

Environmentally robust *cis*-regulatory changes underlie rapid climatic adaptation

Mallory A. Ballinger^{a,b,1,2}, Katya L. Mack^{c,1}, Sylvia M. Durkin^{a,b}, Eric A. Riddell^{a,d}, and Michael W. Nachman^{a,b,2}

^aMuseum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, 94720; ^bDepartment of Integrative Biology, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, 94720; ^cDepartment of Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, 94305; ^dDepartment of Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, 50011

Changes in gene expression have been proposed to play a major role in adaptive evolution. However, gene expression is highly context-dependent and very few studies have determined the influence of genetic and non-genetic effects on adaptive gene regulation in natural populations. Here, we utilize context-dependent allele-specific expression to characterize *cis* and *trans* changes underlying divergence in temperate and tropical house mice in two metabolic tissues under two thermal conditions. First, we show that gene expression divergence is pervasive between populations and across thermal conditions, with roughly 5–10% of genes exhibiting genotype-by-environment interactions. Second, we found that most intraspecific regulatory divergence was due to *cis*-regulatory changes that were stable across temperatures. In contrast, patterns of expression plasticity were largely attributable to *trans*-effects, which showed greater sensitivity to temperature. Nonetheless, we discovered a small subset of temperature-dependent *cis*-regulatory changes, thereby identifying loci underlying expression plasticity. Finally, we performed scans for selection in wild house mice to identify genomic signatures of rapid adaptation. Genomic outliers were enriched in genes with evidence for *cis*-regulatory divergence. Strikingly, these genes were associated with phenotypes that affected body weight and metabolism, identifying *cis*-regulatory changes as a mechanism for adaptive body size evolution between populations. Together, these results support the central role of *cis*-regulatory divergence in adaptive evolution over extremely short timescales.

adaptation | *cis*-regulatory evolution | plasticity-eQTL | *Mus*

A central goal in evolutionary biology is to understand how organisms adapt to novel environments. Gene regulation has long been recognized to play a major role in adaptive evolution (1, 2), especially across short evolutionary timescales (e.g., refs. 3, 4). Yet, we still have a poor understanding of how changes in regulatory architecture shape adaptive evolution. *Cis*-regulatory elements (e.g. promoters, enhancers) are predicted to be the primary substrate of adaptive evolution as they tend to be less pleiotropic than protein-coding changes (5–8). However, selection may favor divergence through *trans*-acting mechanisms (e.g., transcription factors), particularly when *trans*-effects modulate gene regulatory networks that are beneficial in new environments (9, 10). *Trans*-effects may also play a significant role in plastic changes in gene expression (11–13), and selection on genetic variation underlying plasticity may facilitate adaptation to new environments (14, 15). However, determining the relative importance of *cis*- and *trans*-changes to adaptation is challenging given that gene regulation is highly dependent on the environment, tissue-type, sex, and developmental stage (16–21). In most studies, regulatory patterns are often quantified under a single context, limiting our understanding of how gene regulatory architecture shapes adaptive evolution in natural populations.

The recent expansion of house mice into the Americas provides an opportunity to address the role of gene regulatory changes in adaptive evolution. Since their arrival from Western Europe ~500 years ago, house mice (*Mus musculus domesticus*) have rapidly adapted to various climatic extremes through changes in morphology, physiology, and behavior (22–26). One striking example of this is changes in body size, as mice from more northern populations are significantly larger than mice closer to the equator, likely reflecting adaptation to thermal environments (26). Previous studies point to an important role for gene regulation in driving this local adaptation. First, genomic scans have primarily identified positive selection on noncoding regions (23, 24), which have been linked to differences in gene expression (24, 27). Second, changes in *cis*-regulation at specific loci have been associated with variation in body weight in North American mice (27). Finally, gene expression plasticity has been shown to differ between populations in response to environmental stressors (25), suggesting a role for context-specific regulatory divergence in local adaptation.

Here, we investigate the role of gene regulation in adaptation in house mice from contrasting thermal environments. Specifically, using RNA-seq data collected from liver and brown adipose tissue in males and females, we measured gene expression in temperate and tropical mice and in their F1 hybrids when reared under warm and cold temperatures. This allowed us to describe the proportion of divergently expressed

Significance Statement

Little is known about the relative contributions of genetic versus environmental factors to gene expression variation in natural populations. Here, we discovered that genetic effects were far more pervasive than environmental effects on gene expression differences between house mice that have rapidly adapted to new environments. Notably, many of these genetic effects are under selection and underlie adaptive body size differences between populations. However, we also identified a few genes controlling plastic expression across different environments. Our study is one of the few to identify loci associated with plasticity in natural populations and supports the central role of genetic effects in the form of *cis*-regulatory divergence in adaptive evolution over extremely short timescales (a few hundred generations).

M.A.B. and M.W.N. designed research. M.A.B., S.M.D., and E.A.R. performed research. M.A.B. and K.L.M. analyzed data. M.A.B., K.L.M., and M.W.N. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

¹ M.A.B. and K.L.M. contributed equally to this work.

² To whom correspondence should be addressed. M.A.B., mallory.ballinger@berkeley.edu; M.W.N., mnachman@berkeley.edu




Fig. 1. Evolved differences in phenotypes and gene expression. (A) Variation in mean annual temperature across North and South America. Wild-caught individuals were collected in upstate New York (43°N) and equatorial Brazil (3°S). (B) Genetic differences in body mass (g), pelage conductance ($\text{W}^{-1}\text{m}^{-2}\text{C}^{-1}$), tail length (mm), and ear length (mm) between New York and Brazil. Tail length and ear length are plotted relative to body mass for each individual. Individuals are represented as individual points, and boxplots indicate the 25th, median, and 75th quartiles. Results from linear mixed models are presented in upper right corners (* $P < 0.05$; Table S1). Males and females show similar patterns and are combined for plotting simplicity. (C) Common garden experimental design. Individuals were reared under two temperatures from weaning until adults. (D) Principal component plots for PC1 vs PC3 based on male gene expression in BAT and liver. PC1 separates individuals based on genotype while PC3 reflects environmental differences. (E) Expression divergence between New York and Brazil males in warm and cold for both BAT and liver. Log2 fold changes between parents were calculated for all genes independently. In each panel, points (representing individual genes) are colored depending on their direction and significance of the log2 fold change. Insets depict the total number of differentially expressed genes for each comparison (FDR < 0.05). Females show similar patterns and are depicted in Figures S2-S3.

genes that are due to changes in *cis*, *trans*, or both, and to determine the degree to which *cis*- and *trans*-regulation is context-dependent. Finally, we performed scans for selection in wild populations of house mice to identify genomic signatures of adaptation. We then intersect these genomic outliers with genes exhibiting *cis*-regulatory divergence to identify putatively adaptive *cis*-regulatory mutations associated with local adaptation. Our results provide insight into how gene expression is regulated across multiple contexts and how this complex regulatory divergence within species may contribute to adaptive evolution.

Results

Extensive gene expression divergence between temperate and tropical house mice. To characterize the regulatory architecture of adaptation, we first examined gene expression differences in mice from two drastically different environments in the Americas: Saratoga Springs, New York, USA (SARA), located at 43°N , and Manaus, Amazonas, Brazil (MANA), located near the equator at 3°S . Saratoga Springs and Manaus differ considerably in climate, such as mean annual temperature (Figure 1A), and mice from these environments show several phenotypic differences consistent with climatic adaptation. Specifically, mice from New York are larger, retain more

heat through their fur, and have shortened extremities compared to mice from Brazil (ANOVA tests, $P < 0.05$) (Figure 1B; Table S1), suggesting adaptation to cold environments (26).

