Mechanisms of a locally adaptive shift in allocation among growth, reproduction, and

herbivore resistance in *Mimulus guttatus*

David B. Lowry[a,b,c], Damian Popovic[a,b], Darlene J. Brennan[a], Liza M. Holeski[d]

[a]Department of Plant Biology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA

[b]Program in Ecology, Evolutionary Biology and Behavior, Michigan State University, East

Lansing, MI 48824, USA

[c]Plant Resilience Institute, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

[d]Department of Biological Sciences, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ, 86011

ABSTRACT

Environmental gradients can drive adaptive evolutionary shifts in plant resource allocation

among growth, reproduction, and herbivore resistance. However, few studies have attempted to

connect these adaptations to the underlying physiological and genetic mechanisms. Here, we

evaluate potential mechanisms underlying a coordinated locally adaptive shift between growth,

reproduction, and herbivore defense in the yellow monkeyflower, *Mimulus guttatus.* Through

manipulative laboratory experiments we found that gibberellin (GA) growth hormones may play

a role in the developmental divergence between coastal perennial and inland annual ecotypes of

M. guttatus. Further, we detected an interaction between a locally adaptive chromosomal

inversion, *DIV1*, and GA addition. This finding is consistent with the inversion contributing to

the evolution of growth form via an interaction with the GA pathway. Finally, we found

evidence that the *DIV1* inversion is partially responsible for a coordinated shift in the divergence

of growth, reproduction, and herbivore resistance traits between coastal perennial and inland

annual *M. guttatus*. The inversion has already been established to have a substantial impact on

the life-history shift between long-term growth and rapid reproduction in this system. Here, we

demonstrate that the *DIV1* inversion also has sizable impacts on both the total abundance and

profile of phytochemical compounds involved in herbivore resistance.

INTRODUCTION

One of the fundamental tenants of evolutionary biology is that adaptation of organisms to specific environmental conditions inevitability results in a fitness trade-off. Trade-offs often manifest in the form of a cost, such that organisms that become adapted to one set of environmental conditions will be at a disadvantage in alternative environments (Futuyma and Moreno 1988; Whitlock 1996). The idea of trade-offs involved in adaptation and ecological specialization has been borne out in a wide range of evolutionary scenarios, including predator-prey relationships and host-races formation in insect herbivores (Futuyma and Moreno 1988; Kawecki 1998; Svanback and Eklov 2003; Forister et al. 2012). A common source of ecological specialization and consequent trade-offs is the process of local adaptation across environmental gradients (Kawecki and Ebert 2004; Hereford 2009).

Local adaption across environmental gradients can lead to shifts in the allocation of resources to long-term growth (survival) and reproduction (fecundity; Clausen and Hiesey 1958; Lowry 2012; Friedman and Rubin 2015). Those shifts in life-history strategy along environmental gradients can also have major impacts on allocation to herbivore defense (Hahn and Maron 2016). However, there appears to be key differences in how resources are allocated across environmental gradient for interspecific and intraspecific comparisons. Interspecific variation in plant species typically fits well with the resource allocation hypothesis (Coley et al. 1985), where low resource environments tend to be composed of slower growing better defended species while high resource environments promote faster growing poorly defended plants (Endara and Coley 2011). In contrast, intraspecific variation along environmental gradients is far less consistent and more often than not contradicts the predictions of the resource allocation hypothesis (Hahn and

Maron 2016). One common pattern for intraspecific plant variation is a positive relationship

between the length of the growing season along an environmental gradient and the level of

herbivore resistance (Hahn and Maron 2016; Kooyers et al. 2017). This pattern could be driven

by plants having more time to allocate resources to leaf production and defense, greater

herbivore pressure in habitats with longer growing seasons, and/or a greater apparency of plants

with longer growing seasons (Feeny 1976; Mason and Donovan 2015; Hahn and Maron 2016;

Kooyers et al. 2017). Allocation to reproduction (fecundity) frequently trades off with

constitutive and/or induced herbivore resistance (Agren and Schemske 1993; Heil and Baldwin

2002; Strauss et al. 2002; Stowe and Marquis 2011; Cipollini et al. 2014).

Achieving an evolutionary optimum in how resources are allocated to growth, reproduction, and

defense will depend on the nature of all environmental challenges faced by each local population

(Rhoades 1979; Rausher 1996; Hamilton et al. 2001; Strauss et al. 2002; Stamp 2003; Karban

2011; Cipollini et al. 2014; Jensen et al. 2015; Smilanich et al. 2016). Despite the development

of multiple ecological and evolutionary hypotheses that postulate a relationship between growth,

reproduction, and resistance to herbivores (Feeny 1976; Coley et al. 1985; Rhoades 1979; Herms

and Mattson 1992; Strauss et al. 2002; Stamp 2003, Fine et al. 2006; Agrawal et al. 2010;

Cipollini et al. 2014; Hahn and Maron 2016), these hypotheses do not make any predictions

about the underlying molecular mechanisms that mediate these relationships. The genetic

mechanisms responsible for trade-offs among growth, reproduction, and resistance are just

beginning to be elucidated in model systems (Lorenzo et al. 2004; Yang et al. 2012; Kerwin et al.

2015; Campos et al. 2016; Havko et al. 2016; Major et al. 2017; Howe et al. 2018; Rasmann et

al. 2018), but have yet to be evaluated in the evolutionary context of local adaptation.

Recent studies have shown that changes in the allocation of resources to growth versus resistance

are made through a set of interacting gene networks (Karzan and Manners 2012; Huot et al.

2014; Campos et al. 2016; Havko et al. 2016). Jasmonates (JA) are key regulatory hormones

involved in the response of plants to herbivore attack (Zhang and Turner 2008; Havko et al.

2016). While JA production increases herbivore defenses, it also inhibits plant growth through

interactions with other gene networks (Zhang and Turner 2008; Yan et al. 2007; Karzan and

Manners 2012; Yang et al. 2012). For example, the interactions of JAZ genes with DELLA

genes in the signaling pathway of Gibberellin (GA) growth hormones are thought to play a key

role in mediating resource allocation (Yang et al. 2012; Hou et al. 2013; Havko et al. 2016).

Here, we focus on understanding the physiological and genetic mechanisms underlying shifts in

allocation to growth, reproduction, and defense for local adapted populations of the yellow

monkeyflower *Mimulus guttatus*. The availability of soil water is a key driver of local adaptation

in the *M. guttatus* species complex (Hall and Willis 2006; Lowry et al. 2008; Ferris et al. 2017).

The coastal habitats of California and Oregon have many wet seeps and streams that are

maintained year-round as a result of persistent summer oceanic fog and cool temperatures (Hall

and Willis 2006; Lowry et al. 2008; Lowry and Willis 2010). All coastal populations of *M.*

guttatus that reside in those habitats have a late-flowering life-history strategy. These coastal

perennial populations thus, make a long-term investment in growth over reproduction (Hall and

Willis 2006; Lowry et al. 2008; Hall et al. 2010; Baker and Diggle 2011; Baker et al. 2012). That

investment in growth manifests through the production of many vegetative lateral stolons,

adventitious roots, and leaves in coastal perennial plants. In contrast, the vast majority of nearby

inland populations of *M. guttatus* in the coastal mountain ranges reside in habitats that dry out

completely during summer months. These inland populations have evolved a rapid growth

drought escape annual life-history strategy. Instead of investing in vegetative lateral stolons, the

axillary branches of inland plants are mostly upcurved and typically produce flowers quickly

(Lowry et al. 2008; Lowry and Willis 2010; Friedman et al. 2015). Further, inland plants invest

less into the production of leaves before flowering than coastal perennials (Friedman et al. 2015).

