

Quantitative trait loci affecting phenotypic plasticity and the allometric relationship of ovariole number and thorax length in *Drosophila melanogaster*

Alan O. Bergland^{†1}, Anne Genissel^{*}, Sergey V. Nuzhdin^{*a}, Marc Tatar[†]

[†] Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
Brown University
Providence, RI 02912

^{*} Section of Evolution and Ecology
University of California, Davis
Davis, CA 95616

^a Present address:
Department of Biological Sciences
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90089

Running head: QTL for plasticity and allometry

Corresponding author: Alan O. Bergland
Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
Box G-W, 80 Waterman St.
Brown University
Providence, RI 02912

Telephone: (401) 863-3324
Fax: (401) 863-2166
E-mail: Alan_Bergland@brown.edu

Keywords: Quantitative trait loci (QTL),
Ovariole number,
Thorax length,
Phenotypic plasticity,
Allometry

ABSTRACT

Environmental factors during juvenile growth such as temperature and nutrition have major effects on adult morphology and life-history traits. In *Drosophila melanogaster*, ovary size, measured as ovariole number, and body size, measured as thorax length, are developmentally plastic traits with respect to larval nutrition. Herein we investigated the genetic basis for plasticity of ovariole number and body size, as well the genetic basis for their allometric relationship using recombinant inbred lines (RILs) derived from a natural population in Winters, CA. We reared 196 RILs in four yeast concentrations and measured ovariole number and body size. The genetic correlation between ovariole number and thorax length was positive, but the strength of this correlation decreased with increasing yeast concentration. Genetic variation and genotype-by-environment interactions (GxE) were observed for both traits. We identified QTL, epistatic, QTL- and epistatic-by-environment interactions for both traits and their scaling relationships. The results are discussed in the context of multivariate trait evolution.

INTRODUCTION

In general, life history traits are very sensitive to the environment. Temperature, competition, predation, and nutrition can alter age and size at maturity, survival, and reproduction (ROFF 2002). These life history traits directly determine demographic fitness and, consequently, their response to the environment is predicted to be subject to natural selection (VIA and LANDE 1985). In order to accurately assess the evolutionary history and potential of life histories *vis-à-vis* the environment, the specific genetic basis of these environmentally sensitive traits must be understood. With an explicit genetic model in hand, functional and molecular genetics can be tied to population genetics and ecology. Such a synthesis will lead to a deeper understanding of evolutionary processes.

Recently, there has been considerable progress in unraveling the molecular genetic basis life history plasticity. For example, a genetic basis of environmentally influenced, age-dependent survivorship in a variety of animals (PANOSKI 2007) and fungi (BITTERMAN *et al.* 2003) has been described. Remarkably, some of these genetic pathways are highly conserved (BARBIERI *et al.* 2003). However, much less attention has been paid to the genetic basis of environment dependent reproduction (YANG *et al.* 2008), and in particular the role of the pre-adult environment on adult reproductive capacity.

The quality and quantity of nutrition during embryonic and pre-adult stages affects adult reproductive capacity in a variety of animals (RAE *et al.* 2001, RAE *et al.* 2002, RHIND 2004, GUZMÁN *et al.* 2006, HODIN in press). These effects are often mediated by the morphology and size of reproductive organs, especially in females. In *Drosophila melanogaster*, larvae reared on food that varies in yeast concentration differ considerably in total and age-specific fecundity (TU and TATAR 2003). Adult body size

and ovary size, measured as ovariole number, are also modified by larval nutrition such that flies reared on food with less yeast are smaller and have fewer ovarioles than those reared with more yeast (HODIN and RIDDIFORD 2000, TU and TATAR 2003). The plastic response of body size and ovariole number could functionally underlie reductions in fecundity and thus be subject to natural selection. Variation in adult body size may affect fecundity via effects on adult nutrient acquisition or mating success (SISODIA and SINGH 2004). Ovariole number may affect fecundity because ovarioles are the functional units of the ovary. At the tip of each ovariole resides a set of germline stem cells that differentiate into eggs. Eggs can be produced simultaneously in all ovarioles, and thus ovariole number sets an upper limit on fecundity (DAVID 1970).

In addition to the plastic responses of body size and ovariole number, genetic variation in these traits have long been thought to be under natural selection because of their correlation with fecundity (HONEK 1993). In *D. melanogaster*, inter-population variation in ovariole number is correlated with differences in fecundity (BOULÉTREAU-MERLE *et al.* 1982, but see also SCHMIDT *et al.* 2005), and intra-population variation is correlated with maximum fecundity (DAVID 1970), but not necessarily total fitness (WAYNE *et al.* 1997). Artificial selection on ovariole number elicits a correlated response in fecundity; amongst selection lines there is a positive correlation between ovariole number and fecundity (ROBERTSON 1957, ENGSTROM 1971). Thorax length, ovariole number, fecundity are also positively correlated amongst various *Drosophilid* species (KAMBYSELLIS and HEED 1971, R'KHA *et al.* 1997).

Attempts to describe the evolution of either body size or ovariole number in relation to fecundity are complicated by the allometry between these characters across

environments, genotypes or species. One approach to studying the evolution of correlated characters is to measure their variance-covariance matrix (**G**, LANDE and ARNOLD 1983). This is a powerful approach to predicting short term evolution, but it does not describe the specific genetic basis of correlated traits, without which we are limited in predicting evolutionary processes. Using **G** as a predictive tool without knowledge of the causative genetics may lead to a misinterpretation of the underlying developmental and physiological mechanisms that co-regulate traits (HOULE 1991, GROMKO 1995, PIGLIUCCI 2006). A complimentary approach is to identify the genetic basis of the traits through quantitative trait locus (QTL) mapping. This approach identifies pleiotropic and plastic loci, and may eventually lead to the identification of specific genes underlying quantitative variation (MACKAY 2001).

Previous attempts to map pleiotropic and plastic QTL have been successful in many organisms. For example, in *Arabidopsis thaliana* QTL controlling various aspects of flower morphology under variable photic environments have been identified (UNGERER *et al.* 2003). In *Caenorhabditis elegans*, plastic responses of life-history traits across temperatures have been mapped (GUTTELING *et al.* 2007). And, in *D. melanogaster* fitness related traits have been mapped across multiple larval and adult environments (FRY *et al.* 1998, GURGANUS *et al.* 1998, VIEIRA *et al.* 2000, LEIPS and MACKAY 2000). These studies have all revealed QTL that are both pleiotropic and non-pleiotropic as well as QTL that vary in effect across environments (i.e., plastic) and loci with fixed effects across environments. QTL mapping studies, however, are unable to resolve the classic distinction (VIA *et al.* 1995) between loci that vary in direct response to the environment (the so called allelic sensitivity model) and loci that modulate the

response of other genes in an environment dependent fashion (the gene regulation model; but see LEIPS and MACKAY 2000). Such distinctions can only be made when the molecular basis of plasticity for a particular trait are understood.

In the present study, we investigate the genetic basis of variation of ovariole number and body size plasticity and allometry as a first step in describing the functional genetics and evolution of these traits at a molecular level. While there is a considerable information about the molecular and quantitative genetic basis for adult body size (e.g., WAYNE *et al.* 1997, WAYNE *et al.* 2001, LEEVERS and HAFEN 2003, OLDHAM and HAFEN 2003, HAFEN 2004, CALDWELL *et al.* 2005, COLOMBANI *et al.* 2005, MIRTH *et al.* 2005) and ovariole number (COYNE *et al.* 1991, WAYNE *et al.* 1997, HODIN and RIDDIFORD 1998, WAYNE and MACKAY 1998, WAYNE *et al.* 2001, WAYNE and MCINTYRE 2002, TELONIS-SCOTT *et al.* 2005, ORGOGOZO *et al.* 2006) in *D. melanogaster* and related species, little is known about the genetic basis for nutrient induced phenotypic plasticity in these traits.

We used QTL mapping to describe the genetic architecture of phenotypic plasticity in ovariole number and thorax length within a population of recombinant inbred lines (RILs). We address the following questions. First, what are the genomic positions and environment specific effects of QTL and epistatic interactions for ovariole number and thorax length within our mapping population? Second, how many QTL and epistatic interactions are shared between ovariole number and thorax length? And third, what are the genomic positions and environment specific effects of QTL and epistatic interactions that affect the allometric relationship between ovariole number and thorax length?

