

Phenotypic plasticity in response to environmental heterogeneity contributes to fluctuating asymmetry in plants: first empirical evidence

BRANKA TUCIĆ*, SANJA BUDEČEVIĆ* , SANJA MANITAŠEVIĆ JOVANOVIĆ*, ANA VULETA* & CHRISTIAN PETER KLINGENBERG† 

*Department of Evolutionary Biology, Institute for Biological Research "Siniša Stanković", University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

†School of Biological Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

Keywords:

developmental instability;
fluctuating asymmetry;
geometric morphometrics;
Iris pumila;
phenotypic plasticity;
shape.

Abstract

Fluctuating asymmetry (FA) is widely used to quantify developmental instability (DI) in ecological and evolutionary studies. It has long been recognized that FA may not exclusively originate from DI for sessile organisms such as plants, because phenotypic plasticity in response to heterogeneities in the environment might also produce FA. This study provides the first empirical evidence for this hypothesis. We reasoned that solar irradiance, which is greater on the southern side than on the northern side of plants growing in the temperate zone of the Northern Hemisphere, would cause systematic morphological differences and asymmetry associated with the orientation of plant parts. We used geometric morphometrics to characterize the size and shape of flower parts in *Iris pumila* grown in a common garden. The size of floral organs was not significantly affected by orientation. Shape and particularly its asymmetric component differed significantly according to orientation for three different floral parts. Orientation accounted for 10.4% of the total shape asymmetry within flowers in the falls, for 11.4% in the standards and for 2.2% in the style branches. This indicates that phenotypic plasticity in response to a directed environmental factor, most likely solar irradiance, contributes to FA of flowers under natural conditions. That FA partly results from phenotypic plasticity and not just from DI needs to be considered by studies of FA in plants and other sessile organisms.

Introduction

Fluctuating asymmetry (FA) is a kind of phenotypic variation that manifests itself as the variable left–right difference in size or shape of bilaterally symmetric structures or as the variation among repeated parts in structures with complex symmetry (Palmer & Strobeck, 1986, 2003; Graham *et al.*, 2010; Savriama & Klingenberg, 2011; Klingenberg, 2015). FA is widely used in ecology and evolutionary biology as an easily measurable indicator of environmental and genetic stress (Palmer & Strobeck, 1986, 2003; Parsons, 1992; Wilsey

et al., 1998; Waldmann, 2001; Tucić *et al.*, 2008; Tucić & Miljković, 2010; Raz *et al.*, 2011; Beasley *et al.*, 2013; Abeli *et al.*, 2016; Sandner & Matthies, 2017; Telhado *et al.*, 2017), individual quality (Møller, 1995; Møller & Shykoff, 1999; Cornelissen & Stiling, 2005; Frey & Bukoski, 2014), and fitness (Andalo *et al.*, 2000; Lens *et al.*, 2002; Komac & Alados, 2012). These and other studies have yielded mixed results, and the whole approach of using FA as an indicator of stress or individual quality has led to considerable controversy (Palmer, 1996; Houle, 1998; Simmons *et al.*, 1999; Palmer & Hammond, 2000; Leamy & Klingenberg, 2005; Van Dongen, 2006; Debat, 2016). FA has also been widely used to investigate the developmental origin of morphological integration (Klingenberg, 2003b, 2015; Pélabon *et al.*, 2006; Zelditch *et al.*, 2009; Ivanović & Kalezić, 2010; Jamniczky & Hallgrímsson, 2011; Labonne *et al.*, 2014).

Correspondence: Christian Peter Klingenberg, School of Biological Sciences, University of Manchester, Michael Smith Building, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PT, UK.
Tel.: +44 161 2753899;
e-mail: cpk@manchester.ac.uk

Fluctuating asymmetry is considered to be the phenotypic outcome of small random irregularities in developmental processes that occur even under constant genetic and environmental conditions (Palmer, 1996; Klingenberg & Nijhout, 1999; Klingenberg, 2003a, 2015; Polak, 2003). The basic idea is that the left and the right sides of a bilaterally symmetric organism (or of a bilaterally symmetric organ) are separate copies of a morphological structure that develop under the control of the same genome and under the same environmental conditions. If the development of morphological structures were an entirely deterministic process, then the left and the right copies should develop as exact mirror images of each other, both exactly displaying the target phenotype specific for the genotype and environment of each individual (Nijhout & Davidowitz, 2003). In real biological systems, however, the process of development is not fully deterministic, but is affected by intrinsic developmental noise so that the realized phenotype deviates to a greater or lesser degree from the target phenotype expected under a given genotype and environmental conditions (Klingenberg, 2003a; Nijhout & Davidowitz, 2003). Because random developmental perturbations occur independently on each side, their effects are unlikely to be the same on both body sides, and the resulting differences are manifested as FA of morphological traits. Genetic and environmental effects may affect how the developmental system produces such random variation and modulates its phenotypic expression, and thus can affect the observable FA (Klingenberg & Nijhout, 1999; Klingenberg, 2003a). Applications of FA as an expression of developmental instability, regardless of whether they aim to quantify the effects of environmental and genetic stress or to investigate the developmental origins of morphological integration, all make the assumption that FA originates from random developmental perturbations.

If FA is to be interpreted as the phenotypic consequence of developmental instability, a further crucial assumption is that the left and right sides of an organism or structure share the same genome and the same environment (Palmer, 1996; Klingenberg, 2003a, 2015; Nijhout & Davidowitz, 2003). Although somatic mutations have been demonstrated in many species, they appear not to contribute substantially to phenotypic variation within individuals (Herrera, 2009), so that genetic variation is unlikely to be a major contributing factor for asymmetry. For environmental variation, the usual argument is that environmental differences between sides are small or average out over the period of development of an organism (Nijhout & Davidowitz, 2003; Klingenberg, 2015). Whereas this argument is plausible for motile organisms that move through their environment, it is unlikely to hold for sessile organisms, such as most plants, because their parts are exposed to heterogeneity in their immediate environment in a constant manner. For instance, heterogeneous shading

by nearby leaves may produce persistent differences in the incident light between the left and right sides of a single leaf. If phenotypic plasticity leads to a morphological response to such environmental heterogeneity, the resulting asymmetry is a component of FA that is not due to developmental instability. In turn, this raises the question whether FA can be used as a reliable measure of stress or fitness in sessile organisms. That FA in plants and other sessile organisms may be due in part to phenotypic plasticity in response to environmental heterogeneity has been discussed in the literature as a possibility (Palmer, 1996; Nijhout & Davidowitz, 2003; Van Dongen, 2006; Klingenberg *et al.*, 2012; Savriama *et al.*, 2012; Klingenberg, 2015), but so far there is no direct evidence for this effect.

