OXFORD

Article

Divergent male and female mate preferences do not explain incipient speciation between lizard lineages

Claire A. McLean [a,b,*], **Richard A. Bartle**[a], **Caroline M. Dong** [a,b], **Katrina J. Rankin**[a], **and Devi Stuart-Fox**[a]

[a]School of BioSciences, The University of Melbourne, Parkville VIC 3010, Australia and [b]Sciences Department, Museums Victoria, Carlton VIC 3053, Australia

*Address correspondence to Claire McLean. E-mail: cmclean@museum.vic.gov.au.

Handling editor: Rebecca Fuller

Abstract

Diversification in sexual signals is often taken as evidence for the importance of sexual selection in speciation. However, in order for sexual selection to generate reproductive isolation between populations, both signals and mate preferences must diverge together. Furthermore, assortative mating may result from multiple behavioral mechanisms, including female mate preferences, male mate preferences, and male–male competition; yet their relative contributions are rarely evaluated. Here, we explored the role of mate preferences and male competitive ability as potential barriers to gene flow between 2 divergent lineages of the tawny dragon lizard, *Ctenophorus decresii*, which differ in male throat coloration. We found stronger behavioral barriers to pairings between southern lineage males and northern lineage females than between northern males and southern females, indicating incomplete and asymmetric behavioral isolating barriers. These results were driven by both male and female mate preferences rather than lineage differences in male competitive ability. Intrasexual selection is therefore unlikely to drive the outcome of secondary contact in *C. decresii*, despite its widely acknowledged importance in lizards. Our results are consistent with the emerging view that although both male and female mate preferences can diverge alongside sexual signals, speciation is rarely driven by divergent sexual selection alone.

Key words: *Ctenophorus decresii*, hybridization, male–male competition, secondary contact, sexual selection

Populations that evolve in allopatry often diverge in sexual signals, which intuitively implicates sexual selection in speciation. However, speciation by sexual selection requires associated mating preferences in order to generate prezygotic isolation between populations should they come into contact (West-Eberhard 1983; Panhuis et al. 2001; Ritchie 2007). Both signals and preferences can diverge due to drift or local adaptation to different environments rather than, or in addition to, divergent sexual selection (Schluter 2009; Langerhans and Riesch 2013; Mendelson et al. 2016). Thus, sexual signals and mating preferences (or other behaviors involved in acquiring mates, such as male competitive ability) can evolve independently, and several outcomes are possible when populations meet. Behavioral reproductive barriers could be absent, weak, strong, or asymmetrical, resulting in varying levels of admixture, and the potential breakdown of signal and preference differences. For example, song phenotype acts as a barrier to gene flow between subspecies of white-crowned sparrows, but admixed individuals in the contact zone exhibit slightly decreased discrimination, which has the potential to weaken isolation over time (Lipshutz et al. 2019). Consequently, determining the extent to which divergent sexual signals generate premating reproductive isolation upon secondary contact is critical to understand the role of sexual selection in speciation.

Premating isolating barriers between divergent lineages generate patterns of assortative mating. However, assortative mating can arise from multiple behavioral mechanisms such as female mate preference (or rejection of non-preferred mates), male mate preference, and competition between males for access to females. Most studies examining premating isolating barriers focus on female mate preferences but in some species, particularly those that are highly territorial and polygynous, competition between males for access to females can be the primary determinant of male reproductive success (Anderson 1994; Fitzpatrick et al. 2012; Qvarnström et al. 2012; Uller et al. 2013; McDiarmid et al. 2017; Tinghitella et al. 2018). Furthermore, female access to mates may be limited when males dominate territories encompassing the home range of one or more females and/or exhibit mate guarding behavior (Qvarnström et al. 2012). If males control mating opportunities and do not discriminate between conspecific and heterospecific females, then we may see little evidence of assortative mating. Selection for mate discrimination is expected to be weaker in males than females due to generally lower male *per capita* investment in reproduction, particularly in the absence of parental care (Bateman 1948; Anderson 1994; but see Edward and Chapman 2011). Male mate discrimination between females from divergent lineages may also be limited because females are phenotypically similar (i.e., only male sexual signals have diverged). Our understanding of the relative contributions of male–male competition and male mate discrimination in influencing the outcome of secondary contact remains limited but is of growing interest (Peterson et al. 2005; Johannesson et al. 2008; Vallin et al. 2011; While et al. 2015; Heathcote et al. 2016; Martin and Mendelson 2016).

