Organ-specific propensity drives patterns of gene expression evolution

Kenji Fukushima[1,2*] and David D. Pollock[1,*]

[1]Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Genetics, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, CO 80045, USA.

[2]Present address: Institute for Molecular Plant Physiology and Biophysics, University of Würzburg

* Correspondence to: kenji.fukushima@uni-wuerzburg.de (K.F.) and david.pollock@cuanschutz.edu (D.D.P.)

Keywords: evolutionary transcriptomics, preadaptation, vertebrate evolution

Abstract:

The origins of multicellular physiology are tied to evolution of gene expression. Genes can shift expression as organisms evolve, but how ancestral expression influences altered descendant expression is not well understood. To examine this, we amalgamated 1,903 RNA-seq datasets from 182 research projects, including 6 organs in 21 vertebrate species. Quality control eliminated project-specific biases, and expression shifts were reconstructed using gene-family-wise phylogenetic Ornstein–Uhlenbeck models. Expression shifts following gene duplication result in more drastic changes in expression properties than shifts without gene duplication. The expression properties were tightly coupled with protein evolutionary rate, depending on whether and how gene duplication occurred. Fluxes in expression patterns among organs were nonrandom, forming modular connections which were reshaped by gene duplication. Thus, if expression shifted, ancestral expression in some organs induces a strong propensity for expression in particular organs in descendants. This supports a major role for what might be termed "preadaptive" pathways of gene expression evolution.

Introduction:

Vertebrate organs organize physiological activities, and their identities and functions are determined by the diverse expression patterns of thousands of genes. Because of this, the evolution of gene expression patterns plays a central role in organismal evolution. The degree of organ expression specificity correlates to how fast amino acids substitute (Zhang and Li, 2004), how rapidly they change expression levels (Liao and Zhang, 2006), and patterns of histone modifications (She et al., 2009). Major organ-altering evolutionary events such as development of the hominoid brain are also associated with gene expression shifts (Chen et al., 2013; Kaessmann, 2010; Zhang and Long, 2014; Zhang et al., 2011). However, although gene duplication is well-known to play an important role in expression pattern shifts (see e.g. the "ortholog conjecture" (Altenhoff et al., 2012; Castillo-Davis et al., 2004; Chen and Zhang, 2012; Rogozin et al., 2014)), the evolutionary dynamics of expression patterns with and without gene duplication remain poorly understood. An important question is whether long-term expression in one organ predisposes genes to be subsequently utilized in other organs.

A theoretical basis for such predisposition may be the idea that certain pre-existing adapted states are more conducive to evolution of specific new traits than other pre-existing states. This is known as preadaptation, and when a trait makes such a shift it is referred to as exaptation (Gould and Vrba, 1982). Evidence for preadaptation was long ago found in phenotypic traits (Budd, 2007), and recently in molecular traits such as protein sequences during *de novo* gene birth (Wilson et al., 2017) or during functional innovations (Starr et al., 2017). Protein sequence evolution generally involves highly epistatic interactions and context-dependent changes (Podgornaia and Laub, 2015; Starr et al., 2017) that affect preadaptation, but the modular nature of expression regulation (de-Leon and Davidson, 2007) makes it unclear whether preexisting expression patterns constrain evolutionary outcomes. By analyzing such influences on a genome-wide scale in this study, we aim to contribute some evidence towards this question.

Evolution of gene expression has been studied at genome-wide scales mainly using two distinct approaches: phylogenetic and pairwise analyses. Phylogenetic approaches model gene expression dynamics and infer ancestral expression patterns in the context of gene phylogenies. For example, Brownian motion models embody purely neutral expression evolution (Bedford and Hartl, 2009), whereas Ornstein–Uhlenbeck models are designed to detect purifying selection and adaptive evolution along with neutral

fluctuation (Brawand et al., 2011; Chen et al., 2019; Rohlfs et al., 2014). Although each

gene family has a distinct evolutionary history, a species phylogeny is often used for the

sake of simplicity. Because such approximations cannot be applied to gene families

with lineage-specific gene duplications and losses, its application has mostly been

limited to single-copy genes. In contrast, pairwise analysis compares gene expression

between paralogs in single species (Assis and Bachtrog, 2015; Lan and Pritchard, 2016)

or between orthologs or paralogs in pairs of species (Chen and Zhang, 2012;

Guschanski et al., 2017; Kryuchkova-Mostacci et al., 2016; Rogozin et al., 2014;

Warnefors and Kaessmann, 2013). Although pairwise approaches can evaluate the

effect of gene duplications, ancestral expression cannot be inferred.

To infer the adaptive evolution of gene expression in diverse gene families, we

applied Ornstein–Uhlenbeck models for complex gene family phylogenies containing

gene duplications and losses, without assuming species phylogeny. We also developed a

curation pipeline to amalgamate large amounts of transcriptome data from many studies

for a better phylogenetic resolution. Using these methods, we ask how expression

changes link to gene duplication and the rate of protein evolution, and whether previous

patterns of gene expression constrain later evolution, what we will call the

"preadaptation hypothesis".

Results:

Duplication-permissive genome-wide analysis of gene families. To allow

evolutionary expression analysis on a broad set of genes, we used a phylogenetic

approach that deals with the complex history of gene family trees with duplications and

losses, and applied it to 21 tetrapod genomes (Fig. S1). A major challenge in using gene

trees was divergence time estimation, a prerequisite for applying phylogenetic

comparative methods. We overcame this problem by incorporating phylogeny

reconciliation in estimating divergence time of gene trees. Gene divergence nodes were

constrained by the corresponding divergence times in a known species tree, and

duplication nodes were constrained by ancestral and descendant speciation events (see

Materials and Methods for details). Because we estimated individual gene phylogenies

rather than using a single species phylogeny, we could analyze gene families that

included many lineage-specific gene duplications and losses, making our study less

biased towards conserved genes with slow gene turnovers (Guschanski et al., 2017).

Use of gene family trees also allowed us to include many organ-specific genes that are

enriched in lineage-specific and young duplications (Guschanski et al., 2017). There

were only 1,377 single-copy orthologs for which the species phylogeny was applicable,

but we were able to include 15,475 genes per species on average (including 20,873

human genes, merged into 15,280 gene families). This approach eliminates problems

with pairwise analyses that ignore phylogenetic tree structure, and allowed us to infer

expression at ancestral nodes in the tree.

Transcriptome amalgamation. To attain high resolution in our analyses, we

amalgamated 1,903 RNA-seq experiments from 182 research projects (i.e., 182

BioProject IDs in the NCBI SRA database) and generated a dataset covering 6 organs

from 21 vertebrate species without missing data (Tables S1–S2; Fig. S1). In comparison,

other recent comparative transcriptomic analyses of vertebrates (Barbosa-Morais et al.,

2012; Breschi et al., 2016; Carelli et al., 2016; Chen et al., 2019; Cortez et al., 2014;

Guschanski et al., 2017; Julien et al., 2012; Necsulea et al., 2014; Warnefors and

Kaessmann, 2013) often used the same dataset containing 131 RNA-seq experiments

from 6 organs and 10 species (Brawand et al., 2011), with some additional data in

different studies. RNA-seq reads were first mapped to corresponding reference genomes

and then the expression level was quantified by two metrics: transcripts per million

(TPM) and fragments per kilobase million normalized by trimmed mean of M-values

(Robinson and Oshlack, 2010) (TMM-FPKM). To reduce the among-species variation,

the TMM normalization was applied across all 1,903 samples using the 1,377 single-

copy orthologs.

To allow rapid integrated analysis of datasets, we employed automated multi-

aspect quality controls, including metadata curation (Table S3), sequence read filtering

(Fig. S2), and iterative removal of anomalous RNA-seq samples by monitoring

correlations between and within data categories (Fig. 1A; Fig. S3). The metadata

curation enabled us to select appropriate samples from the NCBI SRA database. Data

that were not compatible with those from other research projects (defined by BioProject

ID) were removed in the correlation analysis by implementing a majority rule (Table

S3), resulting in a cleaned dataset. This filtering step was designed to fulfill the

assumption that any samples from the same organ should correlate better than samples

from different organs within species. When anomalous data were detected, all samples

belonging to the same research projects (i.e., the same BioProject ID) were discarded.

Finally, we applied surrogate variable analysis (SVA) (Leek and Storey, 2007) to

detect and correct hidden biases likely originating from heterogeneous sampling

conditions and sequencing procedures among experiments in both $\log_2$-scaled TPM and

TMM-FPKM (SVA-log-TPM and SVA-log-TMM-FPKM, respectively; Fig. S4A–B).

This correction greatly improved the correlation of expression levels within organs from

the same species, even when data were derived from different research projects (Fig.

1B–C; Fig. S4C–F). Among surrogate variables, BioProject IDs tend to show a high

predictive power, suggesting project-specific sources of bias (Fig. 1D; Fig. S4G–H).

Although the inclusion of many species from phylogenetically diverse lineages makes it

difficult to extract organ-wise characteristics from the limited number of single-copy

orthologs, a principal component analysis produced moderate organ-wise segregation in

the multispecies comparison (Fig. 1E; Fig. S4I–K), further indicating that the curated

dataset is sufficiently reliable for use in cross-species expression pattern analyses. The

previously-reported uniqueness of testis transcriptomes (Brawand et al., 2011) was

partly resolved as the third principal component (Fig. S4K).

To further evaluate the validity of amalgamated transcriptomes, we analyzed the

expression of community-curated cell-type-specific marker genes associated with

organs in PanglaoDB (Franzén et al., 2019), which organizes a number of single-cell

RNA-seq experiments in human and mouse. We compared median values of log-

transformed expression levels of >100 marker genes in each organ (Fig. S5). After SVA

correction, all RNA-seq samples in the both species showed the corresponding marker

expression values higher than those from the other organs, suggesting our amalgamated

transcriptomes preserve the organ-specific gene expression. In the cell-type-wise

analysis, a few cases, such as juxtaglomerular cells in kidney and hepatic stellate cells

in liver, could not resolve our organ-wise transcriptomes (Supplementary Data).

However, such low performance was seen in all samples rather than subsets associated

with particular BioProject IDs, suggesting that the dissection decisions have negligible

effects to cell type compositions in the organs.

In addition to the better phylogenetic coverage, greater accuracy of estimated

expression levels is another possible advantage of integrating many RNA-seq datasets.

This idea is supported by subsampling analysis on a housekeeping gene GAPDH

(glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase), where, as more data are used, estimated

expression levels tend to quickly converge to a final value (Fig. 1F; Fig. S4L).

