Sexual dichromatism and differential conspicuousness in two populations of the common collared lizard (*Crotaphytus collaris*) from Utah and New Mexico, USA

JOSEPH M. MACEDONIA1*, YONI BRANDT^{2,3} and DAVID L. CLARK⁴

¹Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996 USA ²Department of Biology and ³Center for the Integrative Study of Animal Behaviour, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405 USA ⁴Department of Biology, Alma College, Alma, ML 48801 USA

⁴Department of Biology, Alma College, Alma, MI 48801 USA

Received 28 November 2001; accepted for publication 7 May 2002

The common collared lizard (Crotaphytus collaris) exhibits considerable geographical colour variation, particularly among males. Populations of this diurnal saxicolous iguanian inhabit patches of rocky habitat throughout the species' broad distribution in North America and are anticipated to experience local differences in selective pressures that influence colouration. Specifically, while social interactions might favour conspicuous colouration, crypsis may be advantageous in interactions with visually orienting predator and prey species. To address the local relationship between lizard and substrate colouration we compared the reflectance spectra of two geographically distant and phenotypically divergent populations of collared lizards with the rocky substrates they inhabit. Our northern study population (C. c. auriceps in eastern Utah) occurs on red rocks, where males exhibit boldly coloured turquoise bodies and bright yellow heads. In contrast, our southern study population (C. c. fuscus in southern New Mexico) lives on grey and tan rocks, and males in this location exhibit subdued brown and tan dorsal colours. Spectral comparisons revealed that males in the northern population contrasted strongly with their local rocks, whereas males in the southern population matched their rock colours with reasonably good fidelity. This relationship held under a variety of lighting conditions. Females in both populations were less conspicuously coloured than males, although northern females contrasted more with their rocks than did southern females. In addition, sexual dichromatism was pronounced in the northern population but minimal in the southern population. Finally, sexual size and weight dimorphism was strong in the southern population while being virtually absent in the northern population. A comparison of the local predator and prey assemblages suggests that the conspicuous and sexually dichromatic colouration of the northern population may have evolved in response to reduced pressure from visually orienting predators as well as reduced dependence on saurian prey. © 2002 The Linnean Society of London, Biological Journal of the Linnean Society, 2002, 77, 67-85

ADDITIONAL KEYWORDS: aggressive camouflage – brightness contrast – colour contrast – conspicuous colouration – cryptic colouration – predation – saurophagy – saxicoly.

INTRODUCTION

Patterns of variation observed in animal colouration across species, populations, seasons and between the sexes have long interested biologists. Although colouration is thought to mediate crucial fitness-altering interactions, colours that are beneficial in one type of interaction can be detrimental in another. Whereas mate choice and intrasexual competition often yield a fitness advantage to individuals with the most conspicuous colour patterns (e.g. Darwin, 1871), this advantage typically is offset by the increased probability of being seen by predators (e.g. Endler, 1992). Research on adaptive colouration in guppies, for

^{*}Correspondence. Present address: Department of Biology, University of Memphis, Memphis, TN 38152 USA. E-mail: jmacedon@memphis.edu

example, has shown that males are polymorphic for colour pattern elements in which patch colour, brightness, and size represent a local compromise between sexual selection for conspicuous colouration (e.g. Kodric-Brown, 1985; Houde, 1987; Long & Houde, 1989; Houde & Endler, 1990) and natural selection for cryptic colouration (Endler, 1978, 1980, 1991).

SEXUAL DICHROMATISM AND ADAPTIVE COLOURATION

It is common for males and females of the same species to exhibit different colour patterns, termed 'sexual dichromatism' (e.g. Gray, 1996; Andersson, Ornborg & Andersson, 1998; Cuthill et al., 1999; Badyaev & Hill, 2000). In species that display sexual dichromatism, males usually are the more conspicuously coloured sex: a result arising from the greater competition among males for mating opportunities and from female mate preferences (e.g. Andersson, 1994). Among reptiles, sexual dichromatism in body colouration has been studied in several lizard species (e.g. McCoy et al., 1997; LeBas & Marshall, 1999; Wiens, Reeder & De Oca, 1999; see Cooper & Greenberg, 1992 for earlier studies). Although males usually are the more dramatically coloured sex, females in some lizard species also exhibit bright nuptial colouration (reviewed in Cooper & Greenberg, 1992).

In the absence of benefits accruing to conspicuous colouration, natural selection tends to produce colour patterns that render animals inconspicuous against their visual backgrounds (e.g. Endler, 1984; Merilaita, Tuomi & Jormalainen, 1999). Naturally selected protective colouration can reduce predation risk by serving as camouflage (e.g. background matching, countershading, disruptive colouration: Cott, 1940; Endler, 1978, 1981; Edmunds, 1990). Although camouflage often is considered in terms of concealment from predators by prey, predators derive equal benefit, i.e. 'aggressive camouflage' (e.g. Ortolani, 1999). Lizards provide excellent examples of camouflage colouration, and several authors have described species whose dorsal surface reflectance spectra were well matched to their local substrates (e.g. sand, rocks, tree bark: Norris & Lowe, 1964; Gibbons & Lillywhite, 1981). One particularly promising taxon for the study of adaptive colouration in reptiles is Crotaphytus, the collared lizards.

COLOUR VARIATION IN COLLARED LIZARDS

Collared lizards comprise one of two iguanian genera in the New World family Crotaphytidae. The nine recognized *Crotaphytus* species are distributed from the mid-western and western United States through northern and western Mexico (McGuire, 1996). These saxicolous (rock dwelling) reptiles are obligate carnivores (Ruppert, 1980), being both insectivorous and saurophagous (lizard eating). Although all species exhibit an increase in the 'vividness' of their colours during the breeding season (whether or not additional nuptial colours are present, e.g. McGuire, 1996), both sexes of most species possess camouflage patterns of spots, bars and reticulations against a relatively drab dorsal colouration. An exception to this trend is the common collared lizard, C. collaris, where males are diverse in dorsal colour throughout their distribution. In some C. collaris populations males display strikingly conspicuous colouration, whereas in other populations males appear dull, much like females; similarly, populations can differ in the degree of sexual size dimorphism (e.g. McCoy et al., 1997). Differences in social organization may account for the variability of male reproductive characters among populations of collared lizards (Baird, Fox & McCoy, 1997).

The social system of *C. collaris* is typical of many iguanians in that adult males are highly territorial, patrolling and defending their territory with conspicuous display behaviours. Typically each male territory overlaps the smaller territories of several females, and to a lesser extent female territories overlap with more than one male. Such a social system facilitates both intrasexual and intersexual competition for mates. Baird *et al.* (1997) argued that the opportunity for collared lizards to engage in territorial and sexual advertising using conspicuous colouration is influenced by population densities and the spatial arrangement of appropriate habitat patches.

Whether colouration appears conspicuous or inconspicuous depends, however, upon the background against which it is viewed and on the visual system of the viewer. Viewers that have the potential to exert selection pressures on the colouration of collared lizards include conspecific individuals, as well as the local array of visually orienting predator and prey species. Moreover, given that (1) stone and earth vary in colouration with geological formations and habitat, that (2) different suites of predator and prey species vary by locality, and that (3) populations vary in the social opportunities for territorial and sexual advertising, it is likely that selective pressures for colour patterns in C. collaris vary on a local scale. Spectral analysis of C. collaris and of their local visual backgrounds is a starting point for understanding the interactions of selective regimes that produce amongpopulation colour variation.

In this study we describe, spectrally and statistically, the colouration of two geographically discontinuous and phenotypically divergent *C. collaris* populations: the yellow-headed collared lizard (*C. c. auriceps* Fitch & Tanner 1951) of eastern Utah and north-western Colorado, and the Chihuahuan col-

lared lizard (*C. c. fuscus* Ingram & Tanner 1971) of southern New Mexico, extreme western Texas, and northern Mexico. *Crotaphytus c. auriceps* males are boldly coloured with turquoise bodies and yellow heads, whereas *C. c. fuscus* males exhibit brown and tan colour patterns very similar to those of females. We compare these two lizard populations from the perspectives of sexual dichromatism, contrast with their natural backgrounds, sexual size and weight dimorphism, and their local suites of predator and prey species.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

STUDY AREAS AND SUBJECTS

We chose our study areas based on sampling by prior researchers (particularly McGuire, 1996). In eastern Utah we concentrated on four sites paralleling the Colorado River, lying from 30 to 50 km north-east of Moab along State Route 128. These locations varied in habitat from boulder fields to eroded cliff faces. Lizard species sympatric with *C. c. auriceps* include *Uta stansburiana*, *Sceloporus undulatus* and *Cnemidophorus tigris*.

In southern New Mexico we focused our efforts on Baylor Canyon Road, a mostly graded dirt road running from Las Cruces, NM approximately 25 km north-east to the town of Organ. We concentrated on the road's northern end, where it bisects an extensive boulder field that spreads out from the base of the Organ Mountains. Sympatric with C. c. fuscus at this location are Cophosaurus texanus, Sceloporus magister, Phrynosoma cornutum and Cnemidophorus sp.

Lizards at all sites were captured with a pole and noose. Subjects whose spectral measurements were taken outdoors (see below) were kept in cloth bags between capture, data gathering and release.

SPECTRAL MEASUREMENTS OF COLLARED LIZARDS AND THEIR HABITATS

Lizard Colouration

Reflectance spectra of the lizards were obtained indoors (year 1: June 2000) and outdoors (year 2: May/ June 2001) using a reflectance probe (Ocean Optics R200-7) connected to a tungsten-halogen lamp (Ocean Optics LS-1), an Ocean Optics USB2000 portable spectrometer, and a notebook computer running Ocean Optics OOIBASE 32 software. For spectral measurements taken indoors a small black light was positioned near the tungsten-halogen lamp to increase near-UV illumination in a room otherwise dimly lit with incandescent bulbs. Subjects were placed on a flat black rubber mat and reflectance was sampled perpendicular to the target. A white standard (Labsphere Spectralon WS-1) was scanned and dark current removed from the signal immediately prior to scanning a subject, and reflectance spectra were calculated automatically from subject radiance by the software. (Note that reflectance measurements made in years 1 and 2 are not biased by the use of different illumination sources. The purpose of the white standard is to allow calculation of a reflectance spectrum from any illumination source that possesses the wavelengths of interest.)

Data were displayed with OOIBase32 software (Ocean Optics, Inc.). Twelve body regions were chosen for spectral measurements to obtain a relatively comprehensive profile of body colouration (Table 1). A small ruler attached to the reflectance probe maintained a constant 5 mm distance between the end of the probe and the target. For *C. c. auriceps*, we sampled 12 males (six each year) and six females (three each year). For *C. c. fuscus*, we sampled 12 males (one in year 1, 11 in year 2) and 11 females (two in year 1, nine in year 2).