To address these questions, we reared a large panel of RILs segregating naturally occurring alleles under controlled density in four larval yeast environments. We document genetic and genotype-environment variation for both traits within our mapping population. We identify QTL and epistatic interactions that underlie these sources of variation for both traits. QTL and epistatic interactions for ovariole number and thorax length are largely independent. Further, we identify QTL and epistatic interactions that affect the allometric relationship between ovariole number and thorax length in an environment dependent fashion. We discuss these findings in relation to the multivariate evolution of life-history plasticity.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Fly stocks and genetic map: We used a panel of 196 advanced intercross recombinant inbred lines (RILs) randomly drawn from a larger population of 300 RILs (GENISSEL and NUZHIDIN, in prep). These RILs were derived from two wild females (lines 89 and 58 whose alleles are hereafter referred to as AA and aa respectively) caught in an orchard population in Winters, CA (38°N, 121°W) during 2001. These two lines were isogenized by 40 generations of inbreeding. These parental lines were expanded to a set of 500 isogenic lines and these offspring lines were randomly intermated for 15 generations. Each intermated line was sib-crossed for 15 generations to make the final set of RILs. Prior to the initiation of the present experiment, RILs were kept at 25°C, 12L:12D, in low culture density on ~2% yeast by volume fly medium, with live yeast sprinkled on top. These lines were SNP genotyped at 31, 34, and 37 intronic and intergenic markers respectively along the X, 2nd, and 3rd chromosomes using a multiplex oligoligation assay

(GENISSEL and NUZH DIN, in prep.). Extensive map expansion was observed, relative to the standard *Drosophila* recombination map (LINDSEY and ZIMM 1992). The cumulative map length in our population is ~4000cM, when using the Kosambi map conversion function, which gives our analysis a high degree of precision in mapping QTL.

Rearing conditions: Larvae were reared in four food treatments that contained 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, and 0.8% autoclaved yeast (Lasaffre Yeast Corp., product number 73050) by volume. Sugar, cornmeal, agar, and tegosept concentrations (11%, 8%, 5%, and 1% by volume, respectively) were kept constant across all treatments. Each rearing vial contained 10ml of medium. Experimental food was used within four days of being made.

Parental lines and RILs were assayed in three replicate blocks, each block representing a successive generation. For each line, approximately 50-100 mixed sex adults were placed into small cages with petri dishes containing apple juice-agar medium as oviposition substrate with ~0.5ml yeast paste, made from autoclaved yeast and water, on each petri dish in order to stimulate oviposition. Adults oviposited for 12-24 hours prior to egg collection. 50 eggs from each line were transferred to a larval rearing vial of each food treatment; care was taken not to transfer any yeast paste. Rearing vials were maintained at 25°C, 12L:12D until preservation.

Adults emerging from rearing vials were transferred to vials with 2% autoclaved yeast by volume (11% sugar, 8% cornmeal, 5% agar, and 1% tegosept) plus live yeast and were left in these vials for three to four days. This treatment does not affect ovariole number but induces vitellogenesis making ovariole counts more reliable. Flies were thereafter transferred to cryovials and frozen at -80°C.

Phenotyping: Up to 5 females (average 4) were phenotyped per genotype per treatment per replicate. Mesothorax length (the distance from the tip of the scutellum to the most anterior part of the mesothorax) was measured with an ocular micrometer accurate to 1/30mm. Flies were dissected to score ovariole number for each ovary.

Statistical analyses

Variance components: We used two approaches to examine the differences in phenotypic plasticity of ovariole number and thorax length amongst RILs. The first approach estimates the proportion of genetic variation within each environment and the second approach estimates the extent of genotype-environment variation. By using these two approaches, we are able to assess whether the genotype-environment variation measured by the second approach is due to changes in the magnitude of genetic variation or changes in the rank order of genotypes across environments. In the first approach, we fit the following model for each food treatment and trait separately: $y = \mu + G + B + G:B + error$. In the second approach, we used the following model: $y = \mu + E + G + B + G:E + E:B + G:B + error$. In both approaches, y refers to either ovariole number or thorax length of individual flies, G is the random line effect, B is the random block effect, and $G:B$ is their random interaction. In the second approach, E is the fixed food effect, and $G:E$ and $E:B$ are the random interaction effects. We also assessed the extent of genotype-environment variation amongst the parental lines using the second approach.

Mixed effect models were calculated in SAS 9.13 using the PROC MIXED function (SAS SOFTWARE 2002).

Genetic correlations: Correlations were calculated between traits within environments, and within traits across environments. The correlation between any two pairs was calculated as $\text{cov}_{ij}/\sigma_i\sigma_j$, where cov_{ij} is the covariance of the line means, σ_i and σ_j are the square roots of the among line variances, and i and j represent different traits or environments depending upon the comparison. 95% confidence ellipses were calculated using the *car* package (FOX 2008).

QTL analysis: Single marker QTL analysis was performed using multiple imputation (SEN and CHURCHILL 2001) implemented in the *R/qtl* package (BROMAN *et al.* 2003) using R 2.4.1 (R DEVELOPMENT CORE TEAM 2006). We used 50 imputations with a step size of 3 cM. QTL models were fit using the within environment mean phenotype for each RIL. For both phenotypes we used two strategies of QTL analysis. The first approach mapped QTL affecting each phenotype within each environment. The second considered the food treatment, and mapped QTL using the null model, $y = \mu + E + \text{error}$, the reduced model, $y = \mu + M_i + E + \text{error}$, and the full model, $y = \mu + M_i + E + M_i:E + \text{error}$, where y is the environment specific genotype mean for either phenotype, μ is the grand mean, M_i is the effect of the i th QTL, E is the food effect coded as a contrast matrix against the 0.2% yeast treatment, and $M_i:E$ is the interaction between the i th QTL and the food effect, and error is the normally distributed residual error. We compared models by taking the differences in the log-likelihood odds (LOD score) at each marker or imputed marker. The difference in LOD scores between the reduced and null models is used to infer QTL that have main effects, averaged across environments. The

difference in LOD scores between the full and reduced models represents the contribution of the $M_i:E$ interaction term, and allows us to distinguish QTL that vary their effect across environments from those that have consistent effects across environments.

We tested for QTL with main and environment specific effects on ovariole number after removing the additive effects of thorax length. To test for main effects, we compared the full model $y = \mu + M_i + E + T + error$, to the reduced model, $y = \mu + E + T + error$, where y is ovariole number, T is environment corrected thorax length (i.e., the residuals of the relationship between thorax length and environment), thereby removing the collinearity between E and T . To test for environment specific effects we compared the full model, $y = \mu + M_i + E + T + M_i:E + error$ to the reduced model, $y = \mu + M_i + E + T + error$. These models fix the slope of the relationship between ovariole number and thorax length, but allow the intercept of the relationship between ovariole number and thorax length to vary.

To test for QTL affecting the relationship between ovariole number and thorax length within and across environments, we compared the full model, $y = \mu + M_i + E + T + E:T + M_i:E + M_i:E:T + error$, to the reduced model, $y = \mu + M_i + E + T + E:T + M_i:E + error$. These models allow both the slope and intercept of the relationship between ovariole number and thorax length to vary.

Epistatic QTL analysis: We used the multiple imputation method to map epistatic and epistatic by environment QTL for ovariole number and thorax length. We also tested for epistatic by environment interactions for ovariole number after removing the additive effects of thorax length, and epistatic by environment interactions affecting the

relationship between ovariole number and thorax length. To account for missing genotype data, we used 50 imputations, however we only imputed data at the empirical markers and not at pseudomarkers. Locations of maximum LOD were later refined to pseudomarkers (see below).

To identify epistatic interactions for ovariole number and thorax length, we calculated the difference in LOD scores between the full model, $y = \mu + E + M_i + M_j + M_i:M_j + error$, and the reduced model, $y = \mu + E + M_i + M_j + error$, where M_i and M_j are the QTL being tested. To identify epistatic-by-environment interactions for ovariole number and thorax length, we calculated the difference in LOD scores between the full model, $y = \mu + E + M_i + M_j + E:M_i + E:M_j + M_i:M_j + E:M_i:M_j + error$, and the reduced model, $y = \mu + E + M_i + M_j + E:M_i + E:M_j + M_i:M_j + error$.

To identify epistatic and epistatic by environment interactions for ovariole number after removing the additive effects of thorax length, we calculated the difference in LOD scores between the full and reduced models, as above, except that environment corrected thorax length (T) was included as an additive covariate. Likewise, we tested for epistatic by thorax length, and epistatic by environment by thorax length, by comparing full and reduced models with thorax length as an additive and interactive covariate.

Once an initial set of epistatic QTL were identified, we refined their location using repeated calls to the *fitqtl* function. We scanned $\pm 30\text{cM}$ with respect to each identified marker per epistatic pair at a step size of 3cM with 50 imputations. This procedure allowed us to localize positions of maximum LOD (when they occurred at pseudomarkers between observed markers) as well as to obtain 2-LOD intervals per epistatic QTL.

