**Resource trait specialisation in an introduced fish population
with reduced genetic diversity**

Will Sowersby^{1,2*}, Topi K. Lehtonen^{1,3,4}, Mark Ravinet^{5,6}, Marta Barluenga⁷ and
Bob B.M. Wong¹

1: School of Biological Sciences, Monash University, Australia

2: Department of Zoology, Stockholm University, Sweden

3: Department of Biology, University of Turku, Finland

4: Department of Ecology and Genetics, University of Oulu, Finland

5: Division of Population Genetics, National Institute of Genetics, Japan

6: Centre for Ecological and Evolutionary Synthesis, University of Oslo, Norway

7: Department of Biodiversity and Evolutionary Biology, Museo Nacional de
Ciencias Naturales, CSIC, Spain

*Corresponding Author: Will Sowersby

Current Address: Department of Biology, Osaka City University, 3-3-138

Sugimoto Sumiyoshi-ku, Osaka 558-8585, Japan.

e-mail: will.sowersby@zoologi.su.se

Phone: +81-6-6605-2504

Running head: Resource trait specialisation in an introduced fish population

Keywords: Plasticity, *Amphilophus* cichlid, Ecological specialisation, RAD tag
sequencing, Introduced species, Phenotypic diversity

Author Contributions: WS, TKL and BMW formulated the idea, developed
methodology, and collected the field data. MB organised, and participated in, data
collection in Nicaragua. WS wrote the first draft of the manuscript, conducted
laboratory experiments and prepared samples for sequencing. WS, TKL and MR
performed statistical analyses. All authors contributed to writing of the manuscript.

Abstract

Ecological specialisation is hypothesised to play a major role in the evolution of phenotypic diversity, especially following the colonisation of novel habitats. For example, cichlid fishes provide some of the most remarkable evidence for rapid ecological diversification. Here, we capitalised on a recently (≤ 40 years ago) introduced population of red devils (*Amphilophus labiatus*) in Australia, to investigate adaptive phenotypic responses to a novel environment. We used stomach content analyses, morphometrics and laboratory experiments to test for covariation between diet and size of an important trophic trait, lip size. We found that, while maximum lip size in the study population was smaller than in the species' natural range, the proportions of algae, insects and fish remains in the diet covaried with lip size. However, contrary to predictions, we found no evidence for lip development to be plastic under laboratory conditions in relation to substrate complexity or food manipulation, nor did we find any relationship between lip morphology and feeding performance in adults. Single nucleotide polymorphism data, in turn, suggested that the introduced population has reduced standing genetic variation, which potentially influences both phenotypic plasticity and diversity, in comparison to native populations. Together, the results suggest that morphological variation in a key trophic trait can respond rapidly to diet in a novel environment, despite reduced genetic diversity in the population.

53 **Introduction**

54 Ecological specialisation to local environments is considered to be a major driver
55 of phenotypic diversity, both within and between populations (Schluter 2000;
56 Sorenson et al. 2003; Savolainen et al. 2006; Muschick et al. 2011). For example,
57 sympatric intraspecific morphs that show differential niche use (i.e. segregation
58 in habitat and/or diet) may represent the intermediate stages of population
59 divergence (Smith and Skúlason 1996; Barluenga and Meyer 2004). Well-known
60 examples of this phenomenon include benthic and limnetic populations of
61 sticklebacks (McKinnon and Rundle 2002) and trophic specialisation in whitefish
62 (Lu and Bernatchez 1999). Such examples are often associated with the
63 colonisation of novel, isolated habitats (e.g. lakes and islands) where ecological
64 opportunities allow for rapid adaptation to empty niches (see Elmer et al.
65 2010a). However, due to the potentially rapid nature of these events, their
66 beginnings are rarely witnessed, and the underlying processes and mechanisms
67 that facilitate ecological diversification are therefore still not completely
68 understood.

69

70 In new habitats, the ability to respond plastically to novel food sources can be
71 critical in promoting the divergence of trophic morphology (Wente and Phillips
72 2003; West-Eberhard 2003; Ledon-Rettig et al. 2008; Wund 2012). In this
73 respect, adaptive phenotypic plasticity (i.e. the ability of an organism's
74 phenotype to vary in response to its environment) appears to be a major
75 contributor to population diversification (Smith and Skúlason 1996; Ghalambor
76 et al. 2007; Pfennig et al. 2010), particularly within novel environments (Kocher
77 2004; Doebeli et al. 2005; Pfennig and McGee 2010). Nevertheless, the role of

78 phenotypic plasticity in adaptation has been controversial (Pfennig et al. 2010)
79 and has previously been viewed as an impediment to evolutionary change (see
80 Schlichting 2004), despite being taxonomically widespread (Meyer 1987; West-
81 Eberhard 2003; Yeh and Price 2004; Pfennig et al. 2010). However,
82 morphological differences among populations may also be accompanied by
83 ecological and genetic differences that are suggestive of various stages of
84 reproductive isolation (Skúlason et al. 1999; Hendry et al. 2000; Adams and
85 Huntingford 2004; Hendry 2009). For example, Pfennig and McGee (2010) found
86 that clades which display resource polyphenism (alternative phenotypes in
87 response to different environmental stimuli) are more species rich, suggesting
88 that resource polyphenism may promote diversification.

89
90 Phenotypic plasticity is considered to play a major role in the explosive adaptive
91 radiations of cichlid fishes (West-Eberhard 1989; Clabaut et al. 2007; Muschick
92 et al. 2011). A common feature of adaptive radiations, including those seen in
93 cichlids, is that species occupying similar niches often display convergent
94 evolution (Schluter and Nagel 1995; Salzburger 2009; Losos 2011). A prominent
95 example of convergent evolution in cichlids is the development of large
96 hypertrophied lips, a key functional trophic trait that has evolved repeatedly in
97 different cichlid lineages in Africa (Arnegard and Snoeks 2001; Salzburger et al.
98 2005; Oliver and Arnegard 2010; Colombo et al. 2013; Henning et al. 2017) and
99 the Americas (Klingenberg et al. 2003; Elmer et al. 2010a, b; Colombo et al. 2013,
100 Manousaki et al. 2013; Burress 2015; Machado-Schiaffino et al. 2017). In this
101 regard, researchers have proposed alternative hypotheses to explain the
102 development of hypertrophied lips (Fryer 1959; Yamaoka 1997; Arnegard and

Snoeks 2001; Ferry et al. 2012). For example, Greenwood (1974) suggested that large lips could be an adaptation to reduce the mechanical shock of striking against rocks during foraging. Currently, however, the consensus hypothesis is that hypertrophied lips most commonly facilitate a suction feeding mechanism, whereby invertebrates, particularly crustaceans, are sucked up, from crevices and gaps in between rocks (Barlow and Munsey 1976; Klingenberg et al. 2003; Colombo et al. 2013; Manousaki et al. 2013; Baumgarten et al. 2015; Machado-Schiaffino et al. 2017). Yet, few studies have tried to experimentally disentangle among these alternative hypotheses.

