

Ecological consequences of intraspecific variation in coevolutionary systems

Athmanathan Senthilnathan^{1,*}

Sergey Gavrilets^{1,2,3,4}

1. Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology,
2. Department of Mathematics,
3. National Institute for Mathematical and Biological Synthesis,
4. Center for the Dynamics of Social Complexity, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996, USA.

* Corresponding author; e-mail: asenthil@vols.utk.edu.

Keywords: Coevolution, coexistence, eco-evolutionary dynamics, trait matching, quantitative traits, model, intraspecific variation.

Abstract

The patterns and outcomes of coevolution are expected to depend on intraspecific trait variation. Various evolutionary factors can change this variation in time. As a result, modeling coevolutionary processes solely in terms of mean trait values may not be sufficient; one may need to study the dynamics of the whole trait distribution. Here, we develop a theoretical framework for studying the effects of evolving intraspecific variation in two-species coevolutionary systems. In particular, we build and study mathematical models of competition, exploiter-victim interactions, and mutualism in which the strength of within- and between-species interactions depends on the difference in continuously varying traits. We use analytical approximations based on the invasion analysis and supplement it with a numerical method. We find that intraspecific variation can be maintained if stabilizing selection is weak in at least one species. When intraspecific variation is maintained, stable coexistence is promoted by small ranges of interspecific interaction in two-species competition and mutualism, and large ranges in exploiter-victim interactions. We show that trait distributions can become multimodal. Our approach and results contribute to the understanding of the ecological consequences of intraspecific variation in coevolutionary systems by exploring its effects on population densities and trait distributions.

Introduction

18 Coevolution, that is, reciprocal evolutionary changes in ecologically interacting species, is a major
research area where ecology and evolution come together (Futuyma and Slatkin, 1983; Nuismer,
2017; Thompson, 1994). Although coevolution is difficult to demonstrate in natural systems
21 (Janzen, 1980; Nuismer *et al.*, 2010), its importance in nature is well established (Brouat *et al.*,
2001; Clayton *et al.*, 1999; Davies and Brooke, 1988; Soler *et al.*, 2001; Toju and Sota, 2006). Co-
evolution explains a number of evolutionary phenomena including character displacement in
24 competing species, evolutionary arms race between exploiters and victims, and trait correlation
between mutualist partners (Anderson and Johnson, 2008; Benkman *et al.*, 2003; Pfennig and
Pfennig, 2009). The geographic mosaic theory of coevolution (GMTC) further highlights the
27 relevance of coevolution by incorporating spatial variation in natural selection and strength of
ecological interactions (Thompson, 2005). Through GMTC, coevolution can explain patterns of
clinal variation, local adaptation, and stability of mutualisms in the presence of costs (Gavrilets
30 and Michalakis, 2008; Gómez *et al.*, 2009; Gomulkiewicz *et al.*, 2000; Nuismer *et al.*, 2000).

Coevolution is not only a very important process but is also complex due to the intricate
relationship between evolutionary and ecological processes. Because of its complexity, there is
33 a strong need for a mathematical theory capturing this relationship. Correspondingly, various
population genetics, quantitative genetics, and adaptive dynamics models and methods have
been used to study eco-evolutionary dynamics in specific two-species systems: competition (Kre-
36 mer and Klausmeier, 2017; Leimar *et al.*, 2013; Roughgarden, 1976; Slatkin, 1980; Taper and Case,
1992), mutualism (Akçay, 2016; Ferrière *et al.*, 2002, 2007; Foster and Kokko, 2006), and exploiter-
victim interactions (Abrams, 2000; Doebeli, 1997; Fleischer *et al.*, 2018; Gavrilets, 1997; Gavrilets
39 and Michalakis, 2008; Nuismer *et al.*, 2005; Schreiber *et al.*, 2016). Doebeli and Dieckmann (2000);
Kopp and Gavrilets (2006); Yoder and Nuismer (2010) modeled all three types of two-species in-
teractions within the same framework. For example, using a weak selection approximation and
42 numerical simulations, Kopp and Gavrilets (2006) studied the dynamics of allele frequencies,

means, and variances of a trait controlled by several diploid diallelic loci. Yoder and Nuismer (2010) modeled how trait variation in a metapopulation changes due to coevolution using a quantitative genetics approach and an individual-based model. Doebeli and Dieckmann (2000) used the adaptive dynamics approach to study phenotypic diversification due to ecological interactions. They also verified the analytic predictions using individual-based models. These and other similar mathematical models explicated the effects of the eco-evolutionary feedback in coevolution.

Both biological intuition and mathematical models tell us that the time-scales, patterns, and outcomes of coevolution should depend on within-species genetic and phenotypic variation. (Albert *et al.*, 2011; Bolnick *et al.*, 2011; Violle *et al.*, 2012). Genetic and phenotypic variation affects not only evolutionary but also ecological forces and factors including population dynamics, interaction strengths, and community composition (Allen *et al.*, 2018; Austin and Dunlap, 2019; Des Roches *et al.*, 2017; Frankham, 1996; Hausch *et al.*, 2018; Lloyd-Smith *et al.*, 2005; Start, 2019; Start and Gilbert, 2019; Vellend, 2006). These forces can change in time as the level of genetic variation in natural populations is not constant but can change on a much faster ecological time scale (Buckling and Rainey, 2002; Nijhawan *et al.*, 2019; Summers *et al.*, 2003). In particular, man-made events have lead to drastic changes in genetic variation (Jacquemyn *et al.*, 2009; Keller and Lurgi, 2003; Mitrovski *et al.*, 2008; Smith *et al.*, 1991). Intraspecific variation is also expected to change as a result of coevolutionary processes. Character displacement, the divergence of mean phenotypes of two species in sympatry (Brown and Wilson, 1956; Dayan and Simberloff, 2005; Schuller and McPhail, 1992), is a well-studied example of temporal changes in phenotypes which decreases interspecific competition between the two species. Alternately, interspecific competition can be decreased by phenotypic diversification of one of the species (Abrams and Matsuda, 1994; Dieckmann and Doebeli, 1999; Winkelmann *et al.*, 2014). Overall, the importance of intraspecific variation in eco-evolutionary dynamics is well established. Thus, the description of the coevolutionary processes solely in terms of mean trait values may not be sufficient - one also needs to consider variances and higher-order moments of trait distribution.

Evolutionary theory has long been concerned with the problem of the maintenance of genetic variation (Barton, 1986; Clarke, 1979; Gavrillets, 2004; Gavrillets and Hastings, 1994b; Lande, 1975; 72 Walsh and Lynch, 2018). There is now a rich variety of models explaining the maintenance of genetic variation by mutation-selection balance, frequency-dependent selection, spatial heterogeneity, *etc.* There is a number of theoretical tools for modeling coevolution of mean trait values. 75 However significantly less efforts have focused on the dynamics of variances. In an early study of the dynamics of genetic variation, Bulmer (1971) used the infinitesimal model which assumes that a quantitative trait is controlled by infinitely many loci with infinitely small effects. In his 78 model, selection builds linkage disequilibrium which changes genetic variation. Using a population genetics model with major loci, Gavrillets and Hastings (1994a, 1995) studied the dynamics of genetic variation under stabilizing selection. Finally, the adaptive dynamics approach has 81 been used to study emergence of genetic polymorphism as a result of evolutionary branching (Dieckmann and Doebeli, 1999; Dieckmann, 2004; Geritz *et al.*, 1998; Zu and Wang, 2013). All these methods have to deal with a trade-off between mathematical complexity and biological 84 realism; each of these methods has its own advantages but also shortcomings. For example, Bulmer (1971) and Gavrillets and Hastings (1994a, 1995) ignored population densities, and the assumptions underlying the adaptive dynamics methods prevent one from exploring the changes 87 in genetic variation in detail (Geritz *et al.*, 1998; Waxman and Gavrillets, 2005).

Here we develop an alternative framework for studying the effects of phenotypic variation in coevolution. Our framework is based on earlier single-species theoretical studies capturing 90 both population densities and genetic variation. We apply our approach to three different types of two-species ecological interactions: (i) competition, (ii) exploiter-victim, and (iii) mutualism. For the cases of competition and exploiter-victim interactions, we study the conditions for coex- 93 istence, equilibrium trait distributions, and the relationship between the strength of interaction and phenotypic variance. In the case of mutualism, we study the conditions for equilibrium coexistence. Our framework relates stabilizing natural selection, trait-based interactions between 96 coevolving species, phenotypic distributions, and population densities to understand the ecolog-

ical consequences of intraspecific variation in two-species coevolutionary systems.

Modeling framework

99 To introduce our approach, we start with the standard logistic model for the dynamics of the population size $N(t)$ in time:

$$\frac{dN(t)}{dt} = rN(t) \left(1 - \frac{N(t)}{K} \right), \quad (1)$$

102 where r is the population growth rate at low densities and K is the carrying capacity. Here, the population size always approaches K asymptotically. This model implicitly assumes that all individuals are identical (Kot, 2001).

105 Roughgarden (1972) and Doebeli and Ispolatov (2010) extended this model for the case of heritable intraspecific trait variation. Following their method, we assume that individuals differ with respect to a single continuous trait x . Then the population density $\phi(x, t)$ of trait x at time t changes according to equation

$$\frac{\partial \phi(x, t)}{\partial t} = r\phi(x, t) \left(1 - \frac{\int C(x, y)\phi(y, t)dy}{K(x)} \right). \quad (2)$$

108 Here r is the growth rate at low densities (assumed to be independent of x), competition kernel $C(x, y)$ measures the effect of competition with individuals with trait y , and function $K(x)$ is the “carrying capacity” for individuals with trait value x . The total population size is given by the integral $N(t) = \int \phi(y, t)dy$. Equation (2) implies that individuals reproduce asexually.

