

**Title:** An experimental test for genetic constraints in *Drosophila melanogaster*.

**Authors:** Ian Dworkin<sup>123</sup>, David Tack<sup>1</sup>, Jarrod Hadfield<sup>4</sup>

Author affiliations:

- 1- Department of Zoology, Michigan State University
- 2- Program in Ecology, Evolutionary Biology and Behavior
- 3- BEACON Center for the Study of Evolution in Action
- 4- Edward Grey Institute of Field Ornithology, University of Oxford

**Corresponding author:** idworkin@msu.edu

**Running title:** An experimental test for genetic constraints

Abstract Word Count: 197

Manuscript Word Count: 6500

Figure Count: 3

Supplementary Figure count: 1

Table Count: 1

Supplementary Table count: 3

**Keywords:** G-matrix, genetic correlations, evolvability, genetic variation, dimensionality, allometry, *Ultrabithorax*, homeotic transformation.

Data has been archived at Datadryad.org (DOI:XXX-XXX)

Analysis Scripts have been archived at DRYAD and github

## Abstract

In addition to natural selection, adaptive evolution requires genetic variation to proceed. Yet the **G**-matrix may have limited “genetic degrees of freedom”, with certain combinations of trait values unavailable to evolution. Such limitations are often referred to as genetic constraints. Unfortunately, clear predictions about when to expect constraints are rarely available. Therefore, we developed an experimental system that provides specific predictions regarding constraints. Such tests are important as disagreements persist regarding the evidence for genetic constraints, possibly due to differences in methodology, study system or both. Numerous measures of genetic constraints have been suggested, and generally focus on whether some axes of **G** have eigenvalues  $\approx 0$ , indicating a lack of genetic variance.

The mutation *Ultrabithorax*<sup>1</sup> causes a mild homeotic transformation of segmental identity. We predicted that this mutation would induce a genetic constraint due to this homeosis. We measured genetic co-variation for a set of traits in a panel of strains with and without *Ubx*<sup>1</sup>. As expected, *Ubx*<sup>1</sup> induced homeotic transformations, and altered patterns of allometry. Yet, no changes in correlational structure nor in the distribution of eigenvalues of **G** were observed. We discuss the role of using genetic manipulations to refine hypotheses of constraints in natural systems.

## Introduction

The structure of  $\mathbf{G}$ , the genetic variances co-variance matrix can influence the direction and rate of evolution, and in turn is influenced by selection, drift and mutation. The pattern of genetic (co)variances ( $\mathbf{G}$ ) that exist between sets of traits is determined by the distribution of mutational effects on those traits and they way in which selection and drift change the frequency of mutants with different pleiotropic effects. Under neutrality,  $\mathbf{G}$  is expected to be proportional to  $\mathbf{M}$ , the mutational covariance matrix, but obtaining theoretical predictions for how  $\mathbf{G}$  depends on selection has been more challenging. Indeed, under persistent directional selection, theoretical models have predicted  $\mathbf{G}$  to be dominated by selection (Charlesworth et al. 1990), whereas others have predicted  $\mathbf{G}$  to be dominated by  $\mathbf{M}$  (Hill 1982; Houle 1991; Barton and de Vladar 2009). Nevertheless, a widely held belief among evolutionary biologists is the idea that  $\mathbf{G}$  is dominated by selection such that the combination of traits favoured by selection is the one with the least additive genetic (co)-variance (Walsh and Blows 2009). To this end, a great deal of empirical work has gone into testing whether such patterns exist (Blows et al. 2004). However, much less work has gone into understanding the relationship between  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{G}$ , primarily because of the great difficulty in getting precise estimates of  $\mathbf{M}$  (Estes et al. 2005).

The structure of  $\mathbf{M}$  is likely to reflect developmental pathways more than patterns of selection do, and observing structure in  $\mathbf{G}$  that reflects these developmental pathways could give us key insights into evolutionary constraints imposed by patterns of mutation. Although general theoretical work on the relationships between  $\mathbf{G}$  and developmental rules does exist (Rice 2000; Agrawal et al. 2001; Wolf et al. 2001; Rice 2004), much has focused on resource acquisition-allocation rules (Rendel 1963; Riska et al. 1989; Houle 1991; Worley et al. 2003). Likewise, empirical work has often focused on explaining patterns of genetic co-variances in terms resource acquisition-allocation rules but only rarely have physical, physiological or genetic manipulations being used to test whether this interpretation is justified (e.g. (Rendel 1963; Nijhout and Emlen 1998). Here we use a genetic manipulation to test whether a well characterised homeotic perturbation results in a change in  $\mathbf{G}$  that is consistent with a change in development.

With respect to the role that  $\mathbf{G}$  plays in the evolutionary response, demonstrating the presence of standing genetic variation is not simply characterized by the individual additive genetic variances for each character, but by combinations of those traits. Instead (and in particular for large numbers of traits), there may be available genetic variation for some combinations, but not others. This may represent a genetic constraint, as potential directions are unavailable for selection to act upon. One noteworthy example of a constraint occurs when there are fewer genetic “traits” (combinations of the original traits), than measured traits. This is best exemplified in when  $\mathbf{G}$  is not of full rank, i.e. some of its eigenvalues are  $\approx 0$  (Mezey and Houle 2005).

Assessing whether such genetic constraints may be of evolutionary relevance has become an important consideration in understanding the potential rate and trajectory of response to selection. A growing body of work has provided evidence for genetic constraints on  $\mathbf{G}$  that limit the direction of the evolutionary response (Mcguigan and Blows 2007; Walsh and Blows 2009), and have often been used to explain apparent phenotypic stasis. Yet a number of examples of traits with apparent phenotypic stasis express considerable genetic variation as demonstrated with artificial selection (Weber 1990, 1992; Conner 2002; Frankino et al. 2005; Hansen and Houle 2008; Conner et al. 2011). This implies that despite certain phenotypic combinations not being observed in nature, the observed pattern is unlikely to be due to genetic constraints. Alternatively, stasis may result from persistent stabilizing selection or an evolutionary constraint, i.e.  $\mathbf{G}$  is not oriented in such a way that much genetic variation is available in the direction of  $\beta$ , which can be quantified using a number of approaches (Mcguigan et al. 2005; Hansen and Houle 2008; Smith and Rausher 2008; Agrawal and Stinchcombe 2009).

To effectively examine the dimensionality of  $\mathbf{G}$  requires a good estimate of this matrix. Estimating  $\mathbf{G}$  is difficult, and studies are hampered by the need for extremely large sample sizes (in terms of numbers of families) for accurate estimates of genetic variances and co-variances. This problem gets more demanding as the number of measured traits (and thus parameters to estimate) increases. Additionally, small sample sizes can cause biased estimates of the rank of  $\mathbf{G}$  (Hill and Thompson 1978; Hayes and

Hill 1981; Meyer and Kirkpatrick 2008; Kirkpatrick 2009). Numerous approaches have been developed for estimating the dimensionality of  $\mathbf{G}$  (Amemiya 1985; Amemiya et al. 1990; Meyer and Kirkpatrick 2005; Hine and Blows 2006; Kirkpatrick 2009) or otherwise inferring constraint (Hansen and Houle 2008; Agrawal and Stinchcombe 2009), but these often provide different results (Simonsen and Stinchcombe 2010). Whether this is due to inherent disparities in power and bias in these methods, or in their application to different data sets remains unclear.

Such differences may be at the heart of the different conclusions regarding apparent genetic constraints. Using non-parametric bootstrapping Mezey and Houle (2005) demonstrated that virtually all 20 dimensions for wing shape expressed genetic variation in *Drosophila melanogaster*. McGuigan and Blows (2007) utilized an alternative approach (Amemiya 1985; Amemiya et al. 1990), and in *D. bunnanda* found only about half of the dimensions for wing morphology had significant genetic variation, implying a genetic constraint. Hine and Blows (2006) performed several simulations to test such methods, and argued that the approach of Mezey and Houle was biased, and over-estimated the effective number of dimensions with genetic variation. However, whether their simulations captured the structure of  $\mathbf{G}$  for wing shape in particular is unclear.

