Unraveling the layers of cryptic genetic variation in a yeast gene regulatory network

Jonathan T. Lee*, Alessandro L.V. Coradini*†, Amy Shen*, and Ian M. Ehrenreich*

*Molecular and Computational Biology Section, Department of Biological Sciences, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-2910, USA

†Laboratory of Genomics and Bioenergy, Department of Genetics and Evolution, Institute of Biology, UNICAMP, Campinas, São Paulo, 13083-970, Brazil

Running title: Layers of cryptic genetic variation

Keywords: Cryptic genetic variation, epistasis, genotype-environment interaction, complex traits, genetic architecture

Corresponding author:
Ian M. Ehrenreich
Address: Molecular and Computational Biology Section, Ray R. Irani Hall 201, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-2910, USA
Phone #: 213 – 821 – 5349
Email: ian.ehrenreich@usc.edu

Abstract

Cryptic genetic variation may be an important contributor to heritable traits, but its extent and

regulation are not fully understood. Here, we investigate the cryptic variation underlying a

Saccharomyces cerevisiae colony phenotype that is typically suppressed in a cross. Mapping of

the trait's genetic basis after induction by three different genetic perturbations identifies 21 total

loci. The perturbations largely uncover distinct loci, and strongly influence additivity, epistasis,

and genotype-environment interaction among these loci. Only a single locus— the coding region

of the cell surface gene *FLO11*—is common to all three perturbations. While the remaining loci

mostly influence *FLO11* transcription in *cis* or *trans*, we detect loci in different pathways and

sub-pathways in the presence of each perturbation. Our work shows that complex gene

regulatory networks can harbor multiple layers of cryptic variation, each of which may only be

visible in highly specific genotypic and environmental contexts.

Article Summary

The extent and regulation of cryptic genetic variation within populations is not fully understood.

To address these questions, we comprehensively dissect the genetic basis of a budding yeast

colony trait following its induction by three different genetic perturbations. In total, we identify

21 distinct loci, most of which show phenotypic effects that depend on particular perturbations,

other segregating loci, and temperature. We find that nearly all involved loci participate in a

common gene regulatory network (GRN). Thus, our work demonstrates the large amount of

cryptic variation underlying a single trait and ties the visibility of this variation to GRN activity.

Introduction

Most research on complex traits focuses on characterizing the genetic basis of phenotypic diversity that is visible within populations (ATWELL *et al.* 2010; AYLOR *et al.* 2011; MACKAY *et al.* 2012; BLOOM *et al.* 2013). Yet, these same populations can also harbor cryptic genetic variation that does not typically impact phenotype, and is only observable when particular genetic or environmental perturbations occur (RUTHERFORD AND LINDQUIST 1998; QUEITSCH *et al.* 2002; BERGMAN AND SIEGAL 2003; DWORKIN *et al.* 2003; GIBSON AND DWORKIN 2004; JAROSZ AND LINDQUIST 2010; GEILER-SAMEROTTE *et al.* 2016). This cryptic variation may be an important source of phenotypic variability in medically and evolutionarily significant traits (LE ROUZIC AND CARLBORG 2008; MCGUIGAN AND SGRO 2009; PAABY AND ROCKMAN 2014). Thus, it is imperative that we determine the extent of cryptic variation within populations, as well as the mechanisms that toggle this cryptic variation between silent and visible states. However, such work is inherently difficult because the specific perturbations needed to uncover cryptic variation, as well as the exact identities of the cryptic variants that are affected by these perturbations, are rarely known. Such information is critical to obtaining a more complete, mechanistic understanding of cryptic variation.

In previous papers, we developed an experimental system that can be used to systematically identify cryptic variants influencing a colony phenotype in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2014; TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2015b; LEE *et al.* 2016; TAYLOR *et al.* 2016). Upon mating the lab strain BY4716 (BY) to a haploid derivative of the clinical isolate 322134S (3S), we found that BY, 3S, and nearly all of their recombinant haploid progeny form smooth colonies when grown on solid media. However, certain genetic perturbations (GPs) can enable some BYx3S segregants to express a rough colony phenotype at particular temperatures (**Figure 1A** and **1B**). Expression of the trait results from complex interactions between the GPs, segregating loci, and temperature (TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2014; TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2015b; TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2015a; LEE *et al.* 2016; TAYLOR *et al.* 2016). Crucially, genetic mapping and genetic engineering techniques can be used to comprehensively identify the specific cryptic variants that enable rough segregants to express the trait.

Our initial work on colony morphology in the BYx3S cross focused on a *de novo* loss-of-
function mutation in *IRA2* ('GPa'), a negative regulator of Ras signaling (TAYLOR AND
EHRENREICH 2014; TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2015b; LEE *et al.* 2016) (**Figure 1C**). Across
several papers, we demonstrated that GPa causes trait expression through temperature-
dependent, higher-order genetic interactions involving cryptic variants inherited from both BY
and 3S (TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2014; TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2015b; LEE *et al.* 2016).
Subsequently, we identified other *de novo* and introduced mutations that also facilitate
expression of the rough phenotype in the BYx3S cross (TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2015b;
TAYLOR *et al.* 2016). These other mutations tended to also disrupt negative regulation of
signaling and transcription within the Ras pathway, and mostly interacted with the same alleles
found in the studies focused on GPa.

In the same study, we also found that some rough BYx3S segregants lacked any detectable *de*
novo mutations (TAYLOR *et al.* 2016). Instead, the majority of these individuals inherited
independent recombination events within a 1.3 kb region in the promoter of the cell surface gene
FLO11 ('GPb', **Figure 1D**). *FLO11* encodes a flocculin whose display on the cell surface
facilitates cell-cell adhesion and is required for expression of the rough phenotype (LO AND
DRANGINIS 1996; TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2015b). Genetic engineering experiments showed
that the recombination event brought at least two linked polymorphisms at *FLO11* onto the same
chromosome, resulting in a new *FLO11* haplotype that behaves like the mutations described in
our earlier studies (LEE *et al.* 2016). Specifically, segregants with a BY promoter and a 3S
coding region had the potential to express the trait. Despite discovering GPb in this past study,
we neither resolved the causal variant(s) in the *FLO11* promoter nor comprehensively mapped
the loci enabling this GP to exert a phenotypic effect. Thus, it was not possible to compare the
genetic basis of the rough phenotype in the presence of GPb to our initial work on GPa.

Here, we use the rough colony system to determine how different types of GPs interact with
distinct cryptic variants in the BYx3S cross to produce the same trait. In addition to GPa and
GPb, we also examine a third GP that facilitates expression of the rough phenotype. To generate
'GPc,' we knocked out the activator Flo8 and the repressor Sfl1, which are the main transcription
factors acting downstream of the Ras pathway to regulate colony morphology in the cross

(**Figure 1E**). Previously, we showed that deletion of *SFL1* is sufficient to enable Ras-dependent

cryptic variants to express *FLO11* and that transcription of *FLO11* in these *sfl1Δ* segregants is

Flo8-dependent (TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2015b). By eliminating these key regulators and

screening for segregants expressing the trait (**Figure 1F**), we sought to uncover previously

unidentified cryptic variants that can also give rise to the rough phenotype.