Independent of the primary function of large lips in cichlid fishes, phenotypic plasticity may play a role in their development (Machado-Schiaffino et al. 2014). In particular, in captive individuals, large hypertrophied lips reduce in size over time (Barlow and Munsey 1976), indicating that there may be a plastic component to this trait. Interestingly, within their native range, large-lipped cichlids often coexist with closely related smaller-lipped species, with the two types tending to otherwise only differ in regard to their ecological niches (Colombo et al. 2013; Baumgarten et al. 2015). Moreover, large-lipped forms appear to be able to rapidly evolve from small-lipped populations (Elmer et al. 2010a), with theory supporting the hypothesis that phenotypic plasticity may promote rapid evolutionary responses to novel conditions (Behera and Nanjundiah 2004; Fierst 2011).

The red devil (*Amphilophus labiatus*) is an omnivorous cichlid with large, hypertrophied lips. The red devil is a member of the Midas cichlid species

complex, a group of Neotropical cichlids that has diversified rapidly, particularly after colonising new environments (Barlow and Munsey 1976; Elmer et al. 2010a; Elmer et al. 2013). In the Nicaraguan native range, there is little neutral genetic differentiation between the red devil and its more common, sympatric and small-lipped congener, the Midas cichlid (*Amphilophus citrinellus*) (Barluenga and Meyer 2004, 2010). Nevertheless, hybrid or intermediate lip phenotypes are absent or very rare. In recent decades (within 40 years), a feral population of red devil cichlids (or possibly a hybrid) has become established in Hazelwood Pondage in south-eastern Australia (Corfield et al. 2008). Importantly, this introduction into an isolated lake is analogous to a founder population naturally colonising a novel environment (*sensu* Elmer et al. 2010a, 2013). For example, in both cases, individuals may need to adjust foraging behaviours and resource trait use in response to a change in both the available sources and type of food. Hence, the feral red devil population provides an excellent opportunity to both observe phenotypic responses to a novel environment and to test the predictions that plasticity and resource polymorphism play an important role in facilitating adaptive diversification after a recent colonisation event.

We set out to investigate whether morphology (i.e. lip size) and diet covary in the introduced red devil population. Our primary focus was lip size, because this key trophic trait can change rapidly in *Amphilophus* populations, suggesting that phenotypic plasticity could potentially play an important role. Because hypertrophied lips are typically associated with an increased head elongation (Klingenberg et al. 2003), we also included head morphology in our analyses. To

this end, we combined laboratory-based behavioural experiments with morphological assays and genomic analyses of samples collected both in the introduced and native lake environments, in Australia and Nicaragua, respectively. First, we experimentally investigated whether among individual morphological variation in the introduced population reflected differences in feeding performance in regard to substrate complexity and diet. Second, focusing on laboratory-reared juveniles from the same population, we tested the extent to which developmental plasticity shapes key trophic traits, in particular, lip size and head morphology in red devils. Thirdly, we compared both the mean and variation in relative lip size between individuals from the native range and the introduced Australian population. Lastly, using genomic data, we examined genetic diversity of fish both in the native and introduced range to test whether there is evidence of a bottleneck in the introduced population, putatively limiting standing genetic variation, which, in turn, might influence phenotypic diversity and plastic responses.

Materials and Methods

Link between morphology and diet in the introduced red devil population

To investigate whether morphology covaries with diet in the introduced population, we collected adult red devils from Hazelwood Pondage, Australia, in December 2011 and September–November 2012, using bait traps, hand-lines and nets. We euthanized the fish with a lethal dose of clove oil solution and then dissected and removed the entire stomach and gut of 81 individuals. We later

classified food items into the following categories and determined their volume (in % of total gut content): insects (terrestrial and aquatic), fish (remains, scales and eggs), plant material and algae, and other (e.g. silt). Molluscs, crustaceans and zooplankton were also found in gut samples, but were only found in less than 2% of individuals and, therefore, these food items were not considered in further analyses. Lip size and head morphology (standardised for body size), in turn, was assessed by analysing a digital photo (Nikon D5200 Digital SLR) taken of the right lateral side of each individual, with a 1-mm grid paper as a scale. Using IMAGEJ 1.50b (National Institutes of Health, Rasband 1997), we measured the area of the lip and the head, which – when compared to the area of the whole body (excluding fins) – allowed us to calculate each trait as a percentage of body area. We defined the head as the region between the snout and the most posterior edge of the operculum.

To investigate whether standardised lip size covaries with diet in the introduced population, we performed a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) test (*sensu* Bolnick et al. 2013). To meet the assumption of normality of data, the proportional values of food item categories found in gut content samples (insects, fish remains, plant material, and algae) were all log transformed and then fitted as a multivariate response variable, with standardised lip size as the explanatory fixed variable, and standard body length as a covariate. Next, we carried out post-hoc significance tests, specifically by conducting four separate univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests for each of the four food item categories, with lip size as the fixed variable, and standard body length as a covariate. We also assessed the strength of the correlation (Pearson's

correlation) between lip size and head morphology. All statistical analyses were conducted using R 3.0.0 software (R Development Core Team).

Feeding performance experiment

We carried out a controlled laboratory experiment to determine whether variation in morphology (standardised lip size and head morphology) is linked to differences in feeding performance in relation to substrate complexity and diet.

For this purpose, we collected sub-adults ($n = 88$, standard length 60 - 75 mm) from Hazelwood Pondage in early 2013 using the same methods as described above. Fish were transported back to the laboratory and were then sorted based on lip size. Standardised lip size and head morphology were assessed from photographs, as detailed above. Each individual was tagged in the caudal peduncle with a visible implant elastomer for identification (Willis and Babcock 1998). Finally, all individuals were also weighed (± 0.01 g), on an electronic balance.

