Gene Regulatory Divergence Between Locally Adapted Ecotypes in Their Native Habitats

Billie A. Gould[a,b], Yani Chen[a], David B. Lowry[a,c,d,*]

[a]Department of Plant Biology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

[b]Counsyl Inc., South San Francisco, CA 94108, USA

[c]Program in Ecology, Evolutionary Biology and Behavior, Michigan State University, East

Lansing, MI 48824, USA

[d]Plant Resilience Institute, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

Key words: *Mimulus*, local adaptation, allele-specific expression, salt tolerance, chromosome

inversion

[*]To whom correspondence should be addressed: David B. Lowry

Department of Plant Biology, Michigan State University, Plant Biology Laboratories, 612

Wilson Road, Room 166, East Lansing MI 48824, USA

Tel: (517) 432-4883

E-mail: dlowry@msu.edu

Running title: Gene Expression Divergence in Nature

ABSTRACT

Local adaptation is a key driver of ecological specialization and the formation of new species. Despite its importance, the evolution of gene regulatory divergence among locally-adapted populations is poorly understood, especially how that divergence manifests in nature. Here, we evaluate gene expression divergence and allele-specific gene expression responses for locally-adapted coastal perennial and inland annual accessions of the yellow monkeyflower, *Mimulus guttatus*, in a field reciprocal transplant experiment. Overall, 6765 (73%) of surveyed genes were differentially expressed between coastal and inland habitats, while 7213 (77%) were differentially expressed between the coastal perennial and inland annual accessions. Further, 18% of transcripts had significant genotype x site (GxE) effects. Habitat-specific differential expression was found for 62% of the GxE transcripts (differential expression in one habitat, but not the other), while only 94 (~5%) GxE transcripts had crossing reaction norms. *Cis*-regulatory variation was pervasive, affecting 79% (5532) of differentially expressed genes. We detected *trans* effects for 52% (3611) of differentially expressed genes. Consistent with the supergene hypothesis of chromosome inversion evolution, a locally adaptive inversion was enriched for *cis*-regulatory divergence. These results provide multiple new insights into the evolution of transcriptome-wide gene regulatory divergence and plasticity among locally adapted populations.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most important forces driving the evolution of ecological specialization and the origin of biodiversity is local adaptation (Clausen 1951; Colosimo et al. 2005; Sobel et al. 2010). Local adaptation is characterized by reciprocal home-site advantage, whereby populations perform best in their home habitat while performing poorly in foreign habitats (Kawecki & Ebert 2004; Hoekstra et al. 2006; Hereford 2009; Wadgymar et al. 2017). Numerous reciprocal transplant experiments have identified locally adapted populations (Leimu & Fisher 2008; Hereford 2009). Recently, reciprocal transplant experiments have been combined with genetic studies to quantify the role of individual loci adaptive divergence between local populations (Verhoeven et al. 2008; Gardner & Latta 2006; Lowry et al. 2009; Lowry & Willis 2010; Anderson et al. 2011, 2013; Leinonen et al. 2013; Ågren et al. 2013; Wadgymar et al. 2017). Despite this advance of integrating transplant experiments with modern genetic techniques, we have a very limited understanding of how gene expression divergence manifests between locally adapted populations in nature.

One very promising route for understanding how gene expression regulation evolves between locally adaptive populations is to conduct allele specific expression (ASE) analyses in natural populations (Tung et al. 2009; Lovell et al. 2016; Wang et al. 2017). By simultaneously evaluating different causes of gene expression, ASE analyses can determine the relative contributions of variation in nearby *cis* elements versus distant *trans* factors on gene expression divergence (Cowles et al. 2002; Wittkopp et al. 2004). Conducting ASE analyses in conjunction with reciprocal transplant experiments offers the opportunity go beyond partitioning gene expression into *cis* and *trans* effects by establishing how habitat context influences those sources

of variation in gene expression. ASE analysis is often conducted in F1 hybrids, where parental

alleles are evaluated for significant differences in expression (de Meaux et al. 2005; Guo et al.

2008; Zhang & Borevitz 2009; Cubillos et al. 2014; Coolon et al. 2014; Steige et al. 2015, 2017;

Lovell et al. 2016; Aguilar-Rangel et al. 2017). ASE relies on there being nucleotide

polymorphisms between parental alleles, so that those alleles can be individually counted in the

F1 transcript pool. *Cis*-regulatory allelic expression differences are expected to persist regardless

of whether alleles are expressed separately in parental genotypes or together in an F1 hybrid. In

this way, ASE allows for the identification of *cis* expression Quantitative Trait Loci (eQTL),

which can be evaluated for their responses to different environmental conditions (Lovell et al.

2016). Further, *trans* effects on gene expression are indicated by a change in allelic effects

between the parental generation and the F1 hybrids (Cowles et al. 2002; Wittkopp et al. 2004).

Despite its great potential, we are unaware of any field reciprocal transplant experiment that has

measured ASE to evaluate how gene expression divergence manifests across the habitats known

to be responsible for local adaptation.

In this study, we evaluated gene regulatory divergence in nature between locally adapted coastal

perennial and inland annual population accessions of the yellow monkeyflower, *Mimulus*

guttatus (*syn. Erythranthe guttata* (Fisch. ex DC.) G.L. Nesom). *M. guttatus* is a model system

for understanding the genetic underpinnings of evolutionary adaptations (reviewed in Wu et al.

2008; Twyford et al. 2015). Both annual and perennial populations are found throughout much of

the range of *M. guttatus* (van Kleunen 2007; Lowry & Willis 2010; Friedman & Willis 2013;

Oneal et al. 2014; Twyford et al. 2015). The large differences in morphology and life-history

among populations of *M. guttatus* has been shown to be genetically-based through common

garden experiments (Vickery 1952; Hall & Willis 2006; Lowry et al. 2008; Lowry & Willis

2010). In the inland Mediterranean climates of California's Coast Range and Sierra Foothills,

most populations of *M. guttatus* have an early flowering annual life-history, which they have

evolved to escape from the hot summer drought endemic to these regions. In contrast, coastal

populations of *M. guttatus* are sheltered from the summer drought by pervasive marine fog,

which supplies soil moisture and reduces transpiration rates (Corbin et al. 2005). As a result,

coastal populations uniformly have a late-flowering perennial life-history (Hall & Willis 2006;

Lowry et al. 2008). While coastal habitats are benign in terms of soil water availability, these

populations must contend with toxic oceanic salt spray, in response to which they have evolved

high salt tolerance (Lowry et al. 2008, 2009; Selby et al. 2014). Across previous reciprocal

transplant field experiments, inland plants survived to flower at 23.9 times the rate of coastal

plants in inland habitat, while coastal plants have survived at 2.5 times the rate of inland plants in

coastal habitat (Hall & Willis 2006; Lowry et al. 2008, 2009; Hall et al. 2010).

Population structure analysis has repeatedly demonstrated that coastal populations, all of which

are perennial, collectively constitute a single ecotype that is genetically distinct from inland

populations of the species (Lowry et al. 2008; Twyford & Friedman 2015). The individual genes

responsible for the divergence of coastal perennial and inland annual populations are unknown,

but it is clear that a large paracentric chromosomal inversion on chromosome 8 is responsible for

much of the divergence in traits and fitness between these populations (Lowry & Willis 2010;

Friedman 2014; Oneal et al. 2014; Gould et al. 2017). Smaller effect loci across the genome also

account for divergence between the coastal perennial and inland annual populations (Hall et al.

2006, 2010; Lowry et al. 2009; Friedman et al. 2015). The chromosome 8 inversion is also

involved in the divergence of inland annual populations from inland perennial populations

(Lowry & Willis 2010). Divergence of inland annual and perennial populations was not a focus

of this study.

The primary goal of our study was to characterize gene regulatory divergence between coastal

perennial and inland annual *M. guttatus* in the natural habitats that drove the evolution of local

adaptation among these ecotypes. In particular, our study aimed to 1) determine the prevalence

of genotype x environment (GxE) interactions affecting the expression of native and non-native

alleles across the divergent habitats, 2) characterize the relative contributions of *cis* and/or *trans*

regulatory variation in expression divergence, 3) establish the role of genome structure (e.g.

inversions) in the evolution of potentially locally adaptive regulatory variation, and 4) identify

candidate genes underlying local adaptation in this system. The results of our study provide new

insights into the gene regulatory evolution and suggest that coupling allele-specific expression

with reciprocal transplant experiments is a promising approach for modern local adaptation

research.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Germplasm

Original field collections of the seeds used in this experiment were made in the Spring of 2005

from the SWB (N39.0359', W123.6904') and LMC (N38.8640', W123.0839') populations

located in Mendocino County, California. The SWB and LMC populations have been the subject

of extensive research since then (Lowry et al. 2008; Lowry & Willis 2010; Wu et al. 2010;

Friedman & Willis 2013; Friedman 2014; Gould et al. 2017). Seeds from these populations were

inbred for multiple generations in the Duke University Greenhouses. The plants used for the field

experiment included the following: 1) An inbred (7 generations self-fertilized) inland line, LMC-

L1-2, henceforth referred to as LL; 2) An inbred (13 generation self-fertilized) coastal line,

SWB-S1-2, henceforth referred to as SS; and 3) An F1 hybrid between the two inbred lines,

henceforth referred to as F1 or SL. The F1s used in this experiment were made in the Michigan

State University (MSU) Growth Chamber Facilities through a cross between the two parental

inbred lines.

