Title: Recent evolution of large offspring size and post-fertilization nutrient provisioning in

swordtails

Cheyenne Y. Payne[1,2,3,4], Derek Ly[5], Rebecca A. Rodriguez-Soto[1], Daniel L. Powell[1,2], Nim D.

Robles[1,2], Theresa Gunn[1], John J Bazcenas[1], Abby J. Bergman[6], Alexa Pollock[1], Ben M.

Moran[1,2], Julie C. Baker[6], David Reznick[5], Molly Schumer[1,2,7]

[1]Department of Biology, Stanford University

[2]Centro de Investigaciones Científicas de las Huastecas "Aguazarca", A.C.

[3]Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of California, Santa Cruz

[4]Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and

Atmospheric Administration

[5]Department of Biology, UC Riverside

[6]Department of Genetics, Stanford University

[7]Freeman Hrabowski Fellow, Howard Hughes Medical Institutes

*Correspondence to: cypayne@ucsc.edu and schumer@stanford.edu

Key words: swordtail fish, matrotrophy, offspring size, hybridization

Abstract

Organisms have evolved diverse reproductive strategies that impact the probability that their

offspring survive to adulthood. Here, we describe divergence in reproductive strategy between

two closely related species of swordtail fish (*Xiphophorus*). Swordtail fish and their relatives

have evolved viviparity: they have internal fertilization and give birth to fully developed fry. We

find that one species, *X. malinche*, which lives in high-elevation environments, has evolved

larger offspring than its closest relative *X. birchmanni* and dwarfs the offspring size of other

species in the genus. The larger fry of *X. malinche* are more resilient to starvation than their *X.*

birchmanni relatives, hinting that the evolution of large offspring size may be an adaptation to

the particularly challenging environments in which *X. malinche* are born. We find evidence that

X. malinche achieves larger offspring size in part by continuing to provision their offspring over

the course of embryonic development after fertilization, the first time this process has been

documented in the *Xiphophorus* genus. Moreover, we observe differential regulation in the ovary

of genes associated with maternal nutrient provisioning in other species that use this reproductive

strategy. Intriguingly, these reproductive differences may drive an asymmetric hybrid

incompatibility, since *X. birchmanni* mothers pregnant with F_1 embryos give birth to premature

and stillborn fry at an exceptionally high rate.

Introduction

Sexually reproducing organisms vary vastly in their investment in their offspring. In some species, investment stops prior to fertilization, whereas in others investment and parental care continue into adulthood (Gross 2005; Klug and Bonsall 2014; Furness and Capellini 2019). In vertebrates, for example, reproductive strategies range from broadcast-spawning millions of eggs (e.g. Atlantic cod; Roney et al. 2018) to a parent raising a single offspring over decades (e.g. orca whales; Weiss et al. 2023). Though the degree of parental investment is generally positively correlated with the probability of offspring survival (Brockelman 1975; Einum and Fleming 2000), there are well-documented tradeoffs between reproductive investment and life history traits like parent survivorship, frequency of reproduction, the number of offspring per reproductive cycle, and the total number over the parent's lifetime (Smith and Fretwell 1974; Brockelman 1975; Stearns 1989; Einum and Fleming 2000; Jørgensen et al. 2011; Roney et al. 2018).

One measure of reproductive investment that has been studied in diverse organisms across the tree of life is offspring size. Within species, size at birth or weaning is strongly correlated with the probability of offspring survival to reproductive maturity (although there are some exceptions; see Kaplan 1992). The mechanisms through which larger offspring achieve better outcomes are incompletely understood but appear to be diverse and vary between species (such as by avoiding size-dependent mortality, starvation, disease, and conspecific competition; Rollinson and Hutchings 2013; Pettersen et al. 2022). Researchers have speculated that these factors could explain the evolution of differences in offspring size across species.

Another mechanism for increasing offspring survival that has recurrently evolved is viviparity, or internal development of embryos. Viviparity reduces size-dependent mortality of

eggs and embryos (Jørgensen et al. 2011) and can offer improved environmental conditions for

developing offspring. For some species, it provides an opportunity to directly provision nutrients

to developing offspring (Griffith and Wagner 2017). While viviparous species typically provide

some level of nutrition to their offspring in the form of yolk in the egg, a strategy known as

lecithotrophy, some provision nutrients both before and after fertilization, a strategy known as

matrotrophy (Wourms et al. 1988). This post-fertilization provisioning is mediated through

physical interfaces between parent and offspring tissue, such as the mammalian placenta

(Meredith et al. 2011). While the complex mammalian placenta evolved once over 100 million

years ago (Meredith et al. 2011), maternal provisioning structures of varying complexity have

evolved over 130 times across vertebrates (Blackburn 2015; Whittington et al. 2022). Lineages

in which nutrient provisioning evolved recently may be especially useful in understanding the

pressures that drive post-fertilization nutrient provisioning.

Poeciliid fishes offer an opportunity to study the evolutionary drivers of viviparity, nutrient

provisioning strategies, and variation in offspring size. The common ancestor of poeciliids

evolved internal fertilization and live birth of juvenile fish, or fry (Pollux et al. 2009), and

species vary widely in the degree of post-fertilization nutrient provisioning (Reznick et al. 2002;

Pires et al. 2010). Counterintuitively, the evolution of offspring size and matrotrophy are often

decoupled in poeciliids. While it might be expected that provisioning more nutrients during

development would lead to larger offspring at birth, empirical data have yielded no consistent

association across taxa (Olivera-Tlahuel et al. 2015; Meiri et al. 2020; Furness et al. 2021).

However, potential links between offspring size and matrotrophy have been difficult to

disentangle because offspring size is often strongly impacted by maternal traits like age, size, and

condition (Berkeley et al. 2004; Marshall and Keough 2007; Hagmayer et al. 2018; but see

Marshall et al. 2010). Ecological factors are also important drivers of offspring size, independent

of post-fertilization nutrient provisioning (Reznick et al. 1996*a*; Jennions et al. 2006; Riesch et

al. 2010; Pollux and Reznick 2011; Schrader and Travis 2012; Leips et al. 2013). For example,

offspring of lecithotrophic *Poecilia* from environments with low predation and high competition

are 50% larger at birth than those from high predation, low competition environments (Reznick

1982*a*; Reznick and Endler 1982; Reznick and Bryga 1987; Reznick et al. 1996*c*; Bashey 2006*a*,

2008; Jørgensen et al. 2011), presumably as a result of mothers investing in larger eggs. Similar

environmental conditions appear to promote larger offspring size in some matrotrophic species

(Schrader and Travis 2012; Leips et al. 2013; but see Reznick et al. 1996*b*) but not in others

(Pollux and Reznick 2011).

Here, we address questions about the evolution of offspring size and matrotrophy in a

group of livebearing fish that are an important evolutionary and behavioral model system.

Xiphophorus species inhabit dramatically different ecological environments, from valley rivers

nearly at sea level to mountain streams in the Sierra Madre Oriental in central México. Past work

on a handful of species has suggested that although all *Xiphophorus* species are livebearing, they

do not invest in their offspring post-fertilization (i.e. they are lecithotrophic; Constantz et al.

1989). However, this hypothesis has not been evaluated on a genus-wide scale, and data is

particularly lacking in species living in extreme environments for the group (Morris and Ryan

1992; Pollux et al. 2014). There is no data available on variation in offspring size within or

between species.

We find that *X. malinche* have evolved exceptionally large offspring and explore the

mechanisms and pressures potentially driving the evolution of this trait. By characterizing the

change in embryo size over development in the lab and wild for the closely related northern

swordtail species *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni*, we find evidence that *X. malinche* achieves

larger offspring size in part through post-fertilization maternal nutrient provisioning. Using a

combination of approaches, including evaluating expression at genes that have been repeatedly

co-opted for post-fertilization maternal nutrient provisioning (Guernsey et al. 2020), we

investigate some of the potential mechanisms underlying this reproductive strategy in *X.*

malinche. Notably, *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* naturally hybridize (Culumber et al. 2011),

which we leverage to study the link between genome-wide ancestry and offspring size. Finally,

we explore the possibility that a conflict between maternal nutrient provisioning and offspring

nutrient demands over development underlies asymmetric hybrid inviability between these two

species. This observation is particularly exciting given ongoing hybridization between these two

species in nature.

Methods

Measuring newborn fry size across Xiphophorus species

To compare the size of newborn fry in several *Xiphophorus* species, broods were

collected in the laboratory on the day they were born. All tanks with gravid females were

inspected multiple times a day for fry. Upon collection, all fry from a brood were photographed

in shallow water (~2 cm deep) from overhead for a dorsal view of each fry. Photos were

imported to ImageJ2 and two measurements, standard length and head width, were made using

the line measurement tool (Supp. Fig. 1). We measured both traits for fry from five *Xiphophorus*

species – *X. birchmanni, X. malinche, X. cortezi, X. pygmaeus*, and *X. variatus*, and from *X.*

malinche x X. birchmanni F_1, F_2, and lab-reared natural hybrids descended from individuals

collected from the Calnali Low wild population. Note that we report newborn fry size for the *X.*

malinche x X. birchmanni F_1 cross direction only, as F_1s from the reciprocal *X. birchmanni x X.*

malinche are rarely carried to term (see below). Given that fry were collected from tanks with

multiple gravid females (*X. birchmanni* and *X. malinche* experience high levels of stress when

singly housed), we were not able to collect covariates such as mother standard length. However,

because average mother size is similar between species (on average, 4.04 cm for *X. malinche* and

3.94 for *X. birchmanni* reared in common conditions; see Supplementary Information 1), we

expect that our large sample sizes (*X. malinche* broods N=35 and *X. birchmanni* broods N=48)

will not be dominated by effects of individual mother size. Since broods varied in size, we

averaged the standard length and head width for each brood and compared means with a

Wilcoxon rank sum exact test. See Table S1 for raw fry standard length and head width and

Table S2 for statistics. Using lab-reared *X. birchmanni. X. malinche,* and hybrid fry, we also

obtained an estimate of broad-sense heritability (H^2) of offspring standard length at birth (see

Supplementary Information 2 for methods).

