1    **Polygenic signals of sex differences in selection in contemporary humans**

3                Filip Ruzicka[1*], Luke Holman[2,3], Tim Connallon[1]

5    [1] School of Biological Sciences, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria, Australia

6    [2] School of BioSciences, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, Australia

7    [3] School of Applied Sciences, Edinburgh Napier University, Edinburgh, UK

9    [*]**Corresponding author e-mail**: Filip.Ruzicka@monash.edu

## **Abstract**

Sex differences in the fitness effects of genetic variants can influence the rate of adaptation and the maintenance of genetic variation. For example, "sexually antagonistic" (SA) variants, which are beneficial for one sex and harmful for the other, can both constrain adaptation and increase genetic variability for fitness components such as survival, fertility, and disease susceptibility. However, detecting variants with sex-differential fitness effects is difficult, requiring genome sequences and fitness measurements from large numbers of individuals. Here, we develop new theory for studying sex-differential selection across a complete life cycle, and test our models with genotypic and reproductive success data from ~250,000 UK Biobank individuals. We uncover polygenic signals of sex-differential selection affecting survival, reproductive success and overall fitness, with signals of sex-differential reproductive selection reflecting a combination of SA polymorphisms and sexually concordant polymorphisms in which the strength of selection differs between the sexes. Moreover, these signals hold up to rigorous controls that minimise the contributions of potential confounders, including sequence mapping errors, population structure, and ascertainment bias. Functional analyses reveal that sex-differentiated sites are enriched in phenotype-altering genomic regions, including coding regions and loci affecting a range of quantitative traits. Population genetic analyses show that sex-differentiated sites exhibit evolutionary histories dominated by genetic drift and/or transient balancing selection, but not long-term balancing selection, which is consistent with theoretical predictions of effectively weak SA balancing selection in historically small populations. Overall, our results are consistent with polygenic sex-differential—including SA—selection in humans. Evidence for sex-differential selection is particularly strong for variants affecting reproductive success, in which the potential contributions of non-random sampling to statistical signals of sex-differentiation can be excluded.

## Introduction

Adaptation of a population to its environment requires heritable genetic variation for fitness [1]. Although many populations show substantial genetic variation for fitness components [2]—including life-history traits such as maturation rate, lifespan, mating success, and fertility [2,3]—genetic trade-offs between components, or between different types of individuals in a population, limit adaptive potential [4]. For example, a mutation that increases the probability of survival to adulthood might simultaneously decrease adult reproductive success (*e.g.*, [5]), weakening the mutation's net fitness effect [4]. In addition to slowing adaptation [6–8], genetic trade-offs can increase standing genetic variation [2,9], give rise to balancing selection [10,11], and favour evolutionary transitions between mating systems [12,13], modes of sex determination [14] and genome structures [15–18].

Sexually antagonistic (SA) genetic polymorphisms—in which the alleles that benefit one sex are harmful to the other—are a type of genetic trade-off that may be common in sexually reproducing species [19]. Theory shows that SA polymorphisms are likely to arise when mutations differentially affect trait expression in each sex, or when mutations similarly affect traits under divergent directional selection between the sexes [20]. Empirical quantitative genetic studies imply that both conditions are frequently met in nature [21–24] and, accordingly, that SA polymorphisms contribute to phenotypic variation in a range of plant and animal populations (*e.g.* [25–27]), including humans [28–31].

Although there is now abundant evidence that SA polymorphisms contribute to phenotypic variation, efforts to identify and characterise SA alleles in genomic data face two formidable challenges [32]. First, methods using explicit fitness measurements to identify SA polymorphisms (*e.g.*, genome-wide association studies (GWAS) of fitness [33]) are rarely feasible, because it is challenging to obtain fitness measurements for large numbers of genotyped individuals under natural conditions [2]. Second, methods using allele frequency differences between adult females and males as genomic signals of SA viability selection (*e.g.*,

between-sex $F_{ST}$ estimates [32,34–41]) are limited in several ways: they have low power to

detect SA loci, they cannot distinguish SA selection from sex differences in the strength of

selection, they are susceptible to artefacts generated by population structure and mis-mapping

of sequence reads to sex chromosomes [32,39,40,42], and they neglect fitness components

other than viability, such as reproductive success [32,43]. Previous studies of human genomic

data [34,35,42,44] have been affected by one or more of these issues [32,40,41,43], such that

we currently lack robust evidence of SA genomic variation in humans. More generally, these

impediments help to explain the limited catalogue of SA polymorphisms across species [45–

47], which currently comprises a handful of loci with exceptionally large phenotypic effects

(*e.g.* [48–52]).

Despite these challenges, new datasets and analytical approaches provide opportunities

to identify robust genomic signals of SA selection. First, massive 'biobank' datasets, which are

widely used in human genomics, sometimes include both genotype and offspring number data

[29,53] that can be used to detect loci with SA effects on reproductive components of fitness

[32]. Second, estimates of allele frequency differences between sexes—though ill-suited for

confidently identifying individual SA loci affecting viability—may nevertheless be amenable

to genome-wide tests for *polygenic* SA viability selection [32,34]. Third, population genomic

metrics of sex-differential selection (*e.g.*, between-sex $F_{ST}$) may include an appreciable

proportion of genuine SA loci in the upper tails of their distributions, providing a set of

candidate loci that can collectively yield insights into the general properties of SA

polymorphisms (*e.g.*, their functional characteristics and evolutionary dynamics), despite

uncertainty about individual candidates.

Here, we extend [32,34] and develop new statistical tests based on $F_{ST}$ metrics of

between-sex allele frequency differentiation to detect polygenic signals of sex-differential

selection affecting viability, reproduction, and total fitness during a full generational cycle.

Applying these tests to the UK Biobank [53]—a dataset comprising quality-filtered genotype

and offspring number data for ~250,000 men and women—reveals polygenic signals of sex-

differential—including SA—polymorphism. We corroborate these results by using mixed-

model statistics that explicitly control for systematic differences in the genetic ancestry of

female and male individuals and potential sequencing artefacts. We further show that sex-

differentiated polymorphisms are preferentially situated in functional, phenotype-altering

genomic sequences. Finally, we use genetic diversity data to examine modes of evolution

affecting sex-differentiated sites.

## Results

### Genomic signals of sex differences in selection: theoretical predictions

Previous studies have examined sex-differential effects of genetic variation during the zygote-

to-adult stage by comparing allele frequencies between adult females and males [32,34,36–

39,42]. By contrast, our analytical approach combines allele frequency with offspring number

data to estimate sex-differential effects during a full generational life cycle (Fig. 1). To

illustrate the approach, consider a large, well-mixed population containing many polymorphic,

bi-allelic, autosomal loci. At fertilisation, Mendelian inheritance equalises allele frequencies

between the sexes (Fig. 1, left box). In the zygote-to-adult stage, loci with sex-differential

effects on survival accumulate allele frequency differences between the adults of each sex (*e.g.*,

the black allele becomes enriched in adult males and deficient in adult females because it

improves zygote-to-adult survival in males but reduces it in females; Fig. 1, middle box).

Among the adults, alleles with sex-differential effects on reproductive success have different

transmission rates to the next generation from surviving females *vs.* surviving males (*e.g.*, the

black allele is enriched among the male gametes contributing to fertilization but deficient

among female gametes, thus increasing its transmission to offspring of males but decreasing

transmission to offspring of females; Fig. 1, right box).

Adult allele frequencies, coupled with offspring number data per individual, thus

provide an opportunity to estimate sex-differential effects of genetic variation during a

complete life cycle, even though zygotic and gametic allele frequencies are inferred and not

directly observed. Below, we apply our approach to the UK Biobank, a dataset that includes

genotypes and reported offspring numbers (hereafter "lifetime reproductive success" or LRS,

following standard terminology [29]) among putatively post-reproductive adults (ages 45-69

after filtering; see Materials and Methods). For a biallelic autosomal locus with alleles $A_1$ and

$A_2$, we denote $\hat{p}_m$ and $\hat{p}_f$ the respective estimated frequencies of the $A_1$ allele in adult males

and females of the UK Biobank. The projected frequencies of $A_1$ in paternal and maternal

gametes contributing to fertilisation are:

$$\hat{p}'_m = \frac{M_{11} + \frac{1}{2} M_{12}}{M_{11} + M_{12} + M_{22}} \qquad [1a]$$

$$\hat{p}'_f = \frac{F_{11} + \frac{1}{2} F_{12}}{F_{11} + F_{12} + F_{22}} \qquad [1b]$$

where $M_{ij}$ and $F_{ij}$ represent the cumulative LRS of males and females, respectively, with

genotype $ij$ (e.g., $M_{11}$, $M_{12}$ and $M_{22}$ correspond to genotypes $A_1A_1$, $A_1A_2$, and $A_2A_2$).

Using $F_{ST}$ [54], we partition between-sex allele frequency differentiation over one

generation into three components: 1) differentiation among adults, which includes effects of

sex-differential survival (hereafter "adult $F_{ST}$"; see [32,34,43]); 2) sex-differential variation in

adult LRS (hereafter "reproductive $F_{ST}$"); and 3) sex-differential variation in overall fitness

(hereafter "gametic $F_{ST}$"). Single-locus estimates of adult, reproductive and gametic $F_{ST}$ are

defined, respectively, as:

$$\hat{F}_{ST(Adult)} = \frac{\left(\hat{p}_f - \hat{p}_m\right)^2}{4\bar{p}(1 - \bar{p})} \qquad [2a]$$

$$\hat{F}_{ST(Reproductive)} = \frac{\left((\hat{p}'_f - \hat{p}_f) - (\hat{p}'_m - \hat{p}_m)\right)^2}{4\bar{p}(1 - \bar{p})} \qquad [2b]$$

135
$$\hat{F}_{ST(Gametic)} = \frac{\left(\hat{p}'_f - \hat{p}'_m\right)^2}{4\bar{p}'(1 - \bar{p}')} \tag{2c}$$

where $\bar{p} = \left(\hat{p}_f + \hat{p}_m\right)/2$ and $\bar{p}' = \left(\hat{p}'_f + \hat{p}'_m\right)/2$.

*$F_{ST}$ distributions in the absence of sex-differential selection*

In the absence of sex differences in selection (*e.g.*, under neutrality, or under sexually

concordant (SC) selection of equal magnitude and direction in each sex), with large sample

sizes, negligible Hardy-Weinberg deviations at birth, and excluding single-nucleotide

polymorphisms (SNPs) with very low minor allele frequencies, we show that the adult,

reproductive and gametic $\hat{F}_{ST}$ metrics converge, respectively, to the following distributions:

144
$$\hat{F}_{ST(Adult)} \approx \left(\frac{1}{8N_f} + \frac{1}{8N_m}\right) X \tag{3a}$$

145
$$\hat{F}_{ST(Reproductive)} \approx \frac{\frac{\hat{p}_f(1 - \hat{p}_f)}{2N_f}\frac{\sigma_f^2}{\mu_f^2}\left(1 - \hat{F}_{IS}^f\right) + \frac{\hat{p}_m(1 - \hat{p}_m)}{2N_m}\frac{\sigma_m^2}{\mu_m^2}\left(1 - \hat{F}_{IS}^m\right)}{4\hat{p}(1 - \hat{p})} X \tag{3b}$$

146
$$\hat{F}_{ST(Gametic)} \approx \left[\frac{1}{8N_f}\left(1 + \frac{\sigma_f^2}{\mu_f^2}\right) + \frac{1}{8N_m}\left(1 + \frac{\sigma_m^2}{\mu_m^2}\right)\right] X \tag{3c}$$

where each $X$ is an independent chi-square random variable with one degree of freedom, $N_f$

and $N_m$ denote adult sample sizes, $\mu_f$ and $\mu_m$ denote mean LRS, $\sigma_f^2$ and $\sigma_m^2$ denote variances

in LRS, and $\hat{F}_{IS}^f$ and $\hat{F}_{IS}^m$ quantify sex-specific departures from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium in

the sample of adults (*SI Appendix*, Section A). In datasets such as the UK Biobank, there is

also between-site variation in the number of genotyped individuals and the extent of Hardy-

Weinberg deviations in the adult sample. The null distributions described by eqs. [3a-c] are

easily adjusted to account for this between-site variation (see Materials and Methods).

