

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna  
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Linking the mitochondrial genotype to phenotype: a complex endeavour

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

*Published Version:*

Ghiselli, F., Milani, L. (2020). Linking the mitochondrial genotype to phenotype: a complex endeavour. *PHILOSOPHICAL TRANSACTIONS - ROYAL SOCIETY. BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES*, 375(1790), 1-8 [10.1098/rstb.2019.0169].

*Availability:*

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/707514> since: 2019-12-19

*Published:*

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0169>

*Terms of use:*

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).  
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

**Ghiselli F, Milani L. (2019) Linking the mitochondrial genotype to phenotype: a complex endeavour. Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B 375: 20190169**

The final published version is available online at  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0169>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

*This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>)*

***When citing, please refer to the published version.***

# PHILOSOPHICAL TRANSACTIONS OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY B

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

## Linking the mitochondrial genotype to phenotype: a complex endeavour

Journal:	<i>Philosophical Transactions B</i>
Manuscript ID	RSTB-2019-0169
Article Type:	Introduction
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Oct-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Ghiselli, Fabrizio; Università di Bologna, Dipartimento di Scienze Biologiche, Geologiche ed Ambientali Milani, Liliana; University of Bologna, Department of Biological, Geological and Environmental Sciences (BiGeA)
Issue Code (this should have already been entered but please contact the Editorial Office if it is not present):	LINKING
Subject:	Evolution < BIOLOGY, Genetics < BIOLOGY, Molecular Biology < BIOLOGY, Synthetic Biology < BIOLOGY, Cellular Biology < BIOLOGY, Biochemistry < BIOLOGY
Keywords:	mtDNA genetic variation, heteroplasmy, mitochondrial bottleneck, mitonuclear interactions, mtDNA editing, mitochondrial expression manipulation

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 **Author-supplied statements**  
4

5 Relevant information will appear here if provided.  
6

7  
8 **Ethics**  
9

10 *Does your article include research that required ethical approval or permits?:*

11 This article does not present research with ethical considerations  
12

13 *Statement (if applicable):*

14 CUST\_IF\_YES\_ETHICS :No data available.  
15

16  
17 **Data**  
18

19 *It is a condition of publication that data, code and materials supporting your paper are made publicly*  
20 *available. Does your paper present new data?:*

21 My paper has no data  
22

23 *Statement (if applicable):*

24 CUST\_IF\_YES\_DATA :No data available.  
25

26  
27 **Conflict of interest**  
28

29 I/We declare we have no competing interests  
30

31 *Statement (if applicable):*

32 CUST\_STATE\_CONFLICT :No data available.  
33

34  
35 **Authors' contributions**  
36

37 This paper has multiple authors and our individual contributions were as below  
38

39 *Statement (if applicable):*

40 FG and LM contributed equally to this work.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Title Page

# Linking the mitochondrial genotype to phenotype: a complex endeavour

Fabrizio Ghiselli, Liliana Milani

Department of Biological, Geological, and Environmental Sciences, University of Bologna, Italy

Authors for Correspondence: [fabrizio.ghiselli@unibo.it](mailto:fabrizio.ghiselli@unibo.it); [liliana.milani@unibo.it](mailto:liliana.milani@unibo.it)

## Abstract

Finding causal links between genotype and phenotype is a major issue in biology, even more in mitochondrial biology. First of all, mitochondria form complex networks, undergoing fission and fusion and we do not know how such dynamics influence the distribution of mtDNA variants across the mitochondrial network and how they affect the phenotype. Second, the non-mendelian inheritance of mitochondrial genes can have sex-specific effects and the mechanism of mitochondrial inheritance is still poorly understood so it is not clear how selection and/or drift act on mtDNA genetic variation each generation. Third, we still do not know how mtDNA expression is regulated; there is growing evidence for a convoluted mechanism which includes RNA editing, mRNA stability/turnover, post-transcriptional and post-translational modifications. Fourth, mitochondrial activity differ across species as a result of several interacting processes such as drift, adaptation, genotype-by-environment interactions, mitonuclear coevolution, epistasis. This issue will cover several aspects of mitochondrial biology along the path from genotype to phenotype, and it is subdivided into four sections focusing on

1  
2  
3 mitochondrial genetic variation, on the relationship among mitochondria, germ line, and  
4 sex, on the role of mitochondria in adaptation and phenotypic plasticity, and on some  
5 future perspectives in mitochondrial research.  
6  
7  
8

9  
10  
11 Keywords: mtDNA genetic variation; heteroplasmy; mitochondrial bottleneck; mitonuclear  
12 interactions; mtDNA editing; mitochondrial expression manipulation.  
13  
14

