ECOSPHERE
AN ESA OPEN ACCESS JOURNAL

ARTICLE

Agroecosystems

Dicamba drift alters plant–herbivore interactions at the agro-ecological interface

Nia M. Johnson (ORCID) | **Regina S. Baucom** (ORCID)

Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
Department, University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

Correspondence
Nia M. Johnson
Email: nmjo@umich.edu

Abstract

Natural populations evolve in response to biotic and abiotic changes in their environment, which shape species interactions and ecosystem dynamics. Agricultural systems can introduce novel conditions via herbicide exposure to non-crop habitats in surrounding fields. While herbicide drift is known to produce a variety of toxic effects in plants, little is known about its impact on nontarget wildlife species interactions. In a two-year study, we investigated the impact of herbicide drift on plant–herbivore interactions with common weed velvetleaf (*Abutlion theophrasti*) as the focal species. The findings reveal a significant increase in the phloem-feeding silverleaf whitefly (*Bermisia tabaci*) abundance on plants exposed to herbicide at drift rates of 0.5% and 1% of the field dose. We also identified a significant phenotypic trade-off between whitefly resistance and herbicide resistance in addition to whitefly resistance and relative growth rate in the presence of dicamba drift after increasing the populations grown in Year 2. In a follow-up greenhouse study, we found evidence that dicamba drift at 0.5% of the field dose significantly increased the average chlorophyll content (in milligrams per square centimeter) along with a positive correlation between whitefly abundance and chlorophyll content. Overall, these findings suggest herbicide exposure to nontarget communities can significantly alter herbivore populations, potentially impacting biodiversity and community dynamics of weed populations found at the agro-ecological interface.

KEYWORDS
agroecology, eco-evolution, ecology, herbicide drift, plant–insect interactions, plasticity

INTRODUCTION

Biotic and abiotic interactions influence species assemblage and evolution throughout ecosystems (Klanderud et al., 2015; Thompson, 1999). Often a source of atypical abiotic factors, agricultural practices are largely dependent on pesticide use for increased crop yield and labor efficiency (Gianessi, 2013). Despite the economic benefits of herbicides for weed control, their use can lead to unintentional impacts on nontarget wildlife if the herbicide "drifts" or migrates outside of the target area during or after the initial application (Carlsen et al., 2006; Freemark & Boutin, 1995). Though herbicide drift is known to produce a variety of toxic effects on nontarget

vegetation (Boutin et al., 2014; Cederlund, 2017; Fletcher et al., 1996; Gove et al., 2007; Marrs et al., 1991; Marrs & Frost, 1997), and can lead to significant plant phenotypic and compositional changes (Iriart et al., 2021), few studies have evaluated how herbicide drift may disrupt or influence the interactions between plants and other community members such as pollinators and herbivores.

Weeds and other non-crop plants found at the edges of agricultural fields serve as important reservoirs of insect biodiversity (Egan & Mortensen, 2012), which provides crucial ecosystem services for agriculture such as pollination and pest control (Daily, 1997). The plant–insect interactions that occur at the agro-ecological interface are key determinants for the movement of energy and nutrients as well as drivers of ecological and evolutionary dynamics (Ehrlich & Raven, 1964; Futuyma & Agrawal, 2009). However, weed communities at the agro-ecological interface can be exposed to herbicide drift rates between 0.1% and 5% of the normal field application rate of herbicide (Cessna et al., 2005), and we currently understand very little about how this drift may influence ecological interactions and potentially lead to subsequent evolutionary responses. For example, does herbicide drift change herbivore abundance or damage, and/or lead to altered patterns of plant investment in resistance to either herbicide or herbivore damage?

One herbicide known for nontarget damage is dicamba (3,6-dichloro-2-methoxybenzoic acid). Dicamba is a broadleaf selective synthetic auxin that is on an upwards trajectory in agriculture due to the increased adoption of dicamba-tolerant crops (USDA ERS, 2019) and is evident by a 600% increase of use in the United States between 2014 and 2019 (National Water-Quality Assessment, 2021). Dicamba is absorbed by plant leaves and mimics the deformative and growth-altering effects caused by overdoses of the natural plant auxin, indole-3-acetic acid (Grossmann, 2010). Dicamba drift can cause a shift in plant and arthropod diversity (Egan et al., 2014), delay the onset of flowering, reduce the number of flowers, and even reduce the amount of pollinator visits (Bohnenblust et al., 2016). However, we have very little information on how dicamba drift may impact plant–herbivore interactions. A broad expectation is that exposure to a synthetic auxin, such as dicamba, could alter plant allocation toward growth and defense, and potentially lead to increased vulnerability to herbivores, in line with the growth–defense trade-off framework (Coley et al., 1985). Recent work has shown that exposure to drift rates of herbicides like dicamba can lead to the evolution of reduced herbicide sensitivity (Vieira et al., 2020) and recurrent selection of low dose herbicides can lead to nontarget site resistance (Busi et al., 2013); however, there is little understanding of how this process may influence selection on allocation toward herbivory defense.

Here we examined the impact of dicamba drift on plant herbivory, dominated by naturally occurring populations of the phloem-feeding silverleaf whitefly (*Bermisia tabaci*) in the field, using the crop weed velvetleaf, *Abutilon theophrasti*. First introduced to the United States from Asia in the late 17th century, this annual species is now one of the most common broad-leaved species in and around corn and soybean agricultural fields located in Canada, Europe, and the United States (Spencer, 1984). While past work in *Amaranthus hybridus* has shown that lines with evolved herbicide resistance (defined by survival given application of herbicide at the recommended field dose) can exhibit reduced herbivory resistance depending on light availability (Gassmann, 2005), there is a striking lack of information on how such phenotypic trade-offs evolve when populations are exposed to drift rates under natural field conditions. We performed field experiments to address this gap in our knowledge and specifically asked the following questions: Does the application of dicamba drift influence herbivory in the common weed *A. theophrasti* (velvetleaf)? Does the amount of herbicide damage, which reflects resistance to herbicide, influence the amount of herbivory damage, which reflects resistance to herbivory? (i.e., is there a trade-off between these two forms of defense in the presence of dicamba drift)? Is either herbicide or herbivore resistance negatively correlated with relative growth rate, indicating a growth–defense trade-off? Is there evidence of selection acting directly on herbicide resistance, herbivory resistance, or relative growth rate or evidence of correlative selection acting on the interactions of these focal traits? Does herbicide drift impact leaf chlorophyll levels, and if so, does that correlate with whitefly abundance?

