

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

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 Vehrenamp, 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., 2014). This selective pressure may drive the local adaptation of communication signals.

One potential barrier to the maintenance of localized signal divergence is the homogenizing effect of gene flow. Population genetics theory suggests that gene flow may counteract local adaptation between localities and prevent divergence altogether, especially at small spatial scales, because of the inflow of maladapted alleles or because of the breaking of linkage between coevolving loci (Felsenstein, 1976; García-Ramos and Kirkpatrick, 1997; Dieckmann and Doebeli, 1999; Lenormand, 2002; Hendry et al., 2007a). This genetic homogenization has been confirmed empirically in systems such as stick insects (Nosil and Crespi, 2004) and stickleback (Hendry et al., 2007b). Yet, examples of microgeographic adaptation, i.e. adaptation at smaller scales than the range of dispersal, exist, highlighting the potential of some organisms to respond to selection in the face of gene flow (see Richardson et al. 2014 and references therein). Examples include small scale adaptation 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
95 differentiation despite gene flow.

96

97 Here, we analyzed the color characteristics of *A. sagrei* dewlaps within nine islands in the
98 Bahamas and Cayman Islands. These island systems presently, if not historically, comprise rel-
99 atively small islands, with no major geographic barriers within islands limiting dispersal for this
100 species (Kamath and Losos, 2018). These islands all share three characteristic native West Indian
101 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 parame-
102 ters including vegetation community, light irradiance, humidity, and temperature (Howard, 1950;
103 Schoener, 1968). The Cayman Islands and the Bahamas have been colonized independently by *A.*
104 *sagrei* from Cuba (van de Schoot 2016 unpublished thesis; Reynolds et al. 2020), such that these
105 archipelagos constitute an ideal suite of natural replicates to explore within-island dewlap diversity
106 across multiple islands.

102
103
104
105
106
107

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).

108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118

Methods

119

Data collection

120

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

121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136

Reflectance measurements

137

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

138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147

Analysis

148

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

149
150
151
152

167 168 All analyses in this study were performed in R 3.6.1 (R Core Team, 2019).

169 **Dimensionality reduction**

170 Because neighboring wavelengths are highly collinear and redundant in reflectance, we reduced
171 the dimensionality of the data using principal component analysis (PCA), as per Cuthill et al.
172 (1999) and Leal and Fleishman (2002). We performed PCA on data from all islands combined, as
173 well as on each island separately and systematically retained the first four principal components
174 (PC), which together always explained more than 88.8% of the variance across islands (Table S2).
175 PCs need not represent the same wavelengths across islands because they are fitted on different
176 datasets. Nevertheless, PC1 was highly collinear with brightness for all islands (Figure S11), while
177 the other PCs captured the chromatic variation (i.e. irrespective of brightness) in dewlap color.

178 **Among-island variance partitioning**

179 We performed a two-way nonparametric multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA, An-
180 derson 2001, R package vegan, Oksanen et al. 2019) to identify differences in coloration between
181 islands, habitats and habitats within islands, using principal components fitted on data from all
182 islands together. We used a nonparametric test because although no multivariate outliers were
183 detected based on the Mahalanobis distance, the assumption of multivariate normality was vio-
184 lated in several habitats on several islands (Henze-Zirkler's test, Henze and Zirkler 1990, R package
185 MVN, Korkmaz et al. 2014, $P < 0.05$, Table S3).

186 **Within-island machine learning**

187 We performed a machine learning classification analysis on the first four principal components
188 within each island separately, using random forests (Breiman, 2001). Random forests are a versa-
189 tile, intuitive, and powerful algorithm commonly used in machine learning, using decision trees to
190 predict the labels of particular observations based on their multivariate coordinates. These coordi-
191 nates, or variables, are passed through a series of successive decision nodes, each examining a given
192 variable of any given observation (James et al., 2013). The prediction for each observation is an
193 aggregate over a large number of decision trees, each tree being trained on a subset of observations
194 sampled with replacement from the dataset, and each tree being allowed to examine only a subset
195 of the variables. This allows the random forest to overcome the individual errors of all trees in the
196 predictions it makes.

