Identifying the fitness consequences of sex in complex natural environments

Catherine A. Rushworth[1,2,3*], Yaniv Brandvain[3], Tom Mitchell-Olds[4]

1. Department of Evolution and Ecology, University of California, Storer Hall, One Shields Avenue Davis, CA 95616 USA

2. University and Jepson Herbaria, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720 USA

3. Department of Plant and Microbial Biology, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN 55108 USA (ybrandva@umn.edu)

4. Department of Biology and Center for Genomic and Computational Biology, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708 USA (tmo1@duke.edu)

* author for correspondence: catherine.rushworth@gmail.com

Running title: The fitness costs of sex in the wild
Keywords: evolution of sex, asexuality, apomixis, reciprocal transplant, *Boechera*, viability selection, herbivory

Statement of authorship: CR and TM-O designed study and collected data; TM-O contributed materials and infrastructure for data collection; CR, YB, and TM-O analyzed data; all authors contributed substantially to writing the manuscript.

Data accessibility: Upon acceptance of the manuscript, all original data and custom R scripts will be archived in Dryad.

<u>Abstract</u>

In the natural world, sex prevails, despite its costs. While much effort has been dedicated

to identifying the intrinsic costs of sex (e.g. the cost of males), few studies have identified

the ecological fitness consequences of sex and the relevant environmental context.

Furthermore, correlated traits that differ between sexuals and asexuals may alter these

costs, and biological traits may render irrelevant the typical costs of sex. Here we use a

large-scale transplant experiment of a North American wildflower to show that sex is

associated with reduced lifetime fitness, despite lower herbivory. We separate the effects

of sex from the associated trait of hybridity, finding that mortality is reduced in asexuals

regardless of parentage, and that herbivores target hybrid asexuals. Our results show that

the consequences of sex are shaped by complex natural environments, and suggest that

some costs of sex are due to correlated traits, rather than sex itself.

Introduction

Even after over a century of research, the predominance of sexual reproduction in nature remains a fundamental mystery in evolutionary biology. At first glance, asexuality appears a simpler method of reproduction, avoiding the metabolic and energetic costs of mate attraction and the inherent risks to sex. Yet asexual reproduction comes with costs, most of which are attributed to the absence of recombination (Lehtonen *et al.* 2012). Over long time scales, the lack of recombination inhibits the removal of deleterious alleles from their genomic background (Müller 1964) and the union of beneficial ones (Hill & Robertson 1966; Keightley & Otto 2006), ultimately resulting in a mutational load that impairs function and/or fitness (Rice 2002). These costs are substantial in the long term; asexual organisms occur only at the tips of eukaryotic phylogenetic trees (Rice 2002), suggesting they are an evolutionary dead end or "blind alley" (Darlington 1939).

Sex is also inherently costly. Much of the focus on the evolution and maintenance of sex has centered on the "twofold cost of sex," wherein sexual organisms produce half as many offspring as asexuals, due to their investment in male offspring (Maynard Smith 1978). However, additional intrinsic costs exist, including that of "genetic slippage," in which recombination reduces fitness via shuffling of beneficial loci (Lehtonen *et al.* 2012). Yet ultimately, through purging of the mutational load, and rapid unification of beneficial mutations into a single genome, sex and recombination likely facilitate adaptation (Felsenstein 1974).

Despite widespread attention to the intrinsic costs of sex and the genetic processes maintaining sex in natural populations, the broader evolutionary and ecological processes

that differ among sexual and asexual organisms have received far less attention. This is a

crucial gap in our knowledge, as the processes that govern sexual/asexual dynamics occur

in complex natural environments. Our best examples come from decades of research on

the freshwater snail *Potamopyrgus antipodes*, establishing trematode parasites as the

main selective agent maintaining sexual/asexual coexistence via frequency-dependent

selection (Lively 1987; Lively & Dybdahl 2000; Vergara *et al.* 2014). At shallow lake

depths, sexual reproduction predominates, while in deeper water, asexuality is

widespread (Jokela & Lively 1995). Trematodes target common asexual genotypes,

leading to repeated cycles of increasing frequency for rare genotypes (Jokela *et al.* 2009;

Koskella & Lively 2009). Taken together, this body of work shows that the abiotic and

biotic environment work in concert to shape complex sexual/asexual dynamics in the

natural world.

Critically, both ecology and its interactions with a system's biological features

provide the context necessary to pinpoint the real-life costs and benefits of sex (Neiman

et al. 2018). For example, knowledge of the asexual formation process, and the

environments supporting formation and maintenance of asexuality, may identify

additional costs or benefits. These costs, such as that of meiotic function or mate choice

(inbreeding, outbreeding, and hybridization) are seldom discussed, but may be crucially

important to understanding sex/asex dynamics in natural populations (Meirmans *et al.*

2012). Indeed, the ecological costs of sex have rarely been identified in the wild, and the

majority of evidence comes from studies of *Potamopyrgus* (Neiman *et al.* 2018).

A further complication in our understanding of the evolution of sex is the strong

association between asexuality and other traits. Two examples are hybridization and

polyploidy, which differ intrinsically between numerous closely related sexual and

asexual systems. For example, populations of asexual whiptail lizards in the deserts of the

southwestern United States are polyploids, resulting from hybridization between sexual

species (Case 1990; Lutes *et al.* 2010). Equivalent trait associations are observed in

nearly all asexual plant systems (Asker & Jerling 1992). Indeed, by necessity, costs of

sex studies generally ignore these intrinsic differences (Gibson *et al.* 2017). But to

understand the evolutionary consequences of sex, we must account for the biological

differences between reproductive systems that contribute to the cost of sex.

The mustard genus *Boechera* offers an ideal system in which polyploidy and

hybridization may be accounted for. Apomixis (asexual reproduction via seed) is

widespread in the genus (Böcher 1951; Roy & Rieseberg 1989; Roy 1995; Sharbel &

Mitchell-Olds 2001; Schranz *et al.* 2005; Schranz *et al.* 2006; Kantama *et al.* 2007).

Asexuals may be polyploid or diploid, enabling separate assessment of the effects of

polyploidy and asexuality (Sharbel & Mitchell-Olds 2001; Schranz *et al.* 2005; Kantama

et al. 2007; Beck *et al.* 2012; Mau *et al.* 2015). Further, asexuality is associated with

outcrossing events, whether interspecific or intraspecific (Li *et al.* 2017; Rushworth *et al.*

2018). This enables comparison of selection on hybrid asexuals separately from non-

hybrid asexuals. Finally, we note that because sexual lineages are highly self-fertilizing,

heterozygosity differs between sexuals and asexuals. To our knowledge, this trait is

inseparable from reproductive system. Nonetheless, this system enables direct assessment

of the impacts of reproduction on fitness while accounting for two key confounding

factors, offering an extraordinary opportunity to examine the evolution of sex.

Here we address a critical gap in the evolution of sex literature, using a large-

scale reciprocal transplant experiment in intact native habitat to identify the fitness

components underlying the costs of sex. We examine female lifetime fitness and insect

herbivory of several thousand sexual and asexual plants, finding strong over-winter

viability selection against sexual lineages. This difference in over-winter survival results

in elevated lifetime fitness for asexual lineages, even though asexuals experience

significantly more herbivory than sexuals. Importantly, the negative impacts of herbivory

appear in later life stages, reducing the probability of survival to a second year of life in a

manner consistent with a cost of hybridization. Our study offers unprecedented

understanding of population-level sexual/asexual dynamics in a flowering plant,

identifying the fitness components that underlie both the costs and benefits of sex in the

natural environment.

