**Title: Positive selection drives *cis*-regulatory evolution across the threespine stickleback Y**

**chromosome**

**Daniel E. Shaw, Alice Shanfelter Naftaly, and Michael A. White***

**Department of Genetics, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, 30602**

**Corresponding Author:**

**Michael A. White**

**Department of Genetics, University of Georgia**

**120 Green St,**

**Athens, GA 30602**

**whitem@uga.edu**

**Abstract**

Allele-specific gene expression evolves rapidly on heteromorphic sex chromosomes. Over time, the

accumulation of mutations on the Y chromosome leads to widespread loss of gametolog expression,

relative to the X chromosome. It remains unclear if expression evolution on degrading Y chromosomes is

primarily driven by mutations that accumulate through processes of selective interference, or if positive

selection can also favor the downregulation of coding regions on the Y chromosome that contain

deleterious mutations. Identifying the relative rates of *cis*-regulatory sequence evolution across Y

chromosomes has been challenging due to the limited number of reference assemblies. The threespine

stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*) Y chromosome is an excellent model to identify how regulatory

mutations accumulate on Y chromosomes due to its intermediate state of divergence from the X

chromosome. A large number of Y-linked gametologs still exist across three differently aged evolutionary

strata to test these hypotheses. We found that putative enhancer regions on the Y chromosome exhibited

elevated substitution rates and decreased polymorphism when compared to non-functional sites, like

intergenic regions and synonymous sites. This suggests that many *cis*-regulatory regions are under

positive selection on the Y chromosome. This divergence was correlated with X-biased gametolog

expression, indicating the loss of expression from the Y chromosome may be favored by selection. Our

findings provide evidence that Y-linked *cis*-regulatory regions exhibit signs of positive selection quickly

after the suppression of recombination and allow comparisons with recent theoretical models that suggest

the rapid divergence of regulatory regions may be favored to mask deleterious mutations on the Y

chromosome.

**Introduction**

The evolution of heteromorphic sex chromosomes has occurred many times among species

(Bachtrog 2013; Bachtrog, et al. 2014). Heteromorphic sex chromosomes evolve once recombination is

suppressed between the X and Y (or Z and W) (Muller 1918; Charlesworth 1978; Charlesworth and

Charlesworth 2000). After recombination is suppressed, the Y chromosome rapidly accumulates

mutations, leading to sequence degeneration (Charlesworth and Charlesworth 2000). Empirical evidence

of this process has focused on the sequence evolution of coding regions on sex chromosomes. Broad

comparative work has revealed that coding sequence evolution can follow one of several different

evolutionary trajectories. Although many ancestral Y-linked genes are lost because of sequence

degeneration through the accumulation of deleterious mutations, growing evidence indicates not all genes

are lost. Some genes appear to be dosage sensitive and are under strong purifying selection to be retained
on the Y chromosome (Bellott, et al. 2014; White, et al. 2015; Bellott, et al. 2017; Peichel, et al. 2020).
Novel genes with sex-specific functions can also accumulate on sex-limited chromosomes via
translocation and subsequent gene duplication (Soh, et al. 2014; Mahajan and Bachtrog 2017; Ellison and
Bachtrog 2019; Hughes, et al. 2020; Peichel, et al. 2020; Chang, et al. 2022).

The accumulation of mutations is not restricted to coding sequences and can also occur in *cis*-
regulatory regions, leading to changes in expression from the sex-limited chromosome. Gametolog
expression (ancestral genes still shared between the X and Y chromosomes) has been shown to evolve
rapidly on degenerating sex chromosomes, often resulting in the loss of expression from the sex-limited
chromosome (Y and W) (Meisel, et al. 2012a; Muyle, et al. 2012; Ayers, et al. 2013; Singh, et al. 2014;
White, et al. 2015; Beaudry, et al. 2017; Muyle, et al. 2018; Rodríguez Lorenzo, et al. 2018; Martin, et al.
2019; Veltsos, et al. 2019; Wei and Bachtrog 2019; Shaw and White 2022). Although deleterious
regulatory mutations may accumulate through selective interference (Charlesworth and Charlesworth
2000; Bachtrog 2008), selection may also favor mutations within *cis*-regulatory regions to downregulate
coding regions with deleterious mutations (Orr and Kim 1998; Bachtrog 2006). Recent theory supports
the role of positive selection driving the rapid accumulation of mutations to downregulate the Y-linked
allele and upregulate the X-linked allele to maintain ancestral dosage balance (Lenormand, et al. 2020;
Lenormand and Roze 2022).

One challenge to characterizing the molecular evolution of regulatory regions on sex
chromosomes is that complete Y chromosome assemblies are only available for a limited number of taxa.
Reference assemblies are needed to identify the substitutions that are accumulating within non-coding
regions. Additionally, many of the available Y chromosome assemblies are from model organisms that
have sex chromosomes that are highly degenerated (Hughes, et al. 2010; Bellott, et al. 2014; Soh, et al.
2014; Tomaszkiewicz, et al. 2016; Mahajan, et al. 2018; Hughes, et al. 2020). These species only have a
few remaining ancestral gametologs on the Y chromosome, thus limiting the number of genes available to
study how *cis*-regulatory evolution potentially leads to expression differences between the X and Y.
Species with recently derived sex chromosomes that still harbor many ancestral Y-linked gametologs at
varied stages of degeneration are needed to understand how substitutions within *cis*-regulatory regions
lead to the evolution of expression differences between the X and Y.

In addition to having a chromosome-scale assembly of the Y chromosome, an additional
challenge is annotating regulatory regions (Reviewed in Shaw & White, 2022). Recent approaches have
focused on identifying regions of the genome with accessible chromatin that may contain transcription
factor binding sites to regulate gene expression (Ricci, et al. 2019). Chromatin accessibility profiling

techniques, like ATAC-seq (Buenrostro, et al. 2013), utilize short-read sequencing to profile accessible

chromatin regions (ACRs) at a fine-scale across the genome. Across autosomes, ACRs show signatures of

purifying selection relative to other intergenic regions, consistent with these regions containing important

functional elements for gene regulation (Connelly, et al. 2014; Lu, et al. 2019; Horvath, et al. 2021).

Profiling ACRs on sex chromosomes would therefore provide a means to study the molecular evolution

of *cis*-regulatory regions in the context of Y degeneration.

The threespine stickleback fish (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*) is an excellent model to study the

evolution of *cis*-regulatory regions on sex chromosomes. Threespine stickleback fish have a high-quality

reference assembly of the Y chromosome and this chromosome is more recently derived compared to

many other species with available chromosome-scale assemblies (Hughes, et al. 2010; Hughes, et al.

2012; Bellott, et al. 2014; Bellott, et al. 2017; Hughes, et al. 2020; Peichel, et al. 2020). The threespine

stickleback sex chromosomes contain multiple evolutionary strata at different stages of degeneration

(Roesti, et al. 2013; White, et al. 2015; Peichel, et al. 2020), allowing for comparisons of sequence

evolution at different temporal scales. Strata form if recombination is suppressed between sex

chromosomes in multiple steps (Bachtrog 2013). Each subsequent phase of recombination suppression is

followed by the accumulation of substitutions on the Y chromosome, leading to increased sequence

divergence between the X and Y. The age of individual strata can therefore be distinguished by varied

levels of synonymous divergence. In threespine stickleback fish, the oldest stratum is estimated to have

formed around 22 million years ago. Two younger strata formed between 4 and 6 million years ago

(Peichel, et al. 2020; Sardell, et al. 2021). Stratum one has undergone the most extensive degeneration,

with only 18% of ancestral coding regions remaining on the Y chromosome (Peichel, et al. 2020). Many

of the coding regions of these gametologs that remain in stratum one on the Y chromosome show

signatures of purifying selection and are enriched for dosage sensitive functions (White, et al. 2015;

Peichel, et al. 2020). Interestingly, chromosome-wide dosage compensation has not evolved to counter

the loss of expression for genes where the coding sequence has degenerated on the Y chromosome

(White, et al. 2015). The lack of chromosome-wide dosage compensation enables a gene-by-gene

comparison of *cis*-regulatory changes to understand how expression of X-linked alleles evolves in

response to degenerating coding regions on the Y.

Here, we leveraged ATAC-seq from two different tissues to identify *cis*-regulatory regions on the

sex chromosomes and an autosome. We found sex-linked *cis*-regulatory regions exhibited signatures of

positive selection, relative to non-functional, intergenic control regions. Our findings complement

existing sex chromosome evolution theory that suggests the accumulation of mutations within *cis*-

regulatory regions may be beneficial to silence expression from a degenerating Y chromosome.

## Results

### Nucleotide substitutions are accumulating at high rates within accessible chromatin regions

The completion of the threespine stickleback Y chromosome assembly (Peichel, et al. 2020) allowed us to thoroughly examine regulatory evolution among sex-linked gametologs shared between the sex chromosomes. ACRs putatively contain *cis*-regulatory elements that serve as domains for transcription factor binding. High sequence divergence within ACRs therefore represent regions of the genome that are likely experiencing *cis*-regulatory evolution. We first sought to compare divergence of ACRs between the X and Y chromosomes to previously characterized synonymous divergence throughout coding regions. Crossing over was suppressed across the threespine stickleback sex chromosomes in at least three separate events, forming strata with distinct levels of divergence (stratum one: oldest; stratum two: intermediate; stratum three: youngest) (Peichel, et al. 2020). To survey ACRs, we utilized an Assay for Transposase Accessible Chromatin sequencing (ATAC-seq) from liver tissue (Naftaly, et al. 2021) and testis tissue. We defined a set of non-coding ACRs that were likely present in the ancestor of the X and Y chromosomes, by identifying X-linked ACRs within intergenic sequence that still had homologous sequence on the Y chromosome and homologous sequence in the ancestral autosome (homologous sequence in ninespine stickleback chromosome 19). To calculate divergence, we compared these regions with the homologous sequence on the Y chromosome, which may no longer be associated with accessible chromatin. In the liver, we found a total of 1,279 X-linked ACRs. We were able to align 948 (74.1%) of these ACRs to homologous regions on the Y chromosome and the ancestral ninespine stickleback *(Pungititus pungitius)* autosome 19. 869 liver ACRs were within 50 kb of a coding region shared by all three chromosomes. In the testis, we identified 896 X-linked ACRs. Compared to the liver, we found far fewer orthologous regions on the Y chromosome and autosome 19 in the ninespine stickleback (118 total aligned; 13.2%), suggesting *cis*-regulatory regions within testis ACRs may be more rapidly evolving. All 118 of the aligned testis ACRs were within 50 kb of a coding region shared by all three chromosomes. We used these aligned sets of ACRs that were close to conserved coding regions for all subsequent analyses.

We estimated divergence between the X and Y chromosomes among ACRs in each tissue and compared this to synonymous and non-synonymous substitutions within coding regions across the sex chromosomes. Coding regions across all three strata on the threespine stickleback Y chromosome are accumulating non-synonymous substitutions at a higher rate than autosomes due to a reduced efficacy of selection (White, et al. 2015; Peichel, et al. 2020). We first compared the divergence among testis and liver ACRs to non-synonymous substitution rates within coding regions to determine if mutations were accumulating at a similar rate. We found liver and testis ACRs have much higher divergence compared to

non-synonymous mutations among all three strata (Figure 1) (P < 0.001; Kruskal-Wallis and Dunn's

Test). We also compared ACR divergence with synonymous substitutions, which is used as measure of

neutral evolution. Testis ACRs had divergence higher than neutral, synonymous substitutions in all three

strata (Figure 1) (P < 0.001; Kruskal-Wallis and Dunn's Test). Liver ACR's exhibited divergence that

was higher than synonymous substitutions in the two oldest strata (one and two) (P < 0.001; Kruskal-

Wallis and Dunn's Test) (Figure 1), indicating these regions are also evolving rapidly. In the youngest

stratum (three), the liver ACRs were not significantly different than synonymous substitutions (P = 0.413,

Kruskal-Wallis and Dunn's Test). Additionally, ACR divergence was distinct between all three

evolutionary strata (P < 0.001; Kruskal-Wallis and Dunn's test) and corresponded with the extent of

evolutionary divergence of each stratum. ACR divergence higher than both non-synonymous and

synonymous substitutions strongly suggests *cis*-regulatory regions are evolving rapidly across all three

strata. However, this analysis alone cannot rule out the possibility that purifying selection may still be

operating within coding regions on the Y chromosome, reducing non-synonymous substitutions.

Synonymous substitutions may also be under weak purifying selection (i.e. codon bias) (Bachtrog 2005;

Lawrie, et al. 2013). In this scenario, we may observe higher divergence rates within ACRs relative to

coding regions.

