1　**Adaptive plasticity and genetic divergence in feeding efficiency during parallel**

2　**adaptive radiation of whitefish (*Coregonus spp*.)**

3　BÄNZ LUNDSGAARD-HANSEN [1,2], BLAKE MATTHEWS [3], PASCAL VONLANTHEN [2], ANDREAS TAVERNA [2],

4　OLE SEEHAUSEN [1,2]

5

6　[1] Division of Aquatic Ecology & Evolution, Institute of Ecology and Evolution, University of Bern, Baltzerstrasse

7　6, CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland

8　[2] Eawag Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology, Department of Fish Ecology & Evolution,

9　Centre of Ecology, Evolution and Biogeochemistry, Seestrasse 79, CH-6047 Kastanienbaum, Switzerland

10　[3] Eawag Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology, Department of Aquatic Ecology, Centre of

11　Ecology, Evolution and Biogeochemistry, Seestrasse 79, CH-6047 Kastanienbaum, Switzerland

12

13　*Corresponding author: Bänz Lundsgaard-Hansen, Tel.: +41 (0)58 765 22 02　Fax: +41 (0)58 765 21 68, E-mail:

14　baenz.lundsgaard@eawag.ch

15

16

17

18

19

20

21　Running title: Divergence in feeding efficiency of whitefish

22 **Abstract**

23 Parallel phenotypic divergence in replicated adaptive radiations could either result from parallel

24 genetic divergence in response to similar divergent selection regimes, or from equivalent

25 phenotypically plastic response to the repeated occurrence of contrasting environments. In

26 postglacial fish replicated divergence in phenotypes along the benthic-limnetic habitat axis is

27 commonly observed. Here we use two benthic-limnetic species pairs of whitefish from two Swiss

28 lakes, raised in a common garden design, with reciprocal food treatments in one species pair, to

29 experimentally measure whether feeding efficiency on benthic prey has a genetic basis or whether it

30 underlies phenotypic plasticity (or both). To do so we offered experimental fish mosquito larvae,

31 partially burried in sand, and measured multiple feeding efficiency variables. Our results reveal both,

32 genetic divergence as well as phenotypically plastic divergence in feeding efficiency, with the

33 phenotypically benthic species raised on benthic food being the most efficient forager on benthic

34 prey. This indicates that both, divergent natural selection on genetically heritable traits and adaptive

35 phenotypic plasticity, are likely important mechanisms driving phenotypic divergence in adaptive

36 radiation.

37

38 **Key Words:** speciation, limnetic, benthic, natural selection, heritable, trophic adaptation, size

Introduction

Parallel adaptive radiations of closely related taxa often exhibit a repeated occurrence of similar ecotypes in similar niches (Schluter, 2000). Such parallel ecotypic differentiation is often attributed to similar evolutionary responses to divergent selection between contrasting environments (Schluter & Nagel, 1995; Schluter, 2000; Barrett & Schluter, 2008), which assumes a genetically heritable basis of the traits characterizing the adaptive radiation. On the other hand, adaptive radiation in general and replicated radiation in particular can be facilitated by phenotypic plasticity (Pfenning et al., 2010). The evolution of similar solutions to the same problems (the repeated evolution of similar phenotypes in different radiations) can be explained by ancestral developmental plasticity (Pfenning et al., 2010). Importantly, the ancestral plasticity hypothesis does not negate the importance of natural selection for the fixation of phenotypic differences, rather it proposes that plasticity explains the origin of those differences (West-Eberhard2003). Neither are adaptation through divergent evolution and adaptation through phenotypic plasticity mutually exclusive and both could act in concert during the origins of adaptive radiations.

There is growing evidence for fitness trade-offs between differentiated morphs or species inhabiting distinct ecological environments across such a broad range of taxa as plants, snails, insects and fish (Boulding & Van Alstyne, 1993; Schluter, 1995; Schluter, 2000; Via et al., 2000; Rundle, 2002; Nosil, 2004). Such trade-offs suggest that the genetically heritable divergence is a result of divergent natural selection and support the idea that natural selection plays an important role in species formation (Schluter, 2000; Via et al., 2000; Rundle, 2002; Nosil, 2004). But some of these reciprocal transplant experiments were not designed to determine whether genetically heritable or phenotypically plastic divergence in early development caused differential fitness in contrasting environments (Boulding & Van Alstyne, 1993; Schluter, 1995). Indeed, there is considerable empirical support for the importance of phenotypic plasticity in diversification of various taxa: Adaptive radiations such as that of Darwin's finches, cichlid fish, stickleback and Anolis lizards all display

64 variable levels of phenotypic plasticity in traits characterizing these radiations (Grant, 1986; Day et

65 al., 1994; Losos et al., 2000; Bouton et al., 2002; West-Eberhard, 2003; Wund et al., 2008).

66 Furthermore it has been suggested that phenotypic plasticity increases species richness of a clade,

67 most likely by facilitating adaptive diversification and by reducing the risk of extinction (Pfennig &

68 McGee, 2010).

69 Northern postglacial fish provide striking examples of adaptive radiations, but the mechanisms of

70 inheritance in these radiations, in particular the relative importance of phenotypic plasticity and

71 genetic predisposition in behavior, are not fully understood. Adaptation to alternative trophic niches

72 has been repeatedly observed in these taxa and has been proposed to be an important driver in their

73 diversification (Skulason & Smith, 1995; Schluter, 2000). Typically, a split along the benthic (lake

74 bottom) to limnetic (open water) habitat axis is observed, which is accompanied by divergence in

75 morphology and trophic ecology: Limnetic morphs/species are usually planktivorous, rather slender,

76 smaller, with a narrower mouth and longer and more numerous gill rakers, whereas benthic

77 morphs/species are more benthivorous, more deep bodied, larger, with a larger mouth and fewer

78 and shorter gill rakers (Robinson & Wilson 1994; Smith & Skulasson, 1996; Schluter, 2000). Taxa

79 displaying this benthic-limnetic-split can be found e.g. in threespine stickleback, rainbow smelt,

80 brown trout, Arctic charr, *Prosopium* and *Coregonus* (Smith & Skulasson, 1996; Taylor, 1999;

81 Schluter, 2000). A genetic basis for shape divergence and differences in feeding efficiency and

82 swimming behavior has been shown in some of these morphs/species (Robinson, 2000; Adams &

83 Huntingford, 2002; Rogers et al. 2002; Klemetsen et al. 2006). In other cases it has been shown that

84 plasticity can affect morphological divergence (Robinson & Parsons 2002), but plasticity in feeding

85 behavior and efficiency have only rarely been measured (but see Day & McPhail, 1996). Experiments

86 specifically designed to measure phenotypically plastic and genetically heritable components in

87 morphology of benthic vs. limnetic ecotypes, found evidence for the presence of both (Day et al.,

88 1994; Adams & Hutingford, 2004; Proulx & Magnan, 2004). However, to our knowledge no study has

89   yet measured the effects of plasticity and of genetic divergence on morphology as well as on feeding

90   behavior in one and the same experiment, although this is important to identify the traits that affect

91   feeding efficiency.

92   Whitefish species complexes might fulfill the four criteria that define an adaptive radiation (Schluter

93   2000), i.e. common ancestry (Bernatchez & Dodson 1994; Pigeon et al. 1997 ; Ostbye et al. 2005a ;

94   Hudson et al. 2011), fast speciation (Bernatchez et al. 1999; Ostbye et al. 2006, Hudson et al. 2011),

95   phenotype-environment correlation (Harrod et al. 2010) and trait utility (Bernatchez 2004; Kahilainen

96   et al. 2007; 2011); and thus represent a good model system to study mechanisms of diversification in

97   adaptive radiations. Sympatric whitefish morphs/species (we adopt species hereafter) are

98   morphologically most strongly divergent in number of gill rakers and in adult body size (Steinmann,

99   1950; Svärdson 1979; Lindsey 1981; Vonlanthen et al. 2012)), traits likely involved in foraging, which

100 have also been shown to probably be under divergent selection (Bernatchez, 2004; Ostbye et al.,

101 2005b; Rogers & Bernatchez, 2007). Speciation involves divergence along the benthic-limnetic

102 habitat axis as described above (Bernatchez et al., 1996; Lu & Bernatchez, 1999; Ostbye et al., 2006;

103 Landry et al., 2007), but adaptive radiations with more than two species frequently occurred in

104 European whitefish (Steinmann 1950; Svärdson 1979; Hudson et al., 2007; Siwertsson et al. 2010;

105 Vonlanthen et al. 2012). Phenotype-environment correlations between traits involved in foraging and

106 niche utilization in sympatric whitefish has been well documented and suggests an important role of

107 trophic adaptation in the commonly observed benthic-limnetic split of these fish (Bernatchez et al.

108 1999; Amundsen et al. 2004; Harrod et al. 2010). Similarly, suggestive evidence for trait utility has

109 been observed in sympatric whitefish, indicating that a higher number of gill rakers likely facilitates

110 feeding on smaller zooplankton (Kahilainen et al. 2007; 201). However, experimental evidence for

111 divergence in feeding efficiency between whitefish species as well as for trait utility is lacking and

112 remains to be tested.