In several cases, epistatic interactions had high LOD scores due to heteroscedasticity, caused by unequal sample sizes. We discarded any of these epistatic interactions when they had fewer than 10 lines representing any one genotype.

Statistical thresholds for QTL and epistatic interaction: Statistical thresholds for all QTL and epistatic interactions were defined by the GWER_k statistic (CHEN and STOREY 2006). Briefly, the GWER_k statistic is a LOD value above which there is a probability (α) of k false positives. We used $k = 1$ and $\alpha = 0.05$ for most thresholds. The only exception were main effect QTL for ovariole number and thorax length where we used $k = 0$ because $k = 1$ was too permissive (the LOD value of GWER_0 was ~ 1.6 for either model). The use of slightly more liberal thresholds (i.e., $k = 1$) is appropriate because all QTL and epistatic interactions were further subjected to model selection (see below).

To derive the GWER_k statistic, we performed 1500 permutations of the phenotypes across environments and RIL genotype for each QTL and epistatic model. For each permutation, we recorded the LOD scores of the highest and second highest peaks. Because different LOD peaks on the same chromosome might actually reflect the same underlying causative locus, we defined the second highest peak as the highest peak not on the chromosome (or chromosomes, in the case of epistasis) previously identified for the highest LOD peak (CHEN and STOREY 2006). The $1-\alpha$ quantile of the distribution of highest LOD peaks corresponds to the GWER_0 threshold and the $1-\alpha$ quantile of the distribution of second highest LOD peaks corresponds to the GWER_1 threshold. The GWER_k thresholds are provided in Table 1.

QTL model selection: We used a robust model selection strategy to identify a set of QTL and epistatic interactions that most parsimoniously explain the observed phenotypic distribution of RIL means. We defined the model search space by the QTL and epistatic interactions that exceeded the GWER_k at the $\alpha = 0.05$ threshold. Each QTL or epistatic interaction was defined as an independent term and we fit every possible additive model of these independent terms. For example, if we identified one QTL and one epistatic interaction (e.g., QTL_A and the epistatic interaction $\text{QTL}_B \times \text{QTL}_C$) there would be four possible models, including the null model (i.e., no QTL or epistatic interaction), that contain the additive effects of QTL_A and $\text{QTL}_B \times \text{QTL}_C$. Note that interactions between independent terms were not tested (e.g., $\text{QTL}_A \times \text{QTL}_B \times \text{QTL}_C$). In general, the number of additive models equals two raised to the number of independent QTL and epistatic interactions identified. For ovariole number we identified 15 QTL and epistatic interactions and for thorax length we identified 12 QTL and epistatic interactions. Thus, we fit 2^{15} models for ovariole number and 2^{12} models for thorax length. (see Tables 6 and 7 for detailed information on QTL and epistatic terms tested). For both ovariole number and thorax length, each model contained yeast level, coded as a contrast matrix against the 0.2% treatment. For ovariole number, each model contained environment corrected thorax length.

Models were fit using the *fitqtl* function in *R/qtl*. Likelihood ratio statistics were extracted and BIC (SCHWARTZ 1978) and mBIC (BOGDAN *et al.* 2004) statistics were computed for each model. These model selection criteria penalize the log-likelihood statistic for the number of parameters, thereby correcting for model over fitting. In simulation studies, model selection based off BIC tends to over estimate the number of

QTL (BROMAN and SPEED 2002), and mBIC is designed to correct this especially when there is epistasis (BOGDAN *et al.* 2004). We choose to calculate both BIC and mBIC because it is unclear how either method performs when there are QTL-environment, epistatic-by-environment, or higher order interactions present. BIC statistics were calculated as,

$$BIC_i = -2\ln(L) + k\ln(n),$$

where BIC_i is the BIC statistic for the i th model, L is log-likelihood of the i th model, k is the number of parameters in the i th model, and n is the sample size (in all cases, 745).

mBIC statistics were calculated as,

$$mBIC_i = -n \log(L) + (p_i + q_i) \log(n) + 2p_i \log(l-1) + 2q_i \log(u-1),$$

where $mBIC_i$ is the mBIC statistic for the i th model, p_i is the number of main effect QTL terms in the i th model, q_i is the number of epistatic terms in the i th model, l is the number of possible main effect QTL (102) and u is the number of possible epistatic terms ($0.5 \cdot 102 \cdot 101$). The model with the lowest penalized log-likelihood ratio, for each penalization method, was considered the best model for that method. The relative probability of a model was calculated as,

$$w_i = \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta_i\right)}{\sum_{r=1}^R \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Delta_r\right)},$$

where Δ_i is the difference in penalized log-likelihood between the i th model and the best model, and R is the full set of models (BURNHAM and ANDERSON 2002). When w for the best model is small, we interpret that there are several nearly equivalent models.

Conversely, when w for the best model is close to unity, we interpret that the best model

is unambiguously the best model. We calculated the relative importance of each QTL or interaction as the sum of w for each model that a term appeared in. A relative importance close to unity is interpreted as highly supported, and one close to zero is interpreted as unsupported (BURNHAM and ANDERSON 2002).

We calculated the LOD scores of the model terms in the best mBIC and BIC models, conditional on that model. The conditional LOD scores were calculated as the difference between the best model and that model without the particular term.

Effects and genetic means: We calculated the effects of the terms in the best mBIC and BIC models, conditional on that model, using the *fitqtl* function. These estimated effects are assumed to be approximately orthogonal to each other (SEN and CHURCHILL 2001). Genetic means across all terms in the model were calculated by multiplying the estimated effects by the model matrix (NETER *et al.* 1985). Residuals were calculated by subtracting observed from fitted values. For each term, errors were subsequently calculated as the fitted values per effect plus the residuals.

RESULTS

Variance components: A significant GxE interaction was found between the parental strains for ovariole number ($F = 21.46_{3,87}$, $p < 0.001$) but not for thorax length ($F = 2.33_{3,87}$, $p = 0.08$). The extent of GxE between the parental lines for ovariole number and thorax length is immediately apparent when comparing their reaction norms (Figure 1A, 1C).

Within each environment, there was significant genetic variation for ovariole number and thorax length amongst the RILs (Tables 2 and 3). GxE was statistically significant for both ovariole number and thorax length (Table 4) indicating genetic variation for the plastic responses of both traits (Figure 1B, 1D).

Genetic correlations: Correlations within traits, between environments, decreased with increasing differences in yeast level (Table 5). These ranges of correlations indicate a moderate amount of crossing reaction norms (ROFF 1997). The correlations within environments, between traits, decreased monotonically with increasing yeast level (Table 5, Figure 2) and were significantly different from zero in all environments (nominal $p < 2e^{-16}$, $p = 2.5e^{-5}$, $p = 0.0013$, and $p = 0.0089$ for 0.2, 0.4, 0.6 and 0.8% yeast by volume, respectively). A significant genetic correlation between ovariole number and thorax length within populations has not been previously reported (WAYNE *et al.* 1997, WAYNE *et al.* 2005, TELONIS-SCOTT *et al.* 2005) where measurements were made on flies reared under high yeast concentrations.

QTL analysis: QTL analysis for ovariole number and thorax length identified the same QTL within any given environment and when phenotypes were concatenated across environments with environment used as an additive covariate. However LOD scores varied for particular QTL across environments (Supp. figure 1, 2), and were reduced when environment was used as an additive covariate. These affects on LOD scores may be attributed to limits in statistical power (e.g., for ovariole number the power to detect a QTL of with effect size of 1, at a nominal $\alpha = 0.01$, within any given environment is 0.21

compared to 0.83 when pooled across environments, given an empirical standard deviation of ~3.8, and assuming equal allele frequencies). Given the low power of QTL detection with our mapping population within each environment and low LOD scores within any given environment, variation in LOD scores for particular QTL across environments cannot resolve QTLx E interactions.

We identified a single QTL for ovariole number (Figure 3A, Table 6) and three QTL for thorax length (Figure 3B, Table 7). We found no QTLx E interactions for ovariole number, and two QTLx E interactions for thorax length (Figure 3B, Table 7).

We identified two marginal QTL when we tested for ovariole number QTL after conditioning on the additive effects of thorax length (Figure 3C, Table 6). We also identified one QTLx E interaction (Figure 3D, Table 6). When we tested for QTL affecting the relationship between ovariole number and thorax length, we identified no marginal QTL (results not shown) and three QTLx E interactions (Figure 3E, Table 6).

Epistatic QTL analysis: Five epistatic interactions were identified for ovariole number (Figure 3A, Table 6), however no epistatic-by-environment interactions were identified for ovariole number. Six epistatic interactions and two epistatic-by-environment interactions were identified for thorax length (Figure 3, Table 7). We identified no additional epistatic interactions for ovariole number when removing the additive effects of thorax length. We identified two epistatic-by-environment interactions for ovariole number when the additive effects of thorax length were removed (Figure 3, Table 6). Additionally, we identified two epistatic-by-environment interactions that affect the relationship between ovariole number to thorax length (Figure 3, Table 6).