We therefore sought to compare ACR divergence with non-functional regions throughout the sex

chromosomes as well as ACR divergence throughout a representative autosome. We used the orthologous

sequence from the ninespine stickleback fish to infer substitution rates throughout the X and Y

chromosomes separately as well as throughout autosome 18. We defined non-functional control regions

as intergenic sequence of the chromosomes that did not overlap known gene annotations, repetitive

elements, or our previously defined ACRs (see methods). Although our ability to define non-functional

regions is limited to the currently available annotations, this represents our best approximation of regions

of the genome that are not under selection. If ACRs are evolving faster than expected under neutrality, we

would predict the average ACR sequence divergence would exceed the rate of divergence observed across

permutations of non-functional control regions (Figure 2A). However, if ACR divergence is similar to the

control regions (Figure 2A), this would suggest substitutions are accumulating in ACRs at the same rate

as the remainder of the Y chromosome, which is subject to sequence degeneration across the non-

crossover region (Charlesworth and Charlesworth 2000).

ACRs functional in the liver exhibited higher substitution rates on the Y chromosome than on the

X chromosome. Y-linked ACRs had significantly higher substitution rates compared to the non-functional

control regions for the two oldest evolutionary strata (Figure 2B; P < 0.001; stratum one and two; 10,000

permutations). In contrast to the Y-linked ACRs, we found the X-linked liver ACR sequence divergence

was significantly lower than non-functional control regions (Figure 2B; Stratum one: P = 0.016; Stratum two and three: P < 0.001; 10,000 permutations). This suggests that ACRs may be functionally constrained more on the X chromosome, compared to Y-linked ACRs. We observed a similar pattern on the Y chromosome for ACRs functional in testis tissue. Y-linked ACRs had significantly higher substitution rates in all three evolutionary strata, compared to non-functional control regions (Figure 2B; P < 0.001, 10,000 permutations). However, we observed X-linked ACRs from testis tissue, also exhibited elevated nucleotide substitutions in the oldest two evolutionary strata (Figure 2B; P < 0.001; 10,000 permutations), while the youngest stratum was significantly lower than intergenic regions (Figure 2B; P < 0.001; 10,000 permutations). This indicates some *cis*-regulatory elements exhibited accelerated substitution rates on the X chromosome and this occurs in a tissue-specific fashion.

Autosomal ACRs have been shown to be under purifying selection in other species (Horvath, et al. 2021). We therefore tested whether threespine stickleback autosomal ACRs also exhibited purifying selection, similar to the pattern we observed on the X chromosome in liver. Consistent with patterns of purifying selection, we found autosomal ACRs exhibited lower sequence divergence compared to non-functional control regions in both liver (Figure 2B; P = 0.002; 10,000 permutations) and testis tissue (Figure 2B; P < 0.001; 10,000 permutations).

**Accessible chromatin regions exhibit signatures of selection**

An excess of substitutions on the Y chromosome could be caused by relaxed purifying selection or positive selection. To distinguish between these alternatives, we used short-read sequencing of 12 males from a freshwater population of stickleback fish (Shanfelter, et al. 2019) to search for signatures of selection within ACRs. In the absence of selection, the ratio of polymorphism to sequence divergence should be equal between functional and non-functional sites. Deviation from this expectation would imply these regions are under selection. To explore this, we performed a modified McDonald-Kreitman (MK) test on non-coding sequences (Andolfatto 2005). We compared the number of X- and Y- specific substitutions to the number of polymorphisms segregating within a population for ACRs and non-functional control sequences. Except for stratum two on the X chromosome, sex chromosome ACRs from the liver and the testis had a greater proportion of sites fixed by positive selection ($\alpha$), compared to autosomal ACRs (P < 0.001; chi-square test) (Table 1). We also identified the direction of selection acting on ACRs by calculating the odds-ratio of the McDonald Kreitman test, known as the neutrality index (NI) (Rand and Kann 1996). Liver ACRs of the sex chromosomes had an NI < 1 (P < 0.001; chi-square test), consistent with positive selection (Figure 3; Table 1). The only exception we found was for one of the younger strata on the X chromosome (stratum two), which had an elevated NI consistent with purifying selection. Despite having a mean divergence lower than intergenic sequence, we found

signatures of positive selection on the X chromosome for strata one and three. In these cases, the

departure from neutrality was driven by the low number of polymorphisms within ACRs compared to

intergenic sequence, rather than high divergence within ACRs (Table 1). In these cases, the reduced

polymorphism may be due to recent positive selection (Stoletzki and Eyre-Walker 2010, Hughes, et al.

2008). Each stratum on the Y chromosome had a clear signature of positive selection (NI < 1; P < 0.001).

Compared to the X chromosome and the autosome, the Y chromosome liver ACRs had stronger

signatures of positive selection, indicative by a non-overlapping bootstrap interval. For the testis ACRs,

NI was indistinguishable between the X and Y chromosome, and both sex chromosomes had non-

overlapping bootstrap intervals with the representative autosome, indicating stronger positive selection

acting on sex-linked ACRs. Similar to X-linked ACRs in liver, we found that testis ACRs in stratum three

on the X chromosome exhibited an NI < 1, due to a low number of polymorphisms in ACR rather than an

excess in divergence.

We compared the patterns we observed across ACRs with coding regions. We found that coding

regions across the entire Y chromosome had an excess of non-synonymous polymorphisms (Figure 3; NI

> 1; P < 0.001; chi-square test), consistent with relaxed purifying selection on a degenerating Y

chromosome. This pattern was largely driven by the youngest two strata of the Y chromosome (Table 2).

The oldest stratum (one) did not deviate from neutral expectations (P = 0.112). Coding regions across the

X chromosome were not significantly different than neutral expectations (NI = 1; P = 0.281; chi-square

test). When split by evolutionary strata only the youngest stratum (three) deviated from neutral

expectations after correcting for multiple comparisons. In stratum three, the coding regions exhibited

purifying selection (NI > 1; Pn < Ps; P < 0.001; chi-square test). Unlike the Y chromosome, the X entire

chromosome did not have an excess of non-synonymous polymorphism (Table 2). A gene-by-gene MK

test revealed that 50% of X-linked gametologs had an NI > 1, compared to only 25% that had an excess of

amino acid substitutions (Supplemental material). Importantly, sex-linked coding regions were not under

widespread positive selection, like ACRs.

**Reduced polymorphism throughout the sex chromosomes**

Due to a lower effective population size, sex chromosomes are expected to have lower nucleotide

diversity relative to the autosomes, given an equal sex ratio in the population. To test whether nucleotide

diversity is reduced on the threespine stickleback sex chromosomes, we estimated average nucleotide

diversity in sliding windows across the sex chromosomes and autosome 18. Across windows, we found Y

chromosome nucleotide diversity was much lower than the expected 25% of nucleotide diversity

compared to autosomes (Y chromosome pi: 0.0001; autosome pi: 0.0043; Supplemental Figure 1). This

suggests that selection acting on linked deleterious or beneficial mutations has lowered nucleotide

diversity beyond neutral expectations on the Y chromosome. The X chromosome is predicted to contain

75% of the nucleotide diversity compared to the autosomes. We found that the non-PAR regions of the X

chromosome had 45% of the amount of nucleotide diversity as autosomes, indicating the X chromosome

may also be under selection, reducing nucleotide diversity beyond neutral expectations (non-PAR X

chromosome pi: 0.0019; autosome pi: 0.0043; Supplemental Figure 1). We found that the Y chromosome

had consistent signatures of low nucleotide diversity across all strata (Supplemental Figure 1). However,

there were distinct differences in nucleotide diversity for each stratum and the PAR on the X chromosome

(Supplemental Figure 1; $P < 0.001$ for all comparisons; Kruskal-Wallis and Dunn's Test), suggesting each

region of the X chromosome may be under different selection pressures depending on gene and regulatory

content.

**Y-linked substitutions are correlated with biased expression from the X chromosome**

Selection should favor the loss of expression from the Y chromosome in order to silence coding

regions that have accumulated deleterious mutations (Orr and Kim 1998; Bachtrog 2006; Lenormand, et

al. 2020). To test if Y-linked *cis*-regulatory divergence was associated with changes in expression, we

compared ACR sequence divergence to changes in allelic expression on the X and Y from liver and testis

RNA-seq transcriptomes (Peichel, et al. 2020). To maximize the total number of genes for this analysis,

we pooled genes across all three evolutionary strata. We found that sequence divergence among liver

ACRs that were proximal to genes was a predictor of allele-specific expression. We observed higher

expression of the X-linked gametolog, relative to the Y-linked gametolog, when ACRs on the Y

chromosome had more substitutions (Figure 4A; $N = 51$; $P = 0.004$; $R=0.4$; Spearman's rank correlation;

95% Confidence Interval via bootstrapping (0.1249, 0.5769)), indicating that ACR divergence explains

around 16% of the X-biased expression observed in liver tissue We also observed a correlation between

expression and substitutions within ACRs on the X chromosome (Figure 4C; $N = 51$; $P = 0.033$; $R=0.30$;

Spearman's rank correlation; 95% Confidence Interval from bootstrapping (0.0909, 0.4742)). The slopes

of each linear regression were indistinguishable between the X and Y chromosome ($P =0.590$; Fisher Z

transformation). Although we do not have gene expression from the ninespine stickleback to determine

which sex chromosome is deviating from the ancestral expression level, the Y-linked substitutions

indicate the X-biased expression we observe is likely due to downregulating the Y chromosome.

A similar trend was observed in testis tissue for Y-linked ACR divergence (Figure 4), but the

correlations were not significant (Figure 4B; $N = 31$; $P = 0.26$; $R=0.201$; Spearman's rank correlation;

95% Confidence Interval via bootstrapping (-0.0095, 0.5706)). There are fewer testis-expressed genes in

this analysis. Therefore, the lack of significance could be due to sample size. To identify if sample size

had an effect, we performed a randomized down-sampling for the liver-expressed genes. Even with down-

sampling, 68.0% of the permutations still produced significant correlations between ACR divergence and

X-biased expression in the liver (P < 0.05; 10,000 permutations). This indicates the lack of correlation

observed with the testis expressed genes is likely not due to a smaller sample size. Despite having greater

ACR divergence in testis compared to liver, 22 gametologs exhibited Y-biased expression in testis (Table

3). This suggests Y ACR evolution also contributes to up-regulation of male-specific genes.

**_Cis_-regulatory evolution is not correlated with deleterious mutations in coding regions**

The downregulation of Y-linked gametologs could be adaptive if loss of expression follows the

accumulation of deleterious coding substitutions (Orr and Kim 1998). We searched for evidence of

adaptive silencing on the Y chromosome by comparing the ACR divergence to the ratio of non-

synonymous to synonymous substitutions ($d_N/d_S$) within the coding region of each gene. An adaptive

silencing model would be supported if Y-linked gametologs with an elevated $d_N/d_S$ ratio also have

elevated _cis_-regulatory divergence. Among genes shared between the X and Y chromosomes, we found

no correlation between ACR nucleotide divergence and $d_N/d_S$ (Supplemental Figure 2; each stratum on X

and Y: P > 0.05; Spearman's rank correlation), indicating coding regions with elevated ACR divergence

are not more likely to have elevated substitutions in the amino acid sequence.

Elevation of $d_N/d_S$ on the Y chromosome could indicate relaxed purifying selection, or positive

selection. Combining genes that are evolving under both could mask signatures of adaptive silencing. To

account for this, we split gametologs on the Y chromosome into classes based on the signatures of

selection from the MK test. We grouped gametologs into categories of purifying selection (NI_Haldane >

0.25; N = 262), positive selection (NI_Haldane < -0.25; N = 41), and genes evolving through relaxed

purifying selection (-0.25 >NI_Haldane > 0.25; N = 219). If selection was acting on ACRs to downregulate

genes with deleterious mutations, we would expect to see a positive correlation between ACR divergence

and $d_N/d_S$ for genes with signatures of relaxed purifying selection. In contrast to this prediction, we found

a weak negative correlation between ACR divergence and $d_N/d_S$ for expressed genes under relaxed

purifying selection (Supplemental Figure 3; R= -0.293; P =0.0155; N=35; Spearman's rank correlation).

These genes also did not have more X-biased expression than other genes (Supplemental Figure 4; P >

0.05; Kruskal-Wallis test). Interestingly, we did find a positive correlation between ACR divergence and

$d_N/d_S$ for genes evolving under positive selection (Supplemental Figure 4; R=0.92; P=0.002; N=10;

Spearman's rank correlation). Overall, most genes on the Y seem to be evolving independently from

neighboring regulatory regions, except for a small set of genes under positive selection.