113

In the large subalpine lakes of Switzerland, multiple whitefish radiations constituting more than 40 different species originated after the last glacial maximum 15000 years ago (Steinmann, 1950; Hudson et al., 2011; Vonlanthen et al. 2012). This impressive whitefish species diversity consists of at least five different adaptive radiations that evolved in parallel (Hudson et al., 2011). Such young and replicated radiations offer excellent opportunities to test for the importance of driving forces and mechanisms of diversification. Here, we raised two species pair of benthic-limnetic whitefish from two Swiss lakes in a common garden design, with reciprocal food treatment in one species pair, to experimentally measure whether feeding efficiency divergence between them has a genetic basis, if phenotypic plasticity can modify feeding efficiency and how feeding efficiency is affected by variation in phenotypes (fish body size and shape). If variation in feeding efficiency was entirely genetically determined we expected to not find any differentiation between the same species raised on different food, but differentiation between the different species independent of the food they were raised on (Fig. 1a). If, on the other hand, variation in feeding efficiency was entirely the result of phenotypic plasticity we expected to find no differentiation between the different species when raised on the same food but differentiation between the same species raised on different food (Fig. 1b). If feeding efficiency was affected by both, genetic divergence and phenotypic plasticity, we expected to find the strongest difference between the benthic species raised on benthic food and the limnetic species raised on limnetic food, while the other treatments would be expected to be intermediate (Fig. 1c). In scenario 1b and 1c we assumed plasticity to be adaptive such that feeding efficiency on benthic food would be higher for fish raised on benthic food than for fish raised on limnetic food. For all hypothetical scenarios outlined above, we for simplicity further assumed that the strength of plasticity does not differ between species. Based on the above outlined existence of empirical evidence for the importance of both, plasticity and genetic divergence in morphology and feeding efficiency of north temperate fish, we predicted that variation in feeding efficiency would have both, a genetic and an environmentally induced component.

139

Materials &Methods

Study species

Whitefish from two subalpine lakes, Lake Thun and Lake Lucerne, were used. In each of these lakes at least five different whitefish species have been documented based on phenotypic and genetic data (Svarvar & Müller 1982; Bittner, 2009; Vonlanthen et al. 2012), and these represent two independently evolved radiations (Hudson et al. 2011). We studied two species, a benthic and a limnetic ecotype, from each of the lakes, namely *C. sp.* "Bodenbalchen" and *C. zugensis* from Lake Lucerne and *C. sp.* „Balchen" and *C. albellus* from Lake Thun. We chose to focus on these species, because they phenotypically correspond to the commonly observed benthic-limnetic split of north temperate fish (Schluter 2000). *C. sp*. "Bodenbalchen" and *C. sp*. "Balchen" correspond to the benthic phenotypes, they grow fast and reach maximum sizes of 600 and 450 mm, respectively, their mean gill raker number is 29.4 (22-34) and 30.5 (22-33) and both of them spawn in very shallow water of approximately 2-5 m depth (Steinmann 1950; Vonlanthen et al. 2012). *C. zugensis* and *C. albellus* correspond to the limnetic phenotype, they grow slow and reach a maximum size of 300 mm, their mean gill raker number is 38.8 (34-43) and 38.1 (35-44) respectively and both spawn in 25 m and deeper (Steinmann 1950; Vonlanthen et al. 2012). Both species pairs are genetically clearly differentiated from each other (Vonlanthen et al. 2012). Gut content analysis of Lake Lucerne species showed that *C. zugensis* almost exclusively feeds on zooplankton, while the diet of *C. sp*. "Bodenbalchen" is more benthic (Michel, 1996; Mookerji et al. 1998). Although gut content data for fish from Lake Thun is lacking, evidence for divergence in resource use in between whitefish species with different gill raker numbers is abundant (i. e. Bernatchez et al. 1999; Amundsen et al. 2004; Harrod et al. 2010). This suggests that the studied whitefish species from Lake Thun also differ in resource use in nature.

7

163 *Breeding and raising of fish*

164 Parental fish were caught in winter 2006, during their spawning time on their respective spawning

165 grounds, to breed experimental fish. The benthic species from the two lakes were caught in

166 approximately 2-5 m depth with gill nets having 38-45 mm mesh sizes. The limnetic species were

167 caught in 30-50 m depth using gill nets of 25-28 mm mesh sizes. By doing target fishing on the

168 extreme ends of whitefish spawning depth gradients and by visual inspection of the catches, we

169 made sure that pure individuals belonging to a particular species and no hybrids were caught,

170 although hybridization has not been uncommon during eutrophication of Swiss lakes (Bittner et al.

171 2010; Vonlanthen et al. 2012). From the catches five females and five males were randomly selected

172 from each species. Eggs and sperm were striped in the lab and eggs of all five females were mixed.

173 The eggs were fertilized simultaneously with sperm from the five males, ideally resulting in 25 half-

174 sib families per species. All fish were fed ad libidum once a day, except on Sundays. All juvenile fish

175 were fed with zooplankton for approximately one year. Zooplankton was collected daily from Lake

176 Lucerne by trawling a plankton-net with a mesh size of 250 µm in a depth of around 8 m. Most

177 common zooplankton taxa were *Daphnia*, Copepods, *Chydorus* and *Bosmina*, which ranged from a

178 size of 250 µm to approximately 5 mm. As soon as fish were large enough to be fed with mosquito

179 larvae (*Chironomus plumosus*), food of all juveniles from Lake Thun was switched to mosquito larvae

180 and the juveniles from Lake Lucerne were subsequently raised in a split family design with reciprocal

181 food treatments. Frozen mosquito larvae were used to simulate a benthic feeding environment and

182 zooplankton was used to simulate a limnetic feeding environment. This resulted in four different

183 treatments for fish from Lake Lucerne: Fish belonging to the benthic species raised on benthic food

184 *BB* and raised on limnetic food *BL;* fish belonging to the limnetic species raised on benthic food *LB*

185 and raised on limnetic food *LL*; and two treatments for Lake Thun**,** *BB* and *LB*. Each treatment was

186 distributed over two raising aquaria, each with a volume of 120*71*50 cm for fish from Lake Lucerne

187 and of 120*142*50 cm for fish from Lake Thun. A flow through system (~ 2.5 l/min) with lake water

188 was used. Water temperature during raising varied over the seasons and ranged from 6 to 15 ° C

189 (temperature fluctuations were much less pronounced in experiments, as no experiments were done

190 in winter, see below). Illumination was provided with a Cool White T 8 light tube with 5200 LM and

191 with 12 h day and 12 h night rhythm. Initially each aquarium contained 100 individuals. One raising

192 aquarium of the LB treatment from Lake Thun was lost due to a technical accident. As a

193 consequence, the limnetic species of Lake Thun was raised in one aquarium only. Mortalities in

194 aquaria of Lake Thun fish were: BB_{AQ1}=0.03; BB_{AQ2}=0.07; LB_{AQ1}=0.1. In aquaria of Lake Lucerne fish

195 they were: BB_{AQ1}=0.06; BB_{AQ2}=0.07; BL_{AQ1}=0.06; BL_{AQ2}=0.2; LB_{AQ1}=0.05; LB_{AQ2}=0.06; LL_{AQ1}=0.02;

196 LL_{AQ2}=0.09. When densities of fish diverged through time between raising aquaria, food provisioning

197 was adjusted by eye. At the end of the raising time, fish from the same treatment, which were raised

198 in different aquaria, were consequently never significantly different in size (t-test: the smallest

199 observed p-value = 0.07 for Lake Lucerne fish of the LL treatment).

200 Two months before the trials started and for the duration of the trials we switched the food

201 environments in the holding tanks once every week to allow all fish to familiarize with both food-

202 types and avoid food recognition or other short-term learning effects to affect our results. The

203 switching of food was paused from October 2009 to May 2010, as no experiments were done in this

204 time period.

205 *Experimental set-up*

206 Experimental aquaria, each with a size of 55*142*40 cm, were divided lengthwise into two

207 compartments using a Plexiglas wall, resulting in one compartment with a size of 33*142*40 cm and

208 the other compartment with a size of 22*142*40 cm. Water temperature varied between 12 – 15 ° C

209 over the entire experimental phase, and was similar between experimental aquaria at each day. The

210 water flow in the aquaria was paused from the moment the fish was introduced into the tank until

211 the experiment was finished. Illumination was the same as during rearing of the fish. The front

212 window of the aquaria was covered with a reflecting mirror foil to prevent fish from seeing the

213 observer, to avoid observer-induced behavioral changes. The bottom of the aquaria was covered

214 with a layer of quartz sand. The trial was conducted in the larger front compartment, where one fish

215 was tested at one time. Additionally two fish were put in the smaller back compartment and were

216 left there for the entire duration of the trials to stimulate natural behavior of the single experimental

217 fish in the front compartment (single isolated individuals did not display natural behavior).

218 Trials were performed from July 2009 to August 2010. Which treatment was tested at which day was

219 randomized for all fish tested in 2009 and for all fish from Lake Thun. Additionally a low number of

220 fish from Lake Lucerne (7 individuals from the LB and 1 from the BL treatment, see Table 1) was

221 tested in 2010 to increase the sample size in these treatments. Despite this, the effect of time was

222 unlikely to bias our findings, as time (in days after the first trial was done) was overall not different

223 between any treatment comparison in any of the lakes. To make sure time did not affect our results,

224 we also included the factor year in generalized linear model analysis to control for potential time

225 effects.

226 Approximately 48 hours before a trial, the experimental fish was introduced into the experimental

227 aquarium and was not fed until the trial started, to increase its motivation to feed. When an

228 experiment started, two petri dishes filled with quartz sand, each containing 10 partially buried but

229 well visible mosquito larvae, were deposited on the bottom using threads to let them down. As soon

230 as the petri dishes were placed on the bottom, the experimental fish was videotaped until all the 20

231 mosquito larvae were eaten. Fish that did not start feeding within an hour were removed and were

232 not re-used in this experiment (in total 5, all from the limnetic species from Lake Lucerne: 4 LL and 1

233 LB). All fish that started feeding ate all the larvae within less than one hour after first feeding. After

234 each trial the fish was removed from the experimental aquaria, was anesthetized, total length and

235 weight were measured and a picture from the left side of the body was taken for shape analysis.

236   Photos were not available for four fish used in the experiments due to a technical problem with a

237   storage device (see Table 1).