## 15 16 Mitochondria: powerhouse and beyond 17

18  
19 Eukaryotic life is powered by mitochondria, cytoplasmic organelles that originated through  
20 a unique endosymbiotic event that changed the history of life on Earth fostering the  
21 evolution of multicellular organisms (Lane and Martin, 2010; Martin et al., 2015). Once a  
22 proteobacterium, the mitochondrion retained the bulk of its original biochemical  
23 machinery, but its genome (mtDNA) underwent a massive reduction in size, and genes  
24 of the ancestral organelle relocated to the nucleus (“endosymbiotic gene transfer”, Timmis  
25 et al., 2004). However, not all the genes moved to the nucleus: of the 1,000+ protein-  
26 coding genes estimated to have been present in the bacterial ancestor of mitochondria,  
27 all known extant mtDNAs retain a subset of 69 ancestral protein-coding genes (Sloan et  
28 al., 2018); animal mtDNAs typically encompass ~13 of such genes (but see Breton et al.,  
29 2014). Interestingly, the organelles performing oxidative phosphorylation (OXPHOS)  
30 retain a genome, and there is a remarkable conservation of genes encoding key  
31 OXPHOS subunits in mtDNAs across eukaryotes (Sloan et al., 2018). John F. Allen  
32 (1993) postulated that organelle genomes encoding core OXPHOS subunits are  
33 necessary for maintaining redox poise (Co-location for Redox Regulation, CoRR; Allen,  
34 2015); under this light, the interaction of two or three genomes—or even more in some  
35 protists (Archibald, 2015)—is unavoidable in eukaryotic cells (Lane et al., 2013). The five  
36 multi-protein complexes responsible for OXPHOS are composed of subunits encoded by  
37 both nuclear and mitochondrial genomes, which need to coevolve despite their markedly  
38 different genetic features (Lane, 2011; Wolff et al., 2014). Because of such differences,  
39 and because of some peculiar characteristics of mitochondria, it is quite challenging to  
40 reconstruct the evolutionary dynamics and predict the outcomes of mitonuclear  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 interactions and coevolution, and it is particularly difficult to find causal links between  
4 genotype and phenotype in mitochondrial biology (Aanen et al., 2014; Ballard and Melvin,  
5 2010; Dowling, 2014). First of all, differently from the nuclear genome, mtDNA is subject  
6 to non-mendelian (uniparental) inheritance, and the underlying mechanism is still poorly  
7 understood, namely it is not clear how drift and selection act on mtDNA genetic variation  
8 each generation (see Milani and Ghiselli, 2015). Second—albeit with large variation (Allio  
9 et al., 2017)—metazoan mtDNA experience a higher mutation rate which results in  
10 different evolutionary rates between the two genomes. Third, because of the high mtDNA  
11 copy number per cell/organelle, mutations result in a phenotypic effect only when  
12 exceeding a threshold level (usually >60% mutant vs wild-type), meaning that alleles can  
13 fluctuate at mid-low frequency in the mitochondrial gene pool without being “visible” to  
14 selection (Busch et al., 2014; Dowling, 2014; “buffering”, or “threshold effect”: Ghiselli et  
15 al., 2013; Milani and Ghiselli, 2015). Fourth, individual mitochondria do not exist as  
16 permanently distinct entities, but undergo rapid fission and fusion processes, exchanging  
17 proteins, mtDNA, and lipids. Fission produces new mitochondria and plays an important  
18 role in quality control and selective elimination of damaged organelles. The fission  
19 process yields functionally divergent mitochondria—with different membrane potential  
20 ( $\Delta\psi_m$ )—and depolarized mitochondria are selectively degraded by mitophagy. On the  
21 other hand, fusion produces a network whose components share matrix content and  
22 electrochemical gradient, and it has been suggested as a mechanism by which  
23 mitochondria complement damaged organelles and compensate metabolic deficiencies  
24 (Busch et al., 2014; Chan, 2006; Kim et al., 2007; Twig et al., 2008a, 2008b; Youle and  
25 van der Bliek, 2012). The mtDNA is organized in nucleoids, discrete DNA-protein  
26 complexes which are present in multiple copies (hundreds to thousands) per cell.  
27 Nucleoids can be segregated across individual organelles in a cell, but, given the dynamic  
28 nature of the mitochondrial network, the association between nucleoids and their  
29 products, among nucleoids, and among products is temporary. Thus, it is of particular  
30 interest the situation—much more common than once believed (Dowling, 2014)—where  
31 different mtDNA variants are present in the same individual, a condition called  
32 heteroplasmy. For reasons that are still unknown, heteroplasmy seems to be  
33 unfavourable (but see Ghiselli et al., 2019; Lane, 2012), and it has been related to  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 physiological, cognitive, and behavioural complications in mice (Sharpley et al., 2012),  
4 and to human neurodegenerative diseases and common age-related disorders (Stewart  
5 and Chinnery, 2015). For the above-mentioned reasons, it is quite difficult to assess the  
6 distribution of mtDNA variants across the mitochondrial network, and how phenotype is  
7 affected. Indeed, the link between genotype (mtDNA) and phenotype (e.g.: OXPHOS  
8 activity) depends on the mobility of mtDNA and the diffusion of its products, so such link  
9 can show various degrees of 'leakyness' (Busch et al., 2014; Kowald and Kirkwood,  
10 2011). Understanding the effects of heteroplasmy—and of mitochondrial genetic  
11 variability in general—is therefore a complex endeavour.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

## 22 From genotype to phenotype

23  
24  
25 The life science community is getting increasingly aware of the great complexity of  
26 mitochondrial biology and evolution, a complexity that has been underestimated for a long  
27 time. Recently, mitochondrial biology is getting more attention from scientists across a  
28 wide range of disciplines, both basic and applied. Even the mass media have been  
29 engaged in mitochondria-related discussion, especially regarding the issue of “three-  
30 parent babies” (mitochondrial replacement therapy for *in vitro* fertilization). On the  
31 biomedical side, the central role of mitochondria in a substantial number of cellular  
32 processes implies that mitochondrial malfunctions cause a wide typology of diseases.  
33 Once considered rare, mitochondrial disease is now thought to affect 1 in 5,000 people,  
34 making it the second most commonly diagnosed, serious genetic disease after cystic  
35 fibrosis (source: Global Mitochondrial Disease Awareness Week website,  
36 <http://gmdaw.org/>). Linking the mitochondrial genotype with disease, predicting its  
37 presence, severity, heritability, and finding a therapy is quite a challenging endeavour.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 We think this Issue represents a relevant contribution for multiple fields of study. The link  
50 between some of the basic research here reported and future applications might seem  
51 far-fetched. We disagree. We are convinced that life sciences reached a turning point,  
52 where new technologies and methods allow to study a wider range of organisms and to  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 compare the basis of their biological features. Comparative analyses across increasingly  
4 large samples of biodiversity, are the most powerful approach to understand the evolution  
5 and functioning of organisms. The models and approaches described in this Issue will  
6 contribute to highlight similarities and differences between known aspects of  
7 mitochondrial biology and features of new uprising models that will surely contribute to  
8 the overall picture. Indeed, we want to highlight the importance of using comparative  
9 methods in a wide range of organisms, and the new models here presented show features  
10 that can help understanding some obscure areas of mitochondrial biology (see: Milani  
11 and Ghiselli, this Issue; Havird et al., 2019).