METHODS

Field experimental design

We performed two consecutive field experiments to characterize the extent of herbicide drift damage and herbivory response in *A. theophrasti*. In the first experiment, we planted replicate seeds from 23 maternal lines originally sampled from a single population (Dexter, MI) in the summer of 2018. We increased the number of populations from 1 to 8 for a total of 50 maternal lines in the second field experiment (Appendix S1: Figure S1), including the 23 maternal lines from the originally sampled population and 2–5 maternal lines from the subsequently sampled populations. All seeds were collected in the fall prior to each summer in and around soybean fields located in Dexter, MI.

In the first field experiment (2018), we scarified and planted 276 total seeds in a randomized block design

(23 maternal lines × 3 treatments × 2 replications × 2 blocks) with each treatment randomized within each block, and two replicate plants per maternal line present within each treatment/block combination. Our three experimental treatments were two levels of a drift exposure (1% and 0.5% of the recommended field dose of dicamba [3,6-dichloro-2-methoxybenzoic acid]) (2.8 g acid equivalent [ae]/ha dicamba, 5.6 g ae/ha dicamba) and water as the control. For the second field experiment (2019), we scarified and planted 450 total seeds in a randomized block design with the same treatments as the previous field experiment (50 maternal lines × 3 treatments × 3 blocks). Treatments were randomized in each block, and one replicate of each maternal line was present within each treatment/block combination. We recorded leaf count, height, and largest leaf width for all plants biweekly in both experiments. We recorded flower count weekly and sampled all seeds at the end of the season for an estimate of fitness. Five weeks after seed germination, when the average plant height was 11 cm tall, we applied 1% and 0.5% dicamba to plants in each respective treatment with a handheld pressurized sprayer for roughly 3 s, which ensured adequate coverage of the entire plant.

Herbicide damage

We assessed herbicide damage 2 weeks following herbicide application by recording the number of leaves exhibiting visual deformation (curling or cupping), and the proportion of plant damage was determined by evaluating the number of leaves with a cupping or curling pattern divided by the total number of leaves.

Herbivory damage

To estimate resistance to herbivory in 2018, we assessed both physical damage from chewing insects and the abundance of phloem-feeding insects (dominated by silverleaf whiteflies). Because there was little evidence of chewing insects, only whitefly abundance was assessed in 2019. We assessed chewing herbivory damage 5 weeks after herbicide application using the imaging software, Fiji ImageJ version 3.0 (Schindelin et al., 2012). To do this, we collected three leaves at random from each plant and scanned them using Canon CanoScan L110. To obtain the total surface area, we converted each image to a binary format and used the particle analysis tool, which quantifies total pixel number into centimeters. We then used a macro plug-in to place a grid with 0.1-cm^2 spacing over each image to estimate the amount of chewing herbivore damage per leaf.

Visual estimates of whitefly abundance were sampled in both field experiments by selecting 10 leaves at random per plant. Because most whiteflies feed and oviposit at the same location (Van Lenterern & Noldus, 1990), estimates of percentage of leaf area covered by whitefly oviposits were captured by visually partitioning each leaf into quarters and evaluated for each section, as suggested in Johnson et al (2009). We estimated whitefly abundance on a scale of 0–5 (adapted from Banks, 1954). A score of 0 meant no whitefly oviposits were present, 1 represented 1%–20% leaf coverage by whitefly oviposits, 2 represented 21%–40% leaf coverage, 3 represented 41%–60% leaf coverage, 4 represented 61%–80% leaf coverage, and 5 represented 81%–100% leaf coverage.

Photosynthetic carbon dioxide response

To determine whether there was a link between herbicide resistance and photosynthetic response to dicamba drift, we estimated photosynthetic efficiency by examining variation in photosynthetic carbon dioxide response curves (A–C_i) using the Li-Cor 6400 portable photosynthesis system (Open System version 4.0, Li-Cor, Inc., Lincoln, NE) in 2018. During gas exchange measurements, we maintained cuvette conditions at a photosynthetic photon flux density of 1500 μmol m^{-2} s^{-1}, air flow rate at 500 μmol/s, and leaf chamber block temperature of 30°C to match ambient air temperature. In order to measure the gas exchange, we first set the CO_2 concentration reference at 400 μmol/mol, and we maintained the leaf under such conditions for 10 min for adaptation and stabilization of leaf photosynthesis. We set a loop of changing reference CO_2 concentration at 400, 300, 200, 100, and 50 μmol/mol. We controlled CO_2 concentration in the cuvette with a CO_2 mixer across this series and measurements were recorded after equilibration to a steady state. We then set another loop of changing reference CO_2 concentration at 400, 600, 800, 1000, 1300, and 1500 μmol/mol and again logged at each iteration. Between each group of measurements, we set the reference CO_2 concentration back to 400 μmol/mol for 5 min. These measurements were made 4–5 weeks after herbicide application, within a 10-day period. We recorded this data on a leaf area of 2 cm^2, from two leaves on each of three plants from each treatment. For plants growing in drift treatments, we included one leaf that developed before herbicide application (Leaf 1), and one leaf that developed after herbicide application, which as a result exhibited a deformation in shape (Leaf 2). The purpose of taking measurements on leaves with different times of development was to

investigate if potential herbicide sequestration impacts the photosynthetic efficiency of leaves exhibiting damage, potentially impacting herbivore resistance mechanisms for the entire plant. Measurements for each leaf per plant were taken on the same day.

Greenhouse experimental design

With the goals of understanding treatment effects on whitefly abundance (i.e., impacts on host-plant selection), we conducted a greenhouse experiment in the summer of 2021. We planted six replicates of 20 maternal lines randomly selected from five of the populations used in the 2019 field experiment totaling 240 seeds (20 maternal lines × 6 experimental replicate seeds × 2 treatments). Half of the plants were directly treated with dicamba at 0.5% of the field dose, while the other half was treated with water 4 weeks following planting. In preparation for herbicide application, plants were placed in rows outside of the greenhouse in order to prevent herbicide drift. We subsequently applied the herbicide solution in the same manner as in the field experiments and relocated the plants back into the greenhouse once they had visually dried. We elected to treat plants with the herbicide 1 week before the field experiment due to observed accelerated growth in the greenhouse. Because whiteflies are common pests in many greenhouses and the origin of the whitefly population in the field had previously been connected to crops transplanted from the greenhouse in plots adjacent to our own, we elected to allow whiteflies to naturally migrate to velvetleaf plants without manipulation or introduction.

Chlorophyll content

We estimated whitefly abundance with the same methodology as above. Since whitefly host selection has previously been linked to leaf wavelength emissions (Husain & Trehann, 1940; Mound, 1962), using the atLEAF Plus Digital Chlorophyll Meter, we measured the chlorophyll levels (in milligrams per square centimeter) of three leaves per plant chosen at random and calculated the average for each plant.