The Australian tawny dragon lizard *Ctenophorus decresii* (Duméril and Bibron, 1837) is well suited to examining the evolution of behavioral mechanisms that may generate assortative mating upon secondary contact. This small sexually dimorphic agamid lizard comprises 2 genetically and phenotypically divergent lineages: "northern" and "southern" (Houston and Hutchinson 1998; McLean et al. 2014b; Figure 1). There is evidence that the lineages are incipient species, and the level of divergence between them (3.7% net sequence divergence in mtDNA) is consistent with contraction to, and expansion from, isolated refugia during Pleistocene glacial–interglacial cycles (Byrne 2008; McLean et al. 2014b). The lineages meet in a narrow contact zone (ca. 20 km) where F1 generation hybrids are not present (i.e., contact is not recent) and genetic admixture is asymmetrical (McLean et al. 2014b; Dong et al. 2019). Specifically, hybrids backcross to the northern but not the southern lineage, and nearly all hybrid individuals have northern lineage maternally inherited mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA), indicating some degree of reproductive isolation (Dong et al. 2019).

The lineages of *C. decresii* differ in male throat coloration, which they display prominently during both contests and courtship (Gibbons 1979; Stuart-Fox and Johnston 2005; Osborne et al. 2012; Ramos and Peters 2016). Northern lineage males are color polymorphic, with orange, yellow, orange–yellow (an orange central patch surrounded by yellow), and gray throat morphs co-occurring within populations (Teasdale et al. 2013; McLean et al. 2014b). Conversely, southern lineage males have blue throats with an ultraviolet (UV) reflectance peak (McLean et al. 2014b). Northern lineage color morphs also exhibit correlated behavioral strategies; gray males are the most cautious, while orange males are the most bold and the most aggressive toward territory intruders (Yewers et al. 2016). Females are cryptically colored and similar in appearance between lineages (Figure 1; McLean et al. 2013). The species occupies open, rocky habitats and males defend territories using elaborate behavioral displays from elevated rock perches, sometimes engaging in physical contests (Gibbons 1979; Stuart-Fox and Johnston 2005; Osborne et al. 2012; Ramos and Peters 2016). Males are polygynous with territories encompassing the home ranges of one or more females (Yewers et al. 2018); thus, a male's ability to defend a territory likely influences reproductive success. Parental care is absent and multiple paternity within clutches is rare (4%), though this does not preclude female multiple mating within or between clutches due to the possibility of sperm storage and sperm competition (Hacking et al. 2017). Consequently, the biology as well as the mating system of *C. decresii* suggests strong intra-sexual selection.

In this study, we staged encounters between captive lizards from populations representing the closest genetically pure populations on either side of the contact zone. This enabled us to assess the extent to which divergent mate preferences have evolved in the 2 lineages, independently of reinforcement subsequent to secondary contact. Doing so is essential to assess the role of sexual selection in the speciation process. We predicted that lizards would display a preference for mates from their own lineage. If this is due to female preference, females should perform more courtship and/or less rejection behavior during encounters with males from the same lineage. Similarly, if male preference plays a role then males should be more likely to court and/or attempt copulation with females from their own lineage as opposed to the alternate lineage. Additionally, we predicted that northern and southern males would differ in their aggressive behavior, and that this behavior may be dependent on the throat color morph of their opponent.

Materials and Methods

Study species and husbandry

We used 90 adult lizards (>65 mm snout–vent length; SVL) comprising 21 male and 24 female northern lineage *C. decresii* from Caroona Creek Conservation Park, South Australia (−33.4114°S, 139.0945°E), and 21 male and 24 female southern lineage *C. decresii* from private properties around Palmer, South Australia (−34.8223°S, 139.1621°E). Lizards were collected in September in 2015 and 2016, and subsequently kept in captivity at The University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, where they were housed individually in 55 × 34 × 38 cm (length × width × height) opaque plastic enclosures containing a layer of sand and a crevice between 2 ceramic tiles for shelter. Housing was maintained at temperatures and lighting cycles that mimicked natural seasonal variation, with UV lights (ZooMed T8 ReptiSun® 10.0 UVB) above each enclosure (30 cm), emitting both UVA and UVB radiation. A heat lamp was provided to generate a thermal gradient and allow the lizards to attain their preferred body temperatures (approx. 36°C; Gibbons 1977; S. Walker, unpublished data). Lizards were misted with water for hydration and fed live crickets dusted with multi-vitamins 3 times per week. All behavioral trials were conducted during the breeding seasons (August–December; Gibbons 1977) in 2016 and 2017. Research methods used in this study were reviewed and approved by the Animal Ethics Committee of The University of Melbourne (1413220.3) and the South Australian Wildlife Ethics Committee (25/2015).

