

Dewlap color variation in *Anolis sagrei* is maintained among habitats within islands of the West Indies

RAPHAËL SCHERRER^{1,3} *, COLIN M. DONIHUE^{1,4},
R. GRAHAM REYNOLDS², JONATHAN B. LOSOS^{1,4} AND ANTHONY J. GENEVA^{1,5}

¹ Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology and Museum of Comparative Zoology
Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, USA

² Department of Biology, University of North Carolina Asheville, Asheville, NC, USA

³ Current address: Groningen Institute for Evolutionary Life Sciences,
University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

⁴ Current address: Department of Biology, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA

⁵ Current address: Department of Biology, Center for Computational and Integrative Biology,
Rutgers University–Camden, Camden, NJ, USA

Abstract

Animal signals evolve in an ecological context. Locally adapting animal sexual signals can be especially important for initiating or reinforcing reproductive isolation during the early stages of speciation. Previous studies have demonstrated that dewlap color in *Anolis* lizards can be highly variable between populations in relation to both biotic and abiotic adaptive drivers at relatively large geographical scales. Here, we investigated differentiation of dewlap coloration among habitat-types at a small spatial scale, within multiple islands of the West Indies, as this may give new insights into the local scale at which adaptation is possible. We explored variation in dewlap coloration in the most widespread species of anole, *Anolis sagrei*, across three characteristic habitats spanning the Bahamas and the Cayman Islands. Using reflectance spectrometry paired with supervised machine learning, we found significant differences in spectral properties of the dewlap between habitats within small islands, sometimes over very short distances. Passive divergence in dewlap phenotype associated with isolation-by-distance did not explain our results. On the other hand, these habitat-specific dewlap differences varied in magnitude and direction across islands, and thus our primary test for adaptation – parallel responses across islands – was not supported. We suggest that neutral processes or selection could be involved in several ways, including sexual selection. Our results shed new light on the scale at which signal color polymorphism can be maintained in the presence of gene flow, and the relative role of local adaptation and other processes in driving these patterns.

Keywords — reflectance, adaptation, sexual signal, machine learning, polymorphism

Introduction

The staggering diversity of animal communication signals has long been of interest to evolutionary biologists. Animals use chemical, mechanical, electromagnetic, and visual signals to communicate in a wide variety of contexts, including, competition for mates, species recognition, aposematism, and cooperation (Bradbury and Vehrenkamp, 2011). A primary evolutionary factor shaping communication signals is the sensory system and behavior of recipients (the sensory drive hypothesis; Endler and McLellan 1988; Endler 1992, 1998). Over the past decades, scientists have established that signals evolve in an ecological context and are dependent on environmental conditions (Endler, 1992, 1993a,b). Just as different habitats may favor different combinations of eco-morphological traits to maximize performance and fitness (Arnold, 1983), they may also shape different forms of a signal, so as to maximize its transmission and detection (e.g. Seehausen 1997), or reduce its detection by unintended recipients such as predators (Endler, 1984, 1990, 1991; Halfwerk et al.,

*Corresponding author: r.scherrer@rug.nl

37 This selective pressure may drive the local adaptation of communication signals.

38
39 One potential barrier to the maintenance of localized signal divergence is the homogenizing effect
40 of gene flow. Population genetics theory suggests that gene flow may counteract local adaptation
41 between localities and prevent divergence altogether, especially at small spatial scales, because
42 of the inflow of maladapted alleles or because of the breaking of linkage between coevolving loci
43 (Felsenstein, 1976; García-Ramos and Kirkpatrick, 1997; Dieckmann and Doebeli, 1999; Lenormand,
44 2002; Hendry et al., 2007a). This genetic homogenization has been confirmed empirically
45 in systems such as stick-insects (Nosil and Crespi, 2004) and stickleback (Hendry et al., 2007b).
46 Yet, examples of microgeographic adaptation, i.e. adaptation at smaller scales than the range of
47 dispersal, exist, highlighting the potential of some organisms to respond to selection in the face of
48 gene flow (see Richardson et al. 2014 and references therein). Examples include small scale adap-
49 tation in fragmented areas in Australian fruit flies (Willi and Hoffmann, 2012), or local adaptation
50 to predation pressure in North American salamanders (Richardson and Urban, 2013). Therefore,
51 despite evidence that local adaptation may be particularly difficult at small spatial scales where
52 gene flow tends to cause adjoining populations to remain genetically homogeneous, the potential
53 adaptive response of species traits, in particular communication signals, to localized differences in
54 habitats remains relatively unknown (Richardson et al., 2014).

55
56 Lizards of the neotropical genus *Anolis* are an excellent group for studying the eco-evolutionary
57 dynamics of local adaptation and natural selection (Losos, 2009). A particularly conspicuous trait
58 of anoles is their dewlap; an extensible flap of skin that is typically sexually dimorphic and used as
59 a communication signal in courtship (Sigmund, 1983; Driessens et al., 2014, 2015) and territorial
60 displays (Losos, 1985; Macedonia and Stamps, 1994; Macedonia et al., 2013) as well as in predator
61 deterrence (Leal and Rodríguez-Robles, 1995, 1997; Leal and Rodriguez-Robles, 1997). Dewlap
62 characteristics vary widely among the approximately 400 species of the genus (Nicholson et al.,
63 2007). Interspecific variation in dewlap coloration is implicated in species recognition (Rand and
64 Williams, 1970; Williams, 1969; Williams and Rand, 1977; Losos, 1985; Macedonia and Stamps,
65 1994; Fleishman, 2000; Macedonia et al., 2013), and this function could have had a role in initiating
66 and/or reinforcing reproductive isolation during speciation (Lambert et al., 2013; Geneva et al.,
67 2015; Ng et al., 2017).

68
69 Within species, studies have shown a link between variation in dewlap coloration and differ-
70 ences in habitats or climatic conditions (Macedonia, 2001; Leal and Fleishman, 2002; Thorpe and
71 Stenson, 2002; Thorpe, 2002; Leal and Fleishman, 2004; Vanhooydonck et al., 2009; Ng et al., 2012,
72 2013, 2016; Vanhooydonck et al., 2009; Driessens et al., 2017). Some studies suggest that those
73 differences may be adaptive, and that dewlaps may have evolved to maximize detectability given
74 local light conditions (Fleishman and Persons, 2001; Leal and Fleishman, 2002, 2004). Although
75 this claim is further supported by recent findings that dewlap colors are perceived differently un-
76 der different levels of shading (Fleishman et al., 2020), other studies found conflicting patterns
77 of between-habitat variation that did not support the sensory drive hypothesis (Fleishman et al.,
78 2009; Ng et al., 2012; Macedonia et al., 2014).

79
80 Previous studies investigating variation in anole dewlaps compared populations at relatively
81 large geographical scales, e.g. between islands (Vanhooydonck et al., 2009; Driessens et al., 2017)
82 or within large islands such as Puerto Rico (Leal and Fleishman, 2004) or Hispaniola (Ng et al.,
83 2012, 2016). These large scales and marine barriers should reduce gene flow (Ng and Glor, 2011;
84 Lambert et al., 2013; Richardson et al., 2014; Ng et al., 2017). That said, examples do exist of
85 divergence in dewlap coloration at smaller scales or between populations with high degrees of gene
86 flow (Thorpe and Stenson, 2002; Thorpe, 2002; Stapley et al., 2011; Ng et al., 2016).

87
88 The species *Anolis sagrei* is widespread across islands of the West Indies (Reynolds et al., 2020).
89 It has been the subject of numerous studies concerning local adaptation (Losos et al., 1994, 1997,
90 2001; Kolbe et al., 2012), biological invasion (Kolbe et al., 2008), sexual selection (Tokarz, 2002;
91 Tokarz et al., 2005; Tokarz, 2006; Driessens et al., 2014; Steffen and Guyer, 2014; Driessens et al.,
92 2015) among many other topics. Between-island variation in the mainly orange-red color of its
93 dewlap was shown to be better explained by climatic variables (Driessens et al., 2017) than by
94 proxies for biotic factors such as sexual selection or predation pressure (Vanhooydonck et al., 2009;

Baeckens et al., 2018). How intra-island differences in habitat may contribute to the diversity of dewlap coloration, however, remains unexplored, and may reveal new insights into the scale of local differentiation despite gene flow.

Here, we analyzed the color characteristics of *A. sagrei* dewlaps within nine islands in the Bahamas and Cayman Islands. These island systems presently, if not historically, comprise relatively small islands, with no major geographic barriers within islands limiting dispersal for this promiscuous species (Kamath and Losos, 2018). These islands all share three characteristic native West Indian small-island habitat-types – beach scrub bush, closed-canopy primary coppice forest, and mangrove forest – that are often spatially intermingled. These habitats contrast in environmental parameters including vegetation community, light irradiance, humidity, and temperature (Howard, 1950; Schoener, 1968). The Cayman Islands and the Bahamas have been colonized independently by *A. sagrei* from Cuba (van de Schoot 2016 unpublished thesis; Reynolds et al. 2020), such that these archipelagos constitute an ideal suite of natural replicates to explore within-island dewlap diversity across multiple islands.

Our sampling design included sites in close proximity; the median distance between two sites within an island was 11.2km. Combining reflectance spectrometry and supervised machine learning, we tested for divergence in dewlap phenotype between habitats within islands and between islands across the range of *A. sagrei*. We predicted that if light conditions in the environment indeed drive color evolution, dewlaps should be most similar between beach scrub and mangrove forest, which both have high levels of light irradiance, compared to the darker, closed-canopy coppice forest. Similar, if detectability is maximized given the local conditions, we expected darker and more contrasting dewlaps in high irradiance habitats. Finally, if habitat characteristics are strong determinants of dewlap color variation, similar patterns should be observed across multiple islands (Losos, 2011).

