

Local adaptation, phenotypic plasticity, and species coexistence

José F. Fontanari

*Instituto de Física de São Carlos, Universidade de São Paulo,
Caixa Postal 369, 13560-970 São Carlos, São Paulo, Brazil*

Margarida Matos

*cE3c - Centre for Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Changes &
CHANGE - Global Change and Sustainability Institute, Lisboa, Portugal and
Departamento de Biologia Animal, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal*

Mauro Santos

*Departament de Genètica i de Microbiologia, Grup de Genòmica,
Bioinformàtica i Biologia Evolutiva (GBBE), Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain and
cE3c - Centre for Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Changes &
CHANGE - Global Change and Sustainability Institute, Lisboa, Portugal*

Understanding the mechanisms of species coexistence has always been a fundamental topic in ecology. Classical theory predicts that interspecific competition may select for traits that stabilize niche differences, although recent work shows that this is not strictly necessary. Here we ask whether adaptive phenotypic plasticity could allow species coexistence (i.e., some stability at an equilibrium point) without ecological differentiation in habitat use. We used individual-based stochastic simulations defining a landscape composed of spatially uncorrelated or autocorrelated environmental patches, where two species with the same competitive strategies, not able to coexist without some form of phenotypic plasticity, expanded their ranges in the absence of a competition-colonization trade-off (a well-studied mechanism for species diversity). Each patch is characterized by a random environmental value that determines the optimal phenotype of its occupants. In such a scenario, only local adaptation and gene flow (migration) may interact to promote genetic variation and coexistence in the metapopulation. Results show that a competitively inferior species with adaptive phenotypic plasticity can coexist in a same patch with a competitively superior, non-plastic species, provided the migration rates and variances of the patches' environmental values are sufficiently large.

I. INTRODUCTION

Spatial variation in the direction and strength of natural selection may often lead to eco-evolutionary dynamics. Local selection for the optimum phenotype could be hindered not only by gene flow but also from competitive interactions with other species; interactions which, in turn, could also be affected by the dual processes of gene flow and divergent selection [28]. Furthermore, theoretical models have shown that phenotypic plasticity, the ability of organisms to express different phenotypes depending on environmental conditions [9, 55], readily evolves when selective conditions are variable, whether in time or space [28, 46]. In particular, spatial environmental variation where selection favors different phenotypes in each environment facilitates the evolution of adaptive phenotypic plasticity given some movement between environments [24, 51, 69]. Since phenotypic plasticity occurs within an ecological context - e.g., a normal or helmet morph in water fleas depending on the absence or presence of predators [1], or quorum sensing in bacteria according to surrounding bacterial cell density [39] - much current interest focuses on how variation in phenotypic plasticity can affect the dynamics of interacting populations or species [17, 23, 41, 45, 62, 66].

Classical theory predicts that interspecific competi-

tion may select for traits that stabilize niche differences, weakening competitive interactions and therefore promoting species coexistence [15, 36, 59]. However, recent work shows that ecological niche differentiation is not a requirement for species coexistence, and ecologically equivalent species can coexist when behaviors associated with reproductive interactions and sexual selection affect species demography in a frequency-dependent way [23]. On the other hand, the effect of phenotypic plasticity on species coexistence has been mainly framed within the classic context, in the sense that plasticity for ecologically relevant traits can eventually stabilize niche differentiation [66]. Our aim here is to tackle the following question: does phenotypic plasticity affect species coexistence to the point that a competitively inferior plastic species can coexist with a competitively superior nonplastic one in the absence of niche differences? Specifically, we consider the following thought experiment: take an ecological model and contrast the community dynamics with or without intraspecific expressed variation for plasticity. When and why does variation change the dynamics? [8].

Here we develop a computational model to investigate the effect of phenotypic plasticity on species' coexistence. We assume a density-compensating process which controls the size of the population (i.e., density-dependent population growth), coupled with a density-

and frequency-independent viability selection for a local optimum that can be attained by adaptive phenotypic plasticity. We ran individual-based stochastic simulations using a two-dimensional landscape composed of spatially uncorrelated or autocorrelated environmental patches. We assumed two species: a competitively superior nonplastic species 1, that will always displace a second, phenotypically plastic species 2, in a single patch as well as in a two-dimensional landscape, with migration between patches but without environmental heterogeneity, which is temporally constant (i.e., when all patches have the same environmental value that defines the optimum phenotype). We mainly focus on the scenario where the two species are placed in a single random patch of a spatially heterogeneous and empty landscape, and thereafter are allowed to expand their ranges without being subjected to a competition-colonization trade-off (a well-studied mechanism for species diversity maintenance; Calcagno et al. [10], Hastings [27], Muthukrishnan et al. [41]). Individuals of both species migrate to adjacent patches with the same probability per generation and have the same competitive strategies (i.e., the same absolute intra- and interspecific competition coefficients all over the patches) across the spatially varying landscape, but those patches with the highest average fitness contribute the most individuals (hard selection; Christiansen [12]). A brief digression: here we refer to fitness in the evolutionary context of population genetics, and not as the average competitive ability as used in the framework of “modern coexistence theory” [6]. Intuition suggests that expressing phenotypic plasticity will enhance local adaptation [51, 52], which could give some fitness advantage to the ecologically inferior plastic species and facilitate coexistence. Quantitative numerical results as well as qualitative analytical arguments support this intuition. In particular, we show that both species coexist in most patches provided the variance of the optimum phenotypes across patches and the migration probability are sufficiently large. This conclusion holds true even when plasticity was to a certain extent costly.

II. MODEL

Here we describe an eco-evolutionary scenario to investigate the possibility of coexistence between two species when the ecological competition matrix violates the mutual invasibility condition for any given patch.

A. Spatial setting

We constructed an individual-based model to simulate a metapopulation of two multi-locus, haploid species that occupy discrete patches located on a 2-dimensional grid of linear length L and toroidal shape (a doughnut) to avoid edge effects. Each patch on the grid is characterized by an environmental value E_i , $i = 1, \dots, L^2$, which are

random variables distributed by the multivariate normal distribution

$$f(E; \mu, \Sigma) = \frac{\exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}(E - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1}(E - \mu)\right]}{(2\pi)^{L^2/2} |\Sigma|^{1/2}}, \quad (1)$$

where $E^T = (E_1, \dots, E_{L^2})$ and $\mu^T = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{L^2})$ is a vector whose elements are the expected values of the environmental values, i.e., $\mathbb{E}(E_i) = \mu_i$. Here Σ is the covariance matrix whose elements are $\Sigma_{ij} = \sqrt{\sigma_i^2 \sigma_j^2} \rho_{ij}$ where σ_i^2 is the variance of the environmental value at patch i and ρ_{ij} is the correlation between the environmental values at patches i and j , which we choose to depend on the Euclidian distance d_{ij} between those patches. Explicitly, we set $\rho_{ij} = \rho^{d_{ij}}$ where $\rho \in [0, 1]$ is the correlation between the environmental values of patches for which $d_{ij} = 1$. Of course, $d_{ij} = 1$ is the smallest distance between any two patches in the grid. We note that the correlation decreases exponentially with the distance between patches, i.e., $\rho_{ij} = \exp(-d_{ij}/\xi)$ where $\xi = 1/|\ln \rho|$ is the correlation length of the environment.

A word is in order about the calculation of the Euclidean distance d between two points (i_1, i_2) and (j_1, j_2) in a rectangular grid with cyclic boundary conditions (toroid). Let us assume that the open grid is $L_1 \times L_2$, i.e., that there are L_1 patches in the horizontal direction and L_2 in the vertical direction ($L_1 = L_2 = L$ for the grid considered in this paper), so that $i_1, j_1 = 1, \dots, L_1$ and $i_2, j_2 = 1, \dots, L_2$. The horizontal and vertical distances between these points are given by the equations $d_h = \min(|j_1 - i_1|, L_1 - |j_1 - i_1|)$ and $d_v = \min(|j_2 - i_2|, L_2 - |j_2 - i_2|)$, from where we can readily calculate the Euclidean distance, viz., $d = \sqrt{d_h^2 + d_v^2}$.

