Adaptation to a novel predator in *Drosophila melanogaster*: How well are we able to predict evolutionary responses?

Michael DeNieu^{1,2}, William Pitchers^{1,2}, Ian Dworkin^{1,2,*}

1 Department of Zoology, Program in Ecology, Evolutionary Biology and Behavior, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, United States of America. 44824.

2 BEACON, The Center for the Study of Evolution in Action, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, United States of America

* E-mail: idworkin@msu.edu

Data and Analysis scripts available at DRYAD (datadryad.org), DOI:XXX

Abstract

2 Evolutionary theory is sufficiently well developed to allow for short-term prediction of
evolutionary trajectories. In addition to the presence of heritable variation, prediction
4 requires knowledge of the form of natural selection on relevant traits. While many studies
estimate the form of natural selection, few examine the degree to which traits evolve in
6 the predicted direction. In this study we examine the form of natural selection imposed
by mantid predation on wing size and shape in the fruitfly, *Drosophila melanogaster*.
8 We then evolve populations of *D. melanogaster* under predation pressure, and examine
the extent to which wing size and shape have responded in the predicted direction. We
10 demonstrate that wing form partially evolves along the predicted vector from selection,
more so than for control lineages. Furthermore, we re-examined phenotypic selection after
12 ~30 generations of experimental evolution. We observed that the magnitude of selection
on wing size and shape was diminished in populations evolving with mantid predators,
14 while the direction of the selection vector differed from that of the ancestral population
for shape. We discuss these findings in the context of the predictability of evolutionary
16 responses, and the need for fully multivariate approaches.

18 **Keywords:** Predation, natural selection, experimental evolution, *Drosophila*, wing shape,
geometric morphometrics, adaptation, multivariate selection.

Introduction

22 Biologists measure natural selection to help identify agents of selection, to infer how
current phenotypes were influenced by past selection and to predict future evolutionary
24 outcomes. Since the publication of the seminal work by Lande and Arnold Lande and
Arnold (1983), considerable effort has gone into measuring the form, magnitude and vari-
26 ability of phenotypic selection (Kingsolver et al., 2001; Hoekstra et al., 2001; Kingsolver
and Diamond, 2011; Siepielski et al., 2009; Morrissey and Hadfield, 2012). However, ad-
28 ditional factors influence the trajectory of evolution such as correlational selection, the
stability of the selective function (Brodie III, 1992), as well as the genetic architecture of
30 the traits (Hansen and Houle, 2008; Agrawal and Stinchcombe, 2009; Kirkpatrick, 2009),
making such predictions difficult in practice. In this study we address this predictability,
32 by investigating the extent to which experimental populations of *Drosophila melanogaster*
subject to predation risk, evolve along the trajectory predicted from phenotypic selection.

34 Studies have investigated how closely populations evolve along the direction predicted
from the multivariate breeders equation, (as a function of both selection and the ge-
36 netic variance-covariance matrix) (Schluter, 1996; Hansen and Houle, 2008; Agrawal and
Stinchcombe, 2009; Higgie and Blows, 2008; Hunt et al., 2007; Mcguigan et al., 2005;
38 Walsh and Blows, 2009; Blows et al., 2004; Simonsen and Stinchcombe, 2010). Yet in
only a handful of cases has selection been observed for a sufficient amount of time (be-
40 yond a few generations) to evaluate these predictions. Furthermore, the ecology and
natural history of many organisms limits us to estimating phenotypic selection, generally
42 over just a few generations (but see Ozgul et al., 2009; Grant and Grant, 2002, 2006).
For some selective agents like predation, the organism is consumed, prohibiting (at least
44 in the field) the measurement of many traits that are targets of selection. As a result,

it may be challenging to predict the evolutionary trajectory of some traits involved with
 46 anti-predator activity. This might suggest a pessimistic view of our ability to predict the
 selective response in natural systems.

48 Despite these issues, convergent and parallel evolution are often observed among pop-
 ulations, suggesting that persistent and predictable selection may be relatively common
 50 (Conte et al., 2012), even if it is difficult to measure. While estimates of the strength of
 viability selection suggest it may be weaker than for other fitness components (Hoekstra
 52 et al., 2001; Lind and Cresswell, 2005; Ajie et al., 2007), repeated evolution of simi-
 lar morphologies in response to predation for several fish species (O'Steen et al., 2002;
 54 Langerhans et al., 2004; Dayton et al., 2005; Langerhans and Makowicz, 2009) suggests
 a strong and consistent regime of selection. Similar results have also been observed for
 56 shell morphology among populations of snails in apparent response to predation (Auld
 and Relyea, 2011; DeWitt et al., 2000, 1999). When selection is relaxed by the removal
 58 of predators, even for just a few generations, trait means have been shown to change
 dramatically (Reznick et al., 1990, 1997; Reznick and Ghalambor, 2005), consistent with
 60 predation maintaining trait values in the face of potentially antagonistic selective effects.
 The prevalence of diverse, and often costly, traits that mediate interactions with predators
 62 suggests that predation profoundly influences fitness.

In this study we investigate how multivariate wing form of *Drosophila melanogaster*
 64 evolves along the trajectory predicted by initial estimates of phenotypic selection in re-
 sponse to predation by mantid nymphs (*Tenodera aridifolia sinensis*). This novel ex-
 66 perimental system has a rather rare (but see Svensson and Friberg, 2007; Kuchta and
 Svensson, 2014) and useful attribute in which the wings are not consumed when the fly
 68 is captured by its mantid predator (figure 1A). This allows us to collect the wings from
 both surviving and consumed flies to estimate the form and magnitude of natural selection

on both size and shape. Multivariate shape provides a robust framework for evaluating evolutionary predictions. While size only varies along one axis, a high dimensional representation of shape is less likely to change in the predicted direction by chance alone. This enables us to make clear quantitative comparisons of the degree of similarity between predicted and observed response to selection (Pitchers et al., 2013). It also extends a well developed genetic system for use in studies of predator-prey interactions.

Wing size and shape in *Drosophila* have been used as a model system for evolution (Gilchrist and Huey, 2004; Gilchrist et al., 2004; Huey et al., 2000; Gilchrist and Partridge, 1999; Weber, 1990b; Mezey and Houle, 2005; Pitchers et al., 2013), genetics, and development (Dworkin and Gibson, 2006; Houle and Fierst, 2013; Palsson and Gibson, 2000). There is substantial segregating variation for wing size and shape, with some variants mapped (Weber et al., 1999; Palsson, 2004; Zimmerman et al., 2000; Mezey et al., 2005; McKechnie et al., 2010; Dworkin et al., 2005; Palsson et al., 2005). Studies have demonstrated that genetic variation is available along many dimensions of wing shape (Mezey et al., 2005). Using artificial selection, it has been demonstrated that this variation can be selected upon (Houle et al., 2003; Weber, 1990b, 1992, 1990a; Palenzona and Alicchio, 1973; Rochetta and Palenzona, 1975). Yet little is known about the selective agents influencing variation for wing form (but see (Hoffmann et al., 2007; Menezes et al., 2013)) or the potential functional role it plays in avoiding predation.

We quantified the magnitude and direction of selection on wing size and shape in an outbred population. We then allowed replicates derived from this population to experimentally evolve under episodic selection with mantids or under predator-free conditions. For the evolved populations we quantified changes in wing form, with particular focus on the direction of change, relating it to the vectors of phenotypic selection predicted from the base population. We demonstrate that while evolution of wing shape for the

predator populations is more aligned with the initial vector of selection than are the con-
 96 trols, not all of the change is in the direction predicted by the initial vector of selection.
 Despite observing consistent directional selection on wing size, we observed considerable
 98 divergence in its evolutionary response. Furthermore, we measured phenotypic selection
 on the evolved populations, and demonstrate that the magnitude of selection on both
 100 size and shape is substantially diminished in the populations exposed to predation and is
 distinct from the initial vector of predicted selection. We discuss these results within the
 102 context of how populations change along a fitness surface, the importance of unmeasured
 traits and the degree of repeatability to agents of selection.

104 **Materials and Methods**

Base Populations

106 We used an advanced intercross with 100 inbred lines to generate a synthetic outbred
 ancestral population referred to as the base. The inbred lines were derived from two pop-
 108 ulations of wild *Drosophila melanogaster* collected in fruit orchards in Maine and North
 Carolina (Goering et al., 2009; Reed et al., 2010). Flies were round robin intercrossed
 110 for three generations and then allowed to mate randomly for 5 generations. We chose
 this approach, as a compromise to minimize confounding laboratory adaptation while
 112 still incorporating genetic variation present in natural populations. With this approach
 linkage disequilibrium among variants will likely be more extensive than in wild-caught
 114 flies. Post-intercross, we maintained the population at large size on cornmeal molasses
 media with live yeast in four 200ml culture bottles at 24°C and 60% humidity.

116 Predation Environment

We used first instar nymphs of the Chinese mantid (*Tenodera aridifolia sinensis*) as
 118 predators. We collected mantid egg cases locally from old fields in southern Michigan
 and supplemented these from garden suppliers (Nature's Control Medford, Oregon) when
 120 necessary. We hatched and maintained egg cases at 24°C and 60% humidity. Approxi-
 mately 100–400 mantids emerged from each egg case and were used as predators for the
 122 duration of the first nymphal instar. After hatching, we housed mantids at 18°C and 60%
 humidity in arenas consisting of a 710mL plastic cup with a mesh covered window for air
 124 flow. We placed a tissue at the bottom of each cup to trap moisture when watering to help
 maintain humidity. We also added a green plastic aquarium plant to provide substrate
 126 for mantids to perch upon. Unless otherwise specified we used five mantids per arena.

