

© Tim Connallon

2009

To my parents

Acknowledgments

The work presented here would have been impossible without the help of many people.

Peter Smouse met to talk about science every week for a year, helped me apply to graduate schools, and encouraged me to go to Michigan. I could not have started without his help. Many of the ideas we talked about served as a foundation for the graduate research.

Lacey Knowles was a great mentor and friend. She invested an enormous amount of time, energy and ideas into these projects, and provided lots of good advice. It is impossible to properly credit each of her contributions – her fingerprints can be found throughout the dissertation.

I am grateful to my dissertation committee: Alex Kondrashov, Jeff Long, Trisha Wittkopp, and George Zhang, who were very generous with their time, and provided great feedback on many topics discussed within, and many tangential to this dissertation. Thank you very much for input, criticism, encouragement, and inspiration.

Many colleagues and friends helped with the research. Their help came in many forms: scientific discussions, data collection, statistical advice, critical manuscript reading, suggestions for improving presentations, career advice, and providing software and research materials. Many thanks to Diego Alvarado, Sarah Barbrow, Russell Bonduriansky, Nico Cabrera, Brittany Calsbeek, Ryan Calsbeek, Dave Cantonwine, Bryan Carstens, Prosanta Chakrabarty, Matt Chatfield, Theodore Joel Cohn, Bob Cox, D. Allan Drummond, Adam Eyre-Walker, Daphne Fairbairn, Emily Farrer, Tatyana Fedina, Paul Fine, Doug Futuyma, Kelsey Gibbons, Charles Goodnight, Jonathan Gruber, Josh Haag, David Hall, Qixin He, David Houle, Huateng Huang, Erin Jakubowski, Danya Keene, Jo Kurdziel, David Lahti, Lucia Luna, Eladio Marquez, John McCormack, John McDonald, Zach Miller, Mohamed Noor, Ron Nussbaum, Elen Oneal, Sally Otto, Bob Payne, Jess

Peirson, Daven Presgraves, Cori Richards, Nicole Scott, Mike Sheehan, Liz Tibbetts, Lucy Tran, Rachel Walters, Akane Uesugi, Cris Van Hout, and Amanda Zellmer.

I owe thanks to Sonja Botes, Sue Burke, Christy Byks-Jazayeri, Norah Daugherty, Julia Eussen, Janet Griffin-Bell, Gale Kuhnlein, Robin Murrell, Fritz Paper, Chris Psujek, Jane Sullivan, and LaDonna Walker for administrative assistance and often help beyond the call of duty.

Funding was provided by the University of Michigan's Museum of Zoology, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology Department, and Rackham Graduate School. Additional support was provided by Sigma Xi, a NIH Genome Science Training Grant (T32 HG00040), and a NSF Doctoral Dissertation Improvement Grant (DEB-0709908).

Finally, I am grateful to my family – Dennis, Sandra, Chris and Matt Connallon, and especially Akane Uesugi – for their support.

Table of Contents

Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Tables	vi
List of Figures	vii
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
Part I. Molecular Signatures of Adaptation on X chromosomes and Autosomes	9
Chapter 2. Adaptive protein evolution of X-linked and autosomal genes in <i>Drosophila</i> : implications for faster-X hypotheses	9
Part II. Genome Architecture and the Heritability of Fitness	33
Chapter 3. Sex Linkage, Genic Capture, and the Heritability of Fitness	33
Chapter 4. Association Between Sex Ratio Distortion and Sexually Antagonistic Fitness Consequences of Female Choice	90
Chapter 5. Evidence for cryptic genetic benefits of female choice in <i>Drosophila melanogaster</i>	105
Part III. Population Benefits and Costs of Sexual Reproduction	114
Chapter 6. Sexual Selection Adds to the Twofold Cost of Sex	114
Chapter 7. Recombination Rate and Protein Evolution in Yeast	151

List of Tables

Table 2.1. X chromosome and autosome gene composition	20
Table 2.2. Divergence and polymorphism data for X-linked and autosomal genes	21
Table 2.3. Average recombination rates for X-linked and autosomal genes	23
Table 4.1. Male mating success and offspring sex ratios.	98
Table 5.1. Female choice and offspring egg-to-adult viability data for the three experimental trials.	110
Table 6.1. Point estimates of sex-specific selection on visible mutations in <i>Drosophila</i> .	131
Table 6.2. Parameter estimates based on sex-specific selection gradient data from natural animal populations.	133
Table 7.1. Different processes of molecular evolution produce different correlations between recombination rate and nucleotide divergence between species.	161

List of Figures

Figure 2.1. Patterns of silent nucleotide diversity (theta per nucleotide) for X-linked and autosomal genes as a function of recombination rate.	25
Figure 2.2. A comparison of silent and replacement polymorphism (theta per nucleotide) from the entire dataset (Worldwide) and African-derived samples.	26
Figure 2.3. Alpha – the proportion of adaptive, nonsynonymous substitutions – for X-linked and autosomal genes. Genes are partitioned based on sex-specific gene expression profiles.	27
Figure 2.4. Alpha – the proportion of adaptive, nonsynonymous substitutions – for X-linked and autosomal genes. Genes are partitioned based on age-specific gene expression profiles.	28
Figure 3.1. Sex chromosome size and “good genes” benefits to offspring.	54
Figure 3.2. Representative effects of dosage compensation, environmental variance, and unequal mutation and selection between males and females.	56
Figure 3.3. Father-to-offspring fitness heritability under X- and Z-linked sex determination and sexually antagonistic variation.	58
Figure 3.4. X-linkage is associated with reduced genetic benefits in nature.	59
Figure 4.1. The male mating success trial design.	99
Figure 4.2. Relationship between different female preference assays.	100
Figure 4.3. Paternal mating success influences daughter fecundity.	101
Figure 5.1. Genetic benefits of female choice under two crossing schemes.	111
Figure 6.1. Benefits of sex-specific selection are severely constrained by sexual antagonism.	135

Figure 6.2. Sex-limitation reduces opportunities for benefits of sex-specific selection.	136
Figure 7.1. Substitution rate as a function of the effective strength of selection.	162
Figure 7.2. Ratios of replacement to silent polymorphism (P_n/P_s) in <i>S. cerevisiae</i> , and substitutions (D_n/D_s) between <i>S. cerevisiae</i> and <i>S. paradoxus</i> ; genes are partitioned according to expression level.	164
Figure 7.3. Ratios of replacement to silent polymorphism (P_n/P_s) in <i>S. cerevisiae</i> , and substitutions (D_n/D_s) between <i>S. cerevisiae</i> and <i>S. paradoxus</i> ; genes are partitioned according to knockout viability phenotype.	165
Figure 7.4. Recombination and protein evolutionary rate.	166
Figure 7.5. The distribution of recombination rates for <i>S. cerevisiae</i> genes.	167