

## **<sup>1</sup> Classification: Biological Sciences**

### **<sup>2</sup> Shaped to kill: The evolution of siphonophore tentilla <sup>3</sup> for specialized prey capture in the open ocean**

<sup>4</sup> Alejandro Damian-Serrano<sup>1,‡</sup>, Steven H.D. Haddock<sup>2</sup>, Casey W. Dunn<sup>1</sup>

<sup>5</sup> <sup>1</sup> Yale University, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, 165 Prospect St.,  
<sup>6</sup> New Haven, CT 06520, USA

<sup>7</sup> <sup>2</sup> Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute, 7700 Sandholdt Rd., Moss Landing, CA  
<sup>8</sup> 95039, USA

<sup>9</sup> ORCID: Alejandro Damian-Serrano: 0000-0002-2544-0489; Steven H.D. Haddock: 0000-  
<sup>10</sup> 0001-9420-4482; Casey Dunn: 0000-0003-0628-5150

<sup>11</sup> <sup>‡</sup> Corresponding author: Alejandro Damian-Serrano. Address: 165 Prospect St., New  
<sup>12</sup> Haven, CT, 06511. Phone: (401) 441-9613. Email: alejandro.damianserrano@yale.edu.

## **<sup>13</sup> Keywords**

<sup>14</sup> Siphonophores, nematocysts, predation, specialization, character evolution

## 15 Abstract

16 Predator specialization has often been considered an evolutionary ‘dead-end’ due to the  
17 constraints associated with the evolution of morphological and functional optimizations  
18 throughout the organism. However, in some predators, these changes are localized in separate  
19 structures dedicated to prey capture. One of the most extreme cases of this modularity can  
20 be observed in siphonophores, a clade of pelagic colonial cnidarians that use tentilla (tentacle  
21 side branches armed with nematocysts) exclusively for prey capture. Here we study how  
22 siphonophore specialists and generalists evolve, and what morphological changes are associated  
23 with these transitions. To answer these questions, we: (1) measured 29 morphological  
24 characters of tentacles from 45 siphonophore species, (2) mapped these data to a phylogenetic  
25 tree, and (3) analyzed the evolutionary associations between morphological characters and prey  
26 type data from the literature. Instead of a dead-end, we found that siphonophore specialists  
27 can evolve into generalists, and that specialists on one prey type have directly evolved into  
28 specialists on other prey types. Our results show that siphonophore tentillum morphology has  
29 strong evolutionary associations with prey type, and suggest that shifts between prey types  
30 are linked to shifts in the morphology, mode of evolution, and genetic correlations of tentilla  
31 and their nematocysts. The evolutionary history of siphonophore specialization helps build  
32 a broader perspective on predatory niche diversification via morphological innovation and  
33 evolution. These findings contribute to understanding how specialization and morphological  
34 evolution have shaped present-day food webs.

## 35 Significance Statement

36 Predatory specialization is often associated with the evolution of modifications in the mor-  
37 phology of the prey capture apparatus. Specialization has been considered an evolutionary  
38 ‘dead-end’ due to the constraints associated with these morphological changes. However,  
39 in predators like siphonophores, armed with modular structures used exclusively for prey  
40 capture, this assumption is challenged. Our results show that siphonophores can evolve

41 generalism and new prey-type specializations by modifying the morphological states, modes of  
42 evolution, and genetic correlations between the parts of their prey capture apparatus. These  
43 findings demonstrate how studying open-ocean non-bilaterian predators can reveal novel  
44 patterns and mechanisms in the evolution of specialization. Understanding these evolutionary  
45 processes is fundamental to the study of food-web structure and complexity.

## 46 Introduction

47 Most animal predators use specific structures to capture and subdue prey. Raptors have  
48 claws and beaks, snakes have fangs, wasps have stingers, and cnidarians have nematocyst-  
49 laden tentacles. The functional morphology of these structures is critical to their ability  
50 to successfully capture prey (1). Long-term adaptive evolution in response to the defense  
51 mechanisms of the prey (*e.g.*, avoidance, escape, protective barriers) leads to modifications  
52 that can counter those defenses. The more specialized the diet of a predator is, the more  
53 specialized its structures need to be to efficiently overcome the challenges posed by the  
54 prey. Characterizing the relationships between morphology and predatory specialization  
55 is necessary to understand how the phenotypic diversity of predators determines food-web  
56 structure. However, for many clades of predators, there is scarce knowledge on how these  
57 specializations evolved. The primary questions we set out to answer are: how do predator  
58 specialists and generalists evolve, and how does predatory specialization shape morphological  
59 evolution?

60 Siphonophores (Cnidaria: Hydrozoa) are a clade of gelatinous, colonial organisms that  
61 swim in the open ocean, feeding on a wide diversity of prey (often fish, crustaceans, and  
62 jellyfish). Siphonophores carry modular structures that are exclusively used for prey capture:  
63 the tentilla (Fig. 1). The tentilla have great morphological variation across species (2).  
64 Together with their well understood function, this makes them an ideal system to study  
65 the relationships between functional traits and prey specialization. Like a head of coral, a  
66 siphonophore is a colony bearing many feeding polyps (Fig. 1). Each feeding polyp has a

67 single tentacle, which branches into a series of tentilla (side branches). Like other cnidarians,  
68 siphonophores capture prey with nematocysts, harpoon-like stinging capsules borne within  
69 specialized cells known as cnidocytes. Unlike the prey capture apparatus of most other  
70 cnidarians, siphonophore tentacles carry their cnidocytes in extremely complex and organized  
71 batteries (3) which are located in their tentilla. While nematocyst batteries and clusters in  
72 other cnidarians are simple static scaffolds for cnidocytes, siphonophore tentilla have their  
73 own reaction mechanism, triggered upon encounter with prey. When it fires, a tentillum  
74 undergoes an extremely fast conformational change that wraps it around the prey, maximizing  
75 the surface area of contact for nematocysts to fire on the prey (4). In addition, some species  
76 have elaborate fluorescent and bioluminescent lures on their tentilla to attract prey with  
77 aggressive mimicry (5–7).

