Repeatability of adaptive radiation depends on spatial scale: regional versus global replicates of stickleback in lake versus stream habitats

Antoine Paccard[1, *, ¶], Dieta Hanson[1, ¶], Yoel E. Stuart[2], Frank A. von Hippel[3], Martin Kalbe[4], Tom Klepaker[5], Skúli Skúlason[6], Bjarni K. Kristjánsson[6], Daniel I. Bolnick[7], Andrew P. Hendry[1], and Rowan D.H. Barrett[1].

[1] *Redpath Museum and Department of Biology, McGill University, Montreal, QC, H3A 0C4, Canada*

[2] *Department of Integrative Biology, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712, USA*

[3] *Department of Biological Sciences, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona, USA*

[4] *Department of Evolutionary Ecology, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Biology, August-Thienemann-Str. 2, 24306 Plön, Germany*

[5] *University of Bergen, Department of Biology, P. O. Box 7800, 5020 Bergen, Norway*

[6] *Department of Aquaculture and Fish Biology, Hólar University College, Háeyri 1, 551 Sauðárkrókur, Iceland*

[7] *Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, 75 N. Eagleville Road, Unit 3043, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269-3043, USA*

* Correspondence: Antoine Paccard Redpath Museum and Department of Biology, McGill University, Montreal, QC, H3A 0C4, Canada

Tel.: +01 514-398-4086
E-mail: antoine.paccard@mcgill.ca

Running title: (Non)parallel evolution in replicate stickleback adaptive radiations

¶ Both authors contributed equally

ABSTRACT: The repeatability of adaptive radiation is expected to be scale dependent, with

determinism decreasing as greater spatial separation among "replicates" leads to their increased

genetic and ecological independence. Threespine stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*) provide

an opportunity to test whether this expectation holds for the early stages of adaptive radiation -

their diversification in freshwater ecosystems has been replicated many times. To better

understand the repeatability of that adaptive radiation, we examined the influence of geographic

scale on levels of parallel evolution by quantifying phenotypic and genetic divergence between

lake and stream stickleback pairs sampled at regional (Vancouver Island) and global (North

America and Europe) scales. We measured phenotypes known to show lake-stream divergence

and used reduced representation genome-wide sequencing to estimate genetic divergence. We

assessed the scale-dependence of parallel evolution by comparing effect sizes from multivariate

models and also the direction and magnitude of lake-stream divergence vectors. At the

phenotypic level, parallelism was greater at the regional than the global scale. At the genetic

level, putative selected loci showed greater lake-stream parallelism at the regional than the global

scale. Generally, the level of parallel evolution was low at both scales, except for some key

univariate traits. Divergence vectors were often orthogonal, highlighting possible ecological and

genetic constraints on parallel evolution at both scales. Overall, our results confirm that the

repeatability of adaptive radiation decreases at increasing spatial scales. We suggest that greater

environmental heterogeneity at larger scales imposes different selection regimes, thus generating

lower repeatability of adaptive radiation at larger spatial scales.

21
Keywords: adaptive radiation, convergent evolution, *Gasterosteus aculeatus*, geographic scale,

parallel evolution

INTRODUCTION

An unanswered question surrounding adaptive radiation is the extent to which the process is

deterministic versus stochastic. That is, if the "tape of life" were rewound and started over

multiple independent times, to what extent would a similar set of species evolve when presented

with a similar set of environmental niches (Gould 1990; Blount *et al.*, 2018)? This thought

experiment cannot be made real outside of the laboratory (MacLean, 2005), and so evolutionary

biologists have tended to substitute geographical space for evolutionary time by asking: To what

extent do related species evolve in parallel in similar sets of environments that are spatially

isolated and evolutionarily independent? A difficulty in addressing this question is that relatively

few adaptive radiations are replicated in space; many are instead unique, such as Darwin's

finches in the Galapagos Islands (Grant 1981) and the Hawaii honeycreepers (James 2004); or

are relatively rare, such as the radiations of cichlids in the three Great Lakes of Africa (Kocher

2004). A few adaptive radiations are sufficiently replicated to make inferences about

repeatability; and these cases generally indicate that adaptive radiations have substantial

repeatable components, such as the same ecomorphs of *Anolis* lizards evolving on multiple

islands in the Greater Antilles (Losos 2009) or the same ecomophs of spiders evolving on

multiple Hawaiian Islands (Gillespie 2004). Yet these same radiations often show substantial

non-deterministic components, such as "missing" ecomorphs of lizards or spiders on some

islands (Gillespie 2004; Losos 2009) or strong contingency depending on physical properties of

the system (Brawand *et al.* 2014).

A remaining complication is that repeated adaptive radiations with a given group of

organisms are not entirely independent – genetically or ecologically. With respect to genetic non-

independence, post-colonization gene flow occurs among islands for *Anolis* lizards (Losos 2009)

and Hawaiian spiders (Gillespie 2004), and independent radiations of African cichlids appear to

be using some of the same ancestral polymorphisms (Loh *et al.* 2012). With respect to ecological

non-independence, adaptive radiations are often replicated on only regional spatial scales (e.g.,

among islands in Caribbean or Hawaii), where overall ecological conditions are relatively

similar. Hence, the resulting genetic or ecological non-independence could be primary factors

shaping deterministic responses. Stated in the same counterfactual sense as "replaying the tape of

life", if a few ancestral species had colonized very different geographic locations, to what extent

would a similar adaptive radiation take place? Intuition would suggest that such "replicate"

adaptive radiations separated by large geographical scale would yield lower repeatability than

would replicate adaptive radiations at a more regional scale – as a result of greater genetic and

ecological independence.

The above-postulated multi-scale adaptive radiation is, in fact, not inevitably

counterfactual. Threespine stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*) are found throughout much of

the northern hemisphere, where they show many replicate adaptive radiations in freshwater

ecosystems arising from independent colonization events from a common marine ancestor

(Colosimo *et al.* 2005). Although the resulting populations are all placed under the same Latin

binomial, many of these populations show large genetic differences known to be shaped by

adaptation to different environments (Schluter *et al.* 2010; Peichel & Marques 2017). For

example, the F_{ST} between parapatric lake-stream stickleback is greater than 0.10 in each of many

watersheds colonized postglacially by marine stickleback (Kaeuffer *et al.*, 2012; Roesti *et al.*,

2012; Stuart *et al.*, 2017). Hence, different freshwater populations of stickleback can be thought

of as representing the early stages of adaptive radiation (Schluter & McPhail 1992; Schluter

1996; Taylor & McPhail 1999). With this stickleback system, one can compare regional replicate

adaptive radiations (stickleback in similar habitats in different watersheds in the same

geographical area) with global replicate adaptive radiations (stickleback in similar habitats in

different watersheds in distant geographical areas). We therefore use this system to ask whether

genetic and phenotypic divergence is more repeatable (similar magnitude and direction across

replicates) at regional than at global scales.

Study system

Parapatric pairs of lake and stream stickleback have been used frequently to study the

repeatability/predictability/parallelism/convergence of adaptive divergence (e.g., Reimchen *et al.*

1985; Lavin & McPhail 1993; Deagle *et al.* 1996; Thompson *et al.* 1997; Reusch *et al.* 2001;

Hendry & Taylor 2004; Aguirre 2009; Lucek *et al.* 2010; Eizaguirre *et al.* 2011; Kaeuffer *et al.*

2012; Roesti *et al.* 2012; Ravinet *et al.* 2013; Lucek *et al.* 2013; Weber *et al.* 2017; Stuart *et al.*

2017). In this study system, stickleback in a lake and its adjoining stream (hereafter, lake-stream

population pairs) often evolve similar patterns of phenotypic divergence in independent

watersheds. Most notably, lake stickleback generally evolve shallower bodies and more gill

rakers than do stream stickleback, a pattern driven at least in part by consistent differences in diet

between habitats (Berner *et al.* 2008; Kaeuffer *et al.* 2012). These phenotypic differences tend to

be genetically based (Sharpe *et al.* 2008; Hendry *et al.* 2011; Berner *et al.* 2011; Oke *et al.* 2016;

Moser *et al.* 2016) and are likely adaptive, given their close association with variation in prey

availability (Berner *et al.* 2008; Kaeuffer *et al.* 2012). However, non-parallel aspects of

divergence are known where some traits show low levels of parallelism (Stuart *et al.* 2017).

Most analyses of parallel evolution in lake-stream stickleback have taken place on

regional geographic scales, where we expect generally similar selective regimes and genetic

backgrounds: northern Vancouver Island (Lavin & McPhail 1993; Hendry & Taylor 2004;

Berner *et al.* 2008; 2009; Kaeuffer *et al.* 2012; Stuart *et al.* 2017), Haida Gwaii (Reimchen *et al.*

1985), Ireland (Ravinet *et al.* 2013), and northern Germany (Reusch *et al.* 2001). Several studies,

however, have analyzed sets of lake-stream pairs within and between regions: Vancouver Island

vs. Switzerland (Berner *et al.* 2010), Vancouver Island vs. artificial habitats in California

(Hendry *et al.* 2013) , Iceland vs. Switzerland (Lucek *et al.* 2014b), and Vancouver Island vs.