Measuring embryo weight across developmental stages

To compare embryo size throughout development in each species, we measured the dry

weights of embryos across developmental stages from wild-caught females, collected with baited

minnow traps. We collected a total of 38 pregnant and 11 nonpregnant females (with fully-

yolked eggs) from the *X. malinche* source population Chicayotla on the Río Xontla (1,003 m

elevation; 20°55′27.24″N 98°34′34.50″W) across two seasons (45 in May 2022 and 4 in August

2020), 59 pregnant and 51 nonpregnant females from the *X. birchmanni* source population

Coacuilco on the Río Coacuilco (320 m elevation; 21°5'50.85 N, 98°35'19.46 W) across four

seasons (31 in October 2023, 22 in February 2023, 30 in September 2022, and 27 in August

2020), and 19 pregnant females from the *X. cortezi* source population Puente de Huichihuayán

on the Río Huichihuayán (89 m elevation; 21°26'9.95 N 98°56'0.00 W) in one season (February

2023). In practice, the sample of 19 females from *X. cortezi* was insufficient to capture

developmental profiles because we had ≤1 brood for many stages, so we limit our discussion of

these results to the supplement (Supplementary Information 3). Each mother was euthanized

with MS-222, cut from the anal pore to the gills so as to expose the brood for fixation, and stored

in 95% ethanol. Consistent with previous reports for *Xiphophorus* (Kindsvater et al. 2012;

Furness et al. 2019), we found that all embryos in a brood were at roughly the same

developmental stage.

Embryos were staged following the numerical scoring guidelines described by Reznick

1981. Briefly, stages range from 0-50 (in intervals of 5), where stage 0 describes yolking or fully

yolked unfertilized eggs and stage 50 describes fully developed fry with a closed pericardial

cavity (see Table S3). Importantly, these stages are categorical based on key morphological

features of developing embryos and do not reflect constant time intervals throughout

development, as the temporal interval varies. It is typically difficult to discern whether stage 0

eggs are fully yolked or are still yolking. Therefore, we noted whether unfertilized eggs had an

even distribution of lipid droplets on the surface of the egg and were evenly sized within their

brood, which are the best visual indicators of completed yolking.

172   Embryos and eggs were separated from the ovarian follicle, staged under a microscope,

173   and then dried following methods described in D. Reznick (1981). The ovarian tissue and each

174   staged embryo and egg were placed in individual microcentrifuge tubes that were dried in a

175   laboratory oven overnight at 65°C, and then dry weighed using a standard scale sensitive to 10^{-4}

176   grams (Table S4).

178   *Comparison of embryo weight over development between species*

179   Maternal size has previously been shown to strongly correlate with offspring size in

poeciliids, including in *X. birchmanni* (Jørgensen et al. 2011; Kindsvater et al. 2012; Hagmayer

et al. 2018), as have brood size and environmental variables like collection season (Kindsvater et

al. 2012). In our wild collections, pregnant mothers ranged in length from 3.4-5.7cm for *X.*

malinche and 2.8-5.2cm for *X. birchmanni*, and brood size ranged from 3-36 and 4-44 embryos,

respectively. Therefore, to evaluate which variables impact embryo dry weight other than our

variables of interest (species, stage, and the interaction between species and stage), we used R

stats::step to compare models that included mother standard length, brood size, and season in an

AIC framework. Collection dates were binned into two seasonal categories describing water

temperature (Supp. Fig. S11): the "warm" season includes April-October months and the "cold"

season includes November-March months. Mother standard length and season were selected and

included as covariates with fixed effects. We confirmed that there was not a significant

interaction between species and mother standard length before proceeding with analysis. We also

note that, reassuringly, the overall patterns in our results are similar with and without standard

length and season covariates included in the model. For the full analysis, we also included brood

ID as a random effect, which is unique to each female and is species-specific. Therefore, we fit

the following mixed linear model with R lme4::lmer: embryo dry weight (g) ~ species + stage +

species:stage + season + mother standard length + (1 | brood ID). Pairwise comparisons between

mean embryo dry weight for each stage were made with an ANOVA and Tukey post-hoc test

with R emmeans::emmeans (Table S6).

We visualized differences in embryo size after accounting for covariates by plotting the

partial residuals of embryo dry weight for each stage with R visreg::visreg (Breheny and

Burchett 2017), split by species. We also plotted the raw data (i.e. without accounting for

covariates) and reassuringly, the overall patterns were similar (Fig. S5).

As noted above, because it is difficult to determine whether stage 0 eggs are fully-yolked,

we omitted these eggs from the developmental profile plots, but separately plot the stage 0 eggs

that appeared to have even lipid distribution and size within their brood (Table S5). We used the

subset of unfertilized eggs that met these criteria to compare pre-fertilized egg weight between

species but note that the distribution of these dry weights likely skews lower than the true pre-

fertilized egg weights for both species (see Table S5). We fit a mixed linear model of egg dry

weight by species with mother standard length and season as selected covariates and brood ID as

a random effect, performed pairwise comparisons with an ANOVA and Tukey post-hoc, and

plotted partial residuals of egg dry weights as above.

Assessing the relationship between genome-wide ancestry and embryo and ovary size

We were curious whether genome-wide ancestry proportion in natural hybrid mothers

might predict embryo size and ovary weight, given that this trait is heritable in lab-raised hybrids

(see Results). We sampled 34 pregnant mothers from a natural hybrid population on the Río

Calnali on a single collection date (the Calnali Low population, elevation 905 m). *X. malinche*

ancestry proportions ranged from 0.28 to 0.71 in these individuals (see Table S7 and

Supplementary Information 4). Embryos and ovary tissue were dissected, staged, and dry-

weighed as described in the previous section. As above, we used R stats::step to choose an

appropriate model for testing the relationship between embryo dry weight, as well as ovary dry

weight, and mother ancestry proportion. The selected mixed linear model included brood size,

stage, and the interaction between stage and ancestry proportion, with brood ID as a random

effect. We evaluated significance with a likelihood ratio test using R stats::anova to compare the

full model and a reduced model without ancestry proportion and its interaction with stage. We

also evaluated whether mother mitochondrial genotype predicted embryo or ovary dry weight

(see Supplementary Information 4). We calculated and plotted partial residuals of embryo dry

weight after accounting for covariates (e.g. ancestry proportion) with R visreg::visreg.

Calculating Matrotrophy Index

The degree of post-fertilization nutrient provisioning varies along a continuum, but

researchers have described two general provisioning strategies: lecithotrophy and matrotrophy

(Pollux et al. 2009). A simple quantitative metric for distinguishing these strategies and

measuring the level of post-fertilization provisioning is the Matrotrophy Index, which is the dry

weight of the fully-developed embryo divided by the dry weight of the fully-yolked egg. A

Matrotrophy Index < 1 indicates that the embryo has decreased in size over development

(lecithotrophy) while a value ≥ 1 indicates that the embryo has maintained or increased in size,

indicative of some level of maternal provisioning over development (matrotrophy). Reported

Matrotrophy Indices within poeciliids range from 0.45 to 103 (Furness et al. 2021). Note that a

large Matrotrophy Index does not necessarily correspond to large offspring size at birth.

We calculated Matrotrophy Index for *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* as the dry weight of

a fully-developed embryo divided by the dry weight of an early-stage embryo, averaging dry

weights for embryos of the same stage within a brood. Since it is difficult to identify fully-yolked

eggs, we calculated Matrotrophy Index with dry weight measurements from stage 10 embryos.

This analysis choice is conservative in the context of our study, since it will give an

underestimate of Matrotrophy Index in matrotrophic species. Since multiple variables impact

embryo dry weight, we calculated Matrotrophy Index using both the raw averages (Table S4)

and the partial residuals of average embryo dry weights (Table S8) after accounting for season

and mother standard length as covariates as above (with R stats::lm). We describe the impact of

different calculations with raw and partial residual dry weights on our estimate of Matrotrophy

Index in Supplementary Information 3.

Multifactorial artificial insemination crosses

To compare results from wild-caught females to females raised in controlled lab

conditions, we artificially inseminated lab-raised *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* mothers

following the *Xiphophorus* Genetic Stock Center Protocol to create the following crosses: *X.*

malinche ♀ × X. malinche ♂, X. birchmanni ♀ × X.birchmanni ♂, X. malinche ♀ × X.

birchmanni ♂, and *X. birchmanni* ♀ × *X. malinche* ♂. Artificially inseminated females from

each cross (N=10-15) were reared in 200-gallon outdoor tanks at Stanford University until

females were visually determined to be late in pregnancy in April-May 2023, at which point all

fish were sedated with MS-222 and euthanized by severing the spinal cord. Embryos were

dissected, and each embryo was assigned a developmental stage following Table S3. Dry weight

of each embryo and the ovarian tissue were measured as described above (see Table S9).

Because we were interested in evaluating cross-level differences in late-stage embryo size, we

subsampled stage 30-50 embryos (from 2 broods for all crosses except *X. birchmanni* ♀ × *X.*

malinche ♂, for which there was only 1 brood; see Table S9). We found that for this dataset, due

to the small sample size, mother standard length and brood ID were perfectly correlated, and

including brood ID as a random effect caused singularity in the model. Therefore, we fit a simple

linear model including species, stage, brood size, and mother standard length as selected

covariates with R stats::lm, ANOVA, and Tukey post-hoc test with R emmeans::emmeans (see

Table S10), and plotted partial residuals of dry weights with R visreg::visreg. Reassuringly, the

partial residual results are the same whether brood ID is included as a random effect in the model

or not. We also made crosses between individuals of the same species from different populations

for comparison (Table S11-12 and Supplementary Information 5).

To look for evidence of anatomical differences between species at the maternal-offspring

interface that could be associated with nutrient provisioning (i.e. thicker ovarian follicle and

interacting embryo and maternal tissue), we prepared histological slides of ovaries from both

nonpregnant and late-stage (stage 35-40) pregnancy females from the pure *X. malinche* and *X.*

birchmanni crosses, as well as both F_1 crosses. Whole ovaries containing eggs or embryos were

carefully dissected and fixed in 10% formalin. Ovaries were paraffin-embedded, sectioned, and

stained with Hematoxylin & Eosin by the Histo-Tec Laboratory (Hayward, CA). We digitally

scanned the stained slides through the Human Pathology Histology Services Laboratory at

Stanford University for morphological analysis of the ovary sections. See Supplementary

Information 6 for methods quantifying morphological differences. Additionally, we verified the

genetic origin of ovary follicle tissue in *X. malinche* mothers carrying F_1 offspring

(Supplementary Information 7).

