**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2020

Intraspecific mating system evolution and its effect on complex male secondary sexual traits: Does male–male competition increase selection on size or shape?

Baur, Julian ; Roy, Jeannine ; Schäfer, Martin A ; Puniamoorthy, Nalini ; Blanckenhorn, Wolf U ; Rohner, Patrick T

Abstract: Sexual selection is generally held responsible for the exceptional diversity in secondary sexual traits in animals. Mating system evolution is therefore expected to profoundly affect the covariation between secondary sexual traits and mating success. Whereas there is such evidence at the interspecific level, data within species remain scarce. We here investigate sexual selection acting on the exaggerated male fore femur and the male wing in the common and widespread dung flies *Sepsis punctum* and *S. neocynipsea* (Diptera: Sepsidae). Both species exhibit intraspecific differences in mating systems and variation in sexual size dimorphism (SSD) across continents that correlates with the extent of male–male competition. We predicted that populations subject to increased male–male competition will experience stronger directional selection on the sexually dimorphic male foreleg. Our results suggest that fore femur size, width and shape were indeed positively associated with mating success in populations with male-biased SSD in both species, which was not evident in conspecific populations with female-biased SSD. However, this was also the case for wing size and shape, a trait often assumed to be primarily under natural selection. After correcting for selection on overall body size by accounting for allometric scaling, we found little evidence for independent selection on any of these size or shape traits in legs or wings, irrespective of the mating system. Sexual dimorphism and (foreleg) trait exaggeration is therefore unlikely to be driven by direct precopulatory sexual selection, but more so by selection on overall size or possibly selection on allometric scaling.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.13565>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-184760>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

Originally published at:

Baur, Julian; Roy, Jeannine; Schäfer, Martin A; Puniamoorthy, Nalini; Blanckenhorn, Wolf U; Rohner, Patrick T (2020). Intraspecific mating system evolution and its effect on complex male secondary sexual traits: Does male–male competition increase selection on size or shape? *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 33(3):297-308.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.13565>

**Intraspecific mating system evolution and its effect on complex male
secondary sexual traits: Does male-male competition increase selection on
size or shape?**

**Julian Baur^{1,2} | Jeannine Roy¹ | Martin A. Schäfer¹ | Nalini Puniamoorthy³ | Wolf U.
Blanckenhorn¹ | Patrick T. Rohner^{1,4}**

¹Department of Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies, University of Zurich, Zürich, Switzerland

²Uppsala Universitet, Institute for Ecology and Genetics; Animal Ecology, Uppsala, Sweden

³Department of Biological Science, National University of Singapore, Singapore City, Singapore

⁴Department of Biology, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA

J Evol Biol. 2020;33:297–308. DOI: [10.1111/jeb.13565](https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.13565)

Abstract (249 words)

Sexual selection is generally held responsible for the exceptional diversity in secondary sexual traits in animals. Mating system evolution is therefore expected to profoundly affect the covariation between secondary sexual traits and mating success. While there is such evidence at the interspecific level, data within species remain scarce. We here investigate sexual selection acting on the exaggerated male fore femur and the male wing in the common and widespread dung flies *Sepsis punctum* and *S. neocynipsea* (Diptera: Sepsidae). Both species exhibit intraspecific differences in mating systems and variation in sexual size dimorphism (SSD) across continents that correlates with the extent of male-male competition. We predicted that populations subject to increased male-male competition will experience stronger directional selection on the sexually dimorphic male foreleg. Our results suggest that fore femur size, width and shape were indeed positively associated with mating success in populations with male-biased SSD in both species, which was not evident in conspecific populations with female-biased SSD. However, this was also the case for wing size and shape, a trait often assumed to be primarily under natural selection. After correcting for selection on overall body size by accounting for allometric scaling, we found little evidence for independent selection on any of these size or shape traits in legs or wings, irrespective of the mating system. Sexual dimorphism and (foreleg) trait exaggeration is therefore unlikely to be driven by direct precopulatory sexual selection, but more so by selection on overall size or possibly selection on allometric scaling.

Keywords: allometric scaling, body shape, body size, mating system, morphometrics, secondary sexual traits, sexual selection

Introduction

Sexually dimorphic trait expression, be it in physiology, morphology or behaviour, represents a hallmark of gonochoristic species and therefore contributes greatly to the phenotypic diversity across the tree of life. Although sexual dimorphism can be driven by niche differentiation between sexes via ecological character displacement (Temeles et al., 2000; Shine, 1989; Hedrick & Temeles, 1989), its evolution has classically been attributed mostly to variation in the intensity of sexual selection acting on males and females (Fairbairn et al., 2007; Darwin, 1872; Andersson, 1994). Correspondingly, mating system evolution is often identified as a major covariate of sexual dimorphism (Székely et al., 2000; Weckerly, 1998; Shine & Fitzgerald, 1995; Webster, 1992).

However, it is now clear that the expression of sexual traits is shaped by more than sex-specific patterns of sexual selection. General life history, behaviour and ecology can all interact with, bias or modulate the evolution of sexual traits (Gomez & Perfectti, 2010; Blanckenhorn, 2005; Emlen, 2001, 2006; McCullough et al., 2014). In addition, variation in the underlying genetic and developmental mechanisms, as well as the dependence on environmental variation, can give rise to sex-specific trait expression (Chenoweth et al., 2008; Lande, 1980; Badyaev, 2002) to further influence the establishment of sexual dimorphisms (Allen et al., 2015; Bonduriansky, 2007a; Zinna et al., 2018; Rohner & Blanckenhorn, 2018; Ledon-Rettig & Moczek, 2016). Hence, while sexual selection is often responsible for the establishment of sexual dimorphisms, it does so in interaction with other evolutionary forces and hence necessitates studying the mechanism in action in detail. This particularly applies to traits that act as armaments and/or ornaments. Such traits are frequently structurally and developmentally complex, and due to their intrinsically high dimensionality give rise to multivariate fitness landscapes. Examples include the chemical bouquets used in mate attraction (Chenoweth & Blows, 2005), acoustic signalling (Bentsen et al., 2006), elaborate

visual displays used in courtship (Katayama et al., 2014), or the evolution of elaborate sexual morphology of primary (Arnqvist, 1998; Simmons et al., 2009) and secondary sexual traits (O'Brien et al., 2017; Emlen et al., 2005).

Another common and frequently highlighted feature of secondary sexual trait expression is its dependence on overall size. Allometric scaling is the norm rather than the exception in general, but exaggerated structures are often considered to show particularly steep allometric slopes. While this is sometimes seen as evidence for sexual selection acting on a trait, this is not necessarily expected (Eberhard et al., 2018; Cotton et al., 2004; Bonduriansky, 2007b; Fairbairn, 2005). Nevertheless, selection on size is very common in the animal kingdom (Blanckenhorn, 2000), and therefore variation in overall body size can confound selection on specific body parts, making it important to account for body size variation when investigating the selective forces driving secondary sexual morphology.