We also examined whether ACR divergence was higher within genes that contained frameshift

mutations, nonsense mutations, or in-frame deletions. These types of mutations are more likely to produce

a non-functional or sub-optimal peptide. We found no significant difference in the number of ACR

substitutions from liver and testis tissue for coding regions that contained frameshift, nonsense mutations,

or deletions, compared to coding regions that did not have these putatively deleterious mutations

(functional) (Supplemental Figure 5) (all pairwise comparisons P > 0.05; Mann-Whitney U test). Overall,

we found no evidence of *cis*-regulatory divergence associated with deleterious coding sequence

divergence, suggesting the adaptive silencing model is unlikely the major driver of *cis*-regulatory

evolution on the threespine stickleback sex chromosomes.

**Discussion**

The evolution of gene regulation on Y chromosomes has largely been studied in the context of

RNA expression levels of gametologs (Muyle, et al. 2012; White, et al. 2015; Beaudry, et al. 2017;

Muyle, et al. 2018; Martin, et al. 2019; Veltsos, et al. 2019). Over time, gametolog expression is generally

lost across most genes on the Y chromosome. With the growing number of Y chromosome reference

assembles and sequencing methods to quickly profile functional *cis*-regulatory regions across the genome,

it has become feasible to explore the molecular evolution of *cis*-regulatory regions that have led to altered

expression patterns. Here, we observed elevated nucleotide substitutions and reduced polymorphisms

within *cis*-regulatory elements across the threespine stickleback Y chromosome, consistent with positive

selection driving this process. We found that increased rates of *cis*-regulatory divergence were associated

with X-biased expression of gametologs, suggesting loss of expression from the Y chromosome. Without

liver and testis gene expression from the ninespine stickleback as an ancestral comparison, we were

unable to confirm that X-biased gametolog expression is a result of downregulation of the Y chromosome

or upregulation of the X chromosome. However, previous sequencing of a brain transcriptome showed

expression patterns consistent with loss of Y expression rather than gain of X expression (White, et al.

2015). It is therefore likely that the X-biased expression we observed in liver and testis tissue also occurs

through the loss of Y chromosome expression, similar to what has been observed in other species with

degenerating Y chromosomes (Muyle, et al. 2012; Beaudry, et al. 2017; Wei and Bachtrog 2019).

Additional work will be necessary to identify the functional variants responsible for the X-biased

expression pattern. We currently cannot determine whether the X-biased expression pattern is due to the

accumulation of deleterious mutations from inefficient selection, adaptive substitutions that are

accumulating in the ACRs, or a combination of the two.

Several theoretical models of sex chromosome evolution have been developed that predict how

gene expression evolves over time. Like coding regions, *cis*-regulatory regions will accumulate

deleterious mutations because of a reduced efficacy of purifying selection (Charlesworth and

Charlesworth 2000; Bachtrog 2008). Without the removal of deleterious mutations, substitution rates

within regulatory and coding regions approach the rates observed among non-functional intergenic sites.

Theory predicts that substitution rates within regulatory regions can be elevated further through positive

selection favoring beneficial mutations. The adaptive silencing model (Orr and Kim 1998) posits that Y

gametologs that have accumulated maladaptive coding substitutions would be favored to be

downregulated through *cis*-regulatory mutations. Only the functional X-linked gametolog would be

expressed in males. An alternative model suggests that deleterious mutations accumulate in *cis*-regulatory

elements throughout the non-recombining region, initially downregulating all Y-linked gametologs (i.e.

degeneration by regulatory evolution (Lenormand, et al. 2020; Lenormand and Roze 2022). As

deleterious mutations simultaneously accumulate within coding regions, a positive-feedback loop ensues,

leading to a higher substitution rate within *cis*-regulatory elements to selectively downregulate

increasingly maladaptive coding regions. Our survey of ACR evolution in threespine stickleback fish

allowed us to compare with each of the previously discussed theories.

Evidence for adaptive silencing (Orr and Kim 1998) would be present if alleles with elevated

rates of coding divergence between the X and Y chromosomes, were more likely silenced on the Y

chromosome. Our results did not support this model. We found that the accumulation of X or Y ACR

divergence had no association with relaxed purifying selection in nearby coding regions. Our results

complement previous findings that have compared coding sequence evolution to gametolog expression.

The level of expression from the Y chromosome is often not correlated with the overall number of

deleterious mutations within coding regions (Bachtrog 2006; Bachtrog, et al. 2008; Beaudry, et al. 2017).

While an elevation of $d_N/d_S$ has been previously used as a proxy for the accumulation of deleterious

variants on the Y, this association could also be conflated by positive selection. Here, we showed the lack

of an association still held when only looking at genes evolving under relaxed selection. Additionally, we

found no correlation between divergence within an ACR and the functional state of a coding region (i.e.

containing frameshift or nonsense mutations). We found *cis*-regulatory evolution was correlated with

expression differences, but that ACR divergence accumulated independent of coding divergence. A

correlation between nucleotide substitutions in *cis*-regulatory regions and deleterious mutations in coding

regions may be observed if ACRs and gene expression are profiled from additional tissues. In addition,

we assigned ACRs to coding sequences based on overall proximity to a gene. Although this method of

annotating ACRs is commonly used to assign *cis*-regulatory regions to genes (Connelly, et al. 2014;

Alexandre, et al. 2018; Ricci, et al. 2019), it is possible that some ACRs interact with other genes through

long range interactions based on chromatin configuration (Mifsud, et al. 2015; Schoenfelder and Fraser

2019), reducing our ability to detect an association between deleterious mutations in coding regions and

nucleotide substitutions in ACRs. Also, the number of substitutions within an ACR may not be a fully

accurate predictor of the overall ability to silence a given gametolog on the Y chromosome. If only a

small number of substitutions are needed to ablate transcription factor binding within an ACR, we would

not expect to see a strong correlation between the number of deleterious mutations within coding

sequences and the number of substitutions within ACRs. Additional functional work will be necessary to

explore these alternatives.

Elevated substitution rates in *cis*-regulatory regions quickly following recombination suppression

would be consistent with the model of degeneration by regulatory evolution (Lenormand, et al. 2020;

Lenormand and Roze 2022). Silencing of Y-linked alleles occurs first in this model, followed by the

accumulation of deleterious mutations within coding regions. We found that putative *cis*-regulatory

elements exhibited signatures of positive selection on the Y chromosome across all three evolutionary

strata, including the two youngest strata that still contain most of the ancestral gene content (Peichel, et al.

2020). The degeneration by regulatory evolution model predicts that the substitution rate within *cis*-

regulatory elements will accelerate once deleterious mutations begin to accumulate within coding regions.

This will further suppress gametolog expression from the Y chromosome, masking maladaptive coding

mutations. Consistent with this model, our results show *cis*-regulatory regions have stronger signatures of

positive selection compared to autosomal ACRs, as well as both coding and non-coding regions on the

sex chromosomes. This suggests there is selection to downregulate Y-linked alleles in liver. Alternatively,

substitutions in ACRs could reflect adaptation to upregulate genes on the Y chromosome, to maintain

expression or to gain male beneficial expression (Skaletsky, et al. 2003; Martínez-Pacheco, et al. 2020;

Shaw and White 2022). Non-adaptive explanations should also be carefully considered as alternatives to

adaptive models. For example, elevated substitution rates could be observed in Y-linked ACRs if they

have higher mutation rates compared to synonymous and silent intergenic sites. Indeed, it has been

suggested that male-biased mutation rates, due to increased cell division (Link, et al. 2017), or specialized

DNA repair pathways (Chang, et al. 2022), could shape the evolution of the Y chromosome. These

mutations could fix at a faster rate within populations and produce false adaptive signatures because of

the smaller effective population size of the Y chromosome. However, the threespine stickleback fish Y

chromosome does not show evidence of male-biased mutation rate at synonymous sites (White, et al.

2015), and thus it remains unclear how these mutation biases would increase substitution rates uniquely at

accessible chromatin regions.

The degeneration by regulatory evolution model also indicates dosage compensation should

evolve simultaneously for genes that are under strong stabilizing selection to maintain expression levels

(Lenormand, et al. 2020). Degeneration of *cis*-regulatory elements on the Y chromosome and loss of

expression should select for upregulation of the gametolog on the X chromosome to compensate for

dosage loss. In this scenario, nucleotide substitutions should accumulate within ACRs on the X

chromosome. We found that X-linked ACRs had a depletion of polymorphism, consistent with positive

selection. Unlike Y-linked ACRs, the X-linked ACRs had low divergence over longer evolutionary

timespans between ninespine and threespine stickleback fish. This suggests that selection has acted on

some X-linked sites more recently within threespine stickleback populations to fix beneficial regulatory

mutations. This distinction is consistent with Y-linked ACR divergence accumulating first, as predicted

by the degeneration by regulatory evolution model (Lenormand et al. 2020). Selection on X-linked *cis*-

regulatory elements within ACRs may still be ongoing. A similar finding was observed on the neo-sex

chromosomes of *Drosophila miranda*, where the neo-X chromosome was enriched for signatures of

selective sweeps, while the ancestral X chromosome region was not (Bachtrog, et al. 2009).

We found the strongest signatures of positive selection on the X chromosome were from testis

ACRs. Testis ACRs may have faster rates of sequence divergence on both the X and Y chromosome,

from processes similar to the faster X-effect (Charlesworth, et al. 1987; Vicoso and Charlesworth 2009).

There is widespread evidence for accelerated rates of coding evolution on X chromosomes compared to

autosomes, especially in male specific tissues (Baines, et al. 2008; Meisel and Connallon 2013; Parsch

and Ellegren 2013; Larson, et al. 2016; Kopania, et al. 2022), as the X-linked mutations in hemizygous

regions are always exposed to selection in males. Expression of X-linked gametologs may also evolve at

faster rates (Khaitovich, et al. 2005; Brawand, et al. 2011; Meisel, et al. 2012b; Coolon, et al. 2015;

Kopania, et al. 2022), presumably due to mutations in *cis*-regulatory regions. The elevated substitution

rate we observed on the X chromosome in testis ACRs may reflect male-beneficial selection to alter

expression levels that is not necessarily connected to dosage compensation.

While we observed molecular signatures of positive selection on ACRs, we did not find sufficient

evidence to suggest selection is associated with elevated X expression, as predicted by the degeneration

by regulatory evolution model. While selection for dosage compensation could be ongoing, previous

findings suggest that most genes on the threespine stickleback Y chromosome can be lost without

consequence. Within the oldest stratum, over half of the Y-linked gametologs have been completely lost

and males exhibit half expression, relative to females (White, et al. 2015). Even across species with

chromosome-wide dosage compensation mechanisms, many genes are not compensated completely

(Cotton, et al. 2013; Tukiainen, et al. 2017), which suggests that loss of Y expression is not always

deleterious. The dosage sensitivity of each sex-linked gene may be essential for predicting how rapidly

*cis*-regulatory regions evolve on both sex chromosomes. In the degeneration by regulatory evolution

model, if stabilizing selection is relaxed, chromosome-wide degeneration in *cis*-regulatory regions still

occurs, the genes just do not evolve dosage compensation (Lenormand, et al. 2020). Our results provide

empirical support that *cis*-regulatory degeneration can occur without dosage compensation.

Expression balance of dosage sensitive genes can also be maintained if the Y-linked gametolog

does not degenerate. The coding sequence of haploinsufficient genes on Y chromosomes have been

shown to be maintained through purifying selection. These genes presumably cannot be lost from the Y

chromosome (Bellott, et al. 2014; Bellott, et al. 2017; Peichel, et al. 2020; Bellott and Page 2021). For

these genes, if Y-linked *cis*-regulatory elements accumulated deleterious mutations, ancestral expression

patterns could be maintained if compensatory transcription binding sites evolved. This would also result

in signatures of increased substitution rates with ACRs on the Y chromosome, relative to intergenic

regions. This type of compensatory evolution has been proposed for functionally critical genes in

mammals (Chaix, et al. 2008; Vermunt, et al. 2016), and *Drosophila* (Landry, et al. 2005; Arnold, et al.

2014; Signor and Nuzhdin 2018). Functional analysis of what transcription binding sites are affected by

Y-linked mutations could help identify which mutations are leading to down-regulation of gametologs

compared to those that maintain ancestral expression.

