

Eco-evolutionary diversification of trait convergence and complementarity in mutualistic networks

Francisco Encinas-Viso^{1,*}, Rampal S. Etienne^{2,**} and Carlos J. Melián^{3,**}

1) NRCA & Centre for Australian National Biodiversity Research, CSIRO, GPO Box 1600
Canberra, Australia

2) Groningen Institute for Evolutionary Life Sciences, University of Groningen, The Netherlands

3) Department of Fish Ecology and Evolution, Center for Ecology, Evolution and Biogeochemistry,
EAWAG, Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology, Switzerland

Keywords: Diffuse coevolution, specialization, sexual reproduction, assortative mating, dispersal limitation, phylogenetic relatedness, obligate mutualism, morphological constraints, individual based model.

Type of Article: Letters

Number of figures: 6 in color; Number of tables: 1

* Corresponding author: franencinas@gmail.com

** Joint last authorship

1 Mutualistic networks show high levels of convergence, complementarity and nestedness.
2 Convergence and complementarity have been attributed to coevolutionary interaction se-
3 lection under a phenotype matching scenario. It is not clear, however, whether phenotype
4 matching fits empirical patterns better than a phenotype difference scenario. Here, we
5 present a spatially and genetically explicit plant-animal trait diversification model com-
6 bining the phenotype matching and phenotype difference model. Our model predicts high
7 levels of convergence, complementarity, and nestedness. Comparing the predictions with
8 observed levels of complementarity and convergence in an empirical plant-hummingbird
9 mutualistic network, we find good predictions except for convergence patterns in plants.
10 Our results indicate that combining the spatial structure of plant-animal trait diversifica-
11 tion with population dynamics in a phenotypic difference model may alter predictions in
12 a direction that is more in line with observations, and hence are important to be included
13 in future studies of coevolutionary dynamics in mutualistic networks.

14 Introduction

15 Since Darwin's book "On The Origin of Species" (Darwin, 1859), the idea of coevolution, defined as
16 reciprocal evolutionary trait change between species, has sparked interest from biologists trying to
17 understand how species interactions generate trait changes. The first clear indication of coevolution
18 was Darwin's moth example (Darwin, 1862) showing that the long corolla from the orchid *Angraecum*
19 *sesquipedale* could only be reached by a pollinator species with a similar or larger proboscis length.
20 Following the moth and orchid mutualism model system, several studies have modeled coevolutionary
21 dynamics of a few species (Ferriere et al., 2007; Law et al., 2001; Ferdy et al., 2002; Gomulkiewicz
22 et al., 2003; Jones et al., 2009), particularly highly specialized (i.e. obligatory mutualists) systems of
23 plant-animal interactions, such as the fig-fig wasp mutualism (Bronstein et al., 2006). These studies
24 have determined the ecological conditions for coevolutionary stable systems in highly specialized
25 plant-animal interactions (Law et al., 2001; Jones et al., 2009)

26 Janzen (1980) argued that high specialization between plants and animals was not the only example
27 of coevolution, but coevolution can also be the product of multiple-species interactions, a term that
28 he coined "diffuse coevolution". Diffuse coevolution means that selection on traits is determined by
29 the interaction of more than two species and not only based on pairwise interactions. This concept
30 is based on the idea of "syndromes", where, for example, plants have a set of traits that attract
31 a specific group of pollinator species with traits complementary to those of the plants (Jousselin
32 et al., 2003; Guimarães et al., 2011). Evolutionary convergence, i.e. independent evolution of similar
33 features among different lineages of the same plant or animal community may partly explain the
34 formation of "syndromes" produced by the presence of specific mutualist partner species (Howe and
35 Smallwood (1982); Waser et al. (1996); Bascompte and Jordano (2007); Stayton (2008); Losos (2011)).

36 Theoretical studies suggest that evolutionary convergence and complementarity are generated by
37 coevolutionary interaction selection driven by a "phenotype matching model" (Nuismer et al. 2005;
38 Kopp and Gavrillets 2006). For example, in highly specialized two-species interactions such as the
39 fig-fig wasp mutualism (Bronstein et al., 2006), plants coevolve with their most efficient pollinator to
40 strengthen the complementarity of their matching traits. The phenotype matching model assumes
41 that the probability of a successful interaction decreases with increasing distance between the pheno-
42 types of the interacting individuals (Nuismer et al, 2012). Examples are plant and animal phenology

(Jordano et al. 2003; Olesen et al. 2010; Encinas-Viso et al., 2012) or proboscis and corolla lengths (Agosta and Janzen 2005; Santamaría and Rodríguez-Gironés 2007; Stang et al. 2007).

Only two theoretical studies have explored the importance of coevolutionary selection and phenotype matching in the emergence of convergence, complementarity and network structure in species-rich mutualistic networks (Nuismer et al., 2012; Guimarães et al., 2011). Guimarães et al. (2011) studied a coevolutionary model with a fixed network structure and showed that convergence in a one-dimensional trait may emerge as a consequence of coevolutionary selection for a complementarity trait between trophic levels. Nuismer et al. (2012) explored the importance of coevolutionary selection in a multispecies context to study the emergence of convergence, complementarity and network structure in mutualistic networks. They found that weak coevolutionary selection produces little to no convergence but generates high complementarity. As coevolutionary selection intensifies, variation in the trait values of animal and plant species is reduced and high convergence emerges but complementarity decreases. Furthermore they found antinested networks regardless of the strength of coevolutionary selection.

Nuismer et al. (2012) also used an alternative model called “phenotypic difference” in which the success probability of an interaction increases with the degree to which the animal trait exceeds the plant trait as might be the case for fruit and beak size in a dispersal mutualism (Lambert 1989; da Silva and Tabarelli 2000) or proboscis and corolla length in some pollination mutualisms (Inouye 1980; Borrell 2007; Anderson and Johnson 2009; Anderson et al. 2010). They showed that under the phenotypic difference model networks were more nested when coevolutionary selection was weak. Furthermore, similar to the phenotypic matching model, convergence increases with the strength of coevolution in the phenotypic difference model (but only when interactions depend strongly of phenotypes); however complementarity is weaker for interactions mediated by phenotype difference than those mediated by phenotype matchings. Taken together, these results suggest that it is not trivial to simultaneously explain high degrees of convergence, complementarity and nestedness in species-rich mutualistic networks as observed in empirical data (Bascompte and Jordano (2007).

The failure of successfully explaining three patterns simultaneously may also be a consequence of factors currently lacking in coevolutionary models of mutualistic networks, such as the role of genetics, gene flow, and assortative mating in plant-animal trait diversification (Gavrilets et al. (2000); de Aguiar

et al. (2009); Schluter (2009); Doebeli (2011); Seehausen et al. (2014)), and spatial structure and population dynamics. For example, although gene flow can be seen as an homogenizing factor, there is increasing evidence showing the importance of gene flow in the speciation process (Nosil, 2008) as well as the importance of spatial structure de Aguiar et al. (2009). ~~However, more importantly, there is no doubt that considering genetic processes (e.g. drift, selection) are essential to understand biodiversification patterns.~~ In this study we present an integrative model to study the patterns of convergence, complementarity and nestedness in a model that includes genetic processes, sexual reproduction, spatial structure, population and trait diversification dynamics. Our model lies between a phenotype matching and phenotype difference model, as an interaction can only occur when the animal trait exceeds the plant trait, but the probability of success does not increase with this difference. Furthermore, we use a definition of convergence that accounts for phylogenetic relatedness.

