Evolution of Gene Expression and Splicing in Parallel Cold-Adapted Fly Populations

Yuheng Huang[1][*][@], Justin B. Lack[1][**], Grant T. Hoppel[1], and John E. Pool[1][@]

[1]Laboratory of Genetics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin 53706

[*]Current address: Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of California, Irvine, Irvine, CA 92697

[**]Current address: Advanced Biomedical Computational Science, Frederick National Laboratory for Cancer Research, Frederick, MD 21701

[@]e-mail: yhenh3@uci.edu; jpool@wisc.edu.

Abstract

Changes in gene regulation at multiple levels may comprise an important share of the molecular changes underlying adaptive evolution in nature. However, few studies have assayed within- and between-population variation in gene regulatory traits at a transcriptomic scale, and therefore inferences about the characteristics of adaptive regulatory changes have been elusive. Here, we assess quantitative trait differentiation in gene expression levels and alternative splicing (intron usage) between three closely-related pairs of natural populations of *Drosophila melanogaster* from contrasting thermal environments that reflect three separate instances of cold tolerance evolution. The cold-adapted populations were known to show population genetic evidence for parallel evolution at the SNP level, and here we find significant although somewhat limited evidence for parallel expression evolution between them, and less evidence for parallel splicing evolution. We find that genes with mitochondrial functions are particularly enriched among candidates for adaptive expression evolution. We also develop a method to estimate cis- versus trans-encoded contributions to expression or splicing differences that does not rely on the presence of fixed differences between parental strains. Applying this method, we infer important roles of both cis- and trans-regulation among our putatively adaptive expression and splicing differences. The apparent contributions of cis- versus trans-regulation to adaptive evolution vary substantially among population pairs, with an Ethiopian pair showing pervasive trans-effects, suggesting that basic characteristics of regulatory evolution may depend on biological context. These findings expand our knowledge of adaptive gene regulatory evolution and our ability to make inferences about this important and widespread process.

Introduction

Different species or populations often evolve similar phenotypes when adapting to similar environments (Schluter 2000; Losos, 2011). Although such parallel phenotypic evolution can be caused by structural mutations changing amino acids (Hoekstra and Coyne, 2007), there is increasing evidence that regulatory mutations altering gene expression underlie many cases of phenotypic evolution (Wittkopp & Kalay, 2012; Jones et al. 2012; Stern 2013; Sackton et al. 2019). Most studies on gene expression focus on expression abundance (the number of transcripts for a whole gene). However, alternative splicing resulting in the difference of transcript proportions can also contribute to adaptation (Barbosa-Morais et al. 2012; Gamazon and Stranger 2014; Smith et al. 2018). Therefore, understanding the transcriptomic basis of parallel phenotypic evolution requires studies of both expression abundance and alternative splicing, although the latter aspect has rarely been studied.

The level of parallelism for gene expression abundance changes varies across study systems. In some

taxa and natural conditions, significantly more genes show parallel changes (repeatedly up- or down-

regulated in one ecotype relative to the other among independent population pairs) than anti-

directional changes (Zhao et al. 2015; Hart et al. 2018; Kitano et al. 2018; McGirr and Martin.

2018). However, some other cases did not show significant parallel patterns, or they even show anti-

parallel patterns (Derome et al. 2006; Lai et al. 2008; Hanson et al. 2017). The varying degree of

parallelism may partly be explained by the level of divergence among ancestors: more closely related

ancestors are expected to show a higher degree of parallel genetic evolution underlie similar

phenotypic evolution (Conte et al. 2012; Rosenblum et al. 2014).

Furthermore, gene expression evolution can be caused by the same or different molecular

underpinnings. Because of the difficulties of mapping expression QTL, a first step is to classify the

expression evolution into two regulatory classes. Cis-regulatory changes are caused by local

regulatory mutations and result in allele-specific expression difference in a hybrid of divergent

parental lines (Cowles et al. 2002; Wittkopp et al. 2004). Trans-regulatory changes are caused by

regulatory mutations at other loci. They modify the expression of both alleles in hybrid diploids and

do not result in allele-specific expression difference (Gilad et al. 2008). The relative importance of cis-

and trans-effects to parallel evolution varies among different studies systems (Wittkopp et al. 2008;

McManus et al. 2010; Wittkopp and Kalay 2012; Chen et al. 2015; Osada et al. 2017; Hart et al.

2018; Nandamuri et al. 2018; Verta and Jones 2019). Most previous studies have focused on

regulatory evolution between relatively distantly related lineages such as different species, from which

population genetic evidence of adaptive evolution may not be available. Hence, the contributions of

cis- and trans-effects to the recent adaptive divergence between populations remain mostly unknown.

In part because of the interest in the evolutionary response to climate change, *Drosophila* has been

used as a model system to study the genetic basis of thermal adaptation (Hoffmann et al. 2003).

Because temperature is an important environmental variable along latitudinal clines, clinal

populations of *Drosophila melanogaster* have been studied for decades (Adrion et al. 2015). Along these

clines, populations exhibit different degrees of cold tolerance in the expected direction, suggesting

spatially varying selection related to temperature (Hoffmann and Weeks 2007; Schmidt and Paaby

2008). The recent development of genomics has allowed identification of clinal genomic variants,

which are candidates for thermal adaptation (e.g., Kolaczkowski et al. 2011; Fabian et al. 2012;

Bozicevic et al. 2016; Mateo et al. 2018). There is also evidence of parallel evolution at the genomic

and transcriptomic level (Reinhardt et al. 2014; Bergland et al. 2015; Machado et al. 2015; Zhao et

al. 2015; Juneja et al. 2016; Zhao and Begun 2017). Some of these studies compared clines between

species (which may have somewhat distinct biology), while others compared clines between Australia

and North America (which both feature primarily European ancestry with clinally variable African

admixture). Other transcriptomic studies have identified genes showing differential expression

between sub-Saharan African and European populations (e.g., Catalan et al. 2012; Huylmans and

Parsch 2014), which are separated by moderately strong neutral genetic differentiation associated

with the out-of-Africa bottleneck.

More broadly, populations of *Drosophila melanogaster* from contrasting environments offer an excellent

opportunity to study parallel gene regulatory evolution and its underlying mechanisms. Originating

from a warm sub-Saharan ancestral range (Lachaise et al. 1988; Pool et al. 2012), D. melanogaster

has occupied diverse habitats, including environments with contrasting temperature ranges. There

are at least three instances in which the species expanded to cold environments: from Africa into

higher latitude regions in Eurasia, from Ethiopia lowland to higher altitudes, and from South Africa

lowland to higher altitudes. Populations were collected from these six regions, representing three

warm-cold population pairs: Mediterranean pair (Med), collected in Egypt (EG, warm) and France

(FR, cold); Ethiopian pair (Eth) collected in Ethiopia lowland (EA, warm) and highland (EF, cold);

and South Africa pair (SAf), collect in South Africa lowland (SP, warm) and highland (SD, cold).

Importantly, each of these population pairs has the advantage of low genetic differentiation between

its warm- and cold-adapted members (Pool et al. 2017). Although the cold populations have invaded

colder habitats for only ~1000-2000 years (~15k-30k generations) (Sprengelmeyer et al. 2019), they

have shown signals of parallel adaptation for cold tolerance and allele frequency changes (Pool et al.

2017). In the present study, this unique system allows us to assess the degree of parallelism for

transcriptomic changes underlying parallel cold tolerance evolution.

Here, we generate RNA sequencing (RNA-seq) data for multiple outbred genotypes from each of the

six population samples listed above, from larval, pupal, and adult stages. We estimate gene

expression and alternative intron usage levels for each sample, then identify cases of unusually high

quantitative trait differentiation between each pair of warm- and cold-adapted populations. We find

evidence for parallel evolution for expression abundance at the larval and female adult stage, but less

parallel signal for splicing. We further tease out the cis-vs. trans-regulatory effect by sequencing the

transcriptomics of the parental lines from different populations and their F1 offspring. Applying our
resampling approach to study cis- and trans-regulatory effects, we find the relative contribution of cis-
vs. trans-effects to adaptive expression differentiation varies notably across population pairs. Finally,
we identify several candidate genes with both cis-effects and high F_{ST}, as potential targets of local
adaptation.

Results

Phenotypic evolution related to cold adaptation

The cold populations have been shown to have a higher proportion of recovered female adults after
prolonged cold exposure than the respective warm populations (Pool et al. 2017). Here for egg-to-
adult survival at 15°C, we found the FR and EF populations have significantly higher survival than
the ancestral range Zambia ZI population, while at 25°C benign temperature all the populations
have relatively high survival (75%). Although SD is not significantly better than ZI at cold
temperature for this assay, it follows the same trend. Together the results for survival and adult cold
tolerance suggest the cold populations have evolved to adapt to low temperature.

Fig 1. Survival for the ancestral warm population (ZI) and the cold populations (EF, FR and SD) at
different temperatures. * indicates the survival is significant difference (p < 0.05). Error bar shows the
standard error based on three strains.

