

1 Type of article: Original Article

2 **Differential patterns of within- and between-population genetically-based trait variation**  
3 **in *Lupinus angustifolius* L.**

4 Running title: Within- and between-population traits variation in *Lupinus angustifolius* L.

5 \*For correspondence. E-mail cristinapoyatosfernandez@gmail.com

6 Authors: Cristina Poyatos<sup>1,\*</sup>, Sandra Sacristán-Bajo<sup>1</sup>, Pablo Tabarés<sup>1</sup>, Samuel Prieto-Benítez<sup>2</sup>,  
7 María Luisa Rubio Teso<sup>1</sup>; Elena Torres<sup>3</sup>, Javier Morente-López<sup>1,4</sup>, Carlos Lara-Romero<sup>1</sup>, José  
8 María Iriondo<sup>1</sup>, Alfredo García Fernández<sup>1</sup>

9 Affiliations:

10 <sup>1</sup>Grupo de Ecología Evolutiva (ECOEVO). Área de Biodiversidad y Conservación,  
11 Departamento de Biología y Geología, Universidad Rey Juan Carlos-ESCET, Tulipán s/n.  
12 28933 Móstoles, Madrid (Spain).

13 <sup>2</sup>Ecotoxicology of Air Pollution, CIEMAT. Avda. Complutense, 40. 28040, Madrid (Spain).

14 <sup>3</sup>Departamento de Biotecnología-Biología Vegetal, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Av.  
15 Puerta de Hierro 2-4, 28040, Madrid (Spain).

16 <sup>4</sup>Grupo de Ecología y Evolución en Islas, Instituto de Productos Naturales y Agrobiología  
17 (IPNA-CSIC), Avda. Astrofísico Francisco Sánchez 3, 38206, San Cristóbal de La Laguna,  
18 Santa Cruz de Tenerife (Spain).

19

## 1 **ABSTRACT**

2 *Background and aims.* Within-population genetic and phenotypic variation play a key role in  
3 the development of adaptive responses to environmental change. Between-population variation  
4 is also an essential element to assess the evolutionary potential of species in response to changes  
5 in environmental conditions. In this context, common garden experiments are a useful tool to  
6 separate the genetic and environmental components of phenotypic variation. We aimed to  
7 assess within and between-population phenotypic variation of *Lupinus angustifolius* L. in terms  
8 of its evolutionary potential to adapt to ongoing climate change.

9 *Methods.* We evaluated populations' phenotypic variation of foliar, phenological and  
10 reproductive traits with a common garden experiment. Patterns of functional trait variation were  
11 assessed with 1) mixed models analyses and coefficients of variation (CV) with confidence  
12 intervals; 2) principal component analyses (PCA); and 3) correlations between pairs of traits.  
13 Analyses were performed at the population level (four populations) and at the latitude level  
14 (grouping pairs of populations located in two latitudinal ranges).

15 *Key results.* Phenotypic variation had a significant genetic component associated with a  
16 latitudinal pattern. 1) Mixed models found lower SLA, advanced flowering phenology and  
17 lower seed production of heavier seeds in southern populations, whereas CV analyses showed  
18 lower within-latitude variation especially in phenological and reproductive traits at the southern  
19 populations. 2) PCAs showed a clearer differentiation of phenotypic variation between latitudes  
20 than between populations. 3) Correlation analyses showed a greater number of significant  
21 correlations between traits in southern populations (25 vs. 13).

22 *Conclusions.* Between-population phenotypic variation was determined by contrasting  
23 temperature and drought at different latitude and elevation. Southern populations had  
24 differential trait values compatible with adaptations to high temperatures and drought.

1 Moreover, they had lower within-population variation and greater number of trait correlations  
2 probably as a result of these limiting conditions, making them more vulnerable to climate  
3 change.

4 **Key words:** *Lupinus angustifolius*, traits, intraspecific variation, population variation,  
5 evolutionary potential, latitude, climate change.

## 6 INTRODUCTION

7 Phenotype trait expression is the result of a complex set of traits that is determined by the  
8 interaction of the genetic component and the environment (Murren, 2012). Climate change  
9 triggers abrupt environmental changes prompting the need for a trait expression change in a  
10 quick adaptive process (Nagahama *et al.*, 2018; Cruz-Maldonado *et al.*, 2021). In this context,  
11 many species are threatened because their evolutionary processes take place more slowly than  
12 environmental changes due to climate change (Botkin *et al.*, 2007). Therefore, understanding  
13 the change in phenotypic trait variation along environmental gradients is necessary to develop  
14 strategies aimed at the conservation, restoration and management of populations (Mousavi-  
15 Derazmahalleh *et al.*, 2018), since species success depends in great part on their intraspecific  
16 trait variation (McGill *et al.*, 2006; Pescador *et al.*, 2015; Halbritter *et al.*, 2018; Funk *et al.*,  
17 2019). For this reason, the number of studies that have monitored intraspecific trait variation  
18 have multiplied in the last few years (e.g., Carvalho *et al.*, 2020; Westerband *et al.*, 2020; Kühn  
19 *et al.*, 2021; Martin and Isaac, 2021).

20 Intraspecific trait variation has its basis in individual variation and in the traits' variability  
21 expression. It can be evaluated from the genetic variation and phenotypic plasticity perspectives  
22 (Violle *et al.*, 2012), two qualities that largely determine plants' persistence in a climate change  
23 scenario (Funk *et al.*, 2019; Westerband *et al.*, 2021) by maintaining population fitness in  
24 environments with great climatic variation (Matesanz *et al.*, 2010; Welles and Funk, 2021).

1 Many studies have used common garden experiments to distinguish the genetic or phenotypic  
2 plasticity origin of such variation (e.g., Lara-Romero *et al.*, 2014; Moncalvillo *et al.*, 2019;  
3 Matesanz *et al.*, 2020).

4 Species' phenotypic variation can be decomposed in two different sources of variability:  
5 within- and between-populations. Within-population phenotypic variation is an element that  
6 determines population success because its genetic component allows evolution by natural  
7 selection (Bolnick *et al.*, 2011; Westerband *et al.*, 2021). High within-population adaptive  
8 genetic variation may favour rapid evolutionary responses that can mitigate climate change  
9 effects and limit extinction rates (Sgrò *et al.*, 2011). However, in highly stressful conditions,  
10 within-population variation may be reduced due to the presence of powerful environmental  
11 filters that act above the level of the individual (Pescador *et al.*, 2015; Luo *et al.*, 2016; Helsen  
12 *et al.*, 2020). These abiotic filters can generate more coordinated phenotypes by increasing the  
13 number of correlations between traits (Carvalho *et al.*, 2020). This scenario limits natural  
14 selection performance and favours compensation between traits to maintain phenotype viability  
15 (Milla and Reich, 2011). On the other hand, between-population variation includes differences  
16 between populations that can be explained by the evolutionary history of populations,  
17 comprising isolation or adaptation processes, neutral genetic mechanisms, demographic  
18 bottlenecks and biotic and abiotic filters (Ohsawa and Ide, 2008). In this work, we have  
19 highlighted the role of latitude and elevation as shapers of abiotic filters. Latitude and elevation  
20 model the distribution of many climatic variables generating environmental gradients that may  
21 operate at a reduced spatial distance. For instance, increasing latitude is usually associated with  
22 lower temperatures, greater precipitation, and lower daily solar radiation (Li *et al.*, 1998).  
23 Similarly, increasing elevation is usually associated with lower temperatures and greater  
24 precipitation, but also to higher radiation exposure and snow accumulation (Körner, 2007). In  
25 this way, they influence traits' phenotypic expression (Hulshof *et al.*, 2013) and plants'

1 responses, shaping scenarios in which natural selection can play a relevant role in generating  
2 local adaptations (Ohsawa and Ide, 2008; Halbritter *et al.*, 2018).

