Unraveling the Genetic Architecture of Cryptic Genetic Variation

Anupama Yadav, Kaustubh Dhole, Himanshu Sinha*

Department of Biological Sciences, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research,

Mumbai, 400005, India

*Corresponding author

Email: hsinha@tifr.res.in (HS)

Short title

Genetic regulation of cryptic genetic variation

Keywords: cryptic genetic variation; phenotypic buffering; variance QTL; gene-environment
interaction; genetic networks

ABSTRACT

Cryptic genetic variation (CGV), hidden under most conditions, is the repressed genetic

potential that can facilitate adaptation and evolution. The conditional manifestation of CGV

has been claimed to explain the background dependence of causal loci as well as missing

heritability. However, despite being proposed over 60 years ago, the genetic architecture and

regulation of CGV and its contribution towards regulation of complex traits remains unclear.

Using linkage mapping of mean and variance effects, we have identified loci that regulate

phenotypic manifestation of standing genetic variation in a previously published dataset of

biparental *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* population grown in 34 diverse environments. Based on

our results we propose the existence of a gradient of buffering states for a population

determined by the environment. Most environments show a tight buffering with additive,

independent causal loci with little epistasis. However, as this buffering is disrupted, the

underlying highly interconnected environment-specific genetic interactome is revealed such

that each causal locus is a part of this network. Interspersed within these networks are

generalist capacitors that regulate CGV across multiple environments, with one allele

behaving as a capacitor and the other as a potentiator. Our study demonstrates the connecting

link between architecture of hidden and visible genetic variation and uncovers the genetic

networks which potentially underlie all complex traits. Our study establishes CGV as a

significant contributor to phenotypic variation, and provides evidence for a predictable

pattern underlying gene-gene and gene-environment interactions that can explain background

dependence and missing heritability in complex traits and diseases.

SUMMARY

The phenotypic effects of cryptic genetic variation (CGV) are mostly hidden and manifested

only under certain rare conditions and have the potential to facilitate adaptation. However,

little is understood about its genetic regulation. We performed variance QTL mapping to

understand the regulation of phenotypic manifestation of standing genetic variation in a

biparental yeast population. We propose a model describing the connecting link between

visible variation and CGV. We identify generalist capacitors and environment-specific

networks that potentially underlie all phenotypes. This fresh approach of mapping causal loci

can solve the long-standing mystery of missing heritability in complex traits and diseases.

INTRODUCTION

Cryptic genetic variation (CGV) is a heritable variation that is phenotypically inactive or hidden under most conditions, but manifests phenotypically only under certain, often rare, genetic and environmental perturbations (Gibson and Dworkin 2004). In simpler terms, it is bottled up genetic potential (Gibson and Reed 2008). While described in some studies as a separate and an inexplicable class of genetic variation, it essentially refers to gene-environment interactions, *i.e.*, genetic variants show their phenotypic effects only in certain environments or conditional neutrality, and gene-gene interactions, *i.e.* variants show their effects in the certain genetic backgrounds or epistasis. While the idea of CGV was proposed almost 60 years ago (Waddington 1956), for decades, both population genetic studies as well as evolutionary hypotheses have focused on the additive effects of mutations. Low resolution of mapping techniques curtailed the identification of large-scale gene-environment and gene-gene interactions. With recent advances in sequencing technologies and mapping resolution (Liti and Louis 2012; Siegal 2013), the prevalence of CGV in quantitative traits is being recognized. Environment specificity and epistasis identified in multiple studies to understand the architecture of complex traits in model systems, plant and animal breeding or to study environment and background dependence of human disease alleles, have established CGV as an extensive contributor to the genetic landscape of quantitative traits (Gibson 2009; Queitsch *et al.* 2012).

Introgression lines in classical systems like *Drosophila* and plants show that an allele can show a range of effects depending on the genetic backgrounds an allele is functional in (Gibson *et al.* 1999). Comparative studies in genetically accessible yeast have shown that the majority of loci that affect growth, an important fitness phenotype, have environment or genetic background dependent effects (Cubillos *et al.* 2011; Matsui *et al.* 2015). The importance of CGV in human traits is exemplified by increasing prevalence of diseases like type 2 diabetes. A highly heritable disease, type 2 diabetes, shows both population specificity and lifestyle dependence. Its high heritability is due to exposure of CGV by the modern culture (Gibson and Reed 2008; Gibson 2009).

While prevalence and impact of CGV is being demonstrated by increasing number of recent studies, its regulation is still unclear. Whether CGV is randomly distributed without any discernible patterns or is it controlled by specific genes or genetic networks is one of the key debates in the field, understanding of which will provide an ability to study the CGV

landscape and predict its effects on diverse phenotypes (Hermisson and Wagner 2004). To

address this question, it is important to understand how does CGV accumulate. Multiple

evolutionary hypotheses and molecular explanations have been provided to explain the

existence of CGV. Kimura's neutral theory of evolution states that most mutations that

accumulate in a population are phenotypically neutral (Kimura 1977; Kitano 2004).

Waddington (1956) proposed an explanation for this neutrality by stating that if the mutations

are disadvantageous to the optimum phenotype their effects will be hidden or dampened

resulting in an invariant population phenotype, a process known as *canalization*. These

dampening mechanisms could be altered upon genetic or environmental perturbations, thus

revealing heritable variation which could facilitate the process of adaptation (Le Rouzic and

Carlborg 2008; McGuigan and Sgrò 2009). The process of canalization, proposed by

Waddington, invoked two types of genetic buffering mechanisms (Hartman *et al.* 2001;

Burga *et al.* 2012) that contain the effects of CGV in stabilized, well adapted populations –

generic buffering systems called *capacitors* (Rutherford and Lindquist 1998) and specific

buffering systems consisting of *genetic networks* (Carlson and Doyle 2002). Capacitors are

the genes that have the ability to suppress and hence store large amount of genetic variation.

Upon specific environmental cues or genetic perturbations, these capacitors would, therefore,

yield high CGV, that would affect all fitness phenotypes. In an adapting population, the

released CGV can either be advantageous or detrimental (Orr and Betancourt 2001).

However, in an adapted population, release of CGV would be detrimental since the

population already exists at its phenotypic optimum (Barton and Turelli 1989; Hoffmann and

Merilä 1999). As a result, such capacitors are proposed to have pleiotropic effects.

Theoretically, such evolutionary capacitors should demonstrate storage of CGV as well as

promote an increased ability to accumulate mutations or *mutational robustness* (Draghi *et al.*

2010; Fares 2015). The second type of genetic buffering could arise when stabilizing

selection for a particular phenotype results in evolution of specific genetic networks, which

buffer genetic variation in that particular phenotype (Masel and Siegal 2009; Paaby and

Rockman 2014). These systems have different consequences on evolution as well as on

molecular regulation of various traits.

Various studies have provided both direct and indirect molecular evidence for both these

buffering mechanisms. Waddington's initial studies in *Drosophila* lead to detailed

investigation in the same system, which resulted in identification of genes with the ability to

store CGV – *Ultrabithorax* (Gibson *et al.* 1999), EGFR (Dworkin *et al.* 2003) and, the most

commonly studied gene, *HSP90* (Rutherford and Lindquist 1998). These genes result in revelation of cryptic variants with diverse effects on the phenotype upon their perturbation. Studies of Hsp90, across species, have demonstrated its generalized effect in regulating CGV in diverse phenotypes in yeast, worms, flies, plants and fish (Jarosz *et al.* 2010). Other more recently identified examples include *HZT1* (Richardson *et al.* 2013) and *IRA2* (Taylor and Ehrenreich 2015) in yeast. Alternately, molecular compensation through duplicate genes, redundant pathways (Wu and Lai 2015) and high genetic crosstalk have been proposed as specialized networks that contain CGV. A study showed that secondary enhancers of *Shavenbaby* are required to regulate variation in trichome patterning upon extreme stress in *Drosophila*, thus demonstrating a phenotype specific network (Frankel *et al.* 2011). Indirectly, high-resolution mapping of the cellular interactome (Boone *et al.* 2007; Li *et al.* 2010; Laufer *et al.* 2013) have revealed independent networks that are employed in specific traits and diseases, called modules (Vidal *et al.* 2011). This modularity may indicate phenotype specific genetic networks, which would have evolved in response to stabilizing selection to contain CGV in a specialized manner.

While CGV has been proposed to accumulate in a stabilized population and revealed in an adapting population, the accumulation of CGV and genetic buffering are not necessarily synonymous processes (Gibson and Reed 2008; Paaby and Rockman 2014; Siegal and Leu 2014). CGV can be a result of conditional effects of alleles that are maintained by mutation-selection balance and genetic drift across populations. These variants may have conditional effects on specific biochemical pathways, which differ in different populations (Chandler *et al.* 2013; Chari and Dworkin 2013; Chandler *et al.* 2014). Thus a large amount of such CGV can hence exist with no perturbations in the underlying robustness of the system, as conditional epistasis (Gjuvsland *et al.* 2007). This idea is supported by a lack of association between ability to release CGV and accumulate mutations (*mutational robustness*). While Hsp90 has been shown to facilitate release of hidden genetic variants (Jarosz *et al.* 2010; Rohner *et al.* 2013) that may eventually aid in adaptation (Orr and Betancourt 2001), it has not been demonstrated to support accumulation of novel mutations. The only study that directly tested the two phenomena, release of CGV and mutation robustness, compared the abilities of Htz1, the gene encoding histone H2A.Z (Richardson *et al.* 2013). While Htz1 showed high epistasis, CGV was released both in presence and absence of the gene, with no effect on accumulation of novel mutations. Additionally, even Hsp90 has been shown to act as both a capacitor (contain CGV) and as a potentiator (release CGV) (Cowen and Lindquist

2005). Genetic mapping both in functional and repressed Hsp90 states resulted in different, but equal number of genetic loci regulating yeast growth (Jarosz and Lindquist 2010). While such studies do not question the relevance of studying CGV to understand the genetic landscape of complex traits, they propose that loss of robustness is just one of the mechanisms that results in release of CGV (Gibson and Reed 2008; Paaby and Rockman 2014; Siegal and Leu 2014). However, the extent of overlap between the two phenomena is not clear. Additionally, the co-existence of generalist capacitors and specialized networks is not well understood, owing to exclusivity of the studies investigating these two phenomena. Are capacitors a part of specialized networks? Or is their existence independent of the networks active in different phenotypes? Several network based studies further challenge the evolution of such generalized capacitors, with an incentive to maintain phenotypic robustness, by showing that biological networks have evolved to maintain robustness such that multiple genes can behave as capacitors (Bergman and Siegal 2003). High epistasis and environment dependence of this epistasis further backs the case for CGV being a part of all the biological processes (Hermisson and Wagner 2004).