In this paper, we comprehensively determine the genetic basis of the rough phenotype across

temperatures for GPb and GPc, and compare these results to our past work on GPa. Across the

three GPs, we identify 21 loci that contribute to the rough phenotype. Of these loci, 20 show

conditional phenotypic effects that are influenced by particular combinations of GP, other loci,

and temperature. Although all three factors prove important, GP is by far the strongest

determinant of which loci show phenotypic effects, impacting nearly all identified loci. In fact,

12 of the detected loci only exert phenotypic effects in the presence of a single GP. Additionally,

we find that the identified loci exhibit varying degrees of additivity, epistasis, and genotype-

environment interaction depending on the GP that uncovers them. At the molecular level, most,

if not all, of the identified loci influence *FLO11* regulation in *cis* or *trans*, suggesting that our

findings result from complex genetic and environmental effects on the *FLO11* regulatory

network. These findings enhance our understanding of both the extent of cryptic variation within

populations and the mechanisms by which GPs reveal cryptic variants.

Materials and Methods

Knockout of FLO8 and *SFL1 in BY and 3S*

FLO8 and *SFL1* targeting gRNA sequences were cloned into the pML104 plasmid vector, which

carries Cas9 and *URA3* (LAUGHERY *et al.* 2015). Each resulting plasmid was transformed into

the BY and 3S strains alongside a double stranded oligo to be used as a repair template for

homologous recombination (HR). Two sequential knockouts were performed for each strain to

modify both genes. The lithium acetate method (GIETZ AND WOODS 2002) was used for

transformation. Repair template oligos were 90 bases long with homology to either *FLO8* or

SFL1, but with three bases replaced in frame with a stop codon to truncate the gene. A one base

frameshift deletion was also introduced following the stop codon to further ensure loss of gene

function. Stop codons were introduced at amino acid 155 and 39 in *FLO8* and *SFL1*,

respectively. Transformed cells were plated on solid yeast nitrogen base (YNB) media lacking

uracil to select for retention of the pML104 plasmid. Presence of the intended genetic

modifications was checked in the transformants using Sanger sequencing.

Isolation of a rough BYx3S segregant with GPc

The BY and 3S strains engineered with GPc were mated to one another. The resulting diploid

was sporulated and plated at low density (~300 colonies per plate) onto yeast nitrogen base

(YNB) agar containing canavanine to select for MATa haploids using the synthetic genetic array

system (TONG *et al.* 2001). After five days at 30°C, colonies were replicated onto yeast extract-

peptone-ethanol (YPE) plates. A single rough colony was identified after four days of growth at

21°C.

Generation of backcross segregants

The GPb rough segregant used in this study was obtained through a screen described in (TAYLOR

et al. 2016), in which it was referred to as 'Rough segregant 13.' To generate backcross progeny

for genetic mapping and segregation analysis, we mated the GPb and GPc rough segregants to

obtain diploids. The GPb segregant was backcrossed to wild type BY and 3S, while the GPc

segregant was backcrossed to *flo8Δ sfl1Δ* BY and 3S strains. Diploids were sporulated and plated

at low density onto YNB plates containing canavanine. After five days of growth at 30°C,

haploid colonies were replicated onto YPE plates and incubated at 21°C. Segregants expressing

rough morphology after four days of growth on YPE were inoculated into liquid yeast extract-

peptone-dextrose (YPD) media and grown overnight at 30°C. Freezer stocks of rough segregants

were made by mixing aliquots of these cultures with 20% glycerol solution and storing these

glycerol stocks at -80°C.

Phenotyping at multiple temperatures

Cells from freezer stocks were inoculated into liquid YPD media, grown for two days at 30°C,

and then pinned onto three YPE plates. Each plate was then incubated at a single, constant

temperature: 21, 30, or 37°C. The colonies were then phenotyped for expression of the colony

trait after four days of growth. Due to the low frequency of the rough phenotype in the GPb x 3S

backcross at 30 and 37°C, another round of mating was performed to enrich for individuals

expressing the trait in these conditions. Specifically, a 3S backcross segregant was mated to the
BY strain, and segregants were selected and screened for the trait in the same manner described
above.
147
Genotyping of GPb and GPc rough segregants
For each backcross, segregants expressing the rough phenotype at up to 21, 30, or 37°C were
inoculated into liquid YPD. DNA was extracted from overnight cultures using the Qiagen
DNeasy 96 Blood and Tissue kit. Illumina sequencing libraries were then prepared using the
Illumina Nextera kit, with a unique pair of dual-indexed barcodes for each individual. Between
48 and 156 segregants from each combination of GP, backcross, and temperatures sensitivity
were sequenced. Sequencing was performed at the Beijing Genomics Institute on an Illumina
HiSeq 4000 using paired-end 100x100 bp reads. Each segregant was sequenced to an average per
site coverage of at least 2.5x. Reads were mapped onto the S288c reference genome and a 3S
draft genome, from the *Saccharomyces* Genome Database, using the Burrows-Wheeler Aligner
(BWA) version 7 with options mem -t 20 (LI AND DURBIN 2009). SAMtools was used to
generate mpileup files (LI *et al.* 2009), and genome-wide allele frequencies were calculated at
36,756 SNPs that were previously identified between BY and 3S (TAYLOR *et al.* 2016).
161
Genetic mapping of loci underlying the rough phenotype
Each segregant's genotype at 36,756 SNPs was determined using a Hidden Markov model,
implemented in the HMM package in R. Loci associated with the trait for each combination of
GP, backcross, and temperature sensitivity were identified using binomial tests. Sites were
considered statistically significant at a Bonferroni-corrected threshold of $p < .01$. Multiple-
testing correction was performed on each backcross population on its own, as the number of
unique tests varied 837 to 1,526 among these populations. We defined the interval surrounding
identified loci by computing the -log10(p-value) at each linked SNP and determining the SNPs at
which this statistic was 2 lower than the peak marker for a locus. These bounds were used in
fine-mapping and to assess overlap among loci detected in different combinations of GP,
backcross, and temperature sensitivity.
173
Testing for genotypic heterogeneity

Observed and expected haplotype frequencies for each pair of SNPs were compared using χ^2

tests in a custom Python script. Expected haplotype frequencies were calculated as the product of

the individual allele frequencies at each of the two sites. To reduce the number of statistical tests,

SNPs containing the same information across all segregants in a given backcross population

were collapsed into a single marker. The Benjamini-Hochberg method for False Discovery Rate

(FDR) (BENJAMINI AND HOCHBERG 1995) was then implemented using the statsmodels Python

module (SEABOLD AND PERKTOLD 2010). A stringent FDR of 0.0001 was employed and regions

of the genome within 30,000 bases of the ends of chromosomes were excluded to avoid

genotyping errors.

Exploration of additivity and epistasis

Expected multi-locus genotype frequencies were calculated as the product of the frequencies of

the individual alleles segregating in a given backcross. For each population, observed and

expected genotype frequencies were compared using a χ^2 test with degrees of freedom equal to

one less than the number of possible genotypes. These analyses were only performed on

backcross populations in which three or more loci segregated.

Genetic engineering at the FLO11 promoter and other loci

Gene deletions at GP-interacting loci were accomplished by replacement with the *kanMX*

cassette (WACH *et al.* 1994). Using the lithium acetate transformation method (GIETZ AND

WOODS), a genomic region of interest was replaced with a PCR amplicon of the *kanMX* cassette

with 60 bases of homology to the ends of the region. Transformed cells were plated on YPD +

G418 to select for integration of *kanMX* and insertion was verified using PCR.

Allele replacements were performed using a two-step, CRISPR/Cas9-mediated approach. A

kanMX deletion strain, generated as described above, was transformed with the pML104 plasmid

(LAUGHERY *et al.* 2015) carrying the Cas9 gene and a gRNA sequence targeting *kanMX*, along

with a PCR product repair template that should result in excision of *kanMX* and result in an allele

swap. Cells were plated on YNB plates lacking uracil to select for retention of pML104.

