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[1,6]

[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

[6]Division of Ecology and Biodiversity, Kadoorie Building, The University of Hong

Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, SAR

*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 >2x stronger population structuring

among freshwater populations and >10x stronger genetic isolation by distance in the sea

in nine-spined sticklebacks as compared to three-spined sticklebacks.

39
40 **Keywords:** convergent evolution, epistasis, local adaptation, pelvic reduction, Pitx1,
41 *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). Epistatic interactions and the order at which

beneficial alleles enter and become established in a population also play important roles

in determining the genetic architecture of the trait in question (Orr 1998). Thus, the

demographic history of populations likely plays a central role in determining the

likelihood of local adaptation, and hence also parallel phenotypic evolution.

In recent years, the nine-spined stickleback (*Pungitius pungitius*) has been

emerging as a model system for studying adaptive evolution in the wild (Merilä 2013)

alongside the more widely studied three-spined stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*; Bell

and Foster 1994; Gibson 2005). The latter species' 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 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 (as well as in benthic-limnetic

pairs of three-spined sticklebacks; Peichel *et al.* 2001) 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 lake-stream pairs of three-

spined sticklebacks, the genetic architecture of pelvic reduction is more diversified;

Peichel and Marques 2017; Deagle *et al*. 2012; Stuart *et al.* 2017; Rennison *et al.* 2019).

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

sticklebacks (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. These data were 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 the

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). Spine lengths was measured from its distal point

to the basal point and the length of branch and girdle was measured at its maximum linear

length with digital callipers to the nearest 0.01 mm (both sides of the body). Landmark

definitions with illustrations depicting them can be found from Herczeg *et al*. (2010) and

Shapiro et al. (2004). 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

with repeatability >0.97 for all traits (R; Becker 1984). 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

Figure 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/).

A linkage map based on the three crosses was constructed 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 1 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 both computational speed and complexity reduction

(see Supplementary File 2 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,…,n), x_{dij}, x_{sij}, z_{ij} are genotypes coded

as

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

(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,…,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.

258   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 3. 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 1×10^5 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:

269
$$\frac{1}{2n}\sum_{i=l}^{n}(y_i - \beta_0 - x_{dij}\beta_{dj} - x_{sij}\beta_{sj} - z_{ij}\gamma_j) + \lambda\sum_{j=l}^{p}(|\beta_{aj}| + |\beta_{sj}| + |\gamma_j|), (3)$$

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

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

272   (1).

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

276
$$PVE_{total} = \frac{var\left(\sum_{j=l}^{p} x_j \hat{\beta}_j\right)}{var(y)} \approx \frac{var(y) - \sigma_0^2}{var(y)}, (4)$$

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

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

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

280 following formula:

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

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

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

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

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

286
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.

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 4.

These simulations were parameterised using empirical estimates of population structure

and isolation by distance in the sea for the two species (Supplementary File 5).

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. 2), 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 (20,000 generations).

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. 3). 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. 3). 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. 3).

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). This is also consistent with

a strong correlation between relative pelvic spine and girdle lengths ($r^2 = 0.85$, Fig. 1,

Supplementary Fig. 3 and Supplementary Table 1).

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 3). 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). In addition, phenotypes of the F_2 individuals from the HEL × RYT cross were not

normally distributed and the individual and multi-locus phenotypic effects on spine

lengths for the QTL on LGs 6, 15 and 16 indicated epistatic interactions (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 male QTL on LG14 (Supplementary Fig. 5, Table 1 and

Supplementary Table 3).

400   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).

Compared to the HEL × RYT cross, the correlation between relative pelvic spine

and girdle lengths was much weaker in HEL × BYN cross ($r^2 = 0.11$, Fig. 1,

Supplementary Fig. 3 and Supplementary Table 1) 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 (and the spine was absent in the

F_0 male), consistent with spine length being controlled by multiple additive loci.

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).

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. 3). The deletion is around 3.5 kb (LG7:17015109-17018744;

Supplementary Fig. 6) 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. 3b). 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. 3 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. 4a).

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. 4a). 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. 4a; 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 4), the relationship between marine-freshwater

F_{ST} and freshwater-freshwater F_{ST} depended on both the species and genetic architecture

(Fig. 4b). For instance, when the genetic architecture included one additive large effect

locus (architecture A; homozygotes 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. 4b, c; homozygotes 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. 4b, c).

For the locus with the second highest allelic value in architecture B (homozygotes 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. 4b, 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 and Supplementary Figure 7, and QTL-use in parallel

evolution as a function of allelic effect size is shown in Supplementary Figure 8.