114 It is standard and mathematically convenient to use Gaussian functions $C(x, y) = \exp[-(x - y)^2/2\sigma_c^2]$ and $K(x) = K_0 \exp(-x^2/2\sigma_s^2)$. The former function implies that competition decreases with increasing the difference in trait values. The latter function assumes that carrying capacity decreases with deviation from the optimum trait value (which is set to zero without the loss of generality). Parameter σ_c of the competition kernel measures a characteristic *range of competitive interference*: with small σ_c , competition mostly happens between very similar organisms. Parameter σ_s of the carrying capacity measures a characteristic *range of optimal trait values*: with small

σ_s , stabilizing selection is strong and only individuals with trait values close to the optimum can
120 have high carrying capacity.

In this model, depending on parameter values the population evolves to one of two possible
equilibrium states (Doebeli and Ispolatov, 2010). Specifically, if stabilizing selection is relatively
123 strong, i.e. the range of optimal trait values is smaller than the range of competitive interference
($\sigma_s \leq \sigma_c$), the population becomes monomorphic with the optimum trait ($\bar{x} = 0$) and the total
equilibrium population density $N^* = K_0$. This outcome is similar to that in the standard logistic
126 model. However, if stabilizing selection is relatively weak (i.e., if $\sigma_s > \sigma_c$), then the equilibrium
distribution is Gaussian with the mean at the optimum ($\bar{x} = 0$) and a positive variance $v = \sigma_s^2 - \sigma_c^2$
which increases with decreasing σ_c . That is, if competition between dissimilar individuals is
129 weak, variation can be maintained. The corresponding total equilibrium population density is
 $N^* = \frac{\sigma_s}{\sigma_c} K_0$ which is always larger than the total population density K_0 at the monomorphic state.
That is, maintaining genetic variation leads to larger population densities. Figure (1) illustrates
132 these results.

Below we will generalize this approach for three different two-species models which we will
study using analytical approximations and numerical solutions (see the Supplementary Informa-
135 tion for details on our numerical method).




Figure 1: Equilibrium trait distributions in the single-species model. With stronger stabilizing selection ($\sigma_c^2 \geq \sigma_s^2$), the population becomes monomorphic at the optimum trait value $x = 0$ (orange curve). With stronger competition ($\sigma_c^2 < \sigma_s^2$), the equilibrium trait distribution is Gaussian with a positive variance $v = \sigma_s^2 - \sigma_c^2$ (blue curve).

Two-species competition

The standard Lotka-Volterra competition model describes the dynamics of two competing species

138 with densities N_1 and N_2 :

$$\frac{dN_1}{dt} = r_1 N_1 \left(1 - \frac{N_1 + \alpha_{12} N_2}{K_1} \right), \quad (3a)$$

$$\frac{dN_2}{dt} = r_2 N_2 \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_{21} N_1 + N_2}{K_2} \right). \quad (3b)$$

Here, for species i ($i = 1, 2$), r_i is the growth rate at low densities, K_i is the carrying capacity in the
 141 absence of the competing species, and parameters α_{12} and α_{21} represent the strength of between-
 species competition relative to that within species. In this model, the necessary and sufficient
 condition for coexistence is that within-species competition is stronger than between species
 144 competition for both species: $\alpha_{12} K_2 / K_1 < 1$ and $\alpha_{21} K_1 / K_2 < 1$. If the condition is satisfied in one
 species (say $\alpha_{12} K_2 / K_1 < 1$) and not satisfied in the other species (so that $\alpha_{21} K_1 / K_2 \geq 1$) then the
 first species survives and the second species goes extinct. We then say that the first species 1 is
 147 a stronger competitor and species 2 is a weaker competitor. If $\alpha_{12} K_2 / K_1 \geq 1$ and $\alpha_{21} K_1 / K_2 \geq 1$,
 then one species survives and the other becomes extinct based on initial conditions.

We extend the Lotka-Volterra competition model to individuals differing in continuous traits
 150 x in the first species and y in the second species by adapting the single species approach described
 above:

$$\frac{\partial \phi_1(x, t)}{\partial t} = r_1 \phi_1(x, t) \left(1 - \frac{\int C_{11}(x, z) \phi_1(z, t) dz + \alpha_{12} \int C_{12}(x, z) \phi_2(z, t) dz}{\kappa_1(x)} \right), \quad (4a)$$

$$\frac{\partial \phi_2(y, t)}{\partial t} = r_2 \phi_2(y, t) \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_{21} \int C_{21}(y, z) \phi_1(z, t) dz + \int C_{22}(y, z) \phi_2(z, t) dz}{\kappa_2(y)} \right). \quad (4b)$$

Here ϕ_i , r_i and κ_i are the population density of the trait, the intrinsic growth rate, and carrying
 153 capacity for species i , and C_{ij} are the corresponding competition kernels. As above, we assume
 that carrying capacity, intraspecific competition, and interspecific competition kernel functions
 are Gaussian: $\kappa_i(z) = K_i \exp(-(z - \theta_i)^2 / 2\sigma_{si}^2)$, $C_{ii}(x, y) = \exp(-(x - y)^2 / 2\sigma_{ci}^2)$, and $C_{ij}(x, y) =$
 156 $\exp(-(x - y)^2 / 2\sigma_{cij}^2)$ respectively. Here θ_i , σ_{ci} , and σ_{si} are the optimum trait value, the range

of within-species competitive interference, and the range of optimal trait values for species i , σ_{c12} and σ_{c21} measure the ranges of between-species competitive interference, whereas α_{12} and α_{21} measure the strength of interspecific competition due to trait-independent between-species differences.

Results

To find sufficient conditions for coexistence we used mutual invasibility analysis (Armstrong and McGehee, 1980; Geritz *et al.*, 1998). The idea underlying this method is that the two species will coexist only if each of them can invade a resident population of the other species at equilibrium. For example, in the Lotka-Volterra competition model described above, species 2 can invade a resident population of species 1 at equilibrium ($N_1 = K_1$) from low population density ($N_2 \approx 0$) only when $\frac{dN_2}{dt} > 0$. This gives the invasion criterion for species 2: $\alpha_{21}K_1/K_2 < 1$. Invasion criteria are sufficient conditions for coexistence since they guarantee neither species can go extinct.

Assume first that the resident population is monomorphic which is the case if stabilizing selection is sufficiently strong ($\sigma_{sj} \leq \sigma_{cj}$). Then the invasion criterion for the invader species i is identical to that in the standard Lotka-Volterra competition model:

$$\alpha_{ij} \frac{K_j}{K_i} < 1 \quad (5a)$$

(see Appendix A for details). Assume next that the resident population is polymorphic which is the case if $\sigma_{sj} \geq \sigma_{cj}$. From the single-species model, the variance of a polymorphic resident population is $v_j = \sigma_{sj}^2 - \sigma_{cj}^2$ and population size is $N_j^* = K_j \sigma_{sj} / \sigma_{cj}$. In this case, if stabilizing selection in the invader is weak enough ($\sigma_{si}^2 \geq v_j + \sigma_{cij}^2$), it will invade always. Otherwise, invasion happens whenever

$$\alpha_{ij} \frac{N_j^*}{K_i} < \sqrt{1 + \frac{v_j}{\sigma_{cij}^2}} \exp\left(\frac{\delta^2}{2(v_j + \sigma_{cij}^2 - \sigma_{si}^2)}\right). \quad (5b)$$

where $\delta = |\theta_i - \theta_j|$ is the difference between the optimum trait values. Note that increasing the difference in the optimum trait values δ , decreasing the strength of stabilizing selection in the invader (i.e., increasing σ_{si}), or decreasing the range of between-species competitive interference

180 σ_{cij} always increases the right-hand side of equation (5b) and, thus, makes invasion easier. If
 $\delta = 0$, increasing the ratio v_j/σ_{cij}^2 , i.e. decreasing the range of between-species competitive
interference relative to the phenotypic variance in the resident species, makes invasion easier.
183 Figure (2) illustrates our analytical results.




Figure 2: Conditions for invasion as a function of the ranges of between-species σ_{cij} and within-species σ_{cj} competitive interference. In region A, $\sigma_{cj} > \sigma_{sj}$, the resident is monomorphic, and the invasion condition is based on inequality (5a). The line separating regions B and C is based on whether stabilizing selection on the invader is sufficiently weak to guarantee invasion ($\sigma_{si}^2 \geq v_j + \sigma_{cij}^2$ in region B). In region B, invasion is guaranteed for any choice of α_{ij} . Inequality (5b) determines the boundary between region C and D. It is satisfied in region C and not satisfied in region D. The black dots corresponds to the parameter choice for the numerical simulations illustrated in figure (3) below. Other parameters: $\sigma_{sj} = 0.71, \delta = 0, \alpha_{ij} = 0.9$.

The invasion analysis provides only sufficient conditions for coexistence and does not tell anything about the equilibrium distributions of traits. Therefore we supplement it with a numerical study of the model dynamics for different combinations of parameters and initial conditions
186 using an adaptive finite difference method (see Appendix B, also Doebeli (2011)). We describe our results next. In all cases considered, the system evolves to an equilibrium. If only one species
189 survives, the equilibrium trait distribution matches the one predicted by equation (2).

