

1 Coexistence of alleles: insights of Modern
2 Coexistence Theory into the maintenance of
3 genetic diversity

4 Alba Cervantes-Loreto¹, Michelle L. Maraffini¹, Daniel B. Stouffer¹, and
5 Sarah P. Flanagan¹

6 ¹Centre for Integrative Ecology, School of Biological Sciences, University of Canterbury,
7 Christchurch 8140, New Zealand

Words in abstract	to be determined
Words in manuscript	to be determined
Number of references	to be determined
Number of figures	to be determined
Number of tables	2
Number of text boxes	0
Corresponding author	Alba Cervantes-Loreto
Phone	+64 369 2880
Email	alba.cervantesloreto@pg.canterbury.ac.nz

1 Introduction

The question of how genetic variation is maintained, despite the effects of selection and drift, continues to be central to the study of evolutionary biology (Walsh & Lynch, 2018). Classical explanations include overdominance (heterozygote advantage) or frequency-dependent selection, but in the modern era of genomic data, all patterns of variation that exceed the expected variation under neutrality tend to be categorized broadly as balancing selection, regardless of the evolutionary mechanism (Mitchell-Olds *et al.*, 2007). One of the evolutionary mechanisms coined under balancing selection is sexually antagonistic selection, which occurs when the direction of natural selection on traits or loci differs between the sexes (Connallon & Hall, 2018).

Sexually antagonistic selection has been identified as a powerful engine of speciation that in some cases can maintain polymorphisms of otherwise dis-advantageous alleles in a population (Gavrilets, 2014). The effect of sexually antagonistic selection, however, has been generally studied under strong simplifying assumptions such as constant population sizes and homogeneous environments (e.g., Kidwell *et al.* (1977); Pamilo (1979); Immler *et al.* (2012)). Few studies have explored the effect of sexually antagonistic selection on the maintenance of polymorphism with more realistic assumptions. Exceptions include Connallon *et al.* (2018) who found that classical predictions break down when fluctuations in the environment combined with life-history traits allow local adaptations and promote the maintenance of genetic diversity. The effect of environmental fluctuations without local adaptation, however, has not been studied in the context of sexually

antagonistic selection to the best of our knowledge.

The contribution of environmental fluctuations to genetic variability remains a debated issue in evolutionary biology. Classic theoretical models predict that temporal fluctuations in environmental conditions are unlikely to maintain a genetic polymorphism (Hedrick, 1974; 1986). However, other studies have found that fluctuating selection can maintain genetic variance on sex-linked traits (Reinhold, 2000), or in populations where generations overlap (Ellner & Hairston Jr, 1994; Ellner & Sasaki, 1996). Similarly, temporal changes in population sizes have been shown to mitigate the effect of genetic drift in small populations (Pemberton *et al.*, 1996), and in annual plant systems (Nunney, 2002). Thus, both fluctuations in selection and population sizes could dramatically change the effect of sexually antagonistic selection in the maintenance of genetic diversity.

Importantly, progress requires more than just identifying if fluctuations can maintain genetic diversity in a population, but to quantify how exactly they contribute to its maintenance (Ellner *et al.*, 2016). Modern coexistence theory (MCT) provides a powerful conceptual framework to do so (Chesson, 2000b; 1994; Barabás *et al.*, 2018). Although its core ideas were formalized in an ecological context (Chesson, 1994; 2000a), this framework provides the necessary tools to examine the relative contributions of fluctuations to diversity maintenance, which can also be applied to evolutionary contexts (Ellner & Sasaki, 1996; Reinhold, 2000). From an ecological perspective, polymorphism of sexually antagonistic alleles is equivalent to the coexistence of species, and the fixation of either one of the alleles in a population is equivalent to competitive exclusion. The coexistence of alleles, thus, can be examined through the same lens as the coexistence of competing species.

