Natural variation in teosinte at the domestication locus *teosinte branched1* (*tb1*)[1]

Laura Vann[1], Thomas Kono[1,2], Tanja Pyhäjärvi[1,3], Matthew B. Hufford[1,4,6], and Jeffrey Ross-Ibarra[1,5,6]

[1]Department of Plant Sciences, University of California Davis

[2]Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics, University of Minnesota Twin Cities

[3]Department of Biology, University of Oulu

[4]Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology, Iowa State University

[5]Center for Population Biology and Genome Center, University of California Davis

[6]Author for Correspondence

Acknowledgements

1 Abstract

2 *Premise of the study:* The *teosinte branched1* (*tb1*) gene is a major QTL controlling branching

3 differences between maize and its wild progenitor, teosinte. The insertion of a transposable

4 element (*Hopscotch*) upstream of *tb1* is known to enhance the gene's expression, causing reduced

5 tillering in maize. Observations of the maize *tb1* allele in teosinte and estimates of an insertion

6 age of the *Hopscotch* that predates domestication led us to investigate its prevalence and

7 potential role in teosinte.

8 *Methods:* Prevalence of the *Hopscotch* element was assessed across an Americas-wide sample of

9 1110 maize and teosinte individuals using a co-dominant PCR assay. Population genetic

10 summaries were calculated for a subset of individuals from four teosinte populations in central

11 Mexico. Phenotypic data were also collected from a single teosinte population where *Hopscotch*

12 was found segregating.

13 *Key results:* Genotyping results suggest the *Hopscotch* element is at higher than expected

14 frequency in teosinte. Analysis of linkage disequilibrium near *tb1* does not support recent

15 introgression of the *Hopscotch* allele from maize into teosinte. Population genetic signatures are

16 consistent with selection on this locus revealing a potential ecological role for *Hopscotch* in

17 teosinte. Finally, two greenhouse experiments with teosinte do not suggest *tb1* controls tillering in

18 natural populations.

19 *Conclusions:* Our findings suggest the role of *Hopscotch* differs between maize and teosinte.

20 Future work should assess *tb1* expression levels in teosinte with and without the *Hopscotch* and

21 more comprehensively phenotype teosinte to assess the ecological significance of the *Hopscotch*

22 insertion and, more broadly, the *tb1* locus in teosinte.

23 **Key words:** domestication; maize; teosinte; *teosinte branched1*; transposable element

INTRODUCTION

1

2   Domesticated crops and their wild progenitors provide an excellent system in which to study

3 adaptation and genomic changes associated with human-mediated selection (Ross-Ibarra et al.,

4 2007). Perhaps the central focus of the study of domestication has been the identification of

5 genetic variation underlying agronomically important traits such as fruit size and plant

6 architecture (Olsen and Gross, 2010). Additionally, many domesticates show reduced genetic

7 diversity when compared to their wild progenitors, and an understanding of the distribution of

8 diversity in the wild and its phenotypic effects has become increasingly useful to crop

9 improvement (Kovach and McCouch, 2008). For example, *Oryza rufipogon*, the wild progenitor of

10 domesticated rice, has proven useful for the integration of a number of beneficial QTL controlling

11 traits such as grain size and yield into domesticated rice KovackMcCouch2008. While some effort

12 has been invested into understanding how wild alleles behave in their domesticated relatives (e.g.

13 Bai and Lindhout, 2007), very little is known about the role that alleles found most commonly in

14 domesticates play in natural populations of their wild progenitors (Whitton et al., 1997).

15   Maize (*Zea mays* ssp. *mays*) was domesticated from the teosinte *Zea mays* ssp. *parviglumis*

16 (hereafter, *parviglumis*) roughly 9,000 B.P. in southwest Mexico (Piperno et al., 2009; Matsuoka

17 et al., 2002). Domesticated maize and the teosintes are an attractive system in which to study

18 domestication due to the abundance of genetic tools developed for maize and well-characterized

19 domestication loci (Hufford et al., 2012a; Doebley, 2004; Hufford et al., 2012b). Additionally,

20 large naturally occurring populations of both *Zea mays* ssp. *parviglumis* (the wild progenitor of

21 maize) and *Zea mays* ssp. *mexicana* (highland teosinte; hereafter *mexicana*) can be found

22 throughout Mexico (Wilkes, 1977; Hufford et al., 2013), and genetic diversity of these taxa is

23 estimated to be high (Ross-Ibarra et al., 2009).

24   Many morphological changes are associated with maize domestication, and understanding the

25 genetic basis of these changes has been a focus of maize research for a number of years (Doebley,

26 2004). One of the most dramatic changes is found in plant architecture: domesticated maize is

27 characterized by a central stalk with few tillers and lateral branches terminating in a female

28 inflorescence, while teosinte is highly tillered and bears tassels (male inflorescences) at the end of

29 its lateral branches. The *teosinte branched1* (*tb1*) gene, a repressor of organ growth, was

30 identified as a major QTL involved in branching (Doebley et al., 1995) and tillering (Doebley and

31 Stec, 1991) differences between maize and teosinte. A 4.9 kb retrotransposon (*Hopscotch*)

insertion into the upstream control region of *tb1* in maize acts to enhance expression of *tb1*, thus

repressing lateral organ growth (Doebley et al., 1997; Studer et al., 2011). Dating of the

Hopscotch retrotransposon suggests that its insertion predates the domestication of maize, leading

to the hypothesis that it was segregating as standing variation in ancient populations of teosinte

and increased to high frequency in maize due to selection during domestication (Studer et al.,

2011). The effects of the *Hopscotch* insertion have been studied in maize (Studer et al., 2011),

and analysis of teosinte alleles at *tb1* has identified functionally distinct allelic classes (Studer and

Doebley, 2012), but little is known about the role of *tb1* or the *Hopscotch* insertion in natural

populations of teosinte. Previous studies have confirmed the presence of the *Hopscotch* in samples

of ssp. *parviglumis*, ssp. *mexicana*, and landrace maize; however little is known about the

frequency with which the *Hopscotch* is segregating in natural populations.

In teosinte and other plants that grow at high population density, individuals detect

competition from neighbors via the ratio of red to far-red light. An increase in far-red relative to

red light accompanies shading and triggers the shade avoidance syndrome: a suite of physiological

and morphological changes such as reduced tillering, increased plant height and early flowering

(Kebrom and Brutnell, 2007). The *tb1* locus appears to play an important role in the shade

avoidance pathway in *Zea mays* (Lukens and Doebley, 1999) and other grasses (Kebrom and

Brutnell, 2007) and may therefore be crucial to the ecology of teosinte. In this study we aim to

characterize the distribution of the *Hopscotch* insertion in *parviglumis*, *mexicana*, and landrace

maize, and to examine the phenotypic effects of the insertion in *parviglumis*. We use a

combination of PCR genotyping for the *Hopscotch* element in our full panel and sequencing of

two small regions upstream of *tb1* in a subset of teosinte populations to explore patterns of

genetic variation at this locus. Finally, we test for an association between the *Hopscotch* element

and tillering phenotypes in a population of *parviglumis*.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sampling and genotyping—We sampled 1,110 individuals from 350 accessions (247 maize

landraces, 17 *mexicana* populations, and 86 *parviglumis* populations; ranging from 1-38

individuals per population) and assessed the presence or absence of the *Hopscotch* insertion

(Appendix 1 and Appendix 2, See Supplemental Materials with the online version of this article).