Field Reciprocal Transplant Experiment

We conducted a field reciprocal transplant experiment in tandem with allele-specific expression

analyses to understand the causes (*cis*, *trans*) of gene expression divergence between locally

adapted coastal perennial and inland annual populations of *M. guttatus* (Fig. 1). The reciprocal

transplant experiment was conducted in 2016 using one coastal (Bodega Marine Reserve;

N38.3157', W123.0687') and one inland (Pepperwood Preserve; N38.5755', W122.7008') field

site located in Sonoma County, CA. SS, LL, and F1 seeds were originally sown in Sun Gro

Metromix 838 soil on February 3. The seeds were then stratified in the dark at 4°C until

February 9, when they were removed from the cold and germinated in the UC Berkeley Oxford

Track Greenhouses. Seedlings were moved to the Bodega Marine Reserve Greenhouses on

February 21 for acclimation. On February 22, the seedlings were transferred to native soil

collected from the field sites. Seedlings were planted in the field at Bodega on March 7 and at

Pepperwood on March 8. ~90 plants per type (SS, LL, F1) were planted at each field site. Plants

were evenly distributed among three blocks per field site and randomized within block. Tissue

for RNA sequencing was collected from Bodega on April 23 and Pepperwood on April 24. To

avoid effects of circadian rhythm on gene expression, all tissue was collected between 12:00pm

and 1:00pm. Both collection days had mostly clear skies, with mean local temperatures during

collection periods of 14° C at Bodega and 17° C at Pepperwood. Plants had progressed to

different developmental stages at the time of collection, with some plants approaching flowering

and others not. To best standardize tissue collection across genotypes, only the two youngest

pairs of fully expanded leaves were collected from each plant. Tissue was immediately flash

frozen on liquid nitrogen in the field. Samples were then shipped on dry ice to Michigan State

University for RNA extractions.

RNA-sequencing

Total RNA was extracted from 80 leaf tissue samples with the Spectrum Plant Total RNA Kit

(Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO, USA). RNA was extracted from 12 replicates of both SS and LL

parental lines from the coastal field site and 13 replicates of both parental lines from the inland

field site. RNA from 15 F1 hybrids from each site was also extracted. Total RNA was submitted

for library preparation and sequencing at the MSU Genome Core

(https://rtsf.natsci.msu.edu/genomics/). RNA-Seq libraries were prepared using the Illumina

TruSeq Stranded mRNA Library Preparation Kit with a Perkin Elmer (Waltham, MA) Sciclone

NGS robot. Completed libraries were quality controlled and quantified using a combination of

Qubit dsDNA HS (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA), Caliper LabChipGX HS DNA

(Perkin Elmer, Waltham, MA), and Kapa Biosystems Illumina Library Quantification qPCR

(Wilmington, MA) assay kits. All libraries were barcoded and library concentrations were

normalized and pooled in equimolar amounts: 8 pools each consisting of 10 randomly chosen

libraries were made. Each of these pools was loaded on one lane of an Illumina HiSeq 2500 High

Output flow cell (v4) and sequenced in the 1x100bp (SE100) format using HiSeq SBS reagents

(also v4). Base calling was done by Illumina Real Time Analysis (RTA) v1.18.64 and output of

RTA was demultiplexed and converted to Fastq format with Illumina Bcl2fastq v1.8.4.

Reference Transcriptome Assembly

Alignment of RNA-seq to a single reference genome can lead to major biases in ASE studies

(Stevenson et al. 2013). To overcome reference bias, we assembled reference transcriptomes for

the coastal perennial (SS) and inland annual (LL) parents. We chose this method over

construction of a pseudo-transcriptome reference (Shen et al. 2013) to avoid generating bias

caused by the reference genome and transcriptome for *M. guttatus*, which was assembled from

an inland annual line (IM62; Hellsten et al. 2013). Reference bias is of particular concern in *M.*

guttatus because pairwise polymorphism is generally high (π_S = 0.033-0.065; Brandvain et al.

2014; Gould et al. 2017; Puzey et al. 2017). To generate a reference transcriptome assembly that

contained allele-specific sequences for each parental genotype, we sequenced and conducted *de*

novo assembly using RNA-sequencing. Plants of each of the coastal (SS) and inland (LL) lines

were grown in the MSU greenhouses until both genotypes were flowering. Floral bud, leaf, and

root tissue were collected from each of the SS and LL lines, flash frozen with liquid nitrogen,

and stored at -80° C. Total RNA was extracted from each sample using the Spectrum Plant Total

RNA Kit and submitted to the MSU Genome Core for library construction and sequencing.

Strand-specific Tru-Seq Illumina RNA-seq libraries were prepared and sequenced along with

four libraries constructed from field collected leaf tissue from the reciprocal transplant

experiment (one sample per parental line per field site). These libraries were included in the

transcriptome assembly pipeline to capture sequences from genes that may only be expressed

under field conditions. Completed libraries were quality controlled and quantified using a

combination of Qubit dsDNA HS, Caliper LabChipGX HS DNA, and Kapa Biosystems Illumina

Library Quantification qPCR assay kits. A total of 10 libraries were barcoded with dual index

barcodes and pooled together. The entire pool was sequenced using 125 bp paired-end reads on a

single lane of the Illumina GA 2500 platform.

Raw output reads were quality checked using FastQC v.0.11.3 (Andrews 2015). Residual adapter

sequences were removed and reads were quality trimmed using Trimmomatic v.0.33 (Bolger et

al. 2014), discarding sequences less than 50 bp in length. Paired and un-paired reads from each

ecotype were combined and assembled into two separate *de novo* (non-reference guided)

assemblies using Trinity v20140413p1 (Grabherr et al. 2011) with *in silico* read normalization.

To check the quality of our two transcriptomes, we compared our *de novo* assemblies to the set

of primary transcripts from the IM62 reference transcriptome using Trinity utility scripts. We

measured how much of each *Mimulus* primary transcript was reconstructed in the two

assemblies. We found that 74.3% of *Mimulus* primary transcripts were reconstructed (to at least

50% of their full length) in the inland parent (L) transcriptome. In the coastal parent

transcriptome, 74.1% of *Mimulus* primary transcripts were reconstructed (to at least 50% of their

full length). Thus, the two assembled transcriptomes were of similar quality and completeness.

We aligned the filtered input reads back to the finished assemblies using Bowtie2 (Langmead et

al. 2012). A total of 98.98% and 99.26% of input reads aligned back to the inland (L) and coastal

(S) assemblies, respectively. We identified possible non-plant contaminant sequences in each

assembly through comparison to the NCBI nt database using blastn. We eliminated

transcriptome sequences with top blast sequence matches (e-value cutoff of 1e-20) to non-plant

organisms ($N = 16,243$ and $N = 1,222$ eliminated sequences for the inland and coastal

transcriptomes, respectively).

To construct a combined reference transcriptome that contained pairs of allelic sequences from

both lines, we used a reciprocal best blast strategy. Each transcriptome was compared against the

other (blastn) at an e-value cutoff of 1e-5 and reciprocal best hits were returned using a custom

Python (v. 2.7.2) script (https://github.com/lowrylab/Mimulus_Gene_Expression). We tested a

range of e-value cutoffs in this analysis and found that the choice of e-value between 1e-5 and

1e-50 had little effect on the total output number of best blast pairs (see Fig. S1). We considered

two sequences best blast hits if total high-scoring pair (HSP) coverage was 75% or greater

between sequences. We included only aligned sequence regions of the longest HSP in the

combined transcriptome.

To match transcripts in the combined *de novo* reference transcriptome with their corresponding

Mimulus genes, we compared *de novo* assembled alleles against the reference (IM62) set of

primary transcripts (blastn) at an e-value cut-off of 1e-5. In rare cases, where two alleles from a

de novo assembled transcript matched different *Mimulus* genes, the gene with the lowest e-value

alignment was chosen as a match for the allele pair. Note that with this annotation method, each

de novo assembled transcript has only one matching gene and thus, can be unambiguously

assigned a specific location in the genome. However, multiple transcripts can be assigned to the

same genomic location, which is typical of isoforms stemming from the same gene.

Differential Expression Analyses

Raw reads from the 80 field RNA-seq libraries were de-multiplexed, quality filtered, and

trimmed using FastQC and Trimmomatic, as described above for the transcriptome assembly.

Filtered reads were aligned to the *de novo* combined reference transcriptome (described above)

using the un-gapped aligner Bowtie v1.0.0 (Langmead et al. 2009). We outputted only unique

alignments with zero mismatches. In this way, we analyzed only read count data for reads that

aligned uniquely and perfectly to only one parental allele in the combined reference

transcriptome. Only reads that overlap one or more polymorphisms between the parental alleles

provide useful information on differential expression between alleles. Approximately 52% of

reads per individual had one or more than one alignment to the transcriptome. Unaligned reads

fall mainly in areas that were not reconstructed in the reference transcriptomes. On average

28.6% of library reads per individual aligned uniquely to only one allele and were thus,

informative for allele-specific expression (range 23.7 – 30.7%). For confirmation, some

alignments were visually checked using IGV v.2.3.65 (Thorvaldsdóttir et al. 2013).

