Gene expression divergence between locally adapted inland annual and coastal perennial

ecotypes of *Mimulus guttatus* across developmental stages

Running title: Ecotypic gene expression divergence

Jason D. Olsen[a,b] Billie A Gould[a] Yani Chen[a] and David B. Lowry[a,b,c,*]

[a]Department of Plant Biology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA 48824

[b]Ecology, Evolution, and Behavior, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA 48824

[c]Plant Resilience Institute, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA 48824

*Correspondence should be addressed to D.B.L. (dlowry@msu.edu)

ABSTRACT

The action of natural selection across heterogeneous natural landscapes drives local adaptation

and the formation of plant ecotypes, the precursors to new species. Plant ecotypes typically differ

significantly in morphology, physiology, and development, yet our understanding of their

underlying genetic basis remains limited. Despite their importance, studies of the molecular

underpinnings of ecotypic divergence through developmental stages are rare. Here, we compared

gene expression at different developmental time points between ecologically reproductively

isolated coastal perennial and inland annual ecotypes of the yellow monkeyflower, *Mimulus*

guttatus. We took two major approaches to understand differences in gene regulation between the

ecotypes at the level of gene networks. First, we evaluated expression variation between the

ecotypes in candidate molecular pathways. Next, we conducted gene co-expression network

analyses to identify new candidate mechanisms driving ecotypic divergence. Overall, we found

significant differences in global expression between the ecotypes and across developmental

stages. Among the candidate pathways we evaluated, genes in the jasmonic acid pathway were

the most significantly enriched for divergent gene expression. This includes the most

differentially expressed gene in our analyses, which is a key gene (cytochrome P450 CYP94B1)

involved in the degradation of bioactive jasmonic acid. Our gene co-expression network analysis

revealed different but complementary insights into the differential regulation of genes between

the ecotypes, especially at a more microscopic level of these organisms. Overall, our research

further supports the hypothesis that plant hormone pathways play a crucial role in the evolution

of plant ecotypes and, consequently, the emergence of new species.

INTRODUCTION

The evolution of new species generally occurs over long periods of time and involves a combination of geographic isolation, natural selection, and genetic drift (Coyne & Orr 2004). In plants, speciation is thought to often be facilitated through ecogeographic isolation among populations driven by local adaptation (Schemske 2000; Sobel et al. 2010; Sobel 2014; Butlin & Faria 2024). This process leads to the formation of ecotypes, which initially are reproductively isolated by ecological isolating barrier (Lowry 2012; Butlin & Faria 2024). These ecotypes generally have higher fitness in their native habitats, which limits gene flow between habitats and, in turn, facilitates the buildup of greater divergence and reproductive isolating mechanisms (Sobel et al. 2010; Lowry 2012). In this way, ecotypes can be viewed as intermediates in the process of speciation.

Some of the greatest progress in our understanding of the evolution of plant ecotypes comes from studies of the adaptive divergence between coastal and inland plant ecotypes. Indeed, Turesson's (1922a,b) ecotype concept was largely inspired by the high level of morphological divergence between coastal and inland populations of plants in Sweden. Clausen, Keck, and Hiesey famously followed up on the work of Turesson through multiple monograph-length studies of coastal and inland ecotypes of multiple plant species in California (Clausen et al. 1940, 1948). Since that time, several other researchers have found similar patterns of differentiation between coastal and inland ecotypes worldwide (Boyce 1954; Nagy & Rice 1997; Foster et al. 2007; Verhoeven et al. 2008; Itoh et al. 2024). From these studies, some major generalizations can be made about ecotypic differentiation associated with coastal habitats (Lowry 2012). Coastal ecotypes are generally more dwarfed in stature, prostrate in their growth form, and

flower later than inland ecotypes of the same species. Boyce (1954) argued that much of this

growth form difference was due to coastal plant adaptations to oceanic salt spray, and suggested

that coastal ecotypes might be better referred to as salt spray ecotypes.

While the concept of plant ecotypes was first formulated by Turesson (1922a,b) over a century

ago, our understanding of the genetic, physiological, and developmental mechanisms underlying

the evolution of ecotypes remains limited. Some of the largest advances in our understanding of

ecotype evolution have come from the coastal ecotype systems, where molecular genetic and

genomic tools have recently become available. For example, recent molecular research on the

evolution of dune and headland populations of *Senecio latifolius* on the east coast of Australia

has revealed many clues about the evolution of plant ecotypes (Roda et al. 2013; James et al.

2021, 2023; Wilkinson et al. 2021; Broad et al. 2024). In *S. latifolius*, the headland ecotype

experiences intense winds, and presumably salt spray, which in combination with the availability

of steep cliff habitat has driven a dwarfed and prostrate growth architecture. In contrast, the dune

ecotype is taller with an upright growth habit, which may reflect a more sheltered habitat where

this growth form is advantageous. Recent genetic research on this system suggests a complex

genetic basis of the differences in physiology and development between the dune and headland

ecotypes. Despite this complexity, there is strong evidence for a role of evolutionary changes in

the auxin hormone pathway being involved in the changes in growth form, especially with a

large divergence in gravitropism between the ecotypes (Wilkinson et al. 2021; James et al. 2023;

Broad et al. 2024).

Given the major role that plant hormone pathways play in shaping the growth form and

physiology of plants, it is perhaps not surprising that they may also play a key role in the

evolution of plant ecotypes (Voesenek & Blom 1996; VanWallendael et al. 2019; Broad et al.

2024). Recent research has shown that hormone pathways interact with each other through

complex crosstalk through which they coordinate development and stress responses (Fujita et al.

2006; Depuydt & Hardtke 2011; Murphy 2015; Aerts et al. 2021; Gasperini & Howe 2024). For

example, the jasmonic acid and gibberellin hormone pathways are thought to coordinate plant

trade-offs between growth and defense at least partially through the interaction of JASMONATE

ZIM-domain (JAZ) and DELLA genes in each of these hormones' respective signaling pathways

(Pieterse et al. 2014; Howe et al. 2018; Guo et al. 2018). While we are still far from

understanding the highly complex network of plant hormone interactions, our current knowledge

of these pathways provides great utility for gaining new insights into how plant ecotypes evolve

through local adaptation to different habitats.

To better understand how hormone and other key pathways have shifted in the evolution of plant

ecotypes, we conducted a study of gene expression divergence between coastal and inland

ecotypes through developmental stages, from the first set of true leaves to the emergence of

floral buds. The focus of our study was on coastal and inland ecotypes in the yellow

monkeyflower, *M. guttatus*. Over the past two decades, extensive research has been conducted to

understand the evolutionary mechanisms underlying the divergence of inland annual versus

coastal perennial ecotypes in this species (Hall et al. 2006, 2010; Lowry et al. 2008, 2009; Lowry

& Willis 2010; Twyford & Freidman 2015; Twyford et al. 2015; Gould et al. 2017, 2018;

Popovic & Lowry 2020; Kollar et al. 2025). There are large differences in a wide swath of traits

between coastal perennial and nearby inland annual ecotypes (Abrams 1951; Hitchcock and

Cronquit 1973; Vickery 1978; Lowry et al. 2008). These ecotypes diverge in traits such as

growth rate, morphology, phenology, and resistance to herbivory, and are locally adaptive in

reciprocal transplant experiments (Hall and Willis 2006; Van Kleunen 2007; Lowry et al. 2008;

Hall et al. 2010; Lowry et al. 2019). In general, the inland annual ecotype flowers early to avoid

seasonal drought and produces fewer true leaves before developing floral buds. The coastal

perennial ecotype flowers later and produces more leaf pairs before budding. Based on the

morphological distinctness of the coastal perennial ecotype, some taxonomists have raised it to

the species level, naming it the magnificent monkeyflower, *Mimulus grandis* (syn. *Erythranthe*

grandis; Nesom 2012). However, given the high level of allele sharing between coastal perennial

and inland annual groups of populations (only four fixed nucleotide differences out of >29

million SNPs; Gould et al. 2017), we more cautiously treat each group as an ecotype instead of a

species. While we don't consider the coastal perennial and inland annual ecotypes as distinct

species, we do recognize that they are on the speciation continuum, as they have acquired a

significant level of ecologically-based reproductive isolation (Lowry et al. 2008; Lowry & Willis

2010).

Prior research on the coastal perennial and inland annual ecotypes suggests that their

morphological divergence is largely driven by evolutionary shifts in hormone pathways. This

hypothesis first emerged as a result of a prior population genomic outlier study (Gould et al.

