1

Placental effects on maternal brain revealed by disrupted placental gene

expression in mouse hybrids

Lena Arévalo[1,2], Polly Campbell[1,3]

[1]Department of Integrative Biology, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK, U.S.A.

Corresponding author: Lena Arévalo (lena.lueke@gmail.com)

Keywords: Placenta, Maternal behavior, hybrid, Maternal-fetal communication, Maternal-fetal

conflict, Imprinted genes, Placenta-specific gene families, Placental lactogens, Dopamine,

Paternal effects, *Mus musculus domesticus*, *Mus spretus*, Genomic imprinting

Running title: Placental effects on maternal brain

[2]Current address: Department of Developmental Pathology, University Hospital, Bonn, Germany

[3] Current address: Department of Evolution, Ecology and Organismal Biology, University of

California Riverside, Riverside, CA, U.S.A.

Abstract

The mammalian placenta is both the physical interface between mother and fetus, and the source

of endocrine signals that target the maternal hypothalamus, priming females for parturition,

lactation and motherhood. Despite the importance of this connection, the effects of altered

placental signaling on the maternal brain are understudied. Here, we show that placental

dysfunction alters gene expression in the maternal brain, with the potential to affect maternal

behavior. Using a cross between the house mouse and the Algerian mouse in which hybrid

placental development is abnormal, we sequenced late gestation placental and maternal medial

preoptic area transcriptomes and quantified differential expression and placenta-maternal brain

co-expression between normal and hybrid pregnancies. The expression of *Fmn1, Drd3, Caln1*

and *Ctsr* was significantly altered in the brains of females exposed to hybrid placentas. Most

strikingly, expression patterns of placenta-specific gene families and *Drd3* in the brains of house

mouse females carrying hybrid litters matched those of female Algerian mice, the paternal

species in the cross. Our results indicate that the paternally-derived placental genome can

influence the expression of maternal-fetal communication genes, including placental hormones,

suggesting an effect of the offspring's father on the mother's brain.

Introduction

The placenta is a unique, transient organ shared by two organisms. Placental morphology is surprisingly diverse across vertebrates and is subject to rapid evolutionary change and convergent evolution (Blackburn 1993; Reznick et al. 2002; Roberts et al. 2016; Armstrong et al. 2017). In most eutherian mammals, including mice and humans, successful blastocyst implantation relies on endometrial invasion by the embryonic trophoblast cells that give rise to the mature placenta (Cross et al. 1994). As such, the placenta provides the closest physical and molecular link between mother and offspring seen in any animal (Wagner et al. 2014). This intimate connection promotes an array of maternal-fetal interactions, including bidirectional hormonal regulation and even the exchange of entire cells. These interactions are not spatially limited, but extend to both the fetal and the maternal brain (Bridges et al. 1996; Ladyman et al. 2010; Boddy et al.2015).

Throughout pregnancy the placenta mediates the regulation of resource allocation, immune tolerance, fetal development and, importantly, hormonal priming of the maternal brain. A key subset of placenta-secreted molecules are involved in priming maternal physiology for parturition and lactation, and promoting the onset of maternal behaviors in late gestation (reviewed in Bridges 2015; Creeth et al. 2018). In rodents, the medial preoptic area (MPoA) in the hypothalamus is thought to be the primary neural target of these placental molecules (Bridges et al. 1996; Mann and Bridges 2001; Larsen and Grattan 2012). The MPoA has been characterized as the central hub of parenting behavior (Kohl and Dulac 2018): receptors for key pregnancy hormones and neurotransmitters, including estrogen, prolactin and dopamine, are highly expressed in this nucleus and interact with ligands of both maternal and placental origin (Numan and Insel 2003).

Two classes of placental genes are of particular importance to the interaction between

placenta and maternal brain: imprinted genes (IGs) and placenta-specific gene families (PSFs).

Several IGs and PSF genes are expressed in the same placental compartment, especially in the

placental endocrine compartment (Simmons et al. 2007, 2008; Tunster et al. 2013). IGs are

exclusively or predominantly expressed from one allele, and are highly expressed in placenta and

brain. The allelic expression is initiated by heritable epigenetic marks ("imprints") in maternal

and paternal germ cells, such that some IGs are maternally silenced and paternally expressed,

whereas others are paternally silenced and maternally expressed (Reik and Walter 2001;

Ferguson-Smith 2011). During pregnancy, IGs are critical to placental development and

function, maintaining the balance between maternal supply and embryonic demand, and

regulating maternal-fetal exchange (Constancia et al. 2005; Lefebvre 2012; Tunster et al. 2013).

PSFs arose through lineage-specific gene duplication events during placental evolution

(Rawn and Cross 2008). In rodents, these are the prolactin gene family (placental lactogens

(Prls)), placental cathepsin proteases and their inhibitors (PECs) and pregnancy specific

glycoproteins (PSGs) (Zebhauser et al. 2005; Soares et al. 2007; Mason 2008). PSF gene

products are mainly expressed from the placental endocrine compartment and many are secreted

into the maternal bloodstream; key functions include placental development, immunoregulation,

and physiological and neurological priming of the maternal organism (Rawn and Cross 2008;

Bridges et al. 1996; Mann and Bridges 2001). Most notably, a subset of PRLs are able to bind

the prolactin receptor that is expressed in the maternal MPoA leading to the proposal that

placental hormones directly affect maternal endocrine state and behavior (Bridges et al. 1996;

Larsen and Grattan 2012). IGs are implicated in regulating PSF secretion via their effects on the

structure and function of the placental endocrine compartment (John 2017). However, our

current understanding of the role of IGs in PSF signaling is rudimentary, and the relationship

between gene expression in placenta and the maternal MPoA is uncharted.

The majority of the placenta, including the endocrine compartment, is fetally-derived.

Placental representation of both parental genomes sets the stage for conflict (maternal-paternal

and parent-offspring), and for coadaptation (mother-offspring), with imprinted genes uniquely

positioned to mediate both types of interactions (Moore and Haig 1991; Wolf and Hager 2006,

Keverne and Curly 2008; Haig 2014). However, while evolutionary models for imprinted gene

expression abound (reviewed in Patten et al. 2014), few have considered the interaction between

paternally-derived placental signals and signal reception in the maternal brain (Janssen et al.

2016a; McNamara et al. 2018; Creeth et al. 2018).

Here, we use a natural hybrid system to explore the effects of placental dysregulation on

gene expression in the maternal brain. Over- or under-growth that depends on the direction of the

cross is a signature of disrupted imprinting in mammalian hybrids (Vrana 2007). This pattern is

documented in several orders (Gray 1972), with the best-studied examples in rodents (multiple

species in the genera *Peromyscus, Mus* and *Phodopus* (Zechner et al. 1996; Vrana et al. 1998;

Brekke and Good 2014)). Parent-of-origin growth effects in the cross between the house mouse,

Mus m. domesticus (*Dom*) and the Algerian mouse, *M. spretus* (*Spret*), were first described over

20 years ago: placentas are undersized when the mother is *Dom* and the father is *Spret*, and

severely oversized in the reciprocal cross, with more extreme size effects in both directions of

the backcross (Zechner et al. 1996). Subsequent studies confirmed altered expression and

methylation of candidate IGs, and disrupted placental organization (Hemberger et al. 1999;

Zechner et al. 2002, 2004; Shi et al. 2005). Specifically, the placental endocrine compartment (or

junctional zone) was shown to be reduced and disorganized (Zechner et al. 1996; Kurz et al.

1999). However, the extent of placental misexpression has not been measured on a genome

scale, and this system's potential to uncover the maternal consequences of altered placental

signaling has not been considered.

The characteristics of this classic system, together with the availability of high quality

genomes for both parental species (Keane et al. 2011), make the cross between *Dom* and *Spret* an

excellent model in which to explore the effects of placental disruptions on the maternal brain. By

comparing MPoA expression between females of the same species that differ only in the type of

pregnancy/placenta they experience (hybrid vs. conspecific), we specifically isolate the effect of

placental gene expression differences on the maternal brain (Fig. 1). Characterization of altered

gene expression at the maternal-fetal interface provides insight into the mechanisms of maternal-

fetal communication, the contribution of the paternal genome to this interaction, and identifies

promising candidate genes for future evolutionary and biomedical work.

Results

To study the relationship between placenta and maternal MPoA on a molecular level we

produced three crosses resulting in three types of pregnancy: *Dom* x *Dom* (*Dom* pregnancy, n=5,

litter size range = 4-6, sex ratio range [proportion males] = 0.3-0.6), *Dom* x *Spret* (hybrid

pregnancy, n=5, litter size range = 3-6, sex ratio range = 0.3-1.0) and *Spret* x *Spret* (*Spret*

pregnancy, n=5, litter size range = 5-6, sex ratio range = 0.2-0.8) (in all crosses, female is first).

For each type of cross we produced 5 biological replicates and extracted the maternal MPoA and

placentas from each pregnant female in late gestation at embryonic day (e) 17.5. During late

gestation the effect of placental signaling on the maternal MPoA is specifically important for the

onset of maternal care at parturition (Bridges et al. 1996; Mann and Bridges 2001; Larsen and

Grattan 2012). Placenta weights were compared to confirm that hybrid placentas were

hypoplastic as expected (Zechner et al. 1996). Since litter size can have an effect on placental

and embryo size we corrected weights for litter size. Hybrid placentas weighed significantly less

than placentas of both parental species with no significant differences between parental species

(One-way ANOVA (Females): $F(2)=56.95$, $p<0.001$, Tukey HSD: Hybrid-Dom: diff=-0.1,

$p<0.001$, Hybrid-Spret: diff=0.1 , $p<0.001$, Dom-Spret: diff=0.002, $p=0.97$). We sequenced the

maternal MPoA transcriptome and the placental transcriptomes of 1 male and 1 female per

mother (n=9-10/type of pregnancy, in hybrid pregnancies one litter consisted of only males, thus

n=4 for females), and evaluated differential expression between all pregnancy types (Fig. 1).

Because the maternal brain is exposed to the placental signals of both sexes simultaneously, male

and female placental expression was analyzed jointly. Additionally, we assessed co-expression

between the two tissues for each type of pregnancy and determined the differences in co-

expression between pregnancy types (Fig. 1).

Experimental design

Figure 1. Experimental design. Schematic representation of the comparisons performed to test for differential gene expression in the medial preoptic area of the maternal brain and the placenta during late gestation. *Mus m. domesticus* is depicted in red and *Mus spretus* in blue. Hybrid tissue is indicated by a combination of red and blue. Solid arrows indicate differential gene expression analysis. Dashed arrows indicate co-expression analysis.

