**Repeatability of adaptation in sunflowers: genomic regions harbouring inversions also**

**drive adaptation in species lacking an inversion**

Shaghayegh Soudi[1+], Mojtaba Jahani[1,2+], Marco Todesco[2,3,4], Gregory L. Owens[5], Natalia

Bercovich[2], Loren H. Rieseberg[2], Sam Yeaman[1,*]

+Joint first-authors

Author affiliations:

1.  Department of Biological Sciences, University of Calgary, 2500 University Drive NW, Calgary, Canada, T2N 1N4
2.  Department of Botany, University of British Columbia, 6270 University Blvd, Vancouver, Canada, V6T 1Z4
3.  Michael Smith Laboratories, University of British Columbia, 6270 University Blvd, Vancouver, Canada, V6T 1Z4
4.  Irving K. Barber Faculty of Science, University of British Columbia Okanagan, 3187 University Way, Kelowna, Canada, V1V 1V7
5.  Department of Biology, University of Victoria, 3800 Finnerty Rd, Victoria, Canada, V8P 5C2

21 *corresponding author: Sam Yeaman, samuel.yeaman@ucalgary.ca

**Abstract**

Local adaptation commonly involves alleles of large effect, which experience fitness advantages when in positive linkage disequilibrium (LD). Because segregating inversions suppress recombination and facilitate the maintenance of LD between locally adapted loci, they are also commonly found to be associated with adaptive divergence. However, it is unclear what fraction of an adaptive response can be attributed to inversions and alleles of large effect, and whether the loci within an inversion could still drive adaptation in the absence of its recombination-suppressing effect. Here, we use genome-wide association studies to explore patterns of local adaptation in three species of sunflower: *Helianthus annuus*, *H. argophyllus*, and *H. petiolaris*, which each harbour a large number of species-specific inversions. We find evidence of significant genome-wide repeatability in signatures of association to phenotypes and environments, which are particularly enriched within regions of the genome harbouring an inversion in one species. This shows that while inversions may facilitate local adaptation, at least some of the loci can still harbour mutations that make substantial contributions without the benefit of recombination suppression in species lacking a segregating inversion. While a large number of genomic regions show evidence of repeated adaptation, most of the strongest signatures of association still tend to be species-specific, indicating substantial genotypic redundancy for local adaptation in these species.

**Introduction**

The genetic basis of local adaptation is sometimes highly repeatable, with examples of large effect genes driving responses in multiple species, such as *FT* affecting flowering time in numerous plants (Izawa 2007; Auge et al. 2019) or *Mc1r* driving colour polymorphisms in vertebrates (Manceau et al. 2010; Rosenblum et al. 2014). Local adaptation can also be repeated for polygenic traits, with significant patterns of similar association found across many loci for comparisons of conifers (Yeaman et al. 2016), maize and its wild relative teosinte (Tittes et al. 2021; Wang et al. 2021), and *Brassicaceae* (Bohutínská et al. 2021), to name a few. While we have a growing number of examples of repeatability in the basis of adaptation, it is also interesting to know if species use different genes to adapt to the same selection pressure. Genotypic redundancy – the potential for many genotypes to yield a given phenotype – is one critical factor affecting the repeatability of adaptation, as high redundancy would be expected to

result in lower repeatability (Yeaman et al. 2018). Another critical factor affecting repeatability

is shared standing variation, whether present due to introgression or incomplete lineage sorting.

In either case, variants shared among lineages are much more likely to contribute to a repeated

response than new mutations (MacPherson and Nuismer 2018; Ralph and Coop 2015).

Consistent with this, Bohutínská and colleagues (2021) found that repeatability was negatively

related to phylogenetic distance. While we are now accumulating more studies about the

repeatability of adaptation, we still have very few examples and much remains unknown about

the relative importance of these factors (Yeaman 2022).

Inversions have been implicated in local adaptation in many species (Wellenreuther and

Bernatchez 2018), likely due to their effect to suppress recombination among inverted and non-

inverted haplotypes, and thereby maintain LD among beneficial combinations of locally adapted

alleles (Rieseberg 2001; Noor et al. 2001; Kirkpatrick and Barton 2006). This has been

approached by models studying the establishment of inversions that capture combinations of

locally adapted alleles present as standing variation (*e.g.*, Kirkpatrick and Barton 2006), as well

as models examining the accumulation of locally adapted mutations within inversions (*e.g.*,

Schaal et al. 2022). If there is variation in the density of loci that can potentially contribute to

local adaptation, inversions would be expected to preferentially establish and be retained in

regions harbouring a high density of such loci (and this expectation would hold for both the

capture and accumulation models). We would also expect to see stronger signatures of repeated

local adaptation in such high density regions. Despite mounting evidence of their importance in

adaptation, it is unclear how inversions may covary with repeatability of adaptation among

species. A fundamental parameter of importance in these models is the relationship between

migration rate and strength of selection on individual alleles, which may not make persistent

contributions to local adaptation without the suppressing effects of recombination if selection is

too weak (Yeaman and Whitlock 2011; Bürger and Akerman 2011). If most alleles have small

effects relative to migration rate and can only contribute to local adaptation via the benefit of the

recombination-suppressing effect of an inversion, then we would expect little repeatability at the

site of an inversion – other species lacking the inversion would not tend to use that same region

for adaptation because selection would be too weak for alleles to persist. On the other hand, if

some loci are particularly important for local adaptation and regularly yield mutations of large

effect, with these patterns being conserved among species, repeatability within regions

harbouring inversions may be substantial. Thus, studying whether adaptation at the same

genomic region harbouring an inversion is observed in other species lacking the inversion can

give insights about the underlying architecture of adaptation, and the evolution and maintenance

of inversions.

Here, we explore the repeatability of local adaptation in three species of sunflowers, *Helianthus*

*annuus*, *Helianthus argophyllus* and *Helianthus petiolaris* (Figure 1), which harbour large

regions of suppressed recombination ("haploblocks"), most of which are inversions, and are

often associated with adaptive traits (Todesco et al. 2020). *Helianthus annuus*, the common

sunflower, is the closest wild relative of cultivated sunflower, which was domesticated from it

around 4,000 years ago (Blackman et al. 2011). Populations of *H. annuus* are distributed

throughout the central and western USA and generally found on mesic soils, but can grow in a

variety of disturbed or extreme habitats, such as semi-desertic or frequently flooded areas, as

well as salt marshes. *Helianthus petiolaris*, the prairie sunflower, prefers sandier soils, and

ecotypes of this species are adapted to sand sheets and sand dunes (Ostevik et al. 2016). Here we

include samples from two subspecies: *H. petiolaris ssp. petiolaris*, which is commonly found in

the southern Great Plains, and *H. petiolaris ssp. fallax*, which is limited to more arid regions in

Colorado, Utah, New Mexico and Arizona (Heiser et al. 1969). *Helianthus petiolaris* and *H.*

*annuus* have broad and overlapping distributions throughout the central and western United

States and appear to have adapted to similar changes in temperature, moisture and photoperiod

regimes. There is also evidence indicating *H. annuus* and *H. petiolaris* have likely been

exchanging genes during much of their history of divergence (Strasburg and Rieseberg 2008),

although partially isolated by strong pre- and post-zygotic barriers (Sambatti et al. 2012). The

third species, *Helianthus argophyllus*, the silverleaf sunflower, is found exclusively in the

southeast coast of Texas and includes both an early flowering ecotype on the coastal barrier

islands and a late flowering ecotype inland (Moyers and Rieseberg 2016; Todesco et al. 2020).

*H. argophyllus* is thought to have undergone cycles of sympatry and allopatry with *H.*

*annuus* and *H. petiolaris* over time, but currently only overlaps with *H. annuus,* with thus

overlap likely being a recent event (Heiser, 1951).

Using broad sampling across the ranges of these species (Figure 1) and sequencing data

first published by Todesco et al. (2020), we study the genomic basis of local adaptation by

conducting genome-wide scans for associations with climatic and soil environmental variables

and phenotypes measured in a common garden. An inherent problem in studying the basis of

local adaptation is accounting for the covariance between genome-wide population genetic

structure and environment. When the selection pressure driving local adaptation tends to parallel

a main axis of demographic expansion or isolation by distance, neutral alleles will have spatial

patterns resembling those of causal alleles. Methods that do not correct for population structure

have large numbers of false positives because allele frequencies at neutral loci tend to correlate

with the environment more than expected by chance (Lotterhos and Whitlock 2014). By contrast,

methods that use structure correction tend to suffer from false negatives because the causal loci

have similar patterns of allele frequency variation as the genomic background, and so their

statistical signatures are decreased (DeRaad et al. 2021; Booker et al. 2023b). When a non-

corrected approach is applied to multiple species, the false positive problem can be mitigated

when testing for loci that contribute to repeated adaptation, as the same gene should not tend to

be a false positive in multiple species more often than expected by chance (Yeaman et al. 2016).