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 The contributions included are the result of nearly three years of interactions and  
20 discussions among scientists working in the field of mitochondrial evolutionary biology.  
21 Most of the interactions happened during international meetings, the last being "Linking  
22 the mitochondrial genotype to phenotype: a complex endeavour" SMBE 2018 Yokohama,  
23 Japan. The purpose of this collaborative effort is to provide new perspectives and angles  
24 in the field of mitochondrial biology and evolution. Hopefully, the work of the group of  
25 scientists participating in this Issue will increase the future contributions from different  
26 disciplines of life sciences, encouraging new collaborations and generating discussions.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
The Issue will cover several aspects of mitochondrial biology along the path from  
genotype to phenotype, with a special attention to non-model species. The contributions  
(see Table 1) are subdivided into four sections: 1) mitochondrial genetic variation; 2) the  
relationship among mitochondria, germ line, and sex; 3) the role of mitochondria in  
adaptation and phenotypic plasticity; and 4) some future perspectives on mitochondrial  
research.

## 1) MITOCHONDRIAL GENETIC VARIATION

Genetic variation is the engine of evolution, and this section highlights some focal points  
about how mitochondrial genetic variation arises and changes within individuals and  
across generations.

1  
2  
3 Schaack et al. (this Issue) investigate the challenges in estimating mutation rates given  
4 unknowns such as mtDNA effective population size and fixation probability of  
5 heteroplasmic mutations. A critical parameter in understanding rates of change is  
6 estimating the mitochondrial mutation rate (mtDNA MR). Despite its importance, this kind  
7 of estimate is overlooked. Mutation accumulation experiments are demanding and do not  
8 help in distinguishing the role of mutation from other evolutionary forces. mtDNA MRs  
9 depend on the rate of replication errors and unrepaired DNA damage, but since there are  
10 multiple copies of the mtDNA genome per mitochondrion and many organelles per cell,  
11 the fate of a given mutation also depends on its selective coefficient and selection  
12 effectiveness, relative to the likelihood of loss/fixation by genetic drift. Schaack et al. (this  
13 Issue) review the unique features of the mitochondrial genome that pose a challenge for  
14 accurate mutation rate estimation and discuss ways to overcome such challenges and  
15 understand mtDNA MRs variation within and between individuals, populations, and  
16 species. They underline that to understand how mtDNA MRs evolve it is essential to  
17 extend the analysis to non-model organisms and multiple genotypes per taxon.

18  
19 Dubie et al. (this Issue) use *Caenorhabditis elegans* data to discuss proliferation and  
20 persistence of spontaneous selfish mitochondrial deletions. Mitochondrial genomes can  
21 sustain mutations that are detrimental to individual fitness but that proliferate because of  
22 a replicative advantage (hence “selfish”). Dubie et al. (this Issue) analyzed the fitness  
23 effects and population dynamics of a mitochondrial genome containing a novel 499-bp  
24 deletion in the *ctb-1* gene ( $\Delta$ ctb-1).  $\Delta$ ctb-1 reached a high heteroplasmic frequency,  
25 imposing a significant fitness cost compared to individuals bearing wild-type  
26 mitochondria. Deletion-bearing worms were rapidly purged within a few generations when  
27 competed against wild-type mtDNA bearing worms in experimental populations. In  
28 contrast, the  $\Delta$ ctb-1 mitotype was able to persist in large populations comprising  
29 heteroplasmic individuals only. The data obtained within experimental lines subjected to  
30 severe population bottlenecks indicate a selfish drive. Indeed, levels of mitochondrial  
31 heteroplasmy are the product of mutation and selection at different levels of organization,  
32 and the use of single individual bottlenecks can eliminate the selection between  
33 individuals, revealing the contributions of selection and drift within the germline.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Heteroplasmy is the presence of different mtDNA variants within the same individual. The  
4 dynamics of heteroplasmic allele frequency among tissues of the human body is not well  
5 understood. Barrett et al. (this Issue) present data supporting a pronounced bottleneck in  
6 the mtDNA of human hair. By measuring allele frequency at heteroplasmic sites, Barrett  
7 et al. (this Issue) observed high variance in allele frequency among separate hairs from  
8 the same individual. These findings have important implications for understanding mtDNA  
9 variation across different tissues in the human body occurring during embryonic  
10 development and throughout the lifetime. The described population genetic modeling  
11 estimated the somatic bottleneck during embryonic follicle development of separate hairs  
12 to be much more drastic than somatic bottlenecks for blood and buccal tissues but  
13 comparable to the germline bottleneck, and that hair undergoes additional genetic drift  
14 before and after the divergence of mtDNA lineages of individual hair follicles. These  
15 findings have important implications for our understanding of mtDNA dynamics and also  
16 for forensics: heteroplasmic frequency may vary between hairs, and heteroplasmy may  
17 be present in the hair sample but absent in another tissue of the same individual.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