To obtain such evidence, it seems the most elegant approach would be an experiment in which plants are grown in a completely homogeneous environment, and morphological asymmetry is measured to examine whether it is reduced by comparison to plants grown under natural conditions. Eliminating heterogeneity of environmental factors is feasible for some factors (e.g. Koethe *et al.*, 2017), but not for others. For instance, it is impossible to ensure that plant parts experience perfectly homogeneous lighting conditions because different parts of the same plant inevitably shade each other to some degree. Therefore, it is not feasible to conduct an experiment that would completely preclude FA due to plasticity. An alternative is the opposite experimental approach, in which persistent localized heterogeneity is produced for some environmental factor such as light, temperature or humidity, and the resulting effect on morphological asymmetry is recorded. For instance, previous experiments have shown that completely covering half of a leaf can produce measurable asymmetry (Freeman *et al.*, 2003). This approach raises the question, however, whether such experiments are realistic. Experimental manipulations tend to be relatively large, in order to overcome possible procedural imprecision and artefacts, but it is not clear whether the less drastic heterogeneities that occur in natural environments are also sufficient to cause asymmetry. Such experiments can establish that a particular environmental factor has the potential to affect asymmetry, but they cannot indicate whether this factor has a sufficiently strong effect under natural conditions or whether other factors might not be equally or more important. As a consequence, this approach is able to demonstrate that plasticity in response to environmental heterogeneity can produce asymmetry in principle, but it cannot tell whether this actually occurs in nature. Therefore, rather than conducting experimental manipulations, it seems preferable to employ a natural source of environmental heterogeneity.

For testing the hypothesis that phenotypic plasticity contributes to plant FA in nature, it is helpful to focus on a natural component of environmental heterogeneity

that forms a consistent gradient and thus affects many plants in the same way, so that the effect can be demonstrated using statistical approaches. Plant parts with different orientations experience the gradient at different angles in relation to their anatomical axes (Fig. 1). If phenotypic plasticity produces a response to such a gradient, parts with different orientation will differ from each other in a manner that is systematically linked to their orientations. In other words, one would expect differences in the average morphology of parts according to their orientation relative to the gradient, which is fairly straightforward to demonstrate. This leaves the question what environmental gradient can be used for such an experiment. A suitable environmental factor with such a gradient is solar irradiance. Solar irradiance has profound physiological effects on plant development through both visible light and temperature (Larcher, 2003), and it is highly directional. When integrated throughout the day in locations in the temperate zone of the Northern Hemisphere, solar radiation is predominantly from southerly directions. Therefore, plant organs oriented towards the south receive more irradiance on average than organs oriented towards the north, and phenotypic plasticity may produce morphological differences between them. Also, organs directed towards the east tend to receive more irradiance on their left than on their right sides, and the reverse for organs directed towards the west, so that phenotypic plasticity in response to solar irradiance may also cause individual plant organs to be asymmetric in ways that depend on

their orientation (Fig. 1). Because of the effects of shading and reflection by objects in the immediate surroundings (e.g. by parts of the same plant or even the same flower), we expect that the actual distribution of incident light is more complex than a simple gradient. Nevertheless, we can expect that, even though the specific conditions experienced by each organ may be patterned irregularly, the directional nature of solar irradiance will produce a component that is itself directional, so that response elicited by phenotypic plasticity has a component that is consistent among all plants in the experiment and related to the orientation of the parts. Therefore, it is possible to use this directed component for testing the hypothesis that plasticity contributes to FA by examining whether plant organs with different compass orientations differ in the averages of their shapes and asymmetries.

This study presents the first empirical test of the hypothesis that phenotypic plasticity in response to environmental heterogeneity contributes to FA in plant organs. We investigate the floral organs of *Iris pumila*, a species that previously has been used in studies of FA using plants from a common garden experiment (Tucić *et al.*, 2008, 2013; Radović *et al.*, 2017) and from contrasting light habitats in the wild (Tucić & Miljković, 2010). To test the hypothesis, we use the methods of geometric morphometrics (Klingenberg, 2010; Zelditch *et al.*, 2012; Adams *et al.*, 2013) to quantify shape variation and asymmetry of three different floral organs in relation to their compass orientations.




Fig. 1 Effects of an environmental gradient on plant parts with different orientations. (a) Plant parts in their natural arrangement. The environmental gradient acts in a vertical direction from the bottom of the diagram (0°) to the top (180°) and is represented by a gradation from light to dark shading. As a result of the different orientation of the parts, the anatomical axes of each part appear at a different angle to the gradient (L and R mark the left and right sides of each part). (b) The effects of the gradient in relation to the parts viewed separately. Parts have been rearranged to have the same orientation in relation to their anatomical axes. As a consequence, the effects of the gradient are in directions that are distinctive for each one of the parts. If there is phenotypic plasticity in response to the environmental gradient, the resulting morphological differences may also be specific according to the orientation of parts. Note that this argument does not depend on the number or particular arrangement of parts. In conventional studies that do not specifically record the compass orientation of the plant parts under study, differences due to phenotypic plasticity in response to such a gradient would be considered as fluctuating asymmetry.

Material and methods

Study species and experimental set-up

Iris pumila L. is a rhizomatous perennial plant that is widespread in the lowlands of central and south-east Europe (Randolph, 1955). In Serbia, the species is native to the Deliblato Sands (44°47'N, 21°20'E; Gajić, 1983), where it forms round clones differing in size, depending on their age (Tucić *et al.*, 1988). The species blooms in early spring, and the flowering phase lasts about 2–3 weeks.

The flower of *I. pumila*, similar to other species of *Iris* (Pande & Singh, 1981), consists of four trimerous whorls: two whorls of tepals, the stamens and the gynoecium, of which the petaloid style branches form a conspicuous part of the flower (Fig. 2a). The bases of the tepals are united to form a floral tube (Fig. 2a: FT). The outer tepals are called 'falls' and are bent downwards to function as a landing platform for pollinating insects (Fig. 2a: F). The inner tepals, called 'standards', are erect and are the flower elements that are the most visible from a distance (Fig. 2a: S). The stamens (Fig. 2a: Sta) are hidden below the style branches (Fig. 2a: StyB), which bend over the basal part of the falls and carry the receptive stigmatic lip near their tip (Fig. 2a: SL).

The flowers of *I. pumila* are actinomorphic, with floral organs arranged around a central axis so that rotations by an angle of 120° separate the organs in the same whorl from each other (Fig. 2b). In addition to this symmetry of the flower as a whole, each of the individual flower organs is bilaterally symmetric. We take into account this complex symmetry of the flower in the morphometric analyses (Savriama & Klingenberg, 2011; Klingenberg, 2015). For the whole flower, we use the perspective of matching symmetry by separating the flower into individual organs: the falls, standards and style branches. Asymmetry of the whole

flower can be characterized by the differences among the three copies of organs in each whorl. For each flower organ, our analyses use the approach for bilateral object symmetry to extract symmetric and asymmetry components (Klingenberg *et al.*, 2002; Klingenberg, 2015). Therefore, it is possible to examine how the organs at different positions within each whorl differ in their symmetric component of shape and in their shape asymmetries, both of which may be affected by exposure to an environmental gradient (Fig. 1b).

The plants used in this study are part of a common garden experiment established in 1996 from a natural population of *I. pumila* from the Deliblato Sands area. The plants were grown in clay pots in an experimental garden in the grounds of the Siniša Stanković Institute for Biological Research in Belgrade (44°49'2.94"N/20°29'15.51"E), where they still grow as mature clones under common garden conditions (Manitašević Jovanović *et al.*, 2011; Tucić *et al.*, 2013). The pots were positioned haphazardly, without any reference to the plants within them, so that the orientations of the plants were effectively randomized. During the period of development of the flowers used in this experiment, the pots were not moved.