3 Drought and rising temperatures can produce different responses according to the species  
4 considered. Annual species usually develop a drought escape strategy (Welles and Funk, 2021)  
5 that affects traits phenotypic variation. In this way, some foliar traits (e.g. specific leaf area or  
6 SLA and leaf dry matter content or LDMC) have been reported to be highly influenced by these  
7 climatic conditions (Yulin and Zhang, 2005; Hulshof *et al.*, 2013). In warmer environments,  
8 leaves tend to reduce evapotranspiration and to promote carbon assimilation (lower SLA and  
9 higher LDMC values) (Welles and Funk, 2021). In this sense, they can grow faster to (i)  
10 advance their phenology (e.g. earlier flowering onset) and (ii) to ensure their seeds contain the  
11 necessary assimilates to germinate (e.g. heavier seeds) (Rubio de Casas *et al.*, 2017; Anstett *et*  
12 *al.*, 2021; Welles and Funk, 2021; Matesanz *et al.*, 2022).

13 Here, we evaluated the within- and between-populations phenotypic variation of *Lupinus*  
14 *angustifolius* L. (Fabaceae) regarding foliar, phenological and reproductive traits using a  
15 common garden approach. To do so, we used two pairs of *L. angustifolius* populations selected  
16 according to their latitudinal divergence and marked climatic/environmental differences  
17 (northern *vs.* southern populations). The main objective of this study was to assess the  
18 genetically based phenotypic variation of *L. angustifolius* populations in terms of their  
19 evolutionary potential to respond to environmental threats derived from climate change.

20 In this context, we addressed the following hypotheses:

21 1) We consider that between-population phenotypic variation will mostly originate from  
22 divergent selection processes resulting from the contrasting temperature and water availability  
23 conditions caused by differences in latitude and elevation. Therefore, we expect between-  
24 population phenotypic variation to be greater at the latitudinal level (northern *vs.* southern

1 populations) than at the within-latitude level (differences between populations at a given  
2 latitude) and that the trait values obtained at each location will be associated with adaptations  
3 to high temperature and water availability constraints.

4 2) Southern latitude populations of *L. angustifolius*, occurring at higher temperatures and  
5 aridity, will experience more intense selective pressures (i.e., drought tolerance, early flowering  
6 onset, etc.). We expect southern populations to have a greater number of significant correlations  
7 between traits and less variation within and between populations compared to northern  
8 populations, since the intensity of selective pressures has been positively associated with  
9 phenotypic integration (i.e., the correlation of multiple functionally related traits) (Pigliucci,  
10 2003; Carvalho *et al.*, 2020).

11 3) Because higher selective pressures concomitant to southern populations are associated with  
12 specific limitations (i.e., high temperature, drought), the effect of these pressures will be more  
13 marked in functional traits more closely associated to these limitations. Therefore, we expect  
14 that between-population phenotypic variation at the contrasting latitudes will differ depending  
15 on the group of traits analysed (foliar, phenological and reproductive). Specifically, we  
16 anticipate that warmer environment populations will reduce water loss by lowering SLA and  
17 increasing LDMC values. In addition, we expect that they will advance the flowering phenology  
18 and produce larger seeds to guarantee their viability as part of an escape strategy to drought.

## 19 MATERIAL AND METHODS

### 20 Species and study site

21 *Lupinus angustifolius* is an annual self-pollinated herbaceous plant distributed across the  
22 Mediterranean Basin, occurring preferably in well-drained sandy acid soils, including disturbed  
23 or abandoned areas (Castroviejo and Pascual, 1999; Talhinas *et al.*, 2006). This legume has

1 palmate leaves with narrow leaflets and its racemose inflorescence contains bluish-purple  
2 flowers. Under natural conditions, *L. angustifolius* flowers tend almost exclusively to self-  
3 pollinate, as self-pollination takes place in early stages of development when the flower is still  
4 closed (Kazimierska and Kazimierski, 2002). Its legume fruits have variable seed content,  
5 commonly between three and six (Castroviejo and Pascual, 1999). The seed presents a hard  
6 cover that allows it to remain dormant until environmental conditions are adequate (Berger *et*  
7 *al.*, 2017). The flowering season takes place between March and August (Castroviejo and  
8 Pascual, 1999).

9 The western half of the Iberian Peninsula is considered the genetic diversity centre of the  
10 species and it is where this species is most widely distributed (Mousavi-Derazmahalleh *et al.*,  
11 2018). In 2016, two pairs of *L. angustifolius* populations occurring in the Iberian Peninsula  
12 were selected according to their latitudinal divergence, showing marked differences in  
13 temperature and precipitation (Table 1). Two of them, Zafrón (hereafter, FRO) and Zarapicos  
14 (hereafter, PIC) are located in Central Spain in Salamanca province, whereas the other two, La  
15 Garranchosa (hereafter, GAR) and Rivera de la Lanchita (hereafter, RIV) are located in  
16 southwestern Spain in Badajoz province. The latter two populations are located at lower latitude  
17 and elevation than the former. They also experience higher temperatures and lower water  
18 availability (Table 1). The populations were selected over others that were visited because they  
19 all had hundreds of individuals suggesting more stable population dynamics. In each  
20 population, 100 mother plants were haphazardly selected and their seeds were collected  
21 separately. The experiment developed in the present work used individuals descended from  
22 those originally sampled in 2016, since this work is part of a more extensive project (EVA  
23 project, AdAptA-lab, Rey Juan Carlos University, Móstoles, Madrid, [http://adapta-](http://adapta-<br/>24 lab.com/eva/)

## 25 **Common garden experiment**

**Comentado [1]:** ¿Por qué lo pusimos con mayúscula?  
¿en inglés se pone así o lo corregimos y ponemos en  
minúscula?

1 A common garden experiment was established in randomised blocks at the Rey Juan Carlos  
2 University (Móstoles, Madrid, CULTIVE laboratory <https://urjc-cultive.webnode.es/>; Table 1)  
3 to minimise the effect of environmental conditions and assess the genetic component in  
4 phenotypic trait expression. In November 2016 three seeds per each sampled mother plant of  
5 the species were subjected to manual mechanical scarification with a nail cutter, sown in a six-  
6 litre (L) pot with a 1:1 mix of commercial substrate and sand, and placed in a greenhouse  
7 irrigated by nebulisation. After germination and seedling emergence, the largest seedling was  
8 selected, and the other two were clipped. In March 2017 *L. angustifolius* individuals were  
9 moved to the acclimation area outside the greenhouse and grown with drip irrigation until plant  
10 senescence (June 2017). For two additional seasons (2018 and 2019), a new generation of *L.*  
11 *angustifolius* was grown in the common garden experiment using seeds obtained by natural  
12 self-pollination. Each season followed the same schedule: sowing in November, moving to  
13 outside facilities in March and plant senescence in June. After the first generation 25% of  
14 genotypes in each population were randomly selected and maintained with three siblings per  
15 genotype. When we mention “season”, we are alluding to the period between November and  
16 June, that is, from the time we started working with the seeds until we collected the fruits.