Co-directional evolution in gene expression between population pairs

To focus on the transcriptomes of outbred genotypes, we generated eight within-population crosses
from each population under a derived cold environment (15 °C). We then surveyed the
transcriptomes on larvae, pupae and female adults for each cross using high-throughput RNA

sequencing (RNA-Seq). We used a quantitative genetic index, P_{ST}, to quantify phenotypic

differentiation of expression and splicing between populations in each pair. P_{ST}, analogous to F_{ST} for

genetic variation, measures the amount of trait variance between populations versus total variance for

a phenotype (Merila et al. 1997; Brommer 2011; Leinonen et al. 2013). The genes/introns with

highest P_{ST} quantiles are more likely to be under ecological differential selection between populations

than those with lower P_{ST} quantiles (Leder et al. 2015).

The numbers of genes that passed the filters for analysis were (same across population pairs): 4699

genes for larva, 5098 genes for pupa and 6786 genes for adult. To study gene expression divergence

potentially under ecologically differential selection, we calculated P_{ST} (Materials and Methods). The

top 20 P_{ST} outliers for each population/stage for expression and for splicing are listed in Table S1.

We used the upper 5% of P_{ST} quantile as outliers for each population pair. We found signals of

parallel expression divergence in all three pairwise comparisons (Med vs. Eth; Med vs. SAf; Eth vs.

SAf), where the shared outliers with co-directional changes were more than expected by chance.

Across the three developmental stages, adult stage showed the highest level of parallelism (on average

0.34% of outliers were shared and changed consistently).

stage	larva		pupa		adult	
Population pairs	Med	SAf	Med	SAf	Med	SAf
Eth	1.4	1.2	**2.2**	0.79	1.4	**4.3**
SAf	**3.1**		0.16		**2.4**	

Table 1. The proportional enrichment of parallel expression abundance changes in real data relative

to expectation. The proportion of parallelism expected by chance is 0.05×0.05×0.5=0.00125. All the

proportions for larvae and adult stages were higher than the expectation (proportional enrichment >

1). Those that were significantly greater than the expectation are in bold (binomial one-tailed test,

Bonferroni correction for nine tests in total).

To explore the broader patterns of parallel changes, we used the upper 5% P_{ST} outliers in a

population pair (*Outlier Pair*) and examined whether the expression for this set of genes changed in the

same direction in another pair (*Directional Pair*), regardless of outlier status in the latter pair. There

were excesses of co-directional changes in the *Directional Pairs* for the larval stage (Figure 1). However,

the patterns were weaker for the adult stage and there were excesses of anti-directional changes for

the pupal stage.

Fig. 2. Fractions of co-directional gene expression changes in *Directional Pairs* for the P_{ST} outliers

identified at the *Outlier Pairs*. The grey bar indicates the fraction of co-directional change for the

control set of genes. * indicates the fraction for the outliers is significantly different from the control

genes after Bonferroni correction. Overall, the Med and SAf pairs showed stronger co-directional

changes than the comparisons involved Eth pair.

We also performed a similar analysis for P_{ST} outliers of alternative exon junction usage. The numbers

of exon junctions that passed the cutoffs for P_{ST} calculation were 976 for larva, 4604 for pupa and

7059 for adult. The patterns of co-directional changes were qualitatively similar to those for gene

expression (Fig. S1). The fractions of co-directional changes were still highest for the larvae among

the three stages; all of the comparisons except one showed an excess of co-directional changes relative

to the control comparisons. For pupae, there was evidence for both co-directional and anti-

directional changes. For female adult stages, the major pattern was an excess of anti-directional

changes.

Enriched functional categories for the P_{ST} outliers for gene expression and exon usage

Significant Gene Ontology (GO) terms enriched in different sets of P_{ST} outliers for gene expression

are listed in Table S2. Among the significant GO terms for different population pairs, we found six

terms shared between Med pair and Eth pair at the adult stage. The level of sharing is significantly

more than we expect by chance based on permuted outlier sets (p < 0.001), suggesting functional

convergence for adult development to the cold environment for Med pair and Eth pair. Further,

similar GO terms were identified from different pairs at different stages such as terms related to

mitochondria, nucleoside metabolic process, and oxidoreductase complex. However, the majority of

GO terms were unique for different pairs, suggesting that many functional changes for adaptation to

cold environments may be population-specific.

Cis- and trans-acting contributions to differential gene expression abundance

One major goal is to distinguish the contributions of cis- and trans-regulatory effects on expression

differentiation. First, we compared the overall strengths of cis- and trans-effects by estimating the

absolute values of cis- and trans-effects for all analyzed genes. The magnitudes of trans-effects are

significantly larger than the cis-effects in all three population pairs (mean absolute cis effects and trans

effects are: Med pair, 0.09 vs. 0.14, p < 2.2e-16; Eth pair, 0.27 vs. 0.32, p =1.5e-14; SAf pair, 0.14 vs.

0.15, p < 2.2e-16. 'Mann-Whitney' paired test.). Moreover, we found strong negative relationships

between cis- and trans-effects within each population pair (Fig. S2), where the cis- and trans-effects

are generally in the opposite directions.

Next, we used our conservative permutation approach (see Materials and Methods) to study how

many genes show a significant cis-effect, trans-effect or both. Averaged across population pairs, we

found that for the expression abundance, 12.6% show cis only regulatory effects while 26.2% show

trans only effects, consistent with trans-effects being stronger on average than cis-effects (Table 2).

Because we are interested in the regulatory contributions to adaptive evolution of gene expression, we

further compared the ratio of trans only to cis only genes between P_{ST} outliers and non-outliers. The

ratio is significantly lower in P_{ST} outliers than that in non-outliers for Med pair (p = 0.003) but the

pattern reverses for Eth pair (p = 8.5e-10; Fig. 3 left; Fig. 4). While the ratio is not different for SAf

pair (p = 0.999). Hence, there is not a consistent pattern of greater usage of cis- versus trans-

regulatory changes in putatively adaptive expression changes compared with transcriptome-wide

differentiation.

On average across population pairs, about 31% of all genes in the analysis showed both effects (Table

2). Among the outlier genes showing both effects (Fig 4), the vast majority (85%) of them were in

opposite directions (*i.e.* compensatory). Similarly, most of the control genes with both effects showed

apparent compensation (88%), which is consistent with the transcriptome-wide negative relationship

between cis- and trans-effects (Fig. S2). Although the pattern can be biologically meaningful, it may

also represent an artifact from using the same F1 expression data for allele specific expression (ASE)

estimation to infer both cis- and trans-effects. Any measurement error on ASE will introduce

artifactual negative correlation between cis- and trans-acting changes (see Discussion below).

Fig 3. Ratio of genes (left) and intron usage (right) showing trans only regulatory effects to those

showing cis only effects for P_{ST} outliers and non-outliers. * indicates the ratio is significantly different

between P_{ST} outliers and non-outliers (p < 0.005).

Fig 4. The relative expression proportion of cold alleles in parental and F1 datasets. The colors of the points indicate the regulatory mechanism of the outlier genes inferred by our approach.

Since the cis-regulatory mutations contributing to local adaptation may show differentiation in allele frequency between populations, we examined whether genes with cis-effects (including cis only genes and genes with both cis- and trans-effects) show association with high F_{ST} between the two warm and cold populations − for both window F_{ST} (F_{ST_winmax}) and SNP F_{ST} (F_{ST_SNPmax}). We found that only genes with high F_{ST_winmax} are enriched in cis-regulated genes in Med pair (the proportion for high F_{ST_winmax} is: cis-effect genes, 22.5%; control non-outliers, 11%; p = 0.037). However, there was no significant enrichment for high F_{ST_SNPmax} in cis-regulated genes. Moreover, there was no enrichment for either window or F_{ST_SNPmax} with cis-regulated genes in the other population pairs.

We then focused more narrowly on a set of outlier genes that showed both significant cis-effect only and higher F_{ST} quantile (upper 5%), which could reflect adaptive regulatory evolution targeting the surveyed sequences or nearby sites. For Med pair, there were three cis-genes showing high window F_{ST} (*Ciao1*, *Cyp6a17,* and *NiPp1*) and one cis-gene showing high F_{ST_SNPmax} (*spin*). Interestingly, *Cyp6a17* encodes a cytochrome P450 protein that is required for temperature preference behavior (Kang et al. 2011). *Cyp6a17* variants have also been associated with insecticide resistance (Battlay et al. 2018; Duneau et al. 2018). *Cyp6a17* is impacted by a polymorphic whole-gene deletion with contrasting frequencies between populations (Chakraborty et al. 2018), underscoring its likely role in local adaptation. The *spin* gene is essential for mTOR reactivation and lysosome reformation after starvation and has important effects on nervous system and courtship behavior (Nakano et al. 2001; Rong et al. 2011). For Eth pair, there were two genes with high window F_{ST} (*CG3529* and *mle*) and one with high F_{ST_SNPmax} (*Aldh-III*), which encodes a protein that confers a xenobiotic stress resistance and neutralises the lipid aldehydes formed after the attack of reactive oxygen and radicals (Arthaud et

al. 2011; Mateo et al. 2014). For SAf pair, one cis-gene showed both high window F_{ST} and high

F_{ST_SNPmax} (*AGO2*) and one showing high F_{ST_SNPmax} (*eca*). *AGO2* is involved with antiviral defense and

developmental regulation (Deshpande et al. 2005; Nayak et al. 2010) and was previously found to

contain fixed differences between European and African populations (Pool 2015). For the genes

showing high F_{ST_SNPmax} (*spin*, *Aldh-III*, *AGO2*, and *eca*), we plotted the SNP F_{ST} along the gene region

to show the sites that are the most likely targets of selection (Fig. 5). Interestingly, for *spin*, *Aldh-III* and

eca, the highest F_{ST} sites are located in noncoding regions (intron region for *spin*, downstream of the

gene for *Aldh*-III and upstream of the gene for *eca*). While for *AGO2*, the highest F_{ST} site was located in

the protein coding sequence.