To avoid a profusion of parameters we assume that the patches are statistically identical, i.e., $\mu_i = \mu$ and $\sigma_i^2 = \sigma_e^2$ for $i = 1, \dots, L^2$. With this assumption we can set $\mu = 0$ without loss of generality, since a different choice of μ would amount to a uniform shift on the environmental values and so it would be inconsequential. Although we set $\sigma_e^2 = 2$ in most of our simulations, we have also analyzed the effect of σ_e^2 on species' coexistence. We note that for $\rho = 0$ the environmental values E_i are statistically independent normal random variables with mean zero and variance σ_e^2 . Most of our analysis will focus on the uncorrelated environment, but we also analyzed the probability of coexistence in environmentally autocorrelated landscapes (i.e., $\rho > 0$). As a brief technical note, we mention that in the case the matrix Σ is symmetric and positive definite we can readily produce samples of the random vector \mathbf{E} by setting $\mathbf{E} = \mu + \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{X}$ where $\mathbf{X}^T = (X_1, \dots, X_{L^2})$ is a random vector whose components are statistically independent standard normal random variables [71]. The difficulty here is the calculation of the square root of the matrix Σ , which can be done easily using its spectral decomposition.

B. Viability selection

Following Scheiner et al. [53], the phenotype Z_i of an individual located at patch i at the time of development was determined by 40 haploid loci as

$$Z_i = \sum_{k=1}^{m_r} R_k + E_i b \sum_{k=1}^{m_p} P_k + \epsilon, \quad (2)$$

where R_k are the allelic values at the $m_r = 20$ nonplastic or rigid loci (i.e., loci whose phenotypic expression does not ontogenetically react to the environmental value), P_k are the allelic values at the $m_p = 20$ plastic loci (their phenotypic expression depends on external environmental cues that influence development) and ϵ is a normally distributed environmental effect with mean 0 and variance $\sigma_\epsilon = 1/10$. Here b is the plasticity parameter that takes on the value $b = 0$ for the nonplastic species (species 1) and $b = 1$ for the plastic species (species 2). There is no lack of generality in this choice because the allelic values P_k (and R_k as well) are real-valued variables and so any other choice of the plasticity parameter can be reset to $b = 1$ by a proper rescaling of P_k .

The initial allelic values for all loci were also independently drawn from a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance 1/10. Hence the sum of allelic effects for each set of loci is a normal random variable of mean 0 and variance $20/10 = 2$, which matches our typical choice for the variance of the environmental values, viz., $\sigma_e^2 = 2$. In equation (2), for a given genotype the first term is the intersection of the reaction norm and the second term is the slope [52, 53].

Selection is only for viability, and the survival probability of an individual at patch i depends on its phenotype and the cost of plasticity. Here we assume a Gaussian fitness model

$$W_i = \exp \left[-\frac{(Z_i - E_i)^2}{2w^2} - \frac{c}{2} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{m_p} P_k \right)^2 \right], \quad (3)$$

where E_i is the optimum phenotype that coincides with the patch's environmental value (i.e., stabilizing selection with a moving optimum), w^2 is inversely proportional to the strength of stabilizing selection (here we set $w^2 = 1$), and $c \geq 0$ determines the cost of plasticity. This equation includes maintenance costs of plasticity [14] because there is a proportional reduction in survival when $c > 0$ even if plasticity is not expressed as it is the case for species 1. However, in this paper we assume that individuals belonging to species 1 do not carry plastic alleles, so effectively $b = 0$ and $c = 0$ for them.

We note that there are no intra and interspecific interactions during the viability selection process, whose net effect is to decrease the population of both species. After passing the viability selection process, the surviving individuals compete among themselves to repopulate their patch, as described next.

C. Ecological competition

We assume that when the two species occupy the same patch they may interact and there may be interference or scramble competition. Given the species abundances N_1 and N_2 after viability selection, then the total number of offspring N'_1 and N'_2 produced by the individuals of each species is determined by Ricker's equations [49]

$$N'_1 = N_1 \exp \left[r \left(1 - \frac{a_{11}N_1 + a_{12}N_2}{K_{max}} \right) \right] \quad (4)$$

$$N'_2 = N_2 \exp \left[r \left(1 - \frac{a_{21}N_1 + a_{22}N_2}{K_{max}} \right) \right], \quad (5)$$

where e^r is the maximum growth rate in a low-density population, K_{max} is the carrying capacity of each species when alone (assuming $a_{11} = a_{22} = 1$), and a_{ij} is the per capita effect of species j on species i [21]. For simplicity, here we assume that both species have the same maximum growth rate and equilibrium population size when alone in a patch.

In the absence of migration, so the individuals are confined to their birth patches, we consider the scenario where the nonplastic species (i.e., species 1) outcompetes the plastic species (i.e., species 2). This scenario is achieved by setting $r \in (0, 2)$, $a_{21} > a_{11}$ and $a_{12} < a_{22}$. Furthermore, since we do not want to distinguish between the two species when only one species is present in the metapopulation, we set $a_{11} = a_{22} = 1$. To investigate the possibility of species coexistence (or lack thereof) when the ecologically inferior species 2 displays plasticity we set $a_{21} = 3/2$, $a_{12} = 1/2$ and $r = 0.6$ in our simulations. Assuming a relatively large r is reasonable in the case of expanding species as, e.g., insects [19] and plants (Appendix in Franco and Silvertown [18]). We emphasize that our choice for the competition matrix a excludes the possibility of mutual invasion, which is a standard requisite for species coexistence [44]. In fact, since $a_{21} = 3/2 > 1 = a_{11}$ species 1 can invade a resident population of individuals of species 2 at equilibrium, but since $a_{12} = 1/2 < 1 = a_{22}$ species 2 cannot invade a resident population of individuals of species 1 at equilibrium. It is instructive to note that $\det(a)_{Panel} := 1/4 > 0$, so our competition matrix offers a counterexample to the fallacious statement that $\det(a) > 0$ implies negative frequency dependence (i.e. rare advantage) and hence ensures mutual invasibility (TBox 9.1 in Pásztor et al. [44]).

We note that Ricker equations (4) and (5) yield real values for the number of offspring of each species and, in fact, the conditions that guarantee the superiority of species 1 over species 2 presented above for the single-patch situation are valid only when species numbers N_1 and N_2 are real variables. It turns out that transforming those real variables into integer variables that are necessary for our individual-based simulations may produce spurious results, such as permanence of a few individuals of species 2 in patches dominated by individuals of species 1 or the stability of patches dominated by individuals of species 2 against the invasion of a few individuals

of species 1. Here we circumvent this difficulty by taking the ceiling function in equation (4) (i.e., the least integer greater than or equal to N'_1) and the floor function in equation (5) (i.e., the greatest integer less than or equal to N'_2), which biases the competition in favor of species 1. In fact, this procedure impairs considerably the ability of species 2 to colonize vacant patches even when there is no competition (i.e., $N_1 = 0$) because a single founder of species 2 cannot produce more than one offspring for our choice of growth rate ($r = 0.6$). For instance, if there is a single adult individual of species 2 in an otherwise empty patch (i.e., $N_2 = 1$ and $N_1 = 0$), then equation (5) yields $N'_2 < e^r \approx 1.8$. Since $\text{floor}(1.8) = 1$ a single founder of species 2 cannot populate a vacant patch. This effect is mitigated when the migration rate is large since in this case there is a good chance that several individuals of species 2 migrate together to the same patch. However, this is actually a convenient scenario for our purposes since the more ecologically impaired species 2 is, the more remarkable the finding that plasticity can guarantee its permanence in the metapopulation.

In addition, we set K_{max} as a hard upper bound to the number of offspring N'_1 and N'_2 . In other words, whenever $N'_i > K_{max}$ we set $N'_i = K_{max}$ for $i = 1, 2$. This procedure is actually inconsequential because the populations at each patch approach the support capacity K_{max} from below.

