Title: Asymmetric dispersal is a critical element of concordance between biophysical

dispersal models and spatial genetic structure in Great Barrier Reef corals

Authors: Cynthia Riginos, Karlo Hock, Ambrocio M. A. Matias, Peter J. Mumby, Madeleine J. H.

van Oppen, Vimoksalehi Lukoschek

Affiliations:

CR: School of Biological Sciences, The University of Queensland, St Lucia QLD, Australia;

c.riginos@uq.edu.au

KH: School of Biological Sciences, The University of Queensland, St Lucia QLD, Australia;

k.hock1@uq.edu.au

AMAM: School of Biological Sciences, The University of Queensland, St Lucia QLD, Australia;

ambrocio.matias@uqconnect.edu.au

PJM: School of Biological Sciences, The University of Queensland, St Lucia QLD, Australia;

p.j.mumby@uq.edu.au

MJHvO: School of BioSciences, The University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, Australia; Australian

Institute for Marine Sciences, Cape Cleveland QLD 4810, Australia;

madeleine.van@unimelb.edu.au

VL: ARC Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef Studies, James Cook University, Townsville

QLD 4811, Australia; vimoksalehi.lukoschek@jcu.edu.au

Authorship statement: CR, VL, and KH conceived the study. KH created the biophysical

dispersal models, AMAM undertook the coalescent analyses, and CR conducted all remaining

analyses and figure preparations. VL and MLHvO provided the data. CR wrote the first draft of

the manuscript, and all authors contributed substantially to revisions.

Data accessibility statement: Raw data available at datadryad.org/resource/doi:10.5061/

dryad.h8gh3 for *Acropora tenuis* and datadryad.org/resource/doi:10.5061/dryad.q0834p71

for *Acropora millepora.*

Running title: Asymmetric dispersal in GBR corals

Key words: Approximate Bayesian Computation, asymmetric eigenvector modelling,

connectivity, gene flow, marine landscape, Moran eigenvector modelling, oceanography,

planktonic dispersal, seascape genetics

Correspondence: School of Biological Sciences, University of Queensland, St Lucia QLD,

Australia; c.riginos@uq.edu.au, +61 7 336 52152

Abstract

Documenting and predicting spatial connections arising from planktonic larval dispersal in marine species remains a formidable challenge. Biophysical dispersal models using simulations based on biological attributes and physical oceanography are attractive predictive tools. Here we evaluate how such simulated long-distance multigenerational connections align with spatial genetic data for two common coral species (*Acropora tenuis* and *Acropora millepora*) from the Great Barrier Reef (GBR), Australia. We focus on signatures of asymmetric dispersal and evaluate concordance using coalescent genetic simulations, directions of inferred gene flow, and spatial eigenvector modelling. The strongest matches rely on asymmetric north to south connections, consistent with biophysical dispersal models yielding approximate summaries of past multigenerational gene flow conditioned upon directionality. For *A. tenuis* and *A. millepora,* northern and central reefs have been important sources to downstream southern reefs over the recent evolutionary past, yet endemic diversity of southern reefs also suggests substantial recruitment of local progeny.

Introduction

Understanding the spatial dynamics of dispersal by planktonic marine larvae remains a fundamental challenge in marine ecology (Carr *et al.* 2003; Kritzer & Sale 2004). Currents and other oceanographic phenomena are inherently dynamic such that dispersal-mediated connections among populations are difficult to predict and vary by time and place (Cowen & Sponaugle 2009; Watson *et al.* 2012; Liggins *et al.* 2013; Gaggiotti 2017). Yet, knowledge regarding the sources and destinations of dispersive larvae underpin fundamental ecological and evolutionary dynamics and inform optimal management of marine resources for fishing and the protection of key habitats (Beger *et al.* 2010; Gaines *et al.* 2010; Hock *et al.* 2017; Krueck *et al.* 2017).

Coupled biological-physical models (Werner & Cowen 2007; Cowen & Sponaugle 2009) relying on simulations based on species attributes and physical oceanography are increasingly being used to predict spatial and temporal aspects of planktonic larval dispersal. The flexibility of both spatio-temporal scale and outputs makes biophysical models extremely well-suited for alignment against various sources of empirical dispersal data (Cowen & Sponaugle 2009; Kool *et al.* 2013; Liggins *et al.* 2013; Jones 2015) and for generating detailed spatial predictions useful for management assessments (as in Hock *et al.* 2016; 2017; Krueck *et al.* 2017).

The extent to which biophysical models accurately approximate real dispersal phenomena, however, remains an open question. As models of open natural systems, strict validation or rejection of biophysical dispersal models is not feasible (Oreskes *et al.* 1994). Rather, such models can be evaluated against empirical data whereby alignment of the model and empirical data confers increased confidence that both the model and empirically-derived statistics describe the phenomenon of interest, in this case dispersal of planktonic larvae. Geographic surveys of intraspecific genetic variation can provide important insights regarding dispersal (Hellberg 2009; Riginos & Liggins 2013; Selkoe *et al.* 2016a) and indeed several studies have considered predictions arising from biophysical dispersal models alongside observed spatial genetic patterns, typically for coastal marine taxa. Although some individual studies report correlations (Galindo *et al.* 2006; White *et al.* 2010; Schunter *et al.* 2011; Foster *et al.* 2012; Thomas *et al.* 2015; Benestan *et al.* 2016; Truelove *et al.* 2016; Dalongeville *et al.* 2018; Xuereb *et al.* 2018), a recent review of the field found only moderate

to low concordance between biophysical predictions and empirical genetic patterns (Selkoe *et*

al. 2016b).

There are many reasons why biophysical dispersal models and genetic data may not align.

First, biophysical models typically focus solely on dispersal and do not consider differential

recruitment and/or reproductive success of settlers (Pineda *et al.* 2007). Second, a

biophysical model might not sufficiently account for important biological attributes of larvae

or complex near shore oceanography, which are notoriously difficult to parameterise (Pineda

et al. 2007; Werner & Cowen 2007; Metaxas & Saunders 2009). Third, there is a mismatch in

time scales, where biophysical models draw upon oceanographic information collected within

recent years or decades whereas genetic inferences, especially those based on population

allele frequency differences, arise from long term processes (thousands of years and longer).

Fourth, population allele frequencies do not solely reflect gene flow resulting from dispersal

but are also shaped by changes in population sizes, range expansions, colonization and so

forth (Whitlock & McCauley 1999). Lastly, although biophysical models typically predict

asymmetric directionality of dispersal, typical descriptors of genetic diversity are symmetric

so that statistical comparisons between biophysical models and empirical genetic data nearly

exclusively rely on transforming modelled dispersal predictions into symmetric measures,

greatly reducing the information content (Kool *et al.* 2013; Riginos *et al.* 2016).