Recent models indicate inversions that suppress recombination between sex chromosomes can be

selected to be retained within populations if sex-specific *trans*-acting regulators evolve to maintain

optimal expression in both sexes (i.e. dosage compensation) (Lenormand and Roze 2022). This is based

on the idea that if divergent X- and Y- linked *cis*-regulators were to recombine, it would lead to

maladaptive expression levels in males or females. The evolutionary strata on the threespine stickleback

Y chromosome evolved from at least three nested inversions that suppressed recombination (Peichel, et

al. 2020). Unlike this recent model, our results suggest these inversions were likely not under strong

selection to be retained initially because of early evolution of dosage compensation. Chromosome-wide

dosage compensation does not occur in the threespine stickleback (White, et al. 2015) and we did not

observe a corresponding evolution of X-linked upregulation. Interestingly, the excess of X-linked

mutations observed in testis ACRs, may be reflective of a greater abundance of rapidly evolving sex-

specific *trans*-regulators in the testes. However, additional work will be needed to identify the role that

autosomal *trans*-regulators play in modifying gene expression of sex chromosomes in each sex, to test

other aspects of the degeneration by regulatory evolution model.

Although we focused on the degeneration of *cis*-regulatory elements on the Y chromosome, it is

important to note that Y chromosomes become masculinized over time and *cis*-regulatory elements may

also be under positive selection for male-specific neo- or sub-functionalization (Soh, et al. 2014; Mahajan

and Bachtrog 2017; Bachtrog, et al. 2019; Martínez-Pacheco, et al. 2020; Peichel, et al. 2020; Chang, et

al. 2022). Some of the ACRs we found with high divergence may actually reflect functional *cis*-

regulatory regions associated with testis-specific genes. Interestingly, we found signatures of positive

selection in ACRs near testis-expressed genes. Some of these genes were enriched for Y-biased

expression. These findings provide evidence that ancestral gametolog expression levels can also change

presumably through gain of new testis-related functions. Additional work will be necessary to identify the

novel function these regulatory regions provide during spermatogenesis. An increase in testis expression

was also found for ancestral gametologs in a comparative study across 17 species of mammals (Martínez-

Pacheco, et al. 2020). In these species, most Y-linked gametologs gained novel testis expression patterns,

compared to their X-linked alleles. Rapid sex-linked *cis*-regulatory evolution may therefore be a universal

phenomenon across species.

Y chromosomes often have much lower diversity overall, relative to neutral expectations

(Lawson Handley, et al. 2006; Wilson Sayres, et al. 2014). This pattern has been attributed to purifying

selection removing deleterious mutations and the linked neutral variation throughout the non-recombining

region (Wilson Sayres, et al. 2014; Wilson Sayres 2018). Our findings revealed that nucleotide diversity

on the threespine stickleback Y chromosome is also much lower than neutral expectations. Our results

suggest positive selection within ACRs could also be an important driver of reducing nucleotide diversity

on the Y chromosome within populations. One important consideration is whether sex-biased

demography may affect Y-linked diversity. If males are more variable in reproductive success than

females, this could lower the expected effective population size of the Y chromosome, reducing

nucleotide diversity. Little is known about the operating sex-ratios of stickleback fish. Some populations

exhibit sex ratios that are female biased (Rollins, et al. 2017). This could contribute to the low nucleotide

diversity we observed. However, simulations in human populations revealed that even drastic shifts in sex

ratio could not entirely explain the low diversity observed on the Y chromosome (Wilson Sayres, et al.

2014).

**Conclusion**

Together, our results provide evidence of positive selection driving accelerated rates of nucleotide

substitution in *cis*-regulatory elements. Signatures of positive selection, even in the youngest two strata,

indicate that *cis*-regulatory evolution can proceed rapidly following the suppression of recombination,

leading to reduced gene expression from the Y chromosome. These results support some aspects of recent

models of sex chromosome evolution, where *cis*-regulatory degeneration and silencing occurs first on the

Y chromosome. However, we found this can occur in the absence of dosage compensation, contrasting

other assumptions of these models. Improvements in functional annotations of regulatory regions as well

as an ever-growing collection of high-quality Y and W assemblies will allow continued empirical testing

of new regulatory models of sex chromosome evolution.

**Materials and Methods**

**Molecular evolution of accessible chromatin regions and coding regions**

We used accessible chromatin regions (ACRs) from two different tissues. Liver ACRs were

previously identified from two replicates (Naftaly, et al. 2021) (NCBI BioProject PRJNA667175). We

also collected testes from two juvenile males (~4.4 cm in standard length) of laboratory-reared threespine

stickleback fish, originally isolated from Lake Washington (Seattle, Washington, USA) (NCBI BioProject

PRJNA686097). The testis cells were immediately dissociated through homogenization in 1X PBS

containing proteinase inhibitor cocktail (PIC, cOmplete tablets Roche) (PBS+PIC). The cells were fixed

with 16% formaldehyde and washed twice with PBS+PIC, followed by lysis in 1M Tris-HCl, pH=8, 0.5M

EDTA, 10% NP-40, 50% glycerol/molecular grade $H_2O$, and 1X PIC. Nuclei were stained with DAPI and

counted with a hemocytometer. We diluted samples to 60,000 – 80,000 nuclei. ATAC-seq library

preparation was conducted using previously established protocols (Lu, et al. 2017; Naftaly, et al. 2021).

The libraries were sequenced on an Illumina NextSeq (2 x 150 bp; Georgia Genomics and Bioinformatics

Core). Reads were trimmed with Trimmomatic (v. 0.36) (Bolger, et al. 2014), using a sliding window of

four bases, trimming the remainder of the read when the average quality within a window dropped below

20. Residual adapter sequences were removed using Trimmomatic ILLUMINACLIP. Reads were filtered

for a minimum length using MINLEN:30. We aligned the trimmed reads using Bowtie2 (v. 2.4.1) with

default parameters (Langmead and Salzberg 2012). We filtered for alignments with a mapping quality

greater than 20 using SAMtools (v1.14). We also removed PCR duplicates by using the MarkDuplicates

function in Picard (https://github.com/broadinstitute/picard).

We used a Tn5 control sample to normalize ATAC-seq reads to remove the effect of Tn5 bias.

For the control, genomic DNA was extracted from a caudal fin clip of one male fish using a standard

phenol-chloroform extraction. The ATAC-seq library preparation, whole genome sequencing library

preparation, and sequencing (Illumina HiSeq 2 x 150 bp) of the control sample were completed by

GENEWIZ (New Jersey, USA). Whole genome sequencing was conducted in order to show the DNA

sample was of sufficient quality to construct the Tn5 bias control. For the whole genome sequencing, we

recovered over 232 million reads with an average quality score of 38.59, indicating a high-quality sample.

We trimmed residual adapters and low-quality sequences using Trimmomatic as previously described.

Trimmed reads were aligned to the threespine stickleback genome using Bowtie2. The read coverage per

base pair was calculated using BEDTools (v2.29, -d) (Quinlan and Hall 2010). The whole genome

sequencing sample had an average read depth of 90x where only ~10% of the genome was supported with

less than ten reads. Within these regions, only 6% had zero reads per base pair, indicating 94% of the

genome could be queried for biased integration of Tn5. The Tn5 bias control produced over 177 million

reads. The reads were trimmed from these reads using Trimmomatic with the same parameters. The

trimmed reads were aligned to the threespine stickleback genome using Bowtie2 with default parameters.

In order to use previous alignment coordinates between the X and Y chromosome, we used the v. 4

genome build of the X chromosome (Peichel, et al. 2020). We used the v. 5 genome build of chromosome

18 (Nath, et al. 2021).  Reads mapping to the mitochondria and unscaffolded regions were removed. PCR

duplicates were removed using MarkDuplicates from Picard.

548            We evaluated concordance between replicates in several ways. We first searched for enrichment

of ATAC-seq reads around the transcription start sites (TSSs) of expressed genes. Iso-Seq long read

sequencing was previously conducted in threespine stickleback fish to curate accurate transcription start

site annotations across multiple tissues (Naftaly, et al. 2021). We used deepTools (v3.5.1) computeMatrix

reference-point (Ramírez, et al. 2016) on the ATAC-seq alignments to assay read depth 3kb around the

complete set of annotated transcription start sites. We plotted enrichment of ATAC-seq reads around TSS

and compared to RNA-seq expression using deepTools plotHeatmap with default settings, except that we

used the -sortUsingsamples to sort the regions by expression. We found strong enrichment around TSSs,

across both replicates for the same set of expressed genes (Supplemental Figure 6). ACRs were called for

each replicate using MACS2 (v2.2.7.1) callpeak with the –keep--dup all parameter, and read depth was

normalized with Tn5 control sequencing with the -c parameter (Zhang, et al. 2008). The majority of

ACRs were shared across replicates (liver: 67% and testis: 61%) We then used the P-value of each

MACS2 peak to calculate the Irreproducibility Discovery Rate (IDR) (https://github.com/daniel-

shaw1/Regulatory_divergence_paper/blob/main/Supplemental/IDR.r), (Supplemental Figure 7). The IDR

determines the probability that a peak is reproducible between replicates, due to chance (Qunhua, et al.

2011; Landt, et al. 2012). Replicates that have IDR < 0.05 are generally considered to be highly

reproducible. However, the IDR test is considered very stringent (Jalili, et al. 2015), potentially removing

many true regions of increased accessibility. Because both replicates were exhibited high concordance,

we pooled the aligned reads from both replicates and called peaks from the joint alignment using MACS2

as previously described, as pooling raw reads has been previously reported (Reske, et al. 2020; Yan, et al.

2020) as a strategy to find high quality enriched regions. We found that most ACRs (liver: 79%, testis:

75%) from the pooled sample overlapped with low scoring ACRs from the individual replicates (IDR <

0.05). This suggested a majority of ACRs in the pooled dataset were of high quality in the individual

replicates.

To define an ancestral set of ACRs, we mapped the nucleotide sequence of each non-coding ACR

on the X chromosome to the homologous region on the Y chromosome using previously generated

alignment coordinates (Peichel, et al. 2020). A similar approach has been used previously to define the

ancestral set of coding regions, aligning X-linked gene annotations to the Y chromosome (Peichel, et al.

2020). We also attempted to identify Y-linked ACRs and calculate divergence in a similar method as we

identified with X-linked ACRs. However, we found that MACS2 identified significantly fewer enriched

regions of accessible chromatin on the Y chromosome compared to the X chromosome. The few ACRs

that were identified also aligned to multiple regions on the X chromosome, suggesting these regions were

repetitive. Using the X chromosome ACRs, we identified orthologous regions between the X

chromosome, Y chromosome, and orthologous autosome (chromosome 19) from the ninespine

stickleback fish *(Pungitius pungitius*; (Varadharajan, et al. 2019) using BLAST+ (blastn v. 2.11.0) with

default blastn parameters and -perc_identity set to 75. (Camacho, et al. 2009). To ensure high quality

alignments, we filtered for uniquely mapping alignments that also had a bit score greater than 100. We

used BLAST+ alignments to extract ACRs and the proximal 50bp upstream and downstream, to create

multiple sequence alignments for downstream analysis. We aligned the threespine stickleback X and Y

ACR sequences to the ninespine stickleback autosome sequence using MUSCLE (v 3.8.1551) (Edgar

2004) with default parameters. We used MUSCLE to create a multiple sequence alignment between the X

sequence, Y sequence, and the sequence from the orthologous autosome in order to identify X- and Y-

specific variants. We called single nucleotide variants using snp-sites (v2.5.1) (Page, et al. 2016) with

default parameters. We calculated the reported divergence rate by dividing the number of variants by the

number of the aligned sites.

We compared ACR divergence on the sex chromosomes to ACR divergence on autosome 18, a

chromosome similar in length to the X chromosome. We identified orthologous regions between the

threespine stickleback autosome 18 and autosome 18 from the ninespine stickleback fish using BLAST+

(blastn v. 2.11.0) (Camacho, et al. 2009) as previously described. We called variants between autosomal

regions in a similar manner as the sex chromosomes, by creating a pairwise alignment using MUSCLE (v

3.8.1551) with default parameters and called single nucleotide variants using the same python script as

above. We calculated a divergence rate by dividing the number of single nucleotide variants by the size of

the aligned region.

Divergence within ACRs was compared with the divergence of coding regions of neighboring

genes. We identified the closest gene to each ACR by running annotatepeaks.pl in homer (v 4.11) (Heinz,

et al. 2010) using default settings. Per default settings, ACRs were assigned to the closest gene within

50kb of the TSS. We verified the homer peak annotations with a custom Python script that identifies

ACRs near the TSS of genes (https://github.com/daniel-
shaw1/Regulatory_divergence_paper/blob/main/Supplemental/Peaksneargenes.py). Both methods were
100% concordant with each other. We further verified a subset of the annotations (200 peaks total) by
visualizing the ACRs in the threespine stickleback JBrowse genome browser
(https://stickleback.genetics.uga.edu/). We found that 100% of the 200 X-linked ACRs were located
proximal to the predicted annotated gene (Supplemental Figure 8). For coding divergence comparisons,
we used previously reported estimates of synonymous ($d_S$) and non-synonymous ($d_N$) divergence of
gametologs between the X and Y chromosomes (Peichel et al., 2020). Coding regions with $d_N/d_S$ ratios of
99 were omitted as these represent alignments with very little sequence divergence to estimate $d_N/d_S$
accurately.