78 Siphonophores bear four major nematocyst types in their tentacles and tentilla (Fig. 1F)..  
79 The largest type, heteronemes, have open-tip tubules characterized by bearing a distinctly  
80 wider spiny shaft at the proximal end of the everted tubule. These are typically found  
81 flanking the proximal end of the cnidoband. The most abundant type, haplonemes, have no  
82 distinct shaft, but similarly to heteronemes, their tubules have open tips and can be found  
83 in the cnidoband. Both heteronemes and haplonemes bear short spines along the tubule.  
84 Both can be toxic and penetrate the surface of some prey types. In the terminal filament,  
85 siphonophores bear two other types of nematocysts, characterized by their adhesive function,  
86 closed tip tubules, and lack of spines on the tubule. These are the desmonemes (a type of  
87 adhesive coiled-tubule spironeme), and rhopalonemes (a siphonophore-exclusive nematocyst  
88 type with wide tubules).

89 Many siphonophore species inhabit the deep pelagic ocean, which spans from ~200m to the  
90 abyssal seafloor (~4000m). This habitat has fairly homogeneous physical conditions and stable  
91 zooplankton abundances and composition (8). With relatively predictable prey availability,  
92 ecological theory predicts that interspecific competition would inhibit the coexistence of  
93 closely-related species unless evolution towards specialization reduces the breadth of each




Figure 1: Siphonophore anatomy. A - *Nanomia* sp. siphonophore colony (photo by Catriona Munro). B, C - Illustration of a *Nanomia* colony, gastrozooid, and tentacle closeup (by Freya Goetz). D - *Nanomia* sp. Tentillum illustration and main parts. E - Differential interference contrast micrograph of the tentillum illustrated in D. F - Nematocyst types (illustration reproduced with permission from Mapstone 2014), hypothesized homologies, and locations in the tentillum. Undischarged to the left, discharged to the right.

94 species' niche (9–11). If this prediction holds true, we would expect the prey-capture apparatus  
95 morphologies of siphonophores to diversify with the evolution of specializations on a variety  
96 of prey types in different siphonophore lineages.

97 Specialization has been thought to be an evolutionary 'dead-end', meaning that specialized  
98 lineages are unlikely to evolve into generalists or to shift the resource for which they are spe-  
99 cialized (12–16). However, recent studies have found that interspecific competition can favor  
100 the evolution of generalists from specialists (17–19) and specialist resource switching (20, 21).  
101 In addition to studying relationships with morphology, we seek to identify what evolutionary  
102 transitions in trophic niche breadth are prevalent in these open-ocean tactile predators. To  
103 do so, we examine three alternative scenarios of siphonophore trophic specialization: (1)  
104 predatory specialists evolved from generalist ancestors; (2) predatory specialists evolved from  
105 specialist ancestors which targeted different resources, switching their primary prey type; and  
106 (3) predatory generalists evolved from specialist ancestors. These scenarios are non-exclusive,  
107 and each could apply to different transitions along the siphonophore phylogeny.

108 In the past, the study of siphonophore tentilla and diets has been limited due to the  
109 inaccessibility of their oceanic habitat and the difficulties associated with the collection of  
110 fragile siphonophores. Thus, the morphological diversity of tentilla has only been characterized  
111 for a few taxa, and their evolutionary history remains largely unexplored. Contemporary  
112 underwater sampling technology provides an unprecedented opportunity to explore the  
113 trophic ecology (22) and functional morphology (23) of siphonophores. In addition, well-  
114 supported phylogenies based on molecular data are now available for these organisms (24).  
115 These advances allow for the examination of the evolutionary relationships between modern  
116 siphonophore form, function, and ecology. Our work builds upon previous pioneering studies  
117 that have explored the relationships between tentilla and diet, and showed that siphonophores  
118 are a robust system for the study of predatory specialization via morphological diversification.  
119 Purcell (25, 26) showed clear relationships between diet, tentillum, and nematocyst characters  
120 in co-occurring epipelagic siphonophores for a small subset of extant epipelagic siphonophore

121 species.

122 In this study, we present an extensive morphological characterization of tentilla and  
123 their nematocysts across a broad variety of shallow and deep-sea siphonophore species using  
124 modern imaging technologies, summarize the literature on siphonophore diets, expand the  
125 phylogenetic tree of siphonophores by combining ribosomal gene sequences from a broad range  
126 of taxa with a transcriptome-based backbone tree, and explore the evolutionary histories and  
127 correlations between diet, tentillum, and nematocyst characters. Our results suggest that  
128 siphonophores can evolve new specializations and generalism by modifying the phenotypes  
129 and genetic correlations in their prey capture apparatus. These findings show how studying  
130 elusive non-bilaterian predators can challenge traditional views on the evolution of predatory  
131 specialization.

## 132 Results

133 *Novel phylogenetic relationships* – In order to analyze the relationships between morphology  
134 and diet across the evolutionary history of siphonophores, we generated a siphonophore  
135 phylogeny that had broader taxonomic sampling than was available in previously published  
136 analyses. We first inferred a new tree with the needed taxon sampling with publicly available  
137 ribosomal RNA genes (18S & 16S) and new data from one species. This tree is essentially an  
138 extended version of that published in (27), and the two are congruent. We then compared  
139 the new extended ribosomal RNA tree to a recently published siphonophore transcriptome  
140 phylogeny (24). The topology of the extended ribosomal RNA tree recapitulates the resolved  
141 nodes in (27) and most of the nodes in (24). Only five nodes in the unconstrained tree  
142 inference were incongruent with the (24) transcriptome tree, with four of them poorly  
143 supported (bootstrap values <84), and only one of them strongly supported (*Frillagalma*  
144 *vityazi-Nanomia bijuga*, 100 bootstrap support). We constrained the incongruent nodes to  
145 the (24) topology during estimation of the constrained 18S+16S tree inference (Fig. 2).  
146 Since the transcriptome-based placement of *Nanomia bijuga* is more consistent with the

<sup>147</sup> morphological data, that relationship was also constrained. Moreover, with the inclusion of  
<sup>148</sup> sequences from *Stephanomia amphytridis* and multiple *Erenna* species, our tree reveals a  
<sup>149</sup> novel sister relationship between the genus *Erenna* and *Stephanomia*.