D. Reproduction

The ecological competition procedure described above determines the number of offspring of each species N'_1 and N'_2 in each patch. Now we need to specify their phenotypes. We assume that the individuals who passed the viability selection sieve reproduced asexually and that the mother of each offspring is chosen randomly among them. We recall that the numbers of surviving individuals of species 1 and species 2 are N_1 and N_2 , respectively. The differences between mother and offspring are due solely to mutations in the m_r nonplastic loci and in the m_p plastic loci, which were implemented as follows. Each allele of the offspring can mutate with probability u_r or u_p depending on whether it is a nonplastic or a plastic allele. (Here we assume $u_r = u_p = 5/1000$, which gives a genome-wide mutation rate $U = 0.2$.) Once a mutation occurs, say at the plastic locus k , we add a normal random variable ξ of mean zero and variance $1/100$ to the existing allelic value which then becomes $P_k + \xi$. This is Kimura's continuum-of-alleles model [31]. As usual, generations were discrete and nonoverlapping. During the development of an individual in a particular patch, we ignored any potential influence of parental phenotypes as, e.g., transgenerational plasticity [67].

In sum, the offspring generation is obtained by selecting with replacement N'_i mothers from the surviving population of size N_i with $i = 1, 2$. The phenotype differences between offspring and mothers are the mutations

in the nonplastic and plastic loci.

E. Migration

Each individual within each patch can migrate to one of the eight surrounding patches (Moore neighborhood) with probability p_{mig} , and its destination is equally likely to be any of the eight patches. We were careful in keeping track migrant and non-migrant individuals that remained in their natal patch [26]. The flow of migrants between patches takes place simultaneously and it may result in some patches becoming empty or exceeding the carrying capacity. After arriving at their destination patches, the migrants as well as the residents of those patches pass the viability selection sieve as described in subsection II B. Again, some patches may become empty at this stage.

F. Metapopulation dynamics

As originally defined by Levins [35], metapopulation dynamics consists of the extinction and colonization of local populations. Early models analogous to Levins' showed that two competitors could coexist globally even if coexistence was impossible in a single patch [34, 42, 58]. However, here we do not impose a random extinction probability; only local adaptation and gene flow may interact to promote genetic variation and coexistence in the metapopulation. Actually, real metapopulations may contain local populations that never go extinct [56]. A cautionary note: Kawecki and Ebert [30, p. 1232] rightly pointed out that "local adaptation is about genetic differentiation", but warned to minimize non-genetic effects such as plasticity (thus considering it a "nuisance parameter") when studying local adaptation. However, at the metapopulation level studied here the total phenotypic variation for plastic species 2 is the result of the variation in the reaction norm intercepts (first term on the right side of equation (2)) and slopes (second term on the right side of equation (2)), both of which have a genetic basis [50, 61]. Therefore, local adaptation is better understood as how close the mean phenotype matches the patch's environmental optimum value.

In this paper we consider only an expanding population scenario. More pointedly, the initial population was located on a randomly selected patch of the 2-dimensional grid at carrying capacity K_{max} for the two species, each at equal frequency (i.e., $K_{max}/2$ individuals from each species), and all other patches were empty. We recall that the carrying capacity of the metapopulation is $K_{max}L^2$ individuals, so there is plenty of room for expansion from this initial setup. For each species independently, there was an equilibration period of 2000 generations at the seed patch before the colonization of the empty patches started. We initialize the allelic values R_k , $k = 1, \dots, m_r$ and P_k , $k = 1, \dots, m_p$ in equation (2) for each individual as described before. In the equilibration period the two

species evolve independently in the seed patch, i.e., there is no interspecific (as well as intraspecific) competition since after viability selection one guarantees that there will be exactly $K_{max}/2$ offspring of each species. Thus, equations (4) and (5) are not used in the equilibration period. In sum, during equilibration viability selection decreases the population of each species by eliminating the less fit individuals and reproduction resets the population of the seed patch to its original size.

After the equilibration period, the colonization of empty patches starts. The order of events is migration, viability selection, ecological competition and reproduction. The sequence of these four events comprises one generation. Note that this sequence of events guarantees that a given individual undergoes the processes of selection, competition and reproduction within the same patch and that only their offspring have the possibility to migrate to neighboring patches.

G. Computer simulations

Individual-based simulations were independently implemented in Fortran and in MATLAB [38] algebra environment using tools supplied by the Statistics Toolbox. Simulation results were double-checked by different authors to avoid any potential error. The results presented here are based in the Fortran code because it has speed advantages over MATLAB. The variable parameters were: L (landscape dimensionality), σ_e^2 (variance of the environmental values E_i), ρ (environmental correlation), K_{max} (patch's carrying capacity), c (plasticity cost), and p_{mig} (migration probability). For each set of conditions, we run 1000 independent simulations (a random landscape for each simulation). The metapopulation dynamics was run for at most 2100 generations and we used the last 100 generations to average over the quantities of interest (e.g., the abundance of each species) in the equilibrium regime. If one of the two species fixed before that upper limit, we halted the dynamics. Otherwise, we considered that coexistence was achieved. However, in the study of the single-species metapopulation dynamics all runs reached the upper limit of 2100 generations.

III. RESULTS

A. Single-species metapopulation dynamics

Since the uncertain heterogeneous environment poses an adaptive challenge to both species through the viability selection sieve, it is instructive to study the metapopulation dynamics separately for each species before considering the competition between them. As before, the initial single-species population was located on a randomly selected patch of the 2-dimensional grid at carrying capacity K_{max} and there was an equilibration period




FIG. 1. Mean patch relative abundance of the nonplastic species $\langle n_1 \rangle$ for the single-species metapopulation dynamics as function of the migration probability p_{mig} for the environmental correlation $\rho = 0, 0.25, 0.5$ and 0.75 , as indicated. The other parameters are $L = 20$, $K_{max} = 100$ and $\sigma_e^2 = 2$. The lines connecting the symbols are guides to the eye. The dashed horizontal line is $\langle n_1 \rangle = 1/a_{21} = 2/3$.

of 2000 generations before the individuals were allowed to migrate to the neighboring patches.

1. Nonplastic species

Let us consider first the dynamics of the nonplastic species 1, which is obtained by setting $b = 0$ in equation (2), $c = 0$ in equation (3), and $N_2 = 0$ in equations (4) and (5). We focus on the mean patch relative abundance of species 1, which we denote by $\langle n_1 \rangle$. For $p_{mig} > 0$, this quantity is measured by averaging over the mean number of individuals of species 1 (just after viability selection) in each patch during the last 100 generations of the 2100 generations runs. The result is then divided by the number of patches (L^2) and by the patch's carrying capacity (K_{max}). The same procedure applies for $p_{mig} = 0$, except that we must omit the division by the number of patches since the population cannot leave the seed patch in this case.

The effects of the migration probability and environmental correlation on the mean patch relative abundance of species 1 are summarized in figure 1. There is a steady decrease of $\langle n_1 \rangle$ with increasing p_{mig} , which is clearly a consequence of the increase of maladapted individuals to their current patches. In fact, an individual stays in the same patch for about $1/p_{mig}$ generations on the average, which may be a too short time to adapt properly to the patch's environment if p_{mig} is not small. This problem is mitigated when the environment is highly correlated, i.e., the environmental values at neighboring patches are likely to be very similar, and disappears altogether for a homogeneous environment ($\rho = 1$). The finding that the nonplastic species reaches only a fraction of the max-

imal patch occupancy is key to explaining coexistence in our model: the dashed horizontal line in figure 1 indicates the population density below which the nonplastic species cannot prevent the invasion of the plastic species, as will be shown in subsection III B 2

In the case the population is confined to the seed patch (i.e., for $p_{mig} = 0$) we find $\langle n_1 \rangle \approx 0.9$. The adaptation is not perfect due to the noise ϵ in equation (2) and to the nonzero genome-wide mutation probability U . (We note that since the genome of species 1 is determined by the $m_r = 20$ nonplastic alleles R_k only, and since each allele has probability $u_r = 5/1000$ of mutating we have $U = 0.1$.) It is instructive to quantify the effect of ϵ on the survival probability of an individual of species 1 carrying the optimal phenotype in the seed patch i . In this case, $Z_i^{opt} = E_i + \epsilon$ and so $W_i^{opt} = e^{-\epsilon^2/2}$. Recalling that $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma_\epsilon)$, the expected survival probability of the optimal phenotype is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(W_i^{opt}) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\epsilon}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_\epsilon^2}} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma_\epsilon^2}\right)\epsilon^2\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \sigma_\epsilon^2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

which yields $\mathbb{E}(W_i^{opt}) \approx 0.95$ for $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = 1/10$.