DNA was extracted from leaf tissue using a modified CTAB approach (Doyle and Doyle, 1990;

Maloof et al., 1984). We designed primers using PRIMER3 (Rozen and Skaletsky, 2000)

1 implemented in Geneious (Kearse et al., 2012) to amplify the entire *Hopscotch* element, as well as

2 an internal primer allowing us to simultaneously check for possible PCR bias between presence

3 and absence of the *Hopscotch* insertion. Two PCRs were performed for each individual, one with

4 primers flanking the *Hopscotch* (HopF/HopR) and one with a flanking primer and an internal

5 primer (HopF/HopIntR). Primer sequences are HopF, 5'-TCGTTGATGCTTTGATGGATGG-3';

6 HopR, 5'-AACAGTATGATTTCATGGGACCG-3'; and HopIntR,

7 5'-CCTCCACCTCTCATGAGATCC-3' (Appendix 3 and Appendix 4, See Supplemental Materials

8 with the online version of this article). Homozygotes show a single band for absence of the element

9 (∼300bp) and two bands for presence of the element (∼5kb, amplification of the entire element,

10 and ∼1.1kb, amplification of part of the element), whereas heterozygotes are three-banded

11 (Appendix 2, See Supplemental Materials with the online version of this article). If only one of

12 the two PCR reactions resolved well, we scored one allele for the individual. We used Phusion

13 High Fidelity Enzyme (Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc., Waltham, Massachusetts, USA) and the

14 following conditions for amplifications: 98°C for 3 min, 30 cycles of 98°C for 15 s, 65°C for 30 s,

15 and 72°C for 3 min 30 s, with a final extension of 72°C for 10 min. PCR products were visualized

16 on a 1% agarose gel and scored for presence/absence of the *Hopscotch* based on band size.

17   **Sequencing**—In addition to genotyping, we chose a subset of *parviglumis* individuals for

18 sequencing. We chose twelve individuals from each of four populations from Jalisco state, Mexico

19 (San Lorenzo, La Mesa, Ejutla A, and Ejutla B). For amplification and sequencing, we selected

20 two regions approximately 600bp in size from within the 5' UTR of *tb1* (Region 1) and from

21 1,235bp upstream of the start of the *Hopscotch* (66,169bp upstream from the start of the *tb1*

22 ORF; Region 2). We designed the following primers using PRIMER3 (Rozen and Skaletsky, 2000):

23 for the 5' UTR, 5'-GGATAATGTGCACCAGGTGT-3' and 5'-GCGTGCTAGAGACACYTGTTGCT-3';

24 for the 66kb upstream region, 5'-TGTCCTCGCCGCAACTC-3' and

25 5'-TGTACGCCCGCCCCTCATCA-3' (Appendix 1, See Supplemental Materials with the online

26 version of this article). We used Taq polymerase (New England Biolabs Inc., Ipswich,

27 Massachusetts, USA) and the following thermal cycler conditions to amplify fragments: 94°C for

28 3 min, 30 cycles of 92°C for 40 s, annealing for 1 min, 72°C for 40 s, and a final 10 min extension

29 at 72°C. Annealing temperatures for Region 1 and Region 2 were 59.7°C and 58.8°C, respectively.

30 To clean excess primer and dNTPs we added two units of Exonuclease1 and 2.5 units of Antarctic

31 Phosphatase to 8.0 μL of amplification product. This mix was placed on a thermal cycler with

32 the following program: 37°C for 30 min, 80°C for 15 min, and a final cool-down step to 4°C.

1   We cloned cleaned fragments into a TOPO-TA vector (Life Technologies, Grand Island, New

2   York, USA) using OneShot TOP10 chemically competent *E. coli* cells, with an extended ligation

3   time of 30 min for a complex target fragment. We plated cells on LB agar plates containing

4   kanamycin, and screened colonies using vector primers M13 Forward and M13 Reverse under the

5   following conditions: 96°C for 5 min; then 35 cycles at 96°C for 30 s, 53°C for 30 s, 72°C for 2

6   min; and a final extension at 72°C for 4 min. We visualized amplification products for

7   incorporation of our insert on a 1% agarose TAE gel.

8   Amplification products with successful incorporation of our insert were cleaned using

9   Exonuclease 1 and Antarctic Phosphatase following the procedures detailed above, and sequenced

10   with vector primers M13 Forward and M13 Reverse using Sanger sequencing at the College of

11   Agriculture and Environmental Sciences (CAES) sequencing center at UC Davis. We aligned and

12   trimmed primer sequences from resulting sequences using the software Geneious (Kearse et al.,

13   2012). Following alignment, we verified singleton SNPs by sequencing an additional one to four

14   colonies from each clone. If the singleton was not present in these additional sequences it was

15   considered an amplification or cloning error, and we replaced the base with the base of the

16   additional sequences. If the singleton appeared in at least one of the additional sequences we

17   considered it a real variant and kept it for further analyses.

18   **Genotyping analysis**—To calculate differentiation between populations (F_{ST}) and

19   subspecies (F_{CT}) we used HierFstat (Goudet, 2005). These analyses only included populations in

20   which eight or more individuals were sampled, totaling 32 populations. To test the hypothesis

21   that the *Hopscotch* insertion may be adaptive under certain environmental conditions, we looked

22   for significant associations between the *Hopscotch* frequency and environmental variables using

23   BayEnv (Coop et al., 2010). BayEnv creates a covariance matrix of relatedness between

24   populations and then tests a null model that allele frequencies in populations are determined by

25   the covariance matrix of relatedness alone against the alternative model that allele frequencies are

26   determined by a combination of the covariance matrix and an environmental variable, producing

27   a posterior probability (*i.e.,* Bayes Factor; Coop et al. 2010). We used teosinte (ssp. *parviglumis*

28   and ssp. *mexicana* genotyping and covariance data from Pyhäjärvi et al. (2013) for BayEnv, with

29   the *Hopscotch* insertion coded as an additional SNP. SNP data from (Pyhäjärvi et al., 2013) were

30   obtained using the MaizeSNP50 BeadChip and Infinium HD Assay (Illumina, San Diego, CA,

31   USA). Environmental data from a single year were obtained from `www.worldclim.org`, the

32   Harmonized World Soil Database (FAO/IIASA/ISRIC/ISSCAS/JRC, 2012) and

1 `www.harvestchoice.org` and summarized by principle component analysis following Pyhäjärvi

2 et al. (2013).

