

DOI: 10.26786/1920-7603(2021) 673

**APPENDIX 2. EXAMPLES OF STUDIES ASSESSING VARIATION IN SELECTION ON FLOWER-POLLINATOR FIT TRAITS ACROSS MULTIPLE POPULATIONS, YEARS, OR EXPERIMENTAL TREATMENTS.**

Table S1. Examples of studies assessing variation in selection on flower-pollinator fit traits across multiple populations, years, or experimental treatments. The column 'CV mismatch' is computed by scaling the standard deviation in the mismatch between the relevant floral and pollinator traits by the mean of the floral trait, and thus gives the variation in mismatch among studies as a percentage of the size of the floral trait.

Species	Level of analysis	n	Pollinator trait	Floral trait(s)	CV mismatch	Main findings	Reference
<i>Dalechampia scandens</i>	Populations	8	Body length	Gland-stigma distance	58.6%	Selection on fit trait when mismatch occurred in combination with unreliable pollination	Albertsen et al. 2020
<i>Caesalpinia gilliesii</i>	Populations	7	Proboscis length	Style length	10.6%	Stronger selection on the fit trait with greater mismatch	Soteras et al. 2020
<i>Roscoea purpurea</i>	Populations	5	Proboscis length	Corolla tube length	4.0%	Consistent positive selection, very limited variation	Paudel et al. 2016
<i>Nicotiana glauca</i>	Populations	6	Bill length	Corolla tube length	19.7%	Stronger selection on the fit trait with greater mismatch	Nattero et al. 2010a
<i>Nierembergia linariifolia</i>	Populations	4	Oil-collecting structure	Elaiphore size		No variation in selection despite differences in mismatch	Nattero et al. 2010b
<i>Calathea ovandensis</i>	Years	3		Corolla length		Substantial between-year variation in selection linked to variation in pollinator assemblage	Schemske & Horvitz 1989
<i>Cyclopogon elatus</i>	Years	4		Nectary depth		Limited variation in selection on a fit trait, consistent with limited variation in pollinator assemblage	Benitez-Vieyra et al. 2012
<i>Polemonium brandegeei</i>	Experimental arrays	2		Stigma exertion, corolla tube dimensions		Contrasting patterns of selection in experimental arrays visited by hawkmoths vs. hummingbirds	Kulbaba and Worley 2012, 2013
<i>Ipomopsis aggregata</i>	Years	10		Corolla tube width		Negative selection on tube width in years when hawkmoths were present in the population	Campbell and Powers 2015
<i>Gymnadenia conopsea</i>	Populations, treatments	4		Spur length		Differences in selection among populations and between plants exposed to day vs. night-active pollinators	Chapurlat et al. 2015
<i>Primula secundiflora</i>	Populations	2		Corolla tube entrance diameter		Some difference in selection between populations visited by different pollinator assemblages	Wu and Li 2017
<i>Platanthera bifolia</i>	Populations	4	Proboscis length	Spur length		Limited variation in selection despite differences in trait means and pollinator assemblages, possibly related to reliable pollination	Trunschke et al. 2020
<i>Erysimum mediohispanicum</i>	Populations	8		Corolla dimensions		Variable selection on corolla dimensions associated with variation in pollinator assemblages	Gómez et al. 2009

## REFERENCES

- Albertsen E, Opedal ØH, Bolstad GH, Perez-Barrales R, Hansen T, Pélabon C, Armbruster WS. 2021. Using ecological context to interpret spatiotemporal variation in natural selection. *Evolution* 75: 294-309.
- Benitez-Vieyra S, Glinos E, Martin Medina A, Cocucci AA. 2012. Temporal variation in the selection on floral traits in *Cyclopogon elatus* (Orchidaceae). *Evolutionary Ecology* 26: 1451-1468.
- Campbell DR, Powers JM. 2015. Natural selection on floral morphology can be influenced by climate. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* 282: 20150178.
- Chapurlat E, Ågren J, Sletvold N. 2015. Spatial variation in pollinator-mediated selection on phenology, floral display and spur length in the orchid *Gymnadenia conopsea*. *New Phytologist* 208: 1264-1275.
- Gómez JM, Perfectti F, Bosch J, Camacho JPM. 2009. A geographic selection mosaic in a generalized plant-pollinator-herbivore system. *Ecological Monographs* 79: 245-263.
- Kulbaba MW, Worley AC. 2012. Selection on floral design in *Polemonium brandegeei* (Polemoniaceae): female and male fitness under hawkmoth pollination. *Evolution* 66: 1344-1359.
- Kulbaba MW, Worley AC. 2013. Selection on *Polemonium brandegeei* (Polemoniaceae) flowers under hummingbird pollination: in opposition, parallel, or independent of selection by hawkmoths? *Evolution* 67: 2194-2206.
- Nattero J, Cocucci AA, Medel R. 2010. Pollinator-mediated selection in a specialized pollination system: matches and mismatches across populations. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 23: 1957-1968.
- Nattero J, Sérsic AN, Cocucci AA. 2010. Patterns of contemporary phenotypic selection and flower integration in the hummingbird-pollinated *Nicotiana glauca* between populations with different flower-pollinator combinations. *Oikos* 119: 852-863.
- Paudel BR, Shrestha M, Burd M, Adhikari S, Sun YS, Li QJ. 2016. Coevolutionary elaboration of pollination-related traits in an alpine ginger (*Roscoea purpurea*) and a tabanid fly in the Nepalese Himalayas. *New Phytologist* 211: 1402-1411.
- Schemske DW, Horvitz CC. 1989. Temporal variation in selection on a floral character. *Evolution* 43: 461-465.
- Soteras F, Rubini Pisano MA, Bariles JB, More M, Cocucci AA. 2020. Phenotypic selection mosaic for flower length influenced by geographically varying hawkmoth pollinator proboscis length and abiotic environment. *New Phytologist* 225: 985-998.
- Trunschke J, Sletvold N, Ågren J. 2020. Manipulation of trait expression and pollination regime reveals the adaptive significance of spur length. *Evolution* 74: 597-609.
- Wu Y, Li QJ. 2017. Phenotypic selection on flowering phenology and pollination efficiency traits between *Primula* populations with different pollinator assemblages. *Ecol Evol* 7: 7599-7608.