The probability of metapopulation extinction was essentially zero for species 1, except for large values of the migration probability (i.e., $p_{mig} > 0.35$). For instance, for $p_{mig} = 0.4$ we find that only 8 out of the 1000 runs resulted in extinction for $\rho = 0$, whereas no extinction was observed for $\rho = 0.75$.

2. Plastic species

We turn now to the dynamics of the plastic species 2, which is obtained by setting $b = 1$ in equation (2), and $N_1 = 0$ in equations (4) and (5). The setup is the same as described in the study of the nonplastic species, except that the focus now is on the mean patch relative abundance of species 2, which we denote by $\langle n_2 \rangle$.

Figure 2 shows that the migration probability and the environmental correlation have no effect on the patch relative abundance of the plastic species 2 in the case plasticity is costless ($c = 0$). This unexciting finding is actually important because it validates our modeling of the plastic species. In fact, a plastic species should thrive equally well in all patches (hence the unresponsiveness to changes on p_{mig}), regardless of the environment (hence the unresponsiveness to ρ), as observed in figure 2. In addition, these results already illustrate the fitness advantage of the plastic species 2 over the nonplastic species 1, specially for large migration probability. Here we use the relative abundance of the species after viability selection as a proxy for the fitness of the species. Of course, adaptation of species 2 mainly happens via the contribution of the plastic components P_k to the mean optimum phenotype and this is achieved by setting the nonplastic




FIG. 2. Mean patch relative abundance of the plastic species $\langle n_2 \rangle$ for the single-species metapopulation dynamics as function of the migration probability p_{mig} for the environmental correlation $\rho = 0, 0.25, 0.5$ and 0.75 , as indicated, and plasticity cost $c = 0$. The other parameters are $L = 20$, $K_{max} = 100$ and $\sigma_e^2 = 2$. The lines connecting the symbols are guides to the eye.




FIG. 3. Mean patch relative abundance of the plastic species $\langle n_2 \rangle$ for the single-species metapopulation dynamics as function of the plasticity cost c for the environmental correlation $\rho = 0, 0.25, 0.5$ and 0.75 , as indicated, and migration probability $p_{mig} = 0.3$. The other parameters are $L = 20$, $K_{max} = 100$ and $\sigma_e^2 = 2$. The lines connecting the symbols are guides to the eye.

components R_k as close to zero as possible. We note that for $p_{mig} = 0$, we find $\langle n_2 \rangle \approx 0.87$, which indicates that species 2 is slightly less well adapted to the environment of the seed patch than species 1. The probable reason for this is that the genome-wide mutation probability for species 2 is twice that of species 1.

The invariance of $\langle n_2 \rangle$ to changes in p_{mig} and ρ does not hold when there is a cost to plasticity (i.e., $c > 0$), as shown in figure 3. This is expected because introducing a cost to plasticity makes species 2 less plastic and hence

more similar to species 1. In fact, in order to maximize survival for large c , the allelic values P_k must tend to zero, thus reducing the influence of the penalty term in equation (3). Of course, setting the values of the plastic alleles to zero is equivalent to turning species 2 into a nonplastic species. For $p_{mig} = 0$ and $c > 0$ the optimal phenotype is $R_k = E_i, \forall k$ and $P_k = 0, \forall k$ where i the seed patch. This result can be obtained by the direct maximization of W_i , given in equation (3), with respect to R_k and P_k . For $p_{mig} > 0$, there is a trade-off between R_k and P_k : for small c it is advantageous to explore plasticity (see figures 1 and 2), whereas for large c it is advantageous to turn off the plastic alleles. Although in the latter case species 2 becomes essentially a nonplastic species, we note that $\langle n_2 \rangle$ is slightly below $\langle n_1 \rangle$ because of the practical impossibility to keep P_k close to zero due to the persistent perturbations produced by the mutation process.

We advance that, somewhat surprisingly, the plasticity cost will be crucial to the interpretation of the results of the interspecies competition in our model. In fact, as already mentioned without evidence, if the relative abundance of species 1 in a given patch is less than some threshold value, the resident species cannot prevent the invasion of (and the consequent coexistence with) a competitively inferior species. However, we will show next that control of the fitness of species 2 using the parameter c (see figure 3) indicates that successful invasion requires the invading species to be very well adapted to the patchy environment.

In time, we say that a species is competitively inferior if it cannot invade a resident population of the other species in a single-patch scenario (i.e., for $p_{mig} = 0$). In that sense, competitive superiority or inferiority is completely determined by the competition matrix a introduced in subsection II C. Also, by fitness of a species we mean the relative abundance of the species after viability selection, which is given by averaging the survival probability, equation (3), over individuals, patches, and generations at equilibrium.

B. Two-species metapopulation dynamics

We consider now the general setup where the two species are first let to reach equilibrium independently of each other in the seed patch and then are allowed to compete and migrate to the neighboring patches. We focus on three quantities.

- The fraction of runs Γ for which there is coexistence at generation 2100. This quantity essentially measures the fraction of runs for which species 2 is not extinct, since even for rugged environments and large migration probabilities, species 1 is rarely extinct.
- The mean fraction of patches Π that carry both species for the runs that led to coexistence. For




FIG. 4. Influence of the variance of environmental values σ_e^2 and patch's environmental correlation ρ on species coexistence. **Upper Panel:** Fraction of runs that led to species coexistence. **Lower Panel:** Fraction of patches where there is species coexistence. The parameters are $L = 20$, $K_{max} = 100$, $c = 0$ and $p_{mig} = 0.3$. The lines connecting the symbols are guides to the eye.

each run, an average is calculated over the last 100 generations of the run. This quantity is important because coexistence may take place in only a few patches due perhaps to their extreme environmental values. Clearly, this type of accidental coexistence is not interesting and Π allows us to distinguish it from the relevant case where most of the patches harbor the two species.

- The mean patch relative abundances of species 1 ($\langle n_1 \rangle$) and species 2 ($\langle n_2 \rangle$) for the runs that led to coexistence. The average takes into account all patches, including patches where there is no coexistence. The population sizes are measured just after viability selection during the last 100 generations of the runs, as before.

Figure 4 summarizes the effects of the environment on the probability of coexistence considering the entire

metapopulation, which is measured by Γ (upper panel of figure 4), or individual patches, which is measured by Π (lower panel of figure 4). To a good approximation the effect of the environment is represented by the single variable $\sigma_e^2(1 - \rho)$, which means that ρ can be absorbed in σ_e^2 and we can study the uncorrelated landscape only without loss of generality. In other words, increasing the correlation between patches is equivalent to decreasing the variance of environmental values in an uncorrelated landscape. The important message from figure 4 is that the plastic species 2 is extinct in a quasi-homogeneous or smooth environment (i.e., for $\sigma_e^2(1 - \rho) \approx 0$). We note that in this region there are no data for Π because no run resulted in coexistence.

Interestingly, increase of the environment roughness has only a limited effect on the probability of coexistence Γ , which quickly levels out and remains unaffected by further changes on σ_e^2 (upper panel of figure 4). The probability that a patch exhibits coexistence Π displays a more interesting behavior (lower panel of figure 4). For smooth environments, most patches are occupied by species 1 only, but as the environment roughness increases, those patches begin to harbor both species. The slow decrease of Π we observe for large σ_e^2 is due to the appearance of patches occupied by species 2 only.

Figure 5 shows the environmental effect on the patch relative abundances of both species. For smooth environments, species 2 is present in a few patches only (lower panel of figure 4) and so its relative abundance $\langle n_2 \rangle$ must necessarily be small, even if its density is high in the patches where it is present. In fact, the relative abundances are informative only when $\Pi \approx 1$, in which case they represent the proportions of each species within a patch. The low density of species 1 for rugged environments is an indication that there may be patches occupied by species 2 only, which supports our explanation for the decreasing of Π for increasing σ_e^2 . We recall that robust species coexistence can happen only if the density of species 1 is below the threshold $1/a_{21} = 2/3$, which is indicated by the dashed horizontal line in the upper panel of figure 5. Otherwise, the observed coexistence is accidental, in the sense that species 2 occupies patches characterized by extreme environment values that are not suitable to species 1.