238   *Behavioral measurements*

239   Three variables related to feeding efficiency were measured from the video tapes, time to first

240   feeding, time to food depletion, and the number of unsuccessful attacks. Time to first feeding was

241   the time until a fish started feeding after the petri dishes were placed at the bottom of the

242   experimental aquaria. Time to food depletion was the time a fish needed to eat all twenty larvae,

243   measured form the moment it started feeding. As all fish that started feeding ate all larvae, time to

244   food depletion was equivalent to a feeding rate. The number of unsuccessful attacks was the number

245   of targeted attacks a fish made that did not yield a mosquito larva (because it couldn't grab it/lost it

246   immediately after grabbing it). Because all fish were given the same number of larvae, this measure

247   was equivalent to food capture efficiency. Time to first feeding was related to the ability to detect

248   food, the motivation to feed on it and maybe also searching efficiency, while time to food depletion

249   was related to a combination of searching efficiency, food capture efficiency and handling time and

250   the number of unsuccessful attacks represents food capture efficiency. For all feeding efficiency

251   variables, a lower value indicates a higher efficiency.

252   *Shape measurement*

253   Overall body shape variation was quantified using geometric morphometrics methods (Bookstein,

254   1991). Fourteen homologous landmarks distributed over the whole fish body, were selected based

255   on standard landmark description and previous analysis of *Coregonus* body shape variation (Zeldtich

256   et al., 2004; Vonlanthen et al., 2009). Landmarks were set using the software TPSDIG (Rohlf; 2006).

257   Nonshape variation, such as variation in location and orientation, was removed using Generalized

258   Procrustes superimposition (Rohlf & Slice, 1990). Shape variables (x-y-coordinates of individual

259 landmarks) for each individual were then generated using the thin-plate-spine equation (Bookstein,

260 1991).

261 Size correction was done by regression of each shape variable against fish size to remove variation

262 due to allometry (Loy et al., 1998). Residuals were then used for further analysis. As the allometric

263 relationships differed between lakes but not between treatments within lakes, size correction and

264 further analysis of morphometric data was done separately for the two lakes, but pooled for the

265 treatments within lakes. A Principal Component Analysis was performed to display the major axes of

266 shape variation. All morphometric analyses, including size corrections, were performed as

267 implemented in MORPHOJ V.1.02H (Klingenberg, 2011).

268

269 *Data analysis*

270 <u>Differentiation in Shape and Growth</u>

271 To test whether size or shape differed significantly between two treatments a Wilcoxon Rank Sum

272 Test was used, because traits were not always normally distributed (Lehmann, 1975). If four

273 treatments were compared, a Kruskal Wallis ANOVA was used (Kruskal & Wallis, 1952). Additionally

274 fish length was compared between treatments and years in two ANOVAs (one per lake) including

275 treatment and year as explanatory variables (residuals of the ANOVAs were normally distributed

276 indicating that assumptions were met). These statistical tests were performed using R V. 2.13.0 (R

277 Development Core Team 2010).

278 <u>Differentiation in feeding efficiency</u>

279 Generalized linear models were used to test for associations of feeding efficiency variables with

280 species identity of a fish (referred to as species), with food environment (referred to as

281 environment), PC1 and PC2 of body shape (referred to as PC1 and PC2, respectively), total length of a

282 fish (referred to as length) and the year the experiment was performed (referred to as year). One

283   GLM was calculated for each lake and for each response variable. The error distribution with the best

284   structural fit of the data to the model was chosen (Burnham & Anderson, 1998), which was a

285   gaussian distribution for time to food depletion (after a log transformation for Lake Lucerne and a

286   square root transformation for Lake Thun), a negative binomial distribution for time to first feeding

287   and a quasi poisson distribution for number of unsuccessful attacks. For gaussian error distribution

288   we used the identity link function, for the quasi poisson distribution we used the log link function and

289   for negative binomial error distribution we used the logit link function as implemented in R (Bolker et

290   al. 2008; R Devolpment Core Team 2010). The initial model included all potential explanatory

291   variables as well as an interaction of species and environment. A backward elimination model

292   selection approach based on AIC was then used to find the model that best explained the variance in

293   the data (Burnham & Anderson, 1998), while always retaining the main effects (species and

294   environment). If necessary, an AICc instead of an AIC was calculated to correct for low sample sizes

295   (n<40, Burnham & Anderson, 1998). QAIC, which is an approximation to AIC, was calculated, when a

296   quasi poisson error distribution was used, because AIC cannot be calculated when using this error

297   distribution (see Table 2) (Lebreton, 1992; Burnham & Anderson, 1998). We compared models using

298   AIC, Akaike Weights (wi) and evidence ratios (L ratio) (Burnham & Anderson, 1998). In the final model

299   the relationship between residuals and the fitted values was visually checked to ensure normal

300   residuals and similar variance over the fitted values (Zuur et al., 2009). As differences in AIC between

301   the most likely and the second most likely model were sometimes small (<2, Burnham & Anderson,

302   1998), the results of the second most likely model were also examined, but they are not reported as

303   these models yielded similar results and interpretation.

304   In multivariate analysis two or more explanatory variables influence each other, when they share

305   information. This can lead to different estimated effects of a variable depending on which co-

306   variables are included. Thus univariate post hoc comparisons of the feeding efficiency measure and

307   the variables retained in the final models were performed, if the most likely model contained more

308 than one explanatory variable. As Post hoc tests for species, environment and year we calculated

309 Wilcoxon Rank Sum Tests, while Spearman Rank Tests were calculated as post hoc tests for PC2 and

310 length (Lehmann, 1975; Lehmann & D'Abrera, 1998). For post hoc tests for species and environment

311 for Lake Lucerne we applied a random sampling approach, because to compare the two species

312 without confounding the comparison by effects of the raising environment (or vice versa), it was

313 necessary that both species contained the same numbers of fish raised in each of the two

314 environments. Therefore an equal number of fish from all four treatments was needed for these

315 comparisons (N_{ph} ranges from 22 to 26, see Table 1). Equal numbers per treatment were achieved

316 by randomly sub-sampling the number of fish in a particular treatment 1000 times to the same

317 sample size in the treatment with the smallest sample size. Subsequently fish from the same species

318 but different rearing environment were pooled to calculated differences between species (or vice

319 versa). For each pooled random sample, Wilcoxon Rank Sum Tests were performed and test statistics

320 were averaged.

321 All generalized linear model statistics and post hoc comparisons were performed using R V. 2.13.0 (R

322 Development Core Team, 2010). Analyses based on a negative binomial distribution were performed

323 using the packages MASS in R V. 2.13.0 (Venables & Ripley, 2002). All graphs visualizing the models

324 were created using the package GPLOTS in R V. 2.13.0.

325

326 **Results**

327 We compared fish feeding efficiency (time to first feeding, time to food depletion and the number of

328 unsuccessful attacks) and fish morphology (length and shape) between different raising aquaria

329 within treatment. As only one out of 24 comparisons was significant (less than expected by chance)

330 and it was further no more significant after Bonferroni correction (the lowest p-value=0.014; critical

331   p-value after Bonferroni correction = 0.002), we pooled aquaria of the same treatments for all

332   analyses.

Differentiation in size and shape

334   Individual fish sizes ranged from 95 mm to 186 mm for Lake Lucerne: The BB fish were largest, the

335   BL fish second largest, the LB were second smallest and the LL fish were smallest (Table 1). These

336   between treatment differences in size were significant in an ANOVA including treatment (n=99; F-

337   ratio=15.9, p<0.001) and year (n=99, F-ratio=0.39, p=0.53) as explanatory variables. In Lake Thun fish

338   sizes ranged from 112 to 187 and there was a trend for increased size of the benthic species (n=34, F-

339   ratio=2.89, p=0.09), while fish from the different years did not differ significantly in size (n=34, F-

340   ratio=0.23, p=0.64). Pairwise post-hoc tests for size differences between the treatments reveal

341   plasticity and heritable differences in size (Supplementary Table 1a). PC1 of shape accounted for 31

342   % of shape variation in Lake Lucerne and for 38% in Lake Thun. PC2 accounted for 24% of shape

343   variation in Lake Lucerne and 15% in Lake Thun. Other PC scores are not included as they neither

344   differentiated between treatments nor were associated with any measured feeding efficiency

345   variable, and the percentage of explained variance was rather low (< 11 % in Lake Thun, < 8 % in Lake

346   Lucerne). PC1 did not differ between treatments in either of the lakes (not shown). But the four

347   treatments of Lake Lucerne fish did significantly differ in PC2 (Kruskal-Wallis chi-squared=8.7, d.f.=3,

348   p=0.03). Pairwise post hoc tests between treatments indicate that shape divergence mainly arises as

349   a consequence of genetic differences between species and not as a result of phenotypic plasticity

350   (Supplementary Table 1b). PC2 was lower in the benthic species, corresponding to more sub-terminal

351   mouths in this species (see Fig. 4d). In Lake Thun the two species did not differ in PC2 (Wilcoxon Rank

352   Sum Test: n=34, W=135, p=0.76, Supplementary Table 1b).

353

Differentiation in Feeding Efficiency

355   *i) Lake Lucerne*

356   All three measures of feeding efficiency revealed that the BB fish were most efficient and the LL fish

357   were least efficient in feeding on benthic insect larvae (Fig. 2). The BL and the LB fish were

358   intermediate between fish from the BB and LL treatments in all feeding efficiency variables. Results

359   from Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA show that these between treatment differences were significant for time

360   to first feeding and time to food depletion; while there was a trend for the number of unsuccessful

361   attacks (Supplementary Table 2). Pairwise post-hoc tests for feeding efficiency differences between

362   treatments indicate both, a genetic basis as well as phenotypic plasticity, in feeding efficiency

363   divergence (Supplementary Table 2). All feeding efficiency variables were negatively correlated with

364   fish length (Fig. 2), indicating that larger fish were generally more efficient. However, these

365   correlations were only significant over all four treatments and except from one exception not

366   significant within treatment (Foraging Time in the BB treatment, Supplementary Table 3).

367   The observation of plasticity and species divergence in feeding efficiency as well as in fish length

368   (Supplementary Table 1 and 2), combined with the observation of effects of fish length on feeding

369   efficiency (Supplementary Table 3), suggest that species and plasticity effects on feeding efficiency

370   can be twofold: We referred to *direct* species /environmental effects on feeding efficiency in

371   subsequent paragraphs, if length is included in a model as a co-variable and the measured

372   species/environmental effect is therefore independent of effects of length on feeding efficiency.

