

1 **A systematic review and meta-analysis of anti-predator mechanisms of**
2 **eyespot: conspicuous pattern vs eye mimicry**

3 Ayumi Mizuno*^{1,2}, Malgorzata Lagisz², Pietro Pollo², Yefeng Yang², Masayo Soma¹,
4 Shinichi Nakagawa^{2,3}

5
6 **Affiliation**

7 ¹ Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Hokkaido,
8 Japan

9 ² Evolution & Ecology Research Centre, School of Biological, Earth and Environmental
10 Sciences, The University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.

11 ³ Theoretical Sciences Visiting Program, Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology
12 Graduate University, Onna, Okinawa, Japan

13
14 **ORCID iD**

15 Ayumi Mizuno: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0822-5637>

16 Malgorzata Lagisz: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3993-6127>

17 Pietro Pollo: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6555-5400>

18 Yefeng Yang: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8610-4016>

19 Masayo Soma: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8596-1956>

20 Shinichi Nakagawa: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7765-5182>

21
22 **Corresponding author**

23 Ayumi Mizuno

24 Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Hokkaido, Japan

25 ayumi.mizuno5@gmail.com

26
27 **Funding**

28 This work was supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science Research Fellowship
29 for Young Scientists [JP22KJ0076], Japan Society for the Promotion of Science Overseas
30 Challenge Program for Young Researchers [202280247] to Ayumi Mizuno; ARC
31 [DP210100812, DP230101248] to Malgorzata Lagisz and Shinichi Nakagawa; Japan
32 Society for the Promotion of Science Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research [20K06809] to
33 Masayo Soma.

35 **Competing interests**

36 We declare we have no competing interests.

37

38 **Author contribution**

39 AM: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation,
40 Methodology, Software, Project administration, Supervision, Visualization, Writing –
41 original draft, Writing – review & editing

42 ML: Data curation, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – review &
43 editing

44 PP: Data curation, Investigation, Writing – review & editing

45 YY: Data curation, Investigation, Writing – review & editing

46 MS: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Visualization, Writing – review & editing

47 SN: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Software, Supervision, Project
48 administration, Writing – review & editing

49

50 All gave final approval for publication and agreed to be held accountable for the work
51 performed therein.

52

53 **Data Accessibility**

54 Raw data, analysis script and supplementary materials are available at [https://ayumi-
55 495.github.io/eyespot/](https://ayumi-495.github.io/eyespot/). Once the paper is published, these will all be uploaded to Zenodo.

56 **Abstract**

57 Eyespot patterns have evolved in many prey species. These patterns were traditionally
58 explained by the eye mimicry hypothesis, which proposes that eyespots resembling vertebrate
59 eyes function as predator avoidance. However, it is possible that eyespots do not mimic eyes:
60 according to the conspicuousness hypothesis, eyespots are just one form of vivid signals
61 where only conspicuousness matters. They might work simply through neophobia or
62 unfamiliarity, without necessarily implying aposematism or the unprofitability to potential
63 predators. To test these hypotheses and explore factors influencing predators' responses, we
64 conducted a meta-analysis with 33 empirical papers that focused on bird responses to both
65 real lepidopterans and artificial targets with conspicuous patterns (i.e. eyespots and non-
66 eyespots). Supporting the latter hypothesis, the results showed no clear difference in
67 predation survival efficacy between eyespots and non-eyespots. When comparing geometric
68 pattern characteristics, bigger pattern sizes and smaller numbers of patterns were more
69 effective in preventing avian predation. This finding indicates that single concentric patterns
70 have stronger deterring effects than paired ones. Taken together, our study supports the
71 conspicuousness hypothesis more than the eye mimicry hypothesis. Due to the number and
72 species coverage of published studies so far, the generalisability of our conclusion may be
73 limited. The findings highlight that pattern conspicuousness is key to eliciting avian
74 avoidance responses, shedding a different light on this classic example of signal evolution.

75

76 **Keywords**

77 Aves, butterfly, caterpillar, interspecific communication, predator-prey interaction, warning
78 signal

79 **Background**

80 Naturalists have long pondered the evolution and function of the many signals and cues
81 animals use to communicate [1–9]. Visual signals, such as vibrant colours and contrasting
82 patterns, have attracted more interest from researchers than other signals, likely because our
83 species is visually oriented [1, 10, 11]. Eyespot patterns, characterised by concentric rings of
84 different colours with a light outer ring and a dark centre [12], are well-known patterns
85 believed to reduce predation. Although eyespots have been researched for a long time [12–
86 15], researchers continue to debate why eyespots might deter predation.

87 Three hypotheses have been proposed to explain why eyespot patterns can contribute
88 to prey survival (reviewed in [12, 14, 15]; Fig. 1). First, the eye mimicry hypothesis suggests
89 that eyespots play a role in deterring predators from attacking prey and reducing predation
90 risks by mimicking the eyes of vertebrates [16–18]. This hypothesis predicts that if the
91 pattern has specific characteristics (e.g., eye-like shape) and is presented as a pair, predation
92 avoidance will increase, assuming eyespots imitate potential predators. Second, the
93 conspicuousness hypothesis posits that eyespots are simply conspicuous patterns that prevent
94 attacks due to negative predator responses caused by sensory bias, neophobia, or sensory
95 overload [12, 14]. The hypothesis states that the eye-like shape and patterns arranged in pairs
96 do not necessarily deter predators. Rather, it is their conspicuous appearance that makes them
97 effective predator deterrents, and any resemblance to eyes is coincidental. For example,
98 following this rationale, the avoidance effect should increase with the size of the pattern (a
99 measure of conspicuousness). Third, the deflection hypothesis suggests that predator attacks
100 should be directed towards eyespots to avoid damage to vital body parts [19–23]. While the
101 eye mimicry and conspicuousness hypotheses are usually applied to explain large eyespots,
102 the deflection hypothesis is used to interpret the function of small ones [12, 14, 15]. The first
103 two of these hypotheses focus on how eyespots prevent predators from attacking, specifically
104 whether it is because they resemble eyes or are conspicuous. The third hypothesis focuses on
105 whether eyespots divert a predator’s attack away from vital body parts by drawing the
106 predator’s attention to them. Thus, in this third hypothesis, whether the eyespots resemble
107 eyes or are conspicuous is not the central issue [12, 14, 15]. Although there seems to be little
108 disagreement in the deflection hypothesis ([24–26], but see also [27]), why large eyespots can
109 intimidate avian predators has been controversial [12, 14]. This is because while the eye
110 mimicry and conspicuousness hypotheses are not mutually exclusive, the key mechanism that
111 explains why predators react negatively to eyespots is clearly different.

112 Lepidopterans, such as butterflies and moths, have been the leading models for testing
113 the eye mimicry and conspicuousness hypotheses. A typical empirical study has adult
114 individuals, caterpillars, or their models as prey, with birds as predators (reviewed in [12, 14,
115 15]). According to the eye mimicry hypothesis, avian predators perceive the eyespots as the
116 eyes of a potential enemy. For example, great tits (*Parus major*) showed more aversive
117 responses to animated butterflies with a pair of large eyespots than those without, and such
118 eyespots were more effective than modified, less mimetic, but equally contrasting patterns
119 [28]. Although several studies have supported the eye mimicry hypothesis [e.g., 16, 28, 29],
120 many conspicuous patterns other than eyespots, such as dots and stripes, likely deter attacks
121 from predators as well [30–33]. Some field experiments with artificial prey have supported
122 the conspicuousness hypothesis, demonstrating survival rates for both conspicuous (eyespot
123 and non-eyespot) pattern prey stimuli were higher than control prey stimuli [30, 31, 34].
124 Such discrepancies might have arisen from differences in experimental design between
125 studies, such as the size, number, and shape of the presented pattern stimuli or the bird
126 species used as subjects in the experiments [12, 35]. However, there has been no systematic
127 attempt to synthesise and compare earlier studies quantitatively.

128 Here, we conduct a systematic review with meta-analysis to synthesise empirical
129 evidence on the intimidating effects of eyespots and the factors that contribute to predator
130 avoidance responses towards them. To examine the two hypotheses above, we ask three
131 interrelated questions. First, we examine whether conspicuous patterns, namely eyespots and
132 non-eyespot patterns (i.e., conspicuous patterns other than eyespots), influence bird responses
133 or prey survival in a manner that increases the success of predator avoidance. Second, we test
134 whether pattern resemblance to eyes (eye-like shape) is the key to predator avoidance (which
135 differentiates the eye mimicry hypothesis from the conspicuousness hypothesis). Third, we
136 examine what factors promote bird response and increase prey survival, such as pattern size
137 and the number of patterns (i.e., eyespots and non-eyespots; Fig. 1).

138

139 **Materials and Methods**

140 We preregistered our methods and planned analyses before data extraction and analysis in
141 Open Science Framework (<https://osf.io/ymwvb>; [36]). We referenced and followed
142 PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses; [37]) and
143 PRISMA-EcoEvo (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-analyses in
144 Ecology and Evolutionary biology; [38]) for reporting this study (Table S1).

145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178

Search protocols

We used the PICO (Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcome; Table 1) framework [39] to specify the scope of our research questions and to inform our literature searching and screening. We conducted a comprehensive literature search across multiple databases, including Scopus, ISI Web of Science, Google Scholar (for non-English studies), and Bielefeld Academic Search Engine (for unpublished theses; i.e., grey literature). We designed the search strings (see Table S2) to identify studies that used experimental methods to examine the effects of eyespot patterns on birds' predation behaviours. We did not set any temporal restrictions on the database searches. Additionally, we conducted backward and forward reference searches within the Scopus database using four key publications [12–15]. The strings were translated for searches in non-English languages, and search results were assessed by reviewers with expertise in the respective languages: AM for Japanese, ML for Polish and Russian, PP for Portuguese and Spanish, and YY for Simplified and Traditional Chinese. We limited Google Scholar searches to the top 100 results in each language, sorted by relevance. In cases of disagreement between the reviewers, discrepancies were discussed and resolved to reach a consensus. The screening process and results are shown in the PRISMA-like flowchart (Fig. 2a).

Eligibility criteria

We set specific criteria for including studies in our meta-analysis (according to our pre-registered protocol). Initial screening, including titles, abstracts, and keyword assessment for English-language bibliographic records, was conducted by AM and ML using Rayyan (<https://www.rayyan.ai>; [40]) following predefined inclusion criteria. Subsequently, AM and PP independently screened the full texts of studies that passed the initial screening. To be eligible, a study had to conduct experiments and provide data on bird behavioural responses or prey survival/attacked rates. We excluded studies solely involving non-avian predators, such as fish, insects, mammals, or other species. However, studies that included a mix of species from different taxonomic groups were allowed if the primary focus was on avian predation. In our analysis, we only considered research that presented both conspicuous and control (non-conspicuous) patterns as stimuli. We omitted studies using actual predator or human eyes as stimuli since we focused on understanding how eyespot patterns in butterflies and caterpillars, which are unlikely to resemble specific bird or vertebrate species eyes, affect predation avoidance [41]. We also excluded studies that used bright and contrasting patterns

179 as control stimuli because such stimuli would prevent comparison with eyespot patterns or
180 other conspicuous patterns. Furthermore, we focused only on studies that used real or
181 artificial butterflies, moths, caterpillars, or a piece of paper as prey or presented stimuli. We
182 also did not consider research that only investigated avian physiological responses to
183 conspicuous patterns. In addition, we did not include studies that only assessed whether prey
184 with eyespots or conspicuous patterns were less likely to be attacked by birds, based on wing
185 or body damage alone, without including control stimuli. This is because it was not possible
186 to quantitatively assess the effect of eyespots or other conspicuous patterns on predation
187 avoidance without control stimuli.

