TITLE: Local adaptation to climate facilitates a global invasion

AUTHORS: Diana Gamba[1]*, Megan L. Vahsen[2], Toby M. Maxwell[3], Nikki Pirtel[2], Seth

Romero[4], Justin J. Van Ee[5], Amanda Penn[1], Aayudh Das[1], Rotem Ben-Zeev[1], Owen Baughman[6],

C. Sean Blaney[7], Randy Bodkins[8], Shanta Budha-Magar[9], Stella M. Copeland[10], Shannon L.

Davis-Foust[11], Alvin Diamond[12], Ryan C. Donnelly[13], Peter W. Dunwiddie[14], David J. Ensing[15],

Thomas A. Everest[16], Holly Hoitink[8], Martin C. Holdrege[17], Ruth A. Hufbauer[5], Sigitas

Juzėnas[18], Jesse M. Kalwij[19, 20], Ekaterina Kashirina[21], Sangtae Kim[22], Marcin Klisz[23], Alina

Klyueva[24], Michel Langeveld[8], Samuel Lutfy[25], Daniel Martin[8], Christopher L. Merkord[26], John

W. Morgan[27], Dávid U. Nagy[28], Jacqueline P. Ott[29], Radoslaw Puchalka[30], Lysandra A. Pyle[31],

Leonid Rasran[32], Brian G. Rector[33], Christoph Rosche[34], Marina Sadykova[8], Robert K. Shriver[35],

Alexandr Stanislavschi[36], Brian M. Starzomski[37], Rachel L. Stone[38], Kathryn G. Turner[39],

Alexandra K. Urza[40], Acer VanWallendael[41], Carl-Adam Wegenschimmel[42], Justin Zweck[43],

Cynthia S. Brown[5], Elizabeth A. Leger[44], Dana M. Blumenthal[4], Matthew J. Germino[45], Lauren

M. Porensky[4], Mevin B. Hooten[46], Peter B. Adler[2], Jesse R. Lasky[1]

[1] Department of Biology, Pennsylvania State University; University Park, PA, USA.

[2] Department of Wildland Resources and the Ecology Center, Utah State University; Logan, UT,

USA.

[3] Department of Biological Sciences, Boise State University; Boise, ID, USA.

[4] US Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Rangeland Resources and

Systems Research Unit; Fort Collins, CO, USA.

[5] Department of Agricultural Biology, Colorado State University; Fort Collins, CO, USA.

[6] The Nature Conservancy; Burns, OR, USA.

[7] Atlantic Canada Conservation Data Centre; Sackville, NB, Canada.

[8] Not affiliated.

[9] Northtec; Whangarei, New Zealand.

[10] US Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Eastern Oregon Agricultural

Research Center; Burns, OR, USA.

[11] Biology Department, University of Wisconsin Oshkosh; Oshkosh, WI, USA.

[12] Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences, Troy University; Troy, Alabama,

USA.

[13] Division of Biology, Kansas State University; Manhattan, KS, USA.

[14] Department of Biology, University of Washington; Seattle, WA, USA.

[15] Summerland Research and Development Centre, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada;

Summerland, BC, Canada.

[16] Department of Biology, New Mexico State University; Las Cruces, NM, USA.

[17] Northern Arizona University, Center for Adaptable Western Landscapes; Flagstaff, AZ, USA.

[18] Department of Botany and Genetics, Institute of Biosciences, Life Sciences Center, Vilnius

University; Vilnius, Lithuania.

[19] Centre for Ecological Genomics & Wildlife Conservation, Department of Zoology, University

of Johannesburg; Johannesburg, South Africa.

[20] Institute of Geography and Geoecology, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology; Karlsruhe,

Germany.

[21] A.O. Kovalevsky Institute of Biology of the Southern Seas of RAS, Sevastopol, Russian

Federation.

[22] Department of Biology, Sungshin Women's University; Seoul, Republic of Korea.

[23] Department of Silviculture and Genetics of Forest Trees, Forest Research Institute; Raszyn, Poland.

[24] Bryansk State University Academician I. G. Petrovsky; Bryansk, Russian Federation.

[25] Caesar Kleberg Wildlife Research Institute, Texas A&M University - Kingsville; Kingsville, TX, USA.

[26] Biosciences Department, Minnesota State University Moorhead; Moorhead, MN, USA.

[27] Department of Environment and Genetics, La Trobe University; Bundoora, Victoria, Australia.

[28] Faculty of Biological Sciences, Goethe University Frankfurt; Frankfurt am Main, Germany.

[29] US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Rapid City, SD, USA.

[30] Department of Ecology and Biogeography, Nicolaus Copernicus University; Torun, Poland.

[31] Alberta Biodiversity Monitoring Institute; Edmonton, AB, Canada.

[32] BOKU University Vienna; Vienna, Austria.

[33] US Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Invasive Species and Pollinator Health Research Unit; Albany, CA, USA.

[34] Institute of Biology/Geobotany and Botanical Garden, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg; Halle, Saale, Germany.

[35] Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Science, University of Nevada; Reno, NV, USA.

[36] Department of Organic Biochemical and Food Engineering, Gheorghe Asachi Technical University of Iasi; Iasi, Romania.

[37] School of Environmental Studies, University of Victoria; Victoria, BC, Canada.

[38] Department of Biology, Case Western Reserve University; Cleveland, OH, USA.

[39] Department of Biological Sciences, Idaho State University; Pocatello, ID, USA.

[40] US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Reno, NV,

USA.

[41] Department of Horticultural Science, North Carolina State University; Raleigh, NC, USA.

[42] Terrastory Environmental Consulting Inc.; Hamilton, ON, Canada.

[43] Department of Ecosystem Science and Management, Pennsylvania State University;

University Park, PA, USA.

[44] Department of Biology, University of Nevada; Reno, NV, USA.

[45] US Geological Survey, Forest and Rangeland Ecosystem Science Center; Boise, Idaho, USA.

[46] Department of Statistics and Data Sciences, The University of Texas at Austin; Austin, TX,

USA.

* Email address of corresponding author: dgamba333@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Local adaptation may facilitate range expansion during invasions, but the mechanisms underlying successful invasions remain unclear. Cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*), native to Eurasia and Africa, has invaded globally, with severe impacts in western North America. We aimed to identify mechanisms and consequences of local adaptation in the North American cheatgrass invasion. We sequenced 307 range-wide genotypes and conducted controlled experiments. We found that diverse lineages invaded North America, where long-distance gene flow is common. Nearly half of North American cheatgrass comprises a mosaic of ~19 locally adapted, near-clonal genotypes, each seemingly very successful in a different part of North America. Additionally, ancestry, phenotype, and allele frequency-environment clines in the native range predicted those in the invaded range, indicating pre-adapted genotypes colonized different regions. Common gardens showed directional selection on flowering time that reversed between warm and cold sites, potentially maintaining clines. In the USA Great Basin, genomic predictions of strong local adaptation identified sites where cheatgrass is most dominant. Our results indicate that multiple introductions and migration within the invaded range fueled local adaptation and success of cheatgrass in western North America. Understanding how environment and gene flow shape adaptation and invasion is critical for managing ongoing invasions.

INTRODUCTION

Biological invasions are a major cause of global biodiversity decline and ecosystem disruption, but the mechanisms driving ongoing invasions remain poorly understood[1,2]. In particular, the role of adaptive evolution in enabling invasive species to succeed is poorly understood. Is invasion success primarily determined by the susceptibility of invaded ecosystems[3], or are the worst invaders adapted to spread and dominate[4]? For example, local adaptation to invaded environments could increase fitness and abundance[5], while ongoing gene flow into the invaded range could swamp or reshape local adaptation[6,7]. If colonizing propagules are diverse, new populations may quickly adapt to local environments, facilitating invasive spread[4,8]. However, colonizing genotypes may reach new environments to which they are maladapted, swamping local adaptation and potentially hindering further spread[6,7,9,10]. Furthermore, if the diversity of colonizing propagules is low, new populations may be unable to adapt to new conditions[11], phenotypic plasticity of invasive genotypes may counteract local adaptation[1], and/or colonization bottlenecks may increase the frequency of deleterious mutations[12]. Testing these hypotheses requires a rare combination of genomic, fitness, and abundance data[13].

Multiple mechanisms could contribute to local adaptation during invasions, generating distinct patterns of genomic and phenotypic variation[14,15]. In general, selection may change along environmental gradients and promote genotypic and phenotypic clines[16]. If environmental gradients are similar in native versus invaded regions, clines may be similar between native and invaded regions, indicating niche conservatism of different lineages[17–19]. Alternatively, if selective pressures are novel in the invaded range, clines may be distinct between native and invaded regions, suggesting niche shift of some lineages[19–22]. Furthermore, invasive genotypes may closely match the genetic diversity of the native range[23], represent newly admixed

populations[24], or form novel genotypes via introgression from congeners[25]. Understanding

successful invasions thus requires dissecting global patterns of genomic and phenotypic

variation, which has seldom been accomplished. Although some studies have examined genomic

and phenotypic differences between native and invasive populations, sampled populations

between ranges are hard to compare because they often differ in spatial scale and/or do not

incorporate enough environmental variation[26].

Bromus tectorum L. (cheatgrass) is a grass native to Eurasia and northern Africa that spread

across North America by the 1890s[27,28], heavily influencing ecological dynamics of arid and

semi-arid ecosystems of the North American Intermountain West[29]. At least some introductions

likely came via contamination in grain shipments[27,28]. Cheatgrass occurs in high abundance

across an estimated 31% (210,000 km^2) of this region[30], displacing native perennials via rapid

reproduction and shortened fire return intervals[29], reducing biodiversity and degrading wildlife

habitat[31]. It is highly selfing, typically winter annual, with a high-quality reference genome (~2.5

Gb)[28,32]. Existing genetic studies, while limited to small numbers of markers or populations,

suggest that multiple introductions from different regions in Europe might have occurred in

North America[28,33–38]. Studies have shown evidence for local adaptation in phenology at small

scales[39–43], and substantial genetic differentiation in phenology between populations from

different regions[32,44], although range-wide patterns of local adaptation remain elusive. Due to

cheatgrass's high rate of selfing, novel recombinant genotypes are expected to be rare, limiting

novel genomic diversity in the invaded range. However, repeated introductions into North

America and post-introduction dispersal could have promoted the adaptative potential and

invasive spread of cheatgrass populations.

