

1 **Enhanced wort fermentation with *de novo* lager hybrids adapted to high ethanol
2 environments**

3 Running title: Adaptive evolution of de novo lager yeast hybrids

4 Kristoffer Krogerus^{1,2#}, Sami Holmström¹, Brian Gibson¹

5 ¹ VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland, Tietotie 2, P.O. Box 1000, FI-02044 VTT, Espoo,
6 Finland

7 ² Department of Biotechnology and Chemical Technology, Aalto University, School of Chemical
8 Technology, Kemistintie 1, Aalto, P.O. Box 16100, FI-00076 Espoo, Finland

9 # Address correspondence to Kristoffer Krogerus, kristoffer.krogerus@aalto.fi

10 **Abstract**

11 Interspecific hybridization is a valuable tool for developing and improving brewing yeast in a
12 number of industry-relevant aspects. However, the genomes of newly formed hybrids can be
13 unstable. Here, we exploited this trait by adapting four brewing yeast strains, three of which
14 were *de novo* interspecific lager hybrids with different ploidy levels, to high ethanol
15 concentrations in an attempt to generate variant strains with improved fermentation
16 performance in high-gravity wort. Through a batch fermentation-based adaptation process
17 and selection based on a two-step screening process, we obtained eight variant strains which
18 we compared to the wild-type strains in 2L-scale wort fermentations replicating industrial
19 conditions. The results revealed that the adapted variants outperformed the strains from
20 which they were derived, and the majority also possessed several desirable brewing-relevant
21 traits, such as increased ester formation and ethanol tolerance, as well as decreased diacetyl
22 formation. The variants obtained from the polyploid hybrids appeared to show greater
23 improvements in fermentation performance. Interestingly, it was not only the hybrid strains,
24 but also the *S. cerevisiae* parent strain, that appeared to adapt and showed considerable
25 changes in genome size. Genome sequencing and ploidy analysis revealed that changes had

26 occurred both at chromosome and single nucleotide level in all variants. Our study
27 demonstrates the possibility of improving *de novo* lager yeast hybrids through adaptive
28 evolution by generating stable and superior variants that possess traits relevant to industrial
29 lager beer fermentation.

30 **Importance**

31 Recent studies have shown that hybridization is a valuable tool for creating new and diverse
32 strains of lager yeast. Adaptive evolution is another strain development tool that can be
33 applied in order to improve upon desirable traits. Here we apply adaptive evolution to newly
34 created lager yeast hybrids by subjecting them to environments containing high ethanol
35 levels. We isolate and characterize a number of adapted variants, which possess improved
36 fermentation properties and ethanol tolerance. Genome analysis revealed substantial
37 changes in the variants compared to the original strains. These improved variants strains
38 were produced without any genetic modification, and are suitable for industrial lager beer
39 fermentations.

40 **Introduction**

41 Yeast breeding and hybridization has in recent years been shown to be a promising tool for
42 developing and improving brewing yeast in a number of industry-relevant aspects (1–4).
43 These include improving fermentation rates, sugar use, and aroma compound production.
44 However, the genomes of newly formed hybrids tend to be unstable, and these may undergo
45 substantial structural changes after the hybridization event (5–9). As yeast is commonly
46 reused for multiple consecutive fermentations in industrial breweries (even over 10 times
47 depending on brewery), it is vital that the genomes of any newly developed yeast strains
48 remain stable to ensure product quality during industrial use. Yeast encounter a range of
49 challenges during brewery fermentations, such as low oxygen availability, osmotic stress, CO₂
50 accumulation, nutrient limitation and ethanol toxicity (10), which may contribute to faster
51 changes in the genome size (11, 12). Yeast strains with larger genomes (i.e. with a higher
52 ploidy level) in particular have been shown to show greater changes in genome size during
53 such conditions (9, 11–15). This may especially cause concerns when a rare mating approach

54 is used for hybridization (3, 16). However, genome stabilisation can be achieved, for example,
55 by growing newly formed hybrids for 30–70 generations under fermentative conditions (2, 9).
56 Phenotypic changes may occur though during the genome stabilisation process, altering the
57 properties of the original hybrid (6).

58 To influence the changes occurring during the stabilisation process, an adaptive or
59 experimental evolution approach could be applied. Studies have demonstrated that adaptive
60 evolution can be used, for example, to obtain strains with increased tolerance to ethanol (14,
61 17–19), high-gravity wort (20, 21), lignocellulose hydrolysates (22), and extreme temperatures
62 (23, 24), as well as improved consumption of various sugars (25–27). Numerous recent studies
63 utilizing experimental evolution have also provided valuable information on what genetic
64 changes take place in the yeast strains during adaptation to various stresses (5, 8, 14, 15, 22–
65 24, 28, 29). Evolution experiments with yeast hybrids have shown that various changes may
66 occur during adaptation, including partial loss of one of the parental sub-genomes, loss of
67 heterozygosity and selection of superior alleles, and the formation of fusion genes following
68 translocations (5, 8, 22, 28). Studies have also revealed that the ploidy of the yeast has an
69 effect on adaptability, with tetraploid strains appearing to adapt more rapidly than diploid
70 strains (12, 15, 30). Taking this into consideration, we sought to not only stabilize, but
71 simultaneously adapt a range of our newly created lager yeast hybrids to conditions normally
72 encountered during brewery fermentations. One of the main stresses brewing yeast
73 encounter during the fermentation process is that of increasing ethanol concentrations (10).
74 Particularly, as interest from the industry towards very high gravity fermentations (i.e. those
75 with wort containing over 250 g extract / L, resulting in beer with alcohol contents above 10%
76 (v/v)) has increased in recent years (31).

77 In this study, we therefore exposed 3 *de novo* lager yeast hybrids of different ploidy and a
78 common *S. cerevisiae* ale parent strain to 30 consecutive batch fermentations in media
79 containing 10% ethanol in an attempt to retrieve variant strains with increased tolerance to
80 ethanol. Following the adaptation stage, isolates were screened and selected based both on
81 their ability to ferment wort sugars efficiently in the presence of ethanol, and their ability to
82 ferment high gravity wort. Eight variant strains, two from each of the original strains, were
83 ultimately selected and compared in 2L-scale wort fermentations. Analysis of the

84 fermentations and resulting beers revealed that all variants appeared to outperform the
85 original strains during fermentation. Furthermore, the majority of the variants produced
86 beers with higher concentrations of desirable aroma-active esters and lower concentrations
87 of many undesirable aroma compounds, such as higher alcohols and diacetyl. The genomes
88 of the variant strains were also sequenced, and genome analysis revealed that changes had
89 occurred both at chromosome and single nucleotide level.

90 **Results**

91 Three different *de novo* lager yeast hybrids, generated in previous studies by our lab (3, 32),
92 along with a *S. cerevisiae* ale parent strain (common to all three hybrids) were subjected to the
93 adaptation process (Table 1). The ploidy of the interspecific hybrids varied from around 2.4N
94 to 4N. The four yeast strains, referred to as Y1-Y4 according to Table 1, were grown for 30
95 consecutive batch fermentations in two different media containing 10% ethanol in an attempt
96 to generate ethanol-tolerant variants with improved fermentation properties (Figure 1A). The
97 first medium, M1, contained 2% maltose as a fermentable carbon source, while the second,
98 M6, contained 1% maltose and 1% maltotriose. These sugars were chosen as they are the
99 main sugars in all-malt wort. Over the 30 fermentations, approximately 130 to 161 yeast
100 generations were achieved depending on yeast strain and growth media (Figure 2). The
101 optical density at the end of each batch fermentation increased from around 2.5- to over 10-
102 fold depending on the yeast strain, suggesting adaptation to the high ethanol concentration
103 (Figure 2). Isolates from each adaptation line were obtained after 10, 20 and 30 fermentations,
104 by randomly selecting the fastest growing colonies on agar plates containing solidified
105 versions of the same adaptation media (Figure 1B).

106 ***Screening of isolates reveals improved sugar consumption and fermentation rates***

107 The 96 isolates that were obtained from the adaptation fermentations were then subjected to
108 high-throughput screening in a malt-based media containing ethanol and sorbitol (Figure 1C).
109 The ethanol and sorbitol were added to replicate the stresses the yeast is exposed to during
110 brewery fermentations. The majority of the variant strains grew similarly to the wild-type
111 strains, and all strains were able to reach stationary growth phase during the 144 hour
112 cultivation period (Figure S1 in Supplementary material). As the objective was to select variant

113 strains with enhanced fermentation rate, rather than enhanced growth, we also monitored
114 the sugar concentrations in the media at three time points.

115 There were considerable differences in the amounts of maltose and maltotriose consumed
116 between the wild-type and variant strains after 144 hours of fermentation (Figure 3). There
117 was no obvious pattern between the consumption of the different sugars, the isolation time
118 points (i.e. the amount of consecutive batch fermentations), and the two different adaptation
119 media among the variants strains. In many cases, the largest consumption of both maltose
120 and maltotriose was observed with variants that had been isolated after 30 batch
121 fermentations. However, with variants obtained from yeast strain Y2, the average maltose and
122 maltotriose consumption of variants obtained after 30 batch fermentations was lower than
123 those isolated at earlier stages (Figure 3B). Nevertheless, the variant strain derived from Y2
124 with the highest maltose consumption was obtained after 30 batch fermentations. Several
125 variant strains from all four wild-type strains (Y1-Y4) showed higher sugar consumption than
126 the wild-type strains. In total, 83% of the variants consumed more maltose, and 60%
127 consumed more maltotriose than the wild-type strains during the screening fermentations.
128 Interestingly, all variants that consumed more maltotriose than the wild-type strains also
129 consumed more maltose. Excluding maltotriose from the adaptation media did not appear to
130 have any negative effect on maltotriose consumption in the variants, as the variant strains
131 derived from Y2, Y3, and Y4 with the highest maltotriose consumption were obtained from
132 the adaptation media lacking maltotriose. 6 variants per wild-type strain were selected for
133 further screening in small-scale wort fermentations, based on the highest sugar
134 consumptions and the requirement that they were derived from separate adaptation lines
135 and isolation time points.

