Title: Environment-dependent expression of mutational load and species' range limits

Authors: Antoine Perrier[1,2], Darío Sánchez-Castro[2], Yvonne Willi[2]

[1] Department of Biology, University of Virginia, 485 McCormick Road, Charlottesville, VA 22904, USA

[2] Department of Environmental Sciences, University of Basel, Schönbeinstrasse 6, 4056 Basel, Switzerland.

Corresponding author contact details:

Antoine Perrier

Department of Biology,

University of Virginia,

485 McCormick Road,

Charlottesville, VA 22904,

USA

Phone: +1 434 243 0774

Email: cdt9qe@virginia.edu

Orcid ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6447-5692

Type of article: Research article

Number of words: Summary: 158; main text: 4295 (Introduction: 847, Material and Methods: 1451, Results: 710, Discussion: 1287); References: 1777

Number of references: 67

Number of tables: 2

Number of figures: 2 (2 in colour)

Number of electronic supplementary material: 11 supplementary tables, 3 supplementary figures and 2 supplementary methods

Summary:

Theoretical and empirical research on the causes of species' range limits suggests the contribution of several intrinsic and extrinsic factors, with potentially complex interactions among them. An intrinsic factor proposed by recent theory is mutational load increasing towards range edges because of genetic drift. Furthermore, environmental quality may erode towards range edges and enhance the expression of load. Here we tested whether the expression of mutational load associated with range limits in the North American *Arabidopsis lyrata* is enhanced under stressful conditions, by comparing the performance of within- *versus* between-population crosses at common garden sites across the species' distribution and beyond. Heterosis, reflecting the expression of load, increased with heightened estimates of genomic load and with environmental stress caused by warming, but the interaction was not significant. We conclude that range-edge populations suffer from a twofold genetic Allee effect caused by increased mutational load and stress-dependent load linked to general heterozygote deficiency, but no synergistic effect between them.

Keywords: *Arabidopsis lyrata*, environmental stress, genetic drift, geographic distribution limits, heterosis, mutational load.

Introduction

The geographic distribution of species can be constrained by several factors, and they may interact in complex manners [1–5]. An important factor put forward by relatively recent theory is the accumulation of mutational load in range-edge populations due to a history of enhanced genetic drift [6–8]. In parallel, environmental conditions may degrade toward the range limits of a species [9–12]. Apart from their respective negative effect on population performance, mutational load and environmental stress may interact synergistically in their effect on performance, as was suggested and found for inbreeding depression [13 p285-338,14]. The contribution of mutational load to range limits could therfore be much stronger and relevant for shaping the distribution of many species.

Two types of demographic scenarios at range edges are predicted to lead to increased mutational load. First, range expansion through serial demographic bottlenecks enhances genetic drift that opposes purifying selection and leads to the accumulation of deleterious mutations [6,15,16]. High load at the expansion front is predicted to slow down expansion, or even halt expansion under low genome-wide recombination [15], and can persist in populations for thousands of generations [6]. Theoretical work also showed that the so-called expansion load is based mainly on recessive deleterious mutations [16]. Second, mutations may accumulate when the carrying capacity of suitable habitats declines along a line of habitat patches, particularly if dispersal and population growth rates are low [7]. This scenario may occur at range limits if suitable habitat thins out or declines in quality toward range edges. Genomic evidence for the accumulation of mutational load with range expansion was found for humans [17–18], and in plants for expansion and rear-edge isolation [19–22].

At range limits, the environment may also become more stressful. Empirical studies document a general decline in habitat suitability toward range limits in many taxa [3,23]. A rather consistent and pronounced effect was found in species experimentally transplanted beyond their range edges as their lifetime performance generally declined compared to sites within the range [11]. The decline in performance was found to coincide with a decline in predicted habitat suitability revealed by niche modelling [12]. The two meta-level studies suggest that the decay in habitat suitability is rather

general. Such unfavorable conditions may act in isolation and lower population performance, or they may even enhance the expression of mutational load at range edges, further reducing population performance.

Potential mechanisms for a synergistic interaction between mutational load and environmental stress have rarely been explored *per se*, but have been mainly discussed and tested in the context of inbreeding depression [24–26]. Three mechanisms have been proposed [14]. The first is that stress induces the expression of deleterious mutations that are silent under benign conditions [27,28]. For example in *Drosophila*, recessive alleles were linked to increased mortality under temperature stress in inbred lines [29]. Extreme stress and inbreeding impede the function of heat shock proteins such as Hsp90, which are essential in buffering the expression of deleterious mutations [30–32]. A second mechanism is that mutational load may lower stress resistance or tolerance, by destabilizing cellular homeostasis under stress, or affecting tissue and genome repair after stress exposure [14,33]. For example, hybrids of *Arabidopsis thaliana* expressed more metabolites from central pathways linked to higher freezing tolerance or disease resistance compared to inbred lines [34,35], and the regulation of stress-response pathways led to higher recovery after stress [36]. The third mechanism is that stress increases phenotypic variance, increasing the opportunity for relative fitness measures to be lower in inbred individuals than outbred ones [37]. Reed *et al.* [14] found that variation in inbreeding depression was predicted by stress itself and – to a weaker extent – also by phenotypic variance.

In this study, we tested for the stress dependence of the expression of mutational load at the range limits of the North American species *Arabidopsis lyrata* subsp. *lyrata* (L.). The current distribution of the species has been strongly impacted by fast post-glacial range expansion from two separate refugia since the last glacial maximum [21,38]. Range expansion and rear-edge dynamics were both associated with an increase in presumably deleterious mutations assessed on the level of DNA sequences, accumulating toward range edges [21]. This genomic load was related with expressed load, estimated by heterosis [39]. Here wee tested whether the expression of mutational load, via heterosis, depended on the interaction between genomic load and environmental

stressfulness in the direction of a positive synergistic effect. Plants of within- (WPC) and between-population crosses (BPC) were raised in a latitudinal transplant experiment with five common garden sites within and beyond the distribution range (plant data as in Perrier *et al*. [39]). Environmental stressfulness was estimated by (a) the difference in climatic conditions experienced by populations in each common garden compared to their site of origin assuming local adaptation to climate [40], and (b) the relative performance of each population at a site compared to the best site. We investigated the contribution of WPC and BPC to patterns of heterosis. We also tested whether heterosis was higher when range-edge populations with highest load were transplanted beyond the range limits.

