Meta-analysis of meta-analyses in plant evolutionary ecology

Maria Clara Castellanos¹ and Miguel Verdú²

Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Centro de Investigaciones sobre
Desertificación (CSIC-UV-GV), 46113, Moncada, Valencia, Spain

¹ maclacas@uv.es, ² miguel.verdu@uv.es

Running title: Meta-analysis of meta-analyses in plant evolutionary ecology

Keywords Biotic and abiotic selective pressures; fitness and non-fitness traits;
second-order meta-analysis.

Total word count (excluding references, tables and figures): 4089 words

Word counts for each section:

Abstract: 309

Introduction: 793

Materials and Methods: 1183

Results: 421

Discussion: 1393

37 cited references, 1 figure and 1 table

1 online appendix with 51 references

Abstract. After two decades of meta-analyses on plant traits, we can now look for global emergent patterns in plant evolutionary ecology. Hundreds of meta-analyses have focused on the effects of specific selection pressures on plant fitness, and the buildup of such results allows us to ask general questions regarding selection pressures and plant responses, a major focus of evolutionary ecology. Plant traits are affected by both abiotic and biotic factors. For example, biotic pressures like herbivory may affect physiological (i.e. secondary defences) and reproductive (i.e. seed predation) traits. Similarly, abiotic pressures such as increased CO₂ may affect both plant physiology and reproduction. We tested whether biotic or abiotic selective pressures are more important for plant traits, and if the strength of the response to those pressures depends on the plant trait studied by meta-analyzing published meta-analyses on plant responses. We classify meta-analyses according to the type of response variable studied (fitness and non-fitness traits) and the type of selective pressure examined (biotic or abiotic). Our database showed biases in the meta-analysis literature, for example that the majority of studies are focused on non-fitness traits, i.e. on traits that are not directly related to reproduction or survival, and furthermore, on non-fitness traits under abiotic selection pressures. The meta-meta-analysis showed that the strength of responses to selection depends on the nature of selection (stronger for biotic than for abiotic factors) but, unexpectedly, not on the type of trait under study as previously found. The stronger responses to biotic factors can be explained if biotic selection is more variable in space and time, driven by interactions with other organisms. The relative importance of biotic versus abiotic factors on plant traits has been little studied in the past, and would benefit from more studies and reviews that fill the under-represented combinations of selective pressures and plant traits (i.e. abiotic factors on fitness traits).

Introduction

After two decades of meta-analyses on plant traits, beginning with the introduction of the technique in the field of ecology in the early 1990's (see Gurevitch et al. 2001), it is timely to look for global emerging patterns in the literature. In the field of plant evolutionary ecology specifically, hundreds of meta-analytical studies have focused on the effects of specific selection pressures on a single or a few plant fitness components. As a result, generalizations can be made, for example on how increased N availability or increased herbivore activity can affect plant growth or reproductive output and how such effects hold across experiments and plant species. The buildup of meta-analytic results, however, allows us to go further and ask more general questions regarding selection pressures and plant responses, i.e. the types of questions on patterns of selection that are a major focus of modern evolutionary ecology. Key questions that can be explored are whether biotic or abiotic selective pressures are more important for plants, and if the strength of the response to those pressures depends on the plant trait studied.

Natural selection is an important force behind phenotypic differentiation across a wide range of plant traits (Kingsolver et al. 2001; Rieseberg et al. 2002). However, not all traits are expected to be targeted by selection in the same way. For example, traits closely related to fitness, such as life history traits, are expected to experience stronger selection than other types of traits (Merilä and Sheldon 1999). Tests of this idea have come to different conclusions, depending on the methodological approach. Kingsolver et al. (2001) compared selection gradients and differentials measured in wild populations across different types of traits, and found that morphological traits were subject to stronger selection than life history traits. Rieseberg et al. (2002) on the other

hand, compared the signature of selection with a more “historical” approach, using the direction of effects of quantitative trait loci (the QTL sign test), and found evidence of stronger and more consistent selection on life history than on morphological characters.