188

189 **Data collection**

190 We extracted four types of information from each study. First, we collected citation
191 information, such as title, author name, and publication year. Second, we gathered the details
192 of the presented stimuli used in each experiment within studies: type of control pattern (plain
193 neutral-coloured or camouflaged), type of treatment pattern (eyespot or non-eyespot
194 patterns), pattern area (mm^2 : area per shape comprising the pattern), total pattern area (mm^2 :
195 when multiple patterns exist on the presented stimulus, it denotes the total area of all patterns;
196 for stimuli with single eyespot or distinct pattern, the value equals the pattern area), linear
197 size of the pattern (mm: e.g., maximum diameter or length of pattern), number of shapes in
198 pattern, total area of prey surface (mm^2 : e.g., butterfly wings and caterpillar bodies), prey
199 material type (i.e., whether a real butterfly or a complete imitation of a particular butterfly
200 was used as prey), and prey shape type (a further subdivision of the former). For non-eyespot
201 patterns, we also noted pattern shapes (e.g., circles, stripes, and triangles). In each study, bird
202 responses to control and treatment pattern stimuli and prey survival/attacked rates when these
203 patterns were present were reported. Bird responses contained a variety of measures,
204 including the number of attacks and escape behaviours, latency to attack, latency to approach,
205 and the proportion of birds attacking the presented stimuli. Henceforth, we refer to these
206 measures and responses as 'predator avoidance'. Third, we obtained data for calculating effect
207 sizes (e.g., mean, standard deviation or standard error, and sample size of control and
208 treatment group) from plots using WebPlotDigitizer 4.6.0
209 (<https://automeris.io/WebPlotDigitizer>), detailed tables, texts, or raw data. In survival
210 analysis plots, we extracted data at the point in time when the difference between the
211 'survival' or 'attacked' rates of the intervention and comparison groups was greatest as
212 outcomes. Study design (i.e., whether experiments were done independently or dependently

213 between the control and treatment group) was also recorded. Fourth, we gathered predator
 214 and prey information, specifically, the study species (common English name and scientific
 215 name) and predator diet type. In some cases, studies did not use a specific bird species as a
 216 predator or a specific lepidopteran species as prey. We contacted authors when such
 217 information was ambiguous or missing. When the paper did not report the pattern area and
 218 diameter of the treatment stimulus or the presented stimulus surface area, AM calculated or
 219 measured them from available images using ImageJ v.1.53i [42].

220 The dataset was originally divided into two parts. The first part involved the data from
 221 presenting eyespot patterns to avian predators and directly observing their responses
 222 (predator dataset). The sample size or unit of analysis in this part was based on the number of
 223 individual avian predators. The second part involved the data from using real or artificial
 224 abstract butterflies, moths, or caterpillars with eyespots or non-eyespot patterns as stimuli or
 225 prey, and observing their survival/attacked probabilities in the field (prey dataset). The
 226 sample size or unit of analysis in this part was based on the number of real or artificial
 227 abstract prey. However, we also used the combined dataset that included both predator and
 228 prey datasets, as detailed in the “**Meta-analysis and meta-regressions**” and “**Publication**
 229 **bias**” sections.

230

231 **Effect size calculation**

232 To obtain the effect size point estimates and sampling variances, we used the natural
 233 logarithm of the response ratio (lnRR) between the means of the treatment and the treatment
 234 control stimulus groups [43–45]. Positive lnRR values indicate heightened aversion in birds
 235 and enhanced prey survival, while negative lnRR values signify diminished bird aversion and
 236 increased prey mortality. The point estimate and sampling variance (var) of lnRR can be then
 237 calculated in:

$$lnRR = \ln\left(\frac{M_T}{M_C}\right) \quad (1)$$

$$var(lnRR) = \frac{SD^2_T}{N_T M^2_T} + \frac{SD^2_C}{N_C M^2_C} - 2r \sqrt{\frac{SD^2_T}{N_T M^2_T}} \sqrt{\frac{SD^2_C}{N_C M^2_C}} \quad (2)$$

238 where M_T and M_C are mean responses of treatment and control groups (e.g., total frequency
 239 of attacking prey, latency of approach, or prey survivability), respectively. SD and N are
 240 (sample) standard deviations and sample size, respectively. The term, r is the correlation

241 coefficient between responses of the two groups. Some of our eligible studies used the paired
242 (dependent) study design where treatment and control samples originated from the same
243 individuals, and sample sizes between the two groups were the same. None of these studies
244 provided an estimate of r . Thus, when calculating our effect sizes, we assumed that this
245 correlation was 0.5, which is conservative [46]. For the other studies that used independent
246 study design, we set $r = 0$.

247 We note that our dataset included proportion (percentage) data (e.g., predator attack
248 rate or prey survival probability), which are bounded at 0 (0%) and 1 (100%). Therefore, we
249 transformed group means (M) and group standard deviations (SD) for proportion data using
250 Equations (3) and (4) before applying (1) and (2) to calculate lnRR and the sampling
251 variance:

$$f(M) = \arcsine(\sqrt{M}) \quad (3)$$

$$SD(f(M)) = \sqrt{\frac{SD^2}{4M(1-M)}} \quad (4)$$

252 where f indicates a function, in our case, the arcsine transformation. The standard deviation
253 (SD) related to this transformation was derived using the delta method before calculating
254 lnRR and the sampling variance [47]. We have also assumed that the standard deviation was
255 $SD(f(M)) = 1/\sqrt{8}$ if SD was not available.

256

257 **Meta-analysis and meta-regressions**

258 We used the *rma.mv* function from the package metafor v.4.4.0 [48] in R v.4.3.1 [49] for our
259 analyses. We started by fitting multilevel, mixed-effect meta-analytic models to the predator
260 and prey datasets. These meta-analytic models explicitly incorporated random factors, Study
261 ID, Cohort ID (groups of the same subjects), and Shared control ID (indicating effect sizes
262 sharing control groups) [50] along with Observation ID, fitted by the above function [48].

263 The model for the predator dataset included Species ID and a correlation matrix related to
264 phylogenetic relatedness for the species as random factors [51]. This is because we had data
265 on the bird species used in the experiment in the predator dataset, and we needed to control
266 for phylogenetic relationships between birds. We also quantified the total I^2 (a measure of
267 heterogeneity not attributed to sampling error [52]) and how much each random factor was
268 explained (partial I^2), calculated by the *i2_ml* function from the package orchaRd v.2.0.0

269 [53]. After running both meta-analytical models, we found that phylogeny and Species ID did
270 not need to be controlled for in the predator dataset, as their partial I^2 were zero ($I^2 = 0.00\%$).
271 That is, these factors explained little heterogeneity between effect sizes.

272 Therefore, we merged predator and prey datasets (i.e., full dataset) without
273 considering phylogenetic information and used them for the following models. We had, as
274 random effects, Study ID, Cohort ID, Shared control ID, and Observation ID for our meta-
275 analytic model using the full dataset. The Cohort ID and Shared control ID were removed
276 from our subsequent meta-regressions because they both explained little heterogeneity (both
277 partial $I^2 < 0.001\%$). This intercept-only (meta-analytic) model tested the conspicuous
278 patterns (eyespot and non-eyespot) that affected predator avoidance (i.e., our first question).

279 Next, we tested whether eyespot and non-eyespot patterns differ in the magnitude
280 and direction of the effect of elicited bird predator avoidance and what factors contribute to
281 the deterring effects of conspicuous patterns. We performed uni-moderator meta-regression
282 models with each of eight moderators: treatment stimulus pattern types (eyespot vs. non-
283 eyespot), pattern area, the number of pattern shapes, prey material type, maximum pattern
284 diameter/length, total pattern area, total area of prey surface, and prey shape type. We also
285 ran a multi-moderator meta-regression model, including the first four of the eight variables
286 mentioned in the uni-moderators, due to moderator correlations. We used log-transformed
287 data for pattern area, total pattern area, total area of prey surface, and pattern maximum
288 diameter/length in our analysis to normalise these moderators. We created all result plots in
289 the *orchard_plot* and *bubble_plot* functions from the package *orchaRd* [53].

290

291 **Publication bias**

292 We used three approaches to assess the presence of publication bias in our study. First, we
293 visually assessed the funnel plot asymmetry by examining the residuals from a meta-analytic
294 model, which included all the random factors utilised in our study. These residuals were
295 plotted against the precision of the effect sizes. Secondly, we performed an alternative
296 method to Egger's regression. This method used the inverse of the effective sample size as a
297 moderator within a multilevel meta-analytic model [54]. Third, we examined the possibility
298 of time-lag bias by including publication year as a moderator in our multilevel meta-analytic
299 model. Uni-moderator models were run for each inverse of the effective sample size and
300 publication year, and a multi-moderator model was carried out with the full model including
301 both inverse of the effective sample size and publication year as moderators.

302

303 **Additions and deviations**

304 We made two changes to the pre-registration: the addition of four new moderators and the
305 removal of two moderators. The new moderators were pattern area, total pattern area, total
306 area of prey surface, and prey shape types, although similar moderators were in the pre-
307 registration such as the number of eyespots (patterns) and diameter of an eyespot (a pattern).
308 These *post-hoc* decisions were taken to refine our initial moderators. We subsequently used
309 them in our meta-regression analyses. We originally intended to include the broad outcome
310 categories of predator avoidance measure as a moderator in the models, but the diversity of
311 reported results made categorisation impossible. Therefore, we did not include it as a
312 moderator. We also collected information on bird diet but decided not to include it. This
313 decision was because six of the seven bird species in our study were omnivores, resulting in a
314 lack of variability needed to detect diet effects in our data (for more details, please see
315 **Results**).

316

317 **Results**

318 **Screening outcomes and dataset characteristics**

319 We obtained 270 effect sizes from 33 studies (164 experiments) for our analysis. The
320 screening process and reasons for exclusion at the full-text screening stage are summarised in
321 the PRISMA-like flowchart (Fig. 2a), with additional details available in Table S3, which
322 comprises a list of included/excluded studies. Of the dataset, 68.9% of effect sizes came from
323 eyespot presentation experiments (Fig. 2b). The remaining 31.1% of effect sizes came from
324 non-eyespot pattern presentation experiments (Fig. 2b). The latter category encompassed
325 various shapes, including circles (71.4%), rectangles (16.7%), diamonds (6.0%), complex
326 patterns (combinations of circles and diamonds; 4.8%), and stripes (1.1%); 93.7% of the
327 control stimuli used in these experiments involved the removal of the pattern used in the
328 treatment stimuli; the remaining stimuli were camouflage patterns (6.3%). Prey shape type
329 used for stimulus presentation varied from real or imitation of a particular butterfly (24.4%)
330 to simply a piece of paper (21.5%) (Fig. 2b). The number of pattern shapes varied between
331 studies from one to 11, but in most experiments, they were two (i.e., a pair of shapes; Fig.
332 2c). Additionally, we found that the size of these patterns, both area and maximum
333 diameter/length, exhibited considerable variation across studies (Fig. 2c). The total area of
334 the patterns and stimulus also varied widely (Fig. 2c). The studies reported responses to
335 conspicuous pattern stimuli by seven bird species (Fig. 2d). Chickens (*Gallus gallus*) and

336 common starlings (*Sturnus vulgaris*) were the most studied birds in our dataset. Apart from
337 chickens (eight studies) and Eurasian blue tits (*Cyanistes caeruleus*; five studies), effect sizes
338 were available from just one or two studies per species. Six of the seven species were
339 omnivores, and one (yellow bunting; *Emberiza sulphurata*) was a granivore [55].

340

341 **Does the presence of conspicuous patterns affect predator avoidance?**

342 The overall mean effect size was statistically significant, showing a 21.86% (this percentage
343 value is the back-transformed values of lnRR) increase in the probability of predator
344 avoidance, such as higher prey survival rates or eliciting fewer attacks from birds (estimate =
345 0.20, 95% CI = [0.08, 0.31], $t_{[df=268]} = 3.40$, $p = 0.0008$), in prey with conspicuous patterns
346 than in prey without such patterns (Fig. 3a). Total heterogeneity across effect sizes was high
347 ($I^2 = 96.50\%$); more specifically, observation ID (representing the within-study effect)
348 accounted for the most heterogeneity, 79.88%, with study ID (representing between-study
349 effect) accounting for the remaining 16.61%.

