Abstract

The signature of sexual selection has been revealed through the study of differences in patterns of genome-wide gene expression, both between the sexes and between alternative reproductive morphs within a single sex. What remains unclear, however, is whether differences in gene expression patterns between individuals of a given sex consistently map to variation in individual quality. Such a pattern, particularly if found in males, would provide unambiguous evidence that the phenotypic response to sexual selection is shaped through sex-specific alterations to the transcriptome. To redress this knowledge gap, we explored whether patterns of sex-biased gene expression are associated with variation in male reproductive quality in *Drosophila melanogaster*. We measured two male reproductive phenotypes, and their association with sex-biased gene expression, across a selection of inbred lines from the Drosophila Genetic Reference Panel. Genotypes with higher expression of male-biased genes produced males exhibiting shorter latencies to copulation, and higher capacity to inseminate females. Conversely, female-biased genes tended to show negative associations with these male reproductive traits across genotypes. We uncovered similar patterns, by reanalysing a published dataset from a second *D. melanogaster* population. Our results reveal the footprint of sexual selection in masculinising the male transcriptome.

Key words: DGRP, sex-biased genes, sexual selection, gene expression, sexual conflict

Introduction

Sex-specific regulation of gene expression is thought to facilitate the evolution of phenotypic sexual dimorphism from a genome that is largely shared by both sexes (Parisi, et al. 2004; Kopp, et al. 2008; Mank 2009; Parsch and Ellegren 2013; Dean and Mank 2016). As a result, thousands of genes show sex-biased expression across numerous taxa (Ranz, et al. 2003; Yang, et al. 2006; Ellegren and Parsch 2007; Reinius, et al. 2008). Male-biased genes (those with higher expression in males compared to females) are thought to typically encode male functions (Mank 2009), and they tend to have higher rates of evolution (Ranz, et al. 2003; Harrison, et al. 2015), potentially as a result of more intense sexual selection acting on males (Andersson 1994). Conversely, female-biased genes (those with higher expression in females compared to males) are thought to encode female functions. Sex-biases in gene expression therefore offer a key link in understanding how sex-specific selection acting on the phenotype shapes the evolution of the genome (Mank, et al. 2013). To date, this relationship has principally been explored at two phenotypic scales; between the sexes (Hollis, et al. 2014; Immonen, et al. 2014; Harrison, et al. 2015), and between alternative morphs within a single sex (Snell-Rood, et al. 2011; Pointer, et al. 2013; Stuglik, et al. 2014; Dean, et al. 2017). However, one phenotypic scale that has not yet been addressed is whether patterns of sex-biased gene expression reflect within-sex variation in individual quality.

A growing body of evidence suggests that sexual selection drives the evolution of sex-biased gene expression. For example, studies that applied divergent levels of sexual selection on replicate populations of *Drosophila* have found that reducing the intensity of sexual selection led to the evolution of feminised gene expression (i.e. an

48 increase in expression of female-biased genes) in both females and males (Hollis, et
49 al. 2014; Immonen, et al. 2014). Across longer evolutionary timescales, species
50 experiencing more intense sexual selection, as reflected in both their degree of sexual
51 ornamentation and indices of sperm competition, have a higher proportion of genes
52 with male-biased expression than species experiencing less intense sexual selection
53 (Harrison, et al. 2015).
54
55 Sex-biased gene expression has also been shown to facilitate the evolution of
56 alternative mating tactics within a single sex (Snell-Rood, et al. 2011; Pointer, et al.
57 2013; Stuglik, et al. 2014; Dean, et al. 2017). For example, in the wild turkey
58 (*Meleagris gallopavo*), the degree of elaboration of male secondary sexual
59 characteristics scales with sexual dimorphism in gene expression (Pointer, et al.
60 2013). Male turkeys can either become dominant or subordinate reproductive morphs
61 (Krakauer 2008). Dominant male morphs have more elaborate, sexually-selected
62 plumage ornamentation and exhibit higher levels of expression of male-biased genes
63 (i.e. more masculinised) compared to subordinate males which have less elaborate
64 ornamentation (Pointer, et al. 2013). These dominant male morphs also exhibit lower
65 expression of female-biased genes (i.e. defeminised expression), compared to
66 subordinate morphs. However, a somewhat contrasting pattern was observed in the
67 ocellated wrasse (*Symphodus ocellatus)*, a species that also exhibits alternative male
68 morphs, but with morphs that differ in both the level of sexual ornamentation (Alonzo
69 2008; Alonzo and Heckman 2010) as well as the level of sperm competition intensity
70 experienced (Alonzo and Warner 2000). In ocellated wrasse, there are three male
71 morphs. Territorial nesting males are brightly coloured and are preferred by females,
72 satellite males associate with a nesting male, and sneaker males are the smallest male

morph that attempt to procure fertilisations through subterfuge. Sneaker males are the lowest quality male morph with the lowest reproductive success (Alonzo, et al. 2000), and have low expression of both male- and female-biased gonadal genes. Satellite males experience a higher intensity of sperm competition than territorial males and have more masculinised (and defeminised) gene expression in the gonad than the territorial males (Dean, et al. 2017). However, contrary to the patterns seen in the turkey, the most ornamented, territorial morph does not express the most masculinised gene expression profile. Thus, these two studies combined suggest that sexual selection shaped transcriptomic signatures of precopulatory selection in the turkey, and postcopulatory selection in the wrasse. Taken together, these results suggest that sexual selection indeed has the capacity to masculinise (and defeminise) patterns of gene expression throughout the transcriptome. However, whether these patterns of masculinisation of gene expression extend to species without distinct male morphs apparent to human eyes, remains to be tested.