### 17 **Trait measurements**

18 Twelve functional traits were measured for *L. angustifolius* individuals during the 2018-2019  
19 season (Supplementary data Table S1) to avoid the variation associated with maternal effects  
20 in the first two seasons (2016-2017 and 2017/2018). In November 2018, seeds were weighed  
21 prior to sowing, and, once sown, the pots were monitored daily in November and December  
22 2018 to record the date of emergence of the individuals and obtain seed germination time. In  
23 March 2019, we recorded the date when the first flower began to bloom for each plant. Thus,  
24 we defined flowering onset as the number of days from the date of sowing to the date of  
25 appearance of the first flower. The recording of flowering end dates and leaf collection to



1 measure foliar traits began in April 2019. Finally, the fruits produced by each plant were  
2 collected in May 2019 to count the number of seeds per fruit.

### 3 - Foliar traits

4 Six foliar traits were obtained by performing calculations and direct measurements on leaves:  
5 1) sum of leaf area (FA), 2) specific leaf area (SLA), 3) relative water content (RWC), 4) leaf  
6 dry matter content (LDMC), 5) nitrogen content (N) and 6) phosphorus content (P). As the  
7 *Lupinus angustifolius* leaf is palmately compound (with five leaflets that are attached in a single  
8 point at the end of the petiole), these traits were measured by collecting the central leaflet of  
9 eight randomly chosen leaves per individual. FA was measured by scanning the leaflets  
10 (CanoScan LiDE 210; Canon; Japan, Tokio) and adding the leaflet areas obtained with ImageJ  
11 software (Abramoff *et al.*, 2004). SLA resulted from the ratio of FA and dry mass (measured  
12 in grams as the sum of the dry mass of the eight leaflets). The leaflets were dried in an oven at  
13 60°C for at least 72 hours (Digiheat-TFT; SELECTA; Spain, La Rioja). RWC was obtained as  
14 a percentage resulting from the following formula:  $[(M_f - M_d) / (M_s - M_d)] \times 100$ , where  $M_f$ ,  $M_d$   
15 and  $M_s$  are the fresh mass, dry mass and saturated mass of the leaflets sampled measured in  
16 grams (g), respectively. Dry mass was measured with an XPR microbalance (Mettler-Toledo;  
17 Greifensee, Switzerland), whereas fresh and saturated mass were measured with an analytical  
18 balance of KERN ABJ-ABS series (Solent Scale; Chichester, United Kingdom). LDMC is the  
19 percentage obtained from the ratio of dry and fresh mass of the leaflets. Finally, we performed  
20 the digestion of 50 milligrams (mg) of leaf sample according to the Kjeldahl method (Radojevic  
21 and Bashkin, 2015). Subsequently, Skalar protocols were used to obtain total nitrogen and  
22 phosphorus content (Skalar San++ autoanalyzer; Skalar, Netherlands). These analyses were  
23 performed at the Rey Juan Carlos University (Móstoles, Madrid, NUTRILAB laboratory  
24 <https://nutrilab-urjc.es>).

1 - Phenological traits

2 Four phenological traits were recorded: 1) seed germination time (Germination time), 2)  
3 flowering onset (Onset), 3) flowering end (End), and 4) flowering duration (Duration).  
4 Germination time was defined as the days elapsed from seed sowing to seed emergence. Onset  
5 and End were calculated as the days elapsed from the date of seed emergence to the appearance  
6 of the first open flower (Matesanz *et al.*, 2020), and the date the plant stopped producing new  
7 flowers, respectively. Duration was calculated as the days elapsed from flowering onset to  
8 flowering end.

9 - Reproductive traits

10 Two reproductive traits were measured: 1) germinated seed weight (Seed mass) and 2) average  
11 number of seeds per fruit (Seeds per fruit). Each seed mass was individually weighed in mg  
12 using an XPR microbalance (Mettler-Toledo; Greifensee, Switzerland). Seeds per fruit was  
13 obtained from 15 fruits randomly obtained from each individual (Supplementary data Table  
14 S1). These traits were measured as they are known to influence *L. angustifolius* reproductive  
15 success in water stressed environments (Helsen *et al.*, 2020).

16 **Statistical analyses**

17 All statistical analyses were performed using the R statistical environment (version 4.0.3) (R  
18 Core Team, 2020). To analyse the data at different spatial levels (population and latitudinal  
19 region), *L. angustifolius* populations were classified according to their latitude as “north” (FRO  
20 and PIC) or “south” (GAR and RIV) (Table 1).

21 First, trait responses were analyzed using Linear Mixed Models (LMM) and Generalized Mixed  
22 Models (GLMM) at both spatial levels (population and latitudinal region). For this approach,  
23 we use the `glmer` and `lmer` functions within the *lme4* package version 1.1-31 (Bates *et al.*, 2022).  
24 We defined LMM for continuous response variables (i.e., continuous traits: FA, SLA, RWC,

1 LDMC, N, P, Seed mass and Seeds per fruit) and GLMM for discrete response variables (i.e.,  
2 discrete traits: Germination time, Onset, End and Duration). We used a Gaussian distribution  
3 for continuous traits and a Poisson distribution for discrete traits. In all models, mother and  
4 block variables were introduced as random variables to control the variance due to maternal  
5 effects and the variance associated with position within the common garden experiment. At the  
6 population level, we included the variable population as a fixed variable and, at the latitudinal  
7 level, we nested the variable population inside the fixed variable latitude. The significance of  
8 fixed variables was determined by a type-II Wald chi-square statistic test. The significance test  
9 was obtained from the anova function within the *car* package version 3.1-1 (Fox and Weisberg,  
10 2019). To study the existence of significant differences in trait values between population pairs,  
11 we then performed a *post hoc* analysis using the Bonferroni adjustment with *pairwise.t.test*  
12 function in *pairwiseCI* package version 0.1-27 (Schaarschmidt and Gerhard, 2019).

13 Within and between population variation of each trait was estimated by calculating its  
14 coefficient of variation (CV). The 95% confidence intervals of the coefficients of variation were  
15 calculated using the *cv\_versatile* function of the R package *cvcqv* version 1.0.0 (Beigy, 2019).  
16 Comparison of CV confidence intervals between populations was performed using the  
17 inference described by Cumming (2009). Then, CV was represented by violin plots applying  
18 the *vioplot* function in *vioplot* R package version 0.3.7 (Adler *et al.*, 2020).

19 To visualize patterns of similarity between sample units at the population and latitude levels we  
20 performed principal component analyses (PCA) (Abdi and Williams, 2010) using the PCA  
21 function of the *FactoMineR* package version 2.4 (Lê *et al.*, 2008) which automatically  
22 standardise the variables. Leaf nitrogen and phosphorus content were not included in this  
23 analysis due to insufficient sample size. PCA results were represented with the *factoextra*  
24 package version 1.0.3 (Kassambara and Mundt, 2016).

1 Finally, Spearman correlation matrices were obtained with the R package *Hmisc* version 4.6-0  
2 (Harrell Jr and Dupont, 2020) for all pairs of traits at the different study levels, and then  
3 represented using R packages *igraph* version 1.2.7 (Csardi and Nepusz, 2006) and *ggraph*  
4 version 2.0.5 (Pedersen, 2021). In addition, correlation matrices between populations or  
5 between latitudes were compared using the *cor.test.mat* function of the *psych* R package version  
6 2.1.9 (Revelle, 2021) which develops a chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) test considering the differences between  
7 all possible pairs of correlations. This test is generated against the null hypothesis of no  
8 differences between the correlation matrices (Carvalho *et al.*, 2020).

