

## Aberystwyth University

### *Relaxed trait covariance in interspecific cichlid hybrids predicts morphological diversity in adaptive radiations*

Selz, O. M.; Lucek, K.; Young, K. A.; Seehausen, O.

*Published in:*

Journal of Evolutionary Biology

*DOI:*

[10.1111/jeb.12283](https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.12283)

*Publication date:*

2014

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Selz, O. M., Lucek, K., Young, K. A., & Seehausen, O. (2014). Relaxed trait covariance in interspecific cichlid hybrids predicts morphological diversity in adaptive radiations. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 27(1), 11-24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.12283>

#### **Document License**

Unclear

#### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Aberystwyth Research Portal (the Institutional Repository) are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Aberystwyth Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Aberystwyth Research Portal

#### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

tel: +44 1970 62 2400

email: [is@aber.ac.uk](mailto:is@aber.ac.uk)

# Relaxed trait covariance in interspecific cichlid hybrids predicts morphological diversity in adaptive radiations

O. M. SELZ\*†, K. LUCEK\*†, K. A. YOUNG‡ & O. SEEHAUSEN†

\*Department of Fish Ecology and Evolution, EAWAG Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology, Center for Ecology, Evolution and Biogeochemistry, Kastanienbaum, Switzerland

†Division of Aquatic Ecology and Evolution, Institute of Ecology and Evolution, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

‡Environment Agency, Cardiff, UK

## Keywords:

adaptive radiation;  
cichlid;  
hybridization;  
transgressive segregation.

## Abstract

The process of adaptive radiation involves multiple events of speciation in short succession, associated with ecological diversification. Understanding this process requires identifying the origins of heritable phenotypic variation that allows adaptive radiation to progress. Hybridization is one source of genetic and morphological variation that may spur adaptive radiation. We experimentally explored the potential role of hybridization in facilitating the onset of adaptive radiation. We generated first- and second-generation hybrids of four species of African cichlid fish, extant relatives of the putative ancestors of the adaptive radiations of Lakes Victoria and Malawi. We compared patterns in hybrid morphological variation with the variation in the lake radiations. We show that significant fractions of the interspecific morphological variation and the major trajectories in morphospace that characterize whole radiations can be generated in second-generation hybrids. Furthermore, we show that covariation between traits is relaxed in second-generation hybrids, which may facilitate adaptive diversification. These results support the idea that hybridization can provide the heritable phenotypic diversity necessary to initiate adaptive radiation.

## Introduction

Adaptive radiation involves multiple events of speciation in short succession, associated with ecological diversification, and is often initiated when a population colonizes new environments with a variety of available ecological niches (Simpson, 1953; Schluter, 2000; Losos, 2010). Identifying the sources of heritable phenotypic variation required to initiate and sustain the process of adaptive radiation remains an outstanding challenge (Gavrilets & Losos, 2009). Mutations and intraspecific recombination alone are often unlikely to produce and maintain sufficient levels of heritable phenotypic variation (Schlichting & Pigliucci, 1998; Blows & Hoffman, 2005; Orr & Unckless, 2008; Hedrick, 2013) to support the most rapid large radiations. Adaptive radiation is thus likely to require initially high levels of

standing genetic variation in adaptive traits (Barrett & Schluter, 2007). Interspecific hybridization is one mechanism by which high levels of heritable phenotypic variation can be rapidly generated (Anderson & Stebbins, 1954; Lewontin & Birch, 1966; Arnold, 1997; Seehausen, 2004; Bell & Travis, 2005; Hedrick, 2013).

Hybridization can affect patterns of genetic and phenotypic variation in two related ways that can facilitate and influence the process of adaptive radiation. Firstly, hybrids often display novel genotypes and phenotypes (Grant & Grant, 1996; Bell & Travis, 2005; Schwenk *et al.*, 2008) that are intermediate to (Barton & Hewitt, 1985; Mallet, 2007; Rieseberg & Willis, 2007) or outside of the range observed in both parental species combined (Slatkin & Lande, 1994; Rieseberg *et al.*, 1999; Stelkens & Seehausen, 2009). Extreme traits arising through transgressive segregation increase the phenotypic variance upon which divergent natural selection can act, may facilitate the colonization of new environments with novel selection pressures (Johnston, 2004; Nolte *et al.*, 2005; Gompert *et al.*, 2006; Lucek *et al.*, 2010; Nice *et al.*,

Correspondence: Oliver M. Selz, Seestrasse 79, CH-6047 Kastanienbaum, Switzerland. Tel.: +41 (0)58 765 21 46; fax: +41 (0)58 765 21 68; e-mail: oliver.selz@eawag.ch

2012; Pereira *et al.*, 2013) and can increase the likelihood of ecological speciation (Mavárez *et al.*, 2006; Larsen *et al.*, 2010; Hermansen *et al.*, 2011). Secondly, existing genetic and morphological covariance structures (Hallgrímsson *et al.*, 2012) may be relaxed by hybridization, thereby reducing evolutionary constraint (Clausen & Heisey, 1960; Grant & Grant, 1994; Murren, 2002; Ackermann *et al.*, 2006) and increasing the likelihood of adaptive diversification (Renaud *et al.*, 2009; Parsons *et al.*, 2011; Renaud *et al.*, 2012).

Hybridization is particularly common when reproductively compatible species come together in novel or perturbed environments (Anderson, 1948). Such conditions are likely to arise from environmental events that bring together previously allopatric species (Anderson & Stebbins, 1954). Hybridization and adaptive radiation are thus favoured by similar environmental conditions, that is, colonization of novel environments, and a taxonomically broad evidence base suggests hybridization may be a common feature of adaptive radiation (Barrier *et al.*, 1999; Feder *et al.*, 2003; Seehausen, 2004; Herder *et al.*, 2006; Grant & Grant, 2008; Hudson *et al.*, 2010; Joyce *et al.*, 2011; Papadopulus *et al.*, 2013).

This collective body of evidence underpins two complementary hypotheses for the role of hybridization in adaptive radiation (Seehausen, 2004). The 'hybrid swarm origin' hypothesis posits that hybridization between distantly related colonizing lineages can play an important role in initiating adaptive radiation, whereas the 'syngameon' hypothesis highlights the role of occasional hybridization as adaptive radiation progresses. Both the hybrid swarm origin (Barrier *et al.*, 1999; Feder *et al.*, 2003; Seehausen *et al.*, 2003; Hudson *et al.*, 2010; Joyce *et al.*, 2011; Genner & Turner, 2012) and syngameon hypotheses (Herder *et al.*, 2006; Grant & Grant, 2008; Dasmahapatra *et al.*, 2012; Nadeau *et al.*, 2012; Papadopulus *et al.*, 2013) are supported by observational and correlative genetic and phenotypic evidence. Although there is experimental evidence addressing hybrid speciation (Rieseberg *et al.*, 1996; Fordyce *et al.*, 2002; Greig *et al.*, 2002; Mavárez *et al.*, 2006; Melo *et al.*, 2009; Selz *et al.*, 2013), there remains little experimental evidence for the two potentially facilitating roles of hybridization in adaptive radiation. Cooper *et al.* (2011) and Parsons *et al.* (2011) have experimentally addressed the role of the syngameon hypothesis for adaptive radiations, but experimental work on the role of the hybrid swarm origin hypothesis is so far lacking.

Here, we combine experimental and comparative methods to test predictions of the hybrid swarm origin hypothesis using African cichlid fish. The cichlid fish radiations of the three African great lakes (Tanganyika, Malawi and Victoria; hereafter, LT, LM and LV, respectively) have produced famously specious and morphologically diverse and convergent endemic assemblages (Greenwood, 1975; Kocher *et al.*, 1993; Kocher, 2004; Seehausen, 2006; Young *et al.*, 2009; Wagner *et al.*,

2012). All three radiations originate from several distantly related lineages of riverine cichlids. There is evidence for hybridization between distantly related colonists early in the origins of radiations (Seehausen *et al.*, 2003; Seehausen, 2004; Joyce *et al.*, 2011; Genner & Turner, 2012; Loh *et al.*, 2013), hybridization among radiation member species leading to hybrid speciation (Salzburger *et al.*, 2002; Schlieven & Klee, 2004; Schelly *et al.*, 2006; Egger *et al.*, 2007; Keller *et al.*, 2012), and contemporary interspecific hybridization (Seehausen *et al.*, 1997, 2008; Streelman *et al.*, 2004; Konijnendijk *et al.*, 2011; Egger *et al.*, 2012). Diversification in the young LV (0.015–0.1 million years) and moderately young LM (2–4 million years) radiations has been rapid and *in situ*, whereas the LT (8–16 million years) radiation is older and speciation was much slower (Genner *et al.*, 2007; Day *et al.*, 2008). We refer to the lake assemblages as 'radiations' for simplicity even though diversity in Lake Tanganyika has arisen in several distinct radiations in different lineages (Genner *et al.*, 2007).