DATA ANALYSIS

Herbivory response to drift

We conducted all statistical analyses in R studio (version 3.4.1, R Development Core Team). For each type of herbivory measurement in the field experiments (chewing damage and whitefly abundance), we performed ANOVA to determine whether herbivory resistance differed in response to dicamba application for each year separately. Before performing ANOVAs, we transformed response variables using Tukey Ladder of Powers in the rcompanion package (Mangiafico, 2020) to correct for non-normality of residuals. In 2018 ($n = 118$), we fit the following mixed linear model using lmer function of the lmer4 package (Bates et al., 2015):

$$y = u + \text{treatment} + \text{block} + (\text{treatment} \times \text{block}) \\ + (1|\text{maternal line}) + (1|\text{maternal line} \times \text{treatment}) \\ + e.$$

where y, the response variable, is chewing damage or whitefly abundance, u is the intercept or mean of the model, treatment and block are fixed-effect terms, and maternal line and maternal by treatment are random effect terms. In 2019 ($n = 240$), we nested maternal line into population and added population as a random effect to the existing model: $y = u + \text{treatment} + \text{block} + (\text{treatment} \times \text{block}) + (1|\text{population}) + (1|\text{population}: \text{maternal line}) + (1|\text{population}: \text{maternal line}) \times \text{treatment} + e$. We determined the significance of the predictor variables using F statistics for the fixed effects with Kenward–Roger to estimate the degrees of freedom and used a log-likelihood ratio test to estimate χ^2 for the random effect. We then used a Welch two-sample t test to determine whether there were significant differences between the two dicamba drift treatments.

Plant performance in response to drift

To determine how drift treatments influenced plant performance in the field, we ran separate mixed linear models as described above by year. In 2018, we fit separate models for each plant trait (height, leaf count, leaf width, and flower number): $y = u + \text{treatment} + \text{block} + (\text{treatment} \times \text{block}) + (1|\text{maternal line}) + (1|\text{maternal line} \times \text{treatment}) + e$; where each trait was the response variable, block, treatment, and block by treatment interactions were fixed effects, and maternal line and maternal by treatment interactions were random effects. In 2019, we nested maternal line into population and added population as random effects to the existing model: $y = u + \text{treatment} + \text{block} + (\text{treatment} \times \text{block}) + (1|\text{population}: \text{maternal line}) + (1|\text{population}: \text{maternal line}) \times \text{treatment} + (1|\text{population}) + (1|\text{population}) \times \text{treatment} + e$. We transformed each trait again using Tukey Ladder of Powers to meet the assumptions of

normality. We performed separate analyses for each year because preliminary analysis revealed a significant difference in plant growth between years.

Additionally, photosynthetic carbon dioxide response means were analyzed for 2018 using a Kruskal–Wallis test with treatment as the independent variable. We performed exact Wilcoxon rank sum tests on photosynthetic carbon dioxide response means of individuals grown in each drift treatment separately to determine whether time of leaf development impacted photosynthetic carbon dioxide response among leaves with and without deformation by including leaf developmental time as the independent variable.

Genetic variation for resistance

We examined herbicide resistance for each year separately and were explicitly interested in determining if there was evidence for genetic variation for resistance to herbicide drift via a population or maternal line by treatment interaction. We fit the following separate mixed linear models for the proportion of plant damaged from herbicide: $y = u + \text{treatment} + \text{block} + (\text{treatment} \times \text{block}) + (1|\text{population: maternal line}) + (1|\text{population: maternal line}) \times \text{treatment} + (1|\text{population}) + (1|\text{population}) \times \text{treatment} + e$; where each type of resistance was the response variable, block, treatment, and block by treatment interactions were fixed effects, and maternal line, maternal by treatment interactions, population, and population by treatment interactions were random effects. We determined whether there was evidence of genetic variation for herbicide resistance and whitefly resistance by performing log-likelihood ratio tests to estimate χ^2 for maternal, maternal line by treatment, population, and population by treatment interactions for each resistance type. Finally, because we are interested in potential growth–defense trade-offs, we used a similar mixed linear model to examine genetic variation in relative growth rate.

Operational definition of resistance

We define herbicide resistance operationally as 1 minus the proportion of leaves exhibiting damage from the herbicide, which was observed as yellowing and curling/deformation of leaves. Because there was limited damage from chewing herbivores, we elected to focus on phloem-feeding herbivory, dominated by whiteflies. Whitefly resistance was defined as 1 minus the amount of whitefly larvae coverage per individual (as described previously).

Phenotypic correlations

In order to test for correlations between herbicide resistance and whitefly resistance (defined operationally as above), we performed Pearson correlation test. We examined correlations for each experimental year separately.

Phenotypic selection

In accordance with the Lande–Arnold approach (e.g., Arnold, 2003; Arnold et al., 2001; Hereford et al., 2004), we used phenotypic measurements to quantify natural selection on whitefly resistance, herbicide resistance, and relative growth rate. Here, we report selection gradients rather than differentials to understand whether direct selection is acting on individual traits by controlling for any indirect selection present. Relative fitness was calculated as the final seed count per individual divided by mean seed count for each treatment per year (2018: $n = 118$; 2019: $n = 240$). We estimated linear (directional) selection gradients (β) within drift environments (0.5% and 1% the field dose of dicamba) by performing multiple linear regressions of relative fitness on whitefly resistance, herbicide resistance, relative growth rate (calculated as change in leaf count plus change in height divided by the number of weeks spent growing), and their interactions separately for each year. We also estimated nonlinear selection gradients (γ) in a full model that included linear terms, quadratic terms, and the cross-product terms of focal traits. Quadratic regression coefficients were doubled to estimate nonlinear selection gradients. Nonlinear selection gradients examined the potential for selection on phenotypic variance of a trait (quadratic selection) or phenotypic covariance (correlated selection) between focal traits, as there is evidence of relationships between plant stress, defense, and growth (Huot et al., 2014; Züst & Agrawal, 2017). For all selection analysis, we mean standardized focal traits (i.e., subtracted the mean and divided by the standard deviation) and used untransformed values of relative fitness. Furthermore, we estimated linear and nonlinear selection on whitefly resistance in the absence of herbicide drift in order to determine whether herbicide altered the pattern of selection. We compared selection gradients between the two treatment types using an analysis of covariance to perform a regression for relative fitness on whitefly resistance, treatment, and their interaction.

