1 # Genetic population structure constrains local adaptation and
2 # probability of parallel evolution in sticklebacks
3

Petri Kemppainen[1,*,] Zitong Li[1,2], Pasi Rastas[1,3], Ari Löytynoja[3], Bohao Fang[1], Baocheng

Guo[1,5], Takahito Shikano[1], Jing Yang[1,3], Juha Merilä[1]

[1]Ecological Genetics Research Unit, Organismal and Evolutionary Biology Research

Programme, Faculty of Biological and Environmental Sciences, FI-00014 University of

Helsinki, Finland

[2]CSIRO Agriculture & Food, GPO Box 1600, Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia;

[3]Institute of Biotechnology, FI-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland

[4]The Key Laboratory of Zoological Systematics and Evolution, Institute of Zoology,

Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

[5]Chinese Sturgeon Research Institute, Three Gorges Corporation, Yichang, 443100,

China

*Corresponding author: juha.merila@helsinki.fi

**Abstract**

Repeated and independent adaptation to specific environmental conditions from a shared

ancestral pool of standing genetic variation (parallel evolution) is common. However, if

standing genetic variation is limited, local adaptation may be restricted to different and

potentially less optimal solutions (convergent evolution), or prevented from happening

altogether. Using a quantitative trait locus (QTL) mapping approach, we identified

genomic regions responsible for the repeated pelvic reduction (PR) in three crosses

between nine-spined stickleback (NSS) populations expressing full and reduced pelvic

structures (PS). In one cross, PR mapped to linkage group 7 (LG7) containing the gene

*Pitx1* known to cause PR. In the other two crosses, PR was polygenic and attributed to

ten novel QTL, of which 90% were unique to specific crosses. Next we screened the

genomes of individuals from 27 different NSS populations for deletions in the *Pitx1*

regulatory element (*Pel*), which is known to be associated with repeated PR in three-

spined sticklebacks (TSS). This revealed deletions only in the population where PR

mapped to LG7. Using individual-based forward simulations parametrised with empirical

data on NSS and TSS population structures, we show that access to the same ancestral

variation promotes parallel evolution (as seen in TSS), whereas lack thereof restricts local

adaptation and instead promotes emergence of convergent genetic architectures (as seen

in NSS). Hence, the results predict that with an increasing degree of population

subdivision, parallel phenotypic evolution becomes increasingly non-parallel at the

genetic level and restricts local adaptation to less optimal solutions.

40
41    **Keywords:** convergent evolution, epistasis, local adaptation, pelvic reduction, Pitx1,

**Introduction**

Failure to evolve in response to changing environmental conditions may lead to extirpation or even extinction (Orr and Unckless 2008). If the heritable variation necessary for adapting to environmental change already exists in the form of standing genetic variation, genetic adaptation may proceed swiftly, at least compared to the time it would take for populations to adapt from novel mutations (Orr and Unckless 2008; Barret and Schluter 2008; Thompson *et al*. 2019). Therefore, when exposed to novel yet similar environments, populations derived from the same ancestral population – hence carrying the same pool of alleles – can often be expected to respond to similar selection pressures in a similar fashion. The resulting evolution of parallel genetic adaptations is known as parallel evolution (Arendt and Reznick 2007; Schluter and Conte 2009; Elmer and Meyer 2011; Stern 2013; Conte *et al*. 2015; Bolnick *et al*. 2018; Barghi *et al*. 2019; Hermisson and Pennings 2017). However, in genetically highly structured species, potentially advantageous rare alleles may be lost due to founder events and random genetic drift, preventing adaptation. Alternatively, adaptation to given selection pressures might be more easily gained by allelic substitutions in alternate loci (convergent evolution) influencing the same polygenic trait, even if they may significantly differ in their fitness effects (Cohan 1984; Merilä 2013, 2014; Rosenblum *et al*. 2014). Thus, the demographic history of populations may play a central role in determining the likelihood of parallel evolution.

The three-spined stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*) is a widely used model system to study adaptive evolution in the wild (Bell and Foster 1994; Gibson 2005). Its

ability to rapidly adapt to local environmental conditions has often been shown to stem

from a global pool of ancestral standing genetic variation (Schluter and Conte 2009;

Jones *et al*. 2012; Terekhanova *et al*. 2014, 2019). The nine-spined stickleback (*Pungitius*

*pungitius*) has been emerging as another model system for the study of repeated evolution

in the wild (Merilä 2013). In general, it differs from the three-spined stickleback by

having smaller effective population sizes ($N_e$), reduced gene flow in the sea, and a

tendency to occur in small landlocked ponds in complete isolation from other populations

(Shikano *et al*. 2010; DeFaveri *et al*. 2012; Merilä 2013). Given their contrasting

population demographic characteristics, three- and nine-spined sticklebacks can thus be

expected to occupy different parts of a parallelism-convergence continuum with respect

to local adaptation.

Regressive evolution of the pelvic complex has occurred in three (*viz*.,

*Gasterosteus*, *Pungitius*, and *Culaea*) of the five recognised stickleback genera since the

last glacial period (reviewed in Klepaker *et al*. 2013). While marine populations of three-

and nine-spined sticklebacks usually have complete pelvic structures with fully

developed pelvic girdles and lateral pelvic spines, partial or even complete pelvic

reduction is common in freshwater populations (Blouw and Boyd 1992; Shapiro *et al*.

2004, 2006; Herczeg *et al*. 2010; Klepaker *et al*. 2013). Several factors may contribute to

this, including the absence of gape-limited predatory fish and limited calcium availability,

as well as the presence of certain insect predators (Reist *et al*. 1980; Reimchen *et al*.

1983; Giles 1983; Bell *et al*. 1993; Karhunen *et al*. 2013; Chan *et al*. 2010). Collectively,

sticklebacks provide an important model system to study genetic mechanisms underlying

the adaptive parallel pelvic reduction at both intra- and inter-specific levels, under a wide

range of population demographic settings. However, studies of parallel patterns of

marine-freshwater divergence in nine-spined sticklebacks are still scarce (Herczeg *et al*.

2010; Wang *et al*. 2020), especially at the genetic level, precluding any comprehensive

and conclusive comparison of the two species.

The genetic basis of pelvic reduction in the three-spined stickleback is well

understood. Quantitative trait locus (QTL) mapping studies have identified a single

chromosomal region containing the gene *Pituitary homeobox transcription factor 1*

(*Pitx1*) that explains more than two thirds of the variance in pelvic size in crosses

between individuals with complete pelvic girdles and spines, and pelvic-reduced

individuals (Cresko *et al*. 2004; Shapiro *et al*. 2004; Coyle *et al*. 2007). Pelvic loss in the

marine-freshwater three-spined stickleback model system is predominantly caused by

expression changes of the *Pitx1* gene due to recurrent deletions of the pelvic enhancer

(*Pel*) upstream of *Pitx1* (Chan *et al*. 2010; Xie *et al.* 2019). However, in benthic-limnetic

and lake-stream pairs of three-spined sticklebacks, the genetic architecture of pelvic

reduction appears to be more diversified (Peichel *et al.* 2001, 2017; Deagle *et al*. 2012;

Stuart *et al.* 2017). In the three independent nine-spined stickleback QTL studies

available to date, *Pitx1* in linkage group (LG) 7 was also identified as a major cause for

the reduction in pelvic structures in one Canadian (Shapiro *et al.* 2006) and one Finnish

(Shikano *et al.* 2013) population. Another large effect region in LG4 was found to be

associated with pelvic reduction in an Alaskan population (Shapiro *et al.* 2009). Similar

to the three-spined stickleback, pelvic spine and pelvic girdle sizes are strongly correlated

in the population from the Finnish pond Rytilampi, since *Pitx1* controls both phenotypes

(Shikano *et al.* 2013; Fig. 1 and Supplementary Table 1). In contrast, a considerable

amount of phenotypic variation with respect to these traits and their inter-correlations

exists among different freshwater pond populations in northern Europe (Herczeg *et al.*

2010; Karhunen *et al.* 2013, 2014; Fig. 1). Given their high heritability (Blouw and Boyd

1992; Leinonen *et al.* 2011), the lack of correlation between spine and girdle lengths

suggests that they can be independently controlled by different QTL. Thus, the genetic

underpinnings of pelvic reduction in nine-spined sticklebacks could be more diversified

than those in the marine-freshwater three-spined stickleback model system (Merilä 2013,

2014).

To investigate the possible genetic heterogeneity underlying pelvic reduction in

different nine-spined stickleback populations, we analysed data from three $F_2$ generation

inter-population crosses (279–308 progeny per cross) between pond and marine

individuals to identify QTL responsible for pelvic reduction in different ponds. One of

these populations was the previously studied Rytilampi cross (earlier analysed only with

microsatellites, Shikano *et al.* 2013), now re-analysed along with two new populations

(Bynästjärnen and Pyöreälampi) using > 75 000 SNPs. This data was subjected to a

cutting-edge mapping approach (Li Z. *et al.* 2017, 2018) that can provide more

information on the source of the QTL effects than has been previously possible. In

addition, to assess the extent to which *Pel* is responsible for pelvic reduction in the nine-

spined stickleback, we screened the whole genomes of individuals from 27 wild

populations for deletions in the genomic region spanning the *Pel* element and the *Pitx1*

gene. Finally, we used empirical data to estimate realistic levels of population structuring

and genetic isolation by distance (IBD) in marine populations of three- and nine-spined

sticklebacks, and then used individual-based forward simulations to test how these factors

affect the prevalence of genetic parallelism when local adaptation proceeds from standing

genetic variation.

**Materials and Methods**

*Fish collection, crossing, and rearing*

For the QTL crosses, three different marine $F_0$ generation females from the Baltic Sea

(Helsinki, Finland; 60°13′N, 25°11′E) were crossed with a freshwater $F_0$ generation male

from either Bynästjärnen (64°27′N, 19°26′E), Pyöreälampi (66°15′N, 29°26′E) or

Rytilampi (66°23′N, 29°19′E) ponds. Fish crossing, rearing, and sampling followed the

experimental protocol used in the earlier study of the Rytilampi population (Shikano *et*

*al.* 2013; Laine *et al.* 2013). For Rytilampi, the $F_0$ generation fish were artificially mated

in the lab during the early breeding season of 2006 (Shikano *et al.* 2013), and the

resulting full-sib $F_1$-offspring were group-reared in aquaria until mature, as explained in

Shikano *et al.* (2013). Two randomly chosen $F_1$ individuals were mated repeatedly (seven

different clutches) to produce the $F_2$ generation between September and October 2008.

The offspring were reared in separate aquaria. The same procedure was followed for

Pyöreälampi ($F_0$ mating: Jun 2011; $F_1$ mating: Jul–Sep 2012; $F_2$ rearing: Jul 2012–Apr

2013; 8 different clutches) and Bynästjärnen ($F_0$ mating: Jun 2011; $F_1$ mating: Nov 2013–

Jan 2014, $F_2$ rearing: Nov 2013–Aug 2014; 6 different clutches). The $F_2$ fish were

euthanized at 187, 238 and 238 days post-hatch for Rytilampi, Pyöreälampi and

Bynästjärnen, respectively. At this point, the fish were on average 52.3 mm in standard

length (Rytilampi = 48.6 mm; Pyöreälampi = 52.3 mm; Bynästjärnen = 53.6 mm), and

weighed on average 1.34 g (wet weight; Rytilampi = 1.07 g; Pyöreälampi = 1.49 g;

Bynästjärnen = 1.44 g). In total, 308, 283 and 279 $F_2$ offspring were available for

analyses from Helsinki × Bynästjärnen (HEL × BYN), Helsinki × Pyöreälampi (HEL ×

PYÖ) and Helsinki × Rytilampi (HEL × RYT) crosses, respectively.

