

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

1
2

3

Abstract

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

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

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

26 Introduction

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

39 One potential barrier to the maintenance of localized signal divergence is the homogenizing effect
40 of gene flow. Population genetics theory suggests that gene flow may counteract local adaptation
41 between localities and prevent divergence altogether, especially at small spatial scales, because
42 of the inflow of maladapted alleles or because of the breaking of linkage between coevolving loci
43 (Felsenstein, 1976; García-Ramos and Kirkpatrick, 1997; Dieckmann and Doebeli, 1999; Lenor-
44 mand, 2002; Hendry et al., 2007a). This genetic homogenization has been confirmed empirically
45 in systems such as stick insects (Nosil and Crespi, 2004) and stickleback (Hendry et al., 2007b).
46 Yet, examples of microgeographic adaptation, i.e. adaptation at smaller scales than the range of
47 dispersal, exist, highlighting the potential of some organisms to respond to selection in the face of
48 gene flow (see Richardson et al. 2014 and references therein). Examples include small scale adapta-
49 tion in fragmented areas in Australian fruit flies (Willi and Hoffmann, 2012), and local adaptation
50 to predation pressure in North American salamanders (Richardson and Urban, 2013). Therefore,
51 despite evidence that local adaptation may be particularly difficult at small spatial scales where
52 gene flow tends to cause adjoining populations to remain genetically homogeneous, the potential
53 adaptive response of species traits, in particular communication signals, to localized differences in
54 habitats remains relatively unknown (Richardson et al., 2014). Lizards of the neotropical genus
55 *Anolis* (Squamata: Dactyloidae) are an excellent group for studying the eco-evolutionary dynam-
56 ics of local adaptation and natural selection (Losos, 2009). A particularly conspicuous trait of
57 anoles is their dewlap, an extensible flap of skin that is typically sexually dimorphic and used as
58 a communication signal in courtship (Sigmund, 1983; Driessens et al., 2014, 2015) and territorial
59 displays (Losos, 1985; Macedonia and Stamps, 1994; Macedonia et al., 2013) as well as in predator
60 deterrence (Leal and Rodríguez-Robles, 1995, 1997; Leal and Rodriguez-Robles, 1997). Dewlap
61 characteristics vary widely among the approximately 400 species of the genus (Nicholson et al.,
62 2007). Interspecific variation in dewlap coloration is implicated in species recognition (Rand and
63 Williams, 1970; Williams, 1969; Williams and Rand, 1977; Losos, 1985; Macedonia and Stamps,
64 1994; Fleishman, 2000; Macedonia et al., 2013), and this function could have had a role in initiating
65 or reinforcing reproductive isolation during speciation (Lambert et al., 2013; Geneva et al., 2015;
66 Ng et al., 2017).

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

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

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

Anolis sagrei is widespread across islands of the West Indies (Reynolds et al., 2020). It has been the subject of numerous studies concerning local adaptation (Losos et al., 1994, 1997, 2001; Kolbe et al., 2012), biological invasion (Kolbe et al., 2008), and sexual selection (Tokarz, 2002; Tokarz et al., 2005; Tokarz, 2006; Driessens et al., 2014; Steffen and Guyer, 2014; Driessens et al., 2015) among many other topics. Between-island variation in the mainly orange-red color of its dewlap was shown to be better explained by climatic variables such as annual precipitation and solar radiation (proposed to affect the average vegetation type on each island and among other things, its ambient light environment, Driessens et al. 2017), than by proxies for biotic factors such as sexual selection or predation pressure (Vanhooydonck et al., 2009; Baeckens et al., 2018). How intra-island differences in habitat may contribute to the diversity of dewlap coloration, however, remains unexplored, and may reveal new insights into the scale of local differentiation despite gene flow.

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

Our sampling design included sites in close proximity; the median distance between two sites within an island was 11.2km. While this species has traditionally been considered territorial, a recent study revealed that they are polygynandrous and that gene flow is not impeded by territorial-like behaviors exhibited by some males (Kamath and Losos 2018). Combining reflectance spectrometry and supervised machine learning, we tested for divergence in dewlap phenotype between habitats within islands and between islands across part of the range of *A. sagrei*. We predicted that if light conditions in the environment indeed drive color evolution, dewlaps should be most similar between beach scrub and mangrove forest, which both have high levels of light irradiance, compared to the darker, closed-canopy coppice forest. If detectability is maximized given the local conditions, we expected darker and more contrasting dewlaps in high irradiance habitats. Finally, if habitat characteristics are strong determinants of dewlap color variation, similar patterns should be observed across multiple islands (Harvey and Pagel, 1991; Losos, 2011).

124 **Methods**

125 **Data collection**

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

142 **Reflectance measurements**

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

153 **Analysis**

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

172

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

Dimensionality reduction

174

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

Among-island variance partitioning

183

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

Within-island machine learning

191

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Univariate analyses

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

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

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

Spatial autocorrelation

281

We tested for within-island spatial autocorrelation between the geographical distances among sampling sites and their Euclidean distances in multivariate color space (mean PC1 to PC4 per site, Table S5), regardless of habitat type. For this, we performed Mantel's test (Legendre and Legendre 2012, R package vegan; Oksanen et al. 2019) on each island, using 999 permutations and geographical distances computed as geodesic distances from latitude and longitude data (R package geosphere, Hijmans 2019).

