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 across gametologs on heteromorphic sex chromosomes

(X and Y or Z and W). Current models of sex chromosome evolution suggest this occurs through the

rapid accumulation of mutations within regulatory regions. However, these patterns have not been

demonstrated empirically due to the limited number of Y chromosome assemblies available to survey

sequence evolution outside of coding regions. The threespine stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*) Y

chromosome is an ideal model to test hypotheses of rapid regulatory evolution 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 (accessible chromatin regions defined through ATAC-seq) on the Y chromosome exhibited

elevated substitution rates when compared to intergenic regions and synonymous sites within coding

regions. This strongly suggests that many 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 regulatory regions exhibit signs of positive selection quickly after the suppression of

recombination, supporting recent theoretical models that show 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 across 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 as a result of sequence

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

can be 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

regulatory regions, leading to changes in expression from the sex-limited chromosome. Gametolog

expression 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. 2012; 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 many deleterious regulatory mutations may accumulate through selective

interference (Charlesworth and Charlesworth 2000; Bachtrog 2008), selection may also favor mutations

within 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 empirically testing theoretical models that focus on regulatory evolution is

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 regulatory regions on the

sex-limited chromosome. 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 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 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 regulatory regions on sex chromosomes. Threespine stickleback fish have a high-quality
reference Y chromosome that is more recently derived compared to many other 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 Y chromosome contains multiple evolutionary strata at different stages
of degeneration (White, et al. 2015; Peichel, et al. 2020), allowing for comparisons of sequence evolution
at different temporal scales. While some of the Y chromosome has degenerated, over half of X-linked
gametologs remain on the Y chromosome (Peichel, et al. 2020). Many of the coding regions of the shared
gametologs 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 characterize ACRs shared between
the X and Y chromosomes. To understand how selection may be operating within these regions, we
estimated nucleotide divergence of ACRs between the X and Y chromosomes of the threespine
stickleback fish (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*) as well as within-population nucleotide diversity of ACRs. We
found signatures of positive selection across sex-linked ACRs that indicate a rapid accumulation of
nucleotide substitutions on the Y chromosome, relative to other intergenic regions. Our findings
complement existing sex chromosome evolution theory that suggests the accumulation of mutations
within regulatory regions may be beneficial to silence expression from a degenerating Y chromosome.

Results

Nucleotide divergence between the X and Y is higher in 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. Accessible chromatin regions (ACRs) are sites of the genome that putatively serve as
domains for transcription factor binding. 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:

middle; stratum three: youngest) (Peichel, et al. 2020). Based on theories of regulatory evolution on sex

chromosomes (Lenormand, et al. 2020; Lenormand and Roze 2022), we predicted ACRs may be evolving

more rapidly than neutrally evolving synonymous sites within coding regions. To survey ACRs, we

utilized Assay for Transposase Accessible Chromatin sequencing (ATAC-seq) from liver tissue (Naftaly

et al. 2021) and testis tissue. 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 orthologous regions on the Y chromosome and the ancestral ninespine

stickleback autosome 19. In testis tissue, 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 regulatory regions within testis ACRs may be more rapidly

evolving. We estimated divergence between the X and Y chromosomes across ACRs in each tissue.

Matching these predictions, among the ACRs we were able to align, testis ACRs had higher divergence

between the X and Y chromosomes relative to both synonymous coding region divergence and

divergence within liver ACRs (Figure 1). This pattern was consistent across the three evolutionary strata.

Although liver divergence within ACRs was not as high as testis ACRs, it was still significantly higher

than synonymous coding region divergence in the two oldest strata (one and two) (Figure 1), indicating

liver ACRs are also evolving rapidly. In the youngest stratum (three), the liver ACRs were not

significantly different than synonymous substitutions. Our results highlight that ACRs are likely under

positive selection and this has the strongest effect in ACRs that harbor regulatory elements that are

functional in testes.

Mutations within accessible regions are mostly accumulating on the Y chromosome

We used the orthologous sequence from the ninespine stickleback fish to infer whether

substitutions were accumulating at a higher rate on the X or Y chromosome. 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 random intergenic regions for the oldest two

evolutionary strata (Figure 2, 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

intergenic permutations, consistent with purifying selection operating across all three strata (Figure 2;

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 function in testis tissue. Y-linked ACRs had

significantly higher substitution rates in all three evolutionary strata, compared to random intergenic

regions (Figure 2; $P < 0.001$, 10,000 permutations). However, we observed X-linked ACRs from testis

tissue, also exhibited elevated nucleotide substitutions in the oldest two evolutionary strata (Figure 2; $P <$

0.001, 10,000 permutations), while the youngest stratum was significantly lower than intergenic regions

(Figure 2; $P < 0.001$, 10,000 permutations). This indicates some ACRs may also be under positive

selection 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 autosomes 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 random

intergenic regions in both liver (Figure 2; $P = 0.002$; 10,000 permutations) and testis tissue (Figure 2; $P <$

0.001; 10,000 permutations).

