|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Figure Name** | **Experiment** | | **No of days observed** | | **No of beetles released** | **n** | ***X2*** | ***df*** | **cohen’s *w*** | **p value** |  |
| Figure 1 C (b) | | Approach plant in Flight vs. Crawl | | 15 | 327 | 37 | 31.229 | 1 | 0.919 | < 0.0001 | \* |
| Figure 1 C (c) | | Approach plant on leaves vs. stems | | 15 | 327 | 38 | 34.105 | 1 | 0.947 | < 0.0001 | \* |
| Figure 2 A (a) | | Coffee plants with leaves vs. no leaves | | 5 | 60 | 18 | 5.556 | 1 | 0.555 | 0.018 | \* |
| Figure 2 A (b) | | Healthy coffee plants vs. infested coffee plants | | 6 | 54 | 23 | 4.545 | 1 | 0.47 | 0.033 | \* |
| Figure 2 A (c) | | Higher vs. lower levels of leaf rust | | 5 | 51 | 19 | 0.474 | 1 | 0.025 | 0.491 |  |
| Figure 2 A (d) | | Arabica vs. Robusta | | 15 | 210 | 69 | 40.71 | 1 | 0.768 | < 0.0001 | \* |
| Figure 2 A (e) | | Healthy arabica plants vs. cut arabica stems | | 2 | 121 | 23 | 9.783 | 1 | 0.652 | 0.002 | \* |
| Figure 2 A (f) | | Healthy arabica plant vs. cut teak stems | | 2 | 123 | 29 | 21.552 | 1 | 0.862 | < 0.0001 | \* |
| Figure 2 A (g) | | Healthy arabica plant vs. cut Nandi flame stems | | 2 | 148 | 25 | 1.96 | 1 | 0.28 | 0.161 |  |
| Figure 2 A (h) | | Healthy arabica plant vs. cut Silver Oak stems | | 2 | 134 | 32 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.125 | 0.48 |  |
| Figure 2 B (a) | | Volatile +, Visual + vs. Volatile-, Visual+ | | 5 | 72 | 27 | 8.333 | 1 | 0.556 | 0.004 | \* |
| Figure 2 B (b) | | Volatile +, Visual + vs. Volatile+, Visual- | | 5 | 57 | 21 | 1.37 | 1 | 0.255 | 0.242 |  |
| Figure 5 | | Host Volatile Trap experiment: CWSB | | 106 | NA | 18 | 13.111 | 6 | 0.853 | 0.041 | \* |
| Figure 5 | | Host Volatile Trap experiment: *Demonax balyi* | | 106 | NA | 36 | 9.11 | 6 | 0.253 | 0.167 |  |
| Figure 5 | | Host Volatile Trap experiment: *Xylotrechus smei* | | 106 | NA | 19 | 14.526 | 6 | 0.874 | 0.024 | \* |