Under the assumption that male-biased expression confers phenotypic effects of male-benefit and female-detriment, while female-biased expression confers the converse (Mank 2009), we may predict that variation in expression levels of male-biased genes will lie at the heart of population-level variation in male quality. Expression levels of certain male-biased genes, with known effects on components of male reproductive fitness, are likely to contribute to variation in male quality within a population. For example, many genes on the mammalian Y chromosome play a major role in male fertility (Lahn and Page 1997). However, many sexually selected traits are likely to be polygenic in their underlying genetics (Gleason, et al. 2002; Chenoweth, et al. 2008; Poissant, et al. 2008), as demonstrated by sexually selected traits associating with

many quantitative trait loci with only small effect (Limousin, et al. 2012; Randall, et al. 2013; Veltsos, et al. 2015). This has also recently been illustrated in a study on sperm morphology and swimming speed, polygenic traits that predict fertilising advantage in zebra finch (Kim, et al. 2017). In particular, 108 genes were differentially expressed between lines of zebra finch that were under artificial selection for long and short sperm length (Kim, et al. 2017). These genes were over-represented on the avian Z chromosome and tended to be up-regulated in long sperm lines (Kim, et al. 2017). Just as up-regulation of many genes contributes to variation in these sperm traits in the zebra finch, higher expression of an aggregate of male-biased genes (and lower expression of female-biased genes), each with small effect, may be important in determining variation in male quality in general.

In this study, therefore, we aimed to test whether variation in male quality is positively associated with the expression of male-biased genes, and negatively associated with the expression of female-biased genes, in *D. melanogaster*. We used the Drosophila Genetic Reference Panel (DGRP) (Mackay, et al. 2012; Huang, et al. 2014), which consists of inbred lines derived from a population collected in Raleigh (North Carolina, USA). We measured two different aspects of male mating behaviour; latency to copulate and number of females inseminated within a defined period of time. We first tested whether these two aspects of male quality were correlated with gene expression. We next tested whether the strength and direction of the associations between phenotype and gene expression were affected by sex-biased expression of the gene (i.e. whether the gene was male- or female-biased). We also performed a Genome Wide Association (GWA) to locate SNPs that associate with these phenotypes. Finally, we compared our results to those of a different population, by

analysing patterns of gene expression and male fitness under competitive conditions in the LH_M laboratory population (a wild-type outbred population) of *D. melanogaster*, using the dataset of Innocenti and Morrow (2010).

Methods

Fly culturing

Flies were maintained on a cornmeal-molasses-agar diet (Ayroles, et al. 2009), under a 12:12 light:dark cycle at 25°C. We used 33 (out of the core 38) DGRP lines, which were available in the laboratory of the authors. Each DGRP line was propagated by culturing 8 males and 8 females per 40 ml vial (each vial containing 6 ml of food medium), with three vials per DGRP line. These vials were propagated by culling the number of eggs per vial to 100, with flies transferred to fresh vials across three successive days (i.e. a total of 9 vials per DGRP line).

Generating a "Raleigh mixed" population

We created an outbred population of flies, which was used to source females (hereafter "tester" females) that would be mated to the focal DGRP-line males in the experiments measuring male quality. To this end, five virgin males and five virgin females were collected from each of the 33 DGRP lines, and all the individuals combined and cultured in a 250ml bottle containing 60 ml food medium. After the first generation, we maintained this population across 50 vials, each propagated by eight pairs, and standardising egg density to 100 eggs per vial. Adult offspring to emerge from these 50 vials were then admixed during culturing each generation before being redistributed back out to 50 fresh vials. The Raleigh-mixed population was maintained in this way for three generations before the experiment started. Virgin

females from this population were collected, and stored in groups of five per vial, for use as tester females in the experiments described below. Vials containing these tester females were checked prior to the experimental assays of male quality to ensure the absence of larval activity within the vials (thus guaranteeing the females were all virgins).

Measuring male quality

Male mating behaviours were tested against four-day old virgin tester females from the Raleigh mixed population. The diets of these tester females were supplemented with two doses of a standardised yeast solution (20μl of 0.16 g/ml yeast slurry solution, per group of females, made from reverse osmosis water), the first provided 2.5 days prior to the behavioural assays, and the other provided immediately prior to the assays.

A single four-day old male from each DGRP line was transferred, by aspiration, into a vial of five virgin females. Observations were made of time taken for the male to initiate copulation. If males failed to mate within 120 minutes following their introduction to the tester-female vial, a maximum value for latency to copulate of 120 minutes was assigned to that male. Assays started 3 hours after the lights came on in the temperature-controlled room in which the flies were maintained, to coincide with peak mating activity (Sakai and Ishida 2001). The DGRP lines were tested in a randomised order. Observations were carried out in a temperature-controlled laboratory set to 25 °C. Two replicates (flies) per DGRP line were tested per experimental sampling block, for a total of six blocks, where each block was a separate generation of flies. Once the latency to copulate assays were completed, each

vial – containing the five tester females and one focal male – was placed back in the incubator, to cohabit for 24 h.

Following this first 24 h period of cohabitation, each focal male was transferred to a fresh vial containing another five virgin 4-day old tester females that had been given the standardised yeast supplements (20μl of solution 2.5 days and immediately prior to the introduction to the DGRP male), and provided with another 24 h period of cohabitation with this new set of females. The five females from the first cohabitation period were each transferred to their own individual vial, thus kept in singleton, each vial of which had 5μl of yeast solution added to the surface of the food medium. A small incision was made in the surface of the food medium to facilitate normal levels of fecundity when females lay in isolation (Rice, et al. 2005; Long and Rice 2007). After the second 24 h period of cohabitation, each focal male was discarded, and the second set of five tester females were also each transferred to their own yeasted-supplemented vial, with the food once again cut with a spatula to encourage egg laying.

Following cohabitation, the tester females were provided with 24 h to lay eggs, after which these females were also discarded. These vials were kept in temperature-controlled rooms for 12 more days to allow any fertilised eggs to develop into adults, The insemination capacity of each focal male was measured as the number of tester females (a maximum of 10 per male) producing pupae.

We also analysed published data on competitive male fertility within the LH_M population; an outbred, laboratory-adapted population (Innocenti and Morrow 2010).