In this study, we have studied the phenotypic manifestation of standing genetic variation to address two key questions in the field. How common is regulation and release of CGV? Is CGV regulated by a few independent pleiotropic capacitors that function across environments or is it a property of certain environment-specific network modules? How do these generalized and specific forms of genetic buffering overlap?

We have used linkage mapping to identify loci that regulate CGV in a biparental yeast population grown in diverse environments. These genetically diverse parental strains (BY and RM11) have accumulated large number of polymorphisms over the course of their evolutionary trajectories (Liti *et al.* 2009; Bloom *et al.* 2013). Linkage mapping in such populations allows comparison of the effect of the two divergent alleles of a locus on thousands of genetic variants. While conventional quantitative trait locus (QTL) mapping identifies genetic loci, alleles of which have different effects on the population mean, their effects on population variance are often ignored (Rönnegård and Valdar 2012). While differential mean of the two alleles would demonstrate the effect of the two alleles on the average phenotype, differential variance would convey that while the population is invariant or canalized in the presence of one allele, the other allele allows the phenotypic manifestation of diverse variants that results in a high variance. Therefore, differential variance represents differential ability to regulate CGV (Lempe *et al.* 2013). The term to describe these variance-

regulating loci, variance QTL (vQTL) was first introduced by Rönnegård and Valdar (2011).

While most of these loci tend to be small effect when compared with conventional QTL

(Shen *et al.* 2012), some large effect vQTL such as *MOT1* (Forsberg *et al.* 2015) and *nFT*

(Lee *et al.* 2014) have been identified in plants. In addition, vQTL mapping has been

proposed to be a predictor of prevalence of gene-gene interactions, further supporting

differential regulation of CGV by these loci (Paré *et al.* 2010; Rönnegård and Valdar 2012).

This differential variance between allelic effects is different from micro-canalization. Micro-

canalization is another form of robustness that refers to phenotypic variation within two

genetically identical individuals, or clonal variation (Bergman and Siegal 2003; Levy and

Siegal 2008). Here, we have specifically investigated loci, which regulate suppression and

revelation of heritable genetic variation.

We used variance QTL (vQTL) mapping to identify loci, which show the ability to regulate

CGV across diverse environments. We further used covariance analysis to study the

pleiotropy of their variance regulation and identified the revealed CGV through QTL-QTL

and vQTL-vQTL interaction analyses. We identify a gradient of types of environments that

determines the regulation of CGV within them. Most environments are tightly regulated such

that the majority of the loci show additive effect without vQTL and epistasis interactions.

Only in a few rare environments, this robust state is perturbed such that almost all loci

regulate both mean and variance. Such environments reveal high number of epistatic

interactions that regulate yeast colony size. It is in these environments, where we compared

effect and abundance of generalist capacitors and specialized networks. We identify multiple

capacitors that regulate CGV across multiple environments, one allele behaving as a

capacitor and the other as a potentiator. These capacitors are separate from the core network,

which is active independently in each of these extreme environments. We identified a single

unique network for each environment. These networks maintain tight invariant phenotypes,

which are perturbed only in certain allelic combinations, by using either of the following two

approaches: maximalist phenotype or minimalist phenotype. These specialized networks

probably employ these different capacitors to suppress CGV and as a result these capacitors

release CGV, which either have positive effect or negative effect on the phenotype,

depending on the kind of network. Our results argue that the regulation of CGV is a

fundamental force in evolution of genetic networks underlying all complex traits.

RESULTS

variance QTL mapping identified loci that regulate CGV

QTL mapping allows comparison of effect of two alleles of a locus on a heterogeneous population. In an artificially generated biparental population, like the one used for this study, the majority of the alleles are present at an equal frequency. Therefore, while a difference in the mean of the two populations based on a marker demonstrates the effect of that allele independent of other loci, the difference in variance of the population carrying that allele is a representation of the effect of the allele on phenotypic manifestation of other polymorphisms, or CGV.

Using a previously published dataset (Bloom *et al.* 2013) of a recombinant haploid population generated from a biparental cross between a lab strain BY and a vineyard isolate RM11, we carried out linkage mapping to identify genetic loci, which showed an allelic difference on the mean (QTL) and variance (vQTL) of colony size variation. This mapping was done independently in 34 diverse environments, ranging from different carbon sources to oxidative and DNA damaging stresses. QTL were estimated using F-statistic comparisons whereas vQTL were using Brown-Forsythe (BF) test (Figure 1A, see Methods).

By comparing the mean and the variance affects of the identified causal variants, we aimed to address the following main questions in this study. Is CGV pervasive in a population such that most loci show a basal difference in variance? Or do specific hubs, *i.e.*, capacitors exist that regulate the release of CGV across traits? And finally, what is the association between phenotypic robustness and CGV; if capacitors do exists, are they present in all environments such that their existence is decoupled from the state of phenotypic robustness of a trait. Or is the role of these capacitors revealed only in certain conditions in which robustness is perturbed?

Previous studies have mapped vQTL in segregating populations but their effect sizes were found to be small. Additionally, genetic studies claimed that many loci were capable of regulating phenotypic variance. To estimate the number of loci capable of affecting variance and their effect sizes, the loci were shortlisted separately based on significance and LOD score cutoffs (see Table S1). Based on significance of effects ($P < 0.005$), 44% loci behaved as only QTL and 16% as only vQTL across all environments (Table 1). A large proportion, 39%, of markers had a significant effect on both the mean and the variance. This indicated

that more than half (55%) of the loci (including only vQTL and QTL+vQTL loci) affected

variance. However, as previously observed, the differences in the population mean were more

distinguishable than the differences in the population variance. Based on effect sizes (LOD

score > 3, permutation $P < 0.01$), 70% of the loci behaved as only QTL, 6% as only vQTL

and the remaining (24%) as both (Table 1). Thus while more than 50% of the loci had a

significant effect on variance, the effect size was small in most cases. A high overlap was

identified between loci regulating the mean and the variance, which indicated that release of

CGV was associated with a shift in the population mean. Along with highlighting the ability

of commonly studied QTL to regulate population means, this result emphasizes a specific

directionality of release of CGV.

If presence of capacitors and release of CGV is a common process, uncoupled from inherent

robust or buffered state of the population in a given environment, then one would expect a

uniform distribution of loci regulating variance across environments. Instead, we observed

clustering among these loci regulating phenotypic variance along with mean (QTL+vQTL) in

specific environments. A high negative correlation ($r^2 = -0.9$) was observed between ratios of

loci classified as QTL and as QTL+vQTL across environments (Figure 1B). The figure

shows that while the majority of environments show exclusive QTL effects, the enrichment

of QTL+vQTL loci in certain environments demonstrates that most loci in these

environments result in difference in variance along with the mean.

Environment determines the release of CGV

A fundamental question associated with release of variance has been its effect on the average

population phenotype, *i.e.*, whether release of variance will generate low or high fitness

phenotypes, or both (*i.e.*, CGV will be released equally around the mean). A high number of

QTL+vQTL and a few vQTL identified in our analysis established that the release of genetic

variance by an allele was exclusively either advantageous or deleterious for the phenotype of

the segregants (Figure 2A, see Table S1). While we cannot comment on the effect of colony

size on fitness, we identified examples of loci that resulted in either only high or only low

mean associated with release of variance indicating that loci were able to exhibit both

capabilities (Figure 2A). In very few cases was the release of genetic variance by an allele

spread equally around the phenotypic mean. One obvious question, from these observations,

is which factors determine the direction of release of variance – does it depend on the locus

or is it a property of the environment? Little association was observed between the mean and

the variance in different pleiotropic loci across environments. For example, a chrXV (140,012) marker that had a significant effect on the mean and the variance in various environments showed no association between the two (Figure 2B, see Table S2), while the BY allele has a higher mean in $MgCl_2$ and LiCl, and RM allele has a better mean in $MgSO_4$; the RM allele has a higher variance in all these 3 environments suggesting poor correlation ($r^2 = 0.3$) between the mean and the variance for this particular locus (Figure 2B, see Table S2). However, a strong association between the mean and the variance of loci was observed within each environment (Figure 2B). In environment $MgSO_4$, a strong positive correlation ($r^2 = 0.9$) was observed such that an allele with a higher mean always had a higher variance independent of the mapped locus. Pair-wise correlation was calculated between the mean and the variance of all significant loci for each environment independently (see Methods). A poor correlation across the environments would have indicated that different loci resulted in random release of variance in both positive and negative directions within an environment. Interestingly, a significant correlation ($P < 0.01$) was observed in majority of the environments (26/33, Figure 2C). One half of the environments (13/26) showed a strong positive correlation ($r^2 > 0.5$) indicating that release of variance was, on an average, advantageous for the phenotype. The other half environments showed a negative correlation ($r^2 < -0.5$), *i.e.*, release of variance resulted in reduced colony size (Figure 2C). This meant that independent of the molecular nature of the regulatory locus or the hidden genetic variation, effect of release of variability on the population mean was strongly dependent on the environment.

