Absence of Figla-like Gene Is Concordant with Femaleness in Cichlids Harboring the LG1 Sex-Determination System
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Abstract: Oreochromis niloticus has been used as a reference genome for studies of tilapia sex determination (SD) revealing segregating genetic loci on linkage groups (LGs) 1, 3, and 23. The master key regulator genes (MKR) underlying the SD regions on LGs 3 and 23 have been already found. To identify the MKR in fish that segregate for the LG1 XX/XY SD-system, we applied short variant discovery within the sequence reads of the genomic libraries of the Amherst hybrid stock, Coptodon zillii and Sarotherodon galilaeus, which were aligned to a 3-Mbp-region of the O. aureus genome. We obtained 66,372 variants of which six were concordant with the XX/XY model of SD and were conserved across these species, disclosing the male specific figla-like gene. We further validated this observation in Oreochromis mossambicus and in the Chitralada hybrid stock. Genome alignment of the 1252-bp transcript showed that the figla-like gene’s size was 2664 bp, and that its three exons were capable of encoding 99 amino acids including a 45-amino-acid basic helix–loop–helix domain that is typical of the ovary development regulator—factor-in-the-germline-alpha (FIGLA). In Amherst gonads, the figla-like gene was exclusively expressed in testes. Thus, the figla-like genomic presence determines male fate by interrupting the female developmental program. This indicates that the figla-like gene is the long-sought SD MKR on LG1.
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1. Introduction

Genetic sex determination (SD) is principally driven by a single gene, a master key regulator (MKR), capable of turning on an alternative developmental program to that maintained in the homogametic state (XX or ZZ) [1–3]. Among vertebrates, fishes exhibit the most diverse SD mechanisms including genetic and environmental SD [4–6]. In most mammals, the same MKR gene controls an XX/XY SD system, i.e., the sex-determining region Y (SRY) [7,8]. Similarly in birds, a Z-linked dmrt1 is the common MKR utilized for the WZ/ZZ SD system [9,10]. However, different fish species have adopted different MKR genes to initiate the sex cascade, which determines the fate of the bipotential sex gonad [11]. During the last year, two new MKRs (bmpr1b and banf2w) have been suggested [12,13], in addition to ten SD MKRs detected previously [11]. In most cases in fishes, as in other vertebrates, Y and W differ from X and Z, respectively, in the number of copies and sequences [11,14]. Even for closely related fish species such as of the Oreochromis and Oryzias genera, different MKRs have been identified, thus elucidating the complexity of the SD network [15,16].
Showing high diversification of SD systems including XX/XY and WZ/ZZ genetic systems and environmental SD, African cichlids have gained interest as a model for adaptive radiation evolution [16,17]. Tilapia is considered the most economically important clade among cichlids. However, commercial farming of tilapia requires all-male progeny (AMP). This can be achieved by feeding fry with synthetic analogs of androgens [18,19], although, hormone use could constitute a hazard for health and the environment [18,20]. An alternate method for AMP is the breeding of YY “super males”, which can be performed by mating XY females from a sex-reversed population, with XY males [21,22]. However, this technology was not effective in our experiments, which utilized purebred species, due to the significantly lower sexual activity of YY males in comparison with XY males (data not shown). An alternative approach in tilapia is hybridization of different purebred Oreochromis species, such as O. aureus (On) males with O. niloticus (On) females [23–25]. Such crosses are defined as “all-male crosses” as they result in AMP, and the mechanism is assumed to be driven by the variability in the SD mechanisms of the parents. However, as in the case of the YY “super males” approach, this alternative was not practical for mass production because of low reproductive interactions between males and females of different species [19,26,27]. The mating of hybrids is an alternative for AMP in tilapia; by using fish of different SD systems, the reproductive behavioral barrier is avoided. Studies have reported crosses between Oa males and On females that have yielded hybrid couples, which reproduced under natural conditions and produced AMP [28]. The same mating scheme has been suggested through analysis of admixed stocks [19,29]. These results have indicated that the number of loci involved in the SD of Oa × On hybrids is restricted, and that the allelic patterns of the SD loci can be restored to that of the original purebred species, while maintaining reproductive interaction. Hence, understanding the SD mechanisms in tilapia purebred species and their hybrids is essential for the production of sustainable hormone-free AMP [19,28,29].

In general, purebred species of tilapia possess monofactorial SD systems such as WZ/ZZ and XX/XY [30,31]. Nevertheless, On, Oa, and their hybrids have been reported to segregate for three SD loci on LGs 1 [32,33], 3 [12,34], and 23 [14,35,36]. Purebred Oa and On have been reported to segregate for the SD systems on LGs 3 (WZ/ZZ) and 23 (XX/XY), respectively. Yet, the XX/XY SD system on LG1 was suggested to be a result of hybridization [14,19,37], which is in accordance with the autosomal theory suggesting that loci that were in the homozygous autosomal state of progenitors do segregate in hybrid offspring [38]. Another possibility is that the SD on LGs 1 and 3 have been introduced by additional Oreochromis species, due to contamination caused through aquaculture commercial processes and breeding programs [39–42]. However, some oppose the basic hypothesis that the SD is monofactorial in purebred tilapia species [39–41,43].

