

# Computational Modelling of Plasticity-Led Evolution

Eden Tian Hwa Ng and Akira R. Kinjo  
Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science,  
Universiti Brunei Darussalam

August 2, 2022

## Abstract

Plasticity-led evolution is a form of evolution where a change in the environment induces novel traits via phenotypic plasticity, after which the novel traits are genetically accommodated over generations under the novel environment. This mode of evolution is deemed to resolve the problem of gradualism (i.e., evolution by slow accumulation of mutations which induce phenotypic variation) in face of a large environmental change implied by the Modern Evolutionary Synthesis. While experimental works are essential for validating that plasticity-led evolution indeed happened, we need computational models to gain insight into its underlying mechanisms and make qualitative predictions. Such computational models should include the developmental process and gene-environment interactions in addition to genetics and natural selection. We point out that gene regulatory network models can incorporate all the above notions. In this review, we highlight results from computational modelling of gene regulatory networks that consolidate the criteria of plasticity-led evolution. Since gene regulatory networks are mathematically equivalent to artificial recurrent neural networks, we also discuss their analogies and discrepancies, which may help understand the mechanisms underlying plasticity-led evolution.

**Keywords:** evo-devo, gene regulatory networks, genetic accommodation, phenotypic plasticity, adaptive plastic response, artificial recurrent neural networks

# 1 Introduction

Integrating natural selection and genetics, the Modern Evolutionary Synthesis has been the cornerstone of evolutionary models since its inception in the early 20th century (Maynard Smith, 1998; Nowak, 2006; Broom and Rychtár, 2013). However, its gene-centric nature has been criticized : under the Modern Evolutionary Synthesis, all possible variation in the expressed phenotypes of individuals of a species can only be explained in terms of genetic mutations (Laland et al, 2014). Hence, the only means for an individual to survive a large environmental change is to possess mutations that produce a phenotype that is already adapted to the novel environment. Given that mutations are random and selection favors phenotypes that are adapted to the current environment, the pre-existence of adaptive phenotypes to future novel environments seems extremely unlikely.

One possible resolution for the above paradox is to consider phenotypic changes in response to environmental changes without mutations (West-Eberhard, 2003). This allows possibility for individuals to express different phenotypes in different environments, potentially increasing fitness under a novel environment. Moreover, while possession of an adaptive mutation only affects few individuals in the population, an environmental change affects the entire population. This environment-sensitive variation in traits is called phenotypic plasticity and is ubiquitous in nature (West-Eberhard, 2003; Gilbert and Epel, 2009). Examples of phenotypic plasticity include, but are not limited to, temperature dependent sex determination in reptiles (Whiteley et al, 2021), behavioral and physical dimorphism in dung beetles (Emlen, 1997) and caste polyphenism in social insect populations (Weiner and Toth, 2012). Phenotypic plasticity arises from the developmental process through which genetic and environmental information are integrated (Gilbert and Epel, 2009; Merilä et al, 2004; Nishikawa and Kinjo, 2018; Schulz, 2010; Schneider et al, 2014; West-Eberhard, 2003). Hence, plastic traits are partially acquired traits. Since plastic traits are not heritable, the Modern Evolutionary Synthesis has largely neglected the developmental process that produces them (Müller, 2007; Laland et al, 2014). However, there is accumulating evidence that demonstrates the role of phenotypic plasticity in evolution (West-Eberhard, 2003; Ehrenreich and Pfennig, 2016; Pfennig, 2021).

A classical example is Waddington’s observation of genetic assim-

ilation in fruit flies (Waddington, 1953). The *crossveinless* wing pattern which was initially only expressed under heat shock becomes expressed regardless of exposure to heat shock or not after some 20 generations of selective breeding, a phenomenon which Waddington called genetic assimilation. Waddington’s experiment shows that adaptive evolution can start through environmental induction of novel traits and that formerly acquired traits can become heritable. Genetic assimilation was later generalized as genetic accommodation which refers to any adaptive change in the environmental regulation of a phenotype (West-Eberhard, 2003; Ehrenreich and Pfennig, 2016).

