**Heterochiasmy Predictions**

Which bivalent level traits will be sexually dimorphic?

1. **SC length, *SC length will be sexually dimorphic***

**(result**) A. single SC are longer in females than male

B. (this differences in SC size is beyond the effect of XX), (the expected difference if XX was the only source of difference), ALL bivalents (by class) are longer in females than males. The distributions for female SCs within cells are all longer. (The bottom 25% of bivalents are longer in females than males)

**2) Normalized CO positions**

**A. *1CO normalized positions will be sexually dimorphic***

Telomere bias and uniform 1CO landscapes are (pretty conserved in all strains) (look closer at a few male Dom strains)

**B. Sis-co-ten (sister cohesin tension) will also be sexually dimorphic:** this metric reflects the overall uniform vs telomere pattern documented in males and females.

**C. Centromere and telomere distances will be sexually dimorphic**; males having more telomere positioned COs

**3) IFD,  *No predicted difference in physical distance between foci on the same foci across sexes.***

A. raw IFDs are longer in females, and normalized IFDs are longer in males. This is driven by more observations of lower normalized IFDs in females. (Try running the MM without PWD, MSM and SKIVE – Is sex a sig factor for normalized IFD) (I am not sure if I could classify the close IFD positions are different classes)

B. the high Rec strains (and SKIVE) have a male specific 30% normalized IFD lower threshold. (Males in these strains lack bivalents with very close foci on 2 CO bivalents)

Y = subsp \* sex + random(strain)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Traits** | Fixed Effects | | | Random Effect | Predictions met |
| **subsp** | **sex** | **subsp\*sex** | **strain** |
| SC length  All pooled | 0.364038  NS | -28.769236  Highly Sig | 6.037493  NS | Slightly significant | Yes, female bivalents are longer (still need to test XX adjustment) |
| Long.biv | -0.126264  NS | -23.719327  High sig | 6.096744  NS |  | (this model started throwing error) |
| 1CO | 1.616610  NS | -24.979951  Highly sig | 1.646027  NS |  |  |
| 2CO | -- | - | - |  | Can’t get these models to work |
| 3CO | -- | - | - |  | Can’t get these models to work, Na.omit() |
| 2CO\_IFD.raw | 0.448646  P= 0.8551 | -6.358345  P= 0.04751 | 3.661211  P= 0.38178 | X | **No**, the male effect coeff is  -6.5. Female IFDs are slightly longer. |
| 2CO\_IFD.PER  (1-0) | 0.004682 p= 0.737 | 0.072634  **p= 0.00553** | 0.026687  p= 0.41905 | p=0.0548 |
| 2CO\_IFD.PER  (-PWD,MSM,  SKIVE) | 0.008505  p=0.707425 | 0.071628  **p=0.000003** | -0.027552  p=0.320879 |  | Males slightly higher, sex is still significant. |
| Nrm.1CO.pos | X | p=0 | X | p=0 | Yes, the CO position (‘landscape’) traits are sexually dimorphic |
| Sis.co.ten | -0.981277  p=0.712167 | -20.767638  p=0 | 9.928147  p=0.005 | p=0.0018 |
| Telomere.dist | X | p=0 | X | p=0.0021 |
| Cent.dist | X | X | p=0.0009 | X |

-These results confirm that i) SC length/chromatin condensation and ii) differing recombination ‘landscapes’ are conserved chromosome level aspects of heterochiasmy.

-The predication for the IFD differences didn’t meet the null expectation. The IFD tests indicate that female IFD’s are generally longer compared to males.

-There might be more nuanced patterns and effects due to strains for the rec landscape and IFD. I plan to follow up these tests with post-hoc comparisons within each strain.