Greenhouse experiment: Chlorophyll content

To investigate the effects of dicamba on chlorophyll content in the greenhouse, we performed ANOVA on the

plants grown in the greenhouse. We fit the following simple linear model: $y = u + \text{treatment} + e$; where, y, the response variable, is chlorophyll average, u is the intercept or mean of the model, and e is the error term. In order to test for correlations between chlorophyll averages and whitefly abundance, we performed Pearson correlation test.

RESULTS

Herbivory response to drift exposed host

We found no evidence that dicamba drift influenced the amount of chewing damage experienced by *A. theophrasti* (Figure 1a; Appendix S1: Table S1) but we did find a significant increase in whitefly abundance on dicamba-treated plants ($F = 12.01$, $p < 0.01$; Figure 1b; Appendix S1: Table S1). This effect was also present in the second field season in which we included five more *A. theophrasti* populations ($F = 5.30$, $p < 0.01$; Figure 1c; Appendix S1: Table S1). Both levels of dicamba drift—0.5% and 1% of the suggested field dose—exhibited higher whitefly abundance than the controls. Plants exposed to 0.5% dicamba had significantly higher whitefly abundance than 1% dicamba treatments across both years (2018: $t = 2.74$, $p < 0.01$; Figure 1b; 2019: $t = 2.06$, $p = 0.04$; Figure 1c).

Plastic response to herbicide drift on plants

We examined several plant traits in response to dicamba drift in order to determine how drift impacts velvetleaf

growth and physiology, which may underscore herbivory responses. Across both experimental years, we found that leaf count increased following the application of dicamba drift (treatment effect for 2018: $F = 28.01$, $p < 0.01$; Figure 2; Appendix S1: Table S2; 2019: $F = 5.11$, $p < 0.01$; Figure 2; Appendix S1: Table S3), whereas leaf width decreased significantly in 2018 but not 2019 (treatment effect: 2018, $F = 8.25$, $p < 0.01$; Figure 2; Appendix S1: Table S2; 2019: $F = 0.79$, $p = 0.46$; Figure 2; Appendix S1: Table S3), which may be a result of significant population variation in 2019 for leaf width ($\chi^2 = 5.11$, $p = 0.02$, Appendix S1: Table S3). Both plant height and flower count decreased as a result of dicamba drift in both experiments (treatment effect: height 2018: $F = 220.56$, $p < 0.01$; flower count 2018: $F = 7.28$, $p < 0.01$; Figure 2; Appendix S1: Table S2; treatment effect: height 2019: $F = 2.84$, $p = 0.06$; flower count 2019: $F = 6.92$, $p < 0.01$; Figure 2; Appendix S1: Table S3). Typically, plant leaf number was greater, and height and flower count were lower in the 1% dose of dicamba drift compared with the 0.5% dose (Figure 2). We found evidence for block effects and block by treatment effects in the first field experiment across most phenotypic traits (Appendix S1: Table S2), but these effects were less evident in the second field experiment (Appendix S1: Table S3). Finally, we found no evidence for maternal line or population effects associated with dicamba drift exposure, indicating that at least in this sample of 50 maternal lines, there was no evidence that the plastic response for height, leaf count, leaf width, and flower count varied genetically.

Photosynthetic carbon dioxide response ($A - C_i$, in micromoles per square meter), which was examined in


FIGURE 1 Chewing damage (a) and whitefly abundance (b, c) measurements in response to dicamba drift: 0% field dose (peach), 0.5% field dose (green), and 1% field dose (blue). (a) Chewing herbivory damage summarized by dicamba treatment from the first field experiment in 2018. Damage was measured as area with chewing damage/total leaf surface area. Treatment effect on whitefly abundance summarized by treatment in both the (b) 2018 and (c) 2019 field experiments. Whitefly abundance was measured as visual estimates of percent larvae area/total leaf surface area. Each graph illustrates median values and confidence intervals. Bars with different lowercase letters indicate significant differences between treatments.

FIGURE 2 Plant size measurements in response to dicamba drift environments: 0% field dose (peach), 0.5% field dose (green), and 1% field dose (blue). Images show treatment effect for both years on velvetleaf traits: (a) height, (b) leaf count, (c) leaf width, and (d) flower count. Each graph illustrates median values and confidence intervals. Bars with different lowercase letters indicate significant differences between treatments.

the 2018 experiment, differed across treatments, indicating that dicamba drift significantly impacts photosynthetic carbon dioxide response overall ($\chi^2 = 37.605$, $p < 0.001$; Appendix S1: Figure S2). Within drift treatments, we found evidence that the time of leaf development significantly impacts $A-C_i$ curves (0.5%: $W = 696$, $p < 0.001$; 1%: $W = 360$, $p < 0.001$; Appendix S1: Figure S2). In general, leaves exposed directly to 0.5% of the field dose of dicamba exhibited higher $A-C_i$ responses than their counterparts that developed after dicamba treatment (Appendix S1: Figure S2). In contrast to the lower dosage, leaves treated directly with 1% of the field dose of dicamba exhibited lower $A-C_i$ responses than their counterparts that developed after dicamba exposure (Appendix S1: Figure S2). This result indicates high amounts of photosynthetic plasticity in response to different dicamba drift levels, potentially associated with altered herbicide translocation and metabolism contributing to resistance to drift damage.

Chlorophyll content

In the greenhouse, we uncovered a significant treatment effect on chlorophyll levels (in milligrams per square centimeter), where plants exposed to dicamba at drift

levels had on average higher chlorophyll levels than the controls ($F = 4.56$, $p = 0.03$; Figure 3a). We also identified a significantly positive correlation between average chlorophyll values and whitefly abundance ($r = 0.25$, $p < 0.001$; Figure 3b), suggesting that chlorophyll content impacts whitefly host selection on velvetleaf.

Genetic variation for whitefly resistance, herbicide resistance, and relative growth rate

We did not detect evidence of maternal line, maternal line by treatment, population, or population by treatment effects on whitefly resistance, herbicide resistance, or relative growth rate in either year (Appendix S1: Tables S4 and S5). This suggests there is no significant genetic variation in the populations we sampled from, likely due, at least in part, to the low number of maternal lines included in the study.

