MISS HANNE DE KORT (Orcid ID : 0000-0003-2516-0134)

Article type : Original Article

Ecological divergence of wild strawberry DNA methylation patterns at distinct spatial scales

Running head: Epigenetic divergence across spatial scales

H. De Kort^{1*}, B. Panis², D. Deforce³, F. Van Nieuwerburgh³, O. Honnay¹

* **Correspondence to:** hanne.dekort@kuleuven.be, +32 (0)16 32 15 20

¹ Plant Conservation and Population Biology, University of Leuven, Kasteelpark Arenberg 31-2435, BE-3001 Leuven, Belgium.

² Bioversity International, K.U. Leuven, 3001 Leuven, Belgium

³ Laboratory of Pharmaceutical Biotechnology, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

Word count: 5459 (Introduction 1218; Methods 1443; Results 1014; Discussion 1784)

Figures: 7 (all colour)

Tables: 0

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1111/mec.15689](https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.15689)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

Abstract

Epigenetic change is considered relatively unstable and short-lived, which questions its contribution to long-term adaptive potential. However, epigenetic modifications can accumulate in the presence of environmental stress, resulting in beneficial epigenetic memories where environments are challenging. Diverging epigenetic memories have been observed across large spatial scales, and can persist through multiple generations. It is unknown, however, to what extent epigenetic variation contributes to fine-scale population structure and evolution. We compared DNA methylation patterns between a steep, altitudinal gradient (<2 km) and a wide spatial gradient (>500 km) using whole genome bisulfite sequencing data from 30 *Fragaria vesca* plants germinated and grown in controlled conditions. To assess the stability of spatial epigenetic variation in the presence of an environmental stressor, we applied acute drought stress to part of the plants and quantified drought-induced changes in DNA methylation signatures. We find that epigenetic memories and genomic islands of epigenetic divergence arise even at fine spatial scale, and that distinct spatial scales are featured by distinct epigenetic patterns. For example, demethylation of transposable elements consistently occurred at the large but not the fine spatial scale, while methylation differentiation for most biological processes were shared between spatial scales. Acute drought stress did not result in significant epigenetic differentiation. Our results indicate that population history, rather than short-term environmental stress, plays a dominant role in shaping epigenetic signatures. Specifically, repeated historical stress levels associated with heterogeneous environmental conditions may be required for acquiring a stable epigenetic memory and for coping with future environmental change.

Key-words: epigenetic memory, DNA methylation, landscape genetics, non-genetic inheritance, phenotypic plasticity

1. INTRODUCTION

Genetic variation underlying fitness traits is considered the dominant resource upon which plants depend for evolving under environmental change. Driven by drift, mutation and migration, such genetic variation supplies populations with trait values that support local fitness and adaptive potential. However, although it is widely assumed that adaptive phenotypic variation is mainly regulated by the underlying genetic architecture, only small proportions of the total phenotypic variation observed in many species have been associated with genetic variants (Krishna Kumar *et al.* 2016; Wellenreuther & Hansson 2016; Resende *et al.* 2017). The remaining phenotypic variation, typically referred to as missing heritability, can be roughly attributed to (i) the detection limits of rare genetic variants and genetic interactions, and (ii) heritable epigenetic variation (Brachi *et al.* 2011; Miska & Ferguson-Smith 2016; Whipple & Holeski 2016; Gienapp *et al.* 2017; Banta & Richards 2018).

The role of epigenetic variation in governing adaptive evolution remains controversial, yet a growing body of literature demonstrates the ubiquity of transgenerational epigenetic transmission, and consequently considers it as a key evolutionary force (Gugger *et al.* 2016; Miska & Ferguson-Smith 2016; Quadrana & Colot 2016; Lind & Spagopoulou 2018; Schmid *et al.* 2018; Zhang *et al.* 2018; Danchin *et al.* 2019). Non-random epigenetic variation in DNA methylation levels has been shown to be widespread in natural populations, and to co-vary with a range of environmental stressors, including herbivory, drought, salt and temperature (Foust *et al.* 2016; Jeremias *et al.* 2018; Alonso *et al.* 2019; Gáspár *et al.* 2019). While most stress-induced methylation changes are reset to basal levels after stress relief, part of these modifications can be stably inherited across mitotic and even meiotic cell divisions (Chinnusamy & Zhu 2009; Crisp *et al.* 2016). Such an epigenetic stress memory may allow plants to cope more effectively with subsequent stresses, thereby evoking considerable fitness benefits in heterogeneous environments (Crisp *et al.* 2016; Hilker *et al.* 2016). Unraveling the relative extent of intra-generational epigenetic change resulting from acute environmental stress vs. relatively stable transgenerational epigenetic memories may contribute to our understanding of how plants rely on their epigenetic machinery for coping with environmental change.

How selection pressures affect genome-wide DNA methylation levels in natural plant population remains poorly explored in non-model organisms, but considerable advances have been made in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. In plants, DNA methylation typically occurs at cytosines in three sequence contexts: CG, CHG, or CHH (where H represents a G, T or A nucleotide) (Law and Jacobsen, 2010). A study involving genome-wide DNA methylation analysis of 122 *A. thaliana* accessions sampled across Eurasia showed that climate characteristics most abundantly co-varied with methylation levels of cytosines in CHH context, with CHH

methylation typically indicating the involvement of transposable elements (TEs) (Kawakatsu et al. 2016; Keller *et al.* 2016). These findings could be related to natural selection at the level of TE-specific methyltransferase genes that facilitate demethylation of transposons when temperatures reach extreme levels, or where populations are genetically impoverished. Stress-induced demethylation of transposons boosts transposon activity and subsequent genetic change, paving the way for rapid genetic replenishment and adaptation to environmental stressors (Mirouze & Paszkowski 2011; Ito *et al.* 2016; Rey *et al.* 2016; Schrader & Schmitz 2019). The strongest associations between climate and *A. thaliana* methylation levels were, however, found in CG contexts within or near genes related to abiotic stress responses, development and reproduction (Keller *et al.* 2016). Because (i) DNA methylation has been shown to be meiotically most stable in the CG context, and (ii) the majority of reported heritable epimutations occurs at CG sites (Mathieu *et al.* 2007; Jiang *et al.* 2014; Stassen *et al.* 2018), climate-CG methylation associations most likely represent solid adaptive signals. A recent study corroborated the evolutionary relevance of CG methylation using a multi-generational *A. thaliana* selection experiment, demonstrating that (i) methylation of differentially methylated cytosines (DMCs) was significantly higher in CG context after five generations in a selective environment simulating habitat fragmentation, (ii) the majority of these DMCs were stably inherited for 2 or 3 generations following the selection experiment, (iii) selection caused overall reductions in epigenetic diversity, and (iv) methylation levels of some CG DMCs were associated with phenotypic changes (Schmid *et al.* 2018).