Switzerland vs. Ireland (Lucek *et al.* 2013). These studies revealed important morphological and

genetic variation in the direction and magnitude of lake-stream divergence between regions, but

they did not formally compare the extent of parallel evolution across different geographic scales.

In the present study, we conduct such a comparison by assessing parallel evolution of lake-

stream divergence at two very different scales: six pairs within Vancouver Island (hereafter,

"regional" comparisons) and six pairs from worldwide localities that encompass the majority of

the threespine stickleback range (hereafter, "global" comparisons).

We estimate phenotypic (non)parallelism by first comparing the effect sizes of multiple

univariate and multivariate models. We then evaluate the degree of phenotypic and genetic

(non)parallelism by calculating multivariate phenotypic and genetic (neutral and outlier) lake-to-

stream divergence vectors. Then, we quantify the differences among vectors in direction (i.e., the

angle between any two divergence vectors) and in magnitude (i.e., the difference in length

between any two divergence vectors) (Collyer & Adams 2007; Stuart *et al.* 2017). Small angles

and small differences in length imply highly parallel evolution. With these summary statistics for

(non)parallel evolution, we ask the following two questions:

1. What is the relative extent of phenotypic and genetic (non)parallelism at global versus

115   regional scales?

116   2.   What are the potential ecological and genetic drivers of phenotypic and genetic

117   (non)parallelism at each scale?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Field collections and environmental data

We used minnow traps to collect 39-40 lake and 40 stream stickleback, between May 21 and

June 28, 2013, from each of six independent population pairs on Vancouver Island (the

"regional" samples: Table S1A, Fig. S1A). We also used minnow traps or nets to collect 40 lake

and 40 stream stickleback, between April 10 and August 8, 2014, from each of six other

population pairs in North America and Europe (global samples: Table S1B, Fig. S1B). In all

collections, we trapped the lake fish at least 100 m away from the junction with any stream (apart

from Lake Constance, where the lake fish were captured at the mouth of the stream), and we

trapped stream fish at least 100 m away from the junction with any lake. We did not retain any

fish younger than one year or any obviously gravid females.

We euthanized the fish with an overdose of MS-222 fish anesthetic (Argent Chemical

Laboratories, Redmond, WA), and removed the right pectoral fin, which was preserved in 95%

ethanol for genetic analysis. We then fixed the fish in 10% neutral buffered formalin (VWR,

Radnor, Pennsylvania). To facilitate gill raker counts, we stained the fish using alizarin red dye.

To do so, we first soaked the fish in water for 24 hours, then stained the fish in a solution of

alizarin red and 0.5% KOH for 24 hours, and then performed a second soak in water for 24 hours

to remove excess stain. We then stored the fish in 40% isopropyl alcohol until they were

processed further (see below), approximately four weeks later.

To characterize the environment at each site, we measured several habitat variables.

Using the Google Earth Pro V7.3 software, we measured total lake area (m^2), lake perimeter (m),

and mean lake-stream elevation for each pair (m). Using measuring sticks and a tape meter, we

also measured stream depth (cm), lake depth (cm), and stream width (cm) at each trap as well as

stream flow (cm/s) using a flow meter.

Morphological measurements

In the laboratory, we photographed the left and ventral surfaces of each fish against a grid

marked at 1 cm intervals. The grid was placed at a constant distance from the lens of a Canon

G11 digital camera, which was positioned in the same plane (using a surface level) as the grid.

Before the photograph was taken, we removed the left pectoral fin of each fish and pinned it at

maximum extension onto the same grid (for measurements of fin area, perimeter, and the length

of fin rays). We also inserted small pins into the fish to help indicate otherwise cryptic

homologous anatomical points for subsequent geometric morphometrics (Berner *et al.* 2009).

After photographing, we measured several morphological traits (described below) with a focus

on body shape and gill raker traits because repeated patterns of phenotypic divergence between

lake and stream fish often involve these traits (Sharpe *et al.* 2008; Berner *et al.* 2008; Hendry *et*

al. 2011; Berner *et al.* 2011; Kaeuffer *et al.* 2012; Oke *et al.* 2016; Moser *et al.* 2016). In

addition, we dissected each fish to determine sex by gonad inspection.

From the photographs, we measured 25 linear trait distances (Table S2), as well as the

area and perimeter of the pectoral fin using the image processing software *Fiji* (Schindelin *et al.*

2012). We standardized these 27 univariate measurements to a common standard body length

with the allometric formula $M_S = M_0 (L_S / L_0)^b$, where M_S is the standardized trait

measurement, M_0 is the unstandardized trait measurement, L_S is the overall mean body size of all

fish in a given analysis, and L_0 is the standard length of the individual (Elliott *et al.* 1994;

Lleonart *et al.* 2000). Standard length is defined as the distance from the anterior tip of the upper

jaw to the posterior end of the hyperal plate. The exponent *b* was calculated as the common

within-group slope (Reist 1986) from a linear mixed-effect model regressing $\log_{10}(M_0)$ on

$\log_{10}(L_0)$ with pair as the random factor.

We counted the number of gill rakers on the first right gill arch *in situ*, then removed the

right gill arch and photographed it under a dissecting scope using an ocular micrometer and a

Canon EOS Rebel T5 digital camera. To quantify gill raker length, we measured the curved

distance along the centre of the three longest gill rakers. We then calculated raker spacing as $5/l$,

where *l* is the mm distance along the gill arch spanned by the five longest rakers. These four

measurements (lengths of the three longest gill rakers, and gill raker spacing) were standardized

to a common standard body length as described above.

To quantify overall geometric morphometric shape differences, we placed 19 homologous

landmarks on the lateral photographs using the *TPSdig* software (Rohlf 2006) (Fig. S2). We then

superimposed the 19 landmarks using a generalized Procrustes analysis (GPA) with *R* package

geomorph (Adams & Otárola Castillo 2013). We performed this analysis for the global samples

and the regional samples combined so that all fish would be positioned in the same shape space.

These alignments resulted in 38 Procrustes residuals that described the shape differences

between specimens unrelated to scale, rotation, or translation. The 38 principle components

(PCs) derived from the 38 Procrustes residuals were then allometrically adjusted for centroid size

and body depth using the above common within-slope approach (Reist 1986; Lleonart *et al.*

2000; Rolshausen *et al.* 2015). The first PC was found to describe shape differences due to

vertical bending of the fish produced during storage. We therefore excluded this artefactual PC

from further analyses.

DNA extraction and restriction site associated DNA sequencing library construction

DNA was extracted from stickleback fin clips using the Wizard® SV Genomic Purification kit

(Promega® Corp., Madison, USA) and quantified using Picogreen® ds DNA assay (Thermo

Fisher Scientific, Waltham, USA) on an Infinite® 200 Nanoquant (Tecan Group Ltd. Männedorf,

Switzerland). All samples were normalized to a dsDNA concentration of 15ng/µl, re-quantified,

and pooled according to sampling location. Thus, we created 24 pools of 40 individuals each,

consisting of 12 pools for each geographic scale (at each scale, six lake and six stream pools).

ddRAD PoolSeq libraries were prepared following a modified version of the Peterson *et*

al. (2012) protocol. Briefly, pooled samples were first digested using the NLAIII and MluCI

enzymes (New England Biolabs Inc., Frankfurt, Germany), individually barcoded using unique

P1 flex-adapters (Peterson *et al.* 2012), and pooled together into a single library. Fragments of

371-416bp were extracted using a Pippen Prep® 2% MarkerB 100-600bp cassette (Sage Science

Inc., Beverly, USA). In post-size selection, we isolated fragments including at least one biotin-

tagged P2 adapter, using streptavidin-couple beads (Dynabeads® M-270, Thermo Fisher

Scientific, Waltham, USA). The library was then PCR amplified in five separate aliquots (12

cycles, Phusion High Fidelity® PCR kit, New England Biolabs Inc., Frankfurt, Germany). We

used Agencourt® AMPure XP beads (Beckman Coulter, Indianapolis, USA) to clean samples

after each enzymatic reaction.

Sequencing and ddRAD data processing

Barcoded ddRAD samples were sequenced on four lanes of an Illumina Hi-Seq 2500 for 100 bp

paired-end, and demultiplexed using *STACKS* (Catchen *et al.* 2013) v. 1.13 (*process_radtags* -P,

-p, -r, -i, --inline_index, --disable_rad_check). Resulting FASTA files were trimmed using

PoPoolation (Kofler *et al.* 2011a) to eliminate low quality regions (--min-length 50 --quality-

threshold 20). Reads from all 24 pools were aligned to the threespine stickleback genome

(release-084, Ensembl.org) separately using *BWA mem* v. 0.7.13 (Li & Durbin 2009). We then

used *SAMtools* (Li *et al.* 2009) v. 1.3.1 to convert the resulting sam files to sorted bam format,

keeping only reads with mapping quality above 20 (*samtools view* -q 20). A pileup file was then

generated using *SAMtools* v. 1.3.1 (*samtools mpileup* -B), and filtered for completeness by

keeping reads with a minimum coverage of five. We then converted the pileup file to a sync file

using *PoPoolation2* (Kofler *et al.* 2011b) for further downstream analysis.

Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed in *R* 3.2.2 (R Core Team 2015).