Materials and Methods

Study system

Boechera retrofracta (Brassicaceae) is a herbaceous short-lived perennial native to

western North America. Its range spans a wide elevational gradient from 300-3300m and

environments ranging from desert to sagebrush steppe to high elevation mesic and alpine

meadows (Al-Shehbaz & Windham 2010). Recently segregated from four other members

of the *Boechera holboellii* complex (Windham & Al-Shehbaz 2006), *B. retrofracta* is

often confused with closely related species, but distinguished by its stalked, 2-8 rayed

trichomes and steeply recurved pedicels. Multiple species of the genus *Boechera* have

proven to be highly self-fertilizing (Hamilton & Mitchell-Olds 1994; Roy 1995; Song *et*

al. 2006). *B. retrofracta*'s high level of microsatellite homozygosity (mean

homozygosity=0.94, Rushworth *et al.* 2018) as well as its minute flowers that self-

pollinate prior to anthesis (C. Rushworth, pers. obs.) are likewise consistent with self-

fertilization. Nonetheless, *B. retrofracta* has formed hybrids with at least 12 different

species across its range (Al-Shehbaz & Windham 2010). Asexuality is tightly associated

with outcrossing and hybridization in the genus (Schranz *et al.* 2005; Schranz *et al.* 2006;

Kantama *et al.* 2007; Beck *et al.* 2012; Rushworth *et al.* 2018). In this group, apomixis is

pseudogamous, requiring fertilization of the endosperm, but not the embryo. Because

sexuals are highly selfing and asexuals must produce viable pollen, many of the

traditional costs of sex are minimized in this system, allowing investigation of broader

ecological and biological factors maintaining sex.

Sampling and growth methods

From a collection of 1027 individuals from 129 populations, we selected 53 unique

diploid genotypes that reproduce sexually (N=24) and asexually (N=29) for use in a

multi-site reciprocal transplant experiment (see Table S1 in Supporting Information). The

majority of asexual genotypes resulted from interspecific hybridization events (between-

species outcrossing, N=18; "hybrid asexuals"), while the rest were the product of within-

species outcrossing events (N=11; "non-hybrid asexuals"). Species and parental species

of asexuals were determined based on microsatellite analysis and morphological

examination (Rushworth *et al.* 2018) using the *Boechera* Microsatellite Website (Li *et al.*

2017). One sexual genotype that was determined not to be *B. retrofracta* was removed

from further analyses; all asexual genotypes but one ("A5") involved *B. retrofracta* as a

parental species. Other parental species represented were *Boechera sparsiflora*, *Boechera*

exilis, *Boechera pendulocarpa*, *Boechera stricta*, and *Boechera puberula*. Selected

genotypes located within 10km of existing experimental garden sites, so that

experimental selection pressures approximated those of the native environment for each

genotype. In two cases, genotypes occurred >10km away from the focal population, but

were chosen based on similarity of other environmental characteristics.

To minimize maternal effects, genotypes were grown for one generation in the

greenhouse prior to the experiment. Seeds were germinated on wet filter paper in petri

dishes and transplanted as seedlings onto a blend of Fafard 4P Mix and MetroMix 200

(Sun Gro Horticulture, Agawam, MA, USA) in Ray Leach Cone-tainers (Steuwe and

Sons, Tangent, OR, USA). Plants were grown in the Duke University Greenhouses, then

shipped as rosettes for transplanting at six weeks of age. Transplantation into replicated,

randomized blocks occurred in fall for data collection the following growing season,

allowing synchronization of flowering time with the native vegetation.

Transplant experiment

Subsets of the 53 genotypes were planted in two cohorts in the fall of subsequent years

(2012 and 2013). Data was collected for two growth seasons for each planting year, for a

total of three years of data collection. Planting year 1 consisted of 2000 individuals

representing 19 asexual and 22 sexual genotypes, planted at five different experimental

garden sites (ALD, 47.791, -114.253, 1993m elevation; CAP, 45.007, -114.026, 1835m;

CUM, 45.306, -113.889, 1187m; MIL, 44.337, -113.355, 2257m; and SIL 44.901, -

114.397, 1807m; 400 plants/site). In year 2, 2080 individuals representing 18 asexual and

21 sexual lineages were transplanted at the same sites as 2012 (520 plants/site; Figure S1).

The SIL site was excluded from the second planting cohort because its dense vegetation

and close proximity to water are not typical *B. retrofracta* habitat (Al-Shehbaz &

Windham 2010). Survival was scored the following spring, and for a second spring.

Plants that survived over winter were measured for the following traits: plant width,

height, rosette number, fruiting stalk number, flower number, and fruit number. Two sites

were removed prior to analyses due to low reproduction: MIL in year 1 (N=34

reproducing plants), and CUM in year 2 (N=2 reproducing plants). Leaf damage was

quantified visually by trained observers as in Prasad et al. (2012), which has been shown

to be a highly accurate assessment of herbivory (Johnson *et al.* 2016). Herbivory was not

observed at the CUM site, and it was removed from herbivory analyses. Prior to fruit

dehiscence, 1 – 4 fruits were collected from 2 – 3 replicates of each genotype within each

garden. Seeds were counted from each fruit and averaged across replicates for an estimate

of average seed set per genotype per garden. This average was then rounded to the

nearest integer to allow us to appropriately model seed set with a negative binomial

model distribution (see below). Fecundity was estimated as individual fruit number

multiplied by average seed set for that genotype in that garden, representing maximum

seed number for an individual.

Pollen viability study

To assess differences in pollen viability between sexuals and asexuals, we grew 51

unique genotypes (25 sexual, 26 asexual) in a single growth chamber at the Duke

University Phytotron. We collected developing buds, targeting mature buds that have not

yet undergone anthesis (stage 12, Smyth *et al.* 1990) from $1 - 3$ individuals per genotype

(N=112 individual plants). Where more than one replicate was harvested, pollen

viabilities were averaged. Pollen was stained using a simplified protocol that

differentiates viable from inviable grains (Peterson *et al.* 2010). For each individual, 100

pollen grains were randomly counted from a microscopy slide visualized on a Leica

MZ7.5 Stereozoom dissecting microscope and imaged using a Canon EOS Rebel T3i

digital camera.

Statistical analysis

Our primary aim was to evaluate the association between Reproductive System

(*RS*, a factor which can take the value of sexual or asexual), and group (*group*, a factor

which can take the value of sexual, hybrid asexual, or non-hybrid asexual) with fitness

components over time and space.

All analyses were performed using R version 3.5.1 (R Core Team 2016). Outliers

were visually identified using an adjusted boxplot analysis suitable for far-right skewed

data (Hubert & Vandervieren 2008), in the R package robustbase (Maechler *et al.* 2019).

To analyze fitness data, we used generalized linear mixed models (GLMMs) in the R

package glmmTMB (Brooks *et al.* 2017). Model diagnostics were conducted using the

package DHARMa (Hartig 2019) and marginal means were estimated using the

command "ggemmeans" in the package ggeffects (Lüdecke 2018). Lifetime fitness was

estimated using a zero-inflated negative binomial distribution with the canonical link

functions, where structural zeros represent plants that did not survive the winter and the

conditional portion of the model represents fecundity of plants that survived. Separate

fecundity and survival models were also run, using the following error distributions:

survival (binomial), fecundity (negative binomial). The model used was:

233                    $y = RS + garden + RS*garden + year + RS*year$

where y indicates either a fitness component, lifetime fitness, or herbivory. Two random

effects were included in all models: block nested in site and genotype nested in RS. The

same structure was used to model both the zero-inflation and conditional portions of the

zero-inflated negative binomial model for lifetime fitness. In all estimable field models,

we found that a random effect of genotype nested in reproductive system, crossed with

garden, accounted for essentially no variance; it was subsequently removed from our

analyses. A scaled covariate for width at planting was included in survival models, while

a scaled covariate of plant height was added to all herbivory models. Significance testing

for fitness analyses was conducted via likelihood ratio tests (Bolker *et al.* 2009) with

Holm corrections (Holm 1979) applied to *P*-values.

