

The American Naturalist
Ecological genetic conflict between specialism and plasticity through genomic islands of divergence
--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	58395
Full Title:	Ecological genetic conflict between specialism and plasticity through genomic islands of divergence
Short Title:	Ecological genetic conflict
Article Type:	Major Article
Abstract:	<p>There can be genetic conflict between genome elements differing in transmission patterns, and thus in evolutionary interests. We show here that the concept of genetic conflict provides new insight into local adaptation and phenotypic plasticity. Local adaptation to heterogeneous habitats sometimes occurs as tightly linked clusters of genes with among-habitat polymorphism, referred to as genomic islands of divergence, and our work sheds light on their evolution. Phenotypic plasticity can also influence the divergence between ecotypes, through developmental responses to habitat-specific cues. We show that clustered genes coding for ecological specialism and unlinked generalist genes coding for phenotypic plasticity differ in their evolutionary interest. This is an ecological genetic conflict, operating between habitat specialism and phenotypically plastic generalism. The phenomenon occurs both for single traits and for syndromes of co-adapted traits. Using individual-based simulations and numerical analysis, we investigate how among-habitat genetic polymorphism and phenotypic plasticity depend on genetic architecture. We show that for plasticity genes that are unlinked to a genomic island of divergence, the slope of a reaction norm will be steeper in comparison with the slope favored by plasticity genes that are tightly linked to genes for local adaptation.</p>

Ecological genetic conflict between specialism and plasticity through genomic islands of divergence

Olof Leimar^{1,*}, Sasha R. X. Dall², John M. McNamara³, Bram Kuijper⁴, and Peter Hammerstein⁵

¹Department of Zoology, Stockholm University, SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden

²Centre for Ecology and Conservation, University of Exeter, Penryn TR10 9EZ, UK

³School of Mathematics, University of Bristol, University Walk, Bristol BS8 1TW, UK

⁴ Environment and Sustainability Institute, University of Exeter, Penryn Campus,
Penryn TR10 9EZ, UK

⁵Institute for Theoretical Biology, Humboldt University Berlin, D-10115 Berlin, Germany

*Corresponding author: e-mail: olof.leimar@zoologi.su.se

Short running title: Ecological genetic conflict

Author contributions: OL designed the study, wrote and ran the computer programs, and wrote the text. SRXD, JMM, BK, and PH provided input to the design and contributed to the writing of the text.

Acknowledgments: This work was supported by grants from the Carl Trygger Foundation (CTS 15292) to OL and by a Leverhulme Trust International Network Grant to SRXD, PH, OL, and JMM.

The manuscript contains no empirical data to be archived. On acceptance computer code will be placed as an online Electronic Enhancement.

191 words in abstract, 4751 words in main text, 49 references, 7 figures

The authors wish to be identified to the reviewers.

Abstract

There can be genetic conflict between genome elements differing in transmission patterns, and thus in evolutionary interests. We show here that the concept of genetic conflict provides new insight into local adaptation and phenotypic plasticity. Local adaptation to heterogeneous habitats sometimes occurs as tightly linked clusters of genes with among-habitat polymorphism, referred to as genomic islands of divergence, and our work sheds light on their evolution. Phenotypic plasticity can also influence the divergence between ecotypes, through developmental responses to habitat-specific cues. We show that clustered genes coding for ecological specialism and unlinked generalist genes coding for phenotypic plasticity differ in their evolutionary interest. This is an ecological genetic conflict, operating between habitat specialism and phenotypically plastic generalism. The phenomenon occurs both for single traits and for syndromes of co-adapted traits. Using individual-based simulations and numerical analysis, we investigate how among-habitat genetic polymorphism and phenotypic plasticity depend on genetic architecture. We show that for plasticity genes that are unlinked to a genomic island of divergence, the slope of a reaction norm will be steeper in comparison with the slope favored by plasticity genes that are tightly linked to genes for local adaptation.

Keywords: Local adaptation, phenotypic plasticity, ecotypes, supergenes, genetic architecture, linkage

Claims :

- Concept of evolutionary interest provides new insight into local adaptation a. phenotypic plasticity
 - ↳ What is really new?
 - ↳ Is pop. gen. literature properly acknowledged?
- Sheds light on the evolution of genomic islands of divergence
- Difference in evol. interest between specialist a. generalist genes : ecological genetic conflict
 - ↳ To what extent new?
- Effect of genetic architecture: slope of reaction norm steeper for plasticity genes unlinked to genes for local adaptation

evolutionary
 interest:
 to be defined
 environmental
 cue
 ↓
 development.
 response
 II>
 ph. plasticity

Def: genetic conflict: difference in evolutionary interest
between genomic elements
e.g. genetic transmission (nDNA, mtDNA; segregation
distorters; ecologically based g.c.)

1 Introduction

Genetic conflict occurs when different genomic elements, or different haplotypes at a locus, differ in their evolutionary interests. This possibility has been given much attention (Hurst et al. 1996; Werren and Beukeboom 1998; Burt and Trivers 2006; Gardner and Úbeda 2017), resulting in the insight that genetic conflict can be important for evolutionary change and innovation, as well as influence phenomena like sex determination (Werren 2011). Most work has focused on genetic conflict with a basis in the properties of genetic transmission systems. Thus, different pathways of transmission, as for nuclear and mitochondrial genes (e.g., Frank and Hurst 1996; Perlman et al. 2015), or the biasing of transmission along a pathway, as for segregation distorters (Hurst et al. 1996), have been put forward as sources of genetic conflict. Ecologically based genetic conflict is, however, a possibility that is less well-established in evolutionary biology. In heterogeneous environments, genes can differ in their pathways of transmission to future generations, involving the kinds of environments they pass through. Genetic conflict can then appear by favoring or suppressing these pathways, and thus have a basis in the ecology of populations (Leimar et al. 2006; Dall et al. 2015; Leimar et al. 2016).

The long-term reproductive success of a gene, in the sense of its representation in future generations, defines its evolutionary interest. For heterogeneous habitats, the question arises in which kind of habitat we should count future representation. For genes that code for a specialist phenotype it is the long-term representation in the habitat for which the phenotype is specialized that defines evolutionary interest, but for genes for generalism it is instead the representation over a range of habitats that matters. This general idea, with a focus on two habitats and a phenotypically plastic generalist, is illustrated in fig. 1. Although genes for specialism may, as a result of dispersal, end up in different habitats, they are selected against in habitats to which they are not adapted, and have little evolutionary future there. This is an example of a source-sink process (Holt and Gaines 1992; Kawecki 1995), entailing that a specialist already adapted to one habitat need not evolve to be adapted to another, even if there is a certain amount of migration between habitats. Concerning plasticity, we assume that it is a developmental response to a noisy environmental cue.

The difference in evolutionary interests illustrated in fig. 1A,B corresponds to the general idea of genetic conflict (Gardner and Úbeda 2017), and it is thus appropriate to refer to it as an ecological genetic conflict. In analyzing genetic conflict, it is essential to take into account which traits are influenced by genes that differ in

when
{ ahead
be.
adapt.
literature?

| Def. /
evol.
interest


↓
how
related
to fitness?

Def.
plasticity

Def.
ecological
genet. conf.

Def: evolutionary interest := long-term reproductive success of a gene
↳ how is e.i. related to the concept of fitness?

reaction norm:



→ · intercept: local adapt.
· slope: plasticity

their evolutionary interest. Since we study genetic local adaptation and plasticity, we focus on intercepts and slopes of reaction norms (fig. 1C). For instance, pure local adaptation in heterogeneous habitats could be implemented as a genetically polymorphic locus influencing the intercepts in fig. 1C, with slopes being flat. A pure phenotypically plastic generalist, on the other hand, would be implemented as genetically monomorphic intercept and slope. Often, the evolutionary outcome is intermediate between these. Our aim is to explain the role ecological genetic conflict plays in influencing the outcome.

Genetic architecture is an important aspect of our analysis, in particular how genes influencing the intercept and slope of a reaction norm (fig. 1C) are positioned in the genome. To see why linkage matters, note that if two genes are fully linked, their evolutionary interests must coincide, because their representation in a future gene pool will be the same. As a consequence, only genes with less than full linkage, e.g. unlinked genes, can differ in their evolutionary interest. The latter includes genes in the same position, but on different physical stretches of DNA, such as different genes at a locus. Two genes at the same locus but locally adapted to different habitats can differ in their evolutionary interest, together with genes tightly linked to each of them.

It is a characteristic feature of genetic conflict that the degree of linkage between genes influences the evolutionary outcome. There is a tendency for a segment of DNA to share the evolutionary interest of selfish elements (Hurst et al. 1996; Burt and Trivers 2006), which can result in the formation of 'selfish' co-adapted gene complexes or supergenes (for definitions of these terms, see Schwander et al. 2014). As we show here, a similar principle applies to ecological genetic conflicts, where a genomic island of divergence (Nosil et al. 2009) can correspond to the shared interest of a number of genes for local adaptation to specific habitats, in this way favoring transmission through certain habitats but not others. The region might contain several genes of smaller effect that add up to a bigger effect for a particular trait (Yeaman and Whitlock 2011; Yeaman 2013). More generally, it can contain genes that epistatically modify the effect of other genes in the region, as well as genes that influence different traits that contribute to local adaptation (Feder et al. 2012; Marques et al. 2016; Larson et al. 2017), making up a co-adapted gene complex. Although the phenomenon of genomic islands of divergence has attracted much interest in recent years (Nosil et al. 2009; Jones et al. 2012; Via 2012; Flaxman et al. 2014; Lucek et al. 2014; Poelstra et al. 2014; Seehausen et al. 2014; Soria-Carrasco et al. 2014; Malinsky et al. 2015; Riesch et al. 2017), the idea of differences in evolutionary interest between genes in an island of divergence and unlinked genes

X
Based on
this, I
conclude
that

evol. interest ≠ fitness

{ Call
these
alleles?