Since phenotypic plasticity produces a change in phenotype in response to a change in environment before mutations change the regulatory interactions in the genome, this describes a form of evolution called *plasticity-led evolution*. Plasticity-led evolution as defined by Levis and Pfennig (2016) has four core criteria; the first two describe the response of the population when initially exposed to a novel environment (phenotypic accommodation) and the latter two describe the evolution of expressed phenotypes of the population as the population adapts to the novel environment (genetic accommodation). Levis and Pfennig (2016) listed the following criteria for plasticity-led evolution:

1. Novel adaptive traits are initially conditionally expressed,
2. Cryptic genetic variation will be uncovered when populations are exposed to the novel environment,
3. Novel adaptive traits undergo a change in environmental regulation,
4. Novel adaptive traits undergo adaptive refinement.

In this review, we will examine computational models in the light of these criteria.

## 2 Computational modelling of evolution

In essence, traditional computational models based on the Modern Evolutionary Synthesis incorporate the following notions (Laland et al, 2014):

1. Mutations produce variations in phenotypes.

2. Individuals expressing adaptive phenotypes are naturally selected.
3. Genotypes of selected individuals are passed on to their offsprings.

More recently, there have been efforts to incorporate the effects of phenotypic plasticity into traditional models (Chevin and Lande, 2010; Hangartner et al, 2022; Lande, 2009; Nishikawa and Kinjo, 2014; Rago et al, 2019). However, these neglect the developmental process and therefore fail to describe the cause and evolution of phenotypic plasticity.

A minimal model for investigating the evolution of developmental systems is the Wagner model (Wagner, 1996). The ingenuity of the Wagner model is to interpret the developmental process of an individual as the sequence of gene expression patterns determined by the following recursive equation:

$$g_i(s+1) = \sigma \left( \sum_{j=1}^n G_{ij} g_j(s) \right) \quad (1)$$

where  $g_i(s)$  is the gene expression level of the  $i$ -th gene at the  $s$ -th stage of development,  $G_{ij}$  represents the regulatory effect of the  $j$ -th gene expression on the  $i$ -th gene expression and  $\sigma$  is the step activation function. The matrix  $G$  defines the gene regulatory network (GRN) of an individual and is interpreted as the genome. The steady state of the recursive equation is regarded as the adult phenotype which is subject to selection. Selected individuals are then paired for reproduction. Reproduction is modelled by swapping rows of the  $G$  matrices of paired individuals. Genetic mutations are then introduced by randomly changing elements of the  $G$  matrices. In some texts, environmental cues are modelled as a perturbation to the initial gene expression pattern (Espinosa-Soto et al, 2011b; Watson et al, 2014), while others model environmental cues as a developmental threshold (Draghi and Whitlock, 2012; Nagata and Kikuchi, 2020; Kaneko and Kikuchi, 2022). In particular, Espinosa-Soto et al (2011b) ingeniously modelled the environment as an inducer-selector pair of “initial condition”-“optimal gene expression” pair where each vector in the pair is allowed to vary independently from one another.

The Wagner model and its variants have been employed to investigate evolution of robustness (Wagner, 1996; Espinosa-Soto et al, 2011b; Kaneko and Kikuchi, 2022), evolutionary capacitance (Bergman and Siegal, 2003), genetic assimilation (Masel, 2004), relationship between robustness and non-genetic perturbations (Espinosa-Soto et al, 2011b), evo-

lution of novel phenotypes (Espinosa-Soto et al, 2011a; Kaneko and Kikuchi, 2022), evolution of modularity (Espinosa-Soto and Wagner, 2010), selection for non-stationarity (Espinosa-Soto, 2016), and emergence of bistability (Nagata and Kikuchi, 2020). As can be seen in these works, the Wagner model seamlessly incorporates not only natural selection and genetics but also the developmental process. By observing differences in adult phenotypes in response to different environmental cues, we see that the Wagner model can exhibit phenotypic plasticity through the developmental process. Due to these advantages over traditional evolutionary models, we believe that the Wagner model is a strong candidate for studying plasticity-led evolution. We will now discuss how well the Wagner model and its variants can describe plasticity-led evolution.

### **3 Plausibility of Plasticity-led Evolution**

Here, we compare some of the results from the Wagner model and its variants with each criterion given by Levis and Pfennig (2016). By doing so, we aim to demonstrate the extent to which the Wagner model can explain plasticity-led evolution. We also point out necessary innovations for future computational models of plasticity-led evolution.

#### **3.1 Conditional expression of novel adaptive traits**

Under plasticity-led evolution, when a population is first brought into a novel environment, adaptive traits should be expressed via plastic response (West-Eberhard, 2003; Levis and Pfennig, 2016, 2021). In other words, a change in environment induces a change in phenotype, which is more adaptive in the new environment. This prompts us to distinguish the two roles of the environment: “inducer” and “selector”. The environment as an “inducer” gives rise to a response in phenotype. The environment as a “selector” discriminates between well adapted and poorly adapted phenotypes (West-Eberhard, 1989; Espinosa-Soto et al, 2011b). While individuals should exhibit a plastic response to large environmental changes, they should also have robustness against small environmental noise.