We explored patterns of gene expression evolution by rearing New York and Brazil mice under two temperatures (5°C and 21°C) and sequenced brown adipose tissue (BAT) and liver transcriptomes of 48 individuals (6 / line / sex / environment) (Figure 1C). We chose these two tissues as they play important roles in both metabolism and adaptive thermogenesis (28–30). Principal component analysis (PCA) of all gene expression data revealed tissue type as the largest source of variance (PC1 ~97% of variance explained), followed by sex (PC2 ~1.5%) (Figure S1). Within each tissue and sex, New York and Brazil mice cleanly separated along PC1 (>60% of variance explained), while PC3 largely separated warm- and cold-reared mice (>4% of variance explained) (Figures 1D, S2). We also identified more than a third of genes to be differentially expressed between New York and Brazil mice (false discovery rate (FDR) < 0.05) (Figures 1E, S3-S4), with most expression differences concordant across environments and sexes.

This strong pattern of divergence was also apparent when we categorized differentially expressed genes as those showing genetic variation (G), environmental variation [i.e., plasticity

(E)], or genetic variation for plasticity (i.e., GxE) (Figures 2A, S3). Genotype had >1.5x larger effect size (calculated as the mean absolute value of the log₂ fold change) on gene expression than environment across both tissues (Figures 2A, S3). Similar effects were identified when we attributed expression differences to genotype and sex, though these patterns were largely tissue-dependent (Figure S4). Overall, these results demonstrate that within sexes and tissues, genotype plays a larger role than either environment or GxE interactions in shaping expression differences between temperate and tropical house mice.

Reduced gene expression plasticity in cold-adapted mice. Given that New York and Brazil mice have evolved under different thermal environments, we reasoned that gene expression responses to temperature would differ between these lines. Roughly ~5% and ~10% of all expressed genes showed significant GxE in liver and BAT, respectively (FDR < 0.05) (Figures 2B, S3). Notably, we found fewer differentially expressed genes in New York mice (~5% BAT; ~1% liver) than Brazil mice (~10% BAT; ~5% liver) (Chi-square tests, liver and BAT: $P < 0.05$), suggesting that New York mice may be more buffered against cold stress.

Next, we explored the relationship between plastic gene expression changes and evolved gene expression differences. Adaptive plasticity may facilitate the colonization of new environments by moving a population closer to the phenotypic optimum, while non-adaptive plasticity may do the opposite (31, 32). To determine if the pronounced temperature response of Brazil mice is adaptive or non-adaptive, we asked whether the direction of expression plasticity of Brazil mice correlates with expression divergence between New York and Brazil mice (see Methods). We found that expression plasticity generally goes in the same direction as evolved divergence for both tissues (positive Spearman's correlations, $P < 0.05$) (Figures 2C, S3), consistent with patterns of adaptive plasticity (25, 33, 34). These results suggest that plasticity may have facilitated the rapid expansion of house mice into new environments.

Expression divergence is predominantly due to *cis*-regulatory changes, and most *cis*-changes are robust to environmental temperature. To investigate the gene regulatory mechanisms underlying expression differences between New York and Brazil mice, we generated BAT and liver RNA-seq from NY x BZ F1 hybrids reared in both warm and cold environments (Figures 1C, S5). Measuring gene expression in F1 hybrids allowed us to discern if parental gene expression differences are due to *cis*- and/or *trans*-acting changes by assessing patterns of allele-specific expression (ASE) (Figure 3A). Specifically, as F1 hybrids inherit both a Brazil allele and New York allele within the same *trans*-acting environment, differences in expression between alleles are indicative of one or more *cis*-acting elements (35–37). In contrast, if no ASE is detected in hybrids but differences are observed between parental lines, we can infer divergence is likely due to *trans*-acting factors (35–37).

We tested 5,898 genes for ASE based on the presence of fixed differences between parental Brazil and New York lines (see Methods). While most genes showed conserved gene regulation between New York and Brazil mice (~75%), genes with evidence for expression divergence tended to involve changes in *cis* (Figure 3B). Specifically, 7–8% of genes showed




Fig. 2. Patterns of genotype-by-environment interactions (GxE). (A) Ternary plots depicting the proportion of each gene's expression variance explained by genotype (G), environment (E), and GxE. The relative proportion of each factor is shown for all differentially expressed male genes in BAT and liver. Total variance is the sum of all three components. (B) Comparison of gene expression differences between temperature regimes in NY and BZ males in both BAT and liver. Log₂ fold changes between temperatures were calculated for all genes independently. In each panel, points (representing individual genes) are colored depending on their direction and significance of the log₂ fold change. GxE categories include line-specific responses or opposite responses between lines. Insets depict the total number of differentially expressed genes for each comparison (FDR < 0.05). (C) The relationship between gene expression plasticity and evolved divergence in BAT and liver. Points represent expression differences with statistically significant plasticity in BZ (cold vs warm; FDR < 0.05) as well as significant expression divergence between NY and BZ at warm temperature (FDR < 0.05). Points colored in orange represent genes with a positive correlation between plasticity and evolved divergence and represent adaptive plasticity. Points in black represent genes with a negative association and represent non-adaptive plasticity. Insets depict the observed correlation coefficient (orange solid lines) is more positive than a randomized distribution of correlation coefficients for each tissue (see Methods for details). Asterisks denote significance of adaptive plasticity for each tissue (binomial exact tests, $P < 0.05$). Females show similar patterns and are depicted in Figures S2–S3.

expression divergence due to *cis* alone and 5–6% genes showed evidence of divergence due to *cis* and *trans* (Figure 3B). Only ~5% of genes involved regulatory changes solely in *trans* (Figure 3B). Moreover, the magnitude of *cis*-effects were greater than *trans*-effects per gene (Wilcoxon signed-rank test, $P < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$). The predominance of *cis*-regulatory changes relative to *trans*-changes is consistent with previous studies in house mice (38–40).




Fig. 3. The relative distribution of regulatory changes between New York and Brazil house mice across environments and tissues. (A) Schematic depicting how *cis*- and *trans*-changes can be inferred with F1 hybrids, and how environmental differences may result in *cis* x temperature and *trans* x temperature effects. Blue and gold boxes represent *cis*-regulatory regions for NY and BZ, respectively. Wavy lines depict transcript levels of an allele. TF = transcription factor. (B) Points (individual genes) represent log₂ fold changes between reads mapping to each allele in the hybrid (BZ allele / NY allele; y-axis) and the reads mapping to each parental line (BZ parent / NY parent; x-axis). Genes are colored based on their inferred regulatory category: orange = *cis*, purple = *trans*, green = *cis*&*trans*, gray = conserved or ambiguous. Genes categorized as conserved or ambiguous (gray points) constitute roughly 75% of all genes and are centered on the origin and mostly hidden behind other genes. (C) Changes in the number of genes for each inferred regulatory category between temperature regimes are illustrated in the alluvial plot. Genes that were conserved or ambiguous (gray) at both temperatures are not shown.

We next asked how the environment modulates gene regulatory evolution by comparing patterns of *cis*- and *trans*-regulatory differences across environments. Similar to expression patterns observed in the parents, the majority of genes that could be categorized across temperature treatments showed the same regulatory control in both environments (~88%) (Figure 3C). For the genes that did show a change in regulatory control, we found that *cis*-regulatory changes were more insensitive to temperature than *trans*-changes. Comparing the difference in magnitude of the *cis*- and *trans*-differences between warm and cold conditions, we found that *trans*-differences were greater between environments for both tissues (Wilcoxon signed-rank tests, $P < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$) (Figure S6). The cold environment also had a lower proportion of genes with *trans*-divergence (Chi-square tests; BAT, $P=0.0003$; liver, $P=0.02$), where the proportion of genes with only *cis*-divergence was the same across temperature conditions (Chi-square tests; BAT, $P=0.51$; liver, $P=0.66$). These results suggest that *trans*-effects play a larger role in gene expression plasticity than *cis*-effects.