At a coexistence equilibrium with both species polymorphic there are three possibilities: (i) both species are unimodal, (ii) one species is unimodal and another bimodal, or (iii) both species

192 are bimodal. These outcomes are illustrated in figure (3). The values of parameters σ_{cij} and σ_{cj} used in these graphs are marked by dots in figure (2). Assuming that species 2 can invade a resident population of species 1 (i.e. that inequality (5b) holds for $i = 2, j = 1$), parameters
 195 relevant for species 1's invasion may lie in one of the regions A-C. In region B, species 1 is bimodal if the range of within-species competitive interference in species 2 is large and unimodal otherwise. Species 2 is bimodal only if the range of within-species competitive interference in
 198 species 2 is intermediate. In region A and C, both species are unimodal.




Figure 3: Equilibrium trait distributions of species 1 (blue) and species 2 (orange) from numerical simulations for parameters values σ_{cij} and σ_{cj} marked by dots in figure (2). Identical initial phenotypic distributions $\phi(z) = 0.1e^{-10z^2}$. For all the simulations, $\alpha_{12} = 0.9, \alpha_{21} = 0.8, \sigma_{c1} = 0.71, \sigma_{c21} = 0.71, \sigma_{s1} = 0.71, \sigma_{s2} = 0.71, \delta = 0, r_1 = 1, r_2 = 1, K_1 = 1, K_2 = 1$.

In the single species model, the equilibrium population size and variance decrease with the range of within-species competitive interaction σ_{ci} (see above). To explore the effects of σ_{ci} in the
 201 case of two coexisting species, we varied σ_{c2} assuming that parameters for species 1 are in regions B or C, and for species 2 in region A of figure (2). Figure (4) shows the equilibrium variance and

population when the both species coexist (solid lines) and the analytical solution of the single-
 204 species model (dotted line). We find that the equilibrium variance of species 2 decreases with σ_{c2}
 and is always smaller when the other species is present. Equilibrium variances of the two species
 are inversely related. Similarly, the equilibrium population size of species 2 decreases with σ_{c2}
 207 whereas that of species 1 increases with σ_{c2} . Equilibrium population sizes of both the species are
 lower than their respective single-species equilibrium.




Figure 4: Effect of the range of within-species competitive interference σ_{c2} on the equilibrium variance and population sizes of the two species. The dotted lines are based on the equilibrium of the single-species model and the solid lines are based on numerical solutions of the two-species model with identical initial phenotypic distributions $\phi(z) = 0.1 \exp(-10z^2)$. The left and right panels correspond to coexistence in region C and B in figure (2), respectively. Other parameters: $\alpha_{12} = 0.9, \alpha_{21} = 0.8, \sigma_{c1} = 0.71, \sigma_{c21} = 0.71, \sigma_{s1} = 0.71, \sigma_{s2} = 0.71, \delta = 0, r_1 = 1, r_2 = 1, K_1 = 1, K_2 = 1$.

Exploiter-victim interactions

210 Here we consider exploiter-victim interactions such as between a predator and a prey or a parasite and a host (Clayton *et al.*, 1999; Davies and Brooke, 1988; Gavrillets, 1997; Soler *et al.*, 2001; Toju and Sota, 2006). Writing the population density of the victim species as $N_1(t)$ and that of
 213 the exploiter species as $N_2(t)$, and assuming that the exploiter has an obligate relationship with the victim, we start with the model

$$\frac{dN_1}{dt} = \alpha N_1 \left(1 - \frac{N_1}{K_1}\right) - \zeta N_2 N_1, \quad (6a)$$

$$\frac{dN_2}{dt} = \beta N_1 N_2 - \gamma N_2 \left(1 + \frac{N_2}{K_2}\right). \quad (6b)$$

216 Here, the intrinsic growth rate of the victim is α , the intrinsic death rate of the exploiter is γ , β and ζ are the exploiter birth rate and victim death rate due to exploitation, K_1 and K_2 are characteristic population densities. This is a generalization of the classical Lotka (1920) model
 219 to which we have added a quadratic death rate term due to within-species competition. [This change also allows one to avoid structural instability inherent in the Lotka-Volterra model (Kot, 2001). We recover the Lotka-Volterra model in the limit of large K_1 and K_2 .]

222 In this model, both species coexist at an asymptotically stable equilibrium if

$$\frac{\beta K_1}{\gamma} > 1. \quad (7)$$

The numerator of the above ratio is the growth rate of the exploiter when the victim is at carrying capacity (i.e., $N_1 = K_1$) and the denominator is the exploiter's death rate at low densities. The
 225 corresponding equilibrium densities are $N_1^* = \gamma K_1 \frac{\alpha + \zeta K_2}{\alpha \gamma + \beta \zeta K_1 K_2}$ and $N_2^* = \alpha K_2 \frac{\beta K_1 - \gamma}{\alpha \gamma + \beta \zeta K_1 K_2}$. If the inequality above is reversed, only the victim species survives. This model does not lead to exploiter-victim cycles.

228 We extend the above model to individuals differing in continuous traits x in the victim and y in exploiter:

$$\frac{\partial \phi_1(x, t)}{\partial t} = \alpha \phi_1(x, t) \left(1 - \frac{\int C_1(x, z) \phi_1(z, t) dz}{\kappa_1(x)}\right) - \zeta \phi_1(x, t) \int D(x, z) \phi_2(z, t) dz, \quad (8a)$$

$$\frac{\partial \phi_2(y, t)}{\partial t} = \beta \phi_2(y, t) \int D(y, z) \phi_1(z, t) dz - \gamma \phi_2(y, t) \left(1 + \frac{\int C_2(y, z) \phi_2(z, t) dz}{\kappa_2(y)} \right). \quad (8b)$$

231 Here $\phi_1(x, t)$ and $\phi_2(y, t)$ are the corresponding densities of the traits, and parameters α, β, γ and ζ have the same meaning as above. Similar to the competition model with continuous traits, we assume that selection and within-species competition kernels are Gaussian: $\kappa_i(z) =$
 234 $K_i \exp(-(z - \theta_i)^2 / 2\sigma_{si}^2)$ and $C_i(x, y) = \exp(-(x - y)^2 / 2\sigma_{ci}^2)$, where parameters θ_i, σ_{ci}^2 and σ_{si}^2 have the same meaning as before. Assuming that exploiter-victim interactions are based on trait matching (Gavrilets, 1997; Yoder and Nuismer, 2010), the exploitation kernel can be modelled as
 237 a Gaussian function: $D(x, y) = \exp(-(x - y)^2 / 2\sigma_d^2)$, where σ_d^2 measures the *range of exploitative interactions*. For example, with small σ_d^2 the exploiter can utilize only victims with very similar trait values.

240

Results

Using the invasibility analysis, for the exploiter to coexist with the victim, it should be able to grow from small densities. Consider first the case where stabilizing selection in the victim is strong ($\sigma_{c1} \geq \sigma_{s1}$). In this case, the victim is monomorphic and the sufficient conditions for
 243 coexistence is identical to the coexistence condition from the model with no individual variation (inequality (7)). In contrast, if $\sigma_{c1} < \sigma_{s1}$, the victim is polymorphic with equilibrium variance
 246 $v_1 = \sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2$ and equilibrium population size $N_1^* = K_1 \sigma_{s1} / \sigma_{c1}$ in the victim-only model. In this case, the sufficient condition for a successful invasion of the exploiter (and thus for coexistence) is

$$\frac{\beta N_1^*}{\gamma} > \sqrt{1 + \frac{v_1}{\sigma_d^2}}. \quad (9)$$

249 In particular, this shows that increasing the range of exploitative interactions σ_d simplifies survival of the exploiter.

We did not observe any non-equilibrium dynamics in numerical simulations. The equilibrium
 252 trait distribution of the victim matched the single-species equilibrium when the exploiter did not

survive. Figure (5) illustrates trait distributions when the species coexist. The distributions are unimodal if the exploiter death rate (γ) is large. If it is small, the victim diversifies around the exploiter to survive. [This situation was dubbed the Burridan's Ass regime in Gavrilets and Waxman (2002).] If stabilizing selection in the victim (σ_{c1}) is weak, the diversification in the victim can be followed by that in the exploiter (top right graph in figure (5)).




Figure 5: Examples of equilibrium trait distributions of the exploiter (orange) and victim (blue) from numerical simulations with identical initial trait distributions $\phi(z) = 0.1 \exp(-10z^2)$. Other parameters: $\alpha = 1, \beta = 1.5, \zeta = 1, \sigma_{c1} = 0.5, \sigma_{c2} = 0.71, \sigma_d = 0.71, \delta = 0, K_1 = 1, K_2 = 1$.

The equilibrium variance in both species increases with the strength of competition among victims (figure (6)). The exploiter's variance is smaller than that in the victim even when the exploiter trait distribution is bimodal ($\sigma_{s1} = 1, \gamma = 0.5$ in figure (5)). Figure (6) also shows that if the exploiter survives, the victim's variance is larger and the population size is smaller than the equilibrium values of the victim-only model.




Figure 6: The equilibrium variances and population sizes of both species when the exploiter survives. The dotted line is the equilibrium variance of the victim in the single-species model and the solid lines are numerical simulations using identical phenotypic distribution for the victim and exploiter ($\phi(z) = 0.1 \exp(-10z^2)$). Other parameters: $\alpha = 1, \beta = 2, \zeta = 1, \gamma = 1, \sigma_{c2} = 0.32, \sigma_{s1} = 0.71, \sigma_{s2} = 0.71, \delta = 0, K_1 = 1, K_2 = 1$.

