

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

RAPHAËL SCHERRER<sup>1,3</sup> \*, COLIN M. DONIHUE<sup>1,4</sup>,  
R. GRAHAM REYNOLDS<sup>2</sup>, JONATHAN B. LOSOS<sup>1,4</sup> AND ANTHONY J. GENEVA<sup>1,5</sup>

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

<sup>2</sup> Department of Biology, University of North Carolina Asheville, Asheville, NC, USA

<sup>3</sup> Current address: Groningen Institute for Evolutionary Life Sciences,  
University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

<sup>4</sup> Current address: Department of Biology, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA

<sup>5</sup> 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, 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 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 ecomorphological 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 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* are an excellent group for studying the eco-evolutionary dynamics of local adaptation and  
56 natural selection (Losos, 2009). A particularly conspicuous trait of anoles is their dewlap, an  
57 extensible flap of skin that is typically sexually dimorphic and used as a communication signal  
58 in courtship (Sigmund, 1983; Driessens et al., 2014, 2015) and territorial displays (Losos, 1985;  
59 Macedonia and Stamps, 1994; Macedonia et al., 2013) as well as in predator deterrence (Leal  
60 and Rodríguez-Robles, 1995, 1997; Leal and Rodriguez-Robles, 1997). Dewlap characteristics vary  
61 widely among the approximately 400 species of the genus (Nicholson et al., 2007). Interspecific  
62 variation in dewlap coloration is implicated in species recognition (Rand and Williams, 1970;  
63 Williams, 1969; Williams and Rand, 1977; Losos, 1985; Macedonia and Stamps, 1994; Fleishman,  
64 2000; Macedonia et al., 2013), and this function could have had a role in initiating or reinforcing  
65 reproductive isolation during speciation (Lambert et al., 2013; Geneva et al., 2015; Ng et al., 2017).

66  
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  
78 Previous studies investigating variation in anole dewlaps compared populations at relatively  
79 large geographical scales, e.g. between islands (Vanhooydonck et al., 2009; Driessens et al., 2017)  
80 or within large islands such as Puerto Rico (Leal and Fleishman, 2004) or Hispaniola (Ng et al.,  
81 2012, 2016). These large scales and marine barriers should reduce gene flow (Ng and Glor, 2011;  
82 Lambert et al., 2013; Richardson et al., 2014; Ng et al., 2017). That said, examples do exist of  
83 divergence in dewlap coloration at smaller scales or between populations with high degrees of gene  
84 flow (Thorpe and Stenson, 2002; Thorpe, 2002; Stapley et al., 2011; Ng et al., 2016).

85  
86 *Anolis sagrei* is widespread across islands of the West Indies (Reynolds et al., 2020). It has  
87 been the subject of numerous studies concerning local adaptation (Losos et al., 1994, 1997, 2001;  
88 Kolbe et al., 2012), biological invasion (Kolbe et al., 2008), and sexual selection (Tokarz, 2002;  
89 Tokarz et al., 2005; Tokarz, 2006; Driessens et al., 2014; Steffen and Guyer, 2014; Driessens et al.,  
90 2015) among many other topics. Between-island variation in the mainly orange-red color of its  
91 dewlap was shown to be better explained by climatic variables (Driessens et al., 2017) than by  
92 proxies for biotic factors such as sexual selection or predation pressure (Vanhooydonck et al., 2009;  
93 Baeckens et al., 2018). How intra-island differences in habitat may contribute to the diversity of  
94 dewlap coloration, however, remains unexplored, and may reveal new insights into the scale of local

differentiation despite gene flow. 95

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 (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 Shoot 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 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).

**119 Methods**

**120 Data collection**

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

**137 Reflectance measurements**

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

**148 Analysis**

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

**167**

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

169 **Dimensionality reduction**

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.

178 **Among-island variance partitioning**

We performed a two-way nonparametric multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA, An-  
derson 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 vio-  
lated 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).

