**Loss of altruism in the social amoeba *Dictyostelium discoideum* is associated with the**

**G protein-coupled receptor, *grlG***

Laura M. Walker[*], Rintsen N. Sherpa[†], Sindhuri Ivaturi[*], Debra A. Brock[*], Jason R. Walker[‡],

Joan E. Strassmann[*] and David C. Queller[*]

[*]Department of Biology, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri 63130

[†]Department of Computational Medicine and Bioinformatics, University of Michigan, Ann

Arbor, MI 48109

[‡]McDonnell Genome Institute, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Missouri

63130

**ORCID IDs:** 0000-0003-0837-7227 (L.M.W.); 0000-0002-4349-5854 (D.A.B.); 0000-0001-7547-

5789 (J.R.W.); 0000-0003-0638-8440 (J.E.S.); 0000-0002-5464-1984 (D.C.Q)

**Abstract**

Aggregative multicellularity relies on cooperation among individual cells to form a multicellular

body. In *Dictyostelium discoideum* this cooperation is maintained by high relatedness. Previous

work showed that experimental evolution under low-relatedness resulted in an increase of

cheaters (cells that contribute proportionally more to viable spores than to the dead, sterile

stalk) and that many clones completely lost cooperation and the ability to form fruiting bodies.

Here, we investigate the genetic basis underlying the evolution of the cheating phenotype using

whole-genome sequencing and variant analysis of these 24 previously evolved *D. discoideum*

lines. We identified 38 single nucleotide polymorphisms in 29 genes, none of which have been

previously reported to cause cheating and most of which are uncharacterized. Each gene has

one unique variant except for the G protein-coupled receptor *grlG*, which has at least one

variant in over half of the lines. Upon identifying the parallel evolution of *grlG*, we screened

additional clones to investigate the correlation between variants in the gene and the complete

loss of cooperation (identified by the inability to form a fruiting body). We found that variants

in the first half of *grlG* that impact the signal peptide or extracellular binding domain are

significantly associated with the complete loss of cooperation (non-fruiting); the association

was not significant in the second half of the gene. Our results suggest that the loss of *grlG* was

adaptive under the experimental conditions of low-relatedness and that the first half of the

gene in particular is involved in cooperation and multicellular development in *D. discoideum*.

This represents a new selfish mutation that arose naturally under conditions of low-relatedness

and helps confirm the importance of high relatedness in the evolution of altruism in the social

amoeba *Dictyostelium discoideum.*

**Key words:** Aggregative multicellularity, *far2*, Glutamate receptor-like protein, Orphan GPCR,

**Introduction**

High relatedness is crucial for the maintenance of cooperation in multicellularity. Without high

relatedness to reduce conflict among individuals in a cooperative group, cheaters can evolve

that exploit the individual and destabilize altruistic traits (Hardin 1968; Gilbert *et al.* 2007). High

relatedness is easily achieved within organisms that go through a single-cell bottleneck or are

otherwise clonal, as is true for most of the more than 20 transitions from unicellularity to

multicellularity (Grosberg and Strathmann 2007; Knoll 2011). A single-cell origin ensures that all

cells are highly related (genetically identical) which reduces conflict, protects against cheaters

and promotes the division of labor that is so crucial for complex multicellularity such as in

plants and animals (Grosberg and Strathmann 2007; Cooper and West 2018). However, a single-

cell origin is not the only way to achieve multicellularity and its many benefits. Many other

organisms from across the tree of life achieve multicellularity via aggregation or fusion of

individual cells (Bonner 1998; Sebé-Pedrós *et al.* 2017). In this form of multicellularity, called

aggregative multicellularity, the cells that aggregate need not be related, so other mechanisms

are required to reduce conflict and maintain cooperation (Queller 2000).

Organisms that arise by aggregation offer important opportunities for evolutionary and

mechanistic studies of conflict and cooperation. Genetic indications of conflict and its control

are likely to be evident in multicellular organisms that arise by aggregation. Unlike multicellular

organisms that require a single-cell bottleneck, in organisms with aggregative multicellularity it

is possible to experimentally manipulate intra-organismal relatedness and study the outcome.

Among the best studied organisms with aggregative multicellularity is the social amoeba

*Dictyostelium discoideum.* Usually free-living in the soil, when faced with starvation *D.*

*discoideum* amoebae aggregate to cooperatively form a multicellular fruiting body in which

about 80% develop into reproductive spores and the remaining 20% die forming a stalk (Kessin

2001). The stalk lifts the spores, facilitating dispersal (smith *et al.* 2014). Stalk formation is

altruistic because cells that contribute to the stalk die, sacrificing themselves to aid in spore

dispersal. This partitioning of reproductive spores and sterile stalk cells provides an opportunity

for clones to cheat in mixtures of genotypes by contributing more than their fair share of cells

to spores versus the stalk (skewing the typical distribution) (Strassmann *et al.* 2000).

*Dictyostelium discoideum* is a particularly valuable and tractable model system for studying

aggregative multicellularity (Strassmann and Queller 2011; Ostrowski 2019). In the laboratory

we can experimentally manipulate populations of genetically distinct amoebae and they will

aggregate together and develop into a fruiting body. An extensive set of experimental tools and

resources (fluorescent labels, reference genome, etc.) are available that allow us to track the

outcome of the distinct genotypes (Buttery *et al.* 2013). In the multicellular fruiting bodies that

result from mixing experiments, it is usually possible to identify a winner (the clone contributing

more to spores than stalk) and a loser (the clone contributing more to the stalk than spores)

(Strassmann *et al.* 2000; Fortunato *et al.* 2003a; Buttery *et al.* 2009; Wolf *et al.* 2015; Madgwick

*et al.* 2018). Evidence suggests that cheating occurs in natural populations too. Despite the high

relatedness in natural populations (Gilbert *et al.* 2007), distinct clones are often found in close

proximity and they too will aggregate and form chimeric fruiting bodies (Strassmann *et al.*

2000; Fortunato *et al.* 2003b; smith *et al.* 2016).

Genetic mutations that result in a selfish trait such as the preferential formation of spores

versus stalk (cheater mutations), may pose a threat to cooperation depending on the context in

which they arise. Within an individual fruiting body a cheater mutation can be favored by

selection and contribute disproportionately more to spores than to stalk (Strassmann *et al.*

2000). But the outcome more broadly will depend on the relatedness of aggregating cells and

the extent to which those carrying the mutation can still cooperate on their own. If a clone

carrying the cheater mutation has completely lost cooperation such that it can only form spores

(an obligate cheater), then it can only persist when an exploitable clone is available. When an

obligate cheater clone finds itself alone without others to form a stalk, multicellular fruiting

body formation (development) comes to a halt resulting in a mound of cells that cannot

disperse, and thus a fitness of zero. We call these obligate cheater clones "non-fruiters." If

instead, a clone carrying the cheater mutation can still cooperate and can modify its strategy

depending on the availability of exploitable clones then the mutation may persist without

threatening the collapse of multicellularity. We call these clones "facultative cheaters."

It has been experimentally shown that selection under low relatedness increases the

occurrence of both facultative (Santorelli *et al.* 2008) and non-fruiting obligate cheaters (Ennis

*et al.* 2000; Kuzdzal-Fick *et al.* 2011). When obligate cheaters arise in the wild where

relatedness is high, they should not persist because they will usually find themselves in clonal

or nearly clonal aggregations where their cheating advantage will not trump the disavantage of

their inability to form fruiting bodies on their own (Fortunato *et al.* 2003b; Gilbert *et al.* 2007).

In line with that expectation, no obligate cheaters have been identified from natural

populations of *D. discoideum*. While it is true that non-fruiting clones would be missed with

traditional isolation techniques (Cavender and Raper 1965), Gilbert *et al.* (2007) screened

specifically for the presence of non-fruiting obligate cheaters by clonally plating over 3,000

spores from wild-collected fruiting bodies to observe the phenotype. No clones were found that

were incapable of forming a fruiting body. These findings are in line with predictions of kin

selection theory (Hamilton 1964) and show that high relatedness helps stabilize altruism in *D.*

*discoideum.* The altruistic trait of stalk formation can be maintained only if the benefits are

shared with related individuals who likely share the altruism allele.

One way in which organisms with aggregative origins of multicellularity maintain high

relatedness and the resulting cooperation is through kin discrimination (West *et al.* 2006). Kin

discrimination describes mechanisms that allow individuals to identify and preferentially direct

benefits to relatives and either harm or ignore non-relatives (Tsutsui 2004; Strassmann *et al.*

2011). Some species of Dictyostelids have robust kin discrimination systems that aid in the

sorting of different genotypes into mostly clonal fruiting bodies (Mehdiabadi *et al.* 2006, 2009;

Sathe *et al.* 2014). *Dictyostelium discoideum* also has kin discrimination with sorting regulated

by two highly variable cell adhesion genes, *tgrB1* and *tgrC1* (Benabentos *et al.* 2009; Hirose *et*

*al.* 2011; Gruenheit *et al.* 2017). Segregation by kin discrimination in *D. discoideum* takes place

during early aggregation but is not maintained and does not result in fruiting bodies that are

highly sorted by relatedness (Flowers *et al.* 2010; Gilbert *et al.* 2012). So although it may limit

some cheaters from invading (Ho *et al.* 2013), kin discrimination alone is not strong enough to

provide complete protection from selfish cheaters in *D. discoideum*. Instead, high relatedness in

natural populations must be maintained in additional ways such as through structured

population growth and spatial distribution patterns (Buttery *et al.* 2012; smith *et al.* 2016).

Despite the great deal has been learned about cooperation and conflict in *D. discoideum,* much

remains to be learned with respect to the underlying genes and pathways. Several efforts to

identify genes underlying cheating phenotypes have been made, often by employing restriction

enzyme-mediated integration (REMI) to generate gene knock-out mutant libraries (Kuspa and

Loomis 1992). Screening of such REMI mutant libraries has successfully revealed a number of

genes involved in cheating phenotypes in *D. discoideum.* Santorelli *et al.* (2008) screened a

large REMI mutant library, focusing on facultative cheater genes (by requiring one round of

clonal fruiting body development) and identified over 100 genes predicted to cause cheating

when lost to mutation. As might be expected for such a large number of loci, the gene ontology

terms span a wide diversity of biological processes. Thus far only two of the genes from

Santorelli *et al.* (2008) have been characterized including *chtB* (Santorelli *et al.* 2013) and *chtC*

(Khare and Shaulsky 2010). Despite the expectation that mutations in genes that cause cheating

should have an associated fitness cost to control their spread, neither the *chtB* nor *chtC*

mutants have any obvious fitness costs. Mutant clones for both genes are able to cheat

facultatively, increasing in numbers in chimera but when alone, they contribute cells to both

spores and stalk and form fruiting bodies normally (Khare and Shaulsky 2010; Santorelli *et al.*

2013). It may be that there are disadvantageous pleiotropic effects that keep these mutations

from spreading, but they were not detected in the laboratory. Pleiotropy is, after all, another

mechanism proposed to hinder the spread of cheaters such as described for two separately

identified facultative cheater genes in *D. discoideum*, *dimA* and *csaA* (Queller *et al.* 2003; Foster

*et al.* 2004; Strassmann and Queller 2011).

In addition to the aforementioned facultative cheater genes, only one obligate cheater gene

has been described, *fbxA* (Ennis *et al.* 2000). The *fbxA* mutant*,* also resulting from a REMI

mutant library screen, was the first cheater gene to be described and has therefore also been

referred to as "Cheater A" or "chtA" for short. When cells from a clone carrying a mutant copy

of *fbxA* (encoding F-box protein A) are mixed with wild-type cells, they become

overrepresented as spores rather than stalk cells (Ennis *et al.* 2003). But unlike the facultative

cheaters, there is a large group cost; as the frequency of *fbxA* mutants in a group increases, the

overall spore production decreases (Gilbert *et al.* 2007). And when alone (*i.e.,* only *fbxA*

mutants are present), few to no spores are produced; the loss of *fbxA* results in non-fruiting

obligate cheaters (Ennis *et al.* 2000, 2003).

The cheater genes that have been described thus far in *D. discoideum* share few sequence

features or protein domains and are associated with a wide diversity of cellular functions and

pathways, which suggests that cheating can be accomplished in many ways (Santorelli *et al.*

2008). Some of the mechanistic diversity is already apparent; the described cheater genes

cause cheating via different means including altered communications in cell-fate determination

(Ennis *et al.* 2000; Thompson *et al.* 2004; Khare and Shaulsky 2010) and changes in cell

adhesion (Queller *et al.* 2003). Perhaps that is to be expected given the complexity of

multicellular development in *D. discoideum*. In addition to the aggregation and cooperation

required of the previously free-living individuals, multicellular development involves the

differentiation of cell types (*e.g.,* prestalk, prespore), followed by the maintenance and

coordination of each of those cell types fates and their proportions (Loomis 2015). Cheaters can

presumably arise that exploit any number of aspects of this developmental process; the study

of cheating therefore also has the potential to provide insight into development more broadly.

