

1 Does your gene need a background check? How genetic background impacts the
2 analysis of mutations, genes, and evolution

3

4

5 Author list: Christopher H. Chandler^{1,2}, Sudarshan Chari¹ and Ian Dworkin^{1*}

6 * Author for correspondence, Email: idworkin@msu.edu

7

8 Author affiliation:

9 1 - Department of Zoology, BEACON Center for the study of Evolution in Action.

10 Michigan State University.

11 2 - Department of Biological Sciences, SUNY Oswego, Oswego, NY.

12

13 Keywords: Genetic Background, Epistasis, Genotype by Environment Interaction,

14 Genetic Analysis, Penetrance, Expressivity.

15

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

The premise of genetic analysis is that a causal link exists between phenotypic and allelic variation. Yet it has long been documented that mutant phenotypes are not a simple result of a single DNA lesion, but rather are due to interactions of the focal allele with other genes and the environment. Although an experimentally rigorous approach, focusing on individual mutations and isogenic control strains, has facilitated amazing progress within genetics and related fields, a glimpse back suggests that a vast complexity has been omitted from our current understanding of allelic effects. Armed with traditional genetic analyses and the foundational knowledge they have provided, we argue that the time and tools are ripe to return to the under-explored aspects of gene function and embrace the context-dependent nature of genetic effects. We assert that a broad understanding of genetic effects and the evolutionary dynamics of alleles requires identifying how mutational outcomes depend upon the “wild-type” genetic background. Furthermore, we discuss how best to exploit genetic background effects to broaden genetic research programs.

1 **What are genetic background effects?**

2 Although many traits vary phenotypically (and genetically) in natural populations,
3 some appear qualitatively similar across unrelated individuals, as long as those
4 individuals possess a “wild-type” genotype. This phenomenon is often depicted with
5 “genotype-phenotype maps”, diagrams illustrating how similar phenotypes can be
6 produced in spite of variation in both genotypes and in underlying intermediate
7 phenotypes such as gene expression (Figure 1A). However, when particular mutations
8 (whether induced or natural variants) are placed into each of these different wild-type
9 backgrounds, the phenotypic consequences of that allele may be profoundly different
10 (Figure 1B)¹⁻³. Two visibly striking examples of such effects can be found with
11 mutations influencing wing development in *Drosophila* and in sexual characteristics of
12 the tail in *C. elegans* (Figure 2A&B). Despite apparent phenotypic similarity in the wild-
13 type state (or in certain environments), there may be considerable segregating genetic
14 variation influencing mutational effects. This so-called *cryptic genetic variation* has been
15 the subject of a number of recent studies with respect to its evolutionary potential⁴⁻¹¹.
16 Simply put, not all “wild-types” are equal.

17 Genetic background effects have been observed in most genetically tractable
18 organisms where isogenic (or pseudo-isogenic) wild-type strains are used, including
19 mice, nematodes, fruit flies, yeast, rice, *Arabidopsis* and bacteria^{12-18, 19}. Such effects
20 have also been observed across the spectrum of mutational classes including
21 hypermorphs, neomorphs, hypomorphs, and amorphs^{13, 16, 20, 21}. Because they
22 traditionally have been controlled for as “nuisance” variation rather than studied as
23 interesting genetic phenomena in their own right, background-dependent effects are

1 likely to be even more prevalent than current evidence suggests. Here we discuss the
2 importance of considering genetic background effects not only to increase awareness of
3 this issue, but also to argue that by exploiting this variation and integrating knowledge of
4 genetic background, researchers will find increased opportunities for genetic analysis.

5 **Are genetic background effects consequential?**

6 It may be comforting to think that, despite their potential ubiquity, background-
7 dependent effects have only a modest influence on inferences about gene function, but
8 evidence suggests otherwise. Genetic background effects have been implicated in
9 several recent studies, providing explanations for contradictory outcomes and even
10 overturning long accepted results. Several key examples (Boxes 1 and 2) illustrate that
11 a careful consideration of genetic background is crucial for at least two reasons: (i) a
12 failure to control for the genetic background may cause allelic effects at a focal locus to
13 become confounded with variation at other background loci, leading to faulty inferences;
14 and (ii) epistatic interactions between a focal gene and the genetic background may
15 cause different phenotypic outcomes in different genetic backgrounds.

16 Conditional effects may be especially important when considering evolutionary
17 processes, and in particular for evolutionary trajectories. For instance, seemingly
18 phenotypically silent changes in the genetic background of an organism may make later
19 evolution of key innovations accessible. In one example, a long-term experimental
20 evolution line of *Escherichia coli* only evolved a novel trait following certain potentiating
21 mutations^{22, 23}. A defining characteristic of *E. coli* is its inability to use citrate as an
22 energy source in aerobic conditions. However, in one lab population of *E. coli*
23 experimentally evolved in a minimal glucose environment (with citrate also present),

1 citrate utilization (Cit+) evolved after about 30,000 generations. Further experiments
2 indicated that at least two potentiating mutations facilitated the origin of this key
3 innovation, and importantly, that it evolved due to an epistatic interaction between the
4 potentiating mutations and the Cit+ mutation, rather than simply an increase in the rate
5 at which Cit+ mutations occur.

6 Similar permissive changes to the genetic background can also facilitate drug or
7 antibiotic resistance—another novel phenotype—by reducing the pleiotropic fitness
8 costs of resistance. For example, the neuraminidase H274Y mutation confers
9 oseltamivir resistance on N1 influenza but compromises viral fitness, and thus had not
10 been commonly observed in natural flu isolates prior to 2007. But in 2007–2008,
11 resistant viruses containing this mutation became prevalent among human seasonal
12 H1N1 isolates. The evolution of oseltamivir resistance was found to be caused by
13 permissive mutations that allowed the virus to tolerate subsequent occurrences of
14 H274Y ²⁴.

15 A number of studies are consistent with the broader idea that the genetic
16 background in which a mutation occurs will influence its evolutionary fate. Several
17 experimental evolution studies show evidence of negative epistasis or even sign
18 epistasis between successive mutations in evolving populations ²⁵⁻²⁹. As a result, not all
19 possible evolutionary paths towards an adaptive peak are actually accessible, since
20 some of the paths require a population to traverse a fitness valley. In some cases, the
21 final evolutionary outcome is determined by which mutations have occurred earlier ^{26, 28}.
22 The genetic background may also have more subtle quantitative effects, as

1 demonstrated by one study showing distinct patterns of genetic covariation under
2 mutagenesis in two different genetic backgrounds³⁰.

3 A key implication of the above observations is that the selection coefficient of an
4 allele can vary depending upon the genetic background in which it is found. Indeed, one
5 study has found evidence for background dependence of selection coefficients on
6 particular alleles of weak to moderate effect³¹. Thus, new models that account for this
7 context-dependent selection will enhance our ability to detect the genomic signature of
8 past selection³². Similarly, because the fate of new mutations depends on the genetic
9 background, the repeatability of evolutionary outcomes is likely to be highly dependent
10 upon the genomic context of the ancestral population.