186 **Within-island machine learning**

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 versa-  
tile, 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 coordi-  
nates, 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 prin-  
cipal 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 multi-  
ple 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 con-  
ditioned 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.

**276 Spatial autocorrelation**

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).

277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283

**284 Site differences**

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).

285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290

## Results

291

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

301

302 We subsequently tested for differences in dewlap coloration between habitat-populations within  
303 each island, using within-island principal component scores (to maximize the variation captured  
304 for each island, see Methods). Our within-island random forest classification analyses revealed  
305 detectable differences in dewlap coloration on eight out of the nine islands in our sample: Abaco,  
306 Bimini, Cayman Brac, Eleuthera, Little Cayman, Long Island, North Andros and South Andros.  
307 The accuracy of random forest classification exceeded random expectation more often than ex-  
308 pected by chance for all these islands (Table 1). Accuracy was as high as 73% for Cayman Brac.  
309 We obtained similar results using other machine learning approaches such as support vector ma-  
310 chines (Table S7) and linear discriminant analysis (Table S8), except that these methods did not  
311 detect significant differences on Eleuthera and North Andros. We describe in details the specific  
312 differences detected on each island in the Appendix, and focus here on the general patterns emerg-  
313 ing from our data.

314

315 Overall, we found significant differences in dewlap coloration between populations that were  
316 often in close geographical proximity. On Bimini, notably, we found a significant difference be-  
317 tween dewlaps from beach scrub and primary coppice forest, at a distance of a few hundred meters,  
318 making this contrast the smallest geographical scale at which differences in coloration were found  
319 in our study (Fig. S3). We also detected significant differences in dewlap coloration at distances  
320 below one kilometer on Abaco (Fig. S2G), and at distances between one and ten kilometers on  
321 Bimini (Fig. S3G), Cayman Brac (Fig. S4G), Little Cayman (Fig. S6G), Long Island (Fig. S7G)  
322 and South Andros (Fig. S10G).

323

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

333

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

344

## 345 Discussion

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.

346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
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

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). Indeed, given that (1) the populations were continuously distributed between the habitats, (2) populations from different habitats were not monophyletic with respect to mitochondrial haplotypes (van de Schoot 2016 unpublished thesis), and (3) *A. sagrei* is highly mobile (Kamath and Losos, 2018), we would have expected more homogeneous distributions of color phenotypes within islands due to gene flow, with fewer differences between populations, especially those in close proximity.

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

We found no evidence for a role of genetic drift in explaining the observed patterns either.

First, *A. sagrei* was distributed across the islands continuously, usually at relatively high population densities, rather than in small and isolated populations where drift might be expected to have a strong effect. Second, we found no evidence of isolation-by-distance except on Abaco, which was sampled at the largest geographical scale, with sites nearly a hundred kilometers apart from each other. Hence, while isolation-by-distance may explain long-range differences on this island, most of the differences among habitats across the rest of the sampling region are unlikely to be explained by genetic drift, as habitats were often in close proximity (less than 10km). 402

In this study, we found larger differences among than within islands, a pattern already reported and linked to climatic conditions ([Vanhooydonck et al., 2009](#)) and to densities of predators and of anole congeners ([Baeckens et al., 2018](#)). Differences among habitats within islands, however, are still difficult to account for. Remaining hypotheses may include, for example, runaway sexual selection arbitrarily operating in different directions across islands ([Andersson, 1994](#)), but no evidence so far suggests that dewlap is a target of mate choice in anoles ([Tokarz, 2002; Tokarz et al., 2005; Nicholson et al., 2007](#)). Another hypothesis is that the different genetic constitutions of different islands, perhaps resulting from founder effects (the islands have been colonized independently, [van de Shoot 2016 unpubl.; Driessens et al. 2017; Reynolds et al. 2020](#)), may have predisposed populations to adapt differently to similarly selective circumstances. Either way, new data would be needed to test these hypotheses. 420

Altogether, our results show that dewlap color of *A. sagrei* commonly varies between habitat types, even in close geographical proximity, within islands of the West Indies. However, coloration differs in different ways across similar habitats from one island to another. We discussed several non-mutually exclusive mechanisms that could explain these observations. Nevertheless, heterogeneous patterns of divergence across islands do not support an adaptive sensory-drive scenario, and we propose that within-island dewlap color variation may be underlain by a more subtle mosaic of factors. 421

**429 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. This project was made possible through the support of a grant from the John Templeton Foundation (to JBL). The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the John Templeton Foundation. Additional funding for this work was provided by 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).