Mutualism

264 In this section we consider mutualistic interactions where both species benefit from the interaction (Bronstein, 2015). We start with a classical mutualism model (Gause and Witt, 1935; Kostitzin, 1939) describing the dynamics of a pair of mutualistic partners with densities N_1 and N_2 :

$$\frac{dN_1}{dt} = r_1 N_1 \left(1 - \frac{N_1}{K_1} + B_1 N_2 \right), \quad (10a)$$

$$\frac{dN_2}{dt} = r_2 N_2 \left(1 - \frac{N_2}{K_2} + B_2 N_1 \right). \quad (10b)$$

270 Here, the mutualistic benefit for species i is denoted by B_i and the carrying capacity is denoted by K_i . A stable equilibrium exists if and only if $B_1 B_2 K_1 K_2 < 1$. At this equilibrium, the population size of species i is $K_i \left(\frac{1 + B_i K_j}{1 - B_i B_j K_i K_j} \right)$. If the above inequality does not hold, both species grow to infinite sizes. This unbounded growth is sometimes referred to as the “orgy of beneficial mutualism” (May, 1981).
273

Allowing for individual differences in continuous traits x in the first species and y in the second species, the corresponding dynamics of the mutualistic system are described by equations

276

$$\frac{\partial \phi_1(x, t)}{\partial t} = \phi_1(x, t) \left(r_1 - \frac{\int C_1(x, z) \phi_1(z, t) dz}{\kappa_1(x)} + B_1 \int M_1(x, z) \phi_2(z, t) dz \right), \quad (11a)$$

$$\frac{\partial \phi_2(y, t)}{\partial t} = \phi_2(y, t) \left(r_2 - \frac{\int C_2(y, z) \phi_2(z, t) dz}{\kappa_2(y)} + B_2 \int M_2(y, z) \phi_1(z, t) dz \right). \quad (11b)$$

Here ϕ_i , r_i , and κ_i represent the population density of the trait, the intrinsic growth rate, carrying capacity for species i , and C_i are the corresponding competition kernels. Similar to the other models, we assume carrying capacity and competition kernel functions are Gaussian: $\kappa_i(z) = K_{i,0} \exp(-(z - \theta_i)^2 / 2\sigma_{si}^2)$ and $C_i(x, y) = \exp(-(x - y)^2 / 2\sigma_{ci}^2)$. Assuming that mutualism is based on trait matching (Brouat *et al.*, 2001; Yoder and Nuismer, 2010), the mutualism kernel M_i can be modelled by a Gaussian function: $M_i(x, y) = \exp(-(x - y)^2 / 2\sigma_{mi}^2)$, where σ_{mi} measures the range of mutualistic interactions, *i.e.* range of phenotypes over which an individual receives mutualistic benefits. Parameters B_i represent mutualistic benefits due to other trait independent factors.

Results

Similar to the case of no intraspecific variation, in this model the two species either reach an equilibrium with finite population sizes or grow to infinite populations due a positive feedback of mutualistic benefits. To find the conditions for the population to reach an equilibrium, an approach similar to the invasion analysis does not work. Instead we first find upper bounds for the time series of population sizes of the two species, and then determine conditions for the upper bound to converge. This gives us the necessary conditions for stable coexistence (see Appendix A for details).

Our results are as follows. If stabilizing selection is sufficiently strong ($\sigma_{ci} \geq \sigma_{si}$) in both species, then both species are monomorphic and the necessary condition for an equilibrium is identical to that in the model with no intraspecific variation:

$$B_1 B_2 K_1 K_2 < 1. \quad (12a)$$

If stabilizing selection is strong in only one of the species (say, 2nd), then the necessary condition for an equilibrium is

$$B_1 B_2 N_1^* K_2 < \sqrt{1 + \frac{v_1}{\sigma_{m2}^2}}. \quad (12b)$$

300 Here $N_i^* = K_i \sigma_{si} / \sigma_{ci}$ and $v_i = \sigma_{si}^2 - \sigma_{ci}^2$ are the equilibrium population size and variance of the single-species model for species 1. This shows that if stabilizing selection is strong in one of the species, an equilibrium is easier to achieve when the range of mutualistic interactions (σ_{m2}) is
303 small.

Finally, if stabilizing selection is weak in both species, then the necessary condition for an equilibrium is

$$B_1 B_2 N_1^* N_2^* < \sqrt{\left(1 + \frac{v_1}{\sigma_{m2}^2}\right) \left(1 + \frac{v_2}{\sigma_{m1}^2}\right)}. \quad (12c)$$

306 In contrast to the case of strong stabilizing selection in only one of the species, here an equilibrium is easier to achieve when the range of mutualistic benefits is small in either of the two species. Overall, if variation is maintained (i one of both species), it is less likely that their population
309 growth would be unbounded.

Numerical exploration of the model revealed two types of polymorphic equilibrium trait distributions: (i) a unimodal (figure (7(a))), or (ii) a multimodal (figure (7(b))). In the multimodal
312 case, there is one large peak and two smaller peaks (figure (7(b))) or one large and one small peak. The latter case is observed when δ is large and the former when δ is small. These additional smaller peaks exist because with large range of within-species competition σ_{ci} , mutualistic
315 benefits do not decrease as quickly as competitive costs (decrease in growth rate due to competition) for traits farther away from the mean of the distribution.

We also found that as the range of within-species competition decreases, the equilibrium variance
318 increases (figure 7(a)). Figure (8) show that the equilibrium variance increases with smaller range of within-species competition irrespective of the range of within-species competition in the other species. Also, the equilibrium variance is always smaller than the equilibrium variance of
321 the single-species model. In comparison to the single-species model, the equilibrium populations

are higher when the mutualist partner is present. The equilibrium population becomes larger as the range of within-species competition in either species decreases.




Figure 7: Common equilibrium trait distributions of mutualists. (a) $\sigma_{c1} = 0.35$ and (b) $\sigma_{c1} = 0.53$. Species 1 (blue) and mutualist 2 (orange); identical initial trait distributions, other parameters $\phi(z) = 0.1 \exp(-10z^2)$ with $r_1 = 1, r_2 = 1, B_1 = 0.5, B_2 = 0.5, \sigma_{c2} = 0.71, \sigma_{s1} = 0.71, \sigma_{s2} = 0.71, \sigma_{m1} = 0.71, \sigma_{m2} = 0.71, \delta = 0, K_1 = 1, K_2 = 1$. For $\delta > 0$, the mean of the distributions will shift but the shape remains the same.

Discussion

324

Although the dynamic patterns of between-species interactions are expected to strongly depend on intraspecific variation, how exactly ecological and evolutionary processes interact is still largely an open question. Here we approached this question theoretically using three simple two-species models describing competition, exploiter-victim interaction, and mutualism. In our models, individuals differ with respect to a single quantitative character which controls both within- and between-species density-dependent interactions and, simultaneously, is subject to stabilizing natural selection. We analysed conditions for species coexistence, equilibrium population densities as well as the characteristics of trait distributions observed at equilibrium.

330

For intraspecific variation to be important, it needs to be maintained. Our results show that without mutation, intraspecific variation is lost if stabilizing selection is strong enough, specifically, if the range of optimal traits values is narrower than the range of within-species

333




Figure 8: Effect of the range of within-species competitive interference on equilibrium variance and population of the mutualists. The dotted lines show the equilibrium of a single-species model and the solid lines are based on the numerical solution of the two species model with initial phenotypic distributions $\phi(z) = 0.1e^{-10z^2}$. Other parameters: $r_1 = 1, r_2 = 1, \sigma_{s1} = 0.71, \sigma_{s2} = 0.71, \sigma_{m1} = 0.71, \sigma_{m2} = 0.71, B_1 = 0.5, B_2 = 0.5, \delta = 0$.

336 competitive interference ($\sigma_s < \sigma_c$). In this case, the outcomes of population dynamics are the same as predicted by standard ecological models neglecting intraspecific variation. The condition $\sigma_s < \sigma_c$ for the loss of intraspecific variation is the same as the one in single-species models
 339 (Doebeli and Ispolatov, 2010; Roughgarden, 1972). Intraspecific variation can be maintained if stabilizing selection is weak enough in at least one species of the pair. In the discussion below, we assume that this is the case.

342 Consider first between-species competition. In classical ecological models of competition, there are three possible outcomes: the extinction of a weaker competitor and persistence of a stronger competitor, survival of one species or another depending on initial densities, or coex-

345 istence. With intraspecific variation maintained, these three possible outcomes are still possible
but the conditions for them to be observed depend on parameters characterizing ranges of inter-
ference. In particular, small ranges of between-species interference (σ_{cij}) make coexistence a more
348 likely outcome. When the species coexist, their equilibrium trait distribution can be unimodal
for both species, bimodal for both species, or unimodal for one species and bimodal for the other.
The weaker competitor (based on ecological model) has a bimodal distribution when the range
351 of between-species competition is large, and unimodal otherwise. The strong competitor has a
unimodal trait distribution when the range of between-species competition is small or large, and
a bimodal distribution for a narrow range of intermediate values.

354 Second, in classical ecological models of exploiter-victim interactions there are two possible
outcomes: the victim species survives and the exploiter is extinct, or coexistence. These outcomes
are also possible if within-species variation is maintained. In general, large ranges of exploitative
357 interactions (σ_d) promotes survival of the exploiter. When the species coexist, their equilibrium
trait distributions can be both unimodal, both bimodal, or unimodal in one species and bimodal
in the other. When the exploiter's death rate (γ) is high, both the exploiter and victim have uni-
360 modal trait distributions at the coexistence equilibrium. When the exploiter's death rate is low,
the victim diversifies and its equilibrium trait distribution is bimodal. If stabilizing selection in
the victim is weak, its trait distribution becomes bimodal which can be followed by the evolution
363 of bimodality in the exploiter. Third, in classical ecological models of mutualism there are two
possible outcomes: the two species coexist at finite population sizes, or both species grow in-
definitely due to non-diminishing mutualistic benefits. With intraspecific variation maintained,
366 small range of mutualistic interactions (σ_m) promotes coexistence at finite sizes. The equilibrium
trait distribution is typically unimodal, but can become multimodal (with two or three peaks) if
stabilizing selection is strong enough. In this case, only one of the peaks has a high trait density,
369 while other peak(s) have a much smaller trait density.

