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In Brief

Current theory proposes that Y chromosome degeneration occurs from selective interference. Lenormand et al. propose a different theory based on the instability of diploid expression between non-recombining chromosomes. This theory can combine with selective interference and can explain fast Y degeneration and simultaneous dosage compensation.
In many species, the Y (or W) sex chromosome is degenerate. Current theory proposes that this degeneration follows the arrest of recombination and results from the accumulation of deleterious mutations due to selective interference—the inefficacy of natural selection on non-recombining genomic regions. This theory requires very few assumptions, but it does not robustly predict fast erosion of the Y (or W) in large populations or the stepwise degeneration of several small non-recombining strata. We propose a new mechanism for Y/W erosion that works over faster timescales, in large populations, and for small non-recombining regions (down to a single sex-linked gene). The mechanism is based on the instability and divergence of cis-regulatory sequences in non-recombining genome regions, which become selectively haploidized to mask deleterious mutations on coding sequences. This haploidization is asymmetric, because cis-regulators on the X cannot be silenced (otherwise there would be no expression in females). This process causes rapid Y/W degeneration and simultaneous evolution of dosage compensation, provided that autosomal trans-regulatory sequences with sex-limited effects are available to compensate for cis-regulatory divergence. Although this “degeneration by regulatory evolution” does not require selective interference, both processes may act in concert to further accelerate Y degeneration.
closely linked to their target gene and influence expression on both homologs, whereas cis-regulators, such as enhancers, control the expression of the closely linked gene and influence only the copy carried on the same chromosome as themselves [16]. We assume that G and C are present on both sex chromosomes and that they recombine (in females only) at a rate $R_y$. We include trans-regulators in order to examine whether, and over what time-scale, dosage compensation will evolve when expression of the Y-linked allele decreases. With these trans-regulators, overall expression can be maintained, i.e., dosage compensated, even if cis-regulators change and diverge between the X and Y. Dosage compensation cannot evolve if the trans-regulators act in the same way in both males and females or equally on the X and Y. Hence, we do not consider all potential trans-regulators, only those that could influence dosage compensation. Specifically, we focus on the simplest symmetrical case with one trans-regulator expressed in males $T_m$, and one in females $T_f$. Both cases have been described empirically (C. elegans dosage compensation works by halving X expression in females, whereas in Drosophila, it works by doubling X expression in males [17]). For simplicity, we assume that these $T$ loci are autosomal and that they recombine freely with each other and with the G and C loci.

This initial model is later extended to $n_L$ CGT$_m$T$_f$ quadruplets of genes (where $n_L = 1, 50,$ and 500). In these models, we assume that the C and G loci are uniformly spaced on the sex chromosomes, with two adjacent genes G recombining at a rate $R_y$ in females, and where each C locus is assumed to be closer to the G gene it regulates than to the next G gene (ten times closer in the simulations); again, recombination is assumed not to occur in males, representing a non-recombining region including the sex-determining locus, while all T factors are again assumed to recombine freely with the sex-determining region. In this model, each CG pair is influenced by its own $T_mT_f$ pair, which represents the lowest degree of pleiotropy of these trans-acting factors, but involves a very high number of trans-regulators. We also considered a model where only one $T_mT_f$ pair controls all the G and C loci, representing the other extreme case where trans-regulators are maximally pleiotropic and influence many (here all $n_L$) genes.

Deleterious mutations occur within genes G at a rate $U_G$ per gene. Their fitness effect $s$ is drawn from an exponential distribution with mean $s_{\text{mean}}$. The effects of multiple mutations in the same gene are assumed to be additive, but with a maximum effect per gene, $s_{\text{max}}$ (which may be interpreted as the fitness effect of a full gene knockout). Their dominance depends on the weight of their associated cis-regulator (see STAR Methods). The effects of alleles at the cis- (G) and trans-regulators ($T_m, T_f$) are modeled as quantitative traits denoted by $c, t_m, t_f$, respectively, and control the level of expression Q of the gene, which is under stabilizing selection with intensity $I$ (STAR Methods).

The different events of the life cycle occur in the following order: diploid selection, meiosis with recombination, mutation, and syngamy. Simulations are initialized with no polymorphism present, and the optimal gene expression level (no deleterious allele, all C and T fixed to 1). After a burn-in phase in which the chromosome evolves with recombination in both sexes, we stop XY recombination in males to create a sex-linked region and evolve the frequencies and effects of deleterious mutations on the X and Y, as well as the evolution of the regulatory genes. These outputs are averaged over different numbers of replicates depending on the variance in the process under different parameter values (STAR Methods; Table S1). At regular intervals, we compute $P_{\text{halfsilent}}$, the probability (across replicates) that Y allele-specific expression $\phi_Y$, decreased by two fold from the initial value of 0.5 to $\phi_Y < 0.25$. A complementary approach to quantify partial silencing is to measure the dominance coefficient of deleterious alleles on the Y, measured by $h_Y = \phi_Y h / h_{\text{wild-type}}$ (see STAR Methods). We also compute $P_{\text{halfdead}}$, the probability that $\phi_Y$ becomes close to zero (below 0.01), so that alleles on the Y become nearly entirely recessive. The quantity $P_{\text{halfdead}}$ then refers to the probability that, by a given number of generations after the Y-linked region stopped recombining, deleterious mutations on the Y gene copy have reduced fitness by an amount $s_{\text{max}}/2$, and $P_{\text{dead}}$ that they reduced fitness by an amount $s_{\text{max}}$, indicating that the gene has entirely degenerated on the Y.
generates: it becomes progressively recessive, as shown in Figure S1). After recombination arrest, the gene carried by the Y degenerates: it becomes unstable (and loss-of-function effect $s_{\text{max}} = 0.3$, dashed gray line). The dominance coefficient of deleterious mutations (when both alleles are equally expressed) is $h = 0.25$, and the intensity of stabilizing selection on dosage $l = 0.1$. The figure also shows the dominance of deleterious mutations carried on the Y ($h_Y$, blue curve) and the average fitness effect of alleles on the Y ($s_Y$, purple curve). Some individual trajectories are indicated for $h_Y$ and $s_Y$ (same color code, thin lines) to show that degeneration occurs abruptly in each replicate.