430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441

## Figures

442




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

443 **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	0.612	< 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: 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	0.448	0.033 *
Bimini	0.810	0.250
Cayman Brac	-0.737	0.833
Eleuthera	0.844	0.058
Little Cayman	-0.042	0.667
Long Island	0.367	0.333
North Andros	0.051	0.667
Ragged Island	-0.363	0.708
South Andros	-0.979	1.000

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.  $\Delta\text{AICc}$ , difference in AICc between the best-fitting model and the OLS-model. AICcw, AICc weight. Log-lik., log-likelihood.  $\chi^2$ , likelihood ratio. df, degrees of freedom. \*,  $P < 0.05$ ; \*\*,  $P < 0.01$ ; \*\*\*,  $P < 0.001$ .

Island	Variable	AICc	$\Delta\text{AICc}$	AICcw	Model	Log-lik.	$\chi^2$	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. 444  
445  
446
- Andersson, M. B. (1994). *Sexual Selection*. Monographs in Behavior and Ecology. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. 447  
448
- Arnold, S. J. (1983). Morphology, Performance and Fitness. *American Zoologist*, 23(2):347–361. 449
- 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. 450  
451  
452
- Bartoń, K. (2019). MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference. 453
- 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. 454  
455  
456
- Bradbury, J. W. and Vehrencamp, S. L. (2011). *Principles of Animal Communication*. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Mass, 2nd ed edition. 457  
458
- Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45(1):5–32. 459
- 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. 460  
461
- Cortez, P. (2020). Rminer: Data Mining Classification and Regression Methods. 462
- 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. 463  
464  
465
- Cristianini, N. and Shawe-Taylor, J. (2000). *An Introduction to Support Vector Machines and Other Kernel-Based Learning Methods*. Cambridge University Press, first edition. 466  
467
- 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. 468  
469  
470
- Dieckmann, U. and Doebeli, M. (1999). On the origin of species by sympatric speciation. *Nature*, 400(6742):354–357. 471  
472
- 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. 473  
474  
475
- 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. 476  
477  
478
- 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. 479  
480  
481
- Endler, J. (1998). Sensory ecology, receiver biases and sexual selection. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 13(10):415–420. 482  
483
- 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. 484  
485  
486
- 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. 487  
488