It should be noted that a smaller number of inland populations in the Coast Ranges do reside in

rivers and perennials seeps and have a perennial life-history. Farther inland, perennial

populations are more common, especially in high elevation streams and hot springs of the Sierra

and Cascade Mountains (Oneal et al. 2014).

While perennial populations invest more into vegetative growth than reproductive growth, they

also invest more heavily in defending their vegetative tissues. Perennial populations have higher

levels of both constitutive and induced defensive phenylpropanoid glycoside (PPG) compounds

than the annual populations when grown in a common environment (Holeski et al. 2013). This

pattern of highly defended plants in wetter habitats with long growing seasons versus poorly

defended plants in dry habitats with short growing seasons is consistent with an optimal defense

strategy: Greater allocation of resources to herbivore resistance is favored in long growing

season habitats by a greater abundance of herbivores and a lower cost of producing defensive

compounds (Kooyers et al. 2017).

Two major QTLs (*DIV1* and *DIV2*) and many minor QTLs control key traits involved in local

adaptation to perennial and annual habitats within the *M. guttatus* species complex (Hall et al.

2006; Lowry and Willis 2010; Hall et al. 2010; Friedman and Willis 2013; Friedman et al. 2015).

DIV1 has the largest effect on the most traits and has thus been more extensively studied than

DIV2. *DIV1* is a large paracentric chromosomal inversion that plays a pivotal role in the annual

versus perennial life-history divergence described above (Lowry and Willis 2010). The inversion

is at minimum 6.3 Mbp in length along linkage group 8 (LG8) and contains at least 785

annotated genes. In hybrids, *DIV1* has a major effect on growth rate including the adaptive

flowering time phenotype, explaining 21% to 48% of the divergence between inland annual and

coastal perennial parents (Lowry and Willis 2010). In addition to flowering time, the *DIV1*

inversion has major effects on multiple traits involved in the evolutionary shift from more

allocation of resources to long-term growth versus reproduction (Lowry and Willis 2010). These

traits include the production of lateral stolons, adventitious roots, and leaf size (Lowry and Willis

2010; Friedman et al. 2015). Recent outlier analysis of coastal perennial and inland annual

populations identified candidate genes in the gibberellin pathway that may underlie a pleiotropic

shift in allocation between growth and reproduction (Gould et al. 2017).

In this study, we evaluate the role of GA in the divergence of growth morphology and herbivore

resistance between perennial and annual ecotypes of *M. guttatus.* We then test whether there is

an interaction between the *DIV1* inversion and GA addition, which would be consistent with the

inversion contributing to the evolution of shifts in allocation between long-term growth and

reproduction via effects on the GA pathway. Finally, we examined whether the *DIV1* inversion is

responsible for the shift in allocation between reproduction and defense that has been broadly

observed for populations of *M. guttatus* that vary in growing season length (Lowry et al. 2008;

Holeski et al. 2013; Kooyers et al. 2017).

METHODS

Plant material

For comparisons among ecotypes, we utilized single family population accessions derived from

five coastal perennial, four inland annual, and two inland perennial populations of *M. guttatus*

(Fig. 1). The locations from where population accessions were collected are listed in Table S1.

Previous population structure analyses found that coastal perennial populations of *M. guttatus*

are more closely related to each other than they are to the inland populations (Lowry et al. 2008;

Twyford and Friedman 2015). Thus, the coastal populations collectively constitute a distinct

locally adapted ecotype (Lowry 2012). In contrast, population structure between inland annuals

and inland perennial populations is generally low (Twyford and Friedman 2015). However,

particular regions of the genome, including an adaptive chromosomal inversion (*DIV1*, discussed

below) are more differentiated between inland annuals and perennials (Oneal et al. 2014;

Twyford and Friedman 2015). We therefore consider inland annuals and inland perennials as

different ecotypes as well.

To understand the phenotypic effects of the *DIV1* inversion, Lowry and Willis (2010) previously

created near-isogenic lines (NILs). The NILs are the product of crosses between inbred lines

from the coastal perennial SWB population and the nearby inland annual LMC population. F1

hybrids were recurrently backcrossed to both of their respective parents for four generations.

Heterozygous fourth generation backcrosses were then self-fertilized to produce two types of

NILs: 1) Individuals that were homozygous for the introgressed allele of *DIV1* (Introgression-

NILs) and 2) Individuals that were homozygous for the *DIV1* allele of the genetic background

(henceforth referred to as Control-NILs). Comparisons between Introgression-NILs and Control-

NILs are ideal for testing inversion function because their genetic backgrounds are nearly

identical, but they are homozygous for opposite *DIV1* alleles.

The effects of GA application on plant growth among ecotypes

To evaluate whether coastal perennial and inland annual plants differ in their response to GA

addition, we conducted a greenhouse experiment with accessions derived from five coastal and

four inland populations. Seeds were sown in Suremix soil (Michigan Grower Products Inc.,

Galsburg, MI) and stratified at 4° C for two weeks. After stratification, pots were moved to the

Michigan State University Greenhouses. Temperature was set in the greenhouse room to 22° C

days/18° C nights. Plants were grown in 16-hour days and 8-hour nights, where supplemental

lighting was used during the full day period. Seedlings were transplanted to individual 3.5-inch

square pots filled with Suremix soil. Transplanted seedlings were randomized across the

experiment and randomly assigned to a GA treatment group or a mock control group. After

transplantation, plants were sprayed five times each, every other day, with 100mM GA3 (GA

treatment) or DI water (mock). This spray volume amounts to ~3.5 mL of volume.

To standardize the developmental time point at which plant traits were quantified, we measured

the following traits on the day of first flowering (anthesis): Total number of nodes on the primary

shoot, lengths and widths of the first three internodes, length and width of the corolla of the first

open flower, plant height, the total number of adventitious roots at the first node of all branches,

total number of stoloniferous nodes sprouting adventitious roots, total number of aerial branches,

total number of stolons, length of the longest aerial branch, length of the longest stolon, and the

length and width of the longest leaf at the second node. Ten days after first flower, we quantified

the same traits as at first flower, with the following exceptions: Length and width of corollas

were not quantified, but we did count the total number of flowers.

Results were analyzed with JMP 12.2.0 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC). To gain a general

understanding of the effect of GA addition on coastal perennial, inland annual, and inland

perennial ecotypes, we conducted principle components analyses using all traits measured 10

days after flowering plus the width and length of corollas measured at flowering. We did not use

the other traits measured at first flower to avoid including repeated measures in the principle

components analysis. We saved the first three PCs from the analysis of all individuals. To

understand the effects of accession, ecotype, and GA treatment on PCs, we fit standard least

squares models. Each of the three PCs were modeled as response variables to the following

factors and interactions: accession (nested within ecotype), ecotype (coastal perennial, inland

annual, inland perennial), treatment, accession x treatment, and ecotype x treatment. Following

our PC analysis, we fit the same model for individual traits.

Interactions of GA application with the adaptive DIV1 inversion

We grew coastal (S1) and inland (L1) parental inbred lines along with the NILs derived from

those lines in a fully randomized design in the Michigan State University greenhouses, with 16-

hours of supplemental lighting. We focused on the effect of the inversion in the coastal perennial

genetic background, as a previous study had shown that the effect of the inversion had the

greatest effect in the perennial genetic background (Friedman 2014). Following transplantation,

seedlings were sprayed with GA or a mock water treatment every other day and traits were

quantified in the same way as for the comparing population accessions.