All episodes of predation occurred at 18.5°C and 60% humidity, and were initiated
 128 between 12-3 pm. We fasted mantids for 24 hours before each episode of selection to
 increase predation rates. Arenas were cleaned with 70% ethanol and water before use.
 130 25 flies were introduced into each arena via a funnel, after which arenas were returned to
 the incubator. After 24 hours, all predation arenas were moved to a 4°C refrigerator to
 132 knock down flies and mantids to aid collecting. We then removed the mantids from each
 container, and surviving flies were censused.

134 Testing the role of flight in the escape response using a *vestigial*¹ mutant population

136 To test whether flight played a role in the escape response, we tested whether wing loss
 would negatively impact survival under risk of predation. We introgressed a mutation in
 138 the *vestigial* (*vg*¹) gene into the base population by repeated backcrossing for 10 gener-

ations. The vg^1 mutation causes a nearly complete loss of the wing blade and associated musculature (Sudarsan et al., 2001). We competed individuals from the vg^1 mutant population with their wild-type conspecifics by placing 13 mutant and 13 wild-type flies in each of 16 arenas (8 arenas each for male and female flies). The survivors for both vg^1 and their wild-type conspecifics were counted after 24 hours with the predators.

144 **Assaying Phenotypic Selection: Base population**

To assess how naturally segregating variation for wing size and shape might be associated with survival during predation events, flies from the base population were exposed to predation. Predation on males and females was assayed in separate arenas so that we could examine independent effects of sex. We placed 20 flies into each arena (9 arenas each for females and males). Four days later we set up a second block of arenas (10 arenas for females, 8 for males). After predation, we collected all surviving flies and all wings from consumed flies from the bottom of the arenas. We also collected 100 individuals of each sex that were not exposed to predators. All bodies and wings were preserved in ethanol for dissection and measurement.

154 **Experimental Evolution**

We randomly selected five hundred flies from the base population and used these as parents to generate the four populations for experimental evolution. We randomly assigned offspring of these 500 individuals to each of the treatments, with blocks of offspring for the different replicates. The predator free populations control for selection and adaption independent of the predators (i.e. alterations in competitive environment). Selection was administered in two replicate sets each consisting of one predation and one control

population, hereafter referred to as PredR1, ConR1, PredR2, and ConR2. We offset the
 162 generational cycle of replicate 2 from replicate 1 by 2–5 days for logistical reasons, but
 the populations were otherwise treated identically. Each population was reared in four
 164 bottles with approximate densities of 100–500 eggs per bottle each generation. We did not
 explicitly control for density, but restricted egg laying time to 2–6 hours to avoid larval
 166 overcrowding. Bottles were reared at 24°C and 60% humidity until eclosion of adults.

Three days after eclosion of the first flies, progeny from each population were lightly
 168 anesthetized using CO₂, placed randomly into vials, and maintained at 18.5°C and 60%
 relative humidity. The following day, flies from a given treatment were mixed under
 170 anesthesia, to minimize inadvertent selection on developmental time. Flies (25/vial) were
 transferred to fresh vials, corresponding to the number of arenas used for predation in
 172 that generation. Each generation we varied the total number of arenas depending on
 the voracity of the current batch of mantids in order to ensure that the total number
 174 of survivors was large enough to limit the effects of drift (between 150–400 surviving
 individuals/generation). Flies from the control vials were similarly mixed under anesthesia
 176 after which we placed 50 flies into each of 8 vials. Remaining predation and control flies
 were set aside as backups. All flies were then returned to the incubator at 18.5°C and 60%
 178 for at least 24 hours prior to the episode of predation. Because egg cases were seasonally
 available, we occasionally used second instar mantids to maintain experimental evolution.
 180 However, second instar mantids were not used for any experimental trials. Control arenas
 were identical to predation arenas, only lacking mantids.

182 After selection, we collected all survivors from the predation arenas. To maintain
 similar population sizes we selected individuals at random from the control populations
 184 matching the number of male and female survivors from the respective predation pop-
 ulation. Individuals from each treatment were transferred into separate 30x30x30 cm

polyester mesh cages, and allowed to recover for 30–45 minutes before fresh bottles of food media were placed into each cage. After allowing sufficient time for egg laying, the bottles were then removed from the cages and reared at 24°C and 60% humidity. After breeding, remaining adult flies were stored in ethanol at -20°C.

Assaying Phenotypic Selection: Evolved populations

To examine how the fitness function changed as a result of experimental evolution, we repeated phenotypic selection (as described above) during generations 31 and 32 of the experiment. Given the large size of this experiment, it was performed in four blocks, with two blocks for each generation. At generation 31 of experimental evolution, we set up 14 arenas each of PredR1 females & males and ConR1 females & males. Five days later, we set up 14, 14, 8, and 9 arenas for PredR2 females & males and ConR2 females & males respectively. At generation 32, we set up 14 arenas each of PredR1 females & males and ConR1 females & males. Five days later we set up 13, 13, 14, and 14 arenas for PredR2 females & males and ConR2 females & males respectively. As before, we collected all surviving flies and unconsumed wings and stored them in ethanol. Overlapping egg cases were used for this experiment, and egg case of origin was used as a covariate in the model (see below). We distributed mantids so as not to confound predation effects across replicates and treatments.

Wing Measurement & Statistical Analysis

Wings were dissected and mounted on slides in 70% glycerol. When available, both wings from an individual were mounted. Wings were also dissected from 25 flies that were stored from the initial generation of experimental evolution, and from every 10

generations following up to generation 30 to estimate the trajectory of size and shape change. Wings were imaged at 40X magnification on an Olympus DP30BW camera mounted on a Olympus BX51 microscope using ‘DP controller’ V3.1.1 software. All images were saved in greyscale as TIFF files.

To capture landmark and semi-landmark data we followed a modified protocol (Pitchers et al., 2013) for the use of the WINGMACHINE software (Houle et al., 2003). We used the program TPSDIG2 (Rohlf 2011) to manually record the coordinates of two starting landmarks, and used WINGMACHINE to fit nine B-splines to the veins and margins of the wings in the images. We extracted 14 landmark and 34 semi-landmark positions, and performed Procrustes superimposition (Zelditch et al., 2012). After superimposition, the positions of semi-landmarks were allowed to slide along each segment of the wing margin/veins, minimizing Procrustes distance, using CPR V0.2 (Marquez 2011). The data were checked for visual outliers at multiple stages; and putative outlier images were reexamined and splines re-fit if necessary. The (semi-)landmark configurations for all wings measured for this study were superimposed together, resulting in a common shape space. Centroid size was used as measure for size (Zelditch et al., 2012). For flies with both wings collected, we calculated the mean shape and centroid size per individual.

Model Selection

For the univariate analyses, we evaluated model fits using Akaike’s Information Criteria (AIC) and Bayesian information criteria (BIC). AIC has been shown to often ‘prefer’ more complex models than there is support for, particularly when sample sizes are large (Grueber et al., 2011), we used model weights from BIC throughout for consistency to perform model averaging when appropriate. Unless otherwise noted, all further analyses were conducted in R (V2.15.1) (R Core Team, 2012). Scripts for the custom functions

described below are available with the data from DRYAD.doi.XXXX.

Analysis of Survival

For the *vg*¹ mutant and wild-type competition assays, we fit the model:

$$WT_{prop} \sim N(\mu + \beta_{sex}, \sigma^2) \quad (1)$$

where WT_{prop} was the proportion of wild-type survivors in each arena, and β_{sex} was the model coefficient for sex.

For the base and evolved populations, we measured survival ability as the total number of surviving flies in each container. For the base population, we fit the model:

$$Surv \sim N(\mu + \beta_{sex}, \sigma^2) \quad (2)$$

along with a set of expanded and restricted models (Supplementary table 1) where $Surv$ was the number of surviving flies in each arena and β_{sex} was the model coefficient for sex. Model averaging produced coefficient estimates indistinguishable from the model with best support so this model was used for further inference.

For the evolved populations we fit the model:

$$Surv \sim N(\mu + \beta_{SR} + \beta_{gen} + \beta_{eggcs}, \sigma^2) \quad (3)$$

along with a set of expanded and restricted models (supplementary table 2) where $Surv$ was the number of surviving flies in each arena and β_{SR} , β_{gen} , and β_{eggcs} were the model coefficients for selection regime, generation of selection when the assays were performed, and the egg case of origin for the mantids in each arena. The coefficient estimates produced

from model averaging models 1 and 2, which accounted for 95% of the overall support,
 250 were indistinguishable from the model with best support so for simplicity we used it for
 further inference. For the above models, we confirmed the effects using generalized linear
 252 models (poisson with log link), or a logistic regression with similar results.

Analysis of Phenotypic Selection on Size

254 We used the Lande and Arnold (1983) approach to examine selection acting on wing size
 in the base and evolved populations. As recommended by Janzen and Stern (1998), we
 256 used logistic regression on survival for statistical inference and general linear model on
 relative fitness to estimate coefficients. Relative fitness for each individual was calculated
 258 by scaling survival (0 for dead and 1 for survived) by the total proportion of survivors in
 each experiment. To measure linear selection in the base population we fit the model:

$$pr(W) \sim bi(p = \text{logit}^{-1}(\beta_0 + \beta_{size})) \quad (4)$$

260 along with a set of expanded and restricted models (supplementary table 3). W was ab-
 solute fitness (survival) and β_{size} was the model coefficient for standardized wing centroid
 262 size. The coefficients produced by model averaging were indistinguishable from the model
 with best support so it was used for further inference. It should be noted that we are
 264 estimating the linear S , and non-linear C selection differentials (Brodie III et al., 1995).
 The β 's in the equations are used to represent estimated model parameters, and do not
 266 represent selection gradients.