Differential gene expression and co-expression network analysis

Previous work in livebearers has identified several key genes that are differentially

expressed between the ovarian tissue of pregnant lecithotrophic and matrotrophic species (Jue et

al. 2018; Guernsey et al. 2020). To broadly compare gene expression between *X. malinche*, *X.*

birchmanni, and *X. cortezi,* we sequenced ovarian tissue from mothers from two groups: those

with fully-yolked eggs and those with embryos in mid- to late-development.

Because we were interested in species-level rather than environmentally-dependent

differences, we collected both wild and lab-reared females for this analysis. For wild-caught fish,

we collected two *X. malinche* and two *X. birchmanni* pregnant females with stage 40-50 embryos

from the Chicayotla and Coacuilco localities, respectively. Additionally, we sampled at least

three "early" pregnancy females (unfertilized fully-yolked or stage ≤ 5) and at least three "late"

pregnancy females (stage 25-45) from our lab populations. For both sets of samples, fish were

euthanized by rapidly severing the spinal cord with a scalpel and dissecting the mother's body

cavity from anal fin to gills. Wild-caught fish were stored in RNAlater and ovaries were

dissected later. For lab collected fish, whole ovaries were dissected immediately following

euthanasia and preserved in RNAlater. See Table S13 for the full list of samples with collection

dates and developmental stages of embryos.

Ovarian tissue and embryos were carefully separated. See Supplementary Information 8

and Table S14 for differential gene expression analysis of embryos. RNA was extracted from

ovarian tissue from each mother using the Qiagen Mini RNAeasy kit. RNAseq libraries were

prepared with unique barcodes for each sample using a KAPA mRNA HyperPrep Kit, pooled,

and sequenced. The wild-caught samples and half of the lab samples were sequenced on one

Illumina HiSeq4000 lane and the rest of the lab samples were sequenced on one Illumina

NovaSeq6000 lane for an average of 28 million 150 bp paired-end reads per sample (see Table

S13). Raw reads are available under NCBI BioProject PRJNAXXXX. For each sequencing

batch, samples were paired to balance species and developmental stages so that batch effects

could be statistically accounted for in analysis.

We followed the gene expression analysis methods described in Payne et al (2022). We

used cutadapt (Martin 2011) and Trim Galore! (Krueger et al. 2021) to trim Illumina adapter

sequences and low-quality bases (Phred score < 30) from reads. Using the tool *kallisto* (Bray et

al. 2016), we pseudoaligned RNAseq reads to an *X. birchmanni* "pseudoreference" transcriptome

generated from the southern platyfish *X. maculatus* genome (Schartl et al. 2013). The *X.*

maculatus genome assembly is well-annotated and mapped to Ensembl gene IDs with associated

Gene Ontology terms (Wittbrodt et al. 1989; Schartl et al. 2013). Raw transcript counts were

converted to gene-level counts to evaluate gene expression; note that the *X. birchmanni*

transcriptome contains only a single transcript per gene.

For differential gene expression analysis, we combined all lab- and wild-collected

ovarian follicle samples into a single dataset, using a design formula that included species (*X.*

malinche, *X. birchmanni*, or *X. cortezi*) and pregnancy category (early or late) as a grouped

interaction, origin (lab or wild), and library preparation/sequencing batch. Briefly, using R

DESeq2::DESeq (Love et al. 2014), we normalized gene counts by library size, estimated within-

experimental group dispersion, fit a negative binomial generalized linear model, and tested

significance with a Wald test. Shrunken log-fold changes were calculated with the ashr::ashr

shrinkage estimator (Stephens 2017). Extreme outlier and low count genes were removed. Genes

were considered significantly differentially expressed between species at an FDR-adjusted p-

value<0.05. Out of a total of 19,176 genes in the *X. birchmanni* pseudoreference transcriptome,

96% are expressed in at least one species. Expression results from this analysis can be found in

Table S15.

To explore biological pathways enriched in genes that were differentially expressed

between species in ovarian tissue, we performed Gene Ontology enrichment analysis. We used R

biomaRt (Durinck et al. 2009) and GOstats (Falcon and Gentleman 2007) to match *X. maculatus*

Ensembl gene IDs with GO terms. We created a "universe" of all genes analyzed with DESeq2,

which was used as the reference set of genes for testing category enrichment. Using R

GSEABase::hyperGTest (Morgan, Martin et al. n.d.), we ran a hypergeometric test to identify

overrepresented GO terms (p-value<0.05) in the set of genes that were significantly differentially

expressed between species and developmental stage (Table S16). We also used the R tool

WGCNA (Langfelder and Horvath 2008) to cluster co-expressed genes and identify clusters

highly correlated with species and developmental stage as a grouped variable. Detailed WGCNA

methods are in Supplementary Information 9 and full results are in Tables S17-18.

Immunostaining of prolactin expression in ovarian tissue

Ovaries were fixed, processed, and sectioned as described above. Briefly, sections were

deparaffinized and dehydrated through xylenes and a graded ethanol series. Slides were blocked

for 1h (at room temperature, hereafter RT) in gelatin block, then incubated with anti-prolactin

primary antibody (rabbit, Abcam EPR19386, 1:200) overnight (4C). Slides were washed,

peroxide blocked for 30m (RT) then incubated with biotinylated goat anti-rabbit secondary

antibody (Jackson ImmunoResearch 111-065-144, 1:5000) for 1h (RT). Slides were washed,

then incubated for 30m with VectaShield Elite ABC reagent (Vector Labs PK-6100; RT).

Prolactin signal was amplified with TSA-Cy3 (Akoya Biosciences NEL744001KT) for 6m (RT)

and counterstained with DAPI (Thermo Scientific 62248, 1:2000) and mounted with Prolong

Gold Antifade (Thermo Scientific P36930). See complete methods in Supplementary

Information 10.

Images were acquired using NIS Elements software v4.30.02 on a Nikon Ti Eclipse

inverted microscope equipped with an ASI MS-2000 motorized linear XY stage, Yokogawa

CSU-W1 single disk (50mM pinhole) spinning disk unit, Andor Zyla 4.2 (6.5mM pixel size)

scMOS camera, and 10x/0.45 NA or 20X/0.75 NA Nikon PlanApo Lambda air objectives (see

Supplementary Information 10 for complete imaging specifications). Data was saved in .nd2

format and manually processed in ImageJ.

Exploring ecological differences in X. birchmanni and *X. malinche habitats*

One striking environmental difference between *X. birchmanni* and *X. malinche* habitats is

water temperature, driven by elevation differences (Fig. S10). In addition, many ecological

factors such as primary productivity covary with temperature. While we investigated direct

responses to temperature in *X. birchmanni* and *X. malinche* fry (Supplementary Information 11

and Table S19), we were also interested in responses to the indirect effects of temperature, such

as food availability.

Given that *X. malinche* populations likely experience lower food and nutrient availability,

we predicted that newborn fry may be more likely to face starvation conditions than *X.*

birchmanni, and that large offspring size may have evolved as an adaptation to these conditions.

To directly test this, we compared starvation tolerance between newborn *X. malinche* and *X.*

birchmanni fry in the lab. We collected four broods of fry from each species and split individuals

in a brood evenly between one experimental and one control tank. Fry in the control tanks were

fed brine shrimp twice daily for three days while fry in experimental tanks were not fed for those

three days. Observations of physical state and behavior were recorded twice per day at 10:00 and

17:00 during the laboratory light period (09:00-18:00). At the end of the three-day trial, fry were

euthanized with MS-222, photographed so that standard length could be measured with ImageJ,

and prepared for total lipid extraction to measure differences in dry weight and fat content

between control and experimental fry (see below). After model selection, we fit a mixed linear

model (R nlme::lme) for standard length, including species, treatment, and their interaction as

fixed effects and brood ID as a random effect. Pairwise comparisons between the interaction of

species and treatment were made with an ANOVA and Tukey post-hoc test with R

emmeans::emmeans and partial residuals were calculated and plotted with lme4::lmer and

visreg::visreg. See Table S20 for raw data and Table S21 for statistics.

Lipid extraction and fat content analysis of wild-caught females and lab-born fry

Xiphophorus species were thought to reproduce year-round. However, in sampling

natural *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* populations for this project we detected clear evidence for

seasonality in breeding in *X. malinche* populations (see Results). To more systematically

evaluate this, we opportunistically collected pregnancy rates for collections made in August

2020, May 2022, September 2022, and February 2023 from the Chicayotla *X. malinche* and

Coacuilco *X. birchmanni* populations (Table S22).

Dry weight and body fat content are indirect measures of nutrient availability in a fish's

environment. We dry weighed and extracted total lipids from wild-caught nonpregnant

Chicayotla *X. malinche* and Coacuilco *X. birchmanni* adult females caught in September 2022

and February 2023. We also collected dry weight and total lipid data from the fry subject to the

food deprivation trials described above. For adult fish, abdominal organs (i.e. digestive,

excretory, and reproductive tissue from the abdomen) were dissected out to avoid extracting

lipids from undigested food. Fry were left intact. Fish were placed on a tray wrapped with foil

and dried in a drying oven set to 65°C for five days. After desiccation, dried fish were weighed to

obtain dry weight prior to lipid extraction ($weight_1$). To extract lipids, each dried fish was placed

in a 5mL glass vial of petroleum ether. After 24 hours, the petroleum ether was drained and

replaced with fresh petroleum ether. This process was repeated once more to ensure complete

lipid extraction, for a total of three petroleum ether washes. After the third wash, fish were dried

at 65°C for 24 hours and then dry weighed to obtain dry weight after lipid extraction ($weight_2$).

Fat content percentage was calculated as:

$$Fat\ Content\ \% = \frac{weight_1 - weight_2}{weight_1} \times 100$$

Differences in fat content for nonpregnant females for each season were evaluated with a

Student's two-sided t-test. Differences in dry weight and fat content between species and

treatments for food deprivation trial fry were evaluated with the same methods described for fry

standard length (see above), with the same model selected (Tables S20-21).

Measuring viability by cross direction

In addition to comparing embryo size in F_1 hybrids, we quantified differences in survival

of F_1 fry as a function of cross direction. We used additional F_1 crosses generated in the lab to do

so. For these crosses, we monitored females twice daily, and to reduce the risk of fry predation,

we provided low-density and high-cover conditions for females that were morphologically

identified as being close to giving birth. New broods were morphologically scored for being full-

term or premature, and stillborn fry were identified and counted. Tanks of collected fry were

monitored twice daily. For crosses with high mortality rates, survival to two weeks was recorded

for surviving fry (Table S23).