Figure 6 shows the effect of migration on species coexistence for an uncorrelated landscape ($\rho = 0$). Increasing the migration probability p_{mig} has an effect similar to increasing the environment ruggedness. As pointed out in our study of the single-species dynamics, migration affects the adaptation of species 1 only, since an individual of that species does not have enough time to adapt to its environment value, before it is forced to move to another patch. Of course, since the abundance of species 1 affects species 2 in the ecological competition stage, there is a kind of second order effect of migration on species 2, which is observed in the figure.

The parameters σ_e^2 , ρ and p_{mig} influence mainly the adaptation of the nonplastic species 1. The plasticity




FIG. 5. Influence of the variance of environmental values σ_e^2 and patch's environmental correlation ρ on the mean patch relative abundances. **Upper Panel:** Nonplastic species 1. **Lower Panel:** Plastic species 2. The parameters are $L = 20$, $K_{max} = 100$, $c = 0$ and $p_{mig} = 0.3$. The lines connecting the symbols are guides to the eye. The dashed horizontal line is $\langle n_1 \rangle = 1/a_{21} = 2/3$.

cost c , however, affects the plastic species 2 only and figure 7 shows its effect on species coexistence. For the migration probability considered ($p_{mig} = 0.3$), species 1 cannot prevent invasion (and, consequently, coexistence) but species 2 cannot take advantage of that for large c . We note that it is the presence of species 1 that drives species 2 to extinction, since species 2 alone can thrive for large c by turning off the plastic alleles (figure 3). The data missing for $c = 0.4$ is because none of the runs resulted in coexistence.

1. Remarks on the simulation halting time, grid size and carrying capacity

In our study, we assume that a running time of 2000 generations is sufficient to proclaim that the metapopulation dynamics reached equilibrium and hence that co-




FIG. 6. Influence of the migration probability p_{mig} on species coexistence for the uncorrelated environment. **Upper Panel:** Probability of coexistence in the metapopulation Γ and probability of coexistence within a patch II. **Lower Panel:** Mean patch relative abundances of the nonplastic species $\langle n_1 \rangle$ and of the plastic species $\langle n_2 \rangle$. The parameters are $L = 20$, $K_{max} = 100$, $c = 0$, $\sigma_e^2 = 2$ and $\rho = 0$. The lines connecting the symbols are guides to the eye. The dashed horizontal line is $\langle n_1 \rangle = 1/a_{21} = 2/3$.

existence was achieved. Equilibrium population abundances are then evaluated by running the simulations for additional 100 generations when the relevant quantities are stored for averaging purposes. In figure S1 of the Supplementary Material we show the time dependence of the relative abundances of both species for typical runs that led to coexistence. The results support our assumption that a halting time of 2000 generations is adequate to guarantee the equilibration of the metapopulation. Moreover, the dynamics reveals a most interesting feature of our model: the abundance of plastic species 2 increases much faster than its rival's in the initial generations, so species 2 rapidly colonizes almost the entire environment before it is partly or completely displaced by the nonplastic species 1.

In addition, our analysis is restricted to a fixed grid




FIG. 7. Influence of the plasticity cost c on species coexistence for the uncorrelated environment. **Upper Panel:** Probability of coexistence in the metapopulation Γ and probability of coexistence within a patch II. **Lower Panel:** Mean patch relative abundances of the nonplastic species $\langle n_1 \rangle$ and of the plastic species $\langle n_2 \rangle$. The parameters are $L = 20$, $K_{max} = 100$, $p_{mig} = 0.3$, $\sigma_e^2 = 2$ and $\rho = 0$. The lines connecting the symbols are guides to the eye. The dashed horizontal line is $\langle n_1 \rangle = 1/a_{21} = 2/3$.

size of linear length $L = 20$ and patch carrying capacity $K_{max} = 100$, which results in a very large carrying capacity for the metapopulation (viz., $L^2 K_{max} = 40000$). Nevertheless, in the Supplementary Material we present the results for different choices of L and K_{max} . In particular, we show that there is practically no difference between the results for $L = 15$ and $L = 20$ (figures S2 and S3), which indicates that our choice $L = 20$ for the linear dimension of the grid gives a good approximation to the limit of an infinitely large grid. The probability of coexistence in the metapopulation Γ and in a same patch II increase with patch's carrying capacity K_{max} (figure S4), but the mean patch relative abundances of both species rapidly converge to their asymptotic values (figure S5), i.e., the values for $K_{max} \rightarrow \infty$. Since in the case of costless plasticity it is the mean patch rel-

ative abundance of species 1 that determines whether non-accidental coexistence can take place, these findings indicate that our choice of the grid size and patch carrying capacity probably describes very well the behavior of a very large population in a very large grid.

2. Simple argument for coexistence

Although our extensive simulations point rather unequivocally to the possibility of coexistence of the two species in a heterogeneous environment, here we offer analytical evidence for that finding. The aim is not only to dismiss suspicion that the observed coexistence is an artifact of our simulations but to complement the simulation results. Since the species at extinction risk – the plastic species 2 – can thrive very well when alone in the patchy environment, the key to coexistence is the ecological competition stage (subsection II C), so let us look at it more carefully.

First and foremost, we note that equations (4) and (5) are not recursion equations. The quantities N_1 and N_2 that appear in their left-hand sides are the numbers of survivors of each species after viability selection, which we refer to as mothers since the quantities N'_1 and N'_2 are the numbers of offspring they bring forth. But only a fraction of these offspring will become mothers due to the culling effect of viability selection, which is not included in equations (4) and (5).

Let us assume that the metapopulation is at equilibrium (see, e.g., figure S1). The number of mothers of both species N_1^{eq} and N_2^{eq} at a given patch i must satisfy the condition

$$\frac{a_{21}N_1^{eq} + a_{22}N_2^{eq}}{K_{max}} < 1, \quad (7)$$

for the survival of species 2, and the condition

$$\frac{a_{11}N_1^{eq} + a_{12}N_2^{eq}}{K_{max}} < 1, \quad (8)$$

for the survival of species 1. These are necessary conditions for survival of each species as they ensure that the number of offspring will be greater than the number of mothers. (We recall that the number of mothers in a given generation is only a fraction of the number of offspring in the previous generation). Inequality (7) can be rewritten as

$$a_{22}\frac{N_2^{eq}}{K_{max}} < 1 - a_{21}\frac{N_1^{eq}}{K_{max}}, \quad (9)$$

which makes evident the impossibility of an equilibrium scenario where species 2 is present in most patches and $N_1^{eq}/K_{max} > 1/a_{21}$. Hence, increase of the entry a_{21} decreases the chances of survival of species 2 and hence of coexistence. This is the reason we draw a line at $\langle n_1 \rangle = 1/a_{21} = 2/3$ in the graphs for the relative abundance of species 1: the line delimits the regions where

non-accidental coexistence is possible. Note that a similar analysis for inequality (8) indicates that species 1 is extinct if $N_2^{eq}/K_{max} > 1/a_{12} = 2$, a condition that is never satisfied in our simulations since N_2 and N_1 are less than K_{max} by construction. Therefore, non-accidental coexistence is a possible outcome of the metapopulation dynamics, provided species 1 locally maladapted in most patches, which is indeed the case for relatively large migration probabilities and environment variances.

However, the lower panel of figure 7 exhibits a scenario where inequality (7) is satisfied and yet species 2 is extinct. Hence condition (7) is necessary for survival of species 2, but it is not sufficient. In fact, a necessary and sufficient condition is that the production of offspring compensates the population decrease due to viability selection. For instance, assume that the number of offspring is twice the number of mothers, so condition (7) is satisfied, but that viability selection reduces the population to 1/4 of its size. Starting with 100 mothers, we get 200 offspring, then 50 mothers, then 100 offspring, then 25 mothers, and so on until extinction. This is the situation depicted in the lower panel of figure 7 for high plasticity costs. A similar argument can explain the possibility of extinction of species 1 as well, despite the fact that inequality (8) is always satisfied. Unfortunately, we cannot express this necessary and sufficient condition in a simple mathematical formula because it involves the viability selection process and hence information on the individuals' phenotypes. This point highlights that to take advantage of the unfitnes of species 1 in the rugged environment, species 2 must be well-adapted to it, hence the relevance of plasticity in our model.