① linkage

not true

#

{

See e.g. Yeaman et al. (2016) or Aeschbacher et al. (2017) | ≠ But could it be many fitness?

- Interest:**
- difference in evol. interest between genes in a genomic island **BUT:** genomic islands evolve due to shared interest
 - linkage plasticity → reaction-norm slope gene(s)
- 5

74 has not been explored, neither has the idea that plasticity genes can favor different
75 reaction norm slopes depending on their linkage to an island of divergence.

76 Another characteristic feature of genetic conflict is that natural selection will not
77 in general lead to a unique outcome for traits that are influenced by genes in conflict.
78 Instead, there might be an 'arms race' (Hurst et al. 1996; Werren 2011), where the
79 outcome is influenced by such things as supply of mutations, position in the genome,
80 and limits to gene expression. Our main way of dealing with this is to examine
81 situations where there is selectively maintained genetic polymorphism at one or
82 more loci, but where we do not focus on the possible evolution of the corresponding
83 genes. Instead, we examine the evolution of genes that modify the phenotypic effects
84 of the polymorphism, for instance modify intercepts and slopes of a reaction norm
85 (fig. 1C). By examining situations where modifiers of intercepts and plasticity genes
86 influencing slopes have tight versus loose linkage to a polymorphic locus, we can
87 examine the effect of genetic architecture. The genetic conflict we investigate is
88 thus between loci that are tightly versus loosely linked to a genetic polymorphism.
89 As we will show, this can be interpreted in terms of a conflict between habitat
90 specialism, corresponding to tight linkage, and phenotypically plastic generalism,
91 corresponding to loose linkage.

92 We examine between-habitat genetic polymorphism for one trait, as well as for
93 two different traits, for which the optimum differs between habitats, and we determine
94 how the relative contributions of between-habitat genetic polymorphism and
95 phenotypic plasticity depend on genetic architecture. As mentioned, the kind of genetic
96 architecture we are concerned with is the degree of linkage between genetically
97 polymorphic loci, epistatic modifiers of the effects at these loci, and plasticity genes
98 influencing a reaction norm slope. We emphasize the distinction between the case
99 where all loci are tightly linked together in a supergene and that where modifier
100 and plasticity loci are unlinked to genetically polymorphic loci. However, we also
101 investigate intermediate cases, for instance a polymorphic locus with a tightly linked
102 modifier and an unlinked plasticity locus determining the slope of a reaction norm.
103 In such a case, intercept and slope of a reaction norm (fig. 1C) are determined by
104 genes with diverging evolutionary interests.

105 Among our reasons for examining the combination of genetic differentiation and
106 phenotypic plasticity are, first, that traits of ecotypes in nature often are the combined
107 result of genetic and environmental effects and, second, that comparison of
108 the relative weights in phenotype determination on different inputs, such as genetic
109 polymorphism and environmental cues, gives a striking picture of the influence of
110 genetic architecture on the evolutionary outcome. To make contact with previous

genetic conflict studied here:

light vs. loose linkage to polym. = conflict between habitat
specialism vs. plastic generalism

(2)
no unique outcome
are poly-morphisms 'frozen'?

motivation
must be worked out more

("as we show")

To what extent is the situation studied here artificial?

work on genomic islands of divergence, we briefly examine the role of linkage between many loci of small effect in building up a larger effect of between-habitat genetic polymorphism. In addition to genetic architecture, we examine the influence of the rate of migration between habitats and the strength of selection on the characteristics of local adaptation. We also study the question of the evolution of the rate of recombination between polymorphic loci, modifiers, and plasticity loci. For the analysis, we use individual-based evolutionary simulations of diploid populations, with several local populations in each habitat, as well as numerical analysis of evolutionary equilibria for a model with a very large population in each habitat. For simplicity, we let the sex of an individual be randomly determined (Perrin 2016).

- migration
- strength of selection
- evol. of recomb.

A main finding is that for plasticity genes that are unlinked to a genomic island of divergence, the slope of a reaction norm will be steeper in comparison with the slope favored by plasticity genes that are tightly linked to genes for local adaptation. This holds in particular for intermediate rates of between-habitat migration. We discuss our results in relation to empirical work on the genomics of ecotypic variation and on the relative importance of genetic variation and plasticity for local adaptation.

Methods

We first present our two-habitat metapopulation model for a single trait u , then extend it to two traits u_1 and u_2 , followed by an explanation of our individual-based simulations. We have also performed a numerical analysis of a model with a very large population in each habitat, which is described in the supporting information, with results reported in Table A1 and fig. A1.

Single trait

The population is divided into N_p patches, each containing a local population with on average K diploid individuals with non-overlapping generations, and with survival selection operating in each patch. An individual's sex is randomly determined, and each offspring is formed by randomly selecting a mother and a father from the local population. There is a genotype-cue-phenotype mapping, determining an individual's phenotype u as a weighted sum of a 'genetic effect' z and a environmental cue x_{juv} , such that

$$u = \alpha z + \beta x_{juv}, \quad (1)$$

modifier of expression of genet. cue locus

\nearrow \nearrow
genet. effect (polym.) cue
epistasis

'plasticity genes', i.e. modifiers of slope of reaction norm

genotype -
cue -
phenotype

141 where z and the weights α and β are each determined by a diploid locus. This means
 142 that there is epistasis between the locus for the genetic effect z and the locus coding
 143 for α .

144 A patch is in either of two environmental states, corresponding to two types
 145 of habitat, which could, for instance, be low and high resource availability, risk of
 146 predation, or salinity. The two habitats are denoted by $i = 1, 2$, with juvenile-to-
 147 adult survival for phenotype u in habitat i given by

$$s_i(u) = s_0 + (1 - s_0) \exp\left(-\frac{(u - \theta_i)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right), \quad (2)$$

Geroldinger et al.

148 where s_0 is a basic survival rate, θ_i is the optimal phenotype in habitat i and σ is the
 149 width of the Gaussian survival function. An individual can get information about
 150 which habitat it is in through the juvenile cue, given by

$$x_{\text{juv}} = \theta_i + \epsilon_{\text{juv}}, \quad (3)$$

*mimicry
between
cue &
env.*

151 where θ_i is the mean cue in habitat i , for simplicity assumed to be the same as the
 152 optimal phenotype, and ϵ_{juv} is a normally distributed random error with mean 0
 153 and standard deviation σ_{juv} .


154 There is a probability m of juvenile dispersal to a patch randomly selected in
 155 the entire metapopulation, including the patch of origin. The local populations are
 156 regulated such that a patch produces K juveniles, each of which has a probability m
 157 to disperse. There are equal numbers of patches for the two habitats, which means
 158 that the probability for a dispersing individual to change habitat is $m/2$.

159 The life cycle of individuals is as follows: (i) selection, with survival in habitat
 160 i as a function of phenotype u as in equation (2); (ii) within-patch random mating,
 161 forming K offspring in each local population, after which the adults die; (iii) each
 162 juvenile (independently) observes an environmental cue, as given in equation (3),
 163 and has its phenotype determined based on its genotype and the environmental cue;
 164 (iv) each juvenile has a probability m of migrating to a randomly chosen patch; and
 165 the cycle then returns to (i).

166 At the locus for z there are alleles ζ_k , which we represent as real values limited
 167 to an interval. We are interested in situations where there is adaptively maintained
 168 genetic polymorphism at this locus. We think of the effects of the alleles as ‘genetic
 169 cues’, in the sense that they can provide statistical information to an individual
 170 about which habitat it is in (Leimar et al. 2006; Dall et al. 2015). In principle the
 171 alleles ζ_k can mutate, be selected, and evolve, but in order to aid the interpretation

*{ if condi-
tional,
there
should
be no
m*

*locus z
 ζ_k*



say that 'fixed' here refers to the allele value, not the allele frequency!

172 of our results, we make the simplification that there are two ‘fixed’ alleles, ζ_1 and
 173 ζ_2 , that provide the genetic cues. The locus for the weight α in equation (1) can
 174 be seen as a ‘modifier’ locus, with alleles α_k , that influence gene expression at the
 175 cue locus (note also that evolutionary changes of a modifier that is fully linked to z
 176 is equivalent to evolutionary changes of the genes at the locus for z). We represent
 177 the alleles α_k as real values in an interval. The phenotype in equation (1) is also
 178 influenced by the juvenile cue, mediated by the locus for the weight β , with alleles
 179 β_k . In terms of plasticity, β is the slope of a reaction norm, and the alleles at the
 180 locus can be regarded as plasticity genes. We assume the loci are positioned in the
 181 order z, α, β along a chromosome, with $\rho_{z\alpha}$ the recombination rate between the cue
 182 locus and the modifier locus α , and $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ the rate between the modifier locus and the
 183 plasticity locus β .

The alleles at a locus are additive, producing diploid values as the sum of maternal and paternal allelic values. For instance, at the cue locus we have $z = \zeta_{\text{mat}} + \zeta_{\text{pat}}$. The value z is referred to as a genetic effect or ‘genetic cue’, which can be polymorphic across habitats. For the loci giving the weights in equation (1), we are interested in cases where the modifier and slope effects, $\alpha = \alpha_{\text{mat}} + \alpha_{\text{pat}}$ and $\beta = \beta_{\text{mat}} + \beta_{\text{pat}}$, are nearly monomorphic in the metapopulation, but evolving over the longer term.

190 Two traits

What does this mean?
Is this monomorphism a realistically
emerging property?

¹⁹¹ We extend the situation above to two traits, u_1 and u_2 , determined as


Describe more:
- seasonal mutations?

