

610 Peterson, Celeste N., Stephanie Day, Benjamin E. Wolfe, Aaron M. Ellison, Roberto Kolter, and Anne
611 Pringle. 2008. 'A keystone predator controls bacterial diversity in the pitcher-plant (*Sarracenia purpurea*)
612 microecosystem', *Environmental Microbiology*, 10: 2257-66.

613 Plachno, B. J., P. Swiatek, and A. Wistuba. 2007. 'The giant extra-floral nectaries of carnivorous
614 *Heliamphora folliculata*: Architecture and ultrastructure', *ACTA BIOLOGICA CRACOVIENSIS Series*
615 *Botanica*, 49: 91-104.
616 'Recent literature'. 1975. *Carnivorous plant newsletter*, 4: 35-37.
617 Revell, Liam J. 2012. 'Phytools: an R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and other things)',
618 *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 3.
619 Schneider, C. A., W. S. Rasband, and K. W. Eliceiri. 2012. 'NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of image
620 analysis', *Nature Methods*, 9: 671-5.
621 Segall, Marion, Raphaël Cornette, Ramiro Godoy-Diana, and Anthony Herrel. 2020. 'Exploring the
622 functional meaning of head shape disparity in aquatic snakes', *Ecology and Evolution*, 10: 6993-7005.
623 Smith, S. D., and R. Kriebel. 2018. 'Convergent evolution of floral shape tied to pollinator shifts in
624 *Iochrominae* (Solanaceae)', *Evolution*, 72: 688-97.
625 Stayton, C. T. 2019. 'Performance in three shell functions predicts the phenotypic distribution of hard-
626 shelled turtles', *Evolution*, 73: 720-34.
627 Thornham, Daniel G., Joanna M. Smith, T. Ulmar Grafe, and Walter Federle. 2012. 'Setting the trap:
628 cleaning behaviour of *Camponotus schmitzi* ants increases long-term capture efficiency of their pitcher
629 plant host, *Nepenthes bicalcarata*', *Functional Ecology*, 26: 11-19.
630 Thorogood, C. J., U. Bauer, and S. J. Hiscock. 2018. 'Convergent and divergent evolution in carnivorous
631 pitcher plant traps', *New Phytologist*, 217: 1035-41.
632 Tripp, Erin A, and Paul S Manos. 2008. 'Is floral specialization an evolutionary dead-end? Pollination
633 system transitions in *Ruellia* (Acanthaceae)', *Evolution*, 62: 1712-37.
634 Vernescu, Corina, and Peter Ryser. 2009. 'Constraints on leaf structural traits in wetland plants', *American*
635 *Journal of Botany*, 96: 1068-74.
636 Wim A. Ozinga, Audrey Colles, Igor V. Bartish, Françoise Hennion, Stephan M. Hennekens, Sandrine
637 Pavoine, Peter Poschlod, Marie Hermant, Joop H. J. Schaminée, Andreas Prinzing. 2012. 'Specialists
638 leave fewer descendants within a region than generalists', *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 22.
639 Wistuba, Andreas, Thomas Carow, and Peter Harbarth. 2002. '*Heliamphora chimantensis* a New Species
640 of *Heliamphora* (Sarraceniaceae) from the 'Macizo de Chimanta ' in the South of Venezuela', *Carnivorous*
641 *Plant Newsletter*, 31: 78-82.
642 Wistuba, Andreas, Thomas Carow, Peter Harbarth, and Joachim Nerz. 2005. '*Heliamphora pulchella*, eine
643 neue mit *Heliamphora minor* (Sarraceniaceae) verwandte Art aus der Chimanta Region in Venezuela',
644 *Das Taublatt*, 53: 42-50.
645 Wistuba, Andreas, Peter Harbarth, and Thomas Carow. 2001. '*Heliamphora folliculata*, a New Species of
646 *Heliamphora* (Sarraceniaceae) from the 'Los Testigos 'Table Mountains in the South of Venezuela',
647 *Carnivorous Plant Newsletter*, 30: 120 - 25.
648 Wrazidlo, Mateusz. 2019. 'Quest for the origin of *Heliamphora heterodoxa*. Report of May 2018
649 expedition to Venezuela with carnivorous flora occurrences in the base areas of Ptari-tepui', *Carnivorous*
650 *plant newsletter*, 48: 183-87.
651 Ziemer, Robert R. 1979. 'Some Personal Observations on Cultivating the *Heliamphora*', *Carnivorous*
652 *plant newsletter*, 8: 90-92.
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663