Female–male behavioral trials

Females are receptive to mating approximately 2–3 weeks after emergence from hibernation, and after laying their first or second clutch. We conducted mate preference trials during these known receptive periods, when females were in good body condition (average

Figure 1. Phenotypic variation between the northern and southern lineages of *C. decresii*. Parts (**A**) and (**B**) show northern and southern lineage females, respectively, which are similar in appearance. (**C**) Distribution of the 2 lineages (northern = orange shading; southern = blue shading). Parts (**D**) and (**E**) show northern and southern lineage males, respectively. Northern males are polymorphic for throat coloration.

mass of 16.7 ± 2.9 g), though receptivity cannot be determined with certainty *a priori*. Each female was paired with both a southern and a northern lineage male, with half of the females paired with a southern male first and the other half with a northern male first. Females were placed into the first male's enclosure for a period of 24 h, and then into the second male's enclosure for the subsequent 24 h. Both encounters were monitored and recorded using a Swann DVR8-1525 8 channel 960H digital video recorder with a PRO-615 camera attached. We conducted a total of 147 trials, with individual females paired with one southern and one northern male per reproductive cycle, in up to 2 reproductive cycles (average of 3.34 trials, with a range of 2–4 trials, per female).

Videos were analyzed using Behavioral Observation Research Interactive Software (BORIS) version 4.1.5 (Friard and Gamba 2016) and both female and male behavior was scored. For females, we recorded the number of head-bobs (pronounced nodding movement of the head), and combined the number of aggressive behaviors (biting and chasing) and times the female fled from the male as a measure of "rejection." For males, we also recorded the number of head-bobs (courtship behavior) as well as the number of attempts to copulate, and whether or not copulation was successful. We did not analyze the number of successful copulations as copulation was observed in only 7 of the 147 trials (although more may have taken place under the tile). Lizards were not paired for long enough to ensure mating; rather, we were interested in behavior during initial contact as an indicator of mate preference.

We tested whether female lineage, male lineage, or their interaction predicted: 1) number of copulation attempts, 2) number of male head-bobs, 3) number of female head-bobs, and 4) number of female rejection behaviors using generalized linear mixed models (lme4 package, R; Bates et al. 2015). Female ID, male ID, and pairing number (female's first or second trial) were included as random factors in all models to account for repeated use of individuals, and response variables were log transformed to meet model assumptions of normality. We performed pairwise comparisons by calculating least squares means and confidence intervals using the Satterthwaite's approximation for degrees of freedom (lmerTest package, R; Kuznetsova et al. 2017).

Male–male behavioral trials

A previous study investigating aggression levels among morphs of the northern lineage found that orange-throated males were significantly more aggressive toward territory intruders than yellow, orange–yellow, or gray-throated males (Yewers et al. 2016). Therefore, we categorized males into 3 behavioral groups based on lineage and throat color morph: 1) southern, 2) northern high aggression (orange), or 3) northern low aggression (yellow, orange–yellow, gray). We designed trials such that each focal male was matched with 3 others, representing each of the behavioral groups, in random order. Pairs were size-matched to minimize the effect of body size on contest outcome, with an average difference of 1.59 ± 1.16 mm SVL between competing males.

Contest trials were conducted in a neutral $120 \times 30 \times 60$ cm (length $\times$ width $\times$ height) enclosure (i.e., not the home enclosure of either male). An opaque divider initially separated the enclosure into 2 equally sized holding areas, each containing a layer of sand, ceramic tile, and heat lamp. Just prior to the trial, males were weighed to obtain a measure of body condition as the residuals of a linear model of mass and SVL. The designated "focal" and "opponent" males were then placed into the separate holding areas and allowed to acclimatize for 48 h to establish residency (Umbers et al. 2012). At the commencement of the trial, the divider was removed and the interaction was recorded from 2 different angles using Panasonic HC-V770M video cameras. Trials were conducted for a maximum of 35 min and monitored to ensure there was no risk of injury to animals (as required under the Animal Ethics permit). Consequently, we did not record contest outcome (i.e., winner, loser) as some trials were stopped before a winner was established. To minimize stress and the potential influence of previous contest outcomes, males were not used in a subsequent trial for at least 48 h. We conducted a total of 120 trials (involving 42 males), 26 of which were excluded due to no interaction, resulting in 94 trials which were used in the statistical analysis.

We scored focal male behavior from the video footage using BORIS. *Ctenophorus decresii* males perform energetic displays during territory defense prior to engaging in physical aggression (Gibbons 1979). Therefore, we recorded the number of head-bobs, tail flicks, and push-ups performed by the focal male as a measure of "display behavior," and combined the duration of chasing and wrestling (involving biting) as a measure of "physical aggression." We also recorded the time between the start of the trial and the focal male's emergence from beneath the tile ("latency"), as this is an indicator of individual boldness. Display behavior and physical

Figure 2. The total number of (**A**) copulation attempts and (**B**) male head-bobs (courtship) performed during mate preference trials between females and males of the southern (S) and northern (N) lineages of *C. decresii*. Letters indicate statistically significant differences between lineage pairings.

