

Sex-specific selection patterns in a dioecious insect-pollinated plant

Estelle Barbot, Mathilde Dufaÿ, Isabelle de Cauwer

▶ To cite this version:

Estelle Barbot, Mathilde Dufaÿ, Isabelle de Cauwer. Sex-specific selection patterns in a dioecious insect-pollinated plant. 2023. hal-04083935

HAL Id: hal-04083935 https://hal.science/hal-04083935

Preprint submitted on 27 Apr 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

- 1 Sex-specific selection patterns in a dioecious insect-pollinated plant
- 2 Running title: Sex-specific selection in a dioecious plant
- 3 Estelle Barbot^{1,2}, Mathilde Dufaÿ^{3†}, Isabelle De Cauwer^{1†}
- 4 ¹Univ. Lille, CNRS, UMR 8198 Evo-Eco-Paleo, F-59000 Lille, France
- 5 ²ISEM, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, IRD, Montpellier, France
- 6 ³CEFE, Université Montpellier, CNRS, Université Paul Valéry Montpellier 3, EPHE, IRD,
- 7 Montpellier, France
- 8 * Corresponding author; email: estelle.barbot@protonmail.com
- 9 + These authors shared senior authorship

10 Keywords

- 11 floral traits Bateman gradient pollinator-mediated selection fertility selection mating
- 12 success paternity analyses

13 Author contributions

E.B, M.D and I.D.C conceived and planned the experiments. E.B carried out the experiments,
analyzed the data, and took the lead in writing the manuscript. M.D and I.D.C provided help
to analyze the data, and contributed to the interpretation of the results and to the final
manuscript.

18

19 Acknowledgments

20 For fruitful discussion related to the project, we thank J. Shykoff, N. Sletvold, C. Devaux and 21 J. Tonnabel. We also thank T. Janicke for his precious comments that helped improving the 22 manuscript. For laboratory assistance, we thank C. Gode. For greenhouse assistance, we 23 thank E. Schmitt, N. Faure, C. Ponitzki and C. Glorieux. We are grateful to V. Mahut, R. Boisserie, N. Le Roux and P. Drouvin for help in collecting the data. We thank A. Duputié for 24 25 the development of the image analysis script. This work is a contribution to the CPER 26 research project CLIMIBIO. The authors thank the French Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche, the Hauts-de-France Region and the European Funds for 27 28 Regional Economical Development for their financial support to this project.

29 Data and materials availability

30 All data are available in Dryad (https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.j6q573nh1).

31 Conflict of interest

32 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

33 Abstract

34 Competition for mate acquisition is the hallmark of any sexual organism. In insect-pollinated 35 plants, competition to attract pollinators is expected to result in pollinator-mediated selection 36 on attractive floral traits. This could overlap with sexual selection if the number of mating 37 partners increases with pollinator attraction, resulting in an improved reproductive success. 38 In this study, we measured a set of floral traits and estimated individual fitness in male and 39 female Silene dioica in an experimental population. Results align with the predictions of 40 Bateman's principles, in the absence of pollen limitation. In females, natural selection acted on traits that are typically linked with fertility (number of flowers and number of gametes), 41 and selection strength was similar in open- and hand-pollinated females, suggesting a 42 43 limited role of pollinator-mediated selection. In males, flowering duration and corolla width were positively associated with both reproductive success and number of mates, suggesting 44 45 that sexual selection has played a role in the evolution of these traits. The use of Bateman's 46 metrics further confirmed stronger sexual selection in males than in females. Taken together, 47 our results shed light on the occurrence of sex-specific patterns of selection in an insect-48 pollinated plant population.

49 Introduction

50 Sexual selection (selection arising from competition for mating partners and/or their 51 gametes), along with viability selection (selection for traits that increase survival) and fertility selection (selection for traits that increase the number of offspring per reproductive 52 53 episode, e.g. via gamete production), constitute the three routes through which natural 54 selection shapes phenotypic traits (Arnold 1994a; Delph and Herlihy 2012). In animals, pre-55 copulatory sexual selection has often been proposed as the ultimate cause for the evolution of extravagant phenotypes in males, in a large array of traits including ornaments, 56 57 armaments and behaviors (Darwin 1871; Lande 1981; Jennions and Kokko 2010). In this matter, Bateman's principles predict that the sex experimenting the stronger sexual selection 58 59 should display three features. First, it should have the highest variance in reproductive 60 success (i.e. the opportunity for selection, measured as the variance in offspring number). Second, it should display the highest variance in mating success (i.e. the opportunity for 61 62 sexual selection, measured as the variance in the number of reproductive partners). Finally, 63 it should exhibit the strongest dependency of reproductive success on mating success (i.e. the 64 Bateman gradient, which quantifies the reproductive benefit of acquiring more mates by 65 regressing reproductive success on mating success, Bateman 1948; Arnold 1994a). Using 66 metrics of sexual selection (Jones 2009), a recent meta-analysis on animal species showed that 67 sexual selection is often stronger in males than in females (Janicke et al. 2016), which is 68 generally interpreted as a direct consequence of anisogamy (Bateman 1948).

Although animal species with sexual dimorphism in secondary sexual characters have beenthe primary focus of sexual selection theory, there is now a wide acceptance that sexual

71 selection should occur in plants as well (Arnold 1994b; Delph and Ashman 2006; Moore and 72 Pannell 2011). In plants, competition for access to reproductive partners is expected to take 73 place both before pollination (e.g. male-male competition for access to stigmas or female-74 female competition for pollen delivery; Minnaar at al. 2019) and after pollination (e.g. pollen 75 competition for access to ovules; Murphy 1998; Moore and Pannell 2011). Any plant trait that 76 would impact the outcome of competition for mates should thus be under sexual selection. 77 Because a wide majority of angiosperms rely on insects for mate acquisition (Ollerton et al. 78 2011), some of the traits under sexual selection in plants are likely to be directly involved in 79 pollinator attraction, but not necessarily all of them (e.g. some traits can be involved in postpollination sexual selection with no link to pollinator attraction, Tonnabel et al. 2021). 80 81 Selection on attractive floral traits, arising from competition among plants for pollinators, is 82 usually referred to as pollinator-mediated selection and this should thus at least partially 83 overlap with sexual selection (Willson 1994; Delph and Ashman 2006; Waelti et al. 2009; Dai 84 and Galloway 2013; Paterno et al. 2020).

85 If one applies the framework of sexual selection to animal-pollinated plants, male 86 reproductive success should be more dependent on pollinator attraction than female 87 reproductive success, at least in situations where female reproduction is not limited by 88 pollen availability (Stephenson and Bertin 1983). First, plants are anisogamous organisms, 89 and male reproductive success should thus be more limited by mate acquisition than female reproductive success, as is the case in animals without reversed sex-roles (Bateman 1948; 90 91 Willson and Burley 1983; Janicke et al. 2016). Second, a recent study demonstrated that, 92 across hermaphroditic angiosperms, the allometric relationship between flower biomass and 93 sexual organ biomass was steeper for the male than for the female organs, a result that can be

94 explained by a widespread role of male-male competition in the evolution of floral 95 morphology (Paterno et al. 2020). Third, selection on floral traits has been documented to be stronger through male than female function in some hermaphroditic species. This is not a 96 general trend and it may depend on the availability of pollinators (see below) but when 97 98 selection seems stronger through male function, this may be because these traits promote 99 pollinator attraction, although sexual selection was not directly measured in these studies (e.g. Hodgins and Barrett 2008 for corolla width; Briscoe Runquist et al. 2017 for petal area). 100 101 These observations thus seem consistent with sexual selection occurring in males, and 102 potentially being stronger than in females, as observed in the animal kingdom (Janicke et al. 2016). Nonetheless, contrary to what is typically seen in female animals, which are rarely 103 104 sperm limited provided they acquire at least one mating partner (with the exception of animals with external fertilization; Levitan & Petersen 1995), female reproductive success is 105 106 often pollen limited in angiosperms (Burd 1994; Knight et al. 2005). This means that both 107 sexual functions can be limited in their access to reproductive partners and that both sexual 108 functions can display a positive Bateman gradient. In other words, under pollen limitation, 109 pollinator-mediated selection should shape attractive traits through both sexual functions in hermaphroditic species, or in both sexes in dioecious species (Burd 1994). On the contrary in 110 111 the absence of pollen limitation, one could expect that attractive traits would be under stronger selection through the male function, or in males in dioecious species (Arnold 1994a). 112

113 From the female perspective, one way to estimate the strength of pollinator-mediated 114 selection is to use pollen supplementations: by comparing selection gradients on floral traits 115 in open-pollinated versus hand-pollinated females, one can assess the magnitude of 116 pollinator-mediated selection on these traits (Sletvold and Ågren 2010; Trunschke et al. 2017). 117 However, because these methods focus on the female reproductive success, they do not 118 allow any comparison between male and female reproductive functions (Barrett & Harder, 2017). One solution to compare sexes would be to estimate the access to reproduction 119 120 through a measurement of the number of different genetic sexual partners (Tomaszewski et 121 al. 2018), an approach that is commonly used in animal studies. Although the number of genetic sexual partners may underestimate the actual number of mates, because it depends 122 on both access to mates and post-fertilization processes (cryptic female choice and 123 competition among male gametes; Anthes et al. 2016), this estimate has the clear advantage 124 of providing an equivalent measurement of mating success in both males and females. Only 125 two studies estimated the Bateman gradient using the number of genetic sexual partners in 126 127 angiosperm species and both found that while mating and reproductive success were independent in females, they were strongly positively correlated in males (Tonnabel et al. 128 129 2019; Kwok and Dorken 2022). Noteworthily, this measurement might not perfectly reflect 130 the number of mating opportunities in plants, in particular in animal-pollinated taxa. Indeed, 131 because each flower constitutes a reproductive tract, mating events can be quite independent 132 among flowers, depending on pollinators' visitation sequences. One could thus expect the number of genetic mating partners to increase with the number of flowers (and thus with the 133 134 number of ovules for the female function or the number of pollen grains for the male function) and to be an indirect by-product of individual fertility. In such a context, it 135 becomes difficult to distinguish between sexual and fertility selection, a situation which has 136 been referred to as "the grey zone of sexual selection" by Alonzo and Servedio (2019). By 137 138 correcting mating success estimates by individual fertility, one should be able to compare the 139 strength of sexual selection between males and females while minimizing this bias (Henshaw140 et al. 2018).

