Title: Transgenerational effects alter the fitness consequences and genetic architecture of

phenotypic plasticity and its regulatory pathways

Authors and affiliations: Samuel N. Bogan[1], Marie E. Strader[1,2], and Gretchen E. Hofmann[1]

[1]Department of Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology, University of California Santa Barbara,

Santa Barbara, CA, USA

[2]Department of Biology, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA

Corresponding author:

Samuel N. Bogan

samuel.n.bogan@gmail.com

Keywords: Gene expression, plasticity, genetic variation, adaptation, acclimation, global change

Abstract

Parental exposure to environmental stress can influence phenotypic plasticity by offspring developing under that stressor. Transgenerational effects may also reshape natural selection on developmental plasticity by influencing its fitness consequences and expression of its genetic variation. We tested these hypotheses in the purple sea urchin *Strongylocentrotus purpuratus*, an invertebrate exposed to coastal upwelling (periods of low temperature and pH impacting biomineralization and performance). We conditioned parents and larvae to experimental upwelling and integrated RNA-seq, phenotyping of body size and biomineralization, and measured fitness-correlated traits in a quantitative genetic experiment. Larvae developing under upwelling induced widespread differential expression (DE), decreased biomineralization, and reduced body size. We detected fitness benefits for increased biomineralization and reduced size under upwelling indicative of adaptive plasticity, but only when larvae were spawned from parents exposed to upwelling. Larval DE was largely associated with adaptive phenotypic plasticity. Negative genetic correlation in DE was abundant between genes associated with adaptive plasticity. However, genetic correlations in DE associated with body size plasticity were significantly more positive in larvae from upwelling-exposed parents. These results show that transgenerational effects modify the fitness landscape and genetic architecture of phenotypic plasticity and its regulatory pathways.

Introduction

The phenotypic plasticity of physiology and performance has received attention for its ability to facilitate adaptive organismal responses to environmental change on ecological timescales (Bozinovic & Pörtner, 2015; Ghalambor et al., 2007; Hofmann & Todgham, 2010; Million et al., 2022) and, increasingly, its potential to evolve and promote persistence under future climates (Corl et al., 2018; Kelly, 2019; Vinton et al., 2022). We define phenotypic plasticity as an environmental effect on a phenotype's expression independent of genetic variation in that trait (Scheiner & Lyman, 1991). Plasticity can be adaptive, neutral, or maladaptive (Donelan et al., 2020) and has become a focal point for conservation and management strategies (Donelson et al., 2023). The evolution of plasticity relies on the strength and direction of natural selection acting upon it (Hendry, 2016) and heritable genetic variance underpinning it (Kovuri et al., 2023; Scheiner & Lyman, 1991). The plasticity of complex traits is often driven by multiple regulatory pathways that can possess positive or negative genetic covariance with one another, facilitating or constraining integrated responses to natural selection (de Miguel et al., 2022; S.-Y. Kim et al., 2016; Petino Zappala et al., 2024). Molecular pathways responsible for organismal responses to environmental change are often studied using RNA-seq, but in the absence of data on the heritability of differential gene expression or its fitness effects (Rivera et al., 2021). Using a quantitative genetic breeding design (Fig. 1; Fig. S1) integrating RNA-seq with multiple-trait phenotyping in the purple sea urchin *Strongylocentrotus purpuratus*, we examined the genetic variation and fitness effects of phenotypic and gene expression plasticity. Deriving genetic and fitness parameters from a transgenerational experiment, we determined how parental environment affected the genetic architecture and fitness consequences of plasticity and its regulatory pathways.

A small number of empirical studies on single or multiple traits have uncovered patterns

of genetic variation for (mal)adaptive plasticity that help explain its evolution. For example, heat

tolerant populations of Anolis lizards exhibit canalization of gene expression whose differential

expression (DE) is maladaptive under acute thermal stress. There is greater interpopulation

divergence at *cis*-regulatory sites of these maladaptive DE genes, suggesting that genetic variation

in maladaptive plasticity fueled adaptive canalization of pathways related to thermal stress

(Campbell-Staton et al., 2021). Similarly, species adapted to high altitudes exhibit the loss of

ancestral plasticity in several pathways that, when induced under chronic low oxygen, result in

maladaptive pathologies (Durmowicz et al., 1993; Velotta et al., 2018). In each example, it remains

unclear whether canalization was driven by greater standing genetic variation and evolvability

underpinning maladaptive plasticity prior to selection or the shear strength of negative selection

against maladaptive responses. We address this challenge by integrating fitness associated

measures of plasticity across many gene expression traits with estimates of their genetic variation.

A larger body of theory has predicted the joint influence of plasticity's genetic variance

and fitness effects on adaptation. Adaptive plasticity possessing low genetic variation may enable

populations to persist under novel environments at the cost of limiting adaptation. Alternatively,

maladaptive plasticity may drive adaptation if it possesses a high degree of genetic variance and

can express otherwise cryptic phenotypes that are subsequently canalized (Brennan et al., 2022;

Ghalambor et al., 2007). Adaptive plasticity may experience evolutionary increases and improve

populations' abilities to cope with predictable environmental variation when plasticity is

sufficiently heritable (Bitter et al., 2021). Non-heritable, maladaptive plasticity may result in the

evolution of genetic compensation to counteract its effects (Crispo, 2007; Kelly, 2019; Morris &

Rogers, 2013). Essential to these predictions is whether and how genetic variation in plasticity

covaries with its fitness consequences. Theoreticians have urged the need for empirical research

in this area (Chevin & Hoffmann, 2017).

Performance traits and their phenotypic plasticity can be highly polygenic, regulated by

multiple physiological pathways as identified by cross-environment genome-wide association

studies (X. Li et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2021; Nguyen Ba et al., 2022). The multivariate nature of

genetic variants and molecular pathways that shape plasticity adds complexity to how its fitness

effects and genetic variation shape the evolution of plasticity by natural selection. The most

common method used to characterize molecular pathways associated with plastic responses to

environmental change is RNA-seq (Evans & Hofmann, 2012; Martyniuk, 2020; Rivera et al.,

2021). However, changes in gene expression across environments can be a consequence of stress

and reduced performance or adaptive, plastic responses. Without fitness data, results from RNA-

seq studies are black boxes with respect to whether DE is attributed to the maladaptive effects of

stress or adaptive plasticity.

The multitude of molecular pathways that underpin plasticity are not likely to exhibit

unidirectional, integrated responses to selection. Distinct pathways that jointly influence a single

trait can share positive or negative genetic correlations due to pleiotropic alleles and linkage

disequilibrium (Hekerman et al., 2005; Mauro & Ghalambor, 2020). RNA-seq experiments can be

integrated with quantitative genetic breeding designs to (i) measure the additive genetic variation

and heritability of DE and (ii) estimate genetic variance-covariance (G) matrices of DE traits and,

consequently, their genetic correlation (Blows et al., 2015). In environmental studies, it is possible

to model changes in G and genetic correlation between environments as well as environment-

dependent fitness effects. Progress has been made in determining how developmental

environments influence genetic correlation between traits (Sgrò & Hoffmann, 2004; Wood &

Brodie, 2015) and their fitness effects (Kingsolver & Gomulkiewicz, 2003). Whether parental

environments reshape natural selection on traits through these mechanisms is poorly understood,

however (Donelson et al., 2018).

Using the purple sea urchin *Strongylocentrotus purpuratus* as an ecologically important

model invertebrate (Pearse, 2006), we integrated RNA-seq with assays of performance and fitness-

correlated traits in a quantitative genetic crossing design of larval families exposed to ecologically

relevant, abiotic stress (Figures 1A & S1). We input these data to structural equation models of

environmental change in gene expression and performance (Kline, 2015), a quantitative genetic

animal model of additive genetic variation (Wilson et al., 2010), and selection gradient models of

natural selection (Lande & Arnold, 1983) as shown in Figure 1B. We quantified the heritability of

gene expression plasticity and its effect on adaptive phenotypic plasticity before modeling

covariance in heritability and fitness effects. Adults and larvae were conditioned to ecologically

relevant abiotic stress applied in these experiments that mimicked variation in temperature and

pCO_2 under coastal upwelling frequently experienced by *S. purpuratus*. Upwelling occurs when

wind-driven, upward movement of deep seawater lowers the temperature and increases the pCO_2

of surface oceans (Gruber et al., 2012).

In response to experimental upwelling, *S. purpuratus* exhibits transgenerational and

developmental plasticity of differential gene expression, DNA methylation, and several

performance traits including larval growth rate, biomineralization, and lipid content (Bogan et al.,

2023; Strader et al., 2019, 2020, 2022; Wong et al., 2018, 2019). Phenotypic data for larval body

size and biomineralization from the experiment that we describe here were reported by Strader et

al. 2022 who detected significant genetic variation for the plasticity of both phenotypes in response

137
Figure 1 | *Crossing and experimental designs*. **(A)** This graphic depicts adult and larval conditioning to ambient, non-
upwelling (blue) and stressful, experimental upwelling conditions (yellow). Crosses between cohorts of conditioned
adults are depicted with lines. Reciprocal rearing of offspring resulting from each cross is depicted with arrows
directed toward larval non-upwelling and upwelling conditions. **(B)** A visual representation of modeling approaches
used to integrate environmental treatments ("E"), additive genetic variance ("V_A"), gene expression ("GE"),
phenotypes ("P"), and fitness correlating traits ("F"). Structural equation modeling is visualized in blue which
estimated the effect of differential expression on phenotypic plasticity induced by environmental treatments. Animal
models predicting additive genetic variance in gene expression are green. Selection gradient models predicting the
fitness effects of differential expression are red. Environmental treatments are grey. Parameters predicted by modeling
approaches are visualized in shades of blue.
148

to upwelling (Strader et al., 2022). Here we examine whether these reported phenotypic and

molecular responses to upwelling are indeed adaptive and, if so, whether parental environments

alter the fitness effects and genetic variation of environmental responses by offspring.

2. Results

Coastal upwelling causes stressful conditions for *S. purpuratus* larvae (Strader et al., 2020,

2022; Wong et al., 2018, 2019). This was similarly observed here, as evidenced by an increased

percent abnormality in larvae in cultures conditioned to the treatment transgenerationally and

developmentally (Strader et al., 2022). Developmental and parental conditioning to experimental

upwelling induced widespread differential expression (DE) as shown in Figure 2. DE induced by

developmental upwelling was primarily associated with decreases in larval body size and, to a

lesser extent, increases in biomineralization (Fig. 3). The plasticity of body size and

biomineralization both yielded significant fitness effects measured as variance in the proportion of

normal development among larval families. However, fitness effects were contingent upon the

parental environment from which larvae were spawned. Following parental upwelling, reductions

in larval body size and plastic increases in biomineralization were both adaptive. Using a

heritability threshold of $h^2 \geq 0.2$ (Orton, 2020), 56.80 – 59.93% of adaptive gene expression

plasticity exhibited significant heritability (Fig. 4). The heritability of DE did not vary between

transcripts associated with adaptive versus maladaptive changes in biomineralization. However,

DE associated with adaptive reductions in body size was significantly less heritable than DE

associated with maladaptive increases in size (Fig. 4). We further describe these results below.