Moreover, it remains difficult to gauge whether the differences are due to the properties of the statistical methods or the data. For example, in addition to using different *Drosophila* species, each lab population differed in key aspects of history and effective population size. Mezey and Houle (2005) used the long term lab IVES population of *D. melanogaster*, maintained in the lab for ~40 years (~ 300 generations) with population sizes generally in excess of 1000. For their experiment, ~800 sires (with dams nested within sires) were used. In contrast, the study of McGuigan and Blows (2007) used a more recently established population of *D. bunnanda* derived from 8 wild-caught females, and measured progeny from 114 sires for their experiment. Finally different statistical methods to test for constraints were applied to each data set. Thus, in addition to methodological differences, any of the underlying biological factors (species, standing genetic variation and history of the lab population, numbers of families

measured, particular measurements used) could influence the results. These confounding factors make it difficult to compare results across studies.

One issue with all such studies is that *a priori*, there is no clear expectation for the dimensionality of  $\mathbf{G}$ , or when it is likely to be of reduced rank. That is, the covariance matrix can be estimated, and dimensionality inferred, but without a clear point of comparison. The effects of correlational selection appears to influence genetic correlations across traits (Roff and Fairbairn), but, whether it potentially depletes genetic co-variances is less clear. In this study, we present an alternative, complementary approach. We set out to experimentally test for the presence of a genetic constraint (reduced dimensionality) using an explicit genetic manipulation predicted to increase genetic correlations among traits, based on known developmental functions.

Mutations in homeotic genes have been observed to transform the fates of one segment into another (Lewis 1978; Morata 1993; McGinnis 1994). In *Drosophila*, mutations in the *Ultrabithorax* (*Ubx*) gene produce a range of homeotic phenotypes (Lewis 1978; Morata and Kerridge 1980; Bender et al. 1983; Sanchez-Herrero et al. 1985; Casanova et al. 1987; Stern 1998; Rozowski and Akam 2002; Stern 2003; Davis et al. 2007), caused by a transformation of the third thoracic segment towards second segmental identities. As an example, this manifests as a transformation of the halteres towards wing-like fates, with severe manifestations including four-winged flies. While this profound developmental change is the result of multiple mutations in the *Ubx* gene, far subtler transformations can also be observed with the *Ubx*<sup>1</sup> mutation, where heterozygotes display less extreme, quantitative transformations such as an increase in haltere size and the presence of occasional wing-like bristles (Gibson and van Helden 1997; Gibson et al. 1999), changes in organ size (Rozowski and Akam 2002; Stern 2003; Davis et al. 2007), and the rare ectopic expression of the apical bristle on the third thoracic leg, where it is not usually present (Rozowski and Akam 2002). Modulation of *Ubx* function has been implicated in several evolutionary changes between closely related species, as well as potentially at larger taxonomic scales (Stern 1998; Mahfooz et al. 2007; Khila et al. 2009). Previous work has demonstrated that introgression of the *Ubx*<sup>1</sup> mutation into a panel of wild-type lines of *D. melanogaster* reveals considerable

segregating variation for modifiers of aspects of the homeotic phenotype (Gibson and van Helden 1997; Gibson et al. 1999), including allelic variation segregating at the *Ubx* locus (Gibson and Hogness 1996; Phinchongsakuldit 2003).

We argue that the weak homeotic transformation produced by *Ubx*<sup>1</sup> provides a useful test for an altered structure in **G**, with clear *a priori* expectations. Given the partial transformation of third thoracic identity towards that of the second due to *Ubx*<sup>1</sup> (Gibson and van Helden 1997), we hypothesize that the legs on T2 (meso-) and T3 (meta-thoracic segment) should be more similar (higher phenotypic and genetic correlations), potentially reducing the dimensionality of **G**. While the rank of **G** remains difficult to estimate directly, this approach allows for a clear prediction in a reduction in rank in the *Ubx* vs. wild-type contrasts. We demonstrate that *Ubx*<sup>1</sup> clearly has an effect on the legs of *Drosophila*, and we observe segregating variation for aspects of the homeotic transformation. Yet we observe at best weak evidence for a change in the structure of **G**, or differences among measures of its dimensionality and evolvability. These results suggest that even with such a potentially strong genetic effect, we are unable to induce a genetic constraint in this system. We discuss these results within the context of the plausibility of such genetic constraints, and suggestions for future approaches to addressing these questions.

## Material and Methods

**Fly strains and Introgression:** The *Ubx*<sup>1</sup> allele was obtained from the Bloomington *Drosophila* stock center. Wild strains used in this study were as previously described by Dworkin (2005a, b). We backcrossed the *Ubx*<sup>1</sup> allele into 30 wild iso-female strains using a previously described crossing scheme for other mutations (Dworkin 2005a). For *Ubx*<sup>1</sup> a consensus phenotype based upon both haltere size and the presence of one or more “wing”-like bristles on the haltere were used to find virgin females heterozygous for the *Ubx*<sup>1</sup> allele. These females were then used for the proceeding generation of backcrosses to the wild-type strain. Introgressions were performed for 12 generations. After completion of the introgression procedure 26 isofemale strains remained with paired conspecifics with and without the *Ubx*<sup>1</sup> mutation.

**Experimental rearing:** Five pairs of adult flies (five  $Ubx^1/Ubx^+$  females and 5 wild-type  $Ubx^+/Ubx^+$  males) from each introgression line were placed into each of two replicate bottles, with standard medium and seeded with live yeast. The flies were allowed to lay eggs for 3 days, and were then transferred to fresh bottles. One set of replicates (two bottles/strain) were reared at 25°C, and the second set incubated at 18°C. Sterilized cotton was placed in each of bottle after 3 days of egg laying providing additional space for pupation. Larval densities were low to moderate for all lines (<100 individuals/bottle). After eclosion, adult flies ( $Ubx^1/Ubx^+$  and  $Ubx^+/Ubx^+$ ) were stored in 70% ethanol. For one isofemale line used ( $w$ ), no flies reared at 18°C eclosed; therefore we examined models with and without this line, with minimal influences on estimates (not shown).

**Dissection and imaging:** All three right legs and the wing were dissected from 10 individuals from each sex/line/temperature/replicate combination. All organs were mounted (70% Glycerol in phosphate buffered saline, with a small amount of phenol added as a preservative), with organs from 10 individuals to a slide. Legs and wings were imaged using an Olympus DP30BW camera mounted on an Olympus BX51 microscope at 40X magnification using Olympus DP controller image capture software (v3.1.1). ImageJ, v1.38 was utilized to obtain morphometric measurements (“measure straight line command”), for three segments of each leg (femur, tibia and basi-tarsus) in addition to the length and width (anterior crossvein) of the wing. For the current study analyses of measurements from the wing were excluded.

## ***Analysis***

Unless otherwise described, all analyses were done using R (v.2.13.0), using the libraries lme4 (Bates et al. 2011) and ASREML-R v3.0.1 (Butler 2009).