- 490 Endler, J. A. (1991). Variation in the appearance of guppy color patterns to guppies and their predators under different visual conditions. *Vision Research*, 31(3):587–608. 489
- 491 Endler, J. A. (1992). Signals, Signal Conditions, and the Direction of Evolution. *The American Naturalist*, 139:S125–S153.
- 493 Endler, J. A. (1993a). The Color of Light in Forests and Its Implications. *Ecological Monographs*, 494 63(1):1–27.
- 495 Endler, J. A. (1993b). Some general comments on the evolution and design of animal communication systems. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 340(1292):215–225.
- 498 Endler, J. A. and McLellan, T. (1988). The Processes of Evolution: Toward a Newer Synthesis. 499 *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 19(1):395–421.
- 500 Felsenstein, J. (1976). The Theoretical Population Genetics of Variable Selection and Migration. 501 *Annual Review of Genetics*, 10(1):253–280.
- 502 Fleishman, L. J. (2000). *Signal Function, Signal Efficiency and the Evolution of Anoline Lizard Dewlap Color*, pages 209–236. Tapir Academic, Trondheim.
- 504 Fleishman, L. J., Leal, M., and Persons, M. H. (2009). Habitat light and dewlap color diversity in 505 four species of Puerto Rican anoline lizards. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A*, 195(11):1043– 506 1060.
- 507 Fleishman, L. J. and Persons, M. (2001). The influence of stimulus and background colour on 508 signal visibility in the lizard *Anolis cristatellus*. *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, 204(Pt 509 9):1559–1575.
- 510 Fleishman, L. J., Wadman, C. S., and Maximov, K. J. (2020). The interacting effects of total 511 light intensity and chromatic contrast on visual signal visibility in an *Anolis* lizard. *Animal 512 Behaviour*, page S0003347220302037.
- 513 García-Ramos, G. and Kirkpatrick, M. (1997). Genetic Models of Adaptation and Gene Flow in 514 Peripheral Populations. *Evolution*, 51(1):21–28.
- 515 Geneva, A. J., Hilton, J., Noll, S., and Glor, R. E. (2015). Multilocus phylogenetic analyses of 516 Hispaniolan and Bahamian trunk anoles (*distichus* species group). *Molecular Phylogenetics and 517 Evolution*, 87:105–117.
- 518 Goodwin, T. W. (1984). *The Biochemistry of the Carotenoids*. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht.
- 519 Halfwerk, W., Jones, P. L., Taylor, R. C., Ryan, M. J., and Page, R. A. (2014). Risky Ripples Allow 520 Bats and Frogs to Eavesdrop on a Multisensory Sexual Display. *Science*, 343(6169):413–416.
- 521 Harvey, P. H. and Pagel, M. D. (1991). *The Comparative Method in Evolutionary Biology*. Oxford 522 Series in Ecology and Evolution. Oxford University Press, Oxford ; New York.
- 523 Hendry, A. P., Day, T., and Taylor, E. B. (2007a). Population Mixing and the Adaptive Divergence 524 of Quantitative Traits in Discrete Populations: A Theoretical Framework for Empirical Tests. 525 *Evolution*, 55(3):459–466.
- 526 Hendry, A. P., Taylor, E. B., and McPhail, J. D. (2007b). Adaptive Divergence and the Balance 527 Between Selection and Gene Flow: Lake and Stream Stickleback in the Misty System. *Evolution*, 528 56(6):1199–1216.
- 529 Henze, N. and Zirkler, B. (1990). A class of invariant consistent tests for multivariate normality. 530 *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, 19(10):3595–3617.
- 531 Hijmans, R. J. (2019). Geosphere: Spherical Trigonometry.
- 532 Hill, G. E., Inouye, C. Y., and Montgomerie, R. (2002). Dietary carotenoids predict plumage 533 coloration in wild house finches. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological 534 Sciences*, 269(1496):1119–1124.