141 In this study, we measured a set of floral traits and estimated male and female reproductive 142 success in an experimental population of the dioecious insect-pollinated species Silene 143 dioica. Our objectives were fourfold. First, by regressing reproductive success on floral phenotypes in both sexes, we explored sex-specific patterns of natural selection during one 144 flowering season. In our study, this includes both sexual and fertility selection, but not 145 146 viability selection since no deaths were observed. Second, by comparing the relationship between reproductive success and floral phenotypes between open-pollinated and hand-147 148 pollinated females, we quantified the relative importance of pollinator-mediated selection in females. Third, we quantified the importance of floral phenotypes for mate acquisition in 149 150 both sexes by regressing genetic mating success (i.e. the number of genetic mating partners) 151 on floral phenotypes in males and females. In females, this allowed us to compare patterns of pollinator-mediated selection (objective 2) and sexual selection (objective 3), a useful 152 approach to determine whether sexual selection arises from competition to attract pollinators 153 154 or not. Finally, overall sexual selection was compared between sexes using the metrics 155 derived from Bateman's principles: the opportunity for selection I, the opportunity for sexual selection $I_{s_{\prime}}$ and a partial Bateman gradient (regression of reproductive success on 156 157 mating success controlling for flower and gamete production). Studying sexual selection in plants combining several approaches will provide an integrative framework to understand 158 159 how sexual selection on floral traits parallels with other selection components in plants.

160 Material and methods

161 *Study system*

162 Silene dioica (L.) Clairv. is a herbaceous short-lived perennial species of the Caryophyllaceae 163 family that is widely distributed throughout most of northern and central Europe (Baker 164 1947; Jalas and Suhominen 1986). It is a dioecious species with XY sex determination 165 (Warmke 1946; Ming et al. 2011). The species flowers during late spring, but is known to 166 sometimes exhibit a second flowering peak at the end of summer (Jürgens et al. 1996; Bopp 167 and Gottsberger 2004). In Lille (France), this second peak is generally brief and presents 168 extremely male-biased sex ratios, so most of the reproduction effectively occurs during the first peak, between end-April and mid-July (pers. obs). This species presents a generalist 169 170 insect-pollinated system, with Bombus species, Syrphidae, diurnal butterflies and 171 Sphingidae as pollinators (Baker 1947; Westerbergh and Saura 1994). Silene dioica has been 172 documented as sexually dimorphic for flower size and number (males > females; Kay et al. 173 1984; Baena-Díaz et al. 2019; Moquet et al. 2020), total nectar production at the flower level 174 (females > males; Hemborg and Bond 2005) and flowering duration (males > females; 175 Hemborg 1998).

176 Experimental population

Experimental plants were derived from seeds harvested in three forests during 2015, 2016 and 2017 (site A 50°12'05.4″N 3°44'95.7″E, site B 50°26'06.0″N 3°18'39.5″E and site C 50°23'19.3″N 3°25'24.9″E). Our experimental population thus included three cohorts (one, two and three-year-old plants). Sampling sites were geographically close to each other (i.e. 181 maximum distance of 40 km between sites) and to our experimental garden (<65 km). Seeds 182 were collected at different study sites to reach a sufficient sample size while minimizing the 183 probability of including half or full-sibs. Plants from all three populations and from all 184 cohorts were repotted every year in new potting mix and kept in the exact same conditions in 185 the greenhouse until the experiment.

186 Experimental design

187 Three groups of plants were established in the same common garden. The three source forests and the three cohorts were evenly distributed among these groups. The two first 188 189 groups were open-pollinated females (OP females hereafter, 98 individuals) and open-190 pollinated males (OP males, 102 individuals) that were left to be naturally pollinated by 191 insects present in the experimental garden. In the third group, composed of hand-pollinated 192 females (HP females, 65 individuals), all open flowers were supplemented three times a week with pollen from a pool of 65 males from the same collection that were kept in a 193 194 greenhouse. For a given HP female and a given supplementation day, dehiscent anthers were collected on two randomly selected pollen donors and were brushed on the stigmas. 195

196 Common garden

The experimental population was set up in a common garden in April 2018 on the campus of Lille University in France (50°36'32.5″N 3°08'40.3″E) during spring 2018. No wild populations of *Silene dioica* were growing in the vicinity. All individuals were in separate 0.7-L pots filled with a standard soil mixture. Plants were watered every other day, or every day on the hottest days. OP and HP plants were placed separately in two experimental plots 1.5 meter away from each other. Because of inter-individual variance in flowering phenology, the density of flowering plants changed across time (from 2 to 12 individuals per m²). OP females and males were spatially alternated following a grid pattern. Each week, the spatial position of individuals within each plot was randomized while keeping the male-female alternation.

207 Plant traits

A total of 18 traits were measured on all plants from the three experimental groups. A summary of the number of observations per trait and experimental group is available in appendix (Table S3).

Flowering phenology - Flowering phenology was described with two traits: the date of first flowering and flowering duration. Since plants were surveyed once a week, flowering duration is the number of weeks during which at least one flower was open for a given individual.

215 Number of gametes per flower - In females, the number of ovules per flower was estimated 216 at the end of the survey, by dissecting a subsample of fruits per plant. Fruits were collected 217 at maturity, typically two to three weeks after flower opening. At the end of the flowering 218 season, 1004 fruits (one fifth of total fruit production) were randomly chosen and dissected to estimate ovule and seed production for each female (6 to 44 fruit per female, with the 219 number reflecting the females' contribution to the overall fruit production at the population 220 221 level). Unfertilized ovules and seeds were counted by imaging the fruit content using a high resolution scanner (Epson Perfection V700 Photo, Seiko Epson, Suwa, Japan) and using 222

digital image processing (*EBImage* package in R; Pau et al. 2010). Unfertilized ovules and seeds were distinguished on the basis of size ($0.062 \pm 0.031 \text{ mm}^2$ for unfertilized ovules versus $0.86 \pm 0.12 \text{ mm}^2$ for seeds). The number of unfertilized ovules and seeds were then summed within each fruit and averaged over all fruits imaged for each OP and HP female, yielding an estimate of female gamete production per flower.

In males, the number of viable pollen grains per flower was assessed on one nearly open bud 228 229 at the flowering peak. This measurement involved multiplying the proportion of viable pollen grains by the pollen quantity per flower. To do so, each bud was dissected to keep 230 three of the ten anthers. Pollen was removed from the first one and placed on a glass slide 231 with one drop of staining solution to assess the proportion of viable pollen grains under x100 232 microscope (Peterson et al. 2010). The two remaining anthers were used to estimate pollen 233 quantity per flower using a particle counter (CASY® Model TT, Roche Innovatis AG, 234 Bielefeld, Germany) and following the protocol described in Dufaÿ et al. (2008). 235

Floral traits - The remaining 15 traits fall in three categories: (i) non-destructive measurements, performed weekly, (ii) measurements involving the removal and dissection of a flower that were only conducted once, at the flowering peak and (iii) measurements performed at the end of the flowering season.

Weekly measurements - Daily flower display, stem number (i.e. number of branches with at least one open flower), height of the highest open flower (cm), as well as corolla width (mm) and calyx height (mm, measured on two randomly chosen flowers using a digital calliper precise to 0.01 mm and averaged), were surveyed once a week. All the weekly measured traits showed higher variation among than within individuals, as well as a Gaussian 245 distributions across repeated measures, and were thus summarized using an individual246 mean.