Finally, we note that increase of the parameter r that governs the growth of both species in equations (4) and (5) can be disastrous to species 2. The reason is that, other things being equal, N_1^{eq} increases with r so that the condition $N_1^{eq}/K_{max} > 1/a_{21}$ that prevents the growth of species 2 can be more easily fulfilled. Of course, the increase in the number of offspring of species 1 resulting from increasing r can be compensated by increasing the environment variance σ_e^2 , which reduces their chances of becoming mothers.

IV. DISCUSSION

Our results challenge predictions from classical ecological theory by showing that a competitively superior species cannot always displace an inferior competitor in absence of niche differentiation and in a standard scenario of density- and frequency-independent viability selection. This conclusion obviously assumes that the ecologically inferior species 2 displays high levels of adaptive phenotypic plasticity (“any plasticity that allows individuals to have higher fitness in the new environment than it would were it not plastic”; Ghalambor et al. [20, p. 396]) and that plasticity can evolve quickly, which means that it harbors abundant genetic variation.

It has been conjectured that greater plasticity is a key mechanism underlying the success of invasive species [5], an idea that has some positive support in plants [13] although there are counterexamples [22]. These inconsistent findings could be explained because adaptive plasticity might be a transient state during the invasion of new environments and thereafter disappear due to selection on the intersection of the reaction norm and eventual reduction of the slope, a process often referred to as “genetic assimilation” [32, 33]. The problem with this scenario is that for genetic assimilation to happen a very long time seems to be required if plasticity costs are low [54]. Whether or not this initial greater plasticity confers higher fitness is more contentious, though Davidson et al. [13] consider that it is plausible.

Perhaps more controversial is the model’s assumption that there is always plenty of genetic variation for plasticity so that populations will be able to adequately track the environment more closely. For instance, there seems to be limited ability for plasticity in thermal tolerance of ectotherms (over 90% of all animals), which should rely on behavioral thermoregulation to avoid overheating risk [25]; see also Arnold et al. [4], Sunday et al. [63]. Although at spatial scales there is ample information on the genetic evolution of latitudinal clines for thermal-related traits (e.g., Castañeda et al. [11], Hoffmann et al. [29], Sgrò et al. [57], Wallace et al. [70]) widely distributed *Drosophila* species do not seem to show higher plasticity for thermal tolerance than those from restricted areas, being their distributions more closely linked to species-specific differences in thermal tolerance limits [43]. However, these conclusions are problematic because they were based on inferences that might grossly underestimate the population consequences of thermal plasticity. Thus, Rezende et al. [47] have uncovered a dramatic effect of thermal acclimation in *Drosophila*, with warm-acclimated flies being able to increase the window for reproduction by nearly one month from mid-spring to early summer when compared with their cold-acclimated counterparts. In summary, answers to the important question of why adaptive plasticity is not more commonly observed should consider the heritability of plasticity (generally lower than trait heritability; Scheiner [50], the interactions among different traits (e.g., temperature-dependent trade-offs between fitness traits; Svensson et al. [64], the reliability of habitat-specific cues [65], and ecological constraints [52, 60, 68].

We have focused in the situation where both species can simultaneously expand their range, which might not be an unrealistic scenario as range expansions have always occurred in the history of most species [16], and we are currently witnessing how species’ range edges are expanding polewards in response to global warming [37]. The important message here is that a successful invading

species does not necessarily need to be ecologically superior to the resident one, it only needs to display some level of not much costly adaptive phenotypic plasticity under environmental conditions that usually vary across space and over time [48, 72]. Since empirical evidence indicates that costs of plasticity are infrequent or small [40], the former conclusion seems to be robust.

Finally, we can only speculate about the empirical relevance of our model. Nevertheless, it might be interesting to comment on Amarasekare’s work on parasitoid coexistence in a spatially structured host–multiparasitoid community [2, 3]. The two parasitoid species she studied show asymmetric competition in the laboratory with one species being potentially capable of displacing the other, but both species can coexist in some metapopulations even though the two parasitoids have overlapping niches and compete for a shared limiting resource. She tested whether coexistence could happen via a trade-off between competitive ability and a higher dispersal of the inferior competitor, which could find patches where the superior competitor was absent. Her data showed that this was not the case, but pointed to local interactions as, e.g., density-dependent processes that could ameliorate antagonistic interactions in her study system. However, she did not estimate whether the fitness of egg parasitoids in the patches was differentially altered in the two species depending on the environmental conditions (e.g., temperature) at which individuals developed [7]. In other words, could phenotypic plasticity have played any role in explaining Amarasekare’s findings? We do not know, but perhaps this is a hypothesis that has some merit.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

J. F. Fontanari was supported in part by Grant No. 2020/03041-3, Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP) and by Grant No. 305620/2021-5, Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq). M. Matos is financed through the cE3c Unit FCT funding project UIDB/BIA/00329/2020. M. Santos is funded by grants PID2021-127107NB-I00 from Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (Spain), 2017SGR 1379 from Generalitat de Catalunya, and the Distinguished Guest Scientists Fellowship Programme of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (<https://mta.hu>). This work benefited from discussions and insightful comments from Erol Akçay, Benjamin M. Bolker, Harold P. de Vladar, and Eörs Szathmáry.

[1] Agrawal, A. A., Laforsch, C., and Tollrian, R. (1999). Transgenerational induction of defences in animals and