Figure 3. Comparison of (**A**) the total number of rejection behaviors (biting, chasing, and fleeing) performed by southern (S) and northern (N) females and (**B**) the number of rejection behaviors performed by females (regardless of lineage) when paired with southern and northern males. Letters indicate statistically significant differences between lineages.

aggression were divided by the total trial duration (minus latency) to account for differences in trial lengths.

We tested whether behavioral group or body condition predicted: 1) focal male latency to emerge, 2) focal male display behavior, and 3) focal male physical aggression using generalized linear mixed models. We included focal male behavioral group, opponent male behavioral group and their interaction, as well as focal male body condition and opponent male body condition as predictor variables in the models. Additionally, focal male ID and focal male trial number were included as random factors in all models to account for repeated use of individuals. For models 2 (display behavior) and 3 (physical aggression), the response variables were log transformed to meet model assumptions of normality, and we performed *post hoc* pairwise comparisons as detailed above.

Results

Female–male behavioral trials

The interaction between female and male lineage influenced the number of copulation attempts ($F_{1,103.2} = 6.53$, $P = 0.012$) and male head-bobs (courtship; $F_{1,91.2} = 6.61$, $P = 0.012$) during trials (Table 1). Males attempted copulation in 68 of the 147 trials and

there were more copulation attempts between southern males paired with southern females than southern males paired with northern females ($t_{107.8} = 2.46$, $P = 0.015$) or northern males paired with southern females ($t_{63.9} = 2.00$, $P = 0.050$; Figure 2 and Supplementary Table S1). Similarly, southern males courted southern females (with head-bobs) more than they courted northern females ($t_{91.3} = 3.21$, $P = 0.018$; Figure 2 and Supplementary Table S2). Lineage did not influence female head-bobs; however, both female and male lineage affected female rejection behavior (Table 1). Specifically, northern females performed more rejection behaviors than southern females ($F_{1,40.2} = 4.64$, $P = 0.037$) and southern males were rejected more overall (i.e., by females of both lineages) than northern males ($F_{1,38.9} = 10.06$, $P = 0.003$; Figure 3).

Male–male behavioral trials

Focal males displayed (head-bobs, tail flicks, and push-ups) in 73 out of 94 contest trials, and 70 trials involved physical aggression (chasing and wrestling). Focal male ID (a random factor) explained a large proportion (57.07%) of the variance in the time taken for the focal male to emerge from beneath the tile (latency). Taking this into account, latency was affected by both the focal male's

Table 1. Results of generalized linear mixed models investigating whether female and male lineage (southern and northern) predicts behavior during mate preference trials

| Behavior	Variable	R^2m	R^2c	Estimate (95% CI)	F_{df}	P
(1) Copulation attempts	Female lineage	0.05	0.12	−0.067 (−0.198, 0.064)	$1.05_{1,41.5}$	0.311
	Male lineage			−0.018 (−0.139, 0.102)	$0.08_{1,30.5}$	0.780
	Female lineage × male lineage			0.149 (0.033, 0.264)	$6.53_{1,103.2}$	*0.012*
(2) Male head-bobs	Female lineage	0.07	0.22	−0.272 (−0.540, 0.006)	$4.12_{1,31.9}$	0.051
	Male lineage			−0.030 (−0.273, 0.224)	$0.06_{1,28.8}$	0. 805
	Female lineage × male lineage			0.293 (0.066, 0.519)	$6.61_{1,91.2}$	*0.012*
(3) Female head-bobs	Female lineage	0.04	0.27	0.189 (−0.033, 0.412)	$2.91_{1,41.1}$	0.096
	Male lineage			−0.087 (−0.240, 0.067)	$1.26_{1,101.3}$	0.265
	Female lineage × male lineage			0.018 (−0.135, 0.171)	$0.05_{1,100.6}$	0.817
(4) Female rejection	Female lineage	0.11	0.22	0.178 (0.009, 0.341)	$4.64_{1,40.3}$	*0.037*
	Male lineage			−0.279 (−0.457, −0.103)	$10.1_{1,38.9}$	*0.003*
	Female lineage × male lineage			−0.074 (−0.227, 0.079)	$0.92_{1,103.9}$	0.340

Statistically significant relationships are italicized. CI, confidence interval; R^2m, marginal R^2; R^2c, conditional R^2; df, degrees of freedom.

behavioral category ($F_{2,41.5} = 4.35$, $P = 0.019$) and opponent male's behavioral category ($F_{2,58.1} = 5.45$, $P = 0.007$) but neither male's body condition (Table 2). The relationships were such that northern low aggression males (yellow, orange–yellow, and gray morphs) were slower to emerge than southern males ($t_{39.5} = 2.92$, $P = 0.006$), and the focal male emerged more quickly for a southern ($t_{59.1} = 3.05$, $P = 0.003$) or northern low aggression ($t_{56.9} = 2.26$, $P = 0.028$; Supplementary Table S3) opponent compared with a northern high aggression (orange morph) opponent (Figure 4 and Supplementary Table S4). Neither male behavioral category nor body condition affected display behavior or physical aggression during trials (Table 2).

