

1 **Do male panther chameleons use different aspects of color change to settle disputes?**

2 Alexis Y. Dollion<sup>1, 2, 3</sup>, Sandrine Meylan<sup>2</sup>, Olivier Marquis<sup>4</sup>, Mathieu Leroux-Coyau<sup>2</sup> and Anthony  
3 Herrel<sup>3</sup>

4 <sup>1</sup>Université de Paris, 75006, Paris, France

5 <sup>2</sup>Sorbonne Université, CNRS, IRD, INRA, Institut d'Ecologie et des Sciences de l'Environnement-  
6 Paris, iEES-Paris, 75252, Paris, France

7 <sup>3</sup>Département Adaptations du vivant, UMR 7179 C. N. R. S/M. N. H. N, 75005, Paris, France

8 <sup>4</sup>Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Parc Zoologique de Paris, 75012 Paris, France

9 #Pages: 8

10 #Words: 4807

11 #Tables: 2

12 #Figures: 6

13 Corresponding author contacts:

14 Alexis Y. Dollion (ORCID : 0000-0003-1373-2588)

15 e-mail: [dollion.alexis.14340@gmail.com](mailto:dollion.alexis.14340@gmail.com)

16 phone: +33 (0)7 83 67 96 55

17 **Acknowledgements**

18 We would like to thank Marc Thery for letting us use his spectrophotometer to measure the irradiance  
19 spectrum of the experimental arena. We acknowledge Dr. Sylvie Laidebeur, Dr. Laetitia Redon, Dr.  
20 Alexis Lecu, Fabrice Bernard, Morgane Denis and Mickaël Leger for assistance with chameleon  
21 husbandry and care. We thank Karim Daoues, Cédric Bordes, Denis Lebon and Loïc Laumalle-Waddy  
22 from the “ferme tropicale” for their help in providing us with materials for husbandry. We thank  
23 Hugues Clamouze and Thierry Decamps for helping us with the experimental arena. Finally, we thank  
24 the “Ecole Doctorale Frontières de l'Innovation en Recherche et Education - Programme Bettencourt”  
25 for financial support. And, we would like to acknowledge all the reviewers that have reviewed our  
26 work and lead us to this actual manuscript

27 **Abstract**

28 In many animals, males engage in agonistic interactions. Color signals are commonly used to mitigate  
29 these potentially harmful interactions. Both pigment-based color and structural color, notably  
30 ultraviolet coloration, are used in this context to convey information, including an animal's resource  
31 holding potential (RHP) or social status. Despite extensive previous work on this topic, the ability to  
32 change color in this context has received relatively little attention. Moreover, no studies to date have  
33 considered both the visible and the ultraviolet component of this ability. Thus, whether changes in  
34 ultraviolet play a role in the settling of intraspecific disputes remains unknown. Here, we investigate  
35 the role of color change during intrasexual agonistic interactions in male panther chameleons (*Furcifer*  
36 *pardalis*). To do so, we combined behavioral experiments and color analysis. Our results show that the  
37 outcome of male intrasexual agonistic interactions depends on particular aspects of color change in the  
38 visible spectrum. Dominant males exhibit more brightness changes and Euclidian distance changes  
39 within the HSV color space at the level of the bands and interbands, suggesting a prominent role of  
40 these patterns in panther chameleon communication. Our results also align with previous studies in  
41 another species of chameleon, thus supporting the key role of brightness changes in chameleon  
42 communication, at least in a competitive context. Interestingly, although our species did exhibit UV  
43 coloration neither this coloration nor its changes seem to be involved in intrasexual agonistic  
44 interactions among males, possibly because those signals may be used for other purposes like  
45 attracting mates, repelling predators, or deception.

46 **Significance statement:**

47 There is a growing body of evidence that animal color change is used for communication. The  
48 dynamics of color change have been suggested to play a prominent role in settling agonistic  
49 interactions. To date, the ultraviolet component (<400nm) of color change remains largely neglected  
50 despite the fact that many animals, including chameleons, can perceive colors in the UV range. Using  
51 image analysis techniques, we investigated male *F. pardalis* color change during agonistic  
52 interactions, in both the visible and UV range. We demonstrate that male *F. pardalis* settle agonistic  
53 interactions through specific aspects of color change. Interestingly, while our species did show UV  
54 coloration and UV color change, these appeared not to be involved in settling agonistic interactions.

55 **Keywords:** Chameleon, Intrasexual competition, Color signals, Animal communication

56



57 **Declarations**

58 **Funding information:** “Ecole Doctorale Frontières de l’Innovation en Recherche et Education -  
59 Programme Bettencourt”; Université de Paris.

60 **Conflicts of interest:** We have no conflict of interest to disclose.

61 **Ethics approval:** Experiments were carried out in compliance with French legislation and animals  
62 were given regular health checks by Zoo veterinarians. Animals were alive and healthy after the  
63 experiments and showed no weight loss. In accordance with the directive 2010/63/EU of the European  
64 Parliament and French legislation, our study did not require specific authorization because our  
65 observations did not cause any pain, suffering, distress, or lasting harm.

66 **Consent to participate:** Not applicable.

67 **Consent for publication:** Dr. Alexis Y. Dollion, Pr. Sandrine Meylan, Dr. Olivier Marquis, Mr.  
68 Mathieu Leroux-Coyau and Dr. Anthony Herrel, authors of the following articles intitled “Do male  
69 panther chameleons (*Furcifer pardalis*) use different aspects of color change in the visible and the  
70 ultraviolet range to settle intrasexual agonistic interactions?”, acknowledge and consent to the  
71 submission of the article to *The science of Nature* journal and its later potential publication in *The*  
72 *science of Nature*.

73 **Availability of data and material:** The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current  
74 study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

75 **Code availability:** Not applicable.

76 **Authors’ contributions:**

77 Study conception: A. Y. Dollion, S. Meylan and A. Herrel

78 Experimental design: A. Y. Dollion, S. Meylan, O. Marquis and A. Herrel

79 Acquisition of data: A. Y. Dollion and M. Leroux-coyau

80 Analysis and interpretation of data: A. Y. Dollion, S. Meylan and A. Herrel

81 Drafting of the manuscript: A. Y. Dollion, S. Meylan and A. Herrel

82 Critical revision: A. Y. Dollion, S. Meylan, O. Marquis and A. Herrel

## 83 INTRODUCTION

84 In many animal species, males engage in agonistic interactions varying from threat displays to  
85 physical fighting. They do so to compete over sexual partners or over resources to attract potential  
86 mates. Physical fighting is costly, in terms of energy (Briffa and Sneddon 2007), time, possible injury,  
87 and may result in an increase in predation risk (Glass and Huntingford 1988; Kelly and Godin 2001;  
88 Briffa and Elwood 2004). To avoid energy expenditure and potential lethal injuries linked to fighting,  
89 many species rely on signals to assess the quality of the opponent and to mitigate the outcome of the  
90 agonistic interactions (Maynard-Smith and Harper 2003; Briffa 2014). These signals are thought to  
91 convey information on fighting ability or overall male strength or quality, often referred to as resource  
92 holding potential (RHP) (Parker 1974; Andersson 1994). Individuals may consequently assess  
93 asymmetries in RHP between themselves and opponents during intrasexual agonistic interactions  
94 using these signals (Taylor and Elwood 2003) and thus settle the interaction without escalation.

