Genetics and resource availability shape divergence in life history

and behavior between ecotypes of Atlantic mollies (*Poecilia*

***mexicana*, Poeciliidae)**

John L. Coffin & Michael Tobler

Division of Biology, Kansas State University, 104 Ackert Hall, Manhattan, KS 66506

Correspondence: tobler@ksu.edu

Abstract

Phenotypic variation is common along environmental gradients, but it is often unknown to what extent it results from genetic differentiation between populations or phenotypic plasticity. We studied populations of a livebearing fish that have colonized streams rich in toxic hydrogen sulfide (H_2S). In nature, there is strong phenotypic differentiation between adjacent sulfidic and nonsulfidic populations. In this study, we varied food availability to pregnant mothers from different populations to induce maternal effects, a form of plasticity, and repeatedly measured life-history and behavioral traits throughout the offspring's ontogeny. Genetic differentiation affected most of the traits we measured, as sulfidic offspring tended to be born larger, mature later, have lower burst swimming performance, be more exploratory, and feed less accurately. In contrast, maternal effects impacted few traits and at a smaller magnitude, even though offspring from poorly provisioned mothers tended to be born larger and be more exploratory. Population differences and maternal effects (when both were present) acted synergistically, and there was no evidence for population differences in plasticity. Overall, our study suggests that phenotypic divergence between populations in nature is primarily caused by genetic differentiation, and that plasticity mediated by maternal effects accentuates—but does not cause—differences between populations.

Keywords: adaptation, extreme environments, hydrogen sulfide, maternal effects, resource availability, Poeciliidae

Introduction

Phenotypic variation is at the heart of evolutionary analyses because it links the cause (natural selection) to the consequence (genotypic change) of adaptive evolution (Lande and Arnold 1983). We have known that inheritance causes resemblance between parents and their offspring for over a century, reflecting a genetic component to phenotypic variation (Stenseth et al. 2022). However, trait variation can also be influenced by phenotypic plasticity, where a single genotype gives rise to alternate phenotypes in response to internal or environmental cues (West-Eberhard 1989; Pigliucci 2001). In addition, the environment experienced by parents can affect phenotypes of their offspring (*i.e.*, parental effects; Uller 2008; Badyaev and Uller 2009), representing a case of plasticity that spans generational boundaries. Phenotypic variation in nature can therefore arise from genetic differences among individuals, plasticity induced by individual exposure to different environmental conditions, plasticity induced by parental effects, and their interactions (Scheiner 1993; Dingemanse and Araya-Ajoy 2015). For many natural systems, we know little about the origins of phenotypic variation, even though it critically shapes our inference of adaptation in natural populations.

Plasticity induced by parental effects is particularly strong from mothers due to their higher reproductive investment and, in viviparous species, the physically intimate relationship between mothers and their developing young (Lindholm et al. 2006; Wolf and Wade 2009). Such maternal effects are widespread in nature (Mousseau and Fox 1998) and can impact trait expression and evolution (Rossiter 1996; Wilson et al. 2005; Beckerman et al. 2006). Maternal effects can be adaptive if the expression of offspring traits is biased to match the environment experienced by the mother (Marshall and Uller 2007), or if mothers in good condition are able to endow phenotypes that provide a competitive advantage to their offspring in any environment (Grafen 1988; Monaghan 2008; Van Allen et al. 2021). However, maternal effects can also be maladaptive and produce mismatches between offspring phenotype and environment, as documented in some organisms

responding to anthropogenic climate change (Schuler and Orrock 2012; Leonard and Lancaster

2020). Maladaptive maternal effects can also be related to stress, where physiological stress

responses in mothers have unintended negative consequences on offspring (MacLeod et al. 2021).

Regardless of whether maternal effects are adaptive, they are important biological phenomena that

warrant careful attention and explicit accounting in evolutionary analyses due to the non-genetic

effects on phenotypic expression.

Phenotypic variation in nature is common along environmental gradients, but it is often

unclear whether it is caused by genetic differentiation among populations or plastic effects that arise

from population-specific environmental exposure histories experienced by mothers or directly by

their offspring. For example, freshwater springs rich in toxic hydrogen sulfide (H_2S) in the Grijalva

River basin of southern Mexico are extreme environments that are connected to adjacent nontoxic

streams, and stark phenotypic gradients can be observed in fish occupying both habitats in as little as

a few meters. Sulfide springs are complex ecosystems with several correlated sources of selection

(Tobler et al. 2016b). H_2S is toxic because it disrupts aerobic ATP production (Reiffenstein et al.

1992; Cooper and Brown 2008), but habitats rich in H_2S also differ from nonsulfidic habitats in

other physical and chemical water parameters (dissolved oxygen concentrations, pH, and salinity),

resource availability, and the presence of competitors and predators (Riesch et al. 2010a; Tobler et al.

2011; Greenway et al. 2014; Tobler et al. 2015). Populations of Atlantic mollies (*Poecilia mexicana*), a

species of livebearing fish of the family Poeciliidae, have independently colonized and adapted to

sulfidic streams across multiple river drainages, and previous studies have documented that

colonization of sulfide springs has been associated with convergent changes in morphology,

locomotion, and respiration (Tobler and Hastings 2011; Camarillo et al. 2020), behavior (Plath et al.

2007; Doran et al. 2021; Lukas et al. 2021), physiology (Tobler et al. 2011; Barts et al. 2018;

Greenway et al. 2020), and life history traits (Riesch et al. 2011a,b, 2014). Phenotypic divergence

between sulfidic and nonsulfidic mollies likely has a significant genetic component, because it

coincides with strong genetic differentiation between populations, even though there are no physical

barriers separating populations in the different habitat types (Palacios et al. 2013; Plath et al. 2013;

Riesch et al. 2016b). However, trait variation between populations likely also has an environmental

component; while population differentiation persists in captive populations reared in common

garden conditions in the lab (Tobler et al. 2016a; Greenway et al. 2020), there is also evidence for

plasticity caused by short-term exposure to different environmental conditions (Bierbach et al. 2011;

Passow et al. 2017b). In contrast, the impact of maternal effects on offspring trait expression

remains to be investigated in these livebearing fish. Hence, we tested how genetic differentiation,

maternal effects, and their interactions shape phenotypic expression in *P. mexicana* populations from

sulfidic and nonsulfidic habitats. To induce maternal effects, we manipulated resource availability to

pregnant mothers, because natural populations vary substantially in nutritional state. Fish in sulfidic

habitats have significantly reduced body condition (both when inferred through length-weight

regression and body fat content analysis; Tobler et al. 2006; Tobler 2008) because of constraints

associated with resource acquisition. H_2S exacerbates hypoxia, and fish from sulfidic habitats have to

trade off performing aquatic surface respiration, a compensatory behavior to access better-

oxygenated surface waters, with benthic foraging (Tobler et al. 2009). In addition, the resource

environment experienced by mothers has been shown to impact offspring trait expression in other

species, including other members of the family Poeciliidae (Reznick et al. 1996a; Altmann and

Alberts 2005; Boots and Roberts 2012).

To quantify population differentiation and maternal effects in populations of *P. mexicana*, we

followed families of offspring from birth to the onset of maturation and repeatedly quantified a host

of complex phenotypic traits. Focal traits included brood size, size at birth, and age at maturity and

ontogenetic variation in growth rates, burst swimming, exploratory behavior, and feeding accuracy.

We chose these traits because they likely affect fitness, and we have prior knowledge for many of

them from natural populations, providing us with a framework to make *a priori* predictions. Our

experiments sought to address four specific questions: (1) Is there evidence for differences in

phenotypic traits between populations from sulfidic and nonsulfidic habitats that persist in fish

reared in a common-garden environment for multiple generations? Divergence in phenotypic traits

between populations regardless of maternal food treatments would indicate that trait differentiation

is due to genetic variation between populations. (2) Is there evidence for maternal effects in

response to resource availability? Significant differences in offspring traits between maternal food

treatments, irrespective of population of origin, would suggest resource-induced maternal effects. (3)

How do functional traits vary throughout ontogeny, and how do population differences and

maternal effects interact with ontogeny? Age is a major determinant of expression for many traits

(Hegyi et al. 2006; Zhang et al. 2015), but how population differences and maternal effects impact

trait expression through ontogeny is less clear. In other poeciliids, maternal effects tend to be

present at birth and decline with age (Lindholm et al. 2006). In contrast, population differences

between sulfidic and nonsulfidic *P. mexicana* are stark in adults, suggesting differences may emerge

early in life and even increase throughout ontogeny (Riesch et al. 2011b). Accordingly, we predicted

that age would impact most of the traits measured, that population differentiation would increase

with age, and that maternal effects would diminish with age. (4) How do population differences

interact with maternal effects? A difference in how each population responds to variation in

maternal resource availability would indicate genotype-by-environment interactions. Fish from

sulfidic habitats generally face constraints in resource levels, while those from nonsulfidic habitats

have relatively more access to resources (Tobler et al. 2006; Tobler 2008; Tobler et al. 2009). Hence,

we predicted that trait variation induced by the low-food treatment would occur in the same

direction as trait variation produced by differences between the nonsulfidic and sulfidic populations

(i.e., maternal effects would be "aligned" with population differences). In this case, maternal effects

would accentuate divergence between populations that resembles patterns of variation found in the

wild. Alternatively, low-resource traits may be canalized in the sulfidic population because sulfidic

individuals are constantly food stressed in nature. In this case, maternal effects may be weaker in the

sulfidic population.