To establish how trait variation of the coastal and inland parental lines was influenced by the GA

treatment, we conducted a PC analysis with the parental lines. As for the analysis with multiple

population accessions (above), we conducted principle components analyses using all traits

measured 10 days after flowering plus the width and length of corollas measured at flowering.

Models were fit with the first three PCs and individual traits as response variables to the

following factors: line, treatment, and the line x treatment interaction. Following analysis of the

parental lines, we analyzed the effects of the inversion in the perennial genetic background NILs.

As above, we first conducted a PC-based analysis and saved the first three PCs. We then fit the

first three PCs and individual traits as response variables for the following factors: inversion

type, treatment, and the inversion type x treatment interaction.

Effects of the DIV1 inversion on resistance compound concentrations

To evaluate the effects of the *DIV1* inversion on the production of herbivore resistance

compounds, we conducted an experiment using the inversion NILs. Seeds were stratified,

germinated, and transplanted following the same protocols as in the previous two experiments. In

contrast to the GA NIL experiment, we grew outbred NILs which were created by intercrossing

independently derived NILs. As for the GA experiment, we focused our study on the effect of the

inversion in the perennial genetic background. The details of how outbred NILs were generated

can be found in Lowry and Willis (2010). Here, we used the outbred NILs made by intercrossing

S2 and S3 derived coastal genetic background NILs. We used intercrosses between L2 and L3

for the inland parents and between S2 and S3 for the coastal perennial parent comparisons.

To ensure that enough leaf tissue was available for analyses, outbred NILs and outbred parents

were allowed to flower prior to the collections for PPG quantification. Collected leaf tissue was

lyophilized for two days and then shipped to Northern Arizona University for analyses. We

ground the leaf tissue using a 1600 MiniG (Spex, Metuchen, New Jersey). Extractions were

conducted in methanol, as described in Holeski et al. 2013, 2014. We quantified PPGs using high

performance liquid chromatography (HPLC), via an Agilent 1260 HPLC (Agilent Technologies,

Santa Clara, California) with a diode array detector and Poroshell 120 EC-C18 analytical column

(4.6 x 250mm, 2.7μm particle size) maintained at 30°C. HPLC run conditions, as were described

in Kooyers et al. (2017). We calculated concentrations of PPGs as verbascoside equivalents,

using a standard verbascoside solution (Santa Cruz Biotechnology, Dallas, Texas), as described

in Holeski et al. (2013, 2014). We compared the concentrations of total PPGs and individual

PPGs with one-way ANOVAs fit in JMP 12.2.0. Post-hoc Tukey Tests were used to compare

means of parental and NIL classes.

RESULTS

The effects of GA application on plant growth among ecotypes

Consistent with previous studies (Hall et al. 2006; Lowry et al. 2008; Lowry and Willis 2010;

Oneal et al. 2014), there were large differences in morphology between coastal perennial, inland

annual, and inland perennial ecotypes. There were also differences between the inland perennial

ecotype and the two other ecotypes. Most traits (18 out of 20) heavily loaded (Loadings > 0.40)

onto the first PC (Eigenvalue = 8.258; Table S2). The ecotype effect was highly significant for

PC1 ($F_{2,226}$ = 333.64, P < 0.0001; Table 1). Within ecotype, there was a significant effect of

accession on PC1 ($F_{8,226}$ = 20.12, P < 0.0001), and there was a significant effect of the GA

treatment on PC1 ($F_{1,226}$ = 25.75, P < 0.0001). While there was a significant accession x

treatment effect on PC1 ($F_{8,226}$ = 3.36, P = 0.0012), the treatment x ecotype effect was not

significant (P > 0.05). In contrast to PC1, both of the interactions were significant for PC2

(Eigenvalue = 3.463; accession x treatment: $F_{8,226}$ = 8.18, P < 0.0001; ecotype x treatment: $F_{2,226}$

= 6.20, P = 0.0024; Fig. 2A) and PC3 (Eigenvalue = 2.01; accession x treatment: $F_{8,226}$ = 2.92; P

= 0.0040, ecotype x treatment: $F_{2,226}$ = 41.64, P < 0.0001; Fig. 2B). Second and third internode

length, plant height, the total number of adventitious roots at the first nodes, total number of

stoloniferous nodes sprouting adventitious roots, total number of aerial branches, total number of

stolons, and the length of the longest aerial branch all heavily loaded (> 0.40) onto PC2 (Table

S2). Third internode length, total number of aerial branches, total number of stolons, and leaf

width heavily loaded onto PC3 (Table S2).

The results of the individual traits analyses were largely consistent with the principle

components analyses. Ecotype had a significant effect on all traits except for third internode

length. There was a significant accession effect for every trait that we measured in the

experiment. The GA treatment had a significant effect on 16 out of 19 traits at first flower and 12

out of 18 traits measured at 10 days after first flower (Table 1). The most pronounced changes of

the plants in response to the GA treatment was an increase in plant height and a conversion of

lateral branches from adventitious root-making stolon branches into unpurved aerial branches

(Fig. 2C). As the perennials typically have more stolons with adventitious roots than the annuals,

they were generally more obviously affected by the GA treatment. This effect was captured

through the significant ecotype x treatment interactions on plant height. It should be noted that

the effect of GA varied across accessions within ecotype. The coastal PGR accession is the

tallest coastal accession with the fewest stolons (Table 1; Fig. 2C). Thus, it was affected the least

by the GA treatment. In contrast, OPB is a short prostrate coastal accession and was dramatically

affected by the GA treatment (Fig. 2C). Among the inland annual accession, SWC showed the

greatest response to the GA treatment in terms of height and aerial branch formation.

Interactions of GA application with the adaptive DIV1 inversion

Consistent with previous studies (Lowry and Willis 2010; Friedman 2014), the coastal perennial

(SWB S1) and inland annual (LMC L1) lines were highly divergent in morphological traits and

the two lines were differentiated strongly along PC1 ($F_{1,168}$ = 416.81, P < 0.0001). Similar to the

accession analyses (above), the line x treatment interaction was not significant for PC1, but was

highly significant for PC2 ($F_{1,168}$ = 85.57, P < 0.0001) and PC3 ($F_{1,168}$ = 13.54, P < 0.0001). The

line x treatment interactions was also significant for 16 out of the 19 traits measured at flowering

and 12 out of the 18 traits measured 10 days after flowering. Overall, the coastal perennial line

(S1) responded more strongly to GA treatment, just as we found across coastal and inland

populations more generally (above).

The *DIV1* chromosomal inversion is one of many loci responsible for divergence between the

annual and perennial ecotypes. Thus, main effects and interactions in the NILs were expected to

be subtler than for the parental lines. As in previous studies (Lowry and Willis 2010; Friedman

2014), the inversion had significant effects on morphology, with highly significant main effects

on PC1 ($F_{1,173} = 35.44$, $P < 0.0001$; Table 2, S3) and PC3 ($F_{1,173} = 37.55$, $P < 0.0001$). The GA

treatment had significant effects on PC1 ($F_{1,173} = 16.76$, $P < 0.0001$) and PC2 ($F_{1,173} = 489.50$, P

< 0.0001). There were weak, but significant, line x treatment interactions for PC2 ($F_{1,173} = 4.13$,

$P = 0.0437$; Fig. 3A) and PC3 ($F_{1,173} = 4.17$, $P = 0.0427$). While the line x treatment effect on the

morphological PCs was marginal, the effect was greater for some of the individual traits (Fig. 3;

Table 2).