We refined the location of these epistatic interactions and calculated their 2-LOD support intervals (Figure 3, Tables 6 and 7). In general, the positions of maximal LOD were close (typically $\pm 3\text{cM}$) to the physical marker originally identified.

Final model building: We identified different best models for both ovariole number and thorax length depending on the penalization method. For ovariole number, the best mBIC model had a relative probability (w) of 0.19 and the best BIC model had a relative probability of 0.38. For thorax length, the best models had relative probabilities of 0.28 and 0.23 for mBIC and BIC respectively. These values indicate that the best model is nearly equivalent to other models. Nonetheless, for simplicity, we shall restrict the remainder of our analysis to the best mBIC model, for either ovariole number or thorax length, which included fewer epistatic interactions than the best BIC and tended to include fewer main effect QTL. These models represent the minimum number of QTLs segregating in our population.

The relative importance of QTL and epistatic interactions generally reflects their inclusion in the best models. However, the unconditional LOD scores of particular QTL or interactions do not necessarily reflect their relative importance or inclusion into the best models (Tables 6 and 7). QTL with low unconditional LOD scores but high relative importance and conditional LOD scores are QTL that are sensitive to genetic background effects. We also observe some QTL with high raw LOD scores and low relative importance. Generally, these are QTL with main and epistatic effects (e.g., thorax length QTL, 3R@1.23Mb).

Genetic means and effects: The estimated genetic means of model terms retained in the best mBIC models are presented for ovariole number (Figure 4), thorax length (Figure 5), and their relationship (Figures 6 and 7). Effects of each term, and their variance-covariance matrix are presented in the supplementary data (see Supplementary Data). The effects and variance-covariance matrix for the best BIC models are in the supplementary data.

DISCUSSION

We performed a genetic mapping experiment to identify QTL affecting phenotypic plasticity of ovariole number and thorax length in response to yeast concentration in the larval medium. We identified QTL and epistatic interactions for both traits with consistent effects across environments (Figures 3, 4, and 5). Some of these QTL and epistatic interactions overlap with previously reported QTL affecting ovariole number and other body size correlates (WAYNE *et al.* 2001, WAYNE and MCINTYRE 2002, ZIMMERMAN *et al.* 2000). QTL- and epistatic-by-environment interactions were observed for thorax length (Figures 3 and 5, Table 7). Interactions of these types were present for ovariole number when we conditioned on thorax length (Figures 3 and 4, Table 6). Additionally, we identified QTL-by-environment and epistatic-by-environment interactions that affect the relationship between ovariole number and thorax length (Figures 3, 6 and 7, Table 6). The allelic effect of these interactions increases with increasing yeast concentration, a pattern that is congruent with the monotonic decrease in the genetic correlation between these traits. These results

suggest that the correlated evolution of ovariole number and thorax length may be highly sensitive to environmental factors.

Genotype-environment variation and QTL-environment affects: Phenotypic plasticity is a ubiquitous phenomenon in nature (SCHLICHTING and PIGLIUCCI 1998, WEST-EBERHARD 2003) and variation in plasticity is widely documented (SCHEINER 1993). Genetic variation in plasticity (GxE) must be accounted for by alleles that vary in effect across environments (VIA *et al.* 1995) regardless if GxE is caused by changes in rank order of genotypes across environments or by changes in the magnitude of genetic variation across environments. In our mapping population, we see changes in the rank order of genotypes and the magnitude of variance amongst environments for ovariole number and thorax length (Tables 2, 3, 5) and directly tested for QTL that vary in effect across environments.

We identified two QTL- and two epistatic-by-environment interactions for thorax length (Figures 3 and 5, Table 7). All of these interactions show monotonic changes in magnitude across environments (Figure 5). Moreover, all interactions but of one (Figure 5D) show stronger effects in low yeast environments than in high yeast environments. These results are consistent with a higher amount of amongst line variation for thorax length in low- compared to high-yeast environments (Table 3).

The dose dependent effects of these QTL and epistatic interactions suggest that these loci are physiologically responding directly to yeast concentration. In *D. melanogaster*, larval nutrient manipulation primarily affects body size through changes in cell number rather than cell size (DE MOED *et al.* 1997). Thus, the candidate genes in

these QTL are likely to affect cell cycle progression or cell autonomous, nutrient dependent growth. Within the QTL-environment interaction 2R@6.95 is *dare*, a protein involved ecdysone synthesis (FREEMAN *et al.* 1999). Recently ecdysone has been implicated in larval growth control and adult body size (CALDWELL *et al.* 2005, COLOMBANI *et al.* 2005, MIRTH *et al.* 2005) and these effects are mediated by nutrient dependent insulin signaling.

For ovariole number, no QTL- or epistatic-by-environment interactions were identified in our initial genome scans (Figure 3A) despite the high amount of GxE variation (Table 4). There are three possible reasons for this discrepancy. First, GxE variation for ovariole number may be controlled by many loci of very small effect, or by small environment specific effects of the observed main effect QTL and epistatic interactions. Although we cannot directly rule out this hypothesis, we note that small QTL-environment effects were observed for thorax length (Figures 5C and 5D), which suggests that we have adequate statistical power in our experiment. Second, GxE variation for ovariole number may be controlled by high order epistasis (i.e., greater than two loci). While this is a testable hypothesis, in our design we do not have sufficient power to make such inferences. Third, GxE variation for ovariole number may be affected by allometric relationships. Here we examined this hypothesis by testing for QTL- and epistatic-by-environment interactions when thorax length was included as a covariate.

For this analysis, we first discuss the use of thorax length as an additive covariate; in the following section (see THE BASIS OF GENETIC CORRELATIONS) we discuss the use of thorax length as an interactive covariate. The use of thorax length as an additive

covariate assumes a fixed relationship between ovariole number and thorax length across environments and loci. Loci identified using this mapping strategy can, but do not necessarily, affect the joint means of ovariole number and thorax length (Tables 6 and 7, Figure 3). Regardless if the loci identified affect the joint means of ovariole number and thorax length or not, the causative genes within these QTL may mediate the development of one trait through another or through a mutual pathway (LI *et al.* 2006). While we have conditioned our ovariole number scans on thorax length, the results and interpretation remain the same if we conditioned thorax length scans on ovariole number. These QTL do not imply a directionality of effects from one trait to another, but rather a codependency of both traits on environmental and genetic effects.

We identified one QTL- and two epistatic-by-environment interactions for ovariole number when we conditioned on the additive effects of thorax length (Figure 3, Table 6). Within these QTL are plausible candidate genes that are known to, or likely, effect nutrient dependent growth of adult body parts. For instance, within the epistatic-by-environment interaction 2L@15.23Mb -3R@1.23Mb, are *Idgf1*, *Idgf2*, and *Idgf3*, and *Ras85D*, respectively. The IDGFs are known to affect imaginal disc growth and are secreted by the fat body (KAWAMURA *et al.* 1999). RAS signaling (CALDWELL *et al.* 2005), mediated by *PI3K* activity in the prothoracic gland is known to affect insulin signaling in the larval fat body (COLOMBANI *et al.* 2005). It is plausible that IDGF expression is mediated by nutrient dependent insulin signaling.

Because we used environment corrected thorax length as a covariate, QTL identified for ovariole number conditional on the use of thorax length as an additive covariate affect ovariole number relative to the within environment average thorax

length. Such QTL may play an important role in maintaining genetic variation within populations. For instance, stabilizing selection on thorax length (ROFF 1981) may act to maintain allelic variation for ovariole number, and vice versa. To see this, note that these loci do not significantly affect ovariole number prior to conditioning on thorax length. However, different alleles at these loci have an effect on ovariole number relative to average thorax length. Thus, these alleles shift the intercept term of the relationship between ovariole number and thorax length. Because thorax length is centered, the value of ovariole number at the intercept represents the value at the average thorax length. Thus, if there is stabilizing selection on thorax length, segregating allelic variation for ovariole number could be maintained.

The basis of genetic correlations: Genetic correlations are generated by pleiotropy and by linkage disequilibrium between loci. These mechanisms are generally indistinguishable in QTL mapping and we shall refer to both mechanisms as pleiotropic QTL. Pleiotropic QTL can affect a set of traits in two ways. First, they may affect the sign and the magnitude of the relationship between traits. Second, they may affect the joint means of a set of traits. We limit our discussion of pleiotropic QTL to the former case because, in our best mBIC models, there are no QTL or epistatic interactions that appear to affect the joint means of traits.

