Title: Unraveling patterns of disrupted gene expression across a complex tissue

Authors: Kelsie E. Hunnicutt*, Jeffrey M. Good[†,] and Erica L. Larson*

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9674-0630 (KEH)

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0707-5374 (JMG)

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3006-645X (ELL)

* University of Denver, Department of Biological Sciences, Denver, CO, 80208

† University of Montana, Division of Biological Sciences, Missoula, MO, 59812

Running title: Gene expression in complex tissues

Corresponding Authors:

Kelsie Hunnicutt

Department of Biological Sciences

University of Denver

Denver, CO 80208

Email: Kelsie.Hunnicutt@du.edu

Erica Larson

Department of Biological Sciences

University of Denver

Denver, CO 80208

Email: Erica.Larson@du.edu

24   ABSTRACT

Whole tissue RNASeq is the standard approach for studying gene expression divergence in

evolutionary biology and provides a snapshot of the comprehensive transcriptome for a given

tissue. However, whole tissues consist of diverse cell types differing in expression profiles, and

the cellular composition of these tissues can evolve across species. Here, we investigate the

effects of different cellular composition on whole tissue expression profiles. We compared gene

expression from whole testes and enriched spermatogenesis populations in two species of house

mice, *Mus musculus musculus* and *M. m. domesticus*, and their sterile and fertile F1 hybrids,

which differ in both cellular composition and regulatory dynamics. We found that cellular

composition differences skewed expression profiles and differential gene expression in whole

testes samples. Importantly, both approaches were able to detect large-scale patterns such as

disrupted X chromosome expression although whole testes sampling resulted in decreased power

to detect differentially expressed genes. We encourage researchers to account for histology in

RNASeq and consider methods that reduce sample complexity whenever feasible. Ultimately,

we show that differences in cellular composition between tissues can modify expression profiles,

potentially altering inferred gene ontological processes, insights into gene network evolution,

and processes governing gene expression evolution.

Key words: gene expression evolution, hybrid sterility, speciation, RNASeq, fluorescence-

activated cell sorting

47   INTRODUCTION

A single genome acts as the blueprint for all of the diverse cell types that comprise a eukaryotic

organism. This diversity of cellular function is achieved through the expression of individual

genes orchestrated by large, layered regulatory networks (Davidson and Erwin 2006; Wittkopp

2007). Often it is through gene expression that changes to the genome are connected to higher

level organismal phenotypes of primary interest, and the evolution of gene expression itself can

profoundly influence a species' evolutionary trajectory (King and Wilson 1975; Carroll 2008;

Stern and Orgogozo 2008). Gene expression is not a static biochemical phenotype – it is an

amalgamation of expression profiles of individual cell types as genes are turned on and off

across organismal space and developmental time. Bulk RNASeq of whole tissues allows us to

investigate these dynamics in non-model systems with minimal genomic resources and is

affordable and tractable for field-based studies (Alvarez et al. 2015). However, evolutionarily

important phenotypes often manifest in complex heterogenous tissues, such as sterility in

reproductive organs (Turner *et al.* 2012; Suzuki and Nachman 2015), behavioral changes in

neurological tissue (Sato *et al.* 2020), or color patterning across the body (Manceau *et al.* 2011;

Poelstra *et al.* 2014). Standard bulk sequencing approaches necessarily collapse the complexity

inherent to gene expression in these tissues and implicitly assume equivalent proportions of cell

types across different comparisons. But if the relative abundance of cell types differs between

contrasts, then we may be unable to distinguish regulatory divergence from differences in

cellular composition (Good et al. 2010; Montgomery and Mank 2016). What are the

consequences of using a whole tissue approach on expression profiles and how does this impact

inferences on evolutionary divergence?

Testes are emblematic of a complex tissue and are central to reproductive divergence and

speciation. Testes genes are among the most rapidly evolving at the level of protein sequence

(Torgerson et al. 2002; Good and Nachman 2005; Turner et al. 2008; Larson et al. 2016) and

gene expression (Brawand *et al.* 2011). Sperm, which are produced by the testes, are among the

most morphologically diverse animal cells (Pitnick et al. 2009) and are critical in both prezygotic

(*e.g.,* sperm competition) and postzygotic (*e.g.,* hybrid sterility) reproductive barriers between

species. Studies of whole testes expression have yielded great insights into the evolution of male

reproductive traits (*e.g.,* Catron and Noor 2008; Davis et al. 2015; Mack et al. 2016; Ma et al.

2018; Rafati et al. 2018), but relatively few studies have accounted for the cellular complexity of

testes, a factor which we expect to complicate evolutionary inference from whole tissues (Good

et al. 2010). Testes are dominated by various stages of developing sperm, primarily postmeiotic

cells (~ 70% in house mice; Bellvé et al. 1977), but also present are mitotic precursors,

endothelial cells, support cells (White-Cooper et al. 2009), and even multiple types of sperm in

some organisms (Whittington *et al.* 2019). The relative proportion of testes cell types is

evolvable and plastic (Ramm and Schärer 2014; Ramm et al. 2014) and can vary across species

(Lara *et al.* 2018), mating strategies (Firman *et al.* 2015), age (Ernst *et al.* 2019; Widmayer *et al.*

2020), and social conditions (Snyder 1967). For all these reasons, we might expect the cellular

composition of testes to differ – sometimes dramatically – between different species,

populations, or experimental contrasts.

The cellular complexity of tissues is often due to the developmental complexity of the

phenotypes those tissues produce. In testes, undifferentiated germ cells (spermatogonia) undergo

multiple rounds of mitosis then enter meiosis (spermatocytes) where they undergo two rounds of

cell division to produce four haploid cells (round spermatids). These cells then undergo dramatic

postmeiotic differentiation to produce mature spermatozoa. Each of these stages has a unique

gene expression profile (Shima et al. 2004; Green et al. 2018; Hermann et al. 2018) and is

subject to different selective pressures (Larson et al. 2018). Spermatogenesis in many animals

has an additional layer of developmental complexity in the form of the intricate regulation of the

sex chromosomes. During early meiosis in mice, the X chromosome is completely

transcriptionally inactivated (meiotic sex chromosome inactivation or MSCI; Handel 2004) and

remains repressed for the remainder of spermatogenesis (postmeiotic sex chromosome repression

or PSCR; Namekawa et al. 2006). Bulk whole testes sequencing aggregates these diverse

developmental stages, limiting our resolution into how the molecular mechanisms underlying

phenotypic change act in a developmental context (Larson et al. 2018).

The combination of the cellular heterogeneity and developmental complexity of testes is

particularly relevant in understanding the evolution of hybrid male sterility. We expect sterile

hybrids to have disrupted testes expression (Mack and Nachman 2017; Morgan *et al.* 2020), but

sterile hybrids are also likely to have different testes cell composition compared to fertile mice.

For example, some sterile house mouse hybrids have only a fourth as many postmeiotic cells

(Schwahn *et al.* 2018). These differences in cell composition alone might cause what looks like

differential gene regulation associated with hybridization. This is especially problematic when

differences in cell composition correspond to developmental timepoints where hybrid expression

is disrupted, such as with the disruption of X chromosome inactivation at MSCI (Good et al.

2010; Bhattacharyya et al. 2013; Campbell et al. 2013; Larson et al. 2017), and it is not clear

how patterns of stage-specific disruption in hybrids appear in whole testes where stages

exhibiting normal and disrupted X regulation are combined. Evidence for disrupted X

chromosome regulation in sterile hybrids varies across taxa (Davis et al. 2015; Rafati et al. 2018;

Bredemeyer et al. 2021), but outside of mice, most studies have been restricted to whole testes

RNASeq. Although these potentially confounding factors are often acknowledged in whole

tissue studies (Good et al. 2010; Turner et al. 2014; Davis et al. 2015; Mugal et al. 2020), no

systematic effort has been made to distinguish how differences in cellular composition can be

distinguished from underlying regulatory dynamics in hybrids using whole testes samples.

120   Here, we use two analogous RNASeq datasets of fertile and sterile F1 hybrids from *Mus*

musculus musculus and *M. m. domesticus* house mice (Mack *et al.* 2016; Larson *et al.* 2017) as a

model to investigate the effects of bulk whole tissue sequencing on divergent gene expression.

These subspecies form a hybrid zone in Europe where they produce subfertile hybrid males

(Turner et al. 2012). F1 hybrid males from wild-derived strains differ in severity of sterility

dependent on the strains and the direction of the cross (Britton-Davidian et al. 2005; Good et al.

2008; Mukaj et al. 2020), with more sterile crosses having greatly disrupted cellular composition

and gene expression (Good et al. 2010; Bhattacharyya et al. 2013; Campbell et al. 2013; Turner

and Harr 2014; Larson et al. 2017; Schwahn et al. 2018). We use comparisons of fertile and

sterile reciprocal F1 hybrids to disentangle the effects of cellular composition and disrupted

regulatory processes on divergent gene expression. We first examine which cell types contribute

to whole testes expression profiles then test predictions about the effects of cell type abundance

on whole testes comparisons. Finally, we assess whether signatures of disrupted gene regulation

during specific stages of spermatogenesis are detectable in a whole tissue approach and the

consequences of whole tissue sampling on differential gene expression. Collectively, we show

that inferences from comparative bulk RNASeq approaches are sensitive to changes in cellular

composition in complex tissues and advocate for an increased awareness of histology and tissue

morphology during study design of RNASeq in non-model systems to account for such effects.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Mouse strains and datasets

We used gene expression data from two recently published datasets analyzing disrupted hybrid

gene expression in whole testes (SRA PRJNA286765; Mack et al. 2016) and enriched cell

populations across four stages of spermatogenesis (SRA PRJNA296926; Larson et al. 2017).