Here, we seek to explicitly apply recent advances in MCT to the question of how polymorphism is maintained under sexually antagonistic selection. We examined how fluctuations in selection values, fluctuations in population sizes, and their interactions can stabilize or hinder the coexistence of alleles. In particular, we examined i) Can fluctuations in population sizes and selection values allow sexually antagonistic alleles to coexist when differences in their fitness would typically not allow them to? and ii) What is the relative contribution of different types of fluctuations that allow two sexually antagonistic alleles to be maintained in a population? Our study provides the tools to analyze evolutionary dynamics from a novel perspective and contributes to answering long-lasting questions regarding the effect of non-constant environments on genetic diversity.

2 Methods

We first present a model that describes the evolutionary dynamics of sexually antagonistic alleles and show how changes in allele frequencies can be expressed in terms of growth rates, a necessary condition for analyses done using MCT. We continue by simulating different scenarios of alleles invading a population, where we allowed population sizes, selection values, both, or neither to vary. Finally, we examine the results of our simulations through a MCT lens by calculating the contribution of each of these fluctuations in the coexistence of alleles across the parameter space of sexually antagonistic selection.

Population dynamics of sexually antagonistic alleles

As most population genetic models of sex-dependent selection, our model considered evolution at single, biallelic locus with frequency and density independent effects on the relative fitness of females and males (Wright, 1942; Kidwell *et al.*, 1977; Immler *et al.*, 2012).[†] We examined the dynamics of two sexually antagonistic alleles, j and k , that affect fitness in the haploid state. We assumed allele j always has a high fitness in females ($w_{jf} = 1$), but variable fitness in males ($w_{jm} < 1$); and allele k has a high fitness in males ($w_{km} = 1$), but variable fitness in females ($w_{kf} < 1$). The selection against allele j in males is therefore $S_m = 1 - w_{jm}$, and the selection against allele k in females is $S_f = 1 - w_{kf}$.

ACL: Add more recent refs, sarahs suggestions and e.g.,

The frequency of each allele in each sex at the beginning of a life-cycle at time t is given by:

$$p_{jm,t} = \frac{n_{jm,t}}{N_{m,t}} \quad (1)$$

$$p_{jf,t} = \frac{n_{jf,t}}{N_{f,t}} \quad (2)$$

$$p_{km,t} = \frac{N_{m,t} - n_{jm,t}}{N_{m,t}} \quad (3)$$

$$p_{kf,t} = \frac{N_{f,t} - n_{jf,t}}{N_{f,t}} \quad (4)$$

where $N_{m,t}$ and $N_{f,t}$ are the numbers of males and females in a population at time t , $n_{jf,t}$ is the number of females f with allele j , and $n_{jm,t}$ is the number of males m with allele j at time t , respectively.

The individuals in the population mate at random before selection occurs, and there-

fore the frequency of offspring with allele j after mating, $p'_{j,t}$ can be expressed as:

$$p'_{j,t} = \frac{(N_{m,t}n_{jf,t} + N_{f,t}n_{jm,t})}{2N_fN_m}. \quad (5)$$

Selection acts upon these offspring in order to determine the allelic frequencies in females and males in the next generation, $t + 1$. As an example the frequency of females with allele j after selection is given by:

$$p'_{jf,t+1} = \frac{n_{jf,t+1}}{N'_{f,t+1}} = \frac{p'_j w_{jf}}{p'_j w_{jf} + (1 - p'_j) w_{kf}} \quad (6)$$

The logarithmic growth rate of j in females, is therefore given by the number of females with allele j after selection, divided by the original number of females carrying allele j :

$$r_{jf,t} = \ln \left(\frac{n'_{jf,t+1}}{n_{jf,t}} \right) \quad (7)$$

An equivalent expression for the per capita growth rate of allele j in males m can be obtained by exchanging f for m across the various subscripts in this expression.

