TITLE:

Theory of coevolution of cytoplasmic male-sterility, nuclear restorer and selfing

AUTHOR(S):

Yamauchi, Atsushi; Yamagishi, Takahiro; Booton, Ross; Telschow, Arndt; Kudo, Gaku

CITATION:

Yamauchi, Atsushi ...[et al]. Theory of coevolution of cytoplasmic male-sterility, nuclear restorer and selfing. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 2019, 477: 96-107

ISSUE DATE:

2019-09-21

URL:

<http://hdl.handle.net/2433/243218>

RIGHT:

© 2019. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>; The full-text file will be made open to the public on 21 September 2020 in accordance with publisher's 'Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving'; この論文は出版社版ではありません。引用の際には出版社版をご確認ご利用ください。; This is not the published version. Please cite only the published version.

**Theory of coevolution of cytoplasmic male-sterility,
nuclear restorer and selfing**

Atsushi Yamauchi^{1†}, Takahiro Yamagishi¹, Ross Booton², Arndt Telschow³, Gaku Kudo⁴

Running title: CMS, restorer and selfing

Journal of Theoretical Biology, 477 (2019) 96–107

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2019.06.011>

¹ Center for Ecological Research, Kyoto University, Hirano 2-509-3, Otsu 520-2113, Japan

² School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College London, Medical School Building, St Mary's Campus, Norfolk Place, London W2 1PG, United Kingdom

³ Institute for Environmental Systems Research, Osnabrück University, 49069 Osnabrück, Germany

⁴ Faculty of Environmental Earth Science, Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-0810, Japan

[†] (Corresponding author)

Atsushi Yamauchi

Tel: +81-77-549-8259

Fax: +81-77-549-8201

E-mail: a-yama@ecology.kyoto-u.ac.jp

27 **ABSTRACT**

28 Gynodioecy is a sexual polymorphism in angiosperms, where hermaphroditic and female individuals
29 coexist. This is often caused by a cytoplasmic genetic element (CGE) that destroys male functions,
30 which is called cytoplasmic male-sterility (CMS). On the other hand, nuclear genes tend to evolve the
31 ability to restore male function. The coevolutionary process of CMS and the restoration has been studied
32 theoretically. Recently, a theoretical study suggested that these coevolutionary dynamics could be
33 influenced by the rate of selfing within populations, although it assumed that the selfing rate of a
34 population was a fixed parameter. Accordingly, we theoretically study the coevolution of three traits in
35 this paper: CMS, nuclear restorer and selfing rate, in which we hypothesize that selfing evolution can
36 suppress CMS evolution under some conditions. The analysis indicates three significant properties of the
37 system; (1) CMS-restorer evolution can result in bistability under a given selfing rate, (2) the
38 coevolution of three traits can realize intermediate levels of selfing, and (3) the evolution of high levels
39 of selfing is conditionally associated with no CMS and/or no restoration, which may support our
40 hypothesis.

41

42 Keywords: gynodioecy, inter-genomic conflict, pollen discounting, pollen limitation, inbreeding
43 depression, cost of restorer

44

45

46 **INTRODUCTION**

47 Gynodioecy is a sexual polymorphism in angiosperms, where hermaphroditic and female individuals
48 coexist within a population. Gynodioecy is often caused by a cytoplasmic genetic element (CGE) which
49 destroys male functions, typically through mitochondrial mutants (see review by Hanson (1991)), which
50 is termed cytoplasmic male-sterility (CMS). Lewis (1941) was a pioneer in the theoretical research of
51 CMS evolution in plants. He showed that the CMS cytoplasm can increase in a population if CMS
52 results in an advantage in female fitness, and that a frequency of CMS reaches a stable equilibrium if the
53 female fitness involves a negative frequency dependence. After this, Lloyd (1974) theoretically studied
54 the dynamics of both nuclear- and cytoplasmic-controlling male-sterility, and investigated the effects of
55 self-fertilization on gynodioecy. Lloyd (1975) then extended his previous study by considering
56 inbreeding depression and showed that male-steriles can be maintained in a population when their
57 obligatorily outcrossed progenies have higher fitness than the inbred progeny (from self-fertilization in
58 hermaphrodites).

59 CGEs are not transmitted to offspring via male gametes, therefore they would evolve male-
60 sterility when CGEs promote the individual female function. On the other hand, the male function can
61 genetically contribute to nuclear transmission via male gametes, which results in the inter-genomic
62 conflict between CGE and nucleus (Burt & Trivers, 2009), by which nuclear restorer evolves to recover
63 male function. Including this factor, theoretical models were developed to investigate the coevolution
64 between CMS and nuclear restorer allele (Charlesworth & Ganders, 1979). Those early theoretical
65 studies of the coevolution of CMS and nuclear restorer concluded that the final population is fixed for
66 CMS with either restorer fixation (i.e., hermaphrodite) or remains polymorphic for the restorer alleles. In
67 the case with restorer polymorphism, individuals with and without restorer allele develop into
68 hermaphrodite and female, respectively, which corresponds to gynodioecy in some species, called

69 "nuclear gynodioecy" (NG). In other species, however, both nuclear gene and cytoplasm are responsible
70 for the individual sex determination (Bailey & Delph, 2007b), which is called "nuclear-cytoplasmic
71 gynodioecy" (NCG) (Dornier & Dufay, 2013). In order to explain the role of cytoplasm in determining
72 sexuality, theoretical researchers have included a cost of restoration into the model (Delannay *et al.*,
73 1981, Charlesworth, 1981, Gouyon *et al.*, 1991, Jacobs & Wade, 2003, McCauley & Bailey, 2009,
74 Bailey & Delph, 2007b, Dufay *et al.*, 2007), which indicated the importance of restoration cost in the
75 stable maintenance of nuclear-cytoplasmic gynodioecy. Theoretical studies have also shown that the
76 restoration cost can contribute to the coexistence of multiple types of restorer-CMS interactions in a
77 population (Gouyon *et al.*, 1991, Maurice *et al.*, 1993, Bailey *et al.*, 2003). Furthermore, Gouyon *et al.*
78 (1991) and Dufay *et al.* (2007) showed that when both restorer and CMS are accompanied by costs, a
79 continuous oscillation with a limit cycle is possible in a gynodioecious population. These theoretical
80 studies of restoration cost have revealed evolutionary dynamics of nuclear-cytoplasmic gynodioecy,
81 although the recent studies tended to focus on self-incompatible species (except for a discussion by
82 Jacobs and Wade (2003)), thereby ignoring effects of selfing that were considered in earlier published
83 studies (Charlesworth, 1981, Delannay *et al.*, 1981).

84 It should be remarked that the theoretical studies of gynodioecy have generally adopted one
85 critical assumption: a negative correlation between female fitness and female frequency in the
86 population, which is typically derived from the process of pollination. This assumption is based on the
87 principle of "pollen limitation" (Knight *et al.*, 2005), by which there is a positive correlation between the
88 fertilization rate of ovules and the density of male organs in the population, so that fertilization is
89 restricted by the frequencies of male-sterile individuals. This limitation results in a negative frequency-
90 dependence in female fitness, which can stabilize gynodioecy (Maurice & Fleming, 1995). Importantly,
91 this process may be enhanced in the presence of self-fertilization in hermaphrodites, where the total

92 exportation of pollen is limited due to individual self-consumption (Charlesworth, 1980). The reduction
93 of pollen exportation by a preceding self-pollination is called "pollen discounting" (Harder & Wilson,
94 1998, Porcher & Lande, 2005a). Through the combination of pollen limitation and discounting, selfing
95 of hermaphrodites can negatively influence the fitness of CMS females by restricting fertilization in
96 outbreeding. It should also be remarked that this also affects the fitness of hermaphrodites with
97 autogamous selfing, because selfing ability without the help of pollinators ensures the fertilization of
98 their own ovules even under severe pollen limitation, which is called "reproductive assurance" (Sicard &
99 Lenhard, 2011). Theoretical studies have found that in a gynodioecious population, autogamous selfing
100 can be an effective assurance for hermaphrodite reproduction (Maurice & Fleming, 1995). Indeed,
101 Lahiani et al. (2015) empirically measured seed production, strength of pollen limitation, and the selfing
102 rates of hermaphroditic individuals in both female-biased and hermaphrodite-biased gynodioecious
103 populations. They clearly indicated that selfing can be a reproductive assurance, by which
104 hermaphrodites are more tolerant to pollen limitation than females especially in female-biased
105 populations.

106 Despite an expectation of a significant effect of selfing, it has rarely been included within
107 theoretical studies of CMS-restorer coevolution. Charlesworth (1981) initially investigated this issue,
108 although the model did not include any cost of restoration. Delannay et al. (1981) and Jacobs and Wade
109 (2003) clarified selection in CMS-restorer coevolution with selfing in the presence of a restoration cost.
110 Dornier and Dufay (2013) modeled coevolutionary dynamics of CMS and restorer alleles with a cost
111 under selfing, based on computer simulations. These studies successfully revealed a relationship
112 between both CMS-restorer coevolution and selfing, although they considered selfing only as a fixed
113 parameter. In reality, however, selfing itself can be an evolutionary trait. Indeed, apart from CMS
114 studies, the evolution of selfing has been investigated both empirically and theoretically. Goodwillie et

al. (2005) reviewed the history and background of studies surrounding this issue and summarized the theoretical and empirical achievements to date. More recently, Sicard and Lenhard (2011) reviewed the available empirical research on selfing syndrome, in which they discussed a relationship between the two factors that influence the selfing evolution, i.e., ecological and genetic factors. The ecological factors consist of pollen discounting and pollen limitation, which quantitatively affect individual reproductive success. (As described above, those are also important in the evolution of gynodioecy). On the other hand, genetic factors involve inbreeding depression and a "50% automatic advantage of selfing". When a rare mutant with perfect selfing invades a population with outcrossing only, the individual automatically enjoys a 50% advantage of gene transmission because its pollen not only fertilizes the ovules of the resident individuals, but also monopolizes its own ovules (Fisher, 1941, Porcher & Lande, 2005b). Lloyd (1979) theoretically investigated selfing evolution with both inbreeding depression and this automatic advantage and showed that if the loss of seed success by inbreeding depression is smaller than 0.5, selfing can evolve.

Despite the understanding of the importance of selfing evolution in plant reproduction, CMS evolution has not been studied alongside it theoretically. The purpose of the present study is to reveal the effect of the evolution of selfing rate on the coevolution of CMS and nuclear restorer. In this paper, we hypothesize that selfing evolution can suppress the evolution of CMS. For fertilization of ovules, CMS females require hermaphroditic individuals as suppliers of pollen. In the presence of pollen discounting and pollen limitation, selfing reduces the density of exported pollen, by which the evolution of CMS might be suppressed. In order to investigate this process, we theoretically analyze the coevolution of three traits: CMS, nuclear restorer, and selfing rate.

MATHEMATICAL MODEL

138 In our model, we assume a haploid organism with two nuclear loci, which determine a restoration ability
139 of cytoplasmic male sterility and a selfing rate. Theoretical studies of gynodioecy have traditionally
140 focused on diploid model, although studies of pathogen-plant interaction sometime considered haploid
141 plants (Parker, 1994, Agrawal & Lively, 2002), which has been accepted as an appropriate
142 approximation. In this study, we also assume haploidy for a simplicity of analysis. The restoration is
143 considered to be controlled by a major gene that involves non-restorer and restorer alleles, genotypes of
144 which are denoted by m and M , respectively. On the other hand, the selfing rate is a quantitative trait that
145 is determined by many genes on quantitative loci with additive effects, which can evolve gradually. In
146 order to analyze evolutionary dynamics of this selfing rate, we assume two genotypes, i.e., a resident
147 selfing allele and a mutant selfing allele, between which the selfing rate is slightly different from each
148 other. The resident and mutant genotypes are denoted by s and s' , which also represent their selfing rates.
149 In addition to two nuclear genes, the organism includes a cytoplasmic gene that causes male sterility,
150 which is mutant mitochondria. The genotypes of non-CMS and CMS cytoplasm are defined as n and c ,
151 respectively. According to the alternative states on 2 nuclear genes and 1 cytoplasmic gene, there are 8
152 possible cyto-genotypes, i.e., ms/n , Ms/n , ms/c , Ms/c , ms'/n , Ms'/n , ms'/c , and Ms'/c , genotypic
153 frequencies of which are denoted by X_{mn} , X_{Mn} , X_{mc} , X_{Mc} , X'_{mn} , X'_{Mn} , X'_{mc} and X'_{Mc} , respectively. Primes on
154 the frequencies represent genotypes of mutant with respect to selfing. We assume that there is a linkage
155 between two nuclear loci with a recombination rate r , although it does not influence equilibria and their
156 stabilities.