Using the above data, we found that mean lip size, in the introduced population, was 1.2% of standard body area (Fig. 1). To ensure that we had a representative sample of lip sizes in all our experimental tanks, we categorized individuals with lip size above 1.2% as 'large' and below 1.2% as 'small' lipped. The two groups of fish (i.e. relatively large lips versus small lips) were then split equally between eight 250 l tanks maintained at 25°C on a 12:12 day night cycle (stocking density = 11 fish of unknown sex per tank). Using a 2×2 factorial design, we tested the

effects of substrate type (fine grain sand versus cobbles and coarse river rocks) and diet type (thawed frozen adult brine shrimp versus Otohime EP3 fish food pellets) on the feeding performance of the fish (2 tanks per treatment combination). We purposely selected two substrate types that differed in particle size, and consequently, in the size of the interstitial spaces formed between substrate particles. We did this to test whether large and small lip phenotypes differ in their success at extracting food from different substrate surfaces or from gaps between particles (see Baumgarten et al. 2015). The particle size of the fine-grained sand was <1.5 mm in diameter, compared to cobbles, which ranged in diameter from 5 to 20 mm, and coarse river rocks, which ranged in diameter from 55 to 150 mm. In the native range, the diet of the red devil primarily consists of hard-shelled invertebrates and small arthropods, while they also eat plant material, seeds, fish and fish scales (Colombo et al. 2013; Sowersby et al. unpublished data). We therefore selected foods differing in their characteristics for collecting and handling to reflect the naturally varied diet of the species. Fish were kept under experimental conditions and fed 5 days a week for eight weeks. Food (limited to 2 grams per tank) was placed into each aquarium in a container that was pulled along the bottom of the tank with the aid of fishing line and weights so that it was evenly distributed on the substrate before fish could start eating. Fish were weighed and photographed each week. All fish survived the eight-week experiment and weight gain during this time period was used as an indicator of feeding performance.

To assess the influence of substrate and diet type on the feeding performance (weight gain) of individuals with differing lip size, we fitted a linear mixed-

effects model, using the 'lme4' package in R. The full model was fitted with substrate treatment, diet treatment and the interaction between the two as explanatory fixed factors. Standardised lip area (as a continuous variable) and standardised head area were fitted as covariates. The response variable, weight gain, was square root transformed to meet the assumption of normality of data. To account for the potential interdependence between individuals in a treatment tank, tank ID was added as a random effect. The full model was simplified by stepwise removal of non-significant interaction terms (Crawley 2012), using log likelihood ratio tests (with $\alpha = 0.05$).

Experimental assessment of developmental plasticity

In a separate, longitudinal experiment, we also investigated the extent to which lip size and head morphology develop plastically in response to substrate complexity and foods of differing hardness.

Sub-adults, collected at the same time and using the same methods as those described previously, were brought back into the laboratory where they were housed in large tanks (4000 l) maintained at 25°C on a 12:12 day night cycle (stocking density = ~50 fish per tank). Approximately 5 months after collection, breeding pairs were allowed to form naturally in 1500 l tanks. During the study, we were successful in obtaining offspring from three pairs, resulting in three separate clutches. After fry were free-swimming for 14 days, 96 were collected and removed from the parents for use in the experiment.

To assess the role that substrate complexity and the hardness of consumed food

items plays in influencing the development of lip and head morphology, while controlling for differences between families, we used a 2×2 factorial split-clutch experimental design. Specifically, for each clutch, the siblings were split across 4 same sibling tanks (200 l), representing the 4 possible treatment combinations of food hardness (soft versus hard pellets) and substrate complexity (sand versus coarse gravel and cobbles), i.e. in total 12 tanks were used. Here, we manipulated the hardness of the food, so that in soft food replicates pellets were soaked in water for 10 minutes prior to feeding, while in the hard food replicates non-manipulated (hard) pellets were used (and immediately consumed by the fish). Otherwise, the method for delivering the food was the same as that described in the previous experiment. For the first 3 months, fish ($n = 96$) subsisted on pellets that were 1.7 mm in diameter, before progressing onto 3.1 mm pellets for the rest of the experimental period. The entire experiment lasted 14 months, after which, the fish were photographed (left lateral side).

We compared the standardised lip size and head morphology (i.e. area) of each individual ($n = 96$) in IMAGEJ 1.50b using the same methods as described above.

To assess the influence of substrate complexity and food hardness on developmental plasticity, we fitted two separate linear mixed-effects models, using the package 'lme4', in R. In particular, we had standardised lip size and standardised head area (measured at the end of the experimental period) as the response variables in the two models, respectively. In all cases, substrate treatment and diet treatment were fitted as explanatory fixed factors and, to account for the design of the experiment and the potential interdependence

between siblings, clutch ID as a random effect. Each full model was then simplified by stepwise removal of non-significant interaction terms (Crawley 2012), using log likelihood ratio tests (with $\alpha = 0.05$).

Morphological comparisons with fish from the native range

We quantified the morphology of wild-caught red devil cichlids from their native range in Nicaragua ($n = 41$) and compared these with the fish of the feral, Australian population ($n = 82$). Red devils were collected from six locations in Lake Nicaragua in late 2013 (supplementary information) and at multiple times in Australia, (supplementary information), between late 2011 and early 2014, using the same methods as outlined above. Fish were individually photographed (left lateral side) for morphological analyses (see Table S1 in supplementary information for sample size and locations).

Using the same methods as above, we measured variation in standardised lip size in a sub-set of native and introduced fish. We used a Shapiro–Wilk normality test to assess the distribution of lip size in the introduced population and native Nicaraguan populations.

Genetic diversity

Differences in the extent of plasticity and phenotypic variation in the introduced vs. natural populations may be due to different levels of genetic diversity, which could result from, for example, a population bottleneck. To test this possibility, we compared the level of genetic diversity in the introduced population with individuals from the native range using Restriction site associated DNA (RAD)-

sequencing, a reduced representation population genomic method. We extracted DNA (DNeasy Blood and Tissue Kit, QIAGEN) from ethanol preserved samples of individuals from the introduced population in Australia and from six locations in Lake Nicaragua (see supplementary information). Samples were digested using the Sbf1 enzyme following a standard RAD-sequencing protocol (Developed by M. Roesti, Basel University 2011). We pooled 40 (barcoded) individuals into 5 libraries (total $n = 200$). Each library was sequenced (single-end) on separate Illumina HiSeq2500 lanes (200 bp reads) at the ETH Zurich Department of Biosystems Science and Engineering in Basel, Switzerland.

Since no reference genome is currently available for *Amphilophus* species, we used a *de novo* assembly approach implemented in Stacks v 1.30 to identify RAD loci and estimate genome-wide diversity (Catchen et al. 2011, 2013). To ensure that only high quality reads were used in our analysis, we first trimmed sequenced reads to 175 bp and removed any with an average Phred quality score < 20 . Quality screening and sample demultiplexing was performed using the Stacks *process radtags* module.

Restriction site associated DNA loci were first identified within individuals using the *ustacks* module, allowing a minimum of 5 reads per stack, a maximum of 2 stacks per locus and up to 4 nucleotide mismatches within and between stacks. SNPs were called at the individual level using the standard Stacks SNP model with $\alpha = 0.01$. Following this step, we then used a subset of 50 individuals with the highest read depths from across the native and introduced range to create a *de novo* RAD loci catalogue. In short, this catalogue acts as a database of

identified loci amongst all individuals. Care was taken to ensure individuals of both sexes were included to prevent any sex biases. Catalogue construction was performed using *cstacks* with a maximum of 4 mismatches permitted between loci amongst individuals.