95 It has been suggested that intrasexual agonistic interactions may be mediated by color traits,  
96 sometimes referred to as badges of status (Rohrlich and Rubin 1975; Maynard-Smith and Harper  
97 2003). These badges can be used to assess the RHP of the opponent if they reflect the social status or  
98 dominance of the individual (Whiting et al. 2003; Senar 2006). For example, *Anolis* lizards have been  
99 suggested to be able to assess an opponent's bite force by evaluating dewlap color, size, and display  
100 rate (Vanhooydonck et al. 2005; Steffen and Guyer 2014). Signal honesty can be maintained by an  
101 incorruptible, inherent relationship between signal and quality (*i.e.* relatively "cost-free") or costs  
102 associated with signal expression that rely on the quality of the signaller (Zahavi 1975; Searcy and  
103 Nowicki 2005; Bradbury and Vehrencamp 2011; Weaver et al. 2017). This cost could be associated  
104 with the production and maintenance of signals (*i.e.* , handicap signals, Searcy and Nowicki 2005).  
105 Producing color signals is indeed costly as it involves pigments like carotenoids or melanin which are  
106 also involved in the immune response (Griffith et al. 2006) and the oxidative barrier (Henschen et al.  
107 2016). Moreover, the production of melanin-based color is linked to testosterone levels which have an  
108 immunodepressive effect (Buchanan et al. 2003; Foo et al. 2017). Therefore, there appears to be a  
109 potential trade-off in the pigment allocation into badges of status versus immunocompetence and/or  
110 oxidative barriers as predicted by the handicap theory (Zahavi 1975) and the immunocompetence  
111 handicap theory (Folstad and Karter 1992). Nevertheless, the cost ensuring signal honesty can also be  
112 from a social nature, which is mostly the case for badges of status. Here, the signal honesty is mainly  
113 guaranteed by conspecifics imposing a high cost on dishonest individuals through the punishment of  
114 those individuals (*i.e.* significantly more aggressive behavior toward cheaters) (Rohwer 1982;  
115 Tibbetts and Dale 2004; Tibbetts and Izzo 2010).

116 Although pigment-based colors have been extensively studied in this context, structural colors are  
117 clearly also important, notably ultraviolet (UV) coloration. Over the past decade a growing body of

118 evidence has been accumulated on the involvement of UV coloration in intrasexual competition and  
119 the role of these UV color traits as badges of status (Lim and Li 2013; Xu and Fincke 2015; Martin et  
120 al. 2016; Sabol et al. 2017). A higher UV reflectance appears to convey information on RHP (Stapley  
121 and Whiting 2006; Whiting et al. 2006; Tringali and Bowman 2012; Lim and Li 2013), a better  
122 immune response (Doucet and Montgomerie 2003; Griggio et al. 2010; Megía-Palma et al. 2016), or a  
123 higher testosterone level (Roberts et al. 2009). The signal honesty of UV signals has been suggested  
124 to be ensured by the immunocompetence handicap mechanism (Folstad and Karter 1992; Roberts et al.  
125 2009) but mostly through a social cost (Martin et al. 2016).

126 Interestingly, some animals are able to exhibit rapid color change (in a few minutes or even less than a  
127 second) which they may use in the course of intraspecific disputes to communicate (Hutton et al.  
128 2015). This is found in a wide range of taxa: for example, cephalopods (Adamo et al. 2000), lizards  
129 (Korzan et al. 2006; Batabyal and Thaker 2017), and insects (Umbers et al. 2013). Nevertheless, most  
130 of the studies on the use of color change during social interactions have investigated this ability as a  
131 simple ON/OFF feature, without considering the dynamic aspect of color change (*i.e.* speed, temporal  
132 variation, direction). Yet, the dynamics of color change likely offer as much communication  
133 possibilities and complexity as vocalizations. For example, a previous study by Ligon and McGraw  
134 (2013) investigated the role of dynamic color change in intrasexual agonistic interactions in  
135 chameleons. They demonstrated not only that chameleons exhibit submissive behavior through the  
136 exhibition of darker colors (Ligon 2014) and that brighter colors act as badges of status (Ligon and  
137 McGraw 2016), but also that the speed by which the color change occurs matters (Ligon and McGraw  
138 2013). They further suggested that the honesty of this signal is guaranteed by a social cost (Ligon and  
139 McGraw 2016). Yet, the UV component of color change has been neglected despite the fact that  
140 numerous color changing animals are sensitive to UV (Briscoe and Chittka 2001; Bowmaker 2008),  
141 including chameleons (Bowmaker et al. 2005). During intrasexual agonistic interactions, these  
142 animals likely do not only show color changes in the visible spectrum, but also in the UV range. This  
143 raises the question of whether they rely on color change in the visible range only or on both the visible  
144 and UV range to communicate and settle social interactions.

145 Chameleons (Squamata: *Chameleoniae*) are an excellent biological model to investigate the role of  
146 dynamic color change in intrasexual agonistic interactions in both the visible and UV range. Selection  
147 for conspicuous signals is likely to have driven the evolution of color displays in this group (Stuart-  
148 Fox and Moussalli 2008). Moreover, they are highly territorial animals that often engage in physical  
149 and sometimes even deadly fights (Tolley and Herrel 2013). Moreover, some species exhibit complex  
150 color changes (Nečas 1999; Tolley and Herrel 2013; Teyssier et al. 2015) that may include changes in  
151 hue, brightness and saturation, offering a large color change repertoire. Finally, chameleons are  
152 tetrachromatic lizards with UV sensitive photoreceptors ( $\lambda_{\max} = 375\text{-}385\text{ nm}$ ; Bowmaker *et al.*, 2005).

153 In the present study, we investigate the role of color change, in the visible and the ultraviolet range,  
154 during intrasexual agonistic interactions in panther chameleons (*Furcifer pardalis*, Cuvier 1829). To  
155 do so, we staged dyadic agonistic encounters among male *F. pardalis* under appropriate light  
156 conditions (*i.e.* including UV) and examined the dynamic color change, during those interactions. We  
157 predict that, as in *C. calyptratus* (Ligon and McGraw 2013; Ligon 2014), male *F. pardalis* will rely  
158 on brightness changes, to settle agonistic interactions. Moreover, we predict that ultraviolet signals  
159 may also be used, as chameleons perceive UV. Finally, we also tested whether saturation and hue  
160 changes are involved in settling agonistic interactions among males.

## 161 **Material and methods**

### 162 *Animals and husbandry*

163 *Furcifer pardalis* is a diurnal and arboreal lizard, endemic to Madagascar and found in a wide range of  
164 habitats along the northern and eastern coasts of Madagascar. This species exhibits a strong sexual  
165 dimorphism and considerable intraspecific variation in male coloration: females and juveniles are tan  
166 to brown with hints of pink or orange, while adult males are much larger and have various  
167 combinations of bright red, green, blue, and yellow. This polychromatism among males depends on  
168 the region of origin and is either termed a “morph” or “locality”. Local variation also appears to exist  
169 within morphs (Ferguson 2004). For this study, nineteen adult (over six months old) captive-bred  
170 male *Furcifer pardalis* of the ‘Ambilobe’ morph were used.

171 Animals were kept individually and were visually isolated from one another in mesh terraria (46 x 46  
172 x 91 cm, ReptiBreeze, ZooMed) outfitted with branches and plastic plants to provide hiding spots.  
173 Animals were kept in a dedicated room at the Paris Zoo (Parc Zoologique de Paris). The room  
174 temperature was maintained at 26°C during the day and the temperature dropped to 22°C at night.  
175 Fluorescent tubes providing 12% UVB (Reptile Lamp 12% T8, Arcadia) and a 40W heating bulb  
176 (Repti Basking Spot, ZooMed) were suspended above each cage. The photoperiod was set at 12/12h.  
177 The animals were fed thrice weekly and crickets were calcium dusted once a week. Water was  
178 provided to the animals during three daily misting periods (9 am, 12 pm and 4 pm) with an automated  
179 misting system (Vivaria project) and 20cL drippers.

