A comprehensive phylogeny and revised taxonomy illuminate the origin and diversification of the global radiation of Papilio (Lepidoptera: Papilionidae)

Fabien L. Condamine, Rémi Allio, Eliette L. Reboud, Julian R. Dupuis, Emmanuel F.A. Toussaint, Nathan Mazet, Shao-Ji Hu, Delano S. Lewis, Krushnamegh Kunte, Adam M. Cotton, et al.

HAL Id: hal-04031194
https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-04031194v1

Submitted on 14 Apr 2023

1   *Submitted to:* Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution

2

3   *Title*

4   **A comprehensive phylogeny and revised taxonomy illuminate the origin and**

5   **diversification of the global radiation of *Papilio* (Lepidoptera: Papilionidae)**

6

7   *Authors*

8   Fabien L. Condamine [a, *], Rémi Allio [a,b], Eliette L. Reboud [a], Julian R. Dupuis [c], Emmanuel

9   F.A. Toussaint [d], Nathan Mazet [a], Shao-Ji Hu [e,f], Delano S. Lewis [g], Krushnamegh Kunte [h]†,

10   Adam M. Cotton [i]†, and Felix A. H. Sperling [j]†

11

12   *Affiliations*

13   [a] *Institut des Sciences de l'Evolution de Montpellier (Université de Montpellier | CNRS | IRD |*

14   *EPHE), Place Eugène Bataillon, 34095 Montpellier, France*

15   [b] *Centre de Biologie pour la Gestion des Populations, INRAE, CIRAD, IRD, Montpellier*

16   *SupAgro, Université de Montpellier, Montpellier, France*

17   [c] *Department of Entomology, University of Kentucky, S-225 Ag Science Center North, 1100*

18   *South Limestone, Lexington, KY 40546, USA*

19   [d] *Natural History Museum of Geneva, CP 6434, 1211, Geneva 6, Switzerland*

20   [e] *Yunnan Key Laboratory of International Rivers and Transboundary Eco-security, Yunnan*

21   *University, Kunming, 650500, China*

22   [f] *Institute of International Rivers and Eco-security, Yunnan University, Kunming, 650500,*

23   *China*

24   [g] *Burman University, 6730 University Drive, Lacombe T4L 2E5, AB, Canada*

25   [h] *National Centre for Biological Sciences, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, GKVK*

26   *Campus, Bellary Road, Bangalore 560065, India*

27   [i] *86/2 Moo 5, Tambon Nong Kwai, Hang Dong, Chiang Mai, Thailand*

28   [j] *University of Alberta, Department of Biological Sciences, Edmonton T6G 2E9, AB, Canada*

29

30   † Co-senior authors

31

32   *Correspondence (*):* Fabien L. Condamine, Institut des Sciences de l'Evolution de

33   Montpellier, Place Eugène Bataillon, 34095 Montpellier, France. Email:

34   fabien.condamine@gmail.com

35

36   **Running head:** *Global diversification of* Papilio *butterflies*

37 ***Abstract***

38 The swallowtail genus *Papilio* (Lepidoptera: Papilionidae) is species rich, distributed

39 worldwide, and has broad morphological habits and ecological niches. Because of its elevated

40 species richness, it has been historically difficult to reconstruct a densely sampled phylogeny

41 for this clade. Here we provide a taxonomic working list for the genus, resulting in 235 *Papilio*

42 species, and assemble a molecular dataset of seven gene fragments representing ca. 80% of the

43 currently described diversity. Phylogenetic analyses reconstructed a robust tree with highly

44 supported relationships within subgenera, although a few nodes in the early history of the Old

45 World *Papilio* remain unresolved. Contrasting with previous results, we found that *Papilio*

46 *alexanor* is sister to all Old World *Papilio* and that the subgenus *Eleppone* is no longer

47 monotypic. The latter includes the recently described Fijian *Papilio natewa* with the Australian

48 *Papilio anactus* and is sister to subgenus *Araminta* (formerly included in subgenus *Menelaides*)

49 occurring in Southeast Asia. Our phylogeny also includes rarely studied (*P. antimachus*, *P.*

50 *benguetana*) or endangered species (*P. buddha*, *P. chikae*). Taxonomic changes resulting from

51 this study are elucidated. Molecular dating and biogeographic analyses indicate that *Papilio*

52 originated ca. 30 million years ago (Oligocene), in a northern region centered on Beringia. A

53 rapid early Miocene radiation in the Paleotropics is revealed within Old World *Papilio*,

54 potentially explaining their low early branch support. Most subgenera originated in the early to

55 middle Miocene followed by synchronous southward biogeographic dispersals and repeated

56 local extirpations in northern latitudes. This study provides a comprehensive phylogenetic

57 framework for *Papilio* with clarification of subgeneric systematics and species taxonomic

58 changes enumerated, which will facilitate further studies to address questions on their ecology

59 and evolutionary biology using this model clade.

60

61 *Keywords:*

62 Butterflies, Historical biogeography, Macroevolution, Paleotropics, Systematics, Taxonomy

63

1. Introduction

Insects are indisputably the most diverse terrestrial eukaryotic clade, with over a million insect species described and many more awaiting discovery or formal description (Stork, 2018). This staggering species diversity is unevenly distributed across the insect tree of life, with many clades comprising substantially more species than their sister clades (Grimaldi and Engel, 2005; Engel, 2015). For instance, within ants (Formicidae), some genera such as *Camponotus* and *Pheidole* have over 1,500 and 1,100 species, respectively (Hölldobler and Wilson, 1990), while their corresponding sister clades have less than 700 and 200 species, respectively (Economo *et al.*, 2018). Within flies (Diptera), the most well-known case is the genus *Drosophila,* which has more than 1600 species (Brake and Bächli, 2013; O'Grady and DeSalle, 2018), which is sister to a clade composed of seven genera including about 600 species (Wiegmann *et al.*, 2011; O'Grady and DeSalle, 2018). Such genera are difficult to resolve phylogenetically and manage taxonomically. The genus rank is widely used in molecular, morphological and paleontological systematics. However, species-rich genera that are difficult to delimit can also be treated using the subgenus rank, rendering their relationships less complicated while allowing flexibility to taxonomic ranks that are less frequently employed (Winston, 1999; Teta, 2019).

In Lepidoptera, swallowtail butterflies (Papilionidae) of the genus *Papilio* Linnaeus, 1758 include more than 200 species and represent more than one third of all Papilionidae (**Fig. 1**), which has about 600 recognized species (Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a; Haüser *et al.*, 2005; Condamine *et al.*, 2012; Nakae, 2021a). As one of the most well-known and broadly studied groups of insects, *Papilio* swallowtails are recognized as model organisms in evolutionary biology, ecology, genomics, and conservation biology (e.g. Collins and Morris, 1985; Scriber *et al.*, 1995; Kunte, 2009; Kunte *et al.*, 2014; Dupuis and Sperling, 2015). Yet the phylogeny of *Papilio* is far from being resolved despite numerous studies (Ae, 1979; Hancock, 1983; Igarashi, 1984; Miller, 1987; Tyler *et al.*, 1994; Scriber *et al.*, 1995; Aubert *et al.*, 1999; Caterino and Sperling, 1999; Reed and Sperling, 1999; Yagi *et al.*, 1999; Caterino *et al.*, 2001; Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a; Condamine *et al.*, 2013a; Lewis *et al.*, 2015; Wu *et al.*, 2015; Owens *et al.*, 2017, 2020). Ecological and evolutionary hypotheses on their diversification rely on a comprehensive and strongly supported phylogeny as well as accurate age estimates for significant phylogenetic events like host-plant shifts or mimicry evolution.

The first classifications of *Papilio* species relied on morphological characters (summarized in Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a: table 1). Munroe (1961) divided *Papilio* into five sections but did not designate them as subgenera because they lacked a simple diagnosis with adult characters. Using an explicitly cladistic estimation of relationships within *Papilio*,

4

98   Hancock (1983) recognized six genera (*Chilasa*, *Eleppone*, *Heraclides*, *Papilio*, *Princeps*, and

99   *Pterourus*) based on phylogenetic evidence and inferred evolutionary antiquity, but this

100 phylogeny also suffered from lack of character justification. Another classification was

101 proposed by Igarashi (1984) based on the morphology of immature stages, but this work did

102 not represent all of Hancock's genera. Igarashi (1984) nonetheless recognized seven genera

103 (*Achillides*, *Agehana*, *Chilasa*, *Euchenor*, *Menelaides*, *Papilio*, and *Pterourus*), with numerous

104 discrepancies between his treatment and that of Hancock (1983). Hancock's classification was

105 criticized by Miller (1987), who did not consider elevation of *Papilio* subdivisions to the genus

106 level to be justified. However, one group within *Papilio* was elevated in a widely available

107 checklist of swallowtail butterflies (Haüser *et al.*, 2005), where *Chilasa* was treated as a distinct

108 genus. It has been challenging to apply the rules of the PhyloCode in designating subgroups

109 within *Papilio* to generic status as it has proven difficult to find morphological synapomorphies

110 as required by the PhyloCode (Cantino and de Queiroz, 2020). The sole use of genetic data to

111 delimit taxa has not been adequately addressed by the PhyloCode.

112   Due to the limitations of traditional morphological approaches and with the

113 development of new molecular systematic approaches, the classification of *Papilio* has received

114 significant attention in the last three decades. Relationships among species within the *P.*

115 *machaon* and *P. glaucus-troilus* species groups were studied based on allozyme variation

116 (Sperling, 1987; Hagen and Scriber, 1991). Restriction fragment length polymorphism of

117 mitochondrial DNA was used to compare taxa within the same species groups in later studies

118 (Sperling, 1991, 1993a, 1993b; Sperling and Harrison, 1994, Tyler *et al.*, 1994). Phylogenetic

119 relationships within *Papilio* have also been analyzed using DNA sequences of a variety of

120 genes, but these studies have been confined to single species groups or local geographic areas

121 (e.g. Vane-Wright *et al.*, 1999; Yagi *et al.*, 1999; Zakharov *et al.*, 2004b; Condamine *et al.*,

122 2013; Lewis *et al.*, 2015; Owens *et al.*, 2017, 2020; Dupuis and Sperling, 2020; Joshi and Kunte,

123 2022) or have included limited sampling across *Papilio* subdivisions (e.g. Aubert *et al.*, 1999;

124 Caterino and Sperling, 1999; Reed and Sperling, 1999; Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a). Although the

125 two latest molecular phylogenetic studies of Papilionidae (Condamine *et al.*, 2012; Allio *et al.*,

126 2021) substantially increased the fraction of sampled species, they did not provide a sufficient

127 resolution to assess the fine-scale taxonomic delimitation within the genus. Yet, a number of

128 systematic enigmas remain in *Papilio,* starting with the number of valid species to consider in

129 the genus.

130   Here we establish a list of valid *Papilio* species based on previous molecular studies

131 and build a reliable and comprehensive time-calibrated species-level phylogeny for the genus

Papilio using seven gene fragments for ca. 80% of the total species diversity. Our study aims at establishing a reference phylogenetic framework to evaluate both subgeneric monophyly and species relationships within *Papilio*, for the enigmatic and long-debated placement of several groups and species. The phylogeny includes species that are key for testing biogeographic hypotheses (e.g. *P. anactus*, *P. benguetana*), evolution of mimicry (e.g. *Chilasa*, *P. nobilis*), and host-plant associations (e.g. *P. alexanor*), as well as species that are rare and insufficiently studied (e.g. *P. antimachus*, *P. himeros*), endangered (*P. buddha*, *P. chikae*) or recently described (e.g. the Fijian *P. natewa*). The recent discovery of *P. natewa* (Tennent *et al.*, 2018) may clarify the systematic position of *P. anactus*, presently placed in a monotypic subgenus (*Eleppone*) but with an unstable phylogenetic position (Hancock, 1979; Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a; Condamine *et al.*, 2012). Indeed, external morphology and genitalia of *P. natewa* suggest a phylogenetic affinity with *P. anactus* (Tennent *et al.*, 2018), but this remains to be tested. Without knowledge of its larva, the enigmatic African giant swallowtail, *P. antimachus*, has often been placed in species groups of two distinct *Papilio* subgenera (*Druryia* or *Princeps*), and the subgenus *Druryia* has never been studied with a molecular approach. The position of the *nobilis* species-group also remains poorly resolved, wavering between the iconic *phorcas* and *hesperus* species-groups (Munroe, 1961, and Hancock, 1983, respectively). Yet, its placement has important implications for the understanding of mimicry evolution in the *phorcas* group (Vane-Wright *et al.*, 1999) and evolution of iridescent wings (common origin or convergence with the subgenus *Achillides*). Including the giant blue swallowtail, *P. zalmoxis*, in the phylogeny could help solve this puzzle. Moreover, the monophyly and rank of the danaine- and moth-mimicking *Chilasa* are uncertain. Munroe (1961) split its members among two *Papilio* subunits, but Hancock (1983) placed them together in a single genus, considered to be the sister taxon of *Eleppone*. Finally, we also revisited the placement of *P. alexanor*. The relationships of this odd European Apiaceae feeder have been examined several times (Aubert *et al.*, 1999; Caterino and Sperling, 1999; Reed and Sperling, 1999; Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a), nearly reaching a consensus that *P. alexanor* is sister to a clade comprising *Pterourus* and *Chilasa* (Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a; Condamine *et al.*, 2012). However, no strong resolution has been obtained and this position has been questioned with phylogenomic analyses (Allio *et al.*, 2020), albeit with less-than-ideal sampling density. We not only resolve these systematic conflicts and uncertainties, but also provide a phylogenetic framework to infer an evolutionary timescale for *Papilio*, estimate historical biogeography, and investigate heterogeneity of diversification dynamics.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Taxon sampling and molecular data

We first established a taxonomic working list of *Papilio* species (**Table 1**). This species list combines several previous studies (Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a, 2004b; Condamine *et al.*, 2012, 2013a, 2013b; Shiraiwa *et al.*, 2014; Lewis *et al.*, 2015; Wu *et al.*, 2015; Owens *et al.*, 2017, 2020; Allio *et al.*, 2021; Joshi and Kunte, 2022). Like all other working lists (Garnett *et al.*, 2020), we acknowledge that this species list remains provisional and is likely to evolve through time (i.e. species are hypotheses, Pante *et al.*, 2015). Indeed, *Papilio* butterflies will inevitably continue to receive attention as a model clade, and we expect many of the species' boundaries to be tested with new genomic data and evolutionary models in further studies, which are very likely to eventually modify the taxonomic list (e.g. Kunte *et al.*, 2011; Dupuis and Sperling, 2022). From the 235 species that are currently recognized in the new taxonomic list presented here for the genus *Papilio*, we sampled 184 species representing 78.3% of the total diversity (**Table 1**). However, the total number of species will evolve with further systematic studies, especially of the African clades that are currently poorly represented in our analysis (**Fig. 2**). We added 18 outgroup species representing several swallowtail genera to root the *Papilio* tree and provide deeper relationships for secondary calibration of nodes based on previous dated studies (Condamine *et al.*, 2012; Allio *et al.*, 2021). The outgroups included: (1) two species of the genus *Meandrusa* (*M. payeni* and *M. sciron*) to represent the sister genus of *Papilio* and define the crown of tribe Papilionini, (2) five species of the tribe Troidini (*Battus philenor, Ornithoptera priamus*, *Parides photinus*, *Pharmacophagus antenor* and *Troides helena*), which is sister to Papilionini, (3) two species of the tribe Leptocircini (*Graphium sarpedon* and *Lamproptera meges*), which is sister to all other Papilioninae, (4) two species of the tribe Parnassiini (*Hypermnestra helios* and *Parnassius apollo*), (5) four species of the tribe Zerynthiini (*Allancastria louristana*, *Bhutanitis mansfieldi*, *Sericinus montela* and *Zerynthia polyxena*), (6) two species of the tribe Luehdorfiini (*Archon apollinaris* and *Luehdorfia puziloi*), and (7) the single species of the subfamily Baroniinae, *Baronia brevicornis*, which is the sister lineage to all Papilionidae and was used as root of the phylogenetic tree (Condamine *et al.*, 2012; Allio *et al.*, 2020). Overall, the molecular dataset comprised 202 species (184 ingroups and 18 outgroups).

We assembled a supermatrix dataset with data extracted from Sanger sequencing and genome sequencing available on GenBank as of September 2021. The molecular data mainly came from previous studies (e.g. Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a, 2004b; Condamine *et al.*, 2012, 2013a, 2013b; Lewis *et al.*, 2015; Wu *et al.*, 2015; Owens *et al.*, 2017, 2020; Allio *et al.*, 2021; Joshi

7

200 and Kunte, 2022). We used five mitochondrial gene fragments (*COI*, *COII*, *ND1*, *ND5* and
201 *rRNA 16S*) and two nuclear gene fragments (*EF-1a* and *Wg*), chosen based on their availability
202 among *Papilio* species. We aligned the DNA sequences for the rRNA 16S using MAFFT 7.110
203 (Katoh and Standley, 2013) with the E-INS-i algorithm, while we aligned the coding genes
204 using MACSE 2.00 (Ranwez *et al.*, 2011) with the *alignSequences* subprogram and default
205 options. All the resulting alignments were checked for codon stops and eventually refined by
206 eye with Mesquite 3.7 (Maddison and Maddison, 2021). All gene alignments were concatenated
207 into a nucleotide supermatrix, which is available in FigShare (Data 1:
208 https://figshare.com/s/a32288db7e6429714a62).
209

2.2. Inferring phylogenetic relationships

211 We performed both maximum likelihood (ML) and Bayesian Inference (BI) to reconstruct
212 phylogenetic relationships. Although phylogenomic approaches have used amino acids on
213 Papilionidae at the genus level (Allio *et al.*, 2020), all our analyses relied on nucleotides for the
214 tree inference of Papilio because the molecular dataset is limited to seven gene fragments and
215 converting it to amino acids will result in a smaller dataset with limited phylogenetic
216 information given the species diversity of the focal clade. ML inference was implemented with
217 IQ-TREE 2.1.2 (Minh *et al.*, 2020) using ModelFinder to select the best-fit partition scheme
218 and the best-fitting substitution model for each partition (*-m MFP+MERGE* option, Chernomor
219 *et al.*, 2016; Kalyaanamoorthy *et al.*, 2017). For IQ-TREE analyses, we estimated the most
220 likely tree with 100 separate ML searches, which after initial model optimization on a
221 parsimony tree used 100 random tree topologies as starting trees for each search. As
222 recommended, we optimized ML searches to avoid local optima by (1) increasing the number
223 of unsuccessful iterations before stopping tree optimization to 500 (*-nstop 500* option), and (2)
224 decreasing the perturbation strength for randomized NNI to 0.2 (*-pers 0.2* option). Statistical
225 reliability of the ML tree was evaluated with 100 non-parametric bootstraps under the optimal
226 partitioned model to obtain ML bootstrap percentages (BP$_{PART}$). To compare branch supports,
227 a second ML analysis with IQ-TREE was carried out under the same conditions but with 2,000
228 ultrafast bootstraps (UFBS$_{PART}$; Hoang *et al.*, 2018). BS values and UFBS values were
229 considered strong when higher than 70% and 95%, respectively. We also assessed branch
230 support using Shimodaira-Hasegawa approximate likelihood ratio test (SH-aLRT; Guindon *et*
231 *al.*, 2010), with SH-aLRT values above 80% considered as strong support for a clade.