247 Measurements at the flowering peak - On the evening before measurements, all mature 248 flower buds were marked using watercolor paint, and individuals were isolated under an 249 insect-proof tent in order to exclude nectar feeding pollinators. The next day, one newly opened flower per individual was randomly selected among the marked ones and collected. 250 251 On this flower, we estimated the total volume of nectar using 2µL microcapillary tubes. Nectar sugar content (ug of sucrose equivalent per flower) was then determined using a 252 refractometer (Abbe NAR-1T LIQUID, Atago Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan). On the same flower, 253 254 one freshly dissected petal was used to measure reflected light on average every 0.6 nm 255 within 200-700 nm using a probe connected to an AvaLight-XE ULS2048 spectrometer and to an AvaLight-XE xenon pulsed light source (Avantes, Apeldoorn, the Netherlands). Spectra 256 257 were calibrated against a fully absorbing black standard and a fully reflecting barium sulfate white standard. Two measures were performed for each individual, one in the center of each 258 petal lobe (i.e. on both sides of the axis of symmetry of the petal). Averaged reflectance 259 260 spectra were analyzed using the *pavo* package in R (Maia et al. 2019). Using *Apis mellifera* 261 visual systems, which should be representative of bumblebee's perceptions (Peitsch et al. 1992) we extracted cartesian X-Y coordinates from the polygon color space, resulting in two 262 263 traits for petal color. Finally, to characterize petal size, area and shape, another petal was 264 dissected on each collected flower, taped flat and imaged using a high resolution scanner (Epson Perfection V700 Photo, Seiko Epson, Suwa, Japan). Using ImageJ (Schneider et al. 265 266 2012), we then measured petal length from the paracorolla to the apical part (mm), largest 267 width (mm), cleft length (mm) and petal area (mm²). Two indexes of petal shape were then

268 calculated: elongation (i.e. length divided by width) and bifidity (i.e. cleft length divided by269 petal length).

270 *Measurements at the end of the flowering peak* - At the end of the flowering season, total
271 flower production was estimated on both sexes by counting all pedicels attached on the
272 stems.

273 *Reproductive and mating success*

Females – Seed number per fruit was estimated jointly with ovule number (see above).
Female reproductive success was then estimated by multiplying mean seed number per fruit,
total number of fruits and germination rate. Germination rates were estimated on a subsample of seeds (15 to 90 seeds per female according to its relative production) that were
sown in petri dishes filled with 40mL of 10g/L agar in sterile water (photoperiod 14:10 and
temperature 15-21°C).

280 Males - Reproductive success was estimated as the total number of seeds sired on a sample 281 of genotyped seedlings, which was determined using paternity analyses. Genotyped 282 seedlings were selected so as to reflect each female's contribution to the total seed pool (for any given female, the proportion of genotyped seeds relative to the total number of 283 284 genotyped seeds is the same as the proportion of seeds produced relative to the total seed production at the population level) and were sampled across all fruits the female produced 285 during the flowering season. On average, 23 seedlings per mother were genotyped, and this 286 287 number ranged from a minimum of 6 to a maximum of 56 seedlings per mother.

14

288 Total genomic DNA of all adults (200 OP plants) and 2916 seedlings was extracted and 289 single-step multiplex PCR assays were used to amplify five nuclear microsatellites (Text S1 and Table S1). Paternity assignments were conducted using the maximum-likelihood 290 291 procedure implemented in the software CERVUS v.3.0.7 (Marshall et al. 1998; Kalinowski et 292 al. 2007). Likelihood scores, based on allele frequencies in the experimental population, were calculated for each seedling / potential father couple. To determine whether the paternity of 293 294 each offspring could be assigned to the father with the highest likelihood, we used the 295 difference in likelihood scores between the two most likely pollen donors (Δ_{LOD}). The critical value ($\Delta_{\rm C}$) of $\Delta_{\rm LOD}$ below which paternity could not be assigned at 80% was determined using 296 297 a distribution of Δ obtained from 10 000 simulated pollination events. This distribution was 298 generated using the following simulation parameters: no unsampled pollen donors and 2% of genotyping error. The reproductive success of each male was estimated as the number of 299 300 genotyped seedlings fathered. Three males did not sire any seeds in the sample of genotyped 301 offspring. We also used the results from the paternity analysis to estimate mating success of 302 each OP female and male as the number of genetic mating partners per individual.

303 *Statistical analyses*

The dataset with the 18 floral traits and reproductive and mating success for each experimental group is available on Dryad (https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.j6q573nh1). Statistical analyses are organized as follows. First, we evaluated the correlations between all pairs of traits, and then we selected a subsample of traits covering different functional categories and weakly correlated with each other to estimate natural and sexual selection gradients. All linear models verified (i) normal distribution of residuals, (ii) homoscedasticity and (iii) low levels of multicollinearity (i.e. variance inflation factor smaller than 4;Thompson et al. 2017).

312 All analyses were conducted in R (R Development Core Team 2019).

Trait variation – Within each of the three experimental groups (HP females and OP females 313 314 and males), correlations between all 18 measured traits were investigated to explore the phenotypic architecture and to identify trade-offs between traits. Correlations were 315 estimated using the Pearson correlation coefficient and significance was assessed using a t-316 317 test with Bonferroni correction. Additionally, phenotypic variation between groups was tested for all floral traits using Likelihood Ratio Tests (LRT) to assess group effect, in order to 318 (i) verify trait homogeneity between OP and HP females and (ii) assess the occurrence of 319 320 sexual dimorphism between OP females and males.

Standardization – Prior to estimating selection gradients, all floral traits were centeredscaled within groups to allow comparison by removing dimension (i.e. variance(SD)standardized selection gradient; Lande and Arnold 1983; Matsumura et al. 2012). Female and male reproductive success were relativized within groups by dividing the absolute reproductive success for each individual by group mean. Mating success was estimated in OP females and males only and were relativized within sex.

Natural selection gradients – Cohort and source forest were included as random effects in the following models and their effect was tested using LRT. Because source forest had weak effects (P > 0.05), this factor was not kept in final models.

330 The strength and direction of selection was estimated following Lande and Arnold (1983)331 using multiple regression analysis with relative reproductive success (i.e. produced / sired

332 seeds) as dependent variable and standardized trait values as independent variables. The 333 data set was simplified by reducing the number of traits because (i) our statistical power was limited due to sample size and (ii) multicollinearity is known to produce unstable selection 334 335 gradient estimates (Thompson et al. 2017). We selected six traits in order to keep a data set 336 with limited correlations and to cover different functional categories: one trait linked with phenology (flowering duration, i.e. the number of weeks the individual produced flowers), 337 338 one trait that is presumably involved in long distance attraction (plant height, which has been found to positively affect pollinator attraction in other systems; Zu and Schiestl 2017; 339 Brunet et al. 2015), two flower morphology traits (corolla width and calyx height, which are 340 expected to impact both attraction and various aspects of plant-pollinator fit, see for instance; 341 342 Glaettli and Barrett 2008), and two descriptors of plant fertility (number of gametes per flower and number of flowers produced over the whole flowering season). 64 HP females, 98 343 344 OP females and 100 males were measured on all six traits. Of these, three males and one HP 345 female were removed from the analyses because they did not sire / produce any seeds.

346 Multiple linear regressions of reproductive success on the six selected floral traits were 347 performed (i) group by group, (ii) on a dataset grouping HP and OP females, allowing us to 348 test for the occurrence of pollinator-mediated selection and (iii) on a dataset grouping OP females and males, allowing us to test for sex-specific selection. Significance of selection 349 350 gradients was assessed using t-tests for group by group models, and LRT were used to test 351 the effect of the group × trait interaction. Since multicolinearity precluded us from fitting all 352 traits in the same analysis, we also estimated selection differentials on each character one by 353 one. Differentials correspond to the slope of simple regressions of reproductive or mating 354 success on each trait taken separately. It thus covers both direct and indirect selection (i.e.

selection indirectly acting on a trait due to the correlation between this trait and another onethat would be the direct target of selection, see Figure S1).

Sexual selection gradients and indexes – We estimated sexual selection gradients (i.e. direct
sexual selection), by regressing relative mating success (i.e. number of genetic sexual
partners) in OP females and males on the six standardized traits, using the same method as
for natural selection gradients.

361 Additionally, we used Bateman's three metrics to quantify the overall strength of sexual 362 selection in each sex. First, we estimated the standardized variance in reproductive success, which corresponds to the opportunity for selection I (Wade 1979). Second, we estimated the 363 364 standardized variance in mating success in each sex, which corresponds to the opportunity 365 for sexual selection $I_{\rm S}$ (Wade 1979; Wade and Arnold 1980). We tested for differences in 366 reproductive and mating success variances between sexes using Levene tests. Third, we estimated a standardized partial Bateman gradient in each sex, by assessing the slope of the 367 linear regression of relative reproductive success on relative mating success, while 368 controlling for total flower number and mean number of gametes per flower (Henshaw et al. 369 370 2018).