Modeling expression evolution. We next used the amalgamated transcriptomes to

evaluate how expression evolved along 15,280 maximum-likelihood gene family

phylogenies (Table S4), employing multi-optima Ornstein–Uhlenbeck (OU) models

(Hansen, 1997) to allow for possible adaptive shifts of optimal expression levels and

neutral fluctuations (Brawand et al., 2011; Chen et al., 2019; Rohlfs et al., 2014). This

modeling identified statistically supported expression 'regime shifts' (Hansen, 1997;

Khabbazian et al., 2016) on each gene tree (Fig. 2A), which were then analyzed in the

context of preceding duplication events. 'Speciation' events (S node; Fig. 2B) with no

duplication were considered the 'baseline' mode of expression evolution because

regulatory environments and expression patterns are more preserved among orthologous

genes in comparison with paralogous genes produced by gene duplication (Altenhoff et

al., 2012; Castillo-Davis et al., 2004; Chen and Zhang, 2012; Rogozin et al., 2014).

Because OU shift detection has been applied for gene expression by assuming species

tree phylogeny in single-copy genes, shifts in S branches are equivalent to those

characterized previously (Brawand et al., 2011; Chen et al., 2019) but also includes

many more speciation events in duplication-prone gene families. Gene tree nodes

associated with preceding duplication events were categorized as DNA-based

duplication or retrotransposition (D or R nodes, respectively) depending on complete

intron losses (Fig. 2B).

Organ-wise means of the two expression values, SVA-log-TPM and SVA-log-

TMM-FPKM, were separately used to model expression evolution with OU processes.

The two analyses resulted in similar numbers and characteristics of expression regime

shifts (Fig. S6), but the shift locations were sometimes inconsistent. S branches were a

major source of apparently inconsistent regime shifts, whereas branches following

duplication (D and R) showed largely consistent detection between the two metrics (Fig.

2C). Although the inclusion of inconsistently detected branches did not change the

results, we retained only consistently detected regime shifts for all downstream analysis

to draw a more robust conclusion. While SVA-log-TMM-FPKM values were reported

in the main text unless otherwise mentioned, the comparisons with SVA-log-TPM-

based analyses are available as Supplementary Information.

As an example of this analysis, an orthogroup of phosphoglycerol kinases (PGKs),

containing all three categories of branching events followed by expression shifts (S, D,

and R), is shown in Fig. 2D. This protein catalyzes the first ATP-generating step in the

glycolytic pathway and is required for most cell types including sperms (Danshina et al.,

2010; Liu et al., 2015). PGK1, the original copy on the X chromosome, is known to

have duplicated independently in eutherians and marsupials to produce the autosomal

retrocopy PGK2 that compensates the protein activity during X-inactivation (Boer et al.,

1987; McCarrey and Thomas, 1987; Potrzebowski et al., 2008). Our automated analysis

correctly recovered both retrotranspositions as well as the subsequent gains of testis-

specific expression in eutherian and marsupial lineages. This illustrates that our

automated genome-wide analysis can recover evolutionary trajectories that are

compatible with focused single gene family analyses (see Supplementary Data for

individual gene trees).

Duplication-specific effects in expression evolution. Across gene trees, expression

regime shifts were relatively rare in S branches, for a probability of 2.2% per branch,

and an average rate of 5.1×10^{-4} shifts/MY (million years) (Fig. 3A–B). In agreement

with the idea that gene duplication tends to free genes up for functional divergence and

enhance long-term retention of duplicated copies (Assis and Bachtrog, 2015; Huerta-

Cepas et al., 2011), the frequency of regime shifts in D branches was four times as
much per branch (9.0% per branch, at a rate of 1.9×10^{-3} shifts/MY across all genes and
all D branches). Thus, although far fewer branches are preceded by DNA-based
duplication events (72,476 branches) than speciation events (556,240 branches), D
branches account for over 33% of all regime shifts consistently detected by the two
expression measures. We note that this result reinforces previous results on the
"ortholog conjecture", the idea that duplicated gene copies (paralogs) are more prone to
expression shifts than orthologs (Altenhoff et al., 2012; Castillo-Davis et al., 2004;
Chen and Zhang, 2012; Rogozin et al., 2014). R branches were far more likely to result
in expression regime shifts (37.3% per branch, at a rate of 7.6×10^{-3} shifts/MY), but with
only 2,985 R branches, this resulted in only 1,107 shifts (5.6% of the total).
Translocated genes are more likely to shift expression than those that do not (Fig. S7),
in line with previous observations from the human genome (Lan and Pritchard, 2016).
While the expression shift frequency in S and D branches varies slightly across the
phylogeny, R branches showed much stronger among-lineage heterogeneity, and had a
particularly high frequency in the mammalian lineage (Fig. 3B). These
retrotransposition-related expression changes may be related to the variation in the
retrotransposition rate itself, which is known to vary across lineages (Marques et al.,
2005; Yu et al., 2007). Among-species heterogeneity in gene prediction quality may
also be attributed to this pattern because early-diverging species tended to show higher
percentages of missing single-copy orthologs than those in mammalian species (Fig. S8;
but see *Danio rerio*, *Oreochromis niloticus*, and *Oryctolagus cuniculus* as
counterexamples). In the absence of regime shifts, expression levels varied most in
ovary and testes, which had significantly higher average stationary variances than the
other four organs on the basis of tree-wise stationary variance (Fig. 3C). This supports
previously observed high variation of gene expression in testes (Brawand et al., 2011)
and extends it to the reproductive organs of both sexes.
If expression regime shifts are due to functional divergence, it is highly relevant to
characterize how expression properties changed from ancestral to derived regimes. To
do this, we examined changes in organ expression specificity, maximum expression
level, and organ expression complementarity. The specificity measure τ ranges from 0
for uniformly expressed genes to 1 for genes with highly specific expression (Yanai et
al., 2005). The distributions of regime shifts in D and R branches are shifted towards

greater organ specificity compared to shifts in S branches, with R branches creating the

most specific expression (Fig. 3D). To characterize the 'on state' transcriptional activity,

we analyzed the maximum fitted expression levels among the six organs (μ_{max}). D and

R branches appear to be enriched for down-regulation compared to S branches (Fig. 3E).

Complementarity of organ expression patterns was measured to evaluate the

differentiation between a pair of sister branches. We used a metric on the fitted organ-

wise expression levels (μ) called 'TEC', which ranges from 0 for completely

overlapping expression to 1 for mutually exclusive patterns (Huerta-Cepas et al., 2011).

Nearly all branches with regime shifts (95%) had complementarity values greater than

0.5, indicating that most regime shifts detected involve differentiation of expression

patterns, rather than overall up- or down-regulation. Regime shifts in D and R branches

often had more complementarity expression than those in S branches (Fig. 3F), further

supporting the role of gene duplication in functional differentiation. The more drastic

effect in R branches probably reflects the regular loss of regulatory elements in

retrotranspositions, whereas DNA-based duplication can more often retain regulatory

regions (Babushok et al., 2007). Jointly, these results indicate that, compared with the

baseline from speciation-associated shifts, gene duplication tend to produce more organ-

specific, more often down-regulated, and more differentiated expression patterns.

Although the down regulation may be explainable by a tendency to need less of the

newly functional expression regime, it may also be explained by either recent

nonfunctionalization (Balakirev and Ayala, 2003; Mighell et al., 2000) or specialized

expression in organs that were not part of this analysis.

Context-dependent change in the rate of protein evolution. Change in gene

expression can be accompanied by accelerated or decelerated protein evolution, which

may be detected by change in the ratio of nonsynonymous/synonymous substitutions

(*dN/dS* or ω) along branches. In D and R branches, median ω values are more than

double the baseline seen in S branches (Fig. 4A; Fig. S9A), again supporting the

ortholog conjecture and the idea that gene duplication tends to free genes up for

functional divergence (Assis and Bachtrog, 2015; Huerta-Cepas et al., 2011). Within

each of S, D, and R branch categories, branches with expression regime shifts

accompany an increased ω compared to sister branches (Fig. 4A). The increased rate

was quite small in S branches (median ω, 0.096 in branches with shifts versus 0.102 in

sister branches), much bigger in D branches (0.182 versus 0.244), and huge in R

branches (0.036 versus 0.394). If the changes in expression and the rate of protein

evolution are due to functional changes, this may indicate that functional divergence is

sometimes effected by joint changes in expression and accelerated protein evolution.

Although 52.3% of all branches with expression regime shifts had higher ω relative

to sister branches (ω ratio), 27.5% of sister branch pairs are relatively undifferentiated,

with differences in ω within $\pm 5\%$, and 42.5% had lower ω in the branches with

expression shifts. This finding led us to hypothesize that the direction of the rate

changes in protein evolution is linked to how, rather than whether, expression is

changed. Strikingly, we found a context-dependent association between protein and

expression evolution (Fig. 4B; Fig. S9B). Increased ω ratio was linked strongly to

increased, rather than decreased, organ expression specificity in S and D branches,

potentially reflecting adaptive evolution coupled with specialized expression. However,

it was in turn highly associated with decreased specificity in R branches, which may be

explained by frequent gene decay in unsuccessful retro-copies. The change in maximum

expression level was overall negatively correlated with ω ratio, but this link was

stronger in down-regulation compared with up-regulation, except for D branches where

the ω ratio was smaller when $\Delta \mu_{max}$ was larger (Fig. 4B). It has been reported that high

expression slows protein evolution (Zhang and Li, 2004), and our results suggest that

DNA-based duplication creates such constraints when accompanied by up-regulation.

The organ expression complementarity between sister lineages was positively correlated

with ω ratio (Fig. 4B), and its association was strongest in R branches, suggesting that

protein evolution accelerates as gene expression patterns differentiate from their

ancestral state. Collectively, these results suggest that protein evolution rate is linked to

changes in expression properties through a complicated association, which masks their

relationships in a global, unstratified analysis, and potentially explain a previous report

of no strong relation (Warnefors and Kaessmann, 2013).

Organ-specific propensity in gene expression evolution. The preadaptation

hypothesis predicts that the ancestral organ expression prior to the shifts will affect

which organs are likely to become the target of newly specific expression. To assess this,

we tested whether expression shifts are random with respect to change in expression

from one organ to another, by characterizing the organ in which genes are most highly

expressed (PEO, primary-expressed organ).