(B) Time variation of regulatory traits corresponding to the case illustrated in (A), x axis: time in number of generations; y axis: regulator trait values. Pink: X cis-regulator strength; blue: Y cis-regulator strength (plain: female limited; dashed: male limited). Optimal dosage is 2 (dashed gray line). Total expression in males and females is indicated by the dotted curves (male value in blue, female in red). Regulatory trait values before recombination arrest are not stable due to runaway evolution [14] but are rescaled at 1 at generation 250,000 for fair comparisons across parameter values. They are represented at this rescaled value on the figure to avoid overloading the figure (see STAR Methods and Figures S1–S3 for further details).

(C) Values of $s_Y$, $h_Y$ and $P_{\text{max}}$ at generation $3 \times 10^8$, for simulations like in (A) except for some parameter values. The star indicates weaker stabilizing selection ($l = 0.01$) compared to $l = 0.1$ in (A), NOG ($U_G = 0$); REC (no arrest of recombination); NOCT ($U_C = U_T = 0$); NOT ($U_T = 0$); REG (with mutations on gene and regulators, as in A); FREE ($R_C = 0.5$); SYM (symmetrized stabilizing selection function, see STAR Methods).

(D) Accumulation of deleterious mutations on the Y for different population sizes ($10^3$, $10^4$ like in A, $10^5$), x axis: number of generations in log-scale, y axis: $s_Y$. Plain lines: with evolving regulators. Dotted lines: without regulator evolution (NOCT simulations, $U_C = U_T = 0$). Table S1 summarizes the different simulations, parameter values, and number of replicates.

Figure 2 illustrates the process with $n_c = 1$ (one gene, one cis-regulator, one male limited and one female limited trans-regulator). The system does not generate any male-female or X-Y asymmetry before recombination arrest (STAR Methods; Figure S1). After recombination arrest, the gene carried by the Y degenerates: it becomes progressively recessive, as $h_Y$ changes from $h = 0.25$ to zero, and accumulates deleterious mutations (the overall fitness effect of mutations present on the Y copy increases up to $s_{\text{max}}$), despite there being very limited selective interference (at most only occurring between the gene and its cis-regulator). Silencing occurs first, and the accumulation of deleterious mutations follows later in the process (the curve representing $P_{\text{halfsilent}}$ is ahead of the one showing the accumulation of deleterious mutation on the Y, as measured by $P_{\text{halfdead}}$). Degeneration also occurs with full dosage compensation, and overall expression never departs from the optimum in either sex (Figure 2B). Compensation typically involves, at least initially, a mixture of upregulation of X gene copies in males and downregulation in females (STAR Methods; Figure S3).

What is the underlying cause of this asymmetrical degeneration? Once X and Y stop recombining, diploid expression becomes unstable. cis-regulators on the X and Y can diverge, eventually leading to the haploidization of expression in males. This is not prevented by stabilizing selection on expression levels as long as trans-regulators can coevolve to maintain near optimal total expression in both sexes. When the strength of cis-regulators on the Y starts decreasing, the process is accelerated by a “haploidization” positive feedback loop. Indeed, weak Y cis-regulators become associated with coding sequences carrying more deleterious mutations, as they cause a reduction in dominance. They are then selected to weaken further in order to mask those deleterious mutations, which leads to the accumulation of even more deleterious mutations, and so forth. By contrast, the other “haploidized” situation (in which the X is silenced in males) is reversible, as X chromosomes with weak cis-regulators and a higher load of deleterious mutations cannot fix, as they become homozygous and selected against in females when too frequent (unlike partially silenced Y genes, which can spread as they stay heterozygous in males). Therefore, the regulatory system has only one stable equilibrium, in which the Y is silenced and degenerates.

Selective interference plays no role in this process, explaining why degeneration occurs even for a single Y-linked gene. However, the process is stochastic, as it is initiated by a random departure from diploid expression with a sufficiently weak Y cis-regulator to trigger the “haploidization” feedback loop. In individual simulation replicates, degeneration is indeed very abrupt, but occurs at varying time points (Figure 2A). Because...
y-degenerations in non-recombining regions with 50 loci. Coding genes are positioned at regular intervals on the X/Y chromosome, each at a recombination rate $R_0 = 5 \times 10^{-4}$ (map length of the non-recombining region is therefore 2.5 or 25 cM, respectively). Recombination occurs in both sexes during the burn-in period (ending at 2.5 $\times$ 10^5 generations, vertical dotted line) and in females thereafter. x axis: number of generations in log-scale; y axis: degeneration of the Y, as measured by $P_{\text{dead}}$, in log-scale. Dark red: 50 genes, with 50 cis-regulators, 50 male-limited trans-acting factors, and 50 female-limited trans-acting factors. Dark red, dashed: 50 genes, with 50 cis-regulators, no mutation in trans-regulators (NOT simulations, $U_r = 0$). Gray, dashed: 50 genes, with 50 cis-regulators, no trans-regulators (NOT simulations, $U_r = 0$), but dominance of the effect of mutations on genes maintained at $H = 0.25$. Gray: 50 genes without regulatory evolution (NOCT simulations, $U_r = U_t = 0$). Other parameters are as in Figure 2A. Table S1 summarizes the different simulations, parameter values, and number of replicates. See also Figure S4.