121 **Methods**

122 **Data collection**

123 We sampled 466 male *Anolis sagrei* from seven islands in the Bahamas Archipelago – Abaco,
124 North Andros, South Andros, South Bimini, Eleuthera, Long Island, Ragged Island – and two
125 in the Cayman Islands – Cayman Brac and Little Cayman (Figure S1A). These islands were
126 chosen to span the breadth of the West Indian range of *A. sagrei*, because they have highly similar
127 habitat types, and because the *A. sagrei* on each island group are derived from ancient and distinct
128 colonization events from Cuba (i.e. relatively evolutionarily independent, Reynolds et al. 2020).
129 Three habitats were sampled on each island based on characterizations by Howard (1950) and
130 Schoener (1968). Each habitat is clearly distinguishable by its dominant vegetation type — xeric
131 beach scrub (open, relatively dry habitat consisting of low vegetation or isolated trees), primary
132 coppice forest (closed-canopy forest) and mangrove forest (wet coastal habitat with trees growing
133 in brackish water and high light penetration). Sample sizes are given in Table S1. Our sampling
134 design enabled us to test for differences between habitats at a coarse and fine geographical scale.
135 The median distance between two localities within an island was ~ 11km, with some islands being
136 sampled at smaller or larger scales (Figure S1B), and 80.3% of all pairwise distances within islands
137 were less than 50km. Additionally, there are no major barriers to dispersal (such as mountains or
138 grassland) on any of the islands that we sampled.

139 **Reflectance measurements**

140 We measured reflectance between 300nm and 700nm wavelength, a range from ultraviolet to red
141 that encompasses the colors visible to most lizards and vertebrates in general (Lazareva et al.,
142 2012). Measurements were taken with an Ocean Optics USB4000 spectrometer, a pulsed Xenon
143 light source (PX-2, Ocean Optics, Largo, FL, USA) and a reflectance probe protected by a black
144 anodized aluminum sheath. Measurements were taken with a 45-degree inclination to prevent
145 specular reflection (Endler, 1990). The device was regularly standardized with a Spectralon white
146 standard (Labsphere, North Sutton, NH, USA). Reflectance was measured at the center of the
147 dewlap. Reflectance curves were smoothed using the R package pavo (Maia et al., 2013) as well
148 as with custom R functions, down to one reflectance value at each nanometer in wavelength from
149 300 to 700nm.

150 **Analysis**

151 We tested for detectable differences in dewlap coloration between populations from different habi-
152 tats across islands by following an analytic pipeline in several steps. First, we used multivariate
153 analyses of variance to assess the relative contributions of islands, habitats and habitat-by-island
154 interactions on the partitioning of variation in color space. Second, and provided that habitat-by-
155 island interactions were found, we investigated habitat-differences in dewlap color for each island
156 separately using machine learning classification. Third, for each island where multivariate differ-
157 ences were detected using our machine learning pipeline, we used univariate analyses of variance
158 to decompose the signal among the different dimensions of color space. Fourth, for each significant
159 between-habitat variation found in univariate analyses, we used posthoc tests to determine which
160 habitats were involved. Last, to get insights into the spatial scale of phenotypic variation, for each
161 significant contrast between two habitats detected along a given dimension on a given island we
162 performed multiple pairwise Wilcoxon tests to assess differences in dewlap coloration among the
163 sites involved in that significant contrast, and recorded the geographical distance between sites
164 that were found significant. In parallel, we tested a possible effect of isolation-by-distance, an alter-
165 native cause of phenotypic divergence between localities based on diffusion approximation and
166 dispersal distance, irrespective of habitat-types. We did so using a permutation test to assess the
167 significance of the correlation between geographical distances and phenotypic distances among sites
168 within each island.

169
170 All analyses in this study were performed in R 3.6.1 (R Core Team, 2019) and the source code
can be found at <https://github.com/rscherrer/dewlap>, presently private.

Dimensionality reduction	172
Because neighboring wavelengths are highly collinear and redundant in reflectance, we reduced the dimensionality of the data using principal component analysis (PCA), as per Cuthill et al. (1999) and Leal and Fleishman (2002). We performed PCA on data from all islands combined, as well as on each island separately and systematically retained the first four principal components (PC), which together always explained more than 88.8% of the variance across islands (Table S2). PCs need not represent the same wavelengths across islands because they are fitted on different datasets. Nevertheless, PC1 was highly collinear with brightness for all islands (Figure S11), while the other PCs captured the chromatic variation (i.e. irrespective of brightness) in dewlap color.	173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180
Among-island variance partitioning	181
We performed a two-way nonparametric multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA, Anderson 2001, R package vegan, Oksanen et al. 2019) to identify differences in coloration between islands, habitats and habitats within islands, using principal components fitted on data from all islands together. We used a nonparametric test because although no multivariate outliers were detected based on the Mahalanobis distance, the assumption of multivariate normality was violated in several habitats on several islands (Henze-Zirkler's test, Henze and Zirkler 1990, R package MVN, Korkmaz et al. 2014, $P < 0.05$, Table S3).	182 183 184 185 186 187 188
Within-island machine learning	189
We performed a machine learning classification analysis on the first four principal components within each island separately, using random forests (Breiman, 2001). Random forests are a versatile, intuitive, and powerful algorithm commonly used in machine learning, using decision trees to predict the labels of particular observations based on their multivariate coordinates. These coordinates, or variables, are passed through a series of successive decision nodes, each examining a given variable of any given observation (James et al., 2013). The prediction for each observation is an aggregate over a large number of decision trees, each tree being trained on a subset of observations sampled with replacement from the dataset, and each tree being allowed to examine only a subset of the variables. This allows the random forest to overcome the individual errors of all trees in the predictions it makes.	190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200
To detect differences in dewlap coloration between habitats, we measured the success of random forests in reassigning individual lizards to their correct habitat of origin, based solely on their principal component scores. In machine learning, this so-called cross-validation procedure is typically done in two steps (James et al., 2013). First, a random forest is trained in recognizing features of dewlap coloration most associated with the different habitats, by being presented with multiple observations, making predictions about them, and updating its own decision rules based on whether the prediction deviates from the truth. Then, once trained, the patterns that the random forest has learned to recognize are tested by presenting new, previously unseen observations to the random forest, and measuring the proportion of correct predictions. This proportion, or success score, can then be statistically assessed against random guessing using a binomial test.	201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211
The cross-validation procedure requires that the data be split into a training set and a testing set. To remove any bias due to the set that is being sampled for training, it is common practice to use k-fold cross-validation (James et al., 2013), where the data are split into k random bins and k independent machines are trained, each taking one of the bins as a testing set and the rest for training, and where classification success is measured by summing all correct classifications from the k machines.	212 213 214 215 216 217 218
Here, we used a k-fold cross-validation procedure with $k = 5$, where each training set consisted of 80% of the data and the machine was tested on the remaining 20%. Each training set was conditioned on containing at least 5 lizards from each of the three habitats. We also down-sampled the training set to the sample size of the least represented habitat, to ensure that the different habitats were equally represented. To further remove any bias due to the specific random split into the different bins, we replicated each k-fold cross-validation five times. We then averaged the five resulting confusion matrices across replicates, where each confusion matrix shows the number	219 220 221 222 223 224

of lizards from each habitat reassigned into each habitat. For each island, we then used the average proportion of correctly reassigned lizards (i.e. the proportion of observations on the diagonal of the average confusion matrix) as an estimate of classification success. This score was tested against random guessing by comparing it to a binomial distribution with number of trials being the number of lizards on that island and success probability 1/3, representing the rate of successful classification by chance when three habitats are involved.

We used the machine learning fitting functions in the R package rminer (Cortez, 2020), which calls random forest routines from the randomForest package (Liaw and Wiener 2002, implementation from the original random forest algorithm, Breiman, 2001). For each random forest, we optimized the number of trees in the forest and the number of variables examined by each tree using the grid hyperparameter search procedure implemented in rminer, to choose between two numbers of trees (500 or 1,000) and four numbers of principal components examined per tree (1 to 4), using rminer's ordered holdout validation method with 2/3 of the data used for training.

We validated the results of our analysis by using two other widely used machine learning classification methods: linear discriminant analysis and support vector machines (Cristianini and Shawe-Taylor, 2000; James et al., 2013), both accessible in rminer (Cortez, 2020).

To know which wavelengths were most used to assign data points to each habitat, we trained another set of random forests, this time directly on reflectance data (taken every 5nm from 300 to 700nm) instead of principal components. We recorded the relative importance of each wavelength for each habitat, as measured by the mean decrease in accuracy during wavelength permutation, implemented in the randomForest package (Liaw and Wiener, 2002).

Univariate analyses

For each island where significant differences in dewlap coloration were detected between habitats, we used multiple univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA) to identify possible principal components underlying the observed differences. We constructed our ANOVA models in two steps, as per Zuur (2009). In a first step, we accounted for heterogeneity of variances across groups by systematically comparing the goodness-of-fit of an ANOVA model estimated with ordinary least squares (OLS) with that of a model estimated with generalized least squares (GLS), which allowed one estimate of residual variance per habitat (using the R package nlme, Pinheiro and Bates 2000; Pinheiro et al. 2020). Both models were fitted with restricted maximum likelihood (REML). Goodness-of-fit was estimated using Akaike's Information Criterion corrected for small sample sizes (AICc, R package MuMIn, Bartoń 2019), and the estimation method yielding the lowest AICc was retained. In a second step, we re-fitted the retained model with maximum likelihood (ML) to test for the effect of habitat-type using likelihood ratio tests (LRT) between a model including a habitat-term and a null model lacking the habitat-term.

We evaluated the normality of the standardized residuals (residuals divided by their standard error, which can differ among habitats in a GLS model) of each fitted ANOVA model using Shapiro-Wilk's test, with P-values adjusted for multiple testing using the Benjamini-Hochberg correction (Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995). In cases where significant deviations from normality were detected ($P_{adj} < 0.05$, Table S4) we performed Kruskal-Wallis's nonparametric test to back up the ANOVA results.

To know which habitat-populations were different from which in dewlap coloration, we performed different post-hoc multiple comparison tests (all implemented in the PMCMRplus package, Pohlert, 2020), depending on which assumptions were met. In cases where normality and homoskedasticity were met (i.e. OLS-ANOVA was the best fit), we used Tukey's honest significant difference test. When normality was met but not homoskedasticity (i.e. GLS-ANOVA was the best fit), we used Dunnett's T3 test. Finally, whenever we used Kruskal-Wallis's test because the ANOVA residuals were not normally distributed, we used Nemenyi's test for post-hoc comparisons.