To better understand and characterize the role of sexual selection and allometry in the diversification of complex morphological traits, we here investigate the covariation between mating success and morphology in two male traits in sepsid flies (Diptera: Sepsidae): the sexually dimorphic and exaggerated fore femur as well as the unexaggerated wing. Several comparative studies document that even closely related species of sepsids can differ substantially in sexual morphology (e.g. abdominal sternite brushes, pronounced fore leg modifications: Eberhard, 2001a,b, 2005) and mating behaviour (Puniamoorthy et al., 2008; Puniamoorthy, 2014). Such differentiation is however not limited to the species level but can also be found within species (Baur et al. 2019). Populations of some widespread species exhibit clear differences in mating systems. For instance, in the Holarctic *Sepsis punctum*, European populations are characterized by strong male-male competition with male-biased sexual size dimorphism (SSD) and the absence of precopulatory behavioural displays. In

contrast, North American conspecifics exhibit female-biased SSD, and males perform elaborate copulatory courtship in order to secure copulations with choosier females (Dmitriew & Blanckenhorn, 2012, 2014; Puniamoorthy et al., 2012a,b; Schulz, 1999). A similar but geographically reversed situation is evident in the closely related *Sepsis neocynipsea*. In this species, North American populations exhibit male-biased SSD, male-male competition for access to females, and consequently experience stronger selection on male body size, whilst European populations of the same species show female-biased SSD and weaker selection on male size (Rohner et al., 2016, 2018). Because female-biased SSD is the ancestral state in the genus *Sepsis* (as in insects in general: Blanckenhorn et al., 2007), male-biased SSD evolved rather recently and independently in *S. punctum* and *S. neocynipsea* (Rohner et al., 2016). The cross-continental populations of either species are able to mate under laboratory conditions, produce viable offspring and genetically cluster as the same species based on mitochondrial barcodes.

As is typical for the genus *Sepsis*, males of both species have pronounced modifications of the fore femur (Fig. 1). Since males use their femur to hold on to the female's wing base during copulation, these structures appear crucial for mating (Blanckenhorn et al., 2004; Ang et al., 2008; Puniamoorthy et al., 2008, 2009; Eberhard, 2013). Their precise function, however, remains unclear beyond the femur and tibia not merely forming a simple lock-and-key mechanism around the wing base (Eberhard, 2001a, 2005). Previous studies suggest that the replicated mating system shifts in sepsids (including continental variation in *S. punctum* and *S. neocynipsea*) coincide with an increase in the relative size and sex-specific condition dependence of the fore femur, which are presumably simultaneously driven by strong directional sexual selection on fore femur length and its relative width (Rohner & Blanckenhorn, 2018). Wings, on the other hand, are typically primarily under stabilizing

ecological selection (Gilchrist et al., 2000; Dudley, 2002), and are not involved in sexual courtship in *S. punctum* and *S. neocynipsea*.

Although a number of comparative studies have explored how mating system evolution influences (complex) morphological traits (Bro-Jorgensen, 2007; Simmons & Tomkins, 1996), few studies investigate this intraspecifically (e.g. Shine & Fitzgerald, 1995). Studying the function of complex morphological traits in cross-continental populations of both *S. punctum* and *S. neocynipsea* hence offers a unique opportunity to investigate how the evolution of increased male-male competition influences the role of male secondary sexual morphology for male mating success. Based on increased condition dependence and stronger sexual dimorphism in populations with male-biased SSD, we expected fore femur size and shape to be subject to directional precopulatory sexual selection, the intensity of which should be greater in populations with male-biased SSD. In contrast, we expected little sexual selection on wing size and shape, as wings are primarily thought to be under natural selection in these species. Because both structures show allometric scaling and size is known to covary with reproductive success, we additionally test for the effect of static allometry on selection on trait size and shape.

Materials & Methods

Mating trials

We here revisit two studies of *S. punctum* by Puniamoorthy et al. (2012b) and *S. neocynipsea* by Rohner et al. (2016). Both studies investigated sexual selection on male body size in multiple North American and European populations in the laboratory. In both studies, test animals were acquired by rearing the offspring of multiple laboratory iso-female lines per population under variable food quantities, resulting in extensive adult size variation. Immediately upon eclosion, males and females were separated and kept in single-sex

containers for 4-5 days. To assess selection on male morphology, mating trials were conducted in groups of different operational sex ratios (OSR) in 1L plastic containers equipped with water, sugar and cow dung *ad libitum*. These competitive mating experiments were conducted across multiple European and North American populations of both species (for details, see Puniamoorthy et al., 2012b and Rohner et al., 2016, Table 1). Copulating pairs were removed from the arena, and depending on the number of copulations per replicate, mating trials were terminated after 2 to 4 hours. All mated and unmated individuals were subsequently frozen and stored in 70% EtOH until recently dissected for morphometric analysis. While the two original studies included three OSR treatments (OSR1: 5 males vs. 5 females, OSR2: 10 male vs. 5 females, OSR4: 20 males vs. 5 females), we here restricted our analysis to the 2:1 and 4:1 sex ratios because neither study found significant selection under the most unnatural OSR1 condition (Kraushaar & Blanckenhorn, 2002, Blanckenhorn et al., 2004), rendering this treatment uninformative in the context here.

Morphometric measurements

Male forelegs and wings were removed from the adult thorax and dried at room temperature to allow evaporation of the ethanol. They were then embedded in Euparal (Carl Roth GmbH, Karlsruhe, Germany) on a glass slide. Slides were placed on a 35°C heating plate for five minutes to liquefy the Euparal resin and subsequently dried at room temperature. Wings and legs were photographed using a LeicaDFC490 camera mounted on a Leica MZ12 microscope and tpsDig2 (Rohlf, 2009) was used to acquire landmark coordinates.

In both species, 16 homologous landmarks were chosen to describe wing morphology, marking vein-node positions covering the wing base and the blade following previously published methods (Puniamoorthy, 2014) (Fig. 1). Because fore femur morphology differs strongly between *S. punctum* and *S. neocynipsea* (Fig. 1), we could not use the same

landmarks in both species. Note that while this hampers species comparison, it still permits assessing (intercontinental) intraspecific variation, as landmarks are homologous among populations within species. For *S. neocynipsea*, we used 7 landmarks to describe shape variation of the male fore femur, marking distinct features. In addition, three sliding semi-landmarks were placed between landmarks 1 and 2 and between landmarks 6 and 7 to measure the curvature of the leg between the fixed landmarks (Fig. 1). In *S. punctum*, we used 8 full landmarks and 8 semi landmarks. Individuals that had damaged appendages and/or missing wing veins were removed from the analyses. We performed a separate Procrustes transformation for each species and trait, and calculated fore femur and wing centroid size as an estimate of the overall structural size.

Sexual selection on trait size

To test whether hind tibia length (a proxy for body size; cf. Rohner & Blanckenhorn 2018), wing centroid size, fore femur size and fore femur width are subject to precopulatory sexual selection, we followed standard logistic regression approaches following Janzen & Stern (1998). We first z-scored all trait values by subtracting the replicate mean from each individual's trait value and dividing this centred score by the corresponding standard deviation ($z_i = (x_i - \bar{x}_i)/SD_x$). A binomial generalized mixed model with mating success (0 or 1) as dependent variable was then performed to test for the overall effect of standardized selection on trait size and for differences in selection strength between continents and OSRs. To accommodate the experimental setting, replicate mating trials nested within populations were entered as random effect. Standardized univariate selection gradients (β_1) were calculated by multiplying the coefficients of the binomial mixed model α by the constant $\overline{W_i(1 - W_i)}/\overline{W_i}$, where W_i indicates the absolute fitness value for each individual (Janzen & Stern, 1998). Because the traits investigated here are strongly correlated, it is difficult to distinguish between direct selection on trait size and indirect selection via selection on overall

size. We therefore accounted for selection on overall size by calculating bivariate selection estimates (β_2), using standardized hind tibia length (HTL) as covariate and again testing for an effect of trait size on fitness. This procedure produced one bivariate selection coefficient for the corresponding trait of interest (β_2) plus one for hind tibia length (β_{2HTL}).