136 Small-scale wort fermentations were used as a final screening step to ensure that the selected
137 variants were also able to ferment wort efficiently and perform in media without exogenous
138 ethanol (Figure 1D). A 15 °P high gravity wort, i.e. a wort similar to what is used in the brewing
139 industry, was used for the fermentations. They revealed that 17 out of the 24 tested variants
140 outperformed the wild-type strains from which they were derived (Figure 4) in regards to the
141 maximum fermentation rate that was observed. Of these 17 variants, 13 also reached a
142 significantly higher ($p < 0.05$ as determined by two-tailed Student's t-test) final alcohol level

143 after the 9 days of fermentation (data not shown). Variants which had been adapted in the
144 media containing 2% maltose as the sugar source (Media M1) appeared to outperform those
145 obtained from the media containing both 1% maltose and maltotriose (Media M6). One
146 isolate per yeast strain and media (for a total of 8 isolates) were selected for more thorough
147 characterization in 2L-scale wort fermentations. These isolates (listed in Table 1) were selected
148 based on the highest fermentation rates, and those that had undergone 30 batch
149 fermentations were also preferentially selected.

150 ***Enhanced performance confirmed in 2L-scale wort fermentations***

151 In order to examine how the variant strains (Table 1) perform in a brewery environment, 2L-
152 scale tall-tube fermentations were carried out in high-gravity 15 °P all-malt wort at 15 °C
153 (Figure 1E). These conditions were chosen to replicate those of industrial lager fermentations.
154 All eight variant strains appeared to outperform their respective wild-type strains during these
155 fermentations (Figure 5). Time-points after which a significant difference ($p < 0.05$ as
156 determined by Student's t-test) was observed between the variant and the wild-type strain are
157 marked with arrows in the plot. The largest differences in fermentation compared to the wild-
158 type strains were observed with the variants of Y2, i.e. the tetraploid interspecific *S. cerevisiae*
159 × *S. eubayanus* hybrid, and those of Y3, i.e. the triploid interspecific *S. cerevisiae* × *S. eubayanus*
160 hybrid. For most strains, differences between variant and wild-type strains seemed to appear
161 after approximately 48 hours of fermentation. Before this time point, it is mainly the
162 monosaccharides that are consumed from the wort and the alcohol level is still below 2% (v/v)
163 (Figure S2 in Supplementary material). The sugar profiles during fermentation also revealed
164 that improved maltose consumption appears to be one of the main causes for the increased
165 fermentation rate of the variant strains. Three of the variants, derived from strains Y2 and Y4,
166 only showed a difference compared to the wild-type strain late in fermentation. These
167 observations suggest that the observed differences may be due to the variant strains
168 possessing an enhanced ability to ferment maltose and maltotriose or to tolerate increasing
169 ethanol concentrations in the wort.

170 We also wanted to compare the aroma profiles of the beers produced with the variant strains
171 with those produced with the wild-type strains, to ensure that the adaptation process hadn't
172 introduced any negative side effects to the resulting beer. Genetic hitchhiking is common

173 during adaptive evolution (33), and here we only screened and selected for an increased
174 fermentation rate. Analysis of the aroma-active higher alcohols and esters in the beers
175 revealed that the variant strains, in general, produced equal or lower amounts of unwanted
176 higher alcohols, while equal or higher amounts of desirable esters compared to the wild-type
177 strains (Figure 6). The concentrations of 3-methylbutyl acetate, possessing a banana-like
178 flavour (34), and ethyl esters, possessing fruity and apple-like flavours (34), in particular
179 appeared to increase in the variant strains. We also monitored the concentrations of diacetyl,
180 an important unwanted off-flavour in lager beer fermentations (35), and results revealed that
181 five out of eight variant strains had produced significantly lower concentrations of diacetyl
182 than the wild-type strains, while the other three produced concentrations that were equal to
183 the wild-type strains. Hence, results revealed that the adaptation process had not only yielded
184 variant strains with improved fermentation performance in wort, but also, inadvertently,
185 strains that produced more desirable aroma profiles. In addition, all eight variant strains
186 appeared genetically stable over 80 generations (Figure S3 in Supplementary material).

187 ***Ethanol tolerance and accumulation capacity of variant strains***

188 As the variant strains (Table 1) were derived from repeated exposure to high ethanol
189 concentrations and they performed better particularly towards the end of high-gravity wort
190 fermentations, we wanted to test and compare their ethanol tolerance and accumulation
191 capacity to that of the wild-type strains. All strains were able to grow on YPM agar
192 supplemented with 9% ethanol (v/v), but differences in growth were revealed on YPM agar
193 supplemented with 11% ethanol (v/v) (Figure 7). The variant strains derived from Y4 in
194 particular, showed improved growth at 11% ethanol compared to the wild-type strain (Figure
195 7D). For the variants derived from the other strains (Y1-Y3), there were no or less obvious
196 differences in the ability to grow in the presence of 11% ethanol. For strain Y2, the variant
197 (Y2_M1) derived from adaptation media M1 (10% ethanol and 2% maltose) also appeared to
198 grow better than the wild-type strain at 11% ethanol (v/v) (Figure 7B). The ethanol
199 accumulation capacity, which measures both the osmo- and ethanol tolerance of a strain, was
200 significantly higher for both variant strains of Y2 and Y4 compared to their wild-type strains,
201 while no significant differences were observed for strain Y3. Surprisingly, the ethanol
202 accumulation capacities of the variants of Y1 were significantly lower than the wild-type strain,

203 despite both variant strains appearing to grow slightly better on YPM agar supplemented with
204 11% ethanol (Figure 7A).

205 ***Sequencing reveals large-scale changes in genomes***

206 In order to investigate what genetic changes had occurred in the variant strains during the
207 adaptation process, whole genome sequencing and estimation of ploidy by flow cytometry
208 was performed (Figure 1F). Ploidy analysis revealed that relatively large changes in genome
209 size had occurred for many of the variant strains (Table 1). The genome of the variant (Y1_M6)
210 derived from the diploid *S. cerevisiae* strain Y1 and adaptation media M6 had almost doubled
211 in size, while the genomes of both variants (Y2_M1 and Y2_M6) derived from the tetraploid
212 interspecies hybrid Y2 had decreased by approximately 0.5N. Smaller changes were observed
213 in the genome sizes of the variants derived from the triploid and diploid interspecies hybrids
214 Y3 and Y4.

215 Whole genome sequencing of the wild-type and variant strains (average coverage ranged
216 from 152 \times to 1212 \times) revealed both chromosome gains and losses across all variant strains
217 (Figure 8). As indicated by the ploidy analysis, the largest changes in chromosome copy
218 numbers were observed in the variant derived from strain Y1 and adaptation media M6
219 (Y1_M6), where the majority of the chromosomes were now present in two extra copies. The
220 variants derived from interspecies hybrids (Y2-Y4) had, on average, gained 1.7 and lost 3.2
221 chromosomes. A greater amount of chromosome copy number changes were also observed
222 in the variants derived from the polyploid hybrids (6.5, 5.5, and 2.5 for Y2, Y3, and Y4,
223 respectively). In regards to the two sub-genomes of the hybrid variants, there were
224 significantly more ($p < 0.05$) chromosome gains in the *S. cerevisiae* sub-genome (average of 1.5
225 per variant) compared to the *S. eubayanus* sub-genome (average of 0.17 per variant). In the *S.*
226 *cerevisiae* sub-genome there was no significant difference between the amount of
227 chromosome gains and losses (average of 1.17 per variant). In contrast, the *S. eubayanus* sub-
228 genome had experienced significantly more ($p < 0.003$) chromosome losses (average of 2 per
229 variant) than gains. Common chromosome copy number changes were seen in several
230 variants, as the *S. cerevisiae*-derived chromosomes VII and XIV were amplified in four and six
231 variants, respectively, while the *S. eubayanus*-derived chromosome VII had been lost in four
232 variants (Figure 8).

233 The genomes of the variant strains varied not only at chromosome level, as several unique
234 single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNP), insertions and deletions (Indel) were also observed. A
235 total of 109 unique mutations were identified in the eight variant strains (Table S1 in
236 Supplementary material). Of these 64.2% were intergenic, 8.3% were synonymous, and 27.5%
237 were non-synonymous. In addition, 21% of the mutations were hemi- or homozygous. The
238 non-synonymous mutations caused both amino acid substitutions and frameshift mutations
239 (Table 2 and Table S1 in Supplementary material), and at least one was present in all variant
240 strains. Interestingly, non-synonymous mutations in three genes (*IRA2*, *HSP150*, and *MNN4*)
241 were found in multiple variants. In the case of *IRA2*, an inhibitory regulator of the RAS-cAMP
242 pathway (36) which contained non-synonymous mutations in three of the variants, both the *S.*
243 *cerevisiae* and *S. eubayanus* orthologues were affected. In addition to the unique mutations
244 that were observed in the variant strains, several of the variant strains had undergone loss of
245 heterozygosity in large regions of several *S. cerevisiae*-derived chromosomes (Figures S4-15 in
246 Supplementary material). The left arms of chromosomes X and XII, as well as the right arm of
247 XV, for example, were affected in multiple variants. No unique translocations or complex
248 structural variations were identified in the variant strains.