**Estimating a control substitution rate**

To generate control regions, we randomly sampled non-functional intergenic regions throughout
the X chromosome, Y chromosome, or chromosome 18 to estimate a neutral substitution rate. Regulatory
regions tend to be GC-rich, which can be prone to higher mutation rates through mechanisms like GC-
biased gene conversion or spontaneous deamination of methylated cytosines (Nesta, et al. 2021). We
therefore GC-matched the randomly drawn intergenic regions with the GC content of ACRs. We
calculated the GC percentage of ACRs using a modified Perl script (countbp.pl, Nicholas Navin,
http://www.navinlab.com/bioperl/bioperl/gc_content.html). For each ACR, a random intergenic region
was drawn from the X chromosome equal in length and with a GC content within 2.0%. Intergenic
regions were defined as any region that fell outside of annotated functional regions from a combination of
Ensembl annotations (Cunningham, et al. 2021), Isoseq transcripts (Naftaly, et al. 2021), Y chromosome
annotations (Peichel, et al. 2020), repetitive elements (Peichel, et al. 2020; Nath, et al. 2021) and ACRs
from this study. This was performed for each stratum individually using bedtools shuffle –I ACRs.bed -
incl XYalignment.bed -excl annotations.bed. We extracted 10,000 sets of GC-matched intergenic regions
from each of the three evolutionary strata on the threespine stickleback sex chromosomes (set size same
as number of Liver ACRs: stratum one: 442, stratum two: 228, stratum three: 199; Testis ACRs: stratum
one: 30, stratum two: 37, stratum three: 51). Due to a limited number of intergenic sites shared between
the sex chromosomes, we sampled with replacement to align a sufficient number of intergenic regions.
We identified the orthologous regions to the ninespine genome assembly using BLAST+ (blastn v2.11.0)
(Camacho, et al. 2009). We filtered for alignments that mapped uniquely to chromosome 19 in the
ninespine stickleback fish, had an alignment length equal to 75% of the threespine query sequence, and
had a bit-score greater than 100. We generated multiple sequence alignments using MUSCLE (v

3.8.1551), for each intergenic permutation and calculated X and Y specific substitution rate as previously
described.

**Estimating within population nucleotide diversity**

We used whole-genome short-read sequencing of 12 males from the Lake Washington population
(Washington, USA; NCBI SRA SRP137809) to estimate nucleotide diversity across the sex
chromosomes. The raw reads were trimmed with Trimmomatic (v. 0.39) (Bolger, et al. 2014), using a
sliding window of four bases, trimming the remainder of the read when the average quality within a
window dropped below 15. The leading and trailing base pairs below quality three of every read were
removed along with any residual adapter sequence. After trimming, any reads below a minimum length of
36 were discarded. We aligned the trimmed reads using Bowtie2 (v. 2.4.5) with default parameters
(Langmead and Salzberg 2012). We also marked PCR duplicates by using the MarkDuplicates function in
Picard (v. 2.26.10) (https://github.com/broadinstitute/picard). SNP genotyping was conducted using the
GATK software package (v. 4.2.5.0). We called variants using HaplotypeCaller in GVCF mode. We then
joint-called variants using GenotypeGVCFs using a genomics database created by GenomicsDBImport.

We only considered biallelic SNPs in our estimates of nucleotide diversity and we filtered for
high quality genotypes using several different methods. On the sex chromosomes, sites should only have
hemizygous genotypes in males in the non-crossover region outside of the pseudoautosomal region. Any
sites that are heterozygous would be caused by errors in read alignment. We therefore did not consider
sites that were heterozygous in the non-crossover region on the X or Y chromosomes. We also filtered out
sites that exhibited too low or high of read depth, which would be indicative of alignment errors. To do
this, we did not consider sites that were less than one-half or greater than double the median read depth of
each chromosome (X and Y chromosomes: positions were retained if the read depth was between 3.5 and
14; chromosome 18: positions were retained if the read depth was between 6.5 and 26). Read filtering was
conducted using custom Perl scripts.

Nucleotide diversity (pi) was estimated on a per-site basis (--site-pi) across each chromosome
using vcftools (v. 0.1.16) (Danecek, et al. 2011)). Nucleotide diversity was averaged within 10,000 bp
non-overlapping windows across chromosomes X, Y, and 18.

**Testing for positive selection using population polymorphism**

We performed a modified version of the McDonald-Kreitman test (Andolfatto 2005) by treating

divergence (D) and diversity (P) within ACRs as the non-synonymous factor, and non-functional

intergenic sequence previously generated was used as synonymous factor. As intergenic sequence is

independent of each ACR, we pooled sites from each factor as previously described (Andolfatto 2005).

We counted the total number of polymorphic sites or fixed substitutions (divergence) for each factor to

calculate $\alpha$, the fraction of substitutions that are likely fixed due to positive selection. Divergence was

estimated either between the threespine stickleback X and Y chromosomes or between the threespine and

ninespine stickleback autosome 18. Negative alpha values were interpreted as regions that have rates of

adaptive evolution near zero (Good, et al. 2013). We also used these counts to estimate the neutrality

index (NI) (Rand and Kann 1996). An NI greater than one indicates an excess of ACR divergence within

species, while an NI less than one indicates an excess of ACR divergence between species (or between

the X and Y). An index lower than one would be consistent with positive selection. To test for significant

departures from neutrality within each stratum or chromosome we performed a chi-square test to compare

the rates of $d_N/d_S$ to $p_N/p_S$. Standard deviation was determined through non-parametric bootstrapping. We

bootstrapped 10,000 replicates for each factor within the McDonald-Kreitman or NI test and computed

both metrics for each replicate.

We also performed a McDonald-Kreitman test on coding regions. We aligned the coding

sequence of all threespine stickleback X chromosome Ensembl predicted genes (build 95) to the Y

chromosome and the ninespine stickleback outgroup (autosome 19; v. 7) (Varadharajan, et al. 2019) using

Exonerate (v. 2.4.0) (Slater and Birney 2005) with parameters: --model coding2genome -M 2000 --bestn

1 --annotation. The Ensembl coding regions from the  threespine stickleback autosome 18 were also

aligned to the ninespine stickleback autosome 18. The highest scoring alignment from Exonerate was

used for the MK test. Divergence and polymorphism was tallied at each position of the alignment. If a

position was variable, we determined if this was a synonymous or non-synonymous mutation in the

threespine stickleback by comparing to the ninespine stickleback translated codon. Sites were omitted if

they contained any N characters or contained any missing genotype data among the 12 males within the

VCF file. Codons were omitted if they contained any gaps from the alignment. We only considered

biallelic sites when counting polymorphisms and fixed substitutions within the Lake Washington

population. We used custom Perl scripts to count the total number of divergent and polymorphic sites. To

compare to ACRs, we calculated $\alpha$ and NI by pooling sites across all coding regions. For gene-by-gene

MK tests, we log transformed NI to include genes with a count of zero for any particular category of

divergence or polymorphism and refer to the value as NI$_{Haldane}$ (Haldane 1956; Stoletzki and Eyre-

Walker 2010).

**Comparison with allele-specific expression patterns**

We measured allele-specific expression of transcripts on the X and Y chromosome using three replicate liver samples (NCBI BioProject PRJNA591630) and three replicate testis samples (NCBI BioProject PRJNA591630). We trimmed the RNA-seq reads with Trimmomatic (v. 0.36) (Bolger, et al. 2014) using a sliding window of 4 bases, trimming the remainder of the read when the average quality within a window dropped below 20 (SLIDINGWINDOW:4:20). Residual sequencing adapters were also removed using ILLUMINACLIP. We aligned RNA-seq reads using Tophat2 (v2.2.1) with default parameters (Kim, et al. 2013). We filtered for alignments with a map quality greater than 25 using SAMtools (v1.14) (Li, et al. 2009) to identify reads that map uniquely on the X and Y allele. Similar map quality filters have been used to distinguish short reads between sex chromosomes in *Drosophila* and stickleback fish (Ellison and Bachtrog 2019; Peichel, et al. 2020) and between sexes with heteromorphic sex chromosomes in guppies (Kirkpatrick, et al. 2021). Read counts were obtained using htseq-count (v 0.9.1) (Anders, et al. 2015). Default parameters were used with the addition of --stranded=no and --nonunique all to maximize our ability to count reads on the Y chromosome. We used a custom GTF file for htseq-count that included previously determined start and end sites of all Ensembl predicted transcripts that are shared between the X and Y chromosomes (Peichel, et al. 2020). Reads were counted on the X and Y across the entire transcript as a feature. Transcripts were removed from the analysis if they had an RNA expression count of zero in all samples. For each tissue, we calculated the average read count for each gametolog across the three tissue replicates. We calculated the allele-specific expression as $\log_2$(X transcript average / Y transcript average).

**Data availability**

The data for this manuscript is available within the short reads archive under accession numbers: PRJNA667175, PRJNA591630, PRJNA686097, SRP137809.

Scripts and bioinformatic pipelines are available at: https://github.com/daniel-shaw1/Regulatory_divergence_paper

**Acknowledgements**

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation MCB 1943283 (M.A.W.), the National

Institutes of Health R01GM147312 (M.A.W.), and by the University of Georgia Research Foundation

(D.E.S.). We would like to thank Bob Schmitz and Casey Bergman for helpful discussions related to the

project.

**Declaration of interests**

The authors declare no conflicts of interests.

 **Figure legends**

**Figure 1. XY divergence within accessible chromatin regions and coding regions.** Accessible
chromatin regions (ACRs) show elevated divergence between the X and Y, relative to nonsynonymous
and synonymous substitutions in coding regions. Protein-coding divergence was estimated between the X
and Y chromosomes at all shared gametologs. ACRs were identified on the X chromosome and mapped
to the Y chromosome. Substitutions within ACRs were summed and divided by the total length of the
ACR to calculate divergence. Stratum one: 12 gametologs, 442 liver ACRs, 30 testis ACRs; Stratum two:
71 gametologs, 228 liver ACRs, 37 testis ACRs; Stratum three: 46 gametologs, 199 liver ACRs 51 testis
ACRs. Rates of sequence divergence for all 4 categories were compared using a Kruskal-Wallis test for
each stratum (P < 0.001 for all strata). A post-hoc Dunn's test was used to identify which groups were
significantly different from one another. P- values were adjusted for multiple comparisons with a
Bonferroni correction. The letters above each plot indicate the significant differences between sites within
each stratum (P < 0.001). Box plots that share a letter assignment are not significantly different from one
another (P > 0.001).

**Figure 2 Accessible chromatin divergence between threespine and ninespine stickleback. A.**
Predicted substitution rates within accessible regions**.** ACR substitution rates (red) lower than random
non-functional control regions (white) and synonymous substitutions (blue) would indicate purifying
selection (left). ACR substitution rates roughly equal to non-functional control regions would indicate
mutations are accumulating due to inefficient selection from the loss of recombination (middle). ACR
substitution rates higher than non-functional control regions would indicate positive selection. **B.** Y-
linked ACR divergence is elevated over non-functional intergenic regions. X and Y ACR divergence was
compared to randomly drawn non-functional regions matched for GC content (10,000 permutations). The
average ACR divergence of each stratum is shown by the dotted line (stratum one: pink, stratum two:
green, and stratum three: blue). ACRs were identified on the X chromosome and mapped to the Y
chromosome and homologous ninespine stickleback autosome 19 from liver (top) and testis (bottom).
Autosome divergence is from chromosome 18. For the sex chromosomes, we identified variants that were
unique to the X and Y, by aligning to the outgroup and ignoring fixed differences between species that
likely occurred before the sex chromosomes evolved. X- and Y- specific variants within ACRs were
summed and divided by the total length of the ACR to calculate divergence. Stratum one: 442 liver ACRs
and 30 testis ACRs; stratum two: 228 liver ACRs and 37 testis ACRs; stratum three: 129 liver ACRs and
46 testis ACRs; autosomal: 1056 liver ACRs and 305 testis ACRs. Graphic made with BioRender.com

**Figure 3. Quantifying adaptive divergence and departure from neutrality among accessible**
**chromatin regions and coding regions.** Sex-linked ACRs exhibited signatures of positive selection in
both liver (left) and testis (middle). Sex-linked coding regions (right) are mostly under purifying selection
or not significantly different than neutral expectations. The neutrality index (NI) was calculated using the
odds ratio of the McDonald Kreitman test. NI > 1 reflects purifying selection (blue) while NI < 1 is a
signature of positive selection (red). Asterisks denote significant departures from neutrality determined by
a chi-square test. Error bars represent two standard deviations calculated from 10,000 bootstrap replicates.