Variation in environmental variables

To test whether variation in habitat characteristics was greater at the global than regional scale,

we compared within-scale variation for each environmental parameter using Bartlett's tests

(Bartlett 1937). In addition, we calculated levels of among-lake and among-stream variation for

each environmental variable at each scale separately. To calculate among-lake and among-stream

variation at each scale, we computed ANOVAs at each scale separately with each environmental

variable as dependent variable and watershed as predictor. Among-lake or among-stream

variation was calculated by dividing the pair term sum of squares by the total number of pairs in

each scale respectively.

Univariate and multivariate phenotypic analysis

To reduce the large number of univariate traits, we first performed a principal components

analysis (PCA) on the size-standardized trait values for all samples (global and regional)

combined. To consider phenotypic differences between lake and stream stickleback across pairs

for the global and regional sample sets separately, we then used multivariate analysis of

covariance (MANCOVA) models, with Wilks' lambda (λ) as the test statistic. We tested for

differences in specific trait sets for the regional and global samples separately using three

different MANCOVA models, with dependent variables as: i) all 27 (size-standardized)

univariate measurements, ii) the five gill raker traits only, and iii) the PCs derived from the 38

Procrustes residuals.

To understand the contribution to parallelism of a subset of individual traits likely

important to lake-stream divergence (body depth, gill raker number, gill raker spacing, and mean

length of the three longest gill rakers), we analyzed each of these traits separately using an

analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) at each regional and global scale. The independent variables

in every model were the fixed effects of sex, pair, and habitat (lake versus stream), along with all

two-way interactions. Centroid size was also included as a covariate (along with its two-way

interactions) to control for any remaining size effects.

Estimation of genome-wide population differentiation

We evaluated the genetic relationship within pairs by estimating the fixation index (F_{ST}) for each

lake-stream pairwise comparison using *PoPoolation2* (Kofler *et al.* 2011b), applying a number

of stringent criteria (see below) to define genomic sites for analysis across the entire genome.

The accuracy of allele frequency estimation of pooled individuals is highly dependent on

sequence coverage (Schloetterer *et al.* 2014). Therefore, to reduce stochastic error and increase

the accuracy of F_{ST} estimates, for each pairwise combination we used a minimum minor allele

count of two across all pools, a high sequence coverage filter (between five and 500 within each

pool), and a large 100-kb non-overlapping sliding window. This window size led to mean of

146.74 SNPs per window ($\pm$ 90.29, median = 123). We visualized population structure by

building neighbour-joining trees for both scales separately based on average pairwise F_{ST} values.

Evaluation of (non)parallelism at both geographic scales

We used two different approaches to estimate the extent of parallel evolution at the two

geographic scales.

First, we compared the effect sizes of the habitat and habitat-by-pair interaction terms

from the MANCOVA and ANCOVA analyses of phenotype (partial η^2 and η^2 values,

respectively) (Oke *et al.* 2016; Stuart *et al.* 2017). A large effect size for the habitat term

suggests consistent lake versus stream differences shared across pairs, i.e., parallel evolution. A

large effect size for the pair-by-habitat interaction term, on the other hand, suggests idiosyncratic

lake-versus-stream differences across pairs, i.e., non-parallel evolution. Thus, if the ratio of the

habitat to the interaction effect size is greater in the pairs sampled at a regional scale as

compared to the pairs sampled at a global scale, we infer that lake-stream divergence is more

parallel at the regional scale.

Second, we calculated lake-to-stream divergence vectors for our phenotypic and genetic

data. Each vector connects the multivariate lake mean to the multivariate stream mean and

quantifies the magnitude and direction of lake-stream divergence for each population pair

(Adams & Collyer 2009). Then, to describe the extent to which vectors diverged in parallel

across pairs, we calculated: θ, the angle between any two vectors; L, the length of the vector for

each pair; and ΔL, the difference in length between any two vectors. Strict parallel divergence

between pairs would correspond to $\theta = 0$ and $\Delta L = 0$. Vector analysis for the phenotypic and

genetic datasets follows Stuart *et al*. (2017) and is briefly described below:

(i)   Phenotypic: For each pair, for each trait (Table S2), we ran a t-test comparing the

284   distribution of a trait in a lake to that in its adjoining stream. Concatenating each

285   t-statistic resulted in a 1xN vector of scale-standardized lake-stream differences,

286   thereby constituting our lake-stream divergence vector. We then calculated angles

287   between phenotypic divergence vectors (θ_P) as the arc-cosine of the Pearson

288   correlation for each vector pair. L_P was the multivariate Euclidian length of each

289   vector, and ΔL_P was the difference in length between any two divergence vectors.

290   We tested for differences in θ_P and ΔL_P between global and regional scales using

291   a two-tailed t-test.

292   (ii)   Genetic: Using the sync file of allele frequencies extracted with *PoPoolation*, we

293   first calculated the frequency of the minor allele at each SNP. We then used PCA

294   (*R prcomp*) to reduce our large SNP dataset into a smaller number of quantitative

295   axes of genetic differentiation. We saved populations' scores of all the resulting

296   24 axes. We calculated the centroid for each lake and each stream, for these 24

297   axes, to obtain vectors in genotypic space. Thus, each row of the resulting matrix

298   represents the estimate of genetic divergence between the two habitats of the same

299   pair, thereby constituting the genetic lake-stream divergence vector for each pair.

300   First, we performed this analysis on a set of 'outlier' SNPs whose lake-stream F_{ST}

301   values fell within the top 5% of estimated values for each of the 12 lake-stream

302   pairs, thus representing markers putatively linked to selected loci (175,302 outlier

303   loci). To test for differences in genetic divergence between scales, we performed

304   the genetic vector analysis as described above and across both scales to obtain

305   measures of $\theta_{OUTLIERS}$ and $\Delta L_{OUTLIERS}$. We tested for differences in $\theta_{OUTLIERS}$ and

306           $\Delta L_{OUTLIERS}$ between global and regional scales using a two-sided t-test. Second,

307   we calculated θ, L, ΔL by excluding these outlier SNPs to obtain a set of markers

308   likely to represent neutral population genetic processes (327,291 neutral loci -

309   hereafter θ_G, L_G, and ΔL_G). We tested for differences in θ_G and ΔL_G between

310   global and regional scales using a two-sided t-test. Values of θ_G, L_G, and ΔL_G

311   were used further to investigate potential constraints on divergence (see below).

312   Finally, we considered whether neutral processes could be responsible for

313   phenotypic divergence by testing for a linear relationship between θ_P values and

314   averaged between-watershed neutral F_{ST} at each scale separately using linear

315   models with F_{ST} as predictor and θ_P as response variable.

RESULTS

Variation in environmental variables

Overall, environmental variation is higher at the global scale. For all environmental variables (in

both lake and stream habitats), variation among watersheds was significantly greater at the global

than regional scale (Table 1, Fig. S3). Similarly, among-lake and among-stream variation was

greater at the global than at the regional scale (Fig. S4).

Univariate and multivariate phenotypic analysis

Consistent with previous work, we observed variable levels of (non)parallelism in univariate and

multivariate traits. The first and second PCs for the 27 univariate measurements explained 24.7%

and 17.5% of the total variance, respectively, and every trait except the length of the dorsal fin

loaded negatively on the first axis. The within-pair difference between lake and stream fish on

PC1 was always in the same direction, indicating that any habitat-by-pair interaction on PC1 was

due to differences in the magnitude of divergence, rather than the direction of divergence (Fig.

1). The MANCOVA models revealed significant effects of habitat, pair, and their interaction on

all sets of traits at both regional and global scales (Table S3).

ANCOVAs for individual traits revealed that the effects of habitat, pair, and their

interaction were always significant at both the regional and global scales (Table S4).

Specifically, stream fish were generally deeper bodied than lake fish for the regional pairs, often

with similar magnitudes of difference. However, in the global pairs, stream fish were sometimes

not deeper bodied than their lake counterparts (Fig. 2A, B). Lake fish also generally had more

and longer gill rakers than stream fish (Fig. 2C-F), although this difference was more

pronounced at the regional scale. Gill raker spacing was greater in stream fish at the regional

scale but not at the global scale (Fig. 2G, H).

Evaluation of (non)parallelism at both geographic scales

Differences in effect sizes of multivariate models

Significant differences in effect sizes from the MANCOVAs and ANCOVAs revealed that

phenotypic parallelism was greater at the regional than at the global scale. Indeed, the ratio of the

habitat term to the habitat by pair interaction term was always greater at the regional than at the

global scale – across all models. In the MANCOVA models, the averaged ratio was 3.2 at the

regional scale and 1.5 at the global scale. In the ANCOVA models, the averaged ratio was 6.7 at

the regional scale and 0.3 at the global scale (Table 2, Fig. 3; see Tables S3 and S4 for more

detailed results about these models). This finding suggests that lake-stream divergence in

phenotypic traits was more parallel at the regional than global scale.

Vector analysis

F_{ST} extracted from the sliding window analysis revealed that lake-stream populations in each

pair were each other's sister taxon, regardless of the geographic scale of comparison (Table S5,

Fig. S5). This pattern is consistent with evolutionarily independent lake-stream divergence in

each pair, although ongoing gene flow could also contribute to this pattern.