As expected, DRE and DSI combine when more than a single Y-linked gene is considered. The effect is strong: Figure 3 shows that a 50-fold or 500-fold increase in the number of loci results in degeneration being 5-fold and 10-fold faster, respectively: a larger non-recombining Y-linked region degenerates faster than a small one. Without mutation in regulators (i.e., with only DSI), degeneration occurs but is 23–36-fold slower with 50 loci (depending on the control used for the comparison; STAR Methods; Figure 4). With 500 loci, however, the comparison with and without regulators is problematic, as very quickly, a modest accumulation of deleterious mutations on the many Y-linked genes causes an important reduction in male average fitness so that male fitness reaches unrealistically low values (of the order $10^{-17}$). Even if a proportion of genes affecting male fitness may be under soft selection, it seems unlikely that a population with such a low male fitness would survive.

The drop in male fitness is less dramatic with regulatory evolution, as those mutations become progressively more recessive as the Y degenerates. There is nevertheless a transient drop in male average fitness, which can be quite large (e.g., 3% and 85% reduction for a 50-gene and 500-gene Y-linked region, respectively; Figure 3). Data on divergence between sex chromosomes indicate that Y degeneration is often sequential in chiasmate species, with several regions of various sizes, termed “strata” [18], having stopped recombining at different time points. This high transitory fitness drop may prevent large strata from occurring in small populations and may bias toward stabilizing selection on dosage only plays a marginal role in DRE (Figure 2C). Control simulations without mutation in the coding gene ($U_0 = 0$, Figure 2C) show that cis-regulatory divergence and Y silencing can occur even in the absence of deleterious mutations, but as expected, this silencing is slower, not being accelerated by the “haploidization” feedback loop, and reversible (STAR Methods; Figure S2).

As expected, DRE and DSI combine when more than a single Y-linked gene is considered. The effect is strong: Figure 3 shows that a 50-fold or 500-fold increase in the number of loci results in degeneration being 5-fold and 10-fold faster, respectively: a larger non-recombining Y-linked region degenerates faster than a small one. Without mutation in regulators (i.e., with only DSI), degeneration occurs but is 23–36-fold slower with 50 loci (depending on the control used for the comparison; STAR Methods; Figure 4). With 500 loci, however, the comparison with and without regulators is problematic, as very quickly, a modest accumulation of deleterious mutations on the many Y-linked genes causes an important reduction in male average fitness so that male fitness reaches unrealistically low values (of the order $10^{-17}$). Even if a proportion of genes affecting male fitness may be under soft selection, it seems unlikely that a population with such a low male fitness would survive.

The drop in male fitness is less dramatic with regulatory evolution, as those mutations become progressively more recessive as the Y degenerates. There is nevertheless a transient drop in male average fitness, which can be quite large (e.g., 3% and 85% reduction for a 50-gene and 500-gene Y-linked region, respectively; Figure 3). Data on divergence between sex chromosomes indicate that Y degeneration is often sequential in chiasmate species, with several regions of various sizes, termed “strata” [18], having stopped recombining at different time points. This high transitory fitness drop may prevent large strata from occurring in small populations and may bias toward stabilizing selection on dosage only plays a marginal role in DRE (Figure 2C). Control simulations without mutation in the coding gene ($U_0 = 0$, Figure 2C) show that cis-regulatory divergence and Y silencing can occur even in the absence of deleterious mutations, but as expected, this silencing is slower, not being accelerated by the “haploidization” feedback loop, and reversible (STAR Methods; Figure S2).

As expected, DRE and DSI combine when more than a single Y-linked gene is considered. The effect is strong: Figure 3 shows that a 50-fold or 500-fold increase in the number of loci results in degeneration being 5-fold and 10-fold faster, respectively: a larger non-recombining Y-linked region degenerates faster than a small one. Without mutation in regulators (i.e., with only DSI), degeneration occurs but is 23–36-fold slower with 50 loci (depending on the control used for the comparison; STAR Methods; Figure 4). With 500 loci, however, the comparison with and without regulators is problematic, as very quickly, a modest accumulation of deleterious mutations on the many Y-linked genes causes an important reduction in male average fitness so that male fitness reaches unrealistically low values (of the order $10^{-17}$). Even if a proportion of genes affecting male fitness may be under soft selection, it seems unlikely that a population with such a low male fitness would survive.

The drop in male fitness is less dramatic with regulatory evolution, as those mutations become progressively more recessive as the Y degenerates. There is nevertheless a transient drop in male average fitness, which can be quite large (e.g., 3% and 85% reduction for a 50-gene and 500-gene Y-linked region, respectively; Figure 3). Data on divergence between sex chromosomes indicate that Y degeneration is often sequential in chiasmate species, with several regions of various sizes, termed “strata” [18], having stopped recombining at different time points. This high transitory fitness drop may prevent large strata from occurring in small populations and may bias toward stabilizing selection on dosage only plays a marginal role in DRE (Figure 2C). Control simulations without mutation in the coding gene ($U_0 = 0$, Figure 2C) show that cis-regulatory divergence and Y silencing can occur even in the absence of deleterious mutations, but as expected, this silencing is slower, not being accelerated by the “haploidization” feedback loop, and reversible (STAR Methods; Figure S2).
scenarios involving multiple small strata as, for example, in humans [19]. Comparatively, these scenarios involving small strata are more difficult to explain with DSI, as selective interference is weak on small non-recombining regions.