A small number of genes show temperature-dependent *cis*-regulation. While most *cis*-effects were robust to temperature, we were specifically interested in exploring whether any genes showed temperature-dependent *cis*-effects. Such genes are of particular interest since they correspond to *plasticity-eQTL* (i.e., loci that harbor mutations underlying a plastic response)(41). To identify genes for which there was a significant effect of temperature on regulatory divergence, we determined if either the *cis* and/or the *trans* component showed a significant interaction with temperature (see Methods). We identified *cis* x temperature effects for 11 genes in

BAT (*gstt1*, *wars2*, *hsd11b1*, *itih5*, *dst*, *tmed2*, *plbd1*, *cdh13*, *scd1*, *tmem45b*, *s100a13*) and 4 in the liver (*eolv3*, *hmgs2*, *wars2*, *ebpl*) (FDR < 0.1). Most of these genes showed differences in the magnitude of ASE between temperatures, but we also observed cases where ASE was induced by one temperature treatment (i.e., *wars2*, *tmed2*, *cdh13*, *s100a13*, *ebpl*, *hmgs2*). Over half of the genes corresponding to *plasticity-eQTL* showed a smaller plastic response in New York than in Brazil, consistent with the overall reduction in expression plasticity in cold-adapted mice. We also identified a small number of genes with significant *trans* x temperature effects in BAT (18 genes) and liver (1 gene) (FDR < 0.1) (Table S2). Several of these genes with temperature-induced regulatory differences have suggested roles in energy metabolism and thermal tolerance (e.g., refs 42, 43–45). The identification of temperature-dependent gene regulatory effects (especially *plasticity-eQTL*) indicates a role for evolved changes in plasticity between temperate and tropical mice.

Cis-regulatory changes are largely tissue-specific and are enriched for body size and metabolism. While both liver and BAT play essential roles in metabolism and thermogenesis, these tissues have distinct functional properties that differentiate their role in environmental adaptation. In both tissues, genes with evidence for *cis*-divergence were enriched for GO terms related to metabolic processes, as well as the pathway for metabolism (Reactome R-MMU-1430728; liver, FDR=6.55 $\times 10^{-8}$; BAT, FDR=1.49 $\times 10^{-8}$). Genes with *cis*-regulatory changes in the liver were enriched for several mutant phenotype annotations for homeostasis and metabolism, including abnormal lipid homeostasis (FDR=6.248 $\times 10^{-5}$), abnormal cholesterol level (FDR=0.003), abnormal energy expenditure

(FDR=0.001), and abnormal triglyceride level (FDR=0.008). Additionally, genes with *cis*-changes in the liver showed a greater than 2-fold enrichment of genes with mutant phenotypes for abnormal susceptibility to weight gain (FDR=0.014) and were nominally significantly enriched for several other phenotypes related to body weight, size, and composition (Figure S7). Interestingly, two genes (*bcat2*, *adam17*) exhibiting *cis*-regulatory divergence were previously implicated in body weight differences in North American populations (27), further supporting their role in adaptive divergence between house mouse populations.

Next, we assessed the extent to which regulatory control is tissue-biased. Comparing gene expression evolution in BAT and liver, we found regulatory divergence to be largely tissue-biased. The majority of genes (80%) for which we could assign a regulatory category in each tissue were assigned to a different regulatory category in the other tissue (2954/3672 genes). In particular, we found that *trans*-divergence was more likely to be restricted to one tissue (with expression conserved between lines in the other tissue), compared to *cis*-changes which were more often shared (>2-fold more) (Chi-square test $P < 0.0001$). This may reflect the general observation of increased tissue-specificity of *trans*-effects relative to *cis*-effects (46).

To formally identify tissue-biased ASE, we contrasted ASE measurements in BAT and liver for paired hybrid samples (see Methods). We identified 338 genes with evidence for differential allele-specific expression between tissues (Figure S8). While the majority of these genes (77%) showed significant allele-specific expression in just one tissue, we also identified cases where allele-specific expression was present in both tissues but with differences in expression magnitude or direction (23%). Of these genes, forty-three had discordant allele-specific expression between tissues, where the opposite parental allele was up-regulated between tissues. Genes with tissue-biased ASE were enriched for metabolic phenotypes (e.g., abnormal lipid homeostasis, FDR=0.00027; increased food intake, FDR=0.036) and tissue specific functions and physiology (e.g., abnormal adipose tissue physiology, FDR=0.007; abnormal liver morphology, FDR=0.00097). These results highlight the importance of tissue-specific gene regulation in population divergence.

Positive selection on genes with *cis*-regulatory divergence in wild house mouse populations. As *cis*-regulatory variants are often drivers of local adaptation (4, 47, 48), and because most regulatory divergence between New York and Brazil house mice is governed in *cis*, we next explored whether genes regulated in *cis* are under positive selection in wild mice from the Americas. To test this, we utilized previously published whole exome data from wild-caught individuals collected from New Hampshire/Vermont, USA (NH/VT) (24) and Manaus, Brazil (MAN) (Gutiérrez-Guerrero et al., *in prep*), and compared these data to previously published whole genome data from Eurasian populations of house mice (49). Genetic PCA distinguished mice based on subspecies and population-of-origin (Figures 4A, S9), with mice from NH/VT clustering most closely with mice from Germany. These results are consistent with the suggestion that mice from eastern North America are most closely related to populations in northern Europe (50, 51).

Next, to identify genetic signatures of adaptation in house

mice from the Americas, we performed a scan for regions of genetic differentiation consistent with selection using a normalized version of the population branch statistic (*PBSn1*). We used this test to identify highly differentiated loci in our focal populations in the Americas (MAN and NH/VT) relative to Eurasian populations (see Methods). In total, 83,538 and 84,420 non-overlapping 5-SNP windows were analyzed for Manaus and NH/VT, respectively. Outlier windows in NH/VT and MAN overlapped 538 and 530 genes, respectively (File S1).

Finally, we asked to what extent genomic divergence among wild mice from temperate and tropical environments is associated with *cis*-regulatory changes. Specifically, if natural selection associated with climatic adaptation has acted mainly on regulatory variants, we predicted an enrichment of *PBSn1* outliers near genes displaying ASE (e.g., ref. 52). To test this prediction, we overlapped candidate regions for selection based on *PBSn1* outlier windows with genes for which we identified evidence for allele-specific expression in BAT or liver. In NH/VT, we found outlier windows overlapped 71 and 62 genes with evidence for *cis*-regulatory divergence under warm and cold conditions, respectively (overlap 44 genes) (Figure 4B; File S1). The overlap between genes with *cis*-regulatory divergence and outlier windows in this population was greater than expected by chance (hypergeometric test, $P=0.0016$) and genes with allele-specific expression were associated with higher average *PBSn1* scores than background genes ($P=0.00026$, see Methods). ASE outliers were enriched for mutant phenotypes related to body size, growth, and metabolism relative to other genes with *cis*-regulatory divergence (e.g., abnormal postnatal growth/weight/body size, abnormal susceptibility to weight gain, decreased susceptibility to diet-induced obesity, and increased energy expenditure; FDR < 0.05) (Figure 4C; File S1). This gene set also includes genes whose expression in the liver was previously associated with body mass variation in natural populations of North American house mice (*bcat2*, *col6a1*, *col5a2*, *col3a1*) (24, 27). Additionally, this set included genes implicated in obesity and metabolic phenotypes in humans (e.g., *urn*, *plaat3*, *prkar2b*, *sulf2*, *smoc1*) (Figure 4D) (53) and mice (Table S3). Together, these results suggest that selection has acted on *cis*-regulatory genes related to metabolism and body weight in New York mice.

