

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

1  
2  
3

## 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, to test the hypothesis that similar local adaptive processes occur over smaller spatial scales. 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, namely beach scrub, primary coppice forest and mangrove forest. 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 seem to 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 of dewlap color variation across islands.

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

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 Introduction

27 The staggering diversity of animal communication signals has long been of interest to evolutionary  
28 biologists. Animals use chemical, mechanical, electromagnetic, and visual signals to communicate  
29 in a wide variety of contexts, including, competition for mates, species recognition, aposematism,  
30 and cooperation (Bradbury and Vehrenberg, 2011). A primary evolutionary factor shaping com-  
31 munication signals is the sensory system and behavior of recipients (the sensory drive hypothesis;  
32 Endler and McLellan 1988; Endler 1992, 1998). Over the past decades, scientists have established  
33 that signals evolve in an ecological context and are dependent on environmental conditions (Endler,  
34 1992, 1993a,b). Just as different habitats may favor different combinations of ecomorphological  
35 traits to maximize performance and fitness (Arnold, 1983), they may also shape different forms  
36 of a signal, so as to maximize its transmission and detection (e.g. Seehausen 1997), or reduce its  
37 detection by unintended recipients such as predators (Endler, 1984, 1990, 1991; Halfwerk et al.,  
38 2014). This selective pressure may drive the local adaptation of communication signals.

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; Lenor-  
44 mand, 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 adapta-  
49 tion in fragmented areas in Australian fruit flies (Willi and Hoffmann, 2012), and 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). Lizards of the neotropical genus  
55 *Anolis* (Squamata: Dactyloidae) are an excellent group for studying the eco-evolutionary dynam-  
56 ics of local adaptation and natural selection (Losos, 2009). A particularly conspicuous trait of  
57 anoles is their dewlap, an extensible flap of skin that is typically sexually dimorphic and used as  
58 a communication signal in courtship (Sigmund, 1983; Driessens et al., 2014, 2015) and territorial  
59 displays (Losos, 1985; Macedonia and Stamps, 1994; Macedonia et al., 2013) as well as in predator  
60 deterrence (Leal and Rodríguez-Robles, 1995, 1997; Leal and Rodriguez-Robles, 1997). Dewlap  
61 characteristics vary widely among the approximately 400 species of the genus (Nicholson et al.,  
62 2007). Interspecific variation in dewlap coloration is implicated in species recognition (Rand and  
63 Williams, 1970; Williams, 1969; Williams and Rand, 1977; Losos, 1985; Macedonia and Stamps,  
64 1994; Fleishman, 2000; Macedonia et al., 2013), and this function could have had a role in initiating  
65 or reinforcing reproductive isolation during speciation (Lambert et al., 2013; Geneva et al., 2015;  
66 Ng et al., 2017).

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

77 Previous studies investigating variation in anole dewlaps compared populations at relatively  
78 large geographical scales, e.g. between islands (Vanhooydonck et al., 2009; Driessens et al., 2017)  
79 or within large islands such as Puerto Rico (Leal and Fleishman, 2004) or Hispaniola (Ng et al.,

2012, 2016). These large scales and marine barriers should reduce gene flow (Ng and Glor, 2011; Lambert et al., 2013; Richardson et al., 2014; Ng et al., 2017). That said, examples do exist of divergence in dewlap coloration at smaller scales or between populations with high degrees of gene flow (Thorpe and Stenson, 2002; Thorpe, 2002; Stapley et al., 2011; Ng et al., 2016).

*Anolis sagrei* is widespread across islands of the West Indies (Reynolds et al., 2020). It has been the subject of numerous studies concerning local adaptation (Losos et al., 1994, 1997, 2001; Kolbe et al., 2012), biological invasion (Kolbe et al., 2008), and sexual selection (Tokarz, 2002; Tokarz et al., 2005; Tokarz, 2006; Driessens et al., 2014; Steffen and Guyer, 2014; Driessens et al., 2015) among many other topics. Between-island variation in the mainly orange-red color of its dewlap was shown to be better explained by climatic variables such as annual precipitation and solar radiation (proposed to affect the average vegetation type on each island and among other things, its ambient light environment, Driessens et al. 2017), than by 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 species. 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 11.2 8.45km. While this species has traditionally been considered territorial, a recent study revealed that they are polygynandrous and that gene flow is not impeded by territorial-like behaviors exhibited by some males (Kamath and Losos 2018). Combining reflectance spectrometry and supervised machine learning, we tested for divergence in dewlap phenotype between habitats within islands and between islands across part of 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. 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 (Harvey and Pagel, 1991; Losos, 2011).

124 **Methods**

125 **Data collection**

126 We sampled 466 455 male *A. sagrei* from seven islands in the Bahamas Archipelago – Abaco,  
127 North Andros, South Andros, South Bimini, Eleuthera, Long Island, and Ragged Island – and  
128 two in the Cayman Islands – Cayman Brac and Little Cayman (Figure S1A). These islands were  
129 chosen to span the breadth of the West Indian range of *A. sagrei*, because they have highly similar  
130 habitat types, and because the *A. sagrei* on each island group are derived from ancient and distinct  
131 colonization events from Cuba (i.e. relatively evolutionarily independent, Reynolds et al. 2020).  
132 Three habitats were sampled on each island based on characterizations by Howard (1950) and  
133 Schoener (1968). Each habitat is clearly distinguishable by its dominant vegetation type — xeric  
134 beach scrub (open, relatively dry habitat consisting of low vegetation or isolated trees), primary  
135 coppice forest (closed-canopy forest) and mangrove forest (wet coastal habitat with trees growing  
136 in brackish water and high light penetration, although lizards were sampled in dry soil areas).  
137 Sample sizes are given in Table S1. Our sampling design enabled us to test for differences between  
138 habitats at a coarse and fine geographical scale. The median distance between two localities within  
139 an island was ~11 8.5km (Figure S1B), and 80.3 79.3% of all pairwise distances within islands  
140 were less than 50km. Additionally, there are no major barriers to dispersal (such as mountains or  
141 grassland) on any of the islands that we sampled.

142 **Reflectance measurements**

143 We measured reflectance between 300nm and 700nm wavelength, a range from ultraviolet to red  
144 that encompasses the colors visible to most lizards and vertebrates in general (Lazareva et al.,  
145 2012). Measurements were taken with an Ocean Optics USB4000 spectrometer, a pulsed Xenon  
146 light source (PX-2, Ocean Optics, Largo, FL, USA) and a reflectance probe protected by a black  
147 anodized aluminum sheath. Measurements were taken with a 45-degree inclination to prevent  
148 specular reflection (Endler, 1990). The device was regularly standardized with a Spectralon white  
149 standard (Labsphere, North Sutton, NH, USA). Reflectance was measured at the center of the  
150 dewlap. Reflectance curves were smoothed using the R package pavo (Maia et al., 2013) as well  
151 as with custom R functions, down to one reflectance value at each nanometer in wavelength from  
152 300 to 700nm.

153 **Analysis**

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

172

173 All analyses in this study were performed in R 3.6.1 (R Core Team, 2019).

## Dimensionality reduction

174

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.