Spatial autocorrelation

279

We tested for within-island spatial autocorrelation between the geographical distances among sampling sites and their Euclidean distances in multivariate color space (mean PC1 to PC4 per site, Table S5), regardless of habitat-type. Because often only a few sites were sampled per island, we could not get meaningful results from tests that use sites as units of observation, such as Moran's I test (Gittleman and Kot, 1990). Instead, we designed a permutation test where we randomly reshuffled individual lizards across sites within islands 1,000 times each, and systematically recalculated Pearson's correlation coefficient between geographic distances (computed as geodesic distances in the R package geosphere; Hijmans 2019) and phenotypic distances. We used the resulting null distributions of correlation coefficients to assess the significance of the observed spatial autocorrelation for each island.

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

Site differences

290

In this study, we were interested in the minimum spatial scale at which significant differences between habitats could be detected within islands. We performed multiple pairwise nonparametric Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney tests (Hollander et al., 2013) to compare dewlap coloration between sites with different habitat-types, for each pair of habitats and each variable where significant differences were detected with our analyses of variance. The P-values were adjusted using a Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple testing (Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995).

291

292

293

294

295

297 **Results**

298 We tested for variation in *A. sagrei* dewlap coloration between populations living in three characteristic
299 habitat-types across nine islands that span the West Indian range of the brown anole (beach
300 scrub, primary coppice and mangroves). We found that most of the variation in coloration was
301 partitioned between islands (two-way PERMANOVA, $F(df = 8) = 43.7$, $P = 0.0001$, explained
302 variance $R^2 = 40.9\%$). Nonetheless, we did find evidence for differences in dewlap coloration
303 between habitat-types, and those were mostly island-specific (habitat-by-island interaction term,
304 $F(16) = 3.53$, $P = 0.0001$, $R^2 = 6.6\%$), with a significant portion of the variation explained by
305 an habitat effect across all islands, but this effect was relatively small ($F(2) = 4.7$, $P = 0.0001$,
306 $R^2 = 1.1\%$).

307

308 We subsequently tested for differences in dewlap coloration between habitat-populations within
309 each island, using within-island principal component scores (to maximize the variation captured
310 for each island, see Methods). Our within-island random forest classification analyses revealed
311 detectable differences in dewlap coloration on eight out of the nine islands in our sample: Abaco,
312 Bimini, Cayman Brac, Eleuthera, Little Cayman, Long Island, North Andros and South Andros.
313 The accuracy of random forest classification exceeded random expectation more often than ex-
314 pected by chance for all these islands (Table 1). Accuracy was as high as 73% for Cayman Brac.
315 We obtained similar results using other machine learning approaches such as support vector ma-
316 chines (Table S7) and linear discriminant analysis (Table S8), except that these methods did not
317 detect significant differences on Eleuthera and North Andros. We did not find evidence of spatial
318 autocorrelation in dewlap coloration between the sites within islands, except for Eleuthera (Table
319 2). We now describe the specific differences detected on each island.

320

321 On Abaco, dewlaps from the mangrove habitat were the best discriminated, while dewlaps
322 from the beach scrub habitat were often mistaken for dewlaps from the coppice habitat (Fig. 2D).
323 Importance analysis revealed that beach scrub and mangrove lizards mostly differed in reflectance
324 in the ultraviolet (UV) end of the spectrum (below 400nm, Fig. S2F), where mangrove dewlaps
325 had higher UV reflectance relative to beach scrub lizards, and coppice lizards had an intermediate
326 UV reflectance between the two other habitats (Fig. 2B). Consistent with this, our analyses of
327 variance detected significantly lower PC2 scores in mangrove lizards than in the two other habitats
328 (Fig. 2E, Table 3), representing a higher UV-reflectance relative to red (Fig. 2C). Beach scrub
329 lizards also scored lower on PC3 (Fig. 2E, Table 3), indicating less curvature of the reflectance
330 profile and relatively higher reflectance at intermediate wavelengths (blue-to-yellow) than at the
331 ends of the range (Fig. 2C). Differences were detected between sites both at large ($\sim 100\text{km}$) and
332 short ($< 1\text{km}$) distances (Fig. S2G).

333

334 On Bimini, the random forests mostly correctly classified lizards from the coppice and mangrove
335 habitats while often misclassifying lizards from the beach scrub habitat (Fig. S3D). Relatively flat
336 importance profiles for beach scrub lizards suggested that brightness was used instead of a partic-
337 ular wavelength to identify some of the beach scrub dewlaps (Fig. S3F). Indeed, some beach scrub
338 dewlaps were substantially brighter than the rest (Fig. S3B, C), a pattern that was captured by
339 our analysis of variance along PC1 (i.e. brightness, Fig. S3C, E, Table 3). The random forests also
340 used UV reflectance to discriminate between coppice and mangrove dewlaps (Fig. S3F), which
341 could reflect the significant difference we detected along PC3 between these two habitats (Fig.
342 S3C, E, Table 3). Beach scrub lizards were characterized by elevated red reflectance relative to
343 UV (as represented by PC2, (Fig. S3C, E)), and beach scrub and mangrove lizards were charac-
344 terized by a more even distribution of the reflectance along the spectrum (as represented by PC3,
345 (Fig. S3C, E)), in contrast to coppice lizards which harbored a stronger curvature at intermediate
346 wavelengths (Fig. S3C, E). On this island, the beach scrub and coppice habitats were separated
347 by a few hundred meters, making this contrast the smallest geographical scale at which differences
348 in coloration were found in our study (Fig. S3G).

349

350 On Cayman Brac, all three habitats could be well discriminated against each other (Fig. S4D),
351 with UV reflectance appearing to be an important variable differentiating beach scrub and man-
352 grove dewlaps (Fig. S4F). In contrast, coppice dewlaps had a relatively flat importance profile,
353 suggesting that brightness made them more distinct rather than any particular wavelength (Fig.

S4F). Consistent with this, coppice dewlaps were significantly different from all other dewlaps along PC1 (Fig. S4E, Table 3). At a distance between 2 and 3km (Fig. S4G), dewlaps in the beach scrub habitat reflected more red light (as represented by PC2, Fig. S4C, E) and more UV (as represented by PC3, Fig. S4C, E) than in the mangrove habitat. Coppice lizards were also characterized by a higher UV reflectance than mangrove dewlaps (PC3, Fig. S4C, E, Table 3).

Eleuthera was the only island where we detected significant spatial autocorrelation (Table 2), that is, sites that were closer geographically tended to have populations of lizards with more similar dewlap colors. Although random forests detected between-habitat differences in dewlap color, other approaches did not (Tables S8 and S7), suggesting that the differences may be small. Consistent with this, the only significant univariate difference detected was for PC2 between beach scrub and mangrove lizards, where beach scrub lizards had higher levels of red reflectance and mangrove lizards higher levels of UV reflectance (Fig. S5C, E, Table 3).

Little Cayman was characterized by a better discrimination of mangrove lizards from the rest than between beach scrub and coppice lizards (Fig. S6D). Mangrove dewlaps were most distinct with respect to their reflectance in short wavelengths (Fig. S6F), with significantly lower UV reflectance (as represented by PC2, Fig. S6C, E, Table 3). Beach scrub lizards were characterized by brighter dewlaps than coppice lizards (PC1), and also more convex curves, i.e. slightly higher UV and red reflectance (as represented by higher PC3 scores), than lizards from the other two habitats (Fig. S6C, E, Table 3).

On Long Island the three habitats were relatively well discriminated (Fig. S7D). Importance profiles indicated that short wavelengths were used to discriminate between beach scrub and mangrove lizards (Fig. S7F). Beach scrub lizards had more curved reflectance profiles than in either of the two other habitats, with higher levels of UV and red reflectance relative to intermediate wavelengths (PC3, Fig. S7C, E, Table 3). Beach scrub lizards also differed from mangrove lizards along PC4 (Fig. S7E), which represented a rather small portion of the variance not already explained by the first three principal components, and is therefore difficult to interpret (Fig. S7C). Coppice lizards were significantly darker than mangrove and beach scrub lizards (PC1, Fig. S7C, E, Table 3).

On North Andros, although the random forest classification was significant ($P = 0.0216$, Table 1) and the average confusion matrix indicated that lizards from beach scrub were particularly well predicted (Fig. S8D), no significant univariate differences were detected along any of the four PCs (Fig. S8E, Table 3). Importance analysis of full-spectrum random forests showed higher importance scores near the UV-end of the spectrum in discriminating beach scrub dewlaps from the rest (Fig. S8F). Besides, reflectance curves of beach scrub dewlaps appeared more similar to each other in the UV range than dewlaps from other habitats (Fig. S8B), suggesting that the machines may have used this low within-habitat variance, as opposed to between-habitat differences in means, to correctly classify beach scrub lizards. A small sample size on this island may also have contributed to a lack of power in detecting univariate differences using analyses of variance (Table S1).

On South Andros beach scrub and coppice dewlaps could be discriminated better against each other than with mangrove dewlaps (Fig. S10D), with importance profiles supporting UV-reflectance as a predictor of coppice lizards (Fig. S10F). Coppice lizards had more curved reflectance profiles than beach scrub lizards (PC3), and lizards from both habitats differed along PC4, which is again more difficult to interpret (Fig. S10C, E, Table 3). Beach scrub lizards also differed from mangrove lizards in PC4 (Fig. S10C, E, Table 3).

Classification success was not significantly better than expected by chance on Ragged Island (Table 1) where nearly no habitat could be differentiated from any other based on reflectance.

406 Discussion

407 Two main insights follow from our results. First, excluding North Andros where the follow-up
408 univariate analyses were not significant, we detected significant differences in dewlap coloration
409 between habitats within seven out of the nine islands investigated, suggesting a putatively high
410 potential for local differentiation of dewlap coloration in *Anolis sagrei*. Second, we found differ-
411 ences in coloration along different dimensions of color space, and in different directions, on different
412 islands.

