Genetic population structure constrains local adaptation in sticklebacks

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

Yang[1,4], Baocheng Guo[5], Takahito Shikano[1], 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]Chinese Sturgeon Research Institute, Three Gorges Corporation, Yichang, 443100,

China

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

Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

*Corresponding author: petrikemppainen2@gmail.com

Abstract

Repeated and independent adaptation to specific environmental conditions from standing

genetic variation is common. However, if genetic variation is limited, the evolution of

similar locally adapted traits may be restricted to genetically different and potentially less

optimal solutions, or prevented from happening altogether. Using a quantitative trait

locus (QTL) mapping approach, we identified the genomic regions responsible for the

repeated pelvic reduction (PR) in three crosses between nine-spined stickleback

populations expressing full and reduced pelvic structures. In one cross, PR mapped to

linkage group 7 (LG7) containing the gene *Pitx1*, known to control pelvic reduction also

in the three-spined stickleback. In the two other crosses, PR was polygenic and attributed

to ten novel QTL, of which 90% were unique to specific crosses. When screening the

genomes from 27 different populations for deletions in the *Pitx1* regulatory element,

these were only found in the population in which PR mapped to LG7, even though the

morphological data indicated large effect QTL for PR in several other populations as

well. Consistent with the available theory and simulations parameterised on empirical

data, we hypothesise that the observed variability in genetic architecture of PR is due to

heterogeneity in the spatial distribution of standing genetic variation caused by strong

population structuring and genetic isolation by distance in the sea.

Keywords: convergent evolution, epistasis, local adaptation, pelvic reduction, Pitx1,

Pungitius pungitius

Introduction

Failure to evolve in response to changing environmental conditions may lead to extirpation or even extinction (Orr and Unckless 2008). If 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; Barrett and Schluter 2008; Thompson *et al*. 2019). Furthermore, 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, leading to parallel phenotypic evolution (Arendt and Reznick 2007; Schluter and Conte 2009; Elmer and Meyer 2011; Stern 2013; Conte *et al*. 2015; Bolnick *et al*. 2018; 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, thus preventing adaptation. Alternatively, due to heterogeneity in the distribution of standing genetic variation, adaptation to given selection pressures could more likely be acquired with phylogenetically independent alleles (rather than alleles that are identical by descent) at the same or different loci influencing the same trait, even if they may differ significantly in their fitness effects (Cohan 1984; Merilä 2013, 2014; Rosenblum *et al*. 2014). Thus, the demographic history of populations likely plays a central role in determining the likelihood of local adaptation, and hence also parallel phenotypic 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*. 2010a; DeFaveri *et al*. 2012; Merilä 2013; this study). Given their

contrasting population demographic characteristics, three- and nine-spined sticklebacks

can thus be expected to respond differently with respect to local adaption to newly

colonised freshwater habitats.

Regressive evolution of the pelvic complex has occurred in freshwater

populations of 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) in freshwater environments. Collectively, sticklebacks provide an important model

system to study the 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; Shikano *et al*. 2010b; 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; in benthic-limnetic and lake-

stream pairs of three-spined sticklebacks, the genetic architecture of pelvic reduction is

more diversified; Peichel *et al.* 2001, 2017; Deagle *et al*. 2012; Stuart *et al.* 2017). While

pelvic reduction in freshwater is much less common in nine- than three-spined

stickleback (Klepaker *et al*. 2013; Fig. 1), two independent QTL studies also identified

Pitx1 in linkage group (LG) 7 as a major cause for pelvic reduction in a Canadian

(Shapiro *et al.* 2006) and a 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 (when it occurs) appear to be more diversified than those in the marine-

freshwater three-spined stickleback model system (Merilä 2013, 2014).