198 Innocenti & Morrow (2010) generated hemiclones (genetically identical for half of
199 the diploid genome, Abbott and Morrow 2011) and screened them for total adult
200 lifetime fitness. This was done in a competitive assay environment, where five males
201 per hemiclone genotype were tested with 10 competitor males (with bw^- brown eye
202 colour markers) and 15 virgin bw^- females for two days. Females were then separated
203 from males and allowed to lay eggs for 18 hours. The progeny were scored for eye
204 colour to assign paternity to the hemiclone (bw^+/bw^- offspring) or competitor (bw^-/bw^-
205 offspring) males to obtain a measure of relative adult male fitness. This assay was
206 replicated 6 times per hemiclone genotype. Phenotype data are available from
207 (www.sussex.ac.uk/lifesci/morrowlab/data).
208
209 **Gene expression**
210 Gene expression data were downloaded from Huang et al. (2015), comprising two
211 replicates per sex for each DGRP line (n_{genes} = 18,140). These data were the
212 summarised gene expression data (http://dgrp2.gnets.ncsu.edu/data.html) pre-
213 processed from Illumina TruSeq mRNA-seq. Briefly, data consisted of 25 pooled
214 female flies or 40 pooled male flies per replicate per DGRP line. Therefore, for each
215 DGRP line we had the estimated average level of expression for males and females.
216 Sex-bias for each gene was calculated as the $\log_2$ fold change between the average
217 expression across all males divided by the average expression across all females ($\log_2$
218 fold change male:female). Full methods can be found in Huang et al. (2015).
219
220 For the LH_M dataset (Innocenti and Morrow 2010), gene expression data were
221 measured using microarrays, from four replicates per hemiclone per sex. Sex-biased

gene expression was analysed in the same way to the analyses described above for the DGRP lines.

Statistical analyses

Genetic variation for male quality

We first determined whether we could detect genetic variation for our different measures of male reproductive quality across the DGRP lines. Latency to copulate was log transformed to approximate a normal distribution. Log-transformed latency to copulate was fitted with a linear mixed model and REML algorithm using the lme4 package (Bates, et al. 2012) in R v. 3.3.1. An intercept of 1 was specified, and block and DGRP line were specified as random factors (model: male quality measure = 1 + $block_{(random)}$ + DGRP $line_{(random)}$). Log-likelihood ratios tests were used to assess statistical significance (at $p < 0.05$) for the random factors by quantifying change in deviance when removing each random effect from the model.

Male insemination capacity was fitted with a generalised linear model, an intercept of 1 and Poisson error distribution (model: male insemination capacity ~ 1). The model was then tested for underdispersion using the AER package (Kleiber and Zeileis 2008) in R. Since the data were underdispersed (dispersion estimate = 0.63, $z = -4.7$, $p < 0.0001$), a GLMM model using Penalized Quasi-Likelihood (PQL) and quasipoisson error distribution was fitted using the MASS package (Venables and Ripley 2002) in R (model: male quality measure = 1 + $block_{(random)}$ + DGRP $line_{(random)}$). Log-likelihood ratio tests are not supported for PQL fits since they require an optimisation criterion (Venables and Ripley 2002), and as such we do not provide p-values for the random effects for male insemination capacity. To test whether our

two measures of male quality were correlated, we ran a linear regression between male insemination capacity and latency to copulate.

Calculation of genetic covariance and heritability

We used a mixed-effect model to estimate the heritability of male reproductive phenotypes using MCMCglmm v2.24 (Hadfield, 2010). Log transformed latency to copulate was modelled with a Gaussion error distribution with Block as a fixed effect and DGRP line as a random effect. We specified the prior for the residual and random effects variances as 0.002, which is weakly informative for small sample sizes with larger variances. We specified the default priors for the fixed effects. Two independent MCMC chains (Griffith, et al. 2016) were run for 250,000 iterations with a burn-in of 75,000. Convergence was visually checked using trace plots and autocorrelation scores. The distribution of heritability values was taken as the ratio of the posterior distributions of the additive (VA) and phenotypic (VP) variances with the mean giving our heritability estimate for each phenotype.

For male insemination capacity an ordinal error distribution was specified with Block as a fixed effect and DGRP line as a random effect. Residual and random variances were fixed at 1. Iterations were increased to 25,000,000 with a burn-in of 5,000,000 however models failed to converge.

Associations between male quality and gene expression

Since long latencies to copulate denote lower quality males, we transformed this measure (Inverse latency to copulate = 1/latency to copulate). This means that high values equate to males that were quick to copulate and low values equate to males that were slow to copulate, facilitating clearer comparison between the two male quality

measures. We next scaled each male quality measure to have mean of zero and standard deviation of one to facilitate comparison between the measures.

For each gene, Spearman's rho correlation coefficient (ρ) was calculated between the average phenotypic measure of male quality (for each of the two traits) per genotype and the estimated average level of gene expression for males in each DGRP line ($n_{genotypes}$ = 33, model: Average male quality ~ Average expression of $gene_1$). For each gene, we therefore had a value of ρ which measures the rank order correlation between phenotype and gene expression.

Next, we tested how sex-biased gene expression affected the direction and strength of the relationship between male quality phenotype and gene expression. We analysed the relationship between ρ and sex-bias in gene expression as a continuous variable (i.e. $\log_2$ fold change in expression for males:females). For illustration purposes, we plotted mean ρ for 0.1 increments of sex-bias (Mank et al 2008, Dean & Mank 2016), weighting the size of each data point by the number of genes in each increment. We analysed this relationship in two ways. First, we analysed the rank order monotonic relationship between ρ and sex-bias across all genes using Spearman's rank correlation. Second, because male-biased and female-biased genes may show different relationships with male phenotype we split genes into male-biased (i.e. those with more than twice the expression in males compared to females i.e. $\log_2$ male:female > 1) and female-biased (i.e. those with more than twice the expression in females compared to males i.e. $\log_2$ male:female < -1). We then tested for linear and quadratic relationships between ρ and sex-bias for male- and female-biased genes and plotted the model fitted line. If the quadratic relationship was non-significant,

correcting for multiple testing (adjusted $\alpha = 0.00125$, (at $p = 0.01$, with 8 different tests)), we present the linear model.

We also ran linear mixed effects models to test whether the expression of male-biased genes was more positively correlated with male phenotype than female-biased genes. Using lmer in R (Bates, et al. 2015), we specified the model: phenotype ~ gene expression * sex-bias + (1|geneID), where each data point is a DGRP line (such that there are $n_{lines} \times n_{genes}$ (i.e. $33 \times 18{,}140$) data points, and n_{genes} repeated measures of each line). The number of iterations was increased to 50,000. The fitted model lines for male-biased, female-biased and unbiased genes were plotted using the Effects package (Fox 2003) in R. We also ran separate models for male-biased, female-biased and unbiased genes using the model: phenotype ~ gene expression + (1|geneID).