373   Additionally the effects of length on feeding efficiency can be considered as *indirect* plasticity or

374   species effects, because the more benthic a treatment is the larger its fish are and the larger fish are,

375   the more efficient they feed on benthic food.

376   Using generalized linear modeling, time to food depletion in Lake Lucerne was best explained by a

377   model including species, environment and length (Table 2). The effects of the environment and of

378   species were both significant and there was a trend for an effect of length (Table 3). If we controlled

16

379   for the effect of length on time to food depletion, fish raised on benthic food and those from the

380   benthic species were more efficient than fish raised on limnetic food and belonging to the limnetic

381   species (Figure 3a). If we controlled for the effects of species and of the environment on time to food

382   depletion, larger fish depleted food in less time (Figure 4a). Post hoc tests revealed that all of the

383   variables retained in the most likely model (Length, species, environment) were significantly

384   associated with time to food depletion (Supplementary Table 2 and 3). The differences in significance

385   levels between multivariate modeling and univariate post hoc tests arose as a result of shared

386   information between different explanatory variables affecting their significance levels in the GLM.

387   Time to first feeding was best explained by a model including species, environment, length and year

388   (Table 2), whereas only the effect of the environment was significant and there was a trend for the

389   effect of length (Table 3). If we controlled for the effect of length and year on time to first feeding,

390   fish from the benthic species and raised on benthic food were more efficient than fish from the

391   limnetic species and raised on limnetic food (Fig. 3b). Plasticity effects seemed to be stronger in the

392   limnetic species, although there was no statistical support for this, as the interaction between

393   genetics and environment was not significant. If we controlled for the effects of species, the

394   environment and year, larger fish had a lower time to first feeding than smaller fish (Fig. 4b).

395   Univariate post hoc tests revealed that there was a significant association of time to first feeding with

396   the environment, with species and with length, but not with year (Supplementary Table 2 and 3).

397   The number of unsuccessful attacks was best explained by a model including species, environment,

398   length, PC2 and year (Table 2), whereas length was the only variable with a significant effect (Table

399   3). Larger fish displayed fewer unsuccessful attacks, independent of the effects of species, of the

400   environment and other co-variables retained in the most likely model (Fig. 4c). There was a trend for

401   the effect of year, with fish tested in the second year failing less often in grabbing larvae. PC2 was

402   non-significant, but there might be a weak trend. Controlling for species, the environment, length

403   and year, illustrated that fish with a more sub-terminal mouth tended to display less unsuccessful

17

404 attacks (Fig. 4d). Species and the environment were non-significant, but the benthic species seemed

405 to be slightly more efficient than the limnetic species, when controlling for the effects of length, PC2

406 and year (Fig. 3c). Univariate post hoc tests revealed a similar pattern as the GLM and were only

407 significant for length (Supplementary Table 2 and 3; and PC2: S=11972, rho=0.07, p=0.46).

408 ii) Lake Thun

409 In Lake Thun, the benthic species was more efficient than the limnetic species by means of time to

410 food depletion and the number of unsuccessful attacks (Fig. 2). Time to first feeding on the other

411 hand was lower in limnetic than in benthic fish (Fig. 2). Wilcoxon Rank Sum Tests show that species

412 differences in time to food depletion were significant, while other efficiency variables were not

413 significantly different between species (Supplementary Table 2). Feeding efficiency was generally

414 higher for larger fish (Fig. 2), however these correlations were neither significant over both species

415 nor within species (Supplementary Table 3).

416 Using generalized linear modeling, time to food depletion was best explained by a model including

417 species only (Table 2), where the benthic species depleted the food in significantly shorter time

418 (Table 3, Fig. 2). Time to first feeding was also best explained by a model including species only (Table

419 2), but in this case the effect of species was non-significant (Table 3, Fig. 2). The number of

420 unsuccessful attacks was best explained by a model including species, length, PC2 and year (Table 2),

421 where PC2 was the only variable with a significant effect (Table 3). Fish having a more sub-terminal

422 mouth failed less often in grabbing larvae independent of their species identity, of their length and of

423 the year they were tested (Fig. 4f). There was a trend for length; as larger fish, independent of their

424 genetic background, their shape (PC2), and the year when they were tested, displayed fewer

425 unsuccessful attacks (Fig. 4e). And there was a trend for year, with fish tested in the second year

426 failing to grab larvae less often. The effect of species was not significant, but the benthic species had

427 fewer failed attacks than the limnetic species (Fig. 2e). However, this difference between the two

18

428 species disappeared when we controlled for the effects of length, PC2 and year on the number of

429 unsuccessful attacks (Fig. 3d). Univariate post hoc tests were non-significant for an association of

430 species and length with the number of unsuccessful attacks, while they were significant for PC2 and

431 year (Supplementary Table 2 and 3; PC2: n=34, rho=-0.4, p=0.02).

432 Fish tested in the second year generally tended to be slightly more efficient than fish tested in the

433 first year, although the effect of year was never significant in any model (see results above). Size

434 differences between the years cannot explain this pattern, because effects of year remained similar if

435 one controlled for the effects of size on efficiency by including it as a co-variable and fish tested in

436 the second year were not generally larger. We lack a testable explanation for this observation. But

437 independent of the reason, the effect of time was unlikely to bias our findings, as treatments were

438 generally randomly assigned to experimental days and time (in days after the first trial was done)

439 was not different between treatments in neither of the lakes. Further the inclusion of year in the

440 GLM analysis controls for year effects and the effects inferred from the GLMs are thus independent

441 of potentially confounding year effects.

442 **Discussion**

443 Our results show that the sympatric benthic-limnetic species pairs of whitefish differ in their feeding

444 efficiency on benthic food, with the benthic species being more efficient than the limnetic species

445 when raised on the same food in both lakes, suggesting a genetic basis of feeding efficiency

446 divergence. These results are in agreement with field studies reporting that sympatric whitefish

447 species often exhibit differences in resource use along the between benthic-limnetic resource axis

448 (Bernatchez et al., 1999; Amundsen et al., 2004; Harrod et al., 2010) and they add more evidence

449 that adaptation to different trophic niches is likely involved in diversification of north temperate fish.

450 In Lake Lucerne, we further found effects of phenotypic plasticity on feeding efficiency, while we did

451 not quantify plasticity effects in Lake Thun. These findings of a genetic basis and of phenotypic

19

452   plasticity in feeding efficiency are consistent with the suggested importance of both divergent

453   natural selection on heritable traits as well as adaptive phenotypic plasticity in the evolutionary

454   diversification of traits related to trophic ecology in whitefish (Wimberger, 1994; Rogers &

455   Bernatchez, 2007), and more generally in the build-up of diversity in adaptive radiation (Schluter,

456   2000; Pfennig et al., 2010).

457

458   *Species divergence in growth*

459   Independent of the food the fish were raised on, the benthic species grew bigger than the limnetic

460   species, indicating heritable species divergence in growth. This was found for both lakes albeit it was

461   marginally non-significant in fish from Lake Thun. These finding with faster growth in the benthic

462   species (*C. sp.* "Balchen" and *C. sp.* "Bodenbalchen") are in the same direction as species divergence

463   in nature (Vonlanthen et al. 2012) and are consistent with previous work reporting a genetic basis in

464   species divergence in growth of various fishes, including many salmonids and whitefish (Hatfield,

465   1997; Garant et al., 2003; Rogers & Bernatchez, 2007). Among fish from Lake Lucerne, we also

466   observed effects of the rearing environment on growth. Fish raised on benthic food generally grew

467   larger than fish raised on limnetic food. This may be explained by differences in energetic

468   profitabilities between our food treatments (zooplankton vs. mosquito larvae), which were not

469   standardized to equal energetic content.

470   The observed heritable species divergence in growth might have accumulated as a result of divergent

471   selection favoring different growth patterns in the benthic and the limnetic habitat. Slower growth in

472   the limnetic habitat is probably associated with high bioenergetic costs of living in this habitat, with

473   small, spatially widely distributed prey (Mookerji et al. 1998; Trudel et al., 2001; Kahilainen et al.

474   2007). The benthic habitat with larger and more spatially clustered prey requires less swimming

475   effort and attacks, what allows faster growth (Kahilainen et al. 2003). In this experiment we showed

476   that increased size is associated with increased feeding efficiency on benthic food and might

477   constitute an adaptation to exploit benthic resources. It might additionally constitute a different

478   predator escape strategy, namely through accelerated growth to reach a size above the predation

479   window of piscivore fish instead of adaptations in predator avoidance through swimming behavior

480   (Kahilainen and Lehtonen 2002; Roger et al., 2002). Because the studied species are young, having

481   emerged after the last glacial maximum (Hudson et al., 2011), our findings of heritable growth

482   divergence between species are consistent with a role of divergent selection on growth early in the

483   speciation process, as it has been shown for other whitefish systems (Rogers and Bernatchez 2007).

484   Taken together evidence for divergent selection on growth and the predominant role of size as a

485   mate-choise signal in fish (Foote and Larkin 1988; Sigurjonsdottir and Gunnarsson 1989; McKinnon et

486   al. 2004), indicates that size might potentially be a magic trait of speciation in whitefish (magic-trait

487   model of speciation: Gavrilets 2004).

488   In Lake Lucerne, our results further show weak but significant species divergence in shape: The

489   benthic species has a more sub-terminal mouth. In Lake Thun, the two species were not significantly

490   divergent in the shape components we measured. The measured shape components were non-labile

491   in respect to our divergent raising environments for Lake Lucerne fish, indicated by the lack of

492   plasticity effects on shape. Many studies have reported critical effects of the timing of environmental

493   induction on the strength of the plastic response to it (West-Eberhard, 2003). In our experiment all

494   fish had to be raised on zooplankton in the first year (whitefish larvae cannot effectively be raised on

495   benthic food), which could explain why we did not find strong plasticity in morphology induced by

496   divergent feeding regimes while other authors, studying other fish taxa, did find such effects (Day &

497   McPhail, 1996; Bouton et al., 2002; Robinson & Parson, 2002; Muschick et al., 2011). Alternatively it

498   could reflect real differences in canalization of morphology between whitefish and other fish species,

499   however, other studies reported strong plasticity in whitefish morphology (Lindsey 1981).