2.1 Differential expression induced by parental and developmental upwelling – RNA-seq

alignment, quality checking, and filtering – Following trimming, RNA-seq libraries achieved a

mean size of 37.07 ± 5.09 million reads and a mean mapping efficiency of 74.14 ± 1.80%. After

read-count filtering for transcripts with > 0.5 CPM in at least 75% of all samples, 12,953 transcripts

were retained for downstream analysis. Outlier detection was performed with filtered read count

data using arrayQualityMetrics v3.54.0 (Kauffmann et al., 2009), which flagged two half sibling

crosses from parental and developmental upwelling treatments as significant outliers (Fig. S2–S3).

Removal of these two samples brought the RNA-seq sample size to n = 78. Mean variation in gene

expression across samples equaled a BCV of 0.12. Library and alignment metrics are further

described in Supplemental File 1.

Parental conditioning to upwelling induced upregulation of 1,582 transcripts and

downregulation of 1,539 in larval offspring. These differentially expressed genes (DEGs) included

50 and 29 upregulated and downregulated transcripts with an absolute $\log_2FC > 1.0$ (Fig. 2). DEGs

induced by parental upwelling were enriched for 71 biological process (BP) GO terms, 49

molecular function (MF) terms, and 30 cellular component (CC) terms. Upregulated transcripts

included enrichment for the BP/MF terms involved in cellular signaling, cell adhesion,

transmembrane transport, and development localized to CC terms including the endoplasmic

reticulum, cell membrane protein complexes, and extracellular region. Downregulated transcripts

were enriched for BP/MF terms involved in ATP metabolism, ribosomal structure/biogenesis,

mitochondrial organization, and oxidoreductase activity localized to the ribosome, mitochondrial

matrix, and cytosol (Fig. S4–S6).

Developmental exposure to upwelling induced upregulation of 2,246 transcript and

downregulation of 2,205. With a >1.0 log$_2$FC cutoff, these included 38 upregulated and 184

downregulated transcripts (Fig. 2). 39.73% of DEGs induced by transgenerational effects were

also differentially expressed in response to developmental conditioning. Developmental upwelling

DEGs were enriched for 89 BP GO terms, 53 MF terms, and 37 CC terms. Upregulated transcripts

were enriched for BP/MF terms related to chromatin remodeling, mitochondrial organization, ATP

metabolism, cellular responses to stress and DNA damage, ubiquitination, and ribosomal

structure/biogenesis. These upregulated terms were localized to catalytic complexes, nuclear and

organelle lumen, ribosomes, and the nucleolus. Downregulated transcripts were enriched for

Figure 2 | *Differential expression induced by parental and developmental exposure to upwelling.* **(A)** Loading of
samples to principal coordinate axes derived from filtered, normalized read counts. Parental and developmental
treatments are represented by color. Paths connect single crosses and their change in loading between non-upwelling
("N"; no point) and upwelling ("U"; point) treatments. **(B)** Mean difference plots of transcript logFC across average
CPM per transcript, grouped by parental and developmental effects of upwelling. Significant downregulation is
depicted in blue and upregulation in red.
209
210

BP/MF terms related to cytoskeletal organization, cell adhesion, oxidoreductase activity, and

metabolism of lipids and carbohydrates localized to the cytoskeleton, cell junctions, cell

membranes, and endosomes (Fig. S7 – S9).

Upregulated transcripts related to ribosomal function included several ribosomal subunits

and 16 DEAD-box proteins involved in the initiation of translation. Included in cellular responses

to stress was the significant upregulation of 8 heat shock proteins including 3 Hsp70 and 5 Hsp40

chaperones. Interestingly, 8 heat shock proteins were significantly downregulated in response to

upwelling, indicating that they were more highly expressed under warmer conditions. These

included all 3 Hsp90 isoforms present in the *S. purpuratus* genome as well as 2 Hsp70 and 3 Hsp40

chaperones. These functional enrichment results demonstrate a suite of complex molecular

responses to multivariate, abiotic environmental change brought on by experimental upwelling, a

third of which were commonly induced by parental and larval conditioning.

2.2. Associations between differential expression and adaptive versus maladaptive

plasticity – Structural equation models (SEMs) predicting the effect of differential expression (DE)

on plastic changes in body size and biomineralization in response to developmental upwelling

identified 231 transcripts associated with increased body size, 564 with reduced body size, 125

associated with increased biomineralization, and 113 with decreased biomineralization. Selection

gradient models predicting the proportion of normal development per replicate culture (a fitness

correlated trait) as a function of body size or biomineralization and their plasticity estimated fitness

benefits of (i) plastic reductions in size under upwelling and (ii) maintenance of or plastic increases

in biomineralization under upwelling. When larvae were spawned from parents exposed to

upwelling, plastic increases in biomineralization incurred a selection gradient of 0.40 ± 0.09 (Fig.

3A) and plastic reductions in body size incurred a weaker selection gradient of 0.13 ± 0.04 (Fig.

3B). Interestingly, the plasticity of both traits did not exhibit detectable fitness costs or benefits

when larvae were spawned from non-upwelling parents. These selection gradient coefficients

represent the slopes of logistic regressions between larval survival (abnormality) and phenotypic

plasticity visualized in Figures 3A and 3B. Thus, DE driving reductions in body size or increases

in biomineralization were associated with adaptive or weakly adaptive phenotypic outcomes.

As the absolute fold change of a transcript's DE increased, the adaptive effect of DE on

reduced body size and/or increased biomineralization significantly increased. From here forward,

'adaptive' or 'maladaptive' effects refer to selection on larvae from upwelling-exposed parents

unless otherwise specified. Associations between DE and effects on phenotypic plasticity toward

maladaptive directions were weaker, demonstrating that DE induced by developmental upwelling

was predominantly associated with adaptive plasticity (Fig. 3C). Transcripts associated with

reduced body size under upwelling conditions were enriched for BP/MF terms involved in cellular

signaling, transmembrane transport, and ribosomal biogenesis localized to cell junctions and the

nucleolus. In stark contrast to transcripts associated with plasticity of larval body size, DE driving

increases or decreases in biomineralization exhibited no functional enrichment across all GO term

categories.

Figure 3 | *Effects of differential expression on adaptive plasticity*. **(A – B)** The effects of phenotypic values and plasticity in biomineralization (spicule length normalized by body length) and body size (maximum body length) on proportion of normal development grouped by parental environment are plotted in A and B, respectively. Points represent phenotypic means (left) or mean reaction norms (right) of crosses reared in each environment. Environments are depicted by color such that non-upwelling is blue and upwelling is yellow. Error bars depict standard deviation in each trait among replicates of each cross. **(C)** Absolute logFC of differential expression induced by developmental upwelling is plotted across differential expression's association with upwelling effects on body size and biomineralization in A and B, respectively. Points represent transcripts. Solid lines depict fitted quadratic curves ± 95% CI. Plot background color corresponds to the product of differential expression's phenotypic effect on the plasticity of body size or biomineralization and the selection gradient for plasticity of each trait under parental upwelling, resulting in an inferred fitness induced by differential expression.

2.3. The transcriptome-wide heritability of adaptive and maladaptive differential

expression – DE was highly heritable across most genes, but levels of heritability varied according

to associations between DE and adaptive plasticity. DE was more heritable than baseline gene

expression (CPM) by 19.95% h^2 (p < $2.2e^{-16}$) and the two variables were uncorrelated (Fig. 4A).

60.46% of significant DE induced by developmental conditioning exhibited h^2 greater than or

equal to 0.20 (i.e., at least 20% of in DE variance was heritable). The average h^2 of DE was 0.2674

$\pm$ 0.1592. 7.59% of DEGs were both heritable and associated with adaptive plasticity in body size,

but 59.93% of adaptive DE related to body size was heritable. These transcripts exhibited similar

h^2 relative to all DE: 0.2613 $\pm$ 0.1516. Substantially less DE was heritable and associated with

maladaptive plasticity in body size, equaling only 3.59% of all DEGs. However, maladaptive DE

related to body size exhibited greater heritability with a mean h^2 of 0.2984 $\pm$ 0.1600. 56.80 % of

DEGs associated with adaptive increases in biomineralization were heritable, with a mean h^2 of

0.3709 $\pm$ 0.1224. 1.55% of DEG's were heritable and associated with adaptive increases in

biomineralization. 0% of DEGs that were significantly associated with maladaptive decreases in

biomineralization were heritable.

DE associated with adaptive reductions in body size under upwelling was significantly less

heritable than DE associated with maladaptive increases in size. As the effect of DE on adaptive

decreases in body size grew, h^2 significantly decreased (β = -0.96; p = $5.77e^{-8}$) as well as the

probability of $h^2 \geq 0.2$ (β = -5.47; p = $2.16e^{-8}$). Conversely, this means h^2 and the probability of

heritability increased as maladaptive effects of DE on increased body size grew (Fig. 4B). The

phenotypic effect of DE on adaptive biomineralization plasticity had a negative but insignificant

effect on its heritability (Fig. 4B).

Figure 4 | *Heritability of differential expression and its effect on adaptive phenotypic plasticity*. **(A)** h^2 of differential expression (DE) induced by developmental upwelling is plotted across h^2 of baseline gene expression transcriptome wide. The distributions of h^2 for baseline and differential expression are plotted adjacent to the x and y axes, respectively. **(B)** The probability of differential expression $h^2 \geq 0.20$ is plotted as a logistic curve $\pm$ 95% CI across differential expression's effect on biomineralization and body size signed for the effect's direction toward adaptive plasticity. Background color represents the coefficient for DE's effect on phenotypic plasticity multiplied by the selection gradient acting on the plasticity of each phenotype under parental upwelling (e.g., the associated fitness outcome of DE's effect on plasticity).

Adaptive DE remained significantly less heritable when considering the cumulative fitness

effects of plasticity-associated DE. The cumulative fitness effect of DE was measured by summing

DE's phenotypic effects on both traits and multiplying these effects by the selection gradients

acting on each trait's plasticity. This cumulative fitness effect was negatively correlated with the

probability of heritability (β = -0.05; p = 0.00376). For illustrative purposes, variation in DE's

logFC, h^2, and total effect on adaptive plasticity are plotted as a fitness landscape in Figure 5.

Negative fitness effects were enriched among transcripts with DE $h^2 > 0.2$ and logFC > 1.0 while

positive fitness effects clustered at a lower h^2 among downregulated transcripts (Fig. 5). Minimal

changes in gene expression did not result in strong effects on fitness, as evidence by a valley of

neutral costs associated with low DE (Fig. 4 – 5).