Sex chromosomes and associations between gene expression and male quality

Because the sex chromosomes contain an excess or deficit of sex-biased genes (Parisi, et al. 2003; Ranz, et al. 2003), we next identified genes on the X and Y chromosomes. Analyses for the association between ρ and sex-bias were repeated, splitting genes up based on their chromosomal location on the X chromosome or the autosomes. We also looked at the relationship between gene expression and male phenotype for individual genes on the Y chromosome.

GWA to identify SNPs that associate with male quality

A GWA using the DGRP resource (Mackay, et al. 2012; Huang, et al. 2014) was run to identify SNPs that associate with male quality. Since many SNPs are in high linkage with each other, we implemented a SNP clumping approach using bigsnpr

package in R (Privé, et al. 2018). After filtering out SNPs based upon missing genotypes and low minor allele frequency (< 0.05), SNPs were clumped together if they had $r^2 > 0.05$ (estimated from Fig. 1C Mackay, et al. 2012). Out of the 1.2 million SNPs that were tested for our 33 DGRP lines, this left 715 SNPs that were not in linkage (see supplementary methods for more information on quality control thresholds). Next, the p-values from the GWAS regression were adjusted for multiple testing using the FDR method and SNPs that significantly associate with the male phenotypes at the level of $P_{adj} < 0.05$ are reported in the supplementary information. We conducted a power analysis using the pwr package in R (Champely 2017) to test the power to detect an association between a single SNP and the male phenotypes (i.e. not simultaneously testing all 1.2 millions SNPs) specifying a sample size of 33, an effect size of 0.1, and significant level of 0.05.

Associations between male quality and gene expression for LH_M population

We also analysed the association between male gene expression and male quality, as measured by competitive male fertility, in the LH_M dataset (Innocenti and Morrow 2010). This dataset consists of 15 hemiclones, specifically chosen out of a population of 100 hemiclones, for their sexually antagonistic fitness. These 15 hemiclones consist of 5 lines with high male fitness and low female fitness, 5 lines with low male fitness and high female fitness, and 5 lines with intermediate fitness in both males and females, where fitness was defined using the competitive male fertility assay described previously. As before, Spearman's rho rank order correlation (ρ) was calculated, per gene, between male gene expression and male phenotype ($n_{hemiclones} = 15$). The association between ρ (i.e. the correlation between gene expression and

phenotype), and sex-biased gene expression was analysed in the same way as for the DGRP dataset.

All analyses were performed in R (v.3.3.1) (R-Core-Team 2016).

Results

Phenotypic associations with male quality

Across the 33 inbred lines, we detected significant genetic variation for latency to copulate (Table 1, Figure 1). For male insemination capacity, we are unable to use the log-likelihood ratio test on PQL fits, however standard deviations for DGRP line and block are presented in Table 1. For latency to copulate, VA = 0.054 (SD = 0.017) and VP = 0.176 (SD = 0.019) Heritability for latency to copulate was 0.30 (SD = 0.066, 95% CI 0.19-0.44). There was no association between male insemination capacity and copulation latency (Figure 2).

Associations between male quality and male gene expression

No individual gene showed a significant Spearman's ρ correlation between male expression level and male quality phenotype after FDR correction for multiple testing, for either of the male quality phenotypes measured.

<u>Latency to copulate</u>

There was a significant monotonic relationship between ρ (i.e. the rank order correlation between gene expression and latency to copulate) and sex-biased gene

371 expression (Figure 3A, Spearman's rho = 0.576, $p < 0.0001$), such that the rank order
372 of ρ increases with increasing sex-bias.
373
374 More specifically, dividing genes into male-biased and female-biased revealed a
375 significant quadratic relationship for male-biased genes (Figure 3A, Estimate = -0.01,
376 $F_{2,71} = 266$, $p < 0.0001$), such that as genes become more male-biased ρ increases and
377 then declines. These results suggest that higher expression of male-biased genes
378 confers a higher quality male phenotype (i.e. shorter latency to copulate) up until
379 extreme male-biased expression of around $\log_2$ fold change male:female > 5.
380
381 There was also a significant quadratic relationship for female-biased genes (Figure
382 3A, Estimate = -0.006, $F_{2,60} = 8.0$, $p = 0.0002$). As genes get more female-biased, ρ
383 increases moderately and then declines for genes with more extreme degrees of
384 female-bias. In other words, high expression of weakly female-biased genes confers
385 male reproductive advantage, but high expression of extremely female-biased genes
386 confers a lower quality male phenotype (i.e. long latency to copulate).
387
388 Male insemination capacity
389 There was a significant monotonic relationship between ρ (i.e. the relationship
390 between gene expression and male insemination capacity) and sex-biased gene
391 expression (Figure 3B, Spearman's rho = 0.714, $p < 0.0001$) such that the rank order
392 of ρ increases with increasing sex-bias.
393
394 Dividing genes into those with male-biased and female-biased expression revealed a
395 linear relationship for female-biased genes (Figure 3B, Estimate = 0.02, $F_{1,61} = 37.0$, p

396 < 0.0001) and a curvilinear relationship for male-biased genes (Figure 3B, Estimate =
397 -0.004, $F_{2,77}$ = 114, p < 0.0001). In other words, for male-biased genes, higher
398 expression in males equates to a high insemination capacity. This relationship levels
399 out for extremely male-biased genes. For female-biased genes, high expression in
400 males equates to low male insemination capacity.
401
402 Linear mixed model approach
403 We also ran linear mixed effects models to test whether the expression of male-biased
404 genes was more positively correlated with male phenotype than female-biased genes.
405 We found significant interactions between sex-bias and male gene expression for
406 latency to copulate and male insemination capacity (Figure 4A, B). For male-biased
407 genes, gene expression was positively associated with inverse latency to copulate
408 (Figure 4A, Estimate ± Standard error = 0.0061 ± 0.0017, d.f = 1, F-ratio = 13.45, p =
409 0.0002) and positively associated with male insemination capacity (Figure 4A,
410 Estimate ± Standard error = 0.0080 ± 0.0017, d.f = 1, F-ratio = 23.11, p < 0.0001).
411
412 For female-biased genes, gene expression was not associated with inverse latency to
413 copulate (Figure 4A, Estimate ± Standard error = 0.0005 ± 0.0021, d.f = 1, F-ratio =
414 0.045, p = 0.829) and was negatively associated with male insemination capacity
415 (Figure 4B, Estimate ± Standard error = -0.0050 ± 0.0021, d.f = 1, F-ratio = 5.47, p =
416 0.0193).
417
418 For unbiased genes, gene expression was not associated with inverse latency to
419 copulate (Figure 4A, Estimate ± Standard error = -0.0004 ± 0.0007, d.f = 1, F-ratio =
420 0.265, p = 0.607) and was negatively associated with male insemination capacity

(Figure 4B, Estimate ± Standard error = -0.0017 ± 0.0007, d.f = 1, F-ratio = 5.99, p = 0.0144). Our results reveal qualitatively similar patterns using the two different analytical approaches.