500   *Evidence for inherited species differences and phenotypic plasticity in feeding efficiency*

501 We found that both benthic species were generally more efficient in foraging on benthic food than

502 their limnetic sister species, suggesting heritable divergence in feeding efficiency. A genetic

503 component of feeding efficiency between benthic-limnetic sister species is consistent with previous

504 experiments using north temperate fish (Robinson, 2000; Adams & Huntingford, 2002). GLM analyses

505 indicate that the effects of this feeding efficiency divergence between species are twofold. On one

506 hand they are manifested as direct behavioral effects, independent of morphological differences (fish

507 length and shape) between species. On the other hand they can be manifested as indirect effects due

508 to inherited differences in length and shape, which themselves influences feeding efficiency. In our

509 experiment fish of the benthic species from both lakes grew larger, and larger fish were generally

510 more efficient foragers on benthic food, independent of their genetic background. This observation

511 of increased efficiency with increasing size is consistent with empirical observation that the more

512 benthic species are usually larger (Schluter 2000; Vonlanthen et al. 2012) and it is not inconsistent

513 with ontogenetic diet shifts to more benthic prey with increasing size in whitefish (Sandlund et al.

514 1992; Pothoven & Nalepa 2006). Further, in Lake Lucerne we found the benthic species to have a

515 more sub-terminal mouth than the limnetic species and individuals with a sub-terminal mouth

516 displayed fewer failed attacks in our experiments than those with a more terminal mouth. This is

517 consistent predictions from functional morphology and with the empirical observation on many fish

518 taxa, including whitefish, that the position of the mouth relative to the body is associated with

519 benthic vs. limnetic feeding, with benthic feeders having a more sub-terminal mouth (Steinmann,

520 1950; McCart, 1970; Caldecutt & Adams, 1998; Bernatchez 1999; Clabaut et al., 2007; Harrod et al.

521 2010).

522 The observed heritable divergence in feeding behavior between the benthic and limnetic whitefish

523 species is consistent with a role for divergent natural selection favoring different trophic strategies in

524 contrasting foraging environments in north temperate fish (Schluter 1995; Rogers et al., 2002;

525 Klemetsen et al. 2006). Speciation in Lake Thun and Lake Lucerne whitefish was proposed to be intra-

526   lacustrine (Hudson et al., 2011), therefore ecological character displacement after allopatric

527   speciation and secondary contact seems very unlikely. It remains uncertain whether species

528   divergence in feeding efficiency was a driving force of speciation at the very beginning of the process,

529   or whether it could have occurred as a by-product after speciation was initialized (speciation could

530   have been initialized e.g. by physiological adaptation to different thermal regimes in the contrasting

531   environments and divergence in feeding efficiency would have accumulated afterwards). The species

532   differences in feeding efficiency could also have evolved through genetic assimilation of initially

533   plastic differences in feeding efficiency between whitefish growing up in different habitats (West-

534   Eberhard, 2003).

535   Our results of species differences in exploiting benthic resources can be considered as evidence for

536   trait utility (Schluter 2000). Trait utility means that a trait associated with a particular environment

537   enhances performance there (Schluter 2000). This feature of adaptive radiations has so far not

538   experimentally been demonstrated for whitefish (Bernatchez 2004), though indirect evidence from

539   comparative approaches suggest that a high number of gill rakers increases fitness in the limnetic

540   environment (Kahilainen et al. 2007; 2011). We showed that the overall phenotype (including

541   behavior), which can be seen as a multi-dimensional trait, of the benthic species increases its ability

542   to exploit the benthic environment. Our results also show that increased size increases feeding

543   effciency on benthic prey independent of a fish's genetic background. And this is consistent with

544   trait utility of size in regard to fitness in the benthic niche. However, it remains to be tested whether

545   increased size would also increase feeding efficiency on limnetic prey, before we want to draw strong

546   conclusions about trait utility of size in the benthic niche. Other potential traits are, among others,

547   the number of gill rakers (which was not quantified here, as fish were kept alive), the position of the

548   mouth as well as behavioral traits (for example swimming behavior).

549   Consistent with earlier work (Day and McPhail, 1996), we also observed significant effects of

550   environmental plasticity on feeding efficiency. Fish raised on benthic food became more efficient

551   foragers on benthic food than fish raised on zooplankton, indicating that the observed plasticity in

552   feeding efficiency was adaptive. This is consistent with the suggested importance of phenotypic

553   plasticity for species diversification in adaptive radiation (West-Eberhard, 1989, 2003; Pfennig et al.

554   2010). We have two lines of evidence that the effects of plasticity are not simply due to plastic

555   components of size and shape, but primarily the result of plasticity in feeding behavior itself. First,

556   fish size (length) was included in general linear models with significant environmental effects,

557   indicating that plasticity effects are not just due to plasticity in length. Second, there was no plasticity

558   in shape. Earlier work on sticklebacks suggested that behavioral plasticity mainly influenced

559   searching efficiency (Day & McPhail 1996). Consistent with this, the two efficiency variables that

560   showed plasticity in our experiments, time to food depletion and time to first feeding, are more

561   related to detection ability and searching efficiency; whereas the number of unsuccessful attacks,

562   which did not reveal plasticity, is more related to prey capture efficiency. Phenotypic plasticity was

563   suggested to explain why some taxa are more diverse than others, with plasticity increasing species

564   diversity (Pfennig & McGee, 2010). Whitefish and Arctic charr are of the most diverse taxa within the

565   order of the Salmoniformes (Kottelat & Freyhof 2007). Maybe their ability to display strong

566   phenotypic plasticity in feeding behavior and morphology might be one explanation for their high

567   species diversity.

568   *Conclusions*

569   Natural selection is thought to be the most important mechanism behind the diversification of

570   species in adaptive radiations (Schluter, 2000). Our findings of heritable feeding efficiency differences

571   between whitefish species of two parallel adaptive radiations are consistent with this. Additionally,

572   our observation of strong phenotypic plasticity in feeding efficiency indicates an important role of

573   adaptive phenotypic plasticity in diversification of north temperate fish. In conclusion, our data

574   suggest that both, phenotypic plasticity and evolutionary divergence resulting from divergent natural

575   selection, are likely important mechanisms of adaptive radiation.

583   **References**

584   Adams, C. E. & Huntingford, F. A. 2002. The functional significance of inherited differences in feeding

585   morphology in a sympatric polymorphic population of Arctic charr. Evol. Ecol. 16: 15-25.

586   Adams, C. E. & Huntingford, F. A. 2004. Incipient speciation driven by phenotypic plasticity? Evidence

587   from sympatric populations of Arctic charr. Biol. J. Linn. Soc. 81: 611-618.

588   Amundsen, P. A., Knudsen, R., Klemetsen, A. & Kristoffersen, R. 2004. Resource competition and

589   interactive segregation between sympatric whitefish morphs. Ann. Zool. Fenn. 41: 301-307.

590   Barrett, R. D. H. & Schluter, D. 2008. Adaptation from standing genetic variation. Trends Ecol. Evol.

591   23: 38–44.

592   Bernatchez, L. 2004. Ecological Theory of Adaptive Radiation: An Empirical Assessment from

593   Coregonine Fishes (Salmoniformes). In: Evolution Illuminated (Hendry, A. P. & Stearns, S. C., eds.). pp.

594   175-207. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

595   Bernatchez, L., Chouinard, A. & Lu, G. Q. 1999. Integrating molecular genetics and ecology in studies

596   of adaptive radiation: whitefish, *Coregonus sp.*, as a case study. Biol. J. Linn. Soc. 68: 173-194.

597   Bernatchez, L., & Dodson, J. J. 1994. Phylogenetic relationships among palearctic and nearctic

598   whitefish (*Coregonus sp.*) populations as revealed by mitochondrial DNA variation. Can. J. Fish.

599   Aquat. Sci. 51: 240-251.

600   Bernatchez, L., Vuorinen, J. A., Bodaly, R. A & Dodson, J. J. 1996. Genetic evidence for reproductive

601   isolation and multiple origins of sympatric trophic ecotypes of whitefish (*Coregonus*). Evolution 50:

602   624-635.

603   Bittner, D. 2009. Gonad deformations in whitefish (*Coregonus spp.*) from Lake Thun, Switzerland - A

604   population genetic and transcriptomic approach. In: CMPG, Vol. PhD. pp. University of Bern, Bern.

605   Bittner, D., Excoffier, L. & Largiadèr, C. R. 2010. Patterns of morphological changes and hybridization

606   between sympatric whitefish morphs (*Coregonus spp*.) in a Swiss lake: a role for eutrophication? Mol.

607   Ecol. 19: 2152-2167.

608   Bolker, B. M., Brooks, M. E., Clark, C. J., Geange, S. W., Poulsen, J. R., Stevens, M. H. H., White, J.-S. S.

609   2008. Generalized linear mixed models: a practical guide for ecology and evolution. Trends Ecol. Evol.

610   24: 127-135.

611   Bookstein, F.L. 1991. Morphometric Tools for Landmark Data, Geometry and Biology. Cambridge

612   University Press, Cambridge.

613   Boulding, E. G. & Van Alstyne, K. L. 1993. Mechanisms of differential survival and growth of two

614   species of *Littorina* on wave-exposed and on protected shores. J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol. 169: 139-166.

615   Bouton, N., Witte, F. & Van Alphen, J.J.M. 2002. Experimental evidence for adaptive phenotypic

616   plasticity in a rock-dwelling cichlid fish from Lake Victoria. Biol. J. Linn. Soc. 77: 185-192.

