



HAL
open science

On the function of flower number: disentangling fertility from pollinator-mediated selection

Estelle Barbot, Mathilde Dufaÿ, Jeanne Tonnabel, Cécile Godé, Isabelle de Cauwer

► To cite this version:

Estelle Barbot, Mathilde Dufaÿ, Jeanne Tonnabel, Cécile Godé, Isabelle de Cauwer. On the function of flower number: disentangling fertility from pollinator-mediated selection. 2023. hal-04083938

HAL Id: hal-04083938

<https://hal.science/hal-04083938>

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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

1 **On the function of flower number: disentangling fertility from pollinator-**
2 **mediated selection**

3 Estelle Barbot^{1,2}, Mathilde Dufaÿ³, Jeanne Tonnabel^{2,3}, Cécile Godé¹ and Isabelle De
4 Cauwer¹

5 ¹Univ. Lille, CNRS, UMR 8198 - Evo-Eco-Paleo, F-59000 Lille, France

6 ²ISEM, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, IRD, Montpellier, France

7 ³CEFE, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, Univ Paul Valéry Montpellier 3, EPHE, IRD,
8 Montpellier, France

9 **Abstract**

10 In animal-pollinated angiosperms, the “male-function” hypothesis claims that male
11 reproductive success should benefit from large floral displays, through pollinator
12 attraction, while female reproductive success is expected to be mainly limited by
13 resource availability. As appealing as this theory might be, studies comparing
14 selection strength on flower number in both sexes rarely document the expected
15 asymmetry. This discrepancy could arise because flower number impacts both
16 pollinator attraction and overall gamete number. In this study, we artificially
17 manipulate floral displays to disentangle the fertility versus pollinator attraction
18 components of selection, both in terms of mating and reproductive success. In
19 females, flower number was under strong fertility selection, as predicted in the
20 absence of pollen limitation. In contrast, in males, flower number was mainly under
21 sexual selection, which in turn increased male reproductive success. However, these
22 selection patterns were not different in males with artificially increased floral
23 displays. This suggests that sexual selection acting on flower number in males do not
24 occur because flower number increases pollinator attraction, but rather because more
25 pollen is available to disperse on more mates. Our study illustrates the power of
26 disentangling various components of selection with potentially sex-specific effects for
27 understanding the evolution of sexual dimorphism.

28 **Keywords:** sexual selection – pollinator attraction – gametes – sexual dimorphism –
29 “male-function” hypothesis – phenotypic manipulation

30 **Introduction**

31 Darwin himself introduced the notion of sexual selection, advocating that certain
32 traits are selected because they enhance individual fitness through mating success,
33 i.e. the number of sexual partners [1]. According to theory, anisogamy should result
34 in male reproductive success being more limited by gamete acquisition (e.g. through
35 mate acquisition) than female reproductive success [2–5]. Across the animal
36 kingdom, this statement is widely supported by two lines of evidence. First,
37 empirical studies measuring sex-specific Bateman's gradients, the slope of the
38 regression of reproductive success on mating success, generally demonstrate this
39 relation to be steeper in males than in females [6]. Second, male biased sexual
40 dimorphism for armament and ornament is pervasive in animal taxa, particularly in
41 reptiles, birds and mammals, suggesting stronger sexual selection on male versus
42 female phenotypes [7,8].

43 The scope for such sex differences in the dependence of reproductive success on
44 access to sexual partners has long been suggested to include all sexually reproducing
45 anisogamous organisms, thus including plants [2,8]. In animals, during the pre-
46 copulation phase of reproduction, sexual selection can involve (i) competition for the
47 access to sexual partners (usually among males) and/or (ii) choice of sexual partners
48 (usually by females [4]). In plants, during the pre-pollination phase of reproduction
49 when pollen is dispersed from anthers to stigmas, sexual selection can operate
50 through male intrasexual competition to access receptive stigmas [9]. Sexual selection

51 can also take the form of female intrasexual competition to receive viable pollen in
52 the common case of pollen limitation [10,11]. One might thus expect between-sex
53 differences in the intensity of sexual selection to decrease with increasing pollen
54 limitation, as observed in broadcast spawning animals when male gametes become
55 limiting [12].

56 Yet, the pre-pollination phase of plants strongly differs from sexual selection in
57 animals given that it involves a third party – the pollinators – in a vast majority of
58 angiosperm species [13]. Sexual selection mediated by pollinators may thus drive the
59 evolution of phenotypic traits linked with pollinator attraction, with obvious
60 parallels with mate attraction in animals [9,14]. In this respect, a wide range of floral
61 traits has been demonstrated to be involved in pollinator attraction, such as nectar
62 quantity [15], flower size [16,17] or flower number (reviewed in [18]). In dioecious
63 plants, i.e. species with separate sexes, sexual dimorphism in floral traits is generally
64 thought to have evolved through differential sexual selection between sexes [9,19].

65 In dioecious species, males generally carry more flowers than females, at least in
66 temperate regions, suggesting stronger directional selection on this trait in males
67 than in females [20–22]. Similarly, in hermaphroditic species, flower number has
68 been historically considered as a typical ‘male’ trait, as earlier work in plants argued
69 that flower number, beyond a certain threshold, served the purpose of the male
70 function only [23,24]. Indeed, hermaphroditic plants often display fruit-sets lower
71 than one (i.e. produce many flowers that do not mature into fruits), even in optimal

72 pollination conditions [25,26]. The rationale for this “male-function” hypothesis is
73 based on the common observation that flower number affects pollen donation more
74 than seed production [23,24,27,28]. One process behind this involves pollinator
75 attraction : large number of flowers often increase the number of pollinators visits
76 [17,18,29,30]. Thus, if pollen donation depends more on the number of pollinators
77 visits compared to ovule fertilization, large floral displays would mainly benefit male
78 fitness after a certain threshold [23]. Yet, empirical support for the male-function
79 hypothesis remains ambiguous [31]. Indeed, several studies quantifying selection on
80 flower number through both sexual functions in hermaphroditic species found either
81 (i) weaker selection on flower number through male function compared to female
82 function [32,33], (ii) no selection through the male function [34] or even (iii) negative
83 selection through the male function [35,36]. Quantifying the relative effect of flower
84 number through different components of selection in each sex may help understand
85 the current discrepancy between verbal expectations and empirical data.

86 Selection on flower number may arise through two distinct but simultaneous
87 selective processes. First, flower number can be under sexual selection if individuals
88 with larger display benefit from increased reproductive success through enhanced
89 pollinator attraction (i.e. pollinator-mediated sexual selection), ultimately acquiring
90 a higher number of sexual partners. Second, flower number can be under fertility
91 selection if individuals with larger displays benefit from higher gamete production at
92 the plant level. Comparing the strength of selection between arrays of hand-

93 pollinated and open-pollinated plants has allowed to partition the effect of
94 pollinator-mediated and fertility selection on flower number in a number of study
95 systems [37–40]. One important caveat of this approach, however, is that it focuses on
96 female fitness exclusively, precluding any explicit test of the male-function
97 hypothesis [31]. A powerful method to alleviate this issue is the use of phenotypic
98 manipulation [41]. In animals, experiments manipulating traits thought to be
99 involved in mate acquisition has proven to be an effective method in sexual selection
100 studies [42–45]. While phenotypic manipulation has allowed to explain the evolution
101 of various floral traits through pollinator-mediated selection [46–48], this approach
102 has not yet been applied to explicitly test the male-function hypothesis.