The experiments were conducted under licenses from the Finnish National

Animal Experiment Board (#STH379A and #STH223A). Experimental protocols were

approved by the ethics committee of the University of Helsinki, and all experiments were

performed in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations.

*Morphological data*

To visualise bony elements, all of the $F_2$-progeny were stained with Alizarin Red S

following Pritchard and Schluter (2001). Pelvic spine and girdle lengths from both sides

of the body, as well as standard body length, were measured with digital calipers to the

nearest 0.01 mm. Although it is known that the left-right asymmetry of the pelvic girdle

is heritable in sticklebacks (Blouw and Boyd 1992; Bell *et al.* 2007; Coyle *et al.* 2007),

we did not specifically study this. To reduce the number of tests, the mean of the left and

the right side measurements was used (analyses conducted for the two sides separately

always yielded qualitatively similar results as the tests conducted with the averages;

results not shown). All measurements were made by the same person twice; the

repeatability (R; Becker 1984) ranged between 0.80 and 0.84 for girdle lengths, and

between 0.98 and 0.99 for spine lengths. The QTL analyses were performed on both

absolute and relative (scaled to the total body length) trait values, but for all of the

analyses that compared phenotypic data between populations (which also differ in body

sizes), only relative trait values were used. Previously published phenotypic data from 19

wild populations were obtained from Herczeg *et al*. (2010) and Karhunen *et al.* (2013).

These included data on pelvic spine and girdle lengths of wild-collected individuals from

ten pond populations (Abbortjärn = ABB, Bolotjone = BOL, Karilampi = KAR,

Kirkasvetinen lampi = KRK, Mashinnoje = MAS, Lil-Navartjärn = NAV, Hansmytjärn =

HAN, Rytilampi = RYT, Bynästjärnen = BYN), four lake populations (Iso Porontima =

POR, Riikojärvi = RII, Joortilojärvi = JOR, Västre-Skavträsket = SKA) and five marine

populations (Fiskebäckskil = FIS, Trelleborg = TRE, Bölesviken = BÖL, Helsinki = HEL

LEV = Levin Navolak), as well data on common garden-reared $F_1$ generation individuals

from two marine (HEL & LEV) and two pond (BYN & PYÖ) populations. Visibly

broken spines were treated as missing data. A map showing the geographic location of

these populations is provided in Supplementary Fig. 1.

*Genotyping and linkage map construction*

The RAD sequencing protocol used to obtain the SNP data was the same as in Yang *et al.*

(2016) and Li Z. *et al*. (2017). In short, genomic DNA was extracted from ethanol

preserved fin clips using the phenol-chloroform method (Taggart *et al*. 1992). DNA was

fragmented with PstI restriction enzyme and the resulting 300 to 500 bp long fragments

were gel purified. Illumina sequencing adaptors and library specific barcodes were

ligated to the digested DNA fragments, and the barcoded RAD samples were pooled and

sequenced on 24 lanes of the Illumina HiSeq2000 platform with 45 bp single-end

strategy. RAD library construction and sequencing were conducted by BGI

HONGKONG CO., LIMITED. After eliminating adapters and barcodes from reads, a

quality check was done using FastQC

(http://www.bioinformatics.bbsrc.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/).

Linkage mapping for the three crosses was conducted using Lep-MAP3 (LM3;

Rastas 2017), as described in detail in Li H. *et al.* (2018). LM3 can infer the

parental/grandparental phase based on dense SNP data, which allowed us to utilise the

four-way cross QTL mapping method described below. Input data were generated by first

mapping individual fastq files to the nine-spined stickleback reference genome using

BWA mem (Li H. 2013) and SAMtools (mpileup; Li H. *et al.* 2009), followed by

pileupParser.awk and pileup2posterior.awk scripts from the LM3 pipeline using default

parameters.

The mapping was carried out following the basic LM3 pipeline and by combining

the three crosses: parental genotypes were called by taking into account genotype

information on offspring, parents and grandparents (module ParentCall2). Markers

segregating more distortedly than what would be expected by chance (1:1,000 odds) were

filtered out (module Filtering2). Loci were then partitioned into chromosomes (modules

SeparateChromosomes2 and JoinSingles2) yielding 21 linkage groups with > 75 000

markers assigned to these groups. Finally, the markers were ordered within each linkage

group with the module OrderMarkers2, removing markers that were only informative in

either the mother or father, respectively. This created two maps for each chromosome,

one having more maternal markers and the other having more paternal markers, with an

average of ⅔ of the markers shared between the two. Constructing two maps this way

removes the effect of markers that are informative only in one parent, as markers

informative in different parents are not informative when compared against each other.

The phases were converted into grandparental phase by first evaluating the final marker

orders and then matching the (parental) phased data with the grandparental data, inverting

the parental phases when necessary. Orphan markers from map-ends based on scatter

plots of physical and map positions were manually removed.

*Dimensionality reduction by linkage disequilibrium network clustering*

In QTL mapping, it is essential to correct for multiple testing in order to reduce the rate

of false positives. Moreover, in large genomic datasets, physically adjacent SNPs –

particularly those from experimental crosses – are often in linkage disequilibrium (LD),

i.e. correlated. Since a group of SNPs in high LD explains similar amounts of genetic

variation in a given trait, it is reasonable to apply a dimensional reduction procedure

before QTL-mapping to exclude the redundant information from the data. Here we used

linkage disequilibrium (LD) network clustering ("LDn-clustering") and PC regression as

dimensionality reduction tools prior to single-locus QTL mapping (Li Z. *et al.* 2018). The

first step of this approach involves an extension of a method developed by Kemppainen

*et al.* (2015), which uses LD network analysis for grouping loci connected by high LD.

The second step involves principal component analysis (PCA) as a method for

dimensionality reduction in each cluster of loci connected by high LD ("LD-clusters").

This was achieved by the function "LDnClustering" in R-package "LDna" (v.0.64; Li Z.

*et al*. 2018). The method used here differs slightly from the original method described in

Li Z. *et al.* (2018), and was implemented as follows. Initially all edges (representing LD-

values as estimated by $r^2$ using the function "snpgdsLDMat" from the R-package

"SNPRelate", Zheng *et al.* 2012) below the LD threshold value of 0.7 were removed.

This resulted in many sub-clusters in which all loci were connected by at least a single

edge. Second, for each sub-cluster, a complete linkage clustering was performed, where a

cluster is defined by its smallest link. Starting from the root, additional sub-clusters were

found recursively, where the median LD between all loci was > 0.9. This recursive step

was not used in the original implementation, but was later found to increase

computational speed and reduce the number of single locus clusters, i.e. result in more

efficient complexity reduction. To facilitate computational speed, we only considered

SNPs no further than 2000 SNPs away from each other (rather than considering all

pairwise values within a chromosome at a time; parameter w2 = 2000), but nevertheless

analysed all SNPs from each cluster at a time (rather than performing LD clustering in

windows). Thus, each resulting LD-cluster represents sets of physically adjacent and

highly correlated loci. We performed PCA regression based on each LD-cluster in which

individuals are separated according to their LD-cluster multi-locus genotypes. Since the

loci are highly correlated, most of the genetic variation (>90%) between individuals is

explained by the first principal component. For each LD-cluster, we then replaced all the

SNP genotypes by the position of the individuals along the first PC axis after removing

the sex-linked loci (Pearson's correlation coefficient >0.95 between the PC coordinates

and sex). The input data for the LDn-clustering was comprised of the original co-

dominant SNP data with individuals from all three crosses pooled. A custom R-code used

for this dimensionality reduction is available from DRYAD (xxx).

*QTL mapping: four-way crosses model*

In some circumstances, such as a four-way cross (Xu 1996), $F_1$ hybrids of two

heterozygous parents (Van Ooijen 2009), and an outbred $F_2$ design (Xu 2013a), it is

possible that up to four different alleles – A and B from the dam, and D and C from the

sire – segregate in the population. In such cases, a linear regression model for QTL

analysis of the outbred $F_2$ data (Li Z. *et al.* 2018) is defined by:

275
$$y_i = \beta_0 + x_{dij}\beta_{dj} + x_{sij}\beta_{sj} + z_{ij}\gamma_j + \varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2), (1)$$

276 where $y_i$ is the phenotype value of individual $i$ ($i=1,\ldots,n$), $x_{dij}$, $x_{sij}$, $z_{ij}$ are genotypes coded

277 as

278
$$\begin{vmatrix} +1+1+1 \\ +1-1-1 \\ -1+1-1 \\ -1-1+1 \end{vmatrix} \begin{array}{l} for\ genotype\ AC, \\ for\ AD, \\ for\ BC, \\ for\ BD. \end{array} , (2)$$

(Xu 2013b), $\beta_0$ is the parameter of the population mean, $\beta_{dj}$ is the substitution effect of

alleles A and B of the dam (i.e. the grandfather in $F_0$) at the locus $j$ ($j=1,\ldots,p; p$ is the

total number of SNPs), $\beta_{dj}$ is the substitution effect of alleles C and D of the sire (i.e. the

grandmother in $F_0$), $\gamma_j$ is the dominance effect, and $\varepsilon_i$ is the residual error term mutually

following an independent normal distribution.

The model (1) requires the knowledge of the grandparental phase (produced by

LM3) with the benefit that the source (*viz.* $F_0$ female or $F_0$ male) of the observed QTL

effect can be inferred, as described in more detail in Supplementary File 1. A multiple

correction on the basis of permutation tests was further conducted to control for false

positives due to multiplicity (Li Z. *et al.* 2017) with 10 000 replicates.

*Estimating the proportion of phenotypic variance explained by SNPs*

The overall proportion of phenotypic variance (PVE) explained jointly by all SNPs (an

approximation of the narrow sense heritability) was obtained using LASSO regression

(Tibshirani 1996), which incorporates all the SNPs into a multi-locus model:

295    
$$\frac{1}{2n}\sum_{i=l}^{n}(y_i - \beta_0 - x_{dij}\beta_{dj} - x_{sij}\beta_{sj} - z_{ij}\gamma_j) + \lambda\sum_{j=l}^{p}(|\beta_{dj}| + |\beta_{sj}| + |\gamma_j|), (3)$$

296    where the $l_1$ penalty term $\lambda\sum_{j=l}^{p}(|\beta_{dj}| + |\beta_{sj}| + |\gamma_j|)$ $(\lambda > 0)$ shrinks the regression

297    parameters towards zero; all other symbols are defined in the same way as in Equation

298    (1).

300        Following Sillanpää (2011), the PVE can be estimated by the formula:

$$PVE_{total} = \frac{var\left(\sum_{j=l}^{p} x_j \beta_j\right)}{var(y)} \approx \frac{var(y) - \sigma_0^2}{var(y)}, (4)$$

303    where $\beta_j$ is the effects of the SNPs, and $\sigma_0^2$ is the LASSO residual variance estimated by a

304    cross-validation-based estimator introduced by Reid *et al.* (2016). The PVE explained by

305    each linkage group was estimated on the basis of LASSO estimates using the following

306    formula:

$$PVE_{LG} \approx PVE_{total} - \frac{var(\sum x_j \hat{\beta}_j)}{var(y)}, (5)$$

308    where $\hat{\beta}_j (j \notin G)$ represents all the effects estimated by the LASSO of the SNPs which do

309    not belong to a set of SNPs (e.g. to a chromosome/linkage group). A similar approach

310    was used to estimate the contribution of grandparental alleles and to evaluate the

311    dominance component by treating the coding systems [$x_{dij}$, $x_{sij}$, $z_{ij}$] (2) as different groups

312    of SNPs. A custom R-code for PVE estimation is available from DRYAD (XXX).

