Non-parallel transcriptional divergence during parallel adaptation

Eva K Fischer[1*,2], Youngseok Song[3], Kimberly A Hughes[4], Wen Zhou[3], Kim L Hoke[2]

[1] Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Behavior, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

[2] Department of Biology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA

[3] Department of Statistics, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA

[4] Department of Biological Science, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306 USA

*Corresponding author:

Eva K Fischer

Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Behavior

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Morrill Hall, 505 S. Goodwin Avenue

Urbana, IL 61801

Abstract

How underlying mechanisms bias evolution toward predictable outcomes remains an area

of active debate. In this study, we leveraged phenotypic plasticity and parallel adaptation across

independent lineages of Trinidadian guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*) to assess the predictability of

gene expression evolution during parallel adaptation. We observed substantial gene expression

plasticity as well as the evolution of expression plasticity itself across populations. Genes

exhibiting expression plasticity *within* populations were more likely to also differ in expression

between populations, with the direction of expression divergence more likely to be opposite than

in the same direction as plasticity. While we also found more overlap than expected by chance in

genes differentially expressed between high- and low-predation populations from different

lineages, the majority of differentially expressed genes were not shared between distinct

evolutionary lineages. Our data suggest alternative transcriptional configurations associated with

shared phenotypes, highlighting a role for transcriptional flexibility associated with parallel

phenotypic evolution in a species known for rapid adaptation.

Key words: *Poecilia reticulata*, transcriptomics, phenotypic plasticity, adaptation, parallel

evolution

Introduction

Phenotypic evolution is biased by the mechanisms that link genetic variation to phenotypic variation, i.e. the genotype-phenotype map (Alberch, 1991; Pigliucci, 2010). Mechanisms linking genotype to phenotype are characterized by both robustness and flexibility. Robust developmental processes buffer phenotypes from noise such that multiple transcriptional, biochemical, or cellular network configurations give rise to similar organismal phenotypes, while flexibility in these processes allows for phenotypic plasticity in response to environmental conditions (Marder & Goaillard, 2006; Siegal & Leu, 2014; Wagner, 2011). Though contrasting, both phenomena are ultimately bounded by phenotypic, developmental, genetic, and mechanistic constraints. The complex nature of the genotype-phenotype map and the existence of 'many-to-one' mappings across hierarchical levels of biological organization make it challenging to understand how mechanistic properties facilitate or constrain adaptive evolution. Here, we combine studies of phenotypic plasticity and parallel adaptation to assess how mechanistic biases shape evolutionary trajectories across timescales.

Studies of parallel adaptation can reveal biases in mechanisms of evolution by asking whether similar mechanism are associated with repeated, independent evolutionary transitions. Similar mechanisms underlying parallel evolutionary transitions suggest the genotype-phenotype map is constrained by limits on the possible ways to construct adaptive phenotypes (Losos, 2011). In contrast, non-shared mechanisms suggest that mechanistic flexibility may facilitate evolution by providing multiple alternative 'solutions' to a given adaptive problem and providing alternative paths by which organisms can reach adaptive peaks (Badyaev & Morrison, 2018; Drion, O'Leary, & Marder, 2015; Grashow, Brookings, & Marder, 2009). Such mechanistic flexibility may allow organisms to more easily reach the same adaptive peak from alternative starting points, and additionally buffer organisms from pleiotropic effects via compensatory mechanisms that rely on the many-to-one mappings created by these alternative paths.

One potential consequence of the biological robustness generated by many-to-one

mappings is that variation in the function of only a small number of key genes will alter organismal

phenotypes while variation in most genes has no phenotypic consequences (Yang, Maclean,

Park, Zhao, & Zhang, 2017), either because variation does not propagate to higher levels of

organization and/or because variation is compensatory. In this case, phenotypic evolution may

rely on a limited number of mechanistic paths, repeatedly targeting those mechanisms that that

yield the greatest phenotypic responses with the smallest pleiotropic costs. Indeed, compelling

examples demonstrate that similar phenotypes share underlying neural, physiological, molecular,

and/or genetic mechanisms, even across highly divergent taxa (e.g. Insel and Young, 2000;

Manceau et al., 2010; Pankey et al., 2014; Rosenblum et al., 2010). In contrast, other studies

demonstrate flexibility in underlying mechanisms suggesting that different mechanistic 'solutions'

can give rise to shared phenotypes in closely related species, among populations of the same

species, or even among individuals of the same population (e.g. Abouheif and Wray, 2002;

Crawford and Oleksiak, 2007; Drion et al., 2015; Grashow et al., 2009; Mandic et al., 2018).

Nevertheless, even if mechanistic flexibility is a common feature of robust biological networks,

shared genetic background or patterns of pleiotropy in a lineage may still direct evolutionary paths

toward predictable mechanistic pathways, especially at long evolutionary timescales (Gompel &

Prud'homme, 2009; Stern & Orgogozo, 2008). Empirical evidence for both shared and distinct

mechanisms underlying parallel phenotypic evolution leaves open the question of when and why

either pattern dominates.

One feature of biological networks that may channel divergence into particular paths is

environmentally induced plasticity. First, both plastic and evolutionary processes may rely on

those mechanistic paths that yield the greatest phenotypic responses. In this case, we expect

plastic and evolutionary responses to share underlying mechanisms, although they may not act

in the same direction. Theory predicts that plastic and evolutionary changes will be in the same

direction when plasticity in a novel environment is adaptive, increasing immediate survival and

allowing time for evolutionary divergence via co-option of mechanisms involved in environmentally

induced responses (Baldwin, 1896; Ghalambor, McKay, Carroll, & Reznick, 2007; Lande, 2009;

West-Eberhard, 2003). In contrast, plastic and evolutionary changes will be in opposite directions

when plasticity in a novel environment is non-adaptive thereby increasing the strength of selection

or when plastic responses 'overshoot' adaptive optima and are compensated by selection

(Conover, Duffy, & Hice, 2009; Ghalambor et al., 2007; Grether, 2005; Velotta & Cheviron, 2018).

Importantly, plasticity may facilitate adaptation under either scenario and empirical studies

document both patterns. In addition, plastic and evolutionary processes may rely on shared

mechanistic paths because the mechanisms mediating phenotypic plasticity promote the

accumulation of cryptic genetic variation that is released under new environmental conditions,

thereby fostering associations between plasticity and divergence (Draghi & Whitlock, 2012;

Espinosa-Soto, Martin, & Wagner, 2011). Finally, while associations between phenotypic

plasticity and evolution have primarily been considered in the context of phenotypic change,

associations between developmental plasticity and genetic divergence at the level of underlying

mechanisms could also arise if initially plastic compensatory or homeostatic responses to

maintain, rather than alter, organism level phenotypes become genetically fixed as adaptation

proceeds (Velotta & Cheviron, 2018), in which case we may also expect the evolution of plasticity

itself.

In the present study, we take advantage of parallel phenotypic evolution in independent

lineages of Trinidadian guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*) to explore patterns of flexibility and constraint

in transcriptional mechanisms mediating repeated adaptation. We compare whole-brain gene

expression patterns based on developmental experience and genetic background to test four

hypotheses: (1) that genes with significant expression plasticity are more likely to show genetic

divergence in expression, (2) that the direction of plastic responses predicts the direction of

genetic divergence, (3) that gene expression plasticity itself evolves, and (4) that parallel

phenotypic adaptation across independent lineages relies on shared gene expression changes.

Guppies as a model system

Guppies have become a model system in ecology and evolutionary biology due to repeated, independent adaptation of natural populations to distinct predation environments (Endler, 1995; Haskins, Haskins, McLaughlin, & Hewitt, 1961; D. Reznick, Butler IV, & Rodd, 2001). In Trinidad, high- and low-predation population pairs from different river drainages represent independent evolutionary lineages (Barson, Cable, & Van Oosterhout, 2009; Fraser, Künstner, Reznick, Dreyer, & Weigel, 2015; Gilliam, Fraser, & Alkins-Koo, 1993; Willing et al., 2010) in which colonization of low-predation environments has led to parallel, adaptive changes in life history traits, morphology, and behavior (Endler, 1995; Magurran, 2005; D. A. Reznick, Bryga, & Endler, 1990; D. Reznick et al., 2001; D. N. Reznick, 1997). For example, low-predation guppies shoal less tightly (Huizinga, Ghalambor, & Reznick, 2009; Magurran & Seghers, 1990b, 1991), escape more slowly (Ghalambor, Reznick, & Walker, 2004), are slower to re-commence movement following a predator encounter (Elvidge, Ramnarine, & Brown, 2014; Harris, Ramnarine, Smith, & Pettersson, 2010), and perform fewer predator inspections (Magurran & Seghers, 1990a, 1994) than their high-predation counterparts.