Contrasting results are not necessarily surprising because selective pressures are expected to affect plant performance in complex ways (Bell 2010). For example, the strength, form and direction of selection can vary in time (Grant and Grant 2002; Siepielski et al. 2009; Kingsolver and Diamond 2011) and space (Linhart and Grant 1996; Schluter 2000; Herrera et al. 2006) but see also Morrissey and Hadfield (2012). In addition, the type of selection pressure, whether biotic or abiotic, could also exert different responses from plant traits. Biotic selective pressures depend on the interactions with other organisms, such as predators or mutualists, whose distributions and densities can vary rapidly and unpredictably and can therefore be expected to be less consistent in strength, space and time (Linhart and Grant 1996; Thompson 2005). Plant responses to biotic pressures could be then expected to be weaker and less consistent across species and populations than to abiotic pressures. However, a recent study suggests that biotically-selected traits are governed by fewer genes with a large effect, which could allow populations to move faster among variable peaks in an adaptive landscape (Louthan and Kay 2011). Although previous studies have tested for differences between measures of selection on fitness traits compared to other types of traits, to our knowledge no studies have specifically explored the potential differences in selection when the pressures are biotic or abiotic.

We assembled here a database of diverse meta-analyses that allows us to simultaneously test for the strength of the effects of biotic and abiotic selection pressures and the responses of different types of traits (fitness versus non-fitness). We also tested for the interaction between them, which could reveal differential effects of

biotic or abiotic factors on different types of traits. We address these questions quantitatively by performing a meta-analysis of published meta-analyses, or a second-order meta-analysis, an approach that has been little used in ecology so far, but is already common practice in the medical sciences (usually referred to as “umbrella reviews” when various reviews are compared in narrative form, or “multiple treatment meta-analysis” when multiple meta-analytic results are compared under specific models; Caldwell et al. 2010; Ioannidis 2009). Specifically, we compare, with meta-analytical techniques, a) the global effect sizes of meta-analyses of biotic versus abiotic selection pressures, b) the global effect sizes of fitness versus non-fitness response traits, and c) the interaction between them. Note that we are not dealing with data on selection gradients or differentials (as defined by Lande and Arnold 1983), but with studies that control or measure the selective factors and record their effect on plant traits. In addition, we use our database to describe patterns in the published meta-analysis literature on plant evolutionary ecology and detect potential biases towards certain types of reviews.

Materials and methods

Clarification of the terminology used in the remaining of the article follows. The data base used in our qualitative and quantitative analyses is composed of *meta-analyses* mean effect sizes extracted from *publications* that may or may not include more than one meta-analysis. Each meta-analysis in turn included *original case studies*. Data points in our *second-order meta-analysis* are meta-analyses mean effect sizes and not the original case studies. Methods are detailed below.

We compiled the data set of published meta-analyses on plant traits by performing a literature search in the Web of Science with topic keywords “meta-analysis and plant” (as of September 2011). We purged down the initial list of around 440 publications to include meta-analyses that met the following requisites. a) Studies had to perform a formal meta-analysis, that is, a comparison of weighted effect sizes across data sets. b) Meta-analyses were revisions of the published literature designed to extract general patterns. This excludes studies that used formal meta-analytical techniques to compare various sets of original data. c) We excluded meta-analyses performed exclusively on crop species under agricultural conditions, because a long history of artificial selection might affect current response to selective pressures. d) We included only meta-analyses focused on plant traits that can be measured in individuals. Community level (e.g. species richness) or ecosystem level traits (e.g. litter decomposition) were not considered. e) We also excluded allometric meta-analyses that were purely morphological (e.g. trunk diameter vs. leaf area), when they had no clear evolutionary implications.

We classified the remaining meta-analyses according to the type of response variable studied (growth, physiology, reproduction or survival) and the type of selective pressure examined (biotic or abiotic). Response variables were in turn grouped as fitness variables (reproduction and survival) or non-fitness (physiological and growth traits). This division might not seem straightforward, as it can be argued that growth or development are fitness components as well. Our rationale follows that of Merilä and Sheldon (1999), which assumes that reproductive traits and survival are more closely related to fitness itself than other traits.

