

Supplementary Table 1. Epigynal condition of mated *Peucetia viridans* females collected from sites in Los Angeles and San Diego Counties, California, in October-November 2004. For each female, the presence of a male paracymbial process and/or an epigynal plug were noted for each of her epigynal orifices; following Table 1, plugs were scored as complete or partial if present. Since each female has paired orifices, "two" in the tables below denotes presence in both left and right orifices, while "one" denotes presence in the left or right orifice only. For each combination of paracymbial process and plug condition, the number of females with that configuration is indicated. Row and column totals (n) are also provided.

A. All samples ($n = 54$)

Paracymbial Processes	Epigynal Plugs					$n =$
	Two Complete	One Complete	Two Partial	One Partial	Both Absent	
Two Present	7	0	0	0	0	7
One Present	2	5	0	0	1	8
Both Absent	2	9	1	1	26	39
$n =$	11	14	1	1	27	54

B. Kenneth Hahn State Recreation Area, Los Angeles Co. ($n = 34$)

Paracymbial Processes	Epigynal Plugs					$n =$
	Two Complete	One Complete	Two Partial	One Partial	Both Absent	
Two Present	4	0	0	0	0	4
One Present	2	4	0	0	1	7
Both Absent	2	8	1	1	11	23
$n =$	8	12	1	1	12	34

Supplementary Table 1. Continued.

C. Ernest Debs Regional Park, Los Angeles Co. ($n = 7$)

Paracymbial Processes	Epigynal Plugs					$n =$
	Two Complete	One Complete	Two Partial	One Partial	Both Absent	
Two Present	3	0	0	0	0	3
One Present	0	1	0	0	0	1
Both Absent	0	0	0	0	3	3
$n =$	3	1	0	0	3	7

D. Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles Co. ($n = 9$)

Paracymbial Processes	Epigynal Plugs					$n =$
	Two Complete	One Complete	Two Partial	One Partial	Both Absent	
Two Present	0	0	0	0	0	0
One Present	0	0	0	0	0	0
Both Absent	0	0	0	0	9	9
$n =$	0	0	0	0	9	9

E. Crest Canyon Preserve, Del Mar, San Diego Co. ($n = 2$)

Paracymbial Processes	Epigynal Plugs					$n =$
	Two Complete	One Complete	Two Partial	One Partial	Both Absent	
Two Present	0	0	0	0	0	0
One Present	0	0	0	0	0	0
Both Absent	0	1	0	0	1	2
$n =$	0	1	0	0	1	2

Supplementary Table 1. Continued.

F. Carmel Valley Road, Del Mar, San Diego Co. ($n = 2$)

Paracymbial Processes	Epigynal Plugs					$n =$
	Two Complete	One Complete	Two Partial	One Partial	Both Absent	
Two Present	0	0	0	0	0	0
One Present	0	0	0	0	0	0
Both Absent	0	0	0	0	2	2
$n =$	0	0	0	0	2	2

Supplementary Table 2. Means (\pm SE) of the residual index for field-collected *Peuceitia viridans* females grouped by combinations of copulatory plugs and paracymbial processes in their epigyna. As noted in the text, two females with one and two partial plugs, respectively, are not included here, hence the sample size difference between Table 4 ($n = 54$) and this table ($n = 52$). The results of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for differences among groups are also shown, as are the results of post-hoc comparisons using Fisher's PLSD test when there was a significant F for ANOVA.

Epigynal Object		Combination			ANOVA	
		Two	One	None	F	P
Copulatory plugs	$n =$	11	14	27	3.278	0.046*
	$\bar{X} =$	-0.069	-0.041	0.050		
	SE =	0.045	0.041	0.028		
	Post-hoc comparisons:			Two vs One		0.643
				Two vs None		0.029*
				One vs None		0.067
Paracymbia	$n =$	7	8	37	2.961	0.061
	$\bar{X} =$	-0.127	0.026	0.019		
	SE =	0.056	0.063	0.023		

* $p < 0.05$.

Supplementary Table 3. Means (\pm SE) of the residual index for field-collected *Peucetia viridans* females by sample site. This table includes the sample set of females ($n = 52$) as Supplementary Table 2. The results of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for differences among sites and the results of post-hoc comparisons using Fisher's PLSD test are also shown. Site abbreviations are defined in the text.

Site	Residual Index			ANOVA	
	n	\bar{X}	SE	F	P
HSR	32	-0.013	0.025	3.456	0.015*
DEB	7	-0.054	0.057		
LMU	9	0.128	0.047		
CCN	2	-0.224	0.038		
CVR	2	0.040	0.046		
Post-hoc comparisons:			HSR vs DEB	0.484	
			HSR vs LMU	0.012*	
			HSR vs CCN	0.046*	
			HSR vs CVR	0.614	
			DEB vs LMU	0.014*	
			DEB vs CCN	0.140	
			DEB vs CVR	0.411	
			LMU vs CCN	0.003**	
			LMU vs CVR	0.430	
			CCN vs CVR	0.068	

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$.