

Unifying Theories of Molecular, Community and Network Evolution

Carlos J. Melián^{1*}, David Alonso², Diego P. Vázquez³ and James Regetz¹

¹National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis,
University of California, 735 State St., Suite 300,
Santa Barbara, CA 93101, USA.

² Community and Conservation Ecology Group, University of Groningen
Haren, Groningen, The Netherlands.

³Inst. Argentino de Investigaciones de las Zonas Áridas,
CONICET, CC 507, AR-5500, Mendoza, Argentina.

November 13, 2018

*To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: melian@nceas.ucsb.edu, phone: +1-805-892-2529, fax: +1-805-892-2510.

Abstract

The origin of diversification and coexistence of genes and species have been traditionally studied in isolated biological levels. Ecological and evolutionary views have focused on the mechanisms that enable or constrain species coexistence, genetic variation and the genetics of speciation, but a unified theory linking those approaches is still missing. Here we introduce evolutionary graphs in the context of neutral theories of molecular evolution and biodiversity to provide a framework that simultaneously addresses speciation rate and joint genetic and species diversities. To illuminate this question we also study two models of evolution on graphs with fitness differences, which provide insights on how genetic and ecological dynamics drive the speed of diversification. Neutral evolution generates the highest speed of speciation, species richness (i.e. five times and twice as many species as compared to genetic and ecological graphs, respectively) and genetic–species diversity (i.e., twice as many as genetic and ecological graphs, respectively). Thus the speed of speciation, the genetic–species diversity and coexistence can differ dramatically depending on whether genetic factors versus ecological factors drive the evolution of the system. By linking molecular, sexual and trophic behavior at ecological and evolutionary scales, interacting graphs can illuminate the origin and evolution of diversity and organismal coexistence.

20 1 Introduction

21 One outstanding challenge in ecology and evolution is the development of an accu-
22 rate and complete understanding of diversity across biological levels and spatial scales
23 [21, 43, 59]. The neutral and nearly-neutral theories of molecular evolution [36, 39, 58]
24 (hereafter *NTME*) were proposed to explain observations of high evolutionary rates
25 and the maintenance of large amounts of molecular diversity within populations [37, 57].
26 Similarly, the neutral theory of biodiversity (hereafter *NTB*) promises to contribute to
27 our understanding of how species diversity is maintained in ecological systems [2, 9, 30].
28 Both theories share the same framework [28, 62]. Furthermore, both theories offer a
29 baseline from which to extend theories of evolution [4, 47] and to test the role of fre-
30 quency and density dependent selection on the generation, evolution and maintenance
31 of diversity at genetic and ecological levels, respectively [22, 35, 43, 57].

32 Neutral models at the molecular level have considered mutation rate (μ), random
33 fluctuations of alleles (i.e., genetic drift), and molecular constraints on producing fer-
34 tile offspring (i.e., the genetic similarity value q^{ij} between any pair of individuals i
35 and j must be higher than q^{min}) as mechanisms of speciation in populations with J
36 individuals [11, 18, 26]. The neutral theory of biodiversity introduces the implicit speci-
37 ation rate at the individual level (ν) where species fluctuate randomly (i.e., ecological
38 drift) and all individuals are equivalent (i.e., neutral competitive interactions) [30, 54].
39 Speciation is crucial to the neutral biodiversity theory (without it diversity cannot be
40 maintained), yet the speciation parameter is simply assumed and has no basis in bio-

41 logical processes. To integrate genetic and ecological neutral theories, we need to link
42 the speciation rate (ν) with explicit mechanisms of speciation from neutral molecular
43 theories [18].

44 Despite the striking parallels between neutral theories in population genetics and
45 community ecology, the speed of speciation and diversity patterns at genetic and com-
46 munity levels have rarely been studied simultaneously [3, 35, 41, 61, 63]. This raises
47 important questions. For example, let us consider a population with J reproductive
48 compatible individuals. This defines a completely connected graph of size $J \times J$. Given
49 this initial graph in a population, does neutral evolution at molecular and ecological
50 levels speed up speciation and increase genetic–species diversity? If frequency and
51 density dependence effects at genetic and ecological levels are important, how can we
52 discern the speed of speciation and genetic–species diversity under neutral or natural
53 selection scenarios? Thus, do genetic or ecological level drive the speed of speciation,
54 genetic–species diversity and coexistence? [8, 15, 16, 32].

55 In order to answer those questions we need a framework that allows us to study the
56 molecular and ecological levels simultaneously. This framework represents an ambitious
57 research programme – much more than can be accomplished in a single paper. Our
58 goals here are more limited. First, we introduce evolutionary graphs [46] in the con-
59 text of neutral theories of molecular evolution [26, 36, 39] and biodiversity [29, 30] which
60 suggest a promising new way to provide a general account of how neutral, positive and
61 negative density and frequency dependent selection affect the speed of diversification
62 and genetic–species diversity. Second, we introduce genetic and ecological graphs where

63 the genotype-phenotype of each individual are represented as one to one or are decou-
64 pled by the specific behavior and phenotypic plasticity of each individual, respectively.
65 Note that in addition to the graph of reproductive individuals, we need to specify a
66 new graph that captures the effect of the phenotypic plasticity in the system.

67 Evolutionary neutral graphs in the context of two mutualistically interacting pop-
68 ulations are defined as follows. Consider two randomly mating populations of size
69 J_R and J_P where each individual has an infinitely large genome sequence subject to
70 random neutral mutations. The initial genetic similarity values between each pair of
71 individuals (q_R^{ij} and q_P^{ij}) in the matrices $Q_R = [q_R^{ij}]$ and $Q_P = [q_P^{ij}]$ are equal to 1 and
72 mutation rates μ_R and μ_P are equal among all individuals (Fig. 1a). At each time
73 step, an individual of each population is chosen for death (Fig 1b). Two individuals
74 are chosen for reproduction. Individuals have the same probability $1/J_R$ ($1/J_P$) to be
75 chosen for reproduction or for death (Fig 1c). The offspring of these two individuals
76 replaced the dead individual. The newborns in R and P can be the consequence of
77 sexual reproduction without a mutualistic interaction (i.e., facultative mutualism given
78 by $\omega > 0$) or a consequence of a mutualistic interaction with individual effectiveness m
79 between the first two chosen individuals for reproduction in community R and P (i.e.,
80 given by $1 - \omega$) (Fig. 1d).

81 All these elements allow us to develop models of evolution on genetic and ecological
82 graphs with the following additions to the neutral model (Fig. 2): (1) fitness differences
83 within each species according to the number of genetically related mating partners (i.e.,
84 genetic graphs), or to the number of trophic links with individuals in the second com-

85 munity (i.e., ecological graphs); (2) density dependence across species, thus rare species
86 have higher probabilities of reproduction, and (3) contrary to genetic graphs, where
87 the offspring can inherit the high connectance from its parents increasing its reproduc-
88 tive probability, all offspring in the ecological graph start with the same reproductive
89 probability. Let us consider first the genotype-phenotype map as one to one. In this
90 “genotype–fitness speciation model” (hereafter GF) reproductive probabilities are set
91 according to the total number of genetically related individuals each individual i can
92 mate with, so that we take into account explicit fitness differences within each species
93 (Fig. 2b). The genetic level, assuming that all the traits involved in sexual selection
94 are under genetic control, determines the evolution of the system based on the genetic
95 similarity among individuals.

96 There is empirical evidence for the effect of ecological interactions mediated by
97 phenotypic traits on the evolution of diversity [10, 34, 42, 53, 56], but they have so far
98 been missing in neutral theories. Let us consider that the phenotype is not simply the
99 product of the genotype, but that it is influenced by the interactions with individuals of
100 a second community (i.e., second trophic level). In the “phenotype–fitness speciation
101 model” (hereafter PF) we still have the genetic similarity constraint on having fertile
102 offspring, but the role of ecological interactions is represented as a varying reproductive
103 probability for each individual according to its specific behavior, development and
104 phenotypic plasticity [33]. Those phenotypic traits, not linked to the total number
105 of genetically related matings with individuals of the same species, are given by the
106 evolution of the number of trophic links with individuals of the second community.

107 Thus, the reproductive probability of each individual increases with the number of
108 trophic links with individuals of the second community, but it is independent of the
109 number of potential genetically related matings with individuals of the same species
110 (Fig. 2c).

111 We show that the neutral scenario, which is represented by a diverse genetic pool
112 of parents in the context of decoupled evolving mating and trophic graphs, triggers
113 the highest speed of speciation and highest levels of genetic–species diversity and co-
114 existence. We also show that ecological graphs, whose reproduction is determined by
115 specific behavior or phenotypic plasticity and not by the total number of genetically
116 related matings, allow higher speciation rate and coexistence than mating graphs. Link-
117 ing neutral theories at the molecular and ecological levels using evolving graphs promise
118 to contribute to our understanding of contemporary diversity at multiple levels [12].
119 As we will demonstrate, it represents a powerful starting point to: 1) understand the
120 speed of speciation and the relationship between genetic and species diversity by using
121 genetic and ecological graphs [18, 26, 46], and 2) understand the consequences of niche
122 and neutral dynamics as a continuum that is based on ecological interactions among
123 individuals [22, 52, 64]

124 **2 Results**

125 First, not surprisingly, mating and trophic number of links at the individual level are
126 not correlated during the evolution of the system under the neutral and the phenotype
127 fitness scenarios (Fig. 3a and Fig. 3b, respectively). The distribution of Spearman’s

128 rank coefficient values is close to a uniform distribution in both cases (Fig. 3a and
 129 3b represent the distribution for community J_R). The distribution of the Spearman's
 130 values for the genotype fitness model is highly skewed with approximately 80% of p -
 131 values < 0.01 , suggesting that mating and trophic degree are in most cases correlated.
 132 Fig. 3d and 3e represent the evolution of individual mating and trophic degree in the
 133 genotype fitness model as a function of the individual rank (i.e., from the most (left)
 134 to the least (right) connected individual).

135 The neutral unified model generates on average twice and five as many speciation
 136 events (i.e., 188 ± 10) as the phenotype (i.e., 80 ± 1) and the genotype fitness models
 137 (i.e., 34 ± 3) respectively (Fig. 4a, results for the community J_P not shown but with
 138 the same parameter values they are qualitatively the same). Similarly, waiting time to
 139 speciation or the number of generations to the first speciation event is on average twice
 140 and five times as small in the neutral case (170 ± 3) as in the phenotype (440 ± 12)
 141 and the genotype fitness scenarios, respectively (924 ± 25) (Fig. 4a, see appendix for
 142 a detailed description of the sampling of the transients and the steady state). At
 143 stationary state (approx. 1000 generations, see Fig. 5) speciation events scale with the
 144 number of generations for all the three models ($r^2 = 0.99$) with the scaling exponent γ
 145 $= 0.97$ (neutral), 1.03 (phenotype fitness) and 1.31 (genotype fitness), red lines in Fig.
 146 4a.

