## Local adaptation in Brook Trout



**Eric Hallerman** 

# Neutral vs. adaptive genetic variation



- Allozyme, mitochondrial, and microsatellite DNA variation is indicative of non-selective population genetic processes, but not of adaptive variation within and between populations.
- We'd really like to know of adaptive genetic variation!
- What *do* we know of adaptive genetic variation in brook trout?
  - Some local-scale studies of brook trout *have* inferred adaptive variation...

## Background

- All these studies were conducted in Canada, and all investigated the relations among population fragmentation and effective size and putatively adaptive variation.
  - Small, isolated populations might lose genetic variation more rapidly due to genetic drift than large populations, and drift might overcome selection as population size decreases.
- $\rightarrow$  What are the implications for adaptive potential?

## Habitat fragmentation, population size, habitat fragmentation, and adaptive variation

- Fraser et al. (2014) investigated SNP variation at genes encoding different biological functions in 14 fragmented Brook Trout populations of variable sizes in Newfoundland.
- Putatively adaptive differentiation was greater between small and large populations or among small populations than among large populations, *underlining the effect of drift*.
- The results suggest that:
  - fragmentation *does* affect natural selection, and
  - changes in adaptive genetic variation and differentiation of fragmented populations vary with population size.
- → Habitat fragmentation may affect population persistence independently of and perhaps *before* the effects of demographic and genetic stochasticity become apparent.

### Quantitative trait variation

- The Fraser group (Wood et al. 2017) examined additive genetic variation ( $V_A$ ) and quantitative trait differentiation ( $Q_{ST}$ ) for 15 traits among nine populations in Newfoundland populations that varied in census size (N = 179-8416) and effective number of breeders ( $N_b = 18-135$ ).
- Across these traits, population size was only weakly related to quantitative genetic variation.
- This outcome suggests that:
  - Small populations may retain adaptive potential, and
  - Populations of all sizes experience a variety of environmental conditions in nature, and extremely large studies are required before any firm conclusions can be made.



Variation in hatch time, head length, and foraging activity as a function of  $N_{\rm b}$ 

#### Variation of body size, shape, and coloration



- The Fraser group (Zastavniouk et al. 2017) examined relationships between mature adult traits and ecological variables among 14 populations of brook trout in Newfoundland – these are naturally fragmented populations with shared ancestry that exhibit considerable variability in habitat characteristics and population size (49 < N<sub>c</sub> < 10,032).</li>
- Body size, shape, and coloration differed among populations, with a tendency for more variation among *small* populations in trait means and coefficient of variation than among *large* populations.
- Phenotypic differences were more frequently and directly linked to habitat variation or sex ratio than to population size, suggesting that selection *can* overcome genetic drift at small population size.
- Phenotype–environment associations were stronger in females than males, suggesting that natural selection due to abiotic conditions may act more strongly on females.

#### Adaptive and maladaptive genetic diversity in small populations

- The Bernatchez group (Ferchaud et al. 2020) → relative importance of drift and selection on the accumulation of maladaptive and adaptive genetic variants.
- Screened 14,779 SNPs among 1,416 fish representing 50 populations from lacustrine (isolated populations), riverine, and anadromous (connected populations) life histories.



#### Adaptive and maladaptive genetic diversity in small populations

- They observed considerable accumulation of putatively deleterious mutations across populations, suggesting that genetic drift might be the main driver for accumulation of such variants.
- Lacustrine populations showed lower genetic diversity, but did not exhibit more deleterious mutations, suggesting that the negative effect of drift *can* be mitigated by purifying selection.
- They identified particular genomic regions associated with anadromy.



• They noted an over-representation of transposable elements associated with variation in environmental variables, suggesting the importance of transposable elements in adaptation.

### Bigger picture of state of knowledge

- This is a rather *limited* body of studies, with a rather limited scope (geography and traits considered).
- We would benefit from a deeper understanding of genomic regions associated with adaptive traits.
- Investigation of adaptive genetic variation has *not* yet been extended to brook trout populations in the Chesapeake Bay region.
- Further understanding of *adaptive* genetic variation would inform management of regional Brook Trout populations and help us conserve their long-term adaptive potential.



## References

- Ferchaud, A. L., M. Leitwein, M. Laporte, D. Boivin-Delisle, B. Bougas, C. Hernandez, E. Normandeau, I. Thibault, and L. Bernatchez. 2020. Adaptive and maladaptive genetic diversity in small populations: insights from the Brook Charr (*Salvelinus fontinalis*) case study. Molecular Ecology 29:3429-3445.
- Fraser, D. J., P. V. Debes, L. Bernatchez, and J. A. Hutchings. 2014. Population size, habitat fragmentation, and the nature of adaptive variation in a stream fish. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences 281(1790):20140370.
- Wood, J. L., D. Tezel, D. Joyal, and D. J. Fraser. 2015. Population size is weakly related to quantitative genetic variation and trait differentiation in a stream fish. Evolution 69(9):2303-2318.
- Zastavniouk, C., L. K. Weir, and D. J. Fraser. 2017. The evolutionary consequences of habitat fragmentation: Body morphology and coloration differentiation among Brook Trout populations of varying size. Ecology and Evolution 7(17):6850-6862.