Only a few studies have attempted to ascertain whether empirical genetic patterns are

specifically consistent with the asymmetric dispersal processes inherent to biophysically

derived dispersal predictions. For example, migration matrices derived from biophysical

modelling were used to inform gene flow in forward population genetic simulations (Galindo

et al. 2006) and to analytically predict genetic differentiation based on forward matrix

projections (Kool *et al.* 2010; 2011), yielding outcomes that qualitatively matched empirical

genetic patterns. For the Caribbean coral *Orbicellea annularis*, genetic distances derived from

a forward matrix project were shown to be well correlated (ρ = 0.49) to empirical genetic

distance estimates (Foster *et al.* 2012). Another strategy draws upon historical demographic

simulations to quantify migration values consistent with empirically observed allele

frequency spectra or DNA sequences. For example, Matz *et al.* (2018) documented correlation

between population pairwise estimates of migration derived from allele frequency spectra

against biophysically derived migration probabilities for five populations for the coral

Acropora millepora from the Great Barrier Reef (GBR) (Mantel R = 0.58, P = 0.05), with a preponderance of southward migration consistent between both measures. Comparing all sampled populations holistically, Crandall *et al.* (2012) constructed a series of coalescent models of gene flow and contrasted the likelihood of observed DNA haplotype distributions from the biophysically-informed gene flow models against various other null geographic models; they demonstrated greater likelihood of biophysically informed gene flow models across three species of nerite snails in the South Pacific. Recently, three studies turned to asymmetric eigenvector mapping (AEM: Blanchet *et al.* 2011) where asymmetric processes (such as biophysical migration probabilities) are statistically modelled as spatial autocorrelation structures; inclusion of AEMs substantially improved predictions of spatial genetic structure for American lobster (Benestan *et al.* 2016), California sea cucumbers (Xuereb *et al.* 2018), and Mediterranean striped red mullet (Dalongeville *et al.* 2018). Thus, these first few studies that quantitatively incorporate asymmetric biophysical predictions suggest that directions of larval dispersal are important elements of marine population connectivity.

Here, we comprehensively assess the alignment between biophysical models of dispersal and observed spatial genetic patterns for two common broadcast spawning coral species on the GBR, *Acropora tenuis* and *Acropora millepora*, drawing upon methods based on historical demographic simulations, patterns of shared alleles, and AEM spatial autocorrelation structures. We capitalise upon spatially rich genetic data sets for the two species (van Oppen *et al.* 2011; Lukoschek *et al.* 2016) with sampling encompassing most of the 2300 km extent of the GBR. Oceanographic patterns suggest that directional gene flow is likely for GBR species such as *A. tenuis* and *A. millepora* (Fig. 1a).

Although present-day oceanography implies that larval dispersal can create connections among distant reefs, several species show differentiation between central/northern vs. southern GBR locations (reviewed by van Oppen *et al.* 2011), indicative of possible historical vicariance associated with past sea level changes. This divergence is most notable for the spiny chromis damselfish for which genetically distinct colour morphs abut at the north end of Hydrographer's Channel (Planes & Doherty 1997). Recent geological investigations, however, have identified reef structures along the Australian shelf edge that may have provided coral reef habitat during intermediate and low sea level stands (Abbey *et al.* 2011;

Hinestrosa *et al.* 2016), implying that reef species may have shifted their range margins

through multiple glacial cycles following the depth contours of available coastline but

maintaining their approximate latitudinal positions.

No single method can simultaneously infer modern and historical gene flow regimes across

numerous sites spanning large spatial scales. Rather than discounting historical influences (as

is implicit in many spatial genetic studies), we use coalescent demographic simulations to

evaluate competing scenarios of long-standing gene flow vs. late Quaternary divergence. The

resultant affirmation of gene flow-dominated demography along the GBR justifies subsequent

frequentist analyses focusing on directional gene flow inferred from population allele

frequencies and using all sampled reefs. Treating the biophysical models as hypotheses of

spatial connections among GBR reefs for *Acropora* corals, we test whether projected

asymmetric directions and dispersal strengths are superior predictors of spatial genetic

patterns as compared to simple symmetric null predictors. In addition, we examine the spatial

scales and regions for which biophysical predictors best align to observed genetic patterns.

This study provides a framework for aligning spatially rich population genetic data against *a*

priori predictions of asymmetric dispersal and represents the most comprehensive analysis of

asymmetric gene flow along the full length of the GBR to date.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Multi-step connectivity pathways based on larval dispersal models

Dispersal simulations follow Hock *et al.* (in review) and are described in the supplementary

materials. The resultant region-wide species-specific connectivity networks (incorporating all

3806 GBR reefs) were used to predict multistep paths between the reefs from which the

genetic samples were obtained. To calculate the minimum number of *stepping-stones* between

two reefs in a connectivity network, all the positive link weights were set to 1. Links in this

unweighted network include connections that were present at least once over the four years

of simulations regardless of the strength of connection. Dijkstra's (1959) algorithm yielded

the directed path with the minimum number of stepping-stones between any two reefs.

Maximum flow metric calculations were performed by applying a maximum-flow minimum-

cut algorithm (Ford & Fulkerson 1956) on a weighted connectivity network in which link

weights were considered to represent flow capacities. Determining the capacities of links

necessary to connect the two nodes in a network (including multistep paths) then makes it

possible to determine the maximum amount of flow between them. The maximum flow metric

was calculated using the Matlab implementation of Boykov-Kolmogorov max-flow algorithm

(Boykov & Kolmogorov 2004). It is also possible to consider that link weights represent

probabilities of dispersal (i.e., the probability that larvae from reef *i* will disperse to reef *j*), by

multiplying the link probabilities on pathways connecting two reefs, with the most *reliable*

path representing the greatest chance of exchange (applying Dijkstra's algorithm to the

network using negatively log-transformed link weights - see Hock & Mumby 2015).

Genetic data

We capitalise on the extensive microsatellite datasets for *Acropora tenuis* (Lukoschek *et al.*

2016) and *Acropora millepora* (van Oppen *et al.* 2011). These data were filtered to remove

identical multilocus genotypes and individuals or loci with excessive missing data. Loci were

checked for confirmation to Hardy-Weinberg proportions and an absence of linkage

disequilibria. See supplementary materials for full details. For *A. tenuis*, we retained 1928

individuals from 39 sites genotyped at 10 loci and for *A. millepora*, we retained 917

individuals from 19 sites genotyped at 10 loci.

