

Ribosome profiling reveals post-transcriptional buffering of divergent gene expression in yeast

Joel McManus^{1*}, Gemma May¹, Pieter Spealman¹, and Alan Shteyman¹

1) Carnegie Mellon University, Department of Biological Sciences, Pittsburgh, PA 15213

*Corresponding Author

Abstract

Understanding the patterns and causes of phenotypic divergence is a central goal in evolutionary biology. Much work has shown that mRNA abundance is highly variable between closely related species. However, the extent and mechanisms of post-transcriptional gene regulatory evolution are largely unknown. Here we used ribosome profiling to compare transcript abundance and translation efficiency in two closely related yeast species (*S. cerevisiae* and *S. paradoxus*). By comparing translation regulatory divergence to interspecies differences in mRNA sequence features, we show that differences in transcript leaders and codon bias substantially contribute to divergent translation. Globally, we find that translation regulatory divergence often buffers species-differences in mRNA abundance, such that ribosome occupancy is more conserved than transcript abundance. We used allele-specific ribosome profiling in interspecies hybrids to compare the relative contributions of *cis*- and *trans*-regulatory divergence to species differences in mRNA abundance and translation efficiency. The mode of gene regulatory divergence differs for these processes, as *trans*-regulatory changes play a greater role in divergent mRNA abundance than in divergent translation efficiency. Strikingly, most genes with aberrant transcript abundance in F1 hybrids (either over- or under-expressed compared to both parent species) did not exhibit aberrant ribosome occupancy. Our results show that interspecies differences in translation contribute substantially to the evolution of gene expression. Compensatory differences in transcript abundance and translation efficiency may increase the robustness of gene regulation.

Introduction

The relationship between genotype and phenotype is a long-standing biological puzzle. Genetic mutations can affect phenotypes both by changing the coding sequence of proteins and by changing the regulation of gene expression. As much as forty years ago, it became clear that differences in protein coding sequence are too infrequent to explain differences in phenotype (King and Wilson 1975). Consequently, evolution of gene regulation has been suggested as a major source of phenotypic diversity (Rockman and Kruglyak 2006; Carroll 2005).

With the advent of DNA microarrays in the 1990s, many researchers began examining gene expression differences between species. mRNA abundance levels were found to vary greatly both among and between biological species, including yeast (Brem *et al.* 2002; Tirosh *et al.* 2011; Bullard *et al.* 2010), fruit flies (Ranz *et al.* 2003; Rifkin *et al.* 2003), mice (Schadt *et al.* 2003), and humans (Pickrell *et al.* 2010). In general, these studies report that polymorphic mRNA abundance is present in at least 25% of genes in a species and mRNA levels are even more divergent between closely related species. However, a few recent studies suggest that protein abundance is more conserved than mRNA abundance across all domains of life, including *E. coli*, *S. cerevisiae*, and humans (Schimpf *et al.* 2009; Laurent *et al.* 2010). Because these studies depended upon orthologous genes identifiable across vast evolutionary distance, their results could be biased towards high abundant, housekeeping genes. Nonetheless, these works suggest that post-transcriptional processes, including mRNA

translation and protein turnover, could act to reduce the effects of variation in mRNA abundance and offset divergent gene expression.

Gene expression requires numerous steps, including transcription, mRNA translation, and protein turnover. Each of these processes is regulated through complex networks of *cis*-regulatory sequence elements and *trans*-acting factors. *cis*-regulatory elements (e.g. transcription factor binding sites and miRNA target sites) are localized to the alleles they regulate and thus affect gene expression in an allele-specific manner. In contrast, *trans*-acting factors (e.g. transcription factors, RNA binding proteins, and miRNAs) can affect the expression of both alleles in a diploid cell. Consequently, the roles of these network components can be dissected by comparing allele-specific gene expression in F1 hybrids. In F1 hybrids, two parental alleles are subjected to identical *trans*-regulatory environments. Thus, differences in gene expression from the two alleles reflect divergent activity of their *cis*-regulatory sequences. *trans*-regulatory divergence can then be inferred by comparing interspecific expression differences with allele-specific expression differences in F1 hybrids (Wittkopp et al. 2004; Tirosh et al. 2009). This hybrid approach has revealed that most intraspecies variation in mRNA abundance results from *trans*-regulatory differences, but *cis*-regulatory differences accumulate over evolutionary time (Wittkopp et al. 2008a; Lemos et al. 2008; Emerson et al. 2010).

Divergence of gene regulatory networks has also been implicated in inheritance of gene expression levels. Like any phenotype, mRNA abundance can be inherited either additively or non-additively. One extreme form of non-additive inheritance

includes cases in which genes are misexpressed in F1 hybrids, compared to parent species. This misexpression includes both over- and under-dominant inheritance, in which total mRNA abundance in F1 hybrids is either much higher or lower than both parent species, respectively. Misexpression of mRNA abundance can affect many genes, (Ranz et al. 2004; Gibson et al. 2004), and is associated with antagonistic *cis*- and *trans*-regulatory changes (Landry 2005; McManus et al. 2010; Schaefer et al. 2013).

While the evolution of mRNA abundance has been studied extensively, divergent regulation of mRNA translation has received much less attention. We used ribosome profiling to compare mRNA abundance and translation efficiency in two species of yeast, *S. cerevisiae* and *S. paradoxus*. Interspecies differences in mRNA abundance and translation efficiency affected similar proportions of the transcriptome. Importantly, differences in translation efficiency tend to buffer differences in mRNA abundance. We further compared the relative contributions of *cis*- and *trans*-regulatory differences in mRNA abundance and translation efficiency using F1 hybrids. Differences in both mRNA levels and translation efficiency are largely attributed to *trans*-regulatory divergence. Finally, we investigated inheritance patterns of mRNA abundance and ribosome occupancy in F1 Hybrids. Strikingly, ribosome occupancy was much less likely to exhibit misexpression, especially for genes involved in cell cycle regulation. These results reveal the importance of translation regulation in evolution, provide insights into the genetic and molecular mechanisms of translation regulatory divergence, and

indicate that translation regulatory networks often act as a buffer to gene regulatory divergence in yeast.

Results

Measuring translation efficiency with ribosome profiling.

To investigate translation regulatory divergence, we used ribosome profiling in diploid *S. cerevisiae*, *S. paradoxus*, and their F1 hybrid (Fig 1A). This technique provides estimates of the relative number of ribosomes translating mRNA from each gene (ribosome occupancy). Compared with RNA-seq or microarray measurements of mRNA abundance, ribosome occupancy is a better proxy of protein abundance in yeast (Ingolia et al. 2009). This is consistent with the common model that yeast protein synthesis is largely regulated at the translation initiation step (Shah et al. 2013; Lackner et al. 2007; Sonenberg and Hinnebusch 2009). Ribosome bound mRNA were extracted from cycloheximide treated cells and digested with RNase I to produce short (28-30 nucleotides) Ribosome protected mRNA fragments (RPFs). RPFs were then purified and used to generate strand-specific libraries for Illumina high-throughput sequencing (Ingolia et al. 2011). Strand-specific polyA-positive mRNA-seq libraries were made in parallel. Together, this approach measures both ribosome occupancy (RPF) and mRNA abundance (mRNA) that can be compared to estimate relative translation efficiency, defined here as the ratio of ribosome footprints to mRNA fragments (RPF / mRNA) (Ingolia et al. 2009).

We developed an analysis pipeline to compare translation efficiency between species and between alleles in F1 hybrids that leverages the high quality genome

sequences and gene annotations from each species (Scannell et al. 2011). To improve the annotations of introns and translation start sites, we sequenced the transcriptome of *S. paradoxus* (Scannell et al. 2011). Our reannotation of the *S. paradoxus* genome resulted in a working set of 5,474 orthologous protein coding genes. Sequence reads from each species were aligned to their respective genomes. Reads from F1 hybrid samples were aligned to each species genome separately, and alignments were compared to identify reads that map preferentially to one allele (McManus et al. 2010) (Fig 1B). This analysis resulted in an average of 7.4 million RPF and 6.9 million mRNA reads covering ORFs in each replicate (Table S1).

In some cases, allele-specific alignment can be biased towards higher quality genomes (Degner et al. 2009). However, these effects appear to be largely absent when using two high-quality genomes, as was the design of this study (McManus et al. 2010; Stevenson et al. 2013; Graze et al. 2012). To investigate the effectiveness of our allele-specific mapping pipeline, we combined sequence data from individual species to create a “mock hybrid”, and compared divergence estimates from allele-specific and single-species alignment procedures. Estimates of gene expression differences from allele-specific and single-species alignment procedures were highly consistent for ribosome occupancy (RPFs; Pearson’s $R^2 > 0.97$), mRNA abundance ($R^2 > 0.98$) and translation efficiency (RPF / mRNA; $R^2 > 0.96$) (Fig 1C and Fig S1), suggesting that the allele-specific analysis pipeline generates accurate estimates of regulatory divergence. We therefore used our allele-specific pipeline for both interspecies and F1 hybrid allelic comparisons.

Interspecies differences in translation efficiency and mRNA abundance.

We compared interspecies differences in mRNA abundance and ribosome occupancy using a custom analysis pipeline (see methods). Count-based tests were applied to identify statistically significant differences using 5% false discovery rate (FDR) and 1.5-fold minimum thresholds in both replicates. Our biological replicates were well correlated for both mRNA and RPF libraries ($\rho > 0.97$; Fig S2). By requiring at least 20 total allele-specific mapped reads (*S. cer* reads + *S. par* reads > 20) for both RPF and mRNA in each replicate, we identified 1,308 genes (26.9%) with differences in ribosome occupancy (RPFs), 1,739 genes (35.8%) with differences in mRNA abundance, and 1,345 genes (27.7%) with differences in translational efficiency (RPF/mRNA) (Fig 2A-C). Similar results were obtained using minimum cutoffs of 10, 50, and 100 reads (Table S2). These results suggest that translation regulation may play as significant a role as mRNA abundance in the evolution of gene expression.