3 **Sequence analysis**—For population genetic analyses of sequenced Region 1 and sequenced

4 Region 2 we used the Libsequence package (Thornton, 2003) to calculate pairwise F_{ST} between

5 populations and to calculate standard diversity statistics (number of haplotypes, haplotype

6 diversity, Watterson's estimator $\hat{\theta}_W$, pairwise nucleotide diversity $\hat{\theta}_\pi$, and Tajima's D). To

7 produce a visual representation of differentiation between sequences and examine patterns in

8 sequence clustering by *Hopscotch* genotype we used Phylip

9 (`http://evolution.genetics.washington.edu/phylip.html`), creating neighbor-joining trees

10 with bootstrap-supported nodes (100 repetitions). For creation of trees we also included

11 homologous sequence data from Maize HapMapV2 (Chia et al., 2012) for teosinte inbred lines

12 (TILs), some of which are known to be homozygous for the *Hopscotch* insertion (TIL03, TIL17,

13 TIL09), as well as 59 lines of domesticated maize.

14 **Introgression analysis**—In order to assess patterns of linkage disequilibrium (LD) around

15 the *Hopscotch* element in the context of chromosomal patterns of LD we used Tassel (Bradbury

16 et al., 2007) and calculated LD between SNPs across chromosome 1 using previously published

17 data from twelve plants each of the Ejutla A (EjuA), Ejutla B (EjuB), San Lorenzo (SLO), and

18 La Mesa (MSA) populations (Pyhäjärvi et al., 2013). We chose these populations because we had

19 both genotyping data for the *Hopscotch* as well as chromosome-wide SNP data for chromosome 1.

20 For each population we filtered the initial set of 5,897 SNPs on chromosome 1 to accept only

21 SNPs with a minor allele frequency of at least 0.1, resulting in 1,671, 3,023, 3,122, and 2,167

22 SNPs for SLO, EjuB, EjuA, and MSA, respectively. We then used Tassel (Bradbury et al., 2007)

23 to calculate linkage disequilibrium (r^2) across chromosome 1 for each population.

24 We examined evidence of introgression on chromosome 1 in these same four populations

25 (EjuA, EjuB, MSA, SLO) using STRUCTURE (Falush et al., 2003) and phased data from

26 Pyhäjärvi et al. (2013), combined with the corresponding SNP data from a diverse panel of 282

27 maize lines (Cook et al., 2012). SNPs were anchored in a modified version of the IBM genetic

28 map (Gerke et al., 2013). We created haplotype blocks using a custom Perl script that grouped

29 SNPs separated by less than 5kb into haplotypes. We ran STRUCTURE at K=2 under the

30 linkage model, performing 3 replicates with an MCMC burn-in of 10,000 steps and 50,000 steps

31 post burn-in.

32 **Phenotyping of *parviglumis***—To investigate the phenotypic effects of the *Hopscotch*

1 insertion in teosinte, we conducted an initial phenotyping trial (Phenotyping 1). We germinated

2 250 seeds of *parviglumis* collected in Jalisco state, Mexico (population San Lorenzo) (Hufford,

3 2010) where the *Hopscotch* is segregating at highest frequency (0.44) in our initial genotyping

4 sample set. In order to maximize the likelihood of finding the *Hopscotch* in our association

5 population we selected seeds from sites where genotyped individuals were homozygous or

6 heterozygous for the insertion. We chose between 10-13 seeds from each of 23 sampling sites. We

7 treated seeds with Captan fungicide (Southern Agricultural Insecticides Inc., Palmetto, Florida,

8 USA) and germinated them in petri dishes with filter paper. Following germination, 206

9 successful germinations were planted into one-gallon pots with potting soil and randomly spaced

10 one foot apart on greenhouse benches. Plants were watered three times a day with an automatic

11 drip containing 10-20-10 fertilizer, which was supplemented with hand watering on extremely hot

12 and dry days.

13   Starting on day 15, we measured tillering index as the ratio of the sum of tiller lengths to the

14 height of the plant (Briggs et al., 2007). Following initial measurements, we phenotyped plants for

15 tillering index every 5 days through day 40, and then on day 50 and day 60. On day 65 we

16 measured culm diameter between the third and fourth nodes of each plant. Following phenotyping

17 we extracted DNA from all plants using a modified SDS extraction protocol. We genotyped

18 individuals for the *Hopscotch* insertion following the PCR protocols listed above. Based on these

19 initial data, we conducted a *post hoc* power analysis using effect size data for *tb1* associated QTL

20 from Briggs et al. (2007), which indicated that a minimum of 71 individuals in each genotypic

21 class would be needed to detect the suggested effect of the *Hopscotch* on tillering index.

22   We performed a second phenotyping experiment (Phenotyping 2) in which we germinated 372

23 seeds of *parviglumis*, choosing equally between sites previously determined to have or not have the

24 *Hopscotch* insertion. Seeds were germinated and planted on day 7 post fruit-case removal into two

25 gallon pots. Plants were watered twice daily, alternating between fertilized and non-fertilized

26 water. We began phenotyping successful germinations (302 plants) for tillering index on day 15

27 post fruit-case removal, and phenotyped every five days until day 50. At day 50 we measured

28 culm diameter between the third and fourth nodes. We extracted DNA and genotyped plants

29 following the same guidelines as in Phenotyping 1.

30   Tillering index data for each genotypic class did not meet the criteria for a repeated measures

31 ANOVA, so we transformed the data using a Box-Cox transformation ($\lambda = 0$) Car Package for R,

32 Fox and Weisberg 2011) to improve the normality and homogeneity of variance among genotype

1 classes. We analyzed relationships between genotype and tillering index and tiller number using a

2 repeated measures ANOVA through a general linear model function implemented in SAS v.9.3

3 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA). Additionally, in order to compare any association between

4 *Hopscotch* genotype and tillering and associations at other presumably unrelated traits, we

5 performed an ANOVA between culm diameter and genotype using the same general linear model

6 in SAS. Culm diameter is not believed to be correlated with tillering index or variation at *tb1* and

7 is used as our independent trait for phenotyping analyses.

RESULTS

9 **Genotyping**—Genotype of the *Hopscotch* insertion was confirmed with two PCRs for 837

10 individuals. Among the 247 maize landrace accessions genotyped, all but eight were homozygous

11 for the presence of the insertion (Appendix 1 and Appendix 2, See Supplemental Materials with

12 the online version of this article). Within our *parviglumis* and *mexicana* samples we found the

13 *Hopscotch* insertion segregating in 37 (out of 86) and four (out of 17) populations, respectively,

14 and at highest frequency in the states of Jalisco, Colima, and Michoacán in central-western

15 Mexico (Fig. 1).Using our *Hopscotch* genotyping, we calculated differentiation between

16 populations (F_{ST}) and subspecies (F_{CT}) for populations in which we sampled eight or more

17 individuals. We found that $F_{CT} = 0$, and levels of F_{ST} among populations within each subspecies

18 (0.22) and among all populations (0.23) are similar to those reported genome-wide in previous

19 studies (Pyhäjärvi et al. 2013; Table 1). Although we found large variation in *Hopscotch* allele

20 frequency among our populations, BayEnv analysis did not indicate a correlation between the

21 *Hopscotch* insertion and environmental variables (all Bayes Factors < 1).