Differential expression in the placenta

We tested for differential expression in three pairwise comparisons: hybrid vs. *Dom*, hybrid vs. *Spret,* and *Dom* vs. *Spret* placentas. For placental comparisons, only genes with log2 fold change (LFC) in expression ≥ 0.5 (1.5 times higher or lower expression), and Benjamini-Hochberg-corrected p≤0.05, were considered significantly differentially expressed (DE). We define transgressive expression in hybrids as expression that is significantly higher or lower compared to both parental species. Hybrid genes that were DE compared to *Dom* but not to *Spret* are defined as having *Spret*-like expression patterns, and vice versa.

In hybrid placentas 9.73% of all tested genes were expressed higher and 7.79% lower compared to *Dom* placentas (up: 1,781/18,298, including 11 IGs; down: 1,426/18,298, including 3 IGs) (Fig. 2*,* Supplemental Fig. S1 and Supplemental Dataset S1). Compared to *Spret* placentas, 16.32% of genes were expressed higher and 9.6% lower in hybrids (up: 3,036/18,529,

including 16 IGs; down: 1,801/18,529, including 7 IGs) (Fig. 2, Supplemental Fig. S2,

Supplemental Dataset S1). Thirty-two percent of all tested genes were DE between *Dom* and

Spret (up: 4,014/19,079, including 19 IGs; down: 3,278/19,079, including 13 IGs) (Supplemental

Fig. S3, Supplemental Dataset S1). Hybrids clustered slightly closer to Dom samples in the

diagnostic PCA plot (Supplementary Fig. 4).

To explain hybrid placental phenotypes that are not intermediate to both parents, genes

with transgressive expression are of specific interest. We found 275 genes that were expressed at

higher, and 167 at lower, levels in hybrids compared to both parental species (Fig. 2*A*).

Transgressively higher expressed genes were significantly enriched for B-cell receptor activation

and integrin cell surface interaction pathways (Fig. 2*S,* Supplemental Dataset S1). Interestingly,

transgressively lower expressed genes were enriched for prolactin and growth hormone receptor

signaling, ERBB signaling, and cytokine signaling in immune system, among others (Fig. 2*A,*

Supplemental Dataset S1). Many Prls are involved in these pathways, along with other genes.

PSF genes were highly overrepresented among DE genes in hybrids compared to both *Dom*

(Fisher's exact test: p<0.001, odds ratio = 5.65) and *Spret* (p<0.001, odds ratio = 3.41). Multiple

members of these gene families were misexpressed in the hybrid placenta, with the majority

being expressed lower compared to both parental species (14 transgressively lower, 7 DE

intermediate) (Table 1).

Notably, approximately twice as many genes in hybrid placentas were uniquely DE

relative to *Spret* (3,271) as opposed to *Dom* (1,659) (Fig. 2*A*). Thus, the general expression

pattern in hybrid placentas was more similar to the maternal species. *Dom*-like expressed genes

were enriched for multiple immune related pathways, together with angiogenesis, vascular

development and hemostasis related terms, among others (Supplemental Dataset S1).

Genes with a *Spret*-like expression pattern in hybrid placentas are of particular interest,

since these have the potential to alter communication with the *Dom* maternal brain. Of the 1,659

genes with *Spret*-like expression (Fig. 2*A*), 12 were PSF genes and 6 were IGs (Tables 1 and 2).

Spret-like expressed genes in the hybrid were enriched for WNT signaling and extracellular

matrix organization pathways, among others (Fig. 2*A,* Supplemental Dataset S1).

IGs were significantly overrepresented among hybrid DE genes compared to both *Spret*

(Fisher's exact test: p=0.02, odds ratio=0.59) and *Dom* (p=0.03, odds ratio=0.55). Three IGs

(*Tnfrsf23, Phlda2* and *Klf14*) were transgressively higher expressed and two, (*Ascl2* and *Sfmbt2*)

were transgressively down-regulated. Two additional IGs, *Tspan32* and *Th*, were significantly

DE compared to both parental species but intermediate between the two. Four of these

misexpressed IGs belong to the same imprinting cluster (IC2) on the distal part of mouse

chromosome 7 (dist7) (MouseBook (https://www.mousebook.org (03.22.18)), and are normally

maternally expressed (Table 2*,* Supplemental Dataset S1). We note that *Tnfrsf23* is expressed in

decidual cells at the junction between the maternally derived decidua and the extraembryonic

placenta (Clark et al. 2002).

Table 1. Differential expression of PSF genes in hybrid placenta compared to both parental species

	Chr.	Hybrid vs. *Dom* placenta			Hybrid vs. *Spret* placenta			Hybrid vs. both parental species
		LFC	Stat	padj	LFC	Stat	padj	
Prl3c1	13	-1.60	-7.81	<0.001	-2.31	-8.78	<0.001	Transgressive lower
Prl7d1	13	-0.95	-7.80	<0.001	-0.93	-4.36	<0.001	Transgressive lower
Prl2c5	13	-0.89	-7.04	<0.001	-1.26	-5.75	<0.001	Transgressive lower
Ceacam12	7	-0.87	-4.72	<0.001	-0.88	-3.73	<0.001	Transgressive lower
Ctsm	13	-0.82	-3.19	0.01	-1.22	-4.24	<0.001	Transgressive lower
Prl7a1	13	-0.82	-3.21	0.01	-1.72	-5.57	<0.001	Transgressive lower
Psg25	7	-0.76	-3.45	<0.001	-1.44	-5.54	<0.001	Transgressive lower
Cts3	13	-0.76	-3.01	0.01	-1.55	-5.94	<0.001	Transgressive lower
Prl2c3	13	-0.75	-4.64	<0.001	-1.36	-3.58	<0.001	Transgressive lower
Psg28	7	-0.73	-3.26	0.01	-0.62	-2.38	0.04	Transgressive lower
Prl4a1	13	-0.72	-2.80	0.02	-1.46	-5.20	<0.001	Transgressive lower
Prl7a2	13	-0.71	-2.91	0.01	-1.69	-6.09	<0.001	Transgressive lower
Prl2b1	13	-0.64	-3.64	<0.001	-1.26	-7.05	<0.001	Transgressive lower
Prl2a1	13	-0.59	-3.45	<0.001	-1.41	-5.30	<0.001	Transgressive lower
Cts7	13	-3.68	-13.40	<0.001	3.34	7.92	<0.001	Intermediate
Prl3d1	13	-3.39	-21.70	<0.001	2.41	5.89	<0.001	Intermediate
Ceacam5	7	-1.47	-8.01	<0.001	2.25	10.25	<0.001	Intermediate
Ctsr	13	-0.68	-6.29	<0.001	0.83	6.43	<0.001	Intermediate
Psg20	7	1.43	6.58	<0.001	-2.13	-7.59	<0.001	Intermediate
Psg22	7	2.26	11.63	<0.001	-2.17	-9.72	<0.001	Intermediate
Ceacam3	7	2.73	11.03	<0.001	-1.67	-6.30	<0.001	Intermediate
Cts6	13	-0.97	-7.65	<0.001	-0.12	-0.97	0.46	*Spret-like* expression
Prl2c1	13	-1.49	-7.78	<0.001	0.43	1.39	0.26	*Spret-like* expression
Psg26	7	-0.92	-3.80	<0.001	0.46	1.97	0.10	*Spret-like* expression
Psg27	7	-0.90	-4.08	<0.001	-0.36	-1.50	0.22	*Spret-like* expression
Prl7c1	13	-0.84	-2.54	0.03	0.05	0.11	0.95	*Spret-like* expression
Psg19	7	-0.79	-3.39	<0.001	-0.08	-0.34	0.82	*Spret-like* expression
Prl3d2	13	-0.74	-2.54	0.03	-0.48	-1.11	0.39	*Spret-like* expression
Ceacam11	7	-0.73	-3.91	<0.001	-0.43	-1.88	0.12	*Spret-like* expression
Psg29	7	-0.67	-2.85	0.02	-0.30	-0.96	0.46	*Spret-like* expression
Ceacam15	7	1.24	4.17	<0.001	-0.50	-1.79	0.14	*Spret-like* expression
Prl3b1	13	-1.10	-10.71	<0.001	0.41	3.05	0.01	*Spret-like* expression
Tpbpa	13	-0.58	-3.64	<0.001	-0.49	-2.38	0.04	*Spret-like* expression

Chr.=Chromosome, DE=differential expression, LFC=log2 Fold Change of expression, Padj=adjsted p-value according to Benjamini-Hochberg method, Stat=Wald test (DESeq2).

Figure 2. Placental gene expression. Summary of results of differential gene expression (DE) analysis between *Mus m. domesticus* (*Dom*), *Mus spretus* (*Spret*) and hybrid placentas. (A) Venn diagram indicating the overlap of differentially expressed genes between the comparisons hybrid vs. *Dom* and hybrid vs. *Spret*; up = genes expressed higher in hybrids compared to parental species, down = genes expressed lower in hybrids compared to parental species. Genes expressed higher or lower compared to both parental species (transgressive expression) and genes with *Spret*-like expression in the hybrid are marked in the diagram. Results of pathway overrepresentation (Reactome, version 58,Mi et al. 2017) are provided in connected text boxes. Volcano plot of DE analysis results of (B) hybrid vs. *Dom* and (C) hybrid vs. *Spret* placentas. Significantly differentially expressed genes with FDR ≤ 0.05 and log2 fold change ≥ 0.5 are depicted in red. Imprinted genes are indicated in blue and placenta-specific gene family genes in yellow.