2017), which identified genes in the gibberellin hormone pathway as top candidate genes for

ecotype divergence. One of those candidate genes, GA20ox2, a key enzyme in the gibberellin

biosynthetic pathway, is located in a chromosomal inversion polymorphism on chromosome 8

that is responsible for a substantial portion of the divergence between coastal perennial and

inland annual ecotypes (Lowry & Willis 2010; Friedman 2014; Lowry et al. 2019; Blanchard et

al. 2024). A recent study found that GA20ox2 is not expressed in leaves; however, it exhibits

higher expression in the shoot apices of inland annuals compared to coastal perennials (Kollar et

al., 2025). This differential expression could initiate a developmental cascade that impacts the

expression of other important pathways in developing leaves, branches, and reproductive

structures, which may explain some of the broad phenotypic effects associated with the

chromosome 8 inversion. Indeed, the application of gibberellin (GA3) to coastal perennial plants

leads to substantial phenotypic changes, converting their growth architecture from prostrate to

upright (Lowry et al. 2019) and making them more susceptible to oceanic salt spray in the field

(Toll et al. 2024). Beyond its significant morphological and phenological effects, the

chromosome 8 inversion also contributes to elevated constitutive and inducible levels of

defensive phenylpropanoid glycoside (PPG) in coastal perennials versus inland annual plants

(Lowry et al. 2019; Blanchard et al. 2024). This finding suggests the involvement of the

jasmonic acid (JA) hormone pathway in the differentiation of coastal and inland plants, as PPG

production is known to be stimulated by jasmonic acid. Given the known cross-talk between the

gibberellin and jasmonic acid pathways (Fujita et al. 2006; Yang et al. 2012; Wasternack 2017;

Züst & Agrawal 2017; Guo et al. 2018), evaluation of expression patterns for gene in those

pathways could provide further insights into the mechanisms underlying the divergence of the

ecotypes.

In this study, we analyzed patterns of gene expression between coastal perennial and inland

annual accessions of *M. guttatus* across development, from the production of the first pair of true

leaves to the emergence of floral buds. The primary goal of this work was to understand how

coastal perennial and inland annual ecotypes are differentiated at the level of gene networks. To

that end, we took two complementary approaches. First, we evaluated how individual genes were

differentially regulated between ecotypes and across developmental stages, across all of the

major plant hormone pathways. Based on our prior work, we hypothesized that the gibberellin

and jasmonic acid pathways would have an elevated level of differential gene expression

between the ecotypes. In addition to hormone pathways, we evaluated gene expression in the Salt

Overly Sensitive (SOS) pathway, as a few key genes in this pathway were implicated in

divergence between the ecotypes in prior work (Gould et al. 2018). Following our analyses of

individual genes in candidate pathways, we conducted a whole-genome transcriptional module

analysis using a Weighted Gene Co-expression Network Analysis (WGCNA; Langfelder and

Horvath 2008). This analysis did not incorporate any prior knowledge about the *M. guttatus*

system and was thus effective at generating additional new hypotheses of mechanisms

underlying divergence of the ecotypes. Overall, we found that the two approaches to

understanding gene expression at the network level provided different, yet complementary,

insights into ecotype divergence.

METHODS

Plant material

To identify patterns of gene expression divergence between the ecotypes, we selected one coastal

perennial (SWB-4) and one inland annual (LMC-17) accession for a detailed study throughout

development. The coastal perennial SWB population (N 39.02.159, W 123.41.428) is located near

Manchester, CA, while the inland annual population LMC (N 38.51.839, W 123.05.035) is located

near Boonville, CA. By focusing on two accessions, we were able to achieve a high level of

replication for each developmental stage. Seeds from each accession consisted of self-fertilized

families that were two generations inbred in the laboratory before the experiments. To eliminate

potential maternal effects, seeds were grown for one additional generation at Michigan State

University (MSU, East Lansing, MI) in the four months before the growth chamber experiment,

where tissue was collected for gene expression analysis.

Plant growth conditions

Surface-sterilized *Mimulus guttatus* seeds were placed on 60 mm diameter x 15mm height Petri

dishes containing half-strength Linsmaier and Skoog (LS) medium: 1.5% w/v sucrose and 0.25%

Phytagel (P8169, Sigma, St. Louis, MO). Seeds were then stratified at 4°C in the dark for 14 days.

After cold treatment, plants were germinated at 20°C under a 16 h 100 mE light / 8 h dark cycle for 5

to 14 days in a Percival (Percival Scientific, Perry, IA) chamber. Cotyledon-stage seedlings were

transferred to 3.5-inch square pots containing SureMix Perlite (Michigan Grower Products,

Galesburg, MI) and grown in a BioChambers FXC-19 flex growth chamber (BioChambers,

Winnipeg, Manitoba) in the same conditions as in the Percival chamber. Three key steps were taken

to minimize the effects of environmental heterogeneity within the growth chamber. First, the

locations of plants were fully randomized across trays within the chamber. Second, the tray position

within the chamber was haphazardly rotated daily. Third, the developmental stage at which each

plant was sampled was assigned randomly. Leaf pairs and floral buds were collected in a time series

(Fig. S1). Leaves were collected at the point in development when they were nearing maximal

expansion. The floral buds were collected from plants around the time of anthesis. Only one tissue

was collected per plant to avoid induced responses and repeated measures. Each tissue collection was

harvested in a fixed time window (14:00 to 14:30) during the simulated daylight period. Tissue was

immediately flash frozen on liquid nitrogen and stored in a -80° C freezer. RNA was later extracted

from samples using a Spectrum Plant Total RNA Kit (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO). We collected

10 biological replicates for each developmental stage x ecotype combination ($N = 80$ total tissue

samples). For the inland annual plants, we sampled at the two-leaf, four-leaf, and floral bud stages

because plants often flowered after producing two pairs of true leaves. Because the coastal perennial

plants flowered at a later developmental stage, we sampled at the two-leaf, four-leaf, six-leaf, eight-

leaf, and floral bud stages. All tissue samples were collected before anthesis.

Library preparation and sequencing, and processing

We prepared genomic libraries using a 3'-Tag-Seq procedure, which restricts sequencing to the 3' end

of mRNAs and dramatically reduces the cost for RNA-seq studies (Meyer et al. 2011; Lohman et al.

2016; Marx et al. 2020). Our protocol for library preparation followed an updated version of the

methods of Meyer et al. (2011), which had been adapted for sequencing on the Illumina platform, as

described in Weng & Juenger (2022). The detailed protocol of library preparation for our study can

be found in the Supplemental Methods. Each sample was assigned a fully randomized position across

four pools of 20 samples before library construction. The MSU Genomics Core Facility conducted

sequencing in Illumina HiSeq 2500 Rapid Run flow cells (v2) in the 1x100bp conformation.

Sequencing of the four pooled libraries was conducted across three different flow cells, with two

pools being sequenced in two separate flow cells and the other pools only being sequenced on a

single flow cell each.

Raw Illumina reads were processed following our protocol that is available on GitHub along with

code for other analyses detailed below

(github.com/lowrylab/Mimulus_expression_across_development). Briefly, raw reads were first

examined for quality with FastQC (bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/), which found a

median Phred score of ~37 across libraries. Adapter sequences were then removed with Cutadapt

(Martin 2011). Cutadapt was applied with an adapter mismatch error threshold of 20% of primer

length. Primer trimming began with the 5' end (NNNN followed by 3-5 G's with a first step to cut 8

bases and a second step to cut the remaining 5' G's). Trimming of the 3' end was done by removing

15bp of the 3' end of each read to remove the poly-A primer and any readthrough. To retain only

high-quality sequences after trimming, any bases on either end with a quality score < 30 were

removed, and we required the last two bases of each read to match the poly-A primer while

discarding any reads <30bp in length. These parameters align with the requirements for the Tag-Seq

methodology to remove both adapter sequences and non-template bases created during library

preparation (Meyer et al. 2011). Trimmed sequence files were concatenated and aligned to the

Mimulus guttatus v2.0 reference genome (Hellsten et al. 2013; phytozome-next.jgi.doe.gov) using

the memory-efficient Burrows-Wheeler Aligner (BWA-MEM; Li 2013), as in Marx et al. (2020) and

Weng & Juenger (2022). The v2.0 reference genome was selected for alignment because genes are

well annoatated and it has been used for many other recent studies. Aligned reads were filtered to

include only high-quality, primary alignments using Samtools 1.2 (Li et al. 2009). The total number

of aligned reads retained for each sample was calculated with Samtools. Counting the number of

reads aligned per gene per sample was done with HT-seq v.0.6.1 (Anders et al. 2015) with "stranded"

and "union" parameter options. Count files were filtered to remove genes with < 5 aligned reads to

exclude non-expressed genes or alignment artifacts.

Clustering analyses of gene expression

To evaluate whether samples clustered based on genotype, developmental stage, and/or library pool,

we conducted a principal component analysis (PCA) with DESeq2 (Love et al. 2014) in R version

4.4.2. Before the implementation of normalization and PCA, we filtered out low abundance genes by

removing any genes did not have more than 10 counts in more than 5 samples. We then normalized

the remaining data using a variance stabilizing transformation (VST). The PCA was conducted with

this filtered and normalized data (Fig. 1). We focused on the top two PCs, as they explained far more

of the variation than any of the other PCs (Fig. S2). In addition to the PCA, we evaluated clustering

of the same VST data with a heat map produced by the R pheatmap function.

Differential gene expression analyses at the individual gene level

To evaluate differential expression analyses at the individual gene level, we used the edgeR-voom-

limma framework (Law et al. 2014), implemented in R version 4.5.0. Voom-limma was selected for

this analysis because it stabilizes the mean-variance relationships of count data for linear modeling

and allows for complex experimental designs with multiple interactions. Our analysis of differential

gene expression focused on the 2-Leaf, 4-Leaf, and bud developmental stages, as inland annual

plants generally did not produce 6-Leaf and 8-Leaf tissue. Prior to model fitting, we filtered the raw

count data using the filterByExpr function, which is part of the edgeR package (version 4.6.1;

Robinson et al., 2010). This function retains only genes that have sufficient counts to achieve

statistical significance through differential expression analysis, using the default parameters. We used

version 3.64.0 of limma for this analysis. Normalization was then conducted for count data using the

calcNormFactors function, which accounts for composition bias and library size differences. This

normalized data was then converted to log2-counts per million (log2-CPM) using the voom

transformation.