**Analysis of the Penetrance of the ectopic apical bristle:** To determine the extent of the homeotic transformation caused by the  $Ubx^1$  mutation, we utilized the presence of the



apical bristle on the meta-thoracic leg as a proxy for penetrance of the mutation. We analyzed the data using a logistic regression mixed model with linear predictor:

$$\eta_{ijkl} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \delta_l + u_k^{(k1)} + \delta_l u_k^{(k2)} + u_{jk}^{(j1)} + \delta_l u_{jk}^{(j2)}$$

for fly *i* from replicate *j* of line *k* in temperature treatment *l*.  $\delta_l = 1$  when the temperature is 25°C and zero when the temperature is 18°C. The  $\beta$ 's are fixed effects, the *u*'s and *e*'s random effects. The random effects are superscripted with the term they are associated with (*k*=line, *j*=replicate) and the temperature level (1=18°C, 2=25°C). Line effects are assumed to come from a bivariate normal distribution with a mean of zero and estimated covariance matrix. For example, for the *k*<sup>th</sup> line effects:

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_k^{(k1)} \\ u_k^{(k2)} \end{bmatrix} \sim N \left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{k1}^2 & \sigma_{k1,k2} \\ \sigma_{k1,k2} & \sigma_{k2}^2 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

Replicate effects were modeled similarly, although the covariance is non-identifiable and were set to zero. Models in which single variances were estimated for each random term (ignoring temperature) or the random term omitted, were also fitted using `lmer` (Laplace approximation) and compared using AIC.

```
lmer(y~Temp+(Temp-1|line)+(Temp18|Replicate)+(Temp25|Replicate))
lmer(y~Temp+(Temp-1|line)+(1|Replicate))
lmer(y~Temp+(1|line)+(Temp18|Replicate)+(Temp25|Replicate))
lmer(y~Temp+(1|line)+(1|Replicate))
lmer(y~Temp+(Temp-1|line))
lmer(y~Temp+(1|line))
lmer(y~Temp+(Temp18|Replicate)+(Temp25|Replicate))
lmer(y~Temp+(1|Replicate))
```

### ***Multivariate mixed linear model for the influence of $Ubx^1$ and rearing***

***temperature on morphometric measures of the leg***: To test for the potential influences of  $Ubx^1$  and rearing temperature on the nine leg segments (femur, tibia & tarsus for each of the three thoracic segments). We fit the multivariate mixed model:

$$\mathbf{Y}_{ijk} \sim \boldsymbol{\mu} + \text{Genotype}_i + \text{Temperature}_j + \text{Genotype}_i:\text{Temperature}_j + \mathbf{e}_{ijk}$$

$\boldsymbol{\mu} \sim \text{MVN}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{S}_L)$  to fit variance for lines

$\mathbf{e} \sim \text{MVN}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{S}_R)$  to fit residual variances

Where  $\mathbf{Y}$  represents the matrix of response variables. In addition to the fixed effects of Genotype ( $Ubx^1$  vs. wild-type) and rearing temperature (25°C vs. 18°C), we also estimated the variation due to isofemale lines ( $\mathbf{S}_L$ ) and the residual variation ( $\mathbf{S}_R$ ). We used the default (flat) prior on fixed effects, and inverse Wishart,  $iW(V=\mathbf{I}_{9 \times 9}, \nu=0.004)$  priors for all variances structures. We tested several different prior values for the degree of belief parameter,  $\nu$ , none of which had substantial influences on estimates of the posterior distribution of the fixed effects. We used a burn-in of 10,000 iterations, a chain length of 200,000 and thinning interval of 20, which provided an effective sampling of  $\sim 9500$ .

The co-variance structures used for the random effects above are clearly simplistic. To confirm that our estimates were not substantially influenced by the co-variance structure or the prior, we also fit models that parameterized the influence of temperature and  $Ubx^1$  on the genetic (line) effects. However, given the large numbers of parameters required, we could not fit those models for the complete set of nine traits. We instead fit three models with three traits each (each model varied across thoracic segments, but included leg organ, i.e. M1: femur, M2:tibia and M3: tarsus). For each model (Supplementary Table 1), the model including co-variances for line effects for both temperature and genotype were the best fit to the data, based on DIC. To confirm that the parameter estimates were not strongly influenced by the prior we examined the influence of both an inverse Wishart prior  $iW(V=\mathbf{I}_{3 \times 3}, \nu=0.002)$ , as well as using an expanded parameter prior, which has been argued to have better mixing qualities and is less informative than  $iW$  (Gelman 2006; Hadfield 2010). However, in all cases the fixed

effects of primary concern for this particular analysis were similar between these models and the full model described above. We compared the above model to one without the interaction term between genotype and temperature (interaction treated as fixed) as well (Supplementary table 1), and again the effects on the parameters of interest were minimal, and did not alter any of the conclusions.

To quantify the extent to which  $Ubx^1$  induced homeotic transformation of the third leg towards the second leg we used the treatment effect of  $Ubx^1$  on the third leg segment scaled by the magnitude of the difference between the second and third legs for each of the femur, tibia and basi-tarsus. This provides a useful scale to assess the degree of transformation, with 0 representing no homeosis, 1 suggesting that the  $Ubx^1$  resulted in a complete transformation in the predicted direction, and negative values demonstrating transformations in the direction opposite of the prediction of homeosis. Given that the differences between the wild-type T2 and T3 tibia were so small, and the credible intervals included zero, we did not include this trait for this “homeosis” scale, as the resulting estimates were not stable.

***Multivariate mixed linear model to examine the influence of  $Ubx^1$  on the genetic correlational structure among thoracic segments:*** To address the central question of this study, namely how the homeotic mutation altered the pattern of genetic co-variances, leg measurements T2 (Wt), T3(Wt) and T3( $Ubx$ ) were modeled in a single multivariate analysis. As fixed terms we had thoracic segment (T2 and T3), leg segment (femur, tibia and tarsus), genotype (Wt and  $Ubx^1$ ), temperature (18°C and 25°C) and their interactions. Interactions were dropped based on the non-significance of conditional Wald tests.

Given the limited number of lines we chose not to fit an unstructured genetic (line) covariance matrix for the six traits (leg segment by thoracic segment). Instead, we regularized the problem by imposing a biologically motivated structure on the covariance matrix, and utilized the information from the paired genotypes from within each line (with and without the  $Ubx^1$  mutation). Specifically, we consider the line effects of the six traits to be:

$$\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{A}_{2 \times 2} \otimes \mathbf{B}_{3 \times 3}$$

where leg segments (femur, tibia and tarsus) are nested within thoracic segment (meso-thoracic, T2 & meta-thoracic, T3). This model assumes that the covariance structure of the genetic (line) effects for leg-segments ( $\mathbf{B}$ ) are proportional within T2 and T3. Both diagonal elements of  $\mathbf{A}$  are not identifiable and so we set  $a_{1,1}$  to one such that  $\mathbf{B}$  is the estimated covariance matrix of line effects for T2, and  $a_{2,2}\mathbf{B}$  is the estimated covariance matrix of line effects for T3. We also assume that the correlation structure of the line effects for leg-segments between thoracic segments is proportional to the within thoracic segment correlation structure, with scalar  $a_{1,2}$ .

If  $a_{2,2}$  was estimated to be one it would imply that the segments in T2 and T3 have the same covariance structure. If  $a_{2,2}=1$  and the correlation  $a_{1,2}=1$  then this implies that the same leg-segments on different thoracic segments are genetically equivalent traits. If  $a_{1,2} = 0$  this implies that line effects on leg-segments of T2 are uninformative about leg-segments of T3 and they could be treated as genetically distinct traits. We refer to the  $\mathbf{A}$  matrix of this null model, where the mutation does not influence the covariance structure, as  $\mathbf{A}^{(Ubx=0)}$ .

If the  $Ubx^1$  mutation transforms T3 to T2 then we would expect that  $a_{2,2}$  and  $a_{1,2}$  would be closer to one in the presence of the mutation than with out. To test this we fitted a more complex model in which  $\mathbf{A}$  was a 3x3 matrix where  $a_{2,2}$  and  $a_{2,1}$  have the same interpretation as before but for L3 Wt only. The equivalent parameters for L3  $Ubx^1$  are  $a_{3,3}$  and  $a_{3,1}$ , and the new parameter  $a_{3,2}$ , models the correlation between L3 leg segment in the presence of the different mutations. We designate the  $\mathbf{A}$  matrix of this full model simply as  $\mathbf{A}$ .

If the mutation does transform T3 to T2 then we expect  $a_{3,3}$  and  $a_{3,1}$  to be one, and  $a_{3,2}$  to be equal to  $a_{2,1}$ . We designate the  $\mathbf{A}$  matrix of this developmental model as  $\mathbf{A}^{(Ubx=1)}$ , to indicate that the mutation fully transforms the L3 breeding values into L2 breeding values.