Many features of mRNA transcripts influence translation efficiency. Long transcript leaders (5' UTRs), frequent upstream AUGs (uAUGs), and uORF activity have all been associated with reduced translation efficiency (Rojas-Duran and Gilbert 2012; Waern and Snyder 2013; Brar et al. 2011; Ingolia et al. 2009). We used our RNA-seq data to annotate transcript leaders for 3,014 genes in each species. Species differences in transcript leader length were negatively correlated with divergent translation efficiency, such that the species with the longer transcript leader tended to have lower efficiency of translation ($\rho = -0.27$; $P = 1.9 \times 10^{-13}$). Differences in the number of uAUGs were also negatively correlated with divergent translation efficiency, suggesting that

orthologs with more uAUGs tend to be less efficiently translated ($\rho = -0.27$; $P = 6.3 \times 10^{-8}$). Partial correlation analysis of transcript leader length, controlling for uAUG frequency, and vice versa, show that they contribute equally to divergent translation efficiency ($\rho = -0.126$; $P = 0.00054$; and $\rho = -0.129$; $P = 0.00038$). In comparison, the frequency of upstream stop codons was not correlated with divergent translation efficiency ($P > 0.3$). Thus, divergent translation regulation is due in part to divergent transcript leader length and uAUG frequency.

The importance of uAUGs suggests that upstream open reading frames (uORFs) may also contribute to divergent translation efficiency. Once thought to be rare, recent studies have identified thousands of uORFs in *S. cerevisiae*, many of which appear to initiate translation at non-canonical “NTG” start codons (Brar *et al.* 2011; Ingolia *et al.* 2009). We searched for putative uORFs starting with NTG and ending with an in-frame stop codon in transcript leader regions from each species. RPF reads were mapped to uORF regions and the ratios of uORF to main ORF reads from each species were compared. Species differences in ribosome occupancy over uORFs were also negatively correlated with divergent translation efficiency ($\rho = -0.2477153$; $P = 3.6 \times 10^{-8}$), such that orthologs with higher uORF occupancy showed generally lower efficiency of main ORF translation (Fig S3). These results indicate that translation regulatory divergence can be attributed in part to interspecies differences in uORF presence and utilization.

Due to redundancy in the genetic code, codon usage bias can also contribute to regulation of translation efficiency (Plotkin and Kudla 2010). A previous comparison of

nine yeast species revealed divergent codon usage bias for hundreds of orthologous ORFs (Man and Pilpel 2007). We calculated codon bias using the tRNA Adaptation Index (tAI) (Reis et al. 2004) to compare species differences in codon bias to translation regulatory differences. Codon bias was positively correlated to mRNA abundance, ribosome occupancy, and translation efficiency ($\rho > 0.52$; $P < 2 \cdot 10^{-16}$), such that highly expressed genes are biased towards using more abundant tRNA in both species. In contrast, interspecies differences in codon bias were weakly correlated with divergent translation efficiency ($\rho = 0.11$, $P = 4.706e-15$).

Translation regulatory divergence buffers species differences in mRNA abundance

Genes with interspecies differences in mRNA abundance were more than twice as likely to have divergent translation efficiency, compared to genes with conserved mRNA abundance (Fisher's Exact Test (FET), $P < 10^{-16}$). The co-occurrence of divergence in translation efficiency could work in the same (amplifying) or opposite (buffering) direction (Fig 3A). Strikingly, we found that buffering effects were ~ 5.5 times more common ($N=560$) than amplifying effects ($N=101$; FET, $P < 10^{-16}$). Indeed there was a significant negative correlation between mRNA abundance and translation efficiency genome-wide (Fig 3B-C; $\rho = -0.413$, $P < 10^{-16}$). This tendency towards buffering would reduce divergent expression overall at the protein level.

We investigated several features of buffered and amplified genes. Highly expressed genes often have housekeeping functions, and therefore might be buffered more frequently than genes with low mRNA abundance. However the mRNA abundance

of buffered genes was either average (in *S. cerevisiae*) or slightly lower than average (*S. paradoxus*) (Fig S4). We also compared the biological functions of buffered and amplified genes. Gene ontology (GO) analysis (Table S3) revealed that buffered genes were enriched in processes involved in cellular communication and catabolism ($P < 0.01$), while amplified genes, were enriched in functions related to more specific metabolic processes, including amino-acid metabolism, sulfur assimilation ($P < 0.01$), iron import, and redox reactions ($P < 0.004$). The enrichment of these categories is consistent with species / strain differences in metabolic strategies, as *S. paradoxus* metabolism uses aerobic respiration more intensely, while *S. cerevisiae* has more auxotrophies to amino-acid biosynthesis.

***cis*- and *trans*-contributions to translation regulatory divergence.**

To gain further insight into the molecular and genetic changes underlying translation regulatory divergence, we performed allele-specific ribosome profiling on an F1 hybrid strain made by crossing our strains of *S. cerevisiae* and *S. paradoxus*. In F1 hybrids, differences in allele-specific translation efficiency reflect divergence of their *cis*-regulatory sequences. The effects of *trans*-regulatory divergence can then be inferred by comparing inter-species expression differences with F1 hybrid allele-specific expression (Wittkopp et al. 2004; Tirosh et al. 2009; McManus et al. 2010; Bullard et al. 2010). This approach is feasible with our strains, as *S. cerevisiae* and *S. paradoxus* are sufficiently divergent to allow proper allele-assignment for 71% of sequence reads (Table S1). Figure 1C shows an example comparison of sequence coverage with separate species and allele-specific read assignments.

At each level of gene regulatory control - transcript abundance, ribosome occupancy, and translational efficiency - more genes were affected by differences in the activity of *trans*-regulatory factors than by *cis*-regulatory differences (Fig 4A). This is consistent with previous studies of regulatory divergence and shows that the mode of regulatory evolution is similar for mRNA abundance and translation efficiency. However, *cis*-regulatory divergence contributes more to differences in translation efficiency (36.7% *cis*) than to differences in mRNA abundance (30.2% *cis*) (Fig 4B; Wilcoxon Rank-sum Test (WRT); $P = 3.9 \times 10^{-14}$).

We investigated the overlap of genes with *cis*-regulatory divergence in mRNA abundance, translation efficiency, and ribosome occupancy (Fig 4C). *cis*-regulatory divergence in translation efficiency was found three times more often in genes with *cis*-regulatory divergence in mRNA levels than compared to those without (FET, $P < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$). Coupled *cis*-regulatory evolution of mRNA abundance and translation efficiency was biased more than 3-fold towards buffering allele-specific ribosome occupancy. As a result, 345 genes (55%) with *cis*-regulatory differences in mRNA levels do not exhibit *cis*-regulatory divergence in ribosome occupancy. We refer to these genes as “*cis*-mRNA buffered”, while genes with concurrent *cis*-regulatory differences in mRNA abundance and ribosome occupancy are “*cis*-mRNA penetrant”. The median magnitude of *cis*-regulatory divergence for *cis*-mRNA buffered genes is significantly lower than that of *cis*-mRNA penetrant genes (1.84-fold vs 2.31-fold; WRT, $P < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$). This suggests that small magnitude *cis*-regulatory differences in mRNA levels are less likely to penetrate into the phenotype of protein production.

We next examined how *cis*- and *trans*-regulatory divergence in mRNA abundance and translation efficiency contribute to buffered and amplified interspecies expression differences. Compared to buffered genes, amplified genes were more likely to exhibit *cis*-regulatory divergence of both mRNA abundance (FET; 1.6 fold, $P = 0.018$) and translation efficiency (FET; 2.3-fold, $P = 5.3 \times 10^{-5}$). Amplified genes also had higher %*cis* than buffered genes, both for mRNA abundance (31.1% vs 25.5%; WRT $P = 0.07$) and translation efficiency (60.7% vs 31.7%; WRT $P = 0.0003342$; Figure 4). Thus, *cis*-regulatory divergence contributes more to amplified genes than to buffered genes.

Buffering of misexpression in F1 hybrids

Previous studies have revealed aberrant mRNA abundance in interspecies hybrids - either lower (underexpressed) or higher (overexpressed) than both parental species. This misexpression may be related to interspecies network incompatibilities and, potentially, to speciation (Ranz *et al.* 2004; Landry 2005; Moehring *et al.* 2007). However, a recent proteomics study estimated only 3% of 398 analyzed genes exhibit misexpression of protein abundance in F1 hybrids of *S. cerevisiae* and *S. bayanus* (Khan *et al.* 2012). We analyzed the inheritance of divergent expression in both mRNA abundance and ribosome occupancy to test the hypothesis that mRNA misexpression could be translationally buffered. Compared to mRNA abundance, ribosome occupancy showed strikingly fewer genes with non-additive inheritance modes (Figure 5), with 6.3-fold fewer underexpressed genes (FET $P < 10^{-16}$) and 1.9-fold fewer overexpressed genes (FET; $P = 0.0003194$). This result indicates that divergent translation regulation

also buffers misexpression of mRNA abundance, such that total protein synthesis in F1 hybrids is more consistent with that of parent species.