Both studies sequenced transcriptomes from the same wild-derived inbred strains of the mouse

subspecies *M. m. domesticus* and *M. m. musculus*, and their F1 hybrids. For each subspecies, two

strains were crossed to generate intraspecific F1s to serve as parental controls, without the effects

of inbreeding depression on fertility (Good *et al.* 2008). The *M. m. domesticus* mice were

generated by crossing the strains WSB/EiJ and LEWES/EiJ, with LEWES dams for the whole

testes dataset and WSB dams for the enriched cell dataset (hereafter *dom*). *M. m. musculus* mice

were generated by crossing the strains PWK/PhJ and CZECHII/EiJ with PWK dams for the

whole testes dataset and CZECHII dams for the sorted cell dataset (hereafter *mus*). F1 hybrid

mice with differing severity of sterility were generated by reciprocally crossing LEWES and

PWK; PWK female × LEWES male hybrids are mostly sterile (hereafter *sterile*), LEWES female

× PWK male hybrids are mostly fertile (hereafter *fertile*). Mack et al. (2016) produced RNASeq

libraries from whole testes for each of the four crosses ((2 parental crosses + 2 hybrid crosses) x

3 replicates per cross, N = 12). Larson et al. (2017) used Fluorescence-Activated Cell Sorting

(FACS) to isolate enriched cell populations from four different stages of spermatogenesis:

Mitosis: spermatogonia (SP), Meiosis[Before X-Inact.]: leptotene and zygotene spermatocytes (LZ),

Meiosis[After X-Inact.]: diplotene spermatocytes (DIP), and Postmeiosis: round spermatids (RS) ((2

parental crosses + 2 hybrid crosses) x 3 replicates per cross x 4 cell types per replicate, N = 48).

In both studies, libraries were sequenced on an Illumina HiSeq 2000 (100 bp, PE).

Read mapping and count estimation

We processed both datasets in parallel. First, we used Trimmomatic v.0.38 (Bolger *et al.*

2014) to trim low quality bases from the first and last 5 bp of each read and bases averaging a

Phred score of less than 15 across a 4 bp sliding window. We retained reads with a minimum

length of 36 bp (Table S1). To avoid mapping bias, we aligned trimmed reads to published

pseudo-reference genomes for *M. m. musculus* and *M. m. domesticus* (Huang et al. 2007) using

TopHat v.2.1.1 (Trapnell *et al.* 2009) and retained up to 250 alignments per read for multi-

mapped reads. We used Lapels v.1.1.1 to convert alignments to the reference mouse genome

coordinates (GRCm38.p6) and merged alignments with suspenders v.0.2.6 (Holt et al. 2013;

Huang et al. 2014). We summarized read counts for annotated genes (Ensembl Release 96) using

FeatureCounts v.1.4.4 (Liao *et al.* 2014) for read pairs that aligned to the same chromosome (-B

and -C). We analyzed the count data with and without multi-mapped reads (-M) and across all

annotated genes or protein-coding genes only. We found consistent results using all approaches

and here present results using only uniquely mapped reads for all annotated genes, unless

otherwise specified. Whole testes samples averaged ~24 million mapped read pairs per sample

while sorted cell populations averaged ~8 million read pairs.

Characterizing expression patterns

To investigate how expression differed between both datasets, we defined expressed

genes as those with a minimum of one Fragment Per Kilobase of exon per Million mapped reads

(FPKM) in at least 3 samples within each dataset. This restricted our analysis to 16,824 genes

(12,587 protein-coding) in the whole testes dataset and 21,762 genes (14,284 protein-coding) in

the sorted cell dataset. We used R v.4.0.2 for all analyses. We conducted expression analyses

using the Bioconductor v.3.11 package edgeR v.3.30.3 (Robinson *et al.* 2010) and normalized

the data using the scaling factor method (Anders and Huber 2010).

Effects of cellular composition on whole testes expression

To first determine which cell types were present and contributing to the expression

profiles of both datasets, we tested all sample types for the expression of marker genes known to

be specifically expressed in certain cell types. We selected three marker genes from seven testes

cell types: spermatogonia, spermatocytes, round spermatids, elongating spermatids, Sertoli cells,

epithelial cells, and Leydig cells (Raymond *et al.* 2000; Nguyen *et al.* 2002; Maekawa *et al.*

2004; Li *et al.* 2007; Green *et al.* 2018) as well as marker genes from Hermann et al. (2018).

This approach allowed us to assess the purity of sorted cell populations by looking for the

expression of non-target cell types in sorted cell populations. We were also able to identify

which cell types contributed to the expression profile of whole testes.

Next, we tested the hypothesis that differential expression of stage-specific genes in

whole tissues can be caused by differences in the relative abundance of cell types between

comparisons—in this case *sterile* and *fertile* F1 hybrids (Fig 1; Good et al. 2010). We defined

sets of stage-specific genes using our sorted cell populations of each subspecies (Figs S1A, B;

Supplemental File 1). We considered a gene to be specific to a given cell population if its median

expression (normalized FPKM) was greater than two times its median expression across all other

sorted cell populations (*i.e.,* an induced gene approach as in Kousathanas et al. 2014). We then

compared the expression of these stage-specific genes in whole testes of *sterile* and *fertile*

hybrids. We did this separately for autosomal and X-linked genes because we expected the

forces driving patterns of expression to differ between the two. For autosomal genes, we

expected expression to be driven largely by differences in cell composition (*e.g.,* fewer later-stage cell types in *sterile* hybrids should lead to lower expression of stage-specific genes from later stages in *sterile* compared to *fertile* whole testes). In contrast, X chromosome inactivation is disrupted in *sterile* hybrids, which should lead to higher expression of stage-specific genes from later stages in *sterile* whole testes. For autosomal genes, we used one-sided paired Wilcoxon signed-rank tests to test if expression of stage-specific genes from more abundant cell types (Mitosis and Meiosis[Before X-Inact.]) was greater in *sterile* hybrid whole testes and if expression of stage-specific genes from less abundant cell types (Meiosis[After X-Inact.] and Postmeiosis) was lower in *sterile* hybrid whole testes. Because we did not know whether the effects of differing cellular compositions or misregulation of the X chromosome would be stronger for driving expression patterns of stage-specific X-linked genes in whole testes, we used two-sided Wilcoxon signed-rank tests for X-linked genes.

Fig. 1. Crossing design, sampling approach, and predicted cell composition and expression differences between reciprocal hybrids. We compared expression patterns using two sampling

approaches, enriched cell populations (red = Mitosis (SP), yellow = Meiosis[Before X-Inact.] (LZ),

green = Meiosis[After X-Inact.] (DIP), blue = Postmeiosis (RS)) and Whole Testes (WT). Whole testes

are susceptible to changes in cellular composition between hybrids while enriched cell

populations should be buffered from these effects. Relative expression of autosomal stage-

specific genes from each enriched cell population in whole testes samples is predicted to track

changes in cellular composition between *sterile* and *fertile* mice. Relative expression of X-linked

stage-specific genes from enriched cell populations is predicted to be influenced by both changes

in cellular composition and expected regulatory processes operating in those cell types.

To look for additional signatures of disrupted X-linked gene expression in both sampling

approaches, we first used one-sided Wilcoxon signed-rank tests to compare expression of X-

linked genes in *sterile* compared to *fertile* hybrids for each sample type where disrupted X-linked

expression was expected (*i.e.,* Meiosis[After X-Inact.], Postmeiosis, and Whole Testes). Then, we

defined sets of "detected" genes for each sample type as those expressed above an FPKM

threshold within a replicate (FPKM > 0 – 4) and ran one-way ANOVAs on the number of

detected X-linked genes in each cross within a sample type and conducted posthoc Tukey's tests.

Note, because there are only three replicates per sample type, these data inevitability violate

distribution assumptions in both parametric and non-parametric tests, and differences among

treatments should be considered largely qualitative.

Differential expression analysis

We conducted differential expression analysis between *sterile* and *fertile* hybrids for all

five sample types in edgeR. We fit each dataset (whole testes and sorted cells separately) with

negative binomial generalized linear models with Cox-Reid tagwise dispersion estimates

(McCarthy *et al.* 2012) and adjusted *P*-values to a false discovery rate (FDR) of 5% (Benjamini

and Hochberg 1995). We quantified the biological coefficient of variation (BCV) of parental

samples and hybrid samples combined and separately for each dataset. The BCV is the square

root of the dispersion parameter from the negative binomial model and represents variation in

gene expression among replicates (McCarthy *et al.* 2012). We used two bootstrapping

approaches to determine whether BCVs differed across datasets. First, we subsampled raw count

files for 10000 genes across 100 replicates and recalculated the BCV for four groups: hybrid

whole testes, parent whole testes, hybrid sorted cells, and parent sorted cells. Second, we

dropped one individual per group and recalculated the BCV for every set of n-1 individuals. For

both approaches, we estimated 99% confidence intervals for the bootstrap BCV estimates from

each group and approach (reported as CI_1 and CI_2, respectively).

We contrasted expression between *sterile* and *fertile* hybrids so that a positive log fold-

change (logFC) indicated over-expression in *sterile* males. For all pairwise comparisons of

sample types, we assessed the number of genes overlapping between both sets of differentially

expressed (DE) genes and the number of DE genes unique to each sample type in the

comparison. We also calculated whether the direction of fold change for a particular DE gene

switched between sample types (*e.g.,* an up-regulated DE gene in *sterile* whole testes that was a

down-regulated DE gene in any of the *sterile* sorted cell populations). We extended this analysis

comparing the direction of DE genes between sample types to parental samples, contrasting

expression between *mus* and *dom* parents so that a positive logFC indicated over-expression in

mus males. We tested for enrichment of specific chromosomes for DE genes between hybrids for

each sample type using hypergeometric tests in R (phyper) and adjusted *P*-values to an FDR of

5% (Benjamini and Hochberg 1995). To reduce false positives, we used only the number of

autosomal DE genes as the background in the hypergeometric tests because of the known over-

expression of the sex chromosomes in *sterile* hybrids (following Larson et al. 2016).

271   RESULTS

Whole testes showed unique expression patterns

Sample type, not cross, was the main driver of differences in expression profiles between

samples. All sorted cell populations and whole testes samples grouped into distinct clusters (Fig

2). Within each sample type, parents formed distinct clusters and hybrids had intermediate

expression. *Sterile* and *fertile* hybrids each tended to group more closely together within each

sorted cell population, but hybrid crosses were intermixed for whole testes and did not form a

distinct cluster.

Figure 2. Sample type then cross type drives differences in expression profiles.