Building on decades of work comparing high- and low-predation populations from the wild, more recent laboratory breeding designs have disentangled genetic and environmental influences of predation on phenotypic differences. These studies demonstrate that a combination of genetic and environmental influences shape guppy life history (Torres Dowdall et al., 2012), morphology (Fischer, Soares, Archer, Ghalambor, & Hoke, 2013; C. A. Handelsman, Ruell, Torres-Dowdall, & Ghalambor, 2014; Ruell et al., 2013; Torres-Dowdal, Handelsman, Reznick, & Ghalambor, 2012), physiology (Fischer, Harris, Hofmann, & Hoke, 2014; Corey A. Handelsman et al., 2013), and behavior (Fischer, Ghalambor, & Hoke, 2016b; Huizinga et al., 2009; Torres-Dowdal et al., 2012). Yet despite many years of work at the level of organism level phenotypes, the mechanisms underlying adaptive phenotypic differences in guppies remain largely unexplored. A single study

characterized brain gene expression in multiple populations from the same lineage during the

earliest stages of adaptation (~3 generations after colonization of low-predation environments)

and found a negative relationship between phenotypic plasticity and adaptive divergence

(Ghalambor et al., 2015).

In the current study, we compare the effects of genetic background (high- versus low-

predation populations) and developmental environment (rearing with and without predator cues)

on brain gene expression patterns in two parallel, independent evolutionary lineages of guppies.

These lineages diverged at least 600,000 years ago, with subsequent, more recent colonization

of low-predation environments by high-predation ancestors within each river drainage (Fajen &

Breden, 1992; Willing et al., 2010). We here compare whole-brain gene expression patterns *within*

and *between* lineages based on evolutionary history with and rearing with predators. We focus

on gene expression specifically in the brain because the previous gene expression study in

guppies used brain tissue (Ghalambor et al., 2015) and because of previous evidence for

behavioral plasticity in our focal populations (Fischer et al., 2016b).

To test our hypotheses we (1) quantify the extent of overlap in genes exhibiting significant

expression plasticity as well as genetic expression divergence within each drainage, (2) examine

associations in the direction of plastic and genetic expression differences, (3) ask whether

expression plasticity itself evolves, and (4) assess whether parallel phenotypic adaptation across

lineages relies on shared gene expression mechanisms. First, if developmental plasticity does

indeed predict genetic divergence, we expect a within-lineage association in gene identity and/or

expression direction among those genes showing plastic and genetic expression differences.

Second, if gene expression plasticity itself evolves, we expect the extent and/or direction of plastic

responses to differ between genetic backgrounds. Finally, if only a few gene expression

configurations (i.e. mechanistic paths) can give rise to shared adaptive behavioral phenotypes,

we expect parallel adaptation to low-predation habitats to be characterized by parallel evolution

in a set of genes that are largely shared between lineages. In contrast, if transcriptional

mechanisms are flexible, we expect gene expression divergence in largely non-overlapping gene

sets. Taken together, our results allow us to assess the flexibility of transcriptional mechanisms

of adaptation across timescales – from developmental plasticity, to genetic divergence, to parallel

adaptation across lineages.

Material and Methods

Fish collection and rearing

We established lab populations of guppies from high- and low-predation populations pairs

collected from the Aripo and Quare river drainages in 2012 and 2014, respectively. To maintain

the genetic variation of the original wild-caught fish, we established 20 - 30 unique family lines for

each population (i.e., for each generation a single female from each family was crossed to a single

male from another family) (D. N. Reznick & Bryga, 1987). We used second-generation lab born

fish from these unique family lines in this study to minimize environmental and maternal effects.

At birth, we split second-generation siblings into rearing environments with (pred+) or without

(pred-) predator chemical cues, and they remained in these environments until the completion of

the experiment (as in Fischer et al., 2016). We used only mature males in this study. To maximize

the range of genetic variation captured among focal fish, all males in a given experimental group

(i.e. population and rearing environment) were from distinct families; however, our split-brood

design allowed us to simultaneously leverage genetic similarity among siblings and control for the

effects of genetic background on developmental responses. Figure 1 provides an overview of our

experimental design and interpretation of comparisons.

All guppies were individually housed in 1.5 liter tanks on a 12:12 hour light cycle at

Colorado State University. Fish were fed a measured food diet once daily, receiving Tetramin™

tropical fish flake paste and hatched *Artemia* cysts on an alternating basis. Prior to tissue

collection for this study, behavioral and hormone data were collected in an identical manner for

all fish and these results are reported elsewhere (Fischer et al., 2016b). All experimental methods

were approved by the Colorado State University Animal Care and Use Committee (Approval #12-
3818A).

Tissue collection and processing

We collected brain tissue from the Aripo and Quare lineage males described above in
2013 and 2015, respectively. To standardize any effects of recent experience, behavior, and
circadian rhythm on gene expression, we collected whole brains within 10 minutes of lights-on.
We interpret our transcriptional data as baseline, in the sense that fish were minimally stimulated
prior to tissue collection, and expression levels should therefore reflect genetic background and
developmental experience more strongly than responses to immediate environmental context.
Fish were anesthetized by immersion in ice water followed by rapid decapitation. Whole brains
were removed, flash frozen in liquid nitrogen, and stored at -80°C until further processing. Tissue
collection took <2 minutes, rapid enough to minimize changes in gene expression responses to
handling and dissection.

We extracted total RNA from brain tissue using the Qiagen RNeasy Lipid Tissue Mini Kit
(Qiagen, Germany) following manufacturer guidelines. We prepared separate sequencing
libraries for each individual using the NEBNext Ultra RNA Library Prep Kit for Illumina (New
England Biolabs, Massachusetts, USA) following manufacturer instructions. Libraries were
sequenced on an Illumina HiSeq 2000 at the Florida State University College of Medicine
Translational Science Laboratory (Tallahassee, Florida) in May 2014 (Aripo dataset) and January
2016 (Quare dataset). For the Aripo dataset, 40 samples (N=10 per group) were combined with
unique barcodes into eight samples per pool and each pool was sequenced on a single lane. For
the Quare dataset, 60 samples (N=12-14 per group) were combined into three pools with 20
samples per pool and each pool was sequenced in two separate lanes. Blocks of individuals run
in the same week were processed and sequenced together, and experimental groups were
balanced across sequencing lanes.

Transcript abundance estimation

We received 1.45 billion 100-bp paired-end reads that passed the HiSeq quality filter,

averaging 14.5 million reads per sample. We used Rcorrector to amend Illumina sequencing

errors (Song & Florea, 2015), and removed adapter sequences and trimmed reads for high-quality

sequence using Trim Galore! (Babraham Bioinformatics, Babraham Institute). Following

developer recommendations, we used a quality score of 33, a stringency of 5, and a minimum

read length of 36bp. We aligned corrected, trimmed reads from both datasets to the guppy

genome (http://uswest.ensembl.org/Poecilia_reticulata; downloaded November 2019) and

estimated transcript abundance using STAR (Dobin et al., 2013) with default parameters. On

average, 91% (range: 88.8% – 94.2%) of sequences per individual mapped to the guppy genome

assembly.

Data filtering and screening

Preliminary cluster analyses revealed retinal contamination in a subset of our Aripo

dataset brain samples. While opsins are expressed at low levels in the brain, the very high

expression levels (>10,000 copies) in three samples pointed to retinal contamination. To deal with

this issue, we devised a sample filtering and screening procedure to remove genes in which

expression differences between samples were likely dominated by retinal contamination. Briefly,

we first filtered genes with low expression, then we used contigs annotated as known retinal genes

(Rhodopsin, red/green-sensitive opsins, blue-sensitive opsins) as seed contigs to identify other

contamination-related transcripts based on high positive correlations of expression levels with

seed genes. We calculated the gene-wise sum of correlations between candidate genes and seed

genes and performed multiple hypothesis testing using a false discovery rate (FDR) controlling

procedure. The nominal level of FDR was set to α=0.2 to remove presumptive contaminant

contigs. Using this approach, we identified 1,559 contigs as presumptive retina-enriched genes

(~ 3% of all contigs in our final assembly) which we removed from both datasets in all subsequent

analyses (Table S1). More detailed descriptions of statistical procedures are in the Supplemental

Methods.

Differential expression analysis

Due to differences in timing of fish rearing, sample processing, and sequencing, we did

not combine Aripo and Quare datasets for statistical analysis. We instead performed analysis in

an identical fashion for both drainages and subsequently conducted separate analyses to test

hypotheses concerning mechanistic parallelism across drainages (see below). Standard

differential expression analysis packages could not accommodate the random effects in our

experimental design (i.e. family and week; see below) but including these effects improved model

fit and reflected our split-brood experimental design. Upon fitting a generalized linear mixed model

with negative binomial link to each data set (detailed in the Supplemental Methods), a portion of

genes had statistically significant random effects due to either family or week or both. Model

comparisons between the generalized linear model without random effects and the generalized

linear mixed model including week and family effects supported incorporating random effects, as

likelihood ratio tests indicated better fit of the mixed models for 391 out of 19,004 genes in the

Aripo dataset and 1,194 out of 19,902 genes in the Quare dataset. For consistency, we performed

differential expression analysis using generalized linear mixed models with random effects for all

genes as further detailed in the Supplemental Materials.