Methods

Experimental overview

For our experiments, we used two lab-reared populations of *Poecilia mexicana* originating from wild-

caught relatives in the Tacotalpa River drainage. One population originated from a sulfide spring

complex called El Azufre I (according to Plath et al. 2013; hereafter referred to as the sulfidic

population or ecotype), and the other population was from a nonsulfidic stream connected to the

mainstem of the Tacotalpa River, called Arroyo Bonita (according to Plath et al. 2013; hereafter

referred to as the nonsulfidic population or ecotype). Both populations were reared in 680-liter stock

tanks filled with filtered tap water. Tanks were fed *ad libitum* twice daily with commercial dry fish

food (Purina), and ~50 % of the water was exchanged weekly. Fish used in this experiment were

raised under common-garden conditions for at least three generations (*i.e.*, they were at least great-

grandchildren from individuals originally collected in the wild).

145   From each tank, 30 females were caught with a dipnet and isolated in a 19-liter tank with an

aerating filter and a bundle of plastic mesh to help fry hide once they were born. Females were fed

twice daily, with aquatic gel diet for omnivorous fish (Mazuri) in the morning and freshly hatched

Artemia nauplii (Brine Shrimp Direct) in the evening. Females were randomly assigned to either a

"high-food" diet (0.32 ml per feeding) or a "low-food" diet (0.08 ml per feeding), with equal

numbers of females from each population being assigned to each group (Figure 1). Each tank was

checked daily for newborn fry. By the end of the experiment, 17 sulfidic females gave birth (11 from

the high food treatment and 6 from the low food treatment) and 22 nonsulfidic females produced a

brood (12 from the high food treatment and 10 from the low food treatment). Whenever a brood

was born, we recorded the brood size, date of birth for each family, the length of time that the

female was in the food treatment (days), and the mother's standard length (distance from the

anterior tip of the snout to the caudal peduncle, mm). Mothers were then removed from the tanks,

and we randomly selected 15 newborn fry (if available) from each family to remain in the

experimental tanks to minimize density-dependent effects.

From that point on, we followed the developing families through ontogeny. All fry—

irrespective of the mother's food treatment—received the same amount of food; they were fed *ad*

libitum twice daily with a mixture of decapsulated brine shrimp eggs (Brine Shrimp Direct) and dry

food. We assessed offspring phenotypes at approximately weekly intervals by measuring life history

traits (size at birth, weekly growth rate, and age at maturity) and behavioral traits (burst swimming,

exploratory behavior, and feeding accuracy; see Figure 1). We specifically tested whether there were

differences in these phenotypes between maternal food treatments (*i.e.*, maternal effects), between

populations (*i.e.*, sulfidic *vs.* nonsulfidic, indicating effects of evolved population differences), or

both. All analyses were conducted in R 4.0.5 (R Core Team 2021). Code and data to reproduce all

analyses can be found on GitHub (https://github.com/michitobler/common-garden).

Size at birth and growth rate

To measure size at birth, we photographed each family from above on the day of their birth with a

Nikon D90 digital camera fitted with an AF-S Micro NIKKOR 105mm f/2.8 lens. A ruler was

included in the background of each image. Images were imported to ImageJ v. 1.53 (Schneider et al.

2012) and calibrated by setting the scale. We measured the standard length (mm) of each offspring

in the family. These measurements were averaged across all individuals to obtain a single mean size

at birth for each family. This measurement was completed weekly, and the measurement for each

family was subtracted from that family's measurement from the week prior to obtain an average

growth rate [mm/week]. To account for allometric differences in growth rate, we converted the

average weekly growth rates to a proportional growth rate by dividing the average weekly growth

rate by the mean body size the week prior.

Age at maturity

We estimated the minimum age at maturity for each family using morphological characteristics of

male sexual maturity. While the sexes of juvenile livebearers are difficult to distinguish, at the onset

of sexual maturity, the male anal fin is modified into an intromittent organ called a gonopodium,

while it remains unmodified in females (Rosen and Gordon 1953; Chambers 1987). We therefore

measured minimum age at maturity [days] as the time it took to for the first male in a group to

development its gonopodium.

Burst swimming

Most fish avoid predation with a highly conserved, reflexive escape response that causes the head to

move away from the stimulus, bending the body into a 'C' shape (Eaton et al. 1977). Then, a strong

stroke of the caudal fin starts the movement away from the stimulus (Domenici and Blake 1997).

This process (bending into a 'C' and propelling away from the stimulus) is known as a 'C-start'

response and is frequently used as a metric of escape performance in fish (Walker 1997; Ghalambor

et al. 2004; Langerhans et al. 2004; Camarillo et al. 2020). To quantify this burst swimming behavior,

we adopted the methods and metrics used by prior studies (Langerhans et al. 2004; Ingley et al.

2016; Camarillo et al. 2020). We placed a haphazardly chosen individual from each family in a glass

petri dish (9 cm in diameter, containing 2 cm of water) with opaque sides suspended above an

angled mirror, providing a ventral view of each fish. After a 5 min acclimation, we struck the surface

of the water within a body length of the posterior of the fish with a probe and recorded the

movement of the fish from below with a Sony NEX-FS700R camcorder at 60 frames per second

with 1080p resolution. We converted the resulting .mts files into .mp4 files (to enhance compatibility

with downstream applications) with FFmpeg (Tomar 2006).

We used DLTdv8 (Hedrick 2008) to digitize the 2-D location of the isthmus (*i.e.*, the area on

the ventral surface of the head where the opercula converge) of the fish in each frame. Digitized

points were then used to calculate the maximum velocity (v_{max}, mm/s), maximum acceleration (a_{max},

mm/s^2), and net distance traveled (d_{net}, mm of displacement within $1/12^{th}$ of a second after the C-

start). To calculate v_{max}, we calculated the straight-line distance between each pair of successive

digitized points, divided this distance by the inverse of the frame rate (60 fps), and found the

maximum value between any two points. a_{max} was calculated by subtracting the velocity value at each

point from the velocity value at the point immediately preceding it and finding the maximum value.

d_{net} was calculated by recording the 2-D position immediately after the fish ends the C-start with a

single stroke of the caudal fin, and then recording the 2-D position $1/12^{th}$ of a second later (5 video

frames later) and calculating the straight-line distance between the two points. To reduce the

dimensionality of this dataset, we then conducted a principal component analysis (PCA) using the

prcomp function with a correlation matrix. There was one principal component with an eigenvalue

greater than 1 (explaining 85.6 % of the total variance), which was retained as a compound metric of

burst swimming performance. Positive scores along this principal component axis were associated

with higher velocity, acceleration, and distance traveled (Table S1A). All mathematical operations

were conducted using packages contained in the base distribution of R.

Exploratory behavior

We used an open field test to quantify the exploratory tendencies of fry. We filled a 9 cm Styrofoam

cup with 3 cm of water and covered the arena with a sheet of glass coated in anti-fog solution (rain-x

interior glass anti-fog liquid). We haphazardly selected one individual from each family and placed it

in the arena undisturbed for a 5-min acclimation period, after which time we recorded 5 min of

video from above with a GoPro Hero 4 (1080 px resolution, linear field of view, 30 fps).

We used idTracker (v. 2.1, bundled with 64-bit Matlab Compiler Runtime 8.3; Pérez-

Escudero et al. 2014) to track the 2-D location of the fish automatically for the entire 5-min

recording. We set the number of individuals to be 1 and manually determined the intensity threshold

(0.5-0.8) and minimum size (40-250 pixels) based on each video. We also imported a still frame from

each video into ImageJ to measure the centroid coordinates and arena radius.

Using the 2-D coordinates in each frame, we calculated several metrics of motion that we

used as proxies for exploratory behavior. We calculated distance traveled between each pair of

successive points, the velocity, the acceleration, and the total cumulative distance traveled (d_{total},

mm), as above. We then calculated average velocity (v_{avg}, mm/s), maximum velocity (v_{max}, mm/s),

and maximum acceleration (a_{max}, mm/s^2) by finding the means and maxima of all velocity and

acceleration values. Finally, we calculated the proportional average distance from the center of the

arena (d_{center}, dimensionless) by calculating the distance from the fish's location to the centroid of the

arena and dividing this value by the arena radius. Videos were excluded if the fish was completely

still in all frames. To reduce the dimensionality and observe the correlation structure within this

dataset, we ran a PCA on v_{avg}, v_{max}, a_{max}, d_{total}, and d_{center} with a correlation matrix. We retained scores

along the first PC axis (explaining 56.9 % of the total variance) as a composite exploratory behavior

score. As shown in Table S1B, higher PC1 scores were associated with more exploratory behavior,

with positive loadings for all input variables.