To expand our understanding of the genomics underlying cheating and cooperation in *D.*

*discoideum,* and especially the understudied obligate cheaters, in this study we return to cell

lines experimentally evolved under low-relatedness by Kuzdzal-Fick *et al.* (2011). Starting from

a single isolate of the wild type lab strain AX4, Kuzdzal-Fick *et al.* (2011) established 24 replicate

lines and maintained low-relatedness by transferring a million spores to new plates 31 times

(about 290 generations) (**Figure 1A**). Each round began with one million spores which were

allowed to hatch, proliferate by eating bacteria, and then form fruiting bodies. At each transfer,

the low relatedness was reestablished by replating a million thoroughly mixed spores. In this

way, cheaters that appeared by mutation would not be with other such cells among the million

and would instead be in close proximity to cells to exploit. Under these conditions, cheaters

were favored by selection and significantly increased in abundance by contributing more to

spores while contributing less to the stalk. As the percentage of cheaters in a line increased,

fewer spores were produced overall. And among the evolved lines, the percentage of clonal

isolates which had completely lost cooperation and could no longer form fruiting bodies on

their own (non-fruiters) rose to as high as 69% (**Figure 2**). On average, the evolved lines of

Kuzdzal-Fick *et al.* (2011) contained approximately 30% non-fruiters and most of them that

have been tested were cheaters.

The work by  Kuzdzal-Fick *et al.* (2011) showed that drastically reduced relatedness allowed the

spread of cheater mutations that contribute disproportionately to spores and reduced the

overall spore production in many lines (**Figure 1A**). This demonstrates how low relatedness in a

natural population would lead to a collapse of multicellularity and with it, the advantages of

fruiting body formation and spore dispersal. In this study we use whole-genome sequencing

and variant analysis of these experimentally evolved *D. discoideum* cell lines to identify genomic

changes that allowed non-fruiting obligate cheaters to evolve over the course of that

experiment.

**Figure 1. Outline of the experimental workflow. A.** Experimental evolution of *D. discoideum* at

low-relatedness by Kuzdzal-Fick *et al.* (2011). A clonal isolate of AX4 was used to generate 24

replicate lines. After fruiting body formation, spores were collected, thoroughly mixed and one

million spores were replated. Reestablishing low relatedness at each of the 31 passages (about

290 generations) allowed selection to favor mutations that conferred cheating. **B.** Whole-

genome sequencing and variant analysis in this study of the 24 evolved cell lines (from A). We

grew spores from the final passage of each evolved cell line to generate two samples, (**I.**) the

line in bulk, as a population and (**II.**) a non-fruiting clone from each line. For the line in bulk as a

population (**B, I.**), we grew cells for genomic DNA extraction. For the non-fruiting clone (**B, II.**),

we plated a serial dilution of spores from each population to isolate a non-fruiting clone which

we then grew for genomic DNA extraction. We used whole-genome sequencing and variant

analysis of populations and clones to identify 38 SNPs impacting 29 genes. **C.** Association of

SNPs with the loss of altruism in clones. We again plated the evolved populations (lines) (from

A) to allow growth of clonal colonies from individual spores. We evaluated numerous clones

from each line by two criteria: 1) whether they were obligate cheaters (non-fruiters) or not

(normal fruiting body formation) and 2) whether they carried the previously identified SNP or

not, via PCR and Sanger sequencing.

**Materials and Methods**

***Experimental Cell Lines***

*Dictyostelium discoideum* cell lines were experimentally evolved under conditions of low-

relatedness by Kuzdzal-Fick *et al.* (2011) (**Figure 1A**). Kuzdzal-Fick *et al.* (2011) froze spores from

the evolved lines in KK2 buffer (2.25 g $KH_2PO_4$ and 0.67 g $K_2HPO_4$ per L) with 25% glycerol and

stored them at -80°. We thawed spores from the ancestor and from the final passage of each

evolved line for genomic DNA extraction. Each evolved line is a population composed of cells

and lineages carrying any newly acquired mutations. To capture all of this variation, we

generated a whole-genome sequence for each evolved line. We will refer to these sequences as

populations. To narrow the focus to variation associated with obligate cheating, we also

generated a whole-genome sequence for one non-fruiting clone from each evolved line (**Figure**

**1B**). We will refer to these sequences as non-fruiter clones. And finally, to identify variation that

arose during the experimental evolution we generated a whole-genome sequence of the

ancestor.

**Figure 2. Percentage of non-fruiting clones per evolved cell line from Kuzdzal-Fick *et al.***

**(2011).** After about 290 generations under low-relatedness, 19 of the 24 lines had evolved to

cheat their ancestor (the five lines that did not cheat are labeled in grey). Non-fruiting (obligate

cheating), which was not present in the ancestor (Anc.), also increased in frequency to a varying

degree among the evolved lines. The percentage of non-fruiting clones for each line (three

replicate measurements) is displayed in this scattered dot plot with the mean represented by

the horizontal bar. In this study we generated a whole-genome sequence for each evolved line

in bulk as a population and for one non-fruiting clone except where indicated ('°' indicates no

clone was sequenced and '‡' indicates two clones sequenced). Redrawn from Kuzdzal-Fick *et al.*

(2011).

To isolate genomic DNA from each of the 24 evolved lines (**Figure 1B, I.**), we plated spores onto

two SM/5 agar plates (2 g glucose, 2 g BactoPeptone (Oxoid), 2 g yeast extract (Oxoid), 0.2 g

$MgCl_2$, 1.9 g $KH_2PO_4$, 1 g $K_2HPO_4$ and 15 g agar per liter) with 200 μL of *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in

KK2 buffer ($OD_{600}$ 1.5) as food. We plated the spores at two different concentrations (2 X $10^5$

spores and 4 X $10^5$ spores per plate) to allow processing of multiple samples at one time in case

growth rates varied between the evolved lines. We incubated the plates at room temperature

for approximately 36 h or until log phase. We collected amoebae in log phase from the surface

of two plates for each sample and washed them four to five times in chilled KK2 buffer before

DNA extraction.

To isolate genomic DNA from non-fruiting clones (**Figure 1B, II.**) we first plated serial dilutions

of spores to allow for clonal growth from individual spores. We aimed to collect one non-

fruiting clone from each evolved line but for five lines (2, 4, 6 and 17 and 22), despite repeated

attempts, we were unable to locate any non-fruiting clones. To use the remaining sequencing

space, we sequenced a second non-fruiting clone for three haphazardly selected lines (20, 21

and 23). After three to five days of growth, we collected cells from the leading edge of each

non-fruiting clonal plaque using a sterile loop and plated them on SM/5 agar with *K.*

*pneumoniae*. We then plated these cells to grow for DNA extraction using the same protocol

described for the evolved lines. To document the non-fruiting morphology, we took

photographs of each clonal plaque immediately before collecting cells from the leading edge for

expansion (example images are available in **Supplemental Material 1**). A second photograph

was taken one to two days following collection and we continued to monitor the plaques to

ensure they never formed fruiting bodies.

***DNA isolation and sequencing***

We isolated genomic DNA from the washed, log-phase cells in the range of 1–2 X $10^8$ cells using

the Qiagen DNeasy® Blood and Tissue kit (Qiagen). We resuspended the genomic DNA in 10

mM Tris-HCl pH 8.5 and stored it at 4° until submission to the McDonnell Genome Institute at

Washington University in St. Louis, MO for library preparation and sequencing. Sequence

libraries were prepared starting with 0.5 μg of genomic DNA using the KAPA Hyper Library Prep

(KAPA Biosystems). We sequenced genomic DNA on the Illumina NovaSeq (150 bp x 2 paired-

end) to an estimated depth of 100X and 500X for the clones and populations, respectively.

***Sequence Alignment***

We aligned the Illumina paired-end reads to a single FASTA file containing the reference

genomes of both *D. discoideum* AX4 and the food bacterium, *K. pneumoniae* (both downloaded

from NCBI in June 2019). We used BWA-MEM (0.7.15) (Li 2013) to index the *D. discoideum* and

*K. pneumoniae* concatenated reference genome and to align the paired-end reads for each

sample.

We used an alignment pipeline to run BWA-MEM (Li and Durbin 2009) which converts, sorts

and indexes input, intermediate, and output formats using Picard v2.18.1

(http://broadinstitute.github.io/picard/), Sambamba v0.6.4 (Tarasov *et al.* 2015) and Samtools

v1.3.1 (using HTSLib v1.3.2) (Li *et al.* 2009) ultimately resulting in an aligned, sorted,

compressed and indexed CRAM file. We used both Picard (CollectInsertSizeMetrics,

CollectAlignmentSummaryMetrics, CollectGcBiasmetrics) and Samtools (flagstat) to evaluate

alignment and coverage metrics using BAMs of the initial alignments including both *D.*

*discoideum* and *K. pneumoniae* reference genome alignments and again after excluding reads

that aligned to *K. pneumoniae*.

***Variant Calling and Filtration with GATK***

We calculated the initial genotype likelihoods using GATK (4.1.2) (McKenna *et al.* 2010)

HaplotypeCaller (-ERC GVCF --sample-ploidy 1) for each sample. Next, we ran GATK

GenotypeGVCFs (--sample-ploidy 1) to create per-sample genotypes as individual VCF files for

the entire *D. discoideum* and *K. pneumoniae* concatenated reference genome. We selected the

*D. discoideum* chromosomes (and the unplaced contigs associated with the reference genome)

from the VCF files for downstream annotation and filtering using GATK SelectVariants. We used

the Ensembl Variant Effect Predictor (VEP 95.3) (McLaren *et al.* 2016) to annotate all variants

and add sequence ontology terms (--term SO) using the dicty2.7 assembly of

'*Dictyostelium_discoideum*' from Ensembl Protists (release 43). We decomposed complex

variants using vt decompose (Tan *et al.* 2015) before adding allele frequencies, merging or

filtering. We then processed the decomposed variants with bam-readcount (0.7.4)

(https://github.com/genome/bam-readcount) and cyvcf2 (https://github.com/brentp/cyvcf2)

to generate allele frequencies. We used VAtools (https://github.com/griffithlab/VAtools, 3.1.0)

to add the AF (allele frequency) format fields to each sample including the allele frequencies of

each allele as calculated by bam-readcount allele counts. We processed all per-sample VCFs

with bgzip and tabix for speed and storage before merging to generate the full per-sample call

set VCF using GATK (3.6) CombineVariants (-genotypeMergeOptions UNIQUIFY).

We performed variant filtration of the GATK VCF using bcftools v1.12 (using HTSLib v1.12) (Li

2011) and GATK. We did not consider indels or sites with more than one alternate allele. We

are only interested in variation that arose during the course of experimental evolution or, new

variation between the ancestor and the evolved lines. To exclude pre-existing variation we first

removed sites (from all samples) for which the ancestor was called as a variant (*i.e.,* sites in the

ancestor that differed from the reference genome) as well as sites that were left uncalled in the

ancestor. To remove ancestral polymorphism we next calculated the major allele frequency

(MAF) of all sites in the ancestor BAM file using bam-readcount (0.7.4)

(https://github.com/genome/bam-readcount). Using that information, we then removed sites

(from all samples) for which in the ancestor, the MAF < 0.90.

We applied hard filters using GATK VariantFiltration and SelectVariants following the GATK Best

Practices standard recommendations (QD > 2, FS < 60, SOR < 3, MQ > 40, MQRankSum > -12.5

and ReadPosRankSum > -8). Next we applied custom filters using bcftools view. The first custom

filter was the removal of sites missing too much data, which we defined as sites left uncalled in

more than 10 samples. For each of the 24 evolved lines we sequenced the whole line (as a

population), and for most of the lines we also sequenced one non-fruiting clone, for a total of

two samples per line (or a total of three samples for lines 20, 21 and 23 for which we

sequenced two clones). There is a low likelihood that the same SNP will occur by chance in

more than one evolved line. But because we sequenced two or three samples for each line (the

population and individual clones) the maximum number of times that a SNP is likely to appear

in our data is twice (or three times for lines 20, 21 and 23). For this reason, we applied a

maximum alternate allele count (AC) of three. Next, we applied a minimum Phred-based quality

score (QUAL) of 200 to remove low-quality sites and we removed sites with more than 1.5

times the average approximate read depth (DP) to reduce false positives. Last, we manually

reviewed this final set of SNPs using the Integrative Genomics Viewer (IGV) to further reduce

the number of false positives and misclassifications (Robinson *et al.* 2011, 2017).