Resolving historical influences using coalescent-based ABC

If allele frequencies among *Acropora* populations have been strongly influenced by past

interruptions to gene flow, then we would need to evaluate observed geographic

differentiation in light of such a divergence history. In contrast, if gene flow has dominated the

modern distributions of allelic diversity then dispersal interpretations based on observed

allele frequencies are reasonable. We used an approximate Bayesian computation (ABC)

approach to test the competing hypotheses of historical divergence vs. stepping-stone gene

flow, with the location of historical divergence set at the northern opening of Hydrographer's

Passage (Fig. 1). Owing to the high computational requirement in simulating genetic data for

our full datasets, we used representative populations for our ABC analyses (Figure S1). A

custom R script drew parameter values from the prior distributions, which were used with

fastSimcoal2 v2.6.0.3 (Excoffier *et al.* 2013) to generate a total of 500,000 simulations of ten

microsatellite loci for each genetic model. The simulated genetic data were summarised using

the following statistics calculated with the Arlequin command-line version arlsumstat v3.5.2.2

(Excoffier & Lischer 2010): average number of alleles, standard deviation of number of alleles,

allele size range per population, and average pairwise F_{ST} between populations. We limited

the summary statistics to these measures to avoid extreme high dimensionality of summary

statistics while retaining pertinent information about genetic diversity in each population and

genetic differentiation between populations.

In determining the support for each genetic model (model selection), we first obtained

posterior samples from all the simulated data for each species by applying a threshold of 0.01,

equivalent to the 10,000 simulated datasets closest to the observed genetic data. We then

evaluated the support for each genetic model by performing a categorical regression

(Beaumont 2008) on the model indices and summary statistics of the posterior samples.

Model cross validation was undertaken on pseudo-observed data (PODs). See supplementary

materials for further details.

Asymmetric gene flow and larval dispersal connectivity

To estimate directionality of gene flow we use information from semi private alleles between

pairs of populations (Sundqvist *et al.* 2016) as implemented by divMigrateOnline

(https://popgen.shinyapps.io/divMigrate-online/) using the G_{ST} option (with no threshold for

filtering out non-significant values). We assessed the correlation between these asymmetric

(directional) estimates of gene flow with asymmetric measures of connectivity derived from

the larval dispersal model (described above). Significances of the correlations were evaluated

using 10,000 permutations. Maximum flow and reliable path metrics were (natural) log

transformed for these and subsequent evaluations.

Spatial eigenvector mapping

Although isolation-by-distance approaches have long been applied in spatial genetic contexts,

they fail to account for spatial autocorrelation structures. Moran Eigenvector Maps (MEMs)

model orthogonal spatial structures and, when combined with multivariate analyses, can test

for spatial regression (Borcard & Legendre 2002; Dray *et al.* 2006) and are well-suited for

genetic investigations (Diniz-Filho *et al.* 2009). Asymmetric eigenvector maps (AEMs) extend

spatial modelling to describe spatial structures arising from directional processes such as

ocean currents (Blanchet *et al.* 2008; 2011). Here we use AEMs derived from the biophysical

model to test whether asymmetric (directional) connectivity distances predict genetic

structure, with AEM model fits contrasted to null symmetric expectations described by MEMs.

For (symmetrical) MEMs, we followed Dray *et al.* (2006) and examined binary Delauney, weighted Delauney, and truncated (principal coordinates of neighbour matrices: PCNM) networks based on spatial position (i.e. geographic distance between sites) with a variety of link weighting schemes to alter the relative influence of short vs. long distance connections (see Supp.). A custom saturated network allowing connections among combinations of sites was also used as an analogue to conventional isolation-by-distance analyses.

The construction of AEMs requires specifying connexion diagrams (Blanchet *et al.* 2008; 2011) indicating directionality of predicted process (in this case larval dispersal). Initial examination of connections for both species indicated a preponderance of strong connections (Fig. 1) southwards alongshore and westward cross-shelf (approximately NE to SW) especially connecting the Swains to Keppel Island and to the Capricorn-Bunker group. Several northwards alongshore connections were also predicted especially from outer shelf to central reefs. For AEMs, we constructed a series of connexion diagrams summarising the main system-wide connection directions (see Fig. 1), allowing north to south alongshore connections with an inshore bend in the southern GBR connecting the Swains to the Capricorn-Bunker group and Keppels. We also created connexion diagrams for south to north. In each case, models were fit with north to south only and in both directions. Connection links were created for all population pairs with reliable path probabilities in the top 50th percentile. Link weightings based on the number of stepping stone connections, maximum flow, and reliable path were evaluated. For *A. tenuis* where special coverage was more extensive, we also fit AEMs to adjacent sets of regions (far north and north; north, central and south; central and south).

RESULTS
Larval dispersal model

Larval dispersal models for *Acropora tenuis* and *Acropora millepora* suggest that GBR populations are well connected when multi-step (i.e. multigenerational) connections are considered. Overall southward connections were more prevalent, especially long-distance connections: this can be visualised by vectored arcs curving the right in Fig. 1B and C along with greater dispersal probabilities for southwards movements (Fig. 1 D and E). However, some strong northward connections were also present (vectored arcs curving the left) especially among central reefs and some central to northern reefs. All three multistep

connectivity metrics considered were highly correlated ($\rho \geq 0.86$ for *A. tenuis*; $\rho \geq 0.82$ for *A.*

millepora) with the greatest correlations between stepping stone distance and reliable paths

($\rho \geq 0.99$ for both species). Given these high correlations, we present results primarily for the

reliable path metric, which arguably best aligns with biological intuitions regarding

population connectivity across time (Hock & Mumby 2015).

Resolving historical influences using coalescent-based ABC

In the present study it was necessary to verify that gene flow has shaped *Acropora* spatial

genetic patterns and exclude vicariance as an alternative scenario before proceeding with

analyses that implicitly ignore divergence. Indeed, ABC analyses yielded higher support for

the gene flow only stepping-stone model (*A. tenuis*: PP= 0.999; BF = 1210; *A. millepora*: pp=

0.647; BF = 3) compared to a model of historical divergence vicariance. Applying model

selection with the PODs yielded high accuracy (> 99%; proportion of PODs that were correctly

supported) and high robustness (> 99% with thresholds above 0.6 PP). Overall, these results

indicate strong support (*sensu* Roux *et al.* 2016) for the gene flow only stepping-stone model

for both species.