Here we use a conventional GWAS approach with structure correction to study the basis of

phenotypes, which vary both within and among populations, and use an uncorrected approach to

test association to environment, which only varies among populations (as all individuals within

the same population have the same value of environmental variable). For the environmental

association portions of the study, we also explore the effect of structure correction in some

analyses, to contrast the false negative vs. false positive problem inherent in each approach. We

apply these approaches individually to *H. annuus*, *H. argophyllus*, and the two *H. petiolaris*

subspecies, and make pairwise and higher-order comparisons among combinations of these four

lineages to study repeatability.

Our overall aim is to characterize the extent of repeatability of local adaptation for different traits

and environments, and explore the importance of inversions and other factors that may drive

differences in repeatability. This analysis builds upon the work of Todesco et al. (2020), which

focused on the evolution of haplobocks within each species, but did not systematically study

patterns of repeatability in signatures of association among species. We begin by using the

strength of correlations between environment and phenotypes measured in a common garden to

identify which environmental variables are likely driving local adaptation within each species,

and use an index to quantify the relative similarity in these patterns among pairs of species (see

Figure S1 for a schematic overview of methods and research questions). We then conduct

Genome-Wide Association tests to identify regions most strongly associated with phenotypes

and environments within each species. To assess the similarity in these association statistics

among species, we use methods similar to Yeaman et al. (2016) to identify regions of the

genome that exhibit greater similarity in signatures of association among pairs of lineages than

expected by chance, which are likely driven by repeated adaptation using the same genes (but not

necessarily the same alleles). We then explore how the number and total size of these regions of

repeated association covary with the index of similarity in environmental importance. We also

explore whether these regions of repeated association tend to covary with patterns of shared

standing variation and test if they are enriched within previously identified haploblocks, to

explore the role of inversions in adaptation. We then identify candidate genes that show

particularly strong signatures of repeated association across multiple lineages. Finally, based on

the number of signatures of association that are shared vs. non-shared among lineages, we

estimate the number of regions genome-wide that could potentially contribute to local adaptation

for each variable and phenotype, which is related to the genotypic redundancy. Taken together,

our results show that local adaptation in sunflowers tends to involve both strong repeatability at a

small number of genes, often associated with inversions, coupled with high redundancy and non-

repeated responses across a much larger number of loci.

170
171
172

**Figure 1.** Sampling sites and phylogenetic relationship among surveyed species.
(a) Sampling locations of wild sunflower populations studied in the present study, and (b)
phylogenetic relationship of the four (sub-)species. Numbered brackets represent the six pairwise
comparisons performed in this study.

## Results

**Local adaptation at the phenotypic level.** The four taxa vary considerably in the breadth of
environmental variation spanned by their respective ranges, with *H. annuus* spanning the widest
niche and *H. argophyllus* spanning the narrowest (Figure 2A). Using the correlation between
phenotype and environment as a metric of the strength of local adaptation on individual traits, we

observe strong correlations for many combinations (Figure S2), suggesting that local adaptation

is quite pronounced for some traits. To quantify the similarity among pairs of species in the

strength of local adaptation at the phenotypic level (and to later compare this to results at the

genomic level), we calculate an index we refer to as the Similarity in Phenotype-Environment

Correlation (SIPEC), which is maximized when both species have strong correlations (in either

direction) between a phenotype and environmental variable (see Methods). For each

environmental variable, we take the maximum value of SIPEC across all phenotypes as a relative

measure of the importance of the variable for driving local adaptation in both species (such that

when SIPEC is low, the variable is not a strong driver of phenotypic adapatation in at least one

of the two species). We find the largest values of SIPEC for temperature variables and the

smallest values for soil types, and generally find higher values for comparisons between the

*petiolaris* subspecies (Figure S3).

200
201
202
203   **Figure 2.** The range of environmental and phenotypic variation in the studied species.
204   Variation in environment (a) and phenotype (b) for the studied species, along the two largest
205   axes of a Principle component analysis (PCA). Violin plots show two examples of variation in
206   environment (Hargreaves reference evapotranspiration index; Eref) and phenotype (Days to
207   Flower; DTF) within and among the taxa (c,d).

**Genome-wide analysis of repeated local adaptation.** To search for regions of the genome
driving repeated adaptation in multiple taxa, we first identified windows of the genome within
each species that showed strong signatures of association to either phenotype (GWAS; with
structure correaction) or environment (GEA; without structure correction), referred to as "top
candidate" windows. To identify Windows of Repeated Association (WRAs) between pairs of
species, we then assessed whether top candidate windows identified in one focal taxon also
tended to be enriched for strong signatures of association to the same environment or phenotype
in each of the other taxa (using the null-W test, which tends to be more sensitive than just finding
the overlap between the top candidate windows; See Methods). As recombination rate can affect
the sensitivity of these kinds of window-based genome scans (Booker et al. 2020), the
identification of WRAs was conducted after binning windows by recombination rate, although in
many cases we did not observe substantial differences in the null distributions among these bins
(*e.g.*, Figure S4). This analysis revealed many windows with signatures of repeated association,
with the strongest repeated signature found for Number of Frost-Free Days (NFFD; Figure 3A;
S4), but also showed that many of the windows with the strongest association in one species did
not have strong signatures in other species (Figure 3B).

Under the null hypothesis that all regions of the genome evolve neutrally due to drift and
independently in each species, ~5% of the top candidate windows identified in one species
would be expected to fall into the tail of the null distribution of another species (*i.e.*, be classified
as WRAs). While we find significantly more WRAs than the 5% expected by chance, ranging
from 6.3% to 44.1% (mean = 14.5%; Figure S5), multiple factors can violate the assumptions of
this test and increase the proportion of windows classified as WRAs. Most importantly,
similarity in signatures of association can be driven by shared ancestral variation or ongoing
introgression, and this must always be considered as an alternative explanation. It is clear that
most regions of the genome harbour some shared standing variation between all 6 pairwise
comparisons of the taxa, whether due to segregating ancestral variation or introgression, based
on an index quantifying the proportion of shared to non-shared SNPs in each window (Figure
S6). However, we do not find consistent differences in the amount of shared standing variation
within windows when comparing WRAs with the rest of the genome (Figure S6). Thus, while

 introgression may make subtle contributions to WRAs, a lack of increased shared standing

variation in the significant windows suggests that it is not a primary driver of these patterns.

**Figure 3**. Signatures of association for Number of Frost-Free Days (NFFD) in the four taxa on chromosome 15 (A) and genome-wide (B). Panel A shows Windows of Repeated Association (WRAs; coloured bars) for comparisons between the focal species, *H. annuus*, and each of the other 3 taxa, with the haploblocks in *H. annuus* shaded in violet and the regions with significant PicMin hits as vertical orange lines. Panel B shows the value of the top candidate index for each of the 1000 windows with the strongest signatures of association in at least one species (~top 2% of genome-wide windows). Rows are ordered using hierarchical clustering to group windows with similar patterns across multiple species, illustrating the extent of overlap/non-overlap in the windows with strongest signatures in each species (*i.e.*, position in the figure does not reflect chromosomal position).

A second source of inflation in the number of WRAs is due to hitchhiking: if a given

locus is a true positive driving adaptation, LD with other windows in tight physical linkage will

result in spurious correlations causing them to also be classified as WRAs increasing the

genome-wide proportion above 5%, and this effect will be particularly exaggerated in

haploblocks. To control for this, we binned neighbouring WRAs together that exhibited high LD

(>95th percentile) over short spans of the genome (<1 cM) in either species, yielding regions we

refer to as Clusters of Repeated Association (CRAs). While this clustering method should

provide a partial control for the effect of hitchhiking, we note that the number of CRAs cannot be

taken as a reliable estimate of the number of independent targets of natural selection. Instead, we

treat the number and size of these CRAs as proxies for the relative genome-wide similarity in

association between each pair of species, and conduct downstream analyses to test hypotheses

about the factors driving local adaptation.