The following linear model was fit for each gene:

expression ~ genotype + development_stage + genotype:development_stage

Empirical Bayes methods were used to shrink gene-wise variances, which improves the reliability of

inference for genes with highly variable transcript abundance. The "Inland" genotype and "2leaf"

developmental stage were set as the reference levels for statistical contrasts. We tested for differential

expression of genes for five contrasts: 1) Main effect of genotype (Coast vs. Inland), 2) main effect

of developmental stage for 4leaf vs. 2leaf), 3) main effect of developmental stage for bud vs. 2leaf, 4)

interaction between genotype and developmental stage for 4leaf vs. 2leaf, and 5) interaction between

genotype and developmental stage for bud vs. 2leaf. We controlled for multiple testing by calculating

False Discovery Rate (FDR) adjusted P-values using the Benjamini-Hochberg method. To evaluate

how closely overall gene expression analyzed with the voom-limma approach mirrored the analysis

of all genes using DESeq2, we output a multidimensional scaling (MDS) plot for the 2leaf, 4leaf, and

bud stages.

Analysis of candidate pathways

To evaluate whether any hormone pathways were enriched for differentially expressed genes, we

examined the expression of core genes involved in hormone pathways. These core pathway genes for

each of the major hormone pathways (Table 1) were identified by custom Python scripts to parse the

Mimulus guttatus v2.0 genome annotation file. Gene lists identified by these scripts were further

refined through close inspection, followed by the removal of genes of lower confidence. We used the

gene lists that we compiled for those pathways to extract the gene expression results for each gene

from our individual gene analyses (above). Once we had identified the number of differentially

expressed genes (FDR adjusted $P < 0.05$) and highly differenitally expressed genes (Log-Fold

Change (LFC) > 2), we tested for enrichment with Fisher-Exact tests, with Benjamini-Hochberg FDR

adjusted correction for multiple testing. In addition to hormone pathway genes, we also evaluated

key genes in plant cellular homeostasis, including genes in the Salt Overly Sensitive (SOS) pathway,

given prior evidence that these genes may be important for coastal adaptations in this system (Gould

et al., 2017, 2018). As with the hormone pathway genes, we used custom python scripts to identify

candidate genes from the v2.0 annotation file.

Gene co-expression module analyses

To identify gene co-expression modules across genotypes and developmental stages, we conducted a

Weighted Gene Co-expression Network Analysis (WGCNA; Langfelder and Horvath 2008). As

with the analysis of candidate pathways, we focus this analysis on the 2leaf, 4leaf, and bud

developmental stages. Before network construction, we re-conducted a VST normalization with

DESeq2 in R version 4.5.0. To improve the signal in the data, we filtered out low-expressed genes

with fewer than 10 counts in fewer than 5 samples. Following WGCNA recommended best

practices, we used a scale-free topology model fit of $R^2 > 0.80$. To minimize the influence of

outliers, biweight midcorrelations were used instead of Pearson correlations. We used dynamic

tree cutting with a minimum module size of 30 genes and deepSplit parameter of 2 to identify

modules. We then merged similar modules that had correlations among module eigengenes,

representing the first principal component of each module, of greater than 0.75. Module

membership of genes was established through correlations between gene expression and the

eigengene of each module. We defined candidate hub genes for each module as the top ten genes

with the highest module membership.

To interrogate the functional significance of each identified module, we conducted a GO

enrichment analysis of genes within each module using an annotation file from the *Mimulus*

guttatus v2.0 genome. Here, enrichments analyses of GO terms were performed using a

hypergeometric test of a comparison of lists of genes in each module to all annotated genes using

a Benjamini-Hochberg FDR for multiple testing. We also closely inspected the annotations of hub

genes to further understand the functional significance of each module.

RESULTS

Sequencing and alignment

Overall, sequencing resulted in a total of 343,561,167 raw reads. Across the 80 samples, there

was a minimum of 4,271,651 reads and a maximum of 10,858,583 reads (median of 7,403,646

reads per sample). We identified 28,140 unique gene transcripts.

Clustering analyses of gene expression

For the PCA, we retained 18,054 genes after filtering for low expression. The PCA (Fig. 1) of the

prefiltered, VST-normalized expression values for these transcripts revealed a distinct grouping

of samples along two major axes. Comparing gene expression through development between the

coastal perennial and inland annual ecotypes of *M. guttatus* is challenging, as these ecotypes

often develop at different rates and put on different numbers of leaves before flowering. Both *M.*

gutatus ecotypes go through two-leaf and four-leaf vegetative stages. However, the inland

ecotype often flowers at the next node after the 4-leaf stage, while the coastal ecotype transitions

through 6-leaf and 8-leaf stages before forming floral buds. Despite this concern, there was a

high level of clustering across all leaf stages for both the coastal perennial and the inland annual

plants in the PC analysis (Fig. 1). PC1 corresponded most closely to differences between leaf and

bud tissue and accounted for 53.4% of the expression variance. PC2 corresponded to the

divergence between the coastal and inland ecotype samples and accounted for 19.8% of the

variance. The heat map visualization results were consistent with our PCA results, and also revealed

that there was no clustering of samples based on the library pool (Fig. S3).

Figure 1: Principal component analysis of pre-filtered, variance-stabilizing transformed (VST) transcript count data from RNASeq. Different colors denote all combinations of developmental stages and ecotypes. The first principal axis (PC1) explains the variance in the dataset and primarily distinguishes differences between leaf (vegetative) and bud (reproductive) stages. The second principal axis explains the variance that primarily distinguishes differences between ecotypes.

Differential gene expression analyses at the individual gene level

Analysis of individual gene expression using the EdgeR-voom-limma approach revealed

numerous significantly differentially expressed genes for the five major contrasts derived from

linear modeling (Figs. S3-S7). After filtering by the filterByExpr function, 13,920 genes were

retained for statistical analyses. Of these, the following numbers of genes were significantly

differentially expressed with a Benjamini-Hochberg adjusted *P*-value of <0.05: 7238 genes were

differentially expressed for the main effect of genotype (Coast vs. Inland), 2398 for the main effect of

developmental stage (4leaf vs. 2leaf), 10,248 for the main effect of developmental stage (Bud vs.

2leaf), 886 for the interaction between genotype and developmental stage for 4leaf vs. 2leaf, and

5337 for the interaction between genotype and developmental stage for bud vs. 2leaf. For the

genotype main effect, 3417 genes had significantly higher expression in inland annual plants, while

3821 genes had significantly higher expression in coastal perennial plants. Complete gene lists with

statistical results can be found in the supplementary materials. MDS visualization of the 2-leaf, 4-

leaf, and bud stages for 13,920 genes retained after filtering (Fig. S9) revealed a strikingly similar

ordination of samples to the PCA for all samples (Fig. 1).

Analysis of candidate pathways

Across the nine hormone pathways, we identified 768 candidate genes using the v2.0 annotation

(Table 1). Of those, 351 genes were expressed at a high enough level for individual gene

analyses (above), with 195 differentially expressed between the ecotypes (genotype main effect).

Table 1: Differential gene expression of hormone pathway genes between coastal and inland ecotypes and between the floral bud and second pair of true leaves (2-leaf) developmental stages.

Hormone Pathway	Candidate Genes	Genes Evaluated	Ecotype DE	Ecotype LogFC > 2	Bud vs 2-Leaf DE	Bud vs 2-Leaf LogFC > 2
Gibberellin	64	19	12	4	14	6
Jasmonic Acid	82	49	40***	23***	35	15
Abscisic Acid	102	64	27	1	42	14
Brassinosteroid	49	29	16	1	20	5
Auxin	271	111	60	8	90	27
Cytokinin	99	38	23	2	23	4
Ethylene	61	28	14	1	23	5
Salicylic Acid	27	6	1	1	5	0
Strigolactone	13	7	2	0	3	1
Genome-wide	28140	13920	7238	926	10248	2347
***Significant enrichment at an FDR adjusted P<0.001						

There were 41 highly differentially expressed (LFC>2) hormone genes, of which 35 were in the

auxin, gibberellin, or jasmonic acid hormone pathways. The jasmonic acid pathway genes in

particular were overrepresented for differential expression (FDR adjusted *P* = 0.00027) and

highly differential expression (FDR adjusted P = 2.6x10^{-13}) between the coastal and inland

ecotypes. While the gibberellin pathway was overrepresented for highly differentially expressed

genes, the pattern was not significant after FDR adjustment.

Figure 2: Gene expression patterns for the candidate gibberellin (GA) and jasmonic acid (JA) biosynthetic and signaling pathways. Genes that were significantly differentially expressed between coastal and inland plants (genotype main effect, yellow filled square) are shown. The names of genes with higher expression in inland plants are indicated with orange letters, while genes with higher expression in coastal plants are indicated by blue letters. Other significant contrasts are also indicated by filled squares: 4leaf vs. 2leaf (orange), bud vs. 2leaf (red), genotype interaction with 4leaf vs. 2leaf (blue), and genotype interaction with bud vs. 2leaf (purple). Bolded gene names indicate LFC > 2 for the genotype main effect.