Asymmetric gene flow and larval dispersal connectivity

For *A. tenuis*, all directional predictors of connectivity yielded significant correlations with

relative gene flow estimates from divMigrate (ρ values for stepping stone distance: -0.39;

maximum flow: 0.32; reliable path: 0.37; in all cases P << 0.001). For *A. millepora*, reliable

path ($\rho = 0.16$; P < 0.005) and stepping stone distances ($\rho = - 0.13$; P < 0.03) were significantly

correlated with relative gene flow but maximum flow was not ($\rho = 0.06$; NS).

For both species, inspecting the relationship between reliable path probabilities and gene

flow (Fig. 2) shows that for populations predicted to be well connected by the larval dispersal

model (i.e. $P \geq 10^{-20}$) estimates of relative gene flow were highly variable ($\sim$0-1), whereas

sites predicted to require many stepping stone connections ($P \leq 10^{-40}$) had consistently lower

gene flow estimates. This pattern was stronger in *A. tenuis* than *A. millepora*.

Spatial eigenvector mapping

Directional spatial autocorrelation as assessed by AEMs explained a greater proportion of

variance in allele frequencies for both species (Table 1), where the best models were based on

alongshore north to south movements with inshore connections from the Swains to Keppel

Island and to the Capricorn-Bunker group (for *A. tenuis*, $R^2 = 0.37$ with 9 AEMs retained and for *A. millepora*, $R^2 = 0.27$ with 5 AEMs retained). There was no consistency in terms of best-performing link weighting (i.e. stepping stone connections, maximum flow, and reliable path) and notably the binary weighting (presence vs. absence, no weighting by distance) for north to south connections in *A. millepora* was the best performing, indicating that simply recognising strong connections (i.e. those with reliable path probabilities in the top 50th percentile) yields good approximations of spatial genetic patterns. Fig. 3 depicts the highest scoring AEMs for *A. tenuis* where AEM 1 (3.5% of allele frequency variance; P = 0.001) as the largest scale of positive autocorrelation showed a gradient across the entire sampled region of the GBR and AEM 5 (2.3% of variance; P = 0.001) described more local scale autocorrelation patterns. For *A. tenuis*, AEMs 1, 5, 17, 3, 2, and 12 were individually significant at a P = 0.05 threshold based on an RDA of the final model where higher numbers (i.e. AEM17) indicate finer spatial grain sizes out of a total of 19 possible AEMs of positive spatial autocorrelation. Similar results were found for *A. millepora* (Supp Fig. 5) with AEM 1 describing the greatest amount of spatial variance in allele frequencies (5.9%, P = 0.003) followed by AEM 8 (5.7%, P = 0.007), and AEMs 1, 8, 5, and 3 individually significant below a P = 0.05 threshold out of 9 AEMs evaluated. For *A. tenuis*, sampling within regions was sufficiently dense to evaluate fits for adjacent regions of competing AEM models. In all instances links based on north to south alongshore flow returned the best scoring models, with fit to allelic frequency patterns notably lower in the far northern and northern reefs (Table 2).

DISCUSSION

Asymmetric dispersal is undoubtedly a common attribute of benthic marine species. For the corals *Acropora tenuis* and *Acropora millepora*, a preponderance of north to south movement along the GBR was predicted by biophysical models and this directional signal was matched in patterns of microsatellite allele frequencies. Although previous studies have noted distinct characteristics of northern + central vs. southern + Swains + Capricorn-Bunker regions (van Oppen *et al.* 2011; Lukoschek *et al.* 2016), here we can confirm asymmetric gene flow as a contributor to these regional differences. Alternative scenarios involving historical divergence and symmetric gene flow were poor matches to observed spatial genetic patterns relative to scenarios based on directions and extent of larval exchange predicted by biophysical models. Thus, at least at the regional scale within the GBR, oceanography is likely to strongly influence connections arising from planktonic larval dispersal.

Regional connections among GBR populations

Whereas geographically restricted alleles are a hallmark of long-standing isolation, highly

directional dispersal such as among coastal populations can result in regionally private alleles

in downstream populations if dispersal is sufficiently rare and when accompanied by high

self-recruitment of settlers to their parental populations (Pringle & Wares 2007). This

expectation qualitatively matched diversity gradients for both *Acropora* species (as noted by

Lukoschek *et al.* 2016). Here, coalescent demographic simulations allowed us to formally

evaluate a hypothesis of Quaternary divergence against a scenario of long-standing gene flow

without divergence. For *A. tenuis,* we found very high support for gene flow without

divergence (posterior probability: 0.999; BF = 1210) and moderate support for this scenario

in *A. millepora* (PP= 0.647; BF = 3). Thus, if there were past divergence events, the imprint of

such events is no longer discernible from extant allele frequencies and present-day

population genetic structure should be strongly influenced by recent gene flow.

Indeed, contemporary biophysical expectations for gene flow, were strong predictors of

genetic patterns especially at large spatial scales. Using shared alleles, the weakest genetically

connected population pairs (negligible gene flow from reef *i* to reef *j*) match pairs having the

weakest predicted multigenerational connection links (Fig. 2). Where the biophysical

dispersal models predicted stronger connections, in contrast, inferred gene flow was highly

variable indicating that at shorter distances the biophysical models and gene flow were not

consistently aligned. Formal statistical testing for spatial structure of allelic distributions with

MEMs and AEMs reinforced these findings, where eigenvectors derived from predicted

asymmetric connections explained considerably more variance than eigenvectors derived

from null geographic models of symmetric connections (Table 1). Additionally, for both *A.*

tenuis and *A. millepora* AEM 1, which describes the largest scale pattern of spatial

relationships (Fig. 3 and Sup. Fig. 2), explained the greatest proportion of variance in allelic

distributions (3.5 and 5.9%, respectively). AEM analyses, however, were also consistent with

spatial patterning at smaller spatial scales arising from asymmetric connections (Table 1).

Although spatial distributions of microsatellite alleles for both *A. tenuis* and *A. millepora* were

broadly consistent with asymmetric dispersal predicted by biophysical models, the best

alignments were obtained only considering the approximately north to south connections

along the length of the GBR (Table 1). Notably biophysical models for both species suggested

substantial counterflows (south to north) especially among inshore reefs (Fig. 1), yet adding

these connections to AEM models did not increase model fit (Table 1). Thus, either the

stronger north to south connections are sufficient for capturing most of the microsatellite

allelic variance or the predicted south to north movements are not realised: for example,

larvae may conceivably disperse northwards but could have low fitness and therefore not

make substantive contributions to gene flow. Matz *et al.* (2018) also detected greater

southwards migration among five populations of GBR *A. millepora* based on ~11,500

nucleotide polymorphisms, albeit with some northwards migration. Southward spread also

characterises Crown-of-Thorns starfish outbreaks that appear to originate in northern reefs

(Pratchett *et al.* 2014). Therefore, our finding of a strong southward dispersal signal is

compatible with these other results, but the sensitivity of AEM based analyses to bidirectional

flows is unclear.