103 In this study, we performed phenotypic manipulation in order to test whether flower
104 number benefitted more the male rather than the female reproductive success,
105 through its impact on pollinator attraction. By adding dummy flowers on half of the
106 individuals in an experimental population of the dioecious species *Silene dioica*, at
107 the population flowering peak, we amplified the visual signal displayed by some
108 plants without changing their gamete production. Such approach allows
109 disentangling pollinator-mediated from fertility components of selection on flower
110 number with a common methodology for both sexes. Within each sex, two
111 components of individual fitness will be considered: (i) the number of offspring
112 produced, referred to as reproductive success hereafter, which corresponds to the
113 number of seeds for females, and to an estimate of the number of sired offspring for

114 males, obtained through paternity analysis and (ii) the number of acquired mates,
115 referred to as mating success hereafter, which corresponds to the number of genetic
116 mates for both sexes. Because female reproduction is supposed to be limited mainly
117 by resource availability for ovule production and maturation, at least when
118 pollinators are not a limiting factor, we predict that neither female reproductive
119 success, nor its relationship with the number of real flowers, should be impacted by
120 our treatment (control vs. enhanced visual signal). We however hypothesize that
121 female mating success can be affected by our treatment if the addition of dummy
122 flowers enhances pollinator attraction and mate acquisition. In males, we predict that
123 enhancing the visual signal to pollinators should increase both mating and
124 reproductive success, and possibly strengthen the relationship between the number
125 of real flowers and mating/reproductive success assuming that the benefit of
126 displaying a showier signal increases with the number of gametes produced at the
127 plant level.

128 **Material and methods**

129 *Study system*

130 *Silene dioica* (L.) Clairv. is a short-lived perennial herb of the Caryophyllaceae
131 family. This dioecious plant is widespread throughout northern and central Europe
132 [49,50]. Sex determination is genetic, with males being the heterogametic sex [51,52].
133 The species is sexually dimorphic for flower number and size, with males being more

134 conspicuous than females [22,53]. *Silene dioica* is insect-pollinated and displays a
135 generalist pollination system with bees and hoverflies as main pollinators [49,54].

136 *Plant material and experimental design*

137 Plant material was generated using seeds collected in three forests from the same
138 region where the experiment was conducted (Lille University in France, 50°36'27.9''N
139 3°08'36.3''E), in order to reach a sufficient sample size while avoiding the inclusion of
140 half or full-sibs. All individuals were sown in a greenhouse and placed in separate
141 0.7-L pots filled with a standard soil mixture.

142 An array of 172 plants with 1:1 sex-ratio was kept in an insect-proof greenhouse until
143 the beginning of the experiment. The surface area of the experimental plot was of 50
144 m² and local density was 3.3 individuals.m⁻², mirroring typical densities observed in
145 nature. No wild populations of *Silene dioica* were growing in the vicinity. At the
146 flowering peak (31th May 2019), plants were randomly assigned to our two
147 treatments and placed in the experimental garden for ten days with individual
148 spatial positions arranged to follow a grid pattern where sexes and treatments were
149 alternated.

150 In the control group (C), flower number was left unmanipulated. It included 43
151 females (FC) and 43 males (MC). In the treatment group (T), which also included 43
152 females (FT) and 43 males (MT), the visual signal was amplified by adding enough
153 dummy flowers to double the flower number of each individual (i.e. different

154 numbers of dummy flowers were thus used depending on individual flower
155 production). Dummy flowers were created using crepe paper which was selected
156 based on its color spectra to approach average *S. dioica* petals' reflectance, and circles
157 of 3.5cm diameter were cut in the paper with the closest spectra and rolled to roughly
158 mimic *S. dioica*'s flower shape and size (Figure S1). These dummy flowers were then
159 tied on plants using an invisible nylon thread.

160 In addition to these open-pollinated plants, a group of 20 females (FHP) were placed
161 in the same experimental garden over the same period and artificially hand-
162 pollinated to quantify pollen limitation of female reproductive success. All open
163 flowers were supplemented every other day with pollen from a pool of males from
164 the same initial collection, isolated in a greenhouse. Each FHP female received pollen
165 from an average of 20 different males over the course of the experiment, with two
166 males being used for each pollination session for each FHP female. After ten days, all
167 females (FT, FC and FHP) were placed in an insect-proof greenhouse until fruits
168 reached maturity and could be collected, typically two to three weeks after flower
169 opening.

170 *Pollinator observations*

171 In order to verify our expectation that dummy flowers increased pollinator
172 attraction, pollinator visitation patterns were reported and compared between
173 treatments. We conducted observations on groups of ten neighbouring plants

174 through three observational sessions of 20 minutes spread over the course of the
175 experiment. Accordingly, each plant was observed for a total of sixty minutes. For
176 each pollinator entering the group under scrutiny, the identity of the visited plants
177 and the number of visits per plant were noted. A visit was defined as a clear contact
178 between the insect and the reproductive structures of a flower. For each plant, three
179 variables were derived from these observations (Figure 1): (i) whether a plant was
180 visited or not over the course of the sixty minutes, defined hereafter as visitation, (ii)
181 the number of visiting pollinators (i.e. the number of independent insects visiting a
182 given plant), and (iii) the total number of visits (i.e. the total number of contacts
183 between any pollinator and the reproductive structures of a given plant). Note that
184 we did not observe any contact between pollinators and a fake flowers.

185 *Trait measurement*

186 **Floral traits** – A total of twelve floral traits were measured on all plants. Three traits
187 were measured three times during the course of the experiment and averaged across
188 dates: (1) the number of open flowers, (2) corolla width and (3) calyx height. The
189 nine remaining traits were measured once, just before the beginning of the
190 experiment: (4) nectar volume, (5) sugar concentration, (6) petal colour luminance, (7)
191 petal colour saturation, (8) petal reflectance in UV wavelengths, (9) petal length, (10)
192 petal largest width, (11) petal area and (12) petal cleft length. Details about floral trait
193 measurements are available in appendix (Text S1; Figure S4).

194 **Gamete production** - The number of gametes per flower was assessed for both sexes.
195 For females, ovule number was assessed by imaging the contents of a random
196 sample of fruits. For males, pollen quantity was estimated on two anthers using a
197 particle counter. Details about estimation of gamete production in each sex are
198 available in appendix (Text S1).

199 *Female reproductive success*

200 Seed production was assessed on half of the mature fruits (one to six fruits per plant)
201 using image processing, as described in Text S1. Germination rates were estimated
202 on a sub-sample of 60 seeds per female that were sown in petri dishes filled with
203 40mL of 10g/L agar in sterile water (photoperiod 14:10 and temperature 21-15°C) and
204 surveyed during 15 days. For each female, reproductive success over the course of
205 the experiment was then obtained by multiplying three terms: total number of fruits,
206 mean seed number per fruit, and germination rate.