Because of our a priori hypothesis about the role of the gibberellin and jasmonic acid pathways

in divergence of the coastal and inland ecotypes, we evaluated differentially expressed genes in

the context of their position in the biosynthetic and signaling pathways for these hormones (Fig.

2). Striking patterns of gene expression were observed across the core GA and JA pathway genes

(Fig. 2). In the jasmonic acid pathway, all seven of the differentially expressed (genotype main

effect) *JAZ* genes in the signaling pathway and all ten of the differentially expressed JA

catabolism/degradation genes had higher expression in inland plants than coastal plants. In

contrast, the two orthologs of the *COI1* (coronatine-insensitive protein 1) were downregulated.

COI and *JAZ* genes are co-receptors of bioactive jasmonic acid-isoleucine (JA-Ile; Monte et al.

2022). In the gibberellin pathway, genes promoting GA biosynthesis (*GA20ox1* and *GA3ox1*)

were upregulated in coastal plants, while the only differentially expressed gene involved in GA

inactivation (*GA2ox8*) was upregulated in inland plants. In the GA signaling pathway, an

ortholog of the gibberellin receptor *GID1B* was upregulated in inland plants, while two

phytochrome-interacting factor (*PIF1*) orthologs were upregulated in coastal plants. The only

DELLA gene in *M. guttatus* (Migut.H02266) was not significantly differentially expressed

between the genotypes. However, this *DELLA* gene was differentially expressed between the bud

and 2-leaf developmental stages (LFC = -3.17; adjusted P = 8.49 x 10^{-9}), with higher expression

in leaves than in buds.

For each of the other hormone pathways, we report which genes were highly differentially

expressed (LFC >2) here: Eight auxin genes were highly differentially expressed, including two

orthologs of *ILL6* (Migut.C01122, Migut.N03278), an ortholog of *ILL3* (Migut.F00137), an

ortholog of *SHY2* (Migut.N02182), and four auxin-responsive genes (Migut.F01336,

Migut.F01339, Migut.F01341, and Migut.N01563). Only one brassinosteroid candidate gene was

highly differentially expressed, a *BRI1* kinase inhibitor 1 (*BKI1*; Migut.N02706), which had

greater expression in inland plants. The two highly differentially expressed cytokinin genes were

orthologs of *ARR12* (Migut.K00347) and *APRR7* (Migut.L01650). The one highly differentiated

abscisic acid gene was an *ABA4* ortholog, which had greater expression in coastal plants. The

only differentially expressed salicylic acid gene, a *Mov34/MPN/PAD-1* family protein

(Migut.O00742), was also highly differentially expressed. There was only one highly

differentially expressed ethylene gene, an ortholog of an ethylene responsive element binding

factor 1 (*ERF1*; Migut.O00367).

Figure 3: Expression of genes involved in sodium homeostasis. Model of cellular sodium homeostasis genes. *CBL10* and *SOS3* play similar roles in propagating the calcium signal resulting from salt stress, but their roles differ across cell types. Genes significantly differentially expressed between coastal and inland plants (genotype main effect) are indicated by yellow-filled squares. Names of genes with higher expression in coastal plants are indicated by blue letters. Other significant contrasts are also indicated by filled squares: 4leaf vs. 2leaf (orange), bud vs. 2leaf (red), genotype interaction with 4leaf vs. 2leaf (blue), and genotype interaction with bud vs. 2leaf (purple). Bolded gene names indicate LFC > 2 for the genotype main effect.

411 For genes involved in sodium homeostasis, we identified 15 high-confidence candidate genes. Of

412 these, only five were expressed at a high enough level for individual gene statistical analyses

413 (Fig. 3). Three of those genes were significantly expressed between the coastal and inland plants

414 (genotype main effects): Orthologs of *SOS1* (Migut.E00570), *HKT1* (Migut.L01905), and *CIPK8*

415 (Migut.N02833). Only *SOS1* had an LFC greater than 2 (Fig. 3, 4).

Figure 4: Ecotype x developmental stage interactions in gene expression. Patterns of expression for four candidate genes through developmental stages that had LFC > 2 for the contrast between the genotypes. Cytochrome P450 94B1 is the first gene in the jasmonic acid degradation pathway. JAZ9 is one of the key regulatory genes in the jasmonic acid signaling pathway. GA3ox1 is an important gibberellin biosynthesis gene. SOS1 is the key gene that pumps sodium from the cytoplasm of plant cells into the apoplast. Gene expression in the plot was VST normalized.

Gene co-expression module analyses

Analyses with WGCNA revealed nine major gene co-expression modules after the merging of

correlated modules. The following number of genes were assigned to each module: red = 2315,

tan = 1874, turquoise = 4937, green =1686, black = 2633, cyan =184, lightcyan = 62, blue

=3131, greenyellow = 1232. The eigengenes of each of these modules were differentially

correlated with genotype and developmental stage (Figure 5; Fig. S10-S27).

Figure 5: Gene co-expression module correlations with ecotype and developmental stages. The correlation between the eigengene of each module with ecotype, stage, and ecotype x stage combinations are reported above FDR adjusted *P*-values.

Gene Ontology (GO) enrichment

analysis, combined with an

examination of the functions of hub

genes, revealed distinct potential

functions for each of the nine modules.

The modules that most differentiated

the coastal and inland genotypes were

the green, red, greenyellow, and black

modules. The green module appears to

differentiate coastal and inland plants

in stress responses and cell death

decisions. The red module appears to

be primarily associated with vesicle

trafficking and membrane dynamics.

The greenyellow module is likely

involved in the coordination of growth

and stress responses, with auxin

biosynthesis and signaling potentially

Figure 6: Ecotype x developmental stage of co-expression modules. (A) The green module contained genes that principally differed between the ecotypes. (B) The blue module genes were primarily differentially expressed between leaves and floral buds.

447 playing a key role. One of the hub genes in the greenyellow module is a key auxin gene, *Amidase*

448 *1* (Migut.F01717).

450　The cyan and lightcyan modules were differentiated between the ecotypes at the leaf stages, but

451　less differentiated at the bud stage (Fig. 5, S15, S16). Based on the gene composition of the

Table 2: Hypothesized biological function and list of key hub genes for each of the nine modules identified by WGCNA analyses.

Module	Biological function prediction based on GO enrichment and hub genes	Key hub genes
Red	Vesicle trafficking and membrane dynamics, with a possible roles in stress responses. Coordinates phospholipid signaling, vesicle formation, membrane identity, and trafficking processes	Phospholipase D (PLD; Migut.B01671), an important signaling molecule that promotes membrane curvature and facilitates vesicle fusion and fission. Sec1/munc18-like (SM) protein (Migut.E01133), which is involved in vesicle trafficking. Nudix hydrolase 19 (Migut.J01169), which is a regulator of cellular redox homeostasis, crucial for plant stress responses.
Tan	Coordination of plant hormone responses with metabolism, lipid synthesis, posttranslational modifications, and cell wall remodeling. Likely important in growth and development.	Cellulase glycosyl hydrolase (Migut.A00708) and sucrose phosphate synthase (Migut.E01808) are involved in coordination between sugar metabolism and cell wall remodeling. Three of the hub genes were hormone genes involved in jasmonic acid biosynthesis (OPR1, Migut.B00746), gibberellin response (Migut.E01377), and auxin signaling (GH3, Migut.N02078).
Turquoise	Cell wall modifications, membrane dynamics, secretory pathway function, and cell surface signaling/environmental responses.	A pectin methylesterase inhibitor (Migut.C00970) that controls cell wall rigidity. A pectin lyase protein (Migut.M00012) that breaks down pectin in cell walls. EHD1 (Migut.H01794), a gene that regulates endocytic recycling. Two arabinogalactan proteins (AGP20 (Migut.F00245), AGP12 (Migut.K00009)), which are cell surface glycoproteins involved in signaling.
Green	Involved in balancing protein quality control and programmed cell death regulation. May be involved in acting as a molecular switch to determine whether stressed cells recover or undergo apoptosis.	Metacaspase 9 (Migut.K00195), a key protease that executes programmed cell death. A defender against death (DAD) protein (Migut.A01174). Galactinol synthase 2 (Migut.B00857), a gene involved in producing osmoprotectants to abiotic stress. A MADS-box transcription factor (Migut.K00994) that may play a key role in orchestrating stress responses and/or developmental impacts of the module.
Black	Ribosome biogenesis, RNA processing, and protein folding, likely serving as a hub for protein production and cellular growth.	Seven genes with ribosomal structure and function (Ribosomal L38e (Migut.F01852), S19 (Migut.G00718), S12/S23 (Migut.J00403), L35Ae (Migut.L01988), S8e (Migut.M01688), L14p/L23e (Migut.N02225), ans L1p/l10e (Migut.D02448). A peptidyl-prolyl isomerase (Migut.B00563) involved in protein folding. A cell cycle controlling cyclin (Migut.L00181).
Cyan	Enriched for microtubule processes, cell cycle regulation, chromosome dynamics, genome stability, and cytokinesis. Likely involved in plant growth and development through mitotic cell division and cell differentiation.	Microtubule and kinesin motor proteins (Migut.H01772, Migut.F00327). TPX2 (Migut.M00163), which is essential for spindle assembly. A cyclin-dependent kinase (Migut.C00348). Histone H2A6 (Migut.D02117) and a DNA methyltransferase (CMT3, Migut.D02536).
Lightcyan	Likely plays a central role in rapid responses to biotic stresses through pathogen/herbivore resistance and oxidative stress management.	Two MLP-like defense proteins (MLP423, Migut.N00310, Migut.N00312) involved in pathogen recognition/response. A serine protease inhibitor (Migut.A00978) involved in protection against herbivore and pathogen proteases. A peroxidase superfamily protein (Migut.J00066). An auxin responsive protein (Migut.H01293).
Blue	Chloroplast function and photosynthesis, including with both photosystems (I and II), light harvesting complexes, and thylakoid membrane components. The module also is involved in protein folding and redox homeostasis.	A PsbP-like protein 1 (PPL1, Migut.B00505), which is a component of photosystem II. A chloroplast stem-loop binding protein (CSP41A, Migut.D00296). DnaJ/Hsp40 molecular chaperone (Migut.K00479). Ascorbate peroxidase 4 (APX4; Migut.C00083), an antioxidant enzyme. Three chloroplast ribosomal genes (RPL9, Migut.D02295.1; RPL4, Migut.N00890.1; S5, Migut.H01481).
Greenyellow	Auxin response and metabolism, sulfur transport, redox homeostasis, protein structure/stability, and defense compound synthesis. Likely involved in the coordination of growth and stress responses.	Amidase 1 (AMI1; Migut.F01717), which converts indole-3-acetamide to active auxin. Heat stable protein 1 (HS1; Migut.N00022), which protects proteins during heat stress. FAD/NAD(P)-binding oxidoreductase (CTF2A; Migut.A01046). MLO (Migut.G00795), a transmembrane protein involved in defense responses.