To estimate Bateman gradients, we used two alternative sampling strategies for estimating female mating success. In a first set of analyses, we used the same estimate of male and female mating success as before, based on the genotyping of a number of seedlings per female that would reflect each female's contribution to the total seed pool (hereafter pro-rata method). Whereas this method has the advantage of not heavily truncating the variance in female MS (see below), it can however create an artificial relationship between mating and 377 reproductive success for females (Anthes et al. 2016). To estimate Bateman gradients without 378 this possible bias, we produced a second estimate of mating success, by using a bootstrapping procedure where we sampled ten genotyped offspring for each female 1000 379 380 times (hereafter fixed method). The possible disadvantage of this method is that it sets an 381 upper limit of ten reproductive partners per female. Male mating success was directly deduced from female MS and averaged over the bootstrapping procedure. Finally, to take 382 into account that the variance in female RS can translate into a variance in male RS, we 383 calculated individual RS of each male $p(RS_{m,p})$ as the sum of its contribution to each female *i* 384 $\Pi_{p}(\chi_{i})$ weighted by individual RS of each female ($RS_{f,i}$), as follows: 385

386
$$RS_{m,p} = \sum_{i=1}^{I} \Pi_{p}(\chi_{i}) \times RS_{f,i}$$

For each sampling method, we then tested for significance of the Bateman's gradient in each
sex using t-tests. We also tested for the differences in the Bateman gradient between sexes by
using LRT to test for mating success × sex interaction.

390 **Pollen limitation** – The occurrence of pollen limitation was tested on three components of 391 overall female reproductive success by assessing differences between OP and HP females in (i) seed-set (i.e. seed number divided by ovule number over all dissected fruits), (ii) fruit-set 392 (i.e. total fruit number divided by total flower number) and (iii) total number of seeds. 393 Differences in seed-set and fruit-set between OP and HP females were assessed using 394 generalized linear models with binomial distribution and an individual random effect for 395 396 seed-set as several fruits were sampled per individual. Differences in total seed production 397 were assessed by using a generalized linear model with negative binomial distribution to account for overdispersion (package glmmTMB; Brooks et al. 2017). LRT were used to testthe effect of pollination treatment.

400

401 **Results**

402 *Trait variation*

Correlations between traits in open-pollinated plants - Within each sex, correlations 403 404 between traits were explored for all possible pairs (153 pairs). Overall, males appeared to be 405 more phenotypically integrated than females (32.0% versus 13.7% of all correlations were significant after Bonferroni correction, Figure 1 and Table S2). In females, significant 406 correlations were mostly positive (22 out of 26 significant correlations), while nearly half of 407 them were negative in males (23 out of 49 significant correlations). Some obvious correlations 408 409 were observed in both males and females, such as positive correlations between various measurements of flower size (corolla width, calyx height, petal length, width and area) or 410 411 positive correlations between stem number, flower number (both daily and total) and height 412 (Figure 1 and Table S2). The most notable differences between males and females included (i) 413 a positive correlation between estimates of flower number and flowering duration in males only, (ii) a trade-off between flower size and total flower number, as well as between flower 414 415 size and flowering duration in males only, (iii) a negative correlation between the number of gametes per flower and total flower number in females and (iv) a negative correlation 416 between viable pollen production per flower and flowering duration in males. 417

418 Homogeneity between open-pollinated and hand-pollinated females - We detected no 419 significant differences between the two groups of females, except for three traits. HP females 420 displayed fewer flowers per day ($\chi^2_{1,159}$ =4.56,*P*=.033), fewer gametes per flower (421 $\chi^2_{1,159}$ =4.73,*P*=.030) and shorter calyxes ($\chi^2_{1,159}$ =3.91,*P*=.048) than OP females.

Sexual dimorphism – All measured traits were sexually dimorphic, except petal color as 422 423 perceived by bees (Table 1). Males produced more flowers, both daily and total, flowered longer, were taller and produced larger flowers, both in terms of corolla width and calyx 424 height, than females. The same was true for all petal measurements. Males also had more 425 elongated and bifid petals. The only trait showing female-biased sexual dimorphism was 426 nectar sugar content, with females offering significantly more reward per flower than males. 427 However, because of the difference in flower production between sexes, nectar reward at the 428 429 plant level was still overwhelmingly more abundant in males than in females.

430 Natural selection gradients

In females, natural selection gradients were similar in HP and OP plants: in both groups, we detected a significantly positive relation between reproductive success and two traits linked with fertility, total flower number and number of gametes per flower (Table 2). Accordingly, we did not observe any pollinator-mediated selection (i.e. none of the group × trait interactions were significant; Table 2). Regarding selection differentials, we detected significant total selection on the same traits as well as on traits that were strongly correlated with them (Figure S1 and Table S2). In males we detected significant selection for larger corolla width and longer flowering
duration (Table 2). As in females, the patterns detected using selection differentials mirrored
those observed with selection gradients (Figure S1)

When fitting both sexes in the same model, the selection gradient for flowering duration was stronger in OP males than in OP females (i.e. significant effect of the sex × trait interaction; Table 2 and Figure S2). On the contrary, selection on total flower number and number of gametes per flower was stronger in females than in males. Although selection on corolla width was detected in males but not in females, the sex × trait interaction was only marginally significant (Table 2 and Figure S2).

447 Sexual selection gradients

We detected sexual selection for more gametes per flower and more flowers in OP females, along with positive sexual selection on both corolla width and flowering duration in OP males (Table 3). The sex × group interaction was significant for flowering duration, as well as for flower number and number of gametes per flower (Table 3 and Figure S3).

452 Sexual selection indexes

The opportunity for selection I (i.e. standardized variance in reproductive success), as well as the opportunity for sexual selection Is (i.e. standardized variance in mating success), were significantly stronger for OP males than for OP females (0.410 versus 0.168 and 0.286 versus 0.111, respectively). Levene's test on the variances in reproductive and mating success showed significantly stronger variance in males. In OP males, the partial Bateman gradient was significantly positive for both methods (pro-rata method: 1.08 SE ± 0.055, *P*<.001; fixed method: 1.05 SE ± 0.036, *P*<.001). In OP females, it was marginally positive for the fixed number method (0.45 SE ± 0.24, *P*=.067) but significantly positive for the pro-rata method (0.72 SE ± 0.084, *P*<.001). LRT showed that Bateman's gradients were significantly different between sexes for both methods (pro-rata method: $\chi^2_{1,183}$ =8.56, *P*<.01; fixed method: $\chi^2_{1,183}$ =7.24, *P*<.01; Figure 2), with reproductive success being more correlated with mating success in males than in females.

465 Pollen limitation

None of the components of female reproductive success indicated pollen limitation (GLMs, seed-set: $\chi^2_{1,2676} = 2.67$, P = .10; fruit-set: $\chi^2_{1,159} = 0.074$, P = .79; total production of viable seeds: $\chi^2_{1,159} = 1.35$, P = .25). OP females produced an average of 29.4 (SD ± 11.8) fruits and 469 4762.6 (SD ± 1835.2) seeds, and HP females produced 26.3 (SD ± 9.6) fruits and 4336.1 (SD ± 1502.2) seeds.

471 Discussion

Our study aimed at quantifying the strength of sexual and natural selection on an array of traits in both males and females of a dioecious plant, in which sexual selection is expected to partly occur through the action of pollinating insects. Most traits investigated in the current work displayed male-biased sexual dimorphism. Similar results have been reported in some dioecious plant species, and this has sometimes been interpreted as the possible outcome of sexual selection (Delph 1999; Eckhart 1999; Ashman 2009). Indeed, the expression of more conspicuous phenotypes in males may result from stronger selection on traits that increase 479 access to mating partners through pollinator attraction (Moore and Pannell 2011; Barrett and 480 Hough 2012), an expected difference between sexes when pollen is not a limiting factor for 481 female reproductive success. In Silene dioica, at least one previous study performed in 482 natural populations found no evidence for pollen limitation (Carlsson-Granér et al. 1998) and 483 this was also the case in our experimental garden. Consistent with our expectations, we found that: (i) selection acts on traits associated with fertility in females and on traits 484 485 associated with mate acquisition in males and (ii) reproductive and mating success are more 486 variable and show a stronger correlation in males than in females.

487 Patterns of selection on floral traits

Fertility selection acts on flower and ovule number in females - Selection differentials and gradients for total flower number and number of gametes per flower indicated a positive effect of these traits on female fitness. Selection for more flowers through female function is a common pattern in flowering plants (Harder and Johnson 2009; Caruso et al. 2019) and ovule number per flower was also found to be under positive selection in the sister species *Silene latifolia* (Delph and Herlihy 2012).