Do I have predictions for within strain comparisons?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SC Length**  **Means** | **Fmean**  **1CO** | **F**  **N**  **1CO** | **Mmean**  **1CO** | **M**  **N**  **1CO** | **Fmean**  **2CO** | **F**  **N**  **2CO** | **Mmean**  **2CO** | **M**  **N**  **2CO** | **Fmean**  **3CO** | **F**  **N**  **3CO** | **M.mean**  **3CO** | **M**  **N**  **3CO** |
| WSB | 92.58 | 540 | 68.86 | 472 | 112.58 | 187 | 85.62 | 107 | 121.70 | 31 | -- | -- |
| LEW | 94.965 | 433 | 73.92 | 409 | 112.57 | 245 | 91.868 | 106 | 125.43 | 28 | 89.50 | 10 |
| G | 101.77 | 457 | **78.455** | 797 | 123.55 | 242 | 94.49 | 183 | 135.58 | 19 | 95.20 | 10 |
| PWD | 100.25 | 698 | 77.49 | 365 | 119.44 | 286 | **97.24** | 301 | 118.41 | 36 | **99.33** | 9 |
| MSM | 104.69 | 362 | **80.48** | 77 | 127.51 | 159 | **95.406** | 91 | **150.62** | 21 | **97.000** | 5 |
| KAZ | 96.20 | 351 | **79.006** | 502 | 122.51 | 128 | 91.631 | 84 | **166.00** | 5 | 92.57 | 7 |
| SKIVE | 92.304 | 352 | 73.05 | 510 | 110.88 | 113 | 91.956 | 253 | 116.5 | 20 | **98.0** | 6 |
| MOLF |  |  | **78.58** | 326 |  |  | 92.794 | 97 |  |  | 94.6 | 5 |

(make a standardized name for these tables in R).

The 1CO pattern in males is a bit nuanced. The male high rec strains have longer 2CO bivalents. G also have higher average SC.

Run all these thru mixed models

--I should try to subsample these

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IFD** | **F.n** | **M.n** | **F.**  **mean**  **raw** | **M.IFD.**  **mean**  **raw** | **F.**  **norm** | **M.**  **norm** |
| WSB | 187 | 107 | 52.50538 | 47.14019 | 0.4602812 | 0.5362821 |
| LEW | 245 | 106 | 53.96327 | 51.80952 | 0.4791878 | 0.5533493 |
| G | 242 | 183 | 60.44583 | 52.55738 | 0.4886198 | 0.5477403 |
| PWD | 286 | 301 | 57.15088 | **58.81333** | 0.4770388 | **0.6018426** |
| MSM | 159 | **91** | 60.67089 | 56.25275 | 0.4711622 | 0.**5874693** |
| KAZ | 128 | **84** | 63.27344 | 48.94048 | 0.5087810 | 0.5239928 |
| SKIVE | 113 | 253 | 53.93805 | **57.61508** | 0.4846905 | 0.**6266287** |
| MOLF |  | 97 |  | 47.36458 |  | 0.5133379 |

The SKIVE male is normalized IFD is the highest! SKIVE male also has high Norm IFD, like PWD and MSM. – Is it strange that SKIVE has intermediate gwRR (but maybe some aspects are like MSM and PWD). \*\*SKIVE has (IFD) patterns that is closer to the high MSM-PWD\*\*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CO.Positions** | **F.n** | **M.n** | **F.mean** | **M.mean** | **Test (follow up on the sig fixed effect)** |
| WSB |  |  |  |  |  |
| LEW |  |  |  |  |  |
| G |  |  |  |  |  |
| PWD |  |  |  |  |  |
| MSM |  |  |  |  |  |
| KAZ |  |  |  |  |  |
| SKIVE |  |  |  |  |  |

(which metrics are used for this … normalized 1CO position) – In prev MS – I ran KS test to compare the density plots.

(centromere and telomere – these might not be the best metrics)

(sis-co-ten)?

Sis-co-ten by chromosomeLength --- There are distinct patterns by across sexes – In males the chrm classes (1CO, 2CO) separate/cluster very cleanly – where as they don’t separate / cluster in females.

**Sis-co-ten** – Even with in the normalized siscoten, I think the male data shows more clustering. I’m not sure

Sex and interaction are significant. – what does normalized sis.co.ten mean? I’m not sure that it’s most biologically relevant since I don’t think cohesion adjusts to size of chrms.

**Male Musc Polymorphism**

Which traits distinguish high and low recombining males in Musc strains? (High: MSM and PWD, Low: KAZ, SKIVE, MOLF).