617   Burnham, K. P. & Anderson, D. R. 1998. Model selection and multimodel inference, a practical

618   information-theoretic approach. Second edition. Springer, New York.

619   Caldecutt, W. J. & Adams, D. C. 1998. Morphometrics of trophic osteology in the threespine

620   stickleback, *Gasterosteus aculeatus*. Copeia 4: 827-838.

621   Clabaut, C., Bunje, P. M. E., Salzburger, W. & Meyer, A. 2007. Geometric morphometric analyses

622   provide evidence for the adaptive character of the tanganyikan cichlid fish radiations. Evolution 61:

623   560-518.

624   Day, T. & McPhail, J. D. 1996. The effect of behavioural and morphological plasticity on foraging

625   efficiency in the threespine stickleback (*Gasterosteus sp.*). Oecologia 108: 380–388.

626   Day, T., Pritchard, J. & Schluter, D. 1994. A comparison of two stickleback. Evolution 48: 1723-1734.

627   Foote, C.J., & Larkin P. A. 1988. The role of male choice in the assortative mating of anadromous and

628   non-anadromous sockeye salmon, *Oncorhynchus nerka*. Behaviour 106: 43-62.

629   Garant, D., Dodson, J.J. & Bernatchez, L. 2003. Differential reproductive success and heritability of

630   alternative reproductive tactics in wild Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo salar L.).* Evolution 57: 1133–1141.

631   Gavrilets, S. 2004. Fitness Landscapes and the Origin of Species. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton.

632   Grant, P. R. 1986. Ecology and evolution of Darwin's finches. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

633   Harrod, C., Mallela, J. & Kahilainen, K. 2010. Phenotype-environment correlations in a putative

634   whitefish adaptive radiation. J. Anim. Ecol. 79: 1057-1068.

635   Hatfield, T. 1997. Genetic divergence in adaptive characters between sympatric species of

636   stickleback. Am. Nat. 149: 1009-1029.

637   Hudson, A. G., Vonlanthen, P. & Seehausen, O. 2011. Rapid parallel adaptive radiations from a single

638   hybridogenic ancestral population. P. R. Soc. B 278: 58-66.

639   Hudson, A. G., Vonlanthen, P., Müller, R., & Seehausen, O. 2007. Review: The geography of

640   speciation and adaptive radiation in coregonines. Adv. Limnol. 60: 111-146.

641   Kahilainen, K. K., & Lehtonen, H. 2002. Brown trout (*Salmo trutta* (L)) and Arctic charr (*Salvelinus*

642   *alpinus* (L)) as predators of three sympatric whitefish (*Coregonus lavaretus* (L)) in the subarctic Lake

643   Muddusjärvi. Ecol. Freshw. Fish 11: 158-167.

644   Kahilainen, K. K., Lehtonen, H., & Könönen, K. 2003. Consequences of habitat segregation to growth

645   rate of two sparsely rakered whitefish (*Coregonus lavaretus* (L.)) in a subarctic lake. Ecol. Freshw. Fish

646   12: 275-285.

647 Kahilainen, K. K., Malinen, T., Tuomaala, A., Alajärvi, E., Tolonen, A., & Lehtonen, A. 2007. Empirical

648 evaluation of phenotype-environment correlation and trait utility with allopatric and sympatric

649 whitefish (*Coregonus lavaretus* (L.)) in subarctic lakes. Biol. J. Linn. Soc. 92: 561-572.

650 Kahilainen, K. K., Siwertsson, A., Gjelland, K. O., Knudsen, R., Bohn, T., & Amundsen, P.-A. 2011. The

651 role of gill raker variability in adaptive radiation of coregonid fish. Evol. Ecol. 25: 573-588.

652 Klemetsen, A., Knudsen, R., Primicerio, R. & Amundsen, P. A. 2006. Divergent, genetically based

653 feeding behaviour of two sympatric Arctic charr, *Salvelinus alpinus* (L.), morphs. Ecol. Freshw. Fish 15:

654 350-355.

655 Klingenberg, C. P. 2011. MORPHOJ: an integrated software package for geometric morphometrics.

656 Mol. Ecol. Resour. 11: 353-357.

657 Kottelat, M. & Freyhof, J. 2007. Handbook of European freshwater fishes. Kottelat, Cornol,

658 Switzerland and Freyhof, Berlin, Germany.

659 Kruskal, W. & Wallis, W. A. 1952. Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis. J. Am. Stat. Assoc.

660 47: 583–621.

661 Landry, L., Vincent, W. F. & Bernatchez, L. 2007. Parallelism between limnological features and

662 phenotypic evolution of lake whitefish dwarf ecotypes. J. Evolution Biol. 20: 971-984.

663 Lindsey, C. C. 1981. Stocks are chameleons: Plasticity in gill rakers of coregonid fishes. Can. J. Fish.

664 Aquat. Sci. 38: 1497-1506.

665 Lebreton, J.D., Burnham, K. P., Clobert, J. & Anderson, D. R. 1992. Modeling survival and testing

666 biological hypotheses using marked animals: a unified approach with case studies. Ecol. Monogr. 62:

667 67-118.

668 Lehmann, E. L. 1975. Nonparametric statistical methods based on ranks. McGraw-Hill, New York.

669   Lehmann, E. L. & D'Abrera, H. J. M. 2006. Nonparametrics: Statistical methods based on ranks.

670   Springer, New York.

671   Losos, J. B., Douglas, A. C., Glossip, D., Goellner, R., Hampton, A., Roberts, G. et al. 2000. Evolutionary

672   implications of phenotypic plasticity in the hindlimb of the lizard A*nolis sagrei.* Evolution 54: 301-305.

673   Loy, A., Mariani, L., Bertelletti, M. & Tunesi, L. 1998. Visualizing allometry: geometric morphometrics

674   in the study of shape changes in the early stages of the two-banded sea bream, *Diplodus vulgaris*

675   (Perciformes, Sparidae). J. Morphol. 237: 137-146.

676   Lu, G. & Bernatchez, L. 1999. Correlated trophic specialization and genetic divergence in sympatric

677   lake whitefish ecotypes (*Coregonus clupeaformis*): support for the ecological speciation hypothesis.

678   Evolution 53: 1491-1505.

679   McCart, P. 1970. Evidence for the existence of sibling species of pygmy whitefish (Prosopium

680   coulteri) in three Alaskan lakes. In Biology of Coregonid Fishes, ed. CC Lindsey, CS Woods, pp. 81-98.

681   Univ. Manitoba Press, Winnipeg.

682   McKinnon J. S., Mori, S., Blackman, B. K., David, L., Kingsley, D. M. , Jamieson, L., Chou, J., & Schluter,

683   D. 2004. Evidence for ecology's role in speciation. Nature 429: 294-298.

684   Michel, M. 1996. Untersuchungen zur Nahrungsökologie von Grossfelchen im Vierwaldstättersee

685   während des Sommerhalbjahres 1996. Master thesis EAWAG, supervised by R. Müller.

686   Muschick, M., Barluenga, M., Salzburger, W. & Meyer, A. 2011. Adaptive phenotypic plasticity in the

687   Midas cichlid fish pharyngeal jaw and its relevance in adaptive radiation. BMC Evol. Biol. 11: 116.

688   Mookerji, N., Heller, C., Meng, H. J., Bürgi, R., & Müller, R. 1998. Diel and seasonal patterns of food

689   uptake and prey selection by *Coregonus sp*. in re-oligotrophicated Lake Lucerne, Switzerland. J. Fish.

690   Biol. 52: 443-457.

691   Nosil, P. 2004. Reproductive isolation caused by visual predation on migrants between divergent

692   environments. P. Roy. Soc. Lond. B Bio. 271: 1521-1528.

693   Ostbye, K., Amundsen, P. A., Bernatchez, L., Klemetsen, A., Knudsen, R., Kristoffersen, R. *et al*. 2006.

694   Parallel evolution of ecomorphological traits in the European whitefish *Coregonus lavaretus* (L.)

695   species complex during postglacial times. Mol. Ecol. 15: 3983-4001.

696   Ostbye, K., Bernatchez L., Naesje, T. F., Himberg, M., & Hindar, K. 2005a. Evolutionary history of

697   European whitefish (*Coregonus lavaretus*) as inferred from mtDNA phylogeography and gill-raker

698   numbers. Mol. Ecol. 14: 4371-4388.

699   Ostbye, K., Naesje, T. F., Bernatchez, L., Sandlund, O. T., & Hindar, K. 2005b. Morphological

700   divergence and origin of sympatric populations of European whitefish (*Coregonus lavaretus* (L) in

701   Lake Femud, Norway. J. Evol. Biol. 18: 683-702.

702   Pfennig, D. W. & McGee, M. 2010. Resource polyphenism increases species richness: a test of the

703   hypothesis. Philos. T. R. Soc. B 365: 577-591.

704   Pfennig, D. W., Wund, M. A., Snell-Rood, E. C., Cruickshank, T., Schlichting, C. D. & Moczek, A. P.

705   2010. Phenotypic plasticity's impacts on diversification and speciation. Trends Ecol. Evol. 25: 459–

706   467.

707   Pigeon, D., Chouinard, A., & Bernatchez, L. 1997. Multiple modes of speciation involved in the

708   parallel evolution of sympatric morphotypes of lake whitefish (*Coregonus clupeaformis*). Evolution

709   51: 196-205.

710   Pothoven, S. A., & Nalepa, T. F. 2006. Feeding ecology of lake whitefish in Lake Huron. J. Great Lakes

711   Res. 32: 489-501.

712   Proulx, R. & Magnan, P. 2004. Contribution of phenotypic plasticity and heredity to the trophic

713   polymorphism of lacustrine brook charr (*Salvelinus fontinalis* M.). Evol. Ecol. Res. 6: 503-522.