Read alignments to each transcript were quantified using a custom Python (v.2.7.2) script. Using

the raw count data, we identified allele pairs in the transcriptome for which there was a high

probability of residual heterozygosity in one of the parental inbred lines. Potential regions of

residual heterozygosity were indicated when a significant number of reads from a homozygous

parent aligned to the opposite parental allele in the transcriptome. We eliminated from further

analysis transcripts where the average number of reads aligning to the correct parental allele was

less than 5 times the average number of reads aligning to the alternate allele ($N = 2255$

eliminated transcripts). For example, we eliminated transcripts where the SS parental line did not

have at least 5 times more reads aligning to the S allele than the L allele in the reference

transcriptome. We also used the initial count data to test for mapping bias (Fig. S2). For both

field sites, mapping bias was present but well controlled. On average there were 1.9% more reads

aligned to the S allele than the L allele for F1 plants (Fig. S3). There was a small but statistically

significant relationship between transcript nucleotide divergence and differential expression

(equivalent to 0.001 increase in the absolute value of LFC between genotypes, per SNP). Count

data was normalized for library size using Trimmed Mean of M-values (TMM) normalization to

counts per million, which reduces biases generated by the presence of very highly and lowly

expressed transcripts (Robinson et al. 2010). We eliminated any transcript without at least one

library containing >= 10 counts per million reads. The remaining sequences constitute the

'expressed' set of transcripts ($N = 10,122$). The mean expressed library size for samples from the

coast and inland sites was not significantly different (t-tests: all libraries, $P = 0.60$; parental

libraries only, $P = 0.22$, Fig. S4, and is thus, unlikely to strongly affect statistical comparisons

between the two sites. Only 2 transcripts were expressed at only one site and only 7 transcripts

were expressed by only one parental line.

We analyzed the expressed transcript data using the limma (Ritchie et al. 2015) and edgeR

(Robinson et al. 2010) packages in R v.3.2.1 (R. Core Team 2012). Variance stabilizing

normalization of the data was performed using the voom (Law et al. 2014) function in limma,

with a design matrix corresponding to the particular linear model being used for analysis. Model

design matrices were coded using the default treatment-contrast parameterization scheme (see

Smyth et al. (2015), section 9.5.4) and the significance of model effects were calculated using

voom precision weights and the eBayes function. Model effects were judged significant if they

fell below a Benjamini-Hoechberg false-discovery rate corrected *P*-value of 0.05 using the

decideTests function.

We used several different linear models to analyze the count data for expressed transcripts,

modified from the method of Lovell et al. (2016). For this approach, it is important that the size

of the L and S sub-transcriptome in each F1 is approximately equal to produce unbiased results,

which we verified independently (Fig. S3). Each linear model had one or more fixed factors:

allele (L/S), environment (coastal field site vs. inland field site), generation (F0/F1), and

interaction terms. We analyzed the parental plants (F0 generation) separately, the F1 plants

separately, and both generations together in different models. We avoided analyzing models with

more than one categorical factor, except for the purposes of measuring interaction effects

because effect significance testing for crossing categorical factors only captures differences

present in the first level of each factor.

For data from the F0 plants, we ran models examining the allele (homozygous genotype) effect

within each environment separately. We also tested for environmental effects separately within

each parental genotype. We used a model with both genotype and environment to test the

significance of the genotype x environment interactions. Because the inland site had one extra

plant per genotype compared with the coastal site, we analyzed data from 12 randomly chosen

parental lines of each genotype to equalize the power to detect effects between sites. A *post-hoc*

power analysis was conducted using the R package *RnaSeqSampleSize* (Bi & Liu 2016).

We used data from all plants together (both F0 and F1) to test for *cis* and *trans* regulation. *Cis*-

regulatory allelic expression differences are expected to persist regardless of whether alleles are

expressed separately in parental genotypes or together in an F1 hybrid. However, in the F1

genotype, *trans* acting factors from both parental genotypes will influence the expression of an

allele, so *trans* regulation is indicated if allelic patterns of differential expression are different in

the parents vs. the F1 plants. In our model, a significant effect of allele is indicative of a *cis*-

regulatory difference in expression. Within each environment, we tested a model with the

following factors: allele (genotype), generation (F0/F1), and the interaction term. Any transcript

with any *cis* regulation had a significant allele effect (measured in the F1 generation only). Any

transcript with only *trans* regulation had a significant difference between generations, but a non-

significant allele effect in the F1 generation. Any transcript with both *cis* and *trans* regulation

had a significant generational effect and a significant allele effect in the F1.

To gauge the significance of *cis* x environment interactions, we tested the interaction term of a

model using only F1 data and the factors allele, environment, and interaction. To gauge the

significance of trans x environment interactions, we modeled all the data (F0 and F1) and

measured the significance of a three-way interaction term: allele x generation x environment.

Gene Ontology Enrichment and Expression Networks

We tested for enrichment of gene-ontology (GO) terms among subsets of genes with particular

expression patterns (significant model effects). To annotate GO terms, all IM62 reference

Mimulus proteins were paired with their best *Arabidopsis* protein matches (blastp) at an e-value

cutoff of 10^{-3}. The set of expressed transcripts in our study was matched to the IM62 reference

genome genes, as described above, and corresponding GO terms were matched to the

Arabidopsis BLAST hits. Subsequent GO enrichment tests were done using the R

BIOCONDUCTOR package topGO (Alexa & Rahnenführer 2015). We used the Bioconductor

database 'org.At.tair.db' for annotation and the algorithm 'classic' (statistic = 'fisher') for

statistical tests. Because P-value distributions of GO enrichment tests do not typically conform to

a distribution amenable to Benjamini-Hoechberg FDR control, and because such control methods

can be overly conservative causing loss of valuable functional information (Alexa &

Rahnenführer 2015), we report GO terms with uncorrected enrichment P-values <= 0.01 (Table

S1). Enrichment tests were conducted at the level of genes rather than transcripts. For each gene

in the IM62 reference transcriptome, we determined the model effects for all matching expressed

transcripts in our data set. A model effect for a gene was considered significant if at least one

matching transcript had a significant effect. GO enrichment was then tested among all expressed

genes ($N = 9326$) with a significant effect vs. all expressed genes without a significant effect.

Enrichments for GxE effects were measured against all genes where either environmental or

allelic DE could be detected. Reaction norm plots were generated using the LSMean expression

level of all transcripts for each gene in each environment.

We conducted weighted gene co-expression network analysis within each parental genotype

using the R package WGCNA (Langfelder et al. 2008). The analysis identifies genes with

correlated patterns of expression across individuals (eigengenes), finding gene sets that

putatively form molecular networks (or modules). We conducted WGCNA separately for each

parental genotype and then identified which networks in each parent had expression that was

significantly different between field sites. Gene expression was quantified as the expression level

of the longest matching transcript for each gene. For all analyses, we calculated dissimilarity of

expression using a soft thresholding power of 6 and used the dynamicTreeCut function to define

modules with a minimum number of 30 genes. We calculated the correlation of each cluster

(eigengene) with habitat (Fig. S5). Gene ontology term enrichment was calculated for all

modules with a correlation value of r > 0.75 (Table S2).

Chromosomal Inversion Analyses

Two inverted regions of the genome, one on chromosome 5 and one on chromosome 8, have

been linked to adaptive differences between inland and coastal ecotypes in previous studies

(Lowry & Willis 2010; Oneal et al. 2014; Twyford & Friedman 2015; Gould et al. 2017). When

examining genes in putatively inverted regions of the genome, we included reference genome

v1.1 scaffolds that are inferred to be in the inverted regions from a previous linkage mapping

study (Holeski et al. 2014). For the inversion on chromosome 5, we included v1.1 scaffolds 36,

149, 158, 170, 197, 266, 281, 288, 327, and 368. For the inversion on chromosome 8, we

included v1.1 scaffolds 11, 59, 76, 155 233, 604, and 1093. We tested whether genes in these

regions of the genome are enriched for any model effects. Enrichment tests of model effects

among annotated inversion and non-inversion genes were carried out using Fisher's Exact tests.

The magnitude of model effects among genes with significant effects were compared using

Wilcox rank sum tests in R. It should be noted that the presence of alternative orientations of

chromosome 8 inversion in the SS and LL parental lines has been confirmed by previous crosses

(Lowry & Willis 2010) while the chromosome 5 inversion was originally identified in a cross

between different inland and coastal lines (Holeski et al. 2014). High differentiation between the

SS and LL parental lines in both inversion regions has been demonstrated by an allele frequency

outlier analysis (Gould et al. 2017).

Patterns of Candidate Gene Expression

In a study of species-wide genomic variation, Gould et al. (2017) identified a set of 667

candidate adaptation genes. These genes had unusually high differentiation in allele frequencies

between a set of 47 coastal and 50 inland *Mimulus* populations. High differentiation was detected

in either the genic or 1 kb upstream promoter regions of the genes, or both. We tested for

enrichment of differential expression patterns among the expressed candidate genes in the

current study. Enrichment was tested against all expressed non-candidate genes using Fisher's

Exact tests. The magnitude of model effects among genes with significant effects were compared

using Wilcox rank sum tests in R.

RESULTS

Reference Transcriptome Assembly

From the tissues of the two *M. guttatus* parental lines we were able to reconstruct both parental

alleles for 25,893 transcripts, of which 708 pairs were removed because they contained no

polymorphism between lines. Eighty-two percent of transcripts could be matched back to

previously annotated *M. guttatus* genes (www.phytozome.org). Our transcriptome reconstructed

54.0% of *M. guttatus* primary transcripts at 50% coverage or greater (Fig S5). On average, there

were 2.8 polymorphisms (SNPs or indels) per 100 bp for each pair of alleles in the reference

transcriptome (Fig. S6C).

Differential Expression Analyses

RNA-sequencing of plants from the field experiments produced approximately 25.9 million raw

reads per library (range 9.2-35.9 million reads). We were able to evaluate gene expression for

10,122 transcripts corresponding to 9,326 genes, after transcriptome reconstruction and filtering.

Significant expression differences (FDR = 0.05) between the inland and coastal field sites were

common (6765 genes; 73% of genes). Expression differences between parental genotypes within

field sites were also common (7213 genes; 77%; Table 1 and 2). Most transcripts that were

differentially expressed between parental lines were also sensitive to environment: only 7.2% of

transcripts were consistently differentially expressed between lines regardless of field site. We

found that 54% more genes were differentially expressed between parental lines at the inland site

than at the coastal site (Table 2). We can attribute only part of this discrepancy to differences in

power at the two sites. Average power to detect DE genes was only slightly higher at the inland

site than the coastal site (75% vs. 68% for a minimum fold-change of 2X).

