

Federation University ResearchOnline

<https://researchonline.federation.edu.au>

Copyright Notice

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Evans, Banks, S. C., Barton, P. S., Davies, K. F., & Driscoll, D. A. (2018). A long-term habitat fragmentation experiment leads to morphological change in a species of carabid beetle. *Ecological Entomology*, 43(3), 282–293.

Which has been published in final form at:

<https://doi.org/10.1111/een.12498>

This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with [Wiley Terms and Conditions for use of Self-Archived Versions](#).

See this record in Federation ResearchOnline at:

<http://researchonline.federation.edu.au/vital/access/HandleResolver/1959.17/181859>

A long term habitat fragmentation experiment leads to morphological change in a species of carabid beetle.

Maldwyn J. EVANS^{a*}, Sam C. BANKS^a, Philip S. BARTON^a, Kendi F DAVIES^b, Don A. DRISCOLL^c.

^a Fenner School of Environment and Society,

The Australian National University,

Acton, ACT 2601, Australia

^b Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology,

University of Colorado,

Boulder, CO 80309

^c School of Life and Environmental Sciences,

Center for Integrative Ecology

Deakin University Geelong,

Melbourne Burwood campus,

221 Burwood Highway, Burwood, Victoria 3125, Australia

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as doi: [10.1111/een.12498](https://doi.org/10.1111/een.12498)

m.john.evans@anu.edu.au

sam.banks@anu.edu.au

philip.barton@anu.edu.au

kendi.davies@colorado.edu

d.driscoll@deakin.edu.au

**Corresponding author*

Maldwyn John Evans,

Fenner School of Environment and Society,

The Australian National University,

Canberra, ACT 0200, Australia

Telephone: (612) 6125 8133

Fax: (612) 6215 0757

Email: m.john.evans@anu.edu.au

Running headline: Fragmentation changes carabid morphology.

Abstract

1. Habitat fragmentation and transformation are key drivers of species declines in landscapes. Most of our current understanding of species' responses to environmental change originates from studies of populations and communities. However, phenotypic variation offers another key aspect of species responses and could provide additional insights into the functional drivers of population change.
2. Our goal was to address this gap by exploring the morphological changes of a species of carabid beetle (*Notonomus resplendens*) with a known population response to the Wog Wog Habitat Fragmentation Experiment in Australia. We measured morphological traits associated with body size, head width, and dispersal ability. We quantified patterns of morphological variation over time and between native *Eucalyptus* forest fragments and the surrounding pine plantation matrix and the continuous intact native *Eucalyptus* forest controls.
3. We found sexually dimorphic morphological changes in response to the experimental treatments. Males increased in size, had larger legs and had smaller inter-ocular widths in the matrix in both the short and long terms. Conversely, females became comparatively smaller and had increased inter-ocular widths in the same treatments. Effects in the fragments were similar to those in the matrix, but exhibited more uncertainty.
4. Our results demonstrate that species can show morphological change in response to environmental change over very short time periods. We demonstrate that using both

population and morphological data allows stronger inferences about the mechanisms behind species responses to environmental change.

Key words: Carabidae, dispersal, fragmentation, long term, morphological trait, Wog Wog experiment.

Introduction

Habitat fragmentation has occurred in landscapes worldwide, and has led to widespread changes in biodiversity (McCallum 2007, Stone 2007, Rands et al. 2010, Haddad et al. 2015). This has led to an enormous body of literature documenting these changes and synthesising general patterns (Davies and Margules 1998, Didham et al. 2012, Fahrig 2013, Haddad et al. 2015). Yet most of our current understanding of species' responses to environmental change originates from studies of populations and communities (Jackson and Overpeck 2000, Thomas et al. 2004, Williams et al. 2010). This leaves an important gap in our knowledge of species responses because many organisms also express phenotypic variation in response to environmental change (Pigliucci 2001, Norberg and Leimar 2002, DeWitt and Scheiner 2004, Miner et al. 2005, Alberti et al. 2017, Moretti et al. 2017). This includes changes in behaviour, morphology, growth, life history and demography, which can occur across or even within generations (Black and Dodson 1990, Black 1993, Agrawal et al. 1999, Miner et al. 2005). This means that a key aspect of the biology of species is often overlooked when attempting to understand their responses to environmental change.

Morphology is a dominant feature of an organism's phenotype and is directly linked to how it interacts with its environment (Wainwright and Reilly 1994, Salmon et al. 2014).

Investigation of species morphological characteristics, diversity or change can therefore complement knowledge of populations and communities, and yield insight into the factors shaping species' responses to the environment. Habitat change, for example, will affect food quality, vegetation structure, abiotic factors such as temperature, or competition with other species (Kingsolver and Pfennig 2007, Desrochers 2010, Laparie et al. 2010, Marnocha et al.

2011). Each of these factors could affect species, and this could be mediated, in part, by how morphology constrains the way individuals within a population interact with their habitat, food, or competitors. For example, a reduction in population density, which increases the amount of food available to remaining individuals, can lead to larger body size of individuals in deer (Ashley et al. 1998). Conversely, a reduction in prey items results in smaller body size of individuals in terns (McLeay et al. 2009). The morphology of species can also involve changes in their shape, independent of their body size, in response to the type of food or resources in new habitat. For example, the relative width of the head of insect species may also constrain their ability to consume larger food items (Pearson and Stemberger 1980, Laparie et al. 2010).

In addition to the size or shape of organisms, some morphological traits determine how individuals can move or disperse. Typically, better dispersers are more likely to colonise and establish populations in fragmented habitats (Travis and Dytham 2002, Fahrig 2003), resulting in selection of individuals with morphological traits that enable better dispersal ability (Travis and Dytham 2002, Holt 2003, Desrochers 2010). This mechanism has been shown in carabids (Laparie et al. 2013), butterflies (Hill et al. 1999) and damselflies (Anholt 1990).

Research that examines morphological changes within species in response to landscape change and over time is rare (but see Schmidt and Jensen 2003, Desrochers 2010, Marnocha et al. 2011). One of the reasons for this is that there are very few long term studies globally that have sufficient data. This limits our ability to ask questions about long term phenomena,

such as species responses to long term landscape transformation and climate change. Here, we quantify the effects of anthropogenic landscape modification on the intra-specific morphology of the carabid beetle species *Notonomus resplendens* [Castelnau, 1867]. We do by this using the 25 year old Wog Wog Habitat Fragmentation Experiment, one of the longest running fragmentation experiments in the world (Margules 1992, Davies and Margules 2000, Farmilo et al. 2013, Haddad et al. 2015). The experimental landscape consists of native *Eucalyptus* forest, which was fragmented into experimental remnant eucalypt fragments, with the cleared part of the landscape replaced with *Pinus radiata* plantation forest.