All spectral readings taken outdoors were obtained during periods of very clear weather, typically under cloudless skies. If subjects felt colder to the touch than ambient air temperature (approx. 32-35 °C) they were warmed under a heat lamp (2000) or placed in direct sunlight in a cloth bag for 10–15 min (2001) before spectral data were gathered.

Table 1. Locations of lizard body regions measured spectrally in this study

Body region	Description of measurement
Crown	Dorsal surface of skull immediately anterior to parietal eye
Collar colour	Dorsal colour bands adjacent to black band(s) in nuchal-cervical region
Dewlap	Centre of gular area
Mandible	Ventral surface of mandible below labial scales
Dorsum background	Background colouration of dorsum (between dorsum bars, if present)
Dorsum bars	Dorsal transverse colour bands overlying background colouration
Side	Skin on side of abdomen immediately ventral to lateral midline
Ventrum	Central area of abdomen
Thigh	Dorsal (outer) surface of mid-thigh
Calf	Dorsal (outer) surface of mid-calf
Foot	Dorsal surface of front toes
Tail	Dorsal surface of tail, several
	centimeters distal to base

Rocks and Vegetation

Reflectance measurements of rocks, vegetation (e.g. grasses, bushes, cacti, flowers) and soil from the lizards' habitats were gathered in year 2 of the study. These readings were taken at the locations where the objects occurred, and a fibre optic fitted with a collimating lens (Ocean Optics UV-74) was used as the probe with sunlight serving as the illumination source. Soil reflectance spectra were virtually identical in shape to those of local rocks but were slightly darker (5–10%). Given that our soil reflectance sample sizes were small, we elected not to include them in our analyses. Our sample sizes for visual backgrounds in our two study areas were as follows: Utah rocks: N = 22, vegetation: N = 10; New Mexico rocks: N = 42, vegetation: N = 15.

Irradiance

A cosine-corrected irradiance probe (Ocean Optics CC-3-UV) and irradiance measurement software (Ocean Optics OOIIrrad) were used to sample habitat light. Prior to obtaining readings the irradiance probe was calibrated with a light source (Ocean Optics LS-1-CAL) designed for this lens. Irradiance data were collected only under clear, cloudless skies. Solar spectra were gathered by orienting the irradiance probe directly toward the sun. Skylight samples were obtained by orienting the probe toward the blue sky but away from the sun, and sunlight was blocked from striking the probe with a small, opaque black object. Irradiance data were used to calculate lizard and background radiance under different lighting conditions with the formula:

radiance (λ) = reflectance (λ) × irradiance (λ)/2 π

where 2π accounts for the hemispheric shape of the irradiance collector (i.e. the volume of a sphere = 4π). Although radiance could have been obtained directly, calculating radiance via reflectance and irradiance allows for the effects of different lighting conditions on animal and substrate colouration to be estimated using the same set of reflectance values. For example, saxicolous lizards inhabiting open areas of the southwestern US generally experience three types of ambient lighting: direct sunlight, desert (or 'blue') shade, and cloudy skies. As cloudy skies result in a largely 'white' light spectrum, this spectrum is roughly similar in the visible wavelengths to the reflectance spectrum of a white standard. Multiplying reflectance by a solar or skylight spectrum approximates the remaining two lighting conditions.

'COLOUR' TERMINOLOGY

We use 'hue' in the vernacular sense of 'colour', e.g. red, green, blue, etc. Hue is defined by the shape of the spectral curve, particularly by its peak. 'Chroma' refers to colour saturation or purity, and is a function of the dominant wavelength's slope: the steeper the slope, the higher the chroma. We use brightness, or luminance, to refer to a spectrum's intensity, measured as the area under the curve (e.g. Endler, 1990).

COLOUR SPACE

Endler (1990) developed a colour analysis method, termed 'segment classification', that provides a graphical summary of differences in hue and chroma (brightness is equalized for all spectra). Segment classification presumes the presence of a typical opponency system of colour vision that compares the outputs of receptors sensitive to non-adjacent portions of the visible spectrum. Each spectrum from 400 to 700 nm was partitioned into four 75 nm colour segments containing 217 points each. These segments corresponded roughly to the human-perceived colour ranges of violet to blue (400-475 nm), green (475-550 nm), yellow to orange (550-625 nm), and red (625–700 nm). Each colour segment was summed, producing one value per segment, then each of the four values was divided by the sum of the unsegmented spectrum, resulting in four final values. By subtracting non-opposing pairs of these values (i.e. red minus green, yellow minus blue), two 'colour scores' summarizing each spectrum were plotted as a single point in two-dimensional colour space. Hue is determined by the angle of a colour score relative to the top-centre (i.e. 0°) of the graph, and chroma increases with the distance of a colour score from the origin. The further a lizard's colour score falls from the region of colour space occupied by objects in the visual background, the greater the colour contrast and the more conspicuous that body region should appear - irrespective of the visual system viewing it.

For reflectance colour space plots, the reflectance spectra of the lizards, rocks and vegetation were used to create the colour segments and colour scores. To estimate the effects of sunlight and skylight on lizard colouration, two types of radiance colour space plots were also generated, one simulating the effects of direct sunlight and the other of desert shade (i.e. skylight only). For these comparisons an irradiance spectrum (sunlight or skylight) was multiplied by each reflectance spectrum prior to computation of colour scores.

SEX DIFFERENCES IN BRIGHTNESS AND COLOUR

Several approaches were taken to examine sex differences in body colouration. In our first approach we considered brightness (luminance) and colour (hue and chroma) separately. Sex differences in brightness ('sexual diluminance') were determined in each population by (a) calculating a mean reflectance spectrum for each body region of male and of female subjects, (b) taking the absolute value of the difference between the male and female spectrum, and (c) summing this 'difference spectrum' to produce a single value, which then was divided by 10³ for numerical convenience.

To determine sex differences in colouration independent of brightness ('sexual dichromatism'), male and female spectra were equalized for total brightness before calculating the male-female difference spectrum. This was achieved by (1) calculating the sum for each spectrum of the pair, (2) calculating the mean of these two sums, (3) dividing this mean value by each sum determined in step 1 to produce an 'equalization factor' for each sex, and finally (4) multiplying this equalization factor times every data point in the original spectrum for each sex. This procedure equalizes the total intensity of the pair of spectra without altering spectral shape (Endler, 1990). Steps (b) and (c) above then were completed to produce a single final value for each body region, which was used as the index of sexual dichromatism.

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SEX AND POPULATION COLOUR VARIATION

PCA and ANOVA

In a second approach to analysing lizard colour variation, we examined colouration between sexes within each population and for same-sexed individuals between populations. For these analyses spectral data were grouped into 5 nm-wide bins (to meet assumptions for independence of data points), resulting in 75 median values per spectrum from 325 to 700 nm. Principal components analysis (PCA) was used to reduce the 75 values (= 75 variables) to a manageable number. In analyses of spectral data the first PC inevitably represents brightness variation and subsequent PCs represent colour variation (Cuthill et al., 1999). Separate PCAs were run on each of the 12 body regions measured, with both sexes and populations being included in each analysis. Following these 12 PCAs, two-way ANOVAs with factors for sex and population were used to test for significant differences in colouration. Where interaction terms were significant, one-way ANOVAs were run on the two opposite-sex/ within-population and same-sex/between population combinations (with $\alpha = 0.025$).

DFA

We then sought to determine if a stepwise discriminant function analysis (DFA) could create functions from the PC scores capable of discriminating between the populations and sexes at the 'entire body' level. We wished to generate functions that took into account the spectral data from all 12 body regions simultaneously, but computer memory was insufficient for the required 900 median values (i.e. 75, 5 nm-wide median values \times 12 body regions). We therefore broadened the bin size from 5 nm to 20 nm, and a PCA reduced the resulting 216 input variables (18, 20-nmwide bins from 330 to 700 nm \times 12 body regions) to 18 principal components. In the first of two analyses subjects were classified according to population, and in the second they were classified by sex. SPSS (v. 10 for Macintosh) default values were used for variable entry and retention (*F*-to-enter = 3.4; *F*-to-remove = 2.7).

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF CONTRAST BETWEEN LIZARDS AND ROCKS

To test statistically for differences in colour contrast and brightness contrast between the lizards' colouration and that of the local rocks on which they live, the reflectance spectra of rocks first were reduced to medians of 5 nm intervals as was done for lizard colouration. PCAs then were run on data sets that included the reflectance data from males and females of a given population and from rocks in that population's habitat. Next, independent samples *t*-tests were conducted on each of the first two principal components for each body region of each sex, i.e. 12 tests per sex per principal component. Levene's test was employed to determine whether the P-value associated with equal or unequal variances should be used for significance. Protection against increased Type I error rate from multiple comparisons was made to account for 24 pairwise comparisons within each PC (i.e. 12 body regions $\times 2$ sexes $\times 1$ rock reflectance data set for each population) using the sequential Bonferroni method (Rice, 1989).

BODY SIZE AND MASS

After completing each subject's series of spectral readings we gathered two additional forms of data. First, we measured each subject's snout-vent length (SVL) to the nearest 0.5 mm, and then weighed each subject to the nearest 0.5 g. These data were examined statistically with the Mann-Whitney *U*-test.

SYMPATRIC AVIAN AND OPHIDIAN PREDATOR SPECIES AND SAURIAN PREY SPECIES

To obtain a rough between-population comparison of bird and snake species that are likely to prey on *Crotaphytus*, as well as the availability of lizard prey, we compiled a list of potential predator and prey species based on distribution maps from published field guides. We do not present data on the array of sympatric mammalian predators, as these are virtually identical for our two populations and thus are unlikely to account for the observed colour differences. Furthermore, many mammalian predators are active at night when collared lizards are asleep within refugia under rocks.

RESULTS

SEX DIFFERENCES IN BRIGHTNESS AND COLOUR

As anticipated from visual inspection of the lizards, the two study populations differed considerably in their reflectance spectra (Fig. 1). Brightness differences between males and females were greater in more body regions for *C. c. auriceps* than for *C. c. fuscus*, and approached significance (N = 12, Wilcoxon Z = 1.73, P = 0.084; Fig. 2a). When equalizing brightness between the sexes, male and female *C. c. auriceps* differed in colour more than male and female *C. c. fuscus* for all 12 body regions (N = 12, Wilcoxon Z = 3.06, P = 0.022; Fig. 2b).

COLOUR SPACE

Reflectance spectra from rocks in our Utah and New Mexico sites differed both in brightness and in chroma (Fig. 3a). Rocks from both study areas had peaks in the 'red' part of the spectrum, but those from New Mexico (rhyolitic volcanic rock with some fine-grained granite) exhibited lower chroma (Fig. 3c) and were brighter than those from Utah (iron oxide-stained Navaho sandstone). The human perceptual difference in colouration was that the rocks in Utah were of a deep salmon-red colour, whereas those in New Mexico were greyish-white with pale pink, orange, and yellow overtones. Vegetation spectra from the two study areas differed as well, with plants in New Mexico being brighter and more yellowish than those in Utah (Fig. 3b).

