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**Abstract:**

Tropical insects are challenged by global warming, leading to altered distribution and their related ecosystem functions. Multiple abiotic factors and biotic factors can influence species response to climate change. Therefore, to precisely estimate the real magnitude of the impact of warming on tropical species, the correlation between species’ fundamental thermal niche and realized distribution needs to be examined at the first place. Fecundity is key to population growth at different temperatures. Physiological response to sublethal condition is tightly linked with survival during a short period of extreme weather. We examined the relationship between these lab-measured thermal traits and the altitudinal distribution of Drosophila species in Australian rainforest mountains. Our findings reveal that the tropical lowland community is structured by high temperature as the occupying *Drosophila* species are higher in the upper thermal limit of reproduction. Physiological tolerance to extremely high temperatures is also higher among lowland-biased species. In contrast, highland-biased species don’t show stronger cold tolerance. These results provide the foundation for elucidating the role of temperature in structuring the biological community on tropical mountains and imply the vulnerability of tropical insects to future warming.

Key questions related to my DPhil

1. What is the role of temperature in driving species abundance pattern across geographic gradient?
2. How does temperature influence species interaction?
3. How does species interaction influence species’ resilience to increased temperature and its variability?
4. The ecological impact of warming-facilitated range shift.

WHAT IS NEW? WHAT IS GAP?

Temperature -> reproduction and survival -> existence and abundance -> ecological function. Lab-measured tolerance has been used to estimate sensitivity to warming.

The impact of warming to tropical species, a theoretical debate: 1) based on XXX, tropical species are vulnerable; 2) based on YYY, temperature change will have small impact to them.

Mountain system offer a natural gradient to TEST whether the abundance pattern is linked to temperature and what aspect of temperature.

Asymmetry …

Trait choice

Summary

Introduction is to lay the ground/context of the question. It doesn’t need to provide too much specific details about the point that is not your major research question. It is not a literature review! Avoid specific listing!

**Introduction**

Tropical species, which account for the majority of global biodiversity (Gaston 2000), are expected to be particularly vulnerable to warming (Colwell et al. 2008; Deutsch et al. 2008a; Diamond et al. 2012; Trisos, Merow, and Pigot 2020). Tropical species have narrower thermal tolerance ranges. As the result, they are more likely to experience environmental temperatures exceeding their upper limit (Deutsch et al. 2008b; Kellermann, Overgaard, et al. 2012; Khaliq et al. 2014), and they may be as well unable to disperse far and fast enough to bridge the large gaps between their current and projected ranges (Colwell et al. 2008). When tropical species shift poleward or upslope (Freeman and Class Freeman 2014), no species source pools are available to replenish climatically displaced or declining species (Colwell et al. 2008; Lenoir and Svenning 2015). Consequently, tropical regions face a higher risk of biodiversity loss based on features of the residents’ thermal performance.

Prediction based on fundamental thermal niche may not accurately reflect species’ realistic response to warming [CITATION].

Nevertheless, the impact of the projected warming will differ if the species’ distribution is not constrained by the environmental temperature but other factors. For example, drought may instead be a more important environmental constrain than temperature in tropical lowland (Engelbrecht et al. 2007). Behavioral thermoregulation on heterogeneous landscape could increase resilience to warming (Bonebrake et al. 2014; Kearney, Shine, and Porter 2009). Last but not the least, tropical forests are notable for their intense biotic interactions (Roslin et al. 2017), which may predominantly drive realized distributions (DeRivera et al. 2005; Wisz et al. 2013) and alter their individualist response to warming ((Davis et al. 1998)). As the result of the additional abiotic and biotic effect, thermal niche deduced from realized distribution may not accord to the true tolerances (Feeley and Silman 2010). Therefore, correlation between species’ fundamental thermal niche and realized distribution serves as a foundation to study the role of temperature in driving species’ distribution patterns (Kearney and Porter 2004). The generality of this relationship is key to realistically estimate the magnitude of the impact of warming on tropical species.

