Gene expression plasticity followed by genetic change during colonization a high-elevation environment

Huishang She[1,2], Yan Hao[1], Gang Song[1], Xu Luo[3], Fumin Lei[1,2,4], Weiwei Zhai[1,2,4], Yanhua Qu[1,2]

[1] Key Laboratory of Zoological Systematics and Evolution, Institute of Zoology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

[2] College of Life Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

[3] Faculty of Biodiversity and Conservation, Southwest Forestry University, Kunming, China

[4] Center for Excellence in Animal Evolution and Genetics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Kunming 650223, China

Abstract

Phenotypic plasticity facilitates organismal invasion of novel environments, and the resultant phenotypic change may later be modified by genetic change, so called "plasticity followed by genetic change". Herein we quantify gene expression plasticity and regulatory adaptation in a wild bird (Eurasian Tree Sparrow) from its original lowland (ancestral stage), experimentally implemented hypoxia acclimation (plastic stage) and colonized highland (colonized stage). Using a group of co-expressed genes from the cardiac and flight muscle, respectively, we demonstrate that gene expression plasticity to hypoxia tolerance is more often reversed than reinforced at the colonized stage. By correlating gene expression change with muscle phenotypes, we show that colonized tree sparrows reduce gene expression plasticity that largely correlates with decrease hypoxia tolerance. Conversely, gene expression change that is congruent with increase hypoxia tolerance is often reinforced in the colonized tree sparrows. Genes displaying large levels of reinforcement or reversion plasticity (*i.e.*, 200% of original level) show greater genetic divergence between ancestral and colonized populations. Overall, our work demonstrates that gene expression plasticity at the initial stage of high-elevation colonization can be reversed or reinforced through selection-driven adaptive modification.

Key words: Gene expression, plasticity, acclimation, genetic variation, plasticity reinforcement, plasticity reversion

Introduction

Understanding the interactions between organisms and their environments is becoming increasingly important as environmental change and human activity change the original distribution of many species (Visser 2008; Wingfield et al. 2011; McCairns et al. 2016; Oostra et al. 2018). While some organisms can easily cope with environmental change, others run the risk of local or global extinction. An organismal response to environmental change partially depends on its ability of phenotypic change (Pfennig et al. 2010; Scoville et al. 2010; Murren et al. 2015; Fox et al. 2019). For organisms that have recently colonized a new environment, phenotypic change may involve two stages. At the early stage, species may rapidly change their phenotype through plasticity without involving genetic changes. Under a persisting strong selective pressure, selection may bring genetic change to canalize phenotypic changes. Consequently, phenotypic plasticity has been considered to play an important stepping stone for genetically based evolutionary change at a late stage, so called "phenotype plasticity following by genetic change" hypothesis (*i.e.*, Schwander & Leimar 2011; Levis & Pfennig 2016; Corl et al. 2018).

Under this hypothesis, plasticity may serve adaptive evolution in two alternative ways (Ho & Zhang 2018; Ho et al. 2020). On the one hand, if the plasticity changes the phenotype in the same direction as the adaptive evolution does, genetic variation can strengthen the change towards an optimal phenotypic value in the new environment (reinforcement plasticity). On the other hand, if the plastic change works in the opposite direction as that driven by adaptive evolution, the subsequent genetic change would have to revert the initial plastic response (reversion/reduction plasticity). As previous studies on morphological and physiological traits have revealed mixed evidence for the reinforcement and the reversion of plasticity (Pigliucci et al. 2006; Lande 2009; Pfennig et al. 2010; Moczek et al. 2011; Levis & Pfennig 2016; Corl et al. 2018), it remains unclear if and how genetic change act to reinforce or reverse plasticity in the wild species (*i.e.*, Campbell-Staton et al. 2021). The potential challenges are how to quantify phenotypic change relative to plasticity and adaptive evolution, and how to define what genes are involved in the phenotypic change, especially

as many phenotypes are likely polygenically mediated (Novembre & Barton 2018; Pritchard

et al. 2010).

Comparison of gene expression provides a potential approach to quantify the relative

contributions of phenotypic plasticity and genetic variation since gene expression can bridge

an organisms' genotype to its cellular biology and, by extension, higher order physiological

processes (Wray et al. 2003; Carrol 2008). While entire transcriptional program is

orchestrated by the gene regulatory network, it is possible to trace the genes that are

co-expressed or underpin the phenotypic change (Buchanan et al. 2010; Fukao et al. 2011).

In addition, gene expression evolves in a stabilizing manner, where regulatory elements

accumulate mutations that keep gene expression at an optimal level for physiological

functions (Coolon et al. 2014; Gilad et al. 2006; Hodgins-Davis et al. 2015). With a proper

experimental design, it is possible to quantify plastic change and adaptive evolution of the

gene expression (*i.e.*, Campbell-Staton et al., 2021). Herein we used gene expression data to

quantify regulatory plasticity and adaptation, as well as the relevant genetic changes in a

group of wild birds that have recently colonized a highland environment, the Eurasian Tree

Sparrows, *Passer montanus* (hereafter referred as tree sparrows).