Sexual selection on shape

To test for sexual selection on shape of the fore femur and wings, we used a pooled within-group two-block Partial Least Squares analysis (PLS). Two-block PLS quantifies the association between two data matrices and can therefore be used to quantify the covariation between phenotypes (first block) and fitness (second block), rendering a scaled version of the selection gradient (Klingenberg & Monteiro, 2005; Rohlf & Corti, 2000). For each species, continent and OSR, we tested for a relationship between Procrustes-transformed coordinates and reproductive success. Due to our hierarchical experimental design, individuals within a mating container represent the unit of observation and hence the appropriate level of analysis. We therefore used a pooled within-group PLS. We first calculated the deviation of each individual to its group (= mating container) mean shape, using these in one block and mating success (0 or 1) in the other block. This procedure removes variation in shape due to genetic population differentiation as well as random variation in male morphology between mating containers. The direction of the first PLS vector then represents the direction of selection within mating containers irrespective of population. Significance of selection was tested by means of randomization (10000 random samples). As a quantitative measure of the shape difference associated to reproductive success, we computed the Procrustes distance between the mean shape of all individuals (mean phenotype before selection) and the mean shape of all successful males (mean phenotype after selection). In addition, we calculated selection differential (S) following Klingenberg & Monteiro (2005). We first calculated a score of predicted fitness by multiplying an individual's shape by the selection gradient (i.e. the vector

of multiple regression coefficients of fitness on shape). Regressing shape onto this score using a multivariate regression then results in a scaled version of the selection differential. Dividing this vector by the variance of the expected fitness results in the unscaled selection differential (S) that has the same direction as the PLS vectors but has an appropriate magnitude.

To test to which extent the combined effects of sexual selection on overall size and allometric scaling of shape influence selection on shape, we assessed the similarity between the selection vectors and the effect of allometry. To this end, we used multivariate regression of shape against body size and extracted the vector of allometric shape change (A). To quantify the similarity between allometry and selection, we computed the vector correlation between A and S as

$$r_{S,A} = \frac{|S \cdot A|}{\|S\| \times \|A\|}.$$

That is, we scaled the dot product of A and S by their norm (cf. Claude, 2008; Schäfer et al., 2018; Pitchers et al., 2013).

To test for selection on non-allometric shape effects (i.e. to correct for selection that is merely due to selection on overall size), we again used a PLS as above, now using the residuals of a multivariate regression of shape on trait size as shape variables.

Results

Sexual selection on absolute and relative femur and wing size

Univariate sexual selection gradients (β_1) were generally positive across species, continents and traits except for European *S. neocynipsea* (Table 2), indicating that large males generally have an advantage in precopulatory sexual selection, in line with findings from the earlier studies. In *S. punctum*, the intensity of sexual selection on hind tibia length, femur size and

wing size was stronger in the (European) populations with male-biased SSD (continent $\times$ trait interaction: femur: $X^2_1 = 5.49$, $P = 0.019$; wing: $X^2_1 = 5.74$, $P = 0.017$, hind tibia length: $X^2_1 = 10.33$, $P = 0.001$). This was also the case in (North American) *S. neocynipsea* for wing size (continent $\times$ trait interaction: $X^2_1 = 4.19$, $P = 0.041$), while fore femur size showed a marginally non-significant interaction ($X^2_1 = 3.57$, $P = 0.059$), and selection on hind tibia length did not vary across continents ($X^2_1 = 1.43$, $P = 0.232$). However, in contrast to the two previous studies, the trait $\times$ OSR $\times$ continent-interactions were all non-significant. This difference is likely caused by neglecting mating trials with equal sex ratios (OSR1) in this study, leading to less overall variation and diminishing power to detect an interaction, but the effect of OSR was also not of focal interest here.

When controlling for selection on overall body size by adding standardized HTL as covariate, we very often found the bivariate selection gradient opposing the corresponding effect of body size ($\beta_{2\text{HTL}}$). However, due to the strong correlation among explanatory variables (average correlation $r = 0.91$), these results must be interpreted with caution. Strong covariance among predictor variables is known to be problematic, such that the resulting partial selection coefficients are difficult to interpret (Lande & Arnold, 1983, Mitchellolds & Shaw, 1987). As an alternative approach, we computed residual trait size from a regression of log trait size on log HTL for each population and used a binomial generalized mixed model with residual trait size, continent, OSR plus any appropriate interactions to test for selection on relative trait size. As the trait and continent $\times$ trait terms in this analysis were all statistically unrelated to mating success (see Table S1a-c), we conclude that precopulatory sexual selection acts mostly indirectly via body size and not directly on relative trait size (Lynch & Walsh, 1998).

Sexual selection on femur and wing shape

Selection on femur morphology was only significant in populations with male-biased SSD (Table 3). However, fore femur morphology also showed allometric variation (all $P < 0.001$) that closely aligned with the selection vector in populations where selection on shape was significant (see Fig.2). This association was so strong that after correcting shape for allometric scaling there was no evidence for a statistical association between residual shape and mating success throughout (irrespective of species, SSD or OSR).

Similar to fore femur morphology, wing shape co-varied significantly with mating success in populations of both species with male-biased SSD (Fig. 3; Table 4). This association was, however, again mainly due to allometric variation (with the exception of North American *S. neocynipsea* showing a significant association at OSR4).

Discussion

Conspicuous exaggerated male secondary sexual traits are regularly *per se* considered to be subject to directional sexual selection, and often this is indeed supported by experimental evidence. However, the evolution of sexually dimorphic trait expression can be influenced by a plethora of ultimate as well as proximate mechanisms, requiring detailed assessment of the evolutionary role of any given trait. Comparing two species that display intraspecific, continental variation in mating systems, we predicted the evolution of increased male-male competition for access to females in populations with male-biased SSD to have profound effects on directional selection on male secondary morphology. Fore femur size, width and shape were indeed associated with mating success in populations with male-biased SSD in both species, but not consistently so in conspecific populations with female-biased SSD. Surprisingly, however, this was also the case for wing size and shape, a trait assumed to be primarily under natural selection (e.g. in drosophilids: Gilchrist et al., 2000). Yet, after

accounting for allometric scaling, we found little evidence for direct precopulatory sexual selection on fore femur (or wing) morphology beyond the documented selection on overall body size (Puniamoorthy et al., 2012b; Rohner et al., 2016; this study). This suggests that selection acts mainly on size and not directly on the relative size of secondary sexual traits. However, size and shape are often evolutionarily entwined (Gould, 1966; Huxley, 1932; Thompson, 1917). We in turn discuss the function and adaptive value of body size and allometric scaling of secondary sexual traits in the evolution of mating systems.

The evolutionary benefits of being large are manifold (Blanckenhorn, 2000), and sexual or fecundity selection for large size is arguably common in both males and females (Kingsolver & Pfennig, 2004; Honek, 1993; Fairbairn et al., 2007; Andersson, 1994). However, apart from ecological selection (e.g. via predation, parasitism, or foraging success), the advantage of being large must depend on the mating system, and critically so also on the (relative) size of the opposite sex. This is because the larger sex is likely able to effect greater control over copulation and reproduction. For instance, species that exhibit female choice or scramble competition tend to display female-biased SSD, whereas species with larger males demonstrate male-male competition and resource defence polygyny, and males are frequently able to coerce copulations (Blanckenhorn, 2005; Andersson, 1994). That is, the advantage of being a large male should be greater in species where males are larger than females (Ding & Blanckenhorn, 2002). Accordingly, we here found larger males to have higher mating success in populations that display male-biased SSD (the derived character state) relative to the ancestral, female-biased populations. In these populations, the strength of selection further increases with the operational sex ratio. The variation in strength and direction of sexual selection on overall body size shown here and in the two previous studies therefore follows theoretical expectations (Andersson, 1994).