22 **Sequencing**—To investigate patterns of sequence diversity and linkage disequilibrium (LD)

23 in the *tb1* region, we sequenced two small (<1kb) regions upstream of the *tb1* ORF in four

24 populations. After alignment and singleton checking we recovered 48 and 40 segregating sites for

25 the 5' UTR region (Region 1) and the 66kb upstream region (Region 2), respectively. For Region

26 1, Ejutla A has the highest values of haplotype diversity and θ_π, while Ejutla B and La Mesa have

27 comparable values of these summary statistics, and San Lorenzo has much lower values.

28 Additionally, Tajima's D is strongly negative in the two Ejutla populations and La Mesa, but is

29 less negative in San Lorenzo (Table 2, Appendix 2, See Supplemental Materials with the online

30 version of this article). For Region 2, haplotype diversity and θ_π, are similar for Ejutla A and

31 Ejutla B, while La Mesa and San Lorenzo have slightly lower values for these statistics (Table 2).

Tajima's D is positive in all populations except La Mesa, indicating an excess of low frequency variants in this population (Table 2). Pairwise values of F_{ST} within population pairs Ejutla A/Ejutla B and San Lorenzo/La Mesa are close to zero for both sequenced regions as well as for the *Hopscotch*, while they are high for other population pairs (Table 1). Neighbor joining trees of our sequence data and data from the teosinte inbred lines (TILs; data from Maize HapMapV2, Chia et al. 2012) do not reveal any clear clustering pattern with respect to population or *Hopscotch* genotype (Appendix 5, See Supplemental Materials with the online version of this article); individuals within our sample that have the *Hopscotch* insertion do not group with the teosinte inbred lines or domesticated maize that have the *Hopscotch* insertion.

Evidence of introgression—The highest frequency of the *Hopscotch* insertion in teosinte was found in *parviglumis* sympatric with cultivated maize. Our initial hypothesis was that the high frequency of the *Hopscotch* element in these populations could be attributed to introgression from maize into teosinte. To investigate this possibility we examined overall patterns of linkage disequilibrium across chromosome one and specifically in the *tb1* region. If the *Hopscotch* is found in these populations due to recent introgression we would expect to find large blocks of linked markers near this element. We find no evidence of elevated linkage disequilibrium between the *Hopscotch* and SNPs surrounding the *tb1* region in our resequenced populations (Figure 2), and r^2 in the *tb1* region does not differ significantly between populations with (average r^2 of 0.085) and without (average $r^2 = 0.082$) the *Hopscotch* insertion. In fact, average r^2 is lower in the *tb1* region ($r^2 = 0.056$) than across the rest of chromosome 1 ($r^2 = 0.083$; Table 3).

The lack of clustering of *Hopscotch* genotypes in our NJ tree as well as the lack of LD around *tb1* do not support the hypothesis that the *Hopscotch* insertion in these populations of *parviglumis* is the result of recent introgression. However, to further explore this hypothesis we performed a STRUCTURE analysis using Illumina MaizeSNP50 data from four of our *parviglumis* populations (EjuA, EjuB, MSA, and SLO) and the maize 282 diversity panel (Cook et al., 2012; Pyhäjärvi et al., 2013). The linkage model implemented in STRUCTURE can be used to identify ancestry of blocks of linked variants which would arise as the result of recent admixture between populations. If the *Hopscotch* insertion is present in populations of *parviglumis* as a result of recent admixture with domesticated maize, we would expect the insertion and linked variants in surrounding sites to be assigned to the "maize" cluster in our STRUCTURE runs, not the "teosinte" cluster. In all runs, assignment to maize in the *tb1* region across all four *parviglumis* populations is low (average 0.017) and much below the chromosome-wide average (0.20; Table 4; Fig. 3).

1   **Phenotyping**—To assess the contribution of *tb1* to phenotypic variation in tillering in a

2 natural population, we grew plants from seed sampled from the San Lorenzo population of

3 *parviglumis*, which had a high mean frequency (0.44) of the *Hopscotch* insertion based on our

4 initial genotyping. We measured tillering index (TI), the ratio of the sum of tiller lengths to plant

5 height, for 206 plants (Phenotyping 1) from within the San Lorenzo population, and genotyped

6 plants for the *Hopscotch* insertion. Our plantings produced 20 homozygotes for the teosinte (no

7 Hopscotch) allele, 104 heterozygotes, and 82 homozygotes for the maize (Hopscotch) allele. We

8 found the *Hopscotch* segregating at a frequency of 0.65 with no significant deviations from

9 expected frequencies under Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium. After performing a repeated measures

10 ANOVA between our transformed tillering index data and *Hopscotch* genotype we find no

11 correlation between genotype at the *Hopscotch* insertion and tillering index (Fig. 4), tiller

12 number, or culm diameter.

13   We performed a second grow-out of *parviglumis* from San Lorenzo (Phenotyping 2) to assess

14 whether lighting conditions or sample size may have affected our ability to detect an effect of *tb1*.

15 For the second grow-out we measured tillering index every five days through day 50 for 247

16 plants. We found the *Hopscotch* allele segregating at a frequency of 0.69, with a 0.56 frequency of

17 *Hopscotch* homozygotes (138 individuals), a 0.2 frequency of homozygotes for the teosinte allele

18 (49 individuals) and a 0.24 frequency of heterozygotes (60 individuals). Results were similar to

19 Phenotyping 1, with no significant correlation between *Hopscotch* and any of the three

20 phenotypes measured. *why did these numbers change?*

21   # DISCUSSION

22   6) The discussion of introgression, genetic drift, and selection in your Discussion section

23 seems to lack coherence. It sometimes focuses on explaining the unexpectedly high frequency of

24 Hopscotch in present-day populations, whereas other times it seems to be addressing the presence

25 or absence of Hopscotch in teosinte in general, and it also sometimes seems to be addressing

26 selection on the tb1 locus.

27   *should we restructure this? I thought it read clearly. Key points were hop more widely spread than previously and*

28 *evidence of selection on Hop in two*

29   *clean up, restructure, thank editor, explain changes*

30   Adaptation occurs due to selection on standing variation or *de novo* mutations. Adaptation

31 from standing variation has been well-described in a number of systems; for example, selection for

1 lactose tolerance in humans (Plantinga et al., 2012; Tishkoff et al., 2007), variation at the *Eda*

2 locus in three-spined stickleback (Kitano et al., 2008; Colosimo et al., 2005), and pupal diapause

3 in the Apple Maggot fly (Feder et al., 2003). Although the adaptive role of standing variation has

4 been described in many systems, its importance in domestication is not as well studied.