lightcyan module, it appears to be involved in early stress responses, including plant biotic stress

defense and oxidative stress management. The cyan module is likely involved in cell division

and differentiation, and thus may play a key role in regulating plant growth.

Modules most associated with the developmental transition between leaf and floral bud included

the blue, tan, and turquoise modules. The blue module had much greater expression in leaves

than buds (Fig. 5, 6, S17) and was enriched for genes involved in photosynthesis. The tan and

turquoise modules both are likely involved in the developmental transitions through changes in

the expression of genes involved with the construction of cell wall and other processes.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we evaluated gene expression divergence between a coastal perennial and an inland

annual accession of *M. guttatus* during development. Overall, there were clear patterns of

differentiation between ecotypes and across developmental stages, with large shifts between leaf

and floral bud stages. Our analysis of gene expression in candidate pathways revealed a striking

elevation in differential expression between the ecotypes for genes in the jasmonic acid hormone

pathway, with expression patterns in that pathway consistent with the known divergence in

growth, reproduction, and defense between the coastal perennial and inland annual ecotypes.

While no other candidate pathways had significantly elevated expression differentiation, the

patterns of expression for some of the key genes in those pathways were informative. In contrast

to our candidate pathway analyses, the weighted gene network analyses revealed only limited

evidence for a role of plant hormone pathways in the divergence of the ecotypes. Instead, these

network analyses primarily revealed significant differences in cellular division, differentiation,

function, and growth between the ecotypes and across various developmental stages. These

differences at the microscopic level may ultimately help to give rise to organismal-level

divergence of the ecotypes, but have yet to be evaluated in detail in this system. By further

elucidating the mechanisms of ecotype formation, our work brings us closer to understanding the

complex changes involved in the evolution of ecogeographic and phenological reproductive

isolation.

Gene regulatory divergence and the evolution of ecotypes

The finding of elevated gene expression divergence for genes in both the jasmonic acid biosynthesis and signalling pathways is a key result of our study. The higher gene expression of the full complement of genes involved in JA catabolism/degradation in inland annual plants suggests that jasmonic acid is not degraded across all stages at a high rate in the coastal perennial ecotype, while JA may be quickly degraded and recycled in the leaves of the inland ecotype. Key candidate genes, such as *CYP94B1*, exemplify this overall pattern. CYP94B1 is responsible for the first step of degradation of bioactive jasmonic acid (Koo et al. 2014) and was the single most differentially expressed gene (out of 13,920) between the ecotypes genome-wide (LFC = - 9.09; Fig. 3; Supplementary Information). The coastal ecotype had a low expression level that was consistent across all developmental stages. In contrast, the inland annual plants had a 40X higher expression at the two-leaf stage but had a similar level of expression to the coastal ecotype in the floral bud stage (Fig. 4). This pattern of gene expression suggests that jasmonic acid is not degraded at a high rate across all stages in the coastal perennial ecotype while JA may be quickly degraded and recycled in the leaves of the inland ecotype. Similarly, most of the genes in the jasomic acid signalling pathway were expressed in a pattern consistent with previous studies that found a higher production of defensive compounds in the leaves (Fig. 4) of perennial than annual *M. guttatus* populations (Holeski et al. 2013; Lowry et al. 2019; Blanchard et al. 2024).

Trade-offs between rapid growth and herbivore resistance have long been recognized by plant biologists. However, it is only recently that the underlying molecular mechanisms of such trade-offs have begun to be elucidated. The gibberellin pathway is often seen as being at odds with the jasmonic acid pathway in terms of regulating the trade-off between growth and herbivore defense

(Fujita et al. 2006; Yang et al. 2012; Züst & Agrawal 2017). An important recent discovery in

this area is that the gibberellin and jasmonic acid hormone pathways directly interact in an

antagonistic manner though the DELLA-JAZ signaling node (Kazan & Manners 2012; Havko et

al. 2016; Wasternack 2017). If this antagonistic interaction were driving trade-offs between

growth and defense in *M. guttatus*, we would expect a higher level of gibberellin activity in the

leaves of inland plants. This does not appear to be the case, as the pattern of gene expression in

the gibberellin pathway suggests more gibberellin biosynthesis and activity of the pathway in

coastal plants than inland plants. While most of the gibberellin candidate genes were not

expressed at a high enough level for individual gene analyses, the candidate genes in the

biosynthesis pathway all suggested a higher level of gibberellin biosynthesis, especially in leaf

tissues (Fig. 2, 4)

This finding of both higher gibberellin and jasmonic acid pathway activity in coastal leaves may

at first seem contradictory, except that it fits with our general understanding of how trade-offs

occur in this system. Coastal plants allocate more resources to both defense and vegetative

growth; thus, higher levels of expression of both the gibberellin and jasmonic acid pathways in

coastal plant leaves are consistent with this model. The major trade-off in this system is with

reproduction, for which the inland annual *M. guttatus* plants typically allocate more resources to

reproduction over vegetative growth and resistance to insect herbivores (Hall & Willis 2006;

Lowry et al. 2008; Hall et al. 2010; Baker & Diggle 2011; Baker et al. 2012; Holeski et al. 2013;

Lowry et al. 2019). By allocating resources to reproduction, annual plants can successfully

escape the terminal end-of-season drought that characterizes summers in western North America.

In contrast, perennial *M. guttatus* plants preferentially allocate resources to vegetative growth

and resistance to insect herbivores (Holeski et al. 2013; Lowry et al. 2019; Blanchard et al.

2024). The consistently lower temperatures and summer fog along the Pacific coast of North

America (Gilliam 2002; Garcia-Reyes & Largier 2012) provide conditions that facilitate a

perennial life history and, thus, this pattern of resource allocation.

While gibberellin biosynthesis and activity may be lower in inland plants than coastal plants at

the level of leaves, this pattern is likely reversed for the region of the shoot apex, where major

developmental patterns are laid down. Recent studies in this system have found that growth

architecture of coastal plants undergoes greater changes after the application of bioactive

gibberellin (GA3; Lowry et al. 2019). Furthermore, multiple studies suggest that the GA

biosynthesis gene *GA20ox2* plays a critical role in the divergence of the coastal perennial and

inland annual ecotypes (Gould et al. 2017; Kollar et al. 2025). *GA20ox2* is an allele frequency

outlier between coastal and inland populations (Gould et al. 2017) and is located within the

locally adaptive chromosome inversion that drives much of the divergence between the coastal

and inland ecotypes (Lowry & Willis 2010; Friedman 2014; Blanchard et al. 2024). *GA20ox2* is

expressed at a higher level in the shoot apices of inland plants than coastal plants (Kollar et al.

2025). We are currently conducting functional tests with this gene to determine whether it

contributes to the developmental signal that drives morphological divergence between the

ecotypes (Stanley & Lowry, 2024).

Beyond the jasmonic acid and gibberellin pathways, our study suggests the possible involvement

of the auxin hormone pathway in the divergence of the ecotypes. While not a significant

enrichment, eight of the auxin genes that we *a priori* identified were highly differentially

expressed between the ecotypes. Further, auxin was implicated in three of the modules in the

network analyses (tan, cyan, and greenyellow). In contrast, jasmonic acid and gibberellin were

only clearly implicated in the tan module, which appears to primarily capture gene expression

differences between leaf and bud stages, rather than divergence between the ecotypes (Fig. S11).

With both the cyan and greenyellow modules highly differentiated between the ecotypes, the

core role for auxin should be considered in future studies. Of particular interest is the ortholog of

Amidase 1 (Migut.F01717), which mediates growth and stress responses by converting indole-3-

acetamide to the bioactive auxin (Pérez-Alonso et al., 2021). As a member of the greenyellow

module, this *Amidase 1* ortholog may play a key role in the differences in stress responses in

sulfur metabolism for coastal and inland ecotypes, as well as differences key physiological traits.