350

351 **Is there a difference in predator avoidance between eyespots and conspicuous patterns?**

352 There was no statistically significant difference between the effects of eyespots and non-
353 eyespot patterns ($F_{[df1=1, df2=268]} = 0.33$, $p = 0.57$, $R^2 = 0.27\%$; Fig. 3b). On average, eyespot
354 patterns resulted in 24.37% (estimate = 0.22, 95% CI = [0.08, 0.35], $t_{[df=268]} = 3.17$, $p =$
355 0.002) and non-eyespot patterns in 17.11% (estimate = 0.16, 95% CI = [-0.02, 0.34], $t_{[df=268]} =$
356 1.71, $p = 0.09$) increases in predator avoidance compared with control stimuli, although this
357 trend was not statistically significant for non-eyespots (Fig. 3b).

358

359 **What factors promote predator avoidance?**

360 Our uni-moderator meta-regression model with pattern area (individual shape area) showed
361 that larger patterns were associated with an increase in predator avoidance (estimate = 0.11,
362 95% CI = [0.03, 0.19], $t_{[df=268]} = 2.71$, $p = 0.007$, $R^2 = 8.56\%$; Fig. 4a). The total pattern area
363 also promoted predator avoidance (estimate = 0.09, 95% CI = [0.004, 0.17], $t_{[df=268]} = 2.07$, p
364 = 0.04, $R^2 = 5.18\%$; Fig. S1a). Similarly, the maximum diameter/length of the pattern
365 positively influenced predator avoidance (estimate = 0.19, 95% CI = [0.04, 0.35], $t_{[df=268]} =$
366 2.46, $p = 0.01$, $R^2 = 6.62\%$; Fig. S1b). In contrast, an increased number of pattern shapes
367 reduced the effect of predator avoidance (estimate = -0.06, 95% CI = [-0.11, -0.008], $t_{[df=268]} =$
368 -2.29, $p = 0.02$, $R^2 = 2.46\%$; Fig. 4b). We found no significant effects of total prey surface
369 area on predator avoidance (estimate = -0.03, 95% CI = [-0.15, 0.09], $t_{[df=268]} = -0.48$, $p =$

370 0.63, $R^2 = 0.42\%$; Fig. S1c). Predator avoidance was not statistically significantly affected by
371 differences in whether the presented prey looked like a real lepidopteran species ($F_{[df1 = 1, df2 =$
372 $268]} = 0.12, p = 0.72, R^2 = 0.13\%$). Both types of prey material (real/imitation and abstract
373 butterfly) had similar positive trends (Fig. 3c), with the former increasing predator avoidance
374 by 25.55% (estimate = 0.23, 95% CI = [0.03, 0.43], $t_{[df = 268]} = 2.24, p = 0.03$) and the latter
375 by 20.07% (estimate = 0.18, 95% CI = [0.04, 0.33], $t_{[df = 268]} = 2.44, p = 0.02$). Further, when
376 also considering prey type (Fig. S2), abstract and real butterflies significantly exhibited
377 increased predator avoidance by 37.98% (estimate = 0.32, 95% CI = [0.11, 0.53], $t_{[df = 268]} =$
378 $3.04, p = 0.003$) and by 25.40% (estimate = 0.23, 95% CI = [0.03, 0.42], $t_{[df = 268]} = 2.25, p =$
379 0.03), respectively, but artificial abstract caterpillars (estimate = 0.07, 95% CI = [-0.18, 0.31],
380 $t_{[df = 266]} = 0.53, p = 0.60$) and artificial abstract prey (estimate = 0.01, 95% CI = [-0.35, 0.37],
381 $t_{[df = 266]} = 0.06, p = 0.95$) did not, respectively. When comparing each prey type (e.g., abstract
382 butterfly vs. real butterfly), none of the differences was statistically significant (Fig. S2).

383 The multi-moderator (full) regression model showed that only pattern area positively
384 affected predator avoidance (estimate = 0.10, 95% CI = [0.009, 0.18], $t_{[df = 266]} = 2.16, p =$
385 0.03 ; Table S4). Contrary to the uni-moderator regression model, the number of patterns
386 showed no significant effects on predator avoidance, although the consistent trend remained
387 (estimate = -0.05, 95% CI = [-0.11, 0.004], $t_{[df = 266]} = -1.84, p = 0.07$; Table S4). The full
388 model accounted for 8.33% of the variation in the dataset. The complete output of the multi-
389 moderator model is displayed in Table S4.

390

391 **Publication bias**

392 The funnel plot showed no visual sign of funnel asymmetry (Fig. 5a). The meta-regression
393 analysis, which included the square root of the inverse of the effective sample size, further
394 supported this observation by showing that the effective sample size did not significantly
395 predict the effect size values (estimate = -0.09, 95% CI = [-0.83, 0.65], $t_{[df = 266]} = -0.24, p =$
396 0.81 ; Fig. 5b). There was no detectable trend suggesting that more recent publications
397 consistently showed lower or higher effect size values, which would have indicated the
398 presence of time-lag publication bias (estimate = -0.0008; 95% CI = [-0.01, 0.01], $t_{[df = 266]} =$
399 $-0.12, p = 0.90$; Fig. 5c). We obtained the same trends from multi-moderator meta-
400 regressions (Fig. S3).

401

402 **Discussion**

403 Eyespots and non-eyespot patterns did not differ significantly in the magnitude of deterring
404 effects (Fig. 3b). Avian predators showed similar avoidance responses to the conspicuous
405 patterns compared to control ones (Fig. 3a). Specifically, larger pattern sizes played a crucial
406 role in eliciting negative responses from birds (Fig. 4a). Further, negative responses from
407 birds showed the tendency to decline with increasing pattern number: single patterns were
408 likely more intimidating than a group of patterns (Fig. 4b). Taken together, our results
409 support the conspicuousness hypothesis rather than the eye mimicry hypothesis.

410

411 **Eye mimicry or conspicuousness hypothesis?**

412 Overall, our meta-analysis showed that conspicuous patterns could increase predator
413 avoidance by over 20%. Specifically, our results indicate that conspicuousness per se can be
414 advantageous in avoiding bird predation (Fig. 3ab, Fig. 4). The evidence favouring the
415 conspicuousness hypothesis comes mainly from a series of field experiments by Stevens and
416 his colleagues [30, 31, 34]. They showed that both eyespots and non-eyespots improved prey
417 survival compared to non-conspicuous patterns [30, 31, 34]. In addition, their research
418 showed prey with more conspicuous patterns (i.e., large-size patterns) tended to survive more
419 than others [30, 31, 34], and eye resemblance (e.g., number or pattern shapes) did not
420 significantly affect the prey's survival [30, 31, 34]. Given that these pattern stimuli used in
421 the experiments are rarely or never found in natural environments [34], the most
422 parsimonious explanation for these results is neophobia or dietary conservatism in birds [56–
423 58]. Both phenomena appear to diminish with habituation and/or learning. A few studies
424 investigated such factors for intimidating effects, and they showed that repeated encounters
425 made birds more habituated to eyespot patterns [16, 59, 60]. We need more systematic tests
426 of bird habituation to vividly- or aposematic-coloured patterns to better understand the
427 evolution and function of such patterns in Lepidoptera.

428 While our meta-analytic results favour the conspicuousness hypothesis, several
429 empirical studies support the eye mimicry hypothesis. For example, De Bona et al. [28] found
430 that a pair of eyespots of *Caligo martia* was as effective as true owl eyes and more efficient
431 in eliciting predator avoidance responses than less mimetic but equally contrasting circles.
432 Blut and Luau [61] created artificial eye-spotted prey with different similarities to the
433 vertebrate eyes and checked their survival rates in a field experiment. They revealed that the
434 prey with the most mimetic pattern had the highest survival rate [61]. Although studies on

435 Lepidoptera larvae are relatively limited, caterpillar eyespots are considered part of snake
436 mimicry [14]. Some research examined the benefit of eyespots by presenting artificial
437 caterpillars (marked with eyespots and control) made from dyed pastry to wild birds and
438 showed that eyespots improved survival [60, 62, 63]. Despite these convincing pieces of
439 empirical evidence, our meta-analytic results showed that eye resemblance did not improve
440 predator avoidance. If the eye mimic hypothesis was true, we would have seen a clear
441 difference between studies investigating eyespots and non-eyespots.

442 However, we observed little heterogeneity among studies, despite finding high
443 heterogeneity within individual studies. This finding implies that if each study followed
444 similar experimental procedures within studies, our main result on predator avoidance would
445 be more generalisable. The high within-study heterogeneity can be caused by varying
446 stimulus characteristics contributing to the effect size variations, even in the same studies.
447 Bird phylogenetic relatedness explained little heterogeneity in our predator dataset, but this
448 may have occurred because a limited number of subject bird species (i.e., chickens, common
449 starlings, Eurasian blue tits) dominated our dataset (Fig. 2d). While we cannot exclude the
450 possibility of species differences in birds' responses to the conspicuous patterns, our analysis
451 indicated that bird species identity did not explain the observed variation in predator
452 avoidance.

453 We also note that conspicuous patterns can also be important for conspecific
454 communication in butterflies, not just for avoiding predation [12, 64]. For example, eyespots
455 on *Bicyclus anynana* are known to function as sexual signals. Males choose females
456 depending on eyespot size and reflectance [65]. Regarding the non-eyespot patterns, males of
457 *Heliconius cydno* and *H. pachinus* can recognise conspecific females by the bright colour of
458 wing patches [66, 67]. Conspicuous patterns can also act as social signals in other taxa (e.g.,
459 birds: [68]), but this function remains unclear in butterflies. Therefore, the diversity of
460 patterns on wings could be shaped by intraspecific and interspecific communication. We
461 should simultaneously consider the influence of anti-predator and sexual/social signalling
462 functions on the evolution of butterfly conspicuous patterns [cf., 65, 69, 70].

463

464 **What factors explain the observed heterogeneity?**

465 The indicators of pattern size, including each pattern area (Fig. 4a), total pattern area (Fig.
466 S1a), and maximum diameter/length (Fig. S1b), were the most important moderators of effect
467 sizes, overall indicating that large patterns could promote predator avoidance. Notably, these
468 size metrics were correlated, so they are not independent of each other. Several studies

469 suggested that the pattern size difference is related to the difference in prey survival [21, 26,
470 30]. For example, eyespots larger than 6.0 mm may have a strong deterrent effect with
471 increasing size [26], but such patterns may increase the visibility of lepidopterans, and their
472 presence may increase predation rates as well [71]. Indeed, small conspicuous patterns tend
473 to attract predators' attention, as explained by the deflection hypothesis [12, 72]. The effect
474 may contribute to the observed negative overall effect sizes (Fig. 3, Fig. 4). Considering
475 studies on *B. anynana* with eyespots with a deflecting effect (maximum diameter is about 5.0
476 mm; Table S5), a size of at least 6.0 mm is required to avoid predator approach. However, it
477 is uncertain whether the effect would linearly increase with size or whether an optimal size
478 exists. Although eyespot sizes on actual Lepidoptera may be restricted by their body or wing
479 size ([e.g., 73], but see also [21]), it would be interesting to find a maximum threshold for
480 patterns that promote predator avoidance responses in birds.

481 Among other moderators tested (prey material type, total pattern area, and prey shape
482 type), the only moderator that seemed to explain heterogeneity was the number of patterns
483 (Fig. 4b; yet it is likely inconclusive; see Table S4). Previous studies predominantly
484 employed a single pattern or a pair of patterns, leading to limited variations. Nonetheless, our
485 findings indicate that a single eyespot is equally or more effective than a pair of eyespots.
486 Consequently, the resemblance to a pair of eyes, a crucial aspect of the eye mimicry
487 hypothesis, may be optional for effective predator avoidance. Indeed, we should note that the
488 presence of both eyes is unnecessary for birds to recognise their predators because birds may
489 often see only one eye of their predators. To disentangle the two hypotheses, we recommend
490 conducting the following experiments with two key features [30, 35, 74]: a set of stimuli that
491 (1) have the same size (area or diameter/maximum length of each pattern or total pattern
492 area) but with different numbers of patterns ranging from a few usually found in Lepidoptera
493 to numerous patterns unlike those seen in them, and (2) are presented with the same number
494 of patterns and the same size but different pattern shapes. Results from these experiments
495 could deepen our current knowledge, allowing us to inch toward a more definitive answer.