Across vertebrates, switching from one PEO to another was detected in 6,886,

3,586, and 746 regime shifts in S, D, and R branches, respectively. The gain/loss ratios

are heterogeneous among organs (Fig. 5A), suggesting that vertebrate organs serve as

both sources and sinks in expression evolution, but that their relative contributions are

organ-specific. Although S, D, and R branches shared a global trend of relatively

abundant testis-related PEO shifts, their distributions are largely different. D branches

were moderately similar to both S and R branches (Spearman's $\rho \sim 0.6$), but S and R

branches were dissimilar ($\rho = 0.28$). This pattern, including the abundant shifts related

to testis, was robust against the correction by the organ-wise numbers of expressed

genes (Fig. S10). This result suggests a role for gene duplication, including by

retrotranspositions, in remodeling the among-organ flow of expressed genes.

Controlling the total number of shifts from and to each PEO, some PEO shifts are

significantly different from the random expectation (Fig. 5B). There are clear patterns

of evolutionary transitions that are statistically supported by independent OU modeling

of the two expression metrics. In S branches, the pairs of brain–testis and testis–ovary

showed strong connections, indicating a solid exchange module. Kidney and liver also

donate genes to one another, forming a separate module from brain–testis–ovary. D and

R branches showed a pronounced acceleration of PEO shifts between testis and ovary.

PEO shifts in S and D branches were moderately symmetric in the flow between pairs

of organs (Fig. 5C), meaning two organs tend to donate comparable numbers of

expressed genes each other. In contrast, R branches were more asymmetric. The lower

symmetry may have perturbed the evolutionary dynamics of gene expression.

To check the robustness of our analysis, we analyzed high-confidence subsets of

expression regime shifts. The most drastic expression changes were characterized by

introducing a cutoff of organ expression specificity ($\tau > 0.5$) to define organ-specific

genes. Although some previously significant trends were not recovered due to small

sample sizes, the result was largely consistent with the broader analysis (Fig. S11).

Because tree inference errors can bias the downstream analysis including OU modeling,

we also analyzed expression regime shifts found in clades which have a high support in

tree inference (>99% bootstrap support). Again, the results were largely consistent (Fig.

S11). Especially, the brain–testis–ovary and kidney–liver modules in S branches and the

testis–ovary connection in D and R branches were always reproduced in the analyses

with above thresholds in combinations with the two expression metrics (SVA-log-

TMM-FPKM and SVA-log-TPM; Fig. S11), demonstrating the robustness of our

conclusion.

The effect of gene trees was further examined by replicating the analysis with

alternative tree topologies inferred by species tree reconciliation, which takes into

account duplication–loss rates (Morel et al., 2019). This reconciliation step is expected

to correct erroneous tree topology, while possibly introducing another bias derived from

over-correction of biological signals such as incomplete lineage sorting. With the

reconciled trees, the OU modeling with SVA-log-TMM-FPKM values resulted in

equivalent numbers of expression shifts in S and D branches compared with those with

non-reconciled trees (97% [23,231/23,985] and 104% [9,407/9,018], respectively) (Fig.

S12A). In contrast, the phylogeny reconciliation substantially reduced the number of

shifts in R branches (39% [481/1,238]). This could be explained by the correction of

erroneous tree topology caused by the fast-evolving retro-copies (Fig. 4A), although the

differences in shift numbers did not correlate with the topological differences measured

by Robinson-Foulds distance (Robinson and Foulds, 1981) (Fig. S12B). Nevertheless,

resulting PEO shift distributions were largely similar (Fig. S12C), with the reproduced

accelerations in the brain–testis–ovary and kidney–liver modules (Fig. S12D) and the

asymmetric PEO shifts in R branches (Fig. S12E), suggesting the robustness of detected

modules against gene tree topology.

To obtain insight into the biological relevance of the among-organ modules, we

characterized human genes involved in PEO shifts from all branch categories using

the Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (KEGG) pathway enrichment analysis.

The genes descended from the testis–ovary PEO shifts enriched only one KEGG

pathway term "Cell cycle" (Table S5; adjusted P value < 0.05), likely reflecting their

function in meiosis. Although the adjusted P value was not statistically significant, it is

noteworthy that the top-ranked term for the brain–testis connection was "Endocrine and

other factor-regulated calcium reabsorption" annotated to four genes including GNAQ,

which has been implicated to tumor formation in neuronal tissues (Gessi et al., 2013;

Van Raamsdonk et al., 2009). In the kidney–liver module, 15 terms were significantly

enriched, many of which appear to be related to the functions and diseases in those

organs, for example, "Bile secretion", "Phagosome", "Lysosome", "ABC transporters",

"Sphingolipid metabolism", and "Type I diabetes mellitus" (Table S5). These results

suggest that the among-organ modules in the PEO shifts played a role in supplying

functionally important genes.

Because ancestral expression was shown to orient new expression by the analysis

of PEO shifts, we concluded that there was prevalent organ-specific propensity, which

supports the presence of preadaptation in gene expression.

Discussion:

Our results suggest that the landscape of expression evolution is strongly shaped by

mechanisms of gene birth. Expression shifts are more pronounced following gene

duplication in agreement with the results of pairwise gene expression analyses (Assis

and Bachtrog, 2015; Guschanski et al., 2017; Huerta-Cepas et al., 2011), and shifts in

patterns of primary-expressed organs strongly depend on the expression state in the

ancestral organism. Thus, by analyzing such influences on a genome-wide scale for a

moderately large number of species, the question whether long-term expression in one

organ predisposes genes to be subsequently utilized in other organs has been answered

in the affirmative. There are preadaptive propensities in the evolution of vertebrate gene

expression, and the propensity varies with the presence and type of gene duplication.

Furthermore, the approach developed in this study, using complex gene family

phylogenies including gene duplications and losses that do not assume perfect match to

the species phylogeny, and incorporating a curation pipeline to amalgamate large

amounts of transcriptome data from many studies, was essential to obtain the necessary

species density and phylogenetic resolution to answer this question. The extensibility of

this method will allow for more species and more organs to be incorporated as further

studies come into the literature from diverse laboratories.

The mechanisms responsible for the preadaptive propensities that influence

expression shifts among organs are, however, unknown. A key question in

understanding these shifts may be the role of adaptation in the shift, and in subsequent

evolution. We have been careful so far to simply describe the shifts, but adaptive

possibilities include subfunctionalization, escape from adaptive conflict (EAC), and

neofunctionalization (Conant and Wolfe, 2008; Des Marais and Rausher, 2008; Sikosek

et al., 2012). The increased number of shifts following duplication suggests that drift

alone is not the explanation, but subfunctionalization easily could be.

Subfunctionalization is the idea that, if a gene has multiple functions prior to
duplication, they may be segregated among the duplicates following gene duplication.
Thus, the expression shifts may be simply a shift in focus of a duplicated copy on a
subset of the necessary expression profile needed at the organismal level. In this
scenario, any accompanying acceleration of amino acid substitution would be caused by
a loss of constraint and reduced purifying selection in one expression environment or
the other.

EAC involves more adaptation by adding the simple idea that prior to duplication,
the multiple functions and expression regimes were at least partially in conflict. Such
conflicts could clearly occur at the amino acid level, but could also occur at the
expression level. For example, if expression levels were focused on a most-important
tissue or most-sensitive tissue prior to duplication, but after duplication could be more
tailored to what is better for the new expression regime. Finally, neofunctionalization
would occur at the sequence or expression level, if the loss of selection on a duplicate
allowed mutations that were previously harmful to the old function, but now are not,
and are able to carry out some novel functional aspect that was previously prohibited.
Neofunctionalization is perhaps the most interesting and extraordinary possible cause
for the expression regime shifts we see, but it requires strong evidence and it is not a
necessary explanation for what we observe.

In this context, the patterns of expression regime shifts we observed may be
explained at different levels of biological organization, from the tissues and cells that
make up organs, to subcellular compartments, chromatin structure, promoter usage, and
protein biochemistry. Part of the propensity shifts we observed can be explained by the
"out of the testis" hypothesis, which posits that accelerated gains of testis expression are
based on the permissive chromatin state, abundant transcriptional machinery, relatively
simple promoters required for the expression in spermatogenic cells and following gains
of new expression patterns (Kaessmann, 2010; Kleene, 2005). This theory fits to the
accelerated testis-related PEO shifts, and could fit with any of the adaptive scenarios
discussed above, but the other detected patterns (e.g., kidney–liver module) require
other explanations.

One potential mechanism of preferences in expression regime shifts is a cell-type
or sub-cellular component mechanism. In such a mechanism, if two organs tend to share
cell types or usage of sub-cellular components, they may be prone to expropriate genes

between the two organs. It is known that gene expression levels in the kidney and liver tend to change jointly, possibly reflecting their similar physiology including detoxifications and waste excretion (Brawand et al., 2011). Such functional similarity may also explain the presence of the kidney–liver module of gene exchange.

Another possibility is a regulatory mechanism whereby frequent gene-exchanging organs use similar sets of regulatory elements. Altered expression between such organs could occur with relatively few mutations in regulatory sequences. *Cis*-regulation is indeed a major source of expression evolution, as it explains a certain fraction of expression variability, for example, in budding yeast (30% in duplicates and 19% in singletons) and undergoes a more rapid divergence than *trans*-regulation (Dong et al., 2011).

Finally, another possible mechanism for expression regime shifts following gene duplication is at the protein level. If frequently interacting organs have similar environmental requirements for expressed proteins, a few amino acid substitutions may tend to be required to adjust biochemical properties. Protein reusability may be determined by cellular environments such as pH and temperature or by functional categories of proteins. Our analysis indicates that the regime shifts that drastically differentiate the expression tend to be coupled with accelerated protein evolution (Fig. 4B), and this result can be viewed as a support for a protein-level mechanism. In such a mechanism, synergistic resolution of EAC may be a driving force for changes in both amino acid composition and expression regimes. We note that these mechanistic hypotheses are not mutually exclusive, and varying combinations of factors may contribute to generate preadaptive patterns of gene expression.

In this study, we established a method to standardize RNA-seq data from disparate research projects and developed a pathway for data amalgamation. Thanks to multiple rounds of innovations in sequencing technology, transcriptome data are being produced at an unprecedented rate in a greater variety of organisms and samples, such as those for multi-species multi-organ developmental series (Cardoso-Moreira et al., 2019). The transcriptome amalgamation will expand the use of such resources to study gene expression evolution.

By reconstructing gene expression in gene family phylogenies, our analysis revealed non-randomness and directionality of expression evolution. This suggests prevalent preadaptation in gene expression, and that adaptation to expression in certain

478   organs is more conducive to future expression in other organs. This provides further

479   details on how gene duplication has helped to reshape the dynamics of expression

480   evolution that contributed to the vertebrate diversification.

Materials and Methods:

Species selection. A total of 105 species included in the Ensembl release 91 (Yates et al., 2016) were searched for data availability in the NCBI SRA database (Leinonen et al., 2011) (final search on May 1, 2018) and 22 species were found to have RNA-seq data for 6 organs: brain, heart, kidney, liver, ovary, and testis. *Lepisosteus oculatus* was excluded due to an insufficient quality of available expression data, and therefore remaining 21 species were selected for further analysis.