In comparison to males from their own population, *C. c. auriceps* females exhibited less colour variation and their colour scores overlapped more with the visual background (Fig. 4a). In contrast, male and female *C. c. fuscus* were very similar in extent of colour variation, and most colour scores for both sexes overlapped those of their visual background (Fig. 4b).

Between population colour variation may be best visualized by plotting same-sexed individuals from both populations on the same scale. Variation in male colouration was found to be much larger for *C. c. auriceps* than for *C. c. fuscus* (Fig. 5a). Also, whereas male *C. c. auriceps* colour scores did not overlap those of rocks in their study sites, extensive overlap occurred between the colour scores of male *C. c. fuscus* and their local rocks (Fig. 5a). The compar-

ison for females revealed a similar pattern, but the magnitude of the differences between the populations was smaller (Fig. 5b).

To determine how sunlight and shade would affect colouration of the lizards and their visual backgrounds, colour scores were recalculated after being multiplied by a solar spectrum (Fig. 6a) or a skylight/ desert shade spectrum (Fig. 6b). Multiplication by the solar spectrum shifted colour scores toward the yellow region of colour space (Figs 7a,b) whereas multiplication by the skylight spectrum shifted the colour scores toward the blue region (Figs 7c,d). Sunlight had less of an impact than skylight on the colour scores because the solar spectrum is more similar in shape to 'white light' (i.e. reflectance) than is skylight. Interestingly, the skylight spectrum had the overall effect of reducing object chroma, i.e. most colour scores were shifted closer to the colour space origin. This shift was more prominent for C. c. fuscus than for C. c. auriceps due to the lower chroma of C. c. fuscus body colours (Fig. 7).

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF SEX AND POPULATION COLOUR VARIATION

PCA

For the lizard reflectance spectra (Fig. 1), PCA reduced 75, 5 nm-wide spectral medians to three PCs in 11 of the 12 body regions (only two PCs were generated for dewlap reflectance). Most of the variance in the raw spectral data stemmed from brightness variation. Unless brightness is equalized among the spectra prior to conducting a PCA, PC1 is a measure of this property, as evidenced from the 'flat line' appearance of its plotted coefficients (Fig. 8; Cuthill et al., 1999). The coefficients for PC2 and PC3 depict the weightings of components representing different aspects of spectral shape (hue + chroma) that are independent of brightness (Fig. 8). Most of the variation in spectral shape (PC2) was accounted for by differences between short- and long-wavelength reflectance (transition around 525 nm), or between very short wavelengths and long wavelengths (transition around 425 nm) (Fig. 8).

ANOVA

In subsequent two-way ANOVAs a significant main effect of sex on brightness (PC1) was revealed for four of the 12 body regions: dewlap, mandible, side, and ventrum (Table 2). Females were brighter than males in all cases (Fig. 1). Six body regions differed between the sexes in spectral shape (PC2 or PC3): dorsum background, dorsum bars, ventrum, thigh, calf, and tail (Table 2). No significant main effects (that lacked a significant interaction term) of population on brightness were revealed, but significant differences in



Figure 1. Mean reflectance spectra from 12 body regions measured for *Crotaphytus collaris auriceps* in eastern Utah (males: N = 12, solid black lines; females: N = 6, dashed black lines) and *C. c. fuscus* in southern New Mexico (males: N = 12, solid grey lines; females: N = 11, dashed grey lines).



Figure 2. Sex differences in body reflectance: (a) brightness, and (b) colour for males and females from the two study populations. See text for derivation of 'difference units'. Sample sizes as in Fig. 1.

population spectral shape were found for all body regions except side and foot (Table 2).

Significant interaction terms in the two-way ANOVAs were tested for sex and population with one-way ANOVAs. A significant interaction occurred in brightness (PC1) for only one body region: the crown (Table 2). The crown was brighter in males than females in *C. c. auriceps*, but darker in males than females in *C. c. fuscus* (Fig. 1). None of the pairwise comparisons were significant (at $\alpha = 0.025$), however. Interaction terms were significant for spectral shape in four body regions: mandible, dorsum background, side, and ventrum. The mandible was found to differ significantly in spectral shape (PC3) only between males of the two populations ($F_{1,22} = 12.95$, P = 0.001). The dorsum background differed significantly in spectral shape (PC2) between the sexes in *C. c. auriceps* ($F_{1,17} = 8.00$,

P = 0.012), between the sexes in *C. c. fuscus* ($F_{1,21} = 7.97$, P = 0.010), and between males in both populations ($F_{1,22} = 12.95$, P = 0.004) but not between females of the two populations. The side differed significantly in spectral shape (PC3) between the sexes in *C. c. fuscus* ($F_{1,21} = 14.61$, P = 0.001) and between males in the two populations ($F_{1,22} = 15.45$, P = 0.001). Last, the ventrum differed significantly in spectral shape (PC3) only between males in the two populations ($F_{1,22} = 15.45$, P = 0.001).

DFA

In an analysis of population and sex differences in colouration at the 'entire body' level, stepwise DFA generated a single function from seven (analysis by population) or six (analysis by sex) of the 18 components, which accounted for 59.9% and 53.2%, respec-



Figure 3. Mean reflectance spectra of (a) rocks, and (b) vegetation from habitats of the two study populations. Black lines: *Crotaphytus c. auriceps*, eastern Utah: rocks (N = 22), vegetation (N = 10); grey lines: *C. c. fuscus*, southern New Mexico: rocks (N = 42), vegetation (N = 15). (c) Spectral summaries (colour scores) of representative rock and vegetation samples plotted in the 'colour space' of Endler (1990).

tively, of the variation in the PC scores. In the first DFA the discriminant function classified the 41 subjects to the correct population in 100% of the cases. In the second DFA subjects were classified as males or females with 100% accuracy for *C. c. auriceps*, and 94.1% accuracy for *C. c. fuscus*. The single assignment error was due to classifying a female *C. c. fuscus* as a male.

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF CONTRAST BETWEEN LIZARDS AND ROCKS

To determine brightness contrast and colour contrast between the lizards and their visual backgrounds, PCAs first were run on reflectance spectra from each body region of both sexes in one population plus the reflectance spectra of rocks in their habitat. Three PCs with eigenvalues >1.0 were produced for 10 of the 12 body regions of *C. c. auriceps* and their local rocks (Table 3), but a third PC was produced from the *C. c. fuscus* data set for only five of the 12 body regions and rocks (Table 4). This difference between populations arises from greater brightness variation (PC1) between *C. c. fuscus* and their rocks (mean percentage variation = 91.4%; Table 4) as compared to *C. c. auriceps* (mean percentage variation = 74.5%; Table 3). Protected *t*-tests (sequential Bonferroni method: Rice, 1989) between lizard and rock reflectance PC scores revealed differences between the two populations in the manner and extent of contrast with their respective rocky visual backgrounds.

Brightness Contrast

Whereas *C. c. auriceps* exhibited few body regions that contrasted significantly in brightness with local rocks (males: one body region; females: three body regions; Table 3), half of the body regions of *C. c. fuscus* (both sexes) exhibited significant brightness contrast with their rocks (Table 4). Only one body region differed significantly from local rocks in brightness contrast across sexes and populations: the ventrum appeared white in females and greyish-white in males (Fig. 1).

Colour Contrast

On PC2 male and female *C. c. auriceps* differed significantly in colour contrast with their rocks for 12 and nine body regions, respectively (Table 2), but male and female *C. c. fuscus* differed significantly in only four and three body regions, respectively. Four of the five body regions that produced a third PC for *C. c. fuscus* exhibited significant lizard/rock colour contrast, but PC3 accounted on the average for less than 2% of the spectral variation between a given body region and that of local rocks (Table 4). Slightly more of the spectral variation was accounted for by PC3 (6.4%) in *C. c. auriceps*, but few body regions showed significant colour contrast with rocks on this variable (two in males and one in females).

In summary, male *C. c. auriceps* exhibited strong colour contrast but virtually no brightness contrast with the rocks on which they live, whereas male *C. c. fuscus* contrasted moderately in brightness but little in colour with their local rocks. Overall, females showed similar patterns of brightness contrast and colour contrast to those of males in their populations, but that contrast typically was weaker (i.e. fewer significant differences).

BODY SIZE AND MASS

Size and mass data revealed strong differences in sexual dimorphism between the two populations. Although male and female *C. c. auriceps* did not differ



and (b) *C. c. fuscus* (grey symbols; males, N = 12; females, N = 11) against the visual backgrounds of their natural habitats. Legend as in Fig. 3.

in size or mass $(N_1 = 13, N_2 = 6; \text{SVL: males} = 92.3 \pm 0.9 \text{ mm}$, females = $88.0 \pm 2.1 \text{ mm}$, U = 19.5, P = 0.085; mass: males = $30.5 \pm 1.0 \text{ g}$, females = $29.7 \pm 1.5 \text{ g}$, U = 33.5, P = 0.629), *C. c. fuscus* males and females differed significantly on both measures $(N_1 = 12, N_2 = 10; \text{SVL: males} = 107.5 \pm 1.6 \text{ mm}, \text{ females} = 92.0 \pm 2.1 \text{ mm}, U = 10, P = 0.001; \text{ mass: males} = 54.8 \pm 2.5 \text{ g}, \text{ females} = 30.6 \pm 2.9 \text{ g}, U = 5.5, P = 0.0003$). Likewise, males from the two populations differed significantly both in size and mass $(N_1 = 13, N_2 = 12; \text{ SVL: } U = 1, N_2 = 12; \text{ SVL: } U = 1$

P = 0.0001; mass: U = 0, P = 0.0001) but females differed on neither measure ($N_1 = 6$, $N_2 = 10$; SVL: U = 21.5, P = 0.355; mass: U = 28.5, P = 0.870).

SYMPATRIC AVIAN AND OPHIDIAN PREDATOR SPECIES AND SAURIAN PREY SPECIES

Lists compiled from distribution maps in field guides indicated that potential avian predators of adult col-



Figure 5. Plots of reflectance colour scores for (a) males, and (b) females against rocks in their natural habitats. Legend as in Figs 3 and 4.

lared lizards, including various raptors, are mostly shared between the two study populations (Table 5a). A notable exception to this pattern is the roadrunner (*Geococcyx californianus*), which is absent from our Utah population. A rich snake fauna of 19 species occurs at our New Mexico study site, while in Utah a depauperate array of up to five species occurs (Table 5b). Similarly, at 17 species, saurian prey richness is considerably higher in southern New Mexico compared with only seven species in eastern Utah (Table 5c).