The same modeling strategy was also taken for the residual structure, although the cross genotype correlations are not identifiable and were set to zero.

**Evolvability:** We also utilized three recently proposed scalar measures of evolvability from Kirkpatrick (2009), all based on the distribution of the eigenvalues,  $\lambda$ , of  $\mathbf{G}$  when traits are mean standardized.

These measures include the total genetic variance or the trace of  $\mathbf{G}$  ( $\text{tr}(\mathbf{G})$ ) which is equal to the sum of the genetic variances or equivalently the sum of the eigenvalues. The second is  $e_{\max}$  the genetic coefficient of variation or the square root of the dominant eigenvalue ( $\lambda_1$ ), and the third is the effective number of dimensions of  $\mathbf{G}$ ,

$$n_D = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_1} = \frac{\text{tr}(\mathbf{G})}{e_{\max}^2}$$

where  $\lambda_1$  is the dominant eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{G}$ . Maximum evolvability is

$$e_{\max} = \sqrt{\lambda_1},$$

the genetic coefficient of variation for  $\mathbf{g}_{\max}$ .

Several other recent papers have proposed some related measures of evolutionary potential based upon  $\mathbf{G}$  including the average eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{G}$  (Hansen and Houle 2008) and variation across eigenvalues of the correlational matrix of  $\mathbf{G}$  (Van Valen 1978; Agrawal and Stinchcombe 2009). However, for the purposes of this experiment the results appear to be generally consistent regardless of the exact measure.

We were unable to get stable estimates of  $\mathbf{G}$  for all nine traits for mutant and wild-type separately (although our MCMC runs behaved for the model with all data described above). Given that the data was close to balanced, and we saw no evidence for replicate effects in the models we examined, we used “the poor man’s  $\mathbf{G}$ -matrix”, by computing line means. This approach can often be problematic (Hill and Thompson 1978), and generally should be avoided if possible. However, given the experimental design employed in this study, it is likely that any biases in estimation of the eigenvalues (i.e. over-estimating the dominant eigenvalue, underestimating trailing values) is likely to be internally consistent, and biased in a similar manner. In addition, comparisons of the approach based on line means with the mixed model gave similar estimates for models using subsets of the traits. Comparing  $\mathbf{G}$ -matrices generated using mixed models vs. line means we also used a sub-space comparison (Krzanowski 1979) implemented in

MCMCglmm and the first three angles associated between the matrix were all less than  $1^\circ$  (with  $0^\circ$  indicating identical direction, and  $90^\circ$  orthogonality) suggesting very similar matrices. In addition, since our specific comparison is for the contrast of  $Ubx^1$  and wild-type in this study, the results should be internally consistent between them.

To assess uncertainty, we used a hierarchical non-parametric bootstrap for both wild-type and  $Ubx^1/Ubx^+$  estimates of  $\mathbf{G}$  (from line means) to generate confidence intervals. We first sampled with replacement among lines (to account for sampling variance among lines), and then within each line (sampled from the bootstrap) we again sampled with replacement at the level of individual observation (to account for variation among individual observations within the sampled line). This approach accounts for uncertainty for both line (genetic) and observation (residual variation). For each iteration of the bootstrap we estimated  $\mathbf{G}$ , and computed and stored the eigenvalues to compute the effective dimensionality, maximum evolvability and total genetic variance.

## **Results**

### **Segregating genetic variation for the phenotypic effects of the homeotic**

**transformation caused by  $Ubx^1$ :** To confirm that the  $Ubx^1$  was inducing a homeotic transformation, we examined all individuals for the presence of an ectopic apical bristle on the tibia of the leg on the third thoracic segment, in addition to its normal presence on the second leg. This provided a proxy to determine if the third thoracic segments were “transformed” towards second segmental identities. Consistent with previous observations there is low overall frequency of this transformation, (Rozowski and Akam 2002). However our results demonstrate both segregating genetic variation (line) and rearing temperature influence the frequency of observing this phenotype (Figure 1). In particular, several of the strains had a high frequency for the presence of the apical bristle, despite the majority showing no expression of this phenotype. This is interesting given that all strains showed varying degrees of the subtle “wing-like” bristles present on the haltere, and an increase in haltere size when measured in  $Ubx^1$  individuals (not shown), similar to previous observations (Gibson and van Helden 1997).

These observations were confirmed using a mixed model with a logit link function to assess the fit of models including the effects of temperature. The results of the

model suggest that the homeotic transformation, as indicated by the presence of the apical bristle on the third leg, increased in flies reared at 18°C to ~5% (95% CI 3-9%) relative to ~1% (0.8-3.4%) reared at 25°C. These values are in-line with previous studies (Rozowski and Akam 2002). In addition there was considerable variation among lines in the penetrance of this phenotype (Figure 1), although there was no evidence of an interaction between strain and temperature (Supplementary Table 1). In no case was an apical bristle observed on wild-type flies ( $Ubx^+/Ubx^+$ ). These results demonstrate that the  $Ubx^1$  allele can cause the third-leg to take on second-leg-like developmental fates, which itself is influenced by allelic variation segregating in natural populations.

### ***The joint influence of genetic variation, $Ubx^1$ and temperature in the legs***

***of Drosophila***: Given the observation that  $Ubx^1$  influences the phenotypic expression of the apical bristle, consistent with a homeotic transformation, we also wanted to confirm the effects for quantitative variation on the legs of *Drosophila* (Rozowski and Akam 2002; Stern 2003; Davis et al. 2007), where we were ultimately interested in the change in patterns of phenotypic and genetic co-variation. We observed large influences from strain, the  $Ubx^1$  mutation and their interaction, in addition to the influences of rearing-temperature (Table 1, Supplementary Table 2). As predicted by its developmental role, the  $Ubx^1$  mutation had negligible (and non-significant) influences on the first (pro-thoracic) leg (Table 1, supplementary Figure 1). These results are consistent with previously demonstrated effects where *Ubx* function was reduced both in *D. melanogaster* (Stern 2003), as well as several other species of insects (Mahfooz et al. 2007; Khila et al. 2009).

For all measured leg segments on the second and third leg, the  $Ubx^1$  mutation influenced the size of each organ in a manner generally consistent with the homeotic transformation. Given the similarity of the second and third leg lengths even in the wild-type (Table 1, supplementary figure 1), we used a measure of the effect of the  $Ubx^1$  mutation on the segment of T3 scaled by the maximum possible difference between the segments between T2 and T3 wild-type segments. This provides a scaled measure of the degree of homeotic transformation. Thus a value of 1 represents a complete homeotic transformation of T3 to T2 in the predicted direction, zero would be consistent with no

change, and negative values would suggest that the effect of the  $Ubx^1$  mutation on the length of the leg-segments was in the opposite direction relative to the prediction.

As seen in figure 2, both the femur and the basi-tarsus are changing their relative lengths consistent with the homeotic influences of the  $Ubx^1$  allele. While it is unclear why, the two traits do differ in their apparent sensitivity to homeotic transformation. Future studies could consider examining the complex interplay between trait specific genetic background effects, and naturally segregating variation for the relative length of leg segments between T2 and T3.