Starting with a survey of previously published phenotypic data on pelvic

reduction in the wild, we aimed to investigate the possible genetic heterogeneity

underlying pelvic reduction in different nine-spined stickleback populations by mapping

QTL for pelvic reduction in three independently colonised ponds. One was the previously

studied Rytilampi (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. To further assess the extent to which *Pel* could be 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, utilising more comprehensive geographic sampling

than in previous studies (Shikano *et al.* 2010a; DeFaveri *et al*. 2012; Merilä 2013), along

with high-quality SNP data, we re-assessed the differences in population structuring and

genetic isolation by distance (IBD) between nine-and three-spined sticklebacks. We

hypothesised that, in contrast to three-spined sticklebacks, both the scarcity and

variability in the genetic architecture of pelvic reduction in nine-spined sticklebacks is

due to heterogeneity in the spatial patterns of standing genetic variation caused by strong

population structuring – both among adjacent pond populations as well as in the ancestral

sea population(s). Building on previous theoretical work, this hypothesis was tested using

simulated data parameterised on population demographic parameters obtained from

empirical data.

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

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 and LEV) and two pond (BYN and 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 300–500 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 (see Supplementary File 2 for details).

Dimensionality reduction by linkage disequilibrium network clustering

It is essential in QTL mapping 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 the 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) to increase efficiency in computational speed and reduce complexity (see

Supplementary File 3 for details).

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 C and D 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:

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

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

as

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

(Xu 2013b), β_0 is the parameter of the population mean, β_{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), β_{dj} is the substitution effect of alleles C and D of the sire (i.e. the

grandmother in F_0), γ_j is the dominance effect, and ε_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 $1e^5$ 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:

260
$$\frac{1}{2n}\sum_{i=l}^{n}(y_i - \beta_0 - x_{dij}\beta_{dj} - x_{sij}\beta_{sj} - z_{ij}\gamma_j) + \lambda\sum_{j=l}^{p}(|\beta_{dj}| + |\beta_{sj}| + |\gamma_j|), (3)$$

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

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

263   (1).

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

267
$$PVE_{total} = \frac{var\left(\sum_{j=l}^{p} x_j \hat{\beta}_j\right)}{var(y)} \approx \frac{var(y) - \sigma_0^2}{var(y)}, (4)$$

268   where $\hat{\beta}_j$ is the effects of the SNPs, and σ_0^2 is the LASSO residual variance estimated by a

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

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

271   following formula:

272
$$PVE_{LG} \approx PVE_{total} - \frac{var\left(\sum x_j \hat{\beta}_j\right)}{var(y)}, (5)$$

where $\hat{\beta}_j (j \notin G)$ represents all the effects estimated by the LASSO of the SNPs that do not

belong to a set of SNPs (e.g. to a chromosome/linkage group). A similar approach was

used to estimate the contribution of grandparental alleles and to evaluate the dominance

component by treating the coding systems $[x_{dij}, x_{sij}, z_{ij}]$ (2) as different groups of SNPs. A

custom R-code for PVE estimation is available from DRYAD (DOI

https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.76hdr7str).

279
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.* 2019) 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 the 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*. 2019) in regions where significant QTL were found. The

custom R-code for these analyses is provided in DRYAD (DOI

https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.76hdr7str).

Simulations

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). The effects of standing genetic variation (assuming a panmictic ancestral

population) on the probability of parallel local adaptation have already been studied

(Ralph and Coop 2015a; MacPhearson and Nuisimer 2016; Lee and Coop 2017;

Galloway and Cresko 2019), along with the effects of population structure on adaptation

in continuous landscapes (Hermisson and Pennings 2005; Ralph and Coop 2010, 2015b).

However, no simulations to date have explicitly considered the effects of heterogeneous

patterns in the distribution of standing genetic variation on local adaptation/parallel

evolution. Thus, we used forward-in-time simulations to explore the effects of the

differences in population demographic parameters between nine- and three-spined

sticklebacks on the probability of local adaptation, as described in Supplementary File 5.

These simulations were parameterised using empirical estimates of population structure

and isolation by distance in the sea for the two species (Supplementary File 4).