Collection of samples

Flowers were collected daily from 21 March 2014 to 1 April 2014, for a period starting at 11 am and lasting between one and two hours each day, and compass orientation was recorded for each flower. For practical reasons, the orientation of flower organs was determined in relation to the sun. During the sampling period, the direction of the sun at 11 am was approximately from south–south-east (azimuth 164.08° to 164.05° from 21 March to 29 March and 143.67° to 143.40° from 30 March to 1 April; the jump is because of the switch to summer time on 30 March 2014; calculations using the NOAA Solar Calculator, <http://www.e>




Fig. 2 Representative photograph of an *Iris pumila* flower. (a) Side-view image of an *Iris pumila* flower, with acronyms of floral organs and their corresponding parts (according to Mathew, 1981): F, fall; S, standard; StyB, style branch; C, crest; Sta, stamen; SL, stigmatic lip; B, beard; FT, floral tube; (b) Top view of an *Iris pumila* flower and six orientations of floral organs (0° towards the sun).

srl.noaa.gov/gmd/grad/solcalc/). Solar noon was between 11.42 am to 11.45 am from 21 March to 29 March, or roughly midway through the daily sampling period, and at 12.42 pm from 30 March to 1 April. Overall, the position of the sun approximately indicates south, more exactly so during the first 9 days of flower harvesting than during the last 3 days.

For each of 267 potted clones (genets), two simultaneously opened flowers were marked and harvested: one with a fall oriented towards the sun and another with a standard towards the sun (Fig. 2b). Because floral organs in the *Iris* flower are repeated at 120° intervals, this sampling design resulted in a data set with copies of each floral organ from six different orientations: 0° (towards the sun, approximately south), 120° and 240° from one flower and 60°, 180° and 360° from the other flower of the same genet (Fig. 2b).

Immediately after harvesting, flowers were submerged in 70% ethanol and stored singly in bottles until dissection. In the laboratory, every flower was cut at the end of the floral tube to separate the floral organs. The falls, standards and styles were then spread on a glass plate coated with 50% glycerol. Digital images (600-dpi resolution) of floral organs were recorded using an optical scanner (CanoScan 5600F; Canon Inc., Tokyo, Japan).

Landmark data

To characterize the shape of floral organs, we applied the methods of geometric morphometrics, which use the relative positions of a set of landmarks to quantify morphological variation (Klingenberg, 2010; Zelditch *et al.*, 2012; Dryden & Mardia, 2016). Landmarks were

digitized using TPSDIG software (Rohlf, 2006). The landmark data have been deposited at DataDryad (DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.8th5m>).

For the fall, a set of 18 landmarks is used (seven pairs and four median landmarks; Fig. 3a). At the base of the fall, landmark 1 is on the central nerve, landmarks 5 and 6 are on the left and right peripheral nerves, and landmarks 7 and 8 are at the left and right margins, respectively. The tip of the fall is marked by landmark 2; landmark 3 is located at the first branching of the central nerve; and landmark 4 is at the end of the beard. Landmarks 9 and 10 are on the left and right margins, at the same level as landmark 4. The remaining landmarks are distributed at equal distances on the margins between the landmarks defined before (11 and 13 between 7 and 9; 12 and 14 between 8 and 10; 15 and 17 between 2 and 9; 16 and 18 between 2 and 10).

For the standard, 19 landmarks are used (eight pairs and three median landmarks; Fig. 3b). Landmarks 1 and 2 are at the tip and a base of the central nerve. At the base of the standard, landmarks 3 and 4 are on the two peripheral nerves, whereas landmarks 5 and 6 are on the left and right margins. Landmarks 7 and 8 are at the points of maximal curvature where the narrow base broadens into the main blade of the standard, and landmarks 9 and 10 are the widest points of the standard. Several landmarks are equally spaced on the margin between previously defined landmarks (11 between 7 and 9; 12 between 8 and 10; 13, 15 and 17 between 2 and 9; 14, 16 and 18 between 2 and 10). Landmark 19 indicates the first branching of the central nerve.

For the style branch, 18 landmarks are used (eight pairs and two median landmarks; Fig. 3c). At the base, landmark 1 is the central point, midway between the




Fig. 3 Configuration of landmarks on the images of floral organs: (a) fall; (b) standard; and (c) style branch.

two central nerves, landmarks 3 and 4 are at the left and right central nerves, and landmarks 5 and 6 are at the left and right margins, respectively. The remaining landmarks are located on the stigma: landmark 2 is the mid-point of the apical margin of the stigma, whereas the others are arranged as pairs on the basal (landmarks 7 and 8) and apical margin of the stigmatic lip (landmarks 9–18; Fig. 3c). It was not possible to locate landmarks on the lobes at the end of the style branch because of the great variability of this region.

Morphometric analysis

As a measure of size for each floral organ, we used centroid size, the square root of the sum of squared distances of all the landmarks from their centroid (Dryden & Mardia, 2016). The differences in the sizes among organs in different orientations were tested by a one-way ANOVA. Statistical analyses of centroid size were carried out with SAS statistical software (SAS Institute Inc., 1990).

Because the floral organs were separated and flattened to collect landmark data, this study uses the framework of matching symmetry at the level of the whole flower, whereas each organ has bilateral object symmetry (Savriama & Klingenberg, 2011; Klingenberg, 2015). Accordingly, asymmetry at the level of the entire flower is characterized by the differences among the sizes and shapes of organs with different orientations. In addition, because individual flower organs are bilaterally symmetric, there are two separate components of symmetric and asymmetric shape variation for each of them, which may be differently affected by exposure to an environmental gradient under different orientations (Fig. 1b). We therefore conduct comparisons of the flower organs with different orientations separately for the symmetric and asymmetry components of shape variation.

To extract shape information from the landmark configurations of floral organs, we used Procrustes superimpositions (Dryden & Mardia, 2016). To take into account the bilateral symmetry of floral organs, we applied the method for object symmetry, which uses the landmark configurations and their reflected and relabelled copies (Klingenberg *et al.*, 2002; Klingenberg, 2015). This method obtains a symmetric component of shape variation by averaging the original and reflected and relabelled copies, and the asymmetric component from differences between them (Klingenberg *et al.*, 2002). Procrustes superimpositions and subsequent morphometric analyses were carried out with the MORPHOJ software package (Klingenberg, 2011).

Differences among the mean shapes of floral organs according to their orientation were computed as deviations of the mean shapes for the six orientations from the overall mean shape and exaggerated 5- or 15-fold for better visibility in the diagrams. These differences were visualized as warped outline drawings, which

facilitate interpretation of shape changes in their anatomical context (Klingenberg, 2013).

To assess differences in shape between floral organs with different orientations statistically, we used canonical variate analysis (CVA), a technique providing an ordination that maximizes the differences among group means relative to within-group variation (Zelditch *et al.*, 2012). CVAs were conducted separately for the symmetric and asymmetric components of shape variation of each floral organ. The variation within groups, the residual 'error' effect against which the differences among orientations are assessed in the CVAs, includes FA from developmental instability, FA from phenotypic plasticity in response to environmental heterogeneity that affects different flowers differently, as well as measurement error. The statistical significance of pairwise differences in mean shapes was assessed with permutation test using Mahalanobis and Procrustes distances (10 000 permutations per test).

