1   <u>Title</u>: Genetic costs of domestication and improvement
2
3

4   <u>Authors</u>: Brook T. Moyers[1], Peter L. Morrell[2], and John K. McKay[1]
5
6
7   <u>Affiliations</u>: [1] Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management, Colorado State
8   University, Fort Collins, CO, USA 80521. [2] Department of Agronomy and Plant
9   Genetics, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN, USA 55108.
10
11
<u>Address for correspondence</u>:
Brook T. Moyers
Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO, USA 80521
Phone: 707-235-1237
Email: brook.moyers@gmail.com

19
20
21 <u>Running title</u>: Cost of domestication
22
23
24

25 ABSTRACT
26
The 'cost of domestication' hypothesis posits that the process of domesticating

wild species can result in an increase in the number, frequency, and/or

proportion of deleterious genetic variants that are fixed or segregating in the

genomes of domesticated species. This cost may limit the efficacy of selection

and thus reduce genetic gains in breeding programs for these species.

Understanding when and how deleterious mutations accumulate can also provide

insight into fundamental questions about the interplay of demography and

selection. Here we describe the evolutionary processes that may contribute to

deleterious variation accrued during domestication and improvement, and review

the available evidence for 'the cost of domestication' in animal and plant

genomes. We identify gaps and explore opportunities in this emerging field, and

finally offer suggestions for researchers and breeders interested in understanding

or avoiding the consequences of an increased number or frequency of

deleterious variants in domesticated species.

Keywords: deleterious variants, crops, domesticated animals
43

INTRODUCTION

Recently, we have seen a resurgence of evolutionary concepts applied to the domestication and improvement of plants and animals (e.g. Walsh 2007; Wang *et al*. 2014; Gaut, Díez, and Morrell 2015; Kono *et al*. 2016). One particular wave of this resurgence proposes a general 'cost of domestication': that the evolutionary processes experienced by lineages during domestication are likely to increase the number of deleterious variants in the genome. This 'cost' was first hypothesized by Lu *et al*. (2006), who found an increase in nonsynonymous substitutions, particularly radical amino acid changes, in domesticated compared to wild lineages of rice. These putatively deleterious variants were negatively correlated with recombination rate, which the authors interpreted as evidence that they hitchhiked along with the targets of artificial selection (Figure 1B). Lu *et al*. (2006) conclude that: "The reduction in fitness, or the genetic cost of domestication, is a general phenomenon." Here we address this claim by examining the evidence that has emerged in the last decade on deleterious variants in domesticated species.

The processes of domestication and subsequent breeding potentially impose a number of evolutionary effects on populations (Box 1). New mutations can have a range of effects on fitness, from lethal to beneficial. Deleterious variants constitute the mostly directly observable, and likely the most important, source of mutational and therefore genetic load in a population (Box 2). The shape of the distribution of fitness effects of new mutations is difficult to estimate, and estimates suggest it varies across populations and species (Keightley and Eyre-Walker 2007). However, theory predicts that a large proportion of new mutations, particularly those that occur in coding portions of the genome, will be deleterious at least in some proportion of the environments that a species occupies (Ohta 1972; 1992; Gillespie 1994). These predictions are supported by experimental responses to artificial selection and mutation accumulation experiments, as well as molecular genetic studies of variation in populations (Keightley and Lynch 2003; Eyre-Walker, Woolfit, and Phelps 2006; Boyko *et al*. 2008; Kim, Huber,

and Lohmueller 2017).

The rate of new mutations in eukaryotes varies, but is likely at least 1×10^{-8} /

base pair / generation (Baer, Miyamoto, and Denver 2007). For the average

eukaryotic genome, individuals should thereby be expected to carry a small

number of new mutations not present in the parent genome(s) (Agrawal and

Whitlock 2012). The realized distribution of fitness effects for these mutations in a

population will be influenced by inbreeding and by effective population size

(Gillespie 1999; Whitlock 2000; Arunkumar *et al*. 2015; Keightley and Eyre-

Walker 2007). Generally, for a given distribution of fitness effects for segregating

variants, we expect to observe relatively fewer strongly deleterious variants and

more weakly deleterious variants in smaller populations and in populations with

higher rates of inbreeding (Figure 2A).

Domestication and improvement often involve increased inbreeding. Allard

(1999) pointed out that many important early cultigens were produced by

inbreeding, with inbred lines offering agronomic and morphological consistency in

the crop. In some cases, domestication involved a switch in mating system from

outcrossing to highly selfing (e.g. in rice; Kovach, Sweeney, and McCouch 2007).

The practice of producing inbred lines, often through single-seed descent, with

the goal of reducing heterozygosity and creating genetically 'stable' varieties,

remains a major activity in plant breeding programs. Reduced effective

population sizes (N_e) during domestication and artificial selection on favorable

traits also constitute forms of inbreeding (Figure 1). Even in species without the

capacity to self-fertilize, inbreeding that results from selective breeding can

dramatically change patterns of genomic variation. For example, the first

sequenced dog genome, from a female boxer, has runs of homozygosity that

span 62% of genome, with an N50 length of 6.9 Mb (versus heterozygous region

N50 length 1.1 Mb; Lindblad-Tor *et al*. 2005). This level of homozygosity

drastically reduces the effective recombination rate, as crossover events often

exchange identical chromosomal segments. The likelihood of a beneficial allele

moving into a genomic background with fewer linked deleterious alleles is thus
reduced.

Linked selection, or interference among mutations, has much the same effect.
For a trait influenced by multiple loci, interference between linked loci can limit
the response to selection (Hill and Robertson 1966). Deleterious variants are
more numerous than those that have a positive effect on a trait and thus should
constitute a major limitation in responding to selection (Felsenstein 1974). This
forces selection to act on the net effect of favorable and unfavorable mutations in
linkage (Figure 1B). As homozygosity and LD increase, N_e decreases, and so
selection is less effective at purging moderately deleterious mutations and new
slightly beneficial mutations are more likely to be lost to genetic drift (sometimes
termed 'inbreeding depression'). These dynamics will shift the distribution of
fitness effects for segregating variants and result in greater accumulation of
deleterious variation over time (Figure 2A–C).

Overall, the cost of domestication hypothesis posits that compared to their wild
relatives domesticated lineages will have:
      1. Deleterious variants at higher number, frequency, and/or proportion
      2. Enrichment of deleterious variants in linkage disequilibrium with loci
          subject to strong, positive, artificial selection

Among domesticated species, these effects may differ between lineages that
experienced domestication only (e.g. landraces and non-commercial populations)
and those that were subject to modern improvement (e.g. 'elite' varieties and
commercial breeds). Domestication typically involves a genetic bottleneck
followed by a long period of relatively weak and possibly varying selection, while
during the process of improvement, intense selection over short time periods is
coupled with limited recombination and an additional reduction in N_e, often
followed by rapid population expansion (Figure 1A; Yamasaki, Wright, and
McMullen 2007). Gaut, Díez, and Morrell (2015) propose that elite crop lines

could harbor a lower proportion of deleterious variants relative to landraces due

to strong selection for yield during improvement, but the opposing pattern could

be driven by lower N_e and thus increased genetic drift, limited effective

recombination, and rapid population expansion. At least one study, in sunflower,

shows little difference in the composition of deleterious variants between

landrace and elite lines (Renaut and Rieseberg 2015). It is likely that the relative

influence of these factors varies dramatically across domesticated systems.

____

Box 1. Domesticated lineages may experience:

• **Increased number of deleterious variants:**

o Deleterious mutations may accumulate at higher rates in

domesticated lineages versus their wild relatives due to the

reduced efficacy of selection relative to genetic drift. Mutations that

would be purged with a larger N_e or with higher effective

recombination rates are instead retained. This is reflected in a shift

in the distribution of fitness effects for segregating variants towards

more moderately deleterious alleles (Figure 2A).

o **However**: any significant increase in inbreeding, particularly the

transition from outcrossing to selfing, can result in the purging of

recessive, highly deleterious alleles, as these alleles are exposed in

homozygous genotypes more frequently (Arunkumar *et al*. 2015).

This shifts the more deleterious end of the distribution of fitness

effects for segregating variants towards neutrality (Figure 2A).

• **Increased frequency of deleterious variants:**

o As above, reduced N_e (due to inbreeding, genetic bottlenecks, or

strong selection) or reduced effective recombination rate will

increase the strength of genetic drift relative to selection. Stronger

genetic drift can allow deleterious variants to reach higher

frequencies. In the case of inbreeding, this pattern is called

inbreeding depression, but it can occur whenever N_e decreases.

o Deleterious variants that are in linkage disequilibrium with a target

169   of artificial selection can also increase in frequency through genetic

170   hitchhiking, as long as their fitness effects are smaller than the

171   strength of selection on the targeted variant (Figure 1B; Hartfield

172   and Otto 2011; Assaf, Petrov, and Blundell 2015).

173   o The rapid population expansion, coupled with long-distance

174   migration common to the demographic history of many

175   domesticated lineages, can result in the accumulation of

176   deleterious genetic variation known as 'expansion load' (Peischl *et*

177   *al*. 2013; Lohmueller 2014). This occurs when serial bottlenecks are

178   followed by large population expansions (e.g. large local carrying

179   capacities, large selection coefficients, long distance dispersal;

180   Peischl *et al*. 2013). This phenomenon is due to the accumulation

181   of new deleterious mutations at the 'wave front' of expanding

182   populations, which then rise to high frequency via drift regardless of

183   their fitness effects (also known as 'gene surfing', or 'allelic surfing'

184   Klopfstein, Currat, and Excoffier 2006; Travis *et al*. 2007).

———————————————————————————————————

<u>Box 2: What is the link between deleterious variants and the long-standing</u>

<u>concept of genetic load?</u>

The classic concept of genetic load identifies a reduction in fitness from a mean

or optimal genotype (Haldane 1937). Deleterious variants are probably the

largest single contributor to genetic load via 'mutational load' (Muller 1950;

Felsenstein 1974; Agrawal and Whitlock 2012). Due to this, the term 'genetic

load' has often been used colloquially to indicate mutational load, and attempts to

estimate genetic load have involved identifying and quantifying deleterious

genetic variants. However, the genetic load of an individual is not merely a count

of deleterious variants, but is dependent on other factors, including the

distributions of fitness effects and dominance coefficients for deleterious variants

(see Henn *et al*. 2015). These factors are difficult to quantify and estimates of

genetic load are sensitive to their values (Boyko *et al*. 2008; Lohmueller *et al*.
2008; Lohmueller *et al*. 2014; Simons *et al*. 2014). For this reason, much of the
modern literature has eschewed discussion of genetic load and focused on the
various means of counting the number of deleterious variants (see Chun and Fay
2009; Marth *et al*. 2011). Similarly, this review primarily addresses patterns of
deleterious variation in domesticated species, with the view that deleterious
variants likely contribute significantly to genetic load in many cases.
206
207 <u>Measures used to quantify the difference in mutational load among individuals</u>
208 <u>and populations include:</u>