Last, degeneration is initially slower but faster overall when there is only one $T_m$ and $T_r$ controlling all cis-regulators. Despite the large pleiotropy constraint, having only two autosomal trans-regulators precipitates degeneration: the tipping point where it is worth fully silencing the Y is quickly reached when many very weakly deleterious mutations have accumulated on the Y. This is consistent with the observation that dosage compensation can occur locally on a gene-by-gene basis or by chromosome-wide trans-acting effects [17]. Intermediate cases involving cis- and trans-regulators with regional effects (e.g., in Drosophila [20]) may be worth investigating but are likely to behave similarly, as long as trans-regulators only target X genes that have a copy on the Y non-recombining region.

Simulations for lower values of mutation rates and strength of selection against deleterious alleles are shown in Figure S4 for $n_L = 1$ and $n_T = 50$; STAR Methods). Unsurprisingly, reducing mutation rates slows degeneration, while the effect of $s$ is more complicated. However, the acceleration of degeneration caused by regulatory evolution still holds. Figure S4 also shows that a scaling argument from diffusion theory indicates that larger populations with weaker mutation and selection should also behave similarly, albeit on a longer timescale.

The DRE theory proposes a different view of sex-chromosome evolution compared to the DSI theory that has been developed over the past 40 years. In both cases, degeneration starts after the arrest of recombination in a genome region completely linked to the sex-determining locus. In both cases, degeneration is slower in larger populations, but this is considerably less so in the DRE model. However, there are important differences. With very few exceptions [21, 22], DSI was developed without explicitly modeling regulatory evolution. With DSI, regulatory evolution (Y silencing and dosage compensation) is supposed to occur only after deleterious mutations have accumulated on the Y [3, 23–25], although it has also been proposed that silencing may result directly from the accumulation of deleterious mutations in regulatory regions [13]. This is certainly possible, as selective interference applies to all functional sequences and may contribute to the fixation of many kinds of deleterious mutations, including those maintaining adequate expression levels. DRE is based on a reverse causality: regulatory evolution initiates the degeneration process. Contrary to the standard model in which compensation is needed because degeneration damages genes’ function in males, compensation evolves here from the very beginning of the process, by reducing the proportion of transcripts from Y-linked relative to X-linked alleles and maintaining an almost constant overall level of expression in both sexes. However, compensation may not occur when expression levels are under weak stabilizing selection (Figure 2C). Whether compensation occurs on a gene-by-gene basis or chromosome wide depends on the availability of the corresponding trans-acting factor, but both can occur in DRE and, surprisingly, at approximately the same rate (Figure 3).

The specific mode of dosage compensation depends on the type of trans-regulators. Here, we considered trans-regulators with sex-limited expression, which can mimic several well-known dosage compensation systems (with female-limited factors corresponding to C. elegans or mammal systems, while male-limited factors would be more similar to a Drosophila-like situation [17]; STAR Methods). The symmetric DRE model that we used often led to a Drosophila-like compensation, where the X in males was eventually expressed twice as much compared to the situation at the recombination arrest (Figure 2B). However, this is certainly dependent on the relative mutation rates on the different types of trans-regulators. The theory should be extended to examine the diversity of dosage compensation mechanisms, including sex-of-origin effects [26].

Overall, we have presented an alternative theory for the degeneration of sex chromosomes. Although many underlying parameters are still poorly known, this theory could be tested quantitatively, as it works faster than current theory, on smaller non-recombining regions, and it does not require small population sizes or recurrent beneficial mutations causing hitchhiking effects. It does not exclude selective interference, which will necessarily co-occur as long as many genes stop recombining simultaneously. However, a hallmark of DRE is that regulatory changes occur very early. This is consistent with recent studies showing that dosage compensation evolves early on [27, 28] and that Y transcriptional downregulation accompanies degeneration of protein-coding genes from the start [29–31].
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In addition to the fitness consequences of carrying deleterious mutations in the coding gene, we also assume that the overall effect of deleterious mutations in gene $i$ depends on the cis-regulator strengths associated with alleles 1 and 2, denoted $c_{1,i}$ and $c_{2,i}$. We assume that the fraction of the protein expressed from allele 1 is $f_1 = c_{1,i}/(c_{1,i} + c_{2,i})$, and that the resulting effective dominance coefficient of allele 1 is given by

$$h_i = \phi_1^{\text{in}(h)/\text{in}(2)}$$

(Equation 1)

where $h$ is a parameter measuring the dominance of the fitness effect of deleterious mutations in a heterozygote when both alleles are equally expressed ($\phi_{1,j} = 1/2$ leads to $h_{1,j} = h$, see below for a discussion of this and other model assumptions) [14], which will be fixed to 0.25. According to Equation 1, if allele 1 is relatively more expressed ($\phi_{1,j} > 1/2$), it is assumed to have a larger fitness effect ($h_{1,j} > h$). The fitness effect resulting from the presence of deleterious mutations in gene $i$ is then

$$W_i^d = 1 - s_2,i - h_{1,i}(s_{1,i} - s_2,i)$$

(Equation 2)

Together, Equation 1 and 2 link the relative rate of expression $\phi_{1,j}$ of the most deleterious allele present at locus $i$ to the contribution of gene $G_i$ to fitness, illustrated by Figure 1B.