Allelic coexistence in a sexual population, however, is ultimately influenced by growth and establishment of an allele across both sexes. Therefore, the full growth rate of allele j across the entire population of females *and* males is given by:

$$r_j = \ln \left(\frac{n'_{jf,t+1} + n'_{jm,t+1}}{n_{jf,t} + n_{jm,t}} \right). \quad (8)$$

100 An equivalent expression describes r_k , the growth rate of allele k .

101 Selection maintains both alleles in the population under the condition that:

$$\frac{S_m}{1 + S_m} < S_f < \frac{S_m}{1 - S_m} \quad (9)$$

102 Thus, the maintenance of polymorphism of sexually antagonistic alleles is solely deter-
103 mined by the values of S_m and S_f . Note that in our model, the values S_m and S_f can take
104 are bounded from 0 to 1. Therefore the parameter space of sexually antagonistic selection
105 is within the range $0 < S_m, S_f < 1$. Classic theoretical models predict that in constant
106 environments, only in ≈ 0.38 of the selection parameter space alleles can coexist (Kidwell
107 *et al.*, 1977; Pamilo, 1979; Connallon *et al.*, 2018). If fluctuations in population sizes or se-
108 lection values have an effect on the coexistence of sexually antagonistic alleles, it would
109 be reflected in increases or decreases of the proportion of the parameter space of selection
110 where polymorphism is maintained.

111 Simulations

112 Our simulation approach first consisted of incorporating fluctuations in selection and
113 population sizes into our population dynamics model of sexually antagonistic selection.
114 For reasons that will hopefully become clear later, we then performed simulations of each
115 allele invading a population that experiences the aforementioned fluctuations. Finally, we
116 looked at the relative contributions of each type of fluctuation that allowed each allele to
117 establish in a population. We performed simulations across the selection parameter space
118 of sexually antagonistic selection ($0 < S_m, S_f < 1$). For simplicity, we initially present our

119 approach focusing on a fixed point in the selection parameter space.

120 Timeseries

121 We first incorporated the effects of fluctuations into our population dynamics model. To
122 do so, we generated independent timeseries of fluctuations in fitness values and popu-
123 lation sizes. In the case of fluctuations in selection values, for a given value of w_{jm} and
124 w_{kf} (i.e., a fixed point in the selection parameter space), we generated a timeseries of 500
125 timesteps made up of correlated fluctuations of w_{jm} and w_{kf} . Following the approach of
126 Shoemaker *et al.* (2020) we controlled the effect size of fluctuations in fitness values (σ_w)
127 and its' correlation (ρ_w) by using the Cholesky factorization of the variance-covariance
128 matrix:

$$C_w = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_w^2 & \rho_w \sigma_w^2 \\ \rho_w \sigma_w^2 & \sigma_w^2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (10)$$

129 We multiplied Eqn. 10 by a (2×500) matrix of random numbers from a normal dis-
130 tribution with mean 0 and unit variance, which yielded γ_j and γ_k . Then, we calculated
131 the value of w_{jm} at time $t + 1$ as $w_{jm,t+1} = w_{jm}^{\gamma_{j,t}}$. We calculated the value of $w_{kf,t+1}$ analo-
132 gously.

133 Similarly, we generated a timeseries of 500 timesteps made up of correlated fluctua-
134 tions in population sizes. We chose values of N_m and N_f of 200 individuals each as the ini-
135 tial value of population sizes throughout our simulations. We performed a Cholesky fac-
136 torization of the variance-covariance matrix, controlling the effect size of fluctuations in
137 population sizes with σ_g and their correlation with ρ_g . Similar to our previous approach,

we multiplied this factorization by a random matrix of uncorrelated random variables, which yielded γ_m and γ_f . Finally, we calculated the number of males in the population at time $t + 1$ as $N_{m,t+1} = N_m + \gamma_{m,t}$. We calculated the value of $N_{f,t+1}$ analogously.