From each meta-analysis we extracted global effect sizes and their associated sample sizes and sampling error variances to use them as weights. Sampling error

variance is the square of the standard error, but these estimates are seldom reported in the literature. Instead, 95% confidence interval of the effect size is usually provided and half the width of the 95% CI divided by 1.96 is a good approximation to the standard error. We did not include partial effect sizes (predictor factors) that subdivide data sets already used to calculate a global effect (e.g. subdividing data sets to test the effect of ant mutualisms on herbivory in shrubs versus herbs, Chamberlain and Holland 2009), to avoid pseudoreplication. When several global effect sizes were provided by the same publication to test separate response variable types (e.g. physiological, reproduction, etc), we included all of them. For example, mutualism effects on growth and reproduction of target plants were studied independently by Trager et al. (2010) and therefore we included two global effects from this publication. Furthermore, if the original meta-analysis mixed the types of response variables we were interested in, we recalculated a global effect size for each variable type if the original data set was available. For example, Bailey et al. (2009) reported effects of introgression on a mixture of physiological, morphological, and reproductive response variables in *Populus*. We recalculated global effect sizes for growth and physiological response variables separately from their supplementary data set.

For our final second-order meta-analysis, we needed to transform individual meta-analyses' effect sizes to a common metric. However, the most common effect metric used in ecological studies, the log of the response ratio ($\ln RR$) cannot be transformed into other metrics in a straightforward way (M. Lejaunesse, pers. com.). We therefore limited our quantitative analysis to meta-analyses reporting $\ln RR$ and closely related metrics (e.g. percentage of change) and excluded those reporting metrics based on standardized mean differences (i.e. Hedges d) or correlation coefficients. Because the $\ln RR = \ln(X^E) - \ln(X^C)$, i.e. the ratio of the outcome of an experimental group to that of

a control group, our database for the quantitative analysis is composed mostly of meta-analyses of controlled experimental studies, but not exclusively, because some also include original case studies using natural variation (e.g. Chamberlain and Holland 2009; Trager et al. 2010).

There was no significant correlation between effect size and sample size ($r = 0.02$, $df = 137$, $P = 0.81$), suggesting against the biased publication of high effect sizes.

Statistical analyses

Because we were only interested in the strength of plant trait responses to selective pressures, the sign of the effect sizes was not informative in our analysis. We therefore used the absolute values of effect sizes (lnRR) to run Bayesian meta-analyses as explained below. Using the absolute values could introduce an upward bias when estimated effect sizes are non-significantly different from zero (Hereford et al. 2004). However, we do not expect this to affect our comparisons, because around 80% of the reported meta-analyses were significant. In addition, we are not testing for significance in effect sizes, but rather for differences in their strength.

We first calculated an index of heterogeneity among meta-analyses (I^2 ; Higgins and Thompson 2002) using the MCMCglmm R package as suggested by Nakagawa and Santos (2012). Values of I^2 around 25%, 50% and 75% reflect small, medium and large heterogeneity (Higgins et al 2003). For the second-order meta-analysis, we fitted Generalized Linear Mixed Models using Markov chain Monte Carlo techniques with the help of the MCMCglmm package for R (Hadfield 2010). The effect size was the dependent variable in the model, and two types of weights were used: i) sample size and ii) inverse of the sampling error variance. Both weighting strategies have been used in

social sciences (Hunter and Schmidt 2004 and references therein) as well as in ecology (eg., van Groenigen et al 2011). Comparisons of the performance of both methods can be found in Marín-Martínez and Sánchez-Meca (2010) and in Lajeunesse and Forbes (2003). Weights passed to the *mev* argument of MCMCglmm (Hadfield and Nakagawa 2010). We ran 13000 MCMC iterations with a burn-in period of 3000 iterations and convergence of the chain was tested by means of an autocorrelation statistic. The priors used were $\mu=0$ and $V=I*1e+10$, where I is an identity matrix of appropriate dimension. The type of selective variable (biotic and abiotic) and the type of response variable (fitness and non-fitness) were included as predictors in the MCMCglmm model, including an interaction. Although separate global effect sizes could come from the same publications, we decided against using the publication as a random grouping factor in the model. This is because 1) separate meta-analyses reported in the same publications are not necessarily non-independent, because they are derived from different sets of original study cases, and 2) publications deal with only one of the selective variable types (biotic or abiotic), so that including it as a random factor would remove important variance from the main predictors unintentionally. The effect of predictors was estimated by calculating the 95% credible interval of their posterior distribution (Nakagawa and Cuthill 2007).

Results

General patterns in the literature

Our final data set included 196 meta-analyses based on more than 17800 original study cases, reported in 51 publications (Table 1 and appendix). This sample reflects a bias in

the literature towards meta-analyses of non-fitness traits (154 versus 42 involving fitness responses), and particularly towards those of non-fitness traits under abiotic selection (102 studies). In contrast, only 9 meta-analyses in our data base dealt with biotic characters under abiotic selective pressures.