494 Comparing selection patterns between OP and HP females allows infererence of the nature 495 of selection on these two traits. Indeed, flower number could affect both pollinator attraction 496 or gamete production at the individual level, and could thus be subjected to both pollinator-497 mediated and fertility selection. In our experimental garden, seed production was not pollen 498 limited, and selection was found to act on the same traits, and with the same intensity in the 499 two groups. In other words, no pollinator-mediated selection was detected and the 500 significant selection on total flower number and gamete number could be entirely attributed 501 to the variance in fertility among females, rather than variance in the ability to attract pollinators. This pattern is however expected to vary widely with ecological conditions. 502 503 While individual density in our experimental population was within the range of values 504 observed in natura (Barbot et al. pers. obs., Carlsson-Granér et al. 1998), pollinator availability is expected to vary among sites, in particular in the current context of pollinator 505 decline (Biesmeijer 2006; Potts et al. 2010). Three fifths of published studies quantifying 506 507 pollen limitation in angiosperms report significant increases in female reproductive output in hand-pollinated plants (Burd 1994) and there is evidence that the intensity of selection on 508 attractive traits increases with the magnitude of pollen limitation (Ashman & Morgan 2004; 509 Sletvold & Ågren 2016). 510

511 Because competition to attract pollinators is one possible component of sexual selection, but 512 not the only one (for instance, sexual selection can also occur through post-pollination processes), comparing the results obtained with pollen supplementations to those obtained 513 with sexual selection gradients should provide some insight on whether and how pollinator 514 515 mediated selection and sexual selection overlap. We also detected positive sexual selection 516 gradients on both flower number and ovule number. In that case, this link between traits and mating success cannot be attributed to pollinator-mediated selection. In other words, females 517 518 with low values of mating success did not suffer from a shortage of pollen. Two factors could 519 explain this discrepancy between pollinator-mediated and sexual selection patterns. First, we cannot exclude the action of post-pollination sexual selection, receiving gametes from more 520 diverse partners could promote fecundation and zygote development, for example by 521 522 enhancing male-male competition (Aizen and Harder 2007; Pannell and Labouche 2013). Second, a part of this result is likely to emerge from the mechanistic relationship between the
total number of available ovules and the number of reproductive partners. This constraint
motivated our use of partial Bateman gradients (see below).

Finally, as mentioned earlier, this study provides a picture of sexual selection patterns in females in a non pollen-limited situation. Setting-up similar studies in other situations and/or species will allow covering the wide diversity of ecological situations encountered by insect pollinated plants. In particular, this should allow to investigate whether pollinator-mediated and sexual selection are detected on the same traits when pollen becomes limiting.

Sexual selection acts on corolla width and flowering duration in males – In males, patterns 531 of natural selection were consistent with those of sexual selection, based on both selection 532 533 differentials and gradients. Contrary to what was seen in females, we detected no association 534 between the male mating success and components of fertility (i.e. total flower number and 535 gamete number). Moreover, traits that appeared beneficial in terms of mating success were 536 also likely to increase the access of males to their female sexual partners. First, the number of sexual partners increased with corolla width, a trait that has been found to increase 537 538 pollinator attraction in several other species (Ashman and Stanton 1991; Stanton et al. 1991; Conner and Rush 1996). In some species, corolla width was also shown to affect flower-539 540 pollinator fit and impact the efficiency of pollen removal (Conner and Rush 1996; Ashman 541 and Diefenderfer 2001). It thus seems likely that sexual selection on this trait arises from 542 some pollinator-mediated selection, although this cannot be directly demonstrated in males. Second, flowering phenology played a major role in access to reproduction in males. While 543 the strong phenotypic correlation between flowering start and flowering duration prevented 544

545 us of disentangling the effect of these two traits, males that started early (and thus flowered 546 longer) clearly accessed more partners and reached higher siring success than males starting 547 later on in the flowering season. This set of traits increased the flowering overlap with 548 females, a trend that was already documented in *Silene latifolia* by Delph and Herlihy (2012). 549 The advantage of an early flowering start in terms of siring success has been reported in 550 several species (O'Connell and Johnston 1998; Munguía-Rosas et al. 2011; Forrest 2014; 551 Austen and Weis 2016). Here, the possible overlap between pollinator-mediated and sexual 552 selection is less clear. Selection for earlier (and thus longer) flowering may reflect the fidelity 553 of pollinators to individuals on which they had originally been foraging or, since this pattern 554 was also documented in a wind-pollinated species (De Cauwer et al. 2012), the fact that 555 males that flower early have larger floral displays when females start flowering, giving them 556 an edge over competitors starting later during the flowering season.

557 Contrary to females, we found no trace of selection acting on flower number in males. This is an unexpected result, given the common role of flower number in pollinator attraction in 558 many plant species (Conner and Rush 1996; Vaughton and Ramsey 1998), and given the 559 560 positive impact of flower number on the overall pollen production at the plant level. Flower 561 number has historically been considered as a typical 'male trait', based on the fact that many hermaphroditic species exhibit more flowers than the number of fruits they produce, leading 562 563 to the idea that these excess flowers would have a male, rather than a female function 564 (reviewed in Burd & Callahan 2000). This view has however been challenged by several experimental studies that found no or even negative selection through male function on this 565 566 trait (Elle and Meagher 2000; Hodgins and Barrett 2008; Lau et al. 2008; van Kleunen and 567 Burczyk 2008).

568 In Silene dioica, the absence of selection could reflect that flower number is, for the observed 569 range of trait values, more or less neutral for male fitness. Moquet et al. (2022) showed that one major factor explaining why males attract much more pollinators than females is their 570 571 larger floral displays. However, another study showed that artificially increasing the number 572 of flowers increased pollinator attraction in both sexes without impacting plant reproductive 573 success (Barbot et al. 2022). One possibility is thus that the relationship between this trait and 574 male fitness is a saturating one: after a certain threshold producing more flowers does not 575 result in any increase in male fitness. In addition, Barbot et al. (2022) found significant selection on flower number in males, when surveying reproductive success over a period of 576 577 10 days, suggesting that at this short time scale flower number may indeed increase male 578 reproductive success. When considering the whole flowering season, as we did in the current work, this effect no longer holds and flowering phenology appeared to be the most 579 580 impacting trait for male fitness.

581 Estimates of sexual selection

In addition to testing the dependency of mating success on floral phenotypes, sexual 582 583 selection was also quantified using several indexes that are typically used in animals (Klug et 584 al. 2010; Janicke et al. 2016). We found a greater opportunity for sexual selection in males, 585 consistent with the results recently reported in the wind-pollinated Mercurialis annua 586 (Tonnabel et al. 2019) and insect-pollinated Sagittaria latifolia (Kwok and Dorken 2022). 587 Regarding the Bateman gradients, when mating success was estimated based on the pro-rata 588 sampling method, we detected a significant positive relation between mating and reproductive success in females. This result is at least partly explained by the sampling 589

590 method (i.e. we sampled more seed in females with high reproductive success). When we 591 correct for this possible bias using the fixed sampling method, the slope was not significant. 592 In both cases we found a signicantly steeper Bateman gradient for males than for females, as predicted by theory (Arnold 1994*a*), and as found in three plant species (Johnson and Shaw 593 2017; Tonnabel et al. 2019; Kwok and Dorken 2022) . Again, a stimulating perspective of this 594 595 work will be to replicate similar experiments in situations where pollen availability limits 596 female reproductive success, in order to test whether these male-female differences in sexual 597 selection decrease in less favorable situations.

598 Sexual dimorphism evolution

599 Interestingly, the selection patterns detected in our study are only partly consistent with the sexual dimorphism observed in our model species. On the one hand, our findings of males 600 having wider corollas and flowering for a longer period of time than females are consistent 601 with sexual selection acting on these traits in male plants. On the other hand, the stronger 602 603 selection on flower number observed in females appears contradictory with the much higher 604 number of flowers displayed by males in this species. In males, and as mentioned previously, maybe flower number is not under selection because this trait does not increase pollen export 605 at least in the range of values that we observe. In females, the fact that positive selection on 606 607 flower number does not translate into evolution towards larger floral display may be that, 608 due to higher costs of reproduction, females are subjected to stronger trade-offs between 609 components of their fitness. For instance, although not quantified in our study, a trade-off between flower number and survival could maintain the marked sexual dimorphism for this 610

611 traits even in the face of a strong selection for larger number of flowers in females (Obeso612 2002).

613 Conclusion

614 Overall, our findings show that some predictions from sexual selection theory corpus seem to apply well to plants when pollen is not limiting. However, it seems crucial to explicitly 615 616 consider the specificity of plant reproduction when estimating mating success as mate 617 diversity and interpreting its relationship with reproductive success. First, the fact that each individual typically carries several independent reproductive tracts (i.e. flowers), opens the 618 619 question of the transferability of classical sexual selection metrics from animals to plants. 620 Because a high genetic mating success may be an indirect byproduct of fertility in females, 621 one should be cautious when interpreting sexual selection gradients. From the male perspective, one may also question whether genetic mating success accurately reflects access 622 623 to reproduction in plants. Indeed, multiple pollen dispersal events to several flowers carried 624 by the same female plant can constitute an efficient access to reproduction that would translate in a low genetic mating success. The strong positive Bateman gradient documented 625 626 on male *S. dioica* yet suggests that this metrics may satisfactorily capture access to female mates in our study system. The strong correlation between male reproductive and mating 627 628 successes probably stems in part from the observed variance in flowering duration: long-629 flowering males appear to have maximized their access to reproduction through a greater 630 overlap with flowering females. Studying sex-specific selection on attractive traits through 631 another angle, that of sexual partners acquisition, thus seems to constitute a promising 632 avenue.

