Widespread selection and gene flow shape the genomic landscape during a radiation of monkeyflowers

Sean Stankowski[1,2,§], Madeline A. Chase[1,3,§], Allison M. Fuiten[1,4], Murillo F. Rodrigues[1], Peter L. Ralph[1], and Matthew A. Streisfeld[1*].

[1]Institute of Ecology and Evolution, 335 Pacific Hall 5289, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97405, USA
[2]Present address: Department of Animal and Plant Sciences, University of Sheffield, Sheffield S10 2TN, UK
[3]Present address: Department of Evolutionary Biology, Evolutionary Biology Centre (EBC), Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden
[4]Present address: Department of Dermatology, Oregon Heath and Science University, L468R Portland, OR, USA
[§]These authors contributed equally to this work

*Corresponding author: mstreis@uoregon.edu

ORCID ids:
SS: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0472-9299; MAC: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7916-3560; AMF: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3926-5455; MFR: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7508-1384 PLR: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9459-6866; MAS: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2660-8642

Keywords: Indirect selection; introgression; linked selection *Mimulus*; speciation

Short title: Rapid genomic landscape evolution during a radiation of monkeyflowers

Abstract—Speciation genomic studies aim to interpret patterns of genome-wide variation in light of the processes that give rise to new species. However, interpreting the genomic 'landscape' of speciation is difficult, because many evolutionary processes can impact levels of variation. Facilitated by the first chromosome-level assembly for the group*,* we use whole-genome sequencing and simulations to shed light on the processes that have shaped the genomic landscape during a recent radiation of monkeyflowers. After inferring the phylogenetic relationships among the nine taxa in this radiation, we show that highly similar diversity (π) and differentiation (F_{ST}) landscapes have emerged across the group. Variation in these landscapes was strongly predicted by the local density of functional elements and the recombination rate, suggesting that the landscapes have been shaped by widespread natural selection. Using the varying divergence times between pairs of taxa, we show that the correlations between F_{ST} and genome features arose almost immediately after a population split and have become stronger over time. Simulations of genomic landscape evolution suggest that background selection (i.e., selection against deleterious mutations) alone is too subtle to generate the observed patterns, but scenarios that involve positive selection and genetic incompatibilities are plausible alternative explanations. Finally, tests for introgression among these taxa reveal

46 widespread evidence of heterogeneous selection against gene flow during this radiation.
47 Thus, combined with existing evidence for adaptation in this system, we conclude that
48 the correlation in F_{ST} among these taxa informs us about the genomic basis of adaptation
49 and speciation in this system.
50
Author summary—What can patterns of genome-wide variation tell us about the
speciation process? The answer to this question depends upon our ability to infer the
evolutionary processes underlying these patterns. This, however, is difficult, because
many processes can leave similar footprints, but some have nothing to do with speciation
per se. For example, many studies have found highly heterogeneous levels of genetic
differentiation when comparing the genomes of emerging species. These patterns are
often referred to as differentiation 'landscapes' because they appear as a rugged
topography of 'peaks' and 'valleys' as one scans across the genome. It has often been
argued that selection against deleterious mutations, a process referred to as background
selection, is primarily responsible for shaping differentiation landscapes early in
speciation. If this hypothesis is correct, then it is unlikely that patterns of differentiation
will reveal much about the genomic basis of speciation. However, using genome
sequences from nine emerging species of monkeyflower coupled with simulations of
genomic divergence, we show that it is unlikely that background selection is the primary
architect of these landscapes. Rather, differentiation landscapes have probably been
shaped by adaptation and gene flow, which are processes that are central to our
understanding of speciation. Therefore, our work has important implications for our
understanding of what patterns of differentiation can tell us about the genetic basis of
adaptation and speciation.
70

Introduction

The primary goal of speciation genomics is to interpret patterns of genome-wide
variation in light of the ecological and evolutionary processes that contribute to the origin
of new species (Ravinet et al. 2017, Wolf and Ellegren 2017, Campbell et al. 2018).
Advances in DNA sequencing now allow us to capture patterns of genome-wide variation
from organisms across the tree of life, but inferring the processes underlying these
patterns remains a formidable challenge (Ravinet et al. 2017). This is because speciation
is highly complex, involving a range of factors and processes that shape genomes through
time and across different spatial and ecological settings (Abbott et al. 2013).
The difficulty of inferring process from pattern is illustrated by recent efforts to
characterize the genomic basis of reproductive isolation using patterns of genome-wide
variation (Ravinet et al. 2017, Wolf and Ellegren 2017, Campbell et al. 2018). Numerous
studies have revealed highly heterogeneous differentiation 'landscapes' between pairs of
taxa at different stages in the speciation process (Turner et al. 2005, Hohenlohe et al.
2010, Ellegren et al. 2012, Martin et al. 2013, Renaut et al. 2013, Poelstra et al. 2014,
Soria-Carrasco et al. 2014, Lamichhaney et al. 2015, Malinsky et al. 2015). This pattern,
which is characterized by peaks and valleys of relative differentiation (i.e., F_{ST}) across the
genome, was initially thought to provide insight into the genomic architecture of porous
species boundaries (Wu 2001). Peaks in the differentiation landscape were interpreted as
genomic regions containing loci underlying reproductive barriers, while valleys were
thought to reflect regions that were homogenized by ongoing gene flow (Turner et al.

2005, Nosil et al. 2009, Feder et al. 2012). However, as the field of speciation genomics
has matured, it has become clear that heterogeneous differentiation landscapes can be
influenced by factors that have nothing to do with speciation *per se*.

For example, it is now clear that levels of genome-wide differentiation (F_{ST}) can
be influenced by the genomic distribution of intrinsic properties, including the
recombination rate and the local density of functional sites (Cruickshank and Hahn
2014). This is because these properties affect the way that natural selection impacts levels
of variation across the genome. First, regions enriched for functional sequence are more
likely to be subject to selection, because they provide a larger target size for mutations
with fitness effects. Second, when positive or negative directional selection acts on these
mutations, it can indirectly reduce levels of genetic variation at statistically associated
sites (Maynard-Smith and Haigh 1974, Charlesworth et al. 1993, Hudson and Kaplan
1995, Charlesworth 1998, Gillespie 2000, Coop and Ralph 2012, Cruickshank and Hahn
2014). Because these indirect effects of selection are mediated by linkage disequilibrium
(LD) between selected and neutral sites, stronger reductions in diversity (and
corresponding increases in F_{ST}) are expected in genomic regions with low recombination,
as this is where LD breaks down most gradually (Baird 2015). This is also why these
indirect effects of selection are referred to as 'linked selection', even though physical
linkage is not actually the cause. In this paper, we refer to the indirect effects of selection,
as 'indirect selection' for short.

Although genomic features were not initially expected to play a major role in
shaping patterns of between species variation (Kimura 1968, Ohta 1973) (but see
(Charlesworth 1998, Gillespie 2000)), recent empirical studies indicate that they can have
a strong impact on the topography of the differentiation landscape (Hahn 2008,
Cruickshank and Hahn 2014, Burri 2017a, b, Wolf and Ellegren 2017). The most
compelling evidence comes from studies that compare not one pair of taxa, but several
closely related taxa that share a similar distribution of genomic elements due to their
recent common ancestry (Burri 2017a, b, Wolf and Ellegren 2017). For example, Burri et
al. (Burri et al. 2015) examined multiple episodes of divergence in *Ficedula* flycatchers
and found strikingly similar differentiation landscapes between distinct pairs of taxa,
presumably due to a shared pattern of indirect selection across the genome. Highly
correlated differentiation landscapes have also been found in other groups of taxa,
including sunflowers (Renaut et al. 2013), *Heliconius* butterflies (Kronforst et al. 2013,
Martin et al. 2013), Darwin's finches (Han et al. 2017), and other birds (Van Doren et al.
2017, Delmore et al. 2018).

But what, if anything, do these parallel signatures of selection reveal about the
genomic basis of adaptation and speciation? Part of the answer lies in understanding
which forms of selection cause these patterns. In a recent article, Burri (Burri 2017b)
argued that selection against deleterious mutations (*i.e.*, background selection, or BGS) is
primarily responsible for the evolution of differentiation landscapes that are correlated
both among taxa and with the distribution of intrinsic features. This argument was based
on two premises: first, deleterious mutations are far more common than beneficial ones,
so BGS has a greater opportunity to generate a genome-wide correlation between levels
of variation and the distributions of intrinsic properties; second, although all functional
elements are potential targets of BGS, the same loci are not expected to be repeatedly
involved in adaptation or speciation across multiple taxa (Burri 2017b). Although this

interpretation implies that correlated differentiation landscapes are unlikely to inform us
about adaptation or speciation directly, it has been argued that this shared pattern of
differentiation can be used to control for the effects of BGS when attempting to identify
regions of the genome that have been affected by positive selection (Burri 2017b).
Even though it is often argued that correlated differentiation landscapes reflect the
action of recurrent background selection, it stands to reason that they also could arise as a
direct consequence of adaptation and speciation. For example, when adaptation occurs
from standing variation, the rate of adaptation is not limited by the mutation rate,
meaning that heterogeneous differentiation landscapes can evolve rapidly (Barrett et al.
2008, Bassham et al. 2018). Moreover, if adaptation is highly polygenic, positive
selection will inevitably impact most of the genome (Rockman 2012). This could cause
levels of differentiation to become correlated with the distribution of intrinsic genomic
features, even across multiple taxa that are adapting to different environments. Also,
correlated differentiation landscapes may arise across multiple closely related taxa due to
a common basis of reproductive isolation among taxa. This is because incomplete
isolating barriers generate a heterogeneous pattern of selection against gene flow across
the genome. The loci underlying these porous barriers, including genetic incompatibilities
and locally adapted alleles, are expected to accumulate in gene rich regions and will have
stronger barrier effects in genomic regions where the recombination rate is low (Schumer
et al. 2018, Martin et al. 2019). Thus, speciation also may result in genome-wide
correlations between levels of differentiation and genome features, especially if
reproductive isolation is highly polygenic.
Facilitated by a new chromosome-level genome assembly, genetic map, and
annotation, we combine analyses of whole-genome sequencing with simulations to
understand how different processes have contributed to the evolution of correlated
genomic landscapes during a recent radiation. The bush monkeyflower radiation consists
of eight taxa of *Mimulus aurantiacus* distributed mainly throughout California. (Fig. 1;
(Chase et al. 2017). Together with their sister species *M. clevelandii,* they span a range of
divergence times over the past approximately one million years. The plants inhabit a
range of environments, including temperate coastal regions, mountain ranges, semi-arid
habitats, and offshore islands (Thompson 2005). Crossing experiments have shown that
all of these taxa are at least partially inter-fertile (McMinn 1951), and many hybridize in
nature in narrow regions where their distributions overlap (Streisfeld and Kohn 2005,
2007, Sobel and Streisfeld 2015, Stankowski et al. 2015, 2017). Despite their close
evolutionary relationships and opportunities for gene flow, these taxa show striking
phenotypic differentiation (Chase et al. 2017). The most conspicuous trait differences are
associated with their flowers, which show heritable variation in color, size, shape, and the
placement of the reproductive organs (Streisfeld and Kohn 2005, Stankowski et al. 2015).
In his seminal works on plant speciation, Grant (Grant 1981, 1993b, a) postulated that
these floral trait differences were due to pollinator-mediated selection by different avian
and insect pollinators. Detailed studies in one pair of taxa support this hypothesis and
have shown that pollinator-mediated selection can generate strong premating
reproductive isolation in the face of extensive gene flow (Streisfeld and Kohn 2005,
2007, Sobel and Streisfeld 2015, Stankowski et al. 2015, 2017).
After inferring the phylogenetic relationships among these taxa, we show that
highly similar diversity (π) and differentiation (F_{ST}) landscapes have emerged across the

group. Variation in these landscapes was strongly predicted by the local density of functional elements and the recombination rate, suggesting that they have been shaped by widespread selection. Using the varying divergence times between pairs of taxa, we show that the correlations between F_{ST} and genome features arose almost immediately after a population split and have become stronger over the course of time. Simulations of genomic landscape evolution suggest that background selection (i.e., selection against deleterious mutations) alone is too subtle to generate the observed patterns, but scenarios that involve positive selection and genetic incompatibilities are plausible alternative explanations. Finally, tests for introgression among these taxa reveal widespread evidence of heterogeneous selection against gene flow during this radiation. We discuss the implications of these results for our general understanding of genomic landscape evolution, particularly in light of recent efforts to reveal the genomic basis of adaptation and speciation.

Figure 1. Evolutionary relationships and patterns of genome-wide variation across the radiation. A) The black tree was constructed from a concatenated alignment of genome-wide SNPs and is rooted using *M. clevelandii*. The 387 gray trees were constructed from 500 kb genomic windows. The first number associated with each node or taxon is the bootstrap support for that clade in the whole genome tree, and the second number is the percentage of window-based trees in which that clade is present. B) Levels of differentiation (F_{ST}), C) divergence (d_{xy}), and D) diversity (π) within and among taxa based on the same 500 kb windows. For simplicity, F_{ST} and d_{xy} are shown only for comparisons with the red ecotype of subspecies *puniceus*. See Fig. S7 for the distributions of F_{ST} and d_{xy} across all pairs of taxa.

Results and Discussion
A chromosome-level genome assembly, map, and annotation for the bush monkeyflower