Accessible chromatin regions have low nucleotide diversity

We searched for signatures of selection in ACRs from 12 sequenced males from a freshwater

population of stickleback fish. Low nucleotide diversity within ACRs relative to neutrally evolving

intergenic regions would be indicative of either purifying or positive selection. On autosomes, ACRs have

been shown to exhibit lower nucleotide diversity than intergenic regions (Horvath, et al. 2021),

suggesting conserved function. We first tested whether we observed a similar pattern among testis and

liver tissue ACRs on autosome 18. We found that liver ACRs on chromosome 18 had lower nucleotide

diversity compared to intergenic regions (Figure 3; $P < 0.001$, 10,000 permutations), similar to what has

been observed in other species. However, we did not detect a significant difference for autosomal testis

ACRs (Figure 3; $P = 0.251$, 10,000 permutations). We also did not detect differences in nucleotide

diversity between ACRs and intergenic regions on the X or Y chromosomes in liver and testis tissue

(Figure 3; all comparisons $P > 0.05$, 10,000 permutations). Combined with low divergence between

species, the low nucleotide diversity within ACRs identified from liver tissue indicates some ACRs are

under purifying selection, likely due to functional constraints. However, this effect is not consistent across

chromosomes or tissues.

Among neutrally evolving intergenic sites, we detected major differences among the autosomes

and sex chromosomes. Due to a lower effective population size, the Y chromosome is expected to be one-

quarter of the nucleotide diversity observed on autosomes, given an equal sex ratio in the population. We

found Y chromosome nucleotide diversity within intergenic regions was much lower than expected,

compared to autosomes (Y chromosome pi: 0.00013; autosome pi: 0.0050; Figure 3). This suggests that

selection acting on linked deleterious or beneficial mutations has lowered nucleotide diversity beyond

neutral expectations.

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 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 in liver ACRs,

that were proximal to genes, were 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; liver expression, P = 0.004, Spearman's rank

correlation). There was a weaker correlation between expression and substitutions within ACRs on the X

chromosome (Figure 4C: N = 51, P = 0.033, Spearman's rank correlation). Combined, these results

suggest substitutions on the Y chromosome have a greater effect on increasing X-biased gametolog

expression. 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 it is

likely due to downregulating the gametolog on the Y chromosome. A similar trend was observed in testis

tissue, but the correlations were not significant, likely due to the small number of genes available for the

analysis (Figure 4B N = 31, P = 0.111, Spearman's rank correlation).

Regulatory evolution is not correlated with coding sequence evolution

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 elevated non-synonymous substitutions

relative to synonymous substitutions (d_N/d_S) have elevated 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. 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 3) (all pairwise comparisons P >

0.05; Mann-Whitney U test). Overall, we found no evidence of regulatory divergence associated with

deleterious coding sequence divergence, suggesting *cis*-regulatory evolution evolves independently of Y-

linked coding variation**.**

Discussion

Gene regulation evolves rapidly on degenerating Y chromosomes. Our understanding of this

process has largely been informed by characterizing gametolog-specific gene expression from

degenerating sex chromosomes (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 regulatory regions across the genome, it has become

feasible to explore the molecular evolution of these regions that lead to altered expression patterns. Here,

we observed elevated nucleotide substitutions within 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 XY gametologs,

suggesting loss of expression from the Y chromosome. Without liver and testis gene expression from the

ninespine stickleback as an ancestral comparison, we are 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 is also through 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).

Simulations indicate rapid expression loss from the Y chromosome is driven by the divergence of

cis-regulatory elements on both the X and Y chromosomes (Lenormand, et al. 2020; Lenormand and

Roze 2022). Mutations initially accumulate in regulatory elements within the non-recombining region of

the Y chromosome, which can lead to some expression loss. As additional deleterious mutations arise in

the coding sequence of genes, positive selection will favor the accumulation of additional regulatory

substitutions to silence expression of the Y-linked gametolog. Non-synonymous mutations are

accumulating at a higher rate across the threespine stickleback Y chromosome (White, et al. 2015;

Peichel, et al. 2020). However, we found that the number of nucleotide substitutions within regulatory

regions was not correlated with deleterious mutations within neighboring coding regions. Our results

suggest that adaptive regulatory evolution may happen independently of mutations within the amino acid

sequence. 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 (i.e., gametologs with many deleterious

mutations are not necessarily expressed at lower levels from the Y chromosome) (Bachtrog 2006;

Bachtrog, et al. 2008; Beaudry, et al. 2017). It is also possible that we did not capture the complete set of

regulatory elements important for Y expression in our ATAC-seq datasets. A correlation between

nucleotide substitutions in 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 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. Finally, 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.