Measure	Individuals	Populations
Absolute number of derived variants at otherwise conserved sites	X	X
Ratio of deleterious to synonymous variants	X	X
Average frequency of deleterious variants	–	X

210 <u>Box 3: **Definitions**</u>
211 *allelic (or gene) surfing*: the increase in frequency of a genetic variant at the wave
212 front of an expanding population
213
214 *ancient DNA*: DNA samples from archaeological or historical remains
215
216 *deleterious variant*: a genetic variant that reduces fitness
217
218 *derived mutation*: a genetic variant that involves a change from the ancestral
219 state as inferred from a related, outgroup taxon or from sampling of the ancestral
220 genome (e.g. using ancient DNA)
221
222 *effective population size* (N_e): the number of individuals contributing offspring to
223 the next generation of a population, versus the census population size
224
225 *genetic bottleneck*: a large reduction in census population size
226

genetic hitchhiking: when a genetic variant increases in frequency owing to
linkage disequilibrium with a variant subject to positive selection

haplotype: set of genetic variants in LD with each other

linkage disequilibrium (LD): nonrandom association of alleles at two or more loci

LD N50: the approximate physical or genetic distance over which LD decays to
half of its maximum value

linked selection: the tendency for selection on a variant to affect the frequency of
nearby variants due to LD

private alleles: genetic variants unique to a population or set of populations

runs of homozygosity: regions of the genome where both of a pair of
chromosomes are highly similar, thus increasing LD due to reduced effective
recombination

site frequency spectrum: the distribution of variant frequencies in a population

---

Deleterious variation in Domesticated Species
The rapidly expanding number of genome-wide datasets has made the study of
deleterious variants increasingly feasible. Since Lu *et al*. (2006) first
hypothesized the accumulation of deleterious variants as a 'cost of
domestication' in rice, similar studies have examined evidence for such costs in
other crops and domesticated animals.

A number of approaches have been used to quantify the composition and effect
of deleterious variants in domesticated genomes. These approaches largely
parallel those used in studies of the effects of demography on human populations
(Lohmueller 2014; Henn *et al*. 2015). Some studies have inferred a cost of
domestication indirectly from the accumulation of a larger proportion or number
of nonsynonymous variants in domesticated lineages versus their wild relatives,
assuming that nonsynonymous changes are on average deleterious (e.g. Lu *et*

al. 2006; Cruz, Vilà, and Webster 2008). Other studies have looked for reduced

genetic diversity or longer distance linkage disequilibrium (e.g. Lindblad-Toh *et*

al. 2005; Lam *et al.* 2010), and therefore reduced effective recombination and

presumably reduced efficacy of selection in the same comparison. These

approaches assume that wild relatives of domesticated species have not

themselves experienced population bottlenecks, shifts in mating system, or any

of the other processes that could affect patterns of deleterious variation relative

to their shared ancestors.

A more direct approach used to estimate the cost of domestication is to assess

the number and proportion of putatively deleterious variants present in

populations of domesticated species. The measures used include 1) the absolute

number of variants at derived sites, 2) the ratio of deleterious to synonymous

variants, and 3) an increase in the frequency of deleterious variants within a

population (Table S1; Box 2; also reviewed in Lohmueller 2014). We discuss

approaches to identifying deleterious variants in more depth below.

Several approaches attempt to translate the number of observed deleterious

variants into an estimate of genetic load. The first approach is to assume that the

degree of phylogenetic constraint on a variant provides an estimate of the

strength of purifying selection. Summing over the constraint scores (typically

using the GERP++ software; Cooper et al. 2005) relative to the number of

deleterious variants provides a means of estimating mutational load (e.g. Wang

et al. *bioRxiv*; Mardsen *et al*. 2016). A more general translation of deleterious

variants into genetic load depends on three factors: the distribution of fitness

effects of deleterious variants, a model of either additive or multiplicative effects

on fitness, and an estimate of dominance of deleterious variants (Arunkumar *et*

al. 2015; Henn *et al*. 2015; Henn *et al*. 2016; Brandvain and Wright 2016). This

approach directly addresses the question of genetic load, but does not tell us

whether the load is the result of domestication or other evolutionary processes

(unless wild relatives are also assayed, again assuming that their own

evolutionary trajectory has not simultaneously been affected). It also requires
accurate, unbiased algorithms for identifying deleterious variants from neutral
variants (see below).
297
Studies taking these approaches in domesticated species are presented
qualitatively in Table 1 (and quantitatively in Supplementary Table 1). We
searched the literature using Google Scholar with the terms ("genetic load" or
"deleterious") and "domesticat*", and in many cases followed references from
one study to the next. To the best of our knowledge, the studies in Table 1
represent the majority of the extant literature on this topic. We excluded studies
examining only the mitochondrial or other non-recombining portions of the
genome. In a few cases where numeric values were not reported, we extracted
values from published figures using relative distances as measured in the image
analysis program ImageJ (Schneider, Rasband, and Eliceiri 2012), or otherwise
extrapolated values from the provided data. Where exact values were not
available, we provide estimates. Please note that no one study (or set of
genotypes) contributed values to all columns for a particular domestication event,
and that in many cases methods used or statistics examined varied across
species.
313
Recombination and linkage disequilibrium
The process of domestication may increase recombination rate, as measured in
the number of chiasmata per bivalent. Theory predicts that recombination rate
should increase during periods of rapid evolutionary change (Otto and Barton
1997), and in domesticated species this may be driven by strong artificial
selection or small N_es (Otto and Barton 2001). This is supported by the
observation that recombination rates are higher in many domesticated species
compared to wild relatives (e.g. chicken, Groenen *et al*. 2009; honey bee, Wilfert
et al. 2007; and a number of cultivated plant species, Ross-Ibarra 2004; but not
mammals, Muñoz-Fuentes *et al*. 2014). In contrast, recombination in some
domesticated species is limited by genomic structure (e.g. in barley, where 50%

of physical length and many functional genes are in (peri-)centromeric regions

with extremely low recombination rates; The International Barley Genome

Sequencing Consortium 2012), although this structure may be shared with wild

relatives. Even when actual recombination rate (chiasmata per bivalent)

increases, effective recombination may be reduced in many domesticated

species due to an increase in linkage disequilibrium (LD) due to runs of

homozygousity. In other words, chromosomes may physically recombine, but if

the homologous chromosomes contain identical sequences then no 'effective

recombination' occurs and the outcome is no different than no recombination. In

a striking example, the effective recombination rate in maize populations has

decreased by an estimated 83% compared to that in the wild relative teosinte

(Wright *et al*. 2005; with comparable estimates in Hufford *et al.* 2012). We note

that Mezmouk and Ross-Ibarra (2014) found that deleterious variants are not

enriched in areas of low recombination in maize (although see McMullen *et al*.

2009; Rodgers-Melnick *et al*. 2015).

Strong directional selection like that imposed during domestication can reduce

genetic diversity in chromosomal regions linked to the selected locus, creating

runs of homozygousity (Sved 1971; Maynard Smith and Haigh 1974). These

regions of extended LD are among the signals used to identify targets of

selection and reconstruct the evolutionary history of domesticated species (e.g.

Tian, Stevens, and Buckler 2009). Any increase in inbreeding (e.g. after a

population bottleneck or a shift in mating system from outcrossing to selfing) will

have the same effect across the entire recombining portion of the genome, as

heterozygosity decreases with each generation (Pritchard and Przeworski 2001;

Charlesworth 2003). Extended LD has consequences for the efficacy of

selection: deleterious variants linked to larger-effect beneficial alleles can no

longer recombine away, and beneficial variants that are not in LD with larger-

effect beneficial alleles may be lost by genetic drift (Hartfield and Otto 2011;

Assaf, Petrov, and Blundell 2015). In our review of the literature, LD decays most

rapidly in outcrossing plant species (maize and sunflower), and extends much

further in self-fertilizing plants and in domesticated animals (Table S1). In all

cases where we have data for wild relatives, LD decays more rapidly in wild

lineages than in domesticated lineages (Table S1).

While we primarily report mean LD in Table S1, linkage disequilibrium also varies

among varieties and breeds of the same species. For example, in domesticated

pig breeds the length of the genome covered by runs of homozygosity, which

extend LD, ranges from 13.4 to 173.3 Mb, or 0.5–6.5% (Traspov *et al*. 2016; Box

3). Similarly, among dog breeds average LD decay (to $r^2 \leq 0.2$) ranges from 20

kb to 4.2 Mb (Gray *et al*. 2009). In both species, the decay of LD for wild

individuals occurs over shorter distances (Table S1). This suggests that patterns

of LD in these species have been strongly impacted by breed-specific

demographic history (i.e. the process of improvement), in addition to the shared

process of domestication.

Genetic diversity

We see consistent loss of genetic diversity when 'improved' or 'breed' genomes

are compared to domesticated 'landrace' or 'non-commercial' genomes, and

again when domesticated genomes are compared to the genomes of wild

relatives (Table 1; Table S1). This ranges from ~5% nucleotide diversity lost

between wolf populations and domesticated dogs (Gray *et al*. 2009) to 77% lost

between wild and improved tomato populations (Lin *et al*. 2014). The only case

where we see a gain in genetic diversity is in the Andean domestication of the

common bean, where gene flow with the more genetically diverse Mesoamerican

common bean is likely an explanatory factor (Schmutz *et al*. 2013). This pattern

is consistent with a broader review of genetic diversity in crop species: Miller and

Gross (2011) found that annual crops had lost an average of ~40% of the

diversity found in their wild relatives. This same study found that perennial fruit

trees had lost an average of ~5% genetic diversity, suggesting that the impact of

domestication on genetic diversity is strongly influenced by life history (see also

Gaut, Díez, and Morrell 2015). Given a relatively steady evolutionary trajectory

for wild populations, loss of genetic diversity in domesticated populations can be

attributed to artificial selection or reduced N_e due to increased inbreeding and

genetic bottlenecks. On an evolutionary timescales, even the oldest

domestications occurred recently relative to the rate at which new mutations can

recover the loss. This is especially true for non-recombining portions of the

genome like the mitochondrial genome or sex chromosomes. Most modern

animal breeding programs are strongly sex-biased, with few male individuals

contributing to each generation. In horses, for example, this has likely led to

almost complete loss of polymorphism on the Y chromosome via genetic drift

(Lippold *et al*. 2011). Loss of allelic diversity can reduce the efficacy of selection

by reducing additive genetic variance within species (Eyre-Walker, Woolfit, and

Phelps 2006). However, a loss of genetic diversity alone does not necessarily

signal a corresponding increase in the frequency or proportion of deleterious

variants, and so is not sufficient evidence of a cost of domestication.