### ***Transformation of segmental identity and the structure of genetic***

**correlations:** We constructed a model where the co-variances were structured to allow us to examine the overall genetic similarity of the second and third legs. In the full model where elements of  $\mathbf{A}$  were estimated the parameters associated with the mutant were slightly closer to one than the non-mutant ( $a_{2,1} = 0.779 \pm 0.071$  and  $a_{3,1} = 0.812 \pm 0.074$ ;  $a_{2,2} = 0.848 \pm 0.126$  and  $a_{3,3} = 0.914 \pm 0.140$ ). In addition, the genetic correlation between L3 leg segments in the presence/absence of the  $Ubx^1$  mutation ( $a_{3,2}$ ) was  $0.853 \pm 0.121$ , closer to  $a_{2,1}$  than to one as would also be predicted from a homeotic transformation of  $\mathbf{G}$ . However, the differences were subtle with large standard errors and a global test of  $\mathbf{A}$  versus  $\mathbf{A}^{(Ubx=0)}$  was marginal ( $\chi^2_3 = 6.88, p = 0.076$ ), with the estimate of  $\mathbf{A}^{(Ubx=0)}$  being  $a_{2,1} = 0.792 \pm 0.068$  and  $a_{2,2} = 0.860 \pm 0.122$ . A global test of  $\mathbf{A}$  versus the developmental model of a complete transformation of T3 to T2,  $\mathbf{A}^{(Ubx=1)}$  was more firmly rejected ( $\chi^2_3 = 104.98, p < 0.001$ ) with the estimate of  $\mathbf{A}^{(Ubx=1)}$  being  $a_{2,1} = 0.897 \pm 0.062$  and  $a_{2,2} = 0.983 \pm 0.122$ . While there is suggestive evidence for an increased shared structure in  $\mathbf{G}$  due to  $Ubx^1$ , the test of  $\mathbf{A}$  vs.  $\mathbf{A}^{(Ubx=1)}$  is inconsistent with the mutation causing a complete transformation of the breeding values of T3 into T2.

### **Homeosis induced by $Ubx^1$ does not influence dimensionality or evolvability of**

**G:** We also examined whether the homeosis induced by the  $Ubx^1$  mutation would influence the potential for evolutionary change using several recently proposed measures (Kirkpatrick 2009); effective number of dimensions, maximum evolvability and total



genetic variance. These are each based on the distribution or properties of eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{G}$  (Figure 3). For all of these measures, we observed similar patterns for both  $Ubx^1$  and wild-type (Figure 3), suggesting that homeosis induced by  $Ubx^1$  does not alter the potential for evolvability for these traits. Interestingly, the magnitudes for each of these measures is quite modest suggesting a lack of independence among the traits regardless of genotype at the  $Ubx$  locus. For instance the measure of dimensionality (given the nine measured traits) for wild-type and  $Ubx^1$  are 1.33 (95% CI 1.20-1.64) and 1.35 (95% CI 1.22-1.75) respectively. Maximum evolvability: 0.0825 (95% CI 0.064-0.103) and 0.076 (95% CI 0.057-0.095) and total variance: 0.0091 (95% CI 0.0063-0.013) and 0.00785 (95% CI 0.005-0.11) are also remarkably similar between wild-type and mutant. We examined this for each temperature subset (Figure 3), and little evidence for changes in these measures, or in the distribution of eigenvalues was observed. This is consistent with the results of the model presented above where the genetic co-variances are structured based upon developmental models of the function of the  $Ubx^1$  mutation. Despite the possible bias in the estimates of the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{G}$  (Hill and Thompson 1978), the values observed for these measures for this experiment are consistent with what has been observed for a number of other data sets (Kirkpatrick 2009).

## ***Discussion***

Observed patterns of variation in natural and experimental populations have often suggested that there is substantial stasis for many traits. In an evolutionary quantitative genetics framework, such observations have traditionally been explained as either the result of selection (such as the depletion of genetic variation due to historical directional selection, or current stabilizing selection), or as a feature of the genetic architecture of the traits, and in particular with a “genetic constraint” imposed by reduced dimensionality of the G-matrix, although evidence for such reductions have been mixed (Mezey and Houle 2005; Mcguigan and Blows 2007; Hansen and Houle 2008; Agrawal and Stinchcombe 2009; Kirkpatrick 2009). Yet our understanding of constraint has been hindered by a lack of *a priori* predictions for when such a reduction in dimensionality should be expected.

In this study we developed an experimental system with clear *a priori* predictions for the structure of co-variation based on the influence of a homeotic mutation. Despite

clear evidence for transformation of the third thoracic leg towards second leg like fates (Figure 1 and 2, Table 1), we observed weak evidence for changes in the covariance structure for the phenotypic or genetic co-variance matrices, counter to these predictions. Thus even with a mutation of profound developmental effects which might be expected to increase co-variation among traits on the two segments (since they are developmentally “more similar”), little effect was observed. These results suggest that the lack of available variation is unlikely to be caused by a simple “genetic constraint” imposed necessarily by the genetic architecture of the traits.

In light of the evidence we consider the most likely explanation for our observations is that the set of traits we examined (femur, tibia and tarsus across thoracic segments) are already tightly genetically correlated and represent a highly constrained system. Indeed the genetic correlations from our model, and the measures of effective dimensionality and evolvability are consistent with the legs of *Drosophila* being tightly genetically correlated with relatively few genetic degrees of freedom. In this case it may not be surprisingly that *Ubx*<sup>1</sup> was unable to make a highly constrained system detectably more constrained. The study of wing measures in *D. bunnanda* (Mcguigan and Blows 2007; Kirkpatrick 2009) where constraint was inferred had effective dimensionality between 1.6-1.9, while in our study the leg segments demonstrated somewhat lower measures (between 1.2-1.75). However the measures for maximum evolvability and total variance were considerably higher for the legs than for the wing measures in the previous study.

Clearly a mutation such as *Ubx*<sup>1</sup> is unrepresentative of most segregating variation present in natural populations. If such a variant did occur, it would likely be removed rapidly by natural selection. However, the goal of this study was not to mirror allelic effects influencing **G** in natural populations, but to experimentally manipulate **G** based on developmental considerations, with clear *a priori* expectations. Indeed, we consider the approach used here analogous to the numerous studies investigating selection against strong deleterious mutations artificially introduced to high frequencies in natural populations. These mutations were used not so much for the biological plausibility of

such deleterious alleles reaching high frequency, but to examine how selection proceeds, and to address additional questions. (Agrawal and Stinchcombe 2009; Hollis et al. 2009; Maclellan et al. 2009; Arbuthnott and Rundle 2012). In our system, we utilized *Ubx*<sup>1</sup>, to induce homeotic transformations, not because of the expectations of such mutations reaching appreciable frequencies in natural populations, but because it allows for the investigation of fundamental questions in evolutionary biology. Nevertheless, it is clear that there is in fact segregating variation for Ubx function within *D. melanogaster* (Gibson and Hogness 1996; Gibson and van Helden 1997; Gibson et al. 1999; Phinchongsakuldit 2003), and it has potentially played a role in phenotypic changes between species (Stern 1998; Khila et al. 2009). Thus alleles that influence the structure of **G** may indeed fix in natural populations, and it is worth considering their impact on evolvability.

There are several alternative explanations for our observations. Given the small number of genetically independent lines used for this study, it is possible we lacked sufficient power to detect differences in **G** between *Ubx*<sup>1</sup> and wild-type. However, the experimental approach used resulted in similar expectations for the residual variation (where we had high power) as it did for **G** with respect to the contrast between the two genotypes. Despite the difficulties in estimating variances and co-variances (Hayes and Hill 1981; Meyer and Kirkpatrick 2008), and constructing confidence limits, the lack of differences between *Ubx*<sup>1</sup> and wild-type makes it unlikely that this is simply an issue of power. Indeed one of the most powerful aspects of the approach outlined here is it allows for comparisons within the context of the experimental manipulation. However, future studies utilizing an approach similar to the one described might attain greater precision by backcrossing a homeotic (or other) mutations into a large natural outbred population (but not lines), and proceeding with a classic breeding experiment (e.g. pedigree/animal model, or nested half-sib design), or by applying artificial selection against the genetic correlation (and determine if the rate of response is impeded in the presence of the homeotic allele).