Effects of the DIV1 inversion on resistance compound concentrations

We quantified the concentrations of seven PPGs (Table 3). Consistent with our previous

observations (Holeski et al. 2013), the coastal perennial parental (SWB) plants produced 2.5

times more total PPGs than the inland annual parental (LMC) plants ($F_{1,31} = 51.03$; $P < 0.0001$;

Table 3; Fig. 4). There were also significant differences for six out of seven of the PPGs between

the coastal perennial (SWB) and inland annual (LMC) parental lines.

Analysis of the *DIV1* NILs revealed that the introgressed region containing the inversion had

major effects on foliar concentrations of PPGs. Control NILs that were homozygous for the

coastal orientation of the *DIV1* inversion produced 35% higher concentrations of total PPGs than

the introgression NILs, which were homozygous for the inland *DIV1* orientation ($F_{1,87} = 22.70$; P

< 0.0001). In addition, the *DIV1* locus had significant effects on four out of the seven individual

PPGs. Interestingly, the control NILs had higher concentrations of conandroside and

mimuloside, but lower concentrations of calceolarioside A and unknown PPG10, than the

introgression NILs (Table 3). Thus, the *DIV1* inversion influences both the total concentration of

PPGs as well as the composition of suites of these PPGs.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we identified a potential genetic mechanism underlying a coordinated evolutionary

shift between growth, reproduction, and herbivore resistance in the *M. guttatus* species complex.

We found that GA has the potential to play a role in the divergence between coastal perennial

and inland annual ecotypes of *M. guttatus*, with coastal and inland plants responding differently

to the addition of GA for a number of phenotypic traits associated with shifts between long-term

growth and reproduction. Further, we detected an interaction between the locally adaptive *DIV1*

inversion and GA addition, which is consistent with the inversion contributing to the evolution of

growth form by modulating the GA pathway. Finally, we found evidence that the *DIV1* inversion

contributes to the trade-off between growth, reproduction and resistance. The coastal orientation

of the *DIV1* inversion causes plants to allocate more to long-term growth and herbivore

resistance over rapid reproduction than for the inland inversion orientation. We discuss these

findings in the context of the broader literature below.

Environmental gradients and the evolution of growth, reproduction, and defense traits

Studies of intraspecific variation among natural populations adapted to different soil water

availability regimes provide an excellent opportunity to understand how the abiotic environment

influences the relative allocation of resources by plants to growth and constitutive/induced

resistance. Soil water is one of the most limiting factors for plants on Earth (Whittaker 1975;

Bohnert et al. 1995; Bray 1997) and can drastically differ in availability among seasons

(Cowling et al. 1996), which in turn influences plant resource allocation (Juenger 2013). The

timing of soil water availability can dictate the length of the growing season. One major

evolutionary strategy for seasonally low water availability is to allocate resources primarily to

growth and reproduction to achieve an early flowering, drought escape life-history (Ludlow

1989; Juenger 2013; Kooyers 2015). Beyond selection on plants, soil moisture gradients can

drive the abundance of herbivores, which in turn exert their own selective pressures (Kooyers et

al. 2017).

In *M. gutattus*, evolutionary shifts across a soil moisture gradient drives changes in the allocation

not only between growth and reproduction, but also for herbivore resistance (Lowry et al. 2008;

Holeski et al. 2013; Kooyers et al. 2017). The phenotypic differences between coastal perennial

and inland annual populations is likely driven by multiple selective pressures that are tied to the

soil water availability gradient between coastal and inland habitats. Inland annual habitats

generally dry out very quickly at the end of the spring, which leaves little time for a plant to

reproduce before being killed by the summer drought. Further, the short growing season may

also prevent the growth of sizable herbivore populations, which would explain the low level of

leaf damage in fast drying inland annual habitats (Lowry et al. 2008; Kooyers et al. 2017). In

contrast, the year-round soil water availability of coastal habitats means that plants growing there

have much more time to allocate resources to vegetative growth and herbivore resistance. In

addition, wet coastal habitats can build up a considerable load of herbivores, which is likely

reflected by much greater leaf damage and early season mortality in these habitats (Lowry et al.

2008; Lowry and Willis 2010). For intraspecific differences among populations, the strength of

herbivore pressure is thought to be a key driver of plant resistance (Hahn and Maron 2016). It

should be noted that a fair amount of leaf damage in coastal habitats may also be due to oceanic

salt spray (Boyce 1954; Ahmed and Wainwright 1976; Griffiths 2006; Lowry et al. 2009). Future

manipulative field experiments are needed to partition out the relative contributions of herbivory

and salt spray to leaf damage for *M. guttatus* in coastal habitats.

Our findings in *M. guttatus* are likely to have implications for intraspecific variation in many

other plant species as well. There are many studies that have found similar developmental

differences between coastal and inland populations as we have found for *M. guttatus* (reviewed

in Lowry 2012). Given the commonality of coastal plants investing more heavily in lateral

vegetative branches versus inland populations investing primarily in upright flowering branches,

we predict that coastal population of plants will generally be more highly defended than inland

populations, particularly in Mediterranean climates with steep soil moisture gradients.

The role of pleiotropy and linkage

The results of this study and previous studies (Lowry and Willis 2010; Friedman 2014; Friedman

et al. 2015) collectively demonstrate that adaptive chromosomal inversion *DIV1* contributes to

the shift in allocation between long-term growth, short-term fecundity, and herbivore resistance.

An outstanding question is whether this coordinated shift is due to genetic linkage or pleiotropy.

Chromosomal inversions are thought to evolve as adaptation "supergenes," which can trap

multiple linked adaptive loci through their suppression of meiotic recombination (Dobzhansky

1970; Kirkpatrick and Barton 2006; Schwander et al. 2014; Wellenreuther and Bernatchez 2018).

Thus, the fact that the *DIV1* inversion contributes to the evolution of multiple phenotypes could

be result of adaptive alleles at multiple linked loci being held together in tight linkage by the

chromosomal inversion. Alternatively, a single gene within the inversion could have pleiotropic

effects on all of the phenotypic changes.

Two other recent studies have also found potential pleiotropic effects of genes on allocation to

reproduction and herbivore resistance. Rasmann et al. (2018) found that NILs containing genetic

variants of the *Flowering Locus C* (*FLC*) gene in *Cardamine hirsute* are responsible for a trade-

off between early flowering and herbivore resistance in terms of glucosinolate production.

Kerwin et al. (2015) found that there was a positive correlation in *Arabidopsis thaliana* between

glucosinalate production and flowering time for mutant alleles of genes in the glucosinolate

biosynthetic pathway. Overall, both of these studies identified the same trade-off of rapid

reproduction versus herbivore resistance that we found in our study, although mediated through

independent genetic mechanisms.

A hormonal basis of a coordinated shift in the evolution of growth, reproduction, and

herbivore resistance?

The finding that coastal perennial and inland annual plants respond differentially to GA is

consistent with the role of this hormone playing a role in their evolutionary divergence. A recent

outlier analysis of coastal perennial and inland annual populations of *M. gutattus* found that the

gene *GA20-oxidase2* (*GA20ox2*) was a major allele frequency outlier between the ecotypes

within the vicinity of the *DIV1* inversion (Gould et al. 2017). This gene is a strong potential

candidate gene for a pleiotropic shift in allocation between growth and reproduction. GA-

oxidases are involved in the evolution of dwarfed coastal populations of *A. thaliana* (Barboza *et*

al. 2013) and played a key role in the development of dwarfed Green Revolution rice and barley

(Sasaki et al. 2002; Jia et al. 2009). Further, the DELLA gene, *GAI*, is located within the vicinity

of another growth regulatory QTL (*DIV2*). *GAI* was also an allele frequency outlier between

coastal and inland populations (Gould et al. 2017). Friedman (2014) found that the *DIV1* and

DIV2 loci interact epistatically. Thus, it would not be surprising if the genetic changes that

underlie both QTL are in the same molecular pathway. Further, the negative antagonism between

the GA and JA hormone pathways via the DELLA-JAZ signaling node (Havko et al. 2016; Guo

et al. 2018; Howe et al. 2018) suggests a direct mechanism by which trade-offs between growth,

reproduction, and resistance could easily evolve. Future functional genetic studies will be needed

to determine whether these genes in fact are involved in adaptive shifts between growth,

reproduction, and defense underlying local adaptation in this system.