157 We assume that male sterility is accompanied by a female advantage, promoting ovule
158 production with a relative advantage k (so that the ovule number becomes $1 + k$), which is achieved only
159 in genotypes ms/c and ms'/c with the CMS and non-restorer allele. It should be noted that our definition
160 of female advantage is different from that of Dornier and Dufay (2013) who analysed an analogous

161 system. In their analysis, female advantage was denoted as a function of selfing rate and inbreeding
162 depression (they expressed it as $k w_s / (1 - s \delta)$ in a case without the pollen limitation, where w_s
163 represented a negative effect of CMS on ovule production), which represents a relative advantage for
164 inbreeding success. On the contrary to this, we denote female advantage, k , excluding those factors (our
165 $1 + k$ corresponds with $k w_s$ in Dornier and Dufay), which we adopt for a convenience in the analysis of
166 selfing evolution.

167 In this study, we focus on the effects of the selfing rate on coevolution of nuclear restorer and
168 CMS. Selfing influences reproductive success at both the individual and population levels. The first
169 factor is inbreeding depression, which is denoted by a constant δ (i.e., inbreeding success is $1 - \delta$). It
170 should be noted that in reality, inbreeding depression can be a function of selfing rate because selfing
171 tends to sweep out deleterious alleles from the population through strong negative selection on the
172 homozygote of those alleles (Charlesworth et al., 1991, Lande & Schemske, 1985), although we assume
173 a constant inbreeding depression for the simplicity of our analysis. Furthermore, autogamous selfing can
174 reduce the amount of exported pollen if there is a trade-off between pollen number used for self-
175 pollination and outcrossing pollination, i.e., pollen discounting. We denote pollen discounting as a
176 reduction in the number of pollen that an individual releases, which is a function of its selfing rate s as
177 $D_p(s) = 1 - [b + (a - b)s^c]s$, following a formulation by a previous study (Johnston, 1998). In this
178 definition, the negative effect of selfing is expressed as $[b + (a - b)s^c]s$, where a ($0 \leq a \leq 1$) represents
179 reductions of exported pollen when $s = 1$, b determines the concaveness of the functional form (concave
180 and convex with $a > b$ and $a < b$, respectively), and c (> 0) controls the magnitude of curvature. In
181 addition, $D_p(s)$ is a monotonically decreasing function when $b < a(1 + c)/c$. At the population level, the
182 average density of exported pollen can decline with the increase of selfing rate via pollen discounting,
183 and also with the reduction of hermaphrodites as pollen suppliers. The reduction in the density of

184 exported pollen can negatively influence ovule fertilization through pollen limitation. The efficiency of
185 ovule fertilization is defined as an increasing function of the average density of exported pollen P_{EX} , a
186 formulation of which is assumed as $L_p(P_{EX}) = \beta P_{EX} / (\alpha + P_{EX})$. Based on these assumptions, the success
187 of inbreeding and outbreeding are generally weighted by the coefficients $1 - \delta$ and β , respectively. For
188 simplicity, we replace $(1 - \delta) / \beta$ by η . Since $1 - \delta$ is the relative success of inbreeding and β is the
189 maximum fertilization efficiency in outbreeding, η represents the relative advantage of selfing to
190 outbreeding. It should be noted that for outbreeding, the success of exported pollen is determined
191 through pollen competition for ovules, an effect which we incorporate in the model.

192 We consider that the nuclear restorer is accompanied by costs. Various types of expressions are
193 possible for this disadvantage of restoration (Bailey et al., 2003, Dufay et al., 2007). In the present study,
194 we consider two types of negative effect of the restorer allele, in which the restorer allele may reduce
195 either male function (pollen production) or individual performance (relative survivorship of individual)
196 from 1 to $1 - \mu$ ($\mu \leq 1$) in a relative value, which are hereafter referred to as cost types 1 and 2,
197 respectively. Those costs incur in individuals with a restorer allele independently of their cytotypes,
198 which is the so-called "constitutive cost" in the definition by Dufay et al. (2007). Remarkably, it was
199 reported that in *Lobelia siphilitica*, nuclear restore decreased pollen viability even when it did not affect
200 sex determination due to a mismatch of specificity to CMS (Bailey, 2002), which may partly correspond
201 with our cost type 1. We could also consider alternative types of restoration costs that decrease female
202 success only, although dynamic equations are difficult to solve explicitly in this case. Therefore, we
203 exclude this type of cost in the present analysis.

204 Under cost type 1, the male functions of both CMS and non-CMS individuals with the restorer
205 allele are lower than that of an individual without it, and therefore the average density of exported pollen
206 is affected by the restoration cost, a relative value, $P_{EX} = \{X_{mn} + (1 - \mu)(X_{Mn} + X_{Mc})\}D_p(s) +$

207 $\{X'_{mn} + (1 - \mu)(X'_{Mn} + X'_{Mc})\}D_p(s')$. On the other hand, under cost type 2, the frequencies of both
208 CMS and non-CMS individuals with the restorer allele decline immediately before a measurement of
209 their genotypic frequencies. In this case, the average density of exported pollen is $P_{EX} =$
210 $(X_{mn} + X_{Mn} + X_{Mc})D_p(s) + (X'_{mn} + X'_{Mn} + X'_{Mc})D_p(s')$. This expression does not include the
211 restoration cost μ because the costs have already affected the genotypic frequencies before the census of
212 frequency. The densities of pollen influence outbreeding success through the fertilization efficiency of
213 ovules due to pollen limitation, and the competition among pollen for ovules.

214 Based on those assumptions, we formulate the dynamics of genotypic frequencies by
215 combining the reproductive outcomes of selfing and outbreeding. Here, we show frequency dynamics of
216 strains with resident selfing rate under cost type 1 in the absence of mutant strains as simple examples.
217 For simplicity of description, we refer to X_{mn} , X_{Mn} , X_{mc} , and X_{Mc} by w , x , y , z , with which dynamics are

$$218 \quad w_{t+1} = \left[(1 - \delta)sw_t + \frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} D_p(s)(1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \left(w_t + \frac{1}{2} x_t \right) + (1 - \mu) \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} w_t \right\} \right] \frac{1}{W}, \quad (1a)$$

$$219 \quad x_{t+1} = \left[(1 - \delta)sx_t + \frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} D_p(s)(1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} x_t + (1 - \mu) \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2} w_t + x_t \right) \right\} \right] \frac{1}{W}, \quad (1b)$$

$$220 \quad y_{t+1} = \frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} D_p(s)(1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k)y_t + \frac{1}{2} z_t \right) + (1 - \mu) \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} (1 + k) \frac{1}{2} y_t \right\} \frac{1}{W}, \quad (1c)$$

$$221 \quad z_{t+1} = \left[(1 - \delta)sz_t + \frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} D_p(s)(1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} z_t + (1 - \mu) \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} y_t + z_t \right) \right\} \right] \frac{1}{W}, \quad (1d)$$

222 where W represents the average fitness. Variables, parameters and functions that are used in the present
223 model are summarized in Table 1. Full dynamics of the system are shown in the Appendix A.

224

225 Equilibrium mating modes under a fixed selfing rate

226 First, we investigate the dynamics in a population with a homogeneous selfing rate without a
227 mutant selfing rate, i.e., $(X'_{mn}, X'_{Mn}, X'_{mc}, X'_{Mc}) = (0, 0, 0, 0)$. Under both cost types 1 and 2, there are six
228 types of equilibria, two out of which are equilibrium states with a single genotype only. One equilibrium

is $(X_{mn}, X_{Mn}, X_{mc}, X_{Mc}) = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ that comprises a genotype with neither restorer nor CMS, which is always feasible, but stable only if $\{k(1-s) - s\eta\}D_p(s) < s\alpha\eta$. Another solution is $(0, 0, 0, 1)$ with a fixation of both restorer allele and CMS cytotype. It should be remarked that this solution is a subset of an equilibrium with two genotypes $(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$. The systems also generally have three types of equilibria with two genotypes, and a unique solution with a coexistence of four genotypes. Properties of those equilibria with multiple genotypes depend on cost types.

For cost type 1, genotypic frequencies are

$$(X_{mn}, X_{Mn}, X_{mc}, X_{Mc}) = (0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc}), \quad (2a)$$

$$(X_{mn}, X_{Mn}, X_{mc}, X_{Mc}) = \left(0, 0, 1 - \frac{2s\alpha\eta + (1+k)(1-s)(1-\mu)D_p(s)}{2\{k(1-s) - s\eta\}(1-\mu)}, \frac{2s\alpha\eta + (1+k)(1-s)(1-\mu)D_p(s)}{2\{k(1-s) - s\eta\}(1-\mu)}\right), \quad (2b)$$

$$(X_{mn}, X_{Mn}, X_{mc}, X_{Mc}) = \left(\frac{s\alpha\eta}{\{k(1-s) - s\eta\}D_p(s)}, 0, 1 - \frac{s\alpha\eta}{\{k(1-s) - s\eta\}D_p(s)}, 0\right), \quad (2c)$$

$$(X_{mn}, X_{Mn}, X_{mc}, X_{Mc}) =$$

$$\left(\frac{1+k}{k} \frac{s\alpha\eta - \{k(1-s) - s\eta\}(1-\mu)D_p(s)}{\{k(1-s) - s\eta\}\mu D_p(s)}, \frac{1}{k\mu} \left((1+k)(1-\mu) - \frac{s\alpha\eta\{1+k(1-\mu)\}}{\{k(1-s) - s\eta\}D_p(s)}\right), \right. \\ \left. \frac{1}{k} \left(-1 + \frac{s\alpha\eta}{\{k(1-s) - s\eta\}(1-\mu)D_p(s)}\right), \frac{1}{k} \left(1 + k - \frac{s\alpha\eta\{1+k(1-\mu)\}}{\{k(1-s) - s\eta\}(1-\mu)D_p(s)}\right)\right). \quad (2d)$$

Equilibrium (2a) is a line rather than a point, which also includes $(0, 0, 0, 1)$. The feasibility and stability conditions of equilibria are summarized in Table 2. The stability condition of the last equilibrium is too complex to be derived analytically, so are examined numerically based on the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix of the dynamics. Examples of parameter dependence of those conditions are illustrated in Figure 1 under the parameter set given in Table 1. (We also supplementally check the robustness of this trend with varying parameters (see below)).