Finally, we performed simulations where our population dynamics model (Eqns. 1 to 8) iterated over 500 timesteps while allowing selection values and population sizes to fluctuate in each timestep. We started each simulation with the initial values of N_m and N_f described before and equal frequencies of allele j and allele k in each sex. For each timestep t in our simulations, the values of w_{jm} , w_{kf} , N_m and N_f used to calculate allele's frequencies in timestep t (e.g., Eqn. 6), corresponded to the t values calculated in each timeseries, as described previously. This approach yielded a final timeseries that captured the dynamics of sexually antagonistic alleles, with fluctuating values of selection and population sizes.

Invasion simulations

Modern coexistence theory has shown that coexistence is promoted by mechanisms that give species a population growth rate advantage over other species when they become rare (Chesson, 1982; 2003; Barabás *et al.*, 2018). Typically, one species is held at its *resident* state, as given by its steady-state abundances while the rare species is called the *invader*. In the context of alleles in a population, an allele is an *invader* when a mutation occurs that introduces that allele into a population in which it is absent (e.g., if in a population with only k alleles, a random mutation made one individual carry the j allele). Within sexually antagonistic selection, each allele has two pathways of invasion,

depending on whether the mutation arises in a female or in a male. If an allele's *invasion growth rate* (or the average instantaneous population growth rate when rare) is positive, it buffers it against extinction, maintaining its persistence in the population. Coexistence, and hence polymorphism, occurs when all of the alleles in a population have positive invasion growth rates.

To study the dynamics of sexually antagonistic alleles through this framework, we used the timeseries that captured the dynamics of our population model as a template to perform invasion simulations of both alleles. We allowed each allele to invade via two different pathways males and females, and we explored all potential combinations of each allele invading through a different pathway (e.g., allele j invading through males, and allele k invading through females, and so on). For every point in the parameter space of sexually antagonistic selection, therefore, we explored four different types of invasion.

For each timestep in the timeseries, we performed simulations of the two alleles invading separately via their respective pathway. To simulate invasion, we set the density of the invading allele to one individual, while the resident allele was set to the corresponding value of the timeseries, and iterated our model one timestep. Note that this iteration of our model was independent of the previous iteration that we used to generate the timeseries, therefore we denoted a timestep in an invasion simulation with the subscript i . For example, if allele j was invading via males, then we would set $n_{jm,i} = 1$ and $n_{jf,i} = 0$, while the allele k would be the resident. The abundance of the resident before the invasion was determined by its abundance at timestep t of the timeseries. Then, we iterated our model one timestep and calculated the logarithmic growth rate of j allele

181 invading as:

$$r_j = \ln \left(\frac{n_{jm,i+1} + n_{jf,i+1}}{1} \right) \quad (11)$$

182 Correspondingly, the logarithmic growth rate of the k allele as a resident would be
183 given by:

$$r_k = \ln \left(\frac{n_{km,i+1} + n_{kf,i+1}}{N_{m,t} + N_{f,t}} \right) \quad (12)$$

184 We treated each timestep of the timeseries independently, and hence we performed
185 500 invasion simulations. We then calculated, for each allele invading via a different
186 pathway, its mean invasion growth rate as the average of the 500 invasion growth rates.
187 We also calculated the mean growth rate of the resident allele as the average of the 500
188 resident growth rates. We determined alleles to be coexisting if both of them, invading
189 via their respective pathway, had positive mean invasion growth rates, which is often
190 referred to as the mutual invasibility criterion (Barabás *et al.*, 2018).