Synonymous versus nonsynonymous variation

In six species, the domesticated lineage shows an increase in genome-wide

nonsynonymous to synonymous substitution rate or number compared to a wild

lineage (Table 1). This is also true across the domesticated lineages of cattle

(especially the domesticated cow; MacEachern *et al.* 2009). An exception is in

soybean, where the domesticated *Glycine max* and wild *G. soja* genomes

contain approximately the same proportion of nonsynonymous to synonymous

single nucleotide polymorphisms (Lam *et al*. 2010), which are not directly

comparable to substitutions but should exhibit similar patterns under the cost of

domestication hypothesis. These differences in nonsynonymous substitution rate

are likely driven by differences in N_e (Eyre-Walker and Keightley 2007; Woolfit

2009). If nonsynonymous mutations are on average deleterious, as theory and

empirical data suggest (Keightley and Lynch 2003; Eyre-Walker, Woolfit, and

Phelps 2006; Boyko *et al*. 2008; Kim, Huber, and Lohmueller 2017), then an

increase in nonsynonymous substitutions will reduce mean fitness (Figure 2B-C).

The comparisons in Table 1 suggest that this has occurred in domesticated

species. This result differs from Moray, Lanfear, and Bromham (2014), who

examined rates of mitochondrial genome sequence evolution in domesticated

animals and their wild relatives and found no such consistent pattern. This

difference may be attributable to the focus of each review (genome-wide versus

mitochondria) or, as the authors speculate, to genetic bottlenecks in some of the

wild relatives included in their study.

The ratio of nonsynonymous to synonymous substitutions may not be a good

estimate for mutational load. For one, nonsynonymous substitutions are

particularly likely to have phenotypic effects (Kono *et al*. *bioRxiv*). Variants

annotated as deleterious based on sequence conservation (see below) can in

some cases contribute to agronomically important phenotypes (e.g. Nie *et al*.

2015; see also Albalat and Cañestro 2016), and artificial selection during

domestication and improvement is likely to drive a portion of these variants

associated with favorable phenotypes to higher frequencies (or fixation) in

domesticated lineages (Kono *et al*. 2016). In addition, estimates of the proportion

of nonsynonymous sites with deleterious effects range from 0.03 (in bacteria;

Hughes 2005) to 0.80 (in humans; Fay *et al*. 2001; The Chimpanzee Sequencing

and Analysis Consortium 2005). It follows that nonsynonymous substitution rate

may have a poor correlation with patterns of deleterious variation and mutational

load, at least at larger taxonomic scales. However, the consensus proportion of

deleterious variants in Table S1 is between 0.05 and 0.25, which spans a smaller

range. Finally, dN/dS and related ratios may be flawed estimates of functional

divergence because they rely on the assumption that synonymous mutations are

neutral and thus can control for substitution rate variation. This assumption may

not hold true, especially for closely related taxa (e.g. Wolf *et al*. 2009; see also

Kryazhimskiy and Plotkin 2008), and at least one study shows elevated rates of

synonymous relative to non-coding substitutions in domesticated lineages

(MacEachern *et al.* 2009).

Deleterious variants

An increase in mutational load can come from an increased frequency or number
of deleterious variants. The first can be assessed by examining shared
deleterious variants between wild and domesticated lineages, and both by
comparing shared and private deleterious variants across lineages. Looking at
deleterious variants that are at high frequency across all domesticated varieties
may provide insight into the early processes of domestication, while looking at
deleterious variants with varying frequencies among domesticated varieties may
provide insight into the processes of improvement. We recommend that
researchers studying deleterious variants report results per genome, and then
compare across genomes and among lineages. Many, but not all, of the studies
in Table 1 take this approach. The total number or frequency of deleterious
variants within a population will necessarily depend on the size of that population,
and so sufficient sampling is important before values can be compared across
populations. Values per genome are easier to compare across most available
genomic datasets.
464
Renaut and Rieseberg (2015) found a significant increase in both shared and
private deleterious mutations in domesticated relative to wild lines of sunflower,
and similar patterns in two additional closely-related species: cardoon and globe
artichoke (Table 1). This pattern also holds true for *japonica* and *indica*
domesticated rice (Liu *et al*. 2017) and for the domesticated dog (Marsden *et al*.
2016) compared to their wild relatives (Table 1). In horses, deleterious mutation
load as estimated using Genomic Evolutionary Rate Profiling (GERP) appears to
be higher in both domesticated genomes and the extant wild relative
(Przewalski's horse, which went through a severe genetic bottleneck in the last
century) compared to an ancient wild horse genome (Schubert *et al*. 2014).
These four studies, spanning a wide taxonomic range, suggest that an increase
in the number and proportion of deleterious variants may be a general
consequence of domestication. However, the other studies we present that
examined deleterious variants in domesticated species did not include any
sampling of wild lineages. Without sufficient sampling of a parallel lineage that

did not undergo the process of domestication, it is difficult to assess whether the

'cost of domestication' is indeed general.

Identifying dangerous hitchhikers

The effect size of a deleterious mutation is negatively correlated with its

likelihood of increasing in frequency through any of the mechanisms we discuss

here. That is, variants with a strongly deleterious effect are more likely to be

purged by selection than mildly deleterious variants. Similarly, mutations that

have a consistent, environmentally-independent deleterious effect are more likely

to be purged than mutations with environmentally-plastic effects. In the extreme

case, we would never expect mutations that have a consistently lethal effect in a

heterozygous state to contribute to a persistent cost of domestication, as these

would be lost in the first generation of their appearance in a population. However,

mutations with consistent, highly deleterious effects are likely rare relative to

those with smaller or environment-dependent effects, especially in inbred

populations (Figure 2A; Arunkumar *et al*. 2015). When thinking about patterns of

deleterious variation, it is therefore important to recognize that the effect of any

particular mutation can depend on context, including genomic background and

developmental environment. This complexity likely makes these classes of

deleterious variants more difficult to identify, and we might not expect these

variants to show up in bioinformatic screens (discussed below). Furthermore, all

of these expectations are modified by linkage: when deleterious variants are in

LD with targets of artificial selection, they are more likely to evade purging even

with consistent, large, deleterious effects (Figure 1B).

We searched the literature for examples of specific deleterious variants that

hitchhiked along with targets of selection during domestication and improvement.

We did not find many such cases, so we describe each in detail here. The best-

characterized example comes from rice, where an allele that negatively affects

yield under drought (*qDTY1.1*) is tightly linked to the major green revolution

dwarfing allele *sd1* (Vikram *et al*. 2015). Vikram *et al*. (2015) found that the

qDTY1.1 allele explained up to 31% of the variance in yield under drought across
three RIL populations and two growing seasons. Almost all modern elite rice
varieties carry the *sd1* allele (which increases plant investment in grain yield),
and as a consequence these varieties are highly sensitive to drought. The
discovery of the *qDTY1.1* allele has enabled rice breeders to finally break the
linkage and create drought tolerant, dwarfed lines.
517
In sunflower, the *B* locus affects branching and was a likely target of selection
during domestication (Bachlava *et al*. 2010). This locus has pleiotropic effects on
plant and seed morphology that, in branched male restorer lines, mask the effect
of linked loci with both 'positive' (increased seed weight) and 'negative' (reduced
seed oil content) effects (Bachlava *et al*. 2010). To properly understand these
effects required a complex experimental design, where these linked loci were
segregated in unbranched (*b*) and branched (*B*) backgrounds. Managing these
effects in the heterotic sunflower breeding groups has likely also been
challenging.
527
A similarly complex narrative has emerged in maize. The gene *TGA1* was key to
evolution of 'naked kernels' in domesticated maize from the encased kernels of
teosinte (Wang *et al*. 2015). This locus has pleiotropic effects on kernel features
and plant architecture, and is in linkage disequilibrium with the gene *SU1*, which
encodes a starch debranching enzyme (Brandenburg *et al*. 2017). *SU1* was
targeted by artificial selection during domestication (Whitt *et al*. 2002), but also
appears to be under divergent selection between Northern Flints and Corn Belt
Dents, two maize populations (Brandenburg *et al*. 2017). This is likely because
breeders of these groups are targeting different starch qualities, and this work
may have been made more difficult by the genetic linkage of *SU1* with *TGA1*.
538
In the above cases, the linked allele(s) with negative agronomic effects are
unlikely to be picked up in a genome-wide screen for deleterious variation, as
they are segregating in wild or landrace populations and are not necessarily

disadvantageous in other contexts. One putative 'truly' deleterious case is in

domesticated chickens, where a missense mutation in the thyroid stimulating

hormone receptor (*TSHR*) locus sits within a shared selective sweep haplotype

(Rubin *et al*. 2010). However, Rubin *et al*. (2010) argue this is more likely a case

where a 'deleterious' (i.e. non-conserved) allele was actually the target of artificial

selection and potentially contributed to the trait of year-round egg laying in

chickens.

In the Roundup Ready (event 40-3-2) soybean varieties released in 1996, tight

linkage between the transgene insertion event and another allele (or possibly an

allele created by the insertion event itself) reduced yield by 5-10% (Elmore *et al*.

2001). This is not quite genetic hitchhiking in the traditional sense, but the yield

drag effect persisted through backcrossing of the transgene into hundreds of

varieties (Benbrook 1999). This effect likely explains, at least in part, why

transgenic soybean has failed to increase realized yields (Xu *et al*. 2013).

Consistent with this prediction, a second, independent insertion event in

Roundup Ready 2 Yield® does not suffer from the same yield drag effect (Horak

et al. 2015).

It is likely that 'dangerous hitchhiker' examples exist that have either gone

undetected by previous studies (possibly due to low genomic resolution, limited

phenotyping, or limited screening environments), have been detected but not

publicized, or are buried among other results in, for example, large QTL studies.

It is also possible that the role of genetic hitchhiking has not been as important in

shaping genome-wide patterns of deleterious variation as previously assumed.

<u>Gaps and Opportunities</u>

How much of the genome is in LD with major targets of artificial selection?

Artificial selection during domestication targets a clear change in the optimal

multivariate phenotype. This likely affects a significant portions of the genome:

available estimates include 2–4% of genes in maize (Wright *et al*. 2005) and 16%

of the genome in common bean (Papa *et al*. 2007) targeted by selection during

domestication. For crops, traits such as seed dormancy, branching,

indeterminate flowering, stress tolerance, and shattering are known to be

selected for different optima between artificial versus natural selection (Takeda

and Matsuoka 2008; Gross and Olsen 2010). In some cases, we know the loci

that underlie these domestication traits. One well-studied example is the green

revolution dwarfing gene, *sd1* in rice. *sd1* is surrounded by a 500kb region (~13

genes) with reduced allelic diversity in *japonica* rice (Asano *et al*. 2011). Another

example in rice is the *waxy* locus, where a 250 kb region shows reduced diversity

consistent with a selective sweep in temperate *japonica* glutinous varieties

(Olsen *et al*. 2006). The difference in the size of the region affected by these two

selective sweeps may be because the strength of selection on these two traits

varied, with weaker selection at *waxy* then *sd1*. Unfortunately, the relative

strength of selection on domestication traits is largely unknown, and other factors

can also influence the size of the genomic region affected by artificial selection.