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 &= \alpha_1 z_1 + \beta_1 x_{\text{juv}} \\ u_2 &= \alpha_2 z_2 + \beta_2 x_{\text{juv}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

¹⁹² The genetic effects z_1 and z_2 are each determined by a locus with additive alleles,
¹⁹³ as in the case for a single trait above, and the juvenile environmental cue is given
¹⁹⁴ by equation (3). The modifiers α_1 , α_2 and slopes β_1 , β_2 are determined genetically
¹⁹⁵ by separate loci. The juvenile-to-adult survival in habitat i is given by

$$s_i(u_1, u_2) = s_0 + (1 - s_0) \exp\left(-\frac{(u_1 - \theta_{1i})^2 + (u_2 - \theta_{2i})^2}{2\sigma^2}\right). \quad (5)$$

196 The loci are positioned in the order $z_1, z_2, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_1$ along a chromosome.
 197 Concerning recombination rates, ρ_{zz} is the recombination rate between the loci for
 198 the genetic effects z_1 and z_2 , $\rho_{z\alpha}$ is the recombination rate between the locus for z_2
 199 and the locus for α_1 , and $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ is the recombination rate between neighboring loci for



8

locus d :

24

β :

β_1

recombr.
assumed
to be
additive?

i.e.

$S \not\models \beta =$

$$f_{\alpha\beta} + f_{\alpha\beta}$$

Bat, rm. } Why
no interest
in polymorphism?
Boring?

What was done in such cases?

9

200 $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1$ and β_2 .

$K = ?$ Perhaps state here.

201 **Simulation model**

✓ ↳ Is an equilibrium reached?

202 For our individual-based simulations in Figs. 2 and 5, we started with a dimorphism
203 at the locus for z , and allowed this dimorphism be maintained while α and β evolved.

204 For some parameter values, for instance when α became close to 0, the dimorphism
205 at the locus for z was not maintained. As mentioned, we used intervals for the
206 allowed range of the values of alleles.. For the simulations in Figs. 2 and 3 we
207 used $\zeta_1 = -0.4, \zeta_2 = 0.4$ and the range [0.0, 4.0] for alleles at the loci for α and
208 β . Mutational increments had a Laplace (reflected exponential) distribution with
209 a standard deviation of 0.04, but allelic values were constrained to stay within the
210 interval. The simulations were run for 100 000 generations with a mutation rate
211 of 0.0050, to generate enough genetic variation for adaptation to proceed, followed
212 by 100 000 generations with a mutation rate of 0.0001, to remove excess genetic
213 variation. The simulations in Figs. 5 and 6 were performed in a similar way. The
214 C++ source code for the computer programs used in this study is available as an
215 Electronic Enhancement.

{ Enforced
| or
'allowed'?

5/9/18

and

5/13/18



5/14/18

216 **Results**

217 The effect of genetic architecture on local adaptation and phenotypic plasticity is
218 illustrated in Figs. 2 and 3, with data from individual-based simulations. There
219 is a single trait u , with optimal survival at trait value θ_1 and θ_2 in habitat 1 and
220 2 (equation 2). The determination of the phenotype is given by $u = \alpha z + \beta x_{juv}$,
221 where z is a genetic effect, α is an epistatic modifier of z , x_{juv} is an environmental
222 cue (equation 3), and β is a plasticity effect, giving the slope of a reaction norm
223 (equation 1). Each of z , α , and β is determined by a single diploid locus with additive
224 allelic effects, and we are comparing the case where the loci are tightly linked into
225 a supergene with that where they are all unlinked (Figs. 2, 3). As seen in fig. 2, for
226 intermediate rates of migration between habitats the genetic architecture strongly
227 influences the contributions of genetic polymorphism and plasticity to variation in
228 u . For tightly linked loci, the genetic contribution to the variation is larger than for
229 unlinked loci, and the reverse is true for the contribution from plasticity.

$\beta \approx 0$

M.

$\beta \approx 0.5$

5/15/
18

230 The ecological genetic conflict is further exemplified by the reaction norms for
231 migration rate $m = 0.10$ between local populations (corresponding to a migration
232 rate of 0.05 between habitats), which are shown in fig. 3, together with the distri-

butions of the environmental cue that adults in the different habitats observed as juveniles. For the linked case, there are reaction norms with shallower slopes, with different mean intercepts for individuals in habitats 1 and 2 with different genotypes (red and blue lines in fig. 3 represent habitat 1 and 2 specialists, cf. fig. 1C). There is genetic variation in z in each habitat: there are two alleles, each better adapted to one of the habitats, giving rise to alternative homozygotes and heterozygotes, with different frequencies in the habitats (in principle, these genes can evolve, and a balance between mutation, selection and drift can maintain variation around each of them). For the unlinked case, there is single reaction norm with steeper slope (dashed line in fig. 3), corresponding to a phenotypically plastic generalist. Note that the only difference in model parameters between the linked and unlinked cases is the genetic architecture, demonstrating that ecological genetic conflict can have a pronounced influence on phenotype determination.

The issue of divergence of evolutionary interests between specialism and plasticity hinges on whether genes tightly linked to one of the alleles at the polymorphic locus for z , adapted to one of the habitats, has an appreciable chance of recombining to become associated with an allele locally adapted to the other habitat, as well as migrating to that habitat. The way this can happen is if a modifier allele occurs in a heterozygote between alleles at the locus for z , each adapted to different habitats. The strength of selection against such a heterozygote influences the chance for the modifier allele to recombine to the other locally adapted allele. For the linked case shown in fig. 3, this chance is small, illustrating that genes for specialism have their evolutionary future mainly in their own habitat. While studying between-habitat genetic polymorphism, Bengtsson (1985) and Barton and Bengtsson (1986) introduced the concept of an effective migration rate for a neutral locus that is linked to a selected, genetically polymorphic locus. For instance, using equation (4) in Yeaman and Whitlock (2011), and ignoring the effects of plasticity, we find an effective migration rate of 0.0002 for a linkage of $\rho = 0.001$ to z (fig. 3), so for such genes for specialism the two habitats are fairly isolated from each other.

An alternative and more informative way of showing how the evolutionary interest varies with the degree of linkage to a between-habitat polymorphism is to examine how the reproductive value for a modifier of being associated (linked) with an allele adapted to one or the other habitat depends on the rate of recombination. We have performed a numerical analysis of a model with a very large population in each habitat (see supporting information for model description), but otherwise similar to the simulation model with results in Figs. 2 and 3. The results of the numerical analysis, which takes into account plasticity, are given in Table A1 and

Double check: more original work?

Seems
too
important
to be
ignored

{ Sounds
not precise.
Rather:
genetic
architecture
seems
most
important

Effect of
ignoring
plasticity;
understanding
of me!

link between repro.
value and eval. interest
should be made earlier

270 fig. A1. The outcome of their analysis using reproductive values is less extreme but
 271 qualitatively similar to the consideration of effective migration rates. As seen in
 272 Table A1, for m around 0.1 (m_{12} around 0.05) and with modifiers tightly linked to
 273 z , the reproductive value of being associated with the locally adapted allele at the
 274 genetic effect locus is around four times higher than that of being associated with
 275 the other allele, whereas these values are nearly equal for loosely linked modifiers.

276 In any case, for \checkmark migration rate above a critical value, phenotype determination
 277 for the linked case (as well as for the unlinked case) is dominated by plasticity,
 278 because the modifier α in equation (1) approaches zero. For instance, in fig. 2 the
 279 critical migration rate is $m = 0.14$. The critical migration rate for a wider range of
 280 parameters is shown in fig. 4. In general, stronger selection between habitats and
 281 less accurate juvenile environmental cues favor genetic polymorphism in αz , and
 282 thus a higher value of the critical migration rate (fig. 4).

283 The emergence of genomic islands of divergence has been modeled as several
 284 linked genes of smaller effect that add up to a bigger effect for a particular trait
 285 (e.g., Yeaman and Whitlock 2011; Yeaman 2013). In order to make contact with
 286 this work, we performed individual-based simulations with 100 linked loci, with the
 287 alleles at each locus constrained to have small effects, and with parameters similar to
 288 those in fig. 2. Plasticity was prevented from evolving in this simulation. As shown
 289 in fig. A2, based on the between-habitat F_{ST} for each locus, an island of divergence
 290 spanning around 15 loci emerged.

291 For two traits, u_1 and u_2 , each with different optima in the habitats, as given
 292 by equation (5), we again find a pronounced influence of genetic architecture on
 293 the relative importance of genetic polymorphism and plasticity (fig. 5, 6). For each
 294 trait, u_1 and u_2 , there is a separate genetic effect, z_1 and z_2 , coded by one locus,
 295 with modifier α_1 and α_2 and reaction norm slope β_1 and β_2 , but the same juvenile
 296 environmental cue x_{juv} for both reaction norms, as given in equation (4). Three
 297 cases are illustrated in fig. 5, one where all loci are linked, another where the two
 298 genetic effect loci are linked and the loci for α_1 , α_2 , β_1 and β_2 are unlinked from each
 299 other and from the genetic effect loci, and a third case where all loci are unlinked.
 300 From this figure, and the example in fig. 6, it appears that the influence of genetic
 301 architecture is qualitatively similar but even stronger for a two-trait syndrome com-
 302 pared to a single trait. Again, we find that for each trait several genes of smaller
 303 effect can add up to a bigger effect, as shown in fig. A3.

304 For the two-trait syndrome, we explored the evolution of linkage using individual-
 305 based simulations. Instead of specifying the recombination rates ρ_{zz} , $\rho_{z\alpha}$ and $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$,
 306 we let these be coded by three loci. We found that tight linkage between the two

good!
 But
 have you
 explored
 various starting points?

5/16/18

outdated

| ✓

| a
 } Here
 essential
 to show
 what
 happens at
 z loci!

| BUT :
 } With
 plasticity,
 much less
 pressure
 to evolve
 islands!

307 polymorphic effect loci z_1 and z_2 promptly evolved (i.e., ρ_{zz} became close to zero;
 308 Table 1), so these loci emerge as an island of divergence.