To facilitate the analysis of genome-wide variation in this group, we constructed the first chromosome-level reference genome for the bush monkeyflower using a combination of long-read Single Molecule Real Time (SMRT) sequencing (PacBio), overlapping and mate-pair short-reads (Illumina), and a high-density genetic map (7,589

segregating markers across 10 linkage groups; Fig. S1; Table S1). Contig building and
scaffolding yielded 1,547 scaffolds, with an N50 size of 1.6 Mbp, and a total length of
207 Mbp. The high-density map allowed us to anchor and orient 94% of the assembled
genome onto 10 linkage groups, which is the number of chromosomes inferred from
karyotypic analyses in all subspecies of *M. aurantiacus* and *M. clevelandii* (Vickery
1995). Analysis of assembly completeness based on conserved gene space (Simao et al.
2015) revealed that 93% of 1440 universal single copy orthologous genes were
completely assembled, with a further 2% partially assembled (Table S2). Subsequent
annotation yielded 23,018 predicted genes.
226
Phylogenetic relationships among taxa and patterns of discordance across the genome
To infer phylogenetic relationships among the taxa in this radiation, we sequenced
37 whole genomes from the seven subspecies and two ecotypes of *Mimulus aurantiacus*
(*n* = 4-5 per taxon) and its sister taxon *M. clevelandii* (*n* = 3) (Fig. S2; Table S3). Close
sequence similarity allowed us to align reads from all samples to the reference assembly
with high confidence (average 91.7% reads aligned; Table S3). After mapping, we
identified 13.2 million variable sites that were used in subsequent analyses (average
sequencing depth of 21x per individual, Table S3). Relationships were then inferred
among the nine taxa from a concatenated alignment of genome-wide SNPs using
maximum-likelihood (ML) phylogenetic analysis in *RAxML* (Stamatakis 2014).
The tree topology obtained from this analysis (Fig. 1) confirmed the same
phylogenetic relationships as previous analyses based on reduced-representation
sequencing and five different methods of phylogenetic reconstruction (Stankowski and
Streisfeld 2015, Chase et al. 2017), and was supported by patterns of clustering from
principal components analysis (Fig. S3). Individuals of each of the seven subspecies
formed monophyletic groups with 100% bootstrap support (Fig. 1). Relationships within
subspecies *puniceus* were more complex, as the red ecotype formed a monophyletic sub-
clade within the paraphyletic yellow ecotype. This is consistent with the recent origin of
red flowers from a yellow-flowered ancestor (Stankowski and Streisfeld 2015).
Although the whole genome phylogeny provides a well-supported summary of the
relationships among these taxa, concatenated phylogenies can obscure phylogenetic
discordance in more defined genomic regions (Pease et al. 2016) (Fig. 1A). To test for
fine-scale phylogenetic discordance, we next constructed ML phylogenies for 500 kb and
100 kb genomic windows. We then calculated a 'concordance score' for each tree by
computing the correlation between the distance matrix generated from each window-
based tree and the whole-genome tree, with a stronger correlation indicating that two
trees have a more similar topology.
At the 500 kb scale, only 22 (6%) trees showed the same taxon branching order as
the whole-genome tree. However, concordance scores tended to be very high for all of
the trees (mean = 0.964, s.d. 0.039; min 0.719), suggesting that variation in the topologies
was due primarily to minor differences in branching order. This was confirmed by
quantifying how often each node in the genome-wide tree was recovered in the set of
window-based trees (Fig. 1). Specifically, we found that differences in branching order
were associated with the most recent splits, which included pairs of closely related taxa.
For example, even though subspecies *puniceus* was monophyletic in the majority of trees
(72.6%), individuals from the red ecotype only formed a monophyletic group in 27% of

the trees. Similarly, the closely related subspecies *longiflorus* and *calycinus* were
monophyletic in only 45.7% and 24.1% of trees, respectively. Higher discordance among
these closely related, geographically proximate taxa is likely due to two factors. First,
only a short time has passed since they shared a common ancestor, meaning that ancestral
polymorphisms have had little time to sort among lineages. Second, ongoing gene flow
between some taxa may have opposed sorting, prolonging the retention of ancestral
variants among them.
Next, we examined how the level of phylogenetic discordance varied across the
bush monkeyflower genome. If the discordance was due to the stochastic effects of
neutral processes, variation in tree concordance scores should be distributed randomly
across the genome (Hudson 1990). To test this prediction, we plotted the tree
concordance scores across the 10 linkage groups (Fig. 2A; Fig. S4 for results from 100 kb
windows and Fig. S5 for plots along each chromosome). Rather than being randomly
distributed, trees with lower concordance scores tended to cluster in relatively narrow
regions of all 10 chromosomes (Fig. 2A; autocorrelation analysis permutation tests p =
0.001 - 0.023; Fig. S6). This non-random pattern indicates that the rate of sorting varies
along chromosomes, which could be due to variation in the strength of indirect selection
across the bush monkeyflower genome.
281
Correlated patterns of genome-wide variation across the radiation
To gain deeper insight into the evolutionary processes that have shaped patterns
of genome-wide variation during this radiation, we used three summary statistics to
quantify patterns of diversity (π), divergence (d_{xy}), and differentiation (F_{ST}) within and
between these taxa (the same 500 kb and 100 kb sliding windows as above). π, or
nucleotide diversity, was used to quantify the level of genetic variation within each taxon.
It is defined as the average number of nucleotide differences per site between two
sequences drawn from the population (Nei and Li 1979). Second, we calculated d_{xy} as a
measure of sequence divergence between all 36 pairs of taxa. In principle, π and d_{xy} are
the same measure, except that the former is calculated between sequences within a taxon
and the latter between pairs of taxa; they have the same units and both are proportional to
the average coalescence time of the sequences being compared multiplied by mutation
rate. Third, we calculated F_{ST} between each pair of taxa. Unlike d_{xy}, which is a measure
of divergence between sequences drawn from different taxa, F_{ST} measures differentiation
between the taxa relative to the total diversity in the sample. Between samples x and y,
F_{ST} is roughly equal to 1 - π/d_{xy}, where π is the mean diversity in the two taxa (Slatkin
1991). F_{ST} is strongly influenced by current levels of within-taxon diversity, while d_{xy} is
strongly influenced by the level of ancestral variation when divergence times are small.
The use of the term 'divergence' to describe both d_{xy} and F_{ST} has caused some confusion
in the literature, leading to alternative naming schemes. Here, we follow a recently
proposed convention, referring to d_{xy} as 'divergence' and F_{ST} as 'differentiation' (Ravinet
et al. 2017).
The variation in F_{ST} among all 36 pairs of taxa highlights the continuous nature
of differentiation across the group (Fig. 1B; Fig. S7), with mean window-based estimates
ranging from 0.06 (red vs. yellow ecotypes of *puniceus*) to more than 0.70. Distributions
of divergence (d_{xy}) show a similar pattern (Fig. 1C), with mean values ranging from
0.54% (red vs. yellow ecotypes) to 1.6% (yellow ecotype vs. *M. clevelandii*). Broad

distributions of window-based estimates indicate high variability in levels of
differentiation and divergence among genomic regions (Fig. 1B & 1C). Window-based
estimates of nucleotide diversity also varied markedly (π; Fig. 1D), ranging from 0.09%
to 1.26%, even though mean estimates were very similar among the ingroup taxa (0.37%
to 0.53%) and were only slightly lower in *M. clevelandii* (0.26%).
As with tree concordance, variation in these summary statistics was non-randomly
distributed across broad regions of each chromosome ($p < 0.005$; Fig. 2; Fig. S4 Fig. S5;
Fig. S6). To account for the magnitude of variation in these statistics across all nine taxa
(for π) or among the 36 pairs of taxa (for d_{xy} and F_{ST}), we normalized the window-based
estimates using *Z*-transformation and plotted them across the genome (Fig. S5). Visual
inspection of these data revealed that patterns of genome-wide variation in each statistic
were qualitatively similar in all comparisons. We therefore used principal components
analysis to quantify their similarity and extracted a single variable (PC1) that summarized
the common pattern (Fig. S5).

Figure 2. Common genomic landscapes mirror variation in the local properties of the
genome. A) Tree concordance scores for 500 kb non-overlapping genomic windows plotted
across the 10 bush monkeyflower chromosomes. B – D) Plots of the first principal component
(PC1) for F_{ST}, d_{xy}, and π in overlapping 500 kb windows (step size = 50 kb). PC1 explains 66%,
70%, and 85% of the variation in F_{ST}, d_{xy} and π, respectively, and is Z-transformed such that
above average values have positive values and below average values have negative values. E – F)
Gene count and recombination rate (cM/Mbp) in overlapping 500 kb windows. G), Mean f_d
(admixture proportion) in 500 kb non-overlapping genomic windows. See Fig. S4 for the same
plot made for 100 kb windows.

These analyses confirmed that patterns of genome-wide variation were highly
correlated across this group of taxa. Indeed, PC1 explained 65.9% of the variation in F_{ST}
across the 36 pairwise comparisons. Further, all comparisons loaded positively onto PC1
(mean loading = 0.78 s.d. 0.18; Table S5 for all loadings), indicating that peaks and
troughs of F_{ST} tended to occur in the same genomic regions across all comparisons.
Patterns of genome-wide divergence (d_{xy}) and diversity (π) also were highly correlated
across comparisons, with PC1 explaining 69.5% and 84.7% of the variation among the
window-based estimates, respectively. Again, all taxa (for π) and taxon comparisons (for
d_{xy}) loaded positively onto the first principal component (mean loading for d_{xy} = 0.78 s.d.
0.18; for π, 0.91 s.d. 0.07). PC1 therefore provides a summary of the original landscapes
and is effectively the same as taking the mean window-based scores for each statistic (r^2
between PC1 and mean scores > 0.995 for all three statistics).
370
Common genomic landscapes have been shaped by heterogeneous indirect selection
Observing highly similar genomic landscapes suggests that a common pattern of
heterogeneous selection has shaped variation in all nine taxa. Indeed, if a region
experiences recurrent indirect selection across the phylogenetic tree, then it should show
lower diversity (π) within species and lower divergence (d_{xy}) between species, because d_{xy}
is influenced by levels of diversity in the common ancestor (Charlesworth et al. 1993,
Charlesworth 1998, Burri 2017b). In agreement with this prediction, we observed a
strong positive correlation between PC1 d_{xy} and PC1 π ($r = 0.84$), indicating that regions
of the genome with lower diversity tended to be less diverged between these taxa (and
thus had lower ancestral diversity) (Fig. 3, Fig. S8 for scatterplots and Fig. S9 for results
at 100 kb scale). Regions with reduced diversity also tended to show higher levels of
differentiation (F_{ST}) ($r = -0.84$) and tree concordance ($r = -0.69$). These relationships are
also predicted by models of recurrent indirect selection, because local reductions in
diversity decrease the amount of genetic variation in future generations, similar to a local
reduction in N_e. As a result, ancestral variants in impacted regions sort more rapidly than
under neutrality (Pease and Hahn 2013).
387
388
Figure 3. Correlations between
measures of diversity and intrinsic
features reveal the impact of
heterogeneous indirect selection.
Matrix of pairwise correlations between
PC1 F_{ST}, PC1 d_{xy}, PC1 π, tree
concordance, mean f_d, gene density, and
recombination rate, all estimated in 500
kb non-overlapping windows. The heat
map indicates the strength of the
correlation and its sign. All correlations
are statistically significant at $p < 0.001$.
(See Fig. S8 for a more detailed
correlation matrix and Fig. S9 for the
correlation matrix from 100 kb
windows.

In models of recurrent indirect selection, variation in its impact on associated sites
is determined by the distribution of genomic features, including the local density of
functional elements and the recombination rate (Maynard-Smith and Haigh 1974,
Charlesworth et al. 1993). To test these theoretical predictions, we used our genome
annotation and genetic map to calculate the number of protein coding genes and the
average recombination rate (cM/Mbp) in each 500 kb window (Fig. 2E-F; Fig. S4; Fig.
S5). Regions of the genome with more functional elements tended to have a lower
recombination rate (r = -0.40; p < 0.0001), leading to large variation in the predicted
strength of indirect selection among regions. Consistent with the theoretical predictions
outlined above, we found strong correlations between PC1 π and gene count (r = -0.84; p
< 0.0001) and PC1 π and recombination rate (r = 0.44; p < 0.0001; Fig. 3; Figs. S8 &
S9), indicating that diversity is indeed lower in regions where selection is predicted to
have stronger indirect effects. However, we did not observe a significant interactive
effect of gene count and recombination rate on diversity (p = 0.057). This may be
because the distribution of these features is correlated, making it difficult to tease apart
their relative impacts.
Taken together, our results indicate that a common pattern of indirect selection
has caused correlated genomic landscapes to evolve across this radiation. As predicted by
theory (Maynard-Smith and Haigh 1974, Charlesworth et al. 1993, Langley et al. 2012)
(Hudson and Kaplan 1995) and observed in diverse taxa (Pease and Hahn 2013, Burri et
al. 2015, Corbett-Detig et al. 2015), genome-wide variation in the strength of indirect
selection is caused by the heterogeneous distributions of intrinsic genome features,
namely the density of functional elements and the local recombination rate.
429
A known adaptive locus shows a strong deviation from the common pattern of
differentiation
Because widespread signatures of indirect selection are often assumed to reflect
the impact of heterogeneous background selection (BGS) across the genome, several
authors have proposed that the correlation in F_{ST} across multiple pairs of taxa can be used
as a baseline for detecting genomic regions that have been affected by positive selection
(Berner and Salzburger 2015, Burri 2017b). More specifically, loci that have contributed
to adaptation or speciation should be detectable as a positive deviation from the common
pattern of differentiation (i.e., PC1), which is considered to reflect processes that are
unrelated to ecologically relevant positive selection (Burri 2017b).
We have a unique opportunity to test the effectiveness of this comparative
genomic approach by examining patterns of differentiation around a locus that is known
to contribute to adaptation and speciation in subspecies *puniceus*. Using a candidate gene
approach, Streisfeld et al. (Streisfeld et al. 2013) showed that the shift from yellow to red
flowers in *puniceus* was caused by a *cis*-regulatory mutation in the R2R3-MYB
transcription factor *MaMyb2*. Patterns of haplotype variation within the gene indicate that
the red allele was subject to strong positive selection and rapidly swept to fixation in
what is now the geographic range of the red ecotype (Stankowski and Streisfeld 2015).
To test for a linage-specific signature of differentiation at this locus, we examined
patterns of Z-F_{ST} in a relatively narrow region (~3 Mbp) surrounding *MaMyb2*. (Fig. 4;
Fig. S10). At the 500 kb scale, the comparison between the red and yellow ecotypes
shows a sharp peak centered near the flower color locus. The peak is strongly elevated

above PC1 Z-F_{ST} (3.33 standard deviations), indicating that differentiation is indeed
accentuated relative to the level observed between other taxon pairs. Further, other
comparisons, including those with the red ecotype, do not show accentuated
differentiation in this region, indicating that the signal is specific to this taxon pair. The
peak is even more pronounced in the analysis at the 100 kb scale, rising 9.5 standard
deviations above PC1 Z-F_{ST}. At this scale, the signature of positive selection is visible in
other comparisons that include the red ecotype, though the signal is less pronounced than
in the comparison with the yellow ecotype (Fig. S10).

Figure 4. A large-effect adaptive locus
shows a lineage-specific signature of
positive selection. Plots of Z-transformed F_{ST}
across the genome, estimated in 500 kb sliding
windows (step size 50 kb). The red line shows
values between the red and yellow ecotypes of
subspecies *puniceus*, while the gray lines show
the values of all other comparisons. The
dashed blue line shows the first PC calculated
across all of the comparisons. The triangle
marks the position of the gene *MaMyb2*. A
cis-regulatory mutation that is tightly linked to
this gene is responsible for the shift from
yellow to red flowers. See Fig. S10 for the
same plot made for 100 kb windows.

Correlated differentiation landscapes emerge rapidly following a population split

Although correlated landscapes may evolve due to the indirect effects of
widespread background selection, it is also conceivable that they could evolve due to
other evolutionary processes. To gain insight into the role that background selection may
have played in shaping these patterns, we next tested several hypotheses about how BGS
is expected to shape the genomic landscape over time. To do this, we used the level of
genetic distance between each pair of taxa as a proxy for their divergence time and
constructed a temporal picture of genomic landscape evolution that spans the first million
years following a population split.

In a verbal model, Burri (Burri 2017b) made several predictions about how
correlations between measures of variation and genome features should be impacted by
BGS following a population split. First, the correlations between diversity (π) and
intrinsic features should be relatively consistent over time, as heterogeneous BGS will
continue to constrain patterns of diversity in each daughter population after the split.
Second, π and d_{xy} should remain highly correlated with one another, because d_{xy} is largely
influenced by ancestral diversity at these short timescales. Third, levels of genome-wide
differentiation (F_{ST}) initially should be low and vary stochastically across the genome,
due mainly to the sampling effect that accompanies a split. Therefore, F_{ST} should not be
correlated with the distribution of genomic properties early in divergence. However, as
time passes, and the indirect effects of ancestral and lineage-specific BGS accumulate,
levels of differentiation should gradually become more correlated with underlying
genome features.