Asymmetry has been observed in the relative role of high and low temperature in determining species’ distribution, resulting in unequal shift at their cold boundaries and warm boundaries in response to warming (Chen et al. 2011). Although both upper thermal limit and cold resistance have been shown significant correlation with distribution and abundance (Batista, Rocha, and Klaczko 2018; Kellermann, Loeschcke, et al. 2012; Kellermann, Overgaard, et al. 2012), physical constraints by the low temperature is thought to have more profound role in setting the limit of distribution range (Bishop et al. 2017; de La Vega and Schilman 2018; Overgaard, Kearney, and Hoffmann 2014): Large comparative studies suggest that heat tolerance varies less than cold tolerance (Hoffmann 2010a; Sunday, Bates, and Dulvy 2011); organisms in warmer environment are hypothesized to experience higher level of biotic interaction, which predominantly drive ecological limits at warm boundaries (O’Brien et al. 2017).

Thermal tolerances evaluated using different choice of traits sometimes differ markedly between each other (Hoffmann 2010b; Sinclair et al. 2016), which also change their relationships with realized distribution (Overgaard et al. 2014). Reproduction indicates the population-level performance of species within communities. Physiological response to sublethal condition links more tightly with organisms’ capacity to survive during a short period of extreme climatic conditions (Overgaard et al. 2014). In reality, instantaneous measures of organisms’ physiology (e.g. development rate, metabolism, mobility) are often the practical choice to be used to understand distribution patterns and inform predictions of future [CITATION]. There have been very few comparative studies exploring their relationship with each other and their capacity to predict species’ distributions.

In this study, the altitude gradient enables comparison of the effect of high temperature and low temperature on species turnover in connected communities. We hypothesized that low temperature constrains species’ distribution at tropical highland; in contrast, higher abundance toward tropical lowland arises not from stronger heat tolerance. Therefore, species which are found predominantly at high altitude (compared with themselves) are predicted to have stronger cold tolerance; the heat tolerances are similar among all the species and/or do not correlate with distribution patterns. To test the hypotheses, we compared relative abundance of the *Drosophila* species at difference altitude on the Australian tropical mountains, and studied the relationship between the species’ distribution pattern and thermal tolerance based on different performance. Our findings revealed that, on the contrary to the prediction, heat tolerance, rather than cold tolerance, is correlated with distribution inclination. Physiological tolerance and reproductive tolerance agree with each other in predicting distribution. These results suggest that high temperature constrains *Drosophila* species on Australian tropical mountains, thus implying the vulnerability of tropical insects to future warming.

**Methods**

1. Study system

Field data were collected, and laboratory cultures were initiated, from rainforest sites spanning elevations of from 59 – 916 m at Paluma Range (S18° 59.031' E146° 14.096') and Kirrama Range (S18° 12.134' E145° 53.102'), Queensland, Australia,. Mean temperatures at study sites ranged from 21°C to 26°C.

*Drosophila* isofemale cultures were established in 2017 and 2018 from pupae collected from both high- and low-altitude sites. Cultures had been maintained at 24°C and 12/12 L/D cycle at the Biology Centre, Czech Academy of Sciences since collection and transferred and maintained at 25°C and 12/12 L/D cycle at the Department of Zoology, the University of Oxford, UK, since December 2018. Theywere maintained for approximately 15 to 30 non-overlapping generations in Czech Republic and additional approximately four to seven non-overlapping generations in Oxford before they were used to construct mass bred lines (see below).

1. Field distribution survey

*Drosophila* pupae were sampled using bottle traps baited with fermented banana from 11th March – 12th April 2016. Details were described in ??CITATION??. Relative abundance was surveyed for three sites representing the highest, lowest, and most central points of each of the two mountains. 182 pupae were sampled at each site. 716 pupae were successfully identified to species by DNA metabarcoding (??CITATION??), with 86 – 134 pupae at each site. *D. serrata* (1 individual) and *D. immigrans* (4 individuals) were excluded from the distribution analysis due to infrequent occurrence.

1. Preparation of experimental animals

To revive genetic variation, we constructed mass bred lines (MBLs) by combining four isofemale lines of each *Drosophila* species (except for *D. pandora*, where only three isofemale lines were available). The four lines were selected from different mountains and different altitude if possible (Detailed arrangement was shown in supplementary table 1). Each population cage was initiated using two independently-reared MBLs of the same species. Cages were maintained at 25°C and 12/12 L/D cycle for more than four generations before the experiment. Therefore, thermal traits should not have been influenced by maternal effect, acclimation, or isofemale line effect. MBLs of eight Australian *Drosophila* species and one laboratory strain (wild typeDah) of *D. melanogaster* were used for laboratory measurement of thermal performance. *D. melanogaster* does not occur naturally at the study sites, was measured together with the focal species as a benchmark for future comparisons.