Further, we identified seven genes showing consistent cis-effects across two population pairs (cis-effect

favored expression of the same cold or warm parental alleles). Similarly, these shared cis- effect genes

might show high genetic differentiation specific for cold populations in the two focal pairs. Using the

"Population Branch Excess" statistic (PBE) results from Pool et al. 2017, we found that one gene

named *Tollo* contained SNPs showing high cold-population specific differentiation (PBE quantile <

0.05) in both Eth and SAf pairs. *Tollo* is known to be have several important functions: innate

immune response, glucose and protein metabolism regulation, and peripheral nervous system

development (Seppo et al. 2003; Yagi et al. 2010; Akhouayri et al. 2011; Ballard et al. 2014).

Fig 5. SNP F_{ST} along the gene with flanking region of 2kb for *spin* in Med pair, *Aldh-III* in Eth pair

and *AGO2* and *eca* in SAf pair. The top diagram depicts the coding (orange) and non-coding (gray)

exon, captured from GBrowse 2 of *D. melanogaster* (R5.57) from FlyBase (St. Pierre et al. 2014).

pair	expression type	Total tests	Cis only	Trans only	Both co-dir	Both anti-dir	Neither
Med	P_{ST} outliers	282	41 (15%)	107 (38%)	12 (4%)	34 (12%)	88 (31%)
	Non-outliers	4887	431 (9%)	2015 (41%)	288 (6%)	917 (19%)	1236 (25%)
Eth	P_{ST} outliers	251	14 (6%)	75 (30%)	20 (8%)	104 (41%)	38 (15%)
	Non-outliers	4851	967 (20%)	985 (20%)	147 (3%)	1905 (39%)	847 (17%)
SAf	P_{ST} outliers	224	29 (13%)	54 (24%)	1 (0.4%)	49 (22%)	91 (41%)

	Non-outliers	4721	431 (9%)	780 (17%)	60 (1%)	1289 (27%)	2161 (46%)

Table 2. Numbers of gene expression abundance traits showing different regulatory effects for P_{ST} outliers and non-outliers. The percentage in parentheses indicates the fraction of genes in each category relative to total genes in the tests.

pair	Intron type	Total tests	Cis only	Trans only	Both co-dir	Both anti-dir	Neither
Med	P_{ST} outliers	21	2 (10%)	3 (14%)	0	3 (14%)	13 (62%)
	Non-outliers	375	78 (21%)	45 (12%)	2 (1%)	81 (22%)	169 (45%)
Eth	P_{ST} outliers	37	5 (14%)	9 (24%)	1 (3%)	10 (27%)	12 (32%)
	Non-outliers	456	170 (37%)	46 (10%)	5 (1%)	115 (25%)	120 (26%)
SAf	P_{ST} outliers	18	3 (17%)	1 (6%)	0	10 (56%)	4 (22%)
	Non-outliers	460	62 (13%)	41 (9%)	1 (0.2%)	168 (37%)	188 (41%)

Table 3. Numbers of introns showing different regulatory effects for P_{ST} outliers and non-outliers. The percentage in parentheses indicates the fraction of introns in each category relative to the total introns in the tests.

Cis- and trans-acting contributions to differential intron usage

For all intron usage, we found the magnitude of trans-effects on average to be higher than that of cis-effects (mean absolute cis effects and trans effects are: Med pair, 0.15 vs. 0.18, p = 6.2e-06; Eth pair, 0.32 vs. 0.34, p < 3.3e-5; SAf pair, 0.20 vs. 0.22, p = 0.00027. 'Mann-Whitney' paired test.). Although there are few outlier introns tested for cis- and trans-regulatory effects (Table 3) because of the limited diagnostic SNPs located within the intron regions, we found the numbers of significant trans only introns were higher than that of significant cis only introns summing across three population pairs. While for non-outlier introns, the significant trans only introns are fewer than the significant cis only introns (the numbers of cis only vs. trans only introns are ten vs. 13 for outliers; 311 vs. 132 for non-outliers; $X^2 = 6.1$; df = 1; P = 0.014). Thus, trans-regulated splicing changes appear to be relatively more common for putatively adaptive than for putatively neutral population differences, although the pattern varies geographically (Figure 3).

For the outlier introns showing cis-effects (including only cis and both cis and trans), the maximum

F_{ST} (F_{ST_SNPmax}) around their splice sites tends to be higher than that for non-outliers (average F_{ST_SNPmax}

for cis outlier vs. non-outliers: Med: 0.184 vs. 0.153; Eth: 0.152 vs. 0.134; SAf: 0.081 vs. 0.055).

Because there are few cis outlier introns with SNPs located around splice sites, all three comparisons

are non-significant based on Wilcoxon signed-rank test. Across the three comparisons, four genes

contained cis-regulated introns with high F_{ST_SNPmax} around splice sites (top 15% quantile of F_{ST_SNPmax}).

One identified in Med pair is *Usp10*, which is known to regulate Notch Signaling during development

(Zhang et al. 2012). One gene identified in SAf pair is *Sdc*, which has been shown to have

neuromuscular functions (Johnson et al. 2006; Chanana et al. 2009). The other two genes (*DOR* and

Jabba) were related to lipid metabolism (Francis 2010; McMillan et al. 2018). Since the two lipid

related genes were identified in highland pairs (*DOR* in SAf and *Jabba* in Eth), putative changes in

lipid metabolism might facilitate adaptation to high altitude environments.

Discussion

Parallel evolution has often been studied at the population genetic and trait levels, but it has less

frequently been analyzed at the transcriptome level (Stern 2013; Juneja et al. 2016). In this study, we

used three recent instances of adaptation to colder climates in *Drosophila melanogaster* to study the

evolution of gene expression and alternative splicing. The signal of parallel evolution in expression

abundance varied among developmental stages, with a higher degree of parallelism for larva and

adult stages than pupa. Further, we studied cis- and trans-regulatory evolution in the context of this

ecological adaptation. For gene expression abundance, we found geographically variable patterns of

cis- versus trans-effects for highly differentiated expression outliers relative to the other genes.

Specifically, P_{ST} outliers show enrichment of cis-effect relative to background genes in Med pair while

outliers show enrichment of trans-effect in Eth pair. For splicing, we also found P_{ST} outliers enriched

for trans-effects in Eth pair. This pattern of trans-effects contributing to differential expression in the

Ethiopian pair raises the possibility of large-scale gene regulatory network changes in this

phenotypically distinctive highland population, which might result from a few genetic changes or

from many.

Although there are significant patterns of parallel evolution in expression abundance between

population pairs, the majority of outlier genes/intron usages are not shared between pairs. The low

level of detected parallelism could reflect a high false negative rate, for example due to limited

spatiotemporal expression of relevant differences (perhaps contributing to the greater parallelism

detected in larvae, which have somewhat less tissue diversity). Alternatively, it might reflect the

different selection agents in the different natural habitats as well as the demographic histories for

these populations. The cold FR population colonized a higher latitude environment than the related

warm population EG, whereas the other two cold populations colonized higher altitude environments

where the selection agents may include air pressure, desiccation and ultraviolet radiation (Pool et al.

2017). Also, the Med pair has experienced the trans-Saharan bottleneck (Pool et al. 2012;

Sprengelmeyer et al. 2019) and the standing genetic variation may be altered, potentially resulting in

a distinct evolutionary path for FR compared to other two cold populations. Although EF and SD

have both adapted to higher altitudes (EF at 3,070 meters above sea level, SD at 2,000), SD is

seasonally cold (like FR) whereas EF is perpetually cool. Notably, the EF population exhibits distinct

phenotypic evolution such as darker pigmentation (Bastide et al. 2014), larger body size (Pitchers et

al. 2013; Lack et al. 2016), and reduced reproductive rate (Lack et al. 2016). Therefore, the

underlying transcriptomic evolution for EF may partly reflect its unique phenotypic evolution.

Indeed, the Eth pair shows the least parallelism at gene level with the other pairs (Table 1; Fig. 2),

although it shared some parallel functional categories with the Med pair (Table S1).

