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Materials and Methods

Beetle Collection and Care

Live *Brachinus elongatulus* were collected at night in a dry creek bed in Madera Canyon near Green Valley, AZ, or from along the banks of the San Pedro River several miles west of Tombstone, AZ. Beetles were maintained prior to the experiments with free access to water, food, and shelter. After the experiments, beetles were euthanized with ethyl acetate or ethanol and then preserved in 90% ethanol solution.

Synchrotron X-ray Imaging

Synchrotron X-ray phase-contrast imaging was performed at the XOR-32ID undulator beamline of the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne National Laboratory (Argonne, IL, USA). X-ray energy was selected using a Si-111 double-crystal monochromator and flux was adjusted by changing the undulator gap. The source-to-sample distance was 65 m. X-rays transmitted by the sample were converted to visible light by a cerium-doped yttrium aluminum garnet scintillator for detection with a video camera. In early experiments (Aug-2010, 30 and 250 fps), the beetle-mounting setup comprised a metal strip clamped to the end of a horizontal rod, which was itself clamped to a vertical post on an optical table. A stop was placed on the post so that the horizontal assembly could be removed and then quickly returned to the same height. In later experiments (Mar-2013, 1000 and 2000 fps), the mounting setup comprised a metal plate bearing a hole along the midline. The plate was screwed to a metal frame at its corners, and this frame was affixed to a vertical post attached to an optical table.

In preparation for imaging, a beetle was anesthetized by placement in a laboratory freezer or in a vial placed in an ice-filled container. Beetles sometimes discharged during chilling. Once immobile, the beetle was mounted with a “collar” of modeling clay, either to the metal strip with its abdomen protruding below (in early experiments) or to the metal plate with its abdomen tip placed over the hole (in later experiments). In the early experiments, the horizontal rod bearing the metal strip was removed from the vertical post and placed on a table to mount the beetle and then returned to its previous configuration. In later experiments, the mounting assembly was kept fixed in place. Mounting was accomplished by pressing a strip of modeling clay across the midsection of the beetle while it laid ventral-side-up on a table, then lifting the clay and beetle and placing in the desired position on the mounting apparatus, and then pressing the clay firmly onto the metal on either side of the beetle to cause it to stick. In some cases, an ice pack was used to chill the modeling clay and the table where the beetle was handled in an attempt to delay the beetle’s waking. The mounting setup was pre-positioned to place the abdomen tip approximately in line with the X-ray beam, and in the case of the metal plate a piece of tape placed across part of the hole was used to aid alignment. For a few tests, beetles were mounted upside down to test the effect of gravity on vapor pocket shape and position (no effect was observed); beetle 12 in Tables S1 and S2 was mounted in this fashion. Occasionally, beetles awoke during handling and mounting, and these were either re-anesthetized for remounting or, if they discharged, returned to a separate container and imaged at a later time. After securing the experimental hutch, the beetle was monitored by closed-circuit television. When the beetle started to wake and move its legs, the X-ray stutter was opened. Typically the beetle panicked upon waking.
presumably due to a combination of confinement by the clay and irritation from the X-ray beam; these conditions produced the best chances of observing a spray. If the beetle did not spray immediately, it was poked repeatedly using a sharp object (such as a pin) attached to a remotely controlled positioning stage. If a spray was observed, the camera was stopped manually. In some cases, multiple imaging trials were conducted for a single beetle, but in no case was a spray recorded after the first trial, and only first trials are considered in the statistical analyses.

Imaging at 30 fps was performed under conditions similar to those described in the literature (12-16) with 25-keV X-rays, a 1-m sample-to-detector distance, and a flux of approximately $2 \times 10^{10}$ photons/s/mm$^2$. Video was recorded onto a MiniDV tape using a Cohu 2700 video camera (San Diego, CA, USA) coupled to a 2× microscope objective and tube lens, providing a field of view of roughly 3.2 mm by 2.4 mm (708×480 pixels). The video (in DV format) was transferred to computer using a video tape deck and Apple iMovie software (Cupertino, CA, USA). The DV file was converted first to MP4 format and then to a TIFF image stack using the free open-source software HandBrake (23) and FFmpeg (24), respectively. Movies of the discharges were created from the TIFF files and saved in AVI format (30-fps playback, no compression) using ImageJ (25).

Imaging at 250 fps was performed using the same beam energy and sample-to-detector distance as for 30-fps imaging, but with a higher X-ray flux. A Photron Fastcam SA1.1 model 675K-M1 high-speed camera (Tokyo, Japan) coupled to a 5× microscope objective and tube lens was used for the detector. The theoretical field of view was 4.1 mm by 4.1 mm, though the usable field of view was reduced somewhat vertically by the size of the beam, and the pixel size was 4.0 µm (verified using calibration images taken of a 400-mesh TEM grid). The camera ran continuously until stopped manually when a discharge was observed, and its 8-GB internal memory held 21.8 s (5457 frames) of 250-fps 1024×1024 video. Each video was downloaded from the camera as TIFF image stacks which were later adjusted for brightness and contrast in ImageJ. Movies of the discharges were exported from ImageJ as AVI files (25-fps playback, JPEG compression).

Imaging at 1000 fps and 2000 fps was performed using 18-keV X-rays, a sample-to-detector distance of approximately 60 cm, and a much higher flux (the maximum output of the undulator source at this beam energy, on the order of $10^{13}$ photons/s/mm$^2$). The undulator gap was 15.531 mm with a 0.2-mm taper. The same camera and optics were used as for 250-fps imaging, giving the same theoretical field of view and pixel size (again verified by calibration images of a 400-mesh TEM grid). However, the usable field of view was greatly reduced due to the smaller size of the beam (necessary to reduce the thermal load on the beamline optics), especially in the vertical dimension. The camera ran continuously as before, and its internal memory held 5.46 s and 2.73 s of 1000- and 2000-fps 1024×1024 video, respectively. The image stacks were background-corrected, normalized, and smoothed using a custom script in Matlab (MathWorks, Natick, MA, USA). Movies of the discharges were exported from ImageJ as AVI files (25-fps playback, JPEG compression). Movies S1-S3 were converted to MOV files (25-fps playback, h264 compression) using FFmpeg.

Statistical analysis was generally performed using Microsoft Excel software (Redmond, WA, USA). The calculations for Fisher’s exact test were done using a Texas Instruments TI-89 calculator (Dallas, TX, USA) due to difficulties in calculating large factorials in Excel.
Optical Microscopy

For optical microscopy shown in Fig. 1, following excision of the pygidial glands from the beetles’ abdomens, non-cuticular tissue surrounding the glands was digested and cleared using a pancreatic solution as described by Álvarez-Padilla and Hormiga (26). Non-sclerotized regions of the glands, which were colorless prior to staining, were stained blue with Chlorazol Black E to increase contrast. The glands were imaged using a Visionary Digital BK Plus imaging system (http://www.visionarydigital.com), and images from multiple focal planes were combined using Zerene Stacker software (Richland, WA, USA).