Here, we aim to identify mechanisms and consequences of local adaptation in the North

American cheatgrass invasion. We hypothesize that for cheatgrass, as a self-pollinating species

with few constraints on dispersal, local adaptation in the invaded range would be likely due to

rapid spread of pre-adapted genotypes to suitable environments (as opposed to adaptation by *de*

novo mutation or novel admixtures), provided there were multiple diverse introductions. We

sequence whole genomes of a global panel of 307 genotypes from the native and invaded ranges

and measure phenotypes and performance in one growth chamber experiment and two field

common gardens. We ask whether there were multiple and diverse introductions to North

America and examine genetic consequences of the invasion. We evaluate how geography,

environment, and phenotype shape genomic diversity. We test whether ancestry, trait, and allele

frequency-environment clines were repeated in native and invasive genotypes, and if selection

maintains clines. Finally, we integrate field surveys of cheatgrass abundance in the USA Great

Basin[30] to assess whether genomic matching to local climates facilitated invasive dominance.

Our results reveal that multiple introductions and migration within the invaded range fueled local

adaptation and success of cheatgrass in western North America.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Diverse native range ancestries invaded North America

Cheatgrass populations in North America stem from multiple, diverse introductions. Using

~267k unlinked single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), different clustering analyses of global

genomic variation showed that population genetic structure largely followed geography in the

native range and to a lesser degree in North America (Fig. 1 showing K=4 ancestral genetic

clusters/ancestries, Supplementary Fig. 1). In the native range, west Asian, Mediterranean, and

Atlantic genotypes primarily fell in a single ancestry, while central and eastern European

genotypes were mostly assigned to two ancestries differentiated by latitude and were overall

more intermediate (*i.e.*, composed of multiple ancestries). In the invaded range, genotypes were

assigned to all four ancestries in western North America (WNA, west of the Rocky Mountains),

but only to two ancestries in eastern North America (ENA, east of the Rocky Mountains) (Fig.

1a–c, Supplementary Fig. 2). The majority of invasive genotypes were similar to genotypes from

north, central, or eastern Europe (Fig. 1d–f). In WNA, however, warm desert genotypes in

southern California and Nevada were similar to genotypes from Iran and Afghanistan. The warm

Mojave and the cool Pacific Northwest also harbored genotypes similar to those from the

western Mediterranean (Fig. 1e,f). For regions with less extensive invasions, results showed that:

Argentines are similar to Spanish genotypes, an Australian is similar to western Mediterranean

genotypes and a widespread lineage from WNA, New Zealand genotypes are similar to

northeastern European genotypes, and a Korean genotype is similar to central eastern European

genotypes and a widespread lineage from ENA.

The diversity of genotypes found in WNA reflects colonization by propagules from different

native regions, while patterns in ENA reflect reduced genetic diversity. Accordingly, population-

specific F_{ST} (*i.e.*, the degree of relatedness among individuals) was higher in the invaded

compared to the native range (0.2 and 0.03, respectively) especially for ENA (0.39) compared to

WNA (0.18). Pairwise F_{ST} values were lowest between European and North American

genotypes, while other pairs of regions were more diverged (e.g., those involving the

Mediterranean and west Asia, Fig. 1d). The native and invaded range were moderately

genetically differentiated ($F_{ST} = 0.11$), comparable to the differentiation between genotypes from

ENA and WNA ($F_{ST} = 0.12$). In the native range, pairwise F_{ST} values were larger (Fig. 1d),

showing strong divergence between European and west Asian genotypes ($F_{ST} = 0.25$).

WNA and ENA: different patterns of diversity

Much of North America harbors great genomic diversity with little evidence of elevated genetic

load and inbreeding compared to the native range (Supplementary Figs. 3–5 using ~15.1M

SNPs). In WNA, nucleotide diversity (π, Supplementary Fig. 3a,b) was comparable to the most

diverse native region, north-central-eastern Europe ($0.0016 \pm 4.5 \times 10^{-6}$ se vs. $0.0018 \pm 4.6 \times 10^{-6}$

se, respectively), followed by the Mediterranean ($0.0015 \pm 3.8 \times 10^{-6}$ se) and west Asia ($0.0011 \pm$

3.1×10^{-6} se). Nucleotide diversity was much lower in ENA ($0.0009 \pm 4.5 \times 10^{-6}$ se). In WNA, the

skew in the site frequency spectrum (Tajima's D, Supplementary Fig. 3c,d) was positively

shifted (mean=2.8 ± 0.006 se), indicating an excess of intermediate-frequency SNPs, consistent

with strong population structure and heterogeneous ancestry across the region (see also[38]). In

ENA, Tajima's D was low (mean=0.5 ± 0.009 se), indicating more rare variants and suggesting

recent population expansion. In the Mediterranean and north-central-eastern Europe, Tajima's D

was positively shifted (Mediterranean mean=1.6 ± 0.005, north-central-eastern Europe mean=2.2

± 0.007), reflecting substantial population structure within these regions. The Mediterranean

comprises multiple distinct eastern and western lineages (see also[45]), while north-central-eastern

Europe comprises multiple lineages with some intermediate genotypes. In contrast, west Asian

genotypes appeared more closely related to each other (Tajima's D mean=0.3 ± 0.006).

To understand the effects of potential bottlenecks and drift in North America, we first examined

deleterious mutation load using ~15.1M SNPs, under the hypothesis that most protein changing

mutations are deleterious. Estimated mutation load was not different between native versus

invaded range genotypes of the same ancestry (two-way ANOVA: range $F_{(1,290)}$=57.8, p=4×10^{-13},

ancestry $F_{(4,290)}$=46.7, $p<2 \times 10^{-16}$, interaction $F_{(3,290)}$=4.4, p=0.005; Tukey HSD range p=0.2,

Supplementary Fig. 4). The central-eastern European ancestry (teal in Supplementary Fig. 4),

widespread in North America, showed the lowest load in both ranges, suggesting large effective

population size at some point in the past. In contrast, the west Asian and Mediterranean ancestry

(pink in Supplementary Fig. 4) was associated with higher load in both ranges.

Next we examined runs of homozygosity (ROH[46]) using a panel of 101 closely related native and

invasive genotypes sequenced directly from field collections (Supplementary Fig. 5). Native and

invasive genotypes (grouped by range) had similar Tajima's D, thus similar skew in the site

frequency spectrum. The native group, however, had lower counts of ROH and a much higher

FROH (the proportion of the genome with ROH), resulting in inference of a strong selfing rate

(Supplementary Fig. 5a–c). Selfing rates were significantly different between the native and

invasive groups (two-tailed t-test t=3.8437, df=11.896, p=0.002), though both were >0.9

(Supplementary Fig. 5c). This could reflect relaxed selection for reproductive assurance in

invasive genotypes from specific environments. For example, although selfing is more common,

some highly inbred desert lineages appeared overrepresented among parents of heterozygotes in

a previous common garden experiment[47]. Our results suggest that the North American cheatgrass

invasion is not associated with higher inbreeding due to selfing compared to the native range

(Supplementary Fig. 5c,d).

Taken together, the high diversity in WNA indicates great potential for adaptation in this heavily

invaded region. In contrast, the lower diversity in ENA reflects colonization by a few closely

related lineages (see also[34]) that persist as ruderal plants in urban and agricultural environments.

Strong isolation-by-environment in North America

Both geography and environment shape genomic diversity in the native range, but geography

plays a weak role in North America. Isolation-by-distance (based on ~267k SNPs) was strong in

the native range (geographic vs. genetic distance Mantel $p=10^{-4}$, Fig. 2a) but very weak in North

America (Mantel $p=0.06$, Fig. 2b). At 0–100 km distance, pairs of distantly related genotypes

were common in WNA, but not in ENA or the native range (Supplementary Fig. 6a,b). Even at

the smallest scales (0–25 km), isolation-by-distance appeared weaker in the invaded compared to

the native range (Supplementary Fig. 6c,d). Moreover, several groups in North America ("1–19"

in Fig. 1f) composed of 2–14 near-clonal genotypes (>98% SNPs identity) were found across

distances of >3000 km (Fig. 2b, Supplementary Fig. 6a, 7a). In contrast, such widely distributed,

near-clonal genotypes were absent in the native range (Fig. 2a, Supplementary Fig. 6b). These

patterns suggest long-distance dispersal within North America by lineages descended from

distinct native range populations. Furthermore, groups of near-clonal genotypes occupied

significantly different environments (PERMANOVA of multivariate environment predicted by

clonal group: $p=0.0001$, $R^2=0.65$) that together encompass the extent of climate space in North

America (Supplementary Fig. 7b). This suggests that although genotypes might not be dispersal

limited in North America, their spread may be limited by different environmental constraints,

suggesting local adaptation. The weak spatial patterns in North America may also reflect

genotype sorting along the steep, heterogeneous climatic gradients that are common in WNA.

Pairwise climatic distance (based on Euclidian distance in Supplementary Fig. 6e) significantly

increased with spatial distance in both native and invaded ranges (Mantel $p=10^{-4}$ and Mantel

Pearson correlation=0.6 in both ranges; Supplementary Fig. 6f,g), but this relationship was weak

in WNA (Mantel Pearson correlation=0.3 WNA vs. 0.7 ENA), reflecting the fine-scale climatic

heterogeneity of this region.