plants. *Nature* 401, 60–63

- [2] Amarasekare, P. (2000). Coexistence of competing parasitoids on a patchily distributed host: local vs. spatial mechanisms. *Ecology* 81, 1286–1296
- [3] Amarasekare, P. (2000). Spatial dynamics in a host-multiparasitoid community. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 69, 201–213
- [4] Arnold, P. A., Nicotra, A. B., and Kruuk, L. E. (2019). Sparse evidence for selection on phenotypic plasticity in response to temperature. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., B, Biol. Sci.* 374, 20180185
- [5] Baker, H. G. (1965). Characteristics and modes of origin of weeds. In *The Genetics of Colonizing Species*, eds. G. L. Stebbins and H. G. Baker (New York: Academic Press Inc.). 147–172
- [6] Barabás, G., D’Andrea, R., and Stump, S. M. (2018). Chesson’s coexistence theory. *Ecol. Monogr.* 88, 277–303
- [7] Boivin, G. (2010). Phenotypic plasticity and fitness in egg parasitoids. *Neotrop. Entomol.* 39, 457–463
- [8] Bolnick, D. I., Amarasekare, P., Araújo, M. S., Bürger, R., Levine, J. M., Novak, M., et al. (2011). Why intraspecific trait variation matters in community ecology. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 26, 183–192
- [9] Bradshaw, A. D. (1965). Evolutionary significance of phenotypic plasticity in plants. *Adv. Genet.* 13, 115–155
- [10] Calcagno, V., Mouquet, N., Jarne, P., and David, P. (2006). Coexistence in a metacommunity: the competition-colonization trade-off is not dead. *Ecol. Lett.* 9, 897–907
- [11] Castañeda, L. E., Rezende, E. L., and Santos, M. (2015). Heat tolerance in *Drosophila subobscura* along a latitudinal gradient: contrasting patterns between plastic and genetic responses. *Evolution* 69, 2721–2734
- [12] Christiansen, F. B. (1975). Hard and soft selection in a subdivided population. *Am. Nat.* 109, 11–16
- [13] Davidson, A. M., Jennions, M., and Nicotra, A. B. (2011). Do invasive species show higher phenotypic plasticity than native species and, if so, is it adaptive? a meta-analysis. *Ecol. Lett.* 14, 419–431
- [14] DeWitt, T. J., Sih, A., and Wilson, D. S. (1998). Costs and limits of phenotypic plasticity. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 13, 77–81
- [15] Doebeli, M. (1996). An explicit genetic model for ecological character displacement. *Ecology* 77, 510–520
- [16] Excoffier, L., Foll, M., and Petit, R. J. (2009). Genetic consequences of range expansions. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 40, 481–501
- [17] Fischer, B. B., Kwiatkowski, M., Ackermann, M., Krismer, J., Roffler, S., Suter, M. J. F., et al. (2014). Phenotypic plasticity influences the eco-evolutionary dynamics of a predator-prey system. *Ecology* 95, 3080–3092
- [18] Franco, M. and Silvertown, J. (2004). Comparative demography of plants based upon elasticities of vital rates. *Ecology* 85, 531–538
- [19] Frazier, M. R., Huey, R. B., and Berrigan, D. (2006). Thermodynamics constrains the evolution of insect population growth rates: “warmer is better”. *Am. Nat.* 168, 512–520
- [20] Ghalambor, C. K., McKay, J. K., Carroll, S. P., and Reznick, D. N. (2007). Adaptive versus non-adaptive phenotypic plasticity and the potential for contemporary adaptation in new environments. *Funct. Ecol.* 21, 394–407
- [21] Godfray, H. C. J., Cook, L. M., and Hasell, M. P. (1991). Population dynamics, natural selection and chaos. In *Genes in Ecology*, eds. R. T. Berry, T. J. Crawford, and G. M. Hewitt (Oxford: Blackwell Scientific Publications). 55–86
- [22] Godoy, O., Valladares, F., and Castro-Díez, P. (2011). Multispecies comparison reveals that invasive and native plants differ in their traits but not in their plasticity. *Funct. Ecol.* 25, 1248–1259
- [23] Gómez-Llano, M., Germain, R. M., Kyogoku, D., McPeck, M. A., and Siepielski, A. M. (2021). When ecology fails: how reproductive interactions promote species coexistence. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 36, 610–622
- [24] Gomulkiewicz, R. and Kirkpatrick, M. (1992). Quantitative genetics and the evolution of reaction norms. *Evolution* 46, 390–411
- [25] Gunderson, A. R. and Stillman, J. H. (2015). Plasticity in thermal tolerance has limited potential to buffer ectotherms from global warming. *Proc. R. Soc. B* 282, 20150401
- [26] Hassell, M. P., Miramontes, O., Rohani, P., and May, R. M. (1995). Appropriate formulations for dispersal in spatially structured models: comments on bascompte and solé. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 64, 662–664
- [27] Hastings, A. (1980). Disturbance, coexistence, history, and competition for space. *Theor. Popul. Biol.* 18, 363–373
- [28] Hendry, A. P. (2017). *Eco-evolutionary Dynamics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press)
- [29] Hoffmann, A. A., Anderson, A., and Hallas, R. (2002). Opposing clines for high and low temperature resistance in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Ecol. Lett.* 5, 614–618
- [30] Kawecki, T. J. and Ebert, D. (2004). Conceptual issues in local adaptation. *Ecol. Lett.* 7, 1225–1241
- [31] Kimura, M. (1965). A stochastic model concerning the maintenance of genetic variability in quantitative characters. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 54, 731–736
- [32] Lande, R. (2009). Adaptation to an extraordinary environment by evolution of phenotypic plasticity and genetic assimilation. *J. Evol. Biol.* 22, 1435–1446
- [33] Lande, R. (2015). Evolution of phenotypic plasticity in colonizing species. *Mol. Ecol.* 24, 2038–2045
- [34] Levin, S. A. (1974). Dispersion and population interactions. *Am. Nat.* 108, 207–228
- [35] Levins, R. (1969). Some demographic and genetic consequences of environmental heterogeneity for biological control. *Bull. Entomol. Soc. Am.* 15, 237–240
- [36] MacArthur, R. H. and Levins, R. (1967). The limiting similarity, convergence, and divergence of coexisting species. *Am. Nat.* 101, 377–385
- [37] Mason, S. C., Palmer, G., Fox, R., Gillings, S., Hill, J. K., Thomas, C. D., et al. (2015). Geographical range margins of many taxonomic groups continue to shift polewards. *Biol. J. Linnean Soc.* 115, 586–597
- [38] MATLAB (2020). *version 9.9 (R2020b)* (Natick, Massachusetts: The MathWorks Inc.)
- [39] Miller, M. B. and Bassler, B. L. (2001). Quorum sensing in bacteria. *Annu. Rev. Microbiol.* 55, 165–199
- [40] Murren, C. J., Auld, J. R., Callahan, H., Ghalambor, C. K., Handelsman, C. A., Heskell, M. A., et al. (2015). Constraints on the evolution of phenotypic plasticity: limits and costs of phenotype and plasticity. *Heredity* 115, 293–301
- [41] Muthukrishnan, R., Sullivan, L. L., Shaw, A. K., and Forester, J. D. (2020). Trait plasticity alters the range of possible coexistence conditions in a competition-colonisation trade-off. *Ecol. Lett.* 23, 791–799

- [42] Nee, S. and May, R. M. (1992). Dynamics of metapopulations: habitat destruction and competitive coexistence. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 61, 37–40
- [43] Overgaard, J., Kristensen, T. N., Mitchell, K. A., and Hoffmann, A. A. (2011). Thermal tolerance in widespread and tropical drosophila species: does phenotypic plasticity increase with latitude? *Am. Nat.* 178(S1), S80?S96
- [44] Pásztor, L., Botta-Dukát, Z., Magyar, G., Czárán, T., and Meszéna, G. (2006). *Theory-Based Ecology: A Darwinian approach* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- [45] Pérez-Ramos, I. M., Matías, L., Gómez-Aparicio, L., and Godoy, Ó. (2019). Functional traits and phenotypic plasticity modulate species coexistence across contrasting climatic conditions. *Nat. Commun.* 10, 2555
- [46] Pfennig, D. W. (2021). Key questions about phenotypic plasticity. In *Phenotypic Plasticity and Evolution: Causes, Consequences, Controversies*, ed. D. W. Pfennig (Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press). 55–88
- [47] Rezende, E. L., Bozinovic, F., Szilágyi, A., and Santos, M. (2020). Predicting temperature mortality and selection in natural drosophila populations. *Science* 369, 1242–1245
- [48] Richards, C. L., Bossdorf, O., Muth, N. Z., Gurevitch, J., and Pigliucci, M. (2006). Jack of all trades, master of some? on the role of phenotypic plasticity in plant invasions. *Ecol. Lett.* 9, 981–993
- [49] Ricker, W. E. (1954). Stock and recruitment. *J. Fish. Res. Board Can.* 11, 559–623
- [50] Scheiner, S. M. (1993). Genetics and evolution of phenotypic plasticity. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 24, 35–68
- [51] Scheiner, S. M. (1998). The genetics of phenotypic plasticity. vii. evolution in a spatially-structured environment. *J. Evol. Biol.* 11, 303–320
- [52] Scheiner, S. M. (2013). The genetics of phenotypic plasticity. xii. temporal and spatial heterogeneity. *Ecol. Evol.* 3, 4596–4609
- [53] Scheiner, S. M., Barfield, M., and Holt, R. D. (2020). The genetics of phenotypic plasticity. xvii. response to climate change. *Evol. Appl.* 13, 388–399
- [54] Scheiner, S. M. and Levis, N. A. (2021). The loss of phenotypic plasticity via natural selection: genetic assimilation. In *Phenotypic Plasticity and Evolution: Causes, Consequences, Controversies*, ed. D. W. Pfennig (Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press). 161–181
- [55] Schlichting, C. D. (1986). The evolution of phenotypic plasticity in plants. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 17, 667–693
- [56] Schoener, T. W. and Spiller, D. A. (1987). High population persistence in a system with high turnover. *Nature* 330, 474–477
- [57] Sgrò, C. M., Overgaard, J., Kristensen, T. N., Mitchell, K. A., Cockerell, F. E., and Hoffmann, A. A. (2010). A comprehensive assessment of geographic variation in heat tolerance and hardening capacity in populations of drosophila melanogaster from eastern australia. *J. Evol. Biol.* 23, 2484–2493
- [58] Slatkin, M. (1974). Competition and regional coexistence. *Ecology* 55, 128–134
- [59] Slatkin, M. (1980). Ecological character displacement. *Ecology* 61, 163–177
- [60] Snell-Rood, E. C. and Ehlman, S. M. (2021). Ecology and evolution of plasticity. In *Phenotypic Plasticity and Evolution: Causes, Consequences, Controversies*, ed. D. W. Pfennig (Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press). 139–160
- [61] Sommer, R. J. (2020). Phenotypic plasticity: from theory and genetics to current and future challenges. *Genetics* 215, 1–13
- [62] Start, D. (2020). Phenotypic plasticity and community composition interactively shape trophic interactions. *Oikos* 129, 1163–1173
- [63] Sunday, J. M., Bates, A. E., Kearney, M. R., Colwell, R. K., Dulvy, N. K., Longino, J. T., et al. (2014). Thermal-safety margins and the necessity of thermoregulatory behavior across latitude and elevation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 111, 5610–5615
- [64] Svensson, E. I., Gomez-Llano, M., and Waller, J. T. (2020). Selection on phenotypic plasticity favors thermal canalization. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 117, 29767–29774
- [65] Tufto, J. (2000). The evolution of plasticity and nonplastic spatial and temporal adaptations in the presence of imperfect environmental cues. *Am. Nat.* 156, 121–130
- [66] Turcotte, M. M. and Levine, J. M. (2016). Phenotypic plasticity and species coexistence. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 31, 803–813
- [67] Uller, T. (2008). Developmental plasticity and the evolution of parental effects. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 23, 432–438
- [68] Valladares, F., Gianoli, E., and Gómez, J. M. (2007). Ecological limits to plant phenotypic plasticity. *New Phytol.* 176, 749–763
- [69] Via, S. and Lande, R. (1985). Genotype-environment interaction and the evolution of phenotypic plasticity. *Evolution* 39, 505–522
- [70] Wallace, G. T., Kim, T. L., and Neufeld, C. J. (2014). Interpopulational variation in the cold tolerance of a broadly distributed marine copepod. *Conserv. Physiol.* 2, cou041
- [71] Wasserman, L. (2004). *All of Statistics: A Concise Course in Statistical Inference* (New York: Springer)
- [72] Yeh, P. J. and Price, T. D. (2004). Adaptive phenotypic plasticity and the successful colonization of a novel environment. *Am. Nat.* 164, 531–542