Materials and Methods

Experimental design

Populations. Twenty populations of *A. lyrata* subsp. *lyrata* from across the species distribution were selected for producing WPC and BPC (Fig. 1; electronic supplementary material, Table S1). The populations represented the two main ancestral clusters [21,38], the latitudinal range, variation in the genomic signatures of mutational load [21], and the two mating systems: predominant outcrossing and predominant selfing (MO2, ON1, ON11), with the latter occurring at range edges [39]. Eighteen populations (nine per cluster) were considered target populations in the assessment of expressed mutational load, and two were partner populations for BPC (NY1, eastern cluster, and IA1, western cluster). Partner populatoins were selected because of their core location in each genetic cluster, high genomic diversity and history of little genetic drift. Seeds of individual plants had been collected in each population over an area of about 450 m^2.

Crossing. One plant of each of 26 randomly selected and presumably unrelated seed families per population were raised under controlled, indoors conditions. Plants were randomly appointed to “mothers”/pollen recipients (12), “fathers”/pollen donors (12), and backups (2). Each “mother” was crossed using pollen from one “father” of the same population (WPC). For target populations, each “mother” was additionally crossed using pollen from one “father” of the partner population (BPC).

Crosses were non-reciprocal. Pollination was performed at the bud stage to prevent unintended cross- or self-pollination. We repeated each cross-combination to obtain enough healthy-looking seeds to perform the transplant experiment (min. 60). In case of systematic cross failure, we replaced the father plant with a backup plant. In total, 401 family-cross type combinations were used for the transplant experiment (electronic supplementary material,Table S2).

Transplant experiment. Five common garden sites (CG) were selected along a *ca.* 1400 km latitudinal gradient crossing the distribution of *A. lyrata* in the eastern USA (Fig. 1; electronic supplementary material, Table S3 with WorldClim data v 2.0 [41]). The five sites represented the centre of the species' range (CG3, Harrisonburg, VA), the southern and northern range edges (CG4, Winston-Salem, NC, and CG2, Williamstown, MA, respectively), and areas beyond the edges (CG5, Athens, GA, and CG1, in the Adirondacks, NY). In each common garden, seeds of all crosses were sown in pots (2 per pot; pot with opening at the bottom) randomly distributed within each of three spatial blocks (more details in Perrier *et al*. [39]). Five data loggers (iButton®, Maxim Integrated Products, Inc) monitored air temperature every hour (1.5 m above ground, in the shadow) in each site for the duration of the experiment.

Performance. Germination was recorded for each seed three days a week until peak germination was over (four to five weeks) and afterwards once a week until thinning to one seedling per pot. Reproductive output was assessed several weeks after peak flowering in 2018 and 2019, and calculated for each individual as the sum of fruits, pedicels (unfertilized flowers), flowers, and flower buds. During the second winter, we also assessed seed survival to estimate how seeds that did not germinate the first fall could have contributed to population performance. For each population-cross type combination, we pooled 100 seeds from five to twelve seed families, split them in 10 bags and placed 2 bags per garden on bare ground next to pots in October 2018. Bags were retrieved in late spring 2019 and visually screened for germinated seedlings and seeds. Remaining seeds were tested for germination in the laboratory. Seed survival over the winter was calculated for each bag as the fraction of germinated seedlings outdoors and in the lab.

Statistical analysis

Initial analyses were based on *Multiplicative performance* (*MP*) calculated on the level of the pot as the product of the fraction of germinated seeds and the sum of total reproductive output recorded up to year 3 (year 2 for CG 3 that had to be given up early), or to year 2. We tested for a general effect of cross type (BPC compared to WPC = 0), genomic load, environmental stress and interactions. Genomic load was a genomic estimate of mutational load calculated as the ratio of non-synonymous polymorphic sites to synonymous polymorphic sites, adjusted for their mean derived allele frequency (relative to *A. thaliana*), $P_n f_n / P_s f_s$ of Willi *et al.* [21]. Environmental stress was depicted by the difference in climate between garden site and site of origin of a population. Distribution modelling had shown that average minimum temperature in March and April described best the niche and latitudinal range limits of *A. lyrata* [42], and therefore, environmental stress was calculated as the difference in average minimum temperature in early spring (March and April) between common garden sites and site of origin of populations: $\Delta T_{min} = T_{min\ CG} - T_{min\ origin}$. $T_{min\ CG}$ was calculated based on records of temperature loggers (electronic supplementary material, Table S4), and $T_{min\ origin}$ based on the WorldClim 2.0 database (spatial resolutions of 30 seconds [41]; electronic supplementary material, Table S1) and averaged over target and partner population for BPC. Positive and negative values of ΔT_{min} indicated transplanting toward warmer and colder temperatures, respectively. We assumed that both positive and negative deviations could be perceived as stressful and therefore included the square term in the model. Analyses were performed in a Bayesian framework on 10 parallel chains (detailed in electronic supplementary material, Method S5), with the package *MCMCglmm* [43,44] in *R* [45], and accounted for the zero-inflation of *MP* by modelling a Gaussian process (*MP* > 0) and a logistic process (probability of 1 assigned to *MP* > 0). Random effects were maternal plant nested within maternal population and maternal population, for which variance in intercepts and slopes of cross type were estimated, and block nested within common garden and

common garden. Covariates were mean-centred, and square terms were calculated based on mean-centred values.