207 *Male reproductive success*

208 Male reproductive success was estimated by genotyping a subsample of offspring.
209 The number of seedlings genotyped for each female reflected its contribution to the
210 total seed pool (23.6 ± 11.4 seeds genotyped per female). Within each female,
211 seedlings were randomly sampled across fruits. Total genomic DNA from adults (86
212 females and 86 males) and seedlings (2030 individuals) was extracted, and PCR
213 assays were used to amplify five nuclear microsatellites (Table S1, Text S2). Using

214 genotypes and individual spatial data, we then used a spatially explicit mixed
215 mating model (MEMM model, [55]) to assess variation in male reproductive success
216 and in pollen dispersal kernels, as described in Text S3.

217 *Estimation of mating success*

218 We performed categorical paternity assignments using CERVUS 3.07, allowing for a
219 2% genotyping error and using an 80% confidence criterion [56,57]. To assess the
220 number of effective mating partners for each female and male (i.e. genetic mating
221 success), we used a bootstrapping procedure that sampled 8 seeds per mother 1000
222 times. Fixing the number of offspring per mother allows avoiding the establishment
223 of an artificially positive correlation between reproductive and mating success that
224 would solely reflect variation in seed production across females [58]. The mean
225 number of effective mating partners by individual across bootstraps was used in the
226 analysis. All data (pollinator visits, floral traits, male and female reproductive and
227 mating success, as well as pollen dispersal distances) is available on Dryad
228 (doi:10.5061/dryad.0rxwdb4d).

229 *Statistical analysis*

230 **Phenotypic homogeneity between groups** – Prior to all analyses, we removed one
231 male from the treatment with manipulated flower number (MT) because it produced
232 over one standard-deviation more flowers than the second most-floriferous male
233 individual. One female was also removed from dataset because it did not produce

234 any seeds (FC). For each sex, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was
235 then performed to ascertain that values for the thirteen measured traits (twelve floral
236 traits and gamete number, see above) were homogeneous within sex and among
237 treatments, using Wilks' Lambda statistic.

238 **Assessing pollen limitation in the experimental plot** – The occurrence of pollen
239 limitation was tested by assessing whether the treatment (control FC, manipulated
240 FT or hand-pollinated FHP) affected seed set. Seed set was calculated for each
241 dissected fruit as seed number divided by ovule number. Comparisons were
242 performed using a generalized linear model with a binomial distribution. A random
243 individual effect was added because several fruits were sampled for each female
244 (*lme4* package, [59]), and a likelihood ratio test was used to test the effect of
245 pollination treatment, by comparing models without vs. with pollination treatment
246 as a fixed effect.

247 **Testing the effect of phenotypic manipulation on pollinator visits, pollen dispersal**
248 **distances, reproductive success and mating success** – In the following models, we
249 included as fixed effects (1) the first axis of a PCA on all morphological floral traits,
250 (2) the number of real flowers, and (3) gamete number per flower. The latter two
251 were explicitly included in models as fixed effects to account for fertility variation
252 between plants while the former described the general floral phenotype of
253 individuals. PCAs were performed on males and females separately. The first axis
254 accounted for 27.6% of floral traits' variance in females and 29.8% in males. We only

255 retained the first axis of the PCA on basis of the broken-stick method ([60]; Figure
256 S2). In both sexes, this first axis mainly represents flower size variation (Figure S2).

257 ***Pollinator visits*** – Three groups of generalized linear models were built to explain
258 pollinator attraction, one for each estimate (visitation, number of pollinators visits,
259 total visits). For each model, likelihood ratio tests were used to test the significance of
260 the following fixed effects: (i) the number of real flowers, (ii) the first axis of PCA
261 defined above, (iii) treatment, (iv) sex and (v) the interaction effect between treatment
262 and sex, by comparing the likelihood of models including or not those effects.
263 Because pollen production can also play a role in pollinator attraction [61], additional
264 models testing for the effect of gamete production and its interaction with sex were
265 also built. Visitation was modelled using a GLM with a binomial distribution. For
266 models explaining either the number of pollinators or the total number of visits,
267 GLMs with negative binomial distributions were retained based on their greater AIC
268 values compared to hurdle or zero-inflated models (i.e. accounting for
269 overdispersion and/or excess of zeros).

270 ***Pollen dispersal distance*** – Variation in mean pollen dispersal distances among
271 males was assessed using multiple linear regressions including the following
272 explanatory variables: (i) the number of real flowers, (ii) the number of gametes per
273 flower and (iii) the first axis of PCA defined above. Separate analyses were first
274 performed on control males (MC) and on manipulated males (MT). Then, a second
275 analysis on both groups of males was performed to test differences between groups.

276 T-tests were conducted on estimates to assess their significance in separate models,
277 and likelihood ratio tests were used to test the effect of interactions between
278 treatment and each of the three explanatory variables in the complete model. Prior
279 weights were set up to take into account uncertainty of a posteriori individual mean
280 pollen dispersal distance estimated using the MEMM model (Text S3).

281 ***Patterns of selection on flower number*** – We used structural equation modelling
282 (SEM, [62]) which allows to jointly assess the direct and indirect effects of floral traits
283 (number of real flowers, gamete number and first PCA axis) on both mating and
284 reproductive success. Specifically, we evaluated how floral traits affected mating
285 success (Figure 2) while testing the relationship between mating success and
286 reproductive success (i.e. indirect effect of floral traits on reproductive success
287 through mating success; Figure 2). We also evaluated the direct relationship between
288 floral traits and reproductive success, independently of an indirect effect through
289 mating success (Figure 2). This was done on two separate datasets, one for each sex,
290 using *piecewiseSEM* package in R [63]. We then performed a multigroup analysis
291 using local estimation of the parameters for each sex, which is carried out in two
292 steps. The first step provides statistics for each treatment × variable interactions using
293 type III ANOVA to assess which selection patterns were similar between groups (i.e.
294 treatment × variable interaction effects that are not significant). The second step
295 provides correlation estimates, and significant treatment × variable interaction are

296 free to vary between each group. Estimates were then plotted on the network using
297 *semPlot* package in R [64].

298 Another aim of the study was to evaluate if enhanced pollinator attraction through
299 phenotypic manipulation resulted in higher mating success (MS) and/or
300 reproductive success (RS). To that aim and in addition to the SEM analyses, we
301 tested for a main effect of the treatment on MS and/or RS, which cannot be achieved
302 using SEMs. We thus built multiple linear models, predicting either reproductive or
303 mating success, again considering males and females separately. Apart from the
304 treatment variable, we tested for the same independent variables than those included
305 in the SEM analyses, i.e. number of real flowers, number of gametes per flower and
306 the first PCA axis. In models predicting reproductive success, mating success was
307 added as an additional explanatory variable. Significance of estimates were assessed
308 using T-tests for separate models, and likelihood ratio tests were used to test effects
309 of (i) treatment as main effect, (ii) treatment \times trait interactions, as well as (iii)
310 treatment \times mating success interaction in reproductive success models. Uncertainties
311 in the estimation of male reproductive success were again accounted for by
312 modelling prior weights using a posteriori distributions of the MEMM model. The
313 analyses were performed using as response variables either relative reproductive or
314 mating success (i.e. estimates were divided by the mean), and used standardized trait
315 values as explanatory variables (i.e. traits were centred and scaled), following
316 standard recommendations [65,66]. Relativization and standardization were

317 performed per sex and across treatments, since the methods used to estimate fitness
318 differed between sexes.