In contrast to previous studies, our model shows high levels of convergence, complementarity and nestedness. Comparing these predictions to convergence and complementarity patterns observed in a plant-hummingbird mutualistic network, we find that the model is in agreement with observed level of plant-animal complementarity and convergence for the hummingbird community, but conflicts with convergence in the plant community. Our results indicate that combining the spatial structure of plant-animal trait diversification with population dynamics in a phenotype difference model alter predictions in a direction that is more in line with observations, and hence are important to be included in future studies of evolutionary patterns in mutualistic networks.

Eco-evolutionary trait diversification in mutualistic networks

To study the effect of spatial structure and plant-animal trait diversification on convergence, complementarity and nestedness in mutualistic networks, we develop a spatial quantitative genetics model for plant-animal interactions with overlapping generations. Individuals have fixed genome size and we start with one plant and animal species with all individuals having the same genetic composition at the outset (see Figure 1 for the steps of the model). Following population demography males and females individuals in both communities must be close enough in spatial, genetic, and morphological space for an obligate mutualistic interactions to occur (Figure 1 step B) and to produce offspring

99 with a new genotype-phenotype after mutation, recombination and phenotypic plasticity (Figure 1
100 step C, D and E). We follow the species definition of Nei et al. (1983), where a species is a group
101 of interbreeding and successfully reproducing individuals that are reproductively isolated from other
102 groups. In our model two individuals can mate successfully if their genetic similarity value is larger
103 than or equal to the minimum genetic similarity value. Thus, speciation is defined as a group of
104 genetically related individuals, where two individuals in a sexual population can be incompatible, but
105 still conspecific as long as they can exchange genes indirectly through other conspecifics (de Aguiar
106 et al., 2009; Melián et al., 2010). This is the definition of 'ring species' (Moritz and Schneider, 1992).
107 Please refer to Figure 1, Table 1 and SI for a detailed explanation of the terms included in the model
108 and how we model population dynamics, diversification dynamics, quantitative trait dynamics and
109 neutral locus evolution, respectively.

110 **Convergence, complementarity, nestedness and connectance**

111 **Evolutionary convergence and complementarity**

112 A focal species is considered to have convergent traits with another species if it is phenotypically
113 more similar to this other species than to the genetically most similar species (the sister species)
114 (see figure 2 and SI). The number of convergences potentially increases with the number of species
115 present. For example, if we have ten species and we exclude one of them as the sister species of the
116 focal species, we have nine species to calculate convergence. If we find that two out of nine species are
117 phenotypically similar enough to the focal species, we count two (out of nine, ~ 22%) convergences.
118 We repeat this by changing the focal species and calculate the mean number of convergence events
119 over all species. In contrast to previous approaches that used the mean pair-wise difference between
120 traits of species (Guimarães et al., 2011) or the variance of species traits in a guild as a proxy to
121 predict convergence (i.e., large values weak convergence whereas small values of the variance may
122 indicate strong convergence, (Nuismer et al., 2012)), our method considering phylogenetic relatedness
123 is that it excludes cases of development of very similar trait values in sister species due to shared
124 evolutionary history and therefore it does not overestimate convergence events.

125 The condition for complementarity between two mutualistic partners is simply that the phenotypic

126 similarity between them, is larger than some predefined phenotypic threshold value

127 We refer to the SI for a detailed explanation of phenotypic similarity and mean genetic and
128 phenotypic species similarity, and a precise definition of complementarity and convergence in terms
129 of these similarities.

130 Nestedness and connectance

131 To study the connection between convergence and complementarity with network properties, we mea-
132 sured two topological properties of plant-animal mutualistic networks: nestedness and connectance.
133 We estimated nestedness using the NODF algorithm developed by (Almeida-Neto et al., 2008) be-
134 cause of its statistical robustness. NODF is based on standardized differences in row and column fills
135 and paired matching of occurrences. Connectance measures the proportion of realized interactions
136 among all possible interactions in a network. It is defined as $C = \frac{k}{P \times A}$, where k represents the number
137 of realized interactions between plant and animal species and P and A represent the number of plant
138 and animal species in the network, respectively (Jordano et al., 2003).

139 Simulations

140 We simulated equal population sizes for plants and animals with $J^P = J^A = 1,000$ individuals.
141 Genome size, L , of each individual was 150 loci. Initial trait distributions for the plants, $Z^P = [z_i^P]$
142 and animals, $Z^A = [z_i^A]$, were generated following equation 2 plus a normally distributed environ-
143 mental effect, ϵ , $\mathcal{N}(\mu_\epsilon = 0, \sigma_\epsilon^2 = 1)$. To ensure plant mating conditions are met at the beginning of
144 the simulation all animal individuals have a higher phenotypic trait value than the plant individuals.

145 Geographic distances between each pair of individuals i and j for the plants, d_{ij}^P , and animals,
146 d_{ij}^A , were calculated as follows: 1) Euclidean coordinates of a two-dimensional space (x_i, y_i) were
147 sampled from a uniform distribution $(x_i = [0, 1], y_i = [0, 1])$ for each individual for the plants and
148 animals; 2) Using these coordinates we calculated a matrix of relative Euclidean distances between
149 the individuals for the plants, d_{ij}^P , and animals, d_{ij}^A . This procedure was repeated for each of the
150 geographic distance matrices (D^{PA}, D^P, D^A) (See Table 1 and SI).

151 We ran 2,000 generations for each replicate for a total of 500 replicates, where a generation is

the update of the effective population size ($J^P = J^A = 1,000$), i.e. the number of steps equal to the effective population size. Steady-state was verified by checking the constancy of speciation events during the last 1000 generations. We calculated convergence, complementarity, nestedness and connectance at steady-state. Convergence and complementarity events were calculated for a whole range ($[0.0, 1.0]$) of their respective thresholds, t_{conv} and t_{comp} . We explored parameter combinations with mutation rate, $\mu \in \{10^{-4}, 10^{-2}\}$, minimum genetic similarity, $q_{min} = 0.97$, maximum distance for finding a mate and disperse, $d_{max} \in \{0.1, 0.3\}$, and a maximum geographic distance to find a mutualistic partner, $d_{max}^{PA} = 0.3$. We implemented the model in Python (and tested in IPython (Pérez and Granger, 2007)).

Confrontation to empirical data

We tested our model's predictions of convergence and complementarity on a plant-hummingbird network with 38 hummingbird species and 133 plant species (Maglianesi et al. (2014)). To compute phenotypic similarity we used empirical values of corolla length and bill length from plants and hummingbirds, respectively (REF). To compute phylogenetic similarity for the hummingbirds we used a well resolved recently published comprehensive phylogeny (McGuire et al, 2014) to obtain phylogenetic relationships for 24 out of 38 hummingbird species; the remaining 14 species were not present in the phylogenetic tree. For the plant species we constructed a phylogenetic tree using sequence data of 69 species from GenBank (data on rbcL, matK and ndhF genes collected by PhyloGenerator using the option THOROUGH to allow also data from close relatives if these relatives were not present in the community), aligned them using MUSCLE (REF) and coconstructed the maximum likelihood (ML) tree using RAXML (REF). We excluded 64 plant species from the analysis (see Suppl. Information) because there was no sequence data available or the phylogenetic relationships were not well resolved.

