Multiple layers of cryptic genetic variation underlie a yeast complex trait

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 genetic variation underlying

a *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* colony phenotype that is typically suppressed in a cross of the lab

strain BY4716 (BY) and a derivative of the clinical isolate 322134S (3S). To do this, we

comprehensively map the trait's genetic basis in the BYx3S cross in the presence of three

different genetic perturbations that enable its expression. This allows us to detect and compare

the specific loci harboring cryptic genetic variants that interact with each perturbation. In total,

we identify 21 loci, all but one of which interacts with just a subset of the perturbations. Beyond

impacting which loci contribute to the trait, the genetic perturbations also influence the extent of

additivity, epistasis, and genotype-environment interaction among the detected loci.

Additionally, we show that the single locus interacting with all three perturbations corresponds to

the coding region of the cell surface gene *FLO11*. Nearly all of the other loci influence *FLO11*

transcription in *cis* or *trans*. However, the perturbations reveal cryptic genetic variation in

different pathways and sub-pathways upstream of *FLO11*, suggesting that multiple layers of

cryptic genetic variation with highly contextual effects underlie the trait. Our work demonstrates

an abundance of cryptic genetic variation in transcriptional regulation and illustrates how this

cryptic genetic variation complicates efforts to study the relationship between genotype and

phenotype.

Article Summary

To better understand cryptic genetic variation, we comprehensively map the genetic basis of a

trait that is suppressed in a yeast cross. By examining how three different genetic perturbations

give rise to the trait, we identify 21 loci harboring cryptic genetic variants, nearly all of which

play roles in the transcriptional regulation of the same key gene. We examine these loci in

greater detail and show that the perturbations affect every aspect of the trait's genetic

architecture, including which cryptic genetic variants have phenotypic effects, as well as the

extent of additivity, epistasis, and genotype-environment interaction among these variants.

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 convert 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 genetic variants (hereafter, '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). The lab strain BY4716 (BY), a haploid derivative of the clinical isolate 322134S (3S), and their haploid recombinant progeny form 'smooth' colonies when grown on solid media (**Figure 1A**). However, certain *de novo* or induced mutations, as well as recombination between the promoter and coding region of the cell surface gene *FLO11*, can enable some BYx3S segregants to express an alternative 'rough' colony phenotype (**Figure 1B**). Throughout the current paper, we refer to these new alleles that are not naturally present in BY or 3S, but make it possible for the rough phenotype to be expressed in the BYx3S cross as genetic perturbations (or 'GPs'). These GPs on their own are insufficient to cause expression of the rough phenotype; rather, cryptic variants that segregate between BY and 3S are also needed. Moreover, BYx3S segregants that express the trait in the presence of a given GP usually exhibit the phenotype in a temperature-sensitive manner. However, by backcrossing these segregants and examining their backcross progeny

across temperatures, additional cryptic variation can often be found that reduces or eliminates

temperature sensitivity (**Figure 1C**). In other words, expression of the trait results from complex

interactions between the GPs, segregating loci, and temperature.

Crucially, genetic mapping and genetic engineering techniques can be used to comprehensively

identify the specific GPs and cryptic variants that enable a given rough segregant to express the

trait. In our initial work on colony morphology in the BYx3S cross, we found that a *de novo* loss-

of-function mutation in *IRA2* ('GPa'), a negative regulator of Ras signaling, had occurred during

the generation of BYx3S segregants and enabled ~2% of cross progeny to express the phenotype

(TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2014) (**Figure 1D**). 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 induced 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 a screen of 106 independently generated BYx3S crosses in which 17% of the crosses

produced at least one rough segregant, we also found individuals that expressed the trait despite

lacking any detectable *de novo* mutations (TAYLOR *et al.* 2016). Instead, two-thirds of these

segregants inherited recombination events in the promoter of *FLO11* ('GPb', **Figure 1E**). In

total, we recovered six different recombination breakpoints, which all occurred within 1.3 kb of

each other. *FLO11* encodes a flocculin whose display on the cell surface facilitates cell-cell

adhesion; this protein is required for expression of the rough phenotype (LO AND DRANGINIS

1996; TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2015b). Genetic engineering experiments showed that the

recombination events brought at least two alleles at closely linked loci in or near *FLO11* onto the

same chromosome, resulting in a new *FLO11* haplotype that behaves like the mutations

described in our earlier studies (TAYLOR *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 cryptic 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 (**Figure 1G**), which are the main

transcription factors that act downstream of the Ras pathway to regulate colony morphology in

the cross. 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, we sought to uncover previously unidentified

cryptic variants that can also give rise to the rough phenotype. We successfully recovered one

rough BYx3S *flo8Δ sfl1Δ* segregant, making it possible to examine the genetic basis of the

phenotype in the absence of its primary transcriptional regulators.