319 **Results**

320 *No evidence for pollen limitation*

321 We found no evidence of pollen limitation in our experimental garden. Hand-
322 pollinated females (FHP) did not show higher seed sets than open-pollinated females
323 (FC: $0.62 \pm \text{SE } 0.012$; FT: $0.64 \pm \text{SE } 0.011$; FHP: $0.59 \pm \text{SE } 0.018$; $\chi^2_{2,556} = 1.45, P = .48$).

324 *Phenotypic manipulation increased pollinator visitation*

325 A total of 280 pollinators were observed, including Syrphidae (60.7% of visitors),
326 *Bombus* species (28.6%), Halictidae (6.8%) and Lepidopterae (3.9%). Pollinators were
327 more attracted by males than females as revealed by a significant sex effect for all
328 three descriptors of pollinator visitation patterns: visitation ($\chi^2_{1,160} = 14.68, P < .001$
329), number of pollinators ($\chi^2_{1,160} = 63.19, P < .001$) and total number of visits ($\chi^2_{1,160} = 92.36, P < .001$;
330 Figure 1). MANOVAs on the thirteen measured traits did not
331 indicate phenotypic differences between treatments (females: $F_{15,67} = 1.34, P = .20$;
332 males : $F_{15,62} = 0.71, P = .77$), so any effect of treatment on visitation patterns should
333 be ascribable to the phenotypic manipulation. Results showed that dummy flowers
334 did not increase visitation ($\chi^2_{1,160} = 1.82, P = .17$), but increased both the number of
335 visiting pollinators and the total number of visits ($\chi^2_{1,160} = 6.04, P = .014$ and
336 $\chi^2_{1,160} = 6.91, P < .01$ respectively; Figure 1). Although the effect of the treatment

337 appeared stronger in females compared to males, none of sex \times treatment interactions
338 were significant (visitation: $\chi^2_{1,160}=1.98, P=.16$; pollinator number:
339 $\chi^2_{1,160}=2.43, P=.12$; total visits: $\chi^2_{1,160}=2.58, P=.11$). Pollinators were also
340 attracted by higher numbers of real flowers (pollinator number:
341 $\chi^2_{1,160}=25.37, P<.001$; total visits: $\chi^2_{1,160}=35.87, P<.001$), but this effect was
342 weaker for visitations ($\chi^2_{1,160}=3.25, P=.71$). Finally, larger values along PC1
343 (representing larger flower sizes) did not increase visitation ($\chi^2_{1,160}=0.0021, P=.96$)
344 nor the number of pollinators ($\chi^2_{1,160}=2.088, P=.15$) but increased the total number
345 of visits ($\chi^2_{1,160}=6.44, P=.11$). When included in the models, gamete number had
346 no effect on pollinator attraction, and did not modify the results described above.

347 *Pollen dispersal distance was influenced by the number of real flowers*

348 Across treatments, average pollen dispersal distance was 1.50 meters (± 0.32 SD)
349 within our experimental garden. Mean pollen dispersal distance did not differ
350 between control (MC) and manipulated (MT) males ($\chi^2_{1,77}=0.44, P=.51$; Figure S3).
351 Mean pollen dispersal distance increased with the number of real flowers in the
352 manipulated group. This effect was weaker in the control group, although the effect
353 of the interaction between the number of real flowers and treatment was not
354 significant (Table 1). Neither the number of gametes per flower nor PC1
355 (representing variation in flower size) affected pollen dispersal distances in both
356 groups.

357 *Selection patterns differed between sexes*

358 Results from SEM analyses and linear models were globally congruent. Estimates
359 and statistics from linear models are thus reported in supplementary (Table S2). SEM
360 analyses showed the same selection patterns in control and manipulated females
361 (Table 2). In both groups, we detected a significantly positive direct effect of the
362 number of real flowers on both reproductive and, to a lesser degree, mating success
363 (Table 2, Figure 2A), as well as a significant positive effect of the number of gametes
364 per flower on reproductive success. In both groups of females, MS and RS were not
365 significantly correlated. In the linear model, treatment did not increase reproductive
366 success (i.e. treatment as main effect was not significant; $\chi^2_{1,74}=1.23, P=.27$), but
367 significantly increased mating success ($\chi^2_{1,76}=4.97, P=.26$).

368 In both control and manipulated males, the number of real flowers was significantly
369 positively correlated with plant mating success (Table 2; Figure 2B). Because the SEM
370 analyses also detected a strong correlation between MS and RS in males, this
371 suggests an indirect effect of real flower number on reproductive success. The only
372 difference detected between manipulated and control males concerned the
373 correlation between the number of gametes per flower and reproductive success:
374 whereas this correlation was marginally positive in manipulated plants, it was
375 negative in the control group. In the linear model, neither the average reproductive
376 nor mating success were affected by the treatment (respectively $\chi^2_{1,74}=0.87, P=.35$
377 and $\chi^2_{1,76}=0.10, P=.75$).

378 **Discussion**

379 The current study aimed at exploring the male-function hypothesis [23,27], by
380 measuring the relationship between flower number and fitness in both sexes,
381 through its potential impact on pollinator attraction. Specifically, our aims were (i) to
382 investigate the impact of flower production on reproductive and mating success in
383 male and female plants of *S. dioica*, and (ii) to explore whether an experimental
384 enhancement of the floral signal would mainly impact selection patterns in males,
385 highlighting the role of flower number in pollinator attraction and pollen export.
386 Adding dummy flowers indeed increased pollinator attraction, enabling us to test
387 our predictions. As expected, we found that neither female reproductive success, nor
388 its relationship with flower number were impacted by this enhanced attraction. We
389 also found that this manipulation increased female mating success (in terms of mate
390 acquisition), but with no detected impact on seed production. In males, contrarily to
391 our hypotheses, we found no effect of enhanced attraction to pollinators on either
392 reproductive or mating success. Whereas large flower numbers seem to be associated
393 with a higher mating success, we found no difference in this selection pattern
394 between control and manipulated males. The reach of these results for the historical
395 discussion on the male function hypothesis are discussed below.

396 *Pollination context*

397 Seed production was not statistically different between open- and hand-pollinated
398 plants, suggesting that female reproductive success was not limited by pollen receipt
399 in the experimental garden. In such conditions, according to sexual selection theory,
400 one expects fitness of male plants to depend more on their ability to attract
401 pollinators compared to that of females [9,10], provided that pollinator attraction is
402 associated with the probability to reach sexual partners.