This prepotency of the environment in determining direction of release of variance raised the possibility of environmental constraint on the nature of released CGV. Do same loci regulate the mean and the variance across different environmental categories (positively versus negatively correlated environments)? If yes, then do these alleles show similar or opposite effects on the regulation of variance between different categories? A comparison of QTL+vQTL effects of a locus across environments was limiting due to higher number of QTL effects than QTL+vQTL or vQTL effects (see Table 1 and Figure 2B). More importantly, alleles of a locus may show similar variance in an environment but behave differently across environments. Trait covariance measures how a population behaves across two environments (Haber and Dworkin 2015). A high covariance means similar phenotype, and similar identity of CGV released in this case, whereas a low covariance indicates differential phenotype of the segregants across the two environments. Therefore, while the

two alleles can have similar variance, they may show differential release of CGV, across two

environments (Figure 3A). BY allele of the chrXV (160,440) marker showed similar variance

in Lactate ($\sigma^2 = 0.88$) and Lactose ($\sigma^2 = 0.69$), much like BY allele of marker chrXIV

(681,897) in trehalose ($\sigma^2 = 0.77$) and LiCl ($\sigma^2 = 0.86$). However, the latter allele showed a

much lower covariance (*Cov* = 0.13) than the former (*Cov* = 0.84). This indicated that while

the RM allele allowed similar phenotypic manifestation of genetic variants in the population

in both Lactate and Lactose, BY allele showed differential regulation of these variants across

Trehalose and LiCl. Mapping covariance of loci across pairs of environments therefore, will

identify loci exhibiting differential CGV across environments, and hence uncover potential

capacitors. In addition, covariance mapping will also determine whether allelic bias exists

between the ability to release variance, *i.e.*, does one allele always result in release of

variance independent of the environment or this ability of an allele is determined by the

environment in which the locus is present in. In other words, does an allele behave

exclusively as a capacitor or as a potentiator, or can it behave like both depending on the

environment? As an alternative to performing a genome-wide covariance analysis, we chose

only those loci that had a significant effect (QTL, vQTL or QTL+vQTL) in more than one

environment. Forty seven such loci were selected and their covariance was computed across

these environmental pairs (see Methods, Table S3). Eighteen loci showed a significant

difference in the covariance with 9 being significant across multiple (more than 15)

environmental pairs (Figure 3B, Table S3). These 9 loci regulated covariance across multiple

environments and therefore were identified as hubs of variance regulation, *i.e.*, capacitors or

covariance hubs. The same locus regulated covariance in environments from different

categories where the mean and the variance were positively correlated and negatively

correlated (Figures 2C, 3C, Table S3). Furthermore, within a locus, while either of the alleles

had the ability to result in release of variance across environments, a significant allelic bias in

this ability was observed. Among the 5 loci that regulated covariance in more than 15

environmental pairs, 4 had a significant allelic bias (Fisher Exact test *P* < 0.05, Figure 3B).

This meant that while both the alleles of these loci are capable of functioning as capacitors,

one allele tends to contain variance and the other results in its release in majority of the

environments. In Figure 3C, Paraquat shows a positive correlation between the mean and the

variance whereas Cu shows a positive correlation. However, BY allele of the chrXIII

(45,801) marker shows reduced variance in both environments whereas the RM allele shows

a higher variance. Hence alleles of a locus tend to behave exclusively either as capacitors or

as potentiators, independent of the environment.

343 CGV as a major contributor to gene-environment interactions, especially antagonistic

344 pleiotropy

Environmental influence on the direction of release of variance (a better or a poorer

phenotype) and high consistency of the regulation of variance by covariance-regulating

pleiotropic hubs have a pronounced ramification on the role of CGV in regulating gene-

environment interactions. While CGV explains the high conditional neutrality of genetic

effects across environments, we demonstrate that the direction of release of CGV, as

determined by the environment, has a strong effect on gene-environment interactions,

especially antagonistic pleiotropy. Assume a following scenario where a locus regulates the

mean and the variance across two different environments, *i.e.*, there is opposite correlation

between the mean and the variance. Since there is a high consistency in regulation of

variance, one allele will always result in high variance, while the other allele will always

result in lower variance, and hence the high variance allele of this marker will have opposite

effects on the mean thus resulting in antagonistic pleiotropy. For example, the locus chrXV

(140,012), in Figure 2B, resulted in differential variance and mean in environments $MgCl_2$,

LiCl and $MgSO_4$. Because LiCl and $MgSO_4$ have opposite correlations for the mean and the

variance, the consistency of RM allele in showing higher variance results in a trade-off in the

overall mean effects. This phenomenon is clearly demonstrated by the example in Figure 3C,

where BY allele of chrXIII (45,801) marker had better mean in Cu and poorer mean in

Paraquat than the RM allele and hence showed antagonistic effects. Therefore, in this

example, this antagonism was a result of the consistency of the RM allele in reducing

variance and the BY allele in releasing variance. Thus, opposite correlation between the mean

and covariance in Paraquat and Cu resulted in antagonistic effect of this locus. Therefore,

CGV and its regulation contribute to gene-environment interactions in multiple complex

ways.

368 Two-locus mapping identifies the hidden variants

Identification of loci acting as hubs regulating covariance indicates their ability to function as

capacitors. However, to conclusively determine their ability to regulate CGV, identification

of the hidden variants is crucial. As previously stated, release of CGV is dependent on gene-

gene interactions or epistasis between the stimuli (capacitor or genetic background) and the

hidden genetic variants. The conventional use of QTL-QTL mapping is to identify epistatic

interactions that contribute to variation in a population. We utilized QTL-QTL mapping to

identify the genetic basis and patterns of regulation of released CGV. In addition, we adapted

the QTL-QTL mapping technique to perform vQTL-vQTL mapping, which would allow us

to identify the loci that show interactive effects of the allelic combinations on the variance of

the population instead of the mean. We used QTL-QTL and vQTL-vQTL mapping to

understand following points regarding the genetic basis and patterns of regulation of released

CGV (see Table S4). Are most genetic interactions environment-specific, such that release of

CGV is merely conditionally neutral and environment-specific epistasis? Or do discrete loci

exist that behave as capacitors and release CGV across multiple environments? If the

covariance hubs, identified previously, indeed function as capacitors, then they should show a

high number of genetic interactions across environments. Are there genetic networks that

maintain CGV in a population-specific and environment-specific manner? A perturbation of

these networks, either due to a rare environment or genetic intermixing, would result in

release of CGV. Such a scenario would highlight the role of such network(s) beyond

regulation of CGV, in maintaining phenotypic robustness.

QTL-QTL and vQTL-vQTL mapping was carried out in an environment dependent manner

within all loci that were significant as QTL, vQTL or QTL+vQTL in those environments.

Total of 73 significant interactions ($P < 0.1$) were identified of which 18 (24%) were QTL-

QTL, 33 (45%) were vQTL-vQTL and 22 (30%) were both QTL-QTL and vQTL-vQTL

interactions (Table 2). This substantially high number of vQTL-vQTL interactions, in

comparison to proportion of single vQTL (Table 1), indicated their role in contributing to

population variation without demonstrating epistasis of the mean effects. Interestingly,

amongst the loci showing QTL-QTL interactions, 10% had only QTL effects, whereas 80%

were either vQTL or QTL+vQTL (Table 2). In addition, while there was a negative

correlation between the total number of QTL in an environment and the number of QTL-QTL

($r^2 = $ -0.46) and vQTL-vQTL ($r^2 = $ -0.37) interactions, a strongly positive correlation was

observed between number of QTL+vQTL and number of QTL-QTL ($r^2 = 0.64$) and vQTL-

vQTL ($r^2 = 0.65$) interactions, indicating that the release of variance was a result of revelation

of epistatic effects. In other words, a high number of QTL+vQTL effects is a robust predictor

of epistasis in the trait.

Identifying generalist capacitors and specialized genetic networks regulating CGV

By comparing the results of QTL-QTL and vQTL-vQTL interactions across environments, we attempted to distinguish between the three scenarios: environment-specific epistasis, capacitors and networks maintaining robustness. The loci showing interactions, within and across environments, was compiled. A locus that had interactions in two or less than two environments and single interaction per environment was considered as an environment-specific interactor; a locus with interactions in more than two environments was considered a capacitor; and a locus with more than two interactions within an environment was considered a part of a network active within that environment. A total of 73 interactions (QTL-QTL, vQTL-vQTL, QTL-QTL+vQTL-vQTL) were identified, which meant 146 interactors (see Table S5). Amongst these, 29 interactors were involved in environment-specific interactions, 55 interactors which attributed to 9 loci showed interactions across diverse environments, *i.e.*, behaved as capacitors. The remaining 62 showed multiple environment-specific interactions. Of the 55 markers that behave as capacitors, 62% marker showed interactions that had a difference in variance (vQTL-vQTL or vQTL-vQTL+QTL-QTL). Interestingly, of the 62 markers, which showed environment-specific interaction networks, 85% showed a difference in variance, indicating that these capacitors and networks regulate CGV possibly through higher order interactions. Only 2 loci were involved in multiple interactions across environments (chrVIII and chrXIII). These results showed that environment-specific interactions were rare, and loci which form environment specific networks are different from the ones which behave as capacitors.

Epistasis across traits follows a pattern where interaction hubs regulate CGV across multiple environments. Amongst the 9 interaction hubs identified, 7 also behave as covariance hubs indicating that loci that regulate variance across multiple environments do so by interacting with different loci in different environments (Figures 4A, 5A, Table S3). When combined with consistency in direction of covariance, these results demonstrate how CGV is released majorly in the presence of one allele of the capacitor and not the other (Figure 4A). Different genetic variants are released across different environments. The Figure 4A shows that BY allele of the chrXIV (368,185) marker has a higher variance in both 4-HBA and Galactose and the RM allele has a lower variance. In 4-HBA, the chrXIII locus shows a larger effect in the presence of the BY allele than the RM allele (Figure 4B). Similarly, in Galactose, chrXV locus shows a stronger effect on the phenotype in the presence of BY allele than the RM

allele (Figure 4C). These results demonstrate how the covariance hubs result in release of differential CGV across different environments.