Results

X. malinche newborn fry are exceptionally large

To evaluate variation in offspring size at birth across *Xiphophorus*, we measured the standard lengths and head widths of newborn fry from five species: *X. birchmanni, X. malinche, X. cortezi, X. pygmaeus*, and *X. variatus* (Fig. 1A, Supp. Fig. S1-2, Table S1). We found significant differences in size across species (Table S2). Notably, *X. malinche* have the largest fry (10.8 mm $\pm$ 1.1 mm; adjusted p-value<0.005 for all five comparisons, see Table S2). Despite this difference in offspring size, *X. birchmanni* and *X. malinche* did not consistently differ in the number of offspring per brood (although offspring size varied as a function of mother size and collection season; Supp. Fig. S3). Moreover, adult females of the two species grown in common garden conditions were similar in size (Supp. Fig. S4). Although *X. birchmanni* fry are significantly smaller than *X. malinche* fry*,* they are larger than fry of other *Xiphophorus* species (Fig. 1; Table S2).

We also compared the size of newborn *X. malinche x X. birchmanni* F_1 and F_2 fry. We found that F_1 standard length and head width was *X. malinche*-like and F_2 and natural hybrid fry were intermediate in size to their parent species (Fig. 1B, Supp. Fig. 2B, Tables S1-2). After accounting for the effects of season and brood ID, we estimated the broad-sense heritability of standard length at birth attributable to ancestry to be 0.25 (see Supplementary Information 1).

X. malinche mothers provision developing embryos

Given that *X. malinche* fry are significantly larger at birth than *X. birchmanni*, we hypothesized that *X. malinche* embryos are also larger throughout embryonic development. We measured the dry weight of embryos dissected from wild-caught *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni*

pregnant females across developmental stages. First, we estimated the Matrotrophy Index for

each species to obtain a quantitative metric of nutrient provisioning during development using

stage 10 and stage 50 embryos (Fig. 2A; see Supplementary Information 3). On average by

brood, stage 10 embryos weighed 0.0038g for *X. birchmanni* and 0.0040g for *X. malinche*, while

stage 50 embryos weighed 0.0025g and 0.0038g, respectively. We note, however, that in

practice, embryo weight is impacted by season and mother standard length (see Methods). After

accounting for season and mother standard length, we calculated Matrotrophy Indices of 0.66 for

X. birchmanni and 0.98 for *X. malinche*, respectively. We also attempted to calculate

Matrotrophy Index for the sister species to the *X. malinche-X. birchmanni* clade, *X. cortezi*, but

our small sample size led to uncertainty in these estimates (Supplementary Information 3).

Consistent with their Matrotrophy Index estimate, we found that *X. birchmanni* embryos

show a lecithotrophic developmental profile, where embryos lose weight overall across

development (Fig. 2B). Notably, *X. birchmanni* embryonic size appears to change nonlinearly

through development. By contrast, *X. malinche* embryos maintain roughly the same dry weight

throughout development. These species do not differ in embryo dry weight early in development

(p-value=0.38 at stage 10; Fig. 2A) nor at the time of fertilization (p-value=0.18, Fig. 2C; but

note methodological issues with this stage discussed above). However, they significantly diverge

in embryo dry weight at stage 20 (p-value=0.008), and ultimately differ substantially by late

development (p-value=0.002 at stage 50; Fig. 2A-B; see Table S5 for statistical comparisons by

stage). Therefore, the maintenance of weight over development by *X. malinche* embryos suggests

that there is some level of post-fertilization nutrient provisioning from *X. malinche* mothers.

Late-stage F$_1$ embryos in the X. malinche x X. birchmanni cross are intermediate in size

To compare the size of late-stage embryos (stage $\geq$30) from the reciprocal F$_1$ crosses to

pure parental crosses, we made controlled crosses between *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* (see

Methods). Consistent with our measures from wild-caught broods, lab-bred *X. malinche* embryos

are significantly larger than *X. birchmanni* embryos (p-value<0.0005). We find that F$_1$ embryos

from the *X. malinche* mother and *X. birchmanni* father cross direction trend towards being

smaller than *X. malinche* embryos (p-value=0.08) but span the size range of both within-species

crosses. This hints that in a *X. malinche* maternal environment, both maternal effects and

offspring genotype could contribute to offspring size at birth. For F$_1$ embryos with *X. birchmanni*

mothers, we were unable to sample sufficient numbers of embryos to confidently compare size

across groups (Fig. 3C; see Table S10 for summary statistics).

Given that late-stage embryos are larger in *X. malinche* than *X. birchmanni*, we tested

whether higher genome-wide *X. malinche* ancestry in naturally occurring hybrids predicts larger

embryo size. We sampled pregnant mothers carrying stage $\geq$ 20 broods from the Calnali Low

natural hybrid population, since embryo size diverges between species after stage 15. After

accounting for stage and brood ID, we found that proportion of *X. malinche* ancestry in the

mother's genome and its interaction with stage are strongly positively associated with embryo

dry weight (L-ratio=61.6, p-value<0.0001, R=0.37; Supp. Fig. S6A). Unexpectedly, we find a

significant negative relationship between the mother's ancestry and ovary dry weight (F-

value=2.90, p-value=0.02), suggesting that greater *X. birchmanni* ancestry in a hybrid genome

predicts higher ovary dry weight.

X. malinche and X. birchmanni ovaries do not have clear morphological differences

To explore potential differences in ovarian structures between species, we compared

histological slides of sectioned ovaries. In highly matrotrophic livebearing fishes, nutrients are

delivered to developing embryos through the maternal follicle, which is thicker and highly

vascularized (Kwan et al. 2015; Guernsey et al. 2020; Ponce de León and Uribe 2021). Visually,

we did not observe consistent differences in maternal follicle thickness, amount of vasculature,

or overlap of maternal and embryonic membranes between sections of ovaries carrying

unfertilized eggs or late-stage embryos from *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* (Fig. 2D;

Supplementary Information 6). Given that Matrotrophy Indices for *X. malinche* and *X.*

birchmanni both fall below 1, clear morphological differences in reproductive morphology may

not be expected (unlike those observed in other studies; e.g. Guernsey et al. 2020).

We also sought to determine whether ovarian follicular tissue is maternal or embryonic in

origin (see Supplementary Information 7). Taking advantage of gene expression data from late

pregnancy *X. malinche* mothers carrying *X. malinche x X. birchmanni* F_1 broods, we found that

the *X. malinche* allele alone was expressed at nearly all ancestry informative sites, indicating that

the ovarian follicle is maternally-derived (Supp. Fig. S7).

Patterns of gene expression in X. malinche, X. birchmanni, and X. cortezi ovaries

To gain insight into the mechanisms underlying differences in reproductive strategy

between these closely related species, we compared gene expression patterns in ovarian tissue

from *X. malinche, X. birchmanni,* and *X. cortezi* from "early" pregnancy (fully-yolked

unfertilized or stage <5) and "late" pregnancy (25-45; Table S15). Principal component analysis

shows that PC1 explains about 31% of the variation in ovary expression and correlates with

species while PC2 explains about 17% of total variation and correlates with species and rearing-

environment (Fig. 3A). Within *X. malinche*, expression patterns in ovarian tissues separate along

PC1 by the developmental stage of the embryos they contained, while in *X. birchmanni* and *X.*

cortezi they do not (Fig. 3A). Of the genes expressed in the ovaries of both species (adjusted p-

value<0.05), *X. malinche* differs from *X. birchmanni* in expression for 13% (2,202) and 28%

(4,934) of genes in early and late pregnancy, respectively, and from *X. cortezi* for 45% (7,957)

and 32% (5,639) of genes, respectively. Notably, we see that more genes respond to embryonic

developmental stage in *X. malinche* ovaries (310) compared to *X. birchmanni* (63) and *X. cortezi*

(130) ovaries. Although we do not focus on them in the main text, we performed similar analyses

of genes that were differentially expressed in developing embryos across the three species

(Supplementary Information 8).

Several genes that are specifically involved in pregnancy and nutrient provisioning in

placental taxa, including mammals and matrotrophic poeciliids, are significantly upregulated in

X. malinche compared to its close relatives. Notably, we find that the prolactin signaling

pathway, which has been implicated in the evolution of matrotrophy in livebearers (Guernsey et

al. 2020), is strongly upregulated in *X. malinche* ovaries. Prolactin receptor and releaser genes

are highly expressed in *X. malinche* ovaries in both early and late pregnancy compared to *X.*

birchmanni and *X. cortezi* ovaries (adjusted p-value<0.001 for all comparisons; Fig. 3B).

Prolactin receptors (*prlr*) bind the hormone prolactin and are thought to be directly involved in

trophoblast invasion for nutrient uptake in mice (Stefanoska et al. 2013). Prolactin-releasing

peptide receptor (*prlhr*) regulates prolactin expression. Interestingly, *prlhr* is also upregulated in

late pregnancy *X. birchmanni* ovaries (adjusted p-value<0.001), while we did not detect

expression of this gene in *X. cortezi* ovaries (Fig. 3B).

Though there is transcription of prolactin receiving and releasing machinery in late-

pregnancy *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* ovaries, we do not see expression of prolactin itself

based on RNAseq data (as expected since prolactin is a hormone translated in the pituitary

gland). To evaluate whether prolactin protein appears in *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* ovaries,

we performed immunohistochemistry on sections of late pregnancy ovaries for both species (Fig.

3C). We find that prolactin protein is present in both *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* maternal

ovarian follicle and embryonic tissues. Additionally, as expected, prolactin is present in retinal

and mesenchymal tissue of embryos in both species (Fig. 3C).

To explore biological pathways potentially involved in nutrient transfer and provisioning

in *X. malinche*, we first looked for enriched Gene Ontology pathways in genes that were

significantly differentially expressed between *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* ovaries. Notably

artery development is enriched, and the genes in this category are upregulated in *X. malinche*

ovaries (p-value < 0.002; Supp. Fig. S8). We also see enrichment of several potentially relevant

metabolism and nutrient transport pathways, including acyl- and acetyl-CoA metabolism in late-

stage *X. malinche* ovaries (Table S16).