Genetic variance-covariance matrices (*G* matrices) were estimated for sibships' logFC

values for differentially expressed genes associated with adaptive plasticity of body size and

biomineralization. *G* matrices enable identification of genetically correlated modules of traits and

axes of genetic variation (Steppan et al., 2002). *G* matrices are thus integral to the effects of natural

selection on multivariate phenotypic space (S. J. Arnold et al., 2001). Genetically-correlated

modules of DE genes were identified by screening for genes with logFC values that were less than

a genetic distance of 0.5 from one another, where genetic distance equals 1 – genetic correlation.

DE associated with adaptive plasticity in body size was composed of 28 genetically correlated

modules of 564 genes. DE associated with adaptive plasticity in biomineralization was composed

of 32 genetically correlated modules of 125 genes. Genetic correlations between logFC values

were primarily positive and exhibited larger absolute correlation among logFCs sharing positive

genetic correlation (Fig. 6).

325
Figure 5 | *Transcriptome wide distribution of differential expression, its heritability, and associated fitness effects.*
The distribution of heritability for differential expression (DE) in response to upwelling is plotted as h^2 across the
distribution of DE's fold change (logFC). Color represents the fitness outcome associated with DE's effect on
phenotype: the summed products of DE's phenotypic effects on body size and biomineralization multiplied by the
selection gradients acting on the plasticity of each trait.

G matrices for larvae from upwelling versus non-upwelling parents exhibited differences

in genetic correlation for DE associated with adaptive plasticity in body size. Mantel tests were

used to evaluate variation between parental treatments in genetic correlation matrices of DE

associated with adaptive plasticity in body size ($Z = 40477.59$; $p < 1e10^{-4}$) and biomineralization

($Z = 1438.176$; $p < 1e10^{-4}$). For both traits, some correlations shifted from negative-to-positive and

positive-to-negative under parental upwelling (Fig. 6). Even in the absence of environmental

effects, random chance in changes to the sign of genetic correlation are expected. Thus, a chi-

squared test was used to determine if there were greater or fewer positive-to-negative shifts than

expected by chance alone. Genetic correlations in body size DE exhibited significant shifts from

negative-to-positive under parental upwelling ($\chi^2 = 1767.7$; $p < 2e10^{-16}$).

Parental treatment groups contained different genotypes, presenting a potential confound

of transgenerational effects on genetic correlation. Permutations of the experimental pedigree were

performed, dividing it into two random halves with equal representation of parental treatment

groups. Random permutation revealed that 7.25% of enrichment for positive, directional changes

to genetic correlations in body size DE were attributed to pedigree structure rather than

environment. It was also significantly more likely that directional shifts in genetic correlation

under parental upwelling were attributed to environment rather than pedigree structure ($\chi^2 =$

1639.6; $p < 2e10^{-16}$). 94.53% of upwelling-induced directional shifts to genetic correlations in

biomineralization DE were attributable to pedigree structure. Thus, there were detectable effects

of parental environment on the genetic architecture of pathways associated with adaptive body size

plasticity, but not biomineralization.

354
Figure 6 | *Changes in genetic correlation between parental upwelling treatments for log foldchanges (logFC) of*
differential expression (DE) associated with adaptive plasticity in larval body size and biomineralization. X and Y
axes represent genetic correlations extracted from *G* matrices of logFC values estimated from larvae of non-upwelling
and upwelling conditioned parents. Correlations that shifted from negative to positive under parental upwelling are
enlarged and colored in red. Correlations that shifted from positive to negative under parental upwelling are enlarged
and colored in blue.

Heritable DE associated with plasticity in body size was enriched for functions associated

with ribosomal biogenesis and maintenance (Fig. 7). Transcripts with high DE heritability and

adaptive reductions in body size under upwelling were enriched for the BP/MF GO terms related

to ribosomal biogenesis, RNA processing, and transmembrane transport localized to the nucleolus.

Heritable DE associated with maladaptive increases body size was enriched for BP/MF terms

related to amide formation (a component of peptide synthesis during translation) and ribosome

structure localized to the cytosolic ribosome and large ribosomal subunit (Fig. 7). Heritable DE

with adaptive effects on the plasticity of biomineralization was not enriched for GO terms.

370
Figure 7 | *Functional enrichment of differentially expressed genes with high heritability and strong absolute effects*
on the plasticity of body size. Enriched gene ontology (GO) terms are derived from a Mann Whitney U test of variation
in the product of differential expression's heritability (h^2) and DE's effect on adaptive plasticity of body size in
response to upwelling. Trees depict clustering of GO terms based on shared transcripts. Red GO terms are enriched
within heritable differential expression associated with adaptive reductions in body size in response to developmental
upwelling exposure. Blue terms are enriched within heritable differential expression associated with maladaptive
increases in body size under upwelling.

378
379
380

4. Discussion

3.1. Reduced heritability of transcriptional responses associated with adaptive plasticity – We observed that the transcriptome wide heritability of DE significantly decreased when DE was associated with adaptive, phenotypic responses to developmental conditioning under upwelling (Figures 4 – 5). This extent of genetic variation for DE, and its decline in DE associated with adaptive plasticity, confirms observations in other studies of plants (He et al., 2021) and animals (Campbell-Staton et al., 2021; Oostra et al., 2018). However, past research has assigned putatively adaptive and maladaptive roles to molecular responses based on prior findings. Here, we directly integrated gene expression plasticity with fitness measures. Quantifying cross-environment genetic correlations (a measure of genetic variance in plasticity) for gene expression in a tropical butterfly, Oostra et al. detected poor genetic variation for DE between two seasonal morphological phenotypes (Oostra et al., 2018). The authors proposed that minimal genetic variation for transcriptional plasticity resulted from a canalized response to a highly reliable seasonal cue (Oostra et al., 2018). Numerous studies have reported moderate-to-high genetic variation in DE measured as genotype x environment (GxE) interactions shaping expression in animals (Grishkevich & Yanai, 2013; Huang et al., 2020; McCairns et al., 2016). Oostra et al. provide one of the only measures of additive genetic variance in the reaction norm of gene expression rather than variance attributed to GxE. Thus, it is notable that V_A of DE that they detected is strikingly lower than what we observed here.

Multiple factors may contribute to high genetic variance and heritability for transcriptional plasticity under upwelling in *S. purpuratus*. *S. purpuratus* larvae are widely dispersed during their planktonic phase resulting in high connectivity across spatial scales and high genetic diversity within populations (Edmands et al., 1996; Palumbi & Wilson, 1990; Pespeni & Palumbi, 2013).

Its dispersal distances can be wide enough that larvae are frequently transported across areas of

major and minor upwelling in the California Current and Southern California Bight (Chan et al.,

2017; Pespeni & Palumbi, 2013; Zaytsev et al., 2003). *S. purpuratus* populations exhibit evidence

of local adaptation to regional differences in $p\mathrm{CO_2}$ despite high rates of gene flow (Evans et al.,

2013; Pespeni et al., 2013). These findings suggest that an individual population should possess

high genetic variation in trait means and/or plastic responses associated with coastal upwelling,

and that reductions in genetic variation of adaptive plasticity may occur due to selection. Lastly,

genetic variation is often more highly expressed under stressful conditions (Hoffmann et al., 1999).

We observed moderate-to-high levels of developmental abnormality in many larval crosses

indicative of a baseline level of stress across replicates brought on by parental conditioning or

stress incurred *in situ* prior to adult collection.

How V_A of DE covaries with its fitness effects is more poorly understood than genetic

variation in DE itself. Studying Anolis lizards, Campbell-Staton et al. found increased frequencies

of SNPs within *cis*-regulatory regions of genes associated with putatively maladaptive decreases

in CTmax under thermal stress. *Cis*-regulatory mutations proximal to genes with putatively

adaptive DE did not vary relative to genomic background. This study's design differed from our

own in that plasticity was measured at a population level – distinct genotypes were reared under

each treatment rather than single genotypes or families being split across treatments. Plasticity was

thus summarized as a mean change in phenotype in each population (Campbell-Staton et al., 2021).

Our study also expanded on Campbell-Staton's approach of putatively identifying adaptive DE by

directly measuring fitness in the same individuals that gene expression was characterized in.

Our findings are among the first to directly associate transcriptome-wide changes in gene

expression with phenotypic plasticity, genetic variation, and fitness effects. h^2 was high for DE

induced by upwelling, but it decreased for DE associated with adaptive phenotypic plasticity

(Figures 4 – 5). Our study cannot pinpoint specific genetic variants underpinning adaptive

plasticity, but two hypotheses are worth highlighting. Firstly, plastic responses that were adaptive

may incur strong positive or stabilizing selection in nature resulting in decreased genetic variance

(Price & Langen, 1992). This argument is similar to that made by Oostra et al. regarding fixed

levels of morphological plasticity within populations (Oostra et al., 2018). Theory also predicts

decreased genetic variance for plasticity caused by the fixation of plastic alleles in populations

inhabiting more variable environments that select for plasticity (Jong & Gavrilets, 2000).

Alternative hypotheses may explain reduced genetic variation in DE associated with adaptive

versus maladaptive plasticity, however

One hypothesis proposes that maladaptive plasticity stems from the expression of

deleterious cryptic genetic variants under novel environments that have were not subject to prior

negative selection (Acasuso-Rivero et al., 2019; R. F. Schneider & Meyer, 2017). Despite aiming

to experimentally simulate upwelling conditions, laboratory conditioning almost certainly

introduced *S. purpuratus* to novel environments. Secondly, populations subject to stabilizing

selection on a trait incur net negative fitness even when the phenotypic equals the fitness optimum

because deviation from that optimum imposes fitness costs (Brady et al., 2019; Burt, 1995; Hansen

et al., 2006). Therefore, reactions norms that possess high genetic variation and heritability may

be intrinsically likely to exhibit apparent negative directional selection on reaction norms when

selection is truly stabilizing.

Despite reductions in genetic variation for adaptive DE, substantial genetic variation and

heritability remained. If we assume responses to upwelling are under positive or stabilizing

selection for high plasticity in some populations, genetic variation for adaptive plasticity could be

maintained by fluctuating selection caused by (i) variation in the severity and frequency of coastal

upwelling across the wide range and dispersal distance of *S. purpuratus* (Chan et al., 2017; Kelly

et al., 2013) or (ii) the seasonal nature of upwelling intensity (Lynn & Simpson, 1987; Quilfen et

al., 2021). For example, Hallson et al. observed that lines of seed beetles reared under fluctuating

selection acting on thermal performance exhibited significantly greater genetic variance for

thermal plasticity of developmental rate after 18 generations of selection (Hallsson & Björklund,

2012). In summary, positive selection on DE may have caused its reduction in genetic variation,

but plastic alleles may not have fixed due to the variable and fluctuating landscape of upwelling

and its selective pressures across the range of *S. purpuratus*.

3.2. Functional enrichment within heritable, adaptive plasticity – Fitness benefits of

plasticity during developmental conditioning to upwelling can be contingent on whether affected

pathways are developmentally canalized – e.g., whether DE can be induced by any process other

than ontogeny (Siegal & Bergman, 2002). Under this framework, DE that compensates for

pathological deviations from developmentally canalized processes are expected to be more

associated with adaptive plasticity. Variation in ribosomal function during development bears

harmful effects on organismal function (Freed et al., 2010; Ordas et al., 2008), and multiple GO

terms enriched among transcripts differentially expressed in response to developmental upwelling

exposure were indicative of cellular responses to ribotoxic stress.