CRAs varied in number and size across the 6 pairwise-species comparisons, with

particularly large CRAs identified at the sites of known haploblocks (Todesco et al. 2020). For

CRAs identified for phenotypic associations, their extent ranged from 168 clusters spanning

48,524,903 bp (covering only 1.6% of the genome) in *H.argophyllus-H.pet.petiolaris* to a

maximum of 1,667 clusters spanning 426,409,647 bp (14.2 % of the genome) in *H. pet.*

*petiolaris-H. pet. fallax* (Figure S7). CRAs identified for environmental variables tended to be

more numerous and cover a larger region of the genome, varying from 1154 clusters comprising

15% of the total genome for *H. argophyllus-H. pet. fallax* up to 2,260 distinct clusters covering

29% of the genome between *H. petiolaris* subspecies (Figure S8). The large extent of the

genome covered by CRAs is mainly driven by their occurrence within many different

haploblocks, which tend to be unique to each species and cover substantial portions of their

genomes (Todesco et al. 2020). Genes within CRAs tend to be enriched for a large number of

GO terms spanning many different categories (Figure S9, S10). When we use an approach that

corrects for population structure in the genotype-environment association tests (Baypass), we

find substantially reduced numbers of CRAs (Figure S11). This reduction is likely due to

reduced power to detect true positive causal loci when population structure covaries with

environment, as true positives do not "stand out" relative to the genomic background (Booker et

al. 2023b). While single-species association tests without correction for population structure

typically yield large numbers of false positives, the null-W test comparing association results

across species accounts for the chance that the same region is a false positive in both species

(Yeaman et al. 2016).

**Repeated association in the genome reflects patterns at the phenotypic level.** If natural

selection is driving repeated patterns of local adaptation in the genomes of two species, we

should see greater similarity for associations with environmental variables that are also strongly

associated with phenotypic variation in both species. Consistent with this prediction, we found

that environmental variables with a high maximum SIPEC index (*i.e.*, high correlation between

environment and some axis of phenotypic variation in both species; Figure S3) also tended to

have a larger number of CRAs (Figure 4), with higher repeatability at both the phenotype and

genome level for temperature-related variables and much lower repeatability for soil-related

variables (with similar patterns for mean SIPEC index; Figure S12). Unfortunately, given the

non-independence of environmental variables there is pseudo-replication in these data so it is not

possible to conduct a formal significance test of these patterns. In all cases, the number of CRAs

exhibited a weak negative relationship with the index of standing variation, with environmental

variables that had the greatest number of CRAs having the lowest relative amounts of shared

standing variation (Figure S13). This suggests that the observed similarity in patterns of

association among species is not being strongly driven by incomplete lineage sorting or

introgression, as we would expect a positive relationship between the index of shared standing

variation and the number of CRAs. We found similar but weaker patterns in the association

between SIPEC and size of CRAs (Figure S14). The weakening of these patterns relative to those

for number of CRAs may reflect comparatively greater contribution of haploblocks driving

patterns with size rather than number (*i.e.*, if a particularly large haploblock is a CRA, then that

variable will have a particularly large value relative to its actual importance for local adaptation).

**Figure 4.** Relationship between maximum Similarity in Phenotype-Environment Correlation (SIPEC) and number of Clusters of Repeated Association (CRAs). SIPEC was calculated for each phenotypic PCA axis with the maximum taken across the axes that cumulatively explain 95% of the phenotypic variance, for each environment. Each panel includes both a linear model fit to the data within the panel (coloured lines), and a linear model fit to all data simultaneously (black lines) for comparison. Note that because environmental variables are correlated, these points are not independent and therefore represent a source of pseudoreplication, preventing formal statistical tests of this relationship.

## Overlap of signatures of repeated association with low recombination haploblocks.

Inversions can facilitate local adaptation by suppressing recombination between locally adapted alleles within the inverted vs. ancestral haplotypes (Kirkpatrick and Barton 2006). If a given

species exhibits a signature of association to environment at a segregating inversion, it is interesting to test whether similar signatures of association are found in other species that lack a segregating inversion at the same region of the genome. This would suggest that particularly strong selection is acting on loci in this region, as signatures of association can still evolve even without the recombination suppressing effect of the inversion. While not all of the low-recombination haploblocks identified by Todesco et al. (2020) have been validated as inversions, for simplicity we treat each haploblock as representative of a segregating inversion. The majority of these haploblocks are present as segregating variation in only one of the three species, but when they occur in *H. petiolaris*, they tend to be found as segregating variation within both subspecies. Thus, if we find significant enrichment of the regions of repeated association (WRAs and CRAs) within haploblocks, this suggests that both the species with a segregating inversion and the species lacking an inversion are using this region of the genome to drive local adaptation. As a first test of this relationship, we assessed two-way contingency tables for whether top candidate windows within a species were also significant windows of repeated association (WRA/non-WRA) and whether they fell within haploblocks (yes/no). This approach controls for the potential enrichment of top candidate windows within haploblocks relative to the rest of the genome and asks if the proportion of WRAs within haploblocks is even higher than non-WRA top candidate windows. For most phenotypes and environments, we found that the proportion of WRAs occurring within haploblocks was much higher than the proportion of non-WRAs occurring within haploblocks (Figure 5). Across all species comparisons and environmental/phenotypic variables, a total of 310 contrasts showed significant enrichment for WRAs in haploblocks, compared to only 23 contrasts showing a significantly higher proportion of non-WRAs in haploblocks (note that because of non-independence of the phenotypes and environmental variables, there is pseudo-replication inherent in these estimates). In *H. argophyllus*, while non-WRA top candidates tended to fall within haploblocks less commonly than in the other taxa, WRAs tended to be very strongly enriched within haploblocks (Figure 5B). As a follow-up, we also tested whether CRAs were enriched within haploblocks (without controlling for whether top candidate windows also tended to be enriched), also finding strongly significant enrichment of CRAs within haploblocks for many traits and environments (Figure S7C & D). Broad patterns revealed by these analyses are similar, as both show that genomic regions harbouring haploblocks tend to be enriched for signatures of association to environment

357 in species lacking the haploblock. It is noteworthy that few significant signatures of enrichment

358 in haploblocks were found for *H. petiolaris petiolaris* vs. *H. petiolaris fallax* (Figure S7C & D),

359 perhaps because extensive introgression across non-locally adapted regions of the genome

360 obscures true signal.

362
363
**Figure 5.** Enrichment of signatures of repeated association within genomic regions harbouring a
haploblock in one of the two compared lineages. Each panel shows the proportion of top
candidate windows that fall within haploblocks for windows with significant signatures of
repeated association by the null-W test (WRAs) vs. those with non-significant signatures (non-
WRAs). Comparisons of *H. petiolaris petiolaris* vs. *H. petiolaris fallax* are omitted as they share
segregating haploblocks. Each point corresponds to the results for a single phenotype or
environment, with dark shading used for cases where the deviation from random for the
contingency table is significant by a permutation test (p < 0.05), and lighter shading indicating a
non-significant result. Note that because many environmental variables and phenotypes are
correlated with each-other, these points are not independent and therefore represent a source of
pseudoreplication, preventing formal statistical tests of the overall relationship within each panel.

**Multi-species signatures of repeated association.** As a complement to the pair-wise analyses described above, we also conducted an analysis using PicMin, which simultaneously considers any number of lineages to identify genes with particularly strong and repeated signatures of association (Booker et al. 2023a). After identifying significant windows clustering together those < 1 Mbp apart, we found a total of 145 regions that were significant for at least one environmental variable or phenotype (at FDR < 0.1 applied within each variable). The largest number of significant regions for environment was found with the Number of Frost-Free Days variable (20 with FDR < 0.1; 44 with FDR < 0.2) and for phenotypes with Total Leaf Number, a measure of developmental timing of flowering  (9 with FDR < 0.1; 19 with FDR < 0.2). Considering the 720 individual 5000 bp windows with FDR < 0.2 for at least one variable, 387 (53.8%) are within 500 bp of a genic region, representing a 2.3x enrichment relative to the rate for windows that were not significant hits using PicMin (23.3% of other windows fall within 500 bp of a genic region; $X^2$ test $p < 10^{-15}$).

**Estimating the number of potentially adaptive loci.** Even for the environment with the highest repeatability (Number of Frost-Free Days; NFFD), most of the strongest signals of association are found in only one lineage (Figure 3B). Unfortunately, while the null-W test provides strong support and controls false positives when identifying repeated association, regions of the genome with strong associations in only a single species may include a large (and unknown) number of false positives. Thus, while it is biologically interesting to know how much adaptation is non-repeated among species, it is difficult to quantify with certainty (Booker et al. 2023a; Booker et al. 2023b). Under the assumption that at least some of the non-repeated signatures of association are true positives, this implies that there is considerable genotypic redundancy, with many different ways for these species to adaptively respond to variation in the same environment. To estimate the number of windows that could potentially contribute to local adaptation for each variable ($L_{eff}$), we modified the method of Yeaman et al. (2018) to partially account for the effect of linkage among nearby windows (see methods). This method assumes that the windows with signatures of association in each species are a random draw from a larger number of potentially

contributing windows ($L_{eff}$), which can be inferred based on the ratio of shared vs. non-shared

windows with strong association signatures (see Methods). We find that estimates of $L_{eff}$ tend to

be large, always well over 1000 windows regardless of the trait or environment (Figure S15A).