## Among-island variance partitioning

183

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).

## Within-island machine learning

191

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.

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.

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.

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 five 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

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 homoscedasticity were met (i.e. OLS-ANOVA was the best fit), we used Tukey's honest significant difference test. When normality was met but not homoscedasticity (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

281

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. For this, we performed Mantel's test (Legendre and Legendre 2012, R package vegan; Oksanen et al. 2019) on each island, using 999 permutations and geographical distances computed as geodesic distances from latitude and longitude data (R package geosphere, Hijmans 2019).

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

## Site differences

289

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).

290

291

292

293

294

295

296 **Results**

297 We tested for variation in *A. sagrei* dewlap coloration between populations living in three char-  
298 acteristic habitat types across nine islands that span the West Indian range of the brown anole  
299 (beach scrub, primary coppice and mangroves). We found that most of the variation in col-  
300 oration was partitioned between islands (two-way PERMANOVA,  $F(df = 8) = 43.7, P = 0.0001$   
301  $F(df = 8) = 45.38, P = 0.001$ , explained variance  $R^2 = 40.9$   $R^2 = 41.4\%$ ). Nonetheless, we did find  
302 evidence for differences in dewlap coloration between habitat types, and those were mostly island-  
303 specific (habitat-by-island interaction term,  $F(16) = 3.53, P = 0.0001, R^2 = 6.6$   $F(16) = 4.78,$   
304  $P = 0.001, R^2 = 8.7\%$ ), with a significant portion of the variation explained by an habitat  
305 effect across all islands, but this effect was relatively small ( $F(2) = 4.7, P = 0.0001, R^2 = 1.1$   
306  $F(2) = 4.46, P = 0.001, R^2 = 1\%$ ).

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 seven out of the nine islands in our sample:  
312 Abaco, Bimini, Cayman Brac, Eleuthera, Little Cayman, Long Island, and North Andros and  
313 South Andros. The accuracy of random forest classification exceeded random expectation more  
314 often than expected by chance for all these islands (Table 1). Accuracy was as high as 73 74.8%  
315 for Cayman Brac. We obtained similar results using other machine learning approaches such as  
316 support vector machines (Table S7) and linear discriminant analysis (Table S8), except that these  
317 methods did not detect significant differences on Eleuthera and North Andros. We describe in  
318 details the specific differences detected on each island in the Appendix, and focus here on the  
319 general patterns emerging from our data.

320  
321 Overall, we found significant differences in dewlap coloration between populations that were  
322 often in close geographical proximity. On Bimini, notably, we found a significant difference be-  
323 tween dewlaps from beach scrub and primary coppice forest, at a distance of a few hundred meters,  
324 making this contrast the smallest geographical scale at which differences in coloration were found  
325 in our study (Fig. S3). We also detected significant differences in dewlap coloration at distances  
326 below one kilometer on Abaco (Fig. S2G), and at distances between one and ten kilometers on  
327 Bimini (Fig. S3G), Cayman Brac (Fig. S4G), Little Cayman (Fig. S6G), Long Island (Fig. S7G)  
328 and South North Andros (Fig. S8G).

329  
330 We found evidence of spatial autocorrelation in dewlap coloration between the sites within is-  
331 lands for Abaco (Table 2), suggesting that populations from closer sites tend to have more similar  
332 dewlaps on this island than expected by chance. Abaco was the island we sampled at the largest  
333 scale, with some sites nearly a hundred kilometers away from each other (Fig. 2A). That said, some  
334 sites were also in close proximity, and significant differences in coloration were detected between  
335 habitats sometimes less than a kilometer away (Fig. S2G), suggesting that differences in dewlap  
336 coloration between distant sites may be partly attributable to isolation-by-distance, but this may  
337 not necessarily be the case for sites in close proximity. We did not find evidence for spatial auto-  
338 correlation on other islands than Abaco (although Eleuthera was nearly significant, Table 2).

339  
340 A striking feature of our data was inconsistency in between-habitat differences among islands,  
341 in terms of which habitats differ from which, which dimensions of coloration were involved, and  
342 in which direction. For example, while on Cayman Brac the random forests could well distinguish  
343 between all three habitats (Fig. S4D), on Abaco dewlaps from beach scrub and primary coppice  
344 were often mistaken, and on Bimini beach scrub dewlaps were more often classified into primary  
345 coppice or mangrove than into beach scrub (Fig. S3D). In terms of variable importance, for multi-  
346 ple islands the random forests used information in the UV range to discriminate between at least  
347 some habitats, particularly on Abaco (Fig. S2F), Bimini (Fig. S3F), Cayman Brac (Fig. S4F),  
348 Little Cayman (Fig. S6F) and Long Island (Fig. S7F), but differences in UV reflectance involved  
349 different habitats and were in different directions among these islands.

350

## Discussion

351

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

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

Detectable differences in dewlap color between populations are surprising, as habitats were often in close geographical proximity to each other (as close as a few hundred meters on Bimini and most of the time within ten kilometers), and we would have expected gene flow to cause a more homogeneous distribution of color phenotypes within islands. While little is known about the cruising range of individuals from our study populations (but see Steinberg and Leal 2017; Kamath and Losos 2018b for other systems), *A. sagrei* are polygynandrous (both males and females mate with multiple mates, Kamath and Losos 2017, 2018a,b), thus offering opportunity for gene flow, especially given that lizards were distributed continuously and at high densities within the islands we sampled. Consistent with that, while populations from different islands were monophyletic, individuals within islands were not monophyletic with respect to habitat based on mitochondrial haplotypes (van de Schoot 2016 unpublished thesis).

Several scenarios could account for these findings. One explanation is an adaptive one: populations living in different habitats could be phenotypically adapted to their local environmental conditions. Given that the brightly colored dewlap of *A. sagrei* is used as a communication signal, its color may be a target for selection if the transmission or perception of the signal differs from one habitat to another, for example because of differences in ambient light, according to the sensory-drive hypothesis (Endler and McLellan, 1988; Endler, 1992, 1998). The sensory-drive hypothesis has been tested multiple times for dewlap coloration in *Anolis* lizards, with mixed results. Some authors found support for it (Leal and Fleishman, 2002, 2004), while others found differences in dewlap coloration between habitats inconsistent with the sensory-drive hypothesis (Fleishman et al., 2009; Ng et al., 2012).

If our results were an example of sensory drive, we would have expected to see consistent differences between populations from different habitats across islands, given the apparent environmental consistency each of the three habitat types across the islands we sampled. In particular, we would have expected divergence in line with increased detectability given local light conditions, such as the high contrasts with background vegetation found in the UV range in Leal and Fleishman (2002) and Leal and Fleishman (2004). We might also have expected mangrove and beach scrub lizards, both inhabiting areas with high light penetration, to have more similar dewlaps, and to differ significantly from lizards from the coppice habitat, where irradiance is low. Instead, we found inconsistencies in the way dewlap color differed between habitats across islands. While short-wavelengths (UV reflectance) were often involved in color differences, they were not involved on all islands where significant differences were detected. On some islands, other or additional variables differed, such as brightness, red reflectance or the reflectance at the ends of the spectrum visible to *Anolis* lizards (UV and red, Lazareva et al. 2012) relative to intermediate wavelengths (blue-to-yellow). Similar portions of the spectrum were sometimes involved in opposite directions on different islands, such as on Abaco and Cayman Brac, where mangrove lizards had a higher UV-reflectance than beach scrub lizards on the former, but a lower UV-reflectance on the latter. Overall, the observed heterogeneity of divergence patterns across islands provides no support to a sensory-drive explanation.