Heritable and adaptive changes in gene expression were enriched for GO terms associated

with ribosomal biogenesis while maladaptive, heritable DEGs retained enriched functions

indicative of ribotoxic stress such as downregulated ribosomal subunits (Fig. 7). Induced ribotoxic

stress can result in the downregulation of ribosomal subunits in tandem with HSF1's induction of

the cytosolic, 70 kda heat shock protein Hsc70 and Hsp40 chaperones (Albert et al., 2019). These

are the two classes of heat shock proteins that were upregulated in response to developmental

upwelling. However, hsp's were collectively split between being upregulated or downregulated in

response to upwelling, potentially due to positive correlations between the expression of some

chaperones and temperature, and thus require further scrutiny (Feder & Hofmann, 1999). Abiotic

stress can perturbate ribosomal function via denaturation of ribosomal proteins/RNAs or

misfolding of nascent proteins that disrupt proximal ribosomes (De & Mühlemann, 2022; Iordanov

et al., 1998). The extent to which ribosomal biogenesis and structure was overrepresented among

transcripts with heritable, (mal)adaptive plasticity suggests that maintenance of translation and

ribotoxic stress responses may be critical for acclimation and adaptation to upwelling.

3.3.Transgenerational effects reshape fitness consequences and genetic architecture of

adaptive transcriptional and phenotypic plasticity – The heritability of phenotypic plasticity, and

how this heritability covaries with its fitness effects, can impact the evolution of plasticity and the

traits it acts on (Fox et al., 2019; West-Eberhard, 2003). However, evolutionary biology has a

limited ability to predict when plasticity and its genetic variation is subject to selection (P. A.

Arnold et al., 2019; H. M. Schneider, 2022; Van Buskirk & Steiner, 2009). Under global change,

these ecological and evolutionary effects are important for predicting whether future climates will

drive canalization of tolerance or increase acclimatory potential via directional selection on

heritable plasticity (Svensson et al., 2020; Van ASCH et al., 2007). In this study, we observed that

transgenerational effects of parental conditioning to an ecologically relevant stressor modified the

fitness effects of phenotypic plasticity and the genetic architecture of associated regulatory

pathways. By reshaping the genetic (co)variation and fitness effects of phenotypic plasticity,

transgenerational effects may influence its evolution by natural selection.

Genetic variance-covariance matrices (G matrices) can constrain responses to selection in

multivariate trait space when genetic covariance or correlation between traits is strongly negative

(Agrawal & Stinchcombe, 2008). G matrices of absolute logFC values for differential expression

associated with plasticity demonstrated a high degree of positive genetic correlation. This suggests

that adaptive responses by some of the genetically correlated modules associated with adaptive

plasticity should positively correlate in response natural selection. Among DE associated with

adaptive plasticity in body size, genetic correlations between logFC values of thousands of genes

significantly shifted from negative to positive in offspring of upwelling-conditioned parents (Fig.

6). Environments can influence genetic correlations between traits by inducing or silencing the

expression of genetic variation underpinning those traits (Bogan & Yi, 2024; Wood & Brodie,

2015). For polygenic traits, this can lead to the expression of variants that share more positive or

more negative genetic correlation in a given environment. Effects of developmental environments

on genetic correlation have been reported in pairs of traits (Fischer et al., 2016; Sgrò & Hoffmann,

2004; Wood & Brodie, 2015). Our results reveal that not only developmental, but parental

environment, influences the expression of genetic variation and genetic correlations across

thousands of gene expression traits associated with phenotypic plasticity. Increases in positive

genetic correlation among DE associated with adaptive body size plasticity reduced genetic

tradeoffs that may constrain adaptive evolution (Fig. 6).

Upwelling-induced increases in positive genetic correlation (Fig. 6) coincided with an increase in phenotypic plasticity's fitness effects (Fig. 3). Natural selection on phenotypic plasticity requires that it imposes fitness costs or benefits that have been historically difficult to detect. Recently, plasticity's costs have been shown to be contingent on ecological and evolutionary contexts such as fluctuating environments (Schaum et al., 2022), differences between sexes and morphotypes (Hangartner et al., 2022; Svensson et al., 2020), and fitness trade-offs with between plasticity other traits (Bogan et al., 2024; van Heerwaarden & Kellermann, 2020). Our findings that the fitness costs of plasticity in larval biomineralization and body size depended on parental environment expands our knowledge of eco-evolutionary processes influencing plasticity's costs. To our knowledge, this is the first demonstration that parental environments influence the costs of phenotypic plasticity in offspring. Plasticity's fitness costs may have been exacerbated in larvae reared from upwelling-exposed parents due to resource limitation imposed by parental stress during conditioning. However, past work in *S. purpuratus* has shown that maternal conditioning to upwelling during gametogenesis does not alter egg size or protein content and improves lipid provisioning (Wong et al., 2018, 2019). This lipid provisioning may be insufficient to overcome resource limitation and the cost of allocation to plasticity in larvae that are developmentally and transgenerationally exposed to upwelling.

4. Conclusion

Understanding plasticity's fitness costs and genetic variation will improve predictions of adaptive responses by biodiversity to climate change. By leveraging RNA-seq integrated with measures of performance and fitness correlating traits, we resolved a transcriptome scale picture of heritability in the regulatory and physiological pathways that underpin adaptive and maladaptive

responses to an ecologically relevant stressor. In our case study of a pervasive coastal herbivore,

parental exposure to simulated upwelling increased the fitness effects of plastic responses to

upwelling by offspring and reduced negative genetic correlations between differentially expressed

genes associated with adaptive plasticity. Ecological and physiological research on *S. purpuratus*

has demonstrated a high level of resilience to environmental perturbations such as marine

heatwaves relative to other coastal fauna (Chamorro et al., 2023; Rogers-Bennett & Catton, 2019;

Smale, 2020) and potential local adaptation to upwelling (Kelly et al., 2013; Pespeni et al., 2013;

Pespeni & Palumbi, 2013). Our findings further support the potential for *S. purpuratus* to maintain

this resilience via evolution of phenotypic plasticity in multiple physiological pathways and

underscore the influence of transgenerational effects on plasticity's evolution. More broadly, they

reveal evolutionary roles of transgenerational effects as modulators of fitness landscapes and

genetic (co)variation driving evolution by natural selection.

5. Methods

5.1 Adult conditioning, crossing, and larval culture – Adult urchins were collected from 2

coastal sites in the Santa Barbara Channel in August and September of 2018: Naples Reef

(34.4221216, -119.95154) on August 23, 2018, and from Arroyo Quemado Reef (34.46774988, -

120.11905). Adults were distributed across 4 90 L tanks per parental treatment at a density of 10

urchins per tank. Adults acclimated to parental treatments for approximately 4 months: non-

upwelling = 17°C and 596 µatm $p\text{CO}_2$; upwelling = 12.8°C and 1117 µatm $p\text{CO}_2$. Flow rates to

adult tanks equaled 20 l h^{-1}. Adults were fed fresh *Macrocystis pyrifera ad libitum* with food

changes and tank cleanings conducted once per week. Seawater temperature was controlled using

heat pumps regulated by Nema 4X digital temperature controllers. pCO$_2$ was controlled using a

flow-through CO$_2$ mixing system adapted from Fangue *et al.* (Fangue et al., 2010).

Fertilizations were conducted using a staggered cross-classified North Carolina II breeding

design. During each phase of the staggered cross, 2 males and 2 females from a common adult

condition were reciprocally crossed and their resulting offspring were cultured under non-

upwelling and upwelling conditions until the prism stage of larval development. Each cross x larval

treatment group was reared using 2 technical replicate culture buckets, resulting in 16 larval

cultures per staggered cross. This process was repeated 5x for non-upwelling and upwelling

crosses, alternating in order between parental treatments, resulting in 40 crosses reared across 160

technical replicates and 80 biological replicates (Fig. 1A).

Larvae were cultured in replicate flow-through 6 L nested buckets (i.e., an inner bucket

with 30 µM mesh openings nested in an exterior bucket) at a flow rate of 3 L h^{-1} and a density of

10 larvae ml^{-1} until the early prism stage of larval development signified by the onset of tripartite

gut differentiation. Temperature and pH were regulated in larval culture buckets as described

above for adult conditioning. Point measures of temperature, salinity, total alkalinity, and pH for

adult and larval tanks are described by Strader et al. 2022.

5.2. Phenotyping of performance and fitness-correlated traits – Three phenotypes were

measured in larval cultures: (i) percent developmental abnormality (a corollary of survival), (ii)

larval body size, and (iii) spicule length per unit body size (a corollary of biomineralization).

Morphometric measurements of body size and spicule length were performed on $n \geq 30$ larvae per

technical replicated stored in 2% formalin buffered with 100 mM NaBO$_3$ (pH 8.7) in filtered sea

water. Body size was defined as the maximum linear distance of a prism body and spicule length

defined as length from the tip of the body rod to the branching point of the post-oral rod.

Abnormality was scored on $n \geq 30$ larvae during sampling and was measured as the percentage of

larvae exhibiting unsuccessful gastrulation. Because RNA-seq was performed using pooled RNA

samples per culture, performance and fitness-correlating phenotypes were integrated with gene

expression data using culture means rather than per-animal values.

5.3. RNA extraction, sequencing, and bioinformatic processing – Total RNA was extracted

with Trizol from pooled samples of 6,000 larvae per culture replicate. Extractions were performed

on 1 technical replicate per cross x developmental treatment resulting in 80 RNA extractions. Total

RNA quantity and quality was evaluated via Nanodrop, gel electrophoresis, and Qubit

quantification before library preparation. RNA-seq libraries were prepared using polyA

enrichment and were quality checked via LabChip GX. Strand specific PE 150 bp reads were

sequenced on an Illumina HiSeq 4000 platform.

Illumina Universal Adapters were removed from paired end reads using CutAdapt v4.4

(Martin, 2011) and reads were trimmed and quality filtered using Trimmomatic v0.39 set to paired

end mode, trailing and leading clip = 3, sliding window = 4:15, minimum length = 36, and

headcrop = 10 (Bolger et al., 2014). All trimmed reads passed quality check via FastQC v0.12.1

(Andrews, n.d.). Forward strands of paired reads were aligned to the 'Spur_5.1' reference genome

assembly (Sodergren et al., 2006) using hisat2 v2.2.1 (D. Kim et al., 2019). Forward rather than

paired reads were aligned to increase the number of genes included in the dataset after filtering for

read count. Resulting SAM alignments were sorted and converted to BAM using SAMtools v1.6

(H. Li et al., 2009). Reads were counted per transcript from sorted BAM files using featureCounts

v1.6.3 input with the 'Spur_5.1' gtf annotation set to a MAPQ alignment quality cutoff of 10 (Liao

et al., 2014). Read counts were performed with transcript annotations rather than genes to ensure

accurate estimation of additive genetic variation for transcriptional traits, which may vary between

transcript isoforms. Transcripts of the same parent gene made up 9.14% of the final filtered data

set used for differential expression analysis and quantitative genetic models. DE transcripts

associated with adaptive plasticity in larval body size and biomineralization included 0 pairs of

transcript isoforms of the same parent gene, avoiding any confounds of genetic correlation.