We identified pleiotropic QTL and epistatic interactions that affect the relationship between ovariole number and thorax length in an environment dependent manner (Figures 3D, 3E, 6 and 7, Table 6). These QTL- and epistatic-by-environment interactions were identified by including thorax length as an interactive covariate in our

ovariole number scans, thereby allowing us to model trait relationships that vary as a function of environmental and genetic effects. In this sense, we have identified loci that affect the environment specific, allometric relationship between these traits. Pleiotropic QTL that affect the sign and magnitude of trait relationships have been rarely reported (e.g., CHEVERUD 2001, CHEVERUD *et al.* 2004, PAVLICEV *et al.* 2007, and see FLATT and KAWECKI 2004 for the case of a single gene), but provide a context to understand the nature of genetic correlations.

In our mapping population, the net correlation between ovariole number and thorax length monotonically decreases with increasing yeast concentration in the larval medium (Figure 2, Table 5). The net correlation, however, is always positive as would occur if these traits were mutually constrained by resource acquisition or development time (HOULE 1991). The strong pattern of change in this correlation suggests that this constraint is relaxed with increasing resources. Furthermore, the relative degree of this relaxation may be under genetic control. The magnitude of allelic effects at these loci are consistently stronger in high yeast environments (Figures 6 and 7). We may further interpret the decrease in genetic correlation across environments as a product of segregating, environmentally sensitive allelic variation. A small genetic correlation between traits may reflect a high amount of genetic variance in trait relationships, and does not necessarily imply that traits are independent of each other.

Allelic variation at loci that affect allometric relationships between traits can be directly acted upon by selection or drift. The action of these evolutionary processes on allometric relationships and genetic correlations have been documented (e.g., WEBER 1990, PHILLIPS *et al.* 2001), and the genetic control of allometry has important

implications for interspecific variation (LANGLADE *et al.* 2005). The presence of loci that affect allometric relationships and genetic correlations may, however, alter the topology of the evolutionary landscape thereby producing inaccessible regions of phenotypic space (BLOWS and WALSH 2008).

Evolution of plastic life history correlates:

We used QTL mapping to identify the genetic architecture of plasticity in two morphological traits related to fitness, ovariole number and thorax length. Epistasis, pleiotropy and GxE were pervasive and this architecture represents standing genetic variation within a natural population. Theoretical models (e.g., GILLESPIE and TURELLI 1989, TURELLI and BARTON 2004) predict that these factors act to maintain variation in populations, and our results confirm these predictions.

Our results also suggest that the evolution of ovariole number and thorax length are highly integrated and environmentally sensitive; the evolution of one character will affect the evolution of the other and will do so in an environment specific fashion. Assessing the evolutionary potential and history of these characters will ultimately depend on understanding their developmental bases, their relationship to fitness and the extent of environmental heterogeneity in larval resources.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the members of the Tatar and Rand labs for logistic support, T. Flatt, K. Montooth, C. Meiklejohn, D. Rand, A. Schmitt and D. Weinreich for insightful discussion and comments on the early versions of the manuscript. This manuscript was

greatly improved by the comments of two anonymous reviewers and by D. Houle and J.B. Walsh. This work was supported by National Institutes of Health grants GM065513 and GM61773 to SVN and AG021953 to MT and by an Ellison Medical Foundation grant to MT.

LITERATURE CITED

- BARBIERI, M., M. BONAFÉ, C. FRANCESCHI and G. PAOLISSO, 2003. Insulin/IGF-1-signaling pathway: an evolutionarily conserved mechanism of longevity from yeast to humans. *American Journal of Physiology, Endocrinology and Metabolism*, **285**, E1064-1071.
- BITTERMAN, K.J., O. MEDVEDIK, D.A. SINCLAIR, 2003. Longevity regulation in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*: linking metabolism, genome stability, and heterochromatin. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Review*, **67**, 376-399.
- BLOWS, M. and B. WALSH, 2008. Spherical cows grazing in Flatland: Constraints to selection and adaptation. In *Adaptation and Fitness in Animal Populations Evolutionary and Breeding Perspectives on Genetic Resource Management*, J. van der Werf, H.-U. Graser, R. Frankham and C. Gondro (Eds).
- BOGDAN, M., J.K. GOSH, R.W. DOERGE, 2004. Modifying the Schwartz Bayesian Information Criterion to locate multiple interacting quantitative trait loci. *Genetics* **167**: 989-999.
- BOULÉTREAU-MERLE J., R. ALLEMAND, Y. COHET and J.R. DAVID, 1982. Reproductive strategy in *Drosophila melanogaster*: Significance of a genetic divergence between temperate and tropical populations. *Oecologia* **53**: 323-329.
- BROMAN, K.W. and T.P. SPEED, 2002. A model selection approach for the identification of quantitative trait loci in experimental crosses. *J. R. Stat. Soc. B* **64**: 641-656.
- BROMAN, K., H. WU, S. SEN and G.A. CHURCHILL, 2003. R/qtl: QTL mapping in experimental crosses. *Bioinformatics* **19**: 889–890.
- BURNHAM, K.P. and D.R. ANDERSON, 2002 *Model selection and multimodel*

- inference*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- CALDWELL, P.E., M. WALKIEWICZ, and M. STERN, 2005. Ras activity in the *Drosophila* prothoracic gland regulates body size and developmental rate via ecdysone release. *Current Biology* **15**: 1785-95.
- CHEN L. and J.D. STOREY, 2006. Relaxed significance criteria for linkage analysis. *Genetics* **173**: 2371-2381.
- CHEVERUD, J.M., 2001. The genetic architecture of pleiotropic relations and differential epistasis, pp. 411-433 in *The Character Concept in Evolutionary Biology*, ed. By G.P. Wagner. Academic Press, San Diego.
- CHEVERUD, J.M., T.H. EHRICH, T.T. VAUGHN, S.F. KOREISHI, R.B. LINSEY *et al.*, 2004. Pleiotropic effects on mandibular morphology II: Differential epistasis and genetic variation in morphological integration. *Journal of Experimental Zoology (Mol. Dev. Evol.)* **302B**: 424-435.
- COLOMBANI, J., L. BIANCHINI, S. LAYALLE, E. PONDEVILLE, C. DAUPHIN-VILLEMANT, *et al.*, 2005. Antagonistic Actions of Ecdysone and Insulins Determine Final Size in *Drosophila*. *Science* **310**: 667-670.
- COYNE, J.A., J. RUX and J.R. DAVID, 1991. Genetics of morphological differences and hybrid sterility between *Drosophila sechellia* and its relatives. *Genetical Research* **57**: 113-22.
- DAVID, J.R., 1970. Le nombre d'ovarioles chez la drosophile en relation avec la fécondité et la valeur adaptive. *Arch. Zool. Exptl. Gén* **111**: 357-370.
- DE MOED, G.H., G. DE JONG and W. SCHARLOO, 1997. The phenotypic plasticity of wing size in *Drosophila melanogaster*: the cellular basis of its genetic variation.

- Heredity **79**: 260-267.
- ENGSTROM, L.E., 1971. Studies of the effects of two-way selection for ovariole number in *Drosophila melanogaster*. PhD dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- FLATT, T. and T.J. KAWECKI, 2004. Pleiotropic effects of *Methoprene-tolerant (Met)*, a gene involved in juvenile hormone metabolism, on life history traits in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetica* **122**: 141-160.
- FOX, J., 2008. *car*: Companion to applied regression. R package version 1.2-8.
- FREEMAN, M.R., A. DOBRITSA, P. GAINES, W.A. SEGRAVES and J.R. CARLSON, 1999. The *dare* gene: steroid hormone production, olfactory behavior, and neural degeneration in *Drosophila*. *Development*, **126**, 4591-4602.
- FRY, J.D. S.V. NUZHIDIN E.G. PASYUKOVA and T.F. MACKAY, 1998. QTL mapping of genotype-environment interaction for fitness in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetical Research* **71**: 133-41.
- GILLESPIE, J.H. and M. TURELLI, 1989. Genotype-environment interactions and the maintenance of polygenic variation. *Genetics* **121**: 129-138.
- GROMKO, M.H., 1995. Unpredictability of correlated response to selection: pleiotropy and sampling interact. *Evolution* **49**: 685-693.
- GURGANUS, M.C., J.D. FRY, S.V. NUZHIDIN, E.G. PASYUKOVA, R.F. LYMAN *et al.*, 1998. Genotype-by-environment interaction at quantitative trait loci affecting sensory bristle number in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* **149**: 1883-1898.
- GUTTELING, E.W., J.A. RIKSEN, J. BAKKER and J.E. KAMMANGA, 2007. Mapping