Fly eggs collected from the population cage were reared under low-density (less than 100 eggs per vial) at 25°C and 12/12 L/D cycle. Within 12 hours of emergence, virgin females and males were separately kept at 25°C and 12/12 L/D cycle. We additionally mixed five females and five males in each of two vials to monitor their reproductive activity every day. As different species have different development times and sexual maturation times, eggs of different species were collected from cages on different days so that their first day of egg-laying was synchronized. Two days after sexual maturation, half of the adults were subjected to fecundity measurement and the other half, which were siblings, were subjected to physiological measurement.

1. Fecundity measurement

Two virgin females were paired with two virgin males on a 4ml *Drosophila* medium (corn flour, yeast, sugar, agar, and methyl-4-hydroxybenzoate). They were randomly subjected to water baths set at one of the seven constant temperature (14°C, 17°C, 20°C, 23°C, 26°C, 29°C, 32°C) and 12/12 L/D cycle. Vials were submerged in water baths. The water level was kept above the area that flies could freely move. The temperature and humidity of each water bath were monitored in two additional empty tubes. The level of humidity was similar to field condition, ranging between 80% - 95%. The observed temperature showed ±0.5°C fluctuation around the mean temperature, which was used as the corrected temperature in analysis (Supplementary table 2 [both centre and corner logs]).

As fecundity changed through time and this trend of change was influenced by temperature (Supplementary figure 1), the offspring numbers were measured for the 1st – 2nd day and the 7th – 8th day and they were combined to reflect relative fecundity. After eight-day temperature treatments, all flies were kept at 25°C for another four days to examine the recovery of reproduction. Surviving flies were recorded at the beginning and end of each period. Vials containing eggs produced during the testing periods were maintained at their corresponding temperature for development. Vials were examined daily for emergence. The first emergence dates were recorded for different temperatures and the numbers of F1 adults were frozen after 5-7 days and counted later. For each species and each temperature treatment, eight replicates were evenly split between two blocks. The detailed schedule is shown in supplementary figure 2.

1. Physiological measurement

Critical temperatures (CTmin and CTmax), half lethal temperature (LT50cold and LT50heat), heat stress survival, knockdown (heat coma and chill coma) time, recovery time, etc. have been common practice to compare relative resistance to heat stress and cold stress (Gibert et al. 2007; Hoffmann, Sørensen, and Loeschcke 2003). Critical temperature becomes increasing popular for its direct association of climate data [CITATION?]. However, the absolute value of CTmin and CTmax is significantly influenced by the rate of temperature change (Terblanche et al. 2007), making it difficult to compare between studies. Knockdown time and recovery time are simpler measure which also serve the purpose of comparing thermal tolerance. Variation has been observed among species and geographic ranges (Gibert et al. 2007; Hoffmann, Anderson, and Hallas 2002), and knockdown/recovery time were correlated with other measurement, such as critical temperature (Andersen et al. 2015) [CITATION FOR HEAT KNOCKDOWN WITH CTMAX].

Relative tolerance to extreme cold temperature was measured by individuals’ knockdown time at 5°C and the time for recovery of mobility after a 30-minute exposure to 5°C. Constant temperature for cold stress are often chosen around 0°C (Gibert et al. 2007). As tropical species often have significantly lower cold resistance (Gibert et al. 2007), 5°C was used instead to increase the variation among the tested species (pilot results not shown). Heat stress is chosen to be 40°C, following common practice (Hoffmann et al. 2003). After being knocked down by heat (40°C), most flies did not survive. In this case, only knockdown time was used to evaluate tolerance to the extremely high temperature.

Virgin adult flies were kept in groups at 25°C and 12/12 L/D cycle for 9-10 days before randomly-selected individuals were allocated separately in empty flat-bottom 3ml insect tubes. An observation rack was divided into 3X3 grids and each grid held seven tubes containing the same species. Nine species were assigned in random order to one grid. The observation rack was moved immediately into the incubator, representing the start of the heat or cold treatment. Every tube was examined once every minute and the flies that lost or recovered their motor ability were recorded. For each sex, three identical blocks of the above procedures were repeated.