Table 2. Differential expression of imprinted genes in hybrid placenta compared to both parental species

	IC/Chr.	Hybrid vs. *Dom* placenta			Hybrid vs. *Spret* placenta			Hybrid vs. both parental species	expressed allele
		LFC	Stat	padj	LFC	Stat	padj		
Phlda2	dist7-IC2	0.97	5.39	<0.001	1.09	5.44	<0.001	Transgressive higher	Maternal
Klf14	prox6	0.67	5.01	<0.001	1.06	6.29	<0.001	Transgressive higher	Maternal
Tnfrsf23	dist7-IC2	0.59	3.57	<0.001	1.97	9.02	<0.001	Transgressive higher	Maternal
Tspan32	dist7-IC2	-0.66	-3.11	0.01	2.01	6.43	<0.001	Intermediate	Maternal
Th	dist7	0.69	2.48	0.04	-2.28	-7.76	<0.001	Intermediate	Maternal
Ascl2	dist7-IC2	-0.96	-3.85	<0.001	-1.28	-4.90	<0.001	Transgressive lower	Maternal
Sfmbt2	2	-0.56	-4.69	<0.001	-0.67	-6.30	<0.001	Transgressive lower	Paternal
Magel2	cent7	0.61	3.81	<0.001	0.48	2.25	0.06	*Spret-like* expression	Paternal
Dcn	10	0.63	2.45	0.04	-0.06	-0.16	0.92	*Spret-like* expression	Maternal
Nap1l5	prox6	0.82	2.63	0.03	0.31	0.91	0.49	*Spret-like* expression	Paternal
Grb10	prox11	0.83	8.65	<0.001	-0.06	-0.47	0.74	*Spret-like* expression	Maternal
Nnat	dist2	0.84	3.29	<0.001	-0.07	-0.27	0.86	*Spret-like* expression	Paternal
Igf2	dist7-IC1	0.84	2.89	0.01	0.02	0.08	0.96	*Spret-like* expression	Paternal

IC=imprinting cluster (https://www.mousebook.org (03.22.18)), Chr.=Chromosome, DE=differential expression, LFC=log2 Fold Change of expression, Padj=adjsted p-value according to Benjamini-Hochberg method, Stat=Wald test (DESeq2), expressed allele according to https://www.mousebook.org (03.22.18).

Overlap of placental DE genes with genes involved in preeclampsia

Among the misexpressed genes in the hybrid placenta we noticed several that are also

misexpressed in the human pregnancy pathology preeclampsia. Although mice do not develop

preeclampsia, preeclampsia-like phenotypes can occur and several rodent models have been

developed to study key symptoms such as hypertension, proteinura, and altered inflammatory

response (Podjarny et al. 2004; Dokras et al. 2006). To test if DE genes in the hybrid overlap

with genes related to preeclampsia we extracted genes associated with preeclampsia from the

database for preeclampsia (http://ptbdb.cs.brown.edu/dbpec/ (Uzun et al. 2016)) and obtained the

mouse orthologs for these from biomart (R-package biomaRt (Durinck et al. 2005)). Of the 490

mouse orthologs we obtained, 26 were transgressively misexpressed in the hybrid placenta.

Preeclampsia related genes were significantly overrepresented among transgressively

misexpressed genes (Fisher's exact test: p=0.003, odds ratio=1.91). An altered inflammatory

response at the fetal-maternal interface is involved in preeclampsia in humans (Harmon et al.

2016); in the hybrid placenta, both up- and down-regulated transgressively expressed genes were

enriched for immune-related and cytokine signaling pathways (Supplemental Dataset S1).

Differential expression in the MPoA

To explore maternal gene expression in response to placental genotype we compared late

gestation MPoA of *Dom* females during *Dom* pregnancies (MPoA-*dom*), *Dom* females during

hybrid pregnancies (MPoA-*hy*) and *Spret* females during *Spret* pregnancies (MPoA-*spret*).

Neural and placental tissues were collected from the same females. Gene expression in MPoA-*hy*

vs. MPoA-*dom* is expected to be highly similar, with any DE attributable to carrying a hybrid

litter, while the other comparisons should result in a large number of DE genes attributable to

interspecific differences. For the intraspecific comparison we report significantly DE genes with

log2 fold change (LFC) ≥ 0.2, since differences are expected to be subtle. For all other

comparisons we report significantly DE genes with LFC ≥ 0.5.

Four genes were DE between MPoA-*hy* and MPoA-*dom*: Cathepsin-R (*Ctsr*) was

expressed higher in MPoA-*hy* compared to MPoA-*dom*, and Dopamine receptor 3 (*Drd3*),

Calneuron 1 (*Caln1*) and Formin 1 (*Fmn1*) were expressed lower (up: 1/18,779; down: 3/18,779)

(Fig. 3, Table 3, Supplemental Fig. S4 and Supplemental Dataset S2). In MPoA-*hy* compared to

MPoA-*spret* 10.61% of all tested genes were expressed higher and 10.32% lower (up:

1,608/15,154; down: 1,565/15,154) (Fig. 3, Supplemental Fig. S5, Supplemental Dataset S2). In

the interspecific comparison of conspecific pregnancies, 11.32% of all tested gene were

expressed higher and 10.76% lower in MPoA-*dom* compared to MPoA-*spret* (up: 1,757/15,515;

down: 1,670/15,515) (Fig. 3, Supplemental Fig. S6, Supplemental Dataset S2).

Hybrid placentas express both *Spret* and *Dom* alleles and 1,659 genes had *Spret*-like

expression. Therefore, the MPoA in *Dom* females carrying hybrid litters might exhibit

expression patterns more similar to *Spret* female MPoA for some maternal-fetal communication

genes. We extracted a list of 959 genes that were DE in MPoA-*dom* vs. MPoA-*spret* but not in

MPoA-*hy* vs. MPoA-*spret*. This list includes *Drd3*, which was expressed lower in MPoA-*hy*

compared to MPoA-*dom* (Fig. 3, Supplemental Dataset S2). Thus, *Drd3* could be defined as

having *Spret*-like expression in MPoA-*hy*. *Fmn1* and *Ctsr* were expressed lower and higher,

respectively, in MPoA-*hy* compared to both MPoA-*dom* and MPoA-*spret*, and were not DE

between *Dom* and *Spret* MPoA during regular pregnancies (Fig. 3, Supplemental Dataset S2).

Figure 3. Maternal medial preoptic area (MPoA) gene expression. Summary of results of differential gene
expression (DE) analysis between *Mus m. domesticus* MPoA during normal pregnancy (MPoA-*dom*), *Mus m.*
domesticus MPoA during hybrid pregnancy (MPoA-*hy*) and *Mus spretus* MPoA during normal pregnacy (MPoA-
spret). (A) Venn diagram indicating the overlap of differentially expressed genes between the comparisons MPoA-
hy vs. MPoA-*dom*, MPoA-*hy* vs. MPoA-*spret* and MPoA-*dom* vs. MPoA-*spret*. Genes with *Spret*-like expression in
MPoA-*hy* are marked in the diagram. (B) Volcano plot of DE analysis results of MPoA-*hy* vs. MPoA-*dom*.
Significantly differentially expressed genes with FDR ≤ 0.05 and log2 fold change ≥ 0.2 are depicted in red,
placenta-specific gene family genes in yellow.

Table 3. Differential expression in MpoA-*hy* compared to
MPoA-*dom*.

	Chr.	LFC	Stat	padj
Fmn1	2	-0.74	-6.73	<0.001
Drd3	16	-0.47	-4.89	<0.001
Caln1	5	-0.36	-4.52	0.02
Ctsr	13	0.21	4.86	<0.001

Chr.=Chromosome, LFC=log2 Fold Change of expression, Padj=adjsted p-
value according to Benjamini-Hochberg method, Stat=Wald test (DESeq2).

Co-expression between the placenta and MPoA

The MPoA is thought to be an important target of placenta-secreted molecules and we found the

placenta-specific gene, *Ctsr*, to be expressed in the maternal MPoA during hybrid pregnancies.

Therefore, co-expression between placenta and MPoA is of particular interest. We determined

the level of placenta-MPoA co-expression for the three pregnancy types (hybrid, *Dom*, *Spret*),

and assessed differences between them.

10,839 genes were co-expressed between placenta and MPoA in all 3 comparisons. 172

genes were only co-expressed in *Dom* and 494 only in *Spret* pregnancies (Fig. 4, Supplemental

Dataset S3). 176 genes were uniquely co-expressed in hybrid pregnancies. This gene set is of

specific interest since these genes are indicators of MPoA response to abnormal placental

expression. Uniquely co-expressed genes in hybrid pregnancies included 45 genes that were DE

between hybrid and *Dom* placentas and 16 that were DE compared to both parental species'

placentas. *Ctsr*, which was significantly higher expressed in MPoA-*hy* compared to MPoA-*dom*,

was uniquely co-expressed in hybrid pregnancies (Fig. 4, Supplemental Dataset S3).

228 genes were co-expressed in *Spret* and hybrid pregnancies but not in *Dom*

pregnancies. Thus, these genes exhibit *Spret*-like co-expression in the MPoA of *Dom* females

carrying a hybrid litter. There was pathway overrepresentation overlap between this gene set and

genes with transgressive misexpression in hybrid placenta (Fig. 2*A*), including prolactin and

growth hormone receptor signaling, and ERBB signaling (Fig. 4, Supplemental Dataset S3).

Moreover, PSFs were significantly overrepresented among these co-expressed genes (Fisher's

exact test: p<0.001, odds ratio=12.57). Although expression levels were far lower in the MPoA

(range=10-589, mean=100 normalized counts, LFC to placenta: range=-9.54 to -14.13, mean=-

11.12) than in the placenta (range=20-1,127,603, mean=97,988 normalized counts), these results

are striking. To explore this relationship further, we tested for correlated expression of PSF genes

between placenta and MPoA. We found very strong, positive correlations for hybrid

(R^2adj=0.95, p<0.001) and *Spret* (R^2adj=0.9, p<0.001) and a significant but, surprisingly, weaker

positive correlation for *Dom* (R^2adj=0.38, p=0.01) (Fig. 4*B*, Table 3). Additionally, we found

that total PSF expression (sum of all PSF read counts divided by litter size) is significantly

higher in MPoA-*hy* relative to MPoA-*dom* but is statistically indistinguishable fromMPoA-*spret*

(One-way ANOVA: $F_{2,12}$=5.44, p=0.02, Tukey HSD: MPoA-*hy* vs. *MPoA-dom*: p=0.016,

MPoA-*hy* vs. MPoA-*spret*: p=0.18, MPoA-*dom* vs. MPoA-*spret*: p=0.36) (Fig. 4*B*).

Figure 4. Co-expression between maternal medial preoptic area (MPoA) and placenta during late gestation.
Summary of results of co-expression analysis for *Mus m. domesticus* during normal pregnancy (*Dom*-pregnancy),
Mus m. domesticus during hybrid pregnancy (hybrid pregnancy) and *Mus spretus* during normal pregnancy (*Spret*
pregnancy). (A) Venn diagram indicating the overlap of co-expressed genes between the three pregnancy types.
Genes that are only co-expressed in hybrid pregnancy are marked in the diagram. A secondary Venn diagram for
this gene set shows its overlap with differentially expressed genes in hybrid vs. *Dom* placentas. Transgressively
expressed genes contained in this overlap are marked. Genes that are co-expressed in *Spret* and hybrid pregnancies
but not in *Dom* pregnancies (*Spret*-like co-expression) are marked in the primary Venn diagram. Results of pathway
overrepresentation (Reactome, version 58, Mi et al. 2017) for this gene set are provided in the connected text box.
(B) Scatterplot showing the correlation between placenta specific gene family (PSF) gene expression in placenta and
MPoA for the three pregnancy types. Red = *Dom* pregnancy (R^2_{adj}=0.38, p=0.01), Blue = *Spret* pregnancy
(R^2_{adj}=0.9, p<0.001), Yellow = *hybrid* pregnancy (R^2_{adj}=0.95, p<0.001). Inset boxplot shows total PSF gene
expression in MPoA (sum of normalized PSF counts/litter size), asterix indicates significant difference between
MPoA-*hy* and MPoA-*dom*.