147 Note that we have used the same three input parameters in the three models ex-
 148 plored. Mutation rate, with $\mu_R = \mu_P = \mu$, the minimum genetic similarity value $q_R^{min} =$
 149 $q_P^{min} = q^{min}$ and the individual mutualistic effectiveness $m_{ij} = m_{ji} = m = 1$ assuming

150 a fully symmetric case for all the individual interactions in the context of obligate mu-
151 tualism (i.e., $\omega = 0$) (see Methods). Thus, the speed of speciation rate is driven by the
152 specific reproductive transition probabilities at individual level. This result remains
153 similar after relaxing the assumptions of effectiveness and facultative or obligate mu-
154 tualism. Does the distribution of the number of generations to speciation differ among
155 the models? All the nontransformed distributions were highly skewed (skewness index
156 > 2), and significantly different from a normal distribution (Fig. 4b *Lilliefors's* test,
157 all $P < 0.001$ with means of 47, 258, and 115 for the neutral, the genotype and the
158 phenotype scenario, respectively). The distribution of the number of generations to
159 speciation differ significantly between the neutral and the genotype/phenotype models
160 (*Kolmogorov – Smirnov* test, $P < 0.0001$), but the genotype and the phenotype fitness
161 scenarios do not differ significantly (*Kolmogorov – Smirnov* test, $P > 0.1$).

162 The neutral model generates on average twice as many genetic and species diversity
163 as the phenotype and the genotype fitness scenarios (Fig. 5a using eq. (2) in Methods,
164 and 5b, using species diversity S_e as $\frac{1}{\sum_i^{S_e} p_i^2}$, where p_i is the relative abundance of
165 species i). As in the speed of speciation, the neutral scenario predicts twice and
166 five as many number of coexisting species as the phenotype and the genotype fitness
167 model, respectively (Fig. 5c). Genetic diversity (Fig. 5a), species diversity (Fig. 5b)
168 and species richness (Fig. 5c) distributions for all the models differ from a normal
169 distribution (*Lilliefors's* test, $P < 0.001$) despite their strong differences in skewness.
170 The neutral case predicts highly symmetric distributions, all skewness indices between
171 -0.15 and 0.08 , while the phenotype and the genotype model predict skewness indices

172 between 0.87 and 1.44 and > 2 , respectively. Genetic–species diversity and species
173 richness distributions differ significantly among all the models (*Kolmogorov–Smirnov*
174 test, $P < 0.0001$).

175 In summary, the diverse genetic pool underlying our unified neutral scenario in the
176 context of the uncorrelated mating and trophic graphs triggers the highest speed of
177 speciation with consequences to the genetic–species diversity, coexistence and species
178 richness. Note, however, that the species diversity values with the explicit mechanisms
179 of speciation are lower than the values from the biodiversity number θ_b in the neu-
180 tral theory of biodiversity. These results remain qualitatively similar for the range of
181 parameter combinations explored (see appendix).

182 **3 Summary and Discussion**

183 The present study is an attempt to unify the speed of speciation with the evolution
184 of diversity at genetic and ecological levels. We create a bridge between the neutral
185 theory of molecular evolution [36,39] and the neutral theory of biodiversity [30] using
186 mating and ecological graphs in the context of explicit mechanisms of speciation [17,
187 26]. The unified neutral model predicts the highest speed of speciation, number of
188 coexisting species (i.e., five and twice as many as genetic and ecological networks,
189 respectively), and genetic–species diversity (i.e., twice as many as genetic and ecological
190 networks), but diversity values are lower than the neutral biodiversity theory with
191 implicit speciation. This result is not surprising. Genetic variation maintained in non
192 random mating is to same extent cryptic since the heterozygote diversity is less than

193 from a random mating population. However we show how the speed of speciation and
194 genetic-species diversity are closely controlled by the dominant graph (i.e., genetic or
195 ecological) at each level during the evolution of the system.

196 Note that we have explored only a few scenarios (see appendix). Despite that the
197 effect of the genetic regulatory [12, 44, 55] and ecological interactions [10, 34, 42, 56] on
198 the evolution of diversity is widely recognized, they have so far been missing in neutral
199 theories. Here we show that the decoupling of phenotypic (i.e., based on ecological in-
200 teractions) from genotypic evolution (i.e., based on mating–genetic interactions) speeds
201 up diversification and approaches to the neutral scenario. Evolutionary graphs have
202 many fascinating extensions. For example, does frequency dependence selection at ge-
203 netic level trigger higher speed of speciation and diversity than the neutral scenario?
204 how do gene regulatory and mating graphs interact to jump from micro to macroevo-
205 lution?

206 How does sexual reproduction affect evolution on graphs? Here we show that con-
207 straining fitness according to the total number of potential matings or trophic inter-
208 actions per individual (i.e., the genotype or phenotypic fitness model, respectively),
209 which implies most connectivity clustered in few individuals, are a potent selection
210 amplifier [46], and suppresses speciation rate, genetic–species diversity and species rich-
211 ness for all the range of mutation rates and the minimum similarity values explored.
212 This cost to diversification by common parentage factor scaling up from individuals to
213 genetic and ecological graphs adds an additional constraint to the cost of being exces-
214 sively abundant or rare [18] and the metabolic cost [1], thus how does the evolution

215 of metabolic rate interact with sexual and ecological graphs to enhance or constrain
216 diversity at multiple biological levels and spatial scales?

217 Most models of sympatric speciation rely on (1) intraspecific competition to drive
218 divergence and reproductive isolation without specifying the niche or neutral nature
219 of the interactions [13, 25, 40], and (2) ecological dynamics that focus on the waiting
220 time to the first speciation [5, 17]. On the other hand, neutral theory in community
221 ecology studies patterns at the community level based on implicit modes of speciation
222 with incipient species abundance $J^s \geq 1$ [5, 18, 28, 30, 31]. Here, despite the importance
223 of explicit space, local adaptation and explicit prezygotic/postzygotic isolating factors
224 to determine the mode and speed of speciation [11, 18, 48, 49, 57, 61], we link the first
225 speciation event with the speed of speciation (i.e., mutation and fission modes of sym-
226 patric speciation), the number of coexisting species and the genetic-species diversity
227 in a unified framework. Note that the speed of speciation for all the parameter com-
228 binations and models explored is extremely high. On average it is 47, 115, and 258
229 generations to speciation, for the neutral, the phenotype and the genotype scenarios,
230 respectively (see however [24]). If we assume a linear extrapolation from $J_R (J_P) = 10^3$
231 to 10^5 inds., $\mu = 10^{-4}$ to 10^{-6} , and $q^{min} = 0.9$ ($Q_R (Q_P) \sim Q_R^* (Q_P^*) \sim 0.7$, see eq. 1),
232 then the number of generations to speciation approaches to 4.7×10^3 , 11.5×10^3 , and
233 25.8×10^3 , which are close to the observed values in more realistic sympatric speciation
234 models (i.e., less than 2×10^4 [20] and 5×10^4 [19] generations).

235 Studies on food webs assume species level approaches despite the intrinsic variability
236 in individuals [7]. In the genotypic and phenotypic fitness models only a few individuals

237 within each population (i.e. “hubs”) drive reproductive rate in the context of symmetric
238 effectiveness of ecological interactions. The expected outcome by coupling fitness with
239 competitive and trophic asymmetry at ecological level would inevitably decrease species
240 richness, coexistence and diversity by decreasing persistence probabilities of individuals
241 with lower fitness. This suggest that individual variability, driven by the degree of
242 symmetry between each pair of interacting individuals and the effectiveness of each
243 interaction, can dramatically alter the speed of speciation, genetic-species diversity,
244 coexistence and the structure of food webs. Note that “hubs” in networks are common
245 but their role in inhibiting or expressing speciation and diversification at different
246 biological levels is still unknown [59]. The need of food web data at individual level
247 is then crucial to determine how interacting graphs at genetic and ecological levels
248 generate the patterns of diversity and coexistence of food webs. For example, do
249 ecological interactions depend of species or individual traits? are ecological interactions
250 governed by a few number of individuals within each population? does neutral evolution
251 predict the complexity and the structure of food webs?

252 Rapid accumulation of empirical results from different biological levels suggests
253 that ecological and evolutionary theory are undergoing a change [27, 30, 33]. The need
254 to test models from first principles is now widely recognized [18, 35, 43, 47, 63]. Here
255 we present a unified neutral model of evolution with mutation, mating with random
256 mixing of genes, genetic–ecological drift and neutral interactions as the driving forces
257 of diversity at multiple levels in three different scenarios. Promisingly, the huge amount
258 of data collected and meticulously cataloged at each biological level can be used to test

259 neutral models from first principles in a general niche-neutral continuum multilevel
260 framework [22, 30, 35, 43, 51, 56, 64].

261 **4 Methods: Unifying Molecular and Ecological Evo-** 262 **lution**

263 We first describe the Higgs and Derrida model of neutral molecular evolution [26] with
264 explicit mechanisms of sympatric speciation [6]. Second, we describe the Hubbell's
265 neutral model of biodiversity [30] with implicit speciation. Third, we highlight their
266 similarities and link those models in the context of two initial populations that give rise
267 to two mutualistically interacting communities. Finally we show how this framework
268 allow us to compare the speed of speciation and the genetic-species diversity between
269 the neutral scenario and two models of evolution at genotypic and phenotypic levels [23]
270 using genetic and ecological graphs [46], respectively.

271 **4.1 Neutral Molecular Evolution Model**

272 Our starting point is a basic stochastic model for species formation by Higgs and
273 Derrida (1992). This model contains three nonadaptive evolutionary forces in the
274 sense that they are not a function of the fitness properties of the individuals: 1)
275 neutral mutation rate (μ) in diploid and hermaphroditic individuals with equal and
276 independent changes across any locus in a infinite genome size [38]; 2) mating with
277 neutral mixing of genes from an hermaphroditic or two nonidentical parents and 3)
278 genetic drift, which ensures that gene frequencies will deviate slightly from generation

279 to generation independent of other forces [26, 47] (see section A1 in the Appendix).

280 Consider one initial completely connected and randomly mating population of size
281 J , where individuals have the same genetic sequence. The initial genetic similarity
282 values between any pair of individuals (q^{ij}) in the genetic similarity matrix $Q = [q^{ij}]$
283 are equal to 1. At each time step, an individual is chosen for death and two individuals
284 are chosen for reproduction. Individuals have the same probability to be chosen for
285 reproduction or for death ($1/J$). The viability of the offspring is constrained by q^{min} ,
286 defined as the minimum genetic similarity value for postzygotic reproductive isolation
287 (RI) two individuals i and j must satisfy for the development of fertile offspring [11,
288 18, 26, 50, 65]. Thus, in a randomly mating population this minimum value works as a
289 filter generating viable offspring if and only if $q^{ij} > q^{min}$. The offspring of these two
290 individuals replace the individual that died.

291 In this model, if the mutation rate is low ($\mu \ll 1$), then the mean similarity value
292 for Q has a solution [26, 38]

$$Q^* = \frac{1}{4J\mu + 1} \quad (1)$$

293 where $4J\mu = \theta_m$. The mean value arises because of a balance between mutations
294 (which decrease the average similarity value, $\langle Q \rangle$) and the common parentage factor
295 which is given by the probability that two individuals have a common ancestor (which
296 increase $\langle Q \rangle$). Similarly, the probability that two individuals do not have a common

297 ancestor at stationarity is given by

$$1 - Q^* = \frac{\theta_m}{\theta_m + 1} \quad (2)$$

298 Results from eqs. (1) and (2) are similar to the probability that one individual is
299 homozygous or heterozygous for one single locus under the neutral molecular theory,
300 respectively [38]. If $q^{min} < Q^*$ we will have always one species with size J . Eq. (2)
301 represents a measure of genetic diversity in the population J .

