# Genome-wide changes in genetic diversity in a population of *Myotis*

*lucifugus* affected by white-nose syndrome

Lilley TM [1,2], Wilson IW [1], Field KA [3], Reeder DA [3], Turner G [4], Kurta A [5], Blomberg AS [6],

Hoff S [7], Herzog C [7], Paterson S [1].

[1]Institute of Integrative Biology, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom. [2]Finnish Museum

of Natural History, University of Helsinki, Finland. [3]Biology Department, Bucknell University,

1 Dent Drive, Lewisburg, PA 12837, USA. [4]Pennsylvania Game Commission, Harrisburg, PA,

USA. [5]Department of Biology, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, MI, USA. [6]Department

of Biology, University of Turku, Finland. [7]Wildlife Diversity Unit, State Department of

Environmental Conservation, Albany, NY, USA.

Corresponding author: tmlill@liverpool.ac.uk

Abstract

Novel pathogens can cause massive declines in populations, but seldom lead to extirpation

of hosts. Rather, disease can act as a selective pressure on survivors, driving the evolution of

resistance or tolerance. Bat white-nose syndrome (WNS) is a rapidly spreading wildlife disease

in North America. The fungus causing the disease invades skin tissues of hibernating bats,

resulting in disruption of hibernation behaviour, premature energy depletion, and subsequent

death. We use whole-genome sequencing to investigate changes in allele frequencies within a

population of *Myotis lucifugus* in eastern North America to scan for genetic resistance to WNS.

Our results show low $F_{ST}$ values within the population across time, i.e. prior to WNS (Pre-

WNS) compared to the population that has survived WNS (Post-WNS). However, when

dividing the population with a geographical, distance-based cut-off between the states of

Pennsylvania and New York, a sharp increase in values on scaffold GL429776 is evident in

the Post-WNS samples. Genes present in the diverged area are associated with

thermoregulation and promotion of brown fat production. Thus, although WNS may not have

subjected the entire *M. lucifugus* population to selective pressure, it could allowed the rise of a

selection for alleles in Pennsylvania through decreased gene flow within the population, which

may contribute to survival. However, the existence of remnant sub-populations in the aftermath

of WNS is likely due to multiple factors in bat life history.

Keywords: Opportunistic pathogen, white-nose syndrome, Selective pressure, Genetic

resistance.

## 1. Introduction

The emergence and spread of multiple infectious wildlife diseases during recent decades has had devastating consequences for biodiversity (Daszak et al., 2000; Smith et al., 2006). Unfortunately, for many taxa, anthropogenic activities and climate change appear to be the main causes of exposure to sources of infection (Gallana et al., 2013; Tompkins et al., 2015). With shifting pathogen ranges, disease-related declines in naïve wildlife often threaten the persistence of populations. Examples include chytridiomycosis, which has wiped out populations of amphibians globally (Daszak et al., 1999; Lips et al., 2006), and avian malaria, which caused the sharp decline of island populations of birds (van Riper et al., 1986). More recently, white-nose syndrome (WNS) has been described as one of the most rapidly spreading wildlife diseases ever recorded (Blehert et al., 2009; Frick et al., 2010). Since the discovery of WNS in North America in 2006, ten species of bats have been diagnosed with the disease in 33 U.S. states and 7 Canadian provinces (www.whitenosesyndrome.org, 2019). Genetic evidence suggests that *Pseudogymnoascus destructans*, the causative agent of WNS, was introduced to North America from Europe (Campana et al., 2017; Lorch et al., 2013; Minnis and Lindner, 2013; Ren et al., 2012; Wibbelt et al., 2010), where affected species do not experience associated mortality (Harazim et al., 2018; Puechmaille et al., 2011; Warnecke et al., 2012; Wibbelt et al., 2013; Zukal et al., 2016).

When a disease enters a naïve host population, the initial wave of infection often causes epizootics that result in mass mortality, which may extirpate local host populations or even cause species extinction (Daszak et al., 1999; De Castro and Bolker, 2005; Frick et al., 2010). However, extinctions due to a disease appear to occur seldomly, and a disease can act as a

selective pressure on survivors, driving the evolution of tolerance or resistance, which may transform a disease from being epizootic to being enzootic (Boots et al., 2009; Karlsson et al., 2014; Robinson et al., 2012). This may occur through rapid changes in the distribution of genetic variants associated with disease susceptibility over short timescales (Gallana et al., 2013). These powerful selective pressures pathogens exert on naïve host populations (Sironi et al., 2015) and genetic signatures of infection-related selective sweeps may be detectable for generations (Deschamps et al., 2016; Di Gaspero et al., 2012; Groot et al., 2002). Detection of selective sweeps on particular genes or gene families can confirm or exclude potential mechanisms of host susceptibility or pathogen virulence (Campbell and Tishkoff, 2008). Rapid, extreme bottlenecks (such as those caused by panzootic events), meanwhile, are associated with a more stochastic loss of alleles, which does not necessarily indicate selection (Luikart et al., 1998). Much of the research on disease-induced selection has focused on the major histocompatibility complex (MHC), and indeed, diseases can drive the evolution and maintenance of MHC diversity in natural populations (Davy et al., 2017a; Jeffery and Bangham, 2000; Paterson et al., 1998; Spurgin and Richardson, 2010; Teacher Amber G. F. et al., 2009; Zeisset and Beebee, 2014). However, factors not directly associated with interactions between host and pathogen, such as environmental conditions and competition with other species, can have a considerable influence on the manifestation of a disease (Scholthof, 2007).