Species tree. The dated species tree for the 21 species was retrieved from TimeTree (Hedges et al., 2006) (downloaded on March 15, 2018; Supplementary Data). Some species were unavailable in the database and therefore they were temporarily replaced by closely related species to obtain the dated species tree.

Gene sets. Coding sequences (CDS) were retrieved from the Ensembl database. The longest transcript was retained when multiple transcripts were annotated to the gene. The quality of gene sets was evaluated using BUSCO 4.0.5 (Simão et al., 2015) with the single-copy ortholog set "vertebrata_odb10" (Fig. S8).

Transcriptome metadata curation. We developed an automated python program for SRA metadata curation (Table S3; Supplementary Data). RNA-seq data were selected from the NCBI SRA database by keyword searches limited to the 21 species, the 6 organs, and Illumina sequencing platforms. Orthographical variants of annotations were standardized with keyword libraries created by manually checking the original annotations. Prenatal or unhealthy samples and small-scale sequencing samples (<5 million reads) were excluded. Data for non-messenger RNA sequencings were also removed. In treatment and control RNA-seq pairs, only control experiments were included.

Transcriptome quantification. Fastq files were extracted from downloaded SRA files using parallel-fastq-dump 0.6.2 (https://github.com/rvalieris/parallel-fastq-dump) with the minimum read length of 25 bp and the quality filter (-E option) (Leinonen et al., 2011). The fastq sequences were then subjected to a quality filtering by fastp 0.12.3

(Chen et al., 2018). The filtered reads were mapped to genomic features annotated as

non-messenger RNAs in the Ensembl GTF files using bowtie2 2.3.4 (Langmead and

Salzberg, 2012) and resultant unmapped reads were used for expression level

quantification using kallisto 0.43.1 with the sequence-based bias correction (Bray et al.,

2016). Samples were removed if 20% or smaller percentages of reads were mappable

(Fig. S2). Estimated mapped read counts and transcript lengths were used to calculate

TPM and FPKM values. For the latter, the "trimmed mean of M-values (TMM)"

normalization method was applied (Robinson and Oshlack, 2010). Sample-wise TMM

scaling factors were obtained across all RNA-seq samples using the FPKM values of

1,377 single-copy orthologs. Because TMM and TPM transformations are incompatible

with each other, the TMM scaling was applied only to FPKM values. TPM and TMM-

FPKM values were subsequently transformed to $log(N + 1)$ values (log-TPM and log-

TMM-FPKM, respectively). Paralogous genes that haven't diverged in their nucleotide

sequences could not be distinguished well in the quantification step. Although our scope

is to characterize gene expression in the timescale of vertebrate evolution, this difficulty

likely leads to an underestimation of expression regime shifts in young duplicates.

Iterative anomalous sample removal coupled with surrogate variable analysis.

Anomalous RNA-seq samples were iteratively removed by a correlation analysis

coupled with an expression bias correction. In each iteration, unwanted biases in

expression level were removed by surrogate variable analysis (SVA, 'sva' function in

an R package 'sva') (Leek and Storey, 2007). SVA analysis was applied at the

beginning of each iteration so that it is not influenced by anomalous samples removed

in previous iterations. Subsequently, Pearson's correlation coefficients were calculated

for every RNA-seq data against mean expression level in each organ generated by

averaging all other data excluding those from the same BioProject (Fig. S3). We assume

that the sample's correlation coefficient against the same organ is higher than any of the

values against the other organs, and we removed all samples from the same BioProject

when violations were found. These steps were repeated until no violations were left and

SVA-corrected expression levels were finally reported (SVA-log-TMM-FPKM and

SVA-log-TPM). The curation steps were skipped if multiple samples were unavailable

in the species and hence SVA analysis was inapplicable. The final dataset was

comprised of 1,903 RNA-seq experiments from 182 BioProjects that cover 6 organs
from 21 vertebrate species without missing data (Tables S1–S2).
549

Orthogroup classification. Orthogroups, which contain all genes descended from one
gene in the common ancestor, were inferred from coding sequences of the 21 species
using OrthoFinder 2.1.2 (Emms and Kelly, 2015) guided by the species tree. In total,
17,896 orthogroups were generated. The largest orthogroup, which is comprised of
7,893 olfactory receptor genes, was removed from the analysis because of
computational burden. After sequence alignment processing (see "Multiple sequence
alignment"), we removed small orthogroups which retained less than four genes and
orthogroups that showed no parsimony informative sites, because phylogenetic
relationships cannot be inferred. As the result of filtering, 15,280 orthogroups were left
for OU modeling, with the largest one containing 3,796 zinc-finger proteins (Table S4).
560

Multiple sequence alignment. Multiple fasta files containing coding sequences were
generated for each orthogroup. Stops and ambiguous codons were masked as gaps (for
implementation, see https://github.com/kfuku52/cdskit). In-frame multiple codon
sequence alignments were generated using MAFFT 7.394 with the 'auto' option (Katoh
and Standley, 2013) and tranalign in EMBOSS 6.5.7.0 (Rice et al., 2000). Anomalous
genes were excluded by MaxAlign (Gouveia-Oliveira et al., 2007) which decreased the
largest orthogroup size from 3,796 to 2,382 genes. Spurious codons were removed in-
frame   using   pgtrimal   in   Phylogears2-2.0.2016.09.06
(https://www.fifthdimension.jp/products/phylogears/)   with   the   'gappyout'   option
(Capella-Gutierrez et al., 2009).
571

Gene tree reconstruction. Maximum-likelihood trees were reconstructed using IQ-
TREE 1.6.5 (Nguyen et al., 2015) with the best-fit nucleotide substitution models
selected by ModelFinder with the Bayesian Information Criterion (Kalyaanamoorthy et
al., 2017). Larger orthogroups and longer genes tended to fit more complex substitution
matrices and larger numbers of categories of rate heterogeneity (Fig. S13A–B; Table
S4). Ultrafast bootstrapping with 1,000 replicates was performed to evaluate the
credibility of tree topology (Minh et al., 2013) with a further optimization of each
bootstrapping tree (-bnni option) (Hoang et al., 2018). To evaluate the effect of

alternative gene tree topologies, we performed phylogeny reconciliation using GeneRax

1.0.0 (Morel et al., 2019) with the maximum-likelihood gene trees and the species tree

as input. Because rooted trees were generated in this step, the tree rooting (described

below) was skipped for the reconciled trees.

Reconciliation-assisted gene tree rooting. Candidate rooting positions were inferred

with different methods. Using the dated species tree, all rooting branches with the

minimum duplication-loss score were identified using the rooting mode of NOTUNG

2.9 with the default parameters (duplication score = 1.5, loss score = 1.0) (Chen et al.,

2000). The midpoint of the longest path (Farris, 1972) and the position with the minimal

ancestor deviations (MAD) (Tria et al., 2017) were also considered as candidates. The

final rooting position was reported based on overlaps among those rooting positions

(Figs. S13C,E; Table S4).

Reconciliation-assisted divergence time estimation. To prepare dated gene trees, we

first matched species tree nodes with corresponding gene tree nodes using the

reconciliation mode of NOTUNG 2.9 (Chen et al., 2000) and created time constraints of

speciation nodes (Fig. S13F). Duplication nodes were constrained with the upper and

lower age limits derived from corresponding speciation nodes. If the root node is a

duplication node and is not covered by the range of the species tree, the upper age limit

was set to 1,105 million years ago, which corresponds to the split of animals and fungi

(Hedges et al., 2006). Divergence time was then estimated by a penalized likelihood

method (Sanderson, 2002) implemented in an R package 'ape' ('chronos' function with

'discrete' model) (Popescu et al., 2012) with time constraints on speciation, duplication,

and root nodes. When reasonable initial parameters were not found after 1,000 trials, the

above constraints were partly relaxed (Fig. S13D; Table S4). The implementation is

provided on GitHub (https://github.com/kfuku52/RADTE).

Modeling and shift detection of expression evolution. Using the dated gene trees and

organ-wise mean values of SVA-log-TMM-FPKM and SVA-log-TPM, regime shifts in

gene expression were detected as shifts of optimal trait values in Ornstein–Uhlenbeck

(OU) models determined by a Lasso-based model selection with AICc in an R package

'*l*1ou' (Khabbazian et al., 2016). Because there is no available software to handle

within-species variation in phylogenetic OU shift detection without predefined

hypotheses on the number and place of regime shifts, we used mean expression level as

the input. It is shown by simulation that the species mean and species variance models

show comparable power in the regime shift detection (Rohlfs et al., 2014), suggesting

that our species mean model is expected to perform as good as the species variance

model. In the model, α and σ² parameters were assumed unchanged in the tree

(Khabbazian et al., 2016), and therefore only the global, rather than branch- or clade-

wise, stationary variance (γ) were obtained. Expression levels in the six organs were

treated as multivariate traits where α and σ² were estimated for each organ but regime

shifts were assumed to occur jointly in the same set of branches (Khabbazian et al.,

2016). The phylogenetic mean (expression level at the root node) was estimated with

the "OUfixedRoot" model. To handle gene trees recalcitrant to this analysis (especially

those with a large number of genes), we skimmed gene trees by collapsing clades with

small changes in expression level (Fig. S14). Specifically, we first calculated all-vs-all

Pearson's correlation coefficients of gene expression level among all genes that belong

the clade. The clade was collapsed into a single tip if the expression patterns were

almost identical (minimum correlation coefficient between genes > 0.99). Phylogenetic

means of the collapsed clade were calculated by assuming the Brownian motion and

were used as expression level at the new tip. The upper limit of regime shifts was set as

$\max\left[\min(N/2, 100), \sqrt[2]{N}\right]$, except for the largest tree with 2,382 genes where the upper

limit was decreased to 10 to cope with an unrealistically large number of branch

combinations to consider. The number of detected regime shifts was always smaller

than the upper limit in the SVA-log-TMM-FPKM analysis, whereas three out of 15,820

trees reached the upper limit in the SVA-log-TPM analysis (Fig. S6A).

Analysis of expression patterns. We characterized expression patterns of extant and

ancestral genes by calculating different metrics from fitted values (μ) in the OU models.

Organ specificity was measured by τ (Yanai et al., 2005), which outperformed other

methods in a benchmark for tissue specificity (Kryuchkova-Mostacci and Robinson-

Rechavi, 2016). Expression complementarity between sister lineages was measured by

the metrics called 'TEC' (Huerta-Cepas et al., 2011). Because μ was estimated from

log-transformed expression levels, these expression metrics were calculated with unlog-

transformed μ values. PEOs were defined as the organ in which the highest expression

levels were observed among the six organs we analyzed.