Relative to the null distributions in eqs. [3a-c], sex differences in selection inflate each

$\hat{F}_{ST}$ metric (*SI Appendix*, Section A). These inflations may arise due to polymorphisms under

sex-differential selection *and* neutral polymorphisms that hitchhike with selected

polymorphisms. However, linkage disequilibrium (LD) alone cannot inflate genome-wide $\hat{F}_{ST}$

in the absence of genuine selected polymorphisms (*SI Appendix*, Section B). As such, $\hat{F}_{ST}$

inflations represent reliable signals of sex-differentially selected polymorphism [32], provided:

(*i*) technical artefacts are controlled (as shown below); (*ii*) sex-specific population structure is

controlled; and (*iii*) males and females are sampled at random (though (*iii*) is not a requirement

for reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$; see Discussion). To simplify the presentation, we first present analyses

using $F_{ST}$ metrics, but we return to non-$F_{ST}$ metrics in the section "Controlling for sex-specific

population structure".

**Genomic signals of sex differences in selection: empirical data**

*UK Biobank SNP data*

The sample size in the UK Biobank, after removing individuals that were closely related, had

a recorded ancestry other than 'White British', or had missing LRS data, was $N = 249{,}021$ ($N_m$

$= 115{,}531$ males and $N_f = 133{,}490$ females). We removed rare polymorphic sites (MAF < 1%),

sites with low genotype or imputation quality, and sites with high potential for artefactual

between-sex differentiation based on criteria identified by Kasimatis et al. [42] (*i.e.*, between-

sex differences in missing rates, deficits of minor allele homozygotes, and heterozygosity

levels exceeding what can be plausibly be explained by sex differences in selection; see *SI*

*Appendix*, Section C). Reassuringly, none of the 8 sites that Kasimatis et al. [42] identified as

false-positives for sex-differential viability selection appear among the quality-filtered, LD-

pruned, imputed SNPs (N = 1,051,949) that are the focus of our analyses.

*Observed $F_{ST}$ distributions relative to null distributions*

We tested for sex differences in selection by calculating adult, reproductive and gametic $\hat{F}_{ST}$

(eqs. [2a-c]) in the UK Biobank, and contrasting these estimates against: (*i*) their respective

theoretical null distributions (eqs. [3a-c]), and (*ii*) empirical null distributions (generated by a

single random permutation of male and female labels among individuals or, in the case of

reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$, a single permutation of LRS among individuals of each sex; see Materials

and Methods).

All three $\hat{F}_{ST}$ metrics showed greater between-sex differentiation than predicted by their

theoretical and empirical null distributions, consistent with sex differences in selection

contributing to genome-wide allele frequency differentiation between the sexes. Mean adult

$\hat{F}_{ST}$ in the observed data was larger than predicted by both null distributions (theoretical null:

$2.039 \times 10^{-6}$; permuted null: $2.043 \times 10^{-6}$; observed: $2.104 \times 10^{-6}$; Wilcoxon and Kolmogorov-

Smirnov tests, p<0.001; Fig. 2A,D), with a 14.1% and 13.7% excess of SNPs in the top

percentile of the theoretical and empirical nulls, respectively ($\chi^2$ tests, p<0.001). Mean

reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$ was also larger than predicted by both nulls (theoretical null: $8.731 \times 10^{-7}$;

permuted null: $8.749 \times 10^{-7}$; observed: $8.900 \times 10^{-7}$; Wilcoxon and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests,

p<0.001; Fig. 2B,E), with a 7.4% and 5.0% excess of SNPs in the top percentile of the

theoretical and empirical nulls ($\chi^2$ tests, p<0.001). Moreover, mean gametic $\hat{F}_{ST}$ was larger

than predicted by both nulls (theoretical null: $2.908 \times 10^{-6}$; permuted null: $2.907 \times 10^{-6}$;

observed: $2.974 \times 10^{-6}$; Wilcoxon and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests, p<0.001; Fig. 2C,F), with a

9.0% and 7.8% excess of SNPs in the top percentile of the theoretical and empirical nulls ($\chi^2$

tests, p<0.001).

Signals of sex differences in selection in adult, reproductive, and gametic $\hat{F}_{ST}$ were

polygenic. For example, genetic variants situated in genomic regions with high LD tended to

explain more SNP-heritability of each $\hat{F}_{ST}$ metric than variants situated in low-LD regions, as

predicted if each sex-differential fitness component has a polygenic basis (*SI Appendix*, Section

D). Moreover, no individual loci had p-values below the Bonferroni-corrected threshold of

$4.753 \times 10^{-8}$, implying that the significant overall inflations were not driven by a small number

of strongly sex-differentiated polymorphisms (adult $\hat{F}_{ST}$: minimum p- and q-values=$2.237 \times 10^{-}$

[7] and 0.176; reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$: minimum p- and q-values $= 3.925 \times 10^{-7}$ and 0.413; gametic $\hat{F}_{ST}$:

minimum p- and q-values $= 4.152 \times 10^{-6}$ and 0.821).

**Forms of sex-differential selection: theoretical predictions**

The $\hat{F}_{ST}$ elevations reported above indicate the presence of polygenic sex-differential selection

in the UK Biobank. However, the signals could have arisen because of SA selection, because

of sex differences in the strength but not the direction of selection (*i.e.*, sex-differential SC

selection), or a combination of both scenarios. To partition signals affecting LRS into SA and

SC components, we examined the effects of a given allele on LRS in each sex relative to the

other. Specifically, estimates of the product $(\hat{p}'_m - \hat{p}_m)(\hat{p}'_f - \hat{p}_f)$ should tend to be negative

when alleles have SA effects, and positive when alleles have SC effects (Fig. 3A). A new

metric, termed "unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$", provides a standardized measure of the product of

sex-specific effects on LRS:

$$\hat{F}_{ST(Unfolded)} = \frac{(\hat{p}'_m - \hat{p}_m)(\hat{p}'_f - \hat{p}_f)}{\sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}_m(1 - \hat{p}_m)}{2n_m}\frac{\sigma_m^2}{\mu_m^2}\left(1 - \hat{F}_{IS}^m\right)\frac{\hat{p}_f(1 - \hat{p}_f)}{2n_f}\frac{\sigma_f^2}{\mu_f^2}\left(1 - \hat{F}_{IS}^f\right)}} \qquad [4].$$

In the absence of any selection on LRS, unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$ is distributed as the product

of two independent, standard normal distributions (*i.e.*, symmetrically distributed with a mean

of zero; see *SI Appendix*, Section E). SA selection generates an excess of loci in the lower

quantiles of this null model, while SC selection generates an excess of loci in the upper

quantiles of the null. Note that sex differences in SC selection are not required to generate an

excess of positive values for unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$ (SC selection of equal magnitude in

the sexes can generate it as well), but SA selection is required to generate an excess of negative

values.

**Forms of sex-differential selection: empirical data**

As with previous $\hat{F}_{ST}$ metrics, we calculated unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$ (eq. [4]) and contrasted

it against its theoretical and empirical null distributions—the latter generated by a single

random permutation of LRS among the individuals of each sex. Doing so revealed that both

SC *and* SA sites contribute to the polygenic signal of sex-differential selection affecting LRS.

As predicted under SC selection, we observed an enrichment of sites in the upper quantiles of

the null distributions of unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$ (mean $\hat{F}_{ST}$ among sites with $\hat{F}_{ST}>0$;

theoretical null: 0.637; permuted null: 0.640; observed: 0.694; Wilcoxon and Kolmogorov-

Smirnov tests, p<0.001; Fig. 3B,C). As predicted under SA selection, we observed a smaller

but significant enrichment of sites in the lower quantiles of the null (mean $\hat{F}_{ST}$ among sites with

$\hat{F}_{ST}<0$; theoretical null: –0.635; permuted null: –0.638; observed: –0.651; Wilcoxon and

Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests, p<0.001; Fig. 3B,C).

**Controlling for sex-specific population structure**

In principle, polygenic $\hat{F}_{ST}$ elevations can arise entirely in the absence of genuine sex

differences in selection [32,43] if there are systematic differences in ancestry (population

structure) between sexes in the sampled population. We therefore replicated our analyses using

mixed-model association tests that are analogous to $\hat{F}_{ST}$ but which explicitly correct for sex-

specific population structure (see also *SI Appendix*, Section F).

We first re-evaluated signals of sex differences in viability selection present in adult

$\hat{F}_{ST}$ by performing a GWAS of sex [32,42,55] using standardised estimates of the log-odds

ratio ($\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ST}$; see Materials and Methods). Like adult $\hat{F}_{ST}$, $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ST}$ quantifies between-sex allele

frequency differences among adults; moreover, it controls for population structure by including

a kinship matrix of genome-wide relatedness between individuals and principal components

which capture structure-induced axes of genetic variation (see Materials and Methods). As

expected, $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ST}$ was highly correlated with adult $\hat{F}_{ST}$ ($r_g \pm$SE=1.046$\pm$0.020; p<0.001) and mean

$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ST}$ was elevated relative to its empirical null distribution (null $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ST}$: $5.236\times10^{-7}$; observed:

$5.323\times10^{-7}$; Wilcoxon and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests, p<0.001; Fig. 4A,D), with 8.9% excess

of SNPs in the top 1% quantile of the empirical null ($\chi^2$ test, p<0.001).

We then re-evaluated signals of sex-differential selection through reproductive success

by performing separate GWAS for LRS in females and males, each corrected for population

structure, and quantifying the difference between female and male effect sizes using a $t$-statistic

($|t|$; see Materials and Methods). As expected, $|t|$ was highly correlated with reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$

($r_g\pm$SE=$1.025\pm0.059$, p<0.001) and mean $|t|$ was elevated relative to its empirical null

(null=0.796, observed=0.811, Wilcoxon and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests, p<0.001; Fig. 4B,E),

with an 11.9% excess of SNPs in the top 1% quantile of the empirical null ($\chi^2$ test, p<0.001).