To further examine genomic differentiation along climate gradients, we performed redundancy

analysis (RDA) with variance partitioning, comparing the role of climate and spatial variables in

explaining genomic variation. SNP variation was better explained by these predictors in the

native than in the invaded range (native R^2_{adj}=0.25, invaded R^2_{adj}=0.10; Fig. 2c,d). Spatial

variables explained little SNP variation in North America (native R^2_{adj}=0.07, invaded

R^2_{adj}=0.005), confirming low isolation-by-distance. In both ranges the abiotic environment

explained the largest portion of SNP variation (native R^2_{adj}=0.13, invaded R^2_{adj}=0.09; Fig. 2e,f),

highlighting the importance of isolation-by-environment in both the native and invaded range

and consistent with invasive local adaptation via native pre-adaptation[19].

Repeated ancestry-climate clines

Ancestry-environment clines were remarkably similar in the native and invaded ranges,

suggesting environmental filtering of pre-adapted genotypes that could disperse long distances or

via directed gene flow (as opposed to local adaptation by novel genotypes). We focused on

aridity and temperature gradients representative of global climatic variation in the cheatgrass

range (see Supplementary Fig. 6e) and used generalized-additive-models (GAMs) to detect

significant ancestry-climate trends between ranges (Supplementary Fig. 8). In native and

invasive genotypes, the west Asian and Mediterranean genetic cluster (pink) was more frequent

in drier regions (GAM p=0.0004, pseudo-R^2=0.5), the northern Europe cluster (blue) was more

frequent in humid regions (GAM p=0.007, pseudo-R^2=0.08), the central Europe cluster (teal)

was more frequent in regions with little precipitation seasonality (GAM p=10^{-5}, pseudo-R^2=0.2),

and the presumably northeast Europe ancestry (green) was more frequent in regions with colder

winters (GAM p=0.002, pseudo-R^2=0.1).

Repeated phenotype-climate clines

Consistent with the hypothesis that pre-adaptation to local climate facilitated the cheatgrass invasion, we found similar phenotype-environment clines in the invaded and native ranges. A principal components (PC) analysis on genetic variation among 169 native and invasive genotypes for eleven growth chamber phenotypes (Supplementary Data 1, Supplementary Table 1) detected multi-trait axes of variation (Fig. 3a). PC1 explained 35.4% of the variation and suggested a life history axis of delayed flowering and high vegetative investment (more tillers and leaves) versus rapid flowering and high reproductive investment (taller, more fecund inflorescences). PC2 explained 22.2% of the variation and indicated an axis associated with larger plants with greater growth after vernalization versus shorter plants with little growth after vernalization. Native genotypes had on average earlier flowering (two-tailed t-test t=4.09, df=41.36, p=0.0002) and higher reproductive investment (two-tailed t-test t= −1.92, df=43.69, p=0.06) than invasive genotypes (PC1 two-tailed t-test t=3.02, df=38.14, p=0.004) which may be due to different ancestry proportions in the native range. We found no significant native versus invasive trait differences after accounting for relatedness (p>0.4), thus no evidence for evolution of increased competitive ability by invasive cheatgrass[48]. Additionally, near-clonal groups were significantly different in multivariate phenotypes (PERMANOVA of multivariate phenotype predicted by clonal group: p=0.03, R^2=0.39), yet the remaining non-clonal genotypes were also diverse (Supplementary Fig. 7c). These results highlight how North America hosts diverse life histories.

Multiple trait-climate clines potentially maintained by selection were mirrored between the native and invaded range (Fig. 3b), indicating sorting of genotypes along humidity and temperature gradients. We focused on two climate variables that we hypothesized would capture

distinct climatic stressors: maximum vapor pressure deficit (Pa), for drought adaptation, and

mean winter temperature (ºC), for cold adaptation (Supplementary Fig. 6e). To test for evidence

of selection maintaining clines, we used linear-mixed models that accounted for genomic

similarity (lmkin below), similar to Q_{ST}–F_{ST} tests[49]. When significant, these models suggest

selection is driving trait-climate clines, because the cline is stronger than expected by the

genome-wide patterns of variation. In native and invasive genotypes, earlier flowering was

associated with higher aridity (native lmkin-p=2e^{-8}, R^2=0.5; invaded lmkin-p=0.03, R^2=0.3),

suggesting a locally adaptive cline of rapid phenology/early reproductive investment in arid

regions versus delayed phenology/early vegetative investment in humid regions. Also, clines

showed evidence of selection specifically within WNA, but not in ENA (Supplementary Fig. 9).

These patterns suggest local adaptation via life history clines in WNA. In contrast, life history in

ENA is not associated with climate, potentially because a single generalist ruderal strategy is

adaptive throughout ENA.

Selection on flowering time along a temperature gradient in WNA

In field common gardens, selection on flowering time changed direction between sites that

differed in temperature. To test whether phenotypic clines in WNA were promoted by selection,

we conducted two common garden experiments in different climates in Idaho with fall plantings

across two years (2021 and 2022). One site was cooler (Sheep Station, ID, USA 44.2456ºN,

112.2144ºW, annual mean temperature 6ºC) and the other warmer (Wildcat, ID, USA

43.4744ºN, 116.9018ºW, annual mean temperature 12ºC). We planted 95 diverse genotypes from

across WNA, for a total of 14,800 plants[50]. We measured flowering time, survival, and fecundity.

In both years (Fig. 3c), selection favored later flowering at the cool site, with late flowering

genotypes having ~3× the fitness of earlier flowering genotypes (~300 vs. ~100 seeds produced

per original sown seed). By contrast, at the warm site, selection favored earlier flowering, with

the earliest flowering genotypes having ~10× the fitness of the later flowering genotypes (~170

vs. ~17 seeds produced per original sown seed). This suggests that late flowering genotypes have

an extreme disadvantage in warm climates. This strong selection is consistent with our finding

that the hottest sites in WNA were almost exclusively comprised of west Asian-like genotypes.

We saw no clear admixture from distantly related, but geographically proximate European-like

genotypes inhabiting cooler and wetter higher elevations in WNA (Fig. 1a), suggesting a barrier

to dispersal of maladapted genotypes. Thus, climate gradients in WNA appear to impose changes

in selection maintaining a strong phenotypic cline.

Repeated allele frequency-climate clines

Putative quantitative trait loci (QTL) for traits under selection showed similar allele frequency-

climate clines in the invaded and native ranges (Fig. 4, Supplementary Figs. 10–11). Using

genome-wide association studies (GWAS), we identified several genetic loci associated with

variation in flowering time and number of tillers (Supplementary Data 2). We implemented two

methods that accounted for population genetic structure: univariate mixed model LMM and

multilocus mixed model MLMM. Of the 400 top GWAS SNPs (100 top SNPs × 2 phenotypes ×

2 GWAS methods), just one SNP was segregating exclusively within the invaded range. The

other 399 SNPs segregated in both native and invaded ranges, supporting the hypothesis that *de*

novo mutations have not been major drivers of local adaptation in North America.

We annotated SNPs based on genome-wide linkage-disequilibrium (LD, Supplementary Fig.

12a). We found that at 194.5 kb, LD decayed to ~80% of the background LD (here taken as 5

Mb). A similar LD decay pattern was observed across chromosomes (Supplementary Fig. 12b),

while between chromosomes average R^2 ~0.1. Below, we thus highlight QTL based on the

position of the closest gene within a 200 kb window centered at the GWAS SNP. We focus on

flowering time because this was the only trait for which we found gene functions clearly related

to phenotype.

The top flowering time QTL (detected with LMM) contained multiple SNPs along a haploblock

of ~28 Mb (chromosome 1: 56–84 Mb, allele frequency (AF)~0.9) containing ~64 genes with

annotations based on homology to *Oryza sativa* and *Arabidopsis thaliana*. These genes were

enriched for gene ontology terms describing developmental processes involving reproductive

structure/system, embryo, embryo ending in seed dormancy, post-embryonic, fruit, and seed (8

O. sativa genes and 14 *A. thaliana* genes, *p*<0.0003, FDR=0.01). Such a large haploblock could

indicate a structural variant, a potential driver of local adaptation[51,52]. This locus thus merits

further investigation.

The top SNP of the haploblock (chromosome 1: 71007448 bp, AF=0.91; top in LMM and 2nd top

in MLMM) was 25 kb downstream of a *O. sativa* homolog, the DnaJ protein Erdj3b. Expression

of Erdj3b in *O. sativa* is critical for heat stress tolerance during seed development[53]. Late

flowering alleles were more frequent in humid/colder regions of the native (two-tailed t-test t= –

3.66, df=83.61, *p*=0.0004) and invaded range (two-tailed t-test t= –4.31, df=26.41, *p*=0.0002)

(Fig. 4a–c), suggesting cheatgrass adaptation to temperature gradients may be linked to seed

sensitivity to temperature stress.

The fourth top flowering time QTL (only found with LMM) comprised three SNPs (chromosome

1: 236616590 bp, 236616999 bp, 236617691 bp, AF=0.82) 0.5 kb upstream (putative promoter

region) of the *A. thaliana* homolog *ATE1* (AT5G05700). *ATE1* regulates seed maturation,

seedling metabolism, and abscisic acid germination sensitivity[54]. Early flowering alleles were

found in drier regions of the native (two-tailed t-test t=6.73, df=42.19, p=3.4e^{-8}) and invaded

range (two-tailed t-test t= 4.82, df=11.67, p=0.0004), specifically the Mediterranean and west

Asia in the native range, and the Mojave and Lahontan Basin in the invaded range, but also

reaching Mediterranean climates of coastal WNA (Fig. 4d–f). These patterns suggest that even

the specific QTL underlying local adaptation in the native range have been similarly reused for

local adaptation in the invaded range.

We compared our GWAS results with a published study that performed a GWAS for flowering

time using a smaller and much less diverse genotype panel[32]. There was no overlap among the

200 top GWAS SNPs we found (100 top SNPs × 2 GWAS methods) and the SNPs detected in

that study (Table 2 in[32]), likely due to our larger and more diverse panel of genotypes.