Replacement of the *kanMX* cassette was verified by PCR, and transformants were plated and

screened on YPE to determine the phenotypic effects of allele replacement. All replacements

were confirmed by Sanger sequencing. Also, in parallel with each allele replacement, we

generated control strains where *kanMX* was replaced with the original sequence at a given site.

The phenotypes of allele replacement strains were assessed based on comparison to control

strains that had been generated in parallel.

Results

Isolation of a rough flo8Δ sfl1Δ segregant

Our past work showed that expression of the rough phenotype in the BYx3S cross mainly occurs

due to genetic interactions between GPs and polymorphisms in the Ras pathway (TAYLOR AND

EHRENREICH 2014; TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2015b; LEE *et al.* 2016; TAYLOR *et al.* 2016). To

examine whether genetic variation beyond the Ras pathway might also be able to contribute to

the trait, we knocked out *FLO8* and *SFL1* in both BY and 3S using CRISPR/Cas9 (**Methods**).

We then employed random spore techniques to generate and screen > 100,000 *flo8Δ sfl1Δ* (GPc)

cross progeny for the trait at 21°C (**Methods**). We used this condition because the trait is less

genetically complex at 21°C than at higher temperatures, making it easier to find rough

segregants in a screen (LEE *et al.* 2016). The GPc screen produced a single rough segregant,

implying that expression of the rough phenotype in the absence of Flo8 and Sfl1 requires a

complex combination of alleles inherited from both BY and 3S.

The three GPs vary in their potential to express the phenotype across temperatures

Our GPb and GPc rough segregants were both obtained at 21°C, but were limited in their

abilities to express the phenotype at higher temperatures. Following from our previous work

showing that GPa segregants have the potential to express rough morphology across

temperatures (LEE *et al.* 2016), we assessed whether GPb and GPc strains also have the potential

to express the trait at higher temperatures. To check this, we backcrossed GPb and GPc F_2

segregants to both BY and 3S, and then phenotyped the resulting progeny at 21, 30, and 37°C

(**Figure 1F**). Note, such backcrossing generates new multi-locus genotypes that may have the

potential to express the rough phenotype at higher temperatures than the F_2 segregants recovered

from initial screens.

Upon examining 768 GPb and GPc backcross progeny at higher temperatures, we found that
some GPb backcross segregants expressed the trait at higher temperatures whereas GPc
backcross segregants did not (**Figure S1**). We observed varying degrees of temperature
sensitivity among the rough GPb segregants, with only a minority of rough individuals capable
of expressing the trait at 30 and 37°C (**Figure S1**). These results suggest that the trait has a
greater genetic complexity among GPb segregants that express it across temperatures than
among GPb segregants that only express it at low temperature. They also show that GPc provides
an inherently limited potential for trait expression across temperatures, perhaps because Flo8 and
Sfl1 are necessary for expression of the trait at higher temperatures.

The GPs uncover distinct loci

To map loci involved in expression of the rough phenotype across temperatures, we generated >
60,000 and > 12,000 GPb and GPc backcross segregants, respectively. First-generation
backcross segregants were used exclusively in mapping, except in the case of the 3S backcross of
GPb at high temperature. Determining the genetic basis of the trait among GPb 3S backcross
segregants required combining information from the first-generation and second-generation
backcrosses (**Figure S2**). GPb segregants were phenotyped at 21, 30 and 37°C, while GPc
segregants were only phenotyped at 21°C. Low-coverage whole genome sequencing was
performed on between 48 and 151 individuals for each GP–backcross–temperature combination,
and loci associated with the trait were identified based on their enrichment among genotyped
segregants (**Methods**).

In past work, we identified eight loci that act in different multi-locus genotypes to enable GPa
segregants to express the trait at particular temperatures (**Figure 2**). BY and 3S contributed the
causal alleles at two and four of these loci, respectively, while the remaining two loci were
detected in both the BY and 3S states in different multi-locus genotype and temperature contexts
(**Figure 3A**). Here, genetic mapping focused on GPb segregants detected a total of 11 loci across
the three environments (**Figure 2**, **Figure S3**, **Table S1**). Among these loci, six and three were
detected in the BY and 3S allele states, respectively (**Figure 3A**). The other two loci were
identified in both the BY and 3S allele states. Eight of these loci influenced the trait's expression
independent of temperature. Of the remaining loci, two were detected among individuals that

could express the trait at up to 30°C, while the third was identified among individuals that could

express the trait at up to 37°C. In addition, we identified 12 loci in the presence of GPc (**Figure**

2, **Figure S3**, **Table S1**). Among the loci found in the presence of GPc, seven were contributed

by BY and five were contributed by 3S (**Figure 3A**).

Comparison of the loci detected in the presence of each of the three GPs revealed that 21 distinct

genomic regions were identified in total (**Figure 2**, **Table 1**, **Methods**). Among these loci, one

was found in the presence of all three GPs, 8 were found in the presence of two GPs, and 12

were found in the presence of a single GP. This indicates that nearly all of the detected loci show

differential responsiveness to the GPs and that the majority of the loci we have identified are

cryptic variants that only act in the presence of specific GPs.

The GPs alter genotype-environment interaction

We assessed how identified loci interact with particular GPs, each other, and temperature to

produce the rough phenotype. Our past work on GPa found that at particular levels of

temperature sensitivity, distinct sets of epistatic cryptic variants form multi-locus genotypes that

produce the phenotype (LEE *et al.* 2016). Although we could not analyze the GPc segregants in

the same manner, examination of GPb segregants produced results comparable to our findings

for GPa. Among GPb segregants expressing the trait exclusively at 21°C, we detected a pair of

interacting loci on chromosomes XIII and XV, which then allowed us to identify distinct multi-

locus genotypes present among these individuals (**Figure 3A**, **Figure S5**, **Note S1**, **Methods**).

Similar to our work on GPa (LEE *et al.* 2016), only one of the GPb multi-locus genotypes found

at 21°C provided a foundation upon which additional allele substitutions can facilitate trait

expression at higher temperatures (**Figure 3A**, black lines). Among these GPb segregants

exhibiting the trait at higher temperatures, single multi-locus genotypes indicative of higher-

order epistasis facilitated trait expression at temperatures up to 30 and 37°C (**Figure 3A**).

Comparison our results for GPb to our past work on GPa found that more than half of the loci

and the exact multi-locus genotypes differed between the two GPs (**Figure 3A**). These results

show that the GPs significantly modify genotype-environment interactions underlying the rough

phenotype.

The GPs affect additivity and epistasis among identified loci

The only temperature at which all three GPs enable trait expression is 21°C. To compare the

quantitative genetic architectures enabling the three GPs to induce the rough phenotype at this

temperature, we used allele and multi-locus genotype frequency data from backcrosses (**Figure**

3B through **3D**, **Methods**). If loci act in a predominantly additive manner in the presence of a

given GP, observed multi-locus genotype frequencies should match expected multi-locus

genotype frequencies. In contrast, if epistasis meaningfully contributes to the trait, observed

multi-locus genotype frequencies should depart from expected multi-locus genotype frequencies.