Further analyses were – for ease of interpretation – performed on heterosis estimated on the level of the population and addressed what the best model on the expression of load under environmental stress was. Heterosis was calculated as the increase in performance of BPC relative to WPC: $(W_{BPC} - W_{WPC})/W_{WPC}$, where W_{WPC} and W_{BPC} were population averages based on seed family averages in a common garden. W_{WPC} was further averaged across target and partner population. Heterosis was also assessed for the finite rate of increase per year, λ, from stage-classified matrices [46] based on mean performance of plants of each population-cross type-garden group, over the three years (detailed in Perrier *et al*. [39]). These matrices comprised the stages: (1) healthy seeds in year 1, (2) reproducing individuals of year 2, (3) reproducing individuals of year 3, with a one-year projection interval between each stage. Heterosis estimates were $\log_{10}$-transformed and analysed by hierarchical mixed-effects models based on restricted maximum likelihood using the packages *lme4* [47] and *LmerTest* [48] in *R*. Fixed effects were the genomic estimate of mutational load of the mother population, environmental stress, and interactions between them. Crossed random effects were population and common garden (detailed in electronic supplementary material, Method S6A). Here, $\Delta T_{\min}$ was calculated with $T_{\min\,\text{origin}}$ again averaged over target and partner population. To explore the effect of stress, we depicted it by either signed or absolute $\Delta T_{\min}$, included an orthogonal quadratic term or not, and included interaction terms or not. We performed model selection based on the corrected Akaike information criterion (AICc [49]). For the best model, we tested the significance of each fixed effect with a likelihood-ratio χ^2 test using the *Anova* function (type III) of the package *car* [50]. We also used the same model to test for effects on W_{WPC}, as the more interesting component of heterosis. We then repeated the analysis on heterosis on a second estimate of stress, the relative decline in population-level performance at a site relative to the best site ($1 - W_{\text{WPC}}/W_{\max}$) [14]. Stress varied between 0 (conditions leading to maximal performance) and 1 (conditions with $W_{\text{WPC}} = 0$). Relative performance was then averaged over both target and partner populations.

Finally, we tested whether heterosis was higher when range-edge populations (with highest load) were transplanted beyond the range limits. We assessed this effect in two distinc dataset: one considering the six northern edge populations (ON8, ON11, ON12, NY4, NY5 and NY6; in blue in Fig. 1) raised at the northern edge site (CG2) and beyond the northern edge (CG1), and one considering the six southern edge populations (MO1, MO2, IN1, NC2, NC4 and VA1; in red in Fig. 1) raised at the southern edge site (CG4) and beyond the southern edge (CG5). For both datasets, $\log_{10}$-transformed heterosis was tested in hierarchical mixed-effect models based on restricted maximum likelihood. Transplant was a fixed effect (edge = 0) and population was a random effect (detailed in electronic supplementary material, Method S6B).

Results

Analyses on the level of the pot revealed a significant positive effect of cross type on performance in both the log-normal and logistic process (Table 1, results on *MP* to year 2 reported for comparison). Performance was higher in between- compared to within-population crosses (BPC and WPC = 0), supporting a general heterosis effect. Performance was also significantly negatively affected by genomic load and by a positive cross type-by-genomic load interaction in the log-normal process. Performance generally declined with increasing genomic load, but less in BPC than WPC. Performance was further significantly negatively affected by the linear and quadratic term of stress (ΔT_{min} and ΔT_{min}^2) in both the log-normal and logistic process. Performance generally declined when conditions in the common garden diverged from conditions at the site of origin, with a stronger decline under warmer conditions ($\Delta T_{min} > 0$). Furthermore, the interaction cross type-by-ΔT_{min} was significantly positive for the logistic process, indicating that the decline due to stress was stronger for WPC compared to BPC. Finally, the logistic process determining performance was significantly affected by a negative interaction between genomic load and ΔT_{min}. Performance of populations with higher load declined more when exposed to warmer temperatures, but less when exposed to colder temperatures.

Model selection revealed the parameters that could predict population-level heterosis better (electronic supplementary material, Table S7). Among the models compared, the one including – in addition to genomic load that was part of all models – the signed term of stress (ΔT_{min}), its square term, and interactions between genomic load and stress was the best. The next best model was the one without interactions. Results clearly indicated that heterosis could be predicted better if the climate deviation between garden site and site of origin of populations included information on whether conditions were cooler or warmer, if climate was depicted not only as a linear term, and if interactions between stress and genomic load were included. For this best model, heterosis based on *MP* up to year 3 or λ was indeed significantly positively related with genomic load and the linear term of stress (Table 2, Fig. 2a). However, neither the quadratic term of stress nor the interactions between stress and genomic load were significant. Heterosis was highest in populations with more mutational load, and in populations raised in conditions warmer than at their site of origin ($\Delta T_{min} > 0$). Heterosis based on *MP* up to year 3 and λ in the five common gardens ranged from -0.96 to 23.50 (mean: 1.88) and -0.53 to 7.29 (mean: 0.73) respectively (electronic supplementary material, Table S8). Similarly to analysis of heterosis, its component of W_{WPC} revealed an effect of genomic load, ΔT_{min} and ΔT_{min}^2 (electronic supplementary material, Table S9), but no effect of the genomic load-by-ΔT_{min} interaction. The performance of WPC declined with increasing genomic load, and – in an accelerating manner – with warmer conditions compared to the site of origin of populations (electronic supplementary material, Fig. S10). The model-predicted maximal decline in WPC performance for a population with average genomic load was 92% when exposed to warmer temperatures, (baseline of $\Delta T_{min} = 0$; electronic supplementary material, Table S11).