Genome-wide DNA methylation studies in *Quercus* species showed patterns similar to those obtained in *A. thaliana*: DMCs associated with environmental stressors dominate in CG context, and these DMCs occur in or near genes (Platt *et al.* 2015; Gugger *et al.* 2016). Using the experimentally more versatile herb *Plantago lanceolata* as a study organism, Gáspár et al. (2019) demonstrated that much of the environment-related epigenetic variation is maintained in a second-generation common garden. Thus, at least part of the epigenetic variation observed in the field is stable, genomically non-random and of ecological significance. Although these studies considerably increased our understanding of how epigenetic variation is distributed across large spatial scales, it remains unknown to what extent epigenetic variation contributes to population divergence along fine-scale environmental gradients, where the interplay between migration, drift and selection can be extremely dynamic (Richardson *et al.* 2014). Highly heterogeneous environments may thus give rise to distinct signatures of epigenetic variation.

Evidence is accumulating that epigenetic variation may be particularly beneficial where genetic diversity is in short supply, e.g. following demographic bottlenecks or in clonal plant species (Latzel *et al.* 2016;

Ardura *et al.* 2017; Artemov *et al.* 2017; Thorson *et al.* 2017; Rendina González *et al.* 2018; Wibowo *et al.* 2018). More fundamentally, Dapp *et al.* (2015), using epigenetic inbred lines of *Arabidopsis thaliana*, demonstrated that epigenetic diversity can drive hybrid vigour in the absence of genetic diversity. Thus, epigenetic variation may be a crucial element of population persistence where evolutionary trajectories or life history traits limit genetic diversity. Study systems combining strong evolutionary pressure (e.g. expansion fronts or heterogeneous environments) and life history traits that constrain genetic diversity (e.g. asexual reproduction and high levels of self-compatibility) are therefore promising for obtaining more insights in the role of epigenetic variation in adaptation and population persistence.

Here, we explore genome-wide epigenetic profiles of second-generation common garden plants originating from three natural woodland strawberry (*Fragaria vesca* L.) populations that were found to harbor strong natural differentiation in terms of traits related to fitness, most likely driven by local topography impacting local soil moisture levels (De Kort *et al.* 2019). One of the most notable patterns observed in a controlled common garden environment was that plants adapted to the stressful conditions at high altitudinal, south-oriented locations were smaller and produced fewer flowers than plants originating from low altitudinal, north-oriented locations (De Kort *et al.* 2019). These data illustrate strong fine-scale adaptive divergence along the altitudinal gradient studied here. *F. vesca* has also been shown to harbor limited genetic diversity across its range (Hilmarsson *et al.* 2017), presumably as a result of its life history (self-compatible and clonal). Due to this limited genetic diversity in combination with pronounced altitude-dependent phenotypic divergence, we hypothesize substantial adaptive epigenetic signals coinciding with increased stress levels along the studied altitudinal gradient (Fig. 1C). We specifically ask the following questions: (i) do epigenetic memories diverge with altitude, and does DNA methylation change with altitude?; (ii) are these fine-scale genome-wide methylation patterns comparable to those obtained at a much larger spatial scale (>500 km)?; (iii) are altitudinal DMCs enriched for ecologically relevant gene ontology terms?; and (iv) does acute drought stress induce detectable epigenetic change?

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sample collection

Seeds were collected from five plants at (i) three nearby locations in the French Pyrenees, (ii) one location in the French Vosges, and (iii) one location in Poland (Fig. 1). After germination, one seedling per mother plant was randomly selected from every location and grown in controlled conditions in a growth chamber with standardized light and soil moisture regimes. To compare the magnitude of inherited epigenetic memories to intra-generational epigenetic change acquired through acute drought stress, an additional

seedling per mother plant was raised for the mid-altitudinal Pyrenean plants, and these seedlings were subjected to reduced soil moisture levels starting two months after germination. Specifically, watering stopped until leaves went limp (6-10 days), and this process was repeated consecutively for four weeks, after which the plants were allowed to rehydrate for one week to remove most drought-induced epigenetic effects that do not result in a relatively stable epigenetic signal. Between each of three cycles of drought, plants were watered for three days to allow partial recovery of the soil. The plants were full grown (ca. 3 months of age) prior to the drought treatment and WGBS. They were kept in a growth chamber at room temperature and with regular growth lamps. One leaf per plant was then collected in liquid nitrogen prior to DNA extraction, resulting in 30 samples (Fig. 1).

Whole genome bisulfite sequencing and DMC calling

DNA of 30 freeze-dried samples was extracted with a QIAGEN kit. Up to 200ng of DNA was fragmented to 400bp with a Covaris S2 sonicator prior to whole-genome library preparation (NEBNext Ultra II kit), ligation of methylated adaptors and size selection on 2% E-gel (450-650 bp). Bisulfite conversion was performed using the EZ DNA methylation gold kit (Zymo Research, Irvine, CA, USA). The low percentage of unconverted CHH cytosines gives an indication that the bisulfite conversion step was successful and adequate (Fig. S1). An enrichment PCR was performed using KAPA HiFi hotstart Uracil+ mastermix in a 12 cycles PCR reaction. Paired-end 75 bp sequencing of the library fragments was performed on eight lanes of an Illumina HiSeq4000 sequencer, generating $76\,417\,704 \pm 13\,837\,490$ reads (mean $\pm$ standard deviation) per sample. An extensive quality control was performed on the sequencing data using FastQC version 0.11.5 (Babraham Bioinformatics), showing a mean quality value across each base position in the reads, average quality scores of the reads and average GC content of reads that is to be expected from a high-quality Illumina sequencing run (see Figs. S1-S3 for quality and coverage stat). Trimmomatic (Bolger et al. 2014) version 0.36 was used to trim reads for sequences with a Phred score lower than 33 and sequences corresponding to Illumina TruSeq adapters. Sequences shorter than 75bp after trimming were discarded using default filtering parameters. One sample from Poland ("East") showed an increased level of duplicate reads and was excluded from further analysis (Fig. S3).

FastQ Screen version 0.11.1 (Babraham Bioinformatics) was used to remove genomic sequences originating from other species. The trimmed reads were mapped against the *Fragaria vesca*_v4.0.a1 genome using bismark version 0.17.0. (Krueger and Andrews 2011). Average sequencing depth after mapping and deduplication was 30x.

Averaged across the 30 samples, 45.4%, 15.0% and 3.6% of CG, CHG and CHH cytosines were methylated after filtering and mapping, and was thus considered for downstream DMC calling, using the R package methylKit version 1.10.0 with conventional DMC parameters (Akalin *et al.* 2012). Specifically, only cytosines with at least 5x coverage in at least 3 samples per group were retained (Walker *et al.* 2015; Wan *et al.* 2016). To reduce bias due to outlier depth, bases with a read depth above the 99.9th percentile of coverage were filtered out. The filtered data were used to test for differentially methylated cytosines (DMCs), considering a 25% difference and q-values <0.05 as significant. Significant differentially methylated cytosines (DMCs) were identified between (i) low, mid and high altitudinal samples (hereafter “altitudinal DMCs”), (ii) the three distance European samples (hereafter “spatial DMCs”), and (iii) the two soil moisture treatments (hereafter “drought DMCs”).