Scanning Electron Microscopy

For scanning electron microscopy shown in Fig. 1 (except E), B. elongatulus which had been preserved in 90% ethanol solution were dissected in air with the aid of an Olympus SZX16 stereomicroscope (Tokyo, Japan). The pygidial gland assembly was temporarily stored in 95% ethanol solution and then dehydrated through graded ethanol (10 minutes each of 98% and 2× 100%). The glands were picked up in a glass Pasteur pipet and transferred to a piece of filter paper to air-dry. With the aid of the stereomicroscope, the glands were mounted on an aluminum stub using double-sided carbon tape. The glands were sputter-coated with gold-palladium for 120 s at 50 mA utilizing sample rotation with a Denton Vacuum Desk V coater (Moorestown, NJ, USA). Imaging was conducted on a JEOL 6700F field-emission scanning electron microscope (Tokyo, Japan) using an accelerating voltage of 5 kV, an emitter current of 10 μA, and a nominal working distance of either 8 or 15 mm, and images were collected using a low-angle secondary-electron detector.

The female B. elongatulus gland shown in Fig. 1E was sectioned by the following procedure. After excision from a freshly sacrificed beetle and subsequent storage in 75% ethanol, the gland was dehydrated through a graded ethanol series (10 min. each of 80%, 90%, 95%, and 3× 100%) and then transferred to toluene through a graded series (15 min. each of 2:1 ethanol-toluene, 1:2 ethanol-toluene, and 2× 100% toluene). An embedding solution (ES) was prepared by dissolving polystyrene (M_w = 350,000 g/mol, melt index 3.4; Sigma Aldrich) in toluene at 10 w/v% concentration. The gland was transferred to ES through a graded series (45 min. each of 2:1 toluene-ES and 1:2 toluene-ES followed by 90 min. of 100% ES). The gland was picked up in a glass Pasteur pipet and transferred to the tip of a BEEM #3 embedding capsule, the lid of which had been perforated using sharp-tipped forceps. ES was added to fill the capsule, and the capsule lid was attached. The capsule was placed upright in a capsule holder in a fume hood for several days in order for the toluene to slowly evaporate to harden the polystyrene. Once the block had hardened, general-purpose epoxy was poured into the capsule to fill (to compensate for the considerable shrinkage during drying) in order to obtain a block of sufficient length to fix in a microtome chuck. The epoxy was allowed to harden at room temperature. The block was cut from the capsule using a razor blade. Microtome sectioning of the block face to reveal the gland interior was performed using a Leica EM UC6 ultramicrotome (Wetzlar, Germany). Thick sections were cut on a Diatome Histo diamond knife (Hatfield, PA, USA), into a water trough at room temperature, until roughly half of the gland remained. The block was placed in toluene overnight to dissolve the polystyrene
embedment. Once de-embedded, the gland was transferred by pipet to a glass vial. The gland was washed in two changes of toluene (10 min. each) and then transferred to ethanol through a graded series (10 min. each of 2:1 toluene-ethanol, 1:2 toluene-ethanol, and 2× 100% ethanol). The gland was transferred by pipet to a piece of filter paper to air dry and then mounted for SEM, coated with gold-palladium, and imaged using the previously described procedures.

False-colorization of the scanning electron micrographs in Fig. 1D,E was performed using Adobe Photoshop CS6 software (San Jose, CA, USA).

Supplementary Text

Elicitation of Sprays

Previous studies of bombardier beetles have typically relied on the experimenter to manually elicit sprays (e.g. by pinching the beetles’ legs with forceps), but synchrotron X-ray imaging restricted us to remote specimen manipulation due the high radiation levels present. We found that restraining beetles with modeling clay would occasionally cause them to spray upon awaking from cold-induced anesthesia, with irritating effects of the X-ray beam (13) possibly providing further aggravation. All of the sprays recorded at higher imaging rates (1000 and 2000 fps) occurred in this manner. In earlier tests at lower frame rates (30 and 250 fps), a sharp pin attached to a motorized stage was used to poke the beetles if they did not spray immediately, and this method gave some success, but poking was ineffective at the very high X-ray fluxes necessary for higher-rate imaging due to the time required to align the pin and prod the beetle exceeding the brief period before X-ray damage becomes significant. No sprays were recorded after the onset of visible X-ray effects (e.g. leg twitching, protrusion of the aedeagus in males, bowel eversion), the occurrence and timing of which depended on the imaging conditions.

Differences between Aug-2010 and Mar-2013 Experiments

The percentage of beetles recorded spraying relative to the number of beetles tested was higher in the initial set of experiments (Aug-2010) at lower imaging rates than in the later set (Mar-2013) at higher frame rates (40.0% for 10 beetles imaged at 30 or 250 fps vs. 7.75% for 129 beetles imaged at 1000 or 2000 fps), and this discrepancy is greater than what would be expected purely by chance (p = 0.0088, Fisher’s exact test). Multiple factors must be considered to interpret this observation and its possible causes. The beetles were collected at different times and in different locations, so inherent behavioral differences may exist between the two populations. However, the differences in imaging conditions between the two sets of experiments are most likely the dominant factor. Lower X-ray fluxes and higher X-ray energies (which are less readily absorbed by tissue) were used in the first set of experiments, resulting in lower expected rates of radiation-induced damage per unit volume of tissue compared to later experiments. Correspondingly, more time was available for the beetle to spray, spontaneously or as a result of poking, before radiation effects grew pronounced. Additionally, in the earlier experiments, 5 sprays from 2 beetles (over half of those recorded then) occurred while poking, with two of the sprays (both by beetle 1 in Table S1) clearly aimed at the pin as observed in concurrent visible-light video.

X-ray Effects on Live Beetles
For imaging at 30 fps, using the optimized settings as reported in (13) and illuminating only the animals’ abdomens, no X-ray effects were observed even after many minutes of imaging. For imaging at 250-fps, however, the much higher fluxes used resulted in observable radiation effects (leg twitching, gut eversion, and aedeagus protrusion) after only a few minutes of exposure. The fluxes used for 1000- and 2000-fps imaging were higher still, but a much smaller region of the abdomen was illuminated due to the significantly smaller vertical extent of the beam. No externally apparent X-ray effects were noted for these beetles, which would scurry around in normal fashion after imaging. Increased survivorship for abdomen-only irradiation in insects has been noted in previous studies (13). However, in all but a handful of cases, beetles could be handled with impunity after only a short period (<1 minute) of beam exposure at these fluxes, suggesting that the irradiation of their pygidial glands typically rendered them unable to spray, possibly due to damage to the muscles and nerves which control them; this effect likely contributed to the lower success rates relative to the Aug-2010 experiments. It is unknown whether these beetles would have eventually died due to radiation poisoning, as they were typically euthanized at the end of each day. However, a set of beetles imaged at 1000 or 2000 fps that were not euthanized until the end of the experiments (this group included the beetles had been recorded spraying) all survived up to that point, which was up to two days following irradiation.