- phenotypic plasticity and genotype-environment interactions affecting life-history traits in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Heredity* **98**: 28-37.
- GUZMÁN, C., R. CABRERA, M. CÁRDENAS, F. LARREA, P.W. NATHANIELSZ, *et al.*, 2007. Protein restriction during fetal and neonatal development in the rat alters reproductive function and accelerates reproductive ageing in female progeny. *The Journal of Physiology*, **572**, 97-108.
- HAFEN, E., 2004. Interplay between growth factor and nutrient signaling: lessons from *Drosophila* TOR. *Current Topics in Microbiology and Immunology* **279**: 153-67.
- HODIN, J., in press. She shapes events as they come: Plasticity in insect reproduction, in *Insects and Phenotypic Plasticity, Volume II*. Science Publishers, Inc., Enfield, New Hampshire.
- HODIN, J. and L.M. RIDDIFORD, 1998. The ecdysone receptor and ultraspiracle regulate the timing and progression of ovarian morphogenesis during *Drosophila* metamorphosis. *Dev. Genes Evol.* **208**: 304-317.
- HODIN, J. and L.M. RIDDIFORD, 2000. Different mechanisms underlie phenotypic plasticity and interspecific variation for a reproductive character in drosophilids (Insecta: Diptera). *Evolution* **54**: 1638-1653.
- HONEK, A., 1993. Intraspecific variation in body size and fecundity in insects: a general relationship. *Oikos* **66L** 483-492.
- HOULE, D., 1991. Genetic covariance of fitness correlates: What genetic correlations are made of and why it matters. *Evolution* **45**: 630-648.

- KAMBYSELLIS, M.P. and W.B. HEED, 1971. Studies of oogenesis in natural populations of *Drosophilidae*. I. Relation of ovarian development and ecological habitats of the Hawaiian species. *American Naturalist* **105**: 31-49.
- KAWAMURA, K., T. SHIBATA, O. SAGET, D. PEEL and P.J. BRYANT, 1999. A new family of growth factors produced by the fat body and active on *Drosophila* imaginal discs. *Development* **126**: 211-219.
- LANDE, R. and S.J. ARNOLD, 1983. The measurement of selection on correlated characters. *Evolution* **37**: 1210-1226.
- LANGLADE, N.B., X. FENG, T. DRANSFIELD, L. COPSEY, A.I. HANNA *et al*, 2005. Evolution through genetically controlled allometry space. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, **102**, 10221-10226.
- LEEVEERS, S.J., and E. HAFEN, 2003. Growth regulation by insulin and TOR signaling in *Drosophila*, pp. 167-192 *Cell Growth: Control of Cell Size*, edited by M. Hall, M. Raff and G. Thomas. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, New York.
- LEIPS J., and T.F. MACKAY, 2000. Quantitative trait loci for life span in *Drosophila melanogaster*: interactions with genetic background and larval density. *Genetics* **155**: 1773-1788.
- LI, R., S.W. TSAIH, K. SHOCKLEY, I.M. STYLIANOU, J. WERGEDAL *et al.*, 2006. Structural model analysis of multiple quantitative traits. *PLoS Genetics* **2**: e114.
- LINDSEY, D.L. and G.G. ZIMM, 1992. *The Genome of Drosophila melanogaster*. Academic Press, New York.
- MACKAY, T.F.C., 2001. Quantitative trait loci in *Drosophila*. *Nature Reviews Genetics* **2**: 11-20.

- MIRTH, C., J.W. TRUMAN, and L.M. RIDDIFORD, 2005. The role of the prothoracic gland in determining critical weight for metamorphosis in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Current Biology* **15**: 1796-807.
- NETER, J., W. WASSERMAN and M.H. KUTNER, 1985. *Applied linear statistical models*, 2nd ed. Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Homewood, Il.
- OLDHAM, S., and E. HAFEN, 2003. Insulin/IGF and target of rapamycin signaling: a TOR de force in growth control. *Trends in Cell Biology* **13**: 79-85.
- ORGOGOZO, V., K.W. BROMAN, D.L. STERN, 2006. High-resolution quantitative trait locus mapping reveals sign epistasis controlling ovariole number between two *Drosophila* species. *Genetics* **173**: 197-205.
- PANOWSKI, S.H., WOLFF, S., AGUILANIU, H., DURIEUX, J., and A. DILLIN, 2007. PHA-4/Foxa mediates diet-restriction-induced longevity of *C. elegans*. *Nature*, **477**, 550-555.
- PAVLICEV, M., J.P. KENNEY-HUNT, E.A. NORGARD, C.C. ROSEMAN, J.B. WOLF *et al.*, 2008. Genetic variation in pleiotropy: Differential epistasis as a source of variation in the allometric relationship between long bone lengths and body weight. *Evolution*, **62**, 199-213.
- PHILLIPS, P.C., M.C. WHITLOCK and K. FOWLER, 2001. Inbreeding changes the shape of the genetic covariance matrix in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics*, **158**, 1137-1145.
- PIGLIUCCI, M. 2006. Genetic variance-covariance matrices: a critique of the evolutionary quantitative genetic research program. *Biology and Philosophy* **21**: 1-23.

- RAE, M.T., S. PALASSIO, C.E. KYLE, A.N. BROOKS, R.G. LEA, *et al.*, 2001. Effect of maternal undernutrition during pregnancy on early ovarian development and subsequent follicular development in sheep fetuses. *Reproduction*, **122**, 915-22.
- RAE, M.T., C.E. KYLE, D.W. MILLER, A.J. HAMMOND, A.N. BROOKS, *et al.*, 2002. The effects of undernutrition, in utero, on reproductive function in adult male and female sheep. *Animal Reproduction Science*, **72**, 63-71.
- R CORE DEVELOPMENT TEAM, 2006. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- ROBERTSON, F.W., 1957. Studies in quantitative inheritance X. Genetic variation of ovary size in *Drosophila*. *Journal of Genetics* **55**:410-427.
- ROFF, D., 1981. On being the right size. *The American Naturalist* **108**: 405-422.
- ROFF, D., 1997. *Evolutionary Quantitative Genetics*. Chapman and Hall, New York.
- ROFF, D., 2002. *Life history evolution*. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, MA.
- R'HKA, S., B. MORETEAU, J. A. COYNE and J. R. David, 1997. Evolution of a lesser fitness trait: egg production in the specialist *Drosophila sechelia*. *Genet. Res. Camb.* **69**: 17-23.
- RHIND, S.M., 2004. Effects of maternal nutrition on fetal and neonatal reproductive development and function. *Animal Reproduction Science*, **82-83**, 169-181.
- SAS SOFTWARE, 2002. Version 9.13 of the SAS System for Windows . SAS Institute, Cary, N.C., USA.
- SCHEINER, S.M., 1993 Genetics and evolution of phenotypic plasticity. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* **24**: 35-68.
- SCHLICHTING, C.D. and M. PIGLIUCCI, 1998. *Phenotypic evolution: A reaction norm*

- perspective*. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, MA.
- SCHWARTZ, G., 1978. Estimating the dimension of a model. *Ann. Stat.* **6**: 461-464.
- SCHMIDT, P.S., L. MATZKIN, M. IPPOLITO and W.F. EANES, 2005. Geographic variation in diapause incidence, life-history traits, and climatic adaptation in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evolution* **59**: 1721-1732.
- SEN, S. and G.A. CHURCHILL, 2001. A statistical framework for quantitative trait mapping. *Genetics* **159**: 371-387.
- SISODIA, S. and B.N. SINGH, 2004. Size dependent sexual selection in *Drosophila ananassae*. *Genetica* **121**: 207-217.
- TELONIS-SCOTT, M., L.M. MCINTYRE and M.L. WAYNE, 2005. Genetic architecture of two fitness-related traits in *Drosophila melanogaster*: ovariole number and thorax length. *Genetica* **125**: 211-222.
- TU, M. and M. TATAR, 2003. Juvenile diet restriction and the aging and reproduction of adult *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Aging Cell* **125**: 327-333.
- TURELLI, M. and N.H. BARTON, 2004. Polygenic variation maintained by balancing selection: Pleiotropy, sex-dependent allelic effects and GxE interactions. *Genetics* **166**: 1053-1079.
- UNGERER, M.C., S.S. HALLDORSDDOTTIR, M.D. PURUGGANAN and T.F. MACKAY, 2003. Genotype-environment interactions at quantitative trait loci affecting inflorescence development in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Genetics* **165**: 353-365.
- VIEIRA, C., E.G. PASYUKOVA, Z.B. ZENG, J.B. HACKETT, R.F. *et al.*, 2000. Genotype-environment interaction for quantitative trait loci affecting life span in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* **154**: 213-227.