197 To detect differences in dewlap coloration between habitats, we measured the success of random
198 forests in reassigning individual lizards to their correct habitat of origin, based solely on their prin-
199 cipal component scores. In machine learning, this so-called cross-validation procedure is typically
200 done in two steps (James et al., 2013). First, a random forest is trained in recognizing features
201 of dewlap coloration most associated with the different habitats, by being presented with multi-
202 ple observations, making predictions about them, and updating its own decision rules based on
203 whether the prediction deviates from the truth. Then, once trained, the patterns that the random
204 forest has learned to recognize are tested by presenting new, previously unseen observations to the
205 random forest, and measuring the proportion of correct predictions. This proportion, or success
206 score, can then be statistically assessed against random guessing using a binomial test.

208 The cross-validation procedure requires that the data be split into a training set and a testing
209 set. To remove any bias due to the set that is being sampled for training, it is common practice
210 to use k-fold cross-validation (James et al., 2013), where the data are split into k random bins and
211 k independent machines are trained, each taking one of the bins as a testing set and the rest for
212 training, and where classification success is measured by summing all correct classifications from
213 the k machines.

214 Here, we used a k-fold cross-validation procedure with $k = 5$, where each training set consisted
215 of 80% of the data and the machine was tested on the remaining 20%. Each training set was con-
216 ditioned on containing at least five lizards from each of the three habitats. We also down-sampled
217 the training set to the sample size of the least represented habitat, to ensure that the different
218 habitats were equally represented. To further remove any bias due to the specific random split
219 into the different bins, we replicated each k-fold cross-validation five times. We then averaged the
220 five resulting confusion matrices across replicates, where each confusion matrix shows the number
221

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 276
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

Site differences 284
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

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

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

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

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

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

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

320
321
322

345 Discussion

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

351
352 Detectable differences in dewlap color between populations are surprising, as habitats were of-
353 ten in close geographical proximity to each other (as close as a few hundred meters on Bimini and
354 most of the time within ten kilometers). Indeed, given that (1) the populations were continuously
355 distributed between the habitats, (2) populations from different habitats were not monophyletic
356 with respect to mitochondrial haplotypes (van de Schoot 2016 unpublished thesis), and (3) *A.*
357 *sagrei* is highly mobile (Kamath and Losos, 2018), we would have expected more homogeneous
358 distributions of color phenotypes within islands due to gene flow, with fewer differences between
359 populations, especially those in close proximity.

360
361 Several scenarios could account for these findings. One explanation is an adaptive one: pop-
362 ulations living in different habitats could be phenotypically adapted to their local environmental
363 conditions. Given that the brightly colored dewlap of *A. sagrei* is used as a communication sig-
364 nal, its color may be a target for selection if the transmission or perception of the signal differs
365 from one habitat to another, for example because of differences in ambient light, according to the
366 sensory-drive hypothesis (Endler and McLellan, 1988; Endler, 1992, 1998). The sensory-drive hy-
367 pothesis has been tested multiple times for dewlap coloration in *Anolis* lizards, with mixed results.
368 Some authors found support for it (Leal and Fleishman, 2002, 2004), while others found differences
369 in dewlap coloration between habitats inconsistent with the sensory-drive hypothesis (Fleishman
370 et al., 2009; Ng et al., 2012).

371
372 If our results were an example of sensory drive, we would have expected to see consistent
373 differences between populations from different habitats across islands, given the apparent environ-
374 mental consistency each of the three habitat types across the islands we sampled. In particular,
375 we would have expected divergence in line with increased detectability given local light conditions,
376 such as the high contrasts with background vegetation found in the UV range in Leal and Fleish-
377 man (2002) and Leal and Fleishman (2004). We might also have expected mangrove and beach
378 scrub lizards, both inhabiting areas with high light penetration, to have more similar dewlaps,
379 and to differ significantly from lizards from the coppice habitat, where irradiance is low. Instead,
380 we found inconsistencies in the way dewlap color differed between habitats across islands. While
381 short-wavelengths (UV reflectance) were often involved in color differences, they were not involved
382 on all islands where significant differences were detected. On some islands, other or additional
383 variables differed, such as brightness, red reflectance or the reflectance at the ends of the spectrum
384 visible to *Anolis* lizards (UV and red, Lazareva et al. 2012) relative to intermediate wavelengths
385 (blue-to-yellow). Similar portions of the spectrum were sometimes involved in opposite directions
386 on different islands, such as on Abaco and Cayman Brac, where mangrove lizards had a higher
387 UV-reflectance than beach scrub lizards on the former, but a lower UV-reflectance on the latter.
388 Overall, the observed heterogeneity of divergence patterns across islands provides no support to a
389 sensory-drive explanation.