## 31 2) MITOCHONDRIA, GERM LINE, AND SEX

32  
33  
34 Which mitochondria are inherited from one generation to the subsequent through the  
35 germline? Is it a random subset or a selected one? If selection occurs, when and how is  
36 it achieved? Strictly maternal inheritance (SMI) entails an asymmetry in the transmission  
37 mechanism between sexes: what are the consequences on mitochondrial evolution and  
38 on the two sexes?  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 Knorre (this Issue) reviews the role of mitochondrial dynamics in mtDNA quality control  
44 and proposes cases in which mtDNA can evade it. Mitochondria can show different  $\Delta\psi_m$   
45 on which mitochondrial quality-control mechanisms rely, distinguishing between  
46 functional and damaged mitochondria. Nonetheless, mutations that increase  $\Delta\psi_m$  can  
47 evade such control even being deleterious. Knorre (this Issue) reviews recent findings on  
48 intracellular mtDNA quality control by mitophagy and discuss other mechanisms by which  
49 the nuclear genome can affect the competition of mtDNA variants in the cell, thus affecting  
50 heteroplasmy levels. He also examines the hypothesis that the zygote is the stage at  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 which mtDNA quality control takes place at the intracellular level. Mitochondrial dynamics  
4 are required to fulfil multiple functions, but these dynamics can disrupt the genotype-to-  
5 phenotype linkage at the intracellular level, thus preventing intracellular quality control of  
6 mtDNAs. Knorre (this Issue) suggests that this trade-off has been resolved by the  
7 evolution of a restriction of intracellular quality control to the germline.  
8  
9

10 Because of SMI, some Authors predict that mitochondrial quality control is less effective  
11 in males (“Mother’s curse hypothesis”, see Frank and Hurst, 1996; Gemmell et al., 2004).  
12 Bettinazzi et al. (this Issue) use the only known evolutionarily stable exception to SMI to  
13 investigate the link between mtDNA variants and sperm performance. Because of the  
14 strict maternal inheritance of mitochondria in animals, haplotypes that negatively affect  
15 male fertility can become fixed in populations. Doubly uniparental inheritance (DUI) of  
16 mitochondria is a stable exception, found so far in 100+ bivalve species which show two  
17 mtDNA lineages that evolve independently, transmitted separately, one by oocytes and  
18 the other by spermatozoa. Since the two DUI mitochondrial lineages are likely subject to  
19 different sex-specific selective pressures, the DUI system is a unique model to evaluate  
20 selection on sperm mitochondria for male functions, potentially contributing to male  
21 reproductive fitness. This study highlighted a significant divergence in sperm performance  
22 and partially in energy metabolism between DUI and SMI species. As sperm mitochondria  
23 in DUI species are not an evolutionary dead-end, male-specific energetic adaptations  
24 could reflect selection for both fertilization success and male mitotype preservation.  
25  
26

27 Nagarajan-Radha et al. (this Issue) present new data about how mitochondrial genetic  
28 variation exerts sex-specific effects on physiological function. According to the mother's  
29 curse hypothesis, maternal inheritance of mitochondria will facilitate the accumulation of  
30 mtDNA mutations that are harmful to males but benign/beneficial to females. These male-  
31 harming mutations are expected to differ across a population and to cause larger genetic  
32 variation and possibly larger phenotypic effects in males and/or having sexually  
33 antagonistic effects. Nagarajan-Radha et al. (this Issue) explore signatures of male-bias  
34 or sexual antagonism in the metabolic rate by measuring the effects of different  
35 mitochondrial haplotypes on the production of carbon dioxide across strains of *Drosophila*  
36 *melanogaster*, controlling for mass and activity. The study reports sex-specific (male-  
37 biased) effects of mtDNA haplotypes on metabolic rate, and a negative intersexual  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 correlation for metabolic rate across haplotypes consistent with the prediction that SMI  
4 enabled the accumulation of mutations that increase female fitness, but at the expense  
5 of male fitness. The Authors highlight the importance to address future research to a  
6 broader range of nuclear genetic and environmental contexts and also to other metazoan  
7 species.  
8  
9  
10  
11

### 12 13 14 3) MITOCHONDRIA, ADAPTATION, AND 15 PHENOTYPIC PLASTICITY 16 17

18 Mitochondria have a central role in many fundamental processes of eukaryotic life, well  
19 beyond energy production, so it should not be surprising that they have been suggested  
20 to be involved in adaptive processes (James et al., 2016; Meiklejohn et al., 2007).  
21 However, the mechanisms underlying mitochondrial-driven adaptation are complex and  
22 subject of debate. This section deals with the contribution of mitochondria and  
23 mitonuclear interactions to adaptation, phenotypic plasticity, and complex phenotypes.  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Rand and Mossman (this Issue) discuss how mitonuclear conflict and cooperation govern  
29 the integration of genotypes, phenotypes, and environments. The interaction between the  
30 mitochondrial and nuclear genomes under changing environments have pervasively  
31 influenced organism evolution. Indeed, mitochondria play crucial roles in signaling,  
32 altering how nuclear genes are expressed as phenotypes. These interactions are  
33 examples of genotype-by-environment (GxE) and gene-by-gene (GxG) interactions,  
34 producing context-dependent effects on the link between genotype and phenotype.  
35 Mitonuclear interactions have pleiotropic effects across numerous phenotypes and  
36 evidence from *Drosophila* and other organisms shows that mitonuclear interactions are  
37 common features of GxE and GxG. Rand and Mossman (this Issue) outline approaches  
38 that could help depicting the phenotypic and fitness landscapes in a nuclear-mitochondrial  
39 co-evolved unit and their relation to genetic variation. For example, the population-  
40 structure-mitonuclear-coadaptation hypothesis possibly explains why the breakdown of  
41 mitonuclear coadaptation is so evident in *Tigriopus*—highly structured inbred  
42 populations—but not in large outbred species such as *Drosophila*. The Authors underline  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 how mitonuclear interactions are important to understand the context-dependent effects  
4 underlying the architecture of complex phenotypes.