### 180 *Experimental design*

181 We used a large arena (144 x 50 x 80 cm) with opaque Plexiglas sides and a front made of transparent  
182 Plexiglas of 50 cm high to allow behavioral observations and photo/video recordings. As chameleons  
183 are perch-dwelling lizards, we provided artificial branches to simulate an arboreal environment. The  
184 overall setup was illuminated with a combination of nine light sources placed 56 cm above the setup

185 as described previously (Dollion et al. 2020). The combination of those different light sources enabled  
186 us to cover most of the solar spectrum, including infrared with the halogen bulbs, UVs with the  
187 fluorescent tubes, and visible light with the other sources (Fig. S1). Hence, this combination provided  
188 a light environment in accordance with the chameleon visual system which includes UVs in the UVA  
189 range (Bowmaker et al. 2005). In the middle of the arena, a thin (~0.7 mm) transparent PVC plate (50  
190 cm x 100 cm), hereafter called barrier, was placed to prevent direct attacks and injuries while allowing  
191 the animals to see one another (Fig. 1).

192 From April 2018 to May 2018 round-robin tournaments were performed to assess the dominance  
193 status between our 19 male panther chameleons. Males were split into four groups of four to five  
194 different males balanced in size and color pattern, meaning that individuals with similar color patterns  
195 (*i.e.* blue bar and red bar) or size were dispatched in different groups. The round-robin was performed  
196 within groups, resulting in three to four encounters per male, totalling 42 agonistic interactions. The  
197 encounters occurred at room temperature (26°C) from 10 am to 6 pm, corresponding to their daily  
198 activity period. The arena was sprayed and cleaned with clear water before each trial to prevent  
199 potential effects of odors remaining from a previous trial. Animals were able to interact for 30 minutes  
200 unless one of the animals crossed the barrier upon which the trial was halted to avoid physical injury  
201 to the animals. The behavior was recorded with an HD camera, HDCR-CX740VE (SONY, Minato-ku,  
202 Tokyo, Japan). It was not possible to record data blindly because our study involved focal animals, yet  
203 we randomized the order and time of the encounters. Agonistic interaction outcomes were assessed  
204 through behavioral observations (Table 1). Animals were considered as “winners” if they succeeded or  
205 tried to cross the barrier, if they chased (followed) their opponent from their side, or if they spent most  
206 of the interaction trying to climb the barrier (Table 1). Animals were considered as “losers” if they fled  
207 from their opponent while trying to maintain a large distance between them. In some cases, individuals  
208 exhibited “winner”-like behavior at the beginning of the interaction but then the direction  
209 (winner/loser) of the interaction changed. In this case, we only considered the final behavior. We also  
210 observed some “ties” where both animals appeared to ignore each other or were facing and trying to  
211 fight each other (hitting the barrier violently in turn) until the end of the interaction (Table 1). We  
212 chose not to consider these “tie” situations for our statistical analysis as in nature one of the  
213 individuals would likely have prevailed.

#### 214 *Color calibration and measurements*

215 During the disputes, pictures of both protagonists were taken twice every two minutes with a full  
216 spectrum converted camera, Samsung NX-1000. One picture was taken in the visible range (VIS) and  
217 a second in the ultraviolet range (UV) immediately after the first. For pictures in the visible range, a  
218 filter blocking ultraviolet and infrared was manually placed in front of the camera (UV/IR cut/L Filter,  
219 Baader ©, Mammendorf, Germany) and pictures were taken with a 1/640-second exposure.

220 Immediately after the picture was taken, the filter was changed for a filter blocking all wavelengths  
221 except those ranging from 320 to 400 nm (Venus-U Planetary Filter, Optolong ©, Kunming City,  
222 China) and a picture was taken with a one-second exposure.

223 For the color calibration in the visual range, a color checker (SpyderCHECKR™) was photographed  
224 while placed at thirteen different regions of the arena, once empty. Color calibration was performed  
225 using Adobe Photoshop Lightroom 6, and the SpyderCheckr software (version 1. 2. 2) provided with  
226 the SpyderCHECKR™, following the instructions. As each of the two opponents might be in different  
227 regions of the arena, images were cropped to isolate each opponent and then according to the position  
228 of the individuals in the arena the corresponding color calibration was applied. Calibrated images were  
229 then used for color measurements. As the UV filter imposes a narrow hue range resulting in a constant  
230 pink coloration, color calibration was not required for the UV pictures.

231 Color measurements were performed by retrieving RGB values using the RGB measure tool in  
232 ImageJ. We measured fifteen squares of sixteen pixels ( $N_{VIS} = 8$ ;  $N_{UV} = 7$ ; Fig. 2), describing the  
233 specific color patterns of male *F. pardalis*. In the visual spectrum, we quantified color at the bands  
234 ( $N=3$ ), interbands ( $N=3$ ) and the lateral line ( $N=2$ ); in the UV, areas were defined as absorbing UV  
235 ( $N=5$ ) (*i.e.* bands, eyelid and head bony tubercles), or reflecting UV ( $N=1$ ) (*i.e.* lips) and the lateral  
236 line ( $N=1$ ) (Fig. 2). The lateral line was considered independently because according to the individual  
237 and time, it was either absorbing or reflecting UV. RGB values were then compiled in R (R Core  
238 Team 2019) and converted into HSV values (H: Hue, S: Saturation, V: Brightness) using the  
239 Colorscience package (Gamma and Davis 2018). HSV is an alternative representation of the RGB  
240 color model that aligns with color-making attributes and color perception, in humans. As pictures were  
241 taken every two minutes, each picture corresponds to a time step of two minutes with the first picture  
242 of each interaction corresponding to  $t=0$  min.

243 From our measurements, Euclidian distances between colors over two time steps (1 and 2) in the 3D  
244 HSV color space were calculated (DEHSV) (Eqn 1). The next six derived variables which allow us to  
245 describe the color changes occurring during social interactions were computed for each color value  
246 (*i.e.* hue, saturation, brightness, and DEHSV) at each of the fifteen squares selected on the body of the  
247 chameleon: the variance, the maximum speed of change between two time steps, the maximum  
248 absolute color change (Eqn 2), the overall absolute color change (Eqn 3), the maximum color variation  
249 (Eqn 4), and the overall color variation (Eqn 5). DEHSV values enable us to summarise in one  
250 measurement the changes occurring in the three dimensions of the HSV color space. All variables  
251 (Fig. 3; Dollion et al. 2020) were calculated independently for UV pictures and VIS pictures, and  
252 averaged by body region (VIS: bands, interbands and lateral line; UV: absorbing, reflecting and lateral  
253 line). Maximum UV brightness and maximum UV saturation were also retrieved.

254 In our formulae  $x$  represents a color value (H, S, V or DEHSV);  $t_{\min}$  represents the beginning of the  
 255 interaction;  $t_{\max}$  represents the end of the interaction,  $t_{x_{\max}}$  is the time at which  $x$  reaches its maximum  
 256 value;  $t_{x_{\min}}$  is the time at which  $x$  reaches its minimum value;  $x_{t_{\max}}$  is the  $x$  value at the end of the  
 257 interaction; and  $x_{t_{\min}}$  is the  $x$  value at the beginning of the interaction. In Eqn 1, H is the hue value, S  
 258 is the saturation value and V is the brightness value.

$$259 \quad DEHSV_{x_1-x_2} = \sqrt{(S_1 \cos H_1 - S_2 \cos H_2)^2 + (S_1 \sin H_1 - S_2 \sin H_2)^2 + (V_1 - V_2)^2} \quad (1)$$

$$260 \quad \frac{X_{\max} - X_{\min}}{|t_{X_{\max}} - t_{X_{\min}}|} \quad (2)$$

$$261 \quad \frac{|X_{t_{\max}} - X_{t_{\min}}|}{t_{\max} - t_{\min}} \quad (3)$$

$$262 \quad \frac{\sum_{t=t_{X_{\min}}}^{t_{X_{\max}}} (|X_{t+1} - X_t|)}{|t_{X_{\max}} - t_{X_{\min}}|} \quad (4)$$

$$263 \quad \frac{\sum_{t=t_{\min}}^{t_{\max}} (|X_{t+1} - X_t|)}{t_{\max} - t_{\min}} \quad (5)$$

264 We were unable to model the color vision of the panther chameleon because the raw data required to  
 265 calculate the cone-catch values for visual system modeling (Vorobyev and Osorio 1998; Siddiqi 2004;  
 266 Troscianko and Stevens 2015) are no longer available for *Furcifer pardalis* (Bowmaker, personal  
 267 communication).