Estimation of protein evolution rate. Parameters for codon substitution matrix, shape

parameter of discrete gamma distribution for rate heterogeneity (α), equilibrium

transition/transversion rate ratio (κ), equilibrium nonsynonymous/synonymous

substitution rate ratio (ω) were estimated using IQ-TREE 1.6.5 (Nguyen et al., 2015) by

fitting GY+F3X4+G4 models to each gene tree. Equilibrium base composition (θ) was

estimated from empirical codon state frequencies which are calculated from the

alignment by counting. To obtain θ at the root node, we calculated θ at subroot nodes by

taking advantage of IQ-TREE's empirical Bayesian method for ancestral sequence

reconstruction. Considering subroot branch length, a weighted average of the subroot θ

values were calculated as the θ value at the root node. Using all those parameters,

branch-wise nonsynonymous/synonymous substitution rate ratios were estimated by

stochastic substitution mapping (*mapdNdS*) (Guéguen and Duret, 2018) using bio++

library (Guéguen et al., 2013). To examine the robustness of the *mapdNdS*-based ω

estimation, we compared the results with those obtained by maximum-likelihood ω

estimation by fitting MG94W9 models in HyPhy 2.3.11 (Pond et al., 2005). The two

methods yielded consistent results on the effect of branching events and expression

shifts (Fig. 4A; Fig. S9A), suggesting methodological robustness. We reported

mapdNdS-based results in the main text.

Analysis of gene structure and location. The number of introns and chromosomal

location were obtained for each gene from the Ensembl gene models (GFF3 files). The

intron numbers were subsequently converted to binary values that represent intronless

and intron-containing states. Chromosomal locations were categorized into autosome, X

chromosome, and Y chromosome. Genes from non-therian species were treated as

missing data because mechanisms of their sex determination are not homologous to the

mammalian XY system (Veyrunes et al., 2008). Genes from *Chinchilla lanigera* were

also treated as missing data because their sequenced genomes are not anchored to

chromosomes in the Ensembl release 91. The posterior probabilities of ancestral

character states were inferred by the stochastic character mapping of discrete traits (Bollback, 2006) implemented in an R package 'phytools' (Revell, 2012). Because functional retrotranspositions (Jun et al., 2009; Marques et al., 2005) and inter-chromosomal duplications (Pace et al., 2009) are rare events relative to the timescale of the vertebrate evolution on the per-gene basis, we set the transition rate parameters to a sufficiently small value (1×10^{-3} per gene per million years). Since intron gain occurs few orders of magnitude less frequently than its loss caused by retrotransposition and others (Roy and Gilbert, 2005), the rate of intron gain is set to be lower (1×10^{-4} per gene per million years).

Analysis of branching events. Speciation and duplication nodes (S and D/R nodes, respectively) were classified by a species-overlap method (Huerta-Cepas et al., 2007) and were mapped to the species tree on the basis of species coverages of the gene tree clades. A transition from intron-containing to intronless states with a posterior probability greater than 0.5 was classified as a retrotransposition event (R node). The branches that correspond to the original copy of a retrotransposition event were not included in R branches. Although our classification cannot detect retrotranspositions from originally intronless genes, we expect such situations would be rare because most vertebrate genes contain at least one intron (e.g., 20,160/21,242 human genes). Inter-chromosomal translocation was detected by considering chromosomal locations with the highest posterior probability as the ancestral states. Because of the difficulty in determining rooting positions of deep phylogenies, gene tree nodes older than the root node of the species tree were removed from the analysis.

KEGG pathway enrichment analysis. Human genes that descend from the shift branches were pooled for each specific PEO shift. The gene lists were examined for enrichment against an Enrichr library "KEGG_2019_Human" (Kuleshov et al., 2016) using a python package GSEApy (https://github.com/zqfang/GSEApy). Statistically significant (adjusted P value < 0.05) KEGG pathway terms were reported in Table S5.

Data visualization. Phylogenetic trees were visualized using a python package 'ETE 3' (Huerta-Cepas et al., 2016) and an R package 'ggtree' (Yu et al., 2017). A part of animal silhouettes in Fig. 3A were obtained from PhyloPic (http://phylopic.org).

Box plot elements of all figures are defined as follows: center line, median; box limits,

upper and lower quartiles; whiskers, 1.5x interquartile range; points, outliers. Box-plot

outliers are suppressed in Figs. 3, 4, S9, S11, and S12.

Code and data availability. Scripts, parameter values, gene expression values

including SVA-log-TMM-FPKM and SVA-log-TPM, and other data used in this study

are available as Supplementary Data (Mendeley Data ID available on publication).

Acknowledgements:

We acknowledge the following sources for funding: MEXT/JSPS KAKENHI

18J00178 (K.F.), Sofja Kovalevskaja programme by the Alexander von Humboldt

Foundation (K.F.), and NIH R01 GM083127 (D.D.P.). Computations were partially

performed on the NIG supercomputer. The authors declare no competing financial

interests.

Author Contributions:

K.F. and D.D.P. jointly designed the study and wrote the paper. K.F. designed and

wrote all programs and performed data analysis.

References:

Altenhoff, A.M., Studer, R.A., Robinson-Rechavi, M., Dessimoz, C., and Couto, F. (2012). Resolving the ortholog conjecture: orthologs tend to be weakly, but significantly, more similar in function than paralogs. PLoS Comput. Biol. *8*, e1002514.

Assis, R., and Bachtrog, D. (2015). Rapid divergence and diversification of mammalian duplicate gene functions. BMC Evol. Biol. *15*, 138.

Babushok, D. V., Ostertag, E.M., and Kazazian, H.H. (2007). Current topics in genome evolution: Molecular mechanisms of new gene formation. Cell. Mol. Life Sci. *64*, 542–554.

Balakirev, E.S., and Ayala, F.J. (2003). Pseudogenes: Are they "junk" or functional DNA? Annu. Rev. Genet. *37*, 123–151.

Barbosa-Morais, N.L., Irimia, M., Pan, Q., Xiong, H.Y., Gueroussov, S., Lee, L.J., Slobodeniuc, V., Kutter, C., Watt, S., Colak, R., et al. (2012). The evolutionary landscape of alternative splicing in vertebrate species. Science *338*, 1587–1593.

Bedford, T., and Hartl, D.L. (2009). Optimization of gene expression by natural selection. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. *106*, 1133–1138.

Boer, P.H., Adra, C.N., Lau, Y.F., and McBurney, M.W. (1987). The testis-specific phosphoglycerate kinase gene pgk-2 is a recruited retroposon. Mol. Cell. Biol. *7*, 3107–3112.

Bollback, J. (2006). SIMMAP: Stochastic character mapping of discrete traits on phylogenies. BMC Bioinformatics *7*, 88.

Brawand, D., Soumillon, M., Necsulea, A., Julien, P., Csárdi, G., Harrigan, P., Weier, M., Liechti, A., Aximu-Petri, A., Kircher, M., et al. (2011). The evolution of gene expression levels in mammalian organs. Nature *478*, 343–348.

Bray, N.L., Pimentel, H., Melsted, P., and Pachter, L. (2016). Near-optimal probabilistic RNA-seq quantification. Nat. Biotechnol. *34*, 525–527.

Breschi, A., Djebali, S., Gillis, J., Pervouchine, D.D., Dobin, A., Davis, C.A., Gingeras,

T.R., and Guigó, R. (2016). Gene-specific patterns of expression variation across organs

and species. Genome Biol. *17*, 151.

Brunner, E., and Munzel, U. (2000). The nonparametric Behrens-Fisher problem:

asymptotic theory and a small-sample approximation. Biom. J. *42*, 17–25.

Budd, G.E. (2007). On the origin and evolution of major morphological characters. Biol.

Rev. *81*, 609–628.

Capella-Gutierrez, S., Silla-Martinez, J.M., and Gabaldon, T. (2009). trimAl: a tool for

automated alignment trimming in large-scale phylogenetic analyses. Bioinformatics *25*,

1972–1973.

Cardoso-Moreira, M., Halbert, J., Valloton, D., Velten, B., Chen, C., Shao, Y., Liechti,

A., Ascenção, K., Rummel, C., Ovchinnikova, S., et al. (2019). Gene expression across

mammalian organ development. Nature *571*, 505–509.

Carelli, F.N., Hayakawa, T., Go, Y., Imai, H., Warnefors, M., and Kaessmann, H.

(2016). The life history of retrocopies illuminates the evolution of new mammalian

genes. Genome Res. *26*, 301–314.

Castillo-Davis, C.I., Hartl, D.L., and Achaz, G. (2004). cis-Regulatory and protein

evolution in orthologous and duplicate genes. Genome Res. *14*, 1530–1536.

Chen, X., and Zhang, J. (2012). The ortholog conjecture is untestable by the current

gene ontology but is supported by RNA sequencing data. PLoS Comput. Biol. *8*,

e1002784.

Chen, J., Swofford, R., Johnson, J., Cummings, B.B., Rogel, N., Lindblad-Toh, K.,

Haerty, W., Palma, F. di, and Regev, A. (2019). A quantitative framework for

characterizing the evolutionary history of mammalian gene expression. Genome Res. *29*,

53–63.

Chen, K., Durand, D., and Farach-Colton, M. (2000). NOTUNG: a program for dating

gene duplications and optimizing gene family trees. J. Comput. Biol. *7*, 429–447.

Chen, S., Krinsky, B.H., and Long, M. (2013). New genes as drivers of phenotypic
evolution. Nat. Rev. Genet. *14*, 645–660.

Chen, S., Zhou, Y., Chen, Y., and Gu, J. (2018). fastp: an ultra-fast all-in-one FASTQ
preprocessor. Bioinformatics *34*, i884–i890.

Conant, G.C., and Wolfe, K.H. (2008). Turning a hobby into a job: How duplicated
genes find new functions. Nat. Rev. Genet. *9*, 938–950.

Cortez, D., Marin, R., Toledo-Flores, D., Froidevaux, L., Liechti, A., Waters, P.D.,
Grützner, F., and Kaessmann, H. (2014). Origins and functional evolution of Y
chromosomes across mammals. Nature *508*, 488–493.

Danshina, P. V., Geyer, C.B., Dai, Q., Goulding, E.H., Willis, W.D., Kitto, G.B.,
McCarrey, J.R., Eddy, E.M., and O'Brien, D.A. (2010). Phosphoglycerate kinase 2
(PGK2) is essential for sperm function and male fertility in mice. Biol. Reprod. *82*,
136–145.

de-Leon, S.B.-T., and Davidson, E.H. (2007). Gene regulation: gene control network in
development. Annu. Rev. Biophys. Biomol. Struct. *36*, 191–212.