To measure linear selection in the evolved populations we fit the model:

$$pr(W) \sim (p = \text{logit}^{-1}(\beta_0 + \beta_{size} + \beta_{SR} + \beta_{rep} + \beta_{sex} + \beta_{gen} + \beta_{size \times SR} + \beta_{rep \times gen} + \beta_{sex \times gen} + \beta_{SR \times rep})) \quad (5)$$

268 along with a set of expanded and restricted models (supplementary table 4) where W
was fitness and β_{size} , β_{SR} , β_{rep} , β_{sex} , and β_{gen} were model coefficients for standardized
270 wing centroid size, selection regime, replicate, sex, and the generation of experimental
evolution respectively. We fit separate models as above including the quadratic effect of
272 size to estimate non-linear selection. Estimates for non-linear selection on size were near
zero, non-significant, and did not improve model fits in either the base or the evolved
274 populations.

Non-parametric estimation of the form of the fitness functions substantially aids vi-
276 sualization and interpretation of fitness functions (Schluter, 1988). We therefore used
generalized additive models from the the MGCV package V1.7.22 (Wood, 2004) to fit cu-
278 bic splines to subsets of the data from each experiment corresponding to the relevant
significant effects estimated by the logistic regression analyses. Optimal smoothing pa-
280 rameters were estimated using REML.

Variances in Size & Shape

282 One additional approach to investigating natural selection is to examine the changes in
phenotypic variance before and after the selective event (Endler, 1986). Under either
284 directional or stabilizing selection, a reduction in variation would be predicted. Under
disruptive selection however, we would predict an increase in variation. Analyzing dif-

ferences in variance between dead and surviving flies, as well as between predation and control populations may therefore provide additional information on the type of selection occurring in these populations. We used Levene's test to assess changes in variance for wing size, using deviations from the median rather than the mean since this approach is more robust to departures from normality. For the base population, we modeled the main effects of sex and size because our previous analyses lacked support for an interaction between sex and the form of selection. We fit the model:

$$Ld \sim N(\mu + \beta_{sex} + \beta_W, \sigma^2) \quad (6)$$

where Ld was the Levene's deviates for each individual, β_{sex} was the model coefficient for sex and β_W is the model coefficient for absolute fitness. Though our previous analyses do not suggest that selection acting in the evolved populations differed between replicates, differences in size between PredR1 and PredR2 suggest that its inclusion is appropriate. We fit the model:

$$Ld \sim N(\mu + \beta_{SR} + \beta_{rep} + \beta_{sex} + \beta_W + \beta_{SR \times rep}, \sigma^2) \quad (7)$$

where Ld was the Levene's deviates for each individual and β_{SR} , β_{rep} , β_{sex} , and β_W were the model coefficients for selection regime, replicate, sex, and absolute fitness, respectively. Confidence intervals for all estimates were generated by non-parametric bootstraps, in order to avoid issues with non-normality of residuals. We also calculated the coefficient of variation for each of the groups modeled above. Because we know that there is substantial sexual size dimorphism as well as size differences among the base and evolved populations, this approach should provide more intuitive visualization.

To compare levels of variation in shape we took a somewhat simpler approach. We

expressed the variability of each group as the trace of its covariance matrix for shape. We then bootstrapped the data to generate samples of each covariance matrix in order to calculate confidence intervals on the estimated matrix trace. Non-overlapping (95%) confidence intervals were then used to infer statistical support for differences in variance among groups.

Multivariate Analysis of Shape

In our initial analyses, we found that the modeled effects of allometry and sexual dimorphism were extremely consistent between treatments and over time (i.e. the vectors of model coefficients for sex and for size were very tightly correlated; see below). In order to facilitate the interpretation of the modeled coefficients of selection and generation number, we therefore sought to exclude these effects from our analyses. With data from all wings pooled, we fit the model:

$$\mathbf{S} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\beta}_{sex} + \boldsymbol{\beta}_{size}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{S}$ is the matrix of Procrustes coordinates and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{sex}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{size}$ are the vectors of model coefficients for sex and for wing centroid size respectively. $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is the “error” covariance matrix. We retained the residuals from this model as our shape variables.

Configurations of Procrustes coordinates by definition include dimensions without variance. The Procrustes superimposition results in a deficiency of 4 ranks (1 each for removed size and rotation information, and 2 for position), and each semi-landmark may contribute as little as 1 added dimension (Zelditch et al., 2012). In order that the shape data would not be rank deficient, we extracted principal components from the (96-dimensional) residuals, and retained the first $96 - (4 + 34) = 58$ principal components, comprising $> 99.9\%$

of the shape variance in the full set of residuals. Shape PC's used in all the analyses below
 328 are thus of full rank, and are expressed in a common sub-space.

330 Modelling Shape Change

Separately within each of the four evolved populations, we estimated the direction of
 332 observed evolutionary change as the vector of model coefficients from the multivariate
 linear model:

$$\mathbf{S}_p \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\beta}_{gen}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \quad (9)$$

334 where $\mathbf{S}_p$ is the matrix of principal component scores for shape in a given population
 and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{gen}$ is vector of model coefficients for time, expressed as the number of generations
 336 removed from to the base population. Once we had estimated these vectors of parameters,
 we compared their directions by calculating vector correlations as:

$$r = \frac{|\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b}|}{\|\mathbf{a}\| \times \|\mathbf{b}\|} \quad (10)$$

338 where $|\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b}|$ is the absolute value of the dot (scalar) product between vectors $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$,
 while $\|\mathbf{a}\|$, and $\|\mathbf{b}\|$ are the magnitudes (L^2 , or Euclidean norm), for each vector. The
 340 absolute value for the dot product was used to avoid any numeric issues with arbitrary
 sign changes that can occur computationally (during the bootstrapping procedure, see
 342 below). Thus $r = 0$ represents no similarity between the vectors while $r = 1$ means the
 two vectors point in an identical orientation (but possibly opposite in direction). Given
 344 that r is a multivariate extension of the Pearson correlation co-efficient ρ , we consider this
 a more intuitive measure than the vector angle ($\theta = \arccos(r)$ in radians) which has been

used elsewhere. Confidence intervals were computed using non-parametric random pairs bootstrapping, from 10,000 bootstrap iterations. This approach was used both to compare the direction of $\mathbf{S}$ as measured in all five populations, and to compare the directions of observed shape change among the evolved populations.

To illustrate the magnitude of change in wing shape during experimental evolution, we calculated a shape score (Drake and Klingenberg, 2008). Briefly, we projected the shape data onto a line in the direction defined by the vector of model coefficients for the generation term (β_{gen}) from model (3):

$$\text{shapescore} = \mathbf{Y}\beta^T(\beta\beta^T)^{-0.5} \quad (11)$$

The shape score provides a univariate measure of shape change that can be plotted against generation number to visually assess the magnitude and linearity of the relationship (Drake and Klingenberg, 2008). We used custom R functions to calculate vector correlations and shape scores.

Selection on Shape

Within each population, we estimated the vector of linear shape differentials ($\mathbf{S}$). Traditionally this would be calculated as vector of differences between the mean phenotype of survivors and the mean phenotype of those individuals that were preyed upon. Here we estimated $\mathbf{S}$ using a 2-block partial least squares (PLS) approach (Rohlf and Corti, 2000; Klingenberg and Zaklan, 2000; Mitteroecker and Bookstein, 2011; Klingenberg and Monteiro, 2005; Gomez et al., 2008, 2006) with the matrix of the 58 shape PC's forming one block, and the vector of survival data (0 or 1 for dead or survived) as the second block. We note that in this case this estimate of $\mathbf{S}$ is proportional to the differences between the

mean shape configurations for the dead and survivors.

368 It is important to note that wing shape itself is the trait, and not individual land-
marks/PC's. After Procrustes superimposition, individual landmarks and semi-landmarks
370 cannot be meaningfully interpreted independent of the whole shape configuration and the
superimposition can generate correlation between landmarks that is confounded with bi-
372 ological correlations (Zelditch et al., 2012). Thus, interpreting the selection gradients,
 β , from a multiple regression for shape (*sensu* Lande and Arnold, 1983) for "individual"
374 shape variables is biologically meaningless (Albert et al., 2008). In addition, selection
gradients can be difficult to visualize for shape (Klingenberg and Monteiro, 2005) but see
376 (Mitteroecker and Bookstein, 2011), in particular because estimating the inverse of the
phenotypic covariance matrix, $\mathbf{P}^{-1}$, can be problematic. We observed that, upon resam-
378 pling, lack of stability in $\mathbf{P}^{-1}$ caused computationally difficulties. One alternative is to
retain only the first few PC's and analyze them as if they were independent traits (Gomez
380 et al., 2006, 2008; Kuchta and Svensson, 2014). This is still sub-optimal, however, since
substantial variation and selection may be missed and the biological interpretation of any
382 selection that is detected is difficult. While this is an important and outstanding issue, we
elected to use selection differentials for the shape analyses because they retain biological
384 meaning and the focus of the study is on the predictability of selection not its specific
form or estimation. However, this does mean that the results need to be interpreted as a
386 combination of both direct and indirect selection on shape.