Genotype x site (GxE) interactions were relatively common. In total, 1837 transcripts

(corresponding to 19% of expressed genes, Table 1, Table S3) had significant GxE interactions,

where the magnitude of expression differences between parental ecotypes depended on the field

site in which they were grown (Fig. 2A). Only 94 transcripts had crossing reaction norms (green

points, Fig. 2B). More often, expression differences between genotypes were significant at one

site and non-significant at the other (1137 transcripts, 11%, blue and red points, Fig. 2).

Most of the expression differences between the coastal and inland lines could be attributed to *cis*-

regulatory variation: 79% (5532 genes) of differentially expressed genes had *cis* regulatory

differences, while about half (3611 genes) of the differentially expressed genes had detectable

trans effects (Fig. 3 & 4, Table 1). At both coastal and inland field sites, the magnitudes of *cis*

and *trans* regulatory differences were similar (Table S4). However, we detected far more

significant *trans* effects in the inland field site than the coastal field site (Fig. 3 & 4, Table S4).

Overall, there was only moderate overlap between the sets of *cis*-regulated transcripts from the

two environments (Fig. S7. The same was true for the sets of *trans*-regulated transcripts from the

two environments.

Gene Ontology Enrichment and Expression Networks

We explored the functional significance of genes with differential expression between

environments and between parental ecotypes. Differentially expressed genes in the coastal (SS)

parent between sites were enriched for glycosinolate/glucosinolate/S-glycoside biosynthesis and

metabolism, response to starvation, and others (Table S1). Differentially expressed genes in the

inland parent (LL) between sites were enriched for GO categories related to cuticle development,

meristem and floral development, and pigment production. Differentially expressed genes

between the parental lines (across sites) were enriched for genes involved with cell wall

formation, meristem initiation, and responses to viral pathogens. Genes with genotype x site

(GxE) interactions had the most significantly enriched GO terms ($N = 69$), including

brassinosteroid biosynthesis/metabolism, cell wall formation, regulation of development, and

pigment accumulation.

We used network clustering analysis to examine correlated expression of gene clusters (modules)

within habitats for the coastal and inland lines (Pearson's correlation, $r > 0.75$, Fig. S5. The

coastal perennial line (SS) preferentially expressed modules related to root and epidermal

development at its home site, while oxidative stress response, chlorophyll metabolism, and

circadian rhythm modules were highly expressed in inland habitat (Table S2). The inland annual

line preferentially expressed gene clusters related to nucleoside catabolism, sugar and starch

metabolism, pigment accumulation, and photoperiodism at the inland field site, but had no

modules strongly associated with the coastal field site.

Chromosomal Inversion Analyses

Chromosomal inversions are thought to act as adaptation supergenes that hold together long

haplotypes containing multiple adaptive polymorphisms through suppressed recombination

(Kirkpatrick 2010; Joron et al. 2011; Thompson & Jiggins 2014). We were thus interested in

evaluating the hypothesis of whether the known inversions in this system hold together

haplotypes of differentially expressed genes. There were significantly more differentially

expressed genes inside the chromosome 5 inversion than expected by chance and there were

significantly more GxE interactions for genes in this inversion (Table 1). The adaptive (Lowry &

Willis 2010) chromosome 8 inversion also had significantly more differentially expressed genes,

but only at the coastal site (Table 2). Interestingly, the chromosome 8 inversion had a significant

enrichment of *cis*-eQTLs (Table 1), suggesting that it may maintain a higher level of regulatory

divergence caused by the evolution of *cis*-regulatory elements.

Patterns of Candidate Gene Expression

To identify genes putatively linked to local adaptation, we cross-referenced our results with a

recent genomic outlier analysis, which identified 667 genes with a high level of allelic

differentiation between coastal and inland populations (Lowry et al. 2010). We found that the

magnitude of differential expression between environments was significantly elevated for

candidate genes with highly differentiated SNPs (from Gould et al. 2017) in their promoter

regions *(P < 0.05, Table S5)*. The magnitude of differential expression between genotypes for

candidate genes with differentiated promoters was also higher than for non-candidate genes, but

not significantly so *(P = 0.08)*. Candidate genes with differentiated gene regions tended to have

expression differences between lines or between environments that were lower in magnitude than

non-candidate genes.

We were able to examine gene expression in seven top candidate genes highlighted by the outlier

analysis and/or previous QTL mapping studies (Fig. 5). The candidate gene *ABA1* codes for the

first protein in the biosynthesis of the hormone abscisic acid, which controls responses to

osmotic stress, including drought (Xiong et al. 2002). An *ABA1* (abscisic acid deficient 1)

ortholog, Migut.H00431, is located within the chromosome 8 inversion and may contribute to

inland ecotype's adaptation to low soil water availability. *ABA1* was always more highly

expressed in the inland line and was upregulated in both lines at the inland field site (Fig. 5A).

Previously, we showed that coastal *M. guttatus* populations have evolved leaf tissue tolerance to

oceanic salt spray (Lowry et al. 2009). Leaf salt tolerance is generally mediated by a Na^+/H^+

antiporter (*SOS1*; Qiu et al. 2002), which is potentially activated by a calcium sensor (*CBL10*;

Kim et al. 2007). Both *SOS1* (Migut.E00570) and *CBL10* (Migut.A00138) were more highly

expressed in the coastal line than the inland line across habitats (Fig. 5B, C), a pattern consistent

with elevated salt tolerance of coastal populations.

DISCUSSION

Overall, our results identified multiple key patterns regarding the relationship between gene

expression and the evolution of local adaptation. Differential expression is substantial between

locally-adapted accessions in nature. Expression plasticity of alleles across habitats (genotype x

environment interactions) appear to be common and may minimize fitness trade-offs at

individual loci that contribute to the overall pattern of local adaptation. A large portion of that

differential expression is due to *cis*-regulatory divergence. Chromosomal inversions appear to act

as supergenes by holding together haplotypes of differentially expressed genes, but this pattern

depends on habitat context. We discuss each of these major findings as well as the limitations

and caveats associated with our study in detail below.

Sources of Variation in Gene Expression

One of the major outstanding questions in local adaptation research is why the fitness effects of

individual loci on local adaptation are so often asymmetric across habitats. Theoretical models

(Levene 1953; Hedrick 1976, 1986; Dieckmann & Doebeli 1999) and studies in key model

systems (Abzhanov et al. 2004; Hoekstra et al. 2006; Barrett et al. 2009) have suggested trade-

offs at individual loci (e.g. antagonistic pleiotropy) to be common. However, field reciprocal

transplant experiments and experimental evolution studies have often found a pattern of

conditional neutrality, where loci have a strong effect on fitness in one environment but have an

undetectable effect on fitness in alternative environments (reviewed in Bono et al. 2017;

Wadgymar et al. 2017). This pattern has also been found in the coastal perennial/inland annual

M. guttatus system, where three salt tolerance QTLs have fitness effects in coastal habitat but no

detectable effects in inland habitat (Lowry et al. 2009). While a failure to statistically detect a

trade-off across habitats does not rule out the possibility of a small trade-off for an individual

locus, it does suggest that adaptive loci are often strongly asymmetric in their fitness effects

across habitats.

Gene regulatory divergence between locally adapted populations is one possible mechanism by

which trade-offs could be minimized across habitats for individual loci (Rutherford 2003;

Ghalambor et al. 2007; Des Marais et al. 2013, 2017; Dayan et al. 2015; Lohman et al. 2017).

While some gene regulatory differences between ecotypes may evolve due to genetic drift in

isolated populations, adaptive phenotypic plasticity can evolve due to natural selection.

Adaptations of organisms to maintain homeostasis when faced by environmental challenges can

be caused by genotype specific changes in gene expression (Gibson 2008; Des Marais et al.

2017). However, such environmentally dependent changes in gene expression would not be

expected to result in a cost if gene expression did not differ among genotypes in habitats that

lacked particular environmental stresses. In our study, we identified 1137 transcripts that were

differentially expressed between the coastal perennial and inland annual lines in one habitat

(coast or inland) but did not show the same expression difference in the alternative habitat (GxE

transcripts, Fig. 2). In contrast, fewer transcripts (733) had the same expression difference

between ecotypes regardless of environment (G-only transcripts). For the current experiment, we

cannot definitively determine whether any of the GxE or G-only transcripts cause asymmetries in

fitness effects across habitats. Further, some of the genotype specific changes in gene expression

could potentially be maladaptive (Ghalambor et al. 2007). Even so, our results do clearly show

that habitat-specific differential gene expression is common for locally adapted ecotypes. Future

studies should focus on making the critical linkages between patterns of gene expression and

fitness in the field to determine whether asymmetries of fitness effects across habitats are the

result of habitat-specific differential gene expression.

Overall, *cis*-regulatory evolution was responsible for at least 79% of the differentially expressed

genes. This is about twice the percentage of *cis*-regulated differentially expressed genes for

crosses both within and between *Drosophilia* species (Coolon et al. 2014). However, the

relatively high proportion of *cis*-regulatory divergence underlying differentially expressed genes

is not too surprising, given the high level of polymorphism among *M. guttatus* accessions

(Brandvain et al. 2014; Gould et al. 2017; Puzey et al. 2017). Further, in terms of the proportion

of *cis* regulated genes out of all genes surveyed (59% for our study), our results are not very

different from other study systems. Mack et al. (2016) found significant *cis* effects for 68% of

surveyed genes in crosses between house mice subspecies (*Mus musculus musculus* and *M. m.*

domesticus). Steige et al. (2015) found that 33-39% of genes surveyed had significant allele-

specific expression effects for hybrids between accessions of the plant *Capsella grandiflora*.