Based on these tests, we observed significant deviation from expected frequencies for GPa

(**Figure 3B**) and GPb (**Figure 3C**), confirming that epistasis plays a significant role in the trait in

the presence of these GPs. However, data for GPc suggested that trait expression in the presence

of this GP is entirely additive (**Figure 3D**). These findings imply that although the three GPs in

this study can each enable expression of the same rough phenotype, they do so not only through

largely distinct cryptic variants but also through fundamentally different quantitative genetic

architectures.

Coding and regulatory variation in FLO11 plays an essential role in the trait

Only a single locus exhibited a phenotypic effect in the presence of all three GPs. This locus

corresponds to the 3S allele of the *FLO11* coding region (LEE *et al.* 2016). The BY and 3S

alleles of *FLO11* possess not only 57 synonymous and 29 nonsynonymous SNP differences, but

also a length polymorphism of ~581 nucleotides (**Figure S6**). *FLO11*^{3S} encodes a longer cell-

surface protein than *FLO11*^{BY}, an attribute that is known to favor the expression of multi-cellular

traits like the rough phenotype (VERSTREPEN *et al.* 2005; FIDALGO *et al.* 2006; FIDALGO *et al.*

2008; ZARA *et al.* 2009; HOPE AND DUNHAM 2014; MATSUI *et al.* 2015). Although this length

polymorphism is likely causal for the trait, we cannot rule out the possibility that some of the

SNPs also play a role.

In addition to being a required component of GPb, we found the BY allele of the *FLO11*

promoter is necessary for GPc segregants to express the trait (**Figure 4A**, **Table 1**). *FLO11* has

one of the largest and most complex promoters in *S. cerevisiae*, with more than 17 transcription

factors and 6 signaling cascades capable of influencing its regulation (BRUCKNER AND MOSCH

2012). Through genetic engineering experiments, we localized the causal variant in the *FLO11*

promoter to a Rim101 binding site that is present in 3S but not BY (**Figure 4B, Figure 4C,**

Figure S7). This finding is consistent with the important role that transcriptional derepression of

FLO11 plays in expression of the rough phenotype (TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2015b; TAYLOR

et al. 2016). We note that although Rim101 has been described as a *FLO11* activator in other

strains of *S. cerevisiae*, this role is indirect and mediated through its role in silencing *NRG1*

(KUCHIN *et al.* 2002; LAMB AND MITCHELL 2003; BARRALES *et al.* 2008), which encodes a

repressor that directly binds the *FLO11* promoter. The Rim101 binding site in the 3S *FLO11*

promoter most likely results in direct repression of *FLO11* by Rim101, which reinforces Sfl1-

mediated repression. These findings not only speak to the critical role of Flo11 in expression of

the rough phenotype in the BYx3S cross, but also illustrate how regulation of this gene by

multiple pathways determines the phenotypic effects of cryptic variation.

GPa and GPb rough segregants utilize different sub-pathways that impact Ras

Excluding the *FLO11* coding region and promoter, all remaining loci act in the presence of only

one or two of the GPs. To better understand the highly contextual effects of these cryptic

variants, we attempted to resolve detected loci to specific genes. Seven of the GPb-responsive

loci detected in this study were previously found to interact with either GPa or other GPs in

previous papers, in which they were mapped to individual genes (LEE *et al.* 2016; TAYLOR *et al.*

2016) (**Table 1**). These genes encode Ras-regulated transcription factors (*FLO8, MSS11, MGA1,*

SFL1), a protein kinase A subunit (*TPK3*), a TOR pathway component (*MDS3)*, and *IRA2*. Two

of the loci found in the current study among GPb segregants were located on chromosomes II

and XIV, and had never been detected in our past work (**Figure 2, Table 1**). Through genetic

engineering experiments, we resolved the chromosome XIV locus to *SRV2* (**Figure S8**), which

encodes a post-translational activator of adenylate cyclase. At the chromosome II locus, the most

likely candidate is *SRB6*, which encodes an essential subunit of the RNA polymerase II mediator

complex. Previously, we showed that mutations disrupting other mediator components, Srb10

and Srb11 (also known as Ssn3 and Ssn8, respectively), can induce the rough phenotype by

interacting with a subset of the alleles that have a phenotypic effect in the presence of GPa

(TAYLOR *et al.* 2016) (**Note S2**).

Although loci interacting with GPa and GPb primarily act through the Ras pathway and many

loci interact with both GPs, some are specific to one or the other. Among these are *TRR1* and

END3, which were detected in GPa segregants but not GPb segregants, as well as *MDS3*, *SRV2*,

and *TPK3*, which were identified in GPb segregants but not GPa segregants. Notably, these

genes play a role in activating the Ras pathway through oxidative stress and actin organization

(**Figure 5**). Actin cytoskeleton stability is required for cell polarity and yeast-adhesion traits, and

is regulated in part by the effects of End3 and Srv2 on Ras signaling (DU AND AYSCOUGH 2009).

This process results in increased production of reactive oxygen species (ROS) through the

activity of Tpk3 (GOURLAY AND AYSCOUGH 2006). ROS accumulation is then influenced by

Trr1 (CHARIZANIS *et al.* 1999) and the TOR pathway, of which Mds3 is a component. Together,

Mds3, Srv2, and Tpk3 form a well-described sub-pathway that influences Ras activity

(GOURLAY AND AYSCOUGH 2006; DU AND AYSCOUGH 2009). Thus, although different loci cause

the trait in the presence of GPa and GPb, they appear to reflect different sub-pathways affecting

the same cellular processes, which ultimately impact how Ras-regulated transcription factors

influence *FLO11* activity.

Cryptic variation in several pathways underlies the phenotype in GPc segregants

Lastly, we sought to determine the genes harboring cryptic variants that interact with GPc.

Regarding GPc, 3 of the 10 identified loci also interact with either GPa or b. These loci

correspond to *END3*, *IRA2*, and a locus on chromosome XII. For chromosome XII and the

remaining seven loci, we identified likely candidate genes based on our highly resolved genetic

mapping data and publicly available research on these genes' functions and phenotypic effects.

One of these loci corresponds to *IRA1*, a Ras negative regulator and paralog of *IRA2* (LEE *et al.*

2016) (**Table 1**). To obtain additional support for the remaining candidate genes, we deleted

them from GPc rough segregants and determined whether their loss affected the colony trait. All

seven knockouts had an effect, suggesting genetic variation in these genes plays a causal role in

the rough phenotype (**Figure S9**).

Detection of *END3*, *IRA1*, and *IRA2* in the absence of Flo8 and Sfl1 indicates that Ras still

contributes to *FLO11* regulation in the absence of these transcription factors, possibly by

impacting the activities of other transcription factors (ESTRUCH 2000). The remaining loci

implicate alternative signaling pathways as being responsible for trait expression in GPc

segregants. The genes we identified in the other intervals were a TOR pathway gene and *MDS3*

paralog (*PMD1*), components of the MAP kinase (MAPK) signaling cascade (*DIG1*, *GPA1*)

(METODIEV *et al.* 2002), an environmentally-responsive transcriptional activator (*GCN4),* a Rab

GTPase that influences Ras (COSTANZO *et al.* 2010), MAPK (COSTANZO *et al.* 2016), and

Rim101 (ZHENG *et al.* 2010) signaling *(YPT6),* a stress responsive guanine exchange factor

(*SDC25*), and an enzyme that post-translationally modifies proteins to help them anchor into the

cell wall (*GPI8*). Of particular note for *GPA1*, the BY strain is known to carry a lab-derived

allele that is an expression QTL hotspot (YVERT *et al.* 2003), supporting the possibility that

GPA1 allele state might also impact expression of the rough phenotype in the presence of GPc.