We normalized read counts using DESeq2 in R (Love, Huber, & Anders, 2014) and

performed differential expression analysis using the lme4 package in R (github.com/lme4).

Normalized count data were modeled using a generalized linear mixed model with negative

binomial distribution. We included population of origin, rearing environment, and their interaction

as fixed effects. In addition, we included family (siblings split across rearing environments) and

week (tissue was collected from animals in balanced blocks across multiple weeks) as random

effects. A Wald's test provided p-values for main effects and interaction effects for each gene

(Lehmann & Romano, 2005). We adjusted p-values for multiple hypothesis testing using a direct

approach for FDR correction (Storey, 2002) as implemented in the fdrtool package in R (Strimmer,

2008). We considered transcripts differentially expressed (DE) if the adjusted p-value for an effect

was below 0.05. To examine whether differential expression calls were influenced by transcript

abundance, we compared mean and median counts of DE and non-DE genes using two sample

t-tests and Wilcoxon rank sum tests. We also compared overall patterns of gene-wise variance

between DE and non-DE groups with respect to either population or rearing effect using Siegel-

Tukey tests and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests. We performed GO term enrichment analysis for all

sets of DE transcripts using annotation information for 'Biological Processes' in the topGO

package in R (Alexa & Rahnenfuhrer, 2016).

Overlap in identity and expression direction of DE gene sets within lineages

To determine if transcripts exhibiting expression plasticity in response to rearing with

predators were more likely to also exhibit evolutionary divergence between high- and low-

predation populations, we evaluated overlap in transcripts differentially expressed between

populations and between rearing conditions as well as their directions of expression change. To

test the hypothesis that initial plastic responses following colonization of low-predation

environments might drive subsequent divergence, we specifically compared pattern of ancestral

plasticity (i.e. high-predation fish reared with and without predators) to genetic divergence (high-

versus low-predation fish reared in the novel predator-free environment) within each drainage.

We used post-hoc tests of simple effects to identify DE genes in these comparisons and estimate

log-fold gene expression changes. We then used log-fold expression changes to determine

whether gene expression differences were in the same/concordant direction (i.e. upregulated in

high-predation populations and in response to rearing with predator cues, or down-regulated in

high-predation populations and in response to rearing with predator cues) or opposite/non-

concordant direction (upregulated in high-predation populations but down-regulated in response

to rearing with predators, or vice versa).

Within each drainage, we compared the overlap in genes with both statistically significant

genetic and plastic expression changes. We compared the association between directions of

plasticity and divergence (concordant vs. non-concordant) in (1) those genes with both significant

ancestral plasticity and significant population differences, and (2) all transcripts with significant

population differences in expression, including those without significant expression plasticity. The

second comparison addressed the possibility that even subthreshold expression plasticity in

response to rearing environment could influence patterns of expression divergence, especially

given the high false negative rate in our conservative DE analyses. Because these comparisons

rely on two comparisons to a single group (high predation fish reared without exposure to predator

cues), the estimates of plasticity and divergence are dependent. We adapted a parametric

bootstrap method (Efron & Tibshirani, 1993) similar to the approach implemented by (W. C. Ho &

Zhang, 2019) but accounting for conditional probabilities. We tested whether the conditional

probabilities of gene expression divergence differed for genes that exhibited ancestral plasticity

and those that did not. We further tested whether conditional probabilities for upregulated or

downregulated genes in the low predation population compared to the high predation population

differed depending on the direction of plasticity. We calculated parametric bootstrap confidence

intervals for these differences in conditional probabilities as detailed in the Supplemental

Methods, with confidence intervals that do not include zero indicating association between

divergence and plasticity.

Analysis of evolution of expression plasticity

To test for the evolution of plasticity in gene expression responses, we examined the

subset of transcripts with significant interaction effects in our differential expression analysis (see

above). We grouped genes with significant interaction effects into categories for the evolution of

plasticity outlined by Renn and Schumer (2013) based on *post hoc* differences between rearing

environments within a population (p<0.05): (1) Assimilated: plasticity in the ancestral high-

predation population but a loss of plasticity in the derived low-predation population; (2)

Accommodated: a change in the degree, but not the direction, of plasticity in the derived as

compared to the ancestral population; (3) Reversed: opposing directions of plasticity in high-

versus low-predation populations; (4) Evolved plastic: no plasticity in the ancestral high-predation

population but an emergence of plasticity in the derived low-predation population; and (5)

Unclassified: genes that had a significant main interaction effect but no significant *post hoc* rearing

differences and could therefore not be unambiguously classified into one of the other categories.

All statistical tests and data visualization were performed in R (version 3.5.1; The R Foundation

for Statistical Computing).

Parallelism in DE gene identity and expression direction between lineages

To ask whether parallel phenotypic changes across independent lineages rely on shared

gene expression changes, we evaluated overlap in DE transcript identity and expression direction

between the Aripo and Quare lineage datasets. We used chi-square tests of independence to test

for greater than chance overlap *between* drainages in those gene sets differentially expressed

based on rearing environment or population of origin *within* drainages, as well as to test for biases

in concordant versus non-concordant expression between drainages. We performed two

additional comparisons to address potential bias in our conclusions due to high false negative

rates in gene expression data (Rice, Schork, & Rao, 2008). First, we performed the same analysis

as before at two less stringent p-value cut-offs (p=0.1 and 0.2). Second, for comparisons of

expression direction, we made an additional, more conservative comparison by including not only

those genes differentially expressed in *both* drainages (i.e. the intersection of DE gene lists), but

also those differentially expressed in *either* drainage (i.e. the union of DE gene lists) in the

analysis. We again used log-fold expression differences to call gene expression as being in the

same/concordant or opposite/non-concordant direction between drainages.

We also performed one addition comparison to assess parallelism in a subset of the

population DE genes likely to arise from selection rather than other evolutionary processes, such

as drift. We identified to those genes mostly likely to have diverged by selection, rather than by

drift, by calculating P_{ST} (a measure of phenotypic divergence between populations) from

phenotypic variance components and comparing it to published estimates of F_{ST} (a measure of

neutral genetic divergence between populations) for the focal populations, using the method of

Leinonen, Cano, Mäkinen, & Merilä (2006). For these calculations, we made the conservative

assumption that heritability (h^2) of transcript abundance = 0.5 as we have done previously

(Ghalambor et al., 2015), and obtained estimates of within and between population variance from

general linear mixed models (see Supplemental Methods). We then restricted DE gene sets in

both lineages to those in which $P_{ST} > F_{ST}$ and compared the number of overlapping genes and

their relative expression direction using chi-square tests as above. We used F_{ST} estimates for our

focal populations (Aripo = 0.225; Quare = 0.340) reported by Willing et al. (2010).

Results

Differential gene expression and GO term enrichment

Before testing our specific hypotheses, we first summarized differential expression

patterns in both datasets. In the Aripo drainage, 766 genes were differentially expressed (DE)

between high- and low-predation populations, 1,118 genes were differentially expressed between

pred- and pred+ fish, and 825 genes had interaction effects (Fig. 2; Table S2). DE genes were

enriched for GO categories including DNA integration, immune function, and morphogenesis. In

the Quare drainage, 3,831 genes were differentially expressed between high- and low-predation

populations, 791 genes were differentially expressed between pred- and pred+ fish, and 586

genes had interaction effects (Fig. 2; Table S3). DE genes were enriched for GO categories

including immune function, developmental processes, and neurogenesis. Complete results of GO

enrichment analyses for population of origin, rearing, and interaction effects are in the

Supplemental Materials (Tables S4 & S5).

Given the marked difference in the total number of DE genes between datasets, we looked

for evidence that this pattern might arise from technical variation or expression bias. While we

cannot rule out some influence of technical variation, we found no evidence for differences in

sequence quality, read alignment statistics, or variance in transcript abundance to suggest that

variation in the number of DE transcripts between drainages was of technical origin. Nor did we

find evidence that identification of DE transcripts was biased by transcript expression level: mean

and median gene expression were significantly lower in DE (population, rearing, and/or interaction

effects) as compared to non-DE transcripts in both the Aripo (Fig. S1; mean: DE=263, non-

DE=344, $p<0.0001$; median: DE=65, non-DE=107, $p<0.0001$), and Quare (Fig. S1; mean:

DE=264, non-DE=334, $p<0.0001$; median: DE=86, non-DE=101, $p<0.0001$) datasets. This

suggests that identification of DE transcripts was not simply a side effect of relatively greater

expression of these transcripts.