In contrast, we did not find any congruent patterns for relative trait size. Secondary sexual traits are expected to strongly covary with an individual's reproductive success (Cotton et al., 2004), and investment in relative size, complexity or elaborateness is expected to be subject to sexual selection. However, because large individuals almost always have larger secondary sexual traits, it is not always clear whether selection acts directly on trait size or indirectly via selection on overall body size, strength or stature (Gould, 1974; Eberhard et al., 2018). This is not merely a statistical problem, but might underlie biological function. If selection acts on trait size, individuals must be able to wield a large weapon or to carry larger, more elaborate ornaments (Tomkins et al., 2005), so trait exaggeration requires a certain stature. Similarly, for selection to act on overall body size, conspecifics must somehow be able to sense and assess the size of a competitor or a potential mate (Charlton & Reby, 2016). Secondary sexual traits may therefore also act in communicating body size. However, due to sensory biases innate to most stimuli (Weber-Fechner law: Cohen, 1984), it has been argued that an absolute increase in trait size is more difficult to sense in large individuals compared to a smaller conspecific. For structures to be perceived as relatively larger, large males need a disproportionately large structure in order to make sure a similarly sized male recognizes him as larger, hence superior and not worth fighting with. This should particularly be the case in species where males engage in time consuming or energetically costly combat, and/or where ritualized contest replaces actual aggressive and potentially harmful behaviour (Emlen & Nijhout, 2000).

The absence of selection on relative trait size in the sepsids studied here might thus reflect selection on an indicator trait that is directly coupled to overall body size (Wallace, 1987; Emlen & Nijhout, 2000). In North American *S. neocynipsea* and European *S. punctum* (populations of the respective species with male-biased SSD) males engage in aggressive interactions, including displacements of competing males already mounted on a female by

grabbing their competitor with their forelegs. As such, the male foreleg is a trait used in inter- as well as intrasexual contact behaviour that could therefore signal male size, stature, or overall quality. Moreover, given the typically nonlinear, sigmoidal allometry of coloration of the male fore femur (demonstrated in *S. thoracica* by Busso & Blanckenhorn, 2018), but more subtly present in most *Sepsis* species; *unpublished*), which is also subject to sexual selection (Busso & Blanckenhorn, 2018), one could speculate that this structure broadcasts an individuals' size and strength (similar to e.g. vocal signalling in mammals: Charlton & Reby, 2016). The increased allometry of fore femur size in populations with male-biased SSD (Rohner & Blanckenhorn, 2018) also fits the expectations of a trait used in threat signalling (Eberhard et al., 2018). Therefore, although we did not find current directional selection on fore femur morphology after controlling for the effect of allometry in our laboratory setting, we cannot exclude that this structure plays a role in selection on overall size, either visually via the coloration patterns, or via tactile stimulation when interacting with a female or a rival male. The detailed function, and in particular the role in postcopulatory selection, however awaits further scrutiny.

Wings are important for dispersal, and are thus usually thought to be subject to viability (natural) selection via flight performance, and such selection is not necessarily expected to differ between the sexes (Stevens et al., 2010; Roff & Fairbairn, 1991; Hochkirch & Damerau, 2009; Hill et al., 1999, 2011; Harrison, 1980). However, in various flying organisms, wings and flight ability also play a role in finding mates and reproduction (e.g. (Siva-Jothy, 1999; Hoikkala et al., 1998; Møller et al., 1998). Wings could also play a role in male aggression and courtship in some sepsid species (Puniamoorthy et al., 2009; Eberhard, 2002; Araujo et al., 2014), but there is no obvious wing signalling in the species studied here. Although known to play a pronounced role in mating behaviour in other Diptera (e.g. various *Drosophilidae* or *Tephritidae*), we did not find evidence for sexual selection on wings here

other than via overall body size. This is despite the fact that wings show sexual shape dimorphism (Rohner et al., 2019), which is common at least in flies (Gidaszewski et al., 2009) and probably insects in general. Sepsid wings might be naturally selected and there is evidence for adaptive clinal variation in wing shape (Rohner et al., 2019), but whether wing shape is also subjected to other sources of natural selection remains to be tested directly.

Conclusions

In agreement with sexual selection theory, we here found the evolution of male-biased SSD and increased male-male competition to be associated with stronger selection on the size and shape of male secondary sexual traits. However, the same patterns were evident in the weakly sexually dimorphic wings that are unlikely to function in the mating context. As the covariation between male morphology and reproductive success can be explained to a large extent by allometry, most if not all selection may be explained by mere size. However, allometric scaling relationships might themselves be the result of sexual selection (O'Brian et al., 2017), and therefore, disentangling whether sexual selection acts on body size, the relative or absolute trait size, or even on the allometric relationship itself (i.e. a reaction norm) remains difficult, at least in this specific case. Despite the lack of evidence of a direct role of the sepsid fore femur morphology in mating success, secondary sexual traits rarely have only one function (Eberhard et al., 2018; McCullough et al., 2016), and the sepsid fore femur may be no exception. Future investigations of other fitness components under natural conditions will be necessary.

References

- Allen, P. E., Somjee, U. & Miller, C. W. (2015). Different environments lead to a reversal in the expression of weapons and testes in the heliconia bug, *Leptoscelis tricolor* (Hemiptera: Coreidae). *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **115**: 802-809.
- Andersson, B. (1994). Sexual Selection. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton.
- Araujo, D. P., Tuan, M. J., Yew, J. Y. & Meier, R. (2014). Analysing small insect glands with UV-LDI MS: high-resolution spatial analysis reveals the chemical composition and use of the osmeterium secretion in *Themira superba* (Sepsidae: Diptera). *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **27**: 1744-50.
- Arnqvist, G. (1998). Comparative evidence for the evolution of genitalia by sexual selection. *Nature* **393**: 784.
- Badyaev, A. V. (2002). Growing apart: an ontogenetic perspective on the evolution of sexual size dimorphism. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **17**: 369-378.
- Baur, J., Giesen, A., Rohner, P.T., Blanckenhorn, W.U. & Schäfer, M.A. (2019) Exaggerated male forelegs are not more differentiated than wing morphology in two widespread sister species of black scavenger flies. *Journal of Zoological Systematics and Evolutionary Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jzs.12327>
- Bentsen, C. L., Hunt, J., Jennions, M. D. & Brooks, R. (2006). Complex multivariate sexual selection on male acoustic signaling in a wild population of *Teleogryllus commodus*. *American Naturalist* **167**: E102-16.
- Blanckenhorn, W. U. (2000). The evolution of body size: What keeps organisms small? *The Quarterly Review of Biology* **75**: 385-407.
- Blanckenhorn, W. U. (2005). Behavioral causes and consequences of sexual size dimorphism. *Ethology* **111**: 977-1016.