DISCUSSION

In this study we have shown that our two selected populations differ in colouration, sexual dichromatism, contrast with their visual backgrounds, and sexual size/weight dimorphism. Four general trends observed in the lizards' reflectance spectra can be summarized as follows.

First, females typically were brighter than males, especially ventrally and in the longer wavelengths. When perched on rock piles and viewed from below



Figure 6. Representative (a) solar, and (b) skylight spectra used in calculation of lizard and visual background radiance from reflectance. Both irradiance spectra were obtained under exceptionally clear, cloudless skies. The skylight spectrum contains no direct sunlight. Irradiance samples were identical in spectral shape and range of intensities in the eastern Utah and southern New Mexico study areas.



Figure 7. Plots of radiance colour scores that illustrate how different illumination sources affect light reflected from the lizards and from their visual backgrounds. Two ambient spectral conditions commonly experienced by the lizards in this study are shown: illumination by (a,b) direct sunlight, and by (c,d) skylight (as occurs in the shade of a rock under a blue sky). Sample sizes of males and females as in Fig. 1. Sample sizes of rocks and vegetation as in Fig. 3.



Figure 8. Principal component coefficients (or, 'loadings') showing the weightings of the three PCs as they relate to the original 12 body regions. PC1: grey lines, PC2: black lines, PC3: dashed lines. Among-subject variation is greatest where PC coefficients exhibit different signs. For example, in the crown (8a) individual variation in colour (PC2) is greatest between the reflectance strength of wavelengths from 350 to 500 (UV to bluish-green) and that of wavelengths from 550 to 700 (yellowish-green to red). Lizard sample sizes as in Fig. 1.

Table 2. Sex and population comparisons of *Crotaphytus collaris* reflectance spectra. Values shown are *F*-ratios of two-way ANOVAs on principal component scores derived from medians of 5-nm wide bins between 325 and 700 nm. Values in parentheses are the percent variance explained by that component. Each body region analysed separately. All PCs had eigenvalues >1.0. Degrees of freedom: 1, 40. Main effects: *P = 0.05, **P = 0.01, ***P = 0.001. See text for results of significant interactions tested with one-way ANOVAS

	Sex			Population			Interaction		
Body region	Brightness	Spectral shape		Brightness	Spectral shape		Brightness	Spectral shape	
	PC1	PC2	PC3	PC1	PC2	PC3	PC1	PC2	PC3
Crown	1.703 (84.7%)	1.630 (11.0%)	0.179 (2.2%)	7.134** (same as at left)	27.085***	0.000	4.417* (same as at left)	4.047	0.138
Collar colour	0.608 (73.2%)	2.084 (22.3%)	0.013 (2.3%)	4.655	45.467***	0.726	0.089	0.723	0.593
Dewlap	79.521*** (96.4%)	1.499 (1.9%)	_	0.097	10.665**	-	0.191	0.950	-
Mandible	18.430*** (91.4%)	0.280 (5.7%)	0.027 (1.6%)	1.505	11.301***	2.416	0.040	1.672	5.716*
Dorsum background	1.127 (89.1%)	15.681^{***} (5.7%)	0.775 (4.0%)	0.560	3.132	15.165***	0.024	4.684*	0.935
Dorsum bars	0.224 (73.4%)	0.581 (14.7%)	4.172^{*} (7.2%)	1.431	21.461***	2.904	0.001	0.181	1.108
Side	4.195* (78.0%)	2.093 (12.4%)	0.678 (6.6%)	2.322	3.151	1.265	0.014	0.769	19.055***
Ventrum	12.802*** (89.2%)	23.755*** (7.6%)	2.607 (2.0%)	0.140	0.358	6.929*	0.007	1.395	7.410**
Thigh	1.201 (79.8%)	0.233 (9.5%)	6.191* (7.9%)	1.918	1.752	13.216***	0.542	0.001	0.667
Calf	1.855 (83.3%)	13.995^{***} (9.5%)	0.854 (5.4%)	1.964	12.264***	0.602	0.261	1.757	0.571
Foot	2.232 (84.4%)	0.140	2.784	1.011	1.562	3.404	0.200	0.315	0.461
Tail	1.227 (87.9%)	0.696 (6.8%)	(2.5%) 22.193*** (3.5%)	0.107	0.258	5.887*	0.463	0.898	0.669

these features would tend to make females' ventral surfaces contrast less against a bright sky than those of males. This strong ventral brightness may be considered an example of adaptive countershading (e.g. Cott, 1940). The greater brightness in longer wavelengths (ventrally and dorsally) contributed to their brown appearance, which likewise made them contrast less with rocks, dirt, and dead vegetation.

Second, in many body regions (although not all) males exhibited stronger chroma than females. For most animals with colour vision, colours with strong chroma should be more detectable against most natural backgrounds than colours that are chromatically weak (Endler, 1990).

Third, *C. c. fuscus* exhibited weaker chroma than *C. c. auriceps*. As low-chroma colours exhibit 'flatter' reflectance spectra than do high-chroma colours, the former reflect the ambient light spectrum more faith-

fully (Endler, 1990). Animals with low-chroma colours can potentially benefit from a sort of 'dynamic crypsis', where the animals and their visual backgrounds will track changing light conditions in synchrony and along similar spectral trajectories (e.g. Endler, 1997, fig. 14.3). Thus, *C. c. fuscus* should be inherently less conspicuous than *C. c. auriceps* in their respective habitats.

Fourth, body regions of male and female *C. c. auriceps* differed more from each other in brightness and in colour than did those of male and female *C. c. fuscus*. Calculation of 'difference units' showed that *C. c. auriceps* is more sexually dichromatic than *C. c. fuscus*.

The most striking result of the colour space analysis was that most colour scores of *C. c. fuscus* males overlapped those of their rocks, but no colour scores of male *C. c. auriceps* overlapped those of their rocks.

Table 3. Contrast between reflectance spectra of Crotaphytus collaris auriceps body regions and that of local rocks. Values
shown are t-statistics from pairwise tests of principal component scores derived from medians of 5-nm wide bins between
325 and 700 nm. Values in parentheses are the percent variance explained by that component. Each body region analysed
separately. All PCs had eigenvalues >1.0. Degrees of freedom: males = 34; females = 28. $**P = 0.01$, $***P = 0.001$. All tests
2-tailed. P-values adjusted for 12 pairwise comparisons per sex using the sequential Bonferroni method (Rice, 1989)

	Males			Females			
	Brightness contrast	Colour contrast		Brightness contrast	Colour contrast		
Body region	PC1	PC2 PC3		PC1	PC2	PC3	
Crown	-1.866	3.786***	4.036***	-3.436**	0.831	3.164^{***}	
	(75.5%)	(16.3%)	(4.9%)	(same as at left)			
Collar colour	-0.984	-6.937^{***}	4.414***	0.522	-6.457^{***}	-0.016	
	(59.3%)	(33.4%)	(3.5%)				
Dewlap	-1.749	-12.763^{***}	_	4.348**	-4.844^{***}	_	
	(92.0%)	(6.7%)					
Mandible	1.704	-3.964^{***}	-2.429	1.835	-0.582	-1.997	
	(81.3%)	(11.6%)	(4.9%)				
Dorsum background	0.435	-10.240^{***}	-0.463	0.643	-3.692^{***}	-2.121	
0	(81.2%)	(13.4%)	(4.1%)				
Dorsum bars	0.033	-10.496^{***}	-0.979	0.277	-7.860^{***}	0.764	
	(67.5%)	(19.2%)	(10.2%)				
Side	-0.592	8.127^{***}	-0.135	1.014	4.883**	1.600	
	(50.4%)	(40.0%)	(7.4%)				
Ventrum	6.909***	-6.057^{***}	_	4.216**	1.732	_	
	(93.1%)	(4.9%)					
Thigh	-1.573	-7.541^{***}	0.193	-0.906	-4.715^{**}	0.650	
0	(66.6%)	(23.8%)	(6.8%)				
Calf	0.503	-9.436^{***}	-0.404	0.999	-4.584^{***}	1.134	
	(74.3%)	(19.2%)	(5.1%)				
Foot	-0.639	-5.898^{***}	1.027	0.785	-5.765^{***}	0.905	
	(78.8%)	(11.4%)	(7.9%)				
Tail	0.436	-6.747^{***}	-1.306	1.978	-3.477^{**}	0.200	
	(73.6%)	(15.4%)	(8.8%)				

This finding reinforced our visual impression that male C. c. auriceps stand out from the background, whereas male C. c. fuscus are inconspicuous. In both populations, however, male body regions that were most distant in colour space from rocks and vegetation (and which also were the most chromatic) were the dewlap, side, calf and thigh. These body regions would have low visibility to raptors on the wing, but also to the eyes of potential prey being stalked when using rocks to obscure the hunter's body below the eyes. Note that the distance in colour space of these body regions from that of local rocks was far greater in male C. c. auriceps than in C. c. fuscus, and only C. c. auriceps males exhibited additional body areas (e.g. mandible, collar colour) that fell well outside their visual backgrounds. Adult females showed similar patterns to those of males in their populations, except that colour score variability and distance between body and visual background colour scores were much reduced in *C. c. auriceps* females compared to those of males.

By multiplying the reflectance spectra of the lizards and their rocks by a solar spectrum or a skylight/ shade spectrum, we simulated the appearance of the lizards and their substrates under these primary lighting conditions. Application of the solar spectrum increased lizard and rock chroma (shifted colour scores away from the colour space origin), whereas the skylight/shade spectrum reduced chroma (shifted colour scores toward the origin). The correlation between relatively weak chroma in body and rock colouration in *C. c. fuscus*, and relatively strong chroma in body and rock colouration in *C. c. auriceps*, resulted in a greater shift in colour space in the former

	Males			Females			
	Brightness contrast	Colour contrast		Brightness contrast	Colour contrast		
Body Region	PC1	PC2 PC3		PC1	PC2	PC3	
Crown	-8.327***	2.205	_	-2.556	3.502***	_	
	(93.2%)	(5.8%)		(same as at left)			
Collar colour	-1.517	-1.681	-5.707^{***}	-0.976	-2.759	-1.619	
	(91.8%)	(5.9%)	(1.8%)				
Dewlap	-2.698	-4.852^{***}	-5.543^{***}	4.506^{***}	-1.647	-5.471^{**}	
	(93.1%)	(4.4%)	(1.8%)				
Mandible	-0.663	-0.941	-6.511^{***}	2.657	0.793	-5.873^{**}	
	(93.7%)	(3.9%)	(1.7%)				
Dorsum background	-4.952^{***}	-1.074	_	-3.395^{***}	-2.229	_	
	(94.3%)	(4.8%)					
Dorsum bars	-2.681	-3.162^{**}	-	-1.744	-2.143	_	
	(91.5%)	(7.2%)					
Side	-2.273	-2.751	-2.669	-0.735	-0.633	2.094	
	(90.3%)	(6.2%)	(3.1%)				
Ventrum	4.602^{***}	-7.392^{***}	-3.043^{**}	9.157^{***}	1.410	-1.929	
	(88.3%)	(9.4%)	(1.5%)				
Thigh	-4.331^{***}	-1.817	-	-3.196^{**}	-3.436^{***}	-	
	(91.7%)	(6.9%)					
Calf	-4.094^{***}	-1.715	_	-2.927^{**}	-2.872	_	
	(92.2%)	(6.3%)					
Foot	-1.714	-4.846^{***}	_	-1.446	-5.212^{***}	_	
	(82.5%)	(15.7%)					
Tail	-3.403^{***}	-0.976	-	-2.957^{**}	-2.181	-	
	(94.1%)	(5.0%)					

Table 4. Contrast between reflectance spectra of Crotaphytus collaris fuscus body regions and that of local rocks

Degrees of freedom: males: 52; females: 51. Legend as in Table 3.

than the latter. This finding suggests that *C. c. fuscus* should appear relatively inconspicuous, and *C. c. auriceps* (males) should appear relatively conspicuous, regardless of ambient lighting conditions.