### 268 *Statistical analyses*

269 Before analyses, the distribution of each color change variable was transformed where needed using a  
 270 Box-Cox power function with “AID” package to meet the requirements of a normal distribution (Asar  
 271 et al. 2017) .

272 We summarized color change information using principal component analysis (PCA) on the centred  
 273 and scaled individual values of each color change variable with the “ade4” package (Dray and Dufour  
 274 2007). For the visible range (VIS) all variables were incorporated in the PCA, while for the UV range  
 275 (UV) only brightness and saturation were used, as hue was constrained by the filter and nearly  
 276 constant. The number of principal components (PCs) used for the subsequent analyses was chosen  
 277 using the broken stick method (Legendre and Legendre 1998), while representing at least 70% of the  
 278 variability and for which the contribution of each variable to PCs provided a relevant interpretation of  
 279 the color change.

280 To determine whether the color change exhibited by an individual could explain the outcome of an  
281 intrasexual agonistic interaction, generalized linear mixed-effects models (GLMM) ('glmer') using  
282 'lme4' package (Bates et al. 2015) were performed. We tested for the effect of color change (*i.e.* PCs  
283 and also maximum brightness and saturation for the UV range) either in the visible range or in the UV  
284 range, on the agonistic interaction outcome, considering the male identity and the test order as random  
285 factors. These were tested for each body region separately because we found a significant effect of the  
286 body region on most of the color change variables ( $P < 0.01$ ) in both VIS and UV (See Table S1).  
287 Male size (*i.e.* snout-vent-length) was not incorporated in any model as there was no significant effect  
288 of male size on the agonistic interaction outcome (GLMM:  $X^2=3.77$ ;  $P=0.052$ ).

289 We evaluated the relative importance (RI) of each predictor variables using model-averaging  
290 approaches (Burnham et al. 2011) within model sets for each body region from each spectral range, to  
291 build one model per region. From the model averaging results for each region we kept the variables  
292 with an RI value exceeding 50%.

293 All statistical analyses were conducted in R version 3.6.1 (R Core Team 2019). Additionally, model  
294 selection and model-averaging were undertaken using the R package MuMIn (Barton 2019).

## 295 **RESULTS**

### 296 *PCA results and interpretation*

297 In the visible spectrum, the first three principal components accounted for 70.47 % of the total  
298 variance. The first principal component (PC1) of our PCA describes hue and saturation changes and  
299 the second principal component (PC2) depicted brightness and DEHSV changes (Table 2). The third  
300 principal component (PC3) describes brightness changes (Table 2). In the UV, the first two principal  
301 components accounted for 73.93 % of the total variability. The first principal component (PC1)  
302 represents UV color changes, whereas the second principal (PC2) describes UV brightness changes  
303 (Table 2).

### 304 *Male color change and agonistic interaction outcome*

305 In the visual range, multimodel averaging uncovered PC2 (*i.e.* brightness & DEHSV changes) as  
306 being the best predictor for the band models (RI PC2=95%) and lateral line models (RI PC2=99%;  
307 Fig. 4D). Similarly, multimodel averaging on the interbands models uncovered PC1 (*i.e.* hue and  
308 saturation 310 changes) (RI=65%) and PC2 (RI=99%; Fig. 3D) as important predictors. GLMM on  
309 those selected 311 models show that males displaying more brightness and DESHV changes (PC2) at  
310 the bands (Fig. 4a; Fig. 5a) and the interbands (Fig. 4b; Fig. 5b) are significantly more likely to win.  
311 Although a tendency could also be observed for the lateral line, GLMM results are not significant for



312 this body region (Fig. 4c). For the interbands, GLMM results did not show a significant effect of the  
313 hue and saturation changes (PC1) on the probability of winning (Fig. 4b). In the UV range,  
314 multimodel averaging did not uncover any of our UV variables to be good predictors of the winning  
315 probability (i.e. RI < 50%; Fig. 4d; Fig. 6).

## 316 **DISCUSSION**

317 This study highlighted that color change in the visible range plays a key role in agonistic interaction  
318 outcomes in male *F. pardalis*. We showed that animals that exhibited more brightness and DEHSV  
319 changes (PC2) were more likely to win a contest. These results suggest that brightness changes play a  
320 prominent role in agonistic interactions in *F. pardalis*. This is likely the case for chameleons in general  
321 as our results align with previously published data for the veiled chameleon (*Chamaeleo calyptratus*,  
322 Duméril 1851) (Ligon and McGraw 2013). Similar to our results, the dynamics of the brightness  
323 changes matter in *C. calyptratus* (Ligon and McGraw 2013). In this species males that brighten faster  
324 were more likely to win a fight. Furthermore, brightness changes affected the likelihood of winning,  
325 but only at specific body regions, namely the bands and interbands. Hence, those two regions seem to  
326 have significant involvement in communication during agonistic interactions. Contrary to bands and  
327 interbands, the lateral line color change did not significantly explain the agonistic interaction outcome  
328 in male *F. pardalis*. Therefore, the lateral line appears not be involved in intraspecific communication.  
329 Yet, it likely plays a role in antipredator defence as a disruptive coloration pattern (Stevens and  
330 Merilaita 2009). To better understand the importance of patterns in communication in chameleons,  
331 further studies would benefit from quantifying those patterns using Quantitative Color Pattern  
332 Analysis (QPCA) (van den Berg et al. 2020) and doing so across time to investigate pattern changes as  
333 well.

334 Our results highlight the dynamic properties of color change, but also pinpoint the importance of the  
335 frequency of color change (i.e. maximum color variations and overall color variations; see Fig. 3). In  
336 other words, the number of times an individual changed color. Consequently, what we might observe  
337 here is that winners exhibit several brightness changes while losers exhibit a few or only one, namely  
338 darkening. During our experiments, we noticed that losers were generally darker than the winners at  
339 the end of the interaction. We can hypothesize that, as in *C. calyptratus* (Ligon 2014), male *F.*  
340 *pardalis* darken to communicate submission. Submissive behaviors are quite common (Lorenz 1966)  
341 and should be favored by natural selection because they would avoid unnecessary expenditure of time  
342 and energy on both sides (Matsumura and Hayden 2006). Brightness changes in chameleons are also  
343 involved in the context of camouflage in some species of *Bradypodion*, which decrease their  
344 brightness when exposed to highly visual predators (Stuart-Fox et al. 2008). Consequently, we might  
345 predict chameleons to increase brightness to increase conspicuousness to communicate, or  
346 alternatively to decrease it to prevent injuries from conspecifics and from being spotted by predators.