The psychrophilic (cold-growing) fungus *P. destructans*, (Lorch et al., 2011; Minnis and Lindner, 2013; Warnecke et al., 2008) acts as an opportunistic pathogen of bats, invading the skin tissues of hibernating hosts (Cryan et al., 2010; Meteyer et al., 2012). Susceptible species, such as *Myotis lucifugus* and *M. septentrionalis*, have shown population declines greater than 90% in affected hibernacula (Frick et al., 2015). The infection disrupts the hibernation

behaviour of susceptible species and leads to more frequent arousals from torpor, evaporative

water loss, premature energy depletion, and death of susceptible individuals due to emaciation

(McGuire et al., 2017; Reeder et al., 2012; Verant et al., 2014; Warnecke et al., 2013; Willis et

al., 2011). Naïve infected *M. lucifugus* upregulate genes involved in immune pathways during

the hibernation period (Davy et al., 2017b; Field et al., 2015, 2018; Lilley et al., 2017). These

responses are weak during torpor but are robust during the intermittent arousals (Field et al.,

2018; Luis and Hudson, 2006). Therefore, increased arousals may be attempts by the host to

counter the pathogen, in addition to quenching thirst, grooming, expelling waste and possibly

foraging (Bernard and McCracken, 2017; Willis et al., 2011), and supplementing electrolytes

(Cryan et al., 2013).

White-nose syndrome is a prime example of a disease which is manifested when factors

associated with the environment (i.e. temperature and humidity of the hibernaculum), the host

(and the host's response to infection) and the pathogen (optimum growth range, suitable host)

overlap, i.e. intersect within the "disease triangle" (Scholthof, 2007). Therefore bat species,

and populations within species, are affected differently according to hibernation behaviour and

prevailing micro-climate conditions in available hibernacula (Grieneisen et al., 2015; Johnson

et al., 2014; Langwig et al., 2015). As such, with an environmentally persistent opportunistic

pathogen such as *P. destuctans* capable of subsistence in the absence of the host, loci not

associated with MHC diversity or other immune response-associated factors (Donaldson et al.,

2017), such as the amount of body fat prior to hibernation (Cheng et al., 2019), may also affect

survival of species and populations. This highlights the importance of examining the genome

as a whole (Sparks et al., 2019).

The initial impacts of WNS on six species of hibernating bats in the northeastern and

midwestern USA vary from almost complete extirpation to arrested population growth (Turner

et al., 2011). After the initial decline caused by WNS in *M. lucifugus*, reports have surfaced

describing stabilisation at smaller sizes or even increases in numbers of individuals (Dobony

and Johnson, 2018; Frick et al., 2017; Langwig et al., 2015; Maslo et al., 2015). Models

parameterised with long-term data on fungal loads, infection intensity and counts of *M.*

*lucifugus* at hibernacula have suggested development of either tolerance or resistance in these

persisting populations (Frick et al., 2017), which is supported by reports on infected individuals

not arousing from torpor as frequently as during the acute phase of the zoonosis (Lilley et al.,

2016). Since WNS has inflicted massive population declines in some *M. lucifugus*, there is a

possibility that selection could occur for alleles conferring resistance or tolerance from the

standing genetic variation, which would confer to resistance or tolerance could occur. Indeed,

Maslo and Feffermann (2015) suggested the occurrence of evolutionary rescue occurring and

Donaldson et al. (2017) described changes in an immunome across *M. lucifugus* populations

obtained through a sequence capture method, which may be attributed to selection by WNS. A

study suggests the initially affected *M. lucifugus* population is beginning to show signs of

resistance to the pathogen (Langwig et al., 2017). However, the possible selective pressures

WNS has exerted on the population, which may not even be related to immune responses (e.g.

Cheng et al., 2019), have only recently been described at the whole-genome level (Gignoux-

Wolfsohn et al., 2018), however high-sequencing depth studies are lacking.

Here, we utilise high-throughput whole-genome sequencing on the WNS-affected species *M.*

*lucifugus*, allowing us to look at entire genomes via single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs).

We compare genetic patterns ($F_{ST}$ and heterozygosity) before and after the spread of WNS in

the eastern North American population to gain insight into whether the disease is causing

selection of major loci in surviving bats. We hypothesise that, due to the massive population

declines caused by WNS and the fact that the affected population is now beginning to stabilise

or slightly increase in size (Langwig et al., 2017), a soft selective sweep based on standing

genetic variation has resulted in differentiation in one or many regions of the genome (Messer

and Petrov, 2013). Adaptation could therefore be in the process of driving the evolutionary

rescue of a population, in which individuals resistant or tolerant to the disease survived a

bottleneck and passed these traits to their offspring (Carlson et al., 2014). Alternatively,

survival may be due to factors not related to selection for WNS-resistant alleles, such as

microbiome adaptation (Ange-Stark et al., 2019; Lemieux-Labonté et al., 2017) or variation

across hibernation site microhabitats. This study provides a foundation for future work on

genome-wide effects of WNS in *M. lucifugus* and other affected species of bats.

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1. Ethics Statement

This study was carried out on bats from non-endangered species in strict accordance with

recommendations in the Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals of the National

Institutes of Health. All methods were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use

Committee at Bucknell University (protocol DMR-016). The bats were collected under

Pennsylvania Game Commission Special Use Permit #33085, and New York State Department

of Environmental Conservation Permit #427.