To quantify the amount of variation for which compass orientation accounts, which is a part (but not all) of the asymmetry contributed by phenotypic plasticity, we used the decomposition of Procrustes sums of squares for complex matching symmetry according to formula (2) in Savriama & Klingenberg (2011). We expanded the decomposition by including the additional effect of flowers nested within plants. Because of the object symmetry of each floral part, we computed the Procrustes sums of squares separately for the symmetric and asymmetry components and also combined as a measure of variation in the entire shape space of each landmark configuration. To quantify the proportion of FA attributable to the orientation of floral parts, we computed the percentages of the sums of squares of the asymmetry due to orientation and the remaining asymmetry relative to the total asymmetry within flowers. In conventional studies of asymmetry, without recording compass orientation of flower parts, both these components of asymmetry would be considered as part of FA (i.e. no estimate of directional asymmetry is available in radially symmetric flowers without a clear adaxial–abaxial direction; Klingenberg, 2015). The component of asymmetry due to orientation and the residual asymmetry within flowers can therefore be added up to compute the total estimate of FA that would be obtained in a conventional study not recording compass orientation. The proportion of this total for which orientation accounts is a lower bound for the proportion of FA due to phenotypic plasticity, but is most likely an underestimate of the true proportion because it accounts only for the part of environmental heterogeneity that is the same for all flowers.

Results

The mean centroid sizes of the flower organs were very nearly the same regardless of their orientations (Table 1).

Table 1 Size of floral organs in response to orientation.

Orientation	Fall			Standard			Style branch		
	N	Mean	SE	N	Mean	SE	N	Mean	SE
0°	266	7.375	0.211	262	7.433	0.207	257	6.865	0.162
60°	265	7.354	0.206	262	7.394	0.216	257	6.871	0.157
120°	266	7.344	0.214	262	7.402	0.210	257	6.868	0.158
180°	266	7.360	0.218	262	7.399	0.217	257	6.874	0.157
240°	266	7.344	0.217	262	7.394	0.208	257	6.872	0.154
300°	266	7.350	0.209	262	7.391	0.217	257	6.869	0.157

Tabled values are the sample size (*N*), the mean centroid size and its standard error (SE).

The ANOVAS indicated no significant differences due to orientation of falls ($F = 0.82$; d.f. = 5,1588; $P = 0.54$), standards ($F = 1.39$; d.f. = 5,1566; $P = 0.22$) and style branches ($F = 0.11$; d.f. = 5,1536; $P = 0.99$).

The shapes of the falls differed among orientations in subtle ways (Fig. 4). For the symmetric component of shape variation, these differences particularly affected the relative width of the base of the falls, which was especially narrow for the most southerly orientation (0°, Fig. 4a). For the asymmetry component, the most obvious feature was the ‘pinwheel symmetry’ of the falls – each of them is asymmetric in that the mid-vein is shifted towards one side of the fall (counterclockwise;

Fig. 4b). Superimposed on this overall asymmetry, there are subtle asymmetries specific to the different orientations. The ordinations of the CVA plots provide a summary of the patterns of differences among orientations (Fig. 4c and d). For both the symmetric and asymmetry components, some confidence ellipses are clearly separated from each other, whereas some others overlap, suggesting that there were statistically significant shape differences among falls of different orientations. This finding is consistent with the distances between shape means and the results of the permutation tests (Tables S1 and S2). For the symmetric component, the plot of CV scores indicated no clear pattern




Fig. 4 Effects of orientation on the shape of the falls. (a) Differences among the six orientations of falls in the means of the symmetric component of shape variation (shape changes exaggerated five-fold); (b) differences among the six orientations in the means of the asymmetric component of shape variation (shape changes exaggerated 15-fold); (c) 95% confidence ellipses for the means of the symmetric component of shape variation in the six orientations; (d) 95% confidence ellipses for the means of the asymmetry component of shape variation in the six orientations.

(Fig. 4c). For the asymmetry component, however, the sample mean shapes were arranged approximately as a ring (Fig. 3d): starting at the 0° sample, continuing through the 60° sample, to the shared location of the 120° and 180° samples (not statistically different), on to the 240° and 300° samples and back to the 0° sample. This indicates that, for the asymmetric component of shape variation in the falls, the differences among samples for the different orientations correspond approximately to their spatial arrangement in the flowers. Of the total shape asymmetry among falls within flowers, orientation accounted for 11.5% of asymmetry in the symmetric component, for 5.7% in the asymmetry component and for 10.4% in the combined shape components (Table 2).

For the standards, the symmetric component of variation featured differences in the relative lengths and widths of the base vs. the expanded blade (Fig. 5a). As for the falls (Fig. 4a), the standards in the 0° position were narrowest (Fig. 5a; but note that these were not part of the same flowers because falls and standards are offset by 60°). The asymmetric component of shape variation for the standards (Fig. 5b), as for the falls (Fig. 4b), displays clear ‘pinwheel’ symmetry in addition to a variety of asymmetries specific to each orientation. The CVA plot for the symmetric component of variation displays no clear pattern, with some evident differences among samples but also overlap among some of them (Fig. 5c). In the CVA plot of the

asymmetry component of shape variation in the standards (Fig. 5d), the mean shapes of the six samples were arranged approximately in a ring – from the 0° sample to the 60° sample, on to 120° and 180° (those are not significantly different in the permutation tests; Tables S1 and S2), further on to 240°, then 300° and back to the 0° sample. The proportion of the total asymmetry within flowers explained by orientation was 12.8% for the symmetric component, 7.3% for the asymmetry component and 11.4% for total shape variation of the standards (Table 2).

For the style branches, the symmetric component of variation featured fairly subtle differences among orientations dominated by a contrast of relative length vs. width (Fig. 6a). The asymmetry component featured ‘pinwheel’ symmetry with a clockwise displacement of the apical landmarks of the stigmatic lip relative to the more proximal landmarks and more subtle asymmetries specific to the six positions (Fig. 6b). The CVA for the symmetric component of style shape variation showed no clear pattern and extensive overlap among the confidence intervals of the mean shapes (Fig. 6c). The permutation tests of the differences among shape averages for the different orientations provided no evidence for differences in the symmetric component of shape, whereas for the asymmetry component some significant differences were present (Tables S1 and S2). For the asymmetry component of style shape, confidence ellipses for the sample means of the different positions were arranged as a ring, starting from the 0° sample through the 60° sample to the position of the 120° and 180° samples, which overlapped almost perfectly and did not differ from each other significantly, on to 240° through 300° and back to the 0° sample (Fig. 6d). Orientation accounted only for a minor proportion of the total asymmetry of style shape within flowers: 1.6% for the symmetric component, 3.1% for the asymmetry component and 2.2% for total shape variation (Table 2).

Discussion

The hypothesis that phenotypic plasticity in response to environmental heterogeneity contributes to FA predicts that, for plant structures exposed to a gradient from a directed environmental factor such as solar irradiance, there should be systematic differences among parts according to their orientations (Fig. 1). In agreement with this expectation, this study shows that floral organs of *I. pumila* with different orientations differ in their shapes, and particularly in their asymmetries. The effects are fairly subtle, accounting for between 1.6% and 12.8% of FA in the corresponding components of variation, but statistically significant differences exist for all three floral organs examined here. By contrast, there does not appear to be an effect on the size of floral organs.

Table 2 Decomposition of Procrustes sums of squares for the different flower parts (using an expanded version of formula 2 in Savriama & Klingenberg, 2011).