While we saw a greater response to GA addition in coastal plants and observed an interaction

between GA addition and the inversion, other hormones could also play a role or even be the

ultimate cause of the divergence between the coastal perennial and inland annual ecotypes. Three

major classes of hormones, Auxins, Brassinosteroids and Gibberellins, are all associated with

growth phenotypes like those that differ between coastal perennial and inland annual ecotypes of

M. guttatus (Ross and Quittenden 2016; Unterholzner et al. 2016). These hormones interact in

multiple ways, which have yet to be fully elucidated, to result in shifts in growth/reproduction

phenotypes. Future functional studies in *M. guttatus* will be needed to identify the ultimate

causative mechanisms underlying the dramatic shift in allocation between annual and perennial

populations.

Conclusions and future directions

There are numerous evolutionary and ecological models that make predictions on the evolution

of relationships between growth, reproduction, and herbivore resistance. While recent meta-

analyses have found that some models have moderate support (Endara and Coley 2011), there

are numerous exceptions and many models appear to not be well supported at all (Stamps et al.

2003; Hahn and Maron 2016; Smilanich et al. 2016). The reasons that these models do not hold

up are often attributed to vast variation in the extrinsic environmental factors that exert selective

pressures on plant populations, broad variation in life-history among plant species, and

differences between interspecific and intraspecific variation (Stamps et al. 2003; Hahn and

Maron 2016; Smilanich et al. 2016). Less well appreciated are the molecular genetic mechanisms

that underlie shifts in allocation between growth, reproduction, and herbivore resistance (Kerwin

et al. 2015; Rasmann et al. 2018). The nature of the gene networks responsible for shifts in

allocation may also be very important for whether or not particular systems will conform to a

given evolutionary or ecological model. Future research should focus on uncovering the

molecular mechanisms that underlie the evolution of growth, reproduction, and defense trade-

offs in natural populations and integrate predictions from those mechanisms into ecological

models.

AKNOWLEGEMENT

We would like to thank Sol Chavez for assisting with the quantification of PPGs. Seed

collections were originally made possible by permission from the state parks of Oregon and

California. Funding for this research was provided by Michigan State University through a

startup package to DBL.

LITERATURE CITED

Agrawal, A. A., J. K. Conner, and S. Rasmann. 2010. Tradeoffs and adaptive negative

correlations in evolutionary ecology. Pp. 243-268 in M. A. Bell, et al., eds. Evolution after

Darwin: The first 150 years. Sinaur Press, Sunderland, MA.

Agren, J., and D. W. Schemske. 1993. The cost of defense against herbivores: an experimental

study of trichome production in *Brassica rapa*. Am. Nat. **141**:338-350.

Ahmad, I., and S. E. Wainwright. 1976. Ecotype differences in leaf surface properties of *Agrostis*

stolonifera from salt marsh, spray zone and inland habitats. New Phytol. **76**:361-366.

Baker, R. L., and P. K. Diggle. 2011. Node-specific branching and heterochronic changes

underlie population-level differences in *Mimulus guttatus* (Phrymaceae) shoot architecture. Am.

J. Bot. **98**:1924-1934.

Baker, R. L., L. C. Hileman, and P. K. Diggle. 2012. Patterns of shoot architecture in locally

adapted populations are linked to intraspecific differences in gene regulation. New Phytol.

196:271-281.

Barboza, L., S. Effgen, C. Alonso-Blanco, R. Kooke, J. J B. Keurentjes, M. Koornneef, and R.

Alcázar. 2013. *Arabidopsis* semidwarfs evolved from independent mutations in GA20ox1,

ortholog to green revolution dwarf alleles in rice and barley. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 201314979.

Bohnert, H. J., Nelson D. E., and Jensen R. G. 1995. Adaptations to environmental stresses. Plant

Cell **7**:1099–1111.

Boyce, S. G. 1954. The salt spray community. Ecol. Monograph. **24**:29–67.

Bray, E. A. 1997. Plant responses to water deficit. Trends Plant Sci. **2**:48–54.

Campos, M. L., Y. Yoshida, I. T. Major, D. de Oliveira Ferreira, S. M. Weraduwage, J. E.

Froehlich, B. F. Johnson, D. M. Kramer, G. Jander, T. D. Sharkey, and G. A. Howe. 2016.

Rewiring of jasmonate and phytochrome B signalling uncouples plant growth-defense tradeoffs.

Nat. Commun. **7**:12570.

Cipollini, D., D. Walters, C. Voelckel. 2014. Costs of resistance in plants: from theory to

evidence. Annu. Plant Rev. 47:263-307.

Clausen, J., and W. H. Hiesey. 1958. Experimental studies on the nature of species. IV. Genetic

structure of ecological races. Carnegie Institution of Washington, Washington, DC.

Coley, P. D., J. P Bryant, F. F. S. Chapin III. 1985. Resource availability and plant antiherbivore

defense. Science **230**:895-899.

Cowling, R. M., P. W Rundel., B. B. Lamont, M. K. Arroyo, and M. Arianoutsou. 1996. Plant

diversity in Mediterranean-climate regions. Trends Ecol. Evol. **11**:362-366.

Defossez, E., L. Pellissier, and S. Rasmann. 2018. The unfolding of plant growth form-defense

syndromes along elevational gradients. Ecol. Lett. **21**:609-618.

Dobzhansky, T. 1970. Genetics of the Evolutionary Process. Columbia University Press, New

York, NY.

Endara, M. J., and P. D. Coley. 2011. The resource availability hypothesis revisited: A meta-

analysis. Funct. Ecol. **25**:389-398.

Feeny, P. 1976 Plant apparency and chemical defense. Pp. 1-40 in J. W. Wallace and R. L.

Mansell, eds. Biochemical interaction between plants and insects. Springer, Boston, MA.

Ferris, K. G., L. L. Barnett, B. K. Blackman, J. H. Willis. 2017. The genetic architecture of local

adaptation and reproductive isolation in sympatry within the *Mimulus guttatus* species complex.

Mol. Ecol. **26**:208-224.

Fine, P. V, Z. J. Miller, I. Mesones, S. Irazuzta, H. M. Appel, M. H. Stevens, I. Sääksjärvi, J. C.

Schultz, and P. D. Coley. 2006. The growth–defense trade-off and habitat specialization by

plants in Amazonian forests. Ecology **87**:S150-S162.

Forister, M. L., L. A. Dyer, M. S. Singer, J. O. Stireman, and J. T. Lill. 2012. Revisiting the

evolution of ecological specialization, with emphasis on insect–plant interactions. Ecology

93:981-991.

Friedman, J. 2014. Genetic determinants and epistasis for life history trait differences in the

common monkeyflower, *Mimulus guttatus*. J. Heredity **105**:910-921.