245   Leaf damage in the field was log-transformed and analyzed using a linear mixed

246   model (LMM) in the R package lme4 (Bates *et al.* 2014). Significance testing was

247   conducted using F tests with Kenward-Roger approximation of denominator degrees of

248   freedom (Kenward & Roger 1997) using the R package pbkrtest (Halekoh & Højsgaard

249   2014).

250   We next wished to test for differences in fitness between hybrid asexual

genotypes, non-hybrid asexual genotypes, and sexual genotypes. We ran the same set of

models as above, replacing the *RS* term with the *group* term representing these three

categories.

To understand the relationship between herbivory and fitness, and how this

relationship differs between groups, two additional GLMMs were estimated with log

herbivory and its interaction with group and garden as predictors. Each model examined a

fitness component: fecundity and survival to a second year, both of which are conditional

upon both survival to year 1 and non-zero herbivory. The model specified was:

fitness = Group + garden + year + Group*garden + Group*year + herbivory +

Group*herbivory + garden*herbivory

Results

Asexuals have higher lifetime fitness due to survival advantage

Asexuals have higher fitness: Lifetime fitness, the product of survival and reproduction,

was higher for asexuals than sexuals. The main effect of RS was significant (χ^2=11.90,

df=2, *P*=7.82e-03), as were the interactions between RS and year (χ^2=34.74, df=2,

P=1.72e-07) and *RS* and garden (χ^2=23.45, df=8, *P*=0.016; Table S2). To disentangle the

effects of hybridization and sex, we analyzed the same data with the group term. This

model similarly shows that the main effect of group was significant (χ^2=13.33, df=4,

P=0.039), as were the interactions between group and year (χ^2=36.87, df=4, *P*=1.53e-06)

and group and garden (χ^2=66.70, df=16, *P*=3.00e-07; Table 1, Table S2, Appendix S1).

Estimated lifetime fitness for each group varies across year and site, with higher lifetime

fitness most often observed for hybrid asexuals (Figure 1). Estimating marginal means

for a zero-inflated model without accounting for interactions is not recommended, and

thus we do not predict overall lifetime fitness for each group. However, raw data show

higher overall fitness in hybrid asexuals, although years vary slightly (Year 1 means:

sexual, 211.54; hybrid asexual, 289.40; non-hybrid asexual, 299.93; Year 2 means:

sexual, 76.29; hybrid asexual, 181.57; non-hybrid asexual, 145.55; Figure S2).

Asexuals, particularly hybrids, have higher survival: Our next question was whether

fitness disparities are attributable to differences in survival or fecundity. The zero-

inflation portion of a zero-inflated negative binomial GLMM addresses structural zeros,

or the probability of not surviving to reproduce. Over-winter survival was significantly

elevated in asexual genotypes compared to sexuals. In year 1, 81% of asexuals survived

to censusing, while 64.3% of sexuals survived. In year 2, 56.5% of asexuals survived,

compared with only 23.8% of sexuals.

The survival difference between reproductive systems was significant (χ^2=11.82,

df=1, *P*=2.35e-03; Table S3A). Survival also varied significantly across year (χ^2=9.16,

df=1, *P*=0.03; Table S3A), and garden site (χ^2=46.73, df=4, *P*=6.92e-09; Table S3A).

The interaction between year and RS was significant, although in both years asexuals had

higher survival (χ^2=22.88, df=1, *P*=8.60e-06; Table S3A). The interaction between *RS*

and garden was also significant (χ^2=16.23, df=4, *P*=0.016). Similar results were seen in a

separate model of survival (Table S4A). Here, plant size also had a significant impact on

survival, with larger plants surviving more often (χ^2=54.20, df=1, *P*=3.62e-13; Table

S4A).

Over-winter survival was strongly affected by group (χ^2=12.22, df=2, P=0.01;

Table 1, Table S3B), with both groups of asexuals surviving better than sexuals. The

effects of group differed both temporally (group × year interaction, χ^2=23.56, df=2,

P=5.36e-05) and spatially (group × site interaction, χ^2=42.82, df=8, P=6.66e-06; Figure

1B, Table 1, Table S3B, Appendix S1). Significance results were likewise reflected in the

separate model of survival, where group, group × garden, and group × year significantly

predicted mortality (group: χ^2=28.99, df=2, P=3.56e-06; group × garden: χ^2=23.54, df=8,

P=0.01; group × year: χ^2=9.40, df=2, P=0.027; Table S4B, Appendix S1). Hybrid

asexuals were larger than other groups at planting; rosette size, included as a covariate,

predicts survival (χ^2=53.79, df=1, P=3.62e-13; Table S4B). Both groups of asexuals had

higher survival in both cohorts (Figure 2A). Across garden sites, hybrid asexuals had

higher predicted survival than sexuals, while non-hybrid asexual survival was more

variable (Figure 2B, Appendix S1). In three of five sites (ALD, CAP, and MIL), survival

was roughly equivalent in both asexual groups. In the remaining two sites (CUM and

SIL), survival was similarly low for sexuals and non-hybrid asexuals.

Fecundity does not differ by group or RS: In the greenhouse, we found no difference in

pollen viability between sexuals and asexuals (pooled t-test, t=0.599 on 49 df, P=0.55),

which suggests that any intrinsic difference in seed set is due either to maternal

investment or to pollen quantity.

We next examined the conditional portion of the zero-inflated negative binomial

GLMM, which analyzes fecundity (seed set conditional on survival). In total, 995

individuals set seed (597 asexuals and 398 sexuals); removing nine outliers left a dataset

of 986 individuals. We saw no main effect of RS, showing that seed set does not differ

intrinsically between sexuals and asexuals. However, interaction terms were significant.

Asexual fecundity was higher than sexual in year 1, and sexual fecundity was higher in

year 2 (RS × year interaction: χ^2=11.86, df=1, P=1.72e-03; Table S3A). The conditional

group model produced similar results: although the main effect of group was not

significant, the influence of group on fecundity varied by year (χ^2=13.32, df=2, P=5.13e-

03; Table 1, Table S3B, Appendix S1). In both years, non-hybrid asexual fecundity was

lowest; in year 1, hybrid fecundity was highest, while sexual fecundity was highest in

year 2 (Figure 1C). The influence of group on fecundity also varied by garden (χ^2=23.70,

df=8, P=0.01; Table 1, Table S3B, Appendix S1). Across gardens, hybrid asexual

fecundity was highest of the three groups in two sites: CAP and MIL (Figure 1D). At SIL

and CUM, sexual fecundity was highest or among the highest groups, respectively. At

ALD, sexual and non-hybrid asexual fecundity were higher than non-hybrid asexual

(Figure 1D). Substantial environmental affects on seed set were visible in the significant

main effect of garden for both models (RS: χ^2=139.46, df=4, P=4.05e-28; group: χ^2=

138.92, df=4, P=4.80e-28; Table S3). Similar results were found in the independent

models of fecundity (Table S5).

Together, these results show that asexuals, whether derived from hybridization or

outcrossing events, have higher over-winter survival compared to sexuals, although this

advantage varies spatially and temporally. This early life fitness advantage is due either

to asexuality or to a trait shared by numerous asexual lineages.

Herbivores target hybrid asexuals more than other groups

33% of the experiment (1379 of 4080 planted individuals) experienced leaf herbivory.

The removal of 29 high-herbivory outliers resulted in a dataset of 1350 individuals (809

asexuals, 541 sexuals). Asexual herbivory was higher than sexual, with an average of

5.45%±0.002se leaf area damaged per asexual individual (estimated marginal mean

2.14%±0.048se, 95%CI 1.72 – 2.66%). By comparison, mean sexual leaf damage across

both experimental years was 3.16%±0.002se (estimated marginal mean 1.23%±0.05se,

95%CI 0.98 – 1.55%). This difference is statistically significant (F=22.55, df=1, 48.29,

P=9.33e-05; Table 2A, Figure 3, Appendix S1). Herbivory was also spatially variable

(garden term: F=6.40, df=3, 62.99, P=1.50e-03; Table 2A, Figure S3, Appendix S1),

consistent with spatial variation in herbivore communities. To account for a link between

plant size and herbivore attraction, a covariate of maximum plant height was included in

both the RS and group models. This term was significant in both models (RS: F=7.52,

df=1, 1318.25, P=0.019; group: F=6.96, df=1, 1320.42, P=0.019).