- VIA, S. and R. LANDE, 1985. Genotype-environment interaction and the evolution of phenotypic plasticity. *Evolution* **39**: 505-522.
- VIA, S., R. GOMULKIEWICZ, G. DE JONG, S.M. SCHEINER, C.D. SCHLICHTING *et al.*, 1995. Adaptive phenotypic plasticity: Consensus and controversy. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **10**: 212-217.
- WAYNE, M.L., J.B. HACKETT, C.L. DILDA, S.V. NUZHIDIN, E.G. PASYUKOVA *et al.*, 2001. Quantitative trait locus mapping of fitness-related traits in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genet. Res. Camb.* **77**: 107-116.
- WAYNE, M.L., J.B. HACKETT and T.F.C. MACKAY, 1997. Quantitative genetics of ovariole number in *Drosophila melanogaster*: I. Segregating variation and fitness. *Evolution* **51**: 1156-1163.
- WAYNE, M.L. and T.F.C. MACKAY, 1998. Quantitative genetics of ovariole number in *Drosophila melanogaster*. II. Mutational variation and genotype-environment interaction. *Genetics* **148**: 201-210.
- WAYNE, M.L. and L. MCINTYRE, 2002. Combining mapping and arraying: A novel approach to candidate gene identification. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **99**: 14903-14906.
- WEBER, K.E., 1990. Selection on wing allometry in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics*, **126**, 975-989.
- WEST-EBERHARD, M.J., 2003. *Developmental plasticity and evolution*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

YANG, C.H., P. BELAWAT, E. HAFEN, L.Y. JAN and Y.N. JAN, 2008. *Drosophila* egg-laying site selection as a system to study simple decision-making processes.

Science, **319**, 1679-1683.

ZIMMERMAN, E., A. PALSSON and G. GIBSON, 2000. Quantitative trait loci affecting

components of wing shape in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Genetics **155**: 671-683.

Table 1. Statistical thresholds for specific model terms

Trait	Model term	k	GW ER_k
Ovariole number	M_i	0	3.16
	$M_i:E$	1	2.73
	$M_i + T$	1	3.10
	$M_i:E + T$	1	2.78
	$M_i:E:T$	1	2.87
	$M_i:M_j$	1	2.43
	$M_i:M_j:E$	1	4.66
	$M_i:M_j:E + T$	1	4.17
	$M_i:M_j:E:T$	1	4.46
Thorax length	M_i	0	3.11
	$M_i:E$	1	2.76
	$M_i:M_j$	1	3.28
	$M_i:M_j:E$	1	4.67

Table 2. Mixed effect models for ovariole number within each environment

Term ^b	0.2% YBV ^a		0.4% YBV ^a		0.6% YBV ^a		0.8% YBV ^a	
	Mean Square ^c	Var. Comp. ^d	Mean Square ^c	Var. Comp. ^d	Mean Square ^c	Var. Comp. ^d	Mean Square ^c	Var. Comp. ^d
G	83.67 F = 1.61 _{190, 220}	4.48 (2.25 – 10.25)	118 F = 1.31 _{193, 252}	3.13 (1.46 – 10.69)	148.31 F = 1.50 _{190, 220}	4.21 (2.12 – 12.06)	127.56 F = 1.43 _{193, 254}	4.10 (2.17 – 10.45)
B	254 F = 5.62 _{2, 241}	0.25 (0.045-928)	22.45 F = 0.26 _{2, 268}	0 (0 – 0)	1165.55 F = 1.61 _{2, 220}	2.55 (0.65 – 161.4)	1056.01 F = 13.22 _{2, 220}	2.01 (0.51 – 132.95)
G:B	56.49 F = 4.68 _{210, 1126}	13.50 (10.66 – 17.67)	93.47 F = 5.78 _{248, 1714}	17.37 (14.14 – 21.86)	102.78 F = 7.01 _{247, 1660}	20.41 (16.2 – 25.46)	91.77 F = 4.40 _{250, 1706}	16.27 (13.08 – 20.80)
Error	12.07	12.19 (11.24 – 13.27)	16.18	16.33 (15.25 – 17.49)	14.66	14.75 (13.79 – 15.81)	20.87	21.06 (19.71 – 22.57)

^a YBV refers to percent yeast by volume in the larval rearing medium.

^b G, genotype; B, Block; G:B, genotype-by-block.

^c Values represent Type III and F values.

^d Values represent variance components and confidence intervals.

Table 3. Mixed models for thorax length within each environment

Term ^b	0.2% YBV ^a		0.4% YBV ^a		0.6% YBV ^a		0.8% YBV ^a	
	Mean Square ^c	Var. Comp. ^d						
G	261.6 F = 2.05 _{190, 222}	20.62 (13.30 – 36.22)	198.13 F = 1.45 _{193, 252}	6.69 (3.68 – 15.72)	163.85 F = 1.45 _{190, 251}	5.63 (3.09 – 13.36)	188.73 F = 1.76 _{193, 253}	8.75 (5.71 – 15.09)
B	491.8 F = 4.38 _{2, 247}	0.75 (0.14– 2433)	1221 F = 10.14 _{2, 272}	3.13 (0.80 – 20.42)	3610 F = 18.14 _{2, 270}	3.19 (0.83 – 18.00)	570.66 F = 5.94 _{2, 272}	1.04 (0.25 – 12.41)
G:B	138.11 F = 3.87 _{210, 1126}	33.12 (25.54 – 44.66)	142.24 F = 4.95 _{248, 1714}	24.56 (19.84 – 31.20)	116.41 F = 4.78 _{247, 1660}	20.10 (16.20 – 25.60)	110.50 F = 4.59 _{250, 1706}	18.38 (14.86 – 23.31)
Error	35.69	36.38 (33.51 – 36.64)	28.74	28.92 (27.07 – 30.96)	24.33	24.58 (22.99 – 26.36)	24.08	24.11 (22.57 – 25.81)

^a YBV refers to percent yeast by volume in the larval rearing medium.

^b G, genotype; B, Block; G:B, genotype-by-block.

^c Values represent Type III mean squares x10⁴ and F values.

^d Values represent variance components and confidence intervals x10⁴.

Table 4. Mixed model results across environments for RILs

Term ^a	Ovariole Number		Thorax Length	
	Mean Square ^b	Variance Component ^c	Mean Square ^b	Variance Component ^{b, d}
E	18221 F = 42.48 _{3, 7.39}	-	6.51 F = 64.33 _{3, 6.88}	-
G	217.8 F = 1.47 _{195, 562}	2.32 (1.31 – 5.17)	0.0396 F = 1.61 _{195, 553}	5.05 (3.02 – 10.11)
B	707.2 F = 1.83 _{2, 8.46}	0.32 (0.05 – 55381)	0.1189 F = 1.32 _{2, 7.68}	0.47 (0.05 – 36369)
G:E	82.2 F = 3.7 _{557, 6783}	6.21 (5.24 – 7.47)	0.0130 F = 3.75 _{557, 6783}	10.57 (8.95 – 12.68)
E:B	462 F = 20.81 _{6, 6783}	0.88 (0.35 – 4.82)	0.1130 F = 32.63 _{6, 6783}	2.12 (0.86 – 10.99)
G:B	109 F = 4.91 _{300, 6783}	6.22 (5.07 – 7.81)	0.0185 F = 5.33 _{300, 6783}	11.84 (9.72 – 14.74)
Error	-	22.56 (21.82 – 23.35)	-	35.06 (33.91 – 36.28)

^a E, Environment; G, genotype; B, Block; G:E genotype-environment; E:B, environment-block; G:B, genotype-block.

^b Values represent Type III mean squares and F values.

^c Values represent variance components, values in parentheses represent 95% confidence intervals.

^d Variance components and confidence intervals times 10⁴.

Table 5: Genetic correlation matrix

	0.2% YBV ^a	0.4% YBV	0.6% YBV	0.8% YBV
0.2% YBV	0.59 ^b	0.44	0.45	0.13
0.4% YBV	0.45	0.28	0.32	0.29
0.6% YBV	0.33	0.43	0.27	0.26
0.8% YBV	0.25	0.34	0.38	0.19

^a YBV refers to percent yeast by volume in the larval rearing medium.

^b Values above and below the diagonal represent the cross environmental genetic correlation for ovariole number and thorax length, respectively. Values along the diagonal represent the genetic correlation between ovariole number and thorax length within environments.