We also looked at groups of co-expressed genes and asked which of these groups are

significantly associated with late-stage pregnancy in *X. malinche* (see Supp. Fig. S10 for module-

trait correlation matrix). Using WGCNA, we identified 17 ovary co-expression gene clusters

significantly associated with *X. malinche* ancestry (p-value<0.05), 11 of which were associated

with late-pregnancy *X. malinche* ovaries. Gene Ontology enrichment of these clusters revealed

that the 'darkorange2' cluster was highly enriched for acyl- and acetyl-CoA biosynthesis and

metabolic pathways, as well as vascular growth and signaling pathways, like artery development

and vasculogenesis (Fig. 3D, Supp. Fig. S9). Many of the represented acyl- and acetyl-CoA

metabolism genes are strongly upregulated or downregulated in *X. malinche*, particularly in late

pregnancy, compared to *X. birchmanni* and *X. cortezi* ovaries (Fig. 3D, Supp. Fig. S9). In

mammals, fatty acids like acyl-CoA are an important source of energy for both placental and

fetal growth during gestation and are transferred through the placenta to the fetus during mid- to

later-stages of pregnancy (Chavan-Gautam et al. 2018). The 'darkorange' cluster was enriched in

amino acid biosynthesis and metabolism pathways, and the 'violet' cluster was enriched for

intracellular and transmembrane signaling pathways.

Testing the potential role of resource availability in driving the evolution of large offspring size

We tested the response of offspring of both species to two ecological factors that differ

between the *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* environments. We found that the larger offspring of

X. malinche did not have improved minimum thermal tolerance compared to *X. birchmanni* fry

(Supplementary Information 11). We thus turned to investigating another ecological factor that

correlates with temperature: food availability. Cooler, headwater habitats are generally less

resource-rich than warmer downstream habitat (Reznick 1982*b*). Given low winter temperatures

observed in *X. malinche* populations (Supp. Fig. S11; Payne et al. 2022), we asked whether cold

temperatures (and presumably low primary production and food availability associated with such

temperatures) were linked to seasonal breeding in *X. malinche* populations and starvation

tolerance in newborn fry.

Water temperatures at *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* sites are coolest from November to

March with peak lows in January and February and are warmest from April to October with peak

highs in May and June (Supp. Fig. S11). The shifts in temperature roughly correspond with the

rainy season and river flooding, which typically starts late June and ends in October. We

collected mature females from natural populations of both *X. birchmanni* and *X. malinche* across

seasons. We found that while many *X. birchmanni* females were reproducing regardless of

sampling month or season (the lowest pregnancy rate observed was 34% in February), <20% of

X. malinche mature females were pregnant from February – August, while 80% were pregnant in

May (Supp. Fig. S12; Table S22).

To evaluate how relative female condition may vary seasonally, we compared total lipids

from wild nonpregnant Chicayotla *X. malinche* and Coachuilco *X. birchmanni* females and found

temporal differences in fat content between species. In February, before the *X. malinche* breeding

season, we found no significant difference in percent fat content between *X. malinche* and *X.*

birchmanni females (t-value=1.64, p-value=0.12; Fig. 4A). However, in September, after the *X.*

malinche breeding season, *X. birchmanni* females had significantly higher fat content than *X.*

malinche (t-value=-12.45, p-value=1.30×10^{-6}), consistent with limited resource availability in *X.*

malinche habitat.

To directly compare how newborn fry of the two species respond to reduced food

availability, we exposed *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* newborn fry to abundant-food and no-

food conditions and compared standard length, dry weight, and fat content between treatments

and species. Surprisingly, after three days of feeding, *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* fry were

approximately the same standard length and dry weight (ANOVA and Tukey post-hoc test p-

value=0.76 and 0.91, respectively). Compared to their initial standard lengths, *X. birchmanni* fry

grew 4× more rapidly (~0.32mm/day) than *X. malinche* fry (~0.08mm/day) (Supp. Fig. 13A).

However, while both *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* unfed newborn fry weighed less than their

fed counterparts, we found that on average food deprivation for three days impacted *X. malinche*

fry weight less than *X. birchmanni* fry, suggesting that they may be more resilient to starvation

immediately after birth (Fig. 4B). We found no significant difference in total body fat content

between species for either treatment (Supp. Fig. S13B).

Differences in viability by cross direction

In generating F_1 crosses for this and other projects, we have found a clear difference in

the frequency of premature birth and stillbirth in crosses between *X. malinche* mothers and *X.*

birchmanni fathers compared to crosses between *X. birchmanni* mothers and *X. malinche* fathers.

Given that these crosses are genetically identical except for the Y chromosome and

mitochondrial haplotype (Moran et al. 2021), this raises the possibility that maternal effects may

impact survival of the F_1 fry.

We found high rates of premature birth in crosses between *X. birchmanni* mothers and *X.*

malinche fathers (Table S23). Of 25 crosses generated by artificial insemination between 2011-

2022, only eight F_1 fry survived (out of 64 born). In five of these crosses, the mother also

suffered mortality. In sixteen out of the 25 crosses, mothers gave birth to morphologically

premature fry (Supp. Fig. S14), which have a low probability of survival (~98% mortality,

(Moran et al. 2021). In the ten crosses where fry were born at term, 50% contained stillborn fry,

versus 7% for premature broods (Fisher's exact p-value=0.04). Maternal mortality was observed

in 30% of these full-term crosses, versus 13% of crosses where fry were born prematurely

(though this difference was not significant; Fisher's exact test p-value=0.1). For cases where we

developmentally staged premature fry, individuals tended to be around stage 40.

By contrast, we have never documented a premature birth, stillbirth, or maternal

mortality for *X. malinche* mothers. To date we have generated >190 adult F_1 hybrids and 1,253

adult F_2 hybrids from intercrossing these individuals. Premature birth has also not been observed

in F_2 crosses between these F_1 individuals.

Discussion

Offspring size is a complex trait that impacts both parent and offspring fitness. Compared

with its sister species, *X. birchmanni*, and other *Xiphophorus* species, *X. malinche* produce

exceptionally large fry. Though offspring size has been shown to be sensitive to ecological

conditions and the maternal environment in livebearers (Reznick 1982*a*; Reznick and Yang

1993; Reznick et al. 1996*b*; Bashey 2006*b*, 2008), we see this size difference in the offspring of

lab-raised individuals, and estimate that the broad-sense heritability of offspring size attributable

to ancestry is 0.25. Moreover, the proportion of the genome derived from *X. malinche* impacts

offspring size in natural hybrid populations.

Larger offspring size generally increases the probability of survival to adulthood across a

variety of species (Brockelman 1975; McGurk 1986; Tessier and Consolatti 1989; Einum and

Fleming 2000; Marshall and Keough 2007; Jørgensen et al. 2011; Rollinson and Hutchings 2013;

Bowen et al. 2015). Given that *X. malinche* live in unique environments compared to other

species in the genus, we predicted that larger offspring size may have evolved in response to

ecological pressures – specifically, limited nutrient availability. Sampling for this study revealed

that while *X. birchmanni* breed across seasons, *X. malinche* breed more seasonally, with peak

productivity in the warmest months. Notably, before the *X. malinche* breeding season, we find

that nonpregnant *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* females have comparable body fat content.

However, after the *X. malinche* breeding season, *X. malinche* have significantly lower body fat

content than *X. birchmanni* females, hinting that resources are generally more limited in *X.*

malinche habitat.

Past work in guppies has shown that under limited food conditions, mothers produce

larger offspring (Reznick 1982*b*; Reznick and Yang 1993; Reznick et al. 1996*b*; Bashey 2006*b*),

which presumably have a fitness advantage in lower resource environments (Pettersen et al.

2015, 2022). We directly tested offspring performance in food-depleted conditions in a

controlled lab experiment. We find that starved newborn *X. malinche* retain more weight than

newborn *X. birchmanni*. This suggests that *X. malinche* fry may be more resilient to a low

resource environment, consistent with resource limitation (or high competition) as a driver of the

evolution of large offspring in *X. malinche* (Bashey 2006*b*, 2008). Notably, in scenarios where

resources were not limited, newborn *X. birchmanni* fry grew more rapidly than *X. malinche* and

matched their size within days. This pattern could hint that there is an advantage to being large

early, consistent with previous work in other taxa (Chambers et al. 1989; Gliwicz and Guisande

1992; Bashey 2008).

There are two mechanisms through which livebearing fish can produce larger fry. First,

mothers may produce larger eggs. Second, mothers may continue to provision nutrients to

offspring over embryonic development (note that matrotrophy does not predictably lead to large

offspring at birth across taxa; (Furness et al. 2021). We evaluated evidence for both mechanisms

in *X. malinche*. We measured dry weights for embryos across ten embryonic stages ranging from

unfertilized fully-yolked eggs to fully developed juveniles for *X. malinche, X. birchmanni,* and

their close relative, *X. cortezi*. Notably, unfertilized fully-yolked eggs and early stage embryos

are similar in size between *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* (Fig. 2). However, *X. malinche* and *X.*

birchmanni embryos diverge in size around stage 20 of embryonic development. While *X.*

birchmanni embryos undergo an overall decline in dry weight after stage 15, *X. malinche*

embryos maintain roughly the same weight over development. We summarize this difference in

developmental profile with the first estimates of Matrotrophy Index for *X. malinche* (0.98) and *X.*

birchmanni (0.66)*.* This estimate for *X. malinche* is consistent with *X. malinche* embryos

receiving some nutrients from their mother over development, contributing to larger offspring

size at birth in *X. malinche*. It is notable that although *X. birchmanni* do not appear to provision

nutrients during development, *X. birchmanni* also has fry that are much larger at birth than other

Xiphophorus species. We were unable to collect sufficient samples to accurately quantify

Matrotrophy Index from these species but we predict that they may produce smaller eggs than *X.*

birchmanni, and indeed the few samples we have are consistent with this prediction (Fig. S17).

Research on highly matrotrophic species (e.g. with Matrotrophy Indices>40) has shown

that maternal and embryonic tissues interact to form an interface for nutrient transfer, with some

species forming placental structures of varying complexity (Guernsey et al. 2020). To look for

evidence of a more complex maternal-offspring interface in *X. malinche*, we quantified

characteristics of the maternal-embryo interface in histological sections of late-stage pregnancy

in *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* ovaries. In highly matrotrophic poeciliids, embryonic and

maternal blood vessels range from apposed to fused (Ponce de León and Uribe 2021) and the

ovarian follicular epithelium is dense and maximizes surface area contact with embryos for

nutrient transfer (Kwan et al. 2015). We did not see consistent differences in ovarian follicle

thickness or vascularization between stained sections of late-stage *X. malinche* and *X.*

birchmanni ovaries. However, we found it difficult to compare these traits between 2-

dimensional slices of ovary. Because post-fertilization nutrient provisioning in *X. malinche* arose

recently and is less substantial than that observed in other species, we might predict differences

in ovary morphology between these species to be subtle. Future work should focus on obtaining

3-dimensional images suitable for quantitative comparisons of the whole ovary.