In addition to the fitness consequences of carrying deleterious mutations in the coding gene, we also assume that the overall expression level of coding genes is under stabilizing selection with an optimum value $Q_{\text{opt}}$. In males, the total expression level $Q_i$ equals $(c_{1,i} + c_{2,i})\tilde{t}_{m,i}$, where $\tilde{t}_{m,i}$ is the average strength of the trans-regulators expressed in males, which assumes that both cis- and trans-regulators are essential for proper expression (neither can be zero). Symmetrically, it is $(c_{1,i} + c_{2,i})\tilde{t}_{f,i}$ in females. We assume that $\ln(Q_i)$ is under Gaussian stabilizing selection around $\ln(Q_{\text{opt}})$ (with $Q_{\text{opt}} = 2$). We use log-scale to ensure that, irrespective of the
intensity of stabilizing selection, the fitness effect of complete regulatory silencing ($Q = 0$) would be $s_{\text{max}}$, the maximum permitted fitness effect of deleterious alleles on the coding gene (Figure 1C), which we assume to be the same as the effect of a gene knock-out. Denoting by $f$ the intensity of stabilizing selection on the expression level, the fitness resulting from the departure from optimal dosage $W_f^0$ is

$$W_f^0 = 1 - s_{\text{max}} \left( 1 - e^{-f(Q - h \Omega_{\text{max}})} \right)$$

(Equation 3)

This function is equivalent to assuming that fold-changes in expression levels are under symmetric stabilizing selection, while selection on expression levels $Q_i$ is asymmetric (Figure 1C) — in order to investigate whether this asymmetry influenced the results, we also considered a symmetrized version of this function (see below). Finally, the overall fitness of an individual was computed as the product over all genes $i$ of $W_f^0 W_i^0$.

Dominance

The relationship between relative expression and dominance, as given by Equation 1 is based on several considerations. First, it is reasonable to assume that there is a smooth and monotonic curve relating the relative expression of a deleterious mutation and its dominance. This curve also must include three fixed points with fitness 1, 1-hs, 1-s at 0%, 50%, and 100% relative expression, respectively. Given these constraints, the curve relating relative expression and fitness is perhaps not exactly given by Equation 1, but with a very similar shape and curvature. In addition, Equation 2 assumes that the identity of the precise mutation in a given gene does not matter in computing fitness and dominance. For instance, a heterozygous individual carrying two different deleterious mutations at a given gene, each with an effect $s$, will have a fitness equal to 1-s, i.e., the same fitness than an individual homozygous for the same deleterious mutation with effect $s$. Finally the value of $h = 0.25$ used throughout is based on observations made in a diversity of systems (see survey in [33]).

Effect of mutations

We suppose that all mutations occurring on the gene are deleterious. We used an average effect of 0.05 based on direct estimates (see Table 1 in [34]). We used a simple one-parameter exponential distribution to model the diversity of selective effects. Observed distributions of selective effects are similar, especially in absence of beneficial mutations [34]. The model is not considering compensatory mutations in the genes. However, it includes compensatory mutations on regulators, modeled as quantitative traits. In addition, mutations on cis-regulators, by partially silencing the effect of deleterious mutations on the genes, also act as compensatory mutations for mutations in the genes. DRE is based on the fact that they cause a long-lasting compensatory effect, on all future deleterious mutations that will occur on the gene (when a gene becomes partially silenced, all future deleterious on that gene will experience a lower dominance). Although more work is needed to investigate this point in detail, it is unlikely that compensatory mutations in the gene will qualitatively alter the results, as long as they are less frequent than deleterious mutations. Once the expression of a gene on the Y has started decreasing (through the evolution of cis and trans regulators), selection becomes less effective on the Y copy of the gene, leading to an accumulation of deleterious alleles, which further favors reduced expression. This accumulation may proceed more slowly due to the occasional fixation of a reverse mutation, but should occur anyway as long as the rate of reverse mutations is weak. Eventually, when a gene becomes nearly completely silenced, back mutations on the gene become irrelevant, as they will have no effect (being also silenced).

Cis-regulators runaway

For autosomal genes, a ‘cis-regulator runaway’ process occurs that leads to stronger cis-regulators to become associated with better purged chromosomes with fewer deleterious mutations [14]. This favors stronger cis-regulatory alleles, provided they are tightly linked to their coding gene. This process occurs during the burn-in phase of all simulations presented here. Consequently, when recombination stops, cis and trans trait values differed from their initial values (arbitrarily set to one for all regulatory traits) to an extent that differed among simulations with different parameter values (notably population sizes, intensity of stabilizing selection), but not between the sexes or sex chromosomes (Figure S1A). To avoid introducing a bias from this burn-in phase effect, we rescaled all regulatory trait values at the arrest of recombination, by dividing them by their average over the whole population. This allows for a better comparison across parameters and is not biologically consequential as the absolute value of these traits is arbitrary. Figure S1A shows this runaway for the case illustrated in Figure 2. This trait variation and scaling is not represented on Figure 2 to avoid overloading the figure. While runaway before the arrest of recombination plays no important role, as it does not introduce a sex or sex chromosome bias, we investigated whether it played a role after recombination arrest. At this point, cis-regulators on the Y become more tightly linked to their gene, which should cause a higher runaway rate on the Y. We expect this effect to be minor as the rate of runaway shows a plateau toward lower recombination rates [14]. This small asymmetry can be seen immediately following recombination arrest: Y cis-regulator increases slightly faster than X cis-regulator (Figure S1A). This effect is slowing down degeneration as it is initiated by a slight Y relative silencing (which is less likely to occur if Y cis-regulators are on average slightly stronger than X cis-regulators). To confirm this interpretation, we used simulation with larger recombination rate between the cis-regulator and the gene. We found indeed that it further delayed degeneration (see results with $R_c$, artificially set to 0.5, Figure 2C, “FREE” simulations). In any case, after this slight initial asymmetry in runaway rates, cis-regulatory divergence between the X and Y takes over.
Simulations were set up to ensure that no X-Y or male-female asymmetry occurred during the burn-in period. As explained in the previous paragraph on cis-regulators runaway, there is an inherent instability of regulatory systems based on cis and trans control of gene expression. To allow for possible dosage compensation while X and Y cis-regulators diverge, it is necessary to introduce trans-regulators with male-limited or female-limited expression. Introducing only male or female-limited trans-regulators would introduce an initial asymmetry in the runaway process that may cause male-female differences before the arrest of recombination. For instance, if cis-regulators runaway can only be compensated by a female-limited trans-regulator, it will lead to a situation where expression is near optimal dosage in females (since the trans-regulator with female-limited expression ensures that expression level stays optimal in females), but would overshoot in males (since no trans-regulators compensate for cis-regulator runaway in males). This initial male overexpression would greatly facilitate Y silencing immediately after recombination arrest, when X and Y cis-regulators can start diverging. Indeed, Y silencing would be directly selected for to correct for this male overexpression. This silencing would reflect this initial unbalanced expression, rather than a mechanism that inherently breaks X and Y symmetry after recombination arrest. The reciprocal initial condition (with only trans-regulator with male-limited expression) would on the contrary oppose Y silencing (as overexpression in females would rather tend to decrease X cis-regulator strength, which would lead to stronger Y relative expression in males). To avoid these initial conditions effects, where male female symmetry is broken before recombination arrest, we considered the symmetrical case with both male and female limited trans-regulators. However, this introduce twice as many trans- versus cis mutations, as there are two trans- for one cis-regulator. To avoid introducing a higher mutational variance to trans versus cis-effects, we therefore halved mutation rates on the two trans-regulator loci ($U_{cy} = 2 U_{cz}$). The absence of cis- versus trans trait bias during the burn-in period is shown on Figure S1B. Overall, we used initial conditions that did not introduce male versus female biases and that did not introduce cis- versus trans-regulators trait biases.