Des Marais, D.L., and Rausher, M.D. (2008). Escape from adaptive conflict after
duplication in an anthocyanin pathway gene. Nature *454*, 762–765.

Dong, D., Yuan, Z., and Zhang, Z. (2011). Evidences for increased expression variation
of duplicate genes in budding yeast: from *cis*- to *trans*- regulation effects. Nucleic Acids
Res. *39*, 837–847.

Emms, D.M., and Kelly, S. (2015). OrthoFinder: solving fundamental biases in whole
genome comparisons dramatically improves orthogroup inference accuracy. Genome
Biol. *16*, 157.

Farris, J.S. (1972). Estimating phylogenetic trees from distance matrices. Am. Nat. *106*,
645–668.

Franzén, O., Gan, L.-M., and Björkegren, J.L.M. (2019). PanglaoDB: a web server for
exploration of mouse and human single-cell RNA sequencing data. Database *2019*.

Gessi, M., Hammes, J., Lauriola, L., Dörner, E., Kirfel, J., Kristiansen, G., Muehlen, A.

zur, Denkhaus, D., Waha, A., and Pietsch, T. (2013). GNA11 and N-RAS mutations:

alternatives for MAPK pathway activating GNAQ mutations in primary melanocytic

tumours of the central nervous system. Neuropathol. Appl. Neurobiol. *39*, 417–425.

Gould, S.J., and Vrba, E.S. (1982). Exaptation—a missing term in the science of form.

Paleobiology *8*, 4–15.

Gouveia-Oliveira, R., Sackett, P.W., and Pedersen, A.G. (2007). MaxAlign:

maximizing usable data in an alignment. BMC Bioinformatics *8*, 312.

Guéguen, L., and Duret, L. (2018). Unbiased estimate of synonymous and

nonsynonymous substitution rates with nonstationary base composition. Mol. Biol. Evol.

35, 734–742.

Guéguen, L., Gaillard, S., Boussau, B., Gouy, M., Groussin, M., Rochette, N.C., Bigot,

T., Fournier, D., Pouyet, F., Cahais, V., et al. (2013). Bio++: efficient extensible

libraries and tools for computational molecular evolution. Mol. Biol. Evol. *30*, 1745–

1750.

Guschanski, K., Warnefors, M., and Kaessmann, H. (2017). The evolution of duplicate

gene expression in mammalian organs. Genome Res. *27*, 1461–1474.

Hansen, T.F. (1997). Stabilizing selection and the comparative analysis of adaptation.

Evolution *51*, 1341–1351.

Hedges, S.B., Dudley, J., and Kumar, S. (2006). TimeTree: a public knowledge-base of

divergence times among organisms. Bioinformatics *22*, 2971–2972.

Hoang, D.T., Chernomor, O., von Haeseler, A., Minh, B.Q., and Vinh, L.S. (2018).

UFBoot2: Improving the ultrafast bootstrap approximation. Mol. Biol. Evol. *35*, 518–

522.

Huerta-Cepas, J., Dopazo, H., Dopazo, J., Gabaldón, T., McPherson, J., Marra, M.,

Hillier, L., Waterston, R., Chinwalla, A., Wallis, J., et al. (2007). The human phylome.

Genome Biol. *8*, 934–941.

Huerta-Cepas, J., Dopazo, J., Huynen, M.A., and Gabaldón, T. (2011). Evidence for
short-time divergence and long-time conservation of tissue-specific expression after
gene duplication. Brief. Bioinform. *12*, 442–448.

Huerta-Cepas, J., Serra, F., and Bork, P. (2016). ETE 3: Reconstruction, analysis, and
visualization of phylogenomic data. Mol. Biol. Evol. *33*, 1635–1638.

Julien, P., Brawand, D., Soumillon, M., Necsulea, A., Liechti, A., Schütz, F., Daish, T.,
Grützner, F., and Kaessmann, H. (2012). Mechanisms and evolutionary patterns of
mammalian and avian dosage compensation. PLoS Biol. *10*, e1001328.

Jun, J., Ryvkin, P., Hemphill, E., Mandoiu, I., and Nelson, C. (2009). The birth of new
genes by RNA- and DNA-mediated duplication during mammalian evolution. J.
Comput. Biol. *16*, 1429–1444.

Kaessmann, H. (2010). Origins, evolution, and phenotypic impact of new genes.
Genome Res. *20*, 1313–1326.

Kalyaanamoorthy, S., Minh, B.Q., Wong, T.K.F., von Haeseler, A., and Jermiin, L.S.
(2017). ModelFinder: fast model selection for accurate phylogenetic estimates. Nat.
Methods *14*, 587–589.

Katoh, K., and Standley, D.M. (2013). MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software
version 7: improvements in performance and usability. Mol. Biol. Evol. *30*, 772–780.

Khabbazian, M., Kriebel, R., Rohe, K., and Ané, C. (2016). Fast and accurate detection
of evolutionary shifts in Ornstein-Uhlenbeck models. Methods Ecol. Evol. *7*, 811–824.

Kleene, K.C. (2005). Sexual selection, genetic conflict, selfish genes, and the atypical
patterns of gene expression in spermatogenic cells. Dev. Biol. *277*, 16–26.

Kryuchkova-Mostacci, N., and Robinson-Rechavi, M. (2016). A benchmark of gene
expression tissue-specificity metrics. Brief. Bioinform. *44*, bbw008.

Kryuchkova-Mostacci, N., Robinson-Rechavi, M., Shmoish, M., Chalifa-Caspi, V.,
Shklar, M., and Ophir, R. (2016). Tissue-specificity of gene expression diverges slowly
between orthologs, and rapidly between paralogs. PLOS Comput. Biol. *12*, e1005274.

Kuleshov, M.V., Jones, M.R., Rouillard, A.D., Fernandez, N.F., Duan, Q., Wang, Z.,

Koplev, S., Jenkins, S.L., Jagodnik, K.M., Lachmann, A., et al. (2016). Enrichr: a

comprehensive gene set enrichment analysis web server 2016 update. Nucleic Acids

Res. *44*, W90–W97.

Lan, X., and Pritchard, J.K. (2016). Coregulation of tandem duplicate genes slows

evolution of subfunctionalization in mammals. Science *352*, 1009–1013.

Langmead, B., and Salzberg, S.L. (2012). Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2.

Nat. Methods *9*, 357–359.

Leek, J.T., and Storey, J.D. (2007). Capturing heterogeneity in gene expression studies

by surrogate variable analysis. PLoS Genet. *3*, e161.

Leinonen, R., Sugawara, H., and Shumway, M. (2011). The Sequence Read Archive.

Nucleic Acids Res. *39*, D19–D21.

Liao, B.-Y., and Zhang, J. (2006). Low rates of expression profile divergence in highly

expressed genes and tissue-specific genes during mammalian evolution. Mol. Biol. Evol.

23, 1119–1128.

Liu, X.-X., Zhang, H., Shen, X.-F., Liu, F.-J., Liu, J., and Wang, W.-J. (2015).

Characteristics of testis-specific phosphoglycerate kinase 2 and its association with

human sperm quality. Hum. Reprod. *126*, dev301.

Marques, A.C., Dupanloup, I., Vinckenbosch, N., Reymond, A., and Kaessmann, H.

(2005). Emergence of young human genes after a burst of retroposition in primates.

PLoS Biol. *3*, e357.

McCarrey, J.R., and Thomas, K. (1987). Human testis-specific PGK gene lacks introns

and possesses characteristics of a processed gene. Nature *326*, 501–505.

Mighell, A.J., Smith, N.R., Robinson, P.A., and Markham, A.F. (2000). Vertebrate

pseudogenes. FEBS Lett. *468*, 109–114.

Minh, B.Q., Nguyen, M.A.T., and von Haeseler, A. (2013). Ultrafast approximation for

phylogenetic bootstrap. Mol. Biol. Evol. *30*, 1188–1195.

Morel, B., Kozlov, A.M., Stamatakis, A., and Szöllősi, G.J. (2019). GeneRax: A tool
for species tree-aware maximum likelihood based gene tree inference under gene
duplication, transfer, and loss. BioRxiv 779066.

Necsulea, A., Soumillon, M., Warnefors, M., Liechti, A., Daish, T., Zeller, U., Baker,
J.C., Grützner, F., and Kaessmann, H. (2014). The evolution of lncRNA repertoires and
expression patterns in tetrapods. Nature *505*, 635–640.

Nguyen, L.-T., Schmidt, H.A., von Haeseler, A., and Minh, B.Q. (2015). IQ-TREE: A
fast and effective stochastic algorithm for estimating maximum-likelihood phylogenies.
Mol. Biol. Evol. *32*, 268–274.

Pace, J.K., Sen, S.K., Batzer, M.A., and Feschotte, C. (2009). Repair-mediated
duplication by capture of proximal chromosomal DNA has shaped vertebrate genome
evolution. PLoS Genet. *5*, e1000469.

Podgornaia, A.I., and Laub, M.T. (2015). Pervasive degeneracy and epistasis in a
protein-protein interface. Science *347*, 673–677.

Pond, S.L.K., Frost, S.D.W., and Muse, S. V. (2005). HyPhy: hypothesis testing using
phylogenies. Bioinformatics *21*, 676–679.

Popescu, A.-A., Huber, K.T., and Paradis, E. (2012). ape 3.0: New tools for distance-
based phylogenetics and evolutionary analysis in R. Bioinformatics *28*, 1536–1537.

Potrzebowski, L., Vinckenbosch, N., Marques, A.C., Chalmel, F., Jégou, B., and
Kaessmann, H. (2008). Chromosomal gene movements reflect the recent origin and
biology of therian sex chromosomes. PLoS Biol. *6*, e80.

Revell, L.J. (2012). phytools: an R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and
other things). Methods Ecol. Evol. *3*, 217–223.

Rice, P., Longden, I., and Bleasby, A. (2000). EMBOSS: the European Molecular
Biology Open Software Suite. Trends Genet. *16*, 276–277.

Robinson, D.F., and Foulds, L.R. (1981). Comparison of phylogenetic trees. Math.
Biosci. *53*, 131–147.

Robinson, M.D., and Oshlack, A. (2010). A scaling normalization method for

differential expression analysis of RNA-seq data. Genome Biol *11*, 2010–2011.

Rogozin, I.B., Managadze, D., Shabalina, S.A., and Koonin, E. V (2014). Gene family

level comparative analysis of gene expression in mammals validates the ortholog

conjecture. Genome Biol. Evol. *6*, 754–762.