We also developed an analogue of unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$, termed unfolded $t$ (see

Materials and Methods), to partition signals of sex-differential reproductive selection into SA

and SC components. Like unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$, SC selection should generate an

enrichment of values in the upper quantiles of its null, while SA selection should generate an

enrichment of values in its lower quantiles; unlike unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$, this metric also

controls for population structure. Corroborating previous results, we observed an excess of

high values of unfolded $t$ (mean $t$ among sites with $t$>0; permuted null=0.639, observed=0.692,

Wilcoxon and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests, p<0.001; Fig. 4C,F) and an excess of low values of

unfolded $t$ (mean $t$ among sites with $t$<0; permuted null=–0.639, observed=–0.649, Wilcoxon

and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests, p<0.001), signalling the presence of SC and SA

polymorphisms, respectively.

Finally, we examined genetic correlations between metrics. These analyses showed that

metrics of sex-differential LRS selection were not significantly correlated with metrics of sex-

differential mortality selection across loci (Fig. 5A). For example, the genetic correlation

(estimated via LD score regression) between adult and reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$ was –0.24 (SE = 0.16,

p = 0.13) and the genetic correlation between $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ST}$ and |t| was –0.16 (SE = 0.16, p=0.31).

**Functional and phenotypic effects of sex-differentiated loci**

If sex-differentiated loci reflect genuine sex-differential selection—rather than random chance,

genotyping errors, or population structure—such polymorphisms should be preferentially

found in functionally important regions in the genome. We therefore conducted enrichment

tests, both to support our inference that sex-differential selection is occurring and to explore

functional effects of sex-differentiated loci.

We first used LD-score regression to test whether sites with high sex-differentiation

tend to be found in major functional categories in the genome (coding, 3'UTR and 5'UTR

regions). If a given category is enriched for genuine selected SNPs, the expected heritability

tagged by these SNPs (*i.e.*, what LD-score regression measures) should exceed the fraction of

SNPs present in that functional category. While functional enrichment estimates were noisy

and thus not statistically distinguishable from 1 (no enrichment) after multiple-testing

correction (Fig. 5B), each estimate consistently exceeded 1 across functional categories and

metrics, suggesting that sex-differentiated loci are more likely to have phenotype-altering

effects than expected by chance.

Further evidence for the phenotype-altering effects of sex-differentiated loci was

sought through direct comparisons between metrics of sex-differential selection and the Neale

laboratory database of UK Biobank GWAS. Specifically, we used cross-trait LD-score

regression to estimate genetic correlations between metrics of sex-differential selection and 30

phenotypes, chosen for their medical relevance and/or relationship to phenotypic sex

differences. Though many significant associations did not survive multiple testing correction

(Fig. 5C), several disease-relevant and quantitative traits (age at menarche, body fat percentage,

diseases of the eye and adnexa, fluid intelligence, injury, neuroticism score, SHBG [sex

hormone binding globulin], standing height) represent candidates for sex-differential viability

and LRS selection, while other traits (testosterone, high blood pressure) represent candidate

for sex-differential viability selection.

**Modes of evolution of sex-differentiated loci: theoretical predictions**

To gain insight into the modes of evolution affecting sex-differentiated sites, we investigated

the association between metrics of sex-differential selection and MAF in the UK Biobank. In

the absence of any contemporary sex differences in selection, all between-sex $\hat{F}_{ST}$ metrics

should be independent of MAF (*SI Appendix*, Section G). In the presence of sex-differential

selection, the association between each metric and MAF can potentially be positive or negative,

depending on the patterns of contemporary and historical selection affecting loci throughout

the genome. A positive covariance between $\hat{F}_{ST}$ and MAF should arise when alleles subject to

sex-differential selection often segregate at intermediate frequencies, as may occur under a

history of balancing selection or drift (*SI Appendix*, Section G), or non-equilibrium scenarios

such as incomplete selective sweeps. In contrast, a negative association between MAF and

between-sex $\hat{F}_{ST}$ is expected for loci that have evolved under sex-differential purifying

selection (*SI Appendix*, Section G). This negative covariance arises because purifying selection

disproportionately lowers the frequency of large-effect alleles (those generating larger $\hat{F}_{ST}$

values) relative to small-effect alleles [56]. In short, positive associations with MAF indicate

that purifying selection is not the dominant mode of evolution affecting loci under sex-

differential selection and instead signal a recent history of balancing selection, positive

selection, or drift.

While associations between metrics of sex-differential selection and MAF provide

insights into relatively recent and contemporary patterns of selection affecting sex-

differentiated sites, they do not provide insights into their deeper evolutionary histories. To

examine this, we tested the specific hypothesis that sex-differentiated sites are subject to *long-*

*term* balancing selection, as predicted for SA polymorphisms under certain scenarios of selection and dominance [10]. Under long-term balancing selection, we would expect sex-differentiated (and linked) loci to be old, to exhibit low between-population $\hat{F}_{ST}$, to exhibit high genetic diversity, and to disproportionately co-localise with previous candidates for long-term balancing selection, compared to less sex-differentiated sites with similar allele frequencies in the UK Biobank.

**Modes of evolution of sex-differentiated loci: empirical data**

Examining the relationship between MAF and metrics of sex-differential selection in the UK Biobank data revealed consistently positive correlations (adult $\hat{F}_{ST}$, $\rho=0.009$, p<0.001; $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ST}$: $\rho=0.006$, p=0.216; reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$, $\rho=0.006$, p<0.001; $|t|$: $\rho=0.005$, p<0.001; gametic $\hat{F}_{ST}$, $\rho=0.007$, p<0.001; Fig. 6A-D), with all correlations stronger in observed than null data (*SI Appendix*, Section H). Given the absence of negative correlations between MAF and each metric, we can reject purifying selection as the dominant mode of evolution affecting sex-differentiated sites. The positive correlations instead suggest that balancing selection, drift, or incomplete selective sweeps characterise the evolution of sex-differentiated loci.

We then tested the hypothesis that long-term balancing selection has shaped the evolutionary histories of sex-differentiated loci. We focused our analyses on four measures of balancing selection: allele age estimates from the Atlas of Variant Age database [57], between-population $\hat{F}_{ST}$ and Tajima's D estimates from two non-European populations from the 1000 Genomes Project [58], and three sets of candidate loci for long-term balancing selection [59–61]. In each case, we looked for associations between metrics of sex-differential selection and balancing selection, while controlling for ascertainment bias of intermediate-frequency alleles (which are, on average, older and thus more likely to be under long-term balancing selection irrespective of the strength of sex-differential selection) among highly sex-differentiated sites (see Materials and Methods). Overall, we found little support for the hypothesis of long-term

balancing selection affecting sex-differentiated loci. After corrections for multiple testing

across metrics of sex-differential selection (see *SI Appendix*, Section I, for full statistical

results), we found weak or absent associations with allele age (Fig. 6E-H), between-population

$\hat{F}_{ST}$ (*SI Appendix*, Section I), genetic diversity (*SI Appendix*, Section I), or previous candidates

for balancing selection (*SI Appendix*, Section I). We found some indications that candidate SA

alleles (*i.e.*, loci with negative values of unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$ and unfolded $t$) were older

than the genome-wide average (Fig. 6H), and loci experiencing strong SC selection (*i.e.*,

positive values of unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$ and unfolded $t$) were younger (Fig. 6H).

## Discussion

Sex differences in directional selection on phenotypes have been reported in a wide range of

animal taxa [21–23,62], including post-industrial human populations [29,30], yet population

genomic signals of sex-differential selection—let alone SA selection—have been extremely

difficult to establish. The reason is simple: sexual reproduction equalises autosomal allele

frequencies between the sexes every generation, restricting genetic divergence and, in effect,

preventing the use of common tests (*e.g.*, McDonald-Kreitman tests for positive selection and

$F_{ST}$ outlier tests for spatially-varying selection [63–65]) to infer sex differences in selection.

Published studies using human genomic data illustrate the challenges of studying

polymorphisms with sex-differential fitness effects [32,40,41,43,44], including sample sizes

that may be insufficient for detecting polygenic signals of sex-differential selection, lack of

controls for population structure or technical artefacts, and/or absence of data concerning

reproductive fitness components.

### Signals of sex-differential selection in the UK Biobank

383    We developed a theoretical framework for studying genomic variation with sex-differential

384    effects across a complete life cycle. Our approach extends current work based on between-sex

allele frequency differentiation among adults—a potential signal of sex-differential viability selection among juveniles [32,34,35,43]—to further include reproductive success components and total fitness. Applying this approach to data from a quarter-million UK adults, we present evidence for polygenic signals of sex-differential selection in humans. Specifically, UK Biobank individuals showed sex differences in allele frequencies—both among adults and their (projected) offspring—that consistently exceeded expectations defined by our theoretical null models for viability, reproductive and total fitness, and persisted after controlling for potential artefacts arising from mis-mapping of reads to sex chromosomes [55].

Although we focussed on $F_{ST}$ as our metric of differentiation for a variety of reasons (its simplicity, amenability to theoretical modelling, and rich history in population genetic studies of adaptation [63–65]), an important drawback of $F_{ST}$ is its inability to control for systematic sex differences in the genetic ancestry of sampled individuals. We therefore used $F_{ST}$ analogues based on mixed-model association tests to control for sex-specific population structure. These $F_{ST}$ analogues corroborated $F_{ST}$-derived signals of sex-differential selection on each component, with clear enrichments in the upper tails of each null distribution. Additional support for genuine sex-differential selection came from functional enrichment analyses, which, despite noisy individual estimates, consistently indicated that sex-differentiated sites were situated in functional genomic regions and contributed to variation for many phenotypes.

An important limitation of metrics of sex-differential selection affecting non-LRS fitness components (*i.e.*, adult $F_{ST}$, gametic $F_{ST}$ and their mixed-model analogues) applied to the UK Biobank is that UK Biobank individuals are sampled through active participation. Consequently, as noted by Pirastu et al. [66], sex differences in the genetic basis of individuals' predisposition to take part in the UK Biobank may generate sex differences in adult allele frequencies. To support this argument, Pirastu et al. reported significantly greater SNP-heritability of sex (a polygenic measure of sex differences in allele frequencies) in biobanks relying on active participation than in biobanks using passive participation. However, their

analysis is inconclusive because the passive participation studies they analysed were smaller

($N_{Biobank Japan}$ = 178,242, $N_{FinnGen}$ = 150,831, $N_{iPsych}$ = 65,891) than active participation studies

($N_{UK Biobank}$ = 452,302, $N_{23andme}$ = 2,462,132). Thus, differences in statistical power between

studies (and/or differences in the extent of sex-differential viability selection between

populations) could account for their results. Moreover, the positive point estimates of SNP-

heritability for passive participation studies suggest that substantial allele frequency

differences between the sexes are possible. For example, mortality after fertilisation, but before

birth, is very high in humans (on the order of 50% [67]), giving ample opportunity for mortality

in early life to generate allele frequency differences between sexes. In sum, neither their study

nor ours can conclusively distinguish the relative contributions of sex-differential selection and

participation bias to allele frequency differentiation between female and male adults, though

both sources likely contribute.