Overall, we found phenotypic divergence to be more parallel at the regional than global

scale. Multivariate vector analysis of the phenotypic data revealed a continuum of lake-stream

parallelism at both scales (Tables S6 and S7). The mean angle between any two phenotypic

vectors (θ_P) was 61.63° ± 12.24sd at the regional scale and 90.17° ± 15.98sd at the global scale

(Fig. 4A; $t = 5.49$, df = 26.23, $P = 8.97e^{-06}$). In addition, phenotypic vector lengths, which

measure the magnitude (but not direction) of lake-stream divergence, also exhibit greater

similarity among regional pairs than among global pairs. Pairwise comparisons of vector lengths

(ΔL_P) averaged -2.85 ± 10.57sd locally, and 6.52 ± 7.98sd globally (Fig. 4C; t = 3.16, df =

14.00, $P = 0.007$).

At the genetic level, divergence was significantly more parallel at the regional than global

scale, but only for outlier loci: The mean angle between any two outlier genetic vectors

($\theta_{OUTLIERS}$) was 85.51° ± 5.81sd at the regional scale and at 89.15° ± 3.83sd the global scale (Fig.

4B; t = 2.02, df = 24.21, *P* = 0.04). The mean angle between any two neutral genetic vectors (θ_G)

was 89.32° ± 2.72sd at the regional scale and 90.03° ± 1.81sd at the global scale (t = 0.85, df =

24.36, *P* = 0.41). Genetic vector lengths were significantly smaller at the regional than global

scale at both outlier and neutral loci. Outlier vector lengths ($\Delta L_{OUTLIERS}$) differed by a mean of

1.49 ± 4.12sd and 10.29 ± 13.05sd at the regional and global scales, respectively (Fig. 4D; t =

2.49, df = 16.75, *P* = 0.02). Neutral genetic vector lengths (ΔL_G) differed by a mean of 0.46 ±

1.54sd and 6.12 ± 6.77sd at the regional and global scales, respectively (t = 3.16, df = 15.44, *P* =

0.006). Finally, θ_P and averaged between-watershed neutral F_{ST} were not significantly associated

at either scale (regional: t = -0.88, df = 13, *P* = 0.39, R^2 = -0.24; global: t = 1.12, df = 13, *P* =

0.28, R^2 = 0.29).

If different watersheds share the same genetic architecture underlying adaptive traits, we

would expect outlier loci under selection to overlap across population pairs when lake-stream

divergence proceeds in parallel. However, 63% of the outlier loci were unique to a specific

watershed across all watersheds, whereas 61% and 77% of outliers were unique to a specific

watershed at the regional and global scales, respectively (21% and 4% were shared across a

minimum of two watersheds at the regional scale and global scale, respectively). As an overall

summary, comparisons of vector pairs showed less parallelism at the global scale than at the

regional scale, at both the phenotypic and genetic outlier levels; for neutral genetic loci,

(non)parallelism was similar at both scales. Importantly, perfect parallel divergence is non-

existent at both phenotypic and genetic levels and at both geographic scales.

DISCUSSION

We assessed the influence of geographic scale on the repeatability of adaptive radiation by

quantifying levels of phenotypic and genetic parallelism in lake-stream population pairs of

threespine stickleback. In agreement with previous work conducted over restricted spatial scales

(Lavin & McPhail 1993; Hendry & Taylor 2004; Berner *et al.* 2008; 2009; Kaeuffer *et al.* 2012;

Stuart *et al.* 2017), we found a continuum of phenotypic and genetic parallelism, with lake-

stream divergence being more pronounced for some traits, and in some population pairs, than in

others. At the phenotypic level, parallelism was especially notable in body depth and gill raker

number – also consistent with previous work. When comparing between geographic scales,

parallelism in phenotypes and genetic outliers was greater at the regional scale (Vancouver

Island) than at the global scale (Europe and both sides of North America). In contrast,

parallelism was similar across scales for neutral genetic loci. We suggest that the observed

disparities in phenotypic and genetic parallelism between scales are likely the result of

differences in environmental variation, selection pressures, and genetic architecture of traits

between scales. We develop these ideas further in the text below.

Phenotypic (non)parallelism

Univariate, multivariate, and vector analyses all revealed that phenotypic parallelism was greater

at the regional than the global scale (Fig. 4A, C). This difference between scales was especially

pronounced in specific morphological traits, such as body depth and gill raker length, that are

known to have a strong heritable basis and that have been previously implicated in adaptive

parallel evolution (Sharpe *et al.* 2008; Berner *et al.* 2008; Hendry *et al.* 2011; Berner *et al.* 2011;

Kaeuffer *et al.* 2012; Miller *et al.* 2014; Oke *et al.* 2016; Moser *et al.* 2016).

Lake-stream body depth divergence was highly parallel in that stream fish always had

deeper bodies than lake fish; yet the level of this parallelism was almost always greater at the

regional than the global scale (Figs. 1-4). A similar pattern emerged for gill raker number, with

strong parallelism evident in lake-stream divergence at the regional scale, consistent with

previous studies (Berner et al. 2008; 2009; Kaeuffer et al. 2012; Stuart et al. 2017). Although

lake-stream parallelism in these traits was also present at the global scale, it was less pronounced

than at the regional scale (Table 2, Fig. 3). For instance, also in accordance with previous studies

(Berner et al. 2008; Kaeuffer et al. 2012), gill raker spacing and length exhibited low levels of

parallelism (Fig. 2E-H), yet the parallelism that was present in these traits was greater at the

regional than at the global scale (Fig. 3B).

With environmental variation across watersheds being greater at global than regional scales

(Figs. S3, S4), our data are consistent with the hypothesis that reduced environmental variation

among watersheds at smaller spatial scales enhances (or enables) stronger parallel evolution. For

instance, divergent selection related to diet, foraging mode, and swimming performance has been

implicated in variation in body shape and gill rakers between lake and stream stickleback. In

lakes, sticklebacks generally feed on small limnetic prey (Berner *et al.* 2008; 2009; Kaeuffer *et*

al. 2012), leading to selection for an elongated body shape (Webb 1984; Walker 1997) and

longer/more numerous gill rakers (Bentzen & McPhail 1984). In streams, stickleback commonly

feed on benthic prey, leading to selection for deeper bodies and shorter/less numerous gill rakers

(Bentzen & McPhail 1984; Berner *et al.* 2008; 2009; Hendry *et al.* 2011; Kaeuffer *et al.* 2012).

Body depth and gill raker number are both known to be strongly heritable (Hermida *et al.* 2002;

Aguirre *et al.* 2004; Oke *et al.* 2016; McPhail), and as such, the stronger parallelism of these

traits at regional than at global scales presumably reflects greater determinism of selection owing

to more consistent ecological differences between these habitat types across replicate watersheds

on smaller spatial scales.

Genetic (non)parallelism

Like phenotypic parallelism, genetic parallelism at outlier loci was more pronounced at the

regional than the global scale. In contrast, for neutral loci, genetic parallelism was similar at the

two geographic scales. Why might we observe greater parallelism at the regional versus global

scales for outlier genotypes? One explanation is that these outliers are associated with the

underlying genetic basis of adaptive phenotypes, which – as described above – show greater

parallelism at the regional than the global scale. However, phenotypic parallelism does not

necessarily lead to genetic parallelism if different genetic changes are capable of attaining

similar phenotypic outcomes (Kautt *et al.* 2012; Conte *et al.* 2012; Westram *et al.* 2014; Le

Moan *et al.* 2016). The greater parallelism of outlier loci at regional than global scales might thus

reflect more similar genetic architectures and higher levels of shared standing genetic variation

available to selection at smaller geographical scales (Barrett & Schluter, 2008; Agrawal &

Stinchcombe, 2009; Flint & Mackay, 2009; Terekhanova *et al.*, 2014; Saltz *et al.*, 2017; Llaurens

et al., 2017; Bassham *et al.*, 2018). In support of this idea, we found that Vancouver Island lake-

stream pairs shared more outlier loci than did lake-stream pairs at the global scale (21% of

outliers were shared across a minimum of two pairs at the regional scale but only 4% of outliers

were shared across a minimum of two pairs at the global scale).

In contrast to the outlier loci, we detected no differences between geographic scales in the

levels of (non)parallelism at neutral loci – at least when quantified using the *direction* (θ_G) of

genetic vectors. However, neutral genetic vectors were somewhat more similar in *magnitude*

(ΔL_G) at the regional than the global scale. This last result might suggest a role for gene flow in

reducing divergence between watersheds over smaller spatial scales – that is, they are less

genetically "independent" not only in their colonization but also in their contemporary genetic

connections (Stuart *et al.* 2017; Berner & Roesti 2017; Haenel *et al.* 2018). It is also possible that

these patterns could be driven by a difference in the effect of drift in shaping the extent of lake-

stream neutral genetic divergence between scales. However, the lack of differences in θ_G

between scales, and the lack of a relationship between θ_P and the average between-watershed

neutral F_{ST} at either scale, imply that neutral processes are unlikely to be responsible for

phenotypic divergence at either scale.