232 BI analyses were performed using MrBayes 3.2.7a (Ronquist *et al.*, 2012). Because
233 ModelFinder includes more substitution models than BEAST or MrBayes, the most likely

partitioning scheme and substitution models can be altered, the molecular dataset was analyzed with PartitionFinder 2.1.1 (Lanfear *et al.*, 2017) to estimate the best partition scheme with an initial subset of 19 possible partitions (all three codon positions for coding sequences and non-coding genes treated separately). Partitions and corresponding optimal substitution models were searched using the *greedy* algorithm, the *mrbayes* set of models, and the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) to compare the fit of different models. We used reversible-jump Markov chain Monte Carlo (rjMCMC) to sample the entire space of possible models instead of using the *a priori* substitution models recovered by PartitionFinder (Huelsenbeck *et al.*, 2004). MrBayes analyses were performed with two separate runs, a random starting tree, and eight rjMCMC (one cold and seven incrementally heated, *temp=0.1*) running for 30 million generations with tree sampling occurring every 3,000 generations (resulting in 10,000 trees) to calculate the clade posterior probabilities (PP$_{PART}$). We also specified (1) a uniform prior probability of phylogenies (i.e. all possible trees are considered *a priori* equally probable), and (2) a uniform prior probability distribution on branch lengths. Convergence of the Bayesian runs was ensured by checking the average deviation of split frequencies (ADSF), the potential scale reduction factor (PSRF) values, the effective sample size (ESS) of all parameters, and by plotting the log-likelihood of the samples against the number of generations in Tracer 1.7.1 (Rambaut *et al.*, 2018). The runs had to have values of ADSF approaching zero, PSRF close to 1.0 and ESS above 200 to assume convergence. All trees that predated the time needed to reach a log-likelihood plateau were discarded as burn-in, and the remaining samples were used to generate a 50% majority rule consensus tree (option *halfcompat*). Branch support was estimated and PP$_{PART}$≥0.95 was considered to indicate strong support for a given clade (Douady *et al.*, 2003). All MrBayes analyses were performed on the computer cluster CIPRES Science Gateway (Miller *et al.*, 2015), using BEAGLE (Ayres *et al.*, 2012) with default parameters.

BI was also conducted using PhyloBayes MPI 1.8 (Lartillot *et al.*, 2013) under the CAT-GTR-Γ_4 mixture model (Lartillot and Philippe, 2004), which has proven to perform well on large molecular datasets (e.g. Allio *et al.*, 2020). The analyses were conducted on the nucleotide dataset. For each analysis, two independent MCMC starting from a random tree were run at least 10,000 cycles, with trees and associated model parameters being sampled every 10 cycles. The initial 2,000 trees sampled in each MCMC run were discarded as burn-in after checking for convergence in both likelihood and model parameters (*tracecomp* subprogram), and clade posterior probability (*bpcomp* subprogram). We checked the mean (*meandiff*) discrepancy observed across all bipartitions, considering that *meandiff* < 0.01 indicates convergence. The

267   50% majority-rule Bayesian consensus tree and the associated posterior probabilities (PP$_{CAT}$)

268   were then computed from the remaining trees using *bpcomp*.

269

270   ***2.3. Testing topology hypotheses***

271   We conducted tests of topology hypotheses with MrBayes when phylogenetic analyses did not

272   recover the same relationships as those from previous studies (see in Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a;

273   Condamine *et al.*, 2012; Lewis *et al.*, 2015). To do so, we conducted topology hypotheses by

274   enforcing the clade (species, genera) to be sister to another clade or to be monophyletic in a

275   case of non-monophyly. Bayesian inferences were run with the exact same priors and

276   parameters (see above) but including constraints and a model to compute the marginal

277   likelihood estimate (MLE) to obtain the likelihood score of each constrained topology, which

278   was then compared to the score of an unconstrained topology.

279   We used stepping-stone sampling (Xie *et al.*, 2011) to estimate the marginal likelihood

280   of the specified topology and the unconstrained topology. Stepping-stone sampling (SS) is

281   considerably more accurate than the harmonic mean of the likelihoods from a standard MCMC

282   run, and has been shown to be more efficient than the thermodynamic integration (Baele *et al.*,

283   2013). SS estimates the model likelihood by sampling a series of distributions that represent

284   different mixtures of posterior distribution and prior distribution (Xie *et al.*, 2011). To obtain

285   an adequate sample from most of the steps in the algorithm, we used 100 steps with 300,000

286   generations each, for a total of 30 million generations. To monitor convergence during each

287   step, we set the diagnostics frequency to once every 1,000 generations. The MLE obtained with

288   the SS in MrBayes were used to calculate the Bayes factors (BF). The logarithm of the BF is

289   the difference in the logarithms of the marginal model likelihoods. The BF is calculated by

290   subtracting the MLE of the constrained topology and the MLE of the unconstrained topology.

291   We considered BF values >10 favoring one model over another as very significant (Nylander

292   *et al.*, 2004; Brown and Lemmon, 2007).

293

294   ***2.4. Estimation of divergence times***

295   We first tested the hypothesis of a molecular clock with PATHd8 (Britton *et al.*, 2007). Since

296   a strict molecular clock was not supported for 72.7% of the nodes in this dataset at *P*<0.05, a

297   Bayesian relaxed-clock approach considering rate variations across lineages was employed to

298   estimate divergence times (Drummond *et al.*, 2006). Bayesian MCMC analyses implemented

299   in BEAST 1.10.4 (Suchard *et al.*, 2018) were performed to approximate the posterior

300   distribution of rates and divergence times and infer their credibility intervals.

10

Molecular dating analyses can be sensitive to several parameters or priors (Alfaro and Holder, 2006; Drummond and Bouckaert, 2015). For instance the prior governing the branching process (Condamine *et al.*, 2015) or the number of molecular clocks (Angelis *et al.*, 2018; Condamine *et al.*, 2018a) may impact estimates of divergence times. Accordingly, we conducted analyses with the following non-default settings and priors: (1) the molecular dataset was partitioned according to the best-fit scheme recovered by PartitionFinder, (2) substitution models were set based on ModelFinder estimation in IQ-TREE (see above), (3) a birth-death tree prior was set for the branching process, and (4) one clock model was set for the mitochondrial partitions, and one clock for the nuclear partitions. Finally, we let the tree topology be estimated by BEAST (classic operator mix) but enforced the monophyly of subfamilies, tribes, and genus *Papilio* following the results of phylogenomic analyses (Allio *et al.*, 2020).

Bayesian relaxed clocks were set up with an uncorrelated lognormal distribution clock model, with the mean set to a uniform prior between 0 and 0.5 (starting value=0.1), and an exponential prior (lambda=0.333) for the standard deviation. The birth-death process (Gernhard, 2008) is a more realistic branching tree prior than a Yule model for species-level divergence times analysis. The birth-death process was set using the following uniform priors: the mean growth rate ranged between 0 and 1 with a starting value at 0.1 births per lineage per million years, and the relative death rate ranged between 0 and 1 deaths per lineage per million years (starting value=0.5). We performed four independent BEAST runs (different seeds) for 50 million generations of MCMC each and with a sampling frequency of 5,000 generations. We discarded the first 10% of generations as burn-in and checked for convergence using Tracer (ESS>200). We combined the four runs using LogCombiner. Using TreeAnnotator, we computed the maximum clade credibility tree with median ages and the 95% credibility intervals (CI) at each node. The xml files are available in FigShare (Data 2: https://figshare.com/s/a32288db7e6429714a62).

2.5. Fossil and secondary calibrations

To explore the effect of fossil calibrations versus secondary calibrations on estimating divergence times, we designed two calibration sets. All node calibrations were assigned a uniform prior distribution with hard bounds (Yang and Rannala, 2006).

First, we used three unambiguous fossil calibrations assigned to Papilionidae, two of which are Parnassiinae (de Jong, 2017). The first is †*Thaites ruminiana* (Scudder, 1875), a compression fossil from limestone in the Niveau du gypse d'Aix Formation of France (Aix-en-

Provence, Bouches-du-Rhône) within the Chattian (23.03–28.1 Ma) of the late Oligocene (Sohn *et al.*, 2012). †*Thaites* is sister to Parnassiini, and occasionally sister to Luehdorfiini + Zerynthiini (Condamine *et al.*, 2018b). Thus we constrained the crown age of Parnassiinae with a uniform distribution bounded by a minimum age of 23.03 Ma. The second is †*Doritites bosniaskii* (Rebel, 1898), an exoskeleton and compression fossil from Italy (Tuscany) from the Messinian (5.33–7.25 Ma, late Miocene; Sohn *et al.*, 2012). †*Doritites* is sister to *Archon* (Luehdorfiini, Condamine *et al.*, 2018b), in agreement with Carpenter (1992). The crown of Luehdorfiini was thus constrained for divergence time estimation using a uniform distribution bounded with 5.33 Ma. Third is the genus †*Praepapilio* with two fossil species †*P. colorado* and †*P. gracilis* (Durden and Rose, 1978) found in the Green River Formation (Colorado, U.S.A.). The age of †*Praepapilio* was used to constrain the crown age of Papilionidae with a uniform distribution bounded by a minimum age of 47.8 Ma since the Green River Formation encompasses a 5 million-year period between ~48.5 and 53.5 Ma, which falls within the Ypresian (47.8-56 Ma) in the early Eocene (Smith *et al.*, 2003; de Jong, 2007). These three fossil calibrations have been used in previous studies (e.g. Condamine *et al.*, 2012, 2013a, 2018a, 2018b; Allio *et al.*, 2020). Uniform distributions of the fossil calibrations were bounded with a maximum age of 150 Ma, a conservative age congruent with the major radiation of angiosperms (Magallón *et al.*, 2015; Foster *et al.*, 2017; Li *et al.*, 2019).

Second, we relied on secondary calibrations with uniform priors applied to the nodes where we set the fossil calibrations plus nodes that are in common between our phylogeny and the phylogeny of Papilionidae. We retrieved the 95% CI from recent estimations of divergence times of the family (Allio *et al.*, 2021) as follows: (1) the crown of Papilionidae (root of the tree) between 47.8 and 70.9 Ma, (2) the crown of Parnassiinae between 29.9 and 58.9 Ma, (3) the crown of Luehdorfiini between 13.9 and 35.3 Ma, (4) the crown of Papilioninae between 34.4 and 62.9 Ma, (5) the crown of Leptocircini between 26.6 and 49.9 Ma, (6) the crown of Papilionini + Troidini between 30.8 and 56.1 Ma, (7) the crown of Troidini between 26.9 and 50.4 Ma, and (8) the crown of Papilionini between 27.5 and 50.9 Ma (Allio *et al.*, 2021).

2.6. Inference of historical biogeography

We estimated the ancestral ranges of origin and geographic range evolution for *Papilio* using the ML approach of dispersal-extinction-cladogenesis (DEC, Ree and Smith, 2008) as implemented in the DEC eXtended version (DECX, Beeravolu and Condamine, 2016; available at: https://github.com/champost/DECX). To infer the biogeographic history of a clade, DEC requires a time-calibrated tree, the current distribution of each species for a set of geographic

areas, and a time-stratified geographic model that is represented by connectivity and dispersal scalar matrices for specified time intervals spanning the entire evolutionary history of the group. DECX allows classical vicariance as a cladogenetic event by using temporally flexible constraints on the connectivity between any two given areas following the movement of landmasses and dispersal opportunity over time. DECX can analyze phylogenies on the order of several thousand tips with numerous areas (Rolland and Condamine, 2019; Kawahara *et al.*, 2023). DECX does not incorporate the founder-event speciation (+J parameter) because of concerns with statistical validity of model choice among DEC-derived models (Ree and Sanmartín, 2018). Also, founder-event speciation often leads to inferences that are decoupled from time, with null or extremely low extinction rates, an effect of the model favoring cladogenetic events over anagenetic events (Ree and Sanmartín, 2018), which makes it inadequate for reconstructing the history of ancient groups with widespread distributions.

The geographic distribution for all 235 *Papilio* species was categorized by coding the presence or the absence of each species in the following areas: (1) West Palearctic, defined as Europe west of the Urals and the part of Asia west of this north-south line, (2) East Palearctic, defined as everywhere considered Palearctic east of the Urals, above 3,000 m in the Himalayas and north of Sichuan in China, (3) West Nearctic, defined as North America west of the Rocky Mountains, (4) East Nearctic, defined as North America east of the Rocky Mountains, (5) Central America, defined as from the northern border of Mexico southwards to the border between Panama and Colombia, also including the Caribbean islands except Trinidad and Tobago, (6) South America, defined as all countries from Colombia to Argentina and including Trinidad and Tobago, (7) Africa, defined as the whole of the African continent and Arabian Peninsula but excluding the islands in the Indian Ocean, (8) Madagascar, defined as the island of Madagascar and all other Indian Ocean islands in the vicinity, (9) India, defined as the area below 3,000 m from NW Pakistan to the border with Myanmar, (10) Indonesia and Wallacea, defined as Myanmar, SE Asia, southern China, western Indonesia to Lydekker's Line; including the Lesser Sunda Islands but excluding Timor, Wetar and associated islands, which are Australasian in origin, and (11) Australasia, defined as everywhere east of Lydekker's Line but including Timor, Wetar and small nearby islands. Species which only marginally enter an area were excluded. We used data available in the literature (e.g. Collins and Morris, 1985; Tyler *et al.*, 1994; Scriber *et al.*, 1995). The geographic distribution of all species and the species sampled in this study is presented in **Fig. 2**. The resulting matrix of species distribution for *Papilio* is available in Table S1.

402   A time-stratified geographic model was built using connectivity matrices that consider

403   paleogeographic changes through time with time slices indicating the possibility or not for a

404   species to colonize a new area (Beeravolu and Condamine, 2016). Based on paleogeographic

405   reconstructions (e.g. Scotese, 2004; Blakey, 2008; Seton *et al.*, 2012), we created a connectivity

406   matrix to represent major changes in tectonic conditions that may have affected the distribution

407   of these butterflies. We specified constraints on area connectivity by coding 0 if any two areas

408   are not connected or 1 if they are connected at a given period. We did not add dispersal matrices

409   because setting the values for dispersal rates between regions through time is highly subjective,

410   and it has been shown that dispersal probability categories had minor effects on ancestral state

411   estimation (Chacon and Renner, 2014). Therefore, we assumed a dispersal scalar matrix with

412   equal dispersal rates between areas through time. Biogeographic ranges larger than four areas

413   in size were disallowed as valid biogeographic states if they were not subsets of the terminal

414   species ranges; widespread ranges comprising areas that have never been geographically

415   connected were also removed.

416   We estimated the most likely ancestral states at each node by performing a DEC analysis

417   under an ML procedure as implemented in DECX (Beeravolu and Condamine, 2016) using

418   both species distribution matrix and connectivity matrices. The files for reproducing the

419   analyses are available in FigShare (Data 3: https://figshare.com/s/a32288db7e6429714a62).

420

421   *2.7. Investigating heterogeneity of diversification rates*

422   To provide an assessment of diversification rates through time, we used the ML approach of

423   Morlon *et al.* (2011), tested and automated in Mazet *et al.* (2023) and implemented in the R-

424   package *RPANDA* 2.0 (Morlon *et al.*, 2016). This method aims at capturing heterogeneity of

425   diversification by allowing preselected subclades to follow different birth-death models from

426   the deeper pruned tree (the backbone). For both subclades and backbones (different backbones

427   are tested because of the different combination of shifts), speciation and/or extinction rates can

428   change exponentially through time: $\lambda(t) = \lambda_0 \times e^{\alpha t}$ with λ_0 denoting speciation at present, α the

429   trend of rate variation of speciation through time *t*. Extinction rate can exceed speciation,

430   meaning that diversification rates can be negative (Morlon *et al.*, 2011), which results in a

431   declining paleodiversity dynamic that can be expected for the backbone because of the higher

432   proportion of long branches after isolating recently-originated subclades.

433   Following Mazet *et al.* (2023), for the analysis of *Papilio*, we first computed the clades'

434   sampling fractions based on our revised taxonomy with the *get.sampling.fraction* function. We

435   specified the nine following subclades: the subgenera *Achillides*, *Chilasa*, *Druryia*, *Heraclides*,

Menelaides, *Nireopapilio*, *Papilio*, *Pterourus*, and the monophyletic group of Lauraceae feeders regrouping *Chilasa* and *Pterourus* (Apiaceae and Rutaceae feeders are not monophyletic). We then estimated the number of possible shifts to be tested in combination with corresponding backbones using the *get.comb.shift* function. The selection of subclades created 319 combinations of subclade(s)/backbone that were compared to the clade-homogeneous birth-death model. We designed and fitted five diversification models to each clade and backbone with the *shift.estimate* function that determines the best fitting model and most likely combination of shifts. The five models are: (1) a Yule model, where speciation is constant and extinction is null (BCST); (2) a constant birth-death model, where speciation and extinction rates are constant (BCST_DCST); (3) a variable speciation rate model without extinction (BVAR); (4) a variable speciation rate model with constant extinction (BVAR_BCST); and (5) a rate-constant speciation and variable extinction rate model (BCST_BVAR). Diversification rates are defined backward in time such as a positive dependency parameter (α for speciation and β for extinction) reflects a slowdown of rates towards the present. Finally, based on the most likely rate estimates and best combination of shifts, we estimated the diversity dynamics of each clade and resulting backbone recovered in the best shift combination using the *apply_prob_dtt* and *paleodiv* function. The files for reproducing the analyses are available in FigShare (Data 4: https://figshare.com/s/a32288db7e6429714a62).

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Global phylogeny of **Papilio**

Partitioned phylogenetic analyses with IQ-TREE and MrBayes provided almost identical phylogenetic trees, differing in branch length estimates (**Fig. 3**; Figs S1, S2 for IQ-TREE). The genus *Papilio* was always recovered as monophyletic with maximal ($PP_{CAT}=1$, $PP_{PART}=1$, $BP_{PART}=100$, $UFBS_{PART}=100$) branch support (**Table 3**), which was expected since molecular data have never found it non-monophyletic (e.g. Aubert *et al.*, 1999; Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a; Condamine *et al.*, 2012; Lewis *et al.*, 2015; Owens *et al.*, 2017, 2020; Allio *et al.*, 2020). The Bayesian inference with MrBayes converged well (ADSF=0.007293, average PSRF for parameter values=1.000, and ESS>>200 for all parameters). Bayesian analyses reconstructed a robust phylogeny with 69.4% of the nodes recovered with strong support within *Papilio* (nodes with $PP_{PART}\geq0.95$, **Fig. 3**). Robustness was slightly lower for ML analysis with non-parametric bootstrap: 67.4% of branches in the tree were strongly supported (nodes with $BP_{PART}\geq70$, Fig. S1). In comparison, IQ-TREE analysis with $UFBS_{PART}$ recovered the most robust phylogeny

with 82.5% of branches supported by UFBS$_{PART}$≥95 (Fig. S2). PhyloBayes analysis under the mixture (CAT-GTR-Γ_4) model ran during 11,350 cycles and converged well (*meandiff*=0.00814). The topology (Fig. S3) was very similar to traditional partitioned analyses with IQ-TREE and MrBayes, except within the Old World *Papilio* (see below). Overall, branch support in PhyloBayes was also like IQ-TREE and MrBayes with 66.7% of branches having PP$_{CAT}$≥0.95 (see Fig. S4 for a comparison of branch support across all analyses).