<sup>150</sup> We used the clade nomenclature defined in (27) and (24), including Codonophora to  
<sup>151</sup> indicate the sister group to Cystonectae, Euphysonectae to indicate the sister group to  
<sup>152</sup> Calycophorae, Clade A and B to indicate the two main lineages within Euphysonectae. In  
<sup>153</sup> addition, we define two new clades within Codonophora (Fig. 2): Eucladophora as the  
<sup>154</sup> clade containing *Agalma elegans* and all taxa that are more closely related to it than to  
<sup>155</sup> *Apolemia lanosa*, and Tendiculophora as the clade containing *Agalma elegans* and all taxa  
<sup>156</sup> more closely related to it than to *Bargmannia elongata*. Eucladophora is characterized by  
<sup>157</sup> bearing spatially differentiated tentilla with proximal heteronemes and a narrower terminal  
<sup>158</sup> filament region. The etymology derives from the Greek *eu+kládos+phóros* for “true branch  
<sup>159</sup> bearers”. Tendiculophora are characterized by bearing rhopalonemes and desmonemes in the  
<sup>160</sup> terminal filament, having a pair of elastic strands, and developing proximally detachable  
<sup>161</sup> cnidobands. The etymology of this clade is derived from the Latin *tendicula* for “snare or  
<sup>162</sup> noose” and the Greek *phóros* for “carriers”.

<sup>163</sup> *Evolutionary associations between diet and tentillum morphology* – We reconstructed the  
<sup>164</sup> evolutionary history of feeding guilds using stochastic mapping on the new phylogeny (Fig.  
<sup>165</sup> 3). Our reconstructions do not recover generalism as the ancestral siphonophore diet. None  
<sup>166</sup> of the transitions in diet are consistent with scenario 1 (specialists evolving from generalists).  
<sup>167</sup> Feeding guild specializations have shifted from an alternative ancestral state at least five  
<sup>168</sup> times, consistent with instances supporting scenario 2 (specialists evolving to feed on a  
<sup>169</sup> different resource). We also recover multiple independent origins of generalism from specialist  
<sup>170</sup> ancestors (Fig. 3). Large crustacean specialists evolve into generalists twice independently,  
<sup>171</sup> consistent with instances of scenario 3 (generalists evolving from specialists). This finding  
<sup>172</sup> is particularly compelling given in that it is the opposite of known biases in ancestral state  
<sup>173</sup> reconstruction. (28) found that such methods tend to infer higher transition rates toward the




Figure 2: Bayesian time-tree inferred from 18S + 16S concatenated sequences and constrained to be congruent with a published transcriptome phylogeny. Branch lengths estimated using a relaxed molecular clock. Species names in red indicate replicated representation in the morphology data. All data were publicly available, apart from new sequences produced for *Thermopalria taraxaca* and *Frillaglma vityazi*. Nodes labeled with Bayesian posteriors (BP). Green circles indicate BP = 1. Blue circles indicate nodes constrained to be congruent with Munro *et al.* (2018). Tips with black squares indicate the species with transcriptomes used in Munro *et al.* (2018). Tips with purple squares indicate genus-level correspondence to taxa included in Munro *et al.* (2018). The main clades are labeled: with black bars for described taxonomic units, and grey bars for operational phylogenetic designations.

174 more frequent state. In this case, that would lead to a bias for an increased rate of transition  
175 from generalists (the rarer state across the tips) to specialists (the more common state across  
176 the tips). We observe the opposite, indicating strong evidence that these generalists are  
177 indeed a derived state.

178 To test whether measured morphological characters evolved in association with shifts in  
179 feeding ecology, we analyzed the evolutionary history of each character on the phylogeny, with  
180 the feeding guilds reconstructed on it as hypothetical selective regimes. We fit and compared  
181 alternative evolutionary models for each continuous character. The models compared were the  
182 Brownian Motion (BM) model of neutral divergent evolution (29), the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck  
183 (OU) model of stabilizing selection around a single fitted optimum state (30, 31), and an OU  
184 model with multiple optima (OUM) corresponding to each reconstructed selective regime  
185 (feeding guild). The model comparison shows that out of 30 characters, 10 show significantly  
186 stronger support for the diet-driven multi-optima OU model (S15). These characters include  
187 terminal filament nematocyst size and shape, involucrum length, elastic strand width, and  
188 heteroneme number. Most of these characters are found exclusively in Tendiculophora, thus  
189 this may reflect processes that could be unique to this subtree. Five characters including  
190 cnidoband length, cnidoband shape, and haploneme length show maximal support for a  
191 diet-driven single-optimum OU model. The remaining 15 characters support BM (or OU  
192 with marginal AICc difference with BM).

193 In order to investigate the associations between the evolutionary history of morphological  
194 characters and specific prey types found in the diet, we used phylogenetic logistic regressions.  
195 We found that several characters were significantly correlated with the gains and losses of  
196 specific prey types (Fig. 3, right). Shifts toward ostracod presence in diet correlated with  
197 reductions in pedicle width and total haploneme volume. Shifts to copepod presence in  
198 the diet were associated with reductions in haploneme width, cnidoband length and width,  
199 total haploneme and heteroneme volumes, and tentacle and pedicle widths. Consistently,  
200 transitions to decapod presence in the diet correlated with more coiled cnidobands (S21).




Figure 3: Left - Subset phylogeny showing the mapped feeding guild regimes that were used to inform the *OUwie* analyses. Right - Grid showing the prey items consumed from which the feeding guild categories were derived. Diet data were obtained from the literature review, available in the Dryad repository.

201 Evolutionary shifts in these characters may have allowed the inclusion of these prey types in  
202 the diet.

203 In addition to studying correlations with prey type presence/absence in the diet, we also  
204 tested for correlations between morphological characters and shifts in prey selectivity using  
205 phylogenetic linear models. Prey selectivity values were calculated from (32) by contrasting  
206 the gut content frequencies to the corresponding environmental abundances of prey. We  
207 found that fish selectivity is associated with increased number of heteronemes per tentillum,  
208 increased roundness of nematocysts (desmonemes and haplonemes), larger heteronemes,  
209 reduced heteroneme/cnidoband length ratios, smaller rhopalonemes, lower haploneme surface  
210 area to volume ratio (SA/V), and larger the cnidoband, elastic strand, pedicle and tentacle  
211 widths. Decapod-selective diets were associated with increasing cnidoband size and coiledness,  
212 haploneme row number, elastic strand width, and heteroneme number. Copepod-selective  
213 diets evolved in association with smaller heteroneme and total nematocyst volumes, smaller  
214 cnidobands, rounder rhopalonemes, elongated heteronemes, narrower haplonemes with higher  
215 SA/V ratios, and smaller heteronemes, tentacles, pedicles, and elastic strands. Selectivity  
216 for ostracods was associated with reductions in size and number of heteroneme nematocysts,  
217 cnidoband size, number of haploneme rows, heteroneme numbers, and cnidoband coiledness.  
218 Heteroneme length and elongation also correlated negatively with chaetognath selectivity  
219 (S21). These results indicate that not only diet but also differential feeding selectivity has  
220 evolved in correlation with changes in the prey capture apparatus of siphonophores. For each  
221 prey type studied, tentillum morphology is a much better predictor of prey selectivity than  
222 of prey presence in the diet, despite prey selectivity data being available for a smaller subset  
223 of species. Interestingly, many of the morphological predictors had opposite slope signs when  
224 predicting prey selectivity *versus* predicting prey presence in the diet (Table 2).