Additionally, *GPA1*[BY] was previously shown to influence other *FLO11*-dependent traits through

its downstream transcriptional activator Ste12 (MATSUI *et al.* 2015). Nearly all of the genes

identified in rough GPc segregants have the potential to directly or indirectly influence *FLO11*

transcription. The lone exception is *GPI8*, which could still influence Flo11 at the protein level,

as it is responsible for adding glycosylphosphatidylinositol (GPI) anchors to new proteins and

could affect Flo11's binding to the cell surface (BENGHEZAL *et al.* 1996). These results show the

abundant cryptic variation that exists within the *FLO11* gene regulatory network.

Discussion

We have detailed how different genetic perturbations can reveal distinct cryptic variants, thereby

enabling a multitude of genotype, environment, and phenotype relationships to produce the same

trait. Across the 21 loci that can contribute to the rough phenotype in the presence of GPa, GPb,

and GPc, all but one of them show phenotypic effects that depend on the GP that is present. This

single locus corresponds to the coding region of *FLO11*, supporting the notion that regulation of

Flo11 levels and stability is the central determinant of the rough phenotype's expression across

GPs, combinations of segregating loci, and temperature.

Bolstering the importance of variability in *FLO11* regulation to our findings, nearly all of the loci

that exhibit phenotypic effects influence *FLO11* in *trans.* Moreover, many of these loci are only

visible in the absence of a repressive Rim101 binding site in the *FLO11* promoter. These results

highlight the potentially important role that *cis*-regulatory polymorphisms can play in enabling

trans-regulatory polymorphisms to exert phenotypic effects. Indeed, *cis*-regulatory

polymorphisms have been shown to modify the effects of *trans* variants in other systems (REDDY

et al. 2012; WONG *et al.* 2017), thereby altering how genetic differences impact traits (PAYNE

AND WAGNER 2014). More generally, our findings imply that changes at the level of an

organismal phenotype—the rough colony trait—reflect complex genetic and environmental

effects on a key gene's regulatory network, here *FLO11*.

In addition to showing that different GPs enable distinct cryptic variants to have phenotypic

effects, we also demonstrate that the GPs modify how genotype-environment interactions impact

the trait. For both GPa and GPb, we find that certain combinations of epistatic alleles both enable

expression of the trait at a permissive temperature of 21°C, as well as provide the genetic

potential for the phenotype at higher temperatures. However, different loci and multi-locus

genotypes enable GPa and GPb segregants to express the trait at higher temperatures. In contrast,

GPc individuals are unable to express the phenotype at temperatures above 21°C, implying their

potential to express the trait across environments is constrained. These findings support the

concept that not all genotypes specifying the same trait possess comparable phenotypic

robustness (WAGNER 2012; PAYNE *et al.* 2014; PFENNIG AND EHRENREICH 2014; SIEGAL AND

LEU 2014; EHRENREICH AND PFENNIG 2016). In the case of the rough phenotype, our genetic

mapping and genetic engineering results imply that differences in phenotypic robustness relate to

changes in signaling and transcription factor activity across multiple pathways and sub-pathways

influencing *FLO11*.

Furthermore, whereas the rough phenotype in GPa and GPb segregants involves complex

epistatic effects, we find no evidence for epistasis in GPc rough segregants. This implies that by

eliminating the main transcriptional regulators of *FLO11*, we not only uncovered a different set

of cryptic variants but also converted the trait's genetic architecture from mainly epistatic to

additive. Perhaps this additivity at the phenotypic level reflects the cumulative effect of multiple

pathways influencing *FLO11* expression at the molecular level. While the majority of the loci

that interact with GPa and GPb correspond to components of the Ras pathway, many of the loci

found in the presence of GPc are involved in other signaling pathways that may have

compensatory functions (**Figure 5**). This is consistent with the idea that eliminating Flo8 and

Sfl1 might enable other pathways to play a stronger role in expression of *FLO11* and the rough colony phenotype.

Although not an explicit focus of the current manuscript, our results also provide valuable insights into genetic background effects, the phenomenon in which GPs show different phenotypic effects in distinct individuals (NADEAU 2001; CHANDLER *et al.* 2013; EHRENREICH 2017). A number of recent studies have shown that these background effects often result from higher-order epistasis between a GP and multiple segregating loci (CHANDLER *et al.* 2014; TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2014; MIOTTO *et al.* 2015; TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2015b; LEE *et al.* 2016; KUZMIN *et al.* 2018; MULLIS *et al.* 2018). Despite supporting an important role for higher-order epistasis in background effects, our current work, in particular on GPc, also shows that background effects can have much simpler underpinnings. In the context of GPc, identified loci each show pairwise epistasis with the GP, but exhibit no epistasis with each other and thus appear to act additively. These differences in quantitative genetic architecture again tie back to differences in *FLO11* regulation, consistent with theoretical work suggesting that how GPs perturb gene regulatory networks can impact whether loci show additive or epistatic effects (GJUVSLAND *et al.* 2007).

In summary, our study demonstrates the large amount of cryptic variation that can underlie a single phenotype and strongly implicates complex changes in transcription as a mechanism regulating this cryptic variation. Our findings also illustrate how systematically characterizing the impacts of GPs on genotype-environment-phenotype relationships can significantly advance understanding of some of the most difficult, yet fundamental problems in complex trait genetics.

Acknowledgments

We thank Joseph Hale, Takeshi Matsui, Martin Mullis, Joann Phan, Rachel Schell, Fabian Seidl, Matthew Taylor, and Gleidson Teixeira for valuable input regarding this project or manuscript. The work reported in this paper was supported by grant R01GM110255 from the National Institutes of Health to I.M.E, a fellowship from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation to I.M.E, and a fellowship from the São Paulo Research Foundation to A.L.V.C.

483
Figure 1: Different genetic perturbations ('GPs') interact with cryptic variation to cause
rough morphology. (a) Certain GPs can cause BYx3S segregants to express a rough colony
phenotype. **(b)** Expression of the colony trait can be temperature-sensitive, with individuals
varying in their abilities to express the phenotype at 30 and 37°C. **(c)** GPa is a loss-of-function
mutation in *IRA2*, which encodes a Ras negative regulator. **(d)** GPb results from recombination
between the BY (blue) *FLO11* promoter and 3S (orange) *FLO11* coding region. **(e)** GPc is a
double knockout of *FLO8* and *SFL1*, which encode the main Ras-dependent transcriptional
regulators of *FLO11*. **(f)** GPa and GPb occurred spontaneously in the cross, while GPc was
genetically engineered. Genetic mapping populations were generated using backcrossing, as well
as screening for the trait at 21, 30, and 37°C. Loci associated with the trait were identified in

each backcross for each GP-temperature combination. Loci detected in the presence of GP were

then compared.

Figure 2: Loci identified in the presence of the GPs. Twenty-one loci were identified in total.

Circles indicate cryptic variants, whereas stars indicate GPs.