302 Interestingly, if $q^{min} > Q^*$, then the initial population J is greatly perturbed by the
303 cutoff, which implies that the genetic similarity matrix (Q) can never reach its equi-
304 librium state. As a consequence, the initial population splits and speciation happens
305 with the species fluctuating in the system according to demographic stochasticity [26]
306 (see section A1 in the Appendix).

307 **4.2 Neutral Theory of Biodiversity**

308 The neutral theory of biodiversity considers species instead of alleles and introduces
309 the implicit speciation rate at the individual level (ν). The standard evolutionary
310 metacommunity model assumes that at each time step one individual is chosen to die
311 with probability $1/J$ and is replaced by the newborn. With probability $1 - \nu$, this new
312 individual is of the same species as its parent; with probability ν , it is an entirely new
313 species [30, 54].

In this context, the probability that individual i and j in population J chosen at random will be of the same species is

$$f^* = \frac{1}{\theta_b + 1} \quad (3)$$

314 where the biodiversity number (θ_b) is equal to $J\nu$.

315 In this scenario ecological drift dominates. Each individual has a percapita prob-
316 ability to speciate at each reproduction event. This point mutation model of implicit
317 speciation is an individual level process that leads to a proportional relationship be-
318 tween the speciation rate of each species in a community and its abundance [14, 30].

319 In summary, these two neutral models describe a zero-sum evolving population
320 of J individuals with overlapping generations under demographic stochasticity. The
321 neutral molecular model starts with a completely connected graph with mutations
322 and mating with random mixing of genes adding variation to the new individual with
323 explicit speciation if $q^{min} > Q^*$. The biodiversity model includes the implicit speciation
324 parameter ν . In the next section we link the implicit speciation rate (ν) with explicit
325 mechanisms such as mutation rate (μ) and the minimum similarity value for postzygotic
326 reproductive isolation (q^{min}). Both neutral models are based on one initial population
327 that gives rise to one community. In the next sections we describe the link between
328 neutral molecular and biodiversity theory in the context of two initial populations that
329 will give rise to two interacting communities.

4.3 Unified Neutral Model: Molecular and Ecological Evolution

The dynamics of our first two-community model has stochastic birth and death as Hubbell's model, but considers mutation (μ) and the minimum similarity value (q^{min}) as explicit mechanisms of speciation at the molecular level [26] and the effectiveness of each mutualistic interaction at ecological level. We consider sexual diploid populations with overlapping generations and age independent birth and death rates. The individual interactions occur in a single homogeneous patch [30,52]. The two populations can be thought of as hermaphroditic plants and dioecious pollinators, which respectively are labeled $R = 1, \dots, J_R$ and $P = 1, \dots, J_P$, where J_R and J_P are the total number of individual plants and pollinators, respectively. The total number of individuals is $J_m = J_R + J_P$, which implies that all individuals are considered to be of reproductive age in the metacommunity.

The basic model has three input parameters (i.e., the mutation rate assuming $\mu_R = \mu_P = \mu$, the minimum genetic similarity value assuming $q_R^{min} = q_P^{min} = q^{min}$, and the effectiveness of each mutualistic ecological interaction, m , assuming a fully symmetric case for all the individuals interactions) and two explicit biological levels: 1) genetic, represented as mutation (μ), mating with random mixing of genes, genetic drift and the q^{min} as in the Higgs and Derrida model already described [26,38,47], and 2) ecological level represented as ecological drift as in Hubbell's model [30] in the context of equal and symmetric competitive and mutualistic (m) ability among all interacting individuals. This is the simplest neutral scenario but the framework allows extensions to more

352 complicated ones.

The speed of speciation is then governed in each plant and pollinator species by the mutation rate (μ), q^{min} for $q^{min} > Q^*$, and the type of sexual reproduction (i.e., facultative or obligate, mediated by the mutualistic effectiveness parameter, m). The rate of decay of genetic similarity of the newborn j given the similarity between the parents ($k'_1(j), k'_2(j)$) of the new individual j and each individual i already in the population is given by (see appendix):

$$q^{ji} = \frac{e^{-4\mu}}{2}(q^{k'_1(j)i} + q^{k'_2(j)i}), \quad (4)$$

353 where $k'_1(j)$ can be the same than $k'_2(j)$ in the hermaphroditic plant species. The time
 354 evolution of the plant and the pollinator species are governed by the generalized birth
 355 and death process with the probability of speciation in the hermaphroditic plant (ν_R^k)
 356 and dioecious pollinator (ν_P^k) species k represented as:

$$\nu_R^k = \frac{2}{N_R^k(N_R^k + 1)} \sum_{k'_1=1}^{N_R^k} \sum_{k'_2=k'_1}^{N_R^k} P_R^{k'_1, k'_2}, \quad (5)$$

$$\nu_P^k = \frac{2}{N_P^k(N_P^k - 1)} \sum_{k'_1=1}^{N_P^k} \sum_{k'_2=k'_1+1}^{N_P^k} P_P^{k'_1, k'_2}, \quad (6)$$

357

where $P_R^{k'_1, k'_2}$ and $P_P^{k'_1, k'_2}$ are defined as the probabilities to produce a new species from two randomly chosen individuals (k'_1, k'_2) in the plant or pollinator species k ,

respectively:

$$P_R^{k'_1, k'_2} = F \left[\frac{\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^{J_R} H(q_t - (q^{k'_1 i} + q^{k'_2 i}))}{J_R - 1} \right] \quad (7)$$

$$P_P^{k'_1, k'_2} = F \left[\frac{\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^{J_P} H(q_t - (q^{k'_1 i} + q^{k'_2 i}))}{J_P - 1} \right] \quad (8)$$

358

where $q_t = \frac{2q^{min}}{e^{-4\mu}}$, $F(x) = 1$ if $x = 1$ and zero otherwise. $H(\alpha)$ is

$$H(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

359 Note that we have two modes of speciation. Expressions above characterize a mu-
 360 tation mode of speciation. $P_R^{k'_1, k'_2}$ either is 1 when speciation occurs and zero otherwise.
 361 When the offspring of two individuals is a new individual i that cannot mate with
 362 any individual in the community (with $i \neq j$), we have an incipient species of size 1.
 363 However, death events may induce the formation of new species of larger sizes. When
 364 there is only one individual connecting two mating networks and this happens to die,
 365 a new species arises. This speciation process can be called a fission speciation mode.

366 In summary, our unified neutral model represents the stochastic evolution of two
 367 initial finite populations that give rise to two interacting communities (see Fig. 2a).
 368 Therefore, the interactions among individuals belonging to two different communities
 369 trigger the development of the ecological network as a consequence of the neutral
 370 dynamics at molecular and ecological levels.

4.4 Evolution on Graphs: The Genotype and the Phenotype Fitness Speciation Model

Do genetic or ecological mechanisms drive the speed of speciation, genetic–species diversity and coexistence? To illuminate this question we describe two alternative models of evolution on graphs with explicit individual fitness differences. Our goal is to compare them with our unified neutral model, introduced in the last section. Fitness is defined for each individual as the reproductive probability according to the genetic similarity (i.e., genotype fitness model) or ecological affinity (i.e., phenotype fitness model) with other individuals in the same population or with individuals of the other community, respectively, but at the same time we keep neutral mutations at the genetic level symmetric. Apart from the asymmetry introduced by the different reproductive probabilities at individual level, no further asymmetry is assumed.

4.4.1 The Genotype–Fitness Speciation Model

Let us introduce evolution on genetic graphs as follows. In a community, individuals are labeled $i = 1, 2, \dots, J_R$ (J_P). Each individual i can be described as belonging to a genetic group [45]. In each genetic group, fitness of each individual i within each species k is given by the total number of individuals j satisfying $q^{ij} > q^{min}$, i. e., the total number of individuals each individual i can mate with. Reproductive probability of individual i within each species increases with the number of links or the number of genetically related mating partners (Fig. 2b). Thus the genetic level, using the genetic similarity among individuals, determines the speed and evolution of speciation rate and

392 the genetic–species diversity. Each individual i of species k is chosen for reproduction
 393 with probability proportional to its fitness (see appendix):

$$P_{i,k} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_k} H(q^{ij} - q^{min})}{S_R M_k} \quad (9)$$

where $H(\alpha)$ is

$$H(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

394 N_k , S_R and M_k are the abundance of species k , the total number of extant species in
 395 community J_R and the total number of potential mating interactions within the species
 396 k , respectively. This genotype fitness model has the following same ingredient than the
 397 unified neutral model: (1) individuals have the same probability $1/J_R$ ($1/J_P$) to be
 398 chosen for death [60], and (2) individuals equally connected within their own species
 399 or between species are equivalent in fitness, i.e, the identity to a given species does not
 400 confer per se fitness advantage, and the following additions: (1) fitness differences are
 401 then considered only within each species according to the number of genetically related
 402 mating partners; (2) there is density dependence across species, thus rare species have
 403 higher probabilities of reproduction, and (3) we select the most connected parents with
 404 higher probability which implies that the offspring can inherits their connectance, thus
 405 increasing its reproductive probability. Evolution selects for well connected individuals.
 406 In the same way, individuals are chosen for death and reproduction in the second
 407 community.

408 4.4.2 The Phenotype–Fitness Speciation Model

409 Let us now introduce evolution on ecological graphs as follows. In this last model,
410 the phenotype class can be defined at the ecological level. Fitness of each individual i
411 within each population k is associated with specific behavioral, morphological traits or
412 phenotypic plasticity. Fitness is given by the total number of trophic links individual
413 i of population k in one community has with j individuals belonging to populations
414 of the other community (Fig. 2c). In this phenotype fitness model the evolution of
415 the connectivity at the individual level within each species determines the properties
416 of the evolving system. The reproductive probability of individual i increases with
417 the number of trophic links but it is independent of its number of genetically related
418 matings. Then, each individual i of species k is chosen for reproduction with probability
419 proportional to its fitness (see appendix):

$$P_{i,k} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{J_P} m_{ij}}{S_R M_k} \quad (10)$$

420 where the sum until J_P means the total number of interactions of individual i with
421 all the individuals of community J_P . m_{ij} means that there is an interaction between
422 individual i and j . S_R and M_k are the total number of extant species in community J_R ,
423 and the total number of mutualistic interactions among all the individuals of species k
424 with all the individuals in community J_P , respectively. This phenotype fitness model
425 has the same two ingredients to the neutral and genotype model: (1) individuals have
426 the same probability $1/J_R$ ($1/J_P$) to be chosen for death, and (2) individuals equally

427 connected within their own species or between species are equivalent in fitness, i.e,
428 the identity to a given species does not confer per se fitness advantage. The model
429 has the following additions: (1) fitness differences are then considered only within
430 each species according to the number of trophic links with individuals of the second
431 community, (2) there is density dependence in fitness across species, thus rare species
432 have higher probabilities of reproduction, and (3) contrary to the genotype model,
433 where the offspring inherits a number of potential matings from its parents, we assume
434 that each offspring in this model starts with one trophic interaction. In the same way,
435 individuals are chosen for death and reproduction in the second community.