Feeding accuracy

To measure feeding accuracy, we withheld food from individuals of each tank for 24 h prior to the

experiment and placed one haphazardly selected fry in a viewing tank for a 5-min acclimation

period. The viewing tank was constructed by connecting two 10 cm × 10 cm sheets of glass (1/8th

inch thickness) to either side of 1 cm diameter glass rods with waterproof silicone. The rear wall of

the viewing tank was covered with a black sheet of plastic to enhance contrast between the

background and the fish in the tank. The feeding solution consisted of 1 g of freshly hatched, live

Artemia nauplii diluted into 100 ml of filtered tap water. After the 5-min acclimation, we added 0.08

ml of the feeding solution to the viewing tank and recorded 5 min of video with the camcorder. We

analyzed the video frame-by-frame using BORIS v. 7.13 (Friard and Gamba 2016) and recorded the

number of successful strikes (a feeding strike that ends in consumption of the food item) and

unsuccessful strikes (a feeding strike that either misses the food item or results in regurgitation of

the food item). We divided the number of successful strikes by the total number of strikes to get an

overall proportional estimate of feeding accuracy, which was arcsine-square-root transformed prior

to analysis.

Statistical analyses of individual traits

There were many potential sources of variation in our experiment. Other than the effects of interest

for our study (population, maternal food treatment, and their interaction), the observed variation in

traits could also have arisen from differences in fry age, maternal standard length, the duration of

her food treatment, and brood size. Consequently, we used a model selection approach to find the

model that was best supported by our data from each experiment separately. For each phenotype,

we created a global model that contained all possible effects. For phenotypes that were only

measured once for each family (size at birth, brood size, and age at maturity), we used a general

linear model using the lm function from the stats package v. 3.6.2, and for phenotypes that were

measured repeatedly through development (growth rate, burst swimming, exploratory behavior, and

feeding accuracy), we used a linear mixed model implemented with the lmer function from the lme4

package v. 1.1-26 (Bates et al. 2015) that contained 'family' as a random effect. We then used the

dredge function from the MuMIn package v. 1.47.1 (Bartón 2009) to create a model selection table

based on the effects contained in the global model, with different models ranked and weighted

based on AICc. Full model selection tables are available for each phenotype in Table S2. To avoid

overfitting, we limited the models to a maximum of four terms. We chose the top-supported model

for each trait and analyzed it with either type-III analysis of variance (ANOVA) or Wald's chi-square

tests (see Table 1). Quantification and visualization of effects was accomplished by calculating and

plotting estimated marginal means for the effects of 'Population' and/or 'Food Treatment',

depending on the best-supported model, using the Effect function from the effects package v. 4.2-2

(Fox and Weisberg 2018a,b). To aid in drawing inferences from our models, we generated 95 %

confidence intervals (CI) for model coefficients in our top models using the confint function form

the base R distribution. Effect sizes were calculated as partial eta-squared (η_p^2), which represents the

proportion of variance explained by a particular variable after accounting for the variance explained

by all other variables. We calculated η_p^2 with the etasq function (Fox et al. 2021) for general linear

models or the eta_squared function (Ben-Shachar et al. 2020) for linear mixed models.

Multivariate analysis

Since selection ultimately acts on complex, multivariate phenotypes (Lande and Arnold 1983), we

sought to understand how the traits measured for our analyses vary and covary to jointly shape

multivariate phenotypes. To do so, we averaged each phenotype across all ages for each tank. We

used this approach rather than including age as a covariate and analyzing raw phenotypic scores

because of timing and logistical constraints that made it impossible to conduct each experiment on

offspring that were the same age. We analyzed the averaged phenotypes with a PCA (correlation

matrix) and used scores along the first two principal components—which had eigenvalues greater

than 1—as dependent variables. We analyzed principal component scores along each axis separately

because the axes were orthogonal. For each axis, we created a global model containing all possible

effects and selected the best-supported model based on AICc, as explained above.

Results

We measured seven functional traits in offspring from sulfidic and nonsulfidic populations

throughout ontogeny. Model selection tables for the analysis of each trait at birth and separately

across all ages can be found in Table S2, and the best-supported models are summarized in Table 1.

For brevity, we will present results in the context of our hypotheses outlined in the Introduction,

focusing on how all traits vary through ontogeny in terms of population differentiation, maternal

effects, and their interaction, rather than presenting the results for each trait separately.

Is there evidence for population differentiation?

We found evidence for significant population differences in five of the seven traits measured: size at

birth, age at maturity, burst swimming, exploratory behavior, and feeding accuracy (but not brood

size and growth rate). Age at maturity, burst swimming, and feeding accuracy were significantly

different between populations, but not between food treatments, whereas there were significant

effects of 'Population' and 'Food Treatment' (but no interactions) on size at birth and exploratory

behavior (see Table 1 and below). Sulfidic individuals were born 9.2 % larger [$F_{1,35}$ = 20.032; $P <$

0.001; estimated marginal mean for sulfidic fish (EMM_S) = 10.03 mm, estimated marginal mean for

nonsulfidic fish (EMM$_{NS}$) = 9.18 mm; η_p^2 = 0.36; Figure 2A], matured an average of 10.5 days later

($F_{1,26}$ = 4.420; P = 0.045; EMM$_S$ = 54.2 days, EMM$_{NS}$ = 43.7 days; η_p^2 = 0.15), had significantly

lower burst swimming performance (χ_1^2= 4.308; P = 0.038; CI: -0.94, -0.03; η_p^2 = 0.03), were more

exploratory (χ_1^2 = 7.513; P = 0.006; CI: 0.29, 1.70; η_p^2 = 0.28), and were 7.2 % less accurate during

feeding (χ_1^2 = 4.645; P = 0.031; EMM$_S$ = 0.72, EMM$_{NS}$ = 0.80; η_p^2 = 0.04; Figure 3).

3.2 Is there evidence for maternal effects in response to resource availability?

To test whether maternal effects induced by resource availability during pregnancy impact functional

traits in offspring, we compared each phenotype between offspring born to mothers who

experienced a high-food environment and mothers who experienced a low-food environment.

Mothers in low-food treatments produced offspring that were 3.4 % larger at birth [$F_{1,35}$ = 4.354; P

= 0.044; estimated marginal mean for fish in the low-food treatment (EMM$_{low}$) = 9.8 mm, estimated

marginal mean for fish in the high-food treatment (EMM$_{high}$) = 9.4 mm; η_p^2 = 0.11; Figure 2A] and

were more exploratory (χ_1^2 = 4.245; P = 0.039; CI: 0.04, 1.42; η_p^2 = 0.18; Figure 3E). For all

remaining traits (brood size, age at maturity, growth rate, burst swimming, and feeding accuracy),

'Food Treatment' was not included in the best-supported model (see Table 1), suggesting that

maternal effects did not affect the expression of those traits.

How do population differences and maternal effects interact with ontogeny?

To determine how traits changed through offspring development, we compared each phenotype

across age groups. 'Age' was a significant predictor of growth rate and burst swimming, indicating

that these traits changed throughout ontogeny, while the other phenotypes were not affected by age.

Across populations and food treatments, fry grew at a slower relative rate (χ_1^2 = 147.91; P < 0.001,

CI: -0.010, -0.007; $\eta_p^2 = 0.50$) and performed better in burst swimming trials ($\chi_1^2 = 30.178$; $P <$

0.001; CI: 0.024, 0.049; $\eta_p^2 = 0.16$) as they got older (Table 1). Burst swimming scores were also

lower in sulfidic individuals (see above), but the interaction term 'Population × Age' was not

significant, demonstrating that both populations exhibited similar changes in burst swimming

throughout ontogeny.

To ensure that signals of population differentiation and maternal effects occurring at birth

were not obscured by measurements later in life, we also subset our dataset for each phenotype to

obtain only the earliest data point for each family. As mentioned above, fry from the sulfidic

population and the low-food maternal treatment had significantly larger size at birth (Figure 2; Table

1). However, there were no population differences or maternal effects on brood size, which was

higher in larger mothers (Mother SL; $F_{1,37} = 23.342$; $P < 0.001$; CI: 0.73, 1.79; $\eta_p^2 = 0.38$) and

mothers who spent longer in the food treatment (Treatment Length; $F_{1,37} = 8.926$; $P = 0.005$; CI:

0.07, 0.40; $\eta_p^2 = 0.19$). Growth rate at birth was significantly lower in sulfidic fry ($F_{1,37} = 5.025$; $P =$

0.032; CI: -0.12, -0.006; $\eta_p^2 = 0.12$; Table 1; Figure 3A), but there was no evidence for maternal

effects on growth rate at birth ('Food Treatment' was not included in best-supported model). Note

that the population difference in growth rate at birth disappeared as fry developed (Figure 3B). All

other traits that were measured throughout ontogeny (burst swimming, exploratory behavior, and

feeding accuracy) did not exhibit significant population differences or maternal effects at birth.