To test these hypotheses, we computed correlations between relevant window-
based measures of variation and genomic features between all 36 pairs of taxa. We then
plotted these correlations on corresponding measures of between-taxon d_a, which ranged
from very low (0.05%) between the parapatric red and yellow ecotypes of subspecies
punicieus, up to 1.3% in allopatric comparisons that included *M. clevelandii*. We used d_a
(d_{xy} minus mean π), because it corrects for sequence variation present in the common
ancestor, making it a better proxy of recent divergence time than d_{xy}.
This analysis revealed very clear temporal signatures of genomic landscape
evolution, some of which were consistent with the above predictions (Fig. 5; See Fig. S11
for results with d_{xy} as a proxy for time). First, the presence of strong correlations between
π (mean of the two taxa) and the distribution of genomic features barely changed with
increasing divergence time between populations (Fig. 5A & 5B; Table S6). This is
consistent with the prediction that diversity landscapes are inherited from the ancestor
and are then maintained by the indirect effects of selection in each daughter population
following the split. Second, the relationships between F_{ST} and gene count, F_{ST} and
recombination rate, and F_{ST} and π all become stronger as d_a increases (Fig. 5C & 5D;
Table S6). Thus, as predicted, the differentiation landscape increasingly reflects the
distribution of intrinsic features as divergence time increases.
517

Figure 5. The range of divergence times reveals static and dynamic signatures of recurrent
indirect selection. Correlations between variables (500 kb windows) for all 36 taxonomic
comparisons (gray dots) plotted against the average d_a as a measure of divergence time. The left
panels show how the relationships between π (each window averaged across a pair of taxa) and
(A) gene count and (B) recombination rate vary with increasing divergence time. The middle
panels (C & D) show the same relationships, but with F_{ST}. The right panels show the relationships
between (E) d_{xy} and π and (F) F_{ST} and π. The regressions (dashed lines) in each plot are fitted to
the eight independent contrasts (colored points) obtained using a phylogenetic correction. The
color gradient shows the strength of the correlation.

However, two of the observed patterns differed markedly from existing
predictions (Burri 2017b). First, π and d_{xy} did not remain highly correlated over this
relatively short timeframe. Although the correlation is almost perfect at the earliest time
points ($r > 0.99$), it decays rapidly and is not significantly different from zero in the most
diverged taxon pairs (Fig. 5E). In addition, the correlations between F_{ST} and proxies of
the strength of indirect selection are much higher than expected at these early divergence
times. For example, for the red and yellow ecotypes, the correlations between F_{ST} and
gene density ($r = 0.415$), recombination rate ($r = -0.208$), and mean π ($r = -0.452$) are
substantial and highly significant ($p < 0.0001$) at a very early stage of divergence. The
strength of these correlations also increases rapidly, with the diversity and differentiation
landscapes almost perfectly mirroring one another in the most divergent comparisons
(Fig. 5F; $r = -0.94$; Fig. 6; Fig. S12). As our results only partially match the above
predictions, it is possible that other forces aside from BGS are responsible for the rapid
emergence of differentiation landscapes in this system. Therefore, we next considered the
potential for other evolutionary processes to generate these patterns.
542

543
Figure 6. Emergence of a heterogeneous differentiation landscape across one million years
of divergence. A) Plots of F_{ST} (500 kb windows) across the genome for pairs of taxa at early (red
vs. yellow), intermediate (red vs. *parviflorus*), and late stages (red vs. *M. clevelandii*) of
divergence. B) Average nucleotide diversity (for the red ecotype of subspecies *puniceus*, yellow
ecotype of subspecies *puniceus*, subspecies *parviflorus*, and *M. clevelandii*) across the genome in
500 kb windows. The geographic distribution (parapatric or allopatric), sequence divergence ($d_a \times$
10^{-2}), and correlation between F_{ST} and mean π are provided next to each taxon pair.
551
Simulations suggest that adaptation has played an important role in genomic landscape
evolution
To assess the plausibility of different modes of selection for generating the
observed genomic landscapes and temporal patterns, we used individual-based
simulations in SLiM (Haller et al. 2019, Haller and Messer 2019). Our basic model

consisted of an ancestral population (N = 10,000) that evolved for 10N generations and
then split into two daughter populations that diverged for a further 10N generations. Each
individual carried a 21 Mbp chromosome (similar to the physical size of a bush
monkeyflower chromosome), partitioned into three equally sized regions. In the central
third, all mutations were neutral, while some mutations in the two distal ends could affect
fitness, depending on the scenario. While simple, this partitioning scheme generates
broad-scale variation in the strength of indirect selection across the chromosome and
roughly approximates the distributions of genomic features in this system (e.g., LG 7 in
Fig. 2).
We implemented six modifications to this basic model: (*i*) *Neutral divergence*: no
mutations affect fitness; (*ii*) *Background selection* (BGS): non-neutral mutations are
deleterious; (*iii*) *Bateson-Dobzhansky-Muller incompatibility* (BDMI): As *ii*, except that
after the split, a fraction of non-neutral mutations is deleterious in one population and
neutral in the other (randomly chosen). (*iv*) *Positive selection*: non-neutral mutations have
positive fitness effects. (*v*) *BGS and positive selection*: *ii* and *iv combined*; (*vi*) *Local
adaptation:* As *iv*, but after the split some non-neutral mutations are beneficial in one
population and neutral in the other. Migration between populations was allowed only in
scenarios *iii* and *vi*. See Methods for more details and Table S7 for parameter values. To
summarize the results, measures of variation (π, d_{xy}, and F_{ST}) were calculated in 500 kb
regions at 10 time points for each simulation.
This broad range of scenarios generated quite different patterns of variation, both
through time and across the chromosome (Fig. 7; Fig. S13). As expected, the neutral
model did not produce heterogeneous genomic landscapes. Background selection
produced a diversity landscape characterized by higher diversity in the unconstrained
central third of the chromosome (Fig 7; Fig S13). Consistent with the predictions of Burri
(2017a), π and d_{xy} remained highly correlated over the course of the simulations.
However, even with a high proportion of deleterious mutations (10%) and substantial
fitness effects (1%), the variation in π and d_{xy} was modest, as was variation in the
differentiation landscape (Fig. 7).
Under some conditions, the BDM incompatibility model produced patterns of
variation that were more similar to our empirical findings than the BGS model (Fig. 7,
S13). In all simulations, patterns of diversity and divergence were relatively homogenous
at the time of the split. However, selection against gene flow induced by incompatibility
loci on the chromosome ends caused patterns of variation to become highly structured
over time. Indeed, higher π, lower d_{xy}, and lower F_{ST} were observed in the neutrally
evolving chromosome center due to the homogenizing effects of higher gene flow in this
region. As in our empirical data, the correlation between π and d_{xy} decayed over the
course of some simulations, and even became negative depending on rates of gene flow
and selection. Although we simulated this scenario starting with undifferentiated
populations (i.e., primary contact), widespread BDMIs should produce the same patterns
for populations that diverged in allopatry and came back into secondary contact. This is
because gene flow will have a stronger homogenizing effect in regions of the genome that
are not associated with incompatibilities (Durrett et al. 2000).
The three models with positive selection (Positive, BGS & Positive, and Local
adaptation) all produced highly heterogeneous genomic landscapes across the range of
parameter values explored (Fig. 7; Fig. S13). In all cases, positive selection in the

ancestor created a highly heterogeneous diversity landscape that was inherited by each
daughter population and was maintained for the duration of the simulation. As in our
data, π and d_{xy} were perfectly correlated at early divergence times, but the correlation
decayed rapidly and even became negative in scenarios with stronger selection. Unlike in
the BDMI scenario, where the correlation between π and d_{xy} decayed due to higher gene
flow in the chromosome center, it broke down in these simulations because positive
selection caused d_{xy} to increase more rapidly in the chromosome ends (Fig. S13). Highly
heterogeneous differentiation landscapes, characterized by lower F_{ST} in the chromosome
center, emerged rapidly in all three scenarios. This pattern appeared irrespective of the
parameter values examined and was not heavily influenced by other factors, like gene
flow, the inclusion of BGS, or whether adaptation occurred from standing variation.
However, some of these factors may have a larger influence in simulations with different
non-neutral mutation rates and selection strengths.
616

617
618
Figure 7. Genomic landscapes simulated under different divergence histories. Each row of
plots shows patterns of within- and between-population variation (π, d_{xy}, and F_{ST}) across the
chromosome (500 kb windows) at five time points (N generations, where N = 10000) during one
of scenarios The selection parameter (Ns, where s = Ns/N), proportion of deleterious (-) and
positive mutations (+), and number of migrants per generation (Nm; 0 unless stated) for these
simulations are as follows: (*i*) neutral divergence (no selection), (*ii*) background selection (-Ns =
100; -prop = 0.01), (*iii*) Bateson-Dobzhansky-Muller incompatibilities (BDMI) (-Ns = 100, -prop
= 0.05, Nm = 0.1), (*iv*) positive selection (+Ns = 100, +prop = 0.01), (*v*) background selection and
positive selection (-Ns = 100, -prop = 0.01; +Ns = 100, +prop = 0.005), and (*vi*) local adaptation
(+Ns = 100, +prop = 0.001, Nm = 0.1). The gray boxes in the first column show the areas of the
chromosome that are experiencing selection, while the white central area evolves neutrally. Note
that π (in populations a and b) and d_{xy} have been mean centered so they can be viewed on the
same scale. Un-centered values and additional simulations with different parameter combinations
and more time points can be found in Fig. S13.
633

Overall, the results of these simulations suggest that background selection (BGS)
is not primarily responsible for heterogeneous genomic landscapes. Although our
simulations should be interpreted cautiously, because we have not thoroughly explored
parameter space associated with each model, the results of other recent simulation studies
also support this conclusion. For example, Matthey-Doret & Whitlock (Matthey-Doret
and Whitlock 2018) simulated population divergence with BGS under different scenarios
with simulations using parameters estimated from humans and stickleback. They found
that BGS was unable to generate heterogeneous differentiation landscapes over short
timescales, with or without gene flow. Similarly, Rettelbach *et al*. (Rettelbach et al. 2019)
simulated the evolution of diversity landscapes using empirical estimates of
recombination rate and functional densities from the collared flycatcher genome. They
found that BGS was able to generate modest variation in levels of diversity across
chromosomes, but they concluded that it was not sufficient to explain the pronounced
dips observed in empirical studies of flycatcher genomes (e.g., (Burri et al. 2015)). Both
of these studies suggest that other processes (probably positive selection) are responsible
for generating the observed patterns (Matthey-Doret and Whitlock 2018, Rettelbach et al.
2019).
Our simulations suggest that divergence histories involving positive selection
and/or incompatibilities are plausible explanations for heterogeneous genomic landscapes
that emerge rapidly after a population split. However, in order to account for the presence
of strong correlations between measures of variation and genomic features across
multiple comparisons, these scenarios assume that the genomic basis of adaptation and/or
reproductive isolation is diffuse, shared across multiple taxa, and evolves rapidly.
Although this was once considered unlikely, recent studies suggest that these conditions
may be common. For example, adaptation and speciation are now thought to be highly
polygenic (Rockman 2012, Jiggins and Martin 2017, Martin et al. 2019), and recent
evidence suggests that adaptation draws heavily on ancestral mutations, rather than those
arising independently in multiple, related descendent lineages (Barrett et al. 2008, Nelson
and Cresko 2018, Marques et al. 2019). Similarly, the interaction between widespread
hybrid incompatibilities (intrinsic or extrinsic) and intrinsic genomic features is thought
to have caused similar patterns of genome-wide variation to evolve between different
pairs of hybridizing taxa (Martin et al. 2019).
Given the rapid and extensive trait diversification that has occurred during the
bush monkeyflower radiation (Stankowski et al. 2015, Chase et al. 2017, Sobel et al.
2019), positive selection has probably played an important role in shaping patterns of
genome-wide variation across the group. This includes the striking divergence of floral
traits (Fig. 1A), which is thought to be due to divergent pollinator-mediated selection
across southern California (Grant 1981, 1993b, a). In the taxa that have been studied in
detail, crossing experiments have shown that most of these traits are polygenic, and there
is evidence that they are targets of selection (Sobel and Streisfeld 2015, Stankowski et al.
2015). Intrinsic genetic incompatibilities may also influence patterns of variation between
some of the taxa, but they are unlikely to explain the correlated landscapes that have
evolved across the whole group, as most of these taxa show little or no evidence for
intrinsic incompatibilities between them (McMinn 1951, Sobel and Streisfeld 2015).
However, local adaptation also can generate a porous isolating barrier (Wu 2001), so it is
likely that gene flow has contributed to genomic landscape evolution among some taxa,

particularly those that are geographically proximate and/or hybridize in areas where their
distributions overlap.
682
Radiation-wide evidence for selection against gene flow
To determine if gene flow has contributed to the evolution of these correlated
genomic landscapes, we first tested for evidence of introgression among these taxa using
D-statistics (Green et al. 2010). Patterson's *D* measures asymmetry between the numbers
of sites with ABBA and BABA patterns (where A and B are ancestral and derived alleles,
respectively) across three in-group taxa and an out-group (in our case, *M. clevelandii*)
that have the relationship (((P1, P2), P3) O). A significant excess of either pattern gives a
non-zero value of *D*, which is taken as evidence that gene flow has occurred between P3
and one of the in-group taxa (Green et al. 2010). Overall, these tests provide evidence
that gene flow has occurred during this radiation. All 48 of the appropriate four-taxon
combinations yielded significant non-zero values of Patterson's *D* ($p < 0.0001$; Table S7;
Fig. S14). The admixture proportions (*f*) for each test indicate that an average of 2.5% of
the genome has been transferred between pairs of in-group taxa, but the proportion varies
among the tests, ranging from less than 1% to more than 10% (Fig. S4.
Although gene flow initially involves the exchange of whole genomes between
populations, selection against gene flow reduces effective migration (m_e) in regions of the
genome that are associated with barrier loci (Jiggins and Martin 2017, Ravinet et al.
2017). Therefore, porous isolating barriers should result in a heterogeneous pattern of
introgression across the genome (Barton and Hewitt 1985, Wu 2001). To test this
hypothesis, we calculated the f_d statistic, a version of the admixture proportion modified
for application to genomic windows (Martin et al. 2015). As predicted, estimates of f_d,
varied markedly among genomic regions (Fig. 2; Fig. S14). Most windows showed levels
of f_d at or near zero, indicating that foreign alleles have been purged from these regions
by selection. However, a proportion of windows showed substantial admixture
proportions. In some tests, values of f_d exceeded 0.5, indicating that more than half of the
sites in some windows have been shared between taxa.
Because gene flow opposes differentiation, we would expect to see lower F_{ST} in
regions with a higher proportion of introgressed variants. Consistent with this prediction,
we observed a substantial negative correlation ($r = -0.57$; $p < 0.0001$) between mean f_d
(for each window, averaged over the 48 tests) and PC1 F_{ST}. This result is not driven by a
limited number of the four-taxon tests, as 44 of the 48 comparisons showed the same
significant negative relationship (Table S15). Also consistent with models of widespread
selection against gene flow, regions of the genome with higher f_d scores tended to have
higher diversity ($r = 0.45$; $p < 0.0001$), lower tree concordance scores ($r = -0.59$; $p <$
0.0001), fewer functional genes ($r = -0.36$; $p < 0.0001$), and a higher recombination rate
($r = -0.18$; $p < 0.0001$).
Overall, these results indicate that widespread gene flow has played a key role in
the formation of the genomic landscape in this system. In addition to reductions in
diversity and increased differentiation owing to selection against gene flow, the
persistence of introgressed variants has probably resulted in higher levels of diversity in
regions with fewer genes and higher recombination rate. The four-taxon tests show that
the impact of gene flow is widespread across the radiation, though some caution should
be exercised when interpreting the specific pattern of individual introgression events.