Group had a significant effect on herbivory (F=18.08, df=2, 42.39, P=1.26e-05;

Table 2B), with both hybrid and non-hybrid asexuals experiencing higher leaf herbivory

than sexuals (Figure 3, Appendix S1). Importantly, lifetime fitness was highest in

asexuals despite increased herbivory (Figures 1 and 2).

Herbivory negatively impacts survival to subsequent years

What are the effects of herbivory on fitness, and do these effects differ between sexuals

and asexuals? We next predicted two separate fitness components, fecundity and survival

to a second year, using models incorporating a main effect of log-transformed herbivory,

and its interaction with both group and garden.

We note that >90% of fitness occurred in the first year of life for this experiment.

In both years, more asexuals than sexuals survived to a second year. In experimental year

1, only 8.15% of plants survived for a second year (N=163: 108 asexuals, 55 sexuals).

Similarly, 5.9% of plants in year 2 survived for a second year (N=123: 104 asexuals, 19

sexuals). Just over 1% of plants reproduced in their second year (Year 1: 1.4%, N=28: 24

asexuals, 4 sexuals; Year 2: 1.3%, N=26: 25 asexuals, 1 sexual). Nevertheless, survival to

subsequent years could substantially increase lifetime fitness.

In temperate montane environments, herbivory and seed set co-occur during the

short growing season; we thus expected herbivory to directly reduce seed set. However,

the effect of herbivory on fecundity was non-significant (χ^2=0.28, df=1, P=0.598; Table

S6, Figure S4, Appendix S1). In contrast, herbivory had a significant negative impact on

survival to the second year (χ^2=21.26, df=1, P=8.02e-06), as did group (χ^2=32.88, df=2,

P=5.79e-07; Table S7, Appendix S1), with more hybrid asexuals than non-hybrids or

sexuals surviving to a second year (Year 1: 82 hybrid asexuals, 17 non-hybrid asexuals,

41 sexuals; Year 2: 75 hybrid asexuals, 28 non-hybrid asexuals, 17 sexuals). In all three

groups, herbivory and probability of survival were negatively correlated (Figure 4,

Appendix S1). Although the interaction between group and herbivory was non-significant,

the negative relationship was strongest in hybrid asexuals (Figure 4), consistent with the

possibility of a limiting role for herbivory in hybrid asexual fitness.

<u>Discussion</u>

Despite extensive theoretical work on the evolution of sex, few researchers have

examined its ecology: identifying ecologically-relevant traits associated with sex, and the

selective processes acting in natural environments. Such efforts could elucidate the

phenotypes, and ultimately the precise mechanisms, underlying the cost of sex in wild

populations, a fundamental question in evolutionary biology. Here we present the results

of what is, to our knowledge, the first large-scale, multi-site transplant experiment

assessing lifetime fitness of sexual and asexual plants in their native habitat. We find that

strong viability selection against sex results in higher lifetime fitness for asexual lineages.

Insect herbivory is higher in asexuals, and negatively impacts survival to a second year of

life. We further disentangle the influence of a key correlated trait, hybridization, on these

patterns, showing that hybrid and non-hybrid asexuals differ in multiple selection

components. This work suggests a dynamic relationship between reproductive system,

hybridity, and the complex natural environment, which collectively shape patterns of

reproductive variation in the wild.

Intrinsic costs and benefits of sex have limited applicability

Although this study does not definitively pinpoint the mechanisms underlying the

cost of sex, it does suggest—and rule out—several possibilities. *Boechera* avoids many

of the traditional costs of sex via the production of hermaphroditic flowers, including the

time and metabolic investment in finding mates, the risk of infection, and the production

of separate males. Hermaphroditic systems could exhibit unique costs of sex, such as

reducing costly investment in the quantity or quality of male gamete production

(Meirmans *et al.* 2012). Indeed, relaxed selection on asexual male function is predicted to

result in the production of fewer, or fewer functional, male gametes (Whitton *et al.* 2008).

However, selection to maintain male function may not differ when asexuals require

endosperm fertilization to trigger parthenogenesis, as in this system. Despite reports of

reduced pollen viability in previous studies of apomictic *Boechera* (Schranz *et al.* 2006),

we saw no difference in pollen viability between sexual and asexual lineages. It is

important to note that fecundity is highly environmentally dependent, and pollen viability

may vary in field conditions. Nonetheless, our results are consistent with no cost of sex

via differences in male functionality.

Genetic slippage is also less relevant in a self-fertilizing system.

Recombination may disrupt beneficial allelic combinations, negatively impacting the

fitness of sexual organisms. However, self-fertilization obviates the cost of genetic

slippage by rapid assembly and fixation of locally adaptive combinations, accelerating

adaptation to the immediate environment (Glémin & Ronfort 2012; Hartfield *et al.* 2017).

Additionally, although recombination occurs in selfers, high homozygosity leads to fewer

novel genetic combinations, limiting the opportunities for functional disruption (Hartfield

et al. 2017).

The exposure of deleterious recessive alleles may underlie the cost of sex in *Boechera*

Despite the limited relevance of the costs of sex that are laid out in the literature,

we find a pattern of reduced sexual fitness, consistent with a short-term cost of sex.

Following several lines of evidence, we hypothesize that the observed increase in sexual

mortality is due to inbreeding depression rather than a cost of sex. However, we note that

our study does not definitively rule out a benefit of asexuality itself, and additional work

is needed.

First, there are stark differences in homozygosity between selfing sexuals and

asexuals. In this system, as in many other sexual/asexual systems, transitions to

asexuality co-occur with intra- or interspecific outcrossing, resulting in highly

heterozygous asexuals (Beck *et al.* 2012; Lovell *et al.* 2013; Li *et al.* 2017; Rushworth *et*

al. 2018). Through drift, genetic load of many slightly deleterious alleles may fix in

selfing populations, although purging of highly deleterious alleles in selfers has been both

predicted (Barrett & Charlesworth 1991; Wang *et al.* 1999) and shown empirically

(Arunkumar *et al.* 2015; Roessler *et al.* 2019).

Second, we find over-winter survival of asexuals is higher than sexuals,

regardless of hybridity (Figure 2A). In other systems such as inbred maize, the masking

of numerous mildly deleterious alleles via heterosis has profound effects on quantitative

traits such as fitness (Springer & Stupar 2007; Yang *et al.* 2017). It is reasonable to

expect fitness in *Boechera* populations may increase with masking of deleterious alleles

through outcrossing, although further work is needed.

Third, inbreeding depression is predicted to vary spatially and temporally

(Armbruster & Reed 2005; Cheptou & Donohue 2010), and the fitness effects of mildly

deleterious alleles will vary across environments. Consistent with this prediction, we find

that the intensity of viability selection varies spatially and temporally, although its

direction is consistent across years and gardens (Figure 2, Table 1, Table S4). Inbreeding

depression is predicted to increase in stressful environments (Cheptou & Donohue 2010),

and multiple studies have confirmed this prediction, although the pattern is not universal

(Armbruster & Reed 2005; Fox & Reed 2011). Previously, we showed that asexuality

was associated with anthropogenic disturbance (Rushworth *et al.* 2018), as shown in

other asexual systems (Glesener & Tilman 1978). Unfortunately, each of our garden sites

is relatively disturbed, and it is possible that the uniformly low sexual survival that we

observe, if underlain by inbreeding depression, is caused by the stress of disturbance.

Were we to include more diverse sites, we may observe a different pattern.