As soon as recombination stops between the X and Y, cis-regulators can start diverging on the X and Y. This divergence can be compensated for by the corresponding evolution of trans-regulators expressed in males and in females. Hence, X and Y regulatory systems can drift apart even in absence of deleterious mutations in the coding sequences, while maintaining optimal expression levels in both sexes. In the absence of coding sequence degeneration, the regulatory system can however return to X and Y coexpression after a period where only the X or Y was expressed in males. This is not possible when the Y has degenerated as an increased expression of a dysfunctional gene copy cannot be favored back. In addition, the divergence of the regulatory system in absence of deleterious mutations in the coding sequence is slower than when the ‘haploidization’ feedback loop occurs. These two effects are illustrated on Figure S2 (see also Figure 2C, NOG results).

If population size become small ($N_{pop} = 1000$, Figure 2D), Y degeneration can still occur, without DSI or DRE, simply because effective population size of the Y becomes small enough (and smaller than that of the X) to quickly fix deleterious mutations [see 6] for details about this regime]. The asymmetry between the X and the Y results from the lower effective population size of the latter (there are 3 X for one Y in a population with balanced sex-ratio). With small population size, deleterious mutations can also accumulate on the X, for the same reason, although at a much smaller rate (Figure S1D). This may cause population extinction if the non-recombination region is large enough. This mutational meltdown is mitigated if compensatory mutations are included in the model, which is not considered here.

To model stabilizing selection on expression levels, we used Gaussian selection on the log of total expression. We used this log to ensure that, irrespective of the intensity of stabilizing selection, the fitness effect of complete regulatory silencing would be $s_{max}$, the maximum permitted effect of deleterious alleles on the coding gene. This fitness function introduces an asymmetry on the natural scale for total expression (Figure 1C). This asymmetry is not biological implausible in most cases. In particular, decreasing expression to zero is likely more deleterious than increasing expression by the same amount. Quite generally, the cost of producing a protein (or the opportunity cost it represents) is likely to be lower than the loss-of-function caused by the shortage of that protein. However, even if biologically plausible, we investigated whether the asymmetry of this fitness function influenced our results. To do so, we used a symmetrized version of the fitness function.

$$W_i^Q = 1 - s_{max} \left( 1 - e^{-(Q_i - Q_{opt})^2} \right) \text{ if } Q_i < Q_{opt}$$

$$W_i^Q = 1 - s_{max} \left( 1 - e^{-(2Q_{opt} - Q_i)^2} \right) \text{ if } Q_i > Q_{opt}$$

(Equation 4)

This fitness function is identical to Equation 3 when $Q_i < Q_{opt}$, but is reflected around $Q_i = Q_{opt}$ for $Q_i > Q_{opt}$. It is not defined for $Q_i > 2Q_{opt}$, which makes it not biologically very plausible. However it is entirely symmetrical around $Q_i = Q_{opt}$, and with identical effects than the function we use on the left of $Q_{opt}$, i.e., for expression levels corresponding to silencing ($Q_i < Q_{opt}$). With this fitness function, Y degeneration occurs almost identically (Figures 2C and S1G), indicating that the specific form of the stabilizing selection function would be directly selected for to correct for this male overexpression. This silencing would reflect this initial unbalanced expression, rather than a mechanism that inherently breaks X and Y symmetry after recombination arrest. The reciprocal initial condition (with only trans-regulator with male-limited expression) would on the contrary oppose Y silencing (as overexpression in females would rather tend to decrease X cis-regulator strength, which would lead to stronger Y relative expression in males). To avoid these initial conditions effects, where male female symmetry is broken before recombination arrest, we considered the symmetrical case with both male and female limited trans-regulators. However, this introduce twice as many trans- versus cis mutations, as there are two trans- for one cis-regulator. To avoid introducing a higher mutational variance to trans versus cis-effects, we therefore halved mutation rates on the two trans-regulator loci ($U_{cy} = 2 U_{cz}$). The absence of cis- versus trans trait bias during the burn-in period is shown on Figure S1B. Overall, we used initial conditions that did not introduce male versus female biases and that did not introduce cis- versus trans-regulators trait biases.