All phylogenetic analyses reconstructed a backbone topology with three main clades (Clades 1 to 3 on **Fig. 3**, **Table 3**). Subgenus *Heraclides* (Clade 1) was sister to all remaining *Papilio*, which is composed of a clade mostly including the New World *Papilio* (Clade 2, subgenera *Chilasa* and *Pterourus*) and another clade comprising the Old World *Papilio* (Clade 3, the remaining subgenera). Although this topology was consistent across methods, branch support for the large clade of *Papilio* excluding the subgenus *Heraclides* was not robust (PP$_{CAT}$=0.75, PP$_{PART}$=0.98, BP$_{PART}$=55, and UFBS$_{PART}$=90). Subgenus *Heraclides* was always monophyletic with high branch support (PP$_{CAT}$=1, PP$_{PART}$=0.96, BP$_{PART}$=75, and UFBS$_{PART}$=100). The species relationships within *Heraclides* largely correspond to previous works (Lewis *et al.*, 2015; Owens *et al.*, 2017, 2020).

New World *Papilio sensu stricto* (i.e. subgenera *Heraclides* and *Pterourus*) were not inferred as monophyletic in all analyses. We always recovered the American subgenus *Pterourus* within a clade including Asian subgenera *Chilasa* and '*Agehana*' (Clade 2 on **Fig. 3**) with strong branch support (PP$_{CAT}$=0.99, PP$_{PART}$=1, BP$_{PART}$=91, and UFBS$_{PART}$=100). In addition, '*Agehana*' was internal to subgenus *Pterourus* in all analyses (**Table 3**). This topology agrees with some phylogenetic work (Wu *et al.*, 2015) but contrasts with others (Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a; Condamine *et al.*, 2012; Lewis *et al.*, 2015), which proposed that *Heraclides* is sister to *Pterourus + Chilasa + Alexanoria*. The substantial increase of taxon sampling may account for the difference between topologies: we sampled 64 species belonging to these subgenera, while Zakharov *et al.* (2004a) and Condamine *et al.* (2012) analyzed only 21 species (including *P. alexanor*). Bayesian topology tests provided strong support (BF>6) for the non-monophyly of the New World *Papilio* clade (*sensu* Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a; Condamine *et al.*, 2012; Lewis *et al.*, 2015), and decisive support (BF>10) for the non-monophyly of *Pterourus sensu lato* (**Table 2**). These new phylogenetic arrangements have important biogeographic implications (see below).

Papilio alexanor, a mysterious Eurasian lineage that is notoriously difficult to place within *Papilio* (Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a; Wu *et al.*, 2015), was sister to the Old World clade including all remaining species, with moderate to high branch support (PP$_{CAT}$=1, PP$_{PART}$=0.99,

16

504   BP$_{PART}$=58, and UFBS$_{PART}$=85). The Bayesian topology test constraining *P. alexanor* to be
505   sister to the clade *Pterourus* + *Chilasa* + '*Agehana*' (Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a; Condamine *et al.*,
506   2012) yielded a worse MLE than the unconstrained topology with strong support (BF>10,
507   **Table 2**). Our unconstrained topology agrees with a recent but sparsely sampled phylogenomic
508   study (Allio *et al.*, 2020), suggesting that the phylogenetic position of *P. alexanor* is reaching
509   a consensus.

510   The Old World *Papilio* clade (Clade 3 on **Fig. 3**) includes the highest species diversity
511   of the genus. After the divergence with *P. alexanor*, partitioned phylogenetic analyses
512   recovered a series of five main clades (Clades 3a to 3e on **Fig. 3**) sustained by short internal
513   branches leading to different subgenera with moderate to high branch support (**Table 3**). These
514   internal branches were the source of discrepancy between the Bayesian analyses (under both
515   the mixture model and the partitioned analyses) and ML analyses. The main discrepancy was
516   that Clades 3a and 3b were recovered as sisters in ML analyses and weakly supported
517   (BP$_{PART}$=23, and UFBS$_{PART}$=58; Figs S1-2) but not recovered in Bayesian analyses (**Fig. 3**, Fig.
518   S3). Despite a substantially increased taxon sampling compared to previous studies (37% of
519   total species diversity in Condamine *et al.*, 2012 *versus* 78% in this study), these results suggest
520   that the systematic backbone of *Papilio* is still not definitely resolved, which impedes a higher-
521   level systematic revision of the genus. We also acknowledge the limited size of the Sanger-
522   based dataset and phylogenomic studies may illuminate the early evolutionary history of
523   *Papilio* in future studies to provide a definitive resolution of subgeneric classification.

524   Clade 3a was always composed of the subgenus *Euchenor* (Joshi and Kunte, 2022)
525   including two New Guinean species (*Papilio euchenor* and *P. depilis*), subtended by a long
526   branch, which was systematically recovered as sister to a clade comprising species of subgenus
527   *Druryia* (including the *antimachus* and *dardanus* species-groups) with moderate to strong
528   branch support (Clade 3a on **Fig. 3**; PP$_{CAT}$=0.82, PP$_{PART}$=0.99, BP$_{PART}$=74, and UFBS$_{PART}$=99).
529   We still have poor knowledge on subgenus *Druryia* because existing phylogenies only included
530   a handful of species. Here we found the *nireus*, *oribazus*, and *zalmoxis* species groups in a
531   separate clade sister to *Papilio nobilis* with strong branch support (PP$_{CAT}$=1, PP$_{PART}$=1,
532   BP$_{PART}$=76, UFBS$_{PART}$=98). This clade has recently been ranked as the subgenus *Nireopapilio*
533   (Cotton and Nakae, 2020). A Bayesian topology test provided decisive support (BF>10) for
534   non-monophyly of subgenus *Druryia* (**Table 2**), therefore lending support to the validity of
535   subgenus *Nireopapilio*. However, it is important to remain cautious because future studies with
536   more comprehensive sampling could recover subgenus *Druryia* as monophyletic, notably
537   through the inclusion of the *zenobia* species-group not sampled in this or previous studies.

17

538   *Papilio natewa*, the latest described *Papilio* species (Tennent *et al.*, 2018), was always

539   sister to the monotypic subgenus *Eleppone*, with maximal branch support in all analyses (**Fig.**

540   **3, Table 3**). This indicates that *Papilio natewa* can be placed in the subgenus *Eleppone,* together

541   with *P. anactus* from eastern Australia. The subgenus *Eleppone* was always found to be sister

542   to a strongly supported clade of five Indonesian species, the *demolion* species group, which was

543   previously considered to belong to the subgenus *Menelaides* but now assigned to the subgenus

544   *Araminta*. Although often recovered, this sister relationship was not highly supported (Clade

545   3b on **Fig. 3**; PP_{PART}=0.72, BP_{PART}=50, and $UFBS_{PART}$=93).

546   The next clade (Clades 3c + 3d + 3e on **Fig. 3**) included species classified in six

547   subgenera and was generally strongly supported in all analyses (PP_{CAT}=0.99, PP_{PART}=1,

548   BP_{PART}=72, and $UFBS_{PART}$=99). The first to branch off this clade were subgenus *Sinoprinceps*

549   (*Papilio xuthus* and *P. benguetana*) and subgenus *Papilio* (*machaon* species-group) found to

550   be sisters (Clade 3c on **Fig. 3**) in all analyses with maximal branch support (except BP_{PART}=97).

551   These two subgenera were both recovered as monophyletic with maximal branch supports. The

552   remaining subgenera comprised *Nireopapilio + Achillides + Princeps + Menelaides* (Clade 3d

553   + Clade 3e on **Fig. 3**) and formed a strongly supported clade (PP_{CAT}=0.99, PP_{PART}=1,

554   BP_{PART}=60, and $UFBS_{PART}$=99). The species *Papilio nobilis* (usually ranked in subgenus

555   *Princeps*, *nobilis* group) was always found as sister to *Nireopapilio* (PP_{CAT}=1, PP_{PART}=1,

556   BP_{PART}=76, and $UFBS_{PART}$=98; Clade 3d on **Fig. 3**), and the latter contained the species of the

557   *nireus*, *oribazus* and *zalmoxis* groups. The subgenus *Achillides* was strongly supported as

558   monophyletic in all analyses (PP_{CAT}=1, PP_{PART}=1, BP_{PART}=85, and $UFBS_{PART}$=99), and was

559   often found as sister to the clade *Princeps + Menelaides* with moderate nodal support (Clade

560   3e on **Fig. 3**). Within *Achillides*, the species relationships largely agree with the study of

561   Condamine *et al.* (2013b), but we added two endangered species (*P. buddha* and *P. chikae*;

562   Collins and Morris, 1985). Endemic to the Western Ghats biodiversity hotspot of Southern

563   India, *P. buddha* was always recovered in the *palinurus* group (*P. daedalus* and *P. palinurus*)

564   from Southeast Asia with strong support (PP_{CAT}=1, PP_{PART}=1, BP_{PART}=100, and

565   $UFBS_{PART}$=100), but its sister relationship with *P. daedalus* was weakly supported (PP_{CAT}=0.8,

566   PP_{PART}=0.72, BP_{PART}=64, and $UFBS_{PART}$=62). Such a relationship is interesting to study in

567   terms of wing morphological evolution between the *palinurus* group and the other *Achillides*

568   endemic to India, *P. crino*. *Papilio chikae* is endemic to the Philippines (North Luzon) and was

569   always sister to *P. hermeli* as expected (Cabusas *et al.*, 2020), also endemic to the Philippines

570   (North Mindoro) with maximal support in all analyses. They were together nested in the *bianor*

571   group with maximal branch support as previously found (Condamine *et al.*, 2013b). Subgenus

18

572   *Princeps*, containing five species of the *demoleus* species group, constituted a strongly

573   supported clade with maximal branch support, which was found to be sister to subgenus

574   *Menelaides* (PP_{CAT}=0.93, PP_{PART}=1, BP_{PART}=70, and $UFBS_{PART}$=99). A Bayesian topology test

575   rejected the hypothesis of a monophyletic origin for all species usually placed in subgenus

576   *Princeps* like the *dardanus* species-group (BF>10, **Table 2**). Finally, the species comprising

577   the subgenus *Menelaides* formed a solid monophyletic group with robust branch support in all

578   analyses (PP_{CAT}=1, PP_{PART}=0.99, BP_{PART}=99, and $UFBS_{PART}$=100). The species relationships

579   within *Menelaides* largely agree with the recent phylogenetic study of Joshi and Kunte (2022).

580   We constrained subgenera *Menelaides* and *Araminta* (species previously included in

581   *Menelaides*) to form a single clade, but the Bayesian analysis confirmed the non-monophyly of

582   such an artificially inclusive *Menelaides* with decisive support (BF>10, **Table 2**).

583

584   ### *3.2. Origin of* **Papilio** *and subgeneric diversification*

585   The four independent Bayesian runs of the two dating analyses converged well (ESS>>200 for

586   most of the parameters) and were therefore combined. The analyses yielded almost identical

587   estimates of divergence times with less than 0.5 million years of difference for all nodes,

588   regardless of the calibrations used: fossils or secondary (**Fig. 4**, **Table 3**, see Figs S5-6 for the

589   chronograms resulting from the BEAST analyses). The dating analyses estimated that *Papilio*

590   originated in the Oligocene ca. 30.06 Ma (95% CI=20.66-47.42 Ma) with the three-fossil-

591   calibrations analysis, and ca. 29.95 Ma (95% CI=23.97-37.34 Ma) with the eight-secondary-

592   calibrations analysis. These results indicate that fossil and secondary calibrations can provide

593   similar and consistent results in age estimates, which has not always been the case (Sauquet *et*

594   *al.*, 2012). For the subsequent analyses (biogeography and diversification), we selected the

595   maximum clade credibility tree with median ages estimated with a Bayesian uncorrelated

596   lognormal method calibrated with fossils (**Fig. 4**).

597   We estimated that the origin of subgenera ranges from the early Miocene (e.g. *Chilasa*,

598   *Heraclides*, *Pterourus*), middle Miocene (e.g. *Achillides*), to the late Miocene (e.g. *Araminta*,

599   *Menelaides*, *Papilio*) (**Fig. 4**, **Table 3**). These age estimates are slightly younger than previous

600   analyses with age differences ranging from ca. 1 to 2 million years younger, but it is important

601   to note that 95% CIs for these nodes strongly overlap with earlier studies. For instance, we

602   estimated the origin of the clade '*Agehana*' + *Chilasa* + *Pterourus* at 22.73 Ma (95% CI=15.36-

603   35.9 Ma), whereas we previously estimated this age at 20.9 Ma (95% CI=16.9-25.6 Ma; Lewis

604   *et al.*, 2015) or 19.7 Ma (95% CI=17.2-22.9 Ma, Owens *et al.*, 2017, 2020) but we have a similar

605   estimation to Wu *et al.* (2015) who found an age of 22.63 Ma (95% CI=18.93-26.58 Ma). Slight

606   differences are found in (1) subgenus *Heraclides* recovered at 21.22 Ma (95% CI=13.95-33.86
607   Ma) compared to our previous estimation of 22.1 Ma (95% CI=18.0-26.9 Ma; Lewis *et al.*,
608   2015) or 21.9 Ma (95% CI=17.5-26.4 Ma; Wu *et al.*, 2015); and (2) subgenus *Achillides*
609   estimated at 17.1 Ma (95% CI=11.45-26.88 Ma) whereas we previously recovered a 2-million-
610   year older age at 19.3 Ma (95% CI=16.4-21.8 Ma; Condamine *et al.*, 2013). We argue that these
611   slight age discrepancies mostly come from the differences in taxon sampling resulting in new
612   phylogenetic placements (e.g. *P. alexanor*) and potentially from practices in dating techniques
613   both influencing divergence time estimates.
614
615   ### 3.3. Northern origin and dynamic dispersal into the tropics
616   DEC analyses recovered a region including West Nearctic, Central America, East Palearctic,
617   and Sundaland as the most likely ancestral geographic origin (relative probability=0.467), when
618   Asia and North America were connected by the Bering land bridge in the Oligocene (**Fig. 4**).
619   The second best ancestral area was composed of West Nearctic, Central America, and East
620   Palearctic (relative probability=0.215). Hence, a Northern (Laurasian) origin is preferred over
621   a Southern (Gondwanan) origin. This is not unexpected given the age of the genus and the
622   results of previous biogeographic analyses of the genus (e.g. Condamine *et al.*, 2012, 2013;
623   Lewis *et al.*, 2015; Wu *et al.*, 2015), although some studies estimated an older age and
624   Gondwanan origin (Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a). The DEC analyses indicate a dynamic
625   biogeographic history with numerous dispersal events inferred (*n=64*) in comparison to
626   vicariance events (*n=22*). Dispersal events were mostly southward (*n=32*) from a northern
627   origin (or dispersal *into the tropics*, Condamine *et al.*, 2012; Rolland *et al.*, 2015) than
628   northward (*n=17*, when including northwestward dispersals) from the equator (or dispersal *out
629   of the tropics*, Jablonski *et al.*, 2006). Northward dispersals are only estimated in the last 10
630   million years. Excluding vicariance events involving areas around the Bering Strait (*n=2*), we
631   found more vicariance in the Old World (*n=13*) than in the New World (*n=7*). We also
632   estimated numerous local extirpation events (*n=51*), which tend to be more numerous in the
633   Old World subgenera (*n=27*) than in the New World subgenera (*n=15*), likely due to the
634   Miocene fragmentation of the Boreotropical forest in the Holarctic (Pound *et al.*, 2012).
635
636   ### 3.4. The Paleotropics as a biogeographic crossroad
637   In the non-monophyletic New World *Papilio*, subgenus *Heraclides* originated in Central
638   America (very likely including Caribbean Islands; Lewis *et al.*, 2015) and clade *Chilasa +
639   Pterourus* originated in a region comprising the West Nearctic, Central America, East

Palearctic, and Sundaland. The clade of Old World *Papilio* originated in East Palearctic with *P. alexanor* being sister to all remaining Old World *Papilio*, which soon after their divergence colonized the Paleotropics through West and East Palearctic + Sundaland and extended to Africa (see shaded area on **Fig. 4**).

We found the Paleotropics to be an important ancestral area for the historical biogeography of *Papilio*. It is striking that, within the Old World clade (Clade 3), all the main nodes of the backbone (seven in total out of 26, **Table 3**) are estimated to originate within the Paleotropics in the early Miocene (23 to 15 Ma, **Fig. 4**). During this time period, Africa, West and East Palearctic, and Sundaland were mostly covered by tropical-adapted or paratropical forests providing an almost continuous tropical habitat between these large regions, which likely facilitated biotic movements within the Paleotropics (e.g. Ziegler *et al.*, 2003; Morley, 2011). However, starting after the middle Miocene climatic optimum (Steinthorsdottir *et al.*, 2021), the global cooling of the Cenozoic fostered the geographic contraction of the tropical belt toward the equator that disappeared from higher latitudes (Pound *et al.*, 2012). Our biogeographic estimates indicated widespread geographic extinctions in the Paleotropics, especially in the Holarctic, and at least seven different lineages were able to disperse southwards to track their preferred macroclimatic conditions, supposedly tropical climates (Condamine *et al.*, 2012). Like crematogastrine ants (Blaimer *et al.*, 2018), we show that the Paleotropics had a central role in the origin and evolution of *Papilio*. The vast and stable ecological opportunity offered by the tropical rainforests likely explained the *into-the-tropics* dispersal trend to track tropical contractions as climate cooled down toward the present. This supports the hypothesis that potentially many clades, particularly inhabitants of Boreotropical floras, were likely extirpated from the Holarctic and persist today in more southern tropical locations (Meseguer *et al.*, 2018).

3.5. *Tempo and mode of* **Papilio** *diversification*

The diversification analyses investigating rate heterogeneity across *Papilio* revealed four best equally-likely scenarios of diversification (ΔAICc≤2, Table S2), which refutes the hypothesis of a single diversification rate for the whole genus (ΔAICc=14.06; Table S2). These shift-configuration scenarios include three shifts located at subgenera *Achillides*, *Menelaides* and *Papilio* for the first best scenario (**Fig. 5A**), two shifts (*Achillides* and *Menelaides*) for the second best scenario, five shifts (*Achillides*, *Heraclides*, *Menelaides*, *Papilio* and *Pterourus*) for the third best scenario (Fig. S7A), and four shifts (*Achillides*, *Heraclides*, *Menelaides* and *Papilio*) for the fourth best scenario. Subgenera *Achillides* and *Menelaides* are always found as

significant shifts. All subclades are better explained by a pure-birth model (BCST), except subgenus *Menelaides* that follows a model with a decreasing speciation rate through time (BVAR; **Fig. 5B**, Fig. S7B, Table S3).