To test the robustness of our results depending on the DMC settings, we re-constructed DMC density and clustering plots (see “Methylation profiling of altitude, space and drought”) with the following parameters (bold indicates deviation from conventional DMC parameters):

- min sequencing depth of 5 in at least 3 samples, q-value < 0.05, **methylation difference 10%**
- min sequencing depth of 5 in at least 3 samples, **q-value <0.005**, methylation difference 25%
- **min sequencing depth of 10** in at least 3 samples, q-value <0.05, methylation difference 25%

These alternative parameters merely altered comparative methylation patterns and downstream results (Fig. S4 and S5).

Methylation profiling of altitude, space and drought

All DMCs ($q < 0.01$, Table S1) were assumed to be ecologically divergent (i.e. resulting from drift or fitness differences). Because the epigenetic signals observed here have persisted in the second generation (hereafter “common garden generation”), they may represent stable epigenetic changes. However, because the long-term transgenerational stability of these DMCs is uncertain, we further refer to ecological rather than evolutionary divergence of methylation patterns. Cytosines that were significant along the altitudinal gradient (“altitude DMCs”) were thus considered to be ecologically divergent along this gradient. We similarly defined “spatial DMCs” and “drought DMCs” as ecologically divergent DMCs along the spatial gradient and the soil moisture treatment, respectively. We further assumed that clusters of nearby DMCs have a more important role in genome function and ecological processes because individual DMCs have been suggested to contribute little to gene expression (Teschendorff & Relton 2018; Paun *et al.* 2019). We thus defined DMC blocks of 500 bp with a maximum distance of 50 bp between

individual DMCs, using the R package “bumphunter v1.12” (see Table S2 showing that alternative clustering parameters do not strongly affect clustering behavior). For each DMC, we then defined “ClusterSize” as the amount of DMCs in the cluster to which the respective DMC belongs. A higher cluster size thus represents a higher tendency of a DMC to cluster with other DMCs. The relation between DMC differentiation and cluster size was tested using a linear mixed model (DMC differentiation $\sim$ ClusterSize + 1 | Cluster_ID), with Cluster_ID accounting for genomic linkage within clusters. If DMCs involved in large genomic clusters also are significantly more differentiated than solitary DMCs, then these DMCs are strong potential candidates for adaptive processes (isolation-by-environment).

As a measure of epigenetic diversity (ED) that is insensitive to sample size (Vellend *et al.* 2010; Schmid *et al.* 2018), we calculated the mean pairwise methylation difference between the five individuals originating from each location (Schmid *et al.* 2018). High ED thus reflects high variation in the degree of methylation within a population. Because ED represents a proportion, a betaregression model was used to test whether ED differs significantly between populations depending on DMC clustering behavior and genomic context (ED $\sim$ population + Clustering + Context), with ED averaged across DCMs within clusters. The fixed effect “Clustering” was added to the model to specifically test whether (i) clustered (i.e. potentially adaptive) DMCs render lower ED than solitary DMCs, as would be expected when natural selection causes diverging methylation patterns (Schmid *et al.* 2018), and (ii) clustering behavior is a more important determinant of ED than genomic context. The term “Clustering” represents a binary variable distinguishing between solitary DMCs and clustered DMCs (at least 10 DMC in a cluster). The modeling was performed using the R package “betareg”, which also provides an effect size (pseudo R^2) indicating the explanatory power of the model. For each population, we also provided epigenetic fixation rate defined as the number of DMCs that did was either fully methylated or fully de-methylated across all samples.

DMC enrichment analysis

Gene ontology terms (GOs) were retrieved from the Genome Database for Rosaceae (GDR, Jung *et al.* 2019). To test which biological processes were overrepresented in sequences containing DMCs (as compared to the full *F. vesca* genome), we performed a Fisher’s exact test with FDR correction as implemented in OmicsBox, using DMC GOs as test data and *F. vesca* GOs as reference data. The same analysis was performed for the altitudinal and spatial DMCs, and in CG and non-CG (CHG and CHH) context separately.

To address the role of non-CG methylation in transposon regulation, we aligned genes in which we found one or more DMCs to all transposable elements known in *F. vesca*, using the GDR search function. Specifically, we extracted all genes related to the keyword “transpos” (referring to. e.g. transposase, transposon, transposable element), and grouped our transposon-related DMCs into the two major transposable element classes (DNA transposons and retrotransposons).

3. RESULTS

Apart from slight increases in genome-wide methylation levels from high to low soil moisture, and from east to west (Fig. S6), no systematic genome-wide differences in methylation were observed between the 29 samples. Nonetheless, to further explore whether specific genomic regions may be affected, we compared the methylation levels at single cytosines between samples. We accordingly detected a total of 82 839, 699 and 23 DMCs along the spatial gradient, the altitudinal gradient and between the soil moisture treatments, respectively (Fig. 2A, Fig. 3, Table S1). These DMCs often clustered together in genomic islands of differential methylation (Fig. 2A, Fig. 3, Fig. 4).

Methylation divergence was most pronounced along the spatial gradient, both in terms of frequency (Fig. 2A) and strength (Fig. 2B), followed by the altitudinal gradient (Fig. 2B). A total of 59 altitudinal DMCs (8.5%) were also found along the spatial gradient, and another 153 altitudinal DMCs (21.9%) were located within 500 bp of a spatial DMC, indicating shared methylation patterns among distinct spatial scales.

DMC density profiles, showing cumulative loss and gain in methylation percentages, were substantially different between the altitudinal and the spatial gradient (Fig. 2C-D). For altitudinal DMCs, the most dominant shift in methylation was observed in CG context, with considerable methylation gain as altitude increased (Fig. 3C). However, the most extreme shifts in DMC methylation level (i.e. toward 100% methylation loss or gain) were observed along the spatial gradient (Fig. 3D). Thus, fixation of methylation patterns occurred both at fine and large spatial scale, but was more frequent along the spatial gradient.

A total of 247 out of 698 DMCs (35.4%) systematically gained (113 CG, 21 CHG and 20 CHH) or lost (38 CG, 35 CHG and 20 CHH) methylation from low to high altitude. Methylation gains along the altitudinal gradient thus predominantly occurred in the CG context (see also Fig. 3C). Along the spatial gradient, a total of 56 795 out of 82 839 DMCs (68.6%) systematically lost (18 099 CG, 8731 CHG and 3609 CHH) or gained (17 038 CG, 7680 CHG and 1638 CHH) methylation from east to west (see also Fig. 3D). The plants from western Europe thus particularly differ from central Europe in the amount of demethylated CHH sites.