Once our *de novo* reference catalogue was complete, the remaining 150 individuals were matched against it using *stacks* and we used the *populations* module to perform final dataset filtering and to estimate population genetic statistics. Polymorphic RAD loci were only included if they occurred in at least 50% of individuals originating from each of the six locations, had a minimum read depth of 20× and had a minor allele frequency > 0.1. For our final dataset, we used linear mixed-effects models to test for differences in observed heterozygosity and nucleotide diversity amongst the populations. In particular, we fitted a separate model for the two response variables, with polymorphic RAD loci fitted as random effects in both models.

Results

Link between morphology and diet in the introduced red devil population

The most abundant food item categories found in the gut of the introduced population were plant material (23%), algae (22%) and macroinvertebrates (14%) (supplementary information).

A MANOVA revealed a significant difference in the proportions of food item categories in gut/stomach with respect to standardised lip size ($F_{1,63} = 6.904$, $p = 0.001$), the covariate factor body size was not significant ($F_{1,63} = 0.42$, $p = 0.79$). To test what was driving this pattern, we ran separate univariate ANOVAs for the food item categories, which revealed that the proportion of insects ($F_{1,63} = 13.19$, $p = 0.0005$) and fish remains ($F_{1,63} = 6.21$, $p = 0.015$) in the gut content were significantly higher as lip size decreased (see Fig. 2a). However, the significant relationship between fish remains and lip size should be treated with caution, due to an outlier in the data (MANOVA can be sensitive to outliers) (Fig. 2b). In contrast to insects and fish remains which were associated with a decrease in lip size, the proportion of algae in gut content samples significantly increased as lip size increased, in the introduced population ($F_{1,63} = 11.23$, $p = 0.0013$, Fig. 2c). We did not find any significant relationship between plant material and lip size ($F_{1,63} = 1.06$, $p = 0.31$). Lip and head area (both standardised for body size) correlated positively (Pearson's correlation, $r = 0.365$, $df = 80$, $p = 0.0007$).

Feeding performance experiment

Regarding the feeding performance of wild-caught fish (from the introduced population) under laboratory conditions, the interaction between substrate and diet treatments was not significant ($\chi^2 = 0.0022$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.962$), and it was subsequently removed from the model. The diet treatment had a significant effect ($\chi^2 = 121.91$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.0001$), with individuals consuming pellets gaining more weight, compared to those that consumed shrimp. The substrate complexity treatment ($\chi^2 = 0.69$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.41$), and the covariates,

standardised lip size ($\chi^2 = 2.509$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.11$) and standardised head area ($\chi^2 = 0.131$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.72$) did not have a significant effect on weight gain.

Experimental assessment of developmental plasticity

To assess whether the standardised resource use traits – i.e. standardised lip size and standardised head area – responded plastically to substrate treatment or food hardness in the common garden experiment, we ran a separate linear mixed-effects model for each of the response variables. In both cases, we found the interaction between substrate complexity and food hardness to be non-significant (standardised lip size, $\chi^2 = 0.335$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.562$; standardised head area, $\chi^2 = 0.139$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.708$). We then refitted both models without the interaction term. The simplified models showed that neither substrate complexity nor food hardness had a significant effect on standardised lip size (substrate, $\chi^2 = 2.42$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.12$; food, $\chi^2 = 0.986$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.32$) or standardised head area (substrate, $\chi^2 = 0.07$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.79$; food, $\chi^2 = 3.252$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.071$).

Morphological comparison with fish from the native range

We found that lip size relative to body size was larger in the Nicaraguan population ($n = 41$, mean $\pm$ SD: $1.81\% \pm 0.17$) compared to the introduced Australian population ($n = 82$, mean $\pm$ SD: $1.21\% \pm 0.95$; Fig. 1). The distribution of lip size was not significantly different from a normal distribution in either the native (Shapiro–Wilk Normality Test, $W = 0.96$, $p = 0.94$) or feral ($W = 0.97$, $p = 0.28$) populations. Mean standard length in Nicaragua was 16.9 cm (range 11.4 - 22.2 cm) and 11.7 cm (range 7.2 - 20.1 cm) in Australia.

Genetic diversity

Our *de novo* assembly identified 341 226 unique RAD tags, reduced to 6226 RAD loci and 8038 SNPs following filtering for RAD loci which were polymorphic, occurring in all six populations (sampling locations) in >50% individuals, had a MAF of >0.1 and were sequenced to at least 20x depth. In the final dataset, an average of 1.29 SNPs occurred on each RAD tag.

We found mean observed heterozygosity was 38% lower in the introduced population compared to populations from the native range ($F_{5,40185} = 739.81, p < 0.0001$; Fig. 3). Similarly, nucleotide diversity was 34% lower in the introduced population relative to the native range ($F_{5,40185} = 1003.6, p < 0.0001$; Fig. 3).

Discussion

According to theory, ecological specialisation is predicted to be a major driver of phenotypic diversity, especially in response to novel environmental stimuli. Here, we found a significant correlation between standardised lip size and diet in an introduced red devil cichlid fish population. Specifically, as lip size increased, so did the proportion of algae in the diet, while the proportion of insects and fish remains decreased. In the laboratory, we found no significant link between phenotypic variation and feeding performance, when foraging on different substrates or diet treatments. Similarly, there was no apparent plastic developmental response in lip size or head morphology to substrate treatments or food hardness. Finally, compared to individuals in the native range, the lip size

of the introduced red devils is smaller, and the introduced population also has significantly lower genetic diversity.

We found a greater proportion of algae in the stomach and gut content of individuals with relatively larger lips, whereas individuals with smaller lips had consumed a greater proportion of insects and fish remains. This result is in accordance with the observed variation in trophic morphology being linked to the exploitation of different resources (Elmer et al. 2010a). Similar patterns of resource trait variation have been hypothesised to eventually facilitate population divergence in respect to ecological niche. For example, the exploitation of vacant ecological niches is a primary hypothesis for the rapid diversification of finches on the Galapagos Islands (Grant and Grant 2008), with strong intraspecific competition potentially leading to the rapid evolution of different niche use within populations (Bolnick 2001). However, such patterns of apparent ecological specialisation do not necessarily lead to genetic differentiation between the ecomorphs. For instance, there is no observable genetic differentiation between individuals differing in lower pharyngeal jaw morphology in the polymorphic Minkley's cichlid (*Herichthys minckleyi*), with the trait, instead, being developmentally plastic (Kornfield and Koehn 1975; Hulsey et al. 2005).

In the current study, the wide range of food items exploited by the feral population was related to resource use morphology, with lip size being associated with types of commonly consumed food items. This finding suggests that the population may be undergoing an adaptive diversification process,

476 which is resulting in a more efficient exploitation of available food sources (see
477 Bolnick et al. 2002). This type of ecological specialisation has been offered as the
478 main explanation for the rapid diversification within the Midas cichlid species
479 complex (Barluenga et al. 2006). As an example, a large lipped *Amphilophus*
480 phenotype has rapidly (within ~100 years) evolved from a small lipped form in
481 Crater Lake Apoyeque (Elmer et al. 2010a), with lip size being linked to
482 ecological niche use of the fish. In particular, in direct contrast to our findings in
483 Australian red devils, the large lipped form of Lake Apoyeque, consumes more
484 insects, whereas the small lipped form eats more algae (Elmer et al. 2010a).