633 References

- Aizen, M. A., and L. D. Harder. 2007. Expanding the limits of the pollen-limitation concept:
 effects of pollen quantity and quality. Ecology 88:271–281.
- Alonzo S. H., and M. R. Servedio. 2019. Grey zones of sexual selection: why is finding amodern definition so hard? Proceedings of the Royal Society B. 286:20191325.
- Anthes, N., I. K. Häderer, N. K. Michiels, and T. Janicke. 2016. Measuring and interpreting
 sexual selection metrics: evaluation and guidelines. Methods in Ecology and Evolution
 8:918–931.
- Arnold, S. J. 1994*a*. Bateman's principles and the measurement of sexual selection in plantsand animals. The American Naturalist 144:S126–S149.
- 643 ---. 1994*b*. Is there a unifying concept of sexual selection that applies to both plants and 644 animals? The American Naturalist 144:S1–S12.
- Arnold, S. J., and D. Duvall. 1994. Animal mating systems: a synthesis based on selectiontheory. The American Naturalist 143:317–348.
- Ashman T.-L., and M. T. Morgan. 2004. Explaining phenotypic selection on plant attractive
 characters: male function, gender balance or ecological context? Proceedings of the Royal
 Society B. 271:553-559.
- Ashman, T.-L. 2009. Sniffing out patterns of sexual dimorphism in floral scent. FunctionalEcology 23:852–862.
- Ashman, T.-L., and C. Diefenderfer. 2001. Sex ratio represents a unique context for selection
 on attractive traits: consequences for the evolution of sexual dimorphism. The American
 Naturalist 157:334–347.
- Ashman, T.-L., and M. Stanton. 1991. Seasonal variation in pollination dynamics of sexually
 dimorphic *Sidalcea oregana* ssp. *spicata* (Malvaceae). Ecology 72:993–1003.
- Austen, E. J., and A. E. Weis. 2016. Estimating selection through male fitness: three
 complementary methods illuminate the nature and causes of selection on flowering time.
 Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 283:20152635.
- Baena-Díaz, F., N. Zemp, and A. Widmer. 2019. Insights into the genetic architecture of
 sexual dimorphism from an interspecific cross between two diverging *Silene*(Caryophyllaceae) species. Molecular Ecology 28:5052–5067.
- Baker, H. G. 1947. *Melandrium dioicum* (L. emend) Coss. & Germ. Journal of Ecology35:283–292.

- 665 Barbot, E., M. Dufaÿ, J. Tonnabel, C. Godé, and I. De Cauwer. 2022. On the function of flower
- 666 number: disentangling fertility from pollinator-mediated selection. Proceedings of the Royal
- 667 Society B 289:20221987.
- Barrett, S. C. H., and J. Hough. 2012. Sexual dimorphism in flowering plants. Journal ofExperimental Botany 64:67–82.
- Barrett, S. C. H., and L. D. Harder. 2017. The ecology of mating and its evolutionary
 consequences in seed plants. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 48:135157
- 673 Bateman, A. J. 1948. Intra-sexual selection in *Drosophila*. Heredity 2:349–368.
- 674 Bell, G. 1985. On the function of flowers. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London 675 224:223–265.
- Biesmeijer, J. C. 2006. Parallel declines in pollinators and insect-pollinated plants in Britainand the Netherlands. Science 313:351–354.
- Bopp, S., and G. Gottsberger. 2004. Importance of *Silene latifolia* ssp. *alba* and *S. dioica*(Caryophyllaceae) as host plants of the parasitic pollinator *Hadena bicruris* (Lepidoptera,
 Noctuidae). Oikos 105:221–228.
- Briscoe Runquist, R. D., M. A. Geber, M. Pickett-Leonard, and D. A. Moeller. 2017. Mating
 system evolution under strong pollen limitation: evidence of disruptive selection through
 male and female fitness in *Clarkia xantiana*. The American Naturalist 189:549–563.
- Brooks M.E., Kristensen K., van Benthem K.J., Magnusson A., Berg C.W., Nielsen A., Skaug
 H.J., Maechler M., Bolker B.M. 2017. glmmTMB balances speed and flexibility among
 packages for zero-inflated Generalized Linear Mixed Modeling. The R Journal 9:378–400.
- Brunet J., M.W. Thairu, J.M. Hens, R.I. Link, and J.A. Kluever. 2015. The effects of flower,
 floral display, and reward sizes on bumblebee foraging behavior when pollen is the reward
 and plants are dichogamous. International Journal of Plant Sciences 176:811–819.
- Burd M. 1994. Bateman's principle and plant reproduction: the role of pollen limitation infruit and seed set. Botanical Review 60:83-159.
- Burd, M., and H. S. Callahan. 2000. What does the male function hypothesis claim? Journal ofEvolutionary Biology 13:735–742.
- 694 Carlsson-Granér, U., Elmqvist, J. Ågren, Gardfjell, and Ingvarsson. 1998. Floral sex ratios,
 695 disease and seed set in dioecious *Silene dioica*. Journal of Ecology 86:79–91.
- 696 Caruso, C. M., K. E. Eisen, R. A. Martin, and N. Sletvold. 2019. A meta-analysis of the agents697 of selection on floral traits. Evolution 73:4–14.

- 698 Conner, J. K., and S. Rush. 1996. Effects of flower size and number on pollinator visitation to
 699 wild radish, *Raphanus raphanistrum*. Oecologia 105:509–516.
- Dai, C., and L. F. Galloway. 2013. Sexual selection in a hermaphroditic plant through female
 reproductive success. Journal of Evolutionary Biology 26:2622–2632.
- 702 Darwin, C. 1871. The descent of man, and selection in relation to sex. John Murray, London.
- De Cauwer, I., J.-F. Arnaud, E. K. Klein, and M. Düfay. 2012. Disentangling the causes of
 heterogeneity in male fecundity in gynodioecious *Beta vulgaris* ssp. *maritima*. New
 Phytologist 195:676–687.
- Delph, L. F. 1999. Sexual dimorphism in life history. Pages 149–173 *in*Gender and sexual
 dimorphism in flowering plants. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin.
- Delph, L. F., and T.-L. Ashman. 2006. Trait selection in flowering plants: how does sexual
 selection contribute? Integrative and Comparative Biology 46:465–472.
- Delph, L. F., L. F. Galloway, and M. L. Stanton. 1996. Sexual dimorphism in flower size. The
 American Naturalist 148:299–320.
- Delph, L. F., and C. R. Herlihy. 2012. Sexual, fecundity, and viability selection on flower sizeand number in a sexually dimorphic plant. Evolution 66:1154–1166.
- Dufaÿ, M., V. Vaudey, I. De Cauwer, P. Touzet, J. Cuguen, and J.-F. Arnaud. 2008. Variation
 in pollen production and pollen viability in natural populations of gynodioecious *Beta vulgaris* ssp. *maritima*: evidence for a cost of restoration of male function? Journal of
 Evolutionary Biology 21:202–212.
- 718 Eckhart, V. M. 1999. Sexual dimorphism in flowers and inflorescences. Gender and sexual719 dimorphism in flowering plants. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin.
- Elle, E., and T. R. Meagher. 2000. Sex allocation and reproductive success in the
 andromonoecious perennial *Solanum carolinense* (Solanaceae). II. Paternity and functional
 gender. The American Naturalist 156:622–636.
- Forrest, J. R. K. 2014. Plant size, sexual selection, and the evolution of protandry in dioeciousplants. The American Naturalist 184:338–351.
- Fritzsche, K., and G. Arnqvist. 2013. Homage to Bateman: sex roles predict sex differences insexual selection. Evolution 67:1926–1936.
- Glaettli, M., and S.C.H. Barrett. 2008. Pollinator responses to variation in floral display and
 flower size in dioecious *Sagittaria latifolia* (Alismataceae). New Phytologist 179:1193–1201.
- Harder, L. D., and S. D. Johnson. 2009. Darwin's beautiful contrivances: evolutionary and
 functional evidence for floral adaptation. New Phytologist 183:530–545.

- Hemborg, Å. M. 1998. Seasonal dynamics in reproduction of first-year females and males in *Silene dioica*. International Journal of Plant Sciences 159:958–967.
- Hemborg, Å. M., and W. J. Bond. 2005. Different rewards in female and male flowers can
 explain the evolution of sexual dimorphism in plants. Biological Journal of the Linnean
 Society 85:97–109.
- Henshaw, J. M., M. D. Jennions, and L. E. B. Kruuk. 2018. How to quantify (the response to)sexual selection on traits. Evolution 72:1904–1917.
- Hereford, J., T. F. Hansen, and D. Houle. 2004. Comparing strengths of directional selection:how strong is strong? Evolution 58:2133–2143.
- Hodges, S. A. 1995. The influence of nectar production on hawkmoth behavior, selfpollination, and seed production in *Mirabilis multiflora* (Nyctaginaceae). American Journal
 of Botany 82:197–204.
- Hodgins, K. A., and S. C. H. Barrett. 2008. Natural selection on floral traits through male and
 female function in wild populations of the heterostylous daffodil *Narcissus triandrus*.
 Evolution 62:1751–1763.
- Houle, D., C. Pélabon, G. P. Wagner, and T. F. Hansen. 2011. Measurement and meaning inbiology. The Quarterly Review of Biology 86:3–34.
- Jalas, J., and J. Suhominen. 1986. Atlas florae europaeae: distribution of vascular plants in
 Europe. 7. Caryophyllaceae (Silenoideae). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Janicke, T., I. K. Häderer, M. J. Lajeunesse, and N. Anthes. 2016. Darwinian sex rolesconfirmed across the animal kingdom. Science Advances 2:e1500983.
- Jennions, M. D., and H. Kokko. 2010. Sexual selection. Evolutionary behavioral ecology.Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Johnson, M. G., and A. J. Shaw. 2016. The effects of quantitative fecundity in the haploid
 stage on reproductive success and diploid fitness in the aquatic peat moss *Sphagnum macrophyllum*. Heredity 116:523–530.
- Jones, A. G. 2009. On the opportunity for sexual selection, the Bateman gradient and themaximum intensity of sexual selection. Evolution 63:1673–1684.
- Jürgens, A., T. Witt, and G. Gottsberger. 1996. Reproduction and pollination in Central
 European populations of *Silene* and *Saponaria* species. Botanica Acta 109:316–324.
- 761 Kalinowski, S. T., M. L. Taper, and T. C. Marshall. 2007. Revising how the computer program
- 762 cervus accommodates genotyping error increases success in paternity assignment. Molecular
- 763 Ecology 16:1099–1106.