It is presently not known if the reported differences in coloration have a genetic basis. Yet, we find it unlikely that these differences arose through phenotypic plasticity, as although the carotenoids that partly make up the red and orange colors of anole dewlaps must be found in the diet (Goodwin, 1984; Hill et al., 2002; Hill and McGraw, 2006), 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 *A. distichus* (another species with a carotenoid-based dewlap), found little support for phenotypic and developmental plasticity in dewlap coloration. One exception is a study demonstrating that lizards heavily parasitized by skin mites had duller dewlaps

408 (Cook et al., 2013), but we found no sign of that in our study.

409

410 Genetic drift could contribute to some of the observed variation. Indeed, while only Abaco  
411 showed significant patterns consistent with isolation-by-distance (which may emerge under limited  
412 dispersal and drift, Wright 1943; Kimura and Weiss 1964; Slatkin 1987), there may have been  
413 too few sites on most islands to conclusively detect it, and even then, the absence of detectable  
414 isolation-by-distance may not necessarily constitute evidence for the absence of drift. Besides,  
415 spatial autocorrelation was the strongest on islands sampled at the largest scales (e.g. some sites  
416 on Abaco were nearly 100km apart, and Eleuthera – the second strongest signal, albeit nonsignif-  
417 icant – had sites more than 30km apart), such that it is possible that neutral processes and/or  
418 dispersal limitations might contribute to shaping variation over long distances. That said, many  
419 significant differences were found between habitats in close proximity, contrary to what would be  
420 expected under isolation-by-distance, including on islands where spatial autocorrelation was de-  
421 tected. Moreover, *A. sagrei* was distributed across the islands continuously, usually at relatively  
422 high population densities, rather than in small and isolated populations particularly prone to drift.  
423 Together with the fact that isolation-by-distance may not necessarily only emerge from drift (e.g.  
424 if there is a spatial environmental gradient), this indicates that genetic drift may have limited  
425 potential to explain the differences observed between habitats, at least at a local scale.

426

427 In this study, we found larger differences among than within islands, a pattern already reported  
428 and linked to climatic conditions (Driessens et al., 2017) and to densities of predators and of anole  
429 congeners (Vanhooydonck et al., 2009; Baeckens et al., 2018). Differences among habitats within  
430 islands, however, are still difficult to account for. Remaining hypotheses may include, for exam-  
431 ple, runaway sexual selection (i.e. arbitrary preferences of females for some colors over others,  
432 Andersson 1994) operating in different directions across islands, but no evidence so far suggests  
433 that dewlap is a target of mate choice in anoles (Tokarz, 2002; Tokarz et al., 2005; Lailvaux and  
434 Irschick, 2006; Nicholson et al., 2007). Another hypothesis is that the different genetic constitutu-  
435 tions of different islands, perhaps resulting from founder effects (the islands have been colonized  
436 independently, van de Schoot 2016 unpubl.; Driessens et al. 2017; Reynolds et al. 2020), may have  
437 predisposed populations to adapt differently to similarly selective circumstances. Either way, new  
438 data would be needed to test these hypotheses. Visual modeling, for instance, would be a valuable  
439 follow-up analysis as it would indicate whether the differences we detected may be detectable by  
440 the organisms themselves (as has been done in *Anolis* in Leal and Fleishman 2004; Fleishman  
441 et al. 2020), but such approach requires irradiance profiles from the habitats in the field, which we  
442 presently do not have.

443

444 Last, some patterns may arise owing to factors we did not measure. For one, signalling can be a  
445 multifaceted behavior, and while we focused on dewlap color here, other potentially important el-  
446 ements of behavioral interactions include dewlap size, dewlap patterning, display activity as well as  
447 behaviors associated with dewlap extensions such as headbobs and pushups (Vanhooydonck et al.,  
448 2005; Driessens et al., 2014, 2015; Lailvaux et al., 2015). These have been linked in various ways  
449 (and not always consistently across studies) not only with environmental variables but also with  
450 proxies for sexual selection, predation and species recognition (Vanhooydonck et al., 2005; Lailvaux  
451 and Irschick, 2007; Vanhooydonck et al., 2009; Driessens et al., 2017; Baeckens et al., 2018), which  
452 do vary among islands but may also vary within islands, possibly in interaction with dewlap color.  
453 Besides, while the three habitats were clearly recognizable and consistent across islands to the hu-  
454 man eye (Fig. 1), we did not precisely quantify irradiance within each habitat and did not consider  
455 any more subtle environmental differences there might have been for a given habitat among islands.

456

457 Altogether, our results show that dewlap color of *A. sagrei* commonly varies between habitat  
458 types, even in close geographical proximity, within islands of the West Indies. However, coloration  
459 differs in different ways across similar habitats from one island to another. We discussed several  
460 non-mutually exclusive mechanisms that could explain these observations. Nevertheless, heteroge-  
461 neous patterns of divergence across islands do not support an adaptive sensory-drive scenario, and  
462 we propose that within-island dewlap color variation may be underlain by a more subtle mosaic of  
463 factors.