On the other hand, those for the cost type 2 are

$$(X_{mn}, X_{Mn}, X_{mc}, X_{Mc}) = (0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc}), \quad (3a)$$

$$(X_{mn}, X_{Mn}, X_{mc}, X_{Mc}) = \left(0, 0, 1 - \frac{(1-\mu)\{2s\alpha\eta + (1+k)(1-s)D_p(s)\}}{[(1-s)\{k(2-\mu)+\mu\}-2s\eta(1-\mu)]D_p(s)}, \frac{(1-\mu)\{2s\alpha\eta + (1+k)(1-s)D_p(s)\}}{[(1-s)\{k(2-\mu)+\mu\}-2s\eta(1-\mu)]D_p(s)}\right), \quad (3b)$$

$$(X_{mn}, X_{Mn}, X_{mc}, X_{Mc}) = \left(\frac{s\alpha\eta}{\{k(1-s)-s\eta\}D_p(s)}, 0, 1 - \frac{s\alpha\eta}{\{k(1-s)-s\eta\}D_p(s)}, 0\right), \quad (3c)$$

$$(X_{mn}, X_{Mn}, X_{mc}, X_{Mc}) = \frac{1}{\{2s\eta(1+k\mu)+k(k-1)(1-s)(1-\mu)\}D_p(s)} \times \left(\frac{[2s\alpha\eta(k+\mu)-(1+k)\{k(1-s)-2s\eta\}(1-\mu)D_p(s)][s\alpha\eta(1+k\mu)+\{s\eta(1+k\mu)-k(1-s)(1-\mu)\}D_p(s)]}{s\eta\mu\{(k-1)\alpha+(1+k)D_p(s)\}}, \right. \\ \left. \frac{-2(s\alpha\eta)^2(1+\mu)(k+\mu)+(1-\mu)\{s\alpha\eta[k(1-s)\{k(3+\mu)+(1+3\mu)\}-2s\eta\{k(2+\mu)+(1+2\mu)\}]\}-(1+k)\{k(1-s)-s\eta\}\{k(1-s)-2s\eta\}(1-\mu)D_p(s)}{s\eta\mu\{(k-1)\alpha+(1+k)D_p(s)\}}, \right. \\ \left. 2[s\alpha\eta(1+k\mu)+\{s\eta(1+k\mu)-k(1-s)(1-\mu)\}D_p(s)], \right. \\ \left. -2(1+k)[s\alpha\eta(1+\mu)-\{k(1-s)-s\eta\}(1-\mu)]D_p(s)\right). \quad (3d)$$

The equilibrium Eq. (3a) is a line rather than a point, which includes (0, 0, 0, 1). The feasibility and stability conditions of equilibria are summarized in Table 2. Both feasibility and stability conditions of equilibrium (3d) are too complex to be derived analytically, which are examined numerically. Examples of parameter dependence of those conditions are illustrated in Figure 2.

Both Figs. 1 and 2 indicate that the conditions of equilibrium do not overlap each other, except for equilibria (2a) and (3a) which can be bistable with three other equilibria, (1, 0, 0, 0), Eqs. (2c) or (2d) under cost type 1, and (1, 0, 0, 0), Eqs. (3c) or (3d) under cost type 2, respectively (see regions bounded by broken curves). The bistabilities result from a strong positive frequency-dependent selection between non-restorer allele and non-CMS mitochondria. Equilibria (2a) and (3a) associate with a fixation of restorer allele, where CMS mitochondria is neutral due to a suppression of male-sterility. In this case, the frequency of CMS mitochondria changes only by genetic drift, in which the state is relatively stable. On the other hand, when the frequency of CMS cytotype is comparatively low, an advantage of

271 restoration is small, in which the restoration allele cannot increase due to its accompanying cost. These
272 reciprocal suppressions cause bistability of the two equilibria.

273 The trends are similar between Figs. 1 and 2, although there are clear differences. In Fig. 1, a
274 hermaphrodite population with a fixation of restorer allele (i.e., $(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$) tends to occur in
275 relatively wide parameter regions in comparison to Fig. 2. Contrary to this, regions of cytoplasmic
276 gynodioecy without restorer (i.e., $(X_{mn}, 0, X_{mc}, 0)$) become wider in Fig. 2. These differences may result
277 from the influence of a restoration cost on the frequency of the restorer allele. In cost type 1, the
278 restoration cost decreases the restorer alleles in the pollen pool only, but not in the ovule pool, which
279 may mildly suppress restorer evolution. On the other hand, with regards to cost type 2, the restoration
280 cost decreases restoration alleles totally in the entire population, which significantly suppresses the
281 prevalence of the restoration allele. It should be remarked that simple comparisons between two cost
282 cases might be inadequate because the relative effect of pollen limitation is different between those,
283 owing to a difference of census timing of genotypic frequencies (before and after suffering restoration
284 cost in cost types 1 and 2, respectively). However, such comparisons could provide useful information to
285 understand some evolutionary trends.

286 In order to study transient dynamics, we conduct simulations for some example cases, which
287 are illustrated in Figure 3. Figs. 3(a)-(c) represent results in the bistable cases. In the equilibrium (2a) on
288 the X_{Mn} - X_{Mc} axis, CMS mitochondria is neutral owing to restorer fixation, where genetic drift causes the
289 fluctuation of its frequency. Importantly, when the CMS frequency (i.e., X_{Mc}) falls below a threshold, the
290 state becomes unstable, causing an increment in the non-restorer allele. Figure 3(d) illustrates that if the
291 equilibrium (2a) is a unique solution, trajectories starting from an unstable region on the X_{Mn} - X_{Mc} axis
292 finally return to the stable region on the same axis with the disappearance of the non-restorer allele.

293 Accordingly, a combination of genetic drift on mitochondria and the mutational occurrence of non-
294 restorer allele may result in intermittent repeating cycles.

295 296 Selfing evolution from perfect outbreeding and perfect selfing

297 We considered a constant selfing rate in the above analysis, although in reality selfing rate can
298 evolve. This evolution of selfing is analyzed by examining the invasibility of individuals with a mutant
299 selfing rate into a population with a resident selfing rate. We assume that the population always reaches
300 an equilibrium state of restorer and CMS for the resident selfing rate. This assumption may be
301 reasonable because the selfing rate is a quantitative trait which changes more slowly and continuously
302 than allelic dynamics of restorer and CMS. Under bistability of two equilibria, we consider that the
303 system eventually converges to an equilibrium other than Eqs. (2a) and (3a) because those equilibria can
304 be unstable due to genetic drift (see above). In addition to this, when equilibrium (2a) or (3a) is a unique
305 stable solution, we assume that (0, 0, 0, 1) is the realized equilibrium because a fixation of CMS
306 mitochondria can persist for a relatively long time until an emergence of non-CMS mitochondria.

307 First, we analytically investigate the dynamics at the boundary selfing rates, i.e., perfect
308 outbreeding ($s = 0$) and perfect selfing ($s = 1$), by analyzing eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix of the
309 system with resident and mutant selfing rates. According to Eqs. (2) and (3), at perfect outbreeding with
310 $s = 0$, three types of equilibria occur conditionally in both cost types, i.e., (0, 0, X_{mx} , X_{Mc}), (0, 0, 0, 1) and
311 (1, 0, 0, 0) (see also Figs. 1 and 2). In those equilibria, the perfect outbreeding can be either stable or
312 unstable, depending on conditions. For cost type 1, the instability conditions of perfect outbreeding are

$$313 \quad 2\eta \left(1 + \frac{2k\alpha}{(1-\mu)(1+k)} \right) - k(1+b) > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad (0, 0, X_{mc}, X_{Mc}), \quad (4a)$$

$$314 \quad 2\eta \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{1-\mu} \right) - (1+b) > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad (0, 0, 0, 1), \quad (4b)$$

$$315 \quad 2\eta(1+\alpha) - (1+b) > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad (1, 0, 0, 0). \quad (4c)$$

316 On the other hand, those for cost type 2 are

$$317 \quad 2\eta \left(1 - \mu + \frac{\alpha\{2k+(1-k)\mu\}}{1+k} \right) - (k + \mu)(1 + b) > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad (0, 0, X_{mc}, X_{Mc}), \quad (5a)$$

$$318 \quad 2\eta(1 + \alpha) - (1 + b) > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad (0, 0, 0, 1), \quad (5b)$$

$$319 \quad 2\eta(1 + \alpha) - (1 + b) > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad (1, 0, 0, 0). \quad (5c)$$

320 Under these conditions, selfing can evolve from perfect outbreeding. These conditions tend to be
321 satisfied by larger α and $\eta (= (1 - \delta) / \beta)$, and smaller b , which promotes the evolution of selfing. In
322 addition, from Eqs. (4a) and (5a), we can prove that an increment of k suppresses the evolution under the
323 feasibility and stability conditions of those equilibria. Significantly, an increment of μ promotes selfing
324 evolution in Eqs. (4a) and (4b) but suppresses it in Eq. (5a). This indicates that in equilibria with a
325 fixation of restorer allele, restoration costs conversely affect the selfing evolution from perfect
326 outbreeding depending on cost types. Mechanisms of those parameter dependencies are discussed below
327 (see Discussion).

328 We also analyze selfing evolution from perfect selfing ($s = 1$). It can be analytically shown that
329 with $s = 1$, the original hermaphrodite state, $(1, 0, 0, 0)$, is a unique stable equilibrium in both cost types
330 due to an exclusion of $(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$ from consideration under bistability (see also Figs. 1 and 2). At
331 equilibrium, perfect selfing can be stable when

$$332 \quad 2\eta \left(\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} + 1 \right) > 1, \quad (6)$$

333 regardless of cost type. This indicates that under both cost types 1 and 2, perfect selfing tends to persist
334 when α , a or $\eta (= (1 - \delta) / \beta)$ is large (see Discussion). The effects of parameters on instabilities of
335 boundary selfing rates are summarized in Table 3.

336

337 Evolution of intermediate selfing rate

338 Next, we examine the evolution of an intermediate level of selfing rate. The Jacobian matrix of
339 system with $0 < s < 1$ is very complex. In addition to this, equilibrium mating mode discontinuously
340 change with varying selfing rate. These properties mean that analytical derivations of the maximum
341 eigenvalue and its derivative are difficult, therefore, we analyze evolutionary dynamics numerically (see
342 Appendix B). In Figures 1 and 2, solid circles represent selfing rates that are simultaneously
343 convergent and evolutionarily stable, whereas open circles indicate such that are convergent unstable.
344 In each panel, the selfing rate evolves along a horizontal direction under a given k value. In the
345 examined case, all convergent stable solutions satisfy evolutionary stability conditions at least under
346 the given conditions. These figures indicate that there can be multiple convergent and evolutionarily
347 stable solutions in the evolution of selfing, and that intermediate selfing rates can be evolutionarily
348 realized depending on parameters. These figures imply that the evolution of selfing rate realizes multiple
349 equilibria, which associate with various types of mating modes.

350 According to the numerical analysis, all solutions that are indicated by solid circles in Figs. 1
351 and 2 are satisfied both convergent and evolutionary stability conditions. In order to examine the
352 evolutionary dynamics of selfing in more detail, we conducted supplemental analysis (see Appendix B),
353 and illustrate a PIP (pairwise invasibility plot) that represent the invasibilities of mutant strategies into
354 populations with resident strategies (Geritz et al., 1998). Supplementary figures 1 and 2 show PIP for $k =$
355 1 cases of Figs. 1 and 2, respectively, by which we can reconfirm evolutionary stabilities of the solid
356 circles graphically.

357 Figures 1 and 2 focus on effects of cost of restorer (μ) and inbreeding depression (δ) on
358 evolution of mating mode and selfing rate. We also examine dependencies of evolution on parameters of
359 pollen limitation (α and β) and pollen discounting (a and b), which are illustrated in Supplementary
360 figures 3-10 (those trends are discussed below). It is remarkable that all results indicate that once selfing

rate evolves toward some level, it can prevent CMS mitochondria from fixation. If selfing rate evolves toward $s = 1$, both restorer and CMS are excluded from the population (i.e., $(1, 0, 0, 0)$), which represents a negative correlation between selfing, and CMS and restorer in their coevolution. It should be noted that that with a parameter set of panels (a) in Supplementary Figs. (7)-(10), a pollen discounting function $D_p(s)$ is not a monotonically decreasing function within $0 \leq s \leq 1$, which is locally minimized around $s = 0.69444$. However, those figures suggest that a small deviation from monotonically decreasing manner in pollen discounting does not affect trends significantly.