The tree sparrow is a human commensal that has spread over a wide variety of habitats in

the Eurasian continent, and that has been successfully introduced to Australia and North

America (Widmann 1889; Graham et al. 2011). This species colonized the Qinghai-Tibet

plateau approximately 2800 years ago (Qu et al. 2020), possibly concurrently with the

introduction of barley agriculture in the highland. The Qinghai-Tibet plateau is a harsh

environment with an average elevation of 4500 m above sea level (m a.s.l.) where only a few

endemic animals can survive. For mammals and birds living at high elevations, hypoxia is one

of the strongest selective pressures that drive physiological changes (Barve et al. 2016;

McClelland & Scott, 2019; Nicole et al. 2019). Compared to the lowland ancestral population,

highland tree sparrows have evolved physiological and gene expression change for hypoxia

tolerance (Sun et al. 2016; Qu et al. 2020), but how these changes relate to plasticity and

adaptive evolution are largely unknown.

In order to explore this, we acclimate a group of lowland birds to an experimentally

implemented hypoxic condition similar to that where we collected highland birds (*i.e.*, 3200

m a.s.l). We could assess gene expression plasticity and regulatory adaptation in hypoxia

tolerance by studying tree sparrows collected a) in their original lowland environment

(representing the physiologically ancestral stage), b) shortly after their exposure to the new

environmental stimulus (representing the ancestral plasticity at the initially plastic stage),

and c) after having adapted to the highland environment (the colonized stage). Using the

framework described in Fig. 1, we quantify gene expression change stemming from hypoxia

acclimation and highland colonization and define genes with the expression plasticity being

reinforced or reversed at the colonization stage. We test whether these genes increase

genetic variation between ancestral and colonized populations using a permutation test. We

use this framework in four datasets including groups of co-expressed genes associated to

hypoxia tolerance and those correlated to muscle phenotypes for the cardiac and flight

muscle, respectively. These independent comparisons congruently show that gene

expression at the plastic stage is more often reversed than reinforced at the colonized stage,

and the selection-driven genetic change depends on the magnitude of reinforcement and/or

reversion plasticity.

Results

Co-expressed genes involved in hypoxia tolerance generally reverse gene expression

plasticity

We sequenced transcriptomic data of the cardiac and flight muscles from the lowland tree

sparrows that had been kept under the hypoxia acclimation in this study (n=7), and

re-analyzed transcriptomic data in the lowland and highland tree sparrows collected by Qu et

al. (2020)(n=14, Supplementary Table 1). We focused on the flight and cardiac muscles

because they affect thermogenic capacity and oxygen transport and delivery and are thus

critical for the highland adaptation (Scott et al. 2015; Storz et al. 2010). Considering that

response to environmental change often involves complex coordinated biological response,

such as the co-regulation of genes underpinning physiological functions, we analyzed the resultant expression data for all individuals using weighted gene correlation network analysis (WGCNA, Langfelder & Horvath 2008). Weighted correlation network is a system biology method for identifying groups of highly co-expressed genes (modules), summarizing module-level expression and identifying important genes within modules (hub genes). Consequently, these co-expressed genes can capture expression-stage correlations due to the hypoxia-dependent expression. We identified six and nine modules of co-expressed genes with their expression changes that are significantly associated with the three stages (*i.e.*, ancestral, plastic and colonized stages) for the flight and cardiac muscle, respectively (Fig. 2a and Fig. S1). Across these modules, we identified 3220 and 682 hub genes based on the gene significance function (GS>1st quartile and *P*<0.05) for the cardiac and flight muscles, respectively (Fig. 2b-c).

Using these candidate genes we examined expression-stage relationship. We compared the gene expression levels between the birds at the ancestral stage and those at the plastic stage, as well as between the birds at the ancestral stage and those at the colonized stage. We attributed genes showing the same direction of change to the reinforcement group and those showing opposite direction of change to the reversion group as described in Ho and Zhang (2018). Using a threshold of <100% and >50% increase/reduction of gene expression between two comparisons, we attributed 22 and 6 genes to the reinforcement group and 69 and 33 genes to the reversion group for flight and cardiac muscle, respectively. Interestingly, we found fractions of genes with reversion plasticity are larger than those of genes with reinforcement plasticity. In order to explore whether this result is robust with different thresholds, we used a range of thresholds of <150% and >100%, <200% and >150%, and >200% to attribute gene to reinforcement and reversion groups, and found an excess of genes with reversion plasticity in four out of six comparisons (two-tailed binomial test, *P*<0.05, Fig. 2d-e). These results thus suggest that high-elevation colonization generally reverses gene expression plasticity.

If the reinforcement and/or reversion gene expression plasticity in hypoxic tolerance are the

target of selection in the high-elevation environment, we would expect to see an increase in

the genetic divergence between the ancestral and colonized populations. To evaluate this we

searched for genomic signatures of selection using resequencing data from 12 lowland and

11 highland tree sparrows generated from a previous study (Qu et al. 2020). Significantly

elevated genetic divergence (*i.e.*, F_{ST}) within the candidate genes beyond the genic

background would provide evidence for selection acting on this group of co-expressed genes

(*i.e.*, polygenic adaptation). We thus calculated average F_{ST} for the genes with reinforcement

or reversion plasticity using all SNPs included in the genic region, 2kb up-stream and

down-stream regions, respectively. We considered the up-stream and down-stream regions

because gene regulation may also refer to genetic variation in nearby non-coding regions. By

comparing to the F_{ST} distributions generated from 100 random samplings of the same

number of SNPs from the genic background (see Methods), we found that the empirical F_{ST}

values significantly increased in the 2kb up-stream and/or down-stream regions of the

candidate genes, but not in the genic regions ($P < 0.05$, Fig. 2d-e). In addition, we found that

the empirical F_{ST} values increased significantly only in the genes with the levels of

reinforcement/reversion plasticity reaching above 200%. This observation thus suggests that

selection driven genetic change is more targeted on the non-coding regions and depends on

the magnitude of reinforcement/reversion plasticity.