Importantly, participation bias should not affect metrics of sex-differential selection

relating to LRS. Reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$ and its mixed-model analogue, $|t|$, control for allele

frequency differences between samples of adults of each sex and rule out factors that might

otherwise affect estimated adult allele frequencies in the UK Biobank (*e.g.*, mis-mapping of

reads to sex chromosomes, participation biases [55]). Elevations in these metrics thus provide

the most compelling evidence for sex-differential selection in the UK Biobank. Moreover, they

are consistent with previous observations in post-industrial human populations, including

variation in female and male LRS [68] (a necessary precondition for sex-differential selection),

widespread sex differences in the genetic basis of quantitative traits (*e.g.*, in the UK Biobank

[69]), and sex-differential selection on phenotypes (*e.g.*, height [29,30] and multivariate trait

combinations [68]), which should collectively lead to genome-wide polymorphisms with sex-

differential effects on fitness and fitness components [20].

**Distinguishing between SA and SC forms of sex-differential selection**

Having established signals of sex-differential selection affecting LRS, we developed a new test

for investigating the form of selection—SC or SA—affecting these genomic variants by

quantifying the product of a genetic variant's effect on LRS in each sex. Applying our test to

UK Biobank data showed that both types of variant contribute to signals of sex-differential

selection on LRS, with SC variants contributing comparatively more enrichment in the upper

tail of the null of unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$ (and its mixed-model analogue, unfolded $t$) than

SA variants contribute in the lower tail of the null. That signals of SC polymorphism were

more pronounced than SA polymorphism is perhaps unsurprising, given that most traits are

likely to be subject to SC rather than SA selection [29]. Moreover, alleles subject to identical

SC selection in each sex will contribute to the upper tail of unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$, but will

not contribute to the lower tail (or to other metrics of sex-differential selection), which might

also account for greater apparent signal of SC than SA selection in these analyses. Nonetheless,

some human traits have been shown to be under SA selection—most notably standing height,

which positively covaries with male LRS and negatively covaries with female LRS [28–30].

The enrichment of sites in the lower tails of unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$ and unfolded $t$ is

consistent with these previous observations. Our finding that variants that increase height

tended to have male-beneficial and female-detrimental effects (*i.e.*, as reflected by a negative

correlation between height and $t$) is particularly reassuring [28–30], and validates the intuition

that SA selection at the phenotypic level (*e.g.*, over height) gives rise to SA selection

throughout the genome.

**Modes of evolution affecting sex-differentiated loci**

Sex-differentiated sites had, on average, more intermediate frequencies than less sex-

differentiated sites. This finding has several implications. First, we expect no association

between metrics of sex-differentiation and MAF in the absence of sex-differential selection.

Therefore, this positive association represents an independent strand of support for the

argument that sex-differential selection is shaping patterns of genome-wide variation in the UK

Biobank dataset. Second, the positive associations imply that a model of sex-differential

purifying selection, in which variants are maintained at mutation-selection-drift balance, is

inadequate to explain enrichments of sex-differentiated sites. Sex-differential purifying

selection is instead expected to generate negative associations between MAF and the extent of

sex-differentiation (a negative association that is indeed observed for many quantitative traits

[70]). Finally, the positive associations between sex-differentiation and MAF are consistent

with recent evolutionary histories of balancing selection, genetic drift or incomplete selective

sweeps. Balancing selection or drift can both generate a broad spectrum of allele frequency

states at SA loci, in which intermediate-frequency SA variants dominate signals of sex-

differential selection. Alternatively, SC alleles with unequal fitness effects in each sex could

have recently swept to intermediate frequencies and these variants now dominate signals of

sex-differential selection.

Although positive associations between metrics of sex-differential selection and MAF

indicate that balancing selection may be present, our analyses did not reveal clear signals of

*long-term* balancing selection among sex-differentiated sites. The absence of such signals may

stem from several factors. First, SA polymorphisms are only predicted to experience balancing

selection under narrow conditions [71], so SA loci may not experience balancing selection at

all. Second, balancing selection could affect sex-differentiated polymorphisms but be too

recent to generate a clear statistical signal in our analyses [72]. Third, long-term balancing

selection at sex-differentiated loci may be present but *effectively* weak, owing to relatively

small $N_e$ in humans [73] and the high susceptibility of SA alleles to genetic drift [71]. Fourth,

long-term balancing selection may be present, but statistical tests for it may be too weak to

stand out from the background noise of false positives in our metrics and the datasets used to

quantify balancing selection [74].

How do we reconcile these results with previous work in *Drosophila melanogaster* indicating that candidate SA polymorphisms segregate across worldwide populations and even species [33]? A parsimonious explanation for these contrasting findings is that the effectiveness of balancing selection is lower in humans than fruit flies due to much smaller $N_e$. Indeed, given the pronounced sensitivity of SA balancing selection to genetic drift [71,75], we should expect the relationship between signals of SA and balancing selection to vary with $N_e$. Moreover, previous work in *Drosophila melanogaster* focussed on SA polymorphisms [33] to the exclusion of SC polymorphisms, whereas our metrics capture both forms of sex-differential variation, thus further weakening associations with signals of balancing selection in our study compared to theirs. Interestingly, when we partitioned signals of sex-differentiation into SA and SC components, we found indications that candidate SA sites were indeed older, which implies that SA balancing selection may be present but masked by sex-differential SC polymorphisms. Overall, evidence that sex-differentiated, including SA, polymorphisms contribute to standing genetic variation—as in our study—is at present much stronger than evidence that they are maintained by balancing selection.

**Directions for future research**

Our analyses suggest a number of fruitful directions for further research. First, given the difficulty of distinguishing participation bias from selection in signals of between-sex allele frequency differentiation among adults, conclusively establishing the presence of sex-differential viability selection in genomic data remains an important research direction. Parent-offspring trio analyses that control for participation effects [76], or replication of our analysis strategy in large datasets sampled through passive rather than active participation, may yield the evidence required. Second, the extent to which variants with positive effects on mortality in a given sex have similar or opposing effects on reproduction bears further examination. Our finding that genetic correlations between metrics of viability and reproductive selection were

not significantly different from zero indicates a range of possible scenarios. It may suggest that

variants affecting each fitness component are independent (*i.e.*, because alleles affecting each

component are genuinely independent), that between-sex allele frequency differentiation

among adults is a poor signal of sex-differential viability selection, or that a similar fraction of

loci have concordant and antagonistic effects, thus also generating no net correlation.

Finally, given the increasing availability of genotypic and LRS data, further work could

attempt to replicate our analysis strategy in different populations and species. Many taxa

exhibit greater variance for reproductive success than humans [77], generating higher potential

for detecting polygenic signals of sex-differential selection. In line with this, polygenic

inflations of adult $\hat{F}_{ST}$ have previously been documented in modest samples of pipefish and

flycatchers [32,37,38], suggesting that sex differences in selection might be stronger in those

species than in humans. Moreover, these samples are immune to the issues of ascertainment

bias mentioned above because sampling can be randomised with respect to sex. While we

expect that polygenic signals of sex-differential selection will replicate across populations

(provided sample sizes are adequately large [32]), we caution that there may be relatively little

overlap in terms of the most sex-differentiated polymorphisms. One reason is that

environmental differences between populations (*e.g.*, cultural differences in family planning

between human populations) could alter the set of causal loci under sex-differential selection.

Another reason is that the noisiness of polygenic signals of sex-differential selection [32,43],

along with the near-certainty that most polymorphic loci have small effects on fitness [78],

generates variation in the set of candidate sex-differential polymorphisms identified across

populations [79], even if causal sex-differential polymorphisms do not differ.

**Materials and Methods**

**Quality control of UK Biobank data**

Access to UK Biobank data was granted under project number 52049. We used sample-level

information provided by the UK Biobank (see [53] for details) to perform individual-level

(phenotypic) quality controls. Specifically, we excluded individuals with high relatedness (3rd

degree or closer), non-"White British" ancestry, high heterozygosity and high missing rates.

We also excluded individuals whose reported sex did not match their inferred genetic sex,

aneuploids, and individuals with missing or unreliable lifetime reproductive success (LRS)

data (as detailed below).

We processed LRS data as follows. LRS data were obtained from UK Biobank field

2405 "Number of children fathered" for males, and field 2734 "Number of live births" for

females. Previous observations of positive genetic correlations between offspring and grand-

offspring numbers across generations [80] indicate that offspring number represents a good

proxy for LRS in post-industrial human populations. Because some individuals were asked to

report offspring number at repeated assessment points, we considered the maximum offspring

number reported as the definitive value of LRS for that individual. Though mis-estimation of

LRS for each individual cannot be definitively excluded (*e.g.*, individuals may mis-report and

include non-biological children, individuals may reproduce after data collection), we

minimised this possibility by removing individuals: (*i*) younger than 45 years of age (this cut-

off was chosen for consistency with previous research [29] and because Office for National

Statistics data indicates that reproduction is very limited for UK individuals aged 45 and over);

(*ii*) reporting fewer offspring at a later assessment point than at an earlier assessment point;

(*iii*) with 20 or more reported offspring numbers (large offspring numbers often ended in

zero—*e.g.,* 20, 30, 50, 100—and were thus considered less reliable). Furthermore, uncounted

LRS data adds imprecision but should not systematically bias our analyses.

In addition to site-level quality-controls implemented by the UK Biobank [53], we used

PLINK and PLINK2 [81] to remove imputed sites that were non-diallelic, had MAF<1%,

missing rates>5%, p-values<$10^{-6}$ in tests of Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium, and INFO score

≤0.8, denoting poor imputation quality.

**Additional artefact filtering in UK Biobank data**

Mis-mapping of autosomal reads to sex chromosomes can generate between-sex allele

frequency differences among adults in the absence of sex differences in selection [32,42]. In

light of scant direct evidence for SA polymorphisms in humans, and still-developing

bioinformatic methods for distinguishing artefacts from genuine sex-differential

selection[39,42,82–84], our primary concern was to reduce the chance of mapping errors. We

did so by excluding: (*i*) sites with heterozygosity levels that exceeded what could plausibly be

expected under SA selection (see below and *SI Appendix*, Section C); (*ii*) sites with a deficit of

minor allele homozygotes; (*iii*) sites exhibiting large differences in missing rate between sexes.

These three patterns have previously been shown to correlate with mis-mapping of reads to sex

chromosomes [42]. While these filters reduce the chance of false positives, they also potentially

increase chance of false negatives and therefore represent a slightly conservative test of sex-

differential selection. For example, the removal of sites with high heterozygosity levels is

expected to remove sites under strong (but not weak or moderately strong) sex-differential

selection; similarly, the removal of sites with large missing rate differences between sexes may

remove genuine polymorphisms with sex-differential effects.

To remove sites with artificially inflated heterozygosity, we estimated $F_{IS}$ for each SNP,

as:

585    
$$\hat{F}_{IS} = \frac{P_{Aa}}{2\bar{p}(1 - \bar{p})} - 1$$

586     where $P_{Aa}$ denotes the frequency of heterozygotes for a given locus and $\bar{p}$ the sex-averaged

587     allele frequency. For a SA locus at polymorphic equilibrium, the distribution of $\hat{F}_{IS}$ is well

588     approximated by a normal distribution with expectation and variance as follows:

589
$$E[\hat{F}_{IS}] \approx \frac{1}{2n} + \frac{p(1-p)}{4}\left(\frac{s_{max}}{1 - ps_{max}}\right)^2$$

590
$$var[\hat{F}_{IS}] = \frac{1}{n}$$

where $n$ is total sample size of adults, $p$ the minor allele frequency, and $s_{max} = \max(s_m, s_f)$ with

$s_m$ and $s_f$ representing male and female selection coefficients (*SI Appendix*, Section C). To

identify SNPs with excess heterozygosity, we compared $\hat{F}_{IS}$ in the observed data to expected

$\hat{F}_{IS}$ under strong SA selection ($s_{max}$=0.2) by performing a one-tailed Z-test for excess

heterozygosity. We thus obtained p-values for each locus, corrected p-values for multiple

testing using Benjamini-Hochberg false discovery rates [85], and removed sites with FDR q-

values below 0.05.