313
*Scanning for Pel deletions in full-genome sequence data*

A minimum of 20 samples from populations RYT, MAS, BOL, BYN and PYÖ, and 10–

31 samples from an additional 22 populations (from Northern Europe and USA;

Supplementary Fig. 1 and Supplementary Table 2) were sequenced to 10× coverage by

BGI HONGKONG CO., LIMITED. Reads were mapped to the nine-spined stickleback

reference genome (Varadharajan *et al.* 2020) with BWA mem (Li H. 2013), and site-wise

sequencing coverages were computed with SAMtools (depth; Li H. *et al.* 2009). Relative

sequence depths across the *H2afy-Pitx1* intergenic region were estimated for the five

focal populations by first computing the median depths for 1000 bp sliding windows, and

then normalising these by the median depth for the full intergenic region. The Pel-

2.5kb$^{SALR}$ region was extracted from the original BAC contig (GenBank accession

number 'GU130433.1') and mapped to the nine-spined stickleback intergenic region with

minimap2 (Li H. 2018). The sequencing depths for the *Pel*-2.5kb$^{SALR}$ were normalised by

dividing the mean depths of the *Pel* region by the mean depths of the full intergenic

region. Gene annotations and relative sequencing depths (average and confidence

intervals) were computed and visualised using R-package "Gviz" (Hahne and Ivanek

2016). Lastly, we scanned the literature for genes that are known to affect pelvic and hind

limb development and searched for potential matches in the nine-spined stickleback

genome (Varadharajan *et al*. 2020) in regions where significant QTL were found. The

custom R-code for these analyses is provided in DRYAD (XXX).

*Proof of concept simulations*

To obtain empirical data to inform our simulations, we analysed a subset of 4326 SNPs

from 236 nine-spined and 98 three-spined sticklebacks from 54 Fennoscandian

populations. This data was extracted from previously available RAD-seq and full genome

sequence data as described in Supplementary File 2. The purpose of this was to provide a

ballpark estimate of IBD and degree of freshwater-freshwater genetic differentiation for

the simulations. For IBD analyses, the pairwise genetic distance between populations

were regressed against the geographic distance separating the populations. We estimated

geographic distance in the World Geodetic System 84 reference ellipsoid (i.e. point

distance when taking into account the curvature of the planet) using the function

"pointDistance" from the R-package "raster" (Hijmans and van Etten 2012). Genetic

distances were calculated as $F_{ST}/(1-F_{ST})$ (linearised $F_{ST}$), with $F_{ST}$ estimated as shown

above for all pairwise population comparisons. Slope and confidence intervals of the

regression lines were estimated by bootstrapping SNPs (1000 bootstrap replicates). As

the geographic distances between the marine populations in the simulations were on an

arbitrary scale (and uniform between all adjacent marine populations), we scaled the

geographic distance in the simulated data such that the slope for a regression line (mean

from bootstrapping) between linearised $F_{ST}$ and geographic distance for the empirical and

simulated data would be the same.

The repeated local adaptation in independently colonised freshwater stickleback

populations is widely considered to be due to selection on standing genetic variation

available in the sea, which in turn is maintained by recurrent gene flow from previously

colonised freshwater populations (the "transporter hypothesis"; Schluter and Conte

2009). We used individual-based forward simulations (QuantiNemo2; Neuenschwander

*et al.* 2018) to investigate how our estimated differences in population structure between

nine- and three-spined sticklebacks under the transporter hypothesis influence the

prevalence of parallel evolution, following post-glacial colonisation of freshwater

habitats from the sea. For both species, the sea populations were simulated by a stepping-

stone model comprised of ten sub-populations with carrying capacity, $K = 1000$ each

(under mutation-drift equilibrium $K = N_e$). All adjacent marine populations exchanged

100 (TSS) or ten (NSS) migrants per generation ($M$, symmetrical gene flow) with some

long-distance migration also allowed between every second population at a rate of ten

times less than that between adjacent populations (Supplementary Fig. 3). To allow

frequencies of freshwater adapted alleles to build up and filter to the marine populations

as standing genetic variation, a refuge freshwater population ($K = 10000$) with high

frequencies of freshwater adapted alleles was allowed to exchange migrants with the two

most central of the ten marine populations (symmetric gene flow with rate $M = 1$;

Supplementary Fig. 3). After a burn-in, two focal freshwater populations were founded

from the two marine populations situated at the opposite ends of the stepping-stone chain,

after which symmetrical gene flow was allowed between the focal freshwater populations

and their closest marine populations at rates $M = 1$ for TSS and $M = 0.2$ for NSS

(Supplementary Fig. 3). Thus, the freshwater populations were founded from different

marine populations with ancestral freshwater adapted alleles stemming from the same

refuge freshwater population situated equally far from the two focal freshwater

populations, in agreement with the transporter hypothesis. The simulations were then run

for 5000 generations to simulate post glacial colonisation of freshwater habitats (10000

years ago, assuming a generation time of two; Baker 1994; DeFaveri and Merilä 2013;

DeFaveri *et al*. 2014). The above parameters generated patterns of IBD and population

structuring similar to what was estimated from the empirical data (see Results) and are

also consistent with previous studies (DeFaveri *et al*. 2014).

Three different genetic architectures of a single trait coded by five (independent)

bi-allelic loci under stabilising selection for different optima were simulated in the marine

(optimal phenotypic value = 0) and freshwater populations (optimal phenotypic value =

20). In architecture A, one large effect additive locus with the homozygote for allele 1

("a1") yielding a genotypic value of zero (locally adapted to marine habitat) was

simulated; the same was done for the homozygote for allele 2 ("a2") yielding a genotypic

value of 20 (locally adapted for the freshwater habitat). The four remaining minor effect

additive QTL were given the allelic value of zero for a1 and allelic values [1,1,2,3] for

a2. An empirical example of this kind of architecture is the *Ectodysplasin* (*EDA*) gene in

the three-spined stickleback (Colosimo *et al*. 2005). In architecture B, the allelic values of

a2 alleles were [1,2,3,4,6] and the allelic values of the alternative alleles were zero, i.e. a

single large effect locus is lacking. In architecture C, the distribution of allelic values was

the same as in architecture A, but with a2 being recessive to a1. An empirical example of

this is the *Pitx1* locus controlling pelvic reduction in three- and nine-spined sticklebacks

(Cresko *et al*. 2004; Shapiro *et al*. 2004).

We simulated ten chromosomes of 100 centi Morgan (cM) with 100 neutral loci

(and the QTL) equally spaced across the genome (i.e. uniform recombination rate across

chromosomes, with no tight linkage between any two loci). Mutation rate ($\mu$) was set to

$10^{-8}$ for all loci, and simulations were initiated with allele frequencies for all loci set to

0.5. At the end of the simulations (generation 15000) we estimated allele frequency

differences as the fixation index, $F_{ST}$ (Weir and Cocherham 1984), with the "stamppFst"

function in the R-package "StAMPP" (Pembleton *et al*. 2013). Further details of

parameter settings and the simulation code can be found in DRYAD (XXX).

We classified loci being involved in parallel evolution if the $F_{ST}$ between the focal

freshwater populations (pooled) and all marine populations (pooled) was higher than 0.5

(marine-freshwater $F_{ST}$) and lower than 0.5 between the two focal freshwater populations

(freshwater-freshwater $F_{ST}$). Any loci with both high marine-freshwater $F_{ST}$ and

freshwater-freshwater $F_{ST}$ (above 0.5) were classified as being locally adapted, but not

involved in parallel evolution.

**Results**

*Heterogeneity of pelvic reduction in the wild*

Re-analysis of previously published phenotypic data from the wild confirmed a high

degree of variation among different populations with respect to pelvic spine and girdle

lengths and their inter-correlations (Fig. 1, Supplementary Table 1 and Supplementary

Fig. 2). For instance, while spines were absent and pelvic girdles strongly reduced (but

not completely absent) in RYT, spines and girdles were completely lacking in the MAS

population (Fig. 1 and Supplementary Table 1). Furthermore, in the BYN population

spines were absent but pelvic girdles were only partially reduced, whereas in BOL (a

population adjacent to MAS), large variation in both spine (SD = 0.037) and girdle (SD =

0.047) lengths was observed, although these two traits were strongly correlated ($r^2 = 0.61$,

Fig. 1, Supplementary Table 1 and Supplementary Fig. 2). This suggests that a large

effect locus affecting both pelvic spines and girdles segregated in this population at the

time of sampling. In six pond populations (*viz*. ABB, KAR, KRK, NAV, HAN, and PYÖ;

Fig. 1), relative spine (mean = 0.079) and girdle (mean = 0.15) lengths were only slightly

smaller relative to the marine populations (0.11 and 0.16 for spine and girdle lengths,

respectively; Supplementary Table 1). Lack of pelvic reduction (relative to marine

populations) was observed only in one pond population (KAR; Fig. 1, Supplementary

Table 1 and Supplementary Fig. 2).

*QTL mapping of pelvic reduction in Helsinki × Rytilampi cross*

After LD-network based complexity reduction, all QTL mapping analyses were

performed on 241 PCs (six sex-linked PCs were removed). Re-analyses of the 279 $F_2$

progeny from the HEL × RYT cross confirmed a single QTL region on LG7 for both

pelvic spine and girdle lengths in the single-locus analyses (Fig. 2a, b and Table 1). In the

multi-locus analyses (absolute trait values), LG7 explained 74–86% of the PVE for both

spine and girdle lengths, while all other chromosomes individually explained less than

3% of the phenotypic variance (Table 2). An approximately equal amount of the

phenotypic variance was explained by alleles inherited from the $F_0$ male (pond

individual) and the $F_0$ female (marine individual; ~30% of the total variance for all traits;

Table 1), respectively, with 15–21% of the phenotypic variance also explained by

dominance effects. This is the expected outcome for a recessive QTL when the $F_0$

individuals are fixed for different large effect causal alleles, and when no additional

smaller effect loci affect the trait (Klug and Cummings 2018).

*QTL mapping of pelvic reduction in Helsinki × Bynästjärnen cross*

Among the 308 $F_2$ progeny of the HEL × BYN cross, single-locus mapping analyses on

pelvic spine lengths detected two significant QTL on LG15 (PVE = 8.9%) and LG16

(PVE = 13.7%; Fig. 2c and Table 1) for alleles deriving from the $F_0$ male (pond

individual). Thus, the causal alleles for these QTL segregated in the $F_0$ pond male (as

explained in Supplementary File 1). No dominance effects were detected for these QTL,

suggesting that the allelic effects were additive. One QTL on LG6 with an allelic effect

deriving only from the $F_0$ female was also detected (Fig. 2c and Table 1). The QTL

significance profiles, in particular for LG15 and LG16, spanned large genomic regions

with no obvious peaks (in contrast to LG7 in the HEL × RYT cross; Fig. 2). This

remained true when analysing all SNPs individually (fine mapping; Supplementary Fig.

4). The individual and multi-locus phenotypic effects on spine lengths for the QTL on

LGs 6, 15 and 16 (using the most significant QTL for each QTL region) are detailed in

Figure 3. In the absence of any large effect loci, and when all QTL are additive and

independent (as is the case here), phenotypes in the $F_2$ generation are expected to be

normally distributed (Klug and Cummings 2018). For some multi-locus genotypes (of the

QTL on LGs 6, 15 and 16), the distribution of spine lengths were approximately normally

distributed, except with long tails of highly reduced spine lengths, implicating that some

of these loci could be involved in epistatic interactions (this was investigated further in

Supplementary File 3). One significant male QTL on LG4 for girdle length was also

detected (Fig. 2d and Table 1). Results for relative trait values were highly similar to the

absolute trait values, except for an additional significant male and female QTL on LG1,

as well as another significant female QTL on LG16 (Supplementary Fig. 5, Table 1 and

Supplementary Table 3).