The overarching question addressed in this study is: Does the landscape change at Wog Wog lead to morphological changes in a species of carabid beetle? We use adult beetles sampled between 1985 and 2013, and measure key aspects of their morphology linked to body size, body shape, and dispersal ability across the fragmentation treatments. We quantify patterns of morphological variation over time, and test for differences between individuals from remnant native *Eucalyptus* forest fragments (*fragments*) and the surrounding pine plantation matrix (*matrix*) to the continuous intact native *Eucalyptus* forest (*controls*).

The carabid species we have selected for study (*Notonomus resplendens*, [Castelnau, 1867]) has a known response to the fragmentation over the history of the experiment (Evans et al. 2017). This allows us to make a number of predictions on how individuals might change morphologically to the landscape change based on the corresponding population responses. Further, using morphological responses in conjunction with the known population responses may allow us to gain a greater understanding of the underlying mechanism behind the

population responses to the landscape changes. The species has previously been shown to have declined in population in the fragments at Wog Wog in the 2-6 years post fragmentation, but increased in population over the long term (22 years post fragmentation) (Evans et al. 2017). This population response in the remnant vegetation fragments is thought to be a result of the effects of the maturing pine plantation matrix, and associated changes in habitat and food resources, over this time (Evans et al. 2017). Given these previous findings, we make four predictions about morphological responses. First, we predict that this species will show changes in *body size*, as other studies indicate that body size is one of the main traits to respond to environmental variation and landscape change (Laparie et al. 2010, Laparie et al. 2013). Second, we predict that the species will show morphological changes related to *dispersal ability* in response to new habitat provided by the pine plantation (Laparie et al. 2013). Third, we considered that the species would change its diet in response to the new food resources provided by pine plantations, and so predict that this species will change its relative *head width* in response to different food items (Pearson and Stemberger 1980, Laparie et al. 2010). Fourth, we were able to discriminate females from males for individuals of this species, and predict that *reproductive* potential will change in female individuals of the species.

A key finding in Evans et al. (2017) was that population responses in the matrix predicted those in the fragments. This demonstrated that the matrix had a very large impact on the populations in the fragments. We also predict, therefore, that morphological responses in the matrix will be reflected in the fragments. This would add further evidence to the importance

of the matrix and might imply that populations are continuous in the disturbed landscape at Wog Wog.

We compare the morphological responses of this species in light of our predictions, as well as its known population changes (Evans et al. 2017). Our study provides some of the first evidence of the effects of long term habitat fragmentation on insect morphology.

Materials and methods

Study site

Our study was conducted at the Wog Wog Habitat Fragmentation Experiment (Margules 1992), which is a long term and landscape scale experiment (Davies and Margules 2000). Located in south-eastern NSW, Australia (37°04'30"S, 149°28'00"E), the experiment was established in 1985 (Margules 1993) in a valley previously covered with open *Eucalyptus* forest. It consists of six replicates of square plots of three different sizes (0.25 ha, 0.875 ha and 3.062 ha) (Margules 1993). Each plot contains a number of monitoring sites, stratified by topography into slopes and drains and by proximity to the edge of the plot (edge or interior). Each of the 18 plots was divided into four combinations (interior slope, edge slope, interior drain, edge drain) (Margules 1993) and replicated twice giving a total of 144 sites. For example, a site on a slope towards the centre of one of the square plots would be classified as *interior slope*, and a site in a drain on the edge would be classified as *edge drain*. In 1987, the forest surrounding four of these replicates was cleared and planted with a plantation of *Pinus radiata* (Figure 1), often referred to as the matrix. The sites within these four plots are classified as *fragment* sites and form the first main treatment of the experiment. Following

clearing around the plots in 1987, an additional 44 *matrix* sites were added in the pine plantation to form the second main treatment of the experiment. The remaining sites in the plots of the two uncleared replicates form the main spatial *controls* of the experiment. Each site contains two permanent pitfall traps which were opened for seven days, four times a year from 1985 until 1992. Traps were re-opened in 2009 and sampled three times per year until 2013, by which time the pines within the plantation were approximately 30 m high. Throughout the history of the experiment, a subset of the adult beetles were pinned and stored at the Australian National Insect Collection in Canberra, Australia. The temperature near Wog Wog followed a rise from 1991 until 2013, with 2010 being a particularly warm year. Throughout the time of the experiment rainfall fluctuated, with 2008 and 2009 being particularly dry years (Bureau of Meteorology 2017).

Study species

We chose a species of common carabid beetle with a known population response to the experiment: *Notonomus resplendens* (Evans et al. 2017). Species of *Notonomus* are common to coastal and dry sclerophyll forests of eastern Australia (Mathews 1987, Lawrence and Slipinski 2013). *Notonomus resplendens* is a large (18-21mm), flightless species and is one of the most commonly caught species at the Wog Wog Habitat Fragmentation Experiment. *Notonomus resplendens* is a suitable size for morphological work given the equipment available for this study, and was also available in large enough numbers throughout the timespan of the experiment to offer sufficient replication of data for analysis. We investigated using other species of carabid with known population responses to the experiment. However, other species were not available in large enough numbers and were not spread across the

treatments adequately to include in the study. We included samples from 1985-1987 (pre fragmentation), 1988-92 (short term post fragmentation) and 2009-13 (long term post fragmentation).

Measurements

We made morphological measurements using images taken with a SmartDrive SatScan Collections v2.0.10 scanner at the Australian National Insect Collection. Digital landmarks were placed on each image using the software programs tpsUtil (Rohlf 2013a) and tpsDIG (Rohlf 2013b) (Figure 2). We then used the coordinates of the landmarks to calculate the linear distance between the landmarks. We took linear measurements on each individual beetle (Figure 2), and split our trait measurements into four categories used to address our predictions related to body size, head width, dispersal ability, and reproduction.

Body size: As a proxy for overall size, we measured elytra length. We chose the elytra length as opposed to body length for this index, to minimise variation due to orientation or as a result of parts of the body, such as the head, protruding out more in some individuals than others (Smith et al. 2000, Craig Stillwell et al. 2007).

Dispersal ability: To obtain a metric relevant to dispersal capacity, we measured femur length and metatrochanter length. Leg length is considered to indicate dispersal ability (Laparie et al. 2013). We measured metatrochanter length because carabid species that run typically have shorter trochanters than species that use pushing to move through their environment (Evans 1977).

Head width: We measured the distance between the eyes (fore inter-ocular width) as a proxy for head width (Laparie et al. 2010). This allowed us to examine whether the beetles have responded to different food items that require a smaller or larger head width to consume food effectively.

Reproduction: We measured the last abdominal sternite, a trait that has shown to be larger in females than males in carabids and is thought to indicate greater female fecundity in new habitats (Laparie et al. 2010).

Data Analysis

As size is the dominant morphological trait among animals (Peters 1983), we needed to account for the patterns of variation in other morphological traits beyond that which is correlated with body size (Barton et al. 2011). We therefore used *elytra length* as a covariate in all models apart from when we analysed *elytra length* itself as a response variable.