In contrast, we did not find significant overlap between genes with allele-specific expression and *PBSn1* outliers for Manaus ($P=0.4$). Outlier windows overlapped 49 and 51 genes with evidence for *cis*-regulatory divergence under warm and cold conditions, respectively (Figure S10). Genes were not enriched for metabolic process terms or phenotypes. The significant overlap between *PBSn1* outliers and ASE in the temperate mice but not in the tropical mice suggests that adaptive gene expression differences may predominantly reflect adaptation to cold environments (rather than to warm environments).

Discussion

Understanding how both genetic and non-genetic factors influence gene expression is essential to understanding adaptive evolution. Here, we utilized allele-specific expression in liver and brown adipose tissue to characterize *cis* and *trans* changes underlying expression differences between temperate and tropical house mice when reared under warm and cold laboratory




Fig. 4. Genomic outliers are enriched in genes with evidence for *cis*-regulatory divergence. (A) Genetic PCA of wild house mice distinguished mouse populations based on population-of-origin (*Mus musculus domesticus* (M.m.d.)) and subspecies (*Mus musculus castaneus* (M.m.c.), *Mus musculus musculus* (M.m.m.)). The x and y axes show the first and second SNP eigenvectors, respectively (EV1: 29% of variance, PC2: 8% of variance). (B) Autosomal selection scan showing *PBSn1* results for the New Hampshire/Vermont (NH/VT) focal population. Orange points depict genes that exhibit *cis*-regulatory divergence and overlap with outlier regions. (C) Gene set enrichment analysis for genes with ASE that overlap genomic outliers in the NH/VT population. ASE outliers were highly enriched for mouse phenotypes related to body size differences and metabolic features, across both temperature treatments. (D) Candidate gene that exhibits *cis*-regulatory divergence and overlaps with outlier region. Allele frequencies (pie charts) of significant SNPs (gold asterisks) in the four populations.

environments. We found that most regulatory divergence was governed by *cis*-regulatory variation, and that these *cis*-effects were largely independent of environmental temperature. However, a subset of genes showed temperature-dependent *cis*-effects and thus represent QTL for expression plasticity. We also found that many *cis*-regulated genes were associated with metabolism and body size, but that these *cis*-effects were often tissue-biased. Finally, overlap of genes exhibiting *cis*-regulatory divergence with scans for selection identified several *cis*-regulatory genes under positive selection, consistent with a role for these loci in local adaptation. The combination of allele-specific expression with genomic scans is a fruitful approach to identify the regulatory architecture of adaptive evolution in natural populations.

Comparisons between New York and Brazil house mice provide insights into the evolution of gene regulation over very short evolutionary timescales. Although New York and Brazil

house mice colonized the Americas only within the last ~500 years, we find evidence for pervasive regulatory divergence. Moreover, the regulatory control underlying this intraspecific divergence is overwhelmingly due to *cis* variants either alone or together with one or more *trans* variants. The predominance of *cis*-regulatory divergence is in agreement with previous interspecific studies in house mice (38, 40, 54), and has been observed in intraspecific comparisons of other species (55–61). Although some evidence suggests *trans*-effects play larger roles within rather than between species (62–66), it is likely that certain evolutionary contexts, timescales, and selection pressures may favor either *cis*- or *trans*-acting mechanisms (67, 68). Regardless, our study indicates that strong intraspecific *cis*-regulatory divergence between populations can accrue on extremely short timescales.

Despite the plastic response of gene expression in both New York and Brazil house mice, *cis*-regulatory divergence

384 was relatively robust to environmental temperature. In con-
385 trast, changes in the environment preferentially affected *trans*-
386 regulation profiles, suggesting that *trans*-effects play a more
387 pronounced role in gene expression plasticity. Greater sensitivity
388 of *trans*-effects to the environment is in strong agreement
389 with previous studies (11, 12, 41, 57, 69–71) and may be due
390 to the role *trans*-acting factors play in signaling pathways that
391 become activated in response to environmental change (72).
392 Indeed, we found that the effect sizes of *trans* were greater
393 than those of *cis* across environments, indicating that much
394 of expression plasticity we observed is governed by changes
395 in *trans*. Moreover, the pronounced expression plasticity we
396 observe in Brazil house mice largely goes in the same direction
397 as evolved divergence (i.e., adaptive plasticity)(33, 34). Previous
398 studies in house mice have implicated the role of adaptive
399 gene expression plasticity in local adaptation (25), suggesting
400 that plasticity in general may have aided in the colonization
401 of new environments.

402 Although ASE was generally observed at both tempera-
403 tures for a given gene, a subset of genes showed temperature-
404 dependent *cis*-effects. These loci are of particular interest since
405 these constitute *plasticity*-eQTL and harbor mutations that di-
406 rectly affect plasticity of gene expression. Genetic assimilation
407 refers to the conversion of a plastic response to a fixed response
408 (73–76). If the ancestral allele at a *plasticity*-eQTL encodes a
409 plastic response and the derived allele encodes a fixed response,
410 then the *plasticity*-eQTL represents a case of genetic assimilation.
411 For example, selection in a cold, temperate environment
412 may have led to the reduced plasticity exhibited in New York
413 mice. A similar mechanism was recently proposed to underlie
414 rapid divergence in threespine stickleback (57). *Cis*-regulatory
415 variants could rapidly canalize expression through the loss
416 or gain of specific binding sites for conditionally expressed
417 transcription factors, thereby decoupling a gene's expression
418 from the environment (72). Many of the *cis* x environment
419 candidates illustrate potential regulatory mechanisms under-
420 lying genetic assimilation as many of them exhibit reduced
421 plasticity in New York mice (Figure S11). For example, *scd1*
422 plays an important role in basal and cold-induced thermogen-
423 esis (77, 78) and New York mice show higher and constitutive
424 average expression of *scd1* in BAT compared to Brazil mice
425 (Figure S11). Further study of these genes may help us under-
426 stand the relationship between adaptive plasticity and genetic
427 adaptation to novel environments.

428 Finally, we discovered significant overlap between genes
429 exhibiting *cis*-regulatory divergence and genomic SNPs that
430 show evidence for positive selection in wild mice, suggest-
431 ing that selection has acted mainly on regulatory variants
432 associated with local adaptation. This overlapping gene set
433 is enriched for mutant phenotypes related to body size and
434 metabolism in New York mice and are consistent with previous
435 studies showing selection on genes with *cis*-eQTLs related to
436 body size in North American mice (27). Together, our results
437 highlight how natural selection on *cis*-regulatory divergence
438 is a likely contributor to rapid climatic adaptation in house
439 mice.

440 Materials and Methods

441 **Animals and Evolved Phenotypic Differences.** To characterize
442 evolved phenotypic differences between New York and Brazil
443 house mice, we used two wild-derived inbred lines of house

444 mice: SARA (New York) and MANA (Brazil). The estab-
445 lishment of these lines has been described previously (26).
446 Mice from each line were housed in a standard laboratory
447 environment at 21°C with a 12L:12D cycle. Roughly equal
448 numbers of males and females were produced for each within-
449 line comparison ($n = 32$ per line; File S1). We took standard
450 museum measurements on all mice and removed and prepared
451 dried skins. Thermal conductance of pelage (referred to as
452 pelage conductance ($\text{W}^{-1}\text{m}^{-2}\text{C}^{-1}$)) was measured on dry skins
453 following the protocol of Riddell et al. 2021 (see SI Methods)
454 (79). Tail length and ear length were corrected for body mass
455 for each individual. Effects of line and sex for each pheno-
456 type were modeled using ANOVA. All statistical analyses were
457 performed using packages available in R (v.4.1.1).