- <sup>535</sup> Hill, G. E. and McGraw, K. J., editors (2006). *Bird Coloration*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. <sup>536</sup>
- Hollander, M., Wolfe, D. A., and Chicken, E. (2013). *Nonparametric Statistical Methods*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc, Hoboken, New Jersey, third edition edition. <sup>537</sup>  
<sup>538</sup>  
<sup>539</sup>
- Howard, R. A. (1950). Vegetation of the Bimini Island Group: Bahamas, B. W. I. *Ecological Monographs*, 20(4):317–349. <sup>540</sup>  
<sup>541</sup>
- James, G., Witten, D., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (2013). *An Introduction to Statistical Learning*, volume 103 of *Springer Texts in Statistics*. Springer New York, New York, NY. <sup>542</sup>  
<sup>543</sup>
- Kamath, A. and Losos, J. B. (2018). Estimating encounter rates as the first step of sexual selection in the lizard *Anolis sagrei*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 285(1873):20172244. <sup>544</sup>  
<sup>545</sup>  
<sup>546</sup>
- 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. *Biology Letters*, 4(4):434–437. <sup>547</sup>  
<sup>548</sup>  
<sup>549</sup>
- 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. *Science*, 335(6072):1086–1089. <sup>550</sup>  
<sup>551</sup>  
<sup>552</sup>
- Korkmaz, S., Goksuluk, D., and Zararsiz, G. (2014). MVN: An R Package for Assessing Multivariate Normality. *The R Journal*, 6(2):151–162. <sup>553</sup>  
<sup>554</sup>
- 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 *Anolis* lizards. *Molecular Ecology*, 22(15):3981–3995. <sup>555</sup>  
<sup>556</sup>  
<sup>557</sup>
- Lazareva, O. F., Shimizu, T., and Wasserman, E. A. (2012). *How Animals See the World Comparative Behavior, Biology, and Evolution of Vision*. Oxford University Press. <sup>558</sup>  
<sup>559</sup>
- Leal, M. and Fleishman, L. J. (2002). Evidence for habitat partitioning based on adaptation to environmental light in a pair of sympatric lizard species. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 269(1489):351–359. <sup>560</sup>  
<sup>561</sup>  
<sup>562</sup>
- Leal, M. and Fleishman, L. J. (2004). Differences in Visual Signal Design and Detectability between Allopatric Populations of *Anolis* Lizards. *The American Naturalist*, 163(1):26–39. <sup>563</sup>  
<sup>564</sup>
- Leal, M. and Rodríguez-Robles, J. A. (1995). Antipredator Responses of *Anolis cristatellus* (Sauria: Polychrotidae). *Copeia*, 1995(1):155–161. <sup>565</sup>  
<sup>566</sup>
- Leal, M. and Rodriguez-Robles, J. A. (1997). Antipredator Responses of the Puerto Rican Giant Anole, *Anolis cuvieri* (Squamata: Polychrotidae). *Biotropica*, 29(3):372–375. <sup>567</sup>  
<sup>568</sup>
- Leal, M. and Rodríguez-Robles, J. A. (1997). Signalling displays during predator–prey interactions in a Puerto Rican anole, *Anolis cristatellus*. *Animal Behaviour*, 54(5):1147–1154. <sup>569</sup>  
<sup>570</sup>
- Legendre, P. and Legendre, L. (2012). *Numerical Ecology*. Number 24 in Developments in Environmental Modelling. Elsevier, Amsterdam, third english edition edition. <sup>571</sup>  
<sup>572</sup>
- Lenormand, T. (2002). Gene flow and the limits to natural selection. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 17(4):183–189. <sup>573</sup>  
<sup>574</sup>
- Liaw, A. and Wiener, M. (2002). Classification and Regression by randomForest. *R News*, 2(3):18–22. <sup>575</sup>  
<sup>576</sup>
- Losos, J. B. (1985). An Experimental Demonstration of the Species-Recognition Role of *Anolis* Dewlap Color. *Copeia*, 1985(4):905–910. <sup>577</sup>  
<sup>578</sup>
- Losos, J. B. (2009). *Lizards in an Evolutionary Tree: Ecology and Adaptive Radiation of Anoles*. University of California Press. <sup>579</sup>  
<sup>580</sup>