Expression plasticity biases the propensity for and direction of genetic expression divergence

Evolutionary theory and empirical studies suggest that environmentally induced plasticity

may facilitate adaptation to novel environments. To test this prediction, we first asked whether

genes with significant ancestral expression plasticity were more likely to show genetic divergence

in expression. To compare expression changes upon colonization of low-predation environments

by high-predation fish to those present after generations of adaptation to low-predation

environments, we examined the extent of overlap in gene sets differentially expressed between

high-predation fish reared with and without predators and high- versus low-predation fish reared

in a shared, predator-free environment. In both drainages, the DE genes with significant ancestral

plasticity were more likely to show significant population divergence than expected by chance

(Aripo: 264 transcripts, 95% CI for differences in conditional probability of significant divergence

for plastic genes compared to conditional probability of divergence for non-plastic genes: [0.125,

0.150]; Quare: 409 transcripts, 95% CI: [0.211,0.239]), supporting an association between plastic

responses and genetic divergence.

399   We next asked whether the directions of expression plasticity and genetic divergence were

associated. We did so for those genes with both significant ancestral plasticity and population

differences, as well as the larger set of all transcripts with significant population differences (i.e.

including those without significant expression plasticity). We performed the second, more

conservative comparison because we reasoned that even subthreshold expression plasticity

could influence the direction of adaptive divergence. Within both drainages, we found a signature

of non-adaptive plasticity associated with genetic expression divergence. Approximately 84% of

DE genes exhibited population and rearing expression changes in non-concordant directions in

the Aripo drainage (95% CI for difference in probability of same versus opposite expression

direction: [-0.564,-0.499]), and 68% of DE genes exhibiting non-concordant expression in the

Quare drainage (95% CI: [-0.520,-0.456]) (Fig. 3). Patterns were consistent in both drainages

when we considered the larger set of all genes with significant population expression differences

(Aripo: 80% of genes with non-concordant expression, 95% CI: [-0.811,-0.752]; Quare: 66% of

genes with non-concordant expression, 95% CI: [-0.803,-0.733]).

Evolution of expression plasticity

415   We next explored the evolution of expression plasticity itself. We identified genes with

evolved expression plasticity as those in which the direction and/or degree of plasticity depended

on population of origin, i.e. those genes with significant population-by-rearing interaction effects.

The number of genes with significant expression plasticity that evolved (i.e. significant rearing and

interaction effects) was approximately a quarter to a third of the number of genes with significant

expression plasticity that did not evolve (i.e. significant rearing effect but not interaction; 263/1,118

in Aripo, 286/791 in Quare) (Fig. 2).

To characterize how expression plasticity evolved, we further subdivided genes with

significant population-by-rearing interaction effects into one of five categories: assimilated,

accommodated, reversed, evolved plastic, or unclassified (Fig. 4A; based on Renn and Schumer,

2013). We found many transcripts that exhibited evolution of plasticity, with all five categories

represented in both datasets (Fig. 4B). In the Aripo drainage 263 (32%) transcripts showed

patterns of expression assimilation, 81 (10%) transcripts showed patterns of expression

accommodation, 113 (14%) transcripts exhibited reversed plasticity, and 182 (22%) transcripts

evolved plasticity in the derived population. In the Quare drainage, 164 (28%) transcripts showed

patterns of expression assimilation, 110 (19%) transcripts showed patterns of expression

accommodation, 128 (22%) transcripts exhibited reversed plasticity, and 95 (16%) transcripts

evolved plasticity in the derived population (Fig. 4B).

Parallelism in gene expression patterns across drainages

To test for shared mechanisms mediating parallel phenotypic adaptation across

drainages, we asked whether differentially expressed genes within drainages were overlapping

in identity and expression direction between drainages. Of the genes that diverged between high-

and low-predation populations within a drainage (i.e., population main effect), 174 were

overlapping between drainages (Table S6), more than expected by chance (χ^2=8.02, p=0.0046).

However, the direction of expression divergence among these overlapping genes was not

associated across the two drainages (χ^2=0.16, p=0.686): 91 genes had concordant expression

changes and 83 genes had non-concordant expression changes between drainages (Fig. 5). To

control for the influence of false negatives on our conclusions, we repeated this comparison at

less stringent significance cut-offs. At a p=0.1, we found marginally significant overlap in gene

identify (347 overlapping genes; χ^2=3.38, p=0.06), but no association in expression direction

(χ^2=0.65, p=0.42), and at p=0.2 we found no significant overlap or association in expression

direction. As a final, more conservative test, we compared the subset of genes with strong

evidence for adaptive population divergence due to selection by restricting our comparison to

population DE genes for which $P_{ST} > F_{ST}$. We found 534 genes (mean P_{ST} = 0.38, F_{ST} = 0.225) in

the Aripo and 1163 genes (mean P_{ST} = 0.496, F_{ST} = 0.340) in the Quare drainage that met this

criterion. Of these, 53 were overlapping between drainages, again more than expected by chance

(χ^2=12.7, p=0.0004), but without any association in expression direction (28 genes had

concordant expression changes and 25 genes had non-concordant expression changes between

drainages). P_{ST} values for all genes are in Table S8.

Of the genes that showed significant expression plasticity (i.e. main effect of rearing), 64

transcripts were overlapping between drainages (Table S7), more than expected by chance

(χ^2=14.06, p=0.0001). Of these 43 had expression changes in the same direction and 21 had

expression changes in opposite directions between drainages, a significant association between

drainages in the direction of expression plasticity associated with rearing environment (χ^2=7.56,

p=0.006) (Fig. 5). At less stringent p-value cut-offs for differential expression we found no more

overlap in gene identity than expected by chance (p<0.1: 108 overlapping genes; χ^2=0.05, p=0.81;

p<0.2: 276 overlapping genes; χ^2=1.36, p=0.24).

Discussion

We examined transcriptomic differences associated with adaptive divergence and rearing

environment across repeated, independent evolutionary lineages in guppies. Within lineages, we

observed phenotypic plasticity in gene expression patterns as well as the evolution of gene

expression plasticity itself. Plastic genes were more likely to exhibit population differences in

expression, and these population differences were more likely to be in the opposite, rather than

the same, direction as ancestral expression plasticity. Comparing across lineages, gene sets

differentially expressed were largely non-overlapping (i.e. >75% non-shared identity) both for

genes that diverged between populations and for plastic genes. Nonetheless, the small number

of DE genes that did overlap between drainages was more than expected by chance for both

population divergence and plasticity. Taken together our findings suggest that a small number of

core genes may be repeatedly targeted during colonization of low-predation environments, but

that largely non-shared, alternative transcriptional solutions are associated with parallel

phenotypic adaptation across lineages.

Impacts of gene expression plasticity on expression evolution

A growing number of studies are using transcriptomic and proteomic surveys to address

the long-standing debate on the role of plasticity in evolution, with contrasting results favoring the

alternative hypotheses that adaptive (Fraser et al., 2014; Gleason & Burton, 2015; Li et al., 2018;

Mäkinen, Papakostas, Vøllestad, Leder, & Primmer, 2016; Scoville & Pfrender, 2010; Shaw et al.,

2014; Wang & Althoff, 2019) versus non-adaptive (Dayan, Crawford, & Oleksiak, 2015;

Ghalambor et al., 2015; W. Ho & Zhang, 2018; Pespeni et al., 2013; Schaum, Rost, Millar, &

Collins, 2013) plasticity facilitates adaptation. We recently proposed that non-adaptive plasticity

dominates during the earliest stages of rapid evolution, and that adaptive plasticity may contribute

to subsequent fine-tuning of phenotypes (Fischer et al., 2016a). In line with this prediction and

our previous findings, we report here that the strong signature of non-adaptive plasticity in brain

gene expression (89% of transcripts) observed in guppy populations in the earliest stages of

adaptation to low-predation environments (Ghalambor et al., 2015) is present but weaker in long-

established low-predation populations. Furthermore, within our data set, this signature of non-

adaptive plasticity was more apparent in the more recently diverged Aripo lineage (80% of genes)

as compared to the older Quare lineage (65% of genes). Our findings highlight the need to

explicitly consider how plasticity relates to divergence throughout successive stages of adaptation

in order to build a more holistic understanding of the role of plasticity in adaptation.

Evolution of plasticity in gene expression

Diverse transcriptional patterns could accompany evolved differences in behavioral

plasticity (Renn & Schumer, 2013), but relevant data characterizing the evolution of gene

expression plasticity in the brain has been lacking. In both lineages, we found approximately one

third magnitude evolution of plasticity as we did conserved plasticity. As was observed for

transcriptomic evolution of gill tissue in stickleback fish (Gibbons, Metzger, Healy, & Schulte,

2017), plasticity evolution showed no consistent pattern, with genes gaining, losing, and switching

the direction of expression plasticity between ancestral and derived populations in both lineages.