11 These examples also raise questions about the nature of these genetic
12 background variants themselves. For example, what evolutionary forces influence the
13 spread of these background modifier alleles, such as the potentiating mutations in the
14 *E. coli* experiments? One possibility is that without obvious effects on fitness, their
15 spread is dependent on genetic drift. According to this idea of developmental systems
16 drift³³, stochastic forces play a role in determining which regions of “genotype space”
17 are accessible to populations. An alternative is that these potentiating mutations are
18 actually pleiotropic, with effects on other fitness-related traits even in the absence of the
19 focal mutation under investigation. It has been shown that a derived allele influencing
20 vulval phenotypes in *C. elegans* in the presence of sensitizing mutations has a
21 pleiotropic effect on life history traits, which may have helped it spread during laboratory
22 domestication³⁴. In another example, evidence is consistent with selection promoting
23 the spread of three permissive mutations that were required for a fourth to enable a

1 phage population to exploit a novel host receptor³⁵. In this contrasting view, selection
2 (on unrelated traits) is a central force in making different regions of “genotype space”
3 accessible. These are not mutually exclusive hypotheses, and both chance and
4 selection likely play a role. Nevertheless, this is an under-appreciated aspect to the
5 long-standing debate over the relative importance of selection and drift in determining
6 evolutionary outcomes, and will only be settled with the accumulation of empirical data
7 in diverse organisms.

8 **Should genetic background effects be considered quantitative traits?**

9 Most traits involving morphology, behavior, fitness, and disease are quantitative,
10 displaying continuous variation rather than discrete phenotypes. Such variation is
11 usually a function of many loci of small to moderate phenotypic effects modulated by
12 environmental influences. Nevertheless, for both simplicity and efficiency, many
13 functional genetic analyses still discretize traits, even if these traits could be measured
14 quantitatively, and study the effects of mutant alleles in a tightly controlled manner to aid
15 in inference, even when identifying modifiers (e.g., suppressors and enhancers of a
16 focal mutant allele). Although this approach can substantially simplify the analysis of
17 mutational effects of both the focal allele and its modifiers, it may bias the biological
18 interpretations of allelic effects. For instance, this viewpoint implicitly assumes that
19 background dependence is controlled at least in part by one or more modifiers of major
20 effect.

21 However, an equally plausible alternative is that variation in an allele’s effects
22 across two different wild-type genetic backgrounds may be due to variants across many
23 genes. In this case, these genes may interact epistatically, or may have small additive

1 effects (even though these effects are only visible in the presence of the focal mutation).
2 Indeed, the concepts of penetrance and expressivity already provide the necessary
3 framework for this view. For instance, mutations disrupting Ras signaling in *C. elegans*
4 vary quantitatively in the frequencies of different vulval phenotypes induced across
5 different wild-type backgrounds³⁶. Likewise, four or more interacting loci are necessary
6 to explain background-dependent variation in the penetrance of many conditionally
7 lethal deletions in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*¹⁶.

8 Explicitly treating these effects as quantitative rather than discrete traits will
9 allow for a broader set of tools and techniques to be applied to the genetic analysis of
10 context-dependent effects of mutations. Techniques like QTL mapping and association
11 studies can be used to identify polymorphisms associated with variation in expressivity
12 and penetrance (e.g.,^{1, 2, 34, 37}). The value of this viewpoint is that it is agnostic to the
13 genetic basis of such effects, and with an appropriate density of neutral molecular
14 markers (which will become readily available as whole-genome re-sequencing becomes
15 increasingly affordable), such modifiers can be mapped regardless of their genetic
16 architecture.

17 In particular, “classical” modifier screens involve testing thousands of induced
18 mutants for effects on a focal mutation’s penetrance or expressivity. Since any
19 individual induced mutation is unlikely to be a modifier, these studies by necessity look
20 for large effect modifiers. In contrast, moving a focal mutation into a new genetic
21 background nearly always results in subtly different effects. By combining rigorous
22 quantification of these effects with modern genetic mapping approaches, researchers
23 can harness natural genetic variation to detect modifiers with small effects, allowing

1 them to identify a larger and potentially different set of interacting genes³⁸. This
2 approach could prove especially useful for geneticists working on a specific genetic
3 pathway or network, particularly when mutagenesis screens have saturated.

4 **The broader context of conditional effects of mutations**

5 A variety of environmental and other factors can alter how a mutant allele
6 influences organismal phenotypes, and the impact of these factors can vary with
7 genetic background. For instance, interactions between developmental temperatures
8 and genetic background influence how a *Distal-less* mutation perturbs leg development
9 in *D. melanogaster*³⁹. Larval density and/or nutrition influence both the penetrance and
10 expressivity of antennal duplication of the *obake* mutation⁴⁰ and adult foraging behavior
11 for the *rover/sitter* polymorphism⁴¹. Infection status with *Wolbachia* in *D. melanogaster*
12 can suppress the effects of a mutant *Sxl* allele⁴² and influence mutational effects on
13 reproductive success⁴³. Even ploidy (which can be considered a form of genetic
14 background) can influence the magnitude of allelic effects⁴⁴, as can the genomic
15 location (position effects) of a gene⁴⁵. Indeed, as discussed for genetic background
16 below, not only are the focal mutations' effects context dependent, but so are epistatic
17 interactions between mutations, as illustrated by the host-dependent effects of
18 interacting mutations in Tobacco etch virus⁴⁶.

19 Beyond influencing the phenotypic manifestation of large-effect lab-generated
20 mutations, environmental variation frequently modulates the effects of naturally
21 occurring polymorphisms. In *C. elegans*, QTL mapping of life history traits yielded
22 different results at 12°C and 24°C, suggesting distinct loci influence trait variation in
23 different thermal environments⁴⁷. Genome-wide studies imply that these interactions

1 are not rare. For instance, a study mapping variation in transcript levels mirrored this
2 result at the genomic level: a large proportion of expression QTLs (eQTLs) had
3 temperature-specific effects⁴⁸. Likewise, in yeast, a large number of transcripts
4 influenced by eQTLs had environment-specific effects; interestingly, *trans*-acting
5 eQTLs were more likely to have environment-specific effects than *cis*-acting eQTLs⁴⁹.

6 One implication of these results is that it becomes difficult to account for all
7 factors influencing allelic effects. For instance, an investigation of the effects of four
8 natural quantitative trait nucleotides (QTNs) segregating in two yeast strains revealed
9 that trait variation was influenced in a complex way by QTN:QTN interactions which
10 were themselves dependent upon the genetic background and the rearing
11 environment⁵⁰. Thus, what might appear at first to be a two-way QTN:QTN interaction
12 is in reality a higher-order QTN:QTN:background or QTN:QTN:environment interaction.
13 Thus, even when a responsible biologist controls the genetic background and rearing
14 environment of their organism, the scope of their conclusions may be limited to those
15 particular conditions. Of course, many useful discoveries been made by studies using
16 isogenic backgrounds, including the identification of important genes with effects that
17 are apparently consistent across genomic and environmental contexts. However, we
18 still lack enough data to conclude that the genes with “important” roles will generally
19 display similar effects in different situations, and indeed, a failure to control for genetic
20 background may explain conflicting results in several recent studies (Boxes 1 and 2).