Buffering of misexpression could reduce hybrid incompatibilities. To investigate the effects of misexpression and buffering, we compared enrichment of GO functions in genes misexpressed at the mRNA level and at the level of ribosome occupancy. Genes underexpressed at the mRNA level were functionally enriched in cell cycle regulation and cellular metabolic processes, while genes with overexpressed mRNA largely functioned in purine biosynthesis pathways ($P < 0.01$; Table S4). Consistent with this, genes with aberrantly high ribosome occupancy in the F1 hybrid strain were enriched for functions in inosine monophosphate biosynthesis, the precursor to purine synthesis. In contrast, no GO functional categories were enriched in the 34 genes underexpressed at the translation level. In conclusion, compensatory changes in translation efficiency appear to correct aberrant mRNA abundance in F1 hybrids of *S. paradoxus* and *S. cerevisiae*, possibly restoring the expression of cell cycle control genes.

Discussion

The evolution of translation efficiency

Although undoubtedly important, evolutionary changes in mRNA abundance may not always reflect interspecies differences in gene expression. Indeed, prior work has highlighted a disconnect between variation in mRNA and protein abundance within yeast (Foss *et al.* 2007), mice (Ghazalpour *et al.* 2011), and humans (Wu *et al.* 2013). Together, these studies suggest that variation in mRNA translation and protein turnover contribute to polymorphic gene expression. Our results indicate that translation

regulation plays a substantial role in the evolution of gene expression. Roughly one quarter of all expressed genes exhibited divergent translation efficiency, showing that divergence in translation regulation and mRNA abundance affect similar numbers of genes.

Changes in codon usage have been previously implicated in yeast gene regulatory evolution (Man and Pilpel 2007). More recent studies have highlighted important translation regulatory roles of transcript leaders in *S. cerevisiae* (Rojas-Duran and Gilbert 2012; Waern and Snyder 2013; Brar et al. 2011; Ingolia et al. 2009). Our results indicate that interspecies differences in transcript leaders appear to play a larger role than codon bias. One explanation for this observation is that changes in codon bias are more likely to be pleiotropic, as changes in codon usage can alter translation elongation and disrupt co-translational protein folding (Plotkin and Kudla 2010; Angov 2011). In contrast, changes in transcript leader length and sequence composition are likely to affect only translation initiation. Much like transcription promoter regions, transcript leaders provide important opportunities for evolutionary changes in gene expression without affecting protein-coding sequences.

Differences in modes of regulatory evolution for mRNA abundance and translation efficiency.

We used allele-specific ribosome profiling to compare the contributions of *cis*- and *trans*-regulatory changes toward divergence of mRNA abundance and translation efficiency. We found that *cis*-regulatory differences appear to contribute more to divergence in translation efficiency than to interspecies differences in mRNA

abundance. This is inconsistent with other work suggesting fewer *cis*-acting loci contribute to polymorphic regulation of mRNA abundance than of protein abundance among *S. cerevisiae* strains (Foss et al. 2011). This may be due in part to a smaller sample size (354 genes) and lower power of mass spectrometry based studies for QTL mapping. In fact, recent work from the same group has shown that local pQTL are more common than previously appreciated (Albert et al., submitted). Differences in divergence time in the Foss study (between strains) and ours (between species) could also contribute to their differing conclusions, as it has been shown that *cis*-regulatory divergence accumulates over evolutionary time (Wittkopp et al. 2008b; Lemos et al. 2008; Emerson et al. 2010).

Buffering of divergent mRNA abundance and translation efficiency

Our results indicate that regulatory interactions between mRNA abundance and translation regulatory divergence more often reduce than amplify interspecies differences in gene expression. Buffering of gene expression may help explain recent work showing that protein abundance is more conserved than mRNA abundance across organisms (Schrimpf et al. 2009; Laurent et al. 2010). Changes in translation efficiency may compensate for changes in mRNA abundance by balancing the numbers of translating ribosomes.

There are two potential, non-exclusive mechanisms for buffering divergent gene regulation. First, regulatory networks controlling mRNA abundance and translation efficiency could have diverged through compensatory genetic mutations ("genetic compensation"), such that mutations in one pathway counteract the effects of mutations

in a different pathway. Secondly, the gene regulatory networks may be inherently robust, such that changes in mRNA abundance are automatically buffered by feedback loops and regulatory circuitry("network robustness"). The contributions of *cis*- and *trans*-regulatory changes in buffered genes may help differentiate between these mechanisms of buffering. For example, the genetic compensation model predicts that buffered genes would more frequently exhibit counteracting *cis*-regulatory changes in mRNA abundance and translation efficiency. In contrast, counteracting *trans*-acting differences are more consistent with network robustness. Out of the 560 buffered genes in our dataset, 75 (13%) exhibit counteracting *cis*-regulatory changes while 254 (45%) have counteracting *trans*-acting changes. Consequently, we propose that network robustness is likely to be more common than genetic compensation.

Compared to buffered gene expression levels, amplified gene expression levels have fewer concordant *trans*-regulatory changes in both mRNA levels and translation efficiency. Of the 101 amplified genes, 23 (23%) have amplifying *cis*-regulatory changes in both mRNA abundance and translation efficiency, while 24 (24%) have amplifying *trans*-regulatory changes. Amplifying genes also had higher %*cis*, showing that *cis*-regulatory changes contribute more to divergent regulation of amplified genes, compared to buffered genes. Importantly, *cis*-regulatory divergence is thought to be more frequently mediated by positive selection than *trans*-regulatory divergence (Emerson et al. 2010; Graze et al. 2012; Schaefer et al. 2013). Thus amplifying divergence of mRNA abundance and translation efficiency may reflect positive selection

for gene expression, as has been suggested for combinations of *cis*-regulatory mutations affecting mRNA abundance alone in *Drosophila* (Graze et al. 2012).

Many biological systems, including gene regulatory networks, are known to exhibit robustness to genetic and environmental perturbation (Levy and Siegal 2008; MacNeil and Walhout 2011; Masel and Siegal 2009; Denby et al. 2012; Stark et al. 2005). By increasing the robustness of protein production, translational buffering could reduce the phenotypic impacts of variation in mRNA abundance. This in turn would allow increased variation in mRNA abundance which, if unmasked by disruption of buffering, could give organisms more variation upon which selection might act. This would create a situation identical to canalization in development (Waddington 1942; Rutherford and Lindquist 1998), in which capacitor genes allow the buildup of latent variation which is only observed under extraordinary conditions. Our results suggest that translational buffering serves a similar purpose by allowing variation in mRNA abundance to accumulate through genetic drift without substantially changing protein levels.

Earlier studies on gene regulatory evolution have documented widespread misexpression of mRNA abundance in interspecies hybrids (Ranz et al. 2004; Gibson et al. 2004), often associated with counteracting *cis*- and *trans*-regulatory divergence of mRNA abundance (Landry 2005; McManus et al. 2010; Schafke et al. 2013).

Surprisingly, our analysis revealed translational buffering of misexpressed genes. Hundreds of genes had aberrant mRNA levels in hybrid cells, yet few showed aberrant ribosome occupancy patterns. As with interspecies differences in mRNA abundance,

over- and under-expressed genes could be buffered through genetic compensation or network robustness. It has been shown that protein-protein interactions are functional in F1 hybrids of *S. cerevisiae* and *S. kudriavzevii* (Leducq et al. 2012), suggesting that many biochemical features of regulatory networks are robust in interspecies hybrids. Thus, network robustness is an attractive answer. By reducing aberrant gene expression patterns, translational buffering of misexpression could contribute to the considerable success of yeast hybrids (Morales and Dujon 2012).

Thus far, we have investigated translation regulatory evolution only in the context of optimal growth conditions. Because many stress responses involve changes in mRNA translation, repeating these experiments under different conditions could shed light on the role of translation in species-specific responses to stress. It will also be important to identify the genes required to maintain translational buffering, as they could act as capacitors for variation in mRNA abundance. Although there is much yet to learn, our results underscore the importance of translation in the evolution of gene expression, help define the molecular and genetic causes of divergence in translation efficiency, and show that interspecies differences in translation efficiency often act as a buffer to gene regulatory evolution.

Methods

Yeast Strains

Saccharomyces strains: *S. cerevisiae* (GSY83; S288C), *S. paradoxus* (GSY82; CBS432), and their F1 hybrid (GSY88) were kind gifts from Gavin Sherlock (Kao et al. 2010). The original GSY83 is a haploid strain, while GSY82 and GSY88 are diploid

strains. For this study, a diploid version of GSY83 was produced by galactose induced transient expression of the HO gene from plasmid YCP50-Gal::HO, a gift from John Woolford. Diploid GSY83 were identified via PCR screening.

Ribosome profiling library preparation.

Yeast polysome extracts were prepared for ribosome profiling as previously described (Ingolia 2010) with slight modifications (see supplemental methods). RNA for matched RNA-seq was extracted from 50 μ l of cell lysate using TRIzol (Life Technologies) and vortexing with glass beads. The sample was then enriched for mRNA using magnetic oligo-DT DynaBeads (Life Technologies) according to the manufacturers instructions. The resulting RNA was then fragmented by incubating in alkaline fragmentation buffer (50 mM NaCO₃, pH 9.2; 1 mM EDTA) at 95°C for 40 minutes, precipitated with one volume of isopropanol and resuspended in 20 μ l of nuclease free water.