We estimated total selection on wing shape as the magnitude of the vector of the
388 selection differentials, $\|\mathbf{S}\|$, and used sampling with replacement of the data to gener-
ate non-parametric bootstrap confidence intervals on these estimates. Additionally, we
390 permuted survivorship relative to the measures of shape to assess the null hypothesis
that wing shape does not contribute to variation for survivorship. We also compared

the directions of the $\mathbf{S}$ vectors using vector correlations as described above. Finally, we wanted to assess the degree to which the experimental evolution populations had evolved in the direction 'predicted' by selection as measured in the base population. To do this we calculated the vector correlations between the $\mathbf{S}$ vector measured in the precursor population and the vector of model coefficients for generation (β_{gen} from model (8)) as modeled separately for each population.

Results

Evidence that flight aids in the escape response

To test whether flight performance and wing form were potential targets of selection driven by the mantid predators, we introgressed a mutation in the *vestigial* (*vg*) gene into our base outbred population that nearly completely ablates the wing blade and associated flight muscles. We competed *vg^l* (functionally wingless) flies and their wild-type conspecifics with the predators. As predicted, the *vg^l* individuals were disproportionately the targets of predation. The survivors for both sexes consisted of approximately 60% wild-type and 40% mutant individuals (figure S1), consistent with a role for flight and possibly wing morphology in the escape response of *Drosophila*.

Predator driven selection on natural variation for wing form

We next asked how natural variation for wing form was associated with survivorship by exposing flies from the base population to the mantids. We observed evidence for significant negative directional selection on wing size (Figure 1B, Table S1, $S = -0.29 \pm 0.22$, $p \simeq 0.01$) with little evidence for non-linear selection ($C = -0.05 \pm 0.22$, $p \simeq 0.16$). Visualization by fitting cubic splines to the survival data (Schluter 1988) was

414 consistent with the estimates of directional selection (figure 1B). Despite sex specific
differences in survivorship (6.7 ± 0.75 & 3.8 ± 1.07 survivors per arena for females and
416 males respectively), evidence was weak for an interaction between selection on size and
sex (Table S1). It is currently unclear whether the target is wing size *per se* or whether
418 it is due to a correlation between wing size and overall body size.

Additionally, shape has been shown to be correlated with escape ability in other or-
420 ganisms (Langerhans et al., 2004; Dayton et al., 2005; Langerhans and Makowicz, 2009;
Svensson and Friberg, 2007). Using a 58 dimensional representation of wing shape (figure
422 S2), we used partial least squares (PLS) to estimate the vector of selection differentials
for shape (**S**) in the base population. We visualized this **S** vector for shape comparison
424 (figure 1C). We see selection for a change in aspect ratio in which relatively longer and
narrower wings are favored.

426 **What does wing form look like after experimental evolution?**

We asked whether experimental evolution under risk of mantid predation would result
428 in phenotypic changes in wing form consistent with our initial estimates of selection.
Previous work has demonstrated that both wing size and shape have moderate to high
430 heritabilities, and most aspects of wing shape are readily altered by artificial selection
(Mezey and Houle, 2005; Weber, 1990*b*). To assess this we subjected two populations
432 of flies to episodic selection by mantids, each paired with control populations evolved
without predators. The control populations allow us to assess the effects of selection due
434 to the experimental evolution procedure unrelated to the predators that occurred during
the experimental evolution process.

436 As expected, survival in both predator populations increased, compared to the controls
(10.86 ± 0.78 & 13.98 ± 0.79 survivors per arena for control and predation populations re-

spectively; figure 2A). This represents a $\sim 30\%$ increase in survivorship relative to the control populations. We did not observe differential survival between sexes in this experiment for either selection regime.

We measured individuals stored during the experimental evolutionary process every ten generations, from the base to generation 50, to track changes in wing form. Wing size of all populations increased $\sim 3.7\%$ over the 50 generations of experimental evolution ($0.0035 \text{ mm} \pm 0.0004 \text{ mm}$ per generation). This change was most likely a result of selection due to non-predatory aspects of the experimental evolutionary procedure because all populations increased at similar rates and maintained the same overall sexual dimorphism. However, environmental variation in these samples collected directly from the experimental evolution regime is relatively large (Figure S3).

To more carefully estimate size differences among the evolved populations, we measured wing size in the overall population by using the wings from the dead and surviving flies from the phenotypic selection experiments, as all flies were reared under density controlled conditions. Thus environmental and genetic effects were not confounded. Comparison of the number of surviving and dead flies from this assay to the number of wings recovered suggests that nearly all wings from dead individuals were recovered, and should provide reasonable estimates.

Under these conditions, the relevant contrast is the difference between the control populations and predation populations. We found that the two control populations had similar wing sizes, yet the two populations evolved under risk of predation diverged in size (figure 2B) even though all populations showed a general size increase relative to the ancestral population. Surprisingly only PredR2 has evolved in the predicted direction, with wings $\sim 1\%$ smaller than controls, while PredR1 evolved wings that are $\sim 2\%$ larger.

In terms of shape, all four populations have evolved from the base population, though

not to an equal extent. We visualized the evolutionary trajectories of the four populations
 464 by plotting the shape score for generational effects (equation 10) (figure 3A & B). In all
 four cases the evolutionary trajectories were best described by a simple linear model.
 466 Whereas the two control populations have changed in a very similar fashion (figure 3A),
 the two predation populations are clearly divergent, with wing shape in PredR2 evolving
 468 significantly more rapidly than in PredR1 (figure 3B).

Over the course of experimental evolution the wings of all populations have changed
 470 aspect ratio: their length increasing slightly as their depth decreases. This change is most
 pronounced in PredR2 (figure 3C). Other than the differences in aspect ratio, PredR1
 472 and PredR2 differ most noticeably in the response of the cross-veins and the distal end
 of L5. PredR1 demonstrates a proximal shift in the posterior cross-vein and an anterior
 474 shift in the attachment of L5 to the margin; by contrast in PredR2 there was no change
 in L5 and an anterior shift in the anterior cross-vein.

476 **What do the fitness functions look like after experimental evolu- tion**

478 After 30 generations of experimental evolution, we again exposed flies that evolved with
 (and without) predators to a bout of predation. We observed negative directional selection
 480 for size in the control populations ($S = -0.16 \pm 0.07$, $p \simeq 0.0001$; figure 4A), consistent with
 our findings from the ancestral base population. We also observed negative directional
 482 selection in the predation populations, but of diminished magnitude relative to the controls
 ($S = -0.06 \pm 0.05$, $p \simeq 0.0005$; figure 4B). Both the control and the predation populations
 484 showed extremely weak quadratic selection on size ($C = 0.0001 \pm 0.03$, $p \simeq 0.73$). We
 might reasonably expect that the reduction in the magnitude of directional selection in

486 PredR2 was a result of evolutionary change in wing size in response to selection. However, this provides no explanation for the increase in size in PredR1.

488 We assessed selection on wing shape in the evolved populations as $\mathbf{S}$; the vector of selection differentials between captured flies and survivors and compared the magnitudes of total selection on shape from the differential, $\|\mathbf{S}\|$. For the estimates of $\|\mathbf{S}\|$, we also generated distributions under the null expectation (of no association between wing shape and survival) using permutations of the data. In addition we also calculated the vector correlations between differentials in order to quantify their degree of alignment. For 492 both approaches we computed confidence intervals on our estimates by applying a non-parametric bootstrap approach.

496 As can be seen from figure 4C, there was evidence for a significant association between shape and survival in the presence of the mantid predators for all populations: the estimates of $\|\mathbf{S}\|$ exceeded the 95% threshold permuted under the null hypothesis. Also notable are the much smaller $\|\mathbf{S}\|$ estimates of the predation populations compared 500 to that in the base population. This evidence is consistent with a relative reduction in the magnitude of selection experienced by the predation populations after 30 generations. Interestingly, there is some evidence for difference in $\|\mathbf{S}\|$ between the two control 502 populations, however both still exceed the predation treatment regimes.

504 The directions of the $\mathbf{S}$ vectors in the predation populations are also quite divergent, however, and their vector correlations with the base differ; 0.39 (0.07 – 0.59) & 0.02 (~ 0 – 506 0.34) though our estimate are not very precise (vector correlation followed by bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals, base $\mathbf{S}$ vs. PredR1 $\mathbf{S}$ & PredR2 $\mathbf{S}$ respectively). By contrast 508 the vector correlations between the controls and the base population were consistent with one another at 0.39 (0.01 – 0.51) & 0.29 (0.04 – 0.48) respectively (see figure S4 for all pairwise comparisons). Moreover, the directions of the $\mathbf{S}$ vectors measured in the four 510

evolved populations are not closely aligned (figure S5).

512 **Has wing form evolved in the direction predicted by selection on** 514 **the base population?**

514 While there has been evolution of shape in all four populations, we wanted to assess how
much of the observed change is in the predicted direction (based on **S** in the ancestral
516 base population). We calculated the vector correlations between the generation shape
change vectors from each evolved population and the **S** vector from the base population
518 and observed that the evolutionary responses of the predation populations were more
aligned with the predicted vector compared with the control populations (figure 5). It
520 is notable that none of the populations are particularly highly aligned with the initial
predicted vector.