	Fall	Standard	Style branch
Symmetric component of part shape variation			
Orientation	0.1415 (11.5%)	0.2147 (12.8%)	0.0059 (1.6%)
Plant	4.0045	4.6509	2.3826
Flower	0.7545	0.9263	0.3683
Other asymmetry	1.0851 (88.5%)	1.4601 (87.2%)	0.3643 (98.4%)
Total	5.9856	7.2520	3.1212
Asymmetric component of part shape variation			
Orientation	0.0157 (5.7%)	0.0117 (7.3%)	0.0073 (3.1%)
Plant	0.0811	0.0939	0.0566
Flower	0.0534	0.0713	0.0505
Other asymmetry	0.2617 (94.3%)	0.3016 (96.3%)	0.2308 (96.9%)
Total	0.4118	0.4785	0.3452
Total shape variation (symmetric and asymmetry components combined)			
Orientation	0.1571 (10.4%)	0.2263 (11.4%)	0.0132 (2.2%)
Plant	4.0856	4.7448	2.4392
Flower	0.8079	0.9976	0.4189
Other asymmetry	1.3468 (89.6%)	1.7618 (88.6%)	0.5950 (97.8%)
Total	6.3974	7.7305	3.4663

For each flower part, the decomposition has been carried out separately for the symmetric and asymmetry components of shape variation, and both have been combined to quantify the total shape variation. The percentages indicate the proportions of asymmetry within flowers for which orientation can and cannot account.




Fig. 5 Effects of orientation on the shape of the standards. (a) Differences among the six orientations of standards in the means of the symmetric component of shape variation (shape changes exaggerated five-fold); (b) differences among the six orientations of standards in the means of the asymmetric component of shape variation (shape changes exaggerated 15-fold); (c) 95% confidence ellipses for the means of the symmetric component of shape variation in the six orientations; (d) 95% confidence ellipses for the means of the asymmetry component of shape variation in the six orientations.

For the symmetric component of shape variation of all three flower organs, the main feature of differences among positions was variation in the relative length vs. width (Figs 4a, 5a and 6a). The analyses revealed clear shape differences according to position for the falls and standards, but no significant differences for the style branches. It is tempting to attribute that pattern to the fact that the style branches are innermost in the developing bud and therefore might be protected from environmental effects to some extent by the other organs, but the clear effects of position on the asymmetry of the style branches (Fig. 6b and d) refute such reasoning. The CVA plots for the symmetric component (Figs 4c, 5c and 6c) suggested no evident pattern relating either to the orientation on the flowers or to whether the organs were from the same or different flowers (orientations 0°, 120° and 240° vs. 60°, 180° and 300°).

For the asymmetry component, the most immediately striking pattern in the shape changes was the 'pinwheel' symmetry of all three floral organs (Figs 4b and 5b). It is plausible that this pattern relates to the convolute aestivation of the flower parts, where the floral organs are rolled up in the bud in a direction that is constant among flowers, as it is known across the genus *Iris* (Schoute, 1935). Superimposed on this is a

subtler pattern of differences in asymmetry among the six orientations, which is most apparent from the CVA plots (Figs 4d and 5d). For the asymmetry components of all three organs, the averages for the six orientations are arranged approximately in a ring. Although these averages do not form a perfectly regular hexagon, a relation of the asymmetry of flower organs to their spatial orientation on the flowers is clearly evident. Because the direction of CVA axes is arbitrary, it is immaterial whether the averages appear in clockwise or in counterclockwise order and in which region of the plots each particular orientation appears (the plots can be flipped freely about their horizontal or vertical axes).

Exposure of plants to a gradient from a directed environmental factor (Fig. 1) is expected to produce a response that is the same for all plants. If there is phenotypic plasticity in response to this factor, it can be assessed by recording the compass orientation of flower organs and examining whether there are consistent differences between the shapes of flower organs with different orientations. The differences among shape averages of flower organs with different orientations, both in the symmetric and asymmetric components of shape of each organ, indicate systematic asymmetries of the whole flower. Accordingly, the shape differences




Fig. 6 Effects of orientation on the shape of the style branches. (a) Differences among the six orientations of style branches in the means of the symmetric component of shape variation (shape changes exaggerated 15-fold); (b) differences among the six orientations in the means of the asymmetric component of shape variation (shape changes exaggerated 15-fold). Note that there are no landmarks on the terminal lobes – the shape changes in this region are extrapolated from the nearby landmarks on the stigmatic lip; (c) 95% confidence ellipses for the means of the symmetric component of shape variation in the six orientations; (d) 95% confidence ellipses for the means of the asymmetry component of shape variation in the six orientations.

recorded in this study are directional asymmetries, that is systematic differences between the average shapes of repeated parts within flowers (Klingenberg, 2015). Compared to other studies on plant asymmetry, the present study is unique in that the compass orientations of the flower parts were recorded. Previous studies have defined asymmetry in relation to plant architecture, such as the adaxial–abaxial axis of flowers (Savriama *et al.*, 2012; Baranov & Gavrikov, 2013; Gardner *et al.*, 2016) or the left–right asymmetry of leaves (Pélabon *et al.*, 2006; Chitwood *et al.*, 2012; Martinez *et al.*, 2016), but did not record compass orientation of plant organs, and therefore would have included asymmetries according to orientation as a component of FA. There might be directional asymmetry within the flowers in relation to plant architecture in *Iris pumila* too, as there is a consistent arrangement of the flower parts relative to the spathe subtending the flower (pers.obs.; for another species, see Pande & Singh, 1981). Any such directional asymmetry would have to be subtle too, but no morphometric information of this is currently available. Because the pots with plants were positioned in random orientations, however, any intrinsic asymmetry in relation to the whole plant cannot be the cause for the observed systematic differences between the average shapes of flower parts according

to their compass orientations. Therefore, the directional asymmetry according to compass orientation must be a plastic response to some directed environmental factor. Recording the orientation of flower parts enabled us to demonstrate the effect of plasticity in response to a directed environmental factor as directional asymmetry, because such a factor affects a large number of flowers in the same way, and therefore even subtle effects can be documented by statistical methods. This made it possible, for the first time, to show empirically that plasticity in response to environmental heterogeneity indeed contributes to morphological asymmetry in plants (Palmer, 1996; Nijhout & Davidowitz, 2003; Klingenberg *et al.*, 2012; Savriama *et al.*, 2012; Klingenberg, 2015).

The only plausible explanation for the fairly regular patterns of asymmetry (Figs 4d, 5d and 6d) is phenotypic plasticity of the floral organs in response to a consistently directed environmental factor (Fig. 1). The most consistent irregularity in the arrangement of average shape asymmetries in the CVA plots is the partial or complete overlap and nonsignificant differences between the 120° and 180° orientations (Figs 4d, 5d and 6d; Tables S1 and S2). With the information at hand, we cannot offer an explanation for this irregularity. The most likely the environmental factor responsible for these effects is solar irradiance, which is known

to have profound effects on physiological processes in plants through both heat and visible light (Larcher, 2003; Taiz & Zeiger, 2010). Phenotypic plasticity of plant organ shape in response to differences in irradiance has been demonstrated even within shoots (Kubínová *et al.*, 2017), and experiments have shown that floral organs can show plasticity in response to intensity and spectral composition of light (Weinig, 2002; Brock & Weinig, 2007; Kurepin *et al.*, 2016). Nevertheless, we acknowledge that other directed factors, such as geomagnetism (Maffei, 2014), cannot be ruled out on the basis of our data, but they are much less plausible as mechanisms that might account for the observed shape differences. Because *Iris* flowers grow in an upright position, asymmetry in response to gravity, which has been shown to influence asymmetry of petal positions in some *Saxifraga* species (Koethe *et al.*, 2017), also cannot be the factor responsible for the effects of compass orientation.