To identify sites with a deficit of minor allele homozygotes, we compared the observed

frequency of minor allele homozygotes to the expected frequency under Hardy-Weinberg

equilibrium ($p^2$, where $p$ is the frequency of the minor allele) by performing a one-tailed

binomial test, removing sites with FDR q-values below 0.05. Tests for excess heterozygosity

and deficits of minor allele homozygotes were performed across all individuals (regardless of

sex), and also for each sex separately. Sites were removed if they exhibited q-values below

0.05 in any of the three tests (*i.e.*, both sexes combined, females, and males). Finally, to assess

differences in missing rate between the sexes, we performed a $\chi^2$ test, removing sites with

FDR q-values below 0.05.

**Quantifying polygenic signals of sex differences in selection**

*$\hat{F}_{ST}$-based metrics*

We used $\hat{F}_{ST}$ to quantify allele frequency differences between sexes. $\hat{F}_{ST}$ is a simple metric,

well-established in evolutionary biology research, amenable to theoretical modelling (as in eqs.

[2a-c]), and independent of MAF in the absence of sex-differential selection (unlike, say, raw

allele frequency differences [32]). We obtained allele frequencies in adults of each sex directly

from sequence data (after filtering individuals and sites, as described above) and used them to

calculate adult $\hat{F}_{ST}$ for each polymorphic site. We obtained allele frequencies among projected

gametes using LRS data (as per eq. [1]) and used them to calculate reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$, gametic

$\hat{F}_{ST}$ and unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$ (as per eqs. [2a-c] and [4]).

*Statistical comparisons of null and observed distributions*

Null distributions for $\hat{F}_{ST}$ metrics were theoretically derived (see *SI Appendix*, Section A, E).

The theoretical null distributions apply to genome-wide data in which the sample of female

and male sequences, mean and variance in LRS, and Hardy-Weinberg deviations, are constant

across loci. In practice, there is variation in sample sizes, mean LRS, variance in LRS, and the

extent of Hardy-Weinberg deviations between loci. To take these factors into account, we let

the multiplier in eqs. [3a-c] vary in terms of its sample size ($N_{f_i}$ and $N_{m_i}$ per diploid locus $i$),

mean and variance in LRS ($\mu_{f_i}$ and $\mu_{m_i}$, and $\sigma^2_{f_i}$ and $\sigma^2_{m_i}$, per diploid locus $i$) and the extent

of Hardy-Weinberg deviations in the sample ($\hat{F}^f_{IS_i}$ and $\hat{F}^m_{IS_i}$ per diploid locus $i$). We then scaled

$\hat{F}_{ST}$ by the multiplier, such that, for each locus:

629
$$\hat{F}_{ST(Adult,scaled)} \approx \frac{\hat{F}_{ST(Adult)}}{\left(\frac{1}{8N_{f_i}} + \frac{1}{8N_{m_i}}\right)} \approx X$$

630
$$\hat{F}_{ST(Reprod.,scaled)} \approx \frac{4\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})\hat{F}_{ST(Reprod.)}}{\frac{\hat{p}_f(1-\hat{p}_f)}{2N_{f_i}}\frac{\sigma^2_{f_i}}{\mu^2_{f_i}}\left(1-\hat{F}^f_{IS_i}\right) + \frac{\hat{p}_m(1-\hat{p}_m)}{2N_{m_i}}\frac{\sigma^2_{m_i}}{\mu^2_{m_i}}\left(1-\hat{F}^m_{IS_i}\right)} \approx X$$

631
$$\hat{F}_{ST(Gametic,scaled)} \approx \frac{\hat{F}_{ST(Gametic)}}{\left[\frac{1}{8N_{f_i}}\left(1+\frac{\sigma^2_{f_i}}{\mu^2_{f_i}}\right) + \frac{1}{8N_{m_i}}\left(1+\frac{\sigma^2_{m_i}}{\mu^2_{m_i}}\right)\right]} \approx X$$

These scaled $\hat{F}_{ST}$ estimates, which correct for site-specific variation, can then be compared to

a chi-square distribution with 1 degree of freedom. For unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$, no scaling

is required because site-specific adjustments are already taken into consideration in the

definition of the metric (eq. 4).

Null distributions were also obtained empirically, through permutation, as follows. For

adult and gametic $\hat{F}_{ST}$, we performed a single permutation of female and male labels, and re-

calculated $\hat{F}_{ST}$ (scaled by the multiplier, as above) in permuted data. For reproductive and

unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$, we performed a single permutation of LRS values within each

sex—without permuting sex—and re-calculated the statistic (scaled by the multiplier, as above)

in permuted data. Permuting LRS without permuting sex is appropriate for reproductive and

unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$ because it allows allele frequencies to differ between adult males

and females (as would happen if, for example, sex-differential viability selection is occurring

among juveniles) but randomises the effects of genotype on LRS, thus ensuring that only

estimation error can contribute to the empirical null. We performed a single permutation for

each metric because performing large numbers of permutations was computationally

unfeasible and because we were focussed on testing a cumulative signal of selection across

loci, rather than establishing significance at the single-locus level.

To test for elevations in observed data relative to the (theoretical or empirical) nulls,

we LD-pruned the dataset (settings '--indep-pairwise 50 10 0.2' in PLINK) and ran Wilcoxon

Rank-Sum and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests. These tests assess differences in the median and

distribution of the observed and null data, respectively. As a complementary way of comparing

observed and null data, we quantified enrichment of observed values in the top 1% of each null

using a $\chi^2$ test. Finally, we estimated the difference between the mean value of the metric in

the observed data and the mean value of the metric in each null, obtaining 95% confidence

intervals and empirical p-values through bootstrapping (1,000 replicates; where each replicate

consists of the set of relevant SNPs, sampled with replacement).

**Controlling for sex-specific population structure**

*Case-control GWAS of sex*

To complement the test for sex-differential viability selection based on adult $\hat{F}_{ST}$, we performed a GWAS of sex [32,42,55]. By analogy to adult $\hat{F}_{ST}$, loci with sex-differential effects on viability in a GWAS of sex will tend to have relatively large absolute log-odds ratios (corresponding to relatively large allele frequency differences between sexes). Unlike adult $\hat{F}_{ST}$, the GWAS of sex approach additionally permits the inclusion of covariates that account for population structure and other possible confounders [32].

We used BOLT-LMM to run a mixed-model GWAS [86], using a kinship matrix to account for population structure. The kinship matrix was constructed from an LD-pruned set of quality-filtered imputed SNPs (LD-pruning settings as above). We added individual age (field 54), assessment centre (field 21003) and the top 20 principal components derived from the kinship matrix, as fixed-effect covariates. To facilitate comparisons with adult $\hat{F}_{ST}$, we standardised the regression coefficients (log-odds ratios) from the GWAS by allele frequency, such that:

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ST} = (\sqrt{\bar{p}(1-\bar{p})}\hat{\mathcal{L}})^2$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ is the log-odds ratio and $\bar{p}$ is the sex-averaged allele frequency among adults. To obtain permuted $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ST}$ values, we performed a single permutation of female and male labels and re-calculated the statistic in the permuted data.

*t-statistics for sex-differential effects on LRS*

To complement the test for sex differences in selection on LRS based on reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$, we performed a GWAS of LRS in each sex separately, using a mixed-model GWAS, which allowed us to correct for population structure in effect size estimates. Following [87], we

quantified differences in male and female effect size estimates by means of a *t*-statistic, defined

as:

$$|t| = \left| \frac{\beta_{FM} - \beta_{FM}}{\sqrt{SE_{MF}^2 + SE_{FM}^2 - 2\rho SE_{MF} SE_{FM}}} \right|$$

where $\beta_F$ and $\beta_M$ are estimated effect sizes obtained from sex-stratified GWAS (implemented

in BOLT-LMM as above), $SE_M$ and $SE_F$ are sex-specific standard errors, and $\rho$ is the between-

sex rank correlation among genome-wide LD-pruned loci. Relative to permuted data (obtained

using an identical procedure to that implemented for reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$), loci with elevated $|t|$ in

observed data denote candidate loci with sex-differential effects on LRS.

To examine the relative contributions of SA and SC components to signals of sex-

differential reproductive selection, while correcting for sex-specific population structure, we

developed an analogue of unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$, termed "unfolded *t*", as:

$$\text{Unfolded } t = \frac{\beta_F \beta_M}{\sqrt{SE_F^2 SE_M^2}}$$

Relative to permuted data, SA selection (*i.e.*, opposing signs of $\beta_F$ and $\beta_M$) will tend to

generate an excess of negative values of unfolded *t*, while SC selection (*i.e.*, same sign of

$\beta_M$ and $\beta_F$) will tend to generate an excess of positive values of unfolded *t*.

**Functions and phenotypic effects of sex-differentiated loci**

We used Stratified LD Score Regression [88] to examine whether sex-differentiated loci were

more likely to be situated in putatively functional genomic regions (*e.g.*, coding or regulatory

regions) than expected by chance. This method partitions the heritability from GWAS

summary statistics into different functional categories, while accounting for differences in LD

(and thus, increased tagging of a given causal locus) in different regions of the genome (with

LD quantified from European-ancestry samples from the 1000 genome project, and restricted

to SNPs also present in the HapMap 3 reference panel [88]). Because LD-score regression

requires signed summary statistics as input, we first transformed our (unsigned) metrics of sex-

differential selection to signed metrics (e.g., $\hat{F}_{ST}$ metrics and $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ST}$ were transformed to Z-scores,

$|t|$ was transformed to $t$) where positive and negative values denote female- and male-beneficial

effects of the focal allele, respectively.

Enrichments for three putatively functional categories (coding, 3'UTR, 5'UTR) were

then calculated as the fraction of total heritability explained by a given category divided by the

fraction of all SNPs in a given category. Note that we calculated enrichment for these categories

while implementing the "full baseline model", which includes 50 further categories. This

model has been shown to provide unbiased enrichments for focal categories [88] and for total

SNP-heritability [89]; estimates of total SNP-heritability were used in *SI Appendix*, Section D.