347 Unexpectedly, we found no relationship between UV coloration nor its dynamics and the outcome of  
348 intrasexual agonistic interactions, despite its presence in male *F. pardalis* (Fig. 1). This suggests that  
349 UV signals are likely not involved in chameleon communication during intrasexual competition,  
350 contrary to color changes in visible range. This might be explained by the fact that our illumination  
351 spectrum (Fig. S1) presents a gap (low number of photons) between 360 and 420 nm which  
352 corresponds to the peak sensitivity for the chameleon photoreceptors (375-385 nm; Bowmaker et al.  
353 2005). Hence, our individuals may use UV signals, yet our illumination spectrum may not be bright  
354 enough for them to detect those. The use of UV within this specific range would be beneficial for this  
355 chameleon because the spectral range around 430nm also seems to correspond to a spectral sensitivity  
356 gap in avian vision (Hart and Hunt, 2007; Hart and Vorobyev, 2005). Therefore, chameleons might  
357 use UV signals within specific range as private signals, but we were not able to assess this with our  
358 experimental design. Even though UV color change might not be involved in agonistic interactions,  
359 UV coloration and UV color change may still be involved in chameleon communication in other kinds  
360 of social interactions than agonistic. Investigating agonistic intrasexual interactions among males to  
361 study the function of rapid color change is of interest and has been studied in detail (Adamo and  
362 Hanlon 1996; O'Connor et al. 1999; Korzan et al. 2006; Umbers et al. 2013; Ligon and McGraw 2013;  
363 Batabyal and Thaker 2017). However, the role of color change in other contexts like mate choice  
364 remains poorly investigated. Yet, a recent study (Dollion et al. 2020) showed that color change is  
365 involved in chameleon mate choice and that females seem to rely on color change in both the visible  
366 and UV range. Consequently, our understanding of chameleon communication, and more broadly the  
367 communication function of rapid color change, will benefit from future studies investigating this  
368 phenomenon across diverse social contexts.

369 Our study would have benefited from using visual modelling (Vorobyev and Osorio 1998; Siddiqi  
370 2004; Troscianko and Stevens 2015) as this would have provided an animal vision perspective of the  
371 observed changes in colour. Unfortunately, the raw data required for such analyses were not available  
372 at the time of our study (Bowmaker, personal communication). Although the spectral sensitivities of  
373 other chameleons, like *Chameleo dilepis*, could have been used, the study of Bowmaker and  
374 colleagues (2005) showed that the spectral sensitivity of chameleons may vary greatly between genera.  
375 Future studies would obviously benefit from measuring spectral sensitivity in *Furcifer pardalis*. These  
376 data could be then used to define color pattern based on the spectral sensitivity of *F. pardalis* using  
377 JNDs (Just Noticeable difference) approach (Pike 2012) similarly to Ligon and McGraw (2013), but  
378 here taking into account UV range as well. Moreover, given the subspecies diversity and strong  
379 dichromatism in *Furcifer pardalis*, it would be of interest to investigate whether the spectral  
380 sensitivity differs between subspecies and/or between males and females.

381 The cost of different physiological pathways associated with different components of color change  
382 may be different. For example, changes in brightness are the result of the dispersion of melanosomes  
383 within dermal melanophores. The process of melanosome translocation is assumed to be achieved by  
384 the microtubules and actin filaments of the cytoskeleton and the associated motors, kinesin and dynein  
385 (Ligon and McCartney 2016). However, these motors consume energy (Hackney 1996), suggesting  
386 that brightness changes may be costly. Although the mechanisms through which melanophores and  
387 xantho-erythrophores allow color change are very similar, the function of iridiphores is quite different.  
388 Iridiphores enable color change thanks to the modification of the space between photonic  
389 nanostructures, here guanine platelets, within the iridiphores (Teyssier et al. 2015; Ligon and  
390 McCartney 2016). Iridiphores are thought to be the major actors of color change in the panther  
391 chameleon, in which small changes in the space between guanine platelets lead to noticeable  
392 differences in color (*i.e.* hue) (Teyssier *et al.* , 2015). Changing the arrangement of guanine platelets  
393 might thus be cheaper than manipulating brightness through melanosome translocation. If so, winners  
394 might invest more energy in changing brightness, yet the real cost of color change remains unknown  
395 to date.

396 To test these ideas, future work should focus on the physiological cost associated with each  
397 component of color change. This would provide insight into the information content of this dynamic  
398 signal which remains poorly investigated. Along the same vein, color change involves several types of  
399 pigments including carotenoids in xantho-erythrophores, and melanins in melanophores; pigments  
400 known to play key roles in immunoregulation and immunostimulation, lymphocyte proliferation, and  
401 free radical scavenging (Moller et al. 2000; Galván and Solano 2009). Thus, the differences in color  
402 change ability observed in this study may be related to high quantities of circulating pigments in  
403 dominant individuals. These individuals would then also be able to allocate these pigments to both  
404 immune system functioning and antioxidant protection in addition to their use in color signals. It  
405 would be interesting to explore this for UVs as well since UV coloration can also reflect individual  
406 quality, including immunocompetence (Martín and López 2009; Griggio et al. 2010) and testosterone  
407 levels (Roberts et al. 2009).

408 To conclude, this study underlines the importance of brightness changes in the visual spectrum to  
409 settle agonistic interactions in male *F. pardalis*. Unexpectedly, UV seems not to be involved in male  
410 intrasexual interactions in this species.

## 411 **References**

412 Adamo SA, Brown WM, King AJ, et al (2000) Agonistic and reproductive behaviours of the cuttlefish  
413 *Sepia officinalis* in a semi-natural environment. *Journal of Molluscan Studies* 66:417–418

- 414 Andersson M (1994) Coloration and Other Visual Signals. In: Sexual Selection. Princeton University  
415 Press, Princeton, New-Jersey
- 416 Asar Ö, İlk O, Dag O (2017) Estimating Box-Cox power transformation parameter via goodness-of-fit  
417 tests. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation* 46:91–105.  
418 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03610918.2014.957839>
- 419 Barton K (2019) MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference. Version 1. 43. 6URL [https://CRAN.R-project.](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn)  
420 [org/package=MuMIn](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn)
- 421 Batabyal A, Thaker M (2017) Signalling with physiological colours: high contrast for courtship but  
422 speed for competition. *Animal Behaviour* 129:229–236. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2017.05.018)  
423 [2017.05.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2017.05.018)
- 424 Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S (2015) Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models using lme4.  
425 *Journal of Statistical Software* 97:1–48
- 426 Bowmaker JK (2008) Evolution of vertebrate visual pigments. *Vision Research* 48:2022–2041.  
427 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2008.03.025>
- 428 Bowmaker JK, Loew ER, Ott M (2005) The cone photoreceptors and visual pigments of chameleons. *J*  
429 *Comp Physiol A* 191:925–932. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00359-005-0014-4>
- 430 Bradbury JW, Vehrencamp SL (2011) *Principles of Animal Communication*, 2nd edn. Sinauer  
431 Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts
- 432 Briffa M (2014) Agonistic Signals: Integrating Analysis of Functions and Mechanisms. In: J. Irschick  
433 D, Briffa M, Podos J (eds) *Animal Signaling and Function*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. ,  
434 Hoboken, NJ, USA, pp 141–173
- 435 Briffa M, Elwood RW (2004) Use of energy reserves in fighting hermit crabs. *Proceedings of the*  
436 *Royal Society of London Series B: Biological Sciences* 271:373–379.  
437 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2003.2633>
- 438 Briffa M, Sneddon LU (2007) Physiological constraints on contest behaviour. *Functional Ecology*  
439 21:627–637. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2006.01188.x>
- 440 Briscoe AD, Chittka L (2001) The Evolution of Color Vision in Insects. *Annual Reviews of*  
441 *Entomology* 46:471–510
- 442 Buchanan KL, Evans MR, Goldsmith AR (2003) Testosterone, dominance signalling and  
443 immunosuppression in the house sparrow, *Passer domesticus*. *Behavioral Ecology and*  
444 *Sociobiology* 55:50–59. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-003-0682-4>
- 445 Burnham KP, Anderson DR, Huyvaert KP (2011) AIC model selection and multimodel inference in  
446 behavioral ecology: some background, observations, and comparisons. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol*  
447 65:23–35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-010-1029-6>
- 448 Dollion AY, Herrel A, Marquis O, et al (2020) The colour of success: does female mate choice rely on  
449 male colour change in the chameleon *Furcifer pardalis*? *J Exp Biol* 223:.  
450 <https://doi.org/doi:10.1242/jeb.224550>
- 451 Doucet SM, Montgomerie R (2003) Multiple sexual ornaments in satin bowerbirds: ultraviolet  
452 plumage and bowers signal different aspects of male quality. *Behavioral Ecology* 14:503–509.  
453 <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arg035>