413

414 Detectable differences in dewlap color between habitat-populations are surprising, as habitats
415 were often in close geographical proximity to each other (as close as a few hundred meters on
416 Bimini and most of the time within ten kilometers). Indeed, given that (1) the populations were
417 continuously distributed between the habitats, (2) different habitat-populations were not mono-
418 phyletic with respect to mitochondrial haplotypes ([van de Schoot 2016 unpubl.](#)), and (3) *A. sagrei*
419 have been shown to be a highly mobile species ([Kamath and Losos, 2018](#)), we would have expected
420 more homogeneous distributions of color phenotypes within islands due to extensive gene flow,
421 with fewer differences between populations, especially those in close proximity.

422

423 Several scenarios could account for these findings. One explanation is an adaptive one. Indeed,
424 populations living in different habitats could be phenotypically adapted to their local environmen-
425 tal conditions. Given that the brightly colored dewlap of *A. sagrei* is used as a communication
426 signal, its color may be a target for selection if the transmission or perception of the signal differs
427 from one habitat to another, for example because of differences in ambient light, according to the
428 sensory-drive hypothesis ([Endler and McLellan, 1988; Endler, 1992, 1998](#)). The sensory-drive hy-
429 pothesis has been tested multiple times for dewlap coloration in *Anolis* lizards, with mixed results.
430 Some authors found support for it ([Leal and Fleishman, 2002, 2004](#)), while others did find differ-
431 ences in dewlap coloration between habitats, but those were inconsistent with the sensory-drive
432 hypothesis ([Fleishman et al., 2009; Ng et al., 2012](#)).

433

434 If our results were an example of sensory drive, we would have expected to see consistent dif-
435 ferences between habitat-populations across islands (a pattern that would have been a compelling
436 indicator of adaptation at all, [Losos 2011](#)). This is because environmental conditions that may be
437 relevant to color signal detectability such as light, temperature, moisture and vegetation, are con-
438 sistent within the three main and clearly distinct habitat-types found across the sampled islands,
439 i.e. beach scrub, primary coppice and mangroves ([Howard, 1950; Schoener, 1968](#)). Moreover, the
440 patterns of divergence expected under a sensory drive scenario should be consistent with increased
441 detectability given the local light conditions, such as the high contrasts with background vegetation
442 found in the UV-range by [Leal and Fleishman \(2002\)](#) and [Leal and Fleishman \(2004\)](#).

443

444 Instead, we found differences in the way dewlap color differs between habitats across islands.
445 While short-wavelengths (UV reflectance) were often involved in color differences, they were not
446 involved on all islands where significant differences were detected. On some islands, other or ad-
447 dditional variables differed, such as brightness, red reflectance or the reflectance at the ends of the
448 spectrum visible to *Anolis* lizards (UV and red, [Lazareva et al. 2012](#)) relative to intermediate
449 wavelengths (blue-to-yellow). Similar portions of the spectrum were sometimes involved in oppo-
450 site directions on different islands, such as on Abaco and Cayman Brac, where mangrove lizards
451 had a higher UV-reflectance than beach scrub lizards on the former, but a lower UV-reflectance
452 on the latter. Under a sensory-drive scenario, we would have expected the same variables to be
453 consistently divergent between habitats, or at least in a consistent direction.

454

455 Consistent patterns across islands would have been a good clue for a sensory-drive explana-
456 tion, but in particular consistent differences between habitats that are most different in their local
457 conditions regarding the ecological function of the dewlap, such as ambient light. For example, if
458 ambient light is an important factor shaping dewlap coloration, we would expect mangrove and
459 beach scrub lizards, both inhabiting areas with high light penetration, to harbor more similar
460 dewlaps, and to differ significantly from lizards from the coppice habitat, where irradiance is low.
461 Overall, the observed heterogeneity of divergence patterns across islands provides no support to a
sensory-drive explanation.

Phenotypic plasticity could be another cause for dewlap color variation between habitats, where different conditions would favor different phenotypes in different habitats, without genetic changes. Indeed, the yellow, orange and red colors in anoline dewlaps are produced by pterins and carotenoids (Ortiz, 1962; Ortiz et al., 1962; Ortiz and Williams-Ashman, 1963; Ortiz and Mal-
donado, 1966; Macedonia et al., 2000; Steffen and McGraw, 2007, 2009). Animals can synthesize pterins from nucleotides, but lack the ability to synthesize carotenoids (Goodwin, 1984; Hill et al., 2002; Hill and McGraw, 2006). Different food qualities across sites within islands could therefore potentially cause detectable differences in coloration. Alternatively, more subtle effects on dewlap color could arise from developmental plasticity and depend, e.g. on differences in egg-rearing conditions. However, more data are needed to test these hypotheses, and although some work has shown plastic responses of dewlap color in response to parasites in *A. sagrei* (Cook et al., 2013), we find it unlikely to account for the widespread habitat differences we found. Besides, studies testing the effect of carotenoid deprivation (Steffen et al., 2010; Ng et al., 2013) and heritability (Cox et al., 2017) of dewlap coloration in *A. sagrei* and another species with a carotenoid-based dewlap, *A. distichus*, found little support for phenotypic and developmental plasticity in dewlap coloration.

Genetic drift is another process that can account for differences in phenotype between localities, especially in small populations. One way this could proceed is through isolation-by-distance, where more distant populations accumulate more differences through time because of the reduced effect of gene flow at larger geographical scales relative to the dispersal range of the species (Rousset, 2004). Here, we only found a significant correlation between phenotypic and geographical distances on Eleuthera to support this scenario. On all the other islands, in contrast, populations from closer sites were not phenotypically more similar, which argues against isolation-by-distance. That said, there were often few sampling sites per island in our study, whose locations were not uniformly chosen within the islands, and so the true extent of isolation-by-distance may be difficult to test. Other, less trivial forms of drift may be at play than isolation-by-distance, but nevertheless, we did find significant differences in color phenotype at relatively small spatial scales, sometimes in neighboring habitats, on islands where gene flow is probably highly pervasive, as suggested by high rates of encounter between males and females (Kamath and Losos, 2018), making the divergence of habitat-populations by drift in relative genetic isolation an unlikely scenario.

A number of alternative explanations remain. First, there could be sexual selection for different dewlap colors in different locations. Indeed, although the sensory-drive hypothesis may include a sexual selection aspect, e.g. if the optimal male phenotype in a given habitat is a function of female perception, sexual preferences may also be arbitrary and independent of the habitat (Andersson, 1994), and so could differ across habitats and islands. Although one previous study has found no link between dewlap coloration and body size dimorphism in *A. sagrei* (a proxy for the intensity of sexual selection) in an among-island comparison (Baekens et al., 2018), within-island data are lacking to test the plausibility of this scenario.

Alternatively, selective pressures may be different in similar habitats from one island to another, because of other environmental variables not accounted for by the habitat-type classification we used (Howard, 1950; Schoener, 1968). The islands we sampled indeed exhibit variation in some climatic variables but also in densities of predators and anole congeners, which have all been shown to correlate with variation in *A. sagrei* mean dewlap coloration among islands (Vanhooijdonck et al., 2009; Baekens et al., 2018).

Finally, different island-populations could also respond differently to similar selective pressures, resulting in various between-habitat divergence patterns across islands. Several factors could account for this. For example, the founder populations of each island, which we know colonized the islands independently (van de Schoot, unpublished thesis; Driessens et al. 2017; Reynolds et al. 2020), could have exhibited different dewlap colors at the time of colonization, as may be suggested by the larger differences we observed between than within islands. In turn, different initial phenotypes could have led to different ways in which populations would have diverged between habitats. Moreover, the different founding populations may have also consisted in different subsets of the standing genetic variation of their Cuban ancestor due to potential bottlenecks (Reynolds et al., 2020), which may have constrained the way they would later respond to the local selective

521 pressures of their respective islands.

522

523 Altogether, our results show that dewlap color of *A. sagrei* commonly varies between habitat-

524 types, even in close geographical proximity, within islands of the West Indies, and that coloration

525 differs in different ways from one island to another. We discussed several non-mutually exclusive

526 mechanisms that could explain these observations, but more data are needed to thoroughly test

527 each of these. Nevertheless, heterogeneous patterns of divergence across islands do not support an

528 adaptive sensory-drive scenario, and we propose that within-island dewlap color variation may

529 be underlain by a more subtle mosaic of factors.

Acknowledgements

Collection permission was granted by the Bahamas Environment, Science and Technology Commission, the Bahamas National Trust, the Bahamas Ministry of Agriculture, and the Cayman Islands Department of the Environment. The authors thank Sofia Prado-Irwin, Pavitra Muralidhar, Nicholas Herrmann, Richard E. Glor, Alberto R. Puente-Rolón, Kevin Aviles-Rodriguez, Kristin Winchell, Jason Fredette, Quyhn Quach, Wendy Jesse, Inbar Maayan, Alexis Harrison and Melissa Kemp for assistance in the field and Pratik Gupte, Max Lambert and James Stroud for helpful discussions. Funding for this work was provided by the Templeton Foundation (to JBL), NSF DEB #1927194 (to JBL and AJG), NSF DEB #1500761 (to AJG), NSF DBI #1609284 (to CMD), and a Harvard Museum of Comparative Zoology Putnam Expedition Grant (to RGR).

539

530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538

Figures

540




Figure 1: Overview of our study design, including a map of the Bahamas and the Cayman Islands, on which are indicated the nine islands we sampled, two representatives of our study species *Anolis sagrei* with their dewlaps deployed, and the three types of habitats we considered on each island.




Figure 2: Comparison of dewlap coloration across habitats on Abaco. (A) Map of the island with the sampling sites colored by habitat. (B) Reflectance profiles of all the dewlaps on the island. (C) How reflectance profiles map onto the within-island principal components. (D) Confusion matrix showing the proportion of lizards from each (true) habitat reassigned to each (predicted) habitat by the random forests, based on the first four within-island principal components and averaged across replicates. Each column sums to one. (E) Within-island principal component scores across habitats. Bars indicate significant contrasts. *, $P < 0.05$; **, $P < 0.01$; ***, $P < 0.001$.