21 Such a perspective may also be essential for the future of pharmacogenomics
22 and personalized medicine. For instance, although blocking the EGFR receptor by
23 tyrosine kinase inhibitors is effective against certain forms of cancer, cancers are

1 extremely heterogeneous with variably penetrant mutations in multiple signaling
2 pathways influencing their response to treatments⁵¹⁻⁵⁴. In addition environmental and
3 epigenetic effects influence the occurrence, severity, and drug sensitivity of complex
4 diseases⁵⁵. Studies of such context dependent effects of mutations in model
5 organisms may provide a framework for clinical studies in humans, where
6 investigations of such heterogeneous effects are far more difficult.

7 **Drawing inferences about genetic background effects**

8 When studying the causes and consequences of genetic background generally,
9 and how genetic background effects influence a focal trait specifically, there are a
10 number of issues to consider. One seemingly overlooked issue is having a clear idea of
11 what “trait” is being measured. Consider the influence that genetic background has on
12 the expressivity of the *scalloped*^{E3} (*sd*^{E3}) mutation in the *Drosophila* wing (Figure 2). The
13 wings of both wild-type strains (Oregon-R and Samarkand) are qualitatively wild-type,
14 although they differ in size and geometric shape⁵⁶. However, when the *sd*^{E3} mutation is
15 introduced into each of these strains, we observe strong genetic background-dependent
16 effects on wing morphology. As is commonly done in genetic analysis, the measured
17 phenotype (wing morphology) is a proxy for how the mutation perturbs “normal”
18 development. However, adult wing morphology is the result of a complex and dynamic
19 set of developmental events including cell growth, division, death, polarity, and
20 differentiation. The effects of the *sd*^{E3} mutation may influence one or more of these
21 processes. While the differences across genetic backgrounds may be a “strict” genetic
22 background-dependent effect; that is, the mutation perturbs the same developmental
23 processes, but to different degrees in each background. In that case the observed

1 morphological phenotype, and the differences due to genetic background, would reflect
2 the underlying developmental perturbation on a shared set of developmental processes.
3 However, like virtually all other aspects of organismal function, there is considerable
4 variation within and between individuals in these processes. In *Drosophila*, cell
5 proliferation and cell growth vary across wild-type strains^{57, 58}. If in one wild-type
6 genetic background cell proliferation was more important for the final size and shape of
7 the wing, while in the other background it was a combination of proliferation and cell
8 growth, then inferences about genetic background effects could be biased. Perhaps the
9 *sd* gene has a greater role in cell proliferation, so perturbing its function disrupts wing
10 development more in the first background than in the second. In this case the observed
11 differences in wing morphology may have less to do with the differential modulation of
12 *sd* function across backgrounds, than with variation in developmental function itself.
13 Although phenomenologically still a background-dependent effect, the developmental
14 and genetic interpretation can be quite different. In this case, for example, there are
15 multiple intermediate traits (Figure 1) underlying the phenotype being measured (wing
16 shape); the mutation's pleiotropic effects (or lack thereof) are responsible for its
17 background dependence.

18 A second example illustrates how background dependence can likewise
19 influence our inferences regarding pleiotropy. A landmark study investigated genetic
20 background effects on mutations that affect the mushroom body and associative
21 odorant learning in *D. melanogaster*⁵⁹. When mutations in 11 genes were crossed from
22 their progenitor background into a Canton-S wild-type background, multiple aspects of
23 the brain qualitatively changed. The authors also examined a wide array of behaviors

1 associated with brain defects across the original and Canton-S background for an allele
2 of the *mushroom body miniature* gene (*mbm¹*). Although the anatomical phenotypic
3 effects of the mutation were almost completely absent in the Canton-S background, the
4 learning defects remained. This incongruity suggests that the previously inferred causal
5 relationship may have been in part due to the pleiotropic effects of the mutation in the
6 original background, not that the alteration of mushroom body anatomy directly affected
7 learning. Such a disassociation of these supposedly linked phenotypes clearly
8 demonstrates how considering genetic background can help resolve causal links
9 between variation in different traits and lead to a better understanding of pleiotropy.

10 Finally, the background-dependent phenotypic effect may not reflect the
11 interaction of the background with the lesion per se, but may instead reveal more about
12 other genetic processes, such as the molecular machinery influencing RNAi or the
13 somatic effects of transposable elements on gene expression. Mutations caused by a P-
14 element TE insertion in *D. melanogaster*, for example, are known to show variable
15 penetrance and expressivity because of segregating alleles that suppress P-element
16 activity^{60, 61}, and these effects may explain the reduced expressivity of mutations when
17 measured in recently wild-caught backgrounds as seen in some studies⁶². Similarly,
18 RNAi-mediated phenotypes might vary in *C. elegans* due to differences in RNAi
19 susceptibility⁶³ rather than background dependence of specific mutations. Careful
20 interpretation of genetic background effects must therefore also consider whether the
21 effects in question are specific to the focal developmental process or more general
22 properties of a given background.

1 **Where do we go from here: Integrating genetic background effects into genetic** 2 **and evolutionary analyses**

3 Clearly, considering genetic background is essential for researchers seeking a
4 comprehensive understanding of the genotype-phenotype relationship (Figure 1). As
5 others have before, we advocate a research program that controls the genetic
6 background of the focal organism to avoid confounding influences on experimental
7 outcomes. Moreover, we propose that replicating studies across multiple wild-type
8 genetic backgrounds will not only help biologists clearly establish the generality of their
9 findings, but will also help identify larger sets of interacting genes, particularly genes
10 with small effects. Although this approach requires the investment of time and
11 resources, it will provide a less biased view of genetic networks and enable more
12 precise predictive models for today's complex research areas (e.g., personalized
13 medicine). Practical measures can be taken to balance the tradeoff between resource
14 investments and generality of conclusions (Box 3). For instance, in more tractable
15 organisms such as yeast, transgenics could be made in multiple wild backgrounds.
16 When time is an issue, using chromosome substitution (e.g., with balancers as in
17 *Drosophila*) rather than introgression by backcrossing can provide to a first
18 approximation, the background dependence of a mutation's effects (and provides the
19 added benefit of simultaneously mapping any background modifiers to a specific
20 chromosome).

21 For evolutionary geneticists, investigating the background dependence of an
22 allele's effects can lead to an improved understanding of how selection acts on that
23 allele^{17, 44}. As previously mentioned,⁵⁰ the effects of four natural QTNs between two

1 yeast strains have been investigated in detail. Although the QTN effects were
2 consistent in direction across backgrounds and environments, their magnitudes, and
3 those of the QTN:QTN interactions, varied, meaning that selection on them will also
4 vary. Likewise, interest in the various forces that can influence the selection coefficient
5 on an allele, such as sexual selection, has also surged⁶⁴⁻⁷⁰. However, the basic
6 framing of this question depends on the genetic context, and allelic effects (and thus
7 selection coefficients) likely vary across backgrounds. How this variability influences
8 the evolutionary dynamics of allele frequencies thus remains an important open
9 question.