Sex chromosomes and associations between male gene expression and male quality

We next tested for associations between male gene expression on the sex chromosomes and male quality. For inverse latency to copulate, genes on both the autosomes (Figure 5A, rho = 0.548, $p < 0.0001$) and the X chromosome (Figure 5A, rho = 0.307, p = 0.0004) showed significant monotonic relationships.

This relationship was driven by male-biased genes on both the autosomes (Estimate = -0.011, $F_{2,77} = 232$, $p < 0.0001$) and X chromosome (Estimate = -0.012, $F_{2,54} = 11.2$, p = 0.0007). There was no significant relationship between ρ and sex bias for female-biased genes on the autosomes or X chromosome.

Similarly, for male insemination capacity, genes on both the autosomes (Figure 5B, rho = 0.685, $p < 0.0001$) and the X chromosome (Figure 5B, rho = 0.642, $p < 0.0001$) showed significant monotonic relationships. This relationship was driven by genes on the autosomes for both male-biased (autosomes: Estimate = -0.004, $F_{2,77} = 96.8$, $p < 0.0001$) and female-biased genes (autosomes: Estimate = 0.02, $F_{1,56} = 36.3$, $p < 0.0001$). There was no significant relationship for sex-biased genes on the X chromosome.

No genes on the Y chromosome had a significant association between male gene expression and male phenotype, for either of the male quality phenotypes measured.

Associations between male quality and gene expression for a different *Drosophila* population

Finally, we repeated the analysis for a different population of *D. melanogaster* (LH_M), using the dataset of Innocenti and Morrow (2010). In this dataset, male quality across a set of hemiclonal lines was measured as male reproductive success when five focal hemiclonal males competed against ten competitor males over 15 females (Innocenti and Morrow 2010). There was a significant monotonic relationship between ρ and sex-bias (Figure 6, rho = 0.586, $p < 0.0001$). Male-biased genes showed a significant quadratic increase in ρ as sex-bias increases (Estimate = 0.005, $F_{2,87} = 40.3$, $p < 0.0001$). Female-biased genes showed no quadratic or linear relationship between ρ and sex-bias. In other words, there was no relationship between male phenotype and expression of female-biased genes, but higher expression of male-biased genes confers higher male reproductive success and lower expression of male-biased genes confers a lower male reproductive success.

Genome-wide association on male quality measures

We conducted a GWA to detect SNPs that associate with our male phenotypes. After correcting for linkage disequilibrium using SNP clumping (Privé, et al. 2018), the GWA found one SNP on the X chromosome that associated with copulation latency (Table S1 in supplementary material) and no SNPs that associated with male insemination capacity, following FDR correction for multiple testing at the threshold of 0.05. However, a power analysis showed that our GWA had only a small (13%)

chance of detecting SNPs with a 10% effect on the fitness phenotype, suggesting that our study lacks power and is likely to have missed many SNPs with a small effect on male phenotype.

Discussion

Gene expression studies of alternative male mating tactics have been used to study how sexual dimorphism in phenotypes scales with sexual dimorphism in gene expression, and to investigate how sperm competition intensity shapes patterns of male-biased gene expression within the gonads (Pointer, et al. 2013; Dean, et al. 2017). However, whether these patterns of masculinisation of gene expression extend to species without distinct male morphs has remained untested. Here, we explored whether variation in expression levels of male-biased genes associates with variation in components of male reproductive quality, in *D. melanogaster*, a species lacking clear alternative male mating tactics. We used two different populations of flies, each of which captures genetic variation within the population through the use of inbred lines (fully isogenic diploid genomes) or hemiclonal lines (isogenised haploid genomes placed alongside a randomised haploid genome).

In the DGRP population, we found that as sex-biased gene expression becomes more male-biased, genes showed stronger associations (more positive Spearman's ρ) between gene expression and phenotype. This was the case for both components of male quality; male latency to copulation, and male insemination capacity. We also found positive slopes between gene expression and male phenotype for male-biased genes for both phenotypes. Thus, for male-biased genes, higher expression in males is

associated with a higher quality male phenotype. For female-biased genes, lower expression in males is associated with a high quality male phenotype, however the shape of these relationships was different across the two phenotypes measured.

Surprisingly, we found associations between male phenotype and gene expression peaked at intermediate levels of male-bias (i.e. $\log_2$ fold change male:female ~ 5), rather than following a linear relationship. Although we are unable to ascertain why strongly sex-biased genes do not show strong associations with male phenotype, we can speculate about the causes. One reason may be that sexual conflict may have been resolved through past sexually antagonistic selection for strongly sex-biased genes, meaning that current expression variation is no longer antagonistic (Rowe, et al. 2018). In line with this, a similar pattern has been shown in human and fly populations that looked at sex-biased gene expression and $F_{ST,}$ a measure of genetic divergence between males and females due to differences in viability selection (Cheng and Kirkpatrick 2016). This study showed that genes with intermediate sex-bias are targets of strongest sex-specific selection and that genes with either strong or weak sex-bias are under weaker sex-specific selection (Cheng and Kirkpatrick 2016). This may explain why, in our study, genes with intermediate sex-bias associate most strongly with male quality phenotype. It is important to note, however, that sex-specific selection resulting from differences in reproductive fitness may reveal different patterns (Wright, et al. 2018).