There are numerous sources of error that affect the estimation of $L_{eff}$, which will tend to be

overestimated due to linkage (Figure S15A) or when many signatures of association are false

positives (see supplementary results), and will be underestimated when some repeatability is due

to shared standing variation (Yeaman et al. 2018). Even after controls for linkage and assuming a

high false positive rate of 80%, estimates of $L_{eff}$ remain in the hundreds even for the variable with

the lowest value of $L_{eff}$ (Eref; Figure S15C, D).

**Discussion**

Despite its critical importance in shaping the architecture of adaptation, little is known about the

extent of genotypic redundancy underlying different traits (Barghi et al. 2020; Láruson et al.

2020; Yeaman 2022). Here, we have shown evidence of significant repeatability in the basis of

local adaptation (Figure 4, 5), but also an abundance of species-specific, non-repeated signatures

(Figure 3; S14). In particular, we find that regions of the genome that harbour inversions in one

species also tend to be strongly enriched for signatures of association in other species lacking the

inversion (Figure 5). Taken together, this suggests that local adaptation in these species is highly

flexible – different species apparently use quite different sets of loci to adapt to the same

environment – yet still involves some component that has minimal redundancy, with inversions

playing a particularly important role. Some of the "usual suspects" show up in the set of

significantly repeated loci identified by PicMin: in addition to the homologs of the *FT*

(*FLOWERING LOCUS T*) gene reported by (Todesco et al. 2020), we also found hits for several

other genes involved in circadian regulation and flowering time, including *PRR3* (Para et al.

2007), *TOE1* (Aukerman and Sakai 2003), and *PHYC* (Takano et al. 2005; Chen et al. 2014),

which is known to regulate photoperiodic responses in Arabidopsis accessions (Balasubramanian

et al. 2006). Other top hits included genes involved in plant development and auxin transport

(*PIN3*; (Keuskamp et al. 2010), *ARF4* (Pekker et al. 2005), and *MN*; (Bhatia et al. 2016)), and

plant immunity (*CRK13* (Acharya et al. 2007) and *PRR2* (Cheval et al. 2017))

The increased repeatability found in regions of the genome that harbour inversions in only one species is particularly interesting. Inversions are commonly associated with local adaptation (Wellenreuther and Bernatchez 2018), likely because they reduce the rate at which recombination breaks up combinations of co-selected alleles (Kirkpatrick and Barton 2006), which perhaps facilitates contributions by alleles that would be individually too weakly selected to overcome swamping by migration (Bürger and Akerman 2011; Yeaman and Whitlock 2011; Schaal et al. 2022). Evidence here suggests these regions still tend to contribute to adaptation in the species lacking the recombination-suppressing effect of an inversion, consistent with a strong effect of selection relative to migration on at least one locus in the region (rather than adaptation exclusively via many alleles of small effect; Yeaman 2022). As an example, chromosome 15 harbours a large (72 Mbp) haploblock in *H. annuus* that is strongly associated with NFFD (Number of Frost-Free Days), and also shows some signatures of association in the other taxa, with particularly strong signatures of association on either side of the haploblock in *H. argophyllus* (Figure 3A). Interestingly, loci of repeated association identified by PicMin within this region include two genes whose homologs are known to regulate responses to cold: *COLD-RESPONSIVE PROTEIN KINASE 1*, *CRPK1* (Liu et al. 2017) and *LATE ELONGATED HYPOCOTYL*, *LHY* (Mizoguchi et al. 2002; Dong et al. 2011). It seems likely that strong selection relative to migration is therefore acting upon several loci in this region, and in many others harbouring inversions.

The observed repeatability associated with inversions further supports the local adaptation model as an explanation for the long-term persistence of segregating inversions (at least in sunflower), rather than mechanisms based on dominance or meiotic drive (Rieseberg 2001). If there is variation across the genome in the density of loci with the potential to be involved in local adaptation, then the establishment and maintenance of inversions would be biased towards regions harbouring a high density such loci under this model. If the genomic basis for local adaptation is conserved amongst species, then these same regions are more likely to have high repeatability. Thus, our observation of genomic regions harbouring inversions also being enriched for WRAs is consistent with this general model for inversion evolution. Unfortunately, our observations do not provide much insight into whether inversions evolve through the capture (*e.g.* Kirkpatrick and Barton 2006) or accumulation (*e.g.* Schaal et al. 2022) type of model, as either model would be consistent with our results. Most of the the sunflower inversions are >1

My old, and therefore predate any current local adaptation patterns, but likely do not predate the

genes underlying local adaptation (which appear to be shared among the species we studied). As

for the alleles underlying local adaptation, they may be younger than the inversions, but as our

work suggests, these regions are prone to harbouring locally adaptive alleles so it is possible that

they also harboured other ancestral locally adaptive alleles. While many studies have

demonstrated the importance of inversions for adaptation (Wellenreuther and Bernatchez 2018;

Hager et al. 2022), to our knowledge only two other studies have documented the involvement of

the same loci making contributions in the absence of the recombination-suppressing effect of the

inversion (Lee et al. 2017; Coughlan and Willis 2018). This also highlights how comparative

studies of a species lacking an inversion may help identify which genes are driving adaptation in

another species with an inversion, as segregating inversions tend to have extensive LD that

prevents identification of any potential targets of natural selection within them.

While our results suggest a large number of loci can potentially contribute to adaptation,

implying high redundancy (Figure 3B; S14), there are several factors that complicate inference.

Separating the effects of drift and selection to detect signatures of local adaptation is notoriously

difficult, because population structure often covaries with features of the environment that drive

adaptation (Lotterhos and Whitlock 2014; Hoban et al. 2016; DeRaad et al. 2021). As found by

other analyses (Yeaman et al. 2016; DeRaad et al. 2021), when we use structure correction in our

genotype-environment association tests, we find many fewer signatures of repeated association

(Figure S7 vs. S11), likely due to the reduced power of Baypass to detect true positives when the

environment covaries with population structure (Booker et al. 2023b). Here, we have side-

stepped the issues involved in correction for population structure by instead relying on

comparisons among species to identify loci with associations more extreme than expected by

chance in multiple species, using the null-W and PicMin tests. This assumes that most loci in the

genome are not involved in local adaptation, so that the relatively small proportion that are

driving adaptation can therefore be picked out due to their tendency to fall into the tail of the

distribution of association statistics in at least one other species (which would only occur at the

rate of random chance under a purely neutral model). While this approach should be relatively

robust for identifying loci with repeated patterns of adaptation, there is no way to formally

estimate significance of associations found in only a single species, many of which may be false

positives due to covariation of population structure and environment. However, even if we
assume that 80% of the observed non-repeated loci are false positives, we still find that estimates
of the effective number of loci contributing to adaptation ($L_{eff}$) are in the hundreds (Figure
S15C). As we are unable to detect loci of small effect due to the limited power, but these loci
still likely make important contributions to heritability, our estimates of $L_{eff}$ will also be biased
downwards by excluding these potentially important drivers. Finally, it is also difficult to
exclude the contribution of introgression or incomplete lineage sorting to the observed signatures
of repeated association. If a locus tended to be highly introgressed between two species in a
restricted region of their range, it is possible it could also covary with environment and therefore
result in a signature of repeated association that would be mistakenly interpreted as adaptation.
While it is difficult to preclude this from our analysis, regions of the genome with signatures of
repeated association do not tend to have higher levels of shared standing variation than
background regions (Figure S6), suggesting this is not a broad explanation for our observations.
If anything, shared standing variation would be expected to increase repeatability of adaptation
(MacPherson and Nuismer 2017), adding further weight to the inference that there is high
genotypic redundancy in these species.