While most DMCs (n=31,417) clustered together into DMC islands, many DMCs occurred solitary (n=23,578) (Table S1 and S2). Interestingly, we found a significant positive relationship between DMC differentiation and cluster size, also after correcting for cluster_ID (Fig. 4, Table S3, Fig. S5). Thus, DMCs that tend to cluster together are also more differentiated. Based on this relationship, we identified four DMC clusters with exceptionally low DMC differentiation (Fig. 4). While gene function of three of these DMC clusters is unknown, the fourth cluster lies in a gene involved in histone acetylation required for transcription (FvH4_1g16810). In this gene, all DMCs (n=27) behaved congruent, with increased methylation levels in Poland, but complete demethylation in other populations (Table S1). Decreasing methylation levels towards the Pyrenees appears to be the rule for clustered DMCs (Fig. S7), while solitary DMCs behave more randomly irrespective of spatial direction (Fig. S7). Within the Pyrenees, however, both clustered and solitary DMCs systematically increase methylation levels towards higher altitude (Fig. S7).

Clustered DMCs were significantly less diverse than solitary DMCs, but the extent of this difference depended on the population (Table S4, Fig. 5). Particularly at high elevation, clustered DMCs had significantly lower epigenetic diversity than solitary DMCs (Table S4, Fig. 5). The difference in ED between clustered and solitary DMCs also increased from east to west along the spatial gradient (Fig. 5). In addition, there was a marked reduction in ED from east to west for both clustered and solitary DMCs (Table S4, Fig. 5). Finally, genomic context did not affect ED, indicating that clustering behavior is more important than genomic context in explaining differences in ED among the sampled populations of *F. vesca* (Table S4).

Out of 138 and 25 GO terms that were associated with the altitudinal DMCs in CG and non-CG context, respectively, 54 (39.1%) and 2 (8.0%) were significantly enriched in comparison to the full *F. vesca* GO compilation (Table S5-S6). A similar proportion of enriched GO terms was observed for the spatial DMCs in CG context (39.7%, i.e. 578 out of 1456 GOs). As opposed to the altitudinal DMCs, however, a high proportion of enriched GOs was also found in non-CG context (48.0%, i.e. 290 out of 604 GOs).

DMCs in CG vs. non-CG context represented a distinct set of enriched biological processes (Table S5). Where non-CG DMCs were particularly enriched for regulatory functions (e.g. regulation of gene expression and protein dephosphorylation), biological processes more directly related to environmental stressors were overrepresented only in CG-context (e.g. circadian rhythm, antibiotic metabolism and response to light). GOs related to cell division and reproduction (e.g. spindle organization and sexual reproduction) were enriched in both CG and non-CG DMCs. No pronounced differences in GO

composition were found between altitudinal and spatial DMCs, and most altitudinal GOs (69%) were also part of the spatial GO distribution (Table S5-S6).

A total of 30 transposable elements were found to contain one or more DMCs (Tables S1 and S7). The most heavily differentiated transposon was a putative retrotransposon harboring no less than 21 DMCs, of which 15 in non-CG and 6 in CG context. All differentially methylated transposons but one were found at the large spatial scale, and were dominated by DMCs in non-CG context. However, there was a clear distinction in DMC context between DNA transposons and retrotransposons, with CHG and CG DMCs only found in retrotransposons (Fig. 6). We also found that DNA transposons contained much fewer DMCs ($n=2.4$) than retrotransposons ($n=7.1$) (Table S7). On average, transposon DMCs lost 18% and 32% of methylation from east to west in CG and non-CG context, respectively.

The negligible proportion of genome-wide cytosines that was differentially methylated between soil moisture treatments (Fig. 2A, B, E) suggests that short-term acute soil dryness does not result in a pronounced epigenetic signature, and does not seriously impact historically obtained epigenetic memories. Drought stress only generated solitary DMCs (Table S1).

4. DISCUSSION

Epigenetic variation in natural populations probably is key to their survival, particularly when they are genetically depleted and environmentally challenged. In such systems, it may be favorable for individuals to acquire an epigenetic memory that allows efficient responses to fluctuating environmental stressors. Here, we shed light on the prevalence of natural epigenetic variation along a steep environmental gradient, and put these findings into a much wider geographical context. Collectively, our results indicate that epigenetic memories develop both at fine and large spatial scales, each associated with distinct epigenetic signatures. Specifically, methylation in non-CG context gains in importance as the spatial scale increases, and this translates into more methylation differentiation of genes with regulatory functions and transposable elements. Conversely, divergence of CG methylation was more pronounced at the fine-scale altitudinal gradient, where it may guide adaptive gene expression in response to environmental variability. In addition, we are the first to demonstrate an intense correlation between the clustering behavior of DMCs and their differentiation between natural populations. Together with low epigenetic diversity at clustering DMCs in the most stressful environment (high altitude), this finding suggests that clustering DMCs may be more involved in adaptive processes than solitary DMCs. This does not rule out, however, that solitary DMCs may have large effects on gene expression.

We found that epigenetic memories, predominantly in CG context, can diverge even at very fine spatial scale (< 2 km), indicative of epigenetic isolation-by-ecology. This finding is in strong contrast to an earlier study that was unable to detect significant epigenetic differences between alpine herb populations originating from three elevations and grown in a common garden using 150 methylation-sensitive AFLPs (MS-AFLPs) (Nicotra *et al.* 2015). In our study, methylation in CG-context increased from low to high altitude, suggesting that high altitudinal environments may trigger activation of genes predominantly underpinning amino acid metabolism, intracellular transport, responses to light conditions and cellulose catabolism (Table S5). Predicting transcriptional activity from levels of DNA methylation remains, however, a point of discussion. We furthermore observed a markedly lower epigenetic diversity for clustered DMCs than for solitary DMCs at high altitude (Fig. 5), potentially representing signatures of natural selection favoring clustered CG methylation (Fig. 2) in gene bodies. Given that the altitudinal gradient studied here is featured by intense phenotypic divergence (De Kort *et al.* 2019), at least part of the potentially adaptive epigenetic signatures observed here likely is attributed to topographical variation along the gradient. Our finding of reduced epigenetic diversity in CG-context and increased CG methylation at higher altitudes is in line with *A. thaliana* studies showing that increased stress levels at the location of origin are associated with higher CG gene body methylation (Dubin *et al.* 2015; Keller *et al.* 2016; Schmid *et al.* 2018). In parallel, several studies found increased up-regulation and CG gene body methylation of genes involved in environmental responses to novel and/or stressful conditions through gene body methylation (Dubin *et al.* 2015; Artemov *et al.* 2017; Dixon *et al.* 2018).