The physical position of selected mutation can have large effect on this via gene

density and local recombination rate (e.g. in rice, Flowers *et al*. 2012). This

explanation has been invoked in maize (Wright *et al*. 2005), where the extent of

LD surrounding domestication loci is highly variable. For example a 1.1 Mb

region (~15 genes) lost diversity during a selective sweep on chromosome 10 in

maize (Tian, Stevens, and Buckler 2009), but only a 60–90 kb extended

haplotype came with the *tb1* domestication allele (Clark *et al*. 2004). While these

case studies provide examples of sweeps resulting from domestication, they also

show that the size of the affected region is highly variable, and we don't yet know

how this might impact patterns of deleterious variation. This is compounded by

the fact that even in highly researched species we don't always know the number

or location of genomic targets of selection during domestication (e.g. in maize;

Hufford *et al*. 2012), especially if any extended LD driven by artificial selection

has eroded or the intensity or mode of artificial selection has changed over time.

What's "worse" in domesticated species: hitchhikers, drifters, or inbreds?

We do not have a clear sense of which evolutionary processes contribute most to

the putative cost of domestication, and sometimes see contrasting patterns

across species. In maize, relatively few putatively deleterious alleles are shared

across all domesticated lines (hundreds vs. thousands; Mezmouk and Ross-

Ibarra 2014), which points to a larger role for the process of improvement than for

domestication in driving patterns of deleterious variation. In contrast, the increase

in dog dN/dS relative to wolf populations appears to not be driven by recent

inbreeding (i.e. improvement) but by the ancient domestication bottleneck

common to all dogs (Marsden *et al*. 2016).

Of the deleterious alleles segregating in more than 80% of maize lines, only 9.4%

show any signal of positive selection (Mezmouk and Ross-Ibarra 2014). This

suggests that hitchhiking during domestication played a relatively small role in

the increased frequency of deleterious variants in maize. The same study found

little support for enrichment of deleterious SNPs in areas of reduced

recombination (Mezmouk and Ross-Ibarra 2014). However, Rodgers-Melnick *et*

al. (2015) present contrasting evidence supporting enrichment of deleterious

variants in regions of low recombination, and the authors argue that this

difference is due to the use of a tool that does not rely on genome annotation

(Genomic Evolutionary Rate Profiling, or GERP; Cooper *et al*. 2005). This

complex narrative has emerged from just one well-studied domesticated species,

and it is likely that each species will present new and different complexities.

Specific differences

Examining general differences between wild and domesticated lineages ignores

species-specific demographic histories and changes in life history, which may be

important contributors to patterns of deleterious variation. Although we found

some general patterns (e.g. loss of genetic diversity, Table 1), we also see clear

exceptions (e.g. the Andean common bean). We can attribute these exceptions

to particular demographic scenarios (e.g. gene flow with Mesoamerican common

bean populations), assuming we have sufficient archeological, historical, or

genetic data. One clear problem is our inability to sample ancestral (pre-
domestication) lineages, and our subsequent reliance on sampling of current wild
relative lineages that have their own unique evolutionary trajectories. Sequencing
ancient DNA can provide some insight into the history of these lineages and their
ancestral states (e.g. in horses; Schubert *et al*. 2014). Currently, we know very
little about most domesticated species' histories. We are still working towards
understanding dynamics since domestication: even in highly-researched species
like rice, the number of domestication events and subsequent demographic
dynamics are hotly contested (Kovach, Sweeney, and McCouch 2007; Gao and
Innan 2008; He *et al*. 2011; Molina *et al*. 2011; Huang *et al*. 2012; Gross and
Zhao 2014; Civáň *et al*. 2015; Chen, Huang, and Han 2016; Choi *et al*. 2017).
646
A second challenge, briefly mentioned above, is understanding the relative
importance of any one factor in any particular domestication event. Freedman,
Lohmueller, and Wayne (2016) provide an in-depth review on this question in the
domesticated dog, but it is unclear how general the relative contributions of
selection and demography in dogs may be to other species. For example, in rice
the shift to selfing from outcrossing during domestication appears to have played
a larger role than the domestication bottleneck in shaping deleterious variation
(Liu *et al*. 2017). This is useful in understanding rice domestication and its
impact, but similar studies would need to be conducted across domesticated
species to understand the generality of this dynamic. It is possible that general
patterns may be drawn from subsets of domesticated species (e.g. vertebrates
versus vascular plants, short-lived versus long-lived, outcrossing versus selfing
versus clonally propagated etc.). For one, there may be general differences
between annual and perennial crops, including less severe domestication
bottlenecks and higher levels of gene flow from wild populations in perennials
(Miller and Gross 2011; Gaut, Díez, and Morrell 2015).
663
Predictive algorithms
The identification of individual deleterious variants typically relies on sequence

conservation. If a variant occurs at a particular nucleotide site or encoded amino

acid is invariant across a phylogenetic comparison, then it is putatively

deleterious. More advanced approaches use estimates of synonymous

substitution rates at a locus to improve estimates of constraint on a nucleotide

site (Chun and Fay 2009). The majority of 'SNP annotation' approaches are

intended for the annotation of amino acid changing variants, although at least two

approaches (GERP++: Davydov *et al*. 2010; PHAST: Hubisz, Pollard, and Siepel

2010) can be applied to noncoding sequences when nucleotide sequences can

be aligned across species. This estimation of phylogenetic constraint is heavily

dependent on the sequence alignment; new annotation approaches have sought

to use more consistent sets of alignments across loci. Both GERP++ and MAPP

permit users to provide alignments for SNP annotation (Davydov *et al*. 2010;

Stone and Sidow 2005). The recently reported tool BAD_Mutations (Kono *et al*.

2016; Kono *et al*. bioRxiv) permits the use of a consistent set of alignments for

the annotation of deleterious variants by automating the download and alignment

of the coding portion of plant genomes from Phytozome and Ensembl Plants.

This currently includes 50+ sequenced angiosperm genomes (Goodstein *et al*.

2010; Kersey *et al*. 2016). Currently, the tool is configured for use with

angiosperms, but could be applied to other organisms.

Using phylogenetic conservation may be problematic in domesticated species, as

relaxed, balancing, or diversifying selection in agricultural environments could lift

constraint on sites under purifying or stabilizing selection in wild environments

(assuming some commonalities within these environment types). In one such

case, two AGPase small subunit paralogs in maize appear to be under

diversifying and balancing selection, respectively, even though these subunits

are likely under selective constraint across flowering plants (Georgelis, Shaw,

and Hannah 2009; Corbi *et al*. 2010). Similarly, broadly 'deleterious' traits may

have been under positive artificial selection in domesticated species. The loci

underlying these traits could be flagged as deleterious in bioinformatic screens

despite increasing fitness in the context of domestication. For example, the *fgf4*

retrogene insertion that causes chrondrodysplasia (short-leggedness) in dogs

would likely have a strongly deleterious effect in wolves, but has been positively

selected in some breeds of dog (Parker *et al*. 2009). Finally, bioinformatic

approaches that rely on phylogenetic conservation are likely to miss variants with

effects that are only deleterious in specific environmental or genomic contexts

(plastic or epistatic effects), or which reduce fitness specifically in agronomic or

breeding contexts. Specific knowledge of the phenotypic effects of putatively

deleterious mutations is necessary to address these issues, but as we discuss

below these data are challenging to obtain.

Information from the site frequency spectrum, or the number of times individual

variants are observed in a sample, can provide additional information about

which variants are most likely to be deleterious. In resequencing data from many

species, nonsynonymous variants typically occur at lower average frequencies

than synonymous variants (see Nordborg *et al*. 2005; Ross-Ibarra *et al*. 2009;

Günther and Schmid 2010). Mutations that are annotated as deleterious are

particularly likely to occur at lower frequencies than other classes of variants

(Marth *et al*. 2011; Kono *et al*. 2016; Liu *et al*. 2017) and may be less likely to be

shared among populations (Marth *et al*. 2011).

Tools for the annotation of potentially deleterious variants continue to be

developed rapidly (see Grimm *et al*. 2015 for a recent comparison). This includes

many tools that attempt to make use of information beyond sequence

conservation, including potential effects of variants on protein structure or

function (Adzhubei *et al*. 2010) or a diversity of genomic information intended to

improve prediction of pathogenicity in humans (Kircher *et al*. 2014). The majority

of SNP annotation tools are designed to work on human data and may not be

applicable to other organisms (Kono *et al*. *bioRxiv*). There is the potential for

circularity when an annotation tool is trained on the basis of pathogenic variants

in humans and then evaluated on the basis of a potentially overlapping set of

variants (Grimm *et al*. 2015). Even given these limitations, validation outside of

humans is more challenging because of a paucity of known phenotype-changing
variants. To address this issue, Kono *et al*. (*bioRxiv*) report a comparison of
seven annotation tools applied to a set of 2,910 phenotype-changing variants in
the model plant species *Arabidopsis thaliana*. The authors find that all seven
tools more accurately identify phenotype-changing variants likely to be
deleterious in *Arabidopsis* (Kono *et al*. *bioRxiv*) than in humans (Grimm *et al.*
2015; Dong *et al.* 2015). Diversity estimates in *Arabidopsis thaliana* suggest a
slightly larger estimated N_e in *Arabidopsis* than humans (Cao *et al.* 2011). Given
the general principle that for variants with selective coefficients $s < 1 / (2N_e)$,
genetic drift will dominate over the action of selection on a variant, making
purifying selection less effective.
739
No one is perfect, not even the reference
Bioinformatic approaches can suffer from reference bias (Simons *et al*. 2014;
Kono *et al*. 2016; Liu *et al*. 2017). With reference-based read mapping, variants
are typically identified as differences from reference, then passed through a
series of filters to identify putatively deleterious variants. Most annotation
approaches focus on nonsynonymous differences from references. Because a
reference genome, particularly when based on an inbred, has no differences
from itself, the reference has no nonsynonymous variants to annotate and thus
appears free of deleterious variants. This issue can be addressed by identifying
all variants, including those where the reference is different from all other
samples, and defining the mutation as the change relative to an inferred
ancestral state (see Kono *et al*. 2016). A more concerning type of reference bias
is that individuals that are genetically more similar to the reference genome will
have fewer differences from reference and thus fewer variants that annotate as
deleterious. This pattern is observed by Mezmouk and Ross-Ibarra (2014) who
find fewer deleterious variants in the stiff-stalk population of maize (to which the
reference genome B73 belongs) than in other elite maize populations. Along
similar lines, because gene models are derived from the reference genome,
more closely related lines with more similar coding portions of genes will appear

to have fewer disruptions of coding sequence (Gan *et al*. 2011). Finally,

reference bias can contribute to under-calling of deleterious variants, either when

divergent haplotypes fail to properly align to the reference or if the reference is

included in a phylogenetic comparison. Variants that are detected as a difference

from reference may then be compared against the reference in an alignment

testing for conservation at a nucleotide. This conflates diversity within a species

with the phylogenetic divergence that is being tested in the alignment. In cases

where the reference genome contains the novel (or derived) variant compared to

the state in the related species, the presence of the reference variant in the

alignment will cause the site to appear less constrained. This last problem is

easily resolved by leaving the species being tested out of the phylogenetic

alignment used to annotate deleterious variants (as in Schubert *et al*. 2014; Henn

et al. 2016; Kono *et al*. 2016; Marsden *et al*. 2016).