Multi-locus analyses (for absolute trait values) identified 11 LGs that accounted

for at least 3% of the phenotypic variance in pelvic spine or girdle lengths in the HEL ×

BYN cross (Table 2). The largest of these effects were found on LG15 and LG16, which

explained 9% and 12% of variation in pelvic spine lengths, respectively (Table 2). For

pelvic spine and girdle lengths, 39% and 32% of the PVE, respectively, were accounted

for by all SNPs in the dataset, which equates to the narrow sense heritability ($h^2$) also

accounting for dominance (but not epistatic interaction) effects. For spine lengths, 24% of

the total PVE was attributed to alleles deriving from the $F_0$ male and 17% was attributed

to alleles deriving from the $F_0$ female; only 1% was attributed to the dominance effect

(Table 2). For girdle lengths, the corresponding numbers were 16%, 6% and 13% (Table

2).

*QTL mapping of pelvic reduction in Helsinki × Pyöreälampi cross*

In the HEL × PYÖ cross (283 $F_2$ individuals), one QTL for spine length was found on

LG9, which was explained by alleles inherited from the $F_0$ male. Two significant QTL for

girdle length were found, one on LG19 (explained by alleles inherited from the $F_0$ male)

and the other on LG4 (explained by alleles inherited from the $F_0$ female; Fig. 2e, f, and

Table 1). In multi-locus analyses, the PVE for different LGs mirrored these results; the

LGs that contain significant QTL explain most of the PVE, while PVE for all other LGs

were <4 % (Table 2). In multi-locus analyses, PVE for pelvic traits was lower than in the

HEL × BYN cross; 14% and 16% for spine length and girdle length, respectively, with

<2% PVE due to dominance effects (Table 2). When analysing relative trait values, one

additional female QTL peak was found for both girdle and spine lengths on LG1

(Supplementary Fig. 5, Table 1 and Supplementary Table 3). Due to the large size of the

identified QTL regions, it is not possible to know whether this QTL and that on LG1

detected in the HEL × BYN cross are due to the same or different underlying causal

mutations (we consider this as a single QTL region).

*Trait correlations in the QTL crosses*

There was a strong correlation between relative pelvic spine and girdle lengths ($r^2 = 0.85$,

Fig. 1, Supplementary Fig. 2 and Supplementary Table 1) in the HEL × RYT cross as

expected, since pelvic reduction in this cross is controlled by a single large effect QTL

affecting both traits. However, in the HEL × BYN cross, correlation between relative

pelvic spine and girdle lengths was much weaker ($r^2 = 0.11$, Fig. 1, Supplementary Fig. 2

and Supplementary Table 1). This finding is consistent with pelvic spine and girdle

reductions being independently controlled by different QTL. Furthermore, of the 306 $F_2$

individuals, only four displayed complete lack of spines, despite the fact that the BYN

population is fixed for complete spine reduction in the wild (and the spine was absent in

the $F_0$ male). This is consistent with spine length being controlled by multiple additive

loci in the HEL × BYN cross. Among the $F_2$ individuals from the HEL × BYN cross,

relative girdle lengths were normally distributed with much smaller variances (SD =

0.012) compared to the HEL × RYT (SD = 0.041) with only two individuals with reduced

girdles (Fig. 1, Supplementary Fig. 2 and Supplementary Table 1). This is consistent with

the lower heritability of pelvic girdle lengths in the HEL × BYN than in the HEL × RYT

cross, with contributions from many small effect loci. In the HEL × PYÖ cross,

phenotypic variation was comparable to that in the HEL × BYN cross (SD = 0.012),

although the mean relative spine length was slightly smaller (0.078 *vs* 0.091;

Supplementary Table 1) and the mean for relative girdle length was slightly larger (0.175

*vs* 0.169; Supplementary Fig. 2; Supplementary Table 1).

*Scanning for Pel deletions in the full-genome sequence data*

In the full-genome re-sequencing data of wild collected individuals, a large deletion

upstream of *Pitx1* was fixed for all 21 individuals from Rytilampi, where pelvic reduction

maps to this region (Fig. 4). The deletion is around 3.5 kb in size and fully encompasses

the Pel-2.5kb$^{SALR}$ region of the three-spined stickleback (Chan *et al*. 2010). No

comparable deletion was found in any other individuals in the dataset (Fig. 4b). This

included the two White Sea populations where either complete reduction of both the

pelvic spines and girdles was observed (MAS), or a putative large effect locus affecting

both spine and girdle length was found to be segregating (BOL; Fig. 1; Supplementary

Fig. 2 and Supplementary Table 1).

*Candidate genes*

Seven candidate genes or regulatory elements for pelvic reduction from the literature

(Supplementary Table 4) were found in LGs with significant QTL (Fig. 2). *Hif1a* (Mudie

*et al*. 2014), *Pel* (Chan *et al*. 2010) and *Pou1f1* (Kelberman *et al*. 2009) are known to

regulate the expression of *Pitx1,* whereas four genes (*Fgf8*, *Wnt8c*, *Wnt8b* and *Hoxd9*) are

involved in the pelvic fin/hind limb development downstream of *Pitx1* (Don *et al.* 2012,

Tanaka *et al*. 2005). However, aside from *Pel* (LG7) only three of these, *Wnt8c* (LG6),

*Hif1a* (LG15) and *Pouf1f1* (LG16) were clearly within the significant QTL regions (Fig.

2). One candidate locus, *Hif1a*, is also on LG1 where significant QTL peaks were found

when analysing relative (but not absolute) trait values (Table 1 and Supplementary Fig.

5).

*Proof of concept simulations*

There were no trends in QTL allele frequencies in the simulated populations prior to local

adaptation, showing that the 10000 generation burn-in was adequate (Supplementary Fig.

6). In the empirical data from the marine populations, the slope of the regression line

between linearised $F_{ST}$ and geographic distance (point distance in km) was $2.13^{-7}$ (95% of

the bootstrap replicates between $2.05^{-7}$ and $2.2^{-7}$) and $1.53^{-8}$ (95% of the bootstrap

replicates between $1.10^{-8}$ and $1.96^{-8}$) for nine- and three-spined sticklebacks, respectively.

Thus, the slope of the IBD regression line in this dataset was 13.9 times higher for nine-

spined sticklebacks compared to three-spined sticklebacks (Fig. 5a). When scaling the

geographic distance in the simulated data to the empirical data, the distance between the

two simulated marine populations furthest away from each other (i.e. the populations

from which the focal freshwater populations were founded) equalled 264 km and 352 km

for three- and nine-spined sticklebacks, respectively (Fig. 5a). Thus, with comparable

levels of IBD as in the empirical data, our simulations mimic the levels of parallel

evolution that can be expected in three- and nine-spined sticklebacks at relatively short

geographic scales (<400km). The difference in IBD between the two species is also close

to that in the empirical data (264/352 = 0.75). In the empirical data, genetic

differentiation between freshwater habitats for populations <400 km from each other

(mean $F_{ST}$ = 0.19 and 0.49 for three- and nine-spined sticklebacks, respectively) was also

on par with the simulations (mean [across simulation replicates] $F_{ST}$ = 0.21 and 0.58 for

three- and nine-spined sticklebacks, respectively). Notably, $F_{ST}$ was >0.8 (linearised

$F_{ST}$>4) between Pyöreälampi (no pelvic reduction) and Rytilampi (pelvic reduction

controlled by *Pitx1/Pel*), although these ponds are situated only 15 km from each other

(Fig. 5a; max and median $F_{ST}$ = 0.96 and 0.62, respectively, for all pairwise freshwater-

freshwater comparisons). This is higher than the $F_{ST}$ between any pair of three-spined

stickleback populations in the data (max = 0.78 and median = 0.26 for all pairwise

freshwater-freshwater comparisons). Note that the benchmark empirical data stem from

Northern European populations and may thus not accurately represent interspecific

differences in population demographic parameters elsewhere.

*Do population demographic parameters influence local adaptation?*

In the simulations, the relationship between marine-freshwater $F_{ST}$ and freshwater-

freshwater $F_{ST}$ depended on both the species and genetic architecture (Fig. 5b). For

instance, when the genetic architecture included one additive large effect locus

(architecture A), this locus was often involved in parallel evolution in three-spined

sticklebacks (65% of replicates), but not in nine-spined sticklebacks (3% of the

replicates). In 20% of the replicates for both species, the freshwater allele for this locus

was fixed in only one of the focal freshwater populations (i.e. local adaptation, but not

parallel evolution). When the trait under selection was controlled by several medium

effect loci (architecture B), parallel evolution was more common in both stickleback

species, particularly for the locus with the largest allelic value (20% and 80% for nine-

and three-spined sticklebacks, respectively; Fig. 5b, c). Local adaptation also occurred in

57% of the replicates in nine-spined sticklebacks, and in 18% in the three-spined

sticklebacks; Fig. 5b, c). For the locus with the second highest allelic value, the cases of

both parallel evolution and local adaptation collectively dropped to 38% and 43% for

three- and nine-spined sticklebacks, respectively. With one non-additive large effect

locus with recessive alleles locally adapted to freshwater (architecture C), this locus was

less likely to be involved in parallel evolution in the three-spined sticklebacks (48%),

compared to architecture A. However, results for the nine-spined sticklebacks were

similar to architecture A (6% parallel evolution; Fig. 5b and c). Thus, parallel evolution is

an expected outcome in three- but not nine-spined sticklebacks, at relatively short (<400

km) geographical distances, particularly when a single additive large effect locus is

responsible for freshwater adaptation.

*Does local adaptation depend on ancestral allele frequency?*

In the simulations, the frequency of a2 allele (locally adapted to freshwater) in each

freshwater population after 2000 generations post-colonisation from the sea was always

correlated with the a2 allele frequency in the founding marine population, demonstrating

that local adaptation depended on ancestral genetic variation (Supplementary Fig. 7). This

dependency was the strongest for small effect loci (phenotypic effect of a2 = 1). In these

cases, the linear regression slope ($\beta$) ranged between 1 and 1.4, the y-intercept ranged

between 0 and 0.09, and Pearson's squared correlation coefficient ($r^2$) ranged between

0.33 and 0.52, and was lowest in three-spined sticklebacks for genetic architecture A (y-

intercept = 0.51; $\beta$ = 4.2; $r^2$ = 0.07; Supplementary Fig. 7). In the latter case, standing

genetic variation (defined as a2 frequency > 0) was available in 89% of the simulation

replicates (considering each freshwater population independently), of which 76% resulted

in local adaptation (defined as a2 frequency > 0.5) in at least one of the freshwater

populations. The corresponding numbers for nine-spined sticklebacks were 41% and

39%, respectively. Here the correlation between ancestral a2 frequency and a2 frequency

post colonisation was also stronger than for three-spined sticklebacks (y-intercept = 0.04;

$\beta$ = 10.8; $r^2$ = 0.33), indicating a stronger dependence between ancestral variation and

local adaptation. When standing genetic variation was available for local adaptation, three

factors likely contributed to lower levels of local adaptation and parallel evolution in

nine-spined sticklebacks: *i*) the smaller *K* in nine-spined stickleback freshwater

populations (500 vs. 1000), which is expected to result in faster genetic drift; *ii*) lower

(1/5th ) post-colonisation gene-flow between adjacent marine and freshwater populations;

and *iii*) lower a2 frequency (when present as standing genetic variation) in nine-

compared to three-spined sticklebacks (2.9% vs. 3.4%). Thus, IBD in the sea likely limits

the probability that a freshwater adapted allele is maintained as standing genetic

variation, while smaller effective population sizes and reduced gene flow can further limit

local adaptation, even when ancestral variation in the founding population is present (in

low frequencies). The generally higher $\beta$'s (3.20 vs. 2.15) and y-intercepts (0.11 vs. 0.05)

for QTL with a2<6 for nine-spined sticklebacks indicate that smaller effect QTL mostly

have a stronger influence on local adaptation in nine- compared to three-spined

sticklebacks (Supplementary Fig. 7), resulting in polygenic and/or incomplete local

adaptation (Supplementary Fig. 6 and Supplementary Fig. 8).