Given that there is the potential for gene flow between so many taxa and ancestral
lineages, it is difficult to infer the source and timing of individual admixture events. For
example, rather than reflecting recent gene flow between all pairs of taxa, some
introgression events may have occurred deeper in history, and their consequences
inherited by multiple taxa. Although more sophisticated methods will be needed to model
gene flow across this group, these results clearly show that it has contributed to the rapid
evolution of correlated genomic landscapes during this radiation.
733
Conclusions and implications for understanding genomic landscape evolution and the
basis of adaptation and speciation
Facilitated by a new chromosome-level genome assembly, we have shed light on
the causes of correlated genomic landscapes across a radiation of monkeyflowers.
Adaptive divergence and gene flow are hallmarks of rapid radiations (Schluter 2000), and
our data suggest that the indirect effects of selection resulting from these processes have
contributed to a common pattern of differentiation among these taxa. Our 'time-course'
analysis shows that the common landscape emerged rapidly after populations split and
has become more correlated with the distribution of genomic features as divergence time
has increased. Although background selection may play some role, its effects are
probably too subtle to have made a strong contribution to the correlations during over the
timeframe of this radiation.
In addition to enhancing our understanding of the processes that have shaped the
genomic landscape during this radiation, our study contributes toward a more general
understanding of the role that natural selection plays in shaping genome-wide variation.
In line with the findings of other recent studies, our results indicate that little, if any, of
the genome evolves free of the effects of natural selection (Hahn 2008, Corbett-Detig et
al. 2015). Moreover, our 'time-course' analysis shows that between-taxon signatures of
selection can emerge very rapidly after a population split and can be substantial, even
between populations at the early stages of divergence. Overall, these results suggest that
patterns of between-population variation cannot be understood without taking the effects
of natural selection into account.
An important point arising from this work is that multiple divergence histories can
generate heterogeneous differentiation landscapes that are correlated both among taxa
and with the distribution of intrinsic genomic properties. When divergence is recent,
possible explanations include polygenic adaptation across multiple populations and
porous barriers to gene flow arising from divergent ecological selection and/or intrinsic
incompatibilities. Although it has often been assumed that recurrent background selection
is the primary cause of correlated landscapes, it is important to remember that all forms
of selection can indirectly impact levels of variation at associated sites. In fact, our
simulations show that alternative explanations may be more likely when divergence times
are short and there is opportunity for gene flow among taxa. Thus, we advocate for a
more nuanced approach when interpreting correlated differentiation landscapes, rather
than assuming that they are caused by a single evolutionary process.
Finally, our results have important practical implications for studies attempting to
identify the genomic basis of adaptation and speciation from patterns of genome-wide
variation. Indeed, detecting these loci is a major goal of adaptation and speciation studies,
and genome scans are now commonly used to identify promising candidate regions

(Ravinet et al. 2017). In an effort to correct for the potentially confounding effects of
background selection (BGS), it has been proposed that the correlation in F_{ST} among
multiple population pairs can be used as a baseline for outlier detection (Berner and
Salzburger 2015, Burri 2017b). A core premise of this method is that correlated
differentiation landscapes are caused primarily by BGS, so removing this signature
should expose the loci relevant to adaptation and/or speciation. Although this approach
may be successful in identifying large-effect loci targeted by lineage-specific positive
selection, as we illustrated for the *MaMyb2* locus, we caution against treating the
common pattern of differentiation simply as background noise. Rather than parsing out
the effects of BGS, studies that use this approach may actually be discarding the genomic
signature of polygenic adaptation and speciation.
783

Data Accessibility

Raw sequencing reads used for the genome assembly, linkage map construction, and
genome resequencing and are available on the Short-Read Archive (SRA) under the
bioproject ID xxx. The genetic map, annotation, VCF file, and analysis scripts have been
deposited on DRYAD. The reference assembly is available at mimubase.org. Code used
to run the simulations is available on Github at:
https://github.com/mufernando/mimulus_sims.
791

Acknowledgments

We thank William A. Cresko, Thomas Nelson, Roger K. Butlin, Anja M.
Westram, Mark Ravinet, Sarah. P. Otto, and Michael C. Whitlock for stimulating
discussion. John Willis performed the Illumina mate-pair library preps used for the
genome assembly. Julian Catchen, Clay Small, Susan Bassham, Mark Rausher and Janna
Fierst provided technical or analytical support or advice. Doug Turnbull and Maggie
Weitzman conducted the Illumina sequencing at the University of Oregon Genomics
Core facility. Thomas Nelson, Martin Garlovsky, Roger K. Butlin, Anja M. Westram and
Jeff Ross-Ibarra provided comments on an earlier version of this manuscript. We thank
Reto Burri, Stuart J.E. Baird, and two anonymous reviewers for providing insightful
comments that greatly improved the paper. We also thank people who contributed to
insightful discussions at the 2017 Speciation Genomics Meeting, Cambridge UK, the
2019 Gordon Speciation Conference, Ventura CA, USA, and on Twitter. Funding was
provided by the National Science Foundation grant DEB-1258199 to MS and the Sloan
Foundation to PR.

Materials and Methods

Genome Assembly
We used a combination of short-read Illumina and long-read Single Molecule,
Real Time (SMRT) sequencing to assemble the genome of a single individual from the
red ecotype of *M. aurantiacus* subspecies *puniceus* (population UCSD; Table S1).
Genomic DNA was isolated from leaf tissue using either ZR plant/seed DNA miniprep
kits (Zymo Research) or GeneJet Plant Genomic DNA purification kits (Thermo Fisher).
Illumina libraries were generated following the *Allpaths-LG* assembly pipeline (Gnerre et
al. 2011), which included a single fragment library with average 180 bp insert size and
three mate pair libraries (average insert sizes: 3.5-5 kb, 5-7 kb, and 7-13 kb). Libraries

were sequenced on the Illumina HiSeq 2500 using paired-end 100 bp reads. An initial
scaffold-level assembly was performed with *Allpaths-LG* using default parameters and
the *haploidify* function enabled. This assembly yielded 11,123 contigs (N50 = 40.5 kb)
and 2,299 scaffolds (N50 = 1,310 kb), for a total assembly size of 193.3 Mbp. Long-read
sequencing was performed from the same individual using 12 SMRT cells sequenced on
the Pacific Biosystems RS II machine at Duke University. We obtained a total of 6.4 Gbp
of sequence, which corresponds to ~21× coverage of the genome. The PacBio reads were
used to re-scaffold the *Allpaths-LG* scaffolds using *Opera-LG* (Gao et al. 2016). This
reduced the number of scaffolds to 1,547 (N50 = 1,578 kb).
827   We then manually improved the scaffold containing the flower color gene
MaMyb2 (Streisfeld et al. 2013). We first aligned this scaffold to a previously published
draft sequence assembly from this same individual (Stankowski et al. 2017), which was
generated using Illumina short-reads and the *Velvet* assembler (Zerbino and Birney
2008). We used long range PCR and cloning to generate Sanger sequences across three
regions within 20 kb of *MaMyb2* that did not assemble well. Genomic DNA was
amplified using Phusion high fidelity polymerase (NEB). PCR products were cloned into
the pCR2.1 TOPO-TA vector (Life Technologies), and purified plasmids were sequenced
with Sanger technology. Resulting sequences were aligned to the scaffold containing
MaMyb2, and new PCR primers were designed to sequence internal fragments until the
entire insert was sequenced. Using this approach, we sequenced a total of 9,824 bp across
the three regions. The reference sequence in the assembly was corrected manually to
match the Sanger data.
840   Finally, we gap filled the assembly using the PacBio data and the program
PBJelly (English et al. 2012). Resulting scaffolds were assembled into pseudomolecules
using *Chromonomer* (http://catchenlab.life.illinois.edu/chromonomer/), according to the
online manual. This software anchored and oriented scaffolds based on the order of
markers in a high-density linkage map (see below) and made corrections to scaffolds
when differences occurred between the genetic and physical positions of markers in the
map. A final round of gap filling with *PBJelly* was performed to fill any gaps that were
created by broken scaffolds in *Chromonomer*. To assess the completeness of the gene
space in the assembly, we used both the BUSCO and CEGMA pipelines to estimate the
proportion of 956 single copy plant genes (BUSCO) or 248 core eukaryotic genes
(CEGMA) that were completely or partially assembled (Parra et al. 2007, Simao et al.
2015). The proportion of these genes present in an assembly has been shown to be
correlated with the total proportion of assembled gene space, and thus serves as a good
predictor of assembly completeness.
854
855   *Construction of high-density linkage map*
856   We generated an outbred F_2 mapping population by crossing two F_1 individuals,
each the product of crosses between different greenhouse-raised red and yellow ecotype
plants collected from one red ecotype and one yellow ecotype population (populations
UCSD and LO, respectively; Table S1). We then used restriction-site associated DNA
sequencing (RADseq) to genotype F_1 and F_2 individuals. DNA was extracted from leaf
material using Zymo ZR plant/seed DNA miniprep kits, and RAD library preparation
followed the protocol outlined in Sobel and Streisfeld (Sobel and Streisfeld 2015).

Libraries were sequenced on the Illumina HiSeq 2000 platform using single-end 100 bp
reads at the Genomics Core Facility, University of Oregon.
Reads were filtered based on quality, and errors in the barcode sequence or RAD
site were corrected using the *process_radtags* script in *Stacks v. 1.35* (Catchen et al.
2011, Catchen et al. 2013). Loci were created using the *denovo_map.pl* function of
Stacks, with three identical raw reads required to create a stack, two mismatches allowed
between loci for an individual, and two mismatches allowed when processing the catalog.
Single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) were determined and genotypes called using a
maximum-likelihood (ML) statistical model implemented in *Stacks* and a stringent χ^2
significance level of 0.01 to distinguish between heterozygotes and homozygotes. We
then used the *genotypes* program implemented in *Stacks* to identify a set of 9,029
mappable markers. We specified a 'CP' cross design (F_1 individuals coded as the
parents), requiring that a marker was present in at least 85% of progeny at a minimum
depth of 12 reads per individual, and we allowed automated corrections to be made to the
data.
Linkage map construction was performed using *Lep-MAP2* (Rastas et al. 2016).
The data were filtered using the *Filtering* module to include only individuals with less
than 15% missing data and excluded markers that showed evidence for extreme
segregation distortion (χ^2 test, $P < 0.01$). To assign markers to linkage groups, we used
the *SeparateChromosomes* module with a logarithm of odds (LOD) score limit of 20 and
no minimum size for linkage groups (LG). This assigned 7,217 markers to 10 linkage
groups, which matches the number of chromosomes in *M. aurantiacus*. The *JoinSingles*
module was executed again with a LOD limit of 10 to join an additional 877 ungrouped
markers to the 10 previously formed LGs. Fifty-seven singles that were not joined at this
stage were discarded from the dataset. Initial marker orders were determined using sex-
averaged and sex-specific recombination rates using the *OrderMarkers* module. For each
LG, we conducted 10 independent runs using the Kosambi mapping function
(*useKosambi=1*), with the dataset split into seven pseudo-families to take advantage of
parallel processing. When multiple markers had identical genotypes, only the duplicate
marker with the least missing data was used in marker ordering. We retained the marker
order from the run with the best likelihood. After removing markers with an error rate >
0.05, the ML order was re-evaluated using the *evaluateOrder* flag. The map contained
8,094 informative loci from 269 F2 individuals, with an average of 3.5% ± SD 3.86
missing data per individual.
After the integration of our assembly and genetic map using the *Chromonomer*
software (Amores et al. 2014), we made corrections to the map order based on the
physical position of markers within assembled scaffolds. Using the output of
Chromonomer, we identified markers that were out of order in the map compared to their
local assembly order and aligned these markers to the assembly from *Chromonomer*
using *Bowtie2* v. 2.2.5 (Langmead and Salzberg 2012) with the *very_sensitive* settings to
obtain their physical order. We then re-estimated the map using the *evaluateOrder* flag in
Lep-MAP2 as described above, but with the marker order constrained to the physical
order (*improveOrder=0*) and with all duplicate markers included in the analysis
(*removeDuplicates=0*). After initial map construction, we removed 17 markers with an
estimated error rate greater than 5% and estimated the map one last time using the same
settings. The final map contained 7,589 markers across the 10 linkage groups.

909
Genome annotation
Prior to genome annotation, the assembly was soft-masked for repetitive elements
and areas of low complexity with *RepeatMasker* (RepeatMasker Open-4.0) using a
custom *Mimulus aurantiacus* library created by *RepeatModeler* (RepeatModeler Open-
1.0), Repbase repeat libraries (Jurka et al. 2005), and a list of known transposable
elements provided by *MAKER* (Holt and Yandell 2011). In total, 30.99% of the genome
assembly was masked by *RepeatMasker*. Repetitive elements were annotated with
RepeatModeler. Hidden Markov Models for gene prediction were generated by *SNAP*
(Korf 2004) and *Augustus* (Stanke and Waack 2003) and were trained iteratively to the
assembly using *MAKER*, as described by Cantarel et al. (Cantarel et al. 2008). Training
was performed on the 14.5 Mbp sequence from LG9. Evidence used by *MAKER* for
annotation included protein sequences from *Arabidopsis thaliana*, *Oryza sativa*, *Solanum
lycopersicum*, *Solanum tuberosum*, *Daucus carota*, *Vitis vinifera* (all downloaded from
EnsemblPlants on 9 August 2016), *Salvia miltiorrhiza* (downloaded from Herbal
Medicine Omics Database on 9 August 2016), *Mimulus guttatus v. 2* (downloaded from
JGI Genome Portal on 9 August 2016), and all Uniprot/swissprot proteins (downloaded
on 18 August 2016) (Goodstein et al. 2012, Nordberg et al. 2013, Kersey et al. 2016)
(Herbal Medicine Omics Database; Uniprot). We filtered the annotations with *MAKER* to
include: 1) only evidence-based information that also contained assembled protein
support, and 2) those *ab initio* gene predictions that did not overlap with the evidence-
based annotations and that contained protein family domains, as detected with
InterProScan (Quevillon et al. 2005).
932
Genome re-sequencing and variant calling
We collected leaf tissue from each taxon (Collection locations available in Table
S3 and Fig. S2) and extracted DNA from dried tissue using the Zymo Plant/Seed
MiniPrep DNA kit following the manufacturer's instructions. We prepared sequencing
libraries using the Kapa Biosystems HyperPrep kit, and libraries with an insert size
between 400-600 bp were sequenced on the Illumina HiSeq 4000 using paired-end 150
bp reads at the Genomics Core Facility, University of Oregon.
We filtered raw reads using the *process_shortreads* script in *Stacks* v1.46 to
remove reads with uncalled bases or poor quality scores. We then aligned the retained
reads to the reference assembly using the BWA-MEM algorithm in *BWA* v0.7.15 (Li
2013). An average of 91.7% of reads aligned (range: 82.6-96.0%), and the average
sequencing depth was 21x (range: 15.16 – 30.86x). We then marked PCR duplicates
using *Picard* (http://broadinstitute.github.io/picard). We performed an initial run of
variant calling using the UnifiedGenotyper tool in *GATK* v3.8 (McKenna et al. 2010) and
filtered the data to remove variants with a mapping quality < 50, a quality depth < 4, and
a Fisher Strand score > 50. We then used these variants to perform base quality score
recalibration for each individual, before performing another run of the UnifiedGenotyper
to call final variants. After the second run of variant calling, we removed variants with a
mapping quality < 40, a quality depth < 2, and a Fisher Strand score > 60. The final
dataset contained 13,233,829 SNPs across the nine taxa. Finally, we ran
UnifiedGenotyper with the EMIT_ALL_SITES option to output all variant and invariant
genotyped sites.