Constraints on parallel evolution at regional versus global scales

Lake-stream pairs at both scales showed relatively low levels of parallel evolution, especially for

multivariate traits. Indeed, the mean angles between any two phenotypic vectors (θ_P) were 61.63°

± 12.24 sd and 90.17° ± 15.98 sd at the regional and global scales, respectively. Similarly, the

mean angles between any two genetic outlier vectors ($\theta_{OUTLIERS}$) were 85.51° ± 5.81 sd at the

regional scale and 89.15° ± 3.83 sd at the global scale. Multiple factors can restrict the level of

parallel evolution at both scales (Bolnick *et al.* 2018). For instance, a number of ecological

variables that differ between lakes and streams are known to affect the degree of stickleback

divergence, including diet (Berner *et al.* 2008; Kaeuffer *et al.* 2012; Ravinet *et al.* 2013), parasite

load (Eizaguirre *et al.* 2011), flow regimes (generally higher in streams: Jiang *et al.* 2015), and

predators (predatory fish and birds likely more common in lakes: Reimchen *et al.* 1985;

Reimchen 1994). However, the direction and magnitude of lake-stream divergence in these

factors is not always consistent (Berner *et al.* 2008; Kaeuffer *et al.* 2012; Stuart *et al.* 2017).

Parasite communities are not universally more diverse in lakes than streams (Feulner *et al.*

2015), flow can be low in many stream reaches (Moore *et al.* 2007), and fish and bird predators

vary dramatically among different lakes – and among different streams (Moodie & Reimchen

1976). Thus, variation across watersheds in the consistency of the ecological differences between

lake and stream habitats could disrupt patterns of parallel evolution. We found this type of

among-watershed environmental variation to be highest at the global geographic scale, and

suggest that this non-parallel ecological divergence is likely to be a strong contributing factor to

the non-parallel phenotypic and genetic divergence. However, it is noteworthy that univariate

traits, such as body depth and gill raker number, were highly parallel in comparison to

multivariate traits. One possible explanation is that "simple" univariate traits generally

experience more parallel selection than "complex" multivariate traits for which multiple

evolutionary solutions are possible to the same ecological challenge (Thompson *et al.* 2017).

At the genetic level, several factors can constrain the level of parallel evolution. Parallel

evolution at loci associated with ecologically-relevant phenotypes is likely shaped by

environmental heterogeneity for the same reasons as those mentioned for phenotypes above (Orr

2005). Physically proximate populations are also be expected to be more closely related

genetically (both because of colonization and gene flow), and therefore could be expected to

display greater levels of parallelism due to sharing a more similar molecular basis of phenotypes

(Barrett & Schluter 2008; Conte *et al.* 2012). For instance, with partially-shared pools of

standing genetic variation, closely related populations might have more similar genetic solutions

to similar adaptive problems (Barrett & Schluter 2008). The Vancouver Island populations in our

study likely diverged from a marine ancestor at a similar time ~ 5,000 years ago (Stuart *et al.*

2017). In contrast, the global scale populations are estimated to have diverged at quite different

times: as early as 5,000-15,000 years ago in Alaska (Reger & Pinney, 1996; Cresko *et al.*, 2004)

to hundreds to thousands of years in Europe and Iceland (Moser *et al.* 2012; Lucek *et al.* 2014b;

Roesti *et al.* 2015). This discrepancy between scales in divergence times might also explain the

observed differences in parallel evolution; for the reasons outlined above, populations with

similar divergence times might be more parallel than populations with diverse divergence times.

Gene flow is another factor known to effect adaptive divergence (Slatkin, 1987; Lenormand,

2002; Garant *et al.*, 2007) and therefore also evolutionary (non)parallelism. On the one hand,

populations exchanging genes will become more genetically similar, which can promote

parallelism. On the other hand, gene flow between populations in distinct environments can

impede regional adaptation (Garant *et al.*, 2007). Thus, gene flow within watersheds containing

populations inhabiting distinct lake and stream habitat types should generally constrain their

adaptive differentiation – as has frequently been inferred for lake-stream stickleback (Hendry *et*

al., 2002; Moore *et al.*, 2007; Berner *et al.*, 2009; Stuart *et al.*, 2017). If levels of gene flow are

high within some watersheds and low in others, parallelism could be restricted, in particular as

reflected by ΔL (Stuart *et al.* 2017). We detected lower ΔL_P and ΔL_G at regional than global

scales, suggesting that the role of within-watershed gene flow in constraining adaptive

differentiation could be more consistent at smaller spatial scales. However, $\Delta L_{OUTLIERS}$ was not

different between the regional and global scales, which could imply similar levels of within-

watershed gene flow across scales for outlier loci. The differences in ΔL_P may then reflect either

differing levels of phenotypic plasticity between scales (Oke *et al.* 2016), or that our genetic

markers have not included the loci associated with the traits experiencing parallel adaptive

divergence between habitats, which might show distinct patterns of admixture to those described

here (Nosil *et al.* 2009).

Implications for adaptive radiation

Threespine stickleback are a remarkable example of adaptive radiation: they show dramatic

phenotypic and evolutionary divergence from very small to very large geographical scales (Bell

& Foster, 1994; McKinnon and Rundle 2002). Moreover, most of this divergence has played out

over just a few thousand generations; and, in some cases, impressive freshwater divergence from

a marine ancestor has evolved in less than fifty years (Kimmel *et al.*, 2012; Lescak *et al.*, 2015;

Bassham *et al.*, 2018). At the same time, different stickleback populations in the adaptive

radiation can still interbreed in nearly all cases (Hendry, 2009); and they show at most two forms

in a single location (but see: Hippel von & Weigner, 2004). Hence, the applicability of the

stickleback radiation to inferences about other classic adaptive radiations should be limited to the

early stages of those radiations. Yet this potential limitation is also a strength in some respects;

by capturing multiple replicates of the very early stages of adaptive radiation, we can more easily

draw inferences about the processes that promote and constrain adaptive radiation – because we

are removed from concern over confounding effects of non-causal factors that accumulate after

the radiation is largely complete.

From this perspective, we found that, when replicate adaptive radiations are farther apart

in space, and therefore are more likely to be independent, they show greater dissimilarities as

reflected in lower phenotypic and genetic parallelism. We suggest that this scale-dependent

repeatability is primarily driven by ecological rather than genetic factors. That is, the set of

divergent environments in a given location will differ more from the same set of divergent

environments in another location when those locations are situated farther apart in space. Indeed,

the largest differences between scales appears to derive from phenotypes and genetic outliers, as

opposed to neutral genetic markers. Further effort should be directed toward exploring both the

ecological and genetic causes of scale-dependent determinism.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work would not have been possible without help from Katie Peichel, Elena Motivans,

Mingsha Zhou, Susannah Halbrook, Matt Dubin, and Dario Moser in sampling sticklebacks.

Thanks also to Mehvish Bukhari and Louis Astorg for their assistance with gill raker

measurements. Thank you to Daniel Berner for providing samples from the Swiss pairs as well

as environmental data and for providing a friendly review of the manuscript. Thanks to the

Mullaney family for their assistance with catching Nova Scotia sticklebacks. A SEED grant from

the Quebec Centre for Biodiversity Science to DH, Natural Sciences and Engineering Council

(NSERC) of Canada Discovery Grants to RDHB and APH, and a Canada Research Chair Grant

to RDHB provided financial assistance. The Vancouver Island data were collected with funds

from NSF grant DEB-1144773 to DIB. YES was supported by NSF DEB-1456462.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

AP, DH, APH, and RDHB designed the study. YS and DIB provided sequence and

environmental data from the regional pairs. FAvH, MK, TK, SS and BKK provided fish samples

and collected environmental data from the global pairs. AP and DH extracted sequence data from

the global pairs and phenotypic data from both scales. AP and DH analyzed the data. AP and DH

wrote the manuscript with input from all coauthors.