A computational model for studying adaptive plastic response should incorporate all the above features: environment as inducer and selector, plastic response and robustness. While there are many works investigating evolution of GRNs, none have explicitly evaluated models in light of adaptive plastic response. Hence, existing works study some of the features of plastic response, but none include all of them (Espinosa-Soto et al, 2011b; Espinosa-Soto, 2016; Nagata and Kikuchi, 2020; Kaneko and Kikuchi, 2022).

One notable exception is Watson et al (2014) who investigated the evolution of “developmental memory” using a variant of the Wagner model. They treated the environment-as-inducer as the initial condition and the environment-as-selector as the target phenotype. Their model was able to express multiple (trained) phenotypes given distinct inputs, which can be interpreted as phenotypic plasticity. The expressed phenotypes were shown to be robust to noise in the input.

We remark that the approach taken by Watson et al (2014) which stresses on the correlation between the input and output of the GRN gives an insight to studying *adaptive* plastic response. Here, a perturbation to the input induces an informed change to the output, an aspect missing in most other works. By further enforcing correlation between the environment-as-selector and the environment-as-inducer, this will allow one to determine whether such plastic response is adaptive or not.

### 3.2 Uncovering of cryptic genetic variation

In the context of plasticity-led evolution, mutations are said to be cryptic if their regulatory effects are not visible in an adapted environment but are seen under a novel environment. Such cryptic mutations accumulate under an adapted environment because they do not impact the expressed phenotype. On the other hand, under a novel environment, these formerly invisible mutations are expressed, resulting in increased variation in expressed phenotypes. This ability to harbor cryptic mutations for release under a large environmental change is called evolutionary capacitance and has been hypothesized to play a critical role for facilitating evolution (Rutherford and Lindquist, 1998; Masel, 2005, 2013; Ehrenreich and Pfennig, 2016).

A computational model for studying evolutionary capacitance should exhibit the mutational robustness of phenotypes under an adapted environment, increase in variation of the expressed phenotype in the

novel environments. The model should also incorporate the role of the environment as an inducer. While evolution of mutational robustness of GRNs is very well documented (Wagner, 1996; Nagata and Kikuchi, 2020; Kaneko and Kikuchi, 2022), none have explicitly discussed its role in facilitating adaptation to sudden large environmental changes.

A notable exception is Espinosa-Soto et al (2011b) who investigated the role of mutational robustness in facilitating variability in response to environmental perturbations. They represented environmental cues as initial conditions. Hence, a large change in initial conditions corresponds to a large environmental change. They observed that populations that exhibit high mutational robustness harbour a larger variation of genotypes and express a wider variation in phenotypes after a large environmental perturbation. This suggests that the Wagner model is sufficient for describing uncovering of cryptic genetic variations in response to large environmental changes.

### 3.3 Change in regulation or form

The next criterion for validating plasticity-led evolution is evidence of a genetic change in the regulation or form of the phenotype. Levis and Pfennig (2016) proposed measuring changes to the reaction norm to experimentally validate this criterion. However, this approach is inappropriate for highly nonlinear developmental systems such as the Wagner model. In computational models, we can instead measure the degree of plasticity directly as the sensitivity of the phenotype with respect to a change in the environmental cue.

A computational model examining the change in plasticity should express a change in mutational and environmental sensitivity (or robustness) over evolution. The acquisition of mutational robustness as a by-product of increased fitness is well documented (Wagner, 1996; Espinosa-Soto et al, 2011b; Espinosa-Soto, 2016; Kaneko and Kikuchi, 2022). However, few works have explicitly investigated the link between mutational and environmental robustness.

An exception is Espinosa-Soto et al (2011a), who noted that mutations and small environmental perturbations produce a similar range of phenotypes, suggesting that environmental robustness is correlated to mutational robustness. By investigating the genotype space in terms of expressed phenotypes, they also validated that this change in robustness is reflected in mutations in the genome. This is in fact genetic assimilation of novel adaptive traits introduced by Waddington

(1953): reduced response to (small) environmental changes as a result of adaptation.