Pairwise evolutionary rates of selected PSF genes

PSF genes were previously shown to exhibit accelerated evolutionary rates, potentially driven by

maternal-fetal conflict (Chuong et al. 2010). We selected the top 10 co-expressed PSF genes with

the highest expression in MPoA and extracted pairwise evolutionary rates (dN/dS) from Biomart

(R-package biomaRt, (Durinck et al. 2005)) to test for evidence of positive selection. We also

included the PSF gene *Ctsr*, which was significantly differentially expressed between MPoA-*hy*

and MPoA-*dom*.

dN/dS, the per site ratio of nucleotide substitutions that change amino acid identity to

those that do not, is an indicator of selective pressure, with dN/dS = 1 indicating neutral

evolution, dN/dS < 1 purifying selection, and dN/dS > 1 diversifying positive selection

(Goldman and Yang 1994). Of the 11 genes, three (*Prl8a6*, *Tpbpb* and *Ctsr*) had pairwise dN/dS

>1 between *Dom* and *Spret* (Fig. 5, Supplemental Table S1). To infer which lineage experienced

selection, we analyzed these three genes using the application CodeML (implemented in PAML

4; (Yang and Rannala 1997; Yang 2007)), and including sequences from additional *Mus*

subspecies and species (*Mus m. musculus* (*Musc*), *Mus m. castaneus* (*Cast*), *Mus caroli* (*Car*)

and *Mus pahari* (*Pah*)). CodeML fits alternative models to the data; the best-fit model is chosen

based on likelihood ratio tests (LTRs). The two main models tested were M0, one evolutionary

rate for the whole tree, and MC, selected branches (foreground) evolve at a different rate than the

rest of the tree (background).

For all three genes, we found evidence for positive selection on *Dom* (*Prl8a6*) or *Spret*

branches (*Ctsr*), or both (*Tpbpb*) (Fig. 5, Supplemental Table S1). Specifically, there was

evidence for positive selection on *Prl8a6* in the *Mus musculus* subspecies clade (LRT$_{(M0-}$

$_{MC)}$=7.50, p=0.01, foreground dN/dS$_{(MC)}$=3.78, background dN/dS$_{(MC)}$=0.25). Evolutionary rates

for *Ctsr* were elevated on branches leading to *Pah, Spret* and *Musc* relative to the rest of the tree

(LRT$_{(M0-MC)}$=6.93, p=0.01, foreground dN/dS$_{(MC)}$>10, background dN/dS$_{(MC)}$=0.26). Results for

Tpbpb suggest high evolutionary rates across the whole tree (LRT$_{(M0-MC)}$=3.56, p=0.1,

dN/dS$_{(M0)}$=1.43) (Fig. 5, Supplemental Table S1).

Figure 5. Evolutionary rates of placenta-specific gene family (PSF) genes expressed in the maternal medial preoptic
area (MPoA). (A) Pairwise evolutionary rate between *Mus m. domesticus (Dom)* and *Mus spretus (Spret)* for *Ctsr*
and the 10 co-expressed PSF genes with the highest expression in MPoA. Evolutionary rate (dN/dS) > 1 is marked
in red throughout the figure and is indicative of positive selection. (B) PAML4 CodeML analysis results for the
three genes with pairwise dN/dS>1. Species are *Mus m. castaneus (Cast), Mus m. musculus (Musc), Mus m.*
domesticus (Dom), Mus spretus (Spret), Mus caroli (Car), Mus pahari (Pah). dN/dS values are indicated for groups
of branches depending on which CodeML model provided the best fit for the data (M0: one evolutionary rate for the
whole tree, MC: selected branches evolve at a different rate than the rest of the tree). dN/dS values depicted in black
for *Prl8a6* and *Ctsr* indicate background evolutionary rates.

Discussion

Molecular communication between the placenta and the maternal brain is crucial for the

expression of maternal behavior in rodents (Bridges et al. 1996; Larsen and Grattan 2012; Creeth

et al. 2018). In humans, altered regulation of placental imprinted genes is associated with

prenatal depression (Janssen et al. 2016b), a predictor of lower growth rate and higher disease

risk in infants (Rahman et al. 2004). In this study, we used a hybrid mouse model to characterize

the extent to which placental disruption influences gene expression in the maternal brain. Several

maternally expressed imprinted genes were transgressively misexpressed in the hybrid placenta.

In *Mus m. domesticus* females carrying hybrid litters we found altered placenta-specific gene

family expression in the placenta, and in the maternal MPoA. Surprisingly, the expression of

these genes was highly correlated between the two tissues, and was *Mus spretus*-like in the

MPoA. This suggests that paternally inherited alleles in the placenta exert substantial influence

on expression in the maternal brain. Collectively, our results reveal reciprocal effects of mothers

on offspring and offspring on mothers, mediated in both cases by the placenta. We discuss these

findings in light of maternal-fetal coevolution and parental conflict, and identify potential

implications for placental pathologies.

Maternal effects on placental expression

Global patterns of expression in the placenta were strongly associated with maternal genotype. In

hybrids, half as many genes were DE relative to normal *Dom* placentas as opposed to *Spret*

placentas. Notably, the >1,600 genes with *Dom*-like expression in hybrid placenta were highly

enriched for terms associated with immunity and regulation of blood flow, both of which are

essential to placental mediation between mother and embryo (Cross et al. 1994). Because

maternal vasculature is incorporated into the placenta, whole placenta transcriptomes necessarily

include some transcripts of maternal origin and detection of *Tnfsrs23* transcripts in all samples

indicates that some cells from the maternal decidua remained following dissection. However,

maternal blood flow within the placenta is under the direct control of placental cell lineages;

trophoblast giant cells invade and replace maternal vascular endothelium, limiting maternally-

derived tissue to blood (Rai and Cross 2014). Likewise, *Tnfsrs23*-expressing cells are adjacent to

fetal trophoblast giant cells at the junction between fetal and maternal tissues (Clark et al. 2002).

Therefore, while contamination from maternal transcripts may contribute to *Dom*-like expression

in hybrid placenta, it is unlikely to bias the expression of such a large number of genes. The

regulatory effects of maternal hormones, and of maternally inherited genes in the placenta, are

non-mutually exclusive alternative explanations. For example, because paternal X chromosome

inactivation is maintained in mouse placenta (Tagaki and Sasaki 1975), maternally inherited X-

linked genes are strong candidates for modulating autosomal expression in both sexes. While

disentangling maternal effects (*sensu* Wolf and Wade 2009) from the effects of maternally

inherited genes is a challenge for future studies, we note that the match between maternal

genotype and placental expression of genes that modulate maternal immune tolerance and

angiogenesis is consistent with the expectation of molecular coadaptation between mother and

offspring (Wolf and Brodie 1998, Keverne and Curley 2008), and the well-established effect of

maternal environment on placental function (Cottrell and Seckl 2009; Monk et al. 2012).

Altered PSF and IG expression in the placenta

Maternal adaptation to pregnancy relies to a great extent on placental signaling. Thus, altered

expression of genes encoding or influencing placental signaling molecules can ultimately affect

maternal physiological and behavioral response to pregnancy (Bridges et al. 1996; Creeth et al.

2018). Misexpression in the hybrid placenta was substantial. However, the most striking pattern

we found was the reduced expression of a large number of PSFs. In mice, most of these genes

are expressed from the placental endocrine compartment and many are found in maternal plasma

during pregnancy (Rawn and Cross 2008). In this hybrid mouse model, the endocrine

compartment is markedly reduced when the mother is *Dom* (Zechner et al. 1996). Thus, reduced

abundance of PSF producing cell types likely contributes to overall reduction in PSF expression.

IGs are thought to modulate PSF expression, primarily through effects on placental

endocrine cell abundance, with maternally expressed genes (MEGs) repressing and paternally

expressed genes (PEGs) promoting cell proliferation (John 2013, 2017). Two such MEGs,

Phlda2 and *Ascl2*, were transgressively misexpressed in hybrid placentas. Altered expression of

either of these genes in lab mouse models results in an undersized endocrine compartment,

altered glycogen energy stores and reduced PSF gene expression (Tunster et al. 2010, 2016a,b).

Indeed, *Phlda2* and *Ascl2* seem to be critical co-regulators of placental endocrine compartment

development (John 2017). Two other MEGs, *Dcn* and *Grb10*, were overexpressed when

compared to *Dom* placentas. While neither is specifically implicated in placental endocrine

function, both are key modulators of placental growth, and *Dcn* overexpression represses cellular

proliferation (Yamaguchi and Ruoslahti 1988; Kresse and Schönherr 2001; Garfield et al. 2011).

Collectively, our results are consistent with the proposed role of IGs in placental signaling (Haig

1996; Tunster et al. 2013; John 2013,2017), and identify MEG misexpression as a candidate

mechanism for the undersized endocrine compartment and consequent global reduction in PSF

expression in hybrid placenta.

The effects of hybrid placental dysfunction on the maternal brain

Altered signaling in hybrid placentas has the potential to affect the maternal brain. We found

subtle but significant differences in the expression of four genes in the MPoA of *Dom* females

exposed to hybrid relative to conspecific placentas. Both *Fmn1* (Formin1) and *Caln1*

(Calneuron1) were underexpressed. In the brain, *Fmn1* is involved in the formation of adherens

junctions and in linear actin cable polymerization (Kobielak et al. 2004). The formation of

adherens junctions is important in the maintenance of the blood brain barrier (BBB), a highly

specialized structure that regulates the influx of molecules into the brain (Stamatovic et al. 2008).

During pregnancy, the permeability of the BBB is increased by placenta-derived factors to which

the maternal brain must respond in order to maintain this barrier (Cipolla 2007; Schreurs et al.