Sixty six markers showed environment-specific networks in 12 environments (see Table S5). Some of these networks were denser than others. These networks showed high interconnectivity and the loci in these networks showed QTL+vQTL effects. Additionally, the interactions showed both QTL-QTL and vQTL-vQTL effects, *e.g.* a network of 4 loci present in Indoleacetic acid (IAA) where all loci show significant interactions with each other (Figure 5B, C). As demonstrated by the dot plots, the allelic combinations differed in mean as well as variance (Figure 5B). As shown above, the differential variance between alleles of a locus is deterministic of allele-specific revelation of effects. This finding (derived from many such examples as one shown in Figure 5, also see Figure 6B) can be extrapolated to state that loci showing vQTL-vQTL interactions harbour higher degree interactions within them, which results in differential variance of the allelic combinations. Indeed, as shown in the Figure 5B, vQTL-vQTL interactions occured when 3 out of 4 biallelic combinations exhibited lower variance, higher mean phenotype, whereas one combination resulted in increase in the variance and reduction in the mean. Similar networks were present in other environments as well, with these environments demonstrating a range of connectivity patterns. While all 4 loci showed similar effects in IAA, networks in other environments have loci that act as hubs showing higher interactions than other members of the network (see Figure 6B). A consistent property of an environment containing such networks is that all loci showing an effect on the phenotype in these environments are a part of this network. They may be present as highly interacting hubs or as interactors of one of these hub loci (see Figure 6B). Additionally, most of the loci of these networks are exclusive to each environment (see Figure 6B). This indicates a revelation of underlying genetic networks in these environments, with rare additive effects of loci. A tempting possibility is that this dense genetic interactome underlies all traits, but is revealed under specific genetic and environmental perturbations.

DISCUSSION

The phenomenon of CGV was first proposed over 60 years ago (Waddington 1956). While its existence has been demonstrated in various systems across taxa, the architecture of cryptic genetic variation and its effect on the genetic regulation of complex traits are still unclear (Siegal and Leu 2014). Several questions surround the understanding of regulation of CGV.

How is it regulated – by generalist pleiotropic capacitors or by phenotype-specific networks?

What effect does it has on the phenotype, in other words, what is the distribution of

deleterious versus advantageous CGV? Can the effect of release of CGV on the phenotype be

predicted? Is the architecture of the hidden genetic variants different from that of the additive

loci (Gibson and Reed 2008)? Studies have demonstrated both detrimental and beneficial

effects of CGV on various phenotypes (Jarosz *et al.* 2010). In addition, contribution of

various phenomena *viz.* robustness, canalization, buffering and capacitance to CGV, further

complicates its mechanistic understanding (Gibson and Dworkin 2004). We used an

integrative approach of mapping loci regulating mean, variance and covariance and their

epistatic regulation to understand the underlying genetic framework of CGV. Comparing

genetic regulation of multiple environments allowed us to comprehensively study the

regulation of CGV and the integrated co-existence of conventionally identified loci and CGV.

We propose the following model based on our results (Figure 6A).

A population can exist in different states based on its genetic diversity and the surrounding

environment. While we do not understand the underlying mechanistic differences between

these states, they appear to be a gradient of the internal buffering states or phenotypic

robustness (of heritable variation) of the population. Towards the left end (gray) are states

where genetic variation is majorly additive in nature, with a few epistatic interactions such

that most loci have independent effects with difference in the population mean. Some loci do

show pleiotropic effects in these states but only affect the mean in different environments.

For the biparental population used in this study, majority (more than half) of the

environments are confined to this side of the spectrum. This result is substantiated by

mapping of loci with predominantly additive effects and limited identification of epistasis in

different studies (Carlborg and Haley 2004; Bloom *et al.* 2015). Additionally, this explains

the low effect of variance QTL identified in multiple studies. Moving towards the right side

(blue)along this gradient, the population state gets altered such a way that the underlying

genetic interconnectivity, and hence CGV, gets revealed (Carlborg and Haley 2004; Mackay

2014; Siegal and Leu 2014; Fares 2015). This perturbation appears to happen in rare

environments (Kitano 2004) and uncovers both kinds of genetic buffering mechanisms –

capacitors, which regulate CGV across multiple environments and environment-specific

genetic networks. Results from a recent study, which has identified capacitors and

potentiators of bristle numbers in *D. melanogaster*, support our model, thus suggesting its

universality (Takahashi 2015). Not just regulation of CGV, but these two mechanisms

together form the core genetic regulation in these environments (Félix and Barkoulas 2015).
The unusualness of these environments provides support for the Highly Optimized Tolerance
(HOT) hypothesis, which states that systems evolved to be robust against most common
perturbations, show high vulnerability to rare conditions (Carlson and Doyle 2002).

The capacitors identified by our study regulate the release of CGV across multiple
environments, as demonstrated both by their ability to regulate covariance as well as by
multiple epistatic interactions exhibited by them across environments. A few molecular
examples of such capacitors have been identified including *HSP90* (Rutherford and Lindquist
1998), *HZT1* (Richardson *et al.* 2013) and *IRA2* (Taylor and Ehrenreich 2015). These genes
have been shown to result in revelation of the hidden variants upon genetic or environmental
perturbations. However, a discrepancy exists between the theoretical understanding of
evolutionary capacitors and functions of these genes, *HSP90* and *HZT1*, since CGV is
released both in their presence and absence. While the released CGV depends on their
functional state, thus demonstrating their ability to show high epistasis, this argues against
their role in evolution towards maintenance of phenotypic robustness. Such disparity in their
roles questions the overlap between robustness and CGV regulation. While the capacitors
identified in our study show a similar behavior, *i.e.*, both alleles have the capability to result
in release of variance; they show a strong allelic bias. In majority of the cases one allele
allowed the interacting locus to manifest phenotypically whereas the other allele suppressed
its effect such that one allele behaved as a potentiator whereas the allele behaved as a
capacitor. This along with the enrichment of such capacitors in only certain environments
indicates a link between release of CGV and robustness of the phenotype.

A classic argument against an association of such loci, which regulate epistasis in standing
genetic variation, with phenotypic robustness and buffering has been a lack of demonstration
of their ability to accumulate new mutations. These arguments propound that CGV is
independent of the state of phenotypic robustness (Paaby and Rockman 2014). While we
have focused only on standing genetic variation in this study and hence cannot comment on
mutational robustness, we observed a strong bias in the ability of a few environments to
activate these capacitors. These capacitors have pleiotropic effects across all the
environments (Cassidy *et al.* 2016) but they regulate variance only in the few environments
found on the right side of the gradient and act as conventional QTL for the environments
towards the left (Figure 6A). While the effect of these capacitors on novel mutations, and
hence mutational robustness, cannot be demonstrated, our results confidently show that the

ability of these loci to behave as capacitors is dependent on the environment and hence may

be a representation of the buffered state of the environment (Fares 2015). Our results,

therefore, argue in favor of evolution of these capacitors to maintain CGV (Elena and Lenski

2001).

In these specific environments, along with increased prevalence of capacitors, we identified

highly interconnected networks (Figure 6B). These genetic networks were specific to each

environment. The pleiotropic capacitors showed an effect in these environments but they

were just one the interactors – either a part of the network or an interactor of the hub gene in

the network, but never forming the core themselves (Figure 6A,B). An interesting property in

these environments was the extensive cross talk that resulted in a single specific network in

each environment, *i.e.*, almost all loci active in a particular environment form a part of this

single network. The high number of epistatic interactions in this extreme right of the

spectrum, and increased differential regulation of population variance at both single locus and

two-locus levels indicates prevalence of higher order epistasis (Figure 6A,B). While we do

not have the power to confidently demonstrate such high order interactions, multiple epistasic

interactions between a few loci and their vQTL-vQTL mapping plots suggest their presence

(see Figure 5B,C). These results support the predictions of high prevalence of such higher

order interactions (Carlborg *et al.* 2006; Taylor and Ehrenreich 2014). This high

interconnectivity is the reason why we observe so few additive QTL in the left side of the

gradient with the majority of loci behaving as QTL+vQTL.

As described above, while the pleiotropic capacitors are also a part of these interactions, they

do not form the core network. A reason for this exclusion can be that these networks could

have evolved in response to specific selection pressures to reach phenotypic optimum for a

particular phenotype, and the pleiotropic nature of the capacitors would implement a

constraint on their ability to evolve or mold to a specific environment. These results indicate

that a possible reason for the evolution of pleiotropic genes could have been the regulation of

this CGV across environments. Furthermore, modularity of the interactome identified

recently in disease networks (Vidal *et al.* 2011; Menche *et al.* 2015) to regulate specific

diseases could be a result of evolution of these environment or phenotype specific hubs,

which maintain robustness for specific phenotypes by genetic redundancy (Kafri *et al.* 2009).

At a molecular level this indicates that these specific networks, which maintain robustness

and contain CGV form the core regulation in each environment. A perturbation in them

results in release of CGV, probably by impinging on these capacitors. Our results argue that

such an interconnected system probably underlies the regulation of all complex traits but
unveils itself only upon certain environmental and genetic perturbation. Different
environments or phenotypes have different core networks (Chari and Dworkin 2013), which
impinge on these capacitors and regulate phenotypic variation and robustness (de Visser *et al.*
2003; Chevin *et al.* 2010).

Along with high epistasis or gene-gene interactions (Mackay 2014), a major consequence of
CGV is high gene-environment interactions, since these hidden variants show their effects in
certain environments and not in others. While this would explain the high conditional
neutrality in genetic effects across environments identified in various gene-environment
interaction studies, it does not justify the observed environmental constraint on the direction
of release of variance (see Figure 2B). Our results show that CGV is released in only one
direction in each environment and QTL-QTL and vQTL-vQTL mapping has shown that one
single network is active in each environment. Therefore, one can surmise that the hidden
variation is released in only one direction by a particular network. Based on our results, we
propose that a particular network, evolved to maintain optimum phenotype, can curb
expression of phenotypic variation in two ways – the maximalistic approach or the
minimalistic approach. The maximalistic approach would be evolution of networks that
maintain high flux through the pathway(s) contributing to the phenotype such that the default
state is always on. In this scenario, any genetic variant that results in a reduced flux, and
hence lower phenotype, will not have much effect since there will be an excess of
transcriptional or biochemical signal. As a result, such variants will get accumulated due to
lack of purifying selection on them, whereas a variant that increases the flux will get fixed
and become a part of the network. Perturbation of this network will, therefore, only release
variants with a poorer phenotype. The alternate minimalistic approach would describe a
default state with the minimum possible flux, such that the network maintains the pathway(s)
in a practically shutdown state. Since the upstream signal is off or minimal, the downstream
genetic variants that increase the flux will not be able to show their effects and hence get
fixed. Consequently, a breakdown of this network will reveal genetic variants that increase
the phenotype. Our conjecture is that modules or specialized network may have evolved this
way to contain CGV in the most optimal manner. While this regulation may happen at
various levels (transcription, translation or for metabolites) and differ for different
phenotypes and environments, it would follow either of the two above approaches.