References

- [1] A. P. Allen, J. F. Gillooly, V. M. Savage, and J. H. Brown. Kinetic effects of temperature on rates of genetic divergence and speciation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, 103:9130–9135, 2006.
- [2] D. Alonso, R. S. Etienne, and A. J. McKane. The merits of neutral theory. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 21:451–457, 2006.
- [3] J. Antonovics. The input from population genetics: the new ecological genetics. *Systematics Botany*, 1:233–245, 1976.
- [4] G. Bernardi. The neoselectionist theory of genome evolution. 104:8385–8390, 2007.
- [5] D. I Bolnick. Multi-species outcomes in a common model of sympatric speciation. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 241:734–744, 2006.
- [6] D. I. Bolnick and B. Fitzpatrick. Sympatric speciation: Models and empirical evidence. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution and Systematic*, 38:459–487, 2007.
- [7] D. I. Bolnick, L. H. Yang, J. A. Fordyce, J. M. Davis, and R. Svanback. Measuring individual-level resource specialization. *Ecology*, 83:2936–2941, 2002.
- [8] G. L. Bush. *A reaffirmation of Santa Rosalia or Why are there so many kinds of small animals? In: Evolutionary Patterns and Processes (eds. Lees, D. R., and Edwards, D).* (Academic Press, London, pp. 229-249). 1993.

- 454 [9] J. Chave. Neutral theory and community ecology. *Ecology Letters*, 7:241–253,
455 2004.
- 456 [10] J. H. Connell. Diversity in tropical rain forest and coral reefs. *Science*, 199:1302–
457 1310, 1978.
- 458 [11] J. A. Coyne. Genetics and speciation. *Nature*, 355:511–515, 1992.
- 459 [12] E. H. Davidson and D. H. Erwin. Gene regulatory networks and the evolution of
460 animal body plans. *Science*, 311:796–800, 2006.
- 461 [13] U. Dieckmann and M. Doebeli. On the origin of species by sympatric speciation.
462 *Nature*, 400:354–357, 1999.
- 463 [14] R. S. Etienne, F. Apol, M. E., H. Olf, and F. J. Weissing. Modes of speciation
464 and the neutral theory of biodiversity. *Oikos*, 2:241–258, 2007.
- 465 [15] J. Felsenstein. Skepticism towards santa rosalia, or why are there so few kinds of
466 animals? *Evolution*, 35:124–138, 1981.
- 467 [16] S. Gavrilets. Waiting time to parapatric speciation. *Proceedings of the Royal
468 Society of London Serie B*, 267:2483–2492, 2000.
- 469 [17] S. Gavrilets. Models of speciation: what have we learned in 40 years? *Evolution*,
470 57:2197–2215, 2003.
- 471 [18] S. Gavrilets. *Fitness Landscapes and the Origin of Species*. (Princeton University
472 Press, Princeton). 2004.

- 473 [19] S. Gavrilets and A. Vose. Case studies and mathematical models of ecological
474 speciation. 2. palms on an oceanic island. *Molecular Ecology*, 16:2910–2921, 2007.
- 475 [20] S. Gavrilets, A. Vose, M. Barluenga, W. Salzburger, and A. Meyer. Case studies
476 and mathematical models of ecological speciation. 1. cichlids in a crater lake.
477 *Molecular Ecology*, 16:2893–2909, 2007.
- 478 [21] S. J. Gould. *The Structure of Evolutionary Theory*. (The Belknap Press of Harvard
479 University Press, Cambridge). 2002.
- 480 [22] D. Gravel, C. D. Canhan, M. Beaudet, and C. Messer. Reconciling niche and
481 neutrality: the continuum hypothesis. *Ecology Letters*, 9:399–409, 2006.
- 482 [23] J. B. S.. Haldane. The cost of natural selection. *J. Genetics*, 55:511–524, 1957.
- 483 [24] A. P. Hendry, P. Nosil, and L. H. Rieseberg. The speed of ecological speciation.
484 *Functional Ecology*, 21:455–464, 2007.
- 485 [25] M. Higashi, G. Takimoto, and N. Yamamura. Sympatric speciation by sexual
486 selection. *Nature*, 402:523–526, 1999.
- 487 [26] P. G. Higgs and B. Derrida. Genetic distance and species formation in evolving
488 populations. *Journal of Molecular Evolution*, 35:454–465, 1992.
- 489 [27] D. J. Howard and S. H. Berlocher. *Endless Forms*. (Oxford University Press,
490 Oxford). 1998.

- 491 [28] X-S. Hu, F. He, and S. P. Hubbell. Neutral theory in macroecology and population
492 genetics. *Oikos*, 3:548–556, 2006.
- 493 [29] S. P. Hubbell. Tree dispersion, abundance and diversity in a tropical dry forest.
494 *Science*, 203:1299–1309, 1979.
- 495 [30] S. P. Hubbell. *The Unified Neutral Theory of Biodiversity and Biogeography*.
496 (Princeton University Press, Princeton). 2001.
- 497 [31] S. P. Hubbell and J. Lake. *The Neutral Theory of Biodiversity and Biogeography,*
498 *and beyond. In: Macroecology: patterns and processes (eds. Blackburn T. M., and*
499 *Gaston, K. J.). (Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 45-63). 2003.*
- 500 [32] G. E. Hutchinson. Homage to santa rosalia or why are there so many kind of
501 animals? *The American Naturalist*, 93:145–159, 1959.
- 502 [33] E. Jablonka and M. J. Lamb. *Evolution in Four Dimensions*. (MIT Press, Cam-
503 bridge). 2005.
- 504 [34] D. H. Janzen. Herbivores and the number of tree species in tropical forests. *The*
505 *American Naturalist*, 104:502–528, 1970.
- 506 [35] M. T. J. Johnson and J. R. Stinchcombe. An emerging synthesis between commu-
507 nity ecology and evolutionary biology. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 22:250–
508 257, 2007.
- 509 [36] M. Kimura. Evolutionary rate at the molecular level. *Nature*, 217:624–626, 1968.

- 510 [37] M. Kimura. *The neutral theory of molecular evolution*. (Cambridge University
511 Press, Cambridge). 1983.
- 512 [38] M. Kimura and J. Crow. The number of alleles that can be maintained in a finite
513 population. *Genetics*, 49:725–738, 1964.
- 514 [39] J.L. King and T. H. Jukes. Non-darwinian evolution. *Science*, 164:788–798, 1969.
- 515 [40] A. S. Kondrashov and F. A. Kondrashov. Interactions among quantitative traits
516 in the course of sympatric speciation. *Nature*, 400:351–354, 1999.
- 517 [41] R. A. Lankau and S. Y. Strauss. Mutual feedbacks maintain both genetic and
518 species diversity in a plant community. *Science*, 317:1561–1563, 2007.
- 519 [42] E. G. Leigh. *Tropical Forest Ecology*. (Oxford University Press). 1999.
- 520 [43] S. A. Levin. Fundamental questions in biology. *PLoS Biol.*, 4:1472–1472, 2006.
- 521 [44] E. B. Lewis. A gene complex controlling segmentation in *drosophila*. *Nature*,
522 276:565–570, 1978.
- 523 [45] R. C. Lewontin, D. Kirk, and J. F. Crow. Selective mating, assortative mating and
524 inbreeding: definitions and implications. *Eugenics quarterly*, 15:141–143, 1966.
- 525 [46] E. Lieberman, C. Hauert, and M. A. Nowak. Evolutionary dynamics on graphs.
526 *Nature*, 433:312–316, 2005.

- 527 [47] M. Lynch. The frailty of adaptive hypotheses for the origins of organismal complex-
528 ity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, 104:8597–8604,
529 2007.
- 530 [48] G. Malecot. *The Mathematics of Heredity*. (W. H. Freeman, San Francisco). 1970.
- 531 [49] F. Manzo and L. Peliti. Geographic speciation in the higgs-derrida model of species
532 formation. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 27:7079–7086, 1994.
- 533 [50] E. Mayr. *Populations, Species and Evolution*. (Harvard University Press, Cam-
534 bridge). 1970.
- 535 [51] B. J. McGill. A test of the unified neutral theory of biodiversity. *Nature*, 422:881–
536 885, 2003.
- 537 [52] A. J. McKane and T. J. Newman. Stochastic models in population biology and
538 their deterministic analogs. *Physical Review E*, 70:041902, 2004.
- 539 [53] J. E. McKinnon, S. Mori, B. K. Blackman, L. David, D. M. Kingsley, L. Jamieson,
540 J. Chou, and D. Schluter. Evidence for ecology’s role in speciation. *Nature*,
541 429:294–298, 2004.
- 542 [54] P. A. P. Moran. *The Statistical Processes of Evolutionary Theory*. (Clarendon
543 Press, Oxford). 1962.
- 544 [55] G. Morata and P. A. Laurence. Homoeotic genes, compartments and cell deter-
545 mination in drosophila. *Nature*, 265:211–216, 1977.

- 546 [56] S. Nee. The neutral theory of biodiversity: do the numbers add up? *Functional*
547 *Ecology*, 19:173–176, 2005.
- 548 [57] M. Nei. Selectionism and neutralism in molecular evolution. *Molecular Biology*
549 *and Evolution*, 22:2318–2342, 2005.
- 550 [58] T. Ohta. Slightly deleterious mutant substitutions in evolution. *Nature*, 246:96–98,
551 1973.
- 552 [59] S. H. Strogatz. Exploring complex networks. *Nature*, 410:268–276, 2001.
- 553 [60] D. Tilman. Niche tradeoffs, neutrality, and community structure: A stochastic
554 theory of resource competition, invasion, and community assembly. *Proceedings*
555 *of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, 101:10854–10861, 2004.
- 556 [61] M. Vellend. Species diversity and genetic diversity: Parallel processes and corre-
557 lated patterns. *The American Naturalist*, 166:199–215, 2005.
- 558 [62] G. A. Watterson. Models for the logarithmic species abundance distributions.
559 *Theoretical Population Biology*, 6:217–250, 1974.
- 560 [63] T. G. Whithman, J. K. Bailey, J. A. Schweitzer, S. M. Shuster, R. K. Bangert,
561 C. J. LeRoy, and E. V. Lonsdorf. A framework for community and ecosystem
562 genetics: from genes to ecosystems. *Nature*, 7:510–522, 2006.
- 563 [64] J. T. Wootton. Field parametrization and experimental test of the neutral theory
564 of biodiversity. *Nature*, 433:309–312, 2005.

565 [65] C.-I. Wu. The genic view of the process of speciation. *Journal of Evolutionary*
566 *Biology*, 14:851–865, 2001.

567 **5 Acknowledgments**

568 We thank Andrew P. Allen, Jordi Bascompte, Rick Condit, Scott Chamberlain, Jonathan
569 Davies, Jennifer Dunne, Rampal S. Etienne, Stanley Harpole,, Miguel A. Fortuna, Bill
570 Langford, Pablo Marquet, Neo Martinez, Mark Urban, César Vilas, Mark Vellend
571 and Tommaso Zillio for useful comments and ideas on the development of the present
572 study. CJM was supported by a Postdoctoral Fellowship at the National Center for
573 Ecological Analysis and Synthesis, a Center funded by NSF (Grant #DEB-0553768),
574 the University of California, Santa Barbara, and the State of California. CJM also
575 acknowledges the support by Microsoft Research Ltd., Cambridge, United Kingdom.
576 DA acknowledges the support of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research
577 (NWO). DPV is a career researcher with CONICET, and was also partly funded by
578 FONCYT (PICT 20805).