All our statistical analyses of beetle morphological responses to time and experimental treatments (*fragments, matrix*) were conducted using linear mixed effects models using the ‘lme4’ (Bates et al. 2016) and ‘MuMIn’ (Barton 2016) packages in R (R Core Team 2017). We assumed a Gaussian distribution and tested this assumption by checking for normally distributed residual errors, and accounted for potential spatial autocorrelation in our data for all models by fitting patch nested within replicate as random effects in the models.

Our fixed effects comprised of time, the experimental treatments and the sex of the beetle. To test for the effect of time, we combined our morphological data into year blocks, defined by

1985-1987 (pre-fragmentation), 1988-92 (short term post-fragmentation) and 2009-13 (long term post-fragmentation). Pine plantation sites were not established until after fragmentation, meaning we did not have a balanced design of all time x treatment combinations. We therefore subsetted our data to reflect this, resulting in two kinds of models (model set #1, model set #2 respectively) (see Table S1).

Model set #1 – all time periods but excluding pine plantations

We tested whether there was an effect of time ($R[\text{morphological trait}] \sim Y[\text{year block}]$) or if there was an interactive effect of time and treatment ($R \sim Y * F[\text{treatment of controls vs fragments}]$). We also tested for effects of the nested treatments of fragment size ($R \sim Y * F / S[\text{size}]$) and edge ($R \sim Y * F / E[\text{edge}]$) and for effects of topography (i.e. slopes and drainage lines) ($R \sim T[\text{topography}]$), its interaction with year group ($R \sim Y * T$), treatments ($R \sim F * T$) and the further interaction of time ($R \sim Y * F * T$). We also included sex (*Sex*) as an interacting factor in the models (See Table 1 for full models). We ranked all the resulting models, including the null model, considering those within two AICc (second order Akaike Information Criterion) units of the lowest AICc score (Burnham and Anderson 2002). Finally, we determined the relative importance of the predictor variables by summing the Akaike weights of the highest ranked models ($\Delta \text{AICc} < 2$) that included the given variable or interaction of variables (Burnham and Anderson 2002, Johnson and Omland 2004).

Model set #2 – two time periods but including all experimental treatments

For the data that included the pine plantation sites, we repeated the same model selection procedure as the models with the pre-fragmentation data, however, we excluded the nested treatments of size and edge (Table 1).

Effect sizes

To understand the direction and relative magnitude of beetle trait responses to the treatments of *fragment* and *matrix*, we calculated effect sizes using linear models of our response variables against the main treatments (eucalypt *fragments*, eucalypt *controls*, pine plantation *matrix*), time (three year blocks), and their interactions. As with our model selection procedure, we used patch nested with replicate as random effects. Because there were no data for the matrix sites before fragmentation took place, we fixed the parameter for the difference between the matrix and controls before fragmentation to the difference between the fragments and controls before fragmentation. This assumption is suitable because the habitat in the matrix before fragmentation was the same as the habitat in the fragments (i.e. native *Eucalyptus* forest). This parameter was assigned using the offset function in the linear model formula in R (R Core Team 2017). Effect sizes for fragments were the difference between the fragments and controls at each year block after the observed difference between the fragments and controls before fragmentation was subtracted, as follows:

$$(R_{frag} - R_{cont})_{after} - (R_{frag} - R_{cont})_{before},$$

where R_{frag} and R_{cont} are the observed means of trait response variable in the fragments and controls respectively. Effect sizes for the matrix sites were the difference between the matrix

and controls at each year block after the observed difference between the fragments and controls before fragmentation was subtracted:

$$(R_{matrix} - R_{cont})_{after} - (R_{frag} - R_{cont})_{before},$$

where R_{matrix} is the observed mean of the trait response variable.

We calculated the effect sizes for both males and females, by subsetting the data before running the models. We estimated confidence intervals for the effect sizes from likelihood profiles.

Analyses and plotting were performed using the ‘lme4’ (Bates et al. 2016), ‘MuMIn’ (Barton 2016) and ‘ggplot2’ (Wickham 2009) packages in R (R Core Team 2017).

Results

We measured 374 individuals of *N. resplendens* (Table S1).

Morphological responses to the fragments and matrix after fragmentation

Notonomus resplendens changed morphologically over time, indicated by year block appearing as an important predictor variable for all of the morphological traits in both sets of models (Tables 2 and 3). Changes in elytra width (model#1), and changes in trochanter and femur length (model#2), were also explained by an interaction between year block and the main treatments relating to habitat fragmentation.

The plotted effect sizes revealed a mix of positive and negative responses of morphological traits of *N. resplendens* in response to the fragments and matrix, over time, and between males and females (Figure 3).

Body size

Males of *N. resplendens* became bigger in the matrix in the long term with a strong increase in the short term (Figure 3). Males did not change in the fragments, as indicated by the very large 95% confidence intervals for effects on elytra length in the fragments (Figure 3).

Females, in contrast, became smaller in the matrix over the short and long terms in the matrix, but again did not change in the fragments (Figure 3). There was a pattern of females becoming more robust in the matrix and fragments of the short and long terms, as shown by an increase in relative elytra width in these treatments. However, the 95 % confidence intervals crossing the zero-effect line indicate that there is uncertainty in this response.

Dispersal ability

Femur length and trochanter length showed relative increases for males in the matrix sites over the short and long terms, whilst for females, femur and trochanter length showed a relative decrease over the short term but not over the long term. A similar pattern was shown in the fragments, however, again there was uncertainty in this response as shown by the 95 % confidence intervals crossing the zero-effect line (Figure 3).

Head width

Changes in relative inter-ocular width were strong in the matrix, with males affected negatively and females positively. This pattern was mirrored in the fragments for females, but not for males (Figure 3).

Reproduction

In the short term, last sternite length showed a similar pattern to the changes in femur and trochanter lengths, however, with only the effect for males in the matrix showing an effect with 95 % confidence intervals that did not cross the zero-effect line. Over the long term, only effects for females in the matrix were positive and with acceptable uncertainty (Figure 3).

Effects of the matrix vs effects of the fragments for both species

Our results revealed a very strong relationship between effect sizes in the matrix and effect sizes in the fragments (slope = 0.66, $p=4.00e^{-9}$, $R^2=0.80$). (Figure 4). This relationship spanned both year groups.

Discussion

We have shown that landscape change had indeed led to morphological changes in the focal carabid beetle species of our study. The temporally and spatially controlled landscape experiment at Wog Wog has allowed us to gain novel insights into how this species has changed morphologically in response to habitat fragmentation. We discuss our findings in the context of the corresponding population response shown by Evans et al. (2017). Using both population and morphological data of this species allows us to make stronger inferences about the mechanisms behind its responses to the experimental treatments.