***Variant Calling and Filtration with Freebayes***

We also performed joint variant calling on all samples using Freebayes v1.3.1-dirty (Garrison

and Marth 2012). We used the default parameters but for the following exceptions: sample

ploidy of one, pooled continuous mode, minimum base quality 10, minimum mapping quality

10 and we only retained the best of six alleles. We streamed variant calls directly through the

vcflib (Garrison *et al.* 2021) vcffilter, to remove variants with a quality score below 20. We

decomposed complex variants into their constituent SNPs and indels using vcflib

vcfallelicprimitives followed by normalization with vt (Tan *et al.* 2015).

We performed variant filtration of the normalized Freebayes VCF using bcftools v1.12 (using

HTSLib v1.12) (Li 2011) following a similar process to that used for filtering the GATK VCF.

Although the two callers calculate and output some different metrics for quality assessment,

we generated filters resembling those applied to the GATK VCF as much as possible. First, we

excluded indels and sites with more than one alternate allele, followed by the removal of

background variation as described for the GATK VCF (ancestral sites with an MAF < 0.90 or sites

in the ancestor that were either called as a variant or left uncalled). Next we applied hard filters

to remove calls affected by mapping quality or strand bias (MQM > 40, SAF > 0 and SAR > 0, SAP

> 0.5 and SRP > 0.5, RPR > 1 and RPL > 1). We then applied the same set of custom filters to the

Freebayes VCF as described for the GATK VCF including the removal of sites with more than 10

missing samples, sites with an alternate allele count (AC) greater than three and sites with a

Phred-based quality score (QUAL) below 200. Finally, based on the approximate read depth

(DP) in this remaining set of variants we removed sites with more than 1.5 times the average to

reduce false positives. To further reduce the number of false positives and misclassifications we

manually reviewed this final set of SNPs using the Integrative Genomics Viewer (IGV) (Robinson

*et al.* 2011, 2017).

***The Intersection of GATK and Freebayes VCFs and Variant Read Support***

We viewed the two separately generated and filtered VCF files (from GATK and Freebayes) side-

by-side and removed four sites that were not present in both files. The SNPs we removed

included one SNP that had only been initially called by one of the callers and three SNPs that

although initially called by both callers, only survived the filtration in one of the separate

filtering pipelines. Going forward we worked with these cross-validated SNPs in the annotated

GATK generated VCF.

As one final verification of variant support and quality we confirmed that each variant that had

been called in a non-fruiting clone could also be detected in its origin population (or the line

from which the clone was isolated). To do this, we generated read counts for each SNP across

all samples using bam-readcount v0.7.4 (https://github.com/genome/bam-readcount). We

removed any SNP for which the origin population did not support the same alternate allele with

at least five reads, which we expect would only occur for false positives or for SNPs that did not

provide a selective advantage. Also, because we expect that most true variants will be unique

to one replicate line, for each SNP we viewed the number of reads supporting the same

alternate allele across all samples. This led to the removal of one SNP that shared low level

support for the same allele across multiple lines and also the rejection of one sample from a

variant call (for details see *Variant Read Support* in the **Supplemental Methods**).

***Functional Annotation Clustering of Genes with SNPs***

We performed functional annotation enrichment analysis with the final set of 29 genes

containing SNPs using the online tool, DAVID (Database for Annotation, Visualization and

Integrated Discovery (https://david.ncifcrf.gov/; Huang *et al.* 2009a, 2009b). We determined

enriched terms using a Benjamini-corrected p-value (< 0.05) (Benjamini and Hochberg 1995).

***Structural Variant (SV) Calling and Filtration with Delly***

We called structural variants (SVs) with Delly v0.8.3 (Rausch *et al.* 2012) following the Germline

SV Calling workflow. We first did per-sample SV calling, providing the indexed, sorted and

duplicate-marked BAM files and the indexed *D. discoideum* and *K. pneumoniae* concatenated

reference genome. We then merged the SV sites to a single list and called genotypes across all

samples. We merged all samples genotypes using bcftools v1.12 (using HTSLib v1.12) (Li 2011).

We applied the Delly filter (-f germline) and then removed low quality variants that were not

flagged as "PASS" in the VCF filter field (PE > 3 [or PE > 5 for translocations] and QUAL >=20).

We annotated the SVs using the Ensembl Variant Effect Predictor (VEP 95.3) as described for

the GATK VCF. We only retained simple, intrachromosomal SVs. As described for the SNPs, the

same SV is unlikely to occur in more than one evolved line. But because we sequenced two or

three samples for each line (the population and individual clones) the maximum number of

times that a SNP is likely to appear in our data is twice (or three times for lines 20, 21 and 23).

For this reason, we discarded SVs that were called in more than three samples. Last, as

described for the SNPs, we manually reviewed this final set of SVs in IGV (Robinson *et al.* 2011).

***Association of Variants with the Loss of Altruism***

To investigate for a potential correlation between variants and the complete loss of

cooperation we returned to some of the evolved lines to isolate additional clones for targeted

re-sequencing (**Figure 1C**). Each evolved line is a population comprised of both cooperators and

evolved cheaters. The complete loss of cooperation is therefore only revealed when spores are

plated clonally and can be identified by an inability to form a fruiting body (non-fruiting clones).

Taking advantage of this population variation (**Figure 2**) we scored multiple additional clones

for 1) whether or not it was able to form a fruiting body in isolation and 2) the presence or

absence of the called variant(s) in the line.

For this analysis we again plated the evolved cell lines clonally (as described in the section,

*Experimental Cell Lines*) to allow for growth from individual spores. After three to five days of

growth we screened clones via PCR and Sanger sequencing. As previously described (in the

section, *Experimental Cell Lines*), we took photographs of the screened clones to document the

presence or absence of fruiting body formation (example images are available in **Supplemental**

**Material 1**).

We generated genomic DNA for PCR genotyping clones using one of two methods. For some of

the clones we first collected cells from the leading edge of the plaque, grew them to larger

numbers and carried out a formal DNA extraction with the DNeasy® Blood and Tissue kit

(Qiagen). To increase throughput, for most clones we directly lysed cells from the leading edge

of the plaque and used the lysate for what we called a "plaque PCR."  Based on a protocol

described by Charette and Cosson (2004), the plaque PCR included two steps. First, we used a

sterile pipette tip to collect a small number of cells from the leading edge of a plaque and

placed it in a tube containing 20 µl lysis buffer (10 mM Tris, pH 8.3, 50 mM KCl, 2.5 mM $MgCl_2$,

0.45% Nonidet® P-40 (NP40) and 0.45% Tween® 20) with PK (1 µL of 20 µg/µL of PK for every 25

µL of lysis buffer). Next, we incubated the cells in lysis buffer for 1 min at 95° to inactivate the

PK after which we used the cell lysate for PCR or stored them at -20°.

We designed primers to PCR-amplify the region spanning each called variant of interest

(**Supplemental Table S1**). For the PCR we used either 1 µl of cell lysate or approximately 10 ng

of DNA for the formal DNA isolations and the following reaction components: $MgCl_2$ (25 mM) 1

µl, dNTPs (10 mM each) 0.5 µl, 5 pM of each primer, 5X GoTaq® Flexi Buffer 5 µl, GoTaq® DNA

Polymerase 0.2 µl and $H_2O$ 10.3 µl for a 20 µl reaction. We used the following PCR protocol

(adjusting the annealing temperature as needed, according to primer pairing): 95°, 2:00; 95°,

0:15; 50°, 0:15; 60°, 3:00; repeat steps 2–4 34X, 60°, 5:00; 4° hold. We submitted PCR products

and primers (the same primers used for amplification) to Genewiz (South Plainfield, NJ) for

purification and Sanger sequencing. We trimmed the returned sequences with 4Peaks

(https://nucleobytes.com/4peaks/) for alignment using Seaview

(http://doua.prabi.fr/software/seaview).

We screened a varying number of clones according to the availability of the fruiting and non-

fruiting clones from each line. For each line included in this screen we tallied the number of

clones that did and did not carry the called mutation(s) and whether or not the clone was able

to form a fruiting body when plated clonally. We tested for significance using Fisher's Exact Test

with a 95% confidence interval using GraphPad Prism (version 9.3 for MacOS).

***Predicted Protein Structure***

To explore proteins of interest, we first downloaded the amino acid sequences from DictyBase

(Fey *et al.* 2009) and submitted them to Protter (Omasits *et al.* 2014) for visualization. We

accessed three-dimensional structural predictions generated by AlphaFold

(https://alphafold.ebi.ac.uk/) (Jumper *et al.* 2021; Varadi *et al.* 2022).

***Data Availability Statement***

Raw reads in CRAM format will be stored in the Sequence Read Archive (SRA) [link/citation]

(accession numbers/DOIs). Variant calls that survived filtration from each of the three variant

callers (GATK, Freebayes and Delly) are available in **Supplemental Material 2** in VCF format. All

cell lines used in this study are in the lab of the senior authors and are available upon request.

**Results**

***Raw Data Generation and Alignment***

We obtained over 5 trillion reads across all samples, with a high rate of alignment (94.7%) to

the concatenated *D. discoideum* and *K. pneumoniae* reference genomes. All reads that aligned

to *K. pneumoniae* (food bacterium) were excluded from further analysis. The remaining 2.7

trillion reads aligned to *D. discoideum* with an average rate of 89.3%. Read alignment was, on

average, equally successful for clones and evolved lines (89.3% and 89.4%, respectively). The

average mapped read depth of all annotated genes normalized by gene length (gene

annotations downloaded from NCBI on 10-25-19, **Supplemental Material 3)** is 54X and 195X for

clones and evolved lines, respectively (**Table 1**). The average mapped read depth of normalized

intergenic regions is very similar with averages of 53X and 180X for clones and evolved lines,

respectively.

***Resulting SNPs are Selection Driven***

We joint called SNPs across all samples resulting in 53,220 unfiltered variants with GATK and

32,775 with Freebayes (before normalization). After independently filtering each call set the

GATK VCF contained 306 SNPs and the Freebayes VCF contained 230 SNPs (the number of

variants removed by each filter is available in **Supplemental Material 4**). We next manually

reviewed all remaining SNPs in IGV resulting in approximatly 75 sites in each call set. Finally, we

removed any sites that did not co-occur in both call sets and/or sites lacking read support (as

described in ***The Intersection of GATK and Freebayes VCFs and Variant Read Support***). The

final set of SNPs contained 38 biallelic SNPs associated with 29 different genes (**Table 2**). Each

gene in this list has only one SNP except for the gene, *grlG* (DDB_G0272244), which has 10

516 unique SNPs (discussed in detail in the following sections). All SNPs are unique to one evolved

517 line with the exception of one in the unannotated gene, DDB_G0276529, which was called in

518 two lines (7 and 16). Most evolved lines have between one and three SNPs except for lines 7

519 and 21, which have five and eight SNPs each, respectively (**Table 1**).

521 Most SNPs (31 of 38) are in coding regions of the genome and all but one of these result in an

522 introduced stop codon or amino acid substitution (**Table 2**). Among the 31 SNPs in coding

523 sequence, 22 are missense variants and according to the Variant Effect Predictor annotations

524 are predicted to have a moderate impact, eight others introduce a premature stop codon with

525 a high predicted impact and the one synonymous variant has a low predicted impact. Among

526 the seven SNPs in non-coding sequence, five are upstream and two are downstream variants

527 that the Variant Effect Predictor annotated as "modifier," meaning they are either difficult to

528 predict or that there is no evidence of an impact. This distribution of large effect SNPs strongly

529 supports that they have increased in abundance due to selection, rather than drift.

532 ***Genes with SNPs***

533 The 29 genes with SNPs (**Table 2**) are distributed throughout the *D. discoideum* genome with

534 between one and eight SNPs on each of the six chromosomes. The average GC for the set of 29

535 genes (excluding introns) is 28.4% which is close to the genome-wide average of 27% for

536 protein-coding genes. Each of the genes in our list has one SNP except for the G protein-

537 coupled receptor (GPCR), *grlG*, which has 10 unique SNPs. *GrlG* is one of 17 glutamate receptor-

like ('grl') proteins in the *D. discoideum* genome (*grlA*–H and *grlJ*–R) (Eichinger *et al.* 2005) but

the function of *grlG* is not yet known. And like the majority of glutamate receptor-like proteins

in *D. discoideum*, we do not know the ligand(s) that it binds nor the downstream effector(s).

Among the remaining 28 genes (each with one unique SNP) a few have been well described

(*e.g., sgmA*, *pks39* and *arkA*) but the majority (17) are hypothetical proteins still largely lacking

annotation.

Using annotations that are available for our 29 genes with SNPs, we carried out functional

annotation clustering with DAVID and identified two significantly enriched annotation clusters.