Analyses on the effect of stress expressed by performance decline on heterosis revealed similar results as those based on ΔT_{min}. The best model predicting heterosis considered again the linear and quadratic term for stress and interactions between stress and genomic load (electronic supplementary material, Table S12). The second model was the one without interactions. Heterosis was significantly positively affected by genomic load (marginal for λ), and both the linear (except

MP to year 3) and the quadratic term of stress (electronic supplementary material, Table S13, results on *MP* to year 2 reported for comparison), but again was unaffected by interactions. Heterosis based on *MP* to year 3 increased almost symmetrically toward low ($W_{WPC} = W_{max}$) and high stressfulness ($W_{WPC} = 0$; electronic supplementary material, Fig. S14), while heterosis based on λ increased more strongly toward high stressfulness (Fig. 2b).

Finally, heterosis of range edge populations did not significantly differ between the garden sites at the range edge and the garden sites beyond the range, neither for the southern nor for the northern range edge (electronic supplementary material, Table S15, Fig. S16).

Discussion

Recent evolutionary theory proposes that species' range limits may result from high mutational load of range-edge populations due to prolonged exposure to genetic drift caused by past range expansion or rear-edge demographics [8]. Here we tested whether the expression of such load is enhanced by environmental stress in a large-scale transplant experiment with *Arabidopsis lyrata*. To express load, we used heterosis of between- compared to within-population crosses, assuming that load was mainly due to recessive deleterious mutations. To estimate stress, we used divergent thermal conditions during a critical part of the year between gardens and sites of origin of populations, or relative performance decline of each population. Expressed mutational load was stronger in populations with higher deleterious counts inferred from coding DNA sequences, as previously found [21,39]. However, stress did not clearly synergistically interact with genomic load to enhance heterosis. Nonetheless, we found a general effect of stress on heterosis linked to a stronger performance decline under warmer conditions than at sites of origin of populations. Our study therefore suggests that a general heterozygote deficit is more detrimental under temperature stress, and that interspecific outcrossing can alleviate this effect.

A main result of this study is that the expression of mutational load was not significantly enhanced under thermal stress. Analyses on pot-level performance were not supportive of an

interaction between cross type, genomic load and climate stress, suggesting that a higher accumulation of recessive deleterious mutations does not lead to the enhanced expression of mutational load by environmental stressfulness. Analyses on population-level heterosis were not supportive either, even though the model including interactions between stress and genomic load was better supported than the model without interactions. Such environment dependence has often been evoked due to the similarities in the underlying genetics between heterosis (if caused by dominance) and inbreeding depression [51,52]. Indeed, a previous meta-level study on the stress dependence of heterosis found that the benefit of outcrossing for small and inbred populations was considerably higher under stress [53], however the study did not include large populations for comparison. Some of them may too show a heterotic effect under outbreeding that may be enhanced under stress, as found in our study.

We think that our result for *A. lyrata* is robust despite caveats that were previously mentioned for the study of environment dependence of load. It was argued that environment dependence of the expression of load depends on the strength of stress [26]. In our study, exposure to warmer conditions strongly reduced WPC population performance, by up to 92%. Type and novelty of stress were also suggested to affect stress dependence of the expression of load [25,55]. If *A. lyrata* had regularly experienced conditions we considered stressful here across its evolutionary history, deleterious alleles expressed under these conditions may have already been purged [56–58]. However, the expression of mutational load was also not enhanced by stress based on relative performance, a broader measure of stress likely depicting also novel stressors. Furthermore, the interaction between genomic load and stress could have been masked by outbreeding depression, previously reported to counteract heterosis under environmental stress such as drought [54]. Outbreeding depression is expected to be stronger in crosses involving populations of highest divergence [52,59]. In our study, partner populations came from the centers of geographic distribution and were unlikely highly divergent, given the shared postglacial history and moderate climatic differences between populations. Furthermore, the high performance gain especially in populations with high load speaks in favor of an overwhelming

positive effect of heterosis and little action of outbreeding depression. For these reasons we conclude that the lack of environment dependence of mutational load seems real.

Heterosis was nonetheless affected by stress in our study, especially warm stress. Heterosis increased under warmer conditions than at the sites of origin of populations (Fig. 2). Perrier *et al.* [39] previously linked patterns of heightened heterosis with increasing genomic load to a performance decline in WPC, with BPC being fairly constant across that gradient. Here we observed that WPC and BPC performance generally declined with increasing warm stress, but less in BPC, as suggested by the pot-level analys on performance. Lower sensitivity to stress in outbred plants could result from recessive deleterious mutations being frequently heterozygous and their better buffering under stress. Higher performance of heterotic hybrids under stress in *A. thaliana* has been linked to disruptions of stress response pathways in inbred parental lines [34–36]. Previous research in the context of agriculture or genetic rescue has also provided many examples the effect of heterosis increased under stress [53,60,61]. Here, the overall increase in heterosis under warm stress independent of genomic load suggests that most populations of *A. lyrata* suffer from a general heterozygote deficit whose expression is heat-sensitive.

Our results offer some important insights to the understanding of heterosis and its stress-dependence. First, model selection clearly showed that the effect of increasing stressfulness was not linear but better described by a positive accelerating relationship. This was the case both when stress was expressed as the difference in temperature regime during a critical part of the year for *A. lyrata* between common garden and site of origin of populations, or as the performance decline in a garden by populations. Second, when stress was depicted by temperature difference, it was the unsigned temperature difference that depicted stress better. While cooler conditions led to relatively high plant performance, it was the warmer conditions that were stressful and that led to higher heterosis. Third, even though interactions were not significant between genomic load and stressfulness on heterosis, our study suggests that they may still be of some relevance. One indication is that model selection pointed to the inclusion of interactions being a better model predicting heterosis. Another indication

is that pot-level performance revealed significant negative interactions between genomic load and the linear term of stress, suggesting that populations with high genomic load performed worse under increasingly warmer conditions than at site of origin, independent of cross type.