**Spray Durations**

Spray durations, as determined from X-ray video, ranged from 5.0 ± 0.5 ms to 344 ± 4 ms, with the median duration being 23.5 ms and 80% of the discharges lasting 40 ms or less (Table S1). On the whole, spray durations were lengthier than those reported for S. insignis (5)—in some cases, considerably so—but it is unclear whether this represents a fundamental difference between the two species or differences in experimental conditions. We also find that spray durations often vary considerably between consecutive discharges from the same beetle, suggesting that physical characteristics such as the size or shape of the pygidial glands do not fix the duration. Rather, it would appear that the beetle exercises control over spray duration, which could be a means of tuning its defensive response to a wide variety of potential predators to ensure effective deterrence while conserving reactants and enzymes.

**Spray Pulsation Rates**

Pulses were sufficiently distinct in 2000-fps X-ray video that average spray pulsation rates were quantifiable (Fig. S1, Table S2), and these values ranged from 341-976 Hz (median, 667 Hz; mean ± SD, 698 ± 146 Hz). These analyses exclude data from beetle 14 in table S1; of this beetle’s two recorded sprays, the first comprised only a single pulse; and the second was highly irregular, with vapor back-flowing into the reservoir chamber with each pulsation cycle so that the reservoir partially filled with vapor, impeding the injection of reactants and causing pulsation to be dramatically slower than observed in other beetles. As shown in Fig. S1B, average pulsation rate does not obviously correlate with the gland active time suggesting no tendency of sprays with greater or lesser pulsation rates towards longer or shorter durations, or vice-versa. For individual beetles, average pulsation rates did not vary significantly between glands or successive sprays. In addition, qualitatively, pulsation appeared to be quite regular rather
than increasing or decreasing in rate. Overall, average pulsation rates were similar to those reported in (5) for *S. insignis* but higher on average and showing wider variation.

**Exit Channel Opening/Closing**

The ability for the exit channel to open and close is due to its membranous dorsal part, which is readily displaced by the exiting spray to form an open channel when the gland is active. When pulsation stops at the conclusion of gland activity, the dorsal membrane collapses into the trough of the exit channel, displacing vapor from the exit channel and causing the exit channel to disappear from view in the X-ray video (Movies S1-S3). This relaxation occurs slowly (median closure time, 12.0 ms; range, 2.5-86.5 ms) compared to the timescale of a pulse cycle (~1-3 ms).

**One-Gland versus Two-Gland Sprays**

Two-gland sprays were very common in our experiments, comprising 80% of those we recorded (Table S1); it is unclear if this preference is a response to the specific procedures we employed or a more general behavior. This ability to use the pygidial glands independently gives the beetle an additional method (other than adjusting spray duration) of tailoring its defensive response to the perceived threat and also provides redundancy should one of its glands lack sufficient reactants or enzymes to function. For two-gland sprays, glands typically did not become active simultaneously. The median offset between the start of activity in the two glands was 3.5 ms (range, 0-18 ms). This second-gland start delay is an order of magnitude shorter than the beetles’ defensive reaction time as reported by Dean (27), suggesting that it is due to physiological limitations in synchronizing the start of gland activity rather than conscious control by the beetle. In contrast, once both glands are active, their pulsation is roughly synchronous, and activity typically ceases almost simultaneously in both glands at the conclusion of spraying.

**Reaction Chamber Vapor Pockets**

X-ray imaging revealed the frequent presence of vapor pockets inside quiescent beetles which appear as bright, rounded features with edges enhanced by phase contrast. The positions of the vapor pockets are generally consistent with being internal to the reaction chambers, even reflecting conformational differences between females and males which are apparent in excised pygidial glands, indicating that the vapor pockets are located within the reaction chambers. Such vapor pockets were quite common, being observed in roughly two-thirds of the beetles we imaged, and their presence did not obviously impede the beetles’ ability to spray. The size and shape of the vapor pockets varied from beetle to beetle, and between glands of individual beetles, but typically conformed to a few motifs (e.g. ovoid, heart-shaped, or bi-lobular similar to the reaction chamber). This variation does not reflect differences in the sizes and shapes of the reaction chambers but rather in the portion of their volume that is occupied by vapor, the balance being enzyme solution (liquid). Presumably, while the gland is inactive, fresh enzyme solution is synthesized and transported to the reaction chamber, where it gradually displaces vapor (which could be passively released from the exit pore), until the reaction chamber once again becomes completely liquid-filled given sufficient recharging time. Rarely, vapor pockets were also observed in reservoir chambers; this may be due to
leakage of either vapor or enzyme solution from the reaction chamber into the reservoir through the inter-chamber valve, as was observed during spray 2 from beetle 14 in Table S1.

**Behavioral Differences between Females and Males**

The differences in pygidial gland morphology between females and males (Fig. 1B) raise the question of what other differences might exist between the sexes. In fact, our experiments suggest that defensive behavior does differ somewhat between *B. elongatulus* females and males. Previous studies of bombardier beetles have rarely distinguished between the sexes and none have systematically looked for sex-specific differences in the defensive mechanism, whereas our experiments were conducted with comparable numbers of females and males. The percentage of females tested that we recorded spraying was much less than that of males (4.35% of 69 females vs. 15.7% of 70 males, p = 0.019, Fisher’s exact test), suggesting that females are less likely to spray or require a greater perceived threat to do so. Moreover, female sprays tended to be longer in duration than male discharges, as reflected in their median durations (68.8 ms for 6 female sprays vs. 20.8 ms for 24 male sprays), which supports the idea that the females typically sprayed in response to a greater perceived threat. It is not clear if the sexual dimorphism of the pygidial glands relates to these behavioral differences, although the wider separation of the pygidial glands in females as compared to males might provide more efficient cooling and thereby permit longer discharges.

However, females and males did share some important similarities. For beetles recorded discharging, the average number of recorded sprays per beetle was not statistically different between females and males (2.00 vs. 2.18 respectively, p = 0.82, two-tailed unpooled t-test). Average spray pulsation rates were also similar between the single female and several males recorded spraying at 2000 fps (679 Hz vs. 700 Hz, respectively, p = 0.53, two-tailed unpooled t-test), suggesting that despite sexual differences in exit pore configuration, the pulsation mechanism operates fundamentally the same in both sexes. Finally, both sexes showed the ability to spray with either one defensive gland alone or both glands simultaneously.