In single-species models allowing for heritable intraspecific variation (such as given by equa-
tion (2)), the appearance of bimodal trait distributions or evolutionary branching require a non-

372 Gaussian competition kernel, e.g. an asymmetric (Kisdi, 1999) or a platykurtic (Doebeli and
Ispolatov, 2010). In contrast, our coevolutionary models show that species interactions could
lead to bimodal trait distribution even for Gaussian competition and interaction functions. In
375 our competition model, the equilibrium trait variances are smaller than those in the correspond-
ing single-species model. For the exploiter-victim interaction, the equilibrium trait variance of
the exploiter is always much smaller than that in the victim. In comparison to the single-species
378 model, the victim always has a higher variance in presence of the exploiter. In the case of mu-
tualism, equilibrium trait variances are smaller for both mutualist species compared to those in
the corresponding single-species model. Overall, we find that coevolutionary interactions lead to
381 smaller trait variances except for the victims in exploiter-victim interactions.

Both theoretical and empirical studies have explored the ecological consequences of intraspe-
cific variation (Austin and Dunlap, 2019; Breza *et al.*, 2012; Des Roches *et al.*, 2017; Frankham,
384 1996; Gavrilets, 1997; Hart *et al.*, 2016; Lichstein *et al.*, 2007; Start, 2019; Start and Gilbert, 2019).
However only few earlier theoretical studies allowed for within-species variation to evolve (Kopp
and Gavrilets, 2006; Nuismer *et al.*, 2005). An interesting consequence of heritable trait variation
387 is character displacement when between-species competition is reduced due to the divergence of
mean phenotypes (Brown and Wilson, 1956; Dayan and Simberloff, 2005; Schuler and McPhail,
1992). Our results suggest competition can also be reduced due to an increase in phenotypic
390 variances, or when the distributions become multimodal.

Our models show that the relationship between the range of optimum traits (which depends
on the strength of stabilizing selection) and the ranges of within- and between-species interac-
393 tions is an important determinant of coevolutionary dynamics. In general, a larger range of op-
timum traits relative to the range of within-species interactions leads to the maintenance of trait
variation which in turn allows for competitors to coexist, exploiters to survive, and mutualists
396 to reach a stable equilibrium. Increased evolutionary flexibility allowed for by intraspecific vari-
ation potentially offers a way to reconcile differences in empirical observations, some of which
shows that intraspecific variation promotes coexistence (Clark, 2010; Fricke *et al.*, 2019; Jung *et al.*,

399 2010), while others suggest that it restricts it (Hausch *et al.*, 2018). The coexistence conditions we
have derived extend coexistence theory (Barabás *et al.*, 2018; Chesson, 2000; Ellner *et al.*, 2019) by
including the effect of heritable intraspecific variation, stabilizing selection, and trait-dependent
402 competition. Our models also demonstrate that with heritable intraspecific variation maintained,
the strength of trait-based interactions can change through time.

Cyclical dynamics in exploiter-victim interactions have been of great interest in ecological
405 (Lotka, 1920; Turchin, 2003) and evolutionary (Gavrilets, 1997; Kopp and Gavrilets, 2006; Nuis-
mer and Doebeli, 2004; Nuismer *et al.*, 2005) models. However cycling was not possible in our
basic model (equations (6)) and we did not observe it in our extension of that model for the case
408 of within-species variation. We note that Nuismer *et al.* (2005) investigated a range of evolu-
tionary models of victim-exploiter type and concluded that cycling happens only under certain
conditions.

411 Our results show that exploiter-victim interactions and competition can lead to bimodal trait
distributions. Such distributions can emerge via the process of evolutionary branching (Geritz
et al., 1998) and can potentially lead to speciation. Doebeli and Dieckmann (2000) studied co-
414 evolutionary interaction between an exploiter and a victim using adaptive dynamics, and found
that a large range of exploitative interaction and weak stabilizing selection in the victim can lead
to evolutionary branching in exploiters. We find similar relationships between the range of ex-
417 ploitative interaction, the strength of stabilizing selection in the victim, and bimodality of the
exploiter's trait distribution when the exploiter's death rate is high. Yoder and Nuismer (2010)
studied phenotypic diversification in a metapopulation. They found that in coevolutionary in-
420 teractions where fitness of at least one species is reduced when its traits match the other species,
phenotypic diversity is higher compared to diversification by spatially variable selection without
coevolution. We find that such costly trait matching leads to a higher trait variance in the victim,
423 but can lead to a lower variance for a competitor. This is due to one of the competitor diversify-
ing around the other competitor (*i.e.* bimodal distribution with the modes on either side of the
mean trait of the other species), and competing from both directions of the mean trait value of

426 the other species (see figure (3), $\sigma_{c2} = 0.58, \sigma_{c12} = 0.35$).

The main limitations to our approach in terms of biological realism are that we ignored muta-
tion and sexual reproduction. Including mutation would make it easier to maintain intraspecific
429 variation at low levels but is not expected to significantly change our results. For analytical con-
venience, we assumed clonal reproduction in all our models neglecting the homogenizing force
of sexual reproduction. Earlier theoretical studies of coevolution find that genetic details can
432 lead to novel dynamics (Kopp and Gavrillets, 2006; Nuismer and Doebeli, 2004; Nuismer *et al.*,
2005). Some of the effects we observed (e.g., bimodal trait distributions) may be an artifact of
our simplifying assumptions. Future work should focus on extending these models to sexually
435 reproducing populations. The analytical conditions we have found are only sufficient (but not
necessary) in the case of competition and exploiter-victim interaction, and necessary (but not
sufficient) in the case of mutualism.

438 Our work adds to the toolkit of theoretical studies of coevolution a numerical approach (de-
scribed in the SI) for modeling the dynamics of population densities and phenotypic distribu-
tions under different two-species interactions. We have also developed a novel application of the
441 invasion analysis (Armstrong and McGehee, 1980), and derived an approximate analytical condi-
tion for existence of a stable coexistence equilibrium for mutualists (Appendix A). Our methods
allowed us to obtain analytical results without the common assumption of weak selection in co-
444 evolutionary models (Gavrillets, 1997; Nuismer and Doebeli, 2004). Overall, our approach allows
us to understand better the role of heritable trait variation in coevolutionary systems, which is the
first step towards achieving a better understanding of the implications of heritable trait variation
447 in evolutionary community ecology (McPeck, 2017).

Acknowledgements

We thank E. Derryberry, J. Day, D. Tverskoi, B. Fitzpatrick, and J. Bailey for comments and
450 suggestions. Supported by the Office of Naval Research grant W911NF-17-1-0150, the National

Institute for Mathematical and Biological Synthesis through NSF Award #EF-0830858, and by the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

453

Appendix A: Analytical solution

Competition

Based on mutual invasibility analysis, we can derive conditions for each species to grow from
 456 low density in a population of the other species. In the absence of the species 1, species 2 will
 reach the equilibrium of the one species model (equation (2)). If $\sigma_{s2}^2 > \sigma_{c2}^2$, the trait distribution
 at the single-species equilibrium will be $\phi_2^*(y) = \frac{\sigma_{s2}}{\sigma_{c2}} \frac{K_2}{\sqrt{2\pi(\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{c2}^2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(y-\theta_2)^2}{2(\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{c2}^2)}\right)$. Else, it would
 459 be a delta function at θ_2 . Invasion criteria for species 1 in that case turns out to be identical to
 the population dynamics model (*i.e.*, $\alpha_{12} < K_1/K_2$).

For species *i* to coexist with species *j*, atleast individuals of some trait *x* needs to survive
 462 when $\phi_1(x) \approx 0$ and $\phi_2(y) = \phi_1^*(y)$. From equation (4),

$$\phi_1(x) \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_{12} \int \exp\left(-\frac{(x-z)^2}{2\sigma_{c12}^2}\right) \phi_2^*(z) dz}{K_1 e^{-\frac{(x-\theta_1)^2}{2\sigma_{s1}^2}}} \right) > 0$$

$$\Rightarrow f(x) = \alpha_{12} \frac{\sigma_{s2}}{\sigma_{c2}} \frac{\sigma_{c12}}{\sqrt{\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{c2}^2 + \sigma_{c12}^2}} \frac{K_2}{K_1} \exp\left(\frac{(x-\theta_1)^2}{2\sigma_{s1}^2} - \frac{(x-\theta_2)^2}{2(\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{c2}^2 + \sigma_{c12}^2)}\right) < 1$$

If $\sigma_{c2}^2 - \sigma_{c12}^2 \geq \sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{s1}^2$ (inequality *A*), then $\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} f(x) = 0$ and the inequality holds for
 465 some *x*. Else, $\lim_{x \rightarrow \pm\infty} f(x) = \infty$ and the condition holds only if $\min f(x) < 1$. This gives the
 invasion criteria for species 1,

$$\alpha_{12} \frac{\sigma_{s2}}{\sigma_{c2}} \frac{\sigma_{c12}}{\sqrt{\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{s2}^2 + \sigma_{c12}^2}} \frac{K_2}{K_1} \exp\left(-\frac{(\theta_1 - \theta_2)^2}{2((\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{s1}^2) - (\sigma_{c2}^2 - \sigma_{c12}^2))}\right) < 1 \quad (\text{A1})$$

Since the system is symmetric, a similar analysis yields the invasion criteria for species 2.