**Discussion**

This study demonstrates that the genetic basis of pelvic reduction in nine-spined

sticklebacks is more variable than in three-spined sticklebacks. This is consistent with the

empirical evidence that IBD in the sea is stronger, and that freshwater populations are

more isolated in nine- than three-spined sticklebacks. According to our simulations, such

scenario would limit the pool of ancestral variation available for freshwater adaptation in

nine-spined sticklebacks compared to three-spined sticklebacks. Thus, the level of

ancestral variation available for local adaptation (and also for parallel evolution) is likely

a function of population demographic parameters, with local adaptation being less likely

in poorly connected species, as suggested by Merilä (2013, 2014). However, other non-

mutually exclusive factors, such as the genetic architecture (i.e. dominance effects,

heritability, mutation rates and numbers of causal loci involved), as well as non-

parallelism in phenotypic selection optima are also likely to play roles. In the following,

we discuss the possible causes of the discrepancy in pelvic structure development

between nine- and three-spined sticklebacks, as well as their implications to our

understanding of adaptive evolution in the wild.

*Can the genetic architecture of pelvic reduction be explained by population demographic*

*history?*

Together with earlier QTL studies (Shapiro *et al.* 2006, 2009; Shikano *et al.* 2013), we

show that multiple genomic regions (11 QTL, of which ten are novel to this study) are

associated with pelvic reduction in nine-spined sticklebacks across their distribution

range. Only one small effect QTL region (LG1; Table 1 and Supplementary Fig. 5) was

shared between any two crosses (HEL × BYN and HEL × PYÖ), but even here it is not

certain that the underlying causal mutations are the same. Support for genetic parallelism

among marine-freshwater pairs of three-spined stickleback populations is strong

(Colosimo *et al.* 2005; Jones *et al.* 2012; Terekhanova *et al.* 2014, 2019; Nelson and

Cresko 2018). Although the high frequency of *Pel* deletions (disrupting pelvic armour

development) means that most of the deletions associated with pelvic reduction in three-

spined sticklebacks are independently derived (Xie *et al.* 2019), *Pitx1*/*Pel* is

predominantly responsible for pelvic reduction in three-spined sticklebacks (Chan *et al.*

2010; Xie *et al.* 2019). On the other hand, almost all of the studied nine-spined

stickleback populations to date display different QTL regions responsible for pelvic

reduction (of varying QTL effect sizes and dominance relationships). One explanation for

this could be that the independently derived *Pel* deletions (among other possible solutions

for pelvic reduction) are usually the most favoured by selection, and when they are

accessible as standing genetic variation, they quickly spread and become fixed in newly

colonised freshwater populations. However, with a more limited pool of ancestral

variation, freshwater adaptation in nine-spined sticklebacks could be restricted to less

optimal solutions. This is consistent with our results that showed only marginal, partial or

no pelvic reduction in seven out of the ten pond populations, and exemplified by the HEL

× PYÖ and HEL × BYN crosses where pelvic reduction was polygenic and much less

heritable than in the HEL × RYT cross. This hypothesis predicts that if the pelvic

reducing *Pel*-deletion from Rytilampi (or any other allele with comparable fitness effects)

would invade pond populations that currently do not display complete pelvic reduction,

this mutation would quickly spread and become fixed. Such rapid spread of freshwater

adapted *EDA* alleles has been well documented in the three-spined stickleback (Schluter

*et al*. 2010; Bell *et al*. 2004).

Using simulations with population demographic parameters similar to those

estimated from empirical data, we demonstrated that parallel evolution is more likely to

occur in three- than in nine-spined sticklebacks – that is, when independently founded

freshwater populations have access to the same ancestral standing genetic variation. This

is consistent with the large body of studies showing that parallel evolution among pairs of

marine-freshwater ecotypes in three-spined sticklebacks is commonly due to the repeated

use of the same ancestral variation from a global pool of standing genetic variation in the

sea, both at the global (Jones *et al.* 2012) and more local scales (Colosimo *et al.* 2005;

Jones *et al.* 2012; Terekhanova *et al.* 2014, 2019; Nelson and Cresko, 2018).

Furthermore, while pelvic reduction in freshwater populations of three-spined stickleback

populations is more or less the norm (Colosimo 2005; Klepaker *et al*. 2013), our survey

of phenotypic data from the wild demonstrates that full pelvic reduction in northern

European freshwater populations of nine-spined sticklebacks is rare. In fact, it only

occurs in two of the ten populations, with one additional population segregating for a

large effect locus and one showing reduction in spines but not in girdles. Consistent with

these results, when the access to ancestral standing genetic variation was restricted in the

simulations (by IBD in the sea and population structuring among freshwater populations

being similar to that observed in nine-spined sticklebacks), parallel evolution was much

less likely, and local adaptation was less complete or lacking altogether. Furthermore,

(partial) local adaptation was often polygenic and due to fixation of phylogenetically

independent (small effect) QTL, and not due to parallel evolution.

In our simulations, genetic parallelism in the three-spined stickleback was less

common when the large effect freshwater adapted allele was recessive (architecture C),

compared to when it was additive (architecture A). This may also partly explain why the

*Pitx1/Pel* deletions responsible for pelvic reduction in three-spined sticklebacks are

mostly due to repeated independent deletions rather than phylogenetically related alleles

(Xie *et al.* 2019). In contrast, the additive *EDA* gene controlling lateral armour plate

numbers in three-spined sticklebacks is a classic example of local adaptation from

ancestral standing variation (Colosimo *et al.*, 2005; Schluter and Conte 2009).

Furthermore, if a single large effect QTL already leads to a near-optimal phenotype, any

additional minor or medium effect loci could lead individuals farther from the optimum,

i.e. maladaptation (Bolnick *et al.* 2018). If so, selection is expected to prune such

variants, leaving only large effect QTL in the population. This could explain why other

small or medium effect loci for pelvic reduction are rare – but not completely absent – in

three-spined sticklebacks as well as in Rytilampi nine-spined sticklebacks. Consistent

with this, the single large effect locus available for freshwater adaptation (architectures A

and C) was the most commonly used allele for local adaptation at the expense of medium

effect loci; using both would have led to overshooting the phenotypic optimum (in both

species; Supplementary Fig. 8; Rogers *et al*. 2012).

*Geographic heterogeneity in selection optima*

Another explanation for the high heterogeneity in the genetic architecture of pelvic

reduction in the nine-spined stickleback resides within habitat environmental variation

resulting in different selection optima in different pond populations (cf. Stuart *et al.* 2017;

Thompson *et al.* 2019). The small differences between pelvic reduced phenotypes in our

study (e.g. in BYN and MAS/BOL spines are completely absent, while in RYT they are

only strongly reduced; Fig. 1, Supplementary Table 1 and Supplementary Fig. 2) could in

fact indicate different selection optima in the different populations (Stuart *et al*. 2017;

Thompson *et al*. 2019). It is possible to use available phenotypic data to estimate the

phenotypic optima of pelvic morphology (hypersphere) in each of the populations using

Fisher's geometric model (Stuart *et al.* 2017; Thompson *et al.* 2019), where a strong

overlap would suggest a higher probability of genetic parallelism (Thompson *et al.* 2019).

However, this assumes that the populations have access to exactly the same ancestral

variation and are free to evolve and reach their optima, which is at odds with the results

presented here. Without detailed environmental data or direct estimates of strength of

selection on pelvic phenotypes, disentangling the effects of gene flow and within habitat

environmental variation (assuming this leads to non-parallel angles of selection) is not

possible (Stuart *et al.* 2017).

In a recent simulation study, Thompson *et al.* (2019) showed that genetic

parallelism from standing genetic variation rapidly declines as selection starts to change

from fully parallel (optima angle of 0°) to divergent (optima angle of 180°), especially

when the trait is polygenic. However, although selection was fully parallel in our

simulations, we failed to observe strong genetic parallelism for smaller effect loci (with

allelic effects < 6) in both the three- and nine-spined stickleback-like scenarios (Fig. 5a,

c). This suggests that the effects of the underlying genetic architecture on parallelism (in

conjunction with some IBD and population structuring) can be independent of the angle

of optimal phenotypes between two habitats. In other words, non-parallelism in selection

optima is not necessary to explain non-parallelism at the phenotypic and genetic levels.

Thus, it is important not to disregard the population demographic setting as a factor that

could severely restrict heritability for adaptation and/or constrain adaptation to less

optimal solutions. Evolutionary studies of species with population demographic

parameters comparable to those typical for vulnerable or endangered species/populations

(such as the nine-spined stickleback) would be valuable to gain a better understanding of

how such species may respond to environmental changes and urbanisation (Thompson *et*

*al.* 2018).

*The limited role of* Pitx1/Pel *in the nine-spined stickleback pelvic reduction*

Thus far, *Pitx1* has been found to be responsible for pelvic reduction in nine-spined

sticklebacks in both Canada (Shapiro *et al*. 2006) and Finland (Shikano *et al*. 2013; this

study), but we do not know to what extent the underlying mutations are identical by

descent. By scanning whole-genome sequence data of 27 populations, we found a

deletion in the genomic region expected to contain *Pel* (LG7) only in Rytilampi – where

pelvic reduction maps to this gene. Similar to marine-freshwater pairs of three-spined

sticklebacks, we would have expected *Pitx1/Pel* deletions to exist in several other nine-

spined stickleback pond populations as well, most notably in the MAS and BOL

populations, where phenotypic data suggest large effect QTL to be responsible for pelvic

reduction. Since no deletions were found in the genomic region spanning *Pel* and *Pitx1* in

MAS and BOL, *Pitx1/Pel* is likely not responsible for the pelvic reduction in these two

populations. This provides further evidence that the genomic basis of pelvic reduction in

the nine-spined stickleback is more heterogeneous than that in the three-spined

stickleback. The loci, most likely major effect, responsible for pelvic reduction in these

ponds are yet to be identified.