496

497 **Knowledge gaps and future opportunities**

498 Along with other conspicuous patterns, eyespots are believed to deter bird predation, and our
499 meta-analysis supports this function. However, five major gaps remain in the current
500 literature and our knowledge. First, birds and humans likely perceive eye-like shapes
501 differently based on the interspecific diversity of bird vision [75]. For example, most bird
502 species can detect ultraviolet light, which is invisible to humans, and the ultraviolet reflection

503 of the butterflies' eyespots may contribute to predator avoidance [e.g., 20, 22]. In addition,
504 researchers can quantify and objectively evaluate conspicuousness, such as size and number,
505 but the assessment of 'eye mimicry' remains subjective. Thus, it could be premature to
506 conclude that eyespots on Lepidoptera resemble vertebrate eyes universally.

507 Second, some lepidopterans present conspicuous patterns to potential predators in
508 combination with other elements, such as sounds and movements [13, 16, 17, 76, 77],
509 presumably to emphasise the conspicuousness of the patterns. Most of the current literature
510 does not take these effects into account in experiments, although some studies argue in favour
511 or against their importance [e.g., 16, 17]. We should also consider how factors other than
512 those constituting the pattern (e.g., colour, number, and size) are involved in the predator
513 avoidance function of eyespots. The location of the butterfly's eyespot patterns varies from
514 species to species as well; eyespots exist on the wings' ventral, dorsal, or both sides. Not only
515 the dorsal eyespot patterns, which were used in most studies, but also the ventral eyespot
516 patterns should be explored. In addition, we need to avoid presenting patterns unnaturally
517 when using real butterflies in experiments. For example, many owl butterflies (family Caligo)
518 have a pair of eyespot patterns on the ventral side. Their eyespots are usually visible to birds
519 when the wings are closed and would not present side by side as in the eyes of the owl's
520 frontal face.

521 Third, recent studies have shown that birds are sensitive to the gaze of other
522 individuals and may respond more aversively when their gazes are directed at them [e.g., 78-
523 80]. Skelhorn and Rowland [81] showed that the anti-predation effect may be further
524 enhanced if the inner circle of the eyespot is in a more gazing-like position for subject birds.
525 However, further research is needed to investigate the importance of the position of the inner
526 circle.

527 Fourth, as mentioned above, studies focusing on caterpillar eyespots are much more
528 scarce compared to butterflies; Hossie and Sherratt [82] have shown similarities between
529 caterpillars and snakes, but the response of birds to actual caterpillars has not been
530 experimentally tested. Conversely, in butterflies, similarities between the eyespot patterns on
531 wings and the eyes of birds of prey have not been investigated.

532 Finally, birds are generally considered as potential predators of butterflies and
533 caterpillars. Although other taxa species, such as invertebrates [83–85], lizards [27, 86, 87],
534 and rats [88–91], are also known to prey on lepidopterans, there are much fewer studies using
535 non-avian species as predators. The effectiveness of eye mimicry versus being conspicuous
536 may vary depending on the predator, and either one may be more effective depending on

537 specific predator species. Therefore, we should expand the range of taxa used for experiments
538 to get a better and more generalisable understanding of the eyespots' function and evolution
539 in butterflies and caterpillars. Additionally, much of the research has been conducted in
540 Europe and North America. Of the studies we included, only two were from other regions
541 (India [115] and Singapore [26]). The empirical results may differ in areas with many species
542 of lepidopterans with eyespot patterns [e.g. 41].

543 Knowing the effects of conspicuous patterns may contribute to creating a world where
544 birds and humans can live more harmoniously. Both eyespots and conspicuous patterns have
545 already been used to control birds, particularly in agriculture, although their effectiveness has
546 been questioned [e.g., 92, 93]. Such uncertainty may reflect our limited understanding of why
547 birds avoid eyespots and conspicuous patterns. Nevertheless, visual stimuli are less likely to
548 harm birds or affect the natural environment than others (e.g., nest/egg destructions or toxic
549 chemicals; reviewed in [94]). Therefore, when proven effective, they could be used for better
550 pest control, population management and conservation [95].

551

552 **Conclusion**

553 We have shed light on a traditional but controversial research topic that has fascinated
554 behavioural ecologists for decades. Our findings provide a better understanding of the
555 evolution of signal designs, but also show that more work is needed to understand the
556 function of the eyespot patterns in Lepidoptera, such as whether eyespot patterns evolved due
557 to mimicry or conspicuousness.

558

559 **Acknowledgements**

560 The authors thank Martin Stevens and Ben Brilot for sharing data.

561

562 **References**

- 563 1. Endler JA. 1992. Signals, Signal Conditions, and the Direction of Evolution. *Am Nat* 139,
564 S125–S153. (doi:10.1086/285308)
- 565 2. Andersson MB. 1994 Sexual selection. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 566 3. Jones AG, Ratterman NL. 2009 Mate choice and sexual selection: what have we learned
567 since Darwin? *PNAS* 106 (supplement_1), 10001–10008. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0901129106)
- 568 4. Endler JA, Butlin RK, Guilford T, Krebs JR. 1993 Some general comments on the evolution
569 and design of animal communication systems. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 340,
570 215–225. (doi:10.1098/rstb.1993.0060.)

- 571 5. Johnstone RA. 1997 Multiple displays in animal communication: ‘backup signals’ and
572 ‘multiple messages’. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 351, 329–338.
573 (doi:10.1098/rstb.1996.0026)
- 574 6. Martin Schaefer H, Schaefer V, Levey DJ. 2004 How plant–animal interactions signal new
575 insights in communication. *Trends Ecol Evol* 19, 577–584. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2004.08.003)
- 576 7. Johansson BG, Jones TM. 2007 The role of chemical communication in mate choice. *Biol*
577 *Rev* 82, 265–289. (doi:10.1111/j.1469-185X.2007.00009.x)
- 578 8. Hill PS. 2009 How do animals use substrate-borne vibrations as an information source?
579 *Naturwissenschaften* 96, 1355–1371. (doi: 10.1007/s00114-009-0588-8)
- 580 9. Rose EM, Prior NH, Ball GF. 2022 The singing question: re-conceptualizing birdsong. *Biol*
581 *Rev* 97, 326–342. (doi:10.1111/brv.12800)
- 582 10. Endler JA, Westcott DA, Madden JR, Robson T. 2005 Animal visual systems and the
583 evolution of color patterns: sensory processing illuminates signal evolution. *Evolution* 59,
584 1795–1818. (doi:10.1554/04-669.1)
- 585 11. Kelber A, Vorobyev M, Osorio D. 2003 Animal colour vision-behavioural tests and
586 physiological concepts. *Biol Rev* 78, 81–118. (doi:10.1017/s1464793102005985)
- 587 12. Stevens M. 2005 The role of eyespots as anti-predator mechanisms, principally
588 demonstrated in the Lepidoptera. *Biol Rev* 80, 573–588. (doi:10.1017/S1464793105006810)
- 589 13. Drinkwater E, Allen WL, Endler JA, Hanlon RT, Holmes G, Homziak NT, Kang C, Leavell
590 BC, Lehtonen J, Loeffler-Henry K, Ratcliffe JM, Rowe C, Ruxton GD, Sherratt TN,
591 Skelhorn J, Skojec C, Smart HR, White TE, Yack JE, Young CM, Umbers KDL. 2022 A
592 synthesis of deimatic behaviour. *Biol Rev* 97, 2237–2267. (doi:10.1111/brv.12891)
- 593 14. Stevens M, Ruxton GD. 2014 Do animal eyespots really mimic eyes? *Curr Zool* 60, 26–36.
594 (doi:10.1093/czoolo/60.1.26)
- 595 15. Kodandaramaiah U. 2011 The evolutionary significance of butterfly eyespots. *Behav Ecol*
596 22, 1264–1271. (doi:10.1093/beheco/arr123)
- 597 16. Blest AD. 1957 The Function of Eyespot Patterns in the Lepidoptera. *Behaviour* 11, 209–
598 256. (doi:10.1163/156853956X00048)
- 599 17. Vallin A, Jakobsson S, Lind J, Wiklund C. 2005 Prey survival by predator intimidation: an
600 experimental study of peacock butterfly defence against blue tits. *Proc R Soc B* 272, 1203–
601 1207. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2004.3034)
- 602 18. Kjærnsmo K, Merilaita S. 2017 Resemblance to the enemy’s eyes underlies the intimidating
603 effect of eyespots. *Am Nat* 190, 594–600. (doi:10.1086/693473)
- 604 19. Hill RI, Vaca JF. 2004 Differential wing strength in *Pierella* butterflies (nymphalidae,

- 605 Satyrinae) supports the deflection hypothesis. *Biotropica* 36, 362–370. (doi:10.1646/03191)
- 606 20. Olofsson M, Vallin A, Jakobsson S, Wiklund C. 2010 Marginal eyespots on butterfly wings
607 deflect bird attacks under low light intensities with UV wavelengths. *PLoS One* 5, e10798.
608 (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0010798)
- 609 21. Kodandaramaiah U, Lindenfors P, Tullberg BS. 2013 Deflective and intimidating eyespots:
610 a comparative study of eyespot size and position in Junonia butterflies. *Ecol Evol* 3, 4518–
611 4524. (doi:10.1002/ece3.831)
- 612 22. Olofsson M, Jakobsson S, Wiklund C. 2013 Bird attacks on a butterfly with marginal
613 eyespots and the role of prey concealment against the background. *Biol J Linn Soc Lond*
614 109, 290–297. (doi:10.1111/bij.12063)
- 615 23. Merilaita S, Scott-Samuel NE, Cuthill IC. 2017 How camouflage works. *Philos Trans R Soc*
616 *Lond B Biol Sci* 372, 2016034. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2016.0341)
- 617 24. Pinheiro CEG, Antezana MA, Machado LP. 2014 Evidence for the Deflective Function of
618 Eyespots in Wild Junonia evarete Cramer (Lepidoptera, Nymphalidae). *Neotrop Entomol* 43,
619 39–47. (doi:10.1007/s13744-013-0176-7)
- 620 25. Lyytinen A, Brakefield PM, Lindström L, Mappes J. 2004 Does predation maintain eyespot
621 plasticity in *Bicyclus anynana*? *Proc R Soc B* 271, 279–283. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2003.2571)
- 622 26. Ho S, Schachat SR, Piel WH, Monteiro A. 2016 Attack risk for butterflies changes with
623 eyespot number and size. *R Soc Open Sci.* 3, 150614. (doi:10.1098/rsos.150614)
- 624 27. Lyytinen A, Brakefield PM, Mappes J. 2003 Significance of butterfly eyespots as an anti-
625 predator device in ground-based and aerial attacks. *Oikos* 100, 373–379.
626 (doi:10.1034/j.1600-0706.2003.11935.x)
- 627 28. De Bona S, Valkonen JK, López-Sepulcre A, Mappes J. 2015 Predator mimicry, not
628 conspicuousness, explains the efficacy of butterfly eyespots. *Proc R Soc B* 282, 20150202.
629 (doi: 10.1098/rspb.2015.0202)
- 630 29. Merilaita S, Vallin A, Kodandaramaiah U, Dimitrova M, Ruuskanen S, Laaksonen T. 2011
631 Number of eyespots and their intimidating effect on naïve predators in the peacock butterfly.
632 *Behav Ecol* 22, 1326–1331. (doi:10.1093/beheco/arr135)
- 633 30. Stevens M, Hardman CJ, Stubbins CL. 2008 Conspicuousness, not eye mimicry, makes
634 “eyespots” effective antipredator signals. *Behav Ecol* 19, 525–531.
635 (doi:10.1093/beheco/arm162)
- 636 31. Stevens M, Cantor A, Graham J, Winney IS. 2009 The function of animal “eyespots”:
637 Conspicuousness but not eye mimicry is key. *Curr Zool* 55, 319–326. (doi:
638 10.1093/czoolo/55.5.319)