REFERENCES

Adams DC, Collyer ML (2009) A general framework for the analysis of phenotypic trajectories
in evolutionary studies. *Evolution*, **63**, 1143–1154.
Adams DC, Otárola Castillo E (2013) geomorph: an r package for the collection and analysis of
geometric morphometric shape data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **4**, 393–399.
Agrawal AF, Stinchcombe JR (2009) How much do genetic covariances alter the rate of
adaptation? *Proceedings Of The Royal Society A*, **276**, 1183–1191.
Aguirre WE (2009) Microgeographical diversification of threespine stickleback: body shape–
habitat correlations in a small, ecologically diverse Alaskan drainage. *Biological Journal of*
the Linnean Society, **98**, 139–151.
Aguirre WE, Doherty PK, Bell MA (2004) Genetics of lateral plate and gillraker phenotypes in a
rapidly evolving population of threespine stickleback. *Behaviour*, **141**, 1465–1483.
Arendt J, Reznick D (2008) Convergence and parallelism reconsidered: what have we learned
about the genetics of adaptation? *Trends In Ecology & Evolution*, **23**, 26–32.
Barrett RDH, Schluter D (2008) Adaptation from standing genetic variation. *Trends In Ecology*
& Evolution, **23**, 38–44.
Bartlett MS (1937) Properties of sufficiency and statistical tests. *Proceedings Of The Royal*
Society A, **160**, 268–282.
Bassham, S., Catchen, J., Lescak, E., Hippel, von, F.A. & Cresko, W.A. 2018. Repeated
Selection of Alternatively Adapted Haplotypes Creates Sweeping Genomic Remodeling in
Stickleback. *Genetics* **209**: 921–939.
Bell, M.A. & Foster, S.A. 1994. *The Evolutionary Biology of the Threespine Stickleback*. Oxford
University Press, Oxford.
Bentzen P, McPhail JD (1984) Ecology and evolution of sympatric sticklebacks (*Gasterosteus*):
spatial segregation and seasonal habitat shifts in the Enos Lake species pair. *Canadian*
Journal of Zoology, **62**, 2280–2286.
Berner D, Roesti M (2017) Genomics of adaptive divergence with chromosome-scale
heterogeneity in crossover rate. *Molecular Ecology*, **26**, 6351–6369.
Berner D, Adams DC, Grandchamp AC, Hendry AP (2008) Natural selection drives patterns of
lake-stream divergence in stickleback foraging morphology. *Journal of Evolutionary*
Biology, **21**, 1653–1665.
Berner D, Grandchamp A-C, Hendry AP (2009) Variable progress toward ecological speciation
in parapatry: stickleback across eight lake-stream transitions. *Evolution*, **63**, 1740–1753.
Berner D, Kaeuffer R, Grandchamp AC *et al.* (2011) Quantitative genetic inheritance of
morphological divergence in a lake-stream stickleback ecotype pair: implications for
reproductive isolation. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **24**, 1975–1983.
Berner D, Roesti M, Hendry AP, Salzburger W (2010) Constraints on speciation suggested by
comparing lake-stream stickleback divergence across two continents. *Molecular Ecology*,
19, 4963–4978.
Blount ZD, Lenski RE, Losos JB (2018) Contingency and determinism in evolution: Replaying
life's tape. *Science*, **362**, eaam5979–12.
Bolnick DI, Barrett RDH, Oke KB, Rennison DJ, Stuart YE (2018) (Non)Parallel Evolution.
Annual Review Of Ecology Evolution And Systematics, **49**, 303–330.
Brawand D, Wagner CE, Li YI *et al.* (2014) The genomic substrate for adaptive radiation in
African cichlid fish. *Nature*, **513**, 375–381.

Campbell DR, Waser NM, Melendez-Ackerman EJ (1997) Analyzing pollinator-mediated
selection in a plant hybrid zone: hummingbird visitation patterns on three spatial scales.
American Naturalist, **149**, 295–315.
Catchen J, Hohenlohe PA, Bassham S, Amores A, Cresko WA (2013) Stacks: an analysis tool
set for population genomics. *Molecular Ecology*, **22**, 3124–3140.
Cavender-Bares J, Keen A, Miles B (2006) Phylogenetic structure of Floridian plant
communities depends on taxonomic and spatial scale. *Ecology*, **87**, S109–S122.
Chavarie L, Howland K, Harris L (2015) Polymorphism in lake trout in Great Bear Lake: intra-
lake morphological diversification at two spatial scales. *Biological Journal of the Linnean*
Society, **114**, 109–125.
Collyer ML, Adams DC (2007) Analysis of two-state multivariate phenotypic change in
ecological studies. *Ecology*, **88**, 683–692.
Colosimo PF, Hosemann KE, Balabhadra S *et al.* (2005) Widespread parallel evolution in
sticklebacks by repeated fixation of ectodysplasin alleles. *Science*, **307**, 1928–1933.
Conte GL, Arnegard ME, Peichel CL, Schluter D (2012) The probability of genetic parallelism
and convergence in natural populations. *Proceedings Of The Royal Society A,* **279**, 5039–
5047.
Craig MacLean R (2005) Adaptive radiation in microbial microcosms. *Journal of Evolutionary*
Biology, **18**, 1376–1386.
Cresko WA, Amores A, Wilson C *et al.* (2004) Parallel genetic basis for repeated evolution of
armor loss in Alaskan threespine stickleback populations. *PNAS*, **101**, 6050–6055.
De Kort H, Vandepitte K, Mergeay J, Mijnsbrugge KV, Honnay O (2015) The population
genomic signature of environmental selection in the widespread insect-pollinated tree
species *Frangula alnus* at different geographical scales. *Heredity*, **115**, 415–425.
Deagle BE, Reimchen TE, Levin DB (1996) Origins of endemic stickleback from the Queen
Charlotte Islands: mitochondrial and morphological evidence. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*,
74, 1045–1056.
Drakare S, Lennon JJ, Hillebrand H (2006) The imprint of the geographical, evolutionary and
ecological context on species-area relationships. *Ecology Letters*, **9**, 215–227.
Eizaguirre C, Lenz TL, Sommerfeld RD, Harrod C, Milinski M (2011) Parasite diversity,
patterns of MHC II variation and olfactory based mate choice in diverging three-spined
stickleback ecotypes. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **25**, 605–622.
Elliott NG, Haskard K, Koslow JA (1994) Morphometric analysis of orange roughy
(*Hoplostethus atlanticus*) off the continental slope of southern Australia. *Journal of*
Investigative Medicine, **46**, 202–220.
Feulner PGD, Chain FJJ, Panchal M *et al.* (2015) Genomics of divergence along a continuum of
parapatric population differentiation. *PLoS Genetics*, **11**, e1004966.
Flint J, Mackay TFC (2009) Genetic architecture of quantitative traits in mice, flies, and humans.
Genome Research, **19**, 723–733.
Garant, D., Forde, S.E. & Hendry, A.P. 2007. The multifarious effects of dispersal and gene flow
on contemporary adaptation. *Functional Ecology* **21**: 434–443.
Gillespie R (2004) Community assembly through adaptive radiation in Hawaiian spiders.
Science, **303**, 356–359.
Gould SJ (1990) *Wonderful life: The burgess shale and the nature of history*. WW Norton &
Company, New York.

Grant PR (1981) Speciation and the adaptive radiation of Darwin's Finches. *American Scientist*,
69, 653–663.
Haenel Q, Laurentino TG, Roesti M, Berner D (2018) Meta-analysis of chromosome-scale
crossover rate variation in eukaryotes and its significance to evolutionary genomics.
Molecular Ecology, **27**, 2477–2497.
Hendry, A.P. 2009. Ecological speciation! Or the lack thereof? *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **66**:
1383–1398.
Hendry AP, Taylor EB (2004) How much of the variation in adaptive divergence can be
explained by gene flow? An evaluation using lake-stream stickleback pairs. *Evolution*, **58**,
2319–2331.
Hendry, A.P., Taylor, E.B. & McPhail, J.D. 2002. Adaptive divergence and the balance between
selection and gene flow: lake and stream stickleback in the Misty system. *Evolution* **56**:
1199–1216.
Hendry AP, Hendry AS, Hendry CA (2013) Hendry Vineyard stickleback: testing for
contemporary lake–stream divergence. *Evolutionary Ecology Research*, **15**, 343–359.
Hendry AP, Hudson K, Walker JA, Räsänen K, Chapman LJ (2011) Genetic divergence in
morphology-performance mapping between Misty Lake and inlet stickleback. *Journal of
Evolutionary Biology*, **24**, 23–35.
Hermida M, Fernandez C, Amaro R, San Miguel E (2002) Heritability and "evolvability" of
meristic characters in a natural population of *Gasterosteus aculeatus*. *Canadian Journal of
Zoology*, **80**, 532–541.
James HF (2004) The osteology and phylogeny of the Hawaiian finch radiation (Fringillidae:
Drepanidini), including extinct taxa. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society*, **141**, 207–
255.
Jenkins DG, Carey M, Czerniewska J *et al.* (2010) A meta-analysis of isolation by distance: relic
or reference standard for landscape genetics? *Ecography*, **33**, 315–320.
Jiang Y, Torrance L, Peichel CL, Bolnick DI (2015) Differences in rheotactic responses
contribute to divergent habitat use between parapatric lake and stream threespine
stickleback. *Evolution*, **69**, 2517–2524.
Kaeuffer R, Peichel CL, Bolnick DI, Hendry AP (2012) Parallel and nonparallel aspects of
ecological, phenotypic, and genetic divergence across replicate population pairs of lake and
stream stickleback. *Evolution*, **66**, 402–418.
Kautt AF, Elmer KR, Meyer A (2012) Genomic signatures of divergent selection and speciation
patterns in a "natural experiment," the young parallel radiations of Nicaraguan crater lake
cichlid fishes. *Molecular Ecology*, **21**, 4770–4786.
Kimmel, C.B., Cresko, W.A., Phillips, P.C., Ullmann, B., Currey, M., Hippel, von, F., *et al.*
2012. Independent axes of genetic variation and parallel evolutionary divergence of opercle
bone shape in threespine stickleback. *Evolution* **66**: 419–434.
Kocher TD (2004) Adaptive evolution and explosive speciation: the cichlid fish model. *Nature
Reviews Genetics*, **5**, 288–298.
Kofler R, Orozco-Terwengel P, De Maio N *et al.* (2011a) PoPoolation: a toolbox for population
genetic analysis of next generation sequencing data from pooled individuals. *PLoS ONE*, **6**,
e15925.
Kofler R, Pandey RV, Schlötterer C (2011b) PoPoolation2: identifying differentiation between
populations using sequencing of pooled DNA samples (Pool-Seq). *Bioinformatics*, **27**, 3435–
3436.