Phenotypic correlations

We did not detect evidence of phenotypic correlations between any of the focal traits in 2018 (i.e., herbicide

FIGURE 3 Greenhouse experiment (a) average chlorophyll content per individual in response to dicamba application of 0.5% of the field dose ($F = 4.56$, $p = 0.03$). (b) Relationship chlorophyll average and whitefly abundance estimated as Pearson product–moment correlation; control treatment (peach) $r = 0.34$, $p = 0.002$; drift treatment (blue) $r = 0.21$ $p = 0.01$. Each graph illustrates median values and confidence intervals. Different lowercase letters in (a) indicate a significant difference between the control and 0.5% treatment.

resistance, whitefly resistance, and relative growth rate), but in 2019 we found evidence of a moderately strong negative phenotypic correlation between herbicide resistance and whitefly resistance within drift environments ($r = -0.32$, $p \leq 0.001$). This suggests that both types of resistance may be indirectly impacting one another. We also found a negative correlation between whitefly resistance and relative growth rate in the presence of drift but not in its absence in 2019 (drift environment: $r = -0.22$, $p = 0.02$; control environment: $r = -0.07$, $p = 0.58$), indicating a trade-off between growth and herbivory defense when exposed to herbicide drift.

Phenotypic selection

In 2018, we did not identify evidence of linear selection on herbicide resistance nor whitefly resistance (herbicide resistance: $\beta = -0.19$, $p = 0.57$; whitefly resistance: $\beta = 0.08$, $p = 0.30$; Appendix S1: Table S4) in the herbicide drift environment, though we did identify selection acting on relative growth rate ($\beta = 1.71$, $p < 0.001$; Appendix S1: Table S4). We further detected marginal evidence of quadratic selection acting on whitefly resistance ($\gamma = -0.19$, $p = 0.09$; Appendix S1: Table S4) and marginal correlative selection acting on whitefly resistance and relative growth rate ($\gamma = 0.82$, $p = 0.07$; Appendix S1: Table S4). In 2019, we again found no evidence of linear selection on herbicide resistance and whitefly resistance in the herbicide drift environment and identified positive selection on relative growth rate

(whitefly resistance, $\beta = 0.002$, $p = 0.99$; herbicide resistance, $\beta = 0.05$, $p = 0.72$; relative growth rate, $\beta = 2.17$, $p < 0.001$; Appendix S1: Table S5). Patterns of correlative selection differed in 2019 compared with the 2018 experiment in that we detected marginal evidence of correlative selection acting on herbicide resistance and relative growth rate ($\gamma = 0.66$, $p = 0.08$; Appendix S1: Table S5). Overall, though we found a significant negative phenotypic correlation between resistance to herbicide and whitefly herbivory, indicating a trade-off between the two types of resistance (at least in 2019), we found no evidence of correlative selection acting on the two traits in either year (2018: $\gamma = 3.36$, $p = 0.14$; Appendix S1: Table S4; 2019: $\gamma = 0.29$, $p = 0.46$; Appendix S1: Table S5).

DISCUSSION

Ecological effects: Dicamba drift increases whitefly abundance and alters plant morphology and physiology

Our study provides the first evidence that dicamba drift can increase phloem-feeding herbivore abundance in the field, a finding that should be of concern to agriculture more broadly given the negative effects of whiteflies on crops (e.g., viral transmission mediated by whitefly—Hogenhout et al., 2008; Legg et al., 2014; Moodley et al., 2019; Ning et al., 2015; Sundararaj & Selvaraj, 2017). In two separate field experiments, velvetleaf exposed to dicamba drift showed higher whitefly abundance in

comparison to their control counterparts. These findings indicate dicamba drift can increase susceptibility to phloem-feeding herbivorous insects such as whitefly, which is aligned with previous work showing increased abundance of English green aphids feeding on dicamba-treated barley in a glasshouse experiment (Hintz, 1971).

Additionally, in the second year of our study, we found evidence of significant phenotypic trade-offs between whitefly resistance and herbicide resistance as well as between whitefly resistance and relative growth rate in the presence of drift. Growth rate has long been linked to investment toward herbivory defense, suggesting that when resources are limited competition favors fast-growing plant species that allocate less toward herbivore defenses (Coley et al., 1985). In the literature, this is evident by positive correlations between growth rate and herbivory damage (Cebrian & Duarte, 1994; Coley, 1987; Fine et al., 2006) and negative correlations between biomass accumulation and defense chemicals, such as salicylic acid (Meyer et al., 2007), a plant hormone specifically involved in defense against phloem-feeding silverleaf whiteflies (Kempema et al., 2007). Such negative correlations suggest that pools of herbivore defenses can be depleted as strong growth occurs under certain environmental conditions. While our results reveal no correlation between growth rate and herbicide resistance, a significant correlation between growth rate and whitefly resistance when under drift-induced stress supports the growth–defense trade-off expectations of depleted reservoirs of herbivore defenses in the presence of high growth.

Because plant architecture influences herbivore performance and abundance (Haysom & Coulson, 1998; Jaenike, 1978; Schlinkert et al., 2015), we assessed the morphological and physiological response of velvetleaf to dicamba drift. While our results indicate dicamba at drift levels stunts velvetleaf height, this synthetic auxin also increased the number of leaves produced, although they were typically smaller in size compared with non-sprayed control plants. Additionally, we examined the impact of dicamba on $A–C_i$ response curves, as photosynthetic capabilities are linked to natural auxin presence (McAdam et al., 2017) and are a key driver for plant metabolism. The pattern of $A–C_i$ response differed between drift treatments and time of leaf development, indicating a high amount of photosynthetic plasticity, which varied over herbicide exposure and time. These findings align with a recent study that showed dicamba exposure initially decreased photosynthesis by 22% in *Palmer amaranth*, which then improved over time (Browne et al., 2020). Moreover, there was no evidence of maternal line nor population variation for morphological or physiological responses to herbicide drift, suggesting a high level of plasticity among all traits measured across individuals.

Natural auxins are involved in chlorophyll accumulation (Yuan et al., 2018). However, the addition of synthetic auxins, such as dicamba applied at 50% of the field dose (280 g ae), causes greater than 70% reduction in chlorophyll content (Turgut, 2007). Our results show that dicamba applied at drift rates (0.5% the field dose, i.e., 2.8 g ae) can *increase* the average amount of chlorophyll in plants that could impact host selection of whitefly. These findings are consistent with recent studies in which whitefly species laid more eggs on leaves with higher chlorophyll and higher nitrogen (Park et al., 2009; Tsueda et al., 2014) due to the highly linked nature of chlorophyll content and chloroplast thylakoids, which represent a large proportion of leaf nitrogen content (Evans, 1989), but conflicts with past work reporting whitefly attraction to yellow plants (Mound, 1962; Van Lenterern & Noldus, 1990). This suggests that color alone may not be the primary indicator for whitefly host selection with every species. Although further studies on this dynamic are warranted, our results suggest that one mechanism behind the increase of whiteflies on dicamba-drifted plants is due to the auxin-induced increase in the chlorophyll content of leaves.