In short, two freshwater populations were connected to different marine

populations at the ends of a stepping-stone chain of marine populations with the carrying

capacity (K) and migration (M) both in the sea, and between the founding (marine) and

founder (freshwater) population (Supplementary Fig. 3), thus generating comparable

patterns of population structuring and IBD in the sea as in the empirical data (see

Results). The two freshwater populations were colonised once and allowed to become

locally adapted for 10,000 years. All freshwater adaptation was due to standing genetic

variation in the sea that was continually replenished from a "refuge" freshwater

population (situated at an equal distance from the two focal freshwater populations), as

well as from the two focal freshwater populations once they were colonised. Three

different genetic architectures were studied. One (architecture A) corresponds to a single

large effect QTL (allowing 100% local adaptation, but with minor effect QTL also

affecting the trait), another (architecture B) to a situation where at least two loci are

needed to allow local adaptation (allowing 40% or 60% local adaptation), and the third

(architecture C) corresponds to the same scenario as A, except that the large effect locus

is recessive. Mutation rate was fixed at $1e^{-8}$ and all loci were polymorphic at the

beginning of the simulations. More details are given in Supplementary File 4.

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; 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). A lack of pelvic reduction (relative to the 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 the 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 2), 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 the Helsinki × Bynästjärnen cross

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

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

(PVE = 13.7%; Fig. 2c, Table 1 and 2) 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. 2a, b). 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 was approximately normally

distributed, except the highly reduced spine lengths, which had long tails, implicating that

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

further in Supplementary File 6). 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 the 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 the 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. 2f and

Table 1). In the 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). Overall, the multi-locus analyses revealed that 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 cross (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

compared to 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, in which 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 identified from the

literature (Supplementary Table 4) were found in the 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 – *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).

Simulations

In the empirical data from the marine populations, IBD (the slope of the regression line

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

the $1e^6$ bootstrap replicates were between 2.05^{-7} and 2.2^{-7}) for nine-spined sticklebacks,

and 1.53^{-8} (95% of the bootstrap replicates were between 1.10^{-8} and 1.96^{-8}) for three-

spined sticklebacks. 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).

The geographic distance (which is on an arbitrary scale) in the simulated data was scaled

based on the observed levels of IBD in the empirical data. This resulted in the distance

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

marine populations from which the focal freshwater populations were founded)

corresponding to 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 (<400 km). The difference in

IBD between the two species is also close to that in the empirical data (264/352 km =

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, 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).

Do population demographic parameters influence local adaptation?

In the simulations (Supplementary File 5), 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; heterozygotes for this locus were 100% locally adapted to

freshwater), this locus was often involved in parallel evolution when population structure

was parameterised based on three-spined sticklebacks (65% of replicates, n = 100), but

not when population structure was parameterised based on 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

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

and three-spined sticklebacks, respectively; Fig. 5b, c; heterozygotes for this locus were

60% locally adapted to freshwater). Local adaptation also occurred in 57% of the

replicates in the nine-spine stickleback-like scenario, and in 18% in the 3-sp (Fig. 5b, c).

For the locus with the second highest allelic value in architecture B (heterozygotes for

this locus were 40% locally adapted to freshwater), the cases of both parallel evolution

and local adaptation collectively dropped to 38% and 43% three and nine-spined like

stickleback scenarios, 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 stickleback-like scenario (48%),

compared to architecture A. However, results for the nine-spined stickleback-like

scenario was similar to architecture A (6% parallel evolution; Fig. 5b, c). Thus, at

relatively short (<400 km) geographical distances, parallel evolution is an expected

outcome in three- but not nine-spined stickleback-like scenarios, particularly when a

single additive large effect locus is responsible for freshwater adaptation. Results

addressing the questions of how local adaptation depend on ancestral allele frequency are

presented in Supplementary File 7.