*Pelvic reduction outside marine-freshwater study systems*

While the evidence for genetic parallelism at large geographical scales in the marine-

freshwater stickleback model system is extensive (Colosimo *et al.* 2005; Jones *et al.*

2012; Terekhanova *et al.* 2014, 2019; Nelson and Cresko 2018; Fang et al. 2019), the

level of parallelism in lake-stream and pelagic-benthic ecotype pairs of three-spined

sticklebacks is much more diverse (Peichel *et al*. 2001, 2017; Conte *et al*. 2012, 2015;

Stuart *et al*. 2017). For instance, Conte *et al*. (2015) found that among benthic-limnetic

three-spined stickleback pairs from Paxton and Priest lakes (Vancouver Island, BC,

Canada), 76% of 42 phenotypic traits diverged in the same direction, whereas only 49%

of the underlying QTL evolved in parallel in both lakes. For highly parallel traits in two

other pairs of benthic-limnetic sticklebacks, only 32% of the underlying QTL were shared

(Conte *et al*., 2012). Similarly, Stuart *et al*. (2017) found that among 11 independent

evolutionary replicate pairs of lake-stream three-spined stickleback populations

(Vancouver Island, BC, Canada), both within habitat variation and constraints to gene

flow contributed to the observed variation in levels of phenotypic parallelism. Different

lakes and streams do not likely have similar access to the same global pool of ancestral

variation as pairs of marine-freshwater three-spined sticklebacks, where gene flow in the

sea is high. This is consistent with the notion that more heterogeneous access to ancestral

variation can indeed limit genetic parallelism. This is also true for one example of

marine-freshwater three-spined stickleback divergence among isolated insular freshwater

populations in the Haida Gwaii archipelago off the northern Pacific coast of Canada

(Deagle *et al.* 2013). Here, similar to the nine-spined sticklebacks in this study, several

freshwater populations did not display any reduction in pelvic armour. However, those

populations that were fully plated were also genetically more similar to adjacent marine

individuals, suggesting that recent marine-freshwater admixture and/or selection

favouring plated freshwater individuals could explain this pattern. Other morphological

traits, such as lateral plating (coded by the *EDA* locus) were instead more consistent with

the same global variants being repeatedly re-used at the regional scale. Thus, with respect

to access to ancestral variation available for freshwater adaptation, nine-spined

sticklebacks are likely closer to the three-spined stickleback lake-stream and benthic-

limnetic study systems than to the three-spined stickleback marine-freshwater study

system. The only notable exception is the lake-stream three-spined sticklebacks

mentioned above, where genetic structuring also is high.

*Epistatic control of pelvic reduction?*

For traits with more than one additive QTL of equal effect sizes, the $F_2$ phenotypes are

expected to be normally distributed with a mean close that of the mean for the parents

(Klug and Cummings 2018). This was not the case for spine length in the HEL × BYN

cross, which was controlled by three QTL with similar effect sizes. In this case, the bulk

of the phenotypic values was centered around the mean, but also had a long tail of

individuals with strongly reduced pelvic spines (Fig. 1, Fig. 3 and Supplementary Fig. 2).

This skew in the phenotype distribution could be caused by epistatic interactions among

loci controlling pelvic spine length (Wolf *et al*. 2000). Consistent with this hypothesis,

complete spine reduction was most likely when the allele responsible for spine reduction

for the LG6 QTL was combined with at least one allele causing spine reduction from the

LG15 and LG16 QTL (Fig. 3b and Supplementary File 3). If a threshold number of

alleles are needed for complete pelvic reduction, this could also explain how standing

genetic variation in the sea is maintained, as the necessary multi-locus genotypes that

cause sub-optimal phenotypes in the sea are rarely formed, due to overall lower

frequencies of spine-reducing alleles in the sea. This is analogous to "epistatic shielding"

that can contribute to the persistence of disease alleles in populations (Phillips and

Johnsson 1998; Phillips 2008). Consistent with this possibility, LG6 of the $F_0$ female of

the HEL × BYN cross (from the sea) was polymorphic for the pelvic spine QTL effect

(Fig. 2) – evidently a single pelvic-reducing allele alone in this female was not enough to

cause any pelvic reduction at all (this female had a complete pelvis).

*Candidate genes*

While the QTL peak for the *Pitx1/Pel* region in the HEL × RYT cross was narrow, this

was not the case for the other QTL we detected. Hence, due to the large QTL regions

detected by four-way single-mapping analyses, it was not meaningful to perform gene

ontology enrichment (GO) analyses – the QTL regions would have contained possibly

thousands of genes. Instead, we searched the literature for known candidate genes for

pelvic reduction and found three (excluding *Pitx1/Pel*) that were clearly contained within

the identified QTL regions (Fig. 2 and Supplementary Table 4). Due to the

aforementioned large QTL regions, these can only be considered as highly putative

candidate genes for pelvic reduction and will not be discussed further. However, further

studies of pelvic reduction might find these candidates worthy of attention.

*Conclusions*

Our results show that the repeated parallel reduction in pelvic structures in freshwater

populations of nine-spined sticklebacks is due to a diverse set of genetic changes: only

one small effect QTL for pelvic reduction was shared between the three experimental

crosses in this study. In one cross, pelvic reduction was mapped to the previously

identified *Pitx1/Pel* regions, but in the two other crosses, the genetic basis of pelvic

reduction was polygenic, and mapped to many different chromosomes. In addition to

these, yet another large effect QTL different from the *Pitx1*/*Pel* locus likely segregates in

one nine-spined stickleback population waiting to be identified. The results also shed

light on the possible drivers of the observed genetic heterogeneity underlying pelvic

reduction; as shown by simulations, heterogeneous genetic architectures are more likely

to emerge when access to ancestral variation is limited by strong isolation by distance and

population structuring. This reinforces the role of the nine-spined sticklebacks as a useful

model system, alongside the three-spined stickleback, to study adaptive evolution in the

wild. Furthermore, since the population demographic characteristics of nine-spined

sticklebacks are similar to small and endangered species/populations, it is also likely to

be a well-suited model to study genetics of adaptation in populations of conservation

concern.

**Literature cited**

Arendt, J., and D. Reznick. 2007. Convergence and parallelism reconsidered: what have
we learned about the genetics of adaptation? Trends Ecol. Evol. 23: 26–32.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2007.09.011

Barghi, N., Tobler, R., Nolte, V., Jakšić, A. M., Mallard, F., Otte, K. A., … C.
Schlötterer. 2019. Genetic redundancy fuels polygenic adaptation in Drosophila.
PLoS Biol. 17: 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000128

Baker, J.A. 1994. Life history variation in female threespine stickleback. In The
evolutionary biology of the threespine stickleback. M.A. Bell MA, Foster SA, (eds).
Oxford University Press, New York. pp. 144–187.

Barrett, R. D. H., and D. Schluter. 2008. Adaptation from standing genetic variation.
Trends Ecol. Evol. *23*: 38–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2007.09.008

Becker, W. A. 1984. Manual of quantitative genetics (Fourth ed.). Academic enterprises,
Washington.

Bell, M. A., and S. A. Foster (Eds). 1994. The evolutionary biology of the threespine
Stickleback. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Bell, M. A., Khalef, V. and M. Travis. 2007. Directional asymmetry of pelvic vestiges in
threespine stickleback. J. Exp. Zool. Part B, Mol. Dev. Evol. 308B: 189–199.
https://doi.org/10.1002/jez.b

Bell, M. A., Orti, G., Walker, J. A., and J.P. Koenings. 1993. Evolution of pelvic
reduction in threespine stickleback fish: a test of competing hypotheses. Evolution
47: 906–914. https://doi.org/10.2307/2410193

Bell, M. A., Windsor, E. A., Buck, N. J. 2004. Twelve years of contemporary evolution
in a threespine stickleback population. *Evolution* 58:814-24. 10.1554/03-373.

Blouw, D. M., and G.J. Boyd. 1992. Inheritance of reduction, loss, and asymmetry of the
pelvis in Pungitius pungitius (ninespine stickleback). Heredity, 68: 33-42.
https://doi.org/10.1038/hdy.1992.4

Bolnick, D. I., Barrett, R. D. H., Oke, K. B., Rennison, D. J., and Y.E. Stuart. 2018.
(Non) Parallel Evolution. Ann. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 12: 303–330.

Chan, Y. F., Marks, M. E., Jones, F. C., Jr, G. V., Shapiro, M. D., Brady, S. D., … D.M.
Kingsley. 2010. Adaptive evolution of pelvic reduction in sticklebacks by recurrent
deletion of a Pitx1 enhancer. Science 327: 302–305.

Cohan, F. M. 1984. Can uniform selection retard random genetic divergence between
isolated conspecific populations? Evolution 38: 495-504.
https://doi.org/10.2307/2408699

Colosimo, P. F., Hosemann, K. E., Balabhadra, S., Villarreal, G., Dickson, H.,
Grimwood, J., … D.M. Kingsley. 2005. Widespread parallel evolution in
sticklebacks by repeated fixation of ectodysplasin alleles. Science 307: 1928–1933.
https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1107239

Conte, G. L., Arnegard, M. E., Best, J., Chan, Y. F., Jones, F. C., Kingsley, D. M., …
C.L. Peichel. 2015. Extent of QTL reuse during repeated phenotypic divergence of
sympatric threespine stickleback. Genetics 201: 1189–1200.
https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.115.182550

Conte, G. L., Arnegard, M. E., Peichel, C. L., and D. Schluter. 2012. The probability of
genetic parallelism and convergence in natural populations. Proc. R. Soc B. 279:
5039–5047. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2012.2146

Coyle, S. M., Huntingford, F. A., and C.L. Peichel. 2007. Parallel evolution of Pitx1
underlies pelvic reduction in Scottish Threespine Stickleback (Gasterosteus
aculeatus ). Genetics *98*: 581–586. https://doi.org/10.1093/jhered/esm066

Cresko, W. A., Amores, A., Wilson, C., Murphy, J., Currey, M., Phillips, P., … J.H.
Postlethwait. 2004. Parallel genetic basis for repeated evolution of armor loss in
Alaskan threespine stickleback populations. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 101: 6050–
6055.

Deagle, B. E., Jones, F., Chan, Y. F., Absher, D. M., Kingsley, D. M.,and T. E.
Reimchen. 2012. Population genomics of parallel phenotypic evolution in
stickleback across stream–lake ecological transitions. Proc. R. Soc. B 279:1277–
1286 doi:10.1098/rspb.2011.1552

Deagle, B. E., Jones, F. C., Absher, D. M., Kingsley, D. M., and T. E. Reimchen. 2013.
Phylogeography and adaptation genetics of stickleback from the Haida Gwaii
archipelago revealed using genome-wide single nucleotide polymorphism
genotyping. *Mol. Ecol. 22:* 1917–1932. https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12215

DeFaveri, J., Shikano, T., Ghani, N. I. A., and J. Merilä. 2012. Contrasting population
structures in two sympatric fishes in the Baltic Sea basin. Mar. Biol. 159: 1659–
1672. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-012-1951-4

DeFaveri, J., and J. Merilä. 2013. Variation in age and size in Fennoscandian three-spined
sticklebacks (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*). PLoS One 8: e80866.
https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0080866

DeFaveri, J., Shikano, T., and J. Merilä. 2014. Geographic variation in age structure and
longevity in the nine-spined stickleback (*Pungitius pungitius*). PLoS One 9:
e102660. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0102660

Don, E. K., Currie, P. D., and N.J. Cole. 2012. The evolutionary history of the
development of the pelvic fin/hindlimb. J. Anatomy 222: 114–133.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7580.2012.01557.x

Elmer, K. R., and A. Meyer. 2011. Adaptation in the age of ecological genomics: Insights
from parallelism and convergence. Trends Ecol. Evol. *26*: 298–306.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2011.02.008

Fang, F., Kemppainen, P., Momigliano, P., and J. Merilä. 2019. Oceans apart:
Heterogeneous patterns of parallel evolution in sticklebacks, *BioRxiv*, doi:
https://doi.org/10.1101/826412

Gibson, G. 2005. The synthesis and evolution of a super-model. Science 307: 1890-1891

Giles, N. 1983. The possible role of environmental calcium levels during the evolution of
phenotypic diversity in outer Hebridean populations of the Three-spined stickleback,
*Gasterosteus aculeatus*. J. Zool. 199: 535–544. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-
7998.1983.tb05104.x

Hahne, F. and R. Ivanek. 2016. Statistical Genomics: Methods and Protocols. In Mathé E,
Davis S (eds.), chapter Visualizing Genomic Data Using Gviz and Bioconductor,
335–351. Springer, New York.

Herczeg, G., Turtiainen, M., and J. Merilä. 2010. Morphological divergence of North-
European nine-spined sticklebacks (*Pungitius pungitius*): Biol. J. Linn. Soc. 101:
403–416.