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 regulation of a single key

gene, *FLO11*. These findings enhance our understanding of both the extent of cryptic variation

within populations and the mechanisms by which GPs reveal cryptic variants. Further, they show

how conditional uncovering of cryptic genetic variation can result in highly divergent genetic

architectures that produce the same trait, even within a single population examined in a common

environment.

Materials and Methods

Knockout of FLO8 and SFL1 in BY and 3S

FLO8 and *SFL1* targeting guide RNA (gRNA) sequences were cloned into the pML104 plasmid

vector, which carries Cas9 and *URA3* (LAUGHERY *et al.* 2015). Each resulting plasmid was

transformed into BY or 3S alongside a double-stranded oligo repair template for homologous

recombination. The *flo8 sfl1Δ* BY and 3S strains were both generated through a series of two

sequential knockouts. The lithium acetate method (GIETZ AND WOODS 2002) was used for

transformation. Oligos were 90 bases long with homology to either *FLO8* or *SFL1*, with

inclusion of a stop codon followed by single base frameshift deletion in the middle. Stop codons

were introduced at amino acids 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. Plasmids were then eliminated from the transformants by plating on 5-

fluoroorotic acid (5-FOA). Presence of the intended genetic modifications was checked in the

transformants using Sanger sequencing.

Isolation of rough BYx3S F_2 segregants

GPa and GPb were identified in BYx3S crosses produced by sporulating independently

generated BY/3S diploids. The GPa rough F_2 segregant included in the current study is discussed

in (TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2014; TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2015b; LEE *et al.* 2016), while

the GPb rough F_2 segregant used in this study was described in (TAYLOR *et al.* 2016), in which it

was referred to as 'Rough segregant 13'. GPa and GPb were identified in these past studies by

taking individual rough F_2 segregants recovered from screens of BYx3S crosses, performing

genetic mapping in backcross populations obtained by mating the respective rough F_2 segregants

to both BY and 3S, and analyzing whole genome sequencing data for backcross segregants. To

obtain a rough F_2 segregant with GPc, *flo8Δ sfl1Δ* BY and 3S strains were mated to one another.

The resulting diploid was sporulated and plated at low density (~300 colonies per plate) onto

YNB agar containing canavanine to select for MAT**a** 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

All data for GPa was described in previous papers (TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH 2014; TAYLOR
AND EHRENREICH 2015b; LEE *et al.* 2016), while data for GPb and GPc were generated in this
current paper. To obtain backcross progeny for genetic mapping and segregation analysis, the
rough F_2 segregant with GPb was backcrossed to wild type BY and 3S strains, while the rough F_2
segregant with GPc was backcrossed to *flo8Δ sfl1Δ* BY and 3S strains. A second-generation
backcross was also performed for GPb; specifically, a rough segregant from the GPbx3S cross
was mated to BY. For all backcrosses, diploids were sporulated and plated at low density onto
YNB plates containing canavanine to select for random MAT**a** spores using the Synthetic
Genetic Array marker system (TONG *et al.*). After five days of growth at 30°C, haploid colonies
were replicated onto YPE plates and incubated at 21°C. Backcross 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 the colony trait after four
days of growth, and designated as belonging to one of three temperature sensitivity classes:
expression of the trait at 21°C only, expression of the trait at 21 and 30°C only, or expression of
the trait at all examined temperatures. Genetic mapping was then performed separately on each
of these temperature sensitivity classes.

Genotyping of GPb and GPc rough segregants

Segregants from each temperature sensitivity class 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 100 bp

x100 bp reads. Each segregant was sequenced to an average per site coverage of at least 2.5x.

Reads were aligned to either a BY or 3S reference genome 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).

Genetic mapping of loci underlying the rough phenotype

Segregants' genotypes at each SNP were 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 at a given locus. These bounds were used

in fine-mapping and comparison of loci detected in different combinations of GP, backcross, and

temperature sensitivity.