This demonstration that plasticity in response to environmental heterogeneity contributes to FA has substantial implications for the growing number of studies that use FA in plant parts as an indicator of developmental instability to measure the effects of environmental stresses such as pollution or unfavourable growing conditions (Kozlov *et al.*, 1996; Cornelissen & Stiling, 2010; Raz *et al.*, 2011; Baranov, 2014), to assess plant quality in plant–herbivore and plant–pollinator interactions (Møller, 1995; Cornelissen & Stiling, 2005; Anton *et al.*, 2013; Frey & Bukoski, 2014; Alves-Silva & Del-Claro, 2016), or to gauge the effects of genetic factors such as hybridization or inbreeding (Siikamäki & Lamm, 1998; Waldmann, 2001; Rao *et al.*, 2002; Albarrán-Lara *et al.*, 2010; Vaupel & Matthies, 2012; Helsen & Van Dongen, 2016; Sandner & Matthies, 2017). Because FA results not only from developmental instability, but also from plasticity in response to heterogeneity in the immediate surroundings of the plant parts, explanations of the association between FA and other factors can be ambiguous. For instance, in studies that found higher FA for leaves or flowers more exposed to sunlight than for those from more shaded positions in the same trees (Coward & Graham, 1999; Perfectti & Camacho, 1999), there may be two alternative explanations: positions more exposed to light may be more stressful, leading to greater developmental instability and thus FA, or the greater FA may result from greater effects of plasticity in response to the sharper differences between light and shade in more exposed positions. Likewise, in comparisons of FA in plants between different environments, differences in FA might reflect greater developmental instability or more accentuated microenvironmental heterogeneity in some locations than in others. For example, observations that FA in sun-exposed habitats is greater than in shaded habitats (Tucić & Miljković, 2010; Raz *et al.*, 2011) might be explained by increased developmental instability due to

light or heat stress or, alternatively, by plasticity in response to the more drastic contrasts between the lit and shaded sides of each plant organ. Also, because FA from phenotypic plasticity simply adds to the observed asymmetry without any necessary relation to developmental instability, the additional noise it provides may contribute to the many negative results in studies attempting to correlate FA to stress, individual quality or fitness (Palmer & Strobeck, 2003; Van Dongen, 2006; Debat, 2016).

The demonstration that FA originates in part from phenotypic plasticity in response to environmental heterogeneity raises the question of how much FA is due to plasticity. Depending on which floral organ and component of shape variation is considered, orientation accounts for 1.6–12.8% of FA (Table 2). Because these calculations consider only aspects of local heterogeneity in environmental factors that are affecting all the flowers in the same way, but ignore all those aspects of heterogeneity that act in more irregular ways, these values are minimal estimates of how much of FA is due to phenotypic plasticity. Almost certainly, the true proportions will be greater because the environmental factors have patterns that are locally patchy and do not conform to a simple gradient, so that their effects will differ from plant to plant. To quantify how much FA actually originates from phenotypic plasticity, it would be necessary to identify all factors that might elicit phenotypic plasticity, characterize all the respective reaction norms and measure the heterogeneity of the relevant factors in the surroundings of the plant organs under study. This is far beyond the scope of this study and, in practice, doing this in a comprehensive manner would be extremely challenging. For instance, it is likely that the equipment required to measure heterogeneity of light, temperature and humidity in the immediate surroundings of a plant organ would affect that heterogeneity itself as it would cast shadows, change air circulation and so forth. Also, it is far from clear how measurements of heterogeneity would have to be integrated over time to quantify the role of plasticity.

The main conclusion, at this point, is that investigators need to take into account that FA in plants and other sessile organisms originates from a combination of developmental instability and phenotypic plasticity in response to environmental heterogeneity. The relative contributions of these two sources of variation are currently unknown. Motile animals are less affected by this phenomenon because environmental heterogeneities will change in direction and intensity as each individual moves through its environment, and it is thus likely that differences between body sides effectively will average out (Nijhout & Davidowitz, 2003; Klingenberg, 2015). Even for studies of motile animals, however, FA from phenotypic plasticity may be a serious concern if animals are mostly stationary during an

important developmental phase, such as the pupal stage in many holometabolous insects (Van Dongen, 2006). This problem is therefore important for many applications of FA in studies of ecology and evolution.

Acknowledgments

We thank two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on a previous version of this manuscript. This work was supported by the Ministry for Education, Science and Technological Development of Serbia, Grant # 173007. The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