New habitat promotes dispersal related traits

The most compelling morphological responses expressed related to dispersal, such as changes in femur length and trochanter length (Figure 3). Most notable, were the sexually dimorphic changes in response to the treatments. A key finding in Evans et al. (2017), was that this species' population was negatively impacted by the matrix in the short term. In the short term, the early pine matrix was very young with most vegetation recently cleared and replaced with pine seedlings. At this time, as Evans et al. (2017) discuss, the matrix might be considered less preferable than native *Eucalyptus* forest to this species. This would have the result that the landscape, in particular the matrix, would have an insufficient amount of habitat to sustain the populations; a mechanism that is linked to pressures for individuals to emigrate (Schtickzelle and Baguette 2003, Heidinger et al. 2010). This pressure to emigrate from habitat within the landscape may have led to promotion of dispersal associated traits for *N. resplendens*, a phenomenon known to occur at invasion fronts for carabids (Laparie et al. 2013) and other taxa (Phillips et al. 2006, Heidinger et al. 2010, Weiss-Lehman et al. 2017). The fact that this selection pressure for increased dispersal related traits is shown only in males of this species, does not invalidate this interpretation. Many species, including carabids (see Lagisz et al. 2010, Laparie et al. 2013), also exhibit sex-biased morphological changes related to dispersal (Travis and Dytham 2002, Dubois et al. 2010, Heidinger et al. 2010, Tanahashi 2014), with the cause thought to be that increased dispersal ability is often offset by lower reproductive rates in females (Crawley 1989). Furthermore, direct data from at least one species of carabid has shown that males demonstrate more locomotive activity than females (Szyszko et al. 2004).

In contrast to its population response (Evans et al. 2017), the morphological response of *N. resplendens* remained similar (but possibly increased in effect) from the short to the long term. In the long term, this species increased in occurrence in the fragments and matrix to a point that the matrix could be considered as much as habitat as the native fragments (Evans et al. 2017). As Evans et al. (2017) discuss, this was because the pine matrix had changed considerably as the pines grew into mature trees, providing a more similar habitat to that of the *Eucalyptus* forest than previously. At Wog Wog, *N. resplendens* prefers the darker and moister microhabitat of drainage lines to drier and sunnier slopes (Evans et al. 2017). The mature pine plantation in 2009–2013, with its tall and closed canopy, provides cooler darker habitat than the younger, more open, plantation in the early years of the experiment. The similar morphological response shown in the long term to the short term might indicate that the mature matrix still exerted selection pressures for increased dispersal over the long term. It could be possible that the populations are still adjusting to this new environment and are still dispersing into new habitat. It could also be possible that the differing floor structure of the pine plantation could be selecting for dispersal related traits. The pine plantation floor is a much less complex environment when compared with the eucalypt forest floor. In ants, a decrease in leg length is associated with a more complex habitat (Parr et al. 2003, Farji-Brener et al. 2004, Sarty et al. 2006, Gibb and Parr 2010, Wiescher et al. 2012). If this were the case with carabids, then we might expect that a simpler habitat structure, such as the pine forest floor, would drive an increase in leg length.

Other factors influencing body size sexual dimorphism

Body size in insects is also often directly affected by environmental conditions, especially those experienced during larval development (Margraf et al. 2003, Davidowitz et al. 2004, Lagisz 2008, Chown and Gaston 2010, Sukhodolskaya and Eremeeva 2013). At Wog Wog, we see a comparative reduction in size of females in tandem with an increase in size of males. It may be possible, therefore, that two pressures are manifested morphologically differently in each of the sexes – i.e. that females respond to the poorer environmental conditions across the landscape, whereas males respond to pressures to disperse. In insects, smaller females are usually associated with lower fecundity (Kozłowski 1992, Honkaniemi 1993). Therefore, the demographic changes we see in the short term of significant decline in the matrix (Evans et al. 2017) might be expected.

New habitat selects for increased head width among females

We also found that females had increased inter-ocular width compared with males by 2009-13. A larger head width can be related to the ability to consume larger food items (Pearson and Stemberger 1980, Laparie et al. 2010). Most carabids, including *N. resplendens* are predators, therefore prey availability is a key habitat determinant (Niemelä 1993, Koivula et al. 1999). Further, food is a vital resource needed for arthropod reproduction (Juliano 1985, Sota 1985). This could indicate that females, under pressure from a novel environment, i.e. the plantation, have adapted to different food resources to be able to invest in reproduction.

Phenotypic plasticity or gene frequency changes?

A question that follows the findings of this study is whether the morphological changes that we have documented result from phenotypic plasticity or changes in gene frequencies.

Phenotypic plasticity is the ability of a genotype to produce different phenotypes in response to different environmental conditions (Fusco and Minelli 2010, Pigliucci 2010). In the case of beetles, phenotypic plasticity is known to play a large role in this group's response to environmental change (Fusco and Minelli 2010, Gotoh et al. 2014, Ozawa et al. 2016). For example, horned beetles (subfamilies Dynastinae and Scarabaeinae within the Scarabaeidae family) demonstrate marked morphological differences in horn shape and overall body size in response to differing food availability during larval development (Valena and Moczek 2012). Further, these changes, as with *N. resplendens*, are sexually dimorphic, and are usually only manifested in the males of these species. Smaller horned beetle males, instead of investing in horns for combat with other males over females, invest in non-aggressive tactics such as enlarged testes and ejaculate volumes to aid in sperm competition (Tomkins and Simmons 2000). It is possible, therefore, that the morphological changes we see in *N. resplendens* in response to the landscape changes at Wog Wog, are as a result of the phenotypic plasticity inherent in this species. The alternative is a change in the frequency of alleles relevant to morphology between the land cover types in the Wog Wog landscape. However, to determine this directly, genetic research is needed on this species at Wog Wog. Local adaptation to spatially varying environmental conditions can be swamped by migration (gene flow) when the scale of environmental heterogeneity is much finer than the scale of dispersal (Blanquart et al. 2012, Forester et al. 2016). Potentially, the scale of environmental heterogeneity may be too fine for strong local adaptation to fragmentation-related environmental conditions in our study landscape. This could be informed by studies of spatial patterns of genetic structure

(allele frequency differentiation) and gene-environment analyses to identify signatures of environmental selection (Schoville et al. 2012).

Morphological changes at the landscape scale

The strong relationship between effect sizes in the fragments and effect sizes in the matrix for all traits indicates that the selection pressures are acting across the whole landscape of the treatments. It could also mean that the populations are continuous between these habitats.

Morphological changes in response to environmental change

Morphological adaptation is gaining more attention as a mechanism behind how species respond to environmental change (Nicotra et al. 2015). Despite being one of the longest running experiments of its kind, the morphological changes we see at Wog Wog appear over relatively short time periods, during a time of constant change to the environment in which these species inhabit. The insights gained demonstrates that species are able to adapt in short time scales, but also adds an extra dimension to understanding how species respond to environmental change. A species' *adaptive capacity* has the potential to change how it can cope with environmental change (Dawson et al. 2011, Nicotra et al. 2015). Therefore, considering this adaptive capacity is potentially very important for the management of species through future environmental change (Bell and Gonzalez 2009, Desrochers 2010, Nicotra et al. 2015). Furthermore, we have demonstrated the importance of museum specimens, such as those collected during the history of Wog Wog, as a resource for monitoring how species respond to landscape change (Desrochers 2010) and offer great

potential for insights into evolution of species in natural habitat over time (Holmes et al. 2016), in turn providing information of their capacity to adapt to environmental change.