**Figure 4**. **Gametolog expression level compared to accessible chromatin region divergence.** ACR
divergence on the X and Y chromosomes is correlated with X-biased gene expression in both liver and
testis tissues. RNA-seq transcript counts that uniquely mapped to the X and Y chromosome were
quantified to determine allele-specific expression for all gametologs. Gametolog expression was
compared to the average divergence of Y- specific (A and B) and X-specific (C and D) mutations for
ACRs within 50 kb of expressed genes. (A). Y liver: R= 0.40, P = 0.004, N = 51; (B.) Y Testis: R=0.201,
P = 0.26, N = 31; (C). X Liver: R = 0.30, P = 0.033, N = 51; (D). X Testis: R = 0.07, P = 0.94, N = 31.
Shaded regions represent 95% confidence intervals based on bootstrapping. The regressions were not

significantly different between the X and Y chromosome for liver (P = 0.590, Fisher transformation) or
testis (P = 0.077, Fisher transformation).
788
789
790
791
792  **Figures**

795  **Figure 1. XY divergence within accessible chromatin regions and coding regions.**

**Figure 2. Accessible chromatin divergence between threespine and ninespine stickleback.**

**Figure 3. Departure from neutrality at sex-linked ACRs.**

**Figure 4**. **Gametolog expression level compared to ACR divergence.**

**Table 1. McDonald-Kreitman Test for non-coding ACRs.**

| Chromosome | Stratum | Tissue | D(ACR) | D(INT) | P(ACR) | P(INT) | $\alpha$ | NI | ChiSquare | P-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Y | Stratum 1 | Testis | 739 | 555 | 18 | 46 | 0.706 | 0.294 | 20.77 | P< 0.001 |
| Y | Stratum 2 | Testis | 1292 | 912 | 2 | 10 | 0.859 | 0.141 | 8.65 | P=0.003 |
| Y | Stratum 3 | Testis | 454 | 194 | 7 | 16 | 0.813 | 0.187 | 14.43 | P<0.001 |
| Y | Stratum 1 | Liver | 89313 | 52716 | 243 | 923 | 0.845 | 0.155 | 870.81 | P<0.001 |
| Y | Stratum 2 | Liver | 30619 | 20743 | 210 | 388 | 0.633 | 0.367 | 147.01 | P<0.001 |
| Y | Stratum 3 | Liver | 16889 | 16875 | 321 | 412 | 0.222 | 0.778 | 11.13 | P<0.001 |
| X | Stratum 1 | Testis | 878 | 760 | 452 | 18109 | 0.978 | 0.022 | 6406.49 | P<0.001 |
| X | Stratum 2 | Testis | 1225 | 1037 | 52 | 460 | 0.904 | 0.096 | 325.35 | P<0.001 |
| X | Stratum 3 | Testis | 382 | 302 | 91 | 365 | 0.803 | 0.197 | 145.19 | P<0.001 |
| X | Stratum 1 | Liver | 26658 | 34849 | 6009 | 10003 | 0.215 | 0.785 | 176 | P<0.001 |
| X | Stratum 2 | Liver | 7121 | 13850 | 1265 | 1321 | -0.863 | 1.863 | 224.76 | P<0.001 |
| X | Stratum 3 | Liver | 9644 | 13485 | 2618 | 7618 | 0.519 | 0.481 | 793.25 | P<0.001 |
| Chr18 | NA | Liver | 23380 | 25607 | 9533 | 4193 | -1.49 | 2.49 | 2028.33 | P<0.001 |
| Chr18 | NA | Testis | 8715 | 9545 | 1509 | 1563 | -0.057 | 1.057 | 2.05 | P=0.153 |

**Table 2. McDonald-Kreitman Test for coding regions.**

| Chromosome | Subset of coding sites | DN | DS | PN | PS | NI | ChiSquare | P-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Y | Whole Chromosome | 16892 | 23964 | 59 | 34 | 2.461 | 18.674 | P<0.001 |
| X | Whole Chromosome | 12586 | 22431 | 261 | 427 | 1.089 | 1.164 | P=0.281 |
| Y | Stratum 1 | 3389 | 4143 | 12 | 7 | 2.090 | 2.526 | P=0.112 |
| Y | Stratum 2 | 4240 | 7198 | 11 | 7 | 2.096 | 4.451 | P=0.035 |
| Y | Stratum 3 | 8147 | 11335 | 31 | 20 | 2.157 | 7.517 | P=0.006 |
| X | Stratum 1 | 1901 | 3465 | 60 | 154 | 0.710 | 4.93 | P=0.026 |
| X | Stratum 2 | 3549 | 6952 | 57 | 102 | 1.094 | 0.294 | P=0.588 |
| X | Stratum 3 | 6245 | 10776 | 135 | 140 | 1.664 | 17.876 | P<0.001 |
| Chr18 | Whole Chromosome | 23795 | 31499 | 2581 | 3823 | 0.890 | 17.485 | P<0.001 |

**Table 3. Gametologs with Y-biased expression in testes**

| Gene ID | Gene name | Gene description |
|---|---|---|
| ENSGACG00000003328 | hipk3a | homeodomain interacting protein kinase 3a |
| ENSGACG00000004302 | KCNA1 | potassium voltage-gated channel, shaker-related subfamily, member 1a |
| ENSGACG00000006090 | RFX7 | regulatory factor X7b |
| ENSGACG00000006809 | tdg.1 | thymine DNA glycosylase, tandem duplicate 1 |
| ENSGACG00000010054 | hbp1 | HMG-box transcription factor 1 |
| ENSGACG00000010672 | roraa | RAR-related orphan receptor A, paralog a |
| ENSGACG00000010898 | NA | NA |
| ENSGACG00000011130 | mrpl23 | mitochondrial ribosomal protein L23 |
| ENSGACG00000011958 | ergic2 | si:ch211-225b10.3 |
| ENSGACG00000012079 | NA | WNK lysine deficient protein kinase 1a |
| ENSGACG00000012796 | NA | NA |
| ENSGACG00000012946 | c2cd5 | C2 calcium dependent domain containing 5 |
| ENSGACG00000013060 | IQSEC3 | IQ motif and Sec7 domain ArfGEF 3b |
| ENSGACG00000013333 | SRGAP1 | SLIT-ROBO Rho GTPase activating protein 1a |
| ENSGACG00000013345 | rxylt1 | ribitol xylosyltransferase 1 |
| ENSGACG00000013388 | mtss1la | MTSS I-BAR domain containing 2a |
| ENSGACG00000013447 | trabd | TraB domain containing |
| ENSGACG00000013796 | CDH13 | cadherin 13, H-cadherin (heart) |
| ENSGACG00000013862 | nup93 | nucleoporin 93 |
| ENSGACG00000013972 | cbfb | core-binding factor subunit beta |
| ENSGACG00000013994 | hsf4 | heat shock transcription factor 4 |
| ENSGACG00000014090 | NA | NA |

**Supplemental Figures**

**Supplemental Figure 1. Nucleotide diversity (pi) across the sex chromosomes and representative autosome.** The Y chromosome exhibits a strong reduction in nucleotide diversity consistent with a lower effective population size, and selection. Estimates of nucleotide diversity were calculated from 12 male individuals from a freshwater population. Nucleotide diversity was averaged across 10,000bp windows for A. Chromosome 18, B. X chromosome, and C. Y chromosome. D. The Y chromosome has lower diversity than both the X chromosome and chromosome 18. E. Distinct strata on the X chromosome have varying levels of the nucleotide diversity. A Kruskal Wallis test indicated differences between the groups (P < 0.001). A post-Hoc Dunn's test and Bonferroni Correction revealed that the PAR was significantly higher from all three strata (P < 0.001). Stratum one was significantly higher than stratum two and three (P < 0.001). After removing windows that overlapped the centromeric region, stratum two and three are not significantly different (P =0.937). F. All three strata across the Y chromosome have similar estimates of nucleotide diversity (P=0.768, Kruskal Wallis test). The PAR was not analyzed for the Y chromosome as the assembly is missing most of the PAR sequence. The letters above each plot indicate the significant differences between sites within each stratum (P < 0.001). Box plots that share a letter assignment are not significantly different from one another (P > 0.001).

**Supplemental Figure 2. $d_N$ / $d_S$ ratios of coding regions compared to accessible chromatin region divergence.** There is no correlation between $d_N$ / $d_S$ and ACR divergence using a Spearman's Rank Correlation using ACRs from liver (A and B) or testis (C and D) tissue. Liver: (**A**) Y divergence: (Stratum one (Blue): R=-0.12 P = 0.230, N = 30, Stratum two (Yellow): R = 0.2, P = 0.430, N=61;

Stratum three (Grey): R = 0.11, P = 0.770 N=126. (**B**) X divergence: (Stratum one (Blue): R = -0.080, P =
0.420, N=30; Stratum two (Yellow): R = 0.032, P = 0.9, N = 61; Stratum three (Grey): R = -0.054, P =
0.890, N = 126. Similar results in testis: (**C**) Y divergence: (Stratum one (Blue): R = -0.020, P = 0.650,
N=14; Stratum two (Yellow): R = -0.430, P = 0.160, N = 12; Stratum three (Grey): R = -0.140, P = 0.480,
N = 17. (**D**) X divergence: (Stratum one (Blue): R = 0.520, P = 0.120, N=14; Stratum two (Yellow): R = -
0.360, P = 0.210, N = 12; Stratum three (Grey): R = -0.020, P = 0.670, N = 17.

**Supplemental Figure 3. Selective constraint of genes affects correlation between ACR and proximal**
**coding divergence.** Y-linked gametologs were classified by their mode of selection based on a McDonald
Kreitman Test. Genes were classified as Positive selection: $NI_{Haldane} < -0.25$, Relaxed purifying selection: -
0.25 $<NI_{Haldane} < 0.25$, and purifying selection: $NI_{Haldane} > 0.25$. Genes likely evolving under positive
selection had Y-linked and X-linked ACR divergence significantly correlated with $d_N/d_S$ (Y chromosome:
R=0.92, P=0.002, N=10; X chromosome: R = 0.81, P = 0.03, Spearman's Rank correlation coefficient).
Genes under purifying selection and relaxed purifying selection did not show correlations between ACR
divergence and DN/DS (Purifying: Y chromosome: R= -0.14, P = 0.30, N=57; X chromosome: R= -
0.022, P =0.87, N=57; Relaxed purifying selection: Y chromosome: R= -0.293, P =0.0155, N=35, X
chromosome: R= -0.32, P =0.063, N=35, Spearman's Rank Correlation coefficient. Grey areas represent
95% confidence intervals. Outliers with $d_N/d_S > 3$ were removed prior to analysis. When $d_N/d_S > 1$ are
removed the relationship for genes under positive selection is still significant (R=0.86, P=0.006).

**Supplemental figure 4. Rates of allelic expression for Y gametologs under different modes of**
**selection.** Y-linked gametologs were classified by their mode of selection based on a McDonald Kreitman
Test. Genes were classified as Positive selection: $NI_{Haldane} < -0.25$, Relaxed constraint selection: -0.25
$<NI_{Haldane} < 0.25$, and purifying selection: $NI_{Haldane} > 0.25$. X/Y gene expression was quantified based on
counts from liver and testis RNA-seq data from 3 individuals. Counts were averaged across all three
replicates. Rates of X/Y expression are not significantly different for each class (Kruskal-Wallis test).

880
**Supplemental Figure 5. Accessible chromatin region divergence compared to functional states of Y-**
**linked gametologs.** ACR divergence was not significantly different among gametologs that contained
mutations that potentially impede function (i.e., premature stop codons, frameshifts, deleted nucleotides)
or are functional. Y-specific functional mutations were identified by comparing coding sequence between
the Y chromosome and the outgroup autosomal coding sequence in the ninespine stickleback. ACRs were
assigned to the closest gametolog within 50kb. P > 0.05 for all pairwise comparisons for both liver (A and
C) and testis (B and D) for regulatory divergence on the X and Y.