499
Figure 3: Loci detected across GPs and temperature sensitivity classes. (**a**) Loci interacting
with GPa and GPb at 21 and 30°C act in different multi-locus genotypes. As shown with black
lines, certain temperature-sensitive genotypes provide the potential for additional alleles to
enable trait expression at higher temperatures. Loci interacting with GPc only have effects at
21°C. (**b**) For GPa individuals expressing the trait at only 21°C, observed multi-locus genotype
frequencies at the four loci segregating in the 3S backcross do not reflect expected frequencies.
This can occur if certain alleles exhibit epistasis and co-segregate in a non-random manner. (**c**)
Observed and expected genotype frequencies based on four loci in GPb individuals expressing
the trait at only 21°C. (**d**) Observed genotype frequencies in GPc individuals closely match
expected frequencies, suggesting involved loci act in an additive manner.
510

512
Figure 4: A transcription factor binding site polymorphism is required for GPb and GPc
rough segregants to express the trait. (a) The GPb and GPc *FLO11* promoters contain portions
of both the BY (blue) and 3S (orange) versions. **(b)** Genetic engineering experiments identified a
534 nucleotide segment of the BY-derived promoter as being responsible for the trait. **(c)** A
Rim101 transcription factor binding site that is absent in BY was found to be the causal
polymorphism.

Functional Variation

⬤ GPa ⬤ GPb ⬤ GPc ⬤ none detected

Figure 5: GPs unmask cryptic genetic variation in parallel signaling pathways and sub-
pathways. (a) Loci that interact with GPa influence *FLO11* regulation by the Ras pathway. **(b)**
GPb uncovers loci that primarily act through a different Ras sub-pathway involving Mds3, Srv2,
and Tpk3. **(c)** Loci interacting with GPc function in a number of different pathways that are
capable of regulating *FLO11* activity. The locations of transcription factor binding sites are not
intended to reflect specific positioning along the *FLO11* promoter.

Table 1: Causal genes underlying identified loci

Genetic Perturbation	Chr.	Gene	Function	Allele	Initial detection
GPc	2	IRA1	Ras negative regulator, IRA2 paralog	3S	Taylor et al., 2016
GPb	2	SRB6*	RNA Pol II subunit	BY	this paper
GPc	4	GPI8	GPI transamidase complex subunit	3S	this paper
GPa	4	TRR1	redox state regulator	3S	Taylor and Ehrenreich, 2014
GPc	5	GCN4	stress response transcription factor	3S	this paper
GPa,b	5	FLO8	Ras activated transcription factor	3S	Taylor and Ehrenreich, 2014
GPc	5	PMD1	growth regulator; MDS3 paralog	BY	this paper
GPb	7	MDS3	TOR pathway growth regulator	3S	Taylor et al., 2016
GPa,b	7	MGA1	transcriptional activator	BY	Taylor and Ehrenreich, 2015
GPc	8	GPA1	G-protein	BY	this paper
GPa,b,c	9	FLO11	cell surfaace glycoprotein	3S	Lee et al., 2016
GPb,c	9	prFLO11	FLO11 promoter	BY/3S	Taylor et al., 2016
GPb	11	TPK3	Protein Kinase A subunit	BY	Taylor et al., 2016
GPc	12	SDC25	Ras GEF	BY	this paper
GPa,c	12	YPT6	Rab GTPase	3S	Lee et al., 2016
GPa,b	13	MSS11	Ras activated transcription factor	BY	Taylor and Ehrenreich, 2014
GPb	14	SRV2	activator of adenylate cyclase	BY	this paper
GPa,c	14	END3	cell wall morphogenesis	BY, 3S	Taylor and Ehrenreich, 2014
GPb,c	15	IRA2	Ras negative regulator	BY	Taylor et al., 2016
GPa,b	15	SFL1	Ras inactivated transcription factor	BY	Taylor and Ehrenreich, 2015
GPc	16	DIG1	MAPK-regulated transcription factor	3S	this paper

527   * candidate gene

References

Atwell, S., Y. S. Huang, B. J. Vilhjalmsson, G. Willems, M. Horton *et al.*, 2010 Genome-wide association study of 107 phenotypes in Arabidopsis thaliana inbred lines. Nature 465**:** 627-631.

Aylor, D. L., W. Valdar, W. Foulds-Mathes, R. J. Buus, R. A. Verdugo *et al.*, 2011 Genetic analysis of complex traits in the emerging Collaborative Cross. Genome Res 21**:** 1213-1222.

Barrales, R. R., J. Jimenez and J. I. Ibeas, 2008 Identification of novel activation mechanisms for FLO11 regulation in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. Genetics 178**:** 145-156.

Benghezal, M., A. Benachour, S. Rusconi, M. Aebi and A. Conzelmann, 1996 Yeast Gpi8p is essential for GPI anchor attachment onto proteins. EMBO J 15**:** 6575-6583.

Benjamini, Y., and Y. Hochberg, 1995 Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B 57**:** 289-300.

Bergman, A., and M. L. Siegal, 2003 Evolutionary capacitance as a general feature of complex gene networks. Nature 424**:** 549-552.

Bloom, J. S., I. M. Ehrenreich, W. T. Loo, T. L. Lite and L. Kruglyak, 2013 Finding the sources of missing heritability in a yeast cross. Nature 494**:** 234-237.

Bruckner, S., and H. U. Mosch, 2012 Choosing the right lifestyle: adhesion and development in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. FEMS Microbiol Rev 36**:** 25-58.

Chandler, C. H., S. Chari and I. Dworkin, 2013 Does your gene need a background check? How genetic background impacts the analysis of mutations, genes, and evolution. Trends Genet 29**:** 358-366.

Chandler, C. H., S. Chari, D. Tack and I. Dworkin, 2014 Causes and consequences of genetic background effects illuminated by integrative genomic analysis. Genetics 196**:** 1321-1336.

Charizanis, C., H. Juhnke, B. Krems and K. D. Entian, 1999 The oxidative stress response mediated via Pos9/Skn7 is negatively regulated by the Ras/PKA pathway in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. Mol Gen Genet 261**:** 740-752.

Costanzo, M., A. Baryshnikova, J. Bellay, Y. Kim, E. D. Spear *et al.*, 2010 The genetic landscape of a cell. Science 327**:** 425-431.

Costanzo, M., B. VanderSluis, E. N. Koch, A. Baryshnikova, C. Pons *et al.*, 2016 A global
genetic interaction network maps a wiring diagram of cellular function. Science 353.

Du, W., and K. R. Ayscough, 2009 Methyl beta-cyclodextrin reduces accumulation of reactive
oxygen species and cell death in yeast. Free Radic Biol Med 46**:** 1478-1487.

Dworkin, I., A. Palsson, K. Birdsall and G. Gibson, 2003 Evidence that Egfr contributes to
cryptic genetic variation for photoreceptor determination in natural populations of
Drosophila melanogaster. Curr Biol 13**:** 1888-1893.

Ehrenreich, I. M., 2017 Epistasis: Searching for Interacting Genetic Variants Using Crosses.
Genetics 206**:** 531-535.

Ehrenreich, I. M., and D. W. Pfennig, 2016 Genetic assimilation: a review of its potential
proximate causes and evolutionary consequences. Ann Bot 117**:** 769-779.

Estruch, F., 2000 Stress-controlled transcription factors, stress-induced genes and stress tolerance
in budding yeast. FEMS Microbiol Rev 24**:** 469-486.

Fidalgo, M., R. R. Barrales, J. I. Ibeas and J. Jimenez, 2006 Adaptive evolution by mutations in
the FLO11 gene. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 103**:** 11228-11233.

Fidalgo, M., R. R. Barrales and J. Jimenez, 2008 Coding repeat instability in the FLO11 gene of
Saccharomyces yeasts. Yeast 25**:** 879-889.

Geiler-Samerotte, K. A., Y. O. Zhu, B. E. Goulet, D. W. Hall and M. L. Siegal, 2016 Selection
Transforms the Landscape of Genetic Variation Interacting with Hsp90. PLoS Biol 14**:**
e2000465.