Gene expression and muscle phenotype analyses show reinforcement of adaptive plasticity

and reversion of maladaptive plasticity

The evolutionary outcome of the phenotypic plasticity for a population colonizing a novel

environment depends on the direction of plastic change with respect to the local optimum

of novel environment. If the plastic change is close to the local optimum, *i.e.*, adaptive

plasticity, natural selection likely reinforces adaptive plasticity. Conversely, if the plasticity

moves the phenotypic change away from the local optimum, *i.e.*, maladaptive plasticity,

natural selection should reduce or reverse the reaction norm and restore the phenotypic

change back to the original ancestral values (Campbell-Staton et al. 2021). In order to

investigate phenotypic plasticity and its evolutionary consequence, we analyzed two

datasets that included gene expression and muscle phenotype collected from the lowland

ancestral and highland colonized tree sparrows (Qu et al. 2020).

To categorize gene expression plasticity of a give gene as adaptive or maladaptive, we made

the assumption that great hypoxia tolerance is adaptive at hypoxic condition of

high-elevation environment, whereas low hypoxia tolerance is maladaptive and results in

reduced fitness. Based on the correlation coefficients from the correlation analysis between

gene expression and muscle phenotypic values of the ancestral and colonized individuals

(see Methods), we categorized the direction of expression-phenotype correlation as positive

or negative for these muscle phenotype-associated genes ($P < 0.05$, Fig. 3a and Fig. S2). We

then characterized the differences in expression observed for the ancestral-plastic groups

and the ancestral-colonized groups as congruent or incongruent with increased hypoxia

tolerance. Because the muscle phenotypic changes observed in the colonized tree sparrows

have been shown to enhance oxygen delivery and improve metabolic capacity in other

highland animals (Giordano 2005; Storz et al. 2010; Scott 2011; Scott et al. 2015), we thus

deemed that the gene expressions in which the direction of plastic change matched the

expectation for increase hypoxia tolerance as putatively adaptive, while those that opposed

this expectation were considered to be putatively maladaptive (categorization workflow see

Fig. 3a). We identified 2037 and 1866 muscle phenotype-associated genes in the flight and

cardiac muscle, respectively (Fig. 3b-c). Interestingly, we found that the tree sparrows

displayed more genes with maladaptive plasticity than genes with adaptive plasticity

(two-tailed binomial test, flight muscle, 1709 vs. 328, cardiac muscle 1023 vs. 843,

$P<0.2.2e^{-16}$). These results indicate that hypoxia-induced plasticity of gene expression may

be maladaptive for muscle physiological performance in highland environment.

The observed adaptive and maladaptive gene expressions in the tree sparrows suggest that

selection may have acted to reinforce and/or reverse gene expression plasticity. We then

quantified the direction of the correlation as the fold change of gene expression between

the ancestral and plastic groups (plasticity) and between the ancestral and colonized groups (evolved divergence). Consistent with the observation that selection has acted to reduce the magnitude of maladaptive plasticity, we found that gene expression plasticity and evolved divergence displayed a strong negative correlation (cardiac muscle, R=-0.87, P<0.001; flight muscle, R=-0.92, P<0.001, Fig. 3d-e). Conversely, we found a positive correlation between gene expression plasticity and evolved divergence in the genes that showed adaptive expression plasticity (cardiac muscle, R=0.92, P<0.05; flight muscle, R=0.84, P<0.001, Fig. 3d-e). Together, these results suggest that whether plastic changes in the gene expression are reinforced or reversed depends primarily on if they are functionally adaptive or maladaptive in the high-elevation environment.

We subsequently examined expression-stage relationship using the same thresholds as above, *i.e.*, <100% and >50%, <150% and >100%, <200% and >150%, and >200% of reversal/reinforcement plasticity. In six out of eight comparisons, we found that the fractions of genes with reversion plasticity were larger than those of genes with reinforcement plasticity (two tailed binomial test, P<0.01, Fig. 3f-g). We then quantified the genetic divergence of these genes between ancestral and colonized tree sparrows by testing for statistically significant increase of F_{ST} as compared to the F_{ST} distributions generated from 100 random samplings (see Methods). We found that the empirical F_{ST} values were significantly larger in the genes within the <200% and >150% category (cardiac muscle, P<0.05) and >200% category (flight and cardiac muscle, P<0.05), but not in those within other categories with low levels of reinforcement and reversion plasticity. These results suggest that the strength of selection may depend on the magnitude of reinforcement and reversion plasticity. Interestingly, we found that the genetic divergence between the ancestral and colonized tree sparrows tends to increase in the 2kb up-stream and down-stream regions of these genes (P < 0.05, Fig. 3f-g). This observation suggests that selection on gene expression plasticity related to muscle phenotype drives primarily on genetic variation in regulatory regions.