Most abiotic selective pressures were climatic variables (111 vs. only 3 related to disturbance). Among the climatic variables, there is a majority of meta-analyses dealing with responses to elevated CO₂ (50 meta-analyses) and exposure to UV-B radiation (25). Biotic pressures are all related to interactions, spanning from ant-plant mutualisms (10 meta-analyses), to herbivory (19), interactions with plant neighbors (11), and less often with plant-microbial interactions, pollinators, etc.

Finally, fitness responses are most often some measurement of reproductive output (37 of 42 studies), while survival is the response variable in only 5 studies. In contrast, within non-fitness variables there is a balance between growth and physiological responses (77 each).

Quantitative analysis

As explained above, we limit our quantitative analysis to the subset of meta-analyses in our database reporting lnRR as the effect size (N= 139 meta-analyses in 30 publications. Sampling error variance could only be obtained from 134 meta-analyses, see appendix). We detected a large value of heterogeneity among meta-analyses ($I^2 = 99.6\%$; [99.5, 99.7]), which justified using predictors. Results were very similar for both weighting – sample size and variance- procedures. We found no significant interaction between the type of selective variable (biotic and abiotic) and the type of response variable (fitness and non-fitness) in their effect on effect sizes (posterior mean estimate = -0.010, 95%

246 CI [-0.251 to 0.208] for sample size weighted and -0.043 [-0.197, 0.079] for variance
247 weighted models). We therefore tested for the main effects of the two variables in a
248 model without interaction. It showed no significant differences in effect sizes between
249 fitness and non-fitness response variables (-0.059, [-0.172, 0.044] for sample size
250 weighted and -0.014 [-0.086, 0.051] for variance weighted models). However, there was
251 a significant effect of the type of selective variable analyzed, because biotic variables
252 elicit higher responses than abiotic ones (0.188 [0.104, 0.273] for sample size weighted
253 and 0.177 [0.120, 0.234]). Raw mean effect sizes and their standard errors are shown
254 in Fig. 1. These results are unchanged if we include response variables as physiology,
255 growth, or reproduction traits instead of grouping them as fitness or non-fitness.

Discussion

Our review of the meta-analytical literature of selection pressures on plants showed, on the one hand, that the majority of meta-analyses are studies of non-fitness traits and mostly on a few abiotic selection pressures such as increased CO₂ concentrations. On the other hand, these biases did not prevent a quantitative comparison of the effects of different selective pressures, which showed that the strength of responses to selection depends on the nature of selection (biotic versus abiotic factors) but, unexpectedly, not on the type of trait under selection. We discuss these results below.

Trends in the meta-analysis literature

Biases in our data base allowed us to detect biases in the meta-analysis literature. The majority of review studies are focused on non-fitness traits, i.e. on traits that are not directly related to reproduction or survival, and furthermore, on non-fitness traits under abiotic selection pressures. Certainly measuring a plant's reproductive output might be more difficult than measuring a morphological or physiological character and this can be one of the reasons for the unbalanced number of reviews. We suspect there is also a tradition of studying plant reproductive responses in a biotic context, and physiological and growth traits as influenced by abiotic environments (see Geber and Griffen 2003). These trends are reinforced by the recent boom of climate change studies, as reflected by the high number of CO₂ and UV radiation papers. The differential number of meta-analyses might then reflect a general bias in the plant literature. Louthan & Kay (2011), for example, also detected a bias towards abiotic-selected traits in a review of plant QTL mapping studies.

Strength of biotic and abiotic selection on fitness and non-fitness traits

Our approach to comparing the strength of selection on different types of traits differs from other review papers (Kingsolver et al. 2001, Rieseberg et al. 2002, Geber and Griffen 2003) in that we compare the results of multiple meta-analyses in a global, second order meta-analysis that includes thousands of results published in the literature. In addition, we do not focus on phenotypic selection as those articles, but on studies that control biotic or abiotic environmental variation and measure the resulting fitness and non-fitness responses. Because phenotypic selection studies do not formally measure environmental variation, such studies would not be appropriate to test our hypothesis. Still, we can compare our results on response variables to theirs. As opposed to those previous findings, we did not detect differences in the strength of responses to selection among different types of traits, either fitness or non-fitness. In contrast, when we looked for differences in the responses to selection elicited by biotic versus abiotic traits, we found a clear signal. Biotic-driven selection leads to stronger selection on traits in general when compared to abiotic selection pressures, at least for plants. It is possible that the biotic-abiotic comparison absorbs the differences between fitness and non-fitness traits detected in previous studies, as both variables are collinear in our database because of the biases described above.