Discussion

Speciation via sexual selection requires sexual signals and mating preferences to diverge together, resulting in assortative mating upon secondary contact. Males of the northern and southern lineages of *C. decresii* differ markedly in male throat coloration, a signal used in both intra- and inter-sexual interactions. Mating trials between the lineages showed that southern males display a preference for females from their own lineage. Southern males courted and attempted copulation with southern females more than northern females. By contrast, northern males did not court or attempt copulation with northern females more than with southern females. Additionally, northern females displayed more rejection behaviors than southern females and southern males were rejected more (regardless of female lineage) than northern males. These data suggest that both male and female mate preferences may act as behavioral barriers to gene flow upon secondary contact. However, we found no evidence for behavioral barriers to mating between northern males and southern females, suggesting that the evolution of premating isolation prior to secondary contact is incomplete and asymmetrical.

Divergent sexual selection can theoretically drive speciation, even in the absence of reinforcement (Lorch et al. 2003; Reinhold 2004; van Doorn et al. 2009). This is most likely when sexual signals are condition-dependent or directly under natural selection because selection against locally maladapted offspring should generate linkage disequilibrium between trait and preference, ultimately leading to assortative mating (Maan and Seehausen 2011). Male throat coloration in *C. decresii* is locally adapted to increase conspicuousness against the color of the dominant lichens on rocks in the

Figure 4. Time taken (in minutes) for (A) southern (blue), northern low aggression (yellow, orange–yellow, gray morphs), and northern high aggression (orange morph) focal males to emerge from beneath the tile and (B) focal males to emerge depending on the behavioral category of the opponent male. Lowercase letters indicate significant differences between behavioral categories. Note that focal male ID explains a large proportion of the variance in latency to emerge.

Table 2. Results of generalized linear mixed models investigating whether male behavioral category or condition predict behavior during male–male contests

Behavior	Variable	R^2m	R^2c	SS	F_{df}	P
(1) Latency	FM behavioral category	0.22	0.73	166.8	$4.35_{2,41.5}$	*0.019*
	OM behavioral category			209.0	$5.45_{2,58.1}$	*0.007*
	FM condition			73.4	$3.83_{1,91.2}$	0.053
	OM condition			63.4	$3.31_{1,75.7}$	0.073
	FM behavioral category×OM behavioral category			73.0	$0.95_{4,57.2}$	0.441
(2) Display behavior	FM behavioral category	0.14	0.33	7.7×10^{-5}	$0.84_{2,32.5}$	0.441
	OM behavioral category			6.1×10^{-5}	$0.66_{2,58.5}$	0.519
	FM condition			6.1×10^{-6}	$0.13_{1,65.6}$	0.717
	OM condition			5.0×10^{-5}	$1.09_{1,92.6}$	0.300
	FM behavioral category×OM behavioral category			4.4×10^{-4}	$2.39_{4,56.2}$	0.062
(3) Physical aggression	FM behavioral category	0.08	0.09	0.061	$1.35_{2,93.5}$	0.264
	OM behavioral category			0.041	$0.90_{2,93.6}$	0.410
	FM condition			0.030	$1.33_{1,92.6}$	0.251
	OM condition			7.2×10^{-6}	$3.0\times10^{-4}{}_{1,94.0}$	0.986
	FM behavioral category×OM behavioral category			0.011	$0.12_{4,92.8}$	0.973

Behavioral categories are: "southern," "northern low aggression" (yellow, orange–yellow, and gray morphs) and "northern high aggression" (orange morph). Statistically significant relationships are italicized. SS, type III sum of squares; R^2m, marginal R^2; R^2c, conditional R^2; df, degrees of freedom; FM, focal male; OM, opponent male.

habitats of the 2 lineages (McLean et al. 2014a). Southern blue throats are more conspicuous against the orange lichen found extensively on rocks in the south, while northern orange and yellow throats are more conspicuous against the gray–green lichen that dominates in the north (McLean et al. 2014a). Despite local adaptation of the color signal, we found little evidence for a strong link between signal and preference: southern females did not discriminate between northern and southern males, and northern males did not show a preference for northern females. Thus, the strength of divergent ecological selection on sexual signals in this system appears insufficient to generate strong linkage between sexual trait and preference, and therefore assortative mating upon secondary contact.