5 In maize, alleles at domestication loci (*RAMOSA1*, Sigmon and Vollbrecht 2010; *barren*

6 *stalk1*, Gallavotti et al. 2004; and *grassy tillers1*, Whipple et al. 2011) are thought to have been

7 selected from standing variation, suggesting that diversity already present in teosinte may have

8 played an important role in maize domestication. The *teosinte branched1* gene is one of the best

9 characterized domestication loci, and, while previous studies have suggested that differences in

10 plant architecture between maize and teosinte are a result of selection on standing variation at

11 this locus (Clark et al., 2006; Studer et al., 2011), much remains to be discovered regarding

12 natural variation at this locus and its ecological role in teosinte.

13 Studer et al. (2011) genotyped 90 accessions of teosinte (inbred and outbred), providing the

14 first evidence that the *Hopscotch* insertion is segregating in teosinte (Studer et al., 2011). Given

15 that the *Hopscotch* insertion has been estimated to predate the domestication of maize, it is not

16 surprising that it can be found segregating in populations of teosinte. However, by widely

17 sampling across teosinte populations our study provides greater insight into the distribution and

18 prevalence of the *Hopscotch* in teosinte. While our findings are consistent with Studer et al.

19 (2011) in that we identify the *Hopscotch* allele segregating in teosinte, we find it at higher

20 frequency than previously suggested. Many of our populations with a high frequency of the

21 *Hopscotch* allele fall in the Jalisco cluster identified by Fukunaga et al. (2005), perhaps suggesting

22 a different history of the *tb1* locus in this region than in the Balsas River Basin where maize was

23 domesticated (Matsuoka et al., 2002). Potential explanations for the high frequency of the

24 *Hopscotch* element in *parviglumis* from the Jalisco cluster include gene flow from maize, genetic

25 drift, and natural selection.

26 While gene flow from crops into their wild relatives is well-known, (Ellstrand et al., 1999;

27 Zhang et al., 2009; Thurber et al., 2010; Baack et al., 2008; Hubner et al., 2012; Wilkes, 1977; van

28 Heerwaarden et al., 2011; Barrett, 1983), our results do not suggest introgression from maize into

29 teosinte at the *tb1* locus, and are more consistent with Hufford et al. (2013) who found resistance

30 to introgression from maize into teosinte around domestication loci. Clustering in our NJ trees

31 does not reflect the pattern expected if maize alleles at the *tb1* locus had introgressed into

32 populations of teosinte. Moreover, there is no signature of elevated LD in the *tb1* region relative

1 to the rest of chromosome 1, and Bayesian assignment to a maize cluster in this region is both low

2 and below the chromosome-wide average (Fig. 3, Table 4). Together, these data point to an

3 explanation other than recent introgression for the high observed frequency of *Hopscotch* in a

4 subset of our *parviglumis* populations.

5   Although recent introgression seems unlikely, we cannot rule out ancient introgression as an

6 explanation for the presence of the *Hopscotch* in these populations. If the *Hopscotch* allele was

7 introgressed in the distant past, recombination may have broken up LD, a process that would be

8 consistent with our data. We find this scenario less plausible, however, as there is no reason why

9 gene flow should have been high in the past but absent in present-day sympatric populations. In

10 fact, early generation maize-teosinte hybrids are common in these populations today (MB

11 Hufford, pers. observation), and genetic data support ongoing gene flow between domesticated

12 maize and both *mexicana* and *parviglumis* in a number of sympatric populations (Hufford et al.,

13 2013; Ellstrand et al., 2007; van Heerwaarden et al., 2011; Warburton et al., 2011).

14   Remaining explanations for differential frequencies of the *Hopscotch* among teosinte

15 populations include both genetic drift and natural selection. Previous studies using both SSRs

16 and genome-wide SNP data have found evidence for a population bottleneck in the San Lorenzo

17 population (Hufford, 2010; Pyhäjärvi et al., 2013), and the lower levels of sequence diversity in

18 this population in the 5' UTR (Region 1) coupled with more positive values of Tajima's D are

19 consistent with these earlier findings. Such population bottlenecks can exaggerate the effects of

20 genetic drift through which the *Hopscotch* allele may have risen to high frequency entirely by

21 chance. A bottleneck in San Lorenzo, however, does not explain the high frequency of the

22 *Hopscotch* in multiple populations in the Jalisco cluster. Moreover, available information on

23 diversity and population structure among Jaliscan populations (Hufford, 2010; Pyhäjärvi et al.,

24 2013) is not suggestive of recent colonization or other demographic events that would predict a

25 high frequency of the allele across populations. Finally, diversity values in the 5' UTR of *tb1* are

26 suggestive of natural selection acting upon the gene in natural populations of *parviglumis*. Overall

27 nucleotide diversity is 76% less than seen in the sequences from the 66kb upstream region, and

28 Tajima's D is considerably lower and consistently negative. In fact, values of Tajima's D in the 5'

29 UTR are toward the extreme negative end of the distribution of this statistic previously

30 calculated across loci sequenced in *parviglumis* (Wright et al., 2005; Moeller et al., 2007). Though

31 not definitive, these results are consistent with the action of selection on the upstream region of

32 *tb1*, perhaps suggesting an ecological role for the gene in *parviglumis*.

1   Significant effects of the *Hopscotch* insertion on lateral branch length, number of cupules, and

2   tillering index in domesticated maize have been well documented (Studer et al., 2011). Weber

3   et al. (2007) described significant phenotypic associations between markers in and around *tb1* and

4   lateral branch length and female ear length in a sample from 74 natural populations of

5   *parviglumis* (Weber et al., 2007); however, these data did not include markers from the *Hopscotch*

6   region 66kb upstream of *tb1*. Our study is the first to explicitly examine the phenotypic effects of

7   the *Hopscotch* insertion across a wide collection of individuals sampled from natural populations

8   of teosinte. We have found no significant effect of the *Hopscotch* insertion on tillering index or

9   tiller number, a result that is discordant with its clear phenotypic effects in maize. One

10   interpretation of this result would be that the *Hopscotch* controls tillering in maize (Studer et al.,

11   2011), but tillering in teosinte is affected by variation at other loci. Consistent with this

12   interpretation, *tb1* is thought to be part of a complex pathway controlling branching, tillering and

13   other phenotypic traits (Kebrom and Brutnell, 2007; Clark et al., 2006).

14   A recent study by Studer and Doebley (2012) examined variation across traits in a three-taxa

15   allelic series at the *tb1* locus. Studer and Doebley (2012) introgressed nine unique teosinte *tb1*

16   segments (one from *Zea diploperennis*, and four each from *mexicana* and *parviglumis*) into an

17   inbred maize background and investigated their phenotypic effects. Phenotypes were shown to

18   cluster by taxon, indicating *tb1* may underlie morphological diversification of *Zea*. Additional

19   analysis in Studer and Doebley (2012) suggested tillering index was controlled both by *tb1* and

20   loci elsewhere in the genome. Clues to the identity of these loci may be found in QTL studies

21   that have identified loci controlling branching architecture (*e.g.,* Doebley and Stec 1991, 1993).