Along with providing molecular insights into genetic regulation of various traits, this
directionality of the networks has strong implications on gene-environment interactions,
especially antagonistic pleiotropy. While the core network loci are environment-specific, the
generalist capacitors are common across different environments. Our results show that the
abundant antagonistic pleiotropy of the mean effects of these loci is not due to opposing
molecular effect of the locus on the two environments but majorly due to the opposing
constraints of the environment on direction of released CGV (see Figure 3). Depending on
the kind of network that impinges on the capacitor, the released CGV will either increase or
decrease the phenotype. Therefore, along with regulating condition specificity of the effects
of loci, regulation of CGV can result in trade-offs in the effect of loci across different
environments. In our previous paper, we reported high antagonistic pleiotropy of a locus on
chrXV containing the gene, *IRA2* (Yadav *et al.* 2015). *IRA2* is an inhibitor of the highly
conserved Ras/PKA pathway, which we demonstrated to show high diversity in natural
populations of *S. cerevisiae* adapted to diverse ecological and geographical niches.
Investigation of QTL and vQTL revealed that the loci containing *IRA2* is a covariance hub
and hence a capacitor (see Table S3). This is supported by a recent study, which
demonstrated role of *IRA2* in regulating cryptic variation in colony morphology trait by
disruption of transcriptional silencing of one or more genes that affect the trait (Taylor and
Ehrenreich 2015). Comparing the mean and the variance revealed that the antagonistic effect
in different environments is a consequence of differential robustness of the two alleles of
IRA2, which may be the primary reason underlying their role in adaptation. This has profound
significance on the increasing identification of antagonistic effects in various diseases
causing alleles (Carter and Nguyen 2011). Our study indicates that their opposing effects are
potentially a result of their differential robustness in different populations and lifestyles. This
inference will be crucial in understanding their pleiotropic effects as well as their molecular
mechanisms.

Our study provides a detailed understanding of the architecture of CGV affecting yeast
growth across multiple environments. In doing so, we have uncovered patterns and governing
principles which can be used to predict existence and behavior of CGV. This underlying
architecture has the potential to elucidate certain fundamental, hitherto unclear, phenomena in
quantitative biology – varying contribution of epistasis in different traits, pleiotropy, network
modularity, environment and genetic background dependence of causal loci. Revisiting the
already existence datasets of breeding traits and human diseases in the light of conclusions

from this study can provide better insights into their genetic regulation and has the potential

to solve the mystery of missing heritability (Eichler *et al.* 2010; Nelson *et al.* 2013).

Identification of regulation of CGV can provide better comprehension of the molecular

functioning and evolution of the modules regulating various traits and disease.

METHODS

Dataset

The raw growth data analysed in this study was derived from a study by Bloom *et al.* (2013),

in which the experimental procedures are described in detail. The data we used was generated

for 1,008 segregants derived from a cross between *S. cerevisiae* strains BY (a laboratory

strain) and RM11-1a (a wine isolate, indicated as RM). These segregants were grown in 46

different conditions and phenotyped for colony size of which 34 conditions were considered

in this study (see Table S1, see Files S1 and S2 for more information). A total of 11,623

markers were considered.

QTL and vQTL mapping

The single environment QTL mapping was carried out as described previously (Bhatia *et al.*

2014). In brief, the R/qtl package (Broman *et al.* 2003; Broman and Sen 2009) was used to

identify QTL separately for colony size in each environment. QTL were identified using the

LOD score, which is the $\log_{10}$ of the ratio of the likelihood of the experimental hypothesis to

the likelihood of the null hypothesis (Broman and Sen 2009). An interval mapping method

("scanone" function in R/qtl) was used to compute this LOD score using the Haley-Knott

regression algorithm (Broman *et al.* 2003).

The following formula was used to calculate the F-score, which was further used to derive the

LOD score. At a particular marker, let segregant *i*'s phenotypic value be y_{ij} where j can

take two values ($j=1$: BY allele and $j=2$: RM allele).

$$F = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k} n_j \left(\bar{y}_j - \bar{y} \right)^2 \big/ (k-1)}{\sum_{j=1}^{k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} \left(y_{ij} - \bar{y}_j \right)^2 \big/ (n-k)}$$

658   Here, N is the total number of segregants, n_1 and n_2 are the number of segregants having

659   the BY and RM allele respectively ($k = 2$) and y_j is the genotypic mean of allele j.

660   Let df denote the degrees of freedom ($df = 1$ for a backcross and $df = 2$ for an intercross). The

661   LOD score is accordingly derived as follows:

662
$$LOD = \frac{n}{2}\log_{10}\left[F\left(\frac{df}{n-df-1}\right)+1\right]$$

Under the null hypothesis, there is no significant difference in the means at the marker under

consideration while under the alternative hypothesis, there is a presence of a QTL.

To estimate the difference in phenotypic variance between the two genotypic groups, *i.e.*, to

identify vQTL in each environment, the standard Brown-Forsythe (BF) statistic (Rönnegård

and Valdar 2011; Lee *et al.* 2014) and the corresponding LOD score were calculated for each

genetic marker in each environment (see Files S1 and S2). The BF test is equivalent to an F-

test performed on the deviations of the phenotypic values from their respective genotypic

medians (or the means). Hence, under the alternative hypothesis, the phenotypes of the two

alleles reveal a difference in the variance.

At a particular marker, let z_{ij} be the absolute deviation of segregant i's phenotypic value y_{ij}

from its genotypic mean $\tilde{y}_j$ where j can take two values ($j = 1$: BY allele and $j = 2$: RM

allele).

675
$$z_{ij} = \left|y_{ij} - \tilde{y}_j\right|$$

676   Then BF statistic for that marker can be computed as follows:

677
$$F = \frac{(N-p)}{(p-1)}\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{p}n_j(\tilde{z}_{.j}-\tilde{z}_{..})^2}{\sum_{j=1}^{p}\sum_{i=1}^{n_j}(z_{ij}-\tilde{z}_{.j})^2}$$

Here, N is the total number of segregants, n_1 and n_2 are the number of segregants having

the BY and RM allele respectively ($p = 2$). In order to estimate the effects of vQTL in the

same order as in QTL, LOD scores were computed as described previously (Broman and Sen

2009).

To establish the statistical significance of the putative QTL and vQTL, *P* values were
computed using a genome-wide permutation test of 1,000 permutations, where the null
distribution consisted of the highest genome-wide LOD score obtained from each
permutation (Broman *et al.* 2003). A LOD score cut off of greater than 3.0 and a *P* value cut
off of less than 0.01 was considered.

Comparing QTL and vQTL

To estimate pleiotropy, we divided the genome into 20kb non-overlapping bins (Table S3).
The bins containing two or more QTL or vQTL significant (*P* < 0.01) in different
environments were considered as pleiotropic bins. The first markers of each of these
pleiotropic bins, used as representative of the bins, were collated to represent the set of
pleiotropic markers (Table S3).

Calculating correlation between mean and variance

To calculate environment-specific correlation (for Figure 2C), difference in the mean (mean
BY − mean RM) and difference in the variance (var BY − var RM) was calculated for all
significant loci within each environment. Pearson's correlation between these two parameters
was calculated for each environment.

Covariance across environmental pairs

To assess the differential covariance of a locus across multiple pairs of environments, we
considered the collated set of pleiotropic markers for our study (Table S3). To quantify the
differential covariance across a pair of environments, a Deming regression was calculated
between the phenotype values of the chosen pair of environments for each allele, using R
package 'mcr'. Deming regression, which minimizes errors in multiple dimensions
simultaneously, served as a suitable measurement error model for assessing buffering across
two or more environments. Unlike simple least squares regression, Deming regression
accounts for deviations in observations on both the *x*- and the *y*- axis. It seeks to find the line
of best fit

$$y^* = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x^*$$

such that the below weighted sum of squared residuals is minimized,

710
$$\frac{1}{\sigma_\varepsilon^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\left(y_i - \beta_0 - \beta_1 x_i^*\right)^2 + \delta\left(x_i - x_i^*\right)^2\right)$$

where, the estimate of δ is the ratio of the two variances.

Since both the phenotypic values (x and y) are normally distributed across their respective
axes, Deming regression, serves as a suitable measurement-error model for assessing
buffering across two environments. Two Deming regression models were fitted for each
environment pair corresponding to the two alleles.

A Student's t-test was performed between the deviations of the phenotypic values from the
Deming fit of the BY and RM alleles ($P < 0.05$). This sign of the t-test value represented the
allele that had higher mean of deviations, *i.e.*, lower covariance. If t-test value was positive,
then the mean deviation of BY allele was greater than that of the RM allele and vice versa.
All the significant markers and their corresponding environmental pairs along with mean
deviations of the alleles and independent mean and variance of both the alleles and both the
environments are listed in Table S3. A locus with significantly different allelic covariance
across more than 15 environmental pairs was considered pleiotropic. For each of these loci,
total number of positive and negative t-test statistic were compiled. A Fisher's Exact test of
random distribution of positive and negative t-test statistic was done each locus, normalized
for the number of environmental pairs. A P value cut-off less than 0.05 was considered
significant.

QTL-QTL and vQTL-vQTL mapping

A QTL-QTL interaction occurs when an effect of a QTL at a single locus depends on another
locus. We used a QTL-QTL mapping technique described previously (Bhatia *et al.* 2014). In
brief, we used a custom Python script, from Bhatia *et al.* (2014) to compute LOD scores for
pairwise comparisons among a set of selected markers. These markers were selected using a
QTL P value cut-off of 0.01 in each environment. For the QTL-QTL mapping, P values were
computed using a permutation test (10,000 permutations), where the null distribution
consisted of the highest LOD score obtained among all pairwise comparison for each
permutation of the phenotype. The following hypotheses were compared:

737
$$H_I : y_i = \mu + \beta_1 g_{1i} + \beta_2 g_{2i} + \gamma g_{1i} g_{2i} + \epsilon_i$$

738
$$H_A : y_i = \mu + \beta_1 g_{1i} + \beta_2 g_{2i} + \epsilon_i$$

Here, g_{1i} and g_{2i} are the binary variables that specify the genotype at the two loci, μ, β_1,

β_2 and γ are inferred from the data using maximum likelihood. The parameters β_1 and β_2

quantify the individual effect of each QTL, and γ quantifies the effect of the QTL-QTL

interaction. See Files S1 and S2 for details of calculation of the interaction LOD (LOD_i)

score.