888
889
890  **Supplemental Figure 6. High concordance of chromatin accessibility around transcription start site**
891  **of expressed genes**. Transcription start sites (TSSs) for all genes were ordered by RNA-seq read depth.
892  ATAC-seq read depth was quantified ±3 kb of TSSs. Similar ATAC-seq read depth was observed
893  between replicates. ATAC-seq depth across replicates is a strong predictor of expression from RNA-seq
894  from same tissue type.

895
**Supplemental Figure 7. High concordance of chromatin accessibility between peaks identified in**
**two replicates.** Peaks were identified in two replicates of liver (left) and testis (right). Log-10(P-Value) of
each shared peak is highly correlated between replicates. Irreproducible Discovery Rate was calculated by
calculated the ranked significance of reproducible and irreproducible peaks between replicates. Peaks
with an IDR < 0.05 are shown in red.

**Supplemental Figure 8. Verification of ATAC-seq proximity to annotated genes.** Three
representative examples of ATAC-seq read depth enriched at ACRs called with MACS2. The most
proximal genes were identified with homer and with a custom python script. Annotations for a subset of
100 X chromosome ACR were visually inspected with JBrowse, to confirm that the peak was accurately
assigned to nearby genes. ATAC-seq read depth is shown in grey. Bed files for the summit of each ACR
identified by MACS2 is shown below the Ensembl gene annotations.

912 **Supplemental Figure 1. Nucleotide diversity (pi) across the sex chromosomes and representative**
913 **autosome.**

**Supplemental Figure 2.** $d_N / d_S$ ratios of coding regions compared to ACR divergence.

**Supplemental Figure 3. Selective constraint of genes affects correlation between ACR and proximal coding divergence.**

**Supplemental figure 4. Allelic-specific expression for Y gametologs under different modes of selection**

934 **Supplemental Figure 5. ACR divergence compared to functional states of Y-linked gametologs.**

938 **Supplemental Figure 6. High concordance of chromatin accessibility around transcription start site**
939 **of expressed genes.**

**Supplemental Figure 7. High concordance of chromatin accessibility between peaks identified in two replicates.**

**Supplemental Figure 8. Verification of ATAC-seq proximity to annotated genes.**

950 **References**
951

Alexandre CM, Urton JR, Jean-Baptiste K, Huddleston J, Dorrity MW, Cuperus JT, Sullivan AM, Bemm F,
Jolic D, Arsovski AA, et al. 2018. Complex Relationships between Chromatin Accessibility,
Sequence Divergence, and Gene Expression in Arabidopsis thaliana. Molecular Biology and
Evolution 35:837-854.
Anders S, Pyl PT, Huber W. 2015. HTSeq--a Python framework to work with high-throughput sequencing
data. Bioinformatics 31:166-169.
Andolfatto P. 2005. Adaptive evolution of non-coding DNA in Drosophila. Nature 437:1149-1152.
Arnold CD, Gerlach D, Spies D, Matts JA, Sytnikova YA, Pagani M, Lau NC, Stark A. 2014. Quantitative
genome-wide enhancer activity maps for five Drosophila species show functional enhancer
conservation and turnover during cis-regulatory evolution. Nature Genetics 46:685-692.
Ayers KL, Davidson NM, Demiyah D, Roeszler KN, Grützner F, Sinclair AH, Oshlack A, Smith CA. 2013. RNA
sequencing reveals sexually dimorphic gene expression before gonadal differentiation in chicken
and allows comprehensive annotation of the W-chromosome. Genome Biology 14:R26.
Bachtrog D. 2006. Expression Profile of a Degenerating Neo-Y Chromosome in Drosophila. Current
Biology 16:1694-1699.
Bachtrog D. 2005. Sex chromosome evolution: molecular aspects of Y-chromosome degeneration in
Drosophila. Genome Research 15:1393-1401.
Bachtrog D. 2008. The Temporal Dynamics of Processes Underlying Y Chromosome Degeneration.
Genetics 179:1513-1525.
Bachtrog D. 2013. Y-chromosome evolution: emerging insights into processes of Y-chromosome
degeneration. Nature Reviews Genetics 14:113-124.
Bachtrog D, Hom E, Wong KM, Maside X, De Jong P. 2008. Genomic degradation of a young Y
chromosome in Drosophila miranda. Genome Biology 9:R30.
Bachtrog D, Jensen JD, Zhang Z. 2009. Accelerated Adaptive Evolution on a Newly Formed X
Chromosome. PLoS Biology 7:e1000082.
Bachtrog D, Mahajan S, Bracewell R. 2019. Massive gene amplification on a recently formed Drosophila
Y chromosome. Nature Ecology & Evolution 3:1587-1597.
Bachtrog D, Mank JE, Peichel CL, Kirkpatrick M, Otto SP, Ashman T-L, Hahn MW, Kitano J, Mayrose I,
Ming R, et al. 2014. Sex Determination: Why So Many Ways of Doing It? PLoS Biology
12:e1001899.
Baines JF, Sawyer SA, Hartl DL, Parsch J. 2008. Effects of X-Linkage and Sex-Biased Gene Expression on
the Rate of Adaptive Protein Evolution in Drosophila. Molecular Biology and Evolution 25:1639-
1650.
Beaudry FEG, Barrett SCH, Wright SI. 2017. Genomic Loss and Silencing on the Y Chromosomes of
Rumex. Genome Biology and Evolution 9:3345-3355.
Bellott DW, Hughes JF, Skaletsky H, Brown LG, Pyntikova T, Cho T-J, Koutseva N, Zaghlul S, Graves T,
Rock S, et al. 2014. Mammalian Y chromosomes retain widely expressed dosage-sensitive
regulators. Nature 508:494-499.
Bellott DW, Page DC. 2021. Dosage-sensitive functions in embryonic development drove the survival of
genes on sex-specific chromosomes in snakes, birds, and mammals. Genome Research 31:198-
210.
Bellott DW, Skaletsky H, Cho T-J, Brown L, Locke D, Chen N, Galkina S, Pyntikova T, Koutseva N, Graves T,
et al. 2017. Avian W and mammalian Y chromosomes convergently retained dosage-sensitive
regulators. Nature Genetics 49:387-394.

Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. 2014. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data.
Bioinformatics 30:2114-2120.
Brawand D, Soumillon M, Necsulea A, Julien P, Csárdi G, Harrigan P, Weier M, Liechti A, Aximu-Petri A,
Kircher M. 2011. The evolution of gene expression levels in mammalian organs. Nature 478:343-
348.
Buenrostro JD, Giresi PG, Zaba LC, Chang HY, Greenleaf WJ. 2013. Transposition of native chromatin for
fast and sensitive epigenomic profiling of open chromatin, DNA-binding proteins and
nucleosome position. Nature Methods 10:1213-1218.
Camacho C, Coulouris G, Avagyan V, Ma N, Papadopoulos J, Bealer K, Madden TL. 2009. BLAST+:
architecture and applications. BMC Bioinformatics 10:421.
Chaix R, Somel M, Kreil DP, Khaitovich P, Lunter GA. 2008. Evolution of Primate Gene Expression: Drift
and Corrective Sweeps? Genetics 180:1379-1389.
Chang C-H, Gregory LE, Gordon KE, Meiklejohn CD, Larracuente AM. 2022. Unique structure and positive
selection promote the rapid divergence of Drosophila Y chromosomes. eLife 11.
Charlesworth B. 1978. Model for evolution of Y chromosomes and dosage compensation. Proceedings of
the National Academy of Sciences 75:5618-5622.
Charlesworth B, Charlesworth D. 2000. The degeneration of Y chromosomes. Philosophical Transactions
of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences 355:1563-1572.
Charlesworth B, Coyne JA, Barton NH. 1987. The relative rates of evolution of sex chromosomes and
autosomes. The American Naturalist 130:113-146.
Connelly CF, Wakefield J, Akey JM. 2014. Evolution and Genetic Architecture of Chromatin Accessibility
and Function in Yeast. PLoS Genetics 10:e1004427.
Coolon JD, Stevenson KR, McManus CJ, Yang B, Graveley BR, Wittkopp PJ. 2015. Molecular mechanisms
and evolutionary processes contributing to accelerated divergence of gene expression on the
Drosophila X chromosome. Molecular Biology and Evolution 32:2605-2615.
Cotton AM, Ge B, Light N, Adoue V, Pastinen T, Brown CJ. 2013. Analysis of expressed SNPs identifies
variable extents of expression from the human inactive X chromosome. Genome Biology
14:R122.
Cunningham F, Allen JE, Allen J, Alvarez-Jarreta J, Amode M R, Armean Irina M, Austine-Orimoloye O,
Azov Andrey G, Barnes I, Bennett R, et al. 2021. Ensembl 2022. Nucleic Acids Research 50:D988-
D995.
Danecek P, Auton A, Abecasis G, Albers CA, Banks E, DePristo MA, Handsaker RE, Lunter G, Marth GT,
Sherry ST, et al. 2011. The variant call format and VCFtools. Bioinformatics 27:2156-2158.
Edgar RC. 2004. MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high throughput. Nucleic
Acids Research 32:1792-1797.
Ellison C, Bachtrog D. 2019. Recurrent gene co-amplification on Drosophila X and Y chromosomes. PLoS
Genetics 15:e1008251.
Good JM, Wiebe V, Albert FW, Burbano HA, Kircher M, Green RE, Halbwax M, André C, Atencia R,
Fischer A, et al. 2013. Comparative Population Genomics of the Ejaculate in Humans and the
Great Apes. Molecular Biology and Evolution 30:964-976.
Haldane J. 1956. The estimation and significance of the logarithm of a ratio of frequencies. Annals of
human genetics 20:309-311.
Heinz S, Benner C, Spann N, Bertolino E, Lin YC, Laslo P, Cheng JX, Murre C, Singh H, Glass CK. 2010.
Simple Combinations of Lineage-Determining Transcription Factors Prime cis-Regulatory
Elements Required for Macrophage and B Cell Identities. Molecular Cell 38:576-589.
Horvath R, Josephs EB, Pesquet E, Stinchcombe JR, Wright SI, Scofield D, Slotte T. 2021. Selection on
Accessible Chromatin Regions in Capsella grandiflora. Molecular Biology and Evolution 38:5563-
5575.

Hughes JF, Skaletsky H, Brown LG, Pyntikova T, Graves T, Fulton RS, Dugan S, Ding Y, Buhay CJ, Kremitzki
C, et al. 2012. Strict evolutionary conservation followed rapid gene loss on human and rhesus Y
chromosomes. Nature 483:82-86.
Hughes JF, Skaletsky H, Pyntikova T, Graves TA, Van Daalen SKM, Minx PJ, Fulton RS, McGrath SD, Locke
DP, Friedman C, et al. 2010. Chimpanzee and human Y chromosomes are remarkably divergent
in structure and gene content. Nature 463:536-539.
Hughes JF, Skaletsky H, Pyntikova T, Koutseva N, Raudsepp T, Brown LG, Bellott DW, Cho T-J, Dugan-
Rocha S, Khan Z, et al. 2020. Sequence analysis in Bos taurus reveals pervasiveness of X–Y arms
races in mammalian lineages. Genome Research 30:1716-1726.
Jalili V, Matteucci M, Masseroli M, Morelli MJ. 2015. Using combined evidence from replicates to
evaluate ChIP-seq peaks. Bioinformatics 31:2761-2769.
Khaitovich P, Hellmann I, Enard W, Nowick K, Leinweber M, Franz H, Weiss G, Lachmann M, Paabo S.
2005. Parallel patterns of evolution in the genomes and transcriptomes of humans and
chimpanzees. Science 309:1850-1854.
Kim D, Pertea G, Trapnell C, Pimentel H, Kelley R, Salzberg SL. 2013. TopHat2: accurate alignment of
transcriptomes in the presence of insertions, deletions and gene fusions. Genome Biology
14:R36.
Kirkpatrick M, Sardell JM, Pinto BJ, Dixon G, Peichel CL, Schartl M. 2021. Evolution of the canonical sex
chromosomes of the guppy and its relatives. G3 Genes|Genomes|Genetics.
Kopania EEK, Larson EL, Callahan C, Keeble S, Good JM. 2022. Molecular Evolution across Mouse
Spermatogenesis. Molecular Biology and Evolution 39.
Landry CR, Wittkopp PJ, Taubes CH, Ranz JM, Clark AG, Hartl DL. 2005. Compensatory *cis-trans*
Evolution and the Dysregulation of Gene Expression in Interspecific Hybrids of Drosophila.
Genetics 171:1813-1822.
Landt SG, Marinov GK, Kundaje A, Kheradpour P, Pauli F, Batzoglou S, Bernstein BE, Bickel P, Brown JB,
Cayting P, et al. 2012. ChIP-seq guidelines and practices of the ENCODE and modENCODE
consortia. Genome Research 22:1813-1831.
Langmead B, Salzberg SL. 2012. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. Nature Methods 9:357-359.
Larson EL, Vanderpool D, Keeble S, Zhou M, Sarver BA, Smith AD, Dean MD, Good JM. 2016. Contrasting
Levels of Molecular Evolution on the Mouse X Chromosome. Genetics 203:1841-1857.
Lawrie DS, Messer PW, Hershberg R, Petrov DA. 2013. Strong Purifying Selection at Synonymous Sites in
D. melanogaster. PLoS Genetics 9:e1003527.
Lawson Handley LJ, Berset-BräNdli L, Perrin N. 2006. Disentangling Reasons for Low Y Chromosome
Variation in the Greater White-Toothed Shrew (Crocidura russula). Genetics 173:935-942.
Lenormand T, Fyon F, Sun E, Roze D. 2020. Sex Chromosome Degeneration by Regulatory Evolution.
Current Biology 30:3001-3006.e3005.
Lenormand T, Roze D. 2022. Y recombination arrest and degeneration in the absence of sexual
dimorphism. Science 375:663-666.
Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, Marth G, Abecasis G, Durbin R. 2009. The
Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics 25:2078-2079.
Link V, Aguilar-Gómez D, Ramírez-Suástegui C, Hurst LD, Cortez D. 2017. Male Mutation Bias Is the Main
Force Shaping Chromosomal Substitution Rates in Monotreme Mammals. Genome Biology and
Evolution 9:2198-2210.
Lu Z, Hofmeister BT, Vollmers C, DuBois RM, Schmitz RJ. 2017. Combining ATAC-seq with nuclei sorting
for discovery of cis-regulatory regions in plant genomes. Nucleic Acids Res 45:e41.
Lu Z, Marand AP, Ricci WA, Ethridge CL, Zhang X, Schmitz RJ. 2019. The prevalence, evolution and
chromatin signatures of plant regulatory elements. Nature Plants 5:1250-1259.