 ## 2.2. Sample collection and DNA extraction

We conducted whole-genome sequencing on a population of *M. lucifugus* prior to, and up to

10 years after, the onset of WNS. White-nose syndrome in bats was first observed in upstate

New York, at Howe's Cave during the winter of 2006-2007 (Blehert et al., 2009). Our historic

samples were obtained from individuals consisting of the eastern population of *M. lucifugus*

(Miller-Butterworth et al., 2014; Vonhof et al., 2015) from New York (NY) (from the first

batch of dead bats found at Howe's Cave in 2006) and from bats caught in central Pennsylvania

(PA) in 2005-2006 (Fig. 1., Table 1.,Supp. Table 1.). The bats sampled from Howe's Cave,

New York were affected by WNS, but because they were the first bats to be documented with

the disease in North America, and moreover, because of the massive declines caused by the

disease, we believe this batch of samples is representative of the population genetic structure

of *M. lucifugus* prior to WNS. Bats in PA became affected by the disease in roughly 2008–

2009 and had not been affected by WNS at the time of sampling. We sampled wing tissue from

frozen specimens of known origin (Supp. Table 1.) that were collected and stored by the New

York State Department of Environmental Conservation (Delmar, NY) and D. Reeder to obtain

Pre-WNS samples. The remnants of the eastern North American population in NY and PA

were sampled again in 2016, and genetic diversity was compared before and after WNS (Fig.1.,

Table 1., Supp. Table 1.). Post-WNS bats were captured using mist nets and harp traps during

2015 -2016 from a number of maternal colonies, with the exception of individuals from

Williams Preserve Mine, NY and Woodward, Center County, PA, which were sampled from

hibernacula. In addition to samples from PA and NY, we collected gDNA from two individuals

from Upper-Peninsula Michigan (UPMI) for use in polymorphism detection. We did this in

order to take advantage of the greater number of polymorphic sites one would expect to arise

from a more diverse collection of individuals (see Section 2.3.). Tissue samples were collected

using either 3.0 mm or 5.0 mm biopsy punches (Integra Milltex, Plainsboro, NJ) and stored in

95% ethanol until extraction. We extracted DNA using QIAmp DNA Mini Kits (Qiagen,

Hilden Germany) and stored DNA at -80°C until sequencing.

## 171    2.3. Sequencing methods

Sequencing libraries were made for two separate sets of data: **(1)** Six individuals from PA (N

= 2), NY (N = 2) and UPMI (N= 2) were sequenced separately in order to initially identify a

set of polymorphic sites within the *M. lucifugus* genome within the focal population (See Supp.

Table 1. for information on individuals). Individual sequencing increases the confidence of

SNP discovery, relative to pooled sequencing, since individuals exhibit discrete variation in

the number of alleles they carry at each potential SNP site; **(2)** Equimolar pools of DNA from

multiple individuals from within our north-eastern US population (NY and PA) at each of the

two timepoints (pre- and post-WNS) to give four pooled sequencing libraries (See Table 1. and

Supp. Table 1. for information on individuals). TruSeq Nano libraries with a 350 bp insert size

were prepared from all samples and run on a HiSeq4000 platform to generate 2x 150 bp reads

providing ~15 Gbp of sequence data (~7.5x coverage) for each of the six individuals **(1)** and

~90 Gbp of sequence data (~45x coverage) for each of the four pools **(2)**. Adapter sequences

were removed with Cutadapt v1.2.1 and trimmed with Sickle 1.200 with a minimum quality

score of 20.

## 2.4. Bioinformatics methods

First, reads from the six individually sequenced individuals (see 2.3.) were mapped onto the *M. lucifugus* reference genome (https://www.broadinstitute.org/brown-bat/little-brown-bat-genome-project) using Bowtie2 v2.2.5 (Langmead and Salzberg, 2012), with the '—sensitive-local' preset. Reads were sorted using SAMtools v1.1 (Li et al., 2009) and combined by read group (with duplicates removed using a 'lenient' validation stringency setting) using Picard-tools v2.5.0 (http://broadinstitute.github.io/picard). SNPs were called across all six individuals with the Genome Analysis Toolkit (GATK) v3.4 HaplotypeCaller (McKenna et al., 2010) using default parameters. Within this SNP set, high-quality bivalent SNPs were selected that met selection criteria across the six individuals (Quality Score > 100; AF<1; 30>=DP>=100) and were input to the SAMtools mpileup function as a list of sites at which pileup was to be generated. After SNP calling, these six individuals were discarded from further analyses.

Reads from the four pooled samples were mapped to the *M. lucifugus* reference genome as above and SAMtools mpileup was used to count alleles at high-quality SNP sites identified above from the six sequenced individuals (i.e. reads matching either the reference or alternate allele for bivalent loci). Sites with coverage in the bottom 10% or top 10% quantiles summed across the pooled samples were excluded (since these could reflect inaccuracies in the reference genome), leaving about 13.5 million sites.

Average heterozygosity within the pooled samples was calculated using npstats (Ferretti et al., 2013), which controls for number of individuals within each sequencing pool and sequencing depth, thus allowing robust comparisons between pooled samples. One million SNPs were randomly picked and permuted, with 1000 sets of 1000 SNPs used to calculate the observed

heterozygosity within each pooled set of individuals and, from these, we produced the median

and 95% confidence intervals on heterozygosity.

Using allele counts at each locus to estimate allele frequencies, $F_{ST}$ was calculated without

weighting for sampling effort ($F_{ST} = \left(\bar{p}(1-\bar{p}) - \overline{p(1-p)}\right)/\bar{p}(1-\bar{p})$, where $p$ is the allele

frequency and either averaged between populations ($\bar{p}$) or the value $p(1-p)$ averaged across

populations). $F_{ST}$ was separately calculated between the Pre-WNS and Post-WNS samples and

between subsections thereof, specifically PA pre- vs post-WNS, NY pre- vs post-WNS, PA

pre- vs NY pre-WNS, PA post- vs NY post-WNS, and all PA vs all NY). Selection is expected

to elevate $F_{ST}$ at specific genomic regions relative to background levels due to sampling noise

or genetic drift, which are expected to act equally across the genome. To identify such regions

across the genome, a moving window was applied to calculate median pairwise $F_{ST}$ values for

groups of 500 consecutive SNPs at a time to even out sampling effects. Moving windows

shifted 100 SNPs at a time, thus providing the best balance between fine detail and practicality.