## References

Anderson, M. J. (2001). A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance.	464
<i>Austral Ecology</i> , 26(1):32–46.	465
466	
Andersson, M. B. (1994). <i>Sexual Selection</i> . Monographs in Behavior and Ecology. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.	467
468	
Arnold, S. J. (1983). Morphology, Performance and Fitness. <i>American Zoologist</i> , 23(2):347–361.	469
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? <i>PeerJ</i> , 6:e4722.	470
471	
472	
Bartoń, K. (2019). MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference.	473
Benjamini, Y. and Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. <i>Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B</i> , 57:289–300.	474
475	
476	
Bradbury, J. W. and Vehrencamp, S. L. (2011). <i>Principles of Animal Communication</i> . Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Mass, 2nd ed edition.	477
478	
Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. <i>Machine Learning</i> , 45(1):5–32.	479
Cook, E. G., Murphy, T. G., and Johnson, M. A. (2013). Colorful displays signal male quality in a tropical anole lizard. <i>Naturwissenschaften</i> , 100(10):993–996.	480
481	
Cortez, P. (2020). Rminer: Data Mining Classification and Regression Methods.	482
Cox, R. M., Costello, R. A., Camber, B. E., and McGlothlin, J. W. (2017). Multivariate genetic architecture of the <i>Anolis</i> dewlap reveals both shared and sex-specific features of a sexually dimorphic ornament. <i>Journal of Evolutionary Biology</i> , 30(7):1262–1275.	483
484	
485	
Cristianini, N. and Shawe-Taylor, J. (2000). <i>An Introduction to Support Vector Machines and Other Kernel-based Learning Methods</i> . Cambridge University Press, first edition.	486
487	
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. <i>The American Naturalist</i> , 153(2):183–200.	488
489	
490	
Dieckmann, U. and Doebeli, M. (1999). On the origin of species by sympatric speciation. <i>Nature</i> , 400(6742):354–357.	491
492	
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 <i>Anolis sagrei</i> lizards. <i>Journal of Evolutionary Biology</i> , 30(10):1846–1861.	493
494	
495	
Driessens, T., Huyghe, K., Vanhooydonck, B., and Van Damme, R. (2015). Messages conveyed by assorted facets of the dewlap, in both sexes of <i>Anolis sagrei</i> . <i>Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology</i> , 69(8):1251–1264.	496
497	
498	
Driessens, T., Vanhooydonck, B., and Van Damme, R. (2014). Deterring predators, daunting opponents or drawing partners? Signaling rates across diverse contexts in the lizard <i>Anolis sagrei</i> . <i>Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology</i> , 68(2):173–184.	499
500	
501	
Endler, J. (1998). Sensory ecology, receiver biases and sexual selection. <i>Trends in Ecology &amp; Evolution</i> , 13(10):415–420.	502
503	
Endler, J. A. (1984). Natural and sexual selection on color patterns in poeciliid fishes. In Balon, E. K. and Zaret, T. M., editors, <i>Evolutionary Ecology of Neotropical Freshwater Fishes</i> , volume 3, pages 95–111. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht.	504
505	
506	
Endler, J. A. (1990). On the measurement and classification of colour in studies of animal colour patterns. <i>Biological Journal of the Linnean Society</i> , 41(4):315–352.	507
508	

- 509 Endler, J. A. (1991). Variation in the appearance of guppy color patterns to guppies and their  
510 predators under different visual conditions. *Vision Research*, 31(3):587–608.
- 511 Endler, J. A. (1992). Signals, Signal Conditions, and the Direction of Evolution. *The American  
512 Naturalist*, 139:S125–S153.
- 513 Endler, J. A. (1993a). The Color of Light in Forests and Its Implications. *Ecological Monographs*,  
514 63(1):1–27.
- 515 Endler, J. A. (1993b). Some general comments on the evolution and design of animal communi-  
516 cation systems. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological  
517 Sciences*, 340(1292):215–225.
- 518 Endler, J. A. and McLellan, T. (1988). The Processes of Evolution: Toward a Newer Synthesis.  
519 *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 19(1):395–421.
- 520 Felsenstein, J. (1976). The Theoretical Population Genetics of Variable Selection and Migration.  
521 *Annual Review of Genetics*, 10(1):253–280.
- 522 Fleishman, L. J. (2000). *Signal Function, Signal Efficiency and the Evolution of Anoline Lizard  
523 Dewlap Color*, pages 209–236. Tapir Academic, Trondheim.
- 524 Fleishman, L. J., Leal, M., and Persons, M. H. (2009). Habitat light and dewlap color diversity in  
525 four species of Puerto Rican anoline lizards. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A*, 195(11):1043–  
526 1060.
- 527 Fleishman, L. J. and Persons, M. (2001). The influence of stimulus and background colour on  
528 signal visibility in the lizard *Anolis cristatellus*. *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, 204(Pt  
529 9):1559–1575.
- 530 Fleishman, L. J., Wadman, C. S., and Maximov, K. J. (2020). The interacting effects of total  
531 light intensity and chromatic contrast on visual signal visibility in an *Anolis* lizard. *Animal  
532 Behaviour*, page S0003347220302037.
- 533 García-Ramos, G. and Kirkpatrick, M. (1997). Genetic Models of Adaptation and Gene Flow in  
534 Peripheral Populations. *Evolution*, 51(1):21–28.
- 535 Geneva, A. J., Hilton, J., Noll, S., and Glor, R. E. (2015). Multilocus phylogenetic analyses of  
536 Hispaniolan and Bahamian trunk anoles (*distichus* species group). *Molecular Phylogenetics and  
537 Evolution*, 87:105–117.
- 538 Goodwin, T. W. (1984). *The Biochemistry of the Carotenoids*. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht.
- 539 Halfwerk, W., Jones, P. L., Taylor, R. C., Ryan, M. J., and Page, R. A. (2014). Risky Ripples Allow  
540 Bats and Frogs to Eavesdrop on a Multisensory Sexual Display. *Science*, 343(6169):413–416.
- 541 Harvey, P. H. and Pagel, M. D. (1991). *The Comparative Method in Evolutionary Biology*. Oxford  
542 Series in Ecology and Evolution. Oxford University Press, Oxford ; New York.
- 543 Hendry, A. P., Day, T., and Taylor, E. B. (2007a). Population Mixing and the Adaptive Divergence  
544 of Quantitative Traits in Discrete Populations: A Theoretical Framework for Empirical Tests.  
545 *Evolution*, 55(3):459–466.
- 546 Hendry, A. P., Taylor, E. B., and McPhail, J. D. (2007b). Adaptive Divergence and the Balance  
547 Between Selection and Gene Flow: Lake and Stream Stickleback in the Misty System. *Evolution*,  
548 56(6):1199–1216.
- 549 Henze, N. and Zirkler, B. (1990). A class of invariant consistent tests for multivariate normality.  
550 *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, 19(10):3595–3617.
- 551 Hijmans, R. J. (2019). Geosphere: Spherical Trigonometry.
- 552 Hill, G. E., Inouye, C. Y., and Montgomerie, R. (2002). Dietary carotenoids predict plumage  
553 coloration in wild house finches. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological  
554 Sciences*, 269(1496):1119–1124.

Hill, G. E. and McGraw, K. J., editors (2006). <i>Bird Coloration</i> . Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.	555 556
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.	557 558 559
Howard, R. A. (1950). Vegetation of the Bimini Island Group: Bahamas, B. W. I. <i>Ecological Monographs</i> , 20(4):317–349.	560 561
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.	562 563 564
Kamath, A. and Losos, J. (2017). The erratic and contingent progression of research on territoriality: A case study. <i>Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology</i> , 71(6):89.	565 566
Kamath, A. and Losos, J. (2018a). Reconsidering territoriality is necessary for understanding <i>Anolis</i> mating systems. <i>Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology</i> , 72(7):106.	567 568
Kamath, A. and Losos, J. B. (2018b). 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.	569 570 571
Kimura, M. and Weiss, G. H. (1964). The Stepping Stone Model of Population Structure and the Decrease of Genetic Correlation with Distance. <i>Genetics</i> , 49(4):561–576.	572 573
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.	574 575 576
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.	577 578 579
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.	580 581
Lailvaux, S. P. and Irschick, D. J. (2006). No Evidence for Female Association with High-Performance males in the Green Anole Lizard, <i>Anolis carolinensis</i> . <i>Ethology</i> , 112(7):707–715.	582 583
Lailvaux, S. P. and Irschick, D. J. (2007). The Evolution of Performance-Based Male Fighting Ability in Caribbean Anolis Lizards. <i>The American Naturalist</i> , 170(4):573–586.	584 585
Lailvaux, S. P., Leifer, J., Kircher, B. K., and Johnson, M. A. (2015). The incredible shrinking dewlap: Signal size, skin elasticity, and mechanical design in the green anole lizard ( <i>Anolis carolinensis</i> ). <i>Ecology and Evolution</i> , 5(19):4400–4409.	586 587 588
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.	589 590 591
Lazareva, O. F., Shimizu, T., and Wasserman, E. A. (2012). <i>How Animals See the World</i> <i>Comparative Behavior, Biology, and Evolution of Vision</i> . Oxford University Press.	592 593
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.	594 595 596
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.	597 598
Leal, M. and Rodríguez-Robles, J. A. (1995). Antipredator Responses of <i>Anolis cristatellus</i> (Sauria: Polychrotidae). <i>Copeia</i> , 1995(1):155–161.	599 600

