



**Fig. S1.** The ten path models (A–J) depicting the relationships among morphological and performance traits with dominance for male *Hemidactylus frenatus*. The same path models were used for examining the relationships among morphology, performance and prey capture (substituting prey capture measurements for dominance).

**Table S1.** Path model output for the dominance trials comparing all 10 models that describe the relationships among morphological and performance traits with dominance in male *Hemidactylus frenatus*. Where  $\chi^2$  = Chi square goodness of fit, df = degrees of freedom,  $K$  = number of parameters, AIC<sub>C</sub> = the Akaike information criterion,  $w_i$  = the Akaike weight and *Rank* = ranking order for all 10 models. Model I is more than 35% likely to be the best predictor of the relationship among morphological and performance traits and dominance.

<b>Model</b>	<b><math>\chi^2</math></b>	<b>d.f.</b>	<b><math>K</math></b>	<b>AIC<sub>C</sub></b>	<b><math>w_i</math></b>	<b><i>Rank</i></b>
Model A (Fig. S1-A)	0.2	1	34	484.1	0.000	10
Model B (Fig. S1-B)	2.7	3	32	308.4	0.000	9
Model E (Fig. S1-C)	1.1	2	25	84.0	0.000	8
Model F (Fig. S1-D)	0.8	2	25	83.6	0.000	7
Model C (Fig. S1-E)	1.2	4	23	56.2	0.021	5
Model D (Fig. S1-F)	1.5	4	23	56.5	0.017	6
Model G (Fig. S1-G)	17.9	6	21	51.2	0.256	2
Model H (Fig. S1-H)	18.7	6	21	52.1	0.167	4
<b>Model I (Fig. S1-I)</b>	<b>26.51</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>50.7</b>	<b>0.325</b>	<b>1</b>
Model J (Fig. S1-J)	27.4	7	20	51.6	0.212	3

**Table S2.** Path model output for prey capture trials comparing all 10 models that describe the relationships among morphological and performance traits with prey capture (*represented by dominance in graphical model – see Fig. S1*) in male *Hemidactylus frenatus*. Where  $\chi^2$  = Chi square goodness of fit, df = degrees of freedom,  $K$  = number of parameters,  $AIC_C$  = the Akaike information criterion,  $w_i$  = the Akaike weight and *Rank* = ranking order for all 10 models. Model G is more than 60% likely to be the best predictor of the relationship among morphological and performance traits and prey capture.

<b>Model</b>	<b><math>\chi^2</math></b>	<b>d.f.</b>	<b><math>K</math></b>	<b><math>AIC_C</math></b>	<b><math>w_i</math></b>	<b><i>Rank</i></b>
Model A (Fig. S1-A)	0.4	1	35	640.4	0.000	10
Model B (Fig. S1-B)	2.0	3	32	307.7	0.000	9
Model E (Fig. S1-C)	1.1	2	25	84.0	0.000	7
Model F (Fig. S1-D)	1.7	2	25	84.6	0.000	8
Model C (Fig. S1-E)	2.5	4	23	57.5	0.000	6
Model D (Fig. S1-F)	3.1	4	23	58.1	0.000	5
<b>Model G (Fig. S1-G)</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>38.6</b>	<b>0.600</b>	<b>1</b>
Model H (Fig. S1-H)	6.4	6	21	39.7	0.345	2
Model I (Fig. S1-I)	21.3	7	20	45.5	0.019	4
Model J (Fig. S1-J)	20.2	7	20	44.4	0.033	3