Conclusions

The landscape presented at the mature stage of the pine plantation selects for individuals of *N. resplendens* with increased dispersal ability which is exhibited as an increase of overall size and leg length. Furthermore, the plantation seems to have driven divergence in dispersal ability between the sexes, probably as a result of the need for reproduction in females offsetting the selection pressures for increased traits related to movement. The pressures to change morphologically in the short term, seem to have lasted over the long term, despite the population responses to fragmentation differing during this time. It might be possible, therefore, that early morphological change in the short term has helped facilitate population increases in the matrix in the long term. Evidence that tests the dispersal strategies of this and other species using tracking studies (Ranius and Hedin 2001, Hedin and Ranius 2002, Ranius 2006) or population genetics (Brouat et al. 2003, Matern et al. 2008) would improve our understanding of why these species respond to habitat change with differing population and morphological responses. Our results demonstrate that species can adapt to environmental change over very short time periods and underline the importance of considering adaptive capacity in the management of species in the face of future environmental change.

Author contribution statement: MJE led the conceptualisation with advice from SCB, PSB, KFD and DAD; MJE and KFD collected the data; MJE led the analysis with advice from

SCB, PSB, KFD and DAD; MJE led the writing; and SCB, PSB, KFD and DAD made contributions to manuscript revision.

Acknowledgements

We thank the many people that have been involved in the establishment and maintenance of the Wog Wog Habitat Fragmentation Experiment, including Chris Margules, Mike Austin and A. O. (Nick) Nicholls. We are grateful to all of the people who have helped with fieldwork over the history of the experiment, particularly George Milkovits. Thanks to the Forestry Corporation of New South Wales for their cooperation and assistance in the day-to-day running of the experiment. We would also like to acknowledge John Lawrence and Andy Hicks for their taxonomic work on the beetles in the Wog Wog collection. Thank you to Brett Melbourne for statistical advice and more generally for his on this project. Thank you to Janet Gardner for advice early on in the project. Funding to collect samples between 2009 and 2013 was provided by NSF DEB 0841892 to KFD. KFD was also supported by NSF DEB 1350872. MJE was funded by an Australian National University PhD Scholarship. The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

References

- Agrawal, A. A., C. Laforsch, and R. Tollrian. 1999. Transgenerational induction of defences in animals and plants. *Nature* **401**:60-63.
- Alberti, M., C. Correa, J. M. Marzluff, A. P. Hendry, E. P. Palkovacs, K. M. Gotanda, V. M. Hunt, T. M. Apgar, and Y. Zhou. 2017. Global urban signatures of phenotypic change in animal and plant populations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.
- Anholt, B. 1990. Size-biased dispersal prior to breeding in a damselfly. *Oecologia* **83**:385-387.
- Ashley, E. P., G. B. McCullough, and J. T. Robinson. 1998. Morphological responses of white-tailed deer to a severe population reduction. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **76**:1-5.
- Barton, K. 2016. MuMIn: Multi-model inference.
- Barton, P. S., H. Gibb, A. D. Manning, D. B. Lindenmayer, and S. A. Cunningham. 2011. Morphological traits as predictors of diet and microhabitat use in a diverse beetle assemblage. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **102**:301-310.
- Bates, D., M. Maechler, B. Bolker, and S. Walker. 2016. lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using Eigen and S4.

- Bell, G., and A. Gonzalez. 2009. Evolutionary rescue can prevent extinction following environmental change. *Ecology Letters* **12**:942-948.
- Black, A. R. 1993. Predator-induced phenotypic plasticity in *Daphnia pulex*: Life history and morphological responses to *Notonecta* and *Chaoborus*. *Limnology and Oceanography* **38**:986-996.
- Black, A. R., and S. Dodson. 1990. Demographic costs of *Chaoborus*-induced phenotypic plasticity in *Daphnia pulex*. *Oecologia* **83**:117-122.
- Blanquart, F., S. Gandon, and S. L. Nuismer. 2012. The effects of migration and drift on local adaptation to a heterogeneous environment. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **25**:1351-1363.
- Brouat, C., F. Sennedot, P. Audiot, R. Leblois, and J. Y. Rasplus. 2003. Fine-scale genetic structure of two carabid species with contrasted levels of habitat specialization. *Molecular Ecology* **12**:1731-1745.
- Bureau of Meteorology. 2017. Australian Government Bureau of Meteorology.
- Burnham, K. P., and D. Anderson. 2002. Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical information-theoretic approach. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Chown, S. L., and K. J. Gaston. 2010. Body size variation in insects: a macroecological perspective. *Biological Reviews* **85**:139-169.

Craig Stillwell, R., Geoffrey E. Morse, and Charles W. Fox. 2007. Geographic Variation in Body Size and Sexual Size Dimorphism of a Seed -Feeding Beetle. T
Naturalist **170**:358-369.

Crawley, M. J. 1989. Chance and timing in biological invasions. *in* J. A. Drake, H. A. Mooney, F. di Castri, R. H. Groves, F. J. Kruger, M. Rejmanek, and M. Williamson, editors. *Biological invasions, a global perspective*. Wiley, Chichester.

Davidowitz, G., L. J. D'Amico, and H. F. Nijhout. 2004. The effects of environmental variation on a mechanism that controls insect body size. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* **6**:49-62.

Davies, K. F., and C. R. Margules. 1998. Effects of habitat fragmentation on carabid beetles: experimental evidence. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **67**:460-471.

Davies, K. F., and C. R. Margules. 2000. The beetles at Wog Wog: a contribution of Coleoptera systematics to an ecological field experiment. *Invertebrate Taxonomy* **14**:953-956.

Dawson, T. P., S. T. Jackson, J. I. House, I. C. Prentice, and G. M. Mace. 2011. Beyond Predictions: Biodiversity Conservation in a Changing Climate. *Science* **332**:53-58.

Desrochers, A. 2010. Morphological response of songbirds to 100 years of landscape change in North America. *Ecology* **91**:1577-1582.

- DeWitt, T. J., and S. M. Scheiner. 2004. Phenotypic plasticity: functional and conceptual approaches. Oxford University Press Oxford.
- Didham, R. K., V. Kapos, and R. M. Ewers. 2012. Rethinking the conceptual foundations of habitat fragmentation research. *Oikos* **121**:161-170.
- Dubois, G., P. Le Gouar, Y. Delettre, H. Brustel, and P. Vernon. 2010. Sex-biased and body condition dependent dispersal capacity in the endangered saproxylic beetle *Osmoderma eremita* (Coleoptera: Cetoniidae). *Journal of Insect Conservation* **14**:679-687.
- Evans, M. E. G. 1977. Locomotion in coleoptera adepaga, especially carabidae. *Journal of Zoology* **181**:189-226.
- Evans, M. J., S. C. Banks, D. A. Driscoll, A. J. Hicks, B. A. Melbourne, and K. F. Davies. 2017. Short- and long-term effects of habitat fragmentation differ but are predicted by response to the matrix. *Ecology* **98**:807-819.
- Fahrig, L. 2003. Effects of habitat fragmentation on biodiversity. *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics* **34**:487-515.
- Fahrig, L. 2013. Rethinking patch size and isolation effects: the habitat amount hypothesis. *Journal of Biogeography* **40**:1649-1663.

and access to food: a test of the size

o grain hypothesis in t

104:165-171.

