

NEWS AND VIEWS

Perspective

Signature of sexual conflict is actually conflict resolved

Judith E. Mank¹  | Jacelyn J. Shu¹  | Alison E. Wright² ¹Department of Zoology and Biodiversity Research Centre, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada²Department of Animal and Plant Sciences, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

Correspondence

Judith E. Mank, Department of Zoology and Biodiversity Research Centre, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada.
Email: mank@zoology.ubc.ca

There has been substantial interest of late in using population genetic methods to study sexual conflict, where an allele increases the fitness of one sex at some cost to the other (Mank, 2017). Population genomic scans for sexual conflict offer an important advance given the difficulties of identifying antagonistic alleles from more traditional methods, and could greatly increase our understanding of the extent and loci of sexual conflict. This is particularly true for studies in natural populations, for which obtaining accurate fitness measurements for each sex can be challenging. In this issue of *Molecular Ecology*, Bissegger, Laurentino, Roesti, and Berner (2019) present a cautionary tale about how to interpret these population genomic data.

KEYWORDS

ecological genetics, population genetics, sex chromosomes, sexual selection

Several recent reports have used differences in allele frequency (such as F_{ST}) between males and females to assess the extent of sexual conflict in a population. Because allele frequencies are identical between the sexes at conception for autosomal loci, the thinking goes that any significant sex differences observed in adults must result from discrepancies between males and females in how an allele influences viability, predation or disease (Mank, 2017). Over the life cycle of a cohort, we might expect allele frequency differences to increase as sex differences in mortality accumulate (Figure 1).

Although some assessments have found significant differentiation in a few loci (Flanagan & Jones, 2017; Wright et al., 2018; Wright, Rogers, Fumagalli, Cooney, & Mank, 2019), others have identified hundreds, even thousands of loci that show major differences in allele frequency between females and males (Cheng & Kirkpatrick, 2016; Dutoit et al., 2018; Lucotte, Laurent, Segurel, & Toupance, 2016). While the former have been argued to be evidence of sex-specific genetic architecture, and therefore conflict resolved (Wright et al., 2018), the latter findings were taken as the signature of ongoing sexual conflict manifesting across a large proportion of the genome.

However, the observation of widespread allelic differences between the sexes presents an intriguing mystery. The selection coefficients required to produce significant differences in allele frequency by sexual conflict are quite high (Kasimatis, Nelson, & Phillips, 2017; Kasimatis, Ralph, & Phillips, 2019), and strong selection coefficients on a large number of loci across the genome would result in excessive




FIGURE 1 Opposing selection at multiple loci between males and females. Two loci, one encoding colour and another for pattern, are associated with different mortality rates between the sexes. Selection for optimal female phenotype (orange, plain) and male phenotype (blue, spotted) results in both significant mortality and sex-specific allele frequency differences in adults




FIGURE 2 Duplication to the Y chromosome leads to perceived differences in male and female allele frequency. Duplications from autosomal loci (green) to the Y chromosome (blue) map back to the autosomal locus on the female reference genome. Y-specific mutations on duplicated regions (blue stars) lead to false inflation of allele frequency differences between the sexes

sex-specific mortality rates (Figure 1). If true, populations would be expected to experience unbearable mortality loads, as vanishingly few individuals would carry the correct allelic complement for their sex and would not survive to reproduce. How could any species, particularly those with low fecundity such as humans (Cheng & Kirkpatrick, 2016; Lucotte et al., 2016) and passerines (Dutoit et al., 2018), possibly persist in the face of these predicted mortality rates?

In this issue, Bissegger et al. (2019) present at least a partial explanation for these findings. They searched the stickleback genome for regions with allele frequency differences between males and females. Similar to other studies (Cheng & Kirkpatrick, 2016; Dutoit et al., 2018; Lucotte et al., 2016), they initially found an implausibly large number of loci with substantial differences between the sexes. Further analysis revealed that these were in fact regions that had recently duplicated from the autosomes to the Y chromosome. Because the stickleback reference genome assembly was done on a female, it currently lacks a Y sequence, and so sequence reads from the Y duplications in male samples mapped back to the original autosomal location. This created perceived allelic differences between the sexes that were in fact due to male-specific mutations accumulating on the Y chromosome (Figure 2). Subsequent copy number

expansion of the Y duplications can in turn generate even higher patterns of intersexual allele frequency differences.