Phylogenetic and principal component analyses

956
We used *RAxML* v8 to reconstruct the evolutionary relationships among the nine
taxa by concatenating variant sites from across the genome. To investigate patterns of
phylogenetic discordance across the genome, we also built trees from windows across the
genome. We phased SNPs using *BEAGLE* v4.1 (Browning and Browning 2007), using a
window size of 100 kb and an overlap of 10 kb. We incorporated information on
recombination rate from the genetic map and did not impute missing genotypes. After
phasing, we used *MVFtools* (https://www.github.com/jbpease/mvftools) to run *RAxML*
from 100 kb and 500 kb nonoverlapping windows, with the *M. clevelandii* samples set as
the outgroups. We then visualized the window trees in *DensiTree* v2.01 (Bouckaert
2010).
To assess concordance between the window-based trees and the whole-genome
tree, we converted trees to distance matrices using the *Ape* package in R (Paradis et al.
2004). We then calculated the Pearson's correlation coefficient between the distance
matrix from each window and the whole-genome tree, with a stronger correlation
indicating higher concordance with the whole-genome tree. We used one-dimensional
autocorrelation analysis to determine if variation in tree concordance was randomly
distributed across the genome. This involved estimating the autocorrelation between
genomic position and tree concordance for each LG with a lag size of 2 Mbp. The
significance of the observed value for each LG was determined from a null distribution of
autocorrelation coefficients estimated from 1000 random permutations of the genome-
wide data.
We also conducted a Principal Components Analysis (PCA) based on all variant
sites from across the entire genome using *Plink* v. 1.90 (Chang et al. 2015). Initially, we
ran the PCA with all 37 samples, but we consecutively re-ran the analysis by removing
different taxa in order to assess clustering patterns among more closely related samples.

Population genomic analyses

To examine how genome-wide patterns of diversity, differentiation, and
divergence varied among taxa, we calculated nucleotide diversity (π), between-taxon
differentiation (F_{ST}), and between-taxon divergence (d_{xy}), respectively, in non-
overlapping and overlapping 100 kb (step size = 10kb) and 500 kb (step size = 50 kb)
windows using custom Python scripts downloaded from
https://github.com/simonhmartin/genomics_general. We calculated measures of
differentiation and divergence across all 36 pairwise comparisons among the nine taxa,
and diversity was estimated separately for each taxon. These scripts estimated π and d_{xy}
by dividing the number of sequence differences within a window (either within or
between taxa) by the total number of sites in that window. To account for missing data,
the script counted the number of differences between each sample, divided by the total
number of variant sites that were genotyped within those samples, and then averaged
across all pairs of samples. To provide an unbiased estimate of diversity and divergence,
we incorporated invariant sites into the calculation by dividing the number of pairwise
differences (within and between taxa, respectively) by the total number of genotyped
sites (variant and invariant) within a window. F_{ST} was calculated following the measure
of K_{ST} (Hudson et al. 1992), equation 9), but was modified to incorporate missing data

using the same approach as π and d_{xy}. We filtered the data separately for each taxonomic
comparison, so that each site was required to be genotyped in at least three individuals for
comparisons within the *M. aurantiacus* complex or at least two individuals for each
comparison involving *M. clevelandii.*

We summarized the variation in each statistic across comparisons using a
Principal Components Analysis (PCA), with taxon or taxon pair as the variables. Thus,
across each window, the first principal component of π, F_{ST}, and d_{xy} provided multivariate
measures that explained the greatest covariance in the data. We used a one-dimensional
autocorrelation analysis and permutation test to determine if the genome-wide patterns of
PC1 π, F_{ST}, and d_{xy} departed from a random expectation, as described above for tree
concordance (see section 'phylogenetic analyses').

To examine the relationships among PC1 diversity, differentiation, and
divergence, we estimated Pearson's correlation coefficient among all three statistics
across genomic windows. Further, we estimated correlations among these three statistics
and tree concordance, gene density, and recombination rate. Recombination rate was
estimated by comparing the genetic and physical distance (in cM/Mbp) between all pairs
of adjacent markers on each LG from the genetic linkage map described above. We
removed the top 5% of recombination rates, as these represented unrealistically high
values of recombination. A minimum of three estimates was required to obtain an
average recombination rate estimate within each window. Gene density was calculated
from the number of predicted genes in each window, as determined from the annotation
described above. Genes spanning two windows were counted in both.

To determine how the correlations among the statistics (diversity, differentiation,
divergence, recombination rate, gene count) changed with increasing divergence time, we
examined the correlation coefficient among all pairs of statistics individually for each of
the 36 pairwise comparisons. Because diversity was measured within taxa, we calculated
the mean value of π between each pair of taxa. Also, because many of the pairwise
comparisons are non-independent, we applied the phylogenetic correction outlined by
(Felsenstein 1985, Coyne and Orr 1989) to produce a statistically independent set of data
points for this analysis.

We calculated the divergence time between *M. clevelandii* and *M. aurantiacus*,
based on a corrected estimate of sequence divergence (d_a) between individuals of *M.*
clevelandii and all subspecies of *M. aurantiacus* combined. We then converted this value
into a divergence time *T* (in generations) using the equation: $T = d_a/(2\mu)$, where μ is the
mutation rate, 1.5 x 10^{-8} (Koch et al. 2001, Brandvain et al. 2014). This value was then
converted into years by multiplying by a generation time of two years.

1037

Simulations

To assess the plausibility of different scenarios in producing heterogeneous
genomic landscapes, we implemented forward-time Wright-Fisher simulations using
SLiM (Haller et al. 2019, Haller and Messer 2019). The basic model consisted of an
ancestral population with a fixed population size of N=10,000 that split after 10N non-
overlapping generations into two daughter populations, each with a fixed size of N. These
populations were then allowed to evolve for a further 10N non-overlapping generations.
We simulated a 21 Mbp chromosome with a recombination rate of 2×10^{-8} and a mutation
rate of 10^{-8}, both per base pair and per generation.

We explored the following six modifications of this basic model. (*i*) *Neutral*
evolution: mutations did not impact fitness; (*ii*) *Background selection* (BGS): mutations
in the ancestor and daughter populations were neutral in the middle third of the
chromosome but can be deleterious in the chromosome ends; (*iii*) *Bateson-Dobzhansky-*
Muller incompatibility (BDMI): Neutral and deleterious mutations occurred in the
ancestor. After the split, we allowed migration between the two daughter populations. To
simulate BDM incompatibilities, a fraction of the selected mutations was deleterious in
each of the populations and neutral in the other. (*iv*) *Positive selection*: mutations in the
ancestor and daughter population were neutral in the middle third of the chromosome but
could be beneficial in the remaining regions. (*v*) *Local adaptation:* mutations in the
ancestor and daughter population were neutral in the middle third of the chromosome but
could be beneficial in the remainder. After the split, we allowed migration between the
daughter populations. To simulate local adaptation, a fraction of the selected mutations
was beneficial in each population and neutral in the other. Unlike the BDMI simulation,
we allowed local adaptation from standing variation, so some of the mutations that were
neutral in the ancestral population became beneficial after the split. *BGS and positive*
selection: mutations in the ancestor and daughter population were neutral in the middle
third of the chromosome but could be either deleterious or beneficial in the tails.
Each scenario was simulated with varying proportions of beneficial/deleterious to
neutral mutations, and varying mean selective coefficients and migration rates, where
applicable (Table S7). For each combination of parameters, we ran five replicate
simulations. As described in Kelleher et al. (Kelleher et al. 2018), to improve simulation
speed we recorded genealogies and non-neutral mutations in a tree sequence and added
neutral mutations afterwards with *msprime* (Kelleher et al. 2016). We used *scikit-allel*
(v1.1.8) (Miles and Harding 2017) to calculate π, $F_{ST,}$ and d_{xy} in 500 kb regions. All of
the SLiM code used is available on GitHub
(https://github.com/mufernando/mimulus_sims).
1074
Tests for genome-wide admixture
We tested for introgression and quantified levels of admixture by calculating
Patterson's *D* and the admixture proportion (Green et al. 2010, Durand et al. 2011).
Patterson's *D* takes four taxa with the relationship (((P1, P2), P3) O) and looks for an
excess of either ABBA or BABA sites, where A and B represent the ancestral and
derived alleles respectively. We calculated Patterson's *D* for all possible groups of three
ingroup taxa based on the set of relationships inferred from the genome-wide
(concatenated) dataset. *M. clevelandii* was used as the outgroup for all tests. The *D*
statistic was calculated from allele frequency data for biallelic sites, with the ancestral
allele called as the allele fixed within *M. clevelandii.* Therefore, only sites fixed within
M. clevelandii were included in the analysis. We converted genotype data into allele
frequency data using a Python script download from
https://github.com/simonhmartin/genomics. Patterson's *D* was calculated from the
proportion of ABBA and BABA sites in R using a custom script. To evaluate the
significance of each test, we performed block jack-knifing with a block size of 500 kb.
We then calculated the genome-wide admixture proportion, *f*, for all tests with a
significant value of Patterson's *D*. This test compares the excess of ABBA sites shared
between P2 and P3 to the expected excess of ABBA sites between two completely

admixed populations. The expected excess is calculated by splitting the samples from P3 into two different groups (P3a and P3b) and calculating the excess of ABBA to BABA sites with one group taking the place of P2 and the other the place of P3.

For tests with significant values of Patterson's D, we then estimated levels of admixture in each 500 kb genomic window. Although Patterson's D is a powerful test for detecting introgression genome-wide, it is not suited for estimating admixture in defined genomic regions (Martin et al. 2015). Thus, we calculated the four-taxon statistic f_d, which is a modified version of the admixture proportion developed for estimating local admixture (Martin et al. 2015). We calculated f_d in 500 kb non-overlapping windows, using Python scripts (https://github.com/simonhmartin/genomics_general). Because f_d is designed to detect an excess of ABBA sites (*i.e.,* gene flow from P3 to P2), we switched the order of P1 and P2 in tests where D was negative (excess of BABA) in the genome-wide tests for introgression. Note that this does not affect the set of relationships in these comparisons. We summarized genome-wide variation in f_d across the different tests by taking the average value of f_d within each window and the maximum value of f_d from the 48 different tests in each window, and estimated the Pearson's correlation coefficient between these values other statistics.

Figure captions

Figure 1. Evolutionary relationships and patterns of genome-wide variation across the radiation. A) The black tree was constructed from a concatenated alignment of genome-wide SNPs and is rooted using *M. clevelandii*. The 387 gray trees were constructed from 500 kb genomic windows. The first number associated with each node or taxon is the bootstrap support for that clade in the whole genome tree, and the second number is the percentage of window-based trees in which that clade is present. B) Levels of differentiation (F_{ST}), C) divergence (d_{xy}), and D) diversity (π) within and among taxa based on the same 500 kb windows. For simplicity, F_{ST} and d_{xy} are shown only for comparisons with the red ecotype of subspecies *puniceus*. See Fig. S7 for the distributions of F_{ST} and d_{xy} across all pairs of taxa.

Figure 2. Common genomic landscapes mirror variation in the local properties of the genome. A) Tree concordance scores for 500 kb non-overlapping genomic windows plotted across the 10 bush monkeyflower chromosomes. B – D) Plots of the first principal component (PC1) for F_{ST}, d_{xy}, and π in overlapping 500 kb windows (step size = 50 kb). PC1 explains 66%, 70%, and 85% of the variation in F_{ST}, d_{xy} and π, respectively, and is Z-transformed such that above average values have positive values and below average values have negative values. E – F) Gene count and recombination rate (cM/Mbp) in overlapping 500 kb windows. G), Mean f_d (admixture proportion) in 500 kb non-overlapping genomic windows. See Fig. S4 for the same plot made for 100 kb windows.

Figure 3. Correlations between measures of diversity and intrinsic features reveal the impact of heterogeneous indirect selection. Matrix of pairwise correlations between PC1 F_{ST}, PC1 d_{xy}, PC1 π, tree concordance, mean f_d, gene density, and recombination rate, all estimated in 500 kb non-overlapping windows. The heat map indicates the strength of the correlation and its sign. All correlations are statistically significant at $p <$

1138 0.001. (See Fig. S8 for a more detailed correlation matrix and Fig. S9 for the correlation
1139 matrix from 100 kb windows.
1140
Figure 4. A large-effect adaptive locus shows a lineage-specific signature of positive
selection. Plots of Z-transformed F_{ST} across the genome, estimated in 500 kb sliding
windows (step size 50 kb). The red line shows values between the red and yellow
ecotypes of subspecies *puniceus*, while the gray lines show the values of all other
comparisons. The dashed blue line shows the first PC calculated across all of the
comparisons. The triangle marks the position of the gene *MaMyb2*. A *cis*-regulatory
mutation that is tightly linked to this gene is responsible for the shift from yellow to red
flowers. See Fig. S10 for the same plot made for 100 kb windows.
1149
Figure 5. The range of divergence times reveals static and dynamic signatures of
recurrent indirect selection. Correlations between variables (500 kb windows) for all 36
taxonomic comparisons (gray dots) plotted against the average d_a as a measure of
divergence time. The left panels show how the relationships between π (each window
averaged across a pair of taxa) and (A) gene count and (B) recombination rate vary with
increasing divergence time. The middle panels (C & D) show the same relationships, but
with F_{ST}. The right panels show the relationships between (E) d_{xy} and π and (F) F_{ST} and π.
The regressions (dashed lines) in each plot are fitted to the eight independent contrasts
(colored points) obtained using a phylogenetic correction. The color gradient shows the
strength of the correlation.
1160
Figure 6. Emergence of a heterogeneous differentiation landscape across one million
years of divergence. A) Plots of F_{ST} (500 kb windows) across the genome for pairs of
taxa at early (red vs. yellow), intermediate (red vs. *parviflorus*), and late stages (red vs.
M. clevelandii) of divergence. B) Average nucleotide diversity (for the red ecotype of
subspecies *puniceus*, yellow ecotype of subspecies *puniceus*, subspecies *parviflorus*, and
M. clevelandii) across the genome in 500 kb windows. The geographic distribution
(parapatric or allopatric), sequence divergence ($d_a \times 10^{-2}$), and correlation between F_{ST}
and mean π are provided next to each taxon pair.
1169
Figure 7. Genomic landscapes simulated under different divergence histories. Each
row of plots shows patterns of within- and between-population variation (π, d_{xy}, and F_{ST})
across the chromosome (500 kb windows) at five time points (N generations, where N =
10000) during one of scenarios The selection parameter (Ns, where s = Ns/N), proportion
of deleterious (-) and positive mutations (+), and number of migrants per generation (Nm;
0 unless stated) for these simulations are as follows: (*i*) neutral divergence (no selection),
(*ii*) background selection (-Ns = 100; -prop = 0.01), (*iii*) Bateson-Dobzhansky-Muller
incompatibilities (BDMI) (-Ns = 100, -prop = 0.05, Nm = 0.1), (*iv*) positive selection
(+Ns = 100, +prop = 0.01), (*v*) background selection and positive selection (-Ns = 100, -
prop = 0.01; +Ns = 100, +prop = 0.005), and (*vi*) local adaptation (+Ns = 100, +prop =
0.001, Nm = 0.1). The gray boxes in the first column show the areas of the chromosome
that are experiencing selection, while the white central area evolves neutrally. Note that π
(in populations a and b) and d_{xy} have been mean centered so they can be viewed on the

same scale. Un-centered values and additional simulations with different parameter
combinations and more time points can be found in Fig. S13.