Cheatgrass dominates where local adaptation is predicted to be stronger

Whole genome-environment associations in the native range predicted local adaptation in the

invaded range, especially where cheatgrass is most dominant. To further evaluate whether

invasive genotypes matched local climates as in the native range, we used a predictive genome-

environment model. Using the native range RDA model of genotype as a function of climate

(Fig. 2e), we first predicted invasive genotypes for locations of our sequenced samples. Next, we

calculated the genetic distance between predicted and observed genotypes, similar to metrics

sometimes referred to as 'genomic offset'[55]. Genotype-environment matching (*i.e.*, low genetic

distance, or offset, between predicted and observed genotypes) was strongest at northern

latitudes across North America, particularly in WNA. Putative maladaptation (*i.e.*, high genetic

distance between predicted and observed genotypes) was strongest in the southeast USA (Fig.

5a). By comparing mean genetic distance to means of 1000 null permutations, we found the

mean genetic distance was significantly lower than the null expectation in WNA ($p<0.002$), but

not in ENA ($p=0.5$, Fig. 5b). This finding is consistent with the hypothesis that local adaptation

to climate in WNA reflects the patterns observed in the native range, while cheatgrass in ENA

has a novel strategy or is not locally adapted. Unlike WNA, cheatgrass populations in ENA are

more restricted to highly disturbed urban and agricultural sites, rarely forming large

monospecific stands[56].

To assess whether matching of specific genotypes to local environments promotes cheatgrass

invasion, we compared the strength of genotype-environment correlations with variation in

cheatgrass abundance from 11,307 field surveys across the Great Basin (Fig. 5a), the region

where the invasion has its worst impacts[30]. Locations where cheatgrass occurs in high abundance

showed significantly high genotype-environment matching based on the native range model

compared to sites where cheatgrass does not dominate (n=55, two-tailed t-test t=2.89, df=52.3,

$p=0.006$, Fig. 5c), suggesting local adaptation promotes cheatgrass dominance. This pattern was

consistent when comparing genotype-environment matching of high-abundance sites to 1000

null permutations of genotypes within the Great Basin ($p=0.01$), evidence that this pattern was

not merely due to environmental characteristics of the low-abundance sites but reflects the match

of genotypes to their local environments.

Synthesis

Biological invasions pose a major environmental threat, but the roles of genomic diversity,

repeated introductions, and adaptation are poorly understood. Our results have important

implications for understanding the evolution of local adaptation in invasive species that have

greatly expanded their range. Past studies suggest that selfing species with large native ranges –

like cheatgrass– are more likely to establish self-sustaining populations in new regions[23,57,58], but

the mechanisms promoting successful establishment have been less explored.

We show that multiple diverse introductions and long-distance dispersal post-introduction likely

increased the chances of cheatgrass genotypes arriving to favorable North American

environments. Across Eurasia, cheatgrass shows clines indicative of local adaptation and

continuous isolation by distance, likely shaped by multiple migrations and subsequent isolation

after the Last Glacial Maximum[45]. In the invaded range, many genotypes represent a mosaic of

near-clonal lineages across sometimes widely spread locations but similar environments, and

non-clonal genotypes sorted along the steep climate gradients of western North America. Despite

differences in genomic diversity and likely demographic history between the native and invaded

ranges, western North American genotypes closely matched the native signatures of local

adaptation along temperature/aridity gradients. Thus, in North America environmental filtering

of pre-adapted genotypes likely led to reuse of native diversity and facilitated range

expansion[18,19,59]. Accordingly, common gardens revealed that changing selection likely

maintains a major life history cline in the USA Intermountain West. Furthermore, genomic

signatures of local adaptation also predicted cheatgrass ecological dominance across the USA

Great Basin, indicating that factors supporting local adaptation, such as high genetic diversity

from repeated introductions, fuel the invasion.

Our findings emphasize that any sources of genetic diversity could continue to reshape

adaptation in established invasive species[60]. With high genomic diversity and no dispersal

limitation, range-wide adaptation could persist over time even under shifting environments.

Limiting ongoing introductions and intra-continental dispersal of genotypes (*e.g.*, by limiting

seed contaminants in grains) could likely help minimize rapid adaptation of invasive plants. For

annual selfers like cheatgrass, this strategy might limit local adaptation via pre-adaptation, but

also via *de novo* variation from uncommon but potentially important outcrossing events[28,39,47].

METHODS

Plant material. Natural inbred lines of *Bromus tectorum* were obtained from 1) the Genome

Resources Information Network (GRIN), 2) Greenhouse inbred/selfed plants (S1 or S2) of field

samples in western North America collected 2019–2020, 3) field samples from the native and

invaded range collected 2020–2022, and 4) DNA extractions of frozen seedlings (contributed by

Brian Rector, USDA–ARS) for 29, 111, 155, and 12 samples, respectively (Supplementary Data

1). With this panel of genotypes, we targeted sites with distinct environmental conditions,

favoring environmental variation over intra-population sampling. Sites were ~1–6600 km apart

within the native or invaded ranges: 194 North American, 105 Eurasian, and 8 from regions with

less extensive invasions: 2 from Argentina, 1 from Australia, 3 from New Zealand, and 2 from

South Korea. Genotypes with available seeds (295) were germinated in a growth chamber at

20ºC (80% humidity, 12 h light/12 h dark, 200 µmol m^2 s^{-1} light intensity) to increase seed

(Supplementary Methods 1), verify identification, and obtain tissue for whole genome

sequencing (Supplementary Methods 2–4) and genotyping (Supplementary Methods 5–6).

Native genotypes were assigned to central-north-east Europe, Mediterranean, or west Asia based

on geographic location (Supplementary Data 1). North American genotypes were assigned to

eastern North America (ENA) or western North America (WNA) based on ecological region at

location of origin (Supplementary Methods 7). WNA: marine west coast forest, Mediterranean

California, North American deserts, northwestern forested mountains, and temperate Sierras.

ENA: eastern temperate forests, Great Plains, and northern forests (Supplementary Fig. 2).

Population genetic structure. With a dataset of 266,504 unlinked sites, we used multiple

methods to infer population genetic structure that we interpret collectively (Supplementary

Methods 8–9). We estimated individual admixture proportions in NGSadmix (v.33)[61] and

inferred population genetic structure with PCA in PCAngsd (v.1.11)[62], which work directly with

genotype likelihoods that contain all relevant information of unobserved genotypes. Individual

admixture proportions were estimated with maximum likelihood in 12 replicates, for K=2–12

genetic clusters, on sites with minor allele frequency (MAF) >0.05, at least in 50% individuals,

and <75% missing data. Cross-validation of number of clusters was determined from log-

likelihoods of the NGSadmix output across all replicates[63].

We also computed an unrooted phylogenetic tree with the Neighbor-Joining (NJ) algorithm[64] and

calculated Nei's[65] pairwise F_{ST} and Weir & Goudet's population-specific F_{ST}[66] based on genetic

dissimilarity estimated with SNPRelate (v.0.9.19)[67]. Pairwise F_{ST} measures population genetic

differentiation between regions, whereas population-specific F_{ST} measures regional deviations

from the ancestral population. High values of population specific-F_{ST} indicate high within-group

allele sharing and potentially greater divergence from ancestral populations, while low values

indicate possible ancestral populations.

Genomic diversity and Tajima's D. We compared nucleotide diversity (π[68]) between ranges

and regions in the native and invaded range using a dataset of 15,101,725 sites (Supplementary

Methods 6). Regional .vcf datasets containing all sites were generated with BCFtools (v.1.18)[69]

(view -S), and genome-wide estimates of π were obtained with VCFtools (v.0.1.15)[70] using 50

kb sampling windows. Deviations from neutral evolution between geographic regions were

examined with the Tajima's D statistic[71], which compares the mean number of pairwise

differences against the number of segregating sites observed in a set of sequences. Tajima's D

for each region was calculated in 50 kb sampling windows for shared SNPs in VCFtools using --

TajimaD.

Genetic load. Genotype mutation load (under the hypothesis that most protein changing

mutations are deleterious) was estimated separately from the high impact and missense variants,

both normalized by (divided by) the number of synonymous variants (Supplementary Methods

10). We used 2-way ANOVA and Tukey HSD tests to examine differences in genetic loads

between native and invaded range genotypes of the same ancestry. Genotypes were assigned to a

cluster based on having >0.55 ancestry proportion for the NGSadmix K=4 ancestral genetic

clusters. If no K=4 ancestry was >0.55, genotypes were designated as intermediate.

Self-fertilization rates. We examined the causes of inbreeding between native and invaded

genotypes with several statistics. We used a subset of 101 closely related native and invasive

genotypes that were sequenced from seedlings of plants collected directly from the field (as

opposed to a greenhouse bulking or GRIN). Based on the ~15M SNPs dataset, we first computed

runs of homozygosity[46,72] (with BCFtools roh), Tajima's D (with VCFtools --TajimaD in 100 kb

windows), and heterozygosity (with PLINK (v.1.9)[73] --het) for one lineage represented in the

native and North American invaded range (native n=27, invaded n=74). Then we implemented

random forests in R to analyze these genetic statistics together and estimate selfing rates for each

group using a recently published model ("sequential model"[46]). We compared group means with

a two-tailed t-test.

Isolation-by-distance. We examined isolation-by-distance in native and invasive genotypes, and

in genotypes from WNA and ENA, with the same LD-filtered SNP dataset. Genome-wide

pairwise genetic dissimilarity matrices were obtained as described above. Pairwise geographic

distances were calculated in kilometers from genotype coordinates with the spDists function in

the R package sp (v.2.1-3)[74], using the WGS84 ellipsoid projection. Simple Mantel tests[75] were

used to test if the natural logarithm of geographic distance predicts genetic distance with the

function mantel.rtest in the R package ade4 (v.1.7-22)[76], using 999 permutations. We conducted

linear regressions (with the R function lm) to assess the proportion of genetic variance explained

by geographic distance. We also used the mantel.rtest R function to assess how climatic distance

changed with geographic distance.