- 764 Kay, Q. O. N., A. J. Lack, F. C. Bamber, and C. R. Davies. 1984. Differences between sexes in
- 765 floral morphology, nectar production and insect visits in a dioecious species, *Silene dioica*.
- 766 New Phytologist 98:515–529.
- Klinkhamer, P. G. L., and T. J. de Jong. 1990. Effects of plant size, plant density and sex
 differential nectar reward on pollinator visitation in the protandrous *Echium vulgare*(boraginaceae). Oikos 57:399–405.
- Klug, H., J. Heuschele, M. D. Jennions, and H. Kokko. 2010. The mismeasurement of sexual
 selection. Journal of Evolutionary Biology 23:447–462.
- Knight, T. M., J. A. Steets, J. C. Vamosi, S. J. Mazer, M. Burd, D. R. Campbell, M. R. Dudash,
 et al. 2005. Pollen limitation of plant reproduction: pattern and process. Annual Review of
 Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 36:467–497.
- Kwok, A., and M.E. Dorken. 2022. Sexual selection on male but not female function in
 monoecious and dioecious populations of broadleaf arrowhead (*Sagittaria latifolia*).
 Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 289:20220919.
- Lande, R. 1981. Models of speciation by sexual selection on polygenic traits. Proceedings ofthe National Academy of Sciences 78:3721–3725.
- 780 Lande, R., and S. J. Arnold. 1983. The measurement of selection on correlated characters.781 Evolution 37:1210–1226.
- Lau, J. A., R. E. Miller, and M. D. Rausher. 2008. Selection through male function favors
 smaller floral display size in the common morning glory *Ipomoea purpurea*(Convolvulaceae). The American Naturalist 172:63–74.
- 785 Levitan D. R. and C. Peterson. 1995. Sperm limitation in the sea. Trends in Ecology and786 Evolution 10:228-231.
- Maia, R., H. Gruson, J. A. Endler, and T. E. White. 2019. *pavo2*: New tools for the spectral and spatial analysis of colour in R. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 10:1097–1107.
- Marshall, T. C., J. Slate, L. E. B. Kruuk, and J. M. Pemberton. 1998. Statistical confidence for
 likelihood-based paternity inference in natural populations. Molecular Ecology 7:639–655.
- 791 Matsumura, S., R. Arlinghaus, and U. Dieckmann. 2012. Standardizing selection strengths to 792 study selection in the wild: a critical comparison and suggestions for the future. BioScience
- **793** 62:1039–1054.
- Ming, R., A. Bendahmane, and S. S. Renner. 2011. Sex chromosomes in land plants. AnnualReview of Plant Biology 62:485–514.
- Minnaar, C., B. Anderson, M. L. de Jager, and J. D Karron. 2019 Plant–pollinator interactions
 along the pathway to paternity. Annals of Botany 123 :225–245

- Moore, J. C., and J. R. Pannell. 2011. Sexual selection in plants. Current Biology 21:R176–R182.
- Moquet, L., L. Lateur, A.-L. Jacquemart, I. De Cauwer, and M. Düfay. 2020. Temporal
 dynamics of sexual dimorphism in a dioecious species. Annals of Botany 126:471–480.
- Moquet, L., A. L. Jacquemart, M. Dufaÿ, and I. De Cauwer. 2022. Effects of sexual
 dimorphism on pollinator behaviour in a dioecious species. Oikos 2022:e08662.
- Morrissey, M. B., and G. D. Ruxton. 2018. Multiple regression is not multiple regressions: the
 meaning of multiple regression and the non-problem of collinearity. Philosophy, Theory, and
 Practice in Biology 10.
- 807 Munguía-Rosas, M. A., J. Ollerton, V. Parra-Tabla, and J. A. De-Nova. 2011. Meta-analysis of
- phenotypic selection on flowering phenology suggests that early flowering plants are
 favoured: Phenotypic selection on flowering phenology. Ecology Letters 14:511–521.
- Murphy, C. G. 1998. Interaction-independent sexual selection and the mechanisms of sexual
 selection. Evolution 52:8–18.
- 812 Obeso, J. R. 2002. The costs of reproduction in plants. New Phytologist 155:321–348.
- 813 O'Connell, L. M., and M. O. Johnston. 1998. Male and female pollination success in a
 814 deceptive orchid, a selection study. Ecology 79:1246–1260.
- Ollerton, J., R. Winfree, and S. Tarrant. 2011. How many flowering plants are pollinated byanimals? Oikos 120:321–326.
- Pannell, J. R., and A.-M. Labouche. 2013. The incidence and selection of multiple mating inplants. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 368:20120051.
- Paterno, G. B., C. L. Silveira, J. Kollmann, M. Westoby, and C. R. Fonseca. 2020. The maleness
 of larger angiosperm flowers. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 117:10921–
 10926.
- Pau, G., F. Fuchs, O. Sklyar, M. Boutros, and W. Huber. 2010. *EBImage* an R package for
 image processing with applications to cellular phenotypes. Bioinformatics 26:979–981.
- Peitsch, D., A. Fietz, H. Hertel, J. de Souza, D. F. Ventura, and R. Menzel. 1992. The spectral
 input systems of hymenopteran insects and their receptor-based colour vision. Journal of
 Comparative Physiology A 170:23–40.
- Peterson, R., J. P. Slovin, and C. Chen. 2010. A simplified method for differential staining ofaborted and non-aborted pollen grains. International Journal of Plant Biology 1:13.
- Pleasants, J. M. 1981. Bumblebee response to variation in nectar availability. Ecology62:1648–1661.

- 831 Potts, S. G., J. C. Biesmeijer, C. Kremen, P. Neumann, O. Schweiger, and W. E. Kunin. 2010.
- 832 Global pollinator declines: trends, impacts and drivers. Trends in Ecology & Evolution
- 833 25:345–353.
- R Development Core Team. 2019. R: A language and environment for statistical computing.
 R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Schneider, C. A., W. S. Rasband, and K. W. Eliceiri. 2012. NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of
 image analysis. Nature Methods 9:671–675.
- Sletvold, N., and J. Ågren. 2010. Pollinator-mediated selection on floral display and spur
 length in the orchid *Gymnadenia conopsea*. International Journal of Plant Sciences 171:999–
 1009.
- Sletvold, N., and J. Ågren. 2016. Experimental reduction in interaction intensity strongly
 affects biotic selection. Ecology 97:3091-3098.
- Stanton, M., H. J. Young, N. C. Ellstrand, and J. M. Clegg. 1991. Consequences of floral
 variation for male and female reproduction in experimental populations of wild radish, *Raphanus sativus* I. Evolution 45:268–280.
- Stephenson, A. G., and R. I. Bertin. 1983. Male competition, female choice and sexualselection in plants. Pollination biology. Academic Press, Orlando.
- Thomann, M., E. Imbert, C. Devaux, and P.-O. Cheptou. 2013. Flowering plants under globalpollinator decline. Trends in Plant Science 18:353–359.
- Thompson, C. G., R. S. Kim, A. M. Aloe, and B. J. Becker. 2017. Extracting the variance
 inflation factor and other multicollinearity diagnostics from typical regression results. Basic
 and Applied Social Psychology 39:81–90.
- Tomaszewski, C. E., M. W. Kulbaba, and L. D. Harder. 2018. Mating consequences of contrasting hermaphroditic plant sexual systems. Evolution 72:2114-2128
- Tonnabel, J., P. David, and J. R. Pannell. 2019. Do metrics of sexual selection conform to
 Bateman's principles in a wind-pollinated plant? Proceedings of the Royal Society B:
 Biological Sciences 286:20190532.
- Tonnabel, J., P. David, T. Janicke, A. Lehner, J. C. Mollet, J. R. Pannell and M. Dufaÿ. 2021.
 The scope for postmating sexual selection in plants. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 36:556–
 567.
- Trunschke, J., N. Sletvold, and J. Ågren. 2017. Interaction intensity and pollinator-mediated
 selection. New Phytologist 214:1381–1389.
- van Kleunen, M., and J. Burczyk. 2008. Selection on floral traits through male fertility in a
 natural plant population. Evolutionary Ecology 22:39–54.