664 Figure Legends

665

666

667

668 **Figure 1. Left: Adult Pitcher Morphologies** of the reconstructed ancestral
669 *Heliamphora* (ANC) and extant species grouped by clades. **Right: Phylogeny of**
670 ***Heliamphora*** adapted and modified from Liu and Smith, 2021. Taxa names in each
671 clade are ordered aesthetically from left to right. **W:** *H. hispida*, *H. ceracea*, *H. tatei*, *H.*
672 *neblinae*, *H. macdonaldae*, and *H. parva*. **E1:** *H. pulchella*, *H. minor* var. *pilosa*, *H.*
673 *ciliata*, *H. huberi*, and *H. chimantensis*. **E2a:** *H. heterodoxa*, *H. collina*, *H. sp.*
674 "Angasima", *H. sp.* "Akopán", *H. sarracenioides*, and *H. purpurascens*. **E2b:** *H.*
675 *exappendiculata*, *H. glabra*, *H. uncinata*, and *H. folliculata*. **E3:** *H. nutans*, *H. arenicola*,
676 *H. ionasi*, and *H. elongata*. The ancestral *Heliamphora* pitcher morphology was
677 generated based on estimated ancestral values for each of the three shape PCs and
678 the estimated ancestral size and maximum pitcher size. Note that the ancestral pitcher
679 is based on the expected values at the root, which carry a degree of uncertainty.

680

681 **Figure 2. Landmarking examples** of three *Heliamphora* species: *H. ciliata* (left), *H.*
682 *pulchella* (middle) and *H. sarracenioides* (right). The adult pitcher functional zones
683 (McPherson et al. 2011) were delineated by six landmarks indicated above.
684 Morphologically, *Heliamphora* pitchers are similar to those of *Sarracenia* and
685 *Darlingtonia*, except that they lack a covering at the pitcher openings to prevent
686 rainwater from overflowing the pitchers. Instead, *Heliamphora* evolved the drainage hole
687 (further modified into drainage slit in E1 clade, indicated by landmark 1) to allow
688 rainwater to accumulate in the pitcher (thus maintaining a high level of pitcher fluid,
689 with maximum fluid level shown with the dotted blue line and roughly align with
690 landmark 1 and 5) while letting the excess to drain out and prevent the pitchers from
691 becoming overfilled and unstable (Bauer et al. 2013).

692

693 **Figure 3. A. Adult pitcher morphospace of pitcher curvature (PC1) and nectar**
694 **spoon elaboration (PC2)** with outlines of each taxa and the reconstructed ancestral
695 *Heliamphora* adult pitcher (darker gray). Taxa are colored by clades: W (orange), E1
696 (red), E2a (blue), E2b (green), E3 (purple). **B. Shape variation along PC axes.** For
697 each of the first three PCs, the mean is shown along with shapes corresponding to ± 2
698 standard deviation (SD). + 2 SD was chosen to better visualize the morphological
699 variation along shape PC axes.

700

701 **Figure 4. Traitgrams of pitcher curvature (PC1), nectar spoon elaboration (PC2),**
702 **pitcher stoutness (PC3), and maximum pitcher size.** Branches are colored by
703 clades. Examples of pitcher and nectar spoon morphologies are shown in the
704 traitgrams.

705

706

707

708 **Figure 5. Associations between adult pitcher shape variations and maximum**
709 **pitcher size in pitcher morphospace.** Taxa are represented by solid circles and
710 colored by clades. Regression lines were drawn based on the best fit phylogenetic
711 generalized linear models. Example pitcher shapes (corresponding to the taxa
712 encircled) are shown in each morphospace.
713

714 **Figure 6. Effect of crowdedness on pitcher angle across developmental stages.**
715 Both phylogenetic and simple unpaired t-tests were conducted for each comparison with
716 test statistics shown in black and gray, respectively. Note the angles shown above each
717 condition were averages pooled from all samples, with potential bias toward species
718 that were over sampled.
719

720 **Figure 7. Morphologies of *Heliampora* rosettes associated with wider (A, B) and**
721 **sharper pitcher angles (D, E).** For each pitcher angle, rosettes are illustrated with
722 three (A, D) to six pitchers (B, E) to demonstrate the effect of shading from overlapping
723 pitchers. In each rosette, pitchers are numbered increasingly from the oldest to the
724 youngest pitcher (most active pitcher). **Hypothetical scenario illustrating the effect of**
725 **wider (C) and sharper pitcher angles (F) on optimal packing in crowded**
726 **conditions.** In this hypothetical scenario, the wider and sharper pitcher angles,
727 respectively, allowed the populations to fit in up to 10 and 12 rosettes when space is
728 limited. The sharper pitcher angle allowed *Heliampora* population to occupy available
729 space more efficiently, with an increase of 20% more active pitchers.