Not only the high-altitude population, but also the “west” population was featured by very low ED for clustered as compared to solitary DMCs (Fig. 5). This may be indicative of increasing environmental stress towards the edge of the species’ distribution (defined by the Pyrenees in the southwest of its distribution), where CG DMCs in particular have increased methylation rates (Fig. 2). Moreover, because roughly 30% of altitudinal DMCs were shared with the spatial DMCs, part of the adaptive epigenetic divergence along both spatial scales may be driven by parallel ecological processes. This spatial ecological parallelism underlying methylation patterns is corroborated by the strong overlap in enriched gene ontology processes between both spatial scales (Table S5-S6). Interestingly, the “east” population was featured by strongly increased methylation (Fig. 2) as well as high ED (Fig. 5), indicating high but very variable methylation levels in this population. High gene flow in the core of the species’ range may counteract natural selection that would otherwise reduce ED at clustered DMCs.

Whereas the suggestive impact of environmental stress on selection towards increased CG methylation may be ubiquitous (i.e. at fine- and large spatial scale, and in *F. vesca* and *A. thaliana*), fine-scale

epigenetic patterns differed substantially from large-scale epigenetic patterns. As compared to the fine-scale altitudinal gradient, the large spatial gradient was featured by (i) an increase in the number of DMCs with two orders of magnitude, (ii) more intense methylation differentiation (on average 70% vs. 40%), (iii) a more prominent role for non-CG differentiation, and (iv) more pronounced differences in epigenetic diversity across populations. Although the CG-context constituted the most divergent methylation patterns irrespective of spatial scale (Fig. 3), the proportion of non-CG DMCs increased considerably from fine to large spatial scale (Fig. 3D). This finding is in agreement with a large-scale study on *A. thaliana* showing that non-CG demethylation associated with transposon activity was abundant where temperature reached extreme levels (Keller *et al.* 2016). It is unclear, however, to what extent demographic history and range dynamics have contributed to this relationship between extreme temperatures and non-CG methylation. Indeed, temperatures become more extreme towards range edges, and the increased transposon activity at *A. thaliana*'s range edges, where its distribution becomes more scattered, may have partially resulted from range dynamics (see Beck *et al.* 2008 and Alonso-Blanco *et al.* 2016 for range-wide genetic population structure). Here, non-CG DMCs lost methylation and were less diverse (Fig. 2, 5) from east to west, which, hypothetically, results from ecology-driven activation of transposons towards the edge of the distribution range of *F. vesca*, where transposon activation through demethylation may provide opportunities for genetically impoverished populations to boost genetic change. Although this could point to an evolutionary rescue mechanism for transposons during range expansions (see also Stapley *et al.* 2015; Rey *et al.* 2016), more research on the spatial distribution of transposon activity and its role in evolution is required to validate this assumption. Nevertheless, the observation that transposons are differentially suppressed at large spatial scale and not along a steep gradient, suggests that differential suppression of transposon activity follows biogeographic or phylogeographic storylines rather than fine-scale environmental clines. If environmental stress drives transposon demethylation, then this should result in systematic transposon demethylation towards the high-altitude population while only one transposon-related DMC was found along the altitudinal gradient. Our findings are thus in favor of intra-specific biogeography as the main determinant of transposon demethylation. In addition, the (i) decrease in CG epigenetic diversity from Poland to the Pyrenees, corresponding to increasing inbreeding and/or decreasing gene flow towards the distribution edge, and (ii) increase in methylation at DMC islands towards Poland (range centre) (Fig. S7) where stress levels are expected to be less pronounced as compared to the range edge, corroborate the role of intra-specific biogeography in shaping spatial epigenetic patterns.

Most of the epigenetic differences observed in this study inevitably is caused by genetic change, for example because cytosine to thymine or adenine substitutions can be erroneously read as a DMC following bisulfite sequencing and PCR, or, more likely, because genetic polymorphisms epistatically drive methylation changes nearby or in other genomic regions (Paun et al. 2019). It is unlikely that many DMCs in the same DMC cluster are erroneous, so we are confident that our clustered DMCs in particular reflect epigenetic rather than genetic divergence. In addition, studies that do combine genetic and epigenetic markers show that relations between methylation patterns and environmental stress are stronger than gene-environment associations, and that *epigene*-environment interactions remain after controlling for genetic structure (e.g. Foust et al. 2016; Schmid et al. 2018; Meröndun et al. 2019; Wogan et al. 2020). In the same vein, we suspect that at least part of our epigenetic differentiation arose from epigenetic isolation-by-environment rather than genetic isolation-by-distance because we found (i) biologically meaningful GO terms for many DMCs, (ii) many DMCs at a fine-scale gradient harboring adaptive phenotypic divergence as shown previously for our study species, (iii) non-random genomic clustering of DMCs within genomic regions, particularly for very divergent DMCs, and (iv) low epigenetic diversity in stressful environments (high altitude and range edge). Together, these findings suggest that many DMCs did not merely arise randomly/neutrally but at least partially result from ecological differentiation. Whether this ecological divergence of methylation is largely gene-independent remains, however, an open question.

While the origin-dependent epigenetic memories (i.e. altitudinal and spatial DMCs) were stably transmitted to the common garden generation, acute drought stress-induced epigenetic signatures were weak (Fig. 2,3). Although the low number of DNA methylation differences induced by our drought stress treatment may reflect the experimental conditions, our plants likely suffered more stress (as we allowed them to go limp) than do *F. vesca* plants usually experience in their natural environment (buffered forest conditions). We therefore argue that the observed lack of methylation is conservative for naturally occurring reductions in soil moisture. We suspect that repeated exposure to stressful conditions is required for acquiring a detectable epigenetic signature, and emphasizes the importance of historical stress experience for the generation of an epigenetic memory. Vice versa, our results suggest that the loss of an epigenetic memory requires long-term release of stressful conditions, and that multiple generations without stress exposure are required for completely resetting the epigenetic machinery. Multi-generational persistence of epigenetic signatures (i.e. epigenetic carryover) and thus slow trans-generational loss of epigenetic variation is a typical epigenetic mechanism observed in common gardens quantifying epigenetic variation across generations (Paszkowski & Grossniklaus 2011; Miska & Ferguson-

Smith 2016; Proulx *et al.* 2019). Given the natural ubiquity of transgenerational epigenetic inheritance, as indicated by the former studies, at least part of the epigenetic patterns observed in our common garden generation is expected to reflect such epigenetic carryover. Nevertheless, the precise extent of multi-generational methylation inheritance requires additional generations of epigenetic profiling, as other mechanisms such as catastrophic events, other time scales and different types of stress may affect the efficacy of transgenerational epigenetic inheritance. Collectively, our findings provide novel insights into the natural prevalence of adaptive epigenetic divergence and the processes driving epigenetic memories at distinct spatial scales. We showed that significantly different epigenetic memories, which are considering the prevalence of CG methylation presumably concentrated in or near gene bodies, arise at fine spatial scales. At large spatial scale, epigenetic memories also diverge at the level of regulatory genes and transposons. We hypothesize that genetic and epigenetic responses complementary support fitness in heterogeneous environments, and that non-CG demethylation increases in importance as genetic variation gets depleted. Further research involving higher resolution sampling and a multi-generational common garden is required to shed more light on the role of epigenetic variation at distinct spatial scales. This would particularly increase our understanding of epigenetic memory acquisition and divergence as an adaptive strategy of natural populations that could enhance their ability to cope with global change stressors. We also argue that disentangling epigenetic signatures and DMC clustering linked to phylogeography vs. adaptive evolution represent interesting research avenues that are fundamental to our understanding of large-scale epigenetic divergence.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

HDK holds a postdoctoral fellowship funded by FWO (Research Foundation Flanders, 12P6517N). Dr. Kenny Helsen and Kasper Van Acker helped raising the plants. Dr. Martin Diekmann and Josef Müller took care of the sampling in Poland. Dr. Filip Rolland provided the cultivation room for raising our plants.