5  
6 Camus et al. (this Issue) analysed the impact of mitonuclear interactions on life-history  
7 responses to diet in *D. melanogaster*. Since mitochondria influence resource allocation,  
8 severe incompatibilities between mitochondrial and nuclear genomes can have pervasive  
9 effects on both fitness and longevity. How milder deficits in mitochondrial function affect  
10 life-history trade-offs is less well understood. Camus et al. (this Issue) found that in closely  
11 related fly populations (in which the genetic distance in mtDNA is similar to human  
12 populations) mitonuclear interactions do have significant impact on life-history trade-offs,  
13 but these effects are not predictable by relatedness and depend on the nuclear  
14 background. Camus et al. (this Issue) analysed how mitonuclear interactions affect the  
15 trade-off between fecundity and longevity considering different mitochondrial DNA  
16 haplotypes against two contrasting nuclear backgrounds in response to different diets.  
17 Mitonuclear interactions had substantial effects on resource allocation and life-history  
18 trade-offs in *D. melanogaster* but did not reflect genetic distance between mitochondrial  
19 haplotypes, so their effects are inconsistent, thus not predictable by relatedness. These  
20 effects can vary greatly, such as between the two nuclear genotypes used in this study,  
21 thus the Authors define as hazardous to generalise from mtDNA interactions with a single  
22 nuclear background.  
23

24  
25 Havird et al. (this Issue) examined mitochondrial function during thermal acclimation in  
26 mayfly larvae (*Baetis* and *Drunella* spp.). Modifications in mitochondrial or nuclear-  
27 encoded genes can modulate mitochondrial function and underlie environmental  
28 adaptation. Environmentally-induced plasticity in mitochondrial function is also common,  
29 especially in response to thermal acclimation in aquatic systems. Havird et al. (this Issue)  
30 examined mitochondrial activity in mayfly larvae from high and low elevation mountain  
31 streams during thermal acclimation to ecologically relevant temperatures. They evaluated  
32 different respiratory states in isolated mitochondria, and cytochrome oxidase and citrate  
33 synthase activities. The data obtained suggest that montane insects may be more  
34 vulnerable to rapid climate change. Indeed, mitochondria from samples collected at a low  
35 elevation site, with highly variable temperatures, showed greater thermal tolerance than  
36 samples from a high elevation site with comparatively stable temperatures, according to  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 predictions of the climate variability hypothesis. The Authors discuss how mitochondrial  
4 phenotypes are more resilient than whole-organism phenotypes in the face of thermal  
5 stress and underline the complex relationships between mitochondrial and organismal  
6 genotypes, phenotypes, and environmental adaptation.  
7  
8  
9

10 Elbassiouny et al. (this Issue) discuss adaptations for elevated metabolic burden in  
11 electric fishes. Indeed, the interest in understanding molecular adaptations that enable  
12 electric fishes to generate and detect electric fields relies also on the extent of energetic  
13 burden required that account for up to 20% of fish daily energy expenditure. Elbassiouny  
14 et al. (this Issue) investigated the molecular evolution of the OXPHOS complexes in the  
15 two most diverse clades of weakly electric fishes—South American Gymnotiformes and  
16 African Mormyroidea—using codon-based likelihood approaches. From the data  
17 obtained, they suggest that the usual strong constraint on mitochondrial OXPHOS  
18 variation is significantly reduced in electric compared to non-electric fishes, particularly  
19 for some OXPHOS complexes. The results presented are consistent with positive  
20 selection on the two fish branches associated with the independent evolutionary origins  
21 of electrogenesis, so the Authors suggest that adaptive evolution in the OXPHOS  
22 machinery may be associated with the evolution of bioelectrogenesis. This evidence is  
23 added to other evidence consistent with positive selection associated with major changes  
24 in physiology or ecology, such as that at the origins of bats and the evolution of powered  
25 flight: these studies highlight the utility of comparative analyses to reveal the molecular  
26 basis of adaptations that appear to be important in the evolution of novel sensory systems.  
27 Mackenzie and Kundariya (this Issue) review plant adaptation and phenotypic plasticity  
28 involving organelle-mediated epigenetic reprogramming. Plants can disperse their  
29 progeny to different environments and they can incorporate epigenetics and  
30 transgenerational stability thus allowing a high level of resilience. These genetic network  
31 and chromatin features increase acclimation opportunity and allow these sessile  
32 organisms to survive environmental change. Interestingly, some of such adaptational  
33 versatility of plants arises from neofunctionalization of organelles and organellar proteins.  
34 Mackenzie and Kundariya (this Issue) describe plastid specialization and multi-functional  
35 organellar protein features that support and enhance plant phenotypic plasticity. Spatio-  
36 temporal regulation of plastid composition, unusual inter-organellar protein targeting and  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 retrograde signalling can facilitate multi-functionalization of existing proteins. The process  
4 of neofunctionalization of sequences transferred from organelles to the nucleus is  
5 discussed, since the evolution of mitochondria and plastids as highly specialized cellular  
6 compartments has increased the functional versatility of many nuclear-encoded  
7 organellar proteins by virtue of their dual targeting: the redirection of a protein to a new  
8 cellular location can indeed influence protein neofunctionalization. The Authors also refer  
9 to the cytoplasmic male sterility (CMS), a mechanism described in over 80 plant species,  
10 associated with the expression of novel mitochondrial genes arising from intragenic  
11 recombination.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

