



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE
DELLA RICERCA

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; 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 (Δ ctb-1). Δ 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 Δ 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.

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
26 Havird et al. (this Issue) examined mitochondrial function during thermal acclimation in
27 mayfly larvae (*Baetis* and *Drunella* spp.). Modifications in mitochondrial or nuclear-
28 encoded genes can modulate mitochondrial function and underlie environmental
29 adaptation. Environmentally-induced plasticity in mitochondrial function is also common,
30 especially in response to thermal acclimation in aquatic systems. Havird et al. (this Issue)
31 examined mitochondrial activity in mayfly larvae from high and low elevation mountain
32 streams during thermal acclimation to ecologically relevant temperatures. They evaluated
33 different respiratory states in isolated mitochondria, and cytochrome oxidase and citrate
34 synthase activities. The data obtained suggest that montane insects may be more
35 vulnerable to rapid climate change. Indeed, mitochondria from samples collected at a low
36 elevation site, with highly variable temperatures, showed greater thermal tolerance than
37 samples from a high elevation site with comparatively stable temperatures, according to
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 Youle, R.J., van der Bliek, A.M., 2012. Mitochondrial fission, fusion, and stress. *Science*
60 337, 1062–1065.

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

Reference (this issue)	Type	Organism(s)	Scale(s)	Evolutionary topic	Finding
MITOCHONDRIAL GENETIC VARIATION					
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
MITOCHONDRIA, GERM LINE, AND SEX					
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
MITOCHONDRIA, ADAPTATION, AND PHENOTYPIC PLASTICITY					
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						