Friedman, J., and J. H. Willis. 2013. Major QTLs for critical photoperiod and vernalization

underlie extensive variation in flowering in the *Mimulus guttatus* species complex. New Phytol.

199:571-583.

Friedman, J., A. D. Twyford, J. H. Willis, and B. K. Blackman. 2015. The extent and genetic

basis of phenotypic divergence in life history traits in *Mimulus guttatus*. Mol. Ecol. **24**:111-122.

Friedman, J., and M. J. Rubin. 2015. All in good time: understanding annual and perennial

strategies in plants. American Journal of Botany **102**:497-499.

Futuyma, D. J., and G. Moreno. 1988. The evolution of ecological specialization. Annu. Rev.

Ecol. Syst. **19**:207-233.

Gould, B. A., Y. Chen, and D. B. Lowry. 2017. Pooled ecotype sequencing reveals candidate

genetic mechanisms for adaptive differentiation and reproductive isolation. Mol. Ecol. **26**:163-

177.

Griffiths, M.E., and C. M. Orians. 2003. Salt spray differentially affects water status, necrosis,

and growth in coastal sandplain heathland species. Am. J. Bot. **90**:1188–1196.

Hahn, P. G., and J. L. Maron. 2016. A framework for predicting intraspecific variation in plant

defense. Trends Ecol. Evol. **31**:646-656.

Hall, M. C., and J. H. Willis. 2006. Divergent selection on flowering time contributes to local

adaptation in *Mimulus guttatus* populations. Evolution **60**:2466-2477.

Hall, M. C., D. B. Lowry, and J. H. Willis. 2010. Is local adaptation in *Mimulus guttatus* caused

by trade-offs at individual loci? Mol. Ecol. **19**:2739-2753.

Hamilton, J. G., A. R. Zangerl, E. H. DeLucia, and M. R. Berenbaum. 2001. The carbon–nutrient

balance hypothesis: its rise and fall. Ecol. Lett. **4**:86-95.

Havko, N. E., I. T. Major, J. B. Jewell, E. Attaran, and G. A. Howe. 2016. Control of carbon

assimilation and partitioning by jasmonate: An accounting of growth–defense tradeoffs. Plants

5:7.

Heil, M., and I. T. Baldwin. 2002. Fitness costs of induced resistance: emerging experimental

support for a slippery concept. Trends Plant Sci. **7**:61-67.

Hereford, J. 2009. A quantitative survey of local adaptation and fitness trade-offs. Am. Nat.

173:579-588.

Herms, D. A., and W. J. Mattson. 1992. The dilemma of plants: to grow or defend. Q. Rev. Biol.

67:283-335.

Holeski, L. M., K. Keefover-Ring, M. D. Bowers, Z. T. Harnenz, and R. L. Lindroth. 2013.

Patterns of phytochemical variation in *Mimulus guttatus* (yellow monkeyflower). J. Chem. Ecol.

39:525–536.

Holeski, L. M., P. Monnahan, B. Koseva, N. McCool, R. L. Lindroth, and J. K. Kelly. 2014. A

high-resolution genetic map of yellow monkeyflower identifies chemical defense QTLs and

recombination rate variation. Genes Genom. Genet. **4**:813–821.

Huot, B., J. Yao, B. L. Montgomery, and S. Y. He. 2014. Growth–defense tradeoffs in plants: a

balancing act to optimize fitness. Mol. Plant. **7**:1267-1287.

Howe, G. A., I. T. Major, and A. J. Koo. 2018. Modularity in jasmonate signaling for multistress

resilience. Annu. Rev. Plant Biol. **69**:387-415.

Hou, X., L. Ding, and H. Yu. 2013. Crosstalk between GA and JA signaling mediates plant

growth and defense. Plant Cell Rep. **32**:1067-1074.

Jensen, L.M., H. K. Jepsen, B. A. Halkier, D. J. Kliebenstein, and M. Burow. 2015 Natural

variation in cross-talk between glucosinolates and onset of flowering in *Arabidopsis*. Front. Plant

Sci. **6**:697.

Jia, Q., J. Zhang, S. Westcott, X-Q. Zhang, M. Bellgard, R. Lance, C. Li. 2009. GA-20 oxidase

as a candidate for the semidwarf gene sdw1/denso in barley. Funct. Integr. Genomics. **9**:255–262

Juenger, T. E. 2013 Natural variation and genetic constraints on drought tolerance. Curr. Opin.

Plant Biol. **16**:274-281.

Karban, R. 2011. The ecology and evolution of induced resistance against herbivores. Funct.

Ecol. 25:339-347.

Kazan, K., and J. M. Manners. 2012. JAZ repressors and the orchestration of phytohormone

crosstalk. Trends Plant Sci. **17**:22-31.

Kawecki, T. J. 1988. Red queen meets Santa Rosalia: arms races and the evolution of host

specialization in organisms with parasitic lifestyles. Am. Nat. **152**:635-651.

Kawecki, T. J., and Ebert D. 2004. Conceptual issues in local adaptation. Ecol. Lett. **7**:1225-

1241.

Kerwin, R., J. Feusier, J. Corwin, M. Rubin, C. Lin, A. Muok, B. Larson, B. Li, B. Joseph, M.

Francisco, and D. Copeland. 2015. Natural genetic variation in *Arabidopsis thaliana* defense

metabolism genes modulates field fitness. eLife. **4**:e05604.

Kirkpatrick, M., and N. H. Barton. 2006. Chromosome inversions, local adaptation and

speciation. Genetics **173**:419-434.

Kooyers, N. J. 2015. The evolution of drought escape and avoidance in natural herbaceous

populations. Plant Sci. 234:155-162.

Kooyers, N. J., B. K. Blackman, and L. M. Holeski. 2017 Optimal defense theory explains

deviations from latitudinal herbivory defense hypothesis. Ecology **98**:1036-1048.

Lowry, D. B., R. C. Rockwood, and J. H. Willis. 2008. Ecological reproductive isolation of coast

and inland races of *Mimulus guttatus*. Evolution **62**:2196-2214.

Lowry, D. B., M. C. Hall, D. E. Salt, and J. H. Willis. 2009. Genetic and physiological basis of

adaptive salt tolerance divergence between coastal and inland *Mimulus guttatus*. New Phytol.

183:776-788.

Lowry, D. B., and J. H. Willis. 2010. A widespread chromosomal inversion polymorphism

contributes to a major life-history transition, local adaptation, and reproductive isolation. PLoS

Biol. **8**:e1000500.

Lowry, D. B. 2012. Ecotypes and the controversy over stages in the formation of new species.

Biol. J. Linnean Soc. **106**:241-257.

Ludlow, M. M. 1989. Strategies of response to water stress. Pp. 509-519 in K. H. Kreeb et al.

(Eds.), Structural and functional responses to environmental stresses. SPB Academic, The

Hague.

Lorenzo, O., J. M. Chico, J. J. Sanchez-Serrano, and R. Solano. 2004. JASMONATE-

INSENSITIVE1 encodes a MYC transcription factor essential to discriminate between different

jasmonate-regulated defense responses in *Arabidopsis*. Plant Cell **16**:1938–1950.

Major, I. T., Y. Yoshida, M. L. Campos, G. Kapali, X. F. Xin, K. Sugimoto, D. Oliveira Ferreira,

S. Y. He, and G. A. Howe. 2017. Regulation of growth–defense balance by the JASMONATE

ZIM-DOMAIN (JAZ)-MYC transcriptional module. New Phytol. **215**:1533-1547.

Mason, C. M., and L. A. Donovan. 2015. Evolution of the leaf economics spectrum in herbs:

evidence from environmental divergences in leaf physiology across Helianthus (Asteraceae).