List of Supplementary tables

List of Supplementary figures

References

Abbott, R., D. Albach, S. Ansell, J. W. Arntzen, S. J. E. Baird, N. Bierne, J. W. Boughman, A. Brelsford, C. A. Buerkle, R. Buggs, R. K. Butlin, U. Dieckmann, F. Eroukhmanoff, A. Grill, S. H. Cahan, J. S. Hermansen, G. Hewitt, A. G. Hudson, C. Jiggins, J. Jones, B. Keller, T. Marczewski, J. Mallet, P. Martinez-Rodriguez, M. Most, S. Mullen, R. Nichols, A. W. Nolte, C. Parisod, K. Pfennig,

1229   A. M. Rice, M. G. Ritchie, B. Seifert, C. M. Smadja, R. Stelkens, J. M. Szymura,
1230   R. Vainola, J. B. W. Wolf, and D. Zinner. 2013. Hybridization and speciation.
1231   Journal of Evolutionary Biology **26**:229-246.
1232   Amores, A., J. Catchen, I. Nanda, W. Warren, R. Walter, M. Schartl, and J. H.
1233   Postlethwait. 2014. A RAD-tag genetic map for the platyfish (Xiphophorus
1234   maculatus) reveals mechanisms of karyotype evolution among teleost fish.
1235   Genetics **197**:625-641.
1236   Baird, S. J. E. 2015. Exploring linkage disequilibrium. Mol Ecol Resour **15**:1017-1019.
1237   Barrett, R. D. H., S. M. Rogers, and D. Schluter. 2008. Natural selection on a major
1238   armor gene in threespine stickleback. Science **322**:255-257.
1239   Barton, N. H. and G. M. Hewitt. 1985. Analysis of Hybrid Zones. Annual Review of
1240   Ecology and Systematics **16**:113-148.
1241   Bassham, S., J. Catchen, E. Lescak, F. A. von Hippel, and W. A. Cresko. 2018. Repeated
1242   Selection of Alternatively Adapted Haplotypes Creates Sweeping Genomic
1243   Remodeling in Stickleback. Genetics **209**:921-939.
1244   Berner, D. and W. Salzburger. 2015. The genomics of organismal diversification
1245   illuminated by adaptive radiations. Trends in Genetics **31**:491-499.
1246   Bouckaert, R. R. 2010. DensiTree: making sense of sets of phylogenetic trees.
1247   Bioinformatics **26**:1372-1373.
1248   Brandvain, Y., A. M. Kenney, L. Flagel, G. Coop, and A. L. Sweigart. 2014. Speciation
1249   and Introgression between Mimulus nasutus and Mimulus guttatus. Plos Genetics
1250   **10**.
1251   Browning, S. R. and B. L. Browning. 2007. Rapid and accurate haplotype phasing and
1252   missing-data inference for whole-genome association studies by use of localized
1253   haplotype clustering. American Journal of Human Genetics **81**:1084-1097.
1254   Burri, R. 2017a. Dissecting differentiation landscapes: a linked selection's perspective.
1255   Journal of Evolutionary Biology **30**:1501-1505.
1256   Burri, R. 2017b. Interpreting differentiation landscapes in the light of long-term linked
1257   selection. Evolution Letters **1**:118-131.
1258   Burri, R., A. Nater, T. Kawakami, C. F. Mugal, P. I. Olason, L. Smeds, A. Suh, L. Dutoit,
1259   S. Bures, L. Z. Garamszegi, S. Hogner, J. Moreno, A. Qvarnstrom, M. Ruzic, S.
1260   A. Saether, G. P. Saetre, J. Torok, and H. Ellegren. 2015. Linked selection and
1261   recombination rate variation drive the evolution of the genomic landscape of
1262   differentiation across the speciation continuum of Ficedula flycatchers. Genome
1263   Research **25**:1656-1665.
1264   Campbell, C. R., J. W. Poelstra, and A. D. Yoder. 2018. What is Speciation Genomics?
1265   The roles of ecology, gene flow, and genomic architecture in the formation of
1266   species. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society **124**:561-583.
1267   Cantarel, B. L., I. Korf, S. M. C. Robb, G. Parra, E. Ross, B. Moore, C. Holt, A. S.
1268   Alvarado, and M. Yandell. 2008. MAKER: An easy-to-use annotation pipeline
1269   designed for emerging model organism genomes. Genome Research **18**:188-196.
1270   Catchen, J., P. A. Hohenlohe, S. Bassham, A. Amores, and W. A. Cresko. 2013. Stacks:
1271   an analysis tool set for population genomics. Molecular Ecology **22**:3124-3140.
1272   Catchen, J. M., A. Amores, P. Hohenlohe, W. Cresko, and J. H. Postlethwait. 2011.
1273   Stacks: Building and Genotyping Loci De Novo From Short-Read Sequences.
1274   G3-Genes Genomes Genetics **1**:171-182.

Chang, C. C., C. C. Chow, L. C. A. M. Tellier, S. Vattikuti, S. M. Purcell, and J. J. Lee. 2015. Second-generation PLINK: rising to the challenge of larger and richer datasets. Gigascience **4**.

Charlesworth, B. 1998. Measures of divergence between populations and the effect of forces that reduce variability. Molecular Biology and Evolution **15**:538-543.

Charlesworth, B., M. T. Morgan, and D. Charlesworth. 1993. The effect of deleterious mutations on neutral molecular variation. Genetics **134**:1289-1303.

Chase, M. A., S. Stankowski, and M. A. Streisfeld. 2017. Genomewide variation provides insight into evolutionary relationships in a monkeyflower species complex (Mimulus sect. Diplacus). American Journal of Botany **104**:1510-1521.

Coop, G. and P. Ralph. 2012. Patterns of neutral diversity under general models of selective sweeps. Genetics **192**:205-224.

Corbett-Detig, R. B., D. L. Hartl, and T. B. Sackton. 2015. Natural selection constrains neutral diversity across a wide range of species. Plos Biology **13**:e1002112.

Coyne, J. A. and H. A. Orr. 1989. Patterns of Speciation in Drosophila. Evolution **43**:362-381.

Cruickshank, T. E. and M. W. Hahn. 2014. Reanalysis suggests that genomic islands of speciation are due to reduced diversity, not reduced gene flow. Molecular Ecology **23**:3133-3157.

Delmore, K. E., J. S. L. Ramos, B. M. Van Doren, M. Lundberg, S. Bensch, D. E. Irwin, and M. Liedvogel. 2018. Comparative analysis examining patterns of genomic differentiation across multiple episodes of population divergence in birds. Evolution Letters **2**:76-87.

Durand, E. Y., N. Patterson, D. Reich, and M. Slatkin. 2011. Testing for ancient admixture between closely related populations. Molecular Biology and Evolution **28**:2239-2252.

Durrett, R., L. Buttel, and R. Harrison. 2000. Spatial models for hybrid zones. Heredity (Edinb) **84 (Pt 1)**:9-19.

Ellegren, H., L. Smeds, R. Burri, P. I. Olason, N. Backstrom, T. Kawakami, A. Kunstner, H. Makinen, K. Nadachowska-Brzyska, A. Qvarnstrom, S. Uebbing, and J. B. W. Wolf. 2012. The genomic landscape of species divergence in Ficedula flycatchers. Nature **491**:756-760.

English, A. C., S. Richards, Y. Han, M. Wang, V. Vee, J. Qu, X. Qin, D. M. Muzny, J. G. Reid, K. C. Worley, and R. A. Gibbs. 2012. Mind the gap: upgrading genomes with Pacific Biosciences RS long-read sequencing technology. Plos One **7**:e47768.

Feder, J. L., S. P. Egan, and P. Nosil. 2012. The genomics of speciation-with-gene-flow. Trends in Genetics **28**:342-350.

Felsenstein, J. 1985. Phylogenies and the comparative method. American Naturalist **125**:1-15.

Gao, S., D. Bertrand, B. K. Chia, and N. Nagarajan. 2016. OPERA-LG: efficient and exact scaffolding of large, repeat-rich eukaryotic genomes with performance guarantees. Genome Biol **17**:102.

Gillespie, J. H. 2000. Genetic drift in an infinite population: The pseudohitchhiking model. Genetics **155**:909-919.

Gnerre, S., I. Maccallum, D. Przybylski, F. J. Ribeiro, J. N. Burton, B. J. Walker, T.
Sharpe, G. Hall, T. P. Shea, S. Sykes, A. M. Berlin, D. Aird, M. Costello, R.
Daza, L. Williams, R. Nicol, A. Gnirke, C. Nusbaum, E. S. Lander, and D. B.
Jaffe. 2011. High-quality draft assemblies of mammalian genomes from
massively parallel sequence data. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A **108**:1513-1518.
Goodstein, D. M., S. Shu, R. Howson, R. Neupane, R. D. Hayes, J. Fazo, T. Mitros, W.
Dirks, U. Hellsten, N. Putnam, and D. S. Rokhsar. 2012. Phytozome: a
comparative platform for green plant genomics. Nucleic Acids Res **40**:D1178-
1186.
Grant, V. 1981. Plant Speciation. 2 edition. Columbia University Press, New York.
Grant, V. 1993a. Effects of hybridization and selection on floral isolation. Proc Natl Acad
Sci U S A **90**:990-993.
Grant, V. 1993b. Origin of floral isolation between ornithophilous and sphingophilous
plant species. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A **90**:7729-7733.
Green, R. E., J. Krause, A. W. Briggs, T. Maricic, U. Stenzel, M. Kircher, N. Patterson,
H. Li, W. Zhai, M. H. Fritz, N. F. Hansen, E. Y. Durand, A. S. Malaspinas, J. D.
Jensen, T. Marques-Bonet, C. Alkan, K. Prufer, M. Meyer, H. A. Burbano, J. M.
Good, R. Schultz, A. Aximu-Petri, A. Butthof, B. Hober, B. Hoffner, M.
Siegemund, A. Weihmann, C. Nusbaum, E. S. Lander, C. Russ, N. Novod, J.
Affourtit, M. Egholm, C. Verna, P. Rudan, D. Brajkovic, Z. Kucan, I. Gusic, V.
B. Doronichev, L. V. Golovanova, C. Lalueza-Fox, M. de la Rasilla, J. Fortea, A.
Rosas, R. W. Schmitz, P. L. F. Johnson, E. E. Eichler, D. Falush, E. Birney, J. C.
Mullikin, M. Slatkin, R. Nielsen, J. Kelso, M. Lachmann, D. Reich, and S. Paabo.
2010. A draft sequence of the Neandertal genome. Science **328**:710-722.
Hahn, M. W. 2008. Toward a selection theory of molecular evolution. Evolution **62**:255-
265.
Haller, B. C., J. Galloway, J. Kelleher, P. W. Messer, and P. L. Ralph. 2019. Tree-
sequence recording in SLiM opens new horizons for forward-time simulation of
whole genomes. Mol Ecol Resour **19**:552-566.
Haller, B. C. and P. W. Messer. 2019. SLiM 3: Forward Genetic Simulations Beyond the
Wright-Fisher Model. Molecular Biology and Evolution **36**:632-637.
Han, F., S. Lamichhaney, B. R. Grant, P. R. Grant, L. Andersson, and M. T. Webster.
2017. Gene flow, ancient polymorphism, and ecological adaptation shape the
genomic landscape of divergence among Darwin's finches. Genome Research
27:1004-1015.
Hohenlohe, P. A., S. Bassham, P. D. Etter, N. Stiffler, E. A. Johnson, and W. A. Cresko.
2010. Population Genomics of Parallel Adaptation in Threespine Stickleback
using Sequenced RAD Tags. Plos Genetics **6**.
Holt, C. and M. Yandell. 2011. MAKER2: an annotation pipeline and genome-database
management tool for second-generation genome projects. BMC Bioinformatics
12:491.
Hudson, R. R. 1990. Gene genealogies and the coalescent process. Oxford Surveys in
Evolutionary Biology **7**:44.
Hudson, R. R., D. D. Boos, and N. L. Kaplan. 1992. A Statistical Test for Detecting
Geographic Subdivision. Molecular Biology and Evolution **9**:138-151.

Hudson, R. R. and N. L. Kaplan. 1995. Deleterious Background Selection with Recombination. Genetics **141**:1605-1617.

Jiggins, C. D. and S. H. Martin. 2017. Glittering gold and the quest for Isla de Muerta. Journal of Evolutionary Biology **30**:1509-1511.

Jurka, J., V. V. Kapitonov, A. Pavlicek, P. Klonowski, O. Kohany, and J. Walichiewicz. 2005. Repbase Update, a database of eukaryotic repetitive elements. Cytogenet Genome Res **110**:462-467.

Kelleher, J., A. M. Etheridge, and G. McVean. 2016. Efficient Coalescent Simulation and Genealogical Analysis for Large Sample Sizes. Plos Computational Biology **12**.

Kelleher, J., K. R. Thornton, J. Ashander, and P. L. Ralph. 2018. Efficient pedigree recording for fast population genetics simulation. Plos Computational Biology **14**.

Kersey, P. J., J. E. Allen, I. Armean, S. Boddu, B. J. Bolt, D. Carvalho-Silva, M. Christensen, P. Davis, L. J. Falin, C. Grabmueller, J. Humphrey, A. Kerhornou, J. Khobova, N. K. Aranganathan, N. Langridge, E. Lowy, M. D. McDowall, U. Maheswari, M. Nuhn, C. K. Ong, B. Overduin, M. Paulini, H. Pedro, E. Perry, G. Spudich, E. Tapanari, B. Walts, G. Williams, M. Tello-Ruiz, J. Stein, S. Wei, D. Ware, D. M. Bolser, K. L. Howe, E. Kulesha, D. Lawson, G. Maslen, and D. M. Staines. 2016. Ensembl Genomes 2016: more genomes, more complexity. Nucleic Acids Res **44**:D574-580.

Kimura, M. 1968. Evolutionary rate at the molecular level. Nature **217**:624-626.

Koch, M., B. Haubold, and T. Mitchell-Olds. 2001. Molecular systematics of Brassicaceae: evidence from plastidic matK and nuclear Chs sequences. American Journal of Botany **88**:534-544.

Korf, I. 2004. Gene finding in novel genomes. BMC Bioinformatics **5**:59.

Kronforst, M. R., M. E. B. Hansen, N. G. Crawford, J. R. Gallant, W. Zhang, R. J. Kulathinal, D. D. Kapan, and S. P. Mullen. 2013. Hybridization Reveals the Evolving Genomic Architecture of Speciation. Cell Reports **5**:666-677.

Lamichhaney, S., J. Berglund, M. S. Almen, K. Maqbool, M. Grabherr, A. Martinez-Barrio, M. Promerova, C. J. Rubin, C. Wang, N. Zamani, B. R. Grant, P. R. Grant, M. T. Webster, and L. Andersson. 2015. Evolution of Darwin's finches and their beaks revealed by genome sequencing. Nature **518**:371-375.

Langley, C. H., K. Stevens, C. Cardeno, Y. C. Lee, D. R. Schrider, J. E. Pool, S. A. Langley, C. Suarez, R. B. Corbett-Detig, B. Kolaczkowski, S. Fang, P. M. Nista, A. K. Holloway, A. D. Kern, C. N. Dewey, Y. S. Song, M. W. Hahn, and D. J. Begun. 2012. Genomic variation in natural populations of Drosophila melanogaster. Genetics **192**:533-598.

Langmead, B. and S. L. Salzberg. 2012. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. Nat Methods **9**:357-359.

Li, H. 2013. Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM. arXiv **1303.3997v1**.

Malinsky, M., R. J. Challis, A. M. Tyers, S. Schiffels, Y. Terai, B. P. Ngatunga, E. A. Miska, R. Durbin, M. J. Genner, and G. F. Turner. 2015. Genomic islands of speciation separate cichlid ecomorphs in an East African crater lake. Science **350**:1493-1498.

Marques, D. A., J. I. Meier, and O. Seehausen. 2019. A Combinatorial View on Speciation and Adaptive Radiation. Trends in Ecology & Evolution.