For male reproductive success in the LH_M population, the pattern for male-biased genes was similar to the DGRP population, with higher expression of male-biased genes linked to higher male reproductive success. However, in this population no

relationship was found for female-biased genes. This convergence on similar patterns between the two populations (DGRP and LH_M) for male-biased genes is striking, given that the male quality traits measured in each of the populations differed in an important way. In our assays of the DGRP dataset, we measured traits that reflected pre-copulatory components of reproductive success (latency to copulation and capacity to secure matings with multiple females). However, the male quality measure in the LH_M population (paternity success when competing against rival males for fertilizations of multiple females) will have been shaped by both pre- and post-copulatory components, as well as by stochastic environmental factors associated with the experimental design, such as the timing of which males procured the final mating with a given female prior to egg laying (given the strong second male sperm precedence in *D. melanogaster*). This suggests that the patterns we have uncovered between levels of male-bias in gene expression and male reproductive quality are general across the gamut of male reproductive traits, including those under pre-copulatory and post-copulatory selection.

Maintenance of genetic variation

It is thought that genetic variation for male sexually selected traits is maintained within populations, despite strong directional selection (the lek paradox, Taylor and Williams 1982; Kirkpatrick and Ryan 1991), due to condition-dependence (Rowe and Houle 1996; Tomkins, et al. 2004), and/or a large number of loci contributing to condition (Rowe and Houle 1996). The male quality traits we measured in our study are likely to be highly condition-dependent given they reflect male sexual behaviours, which may result in a large environmental influence on our trait measures, thus reducing the capacity to have detected genotypic associations between the traits and

patterns of gene expression at the sample sizes used. Although some of the DGRP lines showed substantial variation in male quality measures across the different replicates and blocks (Figure 1), suggesting that environmental variation plays a role in determining trait values, our analyses show that genotype contributed to variation in male quality measures to a greater extent than variation across blocks (Table 1). Furthermore, we note that we attempted to carefully control for potential environmental sources of variation from affecting our results, through regulating egg densities of clutches that produced the focal males and tester females, standardising the ages of the parental flies that produced the focal and tester flies, and standardizing both the dietary and thermal conditions.

The second component explaining maintenance of genetic variation in male sexually selected traits relates to many loci contributing to trait expression (Rowe and Houle 1996). In line with this, our results are consistent with the expression of many male-biased genes, each with small effect, contributing to male quality, rather than a few candidate genes whose expression strongly correlated with male quality. While relationships between sex-biased gene expression and individual quality have previously been reported in species with alternative male morphs (Pointer, et al. 2013; Dean, et al. 2017), our study reveals that similar transcriptomic patterns determine variation in male quality within a population, in a species that does not exhibit clearly divergent male morphs..

Sex chromosomes

Due to their asymmetric patterns of inheritance and difference in copy number between the sexes, the sex chromosomes are expected to play a role in encoding sex

differences (Mank 2009). It is well established that the sex chromosomes harbour a non-random distribution of sex-biased genes, but whether these sex-biased genes play a key role in contributing to sex differences in phenotypic expression is less well understood (Beukeboom and Perrin 2014; Dean and Mank 2014). The X chromosome in *Drosophila* contains an excess of female-biased genes (Ranz, et al. 2003) and few strongly male-biased genes (Parisi, et al. 2003), and thus we may not expect X-linked male-biased genes to reflect variation in male quality to the same extent as male-biased genes across the whole of the genome. Accordingly, the relationship between expression of male-biased genes and male quality was less pronounced for X-linked genes. On the other hand, the Y chromosome experiences strictly paternal transmission, and should be a prime location for genes that affect male reproduction (Lahn and Page 1997). However, we did not find any association between variation in expression of Y-linked genes and male reproductive quality. Notwithstanding, the Y chromosome also exerts a large regulatory role on the rest of the genome, affecting the expression of hundreds to thousands of autosomal genes (Lemos, et al. 2008), and thus the true influence of the Y chromosomes to encoding the male reproductive phenotypes is likely to extend well beyond the contribution of the few protein-coding genes located on it.

To conclude, we found that higher expression of male-biased genes is associated with variation in male phenotypes associated with the outcomes of reproduction. Since we did not identify specific genes whose expression correlated with these reproductive phenotypes, it is likely that male reproductive quality is underpinned by the concerted action of many genes of small effect. Notably, the patterns we revealed were consistent across two different *D. melanogaster* populations, and across a diverse set

595 of reproductive traits; those shaped primarily by pre-copulatory sexual selection, and
596 those shaped by pre- and post-copulatory selection. This indicates that the
597 transcriptomic patterns that we have uncovered are likely to reflect pervasive
598 responses to selection on males, at least amongst *Drosophila*.
599
600

601 ## Literature Cited

602 Abbott JK, Morrow EH. 2011. Obtaining snapshots of genetic variation using
603 hemiclonal analysis. Trends in Ecology and Evolution 26:359-368.

604 Alonzo SH. 2008. Female mate choice copying affects sexual selection in wild
605 populations of the ocellated wrasse. Animal Behaviour 75:1715-1723.

606 Alonzo SH, Heckman KL. 2010. The unexpected but understandable dynamics of
607 mating, paternity and paternal care in the ocellated wrasse. Proceedings of the Royal
608 Society B-Biological Sciences 277:115-122.

609 Alonzo SH, Taborsky M, Wirtz P. 2000. Male alternative reproductive behaviours
610 in a Mediterranean wrasse, Symphodus ocellatus: evidence from otoliths for multiple
611 life-history pathways. Evolutionary Ecology Research 2:997-1007.

612 Alonzo SH, Warner RR. 2000. Allocation to mate guarding or increased sperm
613 production in a Mediterranean wrasse. American Naturalist 156:266-275.

614 Andersson M. 1994. Sexual Selection. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

615 Ayroles JF, Carbone MA, Stone EA, Jordan KW, Lyman RF, Magwire MM,
616 Rollmann SM, Duncan LH, Lawrence F, Anholt RR, et al. 2009. Systems genetics of
617 complex traits in Drosophila melanogaster. Nature Genetics 41:299-307.

618 Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B. 2012. lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using
619 S4 classes: R package version 0.999999-0.

620 Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B, Walker S. 2015. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects
621 Models Using lme4. Journal of Statistical Software 67:1-48.