Hermisson, J., and P.S. Pennings. 2017. Soft sweeps and beyond: understanding the
patterns and probabilities of selection footprints under rapid adaptation. Methods
Ecol. Evol. 8: 700–716. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12808

Hijmans, R.J., and J. van Etten, 2012. raster: Geographic analysis and modeling with
raster data. R package version 2. 0-12. http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=raster

Karhunen, M., Merilä, J., Leinonen, T., Cano, J. M., and O. Ovaskainen. 2013. driftsel:
An R package for detecting signals of natural selection in quantitative traits. Mol.
Ecol. Res. 13: 746–754. https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12111

Karhunen, M., Ovaskainen, O., Herczeg, G., and Merilä, J. 2014. Bringing habitat
information into statistical tests of local adaptation in quantitative traits: A case
study of nine-spined sticklebacks. Evolution 68: 559-568.

Kelberman, D., Rizzoti, K., Lovell-Badge, R., Robinson I. C. A. F., and M. T. Dattani.
2009. Genetic Regulation of Pituitary Gland Development in Human and Mouse.
*Endocrine Reviews* 30:790–829, https://doi.org/10.1210/er.2009-0008

Kemppainen, P., Knight, C. G., Sarma, D. K., Hlaing, T., Prakash, A., Maung Maung, Y.
N., … C. Walton. 2015. Linkage disequilibrium network analysis (LDna) gives a
global view of chromosomal inversions, local adaptation and geographic structure.
Mol. Ecol. *15*: 1031–1045. https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12369

Klepaker, T., Østbye, K., and M. A. Bell. 2013. Regressive evolution of the pelvic
complex in stickleback fishes: a study of convergent evolution. Evol. Ecol. Res. 15:
413–435.

Klug, W. S., and M.R. Cummings. 2018. Concepts of genetics. Pearson Education, Inc,
New Jersey.

Laine, V. N., Shikano, T., Herczeg, G., Vilkki, J., and J. Merilä. 2013. Quantitative trait
loci for growth and body size in the nine-spined stickleback *Pungitius pungitius* L.
Mol. Ecol. 22: 5861–5876. https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12526

Leinonen, T., Cano, J. M., and J. Merilä. 2011. Genetics of body shape and armour
variation in threespine sticklebacks. J. Evol. Biol. 24: 206–218.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2010.02161.x

Li, H. 2018. Sequence analysis Minimap2 : pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences.
Bioinformatics 34: 3094–3100. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bty191

Li, H., Handsaker, B., Wysoker, A., Fennell, T., Ruan, J., Homer, N., … T. Sam. 2009.
The Sequence Alignment / Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics 25: 2078–
2079. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btp352

Li, H. 2013. Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-
MEM. arXiv:1303.3997v2 [q-bio.GN]

Li, Z., Guo, B., Yang, J., Herczeg, G., Gonda, A., Balázs, G., … J. Merilä. 2017.
Deciphering the genomic architecture of the stickleback brain with a novel
multilocus gene-mapping approach. Mol. Ecol. 26: 1557–1575.
https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.14005

Li, Z., Kemppainen, P., Rastas, P., and J. Merilä. 2018. Linkage disequilibrium
clustering-based approach for association mapping with tightly linked genomewide
data. Mol. Ecol. Res. 18: 809–824. https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12893

Merilä, J. 2013. Nine-spined stickleback (*Pungitius pungitius*): An emerging model for
evolutionary biology research. *Ann. NY. Acad. Sci. 1289*: 18–35.
https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.12089

Merilä, J. 2014. Lakes and ponds as model systems to study parallel evolution. J. Limnol.
73: 33–45. https://doi.org/10.4081/jlimnol.2014.805

Mudie, S., Bandarra, D., Batie, M., Biddlestone, J., Ortmann, B., Shmakova, A., … S.
Rocha. 2014. PITX1, a specificity determinant in the HIF-1α- mediated

transcriptional response to hypoxia Sharon. Cell Cycle 13: 3878–3891.
https://doi.org/10.4161/15384101.2014.972889

Nelson, T. C., and W.A. Cresko. 2018. Ancient genomic variation underlies repeated
ecological adaptation in young stickleback populations. Evol. Lett. 2: 9–21.
https://doi.org/10.1002/evl3.37

Neuenschwander, S., Michaud, F., and J. Goudet. 2018. QuantiNemo 2: a Swiss knife to
simulate complex demographic and genetic scenarios, forward and backward in
time. Bioinformatics 35:886-888. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bty737

Orr, H. A., and L. R. Unckless. 2008. Population Extinction and the Genetics of
Adaptation. *Am. Nat.* 172:2, 160-169

Peichel, C. L., Nereng, K. S., Ohgi, K. A., Cole, B. L. E., Colosimo, P. F., Buerkle, C. A.,
…, and D.M. Kingsley. 2001. The genetic architecture of divergence between
threespine stickleback species. Nature 414: 901–905.

Pembleton, L.W., Cogan, N.O.I., and J.W. Forster. 2013. StAMPP: an R package for
calculation of genetic differentiation and structure of mixed-ploidy level
populations. Mol. Ecol. Res. 13: 946-952

Phillips, P. C. 2008. Epistasis — the essential role of gene interactions in the structure
and evolution of genetic systems. Fundamental Concepts in Genetics 9: 855–867.
https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg2452

Phillips, P. C., and N.A. Johnson. 1998. The population genetics of synthetic lethals.
Genetics 150: 449–458.

Pritchard, J. R., and D. Schluter. 2001. Declining interspecific competition during
character displacement: Summoning the ghost of competition past. Evol. Ecol. Res.
3: 209–220.

Rastas, P. 2017. Lep-MAP3: Robust linkage mapping even for low-coverage whole
genome sequencing data. Bioinformatics 33: 3726–3732.
https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btx494

Reid, S., Tibshirani, R., and J. Friedman. 2016. A study of error variance estimation in
lasso regression. Statistica Sinica 26: 35-67. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24721190

Reimchen, T. E. 1983. Structural Relationships Between Spines and Lateral Plates in
Threespine Stickleback (Gasterosteus aculeatus). Evolution 37: 931–946.
https://doi.org/10.2307/2408408

Reist, J. D. 1980. Predation upon pelvic phenotypes of brook stickleback, *Culaea*
*inconstancs*, by selected invertebrates. Can. J. Zool. 58: 1253-1258.

Rogers, S. M., Tamkee, P., Summers, B., Balabahadra, S., Marks, M., Kingsley, D. M.,
and D. Schluter. 2012. Genetic signatures of adaptive peakshift in threespine
sticklebacks. *Evolution* 66: 2439–2450.

Rosenblum, E. B., Parent, C. E., and E.E. Brandt. 2014. The molecular basis of
phenotypic convergence. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst. 45: 203-226. doi:10.1146/annurev-
ecolsys-120213-091851

Schluter, D., and G.L. Conte. 2009. Genetics and ecological speciation. Proc. Natl. Acad.
Sci USA, 106: 9955–9962. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0901264106

Schluter, D., Marchinko, K.B., Barrett, R.D., and S.M. Rogers. 2010. Natural selection
and the genetics of adaptation in threespine stickleback. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B
Biol Sci. 365(1552):2479–2486. doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0036

Shapiro, M. D., Bell, M. A., and D.M. Kingsley. 2006. Parallel genetic origins of pelvic
reduction in vertebrates. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci USA 103: 13753–13758.
https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0604706103

Shapiro, M. D, Marks, M. E., Peichel, C. L., Blackman, B. K., Nereng, K. S., Jo, B., …
D.M. Kingsley. 2004. Genetic and developmental basis of evolutionary pelvic
reduction in threespine sticklebacks. Nature 428: 717–724.

Shapiro, Michael D, Summers, B. R., Balabhadra, S., Aldenhoven, J. T., Miller, A. L.,
Cunningham, C. B., … and D.M. Kingsley. 2009. The genetic architecture of
skeletal convergence and sex determination in ninespine sticklebacks. Curr. Biol. 19:
1140–1145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2009.05.029.The

Shikano, T., Laine, V. N., Herczeg, G., Vilkki, J., and J. Merilä. 2013. Genetic
architecture of parallel pelvic reduction in ninespine sticklebacks. *3G: Genes,*
*Genomes, Genetics*, *3*, 1833–1842. https://doi.org/10.1534/g3.113.007237

Shikano, T., Shimada, Y., Herczeg, G., and J. Merilä. 2010. History vs. habitat type:
Explaining the genetic structure of European nine-spined stickleback (Pungitius
pungitius) populations. Mol. Ecol. 19: 1147–1161. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-
294X.2010.04553.x

Sillanpää, M. J. 2011. On statistical methods for estimating heritability in wild
populations. Mol. Ecol. 20: 1324–1332. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-
294X.2011.05021.x

Stern, D. L. 2013. The genetic causes of convergent evolution. Genetics 14: 751–764.
https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg3483

Stuart, Y. E., Veen, T., Weber, J. N., Hanson, D., Ravinet, M., Lohman, B. K., … D.I.
Bolnick. 2017. Contrasting effects of environment and genetics generate a
continuum of parallel evolution. Nature Ecol. Evol. 1:0158.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-017-0158

Taggart, J. B., Hynes, R. A., and A. Ferguson. 1992. A simplified protocol for routine
total DNA isolation from salmonid fishes. J. Fish. Biol 40: 963–965.

Tanaka, M., Hale, L. A., Amores, A., Yan, Y., Cresko, W. A., Suzuki, T., and J.H.
Postlethwait. 2005. Developmental genetic basis for the evolution of pelvic fin loss
in the pufferfish Takifugu rubripes. Dev. Biol. 281: 227–239.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ydbio.2005.02.016

Terekhanova, N. V, Barmintseva, A. E., Kondrashov, A. S., Bazykin, G. A., and N.S.
Mugue. 2019. Architecture of parallel adaptation in ten lacustrine threespine
stickleback populations from the White Sea area. Genome Biol. Evol. 11: 2605–
2618. https://doi.org/10.1093/gbe/evz175

Terekhanova, N. V, Logacheva, M. D., Penin, A. A., Neretina, T. V, Barmintseva, A. E.,
Bazykin, G. A., … N.S. Mugue. 2014. Fast evolution from precast bricks :
Genomics of young freshwater populations of threespine stickleback Gasterosteus
aculeatus. PLoS Genet. 10: e1004696. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1004696

Thompson, K. A., Osmond, M. M., and D. Schluter. 2019. Parallel genetic evolution and
speciation from standing variation. Evol. Lett. 3:129-141.
https://doi.org/10.1002/evl3.106

Thompson, K. A., Rieseberg, L. H., and D. Schluter. 2018. Speciation and the City.
*Trends Ecol. Evol* 33:815-826

Tibshirani, R. 1996. Regression shrinkage and selection via the Lasso. J. R. Stat. Soc.
*Series. B* 58:267-288

Varadharajan, S., Rastas, P., Löytynoja, A., Matschiner, M., Calboli, F.C.F., Guo, B., …
J. Merilä. 2019. A high-quality assembly of the nine-spined stickleback (Pungitius
pungitius) genome. Genome Biol. Evol. 11:3291-3308. evz240,
https://doi.org/10.1093/gbe/evz240

Van Ooijen, J. W. 2009. MapQTL v. 6.0: Software for the mapping of quantitative trait
loci in experimental populations of diploid species. Kyazma BV, Wageningen, The
Netherlands.

Wang, Y., Zhao, Y., Wang, Y., Li, Z., Baocheng Guo, B. and J. Merilä. 2020. Population
transcriptomics reveals weak parallel genetic basis in repeated marine and
freshwater divergence in nine-spined sticklebacks. Mol. Ecol.
https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.15435

Weir, B. S., and C.C. Cockerham. 1984. Estimating F-statistics for the analysis of
population structure. Evolution 38: 1358–1370.