## 9 RESULTS

### 10 Within- and between-population variation and latitude differentiation

11 Mean values differed in a greater number of traits at the population level (nine) than at the  
12 latitudinal level (seven) (Table 2). Both levels showed significant differences for FA, SLA,  
13 Seed mass, Onset, End and Duration (Table 2), but population level also showed significant  
14 differences for RWC, LDMC and Seeds per fruit (Table 2). Models detailed information is  
15 provided in Supplementary data (Tables S3, S4, S5 and S6). Differences between populations  
16 were greater between populations at different latitudes than between populations at the same  
17 latitude (Supplementary data Table S7). In particular, RIV was the southern population with  
18 the greatest number of significant differences in trait means with northern latitude populations  
19 (Supplementary data Table S7). Between populations of the same latitude, FRO and PIC  
20 populations significantly differed in FA, LDMC and Seeds per fruit, whereas GAR and RIV  
21 populations differed in SLA, RWC, LDMC, Onset, Duration and Seed mass traits  
22 (Supplementary data Table S7 and Figs. S1 and S2).

23 The first two principal components of the PCAs explained 48.40% of the variation in *L.*  
24 *angustifolius* (Fig. 1 A). PC1 axis had an important contribution from Onset, End and Seed

1 mass, whereas, in the PC2 axis, LDMC, Germination time and SLA were important traits (Fig.  
2 1 A; Supplementary data Table S8). In general terms, *L. angustifolius* individuals had similar  
3 traits according to their population of origin (Fig. 1 B). This is supported by the significant  
4 differences obtained at the population level for most of the studied traits (Table 2). Within-  
5 population phenotypic variation differed depending on the studied trait (Table 3). Thus, the  
6 phenotypic variation of five of the study traits was higher in FRO and PIC populations, whereas  
7 in four other traits, GAR was the population with the greatest within-population variation.  
8 Finally, population RIV had the least within-population variation in most of the traits (Table 3,  
9 Fig. 1 B).

10 From a latitudinal perspective, southern individuals were more clustered to each other than  
11 northern ones (Fig. 1 C). When we grouped *L. angustifolius* populations in northern and  
12 southern latitudes, we found fewer significant differences between the mean values of all traits,  
13 i.e., nine traits with significant differences at the population level *versus* seven at the latitude  
14 level (Table 2). Thus, northern latitude populations showed larger FA, finer leaves (higher SLA)  
15 and higher P (Table 2; Supplementary data Table S2 and Fig. S3). The CV of FA was  
16 significantly higher at the northern latitude, while RWC showed a significantly higher CV at  
17 the southern latitude (Supplementary data Table S7).

18 Flowering onset and end dates were later in the northern latitude populations, and duration was  
19 shorter (FRO and PIC, Tables 2; Supplementary data Table S2 and Fig. S4). Onset, End and  
20 Duration showed significantly greater within-latitude variation in the northern latitude  
21 populations, while Germination time showed greater variation at the southern latitude  
22 (Supplementary data Table S2). Seeds from the northern latitude populations had lower mass.  
23 Variation in Seed mass and Seeds per fruit was also significantly greater in the northern latitude  
24 populations (Supplementary data Table S2 and Fig. S4).

## 1 **Correlation patterns between traits**

2 All trait correlation matrices were significantly different from one another, both at the  
3 population and latitudinal levels. A more complex correlation network was observed in GAR  
4 and RIV (with 15 and 23 significant correlations, respectively) than in FRO and PIC (with 11  
5 and 13 significant correlations, respectively) (Fig. 2A, Supplementary data Tables S9 and S10).  
6 FRO, GAR and RIV populations presented significant correlations between the three trait  
7 blocks (foliar, phenological, and reproductive), whereas PIC presented significant correlations  
8 only between phenological and foliar traits (Fig. 2A, Supplementary data Tables S9 and S10).  
9 The southern and northern latitudes presented 25 and 13 significant trait correlations,  
10 respectively, nine of which were common to both latitudes (Fig. 2B, Supplementary data Table  
11 S11). Additionally, the number of significant correlations between reproductive traits was  
12 greater in the southern latitude populations (five in the southern latitude *versus* one in the  
13 northern latitude) (Fig. 2B, Supplementary data Table S11).

## 14 **DISCUSSION**

15 Common garden experiments allow the evaluation of phenotypic traits of plants from different  
16 origins under a common and homogeneous environment, reducing to negligible the effect of  
17 the environmental component in the expression of the phenotypes (de Villedenreuil *et al.*, 2016).  
18 Therefore, the differences observed in the phenotypic values can be attributed to genetic  
19 variation. This way, our common garden experiment provided an assessment of the genetic  
20 basis of the within- and between-population phenotypic variation in the studied *Lupinus*  
21 *angustifolius* populations, as well as some insight on their evolutionary potential to respond to  
22 climate change (Lara-Romero *et al.*, 2014). The results of the PCAs (Fig. 1 B and C) in  
23 combination with the CVs values at both study levels (Table 3, Supplementary data Table S2)  
24 showed a larger phenotypic variation when the populations from different latitudes were

1 compared. Furthermore, several of the trait values obtained at each location (Table 2 and 3,  
2 Supplementary data Table S2) can be associated with adaptations to high temperature and water  
3 availability constraints, supporting, thus, our first hypothesis. The results obtained also  
4 supported our second hypothesis with lower phenotypic variation in most traits in the southern  
5 latitude populations (Supplementary data Table S2) and greater number of significant  
6 correlations between traits (Supplementary data Tables S9, S10 and S11). Finally, as predicted  
7 in our third hypothesis, between-population phenotypic variation differed depending on the  
8 group of traits analysed. We expected a more marked differential pattern on foliar traits as they  
9 are known to be closely related to the drought and high temperature environmental filters that  
10 mainly affect the southern populations. However, differences in phenological traits were, in this  
11 case, also very determinant allowing southern populations to develop an escape strategy to  
12 drought.

### 13 **Greater phenotypic variation at the latitudinal level**

14 The distribution of individuals in the PCAs allowed us to identify a greater dispersion of  
15 phenotypes at the latitudinal level (Fig. 1B and 1C). This is supported by the knowledge that  
16 environmental filters at local levels (population level) favor similar phenotypes (Gaüzère *et al.*,  
17 2022), i.e., lead to a reduction of phenotypic variation. Combining this observation with the  
18 CVs detected at both levels (population and latitudinal), allowed us to conclude that there is  
19 greater phenotypic variation at the latitudinal level than between populations (Tables 3,  
20 Supplementary data Table S2). For example, the clustering of RIV and GAR slightly diluted  
21 the lower CV values of the RIV population for some of the traits (e.g., FA, SLA, RWC, LDMC,  
22 N, P, Germination time, Duration, Seed mass and Seeds per fruit). As we predicted, phenotypic  
23 variation was greater on the latitudinal level for some of the traits. Thus, this pattern of  
24 phenotypic variation at the latitudinal level indicated that latitude acts as a potential  
25 environmental filter (Hulshof *et al.*, 2013). As Ohsawa and Ide (2007) suggest, this may be due

1 to the greater environmental differences existing at this scale, favouring more contrasted  
2 between-population variation.

3 **Greater number of significant correlations between traits and less variation within and**  
4 **between populations in southern populations**

5 Southern populations were more limited in their phenotypic variation probably due to the  
6 presence of more restrictive abiotic filters (e.g., more intense drought and aridity), supporting  
7 the observations of Anderegg *et al.* (2020) and Carvalho *et al.* (2020). We noted this in the  
8 lower phenotypic variation found in many traits (lower CV) at the southern latitude (e.g., FA,  
9 N, Onset, End, Duration, Seed mass and Seeds per fruit) (Supplementary data Table S2). Thus,  
10 higher temperatures and lower water availability generated more challenging environmental  
11 conditions reducing the number of available phenotypes (and, thus, genotypes) (Sgrò *et al.*,  
12 2011; Pescador *et al.*, 2015; Luo *et al.*, 2016; Carvalho *et al.*, 2020; Helsen *et al.*, 2020) in *L.*  
13 *angustifolius* southern populations.