485

486 In several fish species, large hypertrophied lips appear be an adaptation for
487 foraging on rocky surfaces, in particular for invertebrates (Colombo et al. 2013;
488 Baumgarten et al. 2015). This is assumed to be the case also in red devils in their
489 native range in Lake Nicaragua and Lake Managua, where crustaceans and hard-
490 shelled invertebrates form the majority of their diet (Colombo et al. 2013).

491 However, across different species (and populations), large lips seem to have
492 evolved for different functions and to exploit a range of resources (Agrawal and
493 Mittal 1991). For example, in multiple African cichlid species, large lips have a
494 high density of taste buds and may be acting as an accessory gustatory organ
495 (Arnegard and Snoeks 2001; Oliver and Arnegard 2010). Large lips may also be
496 an adaptation for reducing the mechanical shock of striking rocks during
497 foraging (Greenwood 1974). Furthermore, large hypertrophied lips appear to
498 have evolved from a large range of ancestral states in cichlids, such as the
499 algivorous *Lobochilotes* (Wagner et al. 2009; Muschick et al. 2011), omnivorous
500 *Amphilophus* (Barluenga et al. 2006; Colombo et al. 2013), and the piscivorous

501 *Crenicichla* (Burress et al. 2013). In the introduced red devil population, large
502 lips may reduce the mechanical shock of foraging on rocky surfaces, or,
503 considering the gut content of large lipped individuals, may be especially useful
504 in removing algae from benthic surfaces, as in the kissing gourami (*Helostoma*
505 *temminckii*) (Ferry et al. 2012). The absence of crustaceans in the introduced
506 habitat (personal observations), a key food source of red devils in their native
507 range (Colombo et al. 2013), may also have contributed to both the overall
508 smaller lip size and the use of lips for processing alternative food sources. We
509 were not able to distinguish between aquatic and terrestrial insects in our gut
510 content analysis. Therefore, whether individuals with smaller lips primarily feed
511 on insects from the water surface or lake substrate remains unresolved.

512

513 Variation in lip size and head morphology did not influence feeding performance
514 under different substrate complexity or diet treatments. We did, however, find a
515 significant effect of diet type on weight gain, which was not associated with
516 morphological variation and, instead, is most likely due to nutritional differences
517 between the two food types. In contrast to our study, Baumgarten et al. (2015)
518 found that *Haplochromis chilotes*, a large-lipped cichlid, is more efficient at
519 extracting food from crevices, when compared to the small lipped congener,
520 *Haplochromis nyererei*. Why did we not detect such a link between feeding
521 performance and morphology in the laboratory, despite the covariation between
522 lip size and diet in the population studied? It remains possible that our
523 experiment tested environmental conditions that were not the same as those
524 that have resulted in the observed relationship between phenotypic variation
525 (lip size) and diet. For example, in the introduced population, larger lips may be

employed for removing algae from rocky surfaces rather than for drawing food items from gaps and crevices between rocks. In the laboratory, the growth of epiphytic algae on gravel and pebbles was very limited, especially when compared to the availability of the offered food sources.

One motivation for our laboratory experiments was that surprisingly little is known about the mechanisms of individual level diet specialisation, despite the phenomenon appearing to be relatively widespread in nature (Bolnick et al. 2002, 2003). However, our experiments did not provide any evidence for developmental plasticity in lip size or head morphology in response to the assessed environmental conditions. This is in contrast with some other studies on cichlids, which have found support for variation in trophic traits arising from differences in feeding regime (Witte et al. 1989; Stauffer and Gray 2004; Muschick et al. 2011). For example, Meyer (1987) found within sibling differences in the head/snout shape of jaguar cichlids, *Parachromis managuensis*, when they were raised under diet treatments that required different modes of feeding. In red devils, exposure to more than the two particular environmental conditions assessed in this study, while using larger sample sizes, might help unravel the potentially complex mechanisms underlying the development of large hypertrophied lips.

The introduced red devils had a much lower genetic diversity than populations in the native range, which is a common feature of introduced populations (Barrett 1991; Kinziger et al. 2011) and populations that have recently colonized new environments following range expansions (Bernatchez and Wilson 1998).

Individuals of the introduced population presumably had a lower genetic diversity already before their establishment in Hazelwood Pondage because of their origin from the aquarium trade. The level of standing genetic variation is relevant for adaptive divergence and the rapid evolution of phenotypically similar traits among independent populations (Barrett and Schluter 2008; Schluter and Conte 2009). Population bottlenecks and founder events may reduce variation at adaptive loci segregating in a population, potentially reducing phenotypic diversity and the availability of phenotypic variance for selection to act upon (Barrett and Schluter 2008). Yet, increased genetic variation has been hypothesised to increase the potential for phenotypic plasticity, as plasticity itself is often a heritable trait (Scheiner 1993; Pigliucci 2005). Therefore, an interesting avenue for future research would be to test for phenotypic plasticity of the trophic traits in a population of red devils from their native range, in which the current results show genetic variation to be much higher than in our introduced population.

In summary, we found that an introduced red devil population is phenotypically highly variable in regard to lip size. Furthermore, we found that lip size covaries with diet, suggestive of lip size being linked to ecological differences. This association may be an initial sign of adaptive diversification within the population, with variation in a key trophic trait, hypertrophied lips, being used to capitalise different resources. In the context of biological invasions, our findings highlight the potential for introduced species to exploit unoccupied niches and, in so doing, promote specialisation and diversification. Under experimental conditions, we did not find morphological differences to be associated with

feeding performance in the ecological conditions we assessed, nor did we observe any plasticity in these traits during development. Hence, in this introduced population, ecological factors other than those commonly acknowledged (and tested by us) seem to be driving the diet specialisation in red devils with different morphologies. Notably, such morphology-dependent specialisation has taken place despite reduced standing genetic variation in the population.

Funding: This study was funded by a Holsworth Wildlife Endowment, and a Linnean Society of New South Wales Small Research Grant, both awarded to WS. The research also received support from the SYNTHESYS Project (<http://www.synthesys.info/>), which is financed by European Community Research Infrastructure Action under the FP7 "Capacities" Program (to TKL and MB).

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Data archiving: All data generated and analysed during this study are included in this published article [and its supplementary information files].

Ethics: Collection and experimental procedures were approved by the Animal Ethics Committee of Monash University, Australia (BSCI/2012/23), and complied with all relevant State and Federal laws. Collection in Nicaragua was approved by the Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales (MARENA), Permit Number: 013-102013.