Tables

541

Table 1: Random forest classification results. For each island are shown the sample size (N) and the proportion of correctly reassigned observations (or success score). P-values were computed using a binomial test and assess the significance of the observed success score relative to the score expected under random guessing. *, $P < 0.05$; **, $P < 0.01$, ***, $P < 0.001$.

Island	N	Score	P
Abaco	86	0.612	< 0.0001 ***
Bimini	67	0.510	0.0011 **
Cayman Brac	50	0.728	< 0.0001 ***
Eleuthera	56	0.493	0.0072 **
Little Cayman	45	0.649	< 0.0001 ***
Long Island	53	0.634	< 0.0001 ***
North Andros	28	0.507	0.0216 *
Ragged Island	50	0.368	0.2874
South Andros	31	0.484	0.0270 *

Table 2: Test of spatial autocorrelation. For each island are shown the correlation (Pearson's ρ) between the matrix of phenotypic distances between populations from each site and the matrix of geographic distances between sites, where phenotypic distances are Euclidean distances between the mean phenotypes of each site in the multivariate space consisting of the first four within-island principal components. P-values assess the significance of the observed correlation against the correlation expected if lizards were randomly permuted among sites (1,000 permutations). *, $P < 0.05$; **, $P < 0.01$, ***, $P < 0.001$.

Island	ρ	P
Abaco	0.448	0.065
Bimini	0.810	0.137
Cayman Brac	-0.737	0.754
Eleuthera	0.844	0.006 **
Little Cayman	-0.042	0.625
Long Island	0.367	0.183
North Andros	0.051	0.505
Ragged Island	-0.363	0.620
South Andros	-0.979	0.904

Table 3: Significance of habitat differences in dewlap coloration, using ANOVA for all islands where significant multivariate differences in dewlap coloration were detected by random forests. Model, best-fitting model (either OLS or GLS). AICc, corrected AIC score of the best-fitting model. ΔAICc , difference in AICc between the best-fitting model and the OLS-model. AICcw, AICc weight. Log-lik., log-likelihood. χ^2 , likelihood ratio. df, degrees of freedom. *, $P < 0.05$; **, $P < 0.01$; ***, $P < 0.001$.

Island	Variable	AICc	ΔAICc	AICcw	Model	Log-lik.	χ^2	df	P
Abaco	PC1	255.81	2.16	0.746	OLS	-121.45	0.14	2	0.9308
Abaco	PC2	225.32	4.02	0.882	OLS	-105.66	31.74	2	< 0.0001 ***
Abaco	PC3	229.53	2.01	0.732	OLS	-107.84	27.37	2	< 0.0001 ***
Abaco	PC4	254.64	0.78	0.596	OLS	-120.85	1.36	2	0.5070
Bimini	PC1	194.16	0.77	0.595	OLS	-90.87	7.40	2	0.0248 *
Bimini	PC2	193.49	1.29	0.656	OLS	-90.52	8.09	2	0.0175 *
Bimini	PC3	184.22	-0.23	0.529	GLS	-83.46	10.39	2	0.0056 **
Bimini	PC4	200.91	3.54	0.854	OLS	-94.40	0.33	2	0.8499
Cayman Brac	PC1	136.64	-4.05	0.884	GLS	-59.29	13.81	2	0.0010 **
Cayman Brac	PC2	144.75	3.51	0.853	OLS	-66.24	8.41	2	0.0149 *
Cayman Brac	PC3	127.13	2.77	0.800	OLS	-56.86	27.16	2	< 0.0001 ***
Cayman Brac	PC4	147.37	4.33	0.897	OLS	-67.63	5.63	2	0.0600
Eleuthera	PC1	168.72	2.42	0.770	OLS	-78.46	1.00	2	0.6074
Eleuthera	PC2	160.03	-2.20	0.750	GLS	-70.89	11.34	2	0.0034 **
Eleuthera	PC3	163.49	-0.20	0.525	GLS	-72.69	5.57	2	0.0617
Eleuthera	PC4	164.08	3.49	0.852	OLS	-76.01	5.89	2	0.0525
Little Cayman	PC1	130.60	2.50	0.777	OLS	-59.26	8.18	2	0.0167 *
Little Cayman	PC2	112.66	-3.61	0.859	GLS	-46.74	29.76	2	< 0.0001 ***
Little Cayman	PC3	118.32	1.41	0.669	OLS	-52.68	21.34	2	< 0.0001 ***
Little Cayman	PC4	135.58	2.53	0.780	OLS	-61.92	2.85	2	0.2410
Long Island	PC1	154.54	-2.09	0.740	GLS	-68.62	2.91	2	0.2331
Long Island	PC2	155.80	-3.08	0.823	GLS	-68.92	4.52	2	0.1043
Long Island	PC3	150.54	3.67	0.862	OLS	-69.08	11.24	2	0.0036 **
Long Island	PC4	155.05	2.38	0.767	OLS	-71.47	6.46	2	0.0395 *
North Andros	PC1	88.64	0.27	0.534	OLS	-38.84	0.75	2	0.6864
North Andros	PC2	85.36	2.17	0.748	OLS	-37.01	4.42	2	0.1100
North Andros	PC3	85.31	5.82	0.948	OLS	-36.98	4.48	2	0.1065
North Andros	PC4	88.45	4.83	0.918	OLS	-38.74	0.96	2	0.6194
South Andros	PC1	95.12	0.44	0.554	OLS	-41.93	3.10	2	0.2125
South Andros	PC2	89.93	-0.05	0.506	GLS	-35.84	7.76	2	0.0206 *
South Andros	PC3	87.21	-6.14	0.956	GLS	-34.05	10.35	2	0.0056 **
South Andros	PC4	83.01	2.94	0.813	OLS	-35.23	16.51	2	0.0003 ***

References

- Anderson, M. J. (2001). A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance. *Austral Ecology*, 26(1):32–46. 54.2
- Andersson, M. B. (1994). *Sexual Selection*. Monographs in Behavior and Ecology. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. 54.3
- Arnold, S. J. (1983). Morphology, Performance and Fitness. *American Zoologist*, 23(2):347–361. 54.4
- Baeckens, S., Driessens, T., and Van Damme, R. (2018). The brown anole dewlap revisited: Do predation pressure, sexual selection, and species recognition shape among-population signal diversity? *PeerJ*, 6:e4722. 54.5
- Bartoń, K. (2019). MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference. 54.6
- Benjamini, Y. and Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, 57:289–300. 54.7
- Bradbury, J. W. and Vehrenkamp, S. L. (2011). *Principles of Animal Communication*. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Mass, 2nd ed edition. 54.8
- Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45(1):5–32. 54.9
- Cook, E. G., Murphy, T. G., and Johnson, M. A. (2013). Colorful displays signal male quality in a tropical anole lizard. *Naturwissenschaften*, 100(10):993–996. 55.0
- Cortez, P. (2020). Rminer: Data Mining Classification and Regression Methods. 55.1
- Cox, R. M., Costello, R. A., Camber, B. E., and McGlothlin, J. W. (2017). Multivariate genetic architecture of the *Anolis* dewlap reveals both shared and sex-specific features of a sexually dimorphic ornament. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 30(7):1262–1275. 55.2
- Cristianini, N. and Shawe-Taylor, J. (2000). *An Introduction to Support Vector Machines and Other Kernel-Based Learning Methods*. Cambridge University Press, first edition. 55.3
- Cuthill, I. C., Bennett, A. T. D., Partridge, J. C., and Maier, E. J. (1999). Plumage Reflectance and the Objective Assessment of Avian Sexual Dichromatism. *The American Naturalist*, 153(2):183–200. 55.4
- Dieckmann, U. and Doebeli, M. (1999). On the origin of species by sympatric speciation. *Nature*, 400(6742):354–357. 55.5
- Driessens, T., Baeckens, S., Balzarolo, M., Vanhooydonck, B., Huyghe, K., and Van Damme, R. (2017). Climate-related environmental variation in a visual signalling device: The male and female dewlap in *Anolis sagrei* lizards. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 30(10):1846–1861. 55.6
- Driessens, T., Huyghe, K., Vanhooydonck, B., and Van Damme, R. (2015). Messages conveyed by assorted facets of the dewlap, in both sexes of *Anolis sagrei*. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 69(8):1251–1264. 55.7
- Driessens, T., Vanhooydonck, B., and Van Damme, R. (2014). Deterring predators, daunting opponents or drawing partners? Signaling rates across diverse contexts in the lizard *Anolis sagrei*. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 68(2):173–184. 55.8
- Endler, J. (1998). Sensory ecology, receiver biases and sexual selection. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 13(10):415–420. 55.9
- Endler, J. A. (1984). Natural and sexual selection on color patterns in poeciliid fishes. In Balon, E. K. and Zaret, T. M., editors, *Evolutionary Ecology of Neotropical Freshwater Fishes*, volume 3, pages 95–111. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht. 56.0
- Endler, J. A. (1990). On the measurement and classification of colour in studies of animal colour patterns. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 41(4):315–352. 56.1