14 The increase in the number of correlations between traits found in *L. angustifolius* southern  
15 populations (Fig. 2), in addition to lower phenotypic variation, presents a more complicated  
16 situation for these populations. The combination of these two elements generates more  
17 coordinated phenotypes, resulting in the process of phenotypic integration (Carvalho *et al.*,  
18 2020). The occurrence of these trade-offs may discard phenotypes that could favour the survival  
19 of *L. angustifolius* southern populations under changing environmental conditions. This  
20 ultimately could put populations at risk (Anstett *et al.*, 2021).

21 For future studies, it would be interesting to add other species to integrate characteristics of the  
22 species that are known to affect phenotypic variation (e.g., life cycle and reproductive strategy).  
23 In this sense, *L. angustifolius* is an annual species with an autogamous reproductive strategy  
24 (Castroviejo and Pascual, 1999). An annual strategy triggers a higher number of correlations



1 and constrictions between traits (Carvalho *et al.*, 2020) by undergoing faster evolution (with  
2 greater loss of genetic variation) (Anstett *et al.*, 2021). The autogamous character contributes  
3 to reducing population genetic variation, favouring population isolation and local adaptation  
4 events.

#### 5 **Phenotypic variation varies according to the group of traits studied**

6 Our third hypothesis was supported by the differences found in phenotypic variation according  
7 to the trait groups formed (foliar, phenological and reproductive). This underlines the  
8 importance of studying a variety of traits when assessing the evolutionary potential of a species  
9 and, therefore, its capacity to respond to various threats (Westerband *et al.*, 2021).

#### 10 - Foliar traits

11 The lower SLA values (a consequence of lower FA) obtained in the southern latitude  
12 populations (Supplementary data Table S2) could be a strategy aimed at reducing leaf  
13 evapotranspiration in warmer and drier environments (Pescador *et al.*, 2015; Matesanz *et al.*,  
14 2020). Thus, water constraints seem to play a fundamental role in some foliar traits at southern  
15 latitudes (Pescador *et al.*, 2015). In northern latitudes the response is likely to be different.  
16 Summer drought is less intense in northern latitudes of *L. angustifolius* (FRO and PIC) where  
17 annual temperatures are lower (Table 1). This allows *L. angustifolius* individuals to extend their  
18 capture of resources (higher SLA) and develop a strategy of rapid biomass production (Yulin  
19 and Zhang, 2005). At the same time, lower LDMC values would be expected in northern *L.*  
20 *angustifolius* populations since SLA and LDMC are known to be negatively correlated.  
21 However, the relationship between SLA and LDMC weakens when nutrient limitation becomes  
22 the main determining factor (Yulin and Zhang, 2005).

#### 23 - Phenological traits

1 Phenological trait responses to an environmental change are essential to ensure population  
2 viability (Nagahama *et al.*, 2018). When such responses are triggered in the flowering period,  
3 their reproductive success may be affected (Nagahama *et al.*, 2018; Buonaiuto and Wolkovich,  
4 2020). Flowering period is a complex process that depends on multiple factors defined by the  
5 environment itself. These could be summarized as (i) cold temperatures from autumn to late  
6 winter, (ii) warm temperatures from late winter to early spring, and (iii) photoperiod (Ettinger  
7 *et al.*, 2020). In this study, flowering phenology was much earlier in southern latitude  
8 populations of *L. angustifolius* (GAR and RIV) than in northern populations (FRO and PIC)  
9 (Table 3). We infer that southern populations of *L. angustifolius* have developed a drought  
10 escape strategy by expressing an earlier flowering onset under environmental conditions that  
11 do not allow them to extend their life cycle (Anstett *et al.*, 2021; Welles and Funk, 2021;  
12 Matesanz *et al.*, 2022). For this reason, within the same project, a field experiment has been  
13 developed for verifying the results obtained in this section (Sacristán-Bajo, under preparation).  
14 With this experiment, we could specify that this pattern favours GAR and RIV reproductive  
15 success in a warmer environment with lower water availability (Matesanz *et al.*, 2020).  
16 Southern latitude populations of *L. angustifolius* showed greater variation in germination time  
17 according to their CVs. This provides a greater response capacity to adjust to different and  
18 unpredictable environmental conditions (Sgrò *et al.*, 2011). Thus, seeds can remain dormant to  
19 germinate when conditions become favourable (Rubio de Casas *et al.*, 2017).

#### 20 - Reproductive traits

21 *L. angustifolius* reproductive traits showed marked patterns between latitudes. Southern  
22 populations GAR and RIV had lower seed production, but the seeds were heavier. This could  
23 be interpreted as an adaptation to drought (Rubio de Casas *et al.*, 2017; Matesanz *et al.*, 2020).  
24 Greater seed mass is related to a strategy focused on ensuring individual survival until it can  
25 reach reproductive maturity in stressful environments (Helsen *et al.*, 2020). However, this

1 reduces the growing season and the maturation time to seed and fruit (Primack, 1987). Reducing  
2 seed maturation time triggers a trade-off, reducing the number of seeds produced (Helsen *et al.*,  
3 2020).

#### 4 **CONCLUSION**

5 The genetic basis of phenotypic variation studied in the present work allows us to assess the  
6 potential of *Lupinus angustifolius* to generate an adaptive response to climate change.  
7 Moreover, the evaluation of within- and between-population variation in different functional  
8 traits was highly relevant for identifying the different environmental conditions that shape  
9 variation in the phenotypic traits of populations and the potential of populations to deal with  
10 environmental changes. In this context, populations with lower within-population variation and  
11 more coordinated phenotypes (GAR and RIV) may be more vulnerable to swift environmental  
12 changes because it reduces their ability to adapt. The assessment of different groups of  
13 functional traits showed that phenological traits were the most determinant for phenotypic  
14 expression in *L. angustifolius*. The reproductive system and life cycle of *Lupinus angustifolius*  
15 conditioned the traits pattern, as well as the latitudinal and altitudinal differences of the  
16 populations studied. Finally, this work highlights the role of the study of within- and between-  
17 populations traits variation in predicting populations' ability to face climate change.

#### 18 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

19 We thank Carlos Díaz, José Margalet and Victoria Calvo for the technical support in the  
20 CULTIVE facility laboratory greenhouse. We also thank Alastair Plant and Lori De Hond for  
21 language editing. This work was carried out thanks to the financial support of the EVA project  
22 (CGL2016-77377-R) of the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation and found action by  
23 the Community of Madrid in the framework of the Multiannual Agreement with the Rey Juan  
24 Carlos University in line of action 1, "Encouragement of Young Phd students' investigation"

1 Project Ref. M2178 Acronym GAFE. Carlos Lara-Romero was supported by a Juan de la Cierva  
2 Incorporación post-doctoral fellowship (Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades:  
3 IJC2019-041342-I).

#### 4 **LITERATURE CITED**

5 Abdi H, Williams LJ. 2010. Principal component analysis. *WIREs Computational Statistics 2* :  
6 433-459.

7 Abràmoff MD, Magalhães PJ, Ram SJ. 2004. Image processing with ImageJ. *Biophotonics*  
8 *International 11* : 36-42.

9 Adler D, Kelly ST. 2020. *vioplot: violin plot*. R package version 0.3.7.

10 Anderegg LDL, Loy X, Markham IP, *et al.* 2020. Aridity drives coordinated trait shifts but not  
11 decreased trait variance across the geographic range of eight Australian trees. *New Phytologist*  
12 *Foundation 229* : 1375-1387.