Regulatory system instability

As soon as recombination stops between the X and Y, cis-regulators can start diverging on the X and Y. This divergence can be compensated for by the corresponding evolution of trans-regulators expressed in males and in females. Hence, X and Y regulatory systems can drift apart even in absence of deleterious mutations in the coding sequences, while maintaining optimal expression levels in both sexes. In the absence of coding sequence degeneration, the regulatory system can however return to X and Y coexpression after a period where only the X or Y was expressed in males. This is not possible when the Y has degenerated as an increased expression of a dysfunctional gene copy cannot be favored back. In addition, the divergence of the regulatory system in absence of deleterious mutations in the coding sequence is slower than when the ‘haploidization’ feedback loop occurs. These two effects are illustrated on Figure S2 (see also Figure 2C, NOG results).

Small population sizes

If population size become small ($N_{pop} = 1000$, Figure 2D), Y degeneration can still occur, without DSI or DRE, simply because effective population size of the Y becomes small enough (and smaller than that of the X) to quickly fix deleterious mutations [see 6] for details about this regime]. The asymmetry between the X and the Y results from the lower effective population size of the latter (there are 3 X for one Y in a population with balanced sex-ratio). With small population size, deleterious mutations can also accumulate on the X, for the same reason, although at a much smaller rate (Figure S1D). This may cause population extinction if the non-recombination region is large enough. This mutational meltdown is mitigated if compensatory mutations are included in the model, which is not considered here.

Symmetrized stabilizing selection

To model stabilizing selection on expression levels, we used Gaussian selection on the log of total expression. We used this log to ensure that, irrespective of the intensity of stabilizing selection, the fitness effect of complete regulatory silencing would be $s_{max}$, the maximum permitted effect of deleterious alleles on the coding gene. This fitness function introduces an asymmetry on the natural scale for total expression (Figure 1C). This asymmetry is not biological implausible in most cases. In particular, decreasing expression to zero is likely more deleterious than increasing expression by the same amount. Quite generally, the cost of producing a protein (or the opportunity cost it represents) is likely to be lower than the loss-of-function caused by the shortage of that protein. However, even if biologically plausible, we investigated whether the asymmetry of this fitness function influenced our results. To do so, we used a symmetrized version of the fitness function.

$$W_i^Q = 1 - s_{max} \left( 1 - e^{-(Q_i - Q_{opt})^2} \right) \text{ if } Q_i < Q_{opt}$$

$$W_i^Q = 1 - s_{max} \left( 1 - e^{-(2Q_{opt} - Q_i)^2} \right) \text{ if } Q_i > Q_{opt}$$

(Equation 4)

This fitness function is identical to Equation 3 when $Q_i < Q_{opt}$, but is reflected around $Q_i = Q_{opt}$ for $Q_i > Q_{opt}$. It is not defined for $Q_i > 2Q_{opt}$, which makes it not biologically very plausible. However it is entirely symmetrical around $Q_i = Q_{opt}$, and with identical effects than the function we use on the left of $Q_{opt}$, i.e., for expression levels corresponding to silencing ($Q_i < Q_{opt}$). With this fitness function, Y degeneration occurs almost identically (Figures 2C and S1G), indicating that the specific form of the stabilizing selection function
plays a limited role in the process. It also indicates that the fitness effects corresponding to large overexpression plays minimal role. This is expected as the population almost never evolves to such extreme trait value, due to the stabilizing selection around $Q_{opt}$.

**Modes of dosage compensation**

Many different mechanisms of dosage compensation have been described in a diversity of organisms. It is possible to relate these mechanisms to the model we use. Once the Y is fully silenced ($c_{Y,j} = 0$), and assuming that the population stays at $Q_{opt}$ in both males and females (which is a very good approximation unless stabilizing is very weak), we have

$$Q_{opt} = c_x \bar{t}_m = 2c_x \bar{t}_i$$  \hspace{1cm} (Equation 5)

We therefore have $\bar{t}_m = 2\bar{t}_i$, which defines dosage compensation (Figure S3). Hence the way dosage compensation works, i.e., the triplet ($\bar{t}_m, \bar{t}_i, c_{X,j}$) can be described by a single parameter. We can choose e.g., to use $\bar{t}_m$ for this description. Compared to the initial system with $\bar{t}_m = \bar{t}_i = c_{X,j} = c_{Y,j} = 1$, a final compensation characterized by $\bar{t}_m = 1$ (i.e., $\bar{t}_m = 1, \bar{t}_i = 0.5, c_{X,j} = 2, c_{Y,j} = 0$) would correspond to the *Caenorhabditis elegans* case, where the X is inherently expressed twice as much ($c_{X,j} = 2$) to obtain optimal expression in males, while a female-limited trans-regulator halves expression ($\bar{t}_i = 0.5$) to recover optimal expression in females. This is also very similar to the mammal case where a female-limited trans-regulator halves expression by randomly silencing one X (rather than halving expression of each X like in *C. elegans*). The case $\bar{t}_m = 2$ (i.e., $\bar{t}_m = 2, \bar{t}_i = 1, c_{X,j} = 1, c_{Y,j} = 0$) would correspond to the *Drosophila* case, where a male-limited trans-acting factor doubles X expression to obtain optimal expression in males (nothing being changed in females, $\bar{t}_i = 1, c_{X,j} = 1$). Several other compensation mechanisms may occur, such as trans-acting factors specifically targeting the X or Y in males, based on parent-of-origin imprints ([26], but see 35); indeed, maternal or paternal imprints can easily identify proto-X and proto-Y in males. The current model should be extended to examine this diversity of dosage compensation mechanisms including the possibility of mixture of mechanisms [36]. This extension may also require introducing different types of constraints to stabilize the runaway of cis-regulators, in the period preceding the arrest of recombination, so that the type of compensation could be evaluated against a stable regulatory system.