In general, we find that temperature is the strongest driver of repeated adaptation at both
the phenotypic and genomic levels. We quantified local adaptation at the phenotypic level using
correlations between traits measured in common gardens and the home environment of the
population they were sampled from. Across all phenotypes, these correlations tended to be
strongest and most similar among species for temperature variables, particularly in comparisons
among *H. annuus* and *H. petiolaris* subspecies (Figure S3). We see similar patterns of
repeatability reflected in the genome, where temperature variables also tend to have the greatest
repeatability (Figure 4). The similarity in these phenotypic and genomic signatures is consistent
with an effect of strong selection, as other artefactual or drift-based explanations for repeatability
would not be expected to reflect patterns found at the phenotypic level. It should be noted that
the reduced importance of soil variables in the SIPEC index might be partly driven by the fact
that all traits were measured on above-ground features, due to the difficulty of getting non-
disruptive phenotypic measurements for roots.

Taken together, these results suggest that some fraction of the genome contributes to

adaptation with low redundancy and high repeatability (which tends to be enriched within

genomic regions where there exist inversions in at least one species), while the remainder of the

adaptive response is driven by loci with high redundancy and species-specific contributions.

Theoretical models of adaptive evolution necessarily involve simplified representations of

genetics: population genetic approaches explore cases where strong selection deterministically

drives a change in allele frequency at one or a few loci (usually without epistasis), whereas

quantitative genetic approaches make the infinitesimal assumption that phenotypic change can be

realized through small frequency changes at many loci (Barton et al. 2017; Barghi et al. 2020;

Yeaman 2022). Such models implicitly make quite different assumptions about redundancy: if a

population genetic model of directional selection includes no epistasis then it is implicitly

assuming there is no redundancy, as every locus can increase fitness and no locus can affect the

potential of another locus to increase fitness. On the other hand, quantitative genetics models

implicitly assume complete redundancy, as the loci driving trait variation have interchangeable

effects. Given that differences in redundancy result in quite different evolutionary dynamics

(Höllinger et al 2019; Yeaman 2022), it is important to re-evaluate the behaviour of theoretical

models in light of what we can learn about redundancy from empirical data. Our results suggest

that adaptation is a complex process that does not map cleanly onto the assumptions of either

approach. At least some component of trait variation experiences sufficiently strong selection

and has low enough redundancy to drive the significant signatures of repeatability above the

random null that we observe here. On the other hand, most of the strongest signatures of

association are specific to a single species, implying high redundancy for most of the genome,

even if there are still some detectable signatures of repeatability. Such observations may be

consistent with classifying loci into "core" and "peripheral" sets similar to the omnigenic model,

but would involve classification based on redundancy rather than gene expression, as advocated

by Boyle et al. (2017). Theoretical models adopting a two-class representation of the genetic

basis of trait variation may provide more realism than models assuming a simpler distribution,

and perhaps yield new insights about qualitatively different dynamical behaviour. Given the

difficulty of rigourously quantifying the contribution of alleles of small effect and loci

contributing to local adaptation in only one species, it remains an open question what proportion

of adaptive response is governed by loci with dynamical behaviour that follow the infinitesimal

assumption. This could perhaps be quantified explicitly by decomposing heritabilities for traits

driving local adaptation, as has been done for standing variation in humans (Visscher et al.

2017), but this would require a considerable increase in sample size as methods such as GCTA

(Yang et al. 2011) do not yield accurate estimates at the sample sizes used here. Future work

could perhaps resolve this question using multi-generational crossing designs to break up the LD

that tends to accompany local adaptation, allowing a more accurate parsing of the effect sizes of

genomic regions and the contribution by repeated vs. redundant components of adaptive trait

variation.

**Materials and Methods**

**Data collection, common garden, and phenotyping.** Seed samples were collected from 151

wild sunflower populations covering most of their native distributions during the summer of

2015 (*H. annuus*: 61 populations for GWAS and 71 populations for GEA, *H. petiolaris fallax*: 23

populations, *H. petiolaris petiolaris:* 18 populations and *H. argophyllus*: 30 populations, Figure

1 and Supplementary Table 1). Seeds from ten additional populations of *H. annuus* for the GEA

analysis had been previously collected in the summer of 2011. Sample seeds were obtained from

randomly chosen mothers, and were first germinated in a greenhouse for two weeks, later moved

to an open-sided greenhouse for acclimation. Phenotypic data were collected throughout the

growing season, as detailed in Supplementary Table 1. Extensive records of developmental and

morphological traits throughout the growth of the plants including leaves, stem, and seeds which

were collected and digitally imaged to extract relevant phenotypic data.

**Similarity in Phenotype-Environment Correlation (SIPEC).** Locally adapted traits tend to

exhibit strong correlations between environment and common-garden phenotype. To estimate

which environmental variables are driving local adaptation for the same phenotype in pairs of

species, we calculate an index of the similarity in phenotype-environment correlation, SIPEC =

$(|r_1| + |r_2|)|r_1||r_2|$ where $r_1$ and $r_2$ are the Pearson correlations between the environment and

phenotype in the first and second species, respectively. This SIPEC index is maximized when the

correlation between a phenotype and an environmental variable is large in both species

regardless of the direction, so it does not differentiate phenotypically convergent vs. divergent

patterns of local adaptation (*e.g.*, increasing temperature causing an increase in flowering time in

one species and a decrease in the other), and provides a means of estimating the relative

importance of an environment driving local adaptation in both species in a similar way across all

measured phenotypes. To account for non-independence among traits, for each pair of species

we fit a PCA to all measured phenotypes and use the Principal Components that collectively

explain 95% of the variance, and calculate SIPEC on the correlations of each of these axes with

environment. For comparisons including *H. argophyllus*, 95% of the variance was typically

explained by 8-10 PC axes (out of 28 or 29 phenotypes), whereas for comparisons among other

taxa this included 21 or 22 PC axes (out of 65 or 66 phenotypes). We then report the maximum

and mean value of SIPEC for each environmental variable across these phenotypic PCA axes.

**Tests of SNP association with environment (GEA) and phenotype (GWAS).** A total of 39

environmental variables (21 climatic variables, 3 geographic variables, 15 soil variables

Supplementary Table 1) were used for the genotype-environment association analysis (GEA).

We refer to the climatic, soil and geographic variables collectively as the "environmental

variables", for simplicity. Soil data were collected by taking three to five soil samples collected

at each population from across the area in which seeds were collected and submitted to Midwest

Laboratories Inc. (Omaha, NE, USA) for analysis. Climate data for each population were

collected over a 30-year period (1961-1990) from geographic coordinates of the locations where

the samples were collected, using the software package Climate NA (Wang et al. 2012). We used

the package BAYPASS version 2.1 (Gautier 2015), which provides a re-implementation of the

Bayesian hierarchical model, and explicitly accounts for the covariance structure among the

population allele frequencies that originate from the shared history of the populations through the

estimation of the population covariance matrix. This renders the identification of SNPs subjected

to selection less sensitive to the confounding effect of population demography (Günther and

Coop 2013). Population structure was estimated by choosing a random and unlinked set of

10,000 SNPs and running BAYPASS under the core model (*i.e.*, no covariates). Then the Bayes

factors (BF) were calculated running BAYPASS under the STD covariate model to evaluate

association of SNPs with environmental variables (*i.e.*, adjusting for population structure). For

each SNP, the Bayes factor (denoted $BF_{is}$ as in Gautier 2015) was presented in decibian units

(db) via the transformation $10 \log_{10}$ (BF). $BF_{is}$ relies on the importance sampling algorithm

proposed by Coop et al., 2010 and uses MCMC samples obtained under the core model. To

produce a narrower set of outlier loci, we followed the popular Jeffreys' rule (Jeffreys 1961) that

identified outlier loci with BF ≥ 10. As genome scan methods that correct for population

structure can remove some potential signals of local adaption when there is covariation between

the demographic history of the species and the environmental variables or phenotypic traits of

interest, we also calculated Spearman's rank correlation (ρ, uncorrected GEA) between

population allele frequencies for each SNP and each environment variable.

GWAS analysis was performed on 86, 30 and 69 developmental and morphologic traits in *H.*

*annuus, H. argophyllus* and *H. petiolaris,* respectively (Supplementary table 1). 29 variables

were measured in all three focal species, and 39 were measured only in *H. annuus* and in *H.*

*petiolaris* subspecies (Supplementary table 1). Seed and flower traits could not be collected for

*H. argophyllus*, since most plants of this species flowered very late in our common garden, and

failed to form fully developed inflorescences and set seeds before temperatures became too low

for their survival. Population structure was controlled for in GWAS by including the first three

principal components as covariates, as well as an identity-by-state (IBS) kinship matrix

calculated by EMMAX (Kang et al. 2010). We ran each trait GWAS using EMMAX

(v07Mar2010), as well as the EMMAX module in EasyGWAS (Grimm et al. 2017). For every

SNP/peak above the Bonferroni significance threshold, candidate genes were selected within a

100 Kb interval centered in the SNP with the lowest p-value, or within the boundaries of the

GWAS peak, whichever was larger. All variants used for association were initially filtered for

VQSR 90% tranche, and then further filtered to only include bi-allelic SNPs genotyped in ≥ 90%

of samples and with a minor allele frequency ≥ 3%.