458 **Experimental Design and Tissue Collection.** To investigate the gene
459 regulatory mechanisms underlying local adaptation in house
460 mice, we generated F1 hybrids by crossing a SARA female
461 with a MANA male. All experimental animals were born at
462 room temperature (21°C) and were provided water and com-
463 mercial rodent chow *ad libitum*. We weaned and singly housed
464 SARA, MANA, and F1 hybrids at ~3 weeks of age. We split
465 3.5-week-old full-sibs and F1 hybrids into size-matched experi-
466 mental groups across cold (5°C) and warm (21°C) treatments.
467 Mice were kept in their respective experimental environment
468 until ~12 weeks of age, at which point individuals were eutha-
469 nized via cervical dislocation. We took standard museum
470 measurements and then rapidly dissected and preserved liver
471 and brown adipose tissue in RNAlater at 4°C overnight and
472 moved to -80°C until RNA extraction. We prepared standard
473 museum skeletons and accessioned them in UC Berkeley's Mu-
474 seum of Vertebrate Zoology (catalog numbers are given in File
475 S1). All experimental procedures were in accordance with the
476 UC Berkeley Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee
477 (AUP-2017-08-10248).

478 **RNA Extraction, Library Preparation, and Sequencing.** We extracted
479 total RNA from liver and BAT from each sample ($n = \sim 6$ per
480 genotype/sex/treatment/tissue) using the RNeasy PowerLyzer
481 Kit (QIAGEN). We generated Illumina cDNA libraries from
482 1 μg of purified RNA using KAPA Stranded mRNA-Seq Kit
483 (Illumina), and uniquely indexed libraries using unique dual
484 indexes (Illumina). Libraries were pooled in equal molar
485 concentration and sequenced on one lane each of 150 bp paired-
486 end NovaSeq S1 and NovaSeq S4 at the Vincent J. Coates
487 Genomics Sequencing Center at UC Berkeley. We filtered raw
488 reads below a Phred quality score of 15 and trimmed adapter
489 sequences using fastp (80).

490 **Parental Gene Expression Analyses.** After cleaning and trimming
491 parental sequences of MANA and SARA, we mapped reads
492 to the *Mus musculus* reference genome (GRCm38/mm10) us-
493 ing STAR (81). We counted reads overlapping exons using
494 HTSeq (82) based on the Ensembl GRCm38.98 annotation.
495 We imported raw count data into R (v.4.1.1) and transformed
496 expression values using variance stabilizing transformation
497 (83) to assess transcriptome-wide expression patterns via PCA.
498 Next, we removed genes with fewer than an average of 10
499 reads per individual within each tissue, retaining ~14K ex-
500 pressed genes per tissue for downstream analyses. We then
501 used DESeq2 (83) on raw, filtered reads to quantify expres-
502 sion patterns by fitting a generalized linear model following
503 a negative binomial distribution. We computed differential

504 expression between lines with the model population + environment
505 + population*environment to determine the effects
506 of genotype, environment, and genotype-by-environment on
507 expression patterns for each tissue and sex, separately. We
508 also identified genotype-by-sex interactions using a similar
509 model in DESeq2 (see SI Methods and Results).

510 To determine if gene expression plasticity is correlated with
511 gene expression divergence, we compared genes with significant
512 plasticity to genes with significant expression divergence
513 within each tissue and sex, separately. We used Spearman's
514 rank correlation coefficients to assess overall directionality and
515 significance of gene expression. To account for potential sta-
516 tistical artifacts (84), we compared the observed correlations
517 to a permuted distribution (10,000 permutations). Lastly, we
518 used a Benjamini-Hochberg multiple test correction (85) on
519 all resulting *P*-values and considered genes with FDR < 0.05
520 to be significantly differentially expressed.

521 **Identifying Variants between Parental Lines.** To identify differences
522 between lines for allele-specific read assignment, we performed
523 SNP calling on whole genome sequence data from one female
524 each of MANA and SARA. We mapped genomic reads with
525 Bowtie2 (86) to the mm10 reference genome (setting: –very-
526 sensitive) obtained from Ensembl. We marked duplicates
527 with the Picard tool MarkDuplicates and then we used the
528 GATK tools HaplotypeCaller and GenotypeGVCFs for joint
529 genotyping across genomic samples. We filtered for low quality
530 SNP calls with VariantFiltration (QD < 2.0; QUAL < 30.0;
531 FS > 200; ReadPosRankSum < -20.0). To reduce the influence
532 of genotyping error on allele-specific expression, we mapped
533 RNA-seq reads from all individuals and then counted allele-
534 specific reads aligned to each site we genotyped with the GATK
535 tool ASEReadCounter. We excluded sites for which we did not
536 have coverage of at least 5 reads from each population-specific
537 allele. These SNPs were then used for identifying allele-specific
538 reads.

539 **Mapping Allele-Specific Reads.** For allele-specific expression anal-
540 yses, we mapped reads from hybrid individuals to the mouse
541 reference genome (GRCm38/mm10) using STAR. We used
542 WASP (87) to reduce the potential for reference mapping bias.
543 We retained reads that overlapped a population-specific variant
544 and that passed WASP filtering for our allele-specific expres-
545 sion analysis. We separated reads overlapping informative
546 variants into allele-specific pools (NY, BZ) based on genotype
547 for quantification. We used HTSeq to count the number of
548 reads associated with each gene per population based on the
549 overlap of reads and annotated exonic regions based on the
550 Ensembl GRCm38.98 annotation. We examined per site allelic
551 reads with ASEReadCounter to quantify allele-specific map-
552 ping over individual sites. Proportions of reads overlapping
553 the references vs. alternative allele (REF allele / (ALT allele
554 + REF allele)) showed a median 0.5 across samples (Figure
555 S12), indicating no evidence for reference mapping bias.

556 **Identifying Cis- and Trans-Regulatory Divergence.** Parental (F0)
557 and F1 expression data was used to characterize *cis* and *trans*
558 effects. To categorize regulatory divergence at each gene, we
559 inferred differential expression by analyzing raw counts using
560 DESeq2. To identify genes with evidence of allele-specific
561 expression in hybrid individuals, we took reads that mapped
562 preferentially to either New York or Brazil alleles and fit
563 these to a model with allele (NY vs. BZ), sample (individual),

564 and tissue (BAT, liver) for hybrid male samples in DESeq2
565 (Wald-test). As read counts come from the same sequencing
566 library, library size factor normalization was disabled in DE-
567 Seq2 by setting SizeFactors = 1 for measures of allele-specific
568 expression. We used males to assign regulatory categories to
569 maximize power due to a larger number of hybrid samples
570 sequenced (6 replicates of males vs. 4 replicates of females).
571 Differential expression between alleles in the F1 is evidence
572 for *cis*-regulatory divergence, where differential expression in
573 the F0 generation is not recapitulated between alleles in the
574 F1 is evidence for *trans* divergence. The *trans* component (T)
575 was assessed through a Fisher's Exact Test on reads mapping
576 to each parental allele in the hybrid vs. parental read counts,
577 summed over all replicates (37, 62). Reads were randomly
578 down-sampled to account for library size differences between
579 parental and F1 replicates (88, 89). *P*-values for each test
580 were corrected for FDR with the Benjamini-Hochberg method.
581 Genes were sorted into categories based on hard FDR thresh-
582 olds (FDR < 0.05) (37, 62), as described below. We analyzed
583 temperature treatments (warm and cold) separately for regu-
584 latory assignment and then compared as described below:

585 *Conserved:* no significant difference between lines (F0), no
586 significant difference between alleles (F1), no significant *T*.

587 *Cis* only: significant difference between lines (F0), signifi-
588 cant difference between alleles (F1), no significant *T*.

589 *Trans* only: significant difference between lines (F0), no
590 significant difference between alleles (F1), significant *T*.

591 *Cis & Trans* designations: significant differences between
592 alleles (F1) and significant *T*. This category was further sub-
593 divided into *cis* + *trans* (reinforcing), *cis* + *trans* (opposing),
594 *compensatory*, and *cis* x *trans*, as previously described (38,
595 40).