622 Beukeboom L, Perrin N. 2014. The Evolution of Sex Determination: Oxford
623 University Press.

624 Champely S. 2017. pwr: Basic Functions for Pwer Analysis.: R package version
625 1.2-1.

626 Cheng C, Kirkpatrick M. 2016. Sex-Specific Selection and Sex-Biased Gene
627 Expression in Humans and Flies. PLoS Genetics 12:e1006170.

628 Chenoweth SF, Rundle HD, Blows MW. 2008. Genetic constraints and the
629 evolution of display trait sexual dimorphism by natural and sexual selection.
630 American Naturalist 171:22-34.

631 Dean R, Mank JE. 2014. The role of sex chromosome in sexual dimorphism:
632 discordance between molecular and phenotypic data. Journal of Evolutionary Biology
633 27:1443-1453.

634 Dean R, Mank JE. 2016. Tissue-specific and sex-specific regulatory variation
635 permit the evolution of sex-biased gene expression. American Naturalist 188:E74-
636 E84.

637 Dean R, Wright AE, Marsh-Rollo SE, Nugent BM, Alonzo SH, Mank JE. 2017.
638 Sperm competition shapes gene expression and sequence evolution in the ocellated
639 wrasse. Molecular Ecology 26:505-518.

640 Ellegren H, Parsch J. 2007. The evolution of sex-biased genes and sex-biased gene
641 expression. Nature Reviews Genetics 8:689-698.

642 Fox J. 2003. Effect Displays in R for Generalised Linear Models. Journal of
643 Statistical Software 8:1-27.

644 Gleason JM, Nuzhdin SV, Ritchie MG. 2002. Quantitative trait loci affecting a
645 courtship signal in Drosophila melanogaster. Heredity 89:1-6.

646 Griffith RM, Schielzeth H, Friberg U. 2016. Autosomal and X-Linked Additive
647 Genetic Variation for Lifespan and Aging: Comparisons Within and Between the
648 Sexes in Drosophila melanogaster. Genes, Genomes, Genetics 6:3903-3911.

649 Harrison PW, Wright AE, Zimmer F, Dean R, Montgomery SH, Pointer MA,
650 Mank JE. 2015. Sexual selection drives evolution and rapid turnover of male gene
651 expression. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA 112:4393-4398.

652 Hollis B, Houle D, Yan Z, Kawecki TJ, Keller L. 2014. Evolution under
653 monogamy feminizes gene expression in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Nature
654 Communications 5:3482.

655 Huang W, Carbone MA, Magwire MM, Peiffer JA, Lyman RF, Stone EA, Anholt
656 RR, Mackay TF. 2015. Genetic basis of transcriptome diversity in Drosophila
657 melanogaster. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States
658 of America 112:E6010–E6019.

659 Huang W, Massouras A, Inoue Y, Peiffer J, Ramia M, Tarone AM, Turlapati L,
660 Zichner T, Zhu D, Lyman RF, et al. 2014. Natural variation in genome architecture
661 among 205 Drosophila melanogaster Genetic Reference Panel lines. Genome
662 Research 24:1193-1208.

663 Immonen E, Snook RR, Ritchie MG. 2014. Mating system variation drives rapid
664 evolution of the female transcriptome in *Drosophila pseudoobscura*. Ecology and
665 Evolution 4:2186-2201.

Innocenti P, Morrow EH. 2010. The Sexually Antagonistic Genes of Drosophila melanogaster. Plos Biology 8:e1000335.

Kim K, Bennison C, Hemmings N, Brookes L, Hurley LH, Griffith SC, Burke T, Birkhead TR, Slate J. 2017. A sex-linked supergene controls sperm morphology and swimming speed in a songbird. Nature, Ecology & Evolution 1:1168-1176.

Kirkpatrick M, Ryan MJ. 1991. The evolution of mating preferences and the paradox of the lek. Nature 350:33-38.

Kleiber C, Zeileis A. 2008. Applied Econometrics with R. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Kopp A, Duncan I, Carroll SB. 2008. Genetic control and evolution of sexually dimorphic characters in Drosophila. Nature 408:553-559.

Krakauer AH. 2008. Sexual selection and the genetic mating system of wild turkeys. Condor 110:1-12.

Lahn BT, Page DC. 1997. Functional coherence of the human Y chromosome. Science 278:675-680.

Lemos B, Araripe LO, Hartl DL. 2008. Polymorphic Y chromosomes harbor cryptic variation with manifold functional consequences. Science 319:91-93.

Limousin D, Streiff R, Courtois B, Dupuy V, Alem S, Greenfield MD. 2012. Genetic Architecture of Sexual Selection: QTL Mapping of Male Song and Female Receiver Traits in an Acoustic Moth. PloS ONE 7:e44554.

Long TAF, Rice WR. 2007. Adult Locomotory Activity Mediates Intralocus Sexual Conflict in a Laboratory-Adapted Population of Drosophila melanogaster. Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences 274:3105-3112.

Mackay TFC, Richards S, Stone EA, Barbadilla A, Ayroles JF, Zhu D, Casillas S, Han Y, Magwire MM, Cridland JM, et al. 2012. The Drosophila melanogaster Genetic Reference Panel. Nature 482:173-178.

Mank JE. 2009. Sex chromosomes and the evolution of sexual dimorphism: Lessons from the genome. The American Naturalist 173:141-150.

Mank JE, Wedell N, Hosken DJ. 2013. Polyandry and sex-specific gene expression. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, B 368:20120047.

Parisi M, Nuttall R, Edwards P, Minor J, Naiman D, Lu JN, Doctolero M, al e. 2004. A survey of ovary-, testis-, and soma-biased gene expression in Drosophila melanogaster adults. Genome Biology 5:R40.

Parisi M, Nuttall R, Naiman D, Bouffard G, Malley J, Andrews J, Eastman S, Oliver B. 2003. Paucity of genes on the Drosophila X chromosome showing male-biased expression. Science 299:697-700.

Parsch J, Ellegren H. 2013. The evolutionary causes and consequences of sex-biased gene expression. Nature Reviews Genetics 14:83-87.

Pointer MA, Harrison PW, Wright AE, Mank JE. 2013. Masculinization of gene expression is associated with exaggeration of male sexual dimorphism. PLoS Genetics 9:e1003649.