225 We tested some of the diet-morphology associations previously proposed in the literature  
226 (25, 26) for correlated evolution (Table 1). We found that most, such as heteroneme volume  
227 and copepod prey size, do show evidence for correlated evolution. The sole exception was the

228 relationship between terminal filament nematocysts (rhopalonemes and desmonemes) and  
229 crustaceans in the diet. Analyses that do not take phylogeny into account do recover this  
230 correlation across the extant species studied, but it is not consistent with correlated evolution.  
231 The latter is likely a product of the larger species richness of crustacean-eating species with  
232 terminal filament nematocysts, rather than simultaneous evolutionary gains.

233 Table 1. Table 1. Tests of correlated evolution between siphonophore morphological  
234 characters and aspects of the diet found correlated in the literature. We report the direction  
235 and significance of the evolutionary association, the number of taxa used for the analysis,  
236 and the literature source where the morphology-diet association was first reported.

Character	Aspect of diet	Test of evolutionary association	Relationship sign	P-value	Number of taxa	Association first report
Differentiated cnidobands	Hard bodied prey	Page's test	+	0.017	19	Purcell, 1984
Heteroneme volume	Copepod prey size	pGLS	+	0.002	8	Purcell, 1984
Terminal filament nematocysts	Crustacean diet	Page's test	Non-Significant	0.200	19	Purcell & Mills, 1988
Number of nematocyst types	Soft-bodied prey	Phylogenetic logistic regression	-	0.040	22	Purcell & Mills, 1988

237

238  
239 Table 2. Discriminant analysis of principal components for the presence of specific prey  
240 types using the morphological data. Top quartile variable (character) contributions to the  
241 linear discriminants are ordered from highest to lowest. Logistic regressions and GLMs  
242 were fitted to predict prey type presence and selectivity respectively. The sign of the slope  
243 of each predictor is reported, marked with an asterisk if significant ( $p\text{-value} < 0.05$ ), and  
244 highlighted grey if it differs between prey presence in diet and prey selectivity. Pseudo- $R^2$   
245 (%) approximates the percent variance explained by the model.

Prey type	DAPC	GLM for prey type presence (22 taxa)		Best fitting GLM for prey type selectivity (Purcell, 1981) (7 taxa)	
		Discrimination (%)	Top quartile variable contributions	Sign	Pseudo-R <sup>2</sup> (%)
Copepods	95.4	Total nematocyst volume	-	-*	
		Tentacle width	-	+	
		Haploneme elongation	-	+	
		Haploneme surface area/volume ratio	+	-	
		Haploneme row number	+	+	67.8
		Cnidoband length	-	+	
		Cnidoband width	-	-	
		Cnidoband free length	+	+	
		Total haploneme volume	-	+	
		Heteroneme volume	+	-	
Fish	68.1	Total nematocyst volume	-	+	
		Total heteroneme volume	-	-	45.8
		Cnidoband length	-	-	
		Cnidoband free length	+	+	
		Involucrum length	-	-	
		Pedicle width	+	+	
		Involucrum length	+.*	+	
		Total heteroneme volume	-	-	
		Elastic strand width	-	+.*	
		Rhopaloneme length	+	+	
Large crustaceans	81.8	Heteroneme volume	+	-	73.2
		Haploneme elongation	-	+	
		Desmoneme length	-	-	
		Tentacle width	+	+	
					98.7
					97.9

246

247     *Evolution of relationships between characters with diet – Phenotypic integration results*  
248     in correlation patterns between morphological characters and their rates of evolution. To  
249     study these patterns, we fit a set of evolutionary variance-covariance matrices (33). The  
250     quantitative characters we measured from tentilla and their nematocysts are highly correlated.  
251     The results indicate that the dimensionality (number of independent axes of variation) of  
252     tentillum morphology is low, that many traits are associated with size, but that nematocyst  
253     arrangement and shape are independent of it (S4). The variance-covariance matrices (S21-23)  
254     are congruent with the abundant positive correlations observed among simple measurement  
255     characters in S3. This analysis more clearly reveals the diagonal blocks that constitute  
256     the evolutionary modules, such as the heteroneme block, the terminal filament nematocyst  
257     block, and the cnidoband-pedicle-tentacle block. These results were not sensitive to the  
258     transformation of inapplicable states and taxon sampling. These results indicate that  
259     siphonophore tentilla and nematocysts are phenotypically integrated and co-evolve within  
260     discrete evolutionary modules.

261     In order to test whether rate covariance matrices changed with evolutionary shifts in

262 feeding guild regimes, we compared the rate covariance terms between characters across the  
263 subtrees occupied by the different feeding guild regimes (S21). We found that half (48%)  
264 of the character pairs presented significantly distinct correlation coefficients across different  
265 regimes (S19), indicating that the mode of phenotypic integration also shifts with trophic  
266 niche. When contrasting the regime-specific rate correlation matrices to the whole-tree  
267 matrix and to the preceding ancestral regime matrix, we were able to identify the character  
268 dependencies that are unique to each predatory niche (S22-23).