1. Data analysis

All statistics were performed with R statistical software (version 3.6.0 ). All analysis code is available in ??GITHUB or SUPP??. *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans* were not included in analyses involving field distribution, because their distribution patterns were unavailable.

*Distribution*. To calculate the mean relative altitude (hIndex) of distribution, the relative altitude of each sample was assigned 0, 0.5, and 1 if it was collected at low-, middle- and high-altitude sites. In addition, logistic regression was used to determine how detection probability changes with altitude. For each species, pupal identity was labeled as 1 if the pupa was identified as the focal species and 0 if it was identified as any other species. Their identity was fitted against the altitude as the fixed effect and the transect as the random effect in generalized linear mix-effect model (varying intercept, varying slope) using the *lmer* package. These two ways of describing distribution patterns were compared using a Spearman’s rank test.

*Thermal performance curve*. A multi-level, non-linear piecewise model was fitted under the Bayesian framework using MCMC sampling within the *rstan* package in R. Total offspring numbers were calculated by combining the offspring numbers on day 1-2 and day 7-8. The average daily fecundity per female was calculated, then square root transformed. Square-rooted daily fecundity was modeled with the Briere2 function (Briere et al. 1999):

Y = a \* T \* (T - RTmin) \* (RTmax - T)^(1/b) (RTmin < T < RTmax),

Y = 0 (T <= RTmin or R >= RTmax),

where T is the temperature, *RTmin* and *RTmax* is the minimum and maximum temperature for the species to reproduce, *a* is a scaling factor and *b* is a shape factor of the curve. *a*, *b*, *RTmin*, and *RTmax* of the nine species were assumed to share normal distribution respectively. Square rooted daily fecundity was modeled using a normal distribution with temperature-dependent standard deviation. Assuming temperature dependency of standard deviation generated better fitting than assuming the same standard deviation across temperature treatments, as judged by leave-one-out cross-validation. It was because when the temperature was equal or close to *RTmin* and *RTmax*, the standard deviation should be zero or close to zero. A normal distribution is not ideal to model the transformed count data, which are all positive. However, modeling offspring counts with Poisson, zero-inflated Poisson, negative binomial, lognormal distribution did not produce converged results, potentially due to the piecewise nature of the thermal performance function. Diagnostics were performed and the model performance is acceptable (supplementary figure 3). Non-informative priors were chosen for all parameters. The values of *a* were bounded to be positive. The values of *b* were bounded to be larger than 0.8 to ensure that the thermal performance curve has a steeper slope on the right side. The values of *RTmin* were bounded to be lower than 17°C and the values of *RTmax* were bounded between 26°C - 35°C according to experience.

Median of the posterior distribution of *a*, *b*, *RTmin*, and *RTmax* were used as the model parameters to construct the thermal performance curve.

The model parameters were also estimated by the maximum likelihood method using the *bbmle* package. Total offspring numbers were modeled by Poisson distribution. This method was not multi-level; therefore, the shapes of curves of different species varied more than when assuming shared distributions of model parameters. Besides, this method behaved badly in estimating the uncertainty of the parameter estimation. Nevertheless, the ranks of the *RTmax* (rho = 0.88, p = 0.003, Spearman’s rank test) and *RTmin* (rho = 0.97, p = 0.00016, Spearman’s rank test) estimated by both methods are highly correlated.

*Reproduction-related traits*: The posterior distributions of *RTmin*, *RTmax*, and *RTopt* (6000 samples of each parameter of each species) were modeled by hIndex as the fixed effect and species identity as the random effect in the linear mix-effect model. Fecundity of 29°C and 17°C, recovered fecundity after 29°C and 14°C were used as direct measurements of their performance in the high and low temperatures. The offspring numbers were modeled by hIndex and experimental block as fix effects and species as a random effect in the generalized linear mix-effect model (family = “negative binomial”). Diagnostics of the models were conducted. Data points with extreme leverage value were excluded and the model was fitted again to test if the statistical significance still holds.