Farmilo, B. J., B. A. Melbourne, J. S. Camac, and J. W. Morgan. 2013. Changes in plant species density in an experimentally fragmented forest landscape: Are the effects scale-dependent? *Austral Ecology*:n/a-n/a.

Forester, B. R., M. R. Jones, S. Joost, E. L. Landguth, and J. R. Lasky. 2016. Detecting spatial genetic signatures of local adaptation in heterogeneous landscapes. *Molecular Ecology* **25**:104-120.

Fusco, G., and A. Minelli. 2010. Phenotypic plasticity in development and evolution: facts and concepts. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **365**:547-556.

Gibb, H., and C. L. Parr. 2010. How does habitat complexity affect ant foraging success? A test using functional measures on three continents. *Oecologia* **164**:1061-1073.

Gotoh, H., H. Miyakawa, A. Ishikawa, Y. Ishikawa, Y. Sugime, D. J. Emlen, L. C. Lavine, and T. Miura. 2014. Developmental Link between Sex and Nutrition; doublesex Regulates Sex-Specific Mandible Growth via Juvenile Hormone Signaling in Stag Beetles. *PLOS Genetics* **10**:e1004098.

- Haddad, N. M., L. A. Brudvig, J. Clobert, K. F. Davies, A. Gonzalez, R. D. Holt, T. E. Lovejoy, J. O. Sexton, M. P. Austin, C. D. Collins, W. M. Cook, E. I. Damschen, R. M. Ewers, B. L. Foster, C. N. Jenkins, A. J. King, W. F. Laurance, D. J. Levey, C. R. Margules, B. A. Melbourne, A. O. Nicholls, J. L. Orrock, D.-X. Song, and J. R. Townshend. 2015. Habitat fragmentation and its lasting impact on Earth's ecosystems. *Science Advances* **1**.
- Hedin, J., and T. Ranius. 2002. Using radio telemetry to study dispersal of the beetle *Osmoderma eremita*, an inhabitant of tree hollows. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* **35**:171-180.
- Heidinger, I., S. Hein, and D. Bonte. 2010. Patch connectivity and sand dynamics affect dispersal-related morphology of the blue-winged grasshopper *Oedipoda caerulescens* in coastal grey dunes. *Insect Conservation and Diversity* **3**:205-212.
- Hill, J. K., C. D. Thomas, and D. S. Blakeley. 1999. Evolution of Flight Morphology in a Butterfly That Has Recently Expanded Its Geographic Range. *Oecologia* **121**:165-170.
- Holmes, M. W., T. T. Hammond, G. O. U. Wogan, R. E. Walsh, K. LaBarbera, E. A. Wommack, F. M. Martins, J. C. Crawford, K. L. Mack, L. M. Bloch, and M. W. Nachman. 2016. Natural history collections as windows on evolutionary processes. *Molecular Ecology* **25**:864-881.

- Holt, R. D. 2003. On the evolutionary ecology of species' ranges. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* **5**:159-178.
- Honk, A. 1993. Intraspecific Variation in Body Size and Fecundity in Insects: A General Relationship. *Oikos* **66**:483-492.
- Jackson, S. T., and J. T. Overpeck. 2000. Responses of plant populations and communities to environmental changes of the late Quaternary. *Paleobiology* **26**:194-220.
- Johnson, J. B., and K. S. Omland. 2004. Model selection in ecology and evolution. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **19**:101-108.
- Juliano, S. A. 1985. The effects of body size on mating and reproduction in *Brachinus lateralis* (Coleoptera: Carabidae). *Ecological Entomology* **10**:271-280.
- Kingsolver, J. G., and D. W. Pfennig. 2007. Patterns and power of phenotypic selection in nature. *Bioscience* **57**:561-572.
- Koivula, M., P. Punttila, Y. Haila, and J. Niemelä. 1999. Leaf litter and the small-scale distribution of carabid beetles (Coleoptera, Carabidae) in the boreal forest. *Ecography* **22**:424-435.
- Kozłowski, J. 1992. Optimal allocation of resources to growth and reproduction: Implications for age and size at maturity. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **7**:15-19.

- Lagisz, M. 2008. Changes in morphology of the ground beetle *Pterostichus oblongopunctatus* F. (coleoptera; carabidae) from vicinities of a zinc and lead smelter. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* **27**:1744-1747.
- Lagisz, M., K. Wolff, R. A. Sanderson, and R. Laskowski. 2010. Genetic population structure of the ground beetle, *Pterostichus oblongopunctatus*, inhabiting a fragmented and polluted landscape: Evidence for sex-biased dispersal. *Journal of Insect Science* **10**:20.
- Laparie, M., M. Lebouvier, L. Lalouette, and D. Renault. 2010. Variation of morphometric traits in populations of an invasive carabid predator (*Merizodus soledadinus*) within a sub-Antarctic island. *Biological Invasions* **12**:3405-3417.
- Laparie, M., D. Renault, M. Lebouvier, and T. Delattre. 2013. Is dispersal promoted at the invasion front? Morphological analysis of a ground beetle invading the Kerguelen Islands, *Merizodus soledadinus* (Coleoptera, Carabidae). *Biological Invasions* **15**:1641-1648.
- Lawrence, J., and A. Slipinski. 2013. *Australian Beetles Volume 1: Morphology, Classification and Keys*. CSIRO Publishing.
- Margraf, N., K. Gotthard, and M. Rahier. 2003. The growth strategy of an alpine beetle: maximization or individual growth adjustment in relation to seasonal time horizons? *Functional Ecology* **17**:605-610.

- Margules, C. R. 1992. The Wog-Wog habitat fragmentation experiment. *Environmental Conservation* **19**:316-325.
- Margules, C. R. 1993. The Wog Wog habitat fragmentation experiment. *Environmental Conservation* **19**:316-325.
- Marnocha, E., J. Pollinger, and T. B. Smith. 2011. Human-induced morphological shifts in an island lizard. *Evolutionary Applications* **4**:388-396.
- Matern, A., C. Drees, H. Meyer, and T. Assmann. 2008. Population ecology of the rare carabid beetle *Carabus variolosus* (Coleoptera : Carabidae) in North-west Germany. *Journal of Insect Conservation* **12**:591-601.
- Mathews, E. G. 1987. A guide to the Genera of Beetles of South Australia. South Australian Museum, Adelaide, Australia.
- McCallum, M. L. 2007. Amphibian decline or extinction? Current declines dwarf background extinction rate. *Journal of Herpetology* **41**:483-491.
- McLeay, L. J., B. Page, S. D. Goldsworthy, T. M. Ward, D. C. Paton, M. Waterman, and M. D. Murray. 2009. Demographic and morphological responses to prey depletion in a crested tern (*Sterna bergii*) population: can fish mortality events highlight performance indicators for fisheries management? *Ices Journal of Marine Science* **66**:237-247.