We created first- and second-generation hybrids between (i) riverine species closely related to the putative ancestors of the LV and LM radiations and (ii) a riverine species and a generalist from the LM sand cichlid clade, both of which are implicated in giving rise to the young and rapidly diversifying rock-dwelling Mbuna clade of the LM radiation (Joyce *et al.*, 2011; Loh *et al.*, 2013). We compared patterns of morphological diversity among parental species, first- and second-generation hybrids, and representative species from the three great lake radiations. Previous work has shown that cichlid hybrids express a broader range of morphologies than their parental species (Parnell *et al.*, 2008; Stelkens *et al.*, 2009; Parsons *et al.*, 2011) and reduced levels of integration between traits (Parsons *et al.*, 2011), which are two predictions of the hybrid swarm origin hypothesis. Here, we test three further and increasingly refined predictions of this hypothesis: (i) hybrids display increased morphological variation and relaxed morphological covariance compared with parental species when projected into the morphospace of extant adaptive radiations, (ii) the morphological covariance structures of extant radiations are more closely matched by interspecific hybrids than by any one ancestral species, and (iii) the principal axes of hybrid morphospaces predict the principal axes observed in extant adaptive radiations better than do those of any one ancestral species.

## Materials and methods

### Parental species, first- and second-generation hybrids

We created parental type and hybrid lines using three riverine *Astatotilapia* species that are closely related to the radiations of Lakes Victoria and Malawi and

considered archetypical for what the ancestors of these lake radiations would likely have looked like: *Astatotilapia calliptera* (Greenwood, 1979), *A. tweddlei* (Greenwood, 1979) and *Astatotilapia burtoni* (Greenwood, 1979). Additionally, we used the lake-dwelling cichlid *Protomelas taeniolatus* (Trewavas, 1935). All three *Astatotilapia* species occur in lakes, rivers, streams and swamps in East and/or South Africa (van Oijen *et al.*, 1991; Skelton, 1993; Kazembe *et al.*, 2006; Ntakimazi, 2006; Konings, 2007; Bills *et al.*, 2010; Joyce *et al.*, 2011). *Astatotilapia burtoni* is found in Lake Tanganyika and surrounding rivers. *Astatotilapia calliptera* is found in Lake Malawi and its catchment area, as well as in many rivers of southern East Africa from the Rovuma river and Lakes Chilwa and Chiuta in its headwaters south to middle Mozambique. *Astatotilapia tweddlei* is a member of the East African *A. bloyeti* species complex. The species complex is found in most coastal rivers from northern Tanzania down to the Rovuma River including Lakes Chilwa and Chiuta in its headwaters. *Astatotilapia tweddlei* is confined to the Rovuma and its headwater lakes. We refer to the species as CAL for *A. calliptera*, TWE for *A. tweddlei*, BUR for *A. burtoni* and PRO for *P. taeniolatus*. Hybrid lines are named as: maternal species × paternal species – generation (e.g. CAL × BUR-F2). The phylogenetic relationships between these and the great lake radiations are well established (Seehausen *et al.*, 2003; Joyce *et al.*, 2011; Loh *et al.*, 2013). Both, *A. tweddlei* and *A. calliptera* are the nearest known living relatives of different lineages in the Lake Malawi radiation (Joyce *et al.*, 2011). The riverine *Astatotilapia* sp. (including the three species used in this study) are the sister group to the whole Lake Victoria superflock and the Lake Malawi radiation, whereas *P. taeniolatus* is a basal member of the Lake Malawi radiation (Loh *et al.*, 2013). The nonhybrid lines were laboratory populations founded by wild fish collected from Lake Malawi (CAL, PRO), Lake Chilwa (TWE) and rivers connected to Lake Tanganyika (BUR)

and maintained in our laboratory (approximately five generations in captivity). We refer to these as the ‘parental lines’ or ‘ancestral lines’ depending on the context. The parents of the ‘hybrid lines’ were taken from these populations.

We bred four types of hybrid F1 families (CAL × PRO; CAL × BUR; BUR × TWE; CAL × TWE) by holding 5–20 females of one species with one male of another. All F1 families derived from unique male–female combinations. F2 hybrid families of CAL × PRO, CAL × BUR and BUR × TWE were obtained by breeding F1 sibs as above; F2 hybrids of CAL × TWE were not obtained, because no mating events occurred among the F1 hybrids. Following spawning, fertilized eggs were removed from the female’s mouth and transferred to an egg tumbler. After 15 days, fry were moved to small aquaria (20 × 40 × 20 cm) for 15 days and then transferred to larger aquaria (50 × 40 × 30 cm) at a maximum density of 20 individuals. Families were raised in separate aquaria. Fish were fed a mixture of ground shrimp, peas and *Spirulina* powder 2 days a week, and with commercial cichlid flakes on other days. The water temperature (25 ± 2 °C) and light/dark cycle (12:12 h) were the same for all aquaria.

All fish were digitally photographed after 6 months, near the age of sexual maturity. Pictures were taken of the left side of the live fish held in a transparent cuvette with a scale for subsequent size calibration. The total numbers of families and individuals present in each parental and hybrid line are given in Table 1.

### Lake radiations

We collected digital photographs from the left side (scale included) of preserved specimens from the three lake radiations (Young *et al.*, 2009). The preserved cichlid specimens are representative species of each of the radiations in Lake Victoria, Lake Malawi and Lake


**Table 1** Number of families and individuals in each parental and hybrid line and each lake radiation. For the three lake radiations, 99 species of each Lake Victoria and Lake Tanganyika and 97 species from Lake Malawi were used (one individual per species).

Parental line	<i>N</i> families ( <i>N</i> total number of individuals (bold): <i>N</i> individuals per family)		
<i>A. burtoni</i> (BUR)	4 ( <b>46</b> : 8/11/13/14)		
<i>A. calliptera</i> (CAL)	3 ( <b>68</b> : 16/19/33)		
<i>P. taeniolatus</i> (PRO)	3 ( <b>56</b> : 11/22/23)		
<i>A. tweddlei</i> (TWE)	2 ( <b>29</b> : 8/21)		
Hybrid line	<i>N</i> families ( <i>N</i> total (bold): <i>N</i> individuals per family)		
Female parent	Male parent	F1 Hybrid	F2 Hybrid
<i>A. calliptera</i> (CAL)	<i>P. taeniolatus</i> (PRO)	2 ( <b>64</b> : 22/42)	2 ( <b>93</b> : 21/72)
<i>A. calliptera</i> (CAL)	<i>A. burtoni</i> (BUR)	4 ( <b>45</b> : 2/6/18/19)	3 ( <b>62</b> : 9/15/38)
<i>A. burtoni</i> (BUR)	<i>A. tweddlei</i> (TWE)	3 ( <b>45</b> : 5/16/24)	4 ( <b>69</b> : 1/2/26/40)
<i>A. tweddlei</i> (TWE)	<i>A. burtoni</i> (BUR)	2 ( <b>54</b> : 24/30)	2 ( <b>29</b> : 1/28)
<i>A. calliptera</i> (CAL)	<i>A. tweddlei</i> (TWE)	2 ( <b>21</b> : 6/15)	

Tanganyika that are stored at the Natural History Museum (London, UK), Africa Museum (Tervuren, Belgium), Naturalis Museum (Leiden, Netherlands) and the collections of O.S. The sample from LV included species now extinct due to eutrophication and invasive Nile perch (Witte *et al.*, 1992; Seehausen *et al.*, 1997). Most specimens were adult males. For the analyses, we included 99 individuals from LV and LT and 97 individuals from LM. We included specimens from most genera and multiple specimens from polytypic genera to representatively sample the taxonomic and morphological diversity of each radiation (Young *et al.*, 2009; Cooper *et al.*, 2010). Each species is represented with one individual in the data set (Table S3).

### Morphological variance–covariance matrices

We used geometric morphometrics in TPSDIG2 v.9.1 software (Rohlf, 2006) to record the coordinates of 16 homologous landmarks and one homologous semi-landmark (Fig. 1). ‘Traditional’ landmarks and semi-landmark can be used equally after Procrustes superimposition (Gunz & Mitteroecker, 2013) and hence the 16 landmarks and the one semi-landmark were combined and treated equally in subsequent



**Fig. 1** Location of landmarks used in morphometric analysis. F2 hybrid individual between the two riverine cichlid species *Astatotilapia burtoni* and *A. tweddlei*. Numbers mark the 17 landmarks used for geometric morphometric analysis in this study: (1) anterior tip of maxilla, (2) junction of head and dorsal scales, (3) anterior insertion point of dorsal fin, (4) posterior insertion point of dorsal fin, (5) dorsal junction of caudal fin and caudal peduncle, (6) ventral junction of caudal fin and caudal peduncle, (7) posterior insertion point of anal fin, (8) anterior insertion of anal fin, (9) anterior/dorsal insertion of pelvic fin, (10) anterior/ventral insertion of pectoral fin, (11) dorsal insertion of pectoral fin, (12) posterior extreme of operculum (mostly the opercular blotch), (13) ventral-posterior extreme of preoperculum, (14) centre of the eye, (15) anterior reach of the eye, (16) anterior reach of the premaxillary groove and (17) a semi-landmark to depict the curvature of the head; a line is drawn between the landmarks 1 and 2 and at the middle of this line a second line is drawn 90° degrees to the first. The landmark is then placed where the second line crosses the outline of the head (Crispo & Chapman, 2011).

analysis (see below). We first included all individuals from the four parental, four F1 and three F2 hybrid lines and three lake radiations in one data set (Table 1). Using MORPHOJ v.1.05a (Klingenberg, 2011), the landmarks were geometrically scaled to a unit centroid size (=CS) and Procrustes superimposed, which controls for size but retains variation in shape (Rohlf & Slice, 1990). For each fish, CS was then used as a measure of size (Zelditch *et al.*, 2004). For each observational group ( $N = 14$ ; four parental, four F1 and three F2 hybrid lines and three Lake radiations), we regressed the Procrustes coordinates on logCS to create size corrected residuals of the landmark coordinates (Klingenberg, 2011). We then used the residuals to calculate the variance–covariance (VCV) and covariance (CV) matrix for each line (i.e. parental, F1 hybrid and F2 hybrid lines) and the three lake radiations. These matrices were used in subsequent analyses. Morphological (i.e. phenotypic) variance–covariance matrices (P matrices) reflect underlying patterns of genetic variance and covariance (G matrices; Cheverud, 1988; Roff, 1995; Koots & Gibson, 1996). Hence, we discuss morphological P matrices in the context of underlying patterns of heritable morphological variation.