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 only included loci where both

the BY and 3S allele were present among the rough segregants obtained from a population, and

were only performed on backcross populations in which more than one multi-locus genotype was

present.

Genetic engineering at the FLO11 promoter and other loci

Gene deletions were generated using the *kanMX* cassette (WACH *et al.* 1994) and lithium acetate

transformation (GIETZ AND WOODS 2002). A genomic region of interest was replaced with a

PCR amplicon of the *kanMX* cassette that, on each end, had 60 bases of homology to the targeted

gene. 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 replacement of *kanMX* with the desired

allele. Cells were plated on YNB plates lacking uracil to select for retention of the plasmid and

then plated again onto 5-FOA to eliminate the plasmid. Replacement of the *kanMX* cassette was

verified by PCR and Sanger sequencing, and transformants were plated and screened on YPE to

determine the phenotypic effects of allele replacement. 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 then compared to the

phenotypes of these control strains that were generated in parallel. Engineering of the *FLO11*

promoter was performed in the BYx3S F_2 segregant with GPb. Gene deletions and allele

replacements for other genes were performed in a representative BY or 3S backcross segregant
harboring either GPb or GPc.
246
Results
Isolation of a rough flo8Δ sfl1Δ segregant
Our past work showed that expression of the rough phenotype in the BYx3S cross occurs due to
genetic interactions between GPs that were not present in the cross parents and cryptic variants
that segregate in the cross and mainly reside 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
multiple alleles that segregate in the cross, some of which must be inherited from BY and others
of which must be inherited from 3S.
262
The three GPs vary in their potential to express the phenotype across temperatures
In our previous work, we showed that GPa segregants typically express the trait in a temperature
sensitive manner, but that cryptic variation in the cross can eliminate this temperature sensitivity
for some individuals (LEE *et al.* 2016). Because our GPb and GPc rough segregants were both
obtained at 21°C, 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 1H**).
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.
273

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 all examined temperatures (**Figure S1**). In our past work on GPa (Lee *et*
al. 2016), we also found that robustness to temperature was less frequent than temperature
sensitive trait expression. This was because ability to robustly express the rough phenotype
across temperatures involved more loci than temperature sensitive trait expression. Thus, when
considered in light of our past findings, our current results suggest that, in the presence of GPb,
ability to express the rough phenotype across temperatures is also more genetically complex than
ability to express the trait only at lower temperatures. These findings also show that despite
making it possible for the rough phenotype to be expressed at 21°C, GPc provides an inherently
limited potential for trait expression at higher temperatures. This may be because Flo8 and Sfl1
are necessary for expression of the rough phenotype at 30 and 37°C.

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. Because expression of the rough phenotype at 30 and 37°C is rare
among GPbx3S backcross segregants (**Figure S1**), determining the genetic basis of the trait
among GPbx3S backcross segregants required combining information from the first-generation
backcross and a second-generation backcross. Specifically, a rough first-generation GPbx3S
backcross segregant was mated to 3S (**Figure S2**), which increased the frequency of the trait
among backcross progeny by halving the proportion of the genome that was segregating. 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 (Figure 5 in (LEE *et al.*)), 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 allele states in different multi-locus

genotype and temperature contexts (**Figure 3**). 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

(**Table 1**). The other two loci were identified in both the BY and 3S allele states, depending on

the multi-locus genotype context in which they occurred. 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 (**Table 1**).

Some of the loci detected across GPs and temperatures both overlapped and showed involvement

of the same parental allele, indicating potential involvement of the same underlying cryptic

variants. Supporting this possibility, each locus also corresponded to a causal gene that we had

cloned during our work on GPa (TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH ; TAYLOR AND EHRENREICH ; LEE *et*

al. ; TAYLOR *et al.*). Assuming that these overlapping regions represent the same cryptic variant,

we consolidated all detected genomic intervals into 21 distinct loci (**Figure 2**, **Table 1**). 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. However, if our

assumption of overlapping loci representing the same cryptic variants is incorrect, then the

responsiveness of the identified cryptic variants to GP and temperature would be even higher

than discussed in this paper.