Interestingly, after isolating the subclades that significantly diversify at different rates, two patterns emerge from the backbone (remaining lineages) of best combinations. For the two first best combinations, the backbone is explained by a model with a decreasing speciation rate over time without extinction (**Fig. 5B**), while the backbone in the two other scenarios follows a model with the same decreasing speciation rate and includes a constant extinction rate (Fig. S7B). In the latter case, net diversification rate becomes negative in the Pliocene onward (ca. 5 Ma), leading to a waxing-waning pattern of diversification (Fig. S7C). This short diversity decline near the present did not affect the trend of the global diversity dynamics because it happens when subclades are already diversifying, thus compensating the decline (Fig. S7B, C, D). The diversity dynamics of these two different patterns in the backbone (decline or not) are similar except with a faster accumulation of lineages during the early Miocene for the scenarios with a decline (**Fig. 5**, Fig. S7).

These four scenarios highlight common features related to adaptive radiation. First, all scenarios agree to show a two-step diversification history. The first phase of the *Papilio* radiation proceeded at a high net diversification (ranging from 0.224 to 0.426 events/Myr/lineage depending on the scenario), while the second period of diversification is supported by subclade dynamics having lower speciation rates than at the origin of *Papilio* (e.g. 0.122 for *Heraclides*, 0.178 for *Papilio*), except for *Menelaides* (0.386 events/Myr/lineage). The first radiation phase reaches an equilibrium before a short declining phase in half of the best scenarios. For the two other scenarios, the backbones have lower speciation rates at the origin but also contain more lineages (only three or two shifts). These results agree with the general tendency for diversification to slow down as evolution proceeds, considered as one of the most pervasive macroevolutionary principles (Rabosky, 2009; Morlon *et al.*, 2010; Morlon and Moen, 2014; Condamine *et al.*, 2019). Such diversification slowdowns have often been interpreted as the effect of competition for resources or niche availability (Rabosky, 2009) or the role of past environmental changes (Condamine *et al.*, 2019). It is thus possible that the diversity of some *Papilio* lineages can be at equilibrium or limited by ecological resources, although these lineages are still expanding toward the present but at a slower pace than in the past, supporting the 'damped increase' hypothesis (Cornell, 2013).

Clade-specific rates of diversification can further explain differences in clades' species richness. Although the number of clade shifts varies from one scenario to another, this pattern

22

of radiating subclades within the genus *Papilio* seems to be supported by a strong signal (Table S2). Clade-heterogeneous diversification has been unveiled across Papilionidae as a whole (Condamine *et al.*, 2012; Allio *et al.*, 2021) or for other swallowtail clades (Condamine *et al.*, 2018b), which has been then linked to species' traits or environments. In the case of *Papilio*, the two most important shifts in diversification are recovered for subgenera *Achillides* and *Menelaides*. These two subclades are island-dwelling groups in the Indo-Malayan and Australasian Archipelagos (Condamine *et al.*, 2013; Joshi and Kunte, 2022), a region where species diversity is the highest at the global scale for this genus (**Fig. 2**). Their diversification proceeded through repeated island colonizations since the middle Miocene leading to rampant allopatric speciation across the entire archipelago (Condamine *et al.*, 2013; Joshi and Kunte 2022). In addition, the subgenus *Menelaides* shows an early-burst pattern with high speciation rate when it originated (0.386 events/Myr/lineage), followed by a decrease toward the present (0.145 events/Myr/lineage, **Fig. 5**). Besides their island distribution, *Menelaides* are well-known for their Batesian mimicry of aposematic and toxic troidine swallowtails (Kunte, 2009; Palmer and Kronforst, 2020; Kizhakke and Kunte, 2022), which may have spurred their high speciation rates. The subgenus *Menelaides* diversified faster than any other subgenus, and yet is the most recent clade with subgenus *Papilio* (Table S3). The latter is often found as a significant shift (**Fig. 5**), which may be linked to the host-plant shift on Apiaceae (Allio *et al.*, 2021) and/or to the glaciation cycles initiated in the late Pliocene (Dupuis and Sperling, 2020).

We did not recover a model incorporating extinction rate in any subclade, which might be artifactual due to the difficulty of estimating extinction rates from phylogenies of extant species alone, or this may be biologically realistic if the nascent subclades did not have enough time to experience extinction to be detectable (e.g. Morlon *et al.*, 2011). Assuming these estimates are not biased, this may suggest that subclades of *Papilio* evolved under a 'museum model of diversity' with a very low extinction rate. Altogether, while their geographic ranges contracted toward the equator (**Fig. 4**), the genus sustained high rates of species diversification thanks to multiple speciation shifts leading to a global increase of species accumulation toward the present (**Fig. 5**). This suggests that the tropics are not only the evolutionary source of the *Papilio* diversity but have also played an important role in mitigating their extinction.

3.6. Should more than one genus be recognized within **Papilio**?

The rank of genus is the most visible rung in the Linnaean hierarchy. It forms part of every species name, indicating shared relationships when there are multiple species in a genus, or unusual distinctness of a species when it constitutes a monotypic genus. Other than monophyly

742 (evidenced by one or more synapomorphies), there are no objective criteria for determining
743 genus boundaries, and even monophyly does not determine how high up on its tree a branch
744 should be cut. Further, when subclades within a genus are elevated to the rank of genus, the
745 information provided by the name about closer relationships is balanced by the lost information
746 about the broader relationships of the group. Nonetheless, numerous attempts have been made
747 to provide general guidelines for recognizing a genus (Talavera *et al.*, 2012; Dorchin *et al.*,
748 2018; Sigward *et al.*, 2018; Zhang *et al.*, 2019; Nakahara *et al.*, 2020), with criteria including
749 the compactness of a group, its distinctness from other such groups, the number of species it
750 contains, its estimated age of divergence, comparability to related genera, consistency with
751 established usage of a name, and degree of confidence in the assessment of its phylogenetic
752 relationships (Ashlock and Mayr, 1991). Balancing and prioritizing potential conflicts among
753 these criteria, while at the same time conveying as much information as possible about
754 relationships between species to non-expert end-users of the names, remains one of the most
755 subjective aspects of systematics.

756 It is clear that taxonomic stability is a primary aim, if not *the* primary aim, of the
757 International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN, 1999, 2012). The genus *Papilio sensu*
758 *lato* has been stable and unambiguously defined by morphology since Munroe (1961), and later
759 supported by molecular evidence (e.g. Aubert *et al.*, 1999; Caterino and Sperling, 1999;
760 Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a), although the clades within that genus have continued to be volatile
761 (Hancock, 1983; Miller, 1987; Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a). Even *Chilasa* and '*Agehana*', which
762 Hauser *et al.* (2005) treated as distinct, have continued to move back and forth with each new
763 phylogeny (Zakharov *et al.*, 2004a; Wu *et al.*, 2015). Consequently, we have chosen here to
764 retain the use of the genus *Papilio* in its broad sense, pending a more rigorous and objective
765 integration of the multiple criteria that may be used to determine the boundary of a genus. For
766 widely recognized and previously stable taxonomic groups, we consider it to be in the best
767 interests of systematists to be conservative in proposing new name changes for anything other
768 than well supported cases of non-monophyly. In our experience, continued name changes for
769 high-profile taxa will consistently elicit frustration and disrespect from the larger community
770 of biologists, conservationists, and the general public. At the same time, if names reflect current
771 knowledge, then advances based on new evidence or even different weighting of evidence will
772 inevitably result in name changes. Fortunately, a solution to this conflict is available through
773 the use of subgeneric names, which allow systematists to refer clearly to their refined taxonomic
774 concepts without putting the burden of increased confusion from name changes onto the users
775 of these species and genus names in other fields.

24

776

4. Conclusion

Building a comprehensive species-level dated phylogeny for a globally distributed insect clade is challenging. We addressed this challenge with the genus *Papilio*, which currently includes 235 species worldwide. Our study assembles ~80% of the species diversity in a molecular supermatrix and provides a generally robust time-calibrated phylogenetic reference for *Papilio*. This new tree confirms previous results such as the early-diverging position of New World *Papilio* and the sister relationships between some subgenera and unveils novel relationships like the placement of *P. alexanor* and the non-monophyly of several subgenera. This phylogenetic framework provides the foundation for a systematic revision, but we urge specialists to refrain from changing the status of subgenera to the rank of genus. Deep nodes within *Papilio* remain poorly resolved and some subgenera are still poorly sampled, especially in Africa. Future studies with denser taxon sampling and full genomic data will undoubtedly provide a more accurate phylogeny for *Papilio* and justify a thorough systematic revision. Here we used this dated phylogeny to assess the evolutionary history of *Papilio,* with estimated divergence times that place its origin in the Oligocene (~30 Ma). Biogeographic analyses suggest a Beringian origin followed by southward dispersals into the tropics, with a pivotal role of the Paleotropics as a biogeographic crossroad for the worldwide colonization of *Papilio*.

794

5. Formal taxonomic changes

Our results confirm the status of '*Agehana*' (two species, *P. elwesi* and *P. maraho*) within subgenus *Pterourus* as proposed by Wu *et al*. (2015). *Papilio zalmoxis* Hewitson, 1864 is transferred from subgenus *Druryia* to subgenus *Nireopapilio*. This finding is also supported morphologically by Huxley (1976), who showed that the wing scale structure of *P. zalmoxis* is identical to *P. bromius* (valid name: *P. chrapkowskoides* Storace, 1952), both also containing blue-fluorescent pigment.

Two taxa in subgenus *Druryia* are recognized as separate species to *Papilio dardanus* Yeats, 1776, namely *Papilio meriones* C. Felder & R. Felder, 1864 (**stat. rev.**) from Madagascar and *Papilio humbloti* Oberthür, 1888 (**stat. rev.**) from Comoros Islands.

In subgenus *Pterourus*, Tyler *et al*. (1994) placed *Papilio victorinus* Doubleday, 1844 from Mexico within *Pterourus menatius* (Hübner, [1819]), but we consider this Central American taxon as specifically distinct from the South American *Papilio menatius* (Owens *et al*. 2017, 2020), and we reinstate *Papilio victorinus* Doubleday, 1844 as a separate species (**stat. rev.**).

25

In subgenus *Papilio* two North American species are confirmed as separate from *P. machaon* Linnaeus, 1758, namely *Papilio kahli* F. & R. Chermock, 1937 (**stat. nov.**) and *Papilio bairdii* Edwards, 1866 (**stat. rev.**). *Papilio bairdii* includes two subspecies, *oregonia* Edwards, 1876 and *dodi* McDunnough, 1939 (**comb. nov.**) as well as the nominate subspecies. *Papilio saharae* Oberthür, 1879 is treated as a subspecies of *P. machaon* as per Dupuis and Sperling (2020), subject to further investigation.

We found two commonly recurrent patterns in several Asian groups, with speciation between taxa from mainland southern Asia and Sundaland, and between taxa in the Bismarck Archipelago from those in New Guinea, as detailed below.

Within subgenus *Achillides*, five taxa, three with more than one subspecies, are separated at species level based on molecular results from Condamine *et al.* (2013b) and Cabusas *et al.* (2020). *Papilio polyctor* Boisduval, 1836 (**stat. rev.**) from northern Pakistan and NW India is separated from *Papilio bianor* Cramer, 1777, and *Papilio hermeli* Nuyda, 1992 (**stat. rev.**) from Mindoro, Philippines is reinstated as a separate species to *P. chikae* Igarashi, 1965 from Luzon. *Papilio daedalus* C. Felder & R. Felder, 1861 (**stat. rev.**), with subspecies *angustatus* Staudinger, 1888, is confirmed as a separate species to *Papilio palinurus* Fabricius, 1787. Hiura and Alagar (1971) first separated *P. daedalus* from *P. palinurus* based on morphology, but Page and Treadaway (2003a) placed them as conspecific based on perceived similarity of genitalia. Molecular phylogenies clearly show they are separate species, and all subspecies of the two species can easily be separated based on the position of the postdiscal green hindwing band in relation to the anal eyespot. In *P. palinurus* the lowest point of the band is always above the eyespot, whereas in *P. daedalus* the band meets the eyespot. The *Papilio ulysses* group was found to consist of three separate species, *Papilio ulysses* Linnaeus, 1758 (South Moluccas, New Guinea and most associated islands, and Australia), *Papilio telegonus* C. Felder & R. Felder, 1860 (**stat. rev.**) from Northern Moluccas, and *Papilio orsippus* Godman & Salvin, 1888 (**stat. rev.**) from the Bismarck Archipelago and Solomon Islands. Nakae (2021) separated *Papilio arjuna* Horsfield, 1828, found on Sumatra and Java, from mainland Asian *P. paris* based on the findings of Condamine *et al.* (2013b), which is confirmed here due to paraphyly with *P. karna*. That study of *Achillides* also suggested that *P. maackii* and *P. syfanius* may be conspecific; but a recent genomic study clarified that mitochondrial gene exchange occurs between these two species in western China without significant exchange of nuclear genes (Xiong *et al.* 2022). As a result, we retain *P. maackii* and *P. syfanius* as separate species.

Subgenus *Euchenor* has previously been regarded as monobasic, but DNA analysis shows that the subgenus consists of two distinct species (Joshi and Kunte 2022): *Papilio*

26

euchenor Guérin-Méneville, 1830 and *Papilio depilis* Rothschild, 1895 (**stat. rev.**). Jordan, in Rothschild (1895), stated that forewing scale structure in these two taxa are different but refrained from treating them as separate species. Jordan (1896) then separated the two species, citing several morphological differences including genitalia. Jordan (1908-09) without explanation reunited *P. depilis* with *P. euchenor*, which has been followed by all authors until now. This specific separation of Bismarck Archipelago taxa from New Guinea taxa mirrors the separation of *P. orsippus* from *P. ulysses* in subgenus *Achillides*, and similar separation is found in subgenus *Menelaides* below.

In the *helenus* group of subgenus *Menelaides*, both Munroe (1961 - *nephelus*, *nubilus* and *chaon*) and Hancock (1985 - *noblei* and *antonio*) included species which have been found not to be monophyletic. *Papilio noblei* Nicéville, [1889] and *P. antonio* Hewitson, 1875 are shown here to belong to subgenus *Araminta*, which is also supported by morphology and wing pattern, particularly on the underside. *Papilio nubilus* has been shown to be a natural hybrid between *P. nephelus* and *P. polytes* rather than a valid species (Tsukada and Nishiyama 1980: 307). We confirmed that *Papilio hystaspes* C. Felder & R. Felder, 1862, separated from *helenus* by Hiura and Alagar (1971) based on male genitalia and treated as separate by Hancock (1983) but placed within *P. helenus* by Page and Treadaway (2003b), is a distinct species (**stat. rev.**) which branches off before the traditional *helenus* taxa and *sataspes*. However, we also found that several taxa always considered to belong to *P. helenus* are separate species. The first species is *Papilio daksha* (**stat. rev.**) from Southern India. Joshi and Kunte (2022) analyzed specimens of ssp. *enganius* Doherty, 1891 from Sumatra, Java and Borneo and found that they are sister to *P. sataspes* from Sulawesi and associated islands, not *P. helenus* from mainland SE Asia and the Malay Peninsula. The oldest name for the taxon in the Sundaic islands of Sumatra, Java, Borneo and Palawan, is *Papilio palawanicus* Staudinger, 1888 (**stat. nov.**).

In the Lesser Sunda Islands, two more taxa in the *helenus* group are also separate species, *Papilio mangarinus* Rothschild, 1908 (**stat. nov.**) and *Papilio biseriatus* Rothschild, 1895 (**stat. rev.**). *P. biseriatus* from Timor was previously treated as a separate species by Hancock (1983) and differs from the other species in the postdiscal white hindwing patch extending across four hindwing cells as in *P. hystaspes* from the Philippines, whereas in *P. helenus*, *palawanicus* and *mangarinus* the hindwing patch only covers three cells. As a result of this analysis the range of *P. helenus* is restricted to mainland Asia and the Malay Peninsula, Taiwan and Japan.

Within the *polytes* group, *Papilio protenor* Cramer, 1775 is sister to all other species. This does not correspond to its expected position, as the early stages are very similar to *P.*

878   *memnon*, not *polytes*; presumably this similarity is plesiomorphic. Five more species are

879   recognised within the *polytes* group, two of which are newly separated in this work. The two

880   easternmost species, *Papilio ambrax* Boisduval, 1832 and *Papilio phestus* Guérin-Méneville,

881   1830, were treated as distinct species until Fujioka *et al*. (1997) combined them based on

882   morphology and allopatry. However, molecular phylogenies (Joshi and Kunte, 2022) and

883   population genetic analyses (Zhang *et al.*, 2017; Deshmukh *et al.*, 2022) show *P. ambrax* and

884   *P. phestus* to be specifically distinct (**stat. rev.**). *Papilio alphenor* Cramer, 1776 was separated

885   from *P. polytes* based on genitalia by Hiura and Alagar (1971), but subsequently sunk by Page

886   and Treadaway (2003a) without explanation. Molecular phylogenies suggest that *P. alphenor*

887   is sister to *phestus + ambrax*, not *polytes* (Joshi and Kunte, 2022), and thus must be treated as

888   a separate species (**stat. rev.**). The remaining taxa placed in *P. polytes* also belong to two

889   separate species: the mainland Asian populations are specifically distinct from the Sundaic

890   island taxa, the oldest name for which is *Papilio javanus* C. Felder, 1862 (**stat. nov.**). *Papilio*

891   *polytes*, *alphenor* and *javanus* also show prezygotic and postzygotic barriers to hybridization

892   including assortative mating and low fitness of hybrid progeny, thus being reproductively

893   isolated, with genome-wide and population genetic signatures of being highly diverged distinct

894   species (Zhang *et al.*, 2017; Deshmukh *et al.*, 2022).

895   Specific separation between the mainland Asian taxa and those in the Sundaic islands

896   was also found in the *memnon* group, but the status of taxa within this group is shown to be

897   further complicated by several taxa traditionally considered as separate species being

898   conspecific with related species (Joshi and Kunte, 2022). The larger *memnon* group then split

899   into two clades, one containing the *bootes* and *alcmenor* species groups and the other *P.*

900   *memnon* and close relatives. There are two branches within the first clade, one branch

901   containing just two species, *Papilio bootes* Westwood, 1842 and *Papilio janaka* Moore, 1857

902   (**stat. rev.**). Originally these were considered separate species, but they were treated as

903   conspecific by Evans (1923), followed by Talbot (1939) and subsequent authors. Previous

904   molecular phylogenies show that *P. bootes* and *P. janaka* are significantly genetically distinct

905   (Joshi and Kunte, 2022), and are treated as different species although they are sympatric in NE

906   Myanmar. The other branch of the first clade contains *Papilio acheron* Grose-Smith, 1887,

907   *forbesi* Grose-Smith, 1883 and *lampsacus* Boisduval, 1836 (this last taxon not sequenced due

908   to rarity) with *Papilio alcmenor* C. Felder & R. Felder, 1865 and *thaiwanus* Rothschild, 1898

909   sisters within this group. Previously *P. acheron*, *forbesi* and *lampsacus* were considered as very

910   close to *P. memnon* due to their similar appearance, but this relationship was not confirmed by

911   our analysis.