REFERENCES

- Akalın, A., Kormaksson, M., Li, S., Garrett-Bakelman, F.E., Figueroa, M.E., Melnick, A., *et al.* (2012). methylKit: a comprehensive R package for the analysis of genome-wide DNA methylation profiles. *Genome Biol.*, 13, R87.
- Alonso-Blanco, C., Andrade, J., Becker, C., Bemm, F., Bergelson, J., Borgwardt, K.M., *et al.* (2016). 1,135 Genomes Reveal the Global Pattern of Polymorphism in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Cell*, 166, 481–491.
- Alonso, C., Ramos-Cruz, D. & Becker, C. (2019). The role of plant epigenetics in biotic interactions. *New Phytol.*, 221, 731–737.
- Ardura, A., Zaiko, A., Morán, P., Planes, S. & Garcia-Vazquez, E. (2017). Epigenetic signatures of invasive status in populations of marine invertebrates. *Sci. Rep.*, 7, 42193.
- Artemov, A. V., Mugue, N.S., Rastorguev, S.M., Zhenilo, S., Mazur, A.M., Tsygankova, S. V., *et al.* (2017). Genome-Wide DNA Methylation Profiling Reveals Epigenetic Adaptation of Stickleback to Marine and Freshwater Conditions. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, 34, 2203–2213.
- Baerwald, M.R., Meek, M.H., Stephens, M.R., Nagarajan, R.P., Goodbla, A.M., Tomalty, K.M.H., *et al.* (2016). Migration-related phenotypic divergence is associated with epigenetic modifications in rainbow trout. *Mol. Ecol.*, 25, 1785–1800.
- Banta, J.A. & Richards, C.L. (2018). Quantitative epigenetics and evolution. *Heredity (Edinb.)*, 121, 210–224.
- Beck, J.B., Schmuths, H. & Schaal, B.A. (2007). Native range genetic variation in *Arabidopsis thaliana* is strongly geographically structured and reflects Pleistocene glacial dynamics. *Mol. Ecol.*, 17, 902–915.
- Bolger, A. M., Lohse, M., & Usadel, B. (2014). Trimmomatic: A flexible trimmer for Illumina Sequence Data. *Bioinformatics*, btu170.
- Brachi, B., Morris, G.P. & Borevitz, J.O. (2011). Genome-wide association studies in plants: the missing heritability is in the field. *Genome Biol.*, 12, 232.
- Chinnusamy, V. & Zhu, J.-K. (2009). Epigenetic regulation of stress responses in plants. *Curr. Opin. Plant Biol.*, 12, 133–9.
- Crisp, P.A., Ganguly, D., Eichten, S.R., Borevitz, J.O. & Pogson, B.J. (2016). Reconsidering plant memory: Intersections between stress recovery, RNA turnover, and epigenetics. *Sci. Adv.*, 2, e1501340.

- Danchin, E., Pocheville, A., Rey, O., Pujol, B. & Blanchet, S. (2019). Epigenetically facilitated mutational assimilation: epigenetics as a hub within the inclusive evolutionary synthesis. *Biol. Rev.*, 94, 259–282.
- De Kort, H., Panis, P., Janssens, S.B., Helsen, K., & Honnay, O. (2019) Pre-adaptation to climate change through topography-driven evolution of traits and their plasticity. *BioRxiv*, doi.org/10.1101/821561.
- Dapp, M., Reinders, J., Bédiée, A., Balsera, C., Bucher, E., Theiler, G., *et al.* (2015). Heterosis and inbreeding depression of epigenetic Arabidopsis hybrids. *Nat. Plants*, 1, 15092.
- Dixon, G., Liao, Y., Bay, L.K. & Matz, M. V. (2018). Role of gene body methylation in acclimatization and adaptation in a basal metazoan. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 115, 13342–13346.
- Dubin, M.J., Zhang, P., Meng, D. *et al.* (2015) DNA methylation in Arabidopsis has a genetic basis and shows evidence of local adaptation. *eLife* 4:e05255.
- Foust, C.M., Preite, V., Schrey, A.W., Alvarez, M., Robertson, M.H., Verhoeven, K.J.F., *et al.* (2016). Genetic and epigenetic differences associated with environmental gradients in replicate populations of two salt marsh perennials. *Mol. Ecol.*, 25, 1639–1652.
- Gáspár, B., Bossdorf, O. & Durka, W. (2019). Structure, stability and ecological significance of natural epigenetic variation: a large-scale survey in *Plantago lanceolata*. *New Phytol.*, 221, 1585–1596.
- Gienapp, P., Fior, S., Guillaume, F., Lasky, J.R., Sork, V.L. & Csilléry, K. (2017). Genomic Quantitative Genetics to Study Evolution in the Wild. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, 32, 897–908.
- Gugger, P.F., Fitz-Gibbon, S., PellEgrini, M. & Sork, V.L. (2016). Species-wide patterns of DNA methylation variation in *Quercus lobata* and their association with climate gradients. *Mol. Ecol.*, 25, 1665–1680.
- Hilker, M., Schwachtje, J., Baier, M., Balazadeh, S., Bäurle, I., Geiselhardt, S., *et al.* (2016). Priming and memory of stress responses in organisms lacking a nervous system. *Biol. Rev.*, 91, 1118–1133.
- Hilmarsson, H.S., Hytönen, T., Isobe, S., Göransson, M., Toivainen, T. & Hallsson, J.H. (2017). Population genetic analysis of a global collection of *Fragaria vesca* using microsatellite markers. *PLoS One*, 12, e0183384.
- Ito, H., Kim, J.-M., Matsunaga, W., Saze, H., Matsui, A., Endo, T.A., *et al.* (2016). A Stress-Activated Transposon in Arabidopsis Induces Transgenerational Abscissic Acid Insensitivity. *Sci. Rep.*, 6, 23181.
- Jeremias, G., Barbosa, J., Marques, S.M., Asselman, J., Gonçalves, F.J.M. & Pereira, J.L. (2018). Synthesizing

the role of epigenetics in the response and adaptation of species to climate change in freshwater ecosystems. *Mol. Ecol.*, 27, 2790–2806.

Jiang, C., Mithani, A., Belfield, E.J., Mott, R., Hurst, L.D. & Harberd, N.P. (2014). Environmentally responsive genome-wide accumulation of de novo *Arabidopsis thaliana* mutations and epimutations. *Genome Res.*, 24, 1821–9.