6 Figure Legends

579 • Figure 1. The Higgs and Derrida model describes the stochastic evolution of a
580 finite population of constant size. Individuals occupy the vertex of a graph. We start
581 with a completely connected graph with two initial populations each with J_R and J_P
582 individuals (Fig. 1a). A link between each pair of individuals denotes reproductive
583 compatibility (i.e., $q^{ij} > q^{min}$). At each time step, an individual of each population is
584 chosen for death (Fig 1b). Two individuals are chosen for reproduction. Individuals
585 have the same probability $1/J_R$ ($1/J_P$) to be chosen for reproduction or for death
586 (Fig 1c). The offspring of these two individuals replace the dead individual. The
587 newborns in J_R and J_P can be the consequence of sexual reproduction without a
588 mutualistic interaction (i.e., facultative mutualism given by $\omega > 0$) or a consequence of
589 a mutualistic interaction with individual effectiveness m between the first two chosen
590 individuals for reproduction in population J_R and J_P (i.e., Fig. 1d, given by $1 - \omega$).

592 • Figure 2a represents an example of the unified neutral model. In this example
593 each community has 5 isolated groups with different number of individuals. The most
594 abundant groups are interacting frequently, while the rare groups do not interact among
595 them. This neutral model is the special case of an evolving multilevel graph with fitness
596 of each individual according to the abundance of each population. Figure 2b and 2c
597 represent a simple scenario for the genotype and phenotype models, respectively. In the
598 genotype scenario an individual plant and a pollinator are linked according to the total
599 number of genetically related mating partners each individual has in its population. For

600 example, individuals represented with larger black circles in the J_R and J_P community
601 have the highest number of mating links (3 in step 1). These individuals are selected
602 as a parent of the offspring (not represented) and they are linked in step 2 (Fig. 2b).
603 In the phenotype model an individual plant and pollinator are linked according to the
604 total number of trophic interactions each individual has with individuals of the second
605 community. For example, individuals with larger black circles in J_R and J_P have the
606 highest number of trophic links (3 in step 1). These individuals are selected as the first
607 parent of the offspring (not represented) and they are linked in step 2 (Fig. 2c).

608 • Figure 3 represents the distribution of Spearman's rank coefficient values with J_R
609 = $J_P = 10^2$, $\mu = 10^{-3}$, and q^{min} equal to 0.9 ($Q_R(Q_P) \sim Q_R^*(Q_P^*) \sim 0.7$, see eq.
610 1). Fig. 3a,b,c represent the J_R community under the neutral (NUM), the phenotype
611 (PF) and the genotype (GF) scenarios, respectively. As expected, mating and trophic
612 graphs are not correlated during the evolution of the system under the neutral and the
613 phenotype fitness scenarios (i.e., the distribution of Spearman's p values are close to a
614 uniform). We randomly sampled 10^3 transient values from 10 replicates with the above
615 mentioned parameter values. Fig. 3d,e represent the individual mating (Fig. 3d) and
616 trophic (Fig. 3e) degree ranked from the most (left) to the least (right) connected
617 individual after 9 randomly selected transients in one replicate from the genotype
618 fitness model. Mating and trophic degree are correlated in the genotype fitness case.
619 The distribution of the Spearman's values is highly skewed with approximately 80% of
620 p-values < 0.01 .

621 • Figure 4a represents speciation events as a function of the number of generations

622 for community J_R (community J_P not shown in the figure). Neutral, genotype and
 623 phenotype models are represented as circles, continuous and discontinuous lines, re-
 624 spectively. Each data point represents the average value after 100 replicates. We run
 625 each replicate for 10^4 generations with $J_R = J_P = 10^3$, $\mu = 10^{-4}$, and q^{min} equal to 0.9
 626 ($Q_R (Q_P) \sim Q_R^* (Q_P^*) \sim 0.7$, see eq. 1). Speciation events scale with the number of
 627 generations for all the three models ($r^2 = 0.99$, red lines) with the scaling exponent $\gamma =$
 628 0.97 (neutral), 1.03 (phenotype fitness) and 1.31 (genotype fitness). Fig. 4b represents
 629 the cumulative distribution of the number of generations to speciation for the neutral
 630 (circles), the genotype (continuous line) and the phenotype fitness models (discontin-
 631 uous line). The distributions were generated using the mean of the sorted from the
 632 smallest to the largest number of generations to speciation after 100 replicates using
 633 the same parameter values than for Fig. 4a. On average, neutral evolution generates
 634 five and twice as many speciation events as evolving genetic and ecological networks
 635 with fitness differences, respectively.

636 • Figures 5a,b,c represent the evolution of the genetic ($1-Q_R$), species diversity (S_{e_R}
 637 following eq. 10), and species richness for the neutral (circles), the genotype (continuous
 638 line), and the phenotype fitness model (red line) with the number of generations. J_R
 639 = $J_P = 10^3$, $\mu = 10^{-4}$, and q^{min} equal to 0.9 ($Q_R (Q_P) \sim Q_R^* (Q_P^*) \sim 0.7$, see eq.
 640 1 (results for J_P not shown are qualitatively similar). On average, neutral evolution
 641 generates twice as many genetic (Fig. 5a) and species (Fig. 5b) diversity as evolving
 642 genetic and ecological networks with fitness differences, respectively. On the other
 643 hand, on average it generates five and twice as many number of coexisting species as

644 evolving genetic and ecological networks with fitness differences, respectively (Fig. 5c).
645 Results are the mean of 10^4 values (i.e., one value per generation) after 100 replicates
646 with the above mentioned parameter values.

647 **7 Figures**




Figure 1:




Figure 2:




Figure 3:




Figure 4:




Figure 5:

Appendix:
Unifying Theories of Molecular, Community and
Network Evolution:

Carlos J. Melián^{1*}, David Alonso², Diego P. Vázquez³ and James Regetz¹

¹National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis,
University of California, 735 State St., Suite 300,
Santa Barbara, CA 93101, USA.

² Community and Conservation Ecology Group, University of Groningen
Haren, Groningen, The Netherlands.

³Inst. Argentino de Investigaciones de las Zonas Áridas,
CONICET, CC 507, AR-5500, Mendoza, Argentina.

November 13, 2018

*To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: melian@nceas.ucsb.edu, phone: +1-805-892-2529, fax: +1-805-892-2510.

1 **A Appendix**

2 We first describe the model at molecular level starting by the process of mutation,
3 coancestry in overlapping generations and speciation. In the end of the first part we
4 describe in more detail the effective number of alleles using the solution from the genetic
5 similarity matrix in a randomly mating population (section A.1). Second we describe
6 the effective number of species from the biodiversity theory (section A.2). Third, we
7 present a preliminary mathematical description of our unified neutral model by using a
8 master equation approach (section A.3). Fourth, we give a thorough description of our
9 genotype (section A-4) and phenotype (section A-5) fitness speciation model. Fifth,
10 we provide further information about how we sampled the transients and the steady
11 state of our simulation models (section A.6). We also have included in section A.7 and
12 A.8 the table legend for the tables A1, A2, A3 and A4. Table 1 clarifies the acronyms
13 used in the main ms. Tables 2-4 clarify the different levels and mechanisms that can
14 be considered in a general multilevel unified model.

15 **A.1 Neutral Molecular Evolution Model: Mutation, Coances-** 16 **try in Overlapping Generations and Speciation**

17 In the section “Neutral Molecular Evolution Model” of main text of this paper we
18 described briefly the three main components of the Higgs and Derrida model: mutation
19 (μ), mating with random mixing of genes and genetic drift. Here we attempt to describe
20 in more detail those components. Let μ be the average rate of mutation of the alleles
21 existing in a diploid population. Mutation rates are equal for forward and backward

22 mutations and across loci. We consider one initial completely connected population
 23 with all sexual identical diploids J individuals.

24 Each individual i is represented by a sequence of N alleles each of which has two
 25 possible forms (+1/ - 1): $(S_1^i, S_2^i \dots S_N^i)$, where S_u^i is the u^{th} unit in the sequence of
 26 individual i [7]. The initial genetic similarity values between each pair of individuals
 27 (q^{ij}) in the genetic similarity matrix $Q = [q^{ij}]$ are equal to 1. The genetic similarity
 28 between individual i and individual j is defined as

$$q^{ij} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{u=1}^N S_u^i S_u^j, \quad (\text{A-1})$$

29 At each time step, an individual is chosen for death. A second individual and its
 30 partner are chosen for reproduction. Individuals have the same reproductive probability
 31 ($1/J$) to be chosen for reproduction or for death. If $q^{ij} > q^{min}$, then the offspring of
 32 the two chosen parents replace (i.e., it occupies the empty site) the dead individual
 33 [4, 7, 11, 17]. Otherwise the individuals do not mate (prezygotic *RI*) or their offspring
 34 is inviable or sterile (postzygotic *RI*) (i.e., we disregard the second individual and put
 35 it back). It is interesting to note here that this dynamics of speciation is derived from
 36 the underlying microevolutionary processes rather than postulated to follow a certain
 37 statistical distribution [4, 8].

38 Which is the expected sequence of each new offspring? Each new individual (k)
 39 has two parents $G_1(k)$ and $G_2(k)$. Each allele is inherited at random from one or
 40 other of the parent, thus ignoring linkage between neighboring alleles, but with a small
 41 probability of error determined by the mutation rate (μ). Thus if $\mu \rightarrow 0$, n $\mu \rightarrow \lambda$,

42 then as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(1 - \mu)^n \rightarrow e^{-\lambda} \tag{A-2}$$

and the probability to have in the unit of the sequence S_u^k the same allele than one of its parents is

$$P_1(S_u^k = S_u^{G_1(k)}) = \frac{1}{4}(1 + e^{-2\mu}) \tag{A-3}$$

$$P_2(S_u^k = -S_u^{G_1(k)}) = \frac{1}{4}(1 - e^{-2\mu}) \tag{A-4}$$

$$P_3(S_u^k = S_u^{G_2(k)}) = \frac{1}{4}(1 + e^{-2\mu}) \tag{A-5}$$

$$P_4(S_u^k = -S_u^{G_2(k)}) = \frac{1}{4}(1 - e^{-2\mu}), \tag{A-6}$$

with the probabilities $P = (P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4)$ satisfying $0 \leq P_i \leq 1$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$, $\sum_i^{P_4} P_i = 1$. Given the value of the allele $S_u^{G_1(k)}$ of one of the parents, the expected value of that allele in the offspring is $E[S_u^k] = e^{-2\mu} S_u^{G_1(k)}$. Similarly, given the similarity between each parent of the new individual j and the individual i already in the population we update the similarity matrix q according to the following equation;

$$q^{ji} = \frac{e^{-4\mu}}{2}(q^{G_1(j)i} + q^{G_2(j)i}). \tag{A-7}$$

43 We know the evolution of the overlap matrix in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ in the infinite
 44 genome limit [7], because each pair of alleles contributing to q^{ji} comes with equal
 45 probability from one of the two possible combinations of the parents of j and individual
 46 i . By analyzing the similarity matrix Q at any given time it is possible to assign new
 47 individuals to a species. The analysis of the similarity matrix Q can be done by finding

48 the isolated subgroups of individuals. In each time step we first check the k individuals
 49 that can mate with the newborn j (i.e., $q^{jk} > q^{min}$). Second we check all k individuals
 50 that can mate with j but can not mate with the rest of i individuals in the population
 51 ($q^{ik} \leq q^{min}$ for all i). If this two criteria are satisfy, then we have an isolated group.