249 **Discussion**

250 The beer market and industry is driven by an increasing demand for more diverse beer
251 flavours and more efficient fermentations (37, 38). Numerous recent studies have
252 demonstrated how interspecific hybridization can be applied to increasing both lager yeast
253 diversity and fermentation performance (1–3, 32). This ‘natural approach’ is a particularly
254 attractive strain development tool for the brewing industry, because the use of genetically
255 modified yeast is still not common as a result of regulations and public opinion (39). Another
256 such GM-free strain development tool is adaptive evolution, which has also been successfully
257 applied to improve several brewing-relevant traits in yeast (14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 29). Here we
258 demonstrate how adaptive evolution can be applied to newly created interspecific lager yeast
259 hybrids, in order to further improve their fermentation traits, and reveal the genetic changes
260 that have occurred in the variant strains during adaptation.

261 By performing 30 consecutive batch fermentations in media supplemented with 10% ethanol,
262 we aimed to generate and select ethanol-tolerant variants of four different brewing yeast
263 strains; 3 of which were interspecific lager hybrids between *S. cerevisiae* and *S. eubayanus*.
264 While experimental evolution is typically carried out in chemo- or turbidostats to allow for
265 constant growth in defined nutrient availability (40), we here chose to use serial batch cultures
266 for simplicity and to mimic the growth cycle the yeast encounters in repeated use in brewery
267 fermentations (10). Our results show that the amount of yeast produced during each one-
268 week fermentation cycle positively correlated with the number of consecutive batch
269 fermentations, indicating that the strains adapted to the high ethanol concentration in the
270 growth media. Here, approximately 130 to 160 yeast generations were achieved with 30 batch
271 fermentations. Previous studies on adaptive evolution for ethanol tolerance have shown an
272 increase can be achieved after 140 to 480 generations (14, 17–19), with evidence of increased
273 fitness already after 40 generations in media containing ethanol (14). As the yeast is not
274 constantly in exponential growth, it is expected that the batch fermentation process used
275 here is more time-consuming than a continuous setup, where similar results have been
276 achieved in less time (19).

277 A two-step screening process was used to ensure that variants exhibiting improved
278 fermentation both in wort and in the presence of ethanol were selected from the adapted
279 population. While growth in the presence of ethanol has been shown to be weakly positively
280 correlated with ethanol production (41), we chose to monitor and select based on sugar
281 consumption instead of growth, since we were interested in improving fermentation. As was
282 revealed from the initial high-throughput screening, the majority of the strains that were
283 isolated throughout the adaptation process outperformed the wild-type strains in regards to
284 consumption of maltose and maltotriose in the presence of ethanol. However, variants arising
285 from experimental evolution may in some cases exhibit antagonistic pleiotropy, where
286 evolved variants show better fitness only in the environment in which they were selected (14).
287 To prevent this, we performed a final screening step in small-scale wort fermentations. As was
288 revealed during these small-scale fermentations, several isolates did in fact perform worse
289 than the wild-type strains in wort, despite outperforming the wild-type strains in the ethanol-
290 containing media used during high-throughput screenings.

291 The 2L-scale fermentations revealed that all eight of the tested variant strains outperformed
292 the wild-type strains from which they were derived. The exact mechanisms for this
293 improvement were not elucidated, but results seem to suggest that both improved ethanol
294 tolerance and maltose use could have contributed, particularly as differences between variant
295 and wild-type strains seemed to appear as fermentation progressed. Results revealed that
296 many of the variants exhibited improved ethanol tolerance and accumulation capacity, while
297 isolates showed considerable improvements in maltose consumption during high-throughput
298 screening and wort fermentation. In previous studies, where brewing strains have been
299 adapted to very high-gravity wort conditions, variant strains have exhibited increased
300 expression of α -glucoside transporters and genes involved in amino acid synthesis (20, 21).
301 Genome analysis of ethanol-tolerant variants has revealed that ethanol tolerance is a complex
302 process, affected by several different mechanisms, including general stress response,
303 intracellular signalling, and cell wall and membrane composition and organization (14, 19, 42).
304 Here, several changes in the genomes of the variant strains were observed that could
305 potentially contribute to the improved fermentation performance and ethanol tolerance. No
306 SNPs, structural variations or gene-level copy number changes were observed for the genes
307 encoding α -glucoside transporters in the variant strains. However, whole-chromosome copy
308 number gains of the *S. cerevisiae*-derived chromosome VII, containing *MAL31* and *AGT1*, were
309 observed in several variants. Interestingly, non-synonymous mutations in *IRA2* were observed
310 in three of the variant strains. This gene negatively regulates the RAS-cAMP pathway (36),
311 which in turn is involved in regulating metabolism, cell cycle and stress resistance (43, 44).
312 Adaptive mutations in this gene have been reported previously (45) after experimental
313 evolution in glucose-limited media, with *ira2* deletion strains exhibiting increased fitness.
314 Mutations in *IRA2* have also been reported for strains evolved for increased xylose
315 fermentation (46).

316 In regards to ethanol tolerance, we only identified non-synonymous mutations in one gene,
317 *UTH1*, that has previously been reported to enhance ethanol tolerance. In turbidostat
318 evolution experiments in high-ethanol media, Avrahami-Moyal et al. (19) found mutations in
319 *UTH1* in a fraction of the evolved clones, and showed that deletion of this gene enhanced
320 ethanol tolerance. While testing the direct effect of the non-synonymous mutations listed in
321 Table 2 on ethanol tolerance by reverse engineering was outside the scope of this particular

322 study, we feel it would be valuable to confirm their role in response to ethanol stress. In fact,
323 several of the genes that were affected here (*BST1*, *CBP1*, *DAL81*, *EAP1*, *HAP4*, *HSP150*, *IRA2*,
324 *MHP1*, *RAT1*, *RKM3*, *SFL1*, *TOD6* and *YIM1*), were also found to contain mutations in the evolved
325 clones that were isolated by Voordeckers et al. (14) following exposure to increasing ethanol
326 concentrations. In addition to SNPs and Indels, copy number variations are commonly
327 reported in adapted strains (14, 15, 47). While it is thought that chromosome copy number
328 changes allow for a rapid route of adaptation, they have an non-specific effect on the
329 phenotype (14). Here we observed several common chromosome losses and gains. The *S.*
330 *cerevisiae*-derived chromosome XIV was amplified in several of the variant strains, and
331 interestingly, this chromosome has been reported through QTL mapping to carry genes
332 (*MKT1*, *SWS2*, *APJ1*) associated with increased ethanol tolerance (42).

333 The variants did not only ferment faster, but in most cases also produced higher amounts of
334 desirable esters and lower amounts of unwanted off-flavours compared to the wild-type
335 strains. This was unexpected, as we only selected for fermentation and genetic hitchhiking is
336 common during adaptive evolution (33). In previous studies on brewing yeasts adapted to
337 high-gravity conditions, Ekberg et al. (21) reported increased concentrations of unwanted
338 diacetyl, while Blieck et al. (20) observed slight increases in higher alcohol and diacetyl
339 concentrations. As the aroma profile was not monitored during the screening process, it is
340 vital to ensure that it is satisfactory for any selected variants. Genome analysis did not reveal
341 any obvious causes for the increase in ester formation and decrease in diacetyl formation, as
342 no SNPs, Indels or gene-level copy number changes affected genes that have previously been
343 reported to be linked with the formation of these compounds. Some genes, such as *ATF2* on
344 chromosome VII and *ILV6* on chromosome III, were affected by chromosome-level copy
345 number changes, and could therefore have altered expression levels. Furthermore, most of
346 the observed mutations were intergenic, and they could therefore have an indirect effect on
347 these phenotypes by affecting gene regulation. Loss of heterozygosity has also been reported
348 to be a method of adaptation in hybrid strains (28), and here, for example, we observed loss
349 of heterozygosity on the right arm of the *S. cerevisiae*-derived chromosome XV in multiple
350 variant strains. This particular region contains *ATF1*, the gene encoding the main alcohol
351 acetyltransferase responsible for acetate ester synthesis (48, 49), which in the *S. cerevisiae*

352 A81062 genome contains four heterozygous SNPs, one of which is non-synonymous. The two
353 alleles of *ATF1* may therefore have slightly different functionality.