912   Molecular phylogenies confirmed that the Philippine taxon *rumanzovia* Eschscholtz,
913   1821 is genetically conspecific with Moluccan *P. deiphobus* (Joshi and Kunte, 2022), as stated
914   on morphological grounds by Page and Treadaway (2003a,b). There is a wide genetic
915   divergence between the mainland Asian and the Sundaland taxa previously united under *P.*
916   *memnon*, which clearly represent two separate species, *Papilio agenor* Linnaeus, 1758 (**stat.**
917   **rev.**) and *P. memnon* (Joshi and Kunte, 2022). Two traditionally well-regarded species, *Papilio*
918   *polymnestor* Cramer, 1775 from peninsular India and Sri Lanka, and *Papilio mayo* Atkinson,
919   [1874] from the Andaman Islands, do not merit species status. *Papilio polymnestor* was nested
920   within *P. agenor* (Joshi and Kunte, 2022) and should therefore be treated as a subspecies,
921   *Papilio agenor polymnestor* Cramer, 1775 (**stat. rev.**). Likewise, *P. mayo* was nested within
922   and therefore confirmed as conspecific with *P. memnon*, and should be treated as its subspecies,
923   *Papilio memnon mayo* Atkinson, [1874] (**stat. rev.**).

924   The *nephelus* group comprises four species. *Papilio castor* Westwood, 1842 and *P.*
925   *dravidarum* Wood-Mason, 1880 are sister species within this group, and the taxon *Papilio*
926   *mahadeva* Moore, [1879] is confirmed to be conspecific with *P. castor* as stated on
927   morphological grounds by Cotton and Racheli (2007). *Papilio chaon* Westwood, 1844 and *P.*
928   *nephelus* Boisduval, 1836, from mainland SE Asia and Sundaland respectively, were originally
929   described as separate species but were treated as conspecific by Igarashi (1979) based on early
930   stages. Molecular phylogenies showed that genetically *nephelus* and *chaon* are highly divergent
931   (Joshi and Kunte, 2022), and thus must be treated as separate species, *P. nephelus* and *P. chaon*
932   (**stat. rev.**).

933   Within the *aegeus* clade, *P. godeffroyi* was found to be the sister taxon to *Papilio oritas*
934   Godman & Salvin, 1879 (**stat. rev.**) from New Britain, New Ireland and New Hannover, which
935   was placed within *P. aegeus* by Jordan (1909). In molecular phylogenies, *P. oritas* diverged
936   before the remaining species in the *aegeus* group (Joshi and Kunte, 2022), and thus is not
937   conspecific with *P. aegeus*. This is another example of speciation within the Bismarck Islands.
938   *Papilio inopinatus* Butler, 1883 from Timor was found to be nested within *P. aegeus* (**syn.**
939   **nov.**), thus it becomes *Papilio aegeus inopinatus* (**comb. nov.**).

940   The most complex clade within subgenus *Menelaides* is the *fuscus* group. The species
941   *Papilio fuscus* Goeze, 1779 as recognised by Hancock (1992) in the most recent revision of this
942   species is not a monophyletic entity. Hancock placed many taxa in his single species *Princeps*
943   *fuscus* (Goeze, 1779) which we here recognise as five different species in two subclades of the
944   *fuscus* group. Hancock placed *Papilio canopus* Westwood, 1842 and *Papilio hypsicles*
945   Hewitson, 1868 as species level synonyms of *P. fuscus*, but we found that this arrangement is

946   not monophyletic, and these two taxa represent separate species (**stat. rev.**). He also placed four

947   taxa traditionally treated within *P. fuscus* with two taxa previously known as *Papilio pitmani*

948   Elwes & Nicéville, [1887] under the species name *Princeps prexaspes* (C. Felder & R. Felder,

949   1865). We confirmed that these six taxa form a single species which we treat as *Papilio*

950   *prexaspes*, restricting the name *Princeps* Hübner, [1807] as the subgeneric name for the *Papilio*

951   *demoleus* clade.

952   As stated above, Hancock (1992) treated *P. canopus* and *P. hypsicles* within *P. fuscus*,

953   but molecular phylogenies showed that this would result in a paraphyletic species. Two groups

954   of taxa traditionally treated within *Papilio fuscus* (e.g. Jordan 1909) were found to be the sister

955   to *P. hypsicles*, representing two distinct species not directly related to true *P. fuscus* (Joshi and

956   Kunte, 2022). One of these consists of two taxa from New Britain (*lamponius* Fruhstorfer,

957   1904) and New Ireland (*cilix* Godman & Salvin, 1879) which represent a distinct species,

958   *Papilio cilix* Godman & Salvin, 1879 (**stat. rev.**). This follows a pattern of speciation of New

959   Britain and New Ireland taxa seen in other *Papilio* species as discussed above. The sister to *P.*

960   *cilix* consists of the taxa traditionally placed in *P. fuscus* from eastern Australia, New Guinea

961   and the Solomon Islands. The oldest available name for this species is *Papilio capaneus*

962   Westwood, 1843 (**stat. rev.**).

963

964   **CRediT authorship contribution statement**

965   **Fabien L. Condamine:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Taxonomy,

966   Investigation, Resources, Data curation, Writing – original draft, Project administration,

967   Funding acquisition.

968   **Rémi Allio:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Data curation, Writing – review & editing.

969   **Eliette L. Reboud:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – review & editing.

970   **Julian R. Dupuis:** Resources, Validation, Writing – review & editing.

971   **Emmanuel F.A. Toussaint:** Resources, Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Writing

972   – review & editing.

973   **Nathan Mazet:** Methodology, Software, Writing – review & editing.

974   **Shao-Ji Hu:** Resources, Validation, Writing – review & editing.

975   **Delano S. Lewis:** Resources, Validation, Writing – review & editing.

976   **Krushnamegh Kunte:** Conceptualization, Resources, Validation, Taxonomy, Writing –

977   review & editing.

978   **Adam M. Cotton:** Conceptualization, Resources, Validation, Taxonomy, Writing – review &

979   editing.

References

Ae, S.A. (1979) The phylogeny of some *Papilio* based on interspecific hybridization data. *Systematic Entomology*, **4**, 1–16.

Alfaro, M.E. and Holder, M.T. (2006) The posterior and the prior in Bayesian phylogenetics. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution and Systematics*, **37**, 19–42.

Allio, R., Scornavacca, C., Nabholz, B., Clamens, A.-L., Sperling, F.A.H. and Condamine, F.L. (2020) Whole genome shotgun phylogenomics resolves the pattern and timing of swallowtail butterfly evolution. *Systematic Biology*, **69**, 38-60.

Allio, R., Nabholz, B., Wanke, S., Chomicki, G., Pérez-Escobar, O.A., Cotton, A.M., Clamens, A.-L., Kergoat, G.J., Sperling, F.A.H. and Condamine, F.L. (2021) Genome-wide macroevolutionary signatures of key innovations in butterflies colonizing new host plants. *Nature Communications*, **12**, 354.

1014 Angelis, K., Álvarez-Carretero, S., Dos Reis, M. and Yang, Z. (2018) An evaluation of different
1015   partitioning strategies for Bayesian estimation of species divergence times. *Systematic*
1016   *Biology*, **67**, 61–77.

1017 Aubert, J., Legal, L., Descimon, H. and Michel, F. (1999) Molecular phylogeny of swallowtail
1018   butterflies of the tribe Papilionini (Papilionidae, Lepidoptera). *Molecular Phylogenetics*
1019   *and Evolution*, **12**, 156-167.

1020 Ashlock, P.D. and Mayr, E. (1991) *Principles of Systematic Zoology*. 2nd edition. MacGraw-
1021   Hill. Inc. New York.

1022 Ayres, D.L., Darling, A., Zwickl, D.J. *et al.* (2012) BEAGLE: an application programming
1023   interface and high-performance computing library for statistical phylogenetics.
1024   *Systematic Biology*, **61**, 170–173.

1025 Baele, G., Li, W.L.S., Drummond, A.J., Suchard, M.A. and Lemey, P. (2013) Accurate model
1026   selection of relaxed molecular clocks in Bayesian phylogenetics. *Molecular Biology and*
1027   *Evolution*, **30**, 239–243.

1028 Blaimer, B.B., Ward, P.S., Schultz, T.R., Fisher, B.L. and Brady, S.G. (2018) Paleotropical
1029   diversification dominates the evolution of the hyperdiverse ant tribe Crematogastrini
1030   (Hymenoptera: Formicidae). *Insect Systematics and Diversity*, **2**, 3.

1031 Brake, I. and Bächli, G. (2013) Drosophilidae (Diptera). *World Catalogue of Insects, Volume*
1032   *9*. Brill, Leyde.

1033 Britton, T., Anderson, C.L., Jacquet, D., Lundqvist, S. and Bremer, K. (2007) Estimating
1034   divergence times in large phylogenetic trees. *Systematic Biology*, **56**, 741–752.

1035 Cabusas, J.V.B., Barrion-Dupo, A.L.A., Latina, R.A. and Caoili, B.L. (2020) Cytochrome c
1036   oxidase subunit I and II (COI and COII) sequences support recognition of *Papilio chikae*
1037   Igarashi and *Papilio hermeli* Nuyda as distinct species. *Philippine Journal of Science*,
1038   **150**, 111-119.

1039 Cantino, P.D. and De Queiroz, K. (Eds.) (2020) *PhyloCode: A Phylogenetic Code of Biological*
1040   *Nomenclature*. CRC Press.

1041 Carpenter, F.M. (1992) Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology, Part R, Arthropoda 3-4.
1042   Geological Society of America, Boulder, Colorado.

1043 Caterino, M.S. and Sperling, F.A.H. (1999) *Papilio* phylogeny based on mitochondrial
1044   cytochrome oxidase I and II genes. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, **11**, 122–
1045   137.

Caterino, M.S., Reed, R.D., Kuo, M.M. and Sperling, F.A.H. (2001) A partitioned likelihood analysis of swallowtail butterfly phylogeny (Lepidoptera: Papilionidae). *Systematic Biology*, **50**, 106–127.

Chernomor, O., von Haeseler, A. and Minh, B.Q. (2016) Terrace aware data structure for phylogenomic inference from supermatrices. *Systematic Biology*, **65**, 997-1008.

Collins, N.M. and Morris, M.G. (1985) *Threatened Swallowtail Butterflies of the World*. The IUCN Red Data Book, Cambridge.

Condamine, F.L., Sperling, F.A.H., Wahlberg, N., Rasplus, J.-Y. and Kergoat, G.J. (2012) What caused the latitudinal gradient of species diversity in swallowtail butterflies? *Ecology Letters*, **15**, 267–277.

Condamine, F.L., Sperling, F.A.H. and Kergoat, G.J. (2013a) Global biogeographic pattern in swallowtail diversification demonstrates alternate colonization routes in Northern and Southern Hemispheres. *Journal of Biogeography*, **40**, 9–23.

Condamine, F.L., Toussaint, E.F.A., Cotton, A.M., Genson, G.S., Sperling, F.A.H. and Kergoat, G.J. (2013b) Fine-scale biogeographic and temporal diversification processes of peacock swallowtails (*Papilio* subgenus *Achillides*) in the Indo-Australian Archipelago. *Cladistics*, **29**, 88-111.

Condamine, F.L., Nagalingum, N., Marshall, C.R. and Morlon, H. (2015) Origin and diversification of living cycads: A cautionary tale on the impact of the branching process prior on Bayesian molecular dating. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, **15**, 65.

Condamine, F.L., Clapham, M.E. and Kergoat, G.J. (2016) Global patterns of insect diversification: towards a reconciliation of fossil and molecular evidence? *Scientific Reports*, **6**, 19208.

Condamine, F.L., Nabholz, B., Clamens, A.-L., Dupuis, J.R. and Sperling, F.A.H. (2018a) Mitochondrial phylogenomics, the origin of swallowtail butterflies, and the impact of the number of clocks in Bayesian molecular dating. *Systematic Entomology*, **43**, 460-480.

Condamine, F.L., Rolland, J., Höhna, S., Sperling, F.A.H. and Sanmartín, I. (2018b) Testing the role of the Red Queen and Court Jester as drivers of the macroevolution of Apollo butterflies. *Systematic Biology*, **67**, 940-964.

Condamine, F.L., Rolland, J. and Morlon, H. (2019) Assessing the causes of diversification slowdowns: temperature-dependent and diversity-dependent models receive equivalent support. *Ecology Letters*, **22**, 1900-1912.

1079 Cornell, H.V. (2013). Is regional species diversity bounded or unbounded? *Biological Reviews*,
1080   **88**, 140-165.

1081 Cotton, A.M. and Nakae, M. (2020) Replacement name for *Eques* Kirby, 1896 (Lepidoptera:
1082   Papilionidae). *Butterflies*, **84**, 47.

1083 Cotton, A.M. and Racheli, T. (2007) A preliminary annotated checklist of the Papilionidae of
1084   Laos with notes on taxonomy, phenology, distribution and variation (Lepidoptera,
1085   Papilionoidea). *Fragmenta Entomologica*, **38**, 279-378.

1086 Deshmukh, R., Baral, S., Kuwalekar, M., Kizhakke, A.G., and Kunte K. (2022) Reproductive
1087   barriers and genomic hotspots of adaptation during allopatric species divergence.
1088   *bioRxiv*, https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.11.483945.

1089 Dorchin, A., López-Uribe, M.M., Praz, C.J., Griswold, T. and Danforth, B.N. (2018)
1090   Phylogeny, new generic-level classification, and historical biogeography of the *Eucera*
1091   complex (Hymenoptera: Apidae). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, **119**, 81-92.

1092 Douady, C.J., Delsuc, F., Boucher, Y., Doolittle, W.F. and Douzery, E.J.P. (2003) Comparison
1093   of Bayesian and maximum likelihood bootstrap measures of phylogenetic reliability.
1094   *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **20**, 248–254.

1095 Drummond, A.J. and Bouckaert, R.R. (2015) *Bayesian evolutionary analysis with BEAST*.
1096   Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

1097 Drummond, A.J., Ho, S.Y.W., Phillips, M.J. and Rambaut, A. (2006) Relaxed phylogenetics
1098   and dating with confidence. *PLoS Biology*, **4**, e88.

1099 Dupuis, J.R. and Sperling, F.A.H. (2015) Repeated reticulate evolution in North American
1100   *Papilio machaon* group swallowtail butterflies. *PLoS One*, **10**, e0141882.

1101 Dupuis, J.R. and Sperling, F.A.H. (2020) Phylogenomic test of mitochondrial clues to archaic
1102   ancestors in a group of hybridizing swallowtail butterflies. *Molecular Phylogenetics and*
1103   *Evolution*, **152**, 106921.

1104 Durden, C.J. and Rose, H. (1978) Butterflies from the middle Eocene: the earliest occurrence
1105   of fossil Papilionidae. *Pearce-Sellards Series Texas Memorial Museum*, **29**, 1–25.

1106 Engel, M.S. (2015) Insect evolution. *Current Biology*, **25**, R868-R872.

1107 Ehrlich, P.R. and Raven, P.H. (1964) Butterflies and plants: a study in coevolution. *Evolution*,
1108   **18**, 586–608.

1109 Evans, W.H. (1923) The identification of Indian butterflies. *Journal of the Bombay Natural*
1110   *History Society*, **29**, 230–260.

1111 Foster, C.S., Sauquet, H., Van der Merwe, M., McPherson, H., Rossetto, M. and Ho, S.Y.
1112   (2017) Evaluating the impact of genomic data and priors on Bayesian estimates of the
1113   angiosperm evolutionary timescale. *Systematic Biology*, **66**, 338–351.

1114 Fujioka, T., Tsukiyama, H. and Chiba, H. (1997) *Japanese Butterflies and Their Relatives in*
1115   *the World*. Vol. 1. Shuppan Geijutsu Sha, Tokyo. 200 + 304 pp., 162 pl.

1116 Garnett, S.T., Christidis, L., Conix, S., Costello, M.J., Zachos, F.E., Bánki, O.S., Bao, Y., Barik,
1117   S.K., Buckeridge, J.S., Hovern, D., Lien, A., Montgomery, N., Nikolaeva, S., Pyle, R.L.,
1118   Thomson, S.A., van Dijk, P.P., Whalen, A., Zhang, Z.-Q. and Thiele, K.R. (2020)
1119   Principles for creating a single authoritative list of the world's species. *PLoS Biology*,
1120   **18**, e3000736.

1121 Gernhard, T. (2008) The conditioned reconstructed process. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*,
1122   **253**, 769–778.

1123 Grimaldi, D. and Engel, M.S. (2005) *Evolution of the Insects*. Cambridge: Cambridge
1124   University Press.

1125 Guindon, S., Dufayard, J.F., Lefort, V., Anisimova, M., Hordijk, W. and Gascuel, O. (2010)
1126   New algorithms and methods to estimate maximum-likelihood phylogenies: Assessing
1127   the performance of PhyML 3.0. *Systematic Biology*, **59**, 307-321.

1128 Hancock, D.L. (1979) The systematic position of *Papilio anactus* Macleay (Lepidoptera:
1129   Papilionidae). *Australian Entomological Magazine*, **6**, 49–53.

1130 Hancock, D.L. (1983) Classification of the Papilionidae (Lepidoptera): a phylogenetic
1131   approach. *Smithersia*, **2**, 1–48.

1132 Hancock, D.L. (1992) The *Princeps fuscus* complex (Lepidoptera: Papilionidae). *Australian*
1133   *entomological Magazine*, **19**: 1–8.

1134 Häuser, C.L., de Jong, R., Lamas, G., Robbins, R.K., Smith, C. and Vane-Wright, R.I. (2005)
1135   Papilionidae Revised GloBIS/GART Species Checklist (2nd Draft). [WWW
1136   document]. URL http://www.insects-online.de/frames/papilio.htm [accessed on 5
1137   September 2019].

1138 Hiura, I. and Alagar, R.E. (1971) Studies on the Philippine butterflies chiefly collected by the
1139   co-operative survey by the Osaka Museum of Natural History and the National Museum
1140   of the Philippines, 1969. Part 1: Papilionidae. *Bulletin of the Osaka Museum of Natural*
1141   *History*, **24**, 29–44.

1142 Hoang, D.T., Chernomor, O., Von Haeseler, A., Minh, B.Q. and Vinh, L.S. (2018) UFBoot2:
1143   improving the ultrafast bootstrap approximation. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **35**,
1144   518-522.

1145   Hölldobler, B. and Wilson, E.O. (1990) *The Ants*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

1146   Huelsenbeck, J.P., Larget, B. and Alfaro, M.E. (2004) Bayesian phylogenetic model selection
1147   using reversible jump Markov chain Monte Carlo. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*,
1148   **21**, 1123–1133.

1149   Huxley, J. (1976) The coloration of *Papilio zalmoxis* and *P. antimachus*, and the discovery of
1150   Tyndall blue in butterflies. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B,*
1151   *Biological Sciences*, **193**, 441–453.

1152   ICZN (1999) International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, 4th edition. xxix, 306 pp. The
1153   International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, London.

1154   ICZN (2012) Amendment of Articles 8, 9, 10, 21 and 78 of the International Code of Zoological
1155   Nomenclature to expand and refine methods of publication. *ZooKeys*, **219**, 1-10.

1156   Igarashi, S. (1979) *Papilionidae and their early stages*. Vol. 1, 219 pp.; Vol. 2, [xvi] pp., 1-223
1157   pls + 1-32 pls + 1-102 pls. Kodansha, Tokyo.