52 The probability that two randomly selected individuals from the genetic similarity
 53 matrix Q have a common ancestor at time t is (see [1, 3, 9, 13] for a detailed discussion
 54 about the similarities and differences with respect to monoecious and dioecious diploid
 55 populations with overlapping generations)

$$Q_t = e^{-4\mu} \left[\frac{1}{2J} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{2J} \right) Q_{t-1} \right] \quad (\text{A-8})$$

If $\mu \ll 1$, then the genetic similarity matrix Q has a solution [7]:

$$Q^* = \frac{1}{\theta_m + 1} \quad (\text{A-9})$$

where $\theta_m = 4J\mu$. This solution is identical to the inbreeding coefficient (F) in population genetics with non-overlapping generations [10, 16] meaning the probability that an individual will be homozygous. It is interesting to note that Q^* and F have the same value despite that Q^* is an average property of all loci in the sequence whereas F is defined for the infinite allele model in a single locus [7]. The probability that two

individuals do not have a common ancestor is given by

$$1 - Q^* = \frac{\theta_m}{\theta_m + 1} \tag{A-10}$$

56 where $1 - Q^*$ is a measure of heterozygosity or genetic diversity. As we commented
57 in the main part of the ms. if $q^{min} > Q^*$, then the initial population J is greatly
58 perturbed by the cutoff, the connectivity within the population decreases and the
59 genetic similarity matrix (Q) can never reach its equilibrium state. Initial population
60 splits and speciation happens with the species fluctuating in the system according to
61 demographic stochasticity [7].

62 **A.2 Neutral Theory of Biodiversity: The Effective Number** 63 **of Species**

64 Neutral theory of biodiversity discusses species instead of alleles. In this case, the
65 probability that two individuals in population J chosen at random will be of the same
66 species is

$$f_t = (1 - \nu)^2 \left[\frac{1}{J} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{J} \right) f_{t-1} \right] \tag{A-11}$$

67 At equilibrium, assuming ν is small, we have

$$f^* = \frac{1}{\theta_b + 1} \tag{A-12}$$

68 where $\theta_b = J\nu$. Then, the *effective number of species* (S_e) in the J community is [14]

$$S_e = \theta_b + 1 \tag{A-13}$$

69 which represents a measure of species diversity and is identical to the Simpson's species
 70 diversity index [14, 15]. In this scenario ecological drift dominates and speciation is an
 71 individual level process that leads to a proportional relationship between the speciation
 72 rate of each species in a community and its abundance [8]. How can we link neutral
 73 molecular and community ecology theories using evolving multilevel networks? In this
 74 section we describe in more detail the neutral unified model.

75 **A.3 Neutral Unified Model: A Master Equation Approach**
 76 **with Explicit Speciation in Two Interacting Communi-**
 77 **ties.**

78 Our main goal here is to describe in further detail our basic neutral model. In or-
 79 der to do it, we provide a preliminary mathematical description of the evolutionary
 80 and ecological processes controlling community dynamics. An important point is that
 81 two initial populations give rise to two interacting communities, i. e., through a com-
 82 bined effect of speciation, death, and reproduction an ecological network connecting

83 two mutualistic communities emerges. Model dynamics is controlled by three input
84 parameters: the mutation rate ($\mu_R = \mu_P = \mu$), the minimum genetic similarity value
85 ($q_R^{min} = q_P^{min} = q^{min}$) at genetic level, ultimately controlling the speciation process, and
86 the individual mutualistic effectiveness (m) assuming a fully symmetric case for all the
87 individuals interactions at the ecological level.

88 Our simulations consider a zero-sum birth and death stochastic individual based
89 model in sexual diploids populations with overlapping generations and age indepen-
90 dent birth and death rates in the context of neutral mutations and large genome size
91 per individual (effectively infinite gene sequences) [4, 7]. Individual interactions are
92 introduced using a single and large-homogeneous patch (or metacommunity) in which
93 there is a complete mixing and all individuals have the same chance of potentially
94 interacting with each other [8, 12]. Our model produces two mutualistically interacting
95 communities —the resource R or plant community and the consumer or pollinator P
96 community— but it can be easily extended to any kind of ecological interactions and
97 to a larger number of interacting communities.

98 The two communities assume hermaphroditic plant and dioecious pollinator indi-
99 viduals. They are labeled $R = 1, \dots, J_R$, and $P = 1, \dots, J_P$, where J_R and J_P are
100 the total number of individual plants and pollinators, respectively. Site size inside the
101 patch for plants (pollinators) is defined so that each one contains one R (P) plant
102 (pollinator) individual. Thus $J_m = J_R + J_P$ is the total number of effective individ-
103 uals in the metacommunity which implies that all individuals are considered in the
104 reproductive age. These numbers are kept constant by assuming zero-sum dynamics.

105 An important remark is that our simulations are run much faster under the zero-
106 sum rule, but community dynamics is easier to describe by dropping this assumption.
107 Therefore, in what follows, for clarity and simplicity, we assume that death and non-
108 mutualistic reproduction can take place independently in either community. Only
109 mutualistic interactions involve simultaneously individuals from the two communities.
110 Zero-sum models are equivalent to their non zero-sum counterparts at stationarity [2].
111 Although we have run all our simulations under zero-sum dynamics (see our code in
112 section A.9), we are quite confident that our main results are robust and do not rely
113 on the specific implementation of the zero-sum rule.

114 Consider two randomly mating populations of size J_R and J_P where each individual
115 has an infinitely large genome sequence subject to random neutral mutations. The
116 initial genetic similarity values between each pair of individuals (q_R^{ij} and q_P^{ij}) in the
117 matrices $Q_R = [q_R^{ij}]$ and $Q_P = [q_P^{ij}]$ are equal to 1 and mutation rates μ_R and μ_P are
118 equal among all individuals. Individuals have the same probability $1/J_R$ ($1/J_P$) to
119 be chosen for reproduction or for death. An individual of each population is chosen
120 for death and two individuals of each population are chosen for reproduction. The
121 offspring from the two selected individuals for reproduction of the same population
122 replace the dying individual. Parameter ω is defined as the probability of facultative
123 mutualistic interaction, i. e., the probability of having sexual reproduction in plants
124 without pollinators and sexual reproduction in pollinators without plants. To be more
125 precise, any k -species within the plant (R) and pollinator (P) communities will undergo
126 the following processes:


1. Death of an individual in the plant R community:




2. Death of an individual in the pollinator P community:



3. Non-mutualistic reproduction of an individual in the R community:




4. Non-mutualistic reproduction of an individual in the P community:



5. Arising of a new species j as a result of a non-mutualistic reproduction in the R community:



6. Arising of a new species j as a result of a non-mutualistic reproduction in the P community:



127 Furthermore, in case of mutualism is obligate, reproduction and ecological inter-
 128 action are considered to be coupled events involving a pair of individuals from each
 129 community. The strength of the mutualistic interaction is controlled by $1 - \omega$, which is
 130 defined as an individual mutualistic effectiveness, $m_{N_R^k, N_P^k}$. Any time that a mutualistic
 131 event occurs, an interacting link connecting the individuals involved in the interaction
 132 appears. It is in this way that a dynamical ecological network connecting the two com-
 133 munities emerges. Notice that this reproduction-interaction coupled event can result
 134 in four different outputs:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \emptyset^R & \xrightarrow{m_{N_R^k, N_P^k} M_R^k (1-P_R^k) M_P^k (1-P_P^k)} & R^k \\
 \emptyset^P & \xrightarrow{\hspace{10em}} & P^k
 \end{array} \tag{A-20}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \emptyset^R & \xrightarrow{m_{N_R^k, N_P^k} M_R^k (1-P_R^k) M_P^k P_P^k} & R^k \\
 \emptyset^P & \xrightarrow{\hspace{10em}} & P^j
 \end{array} \tag{A-21}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \emptyset^R & \xrightarrow{m_{N_R^k, N_P^k} M_R^k P_R^k M_P^k (1-P_P^k)} & R^j \\
 \emptyset^P & \xrightarrow{\hspace{10em}} & P^k
 \end{array} \tag{A-22}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \emptyset^R & \xrightarrow{m_{N_R^k, N_P^k} M_R^k P_R^k M_P^k P_P^k} & R^j \\
 \emptyset^P & \xrightarrow{\hspace{10em}} & P^j
 \end{array} \tag{A-23}$$

where \emptyset^R (\emptyset^P), represent empty sites, and $d_{N_R^k}$ ($d_{N_P^k}$) and $b_{N_R^k}$ ($b_{N_P^k}$) death and birth per capita rates of plant and pollinator species k , respectively. M_R^k and M_P^k are the probabilities to pick up randomly two individuals that can actually mate $[(i', j') \text{ with } q^{i' j'} > q^{min}]$ among all available pairs in hermaphroditic plant species N_R^k and pollinator species N_P^k , respectively:

$$M_R^k = P\{i', j' | q^{i' j'} > q^{min}\} = \frac{2}{N_R^k(N_R^k + 1)} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_R^k} \sum_{j'=i'}^{N_R^k} H(q^{i' j'} - q^{min}), \quad (\text{A-24})$$

$$M_P^k = P\{i', j' | q^{i' j'} > q^{min}\} = \frac{2}{N_P^k(N_P^k - 1)} \sum_{i'=1}^{N_P^k} \sum_{j'=i'+1}^{N_P^k} H(q^{i' j'} - q^{min}), \quad (\text{A-25})$$

where $H(\alpha)$

$$H(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

135

and ν_R^k and ν_P^k are the probabilities of mutation-induced speciation for species k in the plant and pollinator populations, respectively:

$$\nu_R^k = \frac{2}{N_R^k(N_R^k + 1)} \sum_{k'_1=1}^{N_R^k} \sum_{k'_2=k'_1}^{N_R^k} P_R^{k'_1, k'_2}, \quad (\text{A-26})$$

$$\nu_P^k = \frac{2}{N_P^k(N_P^k - 1)} \sum_{k'_1=1}^{N_P^k} \sum_{k'_2=k'_1+1}^{N_P^k} P_P^{k'_1, k'_2}, \quad (\text{A-27})$$

136

137 where $P_R^{k'_1, k'_2}$ and $P_P^{k'_1, k'_2}$ are defined as the probabilities of producing an individual
 138 offspring belonging to a new species, after two parent individuals (k'_1, k'_2) have been
 139 randomly chosen from plant and pollinator k species, respectively. This new individual
 140 belongs to a new species provided it is sexually incompatible with any other individual
 141 in the respective community:

$$P_R^{k'_1, k'_2} = F \left[\frac{\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^{J_R} H(q_t - (q^{k'_1 i} + q^{k'_2 i}))}{J_R - 1} \right] \quad (\text{A-28})$$

$$P_P^{k'_1, k'_2} = F \left[\frac{\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^{J_P} H(q_t - (q^{k'_1 i} + q^{k'_2 i}))}{J_P - 1} \right] \quad (\text{A-29})$$

142

where $q_t = \frac{2q^{min}}{e^{-4\mu}}$, $F[x] = 1$ if $x = 1$ and zero otherwise $H(\alpha)$ is

$$H(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

143 Expressions above characterize speciation. $P_R^{k'_1, k'_2}$ will be either 1 when speciation
 144 occurs and zero otherwise. When the offspring is a new individual i that cannot mate
 145 with any individual in the community (with $i \neq j$), we have an incipient species of
 146 size 1. This a mutation-induced speciation event. However, note that there is also an
 147 alternative speciation mode. Death events may induce the formation of new species
 148 of larger sizes. When there is only one individual connecting two mating subnetworks

149 within the same species and this “connector” individual happens to die, the ancestral
 150 species splits into two daughter species, which implies that an additional new species
 151 arises. This is a fission-induced speciation event. In order to fully characterize this sec-
 152 ond speciation mode, we would require to count the number of “connector” individuals
 153 per species and the distribution of subnetwork sizes those individuals are connecting
 154 at any point in time.