309 However, for α_1 , α_2 , β_1 and β_2 we did not find notable selection for either tighter
 310 or looser linkage to the z_1 - z_2 complex. Considerable genetic variation for the
 311 recombination rates $\rho_{z\alpha}$ and $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ persisted in the population, perhaps as a result of
 312 mutation-drift balance (see Table 1 and fig. 7 for illustration of these simulations).
 313 Overall, the outcome for the modifiers α_1 , α_2 and plasticity slopes β_1 , β_2 was similar
 314 to the middle (gray) case in fig. 5, with tightly linked z_1 and z_2 and unlinked loci
 315 for modifiers and slopes.

Not
 erwähnt
 based

on results
 shown!

e.g. low
 Sex

$m = 0.18$
 in Table 1

{ But:
 { plasticity
 does not
 evolve
 in some -
 islands !

↓
 link to
 / effect of
 arch. on
 certain norm'

316 Discussion

317 Both habitat specialization and plasticity are well-studied phenomena (van Tienderen
 318 1991, 1997; West-Eberhard 2003; DeWitt and Langerhans 2004; Richards et al. 2006;
 319 Griffith and Sultan 2012), but the perspective of divergence of evolutionary interests
 320 has traditionally not been applied. By examining ecological genetic conflict, we have
 321 identified phenomena that were not studied before. Compared to previous models of
 322 the evolution of genomic islands of divergence, the major new aspect of our work is
 323 that we study phenotypic plasticity together with genetic polymorphism, and that
 324 we interpret our results in terms of genetic conflict, or divergence of evolutionary
 325 interests, between genes for specialization and phenotypically plastic generalism. We
 326 find that the rate of recombination between genetic effect, modifier and plasticity
 327 loci influences the evolutionary outcome, with more plasticity and less genetic poly-
 328 morphism for unlinked loci, in particular for intermediate migration rates (Figs. 2
 329 and 5).

330 Our explanation is that modifier and plasticity genes unlinked to a polymorphic
 331 genetic effect locus favor phenotypes that are less specialized to a particular habitat
 332 compared to tightly linked genes, because unlinked genes become adapted to exist
 333 in all habitats. Tightly linked modifier and plasticity genes, on the other hand,
 334 are selected to perform well mainly in one of the habitats, even at the expense of
 335 performance in another habitat. Thus, a modifier or plasticity allele tightly linked
 336 to an allele at a polymorphic locus can become concentrated to one of the habitats,
 337 with the other habitat acting as a sink, to which little adaptation takes place (Holt
 338 and Gaines 1992; Kawecki 1995). One way of quantifying this effect is as a low
 339 effective migration rate for loci tightly linked to a genetic polymorphism (Barton
 340 and Bengtsson 1986; Yeaman and Whitlock 2011; Aeschbacher et al. 2017), and

2017

This
 may
 still.
 require
 some
 time. !

see Charkiewicz
et al. (1997) ↗ In a strictly genetic
setting, the two
should be equivalent

13


*Genotypic fitness is mainly
determined by migration & polymorphism.*

341 another and perhaps more informative approach is to compute reproductive values
342 of modifiers, as we have done (Table A1). Note that an allele at a polymorphic
343 genetic effect locus does have a future also when present as a heterozygote in the
344 'wrong habitat', because migration can transport it back to the other habitat. Thus,
345 **migration makes the distinction between linked and unlinked genetic architectures**
346 a matter of degree rather than kind.

347 In fact, the general pattern of variation of the modifier α and plasticity slope β
348 with the migration rate m is qualitatively similar for different genetic architectures.
349 with a shift from mainly genetic polymorphism to mainly phenotypic plasticity as m
350 increases (Figs. 2, 5, S1). One way of explaining this shift is in terms of the statistical
351 information about the habitat that is contained in the 'genetic cue' z in comparison
352 with the environmental cue x_{juv} (Leimar et al. 2006; Leimar and McNamara 2015;
353 Dall et al. 2015). Tufto (2000) provides a discussion of earlier papers dealing with
354 this topic. For higher values of m , gene frequency differences between habitats are
355 smaller, thus being less statistically informative about the habitat compared to the
356 environmental cue x_{juv} . An optimal phenotype determination strategy will therefore
357 put less emphasis on the genetic and more on the environmental cue for higher values
358 of m . For high enough rates of migration, and provided that environmental cues
359 are sufficiently accurate, phenotypic plasticity dominates completely, as illustrated
360 by simulations in fig. 4. For a much simpler model with binary cues, inspired by
361 the work of Sultan and Spencer (2002), an analytical solution is possible, leading
362 to qualitative similar results (see equation 4 and fig. 5 in Leimar et al. 2006). Note
363 also that, if migration rates are not too high, a generalist strategy of phenotype
364 determination can make use of the information from a polymorphic genetic cue,
365 provided that the polymorphism is selectively maintained. The unlinked case with
366 $m = 0.06$ in fig. 2 and that with $m = 0.10$ in fig. 5 are examples of this outcome.

↙ *But if this
is what we
want?
RVs also
varying
a degree.*

↙ *discusses
not very
probabilistic
There*



↗ *not
link*

↗ *The
formulation
is weird.
The info
comes from
LD, i.e.
stab.
cond.*

||

367 Our conclusion that the evolution of genomic islands of divergence is favored by
368 a combination of migration and divergent selection between habitats is in qualitative
369 agreement with previous theoretical analyses (e.g., Aeschbacher et al. 2017), includ-
370 ing our result (fig. 4) that there is a critical migration rate above which migration
371 dominates over selection (e.g., Yeaman and Whitlock 2011). Note, however, that
372 our analysis examines how genetic polymorphism balances with phenotypic plastic-
373 ity, rather than with genetic drift. The general idea that migration and divergent
374 selection promote genomic islands of divergence also has empirical support (Samuk
375 et al. 2017).

376 Our main result, that reaction norm slopes can depend on the genetic architec-
377 ture (Figs. 2, 3, 5, 6, S1), is new and there appear to be no empirical data directly

more notes!

examining this question. It is known that ecotypic traits differ in how they are determined, with the variation in some traits being mainly genetic and in other traits mainly plastic (Lucek et al. 2014), but the possible influence of genetic architecture is unknown. There are observations showing that plasticity can decrease during the formation of an ecotype (Hasan et al. 2017), but the genomic basis of the reduction in plasticity is not known. Also, a study of so called expression quantitative trait loci (eQTLs) shows that ‘distant’, *trans*-regulatory changes on average had different effects than ‘local’, *cis*-regulatory changes, and were also more responsive to the environment (Ishikawa et al. 2017), which is at least suggestive of an influence of genetic architecture on trait expression.

In our investigation of the evolution of recombination, for a two-trait situation, we found that low recombination between the polymorphic loci for z_1 and z_2 readily evolved (Table 1), corresponding to an island of divergence, and this is in accordance with the traditional understanding of such situations (Pinho and Hey 2010; Via 2012). On the other hand, we did not detect selection for either tighter or looser linkage between the polymorphic loci and epistatic modifiers or plasticity loci (Table 1). The question appears not to have been analyzed previously, but perhaps other factors that could influence genetic architecture, such as inversions or a tendency towards *cis*-regulatory influences, play a greater role in determining the linkage.

The idea that genes occurring in linked clusters, whether in ecotypes or in other contexts, share an evolutionary interest by being transmitted together, points to the possibility that genetic conflict is of importance for many instances of supergenes and co-adapted gene complexes (Schwander et al. 2014; Thompson and Jiggins 2014; Charlesworth 2016). The ‘genomic islands’ found in microorganisms (Hacker and Carniel 2001; Dobrindt et al. 2004) might have a similar explanation. In conclusion, by applying traditional ideas of genetic conflict to genomic islands of divergence in ecotypes, we have extended the concept of genetic conflict to an ecological context and produced new and fundamental results about the balance between genetic local adaptation and phenotypic plasticity. We hope that our work can inspire further empirical investigation of the genomics of phenotypic plasticity of ecotypes.

But prediction have been made!

many → 2014 ↓

Yesson et al. 2015

Would require studying the work of me or/and §

{ see comment there a bi-modal distribution

of P₂ and a P_{αβ}

{ To hold genomic integrity - part is weak -

then has to impact genet. architecture !

Literature Cited

- Aeschbacher, S., J. P. Selby, J. H. Willis, and G. Coop. 2017. Population-genomic inference of the strength and timing of selection against gene flow. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114:7061–7066.
- Barton, N. H., and B. O. Bengtsson. 1986. The barrier to genetic exchange between hybridising populations. *Heredity* 57:357–376.
- Bengtsson, B. O. 1985. The flow of genes through a genetic barrier. Pages 31–42 in P. J. Greenwood, P. H. Harvey, and M. Slatkin, eds. *Evolution: Essays in honour of John Maynard Smith*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Burt, A., and R. Trivers. 2006. *Genes in conflict: the biology of selfish genetic elements*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Charlesworth, D. 2016. The status of supergenes in the 21st century: Recombination suppression in Batesian mimicry and sex chromosomes and other complex adaptations. *Evolutionary Applications* 9:74–90.
- Dall, S. R., J. M. McNamara, and O. Leimar. 2015. Genes as cues: phenotypic integration of genetic and epigenetic information from a Darwinian perspective. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 30:327–333.
- DeWitt, T. J., and R. B. Langerhans. 2004. Integrated solutions to environmental heterogeneity. Pages 98–111 in T. J. DeWitt, , and S. M. Scheiner, eds. *Phenotypic plasticity*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Dobrindt, U., B. Hochhut, U. Hentschel, and J. Hacker. 2004. Genomic islands in pathogenic and environmental microorganisms. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 2:414–424.
- Feder, J. L., S. P. Egan, and P. Nosil. 2012. The genomics of speciation-with-gene-flow. *Trends in Genetics* 28:342–350.
- Flaxman, S. M., A. C. Wacholder, J. L. Feder, and P. Nosil. 2014. Theoretical models of the influence of genomic architecture on the dynamics of speciation. *Molecular Ecology* 23:4074–4088.
- Frank, S. A., and L. D. Hurst. 1996. Mitochondria and male disease. *Nature* 383:224.
- Gardner, A., and F. Úbeda. 2017. The meaning of intragenomic conflict. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 1:1807–1815.