5.4 Tests of differential expression – Transcript read counts were normalized in edgeR

v3.40.2 as counts per million (CPM). Read counts were filtered to keep all transcripts exhibiting

CPM > 0.5 in at least 75% of the 80 replicates. Differential expression (DE) was modeled using a

negative binomial generalized linear model (glm) fitted with edgeR's robust, tagwise dispersion

parameter using the robust iteration of the model fitting function 'GLMQLFit' and the DE test

function 'GLMQLFTest' (Robinson et al., 2010). Expression was predicted as a function of two

non-interacting, categorical variables for parental and developmental environment. Models were

fit with non-interacting environmental predictors because the study's design only enabled the

measurement of V_A for developmental rather than transgenerational plasticity. Fitting an

interaction between both effects would confound interpretation of V_A for developmental plasticity.

Significant DE was evaluated using FDR adjusted p-values (alpha < 0.05). Functional enrichment

was tested using a rank-based Mann Whitney U test of Gene Ontology terms input with logFC

coefficients for DE. This test determines whether a given GO term's logFC distribution is

significantly skewed from the mean of the background, filtered transcriptome (Wright et al., 2015).

5.5 Measuring the adaptive differential expression – The effect of DE on the plasticity of

body size and biomineralization (body size-normalized spicule length) was measured using

structural equation models (SEMs). SEMs were derived from two linear models: (i) phenotype

predicted as a function of transcript abundance, developmental environment, and parental

environment and (ii) scaled, signed transcript abundance predicted as a function of developmental

and parental environments. Scaled transcript abundance was signed such that samples with low

expression resulting in a negative scaled value were multiplied by the direction of the transcript's

DE under upwelling. The effect of developmental environment on phenotype mediated by DE was

estimated for each transcript using mediation analysis performed with the 'mediate' function of

the R package mediation v4.5.0 set to 1000 simulations (Tingley et al., 2014). Positive mediation

effects indicated that changes in gene expression in the direction of DE were associated with higher

levels of body size or biomineralization under upwelling. Negative mediation effects indicated that

DE was associated with reduced phenotypic values under upwelling. To understand how the

strength of DE impacted phenotypic outcomes, linear regressions were performed between

transcriptome wide, absolute logFC and a second-order, quadratic polynomial for the phenotypic

effects output by SEM.

The fitness costs and benefits of plasticity in body size and biomineralization were

measured using a Lande & Arnold selection gradient model (Lande & Arnold, 1983) as described

in Chapter Two, whereby a fitness correlated trait (proportion of normal development, a larval

corollary of survival) was modeled as a function of developmental and parental environment, body

size or biomineralization per cross in each environment, and the plasticity of body size or

biomineralization of a cross between developmental environments. Selection gradient models

included a random effect identifying each cross and controlling for genetic covariance using a

relatedness matrix generated from custom code (see https://github.com/snbogan/QG_Purp_RNA)

such that offspring-parent relatedness equals 0.5, full-sibling relatedness equals 0.5, half sibling

relatedness equals 0.25, and unrelated cohorts share a relatedness of 0.

Selection gradient models were fitted in brms v2.19.6 (Bürkner, 2017), an R interface to

the Bayesian programming language Stan (Carpenter et al., 2017). Models assumed uniform

priors, employed 40,000 MCMC iterations with a 5,000 iteration warm up, and a beta-distributed

generalized linear regression model family. Beta distribution was selected because the proportion

of normal development is constrained between 0 and 1. A Bayesian approach was selected for

fitting because of the flexibility of packages such as brms for accommodating relatedness matrices

within a beta distributed model family. These selection gradient models predicted whether positive

versus negative plasticity of larval body size and biomineralization promoted greater fitness under

upwelling stress. The significance of fitness effects were tested using probability of direction,

which determines whether the $\geq 95\%$ of posterior distribution falls above or below 0 (Makowski

et al., 2019). Selection gradient coefficients were then multiplied with the phenotypic effects of

DE on plasticity for body size and biomineralization to calculate the associated fitness effect of

transcriptional plasticity.

5.6 Estimating the heritability of gene expression and its plasticity – V_A for gene expression

and DE were measured across all transcripts using animal models fit with the 'relmatLmer'

function of the R package lme4qtl v0.2.2 (Ziyatdinov et al., 2018). Within animal models, DE was

measured as the foldchange of gene expression across developmental environment for a given

cross. Mean-standardized CPM (gene expression) was predicted as a function of fixed effects for

developmental and parental environment, random effects for dam and sire, and a random effect for

cross identity. Genetic covariance between crosses was estimated using the relatedness matrix

described above. Mean-standardized DE fold changes were predicted using an identical animal

model lacking a fixed effect for developmental environment. h^2 was derived from each model as

the heritable proportion of total variance in gene expression or DE. Differences in h^2 of baseline

gene expression and gene expression were modeled transcriptome wide using a beta distributed

glm fitted using the R package betareg v3.1-4 (Grün et al., 2012).

Covariation between DE's heritability and adaptive, phenotypic effects were modelled

using three different approaches addressing the questions (i) 'Does the probability of heritability

($h^2 \geq 0.2$) vary as a function of DE's effect on adaptive plasticity in body size or

biomineralization?', (ii) 'Does total heritability (h^2 as a continuous variable) vary as a function of

DE's phenotypic effects?', and (iii) 'Does total heritability vary according to the fitness costs of

DE's combined effect on plasticity in body size and biomineralization?'. Tests of questions i and

ii were performed by modelling the probability of $h^2 \geq 0.2$ using binomial glm's. Continuous h^2

was modeled as a beta-distributed glm. Each model type fitted two continuous predictor variables

for the phenotypic effect of DE on body size and biomineralization signed toward the adaptive

direction of that effect under parental upwelling, which induced yielded fitness effects of plasticity

as opposed to neutral effects under parental non-upwelling. Models of continuous h^2 set parameters

for DE's phenotypic effects as a second order polynomial to accommodate non-linear variation in

h^2 across the parameter space. For question iii, DE's total effect on adaptive plasticity was

calculated as the summation of the SEM-predicted coefficient for DE of transcript i's effect (E) on

body size (S) and biomineralization (B) multiplied by the selection gradient (β) acting on each

plastic trait under upwelling, such that adaptive plasticity associated with transcript $i = (E_{S,i} \times \beta_{S,i})$

$+ (E_{B,i} \times \beta_{B,i})$. Covariance between DE h^2 and its total adaptive effect on plasticity was modeled

using a beta-distributed glm in the R package betareg v3.1-4 (Grün et al., 2012).

5.7. Estimating G matrices – Genetic variance-covariance matrices of absolute logFC

values for DE associated with adaptive plasticity in larval body size and biomineralization were

estimated by fitting multivariate animal models representing all possible pairs of DEGs in each

group. Additive genetic variance in each absolute logFC trait and covariances between pairs were

extracted from the multivariate models and assembled into *n*-by-*n* variance-covariance matrices,

where *n* equals the number of DEGs associated with adaptive plasticity in body size or

biomineralization. Genetic variance-covariance matrices were then converted to correlation

matrices using the cov2corr() function of R 'stats' v4.2.2. The number of genetically-correlated

modules of adaptive plasticity-associated DEGs was estimated from *G* matrices using hierarchical

clustering of genetic distances (1 – genetic correlation). A distance threshold of < 0.5 was used to

assign DEGs to their shared modules. Hierarchical clustering was performed using the hclust()

function of R stats v4.2.2.

Variation in logFC *G* matrices between larvae of upwelling and non-upwelling parents was

quantified. First, two multivariate animal models fitted with pedigrees of parental non-upwelling

or parental upwelling families were fitted for all pairs of genes with DE associated with adaptive

plasticity in larval body size or biomineralization. As described above, genetic (co)variances from

each model were used to populate parental upwelling and non-upwelling *G* matrices which were

converted to correlation matrices. Significant differences in correlation matrix structure between

parental treatments were evaluated using a three-step approach. Two-sided Mantel tests were used

to compare parental environment matrices, applying separate tests to logFC associated with

adaptive plasticity in body size and adaptive biomineralization plasticity. Mantel tests were run

using the mantel.test() function of the R package 'ape' v5.8 using 10,000 iterations (Paradis et al.,

2004; Paradis & Schliep, 2019). Next, a chi-squared test was used to determine if the number of

negative-to-positive changes in genetic correlation under upwelling relative to positive-to-negative

changes was greater than expected by chance.

To determine whether significant enrichment in negative-to-positive changes in genetic

correlation was attributed to parental environment or the pedigree structure of populations in

parental treatment groups (i.e., differences in genetic (co)variance between animals used in each

treatment), random permutations of the experimental pedigree were constructed. These

permutations split the pedigree into two halves which evenly represented families of parental

treatment groups. Random permutations of split pedigrees were input into animal models and

resulting G matrices. Chi-squared tests of enrichment for directional changes in genetic correlation

between permuted matrices were performed, which determined the effect of pedigree structure on

apparent effects of parental environment on genetic correlations. In Results, enrichment of

directional changes in genetic correlation between parental environment are reported alongside the

percentage of these effects that were attributed to pedigree structure rather than treatment.

Acknowledgements

We thank Juliet Wong, Logan Kozal, Terence Leach, Jannine Chamorro, Maddie Housh,

and Olivia Simon for their assistance in adult conditioning and experimental culturing. We thank

Matthew Wolak, Katie Lotterhos, Steven Roberts, Yaamini Venkataraman, and Alan Downey-Wall

for his insights on quantitative genetic and transcriptomic analyses. This research was funded by

United States National Science Foundation awards IOS-1656262 and OPP-2053726 to GEH.

Diving and boating resources were provided by Santa Barbara Coastal Long Term Ecological

Research program (NSF award OCE-1831937; Director: Dr. Robert Miller).

Data availability

Raw RNA-seq data are available on the Short Read Archive under Bioproject PRJNA1169019. All phenotypic data, pedigree data, and code are hosted on the Github repository https://github.com/snbogan/QG_Purp_RNA. An archived copy of this Github repository is available on Zenodo under the DOI [will be produced upon acceptance].

Author Contributions

SNB, MS, and GEH conceived of the aims and scope of the study. MS led experimental design and phenotyping. GEH assisted SB assisted with experimental culturing. SB and MS assisted with seawater chemistry and phenotyping. SB performed RNA extractions, oversaw sequencing, bioinformatics, and all statistical analyses. SB wrote the manuscript. All authors edited and revised the manuscript.