DISCUSSION

Multi-stability in the analyzed system

Throughout the analyses, we clarify the effect of selfing on the coevolution of nuclear restorer and CMS cytoplasm. First, we demonstrate the bistability of equilibria under a fixed selfing rate, which was first proposed by Charlesworth (1981) but had not been studied in detail. In the present study, we analytically clarify the conditions for bistability of mating modes in relation to selfing rate. The bistability results from a positive frequency-dependent selection between non-restorer allele and non-CMS mitochondria. The possibility of bistability suggests that if local populations are founded by small groups with various genotypic compositions, steady states might differ among those local populations in a single species. Remarkably, the present analysis shows that one equilibrium in bistability is always the hermaphroditic population with a fixation of restorer allele (i.e., $(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$). In this case, the frequency of CMS mitochondria is neutral on an X_{Mn} - X_{Mc} axis, which can lead the equilibrium to a region of instability due to genetic drift. Thus, this state ultimately becomes unstable and subsequently converges to an alternative equilibrium. Although the hermaphroditic population with a fixation of restorer could result from founder effects in colonization or stochasticity in dynamics, it may not persist for a long period.

384 Subsequently, evolution of selfing are included in the model, by which we investigate
385 coevolutionary process of three traits, i.e., selfing rate, nuclear restorer and CMS. According to the
386 analysis, multiple selfing rates (including $s = 0$ and 1) can be stable simultaneously under given
387 parameter values and conditions (Figs. 1 and 2). As described above, bistability is possible even with the
388 fixed selfing rate. When we take into account the evolution of selfing, a greater number of diverging
389 states can be possible due to the combination of multi-stabilities of both the CMS-restorer interaction
390 and the realized selfing rate.

391 It is known that gynodioecious species often show extremely wide variation in female
392 frequencies among populations (Lloyd, 1976, Frank, 1989, Webb, 1999). In addition to this, selfing rates
393 are known to vary among populations of gynodioecious species (Dornier & Dufay, 2013). Diversities
394 that are observed in gynodioecious species may be explained by the property of multi-stability of
395 gynodioecy, which is indicated by the analysis presented in this study. Under the multi-stability of
396 mating systems, stochasticities in dynamics and a founder effect in colonization may cause significant
397 fluctuation or variation in system states, which may result in a variation of selfing rates. Interestingly,
398 female frequencies in nuclear gynodioecy tend to be stable among populations in comparison to nuclear-
399 cytoplasmic gynodioecy (Bailey & Delph, 2007a). Figs.1 and 2 show that nuclear gynodioecy is
400 generally monostable without an alternative equilibrium state, which may be a reason for the relative
401 stability of nuclear gynodioecy.

402 403 Driving force for the evolution of selfing from perfect outbreeding

404 The main driving force of selfing evolution may be due to the reproductive assurance of hermaphrodite
405 individuals under pollen limitation. In a CMS-prevailing population, the average density of exported
406 pollen is low because female individuals with CMS don't export pollen at all. In those cases,

hermaphroditic individuals evolve higher selfing rates to ensure their ovule fertilization. This selfing evolution further intensifies the lack of exported pollen in the population under pollen discounting, consequently suppressing the evolution of CMS that requires pollen, in other words, the enclosure of pollen by hermaphroditic individuals via selfing subdues CMS cytoplasm.

This scenario is supported by an examination of the effects of pollen limitation on selfing evolution. Under pollen limitation, the fertilization of outbred ovules increases with the average density of exported pollen. In the presented model, the function of pollen limitation is determined by two parameters, α and β , which represent an insensitivity of fertilization improvement to pollen density and a maximum level of fertilization respectively, where larger α and smaller β indicate more intensive pollen limitation. Our analysis shows that selfing can evolve from perfect outbreeding under larger α and smaller β (see Eqs. (4) and (5)). This is also supported by supplementary analysis, showing that selfing rate tends to evolve toward higher levels under larger α and smaller β (Supplementary Figs. 3-6). Namely, strong pollen limitation results in higher selfing rates, which is consistent when considering selfing evolution as a reproductive assurance.

We also examine the effects of pollen discounting on selfing evolution. Under intensive pollen discounting, an increase in an individual's selfing rate results in a significant reduction in pollen which is exported by the individual. In our model, pollen discounting is determined by two parameters, a and b . In the pollen discounting function, a represents the reduction of exported pollen at perfect selfing ($s = 1$), whereas b determines the concaveness of the function, i.e., a large b causes a steep reduction of exported pollen at a small selfing rate. Accordingly, it is expected that both large a and b intensify pollen discounting, resulting in similar effects on selfing evolution. However, this should be considered more carefully because the effects of these two parameters on pollen discounting are not straightforward. Here, we focus on a population with a low selfing rate, where outbreeding is dominant (a case with a

430 higher selfing rate is discussed below, where the results are completely different). Under intense pollen
431 discounting, an individual with selfing exports a small amount of pollen, which spoils an individual's
432 ability in competition among pollen for ovules. This disadvantage is significant in the outbreeding-
433 dominant population, which suppresses selfing evolution at low selfing rates via a negative feedback.
434 Importantly, within a range of low selfing rates, the sensitivity of the pollen discounting function to the
435 selfing rate is mainly governed by the parameter b (but not by a), therefore, smaller b is expected to
436 promote selfing evolution. Indeed, our analysis shows that selfing evolution from perfect outbreeding is
437 promoted by smaller b , but is independent of a (see Eqs. (4) and (5)). In contrast, larger b suppresses
438 selfing evolution via a negative feedback between selfing and pollen discounting. The effect of b at low
439 selfing rates can be also confirmed in Supplementary Figs. 7-10.

440 According to the present analysis, when the advantage of CMS in female is high (larger k),
441 selfing evolution from perfect outbreeding tends to be suppressed in the population of nuclear
442 gynodioecy, $(0, 0, X_{mc}, X_{Mc})$ (see Eqs. (4a) and (5a), and Figs. 1 and 2). When females with CMS
443 produce more ovules, selfing reduces the opportunity to fertilize many ovules through outbreeding (i.e.,
444 higher male success in a female-biased population), a disadvantage by which may suppress selfing
445 evolution. It should be noted that this mechanism is effective only when nuclear genes have some
446 transition pathways from female to hermaphroditic individuals, i.e. the existence of some levels of
447 restorer. (Otherwise, after fertilization with ovules of female individuals, the selfing modifier loses any
448 opportunities to be expressed and to be selected). On the other hand, in a hermaphroditic population $((0,$
449 $0, 0, 1)$ and $(1, 0, 0, 0))$, the advantage of CMS in females does not affect selfing evolution from perfect
450 outbreeding (see Eqs. (4b, c) and (5b, c), and Figs. 1 and 2). Such a population comprises no females
451 regardless of an existence of CMS mitochondria, in which an advantage of CMS in females is not
452 effective to selfing evolution.

453 We find that in nuclear gynodioecy, $(0, 0, X_{mc}, X_{Mc})$ being stable with $k > 0$, the effect of the
454 restoration cost (μ) on selfing evolution from perfect outbreeding depends on the cost type. The effect is
455 promotional in a cost reducing male function (Eq. (4a)), but suppressive in a cost reducing individual
456 performance (Eq. (5a): its left-hand side term is negative and positive at small and large μ , respectively,
457 when its sign changes within $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$). In a population with the cost reducing male function, the larger
458 cost significantly decreases individual pollen production, causing lower average density of exported
459 pollen. In this case, ovules are unlikely to be fertilized by outbreeding under pollen limitation, by which
460 selfing becomes more preferable via intensified reproductive assurance. On the other hand, the cost
461 reducing individual performance does not influence the average density of exported pollen in the
462 population (see above). Instead, the cost totally decreases hermaphroditic individuals that carry a
463 restorer allele, which relatively increases the frequency of CMS females, realizing in a female-biased
464 sex ratio. In this case, exported pollen can achieve a high fertilization success via outbreeding with many
465 females, by which the larger restorer cost suppresses selfing evolution (importantly, those offspring can
466 also be hermaphroditic due to the inheritance of the restorer gene in nuclear gynodioecy). Those
467 mechanisms may result in the opposite dependencies of selfing evolution on the restoration cost between
468 nuclear gynodioecy with different cost types. In the presented analysis, we do not consider alternative
469 types of restoration costs that decrease female success only. In reality, however, it was reported that
470 hermaphrodites carrying nuclear restorer genes had lower seed quantity in *Plantago lanceolata* (de Haan
471 et al., 1997). This type of cost does not influence the average density of exported pollen, but reduce a
472 number of ovules of restored hermaphrodites, which may be also suppressive for selfing evolution.

473

474 Evolution of higher levels of selfing

475 According to the present analysis, intermediate levels of selfing can be achieved evolutionarily in a

gynodioecious system. The evolution of intermediate levels of selfing has been a subject of theoretical discussion because it cannot be represented simply (see a review by Goodwillie et al. (2005)). For the stability of intermediate selfing rates, a factor with negative frequency dependence on selfing rate is required. Johnston (1998) indicated that the existence of pollen discounting can result in intermediate levels of selfing that are both convergently and evolutionarily stable, a mechanism which could be effective also in the presented model. Remarkably, the author derived a unique stable solution for an intermediate level of selfing under a given condition, although our model shows the possibility of multiple solutions at intermediate levels (see, for example, Fig. 1(i) with $k = 1.3$). This is because CMS-restorer status can change depending on the selfing rate. In Fig. 1(i), one intermediate level of selfing involves a nuclear gynodioecy with a CMS fixation, whereas another solution is accompanied by a cytoplasmic-nuclear gynodioecy that is potentially bistable with a hermaphrodite. The bistability of intermediate levels of selfing is a characteristic property of the coevolution of CMS, restorer and selfing rate.

In the above discussion of selfing evolution from perfect outbreeding, we explain that selfing evolution is suppressed by intense pollen discounting with large b (the concaveness of the functional form), independently of the value of a (reductions of exported pollen when $s = 1$). The trend varies in a population with high selfing rates. In the selfing-dominant population, intense pollen discounting significantly reduces the average density of exported pollen, in which selfing is favored as a reproductive assurance under pollen limitation. In short, under high selfing rates, strong pollen discounting tends to promote selfing evolution. Importantly, at high selfing rates, a parameter a mainly governs the sensitivity of the pollen discounting function to the selfing rate, by which selfing evolution is expected to be promoted by larger a . Such a trend can be confirmed in Supplementary Figs. 7-10 (it should be noted that stable selfing solutions with intermediate values also exist above the plotted range

in those figures). Consequently, the effect of pollen discounting on selfing evolution at high selfing rate is opposite to that at low selfing rate, which tends to be controlled by different parameters, a and b , respectively.

It should be noted that intense pollen discounting can result in a positive feedback in selfing evolution in response to CMS prevalence. When CMS evolves and dominates in the population, a scarcity of hermaphrodites that are suppliers of exported pollen intensifies pollen limitation in outbreeding, by which selfing could be favored to ensure reproductive success in hermaphroditic individuals. If the pollen discounting is strong, the increment of selfing rate tends to reduce the average density of exported pollen significantly, which enhances the importance of reproductive assurance. These processes accelerate the evolution of higher selfing rates with a positive feedback between pollen limitation and reproductive assurance through pollen discounting, which gradually suppresses CMS females that require pollen supply from hermaphrodites. The cascade is triggered by CMS evolution and eventually suppress CMS.

The presented analysis also shows that perfect selfing ($s = 1$) can be stable under low inbreeding depression (small δ), strong pollen discounting (large a), and intensive pollen limitation (large α and small β) (see Eq. (6)). Namely, when both pollen limitation and pollen discounting are strong, perfect selfing tends to be stable (see also Supplementary Figs. 3-10). This can be explained by individuals with perfect selfing ($s = 1$) exporting little pollen in the presence of pollen discounting, by which a lower selfing mutant finds it difficult to outbreed successfully under intense pollen limitation, resulting in a failure of its invasion.