- Vaughton, G., and M. Ramsey. 1998. Floral display, pollinator visitation and reproductive
 success in the dioecious perennial herb *Wurmbea dioica* (Liliaceae). Oecologia 115:93–101.
- Wade, M. J. 1979. Sexual selection and variance in reproductive success. The AmericanNaturalist 114:742–764.
- Wade, M. J., and S. J. Arnold. 1980. The intensity of sexual selection in relation to male sexual
 behaviour, female choice, and sperm precedence. Animal Behaviour 28:446–461.
- 871 Waelti, M. O., P. A. Page, A. Widmer, and F. P. Schiestl. 2009. How to be an attractive male:
- 872 floral dimorphism and attractiveness to pollinators in a dioecious plant. BMC Evolutionary
- 873 Biology 9:190.
- Warmke, H. E. 1946. Sex determination and sex balance in *Melandrium*. American Journal of
 Botany 33:648–660.
- Westerbergh, A., and A. Saura. 1994. Gene flow and pollinator behaviour in *Silene dioica*populations. Oikos 71:215–224.
- Willson, M. F. 1994. Sexual selection in plants: perspective and overview. The AmericanNaturalist 144:S13–S39.
- Willson, M. F., and N. Burley. 1983. Mate choice in plants: tactics, mechanisms andconsequence. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Zu, P., and F. P. Schiestl. 2017. The effects of becoming taller: direct and pleiotropic effects of
 artificial selection on plant height in *Brassica rapa*. The Plant Journal 89: 1009–1019.

884

885 Tables

886

Traits	OP females	OP males	LRT	P _{sex}
Stem number (mean)	1.09 ± 0.45	5.81 ± 3.07	$\chi_{1.197} = 193.76$	<.001
Height (cm, max)	47.03 ± 14.68	53.31 ± 12.86	$\chi_{1,197} = 13.07$	<.001
Corolla width (mm, mean)	17.93 ± 2.65	20.05 ± 1.87	$\chi_{1.197} = 39.62$	<.001
Calyx height (mm, mean)	13.44 ± 1.01	15.66 ± 1.01	$\chi_{1,197} = 160.18$	<.001
Nectar sugar content (µg sucrose/flower)	0.71 ± 0.57	0.46 ± 0.3	$\chi_{1,162} = 12.71$	< .001
Bees X-coordinate	0.10 ± 0.02	0.095 ± 0.02	$\chi_{1,162} = 0.87$.35
Bees Y-coordinate	0.145 ± 0.02	0.143 ± 0.02	$\chi_{1,162} = 0.19$.66
Petal length (mm)	8.81 ± 1.24	9.23 ± 1.21	$\chi_{1,168} = 6.36$.012
Petal width (mm)	9.02 ± 1.38	9.94 ± 1.51	$\chi_{1,168} = 18.08$	<.001
Petal cleft length (mm)	4.1 ± 0.67	4.71 ± 1.13	$\chi_{1.168} = 17.34$	< .001
Petal area (mm²)	56.72 ± 15.4	63.52 ± 15.85	$\chi_{1,168} = 9.39$	< .01
Petal shape (elongation)	0.98 ± 0.1	0.94 ± 0.11	$\chi_{1,168} = 8.21$	<.01
Petal shape (bifidity)	0.47 ± 0.06	0.51 ± 0.09	$\chi_{1.168} = 9.31$	<.01
Total number of flowers	30.32 ± 11.84	316.32 ± 150	$\chi_{1.197} = 224.71$	< 0.001
Daily flower display (mean)	2.51 ± 1.12	18.59 ± 8.52	$\chi_{1.197} = 240.54$	< 0.001
Number of gametes per flower	257.71 ± 46.02	37152.45 ± 17472.81	$\chi_{1.195} = 229.49$	< 0.001
Flowering start	4.77 ± 1.79	5.16 ± 1.64	$\chi_{1.197} = 6.04$	0.014
Flowering duration (number of weeks)	4.3 ± 1.47	6.79 ± 1.56	$\chi_{1,197} = 104.29$	< 0.001

887 Note: Statistics from LRT are reported as well as associated *P*-values (P_{sex}) for differences

888 between OP females and OP males. Values in bold are significant at P < .05.

889 Table 2: Natural selection gradients estimates ± SE on variance-standardized traits for hand-pollinated females, open-pollinated females and
 890 males.

		eta HP females	Р	eta OP females	Р	eta OP males	Р	Y_{pol}	D	Y _{sex}	
		$R_M^2 = 0.268$	56 d.f	$R_M^2 = 0.157$	90 d.f	$R_M^2 = 0.242$	92 d.f	$R_M^2 = 0.412$	P_{pol}	$R_M^2 = 0.372$	P _{sex}
Height (mean)		-0.083 ± 0.053	.12	0.008 ± 0.036	.81	0.007 ± 0.073	.92	$\chi^2_{1,147} = 0.01$.93	$\chi^2_{1,183} = 0.15$.70
Corolla width (mean)		0.004 ± 0.037	.22	-0.001 ± 0.99	.99	0.13 ± 0.058	.027	$\chi^{2}_{1,147} = 0.52$.52	$\chi^2_{1,183} = 3.72$.054
Calyx height (mean)		-0.056 ± 0.037	.14	-0.034± 0.037	.36	-0.059 ± 0.055	.28	$\chi^{2}_{1,147} = 0.33$.57	$\chi^2_{1,183} = 0.30$.59
Total number of flowers		0.23 ± 0.044	< 0.001	0.26 ± 0.036	<.001	-0.078 ± 0.066	.24	$\chi^2_{1,147} = 0.02$.90	$\chi^2_{1,183} = 21.87$	<.001
Number of gametes per f	lower	0.16 ± 0.038	< 0.001	0.22 ± 0.035	<.001	0.023 ± 0.052	.65	$\chi^2_{1,147} = 1.07$.30	$\chi^2_{1,183} = 9.08$	<.0.01
Flowering duration		-0.045 ± 0.040	.27	0.029 ± 0.036	.42	0.35 ± 0.064	<.001	$\chi^2_{1,147} = 1.17$.28	$\chi^2_{1,183} = 20.70$	< .001
891 Note: Degrees of freedom (d.f.) and <i>P</i> -values from t-tests are reported for the significance of sexual selection gradients. Statistics from LRT											
892 are reported for interaction terms : (i) between pollination group and trait γ_{pol} (OP versus HP females) to investigate pollinator-mediated											
893 selection and (ii) between sex and trait γ_{sex} (OP females versus OP males) to investigate sex-specific selection. The proportion of variance											
894 6	explained by fixed effects in each model is reported using marginal R-squared (R_M^2). Values in bold are significant at $P < .05$.										

895 **Table 3:** Sexual selection gradients estimates ± SE on variance-standardized traits for open-pollinated females and males.

	$eta_{\scriptscriptstyle MS}$ OP females	Р	$eta_{\scriptscriptstyle MS}$ OP males	Р	γ_{sex}	D
	$R_{M}^{2}=0.280$	90 d.f	$R_{M}^{2}=0.201$	92 d.f	$R_{M}^{2}=0.353$	P _{sex}
Height (mean)	-0.019 ± 0.033	.55	-0.068 ± 0.060	.26	$\chi_{1,183} = 0.22$.64
Corolla width (mean)	0.011 ± 0.034	.74	0.12 ± 0.048	.011	$\chi_{1,183} = 3.75$.0.53
Calyx height (mean)	-0.009 ± 0.034	.78	-0.041 ± 0.045	.36	$\chi_{1,183} = 0.34$.56
Total number of flowers	0.18 ± 0.033	<.001	-0.062 ± 0.054	.25	$\chi_{1,183} = 15.70$	<.001
Number of gametes per flower	0.12 ± 0.032	<.001	0.010 ± 0.042	.81	$\chi_{1,183} = 4.15$.042
Flowering duration	0.031 ± 0.033	.35	0.26 ± 0.053	<.001	$\chi_{1,183} = 14.19$	<.001

896 Note: Degrees of freedom (d.f.) and *P*-values from t-tests are reported for the significance of sexual selection gradients. Statistics from LRT are reported for

897 γ_{sex} the interaction between sex γ_{sex} (OP females versus OP males) and trait, highlighting sex-specific sexual selection patterns. The proportion of variance

898 explained by fixed effects in each model is reported using marginal R-squared (R_M^2). Values in bold are significant at P < .05.

899 Figures



Figure 1: Correlations between traits for OP females (left) and OP males (right). Correlation coefficients that were statistically significant after Bonferroni correction are colored, with positive correlations in blue and negative correlations in red. The size of the dot is proportional to the correlation coefficient value. Note that shape indexes were calculated as follows: petal length divided by width for elongation and cleft length divided by petal length for bifidity. Exact values for the coefficients are available in supplementary materials (Table S2).

908

909



Figure 2: Bateman's gradients (i.e. relation between reproductive and mating success) according to the sampling method (A) pro-rata method and (B) fixed method. The distributions of reproductive success and mating success in both sexes are represented respectively along the right and top margins (females in white and males in black). Females are representend with gray lines and empty circles and OP males are represented with black lines and filled circles.

916