To test whether families within lines differed in their morphological distribution, we calculated Procrustes distances (i.e. a multivariate measure of shape differences) between families within a line and between all lines (Klingenberg, 2011). First, we tested whether the Procrustes distances between all lines and between one or several families within a line were significantly different based on a permutation test ( $N = 10\,000$  permutations). Second, we used a Kruskal–Wallis test with subsequent pairwise Mann–Whitney  $U$ -tests to see whether the Procrustes distances between lines are significantly larger than those found between families within each line and also whether the Procrustes distances between families within lines differ between parental, F1 and F2 lines (Table S1).

### Prediction 1. Hybridization increases morphological variance and relaxes covariance structure compared with parental lines when projected into lake radiation morphospaces

We used VCV matrices to first conduct principal component analyses (PCAs) for each lake radiation. We then projected the morphological variation of each parental and each hybrid line into the PCA of each lake radiation. This approach fixes the PCA axes of each lake radiation and then calculates from VCV matrices PC scores for each of the projected groups based on the fixed PCA axes of the lake radiation. We thereby test whether and to what extent the morphospace of individual parental and hybrid lines predicts patterns of interspecific diversity observed in each lake radiation. We measured the 95% confidence ellipse size on the

two leading PC axes for the parental and hybrid lines (Fig. 2) to test the predictions that interspecific hybrids fill a larger (ellipse size) proportion of morphospace of lake radiations than individual species and display more relaxed covariance structure (ellipse structure, i.e. eccentricity).


The 95% confidence ellipses were calculated and used for calculating the ellipse size for each hybrid line and each parental line and also for the combined range of each of the two parental lines that contributed to a hybrid line. As a measure to compare trait covariance between groups, we used the morphological (P) variance–covariance matrix (Schluter, 2000). Eccentricity ( $\epsilon$ ) reflects the shape of a variance–covariance matrix and is calculated as the ratio between the eigenvalues of the two leading eigenaxes ( $p_{\max}$  and  $p_2$ ). High eccentricity reflects strong covariance between morphological shape elements, whereas low values occur when ellipses are more circular ( $\epsilon \sim 1$ ) due to low covariance. We used one-way ANOVA with Tukey *post hoc* test to evaluate whether the ellipse measures of morphological variation and eccentricity differ between the three groups (parental, F1 hybrid and F2 hybrid line; Fig. 3).

Furthermore, we used one-way ANOVA with Tukey *post hoc* tests to determine whether the F1 and F2 hybrid lines displayed higher levels of morphological variation than the combined range of their respective parental lines.


### Prediction 2: Comparing morphological variance–covariance structures

We used matrix correlation ( $R_m$ ) to compare the structures of the variance–covariance (VCV) and covariance (CV – no diagonal elements) matrices of the hybrid and parental lines with those of the three lake radiations. We calculated  $R_m$  for all pairwise comparisons between experimental lines and radiations. Statistical significance was assessed using Mantel tests adapted for geometric morphometrics (Klingenberg *et al.*, 2003), using 10 000 random permutations of the landmarks.

Because our sample sizes of the 11 lines and the three radiations varied (Table 1), we controlled for the potential effects of sampling error as follows. The maximum observable correlation between two matrices is not one, but a value,  $R_{\max}$ , which corresponds to  $(t_a t_b)^{0.5}$ , where  $t_a$  and  $t_b$  represent the



**Fig. 2** Patterns of morphological variation and eccentricity of parental and hybrids lines when projected into the morphospace of the three Lake radiations. Principal component plots (PCA) with the first two components from the morphospace of each Lake radiation (black dots). The morphological variation of each parental lines and the respective F1 (light blue) and F2 (dark blue) hybrid lines (Panel a: CAL × PRO; Panel b: only F1 CAL × TWE; Panel c: BUR × CAL; Panel d: BUR × TWE) are projected in the morphospace of each Lake radiation (black dots from left to right in each panel: LV, LM and LT). Circles represent the 95% confidence ellipses. F1 and F2 hybrid lines on average showed larger morphological variation (ellipse size) than did the parental lines, and the ellipses of both the F1 and F2 hybrid lines were less eccentric than those of the parental lines. See Table 1 for abbreviations.




**Fig. 3** Ellipse sizes and eccentricities derived from the projection of each parental, F1 or F2 hybrid line into the morphospace of each Lake radiation. The ellipse sizes and eccentricities of the parental (in black; from left to right: BUR, CAL, PRO, TWE) and hybrid lines (F1 in dark grey; from left to right: CAL  $\times$  TWE F1, CAL  $\times$  PRO F1, CAL  $\times$  BUR F1, BUR  $\times$  TWE F1, and F2 in mild grey; from left to right: CAL  $\times$  PRO F2, CAL  $\times$  BUR F2, BUR  $\times$  TWE F2) when projected into the morphospace of each lake radiation (from left to right: LV, LM, LT). The upper row shows the ellipse sizes of each group (parental, F1 hybrid and F2 hybrid line) and the lower row shows the eccentricity for the ellipse of each group. When projecting the parental and hybrid lines into the morphospace of each lake radiation, the F1 and F2 hybrid lines on average showed larger morphological variation (ellipse size) than did the parental lines and the ellipses of both the F1 and F2 hybrid lines were less eccentric than those of the parental lines. See Table 1 for abbreviations.

repeatability of matrices A and B, respectively (Cheverud, 1996). We calculated VCV ( $t_{vcv}$ ) and CV ( $t_{cv}$ ) matrix repeatability for each group following Maroig and Cheverud (2001). We then adjusted observed matrix correlations by dividing the observed matrix correlation ( $R_{obs}$ ) by the maximum matrix correlation ( $R_{max}$ ) as:  $R_{adj} = R_{obs}/R_{max}$ . Each group in the subsequent ANOVA (e.g. parental, F1 hybrid and F2 hybrid) contained the matrix correlation values that derived from comparing the VCV and CV matrices of each line with each of the three lake radiations. We used a one-way ANOVA with Tukey *post hoc* tests to test whether the adjusted pairwise matrix correlations calculated between each line and the three lake radiations differed between the groups (parental, F1 hybrid and F2 hybrid; Fig. 4).

### Prediction 3: Comparing trajectories of morphological diversification

We tested the prediction that the trajectories of morphological diversification observed in extant lake radiations are better predicted by hybrid populations

than by individual ancestral species as follows. The VCV matrices of each line and each radiation were calculated independently to extract axes of variation in the global morphospace. For each line-specific PCA, we retained the first four PC axes, which each explained more than 5% of morphological variation (Table S2). We then compared the angles between the principal axes and multidimensional trajectories of each line (ancestral species, F1 hybrid and F2 hybrid line) with those of each lake radiation (LV, LM, LT), and between the lake radiations themselves. We used SpaceAngle6b (Sheets, 2001; Zelditch *et al.*, 2004) to compute the angle between the first axes, 2-D planes and higher dimensional spaces. First, we calculated the observed angle between two groups by re-sampling specimens from each group with replacement (500 bootstrapped replicates). Second, each group was randomly partitioned into two subsamples, and 4900 bootstrapped angles between them (within-group angles) were calculated. The angle between the two groups was considered significantly different if the angle between groups exceeded the 95% range of within-group angles of both groups (Table 2).



**Fig. 4** Variance–covariance and covariance matrix correlations between parental and hybrid lines and the lake radiations. Matrix correlations (from Mantel tests) for comparisons of the parental lines (in black; from left to right: BUR, CAL, PRO, TWE), F1 hybrid (in dark grey; from left to right: CAL  $\times$  TWE F1, CAL  $\times$  PRO F1, CAL  $\times$  BUR F1, BUR  $\times$  TWE F1) and F2 hybrid lines (in mild grey; from left to right: CAL  $\times$  PRO F2, CAL  $\times$  BUR F2, BUR  $\times$  TWE F2) with each lake radiation (from left to right: LV, LM, LT) and among the lake radiations (in light grey). A gradual increase in the correlations from parental to F1 hybrid lines, F2 hybrid lines and lake radiations was observed both for variance–covariance matrices (upper row) and covariance matrices (lower row). The correlations with the three lake radiations were higher for F2 than for parents and based on the CV matrices showed a trend to differ between the two groups.