We used the phylogenetic trees with their respective branch lengths to calculate a genetic distance matrix among species. Using both phylogenetic trees (hummingbirds and plants) we simulated nucleotide sequences of 100 bp with the program SeqGen (Rambaut and Grassly, 1997) following the Jukes-Cantor model of molecular evolution. These simulated sequences were then used to calculate

the genetic distance matrix using the R package *seqinr* in R (R Core Team, 2013). To compare the convergence values obtained from the empirical data with our model predictions, we generated 1000 replicates from the simulations (bootstrapping) with each replicate containing the same number of plant and animal species as the empirical data. Mean values as well 0.05 and 0.95 CI were generated from these 1000 replicates. Complementarity and convergence were calculated for each of the replicates across the whole range of convergence, t_{conv} , and complementarity, t_{comp} , thresholds. . We used a conservative definition for convergence in which not only the sister species, but the 30% most genetically similar species were excluded.

Results

Trait evolution

Population dynamics and diversification dynamics changed plant and animal community trait distributions (i.e. corolla and proboscis lengths) with bimodal distributions being the most commonly produced patterns across replicates (figure 3). At the species level, a gradient of species phenotypes with common species presenting lower mean and higher variance than rare species emerged. Mean and variance of the trait values were correlated for most replicates (Spearman- $\rho > 0.41$, $p < 0.05$) and the distributions of abundance for plant or animal species were highly skewed and significantly different from a normal distribution (Lilliefors's test, all $p < 0.001$). Abundance predicted plant or animal mean species traits in approximately 70% of the replicates (Spearman- $\rho > 0.32$, $p < 0.05$) and trait variance for all replicates ($0.39 < \text{Spearman-}\rho < 0.79$, all $p < 0.05$). Mean and variance of species trait values significantly differed between common and rare plant or animal species (inset in figure 3) suggesting a strong impact of diversification by producing a gradient of species phenotypes in mutualistic networks.

Convergence and complementarity

Evolutionary convergence events occurred in all replicate simulations (see equations SI-4 and SI-5 with an example of evolutionary convergence events in animals and plants represented in figure 4). Convergence events were heterogeneously distributed across species with most events occurring

205 between common species ($0.42 < \text{Spearman-}\rho < 0.89$, all $p < 0.05$). Evolutionary convergence
 206 occurred on average in $17.3 \pm 6\%$ of all possible convergence events with more than 95% of these
 207 events involving some of the three most common species. These results show that evolutionary
 208 convergence is not randomly distributed across pairs of species but highly aggregated during the
 209 diversification process. Evolutionary convergence can also be visualized using a scatter plot of the
 210 genotype-phenotype map for all pairs of individuals within the plant and animal communities (see
 211 Figure SI-1 Supplementary Information). As expected from equation ??, there is a positive genotype-
 212 phenotype relationship. The scatter plot contains three main clouds of points that consistently
 213 occur in our simulations for the plants, P , and animals, A : 1) pairs of individuals of the same
 214 species with high genetic ($q_{ij} > q_{min}$) and phenotypic ($p_{ij} > 0.9$) similarity, 2) pairs of individuals
 215 of the same species with genetic similarity below q_{min} ($q_{ij} < q_{min} = 0.97$) and high phenotypic
 216 similarity ($p_{ij} > 0.9$). These are incompatible individuals of the same species for mating, yet with
 217 high phenotypic similarity, $p_{ij} > 0.9$, and 3) highly genetically dissimilar individuals from different
 218 species, $q_{ij} \ll q_{min}$, but with the presence of highly phenotypically similar individuals ($p_{ij} > 0.9$).
 219 This last category shows evidence of evolutionary convergence between species in plants and animals.
 220 An increase in mutation rate increases the genetic divergence between species, as expected, but it
 221 does not change the genotype-phenotype relationship qualitatively (see Figure SI-1 Supplementary
 222 Information).

223 Evolutionary complementarity occurred with a similar frequency as evolutionary convergence in
 224 each replicate (see equation SI-5 and compare the initial with the final trait distributions in figure
 225 3), but with a larger variation ($20 \pm 18\%$). Connectance values were consistently medium or high
 226 ($\bar{C} = 0.5 \pm 0.07$, figure 5), mostly larger than reported in empirical data where it ranges between 0.05
 227 and 0.25. Nestedness values were always high ($\bar{N} = 69.97 \pm 13.4$ (figure 5)), as observed in the empir-
 228 ical plant-pollinator networks. Convergence, complementarity and nestedness did not show signs of
 229 trade-offs and were uncorrelated across all replicates ($0.08 < \text{Spearman-}\rho < 0.27$, all $p > 0.1$) with
 230 the exception of a positive correlation between trait complementarity and evolutionary convergence
 231 in the plant community (Spearman- $\rho = 0.61$, all $p < 0.05$). Our results, using phylogenetic related-
 232 ness and phenotypic similarity for the estimation of evolutionary convergence and complementarity
 233 under weak coevolutionary selection, show evolutionary trait convergence and complementarity in all

our replicate simulations but with little and large variation, respectively. These results suggest that in our model, trait convergence in plant and animal communities is largely independent or positively correlated with trait complementarity for the animal and plant community, respectively.

Comparison of model predictions with empirical data

Our model predicts well plant-animal complementarity and convergence for animals but not for plants in a empirical plant-hummingbird mutualistic network (Figure 6). The observed proportion of complementarity events for the empirical plant-hummingbird data is within the CI for a broad range of values of the complementarity threshold, t_{comp} (Figure 6a). Our model consistently predicts higher proportion of convergence events than the observed proportion in the plant community (Figure 6b). Predictions in the proportion of convergence events quickly increase for a high convergence threshold value both in the empirical data and in our model predictions (red lines Figure 6b) and saturates around the same observed values for medium and low convergent threshold values. Predictions of the proportion of convergence events for the hummingbird community are within the estimated CI for all the range of convergence threshold values (Figure 6c). These results show that predictions for plant-animal complementarity and convergence in the hummingbird community are robust against a broad range of threshold values.

Discussion

Multispecific coevolution has been poorly studied so far due to its complexity, which involves numerous processes and mechanisms in the ecology and evolution of species interaction networks. Nevertheless, there is accumulating empirical data (REFS) for and increasing interest in understanding the drivers of multispecific coevolution in ecological communities (REFS). . Our model comes closer to observed patterns of complementarity and convergence in the plant-hummingbird community than previous models.

The evolution of convergence and complementarity

Previous studies have argued that evolutionary convergence is the product of multispecific coevolutionary processes ('diffuse coevolution')(Janzen, 1980; Thompson and Cunningham, 2002; Jordano et al., 2003; Bascompte and Jordano, 2007) and therefore convergence events are molded by similar ecological (or niche) selective pressures. The model of (Nuismer et al., 2012), which studied a model of 'phenotype differences' has shown that for weak coevolutionary selection trait values in animal and plant species can be highly variable and non-convergent, but trait values of animal and plants species show high complementarity (i.e. they are positively correlated). However, strong coevolutionary selection decreases variation in the trait values of animal and plant species increasing convergence and simultaneously complementarity decreases (i.e. correlations between traits of interacting species are weakened). Interestingly, the results of Guimarães et al. (2011) show that trait convergence may in part emerge as a consequence of selection for a complementarity trait between the plants and animals. This model, contrary to Nuismer et al (2012), did consider background evolution (i.e. evolution driven by other forces not related to mutualistic interactions Guimarães et al. (2011), which provides support to our results.

Interestingly, the model of 'phenotype differences' considered here has shown to make unlikely the evolution of convergence and complementarity by coevolutionary selection (Nuismer et al., 2012). However, our model shows that by considering a more realistic model of phenotype differences in a more realistic setting gives results that are more like the observations than the results of previous models. In other words, it is possible to observe the evolution of both convergence and complementarity. It remains to be seen whether the action of both (selective and non-selective forces) and other models of plant-animal interaction (e.g. 'phenotypic matching') will be able to generate the observed patterns of high convergence, complementarity and nestedness in species-rich mutualistic networks.