Interestingly, the maternal effect that we detected on exploratory behavior across all ages (see above)

was not evident at birth ($F_{1,31} = 2.727$; $P = 0.108$; CI: -0.29, 2.81). These results collectively

demonstrate that—contrary to our hypothesis regarding ontogenetic variation of functional traits—

population differentiation did not increase with age, and maternal effects were not always observable

at birth, nor did they decline with age.

How do population differences interact with maternal effects?

We hypothesized that variation from maternal effects would be aligned with population differences,

but that there would be a significant interaction between population differences and maternal effects

(*i.e.*, different magnitudes of maternal effects in each population). Contrary to our predictions, no

'Population × Food Treatment' interactions were included in the best-supported model for any of

the traits we measured (Table 1), suggesting a general lack of support for significant interactions

between population differences and maternal effects. Therefore, maternal effects—if present—were

similar in direction and magnitude between populations.

To further address our hypothesis, we asked whether population differences and maternal

effects were, in fact, aligned, and whether they explained a similar proportion of phenotypic variance

when they acted in unison. We compared the signs (positive *vs.* negative coefficient estimates) and

effect sizes (η_p^2) of population differences and maternal effects for the two traits with evidence of

both effects simultaneously impacting trait expression—size at birth and exploratory behavior. For

both traits, the difference between the nonsulfidic and sulfidic population occurred in the same

direction as the trait shifts between the high- and low-food treatments, indicating that the effects

were aligned (Figures 2A and 3E). Effect size estimates for 'Population' and 'Food Treatment' for

both traits indicated that 'Population' had a larger effect on trait expression than 'Food Treatment'

($\eta_p^2 = 0.36$ *vs.* 0.11 for size at birth and 0.28 *vs.* 018 for exploratory behavior).

In addition to the univariate analyses of trait variation, we were also interested in

understanding how the traits covaried with one another, and whether and how multivariate

phenotypes were impacted by population differences and maternal effects. We averaged each

phenotype across ages for each family and conducted a PCA with a correlation matrix. We then

analyzed principal component scores along the first two principal component axes. The first

principal component accounted for 28.5 % of the variance in multivariate phenotypes, and scores

along the first principal component were positively correlated with brood size, growth rate, and

feeding accuracy, and they were negatively correlated with size at birth, age at maturity, burst

swimming, and exploratory behavior (see Table S1C). The second principal component explained

21.1 % of the variance and was positively correlated with burst swimming and size at birth and

negatively correlated with brood size, growth rate, feeding accuracy, exploratory behavior, and age at

maturity (Table S1). After conducting model selection, the best-supported model for PC1 contained

the main effects of 'Population', 'Food Treatment', and 'Treatment Length', and the best-supported

model for PC2 contained the main effects of 'Population', 'Mother SL', and 'Treatment Length'.

398   Sulfidic offspring had significantly lower scores along PC1 ($F_{1,24} = 16.266$; $P < 0.001$; CI: -

2.40, -0.78; $\eta_p^2 = 0.40$), as did offspring from low-food mothers ($F_{1,24} = 4.746$; $P = 0.039$; CI: -1.59, -

0.04), indicating population differences and maternal effects on PC1 scores. As for the univariate

analyses, maternal effects were aligned with population differences in PC1 scores (Figure 4),

'Population' had a larger effect than 'Food Treatment' (η_p^2 for 'Population' = 0.40; η_p^2 for 'Food

Treatment' = 0.17), and there was no evidence for a significant 'Population × Food Treatment'

interaction (the term was not included in best-supported model). We also found that sulfidic

individuals exhibited marginally lower PC2 scores ($F_{1,24} = 3.321$; $P = 0.081$; CI: -1.45, 0.09; $\eta_p^2 =$

0.12) but detected no evidence for maternal effects (the 'Food Treatment' term was not included in

the best-supported model) on PC2.

Discussion

Phenotypic variation can be shaped by multiple genetic and nongenetic factors, but the interplay of

genes and environmental effects is rarely disentangled in natural systems even though it

fundamentally impacts our inference of adaptation. Therefore, we examined how genetic variation

(*i.e.*, population differences), phenotypic plasticity mediated by maternal effects, and their

interactions shape trait expression in two populations of *P. mexicana* that are exposed to strong

divergent selection in nature. We found significant trait differences between populations even

though fish were housed under common-garden conditions in the laboratory for at least three

generations. In contrast, exposure of mothers to different food treatments impacted relatively few

traits in their offspring and had weaker effects than the population differences. In addition, maternal

effects tended to be aligned with population differences and act in the same way across populations.

Principal component analysis supported these overall conclusions in multivariate trait space. We also

found no evidence for interactions between populations and food treatments, suggesting that while

populations have diverged in phenotypic traits, they have retained similar maternal influences on

those same traits. Overall, we found that the stark phenotypic differences between populations of *P.*

mexicana that are evident in nature are largely a consequence of genetic divergence, likely

representing local adaptation to the distinct ecological conditions of their habitats. Maternal effects

in response to resource availability, while present in some traits, appear to accentuate population

differences, but not cause them.

Trait variation across populations and maternal food treatments

There is a rich history integrating field-based studies that quantify trait variation of poeciliid fishes in

nature with laboratory-based studies that isolate causative environmental factors (Endler 1980, 1995;

Reznick and Bryga 1987; Reznick et al. 1990; Langerhans et al. 2007; Tobler et al. 2008; Ghalambor

et al. 2015; Ingley and Johnson 2016). While most studies focus on single or a few related traits and

take a snapshot at a single ontogenetic stage, our study demonstrated that multiple complex trait

differences quantified in common garden conditions, across food treatments and across ontogeny,

closely mirror trait differences between populations in nature.

First, our study corroborates a genetic basis for population divergence in reproductive life

history traits. We documented significant population divergence in size at birth, with sulfidic mollies

giving birth to larger offspring (see Figures 2A and 4). This finding is consistent with life history

studies of sulfide spring populations in *P. mexicana* and other poeciliid species (Riesch et al. 2010b,

2014), suggesting that divergence in offspring size between sulfidic and nonsulfidic populations is a

repeatable evolutionary consequence of sulfide spring colonization that is driven by natural selection

for larger offspring size. Among-population variation in size at birth has also been documented in

other poeciliids that are exposed to other sources of divergent selection (Weeks and Gaggiotti 1993;

Reznick et al. 1996b; Schrader and Travis 2012; Belk et al. 2020). Our multivariate results (Figure 4)

also indicated that, like other poeciliids, the nonsulfidic population of *P. mexicana* closely resembles

an opportunistic life history strategy (Winemiller and Rose 1992), which places a premium on earlier

maturity and higher fecundity, at the expense of lower juvenile survivorship. The population

differences we found in the sulfidic population may represent a shift in the direction of the

equilibrium strategy, which is energetically costly to parents but should ultimately benefit offspring

competitive ability. In natural populations, maternal effects induced by variation in resource

availability likely accentuate genetic differences in offspring size across sulfidic and nonsulfidic

habitats. This pattern was also evident across a plethora of life history traits in guppies; in all ten life

history traits with evidence for significant genetic divergence and maternal effects, these effects

occurred in the same direction (Felmy et al. 2022).

Second, we found patterns of population differentiation in age at maturity that match with

previous work in livebearing fishes. Prior studies have demonstrated that guppies in streams with

high predation pressure on adults mature earlier than conspecifics from low-predation populations

(Reznick and Endler 1982). Several studies have also documented genetic differences in age at

maturity between populations of *P. mexicana*. For example, cave mollies mature significantly later

than surface populations, but unlike our study, there was also significant plasticity in age at maturity

due to resource availability (Riesch et al. 2016a). Another study of surface mollies that compared size

at maturity in sulfidic and nonsulfidic populations found that sulfidic individuals reached maturity at

a significantly smaller size than nonsulfidic individuals (Riesch et al. 2011a), likely because energy

limitation caused by reduced resource availability in sulfidic habitats selects for reduced growth rates

and smaller size at maturity (Passow et al. 2017a). Because poeciliid males exhibit determinate

growth that ends at maturity (Stearns and Sage 1980), size at maturity should closely mirror age at

maturity, assuming growth rates are the same as we found in our study. However, we found that

sulfidic mollies matured at a significantly later age than nonsulfidic individuals, despite identical

growth rates across ontogeny (Figure 3B). This discrepancy between our findings and those of

previous studies suggests that plasticity in age at maturity may be strong and that variation in

experimental design and rearing conditions matters.

Third, we found significant behavioral differences between populations from sulfidic and

nonsulfidic habitats, including exploratory behavior, feeding accuracy, and burst swimming. Previous

work has shown that nonsulfidic mollies—and ones that were better fed—were bolder in their

natural habitat, but behavioral differences also disappeared in the laboratory (Riesch et al. 2009).