To further investigate differences in maternal nutrient provisioning at the molecular level,

we quantified gene expression patterns in early- and late-stage ovarian tissue from pregnant *X.*

malinche and *X. birchmanni*. The observed expression patterns raise multiple possible

mechanisms through which post-fertilization nutrient provisioning may be occurring in *X.*

malinche. Receptor and releaser genes for prolactin, a pituitary hormone important during

pregnancy in mammals and in matrotrophic poecilids (Menzies et al. 2011; Guernsey et al.

2020), are highly expressed in the *X. malinche* ovarian follicle compared to *X. birchmanni* (and

X. cortezi) follicles both before and during pregnancy. Combined with evidence that *X. malinche*

mothers appear to provision their embryos over development to a greater extent than *X.*

birchmanni mothers, this result suggests that prolactin may be a key candidate for the evolution

of matrotrophy in livebearers (as proposed by Guernsey et al. 2020). Immunostains of prolactin

in sections of late-stage pregnant *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* ovaries confirms that prolactin

is present in the ovarian follicle of both species. Given these results, we predict that the striking

differences in abundance of prolactin releasing and receiving machinery that we observe at the

gene expression level (Fig. 3) may regulate the downstream transfer and function of prolactin in

the two species, which includes nutrient transport.

While offspring almost universally benefit from being larger at birth, producing large

offspring can be costly for parents (Einum and Fleming 2000; Walker et al. 2008; Ljungström et

al. 2016) and constrained by environmental conditions (Reznick and Endler 1982; Hutchings

1991; Janzen et al. 2000; Allen et al. 2008; Marshall and Keough 2008; Pettersen et al. 2022).

These pressures can result in parent-offspring conflict in the evolution of offspring size (Trivers

1974; Crespi and Semeniuk 2004; Moore 2012). Similarly, if males and females differ in their

level of resource investment in offspring, conflict between the maternal and paternal genomes

can drive similar dynamics (Moore and Haig 1991), driving evolutionary arms races between

paternally contributed factors that increase offspring growth and maternally contributed factors

that suppress them (Moore and Haig 1991; Barlow and Bartolomei 2014). In hybrids between

species, misregulation of these interactions can result in larger or smaller offspring than expected

(i.e. depending on the cross direction) and impact viability of hybrid offspring (Shi et al. 2004;

Brekke & Good 2014), including in livebearing fish (Schrader et al. 2013). Given these findings

and the large difference in *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* embryos during development, we

were curious to understand whether this trait impacts reproductive isolation between these

species, which naturally hybridize in the wild (Culumber et al. 2011). In the lab, *X. malinche*

mothers and *X. birchmanni* fathers successfully produce viable F_1 offspring and subsequent

early-generation crosses, whereas the reverse cross is typically aborted late in pregnancy (by

stage 40). Asymmetric reciprocal F_1 cross viability has been shown to stem from differences in

nutrient provisioning over development in other poeciliid species (Turcotte et al. 2008; Schrader

et al. 2013). However, this case is unique in that F_1s are inviable when the mother is

lecithotrophic and therefore completely controls nutrient provisions (i.e. the matrotrophic

paternal genome cannot affect nutrient allotment). We initially hypothesized that differences in

provisioning strategy might result in embryos that grow too large too quickly for *X. birchmanni*

mothers to sustain. However, we found it difficult to collect stage matched offspring in F_1 hybrid

crosses with *X. birchmanni* mothers, resulting in a low sample size or this comparison (Fig. 2D).

While initial results do not suggest size differences compared to stage matched *X. birchmanni*

embryos, rigorously testing this hypothesis is an important direction for future work.

Alternatively, the energetic demands of F_1 embryos may outpace the nutrients stored in yolk

from *X. birchmanni* mothers early on, which could lead to malnourishment. Consistent with this

hypothesis, we find that many offspring from this cross are stillborn and the majority are born

prematurely.

Our data also shows that offspring size is a complex trait, and the size of any individual

offspring is impacted by many variables, including developmental stage, mother size, and mother

environment. Accounting for all of these effects make this trait difficult to characterize,

complicating comparisons of offspring size and embryonic development profiles between

livebearing species. Recently, Skalkos et al. (2023) reviewed current limitations in how

matrotrophy is studied for teleost fish. Our findings underscore some of their points, including

that direct measures of early- and late-stage embryo weight, rather than predictive measures

using regression-based approaches, should be used to estimate Matrotrophy Index where possible

(since stages are morphological categories that do not linearly track developmental time).

Moreover, if provisioning varies over development (as hinted at by some of our data), more

nuanced analysis methods may be more appropriate. Future work should consider these factors.

We note that in our work using lab populations served as a powerful resource for confirming

patterns inferred from wild populations (Fig. 2), as they allowed us to control for many of the

environmental variables that impact wild collections.

Using a combination of morphometric and molecular data, we document immense

variation in offspring size across *Xiphophorus* species and provide the first evidence of incipient

matrotrophy and post-fertilization nutrient provisioning mechanism in the *Xiphophorus*.

Importantly, because *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* are recently diverged (~250,000

generations ago), this is an example of recent shift in reproductive strategy. Parent of origin

incompatibility phenotypes associated with spontaneous abortion late in development hint that

this difference in reproductive strategy could contribute to the diverse reproductive barriers

present in these young sister species.

Data Availability

All data is publicly available. Raw sequences are available under NCBI BioProject

PRJNAXXXX. All code and data files can be found in the accompanying GitHub repository at

https://github.com/cypayne/swordtail-offspring-size.

Acknowledgements

We thank Moi Exposito-Alonso and members of the Schumer lab for helpful feedback on

previous versions of this manuscript. We are grateful to the Mexican federal government for

permission to collect samples. We thank Stanford University and the Stanford Research

Computing Center for providing computational support for this project. This study was

supported by a Society for Integrative & Comparative Biology GIAR grant to CYP, an American

Society of Naturalists Student Research Award to CYP, and a Human Frontiers in Science

Programme grant (RGY0081), HHMI Freeman-Hrabowski award, Pew Biomedical Scholars,

and Searle Scholars Award to MS.

Figures

Figure 1. Comparisons of offspring size at birth across *Xiphophorus* species and their hybrids.

A) Violin plots of standard length (mm) of newborn fry from five *Xiphophorus* species – *X.*

malinche, *X. birchmanni*, *X. cortezi*, *X. pygmaeus*, and *X. variatus*. Phylogenetic relationships

between species are shown schematically on the x-axis (following (Preising et al. 2022). **B)**

Violin plots of standard length (mm) of newborn fry of different groups, including *X. malinche*,

X. birchmanni, F_1 hybrids, F_2 hybrids, and natural hybrids ("CALL" – Calnali Low hybrid

population). For both **A & B**, each data point represents the average standard length of newborn

fry from one brood. For each group, boxes show the mean ± 1 standard error.

Figure 2. Comparisons of embryo weight throughout development and ovarian structures

between *X. birchmanni* and *X. malinche*. **A)** Dry weights of wild-caught *X. birchmanni* and *X.*

malinche embryos do not significantly differ shortly after fertilization but are substantially

different in weight just before birth (as well as at birth, see Fig. 1). Plot shows partial residuals of

stage 10 and stage 50 embryo dry weights correcting for season and mother standard length as

covariates and brood ID as a random effect. Points show the partial residuals and boxes show

mean ±1 standard error, colored by species (*X. birchmanni*/Xbir – pink and *X. malinche*/Xmal –

blue). The y-axis was limited to 0.002-0.005g to show the mean differences between species by

stage more clearly; however, several points were cut out of the plot frame. The full plot including

all partial residual points is shown in Fig. S5A. **B**) Developmental size profiles for wild-caught

X. birchmanni (Xbir – pink) and *X. malinche* (Xmal – blue) show that the difference in embryo

size between these species may fluctuate throughout development (or be impacted by variation in

sampling), but appears to diverge after stage 15. Developmental stage is plotted on the x-axis

(with images of *X. malinche* embryos at corresponding stages) and the partial residuals of

average embryo dry weight per brood (after correcting for maternal size and collection season) is

plotted on the y-axis. Points show the partial residuals and boxes show mean ±1 standard error,

colored by species. **C**) Though difficult to accurately stage (see Methods), unfertilized, fully-

yolked eggs do not significantly differ in size between species (p-value=0.18). Violin plot

compares stage 0 (fully-yolked but unfertilized) eggs between wild-caught *X. birchmanni* and *X.*

malinche. Points show the partial residuals and boxes show mean ±1 standard error, colored by

species. **D**) Patterns observed in **B** are replicated in stage ≥30 lab-crossed parental species raised

under common conditions, with *X. birchmanni* embryos being significantly smaller than *X.*

malinche later in development (p-value=0.0005). Given the small sample size of late-stage F_1

hybrids from *X. birchmanni* mothers (bir×mal F_1), we have limited power to evaluate whether

they differ in size from the other crosses. F_1 hybrids from *X. malinche* mothers (mal×bir F_1)

trend towards being smaller than pure *X. malinche* fry (p-value=0.08), hinting that the trait could

be impacted by both genetic and maternal effects. **E)** Histological slides stained with

Hematoxylin & Eosin of *X. birchmanni* (left) and *X. malinche* (right) ovaries derived from

females pregnant with late-stage embryos (stage 35 and 40, respectively) are structurally similar.