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

S1. SNAPSHOT OF THE DYNAMICS

Our study focused only on the equilibrium properties of the metapopulation (e.g., species abundances and fraction of patches harboring the two species), which we measured in the generation window $t \in [2000, 2100]$. Here we offer a brief appraisal of the metapopulation dynamics. Figure S1 shows the relative species abundances for typical runs that led to species coexistence. The run for $p_{mig} = 0.1$ shows an instance of accidental coexistence (species 2 is still present in the metapopulation up to $t = 10^5$), whereas the run for $p_{mig} = 0.3$ illustrates an instance of robust coexistence. It is clear that in both runs, but more conspicuously in the run that led to non-accidental coexistence, the 2000 generations upper limit offers a reliable guarantee that the dynamics is in the equilibrium regime.

We recall that the relative abundance of, say, species 1 is obtained by adding the number of individuals of species 1 in each patch and then dividing the result by K_{max} and L^2 . This is the reason that the relative abundances at generation $t = 0$ are very small (viz., $\langle n_1 \rangle = \langle n_2 \rangle = 1/2L^2$) and that a large relative abundance means that the species is spread all over the L^2 patches. Hence, figure S1 shows that the plastic species 2 rapidly colonizes almost the entire environment before it is completely or partially displaced by the nonplastic species 1. Interestingly, the actual competition scenario in our model is that where the nonplastic species 1 invades a resident population of plastic species 2.




FIG. S1. Time evolution of the relative abundances of the nonplastic $\langle n_1 \rangle$ and plastic $\langle n_2 \rangle$ species for a single run that led to coexistence. **Left Panel:** $p_{mig} = 0.1$. **Right Panel:** $p_{mig} = 0.3$. The parameters are $L = 20$, $K_{max} = 100$, $c = 0$, $\sigma_e^2 = 2$ and $\rho = 0$. The dashed horizontal line is $\langle n_1 \rangle = 1/a_{21} = 2/3$.

S2. EFFECT OF THE GRID SIZE

Figures S2 and S3 show that the grid size has practically no influence on the two-species metapopulation dynamics, except for very small L . Hence the linear grid size $L = 20$ used throughout the paper gives a good approximation to the limit of an infinitely large grid.

We recall that the coexistence observed for p_{mig} such that $\langle n_1 \rangle > 1/a_{21} = 2/3$ is due to the existence of patches with extreme environment values that cannot be colonized by the nonplastic species 1. We refer to it as accidental coexistence. The odds that these extreme values appear increase with the number of patches, which explains the dependence on L of the probability Γ of finding the two species in the metapopulation at equilibrium for small p_{mig} (left panel of figure S2). In this line, we find that decreasing L with fixed σ_e^2 is equivalent to decreasing σ_e^2 with L fixed. More pointedly, we find that Γ is a function of the parameters combination $\sigma_e^2 L^{0.8}$ (data not shown). Now, given that accidental coexistence happens, i.e., that species 2 occupies an extreme patch, it will continuously send doomed migrants to that patch's neighbors which will count to the fraction of patches harboring the two species. If the total number of patches is small, the extreme patch and its neighbors can make a substantial contribution to Π , as observed in the right panel of figure S2.




FIG. S2. Influence of the migration probability on species coexistence for grids of linear size $L = 5, 10, 15$ and 20 , as indicated. **Left Panel:** Fraction of runs that led to species coexistence. **Right Panel:** Fraction of patches where there is species coexistence. The parameters are $K_{max} = 100$, $c = 0$, $\sigma_e^2 = 2$ and $\rho = 0$. The lines connecting the symbols are guides to the eye.




FIG. S3. Influence of the migration probability on the mean patch relative abundances for grids of linear size $L = 5, 10, 15$ and 20 , as indicated. **Left Panel:** Nonplastic species 1. **Right Panel:** Plastic species 2. The parameters are $K_{max} = 100$, $c = 0$, $\sigma_e^2 = 2$ and $\rho = 0$. The lines connecting the symbols are guides to the eye. The dashed horizontal line is $\langle n_1 \rangle = 1/a_{21} = 2/3$.

S3. EFFECT OF THE PATCH'S CARRYING CAPACITY

Figures S4 and S3 show that the patch's carrying capacity K_{max} has a significant influence on the probability of coexistence but not on the mean patch relative abundances of the two species, given coexistence.

As before, the explanation of the effect of K_{max} on Γ and Π has to do with the existence of patches with extreme environment values that cannot be colonized by the nonplastic species 1. For $L = 20$ it is almost certain that those patches exist in all runs. (We recall that we generate a new environment for each run.) The key point is that species 2 can be extinct before reaching those safe heavens, but the odds that this happens decreases with increasing K_{max} : the more individuals of species 2, the greater the odds that some of them will reach the extreme patches. In this sense, we expect that $\Gamma \rightarrow 1$ as $K_{max} \rightarrow \infty$ for $p_{mig} > 0$. Regarding the increase of Π with increasing K_{max} , it can be explained by the large number of doomed migrants (approximately $p_{mig}K_{max}$) that are continuously sent to the neighborhood of the extreme patches and that are likely to reach way beyond their nearest neighbors simply because of their numerosity.

In fact, the right panel of figure S5 confirms that, although certain, the coexistence observed in the region for which $\langle n_1 \rangle > 1/a_{21} = 2/3$ is largely irrelevant since $\langle n_2 \rangle \approx 0$ implies that species 2 is present in only a few patches. The




FIG. S4. Influence of the migration probability on species coexistence for patch's carrying capacity $K_{\text{max}} = 100, 200, 300$ and 400 , as indicated. **Left Panel:** Fraction of runs that led to species coexistence. **Right Panel:** Fraction of patches where there is species coexistence. The parameters are $L = 20$, $c = 0$, $\sigma_e^2 = 2$ and $\rho = 0$. The lines connecting the symbols are guides to the eye.




FIG. S5. Influence of the migration probability on the mean patch relative abundances for patch's carrying capacity $K_{\text{max}} = 100, 200, 300$ and 400 , as indicated. **Left Panel:** Nonplastic species 1. **Right Panel:** Plastic species 2. The parameters are $L = 20$, $c = 0$, $\sigma_e^2 = 2$ and $\rho = 0$. The lines connecting the symbols are guides to the eye. The dashed horizontal line is $\langle n_1 \rangle = 1/a_{21} = 2/3$.

rapid convergence to the asymptotic relative abundances values with increasing K_{max} indicates that the results for $K_{\text{max}} = 100$ already offer a good approximation to the infinite population size limit.