Compared to the expression abundance, the pattern of parallelism is much weaker for intron usage

(Fig. 2, Fig S1), which may partly stem from lower power to detect intron usage change (only a small

proportion of reads are informative for exon junctions). However, we still found the Med pair and

SAf pair show more parallel changes than the combinations with the Eth pair, which is consistent

with results for expression abundance. Given the increasing evidence for alternative splicing

contributing to environmental response and adaptation (e.g., Singh et al. 2017; Signor and Nuzhdin

2018; Smith et al. 2018), we need to study both expression abundance and splicing to fully

understand the evolution at the transcriptome level. The development of sequencing approaches with

long reads that cover the entire transcripts will enable us to quantify isoforms frequency directly and

broaden the scope of alternative splicing variation that can readily be quantified. Since splicing

changes during development and among tissues (Brown et al. 2014; Gibilisco et al. 2016), a detailed

sampling throughout development of different tissues will also be necessary to understand the role of

splicing on ecological adaptation.

We found trans-effects are generally larger than the cis-effects across the transcriptome, which is

consistent with some previous studies (e.g., McManus et al. 2010; Coolon et al. 2014; Albert et al.

2018; Hart et al. 2018) but not with others (e.g., Lemmon et al. 2014; Mack et al. 2016; Verta and

Jones 2018). The transcriptome-wide stronger trans-effects can be caused by random regulatory
changes biased toward trans-regulation because of the larger trans-mutational target size (Landry et
al. 2007). To focus on the evolved changes related to adaptation, we compared the ratios of genes
with trans-effects to those with cis-effects between P_{ST} outliers and non-outliers and saw patterns
varied among population pairs (Fig. 3). Cis only genes are enriched in the outliers of Med pair while
trans only genes are enriched in the outliers of Eth pair, suggesting different adaptive regulatory
mechanisms responding to ecological shifts. These results suggest that both cis- and trans-acting
expression changes may be viable mechanisms of adaptive evolution. For intron usage, we found
more differences showing cis-effects than trans-effects across the transcriptome (Table 3), consistent
with splicing differences between *Drosophila* species studied by McManus et al. 2014. These results
may be unsurprising since alternative splicing in *Drosophila* is mostly regulated by nearby sequences
(Venables et al. 2011; Kurmangaliyev et al. 2015). However, particularly for the Ethiopian pair, we
observed a relative excess of trans-regulation among P_{ST} outliers, which is consistent with expression
abundance results for this same population pair (Fig. 3). Therefore, the genetic basis of gene
regulatory evolution may depend on the mechanism (e.g. transcription vs. splicing), the evolutionary
scale, and population-specific evolutionary events.

When we considered genes/introns showing both cis- and trans- effects, we observed that the two
types of effects were generally in opposite directions (anti-directional. Table 3). This is consistent with
the idea that gene expression is under stabilizing selection in general and gene regulatory networks
evolve negative feedback to buffer effects of regulatory changes (Denby et al. 2012; Coolon et al.
2014; Bader et al. 2015; Fear et al. 2016). With regard to our P_{ST} outliers, it is possible that cis-acting
changes might have evolved to compensate for unfavorable pleiotropic impacts of adaptive trans-
regulatory evolution. However, negative correlations between cis- and trans-effects can also be an
artifact coming from the measurement error on F1 expression data. Because the F1 data was used to
estimate ASE and compared it to 0.5 (cis-effect null) and to parental expression proportion (trans-
effect null), measurement error will introduce artifactual negative correlation between cis- and trans-
acting changes. Therefore, whether the opposing effects between cis- and trans-acting changes are
biologically meaningful will require further study. As Fraser (2019) and Zhang and Emerson (2019)
proposed, using independent F1 replicates or other approaches such as eQTL mapping to infer cis-
and trans-effects separately is necessary to affirm evidence of compensatory evolution.

We expect that the adaptive expression divergence caused by cis-regulatory changes should leave a

signal in the nearby genomic region. Therefore, we used F_{ST} statistics to quantify genetic

differentiation for the region around the focal genes. Window F_{ST} is sensitive to classic hard sweeps,

and relatively useful for incomplete sweeps and moderately soft sweeps, but it is less useful for soft

sweeps with higher initial frequencies of the beneficial allele (Lange and Pool 2016), for which SNP

F_{ST} may be more sensitive. Here, we only found enrichment of window F_{ST} outliers in cis-effect genes

for the Med pair. Interestingly, a previous genomic study on these populations found a stronger signal

of parallel change for SNP F_{ST} than for window F_{ST} genome-wide (Pool et al. 2017). In light of the

lack of elevated SNP F_{ST} among our cis-regulatory P_{ST} outliers, the previously-observed population

genetic parallelism may primarily reflect changes other than the cis-regulatory events identified from

our whole-organism RNAseq data.

Methods and Materials

Ecologically and phenotypically differentiated populations

The three *Drosophila melanogaster* cold-warm population pairs used in this study, France-Egypt (Med),

Ethiopia (Eth) and South Africa (SAf), were described in previous publications (Pool et al. 2012; Lack

et al. 2015; Pool 2017). The three cold derived populations have evolved increased cold tolerance in

parallel. A previous study has shown that female adults from the cold populations were more likely to

recover after 96 hours at 4 °C than the respective warm populations (Pool et al. 2017). Here to

confirm increased cold tolerance for the cold populations for egg-to-adult survival, we selected three

strains from each of the FR, EF and SD populations as well as from the ancestral warm population

ZI as control.

Developmental success was assayed at 15 °C as the cold environment and 25 °C as the warm control

environment. 40 mated female flies were allowed to lay eggs in a half pint glass milk bottle with a

standard medium at room temperature for 15 hours. Each strain had ~8 bottles. After the flies were

removed and the number of eggs were counted, about half of the bottles were incubated at warm

environment and the other half were incubated at cold environment. The numbers of adult flies

emerged from each bottle were counted after 14 days and 42 days from warm and cold environments

respectively. Bottles with more adults than recorded eggs were scored as 100% survival.

Developmental success for each strain was measured as the average emergence proportion among

bottles, which is the number of emerged adults divided by the number of eggs. To determine

significance, unpaired t-tests between each cold population and the ZI population were performed for
both temperature conditions.
438
RNA sample collections and sequencing
Within each population of the three warm-cold pairs (six populations in total), we selected 16 strains
and assigned them into eight crosses. Before the crossing, all the strains had been inbred for eight
generations. The criterion for choosing parental strains for a cross was based on minimal genomic
regions of overlapping heterozygosity. Among the strains chosen within each population, we used
similar criteria to select four strains to perform crosses between the warm and the respective cold
populations. Two of the four strains were used as the maternal lines and the other two were used as
paternal lines in the between-population crosses. One cross between SD and SP populations was lost.
We also collected adult female samples from the parental inbred lines used in the crosses.
448
All the flies were reared at 15°C, which approximated the derived cold condition. 20 virgin females
and 20 males were collected from maternal and paternal lines respectively for each cross and allowed
to mate and lay eggs for a week in half pint bottles. Each bottle contained standard *Drosophila* medium
(containing molasses, cornmeal, yeast, agar, and antimicrobial agents). For the within-population
crosses, samples at three developmental stages were collected: larva, pupa and female adult. Third-
instar larvae were collected on the surface of the medium. For pupa, new yellow pupae were collected
within one day of pupation. For adult, female flies were collected 4-5 days after eclosion. For samples
from between-population crosses and parental lines, only female adults were collected. All the
samples were shock-frozen in liquid nitrogen immediately after collection.
458
Approximate 50 larvae or 50 pupae or 30 female adults were used for RNA extraction for each
sample. Total mRNA was extracted using the Magnetic mRNA Isolation Kit (New England Biolabs,
Ipswich, MA) and RNeasy MinElute Cleanup Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). Strand-specific
libraries were prepared using the NEBNext mRNA Library Prep Reagent Set for Illumina. Libraries
were sized selected for approximately 150 bp inserts using AMPureXP beads (Beckman Coulter, CA,
USA). The libraries were quantified using Bioanalyzer and manually multiplexed for sequencing. All
libraries were sequenced on a HiSeq2500 (V4) with 2×75bp paired-end in two flow cells.
466
Quantifying gene expression and exon usage frequency

The paired-end sequence reads for the within-population cross samples were mapped to the

transcribed regions annotated in *D. melanogaster* (release 6, BDGP6.84) using STAR with parameters

from ENCODE3's STAR-RSEM pipeline (Li and Dewey 2011; Dobin et al. 2013). For gene

expression, the numbers of reads mapped to each gene were quantified using RSEM (Li and Dewey

2011). Reads mapped to the rRNA were excluded in the analysis. The expression abundance for

each gene was standardized by the numbers of reads mapped to the total transcriptome of the

sample.

To quantify exon usage, we used Leafcutter (Li et al. 2018) to estimate the excision frequencies of

alternative introns. This phenotype summarizes different major splicing events, including skipped

exons, 5' and 3' alternative splice-site usage, intron retention. Leafcutter took the alignment files

generated by STAR as input to quantify the usage of each intron. Then Leafcutter formed clusters

that contain all overlapping introns that shared a donor or accept splice site. The default parameters

were used: $\geq$ 50 reads supporting each intron cluster and $\leq$ 500kb for introns length. The exon usage

frequency is the number of intron excision events divided by the total events per cluster. It is worth

noting that Leafcutter only detects exon-exon junction usage and it is unable to quantify 5' and 3'

end usage and intron retention (Alasoo et al. 2018), which were not examined here.