## 20 21 4) FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

22  
23 This section focuses on new and old challenges in mitochondrial biology, reviewing up-  
24 and-coming technologies that will improve our ability to study the link between genotype  
25 and phenotype by, for example, mtDNA editing and manipulation of mitochondrial gene  
26 expression. Finally, we point out the importance of investigating a wider range of  
27 biodiversity by enhancing basic, “curiosity driven” research, and applying the comparative  
28 approach.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Klucnika and Ma (this Issue) discuss the challenge of mapping and editing animal  
35 mitochondrial genomes. Sequence variation among mtDNA haplotypes influences traits  
36 as health and longevity, but also incurable mitochondrial diseases, ageing, and cancer.  
37 However, significant challenges hamper our ability to precisely map mtDNA variants  
38 responsible for traits, and to genetically modify mtDNA. Klucnika and Ma (this Issue)  
39 review the efforts in developing systems to map and edit mtDNA, such as how to  
40 induce/increase the basal recombination frequency, and how to use mito-nucleases to  
41 cut endogenous genome and cause their subsequent degradation. The Authors also  
42 discuss the use of *in vitro* modified mtDNA directly delivered for transformation—but no  
43 mtDNA transformation metazoan system has been established so far—and the use of  
44 cell models for creating mutants that would otherwise be homoplasmic lethal at the  
45 organismal or tissue level. The impossibility to reliably deliver nucleic acids into animal  
46 mitochondria is a huge barrier, preventing us, for example, from importing also RNA for  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 CRISPR-mediated mtDNA editing: the establishment of mitochondria-adapted CRISPR-  
4 Cas9 platform could prompt a revolution in mitochondrial genome engineering and our  
5 biological understanding of mitochondria and mtDNA.  
6  
7

8 Wallis et al. (this Issue) review new methods for studying the genotype-phenotype link by  
9 manipulating mitochondrial gene expression with engineered proteins. Many genome  
10 engineering tools used for nuclear genome modification cannot be used to study  
11 mitochondrial genetics due to the unusual structure and physiology of the mitochondrial  
12 genome. Although challenges in the manipulation of mitochondria persist, new  
13 approaches are developed to modify the levels of mutant mammalian mitochondrial DNA  
14 and mitochondrial RNAs. Wallis et al. (this Issue) reviewed methods—such as mitoREs,  
15 mtZFNs, mitoTALENs, and RNA-binding proteins engineered to target specific  
16 mitochondrial RNA—that enable to manipulate mtDNA and modulate mitochondrial gene  
17 expression, to track and visualise mitochondrial processes, and whose application and  
18 study may provide highly specific and customisable genetic tools that could be applied in  
19 future therapeutics.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 Milani and Ghiselli (this Issue) ponder the potentials of non-model systems in  
30 mitochondrial research, highlighting promising candidates. The concept of model  
31 organism is discussed starting from the words by August Krogh, 1929—“*For a large*  
32 *number of problems there will be some animal of choice or a few such animals on which*  
33 *it can be most conveniently studied*”. Model organisms and inductive reasoning are  
34 irreplaceable, but we have to face with the problem of overgeneralisation. How can we  
35 infer general concepts? The role of model organisms in comparative biology is discussed  
36 in terms of model-organism-based approach vs comparative method. In doing this, some  
37 concepts from philosophy already used in scientific disciplines are utilized, such as  
38 nomothetics, ideographics, and an unusual concept of class. Several animals are rising  
39 as models in mitochondrial research: killifish (*Fundulus spp.* and *Nothobranchius furzeri*),  
40 deer mice (*Peromyscus spp.*), naked mole-rats (*Heterocephalus glaber*), bats of the  
41 genus *Myotis*, the bird *Eopsaltria australis*, the crustacean *Tigriopus californicus*, and  
42 bivalve molluscs, are currently used for answering specific biological questions such as  
43 the role of mitochondria in ageing and environmental adaptation, mitonuclear interactions  
44 and coevolution, genomic conflicts, mitochondrial heteroplasmy and inheritance.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Acknowledgements

We gratefully thank: all the Authors that submitted a contribution for this Issue; all the Reviewers involved; the Senior Commissioning Editor Helen Eaton for her amazing job in coordinating everything; the Editorial Board for the suggestions to the initial proposal; William F. Martin and John F. Allen for guidance. The involvement of Authors in this Issue was driven by personal interactions at several international conferences from 2016 to 2018. We apologize with the many outstanding Authors in the field of mitochondrial evolutionary biology that were not included.

## Funding

This work was supported by the Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research (MIUR) SIR Programme grant No. RBSI14G0P5 funded to L.M., MIUR FIR2013 Programme grant No. RBFR13T97A and the Canziani bequest funded to F.G., and "Ricerca Fondamentale Orientata" (RFO) funding from the University of Bologna to L.M. and F.G.

## Author Contributions

FG and LM contributed equally to this work.