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. 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 whether 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. 3) 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 so naturally, the

lack of *Pel*-deletions in nine-spined sticklebacks could be simply due to lower mutation

rates compared to three-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 from standing genetic

variation depends on the migration rate from the sea (Galloway and Cresko 2019) or from

other populations of the same habitat (Ralph and Coop 2015a) 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), indicating that

population demography is sufficient to preclude local adaptation.

592   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 4). 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 is sufficient for limiting 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.

Interestingly, in the HEL × BYN cross complete spine reduction most likely

occurred 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, indicating

epistatic interactions (Supplementary File 6). 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 – 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).

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. 3) 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 further 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. Thus, overlapping selection optima is necessary but

nevertheless not sufficient for parallel evolution to take place and 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; Rennison *et al*. 2019). 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.

In a small geographic region in Belgium, Raeymaekers et al. (2017) compared the

strength and nature of neutral and adaptive divergence along a salinity gradient in nine-

and three-spined sticklebacks. Since the lake and pond populations in this study were

connected by creaks (allowing contemporary gene flow), in contrast to our study – where

a much larger geographic area is considered – population structuring among the nine-

spined stickleback population was not stronger than in the three-spined sticklebacks.

Despite gene flow, both phenotypic and genetic parallelism was still lower in nine-

compared to three-spined sticklebacks. We suspect that lack of parallelism in nine-spined

sticklebacks in Raeymaekers et al. (2017) simply lies in lack of ancestral variation – it

does not matter how much gene flow there is if the necessary ancestral variation for local

adaptation is lacking. Based on our findings here it seems thus likely that ancestral

variation for local adaptation in nine- but not three-spined sticklebacks was already

lacking in the marine ancestral populations from which the Raeymaekers et al. (2017)

study area was colonised from.

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 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.

Data availably

The data and code for analyses that support the findings of this study are openly

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

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

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

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

MacPherson, A., and Nuismer, S. 2016. The probability of parallel genetic evolution
from standing genetic variation. J. Evol. Biol. 30: 326–337.
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, 160–169

Orr, H. A. 1998. The population genetics of adaptation: the distribution of factors fixed
during adaptive evolution. Evolution 52:935-949. DOI: 10.2307/2411226

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.

Peichel, C.L, Marques, D.A. 2017. The genetic and molecular architecture ofphenotypic
diversity in sticklebacks. Phil.Trans. R. Soc. B372: 20150486.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0486

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

Raeymaekers, J. A. M., Chaturvedi, A., Hablützel, P. I., Verdonck, I., Hellemans, B.,
Maes, G. E., … Volckaert, F. A. M. (2017). Adaptive and non-adaptive divergence
in a common landscape. Nature Communications, 8(1), 267. doi: 10.1038/s41467-
017-00256-6

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.

Rennison, D. J., Stuart, Y. E., Bolnick, D. I., and Peichel, C. L. 2019. Ecological factors
and morphological traits are associated with repeated genomic differentiation
between lake and stream stickleback. Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B374:20180241.
https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2018.0241

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

1036
1037

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

1048

1049 **Table 2 | Proportion phenotypic variance explained (PVE) in pelvic traits.**
1050 Percentages of total phenotypic variance explained by different linkage groups (LG), by
1051 all SNPs (Tot), by loci inherited from females (♀) and males (♂), as well as the
1052 dominance effect (Dom). Results are shown for each cross and trait separately, and for
1053 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	-

1054

Figure 1 | Summary of previously published nine-spined stickleback pelvic phenotypes from the wild and common garden experiments. Scatterplot depicts relative (to standard body length) pelvic spine and girdle lengths colored according to population and habitat type and with size indicating Pearson's product moment correlation (r^2) between spine and girdle lengths for a given population. Populations with complete spine and/or girdle reductions (BYN, RYT and MAS) are here given r^2=0. Further details can be found in Supplementary Fig. 3 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 α = 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 3 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 | Sequence depth for *H2afy-Pitx1* region

b | Sequence depths for *Pel* region

Figure 3 | 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 4 | Simulation results. (a) depicts linearised F_{ST} against geographic distance (IBD) for empirical and simulated data, 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. (b) depicts freshwater-freshwater F_{ST} against marine-freshwater F_{ST} from all QTL from all simulated data (n = 100), with allelic effect sizes indicated as shown in legend (phenotypic optima in marine and freshwater habitats are 0 and 20, respectively). 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.

50