596 *Ambiguous:* all other patterns.

597 We identified *cis* x temperature interactions using DESeq2
598 under a model specifying temperature (cold vs. warm) and
599 allele (BZ vs. NY). To identify *trans* x temperature interactions,
600 we fit a model that included parental and hybrid read counts
601 for temperature (cold vs. warm), allele/genotype (BZ vs. NY),
602 and generation (F1 vs. F0) and interactions. Similar models
603 were also used to identify sex-specific regulatory patterns in
604 DESeq2 (see SI Methods and Results).

605 **Genetic PCA of *M.m. domesticus* populations.** We used SNPRelate
606 (90) to perform PCA and IBS hierarchical clustering of popula-
607 tion genetic data. Genomic data from 3 Eurasian populations
608 of *M. m. domesticus* (Germany [Cologne-Bonn], France, and
609 Iran) and *M. m. musculus* and *M. m. castaneus* subspecies
610 were downloaded from [http://wwwuser.gwdg.de/~evolbio/evolgen/
611 wildmouse/](http://wwwuser.gwdg.de/~evolbio/evolgen/wildmouse/) (49). For PCA, biallelic variants genotyped across
612 all these individuals were extracted and pruned for linkage dis-
613 equilibrium in SNPRelate (thresholds=0.2) resulting in 22,126
614 variant sites for PCA and IBS clustering for *M. m. domesticus*
615 comparisons and 25,467 variants for global *Mus* comparisons
616 (Figures 4A, S9). Altering the pruning threshold to 0.5 did
617 not result in any change in population clustering.

618 **Autosomal Scans for Selection.** To identify regions with evidence
619 for selection in the Americas, we scanned the exomes of our
620 North and South American focal populations for selection by
621 using a modification of the population branch statistic (PBS)
622 which summarizes a three-way comparison of allele frequencies
623 between a focal group, a closely related population, and an

624 outgroup comparison ($PBSn1$) (91, 92):

$$PBSn1 = \frac{PBS_1}{1 + PBS_1 + PBS_2 + PBS_3}$$

625 Here, PBS_1 indicates PBS calculated as either Manaus or
626 NH/VT as the focal population, and PBS_2 and PBS_3 indicate
627 PBS calculated for Eurasians populations as the focal
628 populations (France or Germany and Iran, respectively). To
629 maximize the number of sites that could be compared, Ameri-
630 can populations are not directly compared in the branch test
631 due to the reduced representation of exome data and high per
632 site Fst values between the two populations (Figure S13). In-
633 stead, NH/VT and MAN were each compared to two Eurasian
634 populations [(MAN), France) Iran] and ((NH/VT) Germany)
635 Iran)], selected based on population clustering (Figure S9).
636 We restricted our SNP set to biallelic variants across the 3
637 populations being compared and required that at least six
638 individuals in the focal branch be genotyped. We note that
639 the NH/VT sample used in the PBS test is geographically
640 close to the origin of the SARA line.

641 We used VCFtools (93) to calculate Weir and Cockerham
642 Fst at each variant position. These values were used to calcu-
643 late $PBSn1$ for non-overlapping blocks of 5 SNPs. We consider
644 blocks in the top 1% of $PBSn1$ scores outliers and do not at-
645 tempt to assign P -values to each SNP-block (94). Outliers
646 were >3 standard deviations above the mean windowed value
647 of SNP-blocks in each comparison (MAN focal, median=0.045;
648 NH/VT focal median = 0.064). We identified windows overlap-
649 ping genes based on Ensembl gene coordinates (mm10) and the
650 BEDTools “intersect” tool (95). As allele-specific expression
651 in F1s is consistent with local independent genetic changes
652 influencing gene expression, we focused on genes with evidence
653 for *cis*-regulatory divergence (i.e., differences in expression
654 between parental alleles in the F1) for overlap with outlier loci.
655 To ask whether allele-specific expression was associated with
656 elevated $PBSn1$ scores, we used a generalized linear model in-
657 corporating gene category (ASE or no ASE) and SNP density
658 per kb as factors to $PBSn1$ scores. SNP density was calculated
659 by dividing the number of informative sites between NY and
660 BZ for allele-specific expression per gene by transcript length.

661 **Enrichment Analyses.** We performed all GO and pathway enrichment
662 analyses with PANTHER (96, 97). Phenotype enrichment
663 analyses were performed with ModPheA (98). We annotated
664 genes to specific phenotypes based on Mouse Genome
665 Informatics phenotype annotations (<http://www.informatics.jax.org/>).

666 **Data Availability.** Scripts are available on GitHub(https://github.com/malballinger/BallingerMack_NYBZase_2022). All sequence
667 data generated in this study have been deposited to the National
668 Center for Biotechnology Information Sequence Read
669 Archive under accession BioProject ID PRJNAXXX. All other
670 data are included in the article and/or SI Appendix.

671 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.** We thank Beth Dumont for providing
672 whole genome sequences of MANA and SARA. We thank Yocelyn
673 Gutiérrez-Guerrero for providing exome sequences from a popula-
674 tion from Manaus, Brazil. Funding and support for this work was
675 provided by the National Institutes of Health (NIH; R01 GM074245
676 and R01 GM127468 to M.W.N.). This work used the Extreme
677 Science and Engineering Discovery Environment (XSEDE), which
678 is supported by National Science Foundation grant number ACI-
679 1548562. M.A.B. was supported by a National Science Foundation

680 Graduate Research Fellowship (DGE-1106400), a Junea W. Kelly
681 Museum of Vertebrate Zoology Graduate Fellowship, and a Uni-
682 versity of California Berkeley Philomathia Graduate Fellowship.
683 K.L.M. was supported by a Ruth Kirschstein National Research
684 Service Award from NIH and a Stanford Center for Computational,
685 Evolutionary and Human Genomics postdoctoral fellowship.
686

687 References

1. King MC, Wilson AC (1975) Evolution at two levels in humans and chimpanzees. *Science* 188(4184):107–116.
2. Wray GA, et al. (2003) The evolution of transcriptional regulation in eukaryotes. *Mol Biol Evol* 20(9):1377–1419.
3. Jones FC, et al. (2012) The genomic basis of adaptive evolution in threespine sticklebacks. *Nature* 484(7392):55–61.
4. Fraser HB (2013) Gene expression drives local adaptation in humans. *Genome Res* 23(7):1089–1096.
5. Wray GA (2007) The evolutionary significance of *cis*-regulatory mutations. *Nat Rev Genet* 8(3):206–216.
6. Wittkopp PJ, Kalay G (2011) *Cis*-regulatory elements: Molecular mechanisms and evolutionary processes underlying divergence. *Nat Rev Genet* 13(1):59–69.
7. Carroll SB (2008) Evo-devo and an expanding evolutionary synthesis: A genetic theory of morphological evolution. *Cell* 134(1):25–36.
8. Stern DL, Orgogozo V (2008) The loci of evolution: How predictable is genetic evolution? *Evolution* 62(9):2155–2177.
9. Cooper TF, Rozen DE, Lenski RE (2003) Parallel changes in gene expression after 20,000 generations of evolution in *Escherichia coli*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 100(3):1072–1077.
10. Stern DL, Orgogozo V (2009) Is genetic evolution predictable? *Science* 323(5915):746–751.
11. Smith EN, Kruglyak L (2008) Gene-environment interaction in yeast gene expression. *PLoS Biol* 6(4):e83.
12. Tirosh I, Reikhav S, Levy AA, Barkai N (2009) A yeast hybrid provides insight into the evolution of gene expression regulation. *Science* 324(5927):659–662.
13. Promislow D (2005) A regulatory network analysis of phenotypic plasticity in yeast. *Am Nat* 165(5):515–523.
14. West-Eberhard MJ (2003) *Developmental plasticity and evolution* (Oxford University Press).
15. West-Eberhard MJ (2005) Developmental plasticity and the origin of species differences. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 102 Suppl 1:6543–6549.
16. St Pierre CL, et al. (2022) Genetic, epigenetic, and environmental mechanisms govern allele-specific gene expression. *Genome Res* 32(6):1042–1057.
17. Lopes-Ramos CM, et al. (2020) Sex differences in gene expression and regulatory networks across 29 human tissues. *Cell Rep* 31(12):107795.
18. He F, et al. (2021) *Cis*-regulatory evolution spotlights species differences in the adaptive potential of gene expression plasticity. *Nat Commun* 12(1):3376.
19. Hadadi N, et al. (2022) Comparative multi-tissue profiling reveals extensive tissue-specificity in transcriptome reprogramming during thermal adaptation. *eLife* 11.
20. Tung J, Zhou X, Alberts SC, Stephens M, Gilad Y (2015) The genetic architecture of gene expression levels in wild baboons. *eLife* 4:e04729.
21. Naranjo S, et al. (2015) Dissecting the genetic basis of a complex *cis*-regulatory adaptation. *PLoS Genet* 11(12):e1005751.
22. Lynch CB (1992) Clinal variation in cold adaptation in *mus domesticus*: Verification of predictions from laboratory populations. *Am Nat* 139(6):1219–1236.