Jung, S., Lee, T., Cheng, C.-H., Buble, K., Zheng, P., Yu, J., *et al.* (2019). 15 years of GDR: New data and functionality in the Genome Database for Rosaceae. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 47, D1137–D1145.

Kawakatsu, T., Huang, S.C., Jupe, F., Sasaki, E. *et al.* (2016) Epigenomic diversity in a global collection of *Arabidopsis thaliana* accessions. *Cell*, 166, 492–505.

Keller, T.E., Lasky, J.R. & Yi, S. V. (2016). The multivariate association between genomewide DNA methylation and climate across the range of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Mol. Ecol.*, 25, 1823–1837.

Krishna Kumar, S., Feldman, M.W., Rehkopf, D.H. & Tuljapurkar, S. (2016). Limitations of GCTA as a solution to the missing heritability problem. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 113, E61–70.

Krueger, F. & Andrews, S.R. (2011). Bismark: a flexible aligner and methylation caller for Bisulfite-Seq applications. *Bioinformatics*, 27(11),1571–2.

Latzel, V., Rendina González, A.P. & Rosenthal, J. (2016). Epigenetic Memory as a Basis for Intelligent Behavior in Clonal Plants. *Front. Plant Sci.*, 7, 1354.

Law, J.A. and Jacobsen, S.E. (2010). Establishing, maintainig and modifying DNA methylation patterns in plants and animals. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 11, 204–220.

Lind, M.I. & Spagopoulou, F. (2018). Evolutionary consequences of epigenetic inheritance. *Heredity*, 121, 205–209.

Mathieu, O., Reinders, J., Čaikovski, M., Smathajitt, C. & Paszkowski, J. (2007). Transgenerational Stability of the *Arabidopsis* Epigenome Is Coordinated by CG Methylation. *Cell*, 130, 851–862.

Meröndun, J., Murray, D.L., Shafer, A.B.A. (2019) Genome-scale sampling suggests cryptic epigenetic structuring and insular divergence in *Canada lynx*. *Molecular Ecology*, 28: 3186–3196.

Mirouze, M. & Paszkowski, J. (2011). Epigenetic contribution to stress adaptation in plants. *Curr. Opin.*

Plant Biol., 14, 267–274.

- Miska, E.A. & Ferguson-Smith, A.C. (2016). Transgenerational inheritance: Models and mechanisms of non-DNA sequence-based inheritance. *Science*, 354, 59–63.
- Nicotra, A.B., Segal, D.L., Hoyle, G.L., Schrey, A.W., Verhoeven, K.J.F. & Richards, C.L. (2015). Adaptive plasticity and epigenetic variation in response to warming in an Alpine plant. *Ecol. Evol.*, 5, 634–647.
- Paszkowski, J. & Grossniklaus, U. (2011). Selected aspects of transgenerational epigenetic inheritance and resetting in plants. *Curr. Opin. Plant Biol.*, 14, 195–203.
- Paun, O., Verhoeven, K.J.F., Richards, C.L. (2019) Opportunities and limitations of reduced representation bisulfite sequencing in plant ecological epigenomics. *New Phytologist* 2: 738-742.
- Platt, A., Gugger, P.F., Pellegrini, M. & Sork, V.L. (2015). Genome-wide signature of local adaptation linked to variable CpG methylation in oak populations. *Mol. Ecol.*, 24, 3823–3830.
- Proulx, S.R., Dey, S., Guzella, T. & Teotónio, H. (2019). How differing modes of non-genetic inheritance affect population viability in fluctuating environments. *Ecol. Lett.*, 22, 1767–1775.
- Quadrana, L., Colot, V. (2016) Plant Transgenerational Epigenetics. *Annual Review of Genetics*, 50, 467-491.
- Rendina González, A.P., Preite, V., Verhoeven, K.J.F. & Latzel, V. (2018). Transgenerational Effects and Epigenetic Memory in the Clonal Plant *Trifolium repens*. *Front. Plant Sci.*, 9, 1677.
- Resende, R.T., Resende, M.D.V., Silva, F.F., Azevedo, C.F., Takahashi, E.K., Silva-Junior, O.B., *et al.* (2017). Regional heritability mapping and genome-wide association identify loci for complex growth, wood and disease resistance traits in *Eucalyptus*. *New Phytol.*, 213, 1287–1300.
- Rey, O., Danchin, E., Mirouze, M., Loot, C., Blanchet, S., Bijlsma, K., *et al.* (2016). Adaptation to Global Change: A Transposable Element–Epigenetics Perspective. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, 31, 514–526.
- Richardson, J.L., Urban, M.C., Bolnick, D.I. & Skelly, D.K. (2014). Microgeographic adaptation and the spatial scale of evolution. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, 29, 165–76.
- Schmid, M.W., Heichinger, C., Coman Schmid, D., Guthörl, D., Gagliardini, V., Bruggmann, R., *et al.* (2018). Contribution of epigenetic variation to adaptation in *Arabidopsis*. *Nat. Commun.*, 9, 4446.
- Schrader, L. & Schmitz, J. (2019). The impact of transposable elements in adaptive evolution. *Mol. Ecol.*, 28, 1537–1549.

Stapley, J., Santure, A.W. & Dennis, S.R. (2015). Transposable elements as agents of rapid adaptation may explain the genetic paradox of invasive species. *Mol. Ecol.*, 24, 2241–2252.

Stassen, J.H.M., López, A., Jain, R., Pascual-Pardo, D., Luna, E., Smith, L.M., *et al.* (2018). The relationship between transgenerational acquired resistance and global DNA methylation in *Arabidopsis*. *Sci. Rep.*, 8, 14761.

Supek, F., Bošnjak, M., Škunca, N. & Šmuc, T. (2011). REVIGO Summarizes and Visualizes Long Lists of Gene Ontology Terms. *PLoS One*, 6, e21800.

Teschendorff, A.E., Relton, C.L. (2018) Statistical and integrative system-level analysis of DNA methylation data. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 19: 129-147

Thorson, J.L.M., Smithson, M., Beck, D., Sadler-Riggelman, I., Nilsson, E., Dybdahl, M., *et al.* (2017). Epigenetics and adaptive phenotypic variation between habitats in an asexual snail. *Sci. Rep.*, 7, 14139.

Vellend, M., Cornwell, W., Magnuson-Ford, K. & Mooers, A. (2010). Measuring phylogenetic biodiversity In Magurran A., editor;, & McGill B., editor.(Eds.), Biological diversity. *Front. Meas. Assess.*, 197–207.

Walker, D.L., Bhagwate, A.V., Baheti, S., Smalley, R.L., Hilker, C.A., Sun, Z., *et al.* (2015). DNA methylation profiling: comparison of genome-wide sequencing methods and the Infinium Human Methylation 450 Bead Chip. *Epigenomics*, 7, 1287–1302.