269 We were able to identify specific character correlations that shifted with the evolution of  
270 new diets. Under the majority of stochastic character mapping outcomes, large crustacean  
271 specialists are the ancestral feeding regime, and all other feeding regimes evolve from this  
272 ancestral specialization. Compared to the rate correlation matrix estimated over the whole  
273 tree, large crustacean specialists present strong negative correlations between haploneme  
274 elongation and heteroneme size, and between rhopaloneme elongation and tentillum size, as  
275 well as with involucrum length. Within generalist clades (*Forskalia* and the *Agalma-Athorybia*  
276 clade), terminal filament nematocyst (desmoneme and rhopaloneme) sizes became negatively  
277 correlated with the sizes of most characters, meaning that as some tentilla became larger,  
278 their individual terminal nematocysts became smaller, observed to the extreme in *Agalma*.  
279 In addition, heteroneme and rhopaloneme elongation became positively correlated with  
280 cnidoband size. When large crustacean specialists switched to small crustacean prey in  
281 *Cordagalma* and calycophorans, haploneme size became inversely correlated with heteroneme  
282 elongation, which in turn developed a strong positive relationship with tentillum size. The  
283 extremes of this gradient can be seen in *Cordagalma* and *Hippopodius*, genera subspecialized  
284 in copepods and ostracods respectively. With the evolution of fish prey specialization in  
285 cystonects and within Clade B (Fig. 1), haploneme elongation became negatively correlated  
286 with heteroneme elongation (signal driven by Clade B, since cystonects lack tentacular  
287 heteronemes), and the surface area to volume ratio of haploneme nematocysts switched from  
288 a strong negative relationship with cnidoband size (found in every other regime) to a positive

correlation. This is consistent with Clade B haplonemes becoming rounder, more similar to Cystonect haplonemes specialized in fish prey penetration and envenomation. Gelatinous specialization, albeit appearing only once in our tree, also carries a unique signature in character rate correlation shifts, with an increase in the strength of the correlation between heteroneme shape and shaft width, consistent with the appearance of birrhopaloid nematocysts with swollen shafts that are likely effective at anchoring gelatinous tissue (see reference to Narcomedusae nematocysts in (26)).

## Discussion

Several studies (12–16) have suggested that resource specialization can be an irreversible dead-end due to the constraints posed by extreme phenotypic specialization. Our results show that this is not the case for siphonophores, where the prey type on which they specialize has shifted at least 5 times. We find no support for any transitions from generalist to specialist (scenario 1, as described in the Introduction). We do find support for at least 3 instances of specialists switching from one prey type to another prey type, (scenario 2) and two switches from specialist to generalist (scenario 3). This is consistent with the findings of recent studies on phytophagous insects (19), where the rate of evolution from generalists to specialists is comparable to the reverse, thus specialization does not limit further evolution. Our results are also consistent with analyses of lepidopterans (21), where specialized resource switching is the primary transition type while niche breadth remains fairly constant. The evolutionary history of tentilla shows that siphonophores are an example of trophic niche diversification via morphological innovation and evolution, which allowed transitions between specialized trophic niches. In more familiar predators, the prey capture apparatus (such as claws and jaws) is well integrated in the body, leading to trade-offs and whole-body adaptations for feeding specialization. The extreme modularity of the siphonophore prey capture apparatus could release them from constraints typically imposed by adaptation to ecological specialization. This evolutionary mechanism is particularly important in a deep open ocean ecosystem, which

315 is a relatively homogeneous physical environment, where the primary niche heterogeneity  
316 available is the potential interactions between organisms (8).

317 While selection acting on character states is a widely studied phenomenon, recent studies  
318 have shown that selection can also act upon the patterns of character correlations and  
319 phenotypic dependencies (33–39). This evolution of character relationships can allow lineages  
320 to explore new regions of the morphospace and facilitate the appearance of ecological  
321 novelties. Our results show that the patterns of phenotypic integration in siphonophore  
322 tentilla vary among clades, and appear to display different relationships across shifting feeding  
323 specializations. Similar to what has been found in the feeding morphologies of fish (33, 40),  
324 siphonophore tentilla may have accommodated new diets by altering the correlations between  
325 characters. For example, changes in the size and shape relationships between nematocyst  
326 types gave rise to the nematocyst complements specialized in ensnaring prey with different  
327 combinations of defensive traits.

328 Our results unambiguously show that tentillum morphology evolved with diet and strongly  
329 support deviations from the generalist-to-specialist evolution scenario. However, the conclu-  
330 sions we can draw from these analyses are limited in several ways. The biggest challenge at  
331 present is the sparse dietary data available in the literature. Additional dietary data could  
332 reveal transitions from generalists to specialists we were unable to detect for two reasons.  
333 First, some of the taxa in our dataset have a very limited number of feeding observations,  
334 which could lead to apparent specialization. Second, some of the taxa not included in our  
335 dataset could be undiscovered generalists. When interpreting these results, it is also important  
336 to remember that diet is also dependent on environmental prey availability. In addition,  
337 selectivity differences across siphonophore species could be also driven by other phenotypes not  
338 accounted for in this study. Finally, further observations on behavior, digestion biochemistry,  
339 and toxin composition are necessary to assess their relative importance in determining diet.

## 340 Conclusions

341 Most studies on the evolution of predation have focused on vertebrate systems with an inte-  
342 grated feeding apparatus serving multiple functions. This has led to a narrow understanding of  
343 the evolutionary outcomes of specialization, where extreme morphological evolution constrains  
344 further shifts in their ecology. Siphonophores differ in many ways from commonly-known  
345 predators, using modular weapons for prey capture (the tentilla) that are fully decoupled from  
346 other structures and body functions. Our analysis of the evolutionary history of dietary spe-  
347 cialization and morphological change in these elusive animals has revealed notable deviations  
348 from traditional expectations. While much of the feeding ecology literature focuses on how  
349 predatory generalists evolve into predatory specialists, in siphonophores we find predatory  
350 specialists can evolve into generalists, and that specialists on one prey type have directly  
351 evolved into specialists on other prey types. We find that the character states, evolutionary  
352 optima, and genetic correlations of many morphological characters have evolved following  
353 these ecological shifts. We find that the relationships between form and ecology hold across a  
354 large set of siphonophore taxa and characters. These findings are central to understanding  
355 the evolutionary mechanisms driving the emergence of food web complexity.

## 356 Materials and Methods

357 *Tentillum morphology* – The morphological work was carried out on siphonophore specimens  
358 fixed in 4% formalin from the Yale Peabody Museum Invertebrate Zoology (YPM-IZ) collection  
359 (accession numbers in Dryad repository). These specimens were collected intact across many  
360 years of fieldwork expeditions, using blue-water diving (41), remotely operated vehicles  
361 (ROVs), plankton net trawls, and human-operated submersibles. Tentacles were dissected  
362 from non-larval gastrozooids, sequentially dehydrated into 100% ethanol, cleared in methyl  
363 salicylate, and mounted onto slides with Canada Balsam or Permount mounting media.  
364 The slides were imaged as tiled z-stacks using differential interference contrast (DIC) on an  
365 automated stage at YPM-IZ (with the assistance of Daniel Drew and Eric Lazo-Wasem) and

366 with laser point confocal microscopy using a 488 nm Argon laser that excited autofluorescence  
367 in the tissues. Thirty characters (defined in S1) were measured using Fiji (42, 43). We did not  
368 measure the lengths of contractile structures (terminal filaments, pedicles, gastrozooids, and  
369 tentacles) since they are too variable to quantify. We measured at least one specimen for 96  
370 different species (raw data available in Dryad). Of these, we selected 38 focal species across  
371 clades based on specimen availability and phylogenetic representation. Three to five tentacle  
372 specimens from each one of these selected species were measured to capture intraspecific  
373 variation.