354 Interestingly, the greatest improvements in fermentation compared to the wild-type strains
355 were observed with the polyploid interspecific hybrids. An increased ploidy level may allow for
356 more rapid adaptation (12, 15, 30), presumably from gaining beneficial mutations at higher
357 rates, along with chromosome losses and aneuploidy. The genome size of both of the variants
358 derived from the tetraploid hybrid Y2 had decreased, while it had increased slightly for those
359 derived from the triploid hybrid Y3. Aneuploidy and convergence towards a diploid state has
360 commonly been reported during evolutionary engineering (11, 14, 15). Surprisingly, the
361 largest change in genome size was observed for one of the variants derived from the diploid
362 *S. cerevisiae* parent size. The results indicate that under these adaptation conditions, it was not
363 only hybrid strains that possessed an unstable genome, and adapted variants from an
364 industrial ale strain could be obtained without any prior mutagenesis. Evolutionary
365 engineering studies involving interspecific hybrids, have indicated that in certain conditions
366 either of the parental sub-genomes may be preferentially retained depending on the selective
367 pressure (5, 8, 28), while the other may be lost. Piotrowski et al. (5), for example, showed that
368 growing *S. cerevisiae* × *S. uvarum* hybrids in high temperatures, resulted in the loss of the
369 'heat-sensitive' *S. uvarum* sub-genome. Here, we saw a greater loss of the *S. eubayanus* sub-
370 genome in the variants derived from interspecific hybrids. It is therefore tempting to
371 speculate that repeating the adaptation process at a lower temperature would have retained
372 more of the *S. eubayanus* sub-genome in the variants, and this could be a target for future
373 studies. In fact, the natural lager yeast hybrids of Saaz-type have retained a larger fraction of
374 the *S. eubayanus* sub-genome compared to the *S. cerevisiae* sub-genome (50, 51), and it is still
375 unclear whether exposure to cold temperatures have had any effect on its evolution.

376 In conclusion, adaptive evolution in high-ethanol media was successfully used to generate
377 stable and superior variant strains from 4 different brewing strains, 3 of which were de novo
378 interspecific lager yeast hybrids. These adapted variants outperformed the strains which they
379 were derived from during wort fermentation, and the majority also possessed several
380 desirable brewing-relevant traits, such as increased ester formation and ethanol tolerance,
381 and decreased diacetyl formation. While not tested here, it is likely that many of the adapted

382 variant strains would also outperform the wild-type strains in very high-gravity wort, i.e. wort
383 containing over 250 g extract L⁻¹, as these fermentations require good tolerance towards both
384 high osmotic pressure and ethanol concentrations (10), which several of the variant strains
385 demonstrated by their ethanol accumulation capacity. Our study demonstrates the possibility
386 of improving *de novo* lager yeast hybrids through adaptive evolution, and these superior and
387 stable variants are viable candidates for industrial lager beer fermentation.

388 **Materials & Methods**

389 ***Yeast strains***

390 A list of strains used in this study can be found in Table 1. Three different *de novo* lager yeast
391 hybrids, generated in previous studies by our lab (3, 32), along with a *S. cerevisiae* ale parent
392 strain (common to all three hybrids) were subjected to the adaptation process. Eight variant
393 strains (two from each of the four wild-type strains) were isolated and subjected to
394 phenotypic and genetic analysis. The ploidy of all the strains was determined by flow
395 cytometry as described previously (32).

396 ***Adaptation in a high-ethanol environment***

397 The adaptation process was carried out in batch fermentations to mimic consecutive
398 industrial brewery fermentations. Yeasts were grown in sterile 2 mL screw-cap
399 microcentrifuge tubes (VWR Catalog Number 10025-754) containing 1 mL of growth media.
400 Four different yeast strains (Y1, Y2, Y3 and Y4) were used for the adaptation experiment (see
401 Table 1 for more information). These were grown in two different adaptation media: M1 (1%
402 yeast extract, 2% peptone, 2% maltose, 10% ethanol) and M6 (1% yeast extract, 2% peptone,
403 1% maltose, 1% maltotriose, 10% ethanol). Each batch fermentation was inoculated to a
404 starting OD₆₀₀ of 0.1 with yeast from the previous batch fermentation. The first batch
405 fermentations were inoculated from pre-cultures that were grown overnight in YPM media
406 (1% yeast extract, 2% peptone, 2% maltose). Tubes were incubated statically for 7 days at 18
407 °C. Three replicate tubes or adaptation lines (A, B, and C) were used for each yeast strain and
408 media (A and B were never mixed). In order to avoid contamination, the optical density at the
409 end of each batch fermentation was measured only from the third replicate (C), which was

410 subsequently discarded following the OD600 measurement. After 10, 20 and 30 consecutive
411 batch fermentations, 10 µL aliquots of the cell populations were spread onto agar plates
412 containing solidified versions of the growth media (2% agar added) for isolation of variants
413 showing rapid growth. The agar plates were incubated at 18 °C until colonies started
414 emerging, and the two largest colonies from each plate were selected for further screening
415 (for a total of four isolates per yeast strain, per media, per isolation time point). An overview
416 of the adaptation process and initial isolation step is depicted in Figure 1A and 1B,
417 respectively.

418 ***Screening***

419 The isolates were initially screened on 96-well plates using a Beckman Coulter liquid handling
420 robot to select for fast fermenting variants. Strains were grown in Nunc™ 96-well polystyrene
421 round bottom microwell plates (Thermo Scientific 268200), in 150 µl volume at 14 °C, with
422 1200 rpm agitation in a Thermo Scientific Cytomat Plate Hotel (1 mm throw). Pre-cultures
423 were prepared by inoculating 10 µL aliquots of cell suspension from frozen stocks into 140 µL
424 of media consisting of 6.2% malt extract (Senson Oy, Finland) in the plates. Pre-cultures were
425 incubated for 4 days until all strains had reached stationary phase. The pre-culture plates
426 were centrifuged and pellets were resuspended in 50 mM citrate buffer (pH 7.2) to
427 deflocculate the yeast. 10 µL aliquots of these suspensions were used to inoculate 140 µL of
428 screening media for the experimental cultures. The isolates were grown in a screening media
429 consisting of 6.2% malt extract (Senson Oy, Finland), 5% ethanol and 10% sorbitol. The extract
430 content of this media was approximately 5 °P (50 g/L). The ethanol was added to the
431 screening media to replicate the conditions the yeast is exposed to towards the end of
432 brewery fermentations, while the sorbitol was added to replicate the increased osmotic
433 pressure the yeast is exposed to in the beginning of brewery fermentations when sugar-rich
434 wort is used. Each isolate was grown in triplicate, while wild-type strains were grown in at
435 least 12 replicates. Strains and replicates were distributed randomly on the 96-well plates. The
436 fermentations were monitored by measuring the optical density at 595 nm every 3 hours
437 using the DTX 880 multimode detector (Beckman Coulter) associated with the robot, and by
438 drawing samples for HPLC analysis after 48, 96 and 144 hours. This screening step is depicted
439 in Figure 1C. Three isolates per yeast strain and media (for a total of 24 isolates) were selected

440 for further screening in small-scale wort fermentations based on the following criteria: 1) the
441 highest sugar consumption after 144 hours, 2) the isolates must be from separate adaptation
442 lines and isolation time points.

443 To ensure that the isolates were also able to ferment actual wort efficiently, a final screening
444 step was conducted by carrying out a set of small-scale wort fermentations. The small-scale
445 fermentations were carried out in plastic 50 mL centrifuge tubes capped with a glycerol-filled
446 airlock. The 24 isolates selected from the previous screening step and the 4 wild-type strains
447 were grown overnight in 50 mL YPM at 18 °C. The pre-cultured yeast was then inoculated into
448 30 mL of 15 °P all-malt wort at a rate of 15×10^6 viable cells mL⁻¹. Fermentations were carried
449 out in duplicate at 15 °C for 9 days, and these were monitored daily by mass lost as CO₂. This
450 screening step is depicted in Figure 1D. The maximum fermentation rate of each strain was
451 determined and one isolate per yeast strain and media (for a total of 8 isolates) were selected
452 based on the following criteria: 1) the highest fermentation rate, 2) isolated after a larger
453 number of batch fermentations. These eight isolates are listed in Table 1, and were further
454 characterized in 2L-scale wort fermentations.

455 ***2L-scale wort fermentations***

456 The eight variant strains were characterized in fermentations performed in a 15 °Plato high
457 gravity wort at 15 °C. Yeast was propagated essentially as described previously (3), with the
458 use of a 'Generation 0' fermentation prior to the actual experimental fermentations. The
459 experimental fermentations were carried out in duplicate, in 2-L cylindroconical stainless steel
460 fermenting vessels, containing 1.5 L of wort medium. The 15 °Plato wort (69 g maltose, 17.4 g
461 maltotriose, 15.1 g glucose, and 5.0 g fructose per litre) was produced at the VTT Pilot Brewery
462 from barley malt. Yeast was inoculated at a rate of 15×10^6 viable cells mL⁻¹. The wort was
463 oxygenated to 15 mg L⁻¹ prior to pitching (Oxygen Indicator Model 26073 and Sensor 21158,
464 Orbisphere Laboratories, Switzerland). The fermentations were carried out at 15 °C until an
465 apparent attenuation of 80% (corresponding to approx 7% alcohol (v/v)) was reached, or for a
466 maximum of 14 days. Wort samples were drawn regularly from the fermentation vessels
467 aseptically, and placed directly on ice, after which the yeast was separated from the
468 fermenting wort by centrifugation (9000 × g, 10 min, 1 °C). Samples for yeast-derived flavour
469 compounds analysis were drawn from the beer when fermentations were ended.

470 ***Chemical analysis***

471 Concentrations of fermentable sugars (maltose and maltotriose) were measured by HPLC
472 using a Waters 2695 Separation Module and Waters System Interphase Module liquid
473 chromatograph coupled with a Waters 2414 differential refractometer (Waters Co., Milford,
474 MA, USA). A Rezex RFQ-Fast Acid H⁺ (8%) LC Column (100 × 7.8 mm, Phenomenex, USA) was
475 equilibrated with 5 mM H₂SO₄ (Titrisol, Merck, Germany) in water at 80 °C and samples were
476 eluted with 5 mM H₂SO₄ in water at a 0.8 mL min⁻¹ flow rate.