522 Given that both predation populations have experienced a similar reduction in the
magnitude of selection (as represented by $\|\mathbf{S}\|$: figure 4C), and a similar amount of evo-
524 lutionary change in this direction (figure 5), it appears that they experienced similar
changes in the selective function for shape, despite their divergent evolutionary response
526 for size (figure 3C). This suggests that the two predation populations are evolving dif-
ferent avoidance strategies in response to the predation pressure imposed by the mantids
528 — likely involving traits other than wing morphology. In the case of PredR2 there is
evidence that the reduction in the intensity of selection is associated with evolution in
530 the predicted direction, but it seems likely that there may be other adaptations occurring
in PredR1

532 Changes in variance in both size and shape

Changes in variation can also provide information about the form of selection experienced by a population. Evidence for differences in variance for size between survival classes in the base population was weak (Levene's deviates = 0.28 ± 0.04 , 0.27 ± 0.03 , 0.24 ± 0.04 for unselected, dead, and surviving individuals respectively, $p \simeq 0.25$). Males had lower variance for all survival classes (-0.07 ± 0.03 , $p < 0.001$). For the evolved populations, differences in size variance were only found among populations, with ConR1 and PredR2 having equal variance (Levene's deviates = 0.11 ± 0.01 , 0.11 ± 0.01 respectively), ConR2 having higher variance (Levene's deviates = 0.15 ± 0.01), and PredR1 having lower variance (Levene's deviates = 0.10 ± 0.01). Surviving individuals trended towards lower variance, but the difference was not significant (-0.003 ± 0.006 , $p \simeq 0.37$). Males again had lower size variance, but a much lower magnitude of difference (-0.015 ± 0.006 , $p < 0.005$).

Estimates of variance for shape in each population (the trace of the covariance matrix) show a dramatic reduction in variance in surviving flies and lower overall shape variance in the populations that evolved under predation risk (figure 6). Not only is the variance lower in the predation populations as compared to the controls for shape, but the surviving populations have much lower variation when compared to the populations that were captured and eaten by the mantids suggesting that selection has already reduced variation in the evolved populations and continues to do so.

552 Discussion

For several decades, phenotypic selection analysis has been used to attempt to identify the primary targets of selection within natural populations under the assumption that the

presence of selection on specific traits would provide information about about how those
 556 traits evolved and what future changes could be expected. The striking levels of conver-
 gence and parallellism in several well known study systems suggests that this assumption
 558 may be valid (O'Steen et al., 2002; Langerhans et al., 2004; Dayton et al., 2005; Langer-
 hans and Makowicz, 2009; Auld and Relyea, 2011; DeWitt et al., 2000, 1999). However
 560 estimates of phenotypic selection analyses have not always been able to predict long-term
 evolution. It remains unclear whether this contradiction is a result of publication bias
 562 or indicative of larger issues. In this study we measured phenotypic selection on a naive
 population in response to a novel predator. We then re-measured the strength and direc-
 564 tion of natural selection after populations were allowed to evolve under natural selection
 with the predator to determine whether our results would match the patterns of parallel
 566 response cited above. We found that the populations evolved divergent morphology for
 size but relatively consistent shapes. What do these results tell us about the form of
 568 natural selection, and what are the implications for its use in evolutionary prediction?

To use the breeder's equation to predict an evolutionary response, we require not only
 570 a vector of directional selection, but heritable variation along the same axis as selection
 (Hine et al., 2011; Walsh and Blows, 2009). The direction of this genetic variation is
 572 determined by the size and structure of the genetic covariance matrix $\mathbf{G}$. A number
 of studies have demonstrated that populations tend to evolve along genetic lines of least
 574 resistance (Schluter, 1996; McGuigan et al., 2005), not necessarily the direction of strongest
 selection.

576 Previous work has demonstrated that there is considerable segregating genetic vari-
 ation in most populations for wing shape. In particular the effective dimensionality of
 578 $\mathbf{G}$ for wing shape is quite high, and close to the number of measured traits (Mezey and
 Houle, 2005). Given the size and scope of the endeavor, we did not attempt to estimate

580 **G** for the base population we used. However, genetic variation among the progenitor
strains used to generate the population shows a high effective dimensionality (data not
582 shown), consistent with previous results from other populations. It is possible that genetic
variation in the direction of selection imposed by mantid predation may be minimal, and
584 that the genetic line of least resistance is not perfectly aligned with this direction. Thus
at least some of the common changes in wing form may be the result of a combination
586 of lab domestication and evolution along the genetic lines of least resistance. Despite
this, we see clear evidence for more shape change in the predation regimes consistent
588 with the initial vector of selection. Given the high dimensionality (58) of shape, this is a
pronounced effect, demonstrating that even with potentially countervailing selective and
590 genetic forces, selection is still altering shape as predicted.

In addition to the need for available genetic (co)variation, there are several factors
592 that can influence the evolutionary response to directional selection including: indirect
selection due to correlated traits, stabilizing selection, fluctuating selection, fitness trade-
594 offs, and unmeasured (but strongly selected) traits (Kingsolver and Diamond, 2011). The
selection differentials reported include direct and indirect selection, so even though we
596 cannot estimate the separate contributions of each, we saw significant total selection on
both wing size and shape. Additionally, neither the base nor the evolved populations
598 showed evidence for stabilizing selection that might have reduced the strength of direc-
tional selection. Though we expected the base population to be far from any fitness peak,
600 it is curious that the predation populations did not show stronger non-linear selection
given the reduction in the strength of the linear component.

602 **How similar is the form of selection after 30 generations of ex-** **perimental evolution**

604 The selective pressure imposed by the mantids on size remained relatively stable, con-
 sistent with the conclusions reached by Morrissey and Hadfield (2012). Our measure of
 606 S in the ancestral base suggested strong directional selection for smaller wings (~ -0.29).
 After nearly two years and 30 generations of evolution, the estimate of S was remarkably
 608 similar in the control populations (-0.16 , figure 4). This slight reduction in the magnitude
 is, perhaps, unsurprising since the difference in sample size—nearly an order of magnitude
 610 greater for the evolved populations—allowed for more precise estimation. The estimate
 is also in line with the median reported by Kingsolver and Diamond (2011) for size traits
 612 ($|0.14|$) and viability ($|0.08|$). As a result, there is little evidence to suggest that temporal
 variation in selection from generation to generation resulted in the divergence in size in
 614 the predation populations particularly because both populations still exhibit measurable
 directional selection.

616 **Selection on shape**

For shape, the picture is less clear. Because of the high dimensionality of shape, not only
 618 is estimation much more difficult, but there is a much larger available phenotype space.
 Perhaps unsurprisingly then, the vector correlations between selection in the base popu-
 620 lation and the control populations are reasonably low (~ 0.35) suggesting that fluctuating
 directionality of selection may have limited the evolutionary response. The degree to
 622 which there was true variation in direction of selection for shape, as compared to estima-
 tion issues (even with our large sample sizes) remains unclear. Indeed, this is one of the
 624 major reasons we used $\mathbf{S}$ instead of β , as estimating $\mathbf{P}^{-1}$ proved to be computationally

difficult, and caused problems during resampling. Despite this, both PredR1 and PredR2
 626 show considerable overlap between the vector of shape change during evolution and the
 direction of selection predicted in the base population ($r \sim 0.5$, figure 5). This suggests
 628 that even though the form of selection for shape is apparently less stable than for size, it
 has not resulted in substantial divergence between populations.

It is worth considering what is lost by using the selection differential $\mathbf{S}$ instead of the
 gradient, $\beta = \mathbf{P}^{-1}\mathbf{S}$. For most phenotypic selection studies the main difference relates
 632 to disentangling direct and indirect selection on traits (pre-multiplying by $\mathbf{P}^{-1}$ removes
 the phenotypic covariation). Shape data is unique, in that the different variables are not
 634 independent traits. Instead the whole configuration (as represented by a vector for each
 individual) is a geometric representation of the shape “trait”. Pre-multiplication by $\mathbf{P}^{-1}$
 636 has the potential to change the observed orientation of the vector of the selection differ-
 ential $\mathbf{S}$, however it also causes difficulties with interpretation of the resulting selection
 638 gradients, and so the preferred method is to visualize the selection differentials (Klingen-
 berg and Monteiro, 2005) as we have done here (but see (Mitteroecker and Bookstein,
 640 2011) for an alternative perspective). Other groups have instead utilized a small number
 of principal components of the shape data in a standard Lande–Arnold selection gradi-
 642 ent analysis (Gomez et al., 2006; Kuchta and Svensson, 2014). However, this utilizes a
 fraction of the variation in shape, with no guarantee that it represents the components
 644 of variation under selection. Thus a full multivariate approach is needed (Klingenberg,
 2010) though we currently lack an accepted standard *sensu* Lande–Arnold . We suggest
 646 that continued effort and discussion into estimating and visualizing selection on shape, as
 well as determining the appropriate “dimensionality” of such effects is warranted.

648 Possible causes of divergence and parallel evolution

Unknown fitness trade-offs and lab adaptation may have played a role in the divergence
 650 between PredR1 and PredR2. During the course of evolution, all four evolved populations
 showed a net increase in wing size of $\sim 3.2\%$ and a lengthening and broadening of the wing
 652 blade in direct contrast to the smaller, longer, and narrower wings favored by selection in
 the base population (figure 1). These changes were remarkably consistent among the four
 654 populations and are likely a result of selection due to shared aspects of the experimental
 evolutionary process independent of the predators. However, though the directionality of
 656 the shared evolved response and selection measured in the base population suggests that
 evolution may be slowed in the predation populations, this gives little indication as to
 658 why PredR1 diverged from the predicted size trajectory. This could be caused by drift
 between the replicates over the 30 generations of experimental evolution. However, this
 660 explanation is unsatisfactory as the evidence of drift is missing in the control populations
 wherein it would be expected to dominate. Though the utmost care was taken to control
 662 variation between the replicates, differences in the health and voracity of the mantids,
 as well as in some other environmental factors was unavoidable, possibly contributing to
 664 this effect.