Discussion

An understanding of phenotypic plasticity and its consequence for adaptive evolution is important in evolutionary biology but remains challenging (Ghalambor et al. 2007; 2015; Campbell-Staton et al. 2021; Kenkel et al. 2017; Rivera et al. 2021). Using an integrative approach of field-based studies, experimentally implemented acclimation experiment, multiomics and muscle phenotypic data, our study demonstrates the importance of gene expression plasticity in facilitating initial survival and population persistence at early stage of colonization. In particular, our results provide novel insight into an issue of active debate within evolutionary biology (*i.e.*, reinforcement vs. reversion plasticity) by showing that the evolutionary consequence of plasticity depends on the adaptive plasticity (reinforcement) or maladaptive plasticity (reversion). We also demonstrate that natural selection drives genetic divergence when the magnitude of reinforcement and/or reversion plasticity becomes intense, providing great insights into the mechanism of plasticity followed by genetic change.

Our gene expression and sequence analyses provide several lines of evidence in support for gene expression plasticity contribution to the high-elevation colonization of tree sparrows. First, we show that co-expressed genes and muscle phenotype associated genes change either the intensity or the direction of their expression profiles, and that gene expressions at the plastic stage are more often reversed than reinforced at the colonization stage. Second, by combining gene expression and muscle phenotype, we show that selection operates intensely on maladaptive plasticity during the initial stage of responding novel environment (Ghalambor et al. 2007; 2015; Ho and Zhang 2018; Campbell-Staton et al. 2021). Third, the genes with intensified levels of reinforcement and reversion expression plasticity show large genetic divergence (F_{ST}) in their up-stream and down-stream regions between the ancestral and colonized populations, suggesting that selection has driven genetic changes in the noncoding regions after the tree sparrows had colonized the novel environment.

These observations thus support that plasticity serves as a stepping stone in a successful colonization of a new environment and that genetic changes that evolve at a late stage will modify the plastic change to an optimal phenotype in the new environment (Corl et al. 2018;

Schwander & Leimar, 2011). It is interesting to think about why phenotypic change at the

plastic stage sometimes differs from those at the colonized stage. A likely reason is that initial

plastic change allows organisms to survive upon a sudden environmental shift but the fitness

is much reduced compared to that after a long-term colonization to the novel environment

(Fischer et al. 2016; Huang & Agrawal 2016; Leonard & Lancaster 2020). Thus, the overall

physiological states of the organisms right after an environmental shift may result in low

fitness. To coordinate the phenotype values to close the organismal fitness, a genetic change

may require modifying plastic change of phenotype to approach the optimum to the novel

environment (Storz 2021). Thus, the consequence of genetic change on plasticity is

dependent on the cost of plastic change (Ho and Zhang 2018; Corl et al. 2018).

A limitation of our study is that we could only consider hypoxic condition in the acclimation

experiment, while also other factors associated with high-elevation environments, *e.g.*, low

temperature and UV radiation, may be of importance. Although we assume that hypoxia is

the dominant selective force in the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau (see also Sun et al. 2016; Qu et al.,

2020), the use of a single environmental stimulus makes our conclusions more conservative.

Also, it is reasonable to assume that plastic change in organisms is time-dependent and that

our results cannot catch gene expression occurring at later stage of plastic response (*i.e.*,

after one month). Since we could only run the acclimation experiment for one month it is

likely we have not identified all genes related to hypoxia tolerance. Despite this, we could

observe a clear pattern of reinforcement and reversion plasticity and the associated genetic

changes. Our sample sizes are rather small (n=12 for the flight muscle and n=9 for the cardiac

muscle), mostly because of the logistical challenge of keeping tree sparrows in the necessary

common garden experiments. In order to compensate for this, we utilized comparative

transcriptomics to generate the four independent datasets (a group of co-expressed genes

and a group of phenotype-associated genes for the flight and cardiac muscles, respectively).

As the analyses of these four independent datasets show similar results, we believe the

conclusions drawn from our study are robust.

Despite some limitations, our study demonstrates an easy implemented framework for

quantifying phenotype plasticity and how to relate this to genetic change. This is timely, as the role of plasticity in enabling species to invade new habitats and survive environmental change is only beginning to be understood (Campbell-Staton et al. 2017; 2018; Ho et al. 2020). Such an understanding is important, not least because numerous species are being introduced to new regions of the globe through human intervention and spread as invasive species (Visser 2008; Wingfield et al. 2011).

Materials and Methods

Sampling

We generated transcriptomic data for hypoxia-acclimated lowland tree sparrows by exposing five lowland tree sparrows to hypoxic condition for 30 days using a hypoxic chamber. The oxygen content in the chamber was set to 14% of the oxygen content (simulating the oxygen concentration at 3200 m a.s.l., 70% of ~20%, latter of which is the content of oxygen content at sea level), which is similar to condition where we collected the highland tree sparrows (Heimahe, Qinghai, 3200 m a.s.l.). We collected flight muscle from the four individuals and cardiac muscle from three individuals. In addition, we extended the analyses of the transcriptomic and muscle histological data for three sparrows from lowland (Beijing and Hebei, 100 m a.s.l.) and highland (Heimahe, 3200 m a.s.l., Figure 1) collected by Qu et al. (2020). In total, we used twelve samples for flight muscle and nine samples for cardiac muscle (Supplementary Table 1).