Effect size

The evidence we present supports the cost of domestication hypothesis, namely

that domesticated lineages carry more or higher frequency deleterious variants

than their wild relatives (Table 1). However, the distribution of fitness effects of

variants is important with the regard to the total load within an individual or

population (Henn *et al*. 2015). In other words, it is the cumulative effect of the

variants carried by an individual that make up its mutational load, not simply what

proportion of those variants is 'deleterious'. As we describe above, current

bioinformatic approaches that rely on phylogenetic conservation may identify a

number of false positives (driven by new fitness optima under artificial selection)

or false negatives (with specific epistatic, dominance, or environmentally-

dependent effects). Functional and quantitative genetics approaches provide

means of assessing the phenotypic effect of genetic variants, but there are

practical considerations that limit the quantity of evaluations that can be

conducted.

One potential issue is that the phenotypic effect of a genetic variant often

depends on genomic background, through both dominance (interaction between

alleles at the same locus) and epistasis (interaction among alleles at different

loci). Evaluating the effect of these variants is consequently a complex task,

requiring the creation and evaluation of multiple classes of recombinant

genomes. Similarly, the environment is an important consideration in thinking

about effect size. As we saw with the yield under drought *qDTY1.1* allele in rice

(*Identifying dangerous hitchhikers*, above; Vikram *et al*. 2015), the effect of a

genetic variant can depend on developmental or assessment environment.

These kinds of variants might be expected to be involved in local adaptation in

wild populations, and so would not show up in a screen based on phylogenetic

conservation. Nevertheless, these variants may be important in breeding

programs that target general-purpose genotypes with, for example, high mean

and low variance yields. Identifying these alleles requires assessment in the

appropriate environment(s) and large assessment populations (as the power for

detecting genotype-phenotype correlations generally scales with the number of

genotypes assessed). Addressing effect size in the appropriate context(s)

therefore involves challenges of scale. Fortunately, new types of mapping

populations (e.g. MAGIC) and high-throughput phenotyping platforms that can

enable this work are increasingly available across domesticated systems. Given

these tools and the resultant data, we should soon be able to parameterize

genomic selection and similar models with putatively deleterious variants and test

their cumulative effects.

Heterosis

In systems with hybrid production, complementation of deleterious variants

between heterotic breeding pools may contribute substantially to heterosis (e.g.

in maize; Hufford *et al*. 2012; Mezmouk and Ross-Ibarra 2014; Yang *et al*.

bioRxiv). If this is broadly true, hybrid production may be an interesting solution

to the cost of domestication, as long as deleterious variants are private to

heterotic groups rather than fixed in domesticated species. Theory suggests that

the deleterious variants that contribute to heterosis between populations with low

levels of gene flow are likely to be of intermediate effect, and may not play a

large role in inbreeding depression (Whitlock, Ingvarsson, and Hatfield 2000).

Since fitness in these contexts is largely evaluated in hybrid individuals rather

than inbred parents, parental populations are likely to retain a higher proportion

of slightly and moderately deleterious variants than even selfing populations

(Figure 2A). As long as hybrid crosses are the primary mode of seed production,

these alleles may not be of high importance to breeders even though they

contribute to deleterious variation more broadly. Evaluating effect size in this

context requires assessing both parental and hybrid populations, and is therefore

that much more difficult. However, assuming that complementation of deleterious

variants is a substantial component of heterosis, quantifying these variants

should improve the ability of breeding programs to predict trait values in hybrid

crosses. Further, the question of whether deleterious variation limits genetic

gains in hybrid production systems remains open.

<u>CONCLUSIONS</u>

Research on the putative costs of domestication is still relatively new, and there

remain many open questions. However, our review of the literature suggests that

deleterious variants are generally more numerous or frequent in domesticated

species compared to their wild relatives. This pattern is likely driven by a number

of processes that collectively act to reduce the efficacy of selection relative to

drift in domesticated populations, resulting in increased frequency of deleterious

variants linked to selected loci and greater accumulation of deleterious variants

genome-wide. We encourage further research across domesticated species on

these processes, and recommend that researchers: (1) Sample domesticated

and wild lineages sufficiently to assess diversity within as well as between these

groups and (2) present deleterious variant data per genome and as proportional

as well as absolute values. We also strongly encourage researchers and

breeders to think about deleterious variation in context, both genomic and

environmental. Finally, we think collecting empirical data on the effect sizes and

conditional dependence of putatively deleterious variants is increasingly feasible,

and would contribute greatly to this field.

FUNDING
This work was supported by the US National Science Foundation (award
numbers 1523752 to B.T.M.; and DBI 1339393 to P.L.M.).

857
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
We thank Greg Baute, Thomas Kono, Kathryn Turner, Jeffrey Ross-Ibarra, and
two anonymous and thoughtful reviewers for comments on an earlier version of
this manuscript, and Brandon Gaut, Loren Rieseberg, and Greg Owens for
helpful discussion.

REFERENCES
Adzhubei IA, Schmidt S, Peshkin L, Ramensky VE, Gerasimova A, Bork P, *et al.*
(2010). A method and server for predicting damaging missense mutations.
Nat Methods **7**: 248–249.

Agrawal AF, Whitlock MC (2012). Mutation load: the fitness of individuals in
populations where deleterious alleles are abundant. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst*
43: 115–135.

Albalat R, Cañestro C (2016). Evolution by gene loss. *Nat Rev Genet* **17**: 379–
391.

Allard RW (1999). History of plant population genetics. *Annu Rev Genet* **33**: 1–
27.

Amaral AJ, Megens HJ, Crooijmans RPMA, Heuven HCM, Groenen MAM
(2008). Linkage disequilibrium decay and haplotype block structure in the pig.
Genetics **179**: 569–579.

Arunkumar R, Ness RW, Wright SI, Barrett SCH (2015). The evolution of selfing
is accompanied by reduced efficacy of selection and purging of deleterious
mutations. *Genetics* **199**: 817–829.

Asano K, Yamasaki M, Takuno S, Miura K, Katagiri S, Ito T, *et al.* (2011).
Artificial selection for a green revolution gene during japonica rice
domestication. *PNAS* **108**: 11034–11039.

Assaf ZJ, Petrov DA, Blundell JR (2015). Obstruction of adaptation in diploids by
recessive, strongly deleterious alleles. *PNAS* **112**: E2658–E2666.

Bachlava E, Tang S, Pizarro G, Schuppert GF, Brunick RK, Draeger D, *et al.*
(2009). Pleiotropy of the branching locus (B) masks linked and unlinked
quantitative trait loci affecting seed traits in sunflower. *Theor Appl Genet* **120**:
829–842.

Badouin H, Gouzy J, Grassa CJ, Murat F, Staton SE, Cottret L, *et al.* (2017). The
sunflower genome provides insights into oil metabolism, flowering and
Asterid evolution. *Nature* **546**: 148–152.

Baer CF, Miyamoto MM, Denver DR (2007). Mutation rate variation in
multicellular eukaryotes: causes and consequences. *Nat Rev Genet* **8**: 619–
631.

Benbrook C (1999). *Evidence of the magnitude and consequences of the*
Roundup Ready soybean yield drag from university-based varietal trials in
1998. Ag BioTech InfoNet.

Bosse M, Megens H-J, Madsen O, Crooijmans RPMA, Ryder OA, Austerlitz F, *et*
al. (2015). Using genome-wide measures of coancestry to maintain diversity
and fitness in endangered and domestic pig populations. *Genome Research*
25: 970–981.

Bosse M, Megens H-J, Madsen O, Paudel Y, Frantz LAF, Schook LB, *et al.*
(2012). Regions of homozygosity in the porcine genome: consequence of
demography and the recombination landscape. *PLoS Genet* **8**: e1003100.

Boyko AR, Williamson SH, Indap AR, Degenhardt JD, Hernandez RD,
Lohmueller KE, *et al.* (2008). Assessing the Evolutionary Impact of Amino
Acid Mutations in the Human Genome (MH Schierup, Ed.). *PLoS Genet* **4**:
e1000083.

Brandenburg J-T, Mary-Huard T, Rigaill G, Hearne SJ, Corti H, Joets J, *et al.*
(2017). Independent introductions and admixtures have contributed to
adaptation of European maize and its American counterparts. *PLoS Genet*
13: e1006666.

Cao J, Schneeberger K, Ossowski S, Günther T, Bender S, Fitz J, *et al.* (2011).
Whole-genome sequencing of multiple *Arabidopsis* thaliana populations. *Nat*
Genet **43**: 956–963.

Charlesworth B (2009). Fundamental concepts in genetics: Effective population
size and patterns of molecular evolution and variation. *Nat Rev Genet* **10**:
195–205.

Charlesworth D (2003). Effects of inbreeding on the genetic diversity of
populations. *Phil Trans Roy Soc B* **358**: 1051–1070.

Chen E, Huang X, Han B (2016). How can rice genetics benefit from rice-
domestication study? *National Science Review* **3**: 278–280.

Choi JY, Platts AE, Fuller DQ, Hsing Y-I, Wing RA, Purugganan MD (2017). The
rice paradox: Multiple origins but single domestication in Asian rice. *Mol Biol*
Evol: msx049.

Choi Y, Sims GE, Murphy S, Miller JR, Chan AP (2012). Predicting the
Functional Effect of Amino Acid Substitutions and Indels. *PLoS ONE* **7**:
e46688.

Chun S, Fay JC (2009). Identification of deleterious mutations within three
human genomes. *Genome Research* **19**: 1553–1561.

Civáň P, Craig H, Cox CJ, Brown TA (2015). Three geographically separate
domestications of Asian rice. *NPLANTS* **1**: 15164.

Clark RM, Linton E, Messing J, Doebley JF (2004). Pattern of diversity in the
genomic region near the maize domestication gene *tb1*. *PNAS* **101**: 700–707.

Consortium TCSAA (2005). Initial sequence of the chimpanzee genome and
comparison with the human genome. *Nature* **437**: 69–87.

Consortium TIBGS (2013). A physical, genetic and functional sequence
assembly of the barley genome. *Nature* **491**: 711–716.

Cooper GM, Stone EA, Asimenos G, Green ED, Batzoglou S, Sidow A (2005).
Distribution and intensity of constraint in mammalian genomic sequence.
Genome Research **15**: 901–913.