Miner, B. G., S. E. Sultan, S. G. Morgan, D. K. Padilla, and R. A. Relyea. 2005. Ecological consequences of phenotypic plasticity. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **20**:685-692.

Moretti, M., A. T. C. Dias, F. de Bello, F. Altermatt, S. L. Chown, F. M. Azcárate, J. R. Bell, B. Fournier, M. Hedde, J. Hortal, S. Ibanez, E. Öckinger, J. P. Sousa, J. Ellers, and M. P. Berg. 2017. Handbook of protocols for standardized measurement of terrestrial invertebrate functional traits. *Functional Ecology* **31**:558-567.

Nicotra, A. B., E. A. Beever, A. L. Robertson, G. E. Hofmann, and J. O'Leary. 2015. Assessing the components of adaptive capacity to improve conservation and management efforts under global change. *Conservation Biology* **29**:1268-1278.

Niemelä, J. 1993. Mystery of the missing species: species-abundance distribution of boreal ground-beetles. Pages 169-172 *in* *Annales Zoologici Fennici*.

Norberg, U., and O. Leimar. 2002. Spatial and temporal variation in flight morphology in the butterfly *Melitaea cinxia* (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae). *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **77**:445-453.

Ozawa, T., T. Mizuhara, M. Arata, M. Shimada, T. Niimi, K. Okada, Y. Okada, and K. Ohta. 2016. Histone deacetylases control module-specific phenotypic plasticity in beetle weapons. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **113**:15042-15047.

Parr, Z., C. Parr, and S. Chown. 2003. The size test. *Ecological Entomology* **28**:475-481.

-grain hypothesis

- Pearson, D. L., and S. L. Stemberger. 1980. Competition, body size and the relative energy balance of adult tiger beetles (Coleoptera: Cicindelidae). *American Midland Naturalist*:373-377.
- Peters, R. H. 1983. *The Ecological Implications of Body Size*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England.
- Phillips, B. L., G. P. Brown, J. K. Webb, and R. Shine. 2006. Invasion and the evolution of speed in toads. *Nature* **439**:803-803.
- Pigliucci, M. 2001. *Phenotypic plasticity: beyond nature and nurture*. JHU Press.
- Pigliucci, M. 2010. Genotype–phenotype mapping and the end of the ‘genes as blueprint’ metaphor. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **365**:557-566.
- R Core Team. 2017. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Rands, M. R. W., W. M. Adams, L. Bennun, S. H. M. Butchart, A. Clements, D. Coomes, A. Entwistle, I. Hodge, V. Kapos, J. P. W. Scharlemann, W. J. Sutherland, and B. Vira. 2010. Biodiversity Conservation: Challenges Beyond 2010. *Science* **329**:1298-1303.
- Ranius, T. 2006. Measuring the dispersal of saproxylic insects: a key characteristic for their conservation. *Population Ecology* **48**:177-188.

- Ranius, T., and J. Hedin. 2001. The dispersal rate of a beetle, *Osmoderma eremita*, living in tree hollows. *Oecologia* **126**:363-370.
- Rohlf, F. J. 2013a. tps Utility Program. SUNY at Stony Brook.
- Rohlf, F. J. 2013b. tpsDIG. SUNY at Stony Brook.
- Salmon, S., J. F. Ponge, S. Gachet, L. Deharveng, N. Lefebvre, and F. Delabrosse. 2014. Linking species, traits and habitat characteristics of Collembola at European scale. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* **75**:73-85.
- Sarty, M., K. Abbott, and P. Lester. 2006. Habitat complexity facilitates coexistence in a tropical ant community. *Oecologia* **149**:465-473.
- Schmidt, N. M., and P. M. Jensen. 2003. Changes in mammalian body length over 175 years—adaptations to a fragmented landscape? *Conservation Ecology* **7**.
- Schoville, S. D., A. Bonin, O. François, S. Lobreaux, C. Melodelima, and S. Manel. 2012. Adaptive Genetic Variation on the Landscape: Methods and Cases. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* **43**:23-43.
- Schtickzelle, N., and M. Baguette. 2003. Behavioural responses to habitat patch boundaries restrict dispersal and generate emigration–patch area relationships in fragmented landscapes. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **72**:533-545.

- Smith, R. J., A. Hines, S. Richmond, M. Merrick, A. Drew, and R. Fargo. 2000. Altitudinal Variation in Body Size and Population Density of *Nicrophorus investigator* (Coleoptera: Silphidae). *Environmental Entomology* **29**:290-298.
- Sota, T. 1985. Limitation of reproduction by feeding condition in a carabid beetle, *Carabus yaconinus*. *Researches on population ecology* **27**:171-184.
- Stone, R. 2007. Biodiversity crisis on tropical islands - From flying foes to fantastic friends. *Science* **317**:193-193.
- Sukhodolskaya, R., and N. Eremeeva. 2013. Body size and shape variation in Ground Beetle *Carabus aeruginosus* F.-W., 1822 (Coleoptera, Carabidae). *Contemporary Problems of Ecology* **6**:609-615.
- Szyszko, J., S. Gryuntal, and A. Schwerk. 2004. Differences in Locomotory Activity Between Male and Female *Carabus hortensis* (Coleoptera: Carabidae) in a Pine Forest and a Beech Forest in Relation to Feeding State. *Environmental Entomology* **33**:1442-1446.
- Tanahashi, M. 2014. Female-Biased Dispersal Activity of the River-Shore Stag Beetle, *Nicagus japonicus* Nagel (Coleoptera: Lucanidae), in a Disrupted Habitat. *The Coleopterists Bulletin* **68**:115-118.
- Thomas, C. D., A. Cameron, R. E. Green, M. Bakkenes, L. J. Beaumont, Y. C. Collingham, B. F. N. Erasmus, M. F. de Siqueira, A. Grainger, L. Hannah, L. Hughes, B. Huntley,

A. S. van Jaarsveld, G. F. Midgley, L. Miles, M. A. Ortega-Huerta, A. T. Peterson, O. L. Phillips, and S. E. Williams. 2004. Extinction risk from climate change. *Nature* **427**:145-148.

Tomkins, J. L., and L. W. Simmons. 2000. Sperm competition games played by dimorphic male beetles: fertilization gains with equal mating access. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **267**:1547-1553.

Travis, J. M. J., and C. Dytham. 2002. Dispersal evolution during invasions. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* **4**:1119-1129.