1158   Igarashi, S. (1984) The classification of the Papilionidae mainly based on the morphology of
1159   their immature stages. *Transactions of the Lepidopterist Society of Japan*, **34**, 41–96.

1160   Jablonski, D., Roy, K. and Valentine, J.W. (2006) Out of the tropics: evolutionary dynamics of
1161   the latitudinal diversity gradient. *Science*, **314**, 102-106.

1162   de Jong, R. (2007) Estimating time and space in the evolution of the Lepidoptera. *Tijdschrift*
1163   *voor Entomologie*, **150**, 319–346.

1164   de Jong, R. (2017) Fossil butterflies, calibration points and the molecular clock (Lepidoptera:
1165   Papilionoidea). *Zootaxa*, **4270**, 1–63.

1166   Jordan, H.E.K. (1896) On mechanical selection and other problems. *Novitates Zoologicae*, **3**,
1167   426–525.

1168   Jordan, H.E.K. (1908-09) Family: Papilionidae, Swallowtails. In: Seitz, A. (Ed.), Die Gross-
1169   Schmetterlinge der Erde. Vol. 9, Fauna indoaustralica. Stuttgart, Alfred Kernen, pp. 11–
1170   109, 112.

1171   Joshi, J. and Kunte, K. (2022) Polytypy and systematics: diversification of *Papilio* swallowtail
1172   butterflies in the biogeographically complex Indo-Australian Region. *bioRxiv*,
1173   doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.23.485569.

1174   Kalyaanamoorthy, S., Minh, B.Q., Wong, T.K., Von Haeseler, A. and Jermiin, L.S. (2017)
1175   ModelFinder: fast model selection for accurate phylogenetic estimates. *Nature Methods*,
1176   **14**, 587-589.

1177   Katoh, K. and Standley, D.M. (2013) MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7:
1178   improvements in performance and usability. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **30**, 772–
1179   780.

1180   Kizhakke, A.G. and Kunte, K. (2022) Mimicry promotes morphological diversification but not
1181   speciation in mimetic swallowtail butterflies. *bioRxiv*,
1182   https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.11.05.515277.

1183   Kunte, K. (2009) The diversity and evolution of Batesian mimicry in *Papilio* swallowtails
1184   butterflies. *Evolution*, **63**, 2707–2716.

1185   Kunte, K., Shea, C., Aardema, M.L., Scriber, J.M., Juenger, T.E., Gilbert, L.E. and Kronforst,
1186   M.R. (2011) Sex chromosome mosaicism and hybrid speciation among tiger swallowtail
1187   butterflies. *PLoS Genetics*, **7**, e1002274.

1188   Kunte, K., Zhang, W., Tenger-Trolander, A. *et al.* (2014) *doublesex* is a mimicry supergene.
1189   *Nature*, **507**, 229–232.

1190   Lanfear, R., Frandsen, P.B., Wright, A.M., Senfeld, T. and Calcott, B. (2017) PartitionFinder
1191   2: new methods for selecting partitioned models of evolution for molecular and
1192   morphological phylogenetic analyses. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **34**, 772–773.

1193   Lartillot, N. and Philippe, H. (2004) A Bayesian mixture model for across-site heterogeneities
1194   in the amino-acid replacement process. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **21**, 1095–
1195   1109.

1196   Lartillot, N. and Philippe, H. (2006) Computing Bayes factors using thermodynamic
1197   integration. *Systematic Biology*, **55**, 195–207.

1198   Lartillot, N., Brinkmann, H. and Philippe, H. (2007) Suppression of long-branch attraction
1199   artefacts in the animal phylogeny using a site-heterogeneous model. *BMC Evolutionary
1200   Biology*, **7**, 4.

1201   Lartillot, N., Rodrigue, N., Stubbs, D. and Richer, J. (2013) PhyloBayes MPI: phylogenetic
1202   reconstruction with infinite mixtures of profiles in a parallel environment. *Systematic
1203   Biology*, **62**, 611–615.

1204   Lewis, D.S., Sperling, F.A.H., Nakahara, S., Cotton, A.M., Kawahara, A.Y. and Condamine,
1205   F.L. (2015) Role of Caribbean Islands in the diversification and biogeography of
1206   Neotropical *Heraclides* swallowtails. *Cladistics*, **31**, 291-314.

1207   Li, H.T., Yi, T.S., Gao, L.M. *et al.* (2019) Origin of angiosperms and the puzzle of the Jurassic
1208   gap. *Nature Plants*, **5**, 461-470.

1209   Maddison, W.P. and Maddison, D.R. (2021) Mesquite: a modular system for evolutionary
1210   analysis. Version 3.70 http://www.mesquiteproject.org

Magallón, S., Gómez-Acevedo, S., Sánchez-Reyes, L.L. and Hernández-Hernández, T. (2015) A metacalibrated time-tree documents the early rise of flowering plant phylogenetic diversity. *New Phytologist*, **207**, 437–453.

Mazet, N., Morlon, H., Fabre P.-H and Condamine F.L. (2023) Estimating clade-specific diversification rates and palaeodiversity dynamics from reconstructed phylogenies. *bioRxiv*, https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.10.490920.

Meseguer, A.S., Lobo, J.M., Cornuault, J., Beerling, D., Ruhfel, B.R., Davis, C.C., Jousselin, E. and Sanmartín, I. (2018) Reconstructing deep-time palaeoclimate legacies in the clusioid Malpighiales unveils their role in the evolution and extinction of the boreotropical flora. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **27**, 616-628.

Miller, J.S. (1987) Phylogenetic studies in the Papilioninae (Lepidoptera: Papilionidae). *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, **186**, 365–512.

Miller, M.A., Schwartz, T., Pickett, B.E. *et al.* (2015) A RESTful API for access to phylogenetic tools via the CIPRES science gateway. *Evolutionary Bioinformatics*, **11**, 43–48.

Minh, B.Q., Schmidt, H.A., Chernomor, O., Schrempf, D., Woodhams, M.D., Von Haeseler, A. and Lanfear, R. (2020) IQ-TREE 2: New models and efficient methods for phylogenetic inference in the genomic era. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **37**, 1530-1534.

Moen, D. and Morlon, H. (2014) Why does diversification slow down? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **29**, 190-197.

Morley, R.J. (2011) Cretaceous and Tertiary climate change and the past distribution of megathermal rainforests. In: *Tropical Rainforest Responses to Climatic Change* (eds. Bush, M.B. and Flenley, J.-R.). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. pp. 1-31.

Morlon, H., Potts, M.D. and Plotkin, J.B. (2010) Inferring the dynamics of diversification: a coalescent approach. *PLoS Biology*, **8**, e1000493.

Morlon, H., Parsons, T.L. and Plotkin, J. (2011) Reconciling molecular phylogenies with the fossil record. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, **108**, 16327-16332.

Morlon, H., Lewitus, E., Condamine, F.L., Manceau, M., Clavel, J. and Drury, J. (2016) RPANDA: an R package for macroevolutionary analyses on phylogenetic trees. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **7**, 589-597.

Munroe, E. (1961) The classification of the Papilionidae (Lepidoptera). *Canadian Entomological: Supplement*, **17**, 1–51.

Nakae, M. (2021a) *Papilionidae of the World*. Roppon-Ashi Entomological Books.

Nakae, M. (2021b) Taxonomic revision on five species of the family Papilionidae (Lepidoptera). *Gekkan-Mushi*, **602**, 35–39.

Nakahara, S., Lamas, G., Willmott, K. and Espeland, M. (2020) Description of a new genus and species for a common and widespread Amazonian satyrine butterfly (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae: Satyrinae: Satyrini). *PeerJ*, **8**, e10324.

O'Grady, P. M. and DeSalle, R. (2018) Phylogeny of the genus *Drosophila*. *Genetics*, **209**, 1-25.

Owens, H., Lewis, D.S., Dupuis, J.R. *et al.* (2017) The latitudinal diversity gradient in New World swallowtail butterflies is caused by contrasting patterns of out-of- and into-the-tropics dispersal. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **26**, 1447–1458.

Owens, H.L., Lewis, D.S., Condamine, F.L., Kawahara, A.Y., and Guralnick, R.P. (2020) Comparative phylogenetics of *Papilio* butterfly wing shape and size demonstrates independent hindwing and forewing evolution. *Systematic Biology*, **69**, 813-819.

Page, M.G.P. and Treadaway, C.G. (2003a) Papilionidae of the Philippine Islands I. Descriptions of New Subspecies and Changes in Classification. Bauer & Frankenbach, Butterflies of the World, Supplement, 8: 1–6.

Page, M.G.P. and Treadaway, C.G. (2003b) Bauer & Frankenbach, Butterflies of the World. part 17. Papilionidae IX. Papilionidae of the Philippine Islands. Goecke & Evers, Keltern.

Palmer, D.H. and Kronforst, M.R. (2020) A shared genetic basis of mimicry across swallowtail butterflies points to ancestral co-option of *doublesex*. *Nature Communications*, **11**, 6.

Pante, E., Puillandre, N., Viricel, A., Arnaud-Haond, S., Aurelle, D., Castelin, M., Chenuil, A., Destombe, C., Forcioli, D., Valero, M., Viard, F. and Samadi, S. (2015) Species are hypotheses: Avoid connectivity assessments based on pillars of sand. *Molecular Ecology*, **24**, 525-544.

Pound, M.J., Haywood, A.M., Salzmann, U. and Riding, J.B. (2012) Global vegetation dynamics and latitudinal temperature gradients during the Mid to Late Miocene (15.97–5.33 Ma). *Earth-Science Reviews*, **112**, 1-22.

Rabosky, D.L. (2009) Ecological limits and diversification rate: alternative paradigms to explain the variation in species richness among clades and regions. *Ecology Letters*, **12**, 735-743.

Rambaut, A., Drummond, A.J., Xie, D., Baele, G. and Suchard, M.A. (2018) Posterior summarization in Bayesian phylogenetics using Tracer 1.7. *Systematic Biology*, **67**, 901–904.

Ranwez, V., Harispe, S., Delsuc, F. and Douzery, E.J.P. (2011) MACSE: Multiple Alignment of Coding SEquences accounting for frameshifts and stop codons. *PLoS One*, **6**, e22594.

Rebel, H. (1898) *Doritites bosniaskii*. Sitzungsberichte der akademie der wissenschaften. *Mathematischen-Naturwissenschaftliche Classe*. Abteilung 1: Mineralogie, Biologie, Erdkunde. Wien, **107**, 734–741, 745.

Ree, R.H. and Sanmartín, I. (2018) Conceptual and statistical problems with the DEC+ J model of founder-event speciation and its comparison with DEC via model selection. *Journal of Biogeography*, **45**, 741-749.

Reed, R.D. and Sperling, F.A. (1999) Interaction of process partitions in phylogenetic analysis: an example from the swallowtail butterfly genus *Papilio*. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **16**, 286-297.

Rolland, J., Condamine, F.L., Beeravolu, C.R., Jiguet, F. and Morlon, H. (2015) Dispersal is a major driver of the latitudinal diversity gradient of Carnivora. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **24**, 1059-1071.

Rolland, J. and Condamine, F.L. (2019) The contribution of temperature and continental fragmentation to amphibian diversification. *Journal of Biogeography*, **46**, 1857-1873.

Ronquist, F., Teslenko, M., van der Mark, P. *et al.* (2012) MrBayes 3.2: Efficient Bayesian phylogenetic inference and model choice across a large model space. *Systematic Biology*, **61**, 539–542.

Rothschild, W (1895) A Revision of the Papilios of the Eastern Hemisphere, Exclusive of Africa. *Novitates Zoologicae*, **2**, 167–463.

Sauquet, H., Ho, S.Y., Gandolfo, M.A., Jordan, G.J., Wilf, P., Cantrill, D.J., Bayly, M.J., Bromham, L., Brown, G.K., Carpenter, R.J., Lee, D.M., Murphy, D.J., Sniderman, J.M.K. and Udovicic, F. (2012) Testing the impact of calibration on molecular divergence times using a fossil-rich group: the case of *Nothofagus* (Fagales). *Systematic Biology*, **61**, 289-313.

Scriber, J.M., Tsubaki, Y. and Lederhouse, R.C. (1995) *Swallowtail Butterflies: Their Ecology and Evolutionary Biology*. Scientific Publishers, Gainesville, Florida.

Scudder, S.H. (1875) Fossil butterflies. *Memoirs of the American Association for the Advancement of Science*, **1**, XI + 99.

1310 Shiraiwa, K., Cong, Q. and Grishin, N.V. (2014). A new *Heraclides* swallowtail (Lepidoptera,
1311   Papilionidae) from North America is recognized by the pattern on its neck. *Zookeys*,
1312   **468**, 85-135.

1313 Sigward, J.D., Sutton, M.D. and Bennett, K.D. (2018) How big is a genus? Towards a
1314   nomothetic systematics. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society*, **183**, 237–252.

1315 Sohn, J.-C., Labandeira, C.C., Davis, D. and Mitter, C. (2012) An annotated catalog of fossil
1316   and subfossil Lepidoptera (Insecta: Holometabola) of the world. *Zootaxa*, **3286**, 1–132.

1317 Sperling, F.A.H. (1987) Evolution of the *Papilio machaon* species group in western Canada.
1318   *Quaestiones Entomologicae*, **23**, 198–315.

1319 Sperling, F.A.H. (1990) Interspecific hybrids in *Papilio* butterflies: Poor taxonomy or
1320   interesting evolutionary problem? *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **68**, 1790– 1799.

1321 Sperling, F.A.H. (1991) Mitochondrial DNA phylogeny, speciation, and host-plant coevolution
1322   of *Papilio* butterflies. Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell Univ. Ithaca, New York.

1323 Sperling, F.A.H. (1993a) Mitochondrial DNA phylogeny of the *Papilio machaon* species group
1324   (Lepidoptera: Papilionidae). *The Memoirs of the Entomological Society of Canada*, **165**,
1325   233–242.

1326 Sperling, F.A.H. (1993b) Mitochondrial DNA variation and Haldane's rule in the *Papilio
1327   glaucus* and *Papilio troilus* species group. *Heredity*, **71**, 227–233.

1328 Sperling, F.A.H. and Harrison, R.G. (1994) Mitochondrial DNA variation within and between
1329   species of the *Papilio machaon* group of swallowtail butterflies. *Evolution*, **48**, 408–
1330   422.

1331 Steinthorsdottir, M., Coxall, H.K., de Boer, A.M., Huber, M., Barbolini, N., Bradshaw, C.D.,
1332   *et al.* (2021). The Miocene: The future of the past. *Paleoceanography and
1333   Paleoclimatology*, **36**, e2020PA004037.

1334 Stork, N.E. (2018) How many species of insects and other terrestrial arthropods are there on
1335   Earth? *Annual Review of Entomology*, **63**, 31-45.

1336 Suchard, M.A., Lemey, P., Baele, G., Ayres, D.L., Drummond, A.J. and Rambaut, A. (2018)
1337   Bayesian phylogenetic and phylodynamic data integration using BEAST 1.10. *Virus
1338   Evolution*, **4**, vey016.

1339 Talavera, G., Lukhtanov, V.A., Pierce, N.E. and Vila, R. (2012) Establishing criteria for higher-
1340   level classification using molecular data: the systematics of *Polyommatus* blue
1341   butterflies (Lepidoptera, Lycaenidae). *Cladistics*, **29**, 166- 192.

1342 Talbot, G. (1939) *The Fauna of British India including Ceylon and Burma*. Butterflies Vol. I.
1343   Taylor & Francis, London. xxix + 600 pp.

Tennent, W.J. (1999) Notes on some Solomon Islands *Papilio* Linnaeus, with descriptions of four new subspecies (Lepidoptera: Papilionidae). *Nachrichten des Entomologischen Vereins Apollo, N.F.*, **20**, 207–230.

Tennent, W.J., Chandra, V. and Müller, C.J. (2018) A remarkable new swallowtail butterfly from Fiji (Lepidoptera, Papilionidae). *Nachrichten des Entomologischen Vereins Apollo*, **39**, 53–61.

Teta, P. (2019) The usage of subgenera in mammalian taxonomy. *Mammalia*, **83**, 209-211.

Tsukada, E. and Nishiyama, Y. (1980) *Butterflies of the South East Asian Islands*. Part I. Papilionidae. Plapac Co., Ltd., Tokyo. 457 pp.

Tyler, H.A., Brown, K.S. and Wilson, K. (1994) *Swallowtail Butterflies of the Americas: A Study in Biological Dynamics, Ecological Diversity, Biosystematics, and Conservation*. Scientific Publishers, Gainesville, Florida.

Vane-Wright, R.I., Raheem, D.C., Cieslak, A. and Vogler, A.P. (1999) Evolution of the mimetic African swallowtail butterfly *Papilio dardanus*: Molecular data confirm relationships with *P. phorcas* and *P. constantinus*. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, **66**, 215–229.

Wallace, A.R. (1865) On the phenomena of variation and geographical distribution as illustrated by the Papilionidae of the Malayan region. *Transactions of the Linnean Society of London*, **25**, 1–71.

Wiegmann, B.M., Trautwein, M.D., Winkler, I.S., Barr, N.B., Kim, J.-W., Lambkin, C., Bertone, M.A., Cassel, B.K., Bayless, K.M., Heimberg, A.M., Wheeler, B.M., Peterson, K.J., Pape, T., Sinclair, B.J., Skevington, J.H., Blagoderov, V., Caravas, J., Narayanan Kutty, S., Schmidt-Ott, U., Kampmeier, G.E., Thompson, F.C., Grimaldi, D.A., Beckenbach, A.T., Courtney, G.W., Friedrich, M., Meier, R. and Yeates, D.K. (2011) Episodic radiations in the fly tree of life. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, **108**, 5690–5695.

Winston, J.E. (1999) *Describing Species: Practical Taxonomic Procedure for Biologists*. Columbia University Press, Columbia, USA.

Wu, L.W., Yen, S.H., Lees, D.C., Lu, C.C., Yang, P.S. and Hsu, Y.F. (2015) Phylogeny and historical biogeography of Asian *Pterourus* butterflies (Lepidoptera: Papilionidae): A case of intercontinental dispersal from North America to East Asia. *PLoS One*, **10**, e0140933.

Xie, W., Lewis, P.O., Fan, Y., Kuo, L. and Chen, M.H. (2011) Improving marginal likelihood estimation for Bayesian phylogenetic model selection. *Systematic Biology*, **60**, 150–160.

1378 Xiong, T., Li, X., Yago, M. and Mallet, J. (2022) Admixture of evolutionary rates across a
1379   butterfly hybrid zone. *eLife*, **11**, e78135.

1380 Yagi T., Sasaki, G. and Takebe, H. (1999) Phylogeny of Japanese papilionid butterflies inferred
1381   from nucleotide sequences of the mitochondrial ND5 gene. *Journal of Molecular*
1382   *Evolution*, **48**, 42–48.

1383 Zakharov, E.V., Caterino, M.S. and Sperling, F.A.H. (2004a) Molecular phylogeny, historical
1384   biogeography, and divergence time estimates for swallowtail butterflies of the genus
1385   *Papilio* (Lepidoptera: Papilionidae). *Systematic Biology*, **53**, 193–215.