Kolbe JJ, Leal M, Schoener TW, Spiller DA, Losos JB (2012) Founder effects persist despite
adaptive differentiation: a field experiment with lizards. *Science*, **335**, 1086–1089.
Lavin PA, McPhail JD (1993) Parapatric lake and stream sticklebacks on northern Vancouver
Island: disjunct distribution or parallel evolution? *Canadian Journal of Zoology-Revue*
Canadienne De Zoologie, **71**, 11–17.
Le Moan A, Gagnaire PA, Bonhomme F (2016) Parallel genetic divergence among coastal–
marine ecotype pairs of European anchovy explained by differential introgression after
secondary contact. *Molecular Ecology*, **25**, 3187–3202.
Leinonen T, McCairns RJS, Herczeg G, Merilä J (2012) Multiple evolutionary pathways to
decreased lateral plate coverage in freshwater threespine sticklebacks. *Evolution*, **66**, 3866–
3875.
Lenormand T (2002) Gene flow and the limits to natural selection. *Trends In Ecology &*
Evolution, **17**, 183–189.
Lescak EA, Bassham SL, Catchen J *et al.* (2015) Evolution of stickleback in 50 years on
earthquake-uplifted islands. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **112**, E7204–
E7212.
Li H, Durbin R (2009) Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler transform.
Bioinformatics, **25**, 1754–1760.
Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A *et al.* (2009) The Sequence Alignment/Map format and
SAMtools. *Bioinformatics*, **25**, 2078–2079.
Llaurens V, Whibley A, Joron M (2017) Genetic architecture and balancing selection: the life
and death of differentiated variants. *Molecular Ecology*, **26**, 2430–2448.
Lleonart J, Salat J, Torres GJ (2000) Removing allometric effects of body size in morphological
analysis. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, **205**, 85–93.
Loh Y-HE, Bezault E, Muenzel FM *et al.* (2012) Origins of Shared Genetic Variation in African
Cichlids. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **30**, 906–917.
Losos JB (2009) *Lizards in an Evolutionary Tree*. University of California Press, Berkley.
Lucek K, Lemoine M, Seehausen O (2014a) Contemporary ecotypic divergence during a recent
range expansion was facilitated by adaptive introgression. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*,
27, 2233–2248.
Lucek K, Roy D, Bezault E, Sivasundar A, Seehausen O (2010) Hybridization between distant
lineages increases adaptive variation during a biological invasion: stickleback in
Switzerland. *Molecular Ecology*, **19**, 3995–4011.
Lucek K, Sivasundar A, Kristjánsson BK, Skúlason S, Seehausen O (2014b) Quick divergence
but slow convergence during ecotype formation in lake and stream stickleback pairs of
variable age. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **27**, 1878–1892.
Lucek K, Sivasundar A, Roy D, Seehausen O (2013) Repeated and predictable patterns of
ecotypic differentiation during a biological invasion: lake-stream divergence in parapatric
Swiss stickleback. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **26**, 2691–2709.
McPhail JD Ecology and evolution of sympatric sticklebacks (*Gasterosteus*): morphological and
genetic evidence for a species pair in Enos Lake, British Columbia. *Canadian Journal of*
Zoology, **62**, 1402–1408.
Miller CT, Glazer AM, Summers BR, Blackman BK (2014) Modular skeletal evolution in
sticklebacks is controlled by additive and clustered quantitative trait loci. *Genetics*, **197**,
405–420.
Moodie GEE, Reimchen TE (1976) Phenetic variation and habitat differences in *Gasterosteus*

populations of the Queen Charlotte Islands. *Systematic Zoology*, **25**, 49–61.

Moore JS, Gow JL, Taylor EB, Hendry AP (2007) Quantifying the constraining influence of
gene flow on adaptive divergence in the lake-stream threespine stickleback system.
Evolution, **61**, 2015–2026.

Morlon H, Chuyong G, Condit R *et al.* (2008) A general framework for the distance-decay of
similarity in ecological communities. *Ecology Letters*, **11**, 904–917.

Moser D, Frey A, Berner D (2016) Fitness differences between parapatric lake and stream
stickleback revealed by a field transplant. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **29**, 711–719.

Moser D, Roesti M, Berner D (2012) Repeated lake-stream divergence in stickleback life history
within a central European lake basin. *PLoS ONE*, **7**, e50620.

Nekola JC, White PS (1999) The distance decay of similarity in biogeography and ecology.
Journal of Biogeography, **26**, 867–878.

Nosil P, Funk DJ, Ortiz-Barrientos D (2009) Divergent selection and heterogeneous genomic
divergence. *Molecular Ecology*, **18**, 375–402.

Nosil P, Gompert Z, Farkas TE *et al.* (2012) Genomic consequences of multiple speciation
processes in a stick insect. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, **279**, 5058–5065.

Oke KB, Bukhari M, Kaeuffer R *et al.* (2016) Does plasticity enhance or dampen phenotypic
parallelism? A test with three lake–stream stickleback pairs. *Journal of Evolutionary*
Biology, **29**, 126–143.

Ord TJ, Summers TC (2015) Repeated evolution and the impact of evolutionary history on
adaptation. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, **15**, 137.

Orr HA (2005) The probability of parallel evolution. *Evolution*, **59**, 216–220.

Paccard A, Vance M, Willi Y (2013) Weak impact of fine-scale landscape heterogeneity on
evolutionary potential in *Arabidopsis lyrata*. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **26**, 2331–
2340.

Peichel CL, Marques DA (2017) The genetic and molecular architecture of phenotypic diversity
in sticklebacks. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B,*
Biological sciences, **372**, 20150486–8.

Peterson BK, Weber JN, Kay EH, Fisher HS, Hoekstra HE (2012) Double digest RADseq: an
inexpensive method for de novo SNP discovery and genotyping in model and non-model
species. *PLoS ONE*, **7**, e37135.

Poulin R, Blanar CA, Thieltges DW, Marcogliese DJ (2011) The biogeography of parasitism in
sticklebacks: distance, habitat differences and the similarity in parasite occurrence and
abundance. *Ecography*, **34**, 540–551.

Price TD, Qvarnström A, Irwin DE (2003) The role of phenotypic plasticity in driving genetic
evolution. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B*, **270**, 1433–1440.

R Core Team (2015) R: A language and environment for statistical computing.

Rahbek C (2005) The role of spatial scale and the perception of large-scale species-richness
patterns. *Ecology Letters*, **8**, 224–239.

Ravinet M, Prodöhl PA, Harrod C (2013) Parallel and nonparallel ecological, morphological and
genetic divergence in lake–stream stickleback from a single catchment. *Journal of*
Evolutionary Biology, **26**, 186–204.

Reger, R.D. & Pinney, D.S. 1996. Late Wisconsin glaciation of the Cook Inlet region with
emphasis on Kenai lowland and implications for early peopling. In: *Adventures Through*
Time Readings in the Anthropology of Cook Inlet, Alaska (N. Y. Davis & W. E. Davis, eds),
pp. 15–35. Cook Inlet Historical Society, Anchorage.

Reimchen TE (1994) Predators and morphological evolution in threespine stickleback. In: *The*
Evolutionary Biology of the Threespine Stickleback (eds Bell M, Foster SA). Oxford
University Press, Oxford.
Reimchen TE, Stinson EM, Nelson JS (1985) Multivariate differentiation of parapatric and
allopatric populations of threespine stickleback in the Sangan River watershed, Queen
Charlotte Islands. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **63**, 2944–2951.
Reist JD (1986) An empirical evaluation of coefficients used in residual and allometric
adjustment of size covariation. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **64**, 1363–1368.
Reusch TBH, Wegner KM, Kalbe M (2001) Rapid genetic divergence in postglacial populations
of threespine stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*): the role of habitat type, drainage and
geographical proximity. *Molecular Ecology*, **10**, 2435–2445.
Richardson JL, Urban MC, Bolnick DI, Skelly DK (2014) Microgeographic adaptation and the
spatial scale of evolution. *Trends In Ecology & Evolution*, **29**, 165–176.
Roesti M, Hendry AP, Salzburger W, Berner D (2012) Genome divergence during evolutionary
diversification as revealed in replicate lake-stream stickleback population pairs. *Molecular*
Ecology, **21**, 2852–2862.
Roesti M, Kueng B, Moser D, Berner D (2015) The genomics of ecological vicariance in
threespine stickleback fish. *Nature Communications*, **6**, 8767.
Rohlf FJ (2006) tpsDig version 2.10.
Rolshausen G, Muttalib S, Kaeuffer R *et al.* (2015) When maladaptive gene flow does not
increase selection. *Evolution*, **69**, 2289–2302.
Saltz JB, Hessel FC, Kelly MW (2017) Trait correlations in the genomics era. *Trends In Ecology*
& Evolution, **32**, 279–290.
Schindelin J, Arganda-Carreras I, Frise E *et al.* (2012) Fiji: an open-source platform for
biological-image analysis. *Nature Methods*, **9**, 676–682.
Schloetterer C, Tobler R, Kofler R, Nolte V (2014) Sequencing pools of individuals-mining
genome-wide polymorphism data without big funding. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, **15**, 749–
763.
Schluter D (1996) Adaptive radiation along genetic lines of least resistance. *Evolution*, **50**, 1766–
1774.
Schluter D (2001) Ecology and the origin of species. *Trends In Ecology & Evolution*, **16**, 372–
380.
Schluter D (2009) Evidence for ecological speciation and its alternative. *Science*, **323**, 737–741.
Schluter D, McPhail JD (1992) Ecological character displacement and speciation in sticklebacks.
The American Naturalist, **140**, 85–108.
Schluter D, Marchinko KB, Barrett RDH, Rogers SM (2010) Natural selection and the genetics
of adaptation in threespine stickleback. *Philosophical Transactions Of The Royal Society B-*
Biological Sciences, **365**, 2479–2486.
Sharpe DMT, Räsänen K, Berner D, Hendry AP (2008) Genetic and environmental contributions
to the morphology of lake and stream stickleback: implications for gene flow and
reproductive isolation. *Evolutionary Ecology Research*, **10**, 849–866.
Slatkin M (1987) Gene flow and the geographic structure of natural populations. *Science*, **236**,
787–792.
Soininen J, McDonald R, Hillebrand H (2007) The distance decay of similarity in ecological
communities. *Ecography*, **30**, 3–12.
Stuart YE, Veen T, Weber JN *et al.* (2017) Contrasting effects of environment and genetics