The lack of consistency in these patterns and the dearth of studies that have characterized the

evolution of gene expression plasticity make these patterns difficult to interpret at present. Some

of the diversity is likely associated with adaptive phenotypic divergence between high- and low-

predation populations, in which initially plastic behavioral shifts may become fixed, eliminated, or

altered over time. For example, evolution in gene expression plasticity could reflect the gains,

losses, and switches in plasticity of different behaviors in these populations (Fischer et al., 2016b).

Alternatively, compensatory and homeostatic mechanisms could promote diversity among plastic

responses in gene expression without altering higher-level phenotypic traits such as morphology

and behavior (Badyaev, 2018; Fischer, Ghalambor, & Hoke, 2016a; Renn & Schumer, 2013).

Finally, because fish in low-predation habitats experience relaxed selection on predator-induced

plasticity in conjunction with low effective populations sizes, some of the evolution of

transcriptional plasticity we report likely arose as a product of genetic drift, rather than selection

for altered plastic responses (Lynch, 2007). Documenting the evolution of expression plasticity is

an important first step, and additional studies are needed to understand the ubiquity and

evolutionary sources of these patterns.

Transcriptomic signatures of population divergence in two independent evolutionary lineages

We identified many genes differentially expressed between high- and low-predation

populations in each river drainage. The absolute number of population DE transcripts was smaller

in the Aripo drainage as compared to the Quare drainage, but the number of developmental and

interaction differences was greater in the Aripo drainage. The Quare dataset was 1.5X larger than

the Aripo dataset (40 versus 60 total samples) and the identification of a greater number of DE

genes in the Quare dataset is therefore likely in part related to greater statistical power. This

difference may also be biological in origin, as high- and low-predation populations in the Quare

drainage show greater genetic divergence than those in the Aripo drainage (Willing et al., 2010).

Indeed, we note that the larger number of genes in the Quare dataset come from a large difference

the number of genes with population, but not rearing or interaction, effects. In sum, we suggest

that the difference in the number of differentially expressed transcripts between datasets is likely

a combination of greater statistical power in the larger Quare dataset and the greater degree of

genetic divergence in the Quare as compared to the Aripo river drainage (Willing et al., 2010).

When we compared DE gene sets between drainages, we found a small, but significant,

number of population and rearing DE genes shared across lineages. However, the majority of DE

genes were non-shared across drainages for both population (Aripo: 78%; Quare: 96%) and

rearing (Aripo: 94%; Quare: 92%) effects. Only rearing genes showed a significant association in

expression direction, with 67% of genes concordantly differentially expressed between lineages.

In contrast, only 52% of the genes that diverged when low-predation fish colonized high-predation

habitats in both drainages were concordantly differentially expressed. We suggest that these

patterns across drainages point to a small number of core genes that exhibit predictable, plastic

expression responses upon colonization of low-predation environments, but that lineage-specific

selection pressures, differences in genetic background, non-adaptive processes (e.g. drift,

inbreeding, founder effects), and alternative compensatory gene expression responses give rise

to largely non-overlapping, non-concordant expression differences associated with parallel

phenotypic adaptation across drainages.

A previous study in guppies performed a similar comparison of gene expression changes

associated with adaptation to low-predation environments (Ghalambor et al., 2015) and found a

strong signal of concordant differential expression in genes differentially expressed based on

population of origin. Whereas the present study compared long-term natural population

divergence across drainages, Ghalambor et al. (2015) characterized early stages of adaptation

of experimentally introduced low-predations populations derived from founders from a single high-

predation source population within the same drainage. These contrasting findings in comparisons

of population pairs within the same drainage versus across drainages highlight the impacts of

standing genetic variation within the source population on mechanisms of divergence (Feiner,

Rago, While, & Uller, 2017; Thompson, Osmond, & Schluter, 2019), particularly at early stages

of evolution (Barrett & Schluter, 2008): while alternative transcriptional 'solutions' are possible,

shared genetic background appears to bias evolutionary outcomes toward shared patterns.

Both adaptive and non-adaptive processes may contribute to the combination of shared

and distinct transcriptional mechanisms we find associated with parallel, adaptive life-history,

morphological, and behavioral phenotypes across lineages in guppies. First, as described above,

differences in standing genetic variation likely influence which mechanisms are available to

selection in response to common environmental conditions in different drainages (Barrett &

Schluter, 2008; Thompson et al., 2019). Second, low-predation populations are typically

established by a very small number of individuals (Barson et al., 2009; Fraser et al., 2015; Willing

et al., 2010), making them susceptible to the unpredictable, non-adaptive influences of founder's

effects, genetic drift, and/or inbreeding on gene expression divergence – although we note that

we found no more evidence for shared mechanisms among genes most likely under selection

than among all diverged genes (i.e. genes with $P_{ST} > F_{ST}$). Third, the large number of significantly

evolved genes that did not overlap between drainages may also represent adaptive responses to

drainage- or site-specific environmental factors other than predation (Fitzpatrick, Torres-Dowdall,

Reznick, Ghalambor, & Chris Funk, 2014; Zandonà et al., 2011). Finally, alternative

compensatory or homeostatic gene expression responses may arise in response to any of the

above factors, leading to alternative transcriptional configurations associated with similar higher-

level phenotypes. In other words, genetic similarity among ancestral populations may channel

low-predation populations within the same drainage toward shared transcriptional solutions (as in

Ghalambor et al. 2015), while differences in standing genetic variation, drainage-specific

environmental conditions, founder effects, and alternative compensatory changes could result in

distinct mechanistic paths to arrive at shared organism-level phenotypes. We cannot definitely

distinguish causal from non-adaptive and compensatory gene expression differences under these

scenarios – indeed, it is likely a combination of these factors that contribute to distinct

transcriptional patterns associated with parallel adaptation. Nonetheless, in either case,

alternative transcriptional patterns suggest that mechanistic flexibility and 'many-to-one' mapping

of gene expression to organism level phenotypes may facilitate adaptation.

Conclusions

We assessed the extent to which adaptation to common environments targets predictable

changes in transcript abundance across independent evolutionary events. Within lineages, genes

with greater expression plasticity were more likely to diverge in expression between populations,

but in the direction opposite of plastic changes. Despite a small number of differentially expressed

genes shared across drainages, parallel adaptation to low-predation environments in independent

lineages was associated with divergence in largely non-overlapping transcripts. While

identification of shared genes is generally used as the starting point for work exploring

mechanisms of parallel adaptation – and our work here indeed suggests that a small number of

core genes may indeed be critical during the earliest stages of adaptation – we propose that

parallel evolutionary transitions are not limited to a small set of possible transcriptional

mechanisms in guppies. Instead, our results highlight the potential for alternative transcriptional

solutions associated with parallel, adaptive trait evolution even within a single species.

Transcriptional network versatility, in which diverse alterative network configurations can produce

common network outputs and behavioral phenotypes, may allow underlying networks to

simultaneously accommodate the influences of selection, drift, and genetic background and

thereby facilitate evolution in a species known for rapid adaptation to novel environments.

Acknowledgements: We thank the members of the Colorado State University Guppy Group for

fish care, especially Sarah E Westrick and Kimberly E Dolphin for help with tissue collection. We

thank Laura R Stein for assistance with tissue processing and Cameron K Ghalambor for fruitful

discussions and comments on earlier versions of the manuscript. All high-powered computing

was performed on the Odyssey computing cluster supported by the FAS Science Division

Research Computing Group at Harvard University. This work was supported by the National

Science Foundation DDIG-1311680 (to EKF), RCN IOS-1256839 (to EKF), IOS-1354755 (to

KLH), IOS-1354775 (to KAH), IOS-0934451 (to KAH), DEB-0846175 (to CKG), IIS-1545994 (to

WZ), and US Department of Energy DE-SC0018344 (to WZ).

Data Accessibility: Raw sequencing reads will be made available through the NCBI SRA

repository upon publication. R code for statistical analyses will be made available on GitHub

upon publication.

Author contributions: EKF and KLH conceived of the study; EKF collected samples and

performed molecular work; EKF and KAH performed gene expression mapping, transcript

abundance estimation, and preliminary differential expression analyses; YS and WZ devised

and performed statistical analyses with input from EKF and KLH; EKF and KLH wrote the

manuscript with contributions from all authors. All authors gave final approval for publication.

References

Abouheif, E., & Wray, G. (2002). Evolution of the gene network underlying wing polymorphism in

ants. *Science*, *297*(2002), 249–252. doi: 10.1126/science.1071468

Alberch, P. (1991). From genes to phenotype: dynamical systems and evolvability. *Genetica*, *84*,

5–11. doi: 10.1007/BF00123979

Alexa, A., & Rahnenfuhrer, J. (2016). *topGO: Enrichment Analysis for Gene Ontoloty*. R package

version 2.30.1.