- Griffith, T., and S. E. Sultan. 2012. Field-based insights to the evolution of specialization: Plasticity and fitness across habitats in a specialist/generalist species pair. *Ecology and Evolution* 2:778–791.
- Hacker, J., and E. Carniel. 2001. Ecological fitness, genomic islands and bacterial pathogenicity A Darwinian view of the evolution of microbes. *EMBO reports* 2:376–381.
- Hasan, M. M., J. DeFaveri, S. Kuure, S. N. Dash, S. Lehtonen, J. Merilä, and R. J. S. McCairns. 2017. Kidney morphology and candidate gene expression shows plasticity in sticklebacks adapted to divergent osmotic environments. *The Journal of Experimental Biology* 220:2175–2186.
- Holt, R. D., and M. S. Gaines. 1992. Analysis of adaptation in heterogeneous landscapes: implications for the evolution of fundamental niches. *Evolutionary Ecology* 6:433–447.
- Hurst, L. D., A. Atlan, and B. O. Bengtsson. 1996. Genetic conflicts. *Quarterly Review of Biology* 71:317–364.
- Ishikawa, A., M. Kusakabe, K. Yoshida, M. Ravinet, T. Makino, A. Toyoda, A. Fujiyama, and J. Kitano. 2017. Different contributions of local- and distant-regulatory changes to transcriptome divergence between stickleback ecotypes. *Evolution* 71:565–581.
- Jones, F. C., M. G. Grabherr, Y. F. Chan, P. Russell, E. Mauceli, J. Johnson, R. Swofford, M. Pirun, M. C. Zody, S. White, E. Birney, S. Searle, J. Schmutz, J. Grimwood, M. C. Dickson, R. M. Myers, C. T. Miller, B. R. Summers, A. K. Knecht, S. D. Brady, H. Zhang, A. a. Pollen, T. Howes, C. Amemiya, J. Baldwin, T. Bloom, D. B. Jaffe, R. Nicol, J. Wilkinson, E. S. Lander, F. Di Palma, K. Lindblad-Toh, and D. M. Kingsley. 2012. The genomic basis of adaptive evolution in threespine sticklebacks. *Nature* 484:55–61.
- Kawecki, T. J. 1995. Demography of source—sink populations and the evolution of ecological niches. *Evolutionary Ecology* 9:38–44.
- Larson, W. A., M. T. Limborg, G. J. McKinney, D. E. Schindler, J. E. Seeb, and L. W. Seeb. 2017. Genomic islands of divergence linked to ecotypic variation in sockeye salmon. *Molecular Ecology* 26:554–570.

- Leimar, O., S. R. X. Dall, P. Hammerstein, and J. M. McNamara. 2016. Genes as cues of relatedness and social evolution in heterogeneous environments. *PLOS Computational Biology* 12:e1005006.
- Leimar, O., P. Hammerstein, and T. J. M. Van Dooren. 2006. A new perspective on developmental plasticity and the principles of adaptive morph determination. *American Naturalist* 167:367–376.
- Leimar, O., and J. M. McNamara. 2015. The evolution of transgenerational integration of information in heterogeneous environments. *The American Naturalist* 185:E55–E69.
- Lucek, K., A. Sivasundar, and O. Seehausen. 2014. Disentangling the role of phenotypic plasticity and genetic divergence in contemporary ecotype formation during a biological invasion. *Evolution* 68:2619–2632.
- Malinsky, M., R. J. Challis, A. M. Tyers, S. Schiffels, Y. Terai, B. P. Ngatunga, E. A. Miska, R. Durbin, M. J. Genner, and G. F. Turner. 2015. Genomic islands of speciation separate cichlid ecomorphs in an East African crater lake. *Science* 350:1493–1498.
- Marques, D. A., K. Lucek, J. I. Meier, S. Mwaiko, C. E. Wagner, L. Excoffier, and O. Seehausen. 2016. Genomics of rapid incipient speciation in sympatric threespine stickleback. *PLoS Genetics* 12:1–34.
- Nosil, P., D. J. Funk, and D. Ortiz-Barrientos. 2009. Divergent selection and heterogeneous genomic divergence. *Molecular Ecology* 18:375–402.
- Perlman, S. J., C. N. Hodson, P. T. Hamilton, G. P. Opit, and B. E. Gowen. 2015. Maternal transmission, sex ratio distortion, and mitochondria. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112:10162–10168.
- Perrin, N. 2016. Random sex determination: When developmental noise tips the sex balance. *BioEssays* 38:1218–1226.
- Pinho, C., and J. Hey. 2010. Divergence with Gene Flow: Models and Data. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 41:215–230.
- Poelstra, J. W., N. Vijay, C. M. Bossu, H. Lantz, B. Ryll, I. Muller, V. Baglione, P. Unneberg, M. Wikelski, M. G. Grabherr, and J. B. W. Wolf. 2014. The genomic landscape underlying phenotypic integrity in the face of gene flow in crows. *Science* 344:1410–1414.


- Richards, C. L., O. Bossdorf, N. Z. Muth, J. Gurevitch, and M. Pigliucci. 2006. Jack of all trades, master of some? On the role of phenotypic plasticity in plant invasions. *Ecology Letters* 9:981–993.
- Riesch, R., M. Muschick, D. Lindtke, R. Villoutreix, A. A. Comeault, T. E. Farkas, K. Lucek, E. Hellen, V. Soria-Carrasco, S. R. Dennis, C. F. de Carvalho, R. J. Safran, C. P. Sandoval, J. Feder, R. Gries, B. J. Crespi, G. Gries, Z. Gompert, and P. Nosil. 2017. Transitions between phases of genomic differentiation during stick-insect speciation. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 1:0082.
- Samuk, K., G. L. Owens, K. E. Delmore, S. E. Miller, D. J. Rennison, and D. Schlüter. 2017. Gene flow and selection interact to promote adaptive divergence in regions of low recombination. *Molecular Ecology* 26:4378–4390.
- Schwander, T., R. Libbrecht, and L. Keller. 2014. Supergenes and complex phenotypes. *Current Biology* 24:R288–R294.
- Seehausen, O., R. K. Butlin, I. Keller, C. E. Wagner, J. W. Boughman, P. A. Hohenlohe, C. L. Peichel, G.-P. Saetre, C. Bank, Å. Bränström, A. Brelsford, C. S. Clarkson, F. Eröukhmanoff, J. L. Feder, M. C. Fischer, A. D. Foote, P. Franchini, C. D. Jiggins, F. C. Jones, A. K. Lindholm, K. Lucek, M. E. Maan, D. A. Marques, S. H. Martin, B. Matthews, J. I. Meier, M. Möst, M. W. Nachman, E. Nonaka, D. J. Rennison, J. Schwarzer, E. T. Watson, A. M. Westram, and A. Widmer. 2014. Genomics and the origin of species. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 15:176–192.
- Soria-Carrasco, V., Z. Gompert, A. A. Comeault, T. E. Farkas, T. L. Parchman, J. S. Johnston, C. A. Buerkle, J. L. Feder, J. Bast, T. Schwander, S. P. Egan, B. J. Crespi, and P. Nosil. 2014. Stick Insect Genomes Reveal Natural Selection’s Role in Parallel Speciation. *Science* 344:738–742.
- Sultan, S. E., and H. G. Spencer. 2002. Metapopulation structure favors plasticity over local adaptation. *American Naturalist* 160:271–283.
- Thompson, M. J., and C. D. Jiggins. 2014. Supergenes and their role in evolution. *Heredity* 113:1–8.
- Tufto, J. 2000. The evolution of plasticity and nonplastic spatial and temporal adaptations in the presence of imperfect environmental cues. *The American Naturalist* 156:121–130.

- van Tienderen, P. H. 1991. Evolution of generalists and specialist in spatially heterogeneous environments. *Evolution* 45:1317–1331.
- . 1997. Generalists, specialists, and the evolution of phenotypic plasticity in sympatric populations of distinct species. *Evolution* 51:1372–1380.
- Via, S. 2012. Divergence hitchhiking and the spread of genomic isolation during ecological speciation-with-gene-flow. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 367:451–460.
- Werren, J. H. 2011. Selfish genetic elements, genetic conflict, and evolutionary innovation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 108:10863–10870.
- Werren, J. H., and L. W. Beukeboom. 1998. Sex determination, sex ratios, and genetic conflict. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 29:233–261.
- West-Eberhard, M. J. 2003. Developmental plasticity and evolution. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Yeaman, S. 2013. Genomic rearrangements and the evolution of clusters of locally adaptive loci. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 110:E1743–51.
- Yeaman, S., and M. C. Whitlock. 2011. The genetic architecture of adaptation under migration-selection balance. *Evolution* 65:1897–1911.

Tables

Table 1: Evolution of linkage for two-trait simulations similar to fig. 5. There are 9 loci along a chromosome, coding for z_1 , z_2 , ρ_{zz} , $\rho_{z\alpha}$, $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$, α_1 , α_2 , β_1 , and β_2 , and the table gives averages (\pm SD for recombination rates) in the population after 200000 generations. The loci for the recombination rates are tightly linked to the locus for z_2 , in order to maximize the chances of the evolution of tighter linkage to the polymorphic complex $z_1 - z_2$. The recombination rate ρ_{zz} between z_1 and z_2 evolved towards tight linkage, but the other recombination rates reached intermediate average values, with broad distributions, as illustrated in fig. 7.

m	ρ_{zz}	$\rho_{z\alpha}$	$\rho_{\alpha\beta}$	α_1	α_2	β_1	β_2
0.12	0.0029 ± 0.0071	0.205 ± 0.300	0.209 ± 0.110	0.891	0.897	0.073	0.063
0.18	0.0019 ± 0.0041	0.028 ± 0.022	0.243 ± 0.115	0.871	0.856	0.098	0.113
0.24	0.0008 ± 0.0060	0.251 ± 0.200	0.335 ± 0.060	0.688	0.673	0.238	0.244




$\rho_{z\alpha}$ seems
comparatively
low for
 $m = 0.18$
↳ by chance
→ irrelevant!