References

- Abeli, T., Zubani, L., Bonomi, C., Parolo, G. & Gargano, D. 2016. Is phenotypic canalization involved in the decline of the endemic *Aquilegia thalictrifolia*? Rethinking relationships between fluctuating asymmetry and species conservation status. *Plant Species Biol.* **31**: 247–255.
- Adams, D.C., Rohlf, F.J. & Slice, D.E. 2013. A field comes of age: geometric morphometrics in the 21st century. *Hystrix* **24**: 7–14.
- Albarrán-Lara, A.L., Mendoza-Cuenca, L., Valencia-Avalos, S., González-Rodríguez, A. & Oyama, K. 2010. Leaf fluctuating asymmetry increases with hybridization and introgression between *Quercus magnoliifolia* and *Quercus resinosa* (Fagaceae) through an altitudinal gradient in Mexico. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* **171**: 310–322.
- Alves-Silva, E. & Del-Claro, K. 2016. Herbivory-induced stress: leaf developmental instability is caused by herbivore damage in early stages of leaf development. *Ecol. Indic.* **61**: 359–365.
- Andalo, C., Bazin, A. & Shykoff, J.A. 2000. Is there a genetic basis for fluctuating asymmetry and does it predict fitness in the plant *Lotus corniculatus* grown in different environmental conditions? *Int. J. Plant Sci.* **161**: 213–220.
- Anton, K.A., Ward, J.R. & Cruzan, M.B. 2013. Pollinator-mediated selection on floral morphology: evidence for transgressive evolution in a derived hybrid lineage. *J. Evol. Biol.* **26**: 660–673.
- Baranov, S.G. 2014. Use of morphometric method for study fluctuating asymmetry in leaves *Tilia cordata* under industrial pollution. *Adv. Environ. Biol.* **8**: 2391–2398.
- Baranov, S.G. & Gavrikov, D.E. 2013. Use of TPS software for studying fluctuating asymmetry in flowers. *Int. J. Biosci. Biochem. Bioinforma.* **3**: 284–287.
- Beasley, D.A.E., Bonisoli-Alquati, A. & Mousseau, T.A. 2013. The use of fluctuating asymmetry as a measure of environmentally induced developmental instability: A meta-analysis. *Ecol. Indic.* **30**: 218–226.
- Brock, M.T. & Weinig, C. 2007. Plasticity and environment-specific covariances: an investigation of floral–vegetative and within flower correlations. *Evolution* **61**: 2913–2924.
- Chitwood, D.H., Headland, L.R., Ranjan, A., Martinez, C.C., Braybrook, S.A., Koenig, D.P., et al. 2012. Leaf asymmetry as a developmental constraint imposed by auxin-dependent phyllotactic patterning. *Plant Cell* **24**: 2318–2327.
- Cornelissen, T. & Stiling, P. 2005. Perfect is best: low leaf fluctuating asymmetry reduces herbivory by leaf miners. *Oecologia* **142**: 46–56.
- Cornelissen, T. & Stiling, P. 2010. Small variations over large scales: fluctuating asymmetry over the range of two oak species. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* **171**: 303–309.
- Cowart, N. & Graham, J. 1999. Within- and among-individual variation in fluctuating asymmetry of leaves in the fig (*Ficus carica* L.). *Int. J. Plant Sci.* **160**: 116–121.
- Debat, V. 2016. Symmetry is beauty – or is it? Grandeur et décadence de l'asymétrie fluctuante. *Med. Sci.* **32**: 774–780.
- Dryden, I.L. & Mardia, K.V. 2016. *Statistical Shape Analysis, with Applications in R*, 2nd edn. Wiley, Chichester, UK.
- Freeman, D.C., Brown, M.L., Dobson, M., Jordan, Y., Kizy, A., Micallef, C., et al. 2003. Developmental instability: measures of resistance and resilience using pumpkin (*Cucurbita pepo* L.). *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* **78**: 27–41.
- Frey, F.M. & Bukoski, M. 2014. Floral symmetry is associated with flower size and pollen production but not insect visitation rates in *Geranium robertianum* (Geraniaceae). *Plant Species Biol.* **29**: 272–280.
- Gajić, M. 1983. *The flora of the Deliblato Sand*. University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Natural Sciences, Institute for Biology, Novi Sad, Serbia.
- Gardner, A.G., Gerald, J.N.F., Menz, J., Shepherd, K.A., Howarth, G. & Jabaily, R.S. 2016. Characterizing floral symmetry in the core Goodeniaceae with geometric morphometrics. *PLoS ONE* **11**: e0154736.
- Graham, J.H., Raz, S., Hel-Or, H. & Nevo, E. 2010. Fluctuating asymmetry: methods, theory, and applications. *Symmetry (Basel)* **2**: 466–540.
- Helsen, P. & Van Dongen, S. 2016. Associations between floral asymmetry and individual genetic variability differ among three prickly pear (*Opuntia echios*) populations. *Symmetry (Basel)* **8**: 116.
- Herrera, C.M. 2009. *Multiplicity in Unity: Plant Subindividual Variation and Interactions with Animals*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Houle, D. 1998. High enthusiasm and low R-squared. *Evolution* **52**: 1872–1876.
- Ivanović, A. & Kalezić, M.L. 2010. Testing the hypothesis of morphological integration on a skull of a vertebrate with a biphasic life cycle: a case study of the alpine newt. *J. Exp. Zool. Part B Mol. Dev. Evol.* **314**: 527–538.
- Jamniczky, H.A. & Hallgrímsson, B. 2011. Modularity in the skull and cranial vasculature of laboratory mice: implications for the evolution of complex phenotypes. *Evol. Dev.* **13**: 28–37.
- Klingenberg, C.P. 2003a. A developmental perspective on developmental instability: theory, models and mechanisms. In: *Developmental Instability: Causes and Consequences* (M. Polak, ed.), pp. 14–34. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Klingenberg, C.P. 2003b. Developmental instability as a research tool: using patterns of fluctuating asymmetry to infer the developmental origins of morphological integration. In: *Developmental Instability: Causes and Consequences* (M. Polak, ed.), pp. 427–442. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Klingenberg, C.P. 2010. Evolution and development of shape: integrating quantitative approaches. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **11**: 623–635.
- Klingenberg, C.P. 2011. MorphoJ: an integrated software package for geometric morphometrics. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* **11**: 353–357.
- Klingenberg, C.P. 2013. Visualizations in geometric morphometrics: How to read and how to make graphs showing shape changes. *Hystrix* **24**: 15–24.