We tested principal axes and higher multidimensional trajectories: (i)  $P_{max} = PC1$  only, (ii) the first two PC axes combined (PC1-2) and (iii) including all PC axes explaining  $> 5\%$  of variation (PC1-4). As the number of PC axes explaining  $> 5\%$  of variation varied between groups, we used the number of PC axes of the group with the fewest PC axes explaining more than 5% variance for all the other groups too. This was four PC axes. Hence, by excluding axes explaining  $< 5\%$  of the variance, we focused on testing similarity between the principal trajectories of morphological diversification.

### Statistics

Statistical analyses were performed using MORPHOJ v.1.05a (Klingenberg, 2011), the statistical software R v. 2.13.0 (R development Core Team 2008) and PAST v. 2.03 (Hammer *et al.*, 2001). All statistical tests are two-tailed.

### Results

Normality assumptions were satisfied (assessed by Shapiro–Wilk tests and Q-Q-plots) for all data sets with one exception for which nonparametric test was used.

The Procrustes distances between families within the parental, F1 and F2 hybrids lines were small, and none

were significant in the CAL  $\times$  TWE F1, CAL  $\times$  BUR F1, TWE  $\times$  BUR F1 and BUR  $\times$  TWE F2 lines. Also in the other lines in six cases one and in two cases, more than one of the Procrustes distances between families was marginally significant. Procrustes distances between lines were on average larger than those between families within a line, and all were significantly different ( $P < 0.001$ ). The Procrustes distances between families within parental, F1 and F2 hybrid lines were significantly smaller than those between all lines (parental, F1 and F2 hybrid lines; Kruskal–Wallis,  $H = 27.17$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ; see Table S1). We acknowledge that data sets with small number of families per lines should be treated with some caution due to possible family effects. In our data set, the Procrustes distances between parental, F1 and F2 hybrid lines did not differ and hence any possible family effects would have to be small (Table S1).

### Prediction 1. Hybridization increases morphological variance and relaxes covariance structure

When projected into the morphospace of the three radiations, hybrid lines accounted for more of the total diversity observed in extant radiations than individual parental lines (mean ellipse size and standard deviation: parental lines =  $0.16 \pm 0.05$ , F1 hybrids =  $0.18 \pm 0.08$ ,



**Table 2** Comparing trajectories of morphological diversification. Principal component axes derived from line-specific PCAs were used to compare the angles between the axes of each of the parental, F1 hybrid and F2 hybrid lines to each of the lake radiations and among lake radiations. The orientation in shape space (angle in degrees between the two groups compared, based on PC1, PC1-2 and PC1-4) is considered significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ , in bold) if the observed bootstrapped (500 times) angle between groups exceeds both within-group bootstrapped (4900 times) angles between subsamples of each group. See Table 1 for abbreviations.

Generation	Comparison		PC1 max. angle = 90		PC1-2 max. angle = 127.28		PC1-4 max. angle = 180	
	Group 1	Group 2	Observed angle	Within-group angles	Observed angle	Within-group angles	Observed angle	Within-group angles
			Between groups	Group1/ group 2	Between groups	Group1/ group 2	Between groups	Group1/ group 2
	LV	LM	45.55	65.40/81.67	42.01	68.65/46.44	55.01	89.60/43.42
	LV	LT	39.7	66.45/21.91	60.71	68.04/84.57	80.92	89.56/89.43
	LM	LT	26.3	81/21.82	35.33	44.35/84.70	88.16	43.18/89.40
	BUR × BUR	LV	68.25	51.59/77.68	<b>90.95</b>	55.76/80.72	<b>98.97</b>	96.31/91.42
	CAL × CAL	LV	60.46	57.72/72.77	<b>74.72</b>	41.55/74.45	91.98	93.71/90.30
	PRO × PRO	LV	<b>88.54</b>	61.23/77.06	79.15	90.42/80.23	94.22	100.41/91.02
	TWE × TWE	LV	<b>84.4</b>	68.26/82.57	<b>89.7</b>	69.90/84.51	<b>114.31</b>	105.70/93.46
F1	CAL × PRO	LV	54.06	44.89/75	89.24	89.59/76.52	99.09	100.16/90.62
F1	CAL × BUR	LV	63.89	35.51/77.72	67.67	84.36/80.86	<b>97.13</b>	90.36/91.43
F1	BUR × TWE	LV	37.56	71.87/65.63	64.86	51.43/68.32	<b>93.84</b>	72.61/89.04
F1	CAL × TWE	LV	66.41	87.41/84.79	66.07	88.63/87.47	96.52	106.58/96.05
F2	CAL × PRO	LV	50.92	86.23/67.19	62.53	89.05/71.59	88.51	94.71/89.45
F2	CAL × BUR	LV	59.85	46.07/74.80	66.22	52.28/76.37	77.72	93.87/90.76
F2	BUR × TWE	LV	46.78	43.40/66.01	57.28	51.03/69.80	<b>97.5</b>	93.52/89.93
	BUR × BUR	LM	<b>88.44</b>	51.22/85.23	<b>96.3</b>	55.58/68.60	92.33	95.78/66.22
	CAL × CAL	LM	58.44	60.53/84.03	<b>92.32</b>	42.15/53.11	87.09	93.34/51.71
	PRO × PRO	LM	67.42	60.48/84.48	76.77	90.30/60.74	97.64	100.93/60.89
	TWE × TWE	LM	49.45	68.64/86.20	<b>83.15</b>	69.50/82.70	101.37	105.30/82.32
F1	CAL × PRO	LM	62.32	45.51/84.13	<b>93.52</b>	90/54.40	<b>113.15</b>	99.70/53.03
F1	CAL × BUR	LM	<b>87.55</b>	35.45/84.80	<b>91.67</b>	84.06/72.87	87.63	89.92/69.11
F1	BUR × TWE	LM	46.92	71.70/81.64	<b>92.78</b>	51.09/45.26	<b>88.9</b>	70.37/44.13
F1	CAL × TWE	LM	75.26	87.32/86.77	<b>90.72</b>	87.82/86.49	97.66	105.93/90.11
F2	CAL × PRO	LM	60.78	86.42/82.27	87.79	88.93/47.21	90.41	94.29/44.61
F2	CAL × BUR	LM	83.26	44.31/83.72	<b>89.33</b>	52.65/56.59	82.09	94.16/54.85
F2	BUR × TWE	LM	60.24	44.02/81.45	<b>79.85</b>	50.97/45.87	<b>102.77</b>	93.19/43.93
	BUR × BUR	LT	<b>81.19</b>	51.60/28.87	<b>101.35</b>	55.93/86.19	<b>106.11</b>	95.59/91.81
	CAL × CAL	LT	<b>69.23</b>	56.59/24.62	83.03	41.10/85.57	<b>103.92</b>	93.84/90.26
	PRO × PRO	LT	<b>85.76</b>	59.01/26.42	81.14	90.44/86.41	<b>118.74</b>	100.10/91.03
	TWE × TWE	LT	56.75	67.26/35.84	87.47	71/87.53	<b>122.62</b>	104.70/94.35
F1	CAL × PRO	LT	<b>74.27</b>	45.25/25.06	<b>98.7</b>	89.77/85.78	<b>120.24</b>	100.02/90.80
F1	CAL × BUR	LT	<b>88.37</b>	34.55/29.18	<b>87.05</b>	83.85/86.82	<b>91.95</b>	90.06/91.85
F1	BUR × TWE	LT	53.71	71.07/21.87	<b>85.63</b>	51.23/83.82	86.41	71.26/89.54
F1	CAL × TWE	LT	82.66	87.50/42.55	<b>102.33</b>	89.03/88.83	<b>107.74</b>	106.58/98.48
F2	CAL × PRO	LT	56.74	85.64/22.44	<b>97.72</b>	89.16/84.59	92.82	94.79/89.26
F2	CAL × BUR	LT	<b>82.82</b>	43.21/25.50	<b>100.35</b>	52.28/85.55	<b>94.43</b>	93.79/90.72
F2	BUR × TWE	LT	<b>62.9</b>	42.93/21.63	<b>97.07</b>	51.28/84.72	<b>107.78</b>	93.54/89.10

F2 hybrids =  $0.27 \pm 0.14$ ; ANOVA,  $F_{2,30} = 3.63$ ,  $P = 0.039$ ; Figs 2 and 3). Tukey *post hoc* tests on ellipse sizes revealed that the only significant difference was between F2 and parental lines (F1 vs. F2  $P = 0.110$ ; F1 vs. parental  $P = 0.840$ ; F2 vs. parental  $P = 0.032$ ).