Evolution **69**:2705-2720.

Moreira, X., R. Zas, A. Solla, and L. Sampedro. 2015. Differentiation of persistent anatomical

defensive structures is costly and determined by nutrient availability and genetic growth-defence

constraints. Tree Physiol. **35**:112-123.

Oneal, E., D. B. Lowry, K. M. Wright, Z. Zhu, and J. H. Willis. 2014. Divergent population

structure and climate associations of a chromosomal inversion polymorphism across the M

imulus guttatus species complex. Mol. Ecol. **23**:2844-2860.

Rasmann, S., J. Sánchez Vilas, G. Glauser, M. Cartolano, J. Lempe, M. Tsiantis, and J. R.

Pannell. 2018. Pleiotropic effect of the Flowering Locus C on plant resistance and defence

against insect herbivores. J. Ecol. **106**:1244-1255.

Rausher, M. D. 1996. Genetic analysis of coevolution between plants and their natural enemies.

Trends in Genetics **12**:212-217.

Rhoades, D. F. 1979. Evolution of plant chemical defense against herbivores. P.p. 3–54 in G. A.

Rosenthal and D. H. Janzen, editors. Herbivores: their interaction with secondary plant

metabolites. Academic Press, Orlando, Florida, USA.

Ross J. J., and L. J. Quittenden. 2016. Interactions between brassinosteroids and gibberellins:

Synthesis or Signaling? Plant Cell **28**:829-832.

Sasaki A., M. Ashikari, M. Ueguchi-Tanaka, H. Itoh, A. Nishimura, D. Swapan, K. Ishiyama, T.

Saito, M. Kobayashi, G. S. Khush, H. Kitano, and M. Matsuoka 2002. Green revolution: a

mutant gibberellin-synthesis gene in rice. Nature **416**:701.

Schwander, T., R. Libbrecht, and L. Keller. 2014. Supergenes and complex phenotypes. Curr.

Biol. **24**:R288-R294.

Smilanich, A. M., R. M. Fincher, and L. A. Dyer. 2016. Does plant apparency matter? Thirty

years of data provide limited support but reveal clear patterns of the effects of plant chemistry on

herbivores. New Phytol. **210**:1044-1057.

Stamp, N. 2003 Out of the quagmire of plant defense hypotheses. Q. Rev. Biol. **78**:23-55.

Strauss, S.Y., J.A. Rudgers, J.A. Lau, and R.E. Irwin. 2002. Direct and ecological costs of

resistance to herbivory. Trends Ecol. Evol. **17**:278-285.

Stowe, K. A., and R. J. Marquis. 2011. Costs of defense: correlated responses to divergent

selection for foliar glucosinolate content in *Brassica rapa*. Evol. Ecol. **25**:763-775.

Svanbäck, R., and P. Eklöv. 2003. Morphology dependent foraging efficiency in perch: a trade-

off for ecological specialization? Oikos **102**:273-284.

Twyford, A. D., and J. Friedman. 2015. Adaptive divergence in the monkey flower Mimulus

guttatus is maintained by a chromosomal inversion. Evolution **69**:1476-1486.

Uesugi, A., T. Connallon, A. Kessler, and K. Monro, 2018. Relaxation of herbivore-mediated

selection drives the evolution of genetic covariances between plant competitive and defense

traits. Evolution **71**:1700-1709.

Unterholzner, S. J., W. Rozhon, and B. Poppenberger. 2016. Reply: Interaction between

Brassinosteroids and Gibberellins: Synthesis or Signaling? In Arabidopsis, Both! Plant Cell.

28:836-839.

van Dam, N. M., and I. T. Baldwin. 1998. Costs of jasmonate-induced responses in plants

competing for limited resources. Ecol. Lett. **1**:30-33.

Wellenreuther, M., and L. Bernatchez. 2018. Eco-evolutionary genomics of chromosomal

inversions. Trends Ecol. Evol. **33**:427-440.

Whitlock, M. C. 1996. The red queen beats the jack-of-all-trades: the limitations on the evolution

of phenotypic plasticity and niche breadth. Am. Nat. **148**:S65-S77.

Whittaker, R. H. 1975. Communities and Ecosystems. McMillan, New York, NY.

Yan, Y., S. Stolz, A. Chetelat, P. Reymond, M. Pagni, L. Dubugnon, and E. E. Farmer. 2007. A

downstream mediator in the growth repression limb of the jasmonate pathway. Plant Cell

19:2470–2483.

Yang, D. L., J. Yao, C. S. Mei, X. H. Tong, L. J. Zeng, Q. Li, L. T. Xiao, T. P. Sun, J. Li, X. W.

Deng, C. M. Lee, M. F. Thomashow, Y. Yang, Z. He, S. Y. He. 2012. Plant hormone jasmonate

prioritizes defense over growth by interfering with gibberellin signaling cascade. Proc. Nat.

Acad. Sci. **109**:E1192-1200.

Zhang, Y., and J. Turner. 2008. Wound-induced endogenous jasmonates stunt plant growth by

inhibiting mitosis. PLoS ONE **3**:e3699.

774   **TABLES**

775   **Table 1.** F-values for main effects and interactions on traits measured across population

776   accessions.

Trait	N	Population	Ecotype	Treatment	Population x Treatment	Ecotype x Treatment
PC1	208	22.33****	333.64****	12.84***	3.27**	1.65
PC2	208	16.18****	1.54	52.41****	9.30****	11.70***
PC3	208	17.41****	2.67	54.93****	3.07**	62.66****
Traits Measured at Flowering						
Total number of nodes on the primary shoot	248	20.63****	249.51****	25.94****	0.89	11.71***
Length of the 1st internode	248	15.51****	40.98****	0.02	0.45	0.53
Length of the 2nd internode	248	35.03****	127.59****	35.70****	2.32*	0.79
Length of the 3rd internode	248	27.67****	0.27	18.47****	1.68	0.01
Combined length first three internodes	248	36.71****	31.14****	35.15****	1.55	0.12
Plant Height	248	32.12****	187.20****	100.61****	5.27****	25.68****
Width 1st internode	248	9.59****	153.67****	0.93	0.30	0.80
Width 2nd internode	248	36.32****	571.28****	5.36*	2.12*	0.12
Width 3rd internode	248	29.73****	538.28****	0.85	5.28****	2.16
Corolla length of the 1st flower	248	56.05****	629.66****	16.95****	1.48	1.36
Corolla width of the 1st flower	248	31.87****	303.07****	17.69****	2.71*	2.15
Number of adventitious roots at 1st nodes	248	4.30***	80.55****	7.68**	1.50	3.77
Number of nodes with adventitious roots	248	4.47****	9.16**	6.75*	1.88	4.00*
Total number of aerial branches	248	12.65****	19.28****	33.91****	8.69****	9.32**
Total number of stolons	248	8.37****	66.82****	30.61****	1.78	21.44****
Length of the longest aerial branch	248	19.02****	68.57****	34.38****	3.80***	18.34****
Length of the longest stolon	248	5.32****	23.80****	4.19*	1.47	3.94*
Length of the longest leaf at the 2nd node	248	3.79***	111.60****	1.91	1.44	0.45
Width of the longest leaf at the 2nd node	248	4.88****	50.95****	28.75****	1.91	4.25*
Traits Measured 10 Days After Flowering						
Total number of nodes on the primary shoot	216	19.75****	167.07****	8.41**	2.44*	0.82
Length of the 1st internode	215	16.88****	92.96****	0.23	2.32*	2.78*
Length of the 2nd internode	215	30.52****	108.15****	36.67****	1.53	0.78
Length of the 3rd internode	215	32.82****	0.00	12.54***	2.17*	0.81
Combined length first three internodes	215	39.46****	31.62****	24.54****	1.77	0.37
Plant Height	215	28.85****	181.38****	56.07****	12.74****	0.31
Width 1st internode	215	3.79*	52.44****	1.75	1.79	0.00
Width 2nd internode	215	19.87****	295.50****	10.51**	5.29****	0.03
Width 3rd internode	215	19.43****	470.47****	0.54	3.55**	0.49
Number of adventitious roots at 1st nodes	214	4.93****	71.24****	34.29****	3.79***	18.39****
Number of nodes with adventitious roots	214	5.76****	43.85****	45.64****	5.02****	40.20****
Total number of aerial branches	215	10.51****	0.03	70.45****	5.39****	30.07****
Total number of stolons	215	8.68****	115.03****	82.04****	5.37****	36.71****
Length of the longest aerial branch	214	7.16****	15.46****	8.13**	9.04****	12.37***
Length of the longest stolon	215	2.78**	34.63****	7.56**	0.79	4.98*
Length of the longest leaf at the 2nd node	215	3.29**	53.75****	3.35	1.97	2.99
Width of the longest leaf at the 2nd node	214	3.01**	21.70****	41.65****	2.17*	10.80**
Number of flowers	212	8.99****	13.01***	0.27	1.80	0.68