High-throughput sequencing library preparation was performed as previously described (Ingolia et al. 2011) with slight modifications (see supplemental methods). RPF and mRNA library cDNA templates were amplified by 12 cycles of PCR using Phusion-polymerase™ (New England Biolabs), with primers incorporating barcoded Illumina TruSeq library sequences. The resulting PCR products were then purified using PCR purification columns (Qiagen) according to the manufacturers instructions. The quality and size of the PCR products were assessed using an Agilent TapeStation™. Libraries were sequenced on an Illumina HiSeq 2000 at the University of Southern California Epigenome Center.

Sequence data alignment

Raw sequences were trimmed of 3' adapters using custom perl scripts. For RPF data, reads with lengths of 27 to 33 nucleotides were retained for further analysis as this size is most likely to represent footprinted fragments. For mRNA, reads with lengths of 27 to 40 nucleotides were retained. Adapter trimmed reads were first aligned to genomes using Bowtie (Langmead et al. 2009) (version 0.12.8) with parameters --best -chunkmbs 500. Reads that failed to map to genomic regions were recovered and aligned to splice-junction databases requiring a minimum overlap of 6 nucleotides. Splice-junction read alignments were converted to SAM formatted genomic coordinates using a custom perl script.

Allele-specific read assignment was performed as described previously (McManus et al. 2010) with slight modifications. Briefly, adapter trimmed reads from separate species were concatenated into single "mixed parent" files. Mixed parent and hybrid sequence files were aligned to both species genome and junction databases as described above, and alignments were compared with a custom perl script to identify reads that map preferentially to one genome (Fig 1B). The library preparation procedure used in this frequently adds untemplated nucleotides during reverse transcription (Brar et al. 2012). Considering this, we ignored mismatches at the first two bases of the 5' end of sequence reads when comparing alignments between two species. Reads were assigned to the allele to which they map with the fewest mismatches. Estimates of interspecies differences in gene expression made through our allele-specific pipeline were highly correlated with those made by single-species alignment used in traditional

RNA-seq and ribosome profiling (Fig S1; $\rho > 0.96$ for RPF, mRNA and translation efficiency).

Gene expression analyses

Allele-specific reads were mapped to ORFs and uORFs and normalized by downsampling all genes from the species or allele with more mapped reads (McManus *et al.* 2010). We also accounted for species differences in ORF length by downsampling reads from the longer ortholog in proportion to the ratio of ortholog lengths (i.e. if one species' ORF was twice as long, we would divide the number of assigned reads by two). Tests of statistical significance were performed essentially as previously described (McManus *et al.* 2010) using R (version 2.15.2). For analyses of expression differences, raw p-values were corrected using the Benjamini-Hochberg method (Benjamini and Hochberg 1995), and significant differences were identified using 5% FDR and 1.5-fold magnitude thresholds. Significant differences in mRNA abundance and ribosome occupancy (RPF) were identified using binomial exact tests (BET), requiring both replicates meet significance thresholds. Differences in translation efficiency (RPF/mRNA) were identified using Cochran Mantel-Haenszel tests (CMH), which directly incorporate experimental replicates. CMH tests were used to evaluate *trans*-regulatory divergence by comparing the ratio of expression differences in parents and hybrids for mRNA abundance and ribosome occupancy. The method of Altman and Bland (Altman and Bland 2003) was used to test for *trans*-regulatory divergence in translation efficiency. Table S5 contains all read-count data, tAI calculations, expression

ratios and results of significance test for divergent expression. For full expression analysis details, see the supplemental methods.

Genes were classified as “buffered” or “amplified” using the following criteria. Both buffered and amplified genes have significant differences in mRNA abundance and translational efficiency. In buffered genes, the interspecies difference in ribosome occupancy (RPF) is at least 1.5-fold lower than the interspecies difference in mRNA abundance. In contrast, amplified genes have at least 1.5-fold higher differences in ribosome occupancy compared to differences in mRNA abundance.

Categories of gene expression inheritance were determined using a custom R program as previously described (McManus *et al.* 2010). Total expression in F1 hybrid cells was normalized to that of parental samples and log-transformed. Genes with total expression more than 1.25-fold different from that of either parent species were considered to have nonconserved inheritance and were classified as having additive, dominant, under-dominant or over-dominant inheritance modes based on the magnitude of differences between hybrid and parental expression.

Additional analyses

Gene ontology enrichment analysis was performed using the generic gene ontology term finder (go.princeton.edu), and GO terms were further evaluated using revigo (revigo.irb.hr) (Supek *et al.* 2011). The tRNA adaptation index (tAI) was calculated using the codonR package (<http://people.cryst.bbk.ac.uk/~fdosr01/tAI/index.html>) (Reis *et al.* 2004). Genome browser tracks (bedGraph) were produced for visual analysis using

genomeCoverageBed from bedTools. Images for all figures were produced using the Integrative Genome Browser (Robinson et al. 2011).

Data access

High-throughput sequencing data have been submitted to NCBI Sequence Read Archive (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sra>) under accession number SRP028552. A read-count table for mRNA and RPFs, genome-browser tracks (bedGraph) and gene annotations (bed) have been submitted to NCBI Gene expression omnibus (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/>) under accession number GSE52119.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Gavin Sherlock for sharing strains, and John Woolford and Adam Lindstedt for use of equipment. We also thank Zia Khan, Christine Vogel, and members of the McManus lab for comments and suggestions on the manuscript. This work was supported by laboratory start-up funding provided by the Department of Biological Sciences at Carnegie Mellon University.

Author contributions

CJM conceived of the experiments and designed the study. CJM, GEM, and PS performed the experiments. CJM and AS analyzed the data. CJM wrote the manuscript with input from all authors.

Disclosure Declaration

The authors are not aware of any conflicts of interest.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Overview of allele-specific ribosome profiling to measure divergence in ribosome occupancy, mRNA abundance, and translational efficiency. (A) Ribosome profiling was performed on log-phase cultures of *S. cerevisiae*, *S. paradoxus*, and their F1 hybrid. Ribosome protected fragments (RPFs) were purified and cloned into Illumina high-throughput sequencing libraries (left). Poly-adenylated mRNA sequencing libraries were prepared in parallel (right). (B) Sequence reads from each sample were aligned to both species genomes. Allele-specific reads were identified by comparing genomic alignments and mapped to corresponding regions of orthologous ORFs. (C) Comparison of separate and allele-specific coverage in ribosome profiling experiments. IGV browser tracks showing normalized coverage of RPF and mRNA sequence reads from *S. cerevisiae* (blue) and *S. paradoxus* (magenta) over the *COX6* gene (YHR051W). Measurements of interspecies differences in read coverage are equivalent for separate species (upper) and allele-specific alignments (“mock hybrid”, lower; also see Fig S1).

Figure 2. Comparing regulatory divergence of ribosome occupancy, mRNA abundance, and translation efficiency. (A-C) Scatter plots compare the normalized average number of sequence reads for *S. cerevisiae* (x-axis) and *S. paradoxus* (y axis). Genes with statistically significant differences in read counts (FDR < 5%, minimum 1.5-fold difference) are plotted as open circles with black edges. Translation efficiency is defined here as the number of ribosome protected fragment reads (RPF) divided by the number of mRNA-seq reads covering an ORF.

Figure 3. Translation regulatory divergence buffers interspecies differences in mRNA abundance. (A) Cartoon depicting buffering (left) and amplification (right). mRNA are shown as blue lines, and ribosomes are shown as black circles. Buffered genes have divergent mRNA abundance, with less divergent ribosome occupancy such that protein production is more conserved. In contrast, amplified genes have divergent mRNA abundance and even more divergent ribosome occupancy. (B) Scatterplot comparing divergent translation efficiency (y-axis, RPF/mRNA) with divergent mRNA abundance (x-axis). Buffered and amplified genes are plotted in red and blue, respectively. The negative correlation between mRNA abundance and translation efficiency suggests a genome-wide trend towards buffering. (C) Example of RPF and RNA-seq coverage over *FPK1*, a buffered gene. IGV browser tracks showing normalized coverage for *S. cerevisiae* (blue) and *S. paradoxus* (red).

Figure 4. Contributions of *cis*- and *trans*-regulatory divergence in mRNA abundance, ribosome occupancy, and translation efficiency. (A) Bar plot shows the number of genes affected by significant regulatory divergence in *cis*-acting sequences ("C") and *trans*-acting factors ("T"). *trans*-acting factors contribute most to mRNA abundance. (B) Box plot showing the fraction of regulatory divergence attributable to differences in *cis*-regulatory elements (%*cis*). Ribosome occupancy and translation efficiency both have higher %*cis* than mRNA abundance. (C) Venn diagram showing the overlap of genes with *cis*-regulatory divergence in mRNA abundance, ribosome occupancy, and translation efficiency. (D) Box plot depicting %*cis* for genes with buffering ("Buf") and amplifying ("Amp") regulatory divergence of mRNA abundance (left) and translation

efficiency (right). Asterisks indicate results of wilcoxon rank-sum test comparisons (*, $P < 0.001$; **, $P < 0.0005$).

Figure 5. Inheritance of gene expression in F1 hybrids of *S. cerevisiae* and *S. paradoxus*. (A) Hypothetical patterns of gene expression in *S. paradoxus* (blue), *S. cerevisiae* (red) and F1 hybrid yeast (purple) depicting six modes of gene expression inheritance. Scatterplots showing the difference between mRNA expression levels (left) in the F1 Hybrid and *S. cerevisiae* (x axis) and *S. paradoxus* (y axis). The difference between ribosome occupancy levels (RPF) in the F1 Hybrid and parental species is shown on the right. Bar plots shows the number of genes in each inheritance category from ribosome occupancy data. Genes with overdominant (overexpressed) and underdominant (underexpressed) inheritance occur much less frequently when considering ribosome occupancy, as compared to misexpression in mRNA abundance.