10 Another important consequence of background dependence on evolution is that,
11 because an allele's effects depend on the genetic milieu, the genetic background can
12 limit the types of phenotypes that are evolutionarily or mutationally accessible (e.g.,^{28,}
13⁷¹). An outcome (e.g., parallel molecular evolution) in an experimental evolution study
14 (particularly one beginning with an isogenic strain, as in many microbial studies) may
15 be repeatable only in that genetic background; repeating the study with different
16 genetic backgrounds may yield alternative outcomes, with the potential to change our
17 views on how prevalent convergence is at the genetic level. We therefore believe that
18 efforts should be made to initialize experimental evolution populations with multiple
19 backgrounds, in addition to multiple replicates from a single isogenic ancestor.

20 Although the influences of genetic background and the environment have been
21 recognized since the early days of genetic analysis—and indeed, many conclusions
22 based on studies in isogenic lines have provided valuable generalizable insights—their
23 effects on mutational interactions (epistasis) were assumed to be negligible. But as

1 demonstrated in the examples above ^{1, 16 17, 46}, if genetic interactions as inferred from
2 mutational studies are influenced by genetic background, then we are ignoring an
3 implicit fact that epistatic interactions are themselves background dependent. Thus the
4 choice of the genetic background used in an interaction or sensitization screen can
5 significantly alter its outcome, including the number of modifiers identified as well as
6 the direction and magnitude of their effects. Indeed, mapping of the background-
7 dependent effects may yield additional modifiers, painting a more complete picture of
8 the genetic network being studied. The topologies of the genetic networks inferred from
9 these interaction studies may in fact turn out to be more variable than currently
10 appreciated. For those who aim to chart the genotype-phenotype map—whether to
11 make predictions about health-related traits or the outcome of natural selection—
12 knowing the full topology of these genetic networks is essential; including information
13 on variable interactions will improve predictions of phenotypes from genomic data.

14 In addition, a number of questions about the nature of genetic background
15 effects themselves remain underexplored. At the most basic level, though genetic
16 background effects can clearly confound genetic analyses, we lack sufficient data to
17 generalize how often this occurs and in what situations the problem is most severe. For
18 instance, are mutant alleles with small effects on organismal phenotypes more subject
19 to modulation by genetic background than large-effect mutations? We also know little
20 about the genetic architecture of genetic background effects, such as the number and
21 effect size distribution of the causal background polymorphisms. In addition, a better
22 understanding of how pleiotropy can vary with genetic background is essential for
23 understanding relationships between traits. These questions can only be answered by

1 additional empirical studies, e.g., surveys and mapping studies of genetic background
2 effects involving different allele types and a range of organisms.

3 We understand that performing a complex experiment involving multiple genetic
4 backgrounds and/or environments is difficult and complicates interpretations. But then
5 any conclusions drawn from studies in a single background must be recognized to
6 have a limited scope with respect to allelic effects, gene structure-function
7 relationships, pleiotropy, and epistasis. Despite the additional workload, the payoff for
8 performing such studies across multiple wild-type backgrounds therefore has the
9 potential to profoundly transform our understanding of genetics and the genotype-
10 phenotype relationship.

11

12 Acknowledgements: We thank Greg Gibson, Ellen Larsen and members of the
13 Dworkin lab for insightful discussions. We would like to thank the two anonymous
14 reviewers and the editor (Dr. Rhiannon Macrae) for suggestions that have significantly
15 improved this manuscript. This work was supported by the National Science
16 Foundation under MCB-0922344 and NIH grant 1R01GM094424–01 (to ID). The
17 authors have no conflict of interests to declare.

18

19

20

21

1 **Box 1: Genetic inferences about longevity and genetic background effects**

2

3 Contradictory results across studies may be due to differences in or a lack of controlling
4 for wild-type genetic backgrounds. We discuss two particular examples on the genetics
5 of aging, which could have significant clinical and economic impact. The *I'm not dead*
6 *yet (Indy)* gene of *Drosophila* was initially implicated in extending lifespan: flies
7 heterozygous for loss-of-function alleles of *Indy* were reported to have increased life
8 span in the Canton-S wild-type background⁷³. However, when the mutations were later
9 outcrossed into a large natural population or backcrossed into additional isogenic wild-
10 type strains, most of the mutational effects disappeared⁷⁴. Instead, additional mutations
11 independent of *Indy* seemed responsible for increasing lifespan. Thus many of *Indy*'s
12 previously reported effects likely represent interactions between *Indy* mutations and
13 genetic background (including inbreeding)⁷⁵, in addition to *Indy*-independent mutations
14 and environmental effects^{74, 76}. Despite this, these mutants were used in recent studies
15^{77, 78}, resulting in disagreements on interpretation and a discussion of which isogenic
16 "wild-type" backgrounds the longevity effects are apparent in^{79, 80} (although no
17 discussion of why they differ).

18

19 The role of the *sir2* gene in longevity has also been reconsidered because of genetic
20 background effects. Despite years of research into the role of the *sir* genes on lifespan
21⁸¹, two high-profile papers failed to replicate key results^{82, 83}. Instead, the extended
22 lifespan of transgenic *C. elegans* was the result of a secondary mutation, not the *sir2*-
23 *2.1* transgene itself. In *Drosophila*, backcrossing flies to the appropriate wild-type strain

1 eliminated the increased lifespan associated with overexpression of *sir-2.1*⁸². The
2 implications of these findings have been extensively debated⁸⁴⁻⁸⁶. As with the example
3 above, it is not clear whether these discrepancies are due to true background-
4 dependent effects (i.e., different backgrounds respond to the transgene differently), or
5 artifacts from a failure to control the genetic background (i.e., genetic background is
6 confounded with the focal mutation). Indeed, the wild-type *Drosophila* strain that
7 suppressed the lifespan-increasing effects of *sir-2.1* overexpression was Dahomey, in
8 which *Indy*'s effects also disappeared⁷⁴. One plausible (but untested) explanation is
9 that Dahomey is suppressive of mutations influencing longevity. If so, investigating the
10 effects of these mutations in other isogenic wild-type backgrounds may yield different
11 results⁸⁰.

12 These examples raise two important issues. First, is it ever sensible to perform genetic
13 experiments in only a single wild-type background? Second, how do you ensure that
14 two genetic backgrounds with the same name are in fact genetically similar or identical
15 (given that new mutations accumulate in lab cultures)? We discuss these problems
16 further in Box 3.