Multidimensional scaling (MDS) plots of distances among and within sample types for expressed

genes across all chromosomes. Distances are calculated as the root-mean-square deviation

(Euclidean distance) of log2 fold changes among genes that distinguish each sample. Each cross

is indicated by a symbol (*mus* = △, *dom* = ▽, *fertile* = O, and *sterile* = X). Samples are colored

by sample type (red = Mitosis, yellow = Meiosis[Before X-Inact.], green = Meiosis[After X-Inact.], blue =

Postmeiosis, and purple = Whole Testes). The upper left MDS plot includes all sample types and

remaining plots show each sample type individually. Each sample type for each cross is

represented by three replicates.

Because of the apparent increased variation among whole testes hybrid samples, we next

quantified sample variation within both datasets. We measured variation among replicates using

the BCV, restricting our analysis to only protein coding genes. Whole testes had greater variation

among replicates (BCV = 0.347) compared to sorted cells (BCV = 0.182; Fig S2). Additionally,

hybrid whole testes had the greatest variation among replicates (BCV = 0.445; $CI_1 =$

[0.443,0.445]; $CI_2 =$ [0.375,0.514]) compared to parent whole testes (BCV = 0.207; $CI_1 =$

[0.207,0.208]; $CI_2 =$ [0.161,0.251]), parent sorted cells (BCV = 0.189; $CI_1 =$ [0.190,0.191]; $CI_2 =$

[0.185,0.192]), and hybrid sorted cells (BCV = 0.174; $CI_1 =$ [0.175,0.176]; $CI_2 =$ [0.171,0.177];

Fig S3-S5). When including all annotated genes in variance calculations, the BCV was still

greater in whole testes than in sorted cell populations despite the presence of some lowly

expressed and highly variable non-protein coding genes in the sorted cell dataset (Figs S6, S7).

Whole testes expression patterns are driven by diverse cell composition

We next quantified expression of two panels of marker genes associated with specific

testes cell types in fertile reference *mus* and *dom* samples, where gene expression is not expected

to be disrupted. This allowed us to assess the purity of sorted cell populations as determined by

expression of marker genes from non-target cell types and to ascertain which cell types were

contributing to the unique expression patterns observed in whole testes. Our first panel included

marker genes associated with spermatagonia (mitosis), spermatocytes (meiosis), round

spermatids (postmeiosis), elongating spermatids (postmeiosis), endothelial cells, Sertoli cells

(support cells), and Leydig cells (testosterone producing cells), while the second panel included

additional cell types (from Hermann et al. 2018; Figs S8, S9). Results from both marker panels

were consistent. As expected, sorted cell populations mostly expressed only marker genes

characteristic of their target cell type, overall indicating successful FACS enrichment (results for

dom Figs 3, S8, results for *mus* Figs S9, S10). Mitotic cells showed high expression of

spermatogonia markers and limited expression of non-target markers indicating relative cell

purity. However, intermediate expression of endothelial and Sertoli markers suggested that the

FACS protocol for isolating this cell population may also have captured other somatic cells.

Meiotic$^{\text{Before X-Inact.}}$ cells appeared to have some spermatogonia contamination, while Meiotic$^{\text{After}}$

$^{\text{X-Inact.}}$ cells showed very high purity, expressing only spermatocyte-specific markers. Postmeiotic

cells had high expression of round spermatid markers as expected, but also some expression of

elongating spermatid markers indicating that FACS may also have captured the developmental

transition to these cells.

Figure 3. Whole testes show signatures of more diverse cell types than enriched cell populations. Expression of cell-specific marker genes (Green et al. 2018) across each sample type for *dom* reference samples. We quantified expression (FPKM) of three marker genes (rows) associated with testes-specific cell types (columns). Each panel displays marker expression in each sample type (red = Mitosis (SP), yellow = Meiosis[Before X-Inact.] (LZ), green = Meiosis[After X-Inact.] (DIP), blue = Postmeiosis (RS), and purple = Whole Testes (WT)). Sample types are bolded in each panel where marker gene expression is expected. Note, *Ccnb3* expression is specific to Meiotic[Before X-Inact.] cells (Maekawa et al. 2004), and *Gmc1* is specific to Meiotic[After X-Inact.] cells (Nguyen et al. 2002).

Whole testes expressed marker genes characteristic of all seven testes cell types, particularly postmeiotic (round and elongating spermatids) and support cell types (endothelial, Sertoli, and Leydig cells) (Fig 3). Additionally, expression patterns on the X chromosome revealed a subset of X-linked genes unique to whole testes samples (Fig 4). These genes were

negligibly expressed in each of our sorted cell populations, providing further evidence that

additional cell types present in whole testes samples likely contributed to their expression profile.

Mitotic (spermatogonia) and meiotic (spermatocyte) markers were also expressed in whole testes

but at relatively lower FPKM values, which is consistent with the low relative proportion of

these cell types in whole testes (Bellvé *et al.* 1977; Ernst *et al.* 2019). This suggests that early

developmental cell types contributed less to whole testes expression profiles, consistent with the

hypothesis that the cellular composition of complex tissues can strongly influence relative

expression levels (Good et al. 2010).

Figure 4. Patterns of X-linked gene expression in *sterile* and *fertile* hybrids differ between sorted cells and whole testes. The upper panel displays expression distributions (as normalized FPKM) across replicates for each sample type across X-linked genes. FPKM values were normalized so that the sum of squares equals one using the R package vegan (Oksanen et al. 2007). Expression distributions are colored by sample type (red = Mitosis, yellow = Meiosis[Before X-Inact.], green = Meiosis[After X-Inact.], blue = Postmeiosis, and purple = Whole Testes) and labelled by

cross (*sterile* or *fertile* hybrid). These plots were generated with the R package beanplot

(Kampstra 2008) and differences in expression were calculated with Wilcoxon signed-rank tests

where *** indicates p < 0.001 and * indicates p < 0.05 after FDR correction (Benjamini and

Hochberg 1995). The lower panel shows a heatmap of X-linked gene expression plotted as

normalized FPKM values that are hierarchically clustered using Euclidean distance. Each row

represents a gene with darker colors indicating higher expression. The heatmap was generated

with the R package ComplexHeatmap v.2.3.2 (Gu *et al.* 2016).

Both changes in cellular composition of whole testes and regulatory divergence contribute to

expression differences in hybrids

We further tested whether changes in cellular composition of complex tissues influences

relative expression levels between contrasts. Indeed, we found that differences in whole testes

cell composition between *sterile* and *fertile* hybrids appears to be a large driver of differences in

relative expression of stage-specific genes (Fig 5). In *fertile* hybrids, whole testes are largely

composed of late spermatogensis cell types. In *sterile* hybrids, there is a disruption in

development immediately before normal MSCI, which triggers an apoptotic cascade and

decreases downstream meiotic and postmeiotic cell abundance (Schwahn *et al.* 2018). Based on

these histological predictions, we expected stage-specific genes from pre-X chromosome

inactivation stages (Mitosis and Meiosis[Before X-Inact.]) to appear over-expressed in *sterile* hybrids

and stage-specific genes from post-X chromosome inactivation stages (Meiosis[After X-Inact.] and

Postmeiosis) to appear under-expressed in *sterile* hybrids. Consistent with this, in whole testes,

autosomal Mitotic- and Meiotic[Before X-Inact.]-specific genes had higher expression in *sterile* hybrids

(one-sided Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test; autosomal Mitotic: n = 5307, V = 11247685, p = 0;

autosomal Meiotic[Before X-Inact]: n = 4215, V = 7988923, p = 0), while autosomal Meiotic[After X-Inact.]-

and Postmeiotic-specific genes had lower expression (one-sided Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test;

autosomal Meiotic[After X-Inact.]: n = 4544, V= 2005025, p = 1.46 x 10^{-276} ; autosomal Postmeiotic: n

= 7417, V = 4789686, p = 0; Fig 5).

Figure 5. Changes in cellular composition alters expression of stage-specific genes in whole

testes samples. For each sorted cell population, we defined a set of stage-specific genes and

compared their expression in whole testes of *sterile* and *fertile* hybrids. Mitotic and Meiotic[Before]

[X-Inact.] cells are present at lower abundances in *sterile* hybrids while Meiotic[After X-Inact.] and

Postmeiotic cells are present at higher abundances (Schwahn et al. 2018). FPKM is normalized

so that the sum of squares equals 1 using the R package vegan (Oksanen et al. 2007). Differences

in expression were calculated with Wilcoxon signed-rank tests where *** indicates p < 0.001

and * indicates p < 0.05 after FDR correction (Benjamini and Hochberg 1995).

Given the nature of hybrid sterility in house mice (Bhattacharyya et al. 2013), we had

different expectations for X-linked genes. The normal regulation of the X chromosome is not

disrupted in pre-X inactivation cell types, so differences in cellular composition should drive

expression patterns for stage-specific X-linked genes in pre-X inactivation cell types as with

autosomal genes. However, the X chromosome is over-expressed in post-X inactivation cell

types (Larson et al. 2017), so changes in cellular composition and known regulatory divergence

could influence expression patterns of post-X inactivation stage-specific genes in *sterile* whole

testes. As we predicted based on cell composition, X-linked Mitotic and Meiotic[Before X-Inact.] genes

still had higher expression in *sterile* hybrids (one-sided Wilcoxon signed-rank test; X-linked

Mitotic: n = 465, V = 95946, p = 1.16×10^{-47}; X-linked Meiotic[Before X-Inact.]: n = 361, V = 60492, p

= 1.53×10^{-44}). However, X-linked Meiotic[After X-Inact.] and Postmeiotic genes also had higher

expression (two-sided Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test; X-linked Meiotic[After X-Inact.]: n = 11, V = 56,

p = 0.0420; X-linked Postmeiotic: n = 252, V = 25826, p = 1.59×10^{-17}), indicating that the

disruption of X chromosome inactivation and repression in *sterile* hybrids had a stronger effect

on expression patterns than changes in cell composition, despite the lower abundances of these

cell types (Schwahn et al. 2018). Together these results indicate that the high proportion of

postmeiotic cells in whole testes is a major cause of differences in expression patterns of

autosomal and many X-linked genes between *sterile* and *fertile* whole testes samples.