Identifying outliers in gene expression and intron usage differentiation

To identify candidate genes under differential evolution between the warm and cold populations in

each pair, we first controlled for the potential transcriptome skew caused by very highly expressed

genes. For each expressed gene, we calculated the average expression of the cold samples ($AvgExp_{cold}$)

and that of the warm samples ($AvgExp_{warm}$). Then we obtained the median of the ratio of

$AvgExp_{cold}/AvgExp_{warm}$ across all expressed genes for the population pair. Gene expression for the warm

samples was normalized by multiplying this median before subsequent analysis. This correction was

designed to avoid a scenario in which either the cold population or the warm population had

important expression changes in one or more highly expressed genes that caused the relative

expression of all other genes to shift, even if their absolute expression level did not.

We used P_{ST} statistics to quantify gene expression divergence between cold and warm populations in

each population pair:

499
$$P_{ST} = \frac{V_{between}}{V_{between} + 2V_{within}}$$

where $V_{between}$ is between-populations variance for expression abundance, V_{within} is the average variance

for expression abundance within populations. Although both within- and between-population

components of variance can be confounded by the environmental variance, P_{ST} is still a useful statistic

to quantify phenotypic differentiation (Merila 1997; Brommer 2011; Leinonen et al. 2013). Here,

environmental variance should be reduced by the common laboratory environment. To reduce

sampling variance before calculating P_{ST}, for each gene, we required the total mapped reads across all

48 within-population samples to exceed 200 for a given developmental stage. Then for each

population/stage, we excluded the crosses/samples with the highest and lowest gene expression for

each gene (to avoid high P_{ST} values being driven by single anomalous values), resulting in six samples

per population/stage. The P_{ST} quantile based on data excluding extreme samples is concordant with

the P_{ST} quantile calculated using all the crosses for most cases (Fig. S3).

We chose the above P_{ST}-based approach instead of simply testing for differential expression in part

because our within-population samples reflect real variation as opposed to technical replicates. Also,

many alternative methods make assumptions about the data (e.g., negative binomial distribution for

transcript counts) which are difficult to apply to splicing, even if they hold for expression. P_{ST} and the

population genetic index F_{ST} are under the same theoretical framework, and are often directly

compared to search for evidence of adaptive trait differentiation. However, environmental and

measurement variance will downwardly bias P_{ST}, making targets of local adaptation less likely to

reach a threshold defined by genome-wide high F_{ST} outliers. Hence, in this study we simply focus on

the highest quantiles of P_{ST} for a given trait/population comparison, as detailed below.

As with gene expression, we used P_{ST} to estimate the intron usage differentiation between cold and

warm populations, with $V_{between}$ as the between-populations variance for a given intron's usage

frequency, V_{within} as the average within populations variance for intron usage frequency. Before

calculating the P_{ST}, for each exon-exon junction, we summed the intron excision events (n_i) and the

alternative events (n_j) of the cluster across all samples in a developmental stage. The minimum for

both types of event had to be at least 5 ($n \in [n_i, n_j] \geq 5$) for the exon-exon junction to be included in

subsequent analysis. Then for each exon-exon junction, we excluded the sample with highest and

lowest intron usage in a population/stage and calculated P_{ST}.

Examining co-directional change for outliers shared between population pairs

For gene expression differentiation, we used the upper 5% quantile of P_{ST} as outlier cutoff to identify

candidate genes potentially under geographically differential selection. To study the degree of parallel

evolution in gene expression, we identified outlier genes shared between two population pairs and

showing consistent changes in the cold populations relative to the warm ones (co-directional).

Whether the number of shared outliers with co-directional change was significantly greater than

expected by chance from the total shared genes between population pairs was determined by a one-

tailed binomial test. The statistics here and those below assume the expression changes are

independent among genes/introns, which is not always the case (genes can interact with each other

via regulatory networks).

The second approach used to examine parallelism of gene expression evolution was to focus on the

outlier genes for a specific population pair (*outlier pair*) and examine whether the expression changes in

other pair (*directional pair*) follow the same directions. If cold adaptation causes similar evolution in

gene expression, those genes in the *directional pair* should have changes in the same directions as the

outlier pair. Each of the pairwise population combinations had two comparisons; a population pair was

assigned as the *outlier pair* in one comparison and as the *directional pair* in the other comparison. To

generate a control set of genes for the null expectation of co-directional change proportion, we

identified genes in the bottom 50% quantile for P_{ST} in both the o*utlier pair* and the responding

directional pair. We tested whether the proportion of co-directional change is higher in the outliers than

that in the control using the Chi-squared Test.

To identify exon usage outliers, a cutoff of the upper 5% P_{ST} is used. If multiple exon junctions had

P_{ST} pass the top 5% cutoff, only the exon junction with the highest P_{ST} would be kept as an outlier to

control for nonindependence. Because the numbers of shared exon usage outliers in both population

pairs are small (<10), we only performed the second type of analysis studying the proportion of co-

directional changes between *outlier pair* and *directional pair* for the top 5% exon usage events. We

identified exon usage events in the bottom 50% P_{ST} in both population pairs as control.

GO enrichment test for P_{ST} outlier genes

The Gene Ontology enrichment tests were performed using the R package "clusterProfiler" (Yu et al.

2012) based on the fly genome annotation (Carlson 2018). The types of GO terms being tests

contained all three sub-Ontologies: Biological Process (BP), Cellular Component (CC) and Molecular

Function (MF). Selection of overrepresented GO terms was based on adjusted p-value < 0.1 using

"BH" method (Benjamini and Hochberg 1995) for each sub-Ontology. For gene expression, the

upper 5% P_{ST} outliers for each population pair were tested for GO enrichment. To determinate

whether the shared significant GO terms between pairs were more than expected by chance, we

randomly sampled the same numbers of genes as the outliers and performed the GO test for both

pairs and identified the shared significant GO terms between pairs. We repeated the process 1000

times to get a set of numbers for the shared significant GO terms and compared to the actual number

of shared significant GO terms to get a permuted p-value.

To access the functional categories of the differential intron usage, we calculate the quantile of P_{ST} for

each exon usage. To rank the differentiation for a gene, we used the highest quantile (the most

extreme differentiation) among the exon usages within the gene as the gene quantile (q_{gene}). To

account for the multiple testing of the exon usages for a gene, the adjusted total numbers of testing is

calculated as $n_{sum} = \sum_{i=1}^{i=j}(n_i - 1)$, where n_i is the number of testing for a cluster and j is the number

of clusters for the gene. Then adjust gene quantile is $q'_{gene} = 1- (1- q_{gene})$ x n_{sum}. The upper 5% q'_{gene} was

used to identify the most differentiated genes for intron usage and they were tested for GO

enrichment as described above.

Cis- and trans-effects of regulatory divergence

To study the contributions of cis- and trans-regulatory effects on expression and exon usage

divergent, we focused our analysis on the upper 5% P_{ST} outliers for gene expression/exon usage. For

each gene/exon junction in each population pair, we selected a representative cross showing the

greatest difference between parental strains for this analysis. In addition, this difference needed to be

larger than the average difference between the cold and warm populations for its pair.

To study allele-specific expression/exon junction, we obtained the genomic sequences of the two

parental strains aligned separately to the FlyBase *D. melanogaster* 5.77 assembly (Lack et al. 2015;

2016). The SNP calling from the reference genome was done by samtools (Li et al. 2009). To avoid

mapping bias for the RNAseq reads (Degner et al. 2009; Stevenson et al. 2013), we updated the

reference based on the SNPs for the two parental stains by masking the SNPs as "N". The F1 female

adult RNA-seq reads were mapped to the updated reference using STAR with options: --chimFilter

None --outFilterMultimapNmax 1 (Dobin et al. 2013). Because of the high level of heterozygosity

within our inbred lines (Lack et al. 2015), we used a parental ancestry proportion statistic (*f*) to study

the allele-specific expression instead of focusing on fixed difference between parental strains. The

parental proportion in gene expression level/exon usage in the F1 RNA-seq sample was estimated as

$$f = (p_{F1} - p_w)/(p_c - p_w)$$

where p_{F1} is the allele frequency in the RNA reads for the F1 sample, p_c and p_w are the allele frequency

in the genomic reads for the cold- and warm-adapted parental lines respectively. SNPs were filtered

with read counts ≥ 10 in the F1 RNA-seq sample and the parental samples as well as parental

frequency difference $|p_c - p_w| \geq 0.25$. The parental proportion for each candidate gene was the

average f for all sites located in the gene ($\bar{f}$).

We tested two null hypotheses corresponding to cis only and trans only regulatory differences. Under

the null hypothesis that cis-regulatory effects are absent, the $\bar{f}$ is expected to be near 0.5 because the

cold parental strain contributes half of the alleles to F1 offspring, and alleles from different parents

express similarly in these F1s (Cowles et al. 2002; McManus 2010; Meiklejohn et al. 2014). Under the

null hypothesis that trans-regulatory effects are absent, $\bar{f}$ is expected to approximate the ratio of the

cold parental strain expression to the total expression of both parental strains (Wittkopp et al. 2004):

$r_{F0} = E_c/(E_c + E_w)$. However, sampling effects can cause $\bar{f}$ to deviate from the null expectations.