- 587 Endler, J. A. (1991). Variation in the appearance of guppy color patterns to guppies and their
588 predators under different visual conditions. *Vision Research*, 31(3):587–608.
- 589 Endler, J. A. (1992). Signals, Signal Conditions, and the Direction of Evolution. *The American
590 Naturalist*, 139:S125–S153.
- 591 Endler, J. A. (1993a). The Color of Light in Forests and Its Implications. *Ecological Monographs*,
592 63(1):1–27.
- 593 Endler, J. A. (1993b). Some general comments on the evolution and design of animal communi-
594 cation systems. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological
595 Sciences*, 340(1292):215–225.
- 596 Endler, J. A. and McLellan, T. (1988). The Processes of Evolution: Toward a Newer Synthesis.
597 *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 19(1):395–421.
- 598 Felsenstein, J. (1976). The Theoretical Population Genetics of Variable Selection and Migration.
599 *Annual Review of Genetics*, 10(1):253–280.
- 600 Fleishman, L. J. (2000). *Signal Function, Signal Efficiency and the Evolution of Anoline Lizard
601 Dewlap Color*, pages 209–236. Tapir Academic, Trondheim.
- 602 Fleishman, L. J., Leal, M., and Persons, M. H. (2009). Habitat light and dewlap color diversity in
603 four species of Puerto Rican anoline lizards. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A*, 195(11):1043–
604 1060.
- 605 Fleishman, L. J. and Persons, M. (2001). The influence of stimulus and background colour on
606 signal visibility in the lizard *Anolis cristatellus*. *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, 204(Pt
607 9):1559–1575.
- 608 Fleishman, L. J., Wadman, C. S., and Maximov, K. J. (2020). The interacting effects of total
609 light intensity and chromatic contrast on visual signal visibility in an *Anolis* lizard. *Animal
610 Behaviour*, page S0003347220302037.
- 611 García-Ramos, G. and Kirkpatrick, M. (1997). Genetic Models of Adaptation and Gene Flow in
612 Peripheral Populations. *Evolution*, 51(1):21–28.
- 613 Geneva, A. J., Hilton, J., Noll, S., and Glor, R. E. (2015). Multilocus phylogenetic analyses of
614 Hispaniolan and Bahamian trunk anoles (*distichus* species group). *Molecular Phylogenetics and
615 Evolution*, 87:105–117.
- 616 Gittleman, J. L. and Kot, M. (1990). Adaptation: Statistics and a Null Model for Estimating
617 Phylogenetic Effects. *Systematic Zoology*, 39(3):227.
- 618 Goodwin, T. W. (1984). *The Biochemistry of the Carotenoids*. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht.
- 619 Halfwerk, W., Jones, P. L., Taylor, R. C., Ryan, M. J., and Page, R. A. (2014). Risky Ripples Allow
620 Bats and Frogs to Eavesdrop on a Multisensory Sexual Display. *Science*, 343(6169):413–416.
- 621 Hendry, A. P., Day, T., and Taylor, E. B. (2007a). Population Mixing and the Adaptive Divergence
622 of Quantitative Traits in Discrete Populations: A Theoretical Framework for Empirical Tests.
623 *Evolution*, 55(3):459–466.
- 624 Hendry, A. P., Taylor, E. B., and McPhail, J. D. (2007b). Adaptive Divergence and the Balance
625 Between Selection and Gene Flow: Lake and Stream Stickleback in the Misty System. *Evolution*,
626 56(6):1199–1216.
- 627 Henze, N. and Zirkler, B. (1990). A class of invariant consistent tests for multivariate normality.
628 *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, 19(10):3595–3617.
- 629 Hijmans, R. J. (2019). Geosphere: Spherical Trigonometry.
- 630 Hill, G. E., Inouye, C. Y., and Montgomerie, R. (2002). Dietary carotenoids predict plumage
631 coloration in wild house finches. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological
Sciences*, 269(1496):1119–1124.

Hill, G. E. and McGraw, K. J., editors (2006). <i>Bird Coloration</i> . Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.	633 634
Hollander, M., Wolfe, D. A., and Chicken, E. (2013). <i>Nonparametric Statistical Methods</i> . Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc, Hoboken, New Jersey, third edition edition.	635 636 637
Howard, R. A. (1950). Vegetation of the Bimini Island Group: Bahamas, B. W. I. <i>Ecological Monographs</i> , 20(4):317–349.	638 639
James, G., Witten, D., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (2013). <i>An Introduction to Statistical Learning</i> , volume 103 of <i>Springer Texts in Statistics</i> . Springer New York, New York, NY.	640 641
Kamath, A. and Losos, J. B. (2018). Estimating encounter rates as the first step of sexual selection in the lizard <i>Anolis sagrei</i> . <i>Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences</i> , 285(1873):20172244.	642 643 644
Kolbe, J. J., Larson, A., Losos, J. B., and de Queiroz, K. (2008). Admixture determines genetic diversity and population differentiation in the biological invasion of a lizard species. <i>Biology Letters</i> , 4(4):434–437.	645 646 647
Kolbe, J. J., Leal, M., Schoener, T. W., Spiller, D. A., and Losos, J. B. (2012). Founder Effects Persist Despite Adaptive Differentiation: A Field Experiment with Lizards. <i>Science</i> , 335(6072):1086–1089.	648 649 650
Korkmaz, S., Goksuluk, D., and Zararsiz, G. (2014). MVN: An R Package for Assessing Multivariate Normality. <i>The R Journal</i> , 6(2):151–162.	651 652
Lambert, S. M., Geneva, A. J., Luke Mahler, D., and Glor, R. E. (2013). Using genomic data to revisit an early example of reproductive character displacement in Haitian <i>Anolis</i> lizards. <i>Molecular Ecology</i> , 22(15):3981–3995.	653 654 655
Lazareva, O. F., Shimizu, T., and Wasserman, E. A. (2012). <i>How Animals See the WorldComparative Behavior, Biology, and Evolution of Vision</i> . Oxford University Press.	656 657
Leal, M. and Fleishman, L. J. (2002). Evidence for habitat partitioning based on adaptation to environmental light in a pair of sympatric lizard species. <i>Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences</i> , 269(1489):351–359.	658 659 660
Leal, M. and Fleishman, L. J. (2004). Differences in Visual Signal Design and Detectability between Allopatric Populations of <i>Anolis</i> Lizards. <i>The American Naturalist</i> , 163(1):26–39.	661 662
Leal, M. and Rodríguez-Robles, J. A. (1995). Antipredator Responses of <i>Anolis cristatellus</i> (Sauria: Polychrotidae). <i>Copeia</i> , 1995(1):155–161.	663 664
Leal, M. and Rodriguez-Robles, J. A. (1997). Antipredator Responses of the Puerto Rican Giant Anole, <i>Anolis cuvieri</i> (Squamata: Polychrotidae). <i>Biotropica</i> , 29(3):372–375.	665 666
Leal, M. and Rodríguez-Robles, J. A. (1997). Signalling displays during predator–prey interactions in a Puerto Rican anole, <i>Anolis cristatellus</i> . <i>Animal Behaviour</i> , 54(5):1147–1154.	667 668
Lenormand, T. (2002). Gene flow and the limits to natural selection. <i>Trends in Ecology & Evolution</i> , 17(4):183–189.	669 670
Liaw, A. and Wiener, M. (2002). Classification and Regression by randomForest. <i>R News</i> , 2(3):18–22.	671 672
Losos, J. B. (1985). An Experimental Demonstration of the Species-Recognition Role of <i>Anolis</i> Dewlap Color. <i>Copeia</i> , 1985(4):905–910.	673 674
Losos, J. B. (2009). <i>Lizards in an Evolutionary Tree: Ecology and Adaptive Radiation of Anoles</i> . University of California Press.	675 676
677 Losos, J. B. (2011). Convergence, Adaptation, and Constraint. <i>Evolution</i> , 65(7):1827–1840.	

- 678 Losos, J. B., Irschick, D. J., and Schoener, T. W. (1994). Adaptation and Constraint in the
679 Evolution of Specialization of Bahamian *Anolis* Lizards. *Evolution*, 48(6):1786–1798.
- 680 Losos, J. B., Schoener, T. W., Warheit, K. I., and Creer, D. (2001). Experimental studies of
681 adaptive differentiation in Bahamian *Anolis* lizards. *Genetica*, 112-113:399–415.
- 682 Losos, J. B., Warheit, K. I., and Schoener, T. W. (1997). Adaptive differentiation following
683 experimental island colonization in *Anolis* lizards. *Nature*, 387(6628):70–73.
- 684 Macedonia, J. M. (2001). Habitat light, colour variation, and ultraviolet reflectance in the Grand
685 Cayman anole, *Anolis conspersus*. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 73(3):299–320.
- 686 Macedonia, J. M., Clark, D. L., Riley, R. G., and Kemp, D. J. (2013). Species recognition of color
687 and motion signals in *Anolis grahami*: Evidence from responses to lizard robots. *Behavioral
688 Ecology*, 24(4):846–852.
- 689 Macedonia, J. M., Clark, D. L., and Tamasi, A. L. (2014). Does Selection Favor Dewlap Colors that
690 Maximize Detectability? A Test with Five Species of Jamaican *Anolis* Lizards. *Herpetologica*,
691 70(2):157–170.
- 692 Macedonia, J. M., James, S., Witte, L. W., and Clark, D. L. (2000). Skin Pigments and Coloration
693 in the Jamaican Radiation of *Anolis* Lizards. *Journal of Herpetology*, 34(1):99–109.
- 694 Macedonia, J. M. and Stamps, J. A. (1994). Species Recognition in *Anolis grahami* (Sauria,
695 Iguanidae): Evidence from Responses to Video Playbacks of Conspecific and Heterospecific
696 Displays. *Ethology*, 98(3-4):246–264.
- 697 Maia, R., Eliason, C. M., Bitton, P.-P., Doucet, S. M., and Shawkey, M. D. (2013). Pavo: An
698 R package for the analysis, visualization and organization of spectral data. *Methods in Ecology
699 and Evolution*, pages n/a–n/a.
- 700 Ng, J., Geneva, A. J., Noll, S., and Glor, R. E. (2017). Signals and Speciation: *Anolis* Dewlap
701 Color as a Reproductive Barrier. *Journal of Herpetology*, 51(3):437–447.
- 702 Ng, J. and Glor, R. E. (2011). Genetic differentiation among populations of a Hispaniolan trunk
703 anole that exhibit geographical variation in dewlap colour. *Molecular Ecology*, 20(20):4302–4317.
- 704 Ng, J., Kelly, A. L., MacGuigan, D. J., and Glor, R. E. (2013). The Role of Heritable and Dietary
705 Factors in the Sexual Signal of a Hispaniolan *Anolis* Lizard, *Anolis distichus*. *Journal of Heredity*,
706 104(6):862–873.
- 707 Ng, J., Landeen, E. L., Logsdon, R. M., and Glor, R. E. (2012). Correlation Between *Anolis*
708 Lizard Dewlap Phenotype and Environmental Variation Indicates Adaptive Divergence of a
709 Signal Important to Sexual Selection and Species Recognition. *Evolution*, 67(2):573–582.
- 710 Ng, J., Ossip-Klein, A. G., and Glor, R. E. (2016). Adaptive signal coloration maintained in the
711 face of gene flow in a Hispaniolan *Anolis* Lizard. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, 16(1):193.
- 712 Nicholson, K. E., Harmon, L. J., and Losos, J. B. (2007). Evolution of *Anolis* Lizard Dewlap
713 Diversity. *PLoS ONE*, 2(3):e274.
- 714 Nosil, P. and Crespi, B. J. (2004). Does Gene Flow Constrain Adaptive Divergence or Vice Versa? A
715 Test Using Ecomorphology and Sexual Isolation in *Timema cristinae* Walking-Sticks. *Evolution*,
716 58(1):102–112.
- 717 Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F. G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., McGlinn, D., Minchin, P. R.,
718 O'Hara, R. B., Simpson, G. L., Solymos, P., Stevens, M. H. H., Szoecs, E., and Wagner, H.
719 (2019). Vegan: Community Ecology Package. R package version 2.5-6.
- 720 Ortiz, E. (1962). Drosopterins in the dewlap of some anoline lizards. *American Zoologist*, 2:545–546.
- 721 Ortiz, E. and Maldonado, A. A. (1966). Pteridine accumulation in lizards of the genus *Anolis*.
Caribbean Journal of Science, 6:9–13.