1386 Zakharov, E.V., Smith, C.R., Lees, D.C., Cameron, A., Vane-Wright, R.I. and Sperling, F.A.H.
1387   (2004b) Independent gene phylogenies and morphology demonstrate a Malagasy origin
1388   for a wide-ranging group of swallowtail butterflies. *Evolution*, **58**, 2763-2782.

1389 Zhang, J., Cong, Q., Shen, J., Brockmann, E. and Grishin, N.V. (2019) Genomes reveal drastic
1390   and recurrent phenotypic divergence in firetip skipper butterflies (Hesperiidae:
1391   Pyrrhopyginae). *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London: Biological Sciences*, **286**,
1392   20190609.

1393 Zhang, W., Westerman, E., Nitzany, E., Palmer, S. and Kronforst, M.R. (2017) Tracing the
1394   origin and evolution of supergene mimicry in butterflies. *Nature Communications*, **8**,
1395   1269.

1396 Ziegler, A., Eshel, G., Rees, P. M., Rothfus, T., Rowley, D. and Sunderlin, D. (2003) Tracing
1397   the tropics across land and sea: Permian to present. *Lethaia*, **36**, 227-254.

1398

P. (Alexanoria) alexanor   *P. (Eleppone) anactus*   *P. (Sinoprinceps) benguetana*

P. (Menelaides) bootes   *P. (Papilio) joanae*   *P. (Chilasa) laglaizei*

P. (Heraclides) thoas   *P. (Achillides) ulysses*   *P. (Pterourus) zagreus*

P. (Druryia) antimachus

1403

1404

Fig. 2. Geographic distribution and sampling of *Papilio*. Histogram shows the number of species occurring in 11 biogeographic regions and sampled in the current phylogenetic tree; African species diversity is clearly under sampled. WP: Western Palearctic, EP: Eastern Palearctic, WN: Western Nearctic, EN: Eastern Nearctic, CA: Central America and Caribbean Islands, SA: South America, AF: Africa, MD: Madagascar, IN: India and Himalayan foothills, WA: Southeast Asia and Wallacea, and AU: Australasia. Pictures from Fabien L. Condamine.

1414   **Fig. 3.** Bayesian molecular phylogeny of *Papilio*. The phylogeny was inferred with MrBayes

1415   using a traditional partitioning strategy and a reversible-jump MCMC approach for selecting

1416   the best fitting substitution models. Posterior probabilities ≥0.95 are indicated at nodes with

1417   filled circles. The red dashed rectangle indicates phylogenetic uncertainties between methods.

1418   Existing subgeneric classification is shown with colored rectangles delineating subgenera. The

1419   outgroups are removed. Asterisks indicate species illustrated on the right. Pictures from Fabien

1420   L. Condamine.

Clade 1

Papilio machaonides *
Papilio hyppason
Papilio andraemon
Papilio paeon
Papilio caiguanabus
Papilio aristor
Papilio thoas
Papilio oviedo
Papilio melonius
Papilio homothoas
Papilio rumiko
Papilio cresphontes
Papilio thersites
Papilio androgeus
Papilio aristodemus *
Papilio pallas
Papilio ornython
Papilio astyalus
Papilio anchicayaensis
Papilio torquatus
Papilio himeros
Papilio lamarchei
Papilio hectorides
Papilio oxynius
Papilio pelaus
Papilio isidorus *
Papilio chiansiades
Papilio rogeri
Papilio anchisiades
Papilio epenetus
Papilio garleppi
Papilio erostratus

Heraclides

Clade 2

Papilio paradoxa
Papilio clytia
Papilio agestor
Papilio slateri
Papilio epycides
Papilio veiovis
Papilio laglaizei *
Papilio osmana
Papilio esperanza
Papilio troilus
Papilio pilumnus
Papilio palamedes

Chilasa

Papilio maraho *
Papilio elwesi
Papili- Papilio multicaudata
Papilio rutulus
Papilio eurymedon
Papilio canadensis
Papilio glaucus
Papilio appalachiensis
Papilio neyi
Papilio zagreus
Papilio scamander
Papilio warscewiczii
Papilio euterpinus
Papilio cacicus
Papilio homerus
Papilio garamas *
Papilio birchallii
Papilio victorinus
Papilio menatius
Papilio alexanor

Pterourus

Alexanoria

Clade 3

Clade 3a
Clade 3b
Clade 3c
Clade 3d
Clade 3e

Papilio depilis
Papilio euchenor
Papilio lormieri
Papilio delalandei
Papilio rex
Papilio antimachus
Papilio phorcas *
Papilio constantinus
Papilio meriones
Papilio humbloti
Papilio dardanus
Papilio natewa
Papilio anactus
Papilio gigon
Papilio antonio
Papilio liomedon *
Papilio noblei
Papilio demolion
Papilio xuthus
Papilio benguetana
Papilio indra
Papilio hospiton
Papilio zelicaon
Papilio polyxenes
Papilio kahli
Papilio brevicauda *
Papilio joanae
Papilio machaon
Papilio bairdii
Papilio nobilis
Papilio epiphorbas
Papilio oribazus
Papilio zalmoxis *
Papilio nireus
Papilio montrouzieri
Papilio telegonus
Papilio orsippus
Papilio ulysses
Papilio crino
Papilio neumoegeni
Papilio pericles
Papilio peranthus
Papilio lorquinianus *
Papilio blumei
Papilio palinurus
Papilio daedalus
Papilio arjuna
Papilio karna
Papilio hermosanus
Papilio paris
Papilio sylanius
Papilio maackii
Papilio krishna
Papilio hopponis
Papilio arcturus
Papilio dialis
Papilio hermeli *
Papilio chikae
Papilio polyctor
Papilio bianor
Papilio dehaanii
Papilio ryukyuensis
Papilio morondavana
Papilio grosesmithi
Papilio demoleus
Papilio erithonioides
Papilio demodocus *
Papilio iswara
Papilio iswaroides
Papilio hystaspes
Papilio daksha
Papilio helenus
Papilio sataspes *
Papilio palawanicus
Papilio mangarinus
Papilio biseriatus
Papilio protenor
Papilio polytes
Papilio javanus
Papilio alphenor
Papilio phestus
Papilio ambrax
Papilio diophantus
Papilio macilentus
Papilio jordani
Papilio ascalaphus
Papilio oenomaus
Papilio deiphobus *
Papilio memnon
Papilio agenor
Papilio janaka
Papilio bootes
Papilio acheron
Papilio forbesi
Papilio thaiwanus
Papilio alcmenor *
Papilio nephelus
Papilio chaon
Papilio dravidarum
Papilio castor
Papilio amynthor
Papilio schmeltzi
Papilio tydeus
Papilio oritas
Papilio godefroyi
Papilio bridgei
Papilio weymeri
Papilio gambrisius
Papilio aegeus *
Papilio canopus
Papilio hypsicles
Papilio cilix
Papilio capaneus
Papilio prexaspes
Papilio hipponous
Papilio fuscus
Papilio albinus
Papilio woodfordi *
Papilio heringi

Euchenor

Druryia

Eleppone

Araminta

Sinoprinceps

Papilio

Nireopapilio

Achillides

Princeps

Menelaides

⬤ Posterior probability ≥ 0.95 + SH-aLRT ≥ 80

▢ Phylogenetic uncertainties depending on methods

0.1

1423   **Fig. 4.** Dated phylogeny and historical biogeography of *Papilio*. The maximum clade credibility

1424   tree shows median ages estimated with a Bayesian uncorrelated lognormal method calibrated

1425   with fossils (see Figs S5-7 for additional results). The bottom-left corner map represents the

1426   global paleogeography about 25 Ma with continents delimited into 11 areas. Colored areas on

1427   the map correspond to colored squares for each node, representing inferred ancestral area(s)

1428   with the DEC model, and colored circles at tips, representing present-day distributions. The

1429   outgroups are removed. Asterisks indicate species illustrated on the right. Pictures from Fabien

1430   L. Condamine.

1434 **Fig. 5.** Diversification shifts and diversity dynamics estimated for *Papilio* as estimated by the

1435 best-fitting combination of shifts. A) The phylogeny of *Papilio* with shifts highlighted in colors

1436 and best models in parenthesis. Red dots correspond to all tested nodes. B) The evolution of

1437 diversification rates through time for the backbone and all subclades that are found as

1438 significant shifts. C) Diversity dynamics for the backbone and subclade trees as estimated with

1439 the probabilistic approach (dotted line represents the confidence interval of diversity estimates

1440 for the backbone). For the sake of clarity, confidence intervals of diversity estimates for

1441 subclades are not represented. D) Global diversity dynamics of *Papilio* obtained by summing

1442 all the diversity dynamics for the backbone and subclade trees. Pli.=Pliocene, Q=Quaternary,

1443 Myrs=million years.

1444

Table 1. Taxonomic working list for *Papilio* species. The list includes subgenera that are

currently recovered as monophyletic in molecular phylogenies, and species that belong to each

subgenus. We also indicate the ratio of species sampled in the phylogeny presented in this study,

which highlights subgenera that are well sampled versus poorly sampled. In total, genus *Papilio*

Linnaeus, 1758 includes 235 species, and we sampled 184 species in this study (=78.3%).

| *Achillides* Hübner, [1819] [30 spp.]: 29 spp. sampled in the current study (=96.6%)	Status	In the tree
Papilio (*Achillides*) *arcturus* Westwood, 1842	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *arjuna* Horsfield, 1828	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *bianor* Cramer, 1777	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *blumei* Boisduval, 1836	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *buddha* Westwood, 1872	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *chikae* Igarashi, 1965	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *crino* Fabricius, 1793	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *daedalus* Felder & Felder, 1861	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *palinurus*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *dehaanii* Felder & Felder, 1864	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *dialis* Leech, 1893	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *elephenor* Doubleday, 1845	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Achillides*) *hermeli* Nuyda, 1992	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *chikae*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *hermosanus* Rebel, 1906	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *hopponis* Matsumura, 1907	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *karna* Felder & Felder, 1865	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *krishna* Moore, [1858]	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *lorquinianus* Felder & Felder, 1865	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *maackii* Ménétriés, 1858	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *montrouzieri* Boisduval, 1859	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *neumoegeni* Honrath, 1890	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *orsippus* Godman & Salvin, 1888	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *ulysses*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *palinurus* Fabricius, 1787	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *paris* Linnaeus, 1758	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *peranthus* Fabricius, 1787	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *pericles* Wallace, 1865	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *polyctor* Boisduval, 1836	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *bianor*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *ryukyuensis* Fujioka, 1975	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *syfanius* Oberthür, 1886	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *telegonus* Felder & Felder, 1860	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *ulysses*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Achillides*) *ulysses* Linnaeus, 1758	Valid	Sampled
Alexanoria Koçak and Kemal, 2002 [1 sp.]: 1 sampled in the current study (=100%)	Status	In the tree
Papilio (*Alexanoria*) *alexanor* Esper, [1800]	Valid	Sampled
Araminta Moore, 1886 [5 spp.]: 5 sampled in the current study (=100%)	Status	In the tree
Papilio (*Araminta*) *antonio* Hewitson, 1875	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Araminta*) *demolion* Cramer, 1776	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Araminta*) *gigon* Felder & Felder, 1865	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Araminta*) *liomedon* Moore, [1875]	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Araminta*) *noblei* Nicéville, [1889]	Valid	Sampled

Chilasa Moore, [1881] [11 spp.]: 8 sampled in the current study (=72.7%)	Status	In the tree
Papilio (*Chilasa*) *agestor* Gray, 1831	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Chilasa*) *carolinensis* (Jumalon, 1967)	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Chilasa*) *clytia* Linnaeus, 1758	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Chilasa*) *epycides* Hewitson, 1864	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Chilasa*) *laglaizei* Depuiset, 1877	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Chilasa*) *moerneri* Aurivillius, 1919	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Chilasa*) *osmana* (Jumalon, 1967)	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Chilasa*) *paradoxa* Zincken, 1831	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Chilasa*) *slateri* Hewitson, 1859	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Chilasa*) *toboroi* Ribbe, 1907	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Chilasa*) *veiovis* Hewitson, 1865	Valid	Sampled
Druryia Aurivillius, 1881 [30 spp.]: 9 sampled in the current study (=30%)	Status	In the tree
Papilio (*Druryia*) *andronicus* Ward, 1871	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *antimachus* Drury, [1782]	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Druryia*) *arnoldiana* Vane-Wright, 1995	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *bacelarae* Bivar de Sousa & Mendes, 2009	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *constantinus* Ward, 1871	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Druryia*) *cynorta* Fabricius, 1793	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *cyproeofila* Butler, 1868	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *dardanus* Brown, 1776	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Druryia*) *delalandei* Godart, 1823	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Druryia*) *echerioides* Trimen, 1868	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *fernandus* Fruhstorfer, 1903	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *filaprae* Süffert, 1904	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *fuelleborni* Karsch, 1900	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *gallienus* Distant, 1879	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *humbloti* Oberthür, 1888	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *dardanus*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Druryia*) *jacksoni* Sharpe, 1891	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *leucotaenia* Rothschild, 1908	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *lormieri* Distant, 1874	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Druryia*) *mangoura* Hewitson, 1875	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *mechowi* Dewitz, 1881	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *mechowianus* Dewitz, 1885	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *menestheus* Drury, [1773]	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *meriones* Felder & Felder, 1864	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *dardanus*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Druryia*) *nobicea* Suffert, 1904	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *ophidicephalus* Oberthür, 1878	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *phorcas* Cramer, 1775	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Druryia*) *plagiatus* Aurivillius, 1898	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *rex* Oberthür, 1886	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Druryia*) *sjoestedti* Aurivillius, 1908	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Druryia*) *zenobia* Fabricius, 1775	Valid	**Unsampled**
Eleppone Hancock, 1979 [2 spp.]: 2 sampled in the current study (=100%)	Status	In the tree
Papilio (*Eleppone*) *anactus* Macleay, 1826	Valid	Sampled

	Status	In the tree
Papilio (*Eleppone*) *natewa* Tennent, Chandra & Müller, 2018	Valid	Sampled
***Euchenor* Igarashi, 1979 [2 spp.]: 2 sampled in the current study (=100%)**	**Status**	**In the tree**
Papilio (*Euchenor*) *depilis* Rothschild, 1895	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *euchenor*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Euchenor*) *euchenor* Guérin-Méneville, 1830	Valid	Sampled
***Heraclides* Hübner, [1819] [32 spp.]: 32 sampled in the current study (=100%)**	**Status**	**In the tree**
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *anchicayaensis* Constantino, Le Crom & Salazar, 2002	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *anchisiades* Esper, [1788]	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *andraemon* Hübner, [1823]	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *androgeus* Cramer, 1775	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *aristodemus* Esper, 1794	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *aristor* Godart, 1819	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *astyalus* Godart, 1819	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *caiguanabus* Poey, 1852	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *chiansiades* Westwood, 1872	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *cresphontes* Cramer, 1777	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *epenetus* Hewitson, 1861	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *erostratus* Westwood, 1847	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *garleppi* Staudinger, 1892	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *hectorides* Esper, 1794	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *himeros* Hopffer, 1865	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *homothoas* Rothschild & Jordan, 1906	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *hyppason* Cramer, 1775	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *isidorus* Doubleday, 1846	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *lamarchei* Staudinger, 1892	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *machaonides* Esper, 1796	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *melonius* Rothschild & Jordan, 1906	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *ornythion* Boisduval, 1836	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *oviedo* Gundlach, 1866	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *oxynius* (Geyer, 1827)	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *paeon* Boisduval, 1836	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *pallas* Gray, [1853]	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *pelaus* Fabricius, 1775	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *rogeri* Boisduval, 1836	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *rumiko* (Shiraiwa & Grishin, 2014)	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *thersites* Fabricius, 1775	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *thoas* Linnaeus, 1771	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Heraclides*) *torquatus* Cramer, 1777	Valid	Sampled
***Menelaides* Hübner, [1819] [54 spp.]: 52 sampled in the current study (=96.5%)**	**Status**	**In the tree**
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *acheron* Grose-Smith, 1887	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *aegeus* Donovan, 1805	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *agenor* Linnaeus, 1758	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *memnon*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *albinus* Wallace, 1865	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *alcmenor* Felder & Felder, 1865	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *alphenor* Cramer, 1776	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *polytes*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *ambrax* Boisduval, 1832	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *phestus*)	Sampled

53

Papilio (*Menelaides*) *amynthor* Boisduval, 1859	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *ascalaphus* Boisduval, 1836	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *biseriatus* Rothschild, 1895	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *helenus*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *bootes* Westwood, 1842	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *bridgei* Mathew, 1886	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *canopus* Westwood, 1842	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *fuscus*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *capaneus* Westwood, 1843	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *fuscus*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *castor* Westwood, 1842	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *chaon* Westwood, 1844	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *nephelus*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *cilix* Godman & Salvin, 1879	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *fuscus*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *daksha* Moore, [1889]	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *helenus*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *deiphobus* Linnaeus, 1758	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *diophantus* Grose-Smith, 1883	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *dravidarum* Wood-Mason, 1880	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *erskinei* Mathew, 1886	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *forbesi* Grose-Smith, 1883	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *fuscus* Goeze, 1779	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *gambrisius* Cramer, 1777	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *godeffroyi* Semper, 1866	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *helenus* Linnaeus, 1758	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *heringi* Niepelt, 1924	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *hipponous* Felder & Felder, 1862	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *hypsicles* Hewitson, 1868	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *fuscus*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *hystaspes* Felder & Felder, 1862	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *helenus*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *iswara* White, 1842	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *iswaroides* Fruhstorfer, 1898	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *janaka* Moore, 1857	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *bootes*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *javanus* Felder, 1862	**stat. nov.** (formerly a subspecies of *polytes*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *jordani* Fruhstorfer, 1902	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *lampsacus* Boisduval, 1836	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *macilentus* Janson, 1877	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *mangarinus* Rothschild, 1908	**stat. nov.** (formerly a subspecies of *helenus*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *memnon* Linnaeus, 1758	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *nephelus* Boisduval, 1836	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *oenomaus* Godart, 1819	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *oritas* Godman & Salvin, 1879	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *aegeus*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *palawanicus* Staundinger 1888	**stat. nov.** (formerly a subspecies of *helenus*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *phestus* Guérin-Méneville, 1830	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *polytes* Linnaeus, 1758	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *prexaspes* Felder & Felder, 1865	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *protenor* Cramer, 1775	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *sataspes* Felder & Felder, 1865	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *schmeltzi* Herrich-Schäffer, 1869	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *thaiwanus* Rothschild, 1898	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *tydeus* Felder & Felder, 1860	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *weymeri* Niepelt, 1914	Valid	Sampled