We used cross-trait LD Score Regression [90] to examine genetic correlations between

metrics of sex-differential selection and a suite of phenotypic traits, as well as between the

metrics of sex-differential selection. The method calculates genetic correlations between pairs

of traits while taking into account LD-induced differences in the extent of tagging of causal

loci across the genome. We computed genetic correlations between each metric of sex-

differential selection (transformed to a signed statistic, as above, such that higher values of the

signed metric are more likely to benefit females than males) and an initial list of 43 traits

(subsequently filtered to 30 after removing traits where an accurate genetic correlation, defined

as SE < 0.2, could not be estimated) [91], and used FDR correction (across metrics and traits)

on resulting p-values. These analyses are fully documented (including code and results) at

https://lukeholman.github.io/UKBB_LDSC/

**Modes of evolution affecting sex-differentiated loci**

*Associations with MAF in the UK Biobank*

To test for associations between metrics of sex differences in selection and MAF, we estimated

a Spearman's rank correlation between each metric and MAF. We also tested whether the

relationship between metrics of sex differences in selection and MAF was more pronounced in

the observed data than in the (theoretical or empirical) nulls by estimating the difference

between correlations in the observed data and correlations in the null data among 1,000

bootstrap replicates (as above), thereby generating 95% confidence intervals and empirical p-

values.

*Allele ages*

If sex-differentiated variants experience sufficiently strong and sustained balancing selection

relative to the countervailing effects of genetic drift, we expect them to be older than the

genome-wide average [72]. We used the Atlas of Variant Age database to obtain allele age

estimates for genome-wide variants [57]. Estimates of allele age in this database apply to the

non-reference (*i.e.*, alternative) allele and are derived from coalescent modelling of the time to

the most recent common ancestor using the "Genealogical Estimation of Variant Age" method

(see [57] for details). Estimates of allele age make use of genomic data from: (*i*) the 1000

Genomes Project; (*ii*) the Simons Genome Diversity Project; (*iii*) both datasets combined. For

each site in the UK Biobank, we obtained the median estimate of allele age from the combined

dataset (when available), from the 1000 Genomes Project, or the Simons Genome Diversity

Project (when neither alternative estimate was available).

*Between-population $F_{ST}$ and Tajima's D in non-European populations*

If candidate SA variants experience sufficiently strong balancing selection maintaining a fixed

polymorphic equilibrium, they should exhibit lower-than-average allele frequency differences

*between* populations [72], and larger-than-average allele frequency diversity *within*

populations. We used bcftools [92] to obtain allele frequency data from two non-European

populations from the 1000 Genomes Project: Yoruba Nigerians (YRI, N=108) and Gujarati

Indians (GIH, N=103). We then estimated between-population $\hat{F}_{ST}$ as:

$$759 \qquad \hat{F}_{ST} = \frac{(\hat{p}_1 - \hat{p}_2)^2}{4\bar{p}(1 - \bar{p})}$$

where $\hat{p}_1$ and $\hat{p}_2$ are allele frequency estimates in the relevant pair of populations, and $\bar{p} =$

$(\hat{p}_1 + \hat{p}_2)/2$. We also used vcftools [93] to calculate Tajima's D, a metric of genetic diversity

which takes on elevated values under certain evolutionary and demographic scenarios,

including balancing selection, in 10kb windows across the genome.

*Previous candidates for balancing selection*

If candidate SA variants experience strong balancing selection, they should disproportionately

co-occur with previously identified candidates for balancing selection. We used three

independent sets of candidate sites for balancing selection to investigate this possibility [59–

61]: (*i*) the dataset of Andrés et al. [59], which consists of 64 genes exhibiting elevated

polymorphism (as determined using the Hudson-Kreitman-Aguadé test) and/or intermediate-

frequency alleles across 19 African-American or 20 European-American individuals; (*ii*) the

dataset of DeGiorgio et al. [61], which consists of 400 candidate genes exhibiting elevated $T_1$

or $T_2$ statistics among 9 European (CEU) and 9 African (YRI) individuals. $T_1$ or $T_2$ statistics

quantify the likelihood that a genomic region exhibits levels of neutral polymorphism that are

consistent with a linked balanced polymorphism; (*iii*) the dataset of Bitarello et al. [60], which

consists of 1859 candidate genes exhibiting elevated values of "Non-Central Deviation" (NCD)

statistics. NCD statistics also quantify the likelihood that given genomic regions are situated

nearby a balanced polymorphism, using polymorphism data from 50 random individuals from

two African (YRI; LWK) and European (GBR; TSI) populations and divergence data from a

chimpanzee outgroup.

We assigned each site in the UK Biobank dataset to a gene using SnpEff [94] and

categorised sites as candidates or non-candidates for balancing selection based on whether they

were annotated as belonging to a candidate or non-candidate gene in each of the three

aforementioned datasets.

*Statistical associations between metrics of sex-differential selection and balancing selection*

To test whether signals of sex differences in selection were associated with signals of balancing

selection, we performed Spearman's rank correlations between alternative allele age (scaled

by alternative allele frequency in the UK Biobank, to control for ascertainment bias) and each

metric of sex differences in selection. For between-population $\widehat{F}_{ST}$ and Tajima's D, we

performed multiple linear regressions, with the relevant metric of sex differences in selection

as the independent variable and MAF in the UK Biobank as a fixed-effect covariate (to control

for ascertainment bias). For previous candidates for balancing selection, we performed multiple

logistic regressions, where candidate/non-candidate status was the binary response variable,

with the relevant metric of sex differences in selection as the independent variable and MAF

in the UK Biobank as a fixed-effect covariate. In the case of regressions involving between-

population $\widehat{F}_{ST}$, $\widehat{F}_{ST}$ was first log-transformed to meet normality assumptions. In the case of

Tajima's D analyses (which are window-based rather than SNP-based), we averaged

independent variables across 10kb windows before performing regressions.

# References

1.      Fisher RA. The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection. Genetics. Clarendon Press; 1930. doi:10.1038/158453a0

2.      Charlesworth B. Causes of natural variation in fitness: evidence from studies of *Drosophila* populations. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2015;112: 1662–1629. doi:10.1073/pnas.1423275112

3.      Visscher PM, Wray NR, Zhang Q, Sklar P, McCarthy MI, Brown MA, et al. 10 years of GWAS discovery: Biology, function, and translation. Am J Hum Genet. 2017;101: 5–22. doi:10.1016/j.ajhg.2017.06.005

4.      Walsh B, Blows MW. Abundant Genetic Variation + Strong Selection = Multivariate Genetic Constraints: A Geometric View of Adaptation. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst. 2009;40: 41–59. doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.110308.120232

5.      Johnston SE, Gratten J, Berenos C, Pilkington JG, Clutton-Brock TH, Pemberton JM, et al. Life history trade-offs at a single locus maintain sexually selected genetic variation. Nature. 2013;502: 93–95. doi:10.1038/nature12489

6.      Connallon T, Hall MD. Genetic constraints on adaptation: a theoretical primer for the genomics era. Ann N Y Acad Sci. 2018;1422: 65–87. doi:10.1111/nyas.13536

7.      Arnqvist G, Tuda M. Sexual conflict and the gender load: Correlated evolution between population fitness and sexual dimorphism in seed beetles. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci. 2010;277: 1345–1352. doi:10.1098/rspb.2009.2026

8.      Whitlock MC, Agrawal AF. Purging the genome with sexual selection: Reducing mutation load through selection on males. Evolution. 2009;63: 569–582. doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00558.x

9.      Gilks WP, Abbott JK, Morrow EH. Sex differences in disease genetics: Evidence, evolution, and detection. Trends Genet. 2014;30: 453–463. doi:10.1016/j.tig.2014.08.006

10. Kidwell JF, Clegg MT, Stewart FM, Prout T. Regions of stable equilibria for models

of differential selection in the two sexes under random mating. Genetics. 1977;85:

171–183.

11. Curtsinger JW, Service PM, Prout T. Antagonistic pleiotropy, reversal of dominance,

and genetic polymorphism. Am Nat. 1994;144: 210–228. doi:10.1086/285671

12. Charlesworth B, Charlesworth D. A model for the evolution of dioecy and gynodioecy.

Am Nat. 1978;112: 975–997. doi:10.1086/283342

13. Olito C, Connallon T. Sexually antagonistic variation and the evolution of dimorphic

sexual systems. Am Nat. 2019;193: 688–701. doi:10.1086/702847

14. Van Doorn GS, Kirkpatrick M. Turnover of sex chromosomes induced by sexual

conflict. Nature. 2007;449: 909–912. doi:10.1038/nature06178

15. Charlesworth D, Charlesworth B. Sex differences in fitness and selection for centric

fusions between sex-chromosomes and autosomes. Genet Res. 1980;35: 205–214.

doi:10.1017/S0016672300014051

16. Jordan CY, Charlesworth D. The potential for sexually antagonistic polymorphism in

different genome regions. Evolution. 2012;66: 505–516. doi:10.1111/j.1558-

5646.2011.01448.x

17. Kirkpatrick M, Guerrero RF. Signatures of sex-antagonistic selection on recombining

sex chromosomes. Genetics. 2014;197: 531–541. doi:10.1534/genetics.113.156026

18. Patten MM, Haig D. Maintenance or loss of genetic variation under sexual and

parental antagonism at a sex-linked locus. Evolution. 2009;63: 2888–2895.

doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2009.00764.x

19. Bonduriansky R, Chenoweth SF. Intralocus sexual conflict. Trends Ecol Evol.

2009;24: 280–288. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2008.12.005

20. Connallon T, Clark AG. Evolutionary inevitability of sexual antagonism. Proc R Soc B

Biol Sci. 2014;281: 20132123. doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.2123

21.    Cox RM, Calsbeek R. Sexually antagonistic selection, sexual dimorphism, and the

853            resolution of intralocus sexual conflict. Am Nat. 2009;173: 176–187.

854            doi:10.1086/595841

855    22.    Singh A, Punzalan D. The strength of sex-specific selection in the wild. Evolution.

856            2018;72: 2818–2824. doi:10.1111/evo.13625

857    23.    De Lisle SP, Goedert D, Reedy AM, Svensson EI. Climatic factors and species range

858            position predict sexually antagonistic selection across taxa. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol

859            Sci. 2018;373: 20170415. doi:10.1098/rstb.2017.0415

860    24.    Mackay TFC. The genetic architecture of quantitative traits. Annu Rev Genet.

861            2001;35: 303–339. doi:10.1146/annurev.genet.35.102401.090633

862    25.    Delph LF, Andicoechea J, Steven JC, Herlihy CR, Scarpino S V., Bell DL.

863            Environment-dependent intralocus sexual conflict in a dioecious plant. New Phytol.

864            2011;192: 542–552. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2011.03811.x

865    26.    Svensson EI, McAdam AG, Sinervo B. Intralocus sexual conflict over immune

866            defense, gender load, and sex-specific signaling in a natural lizard population.

867            Evolution. 2009;63: 3124–3135. doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2009.00782.x

868    27.    Chippindale AK, Gibson JR, Rice WR. Negative genetic correlation for adult fitness

869            between sexes reveals ontogenetic conflict in *Drosophila*. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.

870            2001;98: 1671–1675. doi:10.1073/pnas.98.4.1671

871    28.    Stulp G, Kuijper B, Buunk AP, Pollet T V, Verhulst S. Intralocus sexual conflict over

872            human height. Biol Lett. 2012;8: 976–8. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2012.0590

873    29.    Sanjak JS, Sidorenko J, Robinson MR, Thornton KR, Visscher PM. Evidence of

874            directional and stabilizing selection in contemporary humans. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S

875            A. 2017;115: 151–156. doi:10.1073/pnas.1707227114

876    30.    Stearns SC, Govindaraju DR, Ewbank D, Byars SG. Constraints on the coevolution of

877            contemporary human males and females. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci. 2012;279: 4836–

4844. doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.2024

31.    Harper JA, Janicke T, Morrow EH. Systematic review reveals multiple sexually

antagonistic polymorphisms affecting human disease and complex traits. Evolution.