Sulfur metabolism can play a critical role in plant resilience (Takahashi et al., 2023) and has

previously been shown to differ in concentration between leaves of coastal and inland *M.*

guttatus plants (Lowry et al., 2012).

While the evolution of prostrate coastal ecotypes is a common pattern across plant species,

whether shifts in hormone pathways play an integral role in the evolution of ecotypes is still

unresolved. The only other system we know where appreciable progress has been made in

understanding this type of ecotype divergence is between headland and dune ecotypes of *Senecio*

lautus, where ethylene, gibberelins, and especially auxin have been implicated (James et al.

2021a,b; Wilkinson et al. 2021; Broad et al. 2024). No gene in either *S. lautus* or *M. guttatus* has

yet been confirmed to be involved in coastal ecotype divergence through functional genetic

studies.

Our global gene network expression analysis using WGCNA yielded additional insights into the

pathways that differ between ecotypes and across developmental stages. Interestingly, this

network analysis alone would have resulted in a different interpretation than our candidate

pathway analysis. While the gene network analyses captured new pathways to consider for

divergence between the ecotypes, as well as through development, it did not capture the same

insights about hormone pathway divergence. The main new insight into coastal and inland

ecotype divergence from our study was the recognition that gene regulation may greatly differ in

genes that control microscopic phenotypes, including vesicle trafficking and cell death

regulation. These microscopic processes likely serve as a critical intermediate between the

ultimately causative genetic variation at the DNA sequence level and phenotypic variation at the

organismal level. Another major insight from the network analysis was that there were major

differences in the regulation of photosynthetic processes between leaf and bud tissues, but not

between the ecotypes, as represented by the blue module (Fig. 6b). This finding suggests that the

natural variation in components of the photosynthetic machinery is likely not important for the

evolution of these coastal and inland ecotypes. Natural variation in photosynthetic efficiency has

been observed in other systems (Sharwood et al. 2022; Theeuwen et al. 2022), but it remains

unclear whether this is due to functional allelic variation within the photosynthetic machinery

itself or if it is caused by variation in genes peripheral to the core machinery.

Salt spray adaptations of the coastal perennial ecotype

Oceanic salt spray plays a key role in the local adaptation of coastal plant populations, leading to

the evolution of morphological, phenological, and physiological traits (Boyce 1954; Ahmad &

Wainwright 1976; Popovic & Lowry 2020; Itoh et al. 2021, 2024). While salt spray is important

for coastal population adaptations, the mechanisms underlying adaptations to this stress are

poorly understood (Du & Hesp 2020). In *M. guttatus*, we have previously demonstrated that

coastal perennials have higher tolerance to salt spray than inland annuals (Lowry et al. 2008,

2009; Popovic & Lowry 2020; Toll et al. 2024).

Salt spray adaptations likely share some mechanisms with soil salinity adaptations, especially in

terms of leaf tissue tolerance (Munn & Tester 2008). Leaf tissue tolerance to high sodium

accumulation is generally thought to involve the transport of sodium ions across cellular and

vacuolar membranes to maintain cellular homeostais, which includes genes in the SOS pathway

(Fig. 3; Ji et al. 2013; Yang & Guo 2018; Yin et al. 2020). The upregulation of *CIPK8* and *SOS1*

in coastal plants (Fig. 3, 4) is consistent with sodium being pumped out of the cytoplasm cells

into the apoplastic flow. The only other major cellular sodium homeostasis gene that was

significantly differentially expressed between the ecotypes was *HKT1*, which was also

upregulated in coastal plants and serves the function of importing sodium into the cytoplasm

from the apoplast. These seemingly contradictory patterns of gene expression suggest that coastal

plant cells are both exporting and importing sodium at higher rates than inland plants. However,

this result may be explained by our RNA-seq data being quantified across entire leaves. The

regulation and functions of *HKT* genes across different tissues are known to be complex (Munns

& Tester 2008; Zamani Babgohari et al. 2014; Gholizadeh et al. 2024). Thus, it is possible that

some coastal plant cells export sodium, while others take it up in a manner that maintains overall

leaf homeostasis. With single-cell sequencing, it may be possible in subsequent studies to test the

hypothesis that sodium is being actively partitioned between cells to maintain overall leaf

homeostasis (Li et al. 2024).

In addition to the core cellular sodium homeostasis genes, shifts in hormone levels can confer

adaptations to salt. Recent studies have found that both the jasmonic acid and gibberellin

pathways can alter salt tolerance in plants, although in inconsistent ways. Context matters, as

some studies have found that jasmonic acid can improve salt tolerance (reviewed in Khan et al.

2025), while others have found that it can make plants more susceptible to salt stress (Song et al.

2021). Context also appears to matter in the case of gibberellin, where the addition of this

hormone generally confers higher tolerance to soil salinity (Iqbal & Ashraf 2013; Farooq et al.

2022; Liu et al. 2023), but, in contrast, makes *M. guttatus* plants more susceptible to oceanic salt

spray in the field (Toll et al. 2024).

Towards a general understanding of plant ecotype formation

Ecotypes are thought to represent an important early stage in the process of speciation (reviewed

in Lowry 2012; Stankowski & Ravinet 2021; Butlin & Faria 2024). While most ecotypes will

likely not go on to become new species, it is important to understand their formation as part of

the speciation process, as some of them will complete the speciation process. The divergence of

inland and coastal populations have served as an excellent model for understanding the

speciation process, all the way back to when studies on them were used to coin the term

"ecotype" in the first place (Turesson 1922a). Our study provides further evidence that the

evolutionary divergence of hormone networks is a key component in the formation of locally

adapted ecotypes. We hypothesize that such shifts in the complex hormone networks drive the

evolution of shifts from perennality to annuality (Friedman 2020; Lundgren & Des Marais 2020)

and the accumulation of both extrinsic and intrinsic reproductive isolation. Indeed, a recent study

of headland and dune ecotypes of *S. latifolius* found that the evolutionary shifts in the auxin

network associated with different levels of gravitropism of the ecotypes may also cause hybrid

sterility (Wilkinson et al. 2021). Ultimately, functional studies of key candidate genes, currently

underway, will be necessary to test the hypothesis that changes in the regulation of hormone

pathways directly lead to the formation of ecotypes.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by grants (IOS-1855927, IOS-2153100) from the National Science

Foundation and start-up funds from Michigan State University. We thank Madison Plunkert,

Lauren Stanley, Joanna Feehan, Colette Berg, Daniel Ortiz-Barrientos, and two anonymous

reviewers for comments that greatly helped improve this document.

REFERENCES

Aerts, N., Pereira Mendes, M., & Van Wees, S. C. M. (2021). Multiple levels of crosstalk in hormone

networks regulating plant defense. The Plant Journal: For Cell and Molecular Biology, 105(2), 489–

504.

Abrams, L. (1951). Illustrated Flora of the Pacific States, Vol. III, Geraniaceae to Scrophulariaceae.

Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA, USA.

Ahmad, I., & Wainwright, S. I. (1976). Ecotype differences in leaf surface properties of Agrostis

stolonifera from salt marsh, spray zone and inland habitats. New Phytologist, 76(2), 361–366.

Anders, S., Pyl, P. T., & Huber, W. (2015). HTSeq--a Python framework to work with high-throughput

sequencing data. Bioinformatics (Oxford, England), 31(2), 166–169.

Baker, R. L., & Diggle, P. K. (2011). Node-specific branching and heterochronic changes underlie

population-level differences in Mimulus guttatus (Phrymaceae) shoot architecture. American Journal

of Botany, 98(12), 1924–1934.

Baker, R. L., Hileman, L. C., & Diggle, P. (2012). Patterns of shoot architecture in locally adapted

populations are linked to intraspecific differences in gene regulation. The New Phytologist, 196(1),

271–281.

Blanchard, M. L., Lowry, D. B., & Holeski, L. M. (2024). Patterns of constitutive and induced herbivore

defence are complex, but share a common genetic basis in annual and perennial monkeyflower.

Functional Ecology, 38(8), 1796–1810.

Boyce, S. G. (1954). The salt spray community. Ecological Monographs, 24(1), 29–67.

Broad, Z., Lefreve, J., Wilkinson, M. J., Barton, S., Barbier, F., Jung, H., Donovan, D., & Ortiz-

Barrientos, D. (2024). Gravitropic gene expression divergence associated with adaptation to

contrasting environments in an Australian wildflower. Molecular Ecology, e17543.

Butlin, R. K., & Faria, R. (2024). Local adaptation and reproductive isolation: when does speciation start?

Evolutionary Journal of the Linnean Society, 3(1). https://doi.org/10.1093/evolinnean/kzae003

Clausen, J., Keck, D. D., & Hiesey, W. M. (1940). Experimental studies on the nature of species. I. Effect

of varied environments on western North American plants. Carnegie Institution of Washington

Publication No. 520.

Clausen, J., Keck, D. D., & Hiesey, W. M. (1948). Experimental studies on the nature of species. III.

Environmental responses of climatic races of Achillea. Carnegie Institution of Washington

Publication No. 581.

Claus Wasternack. (2017). A plant?s balance of growth and defense ? revisited. The New Phytologist,

215(4), 1291–1294.

Coyne, J. A., & Orr, H. A. (2004). Speciation. Sinauer Associates.