We accounted for different types of uncertainty on estimating f. The first is the uncertainty on

estimating parental strain frequencies p_c and p_w from the genomic data. For each SNP used in the

calculation, we resampled 60 alleles based on the estimated allele frequency, representing the 30

individuals used for genome sequencing (Lack et al. 2015). Then we sampled reads by drawing with

replacement among the resampled 60 alleles until we reached the observed read depth of the site to

calculate the p_c' and p_w'. To account for the measurement uncertainty in F1 expression, we sampled

with replacement for the F1 reads mapped to each gene (based on p_c' and p_w') until we reached the

numbers of reads mapped to the gene. Then we recalculated the p_{F1}' for each SNPs and together with

p_c' and p_w' to calculate the $\bar{f}'$ for each gene. We repeated the above process 1000 times to get a

distribution of $\bar{f}'$. A 95% confidence interval of the distribution not overlapping with 0.5 suggested

the existence of a cis-effect.

However, there is another type of sampling effect if the regulatory variants are not fixed different

between parental strains. For example, one strain may be heterozygous for a causative regulatory

variant, which might be located outside the exons and hence absent from the RNAseq data. The null

hypothesis for inferring a cis-effect is that only trans-effects are present and the $\bar{f}$ is 0.5. Sampling of

trans-regulatory polymorphism does not affect the null expectation since trans-effect influences both

target alleles similarly. However, the sampling of cis-regulatory polymorphism affects the null

expectation for trans-effect because the F1 expression proportion $\bar{f}$ can deviate from the parental

expression ratio r_{F0}, potentially causing false positive inferences of trans-effect. Although there is no

information about the frequency and effect size for the cis-regulatory mutations, we chose simple

assumptions about them to make a relatively conservative approach for inferring trans-effects. We

assumed that the frequency of the cis-regulatory allele is 0.5 in the cold-adapted strain (heterozygous,

Aa) and 0 in the warm adapted strain (homozygous, *aa*). This simplest polymorphism condition

maximized the sampling effect within the cold strain. Then we assigned the effect size for the *a* cis-

regulatory allele as the expression level of the warm adapted strain (E_w). The effect size for the *A* cis-

regulatory allele is $2E_c\text{-}E_w$, where the E_c is the expression level of the cold adapted strain. Then we

sampled 30 alleles randomly from *Aa* with replacement to create diploid individuals and calculated

the average expression for the sampled individuals from the cold strain E_c'. The updated r_{F0}' is

calculated as $E_c'/(E_c'+ E_w)$. The sampling and calculation were repeated 1000 times. Each time the

r_{F0}' is paired with a $\bar{f}$' described above to calculate the difference $D' = \bar{f}'\text{-} r_{F0}'$. A 95% confidence

interval of D' not overlapping with 0 suggested the existence of a trans-effect.

Based on the tests above, the set of candidate genes were classified into categories (McManus 2010;

Schaefke et al. 2013; Chen et al. 2015) including no significant cis- or trans-effect, cis only, and trans

only. For genes showing both cis- and trans-effects, we further classified them based on whether these

two effects favored expression of the same (co-directional) or different parental allele (anti-

directional). For exon usage differentiation, we applied a similar approach to classified the

differentiated exons into the five categories, accounting for different sampling effects and

measurement errors. Instead of analyzing expression level of the parental strains (*E*), we analyzed

their exon usage frequency for the sets of outlier exon junctions.

For the P_{ST} outlier introns identified as cis only or both cis- and trans-effect, we hypothesized that

causative cis-regulatory elements may show elevated allele frequency differentiation between the

warm and cold populations. For expression abundance, the majority of cis-regulatory SNPs are

located within 2kb upstream of the transcription start site and downstream of the transcription end

site (Massouras et al. 2012). Therefore, we used the interval from 2kb upstream to 2kb downstream as

the focal region of a gene for this analysis. We calculated window F_{ST} and SNP F_{ST} using sequenced

genomes from *Drosophila* Genome Nexus (Lack et al. 2015 & 2016). For window F_{ST}, the division of

windows within a gene region is based on 250 non-singleton variable sites per window in the ZI

population (Pool et al. 2017). The highest F_{ST} for the windows overlapping the focal region was

assigned as its F_{ST_winmax}. To determinate the statistical significance of F_{ST_winmax}, we calculated F_{ST_winmax}

for all other blocks of the same number of windows along the same chromosome arm where cross-

over rates were above 0.5cM/Mb (Comeron et al. 2012), but excluding those within 10 windows of

the focal region. The specific non-low recombination regions are: 2.3–21.4 Mb for the X

chromosome, 0.5–17.5 Mb for arm 2L, 5.2–20.8 Mb for arm 2R, 0.6–17.7 Mb for arm 3L, and 6.9–

26.6 Mb for arm 3R. SNP F_{ST} was calculated for all sites within the focal region and the highest value

(F_{ST_SNPmax}) was thus obtained for the focal gene. Analogous to our F_{ST_winmax} permutation, we also

calculated F_{ST_SNPmax} for permuted regions with the same number of SNPs as the focal region, along

the non-low cross-over rate region on the same chromosome arm. For both F_{ST_winmax} and F_{ST_SNPmax},

we then focused on regions in the upper 10% quantile of permuted values for further analysis. We

tested whether the proportion of genes with high F_{ST} is higher in the cis-effect genes than that in

control non-outliers using the Fisher's Exact Test because of the low counts.

We also identified genes with significant cis-effects shared in two population pairs and examined

whether the effects favored expression of the same cold or warm parental alleles (consistent cis-effect).

Also, we tested whether the shared cis-effect genes also show elevated population genetic

differentiation in the two pairs. We obtained "Population Branch Excess" statistic (*PBE*) specific for

cold populations for SNPs from Pool et al. 2017. We used ±2kb around the gene regions to look for

any shared cis-effect genes containing SNPs with high *PBE* statistic for cold population in both pairs

(*PBE* quantile < 0.05 in both pairs).

For exon usage, because the cis-regulation is largely contributed by the splice sites (Kurmangaliyev et

al. 2015), we calculated the F_{ST} value for the splice sites, which are located within ±15 base pair

around the two intron/exon boundaries. The maximum F_{ST} among the splice sites for each intron is

chosen as the SNP F_{ST} for the focal intron. We compared the F_{ST_SNPmax} of the cis outlier introns and

the non-outlier introns to see whether the cis outlier introns showed elevated F_{ST} based on Wilcoxon

signed-rank test. To examine the potential function of splicing differentiation, genes containing high

SNP F_{ST} (upper 15% quantile of F_{ST_SNPmax}) flanking cis-regulated introns were identified as candidate

genes.

Acknowledgements

We thank Colin Dewey for helpful discussions and the UW-Madison Center for High Throughput
Computing (CHTC) for cluster usage. This work was funded by NSF DEB grant 1754745 to JEP
and by NIH NIGMS grant F32GM106594 to JBL.

Reference

Adrion JR, Hahn MW, Cooper BS. 2015. Revisiting classic clines in *Drosophila melanogaster* in the
age of genomics. Trends Genet 8:434–444.

Akhouayri I, Turc C, Royet J, Charroux B. 2011. Toll-8/Tollo negatively regulates antimicrobial
response in the *Drosophila* respiratory epithelium. PLoS Pathog 7:e1002319.

Albert FW, Bloom JS, Siegel J, Day L, Kruglyak L. 2017. Genetics of trans-regulatory variation in
gene expression. eLife 100:371–44.

Arthaud L, Ben Rokia-Mille S, Raad H, Dombrovsky A, Prevost N, et al. 2011. Trade-off between
toxicity and signal detection orchestrated by frequency- and density-dependent genes. PLoS One
6: e19805.

Bader DM, Wilkening S, Lin SG, Tekkedil MM, Dietrich K, et al. 2015. Negative feedback buffers
effects of regulatory variants. Mol Syst Biol 11:785.

Ballard SL, Miller DL, Ganetzky B. 2014. Retrograde neurotrophin signaling through Tollo regulates
synaptic growth in *Drosophila*. J Cell Biol 204:1157–1172.

Barbosa-Morais NL, Irimia M, Pan Q, Xiong HY, Gueroussov S, Lee LJ, et al. 2012. The
evolutionary landscape of alternative splicing in vertebrate species. Science 338:1587–93.

Bastide H, Yassin A, Johanning EJ, Pool JE. 2014. Pigmentation in *Drosophila melanogaster*
reaches its maximum in Ethiopia and correlates most strongly with ultra-violet radiation in sub-
Saharan Africa. BMC Evol Biol 14:222–14.

Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. 1995. Controlling the false discovery rate—a practical and powerful
approach to multiple testing. J Royal Stat Soc B 57:289–300.

Bergland AO, Tobler R, González J, Schmidt P, Petrov D. 2016. Secondary contact and local
adaptation contribute to genome-wide patterns of clinal variation in *Drosophila* melanogaster.
Mol Ecol 25:1157–1174.