For *A. tenuis* we were able to further assess correlations between biophysical predictions and

allelic spatial distributions between adjacent regions (Table 2). For southern and central

reefs, north to south connections models yielded the best fits to the data ($R^2 \geq 0.32$). These

observations spatially align with major jets from the Coral Sea encountering the GBR and

driving southward advective flows along the GBR (i.e. surface waters of the South Caledonia

Jet at the top of the central region and Eastern Australian Current at the Swains: Choukroun *et*

al. 2010; Mao & Luick 2014). In contrast, far northern and northern reefs showed reduced

concordance between predictions and genetic observations ($R^2 = 0.17$) with a model based on

bidirectional connections yielding the best fit to this regional data; surface waters of the North

Caledonia Jet encounters the GBR here and creates both northward and southward flows and

thus might explain a possible signal of bidirectional connections among *A. tenuis* populations

(Choukroun *et al.* 2010; Mao & Luick 2014). For both species, biophysical models predict rare

dispersal connections especially among far northern reefs (Fig. 1) and yet negligible

population structure was observed for either *A. tenuis* or *A. millepora* among reefs in the far

north (Lukoschek *et al.* 2016) suggesting a weaker fit between dispersal models and observed

genetic patterns in this region.

In summary, for the two acroporid corals considered here, we find strong support for recent

gene flow in a predominantly north to south direction. This result implies that northern and

central reefs are important sources for downstream southern reefs, at least over evolutionary time scales of many generations. Downstream southern reef populations, however, harbour greater genetic diversity than northern reefs and are therefore both valuable in terms of distinctive diversity and likely strongly self-recruiting so that they may be more self-sustaining than central and northern reefs. With temperatures and extreme heating events projected to increase in frequency (Wolff *et al.* 2018), resolving the GBR-wide capacity for gene flow including the directionality of naturally occurring gene flow contributes to emerging debates regarding assisted migration and genetic rescue (Anthony *et al.* 2017).

Detecting contemporary asymmetric planktonic larval dispersal

Relatively few studies have evaluated the effect of asymmetric larval dispersal on spatial genetic patterns in marine species (Riginos *et al.* 2016). Perhaps not surprisingly, these studies, like our results here with *A. tenuis* and *A. millepora,* consistently uncover substantial asymmetries in inferred dispersal (e.g. Benestan *et al.* 2016; Dalongeville *et al.* 2018; Xuereb *et al.* 2018). Clearly, conventional analyses, especially those based on summary statistics like F_{ST} where all directional information is obscured, will fail to uncover important elements regarding relationships among populations (Kool *et al.* 2013; Riginos *et al.* 2016).

An additional challenge is to clarify the time frame for processes yielding asymmetric spatial genetic patterns. Empirical genomic data paired with specific historical demographic simulations can sometimes put bounds on the timing and directionality of gene flow (as in Duranton *et al.* 2018; Matz *et al.* 2018), but such approaches are largely constrained to examining a few populations at a time due to exponential increase in number of potential free parameters (for example, if migration is free to vary among n populations then there will be $n!/(n-2)!$ parameters for directional migration). Moreover, there is greater uncertainty surrounding parameter estimation for recent events (Robinson *et al.* 2014). Simple frequentist approaches based on linear models such as AEMs represent an attractive alternative especially as they have been conceived for uncovering contemporary structuring processes in species composition of ecological communities (Dray *et al.* 2006), but if applied to intraspecific genetic data these approaches are likely to be misleading when historical events have strongly shaped spatial genetic patterns.

In the present study, we attempted to bridge this historical-contemporary dilemma by using

constrained historical demographic simulations to reject the historical scenario most likely to

influence observable spatial genetic patterns for GBR species, giving us greater confidence

that the spatial genetic patterns we observe for *A. tenuis* and (to a lesser extent) *A. millepora*

reflect evolutionary processes from the recent past. Using prior information based on geology,

historical habitat shifts, or histories of co-distributed species to identify relevant alternative

hypotheses and then evaluating those hypotheses against hypotheses based on contemporary

gene flow (such as simple stepping-stone gene flow as used here) is a reasonable check of

data before proceeding to interpret results from linear models (including AEMs) at face value.

Biophysical models as summaries of larval dispersal

Biophysical models are increasingly being used to make detailed spatial predictions of

planktonic larval dispersal often with the aim of guiding management actions (as in Hock *et al.*

2016; 2017; Krueck *et al.* 2017). Although such complex models of natural systems cannot be

truly tested (Oreskes *et al.* 1994), alignment of model outputs against independent biological

data can provide greater confidence that a biophysical larval dispersal model captures

elements of biological reality. In the present study, we find that directions and relative

magnitudes of dispersal connections derived from biophysical models are better predictors of

spatial genetic structure in *A. tenuis* and *A. millepora* than null models of symmetric

relationships providing a confirmation that real biological processes mirror expectations

arising from biophysical simulations. The superior predictive power of asymmetric predictors

provides further evidence of the need to consider directional flow when analysing

connectivity in marine systems.

For our *Acropora* species on the GBR, the strongest alignments between the models and

empirical genetic data are at large spatial scales (among regions) and involve north to south

connections. Because small numbers of migrants can homogenize allele frequencies between

populations, inferences based on allele frequencies are poorly suited to distinguishing

strengths of demographically significant connections (Waples 1998). Allele frequency based

methods, however, can theoretically discriminate between rare and very rare connections

such as those that are likely to link spatially distant populations (including via

multigenerational connections). Thus, the appropriate spatial scale for evaluating biophysical

larval dispersal models with population genetic data is at large spatial distances such a

regional connections among GBR coral populations where we find the greatest concordance

between predicted and observed patterns. Comprehensive evaluation of biophysical models

will best be undertaken with a variety of complementary empirical data types (Jones 2015;

Gaggiotti 2017), where geographic patterns of allelic distributions contribute valuable

information about rare long distance connections. Here we have shown that the directionality

of such rare long distance connections discerned from spatial distributions of alleles provides

additional useful information for gauging concordance of larval dispersal models against past

gene flow.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank FG Blanchet for guidance on creating connexion diagrams and C Doropoulos for

help with parameterisation of the dispersal models, the QRIS computing cluster for enabling

simulation modeling, and funding support from the Great Barrier Reef Foundation.