- 639 32. Dell’aglio DD, Stevens M, Jiggins CD. 2016 Avoidance of an aposematically coloured
640 butterfly by wild birds in a tropical forest. *Ecol Entomol* 41, 627–632.
641 (doi:10.1111/een.12335)
- 642 33. Ximenes NG, Gawryszewski FM. 2020 Conspicuous colours in a polymorphic orb-web
643 spider: evidence of predator avoidance but not prey attraction. *Anim Behav* 169, 35–43.
644 (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2020.08.022)
- 645 34. Stevens M, Hopkins E, Hinde W, Adcock A, Connolly Y, Troscianko T, Cuthill IC. 2007
646 Field experiments on the effectiveness of “eyespot” as predator deterrents. *Anim Behav* 74,
647 1215–1227. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2007.01.031)
- 648 35. Stevens M. 2007 Predator perception and the interrelation between different forms of
649 protective coloration. *Proc R Soc B* 274, 1457–1464. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2007.0220)
- 650 36. Mizuno, A., Lagisz, M., Pollo, P., Yang, Y., Soma, M., & Nakagawa, S. 2023 Meta-analysis
651 of fear responses to eyespots on butterfly wings in birds: a protocol for a systematic review
652 with meta-analysis. Meta-analysis of fear responses to eyespots on butterfly wings in birds:
653 a protocol for a systematic review with meta-analysis. Open Science Framework.
654 (doi:10.17605/OSF.IO/YMWVB)
- 655 37. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMA Group. 2009 Preferred reporting
656 items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med* 6,
657 e1000097. (doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097)
- 658 38. O’Dea RE, Lagisz M, Jennions MD, Koricheva J, Noble DWA, Parker TH, Gurevitch J,
659 Page MJ, Stewart G, Moher D, Nakagawa S. 2021 Preferred reporting items for systematic
660 reviews and meta-analyses in ecology and evolutionary biology: a PRISMA extension. *Biol*
661 *Rev* 96, 1695–1722. (doi:10.1111/brv.12721)
- 662 39. Foo YZ, O’Dea RE, Koricheva J, Nakagawa S, Lagisz M. 2021 A practical guide to question
663 formation, systematic searching and study screening for literature reviews in ecology and
664 evolution. *Methods Ecol Evol* 12, 1705–20. (doi:0.1111/2041-210X.13654)
- 665 40. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A 2016 Rayyan-a web and mobile
666 app for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* 5, 210. (doi:10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4)
- 667 41. Janzen DH, Hallwachs W, Burns JM. 2010 A tropical horde of counterfeit predator eyes.
668 *PNAS* 107, 11659–11665. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0912122107)
- 669 42. Abramoff, Magalhães PJ, Ram SJ. 2004 Image processing with ImageJ. *Biophotonics Int* 11,
670 36–42.
- 671 43. Hedges LV, Gurevitch J, Curtis PS. 1999 The meta-analysis of response ratios in
672 experimental ecology. *Ecology* 80, 1150–1156. (doi:10.1890/0012-

- 673 9658(1999)080[1150:TMAORR]2.0.CO;2)
- 674 44. Lajeunesse MJ. 2011 On the meta-analysis of response ratios for studies with correlated and
675 multi-group designs. *Ecology* 92, 2049–2055. (doi:10.1890/11-0423.1)
- 676 45. Senior AM, Viechtbauer W, Nakagawa S. 2020 Revisiting and expanding the meta-analysis
677 of variation: The log coefficient of variation ratio. *Res Synth Methods* 11, 553–567.
678 (doi:10.1002/jrsm.1423)
- 679 46. Noble DWA, Lagisz M, O’dea RE, Nakagawa S. 2017 Nonindependence and sensitivity
680 analyses in ecological and evolutionary meta-analyses. *Mol Ecol* 26, 2410–2425.
681 (doi:10.1111/mec.14031)
- 682 47. Macartney EL, Lagisz M, Nakagawa S. 2022 The relative benefits of environmental
683 enrichment on learning and memory are greater when stressed: A meta-analysis of
684 interactions in rodents. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev* 135, 104554.
685 (doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2022.104554)
- 686 48. Viechtbauer W. 2010 Conducting Meta-Analyses in R with the metafor Package. *J Stat*
687 *Softw* 36, 1–48. (doi:10.18637/jss.v036.i03)
- 688 49. R Core Team. 2023 R: a language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna,
689 Austria.
- 690 50. Nakagawa S, Yang Y, Macartney EL, Spake R, Lagisz M. 2023 Quantitative evidence
691 synthesis: a practical guide on meta-analysis, meta-regression, and publication bias tests for
692 environmental sciences. *Environ Evid* 12, 1–19. (doi:10.1186/s13750-023-00301-6).
- 693 51. Nakagawa S, Santos ESA. 2012 Methodological issues and advances in biological meta-
694 analysis. *Evol Ecol* 26, 1253–1274 (doi:10.1007/s10682-012-9555-5)
- 695 52. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. 2003 Measuring inconsistency in meta-
696 analyses. *BMJ* 32, 557–560. (doi:10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557)
- 697 53. Nakagawa S, Lagisz M, O’Dea RE, Pottier P, Rutkowska J, Senior AM, Yang Y, Noble
698 DWA. 2023 orchaRd 2.0: An R package for visualising meta-analyses with orchard plots.
699 *Methods Ecol Evol* 14, 2003–2010. (doi:10.1111/2041-210x.14152)
- 700 54. Nakagawa S, Lagisz M, Jennions MD, Koricheva J, Noble DWA, Parker TH, Sánchez-Tójar
701 A, Yang Y, O’Dea RE. 2022 Methods for testing publication bias in ecological and
702 evolutionary meta-analyses. *Methods Ecol Evol* 13, 4–21. (doi:10.1111/2041-210X.13724)
- 703 55. Tobias JA, Sheard C, Pigot AL, Devenish AJ, Yang J, Sayol F, Neate-Clegg MH,
704 Alioravainen N, Weeks TL, Barber RA, Walkden PA. 2022. AVONET: morphological,
705 ecological and geographical data for all birds. *Ecol Lett* 25, 581–597.
706 (doi:10.1111/ele.13898)


- 707 56. Marples NM, Roper TJ, David GCH. 1998 Responses of wild birds to novel prey: evidence
708 of dietary conservatism. *Oikos* 83, 161–165. (doi: 10.2307/3546557)
- 709 57. Marples NM, Kelly DJ. 1999 Neophobia and dietary conservatism: two distinct processes?
710 *Evol Ecol* 13, 641–653. (doi:10.1023/A:1011077731153)
- 711 58. Ord TJ, Blazek K, White TE, Das I. 2021 Conspicuous animal signals avoid the cost of
712 predation by being intermittent or novel: confirmation in the wild using hundreds of robotic
713 prey. *Proc R Soc B* 288, 20210706. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2021.0706)
- 714 59. Inglis IR, Huson LW, Marshall MB, Neville PA. 1983 The feeding behaviour of starlings
715 (*sturnus vulgaris*) in the presence of “eyes.” *Z Tierpsychol* 62, 181–208.
716 (doi:10.1111/j.1439-0310.1983.tb02151.x)
- 717 60. Skelhorn J, Dorrington G, Hossie TJ, Sherratt TN. 2014 The position of eyespots and
718 thickened segments influence their protective value to caterpillars. *Behav Ecol* 25, 1417–
719 1422. (doi:10.1093/beheco/aru154)
- 720 61. Blut C, Lunau K. 2015 Effects of lepidopteran eyespot components on the deterrence of
721 predatory birds. *Behaviour* 152, 1481–1505. (doi:10.1093/jisesa/iez123)
- 722 62. Hossie TJ, Sherratt TN. 2012 Eyespots interact with body colour to protect caterpillar-like
723 prey from avian predators. *Anim Behav* 84, 167–173. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.04.027)
- 724 63. Hossie TJ, Sherratt TN. 2013 Defensive posture and eyespots deter avian predators from
725 attacking caterpillar models. *Anim Behav* 86, 383–389. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.05.029)
- 726 64. Crees LD, DeVries P, Penz C. 2021 do hind wing eyespots of caligo butterflies function in
727 both mating behavior and antipredator defense? (Lepidoptera, Nymphalidae). *Ann Entomol*
728 *Soc Am* 114, 329–337. (doi:10.1093/aesa/saaa050)
- 729 65. Robertson KA, Monteiro A. 2005 Female *Bicyclus anynana* butterflies choose males on the
730 basis of their dorsal UV-reflective eyespot pupils. *Proc R Soc B* 272, 1541–1546.
731 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2005.3142)
- 732 66. Kronforst MR, Young LG, Kapan DD, McNeely C, O’Neill RJ, Gilbert LE. 2006 Linkage
733 of butterfly mate preference and wing color preference cue at the genomic location of
734 wingless. *PNAS* 103, 6575–6580. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0509685103)
- 735 67. Finkbeiner SD, Briscoe AD, Reed RD. 2014 Warning signals are seductive: relative
736 contributions of color and pattern to predator avoidance and mate attraction in *Heliconius*
737 butterflies. *Evolution* 68, 3410–3420. (doi:10.1111/evo.12524)
- 738 68. Mason NA, Bowie RCK. 2020 Plumage patterns: ecological functions, evolutionary origins,
739 and advances in quantification. *Auk* 137, ukaa060. (doi:10.1093/auk/ukaa060)

- 740 69. Ng SY, Bhardwaj S, Monteiro A. 2017 Males become choosier in response to manipulations
741 of female wing ornaments in dry season *Bicyclus anynana* butterflies. *J Insect Sci* 17, 81.
742 (doi:10.1093/jisesa/iex053)
- 743 70. Huq M, Bhardwaj S, Monteiro A. 2019 Male *Bicyclus anynana* butterflies choose females
744 on the basis of their ventral uv-reflective eyespot centers. *J Insect Sci* 19, 25.
745 (doi:10.1093/jisesa/iez014)
- 746 71. Lindström L, Alatalo RV, Lyytinen A, Mappes J. 2001 Predator experience on cryptic prey
747 affects the survival of conspicuous aposematic prey. *Proc R Soc B* 268, 357–361. (doi:
748 10.1098/rspb.2000.1377)
- 749 72. Humphreys RK, Ruxton GD. 2018 What is known and what is not yet known about
750 deflection of the point of a predator's attack. *Biol J Linn Soc Lond* 123, 483–495.
751 (doi:10.1093/biolinnean/blx164)
- 752 73. Hossie TJ, Skelhorn J, Breinholt JW, Kawahara AY, Sherratt TN. 2015 Body size affects the
753 evolution of eyespots in caterpillars. *PNAS* 112, 6664–6669.
754 (doi:10.1073/pnas.1415121112)
- 755 74. Stevens M, Castor-Perry SA, Price JRF. 2009 The protective value of conspicuous signals is
756 not impaired by shape, size, or position asymmetry. *Behav Ecol* 20, 96–102.
757 (doi:10.1093/beheco/arn119)
- 758 75. Martin GR. 2017 The sensory ecology of birds. Clarendon, Oxford University press.
- 759 76. Blest AD. 1957 The evolution of protective displays in the Saturnioidea and Sphingidae
760 (Lepidoptera). *Behaviour* 11, 257–309. (doi:10.1163/156853957X00146)
- 761 77. Bura VL, Kawahara AY, Yack JE. 2016 A comparative analysis of sonic defences in
762 bombycoidea caterpillars. *Sci Rep* 6, 31469. (doi:10.1038/srep31469)
- 763 78. Carter J, Lyons NJ, Cole HL, Goldsmith AR. Subtle cues of predation risk: starlings respond
764 to a predator's direction of eye-gaze. 2008 *Proc R Soc B* 275, 1709–1715.
765 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2008.0095)
- 766 79. Clucas B, Marzluff JM, Mackovjak D, Palmquist I. 2013 Do American crows pay attention
767 to human gaze and facial expressions?. *Ethology* 119, 296–302. (doi:10.1111/eth.12064)
- 768 80. Davidson GL, Clayton NS, Thornton A. 2015 Wild jackdaws, *Corvus monedula*, recognize
769 individual humans and may respond to gaze direction with defensive behaviour. *Animal*
770 *Behaviour* 108, 17–24. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2015.07.010)
- 771 81. Skelhorn J, Rowland HM. 2022 Eyespot configuration and predator approach direction
772 affect the antipredator efficacy of eyespots. *Front Ecol Evol* 10, 951967.
773 (doi:10.3389/fevo.2022.951967)