We further investigated the detectability of patterns of disrupted X chromosome

regulation in *sterile* hybrids across both sampling approaches and found that whole testes

sampling partially masks signatures of X chromosome misexpression. Previous research using

sorted cell populations has shown that disruption of MSCI in *sterile* hybrids manifests as over-

expression of the X chromosome both in terms of more expressed X-linked genes and higher

average X-linked gene expression (Larson et al. 2017). We recovered the expected pattern of

higher X-linked gene expression in *sterile* hybrids in both sorted cell populations (one-sided

Wilcoxon signed-rank test; X-linked Meiosis[After X-Inact.]: n = 896, V = 273584, p = 5.34 x 10^{-60}; X-

linked Postmeiosis: n = 896, V = 290110, p = 1.18 x 10^{-64}; Fig 4) and in whole testes (one-sided

Wilcoxon signed-rank test; n = 896, V = 326947, p = 2.40 x 10^{-64}; Fig 4). We also found more

detected X-linked genes in Meiosis[After X-Inact.] ($F_{3,8}$ = 13.8, p = 1.58 x 10^{-3}; Fig S11A) and

Postmeiosis ($F_{3,8}$ = 31.87, p = 8.47 x 10^{-05}; Fig S11B), but there was no difference in the number

of detected X-linked genes in *sterile* whole testes ($F_{3,8}$ = 0.606, p = 0.629; Fig S11C), regardless

of the FPKM threshold used to define detected genes.

Whole testes sampling reduces power for differential expression inference

The increased variance among replicates and the resulting decreased power in the whole

testes dataset also greatly reduced the number of genes considered differentially expressed

between *sterile* and *fertile* hybrids in whole testes compared with sorted cell populations (Fig 6;

Table S2; Supplemental File 2). Fewer DE genes were detected between hybrids for whole testes

samples (DE genes = 83; Table S2) compared to sorted cell populations (Mitotic DE genes =

231, Meiotic[Before X-Inact.] DE genes = 178, Meiotic[After X-Inact.] DE genes = 343, and Postmeiotic DE

genes = 606). However, both whole testes and sorted cell populations exhibited similar broad

patterns of differential expression. In both datasets, more DE genes were upregulated in *sterile*

hybrids than were downregulated (Table S2), and we were able to detect enrichment of the X and

Y chromosomes for DE genes as previously reported (Larson et al. 2017; Fig S12; Tables S3,

S4). In addition, no DE genes between *sterile* and *fertile* hybrids were differentially up- or down-

regulated in whole testes samples compared to sorted cell populations (Table S5; Fig S13),

although we did find this pattern when comparing DE genes between *mus* and *dom* mice— a

small proportion of genes were differentially regulated in whole testes samples compared to

sorted cell populations (0.43% - 3.16%; Table S6; Supplemental Files S3, S4).

Figure 6. Whole testes and enriched cell populations differed in the number and identity of

dfferentially expressed genes. Spatial distribution of differentially expressed (DE) genes across

reference mouse genome chromosomes (build GRCm38.p6) between *sterile* and *fertile* hybrids

for all five sample types. Darker colors indicate genes up-regulated in *sterile* hybrids and lighter

colors indicated genes down-regulated in *sterile* hybrids.

Despite consistent patterns of enrichment of DE genes on the sex chromosomes and

direction of expression of DE genes between hybrids, there was very little overlap in DE genes

between each sample type. Whole testes samples shared very few genes in common with any of

the sorted cell populations (Fig 7). Additionally, there were very few DE genes shared across the

different stages of spermatogenesis, although the proportion of DE genes shared between sample

types generally increased with stricter fold change cutoffs (Table S7). Sorted cell samples often

have large repertoires of genes that were only differentially expressed within one cell type (Fig

7) though there was greater overlap of DE genes between post-X inactivation cell types

(Meiosis$^{\text{After X-Inact.}}$ and Postmeiosis). In sum, different sampling methodology clearly altered the

overall and gene-specific resolution of the regulatory underpinnings of hybrid male sterility.

Figure 7. Whole testes and enriched cell populations differed in pairwise comparisons of DE genes between *sterile* and *fertile* hybrids. The sample types in each comparison are indicated by the pair of connected dots in the bottom panel. For each comparison, DE genes common between the two sample types are indicated with a hollow circle and DE genes unique to each sample type in that comparison are colored by sample type (red = Mitosis, yellow = Meiosis[Before X-Inact.], green = Meiosis[After X-Inact.], blue = Postmeiosis, and purple = Whole Testes).

475   DISCUSSION

476   *Transcriptomic biases of complex tissues in evolutionary biology*

477   Bulk RNASeq of whole tissues has been the canonical method for characterizing

divergent expression in evolutionary biology as it is both cost-effective and tractable for wild

populations (Wang et al. 2009; Alvarez et al. 2015; Todd et al. 2016). Here we characterized

patterns of expression divergence in *sterile* and *fertile* F1 hybrid house mice that differ in cellular

composition using two approaches, whole testes sequencing and isolation of enriched cell

populations across different stages of spermatogenesis. We demonstrated that bulk RNASeq of

this complex tissue strongly reflected the cumulative contributions of diverse cell types and that

the relative cell type proportions in *sterile* and *fertile* hybrids influenced the expression of stage-

specific genes. This suggests that differential expression in whole tissues can be due to either cell

composition or regulatory divergence, and while these reflect fundamentally different

mechanisms, they may be confounded in comparisons between species. This is a critical

distinction given that researchers often interpret patterns of gene expression as reflecting per cell

changes in transcript levels. This biological interpretation is implicit in models of expression

evolution (Rohlfs and Nielsen 2015), which typically assume that cellular composition is stable

across species of interest. We must consider the cellular context of divergent gene expression

patterns (Montgomery and Mank 2016; Breschi et al. 2017; Buchberger et al. 2019), as the

tissues in which these phenotypes occur, such as reproductive organs (Ramm and Schärer 2014),

nervous tissues (Carlson et al. 2011; Davidson and Balakrishnan 2016), and plumage (Abolins-

Abols et al. 2018; Price-Waldman et al. 2020), may be prone to structural evolution, making

them extremely susceptible to confounded mechanisms inherent to whole tissue sampling.

Reproductive tissues are likely to be particularly prone to structural divergence, as

cellular composition is expected to evolve in response to selection for increased reproductive

success. For example, sperm competition leads to selection for males to increase sperm numbers

(Firman et al. 2013, 2018) or the proportion of sperm-producing tissue within the testes (Lüpold

et al. 2009). Sperm production can be increased in multiple ways, each of which has different

consequences for the cellular architecture of the testis (Schärer *et al.* 2011; Ramm and Schärer

2014). The non-sperm-producing tissue within the testes can also evolve in response to sexual

selection. An extreme example are Capybara, which devote ~30% of their testes to the

testosterone-producing Leydig cells (in sharp contrast to other rodents, where Leydig cells

comprise only 2.7-5.3% of testes; Costa et al. 2006; Lara et al. 2018). Differences in

reproductive investment can also drive apparent expression differences between species. Gene

expression divergence between humans and chimpanzees is elevated in testes relative to other

tissues, a pattern proposed to reflect positive selection on gene expression levels (Khaitovich et

al. 2005, 2006). However, whole testis transcriptomes tend to be more similar between species

with similar mating systems and cellular architectures (Brawand et al. 2011; Yapar et al. 2021),

which have presumably evolved convergently in response to investment in sperm production.

Our results show that in bulk tissues even minor testis cell types (such as Leydig cells and Sertoli

cells) contribute to overall expression profiles and suggest that differences in the proportion of

any cell type have the potential to strongly modify expression profiles of whole tissues.

Reducing sample complexity in evolutionary studies of expression divergence

Here we confirm that FACS is an effective way of isolating relatively pure cell types and

removing the effects of divergent cellular composition from experimental contrasts (Getun et al.

2011; da Cruz et al. 2016; Larson et al. 2016, 2017; Geisinger et al. 2021; Kopania et al. 2021).

There are of course, alternative methods available for bulk cell enrichment, such as gradient

centrifugation to separate testes cell types (Shima et al. 2004; Chalmel et al. 2007; Rolland et al.

2009). These approaches are well suited for testes, given the dramatic changes in cell size, DNA

content, and chromatin condensation during spermatogenesis (Bellvé 1993; Getun et al. 2011),

but mechanical or flow cytometry-based enrichment has also been developed for other complex

heterogeneous tissues (e.g., late term placenta; Li et al. 2020). There is the potential for FACS to

bias gene expression in enriched cell populations (*i.e.,* by triggering a stress response from

nozzle pressure or UV exposure; Box et al. 2020). However, cell sorting procedures appear to

have a minimal effect on overall expression profiles, and altered expression is likely consistent

across treatments within an experiment and can be mitigated by minimizing the time between

cell sorting, RNA extraction, and storage (Box et al. 2020). Beyond the limited and potentially

tissue-specific methods of bulk cell enrichment, recent advances in single cell sequencing

technology (scRNA-Seq) and spatial transcriptomic methods (*e.g.,* sci-SPACE, Srivatsan et al.

2021) can allow researchers to assay a greater number of cell types across many tissue types

without *a priori* identification or labelling (Kiselev et al. 2019). Although both FACS and

scRNA-Seq are both powerful approaches for studying gene expression evolution in tissues with

cellular composition differences (Kopania et al. 2021; Murat et al. 2021), they are both currently

difficult to apply in non-model systems, especially for field-based studies, as they typically

require access to flow cytometers and a short timeline for tissue biopsy, cell sorting, and RNA

extraction (Getun et al. 2011; Bageritz and Raddi 2019, but see also Wohnhaas et al. 2019;

Denisenko et al. 2020). Additionally, scRNA-Seq protocols likely have some of the same sources

of biased gene expression as FACS, and further research should be done to determine how

different enrichment protocols alter expression inferences.