Corbi J, Debieu M, Rousselet A, Montalent P, Le Guilloux M, Manicacci D, *et al.*
(2010). Contrasted patterns of selection since maize domestication on
duplicated genes encoding a starch pathway enzyme. *Theor Appl Genet* **122**:
705–722.

Cruz F, Vila C, Webster MT (2008). The legacy of domestication: accumulation of
deleterious mutations in the dog genome. *Mol Biol Evol* **25**: 2331–2336.

Davydov EV, Goode DL, Sirota M, Cooper GM, Sidow A, Batzoglou S (2010).
Identifying a high fraction of the human genome to be under selective
constraint using GERP. *PLoS Comput Biol* **6**: e1001025.

Dong C, Wei P, Jian X, Gibbs R, Boerwinkle E, Wang K, *et al.* (2015).
Comparison and integration of deleteriousness prediction methods for
nonsynonymous SNVs in whole exome sequencing studies. *Human
Molecular Genetics* **24**: 2125–2137.

Elmore RW, Roeth FW, Nelson LA (2001). Glyphosate-resistant soybean cultivar
yields compared with sister lines. *Agron J* **93**: 408–412.

Eyre-Walker A, Keightley PD (2007). The distribution of fitness effects of new
mutations. *Nat Rev Genet* **8**: 610–618.

Eyre-Walker A, Woolfit M, Phelps T (2006). The distribution of fitness effects of
new deleterious amino acid mutations in humans. *Genetics* **173**: 891–900.

Fay JC, Wyckoff GJ, Wu C-I (2001). Positive and Negative Selection on the
Human Genome. *Genetics* **158**: 1227–1234.

Felsenstein J (1974). The evolutionary advantage of recombination. *Genetics* **78**:
737–756.

Flowers JM, Molina J, Rubinstein S, Huang P, Schaal BA, Purugganan MD
(2012). Natural selection in gene-dense regions shapes the genomic pattern
of polymorphism in wild and domesticated rice. *Mol Biol Evol* **29**: 675–687.

Freedman AH, Lohmueller KE, Wayne RK (2016). Evolutionary History, Selective
Sweeps, and Deleterious Variation in the Dog. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst* **47**:
73–96.

Gabriel SB, Schaffner SF, Nguyen H, Moore JM, Roy J, Blumenstiel B, *et al.*
(2002). The structure of haplotype blocks in the human genome. *Science*
296: 2225–2229.

Gan X, Stegle O, Behr J, Steffen JG, Drewe P, Hildebrand KL, *et al.* (2011).
Multiple reference genomes and transcriptomes for *Arabidopsis thaliana*.
Nature **477**: 419–423.

Gao L-Z, Innan H (2008). Nonindependent Domestication of the Two Rice
Subspecies, Oryza sativassp. indicaand ssp. japonica, Demonstrated by
Multilocus Microsatellites. *Genetics* **179**: 965–976.

Gaut BS, Díez CM, Morrell PL (2015). Genomics and the contrasting dynamics of
annual and perennial domestication. *TIG* **31**: 709–719.

Georgelis N, Shaw JR, Hannah LC (2009). Phylogenetic analysis of ADP-
glucose pyrophosphorylase subunits reveals a role of subunit interfaces in
the allosteric properties of the enzyme. *Plant Physiol* **151**: 67–77.

Gheyas AA, Boschiero C, Eory L, Ralph H, Kuo R, Woolliams JA, *et al.* (2015).
Functional classification of 15 million SNPs detected from diverse chicken
populations. *DNA Research* **22**: 205–217.

Gillespie JH (1994). Substitution processes in molecular evolution. II.
Exchangeable models from population genetics. *Genetics* **138**: 943–952.

Gillespie JH (1999). The role of population size in molecular evolution. *Theor Pop*
Biol **55**: 145–156.

Giorgi D, Pandozy G, Farina A, Grosso V, Lucretti S, Gennaro A, *et al.* (2016).
First detailed karyo-morphological analysis and molecular cytological study of
leafy cardoon and globe artichoke, two multi-use Asteraceae crops. *CCG* **10**:
447–463.

Goodstein DM, Shu S, Howson R, Neupane R, Hayes RD, Fazo J, *et al.* (2011). Phytozome: a comparative platform for green plant genomics. *Nucleic Acids Res* **40**: D1178–D1186.

Gore MA, Chia JM, Elshire RJ, Sun Q, Ersoz ES, Hurwitz BL, *et al.* (2009). A First-Generation Haplotype Map of Maize. *Science* **326**: 1115–1117.

Gray MM, Granka JM, Bustamante CD, Sutter NB, Boyko AR, Zhu L, *et al.* (2009). Linkage Disequilibrium and Demographic History of Wild and Domestic Canids. *Genetics* **181**: 1493–1505.

Gregory TR (2017). Animal Genome Size Database. http://www.genomesize.com.

Grimm DG, Azencott C-A, Aicheler F, Gieraths U, MacArthur DG, Samocha KE, *et al.* (2015). The Evaluation of Tools Used to Predict the Impact of Missense Variants Is Hindered by Two Types of Circularity. *Human Mutation* **36**: 513–523.

Groenen MAM, Wahlberg P, Foglio M, Cheng HH, Megens HJ, Crooijmans RPMA, *et al.* (2008). A high-density SNP-based linkage map of the chicken genome reveals sequence features correlated with recombination rate. *Genome Research* **19**: 510–519.

Gross BL, Olsen KM (2010). Genetic perspectives on crop domestication. *Trends Plant Sci* **15**: 529–537.

Gross BL, Zhao Z (2014). Archaeological and genetic insights into the origins of domesticated rice. *PNAS* **111**: 6190–6197.

Günther T, Schmid KJ (2010). Deleterious amino acid polymorphisms in *Arabidopsis thaliana* and rice. *Theor Appl Genet* **121**: 157–168.

Haldane J (1937). The effect of variation of fitness. *Am Nat* **71**: 337–349.

Hartfield M, Otto SP (2011). Recombination and Hitchiking of Deleterious Alleles. *Evolution* **65**: 2421–2434.

He Z, Zhai W, Wen H, Tang T, Wang Y, Lu X, *et al.* (2011). Two Evolutionary Histories in the Genome of Rice: the Roles of Domestication Genes (R Mauricio, Ed.). *PLoS Genet* **7**: e1002100.

Henn BM, Botigué LR, Bustamante CD, Clark AG, Gravel S (2015). Estimating the mutation load in human genomes. *Nat Rev Genet* **16**: 333–343.

Henn BM, Botigué LR, Peischl S, Dupanloup I, Lipatov M, Maples BK, *et al.* (2016). Distance from sub-Saharan Africa predicts mutational load in diverse human genomes. *PNAS* **113**: E440–E449.

Hill WG, Robertson A (1966). The effect of linkage on limits to artificial selection. *Genetics Research* **8**: 269–294.

Horak MJ, Rosenbaum EW, Kendrick DL, Sammons B, Phillips SL, Nickson TE, *et al.* (2015). Plant characterization of Roundup Ready 2 Yield® soybean, MON 89788, for use in ecological risk assessment. *Transgenic Res* **24**: 213–225.

Huang X, Kurata N, Wei X, Wang Z-X, Wang A, Zhao Q, *et al.* (2012). A map of rice genome variation reveals the origin of cultivated rice. *Nature* **490**: 497–501.

Hubisz MJ, Pollard KS, Siepel A (2011). PHAST and RPHAST: phylogenetic analysis with space/time models. *Briefings in Bioinformatics* **12**: 41–51.

Hufford MB, Xu X, van Heerwaarden J, Pyhäjärvi T, Chia J-M, Cartwright RA, *et al.* (2012). Comparative population genomics of maize domestication and improvement. *Nat Genet* **44**: 808–811.

Hughes AL (2005). Evidence for Abundant Slightly Deleterious Polymorphisms in Bacterial Populations. *Genetics* **169**: 533–538.

Keightley PD, Eyre-Walker A (2007). Joint Inference of the Distribution of Fitness Effects of Deleterious Mutations and Population Demography Based on Nucleotide Polymorphism Frequencies. *Genetics* **177**: 2251–2261.

Keightley PD, Lynch M (2003). Toward a realistic model of mutations affecting fitness. *Evolution* **57**: 683–685.

Kersey PJ, Allen JE, Armean I, Boddu S, Bolt BJ, Carvalho-Silva D, *et al.* (2016). Ensembl Genomes 2016: more genomes, more complexity. *Nucleic Acids Res* **44**: D574–D580.

Kim BY, Huber CD, Lohmueller KE (2017). Inference of the Distribution of Selection Coefficients for New Nonsynonymous Mutations Using Large Samples. *Genetics* **206**: 345–361.

Kim S, Plagnol V, Hu TT, Toomajian C, Clark RM, Ossowski S, *et al.* (2007). Recombination and linkage disequilibrium in Arabidopsis thaliana. *Nat Genet* **39**: 1151–1155.

Kircher M, Witten DM, Jain P, O'Roak BJ, Cooper GM, Shendure J (2014). A general framework for estimating the relative pathogenicity of human genetic variants. *Nat Genet* **46**: 310–315.

Klopfstein S, Currat M, Excoffier L (2005). The Fate of Mutations Surfing on the Wave of a Range Expansion. *Mol Biol Evol* **23**: 482–490.

Koenig D, Jiménez-Gómez JM, Kimura S, Fulop D, Chitwood DH, Headland LR,
et al. (2013). Comparative transcriptomics reveals patterns of selection in
domesticated and wild tomato. *PNAS* **110**: E2655–E2662.

Kono TJY, Fu F, Mohammadi M, Hoffman PJ, Liu C, Stupar RM, *et al.* (2016).
The Role of Deleterious Substitutions in Crop Genomes. *Mol Biol Evol* **33**:
2307–2317.

Kono TJY, Lei L, Shih C-H, Hoffman PJ, Morrell PL, Fay JC Comparative
genomics approaches accurately predict deleterious variants in plants.
bioRxiv.

Kovach MJ, Sweeney MT, McCouch SR (2007). New insights into the history of
rice domestication. *TIG* **23**: 578–587.

Kryazhimskiy S, Plotkin JB (2008). The Population Genetics of dN/dS. *PLoS*
Genet **4**: e1000304.

Lam H-M, Xu X, Liu X, Chen W, Yang G, Wong F-L, *et al.* (2010). Resequencing
of 31 wild and cultivated soybean genomes identifies patterns of genetic
diversity and selection. *Nat Genet* **42**: 1053–1059.

Lau AN, Peng L, Goto H, Chemnick L, Ryder OA, Makova KD (2009). Horse
Domestication and Conservation Genetics of Przewalski's Horse Inferred
from Sex Chromosomal and Autosomal Sequences. *Mol Biol Evol* **26**: 199–
208.

Lin T, Zhu G, Zhang J, Xu X, Yu Q, Zheng Z, *et al.* (2014). Genomic analyses
provide insights into the history of tomato breeding. *Nat Genet* **46**: 1220–
1226.