One striking pattern we observed in this study was a great deal more differential regulation

between ecotypes in the inland environment than the coastal environment (Table 2, Fig.3). We

can attribute only a small part of this difference to greater experimental power to detect

differences at the inland site (75% inland vs. 68% coast, for transcripts with a minimum fold-

change of 2X). Because mapping bias is well controlled in this study, we do not believe this

overall pattern is the result of an analytical artifact. We hypothesize that part of this difference is

due to more stressful conditions experienced by plants at the inland site; plants that survive to

maturity in coastal habitats are generally larger than plants growing at the inland habitat (Lowry

et al. 2008; Popovic & Lowry *unpublished data*). It remains to be seen whether the magnitude of

gene regulatory divergence between ecotypes varies across habitats in other systems as well.

Gene Regulatory Evolution and Chromosomal Inversions

Chromosomal inversions have been thought to be involved in evolutionary adaptations since

classic studies in *Drosophila* found that inversion polymorphisms are frequently correlated with

environmental conditions over geographic space and through time (Dobzhansky 1951, 1970;

Kirpatrick & Barton 2006; Hoffman & Rieseberg 2008; Cheng et al. 2012; Ayala et al. 2013,

2014; Adrion et al. 2015). Inversions strongly suppress genetic recombination in heterokaryotic

(inversion heterozygotes) individuals because recombinant gametes are unbalanced (Dobzhansky

1970; Rieseberg 2001). Researchers have thus hypothesized that inversions could act as

supergenes by holding together long haplotypes containing multiple adaptive polymorphisms

through suppressed recombination (Dobzhansky 1970; Joron et al. 2011; Thompson & Jiggins

2014; Kirkpatrick & Barton 2006; Kirkpatrick & Barrett 2015).

The supergene hypothesis is a major reason why inversions are thought to frequently contribute

to the evolution of adaptations (Dobzhansky 1970; Kirkpatrick & Barton 2006; Hoffman &

Rieseberg 2008; Faria & Navarro 2009; Thompson & Jiggins 2014). Early researchers,

especially Dobzhansky (1970), argued that inversions could hold together co-adapted epistatic

complexes of genes through suppressed recombination. However, theoreticians have recently

shown that inversions can spread due to purely additive effects, when at least two locally

adaptive loci are captured within the inverted region (Kirkpatrick & Barton 2006; Kirkpatrick &

Barrett 2015). Regardless of the ultimate genetic mechanisms, these models all predict that

suppression of recombination by inversions maintains adaptive divergence at multiple linked

loci.

Global gene expression analyses offer one way to test whether inversions hold together

haplotypes of genetic variation potentially responsible for phenotypic divergence between locally

adapted populations. Research in a few systems has found evidence of increased levels of

expression divergence in inversions (Marquès-Bonet et al. 2004; Cassone et al. 2011; Fuller et al.

2016). For example, Marquès-Bonet et al. (2004) found 8.9% greater divergence (fold change) in

human versus chimp brain gene expression for chromosomal inversions when compared to the

rest of the genome. We did not observe a significant difference in fold change between inverted

and non-inverted regions in our study. However, genes within the region of the chromosome 5

inversion were 12.5% more likely to be differentially expressed. Genes within the adaptive

chromosome 8 inversion were 8.3% more likely to have a *cis*-eQTL.

The enrichment of gene expression differences in our study is consistent with patterns found in

inversions between chimpanzees and humans (Marquès-Bonet et al. 2004) and *Drosophila*

(Fuller et al. 2016; Said et al. 2018), but contrasts with results for the plant *Boechera stricta* (Lee

et al. 2017). While the finding of an enrichment of differential gene expression for inversions in

this study and others is consistent with the supergene hypothesis of inversion evolution, it is by

no means definitive proof. Demonstrating that an inversion has evolved as an adaptation

supergene requires confirmation that multiple genes within the inversion have effects on adaptive

phenotypes (Hoffman & Rieseberg 2008; Kirkpatrick 2010; Kirkpatrick & Kern 2012). There is

currently no study that we are aware of which has experimentally confirmed that two or more

genes within an inversion contribute additively or epistatically to adaptive phenotypic

differences between locally adapted populations, ecotypes, or species (but see Kunte et al. 2014).

Candidate Genes and Pathways

Analysis of expression across both ecotypes and environments allowed us to examine the

detailed expression patterns of several candidate genes that may contribute to adaptive

divergence. We observed a diversity of expression patterns across candidate genes (Fig. 5). The

gene *ABA1* catalyzes the first step in the synthesis of the abiotic stress hormone ABA, and the

Mimulus ortholog of this gene is located in the adaptive chromosomal inversion on chromosome

8. In *Arabidopsis* and other plants, increased ABA production leads to drought tolerance by

triggering stomatal closure and resistance to osmotic stress (Jakab et al 2005). Previous work has

shown that the chromosome 8 inversion in *M. guttatus* contributes directly to fitness differences

between coastal and inland lines (Lowry & Willis 2010) and that the genic region of *ABA1*

within the inversion has an unusually high degree of differentiation (high F_{ST}) between coastal

and inland populations (Gould et al. 2017). In the present study, we found that both genotypic

and environmental differential regulation contribute to expression patterns at this locus. *ABA1*

was always more highly expressed in the inland ecotype and also upregulated in the inland

environment by both ecotypes (Fig. 5A). In contrast, the candidate gene P-glycoprotein19,

PGP19 (Migut.H00909), also located in the adaptive chromosome 8 inversion (Gould et al.

2017), was differentially regulated between ecotypes only at the inland field site (Fig. 5E). The

Arabidopsis ortholog of *PGP19* is an ATP transporter involved in gravitropism, growth, and

development by mediating auxin signaling (Okamoto et al 2015).

Consistent with oceanic salt spray playing a key role in local adaptation (Lowry et al. 2009),

multiple salt tolerance candidate genes were differentially regulated between the coastal

perennial and inland annual ecotypes. Two major genes in the Salt Overly Sensitive (*SOS*)

pathway, *CBL10* and *SOS1,* were expressed at higher levels in the coastal ecotype than the inland

ecotype across habitats (Fig. 5B, C). *CBL10* is a calcineurin B-like calcium sensor that interacts

with the protein kinase *SOS2* in the shoots of plants to positively regulate Na^+ transporters in the

tonoplast of the vacuole as well as potentially in the plasma membrane (Quan et al. 2007; Kang

& Nam 2016; Egea et al. 2018). The function of *CBL10* in salt response has been shown to be

conserved across *Arabidopsis* (Quan et al. 2007)*, Populus* (Tang et al. 2014)*,* and tomatoes (Egea

et al. 2018). Interestingly, *CBL10* has been found to confer salt tolerance in plants, while at the

same time making them more susceptible to drought (Kang & Nam 2016), suggesting a potential

trade-off for local adaptation to coastal habitats that are inundated by salt spray. *SOS1* is a well

characterized Na^+/K^+ antiporter that pumps toxic Na^+ ions out of the cytoplasm of plant cells into

the surrounding apoplast (Shi et al. 2002). *SOS1* is potentially positively regulated by the

CBL10/SOS2 complex in the shoots of plants (Quan et al. 2007). In addition to the *SOS* pathway,

there were G and E effects (but not GxE) for an ortholog of the High-Affinity K^+ Transporter1,

HKT1. *HKT1* has previously been linked in the evolution of salt tolerance adaptation in coastal

populations of *Arabidopsis thaliana* (Fig. 5D; Rus et al. 2006; Baxter et al. 2010).

Caveats, Limitations, and Future Directions

There are important caveats and concerns to consider in the interpretation of the results of our

study. One of the foremost caveats of the study is its narrow scope. We only evaluated gene

expression differences between one inbred line per ecotype, at two field sites, and for gene

expression at one time point. Despite these drawbacks, this is the first study that we are aware of

to evaluate allele-specific expression in the field between known locally adapted populations

(Voelckel et al. 2017), which allowed us to detect novel *cis* x habitat and *trans* x habitat

interaction (Fig. 4; Table S6). The major outstanding questions include how variable gene

expression is across populations, field sites, and tissue types? In the future, it will be critical to

evaluate gene expression at different time points and across tissue types to gain a more

comprehensive understanding of how ecotypic differences in gene expression manifest

throughout development under natural field conditions.

Perhaps, the greatest challenge for interpreting gene expression results from reciprocal transplant

experiments is understanding how patterns of expression actually contribute to phenotypes and

fitness across habitats. Fitness trade-offs that are associated with local adaptation could

potentially be caused by any type of gene expression pattern. Constitutive expression differences

between ecotypes could cause stable phenotypic differences that are beneficial in one habitat but

deleterious in another. Gene expression characterized by genotype x environment interactions

could cause fitness trade-offs, but just as likely could mitigate trade-offs by helping ecotypes

maintain homeostasis across habitats.

Until recently, studies of gene regulation have for the most part been limited to the laboratory

setting. Coupling those studies with reciprocal transplant experiments to better understand local

adaptation is still rare (Kenkel & Matz 2016; Lohman et al. 2017; Voelckel et al. 2017). Allele-

specific expression is clearly an important tool for understanding the evolution of regulatory

differences between locally adapted populations, ecotypes, and species. However, we hope that

future reciprocal transplant experiments will go beyond RNA-sequencing by also examining

genotypic differences in genome-wide patterns of chromatin remodeling and protein translation

across divergent habitats (Rodgers-Melnick et al. 2016; Voelckel et al. 2017).