Depuydt, S., & Hardtke, C. S. (2011). Hormone signalling crosstalk in plant growth regulation. Current

Biology: CB, 21(9), R365–R373.

Du, J., & Hesp, P. A. (2020). Salt Spray Distribution and Its Impact on Vegetation Zonation on Coastal

Dunes: a Review. Estuaries and Coasts, 43(8), 1885–1907.

Farooq, M., Khan, M. A., Zhao, D.-D., Asif, S., Kim, E.-G., Jang, Y.-H., Park, J.-R., Lee, I.-J., & Kim,

K.-M. (2022). Extrinsic role of gibberellin mitigating salinity effect in different rice genotypes.

Frontiers in Plant Science, 13, 1041181.

Foster, S. A., McKinnon, G. E., Steane, D. A., Potts, B. M., & Vaillancourt, R. E. (2007). Parallel

evolution of dwarf ecotypes in the forest tree Eucalyptus globulus. The New Phytologist, 175(2),

370–380.

Friedman, J. (2014). Genetic determinants and epistasis for life history trait differences in the common

monkeyflower, Mimulus guttatus. The Journal of Heredity, 105(6), 816–827.

Friedman, J. (2020). The evolution of annual and perennial plant life histories: Ecological correlates and

genetic mechanisms. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics, 51(1), 461–481.

Fujita, M., Fujita, Y., Noutoshi, Y., Takahashi, F., Narusaka, Y., Yamaguchi-Shinozaki, K., & Shinozaki,

K. (2006). Crosstalk between abiotic and biotic stress responses: a current view from the points of

convergence in the stress signaling networks. Current Opinion in Plant Biology, 9(4), 436–442.

García-Reyes, M., & Largier, J. L. (2012). Seasonality of coastal upwelling off central and northern

California: New insights, including temporal and spatial variability. Journal of Geophysical Research,

117(C3). https://doi.org/10.1029/2011jc007629

Gasperini, D., & Howe, G. A. (2024). Phytohormones in a universe of regulatory metabolites: lessons

from jasmonate. Plant Physiology, 195(1), 135–154.

Gholizadeh, F., Mirmazloum, I., & Janda, T. (2024). Genome-wide identification of HKT gene family in

wheat (Triticum aestivum L.): Insights from the expression of multiple genes (HKT, SOS, TVP and

NHX) under salt stress. Plant Stress, 13(100539), 100539.

Gilliam, H. (2002). Weather of the San Francisco Bay Region. University of California Press.

Gould, B. A., Chen, Y., & Lowry, D. B. (2017). Pooled ecotype sequencing reveals candidate genetic

mechanisms for adaptive differentiation and reproductive isolation. Molecular Ecology, 26(1), 163–

177.

Gould, B. A., Chen, Y., & Lowry, D. B. (2018). Gene regulatory divergence between locally adapted

ecotypes in their native habitats. Molecular Ecology, 27(21), 4174–4188.

Guo, Q., Major, I. T., & Howe, G. A. (2018). Resolution of growth-defense conflict: mechanistic insights

from jasmonate signaling. Current Opinion in Plant Biology, 44, 72–81.

Hall, M. C., Basten, C. J., & Willis, J. H. (2006). Pleiotropic quantitative trait loci contribute to

population divergence in traits associated with life-history variation in Mimulus guttatus. Genetics,

172(3), 1829–1844.

Hall, M. C., Lowry, D. B., & Willis, J. H. (2010). Is local adaptation in Mimulus guttatus caused by trade-

offs at individual loci? Molecular Ecology, 19(13), 2739–2753.

Hall, M. C., & Willis, J. H. (2006). Divergent selection on flowering time contributes to local adaptation

in Mimulus guttatus populations. Evolution; International Journal of Organic Evolution, 60(12),

2466–2477.

Havko, N. E., Major, I. T., Jewell, J. B., Attaran, E., Browse, J., & Howe, G. A. (2016). Control of carbon

assimilation and partitioning by jasmonate: An accounting of growth-defense tradeoffs. Plants, 5(1),

7.

Hellsten, U., Wright, K. M., Jenkins, J., Shu, S., Yuan, Y., Wessler, S. R., Schmutz, J., Willis, J. H., &

Rokhsar, D. S. (2013). Fine-scale variation in meiotic recombination in Mimulus inferred from

population shotgun sequencing. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United

States of America, 110(48), 19478–19482.

Hitchcock, C. L., Cronquit, A. (1973). Flora of the Pacific Northwest: an illustrated manual. University of

Washington Press. Seattle, WA, USA.

Howe, G. A., Major, I. T., & Koo, A. J. (2018). Modularity in jasmonate signaling for multistress

resilience. Annual Review of Plant Biology, 69, 387–415.

Iqbal, M., & Ashraf, M. (2013). Gibberellic acid mediated induction of salt tolerance in wheat plants:

Growth, ionic partitioning, photosynthesis, yield and hormonal homeostasis. Environmental and

Experimental Botany, 86, 76–85.

Itoh, M. (2021). Phenotypic variation and adaptation in morphology and salt spray tolerance in coastal

and inland populations of Setaria viridis in central Japan. Weed Research, 61(3), 199–209.

Itoh, M., Fukunaga, K., & Osako, T. (2024). Local adaptation in parapatric and sympatric mosaic coastal

habitats through trait divergence of Setaria viridis. The Journal of Ecology.

https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.14269

James, M. E., Allsopp, R. N., Groh, J. S., Kaur, A., Wilkinson, M. J., & Ortiz-Barrientos, D. (2023).

Uncovering the genetic architecture of parallel evolution. Molecular Ecology, 32(20), 5575–5589.

James, M. E., Wilkinson, M. J., Bernal, D. M., Liu, H., North, H. L., Engelstädter, J., & Ortiz-Barrientos,

D. (2021). Phenotypic and genotypic parallel evolution in parapatric ecotypes of Senecio. Evolution;

International Journal of Organic Evolution, 75(12), 3115–3131.

Ji, H., Pardo, J. M., Batelli, G., Van Oosten, M. J., Bressan, R. A., & Li, X. (2013). The Salt Overly

Sensitive (SOS) pathway: established and emerging roles. Molecular Plant, 6(2), 275–286.

Kazan, K., & Manners, J. M. (2012). JAZ repressors and the orchestration of phytohormone crosstalk.

Trends in Plant Science, 17(1), 22–31.

Kollar, L. M., Stanley, L. E., Kenchanmane Raju, S. K., Lowry, D. B., & Niederhuth, C. E. (2025). The

evolution of locally adaptive chromosome inversions in Mimulus guttatus. Molecular Ecology,

e17708.

Koo, A. J., Thireault, C., Zemelis, S., Poudel, A. N., Zhang, T., Kitaoka, N., Brandizzi, F., Matsuura, H.,

& Howe, G. A. (2014). Endoplasmic reticulum-associated inactivation of the hormone jasmonoyl-L-

isoleucine by multiple members of the cytochrome P450 94 family in Arabidopsis. The Journal of

Biological Chemistry, 289(43), 29728–29738.

Langfelder, P., & Horvath, S. (2008). WGCNA: an R package for weighted correlation network analysis.

BMC Bioinformatics, 9(1), 559.

Law, C. W., Chen, Y., Shi, W., & Smyth, G. K. (2014). voom: Precision weights unlock linear model
analysis tools for RNA-seq read counts. Genome Biology, 15(2), R29.
Li, H. (2013). Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM. In
arXiv [q-bio.GN]. arXiv. http://arxiv.org/abs/1303.3997
Li, H., Handsaker, B., Wysoker, A., Fennell, T., Ruan, J., Homer, N., Marth, G., Abecasis, G., Durbin, R.,
& 1000 Genome Project Data Processing Subgroup. (2009). The Sequence Alignment/Map format
and SAMtools. Bioinformatics (Oxford, England), 25(16), 2078–2079.
Li, P., Liu, Q., Wei, Y., Xing, C., Xu, Z., Ding, F., Liu, Y., Lu, Q., Hu, N., Wang, T., Zhu, X., Cheng, S.,
Li, Z., Zhao, Z., Li, Y., Han, J., Cai, X., Zhou, Z., Wang, K., … Peng, R. (2024). Transcriptional
landscape of cotton roots in response to salt stress at single-cell resolution. Plant Communications,
5(2), 100740.
Liu, J., Wu, Y., Dong, G., Zhu, G., & Zhou, G. (2023). Progress of research on the physiology and
molecular regulation of sorghum growth under salt stress by gibberellin. International Journal of
Molecular Sciences, 24(7), 6777.
Lohman, B. K., Weber, J. N., & Bolnick, D. I. (2016). Evaluation of TagSeq, a reliable low-cost
alternative for RNAseq. Molecular Ecology Resources, 16(6), 1315–1321.
Love, M. I., Huber, W., & Anders, S. (2014). Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for
RNA-seq data with DESeq2. Genome Biology, 15(12), 550.
Lowry, D. B., Hall, M. C., Salt, D. E., & Willis, J. H. (2009). Genetic and physiological basis of adaptive
salt tolerance divergence between coastal and inland Mimulus guttatus. The New Phytologist, 183(3),
776–788.
Lowry, D. B., Rockwood, R. C., & Willis, J. H. (2008). Ecological reproductive isolation of coast and
inland races of Mimulus guttatus. Evolution; International Journal of Organic Evolution, 62(9), 2196–
2214.