Influence of selfing evolution on gynodioecy

Our analysis shows that the evolution of selfing significantly influences the CMS-restorer interaction. If

the selfing rate reaches an intermediate level, nuclear-cytoplasmic gynodioecy and cytoplasmic gynodioecy can be achieved (Figs. 1(e), (f), (i), and 2(a), (e), (f), (i)). Furthermore, if selfing reaches a perfect level ($s = 1$), a hermaphrodite population occurs with neither CMS nor restorer. Namely, when selfing rate evolves toward a substantial level, CMS and restorer are likely to be excluded from the population. This trend is inconsistent with the results of Dornier and Dufay (2013), which illustrated that evolution of nuclear gynodioecy was promoted under higher selfing rates (in Dornier and Dufay, Fig. 3). This may be explained by the absence of pollen limitation in their examined cases.

When selfing cannot evolve or stay at very low level ($s \approx 0$), either CMS or restorer allele would be fixed in the population with $k > 0$, which may imply that the failure of selfing evolution intensifies an arms race between CMS and restoration. It should be remarked that with a sufficiently large k , there are also some advantages for non-restorer allele. When CMS persists under large k , female individuals with CMS achieve a high reproductive success. In this case, non-restorer allele can increase by hitchhiking on this female advantage, which is a reason that both restorer and non-restorer alleles coexist with a fixation of CMS cytotype under $k > 1$. On the other hand, the evolution of intermediate levels of the selfing rate ($s > 0$) promotes the coexistence of non-CMS and CMS cytotypes, and non-restorer and restorer alleles. If the selfing rate reaches a very high level ($s \approx 1$), both CMS and restorer allele are eliminated from the population, implying that intense selfing suppresses CMS evolution.

Lahiani et al. (2015) studied reproductive assurance in nuclear-cytoplasmic gynodioecious species, *Silene nutans* (Caryophyllaceae), which categorized plant habitats into female-biased or hermaphrodite-biased patches. The authors showed that female-biased patches were characterized by more fruit set and higher selfing rate than hermaphrodite-biased patches, which suggested a correlation between female advantage (k) and selfing rate (s). The analysis that is presented here predicts a positive correlation between female advantage (k) and selfing rate (s) in nuclear-cytoplasmic gynodioecy (see

Figs.1(e) and (i)). Although a relationship between those values and female ratio is not simple in our analysis (see Eqs. (2d) and (3d)), the observed positive correlation between female advantage and selfing rate is consistent with results of our models, which can be explained by evolution of selfing rate under a given parameter k in the gynodioecious plant.

Implications of observed gynodioecy

Our analysis successfully indicates an evolutionary relationship between gynodioecy and selfing, although it is inconsistent to some observations of selfing in gynodioecy. Dornier and Dufay (2013) reviewed selfing in gynodioecious plants, which indicated that some levels of selfing were observed in nuclear gynodioecy. In our results, nuclear gynodioecy occurs in a region with high female advantage in CMS (large k) and low selfing rate (small s), where stable selfing rates tend to be 0 or small (see Figs. 1 and 2, and Supplementary figures). This inconsistency may imply that additional factors are needed to understand the coevolution of gynodioecy and selfing. In the presented study, we focus on dynamics of genotypic frequencies, ignoring population dynamics that may influence mating processes. In addition, we considered pollen discounting is a function of average density of pollen only, although it might be also influenced by an ovule density typically in animal pollination systems via an efficiency of pollinator attraction. Inclusions of such factors may alternate trends of selfing evolution.

There is also another inconsistency in the present model. It is known that cytoplasmic gynodioecy without restoration is very rare in plants (Burt & Trivers, 2009), although it can be achieved in our model. When the cost of restoration is high (large μ), cytoplasmic gynodioecy without restorer (i.e., $(X_{mn}, 0, X_{mc}, 0)$) is possible within regions of intermediate levels of selfing, which can be an equilibrium of selfing evolution (see Figs. 1(f), and 2(e), (f), (i)). This trend is less significant in the case that restorer cost reduces male function (Fig. 1), especially when the relative advantage of selfing (η) is

small (compare between Figs. 1(f) and (i)). In such a case, instead, nuclear-cytoplasmic gynodioecy is possible (Fig. 1(i)), which is widely observed in natural populations (Delph *et al.*, 2007). This may suggest that in plant species the restorer cost tends to affect male function, and that a relative advantage of inbreeding to outbreeding ($\eta = (1 - \delta) / \beta$) may be relatively small. It was reported that hermaphrodites carrying nuclear restorer genes had lower pollen viability in *Lobelia siphilitica* (Bailey, 2002), which may suggested that the restorer cost on male function is not rare.

In the present analysis, we combine a major gene model (for CSM and restorer) and an adaptive dynamics model (for selfing rate), by which successfully revealed properties of coevolution of gynodioecy and selfing rate. Selfing is generally expected to influence the evolution of cytoplasmic genetic element (CGE) because it affects the inheritance processes of CGEs. Accordingly, the present analysis provides a basis to study evolution of a wide variety of selfish CGEs. For instance, selfing in plants may corresponds with sib mating in animals, therefore it might be also applicable to inter-genomic conflict in animals with sib mating. Our approach involves a potential to contribute on investigations about properties of various intergenomic conflicts.

584 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

585 We thank Dr. K. Ito and the members of the Centre for Ecological Research for their comments and
586 encouragement. This research was supported financially by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers 15K07219
587 and 19K06851 to A.Y. This research was partly supported by the International Research Unit of
588 Advanced Future Studies at Kyoto University to A.Y., and partly supported by a JSPS summer
589 fellowship awarded to R.D.B. We also appreciate helpful suggestions and comments of two anonymous
590 reviewers.

591

592 REFERENCES

- 593 Agrawal, A. & Lively, C. M. 2002. Infection genetics: gene-for-gene versus matching-alleles models and
594 all points in between. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* **4**: 79-90.
- 595 Bailey, M. F. 2002. A cost of restoration of male fertility in a gynodioecious species, *Lobelia siphilitica*.
596 *Evolution* **56**: 2178-2186.
- 597 Bailey, M. F. & Delph, L. F. 2007a. A field guide to models of sex-ratio evolution in gynodioecious
598 species. *Oikos* **116**: 1609-1617.
- 599 Bailey, M. F. & Delph, L. F. 2007b. Sex-ratio evolution in nuclear-cytoplasmic gynodioecy when
600 restoration is a threshold trait. *Genetics* **176**: 2465-2476.
- 601 Bailey, M. F., Delph, L. F. & Lively, C. M. 2003. Modeling gynodioecy: Novel scenarios for
602 maintaining polymorphism. *American Naturalist* **161**: 762-776.
- 603 Burt, A. & Trivers, R. 2009. *Genes in conflict: The biology of selfish genetic elements*. Harvard
604 University Press, Harvard.
- 605 Charlesworth, B. 1980. The cost of sex in relation to mating system. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **84**:
606 655-671.
- 607 Charlesworth, B., Morgan, M. T. & Charlesworth, D. 1991. Multilocus models of inbreeding depression
608 with synergistic selection and partial self-fertilization. *Genetical Research* **57**: 177-194.
- 609 Charlesworth, D. 1981. A further study of the problem of the maintenance of females in gynodioecious
610 species. *Heredity* **46**: 27-39.
- 611 Charlesworth, D. & Ganders, F. R. 1979. Population-genetics of gynodioecy with cytoplasmic-genic
612 male-sterility. *Heredity* **43**: 213-218.
- 613 de Haan, A. A., Hunscheid, M. P. J. & vanHinsberg, A. 1997. Effects of CMS types and restorer alleles
614 on plant performance in *Plantago lanceolata* L.: an indication for cost of restoration. *Journal of*
615 *Evolutionary Biology* **10**: 803-820.
- 616 Delannay, X., Gouyon, P. H. & Valdeyron, G. 1981. Mathematical study of the evolution of gynodioecy
617 with cytoplasmic inheritance under the effect of a nuclear restorer gene. *Genetics* **99**: 169-181.
- 618 Delph, L. F., Touzet, P. & Bailey, M. F. 2007. Merging theory and mechanism in studies of gynodioecy.
619 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **22**: 17-24.
- 620 Dornier, A. & Dufay, M. 2013. How selfing, inbreeding depression, and pollen limitation impact
621 nuclear-cytoplasmic gynodioecy: A model. *Evolution* **67**: 2674-2687.
- 622 Dufay, M., Touzet, P., Maurice, S. & Cuguen, J. 2007. Modelling the maintenance of male-fertile
623 cytoplasm in a gynodioecious population. *Heredity* **99**: 349-356.

- 624 Fisher, R. A. 1941. Average excess and average effect of a gene substitution. *Annals of Eugenics* **11**: 53-
625 63.
- 626 Frank, S. A. 1989. The evolutionary dynamics of cytoplasmic male-sterility. *American Naturalist* **133**:
627 345-376.
- 628 Geritz, S. A. H., Kisdi, E., Meszena, G. & Metz, J. A. J. 1998. Evolutionarily singular strategies and the
629 adaptive growth and branching of the evolutionary tree. *Evolutionary Ecology* **12**: 35-57.
- 630 Goodwillie, C., Kalisz, S. & Eckert, C. G. 2005. The evolutionary enigma of mixed mating systems in
631 plants: Occurrence, theoretical explanations, and empirical evidence. *Annual Review of Ecology*
632 *Evolution and Systematics* **36**: 47-79.
- 633 Gouyon, P. H., Vichot, F. & Vandamme, J. M. M. 1991. Nuclear-cytoplasmic male-sterility - single-point
634 equilibria versus limit-cycles. *American Naturalist* **137**: 498-514.
- 635 Hanson, M. R. 1991. Plant mitochondrial mutations and male-sterility. *Annual Review of Genetics* **25**:
636 461-486.
- 637 Harder, L. D. & Wilson, W. G. 1998. A clarification of pollen discounting and its joint effects with
638 inbreeding depression on mating system evolution. *American Naturalist* **152**: 684-695.
- 639 Jacobs, M. S. & Wade, M. J. 2003. A synthetic review of the theory of gynodioecy. *American Naturalist*
640 **161**: 837-851.
- 641 Johnston, M. O. 1998. Evolution of intermediate selfing rates in plants: pollination ecology versus
642 deleterious mutations. *Genetica* **102-3**: 267-278.
- 643 Knight, T. M., Steets, J. A., Vamosi, J. C., Mazer, S. J., Burd, M., Campbell, D. R., Dudash, M. R.,
644 Johnston, M. O., Mitchell, R. J. & Ashman, T. L. 2005. Pollen limitation of plant reproduction:
645 Pattern and process. *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics* **36**: 467-497.
- 646 Lahiani, E., Touzet, P., Billard, E. & Dufay, M. 2015. When is it worth being a self-compatible
647 hermaphrodite? Context-dependent effects of self-pollination on female advantage in
648 gynodioecious *Silene nutans*. *Ecology and Evolution* **5**: 1854-1862.
- 649 Lande, R. & Schemske, D. W. 1985. The evolution of self-fertilization and inbreeding depression in
650 plants .1. Genetic models. *Evolution* **39**: 24-40.
- 651 Lewis, D. 1941. Male sterility in natural populations of hermaphrodite plants. *New Phytologist* **40**: 56-
652 63.
- 653 Lloyd, D. G. 1974. Theoretical sex-ratios of dioecious and gynodioecious angiosperms. *Heredity* **32**: 11-
654 34.
- 655 Lloyd, D. G. 1975. Maintenance of gynodioecy and androdioecy in angiosperms. *Genetica* **45**: 325-339.