DATA ACCSSIBILITY

The assembled reference transcriptome and normalized count data for all transcripts in all

individuals has been archived at Data Dryad (see DOI: https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.57d6118).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank D. Des Marais, J. Tung, J. Puzey, J. Friedman, R. Guerrero, R. Rellán-Álvarez, J.

Lasky, and six anonymous reviewers for comments that helped to improve our manuscript. We

thank K. Childs and J. Lovell for guidance with expression analyses, B. Blackman and E.

Patterson for starting seeds for us at UC Berkeley, and D. Popovic for assistance in field

planting. The Bodega Marine Reserve and the Pepperwood Preserve kindly allowed us to

conduct this reciprocal transplant field experiment. Funding was provided by Michigan State

University through a start-up package to DBL. The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

Abzhanov A, Protas M, Grant BR *et al.* (2004) Bmp4 and morphological variation of beaks in

Darwin's finches. *Science,* **305,** 1462-1465.

Adrion JR, Hahn MW, Cooper BS (2015) Revisiting classic clines in *Drosophila melanogaster*

in the age of genomics. *Trends in Genetics*, **31**, 434-444.

Aguilar-Rangel MR, Montes RA, González-Segovia E *et al.* (2017) Allele specific expression

analysis identifies regulatory variation associated with stress-related genes in the Mexican

highland maize landrace Palomero Toluqueño. *PeerJ,* **23**, 5e3737.

Ågren, J, Oakley CG, McKay JK *et al.* (2013) Genetic mapping of adaptation reveals fitness

trade-offs in *Arabidopsis thaliana. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences,* **110**,

21077-21087.

Alexa A, Rahnenführer J (2015) Gene set enrichment analysis with topGO. http://www.mpi-

sb.mpg.de/~alexa

Anderson JT, Willis JH, Mitchell-Olds T (2011) Evolutionary genetics of plant adaptation.

Trends in Genetics, **27**, 258-266.

Anderson JT, Lee CR, Rushworth C *et al.* (2013) Genetic tradeoffs and conditional neutrality

contribute to local adaptation. *Molecular Ecology*, **22**, 699-708.

Andrews S (2015) FastQC v0.11.3. A quality control tool for high throughput sequence data.

http://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/

Ayala D, Guerrero RF, Kirkpatrick M (2013) Reproductive isolation and local adaptation

quantified for a chromosome inversion in a malaria mosquito. *Evolution,* **67**, 946-958.

Baack E, Melo MC, Rieseberg LH, *et al.* (2016) The origins of reproductive isolation in plants.

New Phytol, **207,** 207, 968-984.

Barrett RD, Rogers SM, Schluter D (2009) Environment specific pleiotropy facilitates

divergence at the Ectodysplasin locus in threespine stickleback. *Evolution*, **63**, 2831-2837.

Baxter I, Brazelton JN, Yu D *et al.* (2010) A coastal cline in sodium accumulation in

Arabidopsis thaliana is driven by natural variation of the sodium transporter *AtHKT1;1. PLoS*

Genetics, **6**, e1001193.

Bi R, Liu P (2016) Sample size calculation while controlling false discovery rate for differential

expression analysis with RNA-sequencing experiments. BMC Bioinformatics, **17**, 146.

Bell GD, Kane NC, Rieseberg LH, Adams KL (2013) RNA-seq analysis of allele-specific

expression, hybrid effects, and regulatory divergence in hybrids compared with their parents

from natural populations. *Genome Biology and Evolution,* **5**, 1309-1323.

Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B (2014) Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence

data. *Bioinformatics,* **30**, 2114-2120.

Bono LM, Smith LB, Pfennig DW, Burch CL (2017) The emergence of performance trade-offs

during local adaptation: insights from experimental evolution. *Molecular Ecology*, **26**, 1720-

1733.

Brandvain Y, Kenney AM, Flagel L *et al.* (2014) Speciation and introgression between *Mimulus*

nasutus and *Mimulus guttatus*. *PLoS Genetics,* **10**, e1004410.

Cassone BJ, Molloy MJ, Cheng C *et al.* (2011) Divergent transcriptional response to thermal

stress by *Anopheles gambiae* larvae carrying alternative arrangements of inversion 2La.

Molecular Ecology, **20**, 2567-2580.

Charlesworth D, Willis JH (2009) The genetics of inbreeding depression. *Nature Review*

Genetics, **10**, 783-796.

Cheng C, White BJ, Kamdem C *et al.* (2012) Ecological genomics of *Anopheles gambiae* along a

latitudinal cline: a population-resequencing approach. *Genetics,* **190**, 1417-1432.

Colosimo PF, Hosemann KE, Balabhadra S *et al.* (2005) Widespread parallel evolution in

sticklebacks by repeated fixation of ectodysplasin alleles. *Science,* **307**, 1928-1933.

Coolon JD, McManus CJ, Stevenson KR *et al.* (2014) Tempo and mode of regulatory evolution

in Drosophila. *Genome Research,* **24**, 797-808.

Clausen J (1951) Stages in the evolution of plant species. *Cornell University Press*. Ithaca NY,

USA.

Corbin JD, Thomsen MA, Dawson TE, D'Antonio CM (2005) Summer water use by California

coastal prairie grasses: fog, drought, and community composition. *Oecologia*, **145**, 511–521.

Cowles CR, Hirschhorn JN, Altshuler D *et al.* (2002) Detection of regulatory variation in mouse

genes. *Nature Genetics,* **32**, 432-437.

Cubillos FA, Stegle O, Grondin C *et al.* (2014) Extensive *cis*-regulatory variation robust to

environmental perturbation in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Cell,* **26**, 4298-4310.

Dayan DI, Crawford DL, Oleksiak MF (2015) Phenotypic plasticity in gene expression

contributes to divergence of locally adapted populations of *Fundulus heteroclitus*. *Molecular*

Ecology, **24**, 3345-3359.

de Meaux J, Goebel U, Pop A *et al.* (2005) Allele-specific assay reveals functional variation in

the chalcone synthase promoter of *Arabidopsis thaliana* that is compatible with neutral

evolution. *Plant Cell,* **17**, 676-690.

Des Marais DL, Hernandez KM, Juenger TE (2013) Genotype-by-environment interaction and

plasticity: exploring genomic responses of plants to the abiotic environment. *Annual Review of*

Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics, **44**, 5-29.

Des Marais DL, Guerrero RF, Lasky JR, Scarpino SV (2017) Topological features of a gene co-

expression network predict patterns of natural diversity in environmental response. *Proceedings*

of the Royal Society B, **284**, 20170914.

Dieckmann U, Doebeli M (1999) On the origin of species by sympatric speciation. *Nature*, **400**,

354–357.

Dobzhansky T. 1951. Genetics and the Origin of Species (3rd ed.). *Columbia University Press.*

New York, NY, USA.

Dobzhansky T. 1970. Genetics of the Evolutionary Process. *Columbia University Press*. New

York, NY, USA.

Egea I, Pineda B, Ortíz-Atienza A, *et al.* (2018) The *SlCBL10* calcineurin B-like protein ensures

plant growth under salt stress by regulating Na^+ and $Ca2^+$ homeostasis. Plant Physiology. *In*

Press, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.17.01605

Faria R and Navarro A (2010) Chromosomal speciation revisited: rearranging theory with pieces

of evidence. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution,* **25**, 660-669.

Fuller ZL, Haynes GD, Richards S *et al.* (2016) Genomics of natural populations: how

differentially expressed genes shape the evolution of chromosomal inversions in *Drosophila*

pseudoobscura. *Genetics,* **204**, 287-301.

Friedman J, Willis JH (2013) Major QTLs for critical photoperiod and vernalization underlie

extensive variation in flowering in the *Mimulus guttatus* species complex. *New Phytologist*, **199**,

571-583.

Friedman J (2014) Genetic determinants and epistasis for life history trait differences in the

common monkeyflower, *Mimulus guttatus*. *Journal of Heredity,* **105**, 816-827.

Friedman J, Twyford AD, Willis JH *et al.* (2015) The extent and genetic basis of phenotypic

divergence in life history traits in *Mimulus guttatus*. *Molecular Ecology*, **24**, 111-122.

Gardner KM, Latta RG (2006) Identifying loci under selection across contrasting environments

in *Avena barbata* using quantitative trait locus mapping. *Molecular Ecology,* **15,** 1321-1333.

Ghalambor CK, McKay JK, Carroll SP *et al.* (2007) Adaptive versus non-adaptive phenotypic

plasticity and the potential for contemporary adaptation in new environments. *Functional*

Ecology, **21**, 394-407.

Gibson G (2008) The environmental contribution to gene expression profiles. *Nature Reviews*

Genetics, **9**, 575-581.

Gibson G, Riley-Berger R, Harshman L *et al.* (2004) Extensive sex-specific nonadditivity of

gene expression in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics,* **167**, 1791-1799.

Gould BA, Chen Y, Lowry DB (2017) Pooled ecotype sequencing reveals candidate genetic

mechanisms for adaptive differentiation and reproductive isolation. *Molecular Ecology,* **26**, 163-

177.

Grabherr MG, Haas BJ, Yassour M *et al.* (2011) Full-length transcriptome assembly from RNA-

Seq data without a reference genome. *Nature Biotechnology,* **29**, 644-652.

Guo M, Yang S, Rupe M, Hu B, Bickel DR, Arthur L, Smith O (2008) Genome-wide allele-

specific expression analysis using massively parallel signature sequencing (MPSS™) reveals cis-

and trans-effects on gene expression in maize hybrid meristem tissue. *Plant Molecular Biology,*

66, 551-563.