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

Site differences

289

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

290

291

292

293

294

295

296 **Results**

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

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

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

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

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

345

Discussion

350

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.

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

402

403

404

405

406

Detectable differences in dewlap color between populations are surprising, as habitats were often in close geographical proximity to each other (as close as a few hundred meters on Bimini and most of the time within ten kilometers), and we would have expected gene flow to cause a more homogeneous distribution of color phenotypes within islands. While little is known about the

cruising range of individuals from our study populations (but see Steinberg and Leal 2017; Kamath and Losos 2018b for other systems), *A. sagrei* are polygynandrous (both males and females mate with multiple mates, Kamath and Losos 2017, 2018a,b), thus offering opportunity for gene flow, especially given that lizards were distributed continuously and at high densities within the islands we sampled. Consistent with that, while populations from different islands were monophyletic, individuals within islands were not monophyletic with respect to habitat based on mitochondrial haplotypes (van de Schoot 2016 unpublished thesis).

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

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

It is presently not known if the reported differences in coloration have a genetic basis. Yet, we find it unlikely that these differences arose through phenotypic plasticity, as although the carotenoids that partly make up the red and orange colors of anole dewlaps must be found in the diet (Goodwin, 1984; Hill et al., 2002; Hill and McGraw, 2006), studies testing the effect of carotenoid deprivation (Steffen et al., 2010; Ng et al., 2013) and heritability (Cox et al., 2017) of dewlap coloration in *A. sagrei* and *A. distichus* (another species with a carotenoid-based dewlap), found little support for phenotypic and developmental plasticity in dewlap coloration. One exception is a study demonstrating that lizards heavily parasitized by skin mites had duller dewlaps

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

408

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

425

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

442

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

455

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

References

- Anderson, M. J. (2001). A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance. *Austral Ecology*, 26(1):32–46. 463
464
465
- Andersson, M. B. (1994). *Sexual Selection*. Monographs in Behavior and Ecology. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. 466
467
- Arnold, S. J. (1983). Morphology, Performance and Fitness. *American Zoologist*, 23(2):347–361. 468
- 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. 469
470
471
- Bartoń, K. (2019). MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference. 472
- 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. 473
474
475
- Bradbury, J. W. and Vehrencamp, S. L. (2011). *Principles of Animal Communication*. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Mass, 2nd ed edition. 476
477
- Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45(1):5–32. 478
- 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. 479
480
- Cortez, P. (2020). Rminer: Data Mining Classification and Regression Methods. 481
- 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. 482
483
484
- Cristianini, N. and Shawe-Taylor, J. (2000). *An Introduction to Support Vector Machines and Other Kernel-based Learning Methods*. Cambridge University Press, first edition. 485
486
- 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. 487
488
489
- Dieckmann, U. and Doebeli, M. (1999). On the origin of species by sympatric speciation. *Nature*, 400(6742):354–357. 490
491
- 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. 492
493
494
- 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. 495
496
497
- 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. 498
499
500
- Endler, J. (1998). Sensory ecology, receiver biases and sexual selection. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 13(10):415–420. 501
502
- 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. 503
504
505
- 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. 506
507