Lindblad-Toh K, Wade CM, Mikkelsen TS, Karlsson EK, Jaffe DB, Kamal M, *et*
al. (2005). Genome sequence, comparative analysis and haplotype structure
of the domestic dog. *Nature* **438**: 803–819.

Lippold S, Knapp M, Kuznetsova T, Leonard JA, Benecke N, Ludwig A, *et al.*
(2011). Discovery of lost diversity of paternal horse lineages using ancient
DNA. *Nat Commun* **2**: 450–6.

Liu A, Burke JM (2006). Patterns of Nucleotide Diversity in Wild and Cultivated
Sunflower. *Genetics* **173**: 321–330.

Liu Q, Zhou Y, Morrell PL, Gaut BS (2017). Deleterious variants in Asian rice and
the potential cost of domestication. *Mol Biol Evol*: msw296.

Lohmueller KE (2014). The Impact of Population Demography and Selection on
the Genetic Architecture of Complex Traits. *PLoS Genet* **10**: e1004379.

Lohmueller KE, Indap AR, Schmidt S, Boyko AR, Hernandez RD, Hubisz MJ, *et*
al. (2008). Proportionally more deleterious genetic variation in European than
in African populations. *Nature* **451**: 994–997.

Lu J, Tang T, Tang H, Huang J, Shi S, Wu C-I (2006). The accumulation of
deleterious mutations in rice genomes: a hypothesis on the cost of
domestication. *TIG* **22**: 126–131.

MacEachern S, McEwan J, McCulloch A, Mather A, Savin K, Goddard M (2009).
Molecular evolution of the Bovini tribe (Bovidae, Bovinae): Is there evidence
of rapid evolution or reduced selective constraint in Domestic cattle? *BMC*
Genomics **10**: 179.

Mandel JR, Dechaine JM, Marek LF, Burke JM (2011). Genetic diversity and
population structure in cultivated sunflower and a comparison to its wild
progenitor, *Helianthus annuus* L. *Theor Appl Genet* **123**: 693–704.

Marsden CD, Ortega-Del Vecchyo D, O'Brien DP, Taylor JF, Ramirez O, Vilà C,
et al. (2016). Bottlenecks and selective sweeps during domestication have
increased deleterious genetic variation in dogs. *PNAS* **113**: 152–157.

Marth GT, Yu F, Indap AR, Garimella K, Gravel S, Leong WF, *et al.* (2011). The
functional spectrum of low-frequency coding variation. *Genome Biology* **12**:
1–17.

Maynard Smith J, Haigh J (1974). The hitch-hiking effect of a favourable gene.
Genetical research **23**: 1–13.

Megens H-J, Crooijmans RP, Bastiaansen JW, Kerstens HH, Coster A, Jalving
R, *et al.* (2009). Comparison of linkage disequilibrium and haplotype diversity
on macro- and microchromosomes in chicken. *BMC Genet* **10**: 86.

Mezmouk S, Ross-Ibarra J (2014). The Pattern and Distribution of Deleterious
Mutations in Maize. *G3* **4**: 163–171.

Michaelson MJ, Price HJ, Ellison JR, Johnston JS (1991). Comparison of plant
DNA contents determined by Feulgen microspectrophotometry and laser flow
cytometry. *Am J Bot* **78**: 183–188.

Miller AJ, Gross BL (2011). From forest to field: Perennial fruit crop
domestication. *Am J Bot* **98**: 1389–1414.

Miyata T, Miyazawa S, Yasunaga T (1979). Two types of amino acid
substitutions in protein evolution. *J Molec Evol* **12**: 219–236.

Molina J, Sikora M, Garud N, Flowers JM, Rubinstein S, Reynolds A, *et al.*
(2011). Molecular evidence for a single evolutionary origin of domesticated
rice. *PNAS* **108**: 8351–8356.

Monroe JG, McGovern C, Lasky JR, Grogan K, Beck J, McKay JK (2016). Adaptation to warmer climates by parallel functional evolution of *CBF* genes in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Mol Ecol* **25**: 3632–3644.

Moray C, Lanfear R, Bromham L (2014). Domestication and the mitochondrial genome: comparing patterns and rates of molecular evolution in domesticated mammals and birds and their wild relatives. *Genome Biol Evol* **6**: 161–169.

Morrell PL, Buckler ES, Ross-Ibarra J (2011). Crop genomics: advances and applications. *Nat Rev Genet* **13**: 85–96.

Muir WM, Wong G, Zhang Y, Wang J, Groenen MAM, Crooijmans RPMA, *et al.* (2008). Genome-wide assessment of worldwide chicken SNP genetic diversity indicates significant absence of rare alleles in commercial breeds. *PNAS* **105**: 17312–17317.

Nabholz B, Sarah G, Sabot F, Ruiz M, Adam H, Nidelet S, *et al.* (2014). Transcriptome population genomics reveals severe bottleneck and domestication cost in the African rice (*Oryza glaberrima*). *Mol Ecol* **23**: 2210–2227.

Ng PC, Henikoff S (2003). SIFT: predicting amino acid changes that affect protein function. *Nucleic Acids Res* **31**: 3812–3814.

Nie J, Wang Y, He H, Guo C, Zhu W, Pan J, *et al.* (2015). Loss-of-Function Mutations in *CsMLO1* Confer Durable Powdery Mildew Resistance in Cucumber (*Cucumis sativus* L.). *Front Plant Sci* **6**: 30.

Nordborg M, Hu TT, Ishino Y, Jhaveri J, Toomajian C, Zheng H, *et al.* (2005). The Pattern of Polymorphism in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *PLoS Biol* **3**: e196.

Ohta T (1972). Population size and rate of evolution. *J Molec Evol* **1**: 305–314.

Ohta T (1992). The nearly neutral theory of molecular evolution. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* **23**.

Olsen KM (2006). Selection Under Domestication: Evidence for a Sweep in the Rice *Waxy* Genomic Region. *Genetics* **173**: 975–983.

Otto SP, Barton NH (2001). Selection for recombination in small populations. *Evolution* **55**: 1921–1931.

Otto SP, Whitlock MC (1997). The probability of fixation in populations of changing size. *Genetics* **146**: 723–733.

Papa R, Bellucci E, Rossi M, Leonardi S, Rau D, Gepts P, *et al.* (2007). Tagging the Signatures of Domestication in Common Bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris*) by

Means of Pooled DNA Samples. *Ann Bot–London* **100**: 1039–1051.

Parker HG, vonHoldt BM, Quignon P, Margulies EH, Shao S, Mosher DS, *et al.*
(2009). An expressed *Fgf4* retrogene is associated with breed-defining
chondrodysplasia in domestic dogs. *Science* **325**: 995–998.

Peischl S, Dupanloup I, Kirkpatrick M, Excoffier L (2013). On the accumulation of
deleterious mutations during range expansions. *Mol Ecol* **22**: 5972–5982.

Pritchard JK, Przeworski M (2001). Linkage disequilibrium in humans: models
and data. *The American Journal of Human Genetics* **69**: 1–14.

Renaut S, Rieseberg LH (2015). The Accumulation of Deleterious Mutations as a
Consequence of Domestication and Improvement in Sunflowers and Other
Compositae Crops. *Mol Biol Evol* **32**: 2273–2283.

Rice A, Glick L, Abadi S, Einhorn M (2015). The Chromosome Counts Database
(CCDB)–a community resource of plant chromosome numbers. *New Phytol*
206: 19–26.

Rodgers-Melnick E, Bradbury PJ, Elshire RJ, Glaubitz JC, Acharya CB, Mitchell
SE, *et al.* (2015). Recombination in diverse maize is stable, predictable, and
associated with genetic load. *PNAS* **112**: 3823–3828.

Ross-Ibarra J (2004). The evolution of recombination under domestication: a test
of two hypotheses. *Am Nat* **163**: 105–112.

Ross-Ibarra J, Tenaillon M, Gaut BS (2009). Historical Divergence and Gene
Flow in the Genus *Zea*. *Genetics* **181**: 1399–1413.

Rubin C-J, Zody MC, Eriksson J, Meadows JRS, Sherwood E, Webster MT, *et al.*
(2010). Whole-genome resequencing reveals loci under selection during
chicken domestication. *Nature* **464**: 587–591.

Scaglione D, Reyes-Chin-Wo S, Acquadro A, Froenicke L, Portis E, Beitel C, *et*
al. (2015). The genome sequence of the outbreeding globe artichoke
constructed. *Sci Rep*: 1–17.

Scally A, Dutheil JY, Hillier LW, Jordan GE, Goodhead I, Herrero J, *et al.* (2012).
Insights into hominid evolution from the gorilla genome sequence. *Nature*
483: 169–175.

Schmutz J, McClean PE, Mamidi S, Wu GA, Cannon SB, Grimwood J, *et al.*
(2014). A reference genome for common bean and genome-wide analysis of
dual domestications. *Nat Genet* **46**: 707–713.

Schneider CA, Rasband WS, Eliceiri KW (2012). NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years
of image analysis. *Nat Methods* **9**: 671–675.

Schubert M, Jónsson H, Chang D, Sarkissian Der C, Ermini L, Ginolhac A, *et al.* (2014). Prehistoric genomes reveal the genetic foundation and cost of horse domestication. *PNAS* **111**: E5661–E5669.

Semon M, Nielsen R, Jones MP, McCouch SR (2005). The Population Structure of African Cultivated Rice *Oryza glaberrima* (Steud.): Evidence for Elevated Levels of Linkage Disequilibrium Caused by Admixture with *O. sativa* and Ecological Adaptation. *Genetics* **169**: 1639–1647.

Shi T, Dimitrov I, Zhang Y, Tax FE, Yi J, Gou X, *et al.* (2015). Accelerated rates of protein evolution in barley grain and pistil biased genes might be legacy of domestication. *Plant Molecular Biology* **89**: 253–261.

Simons YB, Turchin MC, Pritchard JK, Sella G (2014). The deleterious mutation load is insensitive to recent population history. *Nat Genet* **46**: 220–224.

Stone EA, Sidow A (2005). Physicochemical constraint violation by missense substitutions mediates impairment of protein function and disease severity. *Genome Research* **15**: 978–986.

Sved JA (1971). Linkage disequilibrium and homozygosity of chromosome segments in finite populations. *Theor Pop Biol* **2**: 125–141.

Takeda S, Matsuoka M (2008). Genetic approaches to crop improvement: responding to environmental and population changes. *Nat Rev Genet* **9**: 444–457.

Tian F, Stevens NM, Buckler ES (2009). Tracking footprints of maize domestication and evidence for a massive selective sweep on chromosome 10. *PNAS* **106**: 9979–9986.

Traspov A, Deng W, Kostyunina O, Ji J, Shatokhin K, Lugovoy S, *et al.* (2016). Population structure and genome characterization of local pig breeds in Russia, Belorussia, Kazakhstan and Ukraine. *Genetics Selection Evolution* **48**: 1–9.