Non-selective forces underlying trait dynamics can produce convergence. For example, Stayton (2008) simulated evolution along phylogenies according to a Brownian motion model of trait change and demonstrated that rates of convergence can be quite high when clades are diversifying under only the influence of genetic drift. Furthermore, other types of constraints in the production of variation can also lead to convergence. If the variation produced is limited, then unrelated species are likely to produce the same variation, which may then become fixed in the population by genetic drift (Stayton,

286 2008; Losos, 2011). Developmental constraints or the evolution of genetic networks by non-adaptive
287 processes may also be explanations for the convergence of traits (Solé et al., 2002; Lynch, 2007; Losos,
288 2011), but the role of developmental constraints or genetic networks in determining convergence in
289 species-rich mutualistic networks has yet not been explored. For example, the tinkering of traits
290 by evolutionary forces largely affects developmental pathways (e.g. gene regulatory networks) (Solé
291 et al., 2002). Developmental pathways are not static but can diverge through time randomly without
292 substantially affecting the phenotype (Wagner, 2008). This concept, also called developmental system
293 drift (DSD) (True and Haag, 2001), might play an important role in the evolution of convergence
294 in morphological traits and it should be considered as another process where drift can act (Ohta,
295 2002), for example, by random wiring in gene regulatory networks. Our results based on a method
296 that excludes cases of the development of a similar trait in related but distinct species descending
297 from the same ancestor show that additional constraints such as dispersal limitation and assortative
298 mating limit the production of variation and lead consistently to convergence in distinct lineages in
299 species-rich mutualistic networks.

300 Evolutionary complementarity is also consistently observed in our results but with a larger variation
301 than convergence. Complementarity is argued to be the main result of tight coevolution between
302 mutualistic species by mechanisms, such as trait-matching (e.g. corolla length-proboscis length)
303 (Jordano et al., 2003). There is empirical (Anderson and Johnson, 2008) and theoretical evidence
304 (Gomulkiewicz et al., 2000) for coevolutionary hot spots (Thompson, 1999), which suggests that local
305 selective regimes can promote the coevolution of traits (Gomulkiewicz et al., 2000; Ferdy et al., 2002;
306 Gomulkiewicz et al., 2003; Jordano et al., 2003; Bronstein et al., 2006; Thompson and Cunningham,
307 2002; Thompson, 2009; Jones et al., 2009). In contrast, our results show that medium levels of
308 complementarity can emerge from relatively non-selective forces and constraints occurring at several
309 levels, from geographic limits to encounter partners and disperse to the genetic and morphological
310 constraints on producing viable offspring. In addition, our model fitting show our predictions fit
311 well to the observed plant-hummingbird complementarity across a broad range of complementarity
312 threshold values (Figure 6).

313 Our predictions are able to reproduce some observed patterns of convergence and complementarity
314 in a plant-hummingbird community. Observed convergence values were close to those predicted by

the model for the hummingbird community, but we predicted more convergence values than those observed in the plant community. According to previous models, fewer convergence events could be indicative of weak coevolutionary selection processes acting on the plant species. Although this is a possible explanation for our overestimation of convergence, we think that our convergence estimates may have been biased by the fact that we could not consider all the plant species of the community ($\approx 50\%$) only around 60% of the hummingbird species. Our study is the first to quantify and compare convergence and complementarity values from an empirical dataset with model predictions and we believe this a major leap towards the understanding of multispecific coevolution and community assembly.

The problem of calculating convergence

One prominent problem in the literature is how to quantify convergence. This problem is probably related to the lack of a rigorous or precise definition of convergence (REFS). Previous studies (Nuismer et al, Guimaraes et al) proposed different ways of doing this, but their measurements of convergence do not consider phylogenetic relatedness. For example, Guimarães et al. (2011) measured convergence as “the mean pair-wise difference between traits of species at same trophic level” considering all the species of the guild. (Nuismer et al., 2012) calculated the variance as a proxy to predict convergence (i.e., large values weak convergence whereas small values of the variance may indicate strong convergence). The main problem with these measurements that ignore phylogenetic relatedness is that they will tend to overestimate convergence events . Most definitions of convergence agree that it is an evolutionary pattern in which “similar phenotypes evolve *independently* in multiple lineages” (Stayton, 2015). Therefore, it is important to consider phylogenetic distance to correct for shared and therefore dependent evolutionary history. Our model with our new measure of convergence, which considers phylogenetic relatedness and phenotypic similarity, shows that in the absence of abiotic selection trait convergence and complementarity always evolve but with little and large variation, respectively. Therefore, even with a more conservative estimate of the number of convergence events, the results show that the modelled processes (or background evolution sensu Guimarães et al. (2011)) are crucial for the emergence of these evolutionary patterns.

The emergence of mutualistic network structure

Nuismer et al. (2012) explored the connection between convergence and complementarity to nestedness patterns in mutualistic networks. They show that coevolutionary selection tend to decrease nestedness and it generates even more strongly antinested networks when coevolutionary selection increases by favoring the emergence of reciprocal specialization. In contrast, nestedness values were very high in our model, as in real mutualistic networks. Previous neutral models taking into account ecological drift (Krishna et al., 2008; Canard et al., 2012), produced high values of nestedness which suggests that random interactions and species abundance distribution ('neutral forbidden links' (Canard et al., 2012)), are determinants of the structure of mutualistic networks. Connectance values obtained from our simulations are close to the predictions of other neutral network models (Canard et al., 2012). However, compared to real mutualistic networks with similar diversity as ours (24 plant and animal species on average), our connectance values ($\bar{C} = 0.5$) are higher than the reported webs ($C = 0.28$) (Olesen and Jordano, 2002). Interestingly, Nuismer et al. (2012) found that only assuming coevolutionary selection forces also leads to an increase in connectance. This means that both basic genetic and ecological processes and coevolutionary selection can increase connectance in mutualistic networks. The question is why observed mutualistic webs have a lower connectance than those predicted by our model and previous models. We conjecture that this difference in connectance values might be due to different types of forbidden links (i.e. biological constraints impeding plant-animal interactions), such as phenology (Encinas-Viso et al., 2012; Olesen et al., 2008) or environmental fluctuations that were not explicitly included in our approach.

In summary, our results show the emergence of convergence, complementarity and nestedness following basic genetic and ecological processes. Our predictions fit well to the observed plant-hummingbird complementarity and hummingbird convergence. In contrast to previous studies showing antinested networks, we found highly nested values in agreement with empirical mutualistic networks (Bascompte et al., 2003). Our results suggest that diversification dynamics combining ecological (demography and dispersal limitation), population genetics (mutation, recombination, assortative mating and drift) and morphological constraints may form the basic processes producing the key patterns of mutualistic networks, from trait convergence and complementarity to connectance and nestedness.

371 **Acknowledgments**

372 We thank Martina Stang and Ole Seehausen for useful discussions. FEV and RSE were supported by
373 VIDI and VICI grants from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), awarded to
374 RSE. CJM was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF-project 31003A-144162).