**Identification of top-candidate windows.** We calculated the bottom 0.05 quantiles for the *p*-

values from association tests, Spearman's rank correlation (uncorrected GEA) and GWAS

(corrected and uncorrected), yielding two 5% cutoffs. For each environmental and phenotypic

variable, we identified all outlier SNPs as those that fell below the respective 5% cutoff. For

BayPass, we considered SNPs with Bayes factor ≥ 10 as outlier SNPs. For each 5 kb window

that we defined across the whole genome, we counted the number of outlier SNPs (*a*) and the

total number of SNPs (*n*). To identify top-candidate windows for each variable, we compared the

number of outlier SNPs per each 5 kb window to the 0.9999 quantile of the binomial expectation

where the expected frequency of outlier SNPs per window is calculated as: $\rho = \sum a_i/n_i$

(summation over all 5 kb windows), calculating $\rho$ independently for each environmental and

phenotype variable and excluding windows with 0 outliers from the calculation of $\rho$ (as per

Yeaman et al. 2016). We also calculated a top candidate index using the same approach to

categorize outliers, obtaining a *p*-value for a binomial test for the number of SNPs per window

given an expected proportion of outliers ($\rho$; this *p*-value is not exact due to non-independence of

SNPs so we refer to this as an index).

Identifying outlier SNPs detected by genome scans from genome-wide distribution without

accounting for local recombination rate variation can promote false positive signals in

recombination cold spots (*i.e.*, low recombination regions) and be overly conservative in

recombination hot spots (*i.e.*, high recombination regions) (Booker et al. 2020). Therefore, to

account for local recombination rate variation, all genomic windows were binned by their

estimated recombination rates into 5 equally sized bins (bin1: 0-20% quantile, bin2: 20%-40%

quantile, bin3: 40%-60% quantile, bin4: 60%-80% quantile, bin5: 80%-100% quantile). For each

recombination bin, we estimated expected frequency of SNPs per window ($\rho$) and calculated cut-

off separately. Windows falling above the threshold were identified as top candidate windows.

**Genome-wide survey of repeatability (null-W test).** To explore repeatable genomic signatures

of adaptation for each of the six pairwise contrasts among the 4 taxa (Figure 1), we used the

method developed by Yeaman et al. (2016) with some modifications. A common approach is to

identify candidates for adaptation independently in each species and then examine the overlap

between these lists, however this approach is quite stringent and may miss many interesting

signals. The null-W test is more sensitive, as it takes the list of top candidates from one species

and tests whether they tend to show more extreme signatures of association than expected by

chance. The null-W test is especially favorable when LD increased divergence of SNPs in tight

linkage with causal SNPs but did not raise the test values enough for a window to be classified as

an outlier according to the binomial test. For each top candidate window that we identified for

each focal species in a pair, we refer to the same window in the other species as "top candidate

ortholog". The null distribution for each focal species and variable was constructed by randomly

sampling 10,000 background SNPs from non-top candidate ortholog windows. For each non-top-

candidate window, we then estimated the test statistic ($W$) for the Wilcoxon-signed rank test vs.

the 10,000 background SNPs. This resulted in a null distribution representing the differences

between the 10,000 background SNPs and the non-top-candidate ortholog windows. These were

then standardized to $Z$-scores using the method in Whitlock and Schluter (2020):

680
$$Z = \frac{2W - n1n2}{\sqrt{n1n2(n1+n2+1)/3}} \qquad \text{(Equation 2)}$$

where n1 and n2 are the sample sizes being compared. In order to control for heterogeneity in

recombination rate and its possible effects on the null distribution, we estimated null distribution

for each recombination bin separately (5 in total, see above). We then compared the p-values and

bayes factors (BFs) for each focal top-candidate window to the 10,000 background SNPs,

calculating the W statistics and converting into a Z-score. Empirical P-values were then

calculated by comparing the Z-score for each top-candidate window to the null distribution.

When individual windows had values of W that exceeded the bounds of the null distribution,

their empirical $p$-value was set to the reciprocal of the number of genes in the null distribution.

For each species pair, we refer to the windows identified as significant by this test as "Windows

of Repeated Association" or WRAs.

**Linkage disequilibrium and detection of clusters of repeated association.** Linkage

disequilibrium among adjacent genomic windows can result in statistical non-independence and

similar GEA/GWAS signatures across many windows. To identify the most significant WRAs

and group neighbouring windows with similar signatures of repeatability into a single "Cluster of

Repeated Association" (CRA), we used the following approach in each pairwise contrast, and for

each environmental variable and phenotype: for each variable, empirical $p$-values for all WRAs

were converted to $q$-values to adjust for False Discovery, then beginning with the first significant

WRA along the chromosome (*i.e.*, with $q < 0.05$), we compared it to the next closest significant

WRA by calculating the squared Pearson correlation coefficient ($r^2$) on the allele frequencies

across all pairs of SNPs, and compared this estimate to a null distribution. To construct the null

distribution, we generated a distribution of LD measurements between 10,000 randomly chosen

windows with the same physical distance as between two significant WRAs (excluding all

WRAs from the null distribution). If the $r^2$ between the two neighboring significant WRAs was

greater than the 95th percentile of the null distribution, we clustered these two windows together.

This process was repeated successively with the next closest neighboring significant WRA,

walking out along the chromosome until one of two stopping criteria was reached: 1) the LD

between the last two windows did not exceed the 95 percent of the tail distribution or 2) the

distance between the initial window and the current window next to it was larger than 1 cM,

based on the linkage map from Todesco et al. (2020). When the first round of clustering stopped

due to either of these two criteria, all the clustered windows were removed from the dataset and

the process started with the second smallest empirical p-value. By doing this way, each

significant WRA will only appear in a single CRA.

**Estimating an index of shared standing variation.** As genotype calling was conducted

separately for each species (due to computational concerns), we estimated the amount of shared

standing variation based on counts of shared vs. non-shared SNPs. If two species are evolving

independently, the number of shared SNPs should follow a hypergeometric distribution, so we

used an approach similar to the C-scores (Yeaman et al. 2018) to calculate the difference

between the observed number of shared SNPs and the expectation, scaled by the standard

deviation of the hypergeometric. Because of noise and a relatively small number of SNPs per

window, we applied this approach on a sliding window basis, including the 5 flanking windows

upstream and downstream of each focal window the calculation of its index of shared standing

variation.

**Correspondence between regions of repeated association and chromosomal**

**rearrangements.** To assess the extent of overlap between regions of the genome with repeated

signatures of association and previously identified low-recombination haploblocks, we used two

approaches. Firstly, for each pairwise species contrast and variable, we constructed a

contingency table for the number of top candidates that were significant WRAs vs. not-

significant WRAs (by the null-W test), and that did vs. did not fall within a haploblock. We

calculated the Pearson's $\chi^2$ statistic on this table, and then permuted the location of haploblocks

throughout the genome to construct a null distribution of $\chi^2$ statistics, and calculated the p-value

as the proportion of the null that exceeded the observed $\chi^2$ statistic (to account for non-

independence of nearby WRAs), which is presented in Figure 5. Secondly, we compared

observations of the length and number of overlapping regions to expectations based on a

randomization approach. For each pair of species, we kept the position of each CRA constant

and randomized the position of haploblocks 10,000 times to build a null distribution. By keeping

the position of the CRAs constant, we maintained the architecture of adaptation independent

from chromosomal rearrangements. We assessed significance by testing whether the observed

overlaps between CRAs and haploblocks were more extreme than the 95th percentile of the tail of

null distribution, which is presented in Supplementary Figure S7. Details about identifying

chromosomal rearrangements can be found in Todesco et al. (2020).

**Identifying repeated signatures of association across all taxa**. As a complement to the

pairwise analysis, we used PicMin (Booker et al. 2022a) to identify windows of the genome with

strong signatures of association in multiple (sub-) species. For each environmental variable,

association signatures for each window are ranked genome-wide and PicMin identifies windows

with extreme ranks in multiple species. We ran the analysis once with each of the two 3-way

comparisons involving one *petiolaris* subspecies (*i.e.*, *H. annuus, H. argophyllus,* and either *H.*

*pet. petiolaris* or *H. pet. fallax*) to control for repeatability arising from similar patterns in the

two *petiolaris* subspecies (due to high introgression/shared standing variation).