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

(Lenormand, et al. 2020). In this scenario, nucleotide substitutions should also accumulate within ACRs

on the X chromosome. In contrast to this hypothesis, we found limited evidence for widespread positive

selection across X-linked regulatory regions. We found elevated rates of X-linked ACR divergence in

testis, but this did not extend to ACRs from the liver. In many cases, ACRs on the X chromosome

actually exhibited signatures of purifying selection, with substitution rates lower than random intergenic

regions. This pattern was also observed on the autosomes. Chromosome-wide dosage compensation does

not occur in the threespine stickleback fish. Genes that have completely lost the Y-linked gametolog

exhibit half expression in males, relative to females (White, et al. 2015). The lack of positive selection

among X-linked ACRs is consistent with most genes on the X and Y chromosomes not being strongly

dosage sensitive. In this case, most gametologs on the Y chromosome could be lost without consequence.

Even in the absence of strong stabilizing selection to maintain dosage balance, *cis*-regulatory

degeneration is still predicted to occur rapidly (Lenormand, et al. 2020). The Y-specific positive selection

in ACRs we detected support this scenario.

Low nucleotide diversity within a population is a signature of positive or purifying selection

(Nielsen 2005). We explored whether there was an effect of positive selection in ACRs on nucleotide

diversity within a freshwater population of threespine stickleback fish. Although the elevated nucleotide

divergence between the X and Y we observed in ACRs is a signature of positive selection, we did not

detect corresponding signatures of reduced nucleotide diversity within Y-linked ACRs. However, Y

chromosomes often have much lower diversity overall, relative to neutral expectations (Lawson Handley,

et al. 2006; Wilson Sayres, et al. 2014). In such a case, it is difficult to identify the target of any selective

sweeps. Similar to humans (Wilson Sayres, et al. 2014), our findings revealed that nucleotide diversity on

the threespine stickleback Y chromosome is much lower than neutral expectations. Low Y-linked

diversity has been attributed to purifying selection removing deleterious mutations and affecting linked

neutral sites throughout the entire non-recombining region (Wilson Sayres, et al. 2014; Wilson Sayres

2018). We found ACRs exhibited high divergence between species, but exhibited low nucleotide diversity

within populations, similar to intergenic regions throughout the chromosome. These 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

be affecting 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).

Although expression is lost from most genes across the Y chromosome, the coding sequence of

some genes are maintained through purifying selection. These genes tend to be enriched for

haploinsufficiency phenotypes and 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 this category of genes, if *cis*-

regulatory elements are accumulating deleterious mutations, ancestral expression patterns could be

maintained by gaining new binding sites that maintain expression. This would also result in signatures of

increased substitution rates relative to other 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 (Arnold, et al. 2014). 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 restore ancestral expression.

Conclusion

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

substitution in *cis*-regulatory elements. Consistent signatures across all three evolutionary strata indicate

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

reduced gene expression from the Y chromosome. 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 (v. 5) using Bowtie2 with default

parameters. Reads mapping to the mitochondria and unscaffolded regions were removed. PCR duplicates

were removed using MarkDuplicates from Picard.

We explored overall concordance between each replicate by assaying whether ATAC-seq reads

were enriched around transcription start sites in the two testis and two liver samples. 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 replicates across both tissues

were highly concordant in which transcription start sites were accessible (Supplemental Figure 1). We

also found accessible transcription start sites were a good predictor of gene expression in each tissue

(Supplemental Figure 1). Because both replicates in each tissue were highly concordant, we pooled the

aligned reads for each tissue to maximize read depth for all the analyses. ACRs were called for each

tissue sample 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).

We mapped the nucleotide sequence of each ACR on the X chromosome to homologous regions

on the Y chromosome using previously generated alignment coordinates (Peichel, et al. 2020). 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),

2019) using BLAST+ (blastn v. 2.11.0) with default blastn parameters, with -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 sequence 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 a custom python script modified from

msa2snps.py (Junli Zhang, https://github.com/pinbo/msa2snp). 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. 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.