References

- de Aguiar, M., M. Baranger, E. Baptestini, L. Kaufman, and Y. Bar-Yam, 2009. Global patterns of speciation and diversity. *Nature* 460:384–387.
- Almeida-Neto, M., P. G. aes, P. G. aes, R. Loyola, and W. Ulrich, 2008. A consistent metric for nestedness analysis in ecological systems: reconciling concept and measurement. *Oikos* 117:1227–1239.
- Anderson, B. and S. Johnson, 2008. The geographical mosaic of coevolution in a plant-pollinator mutualism. *Evolution* 62:220–225.
- Bascompte, J. and P. Jordano, 2007. Plant-animal mutualistic networks: The architecture of biodiversity. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 38:567–593.
- Bascompte, J., P. Jordano, C. J. Melian, and J. M. Olesen, 2003. The nested assembly of plant-animal mutualistic networks. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 100:9383–9387.
- Bronstein, J. L., R. Alarcon, and M. Geber, 2006. The evolution of plant-insect mutualisms. *New Phytol.* 172:412–428.
- Canard, E., N. Mouquet, L. Marescot, K. Gaston, D. Gravel, and D. Mouillot, 2012. Emergence of structural patterns in neutral trophic networks. *Plos One* 7:e38295.
- Cavalli-Sforza, L. L. and A. W. Edwards, 1967. Phylogenetic analysis. models and estimation procedures. *Am J Hum Genet.* 19:233–257.
- Darwin, C., 1859. *On the origin of the species.* Murray.
- , 1862. *Fertilisation of Orchids.* Murray.
- Doebeli, M., 2011. *Adaptive diversification.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Encinas-Viso, F., T. Revilla, and R. Etienne, 2012. Phenology drives mutualistic network structure and diversity. *Ecol Lett* 15:198–208.

398 Ferdy, J., L. Despres, and B. Godelle, 2002. Evolution of mutualism between globe-flowers and their
399 pollinating flies. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 217:219–234.

400 Ferriere, R., M. Gauduchon, and J. L. Bronstein, 2007. Evolution and persistence of obligate mu-
401 tualists and exploiters: competition for partners and evolutionary immunization. *Ecology Letters*
402 10:115–126.

403 Gavrillets, S., R. Acton, and J. Gravner, 2000. Dynamics of speciation and diversification in a
404 metapopulation. *Evolution* 54:1493–1501.

405 Gomulkiewicz, R., S. L. Nuismer, and J. N. Thompson, 2003. Coevolution in variable mutualisms.
406 *The American Naturalist* 162:S80–S93.

407 Gomulkiewicz, R., J. N. Thompson, R. D. Holt, S. L. Nuismer, and M. E. Hochberg, 2000. Hot
408 spots, cold spots, and the geographic mosaic theory of coevolution. *The American Naturalist*
409 156:156–174.

410 Guimarães, P., P. Jordano, and J. Thompson, 2011. Evolution and coevolution in mutualistic net-
411 works. *Ecol Lett* 14:877–885.

412 Hoban, S., O. Gaggiotti, C. Consortium, and G. Bertorelle, 2013. Sample planning optimization tool
413 for conservation and population genetics (spotg): a software for choosing the appropriate number
414 of markers and samples. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 4:209–303.

415 Howe, H. and J. Smallwood, 1982. Ecology of seed dispersal. *Ann Rev. Ecol. Syst.* 13:201–228.

416 Janzen, D., 1980. When is it coevolution? *Evolution* 34:611–612.

417 Jones, E., R. Ferrière, and J. Bronstein, 2009. Eco-evolutionary dynamics of mutualists and ex-
418 ploitors. *Am Nat* 174:780–794.

419 Jordano, P., J. Bascompte, and J. Olesen, 2003. Invariant properties in coevolutionary networks of
420 plant-animal interactions. *Ecol. Lett.* 6:69–81.

421 Jousselin, E., J.-Y. Rasplus, and F. Kjellberg, 2003. Convergence and coevolution in a mutualism:
422 evidence from a molecular phylogeny of figs. *Evolution* 57:1255–1269.

423 Kondrashov, A. and M. Shpak, 1998. On the origin of species by means of assortative mating. Proc.
424 R. Soc. Lond. B 265:2273–2278.

425 Krishna, A., P. Guimarães, P. Jordano, and J. Bascompte, 2008. A neutral-niche theory of nestedness
426 in mutualistic networks. *Oikos* 117:1609–1618.

427 Law, R., J. L. Bronstein, and R. Ferrière, 2001. On mutualists and exploiters: plant-insect coevolution
428 in pollinating seed-parasite systems. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 212:373–389.

429 Losos, J., 2011. Convergence, adaptation, and constraint. *Evolution* 65:1827–1840.

430 Lynch, M., 2007. The evolution of genetic networks by non-adaptive processes. *Nature Reviews*
431 *Genetics* 8:803–813.

432 Maglianesi, M., N. Bluthgen, K. Böhning-Gaese, and M. Schleuning, 2014. Morphological traits de-
433 termine specialization and resource use in plant-hummingbird networks in the neotropics. *Ecology*
434 95:3325–3334.

435 Melián, C. J., D. Alonso, D. Vázquez, J. Regetz, and S. Allesina, 2010. Frequency-dependent selection
436 predicts patterns of radiations and biodiversity. *PLoS Comput Biol* 6:e1000892.

437 Moritz, C. and C. J. Schneider, 1992. Evolutionary relationships within the *Ensatina eschscholtzii*
438 complex confirm the ring species interpretation. *Syst Biol* 41:273–291.

439 Nei, M., T. Maruyama, and C.-I. Wu, 1983. Models of evolution of reproductive isolation. *Genetics*
440 103:557–579.

441 Nuismer, S. L., P. Jordano, and J. Bascompte, 2012. Coevolution and the architecture of mutualistic
442 networks. *Evolution* 67:338–354.

443 Ohta, T., 2002. Near-neutrality in evolution of genes and gene regulation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*
444 99:16134–16137.

445 Olesen, J. and P. Jordano, 2002. Geographic patterns in plant-pollinator mutualistic networks.
446 *Ecology* 89:2416–2424.

- Olesen, J. M., J. Bascompte, H. Elberling, and P. Jordano, 2008. Temporal dynamics in a pollination network. *Ecology* 89:1573–1582.
- Pérez, F. and B. Granger, 2007. IPython: a System for Interactive Scientific Computing. *Comput. Sci. Eng.* 9:21–29.
- R Core Team, 2013. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- Rambaut, A. and N. Grassly, 1997. Seq-gen: An application for the monte carlo simulation of dna sequence evolution along phylogenetic trees. *Computer Applications In The Biosciences* 13:235–238.
- Schluter, D., 2009. Evidence for ecological speciation and its alternative. *Science* 323:737–741.
- Seehausen, O., R. K. Butlin, I. Keller, C. E. Wagner, J. W. Boughman, P. A. Hohenlohe, C. L. Peichel, G. P. Saetre, et al., 2014. Genomics and the origin of species. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 15:176–192.
- Solé, R., R. Ferrer-Cancho, J. Montoya, and S. Valverde, 2002. Selection, tinkering, and emergence in complex networks. *Complexity* 8:20–33.
- Stang, M., P. Klinkhamer, and E. van der Meijden, 2006. Size constraints and flower abundance determine the number of interactions in a plant-flower visitor web. *Oikos* 112:111–121.
- Stang, M., P. Klinkhamer, N. Waser, I. Stang, and E. van der Meijden, 2009. Size-specific interaction patterns and size matching in a plant-pollinator interaction web. *Ann Bot* 103:1459–1469.
- Stayton, C. T., 2008. Is convergence surprising? An examination of the frequency of convergence in simulated datasets. *J. Theo. Biol.* 252:1–14.
- Thompson, J. N., 1999. Specific hypotheses on the geographic mosaic of coevolution. *The American Naturalist* 153:S1–S14.
- , 2009. The coevolving web of life. *The American Naturalist* 173:125–140.