Allele frequency estimates were weighted by the number of individuals in each pool. This was

done using a custom R script (see Data availability section), run using R v3.4.1 (R

Development Core Team, 2011). Results were confirmed using Popoolation2 with a 10 kb

sliding window and with defined pool sizes. This gave the same qualitative results, but higher

levels of background noise (Kofler et al., 2011). Additionally, Popoolation2 was used to

perform Fishers Exact Tests on individual SNPs in order to test whether any very highly

significant SNPs were missed by the moving window approach.

From the comparison of the NY and PA pooled samples (i.e. the comparison that produced the

highest $F_{ST}$ values), we visually identified across the whole genome windows with median $F_{ST}$

values greater than 5 standard deviations from the mean, as well as those with $F_{ST}$ values greater

than 0.05, indicating at least 'moderate' genetic differentiation (Wright, 1978). The numbers

of such complete windows within gene models were counted for each gene to identify genes

potentially under selective pressure.

## 3. Results

### 3.1. Pre-WNS vs Post-WNS comparisons

To detect regions of the genome that may be under selection, we plotted $F_{ST}$ across the *M.*

*lucifugus* genome, calculated from allele counts within moving windows covering 500 SNPs

and shifting 100 SNPs at a time. Comparing Pre- and Post-WNS samples revealed an overall

low level of population differentiation due to genetic structure ($F_{ST}$ median of 0.0059; Table

2). Whilst a small number of windows have $F_{ST}$ values slightly beyond our arbitrary cut-off of

5 standard deviations above the mean, none have $F_{ST}$ values exceeding 0.05, suggesting that

there is not even moderate selection in any region of the genome in Post-WNS samples

compared to Pre-WNS samples (Fig. 2, Table 2)(Wright, 1978). Similarly, using Fisher exact

tests from Popoolation2 at a threshold of $p < 10^{-6}$, no individual SNPs were found to be

consistently associated with differences Pre- versus Post-WNS among the four sets of samples.

### 3.2. Comparisons within geographical locations

Due to our sampling and sequencing setup, we were also able to separately look at individuals

of the same population from two discrete geographical locations within their range. In our case

a  divide  was  made  between  bats  sampled  in  New  York  and  Pennsylvania  based  on

geographical distance between the sampling sites. Although population genetic analysis based

on a considerably lower number of genetic markers assigns *M. lucifugus* on the eastern coast

of North America to the same population (Vonhof et al., 2015), the species shows high degrees

of philopatry (Davis and Hitchcock, 1965; Norquay et al., 2013), warranting the examination

of these arbitrarily assigned pools of individuals outside the mean dispersal range of the species

using more accurate, whole-genome sequencing based population genetic analyses.

A number of minor differences ($F_{ST} > 5$ stdevs above mean, but $F_{ST} < 0.05$) between these sets

of samples are evident prior to arrival of WNS, as well as a peak in scaffold GL429835 with

an $F_{ST}$ value exceeding 0.05 (Fig. 3a). The high peak consists of 4 windows the midpoints of

which span an 81,887 bp region within a coding sequence consisting of 47 exons, which

encodes the NIPBL cohesion loading factor (NCBI Gene ID: 102430106). The highest peak in

a comparison of PA populations Pre- and Post-WNS (Fig. 3b) lies in a similar position within

this coding region, as does a peak in a similar comparison of NY samples (Fig. 3c), though

neither exceed the $F_{ST}$ value cut-off of 0.05.

3.3. Post-WNS comparisons between geographically isolated sample sets

When comparing the Post-WNS individuals sampled from PA with the Post-WNS individuals

from NY, the peak on scaffold GL429835 is no longer visible, but a far more pronounced spike

in $F_{ST}$ values can be clearly seen in scaffold GL429776 (Fig. 4a), indicating relatively large

allele frequency differences between the sample sets in this region of the genome. This is also

seen, to a lesser extent, when comparing all samples from NY with all samples from PA (Fig.

4b). However, this significant peak in this comparison of all samples collected does not affect

average fixation indices across the genome relative to the other comparison of all samples, Pre-

WNS vs Post-WNS (Table 2). This peak could be attributed to mapping error, but our coverage

depths show an average depth of 66.33x across the whole genome, whereas the focal region

was sequenced at an average depth of 66.49x. This means that there has been no collapsing of

duplicated regions, nor poor coverage of the region. Also, viewing the data on the NCBI

genome viewer tool, with RepeatMasker histogram enabled, suggested no immediately

obvious increase in repetitive sequence in the region of interest.

We examined scaffold GL429776 more closely to compare the $F_{ST}$ values between individuals

from the arbitrarily selected sample sets from NY Post-WNS and PA Post-WNS (Fig. 4a).

Genes within scaffold GL429776 containing windows with fixation indices > 0.05 between the

NY Post-WNS and PA Post-WNS samples, are presented in Table 4 and Fig. 4a.

To clarify why we saw no fixation at this site when comparing Pre-WNS and Post-WNS

populations (Fig. 3a), nor when we compared Pre-WNS samples from both geographical

origins (Figs. 3b and 3c), we calculated for the relevant subpopulations the proportion of

reference alleles called at each site included in the $F_{ST}$ window analyses (Fig. 5). This revealed

a small decrease over time in the proportion of the reference alleles seen at this locus in the PA

subpopulation (Fig. 5a), commensurate with an increase in proportion of reference alleles in

the NY sample set (Fig. 5b). As such, existing differences between the NY and PA sample sets

were insufficient to cause a relative rise in fixation indices prior to WNS spreading through the

population (Fig 5c). Conversely, Post-WNS, allele proportions at this site in both sample sets

had not changed sufficiently to suggest selection *within* the sample set but demonstrated clear

differences *between* the NY and PA sample sets (Fig. 5d).