Discussion

The results demonstrate that pelvic reduction in nine-spined sticklebacks is not nearly as

common as in three-spined sticklebacks, and when it does exist, the genetic basis is more

variable in nine-spined sticklebacks compared to three-spined sticklebacks. This is

consistent with the re-analyses of neutral population genomic data showing that both IBD

in the sea and the genetic structure among marine populations are >10 times higher in

nine-spined sticklebacks, causing heterogeneity in the distribution of standing genetic

variation that is not present to the same extent in the marine three-spined stickleback

populations. Thus, the level and distribution of ancestral variation available for local

adaptation (and also for parallel phenotypic 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) and corroborated by our simulations.

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

parameters?

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

show that multiple genomic regions (11 QTL, ten of which 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) in our study, but even

here it is not certain that the underlying causal mutations are the same. 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 nevertheless predominantly

responsible for pelvic reduction in three-spined sticklebacks (Chan *et al.* 2010; Xie *et al.*

2019). In contrast, the major effect and recessive *Pitx1/Pel* allele in nine-spined

sticklebacks is known to be responsible for pelvic reduction in only one Canadian

population and Rytilampi. In both Bynästjärnen and Pyöreälampi, pelvic reduction is less

heritable, polygenic and additive. In addition, based on morphological data, it seems

likely that major effect loci not associated with *Pel*-deletions (Fig. 4) control pelvic

reduction in two Russian ponds, with one additional Alaskan population being controlled

by a large effect additive locus mapping to LG4 (Shapiro *et al.* 2009). We do not yet

know the mutation rate of the *Pel*-deletions in nine-spined sticklebacks. Regardless,

pelvic reduction in the nine-spined stickleback is much less common than in three-spined

sticklebacks in general (Klepaker *et al.* 2013), and when it occurs, the QTL that control

pelvic reduction are much more variable with respect to heritability, effect size

distribution and dominance relationships. Assuming that selection for pelvic reduction in

nine-spined stickleback freshwater populations is universal (see below), such a pattern is

consistent with poor connectivity, causing heterogeneity in the patterns of standing

genetic variation. This would restrict local adaptation, and hence, also parallel phenotypic

evolution. However, the focus of this study is on the role of population demographic

parameters on local adaptation from standing genetic variation, regardless of whether the

alleles that confer freshwater adaptations are identical by descent (e.g. EDA) or

independently derived (e.g. *Pel*-deletions in three-spined sticklebacks), and only

secondarily on parallelism (i.e. when the same trait is locally adapted in multiple

independently colonised populations, regardless of genetic architecture).

It has been shown that multiple independent alleles for the same adaptation can

temporarily co-exist in structured populations, causing heterogeneity in standing genetic

variation across the distribution range of a species. This can be true when considering the

dynamics of novel mutations (Ralph and Coop 2010) or neutral alleles segregating in the

population before they become adaptive (Ralph and Coop 2015a). However, these studies

assume uniform selection across single continuous populations and thus do not consider

the scenario where locally adapted freshwater alleles – which can be different in different

parts of the distribution range – are continually introduced to the sea. Furthermore,

simulations showing that the probability of local parallel evolution depends on the

migration rate from the sea (Galloway and Cresko 2019) or from other populations of the

same habitat (Ralph and Coop 2015b) implicitly assume a homogenous pool of ancestral

standing genetic variation. Our simulations show that local adaptation is also a function

of the allele frequency in the founding marine population; with stronger IBD in the sea,

standing genetic variation in the ancestral marine population was a stronger bottleneck

for parameters that resulted in nine-spined stickleback-like population structure (9-sp)

than for parameters that resulted in three-spined stickleback-like population structure (3-

sp; Supplementary Figures 7 and 8). Particularly for smaller effect loci, there was a

stronger dependence between the allele frequency in the ancestral marine population and

local adaptation in 9- compared to 3-sp, indicating that smaller effect QTL have a

stronger influence on local adaptation in 9- compared to 3-sp (Supplementary Figures 7

and 8). This resulted in more polygenic and/or less complete local adaptation in 9-

compared to 3-sp (Supplementary Figures 7 and 8).