Our study has two main implications beyond the study of heterosis. The first is the role of expressed mutational load for range limits. Populations expanding beyond range limits may suffer from a twofold genetic Allee effect [62]. A first is due the accumulation of mutational load beyond tolerable levels to maintain population demographic rates [39]. A second is due to a general heterozygote deficit expressed under stressful, particularly warm-stress conditions. However, the result was not confirmed at range limits. Northern and southern range-edge populations did not significantly differ in heterosis when transplanted at their respective range edge or beyond. Nontheless, the stress-dependent genetic Allee effect could be triggered by extreme environmental events more frequent beyond range limits, and by long range dispersal into less suitable habitats than those immediately beyond range limits. Future simulation studies on range dynamic [63,64] should therefore consider the consequences of stress-dependent genetic Allee effects on range expansion.

The second implication of our study is that interpopulation outbreeding can have a generally positive effect across populations of the distribution of a species. A great majority of populations indeed benefitted from outbreeding, especially under warmer conditions than what the populations had experienced in the past. Such heterotic effects can often be beneficial beyond the first generation [65, 66]. Our results therefore motivate the study of assisted gene flow in the context of climate warming, to preserve species across the entire range. Such management may worth being tested particularly for weak dispersers, potentially combined with the use of climate-adjusted provenances such as explored in restoration ecology [67]. Populations at the southern range limits, with high genomic load, may also need to be supplemented with material from similar climatic conditions but different demographic history, to maximize heterozygote advantage and ensure the local persistence of species.

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (31003 A_166322). We are grateful to Celia Evans (Paul Smith's College, Paul Smith, NY), Joan Edwards (Williams College, Williamstown, MA), Heather Peckham Griscom (James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA), William K. Smith (Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC) and Rodney Mauricio (University of Georgia, Athens, GA) for logistical support in the US. For field assistance, we thank Mary Anderson, Michael Boyd, Bennet Coe, Scott Cory, Rachel Hillyer, Andrew Jones, Deidre Keating, Larry Kummer, David Lampman, Anastasia Levie-Sprick, Blake Macko, Shannon Malisson, Kathryn McGee, Althea Neighbors, Debra Rogers-Gillig, Caleb Rose, Amber Scarabaggio, Anna Shutley, Caroline Vath and Audrey Werner. For assistance with seed counts, we thank Olivier Bachmann, Markus Funk, and Susanna Riedl. Collection permits were provided by the Clinton County Conservation Board, Cornell University, Fort Leonard Wood Army Base, Iowa Department of Natural Resources, Missouri Department of Conservation, New York State Office of Parks, Ontario Parks, Palisades Interstate Park Commission, Rock Island Lodge, United States National Park Service, Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

Author Contributions: All authors contributed to the study design. YW collected the seeds in the field, AP and DS raised and crossed plants. AP analyzed the data and wrote the manuscript, with support by YW.

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Data accessibility statement: All data is stored in Dryad (https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.cc2fqz642).

References

1. Gaston K. 2009 Geographic range limits of species. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **276**, 1391–1393. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2009.0100)
2. Roy K, Hunt G, Jablonski D, Krug AZ, Valentine JW. 2009 A macroevolutionary perspective on species range limits. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **276**, 1485–1493.(doi: 10.1098/rspb.2008.1232)
3. Sexton JP, McIntyre PJ, Angert AL, Rice KJ. 2009 Evolution and ecology of species range limits. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. S.* **40**, 415–436. (doi: 10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.110308.120317)
4. Connallon T, Sgrò CM. 2018 In search of a general theory of species' range evolution. *PLoS Biol*. **16**, e2006735. (doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.2006735)
5. Willi Y, Van Buskirk J. 2019 A practical guide to the study of distribution limits. *Am. Nat.* **193**, 773–785. (doi: 10.1086/703172)
6. Peischl S, Dupanloup I, Kirkpatrick M, Excoffier L. 2013 On the accumulation of deleterious mutations during range expansions. *Mol. Ecol*. **22**, 5972–5982. (doi: 10.1111/mec.12524).
7. Henry RC, Barton KA, Travis JMJ. 2015 Mutation accumulation and the formation of range limits. *Biol. Lett*. **11**, 20140871–20140871. (doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2014.0871)
8. Willi Y. 2019 The relevance of mutational load for species range limits. *Am. J. Bot.* **106**, 757–759. (doi: 10.1002/ajb2.1296)
9. Brown JH. 1984 On the relationship between abundance and distribution of species. *Am. Nat.* **124**, 255–279. (doi: 10.1086/284267)
10. Cahill AE, Aiello-Lammens ME, Fisher-Reid MC, Hua X, Karanewsky CJ, Ryu HY, Sbeglia CG, Spagnolo F, Waldron JB, Wien JJ. 2014 Causes of warm-edge range limits, systematic review, proximate factors and implications for climate change. *J. Biogeogr*. **41**, 429–442. (doi: 10.1111/jbi.12231)
11. Hargreaves AL, Samis KE, Eckert CG. 2014 Are species' range limits simply niche limits writ large? A review of transplant experiments beyond the range. *Am. Nat.* **183**, 157–173. (doi: 10.1086/674525)
12. Lee-Yaw JA, Kharouba HM, Bontrager M, Mahony C, Csergő AM, Noreen AM, Li Q, Schuster R, Angert AL. 2016 A synthesis of transplant experiments and ecological niche models suggests that range limits are often niche limits. *Ecol. Lett.* **19**, 710–722. (doi: 10.1111/ele.12604)
13. Roff DA. 1997 *Evolutionary Quantitative Genetics*. New York, NY, USA: Chapman and Hall.