**Reactant Droplet Mass**

Using the average volume calculated for the reactant droplets observed in Movie S2 (4.7 ± 0.5 nL), the composition of the reactant solution (3, 10), and component densities (28, 29), and making a simplifying assumption that the *p*-hydroquinones behave ideally in solution, an average droplet mass is calculated as:
\[ \begin{align*}
    m_{\text{HP}} &= 0.25m_{\text{tot}}; \\
    m_{\text{HQ}} &= 0.1m_{\text{tot}}; \\
    m_{\text{PD}} &= 0.1m_{\text{tot}}; \\
    m_{\text{W}} &= 0.55m_{\text{tot}}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
    \frac{m_{\text{PD}}}{m_{\text{HP}} + m_{\text{HQ}} + m_{\text{W}}} &= \frac{0.1m_{\text{tot}}}{0.25m_{\text{tot}} + 0.1m_{\text{tot}} + 0.55m_{\text{tot}}} = 0.11 \\
    \frac{m_{\text{PD}}}{m_{\text{HP}} + m_{\text{HQ}} + m_{\text{W}}} &= \rho_{\text{PD}}V_{\text{PD}} = 0.11(m_{\text{HQ}} + \rho_{\text{HP-w}}V_{\text{HP-w}}) \quad (1)
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
    \frac{m_{\text{HP}} + m_{\text{W}}}{m_{\text{HQ}} + m_{\text{PD}}} &= \frac{0.25m_{\text{tot}} + 0.55m_{\text{tot}}}{0.8m_{\text{tot}} + 0.1m_{\text{tot}}} = 8 \\
    m_{\text{HP}} + m_{\text{W}} &= \rho_{\text{HP-w}}V_{\text{HP-w}}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
    \frac{m_{\text{HP}} + m_{\text{W}}}{m_{\text{HQ}} + m_{\text{PD}}} &= \frac{8m_{\text{HQ}}}{\rho_{\text{HP-w}}} \\
    \rho_{\text{PD}}V_{\text{PD}} &= \frac{8m_{\text{HQ}}}{\rho_{\text{HP-w}}}
\end{align*} \]

(continued below)

\[ V_{\text{tot}} - V_{\text{HP-w}} = V_{\text{PD}} \]
\[ \rho_{\text{PD}}(V_{\text{tot}} - V_{\text{HP-w}}) = \rho_{\text{PD}}V_{\text{PD}} = 0.11m_{\text{HQ}} + 0.11\rho_{\text{HP-w}}V_{\text{HP-w}} \]
\[ \rho_{\text{PD}}V_{\text{PD}} = 0.11m_{\text{HQ}} + (0.11\rho_{\text{HP-w}} + \rho_{\text{PD}})V_{\text{HP-w}} \]
\[ \rho_{\text{PD}}V_{\text{PD}} = 0.11m_{\text{HQ}} + (0.11\rho_{\text{HP-w}} + \rho_{\text{PD}})\left(\frac{8m_{\text{HQ}}}{\rho_{\text{HP-w}}}\right) \]
\[ \rho_{\text{PD}}V_{\text{PD}} = 0.11m_{\text{HQ}} + \frac{0.89\rho_{\text{HP-w}}m_{\text{HQ}}}{\rho_{\text{HP-w}}} + \frac{8\rho_{\text{PD}}m_{\text{HQ}}}{\rho_{\text{HP-w}}} \]
\[ \rho_{\text{PD}}V_{\text{PD}} = \left(1 + \frac{8\rho_{\text{PD}}}{\rho_{\text{HP-w}}}\right)m_{\text{HQ}} \quad \rightarrow \quad m_{\text{HQ}} = \frac{\rho_{\text{PD}}V_{\text{PD}}}{\left(1 + \frac{8\rho_{\text{PD}}}{\rho_{\text{HP-w}}}\right)} = \frac{V_{\text{PD}}}{1 + \frac{8}{\rho_{\text{PD}}}} \rho_{\text{PD}} \rho_{\text{HP-w}} \]
\[ V_{\text{PD}} = 4.7 \pm 0.5 \text{ mL} \]
\[ \rho_{\text{PD}} = 0.77 \text{ g/mL} \]
\[ \rho_{\text{HP-w}} = 1.1 \text{ g/mL} \]
\[ \rightarrow \quad m_{\text{HQ}} = \frac{(4.7 \pm 0.5 \text{ mL})}{\left(0.77 \text{ g/mL}\right)} + \frac{8}{\left(1.1 \text{ g/mL}\right)} = 1 \text{ mL} \times 10^{6} \mu\text{g} = 0.55 \pm 0.06 \mu\text{g} \]
\[ m_{\text{HQ}} = 0.1m_{\text{tot}} \quad \rightarrow \quad m_{\text{tot}} = 10m_{\text{HQ}} = 10(0.55 \pm 0.06 \mu\text{g}) = 5.5 \pm 0.6 \mu\text{g} \quad \text{Mass of reactant droplet} \]

**Spray Pulse Mass**

The mass of a spray pulse is expected to be the sum of the mass of the reactants that produced it (i.e. the mass of the reactant droplet) and of some quantity of enzyme solution that is ejected concomitantly. The first pulse from each gland in Fig. 2A, where both reaction chambers are initially completely filled with enzyme solution, results in a vapor pocket which fills most of the reaction chamber, demonstrating that large quantities of enzyme solution can be ejected. However, for subsequent pulses, the maximum size of
the vapor pockets remains consistent, suggesting that no significant amounts of enzyme solution are ejected after the first pulse, i.e. that the spray pulsation mechanism reaches a steady-state condition where reactant mass inflow equals spray pulse mass outflow, and therefore the mass of a spray pulse can be taken to equal that of a reactant droplet.

However, besides the enzyme solution initially present in the reaction chamber, some quantity of enzyme solution is likely present in the enzyme secretory network (11), and this could contribute to the spray pulse mass by draining into the reaction chamber between pulses. As described by Schildknecht (11), the enzyme secretory network consists of numerous tubules, which are about 1 µm in diameter and several tens of micrometers in length, that connect secretory cells outside the reaction chamber to pores in the reaction chamber wall, and this description is consistent with our SEM observations. If we take 100 µm for the tubule length (i.e. an upper estimate), then the volume per tubule is of order $(10^{-6} \text{ m})(10^{-6} \text{ m})(10^{-4} \text{ m}) = 10^{-16} \text{ m}^3$, or 0.1 pL. The total number of tubules has not been thoroughly characterized, but SEM imaging suggests order $10^3$ to be a reasonable estimate, so that the estimated total volume of the enzyme secretory network is of order $10^{-13} \text{ m}^3$, or 0.1 nL. This value is small compared to the volume of a reactant droplet (~5 nL), and assuming the densities of reactant solution and enzyme solution are each ~1 g/cm$^3$, the total mass of enzyme solution present in the secretory network is therefore not significant compared to the mass of a reactant droplet. Although the rate of enzyme synthesis and secretion in bombardier beetles has not been studied, secretion of newly synthesized enzyme solution into the reaction chamber must occur fairly slowly, since the size of vapor pockets inside quiescent reaction chambers was observed to be stable during X-ray imaging (i.e. for at least multiple minutes); thus, enzyme solution synthesized by the secretory cells while spraying is also not expected to meaningfully contribute to the spray pulse mass. Therefore, the spray pulse mass can be reasonably approximated as the reactant droplet mass once the maximum vapor pocket size has reached a steady state.