477 The alcohol level (% v/v) of samples was determined from the centrifuged and degassed
478 fermentation samples using an Anton Paar Density Meter DMA 5000 M with Alcolyzer Beer ME
479 and pH ME modules (Anton Paar GmbH, Austria).

480 Yeast-derived higher alcohols and esters were determined by headspace gas chromatography
481 with flame ionization detector (HS-GC-FID) analysis. 4 mL samples were filtered (0.45 µm),
482 incubated at 60 °C for 30 min and then 1 mL of gas phase was injected (split mode; 225 °C;
483 split flow of 30 mL min⁻¹) into a gas chromatograph equipped with an FID detector and
484 headspace autosampler (Agilent 7890 Series; Palo Alto, CA, USA). Analytes were separated on
485 a HP-5 capillary column (50 m × 320 µm × 1.05 µm column, Agilent, USA). The carrier gas was
486 helium (constant flow of 1.4 mL min⁻¹). The temperature program was 50 °C for 3 min, 10 °C
487 min⁻¹ to 100 °C, 5 °C min⁻¹ to 140 °C, 15 °C min⁻¹ to 260 °C and then isothermal for 1 min.
488 Compounds were identified by comparison with authentic standards and were quantified
489 using standard curves. 1-Butanol was used as internal standard.

490 Total diacetyl (free and acetohydroxy acid form) was measured according to Analytica-EBC
491 method 9.10 (52). Samples were heated to 60 °C and kept at this temperature for 90 min.
492 Heating to 60 °C results in the conversion of α-acetolactate to diacetyl. The samples were then
493 analyzed by headspace gas chromatography using a gas chromatograph equipped with a
494 µECD detector and headspace autosampler (Agilent 7890 Series; Palo Alto, CA, USA). Analytes
495 were separated on a HP-5 capillary column (50 m × 320 µm × 1.05 µm column; Agilent, USA).
496 2,3-Hexanedione was used as an internal standard.

497 ***Ethanol tolerance and accumulation capacity***

498 As several of the wild-type and variant strains flocculated strongly, we were unable to reliably
499 determine ethanol tolerance in liquid cultures based on optical density measurements.
500 Therefore, we assessed ethanol tolerance based on the ability to grow on YPD agar plates
501 supplemented with various levels of ethanol. Overnight pre-cultures of all the strains were
502 grown in YPM at 25 °C. The yeast was then pelleted and resuspended in 50 mM citrate buffer
503 (pH 7.2) to deflocculate the yeast. The cell concentration was measured with a
504 Nucleocounter® YC-100™ (ChemoMetec, Denmark), after which suspensions were diluted to
505 contain approximately 10⁵, 10⁴ and 10³ cells mL⁻¹. 5 µL aliquots of the suspensions of each
506 strain was spotted onto agar plates containing YPD supplemented with 9%, 11% and 13%
507 ethanol. Plates were sealed with parafilm, placed in ziplock bags, and incubated at 25 °C for
508 up to 21 days.

509 The ethanol accumulation capacity of the strains was also assessed as described by Gallone et
510 al. (53) with modifications. Overnight pre-cultures of all the strains were grown in YP-4%
511 Maltose at 25 °C. The yeast was then pelleted and resuspended to an OD600 of 20 in 50 mM
512 citrate buffer (pH 7.2) to deflocculate the yeast. 35 mL of YP-35% Maltose was then inoculated
513 with the yeast strains to an initial OD600 of 0.5. Fermentations took place in 100 mL
514 Erlenmeyer flasks capped with glycerol-filled airlocks. Flasks were incubated at 18 °C with
515 gentle shaking (100 rpm) for 28 days. The mass loss was monitored to estimate when
516 fermentation finished. After the fermentations had finished, the cultures were centrifuged,
517 after which the alcohol content of the supernatants was measured with an Anton Paar
518 Density Meter DMA 5000 M with Alcolyzer Beer ME and pH ME modules (Anton Paar GmbH,
519 Austria).

520 ***Genetic stability of variant strains***

521 The genetic stability of the eight variant strains (Table 1) was assessed by culturing them
522 repeatedly in YP-4% Maltose at 18 °C for over 80 generations (2, 9). After this, DNA was
523 extracted from two randomly chosen isolates from each variant strain. DNA fingerprints were
524 produced for each isolate and the eight variant strains with PCR using delta12 (5'-
525 TCAACAATGGAATCCAAC-3') and delta21 (5'-CATCTAACACCGTATATGA-3') primers for
526 interdelta DNA analysis (54). The DNA fingerprints of the isolates obtained after 80

527 generations were compared with those of the variant strains, and the variants were deemed
528 genetically stable if the fingerprints were identical.

529 ***Genome sequencing and analysis***

530 Wild-type strains Y1 and Y2 have been sequenced in previous studies (3, 32), and reads for
531 these strains were obtained from NCBI-SRA (SRX1423875 and SRX2459842, respectively). For
532 this study, wild-type strains Y2-Y4 and the eight variant strains were sequenced by
533 Biomedicum Genomics (Helsinki, Finland). In brief, DNA was initially isolated using Qiagen
534 100/G Genomic tips (Qiagen, Netherlands), after which an Illumina TruSeq LT pair-end 150 bp
535 library was prepared for each strain and sequencing was carried out with a NextSeq500
536 instrument. Pair-end reads from the NextSeq500 sequencing were quality-analysed with
537 FastQC (55) and trimmed and filtered with Cutadapt (56). Alignment of reads was carried out
538 using SpeedSeq (57). Reads of *S. cerevisiae* Y1 (VTT-A81062) and its variants were aligned to a
539 previously assembled reference genome (available under BioProject PRJNA301545) of the
540 strain (3), while reads of hybrid strains Y2-Y4 and their variants were aligned to concatenated
541 reference sequences of *S. cerevisiae* VTT-A81062 and *S. eubayanus* FM1318 (58) as described
542 previously (3). Quality of alignments was assessed with QualiMap (59). Variant analysis was
543 performed on aligned reads using FreeBayes (60). Variants in wild-type and variant strains
544 were called simultaneously (multi-sample). Prior to variant analysis, alignments were filtered
545 to a minimum MAPQ of 50 with SAMtools (61). Structural variation analysis was performed
546 with LUMPY (62), Manta (63), and Scalpel (64). Variants that were unique to the variant strains
547 (i.e. not present in the wild-type strain) were obtained with SnpSift (65). Annotation and effect
548 prediction of the variants was performed with SnpEff (66). The filtered and annotated variants
549 were finally manually inspected in IGV (67). Copy number variations were estimated based on
550 coverage with CNVKit (68). The median coverage over 10,000 bp windows was calculated with
551 BEDTools (69).

552 ***Data visualization and analysis***

553 Data and statistical analyses were performed with R (<http://www.r-project.org/>). Flow
554 cytometry data was analysed with 'flowCore' (70) and 'mixtools' (71) packages. Growth curves
555 from the high-throughput screening cultivations were produced based on optical density

556 measurements using the logistic model in the 'gprof' package (72). Scatter, box and heatmap
557 plots were produced in R. The 'Circos-like' plots in Figures S4-S15 in the Supplementary
558 material were produced with the 'circlize' package (73). Significance between variant wild-type
559 strains was tested by Student's t-test (two-tailed, unpaired, and unequal variances).

560 ***Data availability***

561 The Illumina reads generated in this study have been submitted to NCBI-SRA under BioProject
562 number PRJNA408119 in the NCBI BioProject database
563 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bioproject/>).

564 **Acknowledgements**

565 We thank Sue James for valuable comments during the study, Virve Vidgren for performing
566 DNA extractions, Eero Mattila for wort preparation and other assistance in the VTT Pilot
567 Brewery, and Aila Siltala for skilled technical assistance. This work was supported by the
568 Alfred Kordelin Foundation, Svenska Kulturfonden - The Swedish Cultural Foundation in
569 Finland, Suomen Kulttuurirahasto, SABMiller (ABInBev), and the Academy of Finland (Academy
570 Project 276480).

571 **References**

- 572 1. Krogerus K, Magalhães F, Vidgren V, Gibson B. 2015. New lager yeast strains generated
573 by interspecific hybridization. *J Ind Microbiol Biotechnol* 42:769–78.
- 574 2. Mertens S, Steensels J, Saels V, De Rouck G, Aerts G, Verstrepen KJ. 2015. A large set of
575 newly created interspecific *Saccharomyces* hybrids increases aromatic diversity in lager
576 beers. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 81:8202–14.
- 577 3. Krogerus K, Arvas M, De Chiara M, Magalhães F, Mattinen L, Oja M, Vidgren V, Yue JX, Liti
578 G, Gibson B. 2016. Ploidy influences the functional attributes of de novo lager yeast
579 hybrids. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 100:7203–7222.
- 580 4. Steensels J, Meersman E, Snoek T, Saels V, Verstrepen KJ. 2014. Large-scale selection
581 and breeding to generate industrial yeasts with superior aroma production. *Appl*