2012). Reduced expression of *Fmn1* therefore suggests alterations in BBB adaptation during

hybrid pregnancies. *Caln1* encodes a neuron-specific protein with sequence similarities to

calcium-binding calmodulins. While the function of *Caln1* is uncharacterized, homology to

calmodulin suggests a role in neuronal calcium signaling (Wu et al. 2001). Decreased expression

of a calcium-binding protein could indicate alterations in neuronal activity in the MPoA exposed

to hybrid placentas.

Drd3 (Dopamine receptor D3) was also underexpressed compared to *Dom* mothers, but

not to *Spret* mothers, in the hybrid pregnancy MPoA. DRD3, a D2-like receptor with a generally

inhibitory role, is implicated in treatment-resistant major depression (Lattanzi et al. 2002) and

Drd3 knock-out mice exhibit a suite of anxiety- and depressive-like behaviors with similar but

milder effects in heterozygous knock-outs (Accili et al. 1996; Moraga-Amaro et al. 2014). Given

that the action of dopamine in the MPoA is critical for the expression of maternal behavior in

rats (Numan and Stolzenberg 2009), and hypothalamic dopamine is altered in a mouse model for

post-partum depression (Avraham et al. 2017), reduced *Drd3* expression in the MPoA might

cause deficits in maternal behavior. However, *M. spretus* mothers are more responsive to pups

than *M. m. domesticus* mothers (Cassaing et al. 2010) and *Drd3* expression in the hybrid

pregnancy was statistically indistinguishable from the normal *Spret* pregnancy. How, and to what

extent placental expression of paternally inherited alleles promotes maternal behaviors is an

intriguing question for in-depth studies.

Ctsr (Cathepsin R), a placenta-specific cathepsin, was the only gene that was

overexpressed in the MPoA exposed to hybrid placentas. The difference in expression, although

significant, was so small that the biological relevance is questionable. However, unlike other PSF

genes, expression of *Ctsr* in the maternal brain was unique to the hybrid pregnancy.

Interestingly, loss of the IG *Peg3* leads to de-repression of several PSF members, including *Ctsr*,

in the fetal and adult brain (Kim et al. 2013). While *Peg3* was not misexpressed in the hybrid

placenta, the transgressively overexpressed MEG, *Phlda2*, was recently shown to perturb

maternal behavior and neural gene expression when its dosage was altered in mouse placenta

(Creeth et al. 2018). Specifically, overexpression of placental *Phlda2* reduced postpartum

nurturing behavior, while underexpression increased maternal behavior (Creeth et al. 2018).

Since *Phlda2* and *Ascl2* jointly regulate development of the endocrine compartment (John 2017),

it is likely that transgressive misexpression of both genes in hybrid placenta impacts the maternal

brain via effects on placental hormone expression.

Paternal effects on the maternal brain

The hybrid placenta expresses both maternally derived (*Dom*) and paternally derived (*Spret*)

alleles. Thus, females pregnant with hybrids are exposed to gene products from a foreign

paternal genome. In *Dom* females exposed to hybrid placentas we found a substantial subset of

genes, including PSF genes and *Drd3*, with expression patterns that differed from *Dom* mothers

with conspecific litters, but closely matched those of *Spret* mothers.

A surprisingly large number of genes were co-expressed between placenta and MPoA in

hybrid and *Spret* pregnancies but not in *Dom* pregnancies. In particular, placental and MPoA

PSF gene expression was highly correlated in hybrid pregnancies and in *Spret* pregnancies, while

Dom pregnancies showed a weaker correlation. Likewise, total MPoA PSF gene expression was

Spret-like in hybrid pregnancies. These results suggest that PSF expression levels in the maternal

MPoA are driven by placental expression levels of the same genes, and that PSF, and potentially

Drd3, expression in the MPoA is influenced by paternally inherited alleles in the placenta. Thus,

natural differences between the parental species used in this study reveal an unanticipated effect

of the paternal genome on the maternal brain. This hypothesis is illustrated in Fig. 6.

A reciprocal shift towards *Dom*-like PSF expression in the brains of *Spret* females

carrying litters sired by *Dom* males would provide strong support for this hypothesis.

Unfortunately, generating hybrid pregnancies in this direction of the cross is notoriously difficult

(Zechner et al. 1996) and our attempts failed (see Methods). However, the generality of

paternally-mediated placental effects on mothers could be tested in other species crosses

characterized by parent-of-origin-dependent placental abnormalities (e.g. *Phodopus* hamsters

(Brekke and Good 2014) and *Peromyscus* mice (Vrana et al. 1998)).

Proposed paternal effect on maternal brain

499 **Figure 6**. Proposed paternal effect on maternal brain. Schematic visualization of the three different crosses and the
500 potential indirect effect of the paternally inherited allele through the placenta on the maternal brain. *Mus m.*
501 *domesticus* is depicted in red and *Mus spretus* in blue. Hybrid tissue is indicated by a combination of red and blue.
502

A signature of conflict in PSF evolution and expression in the maternal brain

Pregnancy requires substantial investment from the mother, which is offset by costs to her

capacity to invest in future offspring (Trivers 1972). However, when offspring are sired by

multiple males, selection favors fathers who extract maximal maternal resources for their own

offspring (Trivers 1972). Haig and colleagues proposed that these asymmetries in the

reproductive interests of males and females, and the coefficients of relatedness between mothers

and offspring (always 0.5) vs. fathers and offspring (0.5 or 0), should promote parental

antagonism, played out at the molecular level between maternally and paternally expressed IGs

in the placenta (Moore and Haig 1991; Haig and Graham 1991; Haig 2000). Because placental

endocrine signals promote maternal investment in current offspring, placental hormones are also

proposed players in both parental and mother-offspring conflicts (Trivers 1985; Haig 1996).

Consistent with a history of antagonistic coevolution, PSFs in general are the fastest evolving

genes in the rodent placenta (Chuong et al. 2010). We report a similar signature of selection on

three PSF genes that are co-expressed in the hybrid placenta and the maternal MPoA.

Trivers (1985) described placental hormones as the molecular equivalent of begging

calls. Here we show for the first time that the expression of Prls and other PSFs is highly

correlated between placenta and maternal brain. While the function of PSFs in the brain is

undefined, placental genotype-dependent differences between *Dom* females in the strength of the

correlation and the number of co-expressed genes indicate that the relationship is driven by the

placenta not the mother. Moreover, the *Spret*-like co-expression patterns of PSF genes in

mothers of litters sired by *Spret* males implicate the paternally inherited genome as the driver of

these placental begging calls, which are echoed in the maternal brain. Given that these patterns

of expression are consistent with parental conflict, it is noteworthy that the opportunity for sperm

competition (inferred from testis-body mass ratios) is higher in *M. spretus* than in *M. m.*

domesticus (Gomez Montoto et al. 2011).

Preeclampsia related gene expression in hybrid pregnancies

Preeclampsia is a serious pregnancy complication and the lead cause of maternal and fetal

morbidity and mortality (Burton and Jauniaux 2004; Redman and Sargent 2009). We found

significant overlap between transgressively misexpressed genes in hybrid placentas and

preeclampsia related genes and pathways. Haig (1993) interpreted preeclampsia as a

consequence of conflicts between maternal and paternal genomes, played out in the placenta and

potentially involving IGs. While the genetic basis of preeclampsia is complex (Uzun et al. 2016),

involvement of IGs is supported in both humans and mouse models. For example, human

chromosome 10 regions containing imprinting clusters are associated with preeclampsia

(Oudejans et al. 2004), and loss of the MEG *Cdkn1c* causes preeclampsia-like symptoms in mice

(Kanayama et al. 2002). Interestingly, *Cdkn1c* is in the same imprinting cluster as *Phlda2* and

Ascl2 (dist7, IC2), both of which were misexpressed in hybrid placentas. While *Cdkn1c* was not

differentially expressed in the hybrid placenta, it is possible that misexpression in this imprinting

cluster is a general contributor to preeclampsia-like placental phenotypes. Because preeclampsia

can significantly alter permeability of the BBB (Cipolla 2007), it is also notable that *Fmn1*, a

gene implicated in BBB maintenance, was underexpressed in brains of mothers exposed to

hybrid placentas.

Conclusions

Evolutionary theoreticians have modeled mammalian pregnancy as both intimate cooperation

and antagonistic struggle between two genetically distinct organisms (Trivers 1974; Haig 1993;

Wolf and Hager 2006). Whether driven by conflict or coadaptation, it is clear that the placenta is

the mediator of these complex interactions between mother and offspring. Here we concentrated

on placental effects on the maternal brain during the final stages of pregnancy, when it is

believed to be a critical source of signal molecules that prime female physiology and behavior

for motherhood (Larsen and Grattan 2012; Bridges 2015). We found both hybrid placental

misexpression with the potential to disrupt maternal-fetal communication, and altered expression

in the brains of mothers exposed to hybrid placentas. Expression in the hybrid placenta seems to

be dominated by the maternally derived genome and/or driven by maternal effects. Maternal-

placental communication genes co-expressed in maternal brain and placenta show elevated

evolutionary rates, consistent with antagonistic coevolutionary processes. The expression of a

proportion of transcripts of these genes from a foreign paternal genome in the placenta has the

potential to affect the maternal brain and alter maternal behavior. In addition to the effects of

placental disruption on the maternal brain, natural differences between the parental species in

this hybrid system suggest a previously undescribed influence of the paternal placental genome

on the maternal brain. These paternal effects on the maternal brain could play a major role in the

expression of maternal behavior and the quality of maternal care, and open novel avenues of

research in both evolutionary and biomedical fields.

Methods

Animals and tissue collection

Mice used in this study were maintained on a 12:12 light:dark cycle with lights on at 9:00 AM,

and were provided with 5001 Rodent Diet (LabDiet, Brentwood, MO, U.S.A.) and water ad lib.

All animal procedures were approved by the Oklahoma State University IACUC under protocol

#141-AS. *Mus m. domesticus* (*Dom*) was represented by the wild-derived inbred strain WSB/EiJ

(Jackson Laboratory) and *Mus spretus* (*Spret*) was represented by the wild-derived inbred strain

SFM/Pas (Montpellier Wild Mice Genetic Repository). We conducted three crosses (female

shown first): *Dom* X *Dom* (n=5), *Dom* X *Spret* (n=5), *Spret* X *Spret* (n=5). The reciprocal cross

(*Spret* X *Dom*) was attempted 25 times but was never successful. Prior to pairing, females were

placed in a cage with soiled conspecific male bedding for ~48 hrs to induce receptivity to mating

(Whitten 1956). Mice were paired between 5:00 and 6:00 PM, left undisturbed for two nights,

and split on the morning of the second day. The second night was counted as embryonic day 0

(e0). Females were weighed after two weeks to confirm pregnancy but were otherwise left

undisturbed. Pregnant females (n=5/type of pregnancy) were euthanized by cervical dislocation

between 10:00 and 11:00 AM on embryonic day 17-18 (e17.5) and the maternal brain was

extracted. Embryos were separated from placentas and placentas were weighed, and the

maternally-derived decidual layer was removed as previously described (Qu et al. 2014) and

discarded. Only fetally-derived placental tissue was used in this study. All tissues were

transferred immediately to RNAlater (Thermo Fisher, USA), kept at 4°C overnight to allow

RNAlater perfusion, and stored at -20°C until microdissection and RNA extraction.