Gibson, G., and I. Dworkin, 2004 Uncovering cryptic genetic variation. Nat Rev Genet 5**:** 681-
690.

Gietz, R. D., and R. A. Woods, 2002 Transformation of yeast by lithium acetate/single-stranded
carrier DNA/polyethylene glycol method. Methods Enzymol 350**:** 87-96.

Gjuvsland, A. B., B. J. Hayes, S. W. Omholt and O. Carlborg, 2007 Statistical epistasis is a
generic feature of gene regulatory networks. Genetics 175**:** 411-420.

Gourlay, C. W., and K. R. Ayscough, 2006 Actin-induced hyperactivation of the Ras signaling
pathway leads to apoptosis in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. Mol Cell Biol 26**:** 6487-6501.

Hope, E. A., and M. J. Dunham, 2014 Ploidy-regulated variation in biofilm-related phenotypes in
natural isolates of Saccharomyces cerevisiae. G3 (Bethesda) 4**:** 1773-1786.

Jarosz, D. F., and S. Lindquist, 2010 Hsp90 and environmental stress transform the adaptive
590   value of natural genetic variation. Science 330**:** 1820-1824.

591   Kuchin, S., V. K. Vyas and M. Carlson, 2002 Snf1 protein kinase and the repressors Nrg1 and
592   Nrg2 regulate FLO11, haploid invasive growth, and diploid pseudohyphal differentiation.
593   Mol Cell Biol 22**:** 3994-4000.

594   Kuzmin, E., B. VanderSluis, W. Wang, G. Tan, R. Deshpande *et al.*, 2018 Systematic analysis of
595   complex genetic interactions. Science 360.

596   Lamb, T. M., and A. P. Mitchell, 2003 The transcription factor Rim101p governs ion tolerance
597   and cell differentiation by direct repression of the regulatory genes NRG1 and SMP1 in
598   Saccharomyces cerevisiae. Mol Cell Biol 23**:** 677-686.

599   Laughery, M. F., T. Hunter, A. Brown, J. Hoopes, T. Ostbye *et al.*, 2015 New vectors for simple
600   and streamlined CRISPR-Cas9 genome editing in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. Yeast 32**:**
601   711-720.

602   Le Rouzic, A., and O. Carlborg, 2008 Evolutionary potential of hidden genetic variation. Trends
603   Ecol Evol 23**:** 33-37.

604   Lee, J. T., M. B. Taylor, A. Shen and I. M. Ehrenreich, 2016 Multi-locus Genotypes Underlying
605   Temperature Sensitivity in a Mutationally Induced Trait. PLoS Genet 12**:** e1005929.

606   Li, H., and R. Durbin, 2009 Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler
607   transform. Bioinformatics 25**:** 1754-1760.

608   Li, H., B. Handsaker, A. Wysoker, T. Fennell, J. Ruan *et al.*, 2009 The Sequence
609   Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics 25**:** 2078-2079.

610   Lo, W. S., and A. M. Dranginis, 1996 FLO11, a yeast gene related to the STA genes, encodes a
611   novel cell surface flocculin. J Bacteriol 178**:** 7144-7151.

612   Mackay, T. F., S. Richards, E. A. Stone, A. Barbadilla, J. F. Ayroles *et al.*, 2012 The Drosophila
613   melanogaster Genetic Reference Panel. Nature 482**:** 173-178.

614   Matsui, T., R. Linder, J. Phan, F. Seidl and I. M. Ehrenreich, 2015 Regulatory Rewiring in a
615   Cross Causes Extensive Genetic Heterogeneity. Genetics 201**:** 769-777.

616   McGuigan, K., and C. M. Sgro, 2009 Evolutionary consequences of cryptic genetic variation.
617   Trends Ecol Evol 24**:** 305-311.

618   Metodiev, M. V., D. Matheos, M. D. Rose and D. E. Stone, 2002 Regulation of MAPK function
619   by direct interaction with the mating-specific Galpha in yeast. Science 296**:** 1483-1486.

Miotto, O., R. Amato, E. A. Ashley, B. MacInnis, J. Almagro-Garcia *et al.*, 2015 Genetic
architecture of artemisinin-resistant Plasmodium falciparum. Nat Genet 47**:** 226-234.

Mullis, M. N., T. Matsui, R. Schell, R. Foree and I. M. Ehrenreich, 2018 The complex
underpinnings of genetic background effects. Nat Commun 9**:** 3548.

Nadeau, J. H., 2001 Modifier genes in mice and humans. Nat Rev Genet 2**:** 165-174.

Paaby, A. B., and M. V. Rockman, 2014 Cryptic genetic variation: evolution's hidden substrate.
Nat Rev Genet 15**:** 247-258.

Payne, J. L., J. H. Moore and A. Wagner, 2014 Robustness, evolvability, and the logic of genetic
regulation. Artif Life 20**:** 111-126.

Payne, J. L., and A. Wagner, 2014 The robustness and evolvability of transcription factor
binding sites. Science 343**:** 875-877.

Pfennig, D. W., and I. M. Ehrenreich, 2014 Towards a gene regulatory network perspective on
phenotypic plasticity, genetic accommodation and genetic assimilation. Mol Ecol 23**:**
4438-4440.

Queitsch, C., T. A. Sangster and S. Lindquist, 2002 Hsp90 as a capacitor of phenotypic variation.
Nature 417**:** 618-624.

Reddy, T. E., J. Gertz, F. Pauli, K. S. Kucera, K. E. Varley *et al.*, 2012 Effects of sequence
variation on differential allelic transcription factor occupancy and gene expression.
Genome Res 22**:** 860-869.

Rutherford, S. L., and S. Lindquist, 1998 Hsp90 as a capacitor for morphological evolution.
Nature 396**:** 336-342.

Seabold, S., and J. Perktold, 2010 Statsmodels: econometric and statistical modeling with
Python. Proc of the 9th Python in Science Conf**:** 57-61.

Siegal, M. L., and J. Y. Leu, 2014 On the Nature and Evolutionary Impact of Phenotypic
Robustness Mechanisms. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst 45**:** 496-517.

Taylor, M. B., and I. M. Ehrenreich, 2014 Genetic interactions involving five or more genes
contribute to a complex trait in yeast. PLoS Genet 10**:** e1004324.

Taylor, M. B., and I. M. Ehrenreich, 2015a Higher-order genetic interactions and their
contribution to complex traits. Trends Genet 31**:** 34-40.

Taylor, M. B., and I. M. Ehrenreich, 2015b Transcriptional Derepression Uncovers Cryptic
Higher-Order Genetic Interactions. PLoS Genet 11**:** e1005606.

Taylor, M. B., J. Phan, J. T. Lee, M. McCadden and I. M. Ehrenreich, 2016 Diverse genetic
652   architectures lead to the same cryptic phenotype in a yeast cross. Nat Commun 7**:** 11669.

653   Tong, A. H., M. Evangelista, A. B. Parsons, H. Xu, G. D. Bader *et al.*, 2001 Systematic genetic
654   analysis with ordered arrays of yeast deletion mutants. Science 294**:** 2364-2368.

655   Verstrepen, K. J., A. Jansen, F. Lewitter and G. R. Fink, 2005 Intragenic tandem repeats generate
656   functional variability. Nat Genet 37**:** 986-990.

657   Wach, A., A. Brachat, R. Pohlmann and P. Philippsen, 1994 New heterologous modules for
658   classical or PCR-based gene disruptions in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. Yeast 10**:** 1793-
659   1808.