403 The strongest determinant of pollinator attraction was clearly sex (males received on
404 average twelve-fold more visits than females), confirming previous observations in *S.*
405 *dioica* [53,67]. It should be noted that this preference for male *S. dioica* plants is
406 known to be at least partly driven by the high degree of sexual dimorphism for
407 flower number [68]. This effect of flower number on pollinator attraction is confirmed
408 in our study: adding dummy flowers resulted in an overall increase in the number of
409 pollinators attracted, as well as in the total number of visits.

410 *Female reproductive success was mainly driven by gamete production*

411 In females, the number of real flowers was shown to positively affect reproductive
412 success, and this effect was similar in both manipulated and control plants. This
413 observation, along with the fact that no pollen limitation was detected, suggests that
414 the benefit for the female function of carrying more flowers is only linked to a higher
415 ovule production at the plant level, and not to any effect on pollinator attraction. In
416 other words, our results support the sole effect of fertility selection on the number of

417 flowers, in alignment with general expectations from sexual selection theory. Our
418 analysis also revealed positive selection on the number of ovules per flower, but no
419 selection on flower size (a trait often associated with pollinator attraction [16,17]).
420 Taken together, these findings support that, as long as the pollination context is
421 favourable, traits that increase female reproductive success are associated with
422 fertility, as found in several other plant species [37,39,69].

423 In our experiment, female mating success increased both when plants received more
424 pollinator visits (treatment effect) and when they carried more real flowers. These
425 two effects are likely to emerge from mechanistic aspects of pollen dispersal. On the
426 one hand, an increase in the number of independent pollinator visits is expected to
427 increase the diversity of pollen arriving on the stigmas. On the other hand, because
428 producing more flowers implies that more ovules are available for fertilization, an
429 increase in flower number should result in a parallel increase in the number of mates.
430 However, because female mating and reproductive success were uncorrelated, a
431 result equivalent to non-significant Bateman gradients found in females of many
432 animal species ([6] but see exceptions within) and in another plant species [70], the
433 detected positive effects on mating success did not translate in an increase in
434 reproductive success. In other words, females did not benefit from an increased seed
435 number because they accessed more sexual partners, confirming that only fertility
436 selection occurred in females of our experiment.

437 *Males do not seem to benefit from enhanced pollinator attraction*

438 Contrary to our expectations, artificially enhanced floral display did no impact male
439 reproductive success or patterns of selection on floral traits. The only difference
440 between control and manipulated male plants concerned selection on the number of
441 pollen grains per flower, with control plants experiencing negative selection on this
442 trait, whereas manipulated plants seemed to experience positive selection. Although
443 we could not find any satisfactory explanation for this difference between control
444 and manipulated plants, this effect is unlikely to be driven by treatment differences
445 in pollinator attraction, since the quantity of gamete per flower had no significant
446 impact on pollinators visits in our analyses. While a negative trade-off between
447 pollen quantity and quality could contribute to the observed change in selective
448 patterns between control and manipulated males, our previous evaluation of pollen
449 phenotypes suggests that this correlation is rather positive [22].

450 In both categories of males, the number of real flowers positively impacted mating
451 success. In strong contrast with the patterns observed in females, however, mating
452 and reproductive success were strongly associated, reflecting the positive Bateman
453 gradient that is often observed in male animals [6] and in a couple of plant species
454 [70,71]. Thus, although flower number did not have any detectable direct effect on
455 male reproductive success, our results support an indirect effect through mating
456 success: male plants with more (real) flowers tended to have a better access to mates,
457 which in turn significantly increased the number of seeds they sired. This part of our

458 results thus seems consistent with the expectation of flower number being under
459 sexual selection in males. Whereas observational studies cannot assess whether such
460 selective pattern is mediated by an increased pollinator attraction or an increased
461 gamete production, our manipulation of floral display -that increased pollinator
462 attraction only- allowed us going further. Under the hypothesis of a male function
463 through pollinator attraction, we were expecting differences between manipulated
464 and control males. Our results did not fit our expectations. Manipulated males did
465 not benefit from increased mating or reproductive success, and they appeared to
466 experience the same selection patterns on real flower number compared to control
467 males. This suggests that the possible benefit of exhibiting a high number of flowers
468 in males is not mediated by pollinator attraction per se. One likely explanation for
469 our results is that producing many flowers results in larger pollen loads on
470 pollinators (e.g. through increased visit time, [72]) and, ultimately, in reaching a
471 larger number of females. The fact that the number of real flowers was positively
472 associated with longer dispersal distance in both control and manipulated males
473 indirectly supports this hypothesis. Pollen production at the plant level is a trait that
474 typically falls in the realm of what is sometimes referred to as “the grey zone” of
475 sexual selection [73], since it can both be argued to be mainly under fertility selection
476 or under sexual selection.

477 This study documented extremely restricted pollen dispersal distances (typical for
478 entomogamous species, [74-76]), which might weaken the opportunity for sexual

479 selection, since male-male competition would typically occur among directly
480 neighbouring individuals. Nevertheless, our result support that males producing
481 more flowers gain higher fitness at through enhanced access to females. It thus
482 seemed that sexual selection played a part in the evolution of flower number in
483 males of *Silene dioica*, whereas selection on the same trait in females was
484 undoubtedly based on fertility selection. Nonetheless, this difference between males
485 and females could not be attributable to a differential in the relationships between
486 male vs. female fitness and pollinator attraction. Taken together, our results are thus
487 not congruent with the male-function hypothesis, when interpreted as an advantage
488 of producing many flowers to the male function through an increased capacity of
489 attracting pollinators [22,26].

490 **Data accessibility**

491 Data are available on Dryad: <https://dx.doi.org/10.5061/dryad.0rxwdb4d> [77].

492 **Funding**

493 This work is a contribution to the CPER research project CLIMIBIO. The authors
494 thank the French Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche, the
495 Hauts de France Region and the European Funds for Regional Economical
496 Development for their financial support to this project. JT was funded by a Marie-
497 Sklodowska-Curie grant (#844321).

498 **Acknowledgements**

499 We would like to thank E. Klein for letting us access the MEMM model. We thank S.
500 P. De Lisle for precious advice about reproductive and mating success relativization
501 and trait standardization in selection gradient analysis. We also thank Céline
502 Devaux, Eric Imbert and François Rousset for their advice about the analyses. This
503 work has been performed using infrastructure and technical support of the
504 "Plateforme Serre, cultures et terrains expérimentaux - Université de Lille". We are
505 grateful to Eric Schmitt for the support in plant collection maintenance. For
506 laboratory assistance, we thank L. Debacker, S. Flourez and N. Le Roux.

507

508 **References**

509

510 1. Darwin C. 1871 *The descent of man, and selection in relation to sex*. London: John
511 Murray.

512 2. Bateman AJ. 1948 Intra-sexual selection in *Drosophila*. *Heredity* **2**, 349–368.
513 (doi:10.1038/hdy.1948.21)

514 3. Trivers R. 1972 Parental investment and sexual selection. In *Sexual selection and*
515 *the descent of man*, pp. 136–179. New York: Aldine DeGruyter.