**Number of selected loci**

The quantitative comparison between DRE and DSI is not straightforward as most models of DRI do not involve regulatory loci. At first sight, it might be possible to ‘convert’ cis-regulators into genes exposed to deleterious mutations to make a comparison that would use the same number of selected loci, mutation load and the same genetic map. This is however not trivial, as selective effects on cis-regulators are not directly comparable to those on genes. Regulatory traits are modeled as traits under stabilizing selection, i.e., with deleterious and beneficial mutations, and influencing the dominance of mutations on the genes. On Figure 4, we present two better control cases. The first corresponds to simulations in the absence of mutation in trans-regulators. This is slowing down degeneration by making cis-regulatory divergence more difficult, but the regulatory feedback loop is still present (dashed red curve). However, the effect of cis-divergence on silencing is still present, and this is therefore not representing DSI well. A second control considers the same situation, but where the link between regulatory trait values and dominance of mutation on the genes is artificially removed (setting $h$ constant and equal to 0.25 in HFIX simulations). In this case, regulatory traits are just quantitative traits with no effect on genes, and the simulation therefore has the same number of loci, load and map compared to a full DRE simulation with the regulatory effects removed (gray dashed line). In this case, we observe that degeneration occurs faster than when all regulators are removed, as expected as there are more interfering loci. However, the dynamics are still much slower than when the regulatory feedback loop is occurring. Specifically, it is 23 times slower to reach the time where 50% of genes are degenerate, compared to DRE.

**Scaling and parameter effects**

Figure S4 shows additional simulation results for lower values of mutations rates and strength of selection against deleterious mutations, and test a scaling argument from diffusion theory.

**Mutation rates**

With smaller mutation rates, all processes are slower. Figure S4A shows results for mutation rates 10 times lower. Results show that the dynamics with only one gene are the same, just ten times slower. This scaling holds true for simulations with or without regulators; therefore, all our conclusions remain the same. Results with 50 genes show that degeneration is slowed down by a factor >20 when mutation rates are 10 times lower. This scaling also holds for simulations with or without regulators, and thus also leaves our main conclusions unchanged (in particular, regarding the fact that regulatory evolution may considerably accelerate degeneration). The difference in scaling between the 1 and 50 genes cases may be due to the fact that the speed of degeneration caused by selective interference increases faster than linearly with the mutation rate. Since the one-gene case is less impacted by lowering the mutation rate than the 50 locus case, we conclude overall that DRE is robust to our assumptions. If anything, it should play a greater role at lower mutation rates, compared with selective interference.

**Effect of deleterious mutations**

Figure S4B shows the results of simulations with lower mean effect $s_{mean}$ of deleterious mutations. Interpreting the effect of $s_{mean}$ is not straightforward, as the fitness effect of deleterious mutations has a non-monotonic effect on the rate of fitness decline in Muller’s
ratchet. With 10 times lower $s_{\text{mean}}$, we find that when regulators evolve, degeneration occurs twice as fast with only one selected
gene, but occurs at about the same rate with 50 genes. Simulations without regulatory evolution show a different scaling (degen-
eration is 10 times faster and 5 times faster with 1 and 50 loci, respectively). This difference in scaling may be expected as with regulator
evolution, dominance of the mutations carried on the Y declines, and tends to zero, which makes the dynamics less dependent on
$s_{\text{mean}}$. In any case, as with the simulations with lower mutation rates, degeneration always occurs much more rapidly in simulations
with regulatory evolution than in simulations without. Our main conclusion is thus robust to our choice of parameters, even if quan-
titative differences can arise with different parameter values. This is to be expected in all cases, as the simulations with regulatory
evolution also necessarily include the effect of selective interference. It only adds an extra process that accelerates degeneration.
Degeneration by regulation can occur ‘alone’ (as in the 1 locus simulations), but it will necessarily combine and add to selective inter-
ference in other cases.

Scalings

From diffusion theory, one expects that allele frequency dynamics should be roughly insensitive to population size, as long as the
product of population size $N_{\text{pop}}$ with the other parameters (mutations rates, strength of selection, etc.) remains constant, and
when time is measured in units of $N_{\text{pop}}$ generations (provided that $N_{\text{pop}}$ is sufficiently large, while mutation and selection are suffi-
ciently weak). This scaling argument is interesting, as it indicates that the behavior of very large populations (that could not be simu-
lated in a reasonable amount of time) can be deduced from simulations of smaller populations (e.g., [37]). In order to test if such a
scaling may hold in our model, we compared simulations with $N_{\text{pop}} = 1000$ and our default parameter values (REG simulations)
with simulations with $N_{\text{pop}} = 10000$, and where the values of the parameters $s_C$, $s_T$, $s$, $I$, $U_g$, $U_c$, $U_{\text{pm}}$, $U_{\text{op}}$, $R_g$ and $R_c$ were
divided by 10, so that the product between $N_{\text{pop}}$ and these parameters stayed constant (SCAL simulations). The results show that SCAL sim-
ulations are comparable but about 100 times slower on the accumulation of deleterious mutations on the Y (10x caused by the scaling
of time expressed in units of $N_{\text{pop}}$ generations, and 10x caused by the scaling of the variable measured $N_{\text{pop}} s_Y$). This scaling works for
SCAL simulations with 1 or 50 genes, suggesting that our results may be extrapolated to other parameter combinations, provided the
products of deterministic parameters with $N_{\text{pop}}$ are kept constant.

QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Not applicable