The GPs alter genotype-environment interaction

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

produce the rough phenotype. Given that we performed such an analysis on GPa in the past (Lee

et al. 2016) and GPc segregants can only express the trait at 21°C, we focused this analysis on

GPb. Note, 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). For example, at 30°C, two distinct combinations of four and five cryptic

variants act in conjunction with GPa to cause the trait's expression (**Figure 3**). Examination of

first-generation GPb backcross 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 3**, **Figure S4**, **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 3**, 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 3**). 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 3**). 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 genotype data from backcrosses (**Figure 4A** through **C**, **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, which can be

calculated as the product of the frequencies of every individual allele involved in a multi-locus

genotype. 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 4A**)

and GPb (**Figure 4B**), 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 4C**). 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 S5)**. $FLO11^{3S}$ 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 3**, **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 5)**. 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 S6)**, which

encodes a post-translational activator of adenylate cyclase, another component of the Ras

pathway. 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 6**). 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 loci, we performed gene

deletions and allele replacements on the identified candidate genes in a GPc rough segregant, and

determined the resulting effects on the colony trait (**Methods**). Knock out and replacement of

PMD1, GPA1, SDC25, GPI8, GCN4, and *YPT6* resulted in loss of the phenotype (**Figure S7a**

and **b**), implying that these six genes play positive roles in the phenotype's regulation. In

contrast, deletion of *DIG1*, a protein that directly inhibits the transcriptional activator Ste12,

enhanced the trait's expression (**Figure S7a** and **c**). These results suggest that genetic variation

in these genes plays a causal role in the rough phenotype.

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 as having a phenotypic effect when

knocked out were a TOR pathway component and *MDS3* paralog (*PMD1*), members 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 implicated in allowing GPc segregants to express

the rough phenotype have the potential to influence, either directly or indirectly, *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 impacts regulation of *FLO11* and the rough phenotype.

Discussion

To better understand the extent of cryptic variation within a population, as well as the

mechanisms regulating this cryptic variation, we comprehensively determined the genetic basis

of a model phenotype that is only expressed in the presence of particular GPs. By doing this, we

identified 21 loci harboring cryptic variants that can contribute to the rough phenotype. Notably,

all but one of these loci show phenotypic effects that depend on the GP that is present. In

addition, because the cryptic variants that are uncovered by each GP vary in their degree of

epistasis with each other and interaction with the environment, we find that the trait's genetic

architecture significantly differs across the GPs. This results in a multitude of genotype,

environment, and phenotype relationships that produce the same trait.

Given the detailed understanding that we have obtained for the colony morphology system, a

major question is, how might our findings relate to other traits and species? One major insight

from our study that may apply to other systems is that most, if not nearly all, of our findings

connect to the transcriptional regulation of a single key gene, *FLO11*. Supporting this point, the

single locus common to all three GPs is the coding region of *FLO11*, suggesting 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, most 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).

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

effects, we also demonstrated 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 Flo8 and Sfl1, 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 6**). 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.
522
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; TAYLOR
AND EHRENREICH 2015a; 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 appear to tie back to *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).
537
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. Further, these results suggest a broader insight into the genetic
architecture of complex traits. Although it has long been known that traits can vary in genetic
architecture depending on the different populations and environments in which they are
measured, our findings illustrate that even the same phenotype examined within a single
population can exhibit a spectrum of genetic architectures. As shown by the GPs in our study,
which of these architectures is visible may depend on only one or two alleles that modify how
the rest of the genetic variation in the population behaves. This suggests that characterizing the
molecular mechanisms that shape genetic architecture will be an important step in improving our
basic understanding of the relationship between genotype and phenotype.
549

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.

We also thank the anonymous reviewers of this paper for their helpful feedback. 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.

Data Availability

All sequencing data from this project is available through the National Center for Biotechnology

Information (NCBI) Short Read Archive. Data can be accessed under Bioproject ID

PRJNA503265, with Biosample accessions SAMN10356503-SAMN10357319.

562
Figure 1: Different genetic perturbations ('GPs') interact with cryptic variation to cause
rough morphology. (a) The BY and 3S strains, as well as their cross progeny, form 'smooth'
colonies. **(b)** Certain GPs can cause BYx3S segregants to express an alternative 'rough' colony
phenotype. **(c)** Expression of the colony trait can be temperature-sensitive, with segregating loci
causing individuals form rough colonies at 21°C only, 21 and 30°C, or 21, 30, and 37°C. **(d)** GPa
is a loss-of-function mutation in *IRA2*, which encodes a Ras negative regulator. **(e)** GPb results
from recombination between the BY (blue) *FLO11* promoter and 3S (orange) *FLO11* coding
region. **(f)** GPc is a double knockout of *FLO8* and *SFL1*, which encode the main Ras-dependent
transcriptional regulators of *FLO11*. **(g)** GPc was genetically engineered in both BY and 3S, and

a rough BYx3S segregant was obtained, as indicated by a brown colony in the illustration. (**h**)

Genetic mapping populations were generated by backcrossing a rough segregant with each

genetic perturbation to BY and 3S, and 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.