Across all lines, the ellipse sizes of F1 and F2 hybrids were not significantly larger than the ellipses of their combined parental species (parental line =  $0.20 \pm 0.05$ , F1 =  $0.18 \pm 0.08$ , F2 =  $0.27 \pm 0.14$ ; ANOVA,  $F_{2,30} = 2.22$ ,  $P = 0.13$ ). However, this was due to the small

morphological variation found both in F1 and F2 hybrid lines of CAL × PRO, which were consistently smaller than those of the other hybrid lines. When excluding the combined parental PRO and CAL ellipse sizes and ellipse sizes of the F1 and F2 hybrid CAL × PRO lines, the F2 hybrid lines had significantly larger ellipse sizes than their parental species combined (parental line =  $0.21 \pm 0.05$ , F1 =  $0.20 \pm 0.06$ , F2 =  $0.34 \pm 0.10$ ; ANOVA,  $F_{2,21} = 7.17$ ,  $P = 0.005$ ; *post hoc*:  $P = 0.006$ ) and the F1 hybrids (*post hoc*:  $P = 0.005$ ).

The parental lines had significantly more eccentric ellipses (mean and standard deviation:  $\varepsilon = 1.81 \pm 0.33$ ) than F1 hybrids ( $\varepsilon = 1.53 \pm 0.20$ ) and F2 hybrids ( $\varepsilon = 1.27 \pm 0.18$ ; ANOVA,  $F_{2,30} = 11.73$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ; *post hoc*: F1 hybrids vs. parental species  $P = 0.044$ ; F2 hybrids vs. parental species  $P < 0.001$ ; Figs 2 and 3). The F1 hybrids showed a tendency to have more eccentric ellipses than the F2 hybrids ( $P = 0.056$ ).

### Prediction 2: Comparing morphological variance–covariance structures

Repeatability was high for both VCV (range: 0.88–0.98; mean  $\pm$  SD:  $0.95 \pm 0.03$ ) and CV matrices (0.86–0.97;  $0.94 \pm 0.03$ ). All pairwise VCV and CV matrix correlations were significant (Mantel test, all  $P < 0.001$ ). The highest correlations were between the lake radiations, reflecting their parallel diversification into sets of convergent phenotypes (VCV:  $0.88 \pm 0.05$ ; VC:  $0.84 \pm 0.06$ ). The correlations with the three lake radiations were higher for F2 (VCV:  $0.71 \pm 0.08$ ; CV:  $0.60 \pm 0.11$ ) and F1 hybrids (VCV:  $0.68 \pm 0.08$ ; CV:  $0.57 \pm 0.10$ ) than for parental species (VCV:  $0.64 \pm 0.07$ ; CV:  $0.50 \pm 0.09$ ; Fig. 4). These differences were almost significant for the CV matrices (one-way ANOVA:  $F_{2,30} = 2.9$ ,  $P = 0.071$ ; *post hoc*: parents vs. F1  $P = 0.264$ , parents vs. F2  $P = 0.062$ , F1 vs. F2  $P = 0.723$ ), whereas the trend was somewhat weaker for the VCV matrices ( $F_{2,30} = 2.52$ ,  $P = 0.123$ ).

### Prediction 3: Comparing trajectories of morphological diversification

The leading axis of morphological variation (PC1) as well as the two- and four-dimensional shape space (PC1-2, PC1-4) did not differ between the three lake radiations, suggesting diversification has accumulated along common trajectories through the global morphospace (Table 2).

In comparisons with the three lake radiations, hybrid lines had more similar diversification trajectories than parental lines, particularly along the principal axes. The parental lines had similar trajectories as the lake radiations in 6 of 12 comparisons (50%) for the principal axes, for 4 of 12 comparisons (33%) for the 2-D plane, and for 6 of 12 comparisons (50%) for the 4-D space (Table 2). For the same comparisons, the F1 hybrids had similar trajectories in 9 of 12 (75%), in 4 of 12 (33%) and 4 of 12 (33%) cases, respectively (Table 2). The F2 hybrids were similar to the lake radiations in 7 of 9 (78%), 4 of 9 (44%) and 5 of 9 (56%) comparisons (Table 2).

## Discussion

Theoretically, hybridization may facilitate adaptive radiation by increasing levels of heritable phenotypic

diversity, relaxing genetic constraint and generating novel trait combinations that provide new trajectories along which diversity can accumulate in response to divergent natural selection. There is empirical evidence demonstrating hybridization can increase diversity (e.g. Grant & Grant, 1994; Albertson & Kocher, 2005; Stelkens & Seehausen, 2009) and relax constraint (e.g. Renaud *et al.*, 2009, 2012; Parsons *et al.*, 2011), and hybridization appears common in adaptive radiations (Seehausen, 2004; Abbott *et al.*, 2013). To date, however, direct evidence for hybridization's role in initiating and sustaining diversification in natural adaptive radiations is limited. By combining experimental and comparative methods using putative ancestors and extant radiations of African cichlids, our results provide new support for refined predictions of the 'hybrid swarm origin' hypothesis of adaptive radiation (Seehausen, 2004, 2013). Compared with parental lines, hybrid lines display increased diversity and relaxed constraint when projected into the morphospace of the extant radiations, have morphological variance–covariance and covariance structures more similar to extant radiations and have trajectories of diversification that more closely match those of extant radiations in the global morphospace.

Both F1 and F2 hybrids occupied greater volumes of the extant radiation morphospaces compared with their parent species. The difference was pronounced for F2 hybrid lines, which sometimes occupied a significantly greater volume of morphospace than that of both their parental species combined. These observations are consistent with previous work demonstrating that hybridization can increase morphological diversity in African cichlids (Albertson & Kocher, 2005; Stelkens *et al.*, 2009; Cooper *et al.*, 2011; Parsons *et al.*, 2011) and that the magnitude of the effect increases with divergence time between parental species (Stelkens & Seehausen, 2009; Stelkens *et al.*, 2009), but only until to a point where hybrid breakdown will occur (Edmunds, 1999). Such transgressive segregation likely occurs through complimentary gene action, is an important source of additive genetic variation and is expected to manifest more in F2 than F1 hybrids (Rieseberg *et al.*, 1999; Stelkens & Seehausen, 2009). Our results advance this body of work by demonstrating that these general patterns hold when parental and hybrid lines are projected into the morphospace of extant adaptive radiations.

Our ellipse analysis revealed that hybrid lines displayed lower eccentricity than parental lines when projected into the morphospace of the extant radiations. Our first-generation hybrid crosses and particularly our second-generation hybrid crosses showed a significant reduction in covariance between traits when compared to the parental species. These findings suggest hybridization relaxes genetic constraint, creates new morphological combinations and may thus facilitate phenotypic diversification in response to novel forms of directional

and divergent natural selection. Relaxation of the G and P matrices may be particularly important during the early stages of adaptive radiation, when phenotypes are likely to be subjected first to relaxation of previously experienced selection in the ecological release phase (Yoder *et al.*, 2010), followed by complex, multi-dimensional forms of diversifying selection in directions not previously experienced by these populations (Gavrilts, 2004; Ito & Dieckmann, 2007). By relaxing constraint, hybridization may first facilitate the expansion to new areas in morphospace in response to ecological release, and second adaptive diversification in response to new diversifying selection in such environments. Hybrid populations may thus be able to evolve along a wider variety of morphological trajectories and respond more quickly to novel selection regimes (Grant & Grant, 1994; Deng *et al.*, 1999; Young *et al.*, 2010; Hallgrímsson *et al.*, 2012; Villmoare, 2013).

Our experimental hybrid lines were not only more diverse with lower eccentricity when projected onto the lake radiations morphospace. Their VCV and CV matrices were more similar to those observed in the extant radiations. This pattern was particularly strong in comparisons with the youngest LV radiation, a point upon which we elaborate below. This pattern was supported by the analysis of trajectories in the global morphospace. Compared with parental lines, hybrid lines were more similar to the extant radiations. The first axes of hybrid line morphological diversity were similar to those of extant radiations more often than were those of parental species. For F2 hybrids, the first axes were consistently similar to those of the LV and LM radiations. Across all dimensions, the morphological trajectories of hybrids were more similar to the youngest LV radiation than to the older radiations.

Our results compliment and extend those of two previous studies that combined experimental and comparative approaches to explore the role of hybridization in African cichlid adaptive radiation. Cooper *et al.* (2011) and Parsons *et al.* (2011) studied patterns of cranial shape variation in second-generation hybrids of LM cichlids, and, similar to our results, they found the primary axes of morphological diversity in hybrids matched those of the wider LM radiation. These studies, however, created hybrids between radiation member species taken from within the extant LM radiation, whereas we created hybrids using three putative ancestors and one basal member of the LM radiation. Thus, whereas the previous results speak to the role of hybridization in the course of adaptive radiation (the 'syngameon' component of the hybrid swarm hypothesis), our design provides the first experimental test for the role of hybridization in initiating adaptive radiation (e.g. the 'origin' component of the hybrid swarm hypothesis; Seehausen, 2004). These studies together provide support for both components of the hybrid swarm hypothesis and suggest that hybridization across

a range of phylogenetic and temporal contexts may create genetic and phenotypic architectures that manifest more broadly in adaptive radiations.