REFERENCES

1.Abbey, E., Webster, J.M. & Beaman, R.J. (2011). Geomorphology of submerged reefs on the

shelf edge of the Great Barrier Reef: The influence of oscillating Pleistocene sea-levels. *Mar*

Geol, 288, 61–78.

2.Anthony, K.R.N., Bay, L., Costanza, R., Firn, J., Gunn, J., Harrison, P., *et al.* (2017). New

interventions are needed to save coral reefs. *Nat Ecol Evol*, 1, 1–3.

3.Beaumont, M.A. (2008). Joint determination of topology, divergence time, and immigration

in population trees. In: *Simulations, genetics and human prehistory* (eds. Matsumura, S.,

Forster, P. & Renfrew, C.).

4.Beger, M., Linke, S., Watts, M., Game, E., Treml, E.A., Ball, I., *et al.* (2010). Incorporating

asymmetric connectivity into spatial decision making for conservation. *Cons Lett*, 3, 359–368.

5.Benestan, L., Quinn, B.K., Maaroufi, H., Laporte, M., Clark, F.K., Greenwood, S.J., *et al.* (2016).

Seascape genomics provides evidence for thermal adaptation and current-mediated

population structure in American lobster (*Homarus americanus*). *Mol Ecol*, 25, 5073–5092.

6.Blanchet, F.G., Legendre, P. & Borcard, D. (2008). Modelling directional spatial processes in

ecological data. *Ecol Model*, 215, 325–336.

7.Blanchet, F.G., Legendre, P., Maranger, R., Monti, D. & Pepin, P. (2011). Modelling the effect of

directional spatial ecological processes at different scales. *Oecologia*, 166, 357–368.

8.Borcard, D. & Legendre, P. (2002). All-scale spatial analysis of ecological data by means of

principal coordinates of neighbour matrices. *Ecol Model*, 153, 51–68.

9.Boykov, Y. & Kolmogorov, V. (2004). An experimental comparison of min-cut/max- flow

algorithms for energy minimization in vision. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Machine Intell.*, 26,

1124–1137.

10.Carr, M.H., Neigel, J., Estes, J., Andelman, S., Warner, R. & Largier, J. (2003). Comparing

marine and terrestrial ecosystems: Implications for the design of coastal marine reserves. *Ecol*

App, 13, S90–S107.

11.Choukroun, S., Ridd, P.V., Brinkman, R. & McKinna, L.I.W. (2010). On the surface circulation

in the western Coral Sea and residence times in the Great Barrier Reef. *J Geophys Res*, 115,

239.

12.Cowen, R.K. & Sponaugle, S. (2009). Larval dispersal and marine population connectivity.

Ann Rev Marine Sci, 1, 443–466.

13.Crandall, E.D., Treml, E.A. & Barber, P.H. (2012). Coalescent and biophysical models of

stepping-stone gene flow in neritid snails. *Mol Ecol*, 21, 5579–5598.

14. Dalongeville, A., Andrello, M., Mouillot, D., Lobreaux, S., Fortin, M.-J., Lasram, F., *et al.*

(2018). Geographic isolation and larval dispersal shape seascape genetic patterns differently

according to spatial scale. *Evol App*, 11, 1437–1447.

15. Dijkstra, E.W. (1959). A note on two problems in connexion with graphs. *Numer. Math.*, 1,

269–271.

16. Diniz-Filho, J.A.F., Nabout, J.C., Telles, M.P. de C., Soares, T.N. & Rangel, T.F.L.V.B. (2009). A

review of techniques for spatial modeling in geographical, conservation and landscape

genetics. *Genet Mol Biol*, 32, 203–211.

17. Dray, S., Legendre, P. & Peres-Neto, P.R. (2006). Spatial modelling: a comprehensive

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

483–493.

18. Duranton, M., Allal, F., Fraïsse, C., Bierne, N., Bonhomme, F. & Gagnaire, P.-A. (2018). The

origin and remolding of genomic islands of differentiation in the European sea bass. *Nat*

Comm, 9, 1–11.

19. Excoffier, L. & Lischer, H.E.L. (2010). Arlequin suite ver 3.5: a new series of programs to

perform population genetics analyses under Linux and Windows. *Mol Ecol Resour*, 10, 564–

567.

20. Excoffier, L., Dupanloup, I., Huerta-Sánchez, E., Sousa, V.C. & Foll, M. (2013). Robust

demographic inference from genomic and SNP data. *PLoS Genet*, 9, e1003905.

21. Ford, L.R. & Fulkerson, D.R. (1956). Maximal flow through a network. *Can J Math*, 8, 399–

404.

22. Foster, N.L., Paris, C.B., Kool, J.T., Baums, I.B., Stevens, J.R., Sanchez, J.A., *et al.* (2012).

Connectivity of Caribbean coral populations: complementary insights from empirical and

modelled gene flow. *Mol Ecol*, 21, 1143–1157.

23. Gaggiotti, O.E. (2017). Metapopulations of Marine Species with Larval Dispersal: A

Counterpoint to Ilkka's Glanville Fritillary Metapopulations. *Ann Zool Fennici*, 54, 97–112.

24. Gaines, S.D., White, C., Carr, M.H. & Palumbi, S.R. (2010). Designing marine reserve

networks for both conservation and fisheries management. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 107,

18286–18293.

25. Galindo, H.M., Olson, M.V. & Palumbi, S.R. (2006). Seascape genetics: A coupled

oceanographic-genetic model predicts population structure of Caribbean corals. *Curr Biol*, 16,

1622–1626.

26. Hellberg, M.E. (2009). Gene flow and isolation among populations of marine animals. *Annu*

Rev Ecol Evol Syst, 40, 291–310.

27.Hinestrosa, G., Webster, J.M. & Beaman, R.J. (2016). Postglacial sediment deposition along a

mixed carbonate-siliciclastic margin: New constraints from the drowned shelf-edge reefs of

the Great Barrier Reef, Australia. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 446,

168–185.

28.Hock, K. & Mumby, P.J. (2015). Quantifying the reliability of dispersal paths in connectivity

networks. *J R Soc Interface*, 12, 20150013–20150013.

29.Hock, K., Wolff, N.H., Beeden, R., Hoey, J., Condie, S.A., Anthony, K.R.N., *et al.* (2016).

Controlling range expansion in habitat networks by adaptively targeting source populations.

Cons Biol, 30, 856–866.

30.Hock, K., Wolff, N.H., Ortiz, J.C., Condie, S.A., Anthony, K.R.N., Blackwell, P.G., *et al.* (2017).

Connectivity and systemic resilience of the Great Barrier Reef. *PLoS Biol*, 15, e2003355–23.