374 *Siphonophore phylogeny* – While the main goal of this work is not to elucidate a novel  
375 phylogeny for Siphonophora, we did expand on the most recent transcriptome based phylogeny  
376 (24) to accommodate a larger taxon sampling. In order to do this, we ran a constrained analysis  
377 on an extensive 18S+16S dataset. The phylogenetic analysis included 55 siphonophore species  
378 and 6 outgroup cnidarian species (*Clytia hemisphaerica*, *Hydra circumcincta*, *Ectopleura*  
379 *dumortieri*, *Porpita porpita*, *Velella velella*, *Staurocladia wellingtoni*). The gene sequences we  
380 used in this study are available online (accession numbers in Dryad repository). Some of the  
381 sequences we used were accessioned in (27), and others we extracted from the transcriptomes  
382 in (24). Two new 16S sequences for *Frillagalma vityazi* (MK958598) and *Thermopalia* sp.  
383 (MK958599) sequenced by Lynne Christianson using the primers from (44) (read 3' to 5' F:  
384 TCGACTGTTACCAAAAAACATAGC , R: ACGGAATGAACTCAAATCATGTAAG) were  
385 included and accessioned to NCBI. Additional details on the phylogenetic inference methods  
386 can be found in the Supplementary Methods.

387 Unconstrained ML and Bayesian phylogenies were congruent (S2,S5). Given the broader  
388 sequence sampling of the transcriptome phylogeny, we ran constrained inferences (using  
389 both ML and Bayesian approaches, which produced fully congruent topologies (S4,S6)) after  
390 clamping the 5 nodes (S3) that were incongruent with the topology of the consensus tree in  
391 (24). This topology was then used to inform a Bayesian relaxed molecular clock time-tree  
392 in RevBayes, using a birth-death process (sampling probability calculated from the known

393 number of described siphonophore species) to generate ultrametric branch lengths (S7-8).

394 Scripts and tree files available in the Dryad repository.

395 *Feeding ecology* – We extracted categorical diet data for different siphonophore species  
396 from published sources, including seminal papers (4, 25, 32, 45–48), and ROV observation  
397 data (22, 49) with the assistance of Elizabeth Hetherington and C. Anela Choy (data available  
398 in Dryad repository). In order to detect coarse-level patterns in feeding habits, the data  
399 were merged into feeding guilds. For more details on how the diet data was curated and  
400 summarized into guilds, please see Supplementary Methods.

401 We also extracted copepod prey length data from (25). To calculate specific prey  
402 selectivities, we extracted quantitative diet and zooplankton composition data from (32),  
403 matched each diet assessment to each prey field quantification by site, calculated Ivlev's  
404 electivity indices (50), and averaged those by species (data available in Dryad repository).

405 *Statistical analyses* – We used a series of phylogenetic comparative methods to test the  
406 evolutionary hypotheses presented in this study. We reconstructed ancestral states using ML  
407 (R phytools::anc.ML (51)), and stochastic character mapping (R phytools::make.simmap) for  
408 categorical characters. For more details on the data wrangling prior to these analyses, please  
409 see the Supplementary Methods. R scripts available in the Dryad repository.

410 In order to study the evolution of predatory specialization, we reconstructed components  
411 of the diet and prey selectivity on the phylogeny using ML (R phytools::anc.ML). To identify  
412 evolutionary associations of diet with tentillum and nematocyst characters, we compared the  
413 performance of a neutral evolution model to that of a diet-driven directional selection model.  
414 First, we collapsed the diet data into the five feeding guilds mentioned above (fish specialist,  
415 small crustacean specialist, large crustacean specialist, gelatinous specialist, generalist), based  
416 on which prey types they were observed consuming most frequently. Then, we reconstructed  
417 the feeding guild ancestral states using the ML function ace (package ape (52)), removing tips  
418 with no feeding data. The ML reconstruction was congruent with the consensus stochastic  
419 character mapping (S15). Then, using the package *OUwie* (53), we fitted an OU model with

420 multiple optima and rates of evolution (OUM) matched to the reconstructed ancestral diet  
421 regimes, a single optimum OU model, and a BM null model, inspired by the analyses in (54).  
422 We then ranked the models in order of increasing parametric complexity (BM, OU, OUM),  
423 and compared the corrected Akaike Information Criterion (AICc) support scores (55) to the  
424 lowest (best) score, using a cutoff of 2 units to determine significantly better support. When  
425 the best fitting model was not significantly better than a less complex alternative, we selected  
426 the least complex model (S9). In addition, we calculated and reported the model adequacy  
427 scores using the R package *arbutus* (56).

428 In order to study correlations between the rates of evolution between different characters,  
429 we fitted a set of evolutionary variance-covariance matrices (33) (R phytools::evol.vcv). For  
430 more details on the data wrangling preceding these analyses, please see Supplementary  
431 Methods. To test whether phenotypic integration changed across selective regimes determined  
432 by the reconstructed feeding guilds, we carried out character-pairwise variance-covariance  
433 analysis comparing alternative models (R phytools::evolvcv.lite), including those where  
434 correlations are the same across the whole tree and models where correlations differ between  
435 selective regimes (S19). Number of taxa used in each pairwise comparison is reported in S20.  
436 Finally, we compared regime-specific variance-covariance matrices to the general matrix and  
437 to their preceding regime matrix to identify the changes in character dependences unique to  
438 each regime (S21-22).

439 We carried out a linear discriminant analysis of principal components (DAPC) using  
440 the dapc function (R adegenet::dapc) (57). This function allowed us to incorporate more  
441 predictors than individuals. We generated discriminant functions for feeding guild, and  
442 for the presence of copepods, fish, and shrimp (large crustaceans) in the diet (S10-13).  
443 From these DAPCs we obtained the highest contributing morphological characters to the  
444 discrimination (characters in the top quartile of the weighted sum of the linear discriminant  
445 loadings controlling for the eigenvalue of each discriminant). In order to identify the sign of  
446 the relationship between the predictor characters and prey type presence in the diet, we then

447 generated generalized logistic regression models (as a type of generalized linear model, or  
448 GLM using R stats::glm) and phylogenetic generalized linear models (R phylolm::phyloglm)  
449 with the top contributing characters (from the corresponding DAPC) as predictors (S14). We  
450 also carried out these GLMs on the Ivlev's selectivity indices for each prey type calculated  
451 from (32). In addition, we ran a series of comparative analyses to address hypotheses of diet-  
452 tentillum relationships posed in the literature. Additional details on the DAPC optimization  
453 are available in the Supplementary Materials.