17

18

1 **Box 2: Genetic Background effects and evolutionary inferences**

2

3 One of the early experiments to use gene replacement in *Drosophila melanogaster*
4 investigated the influence of naturally occurring polymorphisms in the *desat2* (*dz*) gene
5 ⁸⁷, thought to be involved in the synthesis of contact pheromones (cuticular
6 hydrocarbons). Molecular evolution studies suggested *desat2* was under divergent
7 selection in two populations of *D. melanogaster*, with a potential role in premating
8 isolation between flies from Zimbabwe and the cosmopolitan “population”. Greenberg et
9 al ⁸⁷, integrated both the cosmopolitan *dz^M* allele (likely loss of function) and the *dz²*
10 allele found in Africa and the Caribbean into a common genetic background for
11 comparison. There was no evidence that variation in *dz* mediates mate discrimination,
12 but the data suggested that *dz* influenced other ecologically relevant traits. However,
13 one of the co-authors of the original study later reported that attempts to replicate it
14 failed ^{88, 89}. In a reply, Greenberg et al ⁹⁰ suggested that no attempt was made to control
15 for genetic background in the re-analysis. A similar pattern emerged in the analysis of
16 the role of the *tan* locus’s contribution to pigmentation differences between two closely
17 related *Drosophila* species (for more details, see [⁸⁷⁻⁸⁹]). In both examples, the exact
18 contribution of genetic background was never clearly established. The differences might
19 have been caused by epistatic interactions between the focal alleles and the different
20 genetic backgrounds. Alternatively, the focal alleles may have become confounded with
21 additional background variants influencing the traits, resulting in a spurious correlation
22 between the phenotypes and the focal alleles. In the former case, any inferences about
23 the evolutionary processes leading to the fixation of these alleles would need to account

1 for the epistatic interactions between each allele and the genetic background.

1 Box 3. Considerations for research programs incorporating genetic background.

2 **1. How many genetic backgrounds is enough?** A balance between practical
3 consideration, research goal, and generality of conclusions needs to be struck. If
4 the goal is to understand the distribution of genetic background effects for a small
5 number of mutations, then tens to dozens (flies, *C. elegans*, *Arabidopsis*) or more
6 (yeast, bacteria) may be suitable. If the goal is instead to broaden a specific set
7 of genetic inferences (structure-function, modifier screens, epistasis), then only a
8 few genetic backgrounds may be practical for most organisms. If replacing the
9 entire genetic background is impractical, efforts should be made to at least
10 perform preliminary crosses, such as balancer-mediated replacement of
11 individual chromosomes (mice, *Drosophila*).

12 **2. Isogenic (inbred) strains, outbred populations, or somewhere in between?**
13 Isogenic inbred wild-type strains may not always be optimal for particular
14 research questions. Traits closely tied to fitness are susceptible to inbreeding
15 depression in some organisms (*Drosophila*, mice), but less so in others
16 (*Arabidopsis* and *C. elegans*). Inbreeding creates additional genetic stress,
17 independent of the focal mutation, influencing traits like longevity⁷⁵. Yet crossing
18 mutations into outbred populations may be problematic, making it difficult to
19 partition genetic effects, and “average” phenotypes may be biased. If the
20 mutation is lethal with certain combinations of naturally occurring alleles in the
21 base population, then some combinations of alleles may be unobserved. Even
22 when a measure such as the selection coefficient for an allele is examined, an
23 outbred population may not be averaging the fitness cost of an allele *per se*, as

1 variants present in the population may be under selection to compensate for the
2 focal allele.

3 If measuring mutational effects in an inbred line is problematic, crosses between
4 inbred strains can generate “clonal” F_1 individuals, ameliorating inbreeding
5 (reciprocal crosses may be necessary if maternal effects are suspected). This will
6 require introgression of the focal allele into multiple inbred lines, followed by
7 experimental production of F_1 s.

8

9 3. ***How do you know your background is what you think it is?*** Certain sub-
10 fields commonly use the same apparent background, at least in name. Setting
11 aside the non-trivial issue of contamination of wild-type stocks, there are several
12 issues to consider.

13 Researchers often introduce visible markers into given backgrounds, but this
14 may also introduce linked genomic fragments. Moreover, “copies” of strains kept
15 in separate labs will accumulate new, independent mutations, or fixation of
16 different (residual) segregating alleles, especially when maintained at low
17 population sizes⁹¹. Thus a combination of fresh inbreeding, and genotyping by re-
18 sequencing or other methods, may be necessary to confirm the identity of a
19 particular genetic background.

20

21 4. ***How do you get your mutation into each wild-type strain?*** Introducing
22 mutations into multiple backgrounds is often the greatest barrier to this work. In
23 some organisms (*Drosophila*, mice), introgression of the allele into multiple

1 backgrounds occurs by backcrossing, which is labor-intensive, requiring months
2 or years for sufficient introgression. This technique also results in introgression of
3 genomic regions linked to the focal allele, with the size of the introgressed
4 fragment varying across backgrounds (potentially requiring multiple independent
5 replicates for each background). Although this technique will remain an essential
6 tool for the near future, transgenic techniques including homologous gene
7 replacement and gene knockouts⁹² in multiple backgrounds will hopefully
8 become widely available.

9 Additionally, transgenic inserts that knock down gene function using RNAi are
10 becoming widely available⁹³ and can be inserted into the same genomic
11 location (minimizing positional effects). Although this may introduce additional
12 complications (e.g., genetic background influencing RNAi machinery, not the
13 focal gene; off-target effects⁹⁴; RNAi machinery itself influencing phenotype¹⁸), it
14 may be more feasible to generate these in multiple independent genetic
15 backgrounds⁷².

16

1 **Glossary**

2

3 **Penetrance-** The proportion of individuals in a sample with a particular genotype
4 expressing the “expected” phenotype.

5

6 **Expressivity-** The extent to which a mutant genotype is phenotypically expressed in an
7 organism. Often, mutations may display variable expressivity; i.e., multiple individuals
8 carrying the same mutation may vary for the phenotypes induced by the mutation.

9

10 **Cryptic genetic variation-** Genetic variation present in a population that is not
11 phenotypically expressed under benign or ambient conditions, but which may be visible
12 upon genetic or environmental perturbations.

13

14 **eQTL-** A sequence polymorphism in the genome associated with variation in gene
15 expression.

16

17 **Wild-type-** The “average” phenotype, often assumed to be the “normal” phenotype,
18 found in natural populations and/or any subpopulation or inbred lines derived from such
19 a population. The genotypes producing such a phenotype are often considered to be
20 wild-type genotypes.

21

22 **Genetic background-** An organism’s entire genetic and genomic context; the complete
23 genotype of an organism across all loci.

1

2 **Isogenic-** Having identical (or nearly identical) genotypes.

3

4 **Line/strain-** A distinct interbreeding population, usually maintained in the lab, and which
5 is isolated from other such populations, often generated by inbreeding.

6

7 **Potentiating/permissive mutations-** Mutations that are required to occur first in order
8 for subsequent mutations to be expressed.

9

10 **Introgression –** The introduction of an allele or alleles from one population into another
11 by repeated backcrossing.

12

13 **Amorph/hypermorph/hypomorph/neomorph-** Mutant alleles exhibiting no activity,
14 increased activity or expression, reduced activity or expression, and some novel activity,
15 respectively.