Figure S1. Comparison of divergence estimates using the allele-specific and separate-species analysis pipelines for ribosome protected fragments (RPF), RNA-seq (mRNA) and translational efficiency measurements. The X-axis shows estimates of interspecies differences made by aligning reads to each species genome individually. Estimates of interspecies differences made by allele-specific alignment (Y-axis) are compared for each set.

Figure S2. Reproducibility in biological replicates. Scatterplots show comparisons of numbers of normalized reads for each gene from mRNA (top) and RPF (libraries). The value of Spearman's rho is given in the upper left corner of each plot. In all cases, the replicates were highly correlated.

Figure S3. Examples of interspecies differences in uORF usage. IGV browser tracks showing normalized ribosome occupancy (RPF) and mRNA abundance (mRNA) in *S. cerevisiae* (blue) and *S. paradoxus* (red). Boxes below depict ORFs (thick) and 5' UTR regions (thin), as well as putative uORFs (small thin lines). (A) *ALR1* mRNA abundance is higher in *S. paradoxus*. However, this species has more ribosome occupancy over uORFs in the 5' UTR, and less ribosome occupancy on the main ORF, compared to *S. cerevisiae*. (B) *S. paradoxus* and *S. cerevisiae* express similar mRNA levels of the uncharacterized ORF YOL014W, but a frameshift mutation in *S. cerevisiae* has resulted in nearly complete loss of ribosome occupancy on its main ORF. Green and black arrows depict translation start and stop sites, respectively.

Figure S4. Comparisons of buffered and amplified gene expression levels. Box plots show the distribution of expression levels (in RPKM) in each species for buffered, amplified and all genes.

References

Albert FW, Treusch S, Shockley AH, Bloom JS, Kruglyak L. submitted. Genetics of single-cell protein abundance variation in large yeast populations. (<http://arxiv.org/abs/1307.6829>).

Angov E. 2011. Codon usage: Nature's roadmap to expression and folding of proteins. *Biotechnology Journal* **6**: 650–659.

- Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. 1995. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B (Methodological)* 289–300.
- Brar GA, Rouskin S, McGeachy AM, Ingolia NT, Weissman JS. 2012. The ribosome profiling strategy for monitoring translation in vivo by deep sequencing of ribosome-protected mRNA fragments. *Nature Protocols* 7: 1534–1550.
- Brar GA, Yassour M, Friedman N, Regev A, Ingolia NT, Weissman JS. 2011. High-Resolution View of the Yeast Meiotic Program Revealed by Ribosome Profiling. *Science*.
- Brem RB, Yvert G, Clinton R, Kruglyak L. 2002. Genetic dissection of transcriptional regulation in budding yeast. *Science* 296: 752–755.
- Bullard JH, Mostovoy Y, Dudoit S, Brem RB. 2010. Polygenic and directional regulatory evolution across pathways in *Saccharomyces*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 107: 5058–5063.
- Carroll SB. 2005. Evolution at two levels: on genes and form. *PLoS Biol* 3: e245.
- Degner JF, Marioni JC, Pai AA, Pickrell JK, Nkadori E, Gilad Y, Pritchard JK. 2009. Effect of read-mapping biases on detecting allele-specific expression from RNA-sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* 25: 3207–3212.

- Denby CM, Im JH, Yu RC, Pesce CG, Brem RB. 2012. Negative feedback confers mutational robustness in yeast transcription factor regulation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **109**: 3874–3878.
- Emerson JJ, Hsieh LC, Sung HM, Wang TY, Huang CJ, Lu HHS, Lu MYJ, Wu SH, Li WH. 2010. Natural selection on *cis* and *trans* regulation in yeasts. *Genome Res* **20**: 826–836.
- Foss EJ, Radulovic D, Shaffer SA, Goodlett DR, Kruglyak L, Bedalov A. 2011. Genetic Variation Shapes Protein Networks Mainly through Non-transcriptional Mechanisms ed. M.B. Eisen. *PLoS Biol* **9**: e1001144.
- Foss EJ, Radulovic D, Shaffer SA, Ruderfer DM, Bedalov A, Goodlett DR, Kruglyak L. 2007. Genetic basis of proteome variation in yeast. *Nat Genet* **39**: 1369–1375.
- Ghazalpour A, Bennett B, Petyuk VA, Orozco L, Hagopian R, Mungrue IN, Farber CR, Sinsheimer J, Kang HM, Furlotte N, et al. 2011. Comparative Analysis of Proteome and Transcriptome Variation in Mouse ed. M. Snyder. *PLoS Genet* **7**: e1001393.
- Gibson G, Riley-Berger R, Harshman L, Kopp A, Vacha S, Nuzhdin S, Wayne M. 2004. Extensive sex-specific nonadditivity of gene expression in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* **167**: 1791–1799.

Graze RM, Novelo LL, Amin V, Fear JM, Casella G, Nuzhdin SV, McIntyre LM. 2012.

Allelic imbalance in *Drosophila* hybrid heads: exons, isoforms, and evolution. *Mol Biol Evol* **29**: 1521–1532.

Ingolia NT. 2010. *Chapter 6 - Genome-Wide Translational Profiling by Ribosome Footprinting*. 2nd ed. Elsevier Inc.

Ingolia NT, Ghaemmaghami S, Newman JRS, Weissman JS. 2009. Genome-wide analysis in vivo of translation with nucleotide resolution using ribosome profiling. *Science* **324**: 218–223.

Ingolia NT, Lareau LF, Weissman JS. 2011. Ribosome Profiling of Mouse Embryonic Stem Cells Reveals the Complexity and Dynamics of Mammalian Proteomes. *Cell* **147**: 789–802.

Kao KC, Schwartz K, Sherlock G. 2010. A Genome-Wide Analysis Reveals No Nuclear Dobzhansky-Muller Pairs of Determinants of Speciation between *S. cerevisiae* and *S. paradoxus*, but Suggests More Complex Incompatibilities ed. J.-Y. Leu. *PLoS Genet* **6**: e1001038.

Khan Z, Bloom JS, Amini S, Singh M, Perlman DH, Caudy AA, Kruglyak L. 2012. Quantitative measurement of allele-specific protein expression in a diploid yeast hybrid by LC-MS. *Molecular Systems Biology* **8**: 1–12.

King MC, Wilson AC. 1975. Evolution at two levels in humans and chimpanzees. *Science*.

- Lackner DH, Beilharz TH, Marguerat S, Mata J, Watt S, Schubert F, Preiss T, Bähler J. 2007. A Network of Multiple Regulatory Layers Shapes Gene Expression in Fission Yeast. *Mol Cell* **26**: 145–155.
- Landry CR. 2005. Compensatory *cis-trans* Evolution and the Dysregulation of Gene Expression in Interspecific Hybrids of *Drosophila*. *Genetics* **171**: 1813–1822.
- Langmead B, Trapnell C, Pop M, Salzberg S. 2009. Ultrafast and memory-efficient alignment of short DNA sequences to the human genome. *Genome Biol* **10**: R25.
- Laurent JM, Vogel C, Kwon T, Craig SA, Boutz DR, Huse HK, Nozue K, Walia H, Whiteley M, Ronald PC, et al. 2010. Protein abundances are more conserved than mRNA abundances across diverse taxa eds. M. Porto, H.E. Roman, and M. Vendruscolo. *Proteomics* **10**: 4209–4212.
- Leducq J-B, Charron G, Diss G, Gagnon-Arsenault I, Dubé AK, Landry CR. 2012. Evidence for the Robustness of Protein Complexes to Inter-Species Hybridization ed. J. Zhang. *PLoS Genet* **8**: e1003161.
- Lemos B, Araripe LO, Fontanillas P, Hartl DL. 2008. Dominance and the evolutionary accumulation of *cis*- and *trans*-effects on gene expression. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **105**: 14471–14476.
- Levy SF, Siegal ML. 2008. Network Hubs Buffer Environmental Variation in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *PLoS Biol* **6**: e264.

- MacNeil LT, Walhout AJM. 2011. Gene regulatory networks and the role of robustness and stochasticity in the control of gene expression. *Genome Res* **21**: 645–657.
- Man O, Pilpel Y. 2007. Differential translation efficiency of orthologous genes is involved in phenotypic divergence of yeast species. *Nat Genet* **39**: 415–421.
- Masel J, Siegal ML. 2009. Robustness: mechanisms and consequences. *Trends Genet* **25**: 395–403.
- McManus CJ, Coolon JD, Duff MO, Eipper-Mains J, Graveley BR, Wittkopp PJ. 2010. Regulatory divergence in *Drosophila* revealed by mRNA-seq. *Genome Res* **20**: 816–825.
- Moehring AJ, Teeter KC, Noor MAF. 2007. Genome-wide patterns of expression in *Drosophila* pure species and hybrid males. II. Examination of multiple-species hybridizations, platforms, and life cycle stages. *Mol Biol Evol* **24**: 137–145.
- Morales L, Dujon B. 2012. Evolutionary Role of Interspecies Hybridization and Genetic Exchanges in Yeasts. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev* **76**: 721–739.
- Pickrell JK, Marioni JC, Pai AA, Degner JF, Engelhardt BE, Nkadori E, Veyrieras J-B, Stephens M, Gilad Y, Pritchard JK. 2010. Understanding mechanisms underlying human gene expression variation with RNA sequencing. *Nature* **464**: 768–772.
- Plotkin JB, Kudla G. 2010. Synonymous but not the same: the causes and consequences of codon bias. *Nature Publishing Group* **12**: 32–42.