However, genetic assimilation of a single phenotype is not necessarily inevitable in the Wagner model. In fact, Nagata and Kikuchi (2020) and Kaneko and Kikuchi (2022) observed the emergence of bistability, which we interpret as a form of increased phenotypic plasticity, in GRNs. Therefore, the Wagner model is sufficient for describing the increase or decrease to the level of phenotypic plasticity in different contexts.

### 3.4 Evidence of adaptive refinement

Finally, populations exposed to selection under a novel environment should exhibit refinement in adaptive traits. This condition follows from two assumptions inspired by West-Eberhard (2003)(Levis and Pfennig, 2016, 2019): populations exposed to selection under the novel environment should produce the novel trait more frequently than populations that are not exposed to said novel environment and traits in a population in which it is expressed (and exposed to selection) more frequently should evolve greater and more rapid refinement. As a corollary, individuals of such populations should express higher levels of fitness to the novel environment than lineages that were never exposed to selection under the novel environment (Levis and Pfennig, 2016, 2019).

Experimental validation of this criterion requires identification of lineages exhibiting plasticity between environments as a proxy for the ancestral population state (Levis and Pfennig, 2019). Computationally, this is not required because one can directly track evolving populations. This is one of the key advantages of computational modelling which can complement physical experiments. However, the Wagner model, being an evolutionary algorithm itself, continuously tries to optimize the phenotype through exploration of mutations, and hence trivially exhibits adaptive refinement.

Nevertheless, one may attempt to recreate a computational analogy of validation in sensu Levis and Pfennig (2019) by comparing two populations trained to fit to an ancestral environment and then bringing one of the populations to fit to a novel environment while the other continues to train in the ancestral environment. While there are no explicit computational studies that perform such an experiment, we may synthesize some predictions by reviewing results from a collection of computational studies. Espinosa-Soto et al (2011b) noted that the re-



sponse upon such a large environmental change on the ancestral-proxy lineage, which is already adapted to the ancestral environment, does not change after further selection under the ancestral environment. On the other hand, traits become more adaptive, robust (Wagner, 1996) and frequently expressed (Espinosa-Soto et al, 2011a) after selection in the novel environment. This validates that the Wagner model can describe adaptive refinement under the novel environment.

## 4 Plasticity-led evolution and learning theory

We remark that the Wagner model is mathematically equivalent to a recurrent neural network (RNN) (Watson and Szathmary, 2016). Numerous authors have pointed out analogies between evolution and learning in general (Watson et al, 2014; Kouvaris et al, 2017; Szilagyı et al, 2020), which shed new light on plasticity-led evolution in particular. RNNs process input data to give predictions as outputs. In development, GRNs process environmental cues to express phenotypes as outputs. However, the learning process itself differs between RNNs and GRNs. On the one hand, RNNs are (usually) trained by changing their network parameters in order to minimize the prediction error, which bears similarity to Lamarckian evolution. On the other hand, GRNs are selected based on their phenotypes, then mutations are randomly introduced to their network parameters. (Note the absence of direct causality between selection and mutation, a requirement for Darwinian evolution.) Let us further examine these analogies in the context of plasticity-led evolution.

Generalization is defined as the capability of a RNN to produce good predictions for inputs not in the training set (Bishop, 2006). By treating the output of a RNN outside the training set to be analogous to plastic response of an individual in a novel environment, we can regard adaptive plastic response as a form of generalization. In their in-depth comparison between evolution and learning, Kouvaris et al (2017) analogized generalization to facilitated variation (Gerhart and Kirschner, 2007) which they considered a prerequisite for evolvability. This implies a relationship between adaptive plastic response and facilitated variation, which may be an interesting topic for future research.

We remark that there is a lack of analogy for cryptic genetic variation in machine learning. This is because “neutral” weights that do

not contribute to increased performance tend to be eliminated to simplify the models and to increase prediction robustness. In contrast, in plasticity-led evolution, robustness should break down when a population is exposed to a large environmental change. This breakdown uncovers cryptic genetic mutations, which in turn increases phenotypic variation and hence evolvability. We note that a kind of phase transition of robustness should exist in response to environmental changes, which may be an interesting topic for further research.

We also highlight an analogy between retraining of RNNs and genetic accommodation of novel phenotypes. Retraining RNNs changes the network architecture and fine-tunes existing weights to increase performance on new data (Bishop, 2006). Analogously, genetic accommodation results in changes to regulatory mechanisms of the novel phenotype as well as adaptive refinement of traits through accumulation of adaptive mutations. In machine learning, RNNs are retrained when their outputs no longer accurately reflect new data (Bishop, 2006). In plasticity-led evolution, genetic accommodation occurs when the constitutive phenotype does not fit the novel environment.