- 656 Lloyd, D. G. 1976. Transmission of genes via pollen and ovules in gynodioecious angiosperms.
657 *Theoretical Population Biology* **9**: 299-316.
- 658 Lloyd, D. G. 1979. Some reproductive factors affecting the selection of self-fertilization in plants.
659 *American Naturalist* **113**: 67-79.
- 660 Maurice, S., Charlesworth, D., Desfeux, C., Couvet, D. & Gouyon, P. H. 1993. The evolution of gender
661 in hermaphrodites of gynodioecious populations with nucleocytoplasmic male-sterility.
662 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* **251**: 253-261.
- 663 Maurice, S. & Fleming, T. H. 1995. The effect of pollen limitation on plant reproductive systems and the
664 maintenance of sexual polymorphisms. *Oikos* **74**: 55-60.
- 665 McCauley, D. E. & Bailey, M. F. 2009. Recent advances in the study of gynodioecy: the interface of
666 theory and empiricism. *Annals of Botany* **104**: 611-620.
- 667 Parker, M. A. 1994. Pathogens and Sex in Plants. *Evolutionary Ecology* **8**: 560-584.
- 668 Porcher, E. & Lande, R. 2005a. The evolution of self-fertilization and inbreeding depression under
669 pollen discounting and pollen limitation. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **18**: 497-508.
- 670 Porcher, E. & Lande, R. 2005b. Reproductive compensation in the evolution of plant mating systems.
671 *New Phytologist* **166**: 673-684.
- 672 Sicard, A. & Lenhard, M. 2011. The selfing syndrome: a model for studying the genetic and
673 evolutionary basis of morphological adaptation in plants. *Annals of Botany* **107**: 1433-1443.
- 674 Webb, C. L. (1999) Empirical studies: evolution and maintenance of dimorphic breeding systems. In:
675 *Gender and sexual dimorphism in flowering plants*, (Geber, M. A., Dawson, T. E. & Delph, L. F.,
676 eds.). pp. 61-95. Springer, Berlin.

677

678

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Feasible and stable equilibria and evolutionarily realized selfing rates in the case that restorer cost reduces male function (cost type 1). Parameter μ is the cost of restorer, and $1 - \delta$ is the inbreeding coefficient. Initially, the equilibria are analyzed under a given selfing rate. Depending on parameters, 5 types of equilibria are possible. An equilibrium with fixation of nuclear restorer, $(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$, can be bistable with another equilibrium (regions that are surrounded by a broken curve). In the grayscale chart, characters represent sex determination modes of the population, NG: nuclear gynodioecy, CG: cytoplasmic gynodioecy, and NCG: nuclear-cytoplasmic gynodioecy. H1 and H2 represent hermaphroditic populations without CMS and restorer, and that with a fixation of restorer, respectively. It should be noted that the state H2 can be bistable with other equilibrium states depending on parameters. When H2 is a unique equilibrium, it is indicated by H2'. Subsequently, selfing evolution is examined under equilibrium states. Solid circles represent solutions that are both convergently and evolutionarily stable, whereas open circles are convergently unstable solutions, with given k values. See Table 1 for parameter values.

Figure 2. Feasible and stable equilibria and evolutionarily realized selfing rates in a case that a restorer cost reduces individual performance (cost type 2). Parameter μ is the cost of restorer, and $1 - \delta$ is the inbreeding coefficient. Solid circles represent selfing rates that are both convergently and evolutionarily stable, whereas open circles are convergently unstable solutions. Parameters and conditions are identical to Fig. 1.

Figure 3. Simulation of the coevolution of CMS and nuclear restorer under a given selfing rate. Parameter values and conditions correspond to Fig. 1(e) with $k = 0.5$, in which equilibrium restorer-CMS status are bistability of $(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$ (gray region on X_{Mn} - X_{Mc} axis) and another equilibrium, $(1, 0, 0, 0)$ in (a), $(X_{mn}, 0, X_{mc}, 0)$ in (b) and $(X_{mn}, X_{Mn}, X_{mc}, X_{Mc})$ in (c). On the other hand, $(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$ is

702 a unique equilibrium in (d). On the X_{Mn} - X_{Mc} axis, CMS mitochondria are neutral due to a fixation of
703 nuclear restorer, although the equilibrium $(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$ can be unstable when the CMS frequency goes
704 below a threshold (small X_{Mc}). In (d), Genetic drift and subsequent emergence of non-restorer allele may
705 cause cyclic dynamics.
706

Table 1 Notations of traits and parameters

	Description
Genotypic frequencies	
X_{mn}, X'_{mn}	non-restorer and non-CMS with resident and mutant selfing rate
X_{Mn}, X'_{Mn}	restorer and non-CMS with resident and mutant selfing rate
X_{mc}, X'_{mc}	non-restorer and CMS with resident and mutant selfing rate
X_{Mc}, X'_{Mc}	restorer and CMS with resident and mutant selfing rate
Quantitative genetic trait	
s, s'	resident and mutant selfing rate
Parameters and functions	
$D_p(s)$	pollen discounting: $1 - [b + (a - b)s^c]s$
a	reduction when $s = 1$, $0 \leq a \leq 1$ ($a = 1$ in numerical analysis)
b	concaveness of functional form ($b = 0$ in numerical analysis)
c	magnitude of curvature of functional form, $0 < c$ ($c = 0.5$ in numerical analysis)
$L_p(P_{EX})$	pollen limitation: $\beta P_{EX} / (\alpha + P_{EX})$
P_{EX}	density of exported pollen
α	extent of saturation ($\alpha = 0.1$ in numerical analysis)
β	maximum fertilization efficiency in outbreeding ($\beta = 1$ in numerical analysis)
r	recombination rate between restorer and selfing rate loci ($r = 0.5$ in simulation)
δ	inbreeding depression, $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$
η	$(1 - \delta) / \beta$, relative advantage of inbreeding to outbreeding
k	advantage of CMS in female performance (ovule production)
μ	cost accompanying with restorer allele, $0 \leq \mu \leq 1$

Table 2 Mating system, feasibility and stability conditions of equilibria in Eqs. (2) and (3).

Equilibrium	Mating system	Feasibility and stability conditions
Cost type 1		
(2a)	H	$\{(k-1)(1-s) - 2s\eta\}(1-\mu)D_p(s) \leq 2s\alpha\eta$, and $X_{Mn} \leq 1 - \mu$
(2b)	NG	$0 < k(1-s) - s\eta$, and $\{(k-1)(1-s) - 2s\eta\}(1-\mu)D_p(s) > 2s\alpha\eta$
(2c)	CG	$s\alpha\eta \leq \{k(1-s) - s\eta\}D_p(s) \leq s\alpha\eta \frac{1+k(1-\mu)}{(1+k)(1-\mu)}$
(2d)	NCG	$\frac{1+k(1-\mu)}{(1+k)(1-\mu)} s\alpha\eta < \{k(1-s) - s\eta\}D_p(s) < \frac{1}{1-\mu} s\alpha\eta$ (this is a feasibility condition, stability is numerically examined)
Cost type 2		
(3a)	H	$\left\{-\frac{(1-s)(1-2\mu-k)}{2(1-\mu)} - s\eta\right\}D_p(s) \leq s\alpha\eta \leq \left\{\frac{(1-s)(1-2\mu)}{2\mu} - s\eta\right\}D_p(s)$, and $X_{Mn} \leq \frac{-2s\alpha\eta\mu + \{(1-s)(1-2\mu) - 2s\eta\}D_p(s)}{(1-s)D_p(s)}$
(3b)	NG	$0 < (1-s)\{k(2-\mu) + \mu\} - 2s\eta(1-\mu)$, $s\alpha\eta \leq -\left\{\frac{(1-s)(1-k-2\mu)}{2(1-\mu)} + s\eta\right\}D_p(s)$, and $s\alpha\eta \leq \frac{(1+k)(1-\mu)}{2(k+\mu)}\{k(1-s) - 2s\eta\}D_p(s)$
(3c)	CG	$s\alpha\eta \leq \{k(1-s) - s\eta\}D_p(s) \leq s\alpha\eta \frac{1+\mu}{1-\mu}$
(3d)	NCG	(both feasibility and stability are numerically examined)

H: hermaphrodite, NG: nuclear gynodioecy, CG: cytoplasmic gynodioecy, and NCG: nuclear-cytoplasmic gynodioecy

Table 3 Effects of parameters on instabilities of boundary selfing rates (see Eqs. (4)-(6)).

	cost type 1				cost type 2			
	$s = 0$			$s = 1$	$s = 0$			$s = 1$
	NG	H2'	H1	(H1)	NG	H2'	H1	(H1)
a	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	-
b	-	-	-	N/A	-	-	-	N/A
α	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
$\eta(= (1-\delta)/\beta)$	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
k	-	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	N/A	N/A
μ	+	+	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	N/A	N/A

NG: nuclear gynodioecy, H2': hermaphrodite with (0, 0, 0, 1), H1: hermaphrodite with (1, 0, 0, 0), "+": promotion of instability, "-": suppression of instability, N/A: no effect

Figure 1

NCG	$(X_{mn}, X_{Mn}, X_{mc}, X_{Mc})$	H2	$(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$
CG	$(X_{mn}, 0, X_{mc}, 0)$	H2'	$(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$ only
H1	$(1, 0, 0, 0)$	NG	$(0, 0, X_{mc}, X_{Mc})$ only

Figure 2

Figure 3

1 APPENDIX A

2 We formulate the dynamics of genotypic frequencies by combining the reproductive outcomes of
3 selfing and outbreeding. It should be noted that outbreeding success is affected by the average
4 density of exported pollen through both pollen limitation and pollen competition for ovules. For
5 simplicity of description, we refer to X_{mn} , X_{Mn} , X_{mc} , X_{Mc} , X'_{mn} , X'_{Mn} , X'_{mc} and X'_{Mc} by w , x , y , z , w' ,
6 x' , y' and z' in this section. The offspring genotype in outbreeding between two genotypes is
7 summarized in Supplementary Table 1.

8

9 Dynamic equation with cost type 1

10 First, we consider cost type 1 that the nuclear restorer reduces individual pollen production (in x ,
11 x' , z and z'), a fraction of which is denoted by μ . A relative amount of pollen that is exported by
12 an individual decreases with its selfing rate, i.e., pollen discounting, which we denote as $D_p(s)$.
13 On the other hand, the relative density of exported pollen in the population can be expressed by
14 the average pollen exportation from individuals, which is formulated as $P_{EX} = \{w_t +$
15 $(1 - \mu)(x_t + z_t)\}D_p(s) + \{w'_t + (1 - \mu)(x'_t + z'_t)\}D_p(s')$. It should be noted that CMS
16 individuals without restorer (i.e., y and y') cannot produce pollen at all, but promote ovule
17 production with relative ratio k .