- 582 Environ Microbiol 80:6965–6975.
- 583 5. Piotrowski JS, Nagarajan S, Kroll E, Stanberry A, Chiotti KE, Kruckeberg AL, Dunn B,
584 Sherlock G, Rosenzweig F. 2012. Different selective pressures lead to different genomic
585 outcomes as newly-formed hybrid yeasts evolve. BMC Evol Biol 12:46.
- 586 6. Kunicka-Styczyńska A, Rajkowska K. 2011. Physiological and genetic stability of hybrids
587 of industrial wine yeasts *Saccharomyces sensu stricto* complex. J Appl Microbiol
588 110:1538–1549.
- 589 7. Louis VL, Desponts L, Friedrich A, Martin T, Durrens P, Casarégola S, Neuvéglise C,
590 Fairhead C, Marck C, Cruz JA, Straub M-L, Kugler V, Sacerdot C, Uzunov Z, Thierry A,
591 Weiss S, Bleykasten C, De Montigny J, Jacques N, Jung P, Lemaire M, Mallet S, Morel G,
592 Richard G-F, Sarkar A, Savel G, Schacherer J, Seret M-L, Talla E, Samson G, Jubin C,
593 Poulain J, Vacherie B, Barbe V, Pelletier E, Sherman DJ, Westhof E, Weissenbach J, Baret
594 P V, Wincker P, Gaillardin C, Dujon B, Souciet J-L. 2012. *Pichia sorbitophila*, an
595 Interspecies Yeast Hybrid, Reveals Early Steps of Genome Resolution After
596 Polyploidization. G3 (Bethesda) 2:299–311.
- 597 8. Dunn B, Paulish T, Stanberry A, Piotrowski J, Koniges G, Kroll E, Louis EJ, Liti G, Sherlock G,
598 Rosenzweig F. 2013. Recurrent Rearrangement during Adaptive Evolution in an
599 Interspecific Yeast Hybrid Suggests a Model for Rapid Introgression. PLoS Genet 9.
- 600 9. Pérez-Través L, Lopes CA, Barrio E, Querol A. 2014. Stabilization process in
601 *Saccharomyces* intra and interspecific hybrids in fermentative conditions. Int Microbiol
602 17:213–24.
- 603 10. Gibson BR, Lawrence SJ, Leclaire JPR, Powell CD, Smart KA. 2007. Yeast responses to
604 stresses associated with industrial brewery handling. FEMS Microbiol Rev.
- 605 11. Gerstein AC, Chun H-JE, Grant A, Otto SP. 2006. Genomic Convergence toward Diploidy
606 in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. PLoS Genet 2:e145.
- 607 12. Lu Y-J, Swamy KBS, Leu J-Y. 2016. Experimental Evolution Reveals Interplay between
608 Sch9 and Polyploid Stability in Yeast. PLOS Genet 12:e1006409.

- 609 13. Pérez-Través L, Lopes CA, Barrio E, Querol A. 2012. Evaluation of different genetic
610 procedures for the generation of artificial hybrids in *Saccharomyces* genus for
611 winemaking. *Int J Food Microbiol* 156:102–111.
- 612 14. Voordeckers K, Kominek J, Das A, Espinosa-Cant?? A, De Maeyer D, Arslan A, Van Pee M,
613 van der Zande E, Meert W, Yang Y, Zhu B, Marchal K, DeLuna A, Van Noort V, Jelier R,
614 Verstrepen KJ. 2015. Adaptation to High Ethanol Reveals Complex Evolutionary
615 Pathways. *PLoS Genet* 11.
- 616 15. Selmecki AM, Maruvka YE, Richmond P a, Guillet M, Shores N, Sorenson AL, De S,
617 Kishony R, Michor F, Dowell R, Pellman D. 2015. Polyploidy can drive rapid adaptation in
618 yeast. *Nature* 519:349–352.
- 619 16. Gunge N, Nakatomi Y. 1972. Genetic mechanisms of rare matings of the yeast
620 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* heterozygous for mating type. *Genetics* 70:41–58.
- 621 17. Chen S, Xu Y. 2014. Adaptive evolution of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* with enhanced
622 ethanol tolerance for Chinese rice wine fermentation. *Appl Biochem Biotechnol*
623 173:1940–1954.
- 624 18. Stanley D, Fraser S, Chambers PJ, Rogers P, Stanley GA. 2010. Generation and
625 characterisation of stable ethanol-tolerant mutants of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *J Ind*
626 *Microbiol Biotechnol* 37:139–149.
- 627 19. Avrahami-Moyal L, Engelberg D, Wenger JW, Sherlock G, Braun S. 2012. Turbidostat
628 culture of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* W303-1A under selective pressure elicited by
629 ethanol selects for mutations in SSD1 and UTH1. *FEMS Yeast Res* 12:521–533.
- 630 20. Blieck L, Toye G, Dumortier F, Verstrepen KJ, Delvaux FR, Thevelein JM, Van Dijck P. 2007.
631 Isolation and characterization of brewer's yeast variants with improved fermentation
632 performance under high-gravity conditions. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 73:815–824.
- 633 21. Ekberg J, Rautio J, Mattinen L, Vidgren V, Londesborough J, Gibson BR. 2013. Adaptive
634 evolution of the lager brewing yeast *Saccharomyces pastorianus* for improved growth
635 under hyperosmotic conditions and its influence on fermentation performance. *FEMS*

- 636 Yeast Res 13:335–349.
- 637 22. Peris D, Moriarty R V, Alexander WG, Baker E, Sylvester K, Sardi M, Langdon QK, Libkind
638 D, Wang Q-M, Bai F-Y, Leducq J-B, Charron G, Landry CR, Sampaio JP, Gonçalves P, Hyma
639 KE, Fay JC, Sato TK, Hittinger CT. 2017. Hybridization and adaptive evolution of diverse
640 Saccharomyces species for cellulosic biofuel production. Biotechnol Biofuels 10:78.
- 641 23. López-Malo M, García-Ríos E, Melgar B, Sanchez MR, Dunham MJ, Guillamón JM. 2015.
642 Evolutionary engineering of a wine yeast strain revealed a key role of inositol and
643 mannoprotein metabolism during low-temperature fermentation. BMC Genomics
644 16:537.
- 645 24. Caspeta L, Chen Y, Nielsen J. 2016. Thermotolerant yeasts selected by adaptive
646 evolution express heat stress response at 30 °C. Sci Rep 6:27003.
- 647 25. Brickwedde A, van den Broek M, Geertman J-MA, Magalhães F, Kuijpers NGA, Gibson B,
648 Pronk JT, Daran J-MG. 2017. Evolutionary Engineering in Chemostat Cultures for
649 Improved Maltotriose Fermentation Kinetics in *Saccharomyces pastorianus* Lager
650 Brewing Yeast. Front Microbiol 8.
- 651 26. Wouter Wisselink H, Toirkens MJ, Wu Q, Pronk JT, Van Maris AJA. 2009. Novel
652 evolutionary engineering approach for accelerated utilization of glucose, xylose, and
653 arabinose mixtures by engineered *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains. Appl Environ
654 Microbiol 75:907–914.
- 655 27. Scalcinati G, Otero JM, Van Vleet JRH, Jeffries TW, Olsson L, Nielsen J. 2012. Evolutionary
656 engineering of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* for efficient aerobic xylose consumption.
657 FEMS Yeast Res 12:582–597.
- 658 28. Smukowski Heil CS, DeSevo CG, Pai DA, Tucker CM, Hoang ML, Dunham MJ. 2017. Loss
659 of Heterozygosity Drives Adaptation in Hybrid Yeast. Mol Biol Evol 34:1596–1612.
- 660 29. Hope EA, Amorosi CJ, Miller AW, Dang K, Heil CS, Dunham MJ. 2017. Experimental
661 evolution reveals favored adaptive routes to cell aggregation in yeast. Genetics
662 206:1153–1167.

- 663 30. Scott AL, Richmond PA, Dowell R, Selmecki AM. 2017. The influence of polyploidy on the
664 evolution of yeast grown in a sub-optimal carbon source. *Mol Biol Evol.*
- 665 31. Puligundla P, Smogrovicova D, Obulam VSR, Ko S. 2011. Very high gravity (VHG)
666 ethanolic brewing and fermentation: A research update. *J Ind Microbiol Biotechnol.*
- 667 32. Krogerus K, Seppänen-Laakso T, Castillo S, Gibson B. 2017. Inheritance of brewing-
668 relevant phenotypes in constructed *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* x *Saccharomyces*
669 *eubayanus* hybrids. *Microb Cell Fact* 16:66.
- 670 33. Buskirk SW, Peace RE, Lang GI. 2017. Hitchhiking and epistasis give rise to cohort
671 dynamics in adapting populations. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 114:8330–8335.
- 672 34. Pires EJ, Teixeira JA, Branyik T, Vicente AA. 2014. Yeast: The soul of beer's aroma - A
673 review of flavour-active esters and higher alcohols produced by the brewing yeast. *Appl*
674 *Microbiol Biotechnol.*
- 675 35. Krogerus K, Gibson BR. 2013. 125th anniversary review: Diacetyl and its control during
676 brewery fermentation. *J Inst Brew* 119:86–97.
- 677 36. Tanaka K, Nakafuku M, Tamanoi F, Kaziro Y, Matsumoto K, Toh-e a. 1990. IRA2, a
678 second gene of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* that encodes a protein with a domain
679 homologous to mammalian ras GTPase-activating protein. *Mol Cell Biol* 10:4303–4313.
- 680 37. Aquilani B, Laureti T, Poponi S, Secondi L. 2015. Beer choice and consumption
681 determinants when craft beers are tasted: An exploratory study of consumer
682 preferences. *Food Qual Prefer* 41:214–224.
- 683 38. Gibson B, Geertman J-MA, Hittinger CT, Krogerus K, Libkind D, Louis EJ, Magalhães F,
684 Sampaio JP. 2017. New yeasts—new brews: modern approaches to brewing yeast
685 design and development. *FEMS Yeast Res* 17.
- 686 39. Twardowski T, Małyska A. 2015. Uninformed and disinforming society and the GMO
687 market. *Trends Biotechnol* 33:1–3.
- 688 40. Gresham D, Dunham MJ. 2014. The enduring utility of continuous culturing in
689 experimental evolution. *Genomics* 104:399–405.