- Losos, J. B. (2011). Convergence, Adaptation, and Constraint. *Evolution*, 65(7):1827–1840. 581
- 582 Losos, J. B., Irschick, D. J., and Schoener, T. W. (1994). Adaptation and Constraint in the  
583 Evolution of Specialization of Bahamian *Anolis* Lizards. *Evolution*, 48(6):1786–1798.
- 584 Losos, J. B., Schoener, T. W., Warheit, K. I., and Creer, D. (2001). Experimental studies of  
585 adaptive differentiation in Bahamian *Anolis* lizards. *Genetica*, 112-113:399–415.
- 586 Losos, J. B., Warheit, K. I., and Schoener, T. W. (1997). Adaptive differentiation following  
587 experimental island colonization in *Anolis* lizards. *Nature*, 387(6628):70–73.
- 588 Macedonia, J. M. (2001). Habitat light, colour variation, and ultraviolet reflectance in the Grand  
589 Cayman anole, *Anolis conspersus*. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 73(3):299–320.
- 590 Macedonia, J. M., Clark, D. L., Riley, R. G., and Kemp, D. J. (2013). Species recognition of color  
591 and motion signals in *Anolis grahami*: Evidence from responses to lizard robots. *Behavioral  
592 Ecology*, 24(4):846–852.
- 593 Macedonia, J. M., Clark, D. L., and Tamasi, A. L. (2014). Does Selection Favor Dewlap Colors that  
594 Maximize Detectability? A Test with Five Species of Jamaican *Anolis* Lizards. *Herpetologica*,  
595 70(2):157–170.
- 596 Macedonia, J. M. and Stamps, J. A. (1994). Species Recognition in *Anolis grahami* (Sauria,  
597 Iguanidae): Evidence from Responses to Video Playbacks of Conspecific and Heterospecific  
598 Displays. *Ethology*, 98(3-4):246–264.
- 599 Maia, R., Eliason, C. M., Bitton, P.-P., Doucet, S. M., and Shawkey, M. D. (2013). Pavo: An  
600 R package for the analysis, visualization and organization of spectral data. *Methods in Ecology  
601 and Evolution*, pages n/a–n/a.
- 602 Ng, J., Geneva, A. J., Noll, S., and Glor, R. E. (2017). Signals and Speciation: *Anolis* Dewlap  
603 Color as a Reproductive Barrier. *Journal of Herpetology*, 51(3):437–447.
- 604 Ng, J. and Glor, R. E. (2011). Genetic differentiation among populations of a Hispaniolan trunk  
605 anole that exhibit geographical variation in dewlap colour. *Molecular Ecology*, 20(20):4302–4317.
- 606 Ng, J., Kelly, A. L., MacGuigan, D. J., and Glor, R. E. (2013). The Role of Heritable and Dietary  
607 Factors in the Sexual Signal of a Hispaniolan *Anolis* Lizard, *Anolis distichus*. *Journal of Heredity*,  
608 104(6):862–873.
- 609 Ng, J., Landeen, E. L., Logsdon, R. M., and Glor, R. E. (2012). Correlation Between *Anolis*  
610 Lizard Dewlap Phenotype and Environmental Variation Indicates Adaptive Divergence of a  
611 Signal Important to Sexual Selection and Species Recognition. *Evolution*, 67(2):573–582.
- 612 Ng, J., Ossip-Klein, A. G., and Glor, R. E. (2016). Adaptive signal coloration maintained in the  
613 face of gene flow in a Hispaniolan *Anolis* Lizard. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, 16(1):193.
- 614 Nicholson, K. E., Harmon, L. J., and Losos, J. B. (2007). Evolution of *Anolis* Lizard Dewlap  
615 Diversity. *PLoS ONE*, 2(3):e274.
- 616 Nosil, P. and Crespi, B. J. (2004). Does Gene Flow Constrain Adaptive Divergence or Vice Versa? A  
617 Test Using Ecomorphology and Sexual Isolation in *Timema cristinae* Walking-Sticks. *Evolution*,  
618 58(1):102–112.
- 619 Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F. G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., McGlinn, D., Minchin, P. R.,  
620 O'Hara, R. B., Simpson, G. L., Solymos, P., Stevens, M. H. H., Szoecs, E., and Wagner, H.  
621 (2019). Vegan: Community Ecology Package. R package version 2.5-6.
- 622 Pinheiro, J. and Bates, D. (2000). *Mixed-Effects Models in S and S-PLUS*. Statistics and Com-  
623 puting. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- 624 Pinheiro, J., Bates, D., DebRoy, S., Sarkar, D., and Team, R. C. (2020). Nlme: Linear and  
625 Nonlinear Mixed Effects Models.