Environmental differentiation between groups and across space. We examined if the 19

genetically different groups of 2–14 nearly clonal genotypes (detected based on >99% SNP

similarity) were differentiated by environment using climate data at their location of origin. We

used clonal group identity as the predictor of 52 CHELSA climate variables[77,78] (Supplementary

Methods 7, Supplementary Data 1, Supplementary Fig. 7b) with PERMANOVA using function

adonis2 (9999 permutations, Euclidian distances) in the R package vegan (v.2.6-4)[79]. To examine

spatial environmental heterogeneity, climatic distance was estimated for each region (native,

ENA, WNA) based on pairwise Euclidean distances in the environmental PCA produced above,

using the function vegdist in vegan.

Variance partitioning of genomic diversity. Redundancy analyses (RDA) were used to model

how sets of variables explained SNP variation and for identifying abiotic gradients explaining

the most genome-wide SNP variation[80]. To model geographic patterns in the RDA, a distance

matrix obtained from coordinates was converted into a spatial weighting matrix to get a reduced-

dimension set of orthogonal variables (Moran's eigenvector maps, MEMs[81]). MEMs are

eigenvectors of the pairwise spatial weighting matrix among samples (Supplementary Methods

11). Then, RDA was conducted with variance partitioning[80] to quantify proportion of genome-

wide SNP variation explained by each of two categories of covariates: Abiotic variables and

geographic MEMs. We selected abiotic variables that were informative and non-colinear based

on the PCA explaining range-wide environmental variation (Supplementary Fig. 6e). Variance

partitioning estimates proportion of SNP variation that is explained by the collection of variables

in each category and by collinearity among variables. To identify environmental gradients

associated with genome-wide divergence, RDA was also conducted using only abiotic variables

for native and invasive genotypes. We computed RDA and performed variance partitioning with

functions rda and varpart, respectively, in vegan.

Ancestry-environment associations. To assess environmental filtering of pre-adapted

genotypes in North America, we examined ancestry-climate associations in invasive versus

native genotypes using generalized additive models (GAMs). GAMs allow us to account for

nonlinear patterns between predictors and the response variable[82]. Environmental predictors were

the same aridity and temperature gradients used for trait-environment clines, in addition to

precipitation seasonality (all representative of climatic variation in cheatgrass genotypes;

Supplementary Fig. 6e). For each NGSadmix ancestral cluster (K=4), GAMs were implemented

with the function gam in the R package mgcv (v.1.9-1)[83] with a logit link function and beta-

distributed residuals. Genotypes were assigned to a cluster based on having >0.55 ancestry

proportion for the NGSadmix K=4 ancestral genetic clusters. Intermediate genotypes (*i.e.*,

composed of multiple ancestries) were excluded from this analysis.

Phenotypes. During the grow out in 2020, we measured phenotypes on up to 184 genotypes with

2–3 replicates that emerged within ~9–18 days of planting and survived until harvesting. Eleven

phenotypes were recorded: seedling and adult (*i.e.*, reproductive) height (used to get spring

growth), number of leaves, number of tillers, days to flower, inflorescence height, dry biomass,

total seed mass (*i.e.*, fecundity), individual seed mass (*i.e.*, seed mass), total seed length, and awn

length (Supplementary Methods 12).

After quality/error checking, the best linear unbiased estimate (BLUE) of phenotypes was

calculated per genotype with the BLUE function in the R package polyqtlR (v.0.1.1)[84], using

genotype as the predictor of trait measurements across 2–3 replicates and tray as a random effect.

We then calculated broad sense heritability (H^2) of traits as the proportion of phenotypic variance

explained by genotype in a linear model. The total set of phenotyped genotypes included: 184

with vegetative height/growth/count data, 173 with flowering/inflorescence data, 178 with dry

biomass data, and 182 with seed data, for a total of 169 genotypes with no missing phenotypes.

Trait variation and environmental associations. To detect axes of life history variation, we

summarized the natural genetic variation in our growth chamber phenotypes with PCA (function

prcomp, variables scaled and centered) in R. PC1, PC2, and flowering time, were then used as

response variables for investigating trait differences between ranges and environmental gradients

in phenotypes. To assess differences in trait means between native and invasive genotypes we

implemented two-tailed t-tests as well as linear mixed models that accounted for kinship between

genotypes (see below). To assess phenotypic differentiation between groups of nearly clonal

genotypes, we performed PERMANOVA with group identity as the predictor and eleven

phenotypes as response with function adonis2 in the R package vegan (9999 permutations,

Euclidian distances). To assess trait-environment clines we used kinship linear-mixed models,

which when significant (*i.e.*, p≤0.05), they provide evidence of selection (vs. population genetic

structure/drift) explaining variation, similar to Q_{ST}–F_{ST} tests[49]. A kinship matrix was estimated

with identity-by-state (IBS, *i.e.*, allele sharing between pairs of genotypes) using the dataset of

15,101,725 SNPs and function snpgdsIBS in the R package SNPRelate. This kinship matrix was

used to fit linear mixed models with random genotype effects using function lmekin in the R

package coxme (v.2.2-20)[85]. We focused on maximum monthly vapor pressure deficit (Pa),

describing aridity, and mean air temperature of the coldest quarter (ºC), describing winter

temperature. These two climate variables showed the highest loads on PC1 and PC2,

respectively, on a PCA of 52 climate variables for the 307 native and invasive genotypes

(Supplementary Fig. 6e). To test if clines were repeated, absent, or shifted in the invaded relative

to the native range, we also tested for an interaction between ranges in the models.

Field common gardens. We conducted a replicated common garden experiment with cheatgrass

genotypes in the 2022 and 2023 growing seasons, across two sites in the Intermountain West that

varied in their regional climatic conditions: a cool site with little temperature seasonality (Sheep

Station, ID [44.2456ºN, 112.2144ºW]) and a warm site with pronounced temperature seasonality

(Wildcat, ID [43.4744ºN, 116.9018ºW]). We grew replicates of 95 genotypes from Fall 2021 to

Spring 2022 and 93 genotypes from Fall 2022 to Spring 2023 at two different densities (low=100

seeds/1 m^2; high=100 seeds/0.04 m^2) and under two different temperature treatments (low=white

gravel; high=black gravel) in a factorial design at both sites[50] (Supplementary Methods 13).

We compared the direction and magnitude of selection on flowering phenology between the

cold, less seasonal site and the warm, seasonal site for both the 2022 and 2023 growing seasons.

For each year and common garden site combination, we calculated the average fitness

(2022=seed count; 2023=reproductive biomass) and average first flowering day for each

genotype, across all treatments. In the calculations of average first flowering day, if a plant did

not flower (*i.e.*, fitness=0), it was assigned the average first flowering day for all plants of that

genotype that did flower at some point during the growing season. For each growing season year,

we regressed the mean fitness data on the mean flowering time data across genotypes and

compared the slopes between the cold, less seasonal site and the warm, seasonal site. Positive

slopes on this graph indicate that flowering later is selected, while negative slopes indicate that

flowering earlier is selected. Models that included a random intercept for each genotype, with a

correlation structure specified by a kinship matrix, also provided evidence of selection. To

confirm that our larger dataset on flowering time from a growth chamber was consistent with

field measurements, we compared these values and found them correlated with Pearson r=0.6.

Genome wide association studies (GWAS). To identify QTL for growth chamber phenotypes,

we implemented GWAS that controlled for kinship on our BLUEs dataset (n=173–184

genotypes, 14.6–14.7M SNPs excluding SNPs with MAF<0.05) using two methods: a univariate

linear mixed model (LMM) and a multilocus mixed model (MLMM). SNP genotype data were

generated with function snpgdsGetGeno in the R package SNPRelate. The univariate LMM was

fit with gemma (v.0.98.5)[86] with an IBS matrix as the random effect accounting for relatedness

between genotypes. The MLMM was implemented with FarmCPUpp[87], which computes a

restricted kinship matrix based on pseudo-quantitative trait nucleotides (QTN) selected from a

preliminary GWAS step. FarmCPUpp also takes principal components of genome-wide SNP

variation as covariates (here PC1–PC3), providing a stronger control of population genetic

structure. Principal components were obtained with function snpgdsPCA in the R package

SNPRelate. Moreover, while gemma tests for an association with each SNP individually,

FarmCPUpp performs additional steps that detect pseudo-QTNs based on LD and uses model

selection and multiple regression to retain the best set of pseudo-QTNs. Thus, while gemma

might reveal large blocks of significantly associated SNPs (which might correlate with

chromosomal rearrangements), this signal should be lost with FarmCPUpp (which might be

better at detecting causal SNPs). To detect statistical significance of GWAS SNPs, we used a

false-discovery-rate (FDR) threshold of 0.05 on output p-values. Associations were inspected

with Manhattan plots and model fits were assessed with quantile-quantile (Q-Q) plots.

Linkage disequilibrium (LD) and SNP annotation. To assign GWAS SNPs to annotated

cheatgrass genes, we first investigated linkage disequilibrium (LD) decay with genomic distance

in our sequenced panel of 307 genotypes. We used PopLDdecay[88], which takes a .vcf with

samples and computes the square of Pearson correlations (R^2) between pairs of SNPs genome-

wide (using the ~15M SNPs dataset) or per chromosome. We excluded SNPs with MAF<0.05

and >5% heterozygote individuals and calculated R^2 between pairs of SNPs at a minimum of 10

bp apart and a maximum of 5 Mb apart. We detected the pattern of LD decay by plotting mean

LD values in 100 bp bins from 0–5Mb genomic distance. We observed substantial long-range

LD with mean R^2~0.3 even at 5Mb (Supplementary Fig. 12a), in line with strong population

structure. However, there was a clear decay in LD with genomic distance. The initial mean LD

($R^2=0.45$) at 10 bp decayed halfway ($R^2=0.376$) of the minimum observed LD ($R^2=0.3$) by 194.5

kb. Because mean LD was high even at 5Mb, we also assessed inter-chromosomal LD

(Supplementary Methods 14).