## References

- Aanen, D.K., Spelbrink, J.N., Beekman, M., 2014. What cost mitochondria? The maintenance of functional mitochondrial DNA within and across generations. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 369, 20130438.
- Allen, J.F., 2015. Why chloroplasts and mitochondria retain their own genomes and genetic systems: Colocation for redox regulation of gene expression. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 112, 10231–10238.
- Allen, J.F., 1993. Control of gene expression by redox potential and the requirement for chloroplast and mitochondrial genomes. *J. Theor. Biol.* 165, 609–631.
- Allio, R., Donega, S., Galtier, N., Nabholz, B., 2017. Large Variation in the Ratio of Mitochondrial to Nuclear Mutation Rate across Animals: Implications for Genetic Diversity and the Use of Mitochondrial DNA as a Molecular Marker. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 34, 2762–2772.
- Archibald, J.M., 2015. Endosymbiosis and Eukaryotic Cell Evolution. *Curr. Biol.* 25, R911–R921.
- Ballard, J.W.O., Melvin, R.G., 2010. Linking the mitochondrial genotype to the organismal phenotype. *Mol. Ecol.* 19, 1523–1539.
- Breton, S., Milani, L., Ghiselli, F., Guerra, D., Stewart, D.T., Passamonti, M., 2014. A resourceful genome: updating the functional repertoire and evolutionary role of animal mitochondrial DNAs. *Trends Genet.* 30, 555–564.
- Busch, K.B., Kowald, A., Spelbrink, J.N., 2014. Quality matters: how does mitochondrial network dynamics and quality control impact on mtDNA integrity? *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 369, 20130442.
- Chan, D.C., 2006. Mitochondria: dynamic organelles in disease, aging, and development. *Cell* 125, 1241–1252.
- Dowling, D.K., 2014. Evolutionary perspectives on the links between mitochondrial genotype and disease phenotype. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* 1840, 1393–1403.
- Frank, S.A., Hurst, L.D., 1996. Mitochondria and male disease. *Nature* 383, 224.
- Gemmell, N.J., Metcalf, V.J., Allendorf, F.W., 2004. Mother's curse: the effect of mtDNA on individual fitness and population viability. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 19, 238–244.
- Ghiselli, F., Maurizii, M.G., Reunov, A., Ariño-Bassols, H., Cifaldi, C., Pecci, A., Alexandrova, Y., Bettini, S., Passamonti, M., Franceschini, V., Milani, L., 2019. Natural Heteroplasmy and Mitochondrial Inheritance in Bivalve Molluscs. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* <https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icz061>
- Ghiselli, F., Milani, L., Guerra, D., Chang, P.L., Breton, S., Nuzhdin, S.V., Passamonti, M., 2013. Structure, transcription, and variability of metazoan mitochondrial genome: perspectives from an unusual mitochondrial inheritance system. *Genome Biol. Evol.* 5, 1535–1554.
- Havird, J.C., Weaver, R.J., Milani, L., Ghiselli, F., Greenway, R., Ramsey, A.J., Jimenez, A.G., Dowling, D.K., Hood, W.R., Montooth, K.L., Estes, S., Schulte, P.M., Sokolova, I.M., Hill, G.E., 2019. Beyond the powerhouse: integrating mitonuclear evolution, physiology, and theory in comparative biology. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* <https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icz132>
- James, J.E., Piganeau, G., Eyre-Walker, A., 2016. The rate of adaptive evolution in

- 1  
2  
3 animal mitochondria. *Mol. Ecol.* 25, 67–78.
- 4 Kim, I., Rodriguez-Enriquez, S., Lemasters, J.J., 2007. Selective degradation of  
5 mitochondria by mitophagy. *Arch. Biochem. Biophys.* 462, 245–253.
- 6 Kowald, A., Kirkwood, T.B.L., 2011. Evolution of the mitochondrial fusion-fission cycle  
7 and its role in aging. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 108, 10237–10242.
- 8 Lane, N., 2012. The problem with mixing mitochondria. *Cell*.
- 9 Lane, N., 2011. Mitonuclear match: optimizing fitness and fertility over generations  
10 drives ageing within generations. *Bioessays* 33, 860–869.
- 11 Lane, N., Martin, W., 2010. The energetics of genome complexity. *Nature* 467, 929–  
12 934.
- 13  
14 Lane, N., Martin, W.F.F., Raven, J.A.A., Allen, J.F.F., 2013. Energy, genes and  
15 evolution: introduction to an evolutionary synthesis. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B*  
16 *Biol. Sci.* 368, 20120253.
- 17  
18 Martin, W.F., Garg, S., Zimorski, V., 2015. Endosymbiotic theories for eukaryote origin.  
19 *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 370, 20140330.
- 20 Meiklejohn, C.D., Montooth, K.L., Rand, D.M., 2007. Positive and negative selection on  
21 the mitochondrial genome. *Trends Microbiol.* 23, 259–263.
- 22  
23 Milani, L., Ghiselli, F., 2015. Mitochondrial activity in gametes and transmission of viable  
24 mtDNA. *Biol. Direct* 10, 22.
- 25  
26 Sharpley, M.S., Marciniak, C., Eckel-Mahan, K., McManus, M., Crimi, M., Waymire, K.,  
27 Lin, C.S., Masubuchi, S., Friend, N., Koike, M., Chalkia, D., MacGregor, G.,  
28 Sassone-Corsi, P., Wallace, D.C., 2012. Heteroplasmy of mouse mtDNA is  
29 genetically unstable and results in altered behavior and cognition. *Cell* 151, 333–  
30 343.
- 31 Sloan, D.B., Warren, J.M., Williams, A.M., Wu, Z., Abdel-Ghany, S.E., Chicco, A.J.,  
32 Havird, J.C., 2018. Cytonuclear integration and co-evolution. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 19,  
33 635–648.
- 34  
35 Stewart, J.B., Chinnery, P.F., 2015. The dynamics of mitochondrial DNA heteroplasmy:  
36 implications for human health and disease. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 16, 530–542.
- 37  
38 Timmis, J.N., Ayliffe, M.A., Huang, C.Y., Martin, W., 2004. Endosymbiotic gene transfer:  
39 organelle genomes forge eukaryotic chromosomes. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 5, 123–135.
- 40  
41 Twig, G., Elorza, A., Molina, A.J.A., Mohamed, H., Wikstrom, J.D., Walzer, G., Stiles, L.,  
42 Haigh, S.E., Katz, S., Las, G., Alroy, J., Wu, M., Py, B.F., Yuan, J., Deeney, J.T.,  
43 Corkey, B.E., Shirihai, O.S., 2008a. Fission and selective fusion govern  
44 mitochondrial segregation and elimination by autophagy. *EMBO J.* 27, 433–446.
- 45  
46 Twig, G., Hyde, B., Shirihai, O.S., 2008b. Mitochondrial fusion, fission and autophagy as  
47 a quality control axis: the bioenergetic view. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* 1777, 1092–  
48 1097.
- 49  
50 Wolff, J.N., Ladoukakis, E.D., Enríquez, J.A., Dowling, D.K., 2014. Mitonuclear  
51 interactions: evolutionary consequences over multiple biological scales. *Philos.*  
52 *Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 369, 20130443.
- 53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60 Youle, R.J., van der Bliek, A.M., 2012. Mitochondrial fission, fusion, and stress. *Science*  
337, 1062–1065.