2021;75: 3087–3097. doi:10.1111/evo.14394

32.    Ruzicka F, Dutoit L, Czuppon P, Jordan CY, Li X, Olito C, et al. The search for

sexually antagonistic genes: Practical insights from studies of local adaptation and

statistical genomics. Evol Lett. 2020;4: 398–415. doi:10.1002/evl3.192

33.    Ruzicka F, Hill MS, Pennell TM, Flis I, Ingleby FC, Mott R, et al. Genome-wide

sexually antagonistic variants reveal long-standing constraints on sexual dimorphism

in fruit flies. PLoS Biol. 2019;17: e3000244. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3000244

34.    Cheng C, Kirkpatrick M. Sex-specific selection and sex-biased gene expression in

humans and flies. PLoS Genet. 2016;12: e1006170. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1006170

35.    Lucotte EA, Laurent R, Heyer E, Ségurel L, Toupance B. Detection of allelic

frequency differences between the sexes in humans: a signature of sexually

antagonistic selection. Genome Biol Evol. 2016;8: 1489–1500.

doi:10.1093/gbe/evw090

36.    Wright AE, Fumagalli M, Cooney CR, Bloch NI, Vieira FG, Buechel SD, et al. Sex-

biased gene expression resolves sexual conflict through the evolution of sex-specific

genetic architecture. Evol Lett. 2018;2: 52–61. doi:10.1101/176990

37.    Flanagan SP, Jones AG. Genome-wide selection components analysis in a fish with

male pregnancy. Evolution. 2017;71: 1096–1105. doi:10.1111/evo.13173

38.    Dutoit L, Mugal CF, Bolívar P, Wang M, Nadachowska-Brzyska K, Smeds L, et al.

Sex-biased gene expression, sexual antagonism and levels of genetic diversity in the

collared flycatcher (*Ficedula albicollis*) genome. Mol Ecol. 2018;27: 3572–3581.

doi:10.1111/mec.14789

39.    Bissegger M, Laurentino TG, Roesti M, Berner D. Widespread intersex differentiation

across the stickleback genome – The signature of sexually antagonistic selection? Mol

Ecol. 2019;29: 262–271. doi:10.1111/mec.15255

40.    Mank JE, Shu JJ, Wright AE. Signature of sexual conflict is actually conflict resolved.

Mol Ecol. 2020. doi:10.1111/mec.15311

41.    Cheng C, Kirkpatrick M. The signal of sex-specific selection in humans is not an

artefact: Reply to Mank et al. Mol Ecol. 2020. doi:10.1111/mec.15420

42.    Kasimatis KR, Abraham A, Ralph PL, Kern AD, Capra JA, Phillips PC. Evaluating

human autosomal loci for sexually antagonistic viability selection in two large

biobanks. Genetics. 2021;217: 1–10. doi:10.1093/genetics/iyaa015

43.    Kasimatis KR, Ralph PL, Phillips PC. Limits to genomic divergence under sexually

antagonistic selection. G3. 2019;9: 3813–3824. doi:10.1534/g3.119.400711

44.    Gardner EJ, Neville MDC, Samocha KE, Barclay K, Kolk M, Niemi MEK, et al.

Reduced reproductive success is associated with selective constraint on human genes.

Nature. 2022;603: 858–863. doi:10.1038/s41586-022-04549-9

45.    Mank JE. Population genetics of sexual conflict in the genomic era. Nat Rev Genet.

2017;18: 721–730. doi:10.1038/nrg.2017.83

46.    Rowe L, Chenoweth SF, Agrawal AF. The genomics of sexual conflict. Am Nat.

2018;192: 274–286. doi:10.1086/698198

47.    Kasimatis KR, Nelson TC, Phillips PC. Genomic signatures of sexual conflict. J

Hered. 2017;108: 780–790. doi:10.1093/jhered/esx080

48.    Roberts RB, Ser JR, Kocher TD. Sexual conflict resolved by invasion of a novel sex

determiner in Lake Malawi cichlid fishes. Science. 2009;326: 998–1001.

doi:10.1126/science.1174705

49.    Rostant WG, Kay C, Wedell N, Hosken DJ. Sexual conflict maintains variation at an

insecticide resistance locus. BMC Biol. 2015;13: 34. doi:10.1186/s12915-015-0143-3

50.    Barson NJ, Aykanat T, Hindar K, Baranski M, Bolstad GH, Fiske P, et al. Sex-

dependent dominance at a single locus maintains variation in age at maturity in

salmon. Nature. 2015;528: 405–408. doi:10.1038/nature16062

51.   VanKuren NW, Long M. Gene duplicates resolving sexual conflict rapidly evolved

essential gametogenesis functions. Nat Ecol Evol. 2018;2: 705–712.

doi:10.1038/s41559-018-0471-0

52.   Pearse DE, Barson NJ, Nome T, Gao G, Campbell MA, Abadía-Cardoso A, et al. Sex-

dependent dominance maintains migration supergene in rainbow trout. Nat Ecol Evol.

2019;3: 1731–1742. doi:10.1038/s41559-019-1044-6

53.   Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, Band G, Elliott LT, Sharp K, et al. The UK

Biobank resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. Nature. 2018;562: 203–

209. doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0579-z

54.   Wright S. The genetical structure of species. Ann Eugen. 1951;15: 323–354.

55.   Pirastu N, Cordioli M, Nandakumar P, Mignogna G, Abdellaoui A, Hollis B, et al.

Genetic analyses identify widespread sex-differential participation bias. bioRxiv. 2020.

56.   Eyre-Walker A. Genetic architecture of a complex trait and its implications for fitness

and genome-wide association studies. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2010;107: 1752–

1756. doi:10.1073/pnas.0906182107

57.   Albers PK, McVean G. Dating genomic variants and shared ancestry in population-

scale sequencing data. PLoS Biol. 2020;18. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3000586

58.   The 1000 Genomes Project Consortium. A global reference for human genetic

variation. Nature. 2015;526: 68–74. doi:10.1038/nature15393

59.   Andrés AM, Hubisz MJ, Indap A, Torgerson DG, Degenhardt JD, Boyko AR, et al.

Targets of balancing selection in the human genome. Mol Biol Evol. 2009;26: 2755–

2764. doi:10.1093/molbev/msp190

60.   Bitarello BD, de Filippo C, Teixeira JC, Schmidt JM, Kleinert P, Meyer D, et al.

Signatures of long-term balancing selection in human genomes. Genome Biol Evol.

956   2018;10: 939–955. doi:10.1093/gbe/evy054

957 61. DeGiorgio M, Lohmueller KE, Nielsen R. A model-based approach for identifying

958   signatures of ancient balancing selection in genetic data. PLoS Genet. 2014;10:

959   e1004561. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1004561

960 62. Morrissey MB. Meta-analysis of magnitudes, differences and variation in evolutionary

961   parameters. J Evol Biol. 2016;29: 1882–1904. doi:10.1111/jeb.12950

962 63. Hoban S, Kelley JL, Lotterhos KE, Antolin MF, Bradburd G, Lowry DB, et al. Finding

963   the genomic basis of local adaptation: Pitfalls, practical solutions, and future

964   directions. Am Nat. 2016;188: 379–397. doi:10.1086/688018

965 64. Vitti JJ, Grossman SR, Sabeti PC. Detecting natural selection in genomic data. Annu

966   Rev Genet. 2013;47: 97–120. doi:10.1146/annurev-genet-111212-133526

967 65. Booker TR, Jackson BC, Keightley PD. Detecting positive selection in the genome.

968   BMC Biol. 2017;15. doi:10.1186/s12915-017-0434-y

969 66. Pirastu N, Cordioli M, Nandakumar P, Mignogna G, Abdellaoui A, Hollis B, et al.

970   Genetic analyses identify widespread sex-differential participation bias. Nat Genet.

971   2021;53: 663–671. doi:10.1038/s41588-021-00846-7

972 67. Benagiano G, Farris M, Grudzinskas G. Fate of fertilized human oocytes. Reprod

973   Biomed Online. 2010;21: 732–741. doi:10.1016/j.rbmo.2010.08.011

974 68. Stearns SC, Byars SG, Govindaraju DR, Ewbank D. Measuring selection in

975   contemporary human populations. Nat Rev Genet. 2010;11: 611–622.

976   doi:10.1038/nrg2831

977 69. Bernabeu E, Canela-Xandri O, Rawlik K, Talenti A, Prendergast J, Tenesa A. Sex

978   differences in genetic architecture in UK Biobank. Nat Genet. 2021;53: 1283–1289.

979   doi:10.1101/2020.07.20.211813

980 70. Zeng J, De Vlaming R, Wu Y, Robinson MR, Lloyd-Jones LR, Yengo L, et al.

981   Signatures of negative selection in the genetic architecture of human complex traits.

Nat Genet. 2018;50: 746–753. doi:10.1038/s41588-018-0101-4

71.    Connallon T, Clark AG. A general population genetic framework for antagonistic

selection that accounts for demography and recurrent mutation. Genetics. 2012;190:

1477–1489. doi:10.1534/genetics.111.137117

72.    Fijarczyk A, Babik W. Detecting balancing selection in genomes: Limits and

prospects. Mol Ecol. 2015;24: 3529–3545. doi:10.1111/mec.13226

73.    Li H, Durbin R. Inference of human population history from individual whole-genome

sequences. Nature. 2011;475: 493–496. doi:10.1038/nature10231

74.    Connallon T, Clark AG. Antagonistic versus nonantagonistic models of balancing

selection: characterizing the relative timescales and hitchhiking effects of partial

selective sweeps. Evolution. 2013;67: 908–917. doi:10.1111/j.1558-

5646.2012.01800.x

75.    Mullon C, Pomiankowski A, Reuter M. The effects of selection and genetic drift on

the genomic distribution of sexually antagonistic alleles. Evolution. 2012;66: 3743–

3753. doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2012.01728.x

76.    Lucotte EA, Albiñana C, Laurent R, Bhérer C, Bataillon T, Toupance B. Detection of

sexually antagonistic transmission distortions in trio datasets. Evol Lett. 2022.

doi:10.1002/evl3.271

77.    Janicke T, Häderer IK, Lajeunesse MJ, Anthes N. Darwinian sex roles confirmed

across the animal kingdom. Sci Adv. 2016;2: e1500983. doi:10.1126/sciadv.1500983

78.    Eyre-Walker A, Keightley PD. The distribution of fitness effects of new mutations.

Nat Rev Genet. 2007;8: 610–618. doi:10.1038/nrg2146

79.    Yeaman S. Local adaptation by alleles of small effect. Am Nat. 2015;186: S74–S89.

doi:10.1086/682405

80.    Zietsch BP, Kuja-Halkola R, Walum H, Verweij KJH. Perfect genetic correlation

between number of offspring and grandoffspring in an industrialized human

population. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2014;111: 1032–1036.

doi:10.1073/pnas.1310058111

81. Chang CC, Chow CC, Tellier LCAM, Vattikuti S, Purcell SM, Lee JJ. Second-

generation PLINK: Rising to the challenge of larger and richer datasets. Gigascience.