714   R Development Core Team. 2010. R: A language and environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna,

715   Austria. http://www.R-project.org.

716   Robinson, B. W. 2000. Trade offs in habitat-specific foraging efficiency and the nascent adaptive

717   divergence of sticklebacks in lakes. Behavior 137: 865-888.

718   Robinson, B.W. & Wilson, D.S. 1994. Character release and displacement in fishes: A neglected

719   literature. Am. Nat. 144: 596-627.

720   Robinson, B.W. & Parsons, K. J. 2002. Changing times, spaces and faces: tests and implications of

721   adaptive morphological plasticity in the fishes of northern postglacial lakes. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.

722   59: 1819-1833.

723   Rogers, S. M. & Bernatchez, L. 2005. Integrating QTL mapping and genome scans towards

724   characterization of candidate loci of parallel selection in the lake whitefish (*Coregonus clupeaformis*).

725   Mol. Ecol. 14: 351-361.

726   Rogers, S. M. & Bernatchez, L. 2007. The genetic architecture of ecological speciation and the

727   association with signatures of selection in natural lake whitefish (*Coregonus sp*., Salmonidae) species

728   pairs. Mol. Biol. Evol. 24: 1423-1438.

729   Rogers, S. M., Gagnon, V. & Bernatchez, L. 2002. Genetically based phenotype-environment

730   association for swimming behavior in lake whitefish ecotypes (*Coregonus Clupeaformis* Mitchill).

731   Evolution 56: 2322-2329.

732   Rohlf, F. J. 2006. TPSDig Version 2.1. State University of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, NY,

733   USA.

734   Rohlf, F. J. & Slice, D. 1990. Extensions of the Procrustes method for the optimal superimposition of

735   landmarks. Syst. Zool., 39:40-59.

736 Rundle, H. D. 2002. A test of ecologically dependent postmating isolation between sympatric

737 sticklebacks. Evolution 56: 322–329.

738 Sandlund, O. T., Naesje, T. F., & Jonson, B. 1992. Ontogenetic changes in habitat use by whitefish,

739 *Coregonus lavaretus*. Environ. Biol. Fish. 33: 341-349.

740 Schluter, D. 1995. Adaptive radiation in sticklebacks: trade-offs in feeding performance and growth.

741 Ecology 76: 82–90.

742 Schluter, D. 2000. The Ecology of Adaptive Radiation. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

743 Schluter, D. & Nagel, L. 1995. Parallel speciation by natural selection. Am. Nat. 146: 292–301.

744 Sigurjonsdottir H., & Gunnarsson, K. 1989. Alternative mating tactics of Arctic charr, *Salvelinus*

745 *alpinus*, in Thingvallavatn, Iceland. Environ. Biol. Fish. 26: 159-176.

746 Siwertsson, A., Knudsen, R., Kahilainen, K., Praebel, K., Primicerio, & R. Amundsen, P. A. 2010.

747 Sympatric diversification as influenced by ecological opportunity and historical contingency in a

748 yound species lineage of whitefish. Evol. Ecol. Res. 12: 929-948.

749 Skúlason, S. & Smith, T. B. 1995. Resource polymorphism in vertebrates. Trends Ecol. Evol. 10: 366-

750 370.

751 Smith, T. B. & Skúlason, S. 1996. Evolutionary significance of resource polymorphisms in fishes,

752 amphibians, and birds. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst. 27: 111–133.

753 Steinmann, P. 1950. Monographie der schweizerischen Koregonen. Beitrag zum Problem der

754 Entstehung neuer Arten. Spezieller Teil. Schweiz. Z. Hydrol. 12: 340-491.

755 Svärdson, G. 1979. Speciation of Scandinavian *Coregonus*. Rep. Inst. Freshw. Res. Drott. 57: 1-95.

756 Svarvar, P. O. & Müller, R. 1982. Die Felchen des Alpnachersees. Schweiz. Z. Hydrol. 44: 295-314.

757   Taylor, E. B. 1999. Species pairs of north temperate freshwater fishes: evolution, taxonomy, and

758   conservation. Rev. Fish Biol. Fisher. 9: 299-324.

759   Trudel, M., Tremblay, A., Schetagne, R., & Rasmussen, J. B. 2001. Why are dwarf fish so small? An

760   energetic analysis of polymorphism in lake whitefish (*Coregonus clupeaformis*). Can. J. Fish. Aquat.

761   Sci. 58: 394–405.

762   Venables, W. N. & Ripley, B. D. 2002. Modern Applied Statistics with S. Fourth Edition. Springer, New

763   York.

764   Via, S., Bouck, A., & Skillman, S. 2000. Reproductive isolation between sympatric races of pea aphids.

765   II. Selection against migrants and hybrids in the parental environments. Evolution 54: 1626-1637.

766   Vonlanthen, P., Bittner, D., Hudson, A. G., Young, K. A, Müller, R., Lundsgaard-Hansen, B. *et al*. 2012.

767   Eutrophication causes speciation reversal in whitefish adaptive radiations. Nature 482: 357-363.

768   Vonlanthen, P., Roy, D., Hudson, A. G., Largiader, C. R., Bittner, D. & Seehausen, O. 2009. Divergence

769   along a steep ecological gradient in lake whitefish (*Coregonus sp.*). J. Evolution Biol. 22: 498-514.

770   West Eberhard, M. J. 1989. Phenotypic plasticity and the origins of diversity. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.

771   20: 249-278.

772   West Eberhard, M. J. 2003. Developmental plasticity and evolution. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

773   Wimberger, P.H. 1994. Trophic polymorphisms, plasticity, and speciation in vertebrates. In Theory

774   and application in fish feeding ecology (eds D. J. Stouder, K. L. Fresh & R. J. Feller). University of South

775   Carolina Press, Columbia, SC.

776   Wund, M. A., Baker, J. A., Clancy, B., Golub, J. L. & Foster, S. A. 2008. A test of the flexible stem model

777   of evolution: ancestral plasticity, genetic accommodation, and morphological divergence in the

778   threespine stickleback radiation. Am. Nat. 172: 449-462.

779   Zelditch, M.L., Swiderski, D.L., Sheets, H.D. & Fink, W.L. 2004. Geometric Morphometrics for

780   Biologists: A Primer. Elsevier Academic Press, San Diego.

781   Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N., Walker, N., Saveliev, A.A**.** & Smith**,** G.M. 2009. Mixed effects models and

782   extensions in ecology with R. First edition. Springer, New York.

783

784

785

786   **FIGURE CAPTIONS**

787

788   **Figure 1: Hypothetical scenarios** for a) variation in feeding efficiency, if it was entirely under genetic

789   control, b) variation in feeding efficiency, if it was entirely the results of phenotypic plasticity, c)

790   variation in feeding efficiency, if it would have similar genetic and plastic components. Plasticity

791   effects in panel b) and c) are adaptive. In all panels, plasticity is assumed to be equally strong in both

792   species. Shown are the treatments on the x-axis and a hypothetical feeding efficiency value on the y-

793   axis. Error bars are hypothetical standard deviations. In the top line of the legend to the x-axis a large

794   fish corresponds to the benthic species and a small fish to the limnetic species; in the line below a

795   mosquito larvae corresponds to a benthic raising environment and a zooplankton item to a limnetic

796   raising environment; in the lowest line the first letter stands for the species (B=benthic, L=limnetic)

797   and the second letter for the raising environment (B=benthic, L=limnetic).

798   **Figure 2: Feeding efficiency vs. treatments and feeding efficiency vs. length.** Figures on the left

799   show the treatments (for both lakes separately) on the x-axis (see legend of Figure 1 for more detail),

800   and figures on the right show total fish length on the x-axis. The y-axis shows time to food depletion

801   [sec] in figures a) and b), time to first feeding [sec] in figures c) and d), and the number of

802   unsuccessful attacks in figures e) and f). Error bars are the treatment specific standard deviations. In

803   the figures on the left, LU stands for Lake Lucerne and Thun stands for Lake Thun. In the figures on

804   the right, empty dots represent fish from Lake Lucerne (circles=BB; triangles=BL; squares=LB;

805   crosses=LL) and filled dots represent fish from Lake Thun (circles=BB, squares=LB). Solid lines

806   correspond to a linear regression line for Lake Lucnere and dashed lines to a linear regression line for

807   Lake Thun.

808   **Figure 3: Effects of species and the environment on feeding efficiency.** Shown are the treatments on

809   the x-axis (see legend of Figure 1 for more detail) and the residuals of the most likely model

810   excluding species (and in Lake Lucerne also the environment) from that model. This illustrates the

811   effects of species and of the environment corrected for the effects of co-variables in the most likely

812   model (residuals). Positive residuals indicate lower efficiency than predicted based on co-variables

813   alone, while negative residuals predict higher efficiency than predicted based on co-variables alone.

814   a) Time to food depletion of fish from lake Lucerne: Residuals of the model "Time to food depletion =

815   length" on the y-axis. b) Time to first feeding of fish from Lake Lucerne: Residuals of the model "Time

816   to first feeding = length + year" on the y-axis. c) Number of unsuccessful attacks of fish from Lake

817   Lucerne: Residuals of the model "Number of unsuccessful attacks = length + PC2 + year" on the y-

818   axis. d) Number of unsuccessful attacks of fish from Lake Thun: Residuals of the model "Number of

819   unsuccessful attacks = length + PC2 + year" on the y-axis. Error bars are the standard deviations of

820   the residuals per treatment. As species was the only variable retained in the most likely model of

821   Time to food depletion and Time to first feeding of fish from Lake Thun, no residuals could be

822   generated and plotted against species (but see Fig. 2).