22   Many of these loci (*grassy tillers*, *gt1*; *tassel-replaces-upper-ears1*, *tru1*; *terminal ear1*, *te1*) have

23   been shown to interact with *tb1* (Whipple et al., 2011; Li, 2012), and both *tru1* and *te1* affect the

24   same phenotypic traits as *tb1* (Doebley et al., 1995). *tru1*, for example, has been shown to act

25   either epistatically or downstream of *tb1*, affecting both branching architecture (decreased apical

26   dominance) and tassel phenotypes (shortened tassel and shank length and reduced tassel number;

27   Li 2012). Variation in these additional loci may have affected tillering in our collections and

28   contributed to the lack of correlation we see between *Hopscotch* genotype and tillering. Finally,

29   although photoperiod for Phenotyping 2 reasonably approximated that of the normal *parviglumis*

30   growing season, greenhouse-specific environmental conditions (plant density, light regime, etc...)

31   may have contributed to tillering responses different from those found in nature, obscuring the

32   effect of the *Hopscotch* insertion on variation.

1   In conclusion, our findings demonstrate that the *Hopscotch* allele is more widespread in

2   populations of *parviglumis* and *mexicana* than previously thought. Analysis of linkage using SNPs

3   from across chromosome 1 does not suggest that the *Hopscotch* allele is present in these

4   populations due to recent introgression; however, it seems unlikely that the insertion would have

5   drifted to high frequency in multiple populations. We do, however, find preliminary evidence of

6   selection on the *tb1* locus in *parviglumis*; this coupled with our observation of high frequency of

7   the *Hopscotch* insertion in a number of populations suggests that the locus may play an ecological

8   role in teosinte. In contrast to domesticated maize, the *Hopscotch* insertion does not appear to

9   have a large effect on tillering in *parviglumis*. Future studies should examine expression levels of

10   *tb1* in teosinte with and without the *Hopscotch* insertion and further characterize the effects of

11   additional loci involved in branching architecture (e.g. *gt1*, *tru1*, and *te1*) as well as include a

12   more exhaustive phenotyping including all traits. These data, in conjunction with more

13   exhaustive phenotyping, should help reveal the ecological significance of the domesticated *tb1*

14   allele in natural populations of teosinte.

LITERATURE CITED

BAACK, E., Y. SAPIR, M. CHAPMAN, J. BURKE, AND L. RIESEBERG. 2008. Selection on domestication traits and quantitative trait loci in crop-wild sunflower hybrids. *Mol Ecol* 17: 666–677.

BAI, Y. AND P. LINDHOUT. 2007. Domestication and breeding of tomatoes: What have we gained and what can we gain in the future? *Annals of Botany* 100: 1085–1094.

BARRETT, S. 1983. Crop mimicry in weeds. *Econ Bot* 37: 255–282.

BRADBURY, P., Z. ZHANG, D. KROON, T. CASSTEVENS, Y. RAMDOSS, AND E. BUCKLER. 2007. Tassel: software for association mapping of complex traits in diverse samples. *Bioinformatics* 23: 2633–2635.

BRIGGS, W., M. MCMULLEN, B. GAUT, AND J. DOEBLEY. 2007. Linkage mapping of domestication loci in a large maize-teosinte backcross resource. *Genetics* 177: 1915–1928.

CHIA, J., C. SONG, P. BRADBURY, D. COSTICH, N. DE, LEON, J. DOEBLEY, R. ELSHIRE, B. GAUT, L. GELLER, J. GLAUBITZ, M. GORE, K. GUILL, J. HOLLAND, M. HUFFORD, J. LAI, M. LI, X. LIU, Y. LU, R. MCCOMBIE, R. NELSON, J. POLAND, B. PRASANNA, T. PYHÄJÄRVI, T. RONG, R. SEKHON, Q. SUN, M. TENAILLON, F. TIAN, J. WANG, X. XU, Z. ZHANG, S. KAEPPLER, J. ROSS-IBARRA, M. MCMULLEN, E. BUCKLER, G. ZHANG, Y. XU, AND D. WARE. 2012. Maize hapmap2 identifies extant variation from a genome in flux. *Nat Genet* 44: 803–U238.

CLARK, R., T. WAGLER, P. QUIJADA, AND J. DOEBLEY. 2006. A distant upstream enhancer at the maize domestication gene tb1 has pleiotropic effects on plant and inflorescent architecture. *Nat Genet* 38: 594–597.

COLOSIMO, P., K. HOSEMANN, S. BALABHADRA, G. VILLARREAL, M. DICKSON, J. GRIMWOOD, J. SCHMUTZ, R. MYERS, D. SCHLUTER, AND D. KINGSLEY. 2005. Widespread parallel evolution in sticklebacks by repeated fixation of ectodysplasin alleles. *Science* 307: 1928–1933.

COOK, J., M. MCMULLEN, J. HOLLAND, F. TIAN, P. BRADBURY, J. ROSS-IBARRA, E. BUCKLER, AND S. FLINT-GARCIA. 2012. Genetic architecture of maize kernel composition in the nested association mapping and inbred association panels. *Plant Physiol* 158: 824–834.

1   COOP, G., D. WITONSKY, A. DI, RIENZO, AND J. PRITCHARD. 2010. Using environmental

2   correlations to identify loci underlying local adaptation. *Genetics* 185: 1411–1423.

3   DOEBLEY, J. 2004. The genetics of maize evolution. *Annu Rev Genet* 38: 37–59.

4   DOEBLEY, J. AND A. STEC. 1991. Genetic-analysis of the morphological differences between

5   maize and teosinte. *Genetics* 129: 285–295.

6   DOEBLEY, J. AND A. STEC. 1993. Inheritance of the morphological differences between maize

7   and teosinte: Comparison of results for two F_2 populations. *Genetics* 134: 559–570.

8   DOEBLEY, J., A. STEC, AND C. GUSTUS. 1995. *teosinte branched1* and the origin of maize:

9   Evidence for epistasis and the evolution of dominance. *Genetics* 141: 333–346.

10   DOEBLEY, J., A. STEC, AND L. HUBBARD. 1997. The evolution of apical dominance in maize.

11   *Nature* 386: 485–488.

12   DOYLE, J. AND J. DOYLE. 1990. A rapid total dna preparation procedure for small quantities of

13   fresh tissue. *Phytochemical Bulletin* 19: 11–15.

14   ELLSTRAND, N., L. GARNER, S. HEGDE, R. GUADAGNUOLO, AND L. BLANCAS. 2007.

15   Spontaneous hybridization between maize and teosinte. *Journal of Heredity* 98: 183–187.

16   ELLSTRAND, N., H. PRENTICE, AND J. HANCOCK. 1999. Gene flow and introgression from

17   domesticated plants into their wild relatives. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* 30: 539–563.

18   FALUSH, D., M. STEPHENS, AND J. PRITCHARD. 2003. Inference of population structure using

19   multilocus genotype data: Linked loci and correlated allele frequencies. *Genetics* 164:

20   1567–1587.