Apart from the QTL-QTL mapping described previously (Bhatia *et al.* 2014), we mapped

variance-controlling interactions by mapping vQTL-vQTL interactions, which occurs when

the phenotypic variance at one locus depends on the genotype at another locus. The

hypothesis testing for vQTL-vQTL interactions was done in the same way as QTL-QTL

interactions except that instead of scaled values of colony size as the phenotypic values,

deviations from the mean were used as the phenotype for each allelic combination (see

method for vQTL mapping).

To increase power to identify QTL-QTL and vQTL-vQTL interactions, for each

environment, genetic loci significant in either QTL or vQTL or QTL+vQTL mappings were

collated for each environment (Table S1). To compile QTL-QTL and vQTL-vQTL

interaction results, loci within a 50kb linkage interval were considered the same. The *P*

values were computed using a permutation test of 10,000 permutations with the phenotype

data shuffled relative to the genotype data.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by Tata Institute of Fundamental Research intramural funds

(HS). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to

publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceived and designed analysis: AY HS; Analysed data: KD AY HS; Wrote the paper: AY

HS

TABLES

Table 1 – QTL, vQTL and QTL+vQTL

Category	No. of QTL	No. of vQTL	No. of QTL+vQTL
Based on $P < 0.005$	39 (16.6%)	104 (44.3%)	92 (31.1%)
Based on LOD > 3.0	19 (6.4%)	212 (71.6%)	65 (22.0%)

772 **Table 2 – Two-locus interaction mapping**

Interactions ($P < 0.1$)	QTL-QTL	vQTL-vQTL	QTL-QTL+vQTL-vQTL
	18 (24.7%)	33 (45.2%)	22 (30.1%)

 FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1: QTL and vQTL mapping

(A) Schematic showing three categories of QTL mapped. QTL has a significantly different
allelic mean but a non-significant difference in allelic variance; vQTL has a non-significant
mean difference but significantly different variance; QTL+vQTL has both significantly
different allelic mean and variance.

(B) Distribution of loci mapped in each environment as QTL (green) and QTL+vQTL (dark
pink) in the segregating population. The y-axis is proportion of QTL or vQTL in each
category. The x-axis is different environments arranged by decreasing proportion of QTL.
Permutation value cut off < 0.01. See Table S1 for details.

Figure 2: Environment and locus dependence of variance

(A) Representative frequency distributions of three loci showing directionality of release of
variance. Blue distribution is of segregants with BY allele and red is for segregants with RM
allele. 4-NQO [chrXII (207,340)] marker shows release of variance of the BY allele in the
negative direction (mean RM > mean BY); Lactose [chrXIV (376,315)] marker shows equal
variance of the two alleles; $MgSO_4$ [chrVII (187,538)] marker shows release of variance of
BY allele in the positive direction (mean RM < mean BY). The QTL are indicated as
chromosome number followed by marker position in bp within brackets.

(B) Environment and locus dependence of the mean and the variance of loci. The horizontal
arm of the L-shaped grid represents multiple loci L1-Ln significant in environment E1. The
corresponding graph shows the mean and the variance of BY and RM alleles of all markers
(x-axis) in $MgSO_4$. The vertical grid represents pleiotropic effect of the locus L1 in multiple
environments E1-En and corresponding graph shows mean and variance of the marker chrXV
(140,012) in various environments (x-axis).

(C) Correlation between the mean and the variance of all QTL in each environment.
Correlations less than -0.5 (red, $P < 0.05$) represent environments that have a negative
association between the mean and the variance. Correlations more than 0.5 (yellow, $P < 0.05$)
represent environments that have a positive association between the mean and the variance.
Environments with no directional release of variance (correlations between ±0.5) are

represented as blue. The y-axis is correlation between mean and variance; dashed lines mark

±0.5 correlation value.

Figure 3: Allelic bias in across environment covariance

(A) Covariance of normalized growth phenotype of the BY (blue) allele of chrXV (160,440)

marker in Lactose and Lactate. Covariance of normalized growth phenotype of the BY (blue)

allele of chrXIV (481,897) marker in Trehalose and Lithium chloride (LiCl). The mean and

the variance of each allele in each environment are indicated in the box. The QTL is indicated

as a chromosome number followed by the marker position in bp within brackets.

(B) Frequency distribution of number of positive and negative values of Deming regression t-

test (see Methods) across pleiotropic covariance loci (x-axis). The t-test value is positive

where Cov(BY) > Cov(RM) and negative for Cov(BY) < Cov(RM). The y-axis indicates

number of environmental pairs across which the locus showed a significant difference in

covariance. A significant Fisher Exact test ($P < 0.05$) is indicated by a star. The QTL is

indicated as a chromosome number followed by the marker position in bp within brackets.

(C) Covariance of normalized growth phenotype of the BY (blue) and the RM (red) allele of

chrXIII (45,801) marker in Paraquat and Cu (Copper). The mean and the variance of each

allele in each environment are indicated in the box. Paraquat shows a positive correlation

between the mean and the variance whereas Cu shows a negative correlation (Figure 2C).

The QTL is indicated as a chromosome number followed by the marker position in bp within

brackets.

Figure 4: Release of CGV through QTL-QTL interactions

(A) Covariance of normalized growth phenotype of the BY (blue) and the RM (red)

segregants for chrXIV (368,185) marker in 4-HBA and Galactose. The mean and the variance

of each allele in each environment is indicated in the box. The axes are normalized growth of

segregants in the two environments indicated.

(B) QTL-QTL interaction between chrXIV (368,185) - chrXIII (46,758) in 4-HBA.

(C) QTL-QTL interaction between chrXIV (368,165) - chrXV (555,452) in Galactose.

The QTL is indicated as a chromosome number followed by the marker position in bp within

brackets. For (B, C), the x-axis is normalized growth of segregants in the environment and

the y-axis of number of segregants. Dash lines in segregant distributions (B, C) indicate the

means of the distributions. The biallelic marker segregant distributions (in the QTL marker

order written above the plots) are indicated as BB (light blue), BR (light brown), RB (dark

green) and RR (purple). Inset plots show the average distributions of the first marker (BY

(blue) and RM (red) alleles). See Table S4 for details.

Figure 5: QTL-QTL interaction hubs and networks

(A) QTL-QTL interactions between various markers shown as connected links. The chrII

(245,879) marker (red) has multiple QTL-QTL interactions (deep red) for growth in same

environment (Congo red). The chrXIV (466,590) marker (green) has 6 environment-specific

QTL-QTL interactions (4-NQO = dark green, Formamide = deep purple, Indoleacetic acid

(IAA) = light blue, Lithium chloride (LiCl) = deep orange, Trehalose = deep yellow, Xylose

= orange). Other QTL-QTL interactions are indicated as light grey links. Genomic interaction

maps made using Circos (Krzywinski *et al.* 2009). See Table S4 for data.

(B) Scatter plots showing examples of QTL-QTL interactions of four markers [chrIII

(191,928), chrIV (997,621), chrVIII (101,016), chrXIV (466,105)] in Indoleacetic acid

(IAA). The biallelic marker segregant distributions (in the QTL marker order written above

the plots) are indicated as BB (red), BR (yellow), RB (green) and RR (blue) on x-axis. The

mean and the variance of each allelic pair is indicated in the box with allelic pair with most

variance indicated in red. The y-axis is normalized growth phenotype.

(C) Schematic representation of genetic network of four loci, indicated in (B) above, showing

QTL-QTL interactions in Indoleacetic acid.

Figure 6: Genetic architecture of CGV

(A) A model showing gradient of phenotypic buffering from gray (left side) to blue (right

side). Different environments fall in different positions along this gradient. The left side

indicates robust buffering in the population such that most loci have additive independent

effects with a few epistatic interactions. On the right side, are populations with revealed CGV

that exposes the underlying genetic networks present in different environments. Different

environments are represented by different colors. The white nodes refer to independent

additive loci, gray nodes refer to loci which are a part of different genetic networks. The gray

nodes with thick borders denote capacitors. Most of the environments fall on the left side of

the gradient such that the majority of the QTL identified in different studies are additive with

a few epistatic interactions. As the underlying buffering state of the population gets

perturbed, due to either genetic or environmental perturbations, it moves towards the right

side of the gradient. This perturbation reveals the underlying genetic network, which

regulates phenotypic variation such that all loci are part of this highly interconnected

network. These networks are environment-specific interspersed with generalist capacitors

which regulate buffering and epistasis across different environments.

(B) Examples of specific genetic networks identified in different environments using QTL-

QTL and vQTL-vQTL interaction mapping. The potential capacitors identified through

covariance mapping (see Figure 3B) are highlighted as nodes with black outlines. See Tables

S4, S5 for details.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION LEGEND

File S1: Scripts and datasets for QTL, vQTL, Deming regression and QTL-QTL, vQTL-
vQTL interaction mapping.

File S2: Supplementary methods.

Table S1: QTL and vQTL mapping

QTL test and vQTL test refers to the F-test and BF-test statistics respectively, and QTL P
value and vQTL P value refers to the P values of the corresponding tests. Test cutoff of >3
and P value cutoff of <0.005 was used to identify significant markers. 4-HBA refers to 4-
Hydroxybenzaldehyde; 4-NQO is 4-Nitroquinoline; 5-FC is 5-Fluorocytosine; 5-FU is 5
Fluorouracil; 6-AU is 6-Azauracil.

Table S2: Mean and variance of significant QTL and QTL+vQTL

Table S3: t-test of Deming regression to compare trait covariance

t-test refers to t-test statistic of Student's t-test performed on Deming regression values of the
two alleles of a maker across environment 1 and 2. meanRM and meanBY refers to mean of
the regression values of RM and BY alleles, respectively, across environment 1 and 2.
meanRM_env1 and varRM_env1refers to mean and variance of the RM allele in environment
1. Same nomenclature applies to other alleles and environments.