Transcriptome sequencing

RNA libraries were constructed for the flight and cardiac muscles and sequenced on an Illumina HiSeq4000 platform. After filtering low-quality, adapter-contaminated, and N-rich reads (>10%), a total of 134, 128 and 120 million reads of transcriptional data were generated for the lowland, hypoxia-exposed lowland tree sparrows and highland tree sparrows, respectively (Supplementary Table S1). We mapped cleaned reads against the tree sparrow genome using STAR (Alexander et al. 2013) and calculated gene expression level and intensity using RSEM (Li & Dewey 2011) and DESeq 1.22.1 (Anders & Huber 2010).

WGCNA analyses

We used WGCNA v. 1.41-1 (Langfelder and Horvath, 2008) to identify regulatory architecture for the flight muscle and cardiac muscle transcriptomes. Specifically, we used a principal component analysis (PCA) to summarize modules of genes expression with blockwiseModules function, and then used module eigengene values of the first principal component (PC) to test correlation between module expression and stages. We used Pearson linear correlation (cor function) to identify genes with expression reinforcement and nonlinear regression (polynomial regression model: Model = lm(y ~ poly(x, 5, raw = TRUE), data=data) to identify genes with expression reversion. Regulatory modules were identified as branches of the resulting cluster tree via the dynamic tree-cutting method and highly correlated modules (P<0.1) were merged. We used "GS > 1st quartile of GS" and "P<0.05" to identify important genes within modules (hub genes).

Identify gene regulation associated with muscle phenotype

To identify the genes with expression levels that correlate to evolved differences in the muscle phenotypes in the tree sparrows, we used the lowland and highland individuals from Qu et al. (2020) for which RNAseq and muscle phenotypic data were available. We correlated the levels of gene expression with muscle phenotypes in the lowland and highland individuals. We used three phenotypes for the flight muscle (capillary per fiber, fiber area and perimeter) and two for the cardiac muscle (capillary density and fiber diameter). We used Pearson correlation to test the association between each of the phenotypic traits and expression profile of each gene (TPM, transcripts per million). A threshold of P<0.05 was used to detect muscle-associated genes.

We then followed Campbell-Staton et al. (2021) to categorize genes as positive (positively correlated with muscle phenotypes) or negative regulators (negatively correlated with muscle phenotypes). The positive regulators showing increased expression (up-regulation) and negative regulators showing decreased expression (down-regulation) in the highland

tree sparrows were considered to indicate adaptive plasticity. Conversely, the positive

regulators showing decreased expression (down-regulation) and negative regulators showing

increased expression (up-regulation) in highland tree sparrows were deemed as indicating

maladaptive plasticity (Fig. 3a-c). We calculated the log-transformed change in gene

expression between the lowland ancestral and acclimated groups and between the lowland

ancestral and highland colonized groups, and then tested the correlation between the two

log-transformed change values using Spearman's rank correlation (Fig. 3d-e).

Reinforcement and reversion analyses

To investigate the magnitude of reinforcement and reversion plasticity, we followed the

method described in Ho and Zhang (2018). Specifically, expression levels of each gene in the

three stages were treated as E_lowland (expression level at ancestral stage), E_hypoxia

(expression level at plastic stage) and E_highland (expression level at colonized stage). We

used a threshold of 50% of the ancestral gene expression level, *i.e.*, 50% * E_lowland, to

detect an excess of gene expression change. We identified genes with an excess of plastic

change if it satisfied the condition of |(E_hypoxia-E_lowland)|> 50% * E_lowland. Likewise,

we identified genes with an excess of evolutionary change if it met the condition of

|(E_highland-E_hypoxia)|> 50%* E_lowland. If the genes showed same direction in the

expression change at the plastic and colonized stages, we regarded these genes as

reinforcement expression. If the genes showed opposite direction in the expression change

at the plastic and colonized stages, we regarded these genes as reversion expression. We

categorized these genes to reinforcement and reversion groups and then tested if the

proportions of the genes in the two groups were significantly different from the expected

proportions using two-side binomial tests. To test the impact of the choice of thresholds on

the results, we analyzed the data using a range of thresholds, *i.e.*, <100% and >50%, <150%

and >100%, <200% and >150%, and >200%. This setting aimed to obtain independent

gene-sets for subsequently genetic divergence analyses, because a geneset selected by relax

threshold (*i.e.*, 50%) also included genesets obtained by the stringent thresholds (*i.e.*, 100%,

150% and 200%) thus the result of former is partially dependent on those of the latters.

Comparing genetic divergence for genes with reinforcement and reversion expression plasticity

To calculate the genetic divergence between the lowland ancestral and highland colonized tree sparrows, we used 23 individuals from Qu et al. (2020) for which re-sequencing data were available. After mapping the raw reads to the tree sparrow genome using BWA v0.7.17 (Li & Durbin 2009), we obtained mean sequence coverage of 17x for each individual (Table S2). We called variants with GATK v 3.7 (McKenna et al. 2010) and Samtools v1.2 (http://www.htskib.org/) and filtered single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) using VCF tools and GATK with minimum coverage = 138, root mean square mapping quality >= 20, distance of adjacent SNPs >=5, distance to a gap >=5bp and read quality value >=30.