155 In order to write down an equation describing the temporal dynamics of the two
 156 interacting communities, we need to characterize the state of the system and all possible
 157 transitions between states at a given time. Transition rates naturally follow from the
 158 set of events we have considered above. The state of the system is defined by the
 159 community abundance vectors for the plant $\vec{N}_R = [N_1^R, N_2^R, N_3^R, \dots, N_{S_R}^R]$ and pollinator
 160 $\vec{N}_P = [N_1^P, N_2^P, N_3^P, \dots, N_{S_P}^P]$ community, and by the two genetic similarity matrices of
 161 dimensions $J_R \times J_R$ and $J_P \times J_P$ corresponding to the two communities which control
 162 the evolving mating networks. These matrices ultimately control reproduction and
 163 speciation rates through the probabilities M_*^k and P_*^k , where $*$ stands for R and P .
 164 Notice that in the limit of large genome sizes there is no stochasticity in the similarity
 165 matrices. They are updated following the rule given by Eq. (A-7) after any single
 166 reproduction, extinction or speciation event.

167 We study a fully symmetric case ($m_{N_R^k, N_P^k} = m_{N_P^k, N_R^k}$) between plant and pollinator
 168 individuals, within species, and across species within the plant and pollinator commu-
 169 nity. In fact, for simplicity, we also assume $m_{N_R^k, N_P^{k'}} = m_{N_P^k, N_R^{k'}} = m = 1$, i. e., the
 170 obligate mutualistic scenario, and percapita birth and death rates are assumed to take

171 the same value across species and within and across the two communities ($d_R^k = d_P^k$
172 and $b_R^k = b_P^k$). This will further simplify transition rates by scaling time according to
173 the birth-death temporal rate (a single time step is the time required for one death
174 and one birth per community to occur).

175 We define $\vec{e}_k^* = [e_1^k, \dots, e_{S^*}^k]$, where $*$ stands for R and P and e_i^k is 1 if $k = i$
176 and 0 otherwise. The events considered in (A-14)-(A-23) allow to define the following
177 transition rates. Note these three remarks in order. First, the system can only loose
178 one individual from a given species either through a death in the plant or pollinator
179 community and this transition probability rate should increase linearly with the abun-
180 dance of that species. Second, the encounter of two individuals for reproduction is
181 a quadratic process that involve the abundance of that species squared. Third, the
182 speciation process increases the dimension of the abundance community vector with
183 the addition of a new component corresponding to the new incipient species. With this
184 in mind, we can readily write:

1. Death:

$$T \left[\vec{N}_R - \vec{e}_k^R, \vec{N}_P \mid \vec{N}_R, \vec{N}_P \right] = \left(\frac{N_R^k}{J_R} \right) \quad (\text{A-30})$$

$$T \left[\vec{N}_R, \vec{N}_P - \vec{e}_k^P \mid \vec{N}_R, \vec{N}_P \right] = \left(\frac{N_P^k}{J_P} \right) \quad (\text{A-31})$$

2. Non-mutualistic reproduction:

$$T \left[\vec{N}_R + \vec{e}_k^R, \vec{N}_P \mid \vec{N}_R, \vec{N}_P \right] = \omega M_R^k \frac{(N^k)^2}{J_R J_R} (1 - P_R^k) \quad (\text{A-32})$$

$$T \left[\vec{N}_R, \vec{N}_P + \vec{e}_k^P \mid \vec{N}_R, \vec{N}_P \right] = \omega M_P^k \frac{(N^k)^2}{J_P J_P} (1 - P_P^k) \quad (\text{A-33})$$

3. Speciation associated to non-mutualistic reproduction:

$$T \left[\vec{N}_R + \vec{e}_{S_{R+1}}^R, \vec{N}_P \mid \vec{N}_R, \vec{N}_P \right] = \omega M_R^k \frac{(N^k)^2}{J_R J_R} (P_R^k) \quad (\text{A-34})$$

$$T \left[\vec{N}_R, \vec{N}_P + \vec{e}_{S_{P+1}}^P \mid \vec{N}_R, \vec{N}_P \right] = \omega M_P^k \frac{(N^k)^2}{J_P J_P} (P_P^k) \quad (\text{A-35})$$

4. Mutualistic reproduction:

$$T \left[\vec{N}_R + \vec{e}_k^R, \vec{N}_P + \vec{e}_{k'}^P \mid \vec{N}_R, \vec{N}_P \right] = (1 - \omega) M_R^k \frac{(N^k)^2}{J_R J_R} (1 - P_R^k) M_P^{k'} \frac{(N^{k'})^2}{J_P J_P} (1 - P_P^{k'}) \quad (\text{A-36})$$

5. Speciation associated to mutualistic reproduction furnishes the three remaining transitions (either or both species involve in the interaction undergo speciation):

$$T \left[\vec{N}_R + \vec{e}_{S_{R+1}}^R, \vec{N}_P + \vec{e}_{k'}^P \mid \vec{N}_R, \vec{N}_P \right] = (1 - \omega) M_R^k \frac{(N^k)^2}{J_R J_R} (P_R^k) M_P^{k'} \frac{(N^{k'})^2}{J_P J_P} (1 - P_P^{k'}) \quad (\text{A-37})$$

$$T \left[\vec{N}_R + \vec{e}_k^R, \vec{N}_P + \vec{e}_{S_{P+1}}^P \mid \vec{N}_R, \vec{N}_P \right] = (1 - \omega) M_R^k \frac{(N^k)^2}{J_R J_R} (1 - P_R^k) M_P^{k'} \frac{(N^{k'})^2}{J_P J_P} (P_P^{k'}) \quad (\text{A-38})$$

$$T \left[\vec{N}_R + \vec{e}_{S_{R+1}}^R, \vec{N}_P + \vec{e}_{S_{P+1}}^P \mid \vec{N}_R, \vec{N}_P \right] = (1 - \omega) M_R^k \frac{(N^k)^2}{J_R J_R} (P_R^k) M_P^{k'} \frac{(N^{k'})^2}{J_P J_P} (P_P^{k'}) \quad (\text{A-39})$$

185 As we have done in all our simulations, if we consider only the obligate mutualistic
186 scenario, $\omega = 0$, or mutualistic effectiveness, $m_{N_R^k, N_P^k} = m_{N_P^k, N_R^k}$ is equal to 1, stochas-
187 tic transition rates simplify and system is described by death rates (A-30)-(A-31),
188 mutualistic pure reproduction (A-36), and the speciation rates associated to obligate
189 mutualistic reproduction, (A-37)-(A-39).

190 It is important to remark that the stochastic events we have considered are neglect-
191 ing the fission speciation mode. However, all results presented in the main ms. are
192 based on a zero-sum code which does take into account both mechanisms of speciation.
193 Therefore, our preliminary mathematical description above provides only an approxi-
194 mation to the actual dynamics of the system. Within this limitation, we have provided
195 a set of transition probabilities that allow to build exact stochastic simulations [5],
196 and a master equation that provides a general description of the time evolution of two
197 interacting communities with explicit speciation and mutualistic interactions. These
198 tools promise to expand our ability for quantitative analysis. However, more work is
199 needed to fully characterize the contribution to the formation of new species through
200 the fission-mode speciation mechanism.

201 **A.4 Genotype Fitness Speciation Model**

202 Do genetic or ecological mechanisms drive the speed of speciation, genetic-species
203 diversity and coexistence? We here describe in detail the individual fitness according to
204 its reproductive probabilities. Each individual i of species k is chosen for reproduction
205 with probability proportional to its fitness,

$$P_{i,k} = \mathcal{N} F_{i,k} \quad (\text{A-40})$$

where individual fitness is defined as:

$$F_{i,k} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_k} H(q^{ij} - q^{min})}{M_k} \quad (\text{A-41})$$

Thus, we write:

$$P_{i,k} = \mathcal{N} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_k} H(q^{ij} - q^{min})}{M_k} \quad (\text{A-42})$$

where \mathcal{N} is a normalization factor, N_k is the abundance of species k , and M_k is the total number of potential mating interactions within the species k , which, in turn, can be written as:

$$M_k = \sum_{i=1}^{N_k} \sum_{j=1}^{N_k} H(q^{ij} - q^{min}) \quad (\text{A-43})$$

and $H(\alpha)$

$$H(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We now calculate the normalization factor by using the normalization requirement, i.e., by summing $P_{i,k}$ across all individuals and species 1 must be obtained:

$$\mathcal{N} \sum_{i=1}^{S_R} \sum_{j=1}^{N_k} F_{i,k} = 1 \quad (\text{A-44})$$

and, then:

$$\mathcal{N} = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{S_R} \sum_{j=1}^{N_k} F_{i,k}} \quad (\text{A-45})$$

Therefore, the probability of birth for each i individual is:

$$P_{i,k} = \frac{F_{i,k}}{\sum_{i=1}^{S_R} \sum_{j=1}^{N_k} F_{i,k}} \quad (\text{A-46})$$

After the simplification we have:

$$P_{i,k} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_k} H(q^{ij} - q^{min})}{S_R M_k} \quad (\text{A-47})$$

where $H(\alpha)$ is

$$H(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

206 which is the eq. 11 in the main text. N_k , S_R and M_k are the abundance of species k ,
 207 the total number of extant species in community J_R and the total number of potential
 208 mating interactions within the species k , respectively.