Where do these results leave us? We possess robust theory for measuring selection,
 666 and for predicting evolutionary responses into the near future (Lande and Arnold, 1983).
 However, we are often left to assume that populations will evolve phenotypes in the distant
 668 future consistent with these estimates. Though a number of other systems have examined
 the evolutionary consequences of manipulating predation regimes long term, notably the
 670 work of David Reznick and colleagues (Reznick et al., 1990, 1997; Reznick and Ghalambor,
 2005), few studies have investigated how well evolutionary responses coincide with specific
 672 measures of selection. The *Drosophila*-mantid system described here allows us to maintain

specific selective pressure in a relatively homogeneous environment on a population with
 674 a known history. This allows us to not only impose specific selection pressures, but to
 remeasure selection itself during the evolutionary process.

676 It is likely that unmeasured anti-predator behavioral traits played an important role.
 Unmeasured traits that may be under selection (and genetically covary with measured
 678 traits) can profoundly influence the biological inferences we make about natural selection,
 and evolutionary response. While many studies of phenotypic selection attempt to ex-
 680 amine multiple traits that mediate the ecological interactions that generate variation in
 fitness, it is impossible to capture all of them in any one study. In a system like ours, where
 682 we employed a novel predator for *Drosophila*, anti-predator behaviors that were initially
 rare in the progenitor population can rise in frequency, fundamentally changing aspects
 684 of selection on other traits. For instance, if the escape response to direct attacks was the
 primary strategy early in the evolutionary process, but the ability to avoid the predators
 686 developed in later generations, then selection on wing size and shape would potentially
 become far weaker. Study systems like the one used here allow for additional future work
 688 to address these questions in a relatively straightforward manner, which will likely be-
 come increasingly important as we recognize the limitations of measuring relatively small
 690 numbers of traits.

Acknowledgments

692 This manuscript was improved by comments from Jeff Conner, Kay Holekamp, Barry
 Williams, Tony Frankino, and members of the Dworkin lab. This material is based in part
 694 upon work supported by NIH grant 1R01GM09442401 (to ID). This material is based in
 part upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Cooperative Agree-

ment No. DBI-0939454. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations
expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the
views of the National Science Foundation.

References

- Agrawal, A. F., and J. R. Stinchcombe. 2009. How much do genetic covariances alter the
rate of adaptation? *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 276:1183–1191.
- Ajé, B. C., L. M. Pintor, J. Watters, J. L. Kerby, J. I. Hammond, and A. Sih. 2007. A
framework for determining the fitness consequences of antipredator behavior. *Behav-
ioral Ecology* 18:267–270.
- Albert, A. Y. K., S. Sawaya, T. H. Vines, A. K. Knecht, C. T. Miller, B. R. Summers,
S. Balabhadra, D. M. Kingsley, and D. Schluter. 2008. The genetics of adaptive shape
shift in stickleback: pleiotropy and effect size. *Evolution* 62:7685.
- Auld, J. R., and R. A. Relyea. 2011. Adaptive plasticity in predator-induced defenses
in a common freshwater snail: altered selection and mode of predation due to prey
phenotype. *Evolutionary Ecology* 25:189–202.
- Blows, M. W., S. F. Chenoweth, and E. Hine. 2004. Orientation of the genetic variance-
covariance matrix and the fitness surface for multiple male sexually selected traits. *The
American Naturalist* 163:329–340.
- Brodie III, E. D. 1992. Correlational selection for color pattern and antipredator behavior
in the garter snake *Thamnophis ordinoides*. *Evolution* 46:1284–1298.

- 716 Brodie III, E. D., A. J. Moore, and F. J. Janzen. 1995. Visualizing and quantifying natural
selection. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 10:313–318.
- 718 Conte, G. L., M. E. Arnegard, C. L. Peichel, and D. Schluter. 2012. The probability of
genetic parallelism and convergence in natural populations. *Proceedings of the Royal*
720 *Society B* 279:5039–5047.
- Dayton, G. H., D. Saenz, K. A. Baum, R. B. Langerhans, and T. J. DeWitt. 2005. Body
722 shape, burst speed and escape behavior of larval anurans. *Oikos* 111:582–591.
- DeWitt, T., B. Robinson, and D. Wilson. 2000. Functional diversity among predators
724 of a freshwater snail imposes an adaptive trade-off for shell morphology. *Evolutionary*
Ecology Research 2:129–148.
- 726 DeWitt, T., A. Sih, and J. Hucko. 1999. Trait compensation and cospecialization in a
freshwater snail: size, shape and antipredator behaviour. *Animal Behaviour* 58:397–407.
- 728 Drake, A. G., and C. P. Klingenberg. 2008. The pace of morphological change: historical
transformation of skull shape in St Bernard dogs. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*
730 275:71–76.
- Dworkin, I., and G. Gibson. 2006. Epidermal growth factor receptor and transform-
732 ing growth factor-beta signaling contributes to variation for wing shape in *Drosophila*
melanogaster. *Genetics* 173:1417–1431.
- 734 Dworkin, I., A. Palsson, and G. Gibson. 2005. Replication of an *Egfr*-wing shape associ-
ation in a wild-caught cohort of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 169:2115–2125.
- 736 Endler, J. A. 1986. *Natural Selection in the Wild*. Princeton University Press.

- Gilchrist, A. S., and L. Partridge. 1999. A comparison of the genetic basis of wing
738 size divergence in three parallel body size clines of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics*
153:1775–1787.
- Gilchrist, G. W., and R. B. Huey. 2004. Plastic and genetic variation in wing loading as
740 a function of temperature within and among parallel clines in *Drosophila subobscura*.
742 *Integrative And Comparative Biology* 44:461–470.
- Gilchrist, G. W., R. B. Huey, J. Balanyà, M. Pascual, and L. Serra. 2004. A time series
744 of evolution in action: a latitudinal cline in wing size in South American *Drosophila*
subobscura. *Evolution* 58:768–780.
- Goering, L. M., P. K. Hunt, C. Heighington, C. Busick, P. S. Pennings, J. Hermisson,
746 S. Kumar, and G. Gibson. 2009. Association of orthodenticle with natural variation
748 for early embryonic patterning in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Journal Of Experimental*
Zoology Part B: Molecular And Developmental Evolution 312:841–854.
- Gomez, J. M., J. Bosch, F. Perfectti, J. D. Fernandez, M. Abdelaziz, and J. P. M. Ca-
750 macho. 2008. Spatial variation in selection on corolla shape in a generalist plant is
752 promoted by the preference patterns of its local pollinators. *Proceedings of the Royal*
Society B 275:2241–2249.
- Gomez, J. M., F. Perfectti, and J. P. M. Camacho. 2006. Natural selection on *Erysi-*
754 *num mediodispanicum* flower shape: insights into the evolution of zygomorphy. *The*
756 *American Naturalist* 168:531–545.
- Grant, P. R., and B. R. Grant. 2002. Unpredictable evolution in a 30-year study of
758 Darwin’s finches. *Science* 296:707–711.

- . 2006. Evolution of character displacement in Darwin’s finches. *Science* 313:224–
226.
- Grueber, C. E., S. Nakagawa, R. J. Laws, and I. G. Jamieson. 2011. Multimodel inference
in ecology and evolution: challenges and solutions. *Journal Of Evolutionary Biology*
24:699–711.
- Hansen, T. F., and D. Houle. 2008. Measuring and comparing evolvability and constraint
in multivariate characters. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 21:1201–1219.
- Higgie, M., and M. W. Blows. 2008. The evolution of reproductive character displacement
conflicts with how sexual selection operates within a species. *Evolution* 62:1192–1203.
- Hine, E., K. McGuigan, and M. W. Blows. 2011. Natural selection stops the evolution of
male attractiveness. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108:3659–3664.
PMID: 21321197.
- Hoekstra, H. E., J. M. Hoekstra, D. Berrigan, S. N. Vignieri, A. Hoang, C. E. Hill,
P. Beerli, and J. G. Kingsolver. 2001. Strength and tempo of directional selection in
the wild. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 98:9157–9160.
- Hoffmann, A. A., E. Ratna, C. Sgro, M. Barton, M. Blacket, R. Hallas, S. De Garis,
and A. Weeks. 2007. Antagonistic selection between adult thorax and wing size in
field released *Drosophila melanogaster* independent of thermal conditions. *Journal of*
evolutionary biology 20:2219–2227.
- Houle, D., and J. Fierst. 2013. Properties of spontaneous mutational variance and covari-
ance for wing size and shape in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evolution* 67:1116–1130.