*Physiological tolerance*. The six measurements of physiological tolerance were modeled by hIndex, block, and tube position as fixed effects, species as a random effect in the linear mix-effect model.

*Correlation analysis*. The pairwise correlation among thermal traits was evaluated by Spearman’s rank test in *Hmisc* package. Traits included RTmin, RTmax, RTopt, median knockdown time to hot of female (FKDHEAT), median knockdown time to hot of male (MKDHEAT), median knockdown time to cold of female (FKDCOLD), median knockdown time to cold of male (MKDCOLD), median recovery time from cold of female (FRCCOLD), median recovery time from cold of male (MKDCOLD).

1. Distribution
2. Cold tolerance
3. Heat tolerance

**Results**

1. Field distribution

The nine *Drosophila* species shown in figure 1a accounted for 99% of samples. The proportion of occurrence among low-, medium- and high-altitude sites differed among species. The regression coefficient evaluated how detection probability change along with altitude (supplementary figure 4). *D. bipectinate* and *D. pandora* were categorized as lowland-biased species with high confidence. *D. pseudoananassae* was most likely to bias towards lowland. *D. rubida* and *D. sulfurigaster* showed no biases in altitude. *D. birchii* was most likely to bias towards highland. *D. palidifrons* and *D. pseudotakahashii* were significantly enriched in high altitudes. There were only six samples of BUN sampled in our survey, which might explain the peculiar value of its estimated coefficient (coefficient = -69, not shown in figure 1b) and its large standard error (se = 21603). Nevertheless, BUN has been categorized as lowland-biased species.

Values of the regression coefficients correlated tightly with the mean relative altitude (hIndex) of species distribution (rho = 0.98, p-value < 0.001, Spearman’s rank test). For simplification, the hIndex was used to represent the distribution pattern in the following analysis.

1. Reproductive thermal performance

The thermal performance curve, measured by combined daily fecundity, is shown in figure 2 (supplementary figure 5 shows data points and fitted curve for individual species). Table 1 shows estimates of the parameters of the Briere’s function for each species. Species whose distribution were biased towards lowland show higher RTmax (coefficient = -2.52, 95% ci = -3.68 - 1.36, p = 0.00125). RTmin had more variation among species than RTmax. Their values had no relationship with the species distribution patterns (coefficient = 0.024, 95% ci = -2.47 – 2.52). The temperature for optimal reproductive performance (RTopt) also didn’t correlate with their distribution patterns (coefficient = 0.068, 95% ci = -1.93 – 2.07).

As shown in figure 3, in 29°C treatment, daily fecundity decreased with hIndex (coefficient = -5.09, p < 0.0001). In contrast, highland-biased species didn’t show higher fecundity at 17°C (p = 0.788). After exposure to 29°C for eight days, neither of the two highland-biased species could reproduce when transferred back to mild temperature. Five out of the six non-biased and lowland-biased species resumed reproduction. All species recovered their fecundity after eight-day exposure to 14C. This recovered fecundity showed a minor but not significant increase (coefficient = 0.35, p = 0.105) for the species whose distribution were biased towards the higher altitude.

1. Physiological tolerance

Heat tolerance, measured by knockdown time at high temperature, was lower among species whose distribution were biased towards high latitude (male: coefficient = -9.1, p = 0.0013; female: coefficient = -5.4, p = 0.056). Except for *D. simulans* and *D. melanogaster*, the other *Drosophila* species show relatively weak resistance to low temperature with no difference (male: p = 0.18; female: p = 0.53). Species whose distribution were biased towards high altitude spent a longer time to recover from the chill coma (male: p = 0.054; female: p = 0.029), which is presumably disadvantaged in the low-temperature environment. The experimental block and the position on the observation rack sometimes showed a significant effect, which might be explained by the temperature fluctuation of the incubator and the difference of microenvironment.

1. Correlation among thermal traits

Table 2 shows the results of the Spearman’s rank correlation test. Species which had higher RTmax stayed active for longer in extreme high temperature. In contrast, species that had lower RTmin did not show any advantage in cold resistance or cold recovery. RTopt was not correlated with any other traits. For each of the 3 physiological measurements, male performance correlated significantly with female performance. Heat tolerance was not found to have a trade-off relationship with cold tolerance: RTmin and RTmax were not significantly correlated (supplementary figure 6); Species that resisted heat for longer also showed higher tolerance to cold (longer resistance to chill coma and shorter recovery).