It is also plausible that homeosis induced by the  $Ubx^1/Ubx^+$  heterozygotes is too subtle to have sufficient impact on the co-variances for the phenotypes measured. While the phenotypic manifestation of partial homeotic transformation of the haltere was complete in the strains examined, this was not the case for the qualitative measure for the on the meta-thoracic leg (presence of the apical bristle). While stronger mutations could be used, the evidence based on the current study is inconsistent with an explanation based on mutational severity. When reared at a lower temperature (18°C) the penetrance of the qualitative homeotic trait (apical bristle) increased substantially for the  $Ubx^1$  treatment. Yet we did not see a reduction in measures of dimensionality or evolvability even with the increased expression of the homeotic phenotype. While the genetic co-variance structure did not change substantially, the influence of  $Ubx^1$  on the length of segments was consistent with expectations and previous results. Specifically the meso- and meta-thoracic legs (Table 1, Figure 2), but not the pro-thoracic leg, were influenced by the  $Ubx^1$  mutation (Rozowski and Akam 2002; Davis et al. 2007). Exploring how this mutation induces homeotic effects, but with such minimal influences on phenotypic and genetic covariances would be an interesting direction for future research.

The approach used in this study – utilizing a known genetic perturbation to develop clear *a priori* predictions – complements more traditional breeding designs used in evolutionary quantitative genetics. Indeed this experimental design allowed for a set of explicit developmental models for testing, to address the question at hand. While there has been a trend to both larger and considerably more sophisticated experiments that estimate  $\mathbf{G}$ , it is rarely clear to what the estimated matrix should be compared; i.e. there may not be clear null evolutionary hypotheses about the structure of  $\mathbf{G}$ . Mezey and Houle (2005) provided evidence of a large number of dimensions of available genetic variation for wing shape in *D. melanogaster*. In related studies, Weber (1990) and Conner (2002) demonstrated that there was available genetic variation for composite wing or floral traits, despite little observed phenotypic variation within natural populations, and even across closely related taxa. Such findings are often interpreted as the result of natural selection removing individuals with maladaptive trait combinations. The alternative interpretation is that  $\mathbf{G}$  is of reduced rank, with evidence consistent from a number of

traits and systems. Unfortunately in these cases, there was essentially a single estimated  $G$ , with no clear point of comparison. This is most often because it is unclear what the appropriate “null” hypothesis might be, and so only *ad hoc* comparisons are possible, unless sufficient data about the selective history of the population is available. We argue that an approach integrating some knowledge of developmental genetics, and utilizing tools similar to those used in this study can greatly inform such comparisons, and should be considered as an additional tool to help address evolutionary questions as a complement to more traditional studies.

**Acknowledgements:** We would like to thank David Houle, Ellen Larsen and Greg Gibson for discussions related to this project. Thanks to Will Pitchers, Jeff Conner and Chris Chandler for providing feedback on the manuscript. Funding for this project was from the NSF MCB0922344 to ID.

## References

- Agrawal, A. F., E. D. Brodie, and L. H. Rieseberg. 2001. Possible consequences of genes of major effect: transient changes in the G-matrix. *Genetica* 112:33-43.
- Agrawal, A. F., and J. R. Stinchcombe. 2009. How much do genetic covariances alter the rate of adaptation? *Proc Biol Sci* 276:1183-1191.
- Amemiya, Y. 1985. What Should Be Done When an Estimated Between-Group Covariance-Matrix Is Not Nonnegative Definite. *Am Stat* 39:112-117.
- Amemiya, Y., T. Anderson, and P. Lewis. 1990. Percentage Points for a Test of Rank in Multivariate Components of Variance. *Biometrika* 77:637-641.
- Arbuthnott, D., and H. D. Rundle. 2012. Sexual selection is ineffectual or inhibits the purging of deleterious mutations in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evolution* 66:2127-2137.
- Barton, N. H., and H. P. de Vladar. 2009. Statistical Mechanics and the Evolution of Polygenic Quantitative Traits. *Genetics* 181:997-1011.
- Bates, D., M. Machler, and B. Bolker. 2011. lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using S4 classes.
- Bender, W., M. Akam, F. Karch, P. A. Beachy, M. Peifer, P. Spierer, E. B. Lewis, and D. S. Hogness. 1983. Molecular Genetics of the Bithorax Complex in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Science* 221:23-29.
- Blows, M. W., S. F. Chenoweth, and E. Hine. 2004. Orientation of the genetic variance-covariance matrix and the fitness surface for multiple male sexually selected traits. Pp. 329-340. *Am Nat*.
- Butler, D. 2009. asreml: asreml() fits the linear mixed model. R package version 3.0.1.
- Casanova, J., E. Sanchez-Herrero, A. Busturia, and G. Morata. 1987. Double and triple mutant combinations of *bithorax* complex of *Drosophila*. *Embo J* 6:3103-3109.
- Charlesworth, B., D. Charlesworth, and M. T. Morgan. 1990. Genetic Loads and Estimates of Mutation-Rates in Highly Inbred Plant-Populations. *Nature* 347:380-382.
- Conner, J. K. 2002. Genetic mechanisms of floral trait correlations in a natural population. *Nature* 420:407-410.
- Conner, J. K., K. Karoly, C. Stewart, V. A. Koelling, H. F. Sahli, and F. H. Shaw. 2011. Rapid independent trait evolution despite a strong pleiotropic genetic correlation. *Am Nat* 178:429-441.
- Davis, G. K., D. G. Srinivasan, P. J. Wittkopp, and D. L. Stern. 2007. The function and regulation of *Ultrabithorax* in the legs of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Dev Biol* 308:621-631.
- Dworkin, I. 2005a. A Study of Canalization and Developmental Stability in the Sternopleural Bristle System of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evolution* 59:1500-1509.
- Dworkin, I. 2005b. Evidence for canalization of *Distal-less* function in the leg of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evol Dev* 7:89-100.
- Estes, S., B. C. Ajie, M. Lynch, and P. C. Phillips. 2005. Spontaneous mutational correlations for life-history, morphological and behavioral characters in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Genetics* 170:645-653.

- Frankino, W. A., B. J. Zwaan, D. L. Stern, and P. M. Brakefield. 2005. Natural selection and developmental constraints in the evolution of allometries. *Science* 307:718-720.
- Gelman, A. 2006. Prior distributions for variance parameters in hierarchical models. *Bayesian Analysis*.
- Gibson, G., and D. S. Hogness. 1996. Effect of polymorphism in the *Drosophila* regulatory gene *Ultrabithorax* on homeotic stability. *Science* 271:200-203.
- Gibson, G., and S. van Helden. 1997. Is function of the *Drosophila* homeotic gene *Ultrabithorax* canalized? *Genetics* 147:1155-1168.
- Gibson, G., M. Wemple, and S. van Helden. 1999. Potential variance affecting homeotic *Ultrabithorax* and *Antennapedia* phenotypes in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 151:1081-1091.
- Hadfield, J. 2010. MCMC methods for multi-response generalized linear mixed models: the MCMCglmm R package. *Journal of Statistical Software*.
- Hansen, T. F., and D. Houle. 2008. Measuring and comparing evolvability and constraint in multivariate characters. *J Evol Biol* 21:1201-1219.
- Hayes, J. F., and W. G. Hill. 1981. Modification of Estimates of Parameters in the Construction of Genetic Selection Indexes (Bending). *Biometrics* 37:483-493.
- Hill, W., and R. Thompson. 1978. Probabilities of non-positive definite between-group or genetic covariance matrices. *Biometrics*.
- Hill, W. G. 1982. Predictions of response to artificial selection from new mutations. *Genet Res* 40:255-278.
- Hine, E., and M. W. Blows. 2006. Determining the effective dimensionality of the genetic variance-covariance matrix. *Genetics* 173:1135-1144.
- Hollis, B., J. L. Fierst, and D. Houle. 2009. Sexual selection accelerates the elimination of a deleterious mutant in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evolution* 63:324-333.
- Houle, D. 1991. Genetic Covariance of Fitness Correlates - What Genetic Correlations Are Made of and Why It Matters. *Evolution* 45:630-648.
- Khila, A., E. Abouheif, and L. Rowe. 2009. Evolution of a novel appendage ground plan in water striders is driven by changes in the Hox gene *Ultrabithorax*. *PLoS Genet* 5:e1000583.
- Kirkpatrick, M. 2009. Patterns of quantitative genetic variation in multiple dimensions. *Genetica* 136:271-284.
- Lewis, E. B. 1978. A gene complex controlling segmentation in *Drosophila*. *Nature* 276:565-570.
- Maclellan, K., M. C. Whitlock, and H. D. Rundle. 2009. Sexual selection against deleterious mutations via variable male search success. *Biol Lett* 5:795-797.
- Mahfooz, N., N. Turchyn, M. Mihajlovic, S. Hrycaj, A. Popadić, and J. Fraser. 2007. *Ubx* Regulates Differential Enlargement and Diversification of Insect Hind Legs. *PLoS ONE* 2:e866.
- McGinnis, W. 1994. A century of homeosis, a decade of homeoboxes. *Genetics* 137:607-611.
- Mcguigan, K., and M. W. Blows. 2007. The phenotypic and genetic covariance structure of drosophilid wings. *Evolution* 61:902-911.
- Mcguigan, K., S. F. Chenoweth, and M. W. Blows. 2005. Phenotypic divergence along lines of genetic variance. *Am Nat* 165:32-43.