QTL-environment clines and enrichment analysis. Environmental variation of allele

frequency in QTL detected with GWAS was examined with two-tailed t-tests and kinship linear-

mixed models. QTL-environment tests were performed separately for the native and invaded

range. To find significantly over-represented GO terms or parents of these terms in the

haploblock detected for flowering time, we uploaded a gene set to the PlantRegMap GO Term

Enrichment tool[89], based on *A. thaliana* and *O. sativa* homologs obtained from CoGe

annotations.

Genome-environment matching of invasive genotypes. We further tested for evidence of pre-

adaptation by quantifying how well a native range genotype-environment association (GEA)

model predicted genetic composition in the invaded range. Our approach is like the genomic

offset statistics used for predicting climate change impacts on maladaptation[55,80]. We used the

RDA-generated native range GEA to predict maladaptation of invaded range genotypes,

separately for WNA and ENA, with the function 'predict' in the R package vegan. The Euclidian

distance between predicted and observed allele frequencies for each invasive genotype was then

estimated, representing the genetic maladaptation to the invaded range site. To evaluate if the

mean genetic maladaptation WNA and ENA was different from random, predictions and genetic

(*i.e.*, Euclidean) distances were recalculated in 1000 reshuffled environments. Genetic

maladaptation was considered significantly lower than expected by chance if it fell in the lower

0.025 tail of the random distribution of mean genomic distances in a two-tailed test.

Genome-environment matching and invasive spread. We examined if cheatgrass dominance

was correlated with the strength of local adaptation using available cheatgrass abundance data.

Using random forest models, Bradley *et al.*[30] created a regional classification of cheatgrass

presence across the Great Basin based on 11,307 surveyed sites. Their classification

differentiates between cheatgrass present at high abundance ($\geq 15\%$) and cheatgrass absent or at

low abundance ($< 15\%$). Genetic maladaptation/offset was compared between sites where

cheatgrass is in high abundance to sites where cheatgrass is in low abundance (high vs. low in

Fig. 5c, respectively) with a two-tailed t-test (n=54 sites or Great Basin genotypes). To assess if

this pattern was driven by the match of local genotypes to local environments (as opposed to the

environmental characteristics of the low abundance cheatgrass sites), we recalculated genomic

offset in 1000 reshuffled Great Basin environments and compared offset of regions where

cheatgrass dominates to the 1000 null permutations of genotypes within the Great Basin.

Data availability

Seeds of *Bromus tectorum* genotypes used in this study are available from the lead contact upon

request and will be deposited to GRIN. Herbarium vouchers of genotypes will be deposited at

The Pennsylvania State University Herbarium (PAC). Whole-genome sequences for 303

genotypes are being deposited in the European Nucleotide Archive (ENA;

https://www.ebi.ac.uk/ena). Whole-genome sequences for four genotypes sequenced by the DOE

Joint Genome Institute are publicly available at their website under proposal ID: 506608. The

beagle (genotype-likelihoods), vcf (SNP calls), and raw phenotype data will be publicly available

at Figshare[90]. Genotype-level geographic information, climate data, growth chamber phenotypes,

ancestry proportions, GWAS SNPs, and field common gardens data are in Supplementary Data

1. Gene annotations of GWAS results (100 top SNPs) are in Supplementary Data 2.

Code availability

Code used to analyze NGS data will be publicly available at Figshare[90].

References

1. Daly, E. Z. et al. A synthesis of biological invasion hypotheses associated with the introduction–naturalization–invasion continuum. *Oikos* **2023**, e09645 (2023).

2. Catford, J. A., Jansson, R. & Nilsson, C. Reducing redundancy in invasion ecology by integrating hypotheses into a single theoretical framework. *Diversity and Distributions* **15**, 22–40 (2009).

3. Liu, D. et al. Regional invasion history and land use shape the prevalence of non-native species in local assemblages. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **30**, e17426 (2024).

4. Colautti, R. I. & Barrett, S. C. H. Rapid adaptation to climate facilitates range expansion of an invasive plant. *Science* **342**, 364–366 (2013).

5. Urban M. C. et al. Evolutionary origins for ecological patterns in space. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **117**, 17482–17490 (2020).

6. Tigano, A. & Friesen, V. L. Genomics of local adaptation with gene flow. *Mol. Ecol.* **25**, 2144-2164 (2016).

7. Bridle, J. R. & Vines, T. H. Limits to evolution at range margins: When and why does adaptation fail? *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **22**, 140–147 (2007).

8.   Simón-Porcar, V. I., Silva, J. L. & Vallejo-Marín, M. Rapid local adaptation in both sexual

and asexual invasive populations of monkeyflowers (*Mimulus* spp.). *Ann. Bot.* **127**, 655–

668 (2021).

9.   Kirkpatrick, M. & Barton, N. H. Evolution of a species' range. *Am. Nat.* **150**, 1–23 (1997).

10.   Eckert, C. G., Samis, K. E. & Lougheed, S. C. Genetic variation across species'

geographical ranges: the central–marginal hypothesis and beyond. *Mol. Ecol.* **17**, 1170–

1188 (2008).

11.   Mayr E. *Animal Species and Evolution* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1963)

12.   Robinson, J., Kyriazis, C. C., Yuan, S. C. & Lohmueller, K. E. Deleterious variation in

natural populations and implications for conservation genetics. *Annu. Rev. Anim. Biosci.* **11**,

93–114 (2023).

13.   Bay, R. A. et al. Genomic signals of selection predict climate-driven population declines in

a migratory bird. *Science* **359**, 83–86 (2018).

14.   Nota, A., Bertolino, S., Tiralongo, F. & Santovito, A. Adaptation to bioinvasions: When

does it occur? *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **30**, e17362 (2024).

15.   Rosche, C. et al., Climate outweighs native vs. nonnative range-effects for genetics and

common garden performance of a cosmopolitan weed. *Ecol. Monogr.* **89**, e01386 (2019).

16.   Santangelo, J. S. et al., Global urban environmental change drives adaptation in white

clover. *Science* **375**,1275–1281 (2022).

17.   Leger, E. A. & Rice, K. J. Assessing the speed and predictability of local adaptation in

invasive California poppies (*Eschscholzia californica*). *J. Evol. Biol.* **20**, 1090–1103 (2007).

18.   Liu, C., Wolter, C., Xian, W. & Jeschke, J. M. Most invasive species largely conserve their

climatic niche. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **117**, 23643–23651 (2020).

19. Sherpa, S. & Deprés, L. The evolutionary dynamics of biological invasions: A multi-

approach Perspective. *Evolutionary Applications* **14**, 1463–1484 (2021).

20. Turner, K. G., Ostevik, K. L., Grassa, C. J. & Rieseberg, L. H. Genomic analyses of

phenotypic differences between native and invasive populations of diffuse knapweed

(*Centaurea diffusa*). *Front. Ecol. Evol.* **8**, 577635 (2021).

21. Kreiner, J. M., Caballero, A., Wright, S. I. & Stinchcombe, J. R. Selective ancestral sorting

and de novo evolution in the agricultural invasion of *Amaranthus tuberculatus*. *Evolution*

76, 70–85 (2022).

22. Endriss, S. B., Alba, C., Norton, A. P., Pyšek, P. & Hufbauer, R. A. Breakdown of a

geographic cline explains high performance of introduced populations of a weedy invader.

J. Ecol. **106**, 699–713 (2018).

23. Gioria, M., Hulme, P. E., Richardson, D. M. & Pyšek, P. Why are invasive plants

successful? *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.* **74**, 635-670 (2023).

24. Vallejo-Marín, M. et al. Population genomic and historical analysis suggests a global

invasion by bridgehead processes in *Mimulus guttatus*. *Commun. Biol.* **4**, 327 (2021).

25. Bieker, V. C. et al. Uncovering the genomic basis of an extraordinary plant invasion. *Sci.*

Adv. **8**, eabo5115 (2022).

26. Lucas, M. S. et al. Re-focusing sampling, design and experimental methods to assess rapid

evolution by non-native plant species. *Biol. Invasions* **26**, 1327–1343 (2024).

27. Mack, R. N. Invasion of *Bromus tectorum* L. into western North America: An ecological

chronicle. *Agro-Ecosyst.* **7**, 145–165 (1981).

28. Novak, S. J. & Mack, R. N. "Chapter 4. Mating system, introduction and genetic diversity

of *Bromus tectorum* in North America, the most notorious product of evolution within

Bromus section Genea" in *Exotic Brome-Grasses in Arid and Semiarid Ecosystems of the*

Western US: Causes, Consequences, and Management Implications, Germino, M. J.,

Chambers, J. C. & Brown, C. S. Eds. (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2016), pp.

99–132.

29.   Germino, M. J., Belnap, J., Stark, J. M., Allen, E. B. & Rau, B. M. "Chapter 3. Ecosystem

impacts of exotic annual invaders in the genus *Bromus*" in *Exotic Brome-Grasses in Arid*

and Semiarid Ecosystems of the Western US: Causes, Consequences, and Management

Implications, Germino, M. J., Chambers, J. C. & Brown, C. S. Eds. (Springer International

Publishing, Cham, 2016), pp. 61–95.

30.   Bradley, B. A. et al. Cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*) distribution in the intermountain

western United States and its relationship to fire frequency, seasonality, and ignitions. *Biol.*

Invasions **20**, 1493–1506 (2018).

31.   Porensky, L. M. & Blumenthal, D. M. Historical wildfires do not promote cheatgrass

invasion in a western Great Plains steppe. *Biol. Invasions* **18**, 3333–3349 (2016).

32.   Revolinski, S. R., Maughan, P. J., Coleman, C. E. & Burke, I. C. Preadapted to adapt:

Underpinnings of adaptive plasticity revealed by the downy brome genome. *Commun. Biol.*

6, 326 (2023).

33.   Novak, S. J. & Mack, R. N. Genetic variation in *Bromus tectorum* (Poaceae): comparison

between native and introduced populations. *Heredity* **71**, 167–176 (1993).

34.   Barlett, E., Novak, S. J. & Mack, R. N. Genetic variation in *Bromus tectorum* (Poaceae):

differentiation in the eastern United States. *Am. J. Bot.* **89**, 602–612 (2002).