Unequivocal experimental evidence that hybridization facilitates niche shifts and promotes adaptive diversification in African cichlids is lacking (Genner & Turner, 2012). While relevant experiments are tractable in principle, the approach of comparing patterns of diversity within 'ancestral hybrids' and extant radiations provides valuable insights. Our results reveal that F2 hybrids occupy a significantly larger fraction of the radiations morphospace than their parental species and that the principal axes of diversity in morphospace amongst hybrids more closely match those observed amongst species of extant radiations. Thus, the novel morphologies and trajectories of 'ancestral hybrids' match those that have arisen in the expanded morphospaces of adaptive radiation (Fig. S1). To the degree that the morphological diversity observed in extant radiations is adaptive, hybrid phenotypes thus 'predict' the occurrence of niche shifts associated with speciation during adaptive radiation. One likely scenario by which this could occur is if some hybrid genotypes gain a fitness advantage through occupying novel, previously vacant niches and subsequently become new incipient species whilst morphologically diverging in response to novel selection pressures (Seehausen, 2004; Mallet, 2007). The plausibility of such a scenario is supported by previous work demonstrating that under certain conditions even distantly related cichlids readily hybridize and produce fertile offspring. Stelkens *et al.* (2009) found that hybrid crosses between cichlid species that had diverged for at least 3, perhaps up to 7 million years were viable and fertile. Furthermore, their crosses included two used in this study (CAL × PRO and CAL × BUR), which have divergence times similar to the hypothesized multiple ancestors of several large cichlid radiations (LV, Seehausen *et al.*, 2003; LM, Joyce *et al.*, 2011; Loh *et al.*, 2013; Lake paleo-Makgadikgadi, Joyce *et al.*, 2005).

The three lake radiations that we compared with our experimental hybrids differ widely in age (LV, 0.015–0.2 million years; LM, 2–4 million years; LT, 8–16 million years; Genner *et al.*, 2007), offering a rare temporal insight into patterns of morphological diversification during adaptive radiation. Our results provide a new context for previous work (Young *et al.*, 2009; Cooper *et al.*, 2010) that showed that morphological diversity accumulated rapidly, that levels of extant total diversity are nonlinearly age-ordered, and that despite differences in colonization history, phylogenetic context and ecological conditions, the three radiations are diversifying along similar morphological trajectories (Young *et al.*, 2009; Cooper *et al.*, 2010). Our results are consistent with the idea that hybridization contributes to the early bursts of diversification observed in cichlid radiations. The patterns of diversity in the second-generation hybrids most

closely resembled those of the youngest LV radiation, to a lesser extent those of LM, and were least similar to those of the oldest LT radiation. Combined with molecular evidence implicating an initial and on-going role of hybridization in the two younger radiations (Seehausen *et al.*, 2003; Streelman *et al.*, 2004; Joyce *et al.*, 2011; Genner & Turner, 2012; Keller *et al.* 2012; Loh *et al.*, 2013), this body of work suggests hybridization may play a key role during the initial stages of diversification, while the role of mutation in providing heritable variation may increase through time.

Support for the 'hybrid swarm origin' hypothesis (Seehausen, 2004) can come from three complementary types of evidence. First, there should be evidence for hybridization that predates the radiation. Second, there should be evidence that the patterns of morphological diversity observed in extant radiations are derived principally from hybridization between divergent lineages rather than *de-novo* mutations. Third, there should be evidence that the morphological diversity among species that originated through hybridization is adaptive. Molecular evidence from LV and the Mbuna radiation of LM is consistent with the first prediction (Seehausen *et al.*, 2003; Joyce *et al.*, 2011; Loh *et al.*, 2013). This study provides support for the second prediction by showing that experimental hybridization between putative ancestor species creates patterns of morphological diversity that predict those observed in extant radiations. To the degree that extant patterns of between-species diversity in these radiations are adaptive, our results also support the third prediction, although the definitive test will require multigenerational experiments subjecting parental and hybrid lines to ecologically relevant divergent natural selection. Such experiments are not easily feasible with cichlids. However, we suggest that combining experimental hybridization with comparative analyses of morphological diversity and genomic analyses of the underlying genetic changes as well as their phylogenetic histories will be the way to go in exploring the role of hybridization in adaptive radiation.

## Acknowledgments

We thank Corinne Schmid, Andreas Taverna and Rike Stelkens for help with breeding the hybrid and parental lines. We thank Martine E. Maan, Bänz Lundsgaard-Hansen, Catherine E. Wagner and all members of the Fish Ecology and Evolution lab for assistance and valuable comments and suggestions on the manuscript. We also thank H. David Sheets for help with SpaceAngle6d and Heather A. Jamniczky for help on matrix repeatability's. Breeding of hybrids was authorised by the veterinary office of the canton of Lucerne (License number: LU04/07). This research was supported by Swiss National Science Foundation (Schweizer Nationalfond) grant (31003A-118293) to OS.

## References

- Abbott, R., Albach, D., Ansell, S., Arntzen, J.W., Baird, S.J.E., Bierne, N. *et al.* 2013. Hybridization and speciation. *J. Evol. Biol.* **26**: 229–246.
- Ackermann, R., Rogers, H. & Cheverud, H. 2006. Identifying the morphological signatures of hybridization in primate and human evolution. *J. Hum. Evol.* **51**: 632–645.
- Albertson, R.C. & Kocher, T.D. 2005. Genetic architecture sets limits on transgressive segregation in hybrid cichlid fishes. *Evolution* **59**: 686–690.
- Anderson, E. 1948. Hybridization of the Habitat. *Evolution* **2**: 1–9.
- Anderson, E. & Stebbins, G.L. 1954. Hybridization as an evolutionary stimulus. *Evolution* **8**: 378–388.
- Arnold, M.L. 1997. *Natural Hybridization and Evolution*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Barrett, R.D.H. & Schluter, D. 2007. Adaptation from standing genetic variation. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **23**: 38–44.
- Barrier, M., Baldwin, B.G., Robichaux, R.H. & Purugganan, M.D. 1999. Interspecific hybrid ancestry of a plant adaptive radiation: allopolyploidy of the Hawaiian Silversword Alliance (Asteraceae) inferred from floral homeotic gene duplications. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **16**: 1105–1113.
- Barton, N.H. & Hewitt, G.M. 1985. Analysis of hybrid zones. *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **16**: 113–148.
- Bell, M.A. & Travis, M.P. 2005. Hybridization, transgressive segregation, genetic covariation, and adaptive radiation. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **20**: 358–361.
- Bills, R., Kazembe, J. & Marshall, B. 2010. *Astatotilapia calliptera*. In: IUCN 2012. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2012.2.
- Blows, M.W. & Hoffman, A.A. 2005. A reassessment of genetic limits to evolutionary change. *Ecology* **86**: 1371–1384.
- Cheverud, J.M. 1988. A comparison of genetic and phenotypic correlations. *Evolution* **42**: 958–968.
- Cheverud, J.M. 1996. Quantitative genetic analysis of cranial morphology in the cotton-top (*Saguinus oedipus*) and saddle-back (*S. fuscicollis*) tamarins. *J. Evol. Biol.* **9**: 5–42.
- Clausen, J. & Heisey, W.M. 1960. The balance between coherence and variation in evolution. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London B.* **46**: 494–506.
- Cooper, W.J., Parsons, K., McIntyre, A., Kern, B., McGee-Moore, A. & Albertson, R.C. 2010. Benthic-pelagic divergence of cichlid feeding architecture was prodigious and consistent during multiple adaptive radiations within African rift-lakes. *PLoS ONE* **5**: e9551.
- Cooper, W.J., Wernle, J., Mann, K. & Albertson, R.C. 2011. Functional and genetic integration in skulls of Lake Malawi cichlids. *Evol. Biol.* **38**: 316–334.
- Crispo, E. & Chapman, L.J. 2011. Hypoxia drives plastic divergence in cichlid body shape. *Evol. Ecol.* **25**: 949–964.
- Dasmahapatra, K.K., Walters, J.R., Briscoe, A.D., Davey, J.W., Whibley, A., Nadeau, N.J. *et al.* 2012. Butterfly genome reveals promiscuous exchange of mimicry adaptations among species. *Nature* **487**: 94–98.
- Day, J.J., Cotton, J.A. & Barraclough, T.G. 2008. Tempo and mode of diversification of Lake Tanganyika cichlid fishes. *PLoS ONE* **3**: e1730.
- Deng, H.-W., Haynatzka, V., Spitze, K. & Haynatzki, G. 1999. The determination of genetic covariances and prediction of evolutionary trajectories based on a genetic correlation matrix. *Evolution* **53**: 1592–1599.