823   **Figure 4: Effects of fish length and shape on feeding efficiency.** Shown are either length (panel a-c

824   and e) or PC2 (panel d and f) on the x-axis and the residuals of the corresponding most likely model

825   excluding either length or PC2. This illustrates the effect of length and PC2 corrected for the effects

826   of their co-variables in the most likely model (residuals). Positive residuals indicate lower efficiency

827   than predicted based on co-variables, while negative residuals predict higher efficiency than

828   predicted based on co-variables. a) Time to food depletion of fish from Lake Lucerne: Residuals of the

829   model "Time to food depletion = species + environment" on the y-axis. b) Time to first feeding of fish

830   from Lake Lucerne: Residuals of the model "Time to first feeding = species + environment + year" on

831   the y-axis. c) Number of unsuccessful attacks of fish from Lake Lucerne: Residuals of the model

832   "Number of unsuccessful attacks = species + environment + PC2 + year" on the y-axis. d) Number of

833   unsuccessful attacks of fish from Lake Lucerne: Residuals of the model "Number of unsuccessful

834   attacks = species + environment + length + year" on the y-axis. e) Number of unsuccessful attacks of

835   fish from Lake Thun: Residuals of the model "Number of unsuccessful attacks = species + PC2 + year"

836   on the y-axis. f) Number of unsuccessful attacks of fish from Lake Thun: Residuals of the model

837   "Number of unsuccessful attacks = species + length + year" on the y-axis. Fish head shapes (drawn

838   from a subset of landmarks) in panel d) and f) correspond to head shapes at the extremes of the PC2

839   axis and differences are threefold overdrawn. As the most likely models of time to food depletion

840   and time to first feeding of fish from Lake Thun did not contain length or a shape PC, morphological

841   effects on these efficiency measures are not illustrated.

842

a)

Feeding efficiency on benthic food

Species				
Rearing environment				
Treatment	BB	BL	LB	LL

b)

Feeding efficiency on benthic food

Species				
Rearing environment				
Treatment	BB	BL	LB	LL

c)

Feeding efficiency on benthic food

Species				
Rearing environment				
Treatment	BB	BL	LB	LL

a)

Time to food depletion [s]

Lake: LU, LU, LU, LU, Thun, Thun

Species:

Rearing environment:

Treatment: BB, BL, LB, LL, BB, LB

b)

Time to food depletion [s]

Length[mm]

c)

Time to first feeding [s]

Lake: LU, LU, LU, LU, Thun, Thun

Species:

Rearing environment:

Treatment: BB, BL, LB, LL, BB, LB

d)

Time to first feeding [s]

Length[mm]

e)

Unsuccessful attacks

Lake: LU, LU, LU, LU, Thun, Thun

Species:

Rearing environment:

Treatment: BB, BL, LB, LL, BB, LB

f)

Unsuccessful attacks

Length[mm]

a)

Residuals time to food depletion

L. Lucerne

Species	
Rearing environment	
Treatment	BB BL LB LL

b)

Residuals time to first feeding

L. Lucerne

Species	
Rearing environment	
Treatment	BB BL LB LL

c)

Residuals unsuccessful attacks

L. Lucerne

Species	
Rearing environment	
Treatment	BB BL LB LL

d)

Residuals unsuccessful attacks

L.Thun

|	
Species	
Rearing environment	
Treatment	BB LB

Table 1: Sample sizes and body size variation per treatment. Four treatments were available for fish from Lake Lucerne and two treatments were available for fish from Lake Thun. The first letter of the treatment refers to genetic background of the fish and the second letter of the treatment refers to their food during raising. B stands for benthic and L stands for limnetic. The first number corresponds to fish tested in 2009 and the second number to fish tested in 2010. N_{total} includes all fish. These fish were used to test for divergence between Treatments in length. N_{shape} includes all fish for which shape data was available. These fish were used to test for divergence between treatments in shape. N_{ph} (ph= post hoc) includes all fish that started feeding, including those for which shape data was missing. These fish were used in post-hoc tests for associations of feeding efficiency with each of the explanatory variables except shape. N_{GLM} includes all fish that started feeding and for which shape data was available. These fish were used in the GLMs. Fish without shape data had to be excluded from the GLMs even when no shape variable was kept for the most likely model, because AIC is only comparable between models with the same number of observations. In the last column we report mean length of fish (mm) from a particular treatment with the respective standard deviations (with years separated using "/").

Lake	Treatment	Genetics	Environment	N_{total}	N_{shape}	N_{np}	N_{GLM}	Mean length
Lucerne	BB	Benthic	Benthic	23/0	22/0	23/0	22/0	160 (13)
	BL	Benthic	Limnetic	21/1	20/1	21/1	20/1	151 (17)/186 (0)
	LB	Limnetic	Benthic	17/7	17/7	16/7	16/7	141 (14)/139(24)
	LL	Limnetic	Limnetic	30/0	28/0	26/0	24/0	133 (12)
	Total			**91/8**	**87/8**	**86/8**	**82/8**	
Thun	BB	Benthic	Benthic	10/7	10/7	10/7	10/7	144 (21)/154(14)
	LB	Limnetic	Benthic	10/7	10/7	10/7	10/7	139 (17)/135(9)
	Total			**20/14**	**20/14**	**20/14**	**20/14**	

Table 2: Generalized linear model selection. Models of Lake Lucerne are reported first, models of Lake Thun are reported below. Given for each model are

844 its AIC, delta AIC to the most likely model (Delta i), the likelihood of each model (Likelihood), Akaike weights (w_i) and the evidence ratio (L ratio). The

845 evidence ratio indicates how much less likely a particular model is compared to the most likely model. The model likelihood decreases for each model from

846 the top to the bottom and the most likely model is highlighted in bold. $N_{unsuccessful}$ = number of unsuccessful attacks. SP = species, ENV = raising environment,

847 L = length, PC1/PC2=principal components fish body shape variation and Y = year.

Backward model selection Lucerne	AIC	Delta i	Likelihood	w_i	L ratio
Time to food depletion = (SP×ENV)+SP+ENV+L+PC1+PC2+Y	232.67	6.39	0.04	0.02	24.41
Time to food depletion = SP+ENV+L+PC2+Y	230.68	4.4	0.11	0.06	9.03
Time to food depletion = SP+ENV+L+PC2+Y	228.88	2.6	0.27	0.14	3.67
Time to food depletion = SP+ENV+L+Y	227.44	1.16	0.56	0.28	1.79
Time to food depletion = SP+ENV+L	**226.28**	**0**	**1**	**0.5**	
Time to first feeding = (SP×ENV)+SP+ENV+L+PC1+PC2+Y	1206.6	4.4	0.11	0.07	9.03
Time to first feeding = SP+ENV+L+PC1+PC2+Y	1206.1	3.9	0.14	0.09	7.03
Time to first feeding = SP+ENV+L+PC1+Y	1204.1	1.9	0.39	0.24	2.59
Time to first feeding = SP+ENV+L+Y	**1202.2**	**0**	**1**	**0.61**	

	AIC	Delta i	Likelihood	Weigths	L ratio
$N_{unsuccessful}$=(SP×ENV)+SP+ENV+L+PC1+PC2+Y	181.79	3.52	0.17	0.11	5.81
$N_{unsuccessful}$ =SP+ENV+L+PC1+PC2+Y	180.26	1.99	0.37	0.24	2.7
$N_{unsuccessful}$ =SP+ENV+L+PC2+Y	**178.27**	**0**	**1**	**0.65**	
Backward model selection Lake Thun	**AIC**	**Delta i**	**Likelihood**	**Weigths**	**L ratio**
Time to food depletion = SP+L+PC1+PC2+Y	223.13	4.48	0.11	0.04	9.39
Time to food depletion = SP+L+PC1+PC2	221.18	2.53	0.28	0.11	3.54
Time to food depletion = SP+PC1+PC2	220.07	1.42	0.49	0.19	2.03
Time to food depletion = SP+PC1	219.35	0.7	0.7	0.27	1.42
Time to food depletion = SP	**218.65**	**0**	**1**	**0.39**	
Time to first feeding = SP+ L+ PC1+PC2+Y	458.19	6.87	0.03	0.02	31.03
Time to first feeding = SP+L+ PC2+Y	456.2	4.88	0.09	0.04	11.47
Time to first feeding = SP+L+Y	454.22	2.9	0.23	0.12	4.26
Time to first feeding = SP+L	452.39	1.07	0.59	0.3	1.71
Time to first feeding = SP	**451.32**	**0**	**1**	**0.52**	
$N_{unsuccessful}$ = SP+L +PC1+PC2+Y	73.2	2.97	0.23	0.18	4.41
$N_{unsuccessful}$ = SP+L +PC2+Y	**70.23**	**0**	**1**	**0.82**	

848

Table 3: Generalized linear model coefficients of the most likely models. The different models are listed in rows, the different variables are listed in columns. Abbreviations are as in Table 2. Given are the estimated model coefficients (Coef), their error (error) and the p-value (p, significant values highlighted in bold). A positive model coefficient indicates a positive relationship. For species and environment this relationship goes from benthic to limnetic. A positive model coefficient thus means that limnetic fish have a higher value than benthic fish (indicating a lower efficiency) in the response variable and vice versa. For year a positive model coefficient thus means that fish in the second year were less efficient. Environmentally induced effects could not be measured for Thun, which is indicated by the term na.

		SP	ENV	L	PC2	Y
Time to food depletion Lucerne	Coef/error	0.41/0.2	0.7/0.17	0.01/0.005	-	-
	p	**0.048**	**<0.001**	0.065	-	-
Time to first attack Lucerne	Coef/error	0.42/0.37	0.71/0.33	-0.02/0.01	-	0.93/0.57
	p	0.26	**0.03**	0.08	-	0.11
N$_{unsuccesful}$ Lucerne	Coef/error	0.2/0.25	0.05/0.21	-	9.78/6.12	-
	p	0.42	0.81	**0.01**	0.11	0.076
Time to food depletion Thun	Coef/error	4.55/1.95	na	-	-	-
	p	**0.03**	na	-	-	-
Time to first attack Thun	Coef/error	-	na	-	-	-
	p	0.56	na	-	-	-
N$_{unsuccesful}$ Thun	Coef/error	0.03/0.36	na	-0.02/0.01	-	-39.95/13.48
	p	0.92	na	0.07	**>0.01**	0.06