This explanation carries an interesting irony. Although many have concluded that intersexual allele frequency differences are the product of sexual conflict (but see Wright et al., 2018; Wright et al., 2019), the pattern found by Bissegger et al. (2019) actually represents at least the partial resolution of sexual conflict. Duplication to the Y chromosome is a well accepted route by which sexually antagonistic variation can become male-specific, thereby resolving conflict. Fisher (1931) predicted that the Y chromosome would accumulate genetic variation beneficial to males, and recent surveys have suggested that the rate of translocation from the autosomes to the Y chromosome can be very high (e.g., Tobler, Nolte, & Schötterer, 2017). Duplications to the sex-limited chromosome could account for much of the signal of allele frequency differences in other species currently attributed to ongoing conflict. This is particularly likely for observations that sex-biased genes in particular exhibit elevated allele frequency differences (Cheng & Kirkpatrick, 2016; Dutoit et al., 2018), given that genes duplicated to a Y chromosome will show male-specific expression. Indeed, the loci with the most extreme allele frequency differences might actually be those for which conflict

has been most effectively resolved via Y duplication and subsequent copy number expansion.

ORCID

Judith E. Mank  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2450-513X>

Jacelyn J. Shu  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8849-8004>

Alison E. Wright  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2479-5250>

REFERENCES

- Bissegger, M., Laurentino, T. G., Roesti, M., & Berner, D. (2019). Widespread intersex differentiation across the stickleback genome—the signature of sexually antagonistic selection? *Molecular Ecology*, *28*, 15255. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.15255>
- Cheng, C. D., & Kirkpatrick, M. (2016). Sex-specific selection and sex-biased gene expression in humans and flies. *PLOS Genetics*, *12*, e1006170. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1006170>
- Dutoit, L., Mugal, C., Bolcar, P., Wang, M., Nadachowska-Brzyska, K., Smeads, L., ... Ellegren, H. (2018). Sex-biased gene expression, sexual antagonism and levels of genetic diversity in the collared flycatcher (*Ficedula albicollis*) genome. *Molecular Ecology*, *27*, 3572–3581.
- Fisher, R. A. (1931). The evolution of dominance. *Biological Reviews*, *6*, 345–368. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.1931.tb01030.x>
- Flanagan, S. P., & Jones, A. G. (2017). Genome-wide selection components analysis in a fish with male pregnancy. *Evolution*, *71*, 1096–1105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.13173>
- Kasimatis, K. R., Nelson, T. C., & Phillips, P. C. (2017). Genomic signatures of sexual conflict. *Journal of Heredity*, *108*, 780–790. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jhered/esx080>
- Kasimatis, K. R., Ralph, P. L., & Phillips, P. C. (2019). Limits to genomic divergence under sexually antagonistic selection. *Genes|Genomes|Genetics*, *9*(11), 3813–3824. <https://doi.org/10.1534/g3.119.400711>
- Lucotte, E. A., Laurent, R., Segurel, L., & Toupance, B. (2016). Detection of allelic frequency differences between sexes in humans: A signature of sexually antagonistic selection. *Genome Biology and Evolution*, *8*, 1489–1500.
- Mank, J. E. (2017). Population genetics of sexual conflict in the genomic era. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, *18*, 721–730. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg.2017.83>
- Tobler, R., Nolte, V., & Schötterer, C. (2017). High rate of translocation-based gene birth on the Drosophila Y chromosome. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA*, *114*, 11721–11726.
- Wright, A. E., Fumagalli, M., Cooney, C. R., Bloch, N. I., Vieira, F. G., Buechel, S. D., ... Mank, J. E. (2018). Male-biased gene expression resolves sexual conflict through the evolution of sex-specific genetic architecture. *Evolution Letters*, *2*, 52–61. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evl3.39>
- Wright, A. E., Rogers, T. F., Fumagalli, M., Cooney, C. R., & Mank, J. E. (2019). Phenotypic sexual dimorphism is associated with genomic signatures of resolved sexual conflict. *Molecular Ecology*, *28*, 2860–2871. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.15115>

How to cite this article: Mank JE, Shu JJ, Wright AE. Signature of sexual conflict is actually conflict resolved. *Mol Ecol*. 2019;00:1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.15311>