While we did not measure boldness *per se* in our experiments, exploratory behavior as measured in

our experiment (*i.e.*, activity levels in a novel arena) is often characterized as part of a behavioral

syndrome that correlates with boldness (Conrad et al. 2011). Unlike previous work, our study found

that individuals from the sulfidic population and the low-food treatment were more exploratory

(Table 1 and Figure 3E). These results support that maternal resource environment affects

exploratory behavior, but also imply heritable differences between populations. Similar heritable

population differences were also found for feeding accuracy and burst swimming but without any

evidence for maternal effects. At least for burst swimming, the pattern of population differentiation

in our experiment again mirrors findings from adult fish in natural habitats (Camarillo et al. 2020).

Trait variation and adaptive function

Sulfide springs and adjacent nonsulfidic habitats do not only differ in the presence and absence of

H_2S, but they also vary in numerous abiotic and biotic factors that are often unaddressed in studies

of adaptation. Sulfidic habitats tend to have lower dissolved oxygen concentrations, higher

temperature, higher specific conductivity, and lower pH (Tobler et al. 2011), which in turn affect the

biotic communities (Greenway et al. 2014) and selection associated with resource exploitation,

competition, predation, and parasites (Riesch et al. 2010a; Tobler et al. 2014, 2015). Adaptation in

sulfide springs is therefore not solely in response to selection from H_2S but is instead in response to

a multifarious selective regime that has caused multivariate phenotypic differentiation between

populations (Tobler et al. 2018). The complexity of selective regimes and evolutionary responses

make disentangling cause-and-effect relationships difficult, especially because theoretical predictions

for the effects of different, covarying sources of selection are non-mutually exclusive. For example,

the evolution of large offspring size at birth could be explained by (1) selection from H_2S, which

should favor larger offspring with a lower surface-to-volume ratio to reduce the influx of toxic H_2S

(Reznick et al. 1996a); (2) selection from resource constraints, which favors larger offspring with

higher energy stores (Reznick et al. 1996a); or (3) relaxation of selection from predation, which also

favors larger offspring (Reznick and Endler 1982; Johnson and Belk 2001; Jennions et al. 2006).

Similarly, low resource and low predation environments also favor more exploratory individuals that

are better able to locate and exploit resources under those conditions (Teska et al. 1990; Kaun et al.

2007; Huang et al. 2012). Assessing the adaptive value of trait differences between sulfidic and

nonsulfidic population is consequently nontrivial and a work in progress.

Variation in some traits investigated in our study may also be the consequence of genetic,

developmental, or functional tradeoffs with other traits. Such tradeoffs are common in organisms

inhabiting contrasting environments because divergent selection acting to optimize one trait can

inadvertently influence other traits due to constraints (Ghalambor et al. 2004; Kawecki and Ebert

2004; Garland et al. 2022). For example, reductions in burst swimming performance—as

documented in our study for fish from the sulfidic population—may arise as a consequence of

selection for increased steady swimming efficiency, as different body shapes are associated with

optimization of steady *vs.* unsteady swimming (Langerhans 2007, 2009; Tokić and Yue 2012).

Indeed, a tradeoff between burst speed and sustained swimming performance has been documented

in adult fish from the same populations we studied here. The tradeoff is likely balanced by the need

for energy-efficient swimming in sulfidic habitats with resource constraints (but low predation) and

selection for efficient predator avoidance in nonsulfidic habitats with high abundances of natural

enemies (but abundant resources) (Camarillo et al. 2020). Our study found a similar reduction in

burst swimming performance in the sulfidic population, even among individuals that had not yet

reached maturity, suggesting population differences in burst swimming arise early in ontogeny. Our

results also matched *a priori* predictions regarding tradeoffs between respiration and feeding.

Habitats rich in H_2S also experience rampant hypoxia, which has selected for the evolution of

craniofacial traits (larger heads and jaws and longer gill filaments) that increase ventilation efficiency

(Camarillo et al. 2020). In addition to changes in morphology, sulfidic individuals also exhibit

decreased foraging efficiency compared to nonsulfidic individuals (Tobler et al. 2009), which was

supported by our findings related to feeding accuracy (Figure 3F). The decreases in feeding

efficiency noted in this and other studies may therefore be a consequence of the craniofacial

modifications that accompany colonization of sulfidic habitats.

Plasticity accentuates genetic trait differentiation in natural populations

Phenotypes in nature are the sum of genetic and environmental effects, but surprisingly, we found

no evidence for canalization or the evolution of plasticity by genotype × environment interactions.

Our work demonstrated that maternal effects were aligned with population differences, accentuating

trait divergence between populations, and that the trait shifts induced by maternal effects were of a

similar magnitude in both populations. For both traits in which we observed significant population

differentiation and maternal effects (size at birth and exploratory behavior), the lowest phenotypic

scores were found in nonsulfidic fry from high-food mothers, and the highest scores were found in

sulfidic fry from low-food mothers (Figures 2A and 3E). Because sulfidic mollies exhibit reduced

foraging efficiency and body condition as a consequence of hypoxia (Tobler 2008; Tobler et al.

2009), sulfidic habitats are naturally analogous to our low-food treatment, and nonsulfidic habitats

are similar to the high-food treatment. If maternal effects enhance population differences in natural

populations similarly as in our experiments, then it could explain why stronger trait divergence is

typically observed in nature than in common garden reared fish (Tobler et al. 2008; Passow et al.

2015). Likewise, it is important to note that our experiments only captured a small aspect of

plasticity, the portion controlled by the mother. Future work needs to address genetic effects,

maternal effects, and plasticity in response to variation in environmental factors directly experienced

by the offspring to better understand the forces driving trait variation in nature. We also caution that

the shifts found in our study are only from comparisons of a single population pair. Our

understanding of the relative roles of genetic and plastic effects on phenotypic variation would

benefit greatly from studies that expand to other sulfidic and nonsulfidic population pairs in *P.*

mexicana and other species.

Conclusions

Natural selection can act on phenotypes to cause evolutionary change in populations within a single

generation (Grant and Grant 1993). However, selection rarely impacts a single trait, since many traits

have numerous correlated characters (Lande and Arnold 1983). Likewise, selection can act

differently throughout an organism's life (Freda et al. 2019), so ontogenetic patterns of trait variation

are crucial for our understanding of how traits evolve. It is therefore necessary to analyze variation

in multiple fitness-relevant traits across ontogeny to truly understand adaptation. By doing so, our

study provided strong evidence that the patterns of phenotypic variation found in wild populations

of *P. mexicana* inhabiting divergent habitats are primarily driven by population differences indicative

of local adaptation. Maternal effects, on the other hand, were present but generally weak, so they

likely accentuate population differences, rather than causing them.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the members of the community in Tapijulapa, Tabasco for access to field

sites and for their hospitality. We also would like to thank the Mexican government for issuing

permits for past field collections, as well as our collaborators at the Universidad Juárez Autónoma de

Tabasco and the Centro de Investigación E Innovación Para la Enseñanza y El Aprendizaje for

support of research expeditions to obtain the specimens that gave rise to the populations used in

this study. J. Onnen and Q. La Fon assisted in processing our diverse datasets. Funding for this

research was provided by grants from the National Science Foundation (IOS-1931657) and the U.S.

Army Research Office (W911NF-15-1-0175) to MT, and by a Graduate Assistance in Areas of

National Need (GAANN) fellowship from the U.S. Department of Education to JLC.

Author Contributions

JLC and MT designed the study. JLC conducted the experiments and analyzed the data. MT

provided logistical support. JLC drafted the manuscript; both authors contributed text and worked

on the final version of this manuscript.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement

586   All datasets and R scripts used to analyze the data, with associated documentation, have been

587   archived on GitHub (https://github.com/michitobler/common-garden).

References

Altmann, J., and S. C. Alberts. 2005. Growth rates in a wild primate population: ecological influences and maternal effects. Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol. 57:490–501. Springer Science and Business Media LLC.

Badyaev, A. V., and T. Uller. 2009. Parental effects in ecology and evolution: mechanisms, processes and implications. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci. 364:1169–1177.

Bartón, K. 2009. MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference.

Barts, N., R. Greenway, C. N. Passow, L. Arias-Rodriguez, J. L. Kelley, and M. Tobler. 2018. Molecular evolution and expression of oxygen transport genes in livebearing fishes (Poeciliidae) from hydrogen sulfide rich springs. Genome 61:273–286.

Bates, D., M. Mächler, B. Bolker, and S. Walker. 2015. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. Journal of Statistical Software, Articles 67:1–48.

Beckerman, A. P., T. G. Benton, C. T. Lapsley, and N. Koesters. 2006. How effective are maternal effects at having effects? Proc. Biol. Sci. 273:485–493. The Royal Society.

Belk, M. C., S. J. Ingley, and J. B. Johnson. 2020. Life History Divergence in Livebearing Fishes in Response to Predation: Is There a Microevolution to Macroevolution Barrier? Diversity 12:179. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.