16

1 **Figure Legends**

2

3 **Figure 1.** Genetic background effects can be conceptualized in the framework of a
4 genotype-phenotype map⁹⁵⁻⁹⁸. (A) A wild-type genotype at a particular locus results in a
5 wild-type final phenotype (gray circle), even though there may be variation in
6 intermediate (e.g., gene expression) and “final” phenotypes among different genetic
7 backgrounds (or in different environments). Each color represents a distinct genotype or
8 strain. (B) However, when a particular gene is mutated, intermediate variation among
9 different genetic backgrounds may be expressed in the form of distinct final mutant
10 phenotypes (with some possibly overlapping with the range of wild-type phenotypes
11 (gray circle), and others being distinct). The general increase in variation between
12 backgrounds under the mutational perturbation (i.e. the “cryptic genetic variation”) is
13 depicted by the broader distributions of final phenotypes in panel B. Finally, while this
14 and many other representations of the G-P map represent the genotypic space as a
15 simple projection (much like the intermediate “phenotypic” spaces), it is important to
16 remember that the different genotypic spaces interact as well (i.e., the phenotypic
17 outcomes depend on the position in both genotypic spaces, not simply the position in
18 the “lowest” genotypic space).

19

20 **Figure 2.** Induced mutations often have qualitatively or quantitatively variable effects on
21 organismal phenotypes in different genetic backgrounds and in different environments.
22 These effects can range from mild (in some cases, perhaps even resulting in
23 phenotypes that are indistinguishable from the wild-type) to severe. (A) The *scalloped*^{E3}

1 allele has qualitatively distinct effects on wing morphology in two commonly used wild-
2 type strains of *Drosophila melanogaster*, despite the wild-type wings being qualitatively
3 similar across these backgrounds. These background effects extend to include epistatic
4 interactions between *sd* and other loci ¹. (B) The effects of the *tra-2(ar221); xol-1(y9)*
5 genotype on sexual differentiation in the tail of *Caenorhabditis elegans* vary
6 quantitatively with both rearing temperature and wild-type genetic background ². The
7 effects of genetic background are most apparent at intermediate temperatures.

8

9

10

11

1 References


- 2 1. Dworkin, I., *et al.* (2009) Genomic Consequences of Background Effects on *scalloped*
3 Mutant Expressivity in the Wing of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 181
- 4 2. Chandler, C.H. (2010) Cryptic intraspecific variation in sex determination in
5 *Caenorhabditis elegans* revealed by mutations. *Heredity* 105, 473-482
- 6 3. Matin, A., and Nadeau, J.H. (2001) Sensitized polygenic trait analysis. *Trends Genet* 17,
7 727-731
- 8 4. Mcguigan, K., *et al.* (2011) Cryptic genetic variation and body size evolution in
9 threespine stickleback. In *Evolution*, 1203-1211
- 10 5. Ledon-Rettig, C.C., *et al.* (2010) Diet and hormonal manipulation reveal cryptic genetic
11 variation: implications for the evolution of novel feeding strategies. In *P R Soc B*, 3569-3578
- 12 6. Gibson, G., and Dworkin, I. (2004) Uncovering cryptic genetic variation. In *Nat Rev*
13 *Genet*, 681-690
- 14 7. Sgro, C.M., *et al.* (2010) A naturally occurring variant of *Hsp90* that is associated with
15 decanalization. In *P R Soc B*, 2049-2057
- 16 8. Felix, M.A. (2007) Cryptic quantitative evolution of the vulva intercellular signaling
17 network in *Caenorhabditis*. *Curr Biol* 17, 103-114
- 18 9. Masel, J. (2006) Cryptic genetic variation is enriched for potential adaptations. *Genetics*
19 172, 1985-1991
- 20 10. Chen, B., and Wagner, A. *Hsp90* is important for fecundity, longevity, and buffering of
21 cryptic deleterious variation in wild fly populations. *BMC Evol Biol* 12, 25
- 22 11. Le Rouzic, A., and Carlborg, O. (2008) Evolutionary potential of hidden genetic variation.
23 *Trends Ecol Evol* 23, 33-37
- 24 12. Cao, Y., *et al.* (2007) The expression pattern of a rice disease resistance gene *xa3/xa26*
25 is differentially regulated by the genetic backgrounds and developmental stages that influence
26 its function. *Genetics* 177, 523-533
- 27 13. Gibson, G., and van Helden, S. (1997) Is function of the *Drosophila* homeotic gene
28 *Ultrabithorax* canalized? *Genetics* 147, 1155-1168
- 29 14. Remold, S.K., and Lenski, R.E. (2004) Pervasive joint influence of epistasis and
30 plasticity on mutational effects in *Escherichia coli*. *Nat Genet* 36, 423-426
- 31 15. Strunk, K.E. (2004) Phenotypic Variation Resulting From a Deficiency of *Epidermal*
32 *Growth Factor Receptor* in Mice Is Caused by Extensive Genetic Heterogeneity That Can Be
33 Genetically and Molecularly Partitioned. In *Genetics*, 1821-1832
- 34 16. Dowell, R.D., *et al.* (2010) Genotype to phenotype: a complex problem. *Science* 328,
35 469
- 36 17. Wang, Y., *et al.* (2012) Genetic background affects epistatic interactions between two
37 beneficial mutations. In *Biol. Lett.*
- 38 18. Lum, T.E., and Merritt, T.J.S. (2011) Nonclassical Regulation of Transcription:
39 Interchromosomal Interactions at the *Malic enzyme* Locus of *Drosophila melanogaster*. In
40 *Genetics*, 837-849
- 41 19. Huang, X.Q., *et al.* (2012) Epistatic Natural Allelic Variation Reveals a Function of
42 *AGAMOUS-LIKE6* in Axillary Bud Formation in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Cell* 24, 2364-2379
- 43 20. Threadgill, D.W., *et al.* (1995) Targeted disruption of mouse *EGF receptor*: effect of
44 genetic background on mutant phenotype. *Science (New York, N Y)* 269, 230-234
- 45 21. Dworkin, I. (2005) A study of canalization and developmental stability in the
46 sternopleural bristle system of *Drosophila melanogaster*. In *Evolution*, 1500-1509
- 47 22. Blount, Z.D., *et al.* (2008) Historical contingency and the evolution of a key innovation in
48 an experimental population of *Escherichia coli*. In *P Natl Acad Sci Usa*, 7899-7906
- 49 23. Blount, Z.D., *et al.* (2012) Genomic analysis of a key innovation in an experimental
50 *Escherichia coli* population. *Nature*, 1-8