516 4. Jennions MD, Kokko H. 2010 Sexual selection. In *Evolutionary behavioral*
517 *ecology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

518 5. Lehtonen J. 2022 Bateman gradients from first principles. *Nature Comm.* **13**, 3591.
519 (doi:10.1038/s41467-022-30534-x)

520 6. Janicke T, Häderer IK, Lajeunesse MJ, Anthes N. 2016 Darwinian sex roles
521 confirmed across the animal kingdom. *Sci. Adv.* **2**, e1500983.
522 (doi:10.1126/sciadv.1500983)

523 7. Mori E, Mazza G, Lovari S. 2017 Sexual dimorphism. In *Encyclopedia of animal*
524 *cognition and behavior*, Cham: Springer International Publishing.
525 (doi:10.1007/978-3-319-47829-6_433-1)

526 8. Arnold SJ. 1994 Is there a unifying concept of sexual selection that applies to both
527 plants and animals? *Am. Nat.* **144**, S1–S12. (doi:10.1086/285650)

528 9. Moore JC, Pannell JR. 2011 Sexual selection in plants. *Curr. Biol.* **21**, R176–R182.
529 (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2010.12.035)

530 10. Burd M. 1994 Bateman's principle and plant reproduction: the role of pollen
531 limitation in fruit and seed set. *Bot. Rev.* **60**, 83–139. (doi:10.1007/BF02856594)

532 11. Knight TM *et al.* 2005 Pollen limitation of plant reproduction: pattern and
533 process. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **36**, 467–497.
534 (doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.36.102403.115320)

535 12. Levitan DR. 2010 Sexual selection in external fertilizers. In *Evolutionary*
536 *behavioral ecology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

537 13. Ollerton J, Winfree R, Tarrant S. 2011 How many flowering plants are pollinated
538 by animals? *Oikos* **120**, 321–326. (doi:10.1111/j.1600-0706.2010.18644.x)

539 14. Lloyd DG, Webb CJ. 1977 Secondary sex characters in plants. *Bot. Rev.* **43**, 177–
540 216. (doi:10.1007/BF02860717)

- 541 15. Hodges SA. 1995 The influence of nectar production on hawkmoth behavior, self-
542 pollination, and seed production in *Mirabilis multiflora* (Nyctaginaceae). *Am. J.*
543 *Bot.* **82**, 197–204. (doi:10.1002/j.1537-2197.1995.tb11488.x)
- 544 16. Ashman T-L, Stanton M. 1991 Seasonal variation in pollination dynamics of
545 sexually dimorphic *Sidalcea oregana* ssp. *spicata* (Malvaceae). *Ecology* **72**, 993–
546 1003. (doi:10.2307/1940599)
- 547 17. Conner JK, Rush S, Jennetten P. 1996 Measurements of natural selection on floral
548 traits in wild radish (*Raphanus raphanistrum*). I. Selection through lifetime
549 female fitness. *Evolution* **50**, 1127–1136. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.1996.tb02353.x)
- 550 19. Chittka L, Thomson JD. 2001 Behavioral responses of pollinators to variation in
551 floral display size and their influences on the evolution of floral traits. In
552 *Cognitive ecology of pollination - animal behavior and floral evolution*,
553 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 554 19. Barrett SCH, Hough J. 2012 Sexual dimorphism in flowering plants. *J. Exp. Bot.*
555 **64**, 67–82. (doi:10.1093/jxb/ers308)
- 556 20. Eckhart VM. 1999 Sexual dimorphism in flowers and inflorescences. In *Gender*
557 *and sexual dimorphism in flowering plants*, Berlin: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
558 (doi:10.1007/978-3-662-03908-3_5)
- 559 21. Cuevas E, Pérez MÁ, Sevillano L. 2017 Population size, sex-ratio and sexual
560 dimorphism in *Fuchsia parviflora* (Onagraceae) an endemic dioecious shrub. *Bot.*
561 *Sci.* **95**, 401–408. (doi:10.17129/botsci.904)
- 562 22. Moquet L, Lateur L, Jacquemart A-L, De Cauwer I, Dufay M. 2020 Temporal
563 dynamics of sexual dimorphism in a dioecious species. *Ann. Bot.* **126**, 471–480.
564 (doi:10.1093/aob/mcaa088)
- 565 23. Queller DC. 1983 Sexual selection in a hermaphroditic plant. *Nature* **305**, 706–707.
566 (doi:10.1038/305706a0)
- 567 24. Burd M, Callahan HS. 2000 What does the male function hypothesis claim? *J.*
568 *Evol. Biol.* **13**, 735–742. (doi:10.1046/j.1420-9101.2000.00220.x)
- 569 25. Sutherland S, Delph LF. 1984 On the importance of male fitness in plants: patterns
570 of fruit-set. *Ecology* **65**, 1093–1104. (doi:10.2307/1938317)
- 571 26. Holland JN, Bronstein JL, DeAngelis DL. 2004 Testing hypotheses for excess
572 flower production and low fruit-to-flower ratios in a pollinating seed-consuming
573 mutualism. *Oikos*. **105**, 633640. (doi:10.1111/j.0030-1299.2004.13058.x)

- 574 27. Bell G. 1985 On the function of flowers. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.* **224**, 223–265.
575 (doi:10.1098/rspb.1985.0031)
- 576 28. Skogsmyr I, Lankinen Å. 2002 Sexual selection: an evolutionary force in plants?
577 *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.* **77**, 537–562. (doi:10.1017/S1464793102005973)
- 578 29. Bond WJ, Maze KE. 1999 Survival costs and reproductive benefits of floral
579 display in a sexually dimorphic dioecious shrub, *Leucadendron xanthoconus*.
580 *Evol.Ecol.***13**, 1–18. (<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006581412580>)
- 581 30. Morales CL, Traveset A, Harder LD. 2013 Sterile flowers increase pollinator
582 attraction and promote female success in the Mediterranean herb *Leopoldia*
583 *comosa*. *Ann. Bot.* **111**, 103–111. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcs243>)
- 584 31. Ashman T-L, Morgan MT. 2004 Explaining phenotypic selection on plant
585 attractive characters: male function, gender balance or ecological context? *Proc. R.*
586 *Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* **271**, 553–559. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2003.2642)
- 587 32. Broyles SB, Wyatt R. 1990 Paternity analysis in a natural population of *Asclepias*
588 *exaltata*: multiple paternity, functional gender, and the “pollen-donation
589 hypothesis”. *Evolution* **44**, 1454–1468. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.1990.tb03838.x)
- 590 33. Sahli HF, Conner JK. 2011 Testing for conflicting and nonadditive selection: floral
591 adaptation to multiple pollinators through male and female fitness. *Evolution* **65**,
592 1457–1473. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2011.01229.x)
- 593 34. Conner JK, Rush S, Kercher S, Jenetten P. 1996 Measurements of natural
594 selection on floral traits in wild radish (*Raphanus raphanistrum*). II. Selection
595 through lifetime male and total fitness. *Evolution* **50**, 1137–1146.
596 (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.1996.tb02354.x)
- 597 35. Hodgins KA, Barrett SCH. 2008 Natural selection on floral traits through male
598 and female function in wild populations of the heterostylous daffodil *Narcissus*
599 *triandrus*. *Evolution* **62**, 1751–1763. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00404.x)
- 600 36. van Kleunen M, Burczyk J. 2008 Selection on floral traits through male fertility in
601 a natural plant population. *Evol. Ecol.* **22**, 39–54. (doi:10.1007/s10682-007-9157-9)
- 602 37. Sandring S, Ågren J. 2009 Pollinator-mediated selection on floral display and
603 flowering time in the perennial herb *Arabidopsis lyrata*. *Evolution* **63**, 1292–1300.
604 (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2009.00624.x)
- 605 38. Trunschke J, Sletvold N, Ågren J. 2017 Interaction intensity and pollinator-
606 mediated selection. *New Phytol.* **214**, 1381–1389. (doi:10.1111/nph.14479)