Acknowledgments: We thank Carlos Garita Alvarado, Fiona Kang, Rowan

Jacques-Hamilton, Nicholas Deal, Rachel Fetherston, Eeling Ng, Ruby Albury, Andrej Hohmann, Stefanie Forster, Madeleine De Jong and Matthew Simpson for logistic support and animal collection, and members of the Wong and Chapple Labs, Monash University, who assisted with animal husbandry. We also thank Bernd Egger, Christian Beisel Melinda Hofmann, Mariana Leal Cardín and Gema Aguilera García for their assistance in the laboratory, with preparation of samples for genetic analysis. We thank the staff of the DNA Database of Japan (DDBJ) for their assistance with the use of the NIG supercomputer to conduct population genomic analyses. Lastly, we thank Walter Salzburger, Marius Rösti, Bernd Egger and Alysha Heimberg for their advice in regard to genetic analysis.

613

614 **References**

- 615 Adams CE, Huntingford FA (2004) Incipient speciation driven by phenotypic
616 plasticity? Evidence from sympatric populations of Arctic Charr. *Biol J Linn Soc*
617 81:611-618. doi:10.1111/j.1095-8312.2004.00314.x
- 618 Agrawal N, Mittal AK (1991) Epithelium of lips and associated structures of the
619 Indian major carp, *Catla catla*. *Jpn J Ichthyol* 37:363-373. doi:10.1007/BF02905362
- 620 Allendorf FW, Lundquist LL (2003) Introduction: Population biology, evolution, and
621 control of invasive species. *Conserv Biol* 17:24-30. doi:10.1046/j.1523-
622 1739.2003.02365.x
- 623 Arnegard ME, Snoeks J (2001) New three-spotted cichlid species with hypertrophied
624 lips (Teleostei: Cichlidae) from the deep waters of Lake Malaŵi/Nyasa, Africa.
625 *Copeia* 2001:705-717

626 Barlow GW, Munsey JW (1976) The red devil - Midas - arrow cichlid species
 627 complex in Nicaragua. In: Thorson TB (eds) Investigations of the ichthyofauna of
 628 Nicaraguan Lakes. University of Nebraska-Lincoln, School of Life Sciences

 629 Barluenga M, Meyer A (2004) The Midas cichlid species complex: Incipient
 630 sympatric speciation in Nicaraguan cichlid fishes? Mol Ecol 13:2061-2076.
 631 doi:10.1111/j.1365-294X.2004.02211.x

 632 Barluenga M, Meyer A (2010) Phylogeography, colonization and population history
 633 of the Midas cichlid species complex (*Amphilophus* spp.) in the Nicaraguan crater
 634 lakes. BMC Evol Biol 10:326. doi:10.1186/1471-2148-10-326

 635 Barluenga M, Stölting KN, Salzburger W, Muschick M, Meyer A (2006) Sympatric
 636 speciation in Nicaraguan crater lake cichlid fish. Nature 439:719-723.
 637 doi:10.1038/nature04325

 638 Barrett SCH (1991) Genetic and evolutionary consequences of small population size
 639 in plants: Implications for conservation. In: Falk D, Holsinger KE (eds) Genetics and
 640 conservation of rare plants. Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford, pp 3-30

 641 Barrett RD, Schluter D (2008) Adaptation from standing genetic variation. Trends
 642 Ecol Evol 23:38-44. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2007.09.008

 643 Baumgarten L, Machado-Schiaffino G, Henning F, Meyer A (2015) What big lips are
 644 good for: On the adaptive function of repeatedly evolved hypertrophied lips of cichlid
 645 fishes. Biol J Linn Soc 115:448-455. doi:10.1111/bij.12502

 646 Behera N, Nanjundiah V (2004) Phenotypic plasticity can potentiate rapid
 647 evolutionary change. J Theor Biol 226:177-184. doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2003.08.011

648 Bernatchez L, Wilson CC (1998) Comparative phylogeography of Nearctic and
 649 Palearctic fishes. *Mol Ecol* 7:431-452. doi:10.1046/j.1365-294x.1998.00319.x
 650 Bolnick DI, Yang LH, Fordyce JA, Davis JM, Svanbäck R (2002) Measuring
 651 individual-level resource specialization. *Ecology* 83:2936-2941.
 652 doi:10.1890/00129658(2002)083[2936:MILRS]-2.0.CO;2
 653 Bolnick DI, Svanbäck R, Fordyce JA, Yang LH, Davis JM, Hulsey CD, Forister ML
 654 (2003) The ecology of individuals: Incidence and implications of individual
 655 specialization. *Am Nat* 161:1-28. doi:10.1086/343878
 656 Bolnick DI, Snowberg LK, Hirsch PE, Lauber CL, Org E, Parks B, Lusi AJ, Knight
 657 R, Caporaso JG, Svanbäck R (2014) Individual diet has sex-dependent effects on
 658 vertebrate gut microbiota. *Nat Commun* 5:1-13. doi:10.1038/ncomms5500
 659 Burress ED, Duarte A, Serra WS, Gangloff MM, Siefferman L (2013) Species-
 660 specific ontogenetic diet shifts among Neotropical *Crenicichla*: Using stable isotopes
 661 and tissue stoichiometry. *J Fish Biol* 82:1904-1915. doi:10.1111/jfb.12117
 662 Burress ED (2015) Cichlid fishes as models of ecological diversification: Patterns,
 663 mechanisms, and consequences. *Hydrobiologia* 748:7-27. doi:10.1007/s10750-014-
 664 1960-z
 665 Catchen JM, Hohenlohe PA, Bassham S, Amores A, Cresko WA (2013) Stacks: An
 666 analysis tool set for population genomics. *Mol Ecol* 22:3124-3140.
 667 doi:10.1111/mec.12354

668 Catchen JM, Amores A, Hohenlohe P, Cresko W, Postlethwait JH, Hohenlohe PA,
 669 Bassham S, Amores A, Cresko WA (2011) Stacks: Building and genotyping loci de
 670 novo from short-read sequences. *G3* 1:171-182. doi:10.1534/g3.111.000240

 671 Clabaut C, Bunje PME, Salzburger W, Meyer A (2007) Geometric morphometric
 672 analyses provide evidence for the adaptive character of the Tanganyikan cichlid fish
 673 radiations. *Evolution* 61:560-578. doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2007.00045.x

 674 Colombo M, Diepeveen ET, Muschick M, Santos ME, Indermaur A, Boileau N,
 675 Barluenga M, Salzburger W (2013) The ecological and genetic basis of convergent
 676 thick-lipped phenotypes in cichlid fishes. *Mol Ecol* 22: 670-684.
 677 doi:10.1111/mec.12029