- 690 41. Snoek T, Picca Nicolino M, Van den Bremt S, Mertens S, Saels V, Verplaetse A, Steensels
691 J, Verstrepen KJ. 2015. Large-scale robot-assisted genome shuffling yields industrial
692 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* yeasts with increased ethanol tolerance. *Biotechnol Biofuels*
693 8:32.
- 694 42. Swinnen S, Schaerlaekens K, Pais T, Claesen J, Hubmann G, Yang Y, Demeke M,
695 Foulquie-Moreno MR, Goovaerts A, Souvereyns K, Clement L, Dumortier F, Thevelein JM.
696 2012. Identification of novel causative genes determining the complex trait of high
697 ethanol tolerance in yeast using pooled-segregant whole-genome sequence analysis.
698 *Genome Res* 22:975–984.
- 699 43. Budovskaya YV, Stephan JS, Reggiori F, Klionsky DJ, Herman PK. 2004. The Ras/cAMP-
700 dependent protein kinase signaling pathway regulates an early step of the autophagy
701 process in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *J Biol Chem* 279:20663–71.
- 702 44. Thevelein JM, De Winde JH. 1999. Novel sensing mechanisms and targets for the cAMP-
703 protein kinase A pathway in the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Mol Microbiol*.
- 704 45. Venkataram S, Dunn B, Li Y, Agarwala A, Chang J, Ebel ER, Geiler-Samerotte K, H??rissant
705 L, Blundell JR, Levy SF, Fisher DS, Sherlock G, Petrov DA. 2016. Development of a
706 Comprehensive Genotype-to-Fitness Map of Adaptation-Driving Mutations in Yeast. *Cell*
707 166:1585–1596.e22.
- 708 46. Sato TK, Tremaine M, Parreira LS, Hebert AS, Myers KS, Higbee AJ, Sardi M, McIlwain SJ,
709 Ong IM, Breuer RJ, Avanasi Narasimhan R, McGee MA, Dickinson Q, La Reau A, Xie D,
710 Tian M, Reed JL, Zhang Y, Coon JJ, Hittinger CT, Gasch AP, Landick R. 2016. Directed
711 Evolution Reveals Unexpected Epistatic Interactions That Alter Metabolic Regulation and
712 Enable Anaerobic Xylose Use by *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *PLoS Genet* 12.
- 713 47. Payen C, Di Rienzi SC, Ong GT, Pogachar JL, Sanchez JC, Sunshine AB, Raghuraman MK,
714 Brewer BJ, Dunham MJ. 2014. The dynamics of diverse segmental amplifications in
715 populations of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* adapting to strong selection. *G3 (Bethesda)*
716 4:399–409.
- 717 48. Mason AB, Dufour JP. 2000. Alcohol acetyltransferases and the significance of ester

- 718 synthesis in yeast. Yeast 16:1287–1298.
- 719 49. Verstrepen KJ, Van Laere SDM, Vanderhaegen BMP, Derdelinckx G, Dufour JP, Pretorius
720 IS, Winderickx J, Thevelein JM, Delvaux FR. 2003. Expression levels of the yeast alcohol
721 acetyltransferase genes ATF1, Lg-ATF1, and ATF2 control the formation of a broad range
722 of volatile esters. Appl Environ Microbiol 69:5228–5237.
- 723 50. Dunn B, Sherlock G. 2008. Reconstruction of the genome origins and evolution of the
724 hybrid lager yeast *Saccharomyces pastorianus*. Genome Res 18:1610–1623.
- 725 51. Okuno M, Kajitani R, Ryusui R, Morimoto H, Kodama Y, Itoh T. 2015. Next-generation
726 sequencing analysis of lager brewing yeast strains reveals the evolutionary history of
727 interspecies hybridization. DNA Res 23:67–80.
- 728 52. European Brewery Convention. 2004. Analytica EBC. Verlag Hans Carl Getränke-
729 Fachverlag, Nürnberg.
- 730 53. Gallone B, Steensels J, Baele G, Maere S, Verstrepen KJ, Prahl T, Soriaga L, Saels V,
731 Herrera-Malaver B, Merlevede A, Roncoroni M, Voordeckers K, Miraglia L, Teiling C,
732 Steffy B, Taylor M, Schwartz A, Richardson T, White C. 2016. Domestication and
733 Divergence of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* Beer Yeasts. Cell 166:1397–1410.e16.
- 734 54. Legras JL, Karst F. 2003. Optimisation of interdelta analysis for *Saccharomyces*
735 *cerevisiae* strain characterisation. FEMS Microbiol Lett 221:249–255.
- 736 55. Andrews S. 2010. FastQC: A quality control tool for high throughput sequence data.
737 [Http://WwwBioinformaticsBabrahamAcUk/Projects/Fastqc/](http://WwwBioinformaticsBabrahamAcUk/Projects/Fastqc/).
- 738 56. Martin M. 2011. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput
739 sequencing reads. EMBnet.journal 17:10.
- 740 57. Chiang C, Layer RM, Faust GG, Lindberg MR, Rose DB, Garrison EP, Marth GT, Quinlan
741 AR, Hall IM. 2015. SpeedSeq: ultra-fast personal genome analysis and interpretation.
742 Nat Methods 12:1–5.
- 743 58. Baker E, Wang B, Bellora N, Peris D, Hulfachor AB, Koshalek JA, Adams M, Libkind D,
744 Hittinger CT. 2015. The Genome Sequence of *Saccharomyces eubayanus* and the

- 745 Domestication of Lager-Brewing Yeasts. Mol Biol Evol 32:2818–2831.

746 59. García-Alcalde F, Okonechnikov K, Carbonell J, Cruz LM, Götz S, Tarazona S, Dopazo J,
747 Meyer TF, Conesa A. 2012. Qualimap: Evaluating next-generation sequencing alignment
748 data. Bioinformatics 28:2678–2679.

749 60. Garrison E, Marth G. 2012. Haplotype-based variant detection from short-read
750 sequencing. arXiv Prepr arXiv12073907 9.

751 61. Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, Marth G, Abecasis G, Durbin
752 R. 2009. The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics 25:2078–
753 2079.

754 62. Layer RM, Chiang C, Quinlan AR, Hall IM. 2014. LUMPY: a probabilistic framework for
755 structural variant discovery. Genome Biol 15:R84.

756 63. Chen X, Schulz-Trieglaff O, Shaw R, Barnes B, Schlesinger F, Källberg M, Cox AJ, Kruglyak
757 S, Saunders CT. 2016. Manta: Rapid detection of structural variants and indels for
758 germline and cancer sequencing applications. Bioinformatics 32:1220–1222.

759 64. Fang H, Bergmann EA, Arora K, Vacic V, Zody MC, Iossifov I, O’Rawe JA, Wu Y, Jimenez
760 Barron LT, Rosenbaum J, Ronemus M, Lee Y, Wang Z, Dikoglu E, Jobanputra V, Lyon GJ,
761 Wigler M, Schatz MC, Narzisi G. 2016. Indel variant analysis of short-read sequencing
762 data with Scalpel. Nat Protoc 11:2529–2548.

763 65. Cingolani P, Patel VM, Coon M, Nguyen T, Land SJ, Ruden DM, Lu X. 2012. Using
764 Drosophila melanogaster as a model for genotoxic chemical mutational studies with a
765 new program, SnpSift. Front Genet 3.

766 66. Cingolani P, Platts A, Wang LL, Coon M, Nguyen T, Wang L, Land SJ, Lu X, Ruden DM.
767 2012. A program for annotating and predicting the effects of single nucleotide
768 polymorphisms, SnpEff: SNPs in the genome of Drosophila melanogaster strain w1118;
769 iso-2; iso-3. Fly (Austin) 6:80–92.

770 67. Robinson JT, Thorvaldsdóttir H, Winckler W, Guttman M, Lander ES, Getz G, Mesirov JP.
771 2011. Integrative genomics viewer. Nat Biotechnol 29:24–26.

- 772 68. Talevich E, Shain AH, Botton T, Bastian BC. 2016. CNVkit: Genome-Wide Copy Number
773 Detection and Visualization from Targeted DNA Sequencing. PLoS Comput Biol 12.
- 774 69. Quinlan AR, Hall IM. 2010. BEDTools: A flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic
775 features. Bioinformatics 26:841–842.
- 776 70. Hahne F, LeMeur N, Brinkman RR, Ellis B, Haaland P, Sarkar D, Spidlen J, Strain E,
777 Gentleman R. 2009. flowCore: a Bioconductor package for high throughput flow
778 cytometry. BMC Bioinformatics 10:106.
- 779 71. Benaglia T, Chauveau D, Hunter DR, Young D. 2009. mixtools : An *R* Package for
780 Analyzing Finite Mixture Models. J Stat Softw 32:1–29.
- 781 72. Kahm M, Hasenbrink G, Lichtenberg-frate H, Ludwig J, Kschischo M. 2010. Grofit: Fitting
782 biological growth curves. J Stat Softw 33:1–21.
- 783 73. Gu Z, Gu L, Eils R, Schlesner M, Brors B. 2014. Circlize implements and enhances circular
784 visualization in R. Bioinformatics 30:2811–2812.