Rohlfs, R. V., Harrigan, P., and Nielsen, R. (2014). Modeling Gene Expression

Evolution with an Extended Ornstein–Uhlenbeck Process Accounting for Within-

Species Variation. Mol. Biol. Evol. *31*, 201–211.

Roy, S.W., and Gilbert, W. (2005). Rates of intron loss and gain: implications for early

eukaryotic evolution. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. *102*, 5773–5778.

Sanderson, M.J. (2002). Estimating absolute rates of molecular evolution and

divergence times: a penalized likelihood approach. Mol. Biol. Evol. *19*, 101–109.

She, X., Rohl, C.A., Castle, J.C., Kulkarni, A. V, Johnson, J.M., and Chen, R. (2009).

Definition, conservation and epigenetics of housekeeping and tissue-enriched genes.

BMC Genomics *10*, 269.

Sikosek, T., Chan, H.S., and Bornberg-Bauer, E. (2012). Escape from Adaptive Conflict

follows from weak functional trade-offs and mutational robustness. Proc. Natl. Acad.

Sci. *109*, 14888–14893.

Simão, F.A., Waterhouse, R.M., Ioannidis, P., Kriventseva, E.V., and Zdobnov, E.M.

(2015). BUSCO: assessing genome assembly and annotation completeness with single-

copy orthologs. Bioinformatics *31*, 3210–3212.

Soubrier, J., Steel, M., Lee, M.S.Y., Der Sarkissian, C., Guindon, S., Ho, S.Y.W., and

Cooper, A. (2012). The influence of rate heterogeneity among sites on the time

dependence of molecular rates. Mol. Biol. Evol. *29*, 3345–3358.

Starr, T.N., Picton, L.K., and Thornton, J.W. (2017). Alternative evolutionary histories

in the sequence space of an ancient protein. Nature *549*, 409–413.

943 Tria, F.D.K., Landan, G., and Dagan, T. (2017). Phylogenetic rooting using minimal
944 ancestor deviation. Nat. Ecol. Evol. *1*, 0193.

945 Van Raamsdonk, C.D., Bezrookove, V., Green, G., Bauer, J., Gaugler, L., O'Brien,
946 J.M., Simpson, E.M., Barsh, G.S., and Bastian, B.C. (2009). Frequent somatic
947 mutations of GNAQ in uveal melanoma and blue naevi. Nature *457*, 599–602.

948 Veyrunes, F., Waters, P.D., Miethke, P., Rens, W., McMillan, D., Alsop, A.E., Grutzner,
949 F., Deakin, J.E., Whittington, C.M., Schatzkamer, K., et al. (2008). Bird-like sex
950 chromosomes of platypus imply recent origin of mammal sex chromosomes. Genome
951 Res. *18*, 965–973.

952 Warnefors, M., and Kaessmann, H. (2013). Evolution of the Correlation between
953 Expression Divergence and Protein Divergence in Mammals. Genome Biol. Evol. *5*,
954 1324–1335.

955 Wilson, B.A., Foy, S.G., Neme, R., and Masel, J. (2017). Young genes are highly
956 disordered as predicted by the preadaptation hypothesis of de novo gene birth. Nat. Ecol.
957 Evol. *1*, 0146.

958 Yanai, I., Benjamin, H., Shmoish, M., Chalifa-Caspi, V., Shklar, M., Ophir, R., Bar-
959 Even, A., Horn-Saban, S., Safran, M., Domany, E., et al. (2005). Genome-wide
960 midrange transcription profiles reveal expression level relationships in human tissue
961 specification. Bioinformatics *21*, 650–659.

962 Yang, Z. (1994). Maximum likelihood phylogenetic estimation from DNA sequences
963 with variable rates over sites: Approximate methods. J. Mol. Evol. *39*, 306–314.

964 Yang, Z. (1995). A space-time process model for the evolution of DNA sequences.
965 Genetics *139*, 993–1005.

966 Yates, A., Akanni, W., Amode, M.R., Barrell, D., Billis, K., Carvalho-Silva, D.,
967 Cummins, C., Clapham, P., Fitzgerald, S., Gil, L., et al. (2016). Ensembl 2016. Nucleic
968 Acids Res. *44*, D710–D716.

Yu, G., Smith, D.K., Zhu, H., Guan, Y., and Lam, T.T.-Y. (2017). ggtree : an R package

for visualization and annotation of phylogenetic trees with their covariates and other

associated data. Methods Ecol. Evol. *8*, 28–36.

Yu, Z., Morais, D., Ivanga, M., and Harrison, P.M. (2007). Analysis of the role of

retrotransposition in gene evolution in vertebrates. BMC Bioinformatics *8*, 308.

Zhang, L., and Li, W.-H. (2004). Mammalian housekeeping genes evolve more slowly

than tissue-specific genes. Mol. Biol. Evol. *21*, 236–239.

Zhang, Y.E., and Long, M. (2014). New genes contribute to genetic and phenotypic

novelties in human evolution. Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev. *29*, 90–96.

Zhang, Y.E., Landback, P., Vibranovski, M.D., Long, M., and Stark, A. (2011).

Accelerated recruitment of new brain development genes into the human genome. PLoS

Biol. *9*, e1001179.

Figure 1. Transcriptome amalgamation to integrate heterogeneous RNA-seq samples. (**A**) A simplified flow chart of the transcriptome amalgamation. The full chart is available in Fig. S1. (**B–D**) Transcriptome curation within species. Data from *Monodelphis domestica* with SVA-log-TMM-FPKM metrics are shown as an example. The heatmaps show Pearson's correlation coefficients among RNA-seq samples (**B**). Each row and column correspond to one RNA-seq sample. The expression levels of all genes were used to calculate the correlation coefficients. Note that anomalous samples contaminated in the curated metadata (low correlation samples in 1) are successfully removed, and that project-specific correlations visible in the uncorrected data (marked

2) are absent in the corrected data (marked 3). The box plots show distinct distributions of the correlation coefficients depending on whether a pair of samples are the same organ or whether they are from the same research project (**C**). The numbers of comparisons are provided in the plot. The correlation coefficients are largely improved in within-organ comparisons when surrogate variables are removed, while within-project biases are attenuated. In this species, nine surrogate variables were detected against 52 RNA-seq data from eight projects (**D**). Analysis of those variables by linear regression highlights the BioProject feature as the strongest source of removed biases. For full description of predictors, see Fig. S4. (**E**) A principal component analysis using expression levels of 1,377 single-copy orthologs from 21 species. Points correspond to RNA-seq samples. Curves show the estimated kernel density. Explained variations in percentages are indicated in each axis. (**F**) Estimated organ-wise expression levels of a housekeeping gene. Since data from relatively many BioProjects are available, glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase gene (GAPDH, Ensembl gene ID: ENSGALG00000014442) in *Gallus gallus* is shown as an example. Points corresponds to the average expression level calculated by random subsampling. All data points and the median value (bar), rather than a box plot, are shown if the number of subsampled BioProject combinations is less than 10.

Figure 2. Expression evolution in a complex history of gene family evolution. (**A**) Modeling expression evolution with multi-optima Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process. A phylogenetic simulation is shown. Colors show branches belonging to different regimes. Regime shifts (change of color) appear as a substantial change in optimal trait values. (**B**) Nodes and branches of gene family phylogeny were categorized into S, D, or R based on the branching events, i.e., speciation, DNA-based duplication, or retrotransposition, respectively. (**C**) Venn diagrams of expression regime shifts. Circles represent the sets of branches where regime shifts were detected with SVA-log-TMM-FPKM or SVA-log-TPM. (**D**) The gene tree of phosphoglycerol kinases (orthogroup ID: OG0002332) is shown as an example. This orthogroup shows ortholog-specific expression patterns as well as regime shifts after speciation and lineage-specific gene duplication. Tips correspond to genes. The colors of branches and tip labels indicate expression regimes. Node colors match to the categorization in **B**. The heatmap shows expression levels and among-organ expression patterns are shown as a pie chart for each regime. To the right, the number of introns and located chromosomes (A, autosome; X, X chromosome; Y, Y chromosome) are indicated. For full information including complete tip labels and bootstrap branch supports, see Supplementary Data.

Figure 3. Characteristics of expression shifts in 15,280 gene trees. (**A**) The species tree showing analyzed genomes and their divergence time. (**B**) Mapping of 18,812 expression shifts in the species tree. The number and proportion of expression regime shifts in S, D, and R branches are shown. Corresponding branches in the species tree are indicated in **A**. (**C**) Organ-specific stationary variances (γ) of expression level evolution in vertebrates. The distribution of γ between reproductive and non-reproductive organs were compared by a Brunner-Munzel test (Brunner and Munzel, 2000). (**D–F**) Cumulative frequency of change in organ expression specificity (**D**), change in maximum expression level (**E**), and expression complementarity between sister lineages (**F**) among detected expression shifts. Number of analyzed regime shifts are shown in **B**.

Figure 4. Context-dependent changes of protein evolution rate coupled with expression regime shifts. (**A**) Distribution of ω values. A plus (+) indicates branches with expression shifts, whereas minus (−) branches are sisters to the 'plus' branches. Statistical differences between pairs of distributions were tested using a two-sided Brunner–Munzel test (Brunner and Munzel, 2000). Non-log-transformed median values are shown above the boxplots. For visualization purpose, extreme values exceeding ± 10 were clipped. (**B**) Relationships between protein evolution rate and change in expression properties. Points correspond to expression regime shifts. Dashed lines indicate no between-branch difference in ω. Solid lines show a linear regression. Its slope and number of regime shifts are provided in the plot. Regime shifts with negative and positive changes were separately analyzed for organ expression specificity (upper) and maximum expression level (middle).

Figure 5. Evolutionary dynamics of gene expression. (**A**) Shift distributions of primary-expressed organs (PEOs). Y axis was sorted by abundance in S branches. Spearman's correlation coefficients among S, D, and R branches are shown above the plots. (**B**) Preadaptation networks in organ expression. Arrows represent transitions from ancestral PEOs to derived PEOs, and its color shows statistical significance based on 10,000 permutations. The results were obtained with SVA-log-TMM-FPKM, and an asterisk (*) indicates the statistical significance supported also by SVA-log-TMM-based analysis (Fig. S11). (**C**) The global polarity of PEO shifts. The global polarity is defined by the scaled sum of differences between two opposite PEO shifts. Boxplots show the distribution estimated by 1,000 bootstrap resampling.