Average Overpressure in the Reaction Chamber and Estimated Tensile Stress in the Reaction Chamber Walls

The time-average overpressure in the reaction chamber during the process of spray acceleration (i.e. from explosion initiation until the spray pulse exits the beetle, during which time the explosion overpressure can perform work on the spray) is calculated by equating the kinetic energy of the spray pulse ($3 \times 10^{-7} \text{ J}$) to pressure-volume work. The kinetic energy of the spray pulse is calculated by assuming a 10 m/s spray velocity (5) where the spray pulse mass equals the reactant droplet mass. For purposes of calculation, the reaction chamber and exit channel are approximated as a cylinder of radius 100 µm (corresponding to the radius of the exit channel; see Figs. 1 and 2) and length 500 µm (corresponding to the distance from the valve opening to the exit channel opening; see Figs. 1 and 2), and the explosion gasses at average overpressure $P_{\text{over}}$ expand through the volume of this cylinder. The average overpressure is calculated as:
The overpressure will produce a tensile stress in the reaction chamber wall. To estimate an upper limit for the average tensile stress over the duration of a pulse, a cylindrical hoop of radius 200 µm (corresponding to the roughly 400-µm maximum diameter of the reaction chamber) and wall thickness 3 µm (estimated from morphological studies) is considered. The tensile stress is estimated as:

$$\sigma_{\text{wall}} = \frac{P_{\text{over}} r}{t} = \frac{2 \times 10^4 \text{ Pa} \left(2 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}\right)}{3 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}} = 1 \times 10^6 \text{ Pa} = 1 \text{ MPa}$$

(4)

Time Scale and Magnitude of Spray Acceleration
The time during which the spray pulse accelerates from the droplet injection velocity (i.e. that at which the droplet enters the reaction chamber) to the exit velocity of 10 m/s (5) can be calculated with knowledge of the distance over which this acceleration occurs, which is estimated as 500 µm. For purposes of calculation, the droplet injection velocity is estimated as one droplet diameter (~200 µm) divided by one frame duration (0.5 ms), giving a value of 0.4 m/s which is negligible compared to the exit velocity. The time scale of spray pulse acceleration is calculated as:

$$\Delta t = \frac{v_{\text{spray}} t - v_{\text{inject}} t}{2} = \frac{(\Delta v) t}{2} \approx \frac{v_{\text{spray}} t}{2} \rightarrow t = \frac{2l}{v_{\text{spray}}}$$

(5)

From this value, the average acceleration is calculated as:

$$a = \frac{v_{\text{spray}}}{t} = \frac{10 \text{ m/s}}{1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}} = 1 \times 10^5 \text{ m/s}^2 \approx 10000 \text{ g}$$

(6)

Extension Ratios of the Expanded Expansion Membrane
The relaxed expansion membrane dimensions are measured from X-ray (Fig. 2A frame 14) and SEM (Fig. 1E) images as illustrated in Fig. S2A,C. Additionally, the maximum length of the stretched expansion membrane in the coronal plane is measured from Fig. 2A frame 15 as shown in Fig. S2B. To obtain dimensions for the expansion membrane at maximum expansion, the expanded expansion membrane will be considered
to be a hemi-ellipsoid. This assumption is consistent with the hemi-elliptical cross-section observed in the X-ray images (e.g. Fig. 2A frame 15). Fig. S2 defines an $xyz$ coordinate system coincident with the ellipsoid axes which will be referenced in the proceeding discussion. The $x$ and $y$ semi-axes of the hemi-ellipse are estimated as 190 µm and 160 µm as shown in Fig. S2B. The $z$ semi-axis is taken to be the maximum spacing between sclerotized cuticles in the inter-chamber region as shown in Fig. S2C. The hemi-ellipsoid thus occupies a volume that is schematized by the magenta shading in Fig. S2C,D.

Considering an expansion membrane volume element located at the apex of the hemi-ellipsoid and assuming affine deformation, the extension ratio in the $y$ direction, $\lambda_y$, is estimated as the ratio of the stretched and relaxed lengths measured in Fig. S2A,B:

$$\lambda_y = \frac{l_y}{l_{y0}} = \frac{(560 \mu m)}{(340 \mu m)} = 1.6$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

To calculate the extension ratio in the $z$ direction, the stretched length is estimated as one half of the perimeter of the ellipse with the same $x$ and $z$ semi-axes as the hemi-ellipsoid; this perimeter is calculated from the hypergeometric series $F(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}; 1; \chi^2)$ ($30$) in Matlab. The extension ratio $\lambda_z$ is estimated as the ratio of this value to the relaxed length measured in Fig. S2C:

$$\chi = \frac{(190 \mu m) - (90 \mu m)}{(190 \mu m) + (90 \mu m)} = 0.357$$

$$\chi^2 = 0.128 \rightarrow F\left(-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}; 1; \chi^2\right) = 1.03$$

$$l_z = \frac{1}{2} \times \left[ \pi \left( (190 \mu m) + (90 \mu m) \right)(1.03) \right] = 450 \mu m$$

$$\lambda_z = \frac{l_z}{l_{z0}} = \frac{(450 \mu m)}{(160 \mu m)} = 2.8$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

If the expansion membrane material is considered to be incompressible, then the extension ratio in the $x$ direction can be estimated as:

$$\lambda_x \lambda_y \lambda_z = 1 \rightarrow \lambda_x = \frac{1}{\lambda_y \lambda_z} = \frac{1}{(1.6)(2.8)} = 0.22$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

**Kinematics of the Fluid Displaced by the Expansion Membrane**

In order for the expansion membrane to expand outwards, it must displace hemolymph in the body cavity of the beetle. The kinetic energy of the fluid (hemolymph) displaced by the expansion membrane can be estimated as equal to the work done by the pressurized gasses in the reaction chamber expanding through the hemi-ellipsoidal volume included by the expanded expansion membrane. Here, the work done stretching the expansion membrane is neglected; although an accurate estimate of the strain energy is not possible without further knowledge of the expansion membrane materials properties, due to the membrane’s thinness and the extreme compliance exhibited by such
extensible cuticles, the amount of strain energy is expected to be relatively small compared to the available amount of pressure-volume work. The inertia of the expansion membrane is also neglected. The kinetic energy imparted to the displaced fluid is estimated as:

\[ K = P_{\text{over}} \Delta V = P_{\text{over}} V_{\text{hemi}} \]

\[ V_{\text{hemi}} = \frac{2}{3} \pi (1.9 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m})(1.6 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m})(9.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}) = 5.7 \times 10^{-12} \text{ m}^3 = 5.7 \text{ nL} \]  

(10)

\[ K = (2 \times 10^4 \text{ Pa})(5.7 \times 10^{-12} \text{ m}^3) = 1 \times 10^{-7} \text{ J} \]

From this kinetic energy, a velocity can be estimated assuming a density of 1 g/cm$^3$ for the displaced fluid:

\[ K = \frac{1}{2} m v^2 = \rho V_{\text{hemi}} v^2 \rightarrow v = \sqrt{\frac{2K}{\rho V_{\text{hemi}}}} \]

\[ v = \sqrt{\frac{2(1 \times 10^{-7} \text{ J})}{(1 \times 10^3 \text{ kg/m}^3)(5.7 \times 10^{-12} \text{ m}^3)}} = 6 \text{ m/s} \]

(11)

The maximum displacement $\Delta x$ is the largest semi-axis of the hemi-ellipsoid, 190 $\mu$m. From this value and the velocity value in Eq. 11, an estimate of the time scale is obtained assuming constant acceleration:

\[ t = \frac{2\Delta x}{v} = \frac{2(1.9 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m})}{(6 \text{ m/s})} = 6 \times 10^{-5} \text{ s} = 0.06 \text{ ms} \]