- 454 Dray S, Dufour A-B (2007) The ade4 package: implementing the duality diagram for ecologists.  
455 Journal of statistical software 22:1–20
- 456 Ferguson G (2004) The Panther chameleon: color variation, natural history, conservation, and captive  
457 management. Krieger Pub. Co. , Malabar, Fla.
- 458 Folstad I, Karter AJ (1992) Parasites, Bright Males, and the Immunocompetence Handicap. The  
459 American Naturalist 139:603–622
- 460 Foo YZ, Nakagawa S, Rhodes G, Simmons LW (2017) The effects of sex hormones on immune  
461 function: a meta-analysis. Biological Reviews 92:551–571. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12243>
- 462 Galván I, Solano F (2009) The evolution of eu- and pheomelanin traits may respond to an economy of  
463 pigments related to environmental oxidative stress. Pigment Cell & Melanoma Research  
464 22:339–342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-148X.2009.00559.x>
- 465 Gamma J, Davis G (2018) Colorsience : Color Science Methods and Data. Version v1. 0. 5URL  
466 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=colorsience>
- 467 Glass CW, Huntingford FA (1988) Initiation and Resolution of Fights between Swimming Crabs  
468 (*Liocarcinus depurator*). Ethology 77:237–249. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0310.1988.tb00207.x>
- 470 Griffith SC, Parker TH, Olson VA (2006) Melanin- versus carotenoid-based sexual signals: is the  
471 difference really so black and red? Animal Behaviour 71:749–763.  
472 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2005.07.016>
- 473 Griggio M, Zanollo V, Hoi H (2010) UV plumage color is an honest signal of quality in male  
474 budgerigars. Ecol Res 25:77–82. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11284-009-0632-3>
- 475 Hackney DD (1996) The Kinetic Cycles of Myosin, Kinesin, and Dynein. Annual Review of  
476 Physiology 53:731–750
- 477 Henschen AE, Whittingham LA, Dunn PO (2016) Oxidative stress is related to both melanin- and  
478 carotenoid-based ornaments in the common yellowthroat. Funct Ecol 30:749–758.  
479 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12549>
- 480 Hutton P, Seymoure BM, McGraw KJ, et al (2015) Dynamic color communication. Curr Opin Behav  
481 Sci 6:41–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2015.08.007>
- 482 Kelly CD, Godin J-GJ (2001) Predation risk reduces male-male sexual competition in the Trinidadian  
483 guppy (*Poecilia reticulata*). Behav Ecol Sociobiol 51:95–100.  
484 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002650100410>
- 485 Korzan WJ, Øverli Ø, Summers CH (2006) Future social rank: forecasting status in the green anole  
486 (*Anolis carolinensis*). acta ethol 9:48–57. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10211-006-0015-5>
- 487 Legendre P, Legendre L (1998) Numerical ecology, 2nd english edn. Elsevier, Amsterdam,  
488 Netherlands
- 489 Ligon RA (2014) Defeated chameleons darken dynamically during dyadic disputes to decrease danger  
490 from dominants. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 68:1007–1017. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-014-1713-z>  
491

- 492 Ligon RA, McCartney KL (2016) Biochemical regulation of pigment motility in vertebrate  
493 chromatophores: a review of physiological color change mechanisms. *Current Zoology*  
494 62:237–252. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cz/zow051>
- 495 Ligon RA, McGraw KJ (2016) Social costs enforce honesty of a dynamic signal of motivation. *Proc R*  
496 *Soc B* 283:20161873. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2016.1873>
- 497 Ligon RA, McGraw KJ (2013) Chameleons communicate with complex colour changes during  
498 contests: different body regions convey different information. *Biology Letters* 9:20130892–  
499 20130892. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2013.0892>
- 500 Lim MLM, Li D (2013) UV-Green Iridescence Predicts Male Quality during Jumping Spider  
501 Contests. *PLoS ONE* 8:e59774. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0059774>
- 502 Lorenz K (1966) *On aggression*, 1st edn. Methuen & Co., London
- 503 Martín J, López P (2009) Multiple color signals may reveal multiple messages in male Schreiber's  
504 green lizards, *Lacerta schreiberi*. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 63:1743–1755.  
505 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-009-0794-6>
- 506 Martin M, Meylan S, Haussy C, et al (2016) UV color determines the issue of conflicts but does not  
507 covary with individual quality in a lizard. *BEHECO* 27:262–270.  
508 <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arv149>
- 509 Matsumura S, Hayden TJ (2006) When should signals of submission be given?—A game theory model.  
510 *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 240:425–433. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2005.10.002>
- 511 Maynard-Smith J, Harper D (2003) *Animal Signals*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK
- 512 Megía-Palma R, Martínez J, Merino S (2016) A structural colour ornament correlates positively with  
513 parasite load and body condition in an insular lizard species. *Sci Nat* 103:52.  
514 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00114-016-1378-8>
- 515 Moller AP, Biard C, Blount JD, et al (2000) Carotenoid-dependent signals: indicators of foraging  
516 efficiency, immunocompetence or detoxification ability? *Poultry and Avian Biology Reviews*  
517 11:137–160
- 518 Nečas P (1999) *Chameleons: Nature's Hidden Jewels*. Krieger Pub Co
- 519 Parker GA (1974) Assessment strategy and the evolution of fighting behaviour. *Journal of Theoretical*  
520 *Biology* 47:223–243. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193\(74\)90111-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193(74)90111-8)
- 521 Pike TW (2012) Preserving perceptual distances in chromaticity diagrams. *Behavioral Ecology*  
522 23:723–728. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/ars018>
- 523 R Core Team (2019) *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Version 3.6.1. The R  
524 Foundation for Statistical Computing
- 525 Roberts ML, Ras E, Peters A (2009) Testosterone increases UV reflectance of sexually selected crown  
526 plumage in male blue tits. *Behavioral Ecology* 20:535–541.  
527 <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arp028>
- 528 Rohrlich ST, Rubin RW (1975) Biochemical characterization of crystals from the dermal iridophores  
529 of a chameleon *Anolis carolinensis*. *The Journal of Cell Biology* 66:635–645.  
530 <https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.66.3.635>

- 531 Rohwer S (1982) The Evolution of Reliable and Unreliable Badges of Fighting Ability. *Am Zool*  
532 22:531–546. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/22.3.531>
- 533 Sabol AC, Hellmann JK, Gray SM, Hamilton IM (2017) The role of ultraviolet coloration in  
534 intrasexual interactions in a colonial fish. *Animal Behaviour* 131:99–106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2017.06.027>  
535
- 536 Searcy WA, Nowicki S (2005) The evolution of animal communication : reliability and deception in  
537 signaling systems. Princeton university press, Princeton, Oxford
- 538 Senar JC (2006) Color Displays as Intrasexual Signals of Aggression and Dominance. In: *Bird*  
539 *Coloration: Function and evolution*. Harvard University Press, pp 87–136
- 540 Siddiqi A (2004) Interspecific and intraspecific views of color signals in the strawberry poison frog  
541 *Dendrobates pumilio*. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 207:2471–2485.  
542 <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.01047>
- 543 Stapley J, Whiting MJ (2006) Ultraviolet signals fighting ability in a lizard. *Biol Lett* 2:169–172.  
544 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2005.0419>
- 545 Steffen JE, Guyer CC (2014) Display behaviour and dewlap colour as predictors of contest success in  
546 brown anoles. *Biol J Linn Soc* 111:646–655. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bij.12229>
- 547 Stevens M, Merilaita S (2009) Defining disruptive coloration and distinguishing its functions.  
548 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 364:481–488.  
549 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0216>
- 550 Stuart-Fox D, Moussalli A (2008) Selection for Social Signalling Drives the Evolution of Chameleon  
551 Colour Change. *PLoS Biol* 6:e25. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0060025>
- 552 Stuart-Fox D, Moussalli A, Whiting MJ (2008) Predator-specific camouflage in chameleons. *Biol Lett*  
553 4:326–329. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2008.0173>
- 554 Taylor PW, Elwood RW (2003) The mismeasure of animal contests. *Animal Behaviour* 65:1195–  
555 1202. <https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.2003.2169>
- 556 Teyssier J, Saenko SV, van der Marel D, Milinkovitch MC (2015) Photonic crystals cause active  
557 colour change in chameleons. *Nature Communications* 6:  
558 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms7368>
- 559 Tibbetts EA, Dale J (2004) A socially enforced signal of quality in a paper wasp. *Nature* 432:218–222.  
560 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02949>
- 561 Tibbetts EA, Izzo A (2010) Social Punishment of Dishonest Signalers Caused by Mismatch between  
562 Signal and Behavior. *Current Biology* 20:1637–1640.  
563 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2010.07.042>
- 564 Tolley KA, Herrel A (2013) *The Biology of Chameleons*. Univ of California Press
- 565 Tringali A, Bowman R (2012) Plumage reflectance signals dominance in Florida scrub-jay,  
566 *Aphelocoma coerulescens*, juveniles. *Animal Behaviour* 84:1517–1522.  
567 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.09.025>
- 568 Troscianko J, Stevens M (2015) Image calibration and analysis toolbox – a free software suite for  
569 objectively measuring reflectance, colour and pattern. *Methods Ecol Evol* 6:1320–1331.  
570 <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12439>