390
391 It is presently not known if the reported differences in coloration have a genetic basis. Yet,
392 we find it unlikely that these differences arose through phenotypic plasticity, as although the
393 carotenoids that partly make up the red and orange colors of anole dewlaps must be found in
394 the diet (Goodwin, 1984; Hill et al., 2002; Hill and McGraw, 2006), studies testing the effect of
395 carotenoid deprivation (Steffen et al., 2010; Ng et al., 2013) and heritability (Cox et al., 2017) of
396 dewlap coloration in *A. sagrei* and *A. distichus* (another species with a carotenoid-based dewlap),
397 found little support for phenotypic and developmental plasticity in dewlap coloration. One excep-
398 tion is a study demonstrating that lizards heavily parasitized by skin mites had duller dewlaps
399 (Cook et al., 2013), but we found no sign of that in our study.

400
401 We found no evidence for a role of genetic drift in explaining the observed patterns either.

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

409 In this study, we found larger differences among than within islands, a pattern already reported
410 and linked to climatic conditions ([Vanhooydonck et al., 2009](#)) and to densities of predators and of
411 anole congeners ([Baeckens et al., 2018](#)). Differences among habitats within islands, however, are
412 still difficult to account for. Remaining hypotheses may include, for example, runaway sexual selec-
413 tion arbitrarily operating in different directions across islands ([Andersson, 1994](#)), but no evidence
414 so far suggests that dewlap is a target of mate choice in anoles ([Tokarz, 2002; Tokarz et al., 2005;](#)
415 [Nicholson et al., 2007](#)). Another hypothesis is that the different genetic constitutions of different
416 islands, perhaps resulting from founder effects (the islands have been colonized independently, [van](#)
417 [de Shoot 2016 unpubl.; Driessens et al. 2017; Reynolds et al. 2020](#)), may have predisposed pop-
418ulations to adapt differently to similarly selective circumstances. Either way, new data would be
419 needed to test these hypotheses.

420
421 Altogether, our results show that dewlap color of *A. sagrei* commonly varies between habitat
422 types, even in close geographical proximity, within islands of the West Indies. However, coloration
423 differs in different ways across similar habitats from one island to another. We discussed several
424 non-mutually exclusive mechanisms that could explain these observations. Nevertheless, heteroge-
425 neous patterns of divergence across islands do not support an adaptive sensory-drive scenario, and
426 we propose that within-island dewlap color variation may be underlain by a more subtle mosaic of
427 factors.

429 Acknowledgements

430 Collection permission was granted by the Bahamas Environment, Science and Technology Com-
431 mission, the Bahamas National Trust, the Bahamas Ministry of Agriculture, and the Cayman Is-
432 lands Department of the Environment. The authors thank Sofia Prado-Irwin, Pavitra Muralidhar,
433 Nicholas Herrmann, Richard E. Glor, Alberto R. Puente-Rolón, Kevin Aviles-Rodriguez, Kristin
434 Winchell, Jason Fredette, Quyhn Quach, Wendy Jesse, Inbar Maayan, Alexis Harrison and Melissa
435 Kemp for assistance in the field and Pratik Gupte, Max Lambert and James Stroud for helpful
436 discussions. This project was made possible through the support of a grant from the John Tem-
437 pleton Foundation (to JBL). The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the author(s)
438 and do not necessarily reflect the views of the John Templeton Foundation. Additional funding
439 for this work was provided by NSF DEB #1927194 (to JBL and AJG), NSF DEB #1500761 (to
440 AJG), NSF DBI #1609284 (to CMD), and a Harvard Museum of Comparative Zoology Putnam
441 Expedition Grant (to RGR).

442 Figures




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 ρ) between the matrix of phenotypic distances between populations from each site and the matrix of geographic distances between sites, where phenotypic distances are Euclidean distances between the mean phenotypes of each site in the multivariate space consisting of the first four within-island principal components. P-values assess the significance of the observed correlation against the correlation expected if population means were randomly permuted among sites (999 permutations). *, $P < 0.05$.