(12)

The average acceleration of the displaced fluid is estimated as:

\[ a = \frac{v}{t} = \frac{(6 \text{ m/s})}{(6 \times 10^{-5} \text{ s})} = 1 \times 10^5 \text{ m/s}^2 \approx 10000 \text{ g} \]

(13)

The average acceleration of the fluid displaced by the expansion membrane is roughly the same as that of the spray pulse accelerating in the exit channel, which is consistent with the fact that the mass of the fluid displaced by the expansion membrane should be similar to that of the spray pulse (given their similar volumes and densities) and that similar forces are acting on both. The estimated membrane acceleration is also consistent with the observation that the vapor expansion occurs within one video frame (0.5 ms) which requires a minimum acceleration of:
\[ \Delta x = \frac{1}{2}a_{\text{min}}t^2 \implies a_{\text{min}} = \frac{2\Delta x}{t^2} = \frac{2(1.9 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m})}{(5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s})^2} = [1.5 \times 10^3 \text{ m/s}^2] \] (14)

Conversely, if one used the 2000-fps X-ray video alone to extract the membrane acceleration (e.g. by image tracking) rather than the energy arguments employed in this analysis, one would underestimate the acceleration (and the accompanying forces) by two orders of magnitude, because the time scale of the X-ray video frames (0.5 ms) is too coarse compared to the time scale of expansion (0.06 ms).

**Energy Balance**

Based on the estimated reactant droplet mass and the heat of reaction (0.8 J/mg, (2)), about \(4 \times 10^{-3} \text{ J}\) is released in each explosion. The approximate energy balance is shown below, where \(E_{\text{rxn}}\) is the energy released in the explosion, \(K_{\text{fluid}}\) is the kinetic energy of the fluid displaced by the expansion membrane, \(K_{\text{spray}}\) is the kinetic energy of the spray pulse, \(Q_{\text{spray}}\) is the heat which raises the temperature of the spray pulse, and \(H_{\text{vap}}\) is the heat which boils the water content of the spray.

\[ E_{\text{rxn}} = K_{\text{fluid}} + K_{\text{spray}} + Q_{\text{spray}} + H_{\text{vap}} \] (15)

The kinetic energies are of order \(10^{-7} \text{ J}\) which is negligible compared to \(E_{\text{rxn}}\) of order \(10^{-3} \text{ J}\). Therefore almost all of the energy goes into raising the temperature of the spray and boiling the water. Using the specific heat of water (\(\sim 4000 \text{ J/kg/°C}\)) to approximate that of the spray, the heat required to raise the temperature of the spray pulse from 20 °C to 100 °C is estimated:

\[ Q_{\text{spray}} = m_{\text{spray}}c\Delta T = (5.5 \times 10^{-9} \text{ kg})(4000 \text{ J/kg °C})(80 \text{ °C}) = [2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ J}] \] (16)

After heating the spray to 100 °C, about half of the energy released in the explosion (\(2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ J}\)) remains to boil the water. The water content of the reactant solution is about 55%, or 3 µg per droplet, and some additional water is produced in the explosion reaction. The enthalpy of evaporation for water is about 40 kJ/mol, or \(2 \times 10^6 \text{ J/kg}\). The mass of water which is boiled by the remaining energy is estimated as:

\[ \frac{(2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ J})}{(2 \times 10^6 \text{ J/kg})} = 1 \times 10^{-9} \text{ kg} = [1 \mu\text{g}] \] (17)

Thus, the heat given off in the explosion is sufficient to raise the spray temperature to 100 °C and boil about a third of the water content.

**Kinematics of Inter-Chamber Valve Closure**

The kinematics of valve closure will be modeled in three ways. First, only the effect of the dynamic pressure of fluid displaced by the expansion membrane will be considered. Second, the scenario of direct impingement of the expansion membrane on
the valve will be examined. Third, valve bending will be analyzed via energy considerations.

*Dynamic pressure only.* The fluid (hemolymph) displaced by the expansion membrane during the explosion will apply a dynamic pressure on the adjacent inter-chamber valve. Assuming constant fluid acceleration \( a_1 \) during the expansion, this pressure \( P_1 \) as a function of time (for the 0.06 ms duration of fluid acceleration) is estimated as the following, where \( \rho_1 \) is the density of the fluid, \( v_1(t) \) is the fluid velocity, and \( v(t) \) is the velocity of the valve relative to rest of the gland:

\[
P_1(t) = \frac{\rho_1 [v_1(t) - v(t)]^2}{2} = \frac{\rho_1 [a_1 t - v(t)]^2}{2} \tag{18}
\]

This pressure, acting on the area of the valve, accelerates the valve towards the closed position. A second dynamic pressure, due to the velocity of the valve relative to the fluid on the opposite side of the valve (reactant solution in the reservoir chamber) applies a force in the opposite direction. This pressure \( P_2 \) is estimated as the following, where \( \rho_2 \) is the density of the fluid:

\[
P_2(t) = \frac{\rho_2 v(t)^2}{2} \tag{19}
\]

The equation of motion of the valve relative to the gland, where \( \tau_{\text{valve}} \) is the thickness of the valve, is approximated as the following:

\[
\left[ P_1(t) - P_2(t) \right] A_{\text{valve}} = m_{\text{valve}} a(t)
\]

\[
m_{\text{valve}} = \rho_{\text{valve}} A_{\text{valve}} \tau_{\text{valve}} \rightarrow P_1(t) - P_2(t) = \rho_{\text{valve}} \tau_{\text{valve}} a(t)
\]

\[
\frac{\rho_1 [a_1 t - v(t)]^2 - \rho_2 v(t)^2}{2} = \rho_{\text{valve}} \tau_{\text{valve}} a(t) \tag{20}
\]

\[
\rho_1 \approx \rho_2 \approx \rho_{\text{valve}} \rightarrow \left[ a_1 t - v(t) \right]^2 - v(t)^2 = 2\tau_{\text{valve}} a(t)
\]

\[
a(t) = \frac{1}{2\tau_{\text{valve}}} \left[ (a_1 t - v(t))^2 - v(t)^2 \right]
\]

Expressing Eq. 20 in terms of displacement and its derivatives gives a differential equation:

\[
\frac{d^2 x}{dt^2} = \frac{1}{2\tau_{\text{valve}}} \left[ (a_1 t - \frac{dx}{dt})^2 - \left( \frac{dx}{dt} \right)^2 \right] \tag{21}
\]

Taking values for the fluid average acceleration \( a_1 = 1 \times 10^5 \) m/s\(^2\) as calculated in the previous section and estimating the average valve thickness \( \tau_{\text{valve}} = 5 \) µm, we obtain:
\[ \frac{d^2x}{dt^2} = \frac{1}{(1 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m})} \left[ \left( 1 \times 10^5 \text{ m/s}^2 \right) t - \left( \frac{dx}{dt} \right)^2 - \left( \frac{dx}{dt} \right)^2 \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (22)

Numerical solution of Eq. 22 using the NDSolve operation in Mathematica (Wolfram Research, Champaign, IL, USA) for boundary conditions \( x(t) = 0 \text{ m} \) and \( x'(t) = 0 \text{ m/s} \) gives the displacement-time curve shown in Fig. S3A. At \( t = 0.06 \text{ ms} \), when the expansion membrane is expected to be maximally expanded, the displacement of the valve is predicted to be 80 \( \mu \text{m} \), which Fig. S2C suggests is a reasonable estimate for the displacement needed to close the valve.