Stepwise DFA revealed that the sexes and populations could be discriminated statistically with virtually 100% accuracy. The only assignment error was the misclassification of a female *C. c. fuscus* as a male. The classification success of the sexes in *C. c. fuscus* was unexpected, given the significantly weaker sexual dichromatism in that population than in *C. c. auriceps*. Evidently, subtle yet consistent sex differences in brightness and colour occur in *C. c. fuscus*.

Selection and Adaptive Colouration in C. collaris

Inconspicuous colouration, weak sexual dichromatism, and strong male-biased sexual size dimorphism (SSD) are considered ancestral character states for the Crotaphytidae (*Crotaphytus* and *Gambelia*) (McGuire, 1996). The polarity of these character states, together with geographical distribution, suggests that *C. c. auriceps* is a much younger population of *C. collaris* than is *C. c. fuscus* (Ingram & Tanner, 1971). Our interest now lies in determining the factors responsible for maintaining such strong differences in colouration and in sexual size and weight dimorphism between these two populations.

Our results showed that males from New Mexico are considerably larger than females, and exhibit femalelike colouration, while males from Utah are similar in size to females, but conspicuously coloured. This pattern of variation cannot simply be accounted for by differences in the intensity of sexual selection, which would predict a concordant pattern of variation. As suggested by Baird *et al.* (1997), social opportunities to utilize conspicuous colouration in territorial and in sexual advertising, and large body size in aggressive interactions, may vary substantially between populations.