Brain microdissection and RNA extraction

The maternal MPoA was localized using the Mouse Brain atlas (Figs. 26-33, (Paxinos and

Franklin 2013)), and microdissected by sectioning the RNAlater perfused brain at 100μm on a

Leica CM 1950 cryostat, followed by dissection under a dissecting microscope in chilled PBS

droplets for improved visibility of brain microstructure. DNA was extracted from embryonic

tissue using the DNeasy Blood & Tissue Kit (Qiagen, USA) followed by PCR for the Y-linked

gene, *Zfy1*, to determine sex. Placentas from one male and one female per litter were used for

RNA extraction (n=5 males/cross, n=4 females/hybrid cross, n=5 females/conspecific cross).

RNA was extracted from all tissues immediately after microdissection using the RNeasy Plus

Universal Mini Kit (Qiagen) for MPoA, and the AllPrep RNA/DNA Mini Kit (Qiagen) for

placenta. RNA was stored at -80°C until sequencing.

RNAseq pipeline

Sequencing (RNAseq): RNA integrity (RIN) was determined by the sequencing facility

(Novogene, Sacramento, CA) using the RNA Nano 6000 Assay Kit with the Agilent Bioanalyzer

2100 system (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA). RIN values ranged from 8.2-10 for

all samples. Library preparation was performed by the sequencing facility, using the NEB Next

Ultra RNA library prep kit for Illumina. RNAseq was performed on the Illumina HiSeq 4000

platform, producing >30 million, 150bp paired-end reads per sample.

Mapping: QC of raw sequencing reads and trimming were performed in Trim Galore! 0.4.5

(Brabraham Bioinformatics, http://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/trim_galore),

using a phred score cutoff of 30 and minimum sequence length of 100 after trimming. In order to

map hybrid placenta reads we generated a pseudo-hybrid genome using the genome preparation

tool of the program SNPsplit (Brabraham Bioinformatics, (Krueger and Andrews 2016)). Briefly,

SNPs from both *Dom* (WSB/EiJ) and *Spret* (SPRET/EiJ) relative to the mouse genome

(GRCm38.89) available from the Ensembl FTP server (ftp://ftp.ensembl.org) were introduced

into the mouse genome (GRCm38.89). SNPs between *Dom* and *Spret* were then N-masked to

allow mapping of both *Dom*- and *Spret*-derived reads. To improve comparability, all placenta

samples (*Dom*, *Spret* and hybrid) were mapped to the pseudo-hybrid genome. MPoA samples

were mapped to their corresponding genomes (WSB/EiJ_v1 for *Dom* MPoA, SPRET/EiJ_v1 for

Spret MPoA, (Keane et al. 2011)). Mapping was done using HISAT2 2.1 (Kim et al. 2015). After

mapping we filtered the resulting alignment files using SAMtools 0.1.19 (Li et al. 2009),

retaining only high quality (HISAT2 MAPQ score 40), uniquely mapped, paired reads for

analysis.

Post-processing of alignments: Before filtering, average alignment rate for MPoA samples was

87% for *Spret* MPoA samples and 88% for *Dom* MPoA samples. For placenta samples the

alignment rate was slightly lower for *Spret* samples (88%) compared to *Dom* (91%) and *hybrid*

(91%). We therefore randomly downsampled all alignment files to ~40 million reads using

SAMtools 0.1.19 (Li et al. 2009) to account for a possible mapping bias and to improve

comparability.

Allele-splitting of hybrid alignments: To confirm ~equal expression from *Dom* and *Spret* alleles

in the hybrid placenta we split the hybrid alignment files, separating reads originating from the

Spret and *Dom* alleles. Splitting was performed using the program SNPsplit (Brabraham

Bioinformatics, (Krueger and Andrews 2016)). The pseudo-hybrid genome was produced by

introducing SNPs between both Spret and mouse and Dom and mouse into the mouse genome

and then N-masking those SNPs that are present between Dom and Spret. Mapped reads can

therefore be assigned to the *Dom* or *Spret* allele based on the list of SNPs between *Dom* and

Spret and overlap with N-masked positions in the mouse genome. Using this procedure, SNPsplit

produced separate alignment files for each allele containing clearly assignable reads. These were

then quantified and used to produce a diagnostic boxplot, demonstrating ~equal expression of

both alleles in the hybrid placenta (Supplemental Fig. S8).

Quantification: Transcript quantification and annotation was done using StringTie 1.3.3 (Pertea

et al. 2015). Gene annotation information was retrieved from the Ensembl FTP server

(ftp://ftp.ensembl.org) for *Spret* (SPRET/EiJ_v1.86) and *Dom* (WSB/EiJ_v1.86). Mouse genome

annotation was used for samples mapped to the pseudo-hybrid genome (GRCm38.89). We used

the python script (preDE.py) included in the StringTie package to prepare gene-level count

matrices for analysis of differential gene expression.

Differential expression (DE) analysis: Differential expression was tested with DESeq2 1.16.1

(Love et al. 2014). Pseudogenes were removed from the count matrices based on "biotype"

annotation information extracted from Biomart (R-package biomaRt, (Durinck et al. 2005)). Low

counts were removed by the independent filtering process implemented in DESeq2 (Bourgon et

al. 2010). The adjusted p-value (Benjamini-Hochberg method) cutoff for DE was set at 0.05. Due

to variation in litter size, especially in females carrying hybrid litters (range=3-6), and its

potential effect of on MPoA expression, we corrected for litter size in all MPoA sample

comparisons. To analyze DE between *Spret* and *Dom* MPoA, which were mapped to their

respective genomes, we extracted homologous gene names from the mouse genome database

using Ensembl Biomart (R-package biomaRt, (Durinck et al. 2005)) and merged the dataset

based on the genes that had a clear mouse homolog in both. Normalized read count tables

produced by DESeq2 were used in subsequent co-expression analyses.

Co-expression: To determine co-expression between placenta and MPoA we set a cutoff of 10

normalized counts for at least 4 out of 5 observations each tissue type (MPoA, male placenta and

female placenta). Based on this cutoff we report genes expressed in both placenta and MPoA for

each type of pregnancy. We then determined differences in co-expression between the three

pregnancy types.

Gene ontology (GO) term and pathway overrepresentation analysis: We performed GO term and

pathway overrepresentation analyses on relevant lists of genes from DE and co-expression

analyses using the PANTHER gene list analysis tool with Fisher's exact test and FDR correction

(Mi et al. 2017). We tested for overrepresentation based on the GO annotation database

(Biological Processes) (released 07-Jan-2017, (Ashburner et al. 2000; The Gene Ontology

Consortium 2017)) and the Reactome pathway database (version 58 (Fabregat et al. 2017)).

Evolutionary rates for selected genes

We extracted the pairwise evolutionary rate (dN/dS = nonsynonymous to synonymous

substitution rate ratio) between *Dom* and *Spret* from Biomart (R-package biomaRt, (Durinck et

al. 2005)). dN/dS is an index of selective pressure on coding sequence, with dN/dS = 1 indicating

neutral evolution, dN/dS < 1 purifying selection, and dN/dS > 1 diversifying positive selection

(Goldman and Yang 1994). Further analysis of genes with dN/dS > 1 (*Prl8a6*, *Ctsr*, *Tpbpb*) was

performed with CodeML implemented in PAML 4.8 (Yang and Rannala 1997; Yang 2007),

including sequences from related *Mus* subspecies and species (*Mus m. musculus (Musc)*, *Mus m.*

castaneus (Cast), *Mus caroli (Car)* and *Mus pahari (Pah)*). Coding sequences for all three genes

for *Musc*, *Cast* and *Car* were available from Ensembl. For *Pah*, coding sequences for *Prl8a6* and

Ctsr were downloaded from NCBI Genbank. For *Tpbpb*, we ran blastn on NCBI with the *Dom*

Tpbpb coding sequence against the nr/nt database and found two matches for *Pah*, of which one

showed higher similarity to *Dom Tpbpa* and the other to *Dom Tpbpb*. The latter was included in

the CodeML analysis (Supplemental Table S5). CodeML calculates evolutionary rates by

applying different models to an alignment and a phylogeny. To prepare the alignments,

sequences were visualized with Geneious 9.1.8 (Biomatters, http://www.geneious.com/) and

trimmed to coding sequence. Translation alignments were performed using the MUSCLE

alignment algorithm, implemented in Geneious. The phylogeny was built based on recent

phylogenomic analyses of house mice and related species (White et al. 2009; Sarver et al. 2017).

For the CodeML codon frequency setting we used the setting with the best fit for each analysis

according to the preliminary likelihood ratio analysis.

To calculate individual evolutionary rates for each branch in the tree we used CodeML's

"free-ratio" model. This served as an initial indication as to which branches might show higher

evolutionary rates. After this, two models were computed: Model M0 "one ratio" in which all

branches were constrained to evolve at the same rate and MC "two-ratio" in which selected

branches are allowed to evolve at a different rate than the rest of the tree. Branches with

potentially higher evolutionary rate based on the "free-ratio" model result were marked as

foreground branches and were allowed to evolve differently from the background. To test if MC

provides a better fit for the data than M0 we performed Likelihood Ratio Tests. When MC

provided the better fit, and dN/dS calculated for the foreground branches was > 1 and dN/dS

calculated for the background branches was < 1, we inferred positive selection on the foreground

branches. When M0 provided the better fit and dN/dS for the whole tree was > 1, we inferred

positive selection for the whole tree (Yang 1998).

Data Access

RNA-seq data from this study have been submitted to the NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus

(GEO; https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/) under accession number GSE126469.

Acknowledgements

We thank members of the Campbell lab for useful discussion, and B. Horn and S. Windle for

assistance with mouse husbandry, and M. Nightengale for assistance in the lab. P.C. thanks K.

Mack for generously sharing the ideas that catalyzed this project and J. Good for the gift of the

SFM/Pas strain. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF-IOS

1558109 to P.C).