The first cluster of five annotations contained UniProt Keywords (Bateman *et al.* 2021) related

to zinc and metal binding (group enrichment score of 1.45) including *arkA*, DDB_G0272484,

*rnf160*, DDB_G0269332 and *sgmA*. The second cluster of 10 annotations contained terms

related to transmembrane and membrane annotations (group enrichment score of 1.11). This

second cluster contained *arkA* and DDB_G0269332 from the first cluster as well as *grlG*, *pks39*,

DDB_G0276291, DDB_G0278531, DDB_G0278575, DDB_G0281923, DDB_G0290523 and

*tmem144A*. After applying the Benjamini (Benjamini and Hochberg 1995) correction, none of

the individual terms are significantly enriched (**Supplemental Material 5**). The large number of

unannotated genes implicated here does hinder interpretation, but it is not unusual given that

at the time of writing this manuscript, approximately 40% of protein-coding genes in the *D.*

*discoideum* genome still lack annotation (Fey *et al.* 2009).

***Structural Variants (SVs) Provide Further Support for grlG***

We joint called structural variants (SVs) across all samples using Delly resulting in an unfiltered

set of 10,139 SVs. The Delly filter reduced the number to 131 and after all quality filtration we

have a set of 12 SVs (**Supplemental Table S2**). Among the 12 SVs are six deletions, five

inversions and one duplication. Nine of the 24 evolved lines carry 1 or more of these SVs, two of

which (lines 1 and 14) did not have any called SNPs. Each SV is unique to one evolved line with

the exception of one deletion (NC_007088.5:1742215–1742506) in *grlG* which was called in

lines 17 and 18. However, because we cannot rule out potential contamination of the

population sample of line 18 we only report the variant in line 17 (more detail is available in

*Variant Read Support* in the **Supplemental Methods**). The deletion was verified by PCR in line

17 (as part of the analysis described in the section, *Association of Variants with the Loss of*

*Altruism*). The SVs range considerably in length (from 183 bp to 49 Kb) potentially impacting as

many as 21 different genes. Strikingly, five of the 12 SVs impact *grlG*, the same gene that we

already identified as carrying 10 SNPs. None of the 28 other genes with SNPs were impacted by

any of the SVs. Given the clear signals of parallel evolution identified for *grlG*, we chose not to

pursue the other SVs any further. We will only discuss the SVs that impact *grlG* going forward;

the full set of 29 SVs that passed filtration are available in VCF format in **Supplemental Material**

**2**.

***Some Variants in grlG are Associated with the Loss of Cooperation***

Given the high level of parallelism identified in *grlG* (one or more variants in more than half of

the evolved lines) we returned to the evolved lines to screen additional fruiting and non-fruiting

clones for a correlation between variants in *grlG* and the loss of cooperation. The variants are

located throughout the length of the gene but a pattern emerged in which only those variants

located in the 5' half of *grlG* (on exon 1) are associated with the loss of cooperation (*i.e.,* non-

fruiting clones) and variants in the 3' half (on exon 2) are not (**Figure 3** and **Supplemental Table**

**S3**). Because *grlG* has two exons of roughly equal length (383 and 390 amino acids for exon 1

and exon2, respectively) and for simplicity, we will refer to the two halves as the 5' and 3'

regions.

We prioritized screening of variants that we had identified in evolved lines with a moderate

percentage of non-fruiting clones (**Figure 2**) so that both fruiting and non-fruiting clones could

be included. We also prioritized variants with moderate allele frequencies in their evolved

populations. As such, the analysis included ten of the 15 variants identified across the length of

*grlG*. The 10 variants were called in 8 different lines (two unique variants were called in lines 21

and 17), three of which have variants in the 5' region (lines 5, 21 and 24) and five with variants

in the 3' region (7, 10, 11, 13 and 17). From the three lines with variants in the 5' region, we

screened 88 clones (62 non-fruiters and 27 fruiters) for the presence of four called variants. We

found that 88.7% (55 of 62) of the non-fruiter clones carried the variant compared to only 3.7%

(1 of 27) of the fruiting clones. The association between the presence of variants in the 5'

region of *grlG* and the clonal phenotype is significant in each evolved line we screened (Fisher's

Exact $p < 0.0001$, $p = 0.0164$ and $p < 0.0001$ for lines 5, 21 and 24, respectively). In the 3' region,

from the five lines with variants, we screened 78 clones (39 non-fruiters and 39 fruiters) for the

presence of six called variants. Unlike the association in the 5' region, we found the number of

clones carrying a variant in the 3' region was roughly equal between non-fruiters and fruiters

(94.8% [37 of 39] and 87.2% [34 of 39], respectively). There is no association between the

presence of variants in the 3' region of *grlG* and the clonal phenotype in any of the evolved

lines we screened (Fisher's Exact p > 0.05).

According to our results, variants in the 5' region of *grlG* are significantly associated with the

non-fruiting phenotype but not all clones follow that trend (**Figure 3**). In all three evolved lines

that we screened in the 5' region, we found a few clones that did not have a variant, but they

were still unable to form fruiting bodies in isolation. These clones could have lost cooperation

because of a different, undetected variant (anywhere in the genome). However, a clone that is

still able to cooperate and form a fruiting body in isolation, despite the apparent loss of *grlG,* is

more difficult to align with our hypothesis that high impact variants in *grlG* cause non-fruiting.

We only found one such clone in the 5' region. One clone from line 21 was able to form a

fruiting body despite carrying a SNP that introduces a premature stop codon in *grlG* after only

23 amino acids. None of the other 26 fruiting clones that we screened in the 5' region carried a

variant in *grlG*. This is strikingly different from the results in the 3' region, where almost all of

the fruiting clones that we screened carried a variant in *grlG,* though these were concentrated

in lines 11 and 17 and rare in others. Thus, variants in the 5' region of *grlG* usually result in the

loss of cooperation but variants in the 3' region do not. For a subset of the clones that we

screened for *grlG* variants we also screened for the presence of one or more SNPs that we

called in other gene(s). These additional screens were largely uninformative and are therefore

only described in the supplemental materials (**Additional File 1** and **Supplemental Table S4**).

**Figure 3. Location of variants in *grlG* and correlation with the loss of cooperation.** Schematic

representation (drawn to scale) of the coding sequence of *grlG*. The major features of a mature

*grlG* protein are indicated below the schematic (see also, **Figure 5**). Ten of the 15 called variants

(labeled above the schematic) were included in a targeted resequencing of additional clones

from each respective evolved line to investigate the association between variants in *grlG* and

the loss of cooperation (clonal inability to form a fruiting body). For each evolved line that we

screened clones from, a histogram illustrates the results with side-by-side bars showing the

number of clones that could (left bar) and could not (right bar) form a fruiting body in isolation

and the number of each phenotype (fruiting or non-fruiting) that did or did not carry the called

variant. Significant associations are indicated by an asterisk (*).

***The Genes Discovered in This Study Have Not Previously Been Implicated in Cheating***

To look for a relationship between the 29 genes identified herein and the loss of altruism, we

turned to the literature to see if any of them have been previously implicated in cheating in *D.*

*discoideum*. Because we are looking for obligate cheater genes, most notably missing from our

list is *fbxA,* the only previously known obligate cheater gene (Ennis *et al.* 2000). It is also

interesting that our list does not contain any of the characterized facultative cheater genes such

as *chtB, chtC*, *dimA* or *csA* (Queller *et al.* 2003; Foster *et al.* 2004; Khare and Shaulsky 2010;

Santorelli *et al.* 2013). Aside from that handful of genes that first come to mind, the remaining

majority of genes with potential involvement in cheating in *D. discoideum*, have not yet

received attention at the individual level. We were particularly interested in the many loci

recovered in the large restriction enzyme-mediated insertional (REMI) mutant library screening

from Santorelli *et al.* (2008). In that study, a set of 167 mutants (corresponding to 197 loci)

were identified that increased under low-relatedness selection. Based on testing a subset of

those mutants, the authors estimate that approximately 75% of the mutants are cheaters, but

so far, only *chtB* and *chtC* have been described. Although Santorelli *et al.* (2008) focused on

facultative cheater genes (by requiring one round of solo fruiting body formation) they did

recover *fbxA* and a few other mutants were found with morphological abnormalities indicating

there may be a others that are not facultative. The full set of 197 loci identified by Santorelli *et*

*al.* (2008) is the first of four gene lists we chose for cross-comparison. The other gene sets are

each comprised of genes found to be differentially expressed in chimeric mixtures identified at

various stages of multicellular development and thus may contain genes involved in conflict and

cheating. Two are comprised of genes identified at tight aggregate stage (79 genes) or the slug

stage (190 genes) (Noh *et al.* 2018 and Oliveira *et al.* 2019, respectively). The last gene set is

composed of 152 genes that were also identified during the establishment of multicellularity (at

either 8 or 12 hours), but in this case, the strains had been engineered to be mutually

incompatible (*tgrB1/tgrC1* gene replacement strains) which may increase the potential to

identify genes involved in conflict (Hirose *et al.* 2015). Unlike the genes from Santorelli et al.

(2008) these last three gene sets have not been directly implicated in cheating. But given their

differential expression in chimeras, a time at which cheating or the resistance to cheating

would be adaptive (Noh *et al.* 2018), they are likely to include genes involved in conflict and

cheating. In support of this reasoning, the 79 genes from Noh *et al.* (2018) show signatures of

rapid molecular evolution, consistent with conflict driven escalating arms races (Queller and

Strassmann 2018; Scott and Queller 2019). For simplicity, we will refer to these four sets of

genes as candidate cheater genes.

Altogether, the four sets of candidate cheater genes from the literature comprise a list of 591

unique genes (**Supplemental Table S4**). None of the 29 genes identified in this study were

found on that list and there is little overlap among the four candidate cheater gene sets (**Figure**

**4**). This in line with previous reports of limited overlap among sets of social genes (kin

discrimination, cooperation and cheating) (Oliveira *et al.* 2019; Noh *et al.* 2020). Only 26 of the

591 genes are present on more than one list. No genes are present on all four lists and only one

gene is present on three of the four; the pre-spore specific gene D (*pspD*). Because the genes

from Santorelli *et al.* (2008) were identified as part of a screen for cheater genes specifically,

they are of particular interest. Eleven genes from Santorelli *et al.* (2008) were found on one or

more of the other gene lists and three of them were among the subset of mutants directly

tested for cheating in that study. One of these tested mutants (LAS92) had an insertion in a

gene that is also on the list from Hirose *et al.* (2015) and it was confirmed to be a cheater

(DDB_G0283373). Two other tested mutants had intergenic insertions near genes that are also

on the list from Oliveira *et al.* (2019); one of which was confirmed to be a cheater (LAS6)

(DDB_G0276335) and the other was not (LAS60) (DDB_G0285843). However, these last two

mutants from Santorelli *et al.* (2008) had intergenic insertions and the actual gene(s) impacted

was not precisely determined.

**Figure 4. Limited overlap among published candidate cheater gene sets.** We compared our list

of 29 genes with SNPs to four genes sets from the literature including cheater genes and genes

differentially expressed in chimera during the social stage (potentially involved in cheating).

Together, the full list is comprised of 591 genes that have been implicated in cheating or

cooperation (Santorelli *et al.* 2008; Hirose *et al.* 2015; Noh *et al.* 2018; Oliveira *et al.* 2019).

Each gene set is shown in a different color and outlined with a dashed line. Overlapping

portions represent the number of genes shared among the different gene sets. The total

number of genes for each set is as follows: 197 from Santorelli *et al.* (2008), 152 from Hirose *et*

*al.* (2015), 79 from Noh *et al.* (2018) and 190 from Oliveira *et al.* (2019). None of the 29 genes

with SNPs identified in this work were found among the gene sets from the literature and there

is very little overlap among the other four lists.

**Discussion**

In this study we identified SNPs in 29 genes that arose across 24 replicate lines of *D. discoideum*

experimentally evolved by Kuzdzal-Fick *et al.* (2011) under conditions that mean low-

relatedness for any new mutations. In that earlier study, over the course of about 290

generations at low-relatedness, 19 of the 24 replicate lines saw a significant rise in cheating,

defined as a mutant contributing proportionally more to spore cells than stalk cells. When

isolates from these lines were plated clonally, an average of 31% had completely lost altruism

and were unable to form fruiting bodies on their own. Because each line is a mixed population,

the mutations that conferred the obligate cheating advantage were able to spread by forming

chimeric fruiting bodies with cooperators lacking the mutation. Here we used whole-genome

sequencing and variant analyses of those previously evolved cell lines to identify which genes

had changed and might be responsible for the non-fruiting, obligate cheating phenotype. While

there are many genes known to cause facultative cheating, before this study only one gene

(*fbxA*) had been recognized to cause obligate cheating. We identified at least one SNP in 17 of

the 24 experimentally evolved lines for a total of 38 SNPs. Most of the SNPs (31) are in coding

regions of the genome, and all but one results in either an introduced stop codon or other

amino acid substitution suggesting selective pressure acting on these loci under the

experimental conditions in Kuzdzal-Fick *et al.* (2011). The majority of the genes with SNPs are

not well characterized and many lack any annotation which impacted our ability to assess any

uniting similarities among them. Except for one of these genes, *grlG*, with 10 unique SNPs

across multiple lines, the other 28 genes only have one SNP each. *GrlG* also stands out because

we found it also harbors five structural variants, whereas none of the other genes with SNPs

had any. Our results provide strong evidence of parallel evolution of *grlG* and suggests the

involvement of this G protein-coupled receptor (GPCR) in cooperation and multicellular

development in *D. discoideum*.