P-values: *<0.05, **<0.01, ***<0.001, ****<0.0001

778   **Table 2.** F-values for main effects and interactions on traits measured on coastal perennial

779   (SWB) and inland annual (LMC) parents as well as near-isogenic lines of the *DIV1* inversion in

780   the coastal genetic background.

Trait	N	Line	Treatment	Line x Treatment
PC1	176	35.44****	16.76****	3.66
PC2	176	2.55	391.46****	4.13*
PC3	176	37.55****	1.46	4.17*
Traits Measured at Flowering				
Total number of nodes on the primary shoot	253	35.90****	26.61****	5.39*
Length of the 1st internode	251	7.84**	2.95	1.03
Length of the 2nd internode	252	81.97****	68.15****	13.00***
Length of the 3rd internode	252	83.51****	19.07****	0.15
Combined length first three internodes	252	91.13**	48.44****	2.41
Plant Height	252	1.80	100.13****	0.90
Width 1st internode	252	20.13****	13.48***	5.19*
Width 2nd internode	252	47.81****	0.34	7.94**
Width 3rd internode	252	98.32****	0.84	5.76*
Corolla length of the 1st flower	250	24.27****	1.99	1.47
Corolla width of the 1st flower	252	109.77****	87.27****	1.71
Number of adventitious roots at 1st nodes	245	7.94**	27.46****	5.40*
Number of nodes with adventitious roots	245	3.73	10.17**	6.39*
Total number of aerial branches	249	36.33****	132.42****	15.87****
Total number of stolons	249	0.07	286.82****	3.46
Length of the longest aerial branch	249	3.76	35.68****	4.64*
Length of the longest stolon	249	0.33	25.17****	0.08
Length of the longest leaf at the 2nd node	248	11.78***	7.58**	0.61
Width of the longest leaf at the 2nd node	248	1.60	21.35****	0.04
Traits Measured 10 Days After Flowering				
Total number of nodes on the primary shoot	204	6.79**	39.53****	1.78
Length of the 1st internode	205	8.74**	13.46***	5.79*
Length of the 2nd internode	205	132.59****	123.94****	20.97****
Length of the 3rd internode	204	93.44****	8.32**	0.00
Combined length first three internodes	204	95.41****	38.86****	2.80
Plant Height	205	5.42*	136.75****	0.12
Width 1st internode	204	5.89*	1.27	2.35
Width 2nd internode	204	30.62****	1.36	4.16*
Width 3rd internode	204	76.93****	1.09	10.24**
Number of adventitious roots at 1st nodes	204	0.03	76.60****	0.09
Number of nodes with adventitious roots	204	0.11	81.51****	0.04
Total number of aerial branches	203	43.80****	160.41****	28.46****
Total number of stolons	204	3.92*	226.09****	0.00
Length of the longest aerial branch	204	0.05	32.21****	2.36
Length of the longest stolon	204	0.20	23.36****	0.00
Length of the longest leaf at the 2nd node	204	12.11***	14.26***	0.67
Width of the longest leaf at the 2nd node	204	0.88	17.47****	0.05
Number of flowers	200	0.59	0.62	0.59

P-values: *<0.05, **<0.01, ***<0.001, ****<0.0001

Table 3. Means and standard errors for the concentrations of phenylpropanoid glycosides in coastal perennial (SWB) and inland annual (LMC) parents as well as near-isogenic lines of the *DIV1* inversion in the coastal genetic background.

Trait	Coastal Parent	Inland Parent	Control NIL	Introgression NIL
Total PPGs	164.24 (7.74)A	65.65 (13.69)C	161.32 (5.27)A	119.67 (6.55)B
Conandroside	105.11 (6.65)A	42.26 (11.75)B	106. 98 (4.52)A	55.71 (5.62)B
Calceolarioside A	37.15 (2.13)B	12.79 (3.77)C	32.77 (1.45)B	46.30 (1.80)A
Mimuloside	7.93 (0.64)A	3.62 (1.13)B	7.54 (0.43)A	4.24 (0.55)B
Verbascoside	6.91 (0.36)A	1.90 (0.63)B	6.89 (0.24)A	5.90 (0.30)A
Calceolarioside B	0.98 (0.08)A	0.33 (0.13)B	0.66 (0.06)B	0.62 (0.06)B
Unknown PPG 16	5.52 (0.44)A	4.56 (0.77)A	5.87 (0.30)A	6.09 (0.37)A
Unknown PPG10	0.64 (0.04)B	0.19 (0.07)C	0.60 (0.03)B	0.81 (0.03)A

Mean (SE) and Tukey HSD post-hoc results

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. A) Map of coastal perennial (blue), inland annual (yellow), and inland perennial (green) populations from where accessions for experiment were derived. B) Effects of the introgression of the inland *DIV1* inversion orientation into the coastal perennial genetic background. Left: Coastal perennial parental inbred line. Center: Control Near Isogenic Line (NIL) containing the coastal orientation of the inversion. Right: Introgression NIL containing the inland orientation of the inversion. All three plants germinated on the same day. C) Differential responses of inland annual and coastal perennial accessions to gibberellin treatment and water control (mock).

Figure 2. Box and whisker plots of trait responses by coastal perennial, inland annual, and inland perennial accessions to mock and gibberellin treatments.

Figure 3. Box and whisker plots of trait responses by coastal perennial (SWB) and inland annual

(LMC) parents as well as coastal perennial genetic background near-isogenic lines (NILs) to

mock and gibberellin treatments. The introgression NILs were homozygous for the inland annual

orientation of the *DIV1* inversion, while the control NILs were homozygous for the coastal

perennial orientation of the *DIV1* inversion.

Figure 4. Concentration of phenylpropanoid glycosides for coastal perennial (SWB) and inland

annual (LMC) parents as well as coastal perennial genetic background near-isogenic lines

(NILs). The introgression NILs were homozygous for the inland annual orientation of the *DIV1*

inversion, while the control NILs were homozygous for the coastal perennial orientation of the

DIV1 inversion.

A

B

Coastal Parent | Coastal Control | Coastal Intro

C

Inland Mock | Inland GA | Coastal Mock | Coastal GA