Poissant J, Wilson AJ, Festa-Blanchet M, Hogg TJ, Coltman DW. 2008. Quantitative genetics and sex-specific selection on sexually dimorphic traits in bighorn sheep. Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences 275:623-628.

Privé F, Aschard H, Ziyatdinov A, Blum MGB. 2018. Efficient analysis of large-scale genome-wide data with two R packages: bigstatsr and bigsnpr. Bioinformatics 34:2781-2787.

R-Core-Team. 2016. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

Randall JC, Winkler TW, Kutalik Z, Berndt SI, Jackson AU, Monda KL, Kilpeläinen TO, Esko T. 2013. Sex-stratified genome-wide association studies including 270,000 individuals show sexual dimorphism in genetic loci for anthropometric traits. PLoS Genetics 9.

Ranz JM, Castillo-Davis CD, Meiklejohn CD, Hartl DL. 2003. Sex-dependent gene expression and evolution of the Drosophila transcriptome. Science 300:1742-1745.

Reinius B, Saetre P, Leonard JA, Blekhman R, Merino-Martinez R, Gilad Y, Jazin E. 2008. An evolutionarily conserved sexual signature in the primate brain. PLoS Genetics 4: e1000100.

Rice WR, Linder JE, Friberg U, Lew TA, Morrow EH, Stewart AD. 2005. Inter-locus antagonistic coevolution as an engine of speciation: Assessment with hemiclonal analysis. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA 102:6527–6534.

Rowe L, Chenoweth SF, Agrawal AF. 2018. The Genomics of Sexual Conflict. The American Naturalist 192:274-286.

Rowe L, Houle D. 1996. The lek paradox and the capture of genetic variance by condition dependent traits. Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences 263:1415–1421.

Sakai T, Ishida N. 2001. Circadian rhythms of female mating activity governed by clock genes in Drosophila. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA 98:9221–9225.

Snell-Rood EC, Cash A, Han MV, Kijimoto T, Andrews J, Moczek AP. 2011. Developmental decoupling of alternative phenotypes: Insights from the transcriptomes of horn-polyphenic beetles. Evolution 65:231-245.

740 Stuglik MT, Babik W, Prokop Z, Radwan J. 2014. Alternative reproductive tactics
741 and sex-biased gene expression: the study of the bulb mite transcriptome. Ecology
742 and Evolution 4:623-632.

743 Taylor PD, Williams GC. 1982. The lek paradox is not resolved. Theoretical
744 Population Biology 22:392-409.

745 Tomkins JL, Radwan J, Kotiaho JS, Tregenza T. 2004. Genic capture and
746 resolving the lek paradox. Trends in Ecology and Evolution 19:323–328.

747 Veltsos P, Gregson E, Morrissey B, Slate J, Hoikkala A, Butlin RK, Ritchie MG.
748 2015. The genetic architecture of sexually selected traits in two natural populations of
749 Drosophila montana. Heredity 115:565–572.

750 Venables WN, Ripley BD. 2002. Modern Applied Statistics with S. New York:
751 Springer.

752 Wright AE, Fumagalli M, Cooney CR, Bloch NI, Vieira FG, Buechel SD, Kolm N,
753 Mank JE. 2018. Male-biased gene expression resolves sexual conflict through the
754 evolution of sex-specific genetic architecture. Evolution Letters 2:52-61.

755 Yang X, Schadt EE, Wang S, Wang H, Arnold AP, Ingram-Drake L, Drake TA, al
756 e. 2006. Tissue-specific expression and regulation of sexually dimorphic genes in
757 mice. Genome Research 16:995-1004.
758

Tables

Table 1. Contribution of genotype (DGRP line) and block effect to variance in male quality measures. Models are fitted with DGRP line and Block as random factors. Log-likelihood ratios tests (LRT) generated p-values for the random factors (linear mixed model only).

Measure	Factor	S.D	LRT	df	p
Copulation latency[a]	DGRP line	0.23	76.1	1	**<0.0001**
	Block	0.05	2.28	1	0.131
	Residual	0.35			
Insemination capacity[b]	DGRP line	0.10	-	-	-
	Block	0.08	-	-	-
	Residual	0.74			

[a]Log_{10} transformed copulation latency (linear mixed model)

[b]Quasi-Poisson distribution (generalised linear mixed model with Penalized Quasi-Likelihood)

Figure legends

Figure 1. Variation in male quality measures across the DGRP lines (A) latency to copulate and (B) number of females inseminated. Boxes represent medians and first and third quartiles.

Figure 2. Relationship between the different measures of male quality. Error bars denote median ± standard error. Linear model between latency to copulate and number of females inseminated, $F_{1,31} = 0.26$, $p = 0.61$.

Figure 3. Sex-biased gene expression (log_2 male:female) and Spearman's rho correlation coefficient between phenotype and gene expression per gene for (A) inverse latency to copulate and (B) male insemination capacity. Size of data point scales with number of genes in each bin. Dashed lines represent significant model predictions, with male-biased genes in blue and female-biased genes in red.

Figure 4. Model predictions for the relationship between phenotype and gene expression for (A) inverse latency to copulate and (B) male insemination capacity. Female-biased genes (F) in red, male-biased genes (M) in blue and unbiased genes (U) in green. For both phenotypes there were significant interactions between sex-bias and gene expression. Inverse latency to copulate: sex-bias*gene expression, d.f = 2, F-ratio = 6.38, p = 0.0017. Male insemination capacity: sex-bias*gene expression, d.f = 2, F-ratio = 16.77, $p < 0.0001$.

Figure 5. Sex-biased gene expression (log_2 male:female) and Spearman's rho correlation coefficient between phenotype and gene expression per gene for (A)

797 inverse latency to copulate and (B) male insemination capacity. Size of data point
798 scales with number of genes in each bin. Black circles and dashed lines are for
799 autosomal genes and grey diamonds and solid lines are for genes on the X
800 chromosome. Lines represent predicted models, with male-biased genes in blue, and
801 female-biased genes in red.
802
803 **Figure 6.** Sex-biased (log_2 male:female) gene expression and Spearman's rho
804 correlation coefficient between male reproductive success and male gene expression
805 per gene in Drosophila from the LH_M population and using data from Innocenti &
806 Morrow (2011). Size of data point scales with number of genes in each bin. Dashed
807 line represent models predictions for male-biased genes.
808