468

Exploiter-victim

For exploiter to coexist with the victim, the exploiter should be able to grow from low density in a population of victim. In the absence of the exploiter and strong competition among victims

471 ($\sigma_{s1}^2 > \sigma_{c1}^2$), the victim trait distribution will be $\phi_1^*(x) = \frac{\sigma_{s1}}{\sigma_{c1}} \frac{K_1}{\sqrt{2\pi(\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x-\theta_1)^2}{2(\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2)}\right)$. From equation (8), the condition for coexistence is,

$$\left(\beta \int \exp\left(-\frac{(y-z)^2}{2\sigma_d^2}\right) \phi_1^*(z) dz \right) - \gamma > 0,$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{\beta K_1 \sigma_{s1} \sigma_d}{\sigma_{c1} \sqrt{\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2 + \sigma_d^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(y-\delta)^2}{2(\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2 + \sigma_d^2)}\right) > \gamma.$$

474 This is a Gaussian function. Therefore for some trait y of the exploiter to coexist with the victim, the maximum value of the function should satisfy the condition. This gives the sufficient conditions for coexistence,

$$\frac{\beta K_1 \sigma_{s1} \sigma_d}{\sigma_{c1} \sqrt{\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2 + \sigma_d^2}} > \gamma. \quad (\text{A2})$$

477 equation (A2) is the sufficient condition for coexistence when intraspecific variation is allowed to change over time, and intraspecific competition in victim is stronger than the stabilizing selection acting on them ($\sigma_{s1}^2 > \sigma_{c1}^2$). If $\sigma_{s1}^2 \leq \sigma_{c1}^2$, then the sufficient condition for coexistence is $\beta > \gamma$

480 which is identical to the model with no intraspecific variation.

Mutualism

To obtain conditions for the two species to exist at finite population sizes at equilibrium, we find

483 a sequence of trait distributions for species 1 and species 2 which is the upper bound for the dynamics. The equilibrium population will be finite only if the sequence of population sizes obtained from the sequence of trait distributions converges. If $\phi_1(x, 0) \approx 0$ and $\phi_2(y, 0) \approx 0$,

486 $\phi_1(x, \tau)$ will be smaller than its one species equilibrium trait distribution. Assume $\sigma_{si}^2 > \sigma_{ci}^2$.

Then, for some small τ_1 ,

$$\phi_1(x, \tau_1) \leq \frac{r_1 K_1 \sigma_{s1}}{\sigma_{c1} \sqrt{2\pi(\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x - \theta_1)^2}{2(\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2)}\right) = f_{1,1}(x).$$

Mutualistic benefit for species 2 at time τ is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} B_2 \int \exp\left(-\frac{(y-z)^2}{2\sigma_{m2}^2}\right) f_{1,1}(z) dz &= \frac{B_2 r_1 K_1 \sigma_{s1} \sigma_{m2}}{\sigma_{c1} \sqrt{\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(y - \theta_1)^2}{2(\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2)}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{B_2 K_1 \sigma_{s1} \sigma_{m2}}{\sigma_{c1} \sqrt{\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2}} r_1 \end{aligned}$$

489

Therefore for $\tau_i < \tau_{i+1}$,

$$\phi_2(y, \tau_2) \leq \left(r_2 + \frac{B_2 K_1 \sigma_{s1} \sigma_{m2}}{\sigma_{c1} \sqrt{\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2}} r_1 \right) \frac{K_2 \sigma_{s2}}{\sigma_{c2} \sqrt{2\pi(\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{c2}^2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(y - \theta_2)^2}{2(\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{c2}^2)}\right) = f_{2,1}(y),$$

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1(x, \tau_3) &\leq \left(r_1 + \frac{B_1 K_2 \sigma_{s2} \sigma_{m2}}{\sigma_{c2} \sqrt{\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{c2}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2}} \left(r_2 + \frac{B_2 K_1 \sigma_{s1} \sigma_{m2}}{\sigma_{c1} \sqrt{\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2}} r_1 \right) \right) \\ &\quad \frac{K_1 \sigma_{s1}}{\sigma_{c1} \sqrt{2\pi(\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x - \theta_1)^2}{2(\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2)}\right) = f_{1,2}(x), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_2(y, \tau_4) &\leq \left(r_2 + \frac{B_2 K_1 \sigma_{s1} \sigma_{m2}}{\sigma_{c1} \sqrt{\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2}} \left(r_1 + \frac{B_1 K_2 \sigma_{s2} \sigma_{m2}}{\sigma_{c2} \sqrt{\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{c2}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2}} \left(r_2 + \dots \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. \dots \frac{B_2 K_1 \sigma_{s1} \sigma_{m2}}{\sigma_{c1} \sqrt{\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2}} r_1 \right) \right) \right) \frac{K_2 \sigma_{s2}}{\sigma_{c2} \sqrt{2\pi(\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{c2}^2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(y - \theta_2)^2}{2(\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{c2}^2)}\right) = f_{2,2}(y), \end{aligned}$$

492

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1(x, \tau_5) &\leq \left(r_1 + \frac{B_1 K_2 \sigma_{s2} \sigma_{m2}}{\sigma_{c2} \sqrt{\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{c2}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2}} \left(r_2 + \frac{B_2 K_1 \sigma_{s1} \sigma_{m2}}{\sigma_{c1} \sqrt{\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2}} \left(r_1 + \dots \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. \dots \frac{B_1 K_2 \sigma_{s2} \sigma_{m2}}{\sigma_{c2} \sqrt{\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{c2}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2}} \left(r_2 + \frac{B_2 K_1 \sigma_{s1} \sigma_{m2}}{\sigma_{c1} \sqrt{\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2}} r_1 \right) \right) \right) \right) \frac{K_1 \sigma_{s1}}{\sigma_{c1} \sqrt{2\pi(\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(x - \theta_1)^2}{2(\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2)}\right) \\ &= f_{1,3}(x), \end{aligned}$$

The time series of population sizes of the two species are bounded by the sequences $N_{1,i} = \int f_{1,i}(x)dx$ and $N_{2,i} = \int f_{2,i}(y)dy$ respectively. From the sequence of trait distributions, we can
 495 infer that

$$N_{1,1} = \frac{\sigma_{s1}}{\sigma_{c1}} K_1 r_1,$$

$$N_{1,i} = \frac{\sigma_{s1}}{\sigma_{c1}} K_1 \left(r_1 + \frac{B_1 K_2 \sigma_{s2} \sigma_{m2}}{\sigma_{c2} \sqrt{\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{c2}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2}} \left(r_2 + \frac{B_2 K_1 \sigma_{s1} \sigma_{m2}}{\sigma_{c1} \sqrt{\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2}} \frac{\sigma_{c1}}{\sigma_{s1}} \frac{N_{1,i-1}}{K_1} \right) \right), \forall i \geq 2.$$

The equilibrium population size is finite only if these sequences converge. Real-valued sequences
 498 converge if and only if they are Cauchy.

$$N_{1,i} - N_{1,i-1} = \frac{\sigma_{s1}}{\sigma_{c1}} K_1 \left(r_1 + \frac{B_1 K_2 \sigma_{s2} \sigma_{m2}}{\sigma_{c2} \sqrt{\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{c2}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2}} r_2 + \dots \right. \\ \left. \dots \left(\frac{B_1 B_2 K_1 K_2 \sigma_{s1} \sigma_{s2} \sigma_{m1} \sigma_{m2}}{\sigma_{c1} \sigma_{c2} \sqrt{(\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2)(\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{c2}^2 + \sigma_{m1}^2)}} - 1 \right) \frac{\sigma_{c1}}{\sigma_{s1}} \frac{N_{1,i-1}}{K_1} \right).$$

Since $N_{1,i}$ is an increasing sequence, for it to be Cauchy,

$$\frac{B_1 B_2 K_1 K_2 \sigma_{s1} \sigma_{s2} \sigma_{m1} \sigma_{m2}}{\sigma_{c1} \sigma_{c2} \sqrt{(\sigma_{s1}^2 - \sigma_{c1}^2 + \sigma_{m2}^2)(\sigma_{s2}^2 - \sigma_{c2}^2 + \sigma_{m1}^2)}} < 1 \quad (\text{A3})$$

The condition for convergence of $N_{2,i}$ is identical. Equation (A3) is a necessary condition for
 501 the equilibrium population of the two species to be finite.

Appendix B: Numerical Method

We solved our dynamic equations using a finite difference method (Doebeli, 2011; Kreyszig *et al.*,
 504 2011; Simmons and Krantz, 2007). Specifically, we first truncate the phenotype space to a finite
 interval $[-\lambda, \lambda]$. λ needs to be chosen such that ϕ and $\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \tau}$ are small. Second, we partition the
 truncated phenotype space into intervals of length l . This gives a partition of size $N = 2\lceil \lambda/l \rceil$.