785

786 **Tables**

787 **Table 1** - Yeast strains used in the study.

Working code	Species	Information	Measured ploidy	Source
Y1	<i>S. cerevisiae</i>	A <i>S. cerevisiae</i> ale strain (VTT-A81062)	1.95 (± 0.15)	VTT Culture Collection
Y1_M1	<i>S. cerevisiae</i>	Variant obtained from Y1. Isolated after 30 fermentations from media M1, replicate A.	2.02 (± 0.21)	Isolated in this study
Y1_M6	<i>S. cerevisiae</i>	Variant obtained from Y1. Isolated after 30 fermentations from media M6, replicate A.	3.64 (± 0.17)	Isolated in this study
Y2	<i>S. cerevisiae</i> × <i>S. eubayanus</i>	A tetraploid interspecific hybrid between strain Y1 and the <i>S. eubayanus</i> type strain VTT-C12902. Known as 'Hybrid H1' in the source study.	4.03 (± 0.25)	(32)
Y2_M1	<i>S. cerevisiae</i> × <i>S. eubayanus</i>	Variant obtained from Y2. Isolated after 30 fermentations from media M1, replicate B.	3.47 (± 0.26)	Isolated in this study
Y2_M6	<i>S. cerevisiae</i> × <i>S. eubayanus</i>	Variant obtained from Y2. Isolated after 30 fermentations from media M6, replicate B.	3.57 (± 0.31)	Isolated in this study
Y3	<i>S. cerevisiae</i> × <i>S. eubayanus</i>	A triploid interspecific hybrid between strain Y1 and the <i>S. eubayanus</i> type strain VTT-C12902. Known as 'Hybrid B3' in the source study.	2.98 (± 0.22)	(3)
Y3_M1	<i>S. cerevisiae</i> × <i>S. eubayanus</i>	Variant obtained from Y3. Isolated after 30 fermentations from media M1, replicate B.	3.03 (± 0.27)	Isolated in this study
Y3_M6	<i>S. cerevisiae</i> × <i>S. eubayanus</i>	Variant obtained from Y3. Isolated after 30 fermentations from media M6, replicate B.	3.19 (± 0.23)	Isolated in this study
Y4	<i>S. cerevisiae</i> × <i>S. eubayanus</i>	An interspecific hybrid containing DNA from strain Y1, <i>S. cerevisiae</i> WLP099 (White Labs Inc.) and the <i>S. eubayanus</i> type strain VTT-C12902. Known as 'Hybrid T2' in the source study.	2.38 (± 0.24)	(32)
Y4_M1	<i>S. cerevisiae</i> × <i>S. eubayanus</i>	Variant obtained from Y4. Isolated after 30 fermentations from media M1, replicate A.	2.27 (± 0.25)	Isolated in this study
Y4_M6	<i>S. cerevisiae</i> × <i>S. eubayanus</i>	Variant obtained from Y4. Isolated after 20 fermentations from media M6, replicate B.	2.27 (± 0.24)	Isolated in this study

788

789


790 **Table 2** - Non-synonymous mutations discovered in the variant strains. Genes that were
791 affected by mutations in several different variants are **in bold**. Whether the *S. cerevisiae* (Scer)
792 or *S. eubayanus* (Seub) orthologue was affected is indicated in parenthesis after the gene
793 name. An asterisk (*) denotes whether the mutation was either homo- or hemizygous.
794 Positions and nucleotide changes of mutations are listed in Table S1 in Supplementary
795 material.

Variant strain	Amino acid substitution	Frameshift mutation
Y1 M1		MNN4 (Scer)
Y1 M6	<i>PEX11</i> (Scer), <i>TPO1</i> (Scer)	
Y2 M1	<i>TOD6</i> (Seub)	<i>BSC1</i> (Scer)*, <i>COS9</i> (Scer)*, <i>DAL81</i> (Scer), HSP150 (Scer)*, <i>RKM3</i> (Scer)*, <i>UTH1</i> (Scer)
Y2 M6	<i>YIM1</i> (Scer), <i>YMC1</i> (Scer)	<i>MHP1</i> (Scer)*
Y3 M1	<i>CBP1</i> (Scer), <i>HAP4</i> (Scer), IRA2 (Scer), <i>LPL1</i> (Scer)	MNN4 (Scer), <i>RAT1</i> (Seub)*
Y3 M6	<i>GET2</i> (Scer), <i>PRP40</i> (Scer), <i>EAP1</i> (Seub)*	<i>FIT3</i> (Scer), <i>JHD2</i> (Seub)*
Y4 M1		IRA2 (Scer)
Y4 M6	<i>BST1</i> (Seub), <i>SFL1</i> (Seub), <i>YOR292C</i> (Seub)	HSP150 (Scer), IRA2 (Seub)

796


797 **Figures**

798




799

800 **Figure 1 – Experimental overview.** (A) 30 consecutive batch fermentations were carried out
 801 with four different yeast strains and two different ethanol-containing media in duplicate
 802 adaptation lines. (B) An initial set of isolates were obtained by selecting fast-growing colonies
 803 on solidified versions of the adaptation media. (C) High-throughput screening of all the
 804 isolates was performed in a malt extract-based screening media containing ethanol. The best-
 805 performing isolates were chosen for further screening based on the maltose and maltotriose
 806 consumption. (D) Small-scale wort fermentations were performed with selected isolates to
 807 ensure they were able to ferment wort efficiently and perform in media without exogenous
 808 ethanol. (E) 2L-scale wort fermentations replicating industrial conditions were performed with
 809 8 variant strains (Table 1) and vital aroma compounds of the resulting beers were analysed.
 810 (F) The genomes of the 8 variant strains were sequenced and compared to those of the wild-
 811 type strains. For more information, see the Materials & Methods section.




812

813 **Figure 2** – The optical densities at the end of each consecutive batch fermentation with yeast
814 strains (**A**) Y1, (**B**) Y2, (**C**) Y3, and (**D**) Y4 in the two different ethanol-containing media (red
815 diamonds: Media M1 (10% ethanol, 2% maltose); blue squares: Media M6 (10% ethanol, 1%
816 maltose, 1% maltotriose)). The cumulative number of yeast generations after the 30th batch
817 fermentation and Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) between the optical densities and
818 number of consecutive fermentations is presented above in blue and below in red for the
819 yeast grown in Media M6 and M1, respectively.



820


821 **Figure 3** – The percentage of maltose and maltotriose consumed by isolates (selected after
822 10, 20 and 30 consecutive batch fermentations) of the yeast strains **(A)** Y1, **(B)** Y2, **(C)** Y3, and
823 **(D)** Y4 after 144 hours of fermentation in the screening media (6.2% malt extract, 10% sorbitol,
824 5% ethanol) during high-throughput screening in 96-well plates. The black line depicts the
825 amount of sugar consumed by the wild-type strain (average calculated from 12-16 replicate
826 fermentations). For each of the three isolation points (10, 20 and 30 consecutive batch
827 fermentations), four isolates were selected per yeast strain per media (a total of 24 isolates
828 per parent strain). Three replicate fermentations were carried out for each isolate.



829

830 **Figure 4** – The maximum fermentation rate of 24 isolates compared to their wild-type strains
831 during small-scale fermentations in 15 °P all-malt wort at 15 °C. Isolates were selected based
832 on sugar consumption during high-throughput screening and were from the two different
833 growth media (M1 and M6 in *red* and *blue*, respectively), and three different isolation points
834 (10, 20 and 30 consecutive batch fermentations, with *circles*, *squares* and *diamonds*,
835 respectively). Duplicate fermentations were carried out for each isolate.


836



837

838 **Figure 5** – The alcohol content (% ABV) in the beers fermented at 2L-scale from 15 °P wort at
839 15 °C with wild-type (*black squares*) and variant (*red circles* and *blue diamonds*) strains derived
840 from yeast strains **(A)** Y1, **(B)** Y2, **(C)** Y3, and **(D)** Y4. Values are means from two independent
841 fermentations and error bars where visible represent the standard deviation. Arrows indicate
842 the time-point after which a significant difference was observed between the variant and wild-
843 type strain as determined by two-tailed Student's t-test ($p < 0.05$).


844



845


846 **Figure 6** – The concentrations of nine yeast-derived aroma compounds in the beers
847 fermented with the variant strains relative to those fermented with the wild-type strains (**A**)
848 Y1, (**B**) Y2, (**C**) Y3, and (**D**) Y4. Values are means from two independent fermentations and
849 asterisks depict a significant difference in the variant compared to the wild-type as
850 determined by two-tailed Student's t-test (* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$). Me: methyl.

851



852

853 **Figure 7** – The ethanol accumulation capacity from 35% maltose and the ability to grow on
854 media containing 9% and 11% ethanol of the wild-type (wt) and variant strains derived from
855 yeast strains (**A**) Y1, (**B**) Y2, (**C**) Y3, and (**D**) Y4. Values are means from two independent
856 cultures, error bars where visible represent the standard deviation, and asterisks depict a
857 significant difference in the variant compared to the wild-type as determined by two-tailed
858 Student's t-test (* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$).



859

S. cerevisiae A81062

S. eubayanus C12902

CNV
-1
0
1
2
NA

860 **Figure 8** – Chromosome copy number variations (CNV) in the *S. cerevisiae* A81062 (left) and *S.*
861 *eubayanus* C12902 (right) sub-genomes of the variant strains compared to the wild-type
862 strains.