Mahajan S, Bachtrog D. 2017. Convergent evolution of Y chromosome gene content in flies. Nature
Communications 8.
Mahajan S, Wei KHC, Nalley MJ, Gibilisco L, Bachtrog D. 2018. De novo assembly of a young Drosophila Y
chromosome using single-molecule sequencing and chromatin conformation capture. PLoS
Biology 16:e2006348.
Martin H, Carpentier F, Gallina S, Godé C, Schmitt E, Muyle A, Marais GAB, Touzet P. 2019. Evolution of
Young Sex Chromosomes in Two Dioecious Sister Plant Species with Distinct Sex Determination
Systems. Genome Biology and Evolution 11:350-361.
Martínez-Pacheco M, Tenorio M, Almonte L, Fajardo V, Godínez A, Fernández D, Cornejo-Páramo P,
Díaz-Barba K, Halbert J, Liechti A, et al. 2020. Expression Evolution of Ancestral XY Gametologs
across All Major Groups of Placental Mammals. Genome Biology and Evolution 12:2015-2028.
Meisel RP, Connallon T. 2013. The faster-X effect: integrating theory and data. Trends in Genetics
29:537-544.
Meisel RP, Malone JH, Clark AG. 2012a. Disentangling the relationship between sex-biased gene
expression and X-linkage. Genome Research 22:1255-1265.
Meisel RP, Malone JH, Clark AG. 2012b. Faster-X Evolution of Gene Expression in Drosophila. PLoS
Genetics 8:e1003013.
Mifsud B, Tavares-Cadete F, Young AN, Sugar R, Schoenfelder S, Ferreira L, Wingett SW, Andrews S, Grey
W, Ewels PA, et al. 2015. Mapping long-range promoter contacts in human cells with high-
resolution capture Hi-C. Nature Genetics 47:598-606.
Muller HJ. 1918. Genetic Variability, Twin Hybrids and Constant Hybrids, in a Case of Balanced Lethal
Factors. Genetics 3:422-499.
Muyle A, Zemp N, Deschamps C, Mousset S, Widmer A, Marais GAB. 2012. Rapid De Novo Evolution of X
Chromosome Dosage Compensation in Silene latifolia, a Plant with Young Sex Chromosomes.
PLoS Biology 10:e1001308.
Muyle A, Zemp N, Fruchard C, Cegan R, Vrana J, Deschamps C, Tavares R, Hobza R, Picard F, Widmer A,
et al. 2018. Genomic imprinting mediates dosage compensation in a young plant XY system.
Nature Plants 4:677-680.
Naftaly AS, Pau S, White MA. 2021. Long-read RNA sequencing reveals widespread sex-specific
alternative splicing in threespine stickleback fish. Genome Research:gr.274282.274120.
Nath S, Shaw DE, White MA. 2021. Improved contiguity of the threespine stickleback genome using
long-read sequencing. G3 Genes|Genomes|Genetics 11.
Nesta AV, Tafur D, Beck CR. 2021. Hotspots of Human Mutation. Trends in Genetics 37:717-729.
Orr HA, Kim Y. 1998. An Adaptive Hypothesis for the Evolution of the Y Chromosome. Genetics
150:1693-1698.
Page AJ, Taylor B, Delaney AJ, Soares J, Seemann T, Keane JA, Harris SR. 2016. SNP-sites: rapid efficient
extraction of SNPs from multi-FASTA alignments. Microbial Genomics 2.
Parsch J, Ellegren H. 2013. The evolutionary causes and consequences of sex-biased gene expression.
Nature Reviews Genetics 14:83-87.
Peichel CL, McCann SR, Ross JA, Naftaly AFS, Urton JR, Cech JN, Grimwood J, Schmutz J, Myers RM,
Kingsley DM, et al. 2020. Assembly of the threespine stickleback Y chromosome reveals
convergent signatures of sex chromosome evolution. Genome Biology 21.
Quinlan AR, Hall IM. 2010. BEDTools: a flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic features.
Bioinformatics 26:841-842.
Qunhua L, James BB, Haiyan H, Peter JB. 2011. Measuring reproducibility of high-throughput
experiments. The Annals of Applied Statistics 5:1752-1779.

Ramírez F, Ryan DP, Grüning B, Bhardwaj V, Kilpert F, Richter AS, Heyne S, Dündar F, Manke T. 2016.
deepTools2: a next generation web server for deep-sequencing data analysis. Nucleic Acids
Research 44:W160-W165.
Rand DM, Kann LM. 1996. Excess amino acid polymorphism in mitochondrial DNA: contrasts among
genes from Drosophila, mice, and humans. Molecular Biology and Evolution 13:735-748.
Reske JJ, Wilson MR, Chandler RL. 2020. ATAC-seq normalization method can significantly affect
differential accessibility analysis and interpretation. Epigenetics & Chromatin 13.
Ricci WA, Lu Z, Ji L, Marand AP, Ethridge CL, Murphy NG, Noshay JM, Galli M, Mejía-Guerra MK, Colomé-
Tatché M, et al. 2019. Widespread long-range cis-regulatory elements in the maize genome.
Nature Plants 5:1237-1249.
Rodríguez Lorenzo JL, Hobza R, Vyskot B. 2018. DNA methylation and genetic degeneration of the Y
chromosome in the dioecious plant Silene latifolia. BMC Genomics 19.
Roesti M, Moser D, Berner D. 2013. Recombination in the threespine stickleback genome—patterns and
consequences. Molecular Ecology 22:3014-3027.
Rollins JL, Chiang P, Waite JN, Von Hippel FA, Bell MA. 2017. Jacks and jills: Alternative life-history
phenotypes and skewed sex ratio in anadromous threespine stickleback (Gasterosteus
aculeatus). Evolutionary Ecology Research 18:363-382.
Sardell JM, Josephson MP, Dalziel AC, Peichel CL, Kirkpatrick M. 2021. Heterogeneous Histories of
Recombination Suppression on Stickleback Sex Chromosomes. Molecular Biology and Evolution
38:4403-4418.
Schoenfelder S, Fraser P. 2019. Long-range enhancer–promoter contacts in gene expression control.
Nature Reviews Genetics 20:437-455.
Shanfelter AF, Archambeault SL, White MA. 2019. Divergent Fine-Scale Recombination Landscapes
between a Freshwater and Marine Population of Threespine Stickleback Fish. Genome Biology
and Evolution 11:1552-1572.
Shaw DE, White MA. 2022. The evolution of gene regulation on sex chromosomes. Trends in Genetics.
Signor SA, Nuzhdin SV. 2018. The Evolution of Gene Expression in cis and trans. Trends in Genetics
34:532-544.
Singh ND, Koerich LB, Carvalho AB, Clark AG. 2014. Positive and Purifying Selection on the Drosophila Y
Chromosome. Molecular Biology and Evolution 31:2612-2623.
Skaletsky H, Kuroda-Kawaguchi T, Minx PJ, Cordum HS, Hillier L, Brown LG, Repping S, Pyntikova T, Ali J,
Bieri T, et al. 2003. The male-specific region of the human Y chromosome is a mosaic of discrete
sequence classes. Nature 423:825-837.
Slater GSC, Birney E. 2005. Automated generation of heuristics for biological sequence comparison. BMC
Bioinformatics 6:31.
Soh YQ, Alföldi J, Pyntikova T, Laura, Graves T, Patrick, Robert, Kremitzki C, Koutseva N, Jacob, et al.
2014. Sequencing the Mouse Y Chromosome Reveals Convergent Gene Acquisition and
Amplification on Both Sex Chromosomes. Cell 159:800-813.
Stoletzki N, Eyre-Walker A. 2010. Estimation of the Neutrality Index. Molecular Biology and Evolution
28:63-70.
Tomaszkiewicz M, Rangavittal S, Cechova M, Sanchez RC, Fescemyer HW, Harris R, Ye D, O'Brien PCM,
Chikhi R, Ryder OA, et al. 2016. A time- and cost-effective strategy to sequence mammalian Y
Chromosomes: an application to the de novo assembly of gorilla Y. Genome Research 26:530-
540.
Tukiainen T, Villani A-C, Yen A, Rivas MA, Marshall JL, Satija R, Aguirre M, Gauthier L, Fleharty M, Kirby A,
et al. 2017. Landscape of X chromosome inactivation across human tissues. Nature 550:244-248.

Varadharajan S, Rastas P, Löytynoja A, Matschiner M, Calboli FCF, Guo B, Nederbragt AJ, Jakobsen KS,
Merilä J. 2019. A high-quality assembly of the nine-spined stickleback (Pungitius pungitius)
genome. Genome Biology and Evolution.
Veltsos P, Ridout KE, Toups MA, González-Martínez SC, Muyle A, Emery O, Rastas P, Hudzieczek V, Hobza
R, Vyskot B, et al. 2019. Early Sex-Chromosome Evolution in the Diploid Dioecious Plant
Mercurialis annua. Genetics 212:815-835.
Vermunt MW, Tan SC, Castelijns B, Geeven G, Reinink P, De Bruijn E, Kondova I, Persengiev S, Bontrop R,
Cuppen E, et al. 2016. Epigenomic annotation of gene regulatory alterations during evolution of
the primate brain. Nature Neuroscience 19:494-503.
Vicoso B, Charlesworth B. 2009. Effective population size and the faster-X effect: an extended model.
Evolution: International Journal of Organic Evolution 63:2413-2426.
Wei KHC, Bachtrog D. 2019. Ancestral male recombination in Drosophila albomicans produced
geographically restricted neo-Y chromosome haplotypes varying in age and onset of decay. PLoS
Genetics 15:e1008502.
White MA, Kitano J, Peichel CL. 2015. Purifying Selection Maintains Dosage-Sensitive Genes during
Degeneration of the Threespine Stickleback Y Chromosome. Molecular Biology and Evolution
32:1981-1995.
Wilson Sayres MA. 2018. Genetic Diversity on the Sex Chromosomes. Genome Biology and Evolution
10:1064-1078.
Wilson Sayres MA, Lohmueller KE, Nielsen R. 2014. Natural Selection Reduced Diversity on Human Y
Chromosomes. PLoS Genetics 10:e1004064.
Yan F, Powell DR, Curtis DJ, Wong NC. 2020. From reads to insight: a hitchhiker's guide to ATAC-seq data
analysis. Genome Biology 21.
Zhang Y, Liu T, Meyer CA, Eeckhoute J, Johnson DS, Bernstein BE, Nussbaum C, Myers RM, Brown M, Li
W, et al. 2008. Model-based Analysis of ChIP-Seq (MACS). Genome Biology 9:R137.

1208

1209

1210