Wolf, J. B., Brodie, E. D., and M.J. Wade. 2000. Epistasis and the Evolutionary Process.
Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Xie, K. T., Wang, G., Thompson, A. C., Wucherpfennig, J. I., Reimchen, T. E., Maccoll,
A. D. C., … and P. Lake. 2019. DNA fragility in the parallel evolution of pelvic
reduction in stickleback fish. Science 84: 81–84.

Xu, S. 1996. Mapping quantitative trait loci using four-way crosses. Genet. Res. 68: 175–
181.

Xu, S. 2013a. Genetic mapping and genomic selection using recombination breakpoint
data. Genetics 195: 1103–1115. https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.113.155309

Xu, S. 2013b. Principles of Statistical Genomics. Springer, New York.
https://doi.org/DOI 10.1007/978-0-387-70807-2

Yang, J., Guo, B., Shikano, T., Liu, X., and J. Merilä. 2016. Quantitative trait locus
analysis of body shape divergence in nine-spined sticklebacks based on high-density
SNP-panel. Sci. Rep. *6*:26632. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep26632

Zheng, X., Levine, D., Shen, J., Gogarten, S. M., Laurie, C., and B.S. Weir. 2012. A
high-performance computing toolset for relatedness and principal component
analysis of SNP data. Bioinformatics 28: 3326–3328.
https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bts606

**Table 1 | Summary of QTL-mapping analyses.** Each row corresponds to a significant
(arbitrarily numbered) QTL region, with the proportion variance explained (PVE), jointly
estimated for all PCs (one for each significant LD-cluster) extracted from such regions.
Coding indicates whether the QTL was significant for the alleles inherited from the $F_1$
female (♀), the $F_1$ male (♂) or the dominance effect (dom). Effect size ($\beta$) is based on the
first PC extracted from all SNPs from each significant QTL region. "Std." indicates
whether the trait was standardised (Yes) or not (No). $P$ and $P_{COR}$ represent nominal and
corrected $P$-values from single-mapping four-way analyses, respectively. Results for
standardised trait values are only shown for QTL that were not also significant for
absolute trait values.

| Cross | Trait | Coding | LG | QTL | Std. | $P$ | $P_{COR}$ | $PVE_{TOT}$ | $\beta$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **HEL × RYT** | Spine | male | 7 | 1 | No | 1.31e-04 | 0.019 | 0.285 | 1.654 |
| **HEL × RYT** | Spine | female | 7 | 1 | No | 1.26e-04 | 0.026 | 0.311 | 1.573 |
| **HEL × RYT** | Girdle | male | 7 | 1 | No | 3.66e-04 | 0.040 | 0.311 | 2.041 |
| **HEL × RYT** | Girdle | female | 7 | 1 | No | 1.08e-04 | 0.024 | 0.263 | 1.711 |
| **HEL × RYT** | Spine | dom | 7 | 1 | No | 1.08e-07 | <0.001 | 0.213 | 1.432 |
| **HEL × RYT** | Girdle | dom | 7 | 1 | No | 1.35e-04 | 0.028 | 0.154 | 1.463 |
| **HEL × BYN** | Spine | male | 15 | 2 | No | 6.12e-06 | 0.001 | 0.095 | 0.540 |
| **HEL × BYN** | Spine | male | 16 | 3 | No | 1.16e-04 | 0.010 | 0.086 | 0.493 |
| **HEL × BYN** | Spine | male | 21 | 4 | No | 3.36e-04 | 0.031 | 0.037 | 0.360 |
| **HEL × BYN** | Spine | female | 6 | 5 | No | 1.37e-04 | 0.018 | 0.070 | 0.500 |
| **HEL × BYN** | Girdle | male | 14 | 6 | No | 2.49e-04 | 0.024 | 0.039 | 0.307 |
| **HEL × PYÖ** | Spine | male | 9 | 7 | No | 8.96e-11 | <0.001 | 0.108 | 0.352 |
| **HEL × PYÖ** | Girdle | male | 19 | 8 | No | 1.56e-05 | 0.001 | 0.056 | 0.325 |
| **HEL × PYÖ** | Girdle | female | 4 | 9 | No | 1.32e-04 | 0.020 | 0.045 | 0.301 |
| **HEL × BYN** | Spine | female | 16 | 10 | Yes | 2.53e-04 | 0.030 | 0.047 | 0.007 |
| **HEL × BYN** | Girdle | female | 1 | 11 | Yes | 2.13e-05 | 0.002 | 0.077 | 0.006 |
| **HEL × BYN** | Girdle | male | 1 | 11 | Yes | 1.41e-04 | 0.016 | 0.026 | 0.005 |
| **HEL × PYÖ** | Spine | male | 1 | 11 | Yes | 4.75e-06 | <0.001 | 0.075 | 0.005 |
| **HEL × PYÖ** | Girdle | male | 1 | 11 | Yes | 9.69e-05 | 0.016 | 0.044 | 0.005 |

1135

1136 **Table 2 | Proportion phenotypic variance explained (PVE) in pelvic traits.** Shown are
1137 the percentages of total phenotypic variance explained by different linkage groups (LG),
1138 by all SNPs (Tot), by loci inherited from females (♀) and males (♂), as well as the
1139 dominance effect (Dom). Shown are results for each cross and trait separately and for
1140 absolute trait values.

| LG | HEL x RYT | | HEL x BYN | | HEL x PYÖ | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Spine | Girdle | Spine | Girdle | Spine | Girdle |
| 1 | - | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.05 | - | - |
| 2 | - | - | 0.01 | 0.03 | - | 0.02 |
| 3 | - | - | - | 0.01 | - | - |
| 4 | - | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | - | 0.03 |
| 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 6 | - | - | 0.03 | - | 0.02 | - |
| 7 | 0.85 | 0.82 | 0.02 | 0.02 | - | - |
| 8 | - | - | 0.01 | 0.01 | - | - |
| 9 | - | - | - | 0.02 | 0.11 | - |
| 10 | - | - | - | 0.06 | - | - |
| 11 | - | - | 0.02 | - | - | - |
| 12 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.01 | - |
| 13 | - | - | - | 0.01 | - | 0.02 |
| 14 | - | - | - | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
| 15 | - | - | 0.09 | 0.01 | - | - |
| 16 | - | - | 0.12 | 0.01 | - | - |
| 17 | - | - | 0.01 | 0.01 | - | - |
| 18 | - | - | - | 0.04 | - | 0.01 |
| 19 | - | - | 0.02 | 0.06 | - | 0.05 |
| 20 | - | - | - | 0.01 | - | - |
| 21 | - | - | 0.03 | - | 0.01 | - |
| Tot | 0.8 | 0.76 | 0.39 | 0.32 | 0.14 | 0.16 |
| ♂ | 0.3 | 0.38 | 0.24 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.08 |
| ♀ | 0.29 | 0.27 | 0.17 | 0.06 | - | 0.09 |
| Dom | 0.23 | 0.17 | 0.01 | 0.13 | 0.01 | - |

1142

**Figure 1 | Summary of previously published nine-spined stickleback pelvic phenotypes from the wild and common garden experiments.** Violin plots depict relative (to standard body length) pelvic spine and girdle lengths according to population and habitat type. Numbers in the top panel show *P*-values for Pearson's product moment correlation between relative pelvic spine and relative pelvic girdle lengths, and the bottom panel the respective squared correlation coefficients for each population/cross. "na" indicates data with no variation in spine or girdle lengths. Further details can be found in Supplementary Fig. 1 and Supplementary Table 1. Phenotypic data for $F_2$ individuals from the current study are also presented (HEL x RYT, HEL x BYN and HEL x PYÖ), are also shown for comparison. Details of sample locations and data collection can be found from Herczeg *et al*. (2010) and Karhunen et al. (2013). Data from common garden experiments is indicated by the suffix "_CG" in x-axis labels.

1155
**Figure 2 | Quantitative trait locus mapping of pelvic reduction in three independent**
**stickleback crosses.** Single-mapping four-way analyses of four morphological traits
associated with pelvic reduction in (a-b) HEL × RYT cross, (c-d) HEL × BYN cross and
(e-f) HEL × PYÖ cross. Shown are QTL for pelvic spine length and girdle length with x-
axis indicating position in centi Morgans (cM). Results are based on permutation and
dotted vertical line indicates genome wide significance at $\alpha = 0.05$. Results are shown
separately for alleles inherited from the male $F_1$ (M), the female $F_1$ (F) together with the
dominance effect (D) according to legend. Absence of a dominance effect indicates that
the trait inheritance is additive, whereas a peak only for M or F indicates that the allelic
effect was segregating in the $F_0$ male or the $F_0$ female, respectively (see Supplementary
File S1 for details). Candidate genes involved in pelvic development are indicated with
black text representing genes that affect expression of *Pitx1* and red text indicating genes
that affect pelvic development downstream of *Pitx1* expression. Results for analyses
based on relative trait values can be found in Supplementary Figure 4.

**Figure 3 | Epistatic interactions in pelvic spine development for HEL × BYN cross.**
(a) individual genotype effects where the genotype is given by the first PC (scaled
between 0 and 1) from the cluster of SNPs that was the most significant for spine length
on LG6, LG15 and LG16 (see Fig. 2), respectively. Genotypes were further based on the
genotypes $[x_{dij}, x_{sij}]$ depending on which of these were significant for the QTL effects ($x_{dij}$
for LG6 and $x_{sij}$ for LG15 and LG16). Some individuals have genotypes between 0 and 1
only because the genotype is based on the first PC of large sets of highly but not perfectly
correlated SNPs. Slope of the regression line (grey) is shown. (b) distribution of spine
lengths for all multi-locus genotypes from (a). The multi-locus genotype was based on
rounding PC1 coordinates from (a) where values below 0.5 (left of vertical dashed line)
were considered as "Allele 0" or below or equal to 0.5 were considered as "Allele 1". The
first digit for genotypes in (b) represents thus the genotype of the QTL on LG6, followed
by LG15 and LG16, respectively.

## a | Sequence depth for *H2afy-Pitx1* region

## b | Sequence depths for *Pel* region

**Figure 4 | Sequence depths for *H2afy-Pitx1* region.** (a) Relative sequencing depth across the *H2afy-Pitx1* intergenic region for 10 individuals from five different populations. Blue line and shading indicate population average and 95% confidence intervals, respectively. The 3.5kb deletion in RYT, seen as a dip sequencing depth, fully encloses the Pel-2.5kb[SALR] of three-spined stickleback indicated by the red box. (b) Normalised sequencing depths for the Pel-2.5kb[SALR] region for 563 samples from 27 populations show that the complete deletion of the *Pel* region is unique to RYT. Phenotypic data in the Russian populations MAS and BOL suggest a large effect locus is responsible for pelvic reductions, and BYN and PYÖ are populations analysed here where pelvic reduction does not map to LG7.

**Figure 5 | Simulation results.** Linearised $F_{ST}$ against geographic distance (IBD) for
empirical and simulated data (a), with slope and squared Pearson's product moment
correlation coefficient indicated. Geographic distance for simulated data (IBD in the sea)
is scaled to match the slope for the IBD-plot in the sea in empirical data. Freshwater-
freshwater $F_{ST}$ against marine-freshwater $F_{ST}$ from all QTL from all simulated data (n =
100), with effect sizes indicated as shown in legend (b). Loci in upper left quadrant are
classified as being involved in parallel evolution, and loci in the upper right quadrant are
loci that are involved in local adaptation in only one freshwater population. This data is
summarised in (c) focusing on the four largest effect loci, with genetic architecture and
effect sizes indicated by the figure titles.