- Meyer, K., and M. Kirkpatrick. 2005. Restricted maximum likelihood estimation of genetic principal components and smoothed covariance matrices. *Genet Sel Evol* 37:1-30.
- Meyer, K., and M. Kirkpatrick. 2008. Perils of Parsimony: Properties of Reduced-Rank Estimates of Genetic Covariance Matrices. *Genetics* 180:1153-1166.
- Mezey, J. G., and D. Houle. 2005. The dimensionality of genetic variation for wing shape in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Pp. 1027-1038. *Evolution*.
- Morata, G. 1993. Homeotic genes of *Drosophila*. *Curr Opin Genet Dev* 3:606-614.
- Morata, G., and S. Kerridge. 1980. An analysis of the expressivity of some *bithorax* transformations. *Basic Life Sci* 16:141-154.
- Nijhout, H. F., and D. J. Emlen. 1998. Competition among body parts in the development and evolution of insect morphology. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 95:3685-3689.
- Phinchongsakuldit, J. 2003. Evolution of Developmental Genes: Molecular Microevolution of Enhancer Sequences at the *Ubx* Locus in *Drosophila* and Its Impact on Developmental Phenotypes. *Mol Biol Evol* 21:348-363.
- Rendel, J. M. 1963. Correlation between Number of Scutellar and Abdominal Bristles in *Drosophila Melanogaster*. *Genetics* 48:391-&.
- Rice, S. H. 2000. The Evolution of Developmental Interactions: Epistasis, Canalization and Integration. in J. B. wolf, E. D. Brodie III, and M. J. Wade, eds. *Epistasis and the Evolutionary Process*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Rice, S. H. 2004. Developmental associations between traits: covariance and beyond. *Genetics* 166:513-526.
- Riska, B., T. Prout, and M. Turelli. 1989. Laboratory Estimates of Heritabilities and Genetic Correlations in Nature. *Genetics* 123:865-871.
- Roff, D. A., and D. J. Fairbairn. The evolution of trade-offs under directional and correlational selection. *Evolution* 66:2461-2474.
- Rozowski, M., and M. Akam. 2002. Hox gene control of segment-specific bristle patterns in *Drosophila*. *Genes Dev* 16:1150-1162.
- Sanchez-Herrero, E., I. Vernos, R. Marco, and G. Morata. 1985. Genetic organization of *Drosophila bithorax* complex. *Nature* 313:108-113.
- Simonsen, A. K., and J. R. Stinchcombe. 2010. Quantifying Evolutionary Genetic Constraints in the Ivyleaf Morning Glory, *Ipomoea Hederacea*. Pp. 972-986. *International Journal of Plant Sciences*.
- Smith, R. A., and M. D. Rausher. 2008. Selection for character displacement is constrained by the genetic architecture of floral traits in the ivyleaf morning glory. *Evolution* 62:2829-2841.
- Stern, D. L. 1998. A role of *Ultrabithorax* in morphological differences between *Drosophila* species. *Nature* 396:463-466.
- Stern, D. L. 2003. The Hox gene *Ultrabithorax* modulates the shape and size of the third leg of *Drosophila* by influencing diverse mechanisms. *Developmental Biology* 256:355-366.
- Van Valen, L. 1978. The statistics of variation. *Evolutionary Theory* 4:34-43.
- Walsh, B., and M. W. Blows. 2009. Abundant Genetic Variation plus Strong Selection = Multivariate Genetic Constraints: A Geometric View of Adaptation. Pp. 41-59. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.*



- Weber, K. E. 1990. Selection on wing allometry in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 126:975-989.
- Weber, K. E. 1992. How small are the smallest selectable domains of form? *Genetics* 130:345-353.
- Wolf, J., W. Frankino, A. Agrawal, E. Brodie, and A. MOORE. 2001. Developmental interactions and the constituents of quantitative variation. Pp. 232-245. *Evolution*.
- Worley, A. C., D. Houle, and S. C. Barrett. 2003. Consequences of hierarchical allocation for the evolution of life-history traits. *Am Nat* 161:153-167.

Parameter	posterior mean	l-95% CI	u-95% CI	pMCMC
L1_Femur	52.46	51.75	53.15	
L1_Tibia	40.20	39.65	40.73	
L1_Tarsus	17.89	17.56	18.25	
L2_Femur	64.78	63.85	65.68	
L2_Tibia	59.33	58.33	60.20	
L2_Tarsus	26.73	26.26	27.17	
L3_Femur	63.62	62.81	64.41	
L3_Tibia	59.48	58.61	60.32	
L3_Tarsus	29.81	29.29	30.34	
L1_Femur: <i>Ubx</i>	-0.01	-0.17	0.16	0.87
L1_Tibia: <i>Ubx</i>	-0.16	-0.40	0.07	0.18
L1_Tarsus: <i>Ubx</i>	-0.03	-0.13	0.08	0.60
L2_Femur: <i>Ubx</i>	-0.29	-0.48	-0.10	0.003
L2_Tibia: <i>Ubx</i>	-0.54	-0.73	-0.33	<0.0004
L2_Tarsus: <i>Ubx</i>	-0.64	-0.78	-0.51	<0.0004
L3_Femur: <i>Ubx</i>	1.10	0.92	1.29	<0.0004
L3_Tibia: <i>Ubx</i>	-0.52	-0.72	-0.32	<0.0004
L3_Tarsus: <i>Ubx</i>	-0.72	-0.86	-0.58	<0.0004
L1_Femur:Temp18	0.85	0.70	1.02	<0.0004
L1_Tibia:Temp18	-3.86	-4.08	-3.64	<0.0004
L1_Tarsus:Temp18	-0.46	-0.57	-0.36	<0.0004
L2_Femur:Temp18	1.51	1.30	1.69	<0.0004
L2_Tibia:Temp18	1.38	1.18	1.59	<0.0004
L2_Tarsus:Temp18	0.26	0.12	0.38	<0.0004
L3_Femur:Temp18	1.93	1.75	2.10	<0.0004
L3_Tibia:Temp18	1.99	1.78	2.19	<0.0004
L3_Tarsus:Temp18	-0.78	-0.92	-0.64	<0.0004

Table 1: Parameter estimates from mixed model to examine the influence of the *Ubx*<sup>1</sup> mutation and rearing temperature on the length of leg segments within thoracic segments. Of particular note are the negligible effects associated with *Ubx*<sup>1</sup> on the pro-thoracic (first) leg. The pMCMC represents a Bayesian pseudo “p-value” against a value of zero. All parameters had an effective sampling greater than 2500.