191 **Functional decomposition**

192 Our invasion simulations tell us whether or not sexually antagonistic alleles can coex-
193 ist in a determined point of the selection parameter space. However, we also wanted to
194 quantify the relative contributions of fluctuating selection and population sizes into the
195 predicted coexistence outcome. Therefore, we turned towards an extension of modern
196 coexistence theory (Ellner *et al.*, 2019) that provides the flexibility to analyze the contri-
197 butions of different processes to coexistence using *functional decomposition*. This approach
198 applies to any collection of two or more processes, mechanisms, or species differences

199 affecting population growth rate (Ellner *et al.*, 2016; 2019), and has been used to show the
 200 relative contribution of variable temperature and silicate to the coexistence of algal species
 201 (Ellner *et al.*, 2016) and to quantify the relative importance of environmental fluctuations
 202 and variation in predator abundances to the coexistence of intertidal species (Shoemaker
 203 *et al.*, 2020).

204 The functional decomposition approach focuses on any biotic or abiotic fluctuations
 205 affecting a population 's growth rate. In our case, it consists of breaking up the average
 206 growth rate of each allele into a null growth rate in the absences of fluctuations in all
 207 selected variables, a set of main effect terms that represent the effect of only one variable
 208 fluctuating, and a set of two-way interaction terms representing the effect of variables
 209 fluctuating simultaneously (Ellner *et al.*, 2019). This is a function of four variables: the
 210 number of males in the population (N_m), the number of females in the population (N_f),
 211 the fitness of allele j in males (w_{jm}), and the fitness of allele k in females (w_{kf}). As an
 212 example, if only N_m and N_f were fluctuating, the growth rate of allele j when it is the
 213 invader at timestep t could be decomposed into:

$$r_{j,t}(N_m, N_f) = \mathcal{E}_j^0 + \mathcal{E}_j^{N_m} + \mathcal{E}_j^{N_f} + \mathcal{E}_j^{N_m N_f} \quad (13)$$

214 Where \mathcal{E}^0 is the null growth rate when N_m and N_f are set to their averages. Terms
 215 with superscripts represent the marginal effects of letting all superscripted variables vary
 216 while fixing all the other variables at their average values. For example, the term \mathcal{E}^{N_m}
 217 expresses the contribution of fluctuations in N_m when N_f is at its average, without the

218 contribution when both variables are set to their averages :

$$\mathcal{E}_j^{N_m} = r_{j,t}(N_m, \overline{N_f}) - \mathcal{E}_j^0 \quad (14)$$

219 If we average Eqn. 13 across the timesteps in our simulation, we get a partition of
220 the average population growth rate into the variance-free growth rate, the main effects
221 of variability in N_m , the main effects of variability in N_f , and the interaction between
222 variability in N_m and N_f

$$\bar{r}_j = \mathcal{E}_j^0 + \overline{\mathcal{E}_j}^{N_m} + \overline{\mathcal{E}_j}^{N_f} + \overline{\mathcal{E}_j}^{N_m N_f} \quad (15)$$

223 However, in our simulations w_{jm} and w_{kf} also fluctuated, therefore the full functional
224 decomposition of the growth rate of allele j as an invader is found in Table 1, as well as a
225 brief description of the meaning of each term. The implementation and interpretation of
226 the functional decomposition of the invasion growth rates of each allele are identical to
227 each other. We calculated the value of each of the terms in Table 1 by performing another
228 set of invasion simulations as described previously, but instead of allowing all variables
229 to fluctuate, systematically setting the required variables to their means and subtracting
230 the corresponding \mathcal{E} values.

231 The functional decomposition approach further requires the *comparison* of each term,
232 to understand if how it affects invaders and residents. This is because fluctuations can
233 promote coexistence by helping whichever allele is rare, or they can hurt whichever allele
234 is common. Therefore, to understand the role of each type of fluctuation, it is necessary

235 to compare how it affects invader *and* resident growth rates. In the example presented
 236 in Eqn. 15, if allele j is invading, then allele k is at it's resident state and there exists an
 237 analogue decomposition of \bar{r}_k with the exact same terms. Therefore we can express the
 238 difference between contributions of fluctuations in N_m as:

$$\Delta_j^{N_m} = \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_m} - \bar{\mathcal{E}}_k^{N_m} \quad (16)$$