- 471 Thompson, J. N. and B. M. Cunningham, 2002. Geographic structure and dynamics of coevolutionary
472 selection. *Nature* 417:735–738.
- 473 True, J. R. and E. S. Haag, 2001. Developmental system drift and flexibility in evolutionary trajec-
474 tories. *Evolution & Development* 3:109–119.
- 475 Wagner, A., 2008. Neutralism and selectionism: a network-based reconciliation. *Nature Reviews*
476 *Genetics* 9:965–974.
- 477 Waser, N., L. Chittka, M. Price, N. Williams, and J. Ollerton, 1996. Generalization in pollination
478 systems, and why it matters. *Ecology* 77:1043–1060.

479 **Supplementary Information**

480 **The model: evo-evolutionary trait diversification in mutualistic** 481 **networks**

482 To study the role of spatial structure and plant-animal trait diversification on convergence, comple-
483 mentarity and nestedness, we start by considering a landscape consisting of several individual plants
484 (P) and animal pollinators (A). We model obligate mutualism for both partners and the number
485 of individuals at each trophic level is fixed and equal to the environmental carrying capacity for
486 the given community. Genetic, phenotypic and species composition change in time and space due to
487 population dynamics. At each time step replacement of dead individuals are followed by the offspring
488 of the same or another species (the key terms and model steps are summarized in figure 1 and table
489 1, respectively). In this section we explain how we model populations, traits, and diversification.

490 **Population dynamics**

491 Our model is a stochastic individual-based model with overlapping generations. The population
492 consists of J_P and J_A haploid gonochoric (i.e. separated sexes) individuals with an explicit genome of
493 size L each and equal sex ratios at the outset. The genome of each individual is composed of $L - 1$ loci
494 determining assortative mating and one neutral locus. Both plant and animal population reproduce
495 sexually and are spatially structured. First an individual plant k and an animal k' are randomly
496 removed (death). They are replaced by reproduction. There are four conditions for producing viable
497 offspring for the plants and animals. These four conditions are 1) geography, 2) genetics, 3) obligate
498 mutualism and 4) morphology:

- 499 1. Geography: a female and a male individual within the plant and animal populations are ran-
500 domly chosen among all females and males within a maximum distance, d_{max} , of the dead
501 plant k and dead animal k' . This requires two geographic distance matrices, one for plants,
502 $D^P = [d_{ij}^P]$, and one for animals, $D^A = [d_{ij}^A]$, containing all the pairwise distances.
- 503 2. Genetics: to produce viable offspring the female and the male in the plant and animal popula-

tions must have a genetic similarity value of the assortative mating loci, $q_{\varnothing\sigma}$, higher than the minimum genetic similarity to have viable offspring, q_{min} , ($q_{\varnothing\sigma} > q_{min}$). This process reflects assortative mating and it requires two genetic similarity matrices, one for plants, $Q^P = [q_{ij}^P]$, and one for animals, $Q^A = [q_{ij}^A]$, containing all the pairwise similarity values.

3. Obligate mutualism: in order to have a mutualistic interaction the geographic distance between the female, \varnothing (animal or plant), and one of the two male animal or plant individuals, represented here as j , must be lower than the maximum distance, d_{max}^{PA} , ($d_{j\varnothing}^{PA} < d_{max}^{PA}$). This requires one geographic plant-animal distance matrix, $D^{PA} = [d_{ij}^{PA}]$, containing all the pairwise distances.

4. Morphology: the female plant need the presence of an animal pollinator with a larger or equally-sized proboscis than the corolla of the plant, thus the phenotype of the selected pollinator, represented here as j , must satisfy $z_{\varnothing}^P \leq z_j^A$. This requires two phenotype distributions, one for the plants, $Z^P = [z_i^P]$ and one for the animals, $Z^A = [z_i^A]$. This trait-mediated interaction relationship is a variation on the “phenotype differences” model Nuismer et al. (2012).

The offspring arising from this mating event will occupy the geographic position of the just deceased individuals.

Diversification dynamics

To quantify speciation events we calculate the genetic distance between each pair of individuals based on the assortative mating loci. We represent the genome of each individual by a sequence of $L - 1$ loci, where each locus can be in two allelic states, $+1$ or -1 . The assortative mating loci of each plant individual i in a population of size J_P is represented as a vector: $S^i = (S_1^i, S_2^i, \dots, S_L^i)$, where S_u^i is the u^{th} locus of individual i . The genetic similarity based on assortative mating loci between individuals i and j is calculated as the sum of identical loci across the genome

$$q_{ij}^P = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{u=1}^L S_u^i S_u^j \quad (1)$$

where $q_{ij}^P \in \{-1, 1\}$ with the genetic similarity matrix, $Q^P = [q_{ij}^P]$, containing all pairwise genetic similarity values for plants (the same for animals, $Q^A = [q_{ij}^A]$). The genome of the offspring is obtained by a block cross-over recombination of a female genome, S^{\varnothing} , and a male genome, S^{σ} , where a locus

529 l in the genome of the parents is randomly chosen partitioning the genome of each individual in
530 two blocks. All genes beyond that locus l in either genome are swapped between the two parents
531 and eventually form two new genomes. One of the two new genomes is randomly chosen for the
532 offspring. The offspring's genome undergoes mutations at mutation rate μ . Figure 1 describes the
533 recombination-mutation process.

534 At the beginning of the simulations all individuals are genetically identical (all q_{ij}^P and $q_{ij}^A = 1$);
535 hence they are all able to mate and produce viable offspring regardless of their spatial location.
536 The genetic similarity between individuals of a guild can be visualized as an evolutionary spatial
537 graph (Melián et al., 2010), where nodes correspond to individuals and the edges correspond to
538 the geographic distances between a pair of individuals satisfying the genetic similarity condition
539 for mating, $q_{ij}^P(q_{ij}^A) > q_{min}$. The connectance of the graph will decrease when generations move
540 forward because of the processes described in the previous section: 1) spatial constraints for mating
541 driving assortative mating and dispersal limitation; 2) genetic divergence driven by the threshold
542 for mating (incompatibilities), mutation and recombination forming the genome of the offspring; 3)
543 obligate mutualistic interactions driven by spatial proximity of individuals of the other guild, and 4)
544 morphological constraints following the phenotype differences scenario.

545 These four set of processes drive genetic divergence and speciation. We followed the species defi-
546 nition of Nei et al. (1983), which states that species are groups of individuals that are reproductively
547 isolated and can interbreed to produce fertile offspring. In our model this is realized through al-
548 lowing two individuals to mate successfully if their genetic similarity value is larger or equal to the
549 minimum value, q_{min} . Thus, speciation is defined as a group of genetically related individuals, where
550 two individuals in a sexual population can be conspecific while also being incompatible, as long as
551 they can exchange genes indirectly through other conspecifics (de Aguiar et al., 2009; Melián et al.,
552 2010). This is the definition of 'ring species' (Moritz and Schneider, 1992).

553 Genetic divergence will eventually produce the formation of two genetically incompatible clusters
554 of individuals, i.e. two species. This speciation process, also called 'fission-induced' speciation, con-
555 tinues to form more clusters and genetic divergence between individuals of different species increases.
556 However, the diversification dynamics will fluctuate due to random extinctions (death of last indi-
557 vidual of a species). A stochastic balance between speciation and extinction is eventually reached

558 giving the final steady-state of the metacommunity.