In the Post-WNS comparison, peaks which were above our arbitrary threshold of 5 standard

deviations above the mean across the whole genome, but below $F_{ST} = 0.05$, can also be

observed in small scaffolds on the right-hand side of the $F_{ST}$ plots. The 63 windows comprising

these peaks lie in 47 scaffolds. Of these, high $F_{ST}$ windows lie in only 6 protein-coding regions

across 6 scaffolds (Table 3). Two of these encode partial gene models. Of the 4 remaining

models containing high $F_{ST}$ regions, all but 1 is described on NCBI as a "Low Quality Protein".

The exception is a gene encoding the ankyrin 2 protein, within which 7 high $F_{ST}$ windows lie.

## 3.4. Measures of heterozygosity within subpopulations

We examined heterozygosity across the genome in the subpopulations divided by time and

location to measure whether the epizootic reduces genetic diversity. We found the following

values: PA pre-WNS: Median: 0.263 (0.252 – 0.274 95% CI); PA post-WNS: 0.247 (0.239 –

0.255); NY pre-WNS: 0.255 (0.247 – 0.263); and NY post-WNS: 0.256 (0.247 -0.265).

## 4. Discussion

Examining our data as a whole, we found low $F_{ST}$ values between the Pre- and Post-WNS

individuals of our eastern North American *M. lucifugus* population, the absence of fixation

suggesting that WNS has not decreased the population in size sufficiently for the disease to

have an effect on genetic diversity. Also, we found no significant changes in within-population

heterozygosity Post-WNS, despite the massive population declines caused by WNS over the

past decade, and found overall high heterozygosity across the genome. These results are in

accordance with a similar, low-coverage study conducted by Gignoux-Wolfsohn et al. (2018).

Panmixia of populations in evolutionary time in bats to the east of the Rocky Mountains has

been previously documented (Vonhof et al., 2016; Wilder et al., 2015). Gignoux-Wolfsohn et

al. (2018) present evidence for a soft selective sweep, where selection acts on standing genetic

variation, between Pre- and Post-WNS populations. The analysis is based on a change in minor

allele frequencies due to selection, distinguished from background demography using a

simulation approach; and it shows a complex picture of potentially up to 85 unlinked SNPs,

each exhibiting small effects and with little or no selective signal at adjacent SNPs. In contrast,

a recent case study of selection on standing genetic variation, by myxoma virus in rabbits,

showed that soft selective sweeps caused concerted changes in allele frequencies at sets of

linked SNPs around coding loci (Alves et al., 2019). The robust pooled sequencing approach

allows us to examine for similar, larger scale changes in the genome. We acknowledge that

both methods have their advantages and disadvantages, such as the increased possibility for

false outliers in our pooled approach (Li et al., 2008). Hovewer we took these into account with

parameters used for aligning the reads (Kofler et al., 2011), sequencing depth (Ferretti et al.,

2013; Kofler and Schlötterer, 2014) pool size (Futschik and Schlötterer, 2010; Gautier, 2015)

and library preparation protocol (Kofler et al., 2016).

The species originally described as *M. lucifugus* in North America (Fenton and Barclay, 1980)

has since been divided into five non-sister species (Morales and Carstens, 2018). All of the

individuals sampled in our study belong to *M. lucifugus senso stricto*, with a range extending

from the east coast of North America to Alaska, and furthermore, to the same previously

assigned population (Miller-Butterworth et al., 2014). Previous nuclear genetic studies show

that differentiation is low, and there is no evidence for any major barriers to nuclear gene flow

across the range of *M. lucifugus*.

Due to our sampling design, we were able to separate bats geographically within our sampling

range. We made a cut-off point for a more in-depth investigation of bats sampled in the states

of Pennsylvania (PA) compared to New York (NY). Although the cut-off may seem rather

arbitrary, the reasoning behind this is geographic distance between sampling sites, and diving

the data between the two states is appropriate for our purposes as evidenced by the results.

Here, we see low $F_{ST}$ values between the two groups of bats prior to the onset of WNS,

indicating an absence of selection across the genome, with the exception of a small peak in

scaffold GL429835, which lies within a gene model encoding the NIPBL cohesion loading

factor. Relatively high $F_{ST}$ values are also visible within this region when comparing the PA

population before and after the spread of WNS, as well as the NY population pre- and post-

WNS. However, this peak is not evident when comparing PA and NY post-WNS (Fig. 4a).

This suggests that this coding sequence was under selective pressures, manifesting as

differentiating allelic frequencies, in both subpopulations prior to the arrival of WNS, but that

any selection was nullified by the population-level impact of WNS (or another event occurring

during the same timeframe). In addition, this result confirms that although the pre-WNS bats

from NY were from the initial batch of bats found dead of WNS at Howe's cave in 2006, they

were genetically similar to pre-WNS bats from PA, which were sampled before the arrival of

WNS. This is most likely because of the high frequency of initial mortality in the population,

which indiscriminately wiped out most of the population, eroding any genetic differentiation.

As for the protein NIPBL, it plays an important role in the function of the cohesin complex,

which is vital for chromosome segregation, DNA damage repair, and gene expression

regulation (Peters et al., 2008). As these results suggest the loss of low-level functional

diversity at this locus in our subpopulations, it would be interesting to further investigate what

impact this will have on the population as a whole.

The $F_{ST}$ comparison of Post-WNS individuals sampled from PA and NY depicts considerable

genetic differentiation within scaffold GL429776; differentiation which did not exist in the

Pre-WNS comparison of individuals sampled from these geographical areas. This is a

difference which would have gone unnoticed had we not made the comparison between bats

sampled in NY and PA, or used fewer genetic markers instead of a whole-genome approach

(Miller-Butterworth et al., 2014; Vonhof et al., 2015). The region's appearance post-WNS

when considering all geographical locations together is not, however, reflected when the data

are broken down into representatives of each geographic location. A comparison of allele

frequencies of individual SNPs within this region shows that individuals sampled from PA

showed an increase in deviation from the reference genome over time, whilst a greater

proportion of reference alleles were seen in NY samples Post-WNS compared with Pre-WNS.