- 774 82. Hossie TJ, Sherratt TN. 2014 Does defensive posture increase mimetic fidelity of
775 caterpillars with eyespots to their putative snake models? *Curr Zool* 60, 76–89.
776 (doi:10.1093/czoolo/60.1.76)
- 777 83. Sang A, Teder T. 2011 Dragonflies cause spatial and temporal heterogeneity in habitat
778 quality for butterflies. *Insect Conserv Divers* 4, 257–264. (doi:10.1111/j.1752-
779 4598.2011.00134.x)
- 780 84. Prudic KL, Stoehr AM, Wasik BR, Monteiro A. 2015 Eyespots deflect predator attack
781 increasing fitness and promoting the evolution of phenotypic plasticity. *Proc R Soc B* 282,
782 20141531. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.1531)
- 783 85. Chan IZW, Ngan ZC, Naing L, Lee Y, Gowri V, Monteiro A. 2021 Predation favours
784 *Bicyclus anynana* butterflies with fewer forewing eyespots. *Proc R Soc B* 288, 20202840.
785 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2020.2840)
- 786 86. Vlieger L, Brakefield PM. 2007 The deflection hypothesis: eyespots on the margins of
787 butterfly wings do not influence predation by lizards. *Biol J Linn Soc Lond* 92, 661–667.
788 (doi:10.1111/j.1095-8312.2007.00863.x)
- 789 87. Halali D, Krishna A, Kodandaramaiah U, Molleman F. 2019 Lizards as predators of
790 butterflies: shape of wing damage and effects of eyespots. *J Lepid Soc* 73, 78–86.
791 (doi:10.18473/lepi.73i2.a2)
- 792 88. Wiklund C, Vallin A, Friberg M, Jakobsson S. 2008 Rodent predation on hibernating
793 peacock and small tortoiseshell butterflies. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 62, 379–389.
794 (doi:10.1007/s00265-007-0465-4)
- 795 89. Olofsson M, Vallin A, Jakobsson S, Wiklund C. 2011 Winter predation on two species of
796 hibernating butterflies: Monitoring rodent attacks with infrared cameras. *Anim Behav* 81,
797 529–534. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2010.12.012)
- 798 90. Olofsson M, Jakobsson S, Wiklund C. 2012 Auditory defence in the peacock butterfly
799 (*Inachis io*) against mice (*Apodemus flavicollis* and *A. sylvaticus*). *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 66,
800 209–215. (doi:10.1007/s00265-011-1268-1)
- 801 91. Postema EG. 2022 The effectiveness of eyespots and masquerade in protecting artificial
802 prey across ontogenetic and seasonal shifts. *Curr Zool* 68, 451–458.
803 (doi:10.1093/cz/zoab082)
- 804 92. Avery ML, Daneke DE, Decker DG, Lefebvre PW, Matteson RE, Nelms CO. 1988 Flight
805 pen evaluations of eyespot balloons to protect citrus from bird depredations. *Proc Vertebr*
806 *Pest Conf* 13.
- 807 93. Nakamura K. 1995 Scaring effectiveness of eyespot balloons on the rufous turtle dove,

- 808 *Streptopelia orientalis* (Latham), In a flight cage. *Appl Entomol Zool* 30, 383–392. (doi:
809 10.1303/aez.30.383)
- 810 94. Linz GM, Bucher EH, Canavelli SB, Rodriguez E, Avery ML. 2015 Limitations of
811 population suppression for protecting crops from bird depredation: A review. *Crop Prot* 76,
812 46–52. (doi:10.1016/j.cropro.2015.06.005)
- 813 95. McLennan JA, Langham NPE, Porter RER. 1995 Deterrent effect of eye-spot balls on birds.
814 *N Z J Crop Hortic Sci* 23, 139–144. (doi:10.1080/01140671.1995.9513880)
- 815 96. Davies NB, Welbergen JA. 2008 Cuckoo–hawk mimicry? An experimental test. *Proc R Soc*
816 *B* 275, 1817–22. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2008.0331)
- 817 97. Ma L, Yang C, Liang W. 2018 Hawk mimicry does not reduce attacks of cuckoos by highly
818 aggressive hosts. *Avian Res* 9, 1–7. (doi:10.1186/s40657-018-0127-4)
- 819 98. Rota J, Wagner DL. 2006 Predator mimicry: metalmark moths mimic their jumping spider
820 predators. *PLoS One* 20, e45. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0000045)
- 821 99. Saporito RA, Zuercher R, Roberts M, Gerow KG, Donnelly MA. 2007 Experimental
822 evidence for aposematism in the dendrobatid poison frog *Oophaga pumilio*. *Copeia* 2007,
823 1006–1011. (doi:10.1643/0045-8511(2007)7[1006:EEFAIT]2.0.CO;2)
- 824 100. María Arenas L, Walter D, Stevens M. 2015 Signal honesty and predation risk among a
825 closely related group of aposematic species. *Sci rep* 5, 11021. (doi:10.1038/srep11021)
- 826 101. de Framond L, Brumm H, Thompson WI, Drabing SM, Francis CD. 2022 The broken-
827 wing display across birds and the conditions for its evolution. *Proc R Soc B* 289,
828 20220058. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2022.0058)
- 829 102. Bateman PW, Fleming PA. 2009 To cut a long tail short: a review of lizard caudal
830 autotomy studies carried out over the last 20 years. *J zool* 277, 1–4. (doi:10.1111/j.1469-
831 7998.2008.00484.x)
- 832 103. Jones RB. 1980. Reactions of male domestic chicks to two-dimensional eye-like shapes.
833 *Anim Behav* 28, 212–218. (doi:10.1016/S0003-3472(80)80025-X)
- 834 104. Wourms MK, Wasserman FE. 1985 Butterfly wing markings are more advantageous during
835 handling than during the initial strike of an avian predator. *Evolution* 39, 845–851.
836 (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.1985.tb00426.x)
- 837 105. Forsman A, Herrström J. 2004 Asymmetry in size, shape, and color impairs the protective
838 value of conspicuous color patterns. *Behav Ecol* 15, 141–147. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-
839 5646.1985.tb00426.x)
- 840 106. Stevens M, Stubbins CL, Hardman CJ. 2008 The anti-predator function of ‘eyespot’ on
841 camouflaged and conspicuous prey. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 62, 1787–1793.


- 842 (doi:10.1007/s00265-008-0607-3)
- 843 107. Kodandaramaiah U, Vallin A, Wiklund C. Fixed eyespot display in a butterfly thwarts
844 attacking birds. *Anim Behav* 77, 1415–1419. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2009.02.018)
- 845 108. Brilot BO, Normandale CL, Parkin A, Bateson M. 2009 Can we use starlings’ aversion to
846 eyespots as the basis for a novel ‘cognitive bias’ task?. *Appl Anim Behav Sci* 118, 182–190.
847 (doi:10.1016/j.applanim.2009.02.015)
- 848 109. Vallin A, Jakobsson S, Wiklund C. 2010 Constant eyespot display as a primary defense–
849 survival of male and female emperor moths when attacked by blue tits. *J Res Lep* 43, 9–17.
850 (doi:10.5962/p.266504)
- 851 110. Vallin A, Dimitrova M, Kodandaramaiah U, Merilaita S. 2011 Deflective effect and the
852 effect of prey detectability on anti-predator function of eyespots. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 65,
853 1629–1636. (doi:10.1007/s00265-011-1173-7)
- 854 111. Blut C, Wilbrandt J, Fels D, Girgel EI, Lunau K. 2012 The ‘sparkle’ in fake eyes–the
855 protective effect of mimic eyespots in Lepidoptera. *Entomol exp appl* 143, 231–44.
856 (doi:10.1111/j.1570-7458.2012.01260.x)
- 857 112. De Wert L. 2012 Anti-predator adaptations and strategies in the Lepidoptera (Doctoral
858 dissertation, University of Glasgow; <http://theses.gla.ac.uk/id/eprint/3541>)
- 859 113. Stevens M, Marshall KL, Troscianko J, Finlay S, Burnand D, Chadwick SL. 2013
860 Revealed by conspicuousness: distractive markings reduce camouflage. *Behav Ecol* 24,
861 213–22. (doi:10.1093/beheco/ars156)
- 862 114. Olofsson M, Løvlie H, Tibblin J, Jakobsson S, Wiklund C. 2013 Eyespot display in the
863 peacock butterfly triggers antipredator behaviors in naïve adult fowl. *Behav Ecol* 24, 305–
864 310. (doi:10.1093/beheco/ars167)
- 865 115. Mukherjee R, Kodandaramaiah U. 2015 What makes eyespots intimidating–the importance
866 of pairedness. *BMC Evol Biol* 15, 1–10. (doi:10.1186/s12862-015-0307-3)
- 867 116. Olofsson M, Wiklund C, Favati A. 2015 On the deterring effect of a butterfly’s eyespot in
868 juvenile and sub-adult chickens, *Curr Zool* 61, 749–757. (doi:10.1093/czoolo/61.4.749)
- 869 117. Skelhorn J, Holmes GG, Hossie TJ, Sherratt TN. 2016 Multicomponent deceptive signals
870 reduce the speed at which predators learn that prey are profitable. *Behav Ecol* 27, 141–147.
871 (doi:10.1093/beheco/arv135)
- 872




874 **Figure 1.** A visual summary of three hypotheses that explain the predation avoidance
 875 function of eyespots. The resemblance of eye spots to actual eyes is discussed through the
 876 predator mimicry hypothesis and the conspicuous signal hypothesis. The table shows the
 877 predictions derived from these two hypotheses.




878 **Figure 2.** Overview of the dataset. (a) shows a PRISMA-like flowchart of the systematic
879 literature search for the meta-analysis. (b) and (c) give details of the main moderators
880 examined in the meta-analysis. (d) provides the phylogenetic tree of bird species included in
881 the meta-analysis, together with the sample sizes and number of effect sizes per species.



882 **Figure 3.** Mean effect sizes of (a) overall for all highly salient patterns, (b) effects split by
 883 experiments with eyespots versus conspicuous patterns, and (c) two prey types used in the
 884 experiments. Thick horizontal lines represent 95% confidence intervals, and thin horizontal
 885 lines represent 95% prediction intervals. The points in the centre of each thick line indicate
 886 the average effect size. *k* is the number of effect sizes used to estimate the statistics, followed
 887 by the number of studies in the brackets.



888 **Figure 4.** The relationships between (a) prey salient pattern area (log-transformed) and effect
 889 sizes and (b) number of prey salient patterns and effect sizes. Circle sizes are scaled
 890 according to precision, k represents the number of effect sizes. Each fitted regression line is
 891 shown as a coloured straight line, and 95% confidence and prediction intervals are shown as
 892 dashed and dotted coloured lines, respectively.




893 **Figure 5.** (a) Funnel plot using effect size and its inverse standard error. The relationship
 894 between effect sizes and (b) the square root of the inverse of effective sample size and (c)
 895 publication year. In (b) and (c), circle sizes are scaled accordingly to precision, and k
 896 represents the number of effect sizes. Each fitted regression line is shown as a straight line,
 897 and 95% confidence and prediction intervals are shown as dashed and dotted lines,
 898 respectively.

899 **Table 1.** Descriptions of the population, Intervention, comparator, and outcome (PICO) used
900 to define the scope of this study.


PICO	Description
Population	Birds as predators and butterflies, moths, caterpillars, and their models as prey
Intervention	Presenting eyespot or conspicuous pattern stimulus to birds
Comparator	Presenting stimulus that is neither eyespot nor conspicuous patterns
Outcome	Avian behavioural responses to eyespot or conspicuous pattern stimuli The probability of prey surviving or being attacked (for the stimuli)

901


902



904 **Figure S1.** The relationships between (a) total pattern area, (b) pattern maximum
 905 diameter/length, and (c) total prey surface area and effect sizes. k shows the number of effect
 906 sizes. Each fitted regression line is shown as a solid straight line, and 95% confidence and
 907 prediction intervals are shown as dashed and dotted lines, respectively.



908 **Figure S2.** Mean effect sizes of total prey shape types. Thick horizontal lines represent 95%
 909 confidence intervals, and thin horizontal lines represent prediction intervals. The points in the
 910 centre of each thick line indicate the average effect size. k shows the number of effect sizes.