While our simulation results match closely with estimates of population structure

and IBD in the empirical data, these simulations explore only a small proportion of the

possible parameter space with respect to selection intensity, effective population sizes

and migration rates (detailed in Supplementary File 5). We also assume that all parallel

evolution is due to standing genetic variation of alleles that are identical by descent (since

mutation rate is low), whereas it is known that pelvic reduction in three-spined

sticklebacks is, to a large extent, due to independently derived *Pel*-deletions attributable

to high mutation rates (Xie *et al.* 2019). Nevertheless, most three-spined stickleback

studies indicate that freshwater adaptation is indeed chiefly due to alleles identical by

descent that have segregated in the population for millions of years (e.g. Jones *et al.*

2012; Nelson and Cresko 2018), making *Pitx1* an exception. In the case of nine-spined

sticklebacks, *Pitx1* is with certainty associated with pelvic reduction in only two of all

studied populations, suggesting a minor role for recurrent mutation in determining pelvic

reduction in this species. While our simulations demonstrate that heterogeneous patterns

of standing genetic variation can limit local adaptation in species characterized by low

connectivity, further simulations with a wider parameter space could be helpful in

advancing our understanding of the limits of adaptation in small and structured

populations/species.

Geographic heterogeneity in selection optima

The high heterogeneity in the genetic architecture of pelvic reduction in the nine-spined

stickleback can alternatively be attributed to within habitat environmental variation

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

Thompson *et al.* 2019). For example, 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 changes 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 did not observe strong genetic parallelism for smaller effect loci (with allelic effects <

6) in both the three- and nine-spined stickleback-like scenarios (Fig. 5b, 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).

Pelvic reduction outside marine-freshwater study systems

While the evidence for genetic parallelism on 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 evolutionary

independent 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 likely do not 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. 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 to 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 centred around the mean, but also had a long tail of

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

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

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

695 complete spine reduction most likely occurred when the allele responsible for spine

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

708 *Candidate genes*

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

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

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

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

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

to 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 other two 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, which is yet 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 the genetics of adaptation in populations of conservation

concern.

Acknowledgments

We thank Alexandre Budria, Chris Eberlein, Sami Karja, Heini Natri and Ismo

Rautiainen for help in fish collection and/or rearing. Thanks are also due to Kirsi

Kähkönen for help in laboratory, and Oulanka Biological Station (University of Oulu) for

logistic support. We are grateful for the computing resource support from CSC – the

Finnish IT Center for Science Ltd administered by the Ministry of Education and Culture,

Finland. B.G. thanks support from CAS Pioneer Hundred Talents Program and the

National Natural Science Foundation of China (31672273). This work is supported by the

Academy of Finland (grant numbers, 129662, 134728 and 218343 to J.M.), a grant from

Helsinki Institute of Life Science (HiLIFE to JM) and a personal grant to Petri

Kemppainen from the Finnish Cultural Foundation (00190489).

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

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., and 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. Annu. 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

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

Galloway, J., Cresko, W., and Ralph, P. 2019. A few stickleback suffice for the transport
of alleles to new lakes G3: Genes Genomes Genetics 10: 505–514.
https://dx.doi.org/10.1534/g3.119.400564

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*): signatures of parallel evolution. Biol. J. Linn. Soc. 101: 403–416.

Hermisson, J., and Pennings, P. (2005). Soft sweeps: molecular population genetics of adaptation from standing genetic variation. Genetics 169: 2335–2352. https://dx.doi.org/10.1534/genetics.104.036947

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

[dataset] Kemppainen, P., Li, Z., Rastas, P., Löytynoja, A., Fang, F., Yang, J., Guo, B., Shikano, T., and Merilä, M.; 2020; Genetic population structure constrains local adaptation in sticklebacks; Dryad; DOI https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.76hdr7str.

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

856 Klepaker, T., Østbye, K., and M. A. Bell. 2013. Regressive evolution of the pelvic
857   complex in stickleback fishes: a study of convergent evolution. Evol. Ecol. Res. 15:
858   413–435.