## 5 Conclusion

We highlighted the role of phenotypic plasticity in facilitating adaptation and survival in the face of a large environmental change. This led to the discussion on how phenotypic plasticity can change over evolution. Taken together, this motivates an alternative form of evolution called plasticity-led evolution. We reviewed the results on the GRN model introduced by Wagner (1996) and its variants. We propose that the Wagner model forms a minimal model for computationally investigating plasticity-led evolution. We then looked into the extent to which notions arising from machine learning theory can describe plasticity-led evolution. We noted several analogies between learning theory and plasticity-led evolution as well as discrepancies arising from motive and implementation of machine learning. We also point out that deep neural networks are analogous to the hierarchical structure of biological networks, and that studying deep neural networks can provide further insights into how hierarchical network structures can enhance evolvability.

**Acknowledgments** The authors thank David Marshall and Daphne Teck Ching Lai for helpful comments, and Haziq Jamil for stimulating discussion and reading the manuscript. A. R. K. used to work in Prof. Haruki Nakamura’s laboratory at Institute for Protein Research, Osaka University.

## References

- Bergman A, Siegal ML (2003) Evolutionary capacitance as a general feature of complex gene networks. *Nature* 424(6948):549–552. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature01765>
- Bishop CM (2006) Pattern recognition and machine learning. Springer, New York
- Broom M, Rychtár J (2013) Game-theoretical models in biology. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL
- Chevin LM, Lande R (2010) When do adaptive plasticity and genetic evolution prevent extinction of a density-regulated population? *Evolution* 64(4):1143–1150. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2009.00875.x>
- Draghi JA, Whitlock MC (2012) Phenotypic plasticity facilitates mutational variance, genetic variance, and evolvability along the major axis of environmental variation. *Evolution* 66(9):2891–2902. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2012.01649.x>
- Ehrenreich IM, Pfennig DW (2016) Genetic assimilation: a review of its potential proximate causes and evolutionary consequences. *Ann Bot* 117(5):769–779. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcv130>
- Emlen DJ (1997) Alternative reproductive tactics and male-dimorphism in the horned beetle *Onthophagus acuminatus* (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae). *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 41(5):335–341. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002650050393>
- Espinosa-Soto C (2016) Selection for distinct gene expression properties favours the evolution of mutational robustness in gene regulatory networks. *J Evol Biol* 29(11):2321–2333. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.12959>

- Espinosa-Soto C, Wagner A (2010) Specialization can drive the evolution of modularity. *PLoS Comput Biol* 6(3):e1000719. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000719>
- Espinosa-Soto C, Martin OC, Wagner A (2011a) Phenotypic plasticity can facilitate adaptive evolution in gene regulatory circuits. *BMC Evol Biol* 11(1):1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2148-11-5>
- Espinosa-Soto C, Martin OC, Wagner A (2011b) Phenotypic robustness can increase phenotypic variability after nongenetic perturbations in gene regulatory circuits. *J Evol Biol* 24(6):1284–1297. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2011.02261.x>
- Gerhart J, Kirschner M (2007) The theory of facilitated variation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 104(suppl 1):8582–8589. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0701035104>
- Gilbert SF, Epel D (2009) *Ecological Developmental Biology: Integrating Epigenetics, Medicine, And Evolution*. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, MA
- Hangartner S, Sgrò CM, Connallon T, et al (2022) Sexual dimorphism in phenotypic plasticity and persistence under environmental change: An extension of theory and meta-analysis of current data. *Ecol Lett* <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.14005>
- Kaneko T, Kikuchi M (2022) Evolution enhances mutational robustness and suppresses the emergence of a new phenotype: A new computational approach for studying evolution. *PLoS Comput Biol* 18(1):e1009796. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1009796>
- Kouvaris K, Clune J, Kounios L, et al (2017) How evolution learns to generalise: Using the principles of learning theory to understand the evolution of developmental organisation. *PLoS Comput Biol* 13(4):e1005358. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005358>
- Laland K, Uller T, Feldman M, et al (2014) Does evolutionary theory need a rethink? *Nature* 514(7521):161–164. <https://doi.org/10.1038/514161a>