911 **Figure S3.** (a) relationship between effect size and the square root of the inverse of effective
 912 sample size, and (b) relationship between effect size and publication year. Both plots were
 913 based on the multi-moderator model. k shows the number of effect sizes. Each fitted
 914 regression line is shown as a solid straight line, and 95% confidence intervals and prediction
 915 intervals are shown as dashed and dotted lines, respectively.

916 **Table S1.** PRISMA-EcoEvo Checklist.

Checklist item	Sub-item number	Sub-item	Reported by authors?	Notes
Title and abstract	1.1	Identify the review as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both	Yes	
	1.2	Summarise the aims and scope of the review	Yes	
	1.3	Describe the data set	Yes	
	1.4	State the results of the primary outcome	Yes	
	1.5	State conclusions	Yes	
	1.6	State limitations	Yes	
Aims and questions	2.1	Provide a rationale for the review	Yes	
	2.2	Reference any previous reviews or meta-analyses on the topic	Yes	
	2.3	State the aims and scope of the review (including its generality)	Yes	
	2.4	State the primary questions the review addresses (e.g. which moderators were tested)	Yes	
	2.5	Describe whether effect sizes were derived from experimental and/or observational comparisons	Yes	
Review registration	3.1	Register review aims, hypotheses (if applicable), and methods in a time-stamped and publicly accessible archive and provide a link to the registration in the methods section of the manuscript. Ideally registration occurs before the search, but it can be done at any stage before data analysis.	Yes	
	3.2	Describe deviations from the registered aims and methods	Yes	
	3.3	Justify deviations from the registered aims and methods	Yes	
Eligibility criteria	4.1	Report the specific criteria used for including or excluding studies when screening titles and/or abstracts, and full texts, according to the aims of the systematic review (e.g. study design, taxa, data availability)	Yes	

	4.2	Justify criteria, if necessary (i.e. not obvious from aims and scope)	Yes	
Finding studies	5.1	Define the type of search (e.g. comprehensive search, representative sample)	Yes	
	5.2	State what sources of information were sought (e.g. published and unpublished studies, personal communications)	Yes	
	5.3	Include, for each database searched, the exact search strings used, with keyword combinations and Boolean operators	Yes	
	5.4	Provide enough information to repeat the equivalent search (if possible), including the timespan covered (start and end dates)	Yes	
Study selection	6.1	Describe how studies were selected for inclusion at each stage of the screening process (e.g. use of decision trees, screening software)	Yes	
	6.2	Report the number of people involved and how they contributed (e.g. independent parallel screening)	Yes	
Data collection process	7.1	Describe where in the reports data were collected from (e.g. text or figures)	Yes	
	7.2	Describe how data were collected (e.g. software used to digitize figures, external data sources)	Yes	
	7.3	Describe moderator variables that were constructed from collected data (e.g. number of generations calculated from years and average generation time)	Yes	
	7.4	Report how missing or ambiguous information was dealt with during data collection (e.g. authors of original studies were contacted for missing descriptive statistics, and/or effect sizes were calculated from test statistics)	Yes	
	7.5	Report who collected data	Yes	
	7.6	State the number of extractions that were checked for accuracy by co-authors	No	

Data items	8.1	Describe the key data sought from each study	Yes	
	8.2	Describe items that do not appear in the main results, or which could not be extracted due to insufficient information	Yes	
	8.3	Describe main assumptions or simplifications that were made (e.g. categorising both 'length' and 'mass' as 'morphology')	NA: no assumptions or simplifications needed to be made	
	8.4	Describe the type of replication unit (e.g. individuals, broods, study sites)	Yes	
Assessment of individual study quality	9.1	Describe whether the quality of studies included in the systematic review or meta-analysis was assessed (e.g. blinded data collection, reporting quality, experimental <i>versus</i> observational)	No	
	9.2	Describe how information about study quality was incorporated into analyses (e.g. meta-regression and/or sensitivity analysis)	No	
Effect size measures	10.1	Describe effect size(s) used	Yes	
	10.2	Provide a reference to the equation of each calculated effect size (e.g. standardised mean difference, log response ratio) and (if applicable) its sampling variance	Yes	
	10.3	If no reference exists, derive the equations for each effect size and state the assumed sampling distribution(s)	Yes	
Missing data	11.1	Describe any steps taken to deal with missing data during analysis (e.g. imputation, complete case, subset analysis)	NA: there were no missing data	
	11.2	Justify the decisions made to deal with missing data	NA: there were no missing data	
Meta-analytic model description	12.1	Describe the models used for synthesis of effect sizes	Yes	
	12.2	The most common approach in ecology and evolution will be a random-effects model, often with a hierarchical/multilevel structure. If other types of models are chosen (e.g. common/fixed effects model, unweighted model), provide justification for this choice	NA: only (weighted) random-effects models were used	

Software	13.1	Describe the statistical platform used for inference (e.g. <i>R</i>)	Yes	
	13.2	Describe the packages used to run models	Yes	
	13.3	Describe the functions used to run models	Yes	
	13.4	Describe any arguments that differed from the default settings	Yes	
	13.5	Describe the version numbers of all software used	Yes	
Non-independence	14.1	Describe the types of non-independence encountered (e.g. phylogenetic, spatial, multiple measurements over time)	Yes	
	14.2	Describe how non-independence has been handled	Yes	
	14.3	Justify decisions made	Yes	
Meta-regression and model selection	15.1	Provide a rationale for the inclusion of moderators (covariates) that were evaluated in meta-regression models	Yes	
	15.2	Justify the number of parameters estimated in models, in relation to the number of effect sizes and studies (e.g. interaction terms were not included due to insufficient sample sizes)	Yes	
	15.3	Describe any process of model selection	Yes	
Publication bias and sensitivity analyses	16.1	Describe assessments of the risk of bias due to missing results (e.g. publication, time-lag, and taxonomic biases)	Yes	
	16.2	Describe any steps taken to investigate the effects of such biases (if present)	Yes	
	16.3	Describe any other analyses of robustness of the results, e.g. due to effect size choice, weighting or analytical model assumptions, inclusion or exclusion of subsets of the data, or the inclusion of alternative moderator variables in meta-regressions	Yes	
Clarification of <i>post hoc</i> analyses	17.1	When hypotheses were formulated after data analysis, this should be acknowledged.	NA: there are no hypotheses that were formed after data collection	
	18.1	Share metadata (i.e. data descriptions)	Yes	

Metadata, data, and code	18.2	Share data required to reproduce the results presented in the manuscript	Yes	
	18.3	Share additional data, including information that was not presented in the manuscript (e.g. raw data used to calculate effect sizes, descriptions of where data were located in papers)	Yes	
	18.4	Share analysis scripts (or, if a software package with graphical user interface (GUI) was used, then describe full model specification and fully specify choices)	Yes	
Results of study selection process	19.1	Report the number of studies screened	Yes	
	19.2	Report the number of studies excluded at each stage of screening	Yes	
	19.3	Report brief reasons for exclusion from the full text stage	Yes	
	19.4	Present a Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)-like flowchart (www.prisma-statement.org).	Yes	
Sample sizes and study characteristics	20.1	Report the number of studies and effect sizes for data included in meta-analyses	Yes	
	20.2	Report the number of studies and effect sizes for subsets of data included in meta-regressions	Yes	
	20.3	Provide a summary of key characteristics for reported outcomes (either in text or figures; e.g. one quarter of effect sizes reported for vertebrates and the rest invertebrates)	Yes	
	20.4	Provide a summary of limitations of included moderators (e.g. collinearity and overlap between moderators)	Yes	
	20.5	Provide a summary of characteristics related to individual study quality (risk of bias)	Yes	
Meta-analysis	21.1	Provide a quantitative synthesis of results across studies, including estimates for the mean effect size, with confidence/credible intervals	Yes	

Heterogeneity	22.1	Report indicators of heterogeneity in the estimated effect (e.g. <i>I</i> ² , <i>tau</i> ² and other variance components)	Yes	
Meta-regression	23.1	Provide estimates of meta-regression slopes (i.e. regression coefficients) and confidence/credible intervals	Yes	
	23.2	Include estimates and confidence/credible intervals for all moderator variables that were assessed (i.e. complete reporting)	Yes	
	23.3	Report interactions, if they were included	NA: no interactions were included	
	23.4	Describe outcomes from model selection, if done (e.g. R ² and AIC)	Yes	Please see the link provided in the Data Accessibility.
Outcomes of publication bias and sensitivity analyses	24.1	Provide results for the assessments of the risks of bias (e.g. Egger's regression, funnel plots)	Yes	
	24.2	Provide results for the robustness of the review's results (e.g. subgroup analyses, meta-regression of study quality, results from alternative methods of analysis, and temporal trends)	Yes	
Discussion	25.1	Summarise the main findings in terms of the magnitude of effect	Yes	
	25.2	Summarise the main findings in terms of the precision of effects (e.g. size of confidence intervals, statistical significance)	Yes	
	25.3	Summarise the main findings in terms of their heterogeneity	Yes	
	25.4	Summarise the main findings in terms of their biological/practical relevance	Yes	
	25.5	Compare results with previous reviews on the topic, if available	Yes	
	25.6	Consider limitations and their influence on the generality of conclusions, such as gaps in the available evidence (e.g. taxonomic and geographical research biases)	Yes	

Contributions and funding	26.1	Provide names, affiliations, and funding sources of all co-authors	Yes	
	26.2	List the contributions of each co-author	Yes	
	26.3	Provide contact details for the corresponding author	Yes	
	26.4	Disclose any conflicts of interest	NA: there were no conflicts of interest	
References	27.1	Provide a reference list of all studies included in the systematic review or meta-analysis	Yes	
	27.2	List included studies as referenced sources (e.g. rather than listing them in a table or supplement)	Yes	

917

918 **Table S2.** Search strings used for each database. We accessed Scopus, ISI Web of Science
919 core collection, Google Scholar (*Japanese, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Simplified*
920 *Chinese, and Traditional Chinese*) on 08/06/2023, and Bielefeld Academic Search Engine
921 (BASE) on 26/06/2023. BASE was used as a source of grey literature. We conducted
922 backward and forward reference searches for key review articles using Scopus on
923 19/06/2023. We modified search strings to collect studies to capture studies examining the
924 effects of eyespot patterns on birds using experimental methods. Search strings were adapted
925 to the structure of each database.

Database	Search strings
Scopus	TITLE-ABS-KEY (((eyespot* OR eye-spot* OR "eye spot*" OR eye-like* OR "eye like*" OR eye-mimic* OR "eye mimic*" OR "eye similari*" OR "predator* eye*" OR "eye similar*" OR concentric*) AND (attack* OR antipredator* OR anti-predator* OR aposematic* OR avoid* OR conspicuous* OR warn* OR fear* OR intimidat* OR predator-prey* OR butterfl* OR moth* OR bird* OR avian* OR caterpillar* OR prevent* OR aves OR passeri*)) AND NOT (fish* OR manti* OR lizard* OR bat* OR nano* OR health* OR patients OR women OR men OR children OR pediatric OR medic* OR hormon* OR genes OR magnet* OR valve* OR fluid* OR concrete OR beam* OR tissue* OR charge* OR energ* OR electro*))
ISI Web of Science	TS = (((eyespot* OR eye-spot* OR "eye spot*" OR eye-like* OR "eye like*" OR eye-mimic* OR "eye mimic*" OR "eye similari*" OR "predator* eye*" OR "eye similar*" OR concentric*) AND (attack* OR antipredator* OR anti-predator* OR aposematic* OR avoid* OR conspicuous* OR warn* OR fear* OR intimidat* OR predator-prey* OR butterfl* OR moth* OR bird* OR avian* OR caterpillar* OR prevent* OR aves OR passeri*)) NOT (fish* OR manti* OR lizard* OR bat* OR nano* OR health* OR patients OR women OR men OR children OR pediatric OR medic* OR hormon* OR genes OR magnet* OR valve* OR fluid* OR concrete OR beam* OR tissue* OR charge* OR energ* OR electro*))
BASE	eyespot* AND (avoid* predator* prevent* intimidat* mimi*) AND (ave* bird* passerine* butterfly* moth* lepidoptera caterpillar*) AND (experiment* stud*)
Google scholar	eyespot avoid predator prevention intimidation mimic aves bird passerine butterfly moth lepidoptera caterpillar experiment study

We translated the above English search string into *Japanese, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Simplified Chinese, and Traditional Chinese* for searching on Google Scholar.

