|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | **Reverse heterochiasmy direction**  Male > Female  gwRR | **Within mouse variance for CO number**  Eggs more variable than sperm in crossover per cell | **Broad Scale**  **Recombination Landscape**  Male telomere bias, Female uniform placement | **Chromatin Compaction**  Female, longer axis  Male, shorter axis | **Evolution of positive correlation interference strength and CO number** |
| Haploid selection  (Lenormand, 2003; Lenormand and Dutheil, 2005) | No  Generally males should evolve lower gwRR. | NA | NA  No prediction for broad scale recombination landscape. | NA  No prediction for chromosome axis. | NA |
| Two locus modifier  (Brandvain and Coop, 2012) | Yes  Depends on if rec. modifier:  i) suppresses or increases recombination,  ii) linked to driving loci,  iii) the stage in which the driver acts (MI or MII) | NA | Yes  Females will evolve higher RR and COs closer to centromeres to break up MI drive systems. | NA  No prediction for chromosome axis. | NA |
| S.A.C.E.  (Sardell and Kirkpatrick, 2020) | No  Males should evolve to be lower gwRR. | Yes  Maintaining regulatory and coding regions together lowers between cell variance in males. | Yes  Maintaining larger blocks of chromosomes positions crossovers to telomeres. | NA  No prediction for chromosome axis. | Yes  Stronger interference is equivalent to larger blocks of chromosomes segregation together. |
| MI Spindle based selection  (Altendorfer et al., 2020; Dernburg, 2001; Lee, 2019; van Veen and Hawley, 2003) | Yes  More effective checkpoint (SAC) will cause faster evolution in males relative to females. | Yes  Relaxed selection on SAC would increases variance across oocytes relative to spermatocytes. | Yes  Telomere position of single crossover chromosomes maximizes  sister cohesion with tension and may synchronize division of bivalents. | NA  No prediction for chromosome axis. | Yes  Amount of sister cohesion could:  i) stabilize bivalents and allow SAC to detect tension  or  ii) regulate the timing of entry into anaphase via modulating the rate of degradation of the sister cohesion. |
| Pairing based selection, C.O.M.  (Hultén, 2011) | NA  No evolution predictions. | NA  No prediction for between gamete variance. | Yes  Difference of interference in sexes is due to axis length differences. | Yes  Longer female axis driven by larger cell volume. | No  No prediction for reduction phase. |
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