An additional complexity in cichlids is their equivocal taxonomy. As an example, Oa and Sarotherodon galilaeus (Sg), which are classified as two different tilapia genera, have a mitochondrial cox1 sequence difference lower than the minimal interspecies threshold of 1% [44–49]. Additionally, significant discrepancies have been detected in tilapias between mitochondrial and genomic phylogeny [50]. Three groups of cichlids (Oreochromis, Sarotherodon, and Coptodon) are classified based on spawning behavior and the way in which they carry fertilized eggs and embryos [51–53]. This classification does not always match barcoding by mitochondrial sequences, which is widely used for species classification.

The study of the XX/XY system on LG1 has become the principal focus of SD studies in tilapia [32,33,37,39,42,54–61]. Yet, the MKR underlying the SD region has not been discovered. This is in contrast with the two other MKR on LGs 3 and 23 that have been identified, i.e., barrier-to-autointegration-factor 2 (banf2) [12] and anti-Müllerian hormone (amh), respectively [14,35,36]. LG1 has gained interest as a unique SD locus that is involved in the SD of both hybrids of Oa × On [14,29] and of three purebred species O. mossambicus (Om), C. zillii (Cz) [57,62,63], and S. melanotheron (Sm) [54]. In contradiction to this, O. mossambicus was lately found to have an SD locus segregating on LG14 [57]. However, in a previous study, we found that the definition of Om is ambiguous, as two Barcode Index Numbers...
(BIN) identifiers in the BOLD taxonomy dataset are defined as Om [64]. One Om form (OmI), defined in the BOLD system (https://www.boldsystems.org, accessed on 10 July 2022) as BOLD: ADI0792, is currently maintained in the Agricultural Research Organization (Israel) and was established from fish, which originated in Natal (RSA) [65]. In OmI, the SD locus segregates on LG1 [62,63]. Yet, another form of Om (OmII), defined as BOLD: AAA8511, differs by 4% of the cox1 sequence from OmI. Undoubtedly, these sequence differences in cox1 barcodes indicate that the two forms of Om are in fact two different species [64] with two different segregating SD loci on different linkage groups (LGs 1 and 14).

The SD locus on LG1 has been detected by linkage and association studies of independent groups in a proximate similar region on the current genome build of On (Genome accession number: GCA_001858045.3), 24–27 Mbp (Figure 1) [19,29,42,58,60,61]. Initially, the SD region spanned between the GM201 and UNH995 microsatellite markers (Figure 1) [42]. Placed in this region, wtlb was suggested as a candidate SD MKR. Nonetheless, this candidacy was later rejected, as it was proven that wtlb was outside the narrowed SD region [58]. Using RAD sequencing, a few sex-linked SNPs (Oni61067, Oni23063, and Oni28137) were found by additional studies (Figure 1) [60,61]. Our group found that the two microsatellite markers BYL018 [19,29] and BYL012 (developed by Dr. Bo-Young Lee in Prof T.D. Kocher’s Lab) were almost completely linked with sex in fish stocks, which segregate for LG1 only. Whole genome sequencing (WGS) and gonad transcriptome are available for descendants of a commercial On strain from Amherst (As), which segregates on LG1 [32,33]. The On genomic map has been available for use as a reference for the study of LG1 for many years [17], whereas the Oa genome has only recently been published [34].

Figure 1. Genetic markers (red) and genes (blue) previously linked with sex on LG1. Positions (Mbp) of genes and genetic markers on the current On genomic map build (Genome accession number: GCA_001858045.3) are denoted. Gene symbols of genes mentioned in this article are indicated below or above the bars that delineate their positions.

The failure to detect an MKR may be related to the reference genome utilized. It is well-established that LG1 segregates in O. aureus × O. niloticus hybrids [14,29]. To find the LG1 MKR that segregates in multiple cichlid species and their hybrids, in this study, we chose to analyze the critical SD region on LG1, using the Oa genome instead of the On reference genome. Using WGS data from genomic libraries of three tilapia species, which have been reported to segregate for SD on LG1, we investigated the SD critical region. Only one cross-species coding variation determining maleness was observed, in the form of the figla-like gene, which is in the orthologous SD region of LG1 on the Oa genome. Different cichlid species and tilapia commercial stocks were tested to validate the WGS data results and to investigate whether figla-like segregates as an SD MKR in purebred tilapias and hybrids.

2. Results

2.1. Comparison of the SD Region of LG1 in As, Cz, and Sm

To analyze the critical SD region of LG1, we aligned the WGS data to Oa genome (Genome accession number: GCA_013358895.1). We used six genomic libraries of strains and species, which were found previously to segregate for sex on LG1. These included As, Cz, and Sm pools of females and males. Following the Genome Analysis Toolkit (GATK) best-practices workflows of the Broad Institute, we applied short variant discovery within the sequence reads of these genomic libraries and recorded the variants in a Variant Call Format (VCF) text file (Table S1). For the critical sex region (25.4–28.7 Mbp on the Oa map,
Table S2), we obtained 66,372 variants before filtering. Six sites of sequence variation were concordant with the XY model, for all three analyzed fish species (Table 1).