Hybridization influences biotic selection on asexuality

Hybridization is strongly linked with asexuality in numerous systems (Vrijenhoek

1978; Kearney 2005; Lutes *et al.* 2010; Gutekunst *et al.* 2018), but to our knowledge, has

previously been impossible to tease apart from asexuality. We find that hybrid asexuals

experience greater herbivory than both sexuals and non-hybrid asexuals (Table 2B,

Figure 3), showing that interspecific hybridization alters insect herbivore feeding patterns.

An ample body of research shows the profound impacts of hybridization on plant defense

and herbivore preference (Strauss 1994; Fritz 1999; Whitham *et al.* 1999; Orians 2000),

and our results support this pattern. In contrast, viability selection favors both inter- and

intraspecific asexuals, implicating shared causative traits such as heterozygosity or

asexuality itself (Figure 2A). As a pair, these results suggest that, although survival of

adverse abiotic conditions may result from either asexuality itself or associated

heterozygosity, hybridization plays a singular role in the interaction between asexuality

and the biotic environment.

Substantial research has shown that the effects of herbivory on fitness are direct

and negative. Indeed, this is the case in *Boechera stricta* (Prasad *et al.* 2012), where

fitness and herbivory are negatively correlated. Insect herbivory can impact multiple

fitness components, ranging from biomass to photosynthetic capability to root growth

(Marquis 1992). Here we see that, although herbivory has little effect on seed set, it is

negatively correlated with survival to a second year of life (Figure 4). This phenomenon

is not limited to plants; one recent study of Soay sheep showed that fecundity and

parasite load collectively reduce overwinter survival (Leivesley *et al.* 2019). If the

consequences of herbivory manifest at later life stages, they may not be readily apparent

within the normal scope of a short field experiment. Indeed, we find that the relationship

between second-year survival and herbivory is strongest in hybrid asexuals, suggesting

that hybridization may limit the spread of asexuality via herbivory. However, more

hybrids survive to a second year of life overall. Further work, including long term

experiments and herbivore exposure manipulations, are needed to understand the

interplay between fitness and herbivory in this system.

Few field studies examine the role of complex environments in the evolution of

sex, despite the multiplicity of selective forces in nature, their vital role in the evolution

of sex (Neiman *et al.* 2018), and a clear need for more field-based evolution of sex

studies (Agrawal 2006, 2009). Here we show a clear role for both abiotic and biotic

factors in the maintenance of sex in nature. Extensive research in freshwater snails has

revealed the importance of biotic interactions in shaping sexual/asexual dynamics, where

sterilizing parasites target common asexual genotypes in lower depths of a freshwater

lake. Indeed, a recent set of mesocosm experiments representing natural parasite loads

corroborates a two-fold cost of sex when asexuals are rare (Gibson *et al.* 2017). In sharp

contrast to our rich understanding of snails, few researchers have experimentally assessed

fitness of sexual and asexual plants in their native habitat. A series of studies examining

vernal sweet grass, *Anthoxanthum odoratum*, highlighted the importance of genetic

variation (and thus sexual reproduction) for fitness (Antonovics & Ellstrand 1984;

Ellstrand & Antonovics 1985; Schmitt & Antonovics 1986a; Schmitt & Antonovics

1986b). In a later study examining fitness of sexually and asexually-produced propagules,

sexual progeny were found to have a nearly 1.5-fold fitness advantage (Kelley *et al.*

1988). Importantly, further work showed that asexual tillers were more frequently

targeted by a common virus, as were common sexual genotypes, highlighting the

importance of both abiotic and biotic factors in the evolution of sex (Kelley 1994). These

few studies provide much of our understanding of the benefits and detriments of sex in

natural plant populations.

The coexistence of sexual and asexual reproduction in *Boechera*

If herbivory does not limit the spread of asexuality in plant populations, what

does? Ecological differentiation between sexuals and asexuals limits competitive

interactions, and can render irrelevant the need for a balance between costs of sex and

asex. Numerous plant and animal systems show sexual/asexual ecological differentiation,

and sexual and asexual *Boechera* are also ecologically differentiated (Rushworth *et al.*

2018). Despite this differentiation, roughly one-third of documented populations

comprise both sexual and asexual lineages, suggesting limiting costs are relevant in this

group. Importantly, differentiation occurs repeatedly along the same environmental

variables (disturbance, precipitation and temperature seasonality, and slope), offering

avenues for manipulative experiments in the future (Rushworth *et al.* 2018).

Our study suggests that herbivory could potentially limit the spread of asexuality.

First, herbivory may have negative consequences that we failed to observe within the

scope of the work presented here. This relationship may be elucidated by inclusion of

additional sites or years, more individuals or lineages, or measurement of additional

fitness traits. Additionally, the strength of the negative correlation between herbivory and

fitness is highly dependent on numerous factors, including the resources available in a

given environment, which will limit both fitness and herbivory; the timing of herbivory

events; or the abundance and identity of the insect community (Zangerl & Bazzaz 1992).

Each of these factors vary strongly with the environment, and may result in different

experimental outcomes.

Fitness loss due to herbivory may not be the only cost of asexuality in this system.

Previous research has shown that mutations accumulate more rapidly in asexual lineages

of *Boechera* (Lovell *et al.* 2017), which could ultimately reduce both function and fitness.

Alternatively, the costs of asexuality in this system may be due to outcrossing itself

(Meirmans *et al.* 2012), which may introduce maladaptive alleles to locally adapted

populations (Kirkpatrick & Barton 1997; Lenormand 2002). The fitness consequences of

such alleles may covary with genetic distance of the parents, with some optimal distance

between relieving inbreeding depression and avoiding outbreeding depression (e.g. Willi

et al. 2005; Wei & Zhang 2018). Although evidence for an optimal mating distance

between parents is scant (Edmands 2007), it is clear that interspecific matings may result

in lower fitness for multiple reasons. Additionally, the formation of asexual lineages via

outcrossing may itself be difficult due to rarity of outcrossing, crossing barriers, or

developmentally complex transitions to asexuality.

Here we've shown that natural selection and environmental variation act upon

asexual lineages representing different parental backgrounds to shape sexual/asexual

dynamics. We see that the impacts of sex and hybridization on fitness in the natural

environment are separable and unique, and that selection in early life is consistent with a

short-term cost of sex that may be underlain by inbreeding depression. Despite strong

pressure from biotic agents of selection, the tolerance response of both asexuals and

sexuals shows a complex role for herbivory in sexual/asexual coexistence. Future work is

needed to characterize linkage between phenotypes relevant to growth and defense, and

the effects of hybridization and heterozygosity on their expression. This study offers

strong evidence that ecological variation and natural selection drive the evolution of sex

in the wild, and highlights the importance of field-based studies to address this central

question in evolutionary biology.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Sailee Clemens, Rose Keith, Cheng-Ruei Lee, Marshall

McMunn, Tim Park, Katie Putney, Evan Raskin, Kara Stiff, Chris Strock, Maggie

Wagner, and Ash Zemenick for their crucial help with field work. We also thank Julius

Mojica for his statistical expertise and Rob Colautti for his help with both statistics and in

the field, and John Willis, Mohamed Noor, Mark Rausher, and Michael Windham for

guidance. We are especially grateful to Diana Mao for her help quantifying seed set and

pollen viability. This work was supported by funding from the National Science

Foundation (Graduate Research Fellowship to CAR and DEB-1311269 to CAR and TM-

O) and the National Institutes for Health (R01 GM086496 to TM-O).

    Figures and Tables

Table 1. **Reproductive system (sexual vs. asexual) and hybridity predict lifetime**

fitness via spatially- and temporally-variable selection. Results for the main effect of

group and the interactions between group and garden and group and year for zero-inflated

negative binomial GLMMs of lifetime fitness. Left, the zero-inflation portion models

structural zeros or plants that did not survive to reproduce. Center, the conditional portion

models seed set in plants that survived (fecundity). Right, significance estimates for the

overall model, incorporating both portions. Group indicates sexuals, "sex" vs. asexual

hybrids, "hyb" vs. asexual non-hybrids, the reference category. Estimates come from

conditional models, while test statistics (χ^2 deviance, degrees of freedom, and P values)

come from likelihood ratio tests for each overall effect. Full results from each separate

model are in Tables S3, S4, and S5.