- 601 Leal, M. and Rodriguez-Robles, J. A. (1997). Antipredator Responses of the Puerto Rican Giant  
 602 Anole, *Anolis cuvieri* (Squamata: Polychrotidae). *Biotropica*, 29(3):372–375.
- 603 Leal, M. and Rodríguez-Robles, J. A. (1997). Signalling displays during predator–prey interactions  
 604 in a Puerto Rican anole, *Anolis cristatellus*. *Animal Behaviour*, 54(5):1147–1154.
- 605 Legendre, P. and Legendre, L. (2012). *Numerical Ecology*. Number 24 in Developments in Envi-  
 606 ronmental Modelling. Elsevier, Amsterdam, third english edition edition.
- 607 Lenormand, T. (2002). Gene flow and the limits to natural selection. *Trends in Ecology &*  
 608 *Evolution*, 17(4):183–189.
- 609 Liaw, A. and Wiener, M. (2002). Classification and Regression by randomForest. *R News*, 2(3):18–  
 610 22.
- 611 Losos, J. B. (1985). An Experimental Demonstration of the Species-Recognition Role of *Anolis*  
 612 Dewlap Color. *Copeia*, 1985(4):905–910.
- 613 Losos, J. B. (2009). *Lizards in an Evolutionary Tree: Ecology and Adaptive Radiation of Anoles*.  
 614 University of California Press.
- 615 Losos, J. B. (2011). Convergence, Adaptation, and Constraint. *Evolution*, 65(7):1827–1840.
- 616 Losos, J. B., Irschick, D. J., and Schoener, T. W. (1994). Adaptation and Constraint in the  
 617 Evolution of Specialization of Bahamian *Anolis* Lizards. *Evolution*, 48(6):1786–1798.
- 618 Losos, J. B., Schoener, T. W., Warheit, K. I., and Creer, D. (2001). Experimental studies of  
 619 adaptive differentiation in Bahamian *Anolis* lizards. *Genetica*, 112–113:399–415.
- 620 Losos, J. B., Warheit, K. I., and Schoener, T. W. (1997). Adaptive differentiation following  
 621 experimental island colonization in *Anolis* lizards. *Nature*, 387(6628):70–73.
- 622 Macedonia, J. M. (2001). Habitat light, colour variation, and ultraviolet reflectance in the Grand  
 623 Cayman anole, *Anolis conspersus*. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 73(3):299–320.
- 624 Macedonia, J. M., Clark, D. L., Riley, R. G., and Kemp, D. J. (2013). Species recognition of color  
 625 and motion signals in *Anolis grahami*: Evidence from responses to lizard robots. *Behavioral*  
 626 *Ecology*, 24(4):846–852.
- 627 Macedonia, J. M., Clark, D. L., and Tamasi, A. L. (2014). Does Selection Favor Dewlap Colors that  
 628 Maximize Detectability? A Test with Five Species of Jamaican *Anolis* Lizards. *Herpetologica*,  
 629 70(2):157–170.
- 630 Macedonia, J. M. and Stamps, J. A. (1994). Species Recognition in *Anolis grahami* (Sauria,  
 631 Iguanidae): Evidence from Responses to Video Playbacks of Conspecific and Heterospecific  
 632 Displays. *Ethology*, 98(3-4):246–264.
- 633 Maia, R., Eliason, C. M., Bitton, P.-P., Doucet, S. M., and Shawkey, M. D. (2013). Pavo: An R  
 634 package for the analysis, visualization and organization of spectral data. *Methods in Ecology*  
 635 and Evolution, pages n/a–n/a.
- 636 Ng, J., Geneva, A. J., Noll, S., and Glor, R. E. (2017). Signals and Speciation: *Anolis* Dewlap  
 637 Color as a Reproductive Barrier. *Journal of Herpetology*, 51(3):437–447.
- 638 Ng, J. and Glor, R. E. (2011). Genetic differentiation among populations of a Hispaniolan trunk  
 639 anole that exhibit geographical variation in dewlap colour. *Molecular Ecology*, 20(20):4302–4317.
- 640 Ng, J., Kelly, A. L., MacGuigan, D. J., and Glor, R. E. (2013). The Role of Heritable and Dietary  
 641 Factors in the Sexual Signal of a Hispaniolan *Anolis* Lizard, *Anolis distichus*. *Journal of Heredity*,  
 642 104(6):862–873.
- 643 Ng, J., Landeen, E. L., Logsdon, R. M., and Glor, R. E. (2012). Correlation Between *Anolis*  
 644 Lizard Dewlap Phenotype and Environmental Variation Indicates Adaptive Divergence of a  
 645 Signal Important to Sexual Selection and Species Recognition. *Evolution*, 67(2):573–582.

Ng, J., Ossip-Klein, A. G., and Glor, R. E. (2016). Adaptive signal coloration maintained in the face of gene flow in a Hispaniolan <i>Anolis</i> Lizard. <i>BMC Evolutionary Biology</i> , 16(1):193.	646 647
Nicholson, K. E., Harmon, L. J., and Losos, J. B. (2007). Evolution of <i>Anolis</i> Lizard Dewlap Diversity. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2(3):e274.	648 649
Nosil, P. and Crespi, B. J. (2004). Does Gene Flow Constrain Adaptive Divergence or Vice Versa? A Test Using Ecomorphology and Sexual Isolation in <i>Timema cristinae</i> Walking-Sticks. <i>Evolution</i> , 58(1):102–112.	650 651 652
Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F. G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., McGlinn, D., Minchin, P. R., O'Hara, R. B., Simpson, G. L., Solymos, P., Stevens, M. H. H., Szoecs, E., and Wagner, H. (2019). Vegan: Community Ecology Package. R package version 2.5-6.	653 654 655
Pinheiro, J. and Bates, D. (2000). <i>Mixed-Effects Models in S and S-PLUS</i> . Statistics and Computing. Springer-Verlag, New York.	656 657
Pinheiro, J., Bates, D., DebRoy, S., Sarkar, D., and Team, R. C. (2020). Nlme: Linear and Nonlinear Mixed Effects Models.	658 659
Pohlert, T. (2020). PMCMRplus: Calculate Pairwise Multiple Comparisons of Mean Rank Sums Extended. R package version 1.4.4.	660 661
R Core Team (2019). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.	662 663
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.	664 665
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.	666 667 668 669
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.	670 671
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 &amp; Evolution</i> , 29(3):165–176.	672 673
Schoener, T. W. (1968). The <i>Anolis</i> Lizards of Bimini: Resource Partitioning in a Complex Fauna. <i>Ecology</i> , 49(4):704–726.	674 675
Seehausen, O. (1997). Cichlid Fish Diversity Threatened by Eutrophication That Curbs Sexual Selection. <i>Science</i> , 277(5333):1808–1811.	676 677
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.	678 679
Slatkin, M. (1987). Gene Flow and the Geographic Structure of Natural Populations. <i>Science</i> , 236(4803):787–792.	680 681
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.	682 683
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.	684 685 686
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.	687 688
Steinberg, D. S. and Leal, M. (2017). An Unexpected Case of Homing in a Territorial Lizard. <i>Integrative and Comparative Biology</i> , 57:E418.	689 690