***Confidence in Variant Calls and Detection***

The *D. discoideum* genome has features that may have impacted our ability to detect variants.

The AT content of the *D. discoideum* genome is very high, greater than 77% (Eichinger *et al.*

2005). The high AT content contributes to the high density of simple sequence repeats (DNA

tracts of 1–6 bp tandemly repeated a varying number of times) (Tian *et al.* 2011) which

represent 14.3% of the genome (Srivastava *et al.* 2019). Moreover, in *D. discoideum*, these

repeats are not confined to non-coding regions; they are also found in over 16.3% of protein

coding genes (Eichinger *et al.* 2005). Simple sequence repeats are recognized as mutational

hotspots across a number of organisms and are particularly prone to insertions and deletions

(indels) (Tóth *et al.* 2000; Ellegren 2004). In *D. discoideum*, both indels and SNPs have been

shown to occur at a higher frequency in low-complexity, repetitive regions of the genome

(Srivastava *et al.* 2019). The precision of variant calling is also decreased in the same sorts of

low-complexity and repeat regions, compounding the challenges of variant calling in *D.*

*discoideum*. This decreased precision is particularly true for detection of structural variants,

which are inherently more challenging to identify, particularly with short-read sequence data

(Cameron *et al.* 2019; Kosugi *et al.* 2019; Mahmoud *et al.* 2019). Despite these challenges, we

chose not to exclude low-complexity or non-coding regions of the genome, which could lead to

undiscovered variation outright. Instead, we dealt with the challenging features of the *D.*

*discoideum* genome by carefully exploring the effects of different settings for variant calling and

filtering to determine a stringent and robust pipeline. We separately called SNPs with two

independent callers. We applied our carefully chosen quality filters to the two call sets

independently, followed by manual inspection of all variants. We then conservatively only

pursued the SNPs still present in both call sets. Finally, we used the BAM read counts across all

samples to rule out potential contamination or other false positives. Together, despite the

challenging features of the *D. discoideum* genome, we are confident that we obtained a high

quality and strongly supported set of variants.

Our stringent pipeline decreased the likelihood of obtaining false positives and ensured that

variants called at the population level tend to be those most strongly selected. The trade-off of

such a stringent approach is a decreased sensitivity to detect low frequency variants in the

population samples. Given the relatively short amount of time the experimental lines were

allowed to evolve (Kuzdzal-Fick *et al.* 2011), not all variants would have had the time to expand

throughout the population of that line. Therefore, variants that arose later in the experiment or

those not facing strong selection, may have been difficult for us to detect at the population

level. Although we cannot rule out the possibility that some were left undetected, we did

detect some low frequency variants by sequencing individual non-fruiting clones from the lines.

***Parallel Evolution and the Involvement of grlG in Cooperation***

The concentration of highly supported and unique variants in *grlG* across 14 of the 24 replicate

lines is strong evidence of parallel evolution at the gene level (Tenaillon *et al.* 2012; Barrick and

Lenski 2013; Van den Bergh *et al.* 2018). None of these mutations were present in the ancestral

line, indicating that they occurred during the course of experimental evolution (Kuzdzal-Fick *et*

*al.* 2011). At the nucleotide level there is no indication of a mutational hotspot because the

variants are located throughout the length of the gene. Moreover, the variants in *grlG* are

comprised of several types of mutations including 10 non-synonymous SNPs that result in

either an introduced stop codon (four) or a missense mutation (six), as well as four deletions

and one inversion, all of which impact coding sequence. The number of large-effect mutations

(half of which result in protein truncation) and the complete lack of synonymous mutations in

*grlG* suggests that the loss of *grlG* was adaptive under the experimental conditions. Further

support of selection acting on *grlG* is the high population level frequency that several of these

new mutations reached in their respective lines. On average, the 10 unique SNPs in *grlG* are

supported by 61% of the total reads in their respective populations compared to an average of

only 41% support for the 28 remaining SNPs in other genes. These data suggest that *grlG*

variants increased in abundance due to selection, rather than drift. In addition, by screening

multiple additional clones from the experimental lines, we found that variants in the 5' region

of *grlG* are significantly associated with the loss of cooperation (non-fruiting) while those in the

3' region are not. However, very few of the clones screened in the 3' region carried a variant in

*grlG* (9%) and this may have limited our power to detect an association. We were unable to find

any non-fruiting clones for evolved lines 11 and 17 but the large proportion of normally fruiting

clones that carry a *grlG* variant certainly suggests a lack of an association in those lines. To help

us make sense of these results, we next explore the limited amount of currently available

information about *grlG* and view our findings in light of what is known more broadly about the

large and highly conserved family of proteins, the G protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs).

The G protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs) in eukaryotes are the largest class of receptors of

extracellular stimuli. They generally activate intracellular responses via heterotrimeric G-

proteins. In humans there are over 800 GPCR genes making them the most abundant gene

family in the human genome (Lagerström and Schiöth 2008). They are involved in a huge

diversity of biological processes including signaling of hormones, metabolites and

neurotransmitters to cell migration and development (Rosenbaum *et al.* 2009). The GPCRs are

responsible for approximately 66 known single-gene human diseases, and they are the target of

about one third of FDA-approved drugs (Hauser *et al.* 2017; Schöneberg and Liebscher 2021).

Thus, identifying the ligands and the roles of yet uncharacterized GPCRs (or, orphan GPCRs) is of

great interest broadly and the GPCRs in *Dictyostelium* are no exception. *Dictyostelium*

*discoideum* is an established model system for studying numerous processes such as chemotaxis

and other cell-motility linked processes such as phagocytosis and development (Bozzaro 2019),

all of which involve GPCRs.

The *D. discoideum* genome has a surprisingly large and diverse repertoire of more than 55

GPCRs (Eichinger *et al.* 2005; Sucgang *et al.* 2011; Heidel *et al.* 2011). Classically the GPCRs are

categorized into six classes based on sequence and function (Kolakowski 1994; Bockaert and Pin

1999); *D. discoideum* has representative members of most classes (Prabhu and Eichinger 2006).

Similar to those in vertebrates, the GPCRs in *D. discoideum* are involved in a diversity of

biological processes, including significant roles in development. Most notably, members of the

class E GPCRs include the receptors of cAMP (cARs). The chemoattractant cAMP is pivotal in the

initiation and coordination of multicellular development in *D. discoideum* (Saran *et al.* 2002;

Loomis 2014). Perhaps it is not surprising then that the cAMP receptors were the first GPCRs to

be identified (Klein *et al.* 1988) in *D. discoideum* and remain the most extensively studied*.*

Some members of the class C GPCRs (which includes *grlG*) in *D. discoideum* have also been

implicated in development. The *D. discoideum* genome has 17 members of the class C GPCRs,

known as glutamate receptor-like (grl) proteins (Eichinger *et al.* 2005). For most of the group,

the ligands, effectors and even the specific signaling pathways remain unknown. A great deal of

progress has been made over the past few decades especially after the completion of the *D.*

*discoideum* genome in 2005 (Eichinger *et al.* 2005). At least four of the glutamate receptor-like

proteins have been described as having roles in development including *grlA* (Prabhu *et al.*

2007a; Anjard *et al.* 2009), *grlB* (Wu and Janetopoulos 2013), *grlE* (Anjard and Loomis 2006; Wu

and Janetopoulos 2013) and *grlJ* (Prabhu *et al.* 2007b). Moreover, Prabhu *et al.* (2007b) also

found that all 17 are expressed throughout development, some with increased expression early

in aggregation (*grlA, D, E, J, M, N, Q*) and others with increased expression from the tight

aggregate stage and on (including *grlG, B, C, F, H, K, L, O, P, R*). Much remains to be learned but

it is easy to conceive that *grlG,* like other members of this protein family in *D. discoideum*, is

also involved in cooperation during multicellular development.

We are aware of only one previous study that investigated the function of *grlG* but it was in the

context of predation rather than development. Upon exposure to the chemoattractant folic

acid (used by *D. discoideum* to chemotax toward and phagocytose bacteria) Pan *et al.* (2016)

identified increased phosphorylation at key serine residues in both *grlG* and *grlL.* Both *grlG* and

*grlL* were thus considered candidate folic acid receptors (they referred to them as folic acid

receptors ('far') *far2* and *far1,* respectively). However, only *far1* (*grlL*), and not *grlG,* was

required for eliciting the response to folic acid and the authors moved forward with the

characterization of only *far1* (*grlL*) (Pan *et al.* 2016, 2018). During the work that followed, they

noticed that the loss of *far1* (*grlL*) does not completely abolish the response to folic acid and

lipopolysaccharide (LPS) which suggests that other proteins are involved. That observation is in

line with some earlier studies which also suggested that there are two folic acid receptors, each

with a different binding affinity (de Wit and van Haastert 1985; Segall *et al.* 1988). But *grlG* is

not required for the folic acid response and there is only limited evidence to support any

involvement (Pan *et al.* 2016; Lamrabet *et al.* 2020). We have no reason to believe that the

parallel evolution of *grlG* that we have identified is related to the detection or phagocytosis of

bacterial prey. The *D. discoideum* AX4 lines were adapted to the laboratory growth and nutrient

conditions well before the start of experimental evolution by Kuzdzal-Fick *et al.* (2011). Instead,

the primary novelty of the experimental environment was the extreme low-relatedness that

favored cheaters.

The number of large-effect variants in *grlG* suggests that the loss of *grlG* was adaptive under

the experimental conditions of low relatedness. What is less clear from our results is why only

the variants in the 5' region of *grlG* are significantly associated with non-fruiting and those in

the 3' region are not. To investigate, we viewed the amino acid sequence topology and

predicted protein structure to investigate other potential explanations **(Figure 5B)**. *GrlG* shares

the same major features found in most class C GPCRs including a long 5' extracellular domain, a

seven-transmembrane domain toward the 3' end followed by an intracellular C-terminal tail

**(Figure 5B)** (Pin *et al.* 2003; Rosenbaum *et al.* 2009). Ligand binding in class C GPCRs typically

occurs via a Venus flytrap domain (similar to the ancestral periplasmic binding proteins of

bacteria) situated in the 5' extracellular domain (Cao *et al.* 2009; Chun *et al.* 2012). Upon

binding its ligand, conformational changes throughout the seven-transmembrane domain lead

to the activation of G proteins (or other effectors) at the intracellular C-terminus to induce

signaling inside the cell (Rosenbaum *et al.* 2009). Based on sequence homology and the

predicted folding structure, *grlG* appears to function similarly. In the predicted structure

generated by AlphaFold (Jumper *et al.* 2021; Varadi *et al.* 2022), the extracellular region can be

seen folded (with high confidence) into a Venus flytrap structure with a clearly visible cleft, or

ligand binding pocket **(Figure 5A)**.

**Figure 5. Predicted structure and sequence topology of *D. discoideum grlG*. A**. Predicted

folding structure of *grlG* generated by AlphaFold (Jumper *et al.* 2021; Varadi *et al.* 2022). Colors

indicate the model confidence in the local accuracy; dark blue is very high confidence, light blue

is confident, yellow is low confidence and orange is very low confidence. This structure can be

be viewed interactively with the 3D viewer on the AlphaFold Protein Structure Database

(https://alphafold.ebi.ac.uk/entry/Q75JP4). **B.** The sequence topology of *grlG* generated in

Protter (Omasits *et al.* 2014). Extracellular regions are shown above the membrane (in purple)

and the cytoplasmic regions below. The 5' amino acids in grey indicate the signal peptide.

According to the amino acid sequence topology**,** each of the four variants that we screened for

in the 5' region would result in early protein truncation, either upstream of or within the

extracellular binding domain. It is not surprising that the loss of the binding domain, such as in

our 5' variants, would render a receptor non-functional. Similar results have been

experimentally demonstrated for the homologous protein, *grlL* (*far1*). Pan *et al.* (2018)

generated a *grlL* (*far1*) mutant missing only the extracellular binding domain (the remainder of

the protein was intact) to demonstrate that the mutant was unable to elicit a response to its

ligands. But while we might predict that the large impact variants in the transmembrane

domain, particularly those also resulting in early protein truncation, would lead to similar

outcomes, our data do not support a significant association between any of the 3' variants and

non-fruiting. Additional work is needed to understand how *D. discoideum* cells handle aberrant

*grlG* mRNAs and proteins. But even if we assume that aberrant and truncated proteins are not

degraded, given the coordinated functionality between extracellular ligand binding and the

resultant intracellular signaling, the loss of either end of this transmembrane protein receptor

would seem to disable signaling. Moreover, the variants in both regions of *grlG* were positively

selected and increased in abundance under the experimental conditions. Although it is difficult

to speculate given so many unknowns, perhaps all variants in *grlG* (both 5' and 3') provided the

selective advantage of cheating, but only those that inhibit ligand binding are also likely to

result in non-fruiting when in isolation.