559 Quantitative trait dynamics

560 We model each individual plant and animal with a quantitative trait, z^P and z^A , respectively. The
561 processes described in figure 1 govern two quantitative traits, one for each guild: proboscis or bill
562 length (z_i^A) in pollinators and corolla length (z_i^P) in plants. The quantitative trait of offspring is
563 determined by the additive genetic effects of the genome (i.e. no epistasis) after the process of
564 randomly choosing one of the two new genomes and mutation (figure 1) plus a normally distributed
565 environmental effect, ϵ , $\mathcal{N}(\mu_\epsilon = 0, \sigma_\epsilon^2 = 1)$ (Guimarães et al., 2011). The phenotype of the plant
566 offspring i is $z_i^P = g_i^P + \epsilon$ and the genetic component (g_i^P) of the phenotype of offspring i is

$$g_i^P = L + S_o^i \quad (2)$$

567 with $S_o^i = \sum_{u=1}^L S_u^i$. Hence g_i^P is calculated as the sum of alleles across the genome (Kondrashov
568 and Shpak, 1998) plus the number of loci to avoid negative trait values (g_i^A is calculated similarly
569 for animals). We assumed that the magnitude of the influence (i.e., effect sizes) of any given locus
570 on this quantitative trait is equal across all the loci (Seehausen et al., 2014). This means that two
571 individuals with a different combination of alleles in the genome can express the same quantitative
572 trait (Losos, 2011).

573 Neutral locus evolution

574 We considered a neutral locus to estimate genetic divergence among species for the calculation of
575 convergent events (see section “Evolutionary convergence”). The neutral locus is located at the end
576 of the genome at the position L and it has k possible allelic states. The locus is completely unlinked
577 from the rest of the genome that contains the assortative mating loci. We used low mutation rates for
578 this neutral locus, $\mu_{neutral} = 10^{-7}$, and the k allele mutation model (i.e. model in which each allele
579 can mutate to any of the other $k-1$ possible alleles with equal probability (Hoban et al. (2013))). We
580 used the Cavalli-Sforza distance to calculate the matrix of genetic distances among species (Cavalli-
581 Sforza and Edwards (1967)).

582 Convergence, complementarity and nestedness

583 Evolutionary convergence

584 Phenotypic similarity

585 The phenotypic similarity for plants (p_{ij}^P) between individual i and j is defined as

?

$$p_{ij}^P = 1 - \frac{|z_i^P - z_j^P|}{z_{max}^P} \quad (3)$$

586 where z_i^P and z_j^P are the phenotypic similarity values of i and j , respectively, and z_{max}^P is the maximum
587 value of the phenotype distribution, Z^P . Thus, the elements $p_{ij}^P \in \{0, 1\}$ of the phenotypic similarity
588 matrix, $\mathcal{P}^P = [p_{ij}^P]$ represent all pairwise values for plants (the same for animals, $\mathcal{P}^A = [p_{ij}^A]$).

589 Mean genetic and phenotypic species similarity

590 We define evolutionary convergence as the similarity between average species phenotypes from dis-
591 tantly related species. We assume that two species are distantly related, in phylogenetic terms, if
592 they do not come from a direct common ancestor, i.e. they are not sister species. To exclude sister
593 species from the analysis we need to calculate the mean genetic similarity among species of the same
594 guild. The mean genetic similarity between a plant species k and a plant species l is

$$\hat{q}_{kl}^P = \frac{1}{n_k n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \sum_{j=i}^{n_l} q_{ij}^P \quad (4)$$

595 where q_{ij}^P is the genetic similarity between an individual i of plant species k and an individual j of
596 plant species l , and n_k and n_l are the absolute abundances of plant species k and l , respectively. The
597 elements \hat{q}_{kl}^P form the matrix $Q_s^P = [\hat{q}_{kl}^P]$ from which the sister species of each species in the guild can
598 be identified (The elements for animals, $Q_s^A = [\hat{q}_{kl}^A]$, are calculated in the same way as we did for the
599 plants). To calculate evolutionary convergence we need to know the average phenotypic similarity
600 between two species. We define phenotypic similarity between species k and l as

$$\hat{p}_{kl}^P = \frac{1}{n_k n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \sum_{j=i}^{n_l} p_{ij}^P \quad (5)$$

601 which is analogous to the definition of eq. 4, but now considering phenotypes instead of genotypes.
602 This will build a species phenotypic similarity matrix $P_s^P = [\hat{p}_{kl}^P]$ (the species phenotypic similarity
603 matrix, $P_s^A = [\hat{p}_{kl}^A]$, is calculated analogously for the animals). We then focus on each species in
604 turn and exclude its sister species to avoid cases of parallel evolution to calculate the number of
605 convergences related to the focal species. We define a focal plant species k and a non-sister plant
606 species l to be convergent if phenotypic similarity between them is higher than between focal and
607 sister species ($\hat{p}_{k,sister}^P < \hat{p}_{kl}^P$) and higher than a certain phenotypic threshold value t_{conv} ($\hat{p}_{kl}^P > t_{conv}$);
608 convergent species is calculated analogously for the animals).

609 Evolutionary complementarity

610 Plant-animal interactions

611 In addition to the genetic and geographic constraints for mating, we consider two other conditions for
612 plants and animals: obligate mutualism and morphological constraints. Obligate mutualism applies
613 to the plants and animals to reproduce but the morphological constraints only apply to plants. We
614 therefore need a geographic distance matrix, D^{PA} , to describe the geographic distance between plant
615 and animal individuals. Plant-animal mutualistic interactions are here described as follows: plants
616 benefit from the presence of specific pollinators that are able to pollinate them and animals benefit
617 from the presence of plants that provide resources for them. Thus, we have two extra conditions for
618 mating:

- 619 1. Female plants need the presence of an animal pollinator (i.e., male and female represented as
620 j) within a close distance, $d_{j\text{♀}}^{PA} < d_{max}^{PA}$. The pollinator must have a larger or equally-sized
621 proboscis than the corolla of a plant, $z_{\text{♀}}^P \leq z_j^A$. This corresponds to a morphological constraint
622 for individual interactions observed between plant and pollinator species (Stang et al., 2009,
623 2006).
- 624 2. Animals need the presence of a plant (male or female represented as j) within a close geographic
625 distance, $d_{jk}^{PA} < d_{max}^{PA}$.