Table 1. Sequence variations in the SD region on the O. aureus genomic map, which fit an XY model in Amherst strain (As), S. melanotheron (Sm), and C. zillii (Cz).

| Position 3 | REF 4 | ALT  | As F | M | Sm F | M | Cz F | M | Region | 5’ End | 3’ End |
|------------|-------|------|------|---|------|---|------|---|--------|--------|--------|
| 25,672,475 | C     | T, G | 0/0  | 0/1| 0/0  | 0/2| 0/0  | 0/1| depdc7a exon 8 |
| 26,488,670 | T     | A    | 1/1  | 0/1| 1/1  | 0/1| 1/1  | 0/1| intergenic csmd1 figla-like |
| 26,490,716 | G     | C    | ./.  | ./.| ./.  | ./.| ./.  | 1/1| figla-like exon 2 |
| 26,490,863 | C     | T    | ./.  | ./.| ./.  | ./.| ./.  | 1/1| figla-like intron 2 |
| 26,509,215 | A     | C    | 0/0  | 0/1| 0/0  | 0/1| 0/0  | 0/1| intergenic figla-like chs1 |
| 26,510,329 | C     | *, T | 0/0  | 0/1| 0/0  | 0/2| 0/0  | 0/1| intergenic figla-like chs1 |

1 The SD interval was chosen for analysis based on synteny with the reference O. niloticus genome. 2 The Sm definition is according to depositors of the library; however, this is challenged in paragraph 2.5. 3 In bp on the Oa map. 4 0—reference allele (REF, O. aureus), 1—alternative (ALT) allele, 2—alternative allele, ./.—null call, M—males, F—females. A, C, G, T and *—adenine, cytosine, guanine, thymine, and deletion, respectively.

Two sites of variation fitting a model of a null allele on the “X” chromosome were mapped to a predicted figla-like gene (LOC116310109, positions 26,490,716 and 26,490,863). Another three sites of sequence variation that are in accordance with a heterozygous state in males (XY) and a homozygous state in females (XX) were mapped to the intergenic regions that separate the figla-like gene from its two predicted gene neighbors, CUB and sushi domain-containing protein 1 (csmd1) and chitin synthase 1 (chs1) (Figure 1). At position 25,672,475, an additional heterozygous three-allelic variation in males was mapped to an exon of DEP domain containing 7, paralog a gene (depdc7a). However, these genotypes displayed synonymous changes, and although the variation varied between males and females for all species, the male genotypes were not conserved across species.

Visualization of the alignment with Integrative Genomics Viewer (IGV) (Figure S1) revealed that the region of figla-like was male specific, and had no aligned reads in females. Thus, we designated figla-like as “γ” in these species, and its absence as “x” (lowercase distinguishes the xx/xy SD system on LG1 from the On XX/XY SD system on LG23). Using the Gap5 software, we assembled the whole gene sequence of the figla-like gene for As, Sm, and Cz (nucleotide accession numbers: OX031319, OW742804, and OW742498); this had a three-exon genomic organization, in keeping with the predicted reference transcript (Table 2). The predicted proteins from our assembly contained 99 amino acids and shared a 45-amino-acid homologous basic helix–loop–helix (bHLH) domain with the Figla gene from different fish and mammalian species (Figure 2a).

Table 2. Genomic organization of the figla-like gene in O. aureus.

| Intron 1 | Exon no. | Size | Intron | Size |
|--------|-----------|------|--------|------|
| ...TCCAGCCATGAACC | 1 | 174 | TCGAAGCGgtagta | 1290 |
| ttcagATCAGAAA | 2 | 147 | TGAAGCTtagta | 122 |
| atttagGATGAAG | 3 | 931 | CAGTCCTTAATG ... |

1 Intron and exon sequences are written in lowercase and uppercase letters, respectively. The first and last two bases of the introns are presented in bold type (gt and ag for donor and acceptor splice sites, respectively). The initiation and stop codons are shown in bold and underlined. Considering the predicted transcript (Nucleotide accession number: XM_031726851.2), the genomic size of the figla-like gene was 2664 bp.
Figure 2. Protein sequence and phylogenetic tree of the figla-like gene. (a) An alignment of the predicted proteins encoded by figla-like and figla proteins. The alignment includes five shorter polypeptides, which are of figla-like protein groups (G1–4). Protein group G1 (blue) consists of the identical polypeptides of C. zillii (Cz) (Nucleotide accession number: OW742498) and S. galilaeus (Sg) (Nucleotide accession number: OW742804). Protein group G2 (red) consists of the identical polypeptides of O. urolepis hornorum (Oh) (Nucleotide accession number: OW740593) and O. mossambicus (Oml) (Nucleotide accession number: OW739941). Protein group G3 (green) consists of the identical polypeptides of Chitrudala strain (Cs) (Nucleotide accession number: OW739608), O. aureus genomic build (LOC116310109), O. aureus from Ein-Feshka (Oa Ein-Feshka) (Nucleotide accession number: OW770257), and Anherst strain (As) (Nucleotide accession number: OX031319). O. tanganicae (Ot, green) (Nucleotide accession number: OW739839) is shown out of G3, as its sequence differs by an additional D residue. P. mariae (Pm, purple) (Nucleotide accession number: OW742294) is the only member in G4. The alignment also includes three partial figla polypeptides for Oa (Protein accession number: XP_039476449.1), Danio rerio (Dre) (Protein accession number: NP_944601.2), and Mus musculus (Mm) (Protein accession number: NP_036143.1). Dashes indicate gaps introduced by the alignment program. Identical amino-acid residues in at least four of eight sequences are indicated by a black background. White boxes indicate nonconservative amino-acid changes between the proteins, whereas gray boxes indicate conservative changes. The black line represents the position of a 45-long basic helix-loop-helix (bHLH) domain found in factor-in-the-germline-alpha (FIGLA) proteins. The amino-acid numbering follows that of the full alignment of figla with figla-like genes (Figure S2). Below, exon–intron boundaries are delineated. (b, c) Comparison between the phylogenetic trees of figla-like predicted proteins and barcode cox1 DNA sequences. The trees were generated by MEGAX [66] using the Maximum Likelihood method using models with the best Bayesian information criterion (BIC) levels and default setting (5 categories, +G, parameter = 0.2071). Numbers at tree junctions indicate the percentage of trees that correspond to the consensus bootstrap tree (500 replicates) using MUSCLE. (b) JTT matrix-based model with a discrete Gamma distribution was used to model evolutionary rate differences among the figla-like predicted proteins. The scale on the X-axis represents the distance in number of amino-acid substitutions per site. (c) Hasegawa–Kishino–Yano model discrete Gamma distribution [67] was used to study evolutionary rate differences among the mitochondrial DNA sequences. The scale on the X-axis represents the distance in number of nucleotide substitutions per site. Barcode sequences and accession numbers of O. niloticus (On) of Egyptian and Ghanaian origin and of others are provided in the Supplementary Materials (Table S3).
2.2. Expression of the Figla-like Gene