The differential responses to biotic versus abiotic is a question that had been basically unexplored. The main exception is the recent study by Louthan and Kay (2011), who compiled mapping studies on plant traits and compared the direction and effect sizes of QTLs controlling biotic and abiotic-selected traits. Because they were not dealing with selection studies directly, but rather with the consequences of selection on

the genetic architecture of traits, they classified traits *a-priori* as putatively abiotic- or biotic-selected. Our study is the first that can confidently assign studies to the type of selection pressure. Our reviewed studies report more immediate responses and the results are therefore less historical than a QTL comparison, but in spite of the difference in approaches, the two studies found consistent results. Louthan and Kay (2011) found QTL's of larger effect associated with biotic-selected traits, and we found stronger observed responses of traits under biotic pressures. Both results are expected for traits that are under variable selective pressures, as can be the case for biotic selective agents. Biotic agents and interactions can vary strongly in space and time (Thompson 2005 and references therein), and consequently produce complex selective landscapes with multiple peaks or peaks that in turn shift in time and space. Such selective scenario can produce phenotypic responses that are stronger than under more subtle abiotic changes, and in turn select for QTLs of major effects.

To further explore the relative importance of biotic versus abiotic factors on plant character evolution it is clear that a higher diversity of studies would be very useful. In particular, case studies and meta-analyses in the under-represented categories (fitness traits under abiotic selection and non-fitness traits under biotic selection) would be very valuable. In addition, fully factorial case studies on the effects of biotic and abiotic pressures on both fitness and non-fitness traits in individual species are scant but potentially very informative.

Guide for future meta-analyses of meta-analysis

The broad use of formal meta-analytical techniques in plant ecology has undoubtedly contributed to our capacity for summarizing and extracting general results, based on the

331 strength of combining many varied individual studies. We here take the next step of
332 combining effect sizes of meta-analyses on diverse plant systems and traits in a second
333 order meta-analysis. This approach is already frequently used in the health sciences,
334 particularly to answer clinical questions, where for example different treatments for the
335 same disease need to be compared but results are reported in independent reviews
336 (Ioannidis 2009; Becker and Oxman 2011). Multiple-treatment meta-analysis is used to
337 formally compare meta-analytic results in a network approach that incorporates direct
338 and indirect comparisons of clinical treatments (Hasselblad, 1998; Caldwell et al. 2010).
339 Our analysis is a simplified version of such models.

340 One advantage of the approach of meta-analyzing meta-analyses is that it allows a
341 high level of generalization using a very large number of individual case results already
342 summarized in meta-analyses (in our case, more than 17800) that would be very
343 impractical to attempt with the original studies. Most meta-analyses, except perhaps the
344 most recent ones, do not list each individual study case included and their associated
345 effect size, sample size and variance, all required for a new meta-analysis based on the
346 original studies. In a recent article that used published meta-analyses to find groups of
347 papers on specific topics and extract individual study information (Barto and Rillig
348 2011), the authors report that they had to limit their analysis to a small fraction of the
349 available publications, because few report the necessary data for each case study. In our
350 case, using the original data would then imply going back to each case study and
351 repeating the work done by meta-analytical studies. Another advantage of the second-
352 order approach of using published meta-analyses compared to searching for original
353 case studies is that meta-analyses are prepared by expert authors, who identify the
354 relevant questions on each topic and the appropriate case studies to answer them. In a

broad second-order meta-analysis like ours, such level of expertise is left to the original reviews.