-How
essential
is this
linkage?

there /
confirm
without

use
different
notation
for complex?

Figures



suggestion:
use 'convention'
legends

Figure 1: An overview of ecological genetic conflict between genes for specialism and for phenotypically plastic generalism. Illustrations of different pathways of transmission to future generations for A genes for habitat specialism and B plasticity, and C a resulting conflict battleground. Blue and red indicate two different habitats and the arrows show potential dispersal events, when changes between habitat types are possible. Time runs from left to right in panels A and B. For a specialist A, a pathway of transmission to future generations will predominantly go through one habitat type, illustrated by the dashed gray line, because the alternative habitat is a sink. For a phenotypically plastic generalist B, on the other hand, a pathway of transmission to future generations can alternate between habitat types (e.g., dashed gray line). As a consequence, there will be a divergence in evolutionary interests between genes for specialism and plasticity. C Locally adapted genes (specialist) are then in conflict with genes for plasticity (generalist) over both the intercept and the slope of reaction norms.

ecological genetic conflict

the conflict
arises because
different genes
have different evol.
interests in different ecological contexts

different evolutionary
interests between
different genes

- $L = 200'000 = 2 \cdot 10^3 N \rightarrow$ long enough for equil. to be reached?
- Note: mig. rate between habitats: $m/2$

22





Figure 2: Phenotype determination for linked and unlinked genetic architectures, as a function of the rate of migration. Panel A shows how the epistatic modifier α (solid lines) of the genetic effect z and the slope β (dashed lines) of the reaction norm for the environmental cue x_{juv} depend on the migration rate m and on the genetic architecture. The mean \pm SD over 10 replicate individual-based simulations is displayed. The left-hand (green) lines correspond to the case where the loci for z , α and β are all unlinked and the right-hand (orange) lines to the case where the three loci are tightly linked into a supergene. The lines between these (gray) correspond to an intermediate case where the loci for z and α are linked but the locus for β is unlinked to these. Panel B shows the genetic proportion of the partitioning of the variance of the phenotype u into genetic and plastic components. The genetic proportion is defined as the variance of the genetic component plus the covariance of the genetic and plastic components, divided by the total variance of the phenotype. Survival selection between habitats is given by equation (2) and the phenotype is determined as in equation (1). For the linked case, recombination rates are $\rho_{z\alpha} = \rho_{\alpha\beta} = 0.001$, for the unlinked case $\rho_{z\alpha} = \rho_{\alpha\beta} = 0.5$, and for the intermediate case $\rho_{z\alpha} = 0.001, \rho_{\alpha\beta} = 0.5$. Other parameter values: $N_p = 200, K = 100, s_0 = 0.1, \sigma = 1.0, \theta_1 = -0.75, \theta_2 = 0.75, \zeta_1 = -0.4, \zeta_2 = 0.4, \sigma_{\text{juv}} = 0.5$.



$$u = \alpha z + \beta x_{\text{juv}}$$

Recall: locus z contains only two alleles $\zeta_1 = -0.4$ and $\zeta_2 = 0.4$




Figure 3: Example of the effect of genetic architecture (linked or unlinked) on phenotype determination. Mean reaction norms (with slope β) for habitat 1 specialists: thick and thin blue lines (slightly shifted up and down for clarity) represent individuals in habitat 1 with genotype $\zeta_1\zeta_1$ and $\zeta_1\zeta_2$ (with frequencies before migration of 0.76 and 0.22; line widths proportional to frequencies); and habitat 2 specialists: thick and thin red lines represent individuals in habitat 2 with genotype $\zeta_2\zeta_2$ and $\zeta_1\zeta_2$ (with frequencies 0.77 and 0.21); and for phenotypically plastic generalists: gray dashed line, slope and intercepts averaged over both habitats. For the generalist, the reaction norm is very similar between habitats (not shown), because α is small and β does not vary much, but the alleles ζ_1 and ζ_2 still segregate at the locus for z . The distributions of the juvenile environmental cue x_{juv} are shown lightly shaded for adult individuals in habitat 1 (left) and habitat 2 (right). The figure corresponds to the cases in fig. 2 for migration rate $m = 0.10$, with tightly linked loci for specialism and unlinked loci for plasticity.

$$u = \alpha z + \beta x_{juv}$$

What are
the freqs. ?

Shown: \bar{u}

→ show as a
function of
 x_{juv} .

$$\text{Recall: } x_{juv}^{(i)} = \theta_i + \epsilon_i$$

Distinction 'specialist' vs. 'generalist'
not so ideal as done here:
a 'genetic' specialist can
evolve into a 'phenotypic' generalist





Figure 4: Critical migration rate, above which a genetic polymorphism in z is not selectively maintained, resulting in pure phenotypic plasticity. There is a single trait u and the loci for z , α and β are tightly linked. The critical rate is defined as the value of m for which the genetic proportion of the variance in u (see fig. 2B) is less than 0.01. The critical migration rate is shown as a function of the strength of selection in one habitat against a phenotype locally adapted to the other habitat, defined as $1 - s_1(\theta_2) = 1 - s_2(\theta_1)$ (see equation 2 for definition of s_i). The points correspond to $s_0 = 0.9, 0.7, 0.5, 0.3, 0.1$, and the lines are labeled with the juvenile environmental cue error, σ_{juv} . The rightmost point on the line for $\sigma_{\text{juv}} = 0.50$ corresponds to the rightmost point for the linked case in fig. 2A, B. Other parameter values: $\rho_{z\alpha} = \rho_{\alpha\beta} = 0.001$, $N_p = 200$, $K = 100$, $\sigma = 1.0$, $\theta_1 = -0.75$, $\theta_2 = 0.75$.

Visualise mean fitness!

Why does β still evolve?



Indicate where polymorphism at z locus is lost!




Figure 5: Phenotype determination for different genetic architectures, as a function of the rate of migration. Similar to fig. 2, but there are two traits, u_1 and u_2 , each with optima that differ between the habitats. There are two genetic effect loci, one for each trait, and modifiers α_1 and α_2 for each of the genetic effects z_1 and z_2 , as well as slopes β_1 and β_2 for the reaction norms of u_1 and u_2 for the juvenile cue x_{juv} , following equation (4). Panel A shows how the mean modifier $(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)/2$ and mean slope $(\beta_1 + \beta_2)/2$ depend on the migration rate m and on the genetic architecture. The solid lines show the mean modifier over 10 replicate of individual-based simulations, with the left-hand (green) line giving a case where the loci for the two genetic effects and the modifiers $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2$ are all unlinked. The right-hand (orange) line shows the same thing, except that the six loci are tightly linked into a supergene. For the middle (gray) line, the two genetic effect loci are tightly linked, but the modifier and plasticity loci are unlinked from these and from each other. The dashed lines show the corresponding reaction norm slopes. The situation is symmetric between the traits, and the results for each trait separately are very similar to those shown here. Panel B shows the mean genetic proportion in the partitioning of the variance of the phenotypes u_1 and u_2 into genetic and plastic components. Survival selection between habitats is given by equation (5). For the linked case, recombination rates are $\rho_{zz} = \rho_{z\alpha} = \rho_{\alpha\beta} = 0.001$, and for the unlinked case $\rho_{zz} = \rho_{z\alpha} = \rho_{\alpha\beta} = 0.5$. Other parameter values: $N_p = 200$, $K = 100$, $s_0 = 0.1$, $\sigma = 1.0$, $\theta_{11} = \theta_{21} = -0.75$, $\theta_{12} = \theta_{22} = 0.75$, $\sigma_{\text{juv}} = 0.5$.




Figure 6: Example of the effect of genetic architecture (linked or unlinked) on phenotype determination. Mean reaction norms (with slope $(\beta_1 + \beta_2)/2$) for habitat 1 specialists: thick and thin blue lines (slightly shifted up and down for clarity) represent individuals in habitat 1 with genotype $\zeta_1\zeta_1$, $\zeta_1\zeta_2$ and $\zeta_2\zeta_2$ at each of the two genetic effect loci (with frequencies after migration of 0.74, 0.15 and 0.10; line widths proportional to frequencies); and habitat 2 specialists: thick and thin red lines represent individuals in habitat 2 with genotype $\zeta_2\zeta_2$, $\zeta_1\zeta_2$ and $\zeta_1\zeta_1$ at each of the two genetic effect loci (with frequencies 0.73, 0.16 and 0.11); and for phenotypically plastic generalists: gray dashed line, slope and intercepts averaged over both habitats). For the liked case (specialist), the genotypes at the loci for z_1 and z_2 are highly correlated, both among habitats (correlation of genetic effects: 0.999) and within habitats (0.998). For the generalist, the reaction norm is very similar between habitats (not shown), because the α_n are small and the β_n do not vary much, but the alleles ζ_1 and ζ_2 still segregate at the locus for z_2 , whereas in this example z_1 is fixed for ζ_2 . The distributions of the juvenile environmental cue x_{juv} are shown lightly shaded for adult individuals in habitat 1 (left) and habitat 2 (right). The figure corresponds to the cases in fig. 5 for migration rate $m = 0.24$, with tightly linked loci for specialism and unlinked loci for plasticity.




Figure 7: Distribution of recombination rates, over individuals in the population, from the simulations for $m = 0.12$ and $m = 0.24$ reported in Table 1. Panels A and B show $\rho_{z\alpha}$ and $\rho_{\alpha\beta}$ for the case with $m = 0.12$ in Table 1, and C and D show the same for the case with $m = 0.24$. Overall, there seems not to be a tendency for evolution of either very low or very high recombination rates.