Pooled male (n = 58, SRA accession number: SRX727305) and pooled female (n = 33, SRA accession number: SRX727306) fish from As (45 days posthatch) have been previously used for comparing expression in gonads between sexes [32,33]. We aligned the expression data (100 bp reads) from males and females to the Oa predicted figla-like gene using the Gap5 wrapper and the BWA program [68] and found that this gene was exclusively expressed in males. The average read coverage for this alignment was 86-fold, and the RPKM value was 7.6. We also found figla-like gene expression in the expressed sequence tag (EST) database. Expression (>99% identity) was observed in the tilapia adult testis library (2 ESTs, GR703512, GR699597) and in the tilapia adult stomach library (2 ESTs, GR695460, GR693262). These ESTs indicated that the 3’ end of the figla-like transcript is longer than was predicted (Table 2).

2.3. The Figla-like Gene Is Male-Specific in Different Purebred Species and Hybrids of Tilapia

As the male specific figla-like gene was found on LG1 of the Oa genome, and it was absent from the On genome, we compared the LG1 of both species and developed a duplex PCR-based assay, which detects both forms, i.e., LG1y and LG1x (Figure S3, Table 3). The LG1y marker spanned the figla-like second intron, whereas the LG1x marker amplified the orthologous position in On, which lacked the figla-like gene (Table 3, Figure S3). Using this assay in different On strains (On Swansea and Ghana) and in Oa samples (Ein-Feshkha strain), we validated that the On PCR product designated as “x” (LG1x) was only amplified in On, and that the Oa PCR product designated as “y” (LG1y) was only amplified in Oa (Table 4). Sanger sequencing was used to validate the amplified fragment sequence origin. In addition, we tested this assay in females and males from three samples of two additional species, Oml and Sg, which are known to segregate for SD on LG1 (for Sg, LG1 SD is reported in paragraph 2.5) [54,62,63]. Validated by Sanger sequencing, a fragment homologous to On LG1x was found in all samples, whereas the LG1y fragment was found only in males of both species (Table 4). In two Oml families, complete concordance of sex with the xx/xy model was observed. In Sg, a single discrepancy of a male lacking a figla-like gene was found (Table 4). Using the LG1y/LG1x probe sequences, we further confirmed the male specificity of the figla-like gene in pooled male and female samples of Cz and As (Table 4). In addition, we tested figla-like concordance with sex in a family of the Chitralada strain (Cs), which is a hybrid of at least three species, Oa, On, and Oml [64]. This family’s sex was partially explained by the segregation of the SD locus on LG1 using the microsatellite marker BYL018 and the figla-like assay with complete linkage between the two. Only two females had an xy genotype, whereas all other 23 samples segregated for sex according to the xx/xy model (Table 4).

Table 3. Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) primers for generation of amplicons for fragment analysis and resequencing of the figla-like gene in S. galilaeus (Sg) and the Chitralada strain (Cs).

| Marker | Primers | Assay | GenBank Accession | Positions | Amplicon Size (bp) |
|-------|---------|-------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| LG1y  | F: AACCAAGCCAAAATGTGAGC  
        R: CATTCACTTGCCAGAGGTCA | Duplex fragment analysis | LOC116310109 | 1520 1821 | 302 |
|       |         |       |                   |           |                   |
| LG1x  | F: TCTGTGAAGCACTTTGGCATA  
        R: CTGCACCTCCTCCAATGTTT | Duplex fragment analysis | NC_031965.2 | 24,979,876 24,980,010 | 135 |
|       |         |       |                   |           |                   |
| Reseq1| F: CTTGACCTGGCCTTGAGTTT  
        R: AAAATAACAGCCAATACATCTGTT | Resequencing of Sg and Cs | NC_031965.2 | 26,489,072 26,490,461 | 1390 |
Table 3. Cont.