## 454 **Supplementary Materials**

455 Data available from the Dryad Digital Repository: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5061/dryad.NNNN>  
456 Supplementary Materials are available in [https://github.com/dunnlab/tentilla\\_morph/](https://github.com/dunnlab/tentilla_morph/)  
457 Supplement\_forSupershort.pdf

## 458 **Acknowledgements**

459 This work was supported by the Society of Systematic Biologists (Graduate Student Award  
460 to A.D.S.); the Yale Institute of Biospheric Studies (Doctoral Pilot Grant to A.D.S.); and  
461 the National Science Foundation (Waterman Award to C.W.D., and NSF-OCE 1829835 to  
462 C.W.D., S.H.D.H., and C. Anela Choy). A.D.S. was supported by a Fulbright Spain Graduate  
463 Studies Scholarship. We wish to thank the crew and scientists of the R/V Western Flyer, who  
464 participated in the collection of many of the specimens used in this study. We also want to  
465 thank Lynne Christianson and Shannon Johnson from the Monterey Bay Aquarium Research  
466 Institute for their assistance in the field as well as for sequencing some of the species included  
467 in this phylogeny. In addition, we wish to thank Lourdes Rojas, Daniel Drew, and Eric  
468 Lazo-Wasem for their assistance in imaging the fixed specimens and managing the collections.  
469 We thank Dennis Pilarczyk for organizing the prey selectivity data, Michael Landis for  
470 helping design the Bayesian analyses, and Joaquin Nunez for reviewing this manuscript.  
471 Furthermore, we thank Elizabeth D. Hetherington and C. Anela Choy for collating the data

472 on siphonophore feeding and for reviewing the manuscript. Finally, we thank Philip Pugh,  
473 who confirmed many of our specimen identifications and taught us valuable knowledge about  
474 siphonophores.

475 **References**

- 476 1. Schmitz O (2017) Predator and prey functional traits: Understanding the adaptive  
477 machinery driving predator–prey interactions. *F1000Research* 6.
- 478 2. Mapstone GM (2014) Global diversity and review of siphonophorae (cnidaria: Hydro-  
479 zoa). *PLoS One* 9(2):e87737.
- 480 3. Skaer R (1988) *The formation of cnidocyte patterns in siphonophores* (Academic Press  
481 New York).
- 482 4. Mackie GO, Pugh PR, Purcell JE (1987) Siphonophore Biology. *Advances in Marine  
483 Biology* 24:97–262.
- 484 5. Purcell JE (1980) Influence of siphonophore behavior upon their natural diets: Evidence  
485 for aggressive mimicry. *Science* 209(4460):1045–1047.
- 486 6. Haddock SH, Dunn CW, Pugh PR, Schnitzler CE (2005) Bioluminescent and red-  
487 fluorescent lures in a deep-sea siphonophore. *Science* 309(5732):263–263.
- 488 7. Haddock SH, Dunn CW (2015) Fluorescent proteins function as a prey attractant:  
489 Experimental evidence from the hydromedusa olindias formosus and other marine organisms.  
490 *Biology open* 4(9):1094–1104.
- 491 8. Robison BH (2004) Deep pelagic biology. *Journal of experimental marine biology and  
492 ecology* 300(1-2):253–272.
- 493 9. Simpson GG (1944) *Tempo and mode in evolution* (Columbia University Press).
- 494 10. Hardin G (1960) The competitive exclusion principle. *science* 131(3409):1292–1297.
- 495 11. Hutchinson GE (1961) The paradox of the plankton. *The American Naturalist*  
496 95(882):137–145.
- 497 12. Futuyma DJ, Moreno G (1988) The evolution of ecological specialization. *Annual*

- 498 *review of Ecology and Systematics* 19(1):207–233.
- 499 13. Siddall ME, Brooks DR, Desser SS (1993) Phylogeny and the reversibility of parasitism.
- 500 *Evolution* 47(1):308–313.
- 501 14. Hougen-Eitzman D, Rausher MD (1994) Interactions between herbivorous insects and
- 502 plant-insect coevolution. *The American Naturalist* 143(4):677–697.
- 503 15. Robinson BW, Wilson DS, Shea GO (1996) Trade-offs of ecological specialization: An
- 504 intraspecific comparison of pumpkinseed sunfish phenotypes. *Ecology* 77(1):170–178.
- 505 16. Kelley ST, Farrell BD (1998) Is specialization a dead end? The phylogeny of host use
- 506 in *dendroctonus* bark beetles (scolytidae). *Evolution* 52(6):1731–1743.
- 507 17. Stireman-III JO (2005) The evolution of generalization? Parasitoid flies and the
- 508 perils of inferring host range evolution from phylogenies. *Journal of evolutionary biology*
- 509 18(2):325–336.
- 510 18. Johnson KP, Malenke JR, Clayton DH (2009) Competition promotes the evolution of
- 511 host generalists in obligate parasites. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*
- 512 276(1675):3921–3926.
- 513 19. Nosil P (2002) Transition rates between specialization and generalization in phy-
- 514 tophagous insects. *Evolution* 56(8):1701–1706.
- 515 20. Hoberg EP, Brooks DR (2008) A macroevolutionary mosaic: Episodic host-switching,
- 516 geographical colonization and diversification in complex host–parasite systems. *Journal of*
- 517 *Biogeography* 35(9):1533–1550.
- 518 21. Hardy NB, Otto SP (2014) Specialization and generalization in the diversification of
- 519 phytophagous insects: Tests of the musical chairs and oscillation hypotheses. *Proceedings of*
- 520 *the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 281(1795):20132960.
- 521 22. Choy CA, Haddock SH, Robison BH (2017) Deep pelagic food web structure as
- 522 revealed by in situ feeding observations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*
- 523 *Sciences* 284(1868):20172116.
- 524 23. Costello JH, Colin SP, Gemmell BJ, Dabiri JO, Sutherland KR (2015) Multi-jet propul-