Model	Femur	Tibia	Basi-tarsus
G + T, 1 L	<b>22351.6</b>	<b>26183.2</b>	<b>20124.2</b>
G + T + G:T, 1 L	<b>22352.8</b>	<b>26178.6</b>	<b>20126.7</b>
G + T, T L + G L	<b>22241.6</b>	<b>26012.8</b>	<b>19968.1</b>
G + T + G:T, T L + G L	<b>22244.5</b>	<b>26007.5</b>	<b>19968.5</b>

Supplementary Table 1: Summary of DIC for the segment specific models. Each model included the within leg element (either femur, tibia or basi-tarsus) for all three thoracic segments (leg 1, leg 2 and leg 3). Thus we examined the influence of the homeotic *Ubx*<sup>l</sup> allele on femur, tibia and basi-tarsus in isolation. In each case modeling the influence of line (L) on the mutation (G) and rearing temperature (T) provided better approximating models. We utilized several different co-variance structures for these model comparisons, including allowing line (L) to vary according to vary according to mutation G|L and rearing temperature T|L. The incorporation of interactions between mutation and rearing temperature did not substantially change the fit of the model, except for perhaps the tibia.

model	AIC	BIC	logLik
~ 1 + TEMP + (1+TEMP LINE) + (1 REP)	120.5	136.1	-54.27
~ TEMP + (1+TEMP LINE)	118.5	131.5	-54.27
~ 1+ TEMP + (1 LINE)	114.6	122.3	-54.28
~ 1+ TEMP	220.0	225.1	-108.0
~ 1	233.0	235.5	-115.5

Supplementary Table 2: Examining the influence of genetic variation and rearing temperature on the penetrance of the apical bristle homeotic phenotype. AIC/BIC and log likelihoods according to glmer (lme4).

	First leg			Second leg			Third leg		
	Femur	Tibia	Tarsus	Femur	Tibia	Tarsus	Femur	Tibia	Tarsus
Femur	3.01 <i>1.34-5.37</i>	1.48 <i>0.25-3.03</i>	1.04 <i>0.27-2.05</i>	3.69 <i>1.50-2.05</i>	3.00 <i>1.0-5.92</i>	1.17 <i>0.17-2.55</i>	3.08 <i>1.22-5.88</i>	2.77 <i>0.92-5.27</i>	1.37 <i>0.17-2.79</i>
Tibia	0.64 <i>0.26-0.73</i>	1.78 <i>0.67-3.23</i>	0.77 <i>0.15-1.53</i>	2.14 <i>0.59-4.37</i>	2.62 <i>0.18-5.03</i>	1.04 <i>0.31-2.07</i>	1.64 <i>0.28-3.45</i>	2.03 <i>0.51-4.0</i>	1.24 <i>0.28-2.38</i>
Tarsus	0.70 <i>0.43-0.77</i>	0.68 <i>0.33-0.74</i>	0.73 <i>0.30-1.33</i>	1.30 <i>0.30-2.62</i>	1.13 <i>0.09-2.47</i>	0.80 <i>0.28-1.51</i>	1.19 <i>0.29-2.34</i>	1.07 <i>0.10-2.21</i>	0.88 <i>0.29-1.68</i>
Femur	0.93 <i>0.86-0.93</i>	0.70 <i>0.47-0.79</i>	0.66 <i>0.37-0.74</i>	5.29 <i>2.29-9.42</i>	4.62 <i>1.69-8.61</i>	1.67 <i>0.27-3.47</i>	4.29 <i>1.78-7.71</i>	4.05 <i>1.45-7.51</i>	1.98 <i>0.47-4.0</i>
Tibia	0.74 <i>0.57-0.81</i>	0.85 <i>0.72-0.89</i>	0.57 <i>0.11-0.68</i>	0.86 <i>0.74-0.89</i>	5.41 <i>2.29-9.9</i>	1.75 <i>0.4-3.55</i>	3.61 <i>1.23-6.90</i>	4.43 <i>1.67-8.17</i>	2.15 <i>0.61-4.19</i>
Tarsus	0.60 <i>0.21-0.72</i>	0.69 <i>0.31-0.75</i>	0.84 <i>0.71-0.86</i>	0.65 <i>0.25-0.74</i>	0.67 <i>0.38-0.74</i>	1.26 <i>0.50-2.33</i>	1.51 <i>0.39-3.10</i>	1.68 <i>0.38-3.32</i>	1.25 <i>0.45-2.38</i>
Femur	0.89 <i>0.81-0.90</i>	0.62 <i>0.26-0.72</i>	0.70 <i>0.41-0.76</i>	0.94 <i>0.90-0.94</i>	0.78 <i>0.62-0.82</i>	0.67 <i>0.41-0.76</i>	3.97 <i>1.71-7.08</i>	3.50 <i>1.26-6.39</i>	1.75 <i>0.46-3.48</i>
Tibia	0.76 <i>0.59-0.81</i>	0.72 <i>0.46-0.79</i>	0.59 <i>0.13-0.68</i>	0.84 <i>0.71-0.87</i>	0.90 <i>0.82-0.93</i>	0.71 <i>0.40-0.77</i>	0.83 <i>0.72-0.86</i>	4.45 <i>1.82-7.89</i>	2.02 <i>0.64-3.98</i>
Tarsus	0.63 <i>0.19-0.71</i>	0.73 <i>0.43-0.78</i>	0.81 <i>0.68-0.85</i>	0.68 <i>0.40-0.78</i>	0.73 <i>0.51-0.79</i>	0.88 <i>0.81-0.91</i>	0.70 <i>0.45-0.77</i>	0.76 <i>0.60-0.83</i>	1.60 <i>0.62-2.88</i>

Supplementary Table 3: **G**-matrix for the leg segments of *D. melanogaster*. Diagonal and upper triangular components represent variances & co-variances, while below the diagonal are correlations. 95% highest posterior density credible intervals for each estimate (*italics*).

Figure 1: Penetrance of the apical bristle on the third-leg, demonstrating homeotic transformation. A) The morphological marker for the homeotic transformation. The first tibia is from a wild-type second leg (T2), showing the presence of the apical and pre-apical bristles. B) On the tibia of the third leg of wild-type *D. melanogaster* (T3) no apical bristle is present. C) The apical bristle is present on *Ubx<sup>1</sup>* tibia for the third leg, D) however the penetrance of this phenotype varies across strains.

Figure 2: The degree of homeosis for the meta-thoracic femur and basi-tarsus due to *Ubx<sup>1</sup>*. This measure represents the scaled effect of the *Ubx<sup>1</sup>* mutation on either the femur or the basi-tarsus for meta-thoracic (T3) segment, scaled by the difference between the T2 and T3 segments. Error bars represent 95% highest posterior density CIs.

Figure 3: The *Ubx<sup>1</sup>* mutation does not influence the structure of **G**, as demonstrated with the distribution of its eigenvalues. A) Distribution of eigenvalues of **G** for the data subsetted by both rearing temperature (18 VS. 25°C) and for genotype (wild-type VS. *Ubx<sup>1</sup>*). There was no evidence for any differences among these distributions by the experimental treatment. B) Additionally there was no evidence for differences among treatment for the dimensionality measure used in this study.

Supplementary Figure 1: *Ubx<sup>1</sup>* influences the length of leg segments on T2 and T3, but not T1 consistent with its homeotic role. While the phenotypic effects of the *Ubx<sup>1</sup>* mutation are subtle, as expected it had no effect on the leg segments on the first leg, as *Ubx* is not expressed in these organs. On the third leg in particular, the changes in the length of segments are consistent with a homeotic transformation as the mutant femur increases slightly in length (like the T2 femur), while the tarsus decreases slightly. Given how similar the leg segments are overall, it is not surprising that the effects of *Ubx<sup>1</sup>* are so subtle (compare the lengths of T2 and T3 legs for wild-type). \*\* pMCMC < 0.005, \*\*\* pMCMC < 0.0005.



**a**

200  $\mu$ m



**b**



**c**