**Direct impingement.** With the expansion membrane directly impinging on the inter-chamber valve, the force applied to the valve equals the pressure inside the reaction chamber multiplied by the contact area. For purposes of calculation, contact over the entire valve area is assumed. The applied force causes the valve to accelerate towards the closed position. In doing so, the valve displaces fluid, creating a dynamic pressure in the opposite direction as in the previous scenario. The equation of motion is thus:

\[ P_{\text{over}} A_{\text{valve}} - \rho_2 v(t)^2 A_{\text{valve}} = m_{\text{valve}} a(t) = \rho_{\text{valve}} A_{\text{valve}} \tau_{\text{valve}} a(t) \]

\[ P_{\text{over}} - \frac{\rho_2 v(t)^2}{2} = \rho_{\text{valve}} \tau_{\text{valve}} a(t) \]  \hspace{1cm} (23)

\[ \rho_2 \approx \rho_{\text{valve}} \equiv \rho \rightarrow \frac{P_{\text{over}}}{\rho \tau_{\text{valve}}} - \frac{v(t)^2}{2\tau_{\text{valve}}} = a(t) \]

\[ a(t) = \frac{1}{2\tau_{\text{valve}}} \left[ \frac{2P_{\text{over}}}{\rho} - v(t)^2 \right] \]

Expressing Eq. 23 as a differential equation:

\[ \frac{d^2x}{dt^2} = \frac{1}{2\tau_{\text{valve}}} \left[ \frac{2P_{\text{over}}}{\rho} - \left( \frac{dx}{dt} \right)^2 \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (24)

Using values of \( \tau_{\text{valve}} = 5 \mu \text{m}, P_{\text{over}} = 20 \text{ kPa}, \) and \( \rho = 1 \text{ g/cm}^3 \), we obtain:

\[ \frac{d^2x}{dt^2} = \frac{1}{(1 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m})} \left[ \left( 4 \times 10^4 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}^2 \right) - \left( \frac{dx}{dt} \right)^2 \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (25)

Solving Eq. 25 numerically in Mathematica for boundary conditions \( x(t) = 0 \text{ m} \) and \( x'(t) = 0 \text{ m/s} \) gives the displacement-time curve shown in Fig. S3B, which indicates that direct impingement of the expansion membrane results in much more rapid displacement of the valve than dynamic pressure of the displaced fluid alone, with valve closure occurring in \(~0.01 \text{ ms} \).
Valve bending. The previous kinematics treatments assume that the inter-chamber valve is free to displace at the connection with the reservoir chamber. If this connection is instead assumed to be fixed in space, then the valve will bend rather than displace. If we approximate the valve as a rectangular beam of dimensions \((b \times h \times l)\) of 300 \(\mu m\) wide by 5 \(\mu m\) thick by 100 \(\mu m\) long, then the moment of inertia \(I\) is estimated as:

\[
I = \frac{bh^3}{12} = \left(3 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}\right)\left(5 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}\right)^3 = 3 \times 10^{-21} \text{ m}^4
\]  

(26)

The materials properties of the valve have not been measured experimentally; however, the valve stains purplish blue with toluidine blue and is digested by pancreatin, properties which are strongly suggestive of resilin \((31)\) but not of typical nonsclerotized or sclerotized insect cuticles, and so for purposes of calculation we assume the valve material to be resilin with an elastic modulus of \(E = 1\) MPa \((20)\). We consider the loading scenario where a uniform pressure is imposed over the entire valve area, and the valve is considered closed when the valve tip has deflected 80 \(\mu m\). Using beam bending theory \((32)\) relating tip deflection \(\delta_{\text{tip}}\) to load intensity \(q\), the pressure required to close the valve is estimated as:

\[
\delta_{\text{tip}} = \frac{ql^4}{8EI} \quad \rightarrow \quad q = \frac{8EI\delta_{\text{tip}}}{l^4}
\]

\[
q = Pb \quad \rightarrow \quad P = \frac{q}{b} = \frac{8EI\delta_{\text{tip}}}{bl^4}
\]

\[
P = \frac{8\left(1 \times 10^6 \text{ Pa}\right)\left(3 \times 10^{-21} \text{ m}^4\right)\left(8 \times 10^{-5} \text{ m}\right)}{\left(3 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}\right)\left(1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}\right)^4} = 70 \text{ Pa}
\]  

(27)

Thus the pressure needed to close the valve via bending is expected to be negligible compared to the pressure imposed by the expansion membrane, either directly or through fluid effects. The energy required for the deflection can be estimated from this pressure and the volume swept by the deflected valve, which is calculated as:
\[ \delta(x) = \frac{qL^2}{24EI} \left( 6l^2 - 4lx + x^2 \right) \]

\[ V = b \int_0^l \delta(x) \, dx = \frac{bq}{24EI} \left[ 6l^2 \left( \frac{x^3}{3} \right) - 4l \left( \frac{x^4}{4} \right) + \frac{x^5}{5} \right]_0^l \]

\[ V = \frac{bq}{24EI} \left( 2l^5 - l^5 + \frac{l^5}{5} \right) = \frac{bq}{24EI} \left( \frac{6l^5}{5} \right) = \frac{bql^5}{20EI} \]

\[ q = Pb \quad \Rightarrow \quad V = \frac{Pb^2l^5}{20EI} \]

\[ V = \frac{\left( 7 \times 10^1 \text{ Pa} \right) \left( 3 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m} \right)^2 \left( 1 \times 10^{-4} \right)^5}{20 \left( 1 \times 10^6 \text{ Pa} \right) \left( 3 \times 10^{-21} \text{ m}^4 \right)} = 1 \times 10^{-12} \text{ m}^3 \]

The work (strain energy) required to bend the valve is thus estimated as:

\[ W = PV = \left( 7 \times 10^1 \text{ Pa} \right) \left( 1 \times 10^{-12} \text{ m}^3 \right) = 6 \times 10^{-11} \text{ J} \quad (29) \]

This value is several orders of magnitude lower than the kinetic energy of the fluid displaced by the expansion membrane \( (1 \times 10^{-7} \text{ J}) \), and therefore the energy of bending can be neglected and it is only necessary to consider the dynamic pressure of the fluid accelerated by the valve. Thus, the valve bending scenario reduces to the displacement scenarios previously considered, in which valve motion is resisted principally by the fluid behind the valve.
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Fig. S1.
Quantification of spray pulsation rates. (A) Plot of number of pulses vs. active time for periods of gland activity recorded with 2000-fps synchrotron X-ray phase-contrast imaging. Nominal uncertainties for each data point are ±1 pulse and ±0.5 ms (1 frame). (B) Plot of average pulsation rate versus active time for periods of gland activity recorded at 2000 fps, with histogram representation at right. Error bars reflect range of possible values assuming nominal uncertainties for number of pulses and active time.
**Fig. S2**