Ben-Shachar, M., D. Lüdecke, and D. Makowski. 2020. Effectsize: Estimation of effect size indices and standardized parameters. J. Open Source Softw. 5:2815. The Open Journal.

Bierbach, D., M. Schulte, N. Herrmann, M. Tobler, S. Stadler, C. T. Jung, B. Kunkel, R. Riesch, S. Klaus, M. Ziege, J. R. Indy, L. Arias-Rodriguez, and M. Plath. 2011. Predator-induced changes of female mating preferences: innate and experiential effects. BMC Evol. Biol. 11:190.

612 Boots, M., and K. E. Roberts. 2012. Maternal effects in disease resistance: poor maternal

613   environment increases offspring resistance to an insect virus. Proc. Biol. Sci. 279:4009–4014.

614   The Royal Society.

615 Camarillo, H., L. Arias Rodriguez, and M. Tobler. 2020. Functional consequences of phenotypic

616   variation between locally adapted populations: Swimming performance and ventilation in

617   extremophile fish. J. Evol. Biol. 33:512–523.

618 Chambers, J. 1987. The cyprinodontiform gonopodium, with an atlas of the gonopodia of the fishes

619   of the genus Limia. J. Fish Biol. 30:389–418. Wiley.

620 Conrad, J. L., K. L. Weinersmith, T. Brodin, J. B. Saltz, and A. Sih. 2011. Behavioural syndromes in

621   fishes: a review with implications for ecology and fisheries management. J. Fish Biol. 78:395–

622   435. Wiley.

623 Cooper, C. E., and G. C. Brown. 2008. The inhibition of mitochondrial cytochrome oxidase by the

624   gases carbon monoxide, nitric oxide, hydrogen cyanide and hydrogen sulfide: chemical

625   mechanism and physiological significance. Journal of Bioenergy and Biomembranes 40:533–

626   539.

627 Dingemanse, N. J., and Y. G. Araya-Ajoy. 2015. Interacting personalities: behavioural ecology meets

628   quantitative genetics. Trends Ecol. Evol. 30:88–97.

629 Domenici, P., and R. W. Blake. 1997. The kinematics and performance of fish fast-start swimming.

630   J. Exp. Biol. 200:1165–1178.

631 Doran, C., D. Bierbach, J. Lukas, P. Klamser, T. Landgraf, H. Klenz, M. Habedank, L. Arias-

632   Rodriguez, S. Krause, P. Romanczuk, and J. Krause. 2021. Fish waves as emergent collective

633   antipredator behavior. Curr. Biol. 0. Elsevier.

634 Eaton, R. C., R. A. Bombardieri, and D. L. Meyer. 1977. The Mauthner-initiated startle response in

635   teleost fish. J. Exp. Biol. 66:65–81.

Endler, J. A. 1995. Multiple-trait coevolution and environmental gradients in guppies. Trends Ecol.

Evol. 10:22–29.

Endler, J. A. 1980. Natural selection on color patterns in Poecilia reticulata. Evolution 34:76–91.

Felmy, A., D. N. Reznick, J. Travis, T. Potter, and T. Coulson. 2022. Life histories as mosaics:

plastic and genetic components differ among traits that underpin life-history strategies.

Evolution, doi: 10.1111/evo.14440.

Fox, J., M. Friendly, and G. Monette. 2021. heplots: Visualizing Hypothesis Tests in Multivariate

Linear Models. Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN).

Fox, J., and S. Weisberg. 2018a. An R Companion to Applied Regression. SAGE Publications.

Fox, J., and S. Weisberg. 2018b. Visualizing fit and lack of fit in complex regression models with

predictor effect plots and partial residuals. J. Stat. Softw. 87. Foundation for Open Access

Statistic.

Freda, P. J., Z. M. Ali, N. Heter, G. J. Ragland, and T. J. Morgan. 2019. Stage-specific genotype-by-

environment interactions for cold and heat hardiness in Drosophila melanogaster. Heredity

(Edinb.) 123:479–491. Springer Science and Business Media LLC.

Friard, O., and M. Gamba. 2016. BORIS: a free, versatile open-source event-logging software for

video/audio coding and live observations. Methods Ecol. Evol. 7:1325–1330. Wiley.

Garland, T., Jr, C. J. Downs, and A. R. Ives. 2022. Trade-offs (and constraints) in organismal

biology. Physiol. Biochem. Zool. 95:82–112. University of Chicago Press.

Ghalambor, C. K., K. L. Hoke, E. W. Ruell, E. K. Fischer, D. N. Reznick, and K. A. Hughes. 2015.

Non-adaptive plasticity potentiates rapid adaptive evolution of gene expression in nature.

Nature 525:372–375.

Ghalambor, C. K., D. N. Reznick, and J. A. Walker. 2004. Constraints on adaptive evolution: the

659   functional trade-off between reproduction and fast-start swimming performance in the

660   Trinidadian guppy (Poecilia reticulata). Am. Nat. 164:38–50.

661   Grafen, A. 1988. On the uses of data on lifetime reproductive success. Reproductive success 454–

662   485. University of Chicago Press.

663   Grant, B. R., and P. R. Grant. 1993. Evolution of Darwin's finches caused by a rare climatic event.

664   Proc. Biol. Sci. 251:111–117. The Royal Society.

665   Greenway, R., L. Arias-Rodriguez, P. Diaz, and M. Tobler. 2014. Patterns of macroinvertebrate and

666   fish diversity in freshwater sulphide springs. Diversity 6:597–632. MDPI AG.

667   Greenway, R., N. Barts, C. Henpita, A. P. Brown, L. Arias Rodriguez, C. M. Rodríguez Peña, S.

668   Arndt, G. Y. Lau, M. P. Murphy, L. Wu, D. Lin, J. L. Kelley, J. H. Shaw, and M. Tobler.

669   2020. Convergent evolution of conserved mitochondrial pathways underlies repeated

670   adaptation to extreme environments. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 117:16424–16430.

671   National Acad Sciences.

672   Hedrick, T. L. 2008. Software techniques for two- and three-dimensional kinematic measurements

673   of biological and biomimetic systems. Bioinspir. Biomim. 3:034001. IOP Publishing.

674   Hegyi, G., J. Török, L. Tóth, L. Z. Garamszegi, and B. Rosivall. 2006. Rapid temporal change in the

675   expression and age-related information content of a sexually selected trait. J. Evol. Biol.

676   19:228–238. Wiley.

677   Huang, P., K. E. Sieving, and C. M. S. Mary. 2012. Heterospecific information about predation risk

678   influences exploratory behavior. Behav. Ecol. 23:463–472. Oxford University Press (OUP).

679   Ingley, S. J., H. Camarillo, H. Willis, and J. B. Johnson. 2016. Repeated evolution of local adaptation

680   in swimming performance: population-level trade-offs between burst and endurance

681   swimming in Brachyrhaphis freshwater fish. Biol. J. Linn. Soc. Lond. 119:1011–1026.

682   Oxford Academic.

683   Ingley, S. J., and J. B. Johnson. 2016. Divergent natural selection promotes immigrant inviability at

684   early and late stages of evolutionary divergence. Evolution 70:600–616.

685   Jennions, M. D., B. B. M. Wong, A. Cowling, and C. Donnelly. 2006. Life-history phenotypes in a

686   live-bearing fish Brachyrhaphis episcopi living under different predator regimes: seasonal

687   effects? Environ. Biol. Fishes 76:211–219. Springer Science and Business Media LLC.

688   Johnson, J. B., and M. C. Belk. 2001. Predation environment predicts divergent life-history

689   phenotypes among populations of the livebearing fish Brachyrhaphis rhabdophora.

690   Oecologia 126:142–149.

691   Kaun, K. R., C. A. L. Riedl, M. Chakaborty-Chatterjee, A. T. Belay, S. J. Douglas, A. G. Gibbs, and

692   M. B. Sokolowski. 2007. Natural variation in food acquisition mediated via a Drosophila

693   cGMP-dependent protein kinase. J. Exp. Biol. 210:3547–3558. The Company of Biologists.

694   Kawecki, T. J., and D. Ebert. 2004. Conceptual issues in local adaptation. Ecol. Lett. 7:1225–1241.

695   Lande, R., and S. J. Arnold. 1983. THE MEASUREMENT OF SELECTION ON CORRELATED

696   CHARACTERS. Evolution 37:1210–1226.

697   Langerhans, R. B. 2007. Evolutionary consequences of predation: avoidance, escape, reproduction,

698   and diversification. P. *in* A. M. T. Elewa, ed. Predation in Organisms. Springer, Berlin.

699   Langerhans, R. B. 2009. Trade-off between steady and unsteady swimming underlies predator-driven

700   divergence in Gambusia affinis. J. Evol. Biol. 22:1057–1075.

701   Langerhans, R. B., M. E. Gifford, and E. O. Joseph. 2007. Ecological speciation in Gambusia fishes.

702   Evolution 61:2056–2074.

703   Langerhans, R. B., C. A. Layman, A. M. Shokrollahi, and T. J. DeWitt. 2004. Predator-driven

704   phenotypic diversification in Gambusia affinis. Evolution 58:2305–2318.