- 780 Houle, D., J. Mezey, P. Galpern, and A. Carter. 2003. Automated measurement of
Drosophila wings. BMC Evolutionary Biology 3:25.
- 782 Huey, R. B., G. W. Gilchrist, M. L. Carlson, D. Berrigan, and L. Serra. 2000. Rapid
evolution of a geographic cline in size in an introduced fly. Science 287:308–309.
- 784 Hunt, J., M. W. Blows, F. Zajitschek, M. D. Jennions, and R. Brooks. 2007. Reconcil-
ing strong stabilizing selection with the maintenance of genetic variation in a natural
786 population of black field crickets (*Teleogryllus commodus*). Genetics 177:875–880.
- Janzen, F., and H. Stern. 1998. Logistic regression for empirical studies of multivariate
788 selection. Evolution 52:1564–1571.
- Kingsolver, J. G., and S. E. Diamond. 2011. Phenotypic selection in natural populations:
790 What limits directional selection? The American Naturalist 177:346–357.
- Kingsolver, J. G., H. E. Hoekstra, J. M. Hoekstra, D. Berrigan, S. N. Vignieri, C. E.
792 Hill, A. Hoang, P. Gibert, and P. Beerli. 2001. The strength of phenotypic selection in
natural populations. The American Naturalist 157:245–261.
- 794 Kirkpatrick, M. 2009. Patterns of quantitative genetic variation in multiple dimensions.
Genetica 136:271–284.
- 796 Klingenberg, C., and S. Zaklan. 2000. Morphological integration between developmental
compartments in the *Drosophila* wing. Evolution 54:1273–1285.
- 798 Klingenberg, C. P. 2010. Evolution and development of shape: integrating quantitative
approaches. Nature Reviews Genetics 11:623–635.

- 800 Klingenberg, C. P., and L. R. Monteiro. 2005. Distances and directions in multidimen-
sional shape spaces: implications for morphometric applications. *Systematic Biology*
802 54:678–688.
- Kuchta, S. R., and E. I. Svensson. 2014. Predator-mediated natural selection on the wings
804 of the damselfly *Calopteryx splendens*: differences in selection among trait types. *The*
American Naturalist .
- 806 Lande, R., and S. Arnold. 1983. The measurement of selection on correlated characters.
Evolution 37:1210–1226.
- 808 Langerhans, R. B., C. A. Layman, A. M. Shokrollahi, and T. J. DeWitt. 2004. Predator-
driven phenotypic diversification in *Gambusia affinis*. *Evolution* 58:2305–2318.
- 810 Langerhans, R. B., and A. M. Makowicz. 2009. Shared and unique features of morpho-
logical differentiation between predator regimes in *Gambusia caymanensis*. *Journal of*
812 *Evolutionary Biology* 22:2231–2242.
- Lind, J., and W. Cresswell. 2005. Determining the fitness consequences of antipredation
814 behavior. *Behavioral Ecology* 16:945–956.
- Mcguigan, K., S. F. Chenoweth, and M. W. Blows. 2005. Phenotypic divergence along
816 lines of genetic variance. *The American Naturalist* 165:32–43.
- Mckechnie, S. W., M. J. Blacket, S. V. Song, L. Rako, X. Carroll, T. K. Johnson, L. T.
818 Jensen, S. F. Lee, C. W. Wee, and A. A. Hoffmann. 2010. A clinally varying promoter
polymorphism associated with adaptive variation in wing size in *Drosophila*. *Molecular*
820 *Ecology* 19:775–784.

- Menezes, B. F., F. M. Vigoder, A. A. Peixoto, and J. Varaldi. 2013. The influence of
822 male wing shape on mating success in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Animal Behaviour*
85:1217–1223.
- 824 Mezey, J. G., and D. Houle. 2005. The dimensionality of genetic variation for wing shape
in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evolution* 59:1027–1038.
- 826 Mezey, J. G., D. Houle, and S. V. Nuzhdin. 2005. Naturally segregating quantitative trait
loci affecting wing shape of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 169:2101–2113.
- 828 Mitteroecker, P., and F. Bookstein. 2011. Linear discrimination, ordination, and the
visualization of selection gradients in modern morphometrics. *Evolutionary Biology*
830 38:100–114.
- Morrissey, M. B., and J. D. Hadfield. 2012. Directional selection in temporally replicated
832 studies is remarkably consistent. *Evolution* 66:435–442.
- O'Steen, S., A. J. Cullum, and A. F. Bennett. 2002. Rapid evolution of escape ability in
834 trinidadian guppies (*Poecilia Reticulata*). *Evolution* 56:776–784.
- Ozgul, A., S. Tuljapurkar, T. G. Benton, J. M. Pemberton, T. H. Clutton-Brock, and
836 T. Coulson. 2009. The dynamics of phenotypic change and the shrinking sheep of St.
Kilda. *Science* 325:464–467.
- 838 Palenzona, D. L., and R. Alicchio. 1973. Differential response to selection on the two
sexes in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 74:533–542.
- 840 Palsson, A. 2004. Association between nucleotide variation in *Egfr* and wing shape in
Drosophila melanogaster. *Genetics* 167:1187–1198.

- 842 Palsson, A., J. Dodgson, I. Dworkin, and G. Gibson. 2005. Tests for the replication of
an association between *Egfr* and natural variation in *Drosophila melanogaster* wing
844 morphology. BMC Genetics 6:44.
- Palsson, A., and G. Gibson. 2000. Quantitative developmental genetic analysis reveals that
846 the ancestral dipteran wing vein prepatter is conserved in *Drosophila melanogaster*.
Development Genes and Evolution 210:617–622.
- 848 Pitchers, W., J. E. Pool, and I. Dworkin. 2013. Altitudinal clinal variation in wing size and
shape in African *Drosophila Melanogaster*: One cline or many? Evolution 67:438–452.
- 850 R Core Team. 2012. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R
Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 852 Reed, L. K., S. Williams, M. Springston, J. Brown, K. Freeman, C. E. DesRoches, M. B.
Sokolowski, and G. Gibson. 2010. Genotype-by-diet interactions drive metabolic phe-
854 notype variation in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Genetics 185:1009–1019.
- Reznick, D., and C. Ghalambor. 2005. Selection in nature: Experimental manipulations
856 of natural populations. Integrative And Comparative Biology 45:456–462.
- Reznick, D. A., H. Bryga, and J. A. Endler. 1990. Experimentally induced life-history
858 evolution in a natural population. Nature 346:357–359.
- Reznick, D. N., F. H. Shaw, F. H. Rodd, and R. G. Shaw. 1997. Evaluation of the rate of
860 evolution in natural populations of guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*). Science 275:1934–1937.
- Rochetta, G., and D. Palenzona. 1975. Investigation on wing development by multivariate
862 analysis. Riv. Biol. 68:67–78.

- Rohlf, F. J., and M. Corti. 2000. Use of two-block partial least-squares to study covariation
864 in shape. *Systematic Biology* 49:740–753.
- Schluter, D. 1988. Estimating the form of natural selection on a quantitative trait. *Evo-*
866 *lution* 42:849–861.
- . 1996. Adaptive radiation along genetic lines of least resistance. *Evolution* 50:1766–
868 1774.
- Siepielski, A. M., J. D. DiBattista, and S. M. Carlson. 2009. Its about time: the temporal
870 dynamics of phenotypic selection in the wild. *Ecology Letters* 12:1261–1276.
- Simonsen, A. K., and J. R. Stinchcombe. 2010. Quantifying evolutionary genetic con-
872 straints in the ivyleaf morning glory, *Ipomoea hederacea*. *International Journal of Plant*
Sciences 171:972–986.
- 874 Sudarsan, V., S. Anant, P. Guptan, K. VijayRaghavan, and H. Skaer. 2001. Myoblast
diversification and ectodermal signaling in *Drosophila*. *Developmental Cell* 1:829–839.
- 876 Svensson, E. I., and M. Friberg. 2007. Selective predation on wing morphology in sym-
patric damselflies. *The American Naturalist* 170:101–112.
- 878 Walsh, B., and M. W. Blows. 2009. Abundant genetic variation plus strong selection =
multivariate genetic constraints: a geometric view of adaptation. *Annual Review of*
880 *Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 40:41–59.
- Weber, K., R. Eisman, L. Morey, A. Patty, J. Sparks, M. Tausek, and Z. B. Zeng. 1999. An
882 analysis of polygenes affecting wing shape on chromosome 3 in *Drosophila melanogaster*.
Genetics 153:773–786.

- 884 Weber, K. E. 1990*a*. Increased selection response in larger populations. i. selection for
wing-tip height in *Drosophila melanogaster* at three population sizes. *Genetics* 125:579–
886 584.
- . 1990*b*. Selection on wing allometry in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 126:975–
888 989.
- . 1992. How small are the smallest selectable domains of form? *Genetics* 130:345–
890 353.
- Wood, S. N. 2004. Stable and efficient multiple smoothing parameter estimation for
892 generalized additive models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 99:673–
686.
- 894 Zelditch, M. L., D. L. Swiderski, and H. D. Sheets. 2012. *Geometric Morphometrics for
Biologists. A Primer*. Academic Press.
- 896 Zimmerman, E., A. Palsson, and G. Gibson. 2000. Quantitative trait loci affecting com-
ponents of wing shape in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 155:671–683.