14. Reed DH, Fox CW, Enders LS, Kristensen TN. 2012 Inbreeding–stress interactions, evolutionary and conservation consequences. *Ann. NY Acad. Sci*. **1256**, 33-48. (doi: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.2012.06548.x)
15. Peischl S, Kirkpatrick M, Excoffier L. 2015 Expansion load and the evolutionary dynamics of a species range. *Am. Nat.* **185**, E81–E93. (doi: 10.1086/680220)
16. Peischl S, Excoffier L. 2015 Expansion load, recessive mutations and the role of standing genetic variation. *Mol. Ecol.* **24**, 2084–2094. (doi: 10.1111/mec.13154)
17. Lohmueller KE, Indap AR, Schmidt S, Boyko AR, Hernandez RD, Hubisz MJ, Sninsky JJ, White TJ, Sunyaev SR, Nielsen R, et al. 2008 Proportionally more deleterious genetic variation in European than in African populations. *Nature* **451**, 994–998. (doi: 10.1038/nature06611)
18. Peischl S, Dupanloup I, Foucal A, Jomphe M, Bruat V, Grenier JC, Gouy A, Gilbert KJ, Gbeha E, Bosshard L, et al. 2018 Relaxed selection during a recent human expansion. *Genetics* **208**, 763–777. (doi: 10.1534/genetics.117.300551)
19. Zhang M, Zhou L, Bawa R, Suren H, Holliday JA. 2016 Recombination rate variation, hitchhiking, and demographic history shape deleterious load in poplar. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **33**, 2899–2910. (doi: 10.1093/molbev/msw169)
20. González-Martínez SC, Ridout K, Pannell JR. 2017 Range expansion compromises adaptive evolution in an outcrossing plant. *Curr. Biol.* **27**, 2544–2551. (doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2017.07.007)
21. Willi Y, Fracassetti M, Zoller S, Van Buskirk J. 2018 Accumulation of mutational load at the edges of a species range. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **35**, 781–791. (doi: 10.1093/molbev/msy003)
22. Koski MH, Layman NC, Prior CJ, Busch JW, Galloway LF. 2019 Selfing ability and drift load evolve with range expansion. *Evol. Lett.* **3**, 500–512. (doi: 10.1002/evl3.136)
23. Pironon S, Papuga G, Villellas J, Angert AL, García MB, Thompson JD. 2017 Geographic variation in genetic and demographic performance, new insights from an old biogeographical paradigm. *Biol. Rev.* **92**, 1877–1909. (doi: 10.1111/brv.12313)
24. Armbruster P, Reed DH. 2005 Inbreeding depression in benign and stressful environments. *Heredity* **95**, 235–242. (doi: 10.1038/sj.hdy.6800721)
25. Willi Y, Dietrich S, Kleunen MV, Fischer M. 2007a Inter-specific competitive stress does not affect the magnitude of inbreeding depression. *Evol. Ecol. Res.* **9**, 959–974.
26. Fox CW, Reed DH. 2011 Inbreeding depression increases with environmental stress, an experimental study and meta-analysis. *Evolution* **65**, 246–258. (doi: 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2010.01108.x)

27. Kondrashov AS, Houle D. 1994 Genotype-environment interactions and the estimation of the genomic mutation rate in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **258**, 221–227. (doi: 10.1098/rspb.1994.0166)
28. Elena SF, de Visser JAGM. 2003 Environmental stress and the effects of mutation. *J. Biol.* **2**, 12. (doi: 0.1186/1475-4924-2-12)
29. Vermeulen CJ, Bijlsma R. 2004 Characterization of conditionally expressed mutants affecting age-specific survival in inbred lines of *Drosophila melanogaster*, lethal conditions and temperature-sensitive periods. *Genetics* **167**, 1241–1248. (doi: 10.1534/genetics.103.023721)
30. Rutherford SL, Lindquist S. 1998 Hsp90 as a capacitor for morphological evolution. *Nature* **396**, 336–342. (doi: 10.1038/24550)
31. Queitsch C, Sangster TA, Lindquist S. 2002 Hsp90 as a capacitor of phenotypic variation. Nature **417**, 618–624. (doi: 10.1038/news020506-13)
32. Bergman A, Siegal ML. 2003 Evolutionary capacitance as a general feature of complex gene networks. *Nature* **424**, 549–52. (doi: 10.1038/nature01765)
33. Agrawal AF, Whitlock MC. 2010 Environmental duress and epistasis, how does stress affect the strength of selection on new mutations. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **25**, 450–458. (doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2010.05.003)
34. Korn M, Gärtner T, Erban A, Kopka J, Selbig J, Hincha DK. 2010 Predicting *Arabidopsis* freezing tolerance and heterosis in freezing tolerance from metabolite composition. *Mol. Plant* **3**, 224–235. (doi: 10.1093/mp/ssp105)
35. Yang L, Li B, Zheng XY, Li J, Yang M, Dong X, He G, An C, Deng XW. 2015 Salicylic acid biosynthesis is enhanced and contributes to increased biotrophic pathogen resistance in *Arabidopsis* hybrids. *Nature Commun*. **6**, 7309. (doi: 10.1038/ncomms8309)
36. Miller M, Song Q, Shi X, Juenger TE, Chen ZJ. 2015 Natural variation in timing of stress-responsive gene expression predicts heterosis in intraspecific hybrids of *Arabidopsis*. *Nature Commun.* **6**, 7453. (doi: 10.1038/ncomms8453)
37. Waller DM, Dole J, Bersch AJ. 2008 Effects of stress and phenotypic variation on inbreeding depression in *Brassica rapa*. *Evolution* **62**, 917–931. (doi: 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00325.x)
38. Griffin PC, Willi Y. 2014 Evolutionary shifts to self-fertilisation restricted to geographic range margins in North American *Arabidopsis lyrata*. *Ecol. Lett*. **17**, 484–490. (doi: 10.1111/ele.12248)
39. Perrier A, Sánchez-Castro D, Willi Y. 2020 Expressed mutational load increases toward the edge of a species' geographic range. *Evolution* **74**, 1711–1723. (doi: 10.1111/evo.14042)