417 Blanckenhorn, W. U., Kraushaar, U. R., Teuschl, Y. & Reim, C. (2004). Sexual selection on
 418 morphological and physiological traits and fluctuating asymmetry in the black
 419 scavenger fly *Sepsis cynipsea*. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **17**: 629-41.
 420 Blanckenhorn, W. U., Meier, R. & Teder, T. (2007) Rensch's rule in insects: patterns among
 421 and within species. In: *Sex, Size and Gender Roles*, (Fairbairn, D. J., Blanckenhorn,
 422 W. U. & Szekely, T., eds.). pp. 60-70. Oxford, UK.
 423 Bonduriansky, R. (2007a). The evolution of condition-dependent sexual dimorphism.
 424 *American Naturalist* **169**: 9-19.
 425 Bonduriansky, R. (2007b). Sexual selection and allometry: a critical reappraisal of the
 426 evidence and ideas. *Evolution* **61**: 838-49.
 427 Bro-Jorgensen, J. (2007). The intensity of sexual selection predicts weapon size in male
 428 bovids. *Evolution* **61**: 1316-1326.
 429 Busso, J. P. & Blanckenhorn, W. U. (2018). Disruptive sexual selection on male body size in
 430 the polyphenic black scavenger fly *Sepsis thoracica*. *Behavioral Ecology* **29**: 769-777.
 431 Charlton, B. D. & Reby, D. (2016). The evolution of acoustic size exaggeration in terrestrial
 432 mammals. *Nature Communications* **7**.
 433 Chenoweth, S. F. & Blows, M. W. (2005). Contrasting mutual sexual selection on
 434 homologous signal traits in *Drosophila serrata*. *American Naturalist* **165**: 281-9.
 435 Chenoweth, S. F., Rundle, H. D. & Blows, M. W. (2008). Genetic constraints and the
 436 evolution of display trait sexual dimorphism by natural and sexual selection. *American*
 437 *Naturalist* **171**: 22-34.
 438 Claude, J. (2008). *Morphometrics with R*. Springer, New York.
 439 Cohen, J. A. (1984). Sexual Selection and the Psychophysics of Female Choice. *Zeitschrift für*
 440 *Tierpsychologie* **64**: 1-8.

441 Cotton, S., Fowler, K. & Pomiankowski, A. (2004). Do sexual ornaments demonstrate
 442 heightened condition-dependent expression as predicted by the handicap hypothesis?
 443 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* **271**: 771-783.

444 Darwin, C. (1872). *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*.

445 DeNieu, M., Pitchers, W. & Dworkin, I. (2014). Adaptation to a novel predator in *Drosophila*
 446 *melanogaster*: How well are we able to predict evolutionary responses? *bioRxiv*:
 447 005322.

448 Ding, A. & Blanckenhorn, W. U. (2002). The effect of sexual size dimorphism on mating
 449 behaviour in two dung flies with contrasting dimorphism. *Evolutionary Ecology*
 450 *Research* **4**: 259-273.

451 Dmitriew, C. & Blanckenhorn, W. U. (2012). The role of sexual selection and conflict in
 452 mediating among-population variation in mating strategies and sexually dimorphic
 453 traits in *Sepsis punctum*. *Plos One* **7**.

454 Dmitriew, C. & Blanckenhorn, W. U. (2014). Condition dependence and the maintenance of
 455 genetic variance in a sexually dimorphic black scavenger fly. *Journal of Evolutionary*
 456 *Biology* **27**: 2408-19.

457 Duda, O. (1926). Monographie der Sepsiden (Dipt.). I. *Annalen des Naturhistorischen*
 458 *Museums in Wien* **39** [1925]: 1-153.

459 Dudley, R. (2002). *The Biomechanics of Insect Flight: Form, Function, Evolution*. Princeton
 460 University Press.

461 Eberhard, W. G. (2001a). The functional morphology of species-specific clasping structures
 462 on the front legs of male *Archiseptis* and *Palaeoseptis* flies (Diptera, Sepsidae).
 463 *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* **133**: 335-368.

464 Eberhard, W. G. (2001b). Multiple origins of a major novelty: moveable abdominal lobes in
 465 male sepsid flies (Diptera: Sepsidae), and the question of developmental constraints.
 466 *Evolution & Development* **3**: 206-22.

467 Eberhard, W. G. (2002). The relation between aggressive and sexual behavior and allometry
 468 in *Palaeosepsis dentatiformis* Flies (Diptera : Sepsidae). *Journal of the Kansas*
 469 *Entomological Society* **75**: 317-332.

470 Eberhard, W. G. (2005). Sexual morphology of male *Sepsis cynipsea* (Diptera : Sepsidae):
 471 lack of support for lock-and-key and sexually antagonistic morphological coevolution
 472 hypotheses. *Canadian Entomologist* **137**: 551-565.

473 Eberhard, W. G., Rodriguez, R. L., Huber, B. A., Speck, B., Miller, H., Buzatto, B. A. &
 474 Machado, G. (2018). Sexual selection and static allometry: the importance of function.
 475 *Quarterly Review of Biology* **93**: 207-250.

476 Emlen, D. J. (2001). Costs and the diversification of exaggerated animal structures. *Science*
 477 **291**: 1534-1536.

478 Emlen, D. J. (2006). Phylogenetic evidence for an association between tunneling behavior and
 479 the evolution of horns in dung beetles (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae: Scarabaeinae).
 480 *Coleopterists Bulletin* **60**: 47-56.

481 Emlen, D. J., Marangelo, J., Ball, B. & Cunningham, C. W. (2005). Diversity in the weapons
 482 of sexual selection: Horn evolution in the beetle genus *Onthophagus* (Coleoptera:
 483 Scarabaeidae). *Evolution* **59**: 1060-1084.

484 Emlen, D. J. & Nijhout, H. F. (2000). The development and evolution of exaggerated
 485 morphologies in insects. *Annual Review in Entomology* **45**: 661-708.

486 Fairbairn, D. J. (2005). Allometry for sexual size dimorphism: Testing allometry hypotheses
 487 for Rensch ' s rule in the water strider *Aquarius remigis*. *American Naturalist* **166**: 69-
 488 84.

489 Fairbairn, D. J., Blanckenhorn, W. U. & Székely, T. 2007. *Sex, Size and Gender Roles:*
 490 *Evolutionary Studies of Sexual Size Dimorphism*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

491 Gidaszewski, N. A., Baylac, M. & Klingenberg, C. P. (2009). Evolution of sexual
 492 dimorphism of wing shape in the *Drosophila melanogaster* subgroup. *BMC*
 493 *Evolutionary Biology* **9**: 110-110.
 494 Gilchrist, A. S., Azevedo, R. B., Partridge, L. & O'Higgins, P. (2000). Adaptation and
 495 constraint in the evolution of *Drosophila melanogaster* wing shape. *Evolution &*
 496 *Development* **2**: 114-24.
 497 Gomez, J. M. & Perfectti, F. (2010). Evolution of complex traits: The case of *Erysimum*
 498 corolla shape. *International Journal of Plant Sciences* **171**: 987-998.
 499 Gould, S. J. (1966). Allometry and size in ontogeny and phylogeny. *Biological Reviews of the*
 500 *Cambridge Philosophical Society* **41**(4): 587-640.
 501 Gould, S. J. (1974). The origin and function of 'bizarre' structures: antler size and skull size in
 502 the 'Irish Elk,' *Megaloceros giganteus*. *Evolution* **28**: 191-220.
 503 Harrison, R. G. (1980). Dispersal polymorphisms in insects. *Annual Review of Ecology and*
 504 *Systematics* **11**: 95-118.
 505 Hedrick, A. V. & Temeles, E. J. (1989). The evolution of sexual dimorphism in animals:
 506 Hypotheses and tests. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **4**: 136-8.
 507 Hennig, W. (1949) 39a. Sepsidae. In: *Die Fliegen der palaearktischen Region*, (Lindner, E.,
 508 ed.). pp. 1-92. Schweizerbart, Stuttgart.
 509 Hill, J. K., Griffiths, H. M. & Thomas, C. D. (2011). Climate change and evolutionary
 510 adaptations at species' range margins. *Annual Review of Entomology, Vol 56* **56**: 143-
 511 159.
 512 Hill, J. K., Thomas, C. D. & Blakeley, D. S. (1999). Evolution of flight morphology in a
 513 butterfly that has recently expanded its geographic range. *Oecologia* **121**: 165-170.
 514 Hochkirch, A. & Damerau, M. (2009). Rapid range expansion of a wing-dimorphic bush-
 515 cricket after the 2003 climatic anomaly. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **97**:
 516 118-127.