Figure 3. Gene expression analysis hints at a role for prolactin, fatty acid biosynthesis, and

vascular growth pathways in nutrient provisioning post-fertilization in *X. malinche*. **A**) Principal

component analysis of transformed gene abundance counts from ovary RNAseq data from *X.*

birchmanni (pink), *X. malinche* (blue), and *X. cortezi* (yellow). For each species, samples

included ovarian tissue from both early- and late-stage pregnancies. For *X. birchmanni* and *X.*

malinche, two wild-caught samples were also analyzed (denoted by stars and labels). Samples

cluster by species, and for *X. malinche*, by developmental stage. Colored envelops show the

space in PC1 and PC2 occupied by all samples of a given species. **B**) Prolactin receptor (*prlr*)

and releaser (*prlhr*) genes are upregulated in *X. malinche* ovaries, regardless of pregnancy status

or sample origin. For each species, mean normalized read count ±2 standard error is shown for

early-pregnancy samples on the left (denoted with diamonds) and late-pregnancy samples on the

right (denoted with circles). Semi-transparent points show data from each individual (stars for

wild-collected). **C**) Expression heatmap of genes from acyl- and acetyl-CoA biosynthesis and

vasculature development GO pathways that were enriched in the "darkorange2" WGCNA

cluster, which was significantly associated with late pregnancy *X. malinche* ovaries. Sample IDs

appear on the x-axis, gene annotations appear on the y-axis. The blue to yellow color bar

indicates the difference in expression, with yellow colors indicating greater expression than

average and blue colors indicating lower expression than average. **D**) Immunofluorescence

demonstrates the presence of the prolactin protein (magenta) in sections from both pregnant *X.*

birchmanni females (i.-iii.) and *X. malinche* (iv.-vi.). As expected, prolactin positive cells are

identified throughout the developing embryo in mesenchymal and neuronal tissues (such as the

eye, i., iv.). Both species also express prolactin in the maternal membranes surrounding the ovary

and embryos. Yellow boxes identify the area highlighted in the higher magnification images. iii.

and vi. show prolactin signal only, without DAPI counterstain.

Figure 4. Comparisons of responses to food availability in *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni*. **A)**

Boxplots showing fat content of non-pregnant *X. malinche* and *X. birchmanni* females collected

from wild populations in different seasons. *X. malinche* females have much lower fat content

before their breeding season than *X. birchmanni*. Note that fat content is not directly comparable

across the two collections given that samples were processed in different batches. **B)** Results of

starvation experiments in newborn *X. birchmanni* and *X. malinche* fry. *X. birchmanni* (pink) and

X. malinche (blue) did not significantly differ in weight three days after birth when both were

fed, indicating that *X. birchmanni* fry gain weight rapidly after birth (see Fig. 1A). However, in

starvation conditions, *X. birchmanni* fry weighed significantly less than *X. malinche* fry,

suggesting that *X. malinche* fry have improved tolerance to starvation.

References

Allen, R. M., Y. M. Buckley, and D. J. Marshall. 2008. Offspring Size Plasticity in Response to Intraspecific Competition: An Adaptive Maternal Effect across Life-History Stages. The American Naturalist 171:225–237.

Barlow, D. P., and M. S. Bartolomei. 2014. Genomic Imprinting in Mammals. Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Biology 6:a018382.

Bashey, F. 2006*a*. Cross-Generational Environmental Effects and the Evolution of Offspring Size in the Trinidadian Guppy Poecilia Reticulata. Evolution 60:348–361.

———. 2006*b*. Cross-Generational Environmental Effects and the Evolution of Offspring Size in the Trinidadian Guppy Poecilia Reticulata. Evolution 60:348–361.

———. 2008. Competition as a Selective Mechanism for Larger Offspring Size in Guppies. Oikos 117:104–113.

Berkeley, S. A., C. Chapman, and S. M. Sogard. 2004. Maternal Age as a Determinant of Larval Growth and Survival in a Marine Fish, Sebastes Melanops. Ecology 85:1258–1264.

Blackburn, D. G. 2015. Evolution of vertebrate viviparity and specializations for fetal nutrition: A quantitative and qualitative analysis. Journal of Morphology 276:961–990.

Bowen, W. D., C. E. den Heyer, J. I. McMillan, and S. J. Iverson. 2015. Offspring size at weaning affects survival to recruitment and reproductive performance of primiparous gray seals. Ecology and Evolution 5:1412–1424.

Bray, N. L., H. Pimentel, P. Melsted, and L. Pachter. 2016. Near-optimal probabilistic RNA-seq quantification. Nature Biotechnology 34:525–527.

Breheny, P., and W. Burchett. 2017. Visualization of Regression Models Using visreg. The R Journal 9:56.

Brockelman, W. Y. 1975. Competition, the Fitness of Offspring, and Optimal Clutch Size. The American Naturalist 109:677–699.

Chambers, R. C., W. C. Leggett, and J. A. Brown. 1989. Egg Size, Female Effects, and the Correlations Between Early Life History Traits of Capelin, Mallotus villosus: An Appraisal at the Individual Levell. FISHERY BULLETIN 87.

Chavan-Gautam, P., A. Rani, and D. J. Freeman. 2018. Chapter Six - Distribution of Fatty Acids and Lipids During Pregnancy. Pages 209–239 *in* G. S. Makowski, ed. Advances in Clinical Chemistry (Vol. 84). Elsevier.

Constantz, G., G. Meffe, and F. Snelson. 1989. Ecology and evolution of livebearing fishes (Poeciliidae). Reproductive Biology of Poeciliid Fishes. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Crespi, B., and C. Semeniuk. 2004. Parent-offspring conflict in the evolution of vertebrate reproductive mode. The American Naturalist 163:635–653.

Culumber, Z. W., H. S. Fisher, M. Tobler, M. Mateos, P. H. Barber, M. D. Sorenson, and G. G. Rosenthal. 2011. Replicated hybrid zones of Xiphophorus swordtails along an elevational gradient. Molecular Ecology 20:342–356.

Durinck, S., P. T. Spellman, E. Birney, and W. Huber. 2009. Mapping identifiers for the integration of genomic datasets with the R/Bioconductor package biomaRt. Nature Protocols 4:1184–1191.

Einum, S., and I. A. Fleming. 2000. Selection Against Late Emergence and Small Offspring in Atlantic Salmon (salmo Salar). Evolution 54:628–639.

Falcon, S., and R. Gentleman. 2007. Using GOstats to test gene lists for GO term association. Bioinformatics (Oxford, England) 23:257–258.

Furness, A. I., J. C. Avise, B. J. A. Pollux, Y. Reynoso, and D. N. Reznick. 2021. The evolution
of the placenta in poeciliid fishes. Current Biology 31:2004-2011.e5.
Furness, A. I., and I. Capellini. 2019. The evolution of parental care diversity in amphibians.
Nature Communications 10:4709.
Furness, A. I., B. J. A. Pollux, R. W. Meredith, M. S. Springer, and D. N. Reznick. 2019. How
conflict shapes evolution in poeciliid fishes. Nature Communications 10:3335.
Gliwicz, Z. M., and C. Guisande. 1992. Family Planning in Daphnia: Resistance to Starvation in
Offspring Born to Mothers Grown at Different Food Levels. Oecologia 91:463–467.
Griffith, O. W., and G. P. Wagner. 2017. The placenta as a model for understanding the origin
and evolution of vertebrate organs. Nature Ecology & Evolution 1:1–10.
Gross, M. R. 2005. The Evolution of Parental Care. The Quarterly Review of Biology 80:37–45.
Guernsey, M. W., H. van Kruistum, D. N. Reznick, B. J. A. Pollux, and J. C. Baker. 2020.
Molecular Signatures of Placentation and Secretion Uncovered in Poeciliopsis Maternal
Follicles. Molecular Biology and Evolution 37:2679–2690.
Hagmayer, A., A. I. Furness, D. N. Reznick, and B. J. A. Pollux. 2018. Maternal size and body
condition predict the amount of post-fertilization maternal provisioning in matrotrophic fish.
Ecology and Evolution 8:12386–12396.
Hutchings, J. A. 1991. FITNESS CONSEQUENCES OF VARIATION IN EGG SIZE AND
FOOD ABUNDANCE IN BROOK TROUT SALVELINUS FONTINALIS. Evolution;
International Journal of Organic Evolution 45:1162–1168.
Janzen, F. J., J. K. Tucker, and G. L. Paukstis. 2000. Experimental analysis of an early life-
history stage: avian predation selects for larger body size of hatchling turtles. Journal of
Evolutionary Biology 13:947–954.
Jennions, M. D., B. B. M. Wong, A. Cowling, and C. Donnelly. 2006. Life-history phenotypes in
a live-bearing fish Brachyrhaphis episcopi living under different predator regimes: seasonal
effects? Environmental Biology of Fishes 76:211–219.
Jørgensen, C., S. K. Auer, and D. N. Reznick. 2011. A Model for Optimal Offspring Size in Fish,
Including Live-Bearing and Parental Effects. The American Naturalist 177:E119–E135.
Jue, N. K., R. J. Foley, D. N. Reznick, R. J. O'Neill, and M. J. O'Neill. 2018. Tissue-Specific
Transcriptome for Poeciliopsis prolifica Reveals Evidence for Genetic Adaptation Related to the
Evolution of a Placental Fish. G3: Genes|Genomes|Genetics 8:2181–2192.
Kaplan, R. H. 1992. Greater Maternal Investment Can Decrease Offspring Survival in the Frog
Bombina Orientalis. Ecology 73:280–288.
Kindsvater, H. K., G. G. Rosenthal, and S. H. Alonzo. 2012. Maternal size and age shape
offspring size in a live-bearing fish, Xiphophorus birchmanni. PloS One 7:e48473.
Klug, H., and M. B. Bonsall. 2014. What are the benefits of parental care? The importance of
parental effects on developmental rate. Ecology and Evolution 4:2330–2351.
Krueger, F., F. James, P. Ewels, E. Afyounian, and B. Schuster-Boeckler. 2021.
FelixKrueger/TrimGalore: v0.6.7 - DOI via Zenodo. Zenodo.
Kwan, L., M. Fris, F. H. Rodd, L. Rowe, L. Tuhela, and T. M. Panhuis. 2015. An examination of
the variation in maternal placentae across the genus Poeciliopsis (Poeciliidae). Journal of
Morphology 276:707–720.
Langfelder, P., and S. Horvath. 2008. WGCNA: an R package for weighted correlation network
analysis. BMC Bioinformatics 9:559.

Leips, J., F. Helen Rodd, and J. Travis. 2013. The adaptive significance of population differentiation in offspring size of the least killifish, Heterandria formosa. Ecology and Evolution 3:948–960.

Ljungström, G., M. Stjernstedt, E. Wapstra, and M. Olsson. 2016. Selection and constraints on offspring size-number trade-offs in sand lizards (Lacerta agilis). Journal of Evolutionary Biology 29:979–990.