1. **SC length**
   1. **SC length will be longer in high strains.**
2. **IFD**
   1. **Shorter IFD in high rec strains to allow denser packing of COs.**
3. **Normalized CO positions**
   1. **1CO normalized positions, will be the same (Null expectation)**
   2. **Pooled Sis-co-ten: higher in High rec strains because there are more 2COs,**

**Sis-co-ten separated by chromosome class, the strains will not be different (null expectation).**

* 1. **Pooled Centromere and telomere distances, – High rec will have shorter telomere and cent distance on average due to more 2COs.**
  2. **Separated by Chrm Class, the strains will not be different**

Two tests

1. Logistic regression, Rec Group ~ trait
2. T.tests (high vs low)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Traits** | **Logistic regression** | | **t.tests** | |  |
| **^all bivs** | **Mouse average** | **Single bivalent** | **Mouse average** | **Single**  **bivalent** | **Predictions** **met** |
| ^SC length | 0.0237 \* | <2e-16 \*\*\* | 0.001567 | < 2.2e-16 | Yes |
| 1CO | 0.0973 . | 0.179 | 0.1905 | < 2.2e-16 |  |
| 2CO | 0.0176 \* | 3.01e-05 \*\*\* | 0.03376 | < 2.2e-16 | No (2CO are distinct?) |
| 3CO | 0.223 | 0.567 | 0.3661 | 9.889e-08 |  |
| 2CO\_IFD.raw | 0.0366 \* | 9.98e-05 \*\*\* | 0.009133 | 3.595701e-05 | No, High Rec groups have longer, not shorter IFDs. |
| 2CO\_IFD.PER | 0.1143 | 0.0443 \* | 0.06068 | 1.304e-07 |
| Nrm.1CO.pos | 0.942 | 0.355 | 0.2558 | 0.3529 | Yes, (NS)  Yes, pooled pattern is sig, Separated chrm classes NS  No, (redo with chrm separated tests) |
| ^Sis.co.ten | 0.00725 \*\* | <2e-16 \*\*\* | 8.823e-12 | 4.74e-16 |
| Sis.co.ten\_1CO |  |  | 0.6619 |  |
| Sis.co.ten\_2CO |  |  | 0.1787 |  |
| Sis.co.ten\_3CO |  |  | 0.4327 |  |
| ^Telomere.dist | 0.0555 . | 0.00902 \*\* | 0.0007462 | 0.007452 |
| ^Telo.Dist\_PER |  | 1.32e-05 \*\*\* |  | 5.425e-06 |
| ^Cent.dist | 0.00368 \*\* | 5.21e-09 \*\*\* | 0.006659 | 3.658e-09 |
| ^Cent.Dist\_PER |  | 6.74e-16 \*\*\* |  | 4.52e-16 |  |

1. The general increase of SC length along with more DSB meets the model of increase gwRR stemming from changes early in the pathway (more SC area -> more DSB -> more COs).

2. Higher rec strains have more space between foci on the same bivalent, which goes the logic and general pattern I just outlined above. This indicates CO interference strength has also evolved with higher gwRR. These results require some follow up.

**Next Steps**

\*Follow up the SC Length differences with sub-sampling tests and **XX adjustment**.

\*t-tests show no difference between the siscoten scores when separated by chromosome class. Does this indicate that the t-test of pooled sis-co-ten is due to different proportions in the high and low strains? Follow up with sub-sampling permutations.

\*Run pairwise strain comparisons between these groups, currently I’m pooling MSM and PWD.

**Points for Paper**

- Heterochiasmy extends to chromosome level, (could stem from cell processes). SC / Chromatin compaction and placement of COs are conserved traits of heterochiasmy in house mouse.

-Interference (in the physical SC scale), may also be sexually dimorphic.

- Larger IFD/stronger interference might be act as a limit/suppressor of gwRR getting too high in the high Musc strains.

- Male High Rec strains in Musc have more 2CO bivalents per cell. It’s unclear if there are general patterns for the 2CO bivalents from a MSM and PWD cells that distinguish them from other Musc strains.