Martin, S. H., K. K. Dasmahapatra, N. J. Nadeau, C. Salazar, J. R. Walters, F. Simpson,
M. Blaxter, A. Manica, J. Mallet, and C. D. Jiggins. 2013. Genome-wide evidence
for speciation with gene flow in Heliconius butterflies. Genome Research
23:1817-1828.
Martin, S. H., J. W. Davey, and C. D. Jiggins. 2015. Evaluating the use of ABBA-BABA
statistics to locate introgressed loci. Molecular Biology and Evolution **32**:244-
257.
Martin, S. H., J. W. Davey, C. Salazar, and C. D. Jiggins. 2019. Recombination rate
variation shapes barriers to introgression across butterfly genomes. Plos Biology
17.
Matthey-Doret, R. and M. C. Whitlock. 2018. Background selection and the statistics of
population differentiation: consequences for detecting local adaptation. BiorXiv.
Maynard-Smith, J. and J. Haigh. 1974. Hitch-Hiking Effect of a Favorable Gene.
Genetics Research **23**:23-35.
McMinn, H. E. 1951. Studies in the genus *Diplacus*, Scrophulariaceae. Madrono **11**:33-
128.
Miles, A. and N. Harding. 2017. cggh/scikit-allel: v1.1.8.
Nei, M. and W. H. Li. 1979. Mathematical-Model for Studying Genetic-Variation in
Terms of Restriction Endonucleases. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A **76**:5269-5273.
Nelson, T. C. and W. A. Cresko. 2018. Ancient genomic variation underlies repeated
ecological adaptation in young stickleback populations. Evolution Letters **2**:9-21.
Nordberg, H., M. Cantor, S. Dusheyko, S. Hua, A. Poliakov, I. Shabalov, T. Smirnova, I.
V. Grigoriev, and I. Dubchak. 2013. The genome portal of the Department of
Energy Joint Genome Institute: 2014 updates. Nucleic Acids Res **42**:D26-D31.
Nosil, P., D. J. Funk, and D. Ortiz-Barrientos. 2009. Divergent selection and
heterogeneous genomic divergence. Molecular Ecology **18**:375-402.
Ohta, T. 1973. Slightly Deleterious Mutant Substitutions in Evolution. Nature **246**:96-98.
Paradis, E., J. Claude, and K. Strimmer. 2004. APE: Analyses of Phylogenetics and
Evolution in R language. Bioinformatics **20**:289-290.
Parra, G., K. Bradnam, and I. Korf. 2007. CEGMA: a pipeline to accurately annotate core
genes in eukaryotic genornes. Bioinformatics **23**:1061-1067.
Pease, J. B., D. C. Haak, M. W. Hahn, and L. C. Moyle. 2016. Phylogenomics Reveals
Three Sources of Adaptive Variation during a Rapid Radiation. Plos Biology **14**.
Pease, J. B. and M. W. Hahn. 2013. More Accurate Phylogenies Inferred from Low-
Recombination Regions in the Presence of Incomplete Lineage Sorting. Evolution
67:2376-2384.
Poelstra, J. W., N. Vijay, C. M. Bossu, H. Lantz, B. Ryll, I. Muller, V. Baglione, P.
Unneberg, M. Wikelski, M. G. Grabherr, and J. B. W. Wolf. 2014. The genomic
landscape underlying phenotypic integrity in the face of gene flow in crows.
Science **344**:1410-1414.
Quevillon, E., V. Silventoinen, S. Pillai, N. Harte, N. Mulder, R. Apweiler, and R. Lopez.
2005. InterProScan: protein domains identifier. Nucleic Acids Res **33**:W116-
W120.
Rastas, P., F. C. F. Calboli, B. C. Guo, T. Shikano, and J. Merila. 2016. Construction of
Ultradense Linkage Maps with Lep-MAP2: Stickleback F-2 Recombinant Crosses
as an Example. Genome Biol Evol **8**:78-93.

Ravinet, M., R. Faria, R. K. Butlin, J. Galindo, N. Bierne, M. Rafajlovic, M. A. F. Noor, B. Mehlig, and A. M. Westram. 2017. Interpreting the genomic landscape of speciation: a road map for finding barriers to gene flow. Journal of Evolutionary Biology **30**:1450-1477.

Renaut, S., C. J. Grassa, S. Yeaman, B. T. Moyers, Z. Lai, N. C. Kane, J. E. Bowers, J. M. Burke, and L. H. Rieseberg. 2013. Genomic islands of divergence are not affected by geography of speciation in sunflowers. Nature Communications **4**.

Rettelbach, A., A. Nater, and H. Ellegren. 2019. How Linked Selection Shapes the Diversity Landscape in Ficedula Flycatchers. Genetics **212**:277-285.

Rockman, M. V. 2012. The Qtn Program and the Alleles That Matter for Evolution: All That's Gold Does Not Glitter. Evolution **66**:1-17.

Schluter, D. 2000. The Ecology of Adaptive Radiation. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Schumer, M., C. L. Xu, D. L. Powell, A. Durvasula, L. Skov, C. Holland, J. C. Blazier, S. Sankararaman, P. Andolfatto, G. G. Rosenthal, and M. Przeworski. 2018. Natural selection interacts with recombination to shape the evolution of hybrid genomes. Science **360**:656-659.

Simao, F. A., R. M. Waterhouse, P. Ioannidis, E. V. Kriventseva, and E. M. Zdobnov. 2015. BUSCO: assessing genome assembly and annotation completeness with single-copy orthologs. Bioinformatics **31**:3210-3212.

Slatkin, M. 1991. Inbreeding Coefficients and Coalescence Times. Genetical Research **58**:167-175.

Sobel, J. M., S. Stankowski, and M. A. Streisfeld. 2019. Variation in ecophysiological traits might contribute to ecogeographic isolation and divergence between parapatric ecotypes of Mimulus aurantiacus. J Evol Biol.

Sobel, J. M. and M. A. Streisfeld. 2015. Strong premating reproductive isolation drives incipient speciation in Mimulus aurantiacus. Evolution **69**:447-461.

Soria-Carrasco, V., Z. Gompert, A. A. Comeault, T. E. Farkas, T. L. Parchman, J. S. Johnston, C. A. Buerkle, J. L. Feder, J. Bast, T. Schwander, S. P. Egan, B. J. Crespi, and P. Nosil. 2014. Stick Insect Genomes Reveal Natural Selection's Role in Parallel Speciation. Science **344**:738-742.

Stamatakis, A. 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of large phylogenies. Bioinformatics **30**:1312-1313.

Stanke, M. and S. Waack. 2003. Gene prediction with a hidden Markov model and a new intron submodel. Bioinformatics **19**:Ii215-Ii225.

Stankowski, S., J. M. Sobel, and M. A. Streisfeld. 2015. The geography of divergence with gene flow facilitates multitrait adaptation and the evolution of pollinator isolation in Mimulus aurantiacus. Evolution **69**:3054-3068.

Stankowski, S., J. M. Sobel, and M. A. Streisfeld. 2017. Geographic cline analysis as a tool for studying genome-wide variation: a case study of pollinator-mediated divergence in a monkeyflower. Molecular Ecology **26**:107-122.

Stankowski, S. and M. A. Streisfeld. 2015. Introgressive hybridization facilitates adaptive divergence in a recent radiation of monkeyflowers. Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences **282**:154-162.

Streisfeld, M. A. and J. R. Kohn. 2005. Contrasting patterns of floral and molecular variation across a cline in Mimulus aurantiacus. Evolution **59**:2548-2559.

Streisfeld, M. A. and J. R. Kohn. 2007. Environment and pollinator-mediated selection
on parapatric floral races of Mimulus aurantiacus. Journal of Evolutionary
Biology **20**:122-132.
Streisfeld, M. A., W. N. Young, and J. M. Sobel. 2013. Divergent Selection Drives
Genetic Differentiation in an R2R3-MYB Transcription Factor That Contributes
to Incipient Speciation in Mimulus aurantiacus. Plos Genetics **9**.
Thompson, D. M. 2005. Systematics of Mimulus subgenus Schizoplacus
(Scrophulariaceae). Systematic Botany Monographs **75**:1-213.
Turner, T. L., M. W. Hahn, and S. V. Nuzhdin. 2005. Genomic islands of speciation in
Anopheles gambiae. Plos Biology **3**:1572-1578.
Van Doren, B. M., L. Campagna, B. Helm, J. C. Illera, I. J. Lovette, and M. Liedvogel.
2017. Correlated patterns of genetic diversity and differentiation across an avian
family. Molecular Ecology **26**:3982-3997.
Vickery, R. K. 1995. Speciation by Aneuploidy and Polyploidy in Mimulus
(Scrophulariaceae). Great Basin Naturalist **55**:174-176.
Wolf, J. B. and H. Ellegren. 2017. Making sense of genomic islands of differentiation in
light of speciation. Nature Reviews Genetics **18**:87-100.
Wu, C. I. 2001. The genic view of the process of speciation. Journal of Evolutionary
Biology **14**:851-865.
Zerbino, D. R. and E. Birney. 2008. Velvet: Algorithms for de novo short read assembly
using de Bruijn graphs. Genome Research **18**:821-829.
1523
1524

Supplementary information for:

Widespread selection and gene flow shape the genomic landscape during a radiation of monkeyflowers

Sean Stankowski[1,2,§], Madeline A. Chase[1,3,§], Allison M. Fuiten[1], Murillo F. Rodrigues[1], Peter L. Ralph[1], and Matthew A. Streisfeld[1*].

[1]Institute of Ecology and Evolution, 335 Pacific Hall 5289, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97405, USA
[2]Present address: Department of Animal and Plant Sciences, University of Sheffield, Sheffield S10 2TN, UK
[3]Present address: Department of Evolutionary Biology, Evolutionary Biology Centre (EBC), Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden
[§]These authors contributed equally to this work

*Corresponding author: mstreis@uoregon.edu

ORCID ids:
SS: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0472-9299; MAC: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7916-3560; AMF: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3926-5455; MFR: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7508-1384 PLR: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9459-6866; MAS: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2660-8642

Supplementary tables

Table S1. Summary of the genetic linkage map constructed using an F2 intercross between the red and yellow ecotypes of subspecies *puniceu*s. The table includes map length in cM for each linkage group (LG), the number of markers associated with each LG, the number of unique map positions, and the average genetic distance in cM between each unique map position. Standard deviations are given in parentheses.

LG	Map length (cM)	Number of markers	Unique map positions	Avg. genetic dist. between unique markers in cM (sd)
1	93.9	969	335	0.28 (0.33)
2	71.37	893	253	0.28 (0.88)
3	76.3	912	256	0.30 (0.65)
4	70.2	851	257	0.28 (0.41)
5	78.7	778	295	0.27 (0.29)
6	69.1	741	247	0.28 (0.88)
7	59.8	738	234	0.26 (0.33)
8	65.6	674	246	0.27 (0.41)
9	68.6	623	182	0.37 (0.58)
10	71.1	410	150	0.48 (0.96)
Avg.	72.74 (8.69)	758.90 (155.75)	245.50 (49.04)	0.31 (0.06)

Table S2. Analysis of gene space completeness in the *M. aurantiacus* genome using CEGMA and BUSCO. The number and percent of core genes found in the final assembly are shown for each analysis (CEGMA, *n* = 248; BUSCO, *n* = 1440).

Analysis	# Genes	% Found in Assembly
CEGMA Complete	233	93.95
CEGMA Partial	244	98.39
BUSCO total complete (duplicated)	1340 (61)	93 (4.2)
BUSCO Fragmented	29	2.0
BUSCO Missing	71	5.0

Table S3. Sample information for the 37 sequenced individuals. Includes their taxon identity, sampling location, percent read alignment, and average sequencing depth.

Sample	Taxon	Latitude	Longitude	% Reads aligned	Seq. Depth
159_83	ssp. *aridus*	32.6630	-116.2230	91.7	21.12
159_84	ssp. *aridus*	32.6630	-116.2230	89.3	21.98
195_1	ssp. *aridus*	32.6300	-116.1429	92.6	20.20
T84	ssp. *aridus*	32.6526	-116.2449	87.2	21.75
T102	ssp. *aurantiacus*	39.0424	-122.7727	94.9	23.74
T104	ssp. *aurantiacus*	39.2045	-123.7646	94.6	25.09
T50	ssp. *aurantiacus*	35.9865	-121.4928	88.3	24.36
T92	ssp. *aurantiacus*	37.8459	-120.6110	94.0	15.16
T144	ssp. *calycinus*	34.1929	-117.2784	93.2	26.00
T150	ssp. *calycinus*	33.8564	-116.8481	94.7	24.02
T90	ssp. *calycinus*	35.5918	-118.5052	91.3	19.97
T91	ssp. *calycinus*	35.3172	-118.5871	95.5	27.91
T101	ssp. *grandiflorus*	39.5536	-121.4301	92.0	16.05
T61	ssp. *grandiflorus*	39.5590	-120.8243	91.6	17.31
T96	ssp. *grandiflorus*	39.0122	-120.7552	92.0	28.21
T99	ssp. *grandiflorus*	39.4376	-121.0599	91.4	23.84
DPR	ssp. *longiflorus*	33.7459	-117.4485	96.0	26.88
SS	ssp. *longiflorus*	34.2722	-118.6100	94.2	30.86
T33	ssp. *longiflorus*	34.3438	-118.5099	94.6	18.87
T8	ssp. *longiflorus*	34.1347	-118.6452	82.6	25.11
KK168	ssp. *parviflorus*	34.0180	-119.6730	91.8	23.66
KK161	ssp. *parviflorus*	34.0180	-119.6730	92.0	19.11
KK180	ssp. *parviflorus*	34.0180	-119.6730	92.4	18.18
KK182	ssp. *parviflorus*	34.0193	-119.6802	91.3	19.46
ELF	ssp. *puniceus*, red	33.0860	-117.1453	93.0	18.20
JMC	ssp. *puniceus*, red	32.7373	-116.9541	93.8	19.06
LH	ssp. *puniceus*, red	33.0609	-117.1188	87.1	19.77
MT	ssp. *puniceus*, red	32.8210	-117.0618	93.7	20.85
UCSD	ssp. *puniceus*, red	32.8894	-117.2362	87.0	18.23
BCRD	ssp. *puniceus*, yellow	32.9496	-116.6380	94.6	20.85
INJ	ssp. *puniceus*, yellow	33.0979	-116.6643	93.1	18.83
LO	ssp. *puniceus*, yellow	32.6767	-116.3312	93.4	18.04
PCT	ssp. *puniceus*, yellow	32.7326	-116.4698	92.3	19.68
POTR	ssp. *puniceus*, yellow	32.6038	-116.6339	90.5	19.27
CLV_GH	*M. clevelandii*	33.1589	-116.8122	92.3	21.31
CLV_11	*M. clevelandii*	33.3391	-116.9325	84.4	15.52
CLV_4	*M. clevelandii*	33.3391	-116.9325	89.3	17.31

Table S4. Loadings for principal component 1 calculated across all 36 pairwise comparisons (for F_{ST} and d_{xy}) or all nine taxa (for π).