626 Tables

Table 1: Glossary of mathematical notation and parameter values

Notation	Definition	Values
J^P, J^A	Effective population size of plants (P) and animals (A)	1,000
d_{ij}^P, d_{ij}^A	Geographical pairwise distance plants (P) and animals (A)	variable
d_{max}	Maximum geographical distance to mate and disperse	0.3
D^P, D^A	Geographic distance matrix with all d_{ij}^P and d_{ij}^A values	variable
d_{ik}^{PA}	Geographical distance between plant i and animal k	variable
d_{max}^{PA}	Maximum geographical distance to find a mutualistic partner	0.3
D^{PA}	Geographic distance matrix with all the d_{ik}^{PA} values	variable
q_{ij}^P, q_{ij}^A	Genetic similarity between ind. i and j in (P) and (A)	variable
Q^P, Q^A	Genetic similarity matrix with all the q_{ij}^P and q_{ij}^A values	variable
q_{min}	Minimum genetic similarity to have viable offspring	0.97
z_i^P, z_i^A	Quantitative trait of ind. i in (P) and (A)	variable
Z^P, Z^A	Quantitative trait distribution in (P) and (A)	variable
p_{ij}^P, p_{ij}^A	Phenotypic similarity between ind. i and j in (P) and (A)	variable
$\mathcal{P}^P, \mathcal{P}^A$	Phenotypic similarity matrix with all the p_{ij}^P and p_{ij}^A values	variable
L	Size of the genome	150
g_i^P, g_i^A	Genetic component of phenotype of offspring in (P) and (A)	variable
ϵ	Environmental component of phenotype of offspring	$\mathcal{N}(0,1)$
μ	Mutation rate per locus	$10^{-4} - 10^{-2}$
$\hat{q}_{kh}^P, \hat{q}_{kh}^A$	Mean genetic simil. between species k and h in (P) and (A)	variable
Q_s^P, Q_s^A	Species genetic simil. matrix with all \hat{q}_{kl}^P and \hat{q}_{kl}^A values	variable
$\hat{p}_{kh}^P, \hat{p}_{kh}^A$	Mean phen. simil. between species k and h in (P) and (A)	variable
P_s^P, P_s^A	Species phen. simil. matrix with all \hat{p}_{kl}^P and \hat{p}_{kl}^A values	variable
\hat{p}_{kh}^{PA}	Mean trait similarity plant species k and animal species h	variable
P_s^{PA}	Phenotypic simil. matrix with all \hat{p}_{kh} values	variable
h_{conv}	Phenotypic threshold to calculate convergence events	variable
h_{comp}	Phenotypic threshold to calculate complementarity events	variable

Figures




Figure 1: The death-birth cycle per time step. Individuals are represented as filled circles and blue tones represent variation of phenotypes. (A) an individual k is randomly selected to die and leaves an empty location in the landscape. (B) a female individual, \varnothing , is randomly selected among all females satisfying the condition $d_{k\varnothing} < d_{max}$. We then choose randomly a male, σ , among all males satisfying $d_{k\sigma} < d_{max}$ and $q_{\varnothing\sigma} > q_{min}$ with q_{min} , the minimum genetic similarity required for mating. In addition to these two constraints, two more are required to complete mating. For the condition of obligate mutualism, the geographic distance between the female (animal or plant), and an animal (or plant) individual j , must satisfy $d_{j\varnothing}^{PA} < d_{max}^{PA}$. Finally, female plants need the presence of an animal pollinator with a larger or equally-sized proboscis than the corolla of the female plant, thus individual pollinators represented as j , must satisfy $z_{\varnothing_P} \leq z_{j_A}$. In (C) and (D) we calculate the genome of the new offspring once these constraints are satisfied. (C) Genomes are composed of L loci where each locus can be in two allelic states (-1, 1) and undergo block crossover recombination between female (dark gray) and male (black). A position l in the genome of the parents is randomly chosen partitioning the genome in two blocks. All genes beyond the l locus in either organism's genome is swapped between two parents and two new genomes are formed. (D) One of the two new genomes is randomly chosen for the offspring i , S_o^i , and it might undergo mutation (light gray). (E) The phenotype expression of offspring i is $z_i = g_i + \epsilon$ with $g_i = L + S_o^i$ and ϵ are the genetic and environmental component of the phenotype, respectively. (F) The offspring i occupies the site of the dead individual k .

Q_s matrix

	a	b	c
a		0.85	0.97
b			0.89
c			

P_s matrix

	a	b	c
a		0.98	0.90
b			0.92
c			




Figure 2: A simple example of evolutionary convergence using species a , b and c . The upper matrix ($Q_s = [\hat{q}_{kl}]$) shows species a and c are genetically closely related, $\hat{q}_{ac} = 0.97$, while genetically distant from species b ($\hat{q}_{ab} = 0.85$, $\hat{q}_{cb} = 0.89$). A clear description of these genetic relationships can be represented with a cluster tree or dendrogram, as shown in the lower part of the figure. Thus, we establish that species a and c are sister species. The species phenotypic similarity matrix, $P_s = [\hat{p}_{kh}]$ shows that species a and b are phenotypically highly similar ($\hat{p}_{ab} = 0.98$) and highly genetically dissimilar ($\hat{q}_{ab} = 0.85$) (i.e. more than the average intraspecific genetic similarity or sister species 0.97), indicating an event of evolutionary convergence.




Figure 3: Changes in trait distribution of plants (top, blue) and animals (bottom, red). Left and right panels show the initial and final trait distribution, respectively. The insets in the right panels show the mean trait and standard error for each species sorted from the most common to the most rare. Initial trait distributions changed towards higher variance, and in most replicates, towards bimodal distribution in both guilds. Shown is the outputs from one replicate with parameters values $q_{min} = 0.97$, $d_{max} = d_{max}^{PA} = 0.3$, $\mu = 5 \times 10^{-3}$ and $J_P = J_A = 1,000$.




Figure 4: Evolutionary convergence and complementarity in plant-pollinator networks. Trees at the left and right side show genetic similarities between animal (red) and plant (blue) species, respectively. Mean species trait, proboscis and corolla length, is sketched with cartoons next to their respective position in the trees. Animals, composed by six species, have two evolutionary convergence events (A-B and F-D). Plants, composed by three species, have one convergent event (b-c). The central part of the figure shows the network of plant-animal interactions, where each node (colored filled circles) represents an individual. The network is composed of two types of links: genetic relatedness links (black solid) forming clusters that represent species and plant-animal individual-based interaction links (gray). The network shows variability in terms of genetic relatedness and plant-animal interactions within a species (i.e. high intraspecific variability). This figure is an example from one simulation. Parameters used are as in figure 3, $q_{min} = 0.97$, $d_{max} = d_{max}^{PA} = 0.3$, $\mu = 5 \times 10^{-3}$ and $J^P = J^A = 1,000$.




Figure 5: Plant-animal species interaction network. Plant species are represented in rows and animal species in columns. The color gradient indicates the number of mutualistic partners (i.e. individuals interacting) shared between plant and animal species. This matrix comes from one replicate with nine plant and thirteen animal species. The network shows high level of nestedness ($N = 0.72$) and intermediate level of connectance ($C = 0.5$). Parameters used are $q_{min} = 0.97$, $d_{max} = d_{max}^{PA} = 0.3$, $\mu = 5 \times 10^{-3}$ and $J_P = J_A = 1,000$.




Figure 6: Comparison of model's predictions with estimations of convergence and complementarity from an empirical data of a plant-pollinator community. a) The proportion of complementarity events (y-axis) as a function of the complementarity threshold (x-axis) for the empirical data (dotted black line) and for the model (continuous and dotted red lines represent mean, 0.05 and 0.95 CI values, respectively). Predictions are within the CI for most complementarity threshold values. **Empirical data deviates from model predictions for complementarity threshold values around 0.4 and lower.** b) The proportion of convergence events in the plant community (y-axis, 69 species) as a function of the convergence threshold (x-axis) for the empirical data (dotted black line) and for the model (continuous and dotted red lines represent mean, 0.05 and 0.95 CI values, respectively). Convergence events in the empirical data strongly deviates from model predictions for convergence threshold values ranging between 1 and approx. 0.82. In that range, model predicts much higher proportion of convergence events than the empirical observations. c) The proportion of convergence events in the animal community (y-axis, 24 species) as a function of the convergence threshold (x-axis) for the empirical data (dotted black line) and for the model (continuous and dotted red lines represent mean, 0.05 and 0.95 CI values, respectively). Convergence events in the empirical data are within the CI of model predictions for most convergence threshold values.