- Edmands, S. 1999. Heterosis and outbreeding depression in interpopulation crosses spanning a wide range of divergence. *Evolution* **53**: 1757–1768.
- Egger, B., Koblmüller, S., Sturmbauer, C. & Sefc, K.M. 2007. Nuclear and mitochondrial data reveal different evolutionary processes in the Lake Tanganyika cichlid genus *Tropheus*. *BMC Evol. Biol.* **7**: 137.
- Egger, B., Sefc, K.M., Makasa, L., Sturmbauer, C. & Salzburger, W. 2012. Introgressive hybridization between color morphs in a population of cichlid fishes twelve years after human-induced secondary admixis. *J. Hered.* **103**: 515–522.
- Feder, J.L., Berlocher, S.H., Roethele, J.B., Dambroski, H., Smith, J.J., Perry, W.L. et al. 2003. Allopatric genetic origins for sympatric host-plant shifts and race formation in *Rhagoletis*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **100**: 10314–10319.
- Fordyce, J.A., Nice, C.C., Forister, M.L. & Shapiro, A.M. 2002. The significance of wing pattern diversity in the Lycaenidae: mate discrimination by two recently diverged species. *J. Evol. Biol.* **15**: 871–879.
- Gavrilets, S. 2004. High-dimensional fitness landscapes and speciation. In: *Phenotypic Integration Studying the Ecology and Evolution of Complex Phenotypes* (M. Pigliucci, K. Preston, eds), pp. 45–80. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Gavrilets, S. & Losos, J.B. 2009. Adaptive radiation: contrasting theory with data. *Science* **323**: 732–737.
- Genner, M.J. & Turner, G.F. 2012. Ancient hybridization and phenotypic novelty within Lake Malawi's cichlid fish radiation. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **29**: 195–206.
- Genner, M.J., Seehausen, O., Lunt, D., Joyce, D.A., Shaw, P.W., Carvalho, R. et al. 2007. Age of cichlids: new dates for ancient lake fish radiations. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **24**: 1269–1282.
- Gompert, Z., Fordyce, J.A., Forister, M.L., Shapiro, A.M. & Nice, C.C. 2006. Homoploid hybrid speciation in an extreme habitat. *Science* **314**: 1923–1925.
- Grant, P.R. & Grant, B.R. 1994. Phenotypic and genetic effects of hybridization in Darwin's finches. *Evolution* **48**: 297–316.
- Grant, P.R. & Grant, B.R. 1996. High survival of Darwin's finch hybrids: effects of beak morphology and diets. *Ecology* **77**: 500–550.
- Grant, P.R. & Grant, B.R. 2008. *How and Why Species Multiply: The Radiation of Darwin's Finches*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Greenwood, P.H. 1975. Cichlid fishes of Lake Victoria, East Africa: the biology and evolution of a species flock. *Bul. Brit. Nat. Hist. Mus.* **6**: 1–134.
- Greenwood, P.H. 1979. Towards a phyletic classification of the 'genus' *Haplochromis* (Pisces, Cichlidae) and related taxa. Part 1. Bulletin of the British Museum (Natural History). *Zoology* **35**: 265–322.
- Greig, D., Louis, E.J., Borts, R.H. & Travisano, M. 2002. Hybrid speciation in experimental populations of yeast. *Science* **298**: 1773–1775.
- Gunz, P. & Mitteroecker, P. 2013. Semilandmarks: a method for quantifying curves and surfaces. *Hystrix* **24**: 103–109.
- Hallgrímsson, B., Janniczky, H.A., Young, N.M., Rollian, C., Schmidt-Ott, U. & Marcucio, R.S. 2012. The generation of variation and the developmental basis for evolutionary novelty. *Evol. Biol.* **318**: 501–517.
- Hammer, Ø., Harper, D.A.T. & Ryan, P.D. 2001. Past: Paleontological Statistics software package for education and data analysis. *Palaeontol. Electronica* **4**: 9.
- Hedrick, P.W. 2013. Adaptive introgression in animals: examples and comparison to new mutation and standing variation as sources of adaptive variation. *Mol. Ecol.* **22**: 4606–4618.
- Herder, F., Nolte, A.W., Pfaender, J., Schwarzer, J., Hadiaty, R.K. & Schliewen, U.K. 2006. Adaptive radiation and hybridization in Wallace's Dreamponds: evidence from sail-fin silversides in the Malili Lakes of Sulawesi. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **273**: 2209–2217.
- Hermansen, J.S., Saether, S.A., Elgvin, T.O., Borge, T., Hjelte, E. & Saetre, G.P. 2011. Hybrid speciation in sparrows I: phenotypic intermediacy, genetic admixture and barriers to gene flow. *Mol. Ecol.* **20**: 3812–3822.
- Hudson, A.G., Vonlanthen, P. & Seehausen, O. 2010. Rapid parallel adaptive radiations from a single hybridogenetic ancestral population. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **278**: 58–66.
- Ito, H.C. & Dieckmann, U. 2007. A new mechanism for recurrent adaptive radiations. *Am. Nat.* **170**: E96–E111.
- Johnston, J.A. 2004. Novel phenotypes among early generation hybrids of two Louisiana iris species: flooding experiments. *J. Ecol.* **92**: 967–976.
- Joyce, D.A., Lunt, D.H., Bills, R., Turner, G.F., Katongo, C., Duftner, N. et al. 2005. An extant cichlid fish radiation emerged in an extinct Pleistocene lake. *Nature* **435**: 90–95.
- Joyce, D.A., Lunt, D.H., Genner, M.J., Turner, G.F., Bills, R. & Seehausen, O. 2011. Repeated colonization and hybridization characterize the Lake Malawi cichlids. *Curr. Biol.* **21**: 108–109.
- Kazembe, J., Magombo, Z. & Kaunda, E. 2006. *Haplochromis tweddlei*. In: IUCN 2012. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2012.2.
- Keller, I., Wagner, C.E., Greuter, L., Mwaiko, S., Selz, O., Sivasundar, A. et al. 2012. Population genomic signatures of divergent adaptation, gene flow, and hybrid speciation in the rapid radiation of Lake Victoria cichlid fishes. *Mol. Ecol.* **22**: 2848–2863.
- Klingenberg, C.P. 2011. MorphoJ: an integrated software package for geometric morphometrics. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* **2**: 353–357.
- Klingenberg, C.P., Mebus, K. & Auffray, J.-C. 2003. Developmental integration in a complex morphological structure: how distinct are the modules in the mouse mandible? *Evol. Dev.* **5**: 522–531.
- Kocher, T.D. 2004. Adaptive evolution and explosive speciation: the cichlid fish model. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **5**: 288–298.
- Kocher, T.D., Conroy, J.A., McKaye, K.R. & Stauffer, J.R. 1993. Similar morphologies of cichlid fish in Lakes Tanganyika and Malawi are due to convergence. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **2**: 158–165.
- Konijnendijk, N., Joyce, D.A., Mrosso, H.D.J., Egas, M. & Seehausen, O. 2011. Community genetics reveal elevated levels of sympatric gene flow among morphologically similar but not among morphologically dissimilar species of Lake Victoria Cichlid fish. *Int. J. Evol. Biol.* 1–12. doi:10.4061/2011/616320.
- Konings, A. 2007. *Malawi Cichlids in Their Natural Habitat*, 4th edn. Cichlid Press, El Paso, TX.
- Koots, K.R. & Gibson, J.P. 1996. Realized sampling variances of estimates of genetic parameters and the difference between genetic and phenotypic correlations. *Genetics* **143**: 1409–1416.
- Larsen, P.A., Marchán-Rivadeneira, M.R. & Bake, R.J. 2010. Natural hybridization generates mammalian lineage with