- 571 Umbers KDL, Tatarinic NJ, Holwell GI, Herberstein ME (2013) Bright turquoise as an intraspecific  
572 signal in the chameleon grasshopper (*Kosciuscola tristis*). *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 67:439–447.  
573 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-012-1464-7>
- 574 van den Berg CP, Troscianko J, Endler JA, et al (2020) Quantitative Colour Pattern Analysis (QCPA):  
575 A comprehensive framework for the analysis of colour patterns in nature. *Methods Ecol Evol*  
576 11:316–332. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13328>
- 577 Vanhooydonck B, Herrel AY, Van Damme R, Irschick DJ (2005) Does dewlap size predict male bite  
578 performance in Jamaican *Anolis* lizards? *Funct Ecology* 19:38–42.  
579 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0269-8463.2005.00940.x>
- 580 Vorobyev M, Osorio D (1998) Receptor noise as a determinant of colour thresholds. *Proc R Soc Lond*  
581 *B* 265:351–358. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1998.0302>
- 582 Weaver RJ, Koch RE, Hill GE (2017) What maintains signal honesty in animal colour displays used in  
583 mate choice? *Phil Trans R Soc B* 372:20160343. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2016.0343>
- 584 Whiting MJ, Nagy KA, Bateman PW (2003) Evolution and maintenance of social status-signaling  
585 badges: experimental manipulations in lizards. In: *Lizard Social Behavior*. JHU Press, pp 47–  
586 82
- 587 Whiting MJ, Stuart-Fox DM, O'Connor D, et al (2006) Ultraviolet signals ultra-aggression in a lizard.  
588 *Animal Behaviour* 72:353–363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2005.10.018>
- 589 Xu M, Fincke OM (2015) Ultraviolet wing signal affects territorial contest outcome in a sexually  
590 dimorphic damselfly. *Animal Behaviour* 101:67–74.  
591 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2014.12.018>
- 592 Zahavi A (1975) Mate selection—A selection for a handicap. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 53:205–  
593 214. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193\(75\)90111-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193(75)90111-3)
- 594



595 **Table 1: Ethogram used to determine the outcome of the agonistic interactions.**

| <b>Interaction outcomes</b> | <b>Number observed</b> | <b>Description</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Win</b>                  | 24                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The individual goes to the barrier, tries to get as close as possible to its opponent by any means (<i>i.e.</i> tries to climb the barrier). The opponent exhibits one of the losing behaviors.</li> <li>- The individual spends most of the interaction close to the barrier. The opponent exhibits one of the losing behaviors.</li> <li>- The individual tries to attack its opponent by hitting the barrier. The opponent exhibits one of the losing behaviors.</li> <li>- The individual succeeds in crossing the barrier by pushing it fiercely at the bottom of the arena. The opponent exhibits one of the losing behaviors.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Tie</b>                  | 18                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Both individuals face each other and both hit the barrier fiercely trying to attack the opponent.</li> <li>- Both individuals seem to act indifferently towards the opponent's behaviors.</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| <b>Lose</b>                 | 24                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The individual stays far from the barrier for most of the interaction. The opponent exhibits one of the winning behaviors.</li> <li>- The individual turns back from its opponent and maintains a large distance from it. The opponent exhibits one of the winning behaviors.</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |

596

597 **Table 2: Contributions of original variables to principal components (PC) retained for further**  
598 **analysis.** Components accounted for at least 70% of the total variability. In the visible range (VIS) 3  
599 PCs were kept and accounted for 70.46 % of the total variability. In the ultraviolet range (UV) 2 PCs  
600 were kept and accounted for 73.94% of the total variability. Bold values represent high loadings.  
601 Variables were computed from the images of the 42 interactions among male *Furcifer pardalis*. In  
602 each image, the color was measured from the band, interband, and lateral lines in the range of 400-  
603 700nm and from UV absorbing region, UV reflecting region and lateral line in the UV range (320-  
604 400nm).

605

| <b>Spectral range</b>                                            | <b>VIS (400-700 nm)</b> |               |               | <b>UV (320-400 nm)</b> |               |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Principal component</b><br>(% of the variability explained)   | PC1                     | PC2           | PC3           | PC1                    | PC2           |
| <b>Variables</b>                                                 | <b>(29.77%</b>          | <b>(27.73</b> | <b>(12.97</b> | <b>(57.96</b>          | <b>(15.97</b> |
|                                                                  | <b>)</b>                | <b>%)</b>     | <b>%)</b>     | <b>%)</b>              | <b>%)</b>     |
| <b>Brightness variance</b>                                       | 0.47                    | <b>6.06</b>   | <b>10.36</b>  | 4.95                   | <b>27.99</b>  |
| <b>Saturation variance</b>                                       | <b>9.17</b>             | 0.36          | 0.02          | <b>13.08</b>           | 0.87          |
| <b>Hue variance</b>                                              | <b>7.97</b>             | 3.49          | 0.00          |                        |               |
| <b>DEHSV variance</b>                                            | 0.09                    | <b>8.68</b>   | <b>6.39</b>   |                        |               |
| <b>Maximum speed of brightness change between two time steps</b> | 0.91                    | <b>5.68</b>   | <b>15.21</b>  | <b>9.27</b>            | <b>8.83</b>   |
| <b>Maximum speed of saturation change between two time steps</b> | <b>8.28</b>             | 0.02          | 2.30          | <b>8.74</b>            | 5.15          |
| <b>Maximum speed of hue change between two time steps</b>        | <b>6.97</b>             | 4.05          | 0.55          |                        |               |
| <b>Maximum speed of DEHSV change between two time steps</b>      | 0.35                    | 4.08          | 0.03          |                        |               |
| <b>Maximum Brightness variation</b>                              | 0.69                    | <b>7.21</b>   | <b>8.38</b>   | <b>9.64</b>            | <b>9.00</b>   |
| <b>Maximum Saturation variation</b>                              | <b>8.48</b>             | 0.05          | 0.30          | <b>12.59</b>           | 0.11          |
| <b>Maximum Hue variation</b>                                     | <b>8.07</b>             | 3.01          | 0.01          |                        |               |
| <b>Maximum DEHSV variation</b>                                   | 0.06                    | <b>8.79</b>   | 1.28          |                        |               |
| <b>Maximum absolute Brightness change</b>                        | 0.56                    | <b>8.10</b>   | <b>4.27</b>   | <b>9.16</b>            | 7.45          |
| <b>Maximum absolute Saturation change</b>                        | <b>8.36</b>             | 0.15          | 0.32          | <b>9.64</b>            | 0.01          |