Table 6. Positions of putative QTL and epistatic interactions affecting ovariole number

	QTL Location ^a			QTL model term ^b	Raw LOD	Conditional LOD		Relative importance ^c	
	Chr.	LOD peak	2-LOD interval			mBIC	BIC	mBIC	BIC
Main effect QTL	2R	13.42 55A1	13.41 – 13.43 55A1 – 55A1	M_i	4.15	3.61	1.76	0.9535	0.9629
	X	5.98 5D5	4.14 – 13.26 4B5 – 11F6	$M_i:E + T$	3.27	2.37	3.59	0.8875	0.9952
	3L	17.30 93E2	15.58 – 21.85 92B1 – 96F10	$M_i + T$	4.32	-	-	0.0779	0.4157
	3R	6.56 65B5	0.00 – 7.70 61A5 – 66A11	$M_i + T$	6.23	-	0.82	0.2814	0.7429
	X	11.90 11A3	9.26 – 12.63 8E1 – 11C2	$M_i:E:T$	3.39	5.88	4.45	0.9941	0.9859
	2L	7.83 28D2	6.53 – 9.09 26E1 – 30A1	$M_i:E:T$	3.30	7.43	5.20	0.9992	0.9980
	2R	17.86 58D4	17.52 – 19.57 58B1 – 60B7	$M_i:E:T$	3.26	9.07	7.54	0.9999	0.9999
Epistatic interactions	X	6.39 6B2	5.78 – 7.94 5C9 – 7D6	$M_i:M_j$	4.22	-	1.98	0.0012	0.9112
	2R	17.18 57F8	16.30 – 18.55 57B2 – 59C2						
	X	21.74 20C1	20.77 – 21.74 19E5 – 20C1	$M_i:M_j$	6.13	-	3.45	0.2717	0.9980
	3L	1.66 62A10	1.41 – 1.78 62A1 – 62B3						
	2L	2.17 22D1	0.89 – 2.63 21E2 – 23A1	$M_i:M_j$	3.91	8.10	6.41	0.7691	0.9999
	3R	15.90 92C5	15.46 – 16.47 92A11 – 92F4						
	2L	2.17 22D1	0.48 – 3.09 21D1 – 23D1	$M_i:M_j$	3.65	-	3.68	0.0948	0.9981
	3R	27.61 100D2	27.43 – 27.61 100C7 – 100D2						
2L	6.13 26B7	5.71 – 6.63 25F3 – 26F2	$M_i:M_j$	3.86	-	3.54	0.0823	0.9972	
2R	15.77 56F11	13.95 – 16.30 55C9 – 57B2							

Table 6, continued: Positions of putative QTL and epistatic interactions affecting ovariole number

2L	15.23	15.10 – 17.55	$M_i:M_j:E + T$	4.52	13.20	7.88	0.9972	0.9999
	35C4	35C2 – 36D1						
3R	1.23	0 – 8.55	$M_i:M_j:E:T$	5.42	15.52	13.26	0.9999	0.9999
	83A2	81F5 – 87C7						
X	12.84	12.69 – 13.37	$M_i:M_j:E:T$	7.54	13.38	12.82	0.9999	0.9999
	11D6	11D1 – 12A4						
2L	3.57	0 - 3.65	$M_i:M_j:E:T$	7.54	13.38	12.82	0.9999	0.9999
	24A1	21A5 – 24A4						
2L	15.07	14.99 – 15.10	$M_i:M_j:E:T$	7.54	13.38	12.82	0.9999	0.9999
	35C1	35B8 – 35C2						
3L	12.19	11.86 – 12.20	$M_i:M_j:E:T$	7.54	13.38	12.82	0.9999	0.9999
	69A3	68E3 – 69A3						

^a in Mb and cytological band, relative to release 4.3 of the *D. melanogaster* genome

^b See text for description of models

^c Bold values represent terms retained in the best mBIC and BIC models

Table 7. Positions of putative QTL and epistatic interactions affecting thorax length

	QTL Location ^a		QTL model term ^b	Raw LOD	Conditional LOD		Relative Importance ^c		
	Chr.	LOD peak			2-LOD interval	mBIC	BIC	mBIC	BIC
Main effect QTL	3L	12.17 69A2	11.86 – 12.20 68E3 – 69A3	M_i	5.92	2.16	-	0.7913	0.4453
	3L	16.37 72F1	14.25 -18.01 70D4 – 75B5	M_i	4.29	2.70	0.93	0.5845	0.7665
	3R	1.23 83A2	0 – 6.94 81F5 – 86D4	M_i	5.62	-	-	0.4380	0.4385
	2R	6.95 27C6	6.73 – 7.77 47D8 – 48F1	$M_i:E$	2.92	4.38	3.35	0.9974	0.9908
	3L	13.38 70A8	13.35 – 13.39 70A7 – 70A8	$M_i:E$	2.86	2.79	2.74	0.9060	0.9664
Epistatic interactions	X	8.17 7E2	7.94 – 9.29 7D6 – 8E1	$M_i:M_j$	5.34	-	3.15	0.3940	0.9936
	X	17.48 16B10	16.14 – 17.81 14B9 – 16F4						
	X	21.74 20C1	19.33 – 21.74 18C8 – 20C1	$M_i:M_j$	4.18	6.52	2.94	0.5453	0.9905
	2L	2.17 22D1	0.48 – 3.09 21D1 – 23D1						
	X	21.74 20B3	19.56 – 21.74 18E3 – 20C1	$M_i:M_j$	3.80	-	2.99	0.0483	0.9987
	3L	1.66 62A10	1.05 – 1.78 61E3 – 62B4						
	2L	3.09 23D1	2.63 – 5.30 23A1 – 25D4	$M_i:M_j$	4.69	-	4.78	0.0061	0.9992
	3L	5.88 64F5	5.00 – 6.02 64C4 – 65A3						
	2R	9.66 50E1	9.29 – 10.27 50C3 – 51C2	$M_i:M_j$	3.97	-	3.84	0.0031	0.9980
	3L	1.05 61E3	1.05 – 1.78 61E3 – 62B4						
3L	14.26 70D5	14.21 – 16.37 70D4 – 72E5	$M_i:M_j$	3.37	-	3.82	0.0083	0.9971	
3L	21.47 78D5	20.34 – 21.47 77C1 – 78D3							

Table 7, continued. Positions of putative QTL and epistatic interactions affecting thorax length

X	5.57 5B2	4.14 – 6.19 4B5 – 5F2	$M_i:M_j:E$	4.41	7.12	7.70	0.8891	0.9994
X	13.05 11E3	12.74 – 13.16 11D1 – 11E11						

^a in Mb and cytological band, relative to release 4.3 of the *D. melanogaster* genome

^b See text for description of models

^c Bold values represent terms retained in the best mBIC and BIC models

LEGENDS FOR FIGURES

Figure 1. Reaction norms of ovariole number and thorax length to yeast concentration. (A & C) Squares and diamonds represent parental lines 89 and 58, respectively, $\pm 95\%$ CI, and circles represent the mean of the RILs for ovariole number (A) and thorax length (C). (B & D) Each line represents the RIL reaction norm for ovariole number (B) and thorax length (D).

Figure 2. Correlation between ovariole number and thorax length at 0.2% (A), 0.4% (B), 0.6% (C), and 0.8% (D) yeast by volume. Points represent RIL means, circles represent 95% confidence ellipse.

Figure 3. QTL scan results for ovariole number (A), thorax length (B), ovariole number conditioned on the additive effects of thorax length (C), ovariole number by environment conditioned on the additive effects of thorax length (D), and ovariole-thorax length-by-environment interaction (E). The x-axis represents genomic position, in megabase (Mb) along the three major *Drosophila* chromosomes. The y-axis represents LOD scores. For (A) and (B), the top half of the graph represents LOD scores for QTL and epistatic interactions with additive effects across environments, and the lower half of the graph represents LOD scores for QTL and epistatic interactions with variable effects across environments. See text for details of QTL model. Brackets represent epistatic interactions. The tip of each bracket represents the 2-LOD support interval for that locus, conditional on the highest LOD score of its interacting partner. Asterisks (*) represent loci retained in the best mBIC model. Horizontal, dashed lines represent permutation thresholds (see text for details). Ticks and squares represent marker location and approximate centromere location, respectively.

Figure 4. QTL, QTL- and epistatic-by-environment effects from the best mBIC model for ovariole number. Points represent genotype means, $\pm 95\%$ CI. Unless otherwise noted, estimates are relative to the 0.2% yeast by volume treatment.

Figure 5. Effects from the best mBIC model for thorax length. Points represent genotype means, $\pm 95\%$ CI. Unless otherwise noted, estimates are relative to the 0.2% yeast by volume treatment.

Figure 6. Estimated slopes, $\pm 95\%$ CI, of the relationship between ovariole number and thorax length within environments and alleles at each QTL.

Figure 7. Estimated slopes, $\pm 95\%$ CI, of the relationship between ovariole number and thorax length within environments and alleles for each epistatic interaction.

Figure 1.




Figure 2.




Figure 3.






Fig. 4








Figure 7.