Nonetheless, some aspects need to be considered carefully before combining review studies in second-order meta-analysis. First, it is possible that the same individual original studies are included in more than one of the meta-analytic publications available on a given topic. Our questions here were so broad and the number of individual studies on different topics so large, that it is unlikely that this form of pseudoreplication has affected our conclusions. Smaller and more focused meta-analyses should probably be more concerned with excluding replicated results. Care should also be taken not to include meta-analyses that were not careful about another possible form of pseudoreplication, i.e, using the same case studies (and same experimental individuals) to conclude on different effects. Second, there are statistical problems with the conversion of effect sizes to a single common metric, as explained in the Methods section. This can be a problem in ecological studies particularly, because a variety of effect sizes are commonly used and in particular response ratios, whose statistical properties have not been fully studied yet. Because of this problem, we had to limit our quantitative analysis to a single family of effect size metrics and exclude many potentially informative meta-analyses. Finally, future second-order meta-analyses addressing evolutionary issues should ideally include phylogenetic-informed effect sizes (Verdú and Traveset 2004), because of the ubiquity of phylogenetic signal in ecological traits (Blomberg et al. 2003).

Acknowledgements

We thank J. Sánchez-Meca for comments and discussion on the use of meta-analysis of meta-analyses in ecology and other disciplines, and three reviewers for constructive

380 comments on an earlier version of the manuscript. S. Nakagawa helped with the
381 statistical analyses. This work was developed under the framework of projects
382 VAMPIRO (CGL2008-05289-C02-01) and the European LinkTree project
383 (BiodivERsA, EUI2008-03713). MCC was supported by a JAE-Doc CSIC scholarship.

References

- Bailey JK, Schweitzer JA, Úbeda F, Koricheva J, LeRoy CJ, Madritch MD, Rehill BJ, Bangert RK, Fischer DG, Allan GJ, Whitham TG (2009) From genes to ecosystems: a synthesis of the effects of plant genetic factors across levels of organization. *Philos T Roy Soc B* 364 (1523):1607-1616
- Barto EK, Rillig MC (2011) Dissemination biases in ecology: effect sizes matter more than quality. *Oikos* DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0706.2011.19401.x
- Becker LA, Oxman AD (2011) Chapter 22: Overviews of reviews. In: Higgins JPT, Green S (eds) *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011). The Cochrane Collaboration. Available from www.cochrane-handbook.org
- Bell G (2010) Fluctuating selection: the perpetual renewal of adaptation in variable environments. *Phil Trans R Soc B* 365 (1537):87-97
- Blomberg SP, Garland T, Ives AR (2003) Testing for phylogenetic signal in comparative data: behavioral traits are more labile. *Evolution* 57:717-745
- Caldwell DM, Welton NJ, Ades AE (2010) Mixed treatment comparison analysis provides internally coherent treatment effect estimates based on overviews of reviews and can reveal inconsistency. *J Clin Epidemiol* 63 (8):875-882
- Chamberlain SA, Holland JN (2009) Quantitative synthesis of context dependency in ant-plant protection mutualisms. *Ecology* 90 (9):2384-2392
- Geber MA, Griffen LR (2003) Inheritance and natural selection on functional traits. *Int J Plant Sci* 164 (3 Suppl.):S21-S42
- Grant PR, Grant BR (2002) Unpredictable evolution in a 30-year study of Darwin's finches. *Science* 296:707-711

408 Groenigen, KJ , Osenberg CW, Hungate BA. 2011. Increased soil emissions of potent
 409 greenhouse gases under increased atmospheric CO₂. *Nature* 475: 214-216.
 410 Gurevitch J, Curtis PS, Jones MH (2001) Meta-analysis in Ecology. *Advances in*
 411 *Ecological Research* 32:199-247
 412 Hadfield JD (2010) MCMC methods for multi-response generalised linear mixed
 413 models: the MCMCglmm R package. *J Stat Sci* 33 (2):1
 414 Hadfield JD, Nakagawa S (2010) General quantitative genetic methods for comparative
 415 biology: Phylogenies, taxonomies and multi-trait models for continuous and
 416 categorical characters. *J Evol Biol* 23 (3):494-508
 417 Morrissey M, Hadfield J (2012) Directional selection in temporally replicated studies is
 418 remarkably consistent. *Evolution* DOI: 10.1111/j.1558- 5646.2011.01444.x.
 419 Hasselblad V (1998) Meta-analysis of multitreatment studies. *Med Decis Making* 18
 420 (1):37-43
 421 Hereford J, Hansen TF, Houle D (2004) Comparing strengths of directional selection:
 422 how strong is strong? *Evolution* 58 (10):2133-2143
 423 Herrera CM, Castellanos MC, Medrano M (2006) Geographical context of floral
 424 evolution: towards an improved research programme in floral diversification. In:
 425 Harder LD, Barrett SCH (eds) *Ecology and Evolution of Flowers*. Oxford University
 426 Press, New York, pp178-294
 427 Higgins JPT, Thompson SG (2002) Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis.
 428 *Statist Med* 21 (11):1539-1558
 429 Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG (2003) Measuring inconsistency in
 430 meta-analyses. *British Medical Journal* 327:557-560
 431 Hunter, J. E. & Schmidt, F. L. (2004). *Methods of meta-analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand
 432 Oaks, CA: Sage.