(a) Avian predators (a) Avian predators (a) Avian predators (a) Avian predators (a) Avian predators American kestrel yes yes Falco sparverius ³ Prairie falcon yes yes Falco mexicanus ³ Prairie falcon yes yes Gencoccyc californianus ⁴ Radarunner no yes Totals 3 5 (b) Snake predators Arizona elegans Glossy snake no yes Arizona elegans Glossy snake no yes Crotalus storx Western diamondback rattler no yes Crotalus storx Blacktail rattlesnake no yes Crotalus bridis Western rattlesnake no yes Crotalus bridis Western hognose snake no yes Habredon nasicus Western hognose snake no yes Habredon nasicus Western hognose snake no yes Lampropelits triangulum Milk snake no yes Masticophis figgeltun Commo kingsnake no yes Saluadora gra	Species	Common Name	Moab. UT ¹	Las Cruces, NM ²
Circus cyanus ⁴ Northern harrieryesyesFalco sporvinus ⁴ American kestrelyesyesFalco mexicanus ⁴ RoadrunnernoyesGeococcyx californians ⁴ RoadrunnernoyesIctinia mississippinsis ³ Mississippi kitenoyesTotals35(b) Snake predators	(a) Avian predators			
Follo sparverius*American kastrelyesyesFalco mexicanus*Prairie falconyesCococecy californianus*RoadrunnernoyesItatiamississippi kitenoyesTotals35(b) Snake predatorsTrans-Pecos rat snakenoyesArizona elegansClossy snakenoyesCotalus atraxWestern diamondback rattlernoyesCrotalus elegidusBock rattlesnakenoyesCrotalus elegidusBack rattlesnakenoyesCrotalus elegidusCorn snakenoyesCrotalus elegidusCorn snakenoyesHeterodon nasicusWestern rattlesnakeyesyesLampropeltis getulaCorn snakenoyesMasticophis flogellumCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis flogellumCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis flogellumCoachwhipnoyesSalvadora deserticolaBig Bend patch-nosed snakenoyesSolvadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesSolvadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesSistrurus catenatusMassasauganoyesSolvadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesContaidophorus scanguisChihuahuan whiptailnoyesContaidophorus scanguisChihuahuan whiptailnoyesConenidophorus sungeresNew Mexico whiptai	Circus cyaneus ³	Northern harrier	yes	yes
Follow mexicanus ³ Prairie falconyesyesGeococcyx californianus ⁴ RoadrunnernoyesIctinianoyesTotals35(b) Snake predatorsTrans-Pecos rat snakenoyesArizona elegansGlossy snakenoyesBogertophis subocularisTrans-Pecos rat snakenoyesCrotalus atroxWestern diamondback rattlernoyesCrotalus atroxWestern diamondback rattlernoyesCrotalus viridisWestern rattlesnakenoyesCrotalus viridisWestern rattlesnakenoyesElaphe gutataCorn snakenoyesHeterodon nasicusWestern rattlesnakenoyesLampropeltis getulaCommon kingsnakenoyesLampropeltis frangulumMilk snakenoyesMasticophis IdagellumCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis teeniatusBullsnake, gopher snakeyesyesSaluadora grahamiaeMountin patch-nosed snakenoyesSaluadora grahamiaeMountin patch-nosed snakenoyesChenidophorus grahamiaChekered whiptailnoyesChenidophorus grahamiaChekered whiptailnoyesCommidophorus grahamiaChekered whiptailnoyesCommidophorus grahamiaChekered whiptailnoyesCommidophorus grahamiaChekered whiptailnoyesCommidophorus grahami	Falco sparverius ³	American kestrel	yes	yes
Geococyc californianus ⁴ Rodrunner no yes Ictinia mississippiensis ³ Mississippi kite no yes Totals 3 5 (b) Snake predators Glossy snake no yes Arizona elegans Glossy snake no yes Gorotopiis subocularis Trans-Pecos rat snake no yes Crotalus atrox Western diamondback rattler no yes Crotalus nolossats Blacktail rattlesnake no yes Crotalus viridis Western rattlesnake no yes Crotalus viridis Western hognose snake no yes Lampropeltis getula Common kingsnake no yes Lampropeltis fiagulum Milk snake no yes Masticophis flagellum Coachwhip no yes Salvadora deserticola Big Bend patch-nosed snake no yes Salvadora grachamia Mountain patch-nosed snake no yes Salvadora grachamia Mountain patch-nosed snake no yes Salvadora grachamia Chiuahuan whiptail <td>Falco mexicanus³</td> <td>Prairie falcon</td> <td>yes</td> <td>yes</td>	Falco mexicanus ³	Prairie falcon	yes	yes
Intrine mississippiensis ³ Mississippi kite no yes Totals 3 5 (b) Snake predators	Geococcyx californianus ⁴	Roadrunner	no	yes
Totals 3 5 Arizona clegans Glossy snake no yes Arizona clegans Glossy snake no yes Cotalus atrox Western diamondback rattler no yes Crotalus lepidus Rock rattlesnake no yes Crotalus viridis Blacktail rattlesnake no yes Crotalus viridis Western rattlesnake no yes Crotalus viridis Western hognose snake no yes Heterodon nasicus Western hognose snake no yes Jampropeltis getula Corn snake no yes Lampropeltis getula Common kingsnake no yes Masticophis flagellum Coachwhip no yes Masticophis flagellum Coachwhip no yes Saluadora grahamiae Mountain patch-nosed snake yes yes Saluadora grahamiae Mountain patch-nosed snake no yes Saluadora grahamiae Mountain patch-nosed snake no yes Conemidophorus scanguis Chihuahuan whiptail no	Ictinia mississippiensis ³	Mississippi kite	no	yes
(b) Snake predators Arizona elegans Glossy snake no yes Dagertophis subocularis Trans-Peckor rat snake no yes Crotalus atrox Western diamondback rattler no yes Crotalus atrox Blacktail rattlesnake no yes Crotalus viridis Blacktail rattlesnake no yes Crotalus viridis Gors nake No yes Crotalus Gors nake No yes Lampropeltis getula Common kigsnake No yes Lampropeltis teniatus Striped whipsnake Yes Yes Pituophis melanoleucus Bullsnake, gopher snake Yes Yes Salvadora deserticola Big Bend patch-nosed snake No Yes Salvadora deserticola Big Bend patch-nosed snake No Yes Salvadora deserticola No Yes Cremidophorus exsanguis Chihuahuan whiptail No Yes Cremidophorus exsanguis Chihuahuan whiptail No Yes Cremidophorus neomexicanus New Mexico whiptail No Yes Cremidophorus neomexicanus Greater earless lizard No Yes Cremidophorus insignats Greater earless lizard No Yes Cremidophorus insignats Greater Pars Slard No Yes Nev Mexico whiptail No Yes Cremidophorus neomexicanus New Mexico whiptail No Yes Cremidophorus neomexicanus Short-horned lizard No Yes Subtain Crevice piny lizard No Yes Secloporus poinsetti Crevice piny lizard No Yes Yes Yes Yes Secloporus poinsetti Crevice piny lizard No Yes	Totals		3	5
Arizona degansGlessy snakenoyesBogertophis subocularisTrans-Pecos rat snakenoyesCrotalus subocularisTrans-Pecos rat snakenoyesCrotalus subocularisRock rattlesnakenoyesCrotalus subocularisRock rattlesnakenoyesCrotalus viridisWestern rattlesnakenoyesCrotalus viridisWestern rattlesnakenoyesElaphe gutataCorn snakenoyesHeterodon nasicusWestern hognose snakenoyesLampropeltis triangulunMilk snakenoyesLampropeltis triangulunCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis lagellumCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis lagellumCoachwhipnoyesSaluadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesSaluadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesSistrurus catenatusLyre snakeyesyesTrimorpholon biscutatusLyre snakenoyesConemidophorus grahamiiChekered whiptailnoyesConemidophorus grahamiiChekered whiptailnoyesConemidophorus upiarensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesConemidophorus upiarensDesert grasslandnoyesConemidophorus grahamiiChekered whiptailnoyesConemidophorus grahamiiChekered whiptailnoyesConemidophorus grahamiiGreater car	(b) Snake predators			
Bogertophis subocularisTrans-Pecos rat snakenoyesCrotalus atroxWestern diamondback rattlernoyesCrotalus kejdusRock rattlesnakenoyesCrotalus viridisBlacktail rattlesnakenoyesCrotalus viridisWestern rattlesnakeyesyesElaphe gutataCorn snakenoyesHeterodon nasicusWestern hognose snakenoyesHypsiglena torquataNight snakeyesyesLampropeltis getulaCommon kingsnakenoyesLampropeltis faquilumMilk snakenoyesMasticophis fageilumCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis fageilumCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis faquilumBils Bend patch-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesStatrura catenatusMassasauganoyesTotal4-51919(c) Lizard preyChinuahuan whiptailnoyesCremidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesChemidophorus normatusLittle striped whiptailnoyesChemidophorus normatusGreat earless lizardnoyesChemidophorus normatusGreat earless lizardnoyesCheckered whiptailnoyesyesCheckered whiptailnoyesyesCheckered whiptailnoyesyesCheckered whiptailno <td>Arizona elegans</td> <td>Glossy snake</td> <td>no</td> <td>yes</td>	Arizona elegans	Glossy snake	no	yes
Crotalus atrox Western diamondback rattler no yes Crotalus lepidus Rock rattlesnake no yes Crotalus nolossus Blacktail rattlesnake no yes Crotalus viridis Western rattlesnake no yes Crotalus viridis Western nognose snake no yes Heterodon nasicus Western hognose snake no yes Haterodon nasicus Western hognose snake no yes Lampropeltis getula Common kingsnake no yes Lampropeltis triangulum Milk snake no yes Masticophis fagellum Coachwhip no yes Masticophis fagellum Coachwhip no yes Striped whipsnake yes yes yes Staluadora deserticola Big Bend patch-nosed snake no yes Saluadora grahamiae Mountain patch-nosed snake no yes Total 4-5 19 (c) Lizard prey C Chihuahuan whiptail no yes Cnemidophorus inornatus Little striped whiptail	Bogertophis subocularis	Trans-Pecos rat snake	no	ves
Crotalus lepidus Rock rattlesnake no yes Crotalus molossus Blacktail rattlesnake no yes Crotalus viridis Western rattlesnake no yes Elaphe gutata Corn snake no yes Heterodon nasicus Western hognose snake no yes Hypsiglena torquata Night snake yes yes Lampropeltis getula Common kingsnake no yes Masticophis Idagellum Coachwhip no yes Saluadora deserticola Big Bend patch-nosed snake ? yes Saluadora deserticola Big Bend patch-nosed snake no yes Total 4-5 19 (c) Lizard prey	Crotalus atrox	Western diamondback rattler	no	ves
Crotalus molossusBlacktail rattlesnakenoyesCrotalus viridisWestern rattlesnakeyesyesElaphe gutataCorn snakenoyesHeterodon nasicusWestern hognose snakenoyesHeterodon nasicusWestern hognose snakenoyesHapte gutataNight snakeyesyesLampropeltis getulaCommon kingsnakenoyesLampropeltis triangulumMilk snakenoyesMasticophis taeniatusStriged whipsnakeyesyesPituophis melanoleucusBullsnake, gopher snakeyesyesSalvadora deserticolaBig Bend patch-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora deserticolaBig Bend patch-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesTrimorphodon biscutatusLyre snakenoyesTrimorphodon biscutatusLyre snakenoyesCoemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus nonatusLittle striped whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus uniparensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesConsidophorus uniparensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesChekored whiptailnoyesgrasslandChekored whiptailnoyesgrasslandChekored whiptailnoyesgrasslandChekored whiptailnoyesgrasslandChekored whiptailnoyes<	Crotalus lepidus	Rock rattlesnake	no	ves
Crotalus viridisWestern rattlesnakeyesyesElaphe gutataCorn snakenoyesHeterodon nasicusWestern hognose snakenoyesHypsiglena torquataNight snakeyesyesLampropeltis getulaCommon kingsnakenoyesmorpopeltis getulaCommon kingsnakenoyesMasticophis flagellumCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis taeinatusStriped whipsnakeyesyesPituophis melanoleucusBullsnake, gopher snakeyesyesSalvadora deserticolaBig Bend patch-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora deserticolaBig Bend patch-nosed snakenoyesSistrurus catenatusMastasauganoyesTrimorphodon biscutatusLyre snakenoyesTrimorphodon biscutatusLyre snakenoyesCnemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus tigrisWestern whiptailnoyesConsidophorus tigrisWestern whiptailnoyesComidophorus tigrisGreater carless lizardnoyesCombolautuaGreater Plains skinknoyesComidophorus tigrisShort-horned lizardyesyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-	Crotalus molossus	Blacktail rattlesnake	no	ves
Elaphe gutataCorn snakenoyesHeterodon nasicusWestern hognose snakenoyesHypsiglena torquataNight snakenoyesLampropeltis getulaCommon kingsnakenoyesLampropeltis trangulumMilk snakenoyesMasticophis fagellumCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis taeniatusStriped whipsnakeyesyesPituophis melanoleucusBullsnake, gopher snakeyesyesSalvadora deserticolaBig Bend patch-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesSistrurus catenatusMassasauganoyesTrimorphodon biscutatusLyre snakenoyesTotal4-519(c) Lizard preyCtitle striped whiptailno(c) meidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus nornatusLittle striped whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus ninornatusLittle striped whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus tainarensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesCondophorus texanusGreat Plains skinknoyesConsoura texanusGreat Plains skinknoyesCheckered whiptailnoyesyesCheckered whiptailnoyesyesCheckered whiptailnoyesyesCheckered whiptailnoyesyesCheckered earless lizardno<	Crotalus viridis	Western rattlesnake	ves	ves
Heterodon nasicusWestern hognose snakenoyesHypsiglena torquataNight snakeyesyesLampropeltis getulaCommon kingsnakenoyesLampropeltis triangulumMilk snakenoyesMasticophis flagellumCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis fagellumCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis taeniatusStriped whipsnakeyesyesPituophis melanoleucusBullsnake, gopher snakeyesyesSalvadora deserticolaBig Bend patch-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesSistrurus catenatusMassasauganoyesTotal4-519(c) Lizard preyChihuahuan whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus normatusLittle striped whiptailnoyesCondidophorus normatusLittle striped whiptailnoyesComidophorus nigrisWestern whiptailnoyesComidophorus nigrisGreat Pains skinknoyesCombolis maculataLeopard lizardnoyesCombolis maculataLeopard lizardnoyesCheckia maculataLeopard lizardnoyesCheckere arless lizardnoyesyesCheckia maculataLeopard lizardnoyesCheckia maculataLeopard lizardnoyesCophosurus texanus </td <td>Elaphe gutata</td> <td>Corn snake</td> <td>no</td> <td>ves</td>	Elaphe gutata	Corn snake	no	ves
Hypsiglena torquataNight snakeyesyesHypsiglena torquataNight snakenoyesLampropellis getulaCommon kingsnakenoyesMasticophis flagellumCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis taeniatusStriped whipsnakeyesyesMasticophis melanoleucusBullsnake, gopher snakeyesyesSalvadora deserticolaBig Bend patch-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesSistrurus catenatusMassasauganoyesTrimorphodon biscutatusLyre snakenoyesCoemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus neomexicanusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus inornatusLittle striped whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus inornatusDesterr grassland whiptailnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreat Plains skinknoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesGambelia wislizeniiLeoser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma conutumTexas horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesPhrynosoma modustusStried horned lizardnoyesSeloporus magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyes </td <td>Heterodon nasicus</td> <td>Western hognose snake</td> <td>no</td> <td>ves</td>	Heterodon nasicus	Western hognose snake	no	ves
ImpositionImpositionImpositionImpositionImpositionLampropellis getulaCommon kingsnakenoyesMasticophis flagellumCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis flagellumCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis taeniatusStriped whipsnakeyesyesPituophis melanoleucusBullsnake, gopher snakeyesyesSalvadora deserticolaBig Bend patch-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesTrimorphodon biscutatusLyre snakenoyesTotal4-519(c) Lizard preyChihuahuan whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus exsanguisChihuahuan whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus neomexicanusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus neomexicanusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater garless lizardnoyesCophosia maculataLeser earless lizardnoyesEumeces obsoletusGreater Palins skinknoyesPhrynosoma consutuTexas horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardyesnoPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardyesnoSeeloporus magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesPhrynosoma modulatusPraire lizardyesyes	Hypsiglena torayata	Night snake	ves	ves
Lampropeltis triangulumMilk snakenoyesMasticophis fagellumCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis fagellumCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis taeniatusStriped whipsnakeyesyesPituophis melanoleucusBullsnake, gopher snake?yesSalvadora deserticolaBig Bend patch-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora deserticolaBig Bend patch-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesSistrurus catenatusMassasauganoyesTrimorphodon biscutatusLyre snakenoyesTotal4-519(c) Lizard preyCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus normexicanusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus normexicanusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesGambella wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesHolbrookia maculataLesser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardnoyesSceloporus magister <t< td=""><td>Lampropeltis getula</td><td>Common kingsnake</td><td>no</td><td>ves</td></t<>	Lampropeltis getula	Common kingsnake	no	ves
Important Masticophis flagellumCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis flagellumCoachwhipnoyesMasticophis taeniatusStriped whipsnakeyesyesPituophis melanoleucusBullsnake, gopher snakeyesyesRhinocheilus leconteiLong-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora deserticolaBig Bend patch-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora deserticolaMassasauganoyesSistrurus catenatusMassasauganoyesTrimorphodon biscutatusLyre snakenoyesTotal4-519(c) Lizard preyC	Lampropettis triangulum	Milk snake	no	ves
Masticophis jacetumContinuityindjoinMasticophis itaeniatusStriped whipsnakeyesyesPituophis melanoleucusBullsnake, gopher snakeyesyesSalvadora deserticolaBig Bend patch-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesSistrurus catenatusMassasauganoyesTrimorphodon biscutatusLyre snakenoyesTotal4–519(c) Lizard preyChihuahuan whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus inornatusLittle striped whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus neomexicanusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus uniparensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesConsidophorus uniparensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesConsidophorus uniparensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesGambelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesHolbrookia maculataLesser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardyesnoPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardnoyesSecloporus magisterDesert spin Jizardnoyes<	Masticophis flagellum	Coachwhin	no	ves