626	Pohlert, T. (2020). PMCMRplus: Calculate Pairwise Multiple Comparisons of Mean Rank Sums Extended. R package version 1.4.4.	627
	R Core Team (2019). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.	628 629
	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.	630 631
	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.	632 633 634 635
	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.	636 637
	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.	638 639
	Schoener, T. W. (1968). The <i>Anolis</i> Lizards of Bimini: Resource Partitioning in a Complex Fauna. <i>Ecology</i> , 49(4):704–726.	640 641
	Seehausen, O. (1997). Cichlid Fish Diversity Threatened by Eutrophication That Curbs Sexual Selection. <i>Science</i> , 277(5333):1808–1811.	642 643
	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.	644 645
	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.	646 647
	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.	648 649 650
	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.	651 652
	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.	653 654 655
	Thorpe, R. S. and Stenson, A. G. (2002). Phylogeny, Paraphyly and Ecological Adaptation of the Colour and Pattern in the Anolis Roquet Complex on Martinique: Interaction Between Phylogeny and Adaptation. <i>Molecular Ecology</i> , 12(1):117–132.	656 657 658
	Tokarz, R. R. (2002). An Experimental Test of the Importance of the Dewlap in Male Mating Success in the Lizard <i>Anolis sagrei</i> . <i>Herpetologica</i> , 58(1):87–94.	659 660
	Tokarz, R. R. (2006). Importance of Prior Physical Contact with Familiar Females in the Development of a Male Courtship and Mating Preference for Unfamiliar Females in the Lizard <i>Anolis Sagrei</i> . <i>Herpetologica</i> , 62(2):115–124.	661 662 663
	Tokarz, R. R., Paterson, A. V., and McMann, S. (2005). Importance of Dewlap Display in Male Mating Success in Free-Ranging Brown Anoles ( <i>Anolis sagrei</i> ). <i>Journal of Herpetology</i> , 39(1):174–177.	664 665 666
	van de Schoot, M. (2016). <i>Within and between Island Radiation and Genetic Variation in Anolis Sagrei</i> . PhD thesis, Wageningen University, Wageningen, The Netherlands.	667 668
	Vanhooydonck, B., Herrel, A., Meyers, J. J., and Irschick, D. J. (2009). What determines dewlap diversity in <i>Anolis</i> lizards? An among-island comparison. <i>Journal of Evolutionary Biology</i> , 22(2):293–305.	669 670 671

- Willi, Y. and Hoffmann, A. A. (2012). Microgeographic adaptation linked to forest fragmentation and habitat quality in the tropical fruit fly *Drosophila birchii*. *Oikos*, 121(10):1627–1637. 672
- Williams, E. E. (1969). The Ecology of Colonization as Seen in the Zoogeography of Anoline Lizards on Small Islands. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 44(4):345–389. 673
- Williams, E. E. and Rand, A. S. (1977). Species Recognition, Dewlap Function and Faunal Size. *American Zoologist*, 17(1):261–270. 674
- Zuur, A. F., editor (2009). *Mixed Effects Models and Extensions in Ecology with R*. Statistics for Biology and Health. Springer, New York, NY. 675
- 676
- 677
- 678
- 679

## 680 Appendix

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

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

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

On Cayman Brac, all three habitats could be well discriminated against each other (Fig. S4D), with UV reflectance appearing to be an important variable differentiating beach scrub and mangrove dewlaps (Fig. S4F). In contrast, coppice dewlaps had a relatively flat importance profile, 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).

On Eleuthera, 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).

738 On Long Island the three habitats were relatively well discriminated (Fig. S7D). Importance  
 739 profiles indicated that short wavelengths were used to discriminate between beach scrub and man-  
 740 grove lizards (Fig. S7F). Beach scrub lizards had more curved reflectance profiles than in either of  
 741 the two other habitats, with higher levels of UV and red reflectance relative to intermediate wave-  
 742 lengths (PC3, Fig. S7C, E, Table 3). Beach scrub lizards also differed from mangrove lizards along  
 743 PC4 (Fig. S7E), which represented a rather small portion of the variance not already explained  
 744 by the first three principal components, and is therefore difficult to interpret (Fig. S7C). Coppice  
 745 lizards were significantly darker than mangrove and beach scrub lizards (PC1, Fig. S7C, E, Table  
 746 3).

747

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

758

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

765

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

**768 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

769

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	$\chi^2$	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	**