 678 Corfield J, Diggles B, Jubb C, McDowall RM, Moore A, Richards A, Rowe DK
 679 (2008) Review of the impacts of introduced ornamental fish species that have
 680 established wild populations in Australia. Prepared for the Department of the
 681 Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts, Canberra, ACT. [www.environment.gov.](http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/publications/index.html)
 682 [au/biodiversity/publications/index.html](http://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/publications/index.html)

 683 Crawley MJ (2012) Mixed-effects models. In: *The R book*. John Wiley and Sons Ltd.,
 684 United Kingdom, pp 681-714

 685 Doebeli M, Dieckmann U, Metz JA, Tautz D (2005) What we have also learned:
 686 Adaptive speciation is theoretically plausible. *Evolution* 59:691-695. doi:10.1554/04-
 687 154

 688 Elston DA, Moss R, Boulinier T, Arrowsmith C, Lambin X (2001) Analysis of
 689 aggregation, a worked example: number of ticks on red grouse. *Parasitology* 122:563-
 690 569. doi:10.1017/S0031182001007740

691 Elmer KR, Lehtonen TK, Kautt A, Harrod C, Meyer A (2010a) Rapid sympatric
 692 ecological differentiation of crater lake cichlid fishes within historic times. BMC Biol
 693 8:60. doi:10.1186/1741-7007-8-60

694 Elmer KR, Kusche, H Lehtonen TK, Meyer A (2010b) Local variation and parallel
 695 evolution: Morphological and genetic diversity across a species complex of
 696 Neotropical crater lake cichlid fishes. Philos T R Soc B 365:1763-1782.
 697 doi:10.1098/rstb.2009.0271

698 Elmer KR, Lehtonen TK, Fan S, Meyer A (2013) Crater lake colonization by
 699 Neotropical cichlid fishes. Evolution 67:281-288. doi:10.1111/j.1558-
 700 5646.2012.01755.x

701 Ferry LA, Konow N, Gibb AC (2012) Are kissing gourami specialized for substrate-
 702 feeding? Prey capture kinematics of *Helostoma temminckii* and other Anabantoid
 703 fishes. J Exp Zool 317:571-579. doi:10.1002/jez.1749

704 Fierst JL (2011) A history of phenotypic plasticity accelerates adaptation to a new
 705 environment. J Evol Biol 24:1992-2001. doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2011.02333.x

706 Fryer G (1959) The trophic interrelationships and ecology of some littoral
 707 communities of Lake Nyasa with especial reference to the fishes, and a discussion of
 708 the evolution of a group of rock-frequenting Cichlidae. P Zool Soc Lond 132:153-
 709 281. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7998.1959.tb05521.x

710 Ghalambor CK, McKay JK, Carroll SP, Reznick DN (2007) Adaptive versus non-
 711 adaptive phenotypic plasticity and the potential for contemporary adaptation in new
 712 environments. Funct Ecol 21:394-407. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2007.01283.x

713 Grant PR, Grant B (2008) How and why species multiply: The radiation of Darwin's
714 finches. Princeton University Press, Princeton

715 Greenwood PH (1974) The cichlid fishes of Lake Victoria, East Africa: The biology
716 and evolution of a species flock. British Natural History Museum, London, pp 134

717 Hendry AP (2009) Ecological speciation! Or the lack thereof? Can J Fish Aquat Sci
718 66:1383-1398. doi:10.1139/F09-074

719 Hendry AP, Wenburg JK, Bentzen P, Volk EC, Quinn TP (2000) Rapid evolution of
720 reproductive isolation in the wild: Evidence from introduced salmon. Science
721 290:516-518. doi:10.1126/science.290.5491.516

722 Hulsey CD, Hendrickson DA, García de León FJ (2005) Trophic morphology,
723 feeding performance and prey use in the polymorphic fish *Herichthys minckleyi*. Evol
724 Ecol Res 7:303-324

725 Kinziger AP, Nakamoto RJ, Anderson EC, Harvey BC (2011) Small founding
726 number and low genetic diversity in an introduced species exhibiting limited invasion
727 success (speckled dace, *Rhinichthys osculus*). Ecol Evol 1:73-84. doi:10.1002/ece3.8

728 Klingenberg CP, Barluenga M, Meyer A (2003) Body shape variation in cichlid fishes
729 of the *Amphilophus citrinellus* species complex. Biol J Linn Soc 80:397-408.
730 doi:10.1046/j.1095-8312.2003.00246.x

731 Kocher TD (2004) Adaptive evolution and explosive speciation: The cichlid fish
732 model. Nat Rev Genet 5:288-298. doi:10.1038/nrg1316

733 Kornfield IL, Koehn RK (1975) Genetic variation and speciation in new world
734 cichlids. Evolution 29:427-437. doi:10.2307/2407255

735 Ledon-Rettig CC, Pfennig DW, Nascone-Yoder N (2008) Ancestral variation and the
 736 potential for genetic accommodation in larval amphibians: Implications for the
 737 evolution of novel feeding strategies. *Evol Dev* 10:316-325. doi:10.1111/j.1525-
 738 142X.2008.00240.x

739 Lehtonen TK, Kvarnemo C (2015) Infections may select for filial cannibalism by
 740 impacting egg survival in interactions with water salinity and egg density. *Oecologia*
 741 178:673-683. doi:10.1007/s00442-015-3246-1

742 Losos JB (2011) Convergence, adaptation, and constraint. *Evolution* 65:1827-1840.
 743 doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2011.01289.x

744 Lu G, Bernatchez L (1999) A study of fluctuating asymmetry in hybrids of dwarf and
 745 normal lake whitefish ecotypes (*Coregonus clupeaformis*) from different glacial
 746 races. *Heredity* 83:742-747. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2540.1999.00625.x

747 Machado-Schiaffino G, Henning GF, Meyer A (2017) Incipient speciation driven by
 748 hypertrophied lips in Midas cichlids fish? *Mol Ecol* 26:2348-2362.
 749 doi:10.1111/mec.14029

750 Manousaki T, Hull PM, Kusche H, Machado-Schiaffino G, Franchini P, Harrod C,
 751 Elmer KR, Meyer A (2013) Parsing parallel evolution: Ecological divergence and
 752 differential gene expression in the adaptive radiations of thick-lipped Midas cichlid
 753 fishes from Nicaragua. *Mol Ecol* 22:650-669. doi:10.1111/mec.12034

754 McKinnon JS, Rundle HD (2002) Speciation in nature: The threespine stickleback
 755 model systems. *Trends Ecol Evol* 17:480-488. doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(02)02579-X

756 Meyer A (1987) Phenotypic plasticity and heterochrony in *Cichlasoma managuense*
 757 (Pisces, Cichlidae) and their implications for speciation in cichlid fishes. *Evolution*
 758 41:1357-1369. doi:10.2307/2409100