DistributionDistributionDistributionDistributionPituophis melanoleucusBullsnake, gopher snakeyesyesRhinocheilus leconteiLong-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora deserticolaBig Bend patch-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesSistrurus catenatusMassasauganoyesTrimorphodon biscutatusLyre snakenoyesTotal4-519(c) Lizard preyChihuahuan whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus exsanguisChihuahuan whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus nornatusLittle striped whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus niornatusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus uniparensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesGambelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardyesnoPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardyesnoSecloporus poinsettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus poinsettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus nodulatusPrairie lizardyesyesSceloporus nodulatusPrairie lizardyesyesSce	Masticophis flagentum Masticophis taeniatus	Striped whipspake	Ves	Ves
TrianglesDatastate, gopin's mateyesyesRhinocheilus leconteiLong-nosed snake?yesSalvadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesSistrurus catenatusMassasauganoyesTrimorphodon biscutatusLyre snakenoyesTotal4–519(c) Lizard preyChihuahuan whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus inornatusLittle striped whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus normatusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus tigrisWestern whiptailyesyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesGambelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesHolbrookia maculataLesser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma connutumTexas horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardnoyesSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardnoyesSceloporus poinsettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus poinsettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesVes aurosorantusTexa horned lizardnoyesSceloporus noinsettiCrevice spin	Pituonhis melanoleucus	Bullsnake gonber snake	VOS	VOS
Initial contractDorg Flosted shakeiyesSalvadora deserticolaBig Bend patch-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesSistrurus catenatusMassasauganoyesTrimorphodon biscutatusLyre snakenoyesTotal4-519(c) Lizard prey	Rhinochailus lacontai	Long-nosod snako	y c 5 2	yes
Salvadora dreshtoraDig Dent patch-nosed snakenoyesSalvadora grahamiaeMountain patch-nosed snakenoyesSistrurus catenatusMassasauganoyesTrimorphodon biscutatusLyre snakenoyesTotal4–519(c) Lizard preyCnemidophorus exsanguisChihuahuan whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus noomexicanusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus noomexicanusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesConemidophorus uniparensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesGambelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesPhrynosoma anodestumRound-tailed horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardnoyesSecloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardnoyesSceloporus poinsettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesVesSecloporus ornatusPrairie lizardnoyesSceloporus noinsettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus notusPrairie lizardnoyesSceloporus notusTree lizardyesyesSceloporus noinsettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus noinsettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus nontusTree lizardyesyes <t< td=""><td>Salvadora deserticola</td><td>Big Bond natch-nosod snake</td><td>: no</td><td>yes</td></t<>	Salvadora deserticola	Big Bond natch-nosod snake	: no	yes
Subtraction of grantantateInformation pacticities shakeInformationyesSistrurus catenatusMassasauganoyesTrimorphodon biscutatusLyre snakenoyesTotal4-519(c) Lizard preyCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus inornatusLittle striped whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus neomexicanusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus tigrisWestern whiptailyesyesConemidophorus uniparensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesGambelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesHolfrookia maculataLeeser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardnoyesSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardnoyesSceloporus noisettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesSceloporus noisettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus noisettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus ornatusTree lizardyesyesSceloporus undulatusTrairie lizardyesyesSceloporus ornatusTree lizardyesyesSceloporus ornatus <t< td=""><td>Salvadora grahamigo</td><td>Mountain natch nosed snake</td><td>110 no</td><td>yes</td></t<>	Salvadora grahamigo	Mountain natch nosed snake	110 no	yes
Sisturus cuentusMassaduganoyesTrimorphodon biscutatusLyre snakenoyesTotal4–519(c) Lizard prey4–5Cnemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus neomexicanusLittle striped whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus neomexicanusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus tigrisWestern whiptailnoyesConemidophorus tigrisDesert grassland whiptailnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesGambelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesHolbrookia maculataLesser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma cornutumTexas horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardyesnoSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardnoyesSceloporus nagisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus ornatusTree lizardyesyesVorsaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyesSceloporus nagisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus ornatusTree lizardyesyesSceloporus ornatusTree lizardyesyesSceloporus ornatusTree lizardyesyesSceloporus ornatusTree lizardyesyesSceloporus ornatus	Saturda granamiae	Moggoggygg	110 no	yes
Trimorphotoon bisculatusLyre shakenoyesTotal4-519(c) Lizard preyCnemidophorus exsanguisChihuahuan whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus nornatusLittle striped whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus neomexicanusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus uniparensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater Plains skinknoyesGambelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesPhrynosoma cornutumTexas horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardnoyesSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardyesnoSceloporus magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus nudulatusPrairie lizardnoyesVrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyesSceloporus nudulatusPrairie lizardyesyesVrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyesSceloporus nudulatusPrairie lizardyesyesVest or horizoraYesyesyesSceloporus nugisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus ornatusTree lizardyesyesSceloporus ornatusTree lizardyesyesSceloporus ornatusTree lizar	Sistrurus calenalus	Massasauga	110	yes
Total4-319(c) Lizard preyCnemidophorus exsanguisChihuahuan whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus inornatusLittle striped whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus neomexicanusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus tigrisWestern whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus uniparensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesCambelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesHolbrookia maculataLesser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma cornutumTexas horned lizardyesnoPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardyesnoPhrynosoma modestumBesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesVersaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesVersaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyesVersaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyesVersaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyes	Trimorphoaon disculatus	Lyre snake		yes
(c) Lizard preyChihuahuan whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus exsanguisChihuahuan whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus inornatusLittle striped whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus neomexicanusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus tigrisWestern whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus uniparensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesCamedelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesHolbrookia maculataLesser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardyesnoPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardnoyesSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardnoyesSceloporus magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyes	Iotal		4-0	19
Chemidophorus exsanguisChihuahuan whiptailnoyesChemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesChemidophorus inornatusLittle striped whiptailnoyesChemidophorus neomexicanusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus tigrisWestern whiptailyesyesChemidophorus uniparensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesCameces obsoletusGreater Palans skinknoyesGambelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesHolbrookia maculataLesser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardnoyesSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardnoyesSceloporus magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardnoyesVersaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyesSceloporus noticusSide bletched lizardnoyesSceloporus noticusSagebrush lizardnoyesSceloporus noticusTrei lizardyesyesSceloporus ornatusTrei lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyesUter chardenaYesyesyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesUter chardenaYesyesyesSceloporus ornatusTree lizardyesyes<	(c) Lizard prey			
Cnemidophorus grahamiiCheckered whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus inornatusLittle striped whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus neomexicanusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus tigrisWestern whiptailyesyesCnemidophorus uniparensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesGambelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesHolbrookia maculataLesser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma cornutumTexas horned lizardyesnoPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardnoyesSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardnoyesSceloporus magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyes	Cnemidophorus exsanguis	Chihuahuan whiptail	no	yes
Cnemidophorus inornatusLittle striped whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus neomexicanusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus tigrisWestern whiptailyesyesCnemidophorus uniparensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesEumeces obsoletusGreat Plains skinknoyesGambelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesHolbrookia maculataLesser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma cornutumTexas horned lizardyesnoPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardnoyesSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardnoyesSceloporus poinsettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesVosaurus ornatusPrairie lizardyesyesVirosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyes	Cnemidophorus grahamii	Checkered whiptail	no	yes
Cnemidophorus neomexicanusNew Mexico whiptailnoyesCnemidophorus tigrisWestern whiptailyesyesCnemidophorus uniparensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesEumeces obsoletusGreat Plains skinknoyesGambelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesHolbrookia maculataLesser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma cornutumTexas horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardyesnoSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardnoyesSceloporus poinsettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesVosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyesUtstrandentionSidu thethed lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardnoyesSceloporus ornatusTree lizardyesyesStatus ornatusTree lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyesUtstatus ornatusTree lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusSidu thethed lizerdyesyes	Cnemidophorus inornatus	Little striped whiptail	no	yes
Cnemidophorus tigrisWestern whiptailyesyesCnemidophorus uniparensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesEumeces obsoletusGreat Plains skinknoyesGambelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesHolbrookia maculataLesser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma cornutumTexas horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardyesnoSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardyesnoSceloporus magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesVrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyes	Cnemidophorus neomexicanus	New Mexico whiptail	no	yes
Cnemidophorus uniparensDesert grassland whiptailnoyesCophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesEumeces obsoletusGreat Plains skinknoyesGambelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesHolbrookia maculataLesser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma cornutumTexas horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardyesnoPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardnoyesSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardyesnoSceloporus nagisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyes	Cnemidophorus tigris	Western whiptail	yes	yes
Cophosaurus texanusGreater earless lizardnoyesEumeces obsoletusGreat Plains skinknoyesGambelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesHolbrookia maculataLesser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma cornutumTexas horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardyesnoPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardyesnoSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardyesnoSceloporus magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyes	Cnemidophorus uniparens	Desert grassland whiptail	no	yes
Eumeces obsoletusGreat Plains skinknoyesGambelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesHolbrookia maculataLesser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma cornutumTexas horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardyesnoPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardnoyesSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardyesnoSceloporus magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyes	Cophosaurus texanus	Greater earless lizard	no	yes
Gambelia wislizeniiLeopard lizardyesyesHolbrookia maculataLesser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma cornutumTexas horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardyesnoPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardnoyesSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardyesnoSceloporus magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyes	Eumeces obsoletus	Great Plains skink	no	yes
Holbrookia maculataLesser earless lizardnoyesPhrynosoma cornutumTexas horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardyesnoPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardnoyesSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardyesnoSceloporus magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus poinsettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyes	Gambelia wislizenii	Leopard lizard	yes	yes
Phrynosoma cornutumTexas horned lizardnoyesPhrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardyesnoPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardnoyesSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardyesnoSceloporus magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus poinsettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyes	Holbrookia maculata	Lesser earless lizard	no	yes
Phrynosoma douglassiiShort-horned lizardyesnoPhrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardnoyesSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardyesnoSceloporus magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus poinsettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyes	Phrynosoma cornutum	Texas horned lizard	no	yes
Phrynosoma modestumRound-tailed horned lizardnoyesSceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardyesnoSceloporus magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus poinsettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyes	Phrynosoma douglassii	Short-horned lizard	yes	no
Sceloporus graciosusSagebrush lizardyesnoSceloporus magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus poinsettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyes	Phrynosoma modestum	Round-tailed horned lizard	no	yes
Sceloporus magisterDesert spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus poinsettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyesUsaurus ornatusScieloporus undulatusyesyes	Sceloporus graciosus	Sagebrush lizard	yes	no
Sceloporus poinsettiCrevice spiny lizardnoyesSceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyesUseScience barineScience barineyes	Sceloporus magister	Desert spiny lizard	no	yes
Sceloporus undulatusPrairie lizardyesyesUrosaurus ornatusTree lizardyesyesUse of the product of	Sceloporus poinsetti	Crevice spiny lizard	no	yes
Urosaurus ornatus Tree lizard yes yes	Sceloporus undulatus	Prairie lizard	yes	yes
	Urosaurus ornatus	Tree lizard	yes	yes
Uta stansouriana Side-biotched lizard yes ves	Uta stansburiana	Side-blotched lizard	yes	yes
Totals 7 17	Totals		7	17