The differences in proportions, growing as they were over time, were insufficient to exhibit a

high fixation index Pre-WNS, but were notably different after the disease had spread through

the population. One could argue, that this is due to sampling at maternal colonies and swarming

sites, which has known effects on allele frequency differences (Johnson et al., 2015). However,

we sampled at a number of maternal colonies, which would dilute this effect, and furthermore,

recent studies suggest philopatry within maternal colonies may not be as high as previously

expected (Olivera-Hyde et al., 2019, although on *M. septentrionalis*). Therefore we assume our

sampling of multiple maternal colonies and hibernation sites has removed any effects of

relatedness within our sample sets.

This region within the scaffold containing the peak contains six annotated genes with very

different functions. Two, POC1B and CEP290, are involved in cilia development and

maintenance. The ATP2B1 gene encodes a protein which belongs to the family of P-type

primary ion transport ATPases, whereas TMTC3 is involved in the control of endoplasmic

reticulum stress response. MGAT4C is a glycosyltransferase that participates in the transfer of

N-acetylglucosamine (GlcNAc) to the core mannose residues of N-linked glycans. Finally,

KITLG produces a protein involved in mast cell development, migration and function, and

melanogenesis. KITLG has been documented as a target of evolution in recent studies and in

humans it has been linked with thermoregulation (Yang et al., 2018), which is a critical

component of bat life history (Studier and O'Farrell, 1972). In fact, upregulation of KITLG at

low temperature helps promote the production of brown fat for heat generation (Huang et al.,

2014). Bats utilise brown adipose tissue in arousals to normothermia from different degrees of

torpor (Thomas et al., 1990). There is also evidence of parallel evolution of pigmentation in

sticklebacks and humans linked to KITLG (Miller et al., 2007), as well as its role in determining

resistance/susceptibility to swine respiratory diseases in Erhulian pigs (Huang et al., 2017).

KITLG, by influencing mast cell development, could also play a role in either protective or

pathological immune responses to *P. destructans*, which may involve IgE-mediated

recognition of secreted fungal proteins. As such, temporal changes we found in allele

frequencies at this locus could, for instance, be linked to differences in hibernation site

temperatures, and/or thermoregulatory needs in bats sampled at different locations (Humphries

et al., 2002; Thomas et al., 1990). Spatial patterns, as seen here between the arbitrarily pooled

samples from PA and NY, could be due to local adaptation, in which strong selective sweeps

may be linked to gene variants favoured in local interactions (Hansen et al., 2012; Kyle et al.,

2014; Rico et al., 2015; Schoville et al., 2012). Whilst we lack data concerning migration

patterns of the bats studied here, as well as the environmental conditions within their

microfugia, future work would benefit from these data in a bid to understand whether bats

repeatedly frequent habitats with similar conditions and whether, indeed, there is a significant

difference in conditions across these Eastern states that explains the rapid rise in allelic

differentiation, and thus $F_{ST}$ values, at this locus.

The increase in $F_{ST}$ values in this scaffold GL429776 could, alternatively, be due to the massive

population decline caused by WNS (Langwig et al., 2017). Although not supported by existing

data, the decline could potentially have resulted in a decrease in connectivity and gene flow

between remnant local populations allowing for a local adaptation to arise (Bohonak, 1999;

Lilley, Anttila, & Ruokolainen, 2018). Genetically resolved examples of local adaptations are

rare (Hoekstra et al., 2006) and, in our focal system, pinpointing the causality leading to local

adaptation is especially difficult due to the cryptic life history of bats. Determining how these

variants are spread or localised among populations is essential to understanding and managing

the emergence of new selective pressures (Eizaguirre et al., 2012; Kyle et al., 2014). We cannot

fully exclude the possibility of WNS selecting for alleles in our scaffold of interest though. It

is likely that there is concurrent selection occurring across multiple populations, and that

selection is not acting to the same degree or even on the same loci in different geographic areas

affected by WNS (Messer and Petrov, 2013). This also applies to interpreting the results on a

smaller scale: the samples had not been collected from exactly the same locations before and

after WNS, which may contribute to our results. Individuals sampled during the winter, at their

hibernacula, may not inhabit the vicinity of these locations during the summer, although

dispersal distances are often short (Davis & Hitchcock, 1965; but see Norquay et al., 2013).

Understanding how local separate sub-populations cope with pathogen pressure would benefit

from an RNAseq-approach identifying responses at transcript-level (Lilley et al., 2019).

The ankyrin 2 protein encoding gene, lying within the observed small scaffolds on the right-

hand side of the $F_{ST}$ plots has a wide range of attributed Gene Ontology functions (The UniProt

Consortium, 2019), which reinforce the ubiquitous nature and far-reaching roles of ankyrin-

repeat-containing genes across organisms (Voronin and Kiseleva, 2007). Alternatively, the

peaks in this area may have arisen because only relatively few SNPs were called there given

the small size of the scaffolds, thus limiting our ability to generate high-quality windows, hence

the greater sampling noise.

Despite not seeing an overarching genetic signal associated with resistance in *M. lucifugus*,

remnant populations appear to be surviving year after year and even increasing in size

notwithstanding infection loads during the hibernation period (Langwig et al., 2017; Lilley et

al., 2016). The fact that the intensity of infection with *P. destructans* appears to be significantly

lower for remnant populations compared to colonies in the midst of the epidemic phase and

massive declines may suggest the development of resistance in these populations (Bernard et

al., 2017; Langwig et al., 2017; but see Lilley et al., 2019). However, the role of environmental

interactions during the hibernation period, when the bat hosts are most vulnerable to the

pathogen, have been largely neglected, although the effect of humidity and temperature on the

growth of the fungal pathogen and survival of the host have been separately studied (Grieneisen

et al., 2015; Marroquin et al., 2017; Verant et al., 2012). Modelling also suggests that

environmental factors, including the cave microbiome, have an impact on the proliferation and

infectivity of *P. destructans* (Hayman, Pulliam, Marshall, Cryan, & Webb, 2016; Lilley et al.,

2018). This is supported by the discovery of microbes in hibernacula environments and bats

that are able to retard the growth of the fungus (Micalizzi et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2014, 2015).