759 Muschick M, Barluenga M, Salzburger W, Meyer A (2011) Adaptive phenotypic
 760 plasticity in the Midas cichlid fish pharyngeal jaw and its relevance in adaptive
 761 radiation. *BMC Evol Biol* 11:116. doi:10.1186/1471-2148-11-116

762 Oliver MK, Arnegard ME (2010) A new genus for *Melanochromis labrosus*, a
 763 problematic Lake Malawi cichlid with hypertrophied lips (Teleostei: Cichlidae).
 764 *Ichthyol Explor Fres* 21:209-232

765 Pfennig DW, McGee M (2010) Resource polyphenism increases species richness: A
 766 test of the hypothesis. *Philos T R Soc B* 365:577-591. doi:10.1098/rstb.2009.0244

767 Pfennig DW, Wund MA, Snell-Rood EC, Cruickshank T, Schlichting CD, Moczek
 768 AP (2010) Phenotypic plasticity's impacts on diversification and speciation. *Trends*
 769 *Ecol Evol* 25:459-467. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2010.05.006

770 Pigliucci M (2005) Evolution of phenotypic plasticity: Where are we going now?
 771 *Trends Ecol Evol* 20:481-486. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2005.06.001

772 Rasband W (1997) ImageJ (version 1.50b). National Institutes of Health, Bethesda.
 773 <http://rsb.info.nih.gov/ij>

774 Salzburger W (2009) The interaction of sexually and naturally selected traits in the
 775 adaptive radiations of cichlid fishes. *Mol Ecol* 18:169-185. doi:10.1111/j.1365-
 776 294X.2008.03981.x

777 Salzburger W, Mack T, Verheyen E, Meyer A (2005) Out of Tanganyika: genesis,
 778 explosive speciation, key-innovations and phylogeography of the Haplochromine
 779 cichlid fishes. *BMC Evol Biol* 5:17. doi:10.1186/1471-2148-5-17

780 Savolainen V, Lexer C, Anstett M-C, Hutton I, Clarkson JJ, Norup MV, Powell MP,
 781 Springate D, Salamin N, Baker WJ (2006) Evolutionary biology: Sympatric plant
 782 speciation in islands? *Nature* 441:210-213. doi:10.1038/nature05217

783 Scheiner SM (1993) Genetics and evolution of phenotypic plasticity. *Annu Rev Ecol*
 784 *Evol S* 24:35-68. doi:10.1146/annurev.es.24.110193.000343

785 Schlichting CD (2004) The role of phenotypic plasticity in diversification. Oxford
 786 University Press, New York and Oxford

787 Schluter D (2000) The ecology of adaptive radiation. Oxford University Press, New
 788 York and Oxford

789 Schluter D, Conte GL (2009) Genetics and ecological speciation. *P Natl Acad Sci*
 790 *USA* 106:9955-9962. doi:10.1073/pnas.0901264106

791 Schluter D, Nagel LM (1995) Parallel speciation by natural selection. *Am Nat*
 792 146:292-301. doi:10.1086/285799

793 Skúlason S, Snorrason SS, Jonsson B (1999) Sympatric morphs, populations and
 794 speciation in freshwater fish with emphasis on Arctic charr. In: Magurran AE, May
 795 RM (eds) *Evolution of biological diversity*. Oxford University Press, New York and
 796 Oxford, pp 70-92

797 Smith TB, Skúlason S (1996) Evolutionary significance of resource polymorphisms in
 798 fishes, amphibians, and birds. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol S* 27:111-133.
 799 doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.27.1.111

800 Sorenson MD, Sefc KM, Payne RB (2003) Speciation by host switch in brood
 801 parasitic indigobirds. *Nature* 424:928-931. doi:10.1038/nature01863

802 Stauffer JR, van Snick Gray E (2004) Phenotypic plasticity: Its role in trophic
 803 radiation and explosive speciation in cichlids (Teleostei: Cichlidae). *Anim Biol*
 804 54:137-158. doi:10.1163/1570756041445191

805 Wagner CE, McIntyre PB, Buels KS, Gilbert DM, Michel E (2009) Diet predicts
 806 intestine length in Lake Tanganyika's cichlid fishes. *Funct Ecol* 23:1122-1131.
 807 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2009.01589.x

808 Wente WH, Phillips JB (2003) Fixed green and brown color morphs and a novel
 809 color-changing morph of the Pacific tree frog *Hyla regilla*. *Am Nat* 162:461-473.
 810 doi:10.1086/378253

811 West-Eberhard MJ (1989) Phenotypic plasticity and the origins of diversity. *Annu*
 812 *Rev Ecol Evol S* 20:249-278. doi:10.1146/annurev.es.20.110189.001341

813 West-Eberhard MJ (2003) Developmental plasticity and evolution. Oxford University
 814 Press, New York and Oxford

815 Willis TJ, Babcock RC (1998) Retention and in situ detectability of visible implant
 816 fluorescent elastomer (VIFE) tags in *Pagrus auratus* (Sparidae). *New Zeal J Mar*
 817 *Fresh* 32:247-254. doi:10.1080/00288330.1998.9516823

818 Witte F, Barel C, Hoogerhoud R (1989) Phenotypic plasticity of anatomical structures
819 and its ecomorphological significance. *Neth J Zool* 40:278-298.
820 doi:10.1163/156854289X00309

821 Wund MA (2012) Assessing the impacts of phenotypic plasticity on evolution. *Integr*
822 *Comp Biol* 52:5-15. doi:10.1093/icb/ics050

823 Yamaoka, K (1997) Trophic ecomorphology of Tanganyikan cichlids. In: *Fish*
824 *communities in Lake Tanganyika*. Kyoto University Press Kyoto, pp 25-26

825 Yeh PJ, Price TD (2004) Adaptive phenotypic plasticity and the successful
826 colonization of a novel environment. *Am Nat* 164:531-542. doi:10.1086/423825

827 Zuur AF, Hilbe J, Ieno EN (2013) *A beginner's guide to GLM and GLMM with R: A*
828 *frequentist and Bayesian perspective for ecologists*. Highland Statistics Ltd., United
829 Kingdom

830

Figure Legends

Figure 1: The distribution of lip size (relative to body size) in the introduced Australian population (left), and from the native population in Nicaragua (right). The photographs demonstrate, **a)** and **b)**, the variation in lip size in the introduced Australian population, and **c)** and **d)**, the variation in lip size in native populations in Nicaragua.

Figure 2: Proportion of food item categories found in the gut and stomach content of red devil cichlids in the introduced population, **a)** proportion of algae (light green), **b)** proportion of insects (yellow), and **c)** fish remains (blue).

Figure 3: Boxplots showing the distribution of observed heterozygosity (upper panel) and nucleotide diversity (lower panel) estimated from 8038 SNPs occurring in all six populations. Note the considerable reduction of both diversity measures in the introduced Hazelwood population (Ha) compared to native Nicaraguan populations (Lv, Ma, Om, Pd and So).