Table 5. (a) Potential avian predators of *C. collaris* (b) potential snake predators of *C. collaris*, and (c) lizard species that may be preyed upon by *Crotaphytus collaris* in our study areas

Snakes and lizards: ¹species from range maps in Stebbins (1985); ²species from range maps in Degenhardt *et al.* (1996). Avian: species from range maps in ³Clark & Wheeler (1987) and ⁴Peterson (1998). Rare species not included.

In addition, the derived character states in *C. c. auriceps* may have arisen from relaxation of selective pressures operating on *C. c. fuscus*. Specifically, the derived traits could have been facilitated by a reduction in pressure by visually orienting predators and by consumption of lizard prey. These two possibilities may be mutually reinforcing, and we currently lack the data required to assess their relative contributions. Nevertheless, data from stomach contents and bite force studies of C. *collaris* in Utah and New Mexico, coupled with information on the geographical distribution of potential predators and saurian prey, provide a starting point.

STOMACH CONTENTS, BITE FORCE, AND SAUROPHAGY IN C. COLLARIS

In a sample of 145 *C. c. baileyi* from western New Mexico, eight lizards were contained in seven stomachs, one stomach contained a snake, and another a bird nestling (Best & Pfaffenberger, 1987). Although this quantity is small, by comparison not a single stomach in 98 *C. c. baileyi* from north-western Utah contained a vertebrate of any kind (Knowlton, 1938). Moreover, these populations are not as extreme in expression of conspicuous and inconspicuous colouration as observed in our study populations. It seems plausible that *C. c. fuscus*, being both the southernmost representative of *C. collaris* and coinciding with the greatest diversity and abundance of lizard species (see below), may be more saurophagous than other *C. collaris* populations.

Lappin (1999) constructed a transducer to measure bite force performance in live crotaphytids and found that peak bite force increased with absolute increases in cranial size and cranial robustness. Of the *C. collaris* males examined, the top 20% exhibiting the strongest bite force came from the southern reaches of the species' distribution, half of which were *C. c. fuscus* males. It likewise has been our subjective impression during the present study that *C. c. auriceps* males are much more gracile in cranial elements than are *C. c. fuscus* males. We currently are conducting a study of stomach contents, cranial morphology and bite force in our study populations, and to date we have observed saurophagy in *C. c. fuscus* but not in *C. c. auriceps*.

SPECIES RICHNESS AND ABUNDANCE OF CROTAPHYTUS PREDATORS AND LIZARD PREY

Our two study populations appear to differ in the presence of several important diurnal, visually orienting predator species. Of primary importance is the absence from our Utah study area of the roadrunners, a cursorial bird that preys on large numbers of lizards. An additional lizard specialist absent in Utah is the coachwhip, *Masticophis flagellum*. This snake is known to prey so heavily on collared lizards in some areas of Oklahoma that *Crotaphytus* and *Masticophis* densities appear to cycle together (J. Husak, pers. comm.).

The number of lizard species that could serve as collared lizard prey increases from Utah to New Mexico. This latitudinal gradient in lizard diversity, as well as abundance, has been noted by other authors (e.g. Pianka, 1967, 1968; Kiester, 1971). Thus, the conspicuous sexual dichromatism in our northern population may have arisen as a response to relaxed selection for crypsis, stemming from the absence of important visually orienting predators such as roadrunners and coachwhips as well as the decreased availability of saurian prey.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish (authorization #3056), and the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (authorization #6COLL4792) for permission to capture and gather data on C. collaris. P. Andreadis, J. Husak, and P. Hamilton corresponded with us about Crotaphtyus predators and prey, and the latter two researchers independently referred us to K. Lappin's (1999) unpublished dissertation. We also thank P. Hamilton for housing and assistance in field collection of C. collaris in New Mexico. C. S. Evans suggested the term 'dynamic crypsis' for motion signals that mimic visual background motion, although we apply the term in this paper to colour signals. Dan Larsen in the Department of Geology, University of Memphis, identified rock samples from our study areas. M. Rowe graciously endured numerous inquiries about measurement and analysis of light spectra over a several-year period. Earlier versions of this manuscript were improved with comments from P. Hamilton, J. Husak, K. Lappin, and two anonymous reviewers.

REFERENCES

- Andersson M. 1994. Sexual selection. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Andersson S, Ornborg J, Andersson M. 1998. Ultraviolet sexual dimorphism and assortative mating in blue tits. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* 265: 445–450.
- Badyaev AV, Hill GE. 2000. Evolution of sexual dichromatism: contribution of carotenoid- versus melanin-based coloration. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **69**: 153–172.
- Baird TA, Fox FF, McCoy JK. 1997. Population differences in the roles of size and coloration in intra- and intersexual selection in the collared lizard, *Crotaphytus collaris*: influence of habitat and social organization. *Behavioral Ecology* 8: 506–517.
- Best TL, Pfaffenberger GS. 1987. Age and sexual variation

in the diet of collared lizards (*Crotaphytus collaris*). Southwestern Naturalist **32:** 415–426.

- Clark WS, Wheeler BK. 1987. A field guide to hawks, North America. Peterson Field Guide Series. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Cooper WE, Greenberg N. 1992. Reptilian coloration and behavior. In: Gans, C, Crews, D, eds. Biology of the Reptilia, Vol. 18 Physiology E, Hormones, brain and behavior: Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 298–422.
- Cott HB. 1940. Adaptive colouration in animals. London: Methuen.
- Cuthill IC, Bennett ATD, Partridge JC, Maier EJ. 1999. Plumage reflectance and the objective assessment of avian sexual dichromatism. *American Naturalist* 153: 183–200.
- **Darwin C. 1871.** The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex. London: Murray.
- Degenhardt WG, Painter CW, Price AH. 1996. Amphibians and reptiles of New Mexico. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Edmunds M. 1990. The evolution of cryptic coloration. In: Evans, DL, Schmidt, JO, eds. *Insect defences*. New York: SUNY Press, 3–21.
- Endler JA. 1978. A predator's view of animal color patterns. Evolutionary Biology 11: 319–364.
- Endler JA. 1980. Natural selection on color patterns in Poecilia reticulata. Evolution 34: 76–91.
- Endler JA. 1981. An overview of the relationships between mimicry and crypsis. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Soci*ety 16: 25–31.
- Endler JA. 1984. Progressive background in moths, and a quantitative measure of crypsis. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 22: 187–231.
- Endler JA. 1990. On the measurement and classification of colour in studies of animal colour patterns. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **41**: 315–352.
- Endler JA. 1991. Variation in the appearance of guppy color patterns to guppies and their predators under different visual conditions. *Vision Research* 31: 587–608.
- Endler JA. 1992. Signals, signal conditions, and the direction of evolution. *American Naturalist* 139: S125–S153.
- Endler JA. 1997. Light, behavior, and conservation of forestdwelling organisms. In: Clemmons, J, Buchholz, R, eds. *Behavioral approaches to conservation in the wild*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 329–355.
- Fitch HS, Tanner WW. 1951. Remarks concerning the systematics of the collared lizard (*Crotaphytus collaris*) with a description of a new subspecies. *Transactions of the Kansas Academy of Sciences* 54: 548–559.
- Gibbons JRH, Lillywhite HB. 1981. Ecological segregation, color matching, and speciation in lizards of the Amphibolurus decresii species complex (Lacertilia: Agamidae). Ecology 62: 1573–1584.
- Gray DA. 1996. Carotenoids and sexual dichromatism in North American passerine birds. American Naturalist 148: 453–480.
- Houde A. 1987. Mate choice based upon naturally occurring color-pattern variation in a guppy population. *Evolution* 41: 1–10.

- Houde AE, Endler JA. 1990. Correlated evolution of female mating preferences and male color patterns in the guppy, *Poecilia reticulata*. Science 248: 1405–1408.
- Ingram W, Tanner WW. 1971. A taxonomic study of Crotaphytus collaris between the Rio Grande and Colorado Rivers. Brigham Young University Science Bulletin 8: 1–29.
- Kiester AR. 1971. Species density of North American amphibians and reptiles. Systematic Zoology 20: 127–137.
- Knowlton GF. 1938. Lizards in insect control. Ohio Journal of Science 38: 235–238.
- Kodric-Brown A. 1985. Female preference and sexual selection for male coloration in the guppy (*Poecilia reticulata*). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 17: 199–205.
- Lappin AK. 1999. Evolutionary ecomorphology of the feeding biology of crotaphytid lizards. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- LeBas NR, Marshall NJ. 1999. The role of colour in signalling and male choice in the agamid lizard *Ctenophorus orna*tus. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B 267: 445– 452.
- Long KD, Houde AE. 1989. Orange spots as a visual cue for female mate choice in the guppy (*Poecilia reticulata*). *Ethology* 82: 316–324.
- McCoy JK, Harmon HJ, Baird TA, Fox SF. 1997. Geographic variation in sexual dichromatism in the collared lizard, *Crotaphytus collaris* (Sauria: Crotaphytidae). *Copeia* 1997: 565–571.
- McGuire JA. 1996. Phylogenetic systematics of crotaphytid lizards (Reptilia: Iguania: Crotaphytidae). Bulletin of the Carnegie Museum of Natural History 32: 1–143.
- Merilaita S, Tuomi J, Jormalainen V. 1999. Optimization of cryptic coloration in heterogenous habitats. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 67: 151–161.
- Norris KS, Lowe CH. 1964. An analysis of background color matching in amphibians and reptiles. *Ecology* 45: 565– 580.
- **Ortolani A. 1999.** Spots, stripes, tail tips and dark eyes: Predicting the function of carnivore colour patterns using the comparative method. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **67:** 433–476.
- **Peterson RT. 1998.** A field guide to western birds. Peterson Field Guide Series. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Pianka ER. 1967. On lizard species diversity: North American flatland deserts. *Ecology* 48: 333–351.
- Pianka ER. 1968. Ecology and natural history of desert lizards. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Rice WR. 1989. Analyzing tables of statistical tests. *Evolution* 43: 223–225.
- Ruppert RM. 1980. Comparative assimilation efficiencies of 2 lizards. *Comparative Biochemical Physiology* 67A: 491– 496.
- **Stebbins RC. 1985.** A field guide to western amphibians and *reptiles.* Peterson Field Guide Series. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Wiens JJ, Reeder TW, De Oca ANM. 1999. Molecular phylogenetics and evolution of sexual dichromatism among populations of the Yarrow's spiny lizard (*Sceloporus jarrovii*). *Evolution* 53: 1884–1897.