	Status	In the tree
Papilio (Menelaides) woodfordi Godman & Salvin, 1888	Valid	Sampled
***Nireopapilio* Cotton & Nakae, 2020 [24 spp.]: 5 sampled in the current study (=20.8%)**	**Status**	**In the tree**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) aristophontes Oberthür, 1897	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) charopus Westwood, 1843	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) chitondensis Bivar de Sousa & Fernandes, 1966	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) chrapkowskii Suffert, 1904	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) chrapkowskoides Storace, 1952	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) desmondi van Someren, 1939	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) epiphorbas Boisduval, 1833	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (Nireopapilio) euphranor Trimen, 1868	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) hesperus Westwood, 1843	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) hornimani Distant, 1879	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) horribilis Butler, [1872]	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) interjectana Vane-Wright, 1995	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) mackinnoni Sharpe, 1891	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) manlius Fabricius, 1798	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) microps Storace, 1951	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) nireus Linnaeus, 1758	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (Nireopapilio) nobilis Rogenhofer, 1891	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (Nireopapilio) oribazus Boisduval, 1836	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (Nireopapilio) pelodurus Butler, [1896]	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) phorbanta Linnaeus, 1771	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) sosia Rothschild & Jordan, 1903	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) thuraui Karsch, 1900	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) ufipa Carcasson, 1961	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Nireopapilio) zalmoxis Hewitson, [1864]	Valid	Sampled
***Papilio* Linnaeus, 1758 [9 spp.]: 9 sampled in the current study (=100%)**	**Status**	**In the tree**
Papilio (Papilio) bairdii Edwards, 1866	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *machaon*)	Sampled
Papilio (Papilio) brevicauda Saunders, 1868	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (Papilio) hospiton Géné, 1839	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (Papilio) indra Reakirt, 1866	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (Papilio) joanae Heitzman, 1974	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (Papilio) kahli Chermock & Chermock, 1937	**stat. nov.** (formerly a subspecies of machaon)	Sampled
Papilio (Papilio) machaon Linnaeus, 1758	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (Papilio) polyxenes Fabricius, 1775	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (Papilio) zelicaon Lucas, 1852	Valid	Sampled
***Princeps* Hübner, [1807] [5 spp.]: 5 sampled in the current study (=100%)**	**Status**	**In the tree**
Papilio (Princeps) demodocus Esper, 1799	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (Princeps) demoleus Linnaeus, 1758	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (Princeps) erithonioides Grose-Smith, 1891	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (Princeps) grosesmithi Rothschild, 1926	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (Princeps) morondavana Grose-Smith, 1891	Valid	Sampled
***Pterourus* Scopoli, 1777 [28 spp.]: 23 sampled in the current study (=82.1%)**	**Status**	**In the tree**
Papilio (Pterourus) alexiares Hopffer, 1865	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (Pterourus) appalachiensis (Pavulaan & Wright, 2002)	Valid	Sampled

Papilio (*Pterourus*) *ascolius* Felder & Felder, 1864	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *bachus* Felder & Felder, 1865	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *birchallii* Hewitson, 1863	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *cacicus* Lucas, 1852	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *canadensis* Rothschild & Jordan, 1906	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *elwesi* Leech, 1889	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *esperanza* Beutelspacher, 1975	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *eurymedon* Lucas, 1852	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *euterpinus* Salvin & Godman, 1868	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *garamas* (Geyer, [1829])	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *glaucus* Linnaeus, 1758	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *hellanichus* Hewitson, 1868	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *homerus* Fabricius, 1793	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *maraho* Shiraki & Sonan, 1934	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *menatius* (Hübner, [1819])	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *multicaudata* Kirby, 1884	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *neyi* Niepelt, 1909	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *palamedes* Drury, 1773	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *pilumnus* Boisduval, 1836	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *rutulus* Lucas, 1852	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *scamander* Boisduval, 1836	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *troilus* Linnaeus, 1758	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *victorinus* Doubleday, 1844	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *menatius*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *warscewiczii* Hopffer, 1865	Valid	Sampled
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *xanthopleura* Salvin & Godman, 1868	Valid	**Unsampled**
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *zagreus* Doubleday, 1847	Valid	Sampled
Sinoprinceps **Hancock, 1983 [2 spp.]: 2 sampled in the current study (=100%)**	**Status**	**In the tree**
Papilio (*Sinoprinceps*) *benguetana* Joicey & Talbot, 1923	**stat. rev.** (formerly a subspecies of *xuthus*)	Sampled
Papilio (*Sinoprinceps*) *xuthus* Linnaeus, 1767	Valid	Sampled

1450

1451

1452 **Table 2.** Bayesian tests of topology hypotheses using the stepping-stone sampling (SS). The topology was constrained with previously inferred
1453 relationships (Zakharov *et al.*, 2004) that were not recovered in our best topology. The SS estimated the marginal likelihood for each topology and
1454 was compared to the marginal likelihood of the best topology (unconstrained). The marginal likelihood is used to calculate Bayes factors to select
1455 the topology for the dataset. Results for BF are as follows: non-significant (0<BF<2), positive support (2<BF<6), strong support (6<BF<10), and
1456 very strong support (BF>10).

1457

Hypothesis tests on various systematic positions	Marginal likelihood (SS)	Bayes factor
Unconstrained MrBayes phylogenetic analysis	-97,079.39	-
Monophyly of the subgenus *Pterourus* (i.e. excluding *Agehana*)	-97,127.68	**48.29**
Monophyly of the subgenus *Druryia* (i.e. *Druryia + Nireopapilio*)	-97,269.70	**190.31**
Monophyly of the subgenus *Princeps* (i.e. *Princeps + dardanus* sp. gr.)	-97,277.63	**198.24**
Monophyly of the subgenus *Menelaides* (i.e. *Menelaides + Araminta*)	-97,145.29	**65.9**
Monophyly of the New World *Papilio*	-97,094.08	**14.69**
P. alexanor sister to *Agehana + Chilasa + Pterourus*	-97,141.38	**61.99**

1458
1459

1460   **Table 3.** Phylogenetic, dating, and biogeographic results for the main nodes of *Papilio*. Clades 1 to 3 are shown in Fig. 3.

Clades	Node supports				Median node ages, Ma (95% CI)		Ancestral area estimates	Biogeographic interpretation
	PP$_{CAT}$	PP$_{PART}$	BS$_{PART}$	UFBS$_{PART}$	Fossil calibrations	Secondary calibrations		
Papilio sensu lato	1	1	100	100	30.06 (20.66 – 47.42)	29.95 (23.97 – 37.34)	EP + WN + CA + WA	Origin centred on Beringia
Clade 1: *Heraclides*	1	0.96	75	100	21.22 (13.95 – 33.86)	21.2 (16.07 – 27.48)	CA	Central America
Clade 2: *Papilio sensu lato* excl. *Heraclides*	0.75	0.98	55	90	28.57 (19.98 – 45.45)	28.5 (22.89 – 35.55)	EP + WN + CA + WA	Origin centred on Beringia
Chilasa + Pterourus + 'Agehana'	0.99	1	91	100	22.73 (15.36 – 35.9)	22.64 (17.33 – 28.74)	EP + WN + CA + WA	Origin centred on Beringia
Chilasa	1	1	99	100	16.68 (12.49 – 29.71)	18.63 (14.02 – 24.44)	WA	Indonesia
Pterourus + 'Agehana'	1	1	79	99	20.38 (13.8 – 32.28)	20.3 (15.3 – 25.92)	EP + WN + CA	Origin centred on Beringia
'Agehana'	1	1	100	100	0.28 (0.09 – 0.63)	0.27 (0.09 – 0.53)	EP + WA	Asia and Indonesia
Clade 3: Old World *Papilio*	1	0.99	58	85	26.93 (18.62 – 42.62)	26.86 (21.52 – 33.51)	EP	East Palearctic
Old World *Papilio* excl. *Alexanoria*	1	1	86	100	23.74 (16.45 – 37.49)	23.67 (18.96 – 29.58)	WP + EP + AF + WA	Paleotropics
Clade 3a: *Druryia + Euchenor*	0.82	0.99	74	99	22.32 (15.3 – 35.23)	22.23 (17.46 – 27.95)	WP + EP + AF + WA	Paleotropics
Euchenor	1	1	100	100	5.49 (2.74 – 9.71)	5.33 (2.84 – 8.42)	AU	Australasia
Druryia	1	1	99	100	17.95 (12.07 – 28.62)	17.88 (13.61 – 22.95)	AF	Afrotropics
Clade 3b: *Eleppone + Araminta*	-	0.72	50	93	21.09 (14.82 – 33.9)	20.99 (16.4 – 26.47)	WA	Indonesia
Eleppone	1	1	97	100	9.72 (4.41 – 17.0)	9.54 (4.77 – 15.03)	AU	Australasia
Araminta	1	1	100	100	14.07 (8.87 – 22.59)	13.9 (9.89 – 18.61)	WA	Indonesia
Clade 3c + Clade 3d + Clade 3e	0.99	1	72	99	21.35 (15.08 – 33.97)	21.25 (16.97 – 26.59)	WP + EP + AF + WA	Paleotropics
Clade 3c: *Sinoprinceps + Papilio sensu stricto*	1	1	97	100	17.39 (11.36 – 27.85)	17.27 (13.1 – 22.34)	EP	East Palearctic
Sinoprinceps	1	1	100	100	1.5 (0.63 – 2.82)	1.44 (0.67 – 2.45)	EP + WA	Asia and Indonesia
Papilio sensu stricto	1	1	100	100	10.3 (6.26 – 16.69)	10.2 (7.01 – 13.85)	EP + WN	Origin centred on Beringia
Clade 3d + Clade 3e	0.99	1	60	99	20.17 (14.01 – 31.92)	20.09 (16.09 – 25.23)	WP + EP + AF + WA	Paleotropics
Clade 3d: *Nireopapilio*	1	1	76	98	16.1 (10.21 – 25.51)	15.98 (11.78 – 20.65)	AF	Afrotropics
Clade 3e: *Achillides + Princeps + Menelaides*	-	0.91	54	96	19.52 (13.5 – 30.98)	19.41 (15.57 – 24.39)	WP + EP + AF + WA	Paleotropics
Achillides	1	1	85	99	17.1 (11.45 – 26.88)	17.0 (13.31 – 21.62)	WA + AU	Indonesia and Australasia
Princeps + Menelaides	0.93	1	70	99	18.21 (12.6 – 29.05)	18.15 (14.37 – 22.86)	WP + EP + AF + WA	Paleotropics
Princeps	1	1	100	100	11.29 (6.93 – 18.01)	11.21 (8.0 – 14.97)	WP + EP + AF + MD	Paleotropics
Menelaides	1	1	99	100	13.94 (9.4 – 21.98)	13.94 (10.9 – 17.65)	WA	Indonesia

1461

1462 **Table 4.** Changes to subspecies nomenclature resulting from literature review and this study.
1463

Species	New subspecies combinations
Papilio (*Achillides*) *orsippus* Godman & Salvin, 1888 (**stat. rev.**)	*Papilio orsippus orsippus* Godman & Salvin, 1888 *Papilio orsippus ambiguus* Rothschild, 1895 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio orsippus gabrielis* Rothschild, 1898 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio orsippus kallinikos* Fruhstorfer, 1903 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio orsippus rothschildianus* Fruhstorfer, 1909 (**comb. nov.**)
Papilio (*Achillides*) *telegonus* C. Felder & R. Felder, 1860 (**stat. rev.**)	*Papilio telegonus telegonus* C. Felder & R. Felder, 1860 *Papilio telegonus dohertius* Rothschild, 1898 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio telegonus morotaicus* Rothschild, 1908 (**comb. nov.**)
Papilio (*Euchenor*) *depilis* Rothschild, 1895 (**stat. rev.**)	*Papilio depilis depilis* Rothschild, 1895 *Papilio depilis neohannoveranus* Rothschild, 1898 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio depilis novohibernicus* Rothschild, 1898 (**comb. nov.**)
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *aegeus* Donovan, 1805	*Papilio aegeus inopinatus* Butler, 1883 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio aegeus komos* Fruhstorfer, 1904 (**comb. nov.**)
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *agenor* Linnaeus, 1758 (**stat. rev.**)	*Papilio agenor agenor* Linnaeus, 1758 *Papilio agenor polymnestor* Cramer, 1775 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio agenor parinda* (Moore, 1881) (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio agenor nicobarensis* Hachitani, 1986 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio agenor heronus* Fruhstorfer, 1902 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio agenor iriomotensis* Fujioka, 2012 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio agenor thunbergii* Siebold, 1824 (**comb. nov.**)
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *capaneus* Westwood, 1843 (**stat. rev.**)	*Papilio capaneus capaneus* Westwood, 1843 *Papilio capaneus beccarii* Oberthür, 1880 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio capaneus gyrei* Tennent, 1999 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio capaneus hasterti* Ribbe, 1907 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio capaneus indicatus* Butler, 1876 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio capaneus relmae* Tennent, 1999 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio capaneus rotalita* (Swinhoe, 1893) (**comb. nov.**)

	Papilio capaneus xenophilus Mathew, 1886 (**comb. nov.**)
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *chaon* Westwood, 1844 (**stat. rev.**)	*Papilio chaon chaon* Westwood, 1844 *Papilio chaon annulus* Pendlebury, 1936 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio chaon chaonulus* Fruhstorfer, 1902 (**comb. rev.**) *Papilio chaon rileyi* Fruhstorfer, 1913 (**comb. rev.**)
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *cilix* Godman & Salvin, 1879 (**stat. rev.**)	*Papilio cilix cilix* Godman & Salvin, 1879 *Papilio cilix lamponius* Fruhstorfer, 1904 (**comb. nov.**)
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *daksha* Moore, [1889] (**stat. rev.**)	*Papilio daksha daksha* Moore, [1889] *Papilio daksha mooreanus* Rothschild, 1895 (**comb. nov.**)
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *javanus* C. Felder, 1862 (**stat. nov.**)	*Papilio javanus javanus* C. Felder, 1862 *Papilio javanus theseus* Cramer, 1777 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio javanus melanides* Haan, 1840 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio javanus vigellius* Fruhstorfer, 1909 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio javanus messius* Fruhstorfer, 1909 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio javanus sotira* Jordan, 1909 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio javanus timorensis* C. Felder & R. Felder, 1864 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio javanus alcindor* Oberthür, 1879 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio javanus kurokawai* Nakae, 2013 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio javanus tucanus* Jordan, 1909 (**comb. nov.**)
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *mangarinus* Rothschild, 1908 (**stat. nov.**)	*Papilio mangarinus mangarinus* Rothschild, 1908 *Papilio mangarinus jindanus* Rothschild, 1908 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio mangarinus tambora* Rothschild, 1908 (**comb. nov.**)
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *memnon* Linnaeus, 1758	*Papilio memnon memnon* Linnaeus, 1758 *Papilio memnon mayo* Atkinson, 1874 (**comb. nov.**)
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *oritas* Godman & Salvin, 1879 (**stat. rev.**)	*Papilio oritas oritas* Godman & Salvin, 1879 *Papilio oritas websteri* Grose-Smith, 1894 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio oritas byronensis* Talbot, 1932 (**comb. nov.**)
Papilio (*Menelaides*) *palawanicus* Staudinger, 1888 (**stat. nov.**)	*Papilio palawanicus palawanicus* Staudinger, 1888 *Papilio palawanicus enganius* Doherty, 1891 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio palawanicus sinabangana* Goode & Burk, 2013 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio palawanicus boloboca* Page &Treadaway, 1996 (**comb. nov.**)

Papilio (*Papilio*) *bairdii* Edwards, 1866 (**stat. rev.**)	*Papilio bairdii bairdii* Edwards, 1866 *Papilio bairdii oregonia* Edwards, 1876 (**comb. nov.**) *Papilio bairdii dodi* McDunnough, 1939 (**comb. nov.**)
Papilio (*Pterourus*) *victorinus* Doubleday, 1844 (**stat. rev.**)	*Papilio victorinus victorinus* Doubleday, 1844 *Papilio victorinus morelius* Rothschild & Jordan, 1906 (**stat. rev.**) *Papilio victorinus vulneratus* Butler, 1872 (**stat. rev.**)

1464
1465

3

Supplementary Information

Figure S1. Maximum-likelihood phylogeny of *Papilio*. This phylogeny was inferred with IQ-
TREE using a traditional partitioning strategy and non-parametric bootstraps (BS) to estimate
branch supports (values ≥70 are considered as strong support). The outgroups are removed.

Figure S2. Maximum-likelihood phylogeny of *Papilio*. This phylogeny was inferred with IQ-
TREE using a traditional partitioning strategy and ultrafast bootstraps (UFBS) to estimate
branch supports (values ≥95 are considered as strong support). The outgroups are removed.

Figure S3. Bayesian phylogeny of *Papilio*. This phylogeny was inferred with PhyloBayes using
a mixture model for site heterogeneity and posterior probabilities to estimate branch supports
(values ≥0.95 are considered as strong support). The outgroups are removed.

Figure S4. Branch support for phylogenetic analyses of *Papilio*. Histograms show that the
phylogeny of *Papilio* is generally robust, but several branches, in particular in the backbone,
remain unresolved. Percentages of strongly supported branches and branches with maximal
support as well as mean and median branch supports are reported for each analysis with
corresponding thresholds considered as strong supports.

Figure S5. Bayesian divergence times of *Papilio* estimated with three fossil calibrations. The
time-calibrated tree was inferred with BEAST and uniform priors set on fossil ages. The same
partitioning strategy used for phylogenetic reconstructions was used, and an uncorrelated
lognormal clock model was used for each partition.

Figure S6. Bayesian divergence times of *Papilio* estimated with eight secondary calibrations.
The time-calibrated tree was inferred with BEAST and uniform priors set on secondary
calibrations. Secondary calibrations were retrieved from a study of Papilionidae (Allio *et al.*,
2021; see *Material and Methods*). The same partitioning strategy used for phylogenetic
reconstructions was used, and an uncorrelated lognormal clock model was used for each
partition.

Figure S7. Diversification shifts and diversity dynamics estimated for *Papilio* as estimated by
the third best-fitting combination of shifts. A) The phylogeny of *Papilio* with shifts highlighted

in colors and best models in parenthesis. Red dots correspond to all tested nodes. B) The evolution of diversification rates through time for the backbone and all subclades that are found as significant shifts. C) Diversity dynamics for the backbone and subclade trees as estimated with the probabilistic approach (dotted line represents the confidence interval of diversity estimates for the backbone). For the sake of clarity, confidence intervals of diversity estimates for subclades are not represented. D) Global diversity dynamics of *Papilio* obtained by summing all the diversity dynamics for the backbone and subclade trees.

Table S1. Geographic distribution of *Papilio* species. The tables include the geographic data for (1) all species listed in Table 1, and (2) the species that have been sampled in the current phylogenetic tree. We coded the presence (1) or absence (0) in each of the 11 defined biogeographic regions. Histogram plots show the number of species per region.

Table S2. Results of macroevolutionary analyses. A) Global comparison of combinations of diversification shifts for the *Papilio* genus (shifts are tested at the crown) with B) the rates of the diversification model for their backbones. The best combination of shift and the phylogeny analyzed with no shift are highlighted in bold. NP=Number of parameters, logL=log(Likelihood), λ=speciation rate (at present if variable), α=dependency parameter of speciation rate, μ=extinction rate, β=dependency parameter of extinction rate.

Table S3. Comparisons of diversification models for each subclade. The best models are highlighted in bold. NP=Number of parameters, logL=log(Likelihood), λ=speciation rate (at present if variable), α=dependency parameter of speciation rate, μ=extinction rate, β=dependency parameter of extinction rate.