- Ranz JM, Castillo-Davis CI, Meiklejohn CD, Hartl DL. 2003. Sex-dependent gene expression and evolution of the *Drosophila* transcriptome. *Science* **300**: 1742–1745.
- Ranz JM, Namgyal K, Gibson G, Hartl DL. 2004. Anomalies in the expression profile of interspecific hybrids of *Drosophila melanogaster* and *Drosophila simulans*. *Genome Res* **14**: 373–379.
- Reis dos M, Savva R, Wernisch L. 2004. Solving the riddle of codon usage preferences: a test for translational selection. *Nucleic Acids Res* **32**: 5036–5044.
- Rifkin SA, Kim J, White KP. 2003. Evolution of gene expression in the *Drosophila melanogaster* subgroup. *Nat Genet* **33**: 138–144.
- Robinson JT, Thorvaldsdóttir H, Winckler W, Guttman M, Lander ES, Getz G, Mesirov JP. 2011. Integrative genomics viewer. *Nat Biotechnol* **29**: 24–26.
- Rockman MV, Kruglyak L. 2006. Genetics of global gene expression. *Nat Rev Genet* **7**: 862–872.
- Rojas-Duran MF, Gilbert WV. 2012. Alternative transcription start site selection leads to large differences in translation activity in yeast. *RNA* **18**: 2299–2305.
- Rutherford SL, Lindquist S. 1998. Hsp90 as a capacitor for morphological evolution. *Nature* **396**: 336–342.

- Scannell DR, Zill OA, Rokas A, Payen C, Dunham MJ, Eisen MB, Rine J, Johnston M, Hittinger CT. 2011. The awesome power of yeast evolutionary genetics: new genome sequences and strain resources for the *Saccharomyces sensu stricto* genus. *G3 (Bethesda)* **1**: 11–25.
- Schadt EE, Monks SA, Drake TA, Lusk AJ, Che N, Colino V, Ruff TG, Milligan SB, Lamb JR, Cavet G, et al. 2003. Genetics of gene expression surveyed in maize, mouse and man. *Nature* **422**: 297–302.
- Schaefer B, Emerson JJ, Wang T-Y, Lu MYJ, Hsieh LC, Li W-H. 2013. Inheritance of gene expression level and selective constraints on *trans*- and *cis*-regulatory changes in yeast. *Mol Biol Evol* 1–37.
- Schrimpf SP, Weiss M, Reiter L, Ahrens CH, Jovanovic M, Malmström J, Brunner E, Mohanty S, Lercher MJ, Hunziker PE, et al. 2009. Comparative functional analysis of the *Caenorhabditis elegans* and *Drosophila melanogaster* proteomes. *PLoS Biol* **7**: e48.
- Shah P, Ding Y, Niemczyk M, Kudla G, Plotkin JB. 2013. Rate-Limiting Steps in Yeast Protein Translation. *Cell* **153**: 1589–1601.
- Sonenberg N, Hinnebusch AG. 2009. Regulation of translation initiation in eukaryotes: mechanisms and biological targets. *Cell* **136**: 731–745.

- Stark A, Brennecke J, Bushati N, Russell RB, Cohen SM. 2005. Animal MicroRNAs Confer Robustness to Gene Expression and Have a Significant Impact on 3'UTR Evolution. *Cell* **123**: 1133–1146.
- Stevenson KR, Coolon JD, Wittkopp PJ. 2013. Sources of bias in measures of allele-specific expression derived from RNA-seq data aligned to a single reference genome. *BMC Genomics* **14**: 536.
- Supek F, Bošnjak M, Škunca N, Šmuc T. 2011. REVIGO Summarizes and Visualizes Long Lists of Gene Ontology Terms ed. C. Gibas. *PLoS ONE* **6**: e21800.
- Tirosh I, Reikhav S, Levy AA, Barkai N. 2009. A yeast hybrid provides insight into the evolution of gene expression regulation. *Science* **324**: 659–662.
- Tirosh I, Wong KH, Barkai N, Struhl K. 2011. Extensive divergence of yeast stress responses through transitions between induced and constitutive activation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **108**: 16693–16698.
- Waddington C. 1942. Canalization of development and the inheritance of acquired characters. *Nature*.
- Waern K, Snyder M. 2013. Extensive transcript diversity and novel upstream open reading frame regulation in yeast. *G3 (Bethesda)* **3**: 343–352.
- Wittkopp PJ, Haerum BK, Clark AG. 2004. Evolutionary changes in *cis* and *trans* gene regulation. *Nature* **430**: 85–88.

Wittkopp PJ, Haerum BK, Clark AG. 2008a. Independent Effects of *cis*- and *trans*-regulatory Variation on Gene Expression in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* **178**: 1831–1835.

Wittkopp PJ, Haerum BK, Clark AG. 2008b. Regulatory changes underlying expression differences within and between *Drosophila* species. *Nat Genet* **40**: 346–350.

Wu L, Candille SI, Choi Y, Xie D, Jiang L, Li-Pook-Than J, Tang H, Snyder M. 2013. Variation and genetic control of protein abundance in humans. *Nature* 1–4.

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure S1




Figure S2




Figure S3




Figure S4




Table S1. Numbers of sequence reads at each step of analysis. Raw reads include variable amounts of "adapter only" empty library. Library reads contain cloned RNA inserts. Contaminating rRNA reads made up 30% to 70% of the RPF library reads. As rRNA reads from RPF libraries map to both alleles, the fraction of allele-specific reads is reduced in RPF samples compared to mRNA samples.

mRNA Sample	Species / Allele	Raw	Library	Genome aligned	Allele-specific	ORF mapped	Normalized	Percent
Separate Parents Replicate A	<i>S. paradoxus</i>	26,819,693	14,160,104	13,668,788	9,623,380	7,195,448	7,096,639	49.96
	<i>S. cerevisiae</i>	15,288,245	13,937,492	13,644,258	10,085,330	7,472,137	7,109,313	50.04
Separate Parents Replicate B	<i>S. paradoxus</i>	15,222,810	13,364,839	13,087,419	9,434,828	7,281,735	7,190,496	49.96
	<i>S. cerevisiae</i>	15,250,639	13,978,236	13,670,183	10,084,366	7,440,143	7,201,063	50.04
Hybrid Replicate A	<i>S. paradoxus</i>	30,762,220	27,877,353	26,980,719	9,384,780	7,011,265	6,922,017	49.96
	<i>S. cerevisiae</i>				9,657,613	7,154,185	6,932,791	50.04
Hybrid Replicate B	<i>S. paradoxus</i>	27,700,697	25,067,868	24,382,810	8,741,552	6,560,924	6,454,933	49.99
	<i>S. cerevisiae</i>				8,798,257	6,599,162	6,456,613	50.01

RPF Sample	Species / Allele	Raw reads	Library Reads	Aligned reads	Allele-specific	ORF mapped	Normalized	Percent
Separate Parents Replicate A	<i>S. paradoxus</i>	43,461,865	27,640,261	26,897,784	12,661,113	11,291,673	8,904,431	49.98
	<i>S. cerevisiae</i>	41,214,129	22,555,743	22,227,255	10,526,878	9,092,017	8,910,405	50.02
Separate Parents Replicate B	<i>S. paradoxus</i>	76,161,853	36,517,084	35,509,272	7,247,861	6,199,193	6,116,133	49.95
	<i>S. cerevisiae</i>	38,244,257	27,960,534	27,568,540	10,495,172	8,827,413	6,127,161	50.05
Hybrid Replicate A	<i>S. paradoxus</i>	72,221,925	51,421,944	50,795,854	7,741,869	6,879,361	6,802,306	49.97
	<i>S. cerevisiae</i>				8,374,984	7,088,409	6,810,286	50.03
Hybrid Replicate B	<i>S. paradoxus</i>	97,125,729	62,984,843	62,255,282	8,724,669	7,700,918	7,615,853	49.97
	<i>S. cerevisiae</i>				9,313,643	7,894,827	7,624,928	50.03

Table S2. Numbers of genes in each category of regulatory divergence using different minimum read thresholds.

Minimum Read Threshold	Divergent			<i>cis</i> -acting			<i>trans</i> -acting			Buffered	Amplified
	RPF	mRNA	Efficiency (RPF/mRNA)	RPF	mRNA	Efficiency (RPF/mRNA)	RPF	mRNA	Efficiency (RPF/mRNA)		
10	1,345	1,795	1,379	601	668	682	1,401	2,068	1,149	574	104
20	1,308	1,739	1,345	580	631	652	1,372	2,010	1,129	560	101
50	1,237	1,649	1,279	528	578	591	1,309	1,909	1,099	538	88
100	1,149	1,546	1,193	457	516	510	1,213	1,795	1,043	500	69

Table S3. Gene ontology slim categories enriched in Buffered and Amplified genes.