|                                           |              |             |              |             |              |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| <b>Maximum absolute Hue change</b>        | <b>8.11</b>  | 2.30        | 0.53         |             |              |
| <b>Maximum absolute DESHV change</b>      | 0.25         | 3.72        | <b>13.66</b> |             |              |
| <b>Overall Brightness variation</b>       | 1.54         | <b>8.46</b> | <b>5.28</b>  | 5.39        | <b>26.17</b> |
| <b>Overall Saturation variation</b>       | <b>10.18</b> | 1.14        | 0.12         | <b>9.94</b> | 2.67         |
| <b>Overall Hue variations</b>             | <b>9.24</b>  | 1.95        | 0.39         |             |              |
| <b>Overall DESHV variation</b>            | 0.06         | <b>8.79</b> | 1.28         |             |              |
| <b>Overall absolute Brightness change</b> | 0.76         | <b>6.22</b> | 1.97         | 7.59        | 0.62         |
| <b>Overall absolute Saturation change</b> | 4.11         | 2.79        | <b>6.42</b>  | 0.01        | <b>11.15</b> |
| <b>Overall absolute Hue change</b>        | <b>5.11</b>  | 0.12        | <b>5.58</b>  |             |              |
| <b>Overall absolute DEHSV change</b>      | 0.21         | <b>4.79</b> | <b>15.38</b> |             |              |

606

607

608 **Figures captions:**

609 **Figure 1: Picture and schematic representation of the experimental setup.** **a:** Picture of the setup  
610 from one of our cameras. **b:** Schematic drawing of the setup showing where the cameras were  
611 positioned. **c:** Schematic drawing of the light source positions from the top: **1** = 100 Watt. 2800  
612 Kelvin. 1320 lumen halogen bulbs, **2** = 60 Watt. 2700 Kelvin incandescent bulbs, **3** = 60 Watt. 4000  
613 Kelvin. 806 lumen LED bulbs, **4** = UVB fluorescent tube ReptiSun® 10. 0 High Output UVB Bulb **5** =  
614 Reptile systems New Dawn T5 LED and **6** = Arcadia T5 D3+ Desert 12% Reptile Fluorescent Lamp  
615 (Figure adapted from Dollion *et al.* 2020).




616 **Fig. 2: Color patterns sampled during male-male *F. pardalis* agonistic interactions.** As  
617 interindividual variation exists. we focused on common patterns. Body regions were characterized as  
618 bands (○). interbands (□) and lateral line (Δ) in the visible spectrum (VIS; 400 to 700 nm). However,  
619 for the UV range (UV: 320 to 400 nm), body regions were different and characterized by their UV  
620 properties as Absorbing (○), reflecting (□) and lateral line (Δ) which either absorb or reflect through  
621 time and according to the individual. (Illustration by Julien NORWOOD) (Figure adapted from  
622 Dollion *et al.* 2020).


623 **Fig. 3: Schematic representation of the different computed color change variables.** Where X  
624 represents any color value (*e. g.* hue, saturation, brightness or DEHSV). **a:** Overall color variation in  
625 light blue and overall absolute color change in dark blue; **b:** Maximum color variation in light red and  
626 maximum absolute color change dark red.

627 **Fig. 4: Relationships between winning probability and color change variables in the visible range**  
628 **(VIS) selected by the model selection by AICc; and the relative importance of color variables to**  
629 **models, based on multimodel averaging, in both visible and UV range.** Ribbons illustrate the 95%  
630 confidence interval. A winning probability of 100 % corresponds to “winner”, while zero corresponds  
631 to “loser”. **a:** Relationship between winning probability and color change at the bands. **b:** Relationship  
632 between winning probability and color change at the interbands. **c:** Relationship between winning  
633 probability and color change at the lateral line and **b:** RI values of color change variables (PCs) in the  
634 visible range predicting intrasexual agonistic interaction outcome.


635 **Figure 5: Effect of the color change in the visible range in adult males *F. pardalis* on the**  
636 **outcomes of intrasexual agonistic interaction.** Boxplots showing respectively: **a:** Color changes  
637 occurring at the bands, **b:** Color changes occurring at the interbands and **c:** Color changes occurring at  
638 the lateral line. PC1 = hue and saturation changes, PC2 = brightness and DEHSV changes, PC3 =  
639 brightness changes.

640 **Fig. 6: Effect of the color change in the UV range in adult males *F. pardalis* on the outcomes of**  
641 **intrasexual agonistic interaction.** Boxplots showing respectively: **a:** Color changes occurring in  
642 regions that absorb UVs, **b:** Color changes occurring in regions that reflect UVs and **c:** Color changes  
643 occurring at the lateral line. PC1 = UV color changes. PC2 = UV brightness changes.  
644



**a****b****c**







**Visible (400-700nm)**



**UV (320-400nm)**












**Colour change Variables :**

- Hue & saturation changes (VIS: PC1)
- Brightness & DESHV changes (VIS: PC2)
- Brightness changes (VIS: PC3; UV: PC2)
- UV color changes (UV: PC1)
- Maximum UV saturation
- Maximum UV brightness







# SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Do male panther chameleons (*Furcifer pardalis*) use different aspects of colour change in the visible and the ultraviolet range to settle intrasexual agonistic interactions?

running title: Male mate agonistic interaction and colour change

Alexis Y. Dollion<sup>\*1,2,3</sup>, Sandrine Meylan<sup>2</sup>, Olivier Marquis<sup>3</sup>, Marc Théry<sup>4</sup>, Mathieu Leroux-Coyau<sup>2</sup> and Anthony Herrel<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Université Paris Descartes, Sorbonne Paris Cité, Paris 75006, France

<sup>2</sup>Sorbonne Université, CNRS, IRD, INRA, Institut d'Ecologie et des Sciences de l'Environnement de Paris, iEES-Paris, 75252, Paris, France

<sup>3</sup>Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Parc Zoologique de Paris, 75012 Paris, France

<sup>4</sup> **Current address** : Département Adaptations du vivant, UMR 7179 C.N.R.S/M.N.H.N, 75005, Paris, France

\*Address for correspondence: [dollion.alexis.14340@gmail.com](mailto:dollion.alexis.14340@gmail.com); +33 (0) 7 83 67 96 55

**Table S1.** Results of linear mixed-effects models testing for the effect of mate Body region on the color changes variables in both visible and UV range

| Spectral range | Color variable                  | Body region |           | UV body region |           |
|----------------|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|
|                |                                 | $F_{2,123}$ | $P$       | $F_{2,122}$    | $P$       |
| VISIBLE        | PC1(Hue & Saturation changes)   | 10.90       | <0.001*** |                |           |
|                | PC2(Brightness & DEHSV changes) | 12.34       | <0.001*** |                |           |
|                | PC3(Brightness changes)         | 14.04       | <0.001*** |                |           |
| UV             | PC1(UV color change changes)    |             |           | 0.12           | 0.89      |
|                | PC2(UV brightness changes)      |             |           | 1.59           | 0.208     |
|                | Maximum UV saturation           |             |           | 23.80          | <0.001*** |
|                | Maximum UV brightness           |             |           | 45.29          | <0.001*** |

**Figure S1: Irradiance spectra of the arena used for the behavioural experiments.** For irradiance measurements, we used an AvaSpec-2048 spectrometer calibrated between 200 and 850 nm using an Ocean Optics cosine-corrected (CC3-UV) sensor and an optic fiber (FC-UV600-2-ME) calibrated in micromoles per square meter per second with an Avantes AvaLight-DHS deuterium-halogen light source and then converted into microwatt per square centimeter per nanometer. (D= distance from the light sources)