- 691 Thorpe, R. S. (2002). Analysis of Color Spectra in Comparative Evolutionary Studies: Molecular  
692 Phylogeny and Habitat Adaptation in the St. Vincent Anole (*Anolis trinitatis*). *Systematic*  
693 *Biology*, 51(4):554–569.
- 694 Thorpe, R. S. and Stenson, A. G. (2002). Phylogeny, Paraphyly and Ecological Adaptation of  
695 the Colour and Pattern in the *Anolis Roquet* Complex on Martinique: Interaction Between  
696 Phylogeny and Adaptation. *Molecular Ecology*, 12(1):117–132.
- 697 Tokarz, R. R. (2002). An Experimental Test of the Importance of the Dewlap in Male Mating  
698 Success in the Lizard *Anolis sagrei*. *Herpetologica*, 58(1):87–94.
- 699 Tokarz, R. R. (2006). Importance of Prior Physical Contact with Familiar Females in the Devel-  
700 opment of a Male Courtship and Mating Preference for Unfamiliar Females in the Lizard *Anolis*  
701 *Sagrei*. *Herpetologica*, 62(2):115–124.
- 702 Tokarz, R. R., Paterson, A. V., and McMann, S. (2005). Importance of Dewlap Display in  
703 Male Mating Success in Free-Ranging Brown Anoles (*Anolis sagrei*). *Journal of Herpetology*,  
704 39(1):174–177.
- 705 van de Schoot, M. (2016). *Within and between Island Radiation and Genetic Variation in Anolis*  
706 *Sagrei*. PhD thesis, Wageningen University, Wageningen, The Netherlands.
- 707 Vanhooydonck, B., Herrel, A., Meyers, J. J., and Irschick, D. J. (2009). What determines dewlap  
708 diversity in *Anolis* lizards? An among-island comparison. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*,  
709 22(2):293–305.
- 710 Vanhooydonck, B., Herrel, A. Y., Van Damme, R., and Irschick, D. J. (2005). Does dewlap size  
711 predict male bite performance in Jamaican *Anolis* lizards? *Functional Ecology*, 19(1):38–42.
- 712 Willi, Y. and Hoffmann, A. A. (2012). Microgeographic adaptation linked to forest fragmentation  
713 and habitat quality in the tropical fruit fly *Drosophila birchii*. *Oikos*, 121(10):1627–1637.
- 714 Williams, E. E. (1969). The Ecology of Colonization as Seen in the Zoogeography of Anoline  
715 Lizards on Small Islands. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 44(4):345–389.
- 716 Williams, E. E. and Rand, A. S. (1977). Species Recognition, Dewlap Function and Faunal Size.  
717 *American Zoologist*, 17(1):261–270.
- 718 Wright, S. (1943). Isolation by Distance. *Genetics*, 28(2):114–138.
- 719 Zuur, A. F., editor (2009). *Mixed Effects Models and Extensions in Ecology with R*. Statistics for  
720 Biology and Health. Springer, New York, NY.

## Figures

721




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. \*,  $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*,  $P < 0.01$ ; \*\*\*,  $P < 0.001$ .

722 **Tables**

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	0.623	< 0.0001	***
Bimini	57	0.460	0.0194	*
Cayman Brac	50	0.748	< 0.0001	***
Eleuthera	55	0.520	0.0023	**
Little Cayman	45	0.676	< 0.0001	***
Long Island	53	0.611	< 0.0001	***
North Andros	28	0.693	< 0.0001	***
Ragged Island	50	0.412	0.1259	
South Andros	31	0.419	0.1152	

Table 2: Mantel's test of spatial autocorrelation. For each island are shown the correlation (Pearson's  $\rho$ ) 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 population means were randomly permuted among sites (999 permutations). \*,  $P < 0.05$ .

Island	$\rho$	$P$	
Abaco	0.439	0.032	*
Bimini	-0.725	1.000	
Cayman Brac	-0.737	0.833	
Eleuthera	0.827	0.058	
Little Cayman	-0.042	0.667	
Long Island	-0.077	0.583	
North Andros	-0.968	1.000	
Ragged Island	-0.363	0.708	
South Andros	0.963	0.167	

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). AIC<sub>c</sub>, corrected AIC score of the best-fitting model.  $\Delta\text{AIC}_c$ , difference in AIC<sub>c</sub> between the best-fitting model and the OLS-model. AIC<sub>cw</sub>, AIC<sub>c</sub> weight. Log-lik., log-likelihood.  $\chi^2$ , likelihood ratio. df, degrees of freedom. \*,  $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*,  $P < 0.01$ ; \*\*\*,  $P < 0.001$ .

Island	Variable	AIC <sub>c</sub>	$\Delta\text{AIC}_c$	AIC <sub>cw</sub>	Model	Log-lik.	$\chi^2$	df	$P$
Abaco	PC1	255.81	2.06	0.737	OLS	-121.46	0.14	2	0.9318
Abaco	PC2	225.29	3.98	0.880	OLS	-105.64	31.77	2	< 0.0001 ***
Abaco	PC3	229.85	1.44	0.673	OLS	-108.01	27.04	2	< 0.0001 ***
Abaco	PC4	254.59	0.72	0.589	OLS	-120.82	1.41	2	0.4945
Bimini	PC1	162.92	-0.32	0.540	GLS	-72.43	10.03	2	0.0066 **
Bimini	PC2	165.36	3.08	0.824	OLS	-76.52	7.70	2	0.0212 *
Bimini	PC3	163.58	3.13	0.827	OLS	-75.58	9.59	2	0.0083 **
Bimini	PC4	172.47	2.43	0.771	OLS	-80.27	0.20	2	0.9035
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	166.33	2.26	0.756	OLS	-77.29	0.49	2	0.7827
Eleuthera	PC2	155.78	-2.38	0.767	GLS	-68.74	12.80	2	0.0017 ***
Eleuthera	PC3	160.47	-0.22	0.527	GLS	-71.18	5.59	2	0.0613
Eleuthera	PC4	160.61	3.85	0.873	OLS	-74.27	6.54	2	0.0380 *
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	145.51	3.73	0.866	OLS	-66.41	16.58	2	0.0003 ***
Long Island	PC2	158.82	-1.29	0.656	GLS	-70.56	1.35	2	0.5103
Long Island	PC3	154.36	3.02	0.819	OLS	-71.10	7.19	2	0.0274 *
Long Island	PC4	155.59	0.47	0.558	OLS	-71.75	5.89	2	0.0525
North Andros	PC1	89.00	2.87	0.808	OLS	-39.05	0.35	2	0.8406
North Andros	PC2	74.74	-0.37	0.547	GLS	-27.50	17.24	2	0.0002 ***
North Andros	PC3	87.62	0.25	0.531	OLS	-38.28	1.89	2	0.3893
North Andros	PC4	73.56	5.39	0.937	OLS	-30.40	17.64	2	0.0001 ***