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

Hill, G. E. and McGraw, K. J., editors (2006). <i>Bird Coloration</i> . Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.	554 555
Hollander, M., Wolfe, D. A., and Chicken, E. (2013). <i>Nonparametric Statistical Methods</i> . Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc, Hoboken, New Jersey, third edition edition.	556 557 558
Howard, R. A. (1950). Vegetation of the Bimini Island Group: Bahamas, B. W. I. <i>Ecological Monographs</i> , 20(4):317–349.	559 560
James, G., Witten, D., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (2013). <i>An Introduction to Statistical Learning</i> , volume 103 of <i>Springer Texts in Statistics</i> . Springer New York, New York, NY.	561 562 563
Kamath, A. and Losos, J. (2017). The erratic and contingent progression of research on territoriality: A case study. <i>Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology</i> , 71(6):89.	564 565
Kamath, A. and Losos, J. (2018a). Reconsidering territoriality is necessary for understanding <i>Anolis</i> mating systems. <i>Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology</i> , 72(7):106.	566 567
Kamath, A. and Losos, J. B. (2018b). Estimating encounter rates as the first step of sexual selection in the lizard <i>Anolis sagrei</i> . <i>Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences</i> , 285(1873):20172244.	568 569 570
Kimura, M. and Weiss, G. H. (1964). The Stepping Stone Model of Population Structure and the Decrease of Genetic Correlation with Distance. <i>Genetics</i> , 49(4):561–576.	571 572
Kolbe, J. J., Larson, A., Losos, J. B., and de Queiroz, K. (2008). Admixture determines genetic diversity and population differentiation in the biological invasion of a lizard species. <i>Biology Letters</i> , 4(4):434–437.	573 574 575
Kolbe, J. J., Leal, M., Schoener, T. W., Spiller, D. A., and Losos, J. B. (2012). Founder Effects Persist Despite Adaptive Differentiation: A Field Experiment with Lizards. <i>Science</i> , 335(6072):1086–1089.	576 577 578
Korkmaz, S., Goksuluk, D., and Zararsiz, G. (2014). MVN: An R Package for Assessing Multivariate Normality. <i>The R Journal</i> , 6(2):151–162.	579 580
Lailvaux, S. P. and Irschick, D. J. (2006). No Evidence for Female Association with High-Performance males in the Green Anole Lizard, <i>Anolis carolinensis</i> . <i>Ethology</i> , 112(7):707–715.	581 582
Lailvaux, S. P. and Irschick, D. J. (2007). The Evolution of Performance-Based Male Fighting Ability in Caribbean Anolis Lizards. <i>The American Naturalist</i> , 170(4):573–586.	583 584
Lailvaux, S. P., Leifer, J., Kircher, B. K., and Johnson, M. A. (2015). The incredible shrinking dewlap: Signal size, skin elasticity, and mechanical design in the green anole lizard (<i>Anolis carolinensis</i>). <i>Ecology and Evolution</i> , 5(19):4400–4409.	585 586 587
Lambert, S. M., Geneva, A. J., Luke Mahler, D., and Glor, R. E. (2013). Using genomic data to revisit an early example of reproductive character displacement in Haitian <i>Anolis</i> lizards. <i>Molecular Ecology</i> , 22(15):3981–3995.	588 589 590
Lazareva, O. F., Shimizu, T., and Wasserman, E. A. (2012). <i>How Animals See the World</i> <i>Comparative Behavior, Biology, and Evolution of Vision</i> . Oxford University Press.	591 592
Leal, M. and Fleishman, L. J. (2002). Evidence for habitat partitioning based on adaptation to environmental light in a pair of sympatric lizard species. <i>Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences</i> , 269(1489):351–359.	593 594 595
Leal, M. and Fleishman, L. J. (2004). Differences in Visual Signal Design and Detectability between Allopatric Populations of <i>Anolis</i> Lizards. <i>The American Naturalist</i> , 163(1):26–39.	596 597
Leal, M. and Rodríguez-Robles, J. A. (1995). Antipredator Responses of <i>Anolis cristatellus</i> (Sauria: Polychrotidae). <i>Copeia</i> , 1995(1):155–161.	598 599

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

Ng, J., Ossip-Klein, A. G., and Glor, R. E. (2016). Adaptive signal coloration maintained in the face of gene flow in a Hispaniolan <i>Anolis</i> Lizard. <i>BMC Evolutionary Biology</i> , 16(1):193.	645 646
Nicholson, K. E., Harmon, L. J., and Losos, J. B. (2007). Evolution of <i>Anolis</i> Lizard Dewlap Diversity. <i>PLoS ONE</i> , 2(3):e274.	647 648
Nosil, P. and Crespi, B. J. (2004). Does Gene Flow Constrain Adaptive Divergence or Vice Versa? A Test Using Ecomorphology and Sexual Isolation in <i>Timema cristinae</i> Walking-Sticks. <i>Evolution</i> , 58(1):102–112.	649 650 651
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.	652 653 654
Pinheiro, J. and Bates, D. (2000). <i>Mixed-Effects Models in S and S-PLUS</i> . Statistics and Computing. Springer-Verlag, New York.	655 656
Pinheiro, J., Bates, D., DebRoy, S., Sarkar, D., and Team, R. C. (2020). Nlme: Linear and Nonlinear Mixed Effects Models.	657 658
Pohlert, T. (2020). PMCMRplus: Calculate Pairwise Multiple Comparisons of Mean Rank Sums Extended. R package version 1.4.4.	659 660
R Core Team (2019). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.	661 662
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.	663 664
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.	665 666 667 668
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.	669 670
Richardson, J. L., Urban, M. C., Bolnick, D. I., and Skelly, D. K. (2014). Microgeographic adaptation and the spatial scale of evolution. <i>Trends in Ecology & Evolution</i> , 29(3):165–176.	671 672
Schoener, T. W. (1968). The <i>Anolis</i> Lizards of Bimini: Resource Partitioning in a Complex Fauna. <i>Ecology</i> , 49(4):704–726.	673 674
Seehausen, O. (1997). Cichlid Fish Diversity Threatened by Eutrophication That Curbs Sexual Selection. <i>Science</i> , 277(5333):1808–1811.	675 676
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.	677 678
Slatkin, M. (1987). Gene Flow and the Geographic Structure of Natural Populations. <i>Science</i> , 236(4803):787–792.	679 680
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.	681 682
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.	683 684 685
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.	686 687
Steinberg, D. S. and Leal, M. (2017). An Unexpected Case of Homing in a Territorial Lizard. <i>Integrative and Comparative Biology</i> , 57:E418.	688 689

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

Figures

720




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

⁷²¹ **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 ***

722 Appendix

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

810 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. ***, $P < 0.001$.

⁸¹¹ Supplementary Tables

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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