507 We can now discretise the dynamic equations. For example, in the two species competition
 model (4),

$$\frac{\partial \phi_1(x_i, \tau)}{\partial \tau} \approx r_1 \phi_1(x_i, \tau) \left(1 - \frac{\int C_{11}(x_i, z) \phi_1(z, \tau) dz + \alpha_{12} \int C_{12}(x_i, z) \phi_2(z, \tau) dz}{\kappa_1(x_i)} \right), \quad (\text{A4a})$$

$$\frac{\partial \phi_2(y_i, \tau)}{\partial \tau} \approx r_2 \phi_2(y_i, \tau) \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_{21} \int C_{21}(y_i, z) \phi_1(z, \tau) dz + \int C_{22}(y_i, z) \phi_2(z, \tau) dz}{\kappa_2(y_i)} \right). \quad (\text{A4b})$$

510 Here, the integrals are over $[-\lambda, \lambda]$ and $1 \leq i \leq N$. Finally, the integrals can be computed using trapezoidal rule over the same partition and the derivatives can be approximated using the Euler forward method. This leads to the iterative equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{1,\tau+\Delta}(x_i) \approx & \phi_{1,\tau}(x_i) \left(1 + r_1 \Delta - \frac{r_1 l \Delta}{2\kappa_2(x_i)} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \left(C_{11}(x_i, z_k) \phi_{1,\tau}(z_k) + C_{11}(x_i, z_{k+1}) \phi_{1,\tau}(z_{k+1}) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \alpha_{12} \left(C_{12}(x_i, z_k) \phi_{2,\tau}(z_k) + C_{12}(x_i, z_{k+1}) \phi_{2,\tau}(z_{k+1}) \right) \right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5a})$$

513

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{2,\tau+\Delta}(y_i) \approx & \phi_{2,\tau}(y_i) \left(1 + r_2 \Delta - \frac{r_2 l \Delta}{2\kappa_2(y_i)} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \left(\alpha_{21} \left(C_{21}(y_i, z_k) \phi_{1,\tau}(z_k) + C_{21}(y_i, z_{k+1}) \phi_{1,\tau}(z_{k+1}) \right) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + C_{22}(y_i, z_k) \phi_{2,\tau}(z_k) + C_{22}(y_i, z_{k+1}) \phi_{2,\tau}(z_{k+1}) \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5b})$$

For small Δ and l , these equations converge. Numerical convergence can be made faster by using adaptive time steps. This is achieved by halving the time steps and reiterating one step 516 whenever population densities becomes negative. Time steps can also be occasionally doubled if population densities remains positive over several time steps.

Setting $\alpha_{12} = \alpha_{21} = 0$ reduces the two-species competition model to two independent single- 519 species model (equation (2)). We then confirmed that the equilibrium phenotypic distribution we obtain using the numerical method matches the analytical solution of the single-species model for different parameter choices.

522 This same method was applied to the exploiter-victim and mutualism models.

Literature Cited

Abrams, P. A. (2000). The Evolution of Predator-Prey Interactions: Theory and Evidence. *Annual* 525 *Review of Ecology and Systematics*, **31**(1), 79–105.

- Abrams, P. A. and Matsuda, H. (1994). The evolution of traits that determine ability in competitive contests. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **8**(6), 667–686.
- 528 Akçay, E. (2016). Evolutionary Models of Mutualism. In *Mutualism*, pages 57–76. Oxford University Press.
- Albert, C. H., Grassein, F., Schurr, F. M., Vieilledent, G., and Violle, C. (2011). When and how
531 should intraspecific variability be considered in trait-based plant ecology? *Perspectives in Plant Ecology, Evolution and Systematics*, **13**(3), 217–225.
- Allen, W. J., Meyerson, L. A., Flick, A. J., and Cronin, J. T. (2018). Intraspecific variation in indirect
534 plant–soil feedbacks influences a wetland plant invasion. *Ecology*, **99**(6), 1430–1440.
- Anderson, B. and Johnson, S. D. (2008). The geographical mosaic of coevolution in a plant–pollinator mutualism. *Evolution*, **62**(1), 220–225.
- 537 Armstrong, R. A. and McGehee, R. (1980). Competitive Exclusion. *The American Naturalist*, **115**(2), 151–170.
- Austin, M. W. and Dunlap, A. S. (2019). Intraspecific variation in worker body size makes North
540 American bumble bees (*Bombus* spp.) less susceptible to decline. *The American Naturalist*, page 704280.
- Barabás, G., D’Andrea, R., and Stump, S. M. (2018). Chesson’s coexistence theory. *Ecological*
543 *Monographs*, **88**(3), 277–303.
- Barton, N. H. (1986). The maintenance of polygenic variation through a balance between mutation and stabilizing selection. *Genetical Research*, **47**(3), 209–216.
- 546 Benkman, C. W., Parchman, T. L., Favis, A., and Siepielski, A. M. (2003). Reciprocal selection causes a coevolutionary arms race between crossbills and lodgepole pine. *American Naturalist*, **162**(2), 182–194.

- 549 Bolnick, D. I., Amarasekare, P., Araújo, M. S., Bürger, R., Levine, J. M., Novak, M., Rudolf, V.
H. W., Schreiber, S. J., Urban, M. C., and Vasseur, D. A. (2011). Why intraspecific trait variation
matters in community ecology. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **26**(4), 183–192.
- 552 Breza, L. C., Souza, L., Sanders, N. J., and Classen, A. T. (2012). Within and between population
variation in plant traits predicts ecosystem functions associated with a dominant plant species.
Ecology and Evolution, **2**(6), 1151–1161.
- 555 Bronstein, J. L. (2015). *Mutualism*. Oxford University Press.
- Brouat, C., Garcia, N., Andary, C., and McKey, D. (2001). Plant lock and ant key: Pairwise
coevolution of an exclusion filter in an ant-plant mutualism. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*
558 *Biological Sciences*, **268**(1481), 2131–2141.
- Brown, W. L. and Wilson, E. O. (1956). Character Displacement. *Systematic Zoology*, **5**(2), 49.
- Buckling, A. and Rainey, P. B. (2002). The role of parasites in sympatric and allopatric host
561 diversification. *Nature*, **420**(6915), 496–499.
- Bulmer, M. G. (1971). The Effect of Selection on Genetic Variability. *The American Naturalist*,
105(943), 201–211.
- 564 Chesson, P. (2000). Mechanisms of Maintenance of Species Diversity. *Annual Review of Ecology
and Systematics*, **31**, 343–366.
- Clark, J. S. (2010). Individuals and the Variation Needed for High Species Diversity in Forest
567 Trees. *Scientific Reports*, **327**(February), 1129–1132.
- Clarke, B. C. (1979). The evolution of genetic diversity. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London -
Biological Sciences*, **205**(1161), 453–474.
- 570 Clayton, D. H., Lee, P. L. M., Tompkins, D. M., and Brodie III, E. D. (1999). Reciprocal Natural
Selection on Host-Parasite Phenotypes. *The American Naturalist*, **154**(3), 261–270.

- 573 Davies, N. B. and Brooke, M. d. L. (1988). Cuckoos versus reed warblers: adaptation and counteradaptations. *Animal Behaviour*, **36**, 262–284.
- Dayan, T. and Simberloff, D. (2005). Ecological and community-wide character displacement: the next generation. *Ecology Letters*, **8**(8), 875–894.
- 576 Des Roches, S., Post, D. M., Turley, N. E., Bailey, J. K., Hendry, A. P., Kinnison, M. T., Schweitzer, J. A., and Palkovacs, E. P. (2017). The ecological importance of intraspecific variation. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, **2**(1), 57.
- 579 Dieckmann, U. and Doebeli, M. (1999). On the origin of species by sympatric speciation. *Nature*, **400**(22), 354–357.
- Diekmann, O. (2004). A beginner's guide to adaptive dynamics. *Banach Center Publications*, **63**,
582 47–86.
- Doebeli, M. (1997). Genetic variation and the persistence of predator-prey interactions in the Nicholson-Bailey model. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, **188**(1), 109–120.
- 585 Doebeli, M. (2011). *Adaptive diversification (MPB-48)*. Princeton University Press.
- Doebeli, M. and Dieckmann, U. (2000). Evolutionary Branching and Sympatric Speciation Caused by Different Types of Ecological Interactions. *The American Naturalist*, **156**(S4), S77–S101.
- 588 Doebeli, M. and Ispolatov, I. (2010). Complexity and diversity. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, **328**(5977), 494–7.
- Ellner, S. P., Snyder, R. E., Adler, P. B., and Hooker, G. (2019). An expanded modern coexistence
591 theory for empirical applications. *Ecology Letters*, **22**(1), 3–18.
- Ferrière, R., Bronstein, J. L., Rinaldi, S., Law, R., and Gauduchon, M. (2002). Cheating and the evolutionary stability of mutualisms. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*,
594 **269**(1493), 773–780.

- 597 Ferrière, R., Gauduchon, M., and Bronstein, J. L. (2007). Evolution and persistence of obligate mutualists and exploiters: Competition for partners and evolutionary immunization. *Ecology Letters*, **10**(2), 115–126.
- 600 Fleischer, S. R., TerHorst, C. P., and Li, J. (2018). Pick your trade-offs wisely: Predator-prey eco-evo dynamics are qualitatively different under different trade-offs. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, **456**, 201–212.
- Foster, K. R. and Kokko, H. (2006). Cheating can stabilize cooperation in mutualisms. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **273**(1598), 2233–2239.
- 603 Frankham, R. (1996). Relationship of Genetic Variation to Population Size in Wildlife. *Conservation Biology*, **10**(6), 1500–1508.
- 606 Fricke, E. C., Tewksbury, J. J., and Rogers, H. S. (2019). Linking intra-specific trait variation and plant function: seed size mediates performance tradeoffs within species. *Oikos*, page oik.06494.
- Futuyma, D. J. and Slatkin, M. (1983). *Coevolution*. Sinauer Associates.
- Gause, G. F. and Witt, A. A. (1935). Behavior of Mixed Populations and the Problem of Natural Selection. *The American Naturalist*, **69**(725), 596–609.
- 609
- Gavrilets, S. (1997). Coevolutionary chase on exploiter-victim systems with polygenic characters. *Journal of theoretical biology*, **186**(4), 527–534.
- 612 Gavrilets, S. (2004). *Fitness Landscapes and the Origin of Species (MPB-41)*. Princeton University Press.
- 615 Gavrilets, S. and Hastings, A. (1994a). Dynamics of genetic variability in two-locus models of stabilizing selection. *Genetics*, **138**(2), 519–532.
- Gavrilets, S. and Hastings, A. (1994b). Maintenance of multilocus variability under strong stabilizing selection. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, **32**(4), 287–302.