13 Anstett DN, Branch HA, Angert AL. 2021. Regional differences in rapid evolution during  
14 severe drought. *Evolution Letters 5* : 130-142.

15 Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B, *et al.* 2022. *Linear Mixed-Effects Models using 'Eigen' and*  
16 *S4*. R package version 1.1-31.

17 Beigy M. 2019. *cvcqv: Coefficient of Variation (CV) with Confidence Intervals (CI)*. R package  
18 version 1.0.0.

19 Berger JD, Shrestha D, Ludwig C. 2017. Reproductive strategies in mediterranean legumes:  
20 trade-offs between phenology, seed size and vigor within and between wild and domesticated  
21 *Lupinus* species collected along aridity gradients. *Frontiers in Plant Science 8* : 1-16.

- 1 Bolnick DI, Amarasekare P, Araújo MS, *et al.* 2011. Why intraspecific trait variation matters  
2 in community ecology. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 26 : 183-192.
- 3 Botkin DB, Saxe H, Araújo MB, *et al.* 2007. Forecasting the effects of global warming on  
4 biodiversity. *BioScience* 57 : 227-236.
- 5 Buonaiuto DM, Wolkovich EM. 2020. Differences between flower and leaf phenological  
6 responses to environmental variation drive shifts in spring phenological sequences of temperate  
7 woody plants. *Journal of Ecology* 109 : 2922-2933.
- 8 Carvalho B, Bastias CC, Escudero A, Valladares F, Benavides R. 2020. Intraspecific  
9 perspective of phenotypic coordination of functional traits in Scots pine. *PLOS ONE* 2 : 1-15.
- 10 Castroviejo S, Pascual H. 1999. *Lupinus* L. In: Talavera S, Aedo C, Castroviejo S, *et al.*, eds.  
11 *Flora iberica. Plantas vasculares de la Península Ibérica e Islas Baleares*. Madrid: Real Jardín  
12 Botánico CSIC, 251-260.
- 13 Cruz-Maldonado N, Weemstra M, Jiménez L, *et al.* 2021. Aboveground-trait variations in 11  
14 (sub)alpine plants along a 1000-m elevation gradient in tropical Mexico. *Alpine Botany* 131 :  
15 187-200.
- 16 Csárdi G, Nepusz T. 2006. "The igraph software package for complex network research."  
17 *InterJournal, Complex Systems* 1695 : 1-9.
- 18 Cumming G. 2009. Inference by eye: Reading the overlap of independent confidence intervals.  
19 *Statistics in Medicine* 28 : 205-220.
- 20 De Villemereuil P, Gaggiotti OE, Mouterde M, Till-Bottraud I. 2016. Common garden  
21 experiments in the genomic era: new perspectives and opportunities. *Heredity* 116 : 249-254.
- 22 Ettinger AK, Chamberlain CJ, Morales-Castilla I, *et al.* 2020. Winter temperatures predominate  
23 in spring phenological responses to warming. *Nature Climate Change* 10 : 1137-1142.

- 1 Fox J, Weisberg S. 2019. *An R Companion to Applied Regression*. R package, version 3.1-1.
- 2 Funk WC, Forester BR, Converse SJ, Darst C, Morey S. 2019. Improving conservation policy  
3 with genomics: a guide to integrating adaptive potential into U.S. Endangered Species Act  
4 decisions for conservation practitioners and geneticists. *Conservation Genetics* 20 : 115-134.
- 5 Gaüzère P, Blonder B, Denelle P, *et al.* 2022. The functional trait distinctiveness of plant  
6 species is scale dependent. *Ecography*. 2023 : 1-15.
- 7 Halbritter AH, Fior S, Keller I, *et al.* 2018. Trait differentiation and adaptation of plants along  
8 elevation gradients. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*. 31 : 784-800.
- 9 Harrell Jr FE, Dupont C. 2020. *Package "Hmisc" for R: Harrell Miscellaneous*. R package,  
10 version 4.6-0.
- 11 Helsen K, Prasad Acharya K, Jessen Graae B, *et al.* 2020. Earlier onset of flowering and  
12 increased reproductive allocation of an annual invasive plant in the north of its novel range.  
13 *Annals of Botany* 126 : 1005-1016.
- 14 Hulshof CM, Violle C, Spasojevic MJ, *et al.* 2013. Intra-specific and inter-specific variation in  
15 specific leaf area reveal the importance of abiotic and biotic drivers of species diversity across  
16 elevation and latitude. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 24 : 921-931.
- 17 Kassambara A, Mundt F. 2016. *Package "factoextra" for R: Extract and Visualize the Results  
18 of Multivariate Data Analyses*. R package, version 1.0.3.
- 19 Kazimierska EM, Kazimierski T. 2002. Biology of flowering, embryological and caryological  
20 peculiarities. In: Kurlovich, B.S. (ed.) *Lupins. Geography, classification, genetic resources  
21 and breeding*. St. Petersburg OY International North Express, 205-239.

- 1 Körner C. 2007. The use of “altitude” in ecological research. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*.  
2 22 : 569–574.
- 3 Kühn P, Backes AR, Römermann C, Bruelheide H, Haider S. 2021. Contrasting patterns of  
4 intraspecific trait variability in native and non-native plant species along an elevational gradient  
5 on Tenerife, Canary Islands. *Annals of Botany* 127 : 565-576.
- 6 Lara-Romero C, García-Camacho R, Escudero A, Iriondo JM. 2014. Genetic variation in  
7 flowering phenology and reproductive performance in a mediterranean high-mountain  
8 specialist, *Armeria caespitosa* (Plumbaginaceae). *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* 176  
9 : 384-395.
- 10 Lê S, Josse J, Husson F. 2008. FactoMineR: A package for multivariate analysis. *Journal of*  
11 *Statistical Software* 25 : 1–18.
- 12 Li B, Suzuki J-I, Hara T. 1998. Latitudinal variation in plant size and relative growth rate in  
13 *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Oecologia* 115: 293-301.
- 14 Luo Y-H, Liu J, Tan S-L, *et al.* 2016. Trait-based community assembly along an elevational  
15 gradient in subalpine forests: quantifying the roles of environmental factors in inter- and  
16 intraspecific variability. *PLoS ONE* 5 : 1-20.
- 17 Martin AR, Isaac ME. 2021. The leaf economics spectrum’s morning coffee: plant size-  
18 dependent changes in leaf traits and reproductive onset in a perennial tree crop. *Annals of*  
19 *Botany* 127 : 483-493.
- 20 Matesanz S, Gianoli E, Valladares F. 2010. Global change and the evolution of phenotypic  
21 plasticity in plants. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1 : 35-55.
- 22 Matesanz S, Ramos-Muñoz M, Moncalvillo B, *et al.* 2020. Plasticity to drought and ecotypic  
23 differentiation in populations of a crop wild relative. *AoB PLANTS* 12 : 1-13.