Mate discrimination or choosiness is expected to be stronger in the sex that invests more into reproduction per offspring, typically females (Anderson 1994). Thus, premating isolation is generally assumed to be driven by female preferences. In lizards, which mostly lack parental care, females invest more per offspring into reproduction; yet, evidence for female mate choice is scarce (López et al. 2003; Olsson et al. 2003; Martín and López 2006). This is because males largely control female access to mates, either by dominating territories encompassing the home range of one or more females, or by mate guarding (Olsson and Madsen 1995). We do find some evidence suggesting a role for female mate preference in *C. decresii*. Like most lizards, female *C. decresii* mate multiply when receptive, but this does not mean they mate indiscriminately (Elgar et al. 2013), and they may exhibit mate preferences through rejection of non-preferred mates. Our results showed that northern females exhibited more rejection behavior, and that southern males were rejected more overall, which could have contributed to the lower number of copulation attempts observed between this combination.

Male–male competition is unlikely to drive speciation on its own, but may contribute to reproductive isolation in combination with mate preferences or genetic incompatibilities. For example, in European wall lizards *Podarcis muralis*, asymmetric introgression occurs due to strong differences between lineages in male competitive ability and male mate preferences, which are both linked to body size (While et al. 2015; Heathcote et al. 2016). Correlated

evolution of body size and sexual signals is a common pattern (Young et al. 1994; Wirtz 1999; Hagman and Forsman 2003; McGlothlin et al. 2005; reviewed in Bonduriansky 2007). In *C. decresii*, males of the 2 lineages differ very slightly in body size and head shape (McLean et al. 2013), but did not differ in competitive ability in terms of aggression during staged contests. Thus, we find no evidence that male–male competition contributes to incipient speciation in *C. decresii*, despite the importance of intra-sexual selection in this species, and its widely acknowledged importance in lizards more generally.

Although lineages did not differ in aggression, there were differences in boldness between lineages and morphs, consistent with previously described behavioral differences between the northern throat color morphs (Yewers et al. 2016). Southern males were bolder (faster to emerge from their shelter) than northern low aggression (yellow, orange–yellow, and gray) males and equally bold as northern high aggression (orange) males. Overall, focal males were least bold when faced with a northern high aggression (orange) opponent. In other species, higher boldness has been associated with greater reproductive success, foraging ability, dispersal distance, and dominance, but may reduce long-term survival (Réale et al. 2007; Ariyomo and Watt 2012). The relationship between boldness and reproductive success in reptiles is relatively unexplored but it has been suggested that boldness may be associated with the ability to defend territories, but is not necessarily correlated with social dominance and aggression (Taylor and Lattanzio 2016).

In summary, we have shown that both male and female mate preferences may potentially influence the nature and extent of reproductive barriers upon secondary contact between lineages of *C. decresii*. We found little evidence of lineage differences in male competitive ability, despite the importance of male–male competition for male reproductive success in *C. decresii* and lizards in general. Furthermore, the marked divergence in male throat coloration is only weakly correlated with divergence in mate preferences, which is also asymmetric. This suggests that divergent sexual selection alone is unlikely to be the primary driver of incipient speciation between the 2 lineages. Instead, genetic data (asymmetric introgression and northern mtDNA in hybrids) suggest a role for genetic

incompatibilities that have arisen during the independent evolution of the lineages (Dong et al. 2019). More broadly, our data are consistent with the emerging view that sexual selection alone rarely drives speciation to completion (Ritchie 2007; Maan and Seehausen 2011; Scordato et al. 2014; Lackey and Boughman 2017; Servedio and Boughman 2017).

Data Accessibility

Data are available from the Dryad Digital Repository: https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.6m905qfws

Author Contributions

C.A.M., R.A.B., and D.S.-F. designed the study. C.A.M., R.A.B., C.M.D., and K.J.R. contributed to the animal collection and maintenance. R.A.B. conducted the experiments and extracted the behavioral data. C.A.M. performed the statistical analyses. C.A.M., D.S.-F., and C.M.D. drafted the manuscript. All authors contributed to the interpretation and revision of the manuscript.

Acknowledgments

Funding

Supplementary Material

Supplementary material can be found at https://academic.oup.com/cz.

References

Anderson M, 1994. *Sexual Selection*. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press.

Ariyomo TO, Watt PJ, 2012. The effect of variation in boldness and aggressiveness on the reproductive success of zebrafish. *Anim Behav* 83: 41–46.

Bateman AJ, 1948. Intra-sexual selection in *Drosophila*. *Heredity* 2: 349–368.

Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker BM, Walker SC, 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *J Stat Softw* 67: 1–48.

Bonduriansky R, 2007. Sexual selection and allometry: a critical reappraisal of the evidence and ideas. *Evolution* 61: 838–849.

Byrne M, 2008. Evidence for multiple refugia at different time scales during Pleistocene climatic oscillations in southern Australia inferred from phylogeography. *Quat Sci Rev* 27: 2576–2585.

Dong CM, McLean CA, Elliott A, Moussalli A, Stuart-Fox D, 2019. When polymorphism and monomorphism meet: discordant genomic and phenotypic clines across a lizard contact zone. bioRxiv. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1101/840678.