Ortiz, E., Throckmorton, L. H., and Williams-Ashman, H. G. (1962). Drosopterins in the Throat Fans of Some Puerto Rican Lizards. <i>Nature</i> , 196(4854):595–596.	723 724
Ortiz, E. and Williams-Ashman, H. (1963). Identification of skin pteridines in the pasture lizard <i>Anolis pulchellus</i> . <i>Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology</i> , 10(3):181–190.	725 726
Pinheiro, J. and Bates, D. (2000). <i>Mixed-Effects Models in S and S-PLUS</i> . Statistics and Computing. Springer-Verlag, New York.	727 728
Pinheiro, J., Bates, D., DebRoy, S., Sarkar, D., and Team, R. C. (2020). Nlme: Linear and Nonlinear Mixed Effects Models.	729 730
Pohlert, T. (2020). PMCMRplus: Calculate Pairwise Multiple Comparisons of Mean Rank Sums Extended. R package version 1.4.4.	731 732
R Core Team (2019). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.	733 734
Rand, A. S. and Williams, E. E. (1970). An Estimation of Redundancy and Information Content of Anole Dewlaps. <i>The American Naturalist</i> , 104(935):99–103.	735 736
Reynolds, R. G., Kolbe, J. J., Glor, R. E., López-Darias, M., Gómez Pourroy, C. V., Harrison, A. S., Queiroz, K., Revell, L. J., and Losos, J. B. (2020). Phylogeographic and phenotypic outcomes of brown anole colonization across the Caribbean provide insight into the beginning stages of an adaptive radiation. <i>Journal of Evolutionary Biology</i> , 33(4):468–494.	737 738 739 740
Richardson, J. L. and Urban, M. C. (2013). Strong Selection Barriers Explain Microgeographic Adaptation in Wild Salamander Populations. <i>Evolution</i> , 67(6):1729–1740.	741 742
Richardson, J. L., Urban, M. C., Bolnick, D. I., and Skelly, D. K. (2014). Microgeographic adaptation and the spatial scale of evolution. <i>Trends in Ecology & Evolution</i> , 29(3):165–176.	743 744
Rousset, F. (2004). <i>Genetic Structure and Selection in Subdivided Populations</i> . Number 40 in Monographs in Population Biology. Princeton University Press, Princeton.	745 746
Schoener, T. W. (1968). The <i>Anolis</i> Lizards of Bimini: Resource Partitioning in a Complex Fauna. <i>Ecology</i> , 49(4):704–726.	747 748
Seehausen, O. (1997). Cichlid Fish Diversity Threatened by Eutrophication That Curbs Sexual Selection. <i>Science</i> , 277(5333):1808–1811.	749 750
Sigmund, W. R. (1983). Female Preference for <i>Anolis carolinensis</i> Males as a Function of Dewlap Color and Background Coloration. <i>Journal of Herpetology</i> , 17(2):137–143.	751 752
Stapley, J., Wordley, C., and Slate, J. (2011). No Evidence of Genetic Differentiation Between Anoles With Different Dewlap Color Patterns. <i>Journal of Heredity</i> , 102(1):118–124.	753 754
Steffen, J. E. and Guyer, C. C. (2014). Display behaviour and dewlap colour as predictors of contest success in brown anoles: Dewlap Colour and Behaviour in Contests. <i>Biological Journal of the Linnean Society</i> , 111(3):646–655.	755 756 757
Steffen, J. E., Hill, G. E., and Guyer, C. (2010). Carotenoid Access, Nutritional Stress, and the Dewlap Color of Male Brown Anoles. <i>Copeia</i> , 2010(2):239–246.	758 759
Steffen, J. E. and McGraw, K. J. (2007). Contributions of pterin and carotenoid pigments to dewlap coloration in two anole species. <i>Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part B: Biochemistry and Molecular Biology</i> , 146(1):42–46.	760 761 762
Steffen, J. E. and McGraw, K. J. (2009). How dewlap color reflects its carotenoid and pterin content in male and female brown anoles (<i>Norops sagrei</i>). <i>Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part B: Biochemistry and Molecular Biology</i> , 154(3):334–340.	763 764 765
Thorpe, R. S. (2002). Analysis of Color Spectra in Comparative Evolutionary Studies: Molecular Phylogeny and Habitat Adaptation in the St. Vincent Anole (<i>Anolis trinitatis</i>). <i>Systematic Biology</i> , 51(4):554–569.	766 767

- 769 Thorpe, R. S. and Stenson, A. G. (2002). Phylogeny, Paraphyly and Ecological Adaptation of
770 the Colour and Pattern in the Anolis Roquet Complex on Martinique: Interaction Between
771 Phylogeny and Adaptation. *Molecular Ecology*, 12(1):117–132.
- 772 Tokarz, R. R. (2002). An Experimental Test of the Importance of the Dewlap in Male Mating
773 Success in the Lizard *Anolis sagrei*. *Herpetologica*, 58(1):87–94.
- 774 Tokarz, R. R. (2006). Importance of Prior Physical Contact with Familiar Females in the Develop-
775 ment of a Male Courtship and Mating Preference for Unfamiliar Females in the Lizard *Anolis*
776 *Sagrei*. *Herpetologica*, 62(2):115–124.
- 777 Tokarz, R. R., Paterson, A. V., and McMann, S. (2005). Importance of Dewlap Display in
778 Male Mating Success in Free-Ranging Brown Anoles (*Anolis sagrei*). *Journal of Herpetology*,
779 39(1):174–177.
- 780 van de Schoot, M. (2016). *Within and between Island Radiation and Genetic Variation in Anolis*
781 *Sagrei*. PhD thesis, Wageningen University, Wageningen, The Netherlands.
- 782 Vanhooydonck, B., Herrel, A., Meyers, J. J., and Irschick, D. J. (2009). What determines dewlap
783 diversity in *Anolis* lizards? An among-island comparison. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*,
784 22(2):293–305.
- 785 Willi, Y. and Hoffmann, A. A. (2012). Microgeographic adaptation linked to forest fragmentation
786 and habitat quality in the tropical fruit fly *Drosophila birchii*. *Oikos*, 121(10):1627–1637.
- 787 Williams, E. E. (1969). The Ecology of Colonization as Seen in the Zoogeography of Anoline
788 Lizards on Small Islands. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 44(4):345–389.
- 789 Williams, E. E. and Rand, A. S. (1977). Species Recognition, Dewlap Function and Faunal Size.
790 *American Zoologist*, 17(1):261–270.
- 791 Zuur, A. F., editor (2009). *Mixed Effects Models and Extensions in Ecology with R*. Statistics for
792 Biology and Health. Springer, New York, NY.

⁷⁹³ **Supplementary Figures**




Figure S1: Maps of the islands. (A) Map of the West Indies with sampled islands highlighted in black. (B) Sampling sites within islands colored after their respective habitat-types.




Figure S2: Comparison of dewlap coloration across habitats on Abaco, with extended results. (A–E) Legend as per Figure 2. (F) One-dimensional sensitivity analysis showing the relative importance (mean decrease in accuracy) of the various wavelengths in random forest classification of the whole spectrum. (G) Geographical distance between sites where significant differences were detected in within-island principal component scores (Wilcoxon test, Benjamini-Hochberg correction, $P < 0.05$), including only pairs of sites whose habitats were involved in between-habitat dewlap differences.




Figure S3: Comparison of dewlap coloration across habitats on Bimini. Legend is as per Figure S2.




Figure S4: Comparison of dewlap coloration across habitats on Cayman Brac. Legend is as per Figure S2.




Figure S5: Comparison of dewlap coloration across habitats on Eleuthera. Legend is as per Figure S2.




Figure S6: Comparison of dewlap coloration across habitats on Little Cayman. Legend is as per Figure S2.




Figure S7: Comparison of dewlap coloration across habitats on Long Island. Legend is as per Figure S2.




Figure S8: Comparison of dewlap coloration across habitats on North Andros. Legend is as per Figure S2, but without panel G.




Figure S9: Comparison of dewlap coloration across habitats on Ragged Island. Legend is as per Figure S2, but without panel G.




Figure S10: Comparison of dewlap coloration across habitats on South Andros. Legend is as per Figure S2.




Figure S11: PC1 captures brightness across all islands. (A) Correlation between dewlap brightness (as measured by the mean reflectance from 300 to 700nm in wavelength) and PC1 score across all islands. (B) Correlation between brightness and within-island PC1, for each island. Pearson's correlation coefficients are reported. ***, $P < 0.001$.

Supplementary Tables

794

Table S1: Number of lizards sampled in each habitat on each island.

	coastal	coppice	mangrove
Abaco	41	24	21
Bimini	38	14	15
Cayman Brac	15	18	17
Eleuthera	22	25	9
Little Cayman	17	12	16
Long Island	26	14	13
North Andros	9	9	10
Ragged Island	18	15	17
South Andros	10	9	12

Table S2: Proportion of variance explained by the first four principal components on each island, as well as in the PCA performed on all islands together (last row).