Božičević V, Hutter S, Stephan W, Wollstein A. 2016. Population genetic evidence for cold
adaptation in European *Drosophila melanogaster* populations. Mol Ecol 25:1175–1191.

Brommer JE. 2011. Whither P_{ST}? The approximation of Q_{ST} by P_{ST} in evolutionary and conservation
biology. J Evol Biol 24:1160–1168.

Brown JB, Boley N, Eisman R, May GE, Stoiber MH, Duff MO, et al. 2014. Diversity and dynamics
of the *Drosophila* transcriptome. Nature. 7515:393–9.

Catalan A, Hutter S, Parsch J. 2012. Population and sex differences in *Drosophila melanogaster*
brain gene expression. BMC Genomics 13:1–12.

Chakraborty M, VanKuren NW, Zhao R, Zhang X, Kalsow S, Emerson JJ. 2017. Hidden genetic
variation shapes the structure of functional elements in *Drosophila*. Nat Genet 50:20–25.

Chen J, Nolte V, Schlötterer C. 2015. Temperature Stress Mediates Decanalization and Dominance
of Gene Expression in *Drosophila melanogaster*. PLoS Genet 11:e1004883.

Comeron JM, Ratnappan R, Bailin S. 2012. The many landscapes of recombination in *Drosophila*
melanogaster. PLoS Genet 8:e1002905.

Conte GL, Arnegard ME, Peichel CL, Schluter D. 2012. The probability of genetic parallelism and
convergence in natural populations. Proc Royal Soc B 279:5039–5047.

Coolon JD, McManus CJ, Stevenson KR, Graveley BR, Wittkopp PJ. 2014. Tempo and mode of
regulatory evolution in Drosophila. Genome Res 24:797–808.

Cowles CR, Hirschhorn JN, Altshuler D, Lander ES. 2002. Detection of regulatory variation in
mouse genes. Nat Genet 32:432–437

Degner JF, Marioni JC, Pai AA, Pickrell JK, Nkadori E, Gilad Y, Pritchard JK. 2009. Effect of read-
mapping biases on detecting allele-specific expression from RNA-sequencing data.
Bioinformatics 25:3207–3212.

Denby CM, Im JH, Yu RC, Pesce CG, Brem RB. 2012. Negative feedback confers mutational
robustness in yeast transcription factor regulation. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 109:3874–3878.

Deshpande G, Calhoun G& Schedl P. 2005. Drosophila Argonaute-2 is required early in
embryogenesis for the assembly of centric/centromeric heterochromatin, nuclear division,
nuclear migration, and germ-cell formation. Gene Dev 19:1680–1685.

Dobin A, Davis CA, Schlesinger F, Drenkow J, Zaleski C, Jha S, Batut P, Chaisson M, Gingeras TR.
2013. STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. Bioinformatics 29:15–21.

Duneau D, Sun H, Revah J, San Miguel K, Kunerth HD, Caldas IV, Messer PW, Scott JG, Buchon
N. 2018. Signatures of insecticide selection in the genome of *Drosophila melanogaster*. G3
(Bethesda) 8:3469–3480.

Emerson JJ. 2019. Inferring compensatory evolution of cis- and trans-regulatory variation. Trends
Genet 35:1–3.

Fabian DK, Kapun M, Nolte V, Kofler R, Schmidt PS, Schlötterer C, Flatt T. 2012. Genome-wide
patterns of latitudinal differentiation among populations of *Drosophila melanogaster* from North
America. Mol Ecol 21:4748–4769.

Fear JM, Leon-Novelo LG, Morse AM, Gerken AR, Van Lehmann K, Tower J, Nuzhdin SV,

McIntyre LM. 2016. Buffering of genetic regulatory networks in *Drosophila melanogaster*.
Genetics 203:1177–1190.

Francis VA, Zorzano A, Teleman AA. 2010. dDOR is an EcR coactivator that forms a feed-forward
loop connecting insulin and ecdysone signaling. Curr Biol 20:1799–1808.

Fraser HB. 2019. Improving estimates of compensatory cis–trans regulatory divergence. Trends
Genet 35:3–5.

Gamazon ER, Stranger BE. 2014. Genomics of alternative splicing: evolution, development and
pathophysiology Hum Genet 133:679-687

Gibilisco L, Zhou Q, Mahajan S, Bachtrog D. 2016. Alternative splicing within and between
Drosophila species, sexes, tissues, and developmental stages. PLoS Genet 12: e1006464.

Gilad Y, Rifkin SA, Pritchard JK. 2008. Revealing the architecture of gene regulation: the promise of
eQTL studies. Trends Genet 24:408–415.

Green L, Battlay P, Fournier-Level A, Good RT, Robin C. 2019. Cis- and trans-acting variants
contribute to survivorship in a naïve *Drosophila melanogaster* population exposed to ryanoid
insecticides. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 116:10424–10429.

Hanson D, Hu J, Hendry AP, Barrett RDH. 2017. Heritable gene expression differences between lake
and stream stickleback include both parallel and antiparallel components. Heredity 119:339–348.

Hart JC, Ellis NA, Eisen MB, Miller CT. 2018. Convergent evolution of 1493 gene expression in
two high-toothed stickleback populations. PLoS Genetics 6:e1007443.

Hoekstra HE, Coyne JA. 2007. The locus of evolution: evo devo and the genetics of adaptation.
Evolution 615: 995–1016.

Hoffmann AA, Hallas RJ, Dean JA, Schiffer M. 2003. Low potential for climatic stress adaptation in
a rainforest *Drosophila* species. Science 301:100–102.

Hoffmann AA, Weeks AR. 2007. Climatic selection on genes and traits after a 100 year-old invasion:
a critical look at the temper-ate-tropical clines in *Drosophila melanogaster* from eastern
Australia. Genetica 129:133–147.

Huylmans AK, Parsch J. 2014. Population- and sex-biased gene expression in the excretion organs of
Drosophila melanogaster. G3 (Bethesda). 4:2307–15.

Johnson KG, Tenney AP, Ghose A, Duckworth AM, Higashi ME, Parfitt K, Marcu O, Heslip TR,
Marsh JL, Schwarz TL, et al. 2006. The HSPGs Syndecan and Dallylike bind the receptor
phosphatase LAR and exert distinct effects on synaptic development. Neuron 49:517–531.

Jones FC, Grabherr MG, Chan YF, Russell P, Mauceli E, Johnson J, Swofford R, Pirun M, Zody
MC, White S, et al. 2012. The genomic basis of adaptive evolution in threespine sticklebacks.
Nature 484:55–61.

Juneja P, Quinn A, Jiggins FM. 2016. Latitudinal clines in gene expression and cis-regulatory

element variation in Drosophila melanogaster. BMC Genomics:1–11.

Kang J, Kim J, Choi K-W. 2011. Novel cytochrome P450, cyp6a17, is required for temperature
preference behavior in *Drosophila*. PLoS ONE 6:e29800.

Kitano J, Ishikawa A, Kusakabe M. 2018. Parallel transcriptome evolution in stream threespine
sticklebacks. Devel Growth Differ 61:104–113.

Kolaczkowski B, Kern AD, Holloway AK, Begun DJ. 2011. Genomic differentiation between
temperate and tropical australian populations of *Drosophila melanogaster*. Genetics 187:245–
260.

Kurmangaliyev YZ, Favorov,AV, Osman NM, Lehmann K-V, Campo D, Salomon MP, et al. 2015.
Natural variation of gene models in Drosophila melanogaster. BMC Genomics 16:198

Lack JB, Lange JD, Tang AD, Corbett-Detig RB, Pool JE. 2016. A thousand fly genomes: An
expanded Drosophila genome nexus. Mol Biol Evol 33:3308–3313.

Lack JB, Monette MJ, Johanning EJ, Sprengelmeyer QD, Pool JE. 2016. Decanalization of wing
development accompanied the evolution of large wings in high-altitude *Drosophila*. Proc Natl
Acad Sci USA 113:1014–1019.

Lai Z, Kane NC, Zou Y, Rieseberg LH. 2008. Natural variation in gene expression between wild and
weedy populations of *Helianthus annuus*. Genetics 179:1881–1890.

Landry CR, Lemos B, Rifkin SA, Dickinson WJ, Hartl DL. 2007. Genetic properties influencing the
evolvability of gene expression. Science 317:118–121.

Lange JD, Pool JE. 2016. A haplotype method detects diverse scenarios of local adaptation from
genomic sequence variation. Mole Ecol 25:3081–3100.

Leder EH, McCairns RJS, Leinonen T, et al. 2015. The evolution and adaptive potential of
transcriptional variation in sticklebacks—signatures of selection and widespread heritability.
Mol Biol and Evol 32:674–689.

Leinonen T, McCairns RJS, O'Hara RB, Merilä J. 2013. Q_{ST}–F_{ST} comparisons: evolutionary and
ecological insights from genomic heterogeneity. Nat Rev Genet. 14:179–190.

Lemmon ZH, Bukowski R, Sun Q, Doebley JF. 2014. The role of cis regulatory evolution in maize
domestication. PLoS Genet 10:e1004745–15.