433

434 Ioannidis JP (2009) Integration of evidence from multiple meta-analyses: a primer on
 435 umbrella reviews, treatment networks and multiple treatments meta-analyses. *CMAJ*
 436 181 (8):488-493

437 Kingsolver JG, Diamond SE (2011) Phenotypic selection in natural populations: what
 438 limits directional selection? *Am Nat* 177 (3):346-357

439 Kingsolver JG, Hoekstra HE, Hoekstra JM, Berrigan D, Vignieri SN, Hill CE, Hoang
 440 A, Gibert P, Beerli P (2001) The strength of phenotypic selection in natural
 441 populations. *Am Nat* 157 (3):245-261

442 Lajeunesse, M.J. and Forbes, M.R. (2003) Variable reporting and quantitative reviews:
 443 a comparison of three meta-analytical techniques. *Ecology Letters* 6, 448–454

444 Lande R, Arnold SJ (1983) The measurement of selection on correlated characters.
 445 *Evolution* 37:1210–1226

446 Linhart YB, Grant MC (1996) Evolutionary significance of local genetic differentiation
 447 in plants. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* 27:237-277

448 Louthan AM, Kay KM (2011) Comparing the adaptive landscape across trait types:
 449 larger QTL effect size in traits under biotic selection. *BMC Evol Biol* 11:60

450 Marín-Martínez, F. and Sánchez-Meca, J. (2010). Weighting by inverse variance or by
 451 sample size in random-effects meta-analysis. *Educational and Psychological*
 452 *Measurement* 70, 56-73.

453 Merilä J, Sheldon BC (1999) Genetic architecture of fitness and nonfitness traits:
 454 empirical patterns and development of ideas. *Heredity* 83:103-109

455 Nakagawa S, Cuthill IC (2007) Effect size, confidence interval and statistical
 456 significance: a practical guide for biologists. *Biol Rev* 82 (4):591-605

457 Nakagawa S, Santos ESA (2012). Methodological issues and advances in biological
 458 meta-analysis. *Evol. Ecol* DOI 10.1007/s10682-012-9555-5.
 459 Rieseberg LH, Widmer A, Arntz AM, Burke JM (2002) Directional selection is the
 460 primary cause of phenotypic diversification. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 99 (19):12242-
 461 12245
 462 Schluter D (2000) The ecology of adaptive radiation. Oxford series in Ecology and
 463 Evolution. Oxford University Press, New York
 464 Siepielski AM, DiBattista JD, Carlson SM (2009) It's about time: the temporal
 465 dynamics of phenotypic selection in the wild. *Ecol Lett* 12 (11):1261-1276
 466 Thompson JN (2005) The Geographic Mosaic of Coevolution. University of Chicago
 467 Press, Chicago
 468 Trager MD, Bhotika S, Hostetler JA, Andrade GV, Rodriguez-Cabal MA, McKeon CS,
 469 Osenberg CW, Bolker BM (2010) Benefits for plants in ant-plant protective
 470 mutualisms: a meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 5 (12):e14308
 471 Verdú M, Traveset A (2004) Bridging meta-analysis and the comparative method: A
 472 test of seed size effect on germination after frugivores' gut passage. *Oecologia* 138:
 473 414-418.

474 **Figure legends**

475

476 Figure 1. Raw mean and 1 standard error of effect sizes (lnRR) for meta-analyses
477 classified according to the type of selective variable (biotic and abiotic) and the type of
478 response variable (fitness and non-fitness). Sample sizes for each group are included.

Table 1. Number of meta-analyses in each category of selective pressures and trait response types included in this revision. Details and references are in appendix 1.

Selective pressure	Response trait type	Meta-analyses in this study
Biotic	Fitness	
	reproduction	28
	survival	5
	Non-fitness	
	physiology	14
	growth	38
Abiotic	Fitness	
	reproduction	9
	survival	0
	Non-fitness	
	physiology	63
	growth	39