Explanation ?

Would
be
interesting
to see
for $m = 0.18$
too!

$$u = \alpha z + \beta x_{juv} \\ x_{juv} = \theta_i + \varepsilon_{juv} \quad | \quad \varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{juv}^2) \\ s_i(u) = s_0 + (1-s_0) \exp\left(\frac{(u-\theta_i)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$

Numerical analysis

Our approach here shows similarity to the numerical analysis by Leimar *et al.* (2016). The main aim of this analysis is illustrate the divergence of evolutionary interests between tightly linked and unlinked modifiers of a polymorphic genetic effect locus, through the use of reproductive values, as illustrated in Table A1. We also show how the modifier α and the slope β vary as the rate of recombination between these loci and the genetic effect increases from 0 to 0.5 (fig. A1).

Let habitat i , $i = 1, 2$, support a large population of size n_i and let m_{ij} be a rate of migration to habitat i from habitat j , in the sense that, after migration, the respective proportions m_{11} and m_{12} of individuals in habitats 1 originate from habitat 1 and 2, and similarly in habitat 2. We are mostly interested in the symmetric case where $n_1 = n_2$, $m_{11} = m_{22}$ and $m_{12} = m_{21}$. The life cycle of individuals is a version of that in the main text: (i) within-habitat random mating, forming n_i offspring in habitat i , conceptualized as random unions from a pool of gametes, drawn from the adults in the habitat (after which the adults die); (ii) each juvenile (independently) observes an environmental cue, as given in equation (3), and has its phenotype determined based on its genotype and the environmental cue; (iii) each juvenile has a probability $m_{ij}n_i/n_j$ of migrating from its habitat j to habitat i ; (iv) selection, with survival in habitat i as a function of phenotype u as in equation (2); and the cycle then returns to (i).

Let us use notation like ζ_k to denote alleles at the locus for z . We take (i) as our census point, and let p_{ik} be the frequency among the gametes (that form the next generation) of allele ζ_k in habitat i . If we order the gametes as maternal-paternal, the genotype frequencies among the offspring at the census point in habitat i are $p_{ik}p_{il}$. Concerning environmental cues, note that the mean cue in habitat i is θ_i , according to equation (3). The survival in habitat i of individuals with genotypes with alleles ζ_k and ζ_l who have observed the juvenile cue in habitat j becomes

$$W_{ijkl} = s_0 + (1 - s_0) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_{juv}^2}} \times \int \exp\left(-\frac{-(\alpha(\zeta_k + \zeta_l) + \beta(\theta_j + \eta) - \theta_i)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{\eta^2}{2\sigma_{juv}^2}\right) d\eta \\ = s_0 + (1 - s_0) \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{\beta^2\sigma_{juv}^2 + \sigma^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{(\alpha(\zeta_k + \zeta_l) + \beta\theta_j - \theta_i)^2}{\beta^2\sigma_{juv}^2 + \sigma^2}\right), \quad (\text{A1})$$

where the integration variable η represent the environmental cue error. Note that we have the symmetry $W_{ijkl} = W_{ijlk}$. Define an average survival as

5/17/19

$$\bar{W}_{ij} = \sum_{kl} W_{ijkl} p_{jk} p_{jl},$$



we get the genotype frequencies at the end of phase (iv) as

$$\begin{aligned} P_{111}(p_{..}) &= \frac{m_{11}W_{1111}p_{11} + m_{12}W_{1211}p_{21}p_{21}}{m_{11}\bar{W}_{11} + m_{12}\bar{W}_{12}} \\ P_{112}(p_{..}) &= \frac{m_{11}W_{1112}p_{11}p_{12} + m_{12}W_{1212}p_{21}p_{22}}{m_{11}\bar{W}_{11} + m_{12}\bar{W}_{12}} \\ P_{121}(p_{..}) &= \frac{m_{11}W_{1121}p_{12}p_{11} + m_{12}W_{1221}p_{22}p_{21}}{m_{11}\bar{W}_{11} + m_{12}\bar{W}_{12}} \\ P_{122}(p_{..}) &= \frac{m_{11}W_{1122}p_{12}p_{12} + m_{12}W_{1222}p_{22}p_{22}}{m_{11}\bar{W}_{11} + m_{12}\bar{W}_{12}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

in habitat 1, and

$$\begin{aligned} P_{211}(p_{..}) &= \frac{m_{21}W_{2111}p_{11}p_{11} + m_{22}W_{2211}p_{21}p_{21}}{m_{21}\bar{W}_{21} + m_{22}\bar{W}_{22}} \\ P_{212}(p_{..}) &= \frac{m_{21}W_{2112}p_{11}p_{12} + m_{22}W_{2212}p_{21}p_{22}}{m_{21}\bar{W}_{21} + m_{22}\bar{W}_{22}} \\ P_{221}(p_{..}) &= \frac{m_{21}W_{2121}p_{12}p_{11} + m_{22}W_{2221}p_{22}p_{21}}{m_{21}\bar{W}_{21} + m_{22}\bar{W}_{22}} \\ P_{222}(p_{..}) &= \frac{m_{21}W_{2122}p_{12}p_{12} + m_{22}W_{2222}p_{22}p_{22}}{m_{21}\bar{W}_{21} + m_{22}\bar{W}_{22}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

		$\omega^+ \omega^+$
ξ_u	ξ_u	$\xi_u \xi_u$
ξ_u	ξ_v	$\xi_u \xi_v$
ξ_v	ξ_v	$\xi_v \xi_v$

in habitat 2. The notation $P_{ikl}(p_{..})$ means that there is a dependence on the allele frequencies: $p_{..} = (p_{11}, p_{21}, p_{12}, p_{22})$. Again, we have the symmetry $P_{ikl}(p_{..}) = P_{ilk}(p_{..})$, and the index combination kl means that k is the maternal and l the paternal allele. From one generation to the next, we then have the following iteration for the allele frequencies at the census point:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{i1}(t+1) &= P_{i11}(p_{..}(t)) + P_{i12}(p_{..}(t)) \\ p_{i2}(t+1) &= P_{i21}(p_{..}(t)) + P_{i22}(p_{..}(t)), \end{aligned}$$

*should be added,
and a factor
of $\frac{1}{2}$ should multiply
the 2nd
a. 3rd
argument*

where we have taken into account the symmetry $P_{i12} = P_{i21}$. We can note that $p_{i1}(t+1) + p_{i2}(t+1) = 1$, as it should, so we only need the equation for p_{i1} . The iteration (A4) can be used to determine numerically the equilibrium allele frequencies for a given situation, as is done in Table A1. In the following, we let p_{ik} denote such an equilibrium.

*↑
add ^ or no !*

modifier:

- partially linked to z
- unlinked to α, β


Fixed in the simulations, but not here. → Consistency?

Mutant invasion

We now consider a rare mutant modifier, that modifies either ζ_1, ζ_2, α or β , and that has a rate of recombination ρ with the polymorphic locus for z . To make it simple, we assume that a modifier changes either ζ_1 to ζ'_1 , or ζ_2 to ζ'_2 , when linked to that allele, or modifies α to α' or β to β' . Let p'_{ik} be the frequency in habitat i of a mutant modifier linked to allele k , with $p'_{ik} \ll p_{ik}$, and let W'_{ijkl} be the modified survival where the modifier is linked to allele l . Here, we do not distinguish maternal and paternal origin. Similar to equations (A2, A3), we have the first-order terms in mutant frequencies as

accounts for $p_{ik} p_{il} \hat{=} p'_{il} p_{ik}$

$$\begin{aligned} P'_{111} &= \frac{2}{\bar{w}_1} (m_{11} W'_{1111} p_{11} p'_{11} + m_{12} W'_{1211} p_{21} p'_{21}) \\ P'_{121} &= \frac{2}{\bar{w}_1} (m_{11} W'_{1121} p_{12} p'_{11} + m_{12} W'_{1221} p_{22} p'_{21}) \\ P'_{112} &= \frac{2}{\bar{w}_1} (m_{11} W'_{1112} p_{11} p'_{12} + m_{12} W'_{1212} p_{21} p'_{22}) \\ P'_{122} &= \frac{2}{\bar{w}_1} (m_{11} W'_{1122} p_{12} p'_{12} + m_{12} W'_{1222} p_{22} p'_{22}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$



heterozygote mutant and carriers

... p_{ikk} ...
 p_{ikl} p_{ilk}
... p_{ill} ...

$$\begin{aligned} P'_{211} &= \frac{2}{\bar{w}_2} (m_{21} W'_{2111} p_{11} p'_{11} + m_{22} W'_{2211} p_{21} p'_{21}) \\ P'_{221} &= \frac{2}{\bar{w}_2} (m_{21} W'_{2121} p_{12} p'_{11} + m_{22} W'_{2221} p_{22} p'_{21}) \\ P'_{212} &= \frac{2}{\bar{w}_2} (m_{21} W'_{2112} p_{11} p'_{12} + m_{22} W'_{2212} p_{21} p'_{22}) \\ P'_{222} &= \frac{2}{\bar{w}_2} (m_{21} W'_{2122} p_{12} p'_{12} + m_{22} W'_{2222} p_{22} p'_{22}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

where we used the notation $\bar{w}_1 = m_{11} \bar{W}_{11} + m_{12} \bar{W}_{12}$ and $\bar{w}_2 = m_{21} \bar{W}_{21} + m_{22} \bar{W}_{22}$. These represent mutant heterozygote genotypes surviving to the census point, ready to produce gametes for next generation: P'_{ikl} is the frequency of mutant heterozygotes in habitat i where the mutant modifier is linked to the l allele. Recombination gametes from P'_{i12} and P'_{i21} can transfer the mutant modifier to become linked to the other allele at the locus for z . Using this, the iteration from one generation to

$p'_{ikl} \xrightarrow{\text{mutant modifier linked}} \text{to } l$

p_{ik}

{ State explicitly that
the resident pop. is
assumed not to change!