**Evaluating genotypic redundancy using C-scores.** Genome-wide quantification of the

repeatability of association statistics provides insights into the amount of genotypic redundancy

underlying a trait or environmental adaptation, and can be assessed using the C-score approach

(Yeaman et al. 2018). Briefly, for a given trait or environment, the set of association test scores

within each species is classified into "associated" or "non-associated" using the binomial top

candidate approach. For a given pair of species ($i = 1, 2$), the observed number of associated

windows in each species ($a_1$, $a_2$) can be compared to the number of windows that are associated

in both species ($a_b$) and the total number of windows being analysed ($a_x$). Under a null

hypothesis where all windows in the genome have equal potential to be involved in adaptation

(*i.e.*, associated with the trait or environment), the expected number of windows associated in

both species will be described by a hypergeometric distribution, with the expectation $\overline{a_b} =$

$a_1 a_2 / a_x$. The difference between the observed and expected amount of overlap in association

scores can be quantified as a C-score by scaling the difference by the standard deviation of the

hypergeometric (*i.e.*, a C-score of 2 means that the observed amount of overlap is two standard

deviations above the expectation under randomness).

We assess the C-scores for each phenotype and environment trait by classifying the top
0.5% of all 5 kb windows within each species as "associated" ($a_i$; based on the binomial top
candidate index), and begin by calculating the C-score obtained when $a_x$ is set to the union of $a_i$
across all four focal species/sub-species (*i.e.*, only those windows associated in at least one
species are included in $a_x$, a number much lower than the total number of windows in the
genome). This yields a negative C-score, as a random draw from such a small number of
windows tends to yield many more overlapping associations by chance than the observation.
When the C-score = 0, it means that the observed overlap between the pair of taxa being
considered is consistent with a random draw of their respective "associated" windows from an
overall pool of $a_x$ windows. Thus, by adding rows to the matrix with "non-associated" scores for
all 4 species/sub-species until finding the matrix that yields C-score = 0, we can estimate the
effective number of loci that contributed to variation for the trait or environment being
considered ($L_{eff}$), under the assumption that all such $a_x = L_{eff}$ windows had an equal chance of
contributing to the associations.

To run the C-score analysis on LD-clustered windows, we ran the following algorithm for
each trait/environmental variable: for each species, we identified all CRAs that also had a top
candidate index in top 0.5%. In most cases, a large cluster with associated windows in one
species corresponds to either no clusters or a small cluster in another species. To harmonize
cluster boundaries across species, we bin any overlapping clusters together to their maximum
extent, and take the average top candidate index for each cluster in each species as either: (a) the
mean across all windows that were "associated" in that species or (b) the average across all
windows associated in any species, if no windows were associated in that species. This yields a
matrix that can be submitted to the hypergeometric C-score analysis.

**Data availability**

791    All scripts used for analysis and figures are deposited in a Dryad archive at
792    doi:10.5061/dryad.wpzgmsbtd. Raw sequence data are deposited in the Sequence Read Archive
793    (SRA) under BioProject accessions PRJNA532579, PRJNA398560, and PRJNA564337, as
794    described in Todesco et al. (2020).

**Acknowledgements**:

The authors would like to thank the Yeaman and Peichel labs for comments. Computational
support was provided by the Digital Resources Alliance of Canada, and funding was provided by
Genome Canada and Genome BC (LSARP2014-223SUN), the International Consortium for
Sunflower Genomic Resources, Alberta Innovates, and NSERC Discovery. GLO was funded by
a Banting Postdoctoral Fellowship.

**References:**

Acharya BR, Raina S, Maqbool SB, Jagadeeswaran G, Mosher SL, Appel HM, Schultz JC, Klessig DF, Raina R. 2007. Overexpression of CRK13, an Arabidopsis cysteine-rich receptor-like kinase, results in enhanced resistance to Pseudomonas syringae: Overexpression of CRK13 induces pathogen defense. *The Plant Journal* 50:488–499.

Auge GA, Penfield S, Donohue K. 2019. Pleiotropy in developmental regulation by flowering-pathway genes: is it an evolutionary constraint? *New Phytol* 224:55–70.

Aukerman MJ, Sakai H. 2003. Regulation of Flowering Time and Floral Organ Identity by a MicroRNA and Its *APETALA2* -Like Target Genes. *Plant Cell* 15:2730–2741.

Balasubramanian S, Sureshkumar S, Agrawal M, Michael TP, Wessinger C, Maloof JN, Clark R, Warthmann N, Chory J, Weigel D. 2006. The PHYTOCHROME C photoreceptor gene mediates natural variation in flowering and growth responses of Arabidopsis thaliana. *Nat Genet* 38:711–715.

Barghi N, Hermisson J, Schlötterer C. 2020. Polygenic adaptation: a unifying framework to understand positive selection. *Nat Rev Genet* 21:769–781.

Barton NH, Etheridge AM, Véber A. 2017. The infinitesimal model: Definition, derivation, and implications. *Theoretical Population Biology* 118:50–73.

Bhatia N, Bozorg B, Larsson A, Ohno C, Jönsson H, Heisler MG. 2016. Auxin Acts through MONOPTEROS to Regulate Plant Cell Polarity and Pattern Phyllotaxis. *Current Biology* 26:3202–3208.

Blackman BK, Scascitelli M, Kane NC, Luton HH, Rasmussen DA, Bye RA, Lentz DL, Rieseberg LH. 2011. Sunflower domestication alleles support single domestication center in eastern North America. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 108:14360–14365.

Bohutínská M, Vlček J, Yair S, Laenen B, Konečná V, Fracassetti M, Slotte T, Kolář F. 2021. Genomic basis of parallel adaptation varies with divergence in *Arabidopsis* and its relatives. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 118:e2022713118.

Booker TR, Yeaman S, Whitlock MC. 2020. Variation in recombination rate affects detection of outliers in genome scans under neutrality. *Mol Ecol* 29:4274–4279.

Booker TR, Yeaman S, Whitlock MC. 2023a. Using genome scans to identify genes used repeatedly for adaptation. *Evolution* 77:801-811.

Booker TR, Yeaman S, Whitlock MC. 2023b. The WZA: A window-based method for characterizing genotype-environment association. *Mol Ecol Res* (in press).

Bürger R, Akerman A. 2011. The effects of linkage and gene flow on local adaptation: A two-locus continent–island model. *Theoretical Population Biology* 80:272–288.

Chen A, Li C, Hu W, Lau MY, Lin H, Rockwell NC, Martin SS, Jernstedt JA, Lagarias JC,
Dubcovsky J. 2014. PHYTOCHROME C plays a major role in the acceleration of wheat
flowering under long-day photoperiod. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 111:10037–10044.

Cheval C, Perez M, Leba LJ, Ranty B, Perochon A, Reichelt M, Mithöfer A, Robe E, Mazars C,
Galaud JP, et al. 2017. PRR2, a pseudo-response regulator, promotes salicylic acid and
camalexin accumulation during plant immunity. *Sci Rep* 7:6979.

Coughlan JM, Willis HJ. 2018. Dissecting the role of a large chromosomal inversion in life
history divergence throughout the Mimulus guttatus species complex. *Mol Ecol*. 28:1343-
1357.
849

DeRaad DA, Cobos ME, Alkishe A, Ashraf U, Ahadji-Dabla KM, Nuñez-Penichet C, Peterson
AT. 2021. Genome-environment association methods comparison supports omnigenic
adaptation to ecological niche in malaria vector mosquitoes. *Molecular Ecology* 30:6468–
6485.

Dong MA, Farré EM, Thomashow MF. 2011. CIRCADIAN CLOCK-ASSOCIATED 1 and
LATE ELONGATED HYPOCOTYL regulate expression of the C-REPEAT BINDING
FACTOR (CBF) pathway in *Arabidopsis*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 108:7241–7246.

Gautier M. 2015. Genome-Wide Scan for Adaptive Divergence and Association with
Population-Specific Covariates. *Genetics* 201:1555–1579.

Grimm DG, Roqueiro D, Salomé PA, Kleeberger S, Greshake B, Zhu W, Liu C, Lippert C,
Stegle O, Schölkopf B, et al. 2017. easyGWAS: A Cloud-Based Platform for Comparing
the Results of Genome-Wide Association Studies. *Plant Cell* 29:5–19.