898 Tables and Figures

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
(Intercept)	6.71 (0.38)	7.14 (0.50)	7.33 (0.60)
Sex: M	-2.91*** (0.55)	-2.94*** (0.55)	-3.33*** (0.84)
Date: June 2008		-0.77 (0.59)	-1.03 (0.82)
Date: March 2008		-0.57 (0.89)	-1.33 (1.40)
Sex: M x Date: June 2008			0.53 (1.20)
Sex: M x Date: March 2008			1.33 (1.84)
R ²	0.42	0.45	0.46
Adj. R ²	0.41	0.40	0.38
Num. obs.	41	41	41
ΔAIC	0.0	3.1	8.1
ΔBIC	0.0	5.5	12.2
ΔDeviance	7.4	1.8	0.0
BIC Weights	0.937	0.061	0.002

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

Table 1. Survival ability in the base population measured as the number of surviving flies in each arena after 24 hours exposure with the predators. Table shows the output from the LM function in R for a set of models evaluated using Bayesian information criteria. Numbers in parenthesis are standard errors of the above estimates.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
(Intercept)	10.86 (0.40)	10.97 (0.45)	11.41 (0.49)	10.99 (0.50)	11.32 (0.60)
Selection Regime: Pred	3.12*** (0.40)	3.11*** (0.41)	3.11*** (0.40)	3.07*** (0.57)	3.26*** (0.71)
Generation: 32	4.83*** (0.90)	4.83*** (0.90)	4.00*** (0.99)	4.83*** (0.91)	4.24*** (1.08)
Eggcase: B	-1.61** (0.80)	-1.61** (0.80)	-1.62** (0.79)	-1.61** (0.80)	-1.60** (0.80)
Eggcase: C	-4.73*** (1.34)	-4.75*** (1.35)	-4.85*** (1.34)	-4.75*** (1.35)	-4.85*** (1.34)
Eggcase: D	-4.00*** (0.90)	-4.00*** (0.90)	-4.00*** (0.89)	-4.00*** (0.90)	-4.00*** (0.90)
Eggcase: E	2.16* (1.25)	2.16* (1.25)	2.16* (1.24)	2.16* (1.25)	2.14* (1.25)
Sex: M		-0.21 (0.40)	-1.06* (0.58)	-0.25 (0.58)	-1.17 (0.73)
Sex: M x Generation			1.65** (0.80)		1.66** (0.81)
Selection Regime: Pred x Sex				0.09 (0.81)	0.20 (0.81)
Selection Regime: Pred x Generation					-0.47 (0.81)
R ²	0.43	0.43	0.44	0.43	0.44
Adj. R ²	0.41	0.41	0.42	0.41	0.42
Num. obs.	210	210	210	210	210
ΔAIC	0.3	2.2	0.0	4.4	4.1
ΔBIC	0.0	5.1	6.0	10.4	16.3
ΔDeviance	41.2	39.0	3.4	38.9	0.0
BIC weights	0.882	0.07	0.043	0.005	< 0.001

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

Table 2. Survival ability in the evolved populations measured as the number of surviving flies in each arena after 24 hours exposure with the predators. Table shows the output from the LM function in R for a set of models evaluated using Bayesian information criteria. Numbers in parenthesis are standard errors of the above estimates.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
(Intercept)	0.18 (0.12)	0.29 (0.18)	0.32 (0.20)
Wing size	-0.32** (0.12)	-0.41** (0.17)	-0.46** (0.20)
Sex: M		-0.28 (0.35)	-0.21 (0.38)
Wing size x Sex			0.17 (0.39)
Num. obs.	294	294	294
Δ AIC	0.0	1.4	3.3
Δ AIC	0.0	5.1	10.5
Δ Devianc	0.83	0.19	0.0
Bic weights	0.921	0.074	0.005

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

Table 3. The output from the logistic regression of wing size onto survival in the base population for a set of models evaluated using Bayesian information criteria. Numbers in parenthesis are standard errors of the above estimates. The logistic regression models were used to evaluate statistical significance of the estimated selection differentials. The values reported in the manuscript were taken from identical linear regression models (output not shown)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
(Intercept)	0.50 (0.11)	0.53 (0.11)	0.64 (0.12)	0.86 (0.15)	0.79 (0.16)
Wing size	-0.42*** (0.09)	-0.35*** (0.09)	-0.40*** (0.09)	-0.62*** (0.13)	-0.55*** (0.14)
Selection Regime: Pred	0.55*** (0.07)	0.31*** (0.09)	0.16 (0.11)	0.16 (0.11)	0.16 (0.11)
Replicate: R2	-0.27*** (0.10)	-0.60*** (0.13)	-0.57*** (0.13)	-0.57*** (0.13)	-0.57*** (0.13)
Sex: M	-0.45*** (0.17)	-0.29* (0.18)	-0.34* (0.18)	-0.73*** (0.23)	-0.76*** (0.23)
Generation: G32	-0.48*** (0.11)	-0.43*** (0.11)	-0.63*** (0.14)	-1.02*** (0.20)	-1.01*** (0.20)
Wing size x Selection Regime	0.19*** (0.07)	0.20*** (0.07)	0.22*** (0.07)	0.24*** (0.07)	0.23*** (0.07)
Replicate: R2 x Generation	0.96*** (0.14)	1.02*** (0.14)	1.03*** (0.14)	1.09*** (0.15)	1.09*** (0.15)
Sex M x Generation	0.69*** (0.14)	0.64*** (0.14)	0.64*** (0.14)	1.42*** (0.33)	1.38*** (0.33)
Selection Regime: Pred x Replicate		0.60*** (0.15)	0.58*** (0.15)	0.53*** (0.15)	0.52*** (0.15)
Selection Regime: Pred x Generation			0.35** (0.14)	0.32** (0.14)	0.33** (0.14)
Wing size x Generation				0.44*** (0.17)	0.44*** (0.17)
Wing size x Sex					-0.19 (0.17)
Num. obs.	3932	3932	3932	3932	3932
Δ AIC	23.6	8.9	4.8	0.0	0.7
Δ BIC	8.4	0.0	2.2	3.6	10.6
Δ Deviance	30.95	14.25	8.12	1.3	0.0
BIC weights	0.001	0.658	0.224	0.108	> 0.001

*** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

Table 4. The output from the logistic regression of wing size onto survival in the evolved populations for a set of models evaluated using Bayesian information criteria. Numbers in parenthesis are standard errors of the above estimates. The logistic regression models were used to evaluate statistical significance of the estimated selection differentials. The values reported in the manuscript were taken from identical linear regression models (output not shown)

<i>Population</i>	<i>Full Model R^2</i>	<i>Adjusted R^2</i>
Base	0.46	0.76
C1	0.40	0.58
C2	0.36	0.54
S1	0.37	0.67
S2	0.39	0.69

Table 5. R^2 values from partialleast squares analysis for shape.

Figure 1. (A) 1st instar nymph of the Chinese mantid (*Tenodera aridifolia sinensis*) consuming a fruit fly. Note the wing about to drop off. (B) The selective function for size estimated by fitting cubic splines (*sensu* Schluter, 1988) along with estimates for linear and quadratic selection. Stars denote significance from logistic regression, but estimates are derived from a linear regression of size on relative fitness. Points above the function are individuals that survived. Points below the line were captured and eaten. Red dots are females and blue dots are males. Error bands are 95% confidence intervals. (C) Visualization of the selection differential (S) as measured in the base population. Points indicate landmarks and semi-landmarks. The shapes represent the mean shape plus 10x S (black line) and minus 10x S (red line).

Figure 2. (A) Mean number of survivors in each predation arena after 30 generations of experimental evolution. (B) Differences in wing size of the evolved populations after 30 generations of experimental evolution. Female values shown are 13% larger than those for males. Errors are 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 3. (A) Shape score by generation for control (B) and predation selection regimes. Model adjusted shape score for generation (*sensu* Drake and Klingenberg, 2008 see methods) is plotted against generation number, with blue points for males and red points for females. Solid regression lines and 95% confidence intervals are for replicate 1, and dashed lines and 95% confidence intervals are for replicate 2. (C) Visualization of the directions of the evolution of wing shape in the 4 experimental evolution populations. The shapes represent the mean plus (black line) and minus (red line) the modelled vector of evolutionary change in each case, scaled to 50 generations in magnitude. The points represent landmarks and semi-landmarks. Vector correlations between these modelled directions of shape evolutions (and their 95% credible intervals) are printed between the pairs of populations to which they relate.

Figure 4. The selective function for size estimated by fitting cubic splines (*sensu* Schluter, 1988) with replicates pooled for the (A) control (B) and predation populations along with estimates for linear and quadratic selection. Points above the function are individuals that survived. Points below the line were captured and eaten. Red dots are females and blue dots are males. Error bands are 95% confidence intervals. (C) Magnitude of the selection differential (S) as measured in the base (B), the control, and predation populations. Black points and lines are estimates and bootstrapped 95% confidence interval. The grey lines are the 95% confidence intervals from permutation of the same data; they represent the null hypothesis that the magnitude of S is random relative to survival.

Figure 5. Vector correlations between S for wing shape estimated in the base population, and the direction of the direction of shape change during experimental evolution. The response vector was estimated within each population. Points are vector correlation estimates, and lines represent 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals.

Figure 6. Estimates of variance for shape calculated as the trace of the covariance matrix for female and male flies from the evolved populations. Estimates of total variance (grey diamonds) are calculated with dead and surviving flies combined. Error bars are 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals.

Figure S 1. Proportion of wild-type flies surviving in each arena. Error bars are 95% confidence intervals.

Figure S 2. A greyscale wing image from a microscope-mounted camera, showing the splines fitted by the WingMachine software (left panel). Landmarks and semi-landmarks can be extracted from these splines, and superimposed using the CPReader program. From this data the wing is modelled by the position of these landmarks and semi-landmarks (represented by the open circles in the right panel), and simply connecting these coordinates with straight line segments as in the right panel allows for an easily interpretable visualisation of the wing veins and margins.

Figure S 3. Vector correlations between selection differentials (S) measured in the base population (B) and all four experimental evolution populations. Points and lines are vector correlations and bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals.

Figure S 4. Visualisation of the selection differential (S) as measured at generations 31 & 32 (see methods) in the experimental evolution populations. The shapes represent the mean shape plus $15 \times S$ (black line) and minus $15 \times S$ (red line), and the points represent landmarks and semi-landmarks. Vector correlations between S vectors (and their 95% credible intervals) are printed between the pairs of populations to which they relate.