References

Armstrong DL, McGowen MR, Weckle A, Pantham P, Caravas J, Agnew D, Benirschke K, Savage-Rumbaugh S, Nevo E, Kim CJ, Wagner GP. 2017. The core transcriptome of mammalian placentas and the divergence of expression with placental shape. Placenta 57:71–78.

Accili D, Fishburn CS, Drago J, Steiner H, Lachowicz JE, Park BH, Gauda EB, Lee EJ, Cool MH, Sibley DR, Gerfen CR. 1996. A targeted mutation of the D3 dopamine receptor gene is associated with hyperactivity in mice. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 93:1945-1949.

Ashburner M, Ball CA, Blake JA, Botstein D, Butler H, Cherry JM, Davis AP, Dolinski K, Dwight SS, Eppig JT, Harris MA. 2000. Gene ontology: Tool for the unification of biology. *Nat Genet* 25:25–29.

Avraham Y, Hants Y, Vorobeiv L, Staum M, Ahmad WA, Mankuta D, Galun E, Arbel-Alon S. 2017. Brain neurotransmitters in an animal model with postpartum depressive-like behavior. *Behav Brain Res* 326:307–321.

Blackburn DG. 1993. Chorioallantoic placentation in squamate reptiles: Structure, function, development, and evolution. *J Exp Zool* 266:414–430.

Boddy, AM, Fortunato A, Wilson Sayres M, Aktipis A. 2015. Fetal microchimerism and maternal health: A review and evolutionary analysis of cooperation and conflict beyond the womb. BioEssays 37:1106–1118.

Bourgon R, Gentleman R, Huber W. 2010. Independent filtering is a generic approach that needs domain specific adaptation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 107:E175–E175.

Brekke TD, Good JM. 2014. Parent-of-origin growth effects and the evolution of hybrid inviability in dwarf hamsters. Evolution 68:3134–3148.

Bridges RS. 2015. Neuroendocrine regulation of maternal behavior. Frontiers in Neuroendocrinology 36:178-196.

Bridges RS, Robertson MC, Shiu RP, Friesen HG, Stuer AM, Mann PE. 1996. Endocrine Communication between Conceptus and Mother: Placental Lactogen Stimulation of Maternal Behavior. Neuroendocrinology 64:57–64 .

Burton GJ, Jauniaux E. 2004. Placental oxidative stress: From miscarriage to preeclampsia. Journal of the Society for Gynecologic Investigation 11:342–352.

Cassaing J, Cervera S, Isaac F. 2010. Laboratory and field evidence of paternal care in the Algerian mouse. Mus spretus. *J Ethol* 28:7–13.

Chuong E B, Tong W, Hoekstra H E. 2010. Maternal-fetal conflict: Rapidly evolving proteins in the rodent placenta. *Mol Biol Evol* 27:1221–1225.

Cipolla M . 2007. Cerebrovascular function in pregnancy and eclampsia. Hypertension 50:14–24.

Clark L, Wei M, Cattoretti G, Mendelsohn C, Tycko B. 2002. The *Tnfrh1* (*Tnfrsf23*) gene is weakly imprinted in several organs and expressed at the trophoblast-decidua interface. BMC Genetics 3:37.

Constância M, Angiolini E, Sandovici I, Smith P, Smith R, Kelsey G, Dean W, Ferguson-Smith
A, Sibley CP, Reik W, Fowden A. 2005. Adaptation of nutrient supply to fetal demand in the
mouse involves interaction between the Igf2 gene and placental transporter systems. *Proc*
Natl Acad Sci 102:19219–19224.

Cottrell EC, Seckl JR. 2009. Prenatal stress, glucocorticoids and the programming of adult
disease. *Front Behav Neuro* 3:19.

Creeth HD, McNamara GI, Tunster SJ, Boque-Sastre R, Allen B, Sumption L, Eddy JB, Isles
AR, John RM. 2018. Maternal care boosted by paternal imprinting in mammals. PLoS
Biology. 16:e2006599.

Cross JC, Werb Z, Fisher SJ. 1994. Implantation and the placenta: Key pieces of the
development puzzle. Science 266:1508–1518.

Dokras A, Hoffmann DS, Eastvold JS, Kienzle MF, Gruman LM, Kirby PA, Weiss RM,
Davisson RL. 2006. Severe feto-placental abnormalities precede the onset of hypertension
and proteinuria in a mouse model of preeclampsia. Biology of Reproduction 1:899-907.

Durinck S, Moreau Y, Kasprzyk A, Davis S, De Moor B, Brazma A, Huber W. 2005. BioMart
and Bioconductor: A powerful link between biological databases and microarray data
analysis. Bioinformatics 21:3439–3440.

Fabregat A, Sidiropoulos K, Viteri G, Forner O, Marin-Garcia P, Arnau V, D'Eustachio P, Stein
L, Hermjakob H. 2017. Reactome pathway analysis: A high-performance in-memory
approach. BMC Bioinformatics 18:142.

Ferguson-Smith AC. 2011. Genomic imprinting: the emergence of an epigenetic paradigm. Nat
Rev Genet 12:565–575.

Garfield AS, Cowley M, Smith FM, Moorwood K, Stewart-Cox JE, Gilroy K, Baker S, Xia J,
Dalley JW, Hurst LD, Wilkinson LS. 2011. Distinct physiological and behavioural functions
for parental alleles of imprinted Grb10. Nature 469:534–538.

Goldman N, Yang Z. 1994. A codon-based model of nucleotide substitution for protein-coding
DNA sequences. *Mol Biol Evol* 11:725 .

Gómez Montoto L, Magaña C, Tourmente M, Martín-Coello J, Crespo C, Luque-Larena JJ,
Gomendio M, Roldan ER. 2011. Sperm competition, sperm numbers and sperm quality in
muroid rodents. PLoS One 6:e18173.

Gray A. 1972. Mammalian Hybrids: A Check-list with Bibliography. Commonwealth
Agricultural Bureau.

Haig D. 1993. Genetic conflicts in human pregnancy. *Q Rev Biol* 68:495–532.

Haig D. 1996. Placental hormones, genomic imprinting, and maternal-fetal communication. J
Evol Biol 9:357–380.

Haig D. 2000. The kinship theory of genomic imprinting. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* 31:9–32.

Haig D. 2014. Coadaptation and conflict, misconception and muddle, in the evolution of
genomic imprinting. Heredity 113:96–103.

Haig D, Graham C. 1991. Genomic Imprinting and the Strange Case of the Insulin-like Growth
Factor II Receptor. Cell 64:1045–1046.

Harmon AC, Cornelius DC, Amaral LM, Faulkner JL, Cunningham MW, Wallace K, LaMarca
B. 2016. The role of inflammation in the pathology of preeclampsia. *Clin Sci* 347:882–886.

Hemberger MC, Pearsall RS, Zechner U, Orth A, Otto S, Rüschendorf F, Fundele R, Elliott R.
1999. Genetic dissection of X-linked interspecific hybrid placental dysplasia in congenic
mouse strains. Genetics 153:383–390.

Janssen AB, Capron LE, O'Donnell K, Tunster SJ, Ramchandani PG, Heazell AE, Glover V,
John RM. 2016a. Maternal prenatal depression is associated with decreased placental
expression of the imprinted gene PEG3. Psychological medicine 46:2999-3011.

Janssen AB, Kertes DA, McNamara GI, Braithwaite EC, Creeth HDL, Glover VI, John RM.
2016b. Journal of Neuroendocrinology 28:10.1111/jne.12373.

John RM. 2013. Epigenetic regulation of placental endocrine lineages and complications of
pregnancy. *Biochem Soc Trans* 41:701–709.

John RM. 2017. Imprinted genes and the regulation of placental endocrine function: Pregnancy
and beyond. Placenta 56:86–90.

Kanayama N, Takahashi K, Matsuura T, Sugimura M, Kobayashi T, Moniwa N, Tomita M,
Nakayama K. 2002. Deficiency in p57Kip2 expression induces preeclampsia-like symptoms
in mice. *Mol Hum Reprod* 8:1129–1135.

Keane TM, Goodstadt L, Danecek P, White MA, Wong K, Yalcin B, Heger A, Agam A, Slater
G, Goodson M, Furlotte NA. 2011. Mouse genomic variation and its effect on phenotypes
and gene regulation. Nature 477:289–294.

Keverne EB, Curley JP. 2008. Epigenetics, brain evolution and behaviour. Front
Neuroendocrinol 29:398–412.

Kim D, Langmead B, Salzberg S L. 2015. HISAT: A fast spliced aligner with low memory
requirements. *Nat Methods* 12:357–360.

Kim J, Frey WD, He H, Kim H, Ekram MB, Bakshi A, Faisal M, Perera BP, Ye A, Teruyama R.
2013. Peg3 mutational effects on reproduction and placenta-specific gene families. PLoS
One 8:e83359.

Kobielak A, Pasolli H A, Fuchs E. 2004. Mammalian formin-1 participates in adherens junctions
and polymerization of linear actin cables. *Nat Cell Biol* 6:21–30.

Kohl J, Dulac C. 2018. Neural control of parental behaviors. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 49:116–122.

Kresse H, Schönherr E. 2001. Proteoglycans of the extracellular matrix and growth control. J.
Cell Physiol 189:266–274.

Krueger F, Andrews S R. 2016. SNPsplit: Allele-specific splitting of alignments between
genomes with known SNP genotypes. F1000Research 5:1479.

Kurz H, Zechner U, Orth A, Fundele R. 1999. Lack of correlation between placenta and
offspring size in mouse interspecific crosses. *Anat Embryol Berl* 200:335–343.

Ladyman SR, Augustine RA, Grattan DR. 2010. Hormone interactions regulating energy balance
during pregnancy. *J Neuroendocrinol* 22:805–817.

Larsen CM, Grattan DR. 2012. Prolactin, neurogenesis, and maternal behaviors. Brain, Behavior,
and Immunity 26:201–209.

Lattanzi L, Dell'Osso L, Cassano P, Pini S, Rucci P, Houck PR, Gemignani A, Battistini G, Bassi
A, Abelli M, Cassano GB. 2002. Pramipexole in treatment-resistant depression: a 16-week
naturalistic study. Bipolar Disorders, 4:307–314.

Lefebvre L. 2012. The placental imprintome and imprinted gene function in the trophoblast
glycogen cell lineage. *Reprod Biomed Online* 25:44–57.

Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, Marth G, Abecasis G, Durbin R.
2009. The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics 25:2078–2079.

Love M I, Huber W, Anders S. 2014. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for
RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol* 15:1–21.