35.   Valliant, M. T., Mack, R. N. & Novak, S. J. Introduction history and population genetics of

the invasive grass *Bromus tectorum* (Poaceae) in Canada. *Am. J. Bot.* **94**, 1156–1169

(2007).

36. Schachner, L. J., Mack, R. N. & Novak, S. J. *Bromus tectorum* (Poaceae) in midcontinental

United States: Population genetic analysis of an ongoing invasion. *Am. J. Bot.* **95**, 1584–

1595 (2008).

37. Huttanus, T. D., Mack, R. N. & Novak, S. J. Propagule pressure and introduction pathways

of *Bromus tectorum* (cheatgrass; Poaceae) in the central United States. *Int. J. Plant Sci.*

172, 783–794 (2011).

38. Pawlak, A. R., Mack, R. N., Busch, J. W. & Novak, S. J. Invasion of *Bromus tectorum* (L.)

into California and the American southwest: Rapid, multi-directional and genetically

diverse. *Biol. Invasions* **17**, 287–306 (2015).

39. Leger, E. A., Espeland, E. K., Merrill, K. R. & Meyer, S. E. Genetic variation and local

adaptation at a cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*) invasion edge in western Nevada. *Mol. Ecol.*

18, 4366–4379 (2009).

40. Hufft, R. A. & Zelikova, T. J. "Chapter 5. Ecological genetics, local adaptation, and

phenotypic plasticity in *Bromus tectorum* in the context of a changing climate" in *Exotic*

Brome-Grasses in Arid and Semiarid Ecosystems of the Western US: Causes,

Consequences, and Management Implications, Germino, M. J., Chambers, J. C. & Brown,

C. S. Eds. (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2016), pp. 133–154.

41. Meyer, S. E. & Allen, P. S. Ecological genetics of seed germination regulation in *Bromus*

tectorum L. I. Phenotypic variance among and within populations. *Oecologia* **120**, 27–34

(1999).

42 Meyer, S. E. & Allen, P. S. Ecological genetics of seed germination regulation in *Bromus*

tectorum L. II. Reaction norms in response to a water stress gradient imposed during seed

maturation. *Oecologia* **120**, 35–43 (1999).

43. Meyer, S. E., Nelson, D. L. & Carlson, S. L. Ecological genetics of vernalization response

in *Bromus tectorum* L. (Poaceae). *Ann. Bot.* **93**, 653–663 (2004).

44. Meyer, S. E., Leger, E. A., Eldon, D. R. & Craig, C. E. Strong genetic differentiation in the

invasive annual grass *Bromus tectorum* across the Mojave–Great Basin ecological transition

zone. *Biol. Invasions* **18**, 1611–1628 (2016).

45. Kelly, L. J., Mack, R. N. & Novak, S. J. Genetic analysis of *Bromus tectorum* (Poaceae) in

the Mediterranean region: biogeographical pattern of native populations. *Heredity* **126**,

178–193 (2021).

46. Zeitler, L. & Gilbert, K. J. Using runs of homozygosity and machine learning to disentangle

sources of inbreeding and infer self-fertilization rates. *Genome Biol. Evol.* **16**, evae139

(2024).

47. Meyer, S. E., Ghimire, S., Decker, S., Merrill, K. R. & Coleman, C. E. The ghost of

outcrossing past in downy brome, an inbreeding annual grass. *J. Hered.* **104**, 476–490

(2013).

48. Hierro, J. L., Eren, Ö., Čuda, J. & Meyerson, L. A. Evolution of increased competitive

ability may explain dominance of introduced species in ruderal communities. *Ecol.*

Monogr. **92**, e1524 (2022).

49. McKay, J. K. & Latta, R. G. Adaptive population divergence: Markers, QTL and traits.

Trends Ecol. Evol. **17**, 285–291 (2002).

50. Vahsen, M. L. et al. Phenological sensitivity of *Bromus tectorum* genotypes depends on

current and source environments. *Ecology* **106**, e70025 (2025).

51. Todesco, M. et al. Massive haplotypes underlie ecotypic differentiation in sunflowers.

Nature **584**, 602–607 (2020).

52. Battlay, P. et al. Large haploblocks underlie rapid adaptation in the invasive weed *Ambrosia*

artemisiifolia. *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 1717 (2023).

53. Resentini, F., Orozco-Arroyo, G., Cucinotta, M. & Mendes, M. A. The impact of heat stress

in plant reproduction. *Front. Plant Sci.* **14**, 1271644 (2023).

54. Holman, T. J. et al. The N-end rule pathway promotes seed germination and establishment

through removal of ABA sensitivity in *Arabidopsis*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **106**, 4549–4554

(2009).

55. Gain, C. et al. A quantitative theory for genomic offset statistics. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **40**,

msad140 (2023).

56. Morrow, L. A. & Stahlman, P. W. The history and distribution of Downy Brome (*Bromus*

tectorum) in North America. *Weed Sci.* **32**, 2–6 (1984).

57. Razanajatovo, M. et al. Plants capable of selfing are more likely to become naturalized. *Nat.*

Commun. **7**, 13313 (2016).

58. van Kleunen, M., Manning, J. C., Pasqualetto, V. & Johnson, S. D. Phylogenetically

independent associations between autonomous self-fertilization and plant invasiveness. *Am.*

Nat. **171**, 195–201 (2008).

59. NA, A. et al. Niche shift in invasive species: is it a case of "home away from home" or

finding a "new home"? *Biodivers. Conserv.* **31**, 2625–2638 (2022).

60. Smith, A. L. et al. Global gene flow releases invasive plants from environmental constraints

on genetic diversity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **117**, 4218–4227 (2020).

61. Skotte, L., Korneliussen, T. S. & Albrechtsen, A. Estimating individual admixture

proportions from next generation sequencing data. *Genetics* **195**, 693–702 (2013).

62. Meisner, J. & Albrechtsen, A. Inferring population structure and admixture proportions in

low-depth NGS data. *Genetics* **210**, 719–731 (2018).

63. Evanno, G., Regnaut, S. & Goudet, J. Detecting the number of clusters of individuals using

the software STRUCTURE: a simulation study. *Mol. Ecol.* **14**, 2611–2620 (2005).

64. Saitou, N. & Nei, M. The neighbor-joining method: A new method for reconstructing

phylogenetic trees. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **4**, 406–425 (1987).

65. Nei, M. Analysis of gene diversity in subdivided populations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **70**,

3321–3323 (1973).

66. Weir, B. S. & Goudet, J. A unified characterization of population structure and relatedness.

Genetics **206**, 2085–2103 (2017).

67. Zheng, X. et al. A high-performance computing toolset for relatedness and principal

component analysis of SNP data. *Bioinformatics* **28**, 3326–3328 (2012).

68. Nei, M. & Li, W.-H. Mathematical model for studying genetic variation in terms of

restriction endonucleases. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **76**, 5269–5273 (1979).

69. Danecek, P. et al. Twelve years of SAMtools and BCFtools. *Gigascience* **10**, giab008

(2021).

70. Danecek, P. et al. The variant call format and VCFtools. *Bioinformatics* **27**, 2156–2158

(2011).

71. Tajima, F. Statistical method for testing the neutral mutation hypothesis by DNA

polymorphism. *Genetics* **123**, 585–595 (1989).

72. Ceballos, F. C., Joshi, P. K., Clark, D. W., Ramsay, M. & Wilson, J. F. Runs of

homozygosity: windows into population history and trait architecture. *Nat. Rev. Genet*. **19**,

220–234 (2018).

73. Purcell, S. et al. PLINK: A tool set for whole-genome association and population-based

linkage analyses. *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **81**, 559–575 (2007).

74. Bivand, R. S., Pebesma, E. J., Gómez-Rubio, V. & Pebesma, E. J. *Applied Spatial Data*

Analysis with R (Springer, New York City, 2008).

75. Diniz-Filho, J. A. F. et al. Mantel test in population genetics. *Genet. Mol. Biol.* **36**, 475–485

(2013).

76. Dray, S. & Dufour, A.-B. The ade4 package: Implementing the duality diagram for

ecologists. *J. Stat. Softw.* **22**, 1–20 (2007).

77. Brun, P., Zimmermann, N. E., Hari, C., Pellissier, L. & Karger, D. N. Global climate-

related predictors at kilometer resolution for the past and future. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **14**,

5573–5603 (2022).

78. Brun, P., Zimmermann, N. E., Hari, C., Pellissier, L. & Karger, D. N. Data from:

CHELSA-BIOCLIM+ A novel set of global climate-related predictors at kilometer-

resolution. EnviDat. (2022); https://doi.org/10.16904/envidat.332

79. Oksanen, J. et al. vegan: Community ecology package, version 2.6-4 (2022);

https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan.

80. Capblancq, T. & Forester, B. R. Redundancy analysis: A Swiss army knife for landscape

genomics. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **12**, 2298–2309 (2021).

81. Dray, S., Legendre, P. & Peres-Neto, P. R. Spatial modelling: A comprehensive framework

for principal coordinate analysis of neighbour matrices (PCNM). *Ecol. Model.* **196**, 483–

493 (2006).

82. Hastie, T. J. & Tibshirani, R. J. *Generalized Additive Models*. (Chapman and Hall, New

York City, 1990).

83. Wood, S. N. Fast stable restricted maximum likelihood and marginal likelihood estimation

of semiparametric generalized linear models. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **73**, 3–

36 (2011).

84. Bourke, P. M. et al. Detecting quantitative trait loci and exploring chromosomal pairing in

autopolyploids using polyqtlR. *Bioinformatics* **37**, 3822–3829 (2021).

85. Therneau, T. M. coxme: Mixed effects cox models, version 2.2-20 (2022);

https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=coxme.

86. Zhou, X. & Stephens, M. Genome-wide efficient mixed-model analysis for association

studies. *Nat. Genet.* **44**, 821–824 (2012).

87. Kusmec, A. & Schnable, P. S. FarmCPUpp: Efficient large-scale genomewide association

studies. *Plant Direct.* **2**, e00053 (2018).