| Marker | Primers | Assay                  | GenBank Accession | Positions Start | Positions End | Amplicon Size (bp) |
|--------|---------|------------------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Reseq2 | F AAAACCAAACAAGGTCACAATTC | Resequencing of Sg and Cs | NC_031965.2       | 26,490,237     | 26,491,052        | 816               |
|        | R CATTTCAGGACTGACAGCAA    |                        |                   |                |               |                   |
| Reseq3 | F TGACCTCTGGCAAGTGAATG    | Resequencing of Sg     | ERZ9148259        | 1556           | 2526            | 971               |
|        | R ATGCCTGGACTGCAAACAAG    |                        |                   |                |               |                   |
| Reseq4 | F TGACCTCTGGCAAGTGAATG    | Resequencing of Cs     | NC_031965.2       | 26,490,991     | 26,491,772        | 782               |
|        | R GCCGAGCAGAGCCTAGTTTA    |                        |                   |                |               |                   |

Table 4. Association of sex with the figla-like sequence in two O. mossambicus (OmI) families, S. galilacus (Sg), C. zillii (Cz), and Amherst (As) and Chitralada (Cs) strains.

| Species | Genotype | Females | Males | p-Value |
|---------|----------|---------|-------|---------|
|OmI Family 1|xy|0|8|0.0002|
|xx|7|0| |

| OmI Family 2|xy|0|8|0.0003|
|xx|6|0| |

| Sg | xy|0|15|0.0001|
|xx|18|1| |

| Cz 3 | xy|0|9|<0.0001|
|xx|13|0| |

| As 4 | xy|0|58|<0.0001|
|xx|33|0| |

| Cs 5 | xy|2|11|0.0001|
|xx|12|0| |

1 xx and xy genotypes correspond to LG1x/LG1x and LG1x/LG1y, respectively (Table 3, Figure S3).
2 Fisher’s exact test.
3 Electronic PCR based on pooled samples, SRA accession numbers: SRX3638079 and SRX3638078.
4 Electronic PCR based on pooled samples, SRA accession numbers: SRX726489 and SRX726488.
5 Identical results were obtained using marker BYL108.

2.4. Origin Validation of Species and Strains by Cox1 Sequence

To confirm the origin of species and strains of each library, we assembled the cox1 barcode sequence, which is the standard for species identification using the BOLD system. The As barcode was identical to the barcode of Om (Figure 2c), which suggested a hybrid origin of As, explaining the LG1 SD system segregation in this strain despite its annotation as On by depositors. The barcode of the Sm libraries (SRA accession numbers: SRX1740812 and SRX1740810) had only 0.32% difference from our Sg samples. Thus, we concluded that it is likely that these Sm libraries have been misidentified and are in fact Sg; hence, it is Sg and not Sm that segregates for the LG1 SD system. In addition, we analyzed barcodes from other Sg libraries (SRA accession numbers: SRX9968999, SRX4456733, SRX4456732, SRX4456729, SRX4456726, SRX4456723, SRX4456721, SRX4018194, SRX4018193, and SRX4018191). In these ten libraries, we detected four variants of barcodes with a maximal difference of 0.81% between them, which does not exceed the expected interspecies threshold [44–49]. Indeed, one of the barcode variants was identical to the misidentified Sm library. Including two resources [69,70] with a similar barcode (differences < 1%) in GenBank, the comparison of the trusted Sm barcode sequences showed that the difference between the Sg and Sm barcodes was more than 4.5%. This further supports the misclassification of Sg as Sm.
2.5. Figla-like Gene and Barcode Sequence Comparison

Using the WGS data and Sanger resequencing of the figla-like gene (Table 3), we assembled the whole figla-like sequence (Table 2) and compared the predicted protein sequences of the figla-like gene for the different species (Figure 2a,b). The Figla-like protein sequence was conserved, and there were only a few differences between cichlid species. Pm was the most divergent species, having five variations from its closest species Ot (Figure 2a). We observed four distinct Figla-like protein groups (G), i.e., G1: Sg, Cz; G2: Om, Oh; G3: Oa, As, Cs, Ot; and G4: Pm (Figure 2b,c). The members of each group had identical proteins, except for Ot from G3, which differed from the other members of this group by the number of aspartic acid residues in a polyaspartate position (Figure 2a). As the differences on the protein level were low, we compared the nucleotide sequences of the figla-like gene. Yet, the differences within the different groups were still negligible. Within groups 1 to 3, the differences in the nucleotide sequences did not exceed 0.18%, 0.07%, and 0.18%, respectively. However, without Ot, the nucleotide differences of the G3 members, i.e., Oa, As, and Cs, did not exceed 0.11%. This is in line with the hypothesis that based on the figla-like sequences, As and Cs originated from Oa following hybridization. Between groups (G 1 to 3), the nucleotide differences were 0.5–1.5%, indicating high sequence conservation of the figla-like gene. The two members of G1 are relatively distant species according to classical taxonomy. Indeed, the distances of G1 based on the figla-like gene and barcode sequences were contradictory (Figure 2c). According to the barcode sequence, Ot was closely related to Oml and Oh, whereas their figla-like genes clustered in different clades (Figure 2c). In addition, the phylogenetic tree of barcodes showed a complex situation for Oa, which did not cluster with other members of the Oreochromis genus and seemed to be closer to Sarotherodon (Figure 2c).