- species characteristics. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **107**: 11557–52.
- Lewontin, R.C. & Birch, L.C. 1966. Hybridization as a source of variation for adaptation to new environments. *Evolution* **20**: 315–336.
- Loh, Y.H., Bezault, E., Muenzel, F.M., Roberts, R.B., Swofford, R., Barluenga, M. *et al.* 2013. Origins of shared genetic variation in African Cichlids. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **30**: 906–917.
- Losos, J.B. 2010. Adaptive radiation, ecological opportunity, and evolutionary determinism. *Am. Nat.* **175**: 623–629.
- Lucek, K., Roy, D., Bezault, E., Sivasunder, A. & Seehausen, O. 2010. Hybridization between distant lineages increases adaptive variation during a biological invasion: stickleback in Switzerland. *Mol. Ecol.* **19**: 3995–4011.
- Mallet, J. 2007. Hybrid speciation. *Nature* **446**: 279–283.
- Maroig, G. & Cheverud, J.M. 2001. A comparison of phenotypic variation and covariation patterns and the role of phylogeny, ecology, and ontogeny during cranial evolution of new world monkeys. *Evolution* **55**: 2576–2600.
- Mavárez, J., Salazar, C.A., Bermingham, E., Salcedo, C., Jiggins, C.D. & Linares, M. 2006. Speciation by hybridization in *Heliconius* butterflies. *Nature* **441**: 868–871.
- Melo, M.C., Salazar, C., Jiggins, C.D. & Linares, M. 2009. Assortative mating preferences among hybrids offers a route to hybrid speciation. *Evolution* **63**: 1660–1665.
- Murren, C.J. 2002. Phenotypic integration in plants. *Plant Species Biol.* **17**: 89–99.
- Nadeau, N.J., Martin, S.H., Kozak, K.M., Salazar, C., Dasmahapatra, K.K., Davey, J.W. *et al.* 2012. Genome-wide patterns of divergence and gene flow across a butterfly radiation. *Mol. Ecol.* **22**: 814–826.
- Nice, C.C., Gompert, Z., Fordyce, J.A., Forister, M.L., Lucas, L.K. & Burekle, C.A. 2012. Hybrid speciation and independent evolution in lineages of alpine butterflies. *Evolution* **67**: 1055–1068.
- Nolte, A.W., Freyhof, J., Stemshorn, K.C. & Tautz, D. 2005. An invasive lineage of sculpins, *Cottus* sp. (Pisces, Teleostei) in the Rhine with new habitat adaptations has originated from hybridization between old phylogeographic groups. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **272**: 2379–2387.
- Ntakimazi, G. 2006. *Astatotilapia burtoni*. In: IUCN 2012. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2012.2.
- van Oijen, M.J.P., Snoeks, J., Skelton, P.H., Maréchal, C. & Teugels, G.G. 1991. Haplochromis. In: *Check-List of the Freshwater Fishes of Africa* (J. Daget, J.-P. Gosse, G.G. Teugels & D.F.E. Thys van den Audenaerde, eds), pp. 100–184. O.R.S.T.O.M, Agency, France.
- Orr, H.A. & Unckless, R.L. 2008. Population extinction and the genetics of adaptation. *Am. Nat.* **172**: 160–169.
- Papadopolus, A.S.T., Price, Z., Devaux, C., Hipperson, H., Smadja, C.M., Hutton, I. *et al.* 2013. A comparative analysis of the mechanisms underlying speciation on Lord Howe Island. *J. Evol. Biol.* **26**: 733–745.
- Parnell, N.F., Hulsey, C.D. & Streelman, J.T. 2008. Hybridization produces novelty when the mapping of form to function is many to one. *BMC Evol. Biol.* **8**: 122.
- Parsons, K.J., Son, Y.H. & Albertson, R.C. 2011. Hybridization promotes evolvability in African cichlids: connections between transgressive segregation and phenotypic integration. *Evol. Biol.* **38**: 306–315.
- Pereira, R.J., Barreto, F.S. & Burton, R.S. 2013. Ecological novelty by hybridization: experimental evidence for increased thermal tolerance by transgressive segregation in *Tigriopus californicus*. *Evolution*. doi: 10.1111/evo.12254.
- R Development Core Team 2008. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0, <http://www.R-project.org>.
- Renaud, S., Alibert, P. & Auffray, J.-C. 2009. Mandible shape in hybrid mice. *Naturwissenschaften* **96**: 1043–1050.
- Renaud, S., Alibert, P. & Auffray, J.-C. 2012. Modularity as a source of new morphological variation in the mandible of hybrid mice. *BMC Evol. Biol.* **12**: 141.
- Rieseberg, L.H. & Willis, J.H. 2007. Plant Speciation. *Science* **317**: 910–914.
- Rieseberg, L.H., Sinervo, B., Linder, C.R., Ungerer, M.C. & Arias, D.M. 1996. Role of gene interaction in hybrid speciation. Evidence from ancient and experimental hybrids. *Science* **272**: 741–745.
- Rieseberg, L.H., Archer, M.A. & Wayne, R.K. 1999. Transgressive segregation, adaptation and speciation. *Heredity* **83**: 363–372.
- Roff, D.A. 1995. The estimation of genetic correlations from phenotypic correlations: a test of Cheverud's conjecture. *Heredity* **74**: 481–490.
- Rohlf, F.J. 2006. tpsDig Version 2.10. Stony Brook, NY. <http://life.bio.sunysb.edu/morph/>
- Rohlf, F.J. & Slice, D. 1990. Extensions of the Procrustes method for the optimal superimposition of landmarks. *Syst. Zool.* **39**: 40–59.
- Salzburger, W., Baric, S. & Sturmbauer, C. 2002. Speciation via introgressive hybridization in east African cichlids? *Mol. Ecol.* **11**: 619–625.
- Schelly, R., Salzburger, W., Koblmüller, S., Duftner, N. & Sturmbauer, C. 2006. Phylogenetic relationships of the lamprologine cichlid genus *Lepidiolamprologus* (Teleostei: Perciformes) based on mitochondrial and nuclear sequences, suggesting introgressive hybridization. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* **38**: 426–438.
- Schlichting, C.D. & Pigliucci, M. 1998. *Phenotypic Evolution: A Reaction Norm Perspective*. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, MA.
- Schliewen, U.K. & Klee, B. 2004. Reticulate sympatric speciation in Cameroonian crater lake cichlids. *Front. Zool.* **1**: 1–12.
- Schluter, D. 2000. *The Ecology of Adaptive Radiation*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Schwenk, K., Brede, N. & Streit, B. 2008. Introduction, extent, processes and evolutionary impact of interspecific hybridization in animals. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B – Biol. Sci.* **363**: 2805–2811.
- Seehausen, O. 2004. Hybridization and adaptive radiation. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **19**: 198–207.
- Seehausen, O. 2006. African cichlid fish a model system in adaptive radiation research. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **60**: 561–588.
- Seehausen, O. 2013. Conditions when hybridization might predispose populations for adaptive radiation. *J. Evol. Biol.* **26**: 279–281.
- Seehausen, O., van Alphen, J.J.M. & Witte, F. 1997. Cichlid fish diversity threatened by eutrophication that curbs sexual selection. *Science* **277**: 1808–1811.
- Seehausen, O., Koetsier, E., Schneider, M.V., Chapman, L.J., Chapman, C.A., Knight, M.E. *et al.* 2003. Nuclear markers reveal unexpected genetic variation and a Congolese-Nilotic origin of the Lake Victoria cichlid species flock. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **270**: 129–137.

- Seehausen, O., Terai, Y., Magalhaes, I.S., Carleton, K.C., Mrosso, H.D.J., Miyagi, R. *et al.* 2008. Speciation through sensory drive in cichlid fish. *Nature* **455**: 620–626.
- Selz, O., Thommen, R., Maan, M.E. & Seehausen, O. 2013. Behavioural isolation may facilitate homoploid hybrid speciation in cichlid fish. *J. Evol. Biol.* doi:10.1111/jeb.12287
- Sheets, H.D. 2001. SpaceAngle6b. IMP-Software: <http://www3.canisius.edu/~sheets/morphsoft.html>
- Simpson, G.G. 1953. *The Major Features of Evolution*. Columbia University Press, New York, NY.
- Skelton, P.H. 1993. *A Complete Guide to the Freshwater Fishes of Southern Africa*. Southern Book Publishers, Cape Town, South Africa, 388 p.
- Slatkin, M. & Lande, R. 1994. Segregation variance after hybridization of isolated populations. *Genet. Res.* **64**: 51–56.
- Stelkens, R. & Seehausen, O. 2009. Genetic distance between species predicts novel trait expression in their hybrids. *Evolution* **63**: 884–897.
- Stelkens, R., Schmid, C., Selz, O. & Seehausen, O. 2009. Phenotypic novelty in experimental hybrids is predicted by the genetic distance between species of cichlid fish. *BMC Evol. Biol.* **9**: 283.
- Streelman, J.D., Gmyrek, S.L., Kidd, M.R., Kidd, C., Robinson, R.L., Hert, E. *et al.* 2004. Hybridization and contemporary evolution in an introduced cichlid fish from Lake Malawi National Park. *Mol. Ecol.* **13**: 2471–2479.
- Trewavas, E. 1935. A synopsis of the cichlid fishes of Lake Nyasa. *Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.* **10**: 65–118.
- Villmoare, B. 2013. Morphological integration, evolutionary constraints, and extinction: a computer simulation-based study. *Evol. Biol.* **40**: 76–83.
- Wagner, C.E., Harmon, L. & Seehausen, O. 2012. Ecological opportunity and sexual selection together predict adaptive radiation. *Nature* **487**: 366–370.
- Witte, F., Goldshmidt, T., Ligtyoet, W., van Oijen, M.J.P. & Wanink, J.H. 1992. Species extinction and the concomitant ecological changes in Lake Victoria. *Neth. J. Zool.* **42**: 214–223.
- Yoder, J.B., Clancey, E., Des Roches, S., Eastman, J.M., Gentry, L., Godsoe, W. *et al.* 2010. Ecological opportunity and the origin of adaptive radiations. *J. Evol. Biol.* **23**: 1581–1596.
- Young, K.A., Snoeks, J. & Seehausen, O. 2009. Morphological diversity and the roles of contingency, chance and determinism in African cichlid radiations. *PLoS ONE* **4**: e4740.
- Young, N.M., Wagner, G.P. & Hallgrímsson, B. 2010. Development and the evolvability of human limbs. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **107**: 3401–3405.
- Zelditch, M.L., Swiderski, D.L., Sheets, H.D. & Fink, W.L. 2004. *Geometric Morphometrics for Biologists: A Primer*. Elsevier Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

### Supporting information

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article:

**Figure S1** Phenotypes of second-generation hybrid individuals and selected species of the Lake Victoria radiation.

**Table S1** Procrustes distances between families within a line and between lines.

**Table S2** Line-specific Principal component analysis.

**Table S3** The species/morphotypes from each of the three lake radiations used in the study.

Received 6 May 2013; accepted 27 September 2013