Hall MC, Willis JH (2006) Divergent selection on flowering time contributes to local adaptation

in *Mimulus guttatus* populations. *Evolution,* **60**, 2466-2477.

Hall MC, Basten C, Willis JH (2006) Pleiotropic quantitative trait loci contribute to population

divergence in traits associated with life-history variation in *Mimulus guttatus*. *Genetics,* **172**,

1829-1844.

Hall MC, Lowry DB, Willis JH (2010) Is local adaptation in *Mimulus guttatus* caused by

tradeoffs at individual loci? *Molecular Ecology* **19**, 2739-2753.

Hedrick PW, Ginevan ME, Ewing EP. 1976. Genetic polymorphism in heterogeneous

environments. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, **7**, 1-32.

Hedrick PW (1986) Genetic polymorphism in heterogeneous environments: a decade later.

Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, **17**, 535-566.

Hellsten U, Wright KM, Jenkins J *et al.* (2013) Fine-scale variation in meiotic recombination in

Mimulus inferred from population shotgun sequencing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*

Sciences, **110**, 19478-19482.

Hereford J (2009) A quantitative survey of local adaptation and fitness trade-offs. *American*

Society of Naturalists, **173**, 579-588.

Hoekstra HE, Hirschmann RJ, Bundey RA *et al.* (2006) A single amino acid mutation

contributes to adaptive beach mouse color pattern. *Science,* **313**, 101-104.

Holeski L, Monnahan P, Koseva B *et al.* (2014) A high-resolution genetic map of yellow

monkeyflower identifies chemical defense QTLs and recombination rate variation. *G3: Genes,*

Genomes, Genetics, **4**, 813-821.

Hoffmann AA, Rieseberg LH (2008) Revisiting the impact of inversions in evolution: From

population genetic markers to drivers of adaptive shifts and speciation? *Annual Review of*

Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics, **39**, 21-42.

Jakab, G, Ton, J, Flors, V, Zimmerli, L, Métraux, J-P, Mauch-Mani, B. (2005) Enhancing

Arabidopsis Salt and Drought Stress Tolerance by Chemical Priming for Its Abscisic Acid

Responses. Plant Physiology 1:267-274.

Ji H, Pardo JM, Batelli G *et al.* (2013) The Salt Overly Sensitive (SOS) pathway: established and

emerging roles. *Molecular Plant,* **6**, 275-286.

Joron M, Frezal L, Jones RT *et al.* (2011) Chromosomal rearrangements maintain a polymorphic

supergene controlling butterfly mimicry. *Nature,* **477**, 203-206.

Kang HK, Nam KH (2016) Reverse function of ROS-induced CBL10 during salt and drought

stress responses. *Plant Science*, **243**, 49-55.

Kawecki TJ, Ebert D (2004) Conceptual issues in local adaptation. *Ecology Letters,* **7**, 1225-

1241.

Kenkel CD, Matz MV (2016) Gene expression under chronic heat stress in populations of the

mustard hill coral (*Porites astreoides*) from different thermal environments. *Nature Ecology and*

Evolution, **1,** 0014.

Kim BG, Waadt R, Cheong YH, Pandey GK, Dominguez-Solis JR, Schültke S, Lee SC, Kudla J,

Luan S. (2007) The calcium sensor CBL10 mediates salt tolerance by regulating ion homeostasis

in *Arabidopsis*. *The Plant Journal*, **52**, 473-484.

Kirkpatrick M, Barton NH (2006) Chromosome inversions, local adaptation and speciation.

Genetics, **173**, 419-434.

Kirkpatrick M, Barrett B (2015) Chromosome inversions, adaptive cassettes and the evolution of

species' ranges. *Molecular Ecology,* **24**, 2046-2055.

Kirkpatrick M, Kern A (2012) Where's the money? Inversions, genes, and the hunt for genomic

targets of selection. *Genetics*, **190**, 1153-1155.

Kirkpatrick M (2010) How and why chromosome inversions evolve. *PLOS Biology*, **8**, e1000501

Langfelder P, Horvath S (2008) WGCNA: an R package for weighted correlation network

analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics,* **9**, 559.

Kunte K, Zhang W, Tenger-Trolander A et al. (2014) Doublesex is a mimicry supergene. *Nature*,

507, 229-232.

Langmead B, Salzberg SL (2012) Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. *Nature Methods,* **9**,

357-359.

Langmead B, Trapnell C, Pop M *et al.* (2009) Ultrafast and memory-efficient alignment of short

DNA sequences to the human genome. *Genome Biology,* **10**, R25.

Law CW, Chen Y, Shi W *et al.* (2014) Precision weights unlock linear model analysis tools for

RNA-seq read counts. *Genome Biology,* **15**, R29.

Lee CR, Wang B, Mojica JP *et al.* (2017) Young inversion with multiple linked QTLs under

selection in a hybrid zone. *Nature Ecology and Evolution,* **1**, 0119.

Leinonen PH, Remington DL, Leppala *et al.* (2013) Genetic basis of local adaptation and

flowering time variation in *Arabidopsis lyrata*. *Molecular Ecology,* **22,** 709-723.

Leimu R, Fischer M (2008) A meta-analysis of local adaptation in plants. *PLoS One*, **3**, e4010.

Levene H (1953) Genetic equilibrium when more than one ecological niche is available. *The*

American Naturalist, **87**, 331-333.

Lohman B, Stutz W, Bolnick D (2017) Gene expression stasis and plasticity following migration

into a foreign environment. *bioRxiv*, 121608.

Lowry DB, Rockwood JH, Willis JH (2008) Ecological reproductive isolation of coast and

inland races of *Mimulus guttatus*. *Evolution,* **62**, 2196-2214.

Lowry DB, Hall MC, Salt DE *et al.* (2009) Genetic and physiological basis of adaptive salt

tolerance divergence between coastal and inland *Mimulus guttatus*. *New Phytol*, **183**, 776-788.

Lowry DB, Willis JH (2010) A widespread chromosomal inversion polymorphism contributes to

a major life-history transition, local adaptation, and reproductive isolation. *PLOS Biology,* **8**,

e1000500.

Lovell JT, Schwartz S, Lowry DB *et al.* (2016) Drought responsive gene expression regulatory

divergence between upland and lowland ecotypes of a perennial C4 grass. *Genome Research,* **26**,

510-518.

Mack KL, Campbell P, Nachman MW (2016) Gene regulation and speciation in house mice.

Genome Research, **26**, 451-461.

Marquès-Bonet T, Cáceres M, Bertranpetit J *et al.* (2004) Chromosomal rearrangements and the

genomic distribution of gene-expression divergence in humans and chimpanzees. *Trends in*

Genetics, **20**, 524-529.

Okamoto, K, Ueda, H, Shimada, T *et al.* (2015) An ABC transporter B family protein, *ABCB19*,

is required for cytoplasmic streaming and gravitropism of the inflorescence stems. *Plant*

Signaling & Behavior, 3: e1010947

Oneal E, Lowry DB, Wright KM *et al.* (2014) Divergent population structure and climate

associations of a chromosomal inversion polymorphism across the *Mimulus guttatus* species

complex. *Molecular Ecology,* **23**, 2844-2860.

Puzey JR, Willis JH, Kelly JK (2017) Population structure and local selection yield high

genomic variation in *Mimulus guttatus*. *Molecular Ecology*, **26**, 519-535.

Qiu QS, Guo Y, Dietrich MA, Schumaker KS, Zhu JK (2002) Regulation of SOS1, a plasma

membrane Na+/H+ exchanger in *Arabidopsis thaliana*, by SOS2 and SOS3. *Proceedings of the*

National Academy of Sciences, **99**, 8436-8441.

Quan R, Lin H, Mendoza I, *et al.* (2007) SCABP8/CBL10, a putative calcium sensor, interacts

with the protein kinase SOS2 to protect *Arabidopsis* shoots from salt stress. *The Plant Cell*, **19**,

1415-1431.

1000

1001 R. Core Team (2012) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. (available at

1002 http://www.r-project.org/.le).

1003

1004   Rieseberg LH (2001) Chromosomal rearrangements and speciation. *Trends in Ecology &*

1005   *Evolution,* **16**, 351-358.

1006

1007   Ritchie ME, Phipson B, Wu D *et al.* (2015) limma powers differential expression analyses for

1008   RNA-sequencing and microarray studies. *Nucleic Acids Research,* **43**, e47.

1009

1010   Robinson M, Oshlack A (2010) A scaling normalization method for differential expression

1011   analysis of RNA-seq data. *Genome Biology,* **11**, R25.

1012

1013   Robinson MD, McCarthy DJ, Smyth GK (2010) edgeR: a Bioconductor package for differential

1014   expression analysis of digital gene expression data. *Bioinformatics,* **26**, 139-140.

1015

1016   Rockman MV, Kruglyak L (2006) Genetics of global gene expression. *Nature Reviews Genetics,*

1017   **7,** 862-872.

1018

1019   Rodgers-Melnick E, Vera DL, Bass HW, Buckler ES (2016) Open chromatin reveals the

1020   functional maize genome. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **113**, E3177-3184.

1021

1022   Rutherford SL (2003) Between genotype and phenotype: protein chaperones and evolvability.

1023   *Nature Review Genetics,* **4**, 263-274.

1024

1025   Rus A, Baxter I, Muthukumar B, *et al.* (2006) Natural variants of *AtHKT1* enhance Na^+

1026   accumulation in two wild populations of *Arabidopsis*. *PLoS Genetics*, **2**, e210.

1027

1028   Said I, Byrne A, Serrano V, Cardeno C, Vollmers C, Corbett-Detig R (2018) Linked genetic

1029   variation and not genome structure causes widespread differential expression associated with

1030   chromosomal inversions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **2**, 201721275.