Comparison	F_{ST}	d_{xy} PC1
Aur_Ari	0.85707	0.95575
Gra_Ari	0.89606	0.86182
Cal_Ari	0.88738	0.95423
CLV_Ari	0.8969	0.39278
Par_Ari	0.85342	0.94563
Lon_Ari	0.9046	0.96057
Aur_Gra	0.81191	0.85563
Aur_Cal	0.32407	0.90376
Aur_CLV	0.90725	0.46698
Aur_Par	0.79434	0.94778
Lon_Aur	0.40962	0.90381
Ari_Y	0.90097	0.94262
Aur_Y	0.451	0.90512
Gra_Y	0.91203	0.90305
Cal_Y	0.49255	0.88634
CLV_Y	0.90576	0.54264
Par_Y	0.86511	0.94318
Lon_Y	0.59046	0.88521
Cal_Gra	0.89043	0.88319
CLV_Gra	0.91181	0.32045
Par_Gra	0.89579	0.86769
Lon_Gra	0.88549	0.89344
Cal_Par	0.83543	0.94124
Lon_Cal	0.3786	0.87337
Cal_CLV	0.90548	0.52607
Par_CLV	0.91991	0.45233
Lon_CLV	0.90738	0.51482
Lon_Par	0.84197	0.94507
R_Ari	0.90783	0.94574
R_Aur	0.51788	0.89861
R_Y	0.51423	0.84798
R_Gra	0.91936	0.90695
R_Cal	0.62051	0.88316
R_CLV	0.90758	0.55149
R_Par	0.87615	0.93825
R_Lon	0.66912	0.88264

Table S4 continued.

Taxon	π PC1
Ari	0.9251
Aur	0.86508
Cal	0.96734
CLV	0.92017
Gra	0.77181
Lon	0.95166
Par	0.91044
R	0.97282
Y	0.97255

Table S5. Details for the linear regressions presented in Figure 5 of the main text.

Variables	Pearson's r	Regression equation	p
d_{xy} & π	-0.93	y = -60.5x + 1.33	< 0.001
π & gene count	0.59	y = 3.9x - 0.85	0.130
π & cM/mbp	-0.79	y = -5.4x + 0.46	0.020
F_{ST} & π	-0.89	y = -53.3x - 0.13	0.003
F_{ST} & gene count	0.81	y = 46.5x + 0.04	0.016
F_{ST} & cM/mbp	-0.73	y = -25.5x + 0.01	0.041

Table S6. Parameters used in SLiM to simulate genomic landscape evolution. (N=10,000).

Class	Mean Ns of deleterious mutations	Percent of deleterious mutations	Mean Ns of beneficial mutations	Percent of beneficial mutations	Migration rate (Nm)
Neutral	-	-	-	-	-
BGS	-10	5%	-	-	-
	-10	10%	-	-	-
	-100	5%	-	-	-
	-100	10%	-	-	-
BDMI	-10	5%	-	-	0.1
	-10	10%	-	-	1
	-10	5%	-	-	0.1
	-10	10%	-	-	1
	-100	5%	-	-	0.1
	-100	10%	-	-	1
	-100	5%	-	-	0.1
	-100	10%	-	-	1
Positive	-	-	100	0.1%	-
	-	-	100	0.5%	-
Local adaptation	-	-	100	0.1%	0.1
	-	-	100	0.1%	1
	-	-	100	0.5%	0.1
	-	-	100	0.5%	1
BGS & positive	-10	5%	100	0.1%	-
	-10	5%	100	0.5%	-
	-10	10%	100	0.1%	-
	-10	10%	100	0.5%	-
	-100	5%	100	0.1%	-
	-100	5%	100	0.5%	-
	-100	10%	100	0.1%	-
	-100	10%	100	0.5%	-

Table S7. Genome-wide estimates of admixture across the bush monkeyflower radiation.
Measures of Patterson's *D* and the admixture proportion, *f*, are given for all 48 possible pairs of four-taxon tests, with *M. clevelandii* as the outgroup for each test. All values of Patterson's *D* are statistically significant (P < 0.0001) based on a block jackknife approach.

P1	P2	P3	Patterson's D	Admixture proportion
Aur	Cal	Ari	0.0808	0.0209
Lon	Cal	Ari	0.0233	0.0055
Aur	Lon	Ari	0.0633	0.0155
Aur	R	Ari	0.1360	0.0389
Cal	R	Ari	0.0651	0.0184
Lon	R	Ari	0.0883	0.0238
Aur	Y	Ari	0.1595	0.0474
Cal	Y	Ari	0.0949	0.0270
Lon	Y	Ari	0.1177	0.0324
R	Y	Ari	0.0371	0.0088
R	Cal	Aur	0.0831	0.0903
Y	Cal	Aur	0.0976	0.1034
R	Lon	Aur	0.0866	0.0909
Y	Lon	Aur	0.1009	0.1041
Y	R	Aur	0.0188	0.0145
Ari	Par	Gra	0.1053	0.0243
Ari	Aur	Gra	0.1821	0.0477
Cal	Aur	Gra	0.0648	0.0096
Lon	Aur	Gra	0.0936	0.0141
Y	Aur	Gra	0.1392	0.0218
R	Aur	Gra	0.1471	0.0222
Par	Aur	Gra	0.1072	0.0240
Ari	Cal	Gra	0.1523	0.0384
Lon	Cal	Gra	0.0344	0.0045
Y	Cal	Gra	0.0886	0.0123
R	Cal	Gra	0.0943	0.0126
Par	Cal	Gra	0.0665	0.0145
Ari	Lon	Gra	0.1371	0.0341
Par	Lon	Gra	0.0478	0.0101
Y	Lon	Gra	0.0589	0.0078
R	Lon	Gra	0.0650	0.0082
Ari	R	Gra	0.1072	0.0261
Par	R	Gra	0.0099	0.0019
Ari	Y	Gra	0.1103	0.0265

Par	Y	Gra	0.0127	0.0023
R	Y	Gra	0.0059	0.0004
R	Y	Cal	0.0149	0.0438
Aur	Cal	Par	0.0415	0.0182
R	Cal	Par	0.0104	0.0055
Y	Cal	Par	0.0176	0.0077
Aur	Lon	Par	0.0456	0.0207
Cal	Lon	Par	0.0049	0.0025
R	Lon	Par	0.0151	0.0080
Y	Lon	Par	0.0222	0.0102
Aur	R	Par	0.0311	0.0128
Y	R	Par	0.0090	0.0022
Aur	Y	Par	0.0240	0.0106
R	Y	Lon	0.0001	-0.0018

Table S8. Correlation coefficients between the window-based admixture proportion (f_d) and PC1 F_{ST}. Pearson's r was calculated between PC1 F_{ST} and f_d for each of the 48 four-taxon tests, measured in 500kb non-overlapping windows. *M. clevelandii* is the outgroup for each test.

P1	P2	P3	Pearson's r	*p*
Aur	Y	Par	-0.0682	0.1809
R	Lon	Aur	-0.1645	0.0012
Y	Cal	Aur	-0.1388	0.0062
Ari	Cal	Gra	-0.3383	8.19E-12
Y	Aur	Gra	-0.3126	3.23E-10
Cal	R	Ari	-0.4135	2.06E-17
Cal	Lon	Par	-0.1024	0.0441
R	Y	Gra	-0.2732	4.75E-08
Cal	Aur	Gra	-0.2313	4.28E-06
Y	Cal	Gra	-0.2318	4.08E-06
Y	Lon	Par	-0.2484	7.51E-07
Aur	Y	Ari	-0.5850	6.54E-37
R	Lon	Gra	-0.2797	2.18E-08
Y	Lon	Aur	-0.1870	0.0002
Par	Aur	Gra	-0.3334	1.67E-11
Ari	Aur	Gra	-0.3344	1.45E-11
Y	R	Par	-0.2681	8.58E-08
R	Y	Cal	-0.0093	0.8546
R	Aur	Gra	-0.3389	7.40E-12
Ari	Y	Gra	-0.2782	2.61E-08
Ari	Lon	Gra	-0.3538	7.45E-13
Aur	Lon	Ari	-0.3056	8.24E-10
Aur	R	Par	-0.0897	0.0779
Par	Y	Gra	-0.2413	1.56E-06
Aur	Cal	Ari	-0.3456	2.68E-12
R	Lon	Par	-0.2026	5.96E-05
Lon	Cal	Ari	-0.2312	4.29E-06
Y	Lon	Gra	-0.2408	1.65E-06
Par	Cal	Gra	-0.3394	6.91E-12
R	Y	Lon	0.0104	0.8381
Lon	Y	Ari	-0.4775	1.94E-23
Ari	Par	Gra	-0.2272	6.35E-06
Lon	R	Ari	-0.4144	1.71E-17
Aur	R	Ari	-0.5208	2.77E-28
Aur	Lon	Par	-0.1015	0.0460

Ari	R	Gra	-0.2636	1.42E-07
Lon	Aur	Gra	-0.1697	0.0008
Cal	Y	Ari	-0.4707	9.75E-23
Par	Lon	Gra	-0.3104	4.33E-10
Lon	Cal	Gra	-0.1296	0.0107
R	Y	Ari	-0.3998	2.75E-16
Aur	Cal	Par	-0.1359	0.0074
R	Cal	Aur	-0.0881	0.0836
R	Cal	Gra	-0.2463	9.31E-07
Y	R	Aur	-0.1112	0.0287
R	Cal	Par	-0.1981	8.75E-05
Par	R	Gra	-0.2533	4.45E-07
Y	Cal	Par	-0.2735	4.58E-08

Supplementary figures

Figure. S1. Map distance (cM/Mbp) vs. physical distance across the 10 linkage groups. Recombination for each marker is estimated relative to the start of the linkage group and plotted at its physical location on each chromosome in the reference assembly.

Figure S2. Geographic distribution of sampling locations for each sample sequenced in this study. Detailed position information for each population can be found in Table S3.

Figure S3. Genome-wide Principal Components Analysis (PCA). Each plot is a separate PCA performed using different sets of taxa. The legend to the right describes the set of taxa included in each analysis, with the capital letter in parentheses and the color representing the specific taxon. A) All taxa; B) all subspecies of *M. aurantiacus*, but excluding *M. clevelandii*; C) only subspecies *aurantiacus*, *longiflorus*, *calycinus*, and the red and yellow ecotypes of subspecies *puniceus*. The percent variation explained by each principal component is given in parentheses.

Figure S4. Common patterns of genome-wide variation mirror variation in the local properties of the genome. Plots are the same as in Fig. 2 of the main text, but for 100 kb windows (step size 10 kbp). A) Tree concordance; B-D) Z-transformed PC1 for F_{ST}, d_{xy} and π, respectively; E) gene count; and F) recombination rate (cM/Mbp) are plotted across the 10 monkeyflower LGs.

Figure S5. Patterns of variation plotted across each bush monkeyflower linkage group.
Z-transformed F_{ST}, d_{xy}, and π in overlapping 500 kb windows (step size = 50 kbp). The gray lines are z-transformed scores for each of the 36 pairwise comparisons (F_{ST} and d_{xy}) or nine taxa (π), and the blue line is the z-transformed score for the first principal component (PC1). Estimates of tree concordance, gene count and recombination rate (cM/Mbp) are also shown.

Figure S5. continued

Figure S5. continued

Figure S5. continued

Figure S5. continued

Figure S5. continued

Figure S5. continued

Figure S5. continued

Figure S5. continued

Figure S5. continued

Figure S6. Patterns of variation are non-randomly distributed across the genome.
A) Strong autocorrelation of tree concordance scores on LG1 over a Mbp scale. B)
Levels of tree concordance, F_{ST}, d_{xy}, and π all show significant autocorrelation at the 2
Mbp scale. The dashed vertical lines show the observed autocorrelation coefficients for
each LG with a 2 Mbp lag. The histogram shows the null distribution of autocorrelation
coefficients (same lag) generated from 1000 random permutations of the genome-wide
values. The observed data are significant at $p = 0.001$ unless stated otherwise.

Figure S7. Patterns of differentiation and divergence for all 36 pairs of taxa. Box plots for each of the 36 pairwise taxonomic comparisons reveal the range of variation in F_{ST} and d_{xy} across the radiation. Moreover, the data show extensive variance among genomic windows within each comparison. Vertical black lines indicate the median, boxes represent the lower and upper quartiles, and whiskers extend to 1.5 times the interquartile range. Taxon abbreviations: *cal, calycinus; lon, longiflorus; aur, aurantiacus; par, parviflorus; ari, aridus; gra, grandiflorus; clv, M. clevelandii*.

Figure S8. Bivariate plots among measures of variation and genomic features across 500 kb genomic windows. Note that this is the same as Figure 3 but with axes units. Also note that the axes are different across rows and columns of the matrix.

Figure S9. Bivariate plots among measures of variation and genomic features across 100 kb genomic windows. The number is the correlation coefficient. Positive correlation coefficients are colored blue and negative coefficients are colored red.

Figure S10. A large-effect adaptive locus shows a lineage-specific signature of positive selection. Plots of Z-transformed F_{ST} across the genome, estimated in 100 kb sliding windows (step size 10 kb). The red line shows values between the red and yellow ecotypes of subspecies *puniceus*. The orange lines show other comparisons with the red ecotype of *punicues*, and the gray lines show the values of all other comparisons. The dashed blue line shows the first PC calculated across all of the comparisons. The triangle marks the position of the gene *MaMyb2*. A *cis*-regulatory mutation that is tightly linked to this gene is responsible for the shift from yellow to red flowers (Corresponds to Figure 4 in the main text).

Figure S11. The range of divergence times reveals static and dynamic signatures of recurrent indirect selection. Correlations between variables (500 kb windows) for all 36 taxonomic comparisons (gray dots) plotted against the average d_{xy} as a measure of divergence time. The left panels show how the relationships between π (each window averaged across a pair of taxa) and (A) gene count and (B) recombination rate vary with increasing divergence time. The middle panels (C & D) show the same relationships, but with F_{ST}. The right panels show the relationships between (E) d_{xy} and π and (F) F_{ST} and π. The regressions (dashed lines) in each plot are fitted to the eight independent contrasts (colored points) obtained using a phylogenetic correction, with the regression equation and strength of the correlation given in each panel. The color gradient shows the strength of the correlation.

Figure S12. Negative correlation between nucleotide diversity and differentiation becomes stronger with increasing divergence time. Bivariate plots of the correlation between F_{ST} and π at varying levels of sequence divergence (d_{xy}).

Figure S13. Genomic landscapes simulated under different different divergence histories. Each row of plots shows patterns of within- and between-population variation (π, d_{xy}, and F_{ST}) across a 21Mb chromosome (500 kb windows) at ten timepoints (in N generations, where N = 10,000) for one parameter combination of six scenarios: neutral divergence, background selection, Bateson-Dobzhansky-Muller incompatibilities, positive selection, background selection and positive selection, and local adaptation. The grey boxes in the first column show the areas of the chromosome that are constrained by selection. Mean centered (above line) and raw values (below line) of π, d_{xy}. The parameter Ns modulates the average selective coefficient (where s = Ns/N) while Prop is the proportion of new mutations that are not neutral, Nm is the average number of migrants per generation.

Figure S13 continued.

Figure S13 continued.

Positive selection (Mean centered)

Positive selection (Raw values)

Genomic position

Figure S13 continued.

Positive & background selection (Mean centered)

Positive & background selection (Raw values)

Genomic position

Figure S13 continued.

Figure S13 continued.

Figure S14. Evidence for widespread gene flow across the bush monkeyflower radiation. Genome-wide estimates of Patterson's *D* (blue circles) and the admixture proportion (*f;* red crosses) are shown for all 48 possible four taxon comparisons, with *M. clevelandii* as the outgroup in each test. The tests are ordered by increasing values of *D*, and each value is significant based on a block jackknife approach. The taxa included in each test are shown in the order P1, P2, P3 and *D* is always positive, meaning gene flow occurs between P2 and P3.

Figure S15. Variation in levels of admixture across the genome. The grey lines show measures of a modified test of the admixture proportion, f_d, estimated in 500kb non-overlapping windows for 48 different four-taxon comparisons, plotted across the 10 linkage groups of the bush monkeyflower genome. The blue line gives the mean value of f_d, calculated by taking the average value across all 48 tests in each genomic window.

Bonus Haiku!

Peaks and troughs of π,

Static, yet ever-changing.

Their reflection grows.