Evolutionary effects: Correlated evolution between resistance and relative growth rate

In addition to morphological and physiology responses, we also examined the potential that resistance to both dicamba drift and whitefly damage could evolve within these populations and investigated the potential for correlative selection between traits since we identified significant negative phenotypic correlations between herbicide resistance and whitefly resistance along with whitefly resistance and relative growth rate in 2019. In 2018, we detected marginal significance for correlative selection acting on whitefly resistance and relative growth rate. Correlative selection was also marginally detected in 2019 between relative growth rate and herbicide resistance in the presence of drift. While this could imply populations may evolve to an optimum fitness at intermediate values of relative growth rate, whitefly resistance and herbicide resistance, we did not uncover evidence of genetic variation within these populations. We further did not uncover significant maternal line variation for resistance traits, likely due to high amounts of plasticity within this species and/or an insufficient number of individuals per maternal line per treatment. Environment may also be a factor as previous studies in *Amaranthus hydrius* have shown that the fitness cost of herbicide resistance associated with increased

herbivore susceptibility can be environmentally dependent (Gassmann, 2005). Although we did not detect maternal line variation, more work here should be done investigating selection acting on the relationship between herbicide resistance, whitefly resistance, and relative growth rate with a greater number of maternal lines from more distant populations and environments under consideration.

CONCLUSION

Herbicide drift from synthetic auxins can shift herbivorous insect host selection at the agro-ecological interface. Such modifications of herbivore behavior have the potential to impact plant community composition and nutrient dynamics (Belovsky & Slade, 2000; Schowalter, 2006) and may likewise reciprocally influence insect herbivore populations. Increases in insect herbivore abundance may result in positive feedback where elevated consumption increases nutrient cycling and thus stimulates insect population growth, which can directly affect the abundance of other members of the community such predators and pollinators (Ceulemans et al., 2017; Forkner & Hunter, 2000; Hunter, 2001).

Furthermore, our finding that dicamba drift significantly increases whitefly abundance on velvetleaf populations could mean dicamba-treated weeds act as a reservoir for whitefly populations, potentially leading to negative impacts on agricultural yields. If our results are applicable more broadly, plants exposed to dicamba drift in nature may be preferred host for whitefly populations. As agricultural pests that colonize more than 600 host plants globally (Byrne & Bellows, 1991), whiteflies are known vectors for transmitting over 70% of the world's plant viruses (Hogenhout et al., 2008). Given the projected expanded use of dicamba, there is a clear and urgent need to examine to what extent community dynamics may shift as a result of dicamba use, especially for communities existing at the intersection of natural and managed vegetative systems.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST
The authors declare no conflict of interest.

ORCID
Nia M. Johnson https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3110-991X
Regina S. Baucom https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7960-498X

REFERENCES

Arnold, S. J. 2003. "Performance Surfaces and Adaptive Landscapes." *Integrative and Comparative Biology* 43: 367–75. https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/43.3.367.

Arnold, S. J., M. E. Pfrender, and A. G. Jones. 2001. "The Adaptive Landscape as a Conceptual Bridge between Micro- and Macroevolution." In *Microevolution Rate, Pattern, Process, Contemporary Issues in Genetics and Evolution*, edited by A. P. Hendry and M. T. Kinnison, 9–32. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-0585-2_2.

Banks, C. J. 1954. "A Method for Estimating Populations and Counting Large Numbers of Aphis Fabae Scop." *Bulletin of Entomological Research* 45: 751–6.

Bates, D., M. Mächler, B. Bolker, and S. Walker. 2015. "Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4." *Journal of Statistical Software* 67(1): 1–48. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01.

Belovsky, G. E., and J. B. Slade. 2000. "Insect Herbivory Accelerates Nutrient Cycling and Increases Plant Production." *PNAS* 97: 14412–7.

Bohnenblust, E. W., A. D. Vaudo, J. F. Egan, D. A. Mortensen, and J. F. Tooker. 2016. "Effects of the Herbicide Dicamba on Nontarget Plants and Pollinator Visitation." *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 35: 144–51. https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.3169.

Boutin, C., B. Strandberg, D. Carpenter, S. K. Mathiassen, and P. J. Thomas. 2014. "Herbicide Impact on Non-Target Plant Reproduction: What Are the Toxicological and Ecological Implications?" *Environmental Pollution* 185: 295–306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2013.10.009.

Browne, F. B., X. Li, K. J. Price, R. Langemeier, A. S.-S. de Jauregui, J. S. McElroy, Y. Feng, and A. Price. 2020. "Sequential Applications of Synthetic Auxins and Glufosinate for Escaped *Palmer amaranth* Control." *Agronomy* 10: 1425. https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy10091425.

Busi, R., M. M. Vila-Aiub, H. J. Beckie, T. A. Gaines, D. E. Goggin, S. S. Kaundun, M. Lacoste, et al. 2013. "Herbicide-Resistant Weeds: From Research and Knowledge to Future Needs." *Evolutionary Applications* 6: 1218–21. https://doi.org/10.1111/eva.12098.

Byrne, D. N., and T. S. Bellows. 1991. "Whitefly Biology." *Annual Review of Entomology* 36(1): 431–57.

Carlsen, S. C. K., N. H. Spliid, and B. Svensmark. 2006. "Drift of 10 Herbicides after Tractor Spray Application. 2. Primary Drift (Droplet Drift)." *Chemosphere* 64: 778–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2005.10.060.

Cebrian, J., and C. M. Duarte. 1994. "The Dependence of Herbivory on Growth Rate in Natural Plant Communities." *Functional Ecology* 8: 518–25. https://doi.org/10.2307/2390077.

Cederlund, H. 2017. "Effects of Spray Drift of Glyphosate on Nontarget Terrestrial Plants—A Critical Review." *Environmental*

Toxicology and Chemistry 36: 2879–86. https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.3925.

Cessna, A. J., T. M. Wolf, G. R. Stephenson, and R. B. Brown. 2005. "Pesticide Movement to Field Margins: Routes, Impacts and Mitigation." In *Topics in Canadian Weed Science. Vol. 1. Field Boundary Habitats: Implications for Weed, Insect and Disease Management*, edited by A. G. Thomas, 69–112. Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue: Canadian Weed Science Society.

Ceulemans, T., E. Hulsmans, W. Vanden Ende, and O. Honnay. 2017. "Nutrient Enrichment Is Associated with Altered Nectar and Pollen Chemical Composition in *Succisa pratensis* Moench and Increased Larval Mortality of its Pollinator *Bombus terrestris* L." *PLoS One* 12: e0175160. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0175160.

Coley, P. D. 1987. "Interspecific Variation in Plant Anti-Herbivore Properties: The Role of Habitat Quality and Rate of Disturbance." *New Phytologist* 106: 251–63. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.1987.tb04693.x.