## 723 Appendix

724 Here we describe more precisely the patterns identified on each island.

725  
726 On Abaco, dewlaps from the mangrove habitat were the best discriminated, while dewlaps  
727 from the beach scrub habitat were often mistaken for dewlaps from the coppice habitat (Fig. 2D).  
728 Importance analysis revealed that beach scrub and mangrove lizards mostly differed in reflectance  
729 in the ultraviolet (UV) end of the spectrum (below 400nm, Fig. S2F), where mangrove dewlaps  
730 had higher UV reflectance relative to beach scrub lizards, and coppice lizards had an intermediate  
731 UV reflectance between the two other habitats (Fig. 2B). Consistent with this, our analyses of  
732 variance detected significantly lower **higher** PC2 scores in mangrove lizards than in the two other  
733 habitats (Fig. 2E, Table 3), representing a higher UV-reflectance relative to red (Fig. 2C). Beach  
734 scrub lizards also scored **lower higher** on PC3 (Fig. 2E, Table 3), indicating less curvature of the  
735 reflectance profile and relatively higher reflectance at intermediate wavelengths (blue-to-yellow)  
736 than at the ends of the range (Fig. 2C). Differences were detected between sites both at large (~  
737 100km) and short (< 1km) distances (Fig. S2G). Abaco was the only island where we detected  
738 significant spatial autocorrelation (Table 2), that is, sites that were closer geographically tended  
739 to have populations of lizards with more similar dewlap colors.

740  
741 On Bimini, the random forests mostly correctly classified lizards from the coppice and mangrove  
742 habitats while often misclassifying lizards from the beach scrub habitat (Fig. S3D). Relatively flat  
743 importance profiles for beach scrub lizards suggested that brightness was used instead of a par-  
744 ticular wavelength to identify some of the beach scrub dewlaps (Fig. S3F). Indeed, some beach  
745 scrub dewlaps were substantially brighter than the rest (Fig. S3B, C), a pattern that was captured  
746 by our analysis of variance along PC1 (i.e. brightness, Fig. S3C, E, Table 3). Coppice dewlaps  
747 had significantly higher PC2 scores than mangrove dewlaps (Fig. S3E), suggesting a higher curva-  
748 ture (higher UV and red reflectance than more intermediate wavelengths, Fig. S3C). For these two  
749 habitats the random forests were most sensitive to UV reflectance (Fig. S3F). Beach scrub dewlaps  
750 had higher PC3 scores than coppice dewlaps but it was not clear what properties of spectral shape  
751 this principal component mapped onto (Fig. S3C). The random forests also used UV reflectance to  
752 discriminate between coppice and mangrove dewlaps (Fig. S3F), which could reflect the significant  
753 difference we detected along PC3 between these two habitats (Fig. S3C, E, Table 3). Beach scrub  
754 lizards were characterized by elevated red reflectance relative to UV (as represented by PC2, (Fig.  
755 S3C, E)), and beach scrub and mangrove lizards were characterized by a more even distribution of  
756 the reflectance along the spectrum (as represented by PC3, (Fig. S3C, E)), in contrast to coppice  
757 lizards which harbored a stronger curvature at intermediate wavelengths (Fig. S3C, E). On this  
758 island, the beach scrub and coppice habitats were separated by a few hundred meters, making this  
759 contrast the smallest geographical scale at which differences in coloration were found in our study  
760 (Fig. S3G).

761  
762 On Cayman Brac, all three habitats could be well discriminated against each other (Fig. S4D),  
763 with UV reflectance appearing to be an important variable differentiating beach scrub and man-  
764 grove dewlaps (Fig. S4F). In contrast, coppice dewlaps had a relatively flat importance profile,  
765 suggesting that brightness made them more distinct rather than any particular wavelength (Fig.  
766 S4F). Consistent with this, coppice dewlaps were significantly different from all other dewlaps  
767 along PC1 (Fig. S4E, Table 3). At a distance between 2 and 3km (Fig. S4G), dewlaps in the  
768 beach scrub habitat reflected more red light (as represented by PC2, Fig. S4C, E) and more UV  
769 (as represented by PC3, along which coppice dewlaps were intermediate, Fig. S4C, E) than in  
770 the mangrove habitat. Coppice lizards were also characterized by a higher UV reflectance than  
771 mangrove dewlaps (PC3, Fig. S4C, E, Table 3).

772  
773 On Eleuthera, although random forests detected between-habitat differences in dewlap color,  
774 other approaches did not (Tables S8 and S7), suggesting that the differences may be small.  
775 On Eleuthera, beach scrub and mangrove dewlaps were guessed relatively correctly, but coppice  
776 dewlaps were more often mistaken for mangrove dewlaps (Fig. S5D). Mangrove dewlaps had lower  
777 PC2 scores than beach scrub dewlaps (Fig. S5E, indicating higher UV relative to red, Fig. S5C),  
778 and higher PC4 scores than coppice dewlaps (Fig. S5E, suggesting more reflectance profiles with  
779 more curvature, Fig. S5C). Random forests did not seem to consistently capture the wavelengths

responsible for these differences (Fig. S5F). 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 even though all habitats were relatively well discriminated (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 the mangrove 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 beach scrub and coppice dewlaps could be discriminated better against each other than with mangrove dewlaps (Fig. S8D), with importance profiles supporting UV-reflectance as a predictor of coppice lizards (Fig. S8F). Coppice lizards had less curved reflectance profiles than beach scrub and mangrove lizards (PC2), and beach scrub dewlaps had the lowest scores on PC4, which was difficult to interpret (Fig. S8C, 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 and South Andros (Table 1, S8, S7) where nearly no habitat could be differentiated from any other based on reflectance.

<sup>831</sup> 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, but without panel G.




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. \*\*\*,  $P < 0.001$ .