18 Frequencies dynamics of strains with a resident selfing rate s are

$$\begin{aligned} 19 \quad w_{t+1} = & \left[(1 - \delta)sw_t + \frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} \left[D_p(s) \left\{ (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \left(w_t + \frac{1}{2}x_t \right) + (1 - \mu) \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2}w_t \right\} + \right. \right. \right. \\ 20 \quad & \left. \left. \left(1 - s' \right) \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2}w'_t + \frac{1}{2}(1 - r)x'_t \right) + (1 - \mu) \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2}rw'_t \right\} \right\} + \right. \\ 21 \quad & \left. \left. D_p(s')(1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2}w_t + \frac{1}{2}rx_t \right) + (1 - \mu) \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2}rw_t \right\} \right] \right] \frac{1}{W} , \end{aligned}$$

22

(A1a)

$$\begin{aligned}
 23 \quad x_{t+1} = & \left[(1 - \delta) s x_t + \frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} \left[D_p(s) \left\{ (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} x_t + (1 - \mu) \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2} w_t + x_t \right) \right\} + \right. \right. \right. \\
 24 \quad & \left. \left. \left. (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} r x'_t + (1 - \mu) \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2} (1 - r) w'_t + \frac{1}{2} x'_t \right) \right\} \right\} + \right. \right. \\
 25 \quad & \left. \left. \left. D_p(s') (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) x_t + (1 - \mu) \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2} r w_t + \frac{1}{2} x_t \right) \right\} \right\} \right] \right] \frac{1}{W} , \\
 26 \quad & \hspace{15em} (A1b)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 27 \quad y_{t+1} = & \frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} \left[D_p(s) \left\{ (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) y_t + \frac{1}{2} z_t \right) + (1 - \mu) \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} (1 + k) \frac{1}{2} y_t \right\} + \right. \right. \\
 28 \quad & \left. \left. \left. (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} y'_t + \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) z'_t \right) + (1 - \mu) \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} (1 + k) \frac{1}{2} r w'_t \right\} \right\} + \right. \right. \\
 29 \quad & \left. \left. \left. D_p(s') (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} y_t + \frac{1}{2} r z_t \right) + (1 - \mu) \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} (1 + k) \frac{1}{2} r y_t \right\} \right\} \right] \frac{1}{W} , \\
 30 \quad & \hspace{15em} (A1c)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 31 \quad z_{t+1} = & \left[(1 - \delta) s z_t + \right. \\
 32 \quad & \left. \frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} \left[D_p(s) \left\{ (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} z_t + (1 - \mu) \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} y_t + z_t \right) \right\} + \right. \right. \right. \\
 33 \quad & \left. \left. \left. (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} r z'_t + (1 - \mu) \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) y'_t + \frac{1}{2} z'_t \right) \right\} \right\} + \right. \right. \\
 34 \quad & \left. \left. \left. D_p(s') (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) z_t + (1 - \mu) \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} r y_t + \frac{1}{2} z_t \right) \right\} \right\} \right] \right] \frac{1}{W} , \\
 35 \quad & \hspace{15em} (A1d)
 \end{aligned}$$

36 whereas those with a mutant selfing rate s' are

$$\begin{aligned}
 37 \quad w'_{t+1} = & \left[(1 - \delta) s' w'_t + \right. \\
 38 \quad & \left. \frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} \left[D_p(s) (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2} w'_t + \frac{1}{2} r x'_t \right) + (1 - \mu) \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) w'_t \right\} + \right. \right. \\
 39 \quad & \left. \left. \left. D_p(s') \left\{ (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2} w_t + \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) x_t \right) + (1 - \mu) \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} r w_t \right\} + \right. \right. \right. \\
 40 \quad & \left. \left. \left. (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \left(w'_t + \frac{1}{2} x'_t \right) + (1 - \mu) \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} w'_t \right\} \right\} \right] \right] \frac{1}{W} ,
 \end{aligned}$$

41 (A1e)

42 $x'_{t+1} = \llbracket (1 - \delta)s'x'_t +$

43 $\frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} \left[D_p(s)(1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} (1 - r)x'_t + (1 - \mu) \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2} r w'_t + \frac{1}{2} x'_t \right) \right\} + \right.$

44 $D_p(s') \left\{ (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} r x_t + (1 - \mu) \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2} (1 - r) w_t + \frac{1}{2} x_t \right) \right\} + \right.$

45 $\left. (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} x'_t + (1 - \mu) \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2} w'_t + x'_t \right) \right\} \right] \rrbracket \frac{1}{W} ,$

46 (A1f)

47 $y'_{t+1} =$

48 $\frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} \left[D_p(s)(1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} y'_t + \frac{1}{2} r z'_t \right) + (1 - \mu) \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} (1 + k) \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) y'_t \right\} + \right.$

49 $D_p(s') \left\{ (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} y_t + \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) z_t \right) + (1 - \mu) \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} (1 + k) \frac{1}{2} r y_t \right\} + \right.$

50 $\left. (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) y'_t + \frac{1}{2} z'_t \right) + (1 - \mu) \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} (1 + k) \frac{1}{2} y'_t \right\} \right] \rrbracket \frac{1}{W} ,$

51 (A1g)

52 $z'_{t+1} = \llbracket (1 - \delta)s'z'_t +$

53 $\frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} \left[D_p(s)(1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) z'_t + (1 - \mu) \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} r y'_t + \frac{1}{2} z'_t \right) \right\} + \right.$

54 $D_p(s') \left\{ (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} r z_t + (1 - \mu) \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) y_t + \frac{1}{2} z_t \right) \right\} + \right.$

55 $\left. (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} z'_t + (1 - \mu) \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} y'_t + z'_t \right) \right\} \right] \rrbracket \frac{1}{W} .$

56 (A1h)

57 In these equations, W represents the average fitness.

58

59 Dynamic equation with cost type 2

60 Next, we consider cost type 2 that the nuclear restorer reduces individual performance (in $x, x', z,$

61 and z'_t). This cost is assumed to reduce individual survivorship immediately before the census
62 timing of genotypic frequencies, a fraction of which is denoted by μ . The relative density of
63 exported pollen in the population can be expressed by the average pollen exportation from
64 individuals, which can be formulated as $P_{EX} = \{w_t + (x_t + z_t)\}D_p(s) + \{w'_t +$
65 $(x'_t + z'_t)\}D_p(s')$.

66 Similarly to the previous case, frequencies of genotypes with a resident selfing rate s
67 are expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} 68 \quad w_{t+1} = & \left[(1 - \delta)sw_t + \frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} \left[D_p(s) \left\{ (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \left(w_t + \frac{1}{2}x_t \right) + \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2}w_t \right\} + \right. \right. \right. \\ 69 & \quad \left. \left. \left. (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2}w'_t + \frac{1}{2}(1 - r)x'_t \right) + \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2}rw'_t \right\} \right\} + \right. \right. \\ 70 & \quad \left. \left. \left. D_p(s')(1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2}w_t + \frac{1}{2}rx_t \right) + \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2}rw_t \right\} \right\} \right] \right] \frac{1}{W}, \end{aligned}$$

71 (A2a)

$$\begin{aligned} 72 \quad x_{t+1} = & (1 - \mu) \left[(1 - \delta)sx_t + \frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} \left[D_p(s) \left\{ (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2}x_t + \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2}w_t + x_t \right) \right\} + \right. \right. \right. \\ 73 & \quad \left. \left. \left. (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2}rx'_t + \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2}(1 - r)w'_t + \frac{1}{2}x'_t \right) \right\} \right\} + \right. \right. \\ 74 & \quad \left. \left. \left. D_p(s')(1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2}(1 - r)x_t + \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2}rw_t + \frac{1}{2}x_t \right) \right\} \right\} \right] \right] \frac{1}{W}, \end{aligned}$$

75 (A2b)

$$\begin{aligned} 76 \quad y_{t+1} = & \frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} \frac{1}{P_{EX}} \left[D_p(s) \left\{ (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k)y_t + \frac{1}{2}z_t \right) + \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} (1 + k) \frac{1}{2}y_t \right\} + \right. \right. \\ 77 & \quad \left. \left. \left. (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2}y'_t + \frac{1}{2}(1 - r)z'_t \right) + \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} (1 + k) \frac{1}{2}rw'_t \right\} \right\} + \right. \right. \\ 78 & \quad \left. \left. \left. D_p(s')(1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2}y_t + \frac{1}{2}rz_t \right) + \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} (1 + k) \frac{1}{2}ry_t \right\} \right\} \right] \frac{1}{W}, \end{aligned}$$

79 (A2c)

$$\begin{aligned}
 80 \quad z_{t+1} &= (1 - \mu) \left[(1 - \delta) s z_t + \right. \\
 81 \quad &\left. \frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} \left[D_p(s) \left\{ (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} z_t + \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} y_t + z_t \right) \right\} + \right. \right. \right. \\
 82 \quad &\left. \left. (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} r z'_t + \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) y'_t + \frac{1}{2} z'_t \right) \right\} \right\} + \right. \\
 83 \quad &\left. \left. D_p(s') (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) z_t + \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} r y_t + \frac{1}{2} z_t \right) \right\} \right] \right] \frac{1}{W} , \\
 84 \quad & \tag{A2d}
 \end{aligned}$$

85 whereas those with a mutant selfing rate s' are

$$\begin{aligned}
 86 \quad w'_{t+1} &= \left[(1 - \delta) s' w'_t + \right. \\
 87 \quad &\left. \frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} \left[D_p(s) (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2} w'_t + \frac{1}{2} r x'_t \right) + \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) w'_t \right\} + \right. \right. \\
 88 \quad &\left. \left. D_p(s') \left\{ (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2} w_t + \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) x_t \right) + \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} r w_t \right\} + \right. \right. \right. \\
 89 \quad &\left. \left. (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \left(w'_t + \frac{1}{2} x'_t \right) + \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} w'_t \right\} \right\} \right] \right] \frac{1}{W} , \\
 90 \quad & \tag{A2e}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 91 \quad x'_{t+1} &= (1 - \mu) \left[(1 - \delta) s' w'_t + \right. \\
 92 \quad &\left. \frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} \left[D_p(s) (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) x'_t + \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2} r w'_t + \frac{1}{2} x'_t \right) \right\} + \right. \right. \\
 93 \quad &\left. \left. D_p(s') \left\{ (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} r x_t + \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2} (1 - r) w_t + \frac{1}{2} x_t \right) \right\} + \right. \right. \right. \\
 94 \quad &\left. \left. (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} x'_t + \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \left(\frac{1}{2} w'_t + x'_t \right) \right\} \right\} \right] \right] \frac{1}{W} , \\
 95 \quad & \tag{A2f}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 96 \quad y'_{t+1} &= \frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} \left[D_p(s) (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} y'_t + \frac{1}{2} r z'_t \right) + \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} (1 + k) \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) y'_t \right\} + \right. \\
 97 \quad &\left. D_p(s') \left\{ (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} y_t + \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) z_t \right) + \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} (1 + k) \frac{1}{2} r y_t \right\} + \right. \right. \\
 98 \quad &\left. \left. (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) y'_t + \frac{1}{2} z'_t \right) + \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} (1 + k) \frac{1}{2} y'_t \right\} \right\} \right] \frac{1}{W} ,
 \end{aligned}$$

99 (A2g)

100 $z'_{t+1} = (1 - \mu) \left[(1 - \delta) s' w'_t + \right.$

101 $\left. \frac{\beta P_{EX}}{\alpha + P_{EX}} \left[D_p(s) (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) z'_t + \frac{x_t + z_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} r y'_t + \frac{1}{2} z'_t \right) \right\} + \right. \right.$

102 $\left. D_p(s') \left\{ (1 - s) \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} r z_t + \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} (1 - r) y_t + \frac{1}{2} z_t \right) \right\} + \right. \right.$

103 $\left. \left. (1 - s') \left\{ \frac{w'_t}{P_{EX}} \frac{1}{2} z'_t + \frac{x'_t + z'_t}{P_{EX}} \left((1 + k) \frac{1}{2} y'_t + z'_t \right) \right\} \right\} \right] \frac{1}{W} .$

104 (A2h)

105 In these equations, W represents the average fitness.

106

107 APPENDIX B

108 Invasibility of mutant selfing rate

109 We consider invasions of $s - 10^{-8}$ and $s + 10^{-8}$ mutant selfing rates into a resident mutation rate s ,
 110 dominant eigenvalues of which are denoted by λ_- and λ_+ , respectively. The mutant can increase in
 111 the population when a norm of the dominant eigenvalue $\|\lambda\|$ is greater than 1. Therefore, the trait
 112 value evolves towards a larger value when $\|\lambda_-\| \leq 1$ and $\|\lambda_+\| > 1$ (i.e., $\|\lambda_-\| \leq 1 < \|\lambda_+\|$),
 113 and towards a lower value when $\|\lambda_-\| > 1$ and $\|\lambda_+\| \leq 1$ (i.e., $\|\lambda_-\| > 1 \geq \|\lambda_+\|$). Since the
 114 norm of the dominant eigenvalue of a resident selfing rate s itself is always 1, these conditions
 115 can be simplified as $\|\lambda_-\| < \|\lambda_+\|$ and $\|\lambda_-\| > \|\lambda_+\|$, respectively, during the transient process
 116 towards an evolutionary singular point. Accordingly, we search for interior convergently stable
 117 selfing rates by looking for changing points of sign $\|\lambda_+\| - \|\lambda_-\|$ from positive to negative by
 118 using a bisection method for a value of s . We also examine the evolutionary stability of those
 119 solutions, in which a resident selfing rate can be stable if both $\|\lambda_+\| \leq 1$ and $\|\lambda_-\| \leq 1$ hold
 120 simultaneously. On the other hand, boundaries $s = 0$ and $s = 1$ can be convergently and

121 evolutionarily stable solutions when neighborhoods of those boundaries satisfy $\|\lambda_+\| - \|\lambda_-\| <$
122 0 and $\|\lambda_+\| - \|\lambda_-\| > 0$, respectively.