21   FAO/IIASA/ISRIC/ISSCAS/JRC. 2012. Harmonized World Soil Database, version 1.2. FAO,

22   Rome, Italy and IIASA, Laxenburg, Austria.

23   FEDER, J., S. BERLOCHER, J. ROETHELE, H. DAMBROSKI, J. SMITH, W. PERRY,

24   V. GAVRILOVIC, K. FILCHAK, J. RULL, AND M. ALUJA. 2003. Allopatric genetic origins for

25   sympatric host-plant shifts and race formation in rhagoletis. *P Natl Acad Sci Usa* 100:

26   10314–10319.

Fox, J. and S. Weisberg. 2011. An R Companion to Applied Regression, vol. Second Edition. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Fukunaga, K., T. Nussbaum-Wagler, B. Li, Q. Zhao, Y. Vigouroux, M. Faller, K. Bomblies, L. Lukens, and J. Doebley. 2005. Genetic diversity and population structure of teosinte. *Genetics* 169: 2241–2254.

Gallavotti, A., Q. Zhao, J. Kyozuka, R. Meeley, M. Ritter, J. Doebley, M. Pe, and R. Schmidt. 2004. The role of barren stalk1 in the architecture of maize. *Nature* 432: 630–635.

Gerke, J., J. Edwards, G. KE, J. Ross-Ibarra, and M. McMullen. 2013. The genomic impacts of drift and selection for hybrid performance in maize. *arXiv* 1307.7313.

Goudet, J. 2005. Hierfstat, a package for r to compute and test hierarchical f-statistics. *Mol Ecol Notes* 5: 184–186.

Hubner, S., T. Gunther, A. Flavell, E. Fridman, A. Graner, A. Korol, and K. Schmid. 2012. Islands and streams: clusters and gene flow in wild barley populations from the levant. *Mol Ecol* 21: 1115–1129.

Hufford, M. 2010. Genetic and ecological approaches to guide conservation of teosinte (zea mays ssp. parviglumis), the wild progenitor of maize. *PhD Dissertation* : 130pp.

Hufford, M., P. Bilinski, T. Pyhäjärvi, and J. Ross-Ibarra. 2012a. Teosinte as a model system for population and ecological genomics. *Trends in Genetics* 12: 606–615.

Hufford, M., P. Lubinsky, T. Pyhäjärvi, M. Devengenzo, N. Ellstrand, and J. Ross-Ibarra. 2013. The genomic signature of crop-wild introgression in maize. *PLoS Genetics* 9: e1003477.

Hufford, M., X. Xu, J. van, Heerwaarden, T. Pyhäjärvi, J. Chia, R. Cartwright, R. Elshire, J. Glaubitz, K. Guill, S. Kaeppler, J. Lai, P. Morrell, L. Shannon, C. Song, N. Springer, R. Swanson-Wagner, P. Tiffin, J. Wang, G. Zhang, J. Doebley, M. McMullen, D. Ware, E. Buckler, S. Yang, and J. Ross-Ibarra. 2012b. Comparative population genomics of maize domestication and improvement. *Nat Genet* 44: 808–U118.

1 KEARSE, M., R. MOIR, A. WILSON, S. STONES-HAVAS, M. CHEUNG, S. STURROCK,

2 S. BUXTON, A. COOPER, S. MARKOWITZ, C. DURAN, T. THIERER, B. ASHTON,

3 P. MEINTJES, AND A. DRUMMOND. 2012. Geneious basic: An integrated and extendable

4 desktop software platform for the organization and analysis of sequence data. *Bioinformatics*

5 28: 1647–1649.

6 KEBROM, T. AND T. BRUTNELL. 2007. The molecular analysis of the shade avoidance syndrome

7 in the grasses has begun. *Journal of Experimental Botany* 58: 3079–3089.

8 KITANO, J., D. BOLNICK, D. BEAUCHAMP, M. MAZUR, S. MORI, T. NAKANO, AND

9 C. PEICHEL. 2008. Reverse evolution of armor plates in the threespine stickleback. *Curr Biol*

10 18: 769–774.

11 KOVACH, M. AND S. MCCOUCH. 2008. Leveraging natural diversity: back through the

12 bottleneck. *Genome studies and Molecular Genetics* 11: 193–200.

13 LI, W. 2012. Tassels replace upper ears1 encodes a putative transcription factor that regulates

14 maize shoot architecture by multiple pathways. *PhD Dissertation* : 122.

15 LUKENS, L. AND J. DOEBLEY. 1999. Epistatic and environmental interactions for quantitative

16 trait loci involved in maize evolution. *Genet Res* 74: 291–302.

17 MALOOF, M., K. SOLIMAN, R. JORGENSEN, AND R. ALLARD. 1984. Ribosomal dna spacer

18 length polymorphisms in barley - mendelian inheritance, chromosomal location, and population

19 dynamics. *P Natl Acad Sci Usa* 81: 8014–8018.

20 MATSUOKA, Y., Y. VIGOUROUX, M. GOODMAN, G. SANCHEZ, E. BUCKLER, AND

21 J. DOEBLEY. 2002. A single domestication for maize shown by multilocus microsatellite

22 genotyping. *P Natl Acad Sci Usa* 99: 6080–6084.

23 MOELLER, D. A., M. I. TENAILLON, AND P. TIFFIN. 2007. Population structure and its effects

24 on patterns of nucleotide polymorphism in teosinte (zea mays ssp. parviglumis). *Genetics* 176:

25 1799–1809.

26 OLSEN, K. AND B. GROSS. 2010. Genetic perspectives on crop domestication. *Trends in Plant*

27 *Science* 15: 529–537.

1 PIPERNO, D., A. RANERE, I. HOLST, J. IRIARTE, AND R. DICKAU. 2009. Starch grain and

2   phytolith evidence for early ninth millennium bp maize from the central balsas river valley,

3   mexico. *P Natl Acad Sci Usa* 106: 5019–5024.

4 PLANTINGA, T., S. ALONSO, N. IZAGIRRE, M. HERVELLA, R. FREGEL, J. VAN DER MEER,

5   M. NETEA, AND C. DE LA RUA. 2012. Low prevalence of lactase persistence in neolithic

6   south-west europe. *Eur J Hum Genet* 20: 778–782.

7 PYHÄJÄRVI, T., M. HUFFORD, AND J. ROSS-IBARRA. 2013. Complex patterns of local

8   adaptation in the wild relatives of maize. *Genome Biology and Evolution* 5: 1594–1609.

9 ROSS-IBARRA, J., P. MORRELL, AND B. GAUT. 2007. Plant domestication, a unique

10   opportunity to identify the genetic basis of adaptation. *P Natl Acad Sci Usa* 104: 8641–8648.

11 ROSS-IBARRA, J., M. TENAILLON, AND B. GAUT. 2009. Historical divergence and gene flow in

12   the genus zea. *Genetics* 181: 1399–1413.

13 ROZEN, S. AND H. SKALETSKY. 2000. Primer3 on the www for general users and for biologist

14   programmers. *Methods in Molecular Biology* : 365–386.

15 SIGMON, B. AND E. VOLLBRECHT. 2010. Evidence of selection at the ramosa1 locus during

16   maize domestication. *Mol Ecol* 19: 1296–1311.