Valena, S., and A. P. Moczek. 2012. Epigenetic Mechanisms Underlying Developmental Plasticity in Horned Beetles. *Genetics Research International* **2012**:576303.

Wainwright, P. C., and S. M. Reilly. 1994. *Ecological morphology: integrative organismal biology*. The University of Chicago Press, Illinois.

Weiss-Lehman, C., R. A. Hufbauer, and B. A. Melbourne. 2017. Rapid trait evolution drives increased speed and variance in experimental range expansions. **8**:14303.

Wickham, H. 2009. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Wiescher, P. T., J. M. Pearce-Duvet, and D. H. Feener. 2012. Assembling an ant community: species functional traits reflect environmental filtering. *Oecologia* **169**:1063-1074.

Williams, N. M., E. E. Crone, T. a. H. Roulston, R. L. Minckley, L. Packer, and S. G. Potts.

2010. Ecological and life-history traits predict bee species responses to environmental disturbances. *Biological Conservation* **143**:2280-2291.

Table and Figures

Table 1. Summary of full models used for variable selection using AICc model ranking. ‘Y’ = Year group, ‘F’ = main treatments, ‘T’ = topography, ‘S’ = size, ‘E’ = edge, ‘*’ = interaction + variables alone (e.g. Y*F = Y + F + Y:F), ‘/’ = nested interaction.

Data used	Full model
Pre-fragmentation (model set #1)	Morphological trait ~ Y + F + T + Y*F + Y*F/S + Y*F/E + Y*T + F*T + Y*F*T + Y*Sex + F*Sex + T*Sex + Y*F*Sex + Y*F/S*Sex + Y*F/E*Sex + Y*T*Sex + F*T*Sex + Y*F*T*Sex
Plantation matrix (model set #2)	Morphological trait ~ Y + F + T + Y*F + Y*T + F*T + Y*F*T + Y*Sex + F*Sex + T*Sex + Y*F*Sex + Y*T*Sex + F*T*Sex + Y*F*T*Sex

Table 2. Results of AICc model selection for model set #1 for *N. resplendens*. Table showing relative importance of predictor variables for responses of morphological variables of *N. resplendens* to the effects of year block (Y), treatments (F), topography (T) and sex (Sex) and a selection of their interactions. Predictor variables that did not appear in the top ranked models are not included in the table (e.g. size, edge). Numbers are based on the sum of the Akaike weights of the highest ranked models ("AICc<2") that include the variable (a value of one indicates that the variable appears in all highest ranked models). Terms separated by a colon indicate interaction terms. See Table S1 for more details.

Response	Y	F	T	Sex	Y:F	Y:Sex	T:Sex	F:Sex	Y:T	Y:T:Sex
Elytra length	1.00	0.27		1.00		0.24				
Elytra width	1.00	0.49			0.27					
Femur length	1.00	0.27	0.21	1.00		1.00				
Trochanter length	1.00	0.33		1.00		1.00				
Inter-ocular width	1.00	0.46	0.14	1.00	0.14	0.89		0.34		
Last sternite	1.00	0.19	0.34	1.00		0.30	0.13		0.13	0.13

Table 3. Results of AICc model selection for model set #2 for *N. resplendens*. Table showing relative importance of predictor variables for responses of *N. resplendens* to the effects of year block (Y), treatments (F), topography (T) and sex (Sex) and a selection of their interactions. Numbers are based on the sum of the Akaike weights of the highest ranked models (" AICc<2) that include the variable (a value of one indicates that the variable appears in all highest ranked models). Terms separated by a colon indicate interaction terms. See Table S2 for more details.

Response	Y	F	T	Sex	Y:F	T:Sex	F:Sex	Y:Sex	F:T	Y:T	Y:T:Sex
Elytra length				1.00							
Elytra width	1.00	1.00	0.40								
Femur length	1.00	0.67		1.00	0.67			0.20			
Trochanter length	1.00	0.31		1.00	0.31			0.79			
Inter-ocular width	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		0.32	1.00	1.00	1.00		
Last sternite	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00

Figure legends

Figure 1. Map of the experimental site. There are eight sampling sites within each plot, each with two pitfall traps. Paired sampling sites are represented by dots in the pine plantation. Plot sizes are 0.25 ha, 0.875 ha and 3.062 ha. Plots are separated by at least 50 m. Note: The eight monitoring sites within each small plot are not represented due to figure space constraints.



Figure 2. Examples of images of (a) the dorsal and (b) ventral view of *Notonomus resplendens*, including landmarks as hollow circles and linear measurements as arrows.

Figure 3. Effects on *N. resplendens* morphology by the interaction of time and treatment. Effect sizes for each trait are filled with the same colour but have been shaded darker for males and lighter for females (e.g. male elytra width is dark red, female elytra width is light red). Bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 4. Plot of effects sizes in the fragments against effect sizes in the matrix for individual traits across both post-fragmentation year groups (slope = 0.66, $p=4.00e^{-9}$, $R^2=0.80$). Filled points represent 1988-92 effects and unfilled points represent 2009-13 effect sizes. Effect sizes are as in Figure 3. Colours correspond with species trait colours shown in Figure 3. Solid line represents the fitted slope of the relationship, with the grey area representing the 95% confidence intervals.

Short legends for Supporting Information files

Table S1. Summary of individual carabids caught and from which of the main treatments of year block and treatment of *Notonomus resplendens*.



EE Graphical abstract.tif

A long term habitat fragmentation experiment leads to morphological change in a species of carabid beetle.

Maldwyn J. EVANS^{a*}, Sam C. BANKS^a, Philip S. BARTON^a, Kendi F DAVIES^b, Don A. DRISCOLL^c.

^a Fenner School of Environment and Society,
The Australian National University,
Acton, ACT 2601, Australia

^b Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology,
University of Colorado,
Boulder, CO 80309

^c School of Life and Environmental Sciences,
Center for Integrative Ecology
Deakin University Geelong,
Melbourne Burwood campus,
221 Burwood Highway, Burwood, Victoria 3125, Australia

m.john.evans@anu.edu.au

sam.banks@anu.edu.au

philip.barton@anu.edu.au

kendi.davies@colorado.edu

d.driscoll@deakin.edu.au

**Corresponding author*


Maldwyn John Evans,
Fenner School of Environment and Society,
The Australian National University,
Canberra, ACT 0200, Australia
Telephone: (612) 6125 8133

Fax: (612) 6215 0757


Email: m.john.evans@anu.edu.au

Research highlights


1. In a long term, spatially and temporally controlled landscape scale fragmentation experiment, individuals of *Notonomus resplendens* demonstrated sexually dimorphic morphological changes in response to experimental fragmentation.
2. Males became bigger, had larger legs and had smaller inter-ocular widths in the matrix in both the short and long terms. Females became smaller and had increased inter-ocular widths.
3. Changes in the fragments were similar to those in the matrix, but exhibited more uncertainty.




Figure_1.tif



Figure_2.tif



Figure_3.tif



Figure_4.tif