- 1 24. Bloom, J.D., *et al.* (2010) Permissive secondary mutations enable the evolution of
2 influenza oseltamivir resistance. *Science* 328, 1272-1275
- 3 25. Khan, A.I., *et al.* (2011) Negative Epistasis Between Beneficial Mutations in an Evolving
4 Bacterial Population. *Science (New York, NY)* 332, 1193-1196
- 5 26. Woods, R.J., *et al.* (2011) Second-Order Selection for Evolvability in a Large *Escherichia*
6 *coli* Population. *Science (New York, NY)* 331, 1433-1436
- 7 27. Weinreich, D.M., *et al.* (2006) Darwinian evolution can follow only very few mutational
8 paths to fitter proteins. *Science (New York, NY)* 312, 111-114
- 9 28. Salverda, M.L.M., *et al.* (2011) Initial mutations direct alternative pathways of protein
10 evolution. *PLoS Genetics* 7, e1001321
- 11 29. Kvitek, D.J., and Sherlock, G. (2011) Reciprocal Sign Epistasis between Frequently
12 Experimentally Evolved Adaptive Mutations Causes a Rugged Fitness Landscape. *PLoS*
13 *Genetics* 7, e1002056
- 14 30. Camara, M.D., and Pigliucci, M. (1999) Mutational contributions to genetic variance-
15 covariance matrices: An experimental approach using induced mutations in *Arabidopsis*
16 *thaliana*. *Evolution* 53, 1692-1703
- 17 31. Ungerer, M.C., *et al.* (2003) Genotype-environment interactions at quantitative trait loci
18 affecting inflorescence development in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Genetics* 165, 353-365
- 19 32. Van Dyken, J.D., and Wade, M.J. (2010) The Genetic Signature of Conditional
20 Expression. *Genetics* 184, 557-570
- 21 33. True, J.R., and Haag, E.S. (2001) Developmental system drift and flexibility in
22 evolutionary trajectories. *Evolution & Development* 3, 109-119
- 23 34. Dubeau, F., and Félix, M.-A. (2012) Role of Pleiotropy in the Evolution of a Cryptic
24 Developmental Variation in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *PLoS Biology* 10, e1001230
- 25 35. Meyer, J.R., *et al.* (2012) Repeatability and Contingency in the Evolution of a Key
26 Innovation in Phage Lambda. *Science (New York, NY)* 335, 428-432
- 27 36. Milloz, J., *et al.* (2008) Intraspecific evolution of the intercellular signaling network
28 underlying a robust developmental system. In *Gene Dev*, 3064-3075
- 29 37. Dworkin, I., *et al.* (2003) Evidence that *Egfr* contributes to cryptic genetic variation for
30 photoreceptor determination in natural populations of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Current Biology*
31 13, 1888-1893
- 32 38. Rockman, M.V. (2008) Reverse engineering the genotype-phenotype map with natural
33 genetic variation. *Nature* 456, 738-744
- 34 39. Dworkin, I. (2005) Evidence for canalization of *Distal-less* function in the leg of
35 *Drosophila melanogaster*. In *Evol Dev*, 89-100
- 36 40. Atallah, J., *et al.* (2004) The environmental and genetic regulation of *obake* expressivity:
37 morphogenetic fields as evolvable systems. *Evolution & Development* 6, 114-122
- 38 41. Burns, J.G., *et al.* (2012) Gene-environment interplay in *Drosophila melanogaster*.
39 Chronic food deprivation in early life affects adult exploratory and fitness traits. In *Proceedings*
40 *of the National Academy of Sciences*, 17239-17244
- 41 42. Starr, D.J., and Cline, T.W. (2002) A host parasite interaction rescues *Drosophila*
42 oogenesis defects. *Nature* 418, 76-79
- 43 43. Markov, A.V., *et al.* (2009) Symbiotic bacteria affect mating choice in *Drosophila*
44 *melanogaster*. *Animal Behaviour* 77, 1011-1017
- 45 44. Gerstein, A.C. (2012) Mutational effects depend on ploidy level: all else is not equal.
46 *Biology letters*
- 47 45. Wallrath, L.L., and Elgin, S.C. (1995) Position effect variegation in *Drosophila* is
48 associated with an altered chromatin structure. In *Gene Dev*, 1263-1277
- 49 46. Lalić, J., and Elena, S.F. (2012) Epistasis between mutations is host-dependent for an
50 RNA virus. In *Biol. Lett.*, The Royal Society


- 1 47. Gutteling, E., *et al.* (2006) Mapping phenotypic plasticity and genotype–environment
2 interactions affecting life-history traits in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Heredity* 98, 28-37
- 3 48. Li, Y., *et al.* (2006) Mapping determinants of gene expression plasticity by genetical
4 genomics in *C. elegans*. *PLoS Genetics* 2, e222
- 5 49. Smith, E.N., and Kruglyak, L. (2008) Gene–Environment Interaction in Yeast Gene
6 Expression. *PLoS Biology* 6, e83
- 7 50. Gerke, J., *et al.* (2010) Gene-environment interactions at nucleotide resolution. In *PLoS*
8 *Genet*
- 9 51. John, T., *et al.* (2009) Overview of molecular testing in non-small-cell lung cancer:
10 mutational analysis, gene copy number, protein expression and other biomarkers of EGFR for
11 the prediction of response to tyrosine kinase inhibitors. *Oncogene* 28, S14-S23
- 12 52. Sharma, S.V., *et al.* (2007) Epidermal growth factor receptor mutations in lung cancer.
13 *Nature Reviews Cancer* 7, 169-181
- 14 53. Schilsky, R.L. (2010) Personalized medicine in oncology: the future is now. *Nature*
15 *Reviews Drug Discovery* 9, 363-366
- 16 54. Olopade, O.I., *et al.* (2008) Advances in Breast Cancer: Pathways to Personalized
17 Medicine. *Clinical Cancer Research* 14, 7988-7999
- 18 55. Sadee, W. (2005) Pharmacogenetics/genomics and personalized medicine. *Human*
19 *Molecular Genetics* 14, R207-R214
- 20 56. Dworkin, I., and Gibson, G. (2006) Epidermal growth factor receptor and transforming
21 growth factor-beta signaling contributes to variation for wing shape in *Drosophila melanogaster*.
22 *Genetics* 173, 1417-1431
- 23 57. de Moed, G.H., *et al.* (1997) The phenotypic plasticity of wing size in *Drosophila*
24 *melanogaster*: the cellular basis of its genetic variation. *Heredity (Edinb)* 79 (Pt 3), 260-267
- 25 58. de Moed, G.H., *et al.* (1997) Environmental effects on body size variation in *Drosophila*
26 *melanogaster* and its cellular basis. *Genet Res* 70, 35-43
- 27 59. de Belle, J.S., and Heisenberg, M. (1996) Expression of *Drosophila* mushroom body
28 mutations in alternative genetic backgrounds: a case study of the *mushroom body miniature*
29 gene (*mbm*). In *P Natl Acad Sci Usa*, 9875-9880
- 30 60. Williams, J., *et al.* (1988) Suppressible P-element alleles of the vestigial locus in
31 *Drosophila melanogaster*. In *Molecular Genetics and Genomics*
- 32 61. Hodgetts, R.B., *et al.* (2012) An intact RNA interference pathway is required for
33 expression of the mutant wing phenotype of *vg*²¹⁻³, a P-element-induced allele of the *vestigial*
34 gene in *Drosophila*. In *Génome*, 312-326
- 35 62. Yamamoto, A., *et al.* (2009) Epistatic interactions attenuate mutations affecting startle
36 behaviour in *Drosophila melanogaster*. In *Genet Res*, 1-10
- 37 63. Tijsterman, M., *et al.* (2002) THE GENETICS OF RNA SILENCING. In *Annu Rev Genet*,
38 489-519
- 39 64. Arbuthnott, D., and Rundle, H.D. (2012) Sexual selection is ineffectual or inhibits the
40 purging of deleterious mutations in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evolution* 66, 2127-2137
- 41 65. Long, T.A.F., *et al.* (2012) The effect of sexual selection on offspring fitness depends on
42 the nature of genetic variation. In *Curr Biol*, 204-208
- 43 66. Clark, S.C.A., *et al.* (2012) Relative effectiveness of mating success and sperm
44 competition at eliminating deleterious mutations in *Drosophila melanogaster*. In *PLoS ONE*,
45 e37351
- 46 67. MacLellan, K., *et al.* (2011) Dietary stress does not strengthen selection against single
47 deleterious mutations in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Heredity* 108, 203-210
- 48 68. Wang, A.D., *et al.* (2009) Selection, Epistasis, and Parent-of-Origin Effects on
49 Deleterious Mutations across Environments in *Drosophila melanogaster*. In *Am Nat*, 863-874,
50 The University of Chicago Press