Badyaev, A. V. (2018). Evoulutionary transitions in controls reconcile adaptation with continuity

of evolution. *Seminars in Cell and Developmental Biology*, *88*, 36–45. doi:

10.1016/j.semcdb.2018.05.014

Badyaev, A. V, & Morrison, E. S. (2018). Emergent buffering balances evolvability and robustness

in the evolution of phenotypic flexibility. *Evolution*, *72*(3), 647–662. doi: 10.1111/evo.13441

Baldwin, J. M. (1896). A New Factor in Evolution. *The American Naturalist*, *30*, 441–451; 536–

553.

Barrett, R. D. H., & Schluter, D. (2008). Adaptation from standing genetic variation. *Trends in*

Ecology and Evolution, *23*(1), 38–44. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2007.09.008

Barson, N. J., Cable, J., & Van Oosterhout, C. (2009). Population genetic analysis of microsatellite

variation of guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*) in Trinidad and Tobago: Evidence for a dynamic

source-sink metapopulation structure, founder events and population bottlenecks. *Journal of*

Evolutionary Biology, *22*(3), 485–497. doi: 10.1111/j.1420-9101.2008.01675.x

Conover, D. O., Duffy, T. A., & Hice, L. A. (2009). The covariance between genetic and

environmental influences across ecological gradients: Reassessing the evolutionary

significance of countergradient and cogradient variation. *Annals of the New York Academy*

of Sciences, *1168*, 100–129. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04575.x

Crawford, D. L., & Oleksiak, M. F. (2007). The biological importance of measuring individual

variation. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, *210*(9), 1613–1621. doi: 10.1242/jeb.005454

Dayan, D. I., Crawford, D. L., & Oleksiak, M. F. (2015). Phenotypic plasticity in gene expression

contributes to divergence of locally adapted populations of *Fundulus heteroclitus*. *Molecular*

Ecology, *24*(13), 3345–3359. doi: 10.1111/mec.13188

Dobin, A., Davis, C. A., Schlesinger, F., Drenkow, J., Zaleski, C., Jha, S., … Gingeras, T. R.

(2013). STAR: Ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinformatics*, *29*(1), 15–21. doi:

10.1093/bioinformatics/bts635

Draghi, J. A., & Whitlock, M. C. (2012). Phenotypic plasticity facilitates mutational variance,

genetic variance, and evolvability along the major axis of environmental variation. *Evolution*,

66(9), 2891–2902. doi: 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2012.01649.x

Drion, G., O'Leary, T., & Marder, E. (2015). Ion channel degeneracy enables robust and tunable

neuronal Firing rates. *PNAS*. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1516400112

Efron, B., & Tibshirani, R. J. (1993). An introduction to the bootstrap. Monographs on Statistics

and Applied Probability, No. 57. Chapman and Hall, London, 436 p. In *Monographs on*

Statistics and Applied Probability.

Elvidge, C. K., Ramnarine, I., & Brown, G. E. (2014). Compensatory foraging in Trinidadian

guppies: Effects of acute and chronic predation threats. *Current Zoology*, *60*(3), 323–332.

doi: 10.1093/czoolo/60.3.323

Endler, J. A. (1995). Multiple-trait coevolution and environmental gradients in guppies. *Trends in*

Ecology & Evolution, *10*(1), 22–29. doi: 10.1016/S0169-5347(00)88956-9

Espinosa-Soto, C., Martin, O. C., & Wagner, A. (2011). Phenotypic plasticity can facilitate

adaptive evolution in gene regulatory circuits. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, *11*(5), 1–14. doi:

10.1186/1471-2148-11-5

Fajen, A. V. A., & Breden, F. (1992). Mitochondrial DNA sequence variation among natural

populations of the Trinidad guppy, *Poecilia reticulata*. *Evolution*, *46*(5), 1457–1465.

Feiner, N., Rago, A., While, G. M., & Uller, T. (2017). Signatures of selection in embryonic

transcriptomes of lizards adapting in parallel to cool climate. *Evolution*, *72*(1), 67–81. doi:

10.1111/evo.13397

Fischer, E. K., Ghalambor, C. K., & Hoke, K. L. (2016a). Can a Network Approach Resolve How

Adaptive vs Nonadaptive Plasticity Impacts Evolutionary Trajectories? *Integrative and*

Comparative Biology, *56*(5), 877–888. doi: 10.1093/icb/icw087

Fischer, E. K., Ghalambor, C. K., & Hoke, K. L. (2016b). Plasticity and evolution in correlated

suites of traits. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, *29*(5), 991–1002. doi: 10.1111/jeb.12839

Fischer, E. K., Harris, R. M., Hofmann, H. A., & Hoke, K. L. (2014). Predator exposure alters

stress physiology in guppies across timescales. *Hormones and Behavior*, *65*(2), 165–172.

doi: 10.1016/j.yhbeh.2013.12.010

Fischer, E. K., Soares, D., Archer, K. R., Ghalambor, C. K., & Hoke, K. L. (2013). Genetically and

environmentally mediated divergence in lateral line morphology in the Trinidadian guppy

(*Poecilia reticulata*). *Journal of Experimental Biology*, *216*(16), 3132–3142. doi:

10.1242/jeb.081349

Fitzpatrick, S. W., Torres-Dowdall, J., Reznick, D. N., Ghalambor, C. K., & Chris Funk, W. (2014).

Parallelism Isn't Perfect: Could Disease and Flooding Drive a Life-History Anomaly in

Trinidadian Guppies? *The American Naturalist*, *183*(2), 290–300. doi: 10.1086/674611

Fraser, B. A., Janowitz, I., Thairu, M., Travis, J., Hughes, K. A., Fraser, B. A., … Hughes, K. A.

(2014). Phenotypic and genomic plasticity of alternative male reproductive tactics in sailfin

mollies. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *281*, 20132310.

Fraser, B. A., Künstner, A., Reznick, D. N., Dreyer, C., & Weigel, D. (2015). Population genomics

of natural and experimental populations of guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*). *Molecular Ecology*,

24(2), 389–408. doi: 10.1111/mec.13022

Ghalambor, C. K., Hoke, K. L., Ruell, E. W., Fischer, E. K., Reznick, D. N., & Hughes, K. A. (2015).

Non-adaptive plasticity potentiates rapid adaptive evolution of gene expression in nature.

Nature, *525*(7569), 372–375. doi: 10.1038/nature15256

Ghalambor, C. K., McKay, J. K., Carroll, S. P., & Reznick, D. N. (2007). Adaptive versus non-

adaptive phenotypic plasticity and the potential for contemporary adaptation in new

environments. *Functional Ecology*, *21*(3), 394–407. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2435.2007.01283.x

Ghalambor, C. K., Reznick, D. N., & Walker, J. A. (2004). Constraints on adaptive evolution: The

functional trade-off between reproduction and fast-start swimming performance in the

Trinidadian guppy (*Poecilia reticulata*). *American Naturalist*, *164*(1), 38–50. doi:

10.1086/421412

Gibbons, T. C., Metzger, D. C., Healy, T. M., & Schulte, P. M. (2017). Gene expression plasticity

in response to salinity acclimation in threespine stickleback ecotypes from different salinity

habitats. *Molecular Ecology*, *26*, 2711–2725. doi: 10.1111/mec.14065

Gilliam, J. F., Fraser, D. F., & Alkins-Koo, M. (1993). Structure of a Tropical Stream Fish

Community : A Role for Biotic Interactions. *Ecology*, *74*(6), 1856–1870.

Gleason, L. U., & Burton, R. S. (2015). RNA-seq reveals regional differences in transcriptome

response to heat stress in the marine snail *Chlorostoma funebralis*. *Molecular Ecology*,

24(3), 610–627. doi: 10.1111/mec.13047

Gompel, N., & Prud'homme, B. (2009). The causes of repeated genetic evolution. *Developmental*

Biology, *332*(1), 36–47. doi: 10.1016/j.ydbio.2009.04.040

Grashow, R., Brookings, T., & Marder, E. (2009). Reliable neuromodulation from circuits with

variable   underlying   structure.   *PNAS*,   *106*(28),   11742–11746.   doi:

10.1073/pnas.0905614106

Grether, G. F. (2005). Environmental Change, Phenotypic Plasticity, and Genetic Compensation.