- 734 23. Ferris KG, et al. (2021) The genomics of rapid climatic
735 adaptation and parallel evolution in North American house
mice. *PLoS Genet* 17(4):e1009495. 778
- 736 24. Phifer-Rixey M, et al. (2018) The genomic basis of
environmental adaptation in house mice. *PLoS Genet*
14(9):e1007672. 779
- 737 25. Bittner NKJ, Mack KL, Nachman MW (2021) Gene ex-
pression plasticity and desert adaptation in house mice.
Evolution 75(6):1477–1491. 780
- 738 26. Ballinger MA, Nachman MW (2022) The contribution of
genetic and environmental effects to Bergmann's rule and
Allen's rule in house mice. *Am Nat* 199(5):691–704. 781
- 739 27. Mack KL, Ballinger MA, Phifer-Rixey M, Nachman MW
(2018) Gene regulation underlies environmental adaptation
in house mice. *Genome Res* 28(11):1636–1645. 782
- 740 28. Abumrad NA (2017) The liver as a hub in thermogenesis.
Cell Metab 26(3):454–455. 783
- 741 29. Simcox J, et al. (2017) Global analysis of plasma lipids
identifies liver-derived acylcarnitines as a fuel source for
brown fat thermogenesis. *Cell Metab* 26(3):509–522.e6. 784
- 742 30. Cannon B, Nedergaard J (2004) Brown adipose tissue: Func-
tion and physiological significance. *Physiol Rev* 84(1):277–
359. 785
- 743 31. Price TD, Qvarnström A, Irwin DE (2003) The role of
phenotypic plasticity in driving genetic evolution. *Proc Biol
Sci* 270(1523):1433–1440. 786
- 744 32. Ghalambor CK, McKAY JK, Carroll SP, Reznick DN (2007)
Adaptive versus non-adaptive phenotypic plasticity and the
potential for contemporary adaptation in new environments.
Funct Ecol 21(3):394–407. 787
- 745 33. Fischer EK, Ghalambor CK, Hoke KL (2016) Can a net-
work approach resolve how adaptive vs nonadaptive plas-
ticity impacts evolutionary trajectories? *Integr Comp Biol*
56(5):877–888. 788
- 746 34. Ghalambor CK, et al. (2015) Non-adaptive plasticity poten-
tiates rapid adaptive evolution of gene expression in nature.
Nature 525(7569):372–375. 789
- 747 35. Cowles CR, Hirschhorn JN, Altshuler D, Lander ES (2002)
Detection of regulatory variation in mouse genes. *Nat Genet*
32(3):432–437. 790
- 748 36. Wittkopp PJ, Haerum BK, Clark AG (2004) Evolution-
ary changes in *cis* and *trans* gene regulation. *Nature*
430(6995):85–88. 791
- 749 37. McManus CJ, et al. (2010) Regulatory divergence in
drosophila revealed by mRNA-seq. *Genome Res* 20(6):816–
825. 792
- 750 38. Goncalves A, et al. (2012) Extensive compensatory *cis*-
trans regulation in the evolution of mouse gene expression.
Genome Res 22(12):2376–2384. 793
- 751 39. Shen SQ, Turro E, Corbo JC (2014) Hybrid mice reveal
parent-of-origin and *cis*- and *trans*-regulatory effects in the
retina. *PLoS One* 9(10):e109382. 794
- 752 40. Mack KL, Campbell P, Nachman MW (2016) Gene regu-
lation and speciation in house mice. *Genome Res* 26(4):451–
461. 795
- 753 41. Li Y, et al. (2006) Mapping determinants of gene expression
plasticity by genetical genomics in *C. elegans*. *PLoS Genet*
2(12):e222. 796
- 754 42. Fumagalli M, et al. (2015) Greenlandic inuit show ge-
netic signatures of diet and climate adaptation. *Science*
349(6254):1343–1347. 797
- 755 43. Hallmark B, et al. (2019) Genomic evidence of local adap-
tation to climate and diet in indigenous siberians. *Mol Biol
Evol* 36(2):315–327. 798
- 756 44. Shore AM, et al. (2013) Cold-induced changes in gene
expression in brown adipose tissue, white adipose tissue and
liver. *PLoS One* 8(7):e68933. 799
45. Westerberg R, et al. (2006) ELOVL3 is an important com-
ponent for early onset of lipid recruitment in brown adipose
tissue*. *J Biol Chem* 281(8):4958–4968. 800
46. GTEx Consortium, et al. (2017) Genetic effects on gene
expression across human tissues. *Nature* 550(7675):204–213. 801
47. Fraser HB, Moses AM, Schadt EE (2010) Evidence for
widespread adaptive evolution of gene expression in budding
yeast. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 107(7):2977–2982. 802
48. Fraser HB, et al. (2011) Systematic detection of polygenic
cis-regulatory evolution. *PLoS Genet* 7(3):e1002023. 803
49. Harr B, et al. (2016) Genomic resources for wild populations
of the house mouse, *mus musculus* and its close relative *mus
spretus*. *Sci Data* 3(1):1–14. 804
50. Tichy H, Zaleska-Rutczynska Z, O'Huigin C, Figueroa F,
Klein J (1994) Origin of the north american house mouse.
Folia Biol 40(6):483–496. 805
51. Morgan AP, et al. (2022) Population structure and in-
breeding in wild house mice (*mus musculus*) at different
geographic scales. *Heredity* 129(3):183–194. 806
52. York RA, et al. (2018) Behavior-dependent *cis* regulation
reveals genes and pathways associated with bower building in
cichlid fishes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 115(47):E11081–E11090. 807
53. Bérubé J, Garand C, Lettre G, Lebel M (2013) The non-
synonymous polymorphism at position 114 of the WRN
protein affects cholesterol efflux in vitro and correlates with
cholesterol levels in vivo. *Exp Gerontol* 48(6):533–538. 808
54. Crowley JJ, et al. (2015) Analyses of allele-specific gene
expression in highly divergent mouse crosses identifies per-
vasive allelic imbalance. *Nat Genet* 47(4):353–360. 809
55. Lemmon ZH, Bukowski R, Sun Q, Doebley JF (2014) The
role of *cis* regulatory evolution in maize domestication. *PLoS
Genet* 10(11):e1004745. 810
56. Genissel A, McIntyre LM, Wayne ML, Nuzhdin SV (2008)
Cis and trans regulatory effects contribute to natural varia-
tion in transcriptome of drosophila melanogaster. *Mol Biol
Evol* 25(1):101–110. 811
57. Verta J-P, Jones FC (2019) Predominance of *cis*-regulatory
changes in parallel expression divergence of sticklebacks.
eLife 8:e43785. 812
58. Osada N, Miyagi R, Takahashi A (2017) Cis- and trans-
regulatory effects on gene expression in a natural population
of drosophila melanogaster. *Genetics* 206(4):2139–2148. 813
59. Lovell JT, et al. (2016) Drought responsive gene expression
regulatory divergence between upland and lowland ecotypes
of a perennial C4 grass. *Genome Res* 26(4):510–518. 814
60. Gould BA, Chen Y, Lowry DB (2018) Gene regulatory
divergence between locally adapted ecotypes in their native
habitats. *Mol Ecol* 27(21):4174–4188. 815
61. Fear JM, et al. (2016) Buffering of genetic regulatory net-
works in drosophila melanogaster. *Genetics* 203(3):1177–
1190. 816
62. Coolon JD, McManus CJ, Stevenson KR, Graveley BR,
Wittkopp PJ (2014) Tempo and mode of regulatory evolution
in drosophila. 24(5):797–808. 817
63. Hart JC, Ellis NA, Eisen MB, Miller CT (2018) Convergent
evolution of gene expression in two high-toothed stickleback
populations. *PLoS Genet* 14(6):e1007443. 818
64. Jacobs A, et al. (2022) Temperature-dependent gene regu-
latory divergence underlies local adaptation with gene flow in
the Atlantic silverside. *bioRxiv*:2022.04.27.489786. 819
65. Lemos B, Araripe LO, Fontanillas P, Hartl DL (2008) Dom-
inance and the evolutionary accumulation of *cis*- and *trans*-
effects on gene expression. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*
105(38):14471–14476. 820
66. Emerson JJ, et al. (2010) Natural selection on *cis* and *trans*
regulation in yeasts. *Genome Res* 20(6):826–836. 821
67. Signor SA, Nuzhdin SV (2018) The evolution of gene ex-
pression in *cis* and *trans*. *Trends Genet* 34(7):532–544. 822