Table 1. List of the papers included in this Special Issue

Reference (this Issue)	Type	Organism(s)	Scale(s)	Evolutionary topic	Finding
<b>MITOCHONDRIAL GENETIC VARIATION</b>					
Schack et al.	Opinion piece	Eukaryotes	Organismal Cellular	Mitochondrial mutation rate (mtDNA MR)	Ways to overcome the challenges of mtDNA MR estimation, disentangling the role of mutation from other evolutionary forces acting within the cell, and its variation within and between individuals, populations, and species
Dubie et al.	Primary research	<i>Caenorhabditis elegans</i>	Population Organismal Molecular	Selfish mitochondrial genome	Population dynamics of selfish mtDNA are strongly influenced by the population size
Barret et al.	Primary research	<i>Homo sapiens</i>	Population Organismal Tissue	Heteroplasmy	High variance in heteroplasmic allele frequency among hairs from the same individual and implications for forensics
<b>MITOCHONDRIA, GERM LINE, AND SEX</b>					
Knorre	Review	Animals Fungi	Cellular Organelle	Intracellular mitochondrial quality-control mechanisms	Germline cells are under severe pressure to eliminate deleterious mtDNA variants; also, the zygote appears to be another stage at which mtDNA quality control takes place at the intracellular level
Bettinazzi et al.	Primary research	Bivalve molluscs	Cellular	Sperm performance and bioenergetics	Possible link between male-energetic adaptation, fertilization success, and paternal mitochondria preservation in DUI species
Nagarajan-Radha et al.	Primary research	<i>Drosophila melanogaster</i>	Population Organismal	Mitochondrial genetic variation and physiological function	Empirical support that maternal mitochondrial inheritance has led to the accumulation of a sex-specific genetic load within the mitochondrial genome, affecting metabolic rate and the evolution of sex-differences
<b>MITOCHONDRIA, ADAPTATION, AND PHENOTYPIC PLASTICITY</b>					
Rand & Mossman	Opinion piece	<i>Drosophila melanogaster</i>	Population Organismal	Genotype-by-environment (GxE) and gene-by-gene (GxG) interactions	Mitonuclear interactions are common features of GxE and GxG interactions and are an important model to better understand the context-dependent effects on the link between genotype and phenotype

1						
2						
3	Camus et al.	Primary research	<i>Drosophila melanogaster</i>	Population Organismal	Fitness and longevity	Mitonuclear interactions can have significant impact on life-history trade-offs, but their effects are not predictable by relatedness
4						
5						
6						
7	Havird et al.	Primary research	<i>Baetis tricaudatus</i> <i>Baetis bicaudatus</i> <i>Drunella coloradensis</i> (mayflies)	Organismal Cellular Molecular	Environmentally-induced plasticity in mitochondrial function	Mitochondria of cold-adapted insects were sensitive to even moderate increases in temperature; those living in thermally variable environments had greater thermal tolerance
8						
9						
10						
11						
12	Elbassiouny et al.	Primary research	Gymnotiformes Mormyroidea (electric fishes)	Molecular	Molecular evolution of OXPHOS complexes	Evidence for convergent patterns of molecular evolution of mitochondrial OXPHOS genes in two different groups of electrogenic fishes
13						
14						
15						
16	Mackenzie & Kundariya	Review	Plants	Organismal Organelle	Phenotypic plasticity in plants	Some of the underlying versatility of plants to adapt to abiotic and biotic stress emerges from neofunctionalization of organelles and organellar proteins
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22	Klucnika & Ma	Review	Animals	Organismal Molecular	Map and edit mtDNA	The efforts in developing systems to induce/increase the basal recombination frequency, and the use of mito-nucleases, could finally lead to the establishment of mitochondria-adapted DNA editing platform
23						
24						
25						
26						
27	Wallis et al.	Review	Mammals	Population Organismal Molecular	Tools for manipulating mitochondrial gene expression	mtDNA sequence-specific DNA-binding and RNA-binding proteins tethered to various effector domains, show great promise as highly specific, customisable genetic tools for mitochondrial research
28						
29						
30						
31	Milani & Ghiselli	Opinion piece	Model/Non-model animals	Organismal	Perspective in mitochondrial research	The comparative method and new animal models have the potential to address still unanswered biological questions
32						
33						
34						
35						
36						
37						
38						
39						
40						
41						
42						
43						
44						
45						
46						