The American Naturalist, *166*(4), E115–E123. doi: 10.1086/432023

Handelsman, C. A., Ruell, E. W., Torres-Dowdall, J., & Ghalambor, C. K. (2014). Phenotypic

Plasticity Changes Correlations of Traits Following Experimental Introductions of Trinidadian

Guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*). *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, *54*(5), 794–804. doi:

10.1093/icb/icu112

Handelsman, Corey A., Broder, E. D., Dalton, C. M., Ruell, E. W., Myrick, C. A., Reznick, D. N.,

& Ghalambor, C. K. (2013). Predator-induced phenotypic plasticity in metabolism and rate

of growth: Rapid adaptation to a novel environment. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*,

53(6), 975–988. doi: 10.1093/icb/ict057

Harris, S., Ramnarine, I. W., Smith, H. G., & Pettersson, L. B. (2010). Picking personalities apart:

Estimating the influence of predation, sex and body size on boldness in the guppy *Poecilia*

reticulata. *Oikos*. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0706.2010.18028.x

Haskins, C., Haskins, E., McLaughlin, J., & Hewitt, R. (1961). Polymorphism and population

structure in Lebistes reticulatus, an ecological study. In F. Blair (Ed.), *Vertebrate speciation*

(pp. 320–395). Austin: University of Austin Press.

Ho, W. C., & Zhang, J. (2019). Genetic Gene Expression Changes during Environmental

Adaptations Tend to Reverse Plastic Changes Even after the Correction for Statistical

Nonindependence. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, *36*(3), 604–612. doi:

10.1093/molbev/msz002

Ho, W., & Zhang, J. (2018). Evolutionary adaptations to new environments generally reverse

plastic phenotypic changes. *Nature Communications*, *9*(350), 1–11. doi: 10.1038/s41467-

017-02724-5

Huizinga, M., Ghalambor, C. K., & Reznick, D. N. (2009). The genetic and environmental basis of

adaptive differences in shoaling behaviour among populations of Trinidadian guppies,

Poecilia reticulata. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, *22*(9), 1860–1866. doi: 10.1111/j.1420-

9101.2009.01799.x

Insel, T. R., & Young, L. J. (2000). Neuropeptides and the evolution of social behavior. *Current*

Opinion in Neurobiology, *10*(6), 784–789. doi: 10.1016/S0959-4388(00)00146-X

Lande, R. (2009). Adaptation to an extraordinary environment by evolution of phenotypic plasticity

and genetic assimilation. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, *22*(7), 1435–1446. doi:

10.1111/j.1420-9101.2009.01754.x

Lehmann, E. L., & Romano, J. P. (2005). *Testing Statistical Hypotheses* (Third Edit). New York:

Springer.

Leinonen, T., Cano, J. M., Mäkinen, H., & Merilä, J. (2006). Contrasting patterns of body shape

and neutral genetic divergence in marine and lake populations of threespine sticklebacks.

Journal of Evolutionary Biology, *19*, 1803–1812. doi: 10.1111/j.1420-9101.2006.01182.x

Li, L., Li, A., Song, K., Meng, J., Guo, X., Li, S., … Xu, F. (2018). Divergence and plasticity shape

adaptive potential of the Pacific oyster. *Nature Ecology Evolution*, *2*, 1751–1760. doi:

10.1038/s41559-018-0668-2

Losos, J. B. (2011). Convergence, adaptation, and constraint. *Evolution*, *65*(7), 1827–1840. doi:

10.1111/j.1558-5646.2011.01289.x

Love, M. I., Huber, W., & Anders, S. (2014). Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion

for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biology*, *15*(12), 1–21. doi: 10.1186/s13059-014-

0550-8

Lynch, M. (2007). The frailty of adaptive hypotheses for the origins of organismal complexity.

PNAS, *104*, 8597–8604. doi: 10.17226/11790

Magurran, A. E. (2005). Evolutionary ecology: the Trinidadian guppy. In *Oxford Series in Ecology*

and Evolution (Vol. 19). doi: 10.1093/acprof

Magurran, A. E., & Seghers, B. H. (1990a). Population differences in predator recognition and

attack cone avoidance in the guppy *Poecilia reticulata*. *Animal Behaviour*, *40*(3), 443–452.

doi: 10.1016/S0003-3472(05)80524-X

Magurran, A. E., & Seghers, B. H. (1990b). Population Differences in the Schooling Behaviour of

Newborn Guppies, Poecilia reticulata. *Ethology*, *84*, 334–342. doi: 10.1111/j.1439-

0310.1990.tb00807.x

Magurran, A. E., & Seghers, B. H. (1991). Variation in Schooling and Aggression Amongst Guppy

(*Poecilia Reticulata*) Populations in Trinidad. *Behaviour*, *188*(3–4), 214–234. doi:

10.1163/156853991X00292

Magurran, A. E., & Seghers, B. H. (1994). Predator Inspection Behaviour Covaries with Schooling

Tendency Amongst Wild Guppy, *Poecilia Reticulata*, Populations in Trinidad. *Behaviour*,

128(1–2), 121–134. doi: 10.1163/156853994X00073

Mäkinen, H., Papakostas, S., Vøllestad, L. A., Leder, E. H., & Primmer, C. R. (2016). Plastic and

evolutionary gene expression responses are correlated in European grayling (*Thymallus*

thymallus) subpopulations adapted to different thermal environments. *Journal of Heredity*,

107(1), 82–89. doi: 10.1093/jhered/esv069

Manceau, M., Domingues, V. S., Linnen, C. R., Rosenblum, E. B., & Hoekstra, H. E. (2010).

Convergence in pigmentation at multiple levels: mutations, genes and function. *Philosophical*

Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, *365*(1552), 2439–2450. doi:

10.1098/rstb.2010.0104

Mandic, M., Ramon, M. L., Gerstein, A. C., Gracey, A. Y., & Richards, J. G. (2018). Variable gene

transcription underlies phenotypic convergence of hypoxia tolerance in sculpins. *BMC*

Evolutionary Biology, *18*, 163. doi: 10.1186/s12862-018-1275-1

Marder, E., & Goaillard, J. M. (2006). Variability, compensation and homeostasis in neuron and

network function. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *7*, 563–574. doi: 10.1038/nrn1949

Pankey, M. S., Minin, V. N., Imholte, G. C., Suchard, M. A., & Oakley, T. H. (2014). Predictable

transcriptome evolution in the convergent and complex bioluminescent organs of squid.

PNAS, *111*(44), E4736–E4742. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1416574111

Pespeni, M. H., Sanford, E., Gaylord, B., Hill, T. M., Hosfelt, J. D., Jaris, H. K., … Palumbi, S. R.

(2013). Evolutionary change during experimental ocean acidification. *PNAS*, *110*(17), 6937–

6942. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1220673110

Pigliucci, M. (2010). Genotype-phenotype mapping and the end of the "genes as blueprint"

metaphor. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *365*, 557–

566. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2009.0241

Renn, S. C. P., & Schumer, M. E. (2013). Genetic accommodation and behavioural evolution :

insights from genomic studies. *Animal Behaviour*, *85*(5), 1012–1022. doi:

809  10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.02.012

810 Reznick, D. A., Bryga, H., & Endler, J. A. (1990). Experimentally induced life-history evolution in

811  a natural population. *Nature*, *346*(6282), 357–359. doi: 10.1038/346357a0

812 Reznick, D., Butler IV, M. J., & Rodd, H. (2001). Life-History Evolution in Guppies. VII. The

813  Comparative Ecology of High- and Low-Predation Environments. *The American Naturalist*,

814  *157*(2), 126–140. doi: 10.1086/318627

815 Reznick, D. N. (1997). Life history evolution in guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*): Guppies as a model

816  for studying the evolutionary biology of aging. *Experimental Gerontology*, *32*(3), 245–258.

817  doi: 10.1016/S0531-5565(96)00129-5

818 Reznick, D. N., & Bryga, H. (1987). Life-History Evolution in Guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*): 1.

819  Phenotypic and Genetic Changes in an Introduction Experiment. *Evolution*, *41*(6), 1370. doi:

820  10.2307/2409101

821 Rice, T. K., Schork, N. J., & Rao, D. C. (2008). Methods for Handling Multiple Testing. *Advances*

822  *in Genetics*, *60*, 293–308. doi: 10.1016/S0065-2660(07)00412-9

823 Rosenblum, E. B., Rompler, H., Schoneberg, T., & Hoekstra, H. E. (2010). Molecular and

824  functional basis of phenotypic convergence in white lizards at White Sands. *PNAS*, *107*(5),

825  2113–2117. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0911042107

826 Ruell, E. W., Handelsman, C. A., Hawkins, C. L., Sofaer, H. R., Ghalambor, C. K., & Angeloni, L.

827  (2013). Fear, food and sexual ornamentation: plasticity of colour development in Trinidadian

828  guppies. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *280*(1758), 20122019–

829  20122019. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2012.2019

830 Schaum, E., Rost, B., Millar, A. J., & Collins, S. (2013). Variation in plastic responses of a globally

831  distributed picoplankton species to ocean acidification. *Nature Climate Change*, *3*(3), 298–

832  302. doi: 10.1038/nclimate1774

833 Scoville, A. G., & Pfrender, M. E. (2010). Phenotypic plasticity facilitates recurrent rapid

834  adaptation to introduced predators. *PNAS*, *107*(9), 4260–4263. doi:

10.1073/pnas.0912748107

Shaw, J. R., Hampton, T. H., King, B. L., Whitehead, A., Galvez, F., Gross, R. H., … Stanton, B.