Buffered		
term_ID	description	log10 p-value
GO:0007154	cell communication	-2.0023
GO:0009056	catabolic process	-2.2184
GO:0009987	cellular process	-2.2339
GO:0044699	single-organism process	-3.9966
GO:0051179	localization	-2.6193
GO:0044248	cellular catabolic process	-2.2489
GO:0044763	single-organism cellular process	-2.1546

Amplified (higher expression in <i>S. cerevisiae</i>)		
term_ID	description	log10 p-value
GO:1901605	alpha-amino acid metabolic process	-4.4949
GO:0044710	single-organism metabolic process	-2.541
GO:0000103	sulfate assimilation	-2.4692
GO:1901564	organonitrogen compound metabolic process	-3.3163
GO:0006082	organic acid metabolic process	-4.5749
GO:0044281	small molecule metabolic process	-3.1142
GO:1901565	organonitrogen compound catabolic process	-3.2689
GO:0009069	serine family amino acid metabolic process	-2.0884
GO:0009066	aspartate family amino acid metabolic process	-2.7459
GO:0009067	aspartate family amino acid biosynthetic process	-2.4238
GO:0019752	carboxylic acid metabolic process	-4.2096
GO:0043436	oxoacid metabolic process	-4.5935
GO:0006520	cellular amino acid metabolic process	-4.3143

Amplified (higher expression in <i>S. paradoxus</i>)		
term_ID	description	log10 p-value
GO:0055114	oxidation-reduction process	-2.4972
GO:1901678	iron coordination entity transport	-3.3027
GO:0015688	iron chelate transport	-2.4883

Table S4. Gene ontology slim categories enriched in genes misexpressed at the mRNA abundance and ribosome occupancy (RPF) levels. RPF underdominant genes were not enriched in any gene functions.

mRNA Underdominant (underexpressed)			
term_ID	description	log10pvalue	representative
GO:0000278	mitotic cell cycle	-9.2487	mitotic cell cycle
GO:0048285	organelle fission	-4.8245	mitotic cell cycle
GO:0000280	nuclear division	-5.2541	mitotic cell cycle
GO:0006996	organelle organization	-4.7547	mitotic cell cycle
GO:0044763	single-organism cellular process	-6.2454	mitotic cell cycle
GO:0051276	chromosome organization	-3.8428	mitotic cell cycle
GO:0007049	cell cycle	-7.4622	mitotic cell cycle
GO:0007059	chromosome segregation	-3.2387	mitotic cell cycle
GO:0051641	cellular localization	-2.6559	mitotic cell cycle
GO:0051301	cell division	-5.1942	mitotic cell cycle
GO:0009057	macromolecule catabolic process	-3.5642	macromolecule catabolism
GO:0090304	nucleic acid metabolic process	-7.2549	macromolecule catabolism
GO:0043632	modification-dependent macromolecule catabolic process	-2.9545	macromolecule catabolism
GO:0006139	nucleobase-containing compound metabolic process	-5.6396	macromolecule catabolism
GO:0034641	cellular nitrogen compound metabolic process	-4.2466	macromolecule catabolism
GO:0006366	transcription from RNA polymerase II promoter	-2.4759	macromolecule catabolism
GO:0016070	RNA metabolic process	-5.1353	macromolecule catabolism
GO:0006464	cellular protein modification process	-2.0525	macromolecule catabolism
GO:0044260	cellular macromolecule metabolic process	-5.4987	macromolecule catabolism
GO:0009987	cellular process	-5.4116	cellular process
GO:0044699	single-organism process	-5.2674	single-organism process
GO:0065007	biological regulation	-6.4058	biological regulation
GO:0071840	cellular component organization or biogenesis	-6.8034	cellular component organization or biogenesis
GO:0050794	regulation of cellular process	-6.5348	regulation of cellular process
GO:0043170	macromolecule metabolic process	-4.7778	macromolecule metabolism
GO:1901360	organic cyclic compound metabolic process	-3.9786	macromolecule metabolism
GO:0046483	heterocycle metabolic process	-4.6524	heterocycle metabolism
GO:0006725	cellular aromatic compound metabolic process	-4.6309	heterocycle metabolism
GO:0006807	nitrogen compound metabolic process	-2.9407	nitrogen compound metabolism

mRNA Overdominant (overexpressed)			
term_ID	description	log10pvalue	representative
GO:0006164	purine nucleotide biosynthetic process	-9.6069	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:1901576	organic substance biosynthetic process	-2.5486	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:0055086	nucleobase-containing small molecule metabolic process	-4.9392	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:1901564	organonitrogen compound metabolic process	-10.6453	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:0046112	nucleobase biosynthetic process	-2.6326	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:1901566	organonitrogen compound biosynthetic process	-9.519	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:1901137	carbohydrate derivative biosynthetic process	-6.1664	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:1901605	alpha-amino acid metabolic process	-4.5918	purine nucleotide biosynthesis

GO:0009123	nucleoside monophosphate metabolic process	-7.1679	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:0044281	small molecule metabolic process	-8.7138	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:0072522	purine-containing compound biosynthetic process	-8.7296	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:0072521	purine-containing compound metabolic process	-4.5616	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:0006163	purine nucleotide metabolic process	-4.4721	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:0090407	organophosphate biosynthetic process	-4.1909	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:0046394	carboxylic acid biosynthetic process	-2.5264	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:0019752	carboxylic acid metabolic process	-3.632	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:0055114	oxidation-reduction process	-2.8902	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:0006082	organic acid metabolic process	-3.378	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:0042440	pigment metabolic process	-3.1396	purine nucleotide biosynthesis
GO:0006811	ion transport	-2.3434	ion transport
GO:0055085	transmembrane transport	-2.8476	ion transport
GO:0034220	ion transmembrane transport	-2.415	ion transport
GO:0008152	metabolic process	-2.0516	metabolism
GO:0009987	cellular process	-2.5053	cellular process
GO:0044710	single-organism metabolic process	-10.6148	single-organism metabolism
GO:1901135	carbohydrate derivative metabolic process	-4.7286	carbohydrate derivative metabolism
GO:0009058	biosynthetic process	-2.374	biosynthesis
GO:0006793	phosphorus metabolic process	-3.1591	phosphorus metabolism

RPF Overdominant (overexpressed)			
term_ID	description	log10pvalue	representative
GO:0006189	'de novo' IMP biosynthetic process	-14.8967	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:0055086	nucleobase-containing small molecule metabolic process	-5.2224	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:1901564	organonitrogen compound metabolic process	-8.0014	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:0046112	nucleobase biosynthetic process	-4.9137	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:1901566	organonitrogen compound biosynthetic process	-8.7202	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:1901137	carbohydrate derivative biosynthetic process	-4.0189	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:1901605	alpha-amino acid metabolic process	-5.7854	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:0019438	aromatic compound biosynthetic process	-2.0551	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:0009123	nucleoside monophosphate metabolic process	-9.6858	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:0044281	small molecule metabolic process	-7.3388	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:0072522	purine-containing compound biosynthetic process	-12.6204	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:0072521	purine-containing compound metabolic process	-7.3924	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:0006163	purine nucleotide metabolic process	-5.6913	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:0090407	organophosphate biosynthetic process	-3.8273	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:0019878	lysine biosynthetic process via amino adipic acid	-2.3469	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:0019752	carboxylic acid metabolic process	-5.2161	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:0006082	organic acid metabolic process	-5.0142	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:0009066	aspartate family amino acid metabolic process	-3.3552	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:0042440	pigment metabolic process	-5.8078	primede novoprime IMP biosynthesis
GO:0044710	single-organism metabolic process	-7.1985	single-organism metabolism
GO:1901135	carbohydrate derivative metabolic process	-2.4313	carbohydrate derivative metabolism

Table S5. Overview of normalized readcounts and results of statistical tests for divergent expression, and *cis*- and *trans*-regulatory divergence. "Eff" denotes translation efficiency (RPF / mRNA). Percent *cis* denotes the percentage of regulatory divergence attributable to *cis*-regulatory differences. "Padj" denotes p-values adjusted for FDR correction using the Benjamini-Hotthberg method.