Declarations

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

Acasuso-Rivero, C., Murren, C. J., Schlichting, C. D., & Steiner, U. K. (2019). Adaptive

phenotypic plasticity for life-history and less fitness-related traits. *Proceedings of the*

Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, *286*(1904), 20190653.

https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2019.0653

Agrawal, A. F., & Stinchcombe, J. R. (2008). How much do genetic covariances alter the rate of

adaptation? *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *276*(1659), 1183–

1191. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2008.1671

Albert, B., Kos-Braun, I. C., Henras, A. K., Dez, C., Rueda, M. P., Zhang, X., Gadal, O., Kos,

M., & Shore, D. (2019). A ribosome assembly stress response regulates transcription to

maintain proteome homeostasis. *eLife*, *8*, e45002. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.45002

Andrews, S. R. (n.d.). *Babraham Bioinformatics—FastQC A Quality Control tool for High*

Throughput Sequence Data. Retrieved July 7, 2023, from

https://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/

Arnold, P. A., Nicotra, A. B., & Kruuk, L. E. B. (2019). Sparse evidence for selection on

phenotypic plasticity in response to temperature. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*

Society B, *374*(1768), 20180185. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2018.0185

Arnold, S. J., Pfrender, M. E., & Jones, A. G. (2001). The adaptive landscape as a conceptual

bridge between micro- and macroevolution. *Genetica*, *112*(1), 9–32.

https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1013373907708

Bitter, M. C., Wong, J. M., Dam, H. G., Donelan, S. C., Kenkel, C. D., Komoroske, L. M.,

Nickols, K. J., Rivest, E. B., Salinas, S., Burgess, S. C., & Lotterhos, K. E. (2021).

Fluctuating selection and global change: A synthesis and review on disentangling the

roles of climate amplitude, predictability and novelty. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, *288*(1957), 20210727. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2021.0727

Blows, M. W., Allen, S. L., Collet, J. M., Chenoweth, S. F., & McGuigan, K. (2015). The Phenome-Wide Distribution of Genetic Variance. *The American Naturalist*, *186*(1), 15–30. https://doi.org/10.1086/681645

Bogan, S. N., Porat, O. I., Meneses, M. J., & Hofmann, G. E. (2024). Thermal plasticity has higher fitness costs among thermally tolerant genotypes of Tigriopus californicus. *Functional Ecology*, *38*(7), 1562–1577. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.14568

Bogan, S. N., Strader, M. E., & Hofmann, G. E. (2023). Associations between DNA methylation and gene regulation depend on chromatin accessibility during transgenerational plasticity. *BMC Biol*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12915-023-01645-8

Bogan, S. N., & Yi, S. V. (2024). Potential Role of DNA Methylation as a Driver of Plastic Responses to the Environment Across Cells, Organisms, and Populations. *Genome Biology and Evolution*, *16*(2), evae022. https://doi.org/10.1093/gbe/evae022

Bolger, A. M., Lohse, M., & Usadel, B. (2014). Trimmomatic: A flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data. *Bioinformatics*, *30*(15), 2114–2120. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btu170

Bonamour, S., Chevin, L.-M., Charmantier, A., & Teplitsky, C. (2019). Phenotypic plasticity in response to climate change: The importance of cue variation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *374*(1768), 20180178. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2018.0178

Bozinovic, F., & Pörtner, H.-O. (2015). Physiological ecology meets climate change. *Ecology and Evolution*, *5*(5), 1025–1030. https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.1403

Brady, S. P., Bolnick, D. I., Angert, A. L., Gonzalez, A., Barrett, R. D. H., Crispo, E., Derry, A. M., Eckert, C. G., Fraser, D. J., Fussmann, G. F., Guichard, F., Lamy, T., McAdam, A. G., Newman, A. E. M., Paccard, A., Rolshausen, G., Simons, A. M., & Hendry, A. P. (2019). Causes of maladaptation. *Evolutionary Applications*, *12*(7), 1229–1242. https://doi.org/10.1111/eva.12844

Brennan, R. S., deMayo, J. A., Dam, H. G., Finiguerra, M. B., Baumann, H., & Pespeni, M. H. (2022). Loss of transcriptional plasticity but sustained adaptive capacity after adaptation to global change conditions in a marine copepod. *Nature Communications*, *13*(1), 1147. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-28742-6

Bürkner, P.-C. (2017). brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *80*, 1–28. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v080.i01

Burt, A. (1995). The Evolution of Fitness. *Evolution*, *49*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.1995.tb05954.x

Campbell-Staton, S. C., Velotta, J. P., & Winchell, K. M. (2021). Selection on adaptive and maladaptive gene expression plasticity during thermal adaptation to urban heat islands. *Nature Communications*, *12*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-26334-4

Carpenter, B., Gelman, A., Hoffman, M. D., Lee, D., Goodrich, B., Betancourt, M., Brubaker, M., Guo, J., Li, P., & Riddell, A. (2017). Stan: A Probabilistic Programming Language. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *76*, 1–32. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v076.i01

Chamorro, J. D., Macdonald, A. M., & Hofmann, G. E. (2023). Transgenerational plasticity as a mechanism of response to marine heatwaves in the purple sea urchin, *Strongylocentrotus purpuratus*. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2023.1212781

Chan, F., Barth, J. A., Blanchette, C. A., Byrne, R. H., Chavez, F., Cheriton, O., Feely, R. A.,

Friederich, G., Gaylord, B., & Gouhier, T. (2017). Persistent spatial structuring of coastal

ocean acidification in the California Current System. *Scientific Reports*, *7*(1), 2526.

Chevin, L.-M., & Hoffmann, A. A. (2017). Evolution of phenotypic plasticity in extreme

environments. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*,

372(1723), 20160138. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2016.0138

Corl, A., Bi, K., Luke, C., Challa, A. S., Stern, A. J., Sinervo, B., & Nielsen, R. (2018). The

Genetic Basis of Adaptation following Plastic Changes in Coloration in a Novel

Environment. *Current Biology*, *28*(18), 2970-2977.e7.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2018.06.075

Crispo, E. (2007). THE BALDWIN EFFECT AND GENETIC ASSIMILATION: REVISITING

TWO MECHANISMS OF EVOLUTIONARY CHANGE MEDIATED BY

PHENOTYPIC PLASTICITY. *Evolution*, *61*(11), 2469–2479.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2007.00203.x

de Miguel, M., Rodríguez-Quilón, I., Heuertz, M., Hurel, A., Grivet, D., Jaramillo-Correa, J. P.,

Vendramin, G. G., Plomion, C., Majada, J., Alía, R., Eckert, A. J., & González-Martínez,

S. C. (2022). Polygenic adaptation and negative selection across traits, years and

environments in a long-lived plant species (Pinus pinaster Ait., Pinaceae). *Molecular*

Ecology, *31*(7), 2089–2105. https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.16367

De, S., & Mühlemann, O. (2022). A comprehensive coverage insurance for cells: Revealing links

between ribosome collisions, stress responses and mRNA surveillance. *RNA Biology*,

19(1), 609–621. https://doi.org/10.1080/15476286.2022.2065116

Donelan, S. C., Hellmann, J. K., Bell, A. M., Luttbeg, B., Orrock, J. L., Sheriff, M. J., & Sih, A.

(2020). Transgenerational Plasticity in Human-Altered Environments. *Trends in Ecology*

& Evolution, *35*(2), 115–124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2019.09.003

Donelson, J. M., Gaitan-Espitia, J. D., Hobday, A. J., Mokany, K., Andrew, S. C., Boulter, S.,

Cook, C. N., Dickson, F., Macgregor, N. A., Mitchell, N. J., Pickup, M., & Fox, R. J.

(2023). Putting plasticity into practice for effective conservation actions under climate

change. *Nature Climate Change*, *13*(7), Article 7. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-023-

01706-4

Donelson, J. M., Salinas, S., Munday, P. L., & Shama, L. N. S. (2018). Transgenerational

plasticity and climate change experiments: Where do we go from here? *Glob. Chang.*

Biol., *24*(1), 13–34.

Dore, A. A., McDowall, L., Rouse, J., Bretman, A., Gage, M. J. G., & Chapman, T. (2018). The

role of complex cues in social and reproductive plasticity. *Behavioral Ecology and*

Sociobiology, *72*(8), 124. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-018-2539-x

Durmowicz, A. G., Hofmeister, S., Kadyraliev, T. K., Aldashev, A. A., & Stenmark, K. R. (1993).

Functional and structural adaptation of the yak pulmonary circulation to residence at high

altitude. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, *74*(5), 2276–2285.

https://doi.org/10.1152/jappl.1993.74.5.2276

Edmands, S., Moberg, P. E., & Burton, R. S. (1996). Allozyme and mitochondrial DNA evidence

of population subdivision in the purple sea urchin Strongylocentrotus purpuratus. *Marine*

Biology, *126*(3), 443–450. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00354626

Evans, T. G., Chan, F., Menge, B. A., & Hofmann, G. E. (2013). Transcriptomic responses to

ocean acidification in larval sea urchins from a naturally variable pH environment. *Mol.*

Ecol., *22*(6), 1609–1625.

Evans, T. G., & Hofmann, G. E. (2012). Defining the limits of physiological plasticity: How

gene expression can assess and predict the consequences of ocean change. *Philosophical*

Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, *367*(1596), 1733–1745.

https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2012.0019

Fangue, N. A., O'Donnell, M. J., Sewell, M. A., Matson, P. G., MacPherson, A. C., & Hofmann,

G. E. (2010). A laboratory-based, experimental system for the study of ocean

acidification effects on marine invertebrate larvae. *Limnol. Oceanogr. Methods*, *8*(8),

441–452.