- 1 69. YOUNG, J.A., *et al.* (2009) The effect of pathogens on selection against deleterious
2 mutations in *Drosophila melanogaster*. In *J Evol Biol*, 2125-2129
- 3 70. Hollis, B., *et al.* (2009) Sexual selection accelerates the elimination of a deleterious
4 mutant in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evolution* 63, 324-333
- 5 71. Braendle, C., *et al.* (2010) Bias and Evolution of the Mutationally Accessible Phenotypic
6 Space in a Developmental System. *PLoS Genetics* 6, e1000877
- 7 72. Kitzmann, P., *et al.* (2013) RNAi phenotypes are influenced by the genetic background
8 of the injected strain. *BMC Genomics* In Press.
- 9 73. Rogina, B., *et al.* (2000) Extended life-span conferred by cotransporter gene mutations
10 in *Drosophila*. *Science* 290, 2137-2140
- 11 74. Toivonen, J.M., *et al.* (2007) No influence of *Indy* on lifespan in *Drosophila* after
12 correction for genetic and cytoplasmic background effects. *PLoS Genet* 3, e95
- 13 75. Swindell, W.R., and Bouzat, J.L. (2006) Inbreeding depression and male survivorship in
14 *Drosophila*: implications for senescence theory. *Genetics* 172, 317-327
- 15 76. Linnen, C., *et al.* (2001) Cultural artifacts: a comparison of senescence in natural,
16 laboratory-adapted and artificially selected lines of *Drosophila melanogaster*. In *Evol Ecol Res*,
17 877-888
- 18 77. Neretti, N., *et al.* (2009) Long-lived *Indy* induces reduced mitochondrial reactive oxygen
19 species production and oxidative damage. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 106, 2277-2282
- 20 78. Wang, P.Y., *et al.* (2009) Long-lived *Indy* and calorie restriction interact to extend life
21 span. In *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 9262-9267
- 22 79. Toivonen, J.M., *et al.* (2009) Longevity of *Indy* mutant *Drosophila* not attributable to *Indy*
23 mutation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 106, E53; author reply E54
- 24 80. Stephen L Helfand, N.N.P.-Y.W.B.R. (2009) Reply to Partridge *et al.*: Longevity of
25 *Drosophila Indy* mutant is influenced by caloric intake and genetic background. In *P Natl Acad*
26 *Sci Usa*, E54, National Academy of Sciences
- 27 81. Rogina, B., and Helfand, S.L. (2004) *Sir2* mediates longevity in the fly through a pathway
28 related to calorie restriction. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 101, 15998-16003
- 29 82. Burnett, C., *et al.* Absence of effects of *Sir2* overexpression on lifespan in *C. elegans*
30 and *Drosophila*. *Nature* 477, 482-485
- 31 83. Viswanathan, M., and Guarente, L. Regulation of *Caenorhabditis elegans* lifespan by *sir*-
32 2.1 transgenes. *Nature* 477, E1-2
- 33 84. Burgess, D.J. (2011) Model organisms: The dangers lurking in the genetic background.
34 In *Nat Rev Genet*, 742-742
- 35 85. Baumann, K. (2011) Ageing: A midlife crisis for sirtuins. In *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol*, 688-
36 688, Nature Publishing Group
- 37 86. Lombard, D.B., *et al.* (2011) Ageing: Longevity hits a roadblock. In *Nature*, 410-411,
38 Nature Publishing Group
- 39 87. Greenberg, A.J., *et al.* (2003) Ecological adaptation during incipient speciation revealed
40 by precise gene replacement. *Science* 302, 1754-1757
- 41 88. Coyne, J.A., and Elwyn, S. (2006) Does the *desaturase-2* locus in *Drosophila*
42 *melanogaster* cause adaptation and sexual isolation? *Evolution* 60, 279-291
- 43 89. Coyne, J.A., and Elwyn, S. (2006) *Desaturase-2*, Environmental Adaptation, and Sexual
44 Isolation in *Drosophila melanogaster*. In *Evolution*, 626-627, Society for the Study of Evolution
- 45 90. Greenberg, A.J., *et al.* (2006) Proper control of genetic background with precise allele
46 substitution: a comment on Coyne and Elwyn. *Evolution* 60, 623-625; discussion 626-627
- 47 91. Dierick, H.A., and Greenspan, R.J. (2006) Molecular analysis of flies selected for
48 aggressive behavior. In *Nat Genet*, 1023-1031
- 49 92. Venken, K.J.T., and Bellen, H.J. (2012) Genome-wide manipulations of *Drosophila*
50 *melanogaster* with transposons, Flp recombinase, and Φ C31 integrase. In *Methods Mol Biol*,
51 203-228



- 1 93. Bakal, C. (2011) *Drosophila* RNAi screening in a postgenomic world. In *Brief Funct*
- 2 *Genomics*, 197-205
- 3 94. Seinen, E., *et al.* (2011) RNAi-induced off-target effects in *Drosophila melanogaster*:
- 4 frequencies and solutions. In *Brief Funct Genomics*, 206-214
- 5 95. Rutherford, S.L. (2000) From genotype to phenotype: buffering mechanisms and the
- 6 storage of genetic information. *Bioessays* 22, 1095-1105
- 7 96. Houle, D., *et al.* (2010) Phenomics: the next challenge. In *Nat Rev Genet*, 855-866,
- 8 Nature Publishing Group
- 9 97. Lewontin, R.C. (1974) *The genetic basis of Evolutionary Change*. Columbia University
- 10 Press
- 11 98. Waddington, C.H. (1957) *The strategy of the genes*. Allen&Unwin
- 12
- 13







Wild type



Samarkand *sd*^{E3}



Oregon-R *sd*^{E3}

Tail score