We calculated average F_{ST} using Vcftools (Danecek et al. 2011) with SNPs included in the genic region, 2kb up-stream and down-stream regions of the genes within each of the four categories, *i.e.*, <100% and >50%, <150% and >100%, <200% and >150%, and >200%. The up-stream and down-stream regions were considered because gene regulation may refer to genetic variation in the nearby genic regions. We permuted F_{ST} distributions for the genes within each category by random sampling the same number of SNPs, allowing for a fluctuation of 5% of total SNPs. We compared the empirical F_{ST} values to permutated F_{ST} distributions generated from 100 samplings and considered a threshold of $P<0.05$ to be statistically significant (empirical F_{ST}<95% percentile of permutated F_{ST} distribution). We calculated empirical F_{ST} values and permutated F_{ST} distributions for the genic region, 2kb up-stream and down-stream regions separately. To avoid the sampling bias (*i.e.*, sampling SNPs from neutral regions), our SNP sampling was constrained to genic region, 2k up-stream and down-stream regions of all genes (*i.e.*, 16925 genes). All analyses were conducted with the R statistical software package (R Foundation for Statistical Computing 2017).

Data accessibility
DNA sequencing reads used in this study have been deposited in Short Read Archive under the project number PRJNA417520.

Authors' contributions

Q.Y. designed research; S.H., Y.H., X.L., S.G. and Q.Y. performed research; Q.Y. and S.H. wrote the paper.

Acknowledgement

We acknowledge Ying Xiong for logistic work in the hypoxia-exposed experiment. This research was funded by the Third Xinjiang Scientific Expedition and Research (XIKK) (2022xjkk0205), Second Tibetan Plateau Scientific Expedition and Research (2019QZKK0501) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC32020103005).

Reference:

Alonso-Blanco C, Gomez-Mena C, Llorente F, Koornneef M, Salinas J, Martínez-Zapater JM. 2005. Genetic and molecular analyses of natural variation indicate cbf2 as a candidate gene for underlying a freezing tolerance quantitative trait locus in arabidopsis. *Plant physiol.* 139:1304–1312.

Anders S, Huber W. 2010. Differential expression analysis for sequence count data. *Genome Biol.* 11: R106.

Barve S, Dhondt AA, Mathur VB. and Cheviron ZA. 2016. Life-history characteristics influence physiological strategies to cope with hypoxia in Himalayan birds. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* 283: 20162201.

Campbell-Staton SC, Velotta JP, Winchell KM. 2021. Selection on adaptive and maladaptive genes expression plasticity during thermal adaptation to urban heat islands. *Nat. Commun.* 12: 6195.

Carroll SB. 2008. Evo-devo and an expanding evolutionary synthesis: a genetic theory of morphological evolution. *Cell* 134:25–36.

Corl A, Bi K, Luke C, Challa SA, Stern JA, Sinervo B, Nielsen R. 2018. The genetic basis of adaptation following plastic changes in coloration in a novel environment. *Cur. Biol.* 28: 2970–2977.

Coolon JD, McManus CJ, Stevenson KR, Graveley BR, Wittkopp PJ. 2014. Tempo and mode of regulatory evolution in Drosophila. *Genome Res*. 24: 797–808.

Danecek P. et al. 2011. The variant call format and VCFtools. Bioinformatics 27, 2156–2158.

Dobin A, Davis CA, Schlesinger F, Drenkow J, Zaleski C, Jha S, Batut P, Chaisson M, Gingeras TR. 2013. STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinformatics* 29: 15–21.

Fischer EK, Ghalambor CK, Hoke KL. 2016. Can a network approach resolve how adaptive vs nonadaptive plasticity impacts evolutionary trajectories? *Integr. Comp. Biol.* 56: 877–888.

Fox RJ, Donelson JM, Schunter C, Ravasi T and Gaitán-Espitia JD. 2019. Beyond buying time: the role of plasticity in phenotypic adaptation to rapid environmental change. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*. 374: 20180174.

Fukao T, Yeung E, Bailey-Serres J. 2011. The submergence tolerance regulator sub1a mediates crosstalk between submergence and drought tolerance in rice. *The Plant Cell* 23:412–427.

Ghalambor CK, Hoke KL, Ruell EW, Fischer EK, Reznick DN, Hughes KA. 2015. Non-adaptive

plasticity potentiates rapid adaptive evolution of gene expression in nature. Nature
525:372–375.

Ghalambor CK, McKay JK, Carroll SP, Reznick, DN. 2007. Adaptive versus non-adaptive
phenotypic plasticity and the potential for contemporary adaptation in new
environments. *Funct. Ecol.* 21: 394–407.

Gilad Y, Oshlack A, Rifkin SA. 2006. Natural selection on gene expression. *Trends in Genetics*
22: 456–461.

Giordano FJ. 2005. Oxygen, oxidative stress, hypoxia, and heart failure. *J. Clin. Invest.* 115:
550–508.

Graham J, Harnevich C, Young N, Newman G, Stohlgren T. 2011. How will climate change
affect the potential distribution of Eurasian tree sparrows *Passer montanus* in North
America? *Curr. Zool.* 57:648–654.

Ho WC, Zhang J. 2018. Evolutionary adaptations to new environments generally reverse
plastic phenotypic changes. *Nat. Commun.* 9: 350.

Ho WC, Li D, Zhu Q, Zhang J. 2020. Phenotypic plasticity as a long-term memory easing
readaptations to ancestral environments. *Sci. Adv.* 6: eaba3388.

Hodgins-Davis A, Rice DP, Townsend JP. 2015. Gene Expression Evolves under a
House-of-Cards Model of Stabilizing Selection. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 32:2130–2140.

Huang Y, Agrawal AF. 2016. Experimental evolution of gene expression and plasticity in
alternative selective regimes. *PLoS Genet.* 12: 1–23.