88. Zhang, C., Dong, S.-S., Xu, J.-Y., He, W.-M. & Yang, T.-L. PopLDdecay: a fast and

effective tool for linkage disequilibrium decay analysis based on variant call format files.

Bioinformatics **35**, 1786–1788 (2019).

89. Tian, F., Yang, D.-C., Meng, Y.-Q., Jin, J. & Gao, G. PlantRegMap: Charting functional

regulatory maps in plants. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **2019**, gkz1020 (2019).

90. Figshare dataset and code for this study with repository DOI will be available here.

Acknowledgments: Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in the

material are those of the authors and should not be construed to represent any official USDA

determination or policy. Any use of trade, firm, or product names is for descriptive purposes only

and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government. Xavier Mack, Carlos Rodríguez-

Gonzalez, Yuxin Luo, and Katherine Blocklove helped with measuring phenotypes, harvesting,

and performing DNA extractions. Ian Burke, Samuel Revolinski, Peter Maughan, and Craig

Coleman granted us access to the reference genome prior to publication. The USGS FIREss team

contributed to common garden establishment and data collection on the Wildcat site. iNaturalist

was a key resource for identifying seed collectors, among those were also Dave Barnett, David

Board, Chalon Boesel, John Bradford, Jaime Braschi, Howard Bruner, Victoria Bustamante,

Charles Campbell, Jeanne Chambers, Mike Chen, Mark Chynoweth, Jason Cooper, Massimo

Cristofaro, Melodie Cunningham, Kirk Davies, Janelle Downs, Torsten Eriksson, Maggie

Eshleman, Erica Fleishman, Carol Kadonsky & Bill Foreman, Berit Gehrke, Tom Getts, Richard

Gill, Dana Hartel, Nate Hartley, Patricia Hollins, Alex Hood, Tayla Hook, Parker Hopkins,

Becky Hufft, Jennifer Kalt, Lorri Kendrick, Molly Ladd, Matt Lavin, Steven Lee, Jonathan

Levine, Marisa Mancillas, John Maron, Grace McCartha, Randal Mindell, Chandra Moffat,

Brooke Moore, James Nagler, Yael Orgad, Matthew Pedrotti, David Pyke, Sasha Reed, Matt

Rinella, Viktoria Ropak, Håkan Rydin, Geno Schupp, Adam Searcy, Tim Springer, Amy

Symstad, Tracy Thomas, Trudy Trevarthen, Samantha vanDeurs, Biljana Vidovic, Viktoria

Wagner, Gretchen Whetham, David Wilderman, Eileen Wyza, and Pauline & Jon Zweck.

Funding: National Science Foundation grant DEB-1927282 (PBA), DEB-1927009 (JRL), DEB-

1927177 (MBH); Joint Genome Institute of the U.S. Department of Energy grant New

Investigator Award-506608 (JRL); National Institutes of Health grant R35GM138300 (JRL).

Author contributions

Conceptualization: DG, CSB, EAL, DMB, MJG, LMP, MBH, PBA, JRL

Methodology: DG, TMM, NP, SR, AP, CSB, EAL, DMB, MJG, LMP, MBH, PBA, JRL

Investigation: DG, MLV, AD, RB-Z, EAL, DMB, MJG, LMP, PBA, JRL, OB, CSB, RB, SB-M,

SMC, SLD-F, AD, RCD, PWD, DJE, TAV, HH, MCH, RAH, SJ, JMK, EK, SK, MK, AK, ML,

SL, DM, CLM, JWM, DUN, JPO, RP, LAP, LR, BGR, CR, MS, RKS, AS, BMS, RLS, KGT,

AKU, AVV, C-AW, JZ.

Funding acquisition: PBA, MBH, JRL, MJG

Project administration: PBA, MBH, CSB, DMB, MJG, LMP, JRL

Writing – original draft: DG, JRL

Writing – review & editing: all authors

1000

1001 **Competing interests:** Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

1002

1003 **Additional information**

1004 **Supplementary information** is available for this paper.

1005

1006 **Correspondence** and requests for materials should be addressed to D.G.

1007

1008 **Reprints and permission information** is available at http://www.nature.com/reprints

1009

1010

1011

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

Fig. 1: The cheatgrass invasion involved multiple diverse introductions from the native range to North America (**a**) Admixture proportions for K=4 ancestral genetic clusters (colors) for invasive and native genotypes in different regions; WNA: western North America (n=107), ENA: eastern North America (n=67), out: not in North America (n=8), MD: Mediterranean (n=24), NCE EU: north-central-east Europe (n=53), WA: west Asia (n=28). Geographic distribution of (**b**) invasive (n=194, North American only) and (**c**) native (n=105) genotypes. (**d**) Genetic differentiation (F_{ST}) between native and invaded regions, with notations following panel a. (**e**) Principal components analysis showing PC1 (y-axis) and PC2 (x-axis) explaining 20.6% of genomic variation. Axes are shifted to better reflect the latitudinal distribution of genotypes. Gray letters denote geographic origin in the native range and stars represent genotypes in the invaded range. (**f**) Neighbor-joining tree annotated with native (gray letters) and invaded locations (black numbers and stars). Native notations follow the ISO alpha-3 country code or their cardinal direction in Europe (EU). Black numbers mark groups of 2–14 near-clonal, and often widely distributed, invasive genotypes. Stars mark branches with invasive genotypes.

1057

1058

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1066

1067

1068

1069

Fig. 2: Genomic variation is structured by environment in the native and invaded ranges.

Strong isolation-by-distance in the (**a**) native (**Mantel $p=10^{-4}$) but not in the (**b**) invaded range; plots show raw pair-wise data with a spline. Euler Plots show genomic variation is best explained by both the abiotic environment and spatial distance in (**c**) the native range, but only by the abiotic environment in (**d**) the invaded range. Fields of squares represent total genomic variation, circles represent genomic variation explained by a particular group of variables calculated using variance partitioning with RDA ordination (native n=105, invaded n=194). (**e**) Native and (**f**) invasive genotypes projected on the first two canonical axes of RDA (x-axis: RDA1 y-axis: RDA2). Arrows represent environmental predictors that strongly correlate with a maximal proportion of variation in linear combinations of SNPs. ELV: elevation, PET: potential evapotranspiration, PRC: total annual precipitation, PSE: precipitation seasonality, TAR: temperature annual range, TDR: temperature diurnal range, TMP: annual mean temperature. Colors are K=4 ancestral clusters. Geographic annotations are depicted in bolded black; N EU: north Europe, E EU: east Europe, C EU: central Europe, MD: Mediterranean, WA: west Asia, W coast: west coast, InterM. W: intermountain west, ENA: eastern North America.

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098

1099

1100

1101

1102

1103

1104

1105

1106

1107

1108

1109

1110

Fig. 3: Selection along aridity and temperature gradients shapes flowering phenology. (a) Eigenvector plot with loadings of eleven phenotypes onto PC1 (x-axis) and PC2 (y-axis) describing axes of life history variation of 169 genotypes in a growth chamber; fl: Flowering, n: Number, inflor: Inflorescence. (**b**) Growth chamber phenotype-environment associations for invasive (left; n=138–145) and native genotypes (right; n=31–36). Coefficients of determination (R^2), trends (gray lines), and 95% confidence intervals (gray shades) come from linear regressions. Significance comes from linear-mixed kinship models that accounted for relatedness among genotypes: *$p<0.05$, ***$p<0.0001$. (**c**) Fitness advantage of early flowering genotypes at a warm site/common garden (WI: Wild Cat, gray crosses, n=93) and of late flowering genotypes at a cool site/common garden (SS: Sheep Station, gray open circles, n=82) in two consecutive years (top: 2022 Spring harvest and bottom: 2023 Spring harvest). Trends (gray lines) and 95% confidence intervals (gray shades) come from linear regressions. Significance comes from linear-mixed kinship models of fitness (seed count for 2022 and inflorescence mass for 2023) in response to mean first day of flowering (fl), site, and their interaction (int): *$p=0.006$, **$p<0.0006$, ***$p<0.00001$. In all panels colors are K=4 ancestral clusters.

Fig. 4: Environmental trends of two flowering time QTL are mirrored between native and

invasive genotypes. (**a** and **d**) Geographic distribution of QTL SNP alleles in the native (top)

and invaded (bottom) range; crosses represent the reference/major allele, and open circles the

alternate/minor allele. (**b** and **e**) Zoomed-in Manhattan plots showing Wald-test *p*-values (plotted

as $-\log_{10}$) from GWAS and genomic location of top SNP (marked in green), with respective

false-discovery-rate (FDR) and minor allele frequency (MAF). (**c** and **f**) Phenotypic (boxplots to

the left) and environmental variation (boxplots to the right) of flowering time QTL SNP alleles

identified with GWAS. Boxplots indicate median (middle line), 25th, 75th percentile (box), and

whiskers cover the data extent. ***$p<0.0008$ from two-tailed t-tests, but kinship linear-mixed

models showed no significant differences. Max VPD: Maximum vapor pressure deficit in kPa.

A, G, T, C on maps and x-axis of boxplots indicate nucleotides.

1148

1149

1150

Fig. 5: Genomic predictions of strong local adaptation occur in regions where cheatgrass is most dominant. (**a**) Geographic distribution of the genomic offset estimated for each invasive genotype (n=194). The genomic offset or maladaptation is the genetic distance between observed invasive genotypes and the genotype-environment predictions in the invaded range based on the native range genotype-environment association. (**b**) Histograms of the mean genetic distance (offset) of 1000 null permutations in western North America (WNA, n=127) and eastern North America (ENA, n=67), relative to their estimated mean genetic distance (red lines). (**c**) Within the Great Basin (polygon in a, n=55), the mean genetic distance (offset) is significantly lower in areas where cheatgrass occurs in high (*i.e.*, representing >15% vegetation cover) vs. low abundance. Boxplots indicate median (middle line), 25th, 75th percentile (box), and whiskers cover the data extent.