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

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

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

867 Lee, K., and Coop, G. 2017. Distinguishing among modes of convergent adaptation using
868   population genomic data. Genetics https://dx.doi.org/10.1534/genetics.117.300417

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

871 Li, H., Handsaker, B., Wysoker, A., Fennell, T., Ruan, J., Homer, N., … T. Sam. 2009.
872   The Sequence Alignment / Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics 25: 2078–
873   2079. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btp352

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

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

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

883 MacPherson, A., and Nuismer, S. 2016. The probability of parallel genetic evolution
884   from standing genetic variation. J. Evol. Biol. 30: 326–337.
885   https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jeb.13006

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.

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.

Ralph, P., and Coop, G. 2010. Parallel adaptation: one or many waves of advance of an
advantageous allele? Genetics 186: 647–68.
https://dx.doi.org/10.1534/genetics.110.119594

Ralph, P., and G. Coop 2015a. Convergent evolution during local adaptation to patchy
landscapes. PLoS Genetics 11: e1005630.
https://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1005630

Ralph, P., and G. Coop. 2015b. The role of standing variation in geographic convergent
adaptation. Am Nat 186 Suppl 1(S1), S5–23. https://dx.doi.org/10.1086/682948

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. Stat. 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. Phil. 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., …
and 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. 2010a. 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

Shikano, T., Ramadevi, J., & Merilä, J. 2010b. Identification of local-and habitat-
dependent selection: scanning functionally important genes in nine-spined
sticklebacks (*Pungitius pungitius*). Mol. Biol. Evol. 27: 2775–2789.

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., … and
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., …
and 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., 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

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

1018
Data Accessibility Statement
All data and codes used in analyses can be found in Dryad (DOI
https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.76hdr7str).

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 (β) 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}	β
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	0.04	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	0.54
HEL × BYN	Spine	male	16	3	No	1.16e-04	0.01	0.086	0.493
HEL × BYN	Spine	male	21	4	No	3.36e-04	0.031	0.037	0.36
HEL × BYN	Spine	female	6	5	No	1.37e-04	0.018	0.07	0.5
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	0.02	0.045	0.301
HEL × BYN	Spine	female	16	10	Yes	2.53e-04	0.03	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	13	Yes	4.75e-06	<0.001	0.075	0.005
HEL × PYÖ	Girdle	male	1	13	Yes	9.69e-05	0.016	0.044	0.005

1032

1033 **Table 2 | Proportion phenotypic variance explained (PVE) in pelvic traits.**
1034 Percentages of total phenotypic variance explained by different linkage groups (LG), by
1035 all SNPs (Tot), by loci inherited from females (♀) and males (♂), as well as the
1036 dominance effect (Dom). Results are shown for each cross and trait separately, and for
1037 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	-

1038

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 numbers in the bottom panel show 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. 2 and Supplementary Table 1. Phenotypic data for F_2 individuals from the current study are also presented (HEL × RYT, HEL × BYN, and HEL × PYÖ) 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 the x-axis labels.

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. QTL for pelvic spine length and girdle length are shown, with
the x-axis indicating position in centi Morgans (cM). Results are based on permutations,
and the 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 the 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 1 for details). Candidate genes involved in pelvic development are
indicated with black text representing genes that affect expression of *Pitx1*, and red text
indicates genes that affect pelvic development downstream of *Pitx1* expression. Results
for analyses based on relative trait values can be found in Supplementary Figure 5.

a | QTL effects for HEL x BYN

b | Phenotype distribution by multi−locus QTL genotype

Figure 3 | Epistatic interactions in pelvic spine development for HEL × BYN cross.
(a) The effects of individual genotype, 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", and those above or equal to 0.5 were considered as "Allele
1". The first digit for genotypes in (b) thus represents the genotype of the QTL on LG6,
followed by LG15 and LG16, respectively.

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 in 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, showing that the complete deletion of the *Pel* region is unique to RYT.
Phenotypic data in the Russian populations MAS and BOL suggest that a large effect
locus is responsible for pelvic reductions, and BYN and PYÖ (analysed here) are
populations in which 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 the 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 the 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.

51