- 525 sion organized by clonal development in a colonial siphonophore. *Nature communications*  
526 6:8158.
- 527 24. Munro C, et al. (2018) Improved phylogenetic resolution within siphonophora  
528 (cnidaria) with implications for trait evolution. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*.
- 529 25. Purcell JE (1984) The functions of nematocysts in prey capture by epipelagic  
530 siphonophores (coelenterata, hydrozoa). *The Biological Bulletin* 166(2):310–327.
- 531 26. Purcell J, Mills C (1988) The correlation of nematocyst types to diets in pelagic  
532 hydrozoa. In “the biology of nematocysts”.(Eds da hessinger and hm lenhoff.) pp. 463–485.
- 533 27. Dunn CW, Pugh PR, Haddock SH (2005) Molecular phylogenetics of the siphonophora  
534 (cnidaria), with implications for the evolution of functional specialization. *Systematic biology*  
535 54(6):916–935.
- 536 28. Nosil P, Mooers A (2005) Testing hypotheses about ecological specialization using  
537 phylogenetic trees. *Evolution* 59(10):2256–2263.
- 538 29. Martins EP (1996) Phylogenies, spatial autoregression, and the comparative method:  
539 A computer simulation test. *Evolution* 50(5):1750–1765.
- 540 30. Uhlenbeck GE, Ornstein LS (1930) On the theory of the brownian motion. *Physical*  
541 *review* 36(5):823.
- 542 31. Butler MA, King AA (2004) Phylogenetic comparative analysis: A modeling approach  
543 for adaptive evolution. *The American Naturalist* 164(6):683–695.
- 544 32. Purcell J (1981) Dietary composition and diel feeding patterns of epipelagic  
545 siphonophores. *Marine Biology* 65(1):83–90.
- 546 33. Revell LJ, Collar DC (2009) Phylogenetic analysis of the evolutionary correlation  
547 using likelihood. *Evolution: International Journal of Organic Evolution* 63(4):1090–1100.
- 548 34. Young NM, Hallgrímsson B (2005) Serial homology and the evolution of mammalian  
549 limb covariation structure. *Evolution* 59(12):2691–2704.
- 550 35. Goswami A (2006) Morphological integration in the carnivoran skull. *Evolution*  
551 60(1):169–183.

- 552        36. Monteiro LR, Nogueira MR (2010) Adaptive radiations, ecological specialization, and  
553        the evolutionary integration of complex morphological structures. *Evolution: International*  
554        *Journal of Organic Evolution* 64(3):724–744.
- 555        37. Hallgrí'msson B, et al. (2012) The generation of variation and the developmental  
556        basis for evolutionary novelty. *Journal of Experimental Zoology Part B: Molecular and*  
557        *Developmental Evolution* 318(6):501–517.
- 558        38. Claverie T, Patek S (2013) Modularity and rates of evolutionary change in a power-  
559        amplified prey capture system. *Evolution* 67(11):3191–3207.
- 560        39. Caetano DS, Harmon LJ (2018) Estimating correlated rates of trait evolution with  
561        uncertainty. *Systematic biology* 68(3):412–429.
- 562        40. Collar DC, Near TJ, Wainwright PC (2005) Comparative analysis of morphological  
563        diversity: Does disparity accumulate at the same rate in two lineages of centrarchid fishes?  
564        *Evolution* 59(8):1783–1794.
- 565        41. Haddock SH, Heine JN (2005) *Scientific blue-water diving* (California Sea Grant  
566        College Program).
- 567        42. Collins TJ (2007) ImageJ for microscopy. *Biotechniques* 43(S1):S25–S30.
- 568        43. Schindelin J, et al. (2012) Fiji: An open-source platform for biological-image analysis.  
569        *Nature methods* 9(7):676.
- 570        44. Cunningham CW, Buss LW (1993) Molecular evidence for multiple episodes of  
571        paedomorphosis in the family hydractiniidae. *Biochemical Systematics and Ecology* 21(1):57–  
572        69.
- 573        45. Biggs DC (1977) Field studies of fishing, feeding, and digestion in siphonophores.  
574        *Marine & Freshwater Behaviour & Phy* 4(4):261–274.
- 575        46. Pugh P, Youngbluth M (1988) Two new species of prayine siphonophore (calycophorae,  
576        prayidae) collected by the submersibles johnson-sea-link i and ii. *Journal of Plankton Research*  
577        10(4):637–657.
- 578        47. Bardi J, Marques AC (2007) Taxonomic redescription of the portuguese man-of-war,

- 579 physalia physalis (cnidaria, hydrozoa, siphonophorae, cystonectae) from brazil. *Iheringia*  
580 *Série Zoologia* 97(4):425–433.
- 581 48. Andersen OGN (1981) *Redescription of marrus orthocanna (kramp, 1942)*(Cnidaria,  
582 siphonophora) (Zoological Museum, University of Copenhagen).
- 583 49. Hissmann K (2005) In situ observations on benthic siphonophores (physonectae: Rho-  
584 daliidae) and descriptions of three new species from indonesia and south africa. *Systematics*  
585 and *Biodiversity* 2(3):223–249.
- 586 50. Jacobs J (1974) Quantitative measurement of food selection. *Oecologia* 14(4):413–417.
- 587 51. Revell LJ (2012) Phytools: An r package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and  
588 other things). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 3(2):217–223.
- 589 52. Paradis E, et al. (2019) Package “ape”. *Analyses of phylogenetics and evolution,*  
590 *version:2–4*.
- 591 53. Beaulieu J, O’Meara B (2012) OUwie: Analysis of evolutionary rates in an ou  
592 framework. R package version 1.17.
- 593 54. Cressler CE, Butler MA, King AA (2015) Detecting adaptive evolution in phylogenetic  
594 comparative analysis using the ornstein–uhlenbeck model. *Systematic biology* 64(6):953–968.
- 595 55. Sugiura N (1978) Further analysts of the data by akaike’s information criterion  
596 and the finite corrections: Further analysts of the data by akaike’s. *Communications in*  
597 *Statistics-Theory and Methods* 7(1):13–26.
- 598 56. Pennell MW, FitzJohn RG, Cornwell WK, Harmon LJ (2015) Model adequacy and the  
599 macroevolution of angiosperm functional traits. *The American Naturalist* 186(2):E33–E50.
- 600 57. Jombart T, Devillard S, Balloux F (2010) Discriminant analysis of principal compo-  
601 nents: A new method for the analysis of genetically structured populations. *BMC genetics*  
602 11(1):94.