2.6. The Figla-like Gene in Sarotherodon and Coptodon

Among 37 libraries of species from the Sarotherodon and Coptodon genera, which were deposited in GenBank (Table S3), we only found the figla-like gene in Sg and Cz. Using both a 147 bp probe representing Exon 2 from Sg and Cz and the NCBI BLASTN algorithm, we did not find hits in 22 Sarotherodon and 15 Coptodon genomic libraries, even though some of these libraries were referred to as males (SRA accession numbers: SRX7645639, SRX7645637, SRX6434288, and SRX6435742) (Table S3). We only detected the figla-like gene in a Sarotherodon lamprochti library (SRA accession number: SRX4456739). However, assembly of the barcode and the figla-like gene of this library confirmed it was, in fact, an Sg sample.

3. Discussion

In this study, we observed that the absence of the figla-like gene is concordant with femaleness across cichlids with an LG1 SD system, including Oml, Sg, Cz, and certain families isolated from the commercial As and Cs hybrid stocks. In gonads of these As families, we found figla-like gene expression exclusively in testes. The figla gene has a germ cell-specific basic helix-loop–helix (bHLH) domain, and it is a known vertebrate ovarian factor required for ovarian follicle formation [71–74]. In mice, figla simultaneously suppresses testicular genes and activates many oocyte genes [75,76]. The dimorphic regulation of figla is critical for the formation and maturation of primordial follicles. Moreover, similar findings have also been observed in On, where Figla plays an essential role in the development and maintenance of the ovary and in suppression of spermatogenesis [77,78]. However, in this study, we showed that in the abovementioned cichlids, the bHLH domain containing the figla-like gene was involved in male determination. Indeed, it has already been shown, for SD based on dmrt1, that the sex-specific paralog may have an opposing function in the determination of male or female sex [10,79–81]. A possible opposite function has also been suggested in Oa for banf2w, which is a paralog of banf2 [12], and for the figla paralogs in tongue sole (Cynoglossus semilaevis) [82]. As in tongue sole, the figla-like gene may be involved in regulating the synthesis and metabolism of steroid hormones, which
are required for male determination. However, the figla-like sequence is capable of encoding a relative short peptide, and thus is unlikely to perform complex functions as figla does; yet, it is possible that it can drive sex by regulating or competing with its figla paralog (Figure 3). Thus, the figla-like genomic absence is compatible with a female developmental program, whereas its presence interrupts female development, thus determining male fate. This strongly indicates that the figla-like gene is the long-sought SD MKR on LG1.

![Figure 3. Proposed model of the sex related genes’ expression during LG1-driven gonad differentiation.](image)

| Gene     | Ratio at 45 dpf ovary/testis |
|----------|------------------------------|
| figla    | 2.14                         |
| nobox    | 1.89                         |
| sox9a    | 4.12                         |
| taf4b    | 1.77                         |
| gdf9     | 2.21                         |
| figla like | 0.00                        |
| sox9a    | 0.13                         |
| dmrt1    | 0.09                         |
| amh      | 0.06                         |
| wt1a     | 0.21                         |
| gsdnf    | 0.08                         |
| sf-1     | 0.29                         |

The discovery of the figla-like gene as a candidate MKR for SD was made feasible by using the Oa reference genome instead of the Om genome, which has been used in previous studies, but lacks the figla-like gene. As many as 66,372 sequence variants were obtained using the short variant discovery pipeline, which was performed on the LG1 SD’s critical region using meta-analysis of WGS from multiple cichlids. Our strategy assumed that the causative variant was conserved in all cichlid species, which segregate for the LG1 XX/XY SD system. The criterion of conservation across species narrowed the search for the causative sequence to six variants, localized in or in the vicinity of the figla-like gene (Table 1).

Examination of the genetic relationship between the different cichlid species was based on the figla-like sequence or the mitochondrial barcode. The figla-like sequence was consistent with the genus definition of Oa, as it groups separately from Sarotherodon. However, Sarotherodon and Coptodon, which are very distant according to their barcode sequences, had similar figla-like sequences. According to its barcode sequence, Ot is in close relation to OmI and Oh. However, Ot’s figla-like sequence clustered it with Oa (Figure 2b,c). Surprising results for barcodes have already been shown previously [47,50]. It would be expected that Oa, which belongs to the Oreochromis genus, would cluster in a phylogenetic tree with other Oreochromis species; nevertheless, it clustered with Sarotherodon. It was also noted that, in some instances, clustering by barcodes seemed to be more consistent with the common geography [47]. Barcode sequences revealed that OmI (Figure S4) and OmnII were different species that were mistakenly referred to as one. Although barcodes only reflect maternal genetic contribution, in this study, they revealed erroneous definitions and
faulty origins of species. However, it is puzzling that distant cichlid species segregated for a similar MKR for SD (\textit{Sg} and \textit{Cz}, or \textit{Oa} and \textit{Pm}), whereas closely related species such as \textit{Oa} and \textit{On} segregated for others. It is possible that during speciation there were gene flows between species before mating barriers were fully established [85]. Such flows of the \textit{figla-like} gene or of the mitochondrion might break their genetic linkage explaining the inconsistency between phylogenetic trees generated by their sequences.