705   Leonard, A. M., and L. T. Lancaster. 2020. Maladaptive plasticity facilitates evolution of thermal

706   tolerance during an experimental range shift. BMC Evol. Biol. 20:47.

707   Lindholm, A. K., J. Hunt, and R. Brooks. 2006. Where do all the maternal effects go? Variation in

708   offspring body size through ontogeny in the live-bearing fish Poecilia parae. Biol. Lett.

709   2:586–589. The Royal Society.

710   Lukas, J., F. Auer, T. Goldhammer, J. Krause, P. Romanczuk, P. Klamser, L. Arias-Rodriguez, and

711   D. Bierbach. 2021. Diurnal Changes in Hypoxia Shape Predator-Prey Interaction in a Bird-

712   Fish System. Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution 9:151.

713   MacLeod, K. J., G. M. While, and T. Uller. 2021. Viviparous mothers impose stronger

714   glucocorticoid-mediated maternal stress effects on their offspring than oviparous mothers.

715   Ecol. Evol. 11:17238–17259. Wiley.

716   Marshall, D. J., and T. Uller. 2007. When is a maternal effect adaptive? Oikos 116:1957–1963. Wiley.

717   Monaghan, P. 2008. Early growth conditions, phenotypic development and environmental change.

718   Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci. 363:1635–1645. The Royal Society.

719   Mousseau, T., and C. Fox (eds). 1998. Maternal effects as adaptations. Oxford University Press,

720   New York.

721   Palacios, M., L. Arias-Rodriguez, M. Plath, C. Eifert, H. Lerp, A. Lamboj, G. Voelker, and M.

722   Tobler. 2013. The rediscovery of a long described species reveals additional complexity in

723   speciation patterns of poeciliid fishes in sulfide springs. PLoS One 8:e71069.

724   Passow, C., R. Greenway, L. Arias-Rodriguez, P. D. Jeyasingh, and M. Tobler. 2015. Reduction of

725   energetic demands through modification of body size and metabolic rates in locally adapted

726   extremophile fishes. Physiol. Biochem. Zool. 88:371–383.

727   Passow, C. N., L. Arias-Rodriguez, and M. Tobler. 2017a. Convergent evolution of reduced energy

728   demands in extremophile fish. PLoS One 12:e0186935.

Passow, C. N., C. Henpita, J. H. Shaw, C. R. Quackenbush, W. C. Warren, M. Schartl, L. Arias-

Rodriguez, J. L. Kelley, and M. Tobler. 2017b. The roles of plasticity and evolutionary

change in shaping gene expression variation in natural populations of extremophile fish.

Mol. Ecol. 26:6384–6399.

Pérez-Escudero, A., J. Vicente-Page, R. C. Hinz, S. Arganda, and G. G. de Polavieja. 2014.

idTracker: tracking individuals in a group by automatic identification of unmarked animals.

Nat. Methods 11:743–748. Springer Science and Business Media LLC.

Pigliucci, M. 2001. Phenotypic plasticity: beyond nature and nuture. The Johns Hopkins University

Press, Baltimore, MD.

Plath, M., M. Pfenninger, H. Lerp, R. Riesch, C. Eschenbrenner, P. A. Slattery, D. Bierbach, N.

Herrmann, M. Schulte, L. Arias-Rodriguez, J. Rimber Indy, C. Passow, and M. Tobler. 2013.

Genetic differentiation and selection against migrants in evolutionarily replicated extreme

environments. Evolution 67:2647–2661.

Plath, M., M. Tobler, R. Riesch, F. J. Garcia de Leon, O. Giere, and I. Schlupp. 2007. Survival in an

extreme habitat: the role of behaviour and energy limitation. Naturwissenschaften 94:991–

996.

R Core Team. 2021. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for

Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

Reiffenstein, R. J., W. C. Hulbert, and S. H. Roth. 1992. Toxicology of hydrogen sulfide. Annual

Reviews of Pharmacology and Toxicology 1992:109–134.

Reznick, D., H. Callahan, and R. Llauredo. 1996a. Maternal effects on offspring quality in poeciliid

fishes. Am. Zool. 36:147–156.

Reznick, D., and J. A. Endler. 1982. The impact of predation on life history evolution in trinidadian

guppies (Poecilia reticulata). Evolution 36:160–177.

Reznick, D. N., and H. Bryga. 1987. Life-history evolution in guppies (Poecilia reticulata): 1.

Phenotypic and genetic changes in an introduction experiment. Evolution 41:1370–1385.

Wiley.

Reznick, D. N., H. A. Bryga, and J. A. Endler. 1990. Experimentally induced life-history evolution in

a natural population. Nature 346:357–359.

Reznick, D. N., F. H. Rodd, and M. Cardenas. 1996b. Life-History Evolution in Guppies (Poecilia

reticulata: Poeciliidae). IV. Parallelism in Life-History Phenotypes. Am. Nat. 147:319–338.

The University of Chicago Press.

Riesch, R., V. Duwe, N. Herrmann, L. Padur, A. Ramm, K. Scharnweber, M. Schulte, T. Schulz-

Mirbach, M. Ziege, and M. Plath. 2009. Variation along the shy–bold continuum in

extremophile fishes (Poecilia mexicana, Poecilia sulphuraria). Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.

63:1515–1526. Springer Science and Business Media LLC.

Riesch, R., A. Oranth, J. Dzienko, N. Karau, A. Schiessl, S. Stadler, A. Wigh, C. Zimmer, L. Arias-

Rodriguez, I. Schlupp, and M. Plath. 2010a. Extreme habitats are not refuges: poeciliids

suffer from increased aerial predation risk in sulphidic southern Mexican habitats. Biol. J.

Linn. Soc. Lond. 101:417–426.

Riesch, R., M. Plath, and I. Schlupp. 2010b. Toxic hydrogen sulfide and dark caves: life-history

adaptations in a livebearing fish (Poecilia mexicana, Poeciliidae). Ecology 91:1494–1505.

Wiley.

Riesch, R., M. Plath, and I. Schlupp. 2011a. Toxic hydrogen sulphide and dark caves: pronounced

male life-history divergence among locally adapted Poecilia mexicana (Poeciliidae). J. Evol.

Biol. 24:596–606. Wiley.

Riesch, R., M. Plath, I. Schlupp, M. Tobler, and R. B. Langerhans. 2014. Colonization of toxic

springs drives predictable life-history shift in livebearing fishes (Poeciliidae). Ecol. Lett.

17:65–71.

Riesch, R., D. N. Reznick, M. Plath, and I. Schlupp. 2016a. Sex-specific local life-history adaptation

in surface- and cave-dwelling Atlantic mollies (Poecilia mexicana). Sci. Rep. 6:22968.

Riesch, R., I. Schlupp, R. B. Langerhans, and M. Plath. 2011b. Shared and unique patterns of

embryo development in extremophile poeciliids. PLoS One 6:e27377.

Riesch, R., M. Tobler, H. Lerp, J. Jourdan, T. Doumas, P. Nosil, R. B. Langerhans, and M. Plath.

2016b. Extremophile Poeciliidae: multivariate insights into the complexity of speciation

along replicated ecological gradients. BMC Evol. Biol. 16:136.

Rosen, D. E., and M. S. Gordon. 1953. Functional anatomy and evolution of male genitalia in

Poeciliid fishes. Zoologica 38:1–47.

Rossiter, M. 1996. Incidence and consequences of inherited environmental effects. Annu. Rev. Ecol.

Syst. 27:451–476. Annual Reviews.

Scheiner, S. M. 1993. Genetics and Evolution of Phenotypic Plasticity. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst. 24:35–

68. Annual Reviews.

Schneider, C. A., W. S. Rasband, and K. W. Eliceiri. 2012. NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of image

analysis. Nat. Methods 9:671–675. Springer Science and Business Media LLC.

Schrader, M., and J. Travis. 2012. Variation in offspring size with birth order in placental fish: a role

for asymmetric sibling competition? Evolution 66:272–279.

Schuler, M. S., and J. L. Orrock. 2012. The maladaptive significance of maternal effects for plants in

anthropogenically modified environments. Evol. Ecol. 26:475–481.

Stearns, S. C., and R. D. Sage. 1980. Maladaptation in a Marginal Population of the Mosquito Fish,

Gambusia-Affinis. Evolution 34:65–75.

Stenseth, N. C., L. Andersson, and H. E. Hoekstra. 2022. Gregor Johann Mendel and the

development of modern evolutionary biology. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.

119:e2201327119.

Teska, W. R., M. H. Smith, and J. M. Novak. 1990. Food quality, heterozygosity, and fitness

correlates in Peromyscus polionotus. Evolution 44:1318–1325. Wiley.

Tobler, M. 2008. Divergence in trophic ecology characterizes colonization of extreme habitats. Biol.