Table S4: QTL-QTL and vQTL-vQTL mapping

Permutation P value cutoff of < 0.1 was considered. Sheet 1 contains results of QTL-QTL
mapping and Sheet 2 contains results of vQTL-vQTL mapping. Sheet 3 shows the overlap of
the Sheet 1 and Sheet 2. In Sheet 3, markers with a 50kb interval were considered the same to
estimate the overlap between the two kinds of mapping. A significant QTL-QTL or a vQTL-
vQTL interaction is indicated by 1.

Table S5: Classifying interacting loci in specific gene-gene interactions, capacitors and
environment-specific genetic networks.

REFERENCES

Barton N. H., Turelli M., 1989 Evolutionary quantitative genetics: how little do we know?
Annu. Rev. Genet. **23**: 337–370.

Bergman A., Siegal M. L., 2003 Evolutionary capacitance as a general feature of complex
gene networks. Nature **424**: 549–552.

Bhatia A., Yadav A., Gagneur J., Zhu C., Steinmetz L. M., Bhanot G., Sinha H., 2014 Yeast
Growth Plasticity Is Regulated by Environment-Specific Multi-QTL Interactions. G3
(Bethesda) **4**: 769–777.

Bloom J. S., Ehrenreich I. M., Loo W. T., Lite T.-L. V., Kruglyak L., 2013 Finding the
sources of missing heritability in a yeast cross. Nature **494**: 234–237.

Bloom J. S., Kotenko I., Sadhu M. J., Treusch S., Albert F. W., Kruglyak L., 2015 Genetic
interactions contribute less than additive effects to quantitative trait variation in yeast.
Nature Communications **6**: 8712.

Boone C., Bussey H., Andrews B., 2007 Exploring genetic interactions and networks with
yeast. Nat Rev Genet **8**: 437–449.

Broman K. W., Sen S., 2009 *A Guide to QTL Mapping with R/qtl*. Spinger, New York.

Broman K. W., Wu H., Sen S., Churchill G. A., 2003 R/qtl: QTL mapping in experimental
crosses. Bioinformatics **19**: 889–890.

Burga A., Casanueva M. O., Ben Lehner, 2012 Predicting mutation outcome from early
stochastic variation in genetic interaction partners. Nature **480**: 250–253.

Carlborg O., Haley C., 2004 Epistasis: too often neglected in complex trait studies? Nat Rev
Genet **5**: 618–625.

Carlborg O., Jacobsson L., Ahgren P., Siegel P., Andersson L., 2006 Epistasis and the release
of genetic variation during long-term selection. Nat Genet **38**: 418–420.

Carlson J. M., Doyle J., 2002 Complexity and Robustness. Proceedings of the National
Academy of Sciences of the United States of America **99**: 2538–2545.

Carter A. J. R., Nguyen A. Q., 2011 Antagonistic pleiotropy as a widespread mechanism for
the maintenance of polymorphic disease alleles. BMC Med. Genet. **12**: 160.

Cassidy J. J., Straughan A. J., Carthew R. W., 2016 Differential Masking of Natural Genetic
Variation by miR-9a in Drosophila. Genetics **202**: 675–687.

Chandler C. H., Chari S., Dworkin I., 2013 Does your gene need a background check? How
genetic background impacts the analysis of mutations, genes, and evolution. Trends
Genet **29**: 358–366.

Chandler C. H., Chari S., Tack D., Dworkin I., 2014 Causes and consequences of genetic
background effects illuminated by integrative genomic analysis. Genetics **196**: 1321–
1336.

Chari S., Dworkin I., 2013 The Conditional Nature of Genetic Interactions: The
Consequences of Wild-Type Backgrounds on Mutational Interactions in a Genome-Wide
Modifier Screen (J Zhang, Ed.). PLoS Genet **9**: e1003661.

Chevin L.-M., Lande R., Mace G. M., 2010 Adaptation, Plasticity, and Extinction in a
Changing Environment: Towards a Predictive Theory (JG Kingsolver, Ed.). PLoS Biol **8**:
e1000357.

Cowen L. E., Lindquist S., 2005 Hsp90 potentiates the rapid evolution of new traits: drug
resistance in diverse fungi. Science (New York, NY) **309**: 2185–2189.

Cubillos F. A., Billi E., Zörgö E., Parts L., Fargier P., Omholt S., Blomberg A., Warringer J.,
Louis E. J., Liti G., 2011 Assessing the complex architecture of polygenic traits in
diverged yeast populations. Mol Ecol **20**: 1401–1413.

de Visser J. A. G. M., Hermisson J., Wagner G. P., Ancel Meyers L., Bagheri-Chaichian H.,
Blanchard J. L., Chao L., Cheverud J. M., Elena S. F., Fontana W., Gibson G., Hansen T.
F., Krakauer D., Lewontin R. C., Ofria C., Rice S. H., Dassow von G., Wagner A.,
Whitlock M. C., 2003 Perspective: Evolution and detection of genetic robustness.
Evolution **57**: 1959–1972.

Draghi J. A., Parsons T. L., Wagner G. P., Plotkin J. B., 2010 Mutational robustness can
facilitate adaptation. Nature **463**: 353–355.

Dworkin I., Palsson A., Birdsall K., Gibson G., 2003 Evidence that Egfr Contributes to
Cryptic Genetic Variation for Photoreceptor Determination in Natural Populations of
Drosophila melanogaster. Current Biology **13**: 1888–1893.

Eichler E. E., Flint J., Gibson G., Kong A., Leal S. M., Moore J. H., Nadeau J. H., 2010
Missing heritability and strategies for finding the underlying causes of complex disease.
Nat Rev Genet **11**: 446–450.

Elena S. F., Lenski R. E., 2001 Epistasis between new mutations and genetic background and
a test of genetic canalization. Evolution **55**: 1746–1752.

Fares M. A., 2015 The origins of mutational robustness. Trends Genet **31**: 373–381.

Félix M.-A., Barkoulas M., 2015 Pervasive robustness in biological systems. Nat Rev Genet
16: 483–496.

Forsberg S. K. G., Andreatta M. E., Huang X.-Y., Danku J., Salt D. E., Carlborg O., 2015
The Multi-allelic Genetic Architecture of a Variance-heterogeneity Locus for
Molybdenum Accumulation Acts as a Source of Unexplained Additive Genetic Variance.
Cold Spring Harbor Labs Journals.

Frankel N., Erezyilmaz D. F., Mcgregor A. P., Wang S., Payre F., Stern D. L., 2011
Morphological evolution caused by many subtle-effect substitutions in regulatory DNA.
Nature **474**: 598–603.

Gibson G., 2009 Decanalization and the origin of complex disease. Nat Rev Genet **10**: 134–
140.

Gibson G., Dworkin I., 2004 Uncovering cryptic genetic variation. Nat Rev Genet **5**: 681–
690.

Gibson G., Reed L. K., 2008 Cryptic genetic variation. Curr Biol **18**: R989–90.

Gibson G., Wemple M., van Helden S., 1999 Potential variance affecting homeotic
Ultrabithorax and Antennapedia phenotypes in Drosophila melanogaster. Genetics **151**:
1081–1091.

Gjuvsland A. B., Hayes B. J., Omholt S. W., Carlborg O., 2007 Statistical epistasis is a
generic feature of gene regulatory networks. Genetics **175**: 411–420.

Haber A., Dworkin I., 2015 *Dis-integrating the fly: A mutational perspective on phenotypic*
integration and covariation. Cold Spring Harbor Labs Journals.

Hartman J. L., Garvik B., Hartwell L., 2001 Principles for the buffering of genetic variation.
Science (New York, NY) **291**: 1001–1004.

Hermisson J., Wagner G. P., 2004 The population genetic theory of hidden variation and
genetic robustness. Genetics **168**: 2271–2284.

Hoffmann A., Merilä J., 1999 Heritable variation and evolution under favourable and
unfavourable conditions. Trends Ecol Evol (Amst) **14**: 96–101.

Jarosz D. F., Lindquist S., 2010 Hsp90 and Environmental Stress Transform the Adaptive
Value of Natural Genetic Variation. Science (New York, NY) **330**: 1820–1824.

Jarosz D. F., Taipale M., Lindquist S., 2010 Protein Homeostasis and the Phenotypic
Manifestation of Genetic Diversity: Principles and Mechanisms. Annu Rev Genet **44**:
189–216.

Kafri R., Springer M., Pilpel Y., 2009 Genetic Redundancy: New Tricks for Old Genes.
CELL **136**: 389–392.

Kimura M., 1977 Preponderance of synonymous changes as evidence for the neutral theory
of molecular evolution. Nature **267**: 275–276.

Kitano H., 2004 Biological robustness. Nat Rev Genet **5**: 826–837.

Krzywinski M. I., Schein J. E., Birol I., Connors J., Gascoyne R., Horsman D., Jones S. J.,
Marra M. A., 2009 Circos: An information aesthetic for comparative genomics. Genome
Res **19**: 1639–1645.

Laufer C., Fischer B., Billmann M., Huber W., Boutros M., 2013 Mapping genetic
interactions in human cancer cells with RNAi and multiparametric phenotyping. Nat
Meth **10**: 427–431.

Le Rouzic A., Carlborg O., 2008 Evolutionary potential of hidden genetic variation. Trends
in Ecology & Evolution **23**: 33–37.

Lee C.-R., Anderson J. T., Mitchell-Olds T., 2014 Unifying Genetic Canalization, Genetic
Constraint, and Genotype-by-Environment Interaction: QTL by Genomic Background by

Environment Interaction of Flowering Time in Boechera stricta (K Bomblies, Ed.). PLoS Genet **10**: e1004727.

Lempe J., Lachowiec J., Sullivan A. M., Queitsch C., 2013 Molecular mechanisms of robustness in plants. Current Opinion in Plant Biology **16**: 62–69.

Levy S., Siegal M., 2008 Network Hubs Buffer Environmental Variation in Saccharomyces cerevisiae (A Levchenko, Ed.). PLoS Biol **6**: e264.

Li J., Yuan Z., Zhang Z., 2010 The cellular robustness by genetic redundancy in budding yeast (J Zhang, Ed.). PLoS Genet **6**: e1001187.