			Zero-inflation				Conditional				Overall model		
term	condition	df	estimate	se	χ^2	P	estimate	se	χ^2	P	df	χ^2	P
Group	sex	2	0.339	0.468	12.22	**0.01**	-0.329	0.254	1.12	0.57	4	13.33	**0.039**
	hyb		-0.528	0.487			-0.357	0.250					
Group*Garden	sex*CAP	8	0.129	0.342			0.048	0.221			16		
	hyb*CAP		0.977	0.349			0.485	0.208					
	sex*CUM		-0.596	0.495			0.377	0.319					
	hyb*CUM		0.376	0.517	42.82	**6.66e-06**	0.682	0.322	23.70	**0.01**		66.70	**3.00e-07**
	sex*MIL		-0.278	0.394			0.052	0.233					
	hyb*MIL		1.063	0.402			0.435	0.228					
	sex*SIL		-1.167	0.661			1.843	0.481					
	hyb*SIL		-1.746	0.663			1.895	0.463					
Group*Year	sex*2	2	1.103	0.378	23.56	**5.36e-05**	0.594	0.194	13.32	**5.16e-03**	4	36.87	**1.53e-06**
	hyb*2		-0.402	0.407			0.071	0.193					

Table 2. **Herbivory varies by reproductive system, hybridity, and garden.** (A) Model

results for reproductive system ("RS", sexual vs. asexual) LMM and (B) group (sexual,

"sex" vs. asexual hybrid, "hyb" vs. asexual non-hybrid, the reference category) LMM.

Significant *P*-values are in bold. Estimates apply to the conditional models, while test

statistics (*F* statistics, degrees of freedom, and *P* values) come from significance tests for

each overall effect.

A.

term	condition	estimate	se	df	*F*	*P*
	intercept	-1.633	0.071	-	-	-
RS	sexual	-0.299	0.079	1, 48.29	22.55	**9.33-05**
Garden	CAP	-0.002	0.074	3, 62.99	6.40	**1.50e-03**
	MIL	0.340	0.095			
	SIL	-0.002	0.103			
RS*Garden	sexual*CAP	0.049	0.080	3, 1280.95	1.74	0.372
	sexual*MIL	0.059	0.115			
	sexual*SIL	0.234	0.105			
Year	2	-0.045	0.076	1, 67.59	0.38	1
RS*Year	sexual*2	-0.013	0.084	1, 1175.63	0.02	0.876
Plant height	-	0.045	0.016	1, 1318.25	7.52	**0.019**

615   B.

term	condition	estimate	se	df	*F*	*P*
	intercept	-1.719	0.095	-	-	-
Group	sex	-0.210	0.010	2, 42.39	18.08	**1.26e-05**
	hyb	0.141	0.102			
Garden	CAP	-0.035	0.098	3, 62.98	6.37	**1.49e-03**
	MIL	0.332	0.122			
	SIL	0.239	0.149			
Group*Garden	CAP*sex	0.083	0.102	6, 1273.93	1.99	0.065
	CAP*hybrid	0.060	0.102			
	MIL*sex	0.067	0.139			
	MIL*hybrid	0.016	0.132			
	SIL*sex	-0.005	0.150			
	SIL*hybrid	-0.324	0.152			
Year	2	-0.087	0.099	1, 66.98	0.30	1
Group*Year	sex*2	0.023	0.105	2, 1056.46	0.45	0.77
	hybrid*2	0.092	0.105			
Plant height	-	0.042	0.016	1, 1320.42	6.96	**0.019**

Figure 1. Predicted lifetime fitness of asexuals is higher than that of sexuals.

Estimated marginal means for lifetime fitness, including both survival and seed set, by

group across experimental years (Year 1, top row; Year 2, bottom row) and gardens (left

to right). Lifetime fitness is composed of survival and fecundity: sexual fecundity is not

sufficiently high to overcome temporally- and spatially-variable viability selection

favoring both groups of asexuals. Note that SIL was not planted in year 2, but predicted

fitness from the model is shown. Lifetime fitness is shown on a log scale. Bars show 95%

confidence intervals.

Figure 2. **Predicted survival is highest for asexuals, while temporally-variable**

fecundity selection favors asexuals in year 1 and sexuals in year 2. Estimated

marginal means for survival (A and B) and fecundity (C and D) show substantial

temporal variation (A and C, group by year interaction) and spatial variation (B and D,

group by garden interaction). (A) Survival is reduced in sexuals in both experimental

years. (B) In all sites, hybrid asexuals have higher over-winter survival than sexuals; non-

hybrid asexual survival is variable. (C) Fecundity varies temporally, with higher hybrid

asexual fecundity in year 1 and higher sexual fecundity in year 2. (D) In contrast to

survival, sexual fecundity (shown on log scale) is higher than asexual in some garden

sites. Bars show 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 3. **Herbivory is elevated in hybrid asexuals.** Estimated marginal means for

herbivory from LMMs show the main effects of group (sexual vs. non-hybrid asexual vs.

hybrid asexual, left) and reproductive system (sexual vs. asexual, right). Bars show 95%

confidence intervals.

Figure 4. **Herbivory is lower in plants that survive to a second year of life.** Herbivory

has a significant impact on survival to a second year ($P = 8.02\text{e-}06$), suggesting that the

detrimental consequences of herbivory may not be observed in a single growing season.

Although the correlation between year 2 survival and herbivory differs qualitatively by

group (sexual vs. non-hybrid asexual vs. hybrid asexual), the interaction is not significant

(Table S7). Estimated marginal means are shown averaged across five different values of

log herbivory. To convey the relative contribution of each level of herbivory to total year

2 survival, data point size is proportional to the number of plants in each group that

experienced this level of herbivory. Points are jittered for ease of reading. Bars show 95%

confidence intervals.

References

1. Agrawal, A.F. (2006). Evolution of sex: Why do organisms shuffle their genotypes?
Current Biology, 16, R696-R704.
2. Agrawal, A.F. (2009). Spatial heterogeneity and the evolution of sex in diploids.
American Naturalist, 174 Suppl 1, S54-70.
3. Al-Shehbaz, I.A. & Windham, M.D. (2010). *Boechera*. In: *Flora of North America*
North of Mexico (ed. Flora of North America Editorial Committee) New York and
Oxford, pp. 348-412.
4. Antonovics, J. & Ellstrand, N. (1984). Experimental studies of the evolutionary
significance of sexual reproduction. 1. A test of the frequency-dependent selection
hypothesis. *Evolution*, 38, 103-115.
5. Armbruster, P. & Reed, D.H. (2005). Inbreeding depression in benign and stressful
environments. *Heredity*, 95, 235-242.
6. Arunkumar, R., Ness, R.W., Wright, S.I. & Barrett, S. (2015). The evolution of selfing
is accompanied by reduced efficacy of selection and purging of deleterious
mutations. *Genetics*.
7. Asker, S.E. & Jerling, L. (1992). *Apomixis in Plants*. CRC Press, Inc., Boca Raton,
Florida, USA.
8. Barrett, S. & Charlesworth, D. (1991). Effects of a change in the level of inbreeding on
the genetic load. *Nature*, 352, 522-524.
9. Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B. & Walker, S. (2014). lme4: Linear mixed-effects
models using Eigen and S4.
10. Beck, J.B., Alexander, P.J., Allphin, L., Al-Shehbaz, I.A., Rushworth, C., Bailey, C.D.
et al. (2012). Does hybridization drive the transition to asexuality in diploid
Boechera? *Evolution*, 66, 985-995.
11. Böcher, T. (1951). Cytological and embryological studies in the amphi-apomictic
Arabis holboellii complex. *Kongel. Danske Vidensk.-Selskab. Biol. Skr.*, 6, 1-59.
12. Bolker, B.M., Brooks, M.E., Clark, C.J., Geange, S.W., Poulsen, J.R., Stevens,
M.H.H. *et al.* (2009). Generalized linear mixed models: a practical guide for
ecology and evolution. *Trends In Ecology & Evolution*, 24, 127-135.
13. Brooks, M.E., Kristensen, K., van Benthem, K.J., Magnusson, A., Berg, C.W.,
Nielsen, A. *et al.* (2017). glmmTMB Balances Speed and Flexibility Among
Packages for Zero-Inflated Generalized Linear Mixed Modeling. *The R Journal*, 9,
378-400.
14. Case, T. (1990). Patterns of coexistence in sexual and asexual species of
Cnemidophorus lizards. *Oecologia*, 83, 220-227.
15. Cheptou, P.-O. & Donohue, K. (2010). Environment-dependent inbreeding
depression: its ecological and evolutionary significance. *New Phytologist*, 189,
395-407.
16. Darlington, C.D. (1939). *The evolution of genetic systems*. Cambridge University
Press, Cambridge, UK.
17. Edmands, S. (2007). Between a rock and a hard place: evaluating the relative risks of
inbreeding and outbreeding for conservation management. *Molecular Ecology*, 16,
463-475.