239 If $\Delta_j^{N_m}$ is positive, then fluctuations in the male population benefit allele j when it is
 240 rare more than what they benefit k as a resident. If $\Delta_j^{N_m}$ is negative, then fluctuations
 241 benefit k as a resident more than j as an invader, and if it is minimal, then fluctuations
 242 have an equal effect in j and k . Therefore, for each allele invading via a different pathway,
 243 we calculated 16 Δ values, one for each one of the \mathcal{E} terms in Table 1. However, since
 244 the magnitude of each one of these values could vary considerably across the parameter
 245 space of selection, to make them comparable, we normalized each Δ value by dividing
 246 it by the length of the Δ vector. For example, the normalized value of Eqn. 16 would be
 247 given by:

$$\Delta_j^{N_m,n} = \frac{\Delta_j^{N_m}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{16} (\Delta_i)^2}} \quad (17)$$

248 This normalization bounded Δ values from -1 to 1 .

The parameter space of sexually antagonist selection

To evaluate if fluctuations in fitness values and population sizes allow sexually antagonistic alleles to coexist when selection would typically not allow them to, we applied the approach presented so far to the whole parameter space of selection ($0 < S_m, S_f < 1$). To do so, we partitioned the parameter space in 2500 parts, each one a combination of different w_{jm} and w_{kf} values. For each parameter combination, we separately calculated each allele's mean invasion growth rate when invading through males and females, as well as its functional decomposition. Then, we determined coexistence outcomes using the mutual invasibility criterion. Finally, we calculated the proportion of the parameter space that allowed alleles to coexist, for each allele invading via a different sex.

We explored all of the combinations of low, intermediate and high fluctuations in fitness values and population sizes, with different extents of correlations between fluctuations (Table 2). As a control simulation, we set $\sigma_w = 0.001$ and $\sigma_g = 0.001$, with no correlation between fluctuations. For each one of the factorial combinations of $\sigma_g, \sigma_w, \rho_g$ and ρ_w (Table 2), we performed invasion simulations across the parameter space of selection. We did three replicates per parameter combination, which resulted in 432 simulations.

Figures and tables

Table 1: Functional decomposition of the growth rate of allele j .