- 607 39. Chen L, Zhang B, Li Q. 2017 Pollinator-mediated selection on flowering
608 phenology and floral display in a distylous herb *Primula alpicola*. *Sci. Rep.* **7**,
609 13157. (doi:10.1038/s41598-017-13340-0)
- 610 40. Caruso CM, Eisen KE, Martin RA, Sletvold N. 2019 A meta-analysis of the agents
611 of selection on floral traits. *Evolution* **73**, 4–14. (doi:10.1111/evo.13639)
- 612 41. Campbell DR. 2009 Using phenotypic manipulations to study multivariate
613 selection of floral trait associations. *Ann. Bot.* **103**, 1557–1566.
614 (doi:10.1093/aob/mcp032)
- 615 42. Moore AJ, Moore PJ. 1999 Balancing sexual selection through opposing mate
616 choice and male competition. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* **266**, 711–716.
617 (doi:10.1098/rspb.1999.0694)
- 618 43. Cothran RD, Kuzmic A, Wellborn GA, Relyea RA. 2010 Phenotypic manipulation
619 provides insights into the function of a sexually selected trait in a freshwater
620 crustacean species complex. *Anim. Behav.* **80**, 543–549.
621 (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2010.06.019)
- 622 44. Katayama N, Abbott JK, Kjærandsen J, Takahashi Y, Svensson EI. 2014 Sexual
623 selection on wing interference patterns in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proc. Natl.*
624 *Acad. Sci.* **111**, 15144–15148. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1407595111)
- 625 45. Safran RJ, Vortman Y, Jenkins BR, Hubbard JK, Wilkins MR, Bradley RJ, Lotem
626 A. 2016 The maintenance of phenotypic divergence through sexual selection: an
627 experimental study in barn swallows *Hirundo rustica*. *Evolution* **70**, 2074–2084.
628 (doi:10.1111/evo.13014)
- 629 46. Cuartas-Domínguez M, Medel R. 2010 Pollinator-mediated selection and
630 experimental manipulation of the flower phenotype in *Chloraea bletioides*. *Funct.*
631 *Ecol.* **24**, 1219–1227. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2010.01737.x)
- 632 47. Barrio M, Teixido AL. 2015 Sex-dependent selection on flower size in a large-
633 flowered Mediterranean species: an experimental approach with *Cistus ladanifer*.
634 *Plant Syst. Evol.* **301**, 113–124. (doi:10.1007/s00606-014-1058-0)
- 635 48. Pellegrino G, Bellusci F, Palermo AM. 2017 Functional differentiation in
636 pollination processes among floral traits in *Serapias species* (Orchidaceae). *Ecol.*
637 *Evol.* **7**, 7171–7177. (doi:10.1002/ece3.3264)
- 638 49. Baker HG. 1947 *Melandrium dioicum* (L. emend) Coss. & Germ. *J. Ecol.* **35**, 283–
639 292.

- 640 50. Jalas J, Suhominen J. 1986 *Atlas florae europaeae: distribution of vascular plants*
641 *in Europe. 7. Caryophyllaceae (Silenoideae)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
642 Press.
- 643 51. Warmke HE. 1946 Sex determination and sex balance in *Melandrium*. *Am. J. Bot.*
644 **33**, 648–660. (doi:10.1002/j.1537-2197.1946.tb12923.x)
- 645 52. Ming R, Bendahmane A, Renner SS. 2011 Sex chromosomes in land plants. *Annu.*
646 *Rev. Plant Biol.* **62**, 485–514. (doi:10.1146/annurev-arplant-042110-103914)
- 647 53. Kay QON, Lack AJ, Bamber FC, Davies CR. 1984 Differences between sexes in
648 floral morphology, nectar production and insect visits in a dioecious species,
649 *Silene dioica*. *New Phytol.* **98**, 515–529. (doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.1984.tb04145.x)
- 650 54. Westerbergh A, Saura A. 1994 Gene flow and pollinator behaviour in *Silene*
651 *dioica* populations. *Oikos* **71**, 215–224. (doi:10.2307/3546269)
- 652 55. Tonnabel J, David P, Klein EK, Pannell JR. 2019 Sex-specific selection on plant
653 architecture through “budget” and “direct” effects in experimental populations of
654 the wind-pollinated herb, *Mercurialis annua*. *Evolution* **73**, 897–912.
655 (doi:10.1111/evo.13714)
- 656 56. Marshall TC, Slate J, Kruuk LEB, Pemberton JM. 1998 Statistical confidence for
657 likelihood-based paternity inference in natural populations. *Mol. Ecol.* **7**, 639–655.
658 (doi:10.1046/j.1365-294x.1998.00374.x)
- 659 57. Kalinowski ST, Taper ML, Marshall TC. 2007 Revising how the computer
660 program cervus accommodates genotyping error increases success in paternity
661 assignment. *Mol. Ecol.* **16**, 1099–1106. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-294X.2007.03089.x)
- 662 58. Anthes N, Häderer IK, Michiels NK, Janicke T. 2016 Measuring and interpreting
663 sexual selection metrics: evaluation and guidelines. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **8**, 918–
664 931. (doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12707)
- 665 59. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. 2015 Fitting linear mixed-effects models
666 using **lme4**. *J. Stat. Softw.* **67**, 1–48. (doi:10.18637/jss.v067.i01)
- 667 60. Jackson DA. 1993 Stopping rules in principal components analysis: a comparison
668 of heuristical and statistical approaches. *Ecology* **74**, 2204–2214.
669 (doi:10.2307/1939574)
- 670 61. Duffy KJ, Johnson SD. 2011 Effects of pollen reward removal on fecundity in a
671 self-incompatible hermaphrodite plant. *Plant Biol. Stuttg. Ger.* **13**, 556–560.
672 (doi:10.1111/j.1438-8677.2011.00445.x)