18. Ellstrand, N. & Antonovics, J. (1985). Experimental studies of the evolutionary
significance of sexual reproduction. II. A test of the density-dependent selection
hypothesis. *Evolution*, 39, 657-666.
19. Felsenstein, J. (1974). Evolutionary advantage of recombination. *Genetics*, 78, 737-
756.
20. Fox, C.W. & Reed, D.H. (2011). Inbreeding depression increases with environmental
stress: an experimental study and meta-analysis. *Evolution*, 65, 246-258.
21. Fritz, R.S. (1999). Resistance of hybrid plants to herbivores: Genes, environment, or
both? *Ecology*, 80, 382-391.
22. Gibson, A.K., Delph, L.F. & Lively, C.M. (2017). The two-fold cost of sex:
Experimental evidence from a natural system. *Evolution Letters*, 1, 6-15.
23. Glémin, S. & Ronfort, J. (2012). Adaptation and maladaptation in selfing and
outcrossing species: new mutations versus standing variation. *Evolution*, 67, 225-
240.
24. Glesener, R. & Tilman, D. (1978). Sexuality and the components of environmental
uncertainty: clues from geographic parthenogenesis in terrestrial animals.
American Naturalist, 659-673.
25. Gutekunst, J., Andriantsoa, R., Falckenhayn, C., Hanna, K., Stein, W., Rasamy, J. *et*
al. (2018). Clonal genome evolution and rapid invasive spread of the marbled
crayfish. *Nature Ecology and Evolution*, 2, 567-573.
26. Halekoh, U. & Højsgaard, S. (2014). A Kenward-Roger Approximation and
Parametric Boostrap Methods for Tests in Linear Mixed Models - the R package
pbkrtest. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 59, 1-30.
27. Hamilton, M. & Mitchell-Olds, T. (1994). The mating system and relative
performance of selfed and outcrossed progeny in *Arabis fecunda* (Brassicaceae).
American Journal of Botany, 81, 1252-1256.
28. Hartfield, M., Bataillon, T. & Glémin, S. (2017). The Evolutionary Interplay between
Adaptation and Self-Fertilization. *Trends in Genetics*, 33, 420-431.
29. Hartig, F. (2019). DHARMa: Residual Diagnostics for Hierarchical (Multi-
Level/Mixed) Regression Models.
30. Hill, W. & Robertson, A. (1966). Effect of linkage on limits to artificial selection.
Genetical Research, 8, 269-294.
31. Holm, S. (1979). A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure.
Scandinavian Journal of Statistics, 6, 65-70.
32. Hubert, M. & Vandervieren, E. (2008). An adjusted boxplot for skewed distributions.
Computational Statistics and Data Analysis, 52, 5186-5201.
33. Johnson, M.T.J., Bertrand, J.A. & Turcotte, M.M. (2016). Precision and accuracy in
quantifying herbivory. *Ecological Entomology*, 41, 112-121.
34. Jokela, J., Dybdahl, M. & Lively, C.M. (2009). The maintenance of sex, clonal
dynamics, and host-parasite coevolution in a mixed population of sexual and
asexual snails. *American Naturalist*, 174, S43-S53.
35. Jokela, J. & Lively, C.M. (1995). Spatial variation in infection by digenetic
trematodes in a population of freshwater snails (*Potamopyrgus antipodarum*).
Oecologia, 103, 509-517.
36. Kantama, L., Sharbel, T.F., Schranz, M.E., Mitchell-Olds, T., de Vries, S. & de Jong,
H. (2007). Diploid apomicts of the *Boechera holboellii* complex display large-

scale chromosome substitutions and aberrant chromosomes. *Proceedings Of The*
National Academy Of Sciences, USA, 104, 14026-14031.
37. Kearney, M. (2005). Hybridization, glaciation and geographical parthenogenesis.
Trends In Ecology & Evolution, 20, 495-502.
38. Keightley, P.D. & Otto, S.P. (2006). Interference among deleterious mutations
favours sex and recombination in finite populations. *Nature*, 443, 89-92.
39. Kelley, S., Antonovics, J. & Schmitt, J. (1988). A test of the short-term advantage of
sexual reproduction. *Nature*, 331, 714-716.
40. Kelley, S.E. (1994). Viral pathogens and the advantage of sex in the perennial grass
Anthoxanthum odoratum. *Philosophical Transactions Of The Royal Society B-*
Biological Sciences, 346, 295-302.
41. Kenward, M. & Roger, J. (1997). Small sample inference for fixed effects from
restricted maximum likelihood. *Biometrics*, 53, 983-997.
42. Kirkpatrick, M. & Barton, N.H. (1997). Evolution of a Species' Range. *The American*
Naturalist, 150, 1-23.
43. Koskella, B. & Lively, C.M. (2009). Evidence for negative frequency-dependent
selection during experimental coevolution of a freshwater snail and a sterilizing
trematode. *Evolution*, 63, 2213-2221.
44. Lehtonen, J., Jennions, M.D. & Kokko, H. (2012). The many costs of sex. *Trends In*
Ecology & Evolution, 27, 172-178.
45. Leivesley, J.A., Bussière, L.F., Pemberton, J.M., Pilkington, J.G., Wilson, K. &
Hayward, A.D. (2019). Survival costs of reproduction are mediated by parasite
infection in wild Soay sheep. *Ecology Letters*, 22, 1203-1213.
46. Lenormand, T. (2002). Gene flow and the limits to natural selection. *Trends In*
Ecology & Evolution, 17, 183-189.
47. Li, F.-W., Rushworth, C.A., Beck, J.B. & Windham, M.D. (2017). Boechera
Microsatellite Website: an online portal for species identification and
determination of hybrid parentage. *Database*, 1, baw169.
48. Lively, C.M. (1987). Evidence from a New Zealand snail for the maintenance of sex
by parasitism. *Nature*, 328, 519-521.
49. Lively, C.M. & Dybdahl, M.F. (2000). Parasite adaptation to locally common host
genotypes. *Nature*, 405, 679-681.
50. Lovell, J.T., Aliyu, O.M., Mau, M., Schranz, M.E., Koch, M., Kiefer, C. *et al.* (2013).
On the origin and evolution of apomixis in *Boechera*. *Plant Reproduction*, 26,
309-315.
51. Lovell, J.T., Williamson, R.J., Wright, S.I., McKay, J.K. & Sharbel, T.F. (2017).
Mutation accumulation in an asexual relative of *Arabidopsis*. *PLoS Genetics*, 13,
e1006550.
52. Lüdecke, D. (2018). ggeffects: Tidy Data Frames of Marginal Effects from
Regression Models. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 3, 772.
53. Lutes, A.A., Neaves, W.B., Baumann, D.P., Wiegraebe, W. & Baumann, P. (2010).
Sister chromosome pairing maintains heterozygosity in parthenogenetic lizards.
Nature, 464, 283-286.
54. Maechler, M., Rousseeuw, P., Croux, C., Todorov, V., Ruckstuhl, A., Salibian-
Barrera, M. *et al.* (2019). robustbase: Basic Robust Statistics.