Expansion membrane displacement and included volume. (A) Determination of coronal cross-sectional length of relaxed expansion membrane (yellow trace), as estimated from X-ray video (Fig. 2A frame 14). (B) Coronal cross-sectional length of stretched expansion membrane (yellow trace) and estimated hemi-ellipsoid (semi-)axes (magenta dashed lines), based on Fig. 2A frame 15. (C) Sagittal cross-sectional length of relaxed expansion membrane (solid yellow trace), estimated minimum valve displacement needed for valve closure (yellow dashed line), and estimated ellipsoid semi-axis (magenta dashed line) as measured from SEM (Fig. 1E). Superimposed magenta hemi-ellipse represents sagittal cross-section of volume included by stretched expansion membrane. (D) SEM image (Fig. 1D) with superimposed hemi-ellipse representing coronal cross-section of volume included by stretched expansion membrane. Orthogonal $xyz$ axes coincide with hemi-ellipsoid axes.
Fig. S3
Predicted displacement versus time for inter-chamber valve for scenarios of (A) dynamic pressure of fluid displaced by expansion membrane and (B) direct impingement of expansion membrane. Maximum expansion occurs at $t = 0.06$ ms in A. Displacements larger than $\sim 200$ µm are not meaningful.
**Table S1.**
Durations of sprays recorded by synchrotron X-ray phase-contrast imaging: (top) details and (bottom) summary. Uncertainties in duration are nominal. Beetles and sprays are listed in the order in which they were recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imaging rate (fps)</th>
<th>Beetle</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Spray #</th>
<th># of glands active</th>
<th>Duration (frames)</th>
<th>Duration (ms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 ± 1</td>
<td>67 ± 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 ± 1</td>
<td>33 ± 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 ± 1</td>
<td>60 ± 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ± 1</td>
<td>344 ± 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86 ± 1</td>
<td>344 ± 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86 ± 1</td>
<td>34 ± 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8 ± 1</td>
<td>24 ± 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23 ± 1</td>
<td>23 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35 ± 1</td>
<td>141 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38 ± 1</td>
<td>70.5 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35 ± 1</td>
<td>19.0 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46 ± 1</td>
<td>17.5 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42 ± 1</td>
<td>23.0 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35 ± 1</td>
<td>32 ± 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41 ± 1</td>
<td>20.5 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49 ± 1</td>
<td>24.5 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34 ± 1</td>
<td>17.0 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34 ± 1</td>
<td>6.5 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19 ± 1</td>
<td>9.5 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34 ± 1</td>
<td>17.0 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24 ± 1</td>
<td>12.0 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53 ± 1</td>
<td>26.5 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64 ± 1</td>
<td>32.0 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66 ± 1</td>
<td>33.0 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19 ± 1</td>
<td>9.5 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33 ± 1</td>
<td>16.5 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 ± 1</td>
<td>5.0 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>143 ± 1</td>
<td>71.5 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median duration (ms)</th>
<th>Min. value (ms)</th>
<th>Max. value (ms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>5.0 ± 0.5</td>
<td>344 ± 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S2.
Average pulsation rates calculated for periods of gland activity recorded with 2000-fps synchrotron X-ray phase-contrast imaging: (top) details and (bottom) summary.
Uncertainties in pulsation rate represent range of possible values calculated assuming nominal uncertainties of ±1 pulse and ±0.5 ms (1 frame) for the number of pulses and the active time, respectively. Beetles, sprays, and periods of gland activity are listed in the order in which they were recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beetle</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Spray #</th>
<th>Gland</th>
<th>Active time (ms)</th>
<th># of pulses</th>
<th>Avg. pulsation rate (Hz)</th>
<th>Uncertainty (Hz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>70.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>46 ± 1</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>+19 / −19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>left</td>
<td>26.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>19 ± 1</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>+52 / −50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>left</td>
<td>13.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>9 ± 1</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>+103 / −95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>19.0 ± 0.5</td>
<td>10 ± 1</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>+68 / −65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>left</td>
<td>14.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>8 ± 1</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>+91 / −85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>17.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>15 ± 1</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>+84 / −79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>left</td>
<td>16.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>14 ± 1</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>+89 / −84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>23.0 ± 0.5</td>
<td>21 ± 1</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>+65 / −62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>right</td>
<td>20.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>20 ± 1</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>+74 / −71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>19.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>18 ± 1</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>+77 / −73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>right</td>
<td>19.0 ± 0.5</td>
<td>17 ± 1</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>+78 / −74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>17.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>13 ± 1</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>+81 / −76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>right</td>
<td>11.0 ± 0.5</td>
<td>8 ± 1</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>+130 / −119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>20.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>7 ± 1</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>+59 / −56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>right</td>
<td>20.0 ± 0.5</td>
<td>7 ± 1</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>+60 / −57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>24.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>16 ± 1</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>+55 / −53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>left</td>
<td>19.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>13 ± 1</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>+70 / −67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>11.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>8 ± 1</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>+123 / −112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>left</td>
<td>3.0 ± 0.5</td>
<td>2 ± 1</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>+533 / −381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>6.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>4 ± 1</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>+218 / −187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>7 ± 1</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>+152 / −137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>13.0 ± 0.5</td>
<td>10 ± 1</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>+111 / −103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>left</td>
<td>15.0 ± 0.5</td>
<td>10 ± 1</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>+92 / −86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>right</td>
<td>12.0 ± 0.5</td>
<td>8 ± 1</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>+116 / −107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>left</td>
<td>10.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>7 ± 1</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>+133 / −121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>26.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>17 ± 1</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>+51 / −49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>right</td>
<td>24.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>16 ± 1</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>+55 / −53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>32.0 ± 0.5</td>
<td>21 ± 1</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>+42 / −41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>right</td>
<td>29.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>20 ± 1</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>+46 / −45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>32.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>22 ± 1</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>+42 / −41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>right</td>
<td>27.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>17 ± 1</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>+48 / −47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>5.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>4 ± 1</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>+273 / −227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>right</td>
<td>8.0 ± 0.5</td>
<td>4 ± 1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>+167 / −147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>16.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>15 ± 1</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>+91 / −86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>right</td>
<td>13.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>12 ± 1</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>+111 / −103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean (Hz)</th>
<th>Std. dev. (Hz)</th>
<th>Std. error (Hz)</th>
<th>Median (Hz)</th>
<th>Min. value (Hz)</th>
<th>Max. value (Hz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>698</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Movie S1
X-ray video of a spray by a male *B. elongatulus* (beetle 7 in Tables S1 and S2; see also Fig. 2A) recorded at 2000 fps, slowed down 80× (25-fps playback).

Movie S2
X-ray video of a spray by a male *B. elongatulus* (beetle 10 in Tables S1 and S2; see also Fig. 2B) recorded at 2000 fps, slowed down 80× (25-fps playback).

Movie S3
X-ray video of a spray by a female *B. elongatulus* (beetle 6 in Tables S1 and S2) recorded at 2000 fps, slowed down 80× (25-fps playback).