2015;4. doi:10.1186/s13742-015-0047-8

82. McKinney GJ, Waples RK, Seeb LW, Seeb JE. Paralogs are revealed by proportion of

heterozygotes and deviations in read ratios in genotyping-by-sequencing data from

natural populations. Mol Ecol Resour. 2017;17: 656–669. doi:10.1111/1755-

0998.12613

83. Dou J, Zhao X, Fu X, Jiao W, Wang N, Zhang L, et al. Reference-free SNP calling:

Improved accuracy by preventing incorrect calls from repetitive genomic regions. Biol

Direct. 2012;7. doi:10.1186/1745-6150-7-17

84. Tsai KL, Evans JM, Noorai RE, Starr-Moss AN, Clark LA. Novel Y chromosome

retrocopies in canids revealed through a genome-wide association study for sex. Genes

(Basel). 2019;10: 320. doi:10.3390/genes10040320

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

powerful approach to multiple testing. J R Stat Soc. 1995;57: 289–300.

doi:10.2307/2346101

86. Loh P-R, Kichaev G, Gazal S, Schoech A, Price A. Mixed model association for

biobank-scale data sets. Nat Genet. 2018;50: 906–908. doi:10.1101/194944

87. Randall JC, Winkler TW, Kutalik Z, Berndt SI, Jackson AU, Monda KL, et al. Sex-

stratified genome-wide association studies including 270,000 individuals show sexual

dimorphism in genetic loci for anthropometric traits. PLoS Genet. 2013;9: e1003500.

doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1003500

88. Finucane HK, Bulik-Sullivan B, Gusev A, Trynka G, Reshef Y, Loh PR, et al.

Partitioning heritability by functional annotation using genome-wide association

summary statistics. Nat Genet. 2015;47: 1228–1235. doi:10.1038/ng.3404

89.    Evans LM, Tahmasbi R, Vrieze SI, Abecasis GR, Das S, Gazal S, et al. Comparison of

1036           methods that use whole genome data to estimate the heritability and genetic

1037           architecture of complex traits. Nat Genet. 2018;50: 737–745. doi:10.1038/s41588-018-

1038           0108-x

1039    90.    Bulik-Sullivan B, Finucane HK, Anttila V, Gusev A, Day FR, Loh PR, et al. An atlas

1040           of genetic correlations across human diseases and traits. Nat Genet. 2015;47: 1236–

1041           1241. doi:10.1038/ng.3406

1042    91.    http://www.nealelab.is/uk-biobank/.

1043    92.    Li H. A statistical framework for SNP calling, mutation discovery, association

1044           mapping and population genetical parameter estimation from sequencing data.

1045           Bioinformatics. 2011;27: 2987–2993. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btr509

1046    93.    Danecek P, Auton A, Abecasis G, Albers CA, Banks E, DePristo MA, et al. The

1047           variant call format and VCFtools. Bioinformatics. 2011;27: 2156–2158.

1048           doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btr330

1049    94.    Cingolani P, Platts A, Wang LL, Coon M, Nguyen T, Wang L, et al. A program for

1050           annotating and predicting the effects of single nucleotide polymorphisms, SnpEff. Fly

1051           (Austin). 2012;6: 80–92. doi:10.4161/fly.19695

1052

## Acknowledgements

1054    We thank Tom Allison, Isobel Beasley, Isobel Booksmythe, Katja Kasimatis, Max Reuter,

1055    Daniel Berner and six anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on previous versions of the

1056    manuscript. This work was supported by the Monash Bioinformatics Platform, the UK Biobank

1057    (project number 52049 to FR and TC), and funds from the Australian Research Council (to

1058    TC).

1059

## Author contributions

Conceptualization: FR, LH, TC; Methodology: FR, LH, TC; Investigation: FR, LH, TC; Visualization: FR, LH, TC; Funding acquisition: TC; Project administration: FR, TC; Supervision: FR, LH, TC; Writing – original draft: FR, TC; Writing – review & editing: FR, LH, TC.

## Competing Interests

Authors declare no competing interests.

## Data accessibility

Within the restrictions of the UK Biobank MTA agreement, metadata will be made available in the Supplementary Materials. Further metadata will be made available on public data sharing platforms, and code will be made available on public github repositories upon publication (/filruzicka/polygenic_SA_selection_in_the_UK_biobank/ and /lukeholman/ukbb_sex_fst/).

1075

**Figure 1. Partitioning signals of sex differences in selection among fitness components.** A

pair of autosomal alleles are represented by white and black dots, representing female- and

male-beneficial alleles, respectively; $\hat{p}_f$, $\hat{p}_m$, $\hat{p}_f'$, and $\hat{p}_m'$ depict sex-specific frequency

estimates for a given allele at different stages of the life cycle (see main text for details).

Autosomal allele frequencies are equalised between sexes at fertilisation (left box; females,

top; males, bottom), resulting in negligible allele frequency differentiation at this stage of the

life cycle. Differentiation between sexes can arise in the sample of adults (middle box) due to

sex differences in viability selection among juveniles (orange arrow), and in the projected

gametes (right box) due to sex differences in lifetime reproductive success (LRS) among adults

(green arrow). Data on sex-specific allele frequencies and LRS thus allow the estimation of

sex-differential effects of genetic variants on each fitness component (including overall fitness;

purple arrow), despite the absence of allele frequency data among zygotes (left box) and

gametes (right box), which are inferred and not directly observed.

1089

**Figure 2. Polygenic signals of sex-differential selection: inflation in $\widehat{F}_{ST}$ metrics relative to their nulls. A-C**. Percentage of sites (coloured, observed; grey, permuted) falling into each of 100 quantiles of the theoretical null distributions of adult $\widehat{F}_{ST}$ (A), reproductive $\widehat{F}_{ST}$ (B) and gametic $\widehat{F}_{ST}$ (C). Theoretical null data (*x*-axes) were generated by simulating values (nSNPs = 1,051,949) from a chi-square distribution with one degree of freedom. For each locus, observed and permuted $\widehat{F}_{ST}$ values were scaled by the multiplier of the relevant theoretical null distributions (*i.e.*, the multiplier in eqs. [3a-c] for adult, reproductive and gametic $\widehat{F}_{ST}$, respectively; see Materials and Methods). In the absence of sex differences in selection, ~1% of observed SNPs should fall into each quantile of the null (dashed line). LOESS curves ($\pm$SE) are presented for visual emphasis. **D-F.** Difference between the mean of observed and empirical null data for each metric (*i.e.*, adult, reproductive and gametic $\widehat{F}_{ST}$, respectively) (top), and the difference between observed and theoretical null data (bottom), across 1,000 bootstrap replicates. Vertical line intersects zero (no difference between observed and null data). As in panels A-C., $\widehat{F}_{ST}$ values were scaled by the relevant theoretical null distributions.

1104

**Figure 3. Partitioning signals of sex-differential selection into SA and SC components**

**reveals their joint contributions. A.** As in Fig. 1, $\hat{p}_f$, $\hat{p}_m$, $\hat{p}'_f$, and $\hat{p}'_m$ depict sex-specific

frequency estimates for a given allele at different stages of the life cycle. Under SA selection

(top), the white allele is female-beneficial and the black allele is male-beneficial, which tends

to generate negative values of unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$. Under SC selection (bottom), the

black allele is beneficial in both sexes, which tends to generate positive values of unfolded

reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$. **B.** Percentage of sites (turquoise: observed; grey: permuted) falling into each

of 100 quantiles of the theoretical null distributions of unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$. Theoretical

null data (*x*-axes) were generated by simulating values (nSNPs = 1,051,949) from the null (*i.e.*,

the product of two standard normal distributions). In the absence of sex-differential selection,

~1% of observed SNPs should fall into each quantile of the null (dashed line). LOESS curves

($\pm$SE) are presented for visual emphasis. **C.** Difference, for unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$,

between the mean observed and empirical null data (top) and between observed and theoretical

null data (bottom), across 1,000 bootstrap replicates. The vertical line intersects zero, indicating

no difference between the observed and null data. Differences between observed and null data

were obtained separately for negative and positive values of unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$. This

illustrates that there is enrichment of SNPs in both tails of the null.

1122

**Figure 4. Structure-corrected metrics reaffirm $\widehat{F}_{ST}$-based signals of sex-differential selection. A-C.** Percentage of sites falling into each of 100 quantiles of the empirical null distributions of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ST}$, $|t|$ and unfolded $t$. In the absence of sex differences in selection, ~1% of observed SNPs should fall into each quantile of the null (dashed line). LOESS curves ($\pm$SE) are presented for visual emphasis. **D-F.** Difference between the mean of each metric in observed and empirical null data, across 1,000 bootstrap replicates. Vertical line intersects zero (no difference between observed and null data). For unfolded $t$, differences between observed and null data were obtained separately for negative and positive values. This illustrates that there is enrichment of SNPs in both tails of the null.

1132

**Figure 5. Indications that sex-differentiated loci are more likely to be functional and contribute to trait variation. A.** Genetic correlations between metrics of sex-differential selection. Positive correlations (orange) imply that alleles have similar sex-specific effects on given fitness components, while negative correlations (purple) imply that alleles have opposing sex-specific effects on given fitness components. * denotes unadjusted p<0.05. **B.** Enrichments (±SE) of sex-differentiated loci in major functional categories. For each metric, enrichments were calculated as the relative SNP-heritability (as a fraction of total SNP-heritability) explained by a given functional category, divided by the relative number of SNPs (as a fraction of all SNPs) present in a given functional category. Dashed line = 1 (no enrichment). "Negative" and "Positive" refer to negative and positive values (*i.e.*, SA and SC components, respectively) of unfolded reproductive $\widehat{F}_{ST}$ and unfolded t metrics. **C.** Genetic correlations between metrics of sex-differential selection and various UK Biobank phenotypes (as analysed by the Neale laboratory). Metrics of sex-differential selection have been polarised, such that positive correlations (red) imply that a trait is more beneficial to females than males (for the

1148    relevant fitness component), while negative correlations (blue) denote traits which are more

1149    beneficial to males than females. ** denotes FDR-adjusted p<0.05 and * denotes unadjusted

1150    p<0.05.

1151

**Figure 6. Modes of evolution of sex-differentiated sites. A-D.** Mean MAF, in the UK Biobank, across 100 quantiles of the null for each metric of sex-differential selection. For $\hat{F}_{ST}$ metrics, *x*-axes correspond to Figs. 2A-C (and Fig. 3B for unfolded reproductive $\hat{F}_{ST}$). For mixed-model metrics, *x*-axes correspond to Fig. 4A-D. LOESS curves ($\pm$SE) are presented for visual emphasis. **E-H.** Mean age of the alternative (*i.e.*, non-reference) allele across 100 quantiles of the null for each metric of sex-differential selection. Each panel corrects for ascertainment bias of allele frequencies among highly sex-differentiated sites (*i.e.*, Fig. 6A-D). For visualisation purposes, this was done by averaging, in each quantile, allele age across 20 quantiles of alternative allele frequency in the UK Biobank (such that UK Biobank alternative allele frequency is approximately equal across quantiles). LOESS curves ($\pm$SE) are presented for visual emphasis.