31.Jones, G.P. (2015). Mission impossible: unlocking the secrets of coral reef fish dispersal. In:

Ecology of Fishes on Coral Reefs (ed. Mora, C.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 16–

27.

32.Kool, J.T., Moilanen, A. & Treml, E.A. (2013). Population connectivity: recent advances and

new perspectives. *Landscape Ecol*, 28, 165–185.

33.Kool, J.T., Paris, C.B., Andréfouët, S. & Cowen, R.K. (2010). Complex migration and the

development of genetic structure in subdivided populations: an example from Caribbean coral

reef ecosystems. *Ecography*, 105, 26191–10.

34.Kool, J.T., Paris, C.B., Barber, P.H. & Cowen, R.K. (2011). Connectivity and the development

of population genetic structure in Indo-West Pacific coral reef communities. *Global Ecol*

Biogeogr, 20, 695–706.

35.Kritzer, J.P. & Sale, P.F. (2004). Metapopulation ecology in the sea: from Levins' model to

marine ecology and fisheries science. *Fish Fish*, 5, 131–140.

36.Krueck, N.C., Ahmadia, G.N., Green, A., Jones, G.P., Possingham, H.P., Riginos, C., *et al.* (2017).

Incorporating larval dispersal into MPA design for both conservation and fisheries. *Ecol Appl*,

27, 925–941.

37.Liggins, L., Treml, E.A. & Riginos, C. (2013). Taking the plunge: an introduction to

undertaking seascape genetic studies and using biophysical models. *Geogr Comp*, 7, 173–196.

38.Lukoschek, V., Riginos, C. & van Oppen, M.J.H. (2016). Congruent patterns of connectivity

can inform management for broadcast spawning corals on the Great Barrier Reef. *Mol Ecol*, 25,

3065–3080.

39.Mao, Y. & Luick, J.L. (2014). Circulation in the southern Great Barrier Reef studied through

an integration of multiple remote sensing and in situ measurements. *J Geophys Res Oceans*,

119, 1621–1643.

40.Matz, M.V., Treml, E.A., Aglyamova, G.V. & Bay, L. (2018). Potential and limits for rapid

genetic adaptation to warming in a Great Barrier Reef coral. *PLoS Genet*, 14, e1007220–19.

41.Metaxas, A. & Saunders, M. (2009). Quantifying the "bio-" components in biophysical

models of larval transport in marine benthic invertebrates: advances and pitfalls. *Biol Bull*,

216, 257–272.

42.Oreskes, N., Shrader-Frechette, K. & Belitz, K. (1994). Verification, validation, and

confirmation of numerical models in the Earth sciences. *Science*, 263, 641–646.

43.Pineda, J., Hare, J.A. & Sponaugle, S. (2007). Larval transport and dispersal in the coastal

ocean and consequences for population connectivity. *Oceanography*, 20, 22–39.

44.Planes, S. & Doherty, P.J. (1997). Genetic and color interactions at a contact zone of

Acanthochromis polyacanthus: a marine fish lacking pelagic larvae. *Evolution*, 51, 1232–1243.

45.Pratchett, M.S., Caballes, C.F., Rivera-Posada, J.A. & Sweatman, H.P.A. (2014). Limits to

understanding and managing outbreaks of crown-of-thorns starfish (*Acanthaster spp.*).

Oceanogr Mar Biol, 1–68.

46.Pringle, J.M. & Wares, J.P. (2007). Going against the flow: maintenance of alongshore

variation in allele frequency in a coastal ocean. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser*, 335, 69–84.

47.Riginos, C. & Liggins, L. (2013). Seascape genetics: populations, individuals, and genes

marooned and adrift, 7, 197–216.

48.Riginos, C., Crandall, E.D., Liggins, L., Bongaerts, P. & Treml, E.A. (2016). Navigating the

currents of seascape genomics: how spatial analyses can augment population genomic

studies. *Curr Zool*, 62, 581–601.

49.Robinson, J.D., Coffman, A.J., Hickerson, M.J. & Gutenkunst, R.N. (2014). Sampling strategies

for frequency spectrum-based population genomic inference. *BMC Evol Biol*, 14, 254.

50.Roux, C., Fraïsse, C., Romiguier, J., Anciaux, Y., Galtier, N. & Bierne, N. (2016). Shedding light

on the grey zone of speciation along a continuum of genomic divergence. *PLoS Biol*, 14,

e2000234–22.

51.Schunter, C., Carreras-Carbonell, J., Macpherson, E., Tintoré, J., Vidal-Vijande, E., Pascual, A.,

et al. (2011). Matching genetics with oceanography: directional gene flow in a Mediterranean

fish species. *Mol Ecol*, 20, 5167–5181.

52.Selkoe, K.A., D'Aloia, C.C., Crandall, E.D., Iacchei, M., Liggins, L., Puritz, J.B., *et al.* (2016a). A

decade of seascape genetics: contributions to basic and applied marine connectivity. *Mar Ecol*

Prog Ser, 554, 1–19.

53.Selkoe, K.A., Scribner, K.T. & Galindo, H.M. (2016b). Waterscape genetics – applications of

landscape genetics to rivers, lakes, and seas. In: *Landscape Genetics: Concepts, Methods,*

Applications (eds. Balkenhol, N., Cushman, S.A., Storfer, A. & Waits, L.P.). John Wiley & Sons,

Ltd., pp. 1–27.

54.Sundqvist, L., Keenan, K., Zackrisson, M., Prodöhl, P. & Kleinhans, D. (2016). Directional

genetic differentiation and relative migration. *Ecol Evol*, 6, 3461–3475.

55.Thomas, L., Kennington, W.J., Stat, M., Wilkinson, S.P., Kool, J.T. & Kendrick, G.A. (2015).

Isolation by resistance across a complex coral reef seascape. *Proc. Biol. Sci.*, 282, 20151217.

56.Truelove, N.K., Kough, A.S., Behringer, D.C., Paris, C.B., Box, S.J., Preziosi, R.F., *et al.* (2016).

Biophysical connectivity explains population genetic structure in a highly dispersive marine

species. *Coral Reefs*, 1–13.

57.van Oppen, M.J.H., Peplow, L.M., Kinnimonth, S. & Berkelmans, R. (2011). Historical and

contemporary factors shape the population genetic structure of the broadcast spawning coral,

Acropora millepora, on the Great Barrier Reef. *Mol Ecol*, 20, 4899–4914.

58.Waples, R.S. (1998). Separating the wheat from the chaff: patterns of genetic

differentiation in high gene flow species. *J Hered*, 89, 438–450.