<sup>832</sup> Supplementary Tables

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

	coastal	coppice	mangrove
Abaco	41	24	21
Bimini	28	14	15
Cayman Brac	15	18	17
Eleuthera	21	25	9
Little Cayman	17	12	16
Long Island	26	13	14
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	0.277	0.149	0.079
Bimini	0.919	0.530	0.171	0.166	0.052
Cayman Brac	0.888	0.438	0.190	0.155	0.105
Eleuthera	0.926	0.486	0.235	0.138	0.066
Little Cayman	0.907	0.441	0.212	0.176	0.078
Long Island	0.916	0.501	0.215	0.152	0.048
North Andros	0.952	0.485	0.237	0.169	0.062
Ragged Island	0.907	0.483	0.226	0.127	0.072
South Andros	0.937	0.559	0.172	0.151	0.056
All islands	0.915	0.482	0.189	0.167	0.077

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	1.097	0.0028 **
Abaco	coppice	0	1.091	0.0016 **
Abaco	mangrove	0	1.052	0.0028 **
Bimini	coastal	0	0.965	0.0199 *
Bimini	coppice	0	0.828	0.0667
Bimini	mangrove	0	1.211	< 0.0001 ***
Cayman Brac	coastal	0	0.648	0.5261
Cayman Brac	coppice	0	0.691	0.4287
Cayman Brac	mangrove	0	0.671	0.4838
Eleuthera	coastal	0	1.446	< 0.0001 ***
Eleuthera	coppice	0	1.479	< 0.0001 ***
Eleuthera	mangrove	0	0.592	0.5556
Little Cayman	coastal	0	0.626	0.6547
Little Cayman	coppice	0	0.637	0.4895
Little Cayman	mangrove	0	0.867	0.0454 *
Long Island	coastal	0	0.834	0.1291
Long Island	coppice	0	1.001	0.0034 **
Long Island	mangrove	0	0.907	0.0197 *
North Andros	coastal	0	0.747	0.1123
North Andros	coppice	0	0.644	0.3623
North Andros	mangrove	0	0.839	0.0345 *
Ragged Island	coastal	0	0.757	0.2233
Ragged Island	coppice	0	0.810	0.0944
Ragged Island	mangrove	0	0.524	0.9341
South Andros	coastal	0	0.722	0.1765
South Andros	coppice	0	0.628	0.4212
South Andros	mangrove	0	0.684	0.3250

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	0.962	0.0128	0.0599
Abaco	PC2	0.960	0.0093	0.0518
Abaco	PC3	0.982	0.2963	0.6455
Abaco	PC4	0.983	0.3168	0.6455
Bimini	PC1	0.918	0.0009	0.0125 *
Bimini	PC2	0.985	0.7104	0.7956
Bimini	PC3	0.976	0.2997	0.6455
Bimini	PC4	0.977	0.3529	0.6455
Cayman Brac	PC1	0.986	0.8236	0.8869
Cayman Brac	PC2	0.989	0.9299	0.9299
Cayman Brac	PC3	0.934	0.0079	0.0518
Cayman Brac	PC4	0.981	0.5926	0.7214
Eleuthera	PC1	0.936	0.0058	0.0518
Eleuthera	PC2	0.972	0.2199	0.6455
Eleuthera	PC3	0.981	0.5224	0.6965
Eleuthera	PC4	0.977	0.3689	0.6455
Little Cayman	PC1	0.955	0.0821	0.3094
Little Cayman	PC2	0.982	0.6854	0.7956
Little Cayman	PC3	0.891	0.0005	0.0125 *
Little Cayman	PC4	0.977	0.4858	0.6965
Long Island	PC1	0.978	0.4223	0.6956
Long Island	PC2	0.980	0.5161	0.6965
Long Island	PC3	0.981	0.5605	0.7134
Long Island	PC4	0.976	0.3580	0.6455
North Andros	PC1	0.936	0.0884	0.3094
North Andros	PC2	0.966	0.4735	0.6965
North Andros	PC3	0.982	0.8977	0.9299
North Andros	PC4	0.959	0.3348	0.6455

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	1.005	-0.116	0.063	-1.255
Abaco	-77.6	26.9	coastal	0.157	-0.531	-0.086	-2.034
Abaco	-77.6	26.9	coppice	-0.081	-0.034	-0.631	-0.633
Abaco	-77.2	26.1	coastal	0.296	0.091	0.987	-0.158
Abaco	-77.0	26.3	mangrove	-0.312	1.224	-0.898	0.208
Abaco	-77.0	26.3	coppice	0.094	-0.314	-0.120	0.482
Abaco	-77.0	26.3	coastal	-0.334	-0.748	0.201	0.534
Bimini	-79.3	25.7	coastal	0.399	0.000	0.304	-0.049
Bimini	-79.3	25.7	coppice	-0.299	0.511	-0.657	0.097
Bimini	-79.3	25.7	mangrove	-0.466	-0.477	0.046	0.000
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	0.170	-0.855	-0.042	0.086
Eleuthera	-76.3	24.8	coastal	0.503	-0.653	0.564	-0.587
Eleuthera	-76.3	24.8	mangrove	0.067	-0.694	-0.119	0.718
Eleuthera	-76.2	24.9	coppice	-0.353	0.595	-0.544	-0.535
Eleuthera	-76.1	24.9	coastal	-0.215	1.220	0.297	0.396
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	-0.390	0.217	0.541	0.535
Long Island	-75.2	23.4	coastal	0.038	-0.807	0.015	-0.326
Long Island	-75.2	23.4	coppice	0.894	0.018	0.035	-0.161
Long Island	-75.1	23.4	coastal	-0.408	0.299	-0.512	-0.134
North Andros	-77.9	24.8	coastal	-0.152	-0.074	-0.104	-0.957
North Andros	-77.8	24.8	coppice	0.112	0.860	-0.258	0.621
North Andros	-77.8	24.7	mangrove	0.036	-0.707	0.326	0.303
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	0.384	0.492	-0.333	0.472
South Andros	-77.6	24.1	coppice	0.067	-0.211	0.358	-0.018
South Andros	-77.5	24.1	coastal	-0.520	-0.401	0.078	-0.550

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	$\chi^2$	df	$P$	
Bimini	PC1	9.31	2	0.0095	**
Little Cayman	PC3	19.95	2	< 0.0001	***

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

Island	<i>N</i>	Score	<i>P</i>	
Abaco	86	0.614	< 0.0001	***
Bimini	57	0.474	0.0098	**
Cayman Brac	50	0.732	< 0.0001	***
Eleuthera	55	0.476	0.0112	*
Little Cayman	45	0.724	< 0.0001	***
Long Island	53	0.623	< 0.0001	***
North Andros	28	0.721	< 0.0001	***
Ragged Island	50	0.368	0.2874	
South Andros	31	0.445	0.1152	

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

Island	<i>N</i>	Score	<i>P</i>
Abaco	86	0.670	< 0.0001 ***
Bimini	57	0.491	0.0046 **
Cayman Brac	50	0.736	< 0.0001 ***
Eleuthera	55	0.480	0.0112 *
Little Cayman	45	0.747	< 0.0001 ***
Long Island	53	0.562	0.0004 ***
North Andros	28	0.636	0.0008 ***
Ragged Island	50	0.388	0.1964
South Andros	31	0.458	0.0589