- 1 Matesanz S, Ramos-Muñoz M, Rubio Teso ML, Iriondo JM. 2022. Effects of parental drought  
2 on offspring fitness vary among populations of a crop wild relative. *The Royal Society*  
3 *Publishing* 289 : 1-11.
- 4 McGill BJ, Enquist BJ, Weiher E, Westoby M. 2006. Rebuilding community ecology from  
5 functional traits. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 21 : 178-185.
- 6 Milla R, Reich PB. 2011. Multi-trait interactions, not phylogeny, fine-tune leaf size reduction  
7 with increasing altitude. *Annals of Botany* 107 : 455-465.
- 8 Moncalvillo B, Méndez M, Iriondo JM. 2019. Ecotypic differentiation reveals seed colour-  
9 related alkaloid content in crop wild relative. *Plant Biology* 21 : 942-950.
- 10 Mousavi-Derazmahalleh M, Bayer PE, Nevado B, *et al.* 2018. Exploring the genetic and  
11 adaptive diversity of pan-Mediterranean crop wild relative: narrow-leafed lupin. *Theoretical*  
12 *and Applied Genetics* 131: 887-901.
- 13 Murren CJ. 2012. The integrated phenotype. *Integrative and Comparative Biology* 52 : 64-76.
- 14 Nagahama A, Kubota Y, Satake A. 2018. Climate warming shortens flowering duration: a  
15 comprehensive assessment of plant phenological responses based on gene expression analyses  
16 and mathematical modeling. *Ecological Research* 33 : 1059-1068.
- 17 Ohsawa T, Ide Y. 2008. Global patterns of genetic variation in plant species along vertical and  
18 horizontal gradients on mountains. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 17 : 152-163.
- 19 Pedersen TL. 2021. *Package "ggraph" for R: An implementation of grammar of graphics and*  
20 *networks*. R package, version 2.0.5.
- 21 Pescador DS, De Bello F, Valladares F, Escudero A. 2015. Plant trait variation along an  
22 altitudinal gradient in mediterranean high mountain grasslands: controlling the species turnover  
23 effect. *PLoS ONE* 3 : 1-16.



- 1 Pigliucci M. 2003. Phenotypic integration: studying the ecology and evolution of complex  
2 phenotypes. *Ecology Letters* 6 : 265-272.
- 3 Primack RB. 1987. Relationships among flowers, fruits and seeds. *Annual Review of Ecology*  
4 *and Systematics* 18 : 409-430.
- 5 Radojevic M, Bashkin VN. 2015. *Practical environmental analysis*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Cambridge: RSC  
6 Publishing.
- 7 Revelle W. 2021. *psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality*  
8 *Research*. R package version 2.1.9.
- 9 R Core Team. 2020. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation  
10 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org>.
- 11 Rubio de Casas R, Willis CG, Pearse WD, Baskin CC, Baskin JM, Cavender-Bares J. 2017.  
12 Global biogeography of seed dormancy is determined by seasonality and seed size: a case study  
13 in the legumes. *New Phytologist* 214 : 1527-1536.
- 14 Sacristán-Bajo S, García-Fernández A, Lara-Romero C, *et al.* 2023. Population origin  
15 determines the adaptive potential for the advancement of flowering onset in *Lupinus*  
16 *angustifolius* L. (Fabaceae). *Evolutionary Applications* 16 : 62-73.
- 17 Schaarschmidt F, Gerhard D. 2019. *Confidence Intervals for Two Sample Comparisons*. R  
18 package version 0.1-27.
- 19 Sgrò CM, Lowe AJ, Hoffmann AA. 2011. Building evolutionary resilience for conserving  
20 biodiversity under climate change. *Evolutionary Applications* 4 : 326-337.

1 Talhinhos P, Leitaó J, Neves-Martins J. 2006. Collection of *Lupinus angustifolius* L. germplasm  
2 and characterisation of morphological and molecular diversity. *Genetic Resources and Crop*  
3 *Evolution* 53 : 563-578.

4 Violle C, Enquist BJ, McGill BJ, *et al.* 2012. The return of the variance: intraspecific variability  
5 in community ecology. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 27 : 244-252.

6 Welles SR, Funk JL. 2021. Patterns of intraspecific trait variation along an aridity gradient  
7 suggest both drought tolerance strategies in an invasive herb. *Annals of Botany* 127 : 461-471.

8 Westerband A, Knight TM, Barton KE. 2020. Intraspecific trait variation and reversals of trait  
9 strategies across key climate gradients in native Hawaiian plants and non-native invaders.  
10 *Annals of Botany* 127 : 553-564.

11 Westerband AC, Funk JL, Barton KE. 2021. Review: Intraspecific trait variation in plants: a  
12 renewed focus on ecological processes. *Annals of Botany* 127 : 397-410.

13 Yulin L, Zhang TH. 2005. Specific leaf area and leaf dry matter content of plants growing in  
14 sand dunes. *Botanical Bulletin* 46 : 127-134.

15

16

17

18

19 Fig. 1. Principal component analyses of *Lupinus angustifolius*. The x axis (PC1) represents  
20 principal component one, while the y axis (PC2) the principal component two. Variable  
21 contributions in the construction of the principal components (A1 and A2) are represented with  
22 a colour scale from orange (high contribution) to cyan (low contribution). In each axis (A1 and

1 A2), percentage of variance explained by each principal component is indicated. Principal  
 2 component analyses at the population level (B1 and B2) and latitudinal level (C1 and C2)  
 3 represent individuals by points with different colors and shapes depending on the population  
 4 (B1 and B2) or latitude (C1 and C2) to which they belong.

5 Fig. 2. Network of significant correlations of *Lupinus angustifolius* populations (A) and  
 6 latitudes (B). Arrows symbolize the type of significant correlation obtained: continuous line =  
 7 positive correlation; dashed line = negative correlation. The size of the arrows indicates the  
 8 value of the correlation: correlation values between 0/0.29 and 0/-0.29, 0.5-point size; values  
 9 between 0.3/0.49 and -0.3/-0.49, 1-point size; and values 0.5 and above and equal or below -  
 10 0.5, 1.5-point size. Foliar traits are represented by green: sum of leaf area (FA), relative water  
 11 content (RWC), specific leaf area (SLA), leaf dry matter content (LDMC), phosphorus (P) and  
 12 nitrogen content (N); phenological traits by pink: seed germination time (Germination time),  
 13 flowering onset, end and duration (Onset, End and Duration); and reproductive traits by blue:  
 14 germinated seed weight (Seed mass) and average seeds per fruit (Seeds per fruit).

15

16

17

18

19

20 Table 1. Geographic coordinates and climatic variables corresponding to the studied  
 21 populations of *Lupinus angustifolius*. The climatic variables are represented as mean annual  
 22 temperature (T) measured in degrees Celsius, and May-July precipitation (P) measured in  
 23 millimeters; elevation is measured in meters. Latitude to which each population belongs (north

1 or south) is also denoted. Climatic data of *L. angustifolius* populations belong to the 1985-2015  
 2 time series and common garden data located in Móstoles (Madrid) belong to the 2017-2020  
 3 time series. Data were obtained from Sacristán-Bajo *et al.*, (2023).

| Localities (population)       | Latitude | Geographic coordinates   | Elevation | T    | P  |
|-------------------------------|----------|--------------------------|-----------|------|----|
| Zafrón (FRO)                  | North    | 41.024192N;<br>6.028155W | 840       | 12.4 | 92 |
| Zarapicos (PIC)               | North    | 41.004358N;<br>5.813066W | 820       | 12.6 | 89 |
| Rivera de la Lanchita (RIV)   | South    | 38.351586N;<br>6.576084W | 352       | 16.8 | 61 |
| La Garranchosa (GAR)          | South    | 38.325735N;<br>6.433735W | 422       | 16.5 | 64 |
| Common garden (Móstoles) 2017 |          |                          |           | 15.1 | 72 |
| Common garden (Móstoles) 2018 |          |                          |           | 14.6 | 95 |
| Common garden (Móstoles) 2019 |          |                          |           | 14.8 | 16 |
| Common garden (Móstoles) 2020 |          |                          |           | 15.1 | 69 |