- Lande R (2009) Adaptation to an extraordinary environment by evolution of phenotypic plasticity and genetic assimilation. *J Evol Biol* 22(7):1435–1446. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2009.01754.x>
- Levis NA, Pfennig DW (2016) Evaluating ‘plasticity-first’ evolution in nature: key criteria and empirical approaches. *Trends Ecol Evol* 31(7):563–574. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2016.03.012>
- Levis NA, Pfennig DW (2019) Plasticity-led evolution: evaluating the key prediction of frequency-dependent adaptation. *Proc R Soc B* 286(1897):20182,754. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.2754>
- Levis NA, Pfennig DW (2021) Innovation and diversification via plasticity-led evolution. In: Pfennig DW (ed) *Phenotypic Plasticity & Evolution*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, p 211–240, <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429343001-9>
- Masel J (2004) Genetic assimilation can occur in the absence of selection for the assimilating phenotype, suggesting a role for the canalization heuristic. *J Evol Biol* 17(5):1106–1110. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2004.00739.x>
- Masel J (2005) Evolutionary capacitance may be favored by natural selection. *Genet* 170(3):1359–1371
- Masel J (2013) Q&A: evolutionary capacitance. *BMC Biol* 11(1):1–4
- Maynard Smith J (1998) *Evolutionary genetics*. Oxford University Press, New York
- Merilä J, Laurila A, Lindgren B (2004) Variation in the degree and costs of adaptive phenotypic plasticity among rana temporaria populations. *J Evol Biol* 17(5):1132–1140
- Müller GB (2007) Evo–devo: extending the evolutionary synthesis. *Nat Rev Genet* 8(12):943–949
- Nagata S, Kikuchi M (2020) Emergence of cooperative bistability and robustness of gene regulatory networks. *PLoS Comput Biol* 16(6):e1007,969

- Nishikawa K, Kinjo AR (2014) Cooperation between phenotypic plasticity and genetic mutations can account for the cumulative selection in evolution. *Biophysics* 10:99–108. <https://doi.org/10.2142/biophysics.10.99>
- Nishikawa K, Kinjo AR (2018) Mechanism of evolution by genetic assimilation. *Biophys Rev* 10(2):667–676. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12551-018-0403-x>
- Nowak MA (2006) *Evolutionary dynamics: exploring the equations of life*. Harvard university press, Cambridge, MA
- Pfennig DW (2021) *Phenotypic plasticity & evolution: causes, consequences, controversies*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL
- Rago A, Kouvaris K, Uller T, et al (2019) How adaptive plasticity evolves when selected against. *PLoS Comput Biol* 15(3):e1006260. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006260>
- Rutherford SL, Lindquist S (1998) Hsp90 as a capacitor for morphological evolution. *Nature* 396(6709):336–342. <https://doi.org/10.1038/24550>
- Schneider RF, Li Y, Meyer A, et al (2014) Regulatory gene networks that shape the development of adaptive phenotypic plasticity in a cichlid fish. *Mol Ecol* 23(18):4511–4526. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12851>
- Schulz LC (2010) The dutch hunger winter and the developmental origins of health and disease. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 107(39):16,757–16,758. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1012911107>
- Szilágyi A, Szabó P, Santos M, et al (2020) Phenotypes to remember: Evolutionary developmental memory capacity and robustness. *PLoS Comput Biol* 16(11):e1008425. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008425>
- Waddington CH (1953) Genetic assimilation of an acquired character. *Evolution* 7:118–126. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2405747>
- Wagner A (1996) Does evolutionary plasticity evolve? *Evolution* 50(3):1008–1023

- Watson RA, Szathmary E (2016) How can evolution learn? *Trends Ecol Evol* 31(2):147–157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.11.009>
- Watson RA, Wagner GP, Pavlicev M, et al (2014) The evolution of phenotypic correlations and “developmental memory”. *Evolution* 68(4):1124–1138. <https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.12337>
- Weiner SA, Toth AL (2012) Epigenetics in social insects: a new direction for understanding the evolution of castes. *Genet Res Int* 2012:609,810. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/609810>
- West-Eberhard MJ (1989) Phenotypic plasticity and the origins of diversity. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* 20(1):249–278. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.20.110189.001341>
- West-Eberhard MJ (2003) *Developmental plasticity and evolution*. Oxford University Press, New York
- Whiteley SL, Holleley CE, Wagner S, et al (2021) Two transcriptionally distinct pathways drive female development in a reptile with both genetic and temperature dependent sex determination. *PLoS Genet* 17(4):e1009465. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1009465>