Günther T, Coop G. 2013. Robust Identification of Local Adaptation from Allele Frequencies.
*Genetics* 195:205–220.

Hager ER, Harringmeyer OS, Wooldridge TB, Theingi S, Gable JT, McFadden S, Neugeboren
B, Turner KM, Jensen JD, Hoekstra HE. 2022. A chromosomal inversion contributes to
divergence in multiple traits between deer mouse ecotypes. *Science* 377:399–405.

Heiser C, Smith D, Clevenger S, Martin W. 1969. The North American sunflowers (Helianthus).
*Memoirs of the Torrey Botanical Club* 22:1–218.

Heiser, CB. 1951. Hybridization in the Annual Sunflowers: Helianthus annuus x H. argophyllus.
*The American Naturalist* 85:65–72.

Hoban S, Kelley JL, Lotterhos KE, Antolin MF, Bradburd G, Lowry DB, Poss ML, Reed LK,
Storfer A, Whitlock MC. 2016. Finding the Genomic Basis of Local Adaptation: Pitfalls,
Practical Solutions, and Future Directions. *The American Naturalist* 188:379–397.

Höllinger I, Pennings PS, Hermisson J. 2019. Polygenic adaptation: from sweeps to subtle
frequency shifts. PLoS Genet. 15:e1008035.
876

Izawa T. 2007. Adaptation of flowering-time by natural and artificial selection in Arabidopsis
and rice. *Journal of Experimental Botany* 58:3091–3097.

Jeffreys H. 1961. Theory of probability. 3rd ed. New York, NY: Oxford University Press

Kang HM, Sul JH, Service SK, Zaitlen NA, Kong S, Freimer NB, Sabatti C, Eskin E. 2010.
Variance component model to account for sample structure in genome-wide association
studies. *Nat Genet* 42:348–354.

Keuskamp DH, Pollmann S, Voesenek LACJ, Peeters AJM, Pierik R. 2010. Auxin transport
through PIN-FORMED 3 (PIN3) controls shade avoidance and fitness during competition. *Proc.*
*Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 107:22740–22744.
886
Kirkpatrick M, Barton N. 2006. Chromosome Inversions, Local Adaptation and Speciation.
*Genetics* 173:419–434.

Láruson ÁJ, Yeaman S, Lotterhos KE. 2020. The Importance of Genetic Redundancy in
Evolution. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 35:809–822.

Lee C-R, Wang B, Mojica JP, Mandáková T, Prasad KVSK, Goicoechea JL, Perera N, Hellsten
U, Hundley HN, Johnson J, et al. 2017. Young inversion with multiple linked QTLs
under selection in a hybrid zone. *Nat Ecol Evol* 1:0119.

Liu Z, Jia Y, Ding Y, Shi Y, Li Z, Guo Y, Gong Z, Yang S. 2017. Plasma Membrane CRPK1-
Mediated Phosphorylation of 14-3-3 Proteins Induces Their Nuclear Import to Fine-Tune
CBF Signaling during Cold Response. *Molecular Cell* 66:117-128.e5.

Lotterhos KE, Whitlock MC. 2014. Evaluation of demographic history and neutral
parameterization on the performance of $F_{ST}$ outlier tests. *Mol Ecol* 23:2178–2192.

MacPherson A, Nuismer SL. 2017. The probability of parallel genetic evolution from standing
genetic variation. *J. Evol. Biol.* 30:326–337.

Manceau M, Domingues VS, Linnen CR, Rosenblum EB, Hoekstra HE. 2010. Convergence in
pigmentation at multiple levels: mutations, genes and function. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*
365:2439–2450.

Mizoguchi T, Wheatley K, Hanzawa Y, Wright L, Mizoguchi M, Song HR, Carré IA, Coupland
G. 2002. LHY and CCA1 are partially redundant genes required to maintain circadian
rhythms in Arabidopsis. *Dev Cell* 2:629–641.

Moyers BT, Rieseberg LH. 2016. Remarkable life history polymorphism may be evolving under
divergent selection in the silverleaf sunflower. *Mol Ecol* 25:3817–3830.

Ostevik KL, Andrew RL, Otto SP, Rieseberg LH. 2016. Multiple reproductive barriers separate
recently diverged sunflower ecotypes: reproductive barriers between sunflower ecotypes.
*Evolution* 70:2322–2335.

Para A, Farré EM, Imaizumi T, Pruneda-Paz JL, Harmon FG, Kay SA. 2007. PRR3 Is a vascular
regulator of TOC1 stability in the Arabidopsis circadian clock. *Plant Cell* 19:3462–3473.

Pekker I, Alvarez JP, Eshed Y. 2005. Auxin response factors mediate Arabidopsis organ
asymmetry via modulation of KANADI activity. *Plant Cell* 17:2899–2910.

Rosenblum EB, Parent CE, Brandt EE. 2014. The Molecular Basis of Phenotypic Convergence.
*Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 45:203–226.

Sambatti JBM, Strasburg JL, Ortiz-Barrientos D, Baack EJ, Rieseberg LH. 2012. Reconciling
extremely strong barriers with high levels of gene exchange in annual sunflowers: gene
flow across a strong reproductive barrier. *Evolution* 66:1459–1473.

Schaal SM, Haller BC, Lotterhos KE. 2022. Inversion invasions: when the genetic basis of local
adaptation is concentrated within inversions in the face of gene flow. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc.*
*B* 377:20210200.

Strasburg JL, Rieseberg LH. 2008. Molecular demographic history of the annual sunflowers
*helianthus annuus* and *h. Petiolaris* -large effective population sizes and rates of long-
term gene flow. *Evolution* 62:1936–1950.

Takano M, Inagaki N, Xie X, Yuzurihara N, Hihara F, Ishizuka T, Yano M, Nishimura M,
Miyao A, Hirochika H, et al. 2005. Distinct and Cooperative Functions of Phytochromes
A, B, and C in the Control of Deetiolation and Flowering in Rice. *The Plant Cell*
17:3311–3325.

Tittes S, Lorant A, McGinty S, Doebley JF, Holland JB, Sánchez-González J de J, Seetharam A,
Tenaillon M, Ross-Ibarra J. 2021. Not so local: the population genetics of convergent
adaptation in maize and teosinte. Evolutionary Biology Available from:
http://biorxiv.org/lookup/doi/10.1101/2021.09.09.459637

Todesco M, Owens GL, Bercovich N, Légaré J-S, Soudi S, Burge DO, Huang K, Ostevik KL,
Drummond EBM, Imerovski I, et al. 2020. Massive haplotypes underlie ecotypic
differentiation in sunflowers. *Nature* 584:602–607.

Visscher PM, Wray NR, Zhang Q, Sklar P, McCarthy MI, Brown MA, Yang J. 2017. 10 Years
of GWAS Discovery: Biology, Function, and Translation. *The American Journal of*
*Human Genetics* 101:5–22.

Wang L, Josephs EB, Lee KM, Roberts LM, Rellán-Álvarez R, Ross-Ibarra J, Hufford MB.
2021. Molecular Parallelism Underlies Convergent Highland Adaptation of Maize
Landraces.Purugganan M, editor. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 38:3567–3580.

Wang T, Hamann A, Spittlehouse DL, Murdock TQ. 2012. ClimateWNA—High-Resolution
Spatial Climate Data for Western North America. *Journal Of Applied Meteorology And*
*Climatology* 51:14.

Wellenreuther M, Bernatchez L. 2018. Eco-Evolutionary Genomics of Chromosomal Inversions.
*Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 33:427–440.

Whitlock M, Schluter D. 2020. The analysis of biological data. 3rd ed. Macmillan

Yang J, Lee SH, Goddard ME, Visscher PM. 2011. GCTA: A Tool for Genome-wide Complex
Trait Analysis. *The American Journal of Human Genetics* 88:76–82.

Yeaman S. 2022. Evolution of polygenic traits under global *vs* local adaptation. *Genetics*
220:iyab134.

Yeaman S, Gerstein AC, Hodgins KA, Whitlock MC. 2018. Quantifying how constraints limit
the diversity of viable routes to adaptation.Ralph PL, editor. *PLoS Genet* 14:e1007717.

Yeaman S, Hodgins KA, Lotterhos KE, Suren H, Nadeau S, Degner JC, Nurkowski KA, Smets
P, Wang T, Gray LK, et al. 2016. Convergent local adaptation to climate in distantly
related conifers. *Science* 353:1431–1433.

Yeaman S, Whitlock MC. 2011. The genetic architecture of adaptation under migration-selection
balance: the genetic architecture of local adaptation. *Evolution* 65:1897–1911.