Coley, P. D., J. P. Bryant, and F. S. Chapin. 1985. "Resource Availability and Plant Antiherbivore Defense." *Science* 230: 895–9. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.230.4728.895.

Daily, G. C. 1997. "Introduction: What Are Ecosystem Services?" In *Nature's Services: Societal Dependence on Natural Ecosystems*, edited by G. C. Daily, 1–10. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Egan, J. F., E. Bohnenblust, S. Goslee, D. Mortensen, and J. Tooker. 2014. "Herbicide Drift Can Affect Plant and Arthropod Communities." *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 185: 77–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2013.12.017.

Egan, J. F., and D. A. Mortensen. 2012. "A Comparison of Land-Sharing and Land-Sparing Strategies for Plant Richness Conservation in Agricultural Landscapes." *Ecological Applications* 22: 459–71. https://doi.org/10.1890/11-0206.1.

Ehrlich, P. R., and P. H. Raven. 1964. "Butterflies and Plants: A Study in Coevolution." *Evolution* 18: 586–608. https://doi.org/10.2307/2406212.

Evans, J. R. 1989. "Photosynthesis and Nitrogen Relationships in Leaves of C3 Plants." *Oecologia* 78: 9–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00377192.

Fine, P. V. A., Z. J. Miller, I. Mesones, S. Irazuzta, H. M. Appel, M. H. H. Stevens, I. Sääksjärvi, J. C. Schultz, and P. D. Coley. 2006. "The Growth-Defense Tradeoff and Habitat Specialization by Plant in Amazonian Forests." *Ecology* 87: S150–62. https://doi.org/10.1890/00129658(2006)87[150:TGTAHS]2.0.CO;2.

Fletcher, J. S., T. G. Pfleeger, H. C. Ratsch, and R. Hayes. 1996. "Potential Impact of Low Levels of Chlorsulfuron and Other Herbicides on Growth and Yield of Nontarget Plants." *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 15: 1189–96. https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.5620150726.

Forkner, R. E., and M. D. Hunter. 2000. "What Goes up Must Come down? Nutrient Addition and Predation Pressure on Oak Herbivores." *Ecology* 81: 1588–600. https://doi.org/10.1890/00129658(2000)081[1588:WGUMCD]2.0.CO;2.

Freemark, K., and C. Boutin. 1995. "Impacts of Agricultural Herbicide Use on Terrestrial Wildlife in Temperate Landscapes: A Review with Special Reference to North America." *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 52: 67–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-8809(94)00534-L.

Futuyma, D. J., and A. A. Agrawal. 2009. "Macroevolution and the Biological Diversity of Plants and Herbivores." *PNAS* 106: 18054–61. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0904106106.

Gassmann, A. J. 2005. "Resistance to Herbicide and Susceptibility to Herbivores: Environmental Variation in the Magnitude of an Ecological Trade-off." *Oecologia* 145: 575–85.

Gianessi, L. P. 2013. "The Increasing Importance of Herbicides in Worldwide Crop Production." *Pest Management Science* 69: 1099–105. https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.3598.

Gove, B., S. A. Power, G. P. Buckley, and J. Ghazoul. 2007. "Effects of Herbicide Spray Drift and Fertilizer Overspread on Selected Species of Woodland Ground Flora: Comparison between Short-Term and Long-Term Impact Assessments and Field Surveys." *Journal of Applied Ecology* 44: 374–84. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2007.01261.x.

Grossmann, K. 2010. "Auxin Herbicides: Current Status of Mechanism and Mode of Action." *Pest Management Science* 66: 113–20. https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.1860.

Haysom, K. A., and J. C. Coulson. 1998. "The Lepidoptera Fauna Associated with *Calluna vulgaris*: Effects of Plant Architecture on Abundance and Diversity." *Ecological Entomology* 23: 377–85. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2311.1998.00152.x.

Hereford, J., T. F. Hansen, and D. Houle. 2004. "Comparing Strengths of Directional Selection: How Strong Is Strong?" *Evolution* 58: 2133–43. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0014-3820.2004.tb01592.x.

Hintz, S. D. 1971. "Herbicidal Influence on Cereal Grain Aphids in North Dakota." PhD diss., North Dakota State University.

Hogenhout, S. A., E.-D. Ammar, A. E. Whitfield, and M. G. Redinbaugh. 2008. "Insect Vector Interactions with Persistently Transmitted Viruses." *Annual Review of Phytopathology* 46: 327–59. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.phyto.022508.092135.

Hunter, M. D. 2001. "Effects of Elevated Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide on Insect-Plant Interactions: Effect of Elevated Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide." *Agricultural and Forest Entomology* 3: 153–9. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1461-9555.2001.00108.x.

Huot, B., J. Yao, B. L. Montgomery, and S. Y. He. 2014. "Growth–Defense Tradeoffs in Plants: A Balancing Act to Optimize Fitness." *Molecular Plant* 7: 1267–87. https://doi.org/10.1093/mp/ssu049.

Husain, M. A., and K. N. Trehan. 1940. "Final Report on the Scheme of Investigations on the Whitefly on Cotton in the Punjab." *Indian Journal of Agricultural Science* 10: 101–9.

Iriart, V., R. S. Baucom, and T.-L. Ashman. 2021. "Herbicides as Anthropogenic Drivers of Eco-Evo Feedbacks in Plant Communities at the Agro-Ecological Interface." *Molecular Ecology* 30(21): 5406–21. https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.15510.

Jaenike, J. 1978. "On Optimal Oviposition Behavior in Phytophagous Insects." *Theoretical Population Biology* 14: 350–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-5809(78)90012-6.

Johnson, N. 2022. "niajohnson1/DicambaDrift_20182019: Dicamba Drift Alters Plant-Herbivore Interactions (v.0.0.1)." Zenodo. Data Set. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7017181.

Johnson, M. T. J., A. A. Agrawal, J. L. Maron, and J.-P. Salminen. 2009. "Heritability, Covariation and Natural Selection on 24 Traits of Common Evening Primrose (*Oenothera biennis*) from a Field Experiment." *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 22: 1295–307. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2009.01747.x.

Kempema, L. A., X. Cui, F. M. Holzer, and L. L. Walling. 2007. "Arabidopsis Transcriptome Changes in Response to Phloem-Feeding Silverleaf Whitefly Nymphs. Similarities and Distinctions in Responses to Aphids." *Plant Physiology* 143: 849–65. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.106.090662.