When cell enrichment protocols are not feasible, alternative methods are available for

minimizing developmental or cellular complexity differences between species or experimental

contrasts. For example, different stages of sperm development can be isolated by sampling whole

testes at different points in early sexual development (Schultz et al. 2003; Shima et al. 2004;

Laiho et al. 2013), across annual reproductive cycles (Rolland et al. 2009), or spatially, as in

Drosophila, where sperm develop in tubular testes, allowing dissection of distinct regions that

are enriched for particular cell types (Meiklejohn et al. 2011; Landeen et al. 2016). Furthermore,

some developmentally heterogenous samples can be artificially synchronized, for example by

shaving hair or plucking feathers and sampling across regrowth timelines (Poelstra et al. 2014,

2015; Ferreira et al. 2017). Microdissection of complex tissues is also a feasible way to minimize

the effects of cellular composition on transcriptomic profiles. For example, laser capture

microdissection provides a means to rapidly and precisely isolate cellular populations from

complex tissues (Emmert-Buck et al. 1996), albeit with the added requirement of highly

specialized instrumentation. It is common in behavioral research to dissect out major regions of

the brain rather than sampling the whole brain (Khrameeva et al. 2020; Sato et al. 2020). Thus, a

chemical or mechanical approach to partitioning complex tissues can provide researchers with a

way of minimizing the negative effects associated with bulk RNASeq in their own studies.

Despite the potentially confounding effects of cellular composition and regulatory

divergence in whole tissue sampling, a bulk RNASeq approach is appropriate in cases where a

cell type of interest is not easily isolated or when researchers wish to capture all developmental

stages. For example, Larson et al. (2017) used FACS to isolate only four stages of

spermatogenesis, but postzygotic isolation barriers can operate at many different stages of

spermatogenesis (Oka et al. 2010; Ishishita et al. 2015; Torgasheva and Borodin 2016; Schwahn

et al. 2018; Yoshikawa et al. 2018; Liang and Sharakhov 2019). In these situations, bulk

RNASeq can allow researchers to investigate expression differences in hard to obtain cell types.

Indeed, some evolutionary inferences may be robust to sampling strategy. The misexpressed

genes in hybrids identified by Mack et al. (2016) overlapped substantially with sterility eQTLs

identified in wild hybrids from natural hybrid zones of *M. m. musculus* and *M. m. domesticus*

populations (Turner and Harr 2014), suggesting that despite the decreased power and

susceptibility to artifacts introduced by differences in cellular composition associated with bulk

tissue sampling, the genes that are identified are likely genes of large effect and have a high

likelihood of being biologically meaningful. For all these reasons, bulk tissue sampling may be

an appropriate first step depending on the system and questions being addressed.

It is also possible to use computational approaches, such as *in silico* deconvolution

methods to estimate changes in cell type proportions across samples or quantify cell type-

specific expression profiles (Shen-Orr and Gaujoux 2013; Avila Cobos et al. 2018; Newman et

al. 2019). These methods rely on expression profiles from single-cell data and accurate estimates

of cellular proportions (Shen-Orr and Gaujoux 2013; Avila Cobos et al. 2018), which can be

challenging to obtain in non-model systems but are likely to become increasingly more

accessible as technologies advance. Deconvolution may also be less accurate when the

expression of specific genes varies across stages because the net expression of a gene in a whole

tissue may differ from its stage-specific expression. While we found that DE genes between

sterile and *fertile* hybrids had consistent direction of differential expression between our whole

testes samples and sorted cell populations, in our comparisons of DE genes between *mus* and

dom mice, we found DE genes that had the opposite regulation patterns between sample types.

Deconvolution methods in studies of hybrid misexpression may also be inherently flawed given

that there is often no single "sterile" phenotype (Good et al. 2008; Turner et al. 2012; Larson et

al. 2017; Bikchurina et al. 2018) and that the reference expression profiles used for

deconvolution may be disrupted in hybrids (Landeen et al. 2016; Morgan et al. 2020; Mugal et

al. 2020; Brekke et al. 2021). Given these drawbacks, we advocate that detailed histological

analysis of how the phenotype of interest manifests in complex, heterogenous tissues (Oka et al.

2010; Schwahn et al. 2018) should accompany any evolutionary study based on comparative

transcriptomic data, so that researchers can mediate biases associated with sampling

methodology when designing future studies.

Power to detect differential expression using bulk RNASeq

The primary analytical goal of most RNASeq studies is to identify DE genes. It is vital

that we can accurately determine which genes are differentially expressed because we use these

patterns for a myriad of downstream analyses. Accurate assessment should also increase

resolution into the genomic basis of phenotypes of interest. We found that bulk RNASeq can

hinder differential expression analyses through an increase in replicate variability, potentially

masking biologically meaningful changes in gene expression. RNASeq analyses are sensitive to

both technical and biological variation (Todd et al. 2016), and studies of outbred wild

populations are inherently disadvantaged because of the power lost from increased biological

variation (Liu et al. 2014; Todd et al. 2016). The BCV is an estimate of the variation among

biological replicates and is correlated with power to detect DE genes. We found that in inbred

strains of house mice, whole testes had higher inter-replicate variability in expression than sorted

cell populations and levels of variation closer to what would be expected for an outbred wild

population (BCVs greater then 0.3; McCarthy et al. 2012; Todd et al. 2016) than for genetically

identical model organisms (BCV less than 0.2). We suggest that reporting BCV should become a

best-practices standard for all RNASeq studies so that researchers may better understand the

nature of biological variation in gene expression across a variety of evolutionary contrasts.

Consistent with the increased BCV in whole testes samples, we found that fewer genes were

differentially expressed in whole testes samples than in sorted cell populations and that DE genes

in whole testes had little overlap with DE genes in sorted cell populations. However, this overlap

proportionally increased with stricter fold change cutoffs, which strongly supports using these

cutoffs to decrease the chance of detecting false positive DE genes (as proposed by Montgomery

and Mank 2016). The downside to this more conservative approach was that the higher fold

change cutoffs likely led to the exclusion of some genes with biologically relevant expression

differences.

624   Ultimately, both whole tissue and cell enrichment-based approaches were able to detect

broad-scale patterns of disrupted sex chromosome expression in *sterile* hybrids. In house mice,

MSCI is disrupted in *sterile* hybrids (Bhattacharyya et al. 2013; Davies et al. 2016; Gregorova et

al. 2018), leading to an over-expression of X-linked genes (Good et al. 2010; Campbell et al.

2013; Turner et al. 2014). Both Mack *et al.* (2016) and Larson *et al.* (2017) found higher

expression of genes across the X chromosome in *sterile* hybrids, but our results show that it is

more difficult to detect an increased number of expressed X-linked DE genes between *sterile*

hybrids and their parents using whole testes sampling. Patterns of X-linked over-expression can

also be recovered in whole testes given *a priori* knowledge of stage-specific genes for cell types

where the X chromosome should be inactivated or repressed. Of course, approaches relying on

orthologous sets of stage-specific genes from other species will be limited to species with close

evolutionary relationships to model organisms. A sensitivity of the regulatory mechanisms

controlling sex chromosome expression during male meiosis has been proposed to be a major

mechanism underlying hybrid sterility (Lifschytz and Lindsley 1972), but so far, genomic

evidence for disrupted MSCI and downstream postmeiotic repression in other mammalian taxa is

conflicting. In sterile hybrid cats, the X chromosome is misexpressed and MSCI is disrupted

(Davis et al. 2015; Bredemeyer et al. 2021), while sterile rabbit hybrids do not support a role of

X chromosome misexpression in speciation (Rafati *et al.* 2018). Studies outside of house mice

have largely relied on bulk whole testes sequencing (but see Bredemeyer et al. 2021) and

understanding if the detected or undetected misexpression of the X is biologically accurate is

important for determining the role of disrupted sex chromosome regulation in postzygotic

isolation and speciation. Using targeted approaches can give us the developmental perspective

needed for contextualizing the origins of reproductive barriers (Cutter and Bundus 2020).

Conclusions

Here, we demonstrate important consequences of differing cell composition in

identifying DE genes in the context of hybrid sterility. We advocate for sampling approaches

which allow for developmental perspectives in RNASeq studies, so that we can accurately probe

species barriers. These same issues are important for other evolutionary contrasts in complex

tissues, and we underscore the importance of considering the cellular and developmental context

of complex expression in evolutionary studies. Our results suggest that sampling methodology

could influence the biological implications of not only hybrid misexpression in speciation, but

also across studies of divergent gene expression broadly. The consequences of whole tissue

sampling of complex tissues have the potential to alter not only inferred gene ontological

processes, but also the structure and evolution of gene networks, the relative importance of cis-

and trans-regulatory evolution, and even insights into the processes and rates underlying

expression evolution.

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship to

KEH (DGE- 2034612), an NSF grant to ELL (DEB 1557059), and grants from the Eunice

Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development of the National

Institutes of Health (R01-HD073439, R01-HD094787) to JMG. We would like to thank Jonathan

Velotta and members of the Larson and Tinghitella Labs for feedback on this project and Ben

Fotovich, Ivan Kovanda, and the IT Department at the University of Denver for support using

the High Performance Computing Cluster.

Author contributions: KEH, ELL, and JMG conceived of the study. KEH conducted the

analyses. KEH and ELL wrote the manuscript with input from JMG.

Data accessibility: There is no data to be archived. Scripts used in the manuscript will be

available upon publication at https://github.com/KelsieHunnicutt.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

LITERATURE CITED

Abolins-Abols, M., E. Kornobis, P. Ribeca, K. Wakamatsu, M. P. Peterson, E. D. Ketterson, and

B. Milá. 2018. Differential gene regulation underlies variation in melanic plumage

coloration in the dark-eyed junco (Junco hyemalis). Mol. Ecol. 27:4501–4515.

Alvarez, M., A. W. Schrey, and C. L. Richards. 2015. Ten years of transcriptomics in wild

populations: what have we learned about their ecology and evolution? Mol. Ecol.

24:710–725.

Anders, S., and W. Huber. 2010. Differential expression analysis for sequence count data. Nat.

Prec., doi: 10.1038/npre.2010.4282.2.

Avila Cobos, F., J. Vandesompele, P. Mestdagh, and K. De Preter. 2018. Computational

deconvolution of transcriptomics data from mixed cell populations. Bioinformatics

34:1969–1979.