660   Wagner, A., 2012 The role of robustness in phenotypic adaptation and innovation. Proc Biol Sci
661   279**:** 1249-1258.

662   Wong, E. S., B. M. Schmitt, A. Kazachenka, D. Thybert, A. Redmond *et al.*, 2017 Interplay of
663   cis and trans mechanisms driving transcription factor binding and gene expression
664   evolution. Nat Commun 8**:** 1092.

665   Yvert, G., R. B. Brem, J. Whittle, J. M. Akey, E. Foss *et al.*, 2003 Trans-acting regulatory
666   variation in Saccharomyces cerevisiae and the role of transcription factors. Nat Genet 35**:**
667   57-64.

668   Zara, G., S. Zara, C. Pinna, S. Marceddu and M. Budroni, 2009 FLO11 gene length and
669   transcriptional level affect biofilm-forming ability of wild flor strains of Saccharomyces
670   cerevisiae. Microbiology 155**:** 3838-3846.

671   Zheng, J., J. J. Benschop, M. Shales, P. Kemmeren, J. Greenblatt *et al.*, 2010 Epistatic
672   relationships reveal the functional organization of yeast transcription factors. Mol Syst
673   Biol 6**:** 420.

675
Figure S1: GPb and GPc individuals differ in their temperature sensitivities. (a) A subset of
GPb backcross segregants express rough morphology at 30 and 37°C. **(b)** GPc backcross
segregants are incapable of expressing the trait at 30 and 37°C. Ninety-six backcross segregants
were generated and phenotyped for each GP-backcross parent combination.

Figure S2: Scheme to generate GPb backcross mapping populations. A rough BYx3S F_2

segregant carrying GPb was backcrossed to BY and 3S. In the case of the cross to 3S, a second-

generation backcross to BY was then performed, which was necessary to enrich for segregants

that express the rough phenotype at 37°C.

Figure S3: Genetic mapping for loci interacting with GPb and GPc. For each mapping population based on GP, backcross, and temperature sensitivity, a binomial test was performed for each SNP to identify regions of the genome associated with the rough phenotype. Results in are plotted in -$\log_{10}$(p)-values in the following order: GPb (BY backcross, 21, 30, 37°C), GPb (3S backcross, 21°C), GPb (3S backcross, 21, 30°C), GPb (2nd generation backcross, 21°C), GPb (2nd generation backcross, 21, 30°C), GPb (2nd generation backcross, 21, 30, 37°C), GPc (BY backcross, 21°C), GPc (3S backcross, 21°C).

694   **Figure S4: Key corresponding to gene position in Figure 3A.**

Figure S5: Scan for loci with correlated allele states. Significant p-values for χ^2 tests between each pair of uniquely segregating genomic regions: GPb – **(a)** backcross to BY, **(b)** backcross to 3S, and GPc – **(c)** backcross to BY, **(d)** backcross to 3S. Results are only plotted for the upper triangle. Significant results were only found in the GPb backcross to 3S.

Figure S6: Variation in the *FLO11* coding region. The 3S strain carries a longer *FLO11* allele

relative to BY. This is due to a ~500-600 nucleotide length polymorphism in the middle of the

gene. Nucleotide positions are provided based on the BY gene sequence.

Figure S7: Additional pr*FLO11* fine mapping details. (a) Engineering of the six

polymorphisms within the promoter region shown in Figure 3B revealed that replacement of a

TT BY sequence at position 394,846 to 394,847 with the 3S CC allele ablates the phenotype. **(b)**

Replacement of the same polymorphism in a strain with GPc also causes loss of the rough

phenotype.

Figure S8: The *SRV2* gene underlies a locus on chromosome XIV that interacts with GPb.

Replacement of the BY *SRV2* allele with the 3S version results in loss of the rough phenotype. A

similar loss of phenotype is also observed when *SRV2* is deleted.

Figure S9: Deletions support interactions between GPc and identified candidate genes.

Complete deletion of the candidate genes in a GPc rough segregant was performed using tailed

kanMX cassettes. Deletion of six candidate genes causes loss of the phenotype. For the seventh

candidate gene, deletion enhances the phenotype. Notably, *DIG1* encodes a repressor of the

FLO11 activator Ste12. Thus, the phenotypic enhancement seen upon its deletion is consistent

with cryptic variation promoting transcription of *FLO11*.

     Table S1: Loci detected across GPs and temperatures

Genetic perturbation	Chromosome	Maximum temperature of trait expression	Allele	Upstream bound	Downstream bound	$-Log_{10}(p)$-value
b	2	21	BY	723181	734674	9.371
b	2	30	BY	705006	734674	10.706
b	2	37	BY	705006	734674	4.056
b	5	30	3S	368771	394911	10.709
b	5	37	3S	356220	383540	8.826
b	5	21, 30, 37	3S	353654	400481	6.665
b	7	30	3S	87038	214328	4.821
b	7	30	BY	894815	985698	6.917
b	7	37	3S	81381	143359	5.078
b	7	37	BY	852002	1000433	4.374
b	9	21	BY	396020	400489	8.101
b	9	21	BY	396027	439742	14.214
b	9	30	3S	386815	394651	10.709
b	9	30	BY	395106	416603	11.929
b	9	37	3S	386817	394001	10.127
b	9	37	BY	395106	396891	6.92
b	9	21, 30, 37	3S	386511	394651	6.665
b	11	21	BY	97364	242623	4.898
b	11	21	BY	97394	243150	5.854
b	11	30	BY	154545	257237	3.703
b	13	21	BY	319105	924189	4.898
b	13	21	BY	395951	664756	5.854
b	13	21	BY	570969	605817	14.214
b	13	30	BY	548950	609784	10.706
b	13	37	BY	554372	923918	4.98
b	14	37	BY	356409	394076	7.711
b	15	21	BY	100250	202290	4.18
b	15	21	BY	111105	223620	4.283
b	15	21	BY	129314	193871	8.708
b	15	21	BY	553016	631585	4.853
b	15	30	BY	131162	299083	3.703
b	15	30	BY	559403	628841	9.617
b	15	37	BY	498862	623604	6.731
c	2	21	3S	503310	531496	40.859
c	4	21	3S	961848	1151234	16.42

c	5	21	3S	105743	16630	11.564
c	5	21	BY	377154	438640	8.564
c	8	21	BY	98357	122190	13.319
c	9	21	3S	387502	394427	44.464
c	9	21	BY	395106	397560	26.391
c	12	21	BY	109399	173876	6.429
c	12	21	3S	642815	680926	20.06
c	14	21	BY	445983	473648	17.815
c	15	21	BY	147945	182906	12.549
c	16	21	3S	429704	477416	16.42

Note S1: For GPb individuals expressing the rough phenotype at 21°C, we detected two multi-

locus genotypes among segregants from the backcross to 3S. We also identified a third genotype

in the second-generation backcross population, involving a different combination of alleles than

those from the initial 3S backcross.

Note S2: We deleted each non-essential gene at the GPb chromosome II locus – *RRT2*, *HIS7*,

ARO4, *MRPS5*, *MTC4*, *SHG1*, and *YBR259W* – and found that none of these deletions caused

loss of the rough phenotype. This implies that loss-of-function in a non-essential gene is not

responsible for the trait at this locus, and the causal genetic variant is either a gain-of-function

polymorphism or is an essential gene. Among the essential genes at this locus, *SRB6* was

determined to be the strongest candidate.