Term	Formula	Meaning
\mathcal{E}_j^0	$\bar{r}_j(\bar{N}_m, \bar{N}_f, \bar{w}_{jm}, \bar{w}_{kf})$	Growth rate at mean population size and fitness values.
$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_m}$	$\bar{r}_j(N_m, \bar{N}_f, \bar{w}_{jm}, \bar{w}_{kf}) - \mathcal{E}_j^0$	Main effect of fluctuations in N_m
$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_f}$	$\bar{r}_j(\bar{N}_m, N_f, \bar{w}_{jm}, \bar{w}_{kf}) - \mathcal{E}_j^0$	Main effect of fluctuations in N_f
$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{w_{jm}}$	$\bar{r}_j(\bar{N}_m, \bar{N}_f, w_{jm}, \bar{w}_{kf}) - \mathcal{E}_j^0$	Main effect of fluctuations in w_{jm}
$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{w_{kf}}$	$\bar{r}_j(\bar{N}_m, \bar{N}_f, \bar{w}_{jm}, w_{kf}) - \mathcal{E}_j^0$	Main effect of fluctuations in w_{kf}
$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_m, N_f}$	$\bar{r}_j(N_m, N_f, \bar{w}_{jm}, \bar{w}_{kf}) - [\mathcal{E}_j^0 + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_m} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_f}]$	Interaction of fluctuations in N_m and N_f
$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{w_{jm}, w_{kf}}$	$\bar{r}_j(\bar{N}_m, \bar{N}_f, w_{jm}, w_{kf}) - [\mathcal{E}_j^0 + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{w_{jm}} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{w_{kf}}]$	Interaction of fluctuations in w_{jm} and w_{kf}
$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_m, w_{jm}}$	$\bar{r}_j(N_m, \bar{N}_f, w_{jm}, \bar{w}_{kf}) - [\mathcal{E}_j^0 + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_m} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{w_{jm}}]$	Interaction of fluctuations in N_m and w_{jm}
$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_m, w_{kf}}$	$\bar{r}_j(N_m, \bar{N}_f, \bar{w}_{jm}, w_{kf}) - [\mathcal{E}_j^0 + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_m} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{w_{kf}}]$	Interaction of fluctuations in N_m and w_{kf}
$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_f, w_{jm}}$	$\bar{r}_j(\bar{N}_m, N_f, w_{jm}, \bar{w}_{kf}) - [\mathcal{E}_j^0 + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_f} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{w_{jm}}]$	Interaction of variation in N_f and w_{jm}
$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_f, w_{kf}}$	$\bar{r}_j(\bar{N}_m, N_f, \bar{w}_{jm}, w_{kf}) - [\mathcal{E}_j^0 + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_f} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{w_{kf}}]$	Interaction of fluctuations N_f and w_{kf}
$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_m, w_{jm}, w_{kf}}$	$\bar{r}_j(N_m, \bar{N}_f, w_{jm}, w_{kf}) - [\mathcal{E}_j^0 + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_m} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{w_{jm}} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{w_{kf}}]$	Interaction of fluctuations in N_m , w_{jm} , and w_{kf}
$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_f, w_{jm}, w_{kf}}$	$\bar{r}_j(\bar{N}_m, N_f, w_{jm}, w_{kf}) - [\mathcal{E}_j^0 + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_f} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{w_{jm}} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{w_{kf}}]$	Interaction of fluctuations in N_f , w_{jm} , and w_{kf}
$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_m, N_f, w_{jm}}$	$\bar{r}_j(N_m, N_f, w_{jm}, \bar{w}_{kf}) - [\mathcal{E}_j^0 + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_m} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_f} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{w_{jm}}]$	Interaction of variation in N_m , N_f , and w_{jm}
$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_m, N_f, w_{kf}}$	$\bar{r}_j(N_m, N_f, \bar{w}_{jm}, w_{kf}) - [\mathcal{E}_j^0 + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_m} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_f} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{w_{kf}}]$	Interaction of fluctuations in N_m , N_f , and w_{kf}
$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_m, N_f, w_{jm}, w_{kf}}$	$\bar{r}_j(N_m, N_f, w_{jm}, w_{kf}) - [\mathcal{E}_j^0 + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_m} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{N_f} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{w_{jm}} + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_j^{w_{kf}}]$	Interaction of variation in N_f , N_m , w_{jm} , and w_{kf}

Table 2: Parameters used in our simulations to control the effect size of fluctuations in population sizes (σ_g) and selection values σ_w , as well as their respective correlations (ρ_g and ρ_w).

Parameter	Values	Description
σ_w	0.001, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9	Effect size of fluctuations in fitness values
σ_g	0.001, 1, 10, 20, 30, 50	Effect size of fluctuations in population sizes
ρ_w	-0.75, 0, 0.75	Correlation between fluctuations in fitness values
ρ_g	-0.75, 0, 0.75	Correlation between fluctuation in population sizes




Figure 1





Figure 2

A



B




Figure 3




Figure 4

References

- Barabás, G., D'Andrea, R. & Stump, S.M. (2018). Chesson's coexistence theory. *Ecological Monographs*, 88, 277–303.
- Chesson, P. (1994). Multispecies competition in variable environments. *Theoretical population biology*, 45, 227–276.
- Chesson, P. (2000a). General theory of competitive coexistence in spatially-varying environments. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 58, 211–237.
- Chesson, P. (2000b). Mechanisms of maintenance of species diversity. *Annual review of Ecology and Systematics*, 31, 343–366.
- Chesson, P. (2003). Quantifying and testing coexistence mechanisms arising from recruitment fluctuations. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 64, 345–357.
- Chesson, P.L. (1982). The stabilizing effect of a random environment. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 15, 1–36.
- Connallon, T. & Hall, M.D. (2018). Environmental changes and sexually antagonistic selection. *eLS*, pp. 1–7.
- Connallon, T., Sharma, S. & Olito, C. (2018). Evolutionary Consequences of Sex-Specific Selection in Variable Environments: Four Simple Models Reveal Diverse Evolutionary Outcomes. *The American Naturalist*, 193, 93–105.