59.Watson, J.R., Kendall, B.E., Seigel, D.A. & Mitarai, S. (2012). Changing seascapes, stochastic

connectivity, and marine metapopulation dynamics. *Am. Nat.*, 180, 99–112.

60.Werner, F. & Cowen, R.K. (2007). Coupled biological and physical models: present

capabilities and necessary developments for future studies of population connectivity.

Oceanography, 20, 54–69.

61.White, C., Selkoe, K.A., Watson, J., Siegel, D.A., Zacherl, D.C. & Toonen, R.J. (2010). Ocean

currents help explain population genetic structure. *Proc. Biol. Sci.*, 277, 1685–1694.

62.Whitlock, M.C. & McCauley, D.E. (1999). Indirect measures of gene flow and migration: FST

not equal to 1/(4Nm + 1). *Heredity*, 82, 117–125.

63.Wolff, N.H., Mumby, P.J., Devlin, M. & Anthony, K.R.N. (2018). Vulnerability of the Great

Barrier Reef to climate change and local pressures. *Global Change Biol*, 24, 1978–1991.

64.Xuereb, A., Benestan, L., Normandeau, E., Curtis, J.M., Bernatchez, L. & Fortin, M.-J. (2018).

Asymmetric oceanographic processes mediate connectivity and population genetic structure,

as revealed by RADseq, in a highly dispersive marine invertebrate (*Parastichopus*

californicus). *Mol Ecol*, 1–46.

TABLES

Table 1: Spatial eigenvector map modelling of genetic structure. The models explaining the greatest amount of genetic variance are

those that incorporate directional link structures derived from the larval dispersal model, especially those that are based on north to

south alongshore flow.

		Acropora tenuis			*Acropora millepora*		
Eigenmodel	Link structure	Link weighting of best model [a]	Numb EMs in best model [b]	adjusted $R^{2\,b}$	Link weighting of best model [a]	Numb EMs in best model [b]	adjusted $R^{2\,b}$
MEM	Delauney	Binary	1	0.02	Binary	1	0.02
MEM	Delauney	log	1	0.04	log	1	0.04
MEM	PCNM	y=1	**4**	**0.24**	y=1	**1**	**0.09**
MEM	Custom saturated	y=1	3	0.16	y=1	1	0.07
AEM	Alongshore N to S only [c]	MF, y=1	**9**	**0.37**	Binary	**5**	**0.27**
AEM	Alongshore both N to S and S to N	SS, y=1	8	0.29	MF, y=1	2	0.15

[a] Binary distances represent a single model. The link structures were evaluated for link distance weightings based on the formula 1-

$(D/Dmax)^y$ for y=[1-3] or with a log transformation to approximate a typical isolation-by-distance analysis. For AEMs, links were limited

to those in the top 50 percentile of reliable path weights. Link weightings were evaluated based on the number of stepping stone (SS)

connections, maximum flow (MF), and reliable path (RP) strength.

[b] Following forward model selection.

[c] Select AEMs shown graphically in Fig. 3 and Sup. Fig. 2

Table 2: Asymmetric eigenvector map modelling regions within *Acropora tenuis*

Region	Link structure	Best model by region		
		Link weighting [a]	Numb EMs in best model [b]	adjusted R^2 [b]
Far north & north	Alongshore both N to S and S to N	MF, y=1	**3**	0.17
North, central, south	Alongshore N to S	MF, y=1	**7**	0.32
Central & south	Alongshore N to S	RP, y=2	**5**	0.35

665   [a] Link structures were evaluated for distance weightings based on the formula $1-(D/Dmax)^y$ for y=[1-3].

666   [b] Following forward model selection.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1: Sampling locations and main attributes of biophysical model. A) Coastal Queensland and the Great Barrier Reef where bathymetry is shown by grey shading and 120 m depth reflects the approximate land mass exposure at lowest Pleistocene sea level stands. Designated regions correspond to management areas. Major offshore currents are shown (NVJ and SVJ: north and south Vanuatu jets, NQC: north Queensland current, EAC: east Australia current; modified from Coukroun *et al.* 2010; Mao & Luick 2014). B & C) Summary of top 50 percentile predicted connections based on relative path probabilities for *Acropora tenuis* (B) and *Acropora millepora* (C). Sampling locations are color coded by latitude with northern low latitude sites shown in reds (warm) and southern higher latitude sites shown in blues (cool). Vectors show predicted dispersal probabilities with thicker lines indicating higher probabilities and colored by source population. D & E) Dispersal probabilities relative to coastline position for *Acropora tenuis* (D) and *Acropora millepora* (E). The largest positional changes northwards have the lowest probabilities whereas small positional changes and movements southwards have higher probabilities. Movement relative to coastline is based on the difference in relative position between locations as summarised by the first principal component axis describing Queensland coastline. Example contrasts in northward vs. southward dispersal strengths shown for example population pairs (a,b and c,d) traversing the length of the sampling region where a->b and c->d are high probabilities ($P \approx 10^{-20}$) of southward movement (-4 relative positional change) and b->a and d->c are low probabilities ($P \approx 10^{-40}$) of northward movement (+4 relative positional change).

Figure 2: Concordance in directional movement between the larval dispersal model and genetic estimates for pairs of populations for *Acropora tenuis* (A), and *Acropora millepora* (B). Routes of low predicted connectivity (small relative path probabilities: $P < 10^{-40}$) experience low directional gene flow (using the DivMigrate method). Routes of high predicted connectivity ($P > 10^{-20}$) have variable rates of gene flow.

Figure 3: Leading asymmetric eigenvector maps describing spatial genetic structure in *Acropora tenuis*. Values by sampling location are colored by intensity of green hue such that locations with similar colors have similar AEM values. The greatest proportion of variance (AEM 1) describes a GBR-wide cline in genetic diversity followed by local scale spatial autocorrelation structures (AEM 5).

A

Far Northern

NQC

NVJ

Coral Sea

Northern

Depth (m)
0

2500

Central

SCJ

Hydrographer's Passage

Southern

Swains

Capricorn-Bunker Group

Keppel Island

EAC

Queensland, Australia

B

a

Percentile dispersal strength:
95
85
50

Acropora tenuis

b

C

c

Percentile dispersal strength:
95
85
50

d

Acropora millepora

D

northwards

b -> a

Movement relative to Coasline

southwards

a -> b

Acropora tenuis

E

d -> c

c -> d

Acropora millepora

Log$_{10}$ probability of dispersal (reliable path)

AEM 1
3.5% variance; P = 0.001

AEM 5
2.3% variance; P = 0.001