J. Linn. Soc. Lond. 95:517–528. Oxford University Press (OUP).

Tobler, M., D. M. Alba, L. Arias-Rodríguez, and P. D. Jeyasingh. 2016a. Using replicated evolution

in extremophile fish to understand diversification in elemental composition and nutrient

excretion. Freshw. Biol. 61:158–171. Wiley.

Tobler, M., T. J. Dewitt, I. Schlupp, F. J. García de León, R. Herrmann, P. G. D. Feulner, R.

Tiedemann, and M. Plath. 2008. Toxic hydrogen sulfide and dark caves: phenotypic and

genetic divergence across two abiotic environmental gradients in *Poecilia mexicana*. Evolution

62:2643–2659.

Tobler, M., and L. Hastings. 2011. Convergent patterns of body shape differentiation in four

different clades of poeciliid fishes inhabiting sulfide springs. Evol. Biol. 38:412–421. Springer

Science and Business Media LLC.

Tobler, M., J. L. Kelley, M. Plath, and R. Riesch. 2018. Extreme environments and the origins of

biodiversity: Adaptation and speciation in sulphide spring fishes. Mol. Ecol. 27:843–859.

Tobler, M., M. Palacios, L. J. Chapman, I. Mitrofanov, D. Bierbach, M. Plath, L. Arias-Rodriguez, F.

J. G. de León, and M. Mateos. 2011. Evolution in extreme environments: replicated

phenotypic differentiation in livebearing fish inhabiting sulfidic springs. Evolution 65:2213–

2228.

Tobler, M., C. N. Passow, R. Greenway, J. L. Kelley, and J. H. Shaw. 2016b. The Evolutionary

Ecology of Animals Inhabiting Hydrogen Sulfide–Rich Environments. Annu. Rev. Ecol.

Evol. Syst. 47:239–262. Annual Reviews.

Tobler, M., M. Plath, R. Riesch, I. Schlupp, A. Grasse, G. K. Munimanda, C. Setzer, D. J. Penn, and

Y. Moodley. 2014. Selection from parasites favours immunogenetic diversity but not

divergence among locally adapted host populations. J. Evol. Biol. 27:960–974.

Tobler, M., R. Riesch, C. M. Tobler, and M. Plath. 2009. Compensatory behaviour in response to

sulfide-induced hypoxia affects time budgets, feeding efficiency, and predation risk. Evol.

Ecol. Res. 11:935–948.

Tobler, M., K. Scharnweber, R. Greenway, C. N. Passow, L. Arias-Rodriguez, and F. J. García-De-

León. 2015. Convergent changes in the trophic ecology of extremophile fish along replicated

environmental gradients. Freshw. Biol. 60:768–780. Wiley.

Tobler, M., I. Schlupp, K. U. Heubel, R. Riesch, F. J. G. de León, O. Giere, and M. Plath. 2006. Life

on the edge: hydrogen sulfide and the fish communities of a Mexican cave and surrounding

waters. Extremophiles 10:577–585.

Tokić, G., and D. K. P. Yue. 2012. Optimal shape and motion of undulatory swimming organisms.

Proc. Biol. Sci. 279:3065–3074. The Royal Society.

Tomar, S. 2006. Converting Video Formats with FFmpeg. Linux J. 146:10.

Uller, T. 2008. Developmental plasticity and the evolution of parental effects. Trends Ecol. Evol.

23:432–438.

Van Allen, B., N. Jones, B. Gilbert, K. Carscadden, and R. Germain. 2021. Maternal effects and the

outcome of interspecific competition. Ecol. Evol. 11:7544–7556. Wiley.

Walker, J. A. 1997. Ecological morphology of lacustrine threespine stickleback Gasterosteus

aculeatus L. (Gasterosteidae) body shape. Biol. J. Linn. Soc. Lond. 61:3–50.

Weeks, S. C., and O. E. Gaggiotti. 1993. Patterns of offspring size at birth in clonal and sexual

strains of Poeciliopsis (poeciliidae). Copeia 1993:1003. JSTOR.

West-Eberhard, M. J. 1989. Phenotypic plasticity and the origins of diversity. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.

20:249–278.

Wilson, A. J., D. W. Coltman, J. M. Pemberton, A. D. J. Overall, K. A. Byrne, and L. E. B. Kruuk.

2005. Maternal genetic effects set the potential for evolution in a free-living vertebrate

population. J. Evol. Biol. 18:405–414. Wiley.

Winemiller, K. O., and K. A. Rose. 1992. Patterns of life-history diversification in North American

fishes: Implications for population regulation. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 49:2196–2218.

Canadian Science Publishing.

Wolf, J. B., and M. J. Wade. 2009. What are maternal effects (and what are they not)? Philos. Trans.

R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci. 364:1107–1115. The Royal Society.

Zhang, H., O. Vedder, P. H. Becker, and S. Bouwhuis. 2015. Age-dependent trait variation: the

relative contribution of within-individual change, selective appearance and disappearance in a

long-lived seabird. J. Anim. Ecol. 84:797–807. Wiley.

Table 1. Model terms in the best-supported model for each dependent variable. Empty cells represent terms that were not present in the best-supported model for that dependent variable. Type-III ANOVA or Wald's Chi-square tests were used to determine whether model terms were significantly different from zero. F-statistics or χ^2 statistics are presented for each included model term, with the degrees of freedom in a subscript. P-values are presented underneath each test statistic.

Dependent Variable	Brood Size	Treatment Length	Mother SL	Age	Population	Food Treatment
Size at Birth	$F_{1,35} = 20.876$ $P < 0.001$		$F_{1,35} = 16.593$ $P < 0.001$		$F_{1,35} = 20.032$ $P < 0.001$	$F_{1,35} = 4.354$ $P = 0.044$
Brood Size		$F_{1,37} = 8.926$ $P = 0.005$	$F_{1,37} = 23.342$ $P < 0.001$			
Age at Maturity					$F_{1,26} = 4.420$ $P = 0.045$	
Growth Rate at Birth					$F_{1,37} = 5.025$ $P = 0.031$	
Overall Growth Rate				$\chi^2_1 = 147.91$ $P < 0.001$		
Burst Swimming at Birth			$F_{1,39} = 5.025$ $P = 0.121$			
Overall Burst Swimming				$\chi^2_1 = 30.178$ $P < 0.001$	$\chi^2_1 = 4.308$ $P = 0.038$	
Exploratory Behavior at Birth						$F_{1,31} = 2.727$ $P = 0.108$
Overall Exploratory Behavior					$\chi^2_1 = 7.513$ $P = 0.006$	$\chi^2_1 = 4.245$ $P = 0.039$
Feeding Accuracy at Birth		$F_{1,38} = 0.775$ $P = 0.384$				
Overall Feeding Accuracy					$\chi^2_1 = 4.645$ $P = 0.031$	
Multivariate Trait Variation PC1		$F_{1,24} = 15.817$ $P < 0.001$			$F_{1,24} = 14.984$ $P < 0.001$	$F_{1,24} = 4.746$ $P = 0.039$
Multivariate Trait Variation PC2		$F_{1,24} = 7.722$ $P = 0.010$	$F_{1,24} = 5.292$ $P = 0.030$		$F_{1,24} = 3.321$ $P = 0.081$	

Figure 1. Overview of our experimental design. We subjected pregnant sulfidic and nonsulfidic

mothers to either a high- or a low-food treatment and measured seven traits in their offspring

throughout their development. These traits include four life history traits (birth size, brood size,

growth rate, and age at maturity) and three behavioral traits (burst swimming, exploratory behavior,

and feeding accuracy).

Figure 2. Plots of average standard length (A), brood size (B), and their relationship (C) for each

family. Data is summarized in boxplots with raw data points overlaid. In both populations, the high-

food treatment is shown in blue, and the low-food treatment is shown in orange. When the best-

supported model for a phenotype contained the terms 'Population' and 'Food Treatment', the

estimated marginal means for those effects were visualized as large points.

Figure 3. Data for each individual phenotype, including (A) growth rate at birth, (B) overall growth rate, (C) age at maturity, (D) burst swimming, (E) exploratory behavior, and (F) feeding accuracy. Data is summarized in boxplots with raw data points overlaid. In both populations, the high-food treatment is shown in blue, and the low-food treatment is shown in orange. When the best-supported model for a phenotype contained the terms 'Population' and/or 'Food Treatment', the estimated marginal means for those effects were visualized as large points.

Figure 4. Plot of principal component scores representing linear combinations of all phenotypes in multivariate space. Scores were plotted along the first two principal components. Nonsulfidic families are shown in shades of blue, while sulfidic individuals are shown in shades of yellow. The high-food treatment within each population is shown in the darker shade (*i.e.*, dark blue or dark yellow). Radiating from the origin are arrows that represent the correlation between the principal component scores and each input variable (shown as text at the end of each arrow). Loadings were calculated by multiplying the eigenvector for each input variable by the square-root of the eigenvalue for that principal component axis. At the top of the figure are boxplots that show the distribution of principal component scores along the first principal component axis, which exhibited significant effects of 'Population' and 'Food Treatment'.