A. (2014). Natural selection canalizes expression variation of environmentally induced

plasticity-enabling genes. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, *31*(11), 3002–3015. doi:

10.1093/molbev/msu241

Siegal, M. L., & Leu, J.-Y. (2014). On the Nature and Evolutionary Impact of Phenotypic

Robustness Mechanisms. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, *45*(1),

495–517. doi: 10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-120213-091705

Song, L., & Florea, L. (2015). Rcorrector: Efficient and accurate error correction for Illumina RNA-

seq reads. *GigaScience*, *4*(1), 1–8. doi: 10.1186/s13742-015-0089-y

Stern, D. L., & Orgogozo, V. (2008). The loci of evolution: How predictable is genetic evolution?

Evolution, *62*(9), 2155–2177. doi: 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00450.x

Storey, J. D. (2002). A direct approach to false discovery rates. *Journal of the Royal Statistical*

Society. Series B: Statistical Methodology, *64*, 479–498. doi: 10.1111/1467-9868.00346

Strimmer, K. (2008). fdrtool: A versatile R package for estimating local and tail area-based false

discovery rates. *Bioinformatics*, *24*(12), 1461–1462. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btn209

Thompson, K. A., Osmond, M. M., & Schluter, D. (2019). Parallel genetic evolution and speciation

from standing variation. *Evolution Letters*, *3*(2), 129–141. doi: 10.1002/evl3.106

Torres-Dowdal, J., Handelsman, C. a, Reznick, D. N., & Ghalambor, C. K. (2012). Local

adaptation and the evolution of of phenotypic plasticity in Trinidadian guppies (*Poecilia*

reticulata). *Evolution*, *66*(11), 3432–3443. doi: 10.5061/dryad.84gf5

Torres Dowdall, J., Handelsman, C. A., Ruell, E. W., Auer, S. K., Reznick, D. N., & Ghalambor,

C. K. (2012). Fine-scale local adaptation in life histories along a continuous environmental

gradient in Trinidadian guppies. *Functional Ecology*, *26*(3), 616–627. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-

2435.2012.01980.x

Velotta, J. P., & Cheviron, Z. A. (2018). Remodeling Ancestral Phenotypic Plasticity in Local

Adaptation : A New Framework to Explore the Role of Genetic Compensation in the Evolution

of Homeostasis. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, *58*(6), 1098–1110. doi:

10.1093/icb/icy117

Wagner, A. (2011). *The origins of evolutionary innovations: a theory of transformative change in*

living systems. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wang, S. P., & Althoff, D. M. (2019). Phenotypic plasticity facilitates initial colonization of a novel

environment. *Evolution*, *73*(2), 303–316. doi: 10.1111/evo.13676

West-Eberhard, M. J. (2003). *Developmental plasticity and evolution*. doi: 10.2002/ajpa.20219

Willing, E. M., Bentzen, P., Van Oosterhout, C., Hoffmann, M., Cable, J., Breden, F., … Dreyer,

C. (2010). Genome-wide single nucleotide polymorphisms reveal population history and

adaptive divergence in wild guppies. *Molecular Ecology*, *19*(5), 968–984. doi:

10.1111/j.1365-294X.2010.04528.x

Yang, J. R., Maclean, C. J., Park, C., Zhao, H., & Zhang, J. (2017). Intra and interspecific

variations of gene expression levels in yeast are largely neutral. *Molecular Biology and*

Evolution. doi: 10.1093/molbev/msx171

Zandonà, E., Auer, S. K., Kilham, S. S., Howard, J. L., López-Sepulcre, A., O'Connor, M. P., …

Reznick, D. N. (2011). Diet quality and prey selectivity correlate with life histories and

predation regime in Trinidadian guppies. *Functional Ecology*, *25*(5), 964–973. doi:

10.1111/j.1365-2435.2011.01865.x

Figures

Figure 1. Overview of experimental design and interpretation. (A) Schematic shows Aripo and Quare river drainages in the Northern Range Mountains of Trinidad. We sampled population pairs from these two drainages, which represent distinct evolutionary lineages. (B) Wild-caught fish from each high- and low-predation population pair were reared to the second generation in the lab to control for maternal and environmental effects. At birth, second generation siblings from each population were split into rearing environments with (pred+) and without (pred-) predation cues. (C) This rearing design allows us to discern lineage effects (contrast between drainages), genetic divergence (contrast between different populations in the same environment), phenotypic plasticity (contrast between genetically similar fish in different rearing condition), and their interactions.

Figure 2. Summary of differential expression analyses. We identified many transcripts in both the Aripo (left) and Quare (right) drainages whose expression levels differed based on evolutionary history of predation (population of origin; orange), developmental experience of predation (rearing; yellow), and their interaction (grey).

Figure 3. Relationship between ancestral plasticity and evolved expression divergence. Genes exhibiting significant ancestral expression plasticity (i.e. different between high-predation fish reared with and without predator cues) were more likely to also differ in expression between high- and low-predation populations reared without predator cue exposure in both the Aripo (top) and Quare (bottom) lineages. Each circle represents expression differences in a single transcript with statistically significant ancestral plasticity in the high-predation population as well as significant expression differences between high- and low-predation populations. Plastic expression changes were more likely to be in the opposite (white circles) than in the same (grey circles) direction as genetic expression divergence. The number of transcripts in each quadrant is indicated on the graphs. Note that axes differ between plots in order to best visualize variation within each dataset.

Figure 4. Evolution of transcript expression plasticity. (A) We grouped transcripts with significant interaction effects into one of four categories based on patterns of evolution in expression plasticity: (1) Assimilated: plasticity in the ancestral high-predation population but a loss of plasticity in the derived low-predation population; (2) Accommodated: a change in the degree, but no the direction, of plasticity in the derived as compared to the ancestral population; (3) Evolved plastic: no plasticity in the ancestral high-predation population but an emergence of plasticity in the derived low-predation population; (4) Reversed: opposing directions of plasticity in high-versus low-predation populations. We categorized remaining transcripts that had a significant main interaction effect, but no significant *post hoc* rearing differences as unclassified. Adapted from Renn & Schumer (2013). (B) All categories were represented in both Aripo and Quare datasets.

Figure 5. Overlap in population and rearing expression differences across evolutionary lineages. Of the transcripts differentially expressed based on population of origin (top), 124 were overlapping between drainages. Of these, 66 were concordantly differentially expressed (i.e. expression divergence in the same direction in both drainages; dark orange circles) and 58 were not (i.e. expression divergence in opposite directions between drainages; light orange circles), no different than expected by chance. Of the transcripts differentially expressed based on rearing environment (bottom), 35 were overlapping in the two drainages. Of these, 19 were concordantly differentially expressed (dark yellow circles) and six were not (light yellow circles), more non-concordance than expected by chance. The number of differentially expressed transcripts in each quadrant is indicated on the graphs and transcripts differentially expressed in one but not both drainages are shown in grey.

Supplemental Materials

Table S1. Transcripts filtered from the analysis following identification as retinal contaminants. Provided as Excel file.

Table S2. Transcripts significantly differentially expressed between high- and low-predation populations in the Aripo drainage. Provided as Excel file.

 Table S3. Transcripts significantly differentially expressed between high- and low-predation populations in the Quare drainage. Provided as Excel file.

Table S4. Results of GO enrichment analyses for population, rearing, and interaction effects in the Aripo drainage. Provided as Excel file.

Table S5. Results of GO enrichment analyses for population, rearing, and interaction effects in the Quare drainage. Provided as Excel file.

Table S6. Population DE transcripts overlapping between Aripo and Quare drainages. 185 transcripts were DE in both drainages, of these 89 had expression differences in the same direction in both datasets (concordant differential expression). Provided as Excel file.

Table S7. Rearing DE transcripts overlapping between Aripo and Quare drainages. 16 transcripts were DE in both drainages, of these 7 had expression differences in the same direction in both drainages (i.e. concordant differential expression). Provided as Excel file.

Table S8. Pst estimates for the Aripo and Quare drainages.

Figure S1. Differences in means but not variance of differentially expressed (DE) and non-differentially expressed (non-DE) transcripts. DE transcripts had significantly higher means in the Aripo drainage and lower means in the Quare drainage as compared to non-DE transcripts. Due to the large range of expression values, mean differences are plotted on a log scale (y-axis).