Island	ρ	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. ΔAICc , difference in AICc between the best-fitting model and the OLS-model. AICcw, AICc weight. Log-lik., log-likelihood. χ^2 , likelihood ratio. df, degrees of freedom. *, $P < 0.05$; **, $P < 0.01$; ***, $P < 0.001$.

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

444 References

- 445 Anderson, M. J. (2001). A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance.
446 *Austral Ecology*, 26(1):32–46.
- 447 Andersson, M. B. (1994). *Sexual Selection*. Monographs in Behavior and Ecology. Princeton
448 University Press, Princeton, N.J.
- 449 Arnold, S. J. (1983). Morphology, Performance and Fitness. *American Zoologist*, 23(2):347–361.
- 450 Baeckens, S., Driessens, T., and Van Damme, R. (2018). The brown anole dewlap revisited:
451 Do predation pressure, sexual selection, and species recognition shape among-population signal
452 diversity? *PeerJ*, 6:e4722.
- 453 Bartoń, K. (2019). MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference.
- 454 Benjamini, Y. and Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and
455 powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, 57:289–
456 300.
- 457 Bradbury, J. W. and Vehrencamp, S. L. (2011). *Principles of Animal Communication*. Sinauer
Associates, Sunderland, Mass, 2nd ed edition. 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

- 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
490
- Endler, J. A. (1992). Signals, Signal Conditions, and the Direction of Evolution. *The American Naturalist*, 139:S125–S153. 491
492
- Endler, J. A. (1993a). The Color of Light in Forests and Its Implications. *Ecological Monographs*, 63(1):1–27. 493
494
- 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. 495
496
497
- Endler, J. A. and McLellan, T. (1988). The Processes of Evolution: Toward a Newer Synthesis. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 19(1):395–421. 498
499
- Felsenstein, J. (1976). The Theoretical Population Genetics of Variable Selection and Migration. *Annual Review of Genetics*, 10(1):253–280. 500
501
- Fleishman, L. J. (2000). *Signal Function, Signal Efficiency and the Evolution of Anoline Lizard Dewlap Color*, pages 209–236. Tapir Academic, Trondheim. 502
503
- ⁵⁰⁴ Fleishman, L. J., Leal, M., and Persons, M. H. (2009). Habitat light and dewlap color diversity in four species of Puerto Rican anoline lizards. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A*, 195(11):1043–1060.
- ⁵⁰⁷ Fleishman, L. J. and Persons, M. (2001). The influence of stimulus and background colour on signal visibility in the lizard *Anolis cristatellus*. *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, 204(Pt 9):1559–1575.
- ⁵¹⁰ Fleishman, L. J., Wadman, C. S., and Maximov, K. J. (2020). The interacting effects of total light intensity and chromatic contrast on visual signal visibility in an *Anolis* lizard. *Animal Behaviour*, page S0003347220302037.
- ⁵¹³ García-Ramos, G. and Kirkpatrick, M. (1997). Genetic Models of Adaptation and Gene Flow in Peripheral Populations. *Evolution*, 51(1):21–28.
- ⁵¹⁵ Geneva, A. J., Hilton, J., Noll, S., and Glor, R. E. (2015). Multilocus phylogenetic analyses of Hispaniolan and Bahamian trunk anoles (*distichus* species group). *Molecular Phylogenetics and 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 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 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 of Quantitative Traits in Discrete Populations: A Theoretical Framework for Empirical Tests. *Evolution*, 55(3):459–466.
- ⁵²⁶ Hendry, A. P., Taylor, E. B., and McPhail, J. D. (2007b). Adaptive Divergence and the Balance Between Selection and Gene Flow: Lake and Stream Stickleback in the Misty System. *Evolution*, 56(6):1199–1216.
- ⁵²⁹ Henze, N. and Zirkler, B. (1990). A class of invariant consistent tests for multivariate normality. *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 coloration in wild house finches. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 269(1496):1119–1124.