Bageritz, J., and G. Raddi. 2019. Single-cell RNA sequencing with Drop-Seq. Methods Mol.

Biol. 1979:73–85.

Bellvé, A. R. 1993. Purification, culture, and fractionation of spermatogenic cells. Pp. 84–113 *in*

P. M. Wassarman and M. L. DePamphilis, eds. Methods in Enzymology. Academic

Press, London.

Bellvé, A. R., J. C. Cavicchia, C. F. Millette, D. A. O'Brien, Y. M. Bhatnagar, and M. Dym.

1977. Spermatogenic cells of the prepuberal mouse. Isolation and morphological

characterization. J. Cell Biol. 74:68–85.

Benjamini, Y., and Y. Hochberg. 1995. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and

powerful approach to multiple testing. J. R. Stat. Soc. 57:289–300.

Bhattacharyya, T., S. Gregorova, O. Mihola, M. Anger, J. Sebestova, P. Denny, P. Simecek, and J. Forejt. 2013. Mechanistic basis of infertility of mouse intersubspecific hybrids. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 110:E468–E477.

Bikchurina, T. I., K. V. Tishakova, E. A. Kizilova, S. A. Romanenko, N. A. Serdyukova, A. A. Torgasheva, and P. M. Borodin. 2018. Chromosome synapsis and recombination in male-sterile and female-fertile interspecies hybrids of the dwarf hamsters (Phodopus, Cricetidae). Genes 9:227.

Bolger, A. M., M. Lohse, and B. Usadel. 2014. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data. Bioinformatics 30:2114–2120.

Box, A., M. DeLay, S. Tighe, S. V. Chittur, A. Bergeron, M. Cochran, P. Lopez, E. M. Meyer, A. Saluk, S. Thornton, and K. Brundage. 2020. Evaluating the Effects of Cell Sorting on Gene Expression. J. Biomol. Tech. 31:100–111.

Brawand, D., M. Soumillon, A. Necsulea, P. Julien, G. Csárdi, P. Harrigan, M. Weier, A. Liechti, A. Aximu-Petri, M. Kircher, F. W. Albert, U. Zeller, P. Khaitovich, F. Grützner, S. Bergmann, R. Nielsen, S. Pääbo, and H. Kaessmann. 2011. The evolution of gene expression levels in mammalian organs. Nature 478:343–348.

Bredemeyer, K. R., C. M. Seabury, M. J. Stickney, J. R. McCarrey, B. M. vonHoldt, and W. J. Murphy. 2021. Rapid macrosatellite evolution promotes X-Linked hybrid male sterility in a feline interspecies cross. Mol. Biol. Evol., doi: 10.1093/molbev/msab274.

Brekke, T. D., E. C. Moore, S. C. Campbell-Staton, C. M. Callahan, Z. A. Cheviron, and J. M. Good. 2021. X chromosome-dependent disruption of placental regulatory networks in hybrid dwarf hamsters. Genetics 218:iyab043.

Breschi, A., T. R. Gingeras, and R. Guigó. 2017. Comparative transcriptomics in human and

mouse. Nat. Rev. Genet. 18:425–440.

Britton-Davidian, J., F. Fel-Clair, J. Lopez, P. Alibert, and P. Boursot. 2005. Postzygotic

isolation between the two European subspecies of the house mouse: estimates from

fertility patterns in wild and laboratory-bred hybrids. Biol. J. Linn. Soc. Lond. 84:379–

393.

Buchberger, E., M. Reis, T.-H. Lu, and N. Posnien. 2019. Cloudy with a chance of insights:

context dependent gene regulation and implications for evolutionary studies. Genes

10:492.

Campbell, P., J. M. Good, and M. W. Nachman. 2013. Meiotic sex chromosome inactivation is

disrupted in sterile hybrid male house mice. Genetics 193:819–828.

Carlson, B. A., S. M. Hasan, M. Hollmann, D. B. Miller, L. J. Harmon, and M. E. Arnegard.

2011. Brain evolution triggers increased diversification of electric fishes. Science

332:583–586.

Carroll, S. B. 2008. Evo-devo and an expanding evolutionary synthesis: a genetic theory of

morphological evolution. Cell 134:25–36.

Catron, D. J., and M. A. F. Noor. 2008. Gene expression disruptions of organism versus organ in

Drosophila species hybrids. PLoS One 3:e3009.

Chalmel, F., A. D. Rolland, C. Niederhauser-Wiederkehr, S. S. W. Chung, P. Demougin, A.

Gattiker, J. Moore, J.-J. Patard, D. J. Wolgemuth, B. Jégou, and M. Primig. 2007. The

conserved transcriptome in human and rodent male gametogenesis. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.

U. S. A. 104:8346–8351.

746 Costa, D. S., T. A. R. Paula, and S. L. P. Matta. 2006. The intertubular compartment

747   morphometry in capybaras (Hydrochoerus hydrochaeris) testis. Anim. Reprod. Sci.

748   91:173–179.

749 Cutter, A. D., and J. D. Bundus. 2020. Speciation and the developmental alarm clock. Elife

750   9:e56276.

751 da Cruz, I., R. Rodríguez-Casuriaga, F. F. Santiñaque, J. Farías, G. Curti, C. A. Capoano, G. A.

752   Folle, R. Benavente, J. R. Sotelo-Silveira, and A. Geisinger. 2016. Transcriptome

753   analysis of highly purified mouse spermatogenic cell populations: gene expression

754   signatures switch from meiotic-to postmeiotic-related processes at pachytene stage. BMC

755   Genomics 17:294.

756 Davidson, E. H., and D. H. Erwin. 2006. Gene regulatory networks and the evolution of animal

757   body plans. Science 311:796–800.

758 Davidson, J. H., and C. N. Balakrishnan. 2016. Gene regulatory evolution during speciation in a

759   songbird. G3 6:1357–1364.

760 Davies, B., E. Hatton, N. Altemose, J. G. Hussin, F. Pratto, G. Zhang, A. G. Hinch, D. Moralli,

761   D. Biggs, R. Diaz, C. Preece, R. Li, E. Bitoun, K. Brick, C. M. Green, R. D. Camerini-

762   Otero, S. R. Myers, and P. Donnelly. 2016. Re-engineering the zinc fingers of PRDM9

763   reverses hybrid sterility in mice. Nature 530:171–176.

764 Davis, B. W., C. M. Seabury, W. A. Brashear, G. Li, M. Roelke-Parker, and W. J. Murphy.

765   2015. Mechanisms underlying mammalian hybrid sterility in two feline interspecies

766   models. Mol. Biol. Evol. 32:2534–2546.

767 Denisenko, E., B. B. Guo, M. Jones, R. Hou, L. de Kock, T. Lassmann, D. Poppe, O. Clément,

768   R. K. Simmons, R. Lister, and A. R. R. Forrest. 2020. Systematic assessment of tissue

dissociation and storage biases in single-cell and single-nucleus RNA-seq workflows.

Genome Biol. 21:130.

Emmert-Buck, M. R., R. F. Bonner, P. D. Smith, R. F. Chuaqui, Z. Zhuang, S. R. Goldstein, R.

A. Weiss, and L. A. Liotta. 1996. Laser capture microdissection. Science 274:998–1001.

Ernst, C., N. Eling, C. P. Martinez-Jimenez, J. C. Marioni, and D. T. Odom. 2019. Staged

developmental mapping and X chromosome transcriptional dynamics during mouse

spermatogenesis. Nat. Commun. 10:1251.

Ferreira, M. S., P. C. Alves, C. M. Callahan, J. P. Marques, L. S. Mills, J. M. Good, and J. Melo-

Ferreira. 2017. The transcriptional landscape of seasonal coat colour moult in the

snowshoe hare. Mol. Ecol. 26:4173–4185.

Firman, R. C., F. Garcia-Gonzalez, L. W. Simmons, and G. I. André. 2018. A competitive

environment influences sperm production, but not testes tissue composition, in house

mice. J. Evol. Biol. 31:1647–1654.

Firman, R. C., F. Garcia-Gonzalez, E. Thyer, S. Wheeler, Z. Yamin, M. Yuan, and L. W.

Simmons. 2015. Evolutionary change in testes tissue composition among experimental

populations of house mice. Evolution 69:848–855.

Firman, R. C., I. Klemme, and L. W. Simmons. 2013. Strategic adjustments in sperm production

within and between two island populations of house mice. Evolution 67:3061–3070.

Geisinger, A., R. Rodríguez-Casuriaga, and R. Benavente. 2021. Transcriptomics of meiosis in

the male mouse. Front Cell Dev Biol 9:446.

Getun, I. V., B. Torres, and P. R. J. Bois. 2011. Flow cytometry purification of mouse meiotic

cells. J. Vis. Exp. e2602.

Good, J. M., T. Giger, M. D. Dean, and M. W. Nachman. 2010. Widespread over-expression of

the X chromosome in sterile F1 hybrid mice. PLoS Genet. 6:e1001148.

Good, J. M., M. A. Handel, and M. W. Nachman. 2008. Asymmetry and polymorphism of

hybrid male sterility during the early stages of speciation in house mice. Evolution

62:50–65.

Good, J. M., and M. W. Nachman. 2005. Rates of protein evolution are positively correlated with

developmental timing of expression during mouse spermatogenesis. Mol. Biol. Evol.

22:1044–1052.

Green, C. D., Q. Ma, G. L. Manske, A. N. Shami, X. Zheng, S. Marini, L. Moritz, C. Sultan, S. J.

Gurczynski, B. B. Moore, M. D. Tallquist, J. Z. Li, and S. S. Hammoud. 2018. A

comprehensive roadmap of murine spermatogenesis defined by single-cell RNA-Seq.

Dev. Cell 46:651-667.e10.

Gregorova, S., V. Gergelits, I. Chvatalova, T. Bhattacharyya, B. Valiskova, V. Fotopulosova, P.

Jansa, D. Wiatrowska, and J. Forejt. 2018. Modulation of Prdm9-controlled meiotic

chromosome asynapsis overrides hybrid sterility in mice. Elife 7:e34282.