517 Hoikkala, A., Aspi, J. & Suvanto, L. (1998). Male courtship song frequency as an indicator of
518 male genetic quality in an insect species, *Drosophila montana*. *Proceedings of the*
519 *Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* **265**: 503-508.

520 Honek, A. (1993). Intraspecific variation in body size and fecundity in insects - a general
521 relationship. *Oikos* **66**: 483-492.

522 Huxley, J. S. (1932). *Problems of Relative Growth*. London, Methuen & Company Limited.

523 Janzen, F. J. & Stern, H. S. (1998). Logistic regression for empirical studies of multivariate
524 selection. *Evolution* **52**: 1564-1571.

525 Katayama, N., Abbott, J. K., Kjærandsen, J., Takahashi, Y. & Svensson, E. I. (2014). Sexual
526 selection on wing interference patterns in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proceedings of*
527 *the National Academy of Sciences* **111**: 15144-15148.

528 Kingsolver, J. G. & Pfennig, D. W. (2004). Individual-level selection as a cause of Cope's
529 rule of phyletic size increase. *Evolution* **58**: 1608-1612.

530 Klingenberg, C. P. & Monteiro, L. R. (2005). Distances and directions in multidimensional
531 shape spaces: Implications for morphometric applications. *Systematic Biology* **54**:
532 678-688.

533 Kraushaar, U. & Blanckenhorn, W. U. (2002). Population variation in sexual selection and its
534 effect on size allometry in two dung fly species with contrasting sexual size
535 dimorphism. *Evolution* **56**: 307-21.

536 Lande, R. (1980). Sexual dimorphism, sexual selection, and adaptation in polygenic
537 characters. *Evolution* **34**: 292-305.

538 Lande, R. & Arnold, S. J. (1983). The measurement of selection on correlated characters.
539 *Evolution* **37**: 1210-1226.

540 Ledon-Rettig, C. C. & Moczek, A. P. (2016). The transcriptomic basis of tissue- and
541 nutrition-dependent sexual dimorphism in the beetle *Onthophagus taurus*. *Ecology*
542 *and Evolution* **6**: 1601-13.

543 Lynch, M. & Walsh, B. 1998. *Genetics and Analysis of Quantitative Traits*. Sinauer
544 Associates, Sunderland MA.

545 McCullough, E. L., Miller, C. W. & Emlen, D. J. (2016). Why sexually selected weapons are
546 not ornaments. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **31**: 742-751.

547 McCullough, E. L., Tobalske, B. W. & Emlen, D. J. (2014). Structural adaptations to diverse
548 fighting styles in sexually selected weapons. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
549 *Sciences* **111**: 14484-14488.

550 Mitchellolds, T. & Shaw, R. G. (1987). Regression analysis of natural selection – Statistical
551 inference and biological interpretation. *Evolution* **41**: 1149-1161.

552 Moller, A. P., Barbosa, A., Cuervo, J. J., de Lope, F., Merino, S. & Saino, N. (1998). Sexual
553 selection and tail streamers in the barn swallow. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-*
554 *Biological Sciences* **265**: 409-414.

555 O'Brien, D. M., Katsuki, M. & Emlen, D. J. (2017). Selection on an extreme weapon in the
556 frog-legged leaf beetle (*Sagra femorata*). *Evolution* **71**: 2584-2598.

557 Pitchers, W., Pool, J. E. & Dworkin, I. (2013). Altitudinal clinal variation in wing size and
558 shape in African *Drosophila melanogaster*: one cline or many? *Evolution* **67**: 438-52.

559 Puniamoorthy, N. (2014). Behavioural barriers to reproduction may evolve faster than sexual
560 morphology among populations of a dung fly (Sepsidae). *Animal Behaviour* **98**: 139-
561 148.

562 Puniamoorthy, N., Blanckenhorn, W. U. & Schafer, M. A. (2012a). Differential investment in
563 pre- vs. post-copulatory sexual selection reinforces a cross-continental reversal of
564 sexual size dimorphism in *Sepsis punctum* (Diptera: Sepsidae). *J Evol Biol* **25**: 2253-
565 63.

566 Puniamoorthy, N., Ismail, M. R., Tan, D. S. & Meier, R. (2009). From kissing to belly
567 stridulation: comparative analysis reveals surprising diversity, rapid evolution, and

568 much homoplasy in the mating behaviour of 27 species of sepsid flies (Diptera:
569 Sepsidae). *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **22**: 2146-56.

570 Puniamoorthy, N., Schafer, M. A. & Blanckenhorn, W. U. (2012b). Sexual selection accounts
571 for the geographic reversal of sexual size dimorphism in the dung fly, *Sepsis punctum*
572 (Diptera: Sepsidae). *Evolution* **66**: 2117-26.

573 Puniamoorthy, N., Su, K. F. & Meier, R. (2008). Bending for love: losses and gains of sexual
574 dimorphisms are strictly correlated with changes in the mounting position of sepsid
575 flies (Sepsidae: Diptera). *BMC evolutionary biology* **8**: 155.

576 Roff, D. A. & Fairbairn, D. J. (1991). Wing dimorphisms and the evolution of migratory
577 polymorphisms among the Insecta. *American Zoologist* **31**: 243-251.

578 Rohlf, F. J. (2009) TpsDig. pp. Department of Ecology and Evolution, State University of
579 New York.

580 Rohlf, F. J. & Corti, M. (2000). Use of two-block partial least-squares to study covariation in
581 shape. *Systematic Biology* **49**: 740-753.

582 Rohner, P. T. & Blanckenhorn, W. U. (2018). A comparative study of the role of sex-specific
583 condition dependence in the evolution of sexually dimorphic traits. *American*
584 *Naturalist* **192**: E202-e215.

585 Rohner, P. T., Blanckenhorn, W. U. & Puniamoorthy, N. (2016). Sexual selection on male
586 size drives the evolution of male-biased sexual size dimorphism via the prolongation
587 of male development. *Evolution* **70**: 1189-99.

588 Rohner, P. T., Roy, J., Schäfer, M. A., Blanckenhorn, W. U. & Berger, D. (2019). Does
589 thermal plasticity align with local adaptation? – An interspecific comparison of wing
590 morphology in sepsid flies. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **1-13**..

591 Rohner, P. T., Teder, T., Esperk, T., Lüpold, S. & Blanckenhorn, W. U. (2018). The evolution
592 of male-biased sexual size dimorphism is associated with increased body size
593 plasticity in males. *Functional Ecology*.

594 Schäfer, M. A., Berger, D., Rohner, P., Kjærsgaard, A., Bauerfeind, S., Guillaume, F., Fox, C.
 595 W. & Blanckenhorn, W. U. (2018). Geographic clines in wing morphology relate to
 596 biogeographic history in New World but not Old World populations of dung flies
 597 *Evolution* **72**: 1629-1644.

598 Schulz, K. (1999) *The evolution of mating systems in black scavenger flies (Diptera:*
 599 *Sepsidae)*. Department of Entomology. University of Arizona, Tucson.