- ⁵³⁵ Hill, G. E. and McGraw, K. J., editors (2006). *Bird Coloration*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- ⁵³⁷ 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.
- ⁵⁴⁰ Howard, R. A. (1950). Vegetation of the Bimini Island Group: Bahamas, B. W. I. *Ecological Monographs*, 20(4):317–349.
- ⁵⁴² 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.
- ⁵⁴⁴ 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.
- ⁵⁴⁷ 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.
- 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.
- ⁵⁵⁰
- ⁵⁵¹
- ⁵⁵²
- Korkmaz, S., Goksuluk, D., and Zararsiz, G. (2014). MVN: An R Package for Assessing Multivariate Normality. *The R Journal*, 6(2):151–162.
- ⁵⁵³
- ⁵⁵⁴
- 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.
- ⁵⁵⁵
- ⁵⁵⁶
- ⁵⁵⁷
- Lazareva, O. F., Shimizu, T., and Wasserman, E. A. (2012). *How Animals See the WorldComparative Behavior, Biology, and Evolution of Vision*. Oxford University Press.
- ⁵⁵⁸
- ⁵⁵⁹
- 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.
- ⁵⁶⁰
- ⁵⁶¹
- ⁵⁶²
- 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.
- ⁵⁶³
- ⁵⁶⁴
- Leal, M. and Rodríguez-Robles, J. A. (1995). Antipredator Responses of *Anolis cristatellus* (Sauria: Polychrotidae). *Copeia*, 1995(1):155–161.
- ⁵⁶⁵
- ⁵⁶⁶
- 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.
- ⁵⁶⁷
- ⁵⁶⁸
- 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.
- ⁵⁶⁹
- ⁵⁷⁰
- Legendre, P. and Legendre, L. (2012). *Numerical Ecology*. Number 24 in Developments in Environmental Modelling. Elsevier, Amsterdam, third english edition edition.
- ⁵⁷¹
- ⁵⁷²
- Lenormand, T. (2002). Gene flow and the limits to natural selection. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 17(4):183–189.
- ⁵⁷³
- ⁵⁷⁴
- Liaw, A. and Wiener, M. (2002). Classification and Regression by randomForest. *R News*, 2(3):18–22.
- ⁵⁷⁵
- ⁵⁷⁶
- Losos, J. B. (1985). An Experimental Demonstration of the Species-Recognition Role of *Anolis* Dewlap Color. *Copeia*, 1985(4):905–910.
- ⁵⁷⁷
- ⁵⁷⁸
- Losos, J. B. (2009). *Lizards in an Evolutionary Tree: Ecology and Adaptive Radiation of Anoles*. University of California Press.
- ⁵⁷⁹
- ⁵⁸⁰