40. Hoffmann AA, Hercus MJ. 2000 Environmental stress as an evolutionary force. *BioScience* **50**, 217–226. (doi: 10.1641/0006-3568(2000)050[0217:esaaef]2.3.co;2)
41. Fick SE, Hijmans RJ. 2017 WorldClim 2, new 1-km spatial resolution climate surfaces for global land areas. *Int. J. Climatol.* **37**, 4302–4315. (doi: 10.1002/joc.5086)
42. Lee-Yaw JA, Fracassetti M, Willi Y. 2018 Environmental marginality and geographic range limits, a case study with *Arabidopsis lyrata* ssp. *lyrata*. Ecography **41**, 622–634. (doi: 10.1111/ecog.02869)
43. Hadfield JD. 2010 MCMC methods for multi-response generalized linear mixed models, the MCMCglmm R package. *J. Stat. Soft.* **33**, 1–22. (doi: 10.18637/jss.v033.i02)
44. Hadfield JD. 2021 MCMCglmm course notes. See: https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/MCMCglmm/vignettes/CourseNotes.pdf.
45. R Core Team. 2021 *R, a language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. See: http://www.R-project.org.
46. Caswell H. 2001 *Matrix population models*, 2nd edn. Sunderland, MA, USA: Sinauer Associates.
47. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. 2015 Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *J. Stat. Soft.* **67**, 1–48. (doi: 10.18637/jss.v067.i01)
48. Kuznetsova A, Brockhoff PB, Christensen RHB. 2017 lmerTest Package, tests in linear mixed-effects models. *J. Stat. Soft.* **82**, 1–26. (doi: 10.18637/jss.v082.i13)
49. Sugiura N. 1978 Further analysts of the data by akaike' s information criterion and the finite corrections. *Commun. Stat.-Theor. M.* **7**, 13–26. (doi: 10.1080/03610927808827599)
50. Fox J, Weisberg S. 2019 *An R Companion to Applied Regression*, 3rd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage.
51. Fenster CB, Galloway LF. 2000 Population differentiation in an annual legume, genetic architecture. *Evolution* **54**, 1157–1172. (doi: 10.1111/j.0014-3820.2000.tb00551.x)
52. Oakley CG, Ågren J, Schemske DW. 2015 Heterosis and outbreeding depression in crosses between natural populations of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Heredity* **115**, 73–82. (doi: 10.1038/hdy.2015.18)
53. Frankham R. 2015 Genetic rescue of small inbred populations: meta-analysis reveals large and consistent benefits of gene flow. *Mol. Ecol.* **24**, 2610–2618. (doi: 10.1111/mec.13139)
54. Prill N, Bullock JM, van Dam NM, Leimu R. 2014 Loss of heterosis and family-dependent inbreeding depression in plant performance and resistance against multiple herbivores under drought stress. *J. Ecol.* **102**, 1497–1505. (doi: 10.1111/1365-2745.12327)
55. Sandner TM, Matthies D. 2016 The effects of stress intensity and stress type on inbreeding depression in *Silene vulgaris*. *Evolution* **70**, 1225–1238. (doi: 10.1111/evo.12929)

56. Hedrick PW. 1994 Purging inbreeding depression and the probability of extinction, full-sib mating. *Heredity* **73**, 363–372. (doi: 10.1038/hdy.1994.183)
57. Bijlsma R, Bundgaard J, Van Putten WF. 1999 Environmental dependence of inbreeding depression and purging in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *J. Evol. Biol.* **12**, 1125–1137. (doi: 10.1046/j.1420-9101.2001.00303.x)
58. Enders LS, Nunney L. 2016 Reduction in the cumulative effect of stress-induced inbreeding depression due to intragenerational purging in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Heredity* **116**, 304–313. (doi: 10.1038/hdy.2015.103)
59. Lynch M. 1991 The genetic interpretation of inbreeding depression and outbreeding depression. *Evolution* **45**, 622–629. (doi: 10.2307/2409915)
60. Blum A. 2013 Heterosis, stress, and the environment, a possible road map towards the general improvement of crop yield. *J. Exp. Bot.* **64**, 4829–4837. (doi: 10.1093/jxb/ert289)
61. Fujimoto R, Uezono K, Ishikura S, Osabe K, Peacock WJ, Dennis ES. 2018 Recent research on the mechanism of heterosis is important for crop and vegetable breeding systems. *Breeding Sci.* **68**, 145–158. (doi: 10.1270/jsbbs.17155)
62. Luque GM, Vayssade C, Facon B, Guillemaud T, Courchamp F, Fauvergue X. 2016 The genetic Allee effect, a unified framework for the genetics and demography of small populations. *Ecosphere* **7**, e01413. (doi: 10.1002/ecs2.1413)
63. Gilbert KJ, Sharp NP, Angert AL, Conte GL, Draghi JA, Guillaime F, Hargreaves AL, Matthey Doret R, Whitlock MC. 2017 Local adaptation interacts with expansion load during range expansion, maladaptation reduces expansion load. *Am. Nat.* **189**, 368–380. (doi: 10.1086/690673)
64. Polechová J. 2018 Is the sky the limit? On the expansion threshold of a species range. PLoS Biol. **16**, e2006735. (doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.2005372)
65. Willi Y, Kleunen MV, Dietrich S, Fischer M. 2007b Genetic rescue persists beyond first-generation outbreeding in small populations of a rare plant. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **274**, 2357–2364. (doi: 10.1098/rspb.2007.0768)
66. Frankham R. 2016 Genetic rescue benefits persist to at least the F3 generation, based on a meta-analysis. *Biol. Conserv.* **195**, 33–36. (doi: 10.1016/j.biocon.2015.12.038)
67. Prober SM, Byrne M, McLean EH, Steane DA, Potts BM, Vaillancourt RE, Stock WD. 2015 Climate-adjusted provenancing, a strategy for climate-resilient ecological restoration. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* **3**, 65. (doi: 10.3389/fevo.2015.00065)

Table 1: Results of model testing for the effect of cross type (between- compared to within-population crosses [0]), genomic estimate of mutational load, environmental stress ($\Delta T_{min} = T_{min\ CG} - T_{min\ origin}$) and their interactions on *multiplicative performance* up to year 3 or 2, at the five common garden sites