In previous studies [12,14], we concluded that three different LGs, i.e., 1, 3, and 23 are involved in the SD of \textit{Oa}, \textit{On}, and their hybrids. Of these, LGs 3 and 23 segregate in purebred \textit{Oa} and \textit{On}, respectively. In the present study, we indicate a candidate gene for a third MKR for SD, \textit{figla-like} on LG1 (Table 5). We assumed that the \textit{figla-like} gene is associated with SD following hybridization in two hybrid strains (\textit{Cs} and \textit{As}) and is presumably also an original MKR for SD of three purebred cichlid species (\textit{Cz}, \textit{Sg}, and \textit{Oml}). The hybrid origin of \textit{Cs} and \textit{As} strains was supported by the fact that \textit{Cs} stock included three types of mitochondrial barcodes that were identical to those of \textit{Oa}, \textit{On}, and \textit{Oml} [64], and that the \textit{As} strain carries an \textit{Oa} barcode, even though it has been referred to as \textit{On} by depositors (SRA accession numbers: SRX726489 and SRX726488). Moreover, the sequence of the \textit{figla-like} gene of \textit{As} and \textit{Cs} was highly similar to that of \textit{Oa}, thus indicating the possible role of hybridization in the creation of the MKR. The involvement of genes in tilapia SD has been previously predicted to occur only after hybridization by the autosomal theory [30,38]. This simplistic polygenic theory is able to explain most of the experimental results, assuming that sex is determined by the sum of the effects of three alleles (\(W, X, Y\), where \(Y = Z\)) of a major sex-determining locus and two alleles (\(A, a\)) of an autosomal locus. The original \textit{Oa} and \textit{On} homozygous states are designated as “aa” and “AA”, respectively, and affect SD following hybridization but not in in the purebred species. We preferred to use “x” and “y” and not “aa” and “AA” following the proposed involvement of the \textit{figla-like} gene as the MKR on LG1 in purebred \textit{Cz}, \textit{Sg}, and \textit{Oml} (Table 5). Thus, here, our findings are explained by a monofactorial system in \textit{Oa}, \textit{On}, and \textit{Oml} and other cichlids. Even though some exceptions have been found suggesting multiple SD systems in a single species [40], they should be treated with caution in view of admixture in aquaculture [86–89].

Table 5. The schematic allelic state of the SD systems for LGs 1, 3 and 23 in \textit{O. niloticus} and \textit{O. aureus} \(^1\).

| Linkage Group | Sex | 1 | 3 | 23 |
|---------------|-----|---|---|----|
| **Species/Proposed SD MKR** | **Figla-like (y)** | **Banf2 (W)** | **Amh\(\Delta\)Y (Y)** |
| \textit{O. niloticus} | Male | xx | ZZ | XY |
| | Female | xx | ZZ | XX |
| \textit{O. aureus} | Male | yy | ZZ | XX |
| Female | yy | WZ | XX |

\(^1\) This table also integrates our previously published results [12,14].

As \textit{On} lacks the \textit{figla-like} sequence in LG1, hybrids of the first generation between homogametic purebred \textit{Oa} males (yy/ZZ/XX for LGs 1, 3 and 23) and \textit{On} females (xx/ZZ/XX) result in AMP with a uniform genotype (xy/ZZ/XX), thus being heterozygous only for the \textit{figla-like} gene on LG1 (Table 5). Furthermore, according to this minimal genetic model, \textit{On} xx/ZZ/XX carriers were females as the MKRs for the three SD loci (\textit{figla-like}, \textit{banf2w}, and \textit{amh\(\Delta\)Y}) were missing; thus, the developmental program of the female was not altered. In hybrids, this genetic model predicts three possible combinations in each of the three SD loci that form 27 possible genotypes. This may explain why it is difficult to restore AMP production using admixed parental stocks in the absence of an effective assay for genotyping all SD loci. Moreover, the definitions of XX/XY or WZ/ZZ systems are viable only for monofactorial SD systems. Here, we provide a valuable assay that allows simple detection of all three possible genotypes of
LGs 1, 3, and 23 for SD in multiple species (Figure S3). The reliability of this molecular assay stems from the cross-species sequence conservation.

Knockout of amh in On by CRISPR/Cas9 confirmed its involvement in On’s SD [36]. In zebrafish, disruption of the figla gene by CRISPR/Cas9 led to an all-male phenotype in the mutant [90]. Thus, our suggested candidate gene for the MKR for the SD for LG1, i.e., figla-like could be further validated using transgenic fish manipulated by genomic editing with CRISPR/Cas9 or by other methods such as TALEN and antisense RNA [36,91–93].

4. Materials and Methods

4.1. Fish

The purebred Oa specimens from local natural resources (Ein-Feshkha nature reserve), and the On specimens from different introduced strains (Ghana and Swansea) have been previously described [14]. The families of Oml were reared in the Volcani Institute of Agriculture from fish, which originated from Natal (RSA) [65]. Cs and the families used in this study were reared in the Dor Research Station from a stock described previously [64]. Sg specimens were reared in the Ginosar Research Station, which has a breeding stock of Sg used for populating the Sea of Galilee on an annual basis [94]. Cz samples were retrieved from a previous study [47].