Formulation is not clear;
grammar weird

the next for the p'_{ik} becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} p'_{11}(t+1) &= \frac{1}{2} [P'_{111}(t) + (1-\rho)P'_{121}(t) + \rho P'_{112}(t)] \\ p'_{21}(t+1) &= \frac{1}{2} [P'_{211}(t) + (1-\rho)P'_{221}(t) + \rho P'_{212}(t)] \\ p'_{12}(t+1) &= \frac{1}{2} [P'_{122}(t) + (1-\rho)P'_{112}(t) + \rho P'_{121}(t)] \\ p'_{22}(t+1) &= \frac{1}{2} [P'_{222}(t) + (1-\rho)P'_{212}(t) + \rho P'_{221}(t)]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

To Do: Double check!

We can write the mutant population projection as

$$p'_{ik}(t+1) = \sum_{jl} A'_{ikjl} p'_{jl}(t), \quad (\text{A8})$$


$i: 1, 2$
 $j: 1, 2$

$k: 1, 2$

$\ell: 1, 2$

where A'_{ikjl} is the population projection matrix. We get

$$\begin{aligned} A'_{i1j1} &= \frac{m_{ij}}{\bar{w}_i} (W'_{ij11} p_{j1} + (1-\rho) W'_{ij21} p_{j2}) \\ A'_{i1j2} &= \frac{m_{ij}}{\bar{w}_i} \rho W'_{ij12} p_{j1} \\ A'_{i2j1} &= \frac{m_{ij}}{\bar{w}_i} \rho W'_{ij21} p_{j2} \\ A'_{i2j2} &= \frac{m_{ij}}{\bar{w}_i} (W'_{ij22} p_{j2} + (1-\rho) W'_{ij12} p_{j1}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A9})$$



The mutant projection is a 4×4 matrix, and each line of equation (A9) represents a partitioning of this matrix into 2×2 sub-matrices.

5/20/19

Invasion fitness

The leading eigenvalue λ of the matrix \mathbf{A}' , with elements A'_{ikjl} , or rather its logarithm, $\log \lambda$, gives the mutant invasion fitness. For the case where the mutant is equal to the resident, we have $\lambda = 1$, with $(p_{11}, p_{21}, p_{12}, p_{22})$ as right eigenvector and the reproductive values $(v_{11}, v_{21}, v_{12}, v_{22})$ as left eigenvector. Furthermore, the mutant can invade if $\lambda > 1$.

We developed a C++ program that follows a path of small steps through either $\zeta_1 \zeta_2$ -space, or $\alpha \beta$ -space, each of which increases the invasion fitness, until reaching an accurate approximation of the equilibrium. We first put $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 0$ and looked for an equilibrium dimorphism $\zeta_1 \zeta_2$. We then retained this dimorphism and let α and β evolve to an equilibrium, for different values of the rate of recombination ρ between the locus for $\zeta_1 \zeta_2$ and the loci for α and β . In this analysis, we made the

i.e. no plasticity
in why retain it?
Will the $\zeta_1 \zeta_2$ -p dyn. not evolve?

assumption that α and β are tightly linked to each other. The result of the analysis is presented in Table A1. An important point of the analysis appears in the final column, giving the ratio v_{11}/v_{12} of the reproductive value for a small-effect modifier (in the limit of being neutral) of being associated with the locally favoured allele ζ_1 to being associated with the other allele ζ_2 . This ratio expresses how much a small increase in survival in one habitat is weighed against a corresponding decrease in survival in the other habitat.

Notes:

- genes as inclusive-fitness-maximising genes (Gardner and Shoda)
- reproductive value: - discrete age classes: $v_x = \sum_{y=x}^{\infty} \lambda^{-(y-x+1)} \frac{l_y}{l_x} m_y$

where λ is the long-term population growth rate given by the leading eigenvalue of the Leslie matrix, l_x is the probab. of survival of a female from age 0 to age x , and m_x is the average nr. of offspring produced by an indiv. (female) at age x

$$\text{continuous age classes: } v_x = \int_x^{\infty} e^{-r(y-x)} \frac{dy}{l_x} m_x$$

where r is the intrinsic rate of increase (or Malthusian growth rate).

*Here: Two demes, rather than two habitats
each with many demes*

33

Table A1: Numerical analysis of the alternative model. It is similar to the simulation model explored in the main text, with results in figs. 2 and 3. The main difference is that, in the alternative model, each habitat supports a single very large population, instead of several smaller local populations. Phenotype determination follows equation (1) with survival in each habitat given by equation (2) and environmental cues as in equation (3). The rate of migration between habitats is denoted m_{12} (with $m_{21} = m_{12}$) and corresponds to $m/2$ in the model in the main text. The table shows the rate of between-habitat migration m_{12} , the rate of recombination ρ between the genetic effect locus and the loci for α and β , the value ζ_1 of the allele adapted to habitat 1 at the genetic effect locus (with $\zeta_2 = -\zeta_1$), the equilibrium values of the modifier α and the slope β , the frequencies p_{11} and p_{12} in habitat 1 of the alleles ζ_1 and ζ_2 at the time of reproduction, and the reproductive values v_{11} and v_{12} of small-effect mutant modifiers, with linkage ρ to the genetic effect locus. The value v_{11} applies when the mutant modifier is linked to the locally adapted allele ζ_1 and v_{12} when linked to the alternative allele ζ_2 . The final column gives the ratio of the reproductive values, which indicates how strongly modifications that improve performance in habitat 1 are favored. Note that the situation is symmetric, with $p_{21} = p_{12}$, $p_{22} = p_{11}$, $v_{21} = v_{12}$ and $v_{22} = v_{11}$. Other parameter values: $s_0 = 0.1$, $\sigma = 1.0$, $\theta_1 = -0.75$, $\theta_2 = 0.75$, $\sigma_{juv} = 0.5$.

m_{12}	ρ	ζ_1	α	β	p_{11}	p_{12}	v_{11}	v_{12}	v_{11}/v_{12}
0.005	0.001	-0.377	0.978	0.016	0.991	0.009	1.009	0.022	46.461
0.005	0.10	-0.377	0.973	0.020	0.991	0.009	1.007	0.281	3.588
0.005	0.50	-0.377	0.966	0.026	0.991	0.009	1.003	0.655	1.531
0.01	0.001	-0.380	0.955	0.032	0.981	0.019	1.018	0.041	24.822
0.01	0.10	-0.380	0.945	0.041	0.981	0.019	1.014	0.301	3.362
0.01	0.50	-0.380	0.930	0.054	0.981	0.019	1.006	0.673	1.495
0.03	0.001	-0.388	0.856	0.112	0.937	0.063	1.058	0.132	8.008
0.03	0.10	-0.388	0.817	0.145	0.933	0.067	1.043	0.402	2.596
0.03	0.50	-0.388	0.759	0.195	0.926	0.074	1.019	0.757	1.347
0.05	0.001	-0.395	0.735	0.216	0.880	0.120	1.101	0.255	4.316
0.05	0.10	-0.395	0.642	0.297	0.860	0.140	1.074	0.547	1.961
0.05	0.50	-0.395	0.448	0.459	0.800	0.200	1.028	0.888	1.157
0.055	0.001	-0.396	0.699	0.247	0.863	0.137	1.112	0.293	3.792
0.055	0.10	-0.396	0.579	0.351	0.833	0.167	1.081	0.600	1.802
0.055	0.50	-0.396	0.000	0.677	0.500	0.500	1.000	1.000	1.000




Figure A1: Numerical analysis of the alternative model. The panels show the modifier α (solid lines) and slope β (dashed lines) for different values of the parameters $m_{12} = m_{21}$ (orange and green lines), σ_{juv} , and s_0 , as a function of the recombination rate ρ between the genetic effect locus and the loci for α and β . Other parameter values: $\sigma = 1.0$, $\theta_1 = -0.75$, $\theta_2 = 0.75$.

If would be helpful if
the dynamics of P_{11}, P_{12} were
shown here,




Figure A2: An island of divergence where many small effects at linked loci build up a bigger effect. The value of the between-habitat F_{ST} is shown for each of 100 loci. Around 15 loci, with higher than background F_{ST} , are part of the island of divergence. Survival selection between habitats is given by equation (2) and the phenotype is determined as in equation (1) with $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 0$, so there is pure genetic phenotype determination. In the model for a single trait described in the main text, the genetic effect z was determined by one diploid locus, but here we extend the case where z is additively determined by many (100) loci. The additive allelic effects at each locus can vary in the interval from -0.04 to 0.04 and recombination rates between these loci are $\rho_{zz} = 0.002$. The migration rate is $m = 0.06$. Other parameter values: $N_p = 200$, $K = 100$, $s_0 = 0.1$, $\sigma = 1.0$, $\theta_1 = -0.75$, $\theta_2 = 0.75$. The parameter values are similar to those in fig. 2.

in the
this
Very light
linkage →
up to
higher F_{ST}
values!

rel. to max. ↘
 F_{ST}




Figure A3: An island of divergence where many small effects at linked loci build up bigger effects for a two-trait syndrome, involving the traits u_1 and u_2 . The value of the between-habitat F_{ST} is shown for each of 100 loci. Every second of these loci code for u_1 and every second for u_2 . Around 30 loci, with higher than background F_{ST} , are part of the island of divergence. Survival selection between habitats is given by equation (5) and the phenotype is determined as in equation (4) with $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 1$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 0$, so there is pure genetic phenotype determination. The additive allelic effects at each locus can vary in the interval from -0.04 to 0.04 and recombination rates between loci are $\rho_{zz} = 0.002$. The migration rate is $m = 0.12$. The parameter values are similar to those in fig. 5.