Gene	Mixed Parental RPF (ribosome occupancy) read counts						Mixed Parental mRNA read counts						F1 hybrid RPF (ribosome occupancy) read counts						F1 hybrid mRNA read counts						Ratios between Species			Ratios between Alleles in F1 hybrid			Percent <i>cis</i>			Adjusted P-values for tests of divergent expression						Adjusted P-values for <i>cis</i> -regulatory divergence in F1 Hybrids						Adjusted P-values for tests of <i>trans</i> -regulatory divergence						tAI	
	<i>S. cerevisiae</i>		<i>S. paradoxus</i>		<i>S. cerevisiae</i>		<i>S. paradoxus</i>		<i>S. cerevisiae</i>		<i>S. paradoxus</i>		<i>S. cerevisiae</i>		<i>S. paradoxus</i>		RPF	mRNA	Eff	RPF	mRNA	Eff	RPF	mRNA	Eff	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Combined	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Combined	Trans	Eff	RPF	mRNA	Trans	<i>S. cer</i>	<i>S. par</i>											
	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B	Rep A	Rep B											
YKR046C	428	317	2948	2421	356	338	2155	2210	702	875	1684	2324	750	1203	1949	2673	0.14	0.16	0.87	0.39	0.42	0.93	47.23	46.85	50.02	490535E-311	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	2.10E-02	7.48E-120	2.17E-124	1.63E-90	6.79E-148	1.35E-01	3.40E-01	4.29E-104	3.81E-89	0.44	0.43													
YHR071W	99	49	339	256	367	274	2545	2452	37	48	103	83	411	243	1443	985	0.25	0.13	1.91	0.46	0.27	1.71	56.28	63.88	82.93	920623E-322	0.00E+00	4.22E-31	3.74E-34	6.34E-10	4.44E-132	1.71E-104	1.29E-07	6.43E-03	4.40E-04	7.84E-01	3.27E-04	1.71E-32	0.36	0.35													
YOR317W	5069	3660	833	571	4706	5405	455	769	1445	1755	811	1203	1752	3053	764	1727	6.22	8.26	0.74	1.59	1.93	0.81	25.34	31.11	70.05	920623E-322	0.00E+00	754273E-322	0.00E+00	2.47E-12	9.35E-87	2.36E-81	1.39E-39	4.49E-23	9.80E-08	6.23E-02	4.72E-255	928024E-312	0.45	0.44													
YL051C	8014	5614	3103	2479	6654	7255	2192	1983	4204	4684	5154	6220	5318	3893	4687	4160	2.44	3.33	0.73	1.78	1.04	0.76	17.80	3.35	89.19	920623E-322	0.00E+00	754273E-322	3.45E-271	1.88E-37	1.24E-09	5.40E-03	1.50E-21	1.35E-47	7.38E-39	2.24E-01	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.48	0.47													
YDR481C	4235	2769	660	409	4617	4653	925	816	959	1028	982	887	1681	2939	2010	3243	6.55	5.32	1.24	1.06	0.88	1.23	3.26	6.66	93.51	920623E-322	0.00E+00	754273E-322	0.00E+00	6.88E-07	2.22E-07	2.52E-04	7.11E-01	3.33E-03	6.50E-07	8.84E-01	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.40	0.40													
YOR273C	946	962	711	519	3151	3811	495	560	769	1866	292	479	1975	4700	349	669	1.55	6.60	0.24	3.42	6.56	0.52	60.87	99.66	45.22	920623E-322	0.00E+00	1.97E-08	3.40E-30	2.67E-199	3.05E-272	0.00E+00	1.66E-48	2.96E-190	1.58E-33	1.30E-148	8.17E-37	6.13E-01	0.40	0.40													
YDR533C	791	917	43	33	1255	1990	35	56	181	263	35	37	338	453	68	71	22.47	35.66	0.64	6.17	5.69	1.08	58.45	48.65	15.63	967688E-318	0.00E+00	9.96E-178	1.12E-223	9.62E-03	8.65E-43	1.18E-67	1.09E-23	1.00E-41	1.82E-02	1.14E-14	3.26E-46	0.44	0.47														
YPL126W	2693	1333	3276	2154	1760	1545	2951	4695	2198	2002	1924	1777	2174	1388	2069	1300	0.74	0.43	1.57	1.13	1.06	1.07	22.91	5.86	12.57	920623E-322	0.00E+00	1.43E-13	2.48E-43	1.00E-50	1.51E-01	1.27E-01	8.13E-05	7.49E-04	6.34E-02	7.85E-10	1.02E-45	4.13E-150	0.39	0.39													
YMR058W	5996	1369	8108	5506	1768	780	3063	3393	3917	3409	7483	7404	1933	2780	3302	5426	0.54	0.39	1.21	0.49	0.54	0.90	88.22	66.28	26.50	2.48E-77	0.00E+00	5.62E-70	0.88873E-322	3.54E-11	5.97E-79	9.25E-189	2.40E-246	335359E-321	1.27E-05	5.73E-13	6.63E-01	1.10E-35	0.41	0.41													
YLR214W	6827	1471	4614	4310	4601	1461	2827	5128	2491	3026	3548	4090	2368	2019	2930	3601	0.93	0.76	1.00	0.72	0.67	1.08	56.29	75.93	49.70	7.15E-94	0.00E+00	1.60E-94	904755E-316	9.87E-01	6.99E-14	2.32E-98	8.59E-41	3.42E-35	9.56E-03	7.06E-02	2.33E-05	2.59E-03	0.35	0.35													
YFR055W	1636	708	4653	3635	1480	786	3115	4183	1300	1816	2018	2629	1451	1811	2230	3367	0.28	0.31	0.84	0.67	0.58	1.15	31.65	46.16	30.50	5.45E-130	0.00E+00	754273E-322	0.00E+00	4.83E-07	1.20E-36	1.95E-103	1.96E-34	5.49E-33	5.60E-05	8.09E-11	7.13E-163	2.37E-92	0.36	0.34													
YMR290C	2317	1229	4355	2770	1512	1308	3215	4667	2258	2207	2645	2642	1744	1104	2869	1351	0.50	0.36	1.31	0.84	0.67	1.23	24.22	38.26	78.15	4.14E-137	0.00E+00	3.37E-138	4.97E-133	1.15E-17	1.44E-60	2.01E-07	2.87E-09	5.84E-10	3.88E-01	4.51E-76	1.10E-71	0.45	0.42														
YMR305C	3167	2016	5480	3525	2230	2288	4451	5732	2040	2396	2576	2865	2110	3374	2638	4331	0.58	0.44	1.27	0.82	0.79	1.05	34.94	29.49	19.31	3.09E-164	0.00E+00	7.31E-137	3.24E-91	8.32E-21	1.10E-13	9.86E-27	1.11E-11	7.38E-10	1.44E-01	2.35E-05	1.53E-39	3.13E-115	0.45	0.46													
YJL198W	1219	766	1962	1287	1854	1815	3988	5024	1140	1014	1251	1196	2221	3301	3238	4134	0.61	0.41	1.46	0.88	0.75	1.19	25.88	32.15	45.03	4.77E-174	0.00E+00	4.21E-39	5.02E-30	1.54E-26	6.35E-42	3.22E-21	4.77E-02	3.55E-04	4.72E-06	3.70E-03	1.44E-18	2.10E-117	0.40	0.38													
YBR084W	4219	2466	5803	3882	1955	2109	4257	5696	3885	3624	3940	3805	3329	3208	4140	6308	0.69	0.41	1.64	0.97	0.63	1.52	8.35	52.35	84.50	1.63E-190	0.00E+00	1.16E-55	4.36E-70	3.48E-88	5.53E-20	1.98E-223	6.41E-01	6.36E-02	3.80E-75	2.17E-01	1.37E-51	1.50E-68	0.43	0.42													
YJL196C	1848	1691	1415	1048	2361	2676	741	463	862	967	764	834	1337	1623	505	511	1.44	4.18	0.35	1.14	2.91	0.39	37.25	74.72	88.34	8.04E-194	0.00E+00	1.10E-13	4.43E-34	3.74E-146	8.13E-85	2.29E-132	3.29E-02	4.39E-03	1.98E-77	2.18E-06	1.31E-07	2.26E-14	0.37	0.35													
YGR175C	4733	3325	8951	5565	2135	2076	4609	6028	5962	6705	5409	6269	3864	5374	3875	5381	0.56	0.40	1.39	1.08	1.00	1.09	10.82	0.21	24.97	1.67E-202	0.00E+00	1.29E-287	1.15E-124	1.27E-45	9.35E-01	9.70E-01	1.15E-06	4.02E-04	9.98E-05	9.46E-10	2.53E-266	0.00E+00	0.52	0.49													
YOR374W	3551	2119	651	428	1734	2268	382	352	1772	1714	1019	1043	923	2076	669	1602	5.25	5.45	0.98	1.69	1.30	1.28	31.65	15.40	48.02	1.02E-203	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	3.59E-266	7.56E-01	8.90E-10	8.76E-12	5.25E-45	2.78E-36	4.11E-09	6.62E-04	5.14E-152	1.07E-199	0.47	0.47													
YOR067C	2949	3235	752	758	2233	2890	593	554	707	693	725	611	700	557	777	486	4.10	4.47	0.92	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.20	0.32	3.63	8.84E-221	0.00E+00	3.41E-303	0.00E+00	8.91E-02	7.16E-02	4.54E-02	7.41E-01	6.55E-01	9.91E-01	1.38E-01	1.15E-203	4.05E-187	0.53	0.57													
YGL037C	3965	2808	1342	1191	3007	3622	1013	1014	1286	2270	1722	2066	1342	1758	1277	1349	2.67	3.27	0.82	1.07	1.18	0.89	6.43	14.00	56.60	6.15E-225	0.00E+00	8.35E-295	9.14E-147	1.11E-08	2.68E-01	1.06E-12	8.60E-01	4.79E-03	3.91E-03	6.70E-02	3.76E-156	1.52E-173	0.47	0.47													
YOR088W	142	136	98	47	1496	1950	208	274	60	156	109	192	555	1589	445	1385	1.92	7.15	0.27	0.72	1.17	0.61	25.24	8.05	37.53	8.26E-239	0.00E+00	7.87E-03	9.77E-11	8.37E-32	1.18E-03	4.14E-04	6.49E-04	9.85E-02	1.23E-06	1.37E-33	1.29E-14	8.95E-227	0.43	0.44													
YMR006C	1968	1234	5747	4115	1094	1237	3298	4292	2686	2284	3512	4143	1856	2747	3306	6499	0.33	0.21	1.07	0.65	0.47	1.33	39.37	64.05	56.94	8.46E-252	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	4.02E-02	6.97E-90	710597E-321	1.64E-24	1.41E-118	5.70E-27	2.90E-05	1.63E-139	1.19E-49	0.41	0.43													
YDL039C	8	4	508	362	217	98	1670	1719	31	39	191	62	408	913	249	414	0.01	0.09	0.14	0.28	1.99	1.16	30.00	18.36	94.37	5.56E-276	0.00E+00	1.95E-137	1.63E-100	1.11E-13	2.41E-09	2.23E-42	5.35E-28	5.03E-02	1.21E-40	4.74E-02	2.02E-36	0.00E+00	0.38	0.40													
YNL111C	976	610	3956	3428	478	434	2334	2560	2479	2363	2501	2388	1627	1283	1594	1282	0.21	0.19	1.13	0.99	1.01	0.98	0.63	0.69	12.62	3.18E-290	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.09E-02	6.33E-01	1.00E+00	8.34E-01	7.91E-01	6.05E-01	6.71E-01	1.21E-03	2.33E-305	0.00E+00														