Edward DA, Chapman T, 2011. The evolution and significance of male mate choice. *Trends Ecol Evol* 26: 647–654.

Elgar MA, Jones TM, McNamara KB, 2013. Promiscuous words. *Front Zool* 10: 66.

Fitzpatrick JL, Almbro M, Gonzalez-Voyer A, Kolm N, Simmons LW, 2012. Male contest competition and the coevolution of weaponry and testes in pinnipeds. *Evolution* 66: 3595–3604.

Friard O, Gamba M, 2016. BORIS: a free, versatile open-source event-logging software for video/audio coding and live observations. *Methods Ecol Evol* 7: 1325–1330.

Gibbons JRH, 1977. Comparative ecology and behaviour of lizards of the Amphibolurus decresii species complex. Dissertation. The University of Adelaide.

Gibbons JRH, 1979. The hind leg pushup display of the *Amphibolurus decresii* species complex (Lacertilia: Agamidae). *Copeia* 1979: 29–40.

Hacking J, Stuart-Fox D, Gardner M, 2017. Very low rate of multiple paternity detected in clutches of a wild agamid lizard. *Aust J Zool* 65: 328–334.

Hagman M, Forsman A, 2003. Correlated evolution of conspicuous coloration and body size in poison frogs (Dendrobatidae). *Evolution* 57: 2904–2910.

Heathcote RJP, While GM, MacGregor HEA, Sciberras J, Leroy C et al., 2016. Male behaviour drives assortative reproduction during the initial stage of secondary contact. *J Evol Biol* 29: 1003–1015.

Houston TF, Hutchinson M, 1998. *Dragon Lizards and Goannas of South Australia*. Adelaide: South Australian Museum.

Johannesson K, Havenhand JN, Jonsson PR, Lindegarth M, Sundin A et al., 2008. Male discrimination of female mucous trails permits assortative mating in a marine snail species. *Evolution* 62: 3178–3184.

Kuznetsova A, Brockhoff PB, Christensen RHB, 2017. lmerTest Package: tests in linear mixed effects models. *J Stat Softw* 82: 1–26.

Lackey ACR, Boughman JW, 2017. Evolution of reproductive isolation in stickleback fish. *Evolution* 71: 357–372.

Langerhans RB, Riesch R, 2013. Speciation by selection: a framework for understanding ecology's role in speciation. *Curr Zool* 59: 31–52.

Lipshutz SE, Overcast IA, Hickerson MJ, Brumfield RT, Derryberry EP, 2019. Behavioural response to song and genetic divergence in two subspecies of white-crowned sparrows *Zonotrichia leucophrys*. *Mol Ecol* 26: 3011–3027.

López P, Aragón P, Martín J, 2003. Responses of female lizards *Lacerta monticola* to males' chemical cues reflect their mating preference for older males. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 55: 73–79.

Lorch PD, Proulx S, Rowe L, Day T, 2003. Condition-dependent sexual selection can accelerate adaptation. *Evol Ecol Res* 5: 867–881.

Maan ME, Seehausen O, 2011. Ecology, sexual selection and speciation. *Ecol Lett* 14: 591–602.

Martín J, López P, 2006. Links between male quality, male chemical signals, and female mate choice in Iberian Rock Lizards. *Funct Ecol* 20: 1087–1096.

Martin MD, Mendelson TC, 2016. Male behaviour predicts trait divergence and the evolution of reproductive isolation in darters (Percidae: Etheostoma). *Anim Behav* 112: 179–186.

McDiarmid CS, Friesen CR, Ballen C, Olsson M, 2017. Sexual coloration and sperm performance in the Australian painted dragon lizard *Ctenophorus pictus*. *J Evol Biol* 30: 1303–1312.

McGlothlin JW, Parker PG, Nolan V, Ketterson ED, 2005. Correlational selection leads to genetic integration of body size and an attractive plumage trait in dark-eyed juncos. *Evolution* 59: 658–671.

McLean CA, Moussalli A, Sass S, Stuart-Fox D, 2013. Taxonomic assessment of the *Ctenophorus decresii* (Reptilia: Agamidae) complex reveals a new species of dragon lizard from western New South Wales. *Rec Aus Mus* 65: 51–63.

McLean CA, Moussalli A, Stuart-Fox D, 2014a. Local adaptation and divergence in colour signal conspicuousness between monomorphic and polymorphic lineages in a lizard. *J Evol Biol* 27: 2654–2664.

McLean CA, Stuart-Fox D, Moussalli A, 2014b. Phylogeographic structure, demographic history and morph composition in a colour polymorphic lizard. *J Evol Biol* 27: 2123–2137.

Mendelson TC, Martin MD, Flaxman SM, 2016. Mutation-order divergence by sexual selection: diversification of sexual signals in similar environments as a first step in speciation. *Ecol Lett* 17: 1053–1066.