- Losos, J. B. (2011). Convergence, Adaptation, and Constraint. *Evolution*, 65(7):1827–1840. 581
- Losos, J. B., Irschick, D. J., and Schoener, T. W. (1994). Adaptation and Constraint in the Evolution of Specialization of Bahamian *Anolis* Lizards. *Evolution*, 48(6):1786–1798. 582
583
- Losos, J. B., Schoener, T. W., Warheit, K. I., and Creer, D. (2001). Experimental studies of adaptive differentiation in Bahamian *Anolis* lizards. *Genetica*, 112-113:399–415. 584
585
- Losos, J. B., Warheit, K. I., and Schoener, T. W. (1997). Adaptive differentiation following experimental island colonization in *Anolis* lizards. *Nature*, 387(6628):70–73. 586
587
- Macedonia, J. M. (2001). Habitat light, colour variation, and ultraviolet reflectance in the Grand Cayman anole, *Anolis conspersus*. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 73(3):299–320. 588
589
- Macedonia, J. M., Clark, D. L., Riley, R. G., and Kemp, D. J. (2013). Species recognition of color and motion signals in *Anolis grahami*: Evidence from responses to lizard robots. *Behavioral Ecology*, 24(4):846–852. 590
591
592
- Macedonia, J. M., Clark, D. L., and Tamasi, A. L. (2014). Does Selection Favor Dewlap Colors that Maximize Detectability? A Test with Five Species of Jamaican *Anolis* Lizards. *Herpetologica*, 70(2):157–170. 593
594
- 595 Macedonia, J. M. and Stamps, J. A. (1994). Species Recognition in *Anolis grahami* (Sauria, Iguanidae): Evidence from Responses to Video Playbacks of Conspecific and Heterospecific Displays. *Ethology*, 98(3-4):246–264.
- 596 Maia, R., Eliason, C. M., Bitton, P.-P., Doucet, S. M., and Shawkey, M. D. (2013). Pavo: An R package for the analysis, visualization and organization of spectral data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, pages n/a–n/a. 597
- 602 Ng, J., Geneva, A. J., Noll, S., and Glor, R. E. (2017). Signals and Speciation: *Anolis* Dewlap Color as a Reproductive Barrier. *Journal of Herpetology*, 51(3):437–447. 598
- 604 Ng, J. and Glor, R. E. (2011). Genetic differentiation among populations of a Hispaniolan trunk anole that exhibit geographical variation in dewlap colour. *Molecular Ecology*, 20(20):4302–4317. 599
- 606 Ng, J., Kelly, A. L., MacGuigan, D. J., and Glor, R. E. (2013). The Role of Heritable and Dietary Factors in the Sexual Signal of a Hispaniolan *Anolis* Lizard, *Anolis distichus*. *Journal of Heredity*, 104(6):862–873. 600
- 609 Ng, J., Landeen, E. L., Logsdon, R. M., and Glor, R. E. (2012). Correlation Between *Anolis* Lizard Dewlap Phenotype and Environmental Variation Indicates Adaptive Divergence of a Signal Important to Sexual Selection and Species Recognition. *Evolution*, 67(2):573–582. 610
611
- 612 Ng, J., Ossip-Klein, A. G., and Glor, R. E. (2016). Adaptive signal coloration maintained in the face of gene flow in a Hispaniolan *Anolis* Lizard. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, 16(1):193. 613
- 614 Nicholson, K. E., Harmon, L. J., and Losos, J. B. (2007). Evolution of *Anolis* Lizard Dewlap Diversity. *PLoS ONE*, 2(3):e274. 615
- 616 Nosil, P. and Crespi, B. J. (2004). Does Gene Flow Constrain Adaptive Divergence or Vice Versa? A Test Using Ecomorphology and Sexual Isolation in *Timema cristinae* Walking-Sticks. *Evolution*, 58(1):102–112. 617
618
- 619 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. 620
621
- 622 Pinheiro, J. and Bates, D. (2000). *Mixed-Effects Models in S and S-PLUS*. Statistics and Computing. Springer-Verlag, New York. 623
- 624 Pinheiro, J., Bates, D., DebRoy, S., Sarkar, D., and Team, R. C. (2020). Nlme: Linear and Nonlinear Mixed Effects Models. 625