- Klingenberg, C.P. 2015. Analyzing fluctuating asymmetry with geometric morphometrics: concepts, methods, and applications. *Symmetry (Basel)* **7**: 843–934.
- Klingenberg, C.P. & Nijhout, H.F. 1999. Genetics of fluctuating asymmetry: a developmental model of developmental instability. *Evolution* **53**: 358–375.
- Klingenberg, C.P., Barluenga, M. & Meyer, A. 2002. Shape analysis of symmetric structures: quantifying variation among individuals and asymmetry. *Evolution* **56**: 1909–1920.
- Klingenberg, C.P., Duttke, S., Whelan, S. & Kim, M. 2012. Developmental plasticity, morphological variation and evolvability: a multilevel analysis of morphometric integration in the shape of compound leaves. *J. Evol. Biol.* **25**: 115–129.
- Koethe, S., Bloemer, J. & Lunau, K. 2017. Testing the influence of gravity on flower symmetry in five *Saxifraga* species. *Naturwissenschaften* **104**: 37.
- Komac, B. & Alados, C.L. 2012. Fluctuating asymmetry and *Echinopartum horridum* fitness components. *Ecol. Indic.* **18**: 252–258.
- Kozlov, M.V., Wilsey, B.J., Koricheva, J. & Haukioja, E. 1996. Fluctuating asymmetry of birch leaves increases under pollution impact. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **33**: 1489–1495.
- Kubínová, Z., Janáček, J., Lhotáková, Z. & Šprtová, M. 2017. Norway spruce needle size and cross section shape variability induced by irradiance on a macro- and microscale and CO₂ concentration. *Trees*. Advance online, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00468-017-1626-3>.
- Kurepin, L.V., Yeung, E.C., Reid, D.M. & Pharis, R.P. 2016. Light signaling regulates tulip organ growth and ethylene production in a tissue-specific manner. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* **177**: 339–346.
- Labonne, G., Navarro, N., Laffont, R., Chateau-Smith, C. & Montuire, S. 2014. Developmental integration in a functional unit: deciphering processes from adult dental morphology. *Evol. Dev.* **16**: 224–232.
- Larcher, W. 2003. *Physiological Plant Ecology*, 4th edn. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Leamy, L.J. & Klingenberg, C.P. 2005. The genetics and evolution of fluctuating asymmetry. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **36**: 1–21.
- Lens, L., Van Dongen, S., Kark, S. & Matthysen, E. 2002. Fluctuating asymmetry as an indicator of fitness: can we bridge the gap between studies? *Biol. Rev.* **77**: 27–38.
- Maffei, M.E. 2014. Magnetic field effects on plant growth, development, and evolution. *Front. Plant Sci.* **5**: 445.
- Manitašević Jovanović, S., Tucić, B. & Matić, G. 2011. Differential expression of heat-shock proteins Hsp70 and Hsp90 in vegetative and reproductive tissues of *Iris pumila*. *Acta Physiol. Plant.* **33**: 233–240.
- Martinez, C.C., Chitwood, D.H., Smith, R.S. & Sinha, N.R. 2016. Left–right leaf asymmetry in decussate and distichous phyllotactic systems. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **371**: 20150412.
- Mathew, B. 1981. *The Iris*. Timber Press, Portland, OR.
- Møller, A.P. 1995. Bumblebee preference for symmetrical flowers. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **92**: 2288–2292.
- Møller, A.P. & Shykoff, J.A. 1999. Morphological developmental stability in plants: patterns and causes. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* **160**: S135–S146.
- Nijhout, H.F. & Davidowitz, G. 2003. Developmental perspectives on phenotypic variation, canalization, and fluctuating asymmetry. In: *Developmental Instability: Causes and Consequences* (M. Polak, ed.), pp. 3–13. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Palmer, A.R. 1996. Waltzing with asymmetry. *Bioscience* **46**: 518–532.
- Palmer, A.R. & Hammond, L.M. 2000. The emperor's codpiece: a post-modern perspective on biological asymmetries. *Int. Soc. Behav. Ecol. Newsl.* **12**: 13–20.
- Palmer, A.R. & Strobeck, C. 1986. Fluctuating asymmetry: measurement, analysis, patterns. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **17**: 391–421.
- Palmer, A.R. & Strobeck, C. 2003. Fluctuating asymmetry analyses revisited. In: *Developmental Instability: Causes and Consequences* (M. Polak, ed.), pp. 279–319. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Pande, P.C. & Singh, V. 1981. Floral development of *Iris decora* Wall. (Iridaceae). *Bot. J. Linn. Soc.* **83**: 41–56.
- Parsons, P.A. 1992. Fluctuating asymmetry: a biological monitor of environmental and genomic stress. *Heredity (Edinb)* **68**: 361–364.
- Pélabon, C., Hansen, T.F., Carlson, M.L. & Armbruster, W.S. 2006. Patterns of asymmetry in the twining vine *Dalechampia scandens* (Euphorbiaceae): ontogenetic and hierarchical perspectives. *New Phytol.* **170**: 65–74.
- Perfectti, F. & Camacho, J.P.M. 1999. Analysis of genotypic differences in developmental stability in *Anona cherimola*. *Evolution* **53**: 1396–1405.
- Polak, M. 2003. *Developmental Instability: Causes and Consequences*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Radović, S., Urošević, A., Hočevar, K., Vuleta, A., Manitašević Jovanović, S. & Tucić, B. 2017. Geometric morphometrics of functionally distinct floral organs in *Iris pumila*. *Arch. Biol. Sci.* **69**: 223–231.
- Randolph, L.F. 1955. The geographic distribution of European and eastern Mediterranean species of bearded *Iris*. In: *Iris Year Book*, pp. 35–46. British Iris Society, Tunbridge Wells, UK.
- Rao, G.-Y., Andersson, S. & Widén, B. 2002. Flower and cotyledon asymmetry in *Brassica cretica*: genetic variation and relationships with fitness. *Evolution* **56**: 690–698.
- Raz, S., Graham, J.H., Hel-Or, H., Pavlíček, T. & Nevo, E. 2011. Developmental instability of vascular plants in contrasting microclimates at “Evolution Canyon”. *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* **102**: 786–797.
- Rohlf, F.J. 2006. tpsDig, version 2.10. *Dep. Ecol. Evol. State Univ. New York, Stony Brook*.
- Sandner, T.M. & Matthies, D. 2017. Fluctuating asymmetry of leaves is a poor indicator of environmental stress and genetic stress by inbreeding in *Silene vulgaris*. *Ecol. Indic.* **79**: 247–253. Elsevier.
- SAS Institute Inc. 1990. *SAS STAT User's Guide*. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC.
- Savriama, Y. & Klingenberg, C. 2011. Beyond bilateral symmetry: geometric morphometric methods for any type of symmetry. *BMC Evol. Biol.* **11**: 280.
- Savriama, Y., Gómez, J.M., Perfectti, F. & Klingenberg, C.P. 2012. Geometric morphometrics of corolla shape: dissecting components of symmetric and asymmetric variation in *Erysimum mediohispanicum* (Brassicaceae). *New Phytol.* **196**: 945–954.
- Schoute, J.C. 1935. On corolla aestivation and phyllotaxis of floral phyllomes. *Verh. der K. Akad. van Wet. te Amsterdam Afd. Natuurkd.* **34**: 1–77.

- Siikamäki, P. & Lammi, A. 1998. Fluctuating asymmetry in central and marginal populations of *Lychnis viscaria* in relation to genetic and environmental factors. *Evolution* **52**: 1285–1292.
- Simmons, L.W., Tomkins, J.L., Kotiaho, J.S. & Hunt, J. 1999. Fluctuating paradigm. *Proc. R. Soc. London B Biol. Sci.* **266**: 593–595.
- Taiz, L. & Zeiger, E. 2010. *Plant Physiology*, 5th edn. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, MA.
- Telhado, C., Silveira, F.A.O., Fernandes, G.W. & Cornelissen, T. 2017. Fluctuating asymmetry in leaves and flowers of sympatric species in a tropical montane environment. *Plant Species Biol.* **32**: 3–12.
- Tucić, B. & Miljković, D. 2010. Fluctuating asymmetry of floral organ traits in natural populations of *Iris pumila* from contrasting light habitats. *Plant Species Biol.* **25**: 173–184.
- Tucić, B., Milojković, S., Vujčić, S. & Tarasjev, A. 1988. Clonal diversity and dispersion in *Iris pumila*. *Acta oecologica. Oecologia Plant.* **9**: 211–219.
- Tucić, B., Manitašević, S., Vuleta, A. & Matić, G. 2008. Linking Hsp90 function to micro-environmental and stochastic variation in floral organs of *Iris pumila* L. *Arch. Biol. Sci.* **60**: 411–419.
- Tucić, B., Vuleta, A. & Manitašević-Jovanović, S. 2013. Exploring phenotypic floral integration in *Iris pumila* L.: a common-garden experiment. *Arch. Biol. Sci.* **65**: 781–794.
- Van Dongen, S. 2006. Fluctuating asymmetry and developmental instability in evolutionary biology: past, present and future. *J. Evol. Biol.* **19**: 1727–1743.
- Vaupel, A. & Matthies, D. 2012. Abundance, reproduction, and seed predation of an alpine plant decrease from the center toward the range limit. *Ecology* **93**: 2253–2262.
- Waldmann, P. 2001. The effect of inbreeding on fluctuating asymmetry in *Scabiosa canescens* (Dipsacaceae). *Evol. Ecol.* **15**: 117–127.
- Weinig, C. 2002. Phytochrome photoreceptors mediate plasticity to light quality in flowers of the Brassicaceae. *Am. J. Bot.* **89**: 230–235.
- Wilsey, B.J., Haukioja, E., Koricheva, J. & Sulkinoja, M. 1998. Leaf fluctuating asymmetry increases with hybridization and elevation in tree-line birches. *Ecology* **79**: 2092–2099.
- Zelditch, M.L., Wood, A.R. & Swiderski, D.L. 2009. Building developmental integration into functional systems: function-induced integration of mandibular shape. *Evol. Biol.* **36**: 71–87.
- Zelditch, M.L., Swiderski, D.L. & Sheets, H.D. 2012. *Geometric Morphometrics for Biologists: A Primer*, 2nd edn. Academic Press, London.

Supporting information

Additional Supporting Information may be found online in the supporting information tab for this article: **Table S1**. Procrustes distances between the mean shapes of floral organs with different compass orientations, with *P*-values from the respective permutation tests.

Table S2. Mahalanobis distances between the mean shapes of floral organs with different compass orientations, with *P*-values from the respective permutation tests.

Data deposited at Dryad: <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.8th5m>

Received 2 October 2017; accepted 6 November 2017