Liti G., Louis E. J., 2012 Advances in Quantitative Trait Analysis in Yeast (JC Fay, Ed.). PLoS Genet **8**: e1002912.

Liti G., Carter D. M., Moses A. M., Warringer J., Parts L., James S. A., Davey R. P., Roberts I. N., Burt A., Koufopanou V., Tsai I. J., Bergman C. M., Bensasson D., O'kelly M. J. T., van Oudenaarden A., Barton D. B. H., Bailes E., Nguyen A. N., Jones M., Quail M. A., Goodhead I., Sims S., Smith F., Blomberg A., Durbin R., Louis E. J., 2009 Population genomics of domestic and wild yeasts. Nature **458**: 337–341.

Mackay T. F. C., 2014 Epistasis and quantitative traits: using model organisms to study gene-gene interactions. Nat Rev Genet **15**: 22–33.

Masel J., Siegal M. L., 2009 Robustness: mechanisms and consequences. Trends Genet **25**: 395–403.

Matsui T., Linder R., Phan J., Seidl F., Ehrenreich I. M., 2015 Regulatory Rewiring in a Cross Causes Extensive Genetic Heterogeneity. Genetics **201**: 769–777.

McGuigan K., Sgrò C. M., 2009 Evolutionary consequences of cryptic genetic variation. Trends in Ecology & Evolution **24**: 305–311.

Menche J., Sharma A., Kitsak M., Ghiassian S. D., Vidal M., Loscalzo J., Barabási A.-L., 2015 Disease networks. Uncovering disease-disease relationships through the incomplete interactome. Science (New York, NY) **347**: 1257601.

Nelson R. M., Pettersson M. E., Carlborg O., 2013 A century after Fisher: time for a new paradigm in quantitative genetics. Trends Genet **29**: 669–676.

Orr H. A., Betancourt A. J., 2001 Haldane's sieve and adaptation from the standing genetic variation. Genetics **157**: 875–884.

Paaby A. B., Rockman M. V., 2014 Cryptic genetic variation:evolution's hidden substrate. Nat Rev Genet **15**: 247–258.

Paré G., Cook N. R., Ridker P. M., Chasman D. I., 2010 On the Use of Variance per Genotype as a Tool to Identify Quantitative Trait Interaction Effects: A Report from the Women's Genome Health Study (JD Storey, Ed.). PLoS Genet **6**: e1000981.

Queitsch C., Carlson K. D., Girirajan S., 2012 Lessons from Model Organisms: Phenotypic Robustness and Missing Heritability in Complex Disease (SM Rosenberg, Ed.). PLoS

Genet **8**: e1003041.

Richardson J. B., Uppendahl L. D., Traficante M. K., Levy S. F., Siegal M. L., 2013 Histone
Variant HTZ1 Shows Extensive Epistasis with, but Does Not Increase Robustness to,
New Mutations (DA Petrov, Ed.). PLoS Genet **9**: e1003733.

Rohner N., Jarosz D. F., Kowalko J. E., Yoshizawa M., Jeffery W. R., Borowsky R. L.,
Lindquist S., Tabin C. J., 2013 Cryptic variation in morphological evolution: HSP90 as a
capacitor for loss of eyes in cavefish. Science (New York, NY) **342**: 1372–1375.

Rönnegård L., Valdar W., 2011 Detecting major genetic loci controlling phenotypic
variability in experimental crosses. Genetics **188**: 435–447.

Rönnegård L., Valdar W., 2012 Recent developments in statistical methods for detecting
genetic loci affecting phenotypic variability. BMC Genet **13**: 63.

Rutherford S. L., Lindquist S., 1998 Hsp90 as a capacitor for morphological evolution.
Nature **396**: 336–342.

Shen X., Pettersson M., Rönnegård L., Carlborg O., 2012 Inheritance Beyond Plain
Heritability: Variance-Controlling Genes in Arabidopsis thaliana (GS Barsh, Ed.). PLoS
Genet **8**: e1002839.

Siegal M. L., 2013 Crouching variation revealed. Mol Ecol **22**: 1187–1189.

Siegal M. L., Leu J.-Y., 2014 On the Nature and Evolutionary Impact of Phenotypic
Robustness Mechanisms. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. **45**: 495–517.

Takahashi K. H., 2015 Novel genetic capacitors and potentiators for the natural genetic
variation of sensory bristles and their trait specificity in Drosophila melanogaster. Mol
Ecol **24**: 5561–5572.

Taylor M. B., Ehrenreich I. M., 2014 Higher-order genetic interactions and their contribution
to complex traits. Trends Genet **31**: 34–40.

Taylor M. B., Ehrenreich I. M., 2015 Transcriptional Derepression Uncovers Cryptic Higher-
Order Genetic Interactions. (P Wittkopp, Ed.). PLoS Genet **11**: e1005606.

Vidal M., Cusick M. E., Barabási A.-L., 2011 Interactome networks and human disease.
CELL **144**: 986–998.

Waddington C. H., 1956 Genetic Assimilation of the Bithorax Phenotype. Evolution **10**: 1–
13.

Wu W.-S., Lai F.-J., 2015 Functional redundancy of transcription factors explains why most
binding targets of a transcription factor are not affected when the transcription factor is
knocked out. BMC Systems Biology **9 Suppl 6**: S2.

Yadav A., Radhakrishnan A., Bhanot G., Sinha H., 2015 Differential Regulation of
Antagonistic Pleiotropy in Synthetic and Natural Populations Suggests Its Role in
Adaptation. G3 (Bethesda) **5**: 699–709.

Figure 1

A

B

Figure 2

Figure 3

A

chrXV (160,440) marker

$\bar{x}_{BY}(Lactate) = -0.46$
$\sigma^2_{BY}(Lactate) = 0.88$
$\bar{x}_{BY}(Lactose) = -0.49$
$\sigma^2_{BY}(Lactose) = 0.69$

Lactose (y-axis)
Lactate (x-axis)

chrXIV (481,897) marker

$\bar{x}_{BY}(LiCl) = -0.001$
$\sigma^2_{BY}(LiCl) = 0.86$
$\bar{x}_{BY}(Trehalose) = -0.28$
$\sigma^2_{BY}(Trehalose) = 0.77$

Trehalose (y-axis)
Lithium chloride (x-axis)

B

Number of covariance interactions (y-axis)

Positive
Negative

Loci (x-axis): chrXII (760,027), chrXII (640,447), chrXIV (481,897), chrVIII (100,075), chrXIV (461,865), chrXIII (45,801), chrXV (140,012), chrXIV (361,531), chrXV (160,644)

C

chrXIII (45,801) marker

BY allele

$\bar{x}_{BY}(Paraquat) = -0.2$
$\sigma^2_{BY}(Paraquat) = 0.82$
$\bar{x}_{BY}(Cu) = 0.34$
$\sigma^2_{BY}(Cu) = 0.52$

RM allele

$\bar{x}_{RM}(Paraquat) = 0.2$
$\sigma^2_{RM}(Paraquat) = 1.08$
$\bar{x}_{RM}(Cu) = -0.33$
$\sigma^2_{RM}(Cu) = 1.26$

Normalized growth in Paraquat (y-axis)
Normalized growth in Cu (x-axis)

Figure 4

A chrXIV (368,185) marker

BY allele
RM allele

$\bar{x}_{BY}(4-HBA)=0.17$
$\sigma^2_{BY}(4-HBA)=1.27$
$\bar{x}_{BY}(Gal)=-0.01$
$\sigma^2_{BY}(Gal)=1.24$

$\bar{x}_{RM}(4-HBA)=-0.17$
$\sigma^2_{RM}(4-HBA)=0.67$
$\bar{x}_{RM}(Gal)=0.01$
$\sigma^2_{RM}(Gal)=0.77$

Normalized growth in 4-HBA

Normalized growth in Galactose

B chrXIV (368,185) - chrXIII (46,758) in 4-HBA

chrXIV(B)
BB
BR

chrXIII(R)
RB
RR

No. of segregants

C chrXIV (368,165) - chrXV (555,452) in Galactose

chrXIV(B)
BB
BR

chrXV(R)
RB
RR

No. of segregants

Normalized growth

Figure 5

A

B

chrIII (191,928)-chrIV (997,621)

$BB : \bar{x} = 0.15, \sigma^2 = 0.59$
$BR : \bar{x} = -0.57, \sigma^2 = 2.05$
$RB : \bar{x} = 0.30, \sigma^2 = 0.37$
$RR : \bar{x} = 0.09, \sigma^2 = 0.62$

chrIII (191,928)-chrVIII (101,016)

$BB : \bar{x} = -0.74, \sigma^2 = 2.07$
$BR : \bar{x} = 0.30, \sigma^2 = 0.33$
$RB : \bar{x} = 0.08, \sigma^2 = 0.62$
$RR : \bar{x} = 0.32, \sigma^2 = 0.34$

chrIII (191,928)-chrXIV (466,105)

$BB : \bar{x} = -0.68, \sigma^2 = 1.80$
$BR : \bar{x} = 0.21, \sigma^2 = 0.77$
$RB : \bar{x} = 0.06, \sigma^2 = 0.55$
$RR : \bar{x} = 0.34, \sigma^2 = 0.41$

chrIV (997,621)-chrVIII (101,016)

$BB : \bar{x} = 0.13, \sigma^2 = 0.54$
$BR : \bar{x} = 0.34, \sigma^2 = 0.38$
$RB : \bar{x} = -0.78, \sigma^2 = 2.03$
$RR : \bar{x} = 0.29, \sigma^2 = 0.31$

chrIV (997,621)-chrXIV (466,105)

$BB : \bar{x} = 0.05, \sigma^2 = 0.54$
$BR : \bar{x} = 0.42, \sigma^2 = 0.40$
$RB : \bar{x} = -0.60, \sigma^2 = 1.75$
$RR : \bar{x} = 0.13, \sigma^2 = 0.74$

chrVIII (101,016)-chrXIV (466,105)

$BB : \bar{x} = -0.74, \sigma^2 = 1.78$
$BR : \bar{x} = 0.13, \sigma^2 = 0.77$
$RB : \bar{x} = 0.19, \sigma^2 = 0.29$
$RR : \bar{x} = 0.43, \sigma^2 = 0.35$

C

Indoleacetic acid

Figure 6