- 673 62. Kline RB. 2011 *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New-
674 York: Guilford Publications.
- 675 63. Lefcheck JS. 2016 **piecewiseSEM**: piecewise structural equation modelling in R
676 for ecology, evolution and systematics. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **7**, 573–579.
677 (doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12512)
- 678 64. Epskamp S. 2015 **semPlot**: unified visualizations of Structural Equation Models.
679 *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal.* **22**, 474–483.
680 (doi:10.1080/10705511.2014.937847)
- 681 65. Lande R, Arnold SJ. 1983 The measurement of selection on correlated characters.
682 *Evolution* **37**, 1210–1226. (doi:10.2307/2408842)
- 683 66. De Lisle SP, Svensson EI. 2017 On the standardization of fitness and traits in
684 comparative studies of phenotypic selection. *Evolution* **71**, 2313–2326.
685 (doi:10.1111/evo.13325)
- 686 67. Carlsson-Granér U, Elmqvist, Ågren J, Gardfjell, Ingvarsson. 1998 Floral sex
687 ratios, disease and seed set in dioecious *Silene dioica*. *J. Ecol.* **86**, 79–91.
688 (doi:10.1046/j.1365-2745.1998.00231.x)
- 689 68. Moquet L, Jacquemart A-L, Dufay M, De Cauwer I. 2022 Effects of sexual
690 dimorphism on pollinator behaviour in a dioecious species. *Oikos* **2022**, e08662.
691 (doi:10.1111/oik.08662)
- 692 69. Delph LF, Herlihy CR. 2012 Sexual, fecundity, and viability selection on flower
693 size and number in a sexually dimorphic plant. *Evolution* **66**, 1154–1166.
694 (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2011.01510.x)
- 695 70. Tonnabel J, David P, Pannell JR. 2019 Do metrics of sexual selection conform to
696 Bateman’s principles in a wind-pollinated plant? *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **286**,
697 20190532. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2019.0532)
- 698 71. Johnson MG, Shaw AJ. 2016 The effects of quantitative fecundity in the haploid
699 stage on reproductive success and diploid fitness in the aquatic peat moss
700 *Sphagnum macrophyllum*. *Heredity* **116**, 523–530. (doi:10.1038/hdy.2016.13)
- 701 72. Niovi Jones K, Reithel JS. 2001 Pollinator-mediated selection on a flower color
702 polymorphism in experimental populations of *Antirrhinum* (Scrophulariaceae).
703 *Am. J. Bot.* **88**, 447–454. (doi:10.2307/2657109)
- 704 73. Alonzo SH, Servedio MR. 2019 Grey zones of sexual selection: why is finding a
705 modern definition so hard? *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **286**, 20191325.
706 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2019.1325)

- 707 74. Hardy OJ, González-Martínez SC, Fréville H, Mignot A, Colas B, Olivieri I. 2004
708 Fine-scale genetic structure and gene dispersal in *Centaurea corymbosa*
709 (Asteraceae) I. Pattern of pollen dispersal. *J. Evol. Biol.* **17**, 795–806.
710 (doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2004.00713.x)
- 711 75. Llaurens V, Castric V, Austerlitz F, Vekemans X. 2008 High paternal diversity in
712 the self-incompatible herb *Arabidopsis halleri* despite clonal reproduction and
713 spatially restricted pollen dispersal. *Molecular Ecology.* **17**, 1577–1588.
714 (doi:10.1111/j.1365-294X.2007.03683.x)
- 715 76. Van Rossum F, Stiers I, Van Geert A, Triest L, Hardi O. 2011 Fluorescent dye
716 particles as pollen analogues for measuring pollen dispersal in an insect-
717 pollinated forest herb. *Oecologia.* **165**, 663–674 (doi:10.1007/s00442-010-1745-7)
- 718 77. Barbot E, Dufajř M, Tonnabel J, Godé C, De Cauwer I. 2022 Data from: on the
719 function of flower number: disentangling fertility from pollinator-mediated
720 selection. Dryad Digital Repository. (doi:10.5061/dryad.0rxwdb4d)




721 **Tables**722 **Table 1:** Effect of floral traits on pollen dispersal distances and differences between
723 groups.

	Control males (MC)	<i>P</i>	Manipulated males (MT)	<i>P</i>	Treatment × trait	<i>P</i>
	$R_s^2 = -0.014$		$R_s^2 = 0.11$		$R_s^2 = -0.048$	
β Number of real flowers	0.0045 ± 0.0038	.24	0.012 ± 0.0045	.014	$\chi_{1,77}^2 = 1.60$.21
β Gametes number per flower	$8.4 \times 10^{-7} \pm 1.7 \times 10^{-6}$.62	$4.4 \times 10^{-7} \pm 1.8 \times 10^{-6}$.80	$\chi_{1,77}^2 = 0.029$.87
β PC1	0.016 ± 0.024	.51	0.031 ± 0.025	.22	$\chi_{1,77}^2 = 0.65$.65



724 Note: Estimates (\pm SE) from linear models are reported for each effect in both groups
725 (MC and MT). P -values are reported from likelihood ratio tests to assess the interaction
726 between treatment and each trait. P -value in bold are significant. The proportion of
727 variance explained by each model is reported using adjusted R-squared (R_s^2).

728 **Table 2:** *F*-stats (type III ANOVA) for multigroup SEM analyses

		Females	<i>P</i>	Males	<i>P</i>
Reproductive success	Treatment × Mating success	$F_{1,77}=0.3$.25	$F_{1,77}=12.4$.44
	Treatment × Number of real flowers	$F_{1,77}=0.3$.52	$F_{1,77}=12.4$.75
	Treatment × Gametes number per flower	$F_{1,77}=0.3$.33	$F_{1,77}=12.4$.030
	Treatment × PC1	$F_{1,77}=0.3$.29	$F_{1,77}=12.4$.50
Mating success	Treatment × Number of real flowers	$F_{1,77}=0.3$.079	$F_{1,79}=5.2$.50
	Treatment × Gametes number per flower	$F_{1,77}=0.3$.86	$F_{1,79}=5.2$.51
	Treatment × PC1	$F_{1,77}=0.7$.22	$F_{1,79}=5.2$.99



732 **Figure 1:** Illustration of the three proxies used to characterized pollinator visits (A) :
733 visitation, the number of visiting pollinators and the total number of visits. Boxplots
734 representing the number of visiting pollinators (B) and the total number of visits (C),
735 according to sex and treatment. P-values for the treatment effect are represented with
736 * < 0.05 and ** < 0.01. Males (MC: yellow, MT: orange) were more visited than females
737 (FC: light green, FT: dark green), and both sexes were more visited with the addition
738 of dummy flowers. Means are represented with white points.



740 **Figure 2:** Results from multigroup SEM analyses in females (A) and males (B). Each trait
741 can have (i) a direct effect on MS and/or RS, as well as (ii) an indirect effect on RS,
742 depending of the strength of the relationship between RS and MS (i.e. Bateman gradient),
743 through a direct effect on MS. Estimates for each correlations are plotted with associated
744 *P*-values in brackets, with green arrows for positive values and orange arrows for negative
745 values. Covariances between traits are represented with double headed dotted arrows. In
746 the SEM analyses, only one correlation differed between control (C) and manipulated (T)
747 group, with estimates plotted in grey for the correlation between gamete number per
748 flower and reproductive success in males.