Feder, M. E., & Hofmann, G. E. (1999). HEAT-SHOCK PROTEINS, MOLECULAR

CHAPERONES, AND THE STRESS RESPONSE: Evolutionary and Ecological

Physiology. *Annual Review of Physiology*, *61*(1), 243–282.

https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.physiol.61.1.243

Fischer, E. K., Ghalambor, C. K., & Hoke, K. L. (2016). Plasticity and evolution in correlated

suites of traits. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, *29*(5), 991–1002.

https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.12839

Fox, R. J., Donelson, J. M., Schunter, C., Ravasi, T., & Gaitán-Espitia, J. D. (2019). Beyond

buying time: The role of plasticity in phenotypic adaptation to rapid environmental

change. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*,

374(1768), 20180174. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2018.0174

Freed, E. F., Bleichert, F., Dutca, L. M., & Baserga, S. J. (2010). When ribosomes go bad:

Diseases of ribosome biogenesis. *Molecular BioSystems*, *6*(3), 481–493.

https://doi.org/10.1039/B919670F

Ghalambor, C. K., McKAY, J. K., Carroll, S. P., & Reznick, D. N. (2007). Adaptive versus non-

adaptive phenotypic plasticity and the potential for contemporary adaptation in new

environments. *Functional Ecology*, *21*(3), 394–407. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-

2435.2007.01283.x

Grishkevich, V., & Yanai, I. (2013). The genomic determinants of genotype × environment

interactions in gene expression. *Trends in Genetics*, *29*(8), 479–487.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tig.2013.05.006

Gruber, N., Hauri, C., Lachkar, Z., Loher, D., Frölicher, T. L., & Plattner, G.-K. (2012). Rapid

Progression of Ocean Acidification in the California Current System. *Science*, *337*(6091),

220–223. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1216773

Grün, B., Kosmidis, I., & Zeileis, A. (2012). Extended Beta Regression in R: Shaken, Stirred,

Mixed, and Partitioned. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *48*, 1–25.

https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i11

Hallsson, L. R., & Björklund, M. (2012). Selection in a fluctuating environment leads to

decreased genetic variation and facilitates the evolution of phenotypic plasticity. *Journal*

of Evolutionary Biology, *25*(7), 1275–1290. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-

9101.2012.02512.x

Hangartner, S., Sgrò, C. M., Connallon, T., & Booksmythe, I. (2022). Sexual dimorphism in

phenotypic plasticity and persistence under environmental change: An extension of

theory and meta-analysis of current data. *Ecology Letters*, *25*(6), 1550–1565.

https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.14005

Hansen, T. F., Carter, A. J. R., & Pélabon, C. (2006). On Adaptive Accuracy and Precision in

Natural Populations. *The American Naturalist*, *168*(2), 168–181.

https://doi.org/10.1086/505768

He, F., Steige, K. A., Kovacova, V., Göbel, U., Bouzid, M., Keightley, P. D., Beyer, A., & de

Meaux, J. (2021). Cis-regulatory evolution spotlights species differences in the adaptive

potential of gene expression plasticity. *Nature Communications*, *12*(1), 3376.

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-23558-2

Hekerman, P., Zeidler, J., Bamberg-Lemper, S., Knobelspies, H., Lavens, D., Tavernier, J., Joost,

H.-G., & Becker, W. (2005). Pleiotropy of leptin receptor signalling is defined by distinct

roles of the intracellular tyrosines. *The FEBS Journal*, *272*(1), 109–119.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1432-1033.2004.04391.x

Hendry, A. P. (2016). Key questions on the role of phenotypic plasticity in eco-evolutionary

dynamics. *Journal of Heredity*, *107*(1), 25–41. https://doi.org/10.1093/jhered/esv060

Hoffmann, A. A., Merilä, J., Hoffmann, A. A., & Merilä, J. (1999). Heritable variation and

evolution under favourable and unfavourable conditions. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*,

14(3), 96–101. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(99)01595-5

Hofmann, G. E., & Todgham, A. E. (2010). Living in the Now: Physiological Mechanisms to

Tolerate a Rapidly Changing Environment. *Annual Review of Physiology*, *72*(1), 127–

145. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-physiol-021909-135900

Huang, W., Carbone, M. A., Lyman, R. F., Anholt, R. R. H., & Mackay, T. F. C. (2020).

Genotype by environment interaction for gene expression in Drosophila melanogaster.

Nature Communications, *11*(1), 5451. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19131-y

Huyer, A. (1983). Coastal upwelling in the California current system. *Progress in Oceanography*,

12(3), 259–284. https://doi.org/10.1016/0079-6611(83)90010-1

Iordanov, M. S., Pribnow, D., Magun, J. L., Dinh, T.-H., Pearson, J. A., & Magun, B. E. (1998).

Ultraviolet Radiation Triggers the Ribotoxic Stress Response in Mammalian Cells *.

Journal of Biological Chemistry, *273*(25), 15794–15803.

https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.273.25.15794

Jong, G. de, & Gavrilets, S. (2000). Maintenance of genetic variation in phenotypic plasticity:

The role of environmental variation. *Genetics Research*, *76*(3), 295–304.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0016672300004729

Kauffmann, A., Gentleman, R., & Huber, W. (2009). arrayQualityMetrics—A bioconductor

package for quality assessment of microarray data. *Bioinformatics*, *25*(3), 415–416.

https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btn647

Kelly, M. W. (2019). Adaptation to climate change through genetic accommodation and

assimilation of plastic phenotypes. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:*

Biological Sciences, *374*(1768), 20180176. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2018.0176

Kelly, M. W., Padilla-Gamiño, J. L., & Hofmann, G. E. (2013). Natural variation and the

capacity to adapt to ocean acidification in the keystone sea urchin *Strongylocentrotus*

purpuratus. *Glob. Chang. Biol.*, *19*(8), 2536–2546.

Kim, D., Paggi, J. M., Park, C., Bennett, C., & Salzberg, S. L. (2019). Graph-based genome

964   alignment and genotyping with HISAT2 and HISAT-genotype. *Nature Biotechnology*,

965   *37*(8), Article 8. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41587-019-0201-4

966   Kim, S.-Y., Metcalfe, N. B., & Velando, A. (2016). A benign juvenile environment reduces the

967   strength of antagonistic pleiotropy and genetic variation in the rate of senescence.

968   *Journal of Animal Ecology*, *85*(3), 705–714. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12468

969   Kingsolver, J. G., & Gomulkiewicz, R. (2003). Environmental Variation and Selection on

970   Performance Curves1. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, *43*(3), 470–477.

971   https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/43.3.470

972   Kline, R. B. (2015). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling, fourth edition*.

973   Guilford Publications.

974   Kovuri, P., Yadav, A., & Sinha, H. (2023). Role of genetic architecture in phenotypic plasticity.

975   *Trends in Genetics*, *0*(0). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tig.2023.04.002

976   Lande, R., & Arnold, S. J. (1983). The measurement of selection on correlated characters.

977   *Evolution*, *37*(6), 1210–1226. https://doi.org/10.2307/2408842

978   Li, H., Handsaker, B., Wysoker, A., Fennell, T., Ruan, J., Homer, N., Marth, G., Abecasis, G.,

979   Durbin, R., & 1000 Genome Project Data Processing Subgroup. (2009). The Sequence

980   Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics*, *25*(16), 2078–2079.

981   https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btp352

982   Li, X., Guo, T., Mu, Q., Li, X., & Yu, J. (2018). Genomic and environmental determinants and

983   their interplay underlying phenotypic plasticity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*

984   *Sciences*, *115*(26), 6679–6684. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1718326115

Liao, Y., Smyth, G. K., & Shi, W. (2014). featureCounts: An efficient general purpose program

for assigning sequence reads to genomic features. *Bioinformatics*, *30*(7), 923–930.

https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btt656

Liu, N., Du, Y., Warburton, M. L., Xiao, Y., & Yan, J. (2021). Phenotypic Plasticity Contributes

to Maize Adaptation and Heterosis. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, *38*(4), 1262–1275.

https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msaa283

Lynn, R., & Simpson, J. (1987). The California Current System—The Seasonal Variability of Its

Physical Characteristics. *JOURNAL OF GEOPHYSICAL RESEARCH-OCEANS*,

92(C12), 12947-. https://doi.org/10.1029/JC092iC12p12947

Makowski, D., Ben-Shachar, M. S., Chen, S. H. A., & Lüdecke, D. (2019). Indices of Effect

Existence and Significance in the Bayesian Framework. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*.

https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02767

Martin, M. (2011). Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads.

EMBnet.Journal, *17*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.14806/ej.17.1.200

Martyniuk, C. J. (2020). Perspectives on transcriptomics in animal physiology studies.

Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part B: Biochemistry and Molecular Biology,

250, 110490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpb.2020.110490

Mauro, A. A., & Ghalambor, C. K. (2020). Trade-offs, Pleiotropy, and Shared Molecular

Pathways: A Unified View of Constraints on Adaptation. *Integrative and Comparative*

Biology, *60*(2), 332–347. https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icaa056

McCairns, R. J. S., Smith, S., Sasaki, M., Bernatchez, L., & Beheregaray, L. B. (2016). The

adaptive potential of subtropical rainbowfish in the face of climate change: Heritability

and heritable plasticity for the expression of candidate genes. *Evolutionary Applications*, *9*(4), 531–545. https://doi.org/10.1111/eva.12363

Million, W. C., Ruggeri, M., O'Donnell, S., Bartels, E., Conn, T., Krediet, C. J., & Kenkel, C. D. (2022). Evidence for adaptive morphological plasticity in the Caribbean coral, *Acropora cervicornis*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *119*(49), e2203925119. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2203925119

Morris, M. R. J., & Rogers, S. M. (2013). Overcoming maladaptive plasticity through plastic compensation. *Current Zoology*, *59*(4), 526–536. https://doi.org/10.1093/czoolo/59.4.526

Nguyen Ba, A. N., Lawrence, K. R., Rego-Costa, A., Gopalakrishnan, S., Temko, D., Michor, F., & Desai, M. M. (2022). Barcoded bulk QTL mapping reveals highly polygenic and epistatic architecture of complex traits in yeast. *eLife*, *11*, e73983. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.73983

Oostra, V., Saastamoinen, M., Zwaan, B. J., & Wheat, C. W. (2018). Strong phenotypic plasticity limits potential for evolutionary responses to climate change. *Nature Communications*, *9*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-03384-9

Ordas, B., Malvar, R. A., & Hill, W. G. (2008). Genetic variation and quantitative trait loci associated with developmental stability and the environmental correlation between traits in maize. *Genetics Research*, *90*(5), 385–395. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0016672308009762

Orton, T. J. (2020). Chapter 3—Review of Genetics (From The Perspective of A Plant Breeder). In T. J. Orton (Ed.), *Horticultural Plant Breeding* (pp. 39–71). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-815396-3.00003-2

Palumbi, S. R., & Wilson, A. C. (1990). Mitochondrial Dna Diversity in the Sea Urchins

Strongylocentrotus Purpuratus and S. Droebachiensis. *Evolution*, *44*(2), 403–415.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.1990.tb05208.x

Paradis, E., Claude, J., & Strimmer, K. (2004). APE: Analyses of Phylogenetics and Evolution in

R language. *Bioinformatics*, *20*(2), 289–290.

https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btg412

Paradis, E., & Schliep, K. (2019). ape 5.0: An environment for modern phylogenetics and

evolutionary analyses in R. *Bioinformatics*, *35*(3), 526–528.

https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bty633

Pearse, J. S. (2006). Ecological role of purple sea urchins. *Science*, *314*(5801), 940–941.

https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1131888

Pespeni, M. H., Chan, F., Menge, B. A., & Palumbi, S. R. (2013). Signs of adaptation to local pH

conditions across an environmental mosaic in the California Current Ecosystem. *Integr.*

Comp. Biol., *53*(5), 857–870.

Pespeni, M. H., & Palumbi, S. R. (2013). Signals of selection in outlier loci in a widely

dispersing species across an environmental mosaic. *Mol. Ecol.*, *22*(13), 3580–3597.