Gu, Z., R. Eils, and M. Schlesner. 2016. Complex heatmaps reveal patterns and correlations in

multidimensional genomic data. Bioinformatics 32:2847–2849.

Handel, M. A. 2004. The XY body: a specialized meiotic chromatin domain. Exp. Cell Res.

296:57–63.

Hermann, B. P., K. Cheng, A. Singh, L. Roa-De La Cruz, K. N. Mutoji, I.-C. Chen, H.

Gildersleeve, J. D. Lehle, M. Mayo, B. Westernströer, N. C. Law, M. J. Oatley, E. K.

Velte, B. A. Niedenberger, D. Fritze, S. Silber, C. B. Geyer, J. M. Oatley, and J. R.

McCarrey. 2018. The mammalian spermatogenesis single-cell transcriptome, from

spermatogonial stem cells to spermatids. Cell Rep. 25:1650-1667.e8.

Holt, J., S. Huang, L. McMillan, and W. Wang. 2013. Read annotation pipeline for high-

throughput sequencing data. Pp. 605–612 *in* Proceedings of the International Conference

on Bioinformatics, Computational Biology and Biomedical Informatics - BCB'13. ACM

Press, New York, New York, USA.

Huang, S., J. Holt, C.-Y. Kao, L. McMillan, and W. Wang. 2014. A novel multi-alignment

pipeline for high-throughput sequencing data. Database 2014:bau057.

Huang, S., C.-Y. Kao, L. McMillan, and W. Wang. 2007. Transforming genomes using MOD

files with applications. Pp. 595–604 *in* Proceedings of the International Conference on

Bioinformatics, Computational Biology and Biomedical Informatics - BCB'13. ACM

Press, New York, New York, USA.

Ishishita, S., K. Tsuboi, N. Ohishi, K. Tsuchiya, and Y. Matsuda. 2015. Abnormal pairing of X

and Y sex chromosomes during meiosis I in interspecific hybrids of Phodopus campbelli

and P. sungorus. Sci. Rep. 5:9435.

Kampstra, P. 2008. Beanplot: A boxplot alternative for visual comparison of distributions. J.

Stat. Softw. 28.

Khaitovich, P., I. Hellmann, W. Enard, K. Nowick, M. Leinweber, H. Franz, G. Weiss, M.

Lachmann, and S. Pääbo. 2005. Parallel patterns of evolution in the genomes and

transcriptomes of humans and chimpanzees. Science 309:1850–1854.

Khaitovich, P., J. Kelso, H. Franz, J. Visagie, T. Giger, S. Joerchel, E. Petzold, R. E. Green, M.

Lachmann, and S. Pääbo. 2006. Functionality of intergenic transcription: an evolutionary

comparison. PLoS Genet. 2:e171.

Khrameeva, E., I. Kurochkin, D. Han, P. Guijarro, S. Kanton, M. Santel, Z. Qian, S. Rong, P.

Mazin, M. Sabirov, M. Bulat, O. Efimova, A. Tkachev, S. Guo, C. C. Sherwood, J. G.

Camp, S. Pääbo, B. Treutlein, and P. Khaitovich. 2020. Single-cell-resolution

transcriptome map of human, chimpanzee, bonobo, and macaque brains. Genome Res.

30:776–789.

King, M. C., and A. C. Wilson. 1975. Evolution at two levels in humans and chimpanzees.

Science 188:107–116.

Kiselev, V. Y., T. S. Andrews, and M. Hemberg. 2019. Challenges in unsupervised clustering of

single-cell RNA-seq data. Nat. Rev. Genet. 20:273–282.

Kopania, E. E. K., E. L. Larson, C. Callahan, S. Keeble, and J. M. Good. 2021. Molecular

evolution across mouse spermatogenesis. bioRxiv, doi: 10.1101/2021.08.04.455131.

Kousathanas, A., D. L. Halligan, and P. D. Keightley. 2014. Faster-X adaptive protein evolution

in house mice. Genetics 196:1131–1143.

Laiho, A., N. Kotaja, A. Gyenesei, and A. Sironen. 2013. Transcriptome profiling of the murine

testis during the first wave of spermatogenesis. PLoS One 8:e61558.

Landeen, E. L., C. A. Muirhead, L. Wright, C. D. Meiklejohn, and D. C. Presgraves. 2016. Sex

chromosome-wide transcriptional suppression and compensatory cis-regulatory evolution

mediate gene expression in the Drosophila male germline. PLoS Biol. 14:e1002499.

Lara, N. L. M., G. M. J. Costa, G. F. Avelar, S. M. S. N. Lacerda, R. A. Hess, and L. R. de

França. 2018. Testis physiology—overview and histology. Pp. 105–116 *in* M. K. Skinner,

ed. Encyclopedia of Reproduction. Academic Press, London.

Larson, E. L., S. Keeble, D. Vanderpool, M. D. Dean, and J. M. Good. 2017. The composite

regulatory basis of the large X-effect in mouse speciation. Mol. Biol. Evol. 34:282–295.

Larson, E. L., E. E. K. Kopania, and J. M. Good. 2018. Spermatogenesis and the evolution of

mammalian sex chromosomes. Trends Genet. 34:722–732.

Larson, E. L., D. Vanderpool, S. Keeble, M. Zhou, B. A. J. Sarver, A. D. Smith, M. D. Dean, and

J. M. Good. 2016. Contrasting levels of molecular evolution on the mouse X

chromosome. Genetics 203:1841–1857.

Li, H., Q. Huang, Y. Liu, and L. X. Garmire. 2020. Single cell transcriptome research in human

placenta. Reproduction 160:R155–R167.

Li, Y.-F., W. He, K. N. Jha, K. Klotz, Y.-H. Kim, A. Mandal, S. Pulido, L. Digilio, C. J.

Flickinger, and J. C. Herr. 2007. FSCB, a novel protein kinase A-phosphorylated

calcium-binding protein, is a CABYR-binding partner involved in late steps of fibrous

sheath biogenesis. J. Biol. Chem. 282:34104–34119.

Liang, J., and I. V. Sharakhov. 2019. Premeiotic and meiotic failures lead to hybrid male sterility

in the Anopheles gambiae complex. Proc. Biol. Sci. 286:20191080.

Liao, Y., G. K. Smyth, and W. Shi. 2014. featureCounts: an efficient general purpose program

for assigning sequence reads to genomic features. Bioinformatics 30:923–930.

Lifschytz, E., and D. L. Lindsley. 1972. The role of X-chromosome inactivation during

spermatogenesis. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 69:182–186.

Liu, Y., J. Zhou, and K. P. White. 2014. RNA-seq differential expression studies: more sequence

or more replication? Bioinformatics 30:301–304.

Lüpold, S., G. M. Linz, J. W. Rivers, D. F. Westneat, and T. R. Birkhead. 2009. Sperm

competition selects beyond relative testes size in birds. Evolution 63:391–402.

Ma, S., A. S. Avanesov, E. Porter, B. C. Lee, M. Mariotti, N. Zemskaya, R. Guigo, A. A.

Moskalev, and V. N. Gladyshev. 2018. Comparative transcriptomics across 14

Drosophila species reveals signatures of longevity. Aging Cell 17:e12740.

Mack, K. L., P. Campbell, and M. W. Nachman. 2016. Gene regulation and speciation in house

mice. Genome Res. 26:451–461.

Mack, K. L., and M. W. Nachman. 2017. Gene regulation and speciation. Trends Genet. 33:68–

80.

Maekawa, M., C. Ito, Y. Toyama, F. Suzuki-Toyota, T. Kimura, T. Nakano, and K. Toshimori.

2004. Stage-specific expression of mouse germ cell-less-1 (mGCL-1), and multiple

deformations during mgcl-1 deficient spermatogenesis leading to reduced fertility. Arch.

Histol. Cytol. 67:335–347.

Manceau, M., V. S. Domingues, R. Mallarino, and H. E. Hoekstra. 2011. The developmental role

of Agouti in color pattern evolution. Science 331:1062–1065.

McCarthy, D. J., Y. Chen, and G. K. Smyth. 2012. Differential expression analysis of multifactor

RNA-Seq experiments with respect to biological variation. Nucleic Acids Res. 40:4288–

4297.

Meiklejohn, C. D., E. L. Landeen, J. M. Cook, S. B. Kingan, and D. C. Presgraves. 2011. Sex

chromosome-specific regulation in the Drosophila male germline but little evidence for

chromosomal dosage compensation or meiotic inactivation. PLoS Biol. 9:e1001126.

Montgomery, S. H., and J. E. Mank. 2016. Inferring regulatory change from gene expression: the

confounding effects of tissue scaling. Mol. Ecol. 25:5114–5128.

Morgan, K., B. Harr, M. A. White, B. A. Payseur, and L. M. Turner. 2020. Disrupted gene

networks in subfertile hybrid house mice. Mol. Biol. Evol. 37:1547–1562.

Mugal, C. F., M. Wang, N. Backström, D. Wheatcroft, M. Ålund, M. Sémon, S. E. McFarlane,

L. Dutoit, A. Qvarnström, and H. Ellegren. 2020. Tissue-specific patterns of regulatory

changes underlying gene expression differences among Ficedula flycatchers and their

naturally occurring F1 hybrids. Genome Res. 30:1727–1739.

Mukaj, A., J. Piálek, V. Fotopulosova, A. P. Morgan, L. Odenthal-Hesse, E. D. Parvanov, and J.

Forejt. 2020. Prdm9 intersubspecific interactions in hybrid male sterility of house mouse.

Mol. Biol. Evol. 37:3423–3438.

Murat, F., N. Mbengue, S. B. Winge, T. Trefzer, E. Leushkin, M. Sepp, M. Cardoso-Moreira, J.

Schmidt, C. Schneider, K. Mößinger, T. Brüning, F. Lamanna, M. R. Belles, C. Conrad,

I. Kondova, R. Bontrop, R. Behr, P. Khaitovich, S. Pääbo, T. Marques-Bonet, F.

Grützner, K. Almstrup, M. H. Schierup, and H. Kaessmann. 2021. The molecular

evolution of spermatogenesis across mammals. bioRxiv, doi:

10.1101/2021.11.08.467712.