Another challenge to interpreting our results is that variants in *grlG* are apparently not

completely penetrant. While our results are broadly consistent with variants in 5' *grlG* causing

non-fruiting, we did identify a one clone in line 21 that was still able to form a fruiting body

despite carrying a variant in 5' *grlG* that introduces a premature stop codon just before the

extracellular binding domain. Although human or technical error is a possibility, there also

many potential biological explanations. Some of the factors that can influence penetrance

include gene expression levels, modifier genes, the co-occurrence of one or more additional

variants, the environment or other non-genetic factors (Cooper *et al.* 2013). However, the lack

of penetrance we observed may not be explained until we know more about the gene,

particularly the ligand(s) it binds and the pathway(s) it is involved in. This brings our attention

to the complex and pleiotropic nature of GPCR signaling and highlights the challenge of

predicting variant impacts.

From the great deal of work with GPCRs in humans and disease in particular, it is clear that

mutations in membrane proteins can result in a huge variety of impacts. The effect of any

mutation will depend on the properties of the protein as well as the type and location of the

mutation (Schöneberg and Liebscher 2021; Zaucha *et al.* 2021). Some of the many potential

impacts of GPCR mutations include improper membrane trafficking or localization; alterations

to critical secondary or tertiary structures; inhibition or altered efficiency of binding ligand(s) or

interacting proteins and inhibition or altered efficiency of signaling through downstream

effectors. Further complicating matters, some GPCRs bind multiple ligands and/or have

multiple effectors. Likewise, one ligand can have multiple receptors. In *D. discoideum* for

example, the chemoattractant cAMP has four receptors (cARs 1–4) in the GPCR class E, each of

which has a different cAMP-binding affinity and expression pattern. The binding affinity of each

cAMP receptor is correlated with the stage of development during which it is expressed to

optimally meet the needs of the cell at that time (Kim *et al.* 1996).

Members of the class C glutamate receptor-like protein family (which includes *grlG*) in *D.*

*discoideum* also exemplify complexities of GPCR signaling. *GrlE*, which is the GABA receptor

during late development, is also bound by the competitive inhibitor of GABA, glutamate.

Depending on which ligand is bound, GABA or glutamate, *grlE* is coupled to a different G

protein subunit (Gα7 or Gα9, respectively) (Anjard and Loomis 2006). Sporulation is delayed

while glutamate is bound and then induced when displaced and bound by GABA, together

ensuring the appropriate timing of sporulation (Anjard and Loomis 2006; Anjard *et al.* 2009).

Another example of a glutamate receptor-like protein binding multiple ligands is the folic acid

receptor *far1* (otherwise known as *grlL*), which also recognizes lipopolysaccharide (LPS) to

mediate chemotaxis and phagocytosis of bacterial prey (Pan *et al.* 2016, 2018). And similar to

the previously described multiple receptors of cAMP, other ligands bind multiple glutamate

receptor-like proteins of class C as well. While *grlE* is the GABA receptor during late

development, *grlB* is instead the GABA receptor during early stages of development (Wu and

Janetopoulos 2013). There are also several examples in *D. discoideum* of potential redundancy

(or rather, the suspected involvement of multiple receptors) of glutamate receptor-like

proteins, wherein the loss of the focal receptor does not completely abolish the response as

would be expected if a single receptor were responsible for ligand recognition and response.

Examples in which the loss of the focal receptor does not completely abolish the response

include the autocrine proliferation repressor protein A (*aprA*) receptor, *grlH* (Tang *et al.* 2018);

the phenylthiourea receptor, *grlJ* (Robery *et al.* 2013); and the folic acid (and LPS) receptor, *far1*

(*grlL*) (Pan *et al.* 2016, 2018).

Regarding the potential redundancy of *far1* (*grlL*), as previously mentioned, the involvement of

*grlG* has been suggested (Pan *et al.* 2016; Lamrabet *et al.* 2020) but that has little relevance in

this study as we have no reason to believe that our results are predation related. However, we

do not rule out the possibility *grlG* may also interact with folic acid or another molecule with

overlapping roles in bacterial predation as well as in cooperation and fruiting body formation.

Given our understanding of the complex nature of GPCR signaling, even if *grlG* was found to be

involved in the response to bacterial prey, that would not contradict the evidence we present

here suggesting its role in cooperation. Instead, perhaps the knowledge that *grlG* and other

members of the glutamate receptor-like protein family sometimes show low levels of

overlapping functionality may help explain why the loss of *grlG* in our evolved clones did not

always lead to the total loss of cooperation and non-fruiting.

**Conclusion**

In this study we returned to cell lines previously evolved under low-relatedness by Kuzdzal-Fick

*et al.* (2011) to investigate the genomic changes underlying the observed evolution of non-

fruiting obligate cheaters. That study demonstrated how low relatedness in a natural

population would lead to a collapse of multicellularity and with it, the advantages of fruiting

body formation and spore dispersal. In this study we used whole-genome sequencing and

variant analysis of those experimentally evolved *D. discoideum* low-relatedness cell lines. We

identified parallel evolution of the orphan GPCR *grlG* as well as another 28 variants in other

genes. The genes that we identified with variants are spread throughout the genome and do

not share any significantly enriched functions or other annotations. In addition, none of these

genes have been previously implicated in cheating or cooperation. The lack of overlap among

these genes alone, nor with previously implicated cheater genes, is further testament to the

complexity of the social cycle and aggregative multicellularity in *D. discoideum* and further

highlights that these processes are orchestrated by a large diversity of genes and pathways.

The orphan GPCR *grlG* acquired variants of moderate to high impact in more than half of the

experimental lines suggesting that the loss of *grlG* was adaptive under the experimental

conditions of low-relatedness. By screening additional clones from the evolved lines, we

identified a significant correlation between the complete loss of cooperation (inability to form

the social stage, a fruiting body) and the presence of variants in the 5' region of *grlG* containing

the signal peptide and extracellular binding domain. Our results suggest that *grlG* is one of now

two genes (second to *fbxA* (Ennis *et al.* 2000)) to have been implicated in obligate non-fruiting

cheating in *D. discoideum*. Although future work is needed to identify the interacting molecules

and the precise role of *grlG*, this work adds *grlG* to the growing list of GPCRs in the *D.*

*discoideum* genome to have a role in multicellular development. This is noteworthy because it

brings us one step closer to deorphanization of the ever-important GPCRs and highlights the

need to expand research efforts to characterize the remaining GPCRs in *D. discoideum.*

***Acknowledgments***

We thank members of the Queller-Strassmann laboratory for helpful advice on this research

and Jennie Kuzdzal-Fick for making her evolved lines available. This material is based upon work

supported by the National Science Foundation under grant numbers IOS 16-56756 and DEB 17-

53743. Additional funding came from a pilot grant from the McDonnell Genome Institute.

1005

1006

***Supplemental Materials***

**Supplemental Methods**

**Supplemental Tables**

**Additional File 1.** Results of the limited screening of clones for variants in genes other than *grlG*

**Supplemental Material 1.** Example images of non-fruiting clone morphology

**Supplemental Material 2.** Variant calls that survived filtration from each of the three variant

callers (GATK, Freebayes and Delly), in VCF format

**Supplemental Material 3.** *D. discoideum* gene annotations downloaded from NCBI on 10-25-19

**Supplemental Material 4.** The resulting number of variants after each step of filtration of the

VCF files independently generated by each caller.

**Supplemental Material 5.** Results of the functional annotation clustering with a high

classification efficiency performed for the 29 genes with SNPs using the online tool DAVID

(https://david.ncifcrf.gov/)

1020

1021

**References**

Anjard, C., and W. F. Loomis, 2006 GABA induces terminal differentiation of *Dictyostelium*

through a $GABA_B$ receptor. Development 133: 2253–2261.

Anjard, C., Y. Su, and W. F. Loomis, 2009 Steroids initiate a signaling cascade that triggers rapid

sporulation in *Dictyostelium*. Development 136: 803–812.

Barrick, J. E., and R. E. Lenski, 2013 Genome dynamics during experimental evolution. Nat. Rev.

Genet. 14: 827–839.

Bateman, A., M. J. Martin, S. Orchard, M. Magrane, R. Agivetova *et al.*, 2021 UniProt: The

universal protein knowledgebase in 2021. Nucleic Acids Res. 49: D480–D489.

Benabentos, R., S. Hirose, R. Sucgang, T. Curk, M. Katoh *et al.*, 2009 Polymorphic members of

the lag gene family mediate kin discrimination in *Dictyostelium*. Curr. Biol. 19: 567–572.

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

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

Bockaert, J., and J. P. Pin, 1999 Molecular tinkering of G protein-coupled receptors: An

evolutionary success. EMBO J. 18: 1723–1729.

Bonner, J. T., 1998 The origins of multicellularity. Integr. Biol. Issues News Rev. 1: 27–36.

Bozzaro, S., 2019 The past, present and future of *Dictyostelium* as a model system. Int. J. Dev.

Biol. 63: 321–331.

Buttery, N. J., C. N. Jack, B. Adu-Oppong, K. T. Snyder, C. R. L. Thompson *et al.*, 2012 Structured

growth and genetic drift raise relatedness in the social amoeba *Dictyostelium*

*discoideum*. Biol. Lett. 8: 794–797.

Buttery, N. J., D. E. Rozen, J. B. Wolf, and C. R. L. Thompson, 2009 Quantification of social

behavior in *D. discoideum* reveals complex fixed and facultative strategies. Curr. Biol. 19:

1373–1377.

Buttery, N. J., J. Smith, D. C. Queller, and J. E. Strassmann, 2013 Measuring cheating, fitness,

and segregation in *Dictyostelium discoideum*, pp. 231–248 in *Dictyostelium discoideum*

*Protocols*, Humana Press, Totowa, NJ.

Cameron, D. L., L. Di Stefano, and A. T. Papenfuss, 2019 Comprehensive evaluation and

characterisation of short read general-purpose structural variant calling software. Nat.

Commun. 10: 1–11.

Cao, J., S. Huang, J. Qian, J. Huang, L. Jin *et al.*, 2009 Evolution of the class C GPCR Venus flytrap

modules involved positive selected functional divergence. BMC Evol. Biol. 9: 1–12.

Cavender, J. C., and K. B. Raper, 1965 The Acrasieae in nature. I. Isolation. Am. J. Bot. 52: 294–

296.

Charette, S. J., and P. Cosson, 2004 Preparation of genomic DNA from *Dictyostelium discoideum*

for PCR analysis. BioTechniques 36: 574–575.

Chun, L., W. H. Zhang, and J. F. Liu, 2012 Structure and ligand recognition of class C GPCRs. Acta

Pharmacol. Sin. 33: 312–323.

Cooper, D. N., M. Krawczak, C. Polychronakos, C. Tyler-Smith, and H. Kehrer-Sawatzki, 2013

Where genotype is not predictive of phenotype: Towards an understanding of the

molecular basis of reduced penetrance in human inherited disease. Hum. Genet. 132:

1077–1130.

Cooper, G. A., and S. A. West, 2018 Division of labour and the evolution of extreme

specialization. Nat. Ecol. Evol. 2: 1161–1167.

Eichinger, L., J. A. Pachebat, G. Glöckner, M. A. Rajandream, R. Sucgang *et al.*, 2005 The genome

of the social amoeba *Dictyostelium discoideum*. Nature 435: 43–57.

Ellegren, H., 2004 Microsatellites: Simple sequences with complex evolution. Nat. Rev. Genet. 5:

435–445.

Ennis, H. L., D. N. Dao, S. U. Pukatzki, and R. H. Kessin, 2000 *Dictyostelium* amoebae lacking an

F-box protein form spores rather than stalk in chimeras with wild type. Proc. Natl. Acad.

Sci. 97: 3292–3297.

Ennis, H. L., D. N. Dao, M. Y. Wu, and R. H. Kessin, 2003 Mutation of the *Dictyostelium fbxA*

gene affects cell-fate decisions and spatial patterning. Protist 154: 419–429.

Fey, P., P. Gaudet, T. Curk, B. Zupan, E. M. Just *et al.*, 2009 dictyBase—a *Dictyostelium*

bioinformatics resource update. Nucleic Acids Res. 37: D515–D519.