17 STUDER, A. AND J. DOEBLEY. 2012. Evidence for a natural allelic series at the maize

18   domestication locus teosinte branched1. *Genetics* 19: 951–958.

19 STUDER, A., Q. ZHAO, J. ROSS-IBARRA, AND J. DOEBLEY. 2011. Identification of a functional

20   transposon insertion in the maize domestication gene tb1. *Nat Genet* 43: 1160–U164.

21 THORNTON, K. 2003. libsequence: a c++ class library for evolutionary genetic analysis.

22   *Bioinformatics* 19: 2325–2327.

23 THURBER, C., M. REAGON, B. GROSS, K. OLSEN, Y. JIA, AND A. CAICEDO. 2010. Molecular

24   evolution of shattering loci in us weedy rice. *Mol Ecol* 19: 3271–3284.

25 TISHKOFF, S., F. REED, A. RANCIARO, B. VOIGHT, C. BABBITT, J. SILVERMAN, K. POWELL,

26   H. MORTENSEN, J. HIRBO, M. OSMAN, M. IBRAHIM, S. OMAR, G. LEMA, T. NYAMBO,

27   J. GHORI, S. BUMPSTEAD, J. PRITCHARD, G. WRAY, AND P. DELOUKAS. 2007. Convergent

28   adaptation of human lactase persistence in africa and europe. *Nat Genet* 39: 31–40.

1 van Heerwaarden, J., J. Doebley, W. Briggs, J. Glaubitz, M. Goodman,
2   J. Gonzalez, and J. Ross-Ibarra. 2011. Genetic signals of origin, spread, and introgression
3   in a large sample of maize landraces. *P Natl Acad Sci Usa* 108: 1088–1092.

4 Warburton, M. L., W. Garrison, S. Taba, A. Charcosset, C. Mir, F. Dumas,
5   D. Madur, S. Dreisigacker, C. Bedoya, B. Prasanna, C. Xie, S. Hearne, and
6   J. Franco. 2011. Gene flow among different teosinte taxa and into the domesticated maize
7   gene pool. *Genetic Resources and Crop Evolution* 58: 1243–1261.

8 Weber, A., R. Clark, L. Vaughn, J. Sanchez-Gonzalez, J. Yu, B. Yandell,
9   P. Bradbury, and J. Doebley. 2007. Major regulatory genes in maize contribute to
10   standing variation in teosinte (zea mays ssp parviglumis). *Genetics* 177: 2349–2359.

11 Whipple, C., T. Kebrom, A. Weber, F. Yang, D. Hall, R. Meeley, R. Schmidt,
12   J. Doebley, T. Brutnell, and D. Jackson. 2011. grassy tillers1 promotes apical
13   dominance in maize and responds to shade signals in the grasses. *P Natl Acad Sci Usa* 108:
14   E506–E512.

15 Whitton, J., D. Wolf, D. Arias, A. Snow, and L. Riesberg. 1997. The persistence of
16   cultivar alleles in wild populations of sunflowers five generations after hybridization. *Theoretical*
17   *and Applied Genetcs* 95: 33–40.

18 Wilkes, H. 1977. Hybridization of maize and teosinte, in mexico and guatemala and the
19   improvement of maize. *Economic Botany* 31: 254–293.

20 Wright, S. I., I. V. Bi, S. G. Schroeder, M. Yamasaki, J. F. Doebley, M. D.
21   McMullen, and B. S. Gaut. 2005. The effects of artificial selection on the maize genome.
22   *Science* 308: 1310–1314.

23 Zhang, L., Q. Zhu, Z. Wu, J. Ross-Ibarra, B. Gaut, S. Ge, and T. Sang. 2009. Selection
24   on grain shattering genes and rates of rice domestication. *New Phytol* 184: 708–720.

Table 1. Pairwise F_{ST} values from sequence and *Hopscotch* genotyping data

Comparison	Region 1	Region 2	*Hopscotch*
EjuA & EjuB	0	0	0
EjuA & MSA	0.326	0.328	0.186
EjuA & SLO	0.416	0.258	0.280
EjuB & MSA	0.397	0.365	0.188
EjuB & SLO	0.512	0.290	0.280
MSA & SLO	0.007	0	0.016

Table 2. Population genetic statistics from resequenced regions near the *tb1* locus

Population	# Haplotypes	Hap. Diversity	$\hat{\theta}_\pi$	Tajima's D
Region 1(5' UTR)				
EJUA	8	0.859	0.005	-1.650
EJUB	5	0.709	0.004	-1.831
MSA	6	0.682	0.004	-1.755
SLO	3	0.318	0.001	-0.729
Region 2 (66kb upstream)				
EJUA	8	0.894	0.018	0.623
EJUB	8	0.894	0.016	0.295
MSA	3	0.682	0.011	-0.222
SLO	4	0.742	0.014	0.932

Table 3. mean r^2 values between SNPs on chromosome 1, in the broad *tb1* region, within the 5' UTR of *tb1* (Region 1), and 66kb upstream of *tb1* (Region 2).

Population	Chr. 1	*tb1* region	Region 1	Region 2
Ejutla A	0.095	0.050	0.747	0.215
Ejutla B	0.069	0.051	0.660	0.186
La Mesa	0.070	0.053	0.914	0.766
San Lorenzo	0.101	0.067	0.912	0.636

Table 4. Assignments to maize and teosinte in the *tb1* and chromosome 1 regions from STRUCTURE

	tb1 region		Chr 1	
Population	Maize	Teosinte	Maize	Teosinte
Ejutla A	0.022	0.978	0.203	0.797
Ejutla B	0.019	0.981	0.187	0.813
La Mesa	0.012	0.988	0.193	0.807
San Lorenzo	0.016	0.984	0.205	0.795

Figure 1. Map showing the frequency of the *Hopscotch* allele in populations of *parviglumis* where we sampled more than 6 individuals. Size of circles reflects number of alleles sampled.

Figure 2. Linkage disequilibrium for SNPs in Mb 261-268 on chromosome 1. The yellow rectangle indicates the location of the *Hopscotch* insertion and the green represents the *tb1* ORF. A) Ejutla A; B) Ejutla B; C) La Mesa; D) San Lorenzo. The upper triangle above the black diagonal is colored based on the r^2 value between SNPs while the bottom triangle is colored based on p-value for the corresponding r^2 value.

Figure 3. STRUCTURE assignment to maize across a section of chromosome 1. The dotted lines mark the beginning of the sequenced region 66kb upstream (Region 2) and the end of the *tb1* ORF.

Figure 4. Box-plots showing tillering index in greenhouse grow-outs for Phenotyping 1 (A) and Phenotyping 2 (B). White indicates individuals homozygous for the *Hopscotch*, light grey represents heterozygotes, and dark grey represents homozygotes for the teosinte (No *Hopscotch*) allele. Within boxes, dark black lines represent the median, and the edges of the boxes are the first and third quartiles. Outliers are displayed as dots, the maximum value excluding outliers is shown with the top whisker, while the minimum excluding outliers is shown with the bottom whisker.