	Cross type (CT)	***Genomic load (GL)***	***Stress (S)***	***S^2***	***CT * GL***	***CT * S***	***CT * S^2***	***GL * S***	***GL * S^2***	***CT * GL * S***	***CT * GL * S^2***	
Process	*Mean*	*Mean*	*Mean*	*Mean*	*Mean*	*Mean*	*Mean*	*Mean*	*Mean*	*Mean*	*Mean*	
Log-*normal*												
MP to year 3	**0.15** *	**-1.32** *	**-16.97** *	**-8.14** **	**1.50** *	4.92	-2.27	-69.43	-14.63	24.35	38.02	†, ‡
MP to year 2	0.10 (*)	-1.05 (*)	**-15.59** *	**-5.02** *	1.17 (*)	-0.23	-5.87	-48.43	21.61	62.61	7.10	†
Logistic												
MP to year 3	**0.63** ***	-2.58	**-79.65** **	**-58.51** ***	2.76	**65.64** ***	15.35	**-385.58** ***	60.68	-161.89	-30.10	‡
MP to year 2	**0.45** **	-2.90	-54.35 (*)	**-50.83** ***	2.31	**53.69** ***	-16.21	**-316.63** **	122.24	-135.02	45.17	

Multiplicative performance (log_{10}-transformed if > 0) was assumed to follow a Gaussian distribution with 0-inflation. Therefore, the model assessed all fixed and random effects for their importance in both the logistic process (binary variable depicting germination combined with survival and the capacity to initiate flowering) and the Gaussian process (total number of flowers during one or two reproductive seasons). Estimates of coefficients are modes of MCMC samples from the posterior distribution of parameters (*mean*). The logistic part of the model predicts non-zeros in the distribution on the logit scale. Genomic load and stress were standardized prior to analyses (mean = 0). Model fits with significant (positive) intercept are indicated by †. Estimates with *P*-values < 0.05 are written in bold; significance is indicated: (*) $P < 0.1$, * $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$, *** $P < 0.001$. Results for random effects are not shown. For one of the five common gardens (CG3), the experiment stopped early and variables consider performance to year 2 only (indicated by ‡).

Table 2: Results of model testing for the effect of the genomic estimate of mutational load, environmental stress ($\Delta\ T_{min} = T_{min\ CG} - T_{min\ origin}$) and their interaction on heterosis based on *multiplicative performance* (*MP*) up to year 3 or 2, and the finite rate of increase (λ), at the five common garden sites

		Genomic load (GL)		Stress (S)		Stress^2 (S^2)		GL * S		GL * S^2				
Heterosis based on	***N***	***β***	***χ²***	***β***	***χ²***	***β***	***χ²***	***β***	***χ²***	***β***	***χ²***	***R²m***	***R²c***	
MP to year 3	89	**1.92**	**6.63 ****	**1.03**	**5.77 ***	-0.73	2.98 (*)	-3.21	0.48	3.72	0.70	0.18	0.37	†, ‡
MP to year 2	89	**2.32**	**10.76 ****	**1.61**	**15.31 *****	-0.24	0.34	3.69	0.60	**8.71**	**4.03 ***	0.32	0.47	†
λ	89	**0.84**	**5.36 ***	**0.79**	**14.78 *****	-0.07	0.15	0.22	0.01	1.68	0.70	0.23	0.46	†

Estimates of population heterosis were $\log_{10}$-transformed prior to analysis. Stress, $\Delta\ T_{min}$ was an average over target and partner population. Each model was optimized with the *bobyqa* optimizer to improve convergence. Test statistics include regression coefficient (β), χ^2-value of each fixed effect, and the marginal and conditional R^2 of the model. Model fits with significant (positive) intercept are indicated by †. Regression coefficients with *P*-values < 0.05 are written in bold; significance is indicated: (*) $P < 0.1$, * $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$, *** $P < 0.001$. Results for random effects are not shown. For one of the five common gardens (CG3), the experiment stopped early and the dependent variable considers performance to year 2 only (indicated by ‡).

Figures:



Figure 1: Distribution of *Arabidopsis lyrata* in eastern North America, with information on habitat suitability, and the location of the 20 populations studied and the 5 common garden sites. The range of *A. lyrata* is represented by the dotted line, habitat suitability by shades of blue, with darker blue indicating higher suitability [42]. Populations are shown by circles, with abbreviations for state (USA) or province (Canada) and a number [21]. Blue and red circles represent northern- and southern-edge populations in our analysis. Green triangles represent the five common garden (CG) sites; numbers added to labels are in sequence of north to south. State outlines for the USA are shown, and the split between eastern and western genetic cluster is represented by the dashed line. Of the 20 populations, two were used as partner-populations for between-population crosses, NY1 for crosses with eastern populations, and IA1 for crosses with western populations.



Figure 2: Stress dependence of the expression of mutational load estimated by heterosis. Population heterosis was estimated based on the finite rate of increase, λ, of within-population crosses and between-population crosses with a partner population. Stress was depicted as either the difference in minimum temperature in early spring between common garden and the site of origin of a population ($\Delta T_{min} = T_{min\ CG} - T_{min\ origin}$; positive values to the right of the vertical dashed line indicate a warmer environment) **(a)**, or the relative decline in population-level performance W in a garden relative to the garden of highest performance for that population ($1 - W_{WPC}/W_{max}$) **(b)**. For both stress estimates, means of target and partner populations were taken. The horizontal dashed lines indicates when heterosis drops below 0 and outbreeding depression dominates. The black lines represent model-predicted relationships between heterosis and environmental stress (test statistics in Tables 2, S13; * $P < 0.05$, *** $P < 0.001$). Genomic mutational load, the ratio of genome-wide non-synonymous to synonymous polymorphic sites adjusted by their mean derived frequency, P_nf_n/P_sf_s [21], is represented in shades of yellow (low) to red (high).