**Discussions**

1. Interpretation of the results: Our analysis, taken together, show that species that have a higher tolerance to high temperature bias towards the low altitude. However, the pattern doesn’t hold for the cold end.
2. Cold vs warm limit of distribution: The relationship between this finding and the commonly-accepted understanding of latitudinal distribution pattern.
3. Relationship with biotic interaction: 1) environmental filtering and biotic interaction have different relative importance in different areas; 2) the tight correlation between thermal trait and distribution doesn’t mean there is no effect of biotic interaction ---- temperature can change the competitive hierarchy among species, the realized community composition might be a combined effect of temperature and competition.
4. Limitation: Thermal performance curves are not fixed (acclimation, trans-generational effect, diet…). Behavior tolerance, plasticity, inter-population variability, and evolution were not addressed in this study. What do we already know about them in terms of tropical species?
5. Implication: 1) driving factors of distribution are not the same across geographic areas; 2) The important influence to tropical species of daily temperature variation and extreme temperature event; 3) Tropical species are already living close to their upper thermal limits; 4) Thermal performance curve could be used to estimated individual species effect to warming (but competition is not considered. 5) Rank of knockdown time to heat could be used as an approximate of the rank of reproduction upper limit. They may all involve in the fitness of insects in adapting to high temperatures.
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**Figure 1. a) Proportion of samples found in the low-, middle- and high-altitude site for the nine Drosophila species. b) Regression coefficients and hIndex unanimously describe altitudinal distribution patterns. *D. bunnanda* is not included in the graph because its regression coefficient and standard error are peculiarly large in absolute value due to its small sample size. Error bars show 90% confidence intervals.**
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**Figure 2. The thermal performance curve of reproduction. Color is ordered by their distribution pattern, with highland-biased species labeled by cold color and lowland-biased species labeled by warm color.**
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**Figure 3. Reproduction in stressful temperature treatment and after the temperature treatment. The species on the horizontal axis are ordered descendingly by the mean relative altitude of their distribution (hIndex). hIndex of *D. simulans* and *D. melanogaster* is unavailable.**
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**Figure 4. Physiological responses to lethal heat stress and cold stress. The species on the horizontal axis are ordered descendingly by the mean relative altitude of their distribution (hIndex). hIndex of *D. simulans* and *D. melanogaster* is unavailable. Measurements of females were labeled by red, males were labeled by blue.**
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**Table 1 Estimated parameters of thermal performance functions and their 90% credible intervals (CI) of the nine species.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **species** | **a** | **CI\_a** | **b** | **CI\_b** | **RTmin** | **CI\_RTmin** | **RTmax** | **CI\_RTmax** |
| *D. bipectinata* | 0.0046 | 0.0030 - 0.0059 | 1.26 | 1.01 - 1.55 | 15.28 | 14.56 - 15.88 | 30.45 | 30.08 - 31.05 |
| *D. birchii* | 0.0034 | 0.0022 - 0.0056 | 1.17 | 0.95 - 1.57 | 13.45 | 13.08 - 13.79 | 29.25 | 28.11 - 29.80 |
| *D. bunnanda* | 0.0017 | 0.0012 - 0.0026 | 0.88 | 0.81 - 1.07 | 14.58 | 14.09 - 15.20 | 31.19 | 30.61 - 31.77 |
| *D. melanogaster* | 0.0037 | 0.0032 - 0.0042 | 1.72 | 1.48 - 2.02 | 8.32 | 6.93 - 9.38 | 32.13 | 32.03 - 32.28 |
| *D. palidifrons* | 0.0073 | 0.0055 - 0.0099 | 1.74 | 1.36 - 2.39 | 16.23 | 15.51 - 16.77 | 29.07 | 28.14 - 29.39 |
| *D. pandora* | 0.0052 | 0.0037 - 0.0065 | 1.25 | 1.03 - 1.51 | 15.26 | 14.56 - 15.79 | 30.13 | 29.88 - 30.57 |
| *D. pseudoananassae* | 0.0053 | 0.0035 - 0.0071 | 1.67 | 1.22 - 2.33 | 15.07 | 14.15 - 15.91 | 29.22 | 28.42 - 29.80 |
| *D. simulans* | 0.0035 | 0.0027 - 0.0047 | 1.68 | 1.36 - 2.22 | 8.51 | 6.94 - 9.66 | 31.08 | 30.38 - 31.78 |
| *D. sulfurigaster* | 0.0040 | 0.0027 - 0.0051 | 1.26 | 1.03 - 1.53 | 14.37 | 13.92 - 14.94 | 30.12 | 29.84 - 30.63 |