4.2. Comparison of the SD Region among On Amherst, Cz, and Sm Strains

The following genomic libraries were used for alignment of the WGS data to the LG1 of Oa’s genome map (Genome accession number: GCA_013358895.1) and for variant calling: On pools of females and males, designated SRA accession numbers: SRX726489 and SRX726488, respectively; Cz pools of females and males, designated SRA accession numbers: SRX3638079 and SRX3638078, respectively; Sm pools of females and males with SRA accession numbers: SRX1740812 and SRX1740810, respectively. These alignments and variant callings were performed using best practices of GATK4 [95]. The resulting VCF (Table S1) was filtered for variants, which could fit three different models of an XX/XY SD system in all three species: (a) variants that were homozygous in females and heterozygous in males, representing a “Y” chromosome that had a different allele to that of the “X” chromosome; (b) variants that were missing in females and were homozygous in males, representing a locus that was absent from the “X” chromosome; and (c) variants that were homozygous in males and heterozygous in females, representing a locus that was absent from the “Y” chromosome. In addition, the SD region for analysis was based on mapping by previous studies between 24 and 27 Mbp in On [42,58,60,61], which is orthologous by synteny to the respective region 25.4 and 28.7 Mbp in Oa (Table S2).

4.3. Assembly of the Figla-like Gene and Barcode Sequences in Different Species

Assembly of the whole figla-like gene was performed for all male libraries described above and for a male library of Oml (SRA accession number: ERX3541585), which were all validated by assembly of their barcode sequences. In addition, we assembled the genomic nucleotide sequences of figla-like in cichlid fish that segregated a WZ/ZZ system on LG3: Ot (SRA accession number: SRX6434465), Oh (SRA accession number: ERX4446013), Oa from Ein-Feshkha (SRA accession number: ERX2240357), and Pm (SRA accession number: SRX3638080). We also assembled the barcode sequence of these libraries to verify their origin. The Gap5 [68] wrapper and the BWA program were used for alignment of reads against the predicted Oa figla-like gene (LOC116310109) and the barcode of On, respectively. A consensus sequence was predicted using read pairs data and was used for further BLASTN-searching, obtaining and aligning the reads, until the complete gene structure was constructed. To deduce the figla-like exon–intron borders, we used the mRNA data of As and assembled the figla-like transcript from males (SRA accession number: SRX727305). We also tested the alignment of As females (SRA accession number: SRX727306) to negate the expression of the figla-like gene in females.
4.4. Amplifying and Resequencing of Figla-like and LG1x Sequences

Based on the assembled Ou and Sm figla-like sequence (which was later confirmed as Sg) and the LG1x sequence from the On genomic map (Genome accession number: GCA_001858045.3), using Primer3 [96], the primers were designed to resequence the full or partial figla-like gene, the LG1x fragment in samples of Sg, Cz (Cz samples from a previous study were not phenotyped for sex), Oml, Oa, On, and the Cs hybrid strain, and for testing association between the figla-like gene and sex in families of Oml, Cs, and Sg specimens (Table 3). PCR was performed using MyTaq™ HS Red Mix (Bioline Ltd., London, UK) according to the manufacturer’s instructions under the following conditions: 36 cycles for 30 s at 94 °C, 30 sec at 60 °C, and 60 s at 72 °C. Thereafter, the PCR products were separated in a 1–2% agarose gel stained with ethidium bromide. Following excision from the gel, Sanger sequencing was conducted from both directions of the purified products (Montage Gel Extraction, Millipore, Bedford, MA, USA). The diagnostic markers used for testing association (Table 3) were sequenced in the same way for at least two individuals of each species/strain to validate the PCR results. The microsatellite marker BYL018 was used for genotyping the Cs family as previously published [19].

4.5. Sequence Alignments and Phylogenetic Analysis

The protein sequences were aligned with ClustalW (http://clustalw.genome.jp, accessed on 10 July 2022), using the default settings and the BLOSUM matrix. The graphical image of the multiple alignment was made using BoxShade (https://manpages.ubuntu.com/manpages/jammy/man1/boxshade.1.html, accessed on 10 July 2022). Phylogenetic trees of the Figla-like predicted-protein sequences and the cox1 genes for different specimens were generated by MEGAX [66] using the Maximum Likelihood method and JTT matrix-based model. A discrete Gamma distribution was used to model evolutionary rate differences among sites with 5 categories (+G, parameter = 0.2071), and bootstrap analysis (500 replicates) was performed after alignment using MUSCLE. The model was chosen based on the comparison of Bayesian information criterion (BIC) levels for different models, using the MEGAX find best model option. Similarly, the cox1 phylogenetic tree was generated using the Maximum Likelihood method and the Hasegawa–Kishino–Yano model [67].

4.6. Electronic PCR

Using nucleotide probes (Tables S4 and S5), we conducted a BLASTN search in GenBank with a 64-word size against SRA libraries (Section 4.2). The number of hits was documented, and for expression analysis, RPKM was calculated (Tables S4 and S5). A minimal limit of at least three reads was set as the detection threshold in genomic libraries. Following detection in the genomic libraries, the electronic PCR results for the figla-like gene (Table 4) were based on the number of samples reported by the depositors for each of the male and female pools described Section 4.2.

4.7. Statistics

The JMP© statistical package (Pro 13, SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA) was used for conducting Fisher’s exact test, which was applied for testing the association of the figla-like gene and sex.
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