Japanese:

目玉模様|眼状紋 忌避|捕食|防除|威嚇|擬態 鳥|鳴禽|蝶|蛾|鱗翅目
|芋虫|幼虫 実験|研究

Polish:

oko|oczy skrzydla|wzor|plama
ochrona|unikanie|drapieznik|zapobieganie|zastraszenie
ptak|motyl|gasienica|owad eksperyment|badania

Portuguese:

ocelo|”mancha ocelar|”“olhos falsos|”“falsos olhos”
evitar|predador|prevenção|intimidação
ave|pássaro|borboleta|mariposa|lagarta experimento|estudo

Russian:

глаз|глаза избегать|хищник|профилактика|запугивание
птица|бабочка|мотылек|Воробьинообразные|Чешуекрылые|Гусениц
а эксперимент|изучать

Spanish:

ocelo|”ojos falsos|””falsos ojos”
evitar|depredador|prevención|intimidación
ave|pájaro|mariposa|polilla|oruga experimento|estudio

Simplified chinese:

眼点 避免|捕食者|预防|恐吓|模仿 鸟类|鸟|雀|蝴蝶|蛾|鳞翅目|
毛毛虫 实验|试验|学习

Traditional chinese:

眼點 避免|捕食者|預防|恐嚇|模仿 鳥類|鳥|雀|蝴蝶|蛾|鱗翅目|
毛毛蟲 實驗|試驗|學習

927 **Table S3.** List of (a)included and (b) excluded studies at the full-text screening stage with

928 exclusion reasons.

929 (a) included studies

title	year	authors	journal	doi
The Function of Eyespot Patterns in the Lepidoptera	1957	Blest, AD.	Behaviour	10.1163/156853956X00048
Reactions of male domestic chicks to two-dimensional eye-like shapes	1980	Jones, RB.	Animal Behaviour	10.1016/S0003-3472(80)80025-X
The Feeding Behaviour of Starlings (<i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>) in the Presence of ‘Eyes’	1983	Inglis, IR., Huson, LW., Marshall, MB. and Neville, PA.	Zeitschrift für Tierpsychologie	10.1111/j.1439-0310.1983.tb02151.x
Butterfly wing markings are more advantageous during handling than during the initial strike of an avian predator	1985	Wourms, MK. and Wasserman, FE.	Evolution	10.1111/j.1558-5646.1985.tb00426.x
Significance of butterfly eyespots as an anti-predator device in ground-based and aerial attacks	2003	Lyytinen, A., Brakefield, PM. and Mappes, J.	Oikos	10.1034/j.1600-0706.2003.11935.x
Does predation maintain eyespot plasticity in <i>Bicyclus anynana</i> ?	2004	Lyytinen, A., Brakefield, PM., Lindström, L., and Mappes, J.	Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences	10.1098/rspb.2003.2571
Asymmetry in size, shape, and color impairs the protective value of conspicuous color patterns	2004	Forsman, A. and Herretröm, J.	Behavioral Ecology	10.1093/beheco/arg092
Prey survival by predator intimidation: an experimental study of peacock butterfly defence against blue tits	2005	Vallin, A, Jakobsson, S., Lind, J. and Wiklund, C.	Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences	10.1098/rspb.2004.3034

Field experiments on the effectiveness of 'eyespot' as predator deterrents	2007	Stevens, M., Hopkins, E., Hinde, W., Adcock, A., Connolly, Y., Troscianko, T. and Cuthill, IC.	Animal Behaviour	10.1016/j.anbehav.2007.01.031
The anti-predator function of 'eyespot' on camouflaged and conspicuous prey	2008	Stevens, M., Stubbins, CL. and Hardman, CJ.	Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology	10.1007/s00265-008-0607-3
Conspicuousness, not eye mimicry, makes "eyespot" effective antipredator signals	2008	Stevens, M., Hardman, CJ. and Stubbins, CL.	Behavioral Ecology	10.1093/beheco/arm162
The protective value of conspicuous signals is not impaired by shape, size, or position asymmetry	2009	Stevens, M., Castor-Perry, SA. and Price, JRF.	Behavioral Ecology	10.1093/beheco/arm119
The function of animal 'eyespot': Conspicuousness but not eye mimicry is key	2009	Stevens, M., Cantor, A., Graham, J. and Winney, IS.	Current Zoology	10.1093/czoolo/55.5.319
Fixed eyespot display in a butterfly thwarts attacking birds	2009	Kodandaramaiah, U., Vallin, A. and Wiklund, C.	Animal Behaviour	10.1016/j.anbehav.2009.02.018
Can we use starlings' aversion to eyespot as the basis for a novel 'cognitive bias' task?	2009	Brilot, BO., Normandale, CL., Parkin, A. and Bateson, M.	Applied Animal Behaviour Science	10.1016/j.applanim.2009.02.015
Constant eyespot display as a primary defence-survival of male and female emperor moths attacked by blue tits	2010	Vallin, A., Sven J. and Christer W.	The Journal of Research on the Lepidoptera	10.5962/p.266504
Deflective effect and the effect of prey detectability on anti-predator function of eyespot	2011	Vallin, A. and Dimitrova, M., Kodandaramaiah, U. and Merilaita, S.	Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology	10.1007/s00265-011-1173-7
Number of eyespot and their intimidating effect on naïve	2011	Merilaita, S., Vallin, A., Kodandaramaiah, U., Dimitrova, M.,	Behavioral Ecology	10.1093/beheco/arr135

predators in the peacock butterfly		Ruuskanen, S. and Laaksonen, T.		
The 'sparkle' in fake eyes - the protective effect of mimic eyespots in lepidoptera	2012	Blut, C., Wilbrandt, J., Fels, D., Girgel, E.I. and Lunau, K.	Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata	10.1111/j.1570-7458.2012.01260.x
Eyespots interact with body colour to protect caterpillar-like prey from avian predators	2012	Hossie, T.J. and Sherratt, T.N.	Animal Behaviour	10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.04.027
Anti-predator adaptations and strategies in the Lepidoptera	2012	de Wert, L.	Doctoral thesis	none
Bird attacks on a butterfly with marginal eyespots and the role of prey concealment against the background	2013	Olofsson, M., Jakobsson, S. and Wiklund, C.	Biological Journal of the Linnean Society	10.1111/bij.12063
Defensive posture and eyespots deter avian predators from attacking caterpillar models	2013	Hossie, TJ and Sherratt, TN	Animal Behaviour	10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.05.029
Revealed by conspicuousness: distractive markings reduce camouflage	2013	Stevens, M., Marshall, KLA, Troscianko, J., Finlay, S., Burnand, D. and Chadwick, SL.	Behavioral Ecology	10.1093/beheco/ars156
Eyespot display in the peacock butterfly triggers antipredator behaviors in naïve adult fowl	2013	Olofsson, M., Lovlie, H., Tibblin, J., Jakobsson, S. and Wiklund, C.	Behavioral Ecology	10.1093/beheco/ars167
The position of eyespots and thickened segments influence their protective value to caterpillars	2014	Skelhorn, J., Dorrington, G., Hossie, TJ. and Sherratt, TN.	Behavioral Ecology	10.1093/beheco/aru154
Predator mimicry, not conspicuousness, explains the efficacy of butterfly eyespots	2015	De Bona, S., Valkonen, JK., López-Sepulcre, A. and Mappes, J.	Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences	10.1098/rspb.2015.0202
Body size affects the evolution of eyespots in caterpillars	2015	Hossie, TJ., Skelhorn, J., Breinholt, JW.,	Proceedings of the National Academy	10.1073/pnas.1415121112

		Kawahara, AY. and Sherratt, TN.	of Sciences of the United States of America	
What makes eyespots intimidating- the importance of pairedness Evolutionary ecology and behaviour	2015	Mukherjee, R. and Kodandaramaiah, U.	BMC Evolutionary Biology	10.1186/s12862-015-0307-3
On the deterring effect of a butterfly's eyespot in juvenile and sub-adult chickens	2015	Olofsson, M., Wiklund, C. and Favati, A	Current Zoology	10.1093/czoolo/61.4.749
Multicomponent deceptive signals reduce the speed at which predators learn that prey are profitable	2016	Skelhorn, J., Holmes, GG., Hossie, T.J. and Sherratt, TN.	Behavioral Ecology	10.1093/beheco/arv135
Attack risk for butterflies changes with eyespot number and size	2016	Ho, S., Schachat, SR., Piel, WH. and Monteiro, A.	Royal Society Open Science	10.1098/rsos.150614
The effectiveness of eyespots and masquerade in protecting artificial prey across ontogenetic and seasonal shifts	2022	Postema, EG.	Current Zoology	10.1093/cz/zoab082

930

931 (b) excluded studies

title	year	authors	journal	doi	reason
The effects of a tranquilliser on the reactions of domestic chicks to an aversive eye-like shape	1979	Jones, RB.	IRCS Medical Science	none	No full-text
Young domestic chicks avoid eye-like shapes	1980	JONES, RB	Applied Animal Ethology	10.1016/0304-3762(80)90037-1	No full-text
The startle responses of blue jays to Catocala	1985	Schlenoff, DH.	Animal Behaviour	10.1016/S0003-3472(85)80164-0	Wrong outcome

<i>(Lepidoptera: Noctuidae)</i> prey models					
Fearful symmetry: Pattern size and asymmetry affects aposematic signal efficacy	1999	Forsman, A. and Merilaita, S.	Evolutionary Ecology	10.1023/A:1006630911975	Invalid comparator
"An eye for an eye?" - On the generality of the intimidating quality of eyespots in a butterfly and a hawkmoth	2007	Vallin, A., Jakobsson, S. and Wiklund, C.	Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology	10.1007/s00265-007-0374-6	Invalid comparator
Coincident disruptive coloration	2009	Cuthill, IC and Szekely, A	Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Science	10.1098/rstb.2008.0266	Invalid comparator
Marginal eyespots on butterfly wings deflect bird attacks under low light intensities with UV wavelengths	2010	Olofsson, M., Vallin, A., Jakobsson, S. and Wiklund, C.	PLoS ONE	10.1371/journal.pone.0010798	Invalid comparator
Insect coloration as a defence mechanism against visually hunting predators	2011	Lyytinen, A.	Doctoral thesis	none	Published thesis
Effects of lepidopteran eyespot components on the deterrence of predatory birds	2015	Blut, C. and Lunau, K.	Behaviour	10.1163/1568539X-00003288	Invalid comparator
Antipredator behavior by a nesting hummingbird in response to a caterpillar with eyespots	2019	Marden, JH. and Pérez Carrillo, JF.	Ecology	10.1002/ecy.2582	Observational study

The Influence of the eyespots of peacock butterfly (<i>Aglais io</i>) and caterpillar on predator recognition	2020	Park, J. and Heo D	Open Science Journal	10.23954/osj.v5i2.2455	Invalid comparator
---	------	--------------------	----------------------	------------------------	--------------------

932

933 **Table S4.** Summary of a multi-moderator model including all moderators. The bold typeface
 934 is used when a 95% confidence interval (CI) does not contain zero; thus, it can be interpreted
 935 as an existing significant effect in predator avoidance.

	Estimate	95%CI
intercept	-0.06	(-0.50, 0.34)
Treatment stimulus	-0.02	(-0.19, 0.23)
Log-transformed area	0.09	(0.009, 0.18)
Number pattern	-0.05	(-0.11, 0.004)
Material type of prey: real	0.18	(-0.09, 0.45)

936

937 **Table S5.** Average maximum diameter of Eyespots on *Bicyclus anynana*. AM obtained the
 938 pictures from lepdata.org/photos/animals/ and <https://data.nhm.ac.uk/> and measured the
 939 eyespot diameters. Raw data is <https://ayumi-495.github.io/eyespot/>.

Median	Range
3.41	1.82 – 5.04

940