Namekawa, S. H., P. J. Park, L.-F. Zhang, J. E. Shima, J. R. McCarrey, M. D. Griswold, and J.

T. Lee. 2006. Postmeiotic sex chromatin in the male germline of mice. Curr. Biol.

16:660–667.

Newman, A. M., C. B. Steen, C. L. Liu, A. J. Gentles, A. A. Chaudhuri, F. Scherer, M. S.

Khodadoust, M. S. Esfahani, B. A. Luca, D. Steiner, M. Diehn, and A. A. Alizadeh.

2019. Determining cell type abundance and expression from bulk tissues with digital

cytometry. Nat. Biotechnol. 37:773–782.

Nguyen, T. B., K. Manova, P. Capodieci, C. Lindon, S. Bottega, X.-Y. Wang, J. Refik-Rogers, J.

Pines, D. J. Wolgemuth, and A. Koff. 2002. Characterization and expression of

mammalian cyclin b3, a prepachytene meiotic cyclin. J. Biol. Chem. 277:41960–41969.

Oka, A., A. Mita, Y. Takada, H. Koseki, and T. Shiroishi. 2010. Reproductive isolation in hybrid

mice due to spermatogenesis defects at three meiotic stages. Genetics 186:339–351.

Oksanen, J., R. Kindt, P. Legendre, B. O'Hara, M. H. H. Stevens, M. J. Oksanen, and M.

Suggests. 2007. The vegan package. Community ecology package 10:719.

Pitnick, S., D. J. Hosken, and T. R. Birkhead. 2009. Sperm morphological diversity. Pp. 69–149

in T. R. Birkhead, D. J. Hosken, and S. Pitnick, eds. Sperm Biology. Academic Press,

London.

Poelstra, J. W., N. Vijay, C. M. Bossu, H. Lantz, B. Ryll, I. Müller, V. Baglione, P. Unneberg,

M. Wikelski, M. G. Grabherr, and J. B. W. Wolf. 2014. The genomic landscape

underlying phenotypic integrity in the face of gene flow in crows. Science 344:1410–

1414.

Poelstra, J. W., N. Vijay, M. P. Höppner, and J. B. Wolf. 2015. Transcriptomics of colour

patterning and colouration shifts in crows. Mol. Ecol. 24:4617–4628.

Price-Waldman, R. M., A. J. Shultz, and K. J. Burns. 2020. Speciation rates are correlated with

changes in plumage color complexity in the largest family of songbirds. Evolution

74:1155–1169.

Rafati, N., J. A. Blanco-Aguiar, C. J. Rubin, S. Sayyab, S. J. Sabatino, S. Afonso, C. Feng, P. C.

Alves, R. Villafuerte, N. Ferrand, L. Andersson, and M. Carneiro. 2018. A genomic map

of clinal variation across the European rabbit hybrid zone. Mol. Ecol. 27:1457–1478.

Ramm, S. A., and L. Schärer. 2014. The evolutionary ecology of testicular function: size isn't

everything. Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc. 89:874–888.

Ramm, S. A., L. Schärer, J. Ehmcke, and J. Wistuba. 2014. Sperm competition and the evolution

of spermatogenesis. Mol. Hum. Reprod. 20:1169–1179.

Raymond, C. S., M. W. Murphy, M. G. O'Sullivan, V. J. Bardwell, and D. Zarkower. 2000.

950   Dmrt1, a gene related to worm and fly sexual regulators, is required for mammalian testis

951   differentiation. Genes Dev. 14:2587–2595.

952   Robinson, M. D., D. J. McCarthy, and G. K. Smyth. 2010. edgeR: a Bioconductor package for

953   differential expression analysis of digital gene expression data. Bioinformatics 26:139–

954   140.

955   Rohlfs, R. V., and R. Nielsen. 2015. Phylogenetic ANOVA: the expression variance and

956   evolution model for quantitative trait evolution. Syst. Biol. 64:695–708.

957   Rolland, A. D., J.-J. Lareyre, A.-S. Goupil, J. Montfort, M.-J. Ricordel, D. Esquerré, K. Hugot,

958   R. Houlgatte, F. Chalmel, and F. Le Gac. 2009. Expression profiling of rainbow trout

959   testis development identifies evolutionary conserved genes involved in spermatogenesis.

960   BMC Genomics 10:546.

961   Sato, D. X., N. Rafati, H. Ring, S. Younis, C. Feng, J. A. Blanco-Aguiar, C.-J. Rubin, R.

962   Villafuerte, F. Hallböök, M. Carneiro, and L. Andersson. 2020. Brain transcriptomics of

963   wild and domestic rabbits suggests that changes in dopamine signaling and ciliary

964   function contributed to evolution of tameness. Genome Biol. Evol. 12:1918–1928.

965   Schärer, L., D. T. J. Littlewood, A. Waeschenbach, W. Yoshida, and D. B. Vizoso. 2011. Mating

966   behavior and the evolution of sperm design. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 108:1490–

967   1495.

968   Schultz, N., F. K. Hamra, and D. L. Garbers. 2003. A multitude of genes expressed solely in

969   meiotic or postmeiotic spermatogenic cells offers a myriad of contraceptive targets. Proc.

970   Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 100:12201–12206.

Schwahn, D. J., R. J. Wang, M. A. White, and B. A. Payseur. 2018. Genetic dissection of hybrid

male sterility across stages of spermatogenesis. Genetics 210:1453–1465.

Shen-Orr, S. S., and R. Gaujoux. 2013. Computational deconvolution: extracting cell type-

specific information from heterogeneous samples. Curr. Opin. Immunol. 25:571–578.

Shima, J. E., D. J. McLean, J. R. McCarrey, and M. D. Griswold. 2004. The murine testicular

transcriptome: characterizing gene expression in the testis during the progression of

spermatogenesis. Biol. Reprod. 71:319–330.

Snyder, R. L. 1967. Fertility and reproductive performance of grouped male mice. Pp. 458–472

in K. Benirschke, ed. Comparative aspects of reproductive failure. Springer, Berlin.

Srivatsan, S. R., M. C. Regier, E. Barkan, J. M. Franks, J. S. Packer, P. Grosjean, M. Duran, S.

Saxton, J. J. Ladd, M. Spielmann, C. Lois, P. D. Lampe, J. Shendure, K. R. Stevens, and

C. Trapnell. 2021. Embryo-scale, single-cell spatial transcriptomics. Science 373:111–

117.

Stern, D. L., and V. Orgogozo. 2008. The loci of evolution: how predictable is genetic evolution?

Evolution 62:2155–2177.

Suzuki, T. A., and M. W. Nachman. 2015. Speciation and reduced hybrid female fertility in

house mice. Evolution 69:2468–2481.

Todd, E. V., M. A. Black, and N. J. Gemmell. 2016. The power and promise of RNA-seq in

ecology and evolution. Mol. Ecol. 25:1224–1241.

Torgasheva, A. A., and P. M. Borodin. 2016. Cytological basis of sterility in male and female

hybrids between sibling species of grey voles Microtus arvalis and M. levis. Sci. Rep.

6:36564.

Torgerson, D. G., R. J. Kulathinal, and R. S. Singh. 2002. Mammalian sperm proteins are rapidly

evolving: evidence of positive selection in functionally diverse genes. Mol. Biol. Evol.

19:1973–1980.

Trapnell, C., L. Pachter, and S. L. Salzberg. 2009. TopHat: discovering splice junctions with

RNA-Seq. Bioinformatics 25:1105–1111.

Turner, L. M., E. B. Chuong, and H. E. Hoekstra. 2008. Comparative analysis of testis protein

evolution in rodents. Genetics 179:2075–2089.

Turner, L. M., and B. Harr. 2014. Genome-wide mapping in a house mouse hybrid zone reveals

hybrid sterility loci and Dobzhansky-Muller interactions. Elife 3:e02504.

Turner, L. M., D. J. Schwahn, and B. Harr. 2012. Reduced male fertility is common but highly

variable in form and severity in a natural house mouse hybrid zone. Evolution 66:443–

458.

Turner, L. M., M. A. White, D. Tautz, and B. A. Payseur. 2014. Genomic networks of hybrid

sterility. PLoS Genet. 10:e1004162.

Wang, Z., M. Gerstein, and M. Snyder. 2009. RNA-Seq: a revolutionary tool for transcriptomics.

Nat. Rev. Genet. 10:57–63.

White-Cooper, H., K. Doggett, and R. E. Ellis. 2009. The evolution of spermatogenesis. Pp.

151–183 *in* T. R. Birkhead, D. J. Hosken, and S. Pitnick, eds. Sperm Biology. Academic

Press, London.

Whittington, E., T. L. Karr, A. J. Mongue, S. Dorus, and J. R. Walters. 2019. Evolutionary

proteomics reveals distinct patterns of complexity and divergence between Lepidopteran

sperm morphs. Genome Biol. Evol. 11:1838–1846.

Widmayer, S. J., M. A. Handel, and D. L. Aylor. 2020. Age and genetic background modify

hybrid male sterility in house mice. Genetics 216:585–597.

Wittkopp, P. J. 2007. Variable gene expression in eukaryotes: a network perspective. J. Exp.

Biol. 210:1567–1575.

Wohnhaas, C. T., G. G. Leparc, F. Fernandez-Albert, D. Kind, F. Gantner, C. Viollet, T.

Hildebrandt, and P. Baum. 2019. DMSO cryopreservation is the method of choice to

preserve cells for droplet-based single-cell RNA sequencing. Sci. Rep. 9:10699.

Yapar, E., E. Saglican, H. M. Dönertaş, E. Özkurt, Z. Yan, H. Hu, S. Guo, B. Erdem, R. V.

Rohlfs, P. Khaitovich, and M. Somel. 2021. Convergent evolution of primate testis

transcriptomes reflects mating strategy. bioRxiv, doi: 10.1101/010553.

Yoshikawa, H., D. Xu, Y. Ino, T. Yoshino, T. Hayashida, J. Wang, R. Yazawa, G. Yoshizaki,

and Y. Takeuchi. 2018. Hybrid sterility in fish caused by mitotic arrest of primordial

germ cells. Genetics 209:507–521.