600 Shine, R. (1989). Ecological causes for the evolution of sexual dimorphism: a review of the
 601 evidence. *The Quarterly Review of Biology* **64**: 419-61.

602 Shine, R. & Fitzgerald, M. (1995). Variation in mating systems and sexual size dimorphism
 603 between populations of the Australian python *Morelia spilota* (Serpentes: Pythonidae).
 604 *Oecologia* **103**: 490-498.

605 Simmons, L. W., House, C. M., Hunt, J. & García-González, F. (2009). Evolutionary
 606 response to sexual selection in male genital morphology. *Current Biology* **19**: 1442-
 607 1446.

608 Simmons, L. W. & Tomkins, J. L. (1996). Sexual selection and the allometry of earwig
 609 forceps. *Evolutionary Ecology* **10**: 97-104.

610 Siva-Jothy, M. T. (1999). Male wing pigmentation may affect reproductive success via female
 611 choice in a calopterygid damselfly (Zygoptera). *Behaviour* **136**: 1365-1377.

612 Stevens, V. M., Turlure, C. & Baguette, M. (2010). A meta-analysis of dispersal in butterflies.
 613 *Biological Reviews* **85**: 625-642.

614 Székely, T., Reynolds, J. D. & Figuerola, J. (2000). Sexual size dimorphism in shorebirds,
 615 gulls, and alcids: the influence of sexual and natural selection. *Evolution* **54**: 1404-
 616 1413.

617 Temeles, E. J., Pan, I. L., Brennan, J. L. & Horwitt, J. N. (2000). Evidence for ecological
 618 causation of sexual dimorphism in a hummingbird. *Science* **289**: 441-443.

619 Thompson, D. A. W. (1917). *On growth and form*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

620 Tomkins, J. L., Kotiaho, J. S. & LeBas, N. R. (2005). Phenotypic plasticity in the
 621 developmental integration of morphological trade-offs and secondary sexual trait
 622 compensation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **272**: 543-551.
 623 Wallace, B. (1987). Ritualistic combat and allometry. *American Naturalist* **129**: 775-776.
 624 Webster, M. S. (1992). Sexual dimorphism, mating system and body size in New World
 625 blackbirds (Icterinae). *Evolution* **46**: 1621-1641.
 626 Weckerly, F. W. (1998). Sexual size dimorphism: Influence of mass and mating systems in
 627 the most dimorphic mammals. *Journal of Mammalogy* **79**: 33-52.
 628 Zinna, R., Emlen, D., Lavine, L. C., Johns, A., Gotoh, H., Niimi, T. & Dworkin, I. (2018).
 629 Sexual dimorphism and heightened conditional expression in a sexually selected
 630 weapon in the Asian rhinoceros beetle. *Molecular Ecology* **27**: 5049-5072.
 631

632 **Table 1:** Number of mating container replicates per species, continent, population and
633 operational sex ratio (OSR).

<i>species</i>	continent	population	OSR2	OSR4
<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	N. America	Kentucky, USA	4	3
<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	N. America	Ramona, USA	3	3
<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	N. America	Syracuse, USA	4	4
<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	N. America	Yellowstone, USA	3	3
<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	Europe	Sörenberg, Switzerland	4	4
<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	Europe	Bignasco, Switzerland	2	2
<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	Europe	Oberwald, Switzerland	4	5
<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	Europe	Zürich, Switzerland	3	3
<i>S. punctum</i>	N. America	Davis, CA, USA	4	4
<i>S. punctum</i>	N. America	Athens, GA, USA	4	4
<i>S. punctum</i>	N. America	New York (Manhattan), NY, USA	4	4
<i>S. punctum</i>	Europe	Vienna, Austria	4	4
<i>S. punctum</i>	Europe	Zürich, Switzerland	4	4
<i>S. punctum</i>	Europe	Berlin, Switzerland	4	4
<i>S. punctum</i>	Europe	Nyköping, Sweden	4	4

634

635

Table 2: Univariate and bivariate selection gradients with their corresponding standard error based on binomial generalized mixed models following Janzen and Stern (1998). Univariate selection gradients (β_1) were calculated by regressing mating success against the corresponding standardized trait as the only predictor variable. To account for selection on overall size, we used standardized hind tibia length as covariate and calculated bivariate selection estimates (producing one bivariate selection coefficient for the corresponding trait of interest (β_2) plus one for hind tibia length ($\beta_{2\text{HTL}}$)). Significant coefficients are bold.

trait	species	SSD	continent	OSR	β_1 ($\pm$ SE)	β_2 ($\pm$ SE)	$\beta_{2\text{HTL}}$ ($\pm$ SE)
a) hind tibia length	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	female-biased	Europe	2	0.04 ($\pm$ 0.10)		
	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	female-biased	Europe	4	0.02 ($\pm$ 0.10)		
	<i>S. punctum</i>	female-biased	N. America	2	0.11 ($\pm$ 0.13)		
	<i>S. punctum</i>	female-biased	N. America	4	0.19 ($\pm$ 0.16)		
	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	male-biased	N. America	2	0.16 ($\pm$ 0.08)		
	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	male-biased	N. America	4	0.35 ($\pm$ 0.20)		
	<i>S. punctum</i>	male-biased	Europe	2	0.35 ($\pm$ 0.08)		
	<i>S. punctum</i>	male-biased	Europe	4	0.54 ($\pm$ 0.11)		
b) femur size	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	female-biased	Europe	2	0.02 ($\pm$ 0.10)	-0.5 ($\pm$ 0.53)	0.53 ($\pm$ 0.53)
	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	female-biased	Europe	4	-0.02 ($\pm$ 0.10)	-0.58 ($\pm$ 0.38)	0.58 ($\pm$ 0.38)
	<i>S. punctum</i>	female-biased	N. America	2	0.19 ($\pm$ 0.14)	0.46 ($\pm$ 0.30)	-0.30 ($\pm$ 0.30)
	<i>S. punctum</i>	female-biased	N. America	4	0.23 ($\pm$ 0.15)	0.44 ($\pm$ 0.42)	-0.22 ($\pm$ 0.43)
	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	male-biased	N. America	2	0.20 ($\pm$ 0.08)	1.05 ($\pm$ 0.40)	-0.87 ($\pm$ 0.40)
	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	male-biased	N. America	4	0.57 ($\pm$ 0.23)	1.89 ($\pm$ 0.67)	-1.37 ($\pm$ 0.63)
	<i>S. punctum</i>	male-biased	Europe	2	0.33 ($\pm$ 0.08)	-0.13 ($\pm$ 0.25)	0.48 ($\pm$ 0.26)
	<i>S. punctum</i>	male-biased	Europe	4	0.50 ($\pm$ 0.11)	-0.31 ($\pm$ 0.33)	0.84 ($\pm$ 0.34)
c) femur width	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	female-biased	Europe	2	-0.02 ($\pm$ 0.20)	-1.16 ($\pm$ 0.61)	1.20 ($\pm$ 0.60)
	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	female-biased	Europe	4	-0.01 ($\pm$ 0.19)	-0.30 ($\pm$ 0.48)	0.32 ($\pm$ 0.47)
	<i>S. punctum</i>	female-biased	N. America	2	0.02 ($\pm$ 0.13)	-0.23 ($\pm$ 0.24)	0.3 ($\pm$ 0.24)
	<i>S. punctum</i>	female-biased	N. America	4	0.28 ($\pm$ 0.16)	0.37 ($\pm$ 0.27)	-0.11 ($\pm$ 0.27)
	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	male-biased	N. America	2	0.15 ($\pm$ 0.16)	-0.06 ($\pm$ 0.33)	0.24 ($\pm$ 0.34)
	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	male-biased	N. America	4	0.38 ($\pm$ 0.20)	0.28 ($\pm$ 0.34)	0.12 ($\pm$ 0.34)
	<i>S. punctum</i>	male-biased	Europe	2	0.37 ($\pm$ 0.08)	0.26 ($\pm$ 0.19)	0.11 ($\pm$ 0.18)
	<i>S. punctum</i>	male-biased	Europe	4	0.48 ($\pm$ 0.11)	0.63 ($\pm$ 0.24)	-0.10 ($\pm$ 0.23)
d) wing size	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	female-biased	Europe	2	0.07 ($\pm$ 0.10)	0.42 ($\pm$ 0.36)	-0.37 ($\pm$ 0.36)
	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	female-biased	Europe	4	-0.08 ($\pm$ 0.10)	-1.11 ($\pm$ 0.36)	1.08 ($\pm$ 0.36)
	<i>S. punctum</i>	female-biased	N. America	2	0.18 ($\pm$ 0.14)	0.29 ($\pm$ 0.24)	-0.12 ($\pm$ 0.24)
	<i>S. punctum</i>	female-biased	N. America	4	0.14 ($\pm$ 0.15)	-0.10 ($\pm$ 0.30)	0.28 ($\pm$ 0.30)
	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	male-biased	N. America	2	0.20 ($\pm$ 0.08)	0.53 ($\pm$ 0.25)	-0.34 ($\pm$ 0.25)
	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	male-biased	N. America	4	0.61 ($\pm$ 0.24)	1.39 ($\pm$ 0.50)	-0.85 ($\pm$ 0.45)
	<i>S. punctum</i>	male-biased	Europe	2	0.32 ($\pm$ 0.08)	-0.09 ($\pm$ 0.21)	0.44 ($\pm$ 0.21)
	<i>S. punctum</i>	male-biased	Europe	4	0.44 ($\pm$ 0.11)	-0.58 ($\pm$ 0.28)	1.09 ($\pm$ 0.29)