- 618 Gavrillets, S. and Hastings, A. (1995). Dynamics of polygenic variability under stabilizing selection, recombination, and drift. *Genetical Research*, **65**(1), 63–74.
- Gavrillets, S. and Michalakis, Y. (2008). Effects of environmental heterogeneity on victim-exploiter
621 coevolution. *Evolution*, **62**(12), 3100–3116.
- Gavrillets, S. and Waxman, D. (2002). Sympatric speciation by sexual conflict. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **99**(16), 10533–10538.
- 624 Geritz, S. A. H., Kisdi, É., Meszéna, G., and Metz, J. A. (1998). Evolutionarily Singular Strategies and the Adaptive Growth and Branching of the Evolutionary Tree. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **12**(1), 35–57.
- 627 Gómez, J. M., Perfectti, F., Bosch, J., and Camacho, J. P. (2009). A geographic selection mosaic in a generalized plant-pollinator-herbivore system. *Ecological Monographs*, **79**(2), 245–263.
- Gomulkiewicz, R., Thompson, J. N., Holt, R. D., Nuismer, S. L., and Hochberg, M. E. (2000). Hot
630 Spots, Cold Spots, and the Geographic Mosaic Theory of Coevolution. *The American Naturalist*, **156**(2), 156–174.
- Hart, S. P., Schreiber, S. J., and Levine, J. M. (2016). How variation between individuals affects
633 species coexistence. *Ecology Letters*, **19**(8), 825–838.
- Hausch, S., Vamosi, S. M., and Fox, J. W. (2018). Effects of intraspecific phenotypic variation on species coexistence. *Ecology*, **99**(6), 1453–1462.
- 636 Jacquemyn, H., Vandepitte, K., Roldán-Ruiz, I., and Honnay, O. (2009). Rapid loss of genetic variation in a founding population of *Primula elatior* (Primulaceae) after colonization. *Annals of Botany*, **103**(5), 777–783.
- 639 Janzen, D. H. (1980). When is it coevolution? *Evolution*, **34**(3), 611–612.
- Jung, V., Violle, C., Mondy, C., Hoffmann, L., and Muller, S. (2010). Intraspecific variability and trait-based community assembly. *Journal of Ecology*, **98**(5), 1134–1140.

- 642 Keller, I. and Largiadèr, C. R. (2003). Recent habitat fragmentation caused by major roads leads to reduction of gene flow and loss of genetic variability in ground beetles. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **270**(1513), 417–423.
- 645 Kisdi, É. (1999). Evolutionary branching under asymmetric competition. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, **197**(2), 149–162.
- Kopp, M. and Gavrillets, S. (2006). Multilocus genetics and the coevolution of quantitative traits.
648 *Evolution*, **60**(7), 1321–1336.
- Kostitzin, V. (1939). *Mathematical biology*. George G. Harrap And Company Ltd. London.
- Kot, M. (2001). *Elements of Mathematical Ecology*. Cambridge University Press.
- 651 Kremer, C. T. and Klausmeier, C. A. (2017). Species packing in eco-evolutionary models of seasonally fluctuating environments. *Ecology Letters*, **20**(9), 1158–1168.
- Kreyszig, E., Kreyszig, H., and Norminton, E. J. E. J. (2011). *Advanced engineering mathematics*.
654 Wiley.
- Lande, R. (1975). The maintenance of genetic variability by mutation in a polygenic character with linked loci. *Genetical Research*, **26**(3), 221–235.
- 657 Leimar, O., Sasaki, A., Doebeli, M., and Dieckmann, U. (2013). Limiting similarity, species packing, and the shape of competition kernels. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, **339**, 3–13.
- Lichstein, J. W., Dushoff, J., Levin, S. A., and Pacala, S. W. (2007). Intraspecific variation and
660 species coexistence. *American Naturalist*, **170**(6), 807–818.
- Lloyd-Smith, J. O., Schreiber, S. J., Kopp, P. E., and Getz, W. M. (2005). Superspreading and the impact of individual variation on disease emergence. *Nature*, **438**(7066), 355–9.
- 663 Lotka, A. J. (1920). Analytical Note on Certain Rhythmic Relations in Organic Systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **6**(7), 410–415.

- 666 May, R. (1981). Models for Two Interacting Populations. In *Theoretical Ecology. Principles and Applications*, pages 78–104. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- McPeck, M. A. (2017). *Evolutionary community ecology*. Princeton University Press.
- 669 Mitrovski, P., Hoffmann, A. A., Heinze, D. A., and Weeks, A. R. (2008). Rapid loss of genetic variation in an endangered possum. *Biology Letters*, **4**(1), 134–138.
- 672 Nijhawan, S., Mitapo, I., Pulu, J., Carbone, C., and Rowcliffe, J. M. (2019). Does polymorphism make Asiatic golden cat the most adaptable predator in Eastern Himalayas? *Ecology*, page e02768.
- Nuismer, S. L. (2017). *Introduction to coevolutionary theory*. Macmillan Higher Education.
- 675 Nuismer, S. L. and Doebeli, M. (2004). Genetic correlations and the coevolutionary dynamics of three-species systems. *Evolution*, **58**(6), 1165–1177.
- Nuismer, S. L., Thompson, J. N., and Gomulkiewicz, R. (2000). Coevolutionary clines across selection mosaics. *Evolution*, **54**(4), 1102–1115.
- 678 Nuismer, S. L., Doebeli, M., and Browning, D. (2005). The coevolutionary dynamics of antagonistic interactions mediated by quantitative traits with evolving variances. *Evolution*, **59**(10), 2073–2082.
- 681 Nuismer, S. L., Gomulkiewicz, R., and Ridenhour, B. J. (2010). When is correlation coevolution? *The American naturalist*, **175**(5), 525–537.
- 684 Pfennig, K. S. and Pfennig, D. W. (2009). Character displacement: ecological and reproductive responses to a common evolutionary problem.
- Roughgarden, J. (1972). Evolution of Niche Width. *The American Naturalist*, **106**(952), 683–718.
- 687 Roughgarden, J. (1976). Resource partitioning among competing species -A coevolutionary approach. *Theoretical Population Biology*, **9**(3), 388–424.

- Schreiber, S. J., Patel, S., and TerHorst, C. P. (2016). Evolution as a coexistence mechanism: does genetic architecture matter? *The American Naturalist*, pages 1–53.
- 690 Schulte, D. and McPhail, J. D. (1992). Ecological Character Displacement and Speciation in Sticklebacks. *The American Naturalist*, **140**(1), 85–1098.
- Simmons, G. F. and Krantz, S. G. (2007). *Differential equations : theory, technique, and practice*.
693 McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Slatkin, M. (1980). Ecological Character Displacement. *Ecology*, **61**(1), 163–177.
- Smith, P. J., Francis, R. I., and McVeagh, M. (1991). Loss of genetic diversity due to fishing
696 pressure. *Fisheries Research*, **10**(3-4), 309–316.
- Soler, J. J., Martínez, J. G., Soler, M., and Møller, A. P. (2001). Coevolutionary interactions in a host-parasite system. *Ecology Letters*, **4**(5), 470–476.
- 699 Start, D. (2019). Individual and Population Differences Shape Species Interactions and Natural Selection. *The American Naturalist*.
- Start, D. and Gilbert, B. (2019). Trait variation across biological scales shapes community structure
702 and ecosystem function. *Ecology*, page e02769.
- Summers, K., McKeon, S., Sellars, J., Keusenkothen, M., Morris, J., Gloeckner, D., Pressley, C., Price, B., and Snow, H. (2003). Parasitic exploitation as an engine of diversity.
- 705 Taper, M. L. and Case, T. J. (1992). Models of Character Displacement and the Theoretical Robustness of Taxon Cycles. *Evolution*, **46**(2), 317–333.
- Thompson, J. N. (1994). *The coevolutionary process*. University of Chicago Press.
- 708 Thompson, J. N. (2005). *The geographic mosaic of coevolution*. University of Chicago Press.
- Toju, H. and Sota, T. (2006). Adaptive divergence of scaling relationships mediates the arms race between a weevil and its host plant. *Biology Letters*, **2**(4), 539–542.

- 711 Turchin, P. (2003). *Complex Population Dynamics: A Theoretical/Empirical Synthesis (MPB-35)*. Princeton University Press.
- Vellend, M. (2006). The consequences of genetic diversity in competitive communities. *Ecology*,
714 **87**(2), 304–311.
- Violle, C., Enquist, B. J., McGill, B. J., Jiang, L., Albert, C. H., Hulshof, C., Jung, V., and Messier, J. (2012). The return of the variance: Intraspecific variability in community ecology.
- 717 Walsh, B. and Lynch, M. (2018). Maintenance of Quantitative Genetic Variation. In *Evolution and Selection of Quantitative Traits*, volume 1. Oxford University Press.
- Waxman, D. and Gavrillets, S. (2005). 20 Questions on Adaptive Dynamics. *Journal of Evolutionary*
720 *Biology*, **18**(5), 1139–1154.
- Winkelman, K., Genner, M. J., Takahashi, T., and Rüber, L. (2014). Competition-driven speciation in cichlid fish. *Nature Communications*, **5**(1), 3.
- 723 Yoder, J. B. and Nuismer, S. L. (2010). When Does Coevolution Promote Diversification? *The American naturalist*, **176**(6), 802–817.
- Zu, J. and Wang, J. (2013). Adaptive evolution of attack ability promotes the evolutionary branch-
726 ing of predator species. *Theoretical Population Biology*, **89**, 12–23.