Kenkel C, Matz M. 2017. Gene expression plasticity as a mechanism of coral adaptation to a
variable environment. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* 1: 0014.

Lande R. 2009. Adaptation to an extraordinary environment by evolution of phenotypic
plasticity and genetic assimilation. *J. Evol. Biol.* 22: 1435143514

Langfelder P, Horvath S. 2008. WGCNA: an R package for weighted correlation network
analysis. *BMC Bioinform.* 9: 559.

Leonard AM, Lancaster LT. 2020. Maladaptive plasticity facilitates evolution of thermal
tolerance during an experimental range shift. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 20: 1–11.

Levis NA, Pfennig DW. 2016. Evaluating 'plasticity-first' evolution in nature: key criteria and
empirical approaches. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 31: 563–574.

Li B, Dewey CN. 2011. RSEM: Accurate transcript quantification from RNA-Seq data with or
without a reference genome. *BMC Bioinform.* 12: 323.

Li H, Durbin R. 2009. Fast and accurate short read alignment with burrows-wheeler
transform. *Bioinformatics* 25: 1754–60.

McCairns RJS, Smith S, Sasaki M, Bernatchez L, Beheregaray LB. 2016. The adaptive potential
of subtropical rainbowfish in the face of climate change: heritability and heritable
plasticity for the expression of candidate genes. *Evol. Appl.* 9: 531–545.

McClelland GB, Scott R. 2019. Evolved mechanisms of aerobic performance and hypoxia
resistance in high-altitude natives. *Annu. Rev. Physiol*. 81: 561–583.

McKenna A. *et al*. 2010. The genome analysis toolkit: a map reduce framework for analyzing
next-generation DNA sequencing data. *Genome Res.* 20: 1297–303.

Moczek AP, Sultan S, Foster S, Ledultan SC, Dworkin I, Nijhout HF, Abouheif E, Pfennig DW.
2011. The role of developmental plasticity in evolutionary innovation. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 278,
2705–2713.

Murren CJ, et al. 2015. Constraints on the evolution of phenotypic plasticity: limits and costs
of phenotype and plasticity. *Heredity*. 115: 293–301.

Nicole P, Matt W, and Lucy AH. 2019. Natural Climbers: Insights from Avian Physiology at
High Altitude. *High Alt. Med. Biol.* 20: 427–437.

Novembre J, Barton NH. 2018. Tread lightly interpreting polygenic tests of selection. *Genetics*
208: 1351–1355.

Oostra V, Saastamoinen M, Zwaan B, Wheat C, 2018. Strong phenotypic plasticity limits
potential for evolutionary responses to climate change. *Nat. Commun.* 9:1005.

Pfennig DW, Wund MA, Snell-Rood EC, Cruickshank T, Schlichting CD, Moczek AP. 2010.
Phenotypic plasticity's impacts on diversification and speciation. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 25:
459–467.

Pigliucci M, Murren CJ, Schlichting CD. 2006. Phenotypic plasticity and evolution by genetic
assimilation. J. Exp. Biol. 209: 2362–2367.

Pritchard JK, Pickrell JK, Coop G. 2010. The genetics of human adaptation: hard sweeps, soft
sweeps, and polygenic adaptation. *Curr. Biol.* 20: R208–215.

Qu Y, et al. 2020. Rapid phenotypic evolution with shallow genomic differentiation during
early stages of high elevation adaptation in Eurasian Tree Sparrows. *Nat. Sci. Rev.*, 7:
113.

R Foundation for Statistical Computing. 2017. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical
Computing, https://www.r-project.org.

Rivera HE, Aichelman HE, Fifer JE, Kriefall NG, Wuitchik DM, Wuitchik SJS, Davies SW. 2021. A
framework for understanding gene expression plasticity and its influence on stress
tolerance. *Mol. Ecol.* 30: 1381-1397.

Schwander T, Leimar O. 2011. Genes as leaders and followers in evolution. Trends Ecol. Evol.
26: 143–151.

Scott GR. 2011. Elevated performance: the unique physiology of birds that fly at high
altitudes. *J. Exp Biol.* 214:2455–2462.

Scott GR, Elogio TS, Lui MA, Storz JF, Cheviron ZA. 2015. Adaptive modifications of muscle
phenotype in high-altitude deer mice are associated with evolved changes in gene
regulation. *Mo. Biol. Evol.* 32: 1962–1976.

Scoville AG, Pfrender ME. 2010. Phenotypic plasticity facilitates recurrent rapid adaptation to
introduced predators. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 107: 4260–4263

Storz JF, Scott GR, Cheviron AZ. 2010. Phenotypic plasticity and genetic adaptation to
high-altitude hypoxia in vertebrates. *J. Exp. Biol.* 213:4125–4136.

Storz JF. 2021. High-altitude adaptation: mechanistic insights from integrated genomics and
physiology. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 38: 2677–2691.

Sun YF, Ren ZP, Wu YF, Lei FM, Dudley R, Li DM. 2016. Flying high: limits to flight performance
by sparrows on the Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau. *J. Exp. Biol.* 219: 3642–3648.

Visser ME. 2008. Keeping up with a warming world; assessing the rate of adaptation to
climate change. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B.* 275: 649–649.

Widmann O. 1889. History of the House Sparrow Passer domesticus and the European Tree
Sparrow Passer montanus at Saint Louis, Mo. Washington DC: U.S. Department of
Agriculture, Division of Economic Ornithology and Mammology.