Table 3: Procrustes distance between mean shape before and after selection, the norm of the selection differential ($\|S\|$), as well as the significance of the two-block PLS analyses for femur morphology by species, direction of SSD, and operational sex ratio (OSR). Sexual selection on shape was only significant in populations with male-biased SSD, yet the shape difference between successful and unsuccessful males was strongly correlated with the allometric shape change ($r_{S,A}$). After accounting for allometry, there was no statistical support for selection on any aspects of shape in any population or species.

Forefemur	SSD	continent	OSR	Procrustes distance $\times 10^3$	$\ S\ \times 10^2$	P_{PLS} full shape	P_{PLS} allometry-corrected	$r_{S,A}$
<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	female-biased	Europe	2	6.89	1.61	0.470	0.204	0.21 [0.01, 0.63]
	female-biased	Europe	4	7.05	0.51	0.272	0.078	0.09 [0.01, 0.24]
	male-biased	N. America	2	7.6	0.06	<.001	0.180	0.82 [0.15, 0.97]
	male-biased	N. America	4	16.03	0.22	0.005	0.124	0.94 [0.73, 0.99]
<i>S. punctum</i>	female-biased	N. America	2	5.83	0.53	0.090	0.061	0.37 [0.01, 0.84]
	female-biased	N. America	4	10.5	0.1	0.091	0.219	0.68 [0.17, 0.93]
	male-biased	Europe	2	9.88	2.19	0.010	0.665	0.97 [0.94, 0.99]
	male-biased	Europe	4	19.64	11.09	<.001	0.783	0.98 [0.93, 0.99]

Table 4: Procrustes distance between mean shape before and after selection, the norm of the selection differential ($\|S\|$), as well as the significance of the two-block PLS analyses for wing morphology by species, direction of SSD, and operational sex ratio (OSR). Sexual selection on shape was only significant in populations with male-biased SSD, yet the shape difference between successful and unsuccessful males was strongly correlated with the allometric shape change ($r_{S,A}$). After accounting for allometry, there was no statistical support for selection on any aspects of shape in any population or species except for North American *S. neocynipsea*.

Wing	SSD	continent	OSR	Procrustes distance $\times 10^3$	$\ S\ \times 10^2$	P_{PLS} full shape	P_{PLS} allometry-corrected	$r_{S,A}$
<i>S. neocynipsea</i>	female-biased	Europe	2	4.92	0.31	0.440	0.267	0.07 [0.01, 0.17]
	female-biased	Europe	4	5.24	0.52	0.322	0.140	0.06 [0.01, 0.16]
	male-biased	N. America	2	4.75	0.01	0.210	0.443	0.75 [0.23, 0.97]
	male-biased	N. America	4	8.55	0.14	<.001	0.021	0.91 [0.86, 0.98]
<i>S. punctum</i>	female-biased	N. America	2	5.39	0.14	0.870	0.988	0.73 [0.23, 0.97]
	female-biased	N. America	4	3.37	0.56	0.849	0.437	0.04 [0.01, 0.06]
	male-biased	Europe	2	4.36	1.91	<.001	0.265	0.89 [0.73, 0.99]
	male-biased	Europe	4	8.19	5.55	<.001	0.154	0.93 [0.87, 0.98]

femur morphology

a) *Sepsis punctum*

b) *Sepsis neocynipsea*

wing morphology

Fig. 1: Modifications on the male fore femur in *Sepsis punctum* (a; redrawn from Hennig, 1949) and *S. neocynipsea* (b; redrawn from Duda, 1926). Wing morphology (c) is not exaggerated. The wing spot is present in both sexes and represents a synapomorphy of the *Sepsis* clade that includes *S. punctum* and *S. neocynipsea*. Landmarks used in this study are indicated with open circles.

Fig. 2: Forefemur shape deformations associated with mating success under different sex ratios (OSR2: light blue; OSR4: dark blue). Red arrows indicate the shape change associated with an increase in body size. See table 3 for estimates of the magnitude of the selection differentials.

Fig. 3: Wing shape deformations associated with mating success (= PLS coefficients) under different sex ratios (OSR2: light blue; OSR4: dark blue). Red arrows indicate the shape change associated with an increase in body size. See table 4 for estimates of the magnitude of the selection differentials.

Supplementary Material

Table S1: Analysis of variance statistics for all traits assessed.

a) residual wing size (z-scored)

	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>			<i>S. punctum</i>		
	X ²	Df	P	X ²	Df	P
trait	1.20	1	0.274	0.35	1	0.556
continent	10.46	1	0.001	5.78	1	0.016
OSR	5.09	1	0.024	31.56	1	<.001
continent × trait	1.50	1	0.221	3.27	1	0.071

b) residual femur size (z-scored)

	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>			<i>S. punctum</i>		
	X ²	Df	P	X ²	Df	P
trait	1.42	1	0.234	0.94	1	0.333
continent	10.38	1	0.001	5.73	1	0.017
OSR	5.10	1	0.024	31.56	1	<.001
continent × trait	2.17	1	0.141	3.37	1	0.066

c) residual femur width (z-scored)

	<i>S. neocynipsea</i>			<i>S. punctum</i>		
	X ²	Df	P	X ²	Df	P
trait	3.33	1	0.068	1.15	1	0.283
continent	10.59	1	0.001	6.03	1	0.014
OSR	5.10	1	0.024	31.45	1	<.001
continent × trait	0.36	1	0.550	0.00	1	0.955