Klanderud, K., V. Vandvik, and D. Goldberg. 2015. "The Importance of Biotic vs. Abiotic Drivers of Local Plant Community Composition Along Regional Bioclimatic Gradients." *PLoS One* 10(6): e0130205. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0130205.

Legg, J. P., R. Shirima, L. S. Tajebe, D. Guastella, S. Boniface, S. Jeremiah, E. Nsami, P. Chikoti, and C. Rapisarda. 2014. "Biology and Management of *Bemisia* Whitefly Vectors of Cassava Virus Pandemics in Africa." *Pest Management Science* 70: 1446–53. https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.3793.

Mangiafico, S., 2020. *rcompanion: Functions to Support Extension Education Program Evaluation*. Vienna, Austria: R package version 2.3.25 R Foundation for Staistical Computing.

Marrs, R. H., and A. J. Frost. 1997. "A Microcosm Approach to the Detection of the Effects of Herbicide Spray Drift in Plant Communities." *Journal of Environmental Management* 50: 369–88. https://doi.org/10.1006/jema.1996.9984.

Marrs, R. H., A. J. Frost, and R. A. Plant. 1991. "Effects of Herbicide Spray Drift on Selected Species of Nature Conservation Interest: The Effects of Plant Age and Surrounding Vegetation Structure." *Environmental Pollution* 69: 223–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/0269-7491(91)90146-N.

McAdam, S. A. M., M. P. Eléouët, M. Best, T. J. Brodribb, M. C. Murphy, S. D. Cook, M. Dalmais, et al. 2017. "Linking Auxin with Photosynthetic Rate via Leaf Venation." *Plant Physiology* 175: 351–60. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.17.00535.

Meyer, R. C., M. Steinfath, J. Lisec, M. Becher, H. Witucka-Wall, O. Törjék, O. Fiehn, et al. 2007. "The Metabolic Signature Related to High Plant Growth Rate in Arabidopsis Thaliana." *PNAS* 104: 4759–64.

Moodley, V., A. Gubba, and P. L. Mafongoya. 2019. "A Survey of Whitefly-Transmitted Viruses 653 on Tomato Crops in South Africa." *Crop Protection* 123: 21–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2019.05.018.

Mound, L. A. 1962. "Studies on the Olfaction and Colour Sensitivity of *Bemisia tabaci* (Genn.) (Homoptera, 655 Aleyrodidae)." *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata* 5: 99–104. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1570-7458.1962.tb00571.x.

National Water-Quality Assessment. 2021. *Project, Estimated Annual Agricultural Pesticide Use*. Reston, VA: USGS. https://water.usgs.gov/nawqa/pnsp/usage/maps/show_map.php?year=2019&map=DICAMBA&hilo=L&disp=Dicamba.

Ning, W., X. Shi, B. Liu, H. Pan, W. Wei, Y. Zeng, X. Sun, et al. 2015. "Transmission of Tomato Yellow Leaf Curl Virus by *Bemisia tabaci* as Affected by Whitefly Sex and Biotype." *Scientific Reports* 5(10744): 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep10744.

Park, M. K., J. G. Kim, Y. H. Song, J. H. Lee, K. I. Shin, and K. Cho. 2009. "Effect of Nitrogen Levels of Two Cherry Tomato Cultivars on Development, Preference and Honeydew Production of *Trialeurodes vaporariorum* (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae)." *Journal of Asia-Pacific Entomology* 12(4): 227–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aspen.2009.04.004.

Schindelin, J., I. Arganda-Carreras, E. Frise, V. Kaynig, M. Longair, T. Pietzsch, S. Preibisch, et al. 2012. "Fiji: An Open-Source Platform for Biological-Image Analysis." *Nature Methods* 9: 676–82. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2019.

Schlinkert, H., C. Westphal, Y. Clough, Z. László, M. Ludwig, and T. Tscharntke. 2015. "Plant Size as Determinant of Species Richness of Herbivores, Natural Enemies and Pollinators across 21 Brassicaceae Species." *PLoS One* 10(8): e0135928. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0135928.

Schowalter, T. D. 2006. *Insect Ecology: An Ecosystem Approach*. London: Academic Press.

Spencer, N. R. 1984. "Velvetleaf, *Abutilon theophrasti* (Malvaceae), History and Economic Impact in the United States." *Economic Botany* 38: 407–16. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02859079.

Sundararaj, R., and K. Selvaraj. 2017. "Invasion of Rugose Spiraling Whitefly, *Aleurodicus rugioperculatus* Martin (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae): A Potential Threat to Coconut in India." *Phytoparasitica* 45: 71–4. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12600-017-0567-0.

Thompson, J. N. 1999. "The Evolution of Species Interactions." *Science* 284: 2116–8. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.284.5423.2116.

Turgut, C. 2007. "The Impact of Pesticides Toward Parrotfeather When Applied at the Predicted Environmental Concentration." *Chemosphere* 66(3): 469–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2006.05.073.

Tsueda, H., T. Tsuduki, and K. Tsuchida. 2014. "Factors That Affect the Selection of Tomato Leaflets by Two Whiteflies, *Trialeurodes vaporariorum* and *Bemisia tabaci* (Homoptera: Aleyrodidae)." *Applied Entomology and Zoology* 49: 561–70. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13355-014-0287-6.

USDA ERS. 2019. "Recent Trends in GE Adoption." United States Geological Survey. https://www-ers-usda-gov.proxy.lib.umich.edu/data-products/adoption-of-genetically-engineered-crops-in-the-us/recent-trends-in-ge-adoption.aspx.

Van Lenterern, J. C., and L. P. J. J. Noldus. 1990. "Whitefly-Plant Relationships: Behavioral and Ecological Aspects." In *Whiteflies: Their Bionomics, Pest Status and Management*, edited by D. Gerling, 47–9. Andover: Intercept.

Vieira, B. C., J. D. Luck, K. L. Amundsen, R. Werle, T. A. Gaines, and G. R. Kruger. 2020. "Herbicide Drift Exposure Leads to Reduced Herbicide Sensitivity in Amaranthus Spp." *Scientific Reports* 10: 2146. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-59126-9.

Yuan, Y., L. Mei, M. Wu, W. Wei, W. Shan, Z. Gong, Q. Zhang, et al. 2018. "SlARF10, an Auxin Response Factor, Is Involved in Chlorophyll and Sugar Accumulation during Tomato Fruit Development." *Journal of Experimental Botany* 69(22): 5507–18. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/ery328.

Züst, T., and A. A. Agrawal. 2017. "Trade-Offs between Plant Growth and Defense against Insect Herbivory: An Emerging Mechanistic Synthesis." *Annual Review of Plant Biology* 68: 513–34. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-arplant-042916-040856.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of this article.