284 Ellner, S. & Hairston Jr, N.G. (1994). Role of overlapping generations in maintaining
 285 genetic variation in a fluctuating environment. *The American Naturalist*, 143, 403–417.

286 Ellner, S. & Sasaki, A. (1996). Patterns of genetic polymorphism maintained by fluctuating
 287 selection with overlapping generations. *theoretical population biology*, 50, 31–65.

288 Ellner, S.P., Snyder, R.E. & Adler, P.B. (2016). How to quantify the temporal storage effect
 289 using simulations instead of math. *Ecology letters*, 19, 1333–1342.

290 Ellner, S.P., Snyder, R.E., Adler, P.B. & Hooker, G. (2019). An expanded modern coexis-
 291 tence theory for empirical applications. *Ecology Letters*, 22, 3–18.

292 Gavrillets, S. (2014). Is sexual conflict an “engine of speciation”? *Cold Spring Harbor*
 293 *perspectives in biology*, 6, a017723.

294 Hedrick, P.W. (1974). Genetic variation in a heterogeneous environment. i. temporal het-
 295 erogeneity and the absolute dominance model. *Genetics*, 78, 757–770.

296 Hedrick, P.W. (1986). Genetic polymorphism in heterogeneous environments: a decade
 297 later. *Annual review of ecology and systematics*, 17, 535–566.

298 Immler, S., Arnqvist, G. & Otto, S.P. (2012). Ploidally antagonistic selection maintains
 299 stable genetic polymorphism. *Evolution: International Journal of Organic Evolution*, 66,
 300 55–65.

301 Kidwell, J., Clegg, M., Stewart, F. & Prout, T. (1977). Regions of stable equilibria for
 302 models of differential selection in the two sexes under random mating. *Genetics*, 85,
 303 171–183.

- 304 Mitchell-Olds, T., Willis, J.H. & Goldstein, D.B. (2007). Which evolutionary processes
305 influence natural genetic variation for phenotypic traits? *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 8,
306 845–856.
- 307 Nunney, L. (2002). The effective size of annual plant populations: the interaction of a seed
308 bank with fluctuating population size in maintaining genetic variation. *The American*
309 *Naturalist*, 160, 195–204.
- 310 Pamilo, P. (1979). Genic variation at sex-linked loci: Quantification of regular selection
311 models. *Hereditas*, 91, 129–133.
- 312 Pemberton, J., Smith, J., Coulson, T.N., Marshall, T.C., Slate, J., Paterson, S., Albon, S.,
313 Clutton-Brock, T.H. & Sneath, P.H.A. (1996). The maintenance of genetic polymorphism
314 in small island populations: large mammals in the hebrides. *Philosophical Transactions*
315 *of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 351, 745–752.
- 316 Reinhold, K. (2000). Maintenance of a genetic polymorphism by fluctuating selection on
317 sex-limited traits. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 13, 1009–1014.
- 318 Shoemaker, L.G., Barner, A.K., Bittleston, L.S. & Teufel, A.I. (2020). Quantifying the rela-
319 tive importance of variation in predation and the environment for species coexistence.
320 *Ecology letters*, 23, 939–950.
- 321 Walsh, B. & Lynch, M. (2018). *Evolution and Selection of Quantitative Traits*. OUP Oxford.
- 322 Wright, S. (1942). Statistical genetics and evolution. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical*
323 *Society*, 48, 223–246.