Li B, Dewey Colin N. 2011. RSEM: accurate transcript quantification from RNA-Seq data with or
without a reference genome. BMC Bioinform 12:323

Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, et al. 2009. The Sequence alignment/map (SAM)
format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics 25:2078-2079.

Li YI, Knowles DA, Humphrey J, Barbeira AN, Dickinson SP, Im HK, Pritchard JK. 2017.
Annotation-free quantification of RNA splicing using LeafCutter. Nat Genet 50:151–158.

Losos JB. 2011. Convergence, adaptation, and constraint. Evolution 65:1827–1840.
833
Machado HE, Bergland AO, O'Brien KR, Behrman EL, Schmidt PS, Petrov DA. 2016. Comparative
population genomics of latitudinal variation in *Drosophila simulans* and *Drosophila*
melanogaster. Mol Ecol 25:723–740.

Mack KL, Campbell P, Nachman MW. 2016. Gene regulation and speciation in house mice. Genome
Res 26:451–461.

Massouras A, Waszak SM, Albarca-Aguilera M, Hens K, Holcombe W, Ayroles JF, Dermitzakis ET,
Stone EA, Jensen JD, Mackay TFC, et al. 2012. Genomic Variation and Its Impact on Gene
Expression in *Drosophila melanogaster*. PLoS Genet 8:e1003055.

Mateo L, Ullastres A, González J. 2014. A transposable element insertion confers xenobiotic
resistance in *Drosophila*. PLoS Genet 10:e1004560.

McGirr JA, Martin CH. 2018. Parallel evolution of gene expression between trophic specialists
despite divergent genotypes and morphologies. Evol Lett 2:62–75.

McManus CJ, Coolon JD, Duff MO, Eipper-Mains J, Graveley BR, Wittkopp PJ. 2010. Regulatory
divergence in *Drosophila* revealed by mRNA-seq. Genome Res 20:816–825.

McManus CJ, Coolon JD, Eipper-Mains J, Wittkopp PJ, Graveley BR. 2014. Evolution of splicing
regulatory networks in *Drosophila*. Genome Res 24:786–796.

McMillan EA, Longo SM, Smith MD, Broskin S, Lin B, Singh NK, Strochlic TI. 2018. The protein
kinase CK2 substrate Jabba modulates lipid metabolism during *Drosophila* oogenesis. J Biol
Chem 293:2990–3002.

Meiklejohn CD, Coolon JD, Hartl DL, Wittkopp PJ. 2014. The roles of cis- and trans-regulation in
the evolution of regulatory incompatibilities and sexually dimorphic gene expression. Genome
Res 24:84–95.

Merilä J. 1997. Quantitative trait and allozyme divergence in the greenfinch (*Carduelis chloris*,
Aves: Fringillidae). Biol J Linn Soc 61:243–266.

Nakano Y, Fujitani K, Kurihara J, Ragan J, Usui-Aoki K, Shimoda L, Lukacsovich T, Suzuki K,
Sezaki M, Sano Y, et al. 2001. Mutations in the novel membrane protein Spinster interfere with
programmed cell death and cause neural degeneration in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Mol Cell
Biol 21:3775–3788.

Nandamuri SP, Conte MA, Carleton KL. 2018. Multiple trans QTL and one cis-regulatory deletion
are associated with the differential expression of cone opsins in African cichlids. BMC
Genomics. 19:945.

Nayak A, Berry B, Tassetto M, Kunitomi M, Acevedo A, Deng C, Krutchinsky A, Gross J,
Antoniewski C, Andino R. 2010. Cricket paralysis virus antagonizes Argonaute 2 to modulate
antiviral defense in *Drosophila*. Nat Struct Mol Biol. 17:547–554.

Osada N, Miyagi R, Takahashi A. 2017. Cis- and trans-regulatory effects on gene expression in a

natural population of *Drosophila melanogaster*. Genetics 206:2139–2148.

Pitchers W, Pool JE, Dworkin I. 2012. Altitudinal clinal variation in wing size and shape in african
Drosophila melanogaster: one cline or many? Evolution 67:438–452.

Pool JE, Braun DT, Lack JB. 2016. Parallel evolution of cold tolerance within *Drosophila*
melanogaster. Mol Biol Evol 34:349–360.

Pool JE, Corbett-Detig RB, Sugino RP, Stevens KA, Cardeno CM, Crepeau MW, Duchen P,
Emerson JJ, Saelao P, Begun DJ, et al. 2012. Population genomics of sub-Saharan *Drosophila*
melanogaster: African diversity and non-African admixture. PLoS Genet 8:e1003080–24.

Pool JE. 2015. The Mosaic Ancestry of the Drosophila Genetic Reference Panel and the *D.*
melanogaster reference genome reveals a network of epistatic fitness interactions. Mol Biol Evol
32:3236–3251.

Reinhardt JA, Kolaczkowski B, Jones CD, Begun DJ, Kern AD. 2014. Parallel geographic variation
in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Genetics 197:361–373.

Rong et al. 2011. Spinster is required for autophagic lysosome reformation and mTOR reactivation
following starvation. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 108:7826–7831.

Rosenblum EB, Parent CE, Brandt EE. 2014. The molecular basis of phenotypic convergence. Annu
Rev Ecol Evol Syst 45:203–226.

Sackton TB, et al. 2019. Convergent regulatory evolution and loss of flight in paleognathous birds.
Science 364:74–78.

Schaefke B, Emerson JJ, Wang T-Y, Lu M-YJ, Hsieh L-C, Li W-H. 2013. Inheritance of gene
expression level and selective constraints on trans- and cis-regulatory changes in yeast. Mol Biol
Evol 30:2121–2133.

Schluter D. 2000. The ecology of adaptive radiation. Oxford Univ. Press, New York.

Schmidt PS, Paaby AB. 2008. Reproductive diapause and life-history clines in North American
populations of *Drosophila melanogaster*. Evolution 62:1204–1215.

Seppo A. 2003. Induction of neuron-specific glycosylation by Tollo/Toll-8, a *Drosophila* Toll-like
receptor expressed in non-neural cells. Development 130:1439–1448.

Signor S, Nuzhdin S. 2018. Dynamic changes in gene expression and alternative splicing mediate the
response to acute alcohol exposure in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Heredity 121:342-360.

Singh P, Börger C, More H, Sturmbauer C. 2017. The role of alternative splicing and differential
gene expression in cichlid adaptive radiation. Genome Biol Evol 9:2764–2781.

Smith CCR, Tittes S, Mendieta JP, Collier-Zans E, Rowe HC, Rieseberg LH, Kane NC. 2018.
Genetics of alternative splicing evolution during sunflower domestication. Proc Natl Acad Sci
USA 115:6768-6773.

Sprengelmeyer QD, Mansourian S, Lange JD, Matute DR, Cooper BS, Jirle EV, Stensmyr MC, Pool
JE. 2018. Discovery of *Drosophila melanogaster* from Wild African Environments and Genomic
Insights into Species History. biorxiv 45:1153–13.

St Pierre SE, Ponting L, Stefancsik R, McQuilton P, the FlyBase Consortium. 2013. FlyBase 102—
advanced approaches to interrogating FlyBase. Nucleic Acids Res 42:D780–D788.

Stern DL. 2013. The genetic causes of convergent evolution. Nat Rev Genet 14:751–764.

Stevenson KR, Coolon JD, Wittkopp PJ. 2013. Sources of bias in measures of allele-specific
expression derived from RNA-seq data aligned to a single reference genome. BMC Genomics
14:536.

Venables JP, Tazi J, Juge F. 2011. Regulated functional alternative splicing in *Drosophila*. Nucleic
Acids Res 40:1–10.

Verta JP, Jones FC. 2019. Predominance of cis-regulatory changes in parallel expression divergence
of sticklebacks. eLife. 8:e43785.

Wittkopp PJ, Kalay G. 2011. Cis-regulatory elements: molecular mechanisms and evolutionary
processes underlying divergence. Nat Rev Genet 13:59–69.

Wittkopp PJ, Haerum BK, Clark AG. 2004. Evolutionary changes in cis and trans gene regulation.
Nature 430:85–88.

Wittkopp PJ, Haerum BK, Clark AG. 2008. Regulatory changes underlying expression differences
within and between *Drosophila* species. Nat Genet 403:346–350.

Yagi Y, Nishida Y, Ip YT. 2010. Functional analysis of Toll-related genes in *Drosophila*. Dev
Growth Differ 52:771–783.

Yu G, Wang L, Han Y, He Q. 2012. clusterProfiler: an R package for comparing biological themes
among gene clusters. OMICS 16:284-287.

Zhao L, Begun DJ. 2017. Genomics of parallel adaptation at two timescales in *Drosophila*. PLoS
Genet 13:e1007016.

Zhao L, Wit J, Svetec N, Begun DJ. 2015. Parallel gene expression differences between low and high
latitude populations of *Drosophila melanogaster* and *D. simulans*. PLoS Genet 11:e1005184.

Zhang J, Liu M, Su Y, Du J, Zhu AJ. 2012. A targeted in vivo RNAi screen reveals deubiquitinases
as new regulators of Notch signaling. G3 (Bethesda) 2:1563–1575.