123

124 PIP of selfing evolution

125 We plot PIP with examinations of mutant invasibility by using the same procedure as above,
126 although the interval of selfing is set to 0.005 rather than 10^{-8} to reduce the calculation load.
127 Supplementary figures 1 and 2 represent PIP for $k = 1$ cases of Figs. 1 and 2, respectively. A
128 grayscale chart above each panel indicates a mating mode under the given resident selfing rate,
129 which corresponds to grayscale in Figs. 1 and 2. In those figures, the gray regions indicate a
130 successful invasion of a rare mutant strategy (a coordinate of the vertical axis) into the
131 population of resident strategy (a coordinate of the horizontal axis), while the white regions
132 represent the failure of mutant invasion. On the diagonal line, the mutant strategy coincides with
133 the resident strategy. When the plot is white both above and below a point on the diagonal line, it
134 indicates that mutants with slightly larger and smaller values of strategies than the resident
135 strategy cannot increase in the resident population, implying evolutionary stability of the resident
136 strategy. In those figures, solid circles represent convergently and evolutionarily stable states,
137 whereas open circles are convergently unstable states (as Figs. 1 and 2). According to the figures,
138 we can graphically reconfirm evolutionary stabilities of equilibria that are indicated by the solid
139 circles.

140 Interestingly, in Supplementary figure 1(i), a range of selfing rates can be continuously
141 evolutionarily stable, which is indicated by the region with a black arrow. This seems
142 inconsistent to Fig. 1(i), although it may result from the difference of mutation interval between
143 the two figures. In the PIP, we set an interval of mutation at 0.005, which is smaller than that of

144 the above numerical analysis, 10^{-8} . The larger interval in PIP results in a range of selfing rates
145 that are continuously evolutionarily stable. Indeed, an examination with a smaller interval of
146 selfing rate (i.e., 10^{-8}) suggests that the boundary of invasibility adjoins the diagonal line,
147 implying that the evolutionarily stable selfing rate is a point rather than a region.
148
149

150 CAPTIONS OF SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES

151 **Supplementary Figure 1.** Pairwise invasibility plot (PIP) of selfing rate. Each panel indicates a
152 PIP under the same condition as a corresponding panel of Fig. 1 with $k = 1$. Solid circles
153 represent selfing rates that are both convergently and evolutionarily stable, whereas open circles
154 are convergently unstable solutions. A grayscale chart above each panel indicates a mating mode
155 under the given resident selfing rate, which correspond to grayscale in Fig. 1. In panel (i), an
156 arrow indicates a region where a certain range of selfing rates are continuously evolutionary
157 stable (see Appendix B).

158 **Supplementary Figure 2.** Pairwise invasibility plot (PIP) of selfing rate. Each panel indicates a
159 PIP under the same condition as a corresponding panel of Fig. 2 with $k = 1$. Solid circles
160 represent selfing rates that are both convergently and evolutionarily stable, whereas open circles
161 are convergently unstable solutions. A grayscale chart above each panel indicates a mating mode
162 under the given resident selfing rate, which correspond to grayscale in Fig. 2.

163 **Supplementary Figure 3.** Feasible and stable equilibria and evolutionarily realized selfing rates
164 in a case that a restorer cost reduces male function (cost type 1), with varying parameters of
165 pollen limitation function, α and β . Solid circles represent selfing rates that are both convergently
166 and evolutionarily stable, whereas open circles are convergently unstable solutions. In this figure,
167 $\mu = 0.75$ and $1 - \delta = 0.75$, other parameters are shown in Table 1. The panels (b), (e), and (h) of
168 this figure represent similar results to Figs. 1(h), (e) and (b), respectively, because of
169 correspondences between μ , α and $\eta (= (1 - \delta)/\beta)$ values, i.e., $\eta = 0.25, 0.5$ and 1.0 .

170 **Supplementary Figure 4.** Feasible and stable equilibria and evolutionarily realized selfing rates
171 in a case that a restorer cost reduces individual performance (cost type 2), with varying
172 parameters of pollen limitation function, α and β . Parameters and conditions are identical to

173 Supplementary Fig. 3. The panels (b), (e), and (h) of this figure represent similar results with
174 Figs. 2(h), (e) and (b), respectively, because of correspondences between μ , α and $\eta (= (1 - \delta)/\beta)$
175 values, i.e., $\eta = 0.25, 0.5$ and 1.0 .

176 **Supplementary Figure 5.** Pairwise invasibility plot (PIP) of selfing rate. Each panel indicates a
177 PIP under the same condition as a corresponding panel of Supplementary Fig. 3 with $k = 1$. Solid
178 circles represent selfing rates that are both convergently and evolutionarily stable, whereas open
179 circles are convergently unstable solutions. A grayscale chart above each panel indicates a
180 mating mode under the given resident selfing rate, which corresponds to grayscale in
181 Supplementary Fig. 3.

182 **Supplementary Figure 6.** Pairwise invasibility plot (PIP) of selfing rate. Each panel indicates a
183 PIP under the same condition as a corresponding panel of Supplementary Fig. 4 with $k = 1$.
184 Parameters and conditions are identical to Supplementary Fig. 4.

185 **Supplementary Figure 7.** Feasible and stable equilibria and evolutionarily realized selfing rates
186 in a case that a restorer cost reduces male function (cost type 1), with varying parameters of
187 pollen discounting function, a and b . Solid circles represent selfing rates that are both
188 convergently and evolutionarily stable, whereas open circles are convergently unstable solutions.
189 In this figure, $\mu = 0.75$ and $1 - \delta = 0.5$, other parameters are shown in Table 1. Panel (i) of this
190 figure corresponds to Fig. 1(e) due to identical parameters.

191 **Supplementary Figure 8.** Feasible and stable equilibria and evolutionarily realized selfing rates
192 in a case that a restorer cost reduces individual performance (cost type 2), with varying
193 parameters of pollen discounting function, a and b . Parameters and conditions are identical to
194 Supplementary Fig. 7. The panel (i) of this figure corresponds to Fig. 2(e) due to identical
195 parameters.

196 **Supplementary Figure 9.** Pairwise invasibility plot (PIP) of selfing rate. Each panel indicates a
197 PIP under the same condition as a corresponding panel of Supplementary Fig. 7 with $k = 1$. Solid
198 circles represent selfing rates that are both convergently and evolutionarily stable, whereas open
199 circles are convergently unstable solutions. A grayscale chart above each panel indicates a
200 mating mode under the given resident selfing rate, which corresponds to grayscale in
201 Supplementary Fig. 7.

202 **Supplementary Figure 10.** Pairwise invasibility plot (PIP) of selfing rate. Each panel indicates a
203 PIP under the same condition as a corresponding panel of Supplementary Fig. 8 with $k = 1$.
204 Parameters and conditions are identical to Supplementary Fig. 8.

205 **Supplementary Table 1** Mating table of outbreeding

206

				normal mitochondria				CMS mitochondria				
				wildtype selfing		mutant selfing		wildtype selfing		mutant selfing		
				w	x	w'	x'	y (female)	z	y' (female)	z'	
				ms/n	Ms/n	ms'/n	Ms'/n	ms/c	Ms/c	ms'/c	Ms'/c	
normal mitochondria	wildtype selfing	Dp(s)	w	ms	w:1	w:1/2 x:1/2	w:1/2 w':1/2	w:1/2(1-r) w':1/2r x':1/2(1-r) x:1/2r	y:1	y:1/2 z:1/2	y:1/2 y':1/2	y:1/2(1-r) y':1/2r z':1/2(1-r) z:1/2r
			x	Ms	w:1/2 x:1/2	x:1	w':1/2(1-r) w:1/2r x:1/2(1-r) x':1/2r	x:1/2 x':1/2	y:1/2 z:1/2	z:1	y':1/2(1-r) y:1/2r z:1/2(1-r) z':1/2r	z:1/2 z':1/2
	mutant selfing	Dp(s')	w'	ms'	w:1/2 w':1/2	w':1/2(1-r) w:1/2r x:1/2(1-r) x':1/2r	w':1 w:1/2	x':1/2 x:1/2	y:1/2 y':1/2	y':1/2(1-r) y:1/2r z:1/2(1-r) z':1/2r	y':1 y:1/2	y':1/2 z':1/2
			x'	Ms'	w:1/2(1-r) w':1/2r x':1/2(1-r) x:1/2r	x:1/2 x':1/2	w:1/2 w:1/2	x:1 x':1	y:1/2(1-r) y':1/2r z:1/2(1-r) z:1/2r	z:1/2 z:1/2	y':1/2 z:1/2	z':1
CMS mitochondria	wildtype selfing	Dp(s)	y									
			z	ms	w:1/2 x:1/2	x:1	w':1/2(1-r) w:1/2r x:1/2(1-r) x':1/2r	x:1/2 x':1/2	y:1/2 z:1/2	z:1	y':1/2(1-r) y:1/2r z:1/2(1-r) z':1/2r	z:1/2 z':1/2
	mutant selfing	Dp(s')	y'									
			z'	Ms'	w:1/2(1-r) w':1/2r x':1/2(1-r) x:1/2r	x:1/2 x':1/2	w:1/2 w:1/2	x:1 x':1	y:1/2(1-r) y':1/2r z:1/2(1-r) z:1/2r	z:1/2 z:1/2	y':1/2 z:1/2	z':1

† Rows with the same color represet the sama mating consequence

207

208

209

210

Supplementary Figure 1

Supplementary Figure 2

Supplementary Figure 3

NCG	$(X_{mn}, X_{Mn}, X_{mc}, X_{Mc})$	H2	$(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$
CG	$(X_{mn}, 0, X_{mc}, 0)$	H2'	$(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$ only
H1	$(1, 0, 0, 0)$	NG	$(0, 0, X_{mc}, X_{Mc})$ only

Supplementary Figure 4

NCG	$(X_{mn}, X_{Mn}, X_{mc}, X_{Mc})$	H2	$(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$
CG	$(X_{mn}, 0, X_{mc}, 0)$	H2'	$(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$ only
H1	$(1, 0, 0, 0)$	NG	$(0, 0, X_{mc}, X_{Mc})$ only

Supplementary Figure 5

Supplementary Figure 6

Supplementary Figure 7

NCG	$(X_{mn}, X_{Mn}, X_{mc}, X_{Mc})$	H2	$(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$
CG	$(X_{mn}, 0, X_{mc}, 0)$	H2'	$(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$ only
H1	$(1, 0, 0, 0)$	NG	$(0, 0, X_{mc}, X_{Mc})$ only

Supplementary Figure 8

NCG	$(X_{mn}, X_{Mn}, X_{mc}, X_{Mc})$	H2	$(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$
CG	$(X_{mn}, 0, X_{mc}, 0)$	H2'	$(0, X_{Mn}, 0, X_{Mc})$ only
H1	$(1, 0, 0, 0)$	NG	$(0, 0, X_{mc}, X_{Mc})$ only

Supplementary Figure 9

Supplementary Figure 10