Olsson M, Madsen T, 1995. Female choice on male quantitative traits in lizards: why is it so rare?. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 36: 179–184.

Olsson M, Madsen T, Nordby J, Wapstra E, Ujvari B et al., 2003. Major histo-compatibility complex and mate choice in sand lizards. *Proc R Soc B* **270**: S254–S256.

Osborne L, Umbers KDL, Backwell PRY, Keogh JS, 2012. Male tawny dragons use throat patterns to recognize rivals. *Naturwissenschaften* **99**: 869–872.

Panhuis TM, Butlin R, Zuk M, Tregenza T, 2001. Sexual selection and speciation. *Trends Ecol Evol* **16**: 364–371.

Peterson MA, Honchak BM, Locke SE, Beeman TE, Mendoza J et al., 2005. Relative abundance and the species-specific reinforcement of male mating preference in the *Chrysochus* (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae) hybrid zone. *Evolution* **59**: 2639–2655.

Qvarnström A, Vallin N, Rudh A, 2012. The role of male contest competition over mates in speciation. *Curr Zool* **58**: 493–509.

Ramos JA, Peters RA, 2016. Dragon wars: movement-based signalling by Australian agamid lizards in relation to species ecology. *Aus Ecol* **41**: 302–315.

Réale D, Reader SM, Sol D, McDougall PT, Dingemanse NJ, 2007. Integrating animal temperament within ecology and evolution. *Biol Rev* **82**: 291–318.

Reinhold K, 2004. Modeling a version of the good-genes hypothesis: female choice of locally adapted males. *Org Divers Evol* **4**: 157–163.

Ritchie MG, 2007. Sexual selection and speciation. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst* **38**: 79–102.

Schluter D, 2009. Evidence for ecological speciation and its alternative. *Science* **323**: 737–741.

Scordato ESC, Symes LB, Mendelson TC, Safran RJ, 2014. The role of ecology in speciation by sexual selection: a systematic empirical review. *J Hered* **105**: 782–794.

Servedio MR, Boughman JW, 2017. The role of sexual selection in local adaptation and speciation. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst* **48**: 85–109.

Stuart-Fox DM, Johnston GR, 2005. Experience overrides colour in lizard contests. *Behaviour* **142**: 329–350.

Taylor JN, Lattanzio MS, 2016. Boldness, dominance, and territoriality in the color polymorphic tree lizard *Urosaurus ornatus*. *Ethology* **122**: 892–901.

Teasdale LC, Stevens M, Stuart-Fox D, 2013. Discrete colour polymorphism in the tawny dragon lizard *Ctenophorus decresii* and differences in signal conspicuousness among morphs. *J Evol Biol* **26**: 1035–1046.

Tinghitella RM, Lackey A, Martin M, Dijkstra PD, Drury JP et al., 2018. On the role of male competition in speciation: a review and research agenda. *Behav Ecol* **29**: 783–797.

Uller T, Schwartz T, Koglin T, Olsson M, 2013. Sperm storage and sperm competition across ovarian cycles in the dragon lizard *Ctenophorus fordi*. *J Exp Zool* **319A**: 404–408.

Umbers KDL, Osborne L, Keogh JS, 2012. The effects of residency and body size on contest initiation and outcome in the territorial dragon *Ctenophorus decresii*. *PLoS ONE* **7**: e47143.

Vallin N, Rice AM, Bailey RI, Husby A, Qvarnström A, 2011. Positive feed-back between ecological and reproductive character displacement in a young avian hybrid zone. *Evolution* **66**: 1167–1179.

van Doorn GS, Edelaar P, Weissing FJ, 2009. On the origin of species by natural and sexual selection. *Science* **326**: 1704–1707.

West-Eberhard MJ, 1983. Sexual selection, social competition, and speciation. *Q Rev Biol* **58**: 155–183.

While GM, Michaelides S, Heathcote RJP, Macgregor HEA, Zajac N et al., 2015. Sexual selection drives asymmetric introgression in wall lizards. *Ecol Lett* **18**: 1366–1375.

Wirtz P, 1999. Mother species–father species: unidirectional hybridization in animals with female choice. *Anim Behav* **58**: 1–12.

Yewers MSC, Pryke SR, Stuart-Fox D, 2016. Behavioural differences across contexts may indicate morph-specific strategies in the lizard *Ctenophorus decresii*. *Anim Behav* **111**: 329–339.

Yewers MSC, Stuart-Fox D, McLean CA, 2018. Space use and genetic structure do not maintain color polymorphism in a species with alternative behavioral strategies. *Ecol Evol* **9**: 295–306.

Young JR, Hupp JW, Bradbury JW, Braun CE, 1994. Phenotypic divergence of secondary sexual traits among sage grouse *Centrocercus urophasianus* populations. *Anim Behav* **47**: 1353–1362.