209 This genotype fitness model has the following same ingredient than the neutral
 210 unified model: (1) individuals have the same probability $1/J_R$ ($1/J_P$) to be chosen for
 211 death, and the following additions: (1) individuals equally connected within their own
 212 species are equivalent in fitness, i.e, the identity to a given species does not confer per
 213 se fitness advantage. Fitness differences are then considered only within each species;
 214 (2) there is a density dependence in fitness across species, thus rare species have rel-
 215 atively higher probabilities of reproduction in comparison to our unified basic neutral
 216 model described above. Note also that in this model may happen that the offspring of
 217 highly connected parents can inherit their connectance, thus increasing its reproduc-
 218 tive probability. In the same way, individuals are chosen for death and reproduction
 219 in the second community. We have explored this model with the probability for death
 220 inversely proportional to the reproductive probability and the results remain qualita-
 221 tively similar to the results with the same probability to be chosen for death. In the
 222 same way, individuals are chosen for death and reproduction in the second community

223 J_P , thus the description of the model is equivalent.

224 **A.5 Phenotype Fitness Speciation Model**

225 Similar to the neutral and the genotype fitness model individuals have the same prob-
 226 ability $1/J_R$ ($1/J_P$) to be chosen for death. Each individual i of species k is chosen for
 227 reproduction with probability proportional to their fitness, thus

$$P_{i,k}^B = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{J_P} m_{ij}}{M_k} \quad (\text{A-48})$$

where the sum until J_p means the total number of interactions of individual i with all individuals of community J_P . M_k is the total number of mutualistic interactions of all the individuals of species k with all the individuals in community J_P :

$$M_k = \sum_{i=1}^{N_k} \sum_{j=1}^{J_P} m_{ij} \quad (\text{A-49})$$

We now use the normalization factor across all species:

$$\mathcal{N}_B = \sum_{i=1}^{S_R} \sum_{j=1}^{N_k} P_{i,k}^B \quad (\text{A-50})$$

and the probability of individual i of having a newborn is:

$$P_{i,k} = \frac{P_{i,k}^B}{\mathcal{N}_B} \quad (\text{A-51})$$

Finally, after the simplification we have

$$P_{i,k} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{J_P} m_{ij}}{S_R M_k} \quad (\text{A-52})$$

228 which is the eq. 12 in the main text. The sum until J_P means the total number of
229 interactions of individual i with all the individuals of community J_P . m_{ij} means that
230 there is an interaction between individual i and j . S_R and M_k are the total number
231 of extant species in community J_R , and the total number of mutualistic interactions
232 among all the individuals of species k with all the individuals in community J_P , re-
233 spectively. This phenotype fitness model has the same two ingredients to the genotype
234 model but working at ecological level: (1) individuals equally connected within their
235 own species are equivalent in fitness, i.e, the identity to a given species does not con-
236 fer per se fitness advantage. Fitness differences are then considered only within each
237 species, (2) there is a density dependence in fitness across species, thus rare species
238 have higher probabilities of reproduction, and (3) contrary to the genotype model,
239 where the offspring inherits a number of potential matings from its parents, we assume
240 that each offspring in this model starts with one trophic interaction. In the same way,
241 individuals are chosen for death and reproduction in the second community. Similar to
242 the genotype fitness model we have explored this model with the probability for death
243 inversely proportional to the reproductive probability. Results remain qualitatively
244 similar to the results with the same probability to be chosen for death.

245 **A.6 Sampling transients and the Steady State**

246 Recent work has emphasized the importance of transient dynamics rather than long-
247 term behavior in ecological systems [6]. In the present study we sampled transients and
248 the steady state for the number of generations to speciation, genetic-species diversity

249 and species richness. This will allow us to determine if transients and the long-term
250 behavior are similar under the neutral, the phenotype and the genotype fitness models.
251 We thus consider both aspects of the dynamics.

252 In all our simulations, we have assumed a fully symmetric case: $m_{N_R^k, N_P^k} = m_{N_P^k, N_R^k}$
253 between plant and pollinator species, and across species within the plant and pollinator
254 community, $m_{N_R^k, N_P^{k'}} = m_{N_P^k, N_R^{k'}} = m$, and percapita birth and death rates have been
255 assumed to be taken the same value across species. Furthermore, in all the replicates
256 we have simulated the condition $q^{min} > Q_R^* (Q_P^*)$. Given J_R and J_P individuals in
257 the initial population, a generation is an update of J_R and J_P time steps.

258 We have explored a set of initial parameter values. Mutation rates (μ from 0.001
259 to 0.0001), a minimum genetic similarity value to the development of viable and fertile
260 offspring, q^{min} , from 0.75 to 0.95 in the context of a mutualistic effectiveness $m = 1$, and
261 obligate mutualism, $\omega = 0$. For the specific parameter combination of $J_R = J_P = 10^3$, μ
262 $= 10^{-4}$, $q^{min} = 0.9$, $m = 1$, and $\omega = 0$ we run 100 replicates with 10^4 generations each.
263 The equilibrium value for each replicate for each community was closed to $Q_R (Q_P)$
264 $\sim Q_R^* (Q_P^*) \sim 0.7$ for the neutral model. Results for all the parameter combinations
265 explored were qualitatively similar.

References

- [1] S. C. Choy and B. S. Weir. Exact inbreeding coefficients in populations with overlapping generations. *Genetics*, 89:591–614, 1978.
- [2] R. S. Etienne, D. Alonso, and A. J. McKane. The zero-sum assumption in neutral biodiversity theory. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 248:522–536, 2008.
- [3] J. Felsenstein. Inbreeding and variance effective numbers in populations with overlapping generations. *Genetics*, 68:581–597, 1971.
- [4] S. Gavrilets. *Fitness Landscapes and the Origin of Species*. (Princeton University Press, Princeton). 2004.
- [5] D. T Gillespie. A general method for numerically simulating the stochastic time evolution of coupled chemical reactions. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 22:403–434, 1976.
- [6] A. Hastings. Transients: the key to long-term ecological understanding? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 19:39–45, 2004.
- [7] P. G. Higgs and B. Derrida. Genetic distance and species formation in evolving populations. *Journal of Molecular Evolution*, 35:454–465, 1992.
- [8] S. P. Hubbell. *The Unified Neutral Theory of Biodiversity and Biogeography*. (Princeton University Press, Princeton). 2001.

- 284 [9] D. L. Johnson. Inbreeding in populations with overlapping generations. *Genetics*,
285 87:581–591, 1977.
- 286 [10] M. Kimura and J. Crow. The number of alleles that can be maintained in a finite
287 population. *Genetics*, 49:725–738, 1964.
- 288 [11] E. Mayr. *Populations, Species and Evolution*. (Harvard University Press, Cam-
289 bridge). 1970.
- 290 [12] A. J. McKane and T. J. Newman. Stochastic models in population biology and
291 their deterministic analogs. *Physical Review E*, 70:041902, 2004.
- 292 [13] P. A. P. Moran. *The Statistical Processes of Evolutionary Theory*. (Clarendon
293 Press, Oxford). 1962.
- 294 [14] S. Nee. The neutral theory of biodiversity: do the numbers add up? *Functional*
295 *Ecology*, 19:173–176, 2005.
- 296 [15] E. H. Simpson. Measurement of diversity. *Nature*, 163:688, 1949.
- 297 [16] S. Wright. Evolution in mendelian populations. *Genetics*, 16:97–159, 1931.
- 298 [17] C.-I. Wu. The genic view of the process of speciation. *Journal of Evolutionary*
299 *Biology*, 14:851–865, 2001.

300 **A.7 Table Legend of Appendix**

301 • Table A1 shows the variables, parameters and acronyms used in the order that they
302 appear in the main part of the ms.

303 • Table A2 shows the different levels and mechanisms that can be considered in
304 a general “Unified Neutral Model”. Two general mechanisms and three levels give
305 8 possible combinations. Note that we consider here genetic and mating as different
306 levels. Genetic level used in the present study assumes that mutation rates are equal
307 for forward and backward mutations and across loci. This means equal fitness among
308 all individuals within each population at that level (i.e., $f_i \approx f_j$). Mating behavior
309 is constrained by the minimum genetic similarity value for viable and fertile offspring
310 ($q^{ij} > q^{min}$) and can be neutral as in the neutral scenario (i.e., $f_i \approx f_j$, thus all
311 individuals within each species are equivalent) or driven by the number of genetically
312 related matings of each individual (i.e., $f_i \neq f_j$, with explicit differences within each
313 species). Neutrality at ecological level assumes equivalence and symmetry in the feeding
314 behavior ($m_{ij} = m_{ji} = m$). This neutral feeding behavior assumes competitive and
315 mutualistic symmetric interactions of all individuals and the same percapita effect of
316 each pollinator on each plant and viceversa. We explore here three scenarios. The first
317 scenario represents the unified neutral model where individuals have the same fitness
318 across all levels. This implies that each individual has the same probability to death or
319 have descendants during the evolution of the system. This scenario is represented in the
320 three “Neutral” conditions in the Table A2. In the phenotype and genotype models each

321 individual has a fitness value given by the trophic degree or number of potential matings
322 with individuals in the second community or within the same population, respectively.
323 Fitness is defined as the sum of the total number of j individuals each individual i
324 interact or can mate with in each time step. The phenotype model explores the same
325 genetic conditions than the neutral case but with different trophic interactions among
326 individuals within each population (i.e, $d_i \neq d_j$, thus the X in the continuum, Table
327 A3). This generates differences in the reproductive probabilities (i.e., $f_i \neq f_j$). Finally,
328 the genotype fitness model explores different mating conditions than the neutral and
329 the phenotype models (i.e., $f_i \neq f_j$ which implies the evolution of $d_i \neq d_j$, thus the X
330 at both levels, Table A4). Note that the phenotype and the genotype models end up
331 with the same conditions but they work in opposite directions. Finally, we keep the same
332 percapita effectiveness at ecological level in the three scenarios (i.e., $m_{ij} = m_{ji} = m$).

333 **A.8 Tables**

Table A1	
Parameter	Meaning
θ_b	Biodiversity number, species level
J	Initial population size or community size
μ	Mutation rate
q^{min}	Genetic similarity constraint to have viable and fertile offspring
<i>NTME</i>	Neutral Theory of Molecular Evolution
<i>NTB</i>	Neutral Theory of Biodiversity
ν	Speciation rate
<i>NUM</i>	Neutral Unified Model
<i>GF</i>	Genotypic-fitness speciation model
<i>PF</i>	Phenotypic-fitness speciation model
J^s	Incipient species size
q^{ij}	Genetic similarity between individual i and j
$Q = [q^{ij}]$	Genetic similarity matrix
<i>RI</i>	Reproductive isolation
θ_m	Diversity molecular level
S_e	Effective number of species
J_R	Initial population size or community size of resource/plant species
J_P	Initial population size or community size of pollinator species
J_m	Total number of individuals
$Q_R = [q_R^{ij}]$	Genetic similarity matrix for the plant community
$Q_P = [q_P^{ij}]$	Genetic similarity matrix for the pollinator community

334

Level/Mechanism	Neutral	Niche
Genetic ($\mu_{S_u} \approx \neq \mu$)	$f_i \approx f_j$	$f_i \neq f_j$
Mating ($q^{ij} > q^{min}$)	$f_i \approx f_j$	$f_i \neq f_j$
Feeding	$d_i \approx d_j, m_{ij} = m_{ji} = m$	$d_i \neq d_j, m_{ij} \neq m_{ji}$

Table A2

Level/Mechanism	Neutral	Niche	Continuum
Genetic ($\mu_{S_u} \approx \neq \mu$)	$f_i \approx f_j$		
Mating ($q^{ij} > q^{min}$)		$f_i \neq f_j$	X
Feeding	$m_{ij} = m_{ji} = m$	$d_i \neq d_j$	X

Table A3: Phenotype Fitness Speciation Model

Level/Mechanism	Neutral	Niche	Continuum
Genetic ($\mu_{S_u} \approx \neq \mu$)	$f_i \approx f_j$		
Mating ($q^{ij} > q^{min}$)		$f_i \neq f_j$	X
Feeding	$m_{ij} = m_{ji} = m$	$d_i \neq d_j$	X

Table A4: Genotype Fitness Speciation Model