- 626 Pohlert, T. (2020). PMCMRplus: Calculate Pairwise Multiple Comparisons of Mean Rank Sums
627 Extended. R package version 1.4.4.
- 628 R Core Team (2019). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation
629 for Statistical Computing.
- 630 Rand, A. S. and Williams, E. E. (1970). An Estimation of Redundancy and Information Content
631 of Anole Dewlaps. *The American Naturalist*, 104(935):99–103.
- 632 Reynolds, R. G., Kolbe, J. J., Glor, R. E., López-Darias, M., Gómez Pourroy, C. V., Harrison,
633 A. S., Queiroz, K., Revell, L. J., and Losos, J. B. (2020). Phylogeographic and phenotypic
634 outcomes of brown anole colonization across the Caribbean provide insight into the beginning
635 stages of an adaptive radiation. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 33(4):468–494.
- 636 Richardson, J. L. and Urban, M. C. (2013). Strong Selection Barriers Explain Microgeographic
637 Adaptation in Wild Salamander Populations. *Evolution*, 67(6):1729–1740.
- 638 Richardson, J. L., Urban, M. C., Bolnick, D. I., and Skelly, D. K. (2014). Microgeographic adap-
639 tation and the spatial scale of evolution. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 29(3):165–176.
- 640 Schoener, T. W. (1968). The *Anolis*Lizards of Bimini: Resource Partitioning in a Complex Fauna.
641 *Ecology*, 49(4):704–726.
- 642 Seehausen, O. (1997). Cichlid Fish Diversity Threatened by Eutrophication That Curbs Sexual
643 Selection. *Science*, 277(5333):1808–1811.
- 644 Sigmund, W. R. (1983). Female Preference for *Anolis carolinensis* Males as a Function of Dewlap
645 Color and Background Coloration. *Journal of Herpetology*, 17(2):137–143.
- 646 Stapley, J., Wordley, C., and Slate, J. (2011). No Evidence of Genetic Differentiation Between
647 Anoles With Different Dewlap Color Patterns. *Journal of Heredity*, 102(1):118–124.
- 648 Steffen, J. E. and Guyer, C. C. (2014). Display behaviour and dewlap colour as predictors of
649 contest success in brown anoles: Dewlap Colour and Behaviour in Contests. *Biological Journal
650 of the Linnean Society*, 111(3):646–655.
- 651 Steffen, J. E., Hill, G. E., and Guyer, C. (2010). Carotenoid Access, Nutritional Stress, and the
652 Dewlap Color of Male Brown Anoles. *Copeia*, 2010(2):239–246.
- 653 Thorpe, R. S. (2002). Analysis of Color Spectra in Comparative Evolutionary Studies: Molecular
654 Phylogeny and Habitat Adaptation in the St. Vincent Anole (*Anolis trinitatis*). *Systematic
655 Biology*, 51(4):554–569.
- 656 Thorpe, R. S. and Stenson, A. G. (2002). Phylogeny, Paraphyly and Ecological Adaptation of
657 the Colour and Pattern in the Anolis Roquet Complex on Martinique: Interaction Between
658 Phylogeny and Adaptation. *Molecular Ecology*, 12(1):117–132.
- 659 Tokarz, R. R. (2002). An Experimental Test of the Importance of the Dewlap in Male Mating
660 Success in the Lizard *Anolis sagrei*. *Herpetologica*, 58(1):87–94.
- 661 Tokarz, R. R. (2006). Importance of Prior Physical Contact with Familiar Females in the Devel-
662 opment of a Male Courtship and Mating Preference for Unfamiliar Females in the Lizard *Anolis
663 Sagrei*. *Herpetologica*, 62(2):115–124.
- 664 Tokarz, R. R., Paterson, A. V., and McMann, S. (2005). Importance of Dewlap Display in
665 Male Mating Success in Free-Ranging Brown Anoles (*Anolis sagrei*). *Journal of Herpetology*,
666 39(1):174–177.
- 667 van de Schoot, M. (2016). *Within and between Island Radiation and Genetic Variation in Anolis
668 Sagrei*. PhD thesis, Wageningen University, Wageningen, The Netherlands.
- 669 Vanhooydonck, B., Herrel, A., Meyers, J. J., and Irschick, D. J. (2009). What determines dewlap
670 diversity in *Anolis* lizards? An among-island comparison. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*,
671 22(2):293–305.

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

680 Appendix

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

683 On Abaco, dewlaps from the mangrove habitat were the best discriminated, while dewlaps from
684 the beach scrub habitat were often mistaken for dewlaps from the coppice habitat (Fig. 2D). Im-
685 portance analysis revealed that beach scrub and mangrove lizards mostly differed in reflectance in
686 the ultraviolet (UV) end of the spectrum (below 400nm, Fig. S2F), where mangrove dewlaps had
687 higher UV reflectance relative to beach scrub lizards, and coppice lizards had an intermediate UV
688 reflectance between the two other habitats (Fig. 2B). Consistent with this, our analyses of variance
689 detected significantly lower PC2 scores in mangrove lizards than in the two other habitats (Fig.
690 2E, Table 3), representing a higher UV-reflectance relative to red (Fig. 2C). Beach scrub lizards
691 also scored lower on PC3 (Fig. 2E, Table 3), indicating less curvature of the reflectance profile
692 and relatively higher reflectance at intermediate wavelengths (blue-to-yellow) than at the ends of
693 the range (Fig. 2C). Differences were detected between sites both at large ($\sim 100\text{km}$) and short
694 ($< 1\text{km}$) distances (Fig. S2G). Abaco was the only island where we detected significant spatial
695 autocorrelation (Table 2), that is, sites that were closer geographically tended to have populations
696 of lizards with more similar dewlap colors.

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

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

722 On Eleuthera, although random forests detected between-habitat differences in dewlap color,
723 other approaches did not (Tables S8 and S7), suggesting that the differences may be small. Consis-
724 tent with this, the only significant univariate difference detected was for PC2 between beach scrub
725 and mangrove lizards, where beach scrub lizards had higher levels of red reflectance and mangrove
726 lizards higher levels of UV reflectance (Fig. S5C, E, Table 3).

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

737

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

738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767

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

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

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

Supplementary Figures

768




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 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	**