Travis JMJ, Munkemuller T, Burton OJ, Best A, Dytham C, Johst K (2007). Deleterious Mutations Can Surf to High Densities on the Wave Front of an Expanding Population. *Mol Biol Evol* **24**: 2334–2343.

Vikram P, Swamy BPM, Dixit S, Singh R, Singh BP, Miro B, *et al.* (2015). Drought susceptibility of modern rice varieties: an effect of linkage of drought tolerance with undesirable traits. *Sci Rep* **5**.

Wade CM, Giulotto E, Sigurdsson S, Zoli M (2009). Genome Sequence, Comparative Analysis, and Population Genetics of the Domestic Horse. *Science* **326**: 865–867.

Walsh B (2007). Using molecular markers for detecting domestication,
improvement, and adaptation genes. *Euphytica* **161**: 1–17.

Wang G-D, Xie H-B, Peng M-S, Irwin D, Zhang Y-P (2014). Domestication
Genomics: Evidence from Animals. *Annu Rev Anim Biosci* **2**: 65–84.

Wang H, Studer AJ, Zhao Q, Meeley R (2015). Evidence that the origin of naked
kernels during maize domestication was caused by a single amino acid
substitution in *tga1*. *Genetics* **200**: 965–974.

Wang L, Beissinger TM, Lorant A, Ross-Ibarra C, Ross-Ibarra J, Hufford M The
interplay of demography and selection during maize domestication and
expansion. *bioRxiv*.

Whitlock MC (2000). Fixation of new alleles and the extinction of small
populations: drift load, beneficial alleles, and sexual selection. *Evolution* **54**:
1855–1861.

Whitlock MC, Ingvarsson PK, Hatfield T (2000). Local drift load and the heterosis
of interconnected populations. *Heredity* **84**: 452–457.

Whitt SR, Wilson LM, Tenaillon MI, Gaut BS, Buckler ES (2002). Genetic
diversity and selection in the maize starch pathway. *PNAS* **99**: 12959–12962.

Wilfert L, Gadau J, Schmid-Hempel P (2007). Variation in genomic recombination
rates among animal taxa and the case of social insects. *Heredity* **98**: 189–
197.

Wolf JBW, Kunstner A, Nam K, Jakobsson M, Ellegren H (2009). Nonlinear
Dynamics of Nonsynonymous (dN) and Synonymous (dS) Substitution Rates
Affects Inference of Selection. *Genome Biol Evol* **1**: 308–319.

Woolfit M (2009). Effective population size and the rate and pattern of nucleotide
substitutions. *Biology Letters* **5**: 417–420.

Wright SI, Bi IV, Schroeder SG, Yamasaki M, Doebley JF, McMullen MD, *et al.*
(2005). The Effects of Artificial Selection on the Maize Genome. *Science* **308**:
1310–1314.

Xu Z, Hennessy DA, Sardana K, Moschini G (2013). The Realized Yield Effect of
Genetically Engineered Crops: U.S. Maize and Soybean. *Crop Sci* **53**: 735–
745.

Yamasaki M, Wright SI, McMullen MD (2007). Genomic Screening for Artificial
Selection during Domestication and Improvement in Maize. *Ann Bot–London*
100: 967–973.

Yang J, Mezmouk S, Baumgarten A, Buckler ES, Guill KE, McMullen MD, *et al.*

Incomplete dominance of deleterious alleles contributes substantially to trait
variation and heterosis in maize. *bioRxiv.*

Zhou Z, Jiang Y, Wang Z, Gou Z, Lyu J, Li W, *et al.* (2015). Resequencing 302
wild and cultivated accessions identifies genes related to domestication and
improvement in soybean. *Nat Biotechnol* **33**: 408–414.

Zonneveld BJM, Leitch IJ, Bennett MD (2005). First Nuclear DNA Amounts in
more than 300 Angiosperms. *Ann Bot–London* **96**: 229–244.

1286
1287   <u>TABLES AND FIGURES</u>
1288
Table 1. Evidence for a cost of domestication across domesticated plants and
animals, with *Homo sapiens* included for comparison. The first three columns
identify the taxa and major form of propagation and reproduction. Following
columns indicate whether data from the domesticated lineage versus wild
relatives or ancestors fits (+), is equivocal (=) or goes against (-) expectations for
the 'cost of domestication' hypothesis, with those expectations being: extended
linkage disequilibrium (LD), reduced genetic diversity (Diversity), higher rate or
number of nonsynonymous to synonymous substitutions or variants (dN/dS,
Ka/Ks, counts), more or higher frequency deleterious variants (Deleterious
variants), or higher estimated genetic load (GERP score). The values for each of
these and additional data are available in Supplementary Table 1.

1300
Figure 1. Processes of domestication and improvement. (A) Typical changes in
effective population size through domestication and improvement. Stars indicate
genetic bottlenecks. These dynamics can be reconstructed by examining
patterns of genetic diversity in contemporary wild relative, domesticated non-
commercial, and improved populations. (B) Effects of artificial selection (targeting
the blue triangle variant) and linkage disequilibrium on deleterious (red squares)
and neutral variants (grey circles, shades represent different alleles). In the
ancestral wild population, four deleterious alleles are at relatively low frequency
(mean = 0.10) and heterozygosity is high (H_O = 0.51). After domestication, the
selected blue triangle and linked variants increase in frequency (three remaining
deleterious alleles, mean frequency = 0.46), heterozygosity decreases (H_O =
0.35), and allelic diversity is lost at two sites. Recombination may change
haplotypes, especially at sites less closely linked to the selected allele (Xs). After
improvement, further selection for the blue triangle allele has: lowered
heterozygosity (H_O = 0.08), increased deleterious variant frequency (two
remaining deleterious alleles, mean = 0.55), and lost allelic diversity at six
additional sites.
1318
Figure 2. Effects of inbreeding on mutations and fitness. (A) Theoretical density
plot of fitness effects for segregating variants. In outcrossing, non-inbred
populations (solid navy line), more variants with highly deleterious, recessive
effects persist that are rapidly exposed to selection and purged in inbred

populations (dotted red line), shifting the left side of the distribution towards more
neutral effects. At the same time, the reduced effective population size created
through inbreeding causes on average higher loss of slightly advantageous
mutations and retention of slightly deleterious mutations, shifting the right side of
the distribution towards more deleterious effects. (B) Accumulation of
nonsynonymous mutations is accelerated in selfing individuals (dotted red line)
relative to outcrossing individuals (solid navy line). Synonymous mutations
accumulate at similar rates in both populations. Adapted from simulation results
in Arunkumar *et al*. 2015. (C) As a consequence of (B), mean individual fitness
drops in selfing relative to outcrossing populations. Adapted from Arunkumar *et*
al. 2015.
1334
Supplementary Table 1. Quantitative version of Table 1: evidence for a cost of
domestication across domesticated plants and animals, with *Arabidopsis thaliana*
and *Homo sapiens* included for comparison. Plant 1C genome sizes from the
RBG Kew database (http://data.kew.org/cvalues/), except tomato (Michaelson *et*
al. 1991) and *Cynara* spp. (Giorgi *et al*. 2016). Plant chromosome counts from
the Chromosome Counts Database (http://ccdb.tau.ac.il/). Animal 1C genome
sizes and chromosome counts from the Animal Genome Size Database
(http://www.genomesize.com/, mean value when multiple records were
available). Gene numbers are high-confidence (if available) estimates from the
vertebrate and plant Ensembl databases (http://uswest.ensembl.org/;
http://plants.ensembl.org/), except common bean (Schmutz et al. 2013),
sunflower (Composite Genome Project, unpublished), and *Cynara* spp.
(Scaglione et al. 2016). LD N50 is the approximate distance over which LD
decays to half of maximum value. Loss of genetic diversity is calculated as 1 –
(ratio of $p_{domesticated}$ to p_{wild}), or q if p not available.

Species	Common name	Primary reproduction	LD	Diversity	dN/dS or Ka/Ks	Deleterious variants	GERP score	Studies
Oryza sativa var. *japonica*	japonica rice	selfing	+	+	+	+	NA	Lu *et al*. 2006; Huang *et al*. 2012; Liu *et al*. 2017
Oryza sativa var. *indica*	indica rice	selfing	+	+	+	+	NA	Lu *et al*. 2006; Huang *et al*. 2012; Liu *et al*. 2017
Oryza glaberrima	African rice	selfing	NA	+	+	NA	NA	Semon *et al*. 2005; Nabholz *et al*. 2014
Zea mays	maize	outcrossing	NA	+	NA	NA	NA	Gore *et al*. 2009; Hufford *et al*. 2012; Mezmouk and Ross-Ibarra 2014
Hordeum vulgare	barley	selfing	+	+	+	NA	NA	The International Barley Genome Sequencing Consortium 2012; Morrell *et al*. 2014; Shi *et al*. 2015; Kono *et al*. 2016
Glycine max	soybean	selfing	+	+	=	NA	NA	Lam *et al*. 2010; Zhou *et al*. 2015; Kono *et al*. 2016
Phaseolus vulgaris, Mesoamerican domestication	common bean	selfing	NA	+	NA	NA	NA	Schmutz *et al*. 2013
Phaseolus vulgaris, Andean domestication	common bean	selfing	NA	-	NA	NA	NA	Schmutz *et al*. 2013
Solanum lycopersicum	tomato	selfing	+	+	+	NA	NA	Koenig *et al*. 2013; Lin *et al*. 2014
Helianthus annuus	sunflower	outcrossing	+	+	NA	+	NA	Liu and Burke 2006; Mandel *et al*. 2011; Renaut and Rieseberg 2015
Cynara cardunculus var. *scolymus*	globe artichoke	clonal/outcrossing	NA	NA	NA	+	NA	Renaut and Rieseberg 2015
Cynara cardunculus var. *altilis*	cardoon	outcrossing	NA	NA	NA	+	NA	Renaut and Rieseberg 2015
Gallus gallus domesticus	chicken	outcrossing	+	+	NA	NA	NA	Muir *et al*. 2008; Megens *et al*. 2009; Gheyas *et al*. 2015
Canis familiaris	dog	outcrossing	+	+	+	+	+	Lindblad-Tor *et al*. 2005; Cruz, Vila & Webster 2008; Gray *et al*. 2009; Marsden *et al*. 2016
Equus caballus	horse	outcrossing	NA	+	NA	NA	+	Lau *et al*. 2009; Wade *et al*. 2009; Schubert *et al*. 2014
Sus scrofa	pig	outcrossing	+	+	NA	NA	NA	Amaral *et al*. 2008; Bosse *et al*. 2012; Bosse *et al*. 2015
Homo sapiens	human	outcrossing	NA	NA	=	NA	NA	Gabriel *et al*. 2002; Chun and Fay 2009; Scally *et al*. 2012