Wan, Z.Y., Xia, J.H., Lin, G., Wang, L., Lin, V.C.L. & Yue, G.H. (2016). Genome-wide methylation analysis identified sexually dimorphic methylated regions in hybrid tilapia. *Sci. Rep.*, 6, 35903.

Wellenreuther, M. & Hansson, B. (2016). Detecting Polygenic Evolution: Problems, Pitfalls, and Promises. *Trends Genet.*, 32, 155–164.

Whipple, A. V & Holeski, L.M. (2016). Epigenetic Inheritance across the Landscape. *Front. Genet.*, 7, 189.

Wibowo, A., Becker, C., Durr, J., Price, J., Spaepen, S., Hilton, S., *et al.* (2018). Partial maintenance of organ-specific epigenetic marks during plant asexual reproduction leads to heritable phenotypic variation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 115, E9145–E9152.

Wogan, G.O.U., Yuan, M.L., Mahler, D.L., Wang, I.J. (2020) Genome-wide epigenetic by environment in a widespread *Anolis* lizard. *Molecular Ecology* 29: 40-55

Zhang, Y.-Y., Latzel, V., Fischer, M. & Bossdorf, O. (2018). Understanding the evolutionary potential of epigenetic variation: a comparison of heritable phenotypic variation in epiRILs, RILs, and natural ecotypes of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Heredity*, 121, 257–265.

DATA ACCESSIBILITY STATEMENT

All raw data are provided in supplementary material. Sequence reads are stored in Genbank under accession number PRJNA635047. Filtered DMCs used for all analyses are stored in Dryad (doi.org/10.5061/dryad.zs7h44j6r).

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

HDK coordinated the research, performed data-analyses of DMCs and wrote the manuscript. FVN performed all bio-informatics analyses. BP and OH helped shaping the project. All co-authors provided comments and suggestions to the first version of the manuscript.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Fig. 1. Geographical location of altitudinal WGBS samples (A,B) and of the broader spatial WGBS (B). Samples originate from south western France (Pyrenees), eastern France (Vosges) and south western Poland (Karkonosze). N represents the number of successfully sequenced samples (one Polish sample failed post-sequencing quality checks). Samples from location 2 are used for comparisons within the altitudinal gradient (Mid) as well as between the soil moisture treatments (Dry vs. Moist). Samples from location 3 are used for comparisons within the altitudinal (Low) as well as the spatial (West) gradient. High, mid and low altitude correspond to 1200, 750 and 450 meter asl, resp.

Fig. 2. Distribution of methylation patterns among the studied gradients, including DMC counts (A), average DMC differentiation (B), and DMC density of change in methylation level along the altitudinal gradient (C), the spatial gradient (D) and between soil moisture treatments (E). Zero value in density plots represents no change in methylation percentage from low to high altitude, east to west, and moist to dry, respectively. Dotted lines represent the average change in methylation level. All patterns were visualized for each sequence context separately (CG in orange, CHG in green and CHH in blue). Note that panel A shows the range in number of DMCs (e.g. the number of altitudinal DMCs varied from 73 in CHH context to 492 in CG context).

Fig. 3. Genome-wide differentiation in methylation for the DMCs in all sequence contexts along the spatial gradient (grey), along the altitudinal gradient (red), and between soil moisture treatments (green). Methylation differentiation represents the average difference in methylation percentage between groups (e.g. between west, central and east for the spatial gradient).

Fig. 4. Clustering behavior of DMCs, including the genomic position of DMC clusters (grey = spatial DMC clusters, red = altitudinal DMC clusters and blue = spatial DMC clusters with exceptionally low DMC differentiation) (A) and the relationship between cluster size (number of DMCs in a cluster) and DMC differentiation (blue = DMC clusters with exceptionally low DMC differentiation) (B).” Please see Fig. S5 for similar clustering results when different DMC calling parameter settings are chosen.

Fig. 5. Epigenetic diversity (ED) of clustered vs. solitary DMCs. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals of the means (fitted model means). See Table S4 for corresponding statistics.

Fig. 6. DMC density plot showing methylation gain and loss for transposable elements, in CG, CHG and CHH context.

FIGURES

Fig. 1

Fig. 2

Fig. 3

Fig. 4

Fig. 5

Fig. 6

SUPPORTING FILE LEGENDS

Fig. S1. Proportion of cytosines that were methylated across the genome, within each sample, and for each sequence context.

Fig. S2. Number of reads sequenced and aligned against the *F. vesca* genome in each sample.

Fig. S3. Sequence duplication levels for each of the 30 individuals subjected to whole genome bisulfite sequencing.

Fig. S4. Methylation patterns among the studied gradients (Altitude, Drought, Space) for all DMCs in CG and CHH context while considering alternative DMC calling parameters. The default parameters (used for downstream analyses) for significant DMCs are sequencing depth of at least 5, q-value < 0.01 and methylation difference of at least 25% (black bars).

Fig. S5. Relation between methylation differentiation and cluster size compared between alternative DMC calling parameters. Blue colour represents DMC outliers that deviate from the modeled relationship between methylation differentiation and cluster size. Dashed lines indicate the overlap in outliers between alternative DMC scenarios. Note that increasing sequencing depth decreases the probability of finding large DMC clusters (right panel), while decreasing the differentiation threshold (second panel) increases the strength of the relation between methylation differentiation and cluster size. R_M (marginal R) was obtained through running the mixed model [DMC differentiation ~ ClusterSize + 1 | Cluster_ID] and represents the amount of variance in methylation differentiation that can be explained by cluster size while controlling for cluster ID.

Fig. S6. Genome-wide methylation levels at small spatial scale (upper graphs), large spatial scale (central graphs), and between soil moisture treatments (lower graphs).

Fig. S7. DMC density plot showing methylation gain and loss for clustered vs. solitary DMCs along the spatial and altitudinal gradient.

Table S1. DMC methylation details along the fine-scale altitudinal gradient, the large-scale spatial gradient and between soil moisture treatments.

Table S2. Clustering behavior of each DMC.

Table S3. Output of mixed model assessing the relationship between DMC differentiation and cluster size.

Table S4. Generalized model and pairwise post hoc tests demonstrating how epigenetic diversity differs along gradients.

Table S5. Gene ontology terms (biological processes) enriched in spatial DMCs.

Table S6. Gene ontology terms (biological processes) enriched in altitudinal DMCs.

Table S7. Transposon function associated to DMCs in transposons.

Location (N)		Altitude	Space	Latitude	Longitude
1, French Pyrenees (5)	High	Mid(Dry)	West	42.93007	1.151337
2A, French Pyrenees (5)	Mid(Dry)			42.927851	1.165021
2B, French Pyrenees (5)	Mid(Moist)			42.927851	1.165021
3, French Pyrenees (5)	Low	Central	East	42.942821	1.170258
4, Vosges (eastern France) (5)				48.197752	5.884375
5, Karkonosze (Poland) (4)				50.883056	15.559722