In light of our results and considering bat life history as a whole, adaptation and evolutionary

rescue may not be a fast track for recovery of bat populations affected by WNS (Maslo and

Fefferman, 2015), although ultimately these will contribute to long term survival of populations

(Lilley et al., 2019). At the present, it is more likely the variability in hibernation site

environmental conditions and strong selection for microbial taxa that inhibit *P. destructans*

could explain why populations are recovering from the zoonosis (Cheng et al., 2016; Lemieux-

Labonté, Simard, Willis, & Lapointe, 2017; Lilley et al., 2018).

It is still unclear how frequently genetic adaptation occurs in natural populations and under

what circumstances it is promoted (Schoville et al., 2012). Many studies have recorded

phenotypic changes in natural populations and attributed them to host-pathogen interactions

(Frank et al., 2014; Kilpatrick, 2006; Langwig et al., 2017; Råberg et al., 2009). However, it is

difficult to determine conclusively whether changes in phenotype are the result of selection in

the genome or a result of phenotypic plasticity (Paterson et al., 2010; Routtu and Ebert, 2015).

Also, the assumed benefit of change (i.e. adaptation) is often not tested experimentally, which

would allow for inference of causality with the pathogen through exclusion of other potential

drivers.

To conclude, our results suggest WNS has not yet decidedly subjected populations of *M.*

*lucifugus* to selective pressures leading to genetic adaptation in remnant populations. No

population -wide signs of selection in comparisons of genomes of Pre-WNS and ten years Post-

WNS populations were observed (but see Donaldson et al., 2017; Gignoux-Wolfsohn et al.,

2018). This is something that is not unexpected with a species in which the effective population

size most likely numbered in tens of millions of individuals prior to the onset of WNS. The

disease has not caused a true population bottle-neck, as exemplified by our measures of genetic

diversity not varying between pre- and post-WNS samples. Our results indicate that the

existence and recent growth of remnant populations of *M. lucifugus* are more likely attributable

to other factors, such as microbiome adaptation and hibernation site selection among others,

rather than genetic adaption. However, we found increased variability in a specific area of the

genome in a comparison of Post-WNS samples from our two different study states, relative to

Pre-WNS samples. We suggest this is due to weakened connectivity between bats at different

locations allowing for local adaptations to enrich in the absence of gene flow. Although genes

in the high $F_{ST}$ region of the genome were identified, and genes such as KITLG provide

interesting avenues of research, even with regards to WNS, further investigation into the

processes in bat life history to which these genes are related are required to expound upon the

existing gene annotations.

## Acknowledgements

485 We thank Svenska Kulturfonden, H2020 Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions (TML, 706196)

486 and the Natural Environment Research Council, UK for funding the study; staff at the Centre

487 for Genomic Research, University of Liverpool, UK for DNA sequencing expertise; Jenni

488 Prokkola and Riley F. Bernard for proofreading the manuscript; and Alice Lilley, Cali Wilson,

489 Beth Rogers and Mike Scafini for assisting in sample collection.

## Author contributions

491 TML and SP designed the research. TML, DMR, KAF, AK, GGR and CH collected the

492 samples. TML prepared samples for sequencing. TML, IWW and SP analysed the data. TML,

493 IWW and SP wrote the first draft of the manuscript, and all authors contributed to the final

494 version.

 Data availability statement

 Raw data are available at ENA accession XXXXX and bioinformatics code at
 https://github.com/scottishwormboy/myoluc.

 References

 **Table captions**

 Table 1. Samples used in study.

 Table 2. Summary of individual SNP $F_{ST}$ values across the *M. lucifugus* genome when
 comparing Pre-WNS with Post-WNS; and samples from PA and NY (both Pre- and Post-
 WNS).

 Table 3. Genes within the *M. lucifugus* genome – excluding scaffold GL429776 – with
 windows possessing $F_{ST}$ values >= 0.05 when comparing PA and NY samples Post-WNS

 Table 4. Genes within scaffold GL429776 with windows possessing $F_{ST}$ values >= 0.05 when
 comparing PA and NY samples Post-WNS.

 Figure captions

 Fig. 1. *M. lucifugus* sampling locations in Pennsylvania (PA) and New York (NY). Pre-WNS-
 sites in grey circles and Post-WNS-sites in white circles. 1) Aitkin Cave, Mifflin County, PA
 (n=3); 2) Snyder County, Penn, PA (n=19); 3) Lewisburg, Union Co, PA (n=3); 4)
 Northumberland County, PA (n=2); 5) Howes Cave, County Schoharie, NY (n=24); 6)
 Allentown, Lehigh County, PA (n=32); 7) Woodward, Centre County, PA (n=14); 8)
 Alexandria, Huntingdon County, PA (n=20); 9) Lackawaxen, Pike County, PA (n=4); 10)

Oley, County Berks, PA (n=12); 11) Frankstown, County Blair, PA (n=12); 12) Williams

Preserve Mine, NY (n=16); 13) Hoopers Mine, NY (n=24); 14) Delmar, Albany County, NY

(n=36); and 15) Willsboro, Essex County, NY (n=21).

Fig. 2. Fixation indices ($F_{ST}$) across the *M. lucifugus* genome, comparing the population before

and after the arrival of white-nose syndrome. Scaffold lengths presented in green and blue.