**Table 2. Correlation matrix among thermal traits (RTmin, RTmax, RTopt, female knockdown time to heat, male knockdown time to heat, female knockdown time to cold, male knockdown time to cold, female recovery time from cold, male recovery time from cold). Spearman’s rank correlation rho is shown in the table. Significant correlation (p < 0.05) is labeled as bold.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | RTmin | RTmax | RTopt | FKDHEAT | MKDHEAT | FKDCOLD | MKDCOLD | FRCCOLD | MRCCOLD |
| RTmin | 1.00 | -0.55 | 0.02 | **-0.89** | -0.53 | -0.31 | -0.56 | 0.53 | 0.65 |
| RTmax |  | 1.00 | 0.17 | **0.71** | **0.93** | 0.64 | 0.61 | **-0.88** | **-0.85** |
| RTopt |  |  | 1.00 | -0.01 | 0.33 | 0.63 | 0.54 | -0.41 | -0.30 |
| FKDHEAT |  |  |  | 1.00 | **0.72** | 0.53 | **0.71** | -0.57 | **-0.68** |
| MKDHEAT |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | **0.79** | **0.71** | **-0.89** | **-0.83** |
| FKDCOLD |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | **0.85** | **-0.74** | **-0.75** |
| MKDCOLD |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | **-0.72** | **-0.70** |
| FRCCOLD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | **0.93** |
| MRCCOLD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 |

Supplementary figure 1. The change of fecundity during 1st – 2nd day to 7th – 8th day in different temperature.
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Supplementary figure 2. Time table of fecundity measurement.
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Supplementary figures 3. Diagnostics of model fitting of thermal performance curve.
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Supplementary figure 4. Examples of logistic regression on occurrence data. *D. bipectinata* is lowland-biased species. *D. rubida* shows no bias. *D. palidifrons* is highland-biased species.
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Supplementary figure 5. Daily fecundity and fitted thermal performance curve of each of the nine species.
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Supplementary figure 6. Scatter plot of posterior samples of RTmin and RTmax parameters.
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**Supplementary table 1. Isofemale line used to construct MBLs.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Species | Origin of cultured lines (yes/no) | | | | Lines for MBLs |
| Kirrama low1 | Kirrama high1 | Paluma low1 | Paluma high1 |
| *D. bunnanda* | yes | no | yes | no | KL87, KL134, KL127, PL114 |
| *D. pandora* | no | no | yes | no | PL17, PL21, PL012 |
| *D. bipectinata* | yes | no | yes | no | KL84, KL43, PL85, PL20 |
| *D. pseudoananassae* | yes | yes | yes | no | KL19, KH25, PL30, KH42 |
| *D. sulfurigaster* | yes | yes | yes | yes | KL08, KH10, PL51, PH18 |
| *D. rubida* | yes | yes | yes | yes | Construction unfinished3. |
| *D. birchii* | yes | yes | yes | yes | KL22, KH26, PL122, PH169 |
| *D. palidifrons* | no | yes | no | yes | KH20, KH69, PH183, PH184 |
| *D. simulans* | no | no | yes | no | PL45, PL34, PL42, PL43 |
| *D. pseudotakahashii* | no | yes | no | yes | Did not construct MBLs4 |

Note:

1. “Low” means sites from low altitude. “High” means sites from high altitude.
2. The three isofemale lines were the only lines cultured at the lab.
3. Construction is not finished by the start of the experiment in May. *D. rubida* grew poorly on the purchased fly medium before changing food recipe and made at the lab. Therefore, its crossing starts later than other species (April 5th). Additionally, *D. rubida* has significantly longer generation time than other species.
4. Only two isofemale lines were cultured at the lab.