Love, M. I., W. Huber, and S. Anders. 2014. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. Genome Biology 15:550.

Marshall, D. J., S. S. Heppell, S. B. Munch, and R. R. Warner. 2010. The relationship between maternal phenotype and offspring quality: Do older mothers really produce the best offspring? Ecology 91:2862–2873.

Marshall, D. J., and M. J. Keough. 2007. The Evolutionary Ecology of Offspring Size in Marine Invertebrates. Pages 1–60 in Advances in Marine Biology (Vol. 53). Academic Press.

Marshall, D. J., and M. J. Keough. 2008. The Relationship between Offspring Size and Performance in the Sea. The American Naturalist 171:214–224.

Martin, M. 2011. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads. EMBnet.journal 17:10–12.

McGurk, M. 1986. Natural mortality of marine pelagic fish eggs and larvae: role of spatial patchiness. Marine Ecology Progress Series 34:227–242.

Meiri, S., A. Feldman, R. Schwarz, and R. Shine. 2020. Viviparity does not affect the numbers and sizes of reptile offspring. Journal of Animal Ecology 89:360–369.

Menzies, B. R., A. J. Pask, and M. B. Renfree. 2011. Placental expression of pituitary hormones is an ancestral feature of therian mammals. EvoDevo 2:16.

Meredith, R. W., J. E. Janečka, J. Gatesy, O. A. Ryder, C. A. Fisher, E. C. Teeling, A. Goodbla, et al. 2011. Impacts of the Cretaceous Terrestrial Revolution and KPg Extinction on Mammal Diversification. Science 334:521–524.

Moore, T. 2012. Review: Parent-offspring conflict and the control of placental function. Placenta 33 Suppl:S33-36.

Moore, T., and D. Haig. 1991. Genomic imprinting in mammalian development: a parental tug-of-war. Trends in Genetics 7:45–49.

Moran, B. M., C. Y. Payne, D. L. Powell, E. N. K. Iverson, S. M. Banerjee, Q. K. Langdon, T. R. Gunn, et al. 2021. A Lethal Genetic Incompatibility between Naturally Hybridizing Species in Mitochondrial Complex I. bioRxiv 2021.07.13.452279.

Morgan, Martin, S. Falcon, and R. Gentleman. n.d. GSEABase: Gene set enrichment data structures and methods version 1.52.1 from Bioconductor.

Morris, M. R., and M. J. Ryan. 1992. Breeding Cycles in Natural Populations of Xiphophorus nigrensis, X. multilineatus, and X. pygmaeus. Copeia 1992:1074–1077.

Olivera-Tlahuel, C., A. G. Ossip-Klein, H. S. Espinosa-Pérez, and J. J. Zúñiga-Vega. 2015. Have superfetation and matrotrophy facilitated the evolution of larger offspring in poeciliid fishes? Biological journal of the Linnean Society. Linnean Society of London 116:787–804.

Payne, C., R. Bovio, D. L. Powell, T. R. Gunn, S. M. Banerjee, V. Grant, G. G. Rosenthal, et al. n.d. Genomic insights into variation in thermotolerance between hybridizing swordtail fishes. Molecular Ecology n/a.

Pettersen, A. K., L. Schuster, and N. B. Metcalfe. 2022. The Evolution of Offspring Size: A Metabolic Scaling Perspective. Integrative and Comparative Biology 62:1492–1502.

Pettersen, A. K., C. R. White, and D. J. Marshall. 2015. Why does offspring size affect performance? Integrating metabolic scaling with life-history theory. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 282:20151946.

Pires, M. N., J. Arendt, and D. N. Reznick. 2010. The evolution of placentas and superfetation in the fish genus Poecilia (Cyprinodontiformes: Poeciliidae: subgenera Micropoecilia and Acanthophacelus). Biological Journal of the Linnean Society 99:784–796.

Pollux, B. J. A., R. W. Meredith, M. S. Springer, T. Garland, and D. N. Reznick. 2014. The evolution of the placenta drives a shift in sexual selection in livebearing fish. Nature 513:233–236.

Pollux, B. J. A., M. N. Pires, A. I. Banet, and D. N. Reznick. 2009. Evolution of Placentas in the Fish Family Poeciliidae: An Empirical Study of Macroevolution. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 40:271–289.

Pollux, B. J. A., and D. N. Reznick. 2011. Matrotrophy limits a female's ability to adaptively adjust offspring size and fecundity in fluctuating environments. Functional Ecology 25:747–756.

Ponce de León, J. L., and M. C. Uribe. 2021. Morphology of yolk and pericardial sacs in lecithotrophic and matrotrophic nutrition in poeciliid fishes. Journal of Morphology 282:887–899.

Preising, G. A., T. Gunn, J. J. Baczenas, A. Pollock, D. L. Powell, T. O. Dodge, J. A. M. Kairuz, et al. 2022. Recurrent evolution of small body size and loss of the sword ornament in Northern Swordtail fish. bioRxiv.

Reznick, D. 1981. "Grandfather Effects": The Genetics of Interpopulation Differences in Offspring Size in the Mosquito Fish. Evolution 35:941–953.

———. 1982a. Genetic Determination of Offspring Size in the Guppy (Poecilia reticulata). The American Naturalist 120:181–188.

———. 1982b. The Impact of Predation on Life History Evolution in Trinidadian Guppies: Genetic Basis of Observed Life History Patterns. Evolution 36:1236–1250.

Reznick, D., H. Callahan, and R. Llauredo. 1996a. Maternal Effects on Offspring Quality in Poeciliid Fishes. American Zoologist 36:147–156.

———. 1996b. Maternal Effects on Offspring Quality in Poeciliid Fishes. American Zoologist 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.

Reznick, D. N., M. J. Butler, F. H. Rodd, and P. Ross. 1996c. LIFE-HISTORY EVOLUTION IN GUPPIES (POECILIA RETICULATA) 6. DIFFERENTIAL MORTALITY AS A MECHANISM FOR NATURAL SELECTION. Evolution; International Journal of Organic Evolution 50:1651–1660.

Reznick, D. N., M. Mateos, and M. S. Springer. 2002. Independent Origins and Rapid Evolution of the Placenta in the Fish Genus Poeciliopsis. Science 298:1018–1020.

Reznick, D., and A. P. Yang. 1993. The Influence of Fluctuating Resources on Life History: Patterns of Allocation and Plasticity in Female Guppies. Ecology 74:2011–2019.

Riesch, R., M. Plath, F. J. García de León, and I. Schlupp. 2010. Convergent life-history shifts: toxic environments result in big babies in two clades of poeciliids. Die Naturwissenschaften 97:133–141.

Rollinson, N., and J. A. Hutchings. 2013. The relationship between offspring size and fitness:
integrating theory and empiricism. Ecology 94:315–324.
Roney, N. E., R. A. Oomen, H. Knutsen, E. M. Olsen, and J. A. Hutchings. 2018. Temporal
variability in offspring quality and individual reproductive output in a broadcast-spawning
marine fish. ICES Journal of Marine Science 75:1353–1361.
Schartl, M., R. B. Walter, Y. Shen, T. Garcia, J. Catchen, A. Amores, I. Braasch, et al. 2013. The
genome of the platyfish, Xiphophorus maculatus , provides insights into evolutionary adaptation
and several complex traits. Nature Genetics 45:567–572.
Schrader, M., R. C. Fuller, and J. Travis. 2013. Differences in offspring size predict the direction
of isolation asymmetry between populations of a placental fish. Biology Letters 9:20130327.
Schrader, M., and J. Travis. 2012. Assessing the roles of population density and predation risk in
the evolution of offspring size in populations of a placental fish. Ecology and Evolution 2:1480–
1490.
Skalkos, Z. M. G., J. U. Van Dyke, and C. M. Whittington. 2023. Distinguishing Between
Embryonic Provisioning Strategies in Teleost Fishes Using a Threshold Value for Parentotrophy.
Biomolecules 13:166.
Smith, C. C., and S. D. Fretwell. 1974. The Optimal Balance between Size and Number of
Offspring. The American Naturalist 108:499–506.
Stearns, S. C. 1989. Trade-Offs in Life-History Evolution. Functional Ecology 3:259–268.
Stefanoska, I., M. Jovanović Krivokuća, S. Vasilijić, D. Ćujić, and L. Vićovac. 2013. Prolactin
stimulates cell migration and invasion by human trophoblast in vitro. Placenta 34:775–783.
Stephens, M. 2017. False discovery rates: a new deal. Biostatistics 18:275–294.
Tessier, A. J., and N. L. Consolatti. 1989. Variation in Offspring Size in Daphnia and
Consequences for Individual Fitness. Oikos 56:269–276.
Trivers, R. L. 1974. Parent-Offspring Conflict. American Zoologist 14:249–264.
Turcotte, M. M., M. N. Pires, R. C. Vrijenhoek, and D. N. Reznick. 2008. Pre- and post-
fertilization maternal provisioning in livebearing fish species and their hybrids (Poeciliidae:
Poeciliopsis). Functional Ecology 22:1118–1124.
Walker, R. S., M. Gurven, O. Burger, and M. J. Hamilton. 2008. The trade-off between number
and size of offspring in humans and other primates. Proceedings of the Royal Society B:
Biological Sciences 275:827–834.
Weiss, M. N., S. Ellis, D. W. Franks, M. L. K. Nielsen, M. A. Cant, R. A. Johnstone, D. K.
Ellifrit, et al. 2023. Costly lifetime maternal investment in killer whales. Current Biology
33:744-748.e3.
Whittington, C. M., A. L. Buddle, O. W. Griffith, and A. M. Carter. 2022. Embryonic
specializations for vertebrate placentation. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:
Biological Sciences 377:20210261.
Wittbrodt, J., D. Adam, B. Malitschek, W. Mäueler, F. Raulf, A. Telling, S. M. Robertson, et al.
1989. Novel putative receptor tyrosine kinase encoded by the melanoma-inducing Tu locus in
Xiphophorus. Nature 341:415–421.
Wourms, J. P., B. D. Grove, and J. Lombardi. 1988. 1 The Maternal-Embryonic Relationship in
Viviparous Fishes. Pages 1–134 *in* W. S. Hoar and D. J. Randall, eds. Fish Physiology, The
Physiology of Developing Fish (Vol. 11). Academic Press.
1093