Solid red line indicates cut-off for $F_{ST}$ values of 5 standard deviations from the mean across

the whole genome; dotted red line indicates cut-off of $F_{ST}=0.05$.

Fig 3. Fixation indices ($F_{ST}$) across the *M. lucifugus* genome between geographically separated

individuals of the study population a) comparing individuals from PA to individuals from NY

before the arrival of WNS; b) comparing individuals from PA before and after the arrival of

WNS; and c) comparing individuals from NY before and after the arrival of WNS. Solid red

line indicates cut-off for $F_{ST}$ values of 5 standard deviations from the mean across the whole

genome; dotted red line indicates cut-off of $F_{ST}=0.05$.

Fig 4. Fixation indices ($F_{ST}$) across the *M. lucifugus* genome between geographically separated

individuals of the study population a) comparing individuals from PA to individuals from NY

after the arrival of WNS, with a zoomed plot of scaffold GL429776 and gene models therein

containing windows demonstrating $F_{ST}$ values < 0.05; and b) comparing individuals from PA

to individuals from NY with Pre- and Post-WNS data combined. Solid red line indicates cut-

off for $F_{ST}$ values of 5 standard deviations from the mean across the whole genome; dotted red

line indicates cut-off of $F_{ST}=0.05$.

Fig 5. Proportions of reference alleles called at individual SNP sites for the region of scaffold

GL429776 demonstrating high $F_{ST}$ values when comparing a) individuals from Pennsylvania

before and after the arrival of WNS; b) individuals from NY before and after the arrival of

WNS; c) individuals from PA to individuals from NY before the arrival of WNS; and d)

individuals from PA to individuals from NY after the arrival of WNS.

Table 1.

| Sample age | Classification | Total number of samples | Pennsylvania* | New York* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2006 | Pre-WNS | 49 | 25 | 24 |
| 2007 | Pre-WNS | 3 | 3 | |
| 2015 | Post-WNS | 28 | 28 | |
| 2016 | Post-WNS | 139 | 82 | 57 |

* WNS first detected in New York in 2007 and PA in 2009

Table 2.

| | Pre- vs post-WNS | Between site (combining pre- and post-WNS) |
|---|---|---|
| **Median (Interquartile range)** | 0.0059 (0.0013 – 0.0171) | 0.0057 (0.0013 – 0.0165) |
| **Mean (s.d.)** | 0.0127 (0.0173) | 0.0123 (0.0170) |

Table 3.

| Scaffold | Location range (bp) | Gene ID | Protein Function | Number of overlapping high $F_{ST}$ windows |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NW_005871715.1 | 288334 - 351644 | 102435296 | bifunctional heparan sulfate N-deacetylase/N-sulfotransferase 4-like (partial) | 4 |
| NW_005871771.1 | 26662 - 48938 | 102441697 | E3 ubiquitin-protein ligase TRIM7 | 1 |
| NW_005871823.1 | 81353 - 213965 | 102428352 | Ankyrin 2 | 7 |
| NW_005871905.1 | 175 - 139344 | 102428043 | calcium/calmodulin-dependent protein kinase type II subunit delta-like | 10 |

| NW_005872026.1 | 72042 - 101269 | 102443179 | N-deacetylase and N-sulfotransferase 4 (partial) | 1 |
| NW_005872062.1 | 33266 - 86607 | 102428048 | zinc finger GRF-type containing 1 | 1 |

Table 4.

| Gene ID | $F_{ST}$ | No of windows | No of windows | Start pos. | End pos. | Details |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

|  |  |  | (per 10kb) |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MGAT4C | 0.0612 | 78 | 1.08 | 8999210 | 9724150 | Glycosyltransferase that participates in the transfer of N-acetylglucosamine (GlcNAc) to the core mannose residues of N-linked glycans |
| CEP290 | 0.0679 | 12 | 1.01 | 10709418 | 10827912 | Involved in early and late steps in cilia formation |
| ATP2B1 | 0.0826 | 12 | 0.89 | 12228178 | 12362389 | The protein encoded by this gene belongs to the family of P-type primary ion transport ATPases characterised by the formation of an aspartyl phosphate intermediate during the reaction cycle. These enzymes remove bivalent calcium ions from eukaryotic cells against very large concentration gradients and play a critical role in intracellular calcium homeostasis. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| KITLG | 0.0706 | 10 | 1.13 | 11127130 | 11215731 | Plays an essential role in the regulation of cell survival and proliferation, hematopoiesis, stem cell maintenance, gametogenesis, mast cell development, migration and function, and in melanogenesis. |
| POC1B | 0.0686 | 7 | 0.74 | 12044678 | 12139811 | Plays an important role in centriole assembly and/or stability and ciliogenesis |
| TMTC3 | 0.0872 | 6 | 1.00 | 10827719 | 10887502 | Involved in the positive regulation of proteasomal protein degradation in the endoplasmic reticulum (ER), and the control of ER stress response. |
| GeneID:111824954 | 0.0693 | 5 | 1.14 | 11756928 | 11800690 | uncharacterised LOC111824954 |
| CUNH12orf50 | 0.0588 | 2 | 0.67 | 10663328 | 10693373 | chromosome unknown C12orf50 homolog |
| GeneID:111824948 | 0.0816 | 2 | 1.13 | 11375011 | 11392720 | uncharacterised LOC111824948 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GeneID:111824949 | 0.0635 | 2 | 1.14 | 11802704 | 11820273 | uncharacterised LOC111824949 |
| CUNH12orf29 | 0.0488 | 1 | 0.71 | 10696290 | 10710421 | chromosome unknown C12orf29 homolog |
| DUSP6 | 0.0603 | 1 | 2.26 | 11976039 | 11980455 | Inactivates MAP kinases. |
| GeneID:111824955 | 0.0459 | 1 | 1.57 | 12101754 | 12108133 | uncharacterised LOC111824955 |