McNamara GI, Creeth HD, Harrison DJ, Tansey KE, Andrews RM, Isles AR, John RM. 2018.
Loss of offspring Peg3 reduces neonatal ultrasonic vocalizations and increases maternal
anxiety in wild-type mothers. Human molecular genetics 27:440-50.

Mann PE, Bridges RS. 2001. Lactogenic hormone regulation of maternal behavior. Progress in
Brain Research 133:251–262.

Mason RW. 2008. Emerging Functions of Placental Cathepsins. Placenta 29:385–390.

Mi H, Huang X, Muruganujan A, Tang H, Mills C, Kang D, Thomas PD. 2017. PANTHER
version 11: Expanded annotation data from Gene Ontology and Reactome pathways, and
data analysis tool enhancements. *Nucleic Acids Res* 45:D183–D189.

Monk C, Spicer J, Champagne FA. 2012. Linking prenatal maternal adversity to developmental
outcomes in infants: The role of epigenetic pathways. Development and Psychopathology
24:1361–1376.

Moore T, Haig D. 1991. Genomic imprinting in mammalian development: a parental tug-of-war.
Trends Genet 7:45–49.

Moraga-Amaro R, Gonzalez H, Pacheco R, Stehberg J. 2014. Dopamine receptor D3 deficiency
results in chronic depression and anxiety. *Behav Brain Res* 274:186–193.

Numan M, Insel TR. 2003. The Neurobiology of Parental Behavior. New York: Springer.

Numan M, Stolzenberg D S. 2009. Medial preoptic area interactions with dopamine neural
systems in the control of the onset and maintenance of maternal behavior in rats. Frontiers in
Neuroendocrinology 30:46–64.

Oudejans CB, Mulders J, Lachmeijer AM, van Dijk M, Könst AA, Westerman BA, van Wijk IJ,
Leegwater PA, Kato HD, Matsuda T, Wake N. 2004. The parent-of-origin effect of 10q22 in
pre-eclamptic females coincides with two regions clustered for genes with down-regulated
expression in androgenetic placentas. *Mol Hum Reprod* 10:589–598.

Patten MM, Ross L, Curley JP, Queller DC, Bonduriansky R, Wolf JB. 2014. The evolution of
genomic imprinting: Theories, predictions and empirical tests. Heredity 113:119–128.

Paxinos G, Franklin K. 2013. The mouse brain in stereotaxic coordinates. Elsevier.

Pertea M, Pertea GM, Antonescu CM, Chang TC, Mendell JT, Salzberg SL. 2015. StringTie
enables improved reconstruction of a transcriptome from RNA-seq reads. *Nat Biotechnol*
33:290–295.

Podjarny E, Losonczy G, Baylis C. 2004. Animal models of preeclampsia. In Seminars in
Nephrology 24:596-606. WB Saunders.

Qu D, McDonald A, Whiteley KJ, Bainbridge S A, Adamson S L. 2014. Layer-Enriched Tissue
Dissection of the Mouse Placenta in Late Gestation. In: Anne Croy B, Yamada A, DeMayo
F, Adamson SL. Editors. The Guide to Investigation of Mouse Pregnancy. pp. 529–535.
Elsevier.

Rahman A, Iqbal Z, Bunn J, Lovel H, Harrington R. 2004. The impact of maternal depression on
infant nutritional status and illness – a cohort study. Archives of General Psychiatry 61:946-
952.

Rai A, Cross JC. 2014. Development of the hemochorial maternal vascular spaces in the placenta
through endothelial and vasculogenic mimicry. *Dev Biol* 387:131–141.

Rawn SM, Cross JC. 2008. The Evolution, Regulation, and Function of Placenta-Specific Genes.
Annu Rev Cell Dev Biol 24:159–181.

Redman C W G, Sargent IL. 2009. Placental stress and pre-eclampsia: A Revised View. Placenta
30:38–42.

Reik W, Walter J. 2001. Genomic imprinting: Parental influence on the genome. *Nat Rev Genet*
2:21–32.

Reznick DN, Mateos M, Springer M S. 2002. Independent origins and rapid evolution of the
placenta in the fish genus Poeciliopsis. Science 298:1018–20.

Roberts RM, Green J A, Schulz, L C. 2016. The evolution of the placenta. Reproduction
152:R179-R189.

Sarver BA, Keeble S, Cosart T, Tucker PK, Dean MD, Good JM. 2017. Phylogenomic Insights
into Mouse Evolution Using a Pseudoreference Approach. *Genome Biol Evol* 9:726–739.

Schreurs MPH, Houston EM, May V, Cipolla MJ. 2012. The adaptation of the blood-brain
barrier to vascular endothelial growth factor and placental growth factor during pregnancy.
FASEB J 26:355–362.

Shi W, Krella A, Orth A, Yu Y, Fundele R. 2005. Widespread disruption of genomic imprinting
in adult interspecies mouse. Mus. hybrids. Genesis 43:100–108.

Simmons DG, Fortier AL, Cross JC. 2007. Diverse subtypes and developmental origins of
trophoblast giant cells in the mouse placenta. Developmental Biology 304:567-578.

Simmons DG, Rawn S, Davies A, Hughes M, Cross JC. 2008. Spatial and temporal expression
of the 23 murine prolactin/placental lactogen-related genes is not associated with their
position in the locus. BMC Genomics 9:352.

Soares MJ, Konno T, Alam S M K. 2007. The prolactin family: effectors of pregnancy-
dependent adaptations. Trends in Endocrinology and Metabolism 18:114–121.

Stamatovic SM, Keep RF, Andjelkovic AV. 2008. Brain endothelial cell-cell junctions: how to
'open' the blood brain barrier. *Curr Neuropharmacol* 6:179–92.

Takagi N, Sasaki M. 1975. Preferential inactivation of the paternally derived X chromosome in
the extraembryonic membranes of the mouse. Nature 256:640–642.

The Gene Ontology Consortium. 2017. Expansion of the gene ontology knowledgebase and
resources: The gene ontology consortium. *Nucleic Acids Res* 45:D331–D338.

Trivers RL. 1972. Parental investment and sexual selection. In. Campbell B. Editor. Sexual
selection and the descent of man, 1871-1971. pp. 136-179. Aldine-Atherton, Chicago.

Trivers RL. 1974. Parent-offspring conflict. *Integr Comp Biol* 14:249–264.

Trivers RL. 1985. Social Evolution. Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin-Cummings Pub Co.

Tunster SJ, Creeth H D, John RM. 2016a. The imprinted Phlda2 gene modulates a major
endocrine compartment of the placenta to regulate placental demands for maternal resources.
Dev Biol 409:251–260.

Tunster SJ, Jensen AB, John RM. 2013. Imprinted genes in mouse placental development and
the regulation of fetal energy stores. Reproduction 145:R117–R137.

Tunster SJ, McNamara GI, Creeth HDJ, John RM. 2016b. Increased dosage of the imprinted
Ascl2 gene restrains two key endocrine lineages of the mouse Placenta. *Dev Biol* 418:55–65.

Tunster SJ, Tycko B, John RM. 2010. The imprinted Phlda2 gene regulates extra-embryonic
energy stores. *Mol Cell Biol* 30:295–306.

Uzun A, Triche EW, Schuster J, Dewan AT, Padbury JF. 2016. DbPEC: A comprehensive
literature-based database for preeclampsia related genes and phenotypes. Database
2016:baw006.

Vrana PB. 2007. Genomic Imprinting as a Mechanism of Reproductive Isolation in Mammals. *J
Mammal* 88:5–23.

Vrana PB, Guan X J, Ingram RS, Tilghman SM. 1998. Genomic imprinting is disrupted in
interspecific Peromyscus hybrids. *Nat Genet* 20:362–365.

Wagner GP, Kin K, Muglia L, Pavličev M. 2014. Evolution of mammalian pregnancy and the
origin of the decidual stromal cell. Int J Dev Biol 58:117–126. 2014.

White MA, Ané C, Dewey C N, Larget B R, Payseur B A. 2009. Fine-scale phylogenetic
discordance across the house mouse genome. *PLoS Genet* 5:e1000729.

Whitten WK. 1956. Modification of the oestrous cycle of the mouse by external stimuli
associated with the male. *J Endocrinol* 13:399–404.

Wolf JB, Brodie ED. 1998. The coadaptation of parental and offspring characters. Evolution
52:299–308.

Wolf JB, Hager R. 2006. A maternal-offspring coadaptation theory for the evolution of genomic
imprinting. *PLoS Biol* 4:2238–2243.

Wolf JB, Wade, MJ. 2009. What are maternal effects and what are they not? *Phil Trans Royal
Soc B* 364:1107–1115.

Wu Y-Q, Lin X, Liu C-M, Jamrich M, Shaffer LG. 2001. Identification of a human brain-
specific gene, Calneuron 1, a new member of the Calmodulin superfamily. *Mol Genet Metab*
72:343–350.

Yamaguchi Y, Ruoslahti E. 1988. Expression of human proteoglycan in Chinese hamster ovary
cells inhibits cell proliferation. Nature 336:244–246.

Yang Z. 1998. Likelihood ratio tests for detecting positive selection and application to primate
lysozyme evolution. *Mol Biol Evol* 15:568–73.

Yang Z. 2007. PAML 4: Phylogenetic analysis by maximum likelihood. *Mol Biol Evol* 24:1586–
1591.

Yang Z, Rannala, B. 1997. Bayesian phylogenetic inference using DNA sequences: a Markov
Chain Monte Carlo Method. *Mol Biol Evol* 14:717–724.

Zebhauser R, Kammerer R, Eisenried A, McLellan A, Moore T, Zimmermann W. 2005.
Identification of a novel group of evolutionarily conserved members within the rapidly
diverging murine Cea family. Genomics 86:566–580.

Zechner U, Hemberger M, Constância M, Orth A, Dragatsis I, Lüttges A, Hameister H, Fundele
R. 2002. Proliferation and growth factor expression in abnormally enlarged placentas of
mouse interspecific hybrids. *Dev Dyn* 224:125–134.

Zechner U, Reule M, Orth A, Bonhomme F, Strack B, Guénet JL, Hameister H, Fundele R.
1996. An X-chromosome linked locus contributes to abnormal placental development in
mouse interspecific hybrids. *Nat Genet* 12:398–403.

Zechner U, Shi W, Hemberger M, Himmelbauer H, Otto S, Orth A, Kalscheuer V, Fischer U,
Elango R, Reis A, Vogel W. 2004. Divergent genetic and epigenetic post-zygotic isolation
mechanisms in Mus and Peromyscus. *J Evol Biol* 17:453–460.