1066 <div align="center">Supplementary Materials for</div>
1067

1068 **Organ-specific propensity drives patterns of gene expression evolution**

1069

1070 <div align="center">Kenji Fukushima and David D. Pollock</div>

1071

1072

1073 **List of Supplementary Materials:**

1074

1078

Fig. S1. A flow-chart of transcriptome amalgamation, gene tree inference, and

evolutionary characterization in this study.

1081

1082 **Fig. S2. Changes in number of reads, total nucleotide length, mean read length,**
1083 **and mapping rate by RNA-seq read filtering.** Mapping rates were, in almost every
1084 case, improved by both read quality filtering and read filtering by mapping to
1085 miscellaneous genomic features.

1086

1087 **Fig. S3. A correlation analysis for the detection and removal of anomalous RNA-**
1088 **seq samples.** Expression levels of all genes were compared between the sample and the
1089 organ averages. A sample was removed if any between-organ comparisons yielded a
1090 correlation coefficient higher than the within-organ comparison.

Fig. S4. Characteristics of amalgamated transcriptome. (A) The number of RNA-seq experiments, BioProjects, and detected surrogate variables in each species. The counts were derived from the final dataset. The numbers of surrogate variables (SV) are correlated with the numbers of RNA-seq samples and BioProjects. (B) Relationships of the number of SVs with log-TPM and log-TMM-FPKM. Points correspond to species. (C–D) Correlation heatmaps of corrected transcriptomes. See Table S1 for full descriptions including RNA-seq sample IDs and BioProject IDs. (E–F) Distinct distributions of Pearson's correlation coefficients depending on whether a pair of RNA-seq samples are the same organ or whether they are from the same research project. (G–H) Predictor analysis of detected surrogate variables. The predictive power was analyzed by linear regression using different properties of RNA-seq experiments: organ (brain, heart, kidney, liver, ovary, and testis), BioProject (e.g., PRJNA176589), library selection (e.g., cDNA and polyA), library layout (single and paired), instrument (e.g., Illumina HiSeq 2500 and NextSeq 550), number of read (e.g., 91,641,467 reads), % lost, fastp (percentage of reads that are removed by fastp; e.g., 5%), % lost, misc feature (percentage of reads that are mapped to non-nuclear-mRNA features and are removed from the analysis; e.g., 5%), minimum read length (e.g., 25 nt), average read length (e.g., 70 nt), maximum read length (e.g., 75 nt), and mapping rate (e.g., 80%). The predictors

are summarized in Table S1. (**I–J**) Multispecies correlation analysis of averaged organ

expression. Corrected expression levels of 1,377 single-copy orthologs were used to

calculate pairwise Pearson's correlation coefficients. (**K**) A principal component

analysis using expression levels of 1,377 single-copy orthologs from 21 species. Points

correspond to RNA-seq samples. Curves show the estimated kernel density. Explained

variations in percentages are indicated in each axis. (**L**) Estimated organ-wise

expression levels of a housekeeping gene. Since data from relatively many BioProjects

are available, glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase gene (GAPDH,

ENSGALG00000014442) in *Gallus gallus* is shown. Points correspond to the average

expression level calculated by a random subsampling. All data points and the median

value (bar), rather than a box plot, are shown if the number of subsampled BioProject

combinations is less than 10.

1122

1123

1124

1125

 C   SVA-log-TMM-FPKM

Fig. S4 (continued)

1127

1128

1129

D   SVA-log-TPM

1131

Fig. S4 (continued)

1132

1133

1134

1135   E   SVA-log-TMM-FPKM

1136

1137   Fig. S4 (continued)

1138

F SVA-log-TPM

1140

1141   Fig. S4 (continued)

1142

G SVA-log-TMM-FPKM

Fig. S4 (continued)

H SVA-log-TPM

Fig. S4 (continued)

1151   I SVA-log-TMM-FPKM

1152

1153   J SVA-log-TPM

1154

1155   Fig. S4 (continued)

1156

1157   K

1158

1159   L

1160

1161   Fig. S4 (continued)

1162

1163

Fig. S5. Expression of organ-specific marker genes in human and mouse. Marker

genes were retrieved from PanglaoDB (Franzén et al., 2019), and its median expression

values were obtained for each RNA-seq sample. A cell-type-wise analysis is provided in

Supplementary Data. Cell types in ovary and testis were not included in PanglaoDB

(access date: April 1, 2020).

Fig. S6. Comparison of SVA-log-FPKM and SVA-log-TPM in expression regime shift detection. (**A**) The numbers of expression regime shifts. Each point corresponds to a gene tree. The solid red lines show the upper limits in the regime shift search. The numbers of shifts detected with SVA-log-TMM-FPKM (left) and SVA-log-TMM (center) are well correlated (right). The black line is a quantile regression, and the dashed red line shows a slope of 1. (**B**) Expression properties. Each point corresponds to an expression regime shift which is consistently detected by SVA-log-TMM-FPKM and SVA-log-TPM. (**C–D**) The branch-wise numbers of detected shifts in the species tree. The shifts were categorized by primary-expressed organs (PEOs) in ancestral and derived states. The order of the species tree branches (y axis) corresponds to the total number of corresponding gene tree branches in the dataset. See Fig. 3A for branch ids.

1184   C   SVA-log-TMM-FPKM

1185

1186   Fig. S6 (continued)

1187

1188

1189   D   SVA-log-TPM

1190

1191   Fig. S6 (continued)

1192

1193

1194

Fig. S7. The relationships between expression shifts and chromosomal location.
The heatmap shows the frequency of expression shifts observed among the branches
with or without a change in the chromosomal category (non-diagonal or diagonal,
respectively). Chromosomal locations were categorized into autosomes (A), X
chromosome (X) and Y chromosome (Y), and the ancestral locations were inferred by
stochastic character mapping.

1201

1202

Fig. S8. Evaluation of gene set completeness. BUSCO analysis was performed for gene sets from 21 species using 3,407 single-copy orthologs in the dataset "vertebrata_odb10". The species tree is shown to visualize lineage-specific trends.

Fig. S9. Alternative analysis supporting non-linear change in protein evolution rate in correlation with expression regime shifts. (**A**) Distribution of ω values. While the results from stochastic character mapping (map*dNdS*) are reported in the main text, results from maximum-likelihood estimation (HyPhy) are shown here. A plus (+) indicates branches with expression shifts, whereas minus (−) branches are sisters to the 'plus' branches. Statistical differences between pairs of distributions were tested using a two-sided Brunner–Munzel test (Brunner and Munzel, 2000). Non-log-transformed median values are shown above the boxplots. For visualization purpose, extreme values exceeding ±10 were clipped. (**B**) Relationships between protein evolution rate and change in expression properties. While SVA-log-TMM-FPKM-based analysis is reported in the main text, results from SVA-lot-TPM-based analysis is shown here. Stochastic character mapping was used to obtain branch-wise ω values. Points correspond to expression regime shifts (log ω ratio = 0). Dashed lines indicate no between-branch difference in protein evolution rate. Solid lines show a linear regression. Its slope and number of regime shifts are also provided. Regime shifts with negative and positive changes were separately analyzed for organ specificity (upper) and expression level (middle).

1225

 Fig. S10. The number of expressed genes does not explain the organ-wise
 abundance of PEO shifts. (**A**) The organ-wise numbers of expressed genes in the 21
 species. In this analysis, expressed genes are defined as genes with >1 SVA-log-TMM-
 FPKM. (**B**) The PEO shift distributions corrected by the median numbers of expressed
 genes. The data in Fig. 5A were corrected as follows: $S_{corrected} = S_{original} \div$
 $(M_{ancestral}/\overline{M}) \div (M_{derived}/\overline{M})$. $S_{original}$ corresponds to the numbers shown in Fig.
 5A. $M_{ancestral}$ and $M_{derived}$ are median numbers of expressed genes in ancestral and
 derived PEOs, respectively. $\overline{M}$ indicates the across-organ average of expressed gene
 numbers.

Fig. S11. Evolutionary dynamics of gene expression analyzed with conservative datasets. Both SVA-log-TPM and SVA-log-TMM FPKM values were analyzed. Organ-specific genes were examined by selecting PEO shifts with high ancestral and derived organ expression specificity (τ > 0.5). To examine the effect of inference errors in gene tree reconstruction, branches with high support values (ultrafast bootstrap percentage > 99) were analyzed. **A** and **B** correspond to Fig. 5B and C, respectively.

1245

Fig. S12. Effects of phylogeny reconciliation. (**A**) The numbers of detected shifts in

non-reconciled and reconciled maximum-likelihood gene trees. (**B**) The relationship

between shift number difference and tree topology difference measured by Robinson-

Foulds distance [51]. Trees with no detected shifts were removed from the analysis. (**C–E**)

Reproduction of PEO shift distributions using reconciled gene trees. C, D, and E

correspond to Fig. 5A, Fig. 5B, and Fig. 5C, respectively.

1252

Fig. S12 (continued)

1255

Fig. S13. Gene tree reconstruction. (**A**) Complexity of best-fit nucleotide substitution

matrices. (**B**) Complexity of rate heterogeneity among nucleotide sites. Both discrete

Gamma models (Yang, 1994) and FreeRate models (Soubrier et al., 2012; Yang, 1995)

were included to count the number of categories for rate heterogeneity. (**C**) Selected

rooting positions in reconciliation-assisted gene tree rooting. MAD, minimal ancestor

deviation; NTG, 'rooting mode' of NOTUNG; MID, midpoint between the longest path.

(**D**) Time-constrained nodes in tree dating. R, root node; S, speciation node; D,

duplication node. All available constraints (RDS) are used in the first trial and then

successively relaxed if estimation fails. In the category 'allS', all nodes are speciation

nodes and therefore no divergence time estimation was performed for the trees. (**E**)

Reconciliation-assisted gene tree rooting. Rooting points were estimated with two

different methods: the minimum ancestor deviation (MAD) method and midpoint

rooting. If they were compatible with the event parsimony involving gene duplication

and loss, the MAD- or midpoint-rooted tree was reported in sequence. If not, one of

event parsimony trees was reported. (**F**) Reconciliation-assisted gene tree dating.

Speciation nodes in the dated species tree were mapped onto the non-dated gene tree by

phylogeny reconciliation. By using those nodes as calibration points, the other node

ages were estimated using the penalized likelihood method.

1274

1275

1276   **Fig. S14. Gene tree skimming in phylogenetic comparative analysis.** Gene tree

1277   clades are collapsed if character states are highly correlated. Resultant trees contain a

1278   smaller number of leaves than the original trees while preserving drastic changes in

1279   character evolution. Note that, unlike this example, we used extremely stringent

1280   threshold in the analysis (Pearson's correlation coefficient > 0.99).

1281