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Table 2. Chi-square statistic ( $X^2$ ), degrees of freedom (Df) and p-value of type II Wald chi  
 11 squared tests for all GLMM and LMM generated on population and latitude level. Significant  
 12 values are indicated by the p-value when  $<0.05 = *$ ,  $<0.01 = **$  and  $<0.0001 = ***$ .

| Fixed effects | $X^2$ | Df | p-value | Fixed effects    | $X^2$ | Df | p-value |
|---------------|-------|----|---------|------------------|-------|----|---------|
| <b>FA</b>     |       |    |         | <b>Seed mass</b> |       |    |         |

|             |           |   |      |                         |            |   |      |
|-------------|-----------|---|------|-------------------------|------------|---|------|
| Population  | 57.3<br>0 | 3 | ***  | Population              | 296        | 3 | ***  |
| Latitude    | 4.98      | 1 | *    | Latitude                | 98.52      | 1 | ***  |
| <b>SLA</b>  |           |   |      | <b>Seeds per fruit</b>  |            |   |      |
| Population  | 75.3<br>9 | 3 | ***  | Population              | 168.5<br>2 | 3 | ***  |
| Latitude    | 4.97      | 1 | *    | Latitude                | 2.23       | 1 | 0.14 |
| <b>RWC</b>  |           |   |      | <b>Onset</b>            |            |   |      |
| Population  | 12.7<br>1 | 3 | **   | Population              | 173.7<br>1 | 3 | ***  |
| Latitude    | 1.30      | 1 | 0.25 | Latitude                | 73.94      | 1 | ***  |
| <b>LDMC</b> |           |   |      | <b>End</b>              |            |   |      |
| Population  | 57.2<br>5 | 3 | ***  | Population              | 34.53      | 3 | ***  |
| Latitude    | 3.22      | 1 | 0.07 | Latitude                | 33.62      | 1 | ***  |
| <b>N</b>    |           |   |      | <b>Duration</b>         |            |   |      |
| Population  | 0.72      | 3 | 0.87 | Population              | 102.5<br>3 | 3 | ***  |
| Latitude    | 0.05      | 1 | 0.83 | Latitude                | 8.99       | 1 | **   |
| <b>P</b>    |           |   |      | <b>Germination time</b> |            |   |      |
| Population  | 7.83      | 3 | 0.05 | Population              | 3.38       | 3 | 0.34 |
| Latitude    | 3.99      | 1 | *    | Latitude                | 2.19       | 1 | 0.14 |

1

2

3

4

5 Table 3. Mean, standard deviation (SD) and coefficients of variation (CV) with 95% confidence  
6 intervals for leaf traits: 1) sum of leaf area (FA), 2) specific leaf area (SLA), 3) relative water  
7 content (RWC), 4) leaf dry matter content (LDMC), 5) nitrogen (N) and 6) phosphorus (P)  
8 content; phenological traits: 1) seed germination time (Germination time), 2) flowering onset  
9 (Onset), 3) end (End) and 4) duration (Duration); and reproductive traits: 1) weight of

- 1 germinated seed (Seed mass) and 2) average of seeds per fruit (Seeds per fruit), from *Lupinus*  
2 *angustifolius* populations (FRO, PIC, GAR and RIV).

|                            | Mean $\pm$ SD         |                       |                       |                       | CV                      |                         |                         |                         |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|                            | FRO                   | PIC                   | GAR                   | RIV                   | FRO                     | PIC                     | GAR                     | RIV                     |
| FA (cm <sup>2</sup> )      | 14.39 $\pm$<br>3.10   | 16.81 $\pm$ 4.79      | 13.15 $\pm$<br>2.61   | 11.93 $\pm$<br>2.24   | 21.47 (17.57;<br>26.42) | 28.42 (23;<br>33.95)    | 19.79 (17.10;<br>23.05) | 18.69 (16.13;<br>21.52) |
| SLA (cm <sup>2</sup> /g)   | 211.31<br>$\pm$ 32.78 | 216.42 $\pm$<br>31.63 | 198.30<br>$\pm$ 30.17 | 174.27<br>$\pm$ 27.08 | 15.46 (12.85;<br>18.33) | 14.56 (12.29;<br>17.25) | 15.17 (12.49;<br>18.30) | 15.49 (13.14;<br>18.21) |
| RWC (%)                    | 84.91 $\pm$<br>4.29   | 83.82 $\pm$ 3.92      | 84.66 $\pm$<br>5.98   | 86.80 $\pm$<br>4.31   | 5.04 (4.28;<br>5.87)    | 4.66 (3.83;<br>5.60)    | 7.04 (5.87;<br>8.42)    | 4.95 (4.02;<br>6.04)    |
| LDMC (%)                   | 15.28 $\pm$<br>1.07   | 14.69 $\pm$ 1.11      | 13.76 $\pm$<br>1.25   | 14.57 $\pm$<br>0.92   | 6.99 (5.94;<br>8.22)    | 7.49 (5.62;<br>9.46)    | 9.03 (7.25;<br>10.81)   | 6.30 (5.16;<br>7.47)    |
| N (mg/g)                   | 50.61 $\pm$<br>13.67  | 50.71 $\pm$ 13.48     | 52.85 $\pm$<br>14.64  | 49.70 $\pm$<br>10.71  | 26.76 (21.50;<br>33.86) | 26.32 (17.12;<br>36.38) | 36.69 (17.48;<br>54.20) | 21.33 (14.80;<br>29.79) |
| P (mg/g)                   | 4.88 $\pm$<br>1.16    | 4.57 $\pm$ 0.96       | 4.60 $\pm$<br>1.05    | 3.81 $\pm$<br>0.78    | 23.52 (16.50;<br>32.03) | 20.69 (12.39;<br>30.48) | 33.01 (11.71;<br>49.61) | 20.17 (15.93;<br>25.79) |
| Germination<br>time (days) | 9 $\pm$ 2             | 9 $\pm$ 2             | 9 $\pm$ 3             | 9 $\pm$ 2             | 22 (17; 27)             | 20 (17; 23)             | 28 (23; 34)             | 20 (17; 24)             |
| Onset (days)               | 116 $\pm$ 8           | 118 $\pm$ 10          | 103 $\pm$ 5           | 99 $\pm$ 6            | 7 (5; 9)                | 8 (7; 10)               | 5 (4; 6)                | 6 (5; 7)                |
| End (days)                 | 165 $\pm$ 6           | 165 $\pm$ 6           | 155 $\pm$ 4           | 157 $\pm$ 5           | 4 (3; 5)                | 4 (3; 6)                | 3 (2; 3)                | 3 (3; 4)                |
| Duration<br>(days)         | 47 $\pm$ 9            | 47 $\pm$ 8            | 51 $\pm$ 5            | 57 $\pm$ 6            | 19 (14; 23)             | 17 (14; 20)             | 10 (8; 13)              | 10 (7; 12)              |
| Seed mass<br>(mg)          | 112.60<br>$\pm$ 18.25 | 106.56 $\pm$<br>21.32 | 163.83<br>$\pm$ 23.48 | 154.99<br>$\pm$ 17.95 | 16.15 (13.24;<br>19.61) | 19.94 (15.93;<br>24.35) | 14.29 (12.64;<br>15.98) | 11.55 (9.48;<br>13.49)  |
| Seeds per<br>fruit         | 5.75 $\pm$<br>0.32    | 5.19 $\pm$ 0.42       | 5 $\pm$ 0.32          | 5.07 $\pm$<br>0.29    | 5.47 (4.42;<br>6.63)    | 7.97 (6.49;<br>9.63)    | 6.39 (4.70;<br>8.07)    | 5.79 (4.47;<br>7.19)    |