Petino Zappala, M. A., Mensch, J., Carreira, V., Soto, I., & Fanara, J. J. (2024). Genome Wide

Association Studies of Early Fitness Traits in Drosophila melanogaster Unveil Plasticity

and Decoupling of Different Aspects of Phenotype. *Evolutionary Biology*, *51*(1), 69–81.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s11692-023-09619-y

Price, T., & Langen, T. (1992). Evolution of correlated characters. *Trends in Ecology &*

Evolution, *7*(9), 307–310. https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-5347(92)90229-5

Quilfen, Y., Shutler, J., Piolle, J.-F., & Autret, E. (2021). Recent trends in the wind-driven

California current upwelling system. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, *261*, 112486.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2021.112486

Renaud, L.-A., Festa-Bianchet, M., & Pelletier, F. (2022). Testing the match–mismatch

hypothesis in bighorn sheep in the context of climate change. *Global Change Biology*,

28(1), 21–32. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15923

Rivera, H. E., Aichelman, H. E., Fifer, J. E., Kriefall, N. G., Wuitchik, D. M., Smith, S. J., &

Davies, S. W. (2021). A framework for understanding gene expression plasticity and its

influence on stress tolerance. *Molecular Ecology*, *30*(6), 1381–1397.

https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.15820

Robinson, M. D., McCarthy, D. J., & Smyth, G. K. (2010). edgeR: a Bioconductor package for

differential expression analysis of digital gene expression data. *Bioinformatics*, *26*(1),

139–140.

Rogers-Bennett, L., & Catton, C. A. (2019). Marine heat wave and multiple stressors tip bull

kelp forest to sea urchin barrens. *Scientific Reports*, *9*(1), Article 1.

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-51114-y

Schaum, C.-E., Buckling, A., Smirnoff, N., & Yvon-Durocher, G. (2022). Evolution of thermal

tolerance and phenotypic plasticity under rapid and slow temperature fluctuations. *Proc.*

Biol. Sci., *289*(1980), 20220834.

Scheiner, S. M., & Lyman, R. F. (1991). The genetics of phenotypic plasticity. II. Response to

selection. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, *4*(1), 23–50. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1420-

9101.1991.4010023.x

Schneider, H. M. (2022). Characterization, costs, cues and future perspectives of phenotypic

plasticity. *Annals of Botany*, *130*(2), 131–148. https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcac087

Schneider, R. F., & Meyer, A. (2017). How plasticity, genetic assimilation and cryptic genetic

variation may contribute to adaptive radiations. *Molecular Ecology*, *26*(1), 330–350.

https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.13880

Sgrò, C. M., & Hoffmann, A. A. (2004). Genetic correlations, tradeoffs and environmental

variation. *Heredity*, *93*(3), 241–248. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.hdy.6800532

Siegal, M. L., & Bergman, A. (2002). Waddington's canalization revisited: Developmental

stability and evolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *99*(16), 10528–

10532. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.102303999

Smale, D. A. (2020). Impacts of ocean warming on kelp forest ecosystems. *New Phytologist*,

225(4), 1447–1454. https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.16107

Sodergren, E., Weinstock, G. M., Davidson, E. H., Cameron, R. A., Gibbs, R. A., Angerer, R. C.,

Angerer, L. M., Arnone, M. I., Burgess, D. R., Burke, R. D., Coffman, J. A., Dean, M.,

Elphick, M. R., Ettensohn, C. A., Foltz, K. R., Hamdoun, A., Hynes, R. O., Klein, W. H.,

Marzluff, W., … Wright, R. (2006). The Genome of the Sea Urchin Strongylocentrotus

purpuratus. *Science*, *314*(5801), 941–952. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1133609

Steppan, S. J., Phillips, P. C., & Houle, D. (2002). Comparative quantitative genetics: Evolution

of the G matrix. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *17*(7), 320–327.

https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(02)02505-3

Strader, M. E., Kozal, L. C., Leach, T. S., Wong, J. M., Chamorro, J. D., Housh, M. J., &

Hofmann, G. E. (2020). Examining the role of DNA methylation in transcriptomic

plasticity of early stage sea urchins: Developmental and maternal effects in a kelp forest

herbivore. In *Frontiers in Marine Science* (Vol. 7, p. 205).

https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.00205

Strader, M. E., Wolak, M. E., Simon, O. M., & Hofmann, G. E. (2022). Genetic variation

underlies plastic responses to global change drivers in the purple sea urchin,

Strongylocentrotus purpuratus. *Proceedings. Biological Sciences*, *289*(1981), 20221249.

https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2022.1249

Strader, M. E., Wong, J. M., Kozal, L. C., Leach, T. S., & Hofmann, G. E. (2019). Parental

environments alter DNA methylation in offspring of the purple sea urchin,

Strongylocentrotus purpuratus. *J. Exp. Mar. Bio. Ecol.*, *517*, 54–64.

Svensson, E. I., Gomez-Llano, M., & Waller, J. T. (2020). Selection on phenotypic plasticity

favors thermal canalization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*

United States of America, *117*(47), 29767–29774.

https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2012454117

Tingley, D., Yamamoto, T., Hirose, K., Keele, L., & Imai, K. (2014). mediation: R package for

causal mediation analysis. *UCLA Statistics/American Statistical Association*.

https://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/91154

Valladares, F., Gianoli, E., & Gómez, J. M. (2007). Ecological limits to plant phenotypic

plasticity. *New Phytologist*, *176*(4), 749–763. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-

8137.2007.02275.x

Van ASCH, M., Van TIENDEREN, P. H., Holleman, L. J. M., & Visser, M. E. (2007). Predicting

adaptation of phenology in response to climate change, an insect herbivore example.

Global Change Biology, *13*(8), 1596–1604. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-

2486.2007.01400.x

Van Buskirk, J., & Steiner, U. K. (2009). The fitness costs of developmental canalization and

plasticity. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, *22*(4), 852–860.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2009.01685.x

van Heerwaarden, B., & Kellermann, V. (2020). Does plasticity trade off with basal heat

tolerance? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *35*(10), 874–885.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2020.05.006

Velotta, J. P., & Cheviron, Z. A. (2018). Remodeling Ancestral Phenotypic Plasticity in Local

Adaptation: A New Framework to Explore the Role of Genetic Compensation in the

Evolution of Homeostasis. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, *58*(6), 1098–1110.

https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icy117

Velotta, J. P., Ivy, C. M., Wolf, C. J., Scott, G. R., & Cheviron, Z. A. (2018). Maladaptive

phenotypic plasticity in cardiac muscle growth is suppressed in high-altitude deer mice.

Evolution; International Journal of Organic Evolution, *72*(12), 2712–2727.

https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.13626

Vinton, A. C., Gascoigne, S. J. L., Sepil, I., & Salguero-Gómez, R. (2022). Plasticity's role in

adaptive evolution depends on environmental change components. *Trends in Ecology &*

Evolution, *37*(12), 1067–1078. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2022.08.008

Weinig, C. (2000). Plasticity Versus Canalization: Population Differences in the Timing of

Shade-Avoidance Responses. *Evolution*, *54*(2), 441–451. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0014-

3820.2000.tb00047.x

West-Eberhard, M. J. (2003). *Developmental Plasticity and Evolution*. Oxford University Press.

Wilson, A. J., Réale, D., Clements, M. N., Morrissey, M. M., Postma, E., Walling, C. A., Kruuk,

L. E. B., & Nussey, D. H. (2010). An ecologist's guide to the animal model. *Journal of*

Animal Ecology, *79*(1), 13–26. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2009.01639.x

Wong, J. M., Johnson, K. M., Kelly, M. W., & Hofmann, G. E. (2018). Transcriptomics reveal

transgenerational effects in purple sea urchin embryos: Adult acclimation to upwelling

conditions alters the response of their progeny to differential pCO2 levels. *Mol. Ecol.*,

27(5), 1120–1137.

Wong, J. M., Kozal, L. C., Leach, T. S., Hoshijima, U., & Hofmann, G. E. (2019).

Transgenerational effects in an ecological context: Conditioning of adult sea urchins to

upwelling conditions alters maternal provisioning and progeny phenotype. *J. Exp. Mar.*

Bio. Ecol., *517*, 65–77.

Wood, C. W., & Brodie, E. D., III. (2015). Environmental effects on the structure of the G-

matrix. *Evolution*, *69*(11), 2927–2940. https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.12795

Wright, R. M., Aglyamova, G. V., Meyer, E., & Matz, M. V. (2015). Gene expression associated

with white syndromes in a reef building coral, Acropora hyacinthus. *BMC Genomics*, *16*,

371.

Xiu, P., Chai, F., Curchitser, E. N., & Castruccio, F. S. (2018). Future changes in coastal

upwelling ecosystems with global warming: The case of the California Current System.

Scientific Reports, *8*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-21247-7

Zaytsev, O., Cervantes-Duarte, R., Montante, O., & Gallegos-Garcia, A. (2003). Coastal

Upwelling Activity on the Pacific Shelf of the Baja California Peninsula. *Journal of*

Oceanography, *59*(4), 489–502. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025544700632

Ziyatdinov, A., Vázquez-Santiago, M., Brunel, H., Martinez-Perez, A., Aschard, H., & Soria, J.

M. (2018). lme4qtl: Linear mixed models with flexible covariance structure for genetic

studies of related individuals. *BMC Bioinformatics*, *19*(1), 68.

https://doi.org/10.1186/s12859-018-2057-x

1166

A

Non-upwelling, ambient

Upwelling, stressful

Repeated
5x

40 crosses

Ambient temp
Low pCO$_2$

Low temp
High pCO$_2$

n = 80 cultures

B

① Structural equation model

③ Selection gradient model

E

GE

P

F

② Animal model

V$_A$

GO enrichment: DE h^2 x DE body size effect

Biological Process

- 54/163 ncRNA metabolic process
- **36/62 rRNA metabolic process**
- **104/276 RNA processing**
- **66/119 ribonucleoprotein complex biogenesis**
- **110/303 cellular amide metabolic process**
- **90/236 amide biosynthetic process**
- 146/470 RNA biosynthetic process
- 14/43 regulation of cell death
- 86/317 phosphorylation
- 156/503 transmembrane transport
- 26/97 movement of cell or subcellular component

p < 0.001
p < 0.01
p < 0.05

Molecular Function

- 52/133 channel
- 172/578 transporter
- 33/86 cation channel
- 92/314 signaling receptor
- 100/381 transferase, transferring phosphorus-containing groups
- 80/310 kinase
- 75/220 transcription regulator
- 17/77 nucleoside-triphosphatase regulator
- 10/40 guanyl-nucleotide exchange factor
- 27/86 helicase
- 15/35 RNA helicase
- **71/208 structural molecule**
- **58/135 structural constituent of ribosome**
- 17/43 oxidoreductase, acting on the CH-CH group of donors

Cellular Component

- **70/215 membrane-enclosed lumen**
- 19/93 nucleoplasm
- **53/158 nuclear lumen**
- **29/44 nucleolus**
- 18/42 large ribosomal subunit
- **60/136 ribosome**
- **34/72 ribosomal subunit**
- **19/37 cytosolic ribosome**
- 21/82 extracellular region
- 12/50 microtubule associated complex