Estimating a neutral substitution rate

We used randomly drawn 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 that falls within 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 following the GATK (v. 4.2.5.0) best practices for germline short variant discovery. Variants were called per sample 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 for ACRs was computed as the average diversity across all sites within ACRs, including non-variant (zero pi) sites that were not removed by read depth filters. We compared nucleotide diversity within ACRs with nucleotide diversity in randomly drawn intergenic sites. Intergenic sites were defined as previously described. Intergenic sites were drawn with replacement equal to the total number of sites within ACRs on each chromosome (10,000 total permutations).

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

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

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

Acknowledgements

484 This work was supported by a National Science Foundation MCB 1943283 to M.A.W.

Declaration of interests

486 The authors declare no conflicts of interests.

Figure legends

Figure 1. XY divergence within accessible chromatin regions and coding 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. Accessible Chromatin Regions (ACR) 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. Divergence within each category was compared using a pairwise Mann-Whitney U test, adjusting for multiple comparisons. The letters above each plot indicate the significant differences between sites within each stratum ($P < 0.01$).

Figure 2. Accessible chromatin divergence between threespine and ninespine stickleback. Y-linked ACR divergence is elevated over neutrally evolving intergenic regions. X and Y ACR divergence was compared to randomly drawn intergenic regions matched for GC content (10,000 permutations). The average ACR divergence of each stratum is shown by the dotted line (stratum 1: pink, stratum 2: green, and stratum 3: blue). ACRs were identified on the X chromosome and mapped to the Y chromosome and ninespine stickleback *(Pungititus pungititus)* autosome (chromosome 19) in liver and testis. Autosome divergence is for chromosome 18. X- and Y- specific 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.

Figure 3. Regulatory nucleotide diversity (pi) compared to intergenic regions. Nucleotide diversity within ACRs on the X and Y chromosome are not different than randomly drawn intergenic regions (10,000 permutations). ACRs were identified on the X chromosome and mapped to the Y chromosome. Nucleotide diversity of ACRs is also shown on chromosome 18. Average ACR nucleotide diversity for each chromosome is shown by the dotted lines. Y chromosome ACR nucleotide diversity is not different from intergenic permutations in liver ($P = 0.623$) or testis ($P = 0.374$). X chromosome ACR nucleotide diversity is not different than intergenic regions in liver ($P = 0.1985$) or testis ($P = 0.147$). Autosomal ACRs exhibited significantly lower diversity compared to intergenic permutations from liver, not from testis (Liver: $P < 0.001$, Testis $P = 0.252$). 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.

Figure 4. **Gametolog expression level compared to ACR 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 uniquely mapped to the X and Y chromosome were quantified to determine allele-specific expression for all gametologs. Gametolog expression was compared to 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 = 65; (B.) Y Testis: R= 0.34, $P = 0.008$, N = 65; (C). X Liver: R = 0.30, $P = 0.033$, N = 77; (D). X Testis: R = 0.25, 0.061, N = 77.

Supplemental Figure 1. High concordance of chromatin accessibility around transcription start site
of expressed genes. Transcription start sites (TSSs) for all genes were ordered by RNA-seq read depth.
ATAC-seq read depth was quantified ±3 kb of TSSs. Similar ATAC-seq read depth was observed
between replicates. ATAC-seq depth across replicates is a strong predictor of expression from RNA-seq
from same tissue type.

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

References

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.
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. 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, 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.
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.
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.
Connelly CF, Wakefield J, Akey JM. 2014. Evolution and Genetic Architecture of Chromatin Accessibility
and Function in Yeast. PLoS Genetics 10:e1004427.
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.
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.
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.
Langmead B, Salzberg SL. 2012. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. Nature Methods 9:357-359.
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.
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.
Meisel RP, Malone JH, Clark AG. 2012. Disentangling the relationship between sex-biased gene
expression and X-linkage. Genome Research 22:1255-1265.
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.
Nielsen R. 2005. Molecular Signatures of Natural Selection. Annual Review of Genetics 39:197-218.
Orr HA, Kim Y. 1998. An Adaptive Hypothesis for the Evolution of the Y Chromosome. Genetics
150:1693-1698.
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.
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.
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.
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.
Schoenfelder S, Fraser P. 2019. Long-range enhancer–promoter contacts in gene expression control.
Nature Reviews Genetics 20:437-455.
Shaw DE, White MA. 2022. The evolution of gene regulation on sex chromosomes. Trends in Genetics.
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.
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.

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.
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.
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.
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.

Figures

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

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

Figure 3. Regulatory nucleotide diversity (pi) compared to intergenic regions

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

738   **Supplemental Figures**

742   **Supplemental Figure 1. High concordance of chromatin accessibility around transcription start site**
743   **of expressed genes**

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

Supplemental Figure 3. ACR divergence compared to functional states of Y-linked gametologs.

755