Flowers, J. M., S. I. Li, A. Stathos, G. Saxer, E. A. Ostrowski *et al.*, 2010 Variation, sex, and social

cooperation: Molecular population genetics of the social amoeba *Dictyostelium*

*discoideum*. PLoS Genet. 6: 1–14.

Fortunato, A., D. C. Queller, and J. E. Strassmann, 2003a A linear dominance hierarchy among

clones in chimeras of the social amoeba *Dictyostelium discoideum*. J. Evol. Biol. 16: 438–

445.

Fortunato, A., J. E. Strassmann, L. Santorelli, and D. C. Queller, 2003b Co-occurrence in nature

of different clones of the social amoeba, *Dictyostelium discoideum*. Mol. Ecol. 12: 1031–

1038.

Foster, K. R., G. Shaulsky, J. E. Strassmann, D. C. Queller, and C. R. L. Thompson, 2004 Pleiotropy

as a mechanism to stabilize cooperation. Nature 431: 693–696.

Garrison, E., Z. N. Kronenberg, E. T. Dawson, B. S. Pedersen, and P. Prins, 2021 Vcflib and tools

for processing the VCF variant call format. bioRxiv 2021.05.21.445151.

Garrison, E., and G. Marth, 2012 Haplotype-based variant detection from short-read

sequencing.

Gilbert, O. M., K. R. Foster, N. J. Mehdiabadi, J. E. Strassmann, and D. C. Queller, 2007 High

relatedness maintains multicellular cooperation in a social amoeba by controlling

cheater mutants. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 104: 8913–8917.

Gilbert, O. M., J. E. Strassmann, and D. C. Queller, 2012 High relatedness in a social amoeba:

The role of kin-discriminatory segregation. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 279: 2619–2624.

Grosberg, R. K., and R. R. Strathmann, 2007 The evolution of multicellularity: A minor major

transition? Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 38: 621–654.

Gruenheit, N., K. Parkinson, B. Stewart, J. A. Howie, J. B. Wolf *et al.*, 2017 A polychromatic

"greenbeard" locus determines patterns of cooperation in a social amoeba. Nat.

Commun. 8: 1–9.

Hamilton, W. D., 1964 The genetical evolution of social behaviour. II. J. Theor. Biol. 7: 17–52.

Hardin, G., 1968 The tragedy of the commons. Science 162: 1243–1248.

Hauser, A. S., M. M. Attwood, M. Rask-Andersen, H. B. Schiöth, and D. E. Gloriam, 2017 Trends in GPCR drug discovery: New agents, targets and indications. Nat. Rev. Drug Discov. 16: 829–842.

Heidel, A. J., H. M. Lawal, M. Felder, C. Schilde, N. R. Helps *et al.*, 2011 Phylogeny-wide analysis of social amoeba genomes highlights ancient origins for complex intercellular communication. Genome Res. 21: 1882–1891.

Hirose, S., R. Benabentos, H. I. Ho, A. Kuspa, and G. Shaulsky, 2011 Self-recognition in social amoebae is mediated by allelic pairs of tiger genes. Science 333: 467–470.

Hirose, S., B. Santhanam, M. Katoh-Kurosawa, G. Shaulsky, and A. Kuspa, 2015 Allorecognition, via *tgrB1* and *tgrC1*, mediates the transition from unicellularity to multicellularity in the social amoeba *Dictyostelium discoideum*. Development 142: 3561–3570.

Ho, H. I., S. Hirose, A. Kuspa, and G. Shaulsky, 2013 Kin recognition protects cooperators against cheaters. Curr. Biol. 23: 1590–1595.

Huang, D. W., B. T. Sherman, and R. A. Lempicki, 2009a Bioinformatics enrichment tools: Paths toward the comprehensive functional analysis of large gene lists. Nucleic Acids Res. 37: 1–13.

Huang, D. W., B. T. Sherman, and R. A. Lempicki, 2009b Systematic and integrative analysis of large gene lists using DAVID bioinformatics resources. Nat. Protoc. 4: 44–57.

Jumper, J., R. Evans, A. Pritzel, T. Green, M. Figurnov *et al.*, 2021 Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. Nature 596: 583–589.

Kessin, R. H., 2001 *Dictyostelium: evolution, cell biology, and the development of*

*multicellularity*. Cambridge University Press.

Khare, A., and G. Shaulsky, 2010 Cheating by exploitation of developmental prestalk patterning

in *Dictyostelium discoideum*. PLoS Genet. 6: e1000854.

Kim, J., P. V. Haastert, and P. N. Devreotes, 1996 Social senses: G-protein-coupled pathways in

*Dictyostelium*. Chem. Biol. 3: 239–243.

Klein, P. S., T. J. Sun, C. L. Saxe, A. R. Kimmel, L. Ronald *et al.*, 1988 A chemoattractant receptor

controls development in *Dictyostelium discoideum*. Science 241: 1467–1472.

Knoll, A. H., 2011 The multiple origins of complex multicellularity. Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.

39: 217–239.

Kolakowski, L. F., 1994 GCRDb: A G-protein-coupled receptor database. Receptors Channels 2:

1–7.

Kosugi, S., Y. Momozawa, X. Liu, C. Terao, M. Kubo *et al.*, 2019 Comprehensive evaluation of

structural variation detection algorithms for whole genome sequencing. Genome Biol.

20: 8–11.

Kuspa, A., and W. F. Loomis, 1992 Tagging developmental genes in *Dictyostelium* by restriction

enzyme-mediated integration of plasmid DNA. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 89: 8803–

8807.

Kuzdzal-Fick, J. J., S. A. Fox, J. E. Strassmann, and D. C. Queller, 2011 High relatedness is

necessary and sufficient to maintain multicellularity in *Dictyostelium*. Science 334:

1548–1551.

Lagerström, M. C., and H. B. Schiöth, 2008 Structural diversity of G protein-coupled receptors

and significance for drug discovery. Nat. Rev. Drug Discov. 7: 339–357.

Lamrabet, O., A. Melotti, F. Burdet, N. Hanna, J. Perrin *et al.*, 2020 Transcriptional responses of

*Dictyostelium discoideum* exposed to different classes of bacteria. Front. Microbiol. 11:

1–12.

Li, H., 2011 A statistical framework for SNP calling, mutation discovery, association mapping

and population genetical parameter estimation from sequencing data. Bioinformatics

27: 2987–2993.

Li, H., 2013 Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM.

Li, H., and R. Durbin, 2009 Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler

transform. Bioinformatics 25: 1754–1760.

Li, H., B. Handsaker, A. Wysoker, T. Fennell, J. Ruan *et al.*, 2009 The Sequence Alignment/Map

format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics 25: 2078–2079.

Loomis, W. F., 2014 Cell signaling during development of *Dictyostelium*. Dev. Biol. 391: 1–16.

Loomis, W. F., 2015 Genetic control of morphogenesis in *Dictyostelium*. Dev. Biol. 402: 146–

161.

Madgwick, P. G., B. Stewart, L. J. Belcher, C. R. L. Thompson, and J. B. Wolf, 2018 Strategic

investment explains patterns of cooperation and cheating in a microbe. Proc. Natl. Acad.

Sci. U. S. A. 115: E4823–E4832.

Mahmoud, M., N. Gobet, D. I. Cruz-Dávalos, N. Mounier, C. Dessimoz *et al.*, 2019 Structural

variant calling: The long and the short of it. Genome Biol. 20: 1–14.

McKenna, A., M. Hanna, E. Banks, A. Sivachenko, K. Cibulskis *et al.*, 2010 The genome analysis

toolkit: A MapReduce framework for analyzing next-generation DNA sequencing data.

Genome Res. 20: 1297–1303.

McLaren, W., L. Gil, S. E. Hunt, H. S. Riat, G. R. S. Ritchie *et al.*, 2016 The Ensembl Variant Effect

Predictor. Genome Biol. 17: 122.

Mehdiabadi, N. J., C. N. Jack, T. T. Farnham, T. G. Platt, S. E. Kalla *et al.*, 2006 Kin preference in a

social microbe. Nature 442: 881–882.

Mehdiabadi, N. J., M. R. Kronforst, D. C. Queller, and J. E. Strassmann, 2009 Phylogeny,

reproductive isolation and kin recognition in the social amoeba *Dictyostelium*

*purpureum*. Evol. Int. J. Org. Evol. 63: 542–8.

Noh, S., L. Christopher, J. E. Strassmann, and D. C. Queller, 2020 Wild *Dictyostelium discoideum*

social amoebae show plastic responses to the presence of nonrelatives during

multicellular development. Ecol. Evol. 10: 1119–1134.

Noh, S., K. S. Geist, X. Tian, J. E. Strassmann, and D. C. Queller, 2018 Genetic signatures of

microbial altruism and cheating in social amoebas in the wild. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.

A. 115: 3096–3101.

de Oliveira, J. L., A. C. Morales, B. Stewart, N. Gruenheit, J. Engelmoer *et al.*, 2019 Conditional

expression explains molecular evolution of social genes in a microbe. Nat. Commun. 10:

1–12.

Omasits, U., C. H. Ahrens, S. Müller, and B. Wollscheid, 2014 Protter: Interactive protein feature

visualization and integration with experimental proteomic data. Bioinformatics 30: 884–

886.

Ostrowski, E. A., 2019 Enforcing cooperation in the social amoebae. Curr. Biol. 29: R474–R484.

Pan, M., M. P. Neilson, A. M. Grunfeld, P. Cruz, X. Wen *et al.*, 2018 A G-protein-coupled

chemoattractant receptor recognizes lipopolysaccharide for bacterial phagocytosis. PLoS

Biol. 16: 1–20.

Pan, M., X. Xu, Y. Chen, and T. Jin, 2016 Identification of a chemoattractant G-protein-coupled

receptor for folic acid that controls both chemotaxis and phagocytosis. Dev. Cell 36:

428–439.

Pin, J. P., T. Galvez, and L. Prézeau, 2003 Evolution, structure, and activation mechanism of

family 3/C G-protein-coupled receptors. Pharmacol. Ther. 98: 325–354.

Prabhu, Y., and L. Eichinger, 2006 The *Dictyostelium* repertoire of seven transmembrane

domain receptors. Eur. J. Cell Biol. 85: 937–946.

Prabhu, Y., S. Mondal, L. Eichinger, and A. A. Noegel, 2007a A GPCR involved in post aggregation

events in *Dictyostelium discoideum*. Dev. Biol. 312: 29–43.

Prabhu, Y., R. Müller, C. Anjard, and A. A. Noegel, 2007b *GrlJ*, a *Dictyostelium* GABA$_B$-like

receptor with roles in post-aggregation development. BMC Dev. Biol. 7: 1–14.

Queller, D. C., 2000 Relatedness and the fraternal major transitions. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol.

Sci. 355: 1647–1655.

Queller, D. C., E. Ponte, S. Bozzaro, and J. E. Strassmann, 2003 Single-gene greenbeard effects in

the social amoeba *Dictyostelium discoideum*. Science 299: 105–106.

Queller, D. C., and J. E. Strassmann, 2018 Evolutionary conflict. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 49:

73–93.

Rausch, T., T. Zichner, A. Schlattl, A. M. Stütz, V. Benes *et al.*, 2012 DELLY: Structural variant

discovery by integrated paired-end and split-read analysis. Bioinformatics 28: i333–i339.

Robery, S., R. Tyson, C. Dinh, A. Kuspa, A. A. Noegel *et al.*, 2013 A novel human receptor

involved in bitter tastant detection identified using *Dictyostelium discoideum*. J. Cell Sci.

126: 5465–5476.

Robinson, J. T., H. Thorvaldsdóttir, A. M. Wenger, A. Zehir, and J. P. Mesirov, 2017 Variant

review with the integrative genomics viewer. Cancer Res. 77: e31–e34.

Robinson, J. T., H. Thorvaldsdóttir, W. Winckler, M. Guttman, E. S. Lander *et al.*, 2011

Integrative genomics viewer. Nat. Biotechnol. 29: 24–26.

Rosenbaum, D. M., S. G. F. Rasmussen, and B. K. Kobilka, 2009 The structure and function of G-

protein-coupled receptors. Nature 459: 356–363.

Santorelli, L. A., A. Kuspa, G. Shaulsky, D. C. Queller, and J. E. Strassmann, 2013 A new social

gene in *Dictyostelium discoideum*, *chtB*. BMC Evol. Biol. 13: 1–10.

Santorelli, L. A., C. R. L. Thompson, E. Villegas, J. Svetz, C. Dinh *et al.*, 2008 Facultative cheater

mutants reveal the genetic complexity of cooperation in social amoebae. Nature 451:

1107–1110.

Saran, S., M. E. Meima, E. Alvarez-Curto, K. E. Weening, D. E. Rozen *et al.*, 2002 cAMP signaling

in *Dictyostelium*: Complexity of cAMP synthesis, degradation and detection. J. Muscle

Res. Cell Motil. 23: 793–802.