- 823
- 824 68. Buchberger E, Reis M, Lu T-H, Posnien N (2019) Cloudy
with a chance of insights: Context dependent gene regulation
and implications for evolutionary studies. *Genes* 10(7):492.
- 825
- 826 69. Chen J, Nolte V, Schlötterer C (2015) Temperature stress
mediates decanalization and dominance of gene expression
in drosophila melanogaster. *PLoS Genet* 11(2):e1004883.
- 827
- 828 70. Cubillos FA, et al. (2014) Extensive cis-regulatory variation
robust to environmental perturbation in arabidopsis. *Plant
Cell* 26(11):4298–4310.
- 829
- 830 71. Li XC, Fay JC (2017) Cis-regulatory divergence in gene
expression between two thermally divergent yeast species.
Genome Biol Evol 9(5):1120–1129.
- 831
- 832 72. Ehrenreich IM, Pfennig DW (2016) Genetic assimilation: A
review of its potential proximate causes and evolutionary
consequences. *Ann Bot* 117(5):769–779.
- 833
- 834 73. Waddington CH (1942) Canalization of development and the
inheritance of acquired characters. *Nature* 150(3811):563–
565.
- 835
- 836 74. Waddington CH (1952) Selection of the genetic basis for an
acquired character. *Nature* 169(4302):625–626.
- 837
- 838 75. Waddington CH (1953) Genetic assimilation of an acquired
character. *Evolution* 7(2):118–126.
- 839
- 840 76. Burg KRL van der, et al. (2020) Genomic architecture of
a genetically assimilated seasonal color pattern. *Science*
370(6517):721–725.
- 841
- 842 77. Ntambi JM, et al. (2002) Loss of stearoyl-CoA desaturase-1
function protects mice against adiposity. *Proc Natl Acad
Sci* 99(17):11482–11486.
- 843
- 844 78. Lee S-H, et al. (2004) Lack of stearoyl-CoA desaturase 1
upregulates basal thermogenesis but causes hypothermia in
a cold environment. *J Lipid Res* 45(9):1674–1682.
- 845
- 846 79. Riddell EA, Patton JL, Beissinger SR (2022) Thermal adap-
tation of pelage in desert rodents balances cooling and insu-
lation. *Science* (in press).
- 847
- 848 80. Chen S, Zhou Y, Chen Y, Gu J (2018) Fastp: An ultra-fast
all-in-one FASTQ preprocessor. *Bioinformatics* 34(17):i884–
i890.
- 849
- 850 81. Dobin A, et al. (2013) STAR: Ultrafast universal RNA-seq
aligner. *Bioinformatics* 29(1):15–21.
- 851
- 852 82. Anders S, Pyl PT, Huber W (2015) HTSeq—a python frame-
work to work with high-throughput sequencing data. *Bioin-
formatics* 31(2):166–169.
- 853
- 854 83. Love MI, Huber W, Anders S (2014) Moderated estimation
of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2.
Genome Biol 15(12):550.
- 855
- 856 84. Mallard F, Jakšić AM, Schlötterer C (2018) Contesting the
evidence for non-adaptive plasticity. *Nature* 555(7698):E21–
E22.
- 857
- 858 85. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y (1995) Controlling the false dis-
covery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple
testing. *J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol* 57(1):289–300.
- 859
- 860 86. Langmead B, Salzberg SL (2012) Fast gapped-read align-
ment with bowtie 2. *Nat Methods* 9(4):357–359.
- 861
- 862 87. Geijn B van de, McVicker G, Gilad Y, Pritchard JK (2015)
WASP: Allele-specific software for robust molecular quanti-
tative trait locus discovery. *Nat Methods* 12(11):1061–1063.
- 863
- 864 88. Coolon JD, McManus CJ, Stevenson KR, Graveley BR,
Wittkopp PJ (2018) Corrigendum: Tempo and mode of reg-
ulatory evolution in drosophila. *Genome Res* 28(11):1766.
- 865
- 866 89. Mack KL, Nachman MW (2017) Gene regulation and speci-
ation. *Trends Genet* 33(1):68–80.
- 867
- 868 90. Zheng X, et al. (2012) A high-performance computing
toolset for relatedness and principal component analysis of
SNP data. *Bioinformatics* 28(24):3326–3328.
- 869
- 870 91. Yi X, et al. (2010) Sequencing of 50 human exomes reveals
adaptation to high altitude. *Science* 329(5987):75–78.
- 871
92. Crawford JE, et al. (2017) Natural selection on genes related
to cardiovascular health in high-altitude adapted andeans.
Am J Hum Genet 101(5):752–767.
- 872
93. Danecek P, et al. (2011) The variant call format and
VCFtools. *Bioinformatics* 27(15):2156–2158.
- 873
- 874
94. Malaspinas A-S, et al. (2016) A genomic history of aboriginal
australia. *Nature* 538(7624):207–214.
- 875
- 876
95. Quinlan AR, Hall IM (2010) BEDTools: A flexible suite
of utilities for comparing genomic features. *Bioinformatics*
26(6):841–842.
- 877
- 878
96. Mi H, Muruganujan A, Thomas PD (2013) PANTHER in
2013: Modeling the evolution of gene function, and other
gene attributes, in the context of phylogenetic trees. *Nucleic
Acids Res* 41:D377–86.
- 879
- 880
97. Thomas PD, et al. (2003) PANTHER: A library of protein
families and subfamilies indexed by function. *Genome Res*
13(9):2129–2141.
- 881
- 882
98. Weng M-P, Liao B-Y (2017) modPhEA: Model organism phe-
notype enrichment analysis of eukaryotic gene sets. *Bioin-
formatics* 33(21):3505–3507.
- 883
- 884
- 885