Lowry, D. B., Sheng, C. C., Zhu, Z., Juenger, T. E., Lahner, B., Salt, D. E., & Willis, J. H. (2012).

Mapping of ionomic traits in Mimulus guttatus reveals Mo and Cd QTLs that colocalize with MOT1

homologues. PloS One, 7(1), e30730.

Lowry, D. B., & Willis, J. H. (2010). A widespread chromosomal inversion polymorphism contributes to

a major life-history transition, local adaptation, and reproductive isolation. PLoS Biology, 8(9).

https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1000500

Lundgren, M. R., & Des Marais, D. L. (2020). Life history variation as a model for understanding trade-

offs in plant-environment interactions. Current Biology: CB, 30(4), R180–R189.

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

EMBnet.journal, 17, 10–12.

Marx, H. E., Scheidt, S., Barker, M. S., & Dlugosch, K. M. (2020). TagSeq for gene expression in non-

model plants: A pilot study at the Santa Rita Experimental Range NEON core site. Applications in

Plant Sciences, 8(11), e11398.

Meyer, E., Aglyamova, G. V., & Matz, M. V. (2011). Profiling gene expression responses of coral larvae

(Acropora millepora) to elevated temperature and settlement inducers using a novel RNA-Seq

procedure. Molecular Ecology, 20(17), 3599–3616.

Murphy, A. (2015). Hormone crosstalk in plants. Journal of Experimental Botany, 66, 4853–4854.

Nagy, E. S., & Rice, K. J. (1997). Local adaptation in two subspecies of an annual plant: Implications for

migration and gene flow. Evolution; International Journal of Organic Evolution, 51(4), 1079–1089.

Nesom, G. L. (2012). Taxonomy of Erythranthe sect. Simiola (Phrymaceae) in the USA and Mexico.

Phytoneuron 2012-40:1-123.

Pérez-Alonso, M.-M., Ortiz-García, P., Moya-Cuevas, J., Lehmann, T., Sánchez-Parra, B., Björk, R. G.,

Karim, S., Amirjani, M. R., Aronsson, H., Wilkinson, M. D., & Pollmann, S. (2021). Endogenous

indole-3-acetamide levels contribute to the crosstalk between auxin and abscisic acid, and trigger

plant stress responses in Arabidopsis. Journal of Experimental Botany, 72(2), 459–475.

Pieterse, C., Pierik, R., & Van Wees, S. C. M. (2014). Different shades of JAZ during plant growth and

defense. The New Phytologist, 204(2), 261–264.

Popovic, D., & Lowry, D. B. (2020). Contrasting environmental factors drive local adaptation at opposite

ends of an environmental gradient in the yellow monkeyflower (Mimulus guttatus). American Journal

of Botany, 107(2), 298–307.

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

differential expression analysis of digital gene expression data. Bioinformatics (Oxford, England),

26(1), 139–140.

Roda, F., Ambrose, L., Walter, G. M., Liu, H. L., Schaul, A., Lowe, A., Pelser, P. B., Prentis, P.,

Rieseberg, L. H., & Ortiz-Barrientos, D. (2013). Genomic evidence for the parallel evolution of

coastal forms in the Senecio lautus complex. Molecular Ecology, 22(11), 2941–2952.

Schemske, D. (2000). Understanding the origin of species. Evolution, 54(3), 1069–1073.

Sharwood, R. E., Quick, W. P., Sargent, D., Estavillo, G. M., Silva-Perez, V., & Furbank, R. T. (2022).

Mining for allelic gold: finding genetic variation in photosynthetic traits in crops and wild relatives.

Journal of Experimental Botany, 73(10), 3085–3108.

Sobel, J. M. (2014). Ecogeographic isolation and speciation in the genus Mimulus. The American

Naturalist, 184(5), 565–579.

Sobel, J. M., Chen, G. F., Watt, L. R., & Schemske, D. W. (2010). The biology of speciation. Evolution;

International Journal of Organic Evolution, 64(2), 295–315.

Stankowski, S., & Ravinet, M. (2021). Defining the speciation continuum. Evolution; International

Journal of Organic Evolution, 75(6), 1256–1273.

Takahashi, H., Marsolais, F., Cuypers, A., & Kopriva, S. (2023). Sulfur metabolism: actions for plant

resilience and environmental adaptation. Journal of Experimental Botany, 74(11), 3271–3275.

Theeuwen, T. P. J. M., Logie, L. L., Harbinson, J., & Aarts, M. G. M. (2022). Genetics as a key to

improving crop photosynthesis. Journal of Experimental Botany, 73(10), 3122–3137.

Toll, K., Blanchard, M., Scharnagl, A., Holeski, L. M., & Lowry, D. B. (2024). Plant hormone

manipulation impacts salt spray tolerance, which preempts herbivory as a driver of local adaptation in

the yellow monkeyflower,Mimulus guttatus. In bioRxiv (p. 2024.05.23.595619).

https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.23.595619

Turesson, G. (1922a). The species and the variety as ecological units. Hereditas, 3(1), 100–113.

Turesson, G. (1922b). The genotypical response of the plant species to the habitat. Hereditas 3(3): 211–

350.

Twyford, A. D., & Friedman, J. (2015). Adaptive divergence in the monkey flower Mimulus guttatus is

maintained by a chromosomal inversion: GENETICS OF ADAPTIVE DIVERGENCE IN MONKEY

FLOWERS. Evolution; International Journal of Organic Evolution, 69(6), 1476–1486.

Twyford, A. D., Streisfeld, M. A., Lowry, D. B., & Friedman, J. (2015). Genomic studies on the nature of

species: adaptation and speciation inMimulus. In Molecular Ecology (Vol. 24, Issue 11, pp. 2601–

2609). https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.13190

van Kleunen, M. (2007). Adaptive genetic differentiation in life-history traits between populations of

Mimulus guttatus with annual and perennial life-cycles. Evolutionary Ecology, 21(2), 185–199.

VanWallendael, A., Soltani, A., Emery, N. C., Peixoto, M. M., Olsen, J., & Lowry, D. B. (2019). A

molecular view of plant local adaptation: Incorporating stress-response networks. Annual Review of

Plant Biology, 70(1), 559–583.

Verhoeven, K. J. F., Poorter, H., Nevo, E., & Biere, A. (2008). Habitat-specific natural selection at a

flowering-time QTL is a main driver of local adaptation in two wild barley populations. Molecular

Ecology, 17(14), 3416–3424.

Vickery, R. K., Jr. (1978). Case studies in the evolution of species complexes in Mimulus. In

Evolutionary Biology (pp. 405–507). Springer, USA.

Voesenek, L. A. C. J., & Blom, C. W. P. M. (1996). Plants and Hormones: An Ecophysiological View on

Timing and Plasticity. The Journal of Ecology, 84(1), 111.

Weng, X., & Juenger, T. E. (2022). A high-throughput 3'-tag RNA sequencing for large-scale time-series

transcriptome studies. Methods in Molecular Biology (Clifton, N.J.), 2398, 151–172.

Wilkinson, M. J., Roda, F., Walter, G. M., James, M. E., Nipper, R., Walsh, J., Allen, S. L., North, H. L.,

Beveridge, C. A., & Ortiz-Barrientos, D. (2021). Adaptive divergence in shoot gravitropism creates

hybrid sterility in an Australian wildflower. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the

United States of America, 118(47), e2004901118.

Yang, D.-L., Yao, J., Mei, C.-S., Tong, X.-H., Zeng, L.-J., Li, Q., Xiao, L.-T., Sun, T.-P., Li, J., Deng, X.-

W., Lee, C. M., Thomashow, M. F., Yang, Y., He, Z., & He, S. Y. (2012). Plant hormone jasmonate

prioritizes defense over growth by interfering with gibberellin signaling cascade. Proceedings of the

National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 109(19), E1192–E1200.

Yang, Y., & Guo, Y. (2018). Elucidating the molecular mechanisms mediating plant salt-stress responses.

The New Phytologist, 217(2), 523–539.

Yin, X., Xia, Y., Xie, Q., Cao, Y., Wang, Z., Hao, G., Song, J., Zhou, Y., & Jiang, X. (2020). The protein

kinase complex CBL10-CIPK8-SOS1 functions in Arabidopsis to regulate salt tolerance. Journal of

Experimental Botany, 71(6), 1801–1814.

Zamani Babgohari, M., Ebrahimie, E., & Niazi, A. (2014). In silico analysis of high affinity potassium

transporter (HKT) isoforms in different plants. Aquatic Biosystems, 10(1), 9.

Züst, T., & Agrawal, A. A. (2017). Trade-offs between plant growth and defense against insect herbivory:

An emerging mechanistic synthesis. Annual Review of Plant Biology, 68(1), 513–534.

Data Accessibility and Benefit-Sharing

Raw sequence reads and processed count data are publicly available and accessible for reuse

through the NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) under accession numbers GSE280929 and

GSM8607613-GSM8607692. Custom scripts for analysis can be found on GitHub at

https://github.com/lowrylab/Mimulus_expression_across_development

Author contributions

DBL and YC designed the experiment. YC conducted the experiment, performed RNA extractions, and prepared the genomic libraries. JDO, BAG, and DBL conducted the data analyses. DBL and JDO wrote the manuscript, with input from YC and BAG.

Supporting/Supplementary information

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section and includes the following:

Supplementary Methods

Supplementary Figures S1-S27

Supplementary Data Files