55. Marquis, R.J. (1992). Selective Impact of Herbivores. In: *Plant Resistance to*
Herbivores and Pathogens: Ecology, Evolution, and Genetics (eds. Fritz, RS &
Simms, EL). The University of Chicago Press Chicago and London, pp. 301-325.
56. Mau, M., Lovell, J.T., Corral, J.M., Kiefer, C., Koch, M.A., Aliyu, O.M. *et al.* (2015).
Hybrid apomicts trapped in the ecological niches of their sexual ancestors.
Proceedings of The National Academy of Sciences, USA, 112, E2357-2365.
57. Maynard Smith, J. (1978). *The Evolution of Sex*. Cambridge University Press,
Cambridge, UK.
58. Meirmans, S., Meirmans, P.G. & Kirkendall, L.R. (2012). The Costs of Sex: Facing
Real-world Complexities. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 87, 19-40.
59. Müller, H.J. (1964). The relation of recombination to mutational advance. *Mutation*
Research, 1, 2-9.
60. Neiman, M., Meirmans, P.G., Schwander, T. & Meirmans, S. (2018). Sex in the wild:
How and why field-based studies contribute to solving the problem of sex.
Evolution, 72, 1194-1203.
61. Orians, C. (2000). The Effects of Hybridization in Plants on Secondary Chemistry:
Implications for the Ecology and Evolution of Plant-Herbivore Interactions.
American Journal of Botany, 87, 1749-1756.
62. Peterson, R., Slovin, J.P. & Chen, C. (2010). A simplified method for differential
staining of aborted and non-aborted pollen grains. *International Journal of Plant*
Biology, 1, 1-5.
63. Prasad, K.V.S.K., Song, B.-H., Olson-Manning, C., Anderson, J.T., Lee, C.-R.,
Schranz, M.E. *et al.* (2012). A Gain-of-Function Polymorphism Controlling
Complex Traits and Fitness in Nature. *Science*, 337, 1081-1084.
64. R Core Team (2016). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
Foundation for Statistical Computing Vienna, Austria.
65. Rice, W.R. (2002). Evolution of sex: Experimental tests of the adaptive significance
of sexual recombination. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 3, 241-251.
66. Roessler, K., Muyle, A., Diez, C.M., Gaut, G.R.J., Bousios, A., Stitzer, M.C. *et al.*
(2019). The Genomics of Selfing in Maize (*Zea mays* ssp. *mays*): Catching
Purging in the Act. *bioRxiv*.
67. Roy, B. (1995). The Breeding Systems of Six Species of *Arabis* (Brassicaceae).
American Journal of Botany, 82, 869-877.
68. Roy, B. & Rieseberg, L. (1989). Evidence for apomixis in *Arabis*. *Journal of*
Heredity, 80, 506-508.
69. Rushworth, C.A., Windham, M.D., Keith, R.A. & Mitchell-Olds, T. (2018).
Ecological differentiation facilitates fine-scale coexistence of sexual and asexual
Boechera. *American Journal Of Botany*, 105, 1-14.
70. Schmitt, J. & Antonovics, J. (1986a). Experimental studies of the evolutionary
significance of sexual reproduction. III. Maternal and paternal effects during
seedling establishment. *Evolution*, 40, 817-829.
71. Schmitt, J. & Antonovics, J. (1986b). Experimental studies of the evolutionary
significance of sexual reproduction. IV. Effect of neighbor relatedness and aphid
infestation on seedling performance. *Evolution*, 40, 830-836.

72. Schranz, M., Dobes, C., Koch, M. & Mitchell-Olds, T. (2005). Sexual reproduction,
hybridization, apomixis, and polyploidization in the genus *Boechera*
(Brassicaceae). *American Journal Of Botany*, 92, 1797-1810.
73. Schranz, M.E., Kantama, L., de Jong, H. & Mitchell-Olds, T. (2006). Asexual
reproduction in a close relative of Arabidopsis: a genetic investigation of
apomixis in *Boechera* (Brassicaceae). *New Phytologist*, 171, 425-438.
74. Sharbel, T. & Mitchell-Olds, T. (2001). Recurrent polyploid origins and chloroplast
phylogeography in the *Arabis holboellii* complex (Brassicaceae). *Heredity*, 87,
59-68.
75. Smyth, D.R., Bowman, J.L. & Meyerowitz, E.M. (1990). Early flower development
in Arabidopsis. *The Plant cell*, 2, 755-767.
76. Song, B., Clauss, M., Pepper, A. & Mitchell-Olds, T. (2006). Geographic patterns of
microsatellite variation in *Boechera stricta*, a close relative of Arabidopsis.
Molecular Ecology, 15, 357-369.
77. Springer, N.M. & Stupar, R.M. (2007). Allelic variation and heterosis in maize: How
do two halves make more than a whole? *Genome Research*, 17, 264-275.
78. Strauss, S.Y. (1994). Levels of herbivory and parasitism in host hybrid zones. *Trends*
In Ecology & Evolution, 9, 209-214.
79. Vergara, D., Jokela, J. & Lively, C.M. (2014). Infection Dynamics in Coexisting
Sexual and Asexual Host Populations: Support for the Red Queen Hypothesis.
The American Naturalist, 184, S22-S30.
80. Vrijenhoek, R. (1978). Coexistence of clones in a heterogeneous environment.
Science, 199, 549-552.
81. Wang, J., Hill, W.G., Charlesworth, D. & Charlesworth, B. (1999). Dynamics of
inbreeding depression due to deleterious mutations in small populations: mutation
parameters and inbreeding rate. *Genetics Research*, 74, 165-178.
82. Wei, X. & Zhang, J. (2018). The optimal mating distance resulting from heterosis and
genetic incompatibility. *Science Advances*, 4, eaau5518.
83. Whitham, T.G., Martinsen, G.D., Floate, K.D., Dungey, H.S., Potts, B.M. & Keim, P.
(1999). Plant hybrid zones affect biodiversity: Tools for a genetic-based
understanding of community structure. *Ecology*, 80, 416-428.
84. Whitton, J., Sears, C.J., Baack, E.J. & Otto, S.P. (2008). The dynamic nature of
apomixis in the angiosperms. *International Journal Of Plant Sciences*, 169, 169-
182.
85. Willi, Y., Van Buskirk, J. & Fischer, M. (2005). A Threefold Genetic Allee Effect:
Population Size Affects Cross-Compatibility, Inbreeding Depression and Drift
Load in the Self-Incompatible *Ranunculus reptans*. *Genetics*, 169, 2255-2265.
86. Windham, M.D. & Al-Shehbaz, I.A. (2006). New and Noteworthy Species of
Boechera (Brassicaceae) I: Sexual Diploids. *Harvard Papers In Botany*, 1-28.
87. Yang, J., Mezmouk, S., Baumgarten, A., Buckler, E.S., Guill, K.E., McMullen, M.D.
et al. (2017). Incomplete dominance of deleterious alleles contributes
substantially to trait variation and heterosis in maize. *PLoS Genetics*, 13,
e1007019.
88. Zangerl, A. & Bazzaz, F. (1992). Theory and Pattern in Plant Defense Allocation. In:
Plant Resistance to Herbivores and Pathogens: Ecology, Evolution, and Genetics

(eds. Fritz, RS & Simms, EL). The University of Chicago Press Chicago and
London, pp. 363-391.
898