Island	Total	PC1	PC2	PC3	PC4
Abaco	0.906	0.400	0.279	0.147	0.079
Bimini	0.921	0.502	0.208	0.160	0.051
Cayman Brac	0.888	0.438	0.190	0.155	0.105
Eleuthera	0.926	0.490	0.233	0.138	0.066
Little Cayman	0.907	0.441	0.212	0.176	0.078
Long Island	0.925	0.515	0.205	0.161	0.043
North Andros	0.937	0.560	0.170	0.152	0.054
Ragged Island	0.907	0.483	0.226	0.127	0.072
South Andros	0.948	0.488	0.247	0.146	0.067
All islands	0.913	0.473	0.197	0.164	0.079

Table S3: Henze-Zirkler's test of multivariate normality, performed on global principal components (i.e. fitted on data from all islands together) in each habitat and on each island. The number of outlier points detected based on the Mahalanobis distance is reported. HZ , test statistic. *, $P < 0.05$; **, $P < 0.01$; ***, $P < 0.001$.

Island	Habitat	Outliers	HZ	P
Abaco	coastal	0	1.099	0.0027 **
Abaco	coppice	0	1.074	0.0022 **
Abaco	mangrove	0	1.063	0.0023 **
Bimini	coastal	0	1.281	< 0.0001 ***
Bimini	coppice	0	0.850	0.0482 *
Bimini	mangrove	0	1.191	0.0001 ***
Cayman Brac	coastal	0	0.647	0.5311
Cayman Brac	coppice	0	0.701	0.3940
Cayman Brac	mangrove	0	0.657	0.5357
Eleuthera	coastal	0	1.614	< 0.0001 ***
Eleuthera	coppice	0	1.481	< 0.0001 ***
Eleuthera	mangrove	0	0.729	0.1423
Little Cayman	coastal	0	0.624	0.6599
Little Cayman	coppice	0	0.638	0.4867
Little Cayman	mangrove	0	0.873	0.0413 *
Long Island	coastal	0	0.824	0.1468
Long Island	coppice	0	0.923	0.0150 *
Long Island	mangrove	0	0.773	0.1289
North Andros	coastal	0	0.658	0.3174
North Andros	coppice	0	0.763	0.0900
North Andros	mangrove	0	0.668	0.3185
Ragged Island	coastal	0	0.756	0.2268
Ragged Island	coppice	0	0.797	0.1115
Ragged Island	mangrove	0	0.542	0.9022
South Andros	coastal	0	0.660	0.3451
South Andros	coppice	0	0.659	0.3154
South Andros	mangrove	0	0.911	0.0144 *

Table S4: Shapiro-Wilk's test of univariate normality of the standardized residuals from OLS and GLS-ANOVAs performed on each island where significant differences were detected by random forest classification. W , test statistic. *, $P_{adj} < 0.05$; **, $P_{adj} < 0.01$; ***, $P_{adj} < 0.001$.

Island	Variable	W	P	P_{adj}	
Abaco	PC1	0.961	0.0109	0.0497	*
Abaco	PC2	0.960	0.0089	0.0473	*
Abaco	PC3	0.988	0.5938	0.7308	
Abaco	PC4	0.982	0.2709	0.4816	
Bimini	PC1	0.890	0.0000	0.0008	***
Bimini	PC2	0.984	0.5179	0.6906	
Bimini	PC3	0.959	0.0281	0.0997	
Bimini	PC4	0.980	0.3386	0.5418	
Cayman Brac	PC1	0.986	0.8236	0.8785	
Cayman Brac	PC2	0.989	0.9299	0.9299	
Cayman Brac	PC3	0.934	0.0079	0.0473	*
Cayman Brac	PC4	0.981	0.5926	0.7308	
Eleuthera	PC1	0.930	0.0031	0.0330	*
Eleuthera	PC2	0.975	0.3090	0.5204	
Eleuthera	PC3	0.981	0.4989	0.6906	
Eleuthera	PC4	0.970	0.1788	0.4082	
Little Cayman	PC1	0.955	0.0821	0.2539	
Little Cayman	PC2	0.982	0.6854	0.7833	
Little Cayman	PC3	0.891	0.0005	0.0081	**
Little Cayman	PC4	0.977	0.4858	0.6906	
Long Island	PC1	0.937	0.0074	0.0473	*
Long Island	PC2	0.989	0.9039	0.9299	
Long Island	PC3	0.971	0.2170	0.4341	
Long Island	PC4	0.983	0.6261	0.7420	
North Andros	PC1	0.937	0.0952	0.2539	
North Andros	PC2	0.978	0.8075	0.8785	
North Andros	PC3	0.905	0.0147	0.0587	
North Andros	PC4	0.949	0.1913	0.4082	
South Andros	PC1	0.941	0.0879	0.2539	
South Andros	PC2	0.946	0.1199	0.2952	
South Andros	PC3	0.965	0.3950	0.6019	
South Andros	PC4	0.957	0.2480	0.4668	

Table S5: Locations of the sampling sites across islands, with mean within-island principal component scores per site.

Island	Longitude	Latitude	Habitat	PC1	PC2	PC3	PC4
Abaco	-77.7	26.9	mangrove	1.006	0.117	-0.057	-1.259
Abaco	-77.6	26.9	coastal	0.155	0.532	0.079	-2.046
Abaco	-77.6	26.9	coppice	-0.084	0.033	0.636	-0.652
Abaco	-77.2	26.1	coastal	0.304	-0.093	-0.987	-0.133
Abaco	-77.0	26.3	mangrove	-0.316	-1.224	0.899	0.185
Abaco	-77.0	26.3	coppice	0.092	0.314	0.124	0.483
Abaco	-77.0	26.3	coastal	-0.337	0.750	-0.207	0.540
Bimini	-79.3	25.6	coastal	-0.263	-1.270	-0.185	0.164
Bimini	-79.3	25.7	coastal	0.468	0.083	-0.242	0.011
Bimini	-79.3	25.7	coppice	-0.270	0.171	0.926	-0.124
Bimini	-79.3	25.7	mangrove	-0.447	0.533	-0.288	-0.014
Cayman Brac	-79.9	19.7	coastal	0.483	-0.523	-0.781	0.443
Cayman Brac	-79.8	19.7	mangrove	0.219	0.453	0.810	-0.015
Cayman Brac	-79.8	19.7	coppice	-0.610	0.008	-0.114	-0.355
Eleuthera	-76.3	24.8	coppice	-0.123	-0.857	0.045	0.117
Eleuthera	-76.3	24.8	coastal	-0.520	-0.642	-0.492	-0.538
Eleuthera	-76.3	24.8	mangrove	-0.163	-0.651	0.126	0.685
Eleuthera	-76.2	24.9	coppice	0.391	0.602	0.540	-0.539
Eleuthera	-76.1	24.9	coastal	0.254	1.228	-0.315	0.402
Little Cayman	-80.1	19.7	coppice	-0.621	0.614	-0.179	-0.404
Little Cayman	-80.0	19.7	coastal	0.395	0.355	0.743	0.175
Little Cayman	-80.0	19.7	mangrove	0.047	-0.838	-0.655	0.118
Long Island	-75.2	23.5	mangrove	0.207	0.366	0.484	0.587
Long Island	-75.2	23.4	coastal	-0.097	-0.798	-0.140	-0.347
Long Island	-75.2	23.4	coppice	-0.485	-0.133	0.366	-0.148
Long Island	-75.1	23.4	coastal	0.316	0.317	-0.626	-0.130
North Andros	-77.9	24.8	coastal	-0.098	-0.516	-0.403	0.066
North Andros	-77.8	24.8	coppice	-0.139	0.090	0.519	0.192
North Andros	-77.8	24.7	mangrove	0.213	0.384	-0.104	-0.232
Ragged Island	-75.7	22.2	coppice	-0.269	0.440	-0.088	-0.360
Ragged Island	-75.7	22.2	coastal	0.049	0.076	-0.221	0.029
Ragged Island	-75.7	22.2	mangrove	0.246	-0.273	0.118	0.933
Ragged Island	-75.7	22.2	mangrove	0.099	-0.749	0.588	-0.636
South Andros	-77.6	24.2	mangrove	-0.250	-0.539	0.316	-0.211
South Andros	-77.6	24.1	coppice	0.466	0.657	-0.586	-0.687
South Andros	-77.5	24.1	coastal	-0.120	0.055	0.149	0.872

Table S6: Nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis tests performed on each variable on each island where deviations from normality were detected. *, $P < 0.05$; **, $P < 0.01$; ***, $P < 0.001$.

Island	Variable	χ^2	df	P
Abaco	PC1	0.74	2	0.6924
Abaco	PC2	23.13	2	< 0.0001 ***
Bimini	PC1	7.38	2	0.0250 *
Cayman Brac	PC3	22.46	2	< 0.0001 ***
Eleuthera	PC1	0.29	2	0.8666
Little Cayman	PC3	19.95	2	< 0.0001 ***
Long Island	PC1	10.98	2	0.0041 **

Table S7: Support vector machine classification results. Legend is as per Table 1.

Island	<i>N</i>	Score	<i>P</i>	
Abaco	86	0.581	< 0.0001	***
Bimini	67	0.555	< 0.0001	***
Cayman Brac	50	0.708	< 0.0001	***
Eleuthera	56	0.443	0.0513	
Little Cayman	45	0.711	< 0.0001	***
Long Island	53	0.664	< 0.0001	***
North Andros	28	0.429	0.1039	
Ragged Island	50	0.424	0.0756	
South Andros	31	0.574	0.0040	**

Table S8: Linear discriminant analysis classification results. Legend is as per Table 1.

Island	<i>N</i>	Score	<i>P</i>	
Abaco	86	0.644	< 0.0001	***
Bimini	67	0.585	< 0.0001	***
Cayman Brac	50	0.780	< 0.0001	***
Eleuthera	56	0.425	0.0871	
Little Cayman	45	0.738	< 0.0001	***
Long Island	53	0.574	0.0001	***
North Andros	28	0.414	0.1911	
Ragged Island	50	0.400	0.1259	
South Andros	31	0.587	0.0013	**