847   generate a continuum of parallel evolution. *Nature ecology & evolution*, **1**, 158.
848   Schluter D, McPhail JD (1992) Ecological character displacement and speciation in sticklebacks.
849   *The American Naturalist*, **140**, 85–108.
850   Terekhanova NV, Logacheva MD, Penin AA *et al.* (2014) Fast evolution from precast bricks:
851   genomics of young freshwater populations of threespine stickleback *Gasterosteus aculeatus*.
852   *PLoS Genetics*, **10**, e1004696.
853   Thompson CE, Taylor EB, McPhail JD (1997) Parallel evolution of lake-stream pairs of
854   threespine sticklebacks (*Gasterosteus*) inferred from mitochondrial dna variation. *Evolution*,
855   **51**, 1955.
856   Thompson CJ, Ahmed NI, Veen T *et al.* (2017) Many-to-one form-to-function mapping weakens
857   parallel morphological evolution. *Evolution*, **71**, 2738–2749.
858   Volis S, Ormanbekova D, Yermekbayev K, Song M, Shulgina I (2015) Multi-approaches
859   analysis reveals local adaptation in the emmer wheat (*Triticum dicoccoides*) at macro- but
860   not micro-geographical scale. *PLoS ONE*, **10**, e0121153.
861   Walker JA (1997) Ecological morphology of lacustrine threespine stickleback *Gasterosteus*
862   *aculeatus* L. (Gasterosteidae) body shape. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, **61**, 3–
863   50.
864   Webb PW (1984) Body form, locomotion and foraging in aquatic vertebrates. *American*
865   *Zoologist*, **24**, 107–120.
866   Weber JN, Kalbe M, Shim KC *et al.* (2017) Resist globally, infect locally: a transcontinental test
867   of adaptation by stickleback and their tapeworm parasite. *American Naturalist*, **189**, 43–57.
868   Westram AM, Galindo J, Alm Rosenblad M *et al.* (2014) Do the same genes underlie parallel
869   phenotypic divergence in different *Littorina saxatilis* populations? *Molecular Ecology*, **23**,
870   4603–4616.
871   Wood SA, Russell R, Hanson D, Williams RJ, Dunne JA (2015) Effects of spatial scale of
872   sampling on food web structure. *Ecology and Evolution*, **5**, 3769–3782.
873   Wright S (1943) Isolation by Distance. *Genetics*, **28**, 114–138.
874   Wund MA, Baker JA, Clancy B, Golub JL, Foster SA (2008) A test of the "flexible stem" model
875   of evolution: ancestral plasticity, genetic accommodation, and morphological divergence in
876   the threespine stickleback radiation. *American Naturalist*, **172**, 449–462.
877   Wund MA, Valena S, Wood S, Baker JA (2012) Ancestral plasticity and allometry in threespine
878   stickleback fish reveal phenotypes associated with derived, freshwater ecotypes. *Biological*
879   *Journal of the Linnean Society*, **105**, 573–583.
880
881

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1. Within-scale mean and standard deviation in environmental variables. Results from Bartlett's tests of homogeneity of variances are presented with K-squared (K^2), degrees of freedom (df), and *P*-values (*P*-value). *P*-values < 0.05 are in bold.

	Mean		Standard deviation		Bartlett test		
	Regional	Global	Regional	Global	K^2	df	*P*-value
Lake area (m^2)	8.50^{e+05}	1.13^{e+08}	7.16^{e+05}	2.25^{e+08}	45.98	1	**<0.001**
Lake perimeter (m)	6.19^{e+03}	7.19^{e+04}	5.84^{e+03}	1.00^{e+05}	19.56	1	**<0.001**
Lake-stream elevation (m)	106.33	100.17	72.80	159.75	2.56	1	0.109
Lake depth (cm)	14.02	33.25	12.93	35.96	3.84	1	**0.004**
Stream depth (cm)	73.14	75.37	738.62	4438.49	3.25	1	0.070
Stream width (cm)	505.62	2016.57	122.96	2883.69	22.39	1	**<0.001**
Stream flow (cm/s)	3.72	131.60	5.16	130.22	23.06	1	**<0.001**

Table 2. Results from MANCOVAs on the multivariate traits (A) and ANCOVAs on single traits (B) at both regional and global scales. Effect sizes (Partial η^2) and their lower and upper 95% confidence limits (Lo.CI; Up.CI) of the habitat (Hab.) and habitat by pair interaction (Hab. x Pair) as well as their ratios (Ratio: Hab./Hab. x Pair) are reported.

(A) - MANCOVAs

	REGIONAL							GLOBAL						
	Hab.	Lo. CI	Up. CI	Hab.xPair	Lo. CI	Up. CI	*Ratio*	Hab.	Lo. CI	Up. CI	Hab.xPair	Lo. Ci	Up. CI	*Ratio*
Univariate	0.81	0.79	0.85	0.35	0.34	0.46	2.30	0.41	0.30	0.89	0.23	0.22	0.35	1.75
Gill rakers	0.45	0.41	0.65	0.09	0.06	0.19	5.04	0.03	0.18	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.11	0.95
Body shape	0.85	0.85	0.88	0.38	0.34	0.46	2.25	0.34	0.03	0.41	0.19	0.18	0.25	1.82

(B) - ANCOVAs

	REGIONAL							GLOBAL						
	Hab.	Lo. CI	Up. CI	Hab.xPair	Lo. CI	Up. CI	*Ratio*	Hab.	Lo. CI	Up. CI	Hab.xPair	Lo. Ci	Up. CI	*Ratio*
Body depth	0.48	0.39	0.72	0.02	0.02	0.11	21.20	0.02	0.01	0.21	0.03	0.02	0.18	0.54
Gill raker number	0.29	0.12	0.58	0.09	0.05	0.14	3.39	0.01	0.01	0.11	0.03	0.02	0.10	0.54
Mean gill raker length	0.03	0.02	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.34	0.22	0.00	0.00	0.29	0.04	0.04	0.14	0.03
Gill raker spacing	0.15	0.10	0.27	0.08	0.07	0.20	1.35	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.02	0.02	0.12	0.00

Figure Legends

Figure 1: Mean and standard error of score on PC1 of the 27 univariate measurements for regional (A) and global (B) lake-stream pairs. The direction of phenotypic divergence is consistent but the magnitude of phenotypic divergence varies.

Figure 2: Mean and standard error of body depth (A, B), number of gill rakers (C, D), mean gill raker length (E, F) and gill raker spacing (G, H) for regional (left panels) and global (right panels) lake-stream pairs.

Figure 3: Phenotypic parallel divergence is higher in regional versus global comparisons. (A) Effect size of the habitat-by-pair interaction term versus effect size of the habitat term for regional and global pairs. (B) Ratio of the habitat effect size to the habitat-by-pair interaction effect size for regional pairs (x-axis) versus global pairs (y-axis) for all traits examined. In (A) and (B) effect size measured as η^2 for single traits and partial η^2 for multivariate traits. In (A), traits found below the 1:1 line show more parallelism (large, consistent effect of habitat) than non-parallelism (large, but inconsistent effect of habitat). Traits above the line show the opposite pattern. In (B) traits found below the 1:1 line show greater parallelism in regional than in the global pairs.

Figure 4: Pairwise angles between phenotypic vectors (Panel A, θ_P), outlier genetic vectors (Panel B, $\theta_{OUTLIERS}$), as well as differences in vector length between phenotypic vectors (Panel C, ΔL_P) and outlier genetic vectors (Panel D, $\Delta L_{OUTLIERS}$) at regional (grey circles) and global (black triangles) scales. Overall mean values are represented by a straight line (±SE). Significance in mean differences is represented by two stars ($P < 0.01$) or one star ($P < 0.05$).

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4