Wingfield JC, Kelley JP, Angelier F, Chastel O, Lei F, Lynn SE, Miner B, Davis JE, Li DM, Wang G.

2011. Organism-environment interactions in a changing world: a mechanistic approach.
J. Ornithol. 152: S279–S288.
Wray GA, Hahn MW, Abouheif E, Balhoff JP, Pizer M, Rockman MV, Romano LA. 2003. The
evolution of transcriptional regulation in eukaryotes. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 20:1377–1419.
544
545
546

Figure 1. A schematic representation of quantifying gene expression plasticity and genetic change in
relevant genes. **Experimental design**, transcriptomic data of the flight and cardiac muscle were
collected from tree sparrows obtained in their original lowland habitat (ancestral stage), experimental
exposure to the hypoxic condition (plastic stage), and colonization to a high-elevation environment
(colonized stage). **Identify candidate genes**, co-expressed genes that display correlation with hypoxia
tolerance were identified by a WGCNA analysis and muscle phenotype associated genes were
identified by correlating gene expression levels and each of the muscle phenotypes.
Reinforcement/reversion plasticity, the genes with reinforcement or reversion plasticity were defined
by comparing expression changes between the ancestral and plastic stages (plastic change), and
between ancestral and colonized stages (evolved change). The strength of reinforcement/reversion
plasticity is measured by a range of thresholds, *i.e.*, <100% and >50%, <150% and >100%, <200%
and >150%, and >200%. **Quantify genetic divergence**, genetic divergence (*i.e.*, F_{ST}) between lowland
and highland populations were estimated for the genic region, 2kb up-stream and down-stream
regions of the candidate genes. The empirical F_{ST} values were compared with permuted F_{ST}
distributions generated from 100 random samplings from the genic background. A threshold of *P*<0.05
was used to determine statistical significance.

Figure 2. The WGCNA analysis identified co-expressed genes and reinforcement and reversion of expression plasticity. (a) Pearson linear correlation is used to identify genes with expression reinforcement and nonlinear regression to identify genes with expression reversion. Regulatory modules were identified as branches of the resulting cluster tree via the dynamic tree-cutting method and highly correlated modules ($P<0.1$) were merged. We used "GS > 1st quartile of GS" and "$P<0.05$" to identify important genes within modules (hub genes). (b) and (c) Six and nine modules respectively were identified to be associated with different stages for the flight and cardiac muscle ($P<0.01$). Within each module, colored dots show the genes with the expression levels significantly associated with the stages (gene significance function>1st quartile and $P<0.05$). (d) and (e) Left, genes with expression plasticity being reinforced (red) or reversed (blue) at the colonized stage identified for the flight (d) and cardiac muscle (e), respectively. There are more genes showing reversion plasticity than those showing reinforcement plasticity in flight muscle (d, all comparisons, two-tailed binomial test, $P<0.001$) and cardiac muscle (e, two of four comparisons, two-tailed binomial test, $P<0.001$). Right, the F_{ST} values (vertical lines) significantly increase in the 2kb up-stream and/or down-stream regions of the genes having the magnitude of reinforcement/reversion plasticity > 200%. Vertical lines, the empirical F_{ST} values; shades, permuted F_{ST} distributions generated from 100 random samplings. NS, non-significant, *, $P < 0.05$; **, $P < 0.01$; ***, $P < 0.001$.

Figure 3. Genes with expression levels associated with muscle phenotypes and adaptive and maladaptive plasticity. (a) Gene expression profiles were correlated with muscle phenotypes. The genes with expression changes that correlate positively with muscle phenotypes were considered to be positive regulators, and those that correlate negatively with muscle phenotypes were deemed to be negative regulators. The positive regulators showing increased expression (up-regulation) and negative regulators showing decreased expression (down-regulation) in highland tree sparrows were considered to be adaptive plasticity. Conversely, the positive regulators showing decreased expression (down-regulation) and negative regulators showing increased expression (up-regulation) in highland tree sparrows were deemed as maladaptive plasticity. (b) and (c) Gene expression profiles were correlated with three flight muscle phenotypes (b, capillary per fiber, fiber area and perimeter) and two cardiac muscle phenotype (c, capillary density and fiber diameter). Red dots show genes with adaptive gene expression plasticity and blue dots show genes with maladaptive gene expression plasticity (d) and (e) The fold changes of gene expression between the ancestral and plastic stages (plastic change) and between the ancestral and colonized stages (evolved divergence) show positive correlation for the genes showing adaptive plasticity and negative correlation for genes showing maladaptive plasticity (Spearman's rank correlation, $P<0.001$) in the flight muscle (d) and cardiac

muscle (e). (f) and (g) Left, candidate genes were classified to four categories with different magnitudes of reinforcement or reversion plasticity. More genes show reversion plasticity than those show reinforcement plasticity (six out of eight comparisons, two-tailed binomial test, $P<0.01$). Right, the empirical F_{ST} values increase significantly in the 2k up-stream and/or down-stream regions of the genes having reinforcement/reversion plasticity <200% and >150% (cardiac muscle) and >200% (flight and cardiac muscle). (f) flight muscle, (g) cardiac muscle. Vertical lines, the empirical F_{ST} values; shades, permutated F_{ST} distributions generated from 100 times sampling. **, $P < 0.01$; ***, $P < 0.001$.