Sathe, S., N. Khetan, and V. Nanjundiah, 2014 Interspecies and intraspecies interactions in social

amoebae. J. Evol. Biol. 27: 349–362.

Schöneberg, T., and I. Liebscher, 2021 Mutations in G protein–coupled receptors: Mechanisms,

pathophysiology and potential therapeutic approaches. Pharmacol. Rev. 73: 89–119.

Scott, T. J., and D. C. Queller, 2019 Long-term evolutionary conflict, Sisyphean arms races, and

power in Fisher's geometric model. Ecol. Evol. 9: 11243–11253.

Sebé-Pedrós, A., B. M. Degnan, and I. Ruiz-Trillo, 2017 The origin of Metazoa: A unicellular

perspective. Nat. Rev. Genet. 18: 498–512.

Segall, J. E., A. A. Bominaar, E. Wallraff, and R. J. De Wit, 1988 Analysis of a *Dictyostelium*

chemotaxis mutant with altered chemoattractant binding. J. Cell Sci. 91 ( Pt 4): 479–489.

smith, J., D. C. Queller, and J. E. Strassmann, 2014 Fruiting bodies of the social amoeba

*Dictyostelium discoideum* increase spore transport by *Drosophila*. BMC Evol. Biol. 14: 1–

5.

smith, J., J. E. Strassmann, and D. C. Queller, 2016 Fine-scale spatial ecology drives kin selection

relatedness among cooperating amoebae. Evolution 70: 848–859.

Srivastava, S., A. K. Avvaru, D. T. Sowpati, and R. K. Mishra, 2019 Patterns of microsatellite

distribution across eukaryotic genomes. BMC Genomics 20: 1–14.

Strassmann, J. E., O. M. Gilbert, and D. C. Queller, 2011 Kin discrimination and cooperation in

microbes. Annu. Rev. Microbiol. 65: 349–67.

Strassmann, J. E., and D. C. Queller, 2011 Evolution of cooperation and control of cheating in a

social microbe. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 108 Suppl: 10855–62.

Strassmann, J. E., Y. Zhu, and D. C. Queller, 2000 Altruism and social cheating in the social

amoeba *Dictyostelium discoideum*. Nature 408: 965–967.

Sucgang, R., A. Kuo, X. Tian, W. Salerno, A. Parikh *et al.*, 2011 Comparative genomics of the

social amoebae *Dictyostelium discoideum* and *Dictyostelium purpureum*. Genome Biol.

12: R20.

Tan, A., G. R. Abecasis, and H. M. Kang, 2015 Unified representation of genetic variants.

Bioinformatics 31: 2202–2204.

Tang, Y., Y. Wu, S. E. Herlihy, F. J. Brito-Aleman, J. H. Ting *et al.*, 2018 An autocrine proliferation

repressor regulates *Dictyostelium discoideum* proliferation and chemorepulsion using

the G protein-coupled receptor *grlH*. mBio 9: e02443-17.

Tarasov, A., A. J. Vilella, E. Cuppen, I. J. Nijman, and P. Prins, 2015 Sambamba: Fast processing

of NGS alignment formats. Bioinformatics 31: 2032–2034.

Tenaillon, O., A. Rodríguez-Verdugo, R. L. Gaut, P. McDonald, A. F. Bennett *et al.*, 2012 The

molecular diversity of adaptive convergence. Science 335: 457–461.

Thompson, C. R. L., Q. Fu, C. Buhay, R. R. Kay, and S. Gad, 2004 A bZIP/bRLZ transcription factor

required for DIF signaling in *Dictyostelium*. Development 131: 513–523.

Tian, X., J. E. Strassmann, and D. C. Queller, 2011 Genome nucleotide composition shapes

variation in simple sequence repeats. Mol. Biol. Evol. 28: 899–909.

Tóth, G., Z. Gáspári, and J. Jurka, 2000 Microsatellites in different eukaryotic genomes: Surveys

and analysis. Genome Res. 10: 967–981.

Tsutsui, N. D., 2004 Scents of self: The expression component of self/non-self recognition

systems. Ann. Zool. Fenn. 41: 713–727.

Van den Bergh, B., T. Swings, M. Fauvart, and J. Michiels, 2018 Experimental design, population

dynamics, and diversity in microbial experimental evolution. Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev.

82: e00008-18.

Varadi, M., S. Anyango, M. Deshpande, S. Nair, C. Natassia *et al.*, 2022 AlphaFold Protein

Structure Database: Massively expanding the structural coverage of protein-sequence

space with high-accuracy models. Nucleic Acids Res. 50: D439–D444.

West, S. A., A. S. Griffin, A. Gardner, and S. P. Diggle, 2006 Social evolution theory for

microorganisms. Nat. Rev. Microbiol. 4: 597–607.

de Wit, R. J. W., and P. J. M. van Haastert, 1985 Binding of folates to *Dictyostelium discoideum*

cells. Demonstration of five classes of binding sites and their interconversion. Biochim.

Biophys. Acta Biomembr. 814: 199–213.

Wolf, J. B., J. A. Howie, K. Parkinson, N. Gruenheit, D. Melo *et al.*, 2015 Fitness trade-offs result

in the illusion of social success. Curr. Biol. 25: 1086–1090.

Wu, Y., and C. Janetopoulos, 2013 Systematic analysis of γ-aminobutyric acid (GABA)

metabolism and function in the social amoeba *Dictyostelium discoideum*. J. Biol. Chem.

288: 15280–15290.

Zaucha, J., M. Heinzinger, A. Kulandaisamy, E. Kataka, Ó. L. Salvádor *et al.*, 2021 Mutations in

transmembrane proteins: Diseases, evolutionary insights, prediction and comparison

with globular proteins. Brief. Bioinform. 22:.

1290

**Table 1. Number of SNPs and average read depth by sample.** Whole-genome sequencing and

variant analysis resulted in 38 SNPs called in 25 of the 47 samples and distributed throughout

17 of the 24 evolved lines. This table indicates the number of SNPs called for each sample. The

average mapped read depth was calculated for the raw reads normalized by the length of all

annotated genes. Samples from each evolved line, sequenced as populations, are simply

numbered 1 - 24. Clonal samples isolated from each of the evolved lines are named according

to the population number hyphenated with the non-fruiting clone ID (*e.g.,* "NF1"). The non-

fruiting clone IDs were retained for record keeping purposes; they are not related to the

number of clones sequenced for a line.

| Sample | SNP Count | Average Mapped Read Depth |
|--------|-----------|---------------------------|
| 1 | 0 | 128 |
| 1-NF2 | 0 | 43 |
| 2 | 1 | 137 |
| 3 | 0 | 146 |
| 3-NF1 | 1 | 127 |
| 4 | 0 | 171 |
| 5 | 0 | 161 |
| 5-NF2 | 3 | 40 |
| 6 | 1 | 152 |
| 7 | 4 | 229 |
| 7-NF2 | 5 | 44 |
| 8 | 0 | 165 |
| 8-NF1 | 0 | 89 |
| 9 | 1 | 220 |
| 9-NF3 | 1 | 24 |
| 10 | 1 | 151 |
| 10-NF3 | 1 | 23 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 11 | 2 | 116 |
| 11-NF1 | 0 | 37 |
| 12 | 1 | 215 |
| 12-NF1 | 1 | 97 |
| 13 | 1 | 165 |
| 13-NF2 | 1 | 70 |
| 14 | 0 | 127 |
| 14-NF3 | 0 | 22 |
| 15 | 0 | 176 |
| 15-NF1 | 0 | 69 |
| 16 | 0 | 277 |
| 16-NF2 | 3 | 118 |
| 17 | 3 | 123 |
| 18 | 0 | 191 |
| 18-NF1 | 3 | 30 |
| 19 | 0 | 319 |
| 19-NF1 | 0 | 80 |
| 20 | 0 | 231 |
| 20-NF1 | 1 | 66 |
| 20-NF3 | 1 | 32 |
| 21 | 1 | 272 |
| 21-NF1 | 3 | 40 |
| 21-NF2 | 5 | 45 |
| 22 | 3 | 291 |
| 23 | 0 | 305 |
| 23-NF1 | 0 | 25 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 23-NF2 | 0 | 43 |
| 24 | 0 | 222 |
| 24-NF1 | 1 | 32 |
| 1 | 0 | 128 |

1300

1301

**Table 2. List of called SNPs and the impacted locus.** Whole-genome sequencing and variant

analysis resulted in this list of 38 bi-allelic SNPs impacting 29 different genes. For each SNP this

table provides the precise location in the genome and the Dictybase gene ID (followed by gene

name when available), followed by the called samples. Samples from each evolved line,

sequenced as populations, are simply numbered 1–24. Clonal samples isolated from each of the

evolved lines are named according to the population number hyphenated with the non-fruiting

clone ID (*e.g.,* "NF1"). The last two columns of the table are the variant consequence and the

estimated impact rating made by the Ensembl Variant Effect Predictor (VEP) (VEP 95.3).

| Chrom:Site | Gene ID | Called Sample(s) | VEP Consequence | VEP Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NC_007087.3:2556092 | DDB_G0269332 | 22 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007087.3:3010110 | DDB_G0270828 | 21-NF1 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007087.3:3624901 | DDB_G0270964 | 18-NF1 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007087.3:3928085 | DDB_G0269956(RTE) | 21-NF2 | upstream_gene_var. | Modifier |
| NC_007087.3:4563335 | DDB_G0270834(*sgmA*) | 5-NF2 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007088.5:1741979 | DDB_G0272244(*grlG*) | 6 | stop_gained | High |
| NC_007088.5:1741982 | DDB_G0272244(*grlG*) | 7 & 7-NF2 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007088.5:1742043 | DDB_G0272244(*grlG*) | 11 | missense_var. | Moderate |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NC_007088.5:1742355 | DDB_G0272244(*grlG*) | 17 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007088.5:1742362 | DDB_G0272244(*grlG*) | 13 & 13-NF2 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007088.5:1742375 | DDB_G0272244(*grlG*) | 10 & 10-NF3 | stop_gained | High |
| NC_007088.5:1742506 | DDB_G0272244(*grlG*) | 18-NF1 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007088.5:1743478 | DDB_G0272244(*grlG*) | 2 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007088.5:1743823 | DDB_G0272244(*grlG*) | 21 & 21-NF2 | stop_gained | High |
| NC_007088.5:1743844 | DDB_G0272244(*grlG*) | 22 | stop_gained | High |
| NC_007088.5:1761939 | DDB_G0272484 | 16-NF2 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007088.5:4313995 | DDB_G0274875(*rnf160*) | 16-NF2 | stop_gained | High |
| NC_007088.5:6565220 | DDB_G0276291 | 17 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007088.5:6762467 | DDB_G0276367 | 17 | stop_gained | High |
| NC_007088.5:6787007 | DDB_G0276529 | 7-NF2 & 16-NF2 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007088.5:6871012 | DDB_G0276553 | 7 & 7-NF2 | upstream_gene_var. | Modifier |
| NC_007088.5:7954466 | DDB_G0277481 | 21-NF2 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007089.4:1029309 | DDB_G0278531 | 24-NF1 | stop_gained | High |
| NC_007089.4:1073554 | DDB_G0278559 | 7 & 7-NF2 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007089.4:1101637 | DDB_G0278575 | 7 & 7-NF2 | upstream_gene_var. | Modifier |
| NC_007089.4:3459101 | DDB_G0280505(*tmem144A*) | 5-NF2 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007089.4:5126190 | DDB_G0281923(*mrhA*) | 21-NF1 | downstream_gene_var. | Modifier |
| NC_007089.4:5671190 | DDB_G0282355 | 12 & 12-NF1 | upstream_gene_var. | Modifier |
| NC_007090.3:2549009 | DDB_G0284845(*gxcC*) | 3-NF1 | upstream_gene_var. | Modifier |
| NC_007091.3:1993104 | DDB_G0288805 | 22 | stop_gained | High |
| NC_007091.3:2942727 | DDB_G0289555(*arkA*) | 21-NF1 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007091.3:2996049 | DDB_G0289583 | 11 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007091.3:4205385 | DDB_G0290523 | 21-NF2 | synonymous_var. | Low |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NC_007091.3:4793752 | DDB_G0290943(*pks39*) | 20-NF1 & 20-NF3 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007091.3:4956884 | DDB_G0291085(*gxcE*) | 21-NF2 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007091.3:905736 | DDB_G0287967 | 18-NF1 | downstream_gene_var. | Modifier |
| NC_007092.3:1299121 | DDB_G0292198(RTE) | 5-NF2 | missense_var. | Moderate |
| NC_007092.3:1984519 | DDB_G0292696(*colA*) | 9 & 9-NF3 | missense_var. | Moderate |

1310