1031

1032   Selby JP, Jeong AL, Toll K, Wright KM, Lowry DB (2014) Methods and discoveries in the

1033   pursuit of understanding the genetic basis of adaptation to harsh environments in *Mimulus*. In

1034   *Plant Ecology and Evolution in Harsh Environments* (pp. 243-265). *NOVA Science Publishers*.

1035   Hauppauge, NY, USA.

1036

1037   Shen Y, Garcia T, Pabuwal V, et al. (2013) Alternative strategies for development of a reference

1038   transcriptome for quantification of allele specific expression in organisms having sparse genomic

1039   resources. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol. - Part D Genomics Proteomics*, **8**, 11–16.

1040

1041   Shi H, Ishitani M, Kim C, Zhu JK (2000) The *Arabidopsis thaliana* salt tolerance gene *SOS1*

1042   encodes a putative Na^+/H^+ antiporter. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **97**,

1043   6896-6901.

1044

1045   Sobel JM, Chen GF, Watt LR *et al.* (2010) The biology of speciation. *Evolution,* **64**, 295-315.

1046

1047   Smyth GK, Ritchie M, Thorne N (2015) Linear models for microarray and RNA-Seq data user's

1048   guide. R, doi:10.1093/nar/gkv007.

1049

1050   Stupar RM, Springer NM (2006) *Cis*-transcriptional variation in maize inbred lines B73 and

1051   Mo17 leads to additive expression patterns in the F1 hybrid. *Genetics*, **173**, 2199-2210.

1052

1053   Steige KA, Reimegård J, Koenig D *et al.* (2015) *Cis*-regulatory changes associated with a recent

1054   mating system shift and floral adaptation in *Capsella*. *Molecular Biology and Evolution,* **32**,

1055   2501-2514.

1056

1057   Steige KA, Laenen B, Reimegård J (2017) Genomic analysis reveals major determinants of cis-

1058   regulatory variation in *Capsella grandiflora*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences,*

1059   **114**, 1087-1092.

1060

1061   Stevenson KR, Coolon JD, Wittkopp PJ (2013) Sources of bias in measures of allele-specific

1062   expression derived from RNA-seq data aligned to a single reference genome. *BMC genomics,* **14**,

1063   536.

1064

1065   Swanson-Wagner R, Jia Y, De Cook R *et al.* (2006) All possible modes of gene action are

1066   observed in a global comparison of gene expression in a maize f1 hybrid and its inbred parents.

1067   *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **103,** 6805–6810.

1068

1069   Tang RJ, Yang Y, Yang L, *et al.* (2014) Poplar calcineurin B–like proteins *PtCBL10A* and

1070   *PtCBL10B* regulate shoot salt tolerance through interaction with *PtSOS2* in the vacuolar

1071   membrane. *Plant Cell and Environment*, **37**, 573–588

1072

1073   Thompson MJ, Jiggins CD 2014. Supergenes and their role in evolution. *Heredity*, **113**, 1–8.

1074

1075   Thorvaldsdóttir H, Robinson JT, Mesirov JP (2015) Integrative Genomics Viewer (IGV): high-

1076   performance genomics data visualization and exploration. *Briefings in Bioinformatics,* **14**, 1476-

1077   1486.

1078

1079   Tung J, Primus A, Bouley AJ, Severson TF, Alberts SC, Wray GA (2009) Evolution of a malaria

1080   resistance gene in wild primates. *Nature*, **460**, 388-391.

1081

1082   Twyford AD, Friedman J (2015) Adaptive divergence in the monkey flower *Mimulus guttatus* is

1083   maintained by a chromosomal inversion. *Evolution,* **69**, 1476-1486.

1084

1085   Twyford AD, Streisfeld MA, Lowry DB *et al.* Genomic studies on the nature of species:

1086   adaptation and speciation in *Mimulus. Molecular Ecology,* **24**, 2601-2609.

1087

1088   van Kleunen M (2007) Adaptive genetic differentiation in life-history traits between populations

1089   of *Mimulus guttatus* with annual and perennial life-cycles. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **21**,185-199.

1090

1091   Verhoeven KJF, Poorter H, Nevo E *et al.* (2008) Habitat-specific natural selection at a

1092   flowering-time QTL is a main driver of local adaptation in two wild barley populations.

1093   *Molecular Ecology,* **17,** 3416-3424.

1094

1095   Vickery RK (1952) A study of the genetic relationships in a sample of the *Mimulus guttatus*

1096   complex. PhD Dissertation, Stanford Univ., California.

1097

1098   Voelckel C, Gruenheit N, Lockhart P (2017) Evolutionary transcriptomics and proteomics:

1099   Insight into plant adaptation. *Trends in Plant Science*, **22**, 462-471.

1100

1101   Wadgymar S, Lowry DB, Gould BA *et al.* (2017) Identifying targets and agents of selection:

1102   innovative methods to evaluate the processes that contribute to local adaptation. *Methods in*

1103   *Ecology and Evolution*, **8**, 738-749.

1104

1105   Wang M, Uebbing S, Ellegren H (2017) Bayesian inference of allele-specific gene expression

1106   indicates abundant *cis*-regulatory variation in natural flycatcher populations. *Genome Biology*

1107   *and Evolution,* **9**, 1266-1279.

1108

1109   Wittkopp PJ, Haerum BK, Clark AG (2004) Evolutionary changes in *cis* and *trans* gene

1110   regulation. *Nature,* **430**, 85-88.

1111

1112   Wu CA, Lowry DB, Nutter LI *et al.* (2010) Natural variation for drought-response traits in the

1113   *Mimulus guttatus* species complex. *Oecologia,* **162**, 23-33.

1114

1115   Xiong L, Lee H, Ishitani M *et al.* (2002) Regulation of osmotic stress-responsive gene

1116   expression by the LOS6/ABA1 Locus in *Arabidopsis*. *The Journal of Biological Chemistry,* **277**,

1117   8588–8596.

1118

1119   Zhang X, Borevitz JO (2009) Global analysis of allele-specific expression in *Arabidopsis*

1120   *thaliana*. *Genetics,* **182**, 943-954.

1121

1122   **DATA ACCESSIBILITY**

1123   RNA-sequence data are deposited are available through the NCBI Sequence Read Archive under

1124   project identifier XX.

1125

1126   **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

1127   DBL designed and conducted the field experiment. YC conducted the laboratory work. BAG

1128   analyzed the data. DBL and BAG wrote the manuscript.

1129

1130

1131 **TABLES**

1132

1133 Table 1: Summary of model effects on expressed genes.

	Inversion 5 (246)		Inversion 8 (311)		Non-Inversion (8805)		total (9326)
Differential Expression (model 1):	no.	LFC	no.	LFC	no.	LFC	no.
Genotypic DE	201	0.893	239	0.932	6773	0.86	7213
Environmental DE	185	0.667	230	0.808	6350	0.729	6765
Genotype by Environment	**60***	0.19	61	0.213	1659	0.196	1780
Regulation effects (model 2):							
total DE genes	**204*****</br>		232		6490		6962
Cis regulation	158	1.023	**198***	1.04	5176	1.04	5532
Trans regulation	106	1.707	109	1.628	3396	1.229	3611

1134 *significantly greater percentage than non-inversion regions at p<0.05, **p<0.01.
1135 LFC: average magnitude (abs) log2 fold-change of genes with significant effects
1136

1137
1138
1139
1140 Table 2: Number and average effect size of differentially expressed genes within each habitat.

	Coast		Inland	
	no.	LFC	no.	LFC
Inversion 5 (246)	119	1.136	184	0.932
Inversion 8 (311)	**161***	1.092	210	0.993
Non-Inversion (8805)	3997	1.084	6195	0.897
Total (9326)	4277	1.085	**6589*****</br>**	**0.901*****</br>**

1141   *significantly greater than non-inversion regions at p<0.05
1142   *** significantly different than the coastal field site, p<0.001
1143   LFC: average magnitude (abs) log2 fold-change of genes with significant effects
1144

1145

Fig. 1 A) Map of Northern California with the location of two field transplant sites. Colors represent mean temperature of the warmest quarter in degrees C x 10. Inset: left, coastal ecotype; right, inland ecotype. B) The coastal field site. C) The inland field site.
D) SS parental gene expression at two field sites. E) LL parental gene expression at two field sites. F) Survival of parental and F1 (SL) plants at the two field sites.

Fig. 2 A) Average log2 fold-change (LFC) differences between parental genotypes for expressed transcripts at the two field sites. B) Expression reaction norms for inland (red) and coastal (blue) lines. The numbers correspond to the colored points in part A of the figure. LFC has been restricted to <3 and <-3 for graphing purposes. Note, 28 transcripts with ambiguous expression patterns have been excluded.

Fig.3. *Cis* and *trans* regulated transcripts detected at the coastal (A) and inland (B) field sites. Average log2-fold change (LFC) ratios are between inland and coastal alleles in the parental (y-axis) and F1 (x-axis) genetic backgrounds.

Fig.4. The frequency of significant model effects among all expressed transcripts.

Fig.5 Reaction norms of expression at two field sites for seven candidate adaptive genes. A) ABA1 – abscisic acid deficient 1; B) SOS1 – salt overly-sensitive 1; C) CBL10 -calcineurin B-like protein 10; D) HKT1-1, high-affinity K+ transporter (functions in salt tolerance); E) PGP19, p-glycoprotein 19 (functions in auxin transport); F) ARF8 – auxin response factor 8; G) SnRK2, Snf-related protein kinase (functions in salt tolerance); Red, inland genotype. Blue, coastal genotype. Pink, F1 hybrid.