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. In some instances, the same gene

that possesses a GP in one population harbors cryptic variation in another population.

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. These additional alleles are designated with bold outlines. In the legend, 'mutant' refers to the *de novo* or induced mutations present involved in each GP. Additionally, the *prFLO11* recombination (GPb) is indicated with a red outline.

588
589
Figure 4: Loci exhibit epistasis or additivity depending on GP. (a) 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. **(b)** Observed and expected
genotype frequencies based on four loci in GPb individuals expressing the trait at only 21°C. **(c)**
Observed genotype frequencies in GPc individuals closely match expected frequencies,
suggesting involved loci act in an additive manner. In all cases, expected genotype frequencies
are computed as the product of the frequency of the involved alleles. P-values correspond to
results of a χ^2 test with degrees of freedom indicated in the figure. Loci for which only a single
allele is present in their respective population were excluded from analysis, and backcross
populations in which only one multi-locus genotype was present are not shown. Only first-
generation backcross segregants were used to generate this figure.

603
Figure 5: 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. The causal
replacement with the 3S allele leading to loss of the phenotype is outlined in red. **(c)** Engineering
of the six polymorphisms within the delimited promoter region revealed that replacement of the
TT BY sequence with the 3S CC at position 394,846 to 394,847 allele ablates the phenotype. **(d)**
The causal polymorphism results in a Rim101 binding site only present on the 3S promoter. In
panels **b** through **d**, red boxes denote allele replacements with phenotypic effects.

Figure 6: 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: Candidate genes and cloned 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	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,3S	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

* 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
654   genetic interaction network maps a wiring diagram of cellular function. Science 353.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

673   Gibson, G., and I. Dworkin, 2004 Uncovering cryptic genetic variation. Nat Rev Genet 5**:** 681-
674   690.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Metodiev, M. V., D. Matheos, M. D. Rose and D. E. Stone, 2002 Regulation of MAPK function
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.

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

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

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

751   Wach, A., A. Brachat, R. Pohlmann and P. Philippsen, 1994 New heterologous modules for
752   classical or PCR-based gene disruptions in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. Yeast 10**:** 1793-
753   1808.

754   Wagner, A., 2012 The role of robustness in phenotypic adaptation and innovation. Proc Biol Sci
755   279**:** 1249-1258.

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

759   Yvert, G., R. B. Brem, J. Whittle, J. M. Akey, E. Foss *et al.*, 2003 Trans-acting regulatory
760   variation in Saccharomyces cerevisiae and the role of transcription factors. Nat Genet 35**:**
761   57-64.

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

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

769
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). Blue bars indicate loci originating from BY, and
orange bars indicate loci from 3S. Gray bars denote selectable markers used in generating
mapping populations. Details regarding each locus are found in Table S1.

790 **Figure S4: Scan for loci with correlated allele states.** Significant p-values for χ^2 tests between
791 each pair of uniquely segregating genomic regions: GPb – **(a)** backcross to BY, **(b)** backcross to
792 3S, and GPc – **(c)** backcross to BY, **(d)** backcross to 3S. Results are only plotted for the upper
793 triangle. Significant results were only found in the GPb backcross to 3S, identifying an
794 interaction between the genes *MSS11* and *SFL1*.

795

Figure S5: 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 S6: 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.

803
Figure S7: Genetic engineering supports interactions between GPc and identified candidate
genes. Complete deletion of the candidate genes in a GPc rough segregant was performed using
tailed *kanMX* cassettes. The phenotype of the GPc rough segregant is shown in **(a)**. In **(b)**, we
show that deletion of six candidate genes causes loss of the phenotype. We also show that allele
replacement with the non-causal allele at these genes results in no phenotypic recovery, implying
these genes harbor functional genetic variation. Note, these replacements involved the entire
coding region, as well as 100 to 200 bases of promoter sequence and 100 to 200 bases of
downstream sequence. Control experiments were performed in parallel and resulted in
restoration of the phenotype. In **(c)**, 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*.
816

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.