Systematic review reveals multiple sexually antagonistic polymorphisms affecting human disease and complex traits

Jon Alexander Harper[1]*, Tim Janicke[2,3] and Edward H. Morrow[4]

* Corresponding author

[1]Evolution, Behaviour and Environment Group, School of Life Sciences, John Maynard Smith Building, University of Sussex, Brighton, BN1 9QG, UK.

[2]Centre d'Écologie Fonctionnelle et Évolutive, UMR 5175, CNRS, Université de Montpellier, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Montpellier, France.

[3]Applied Zoology, Technical University Dresden, Zellescher Weg 20b, 01062 Dresden, Germany.

[4]Department of Environmental and Life Sciences, Karlstad University, 651 88, Karlstad, Sweden.

Jon Alexander Harper ORCID: 0000-0002-1765-9990

Tim Janicke ORCID: 0000-0002-1453-6813

Edward H Morrow ORCID: 0000-0002-1853-7469

Short title: Systematic review of sexually antagonistic genes in human disease

Abstract

Sex differences in human disease risk and incidence are widely documented but their origins are poorly understood. An evolutionary model for differential disease risk between the sexes posits that alleles that are a risk factor (deleterious) in one sex may actually be protective (beneficial) in the opposite sex, and as such these sexually antagonistic (SA) alleles may be maintained in the population at frequencies higher than expected under purifying selection against unconditionally deleterious alleles. Sexual antagonism at genetic loci is thought to arise due to fundamental differences in how Darwinian fitness is maximized in the two sexes. Evidence for the occurrence of SA alleles comes from a number of non-human vertebrate and invertebrate models, which indicate they are common, although only very few specific SA loci have been identified. While there are many examples of loci with sex-limited effects in humans, there are no known examples of specific genetic variants that experience opposing patterns of selection between the sexes in humans. We hypothesized that this may be due to a mismatch in terminology between scientific disciplines rather than a genuine lack of examples. We therefore undertook a two-stage review of the literature for evidence of genetic polymorphisms in human disease and complex traits that exert their effects in a SA pattern, extracting effect sizes and allele frequencies where possible. In the first stage, we used search terms from evolutionary biology that aimed to identify examples of genes specifically referred to as having SA effects or were implicated in intralocus sexual conflict. In the second, we used terminology that was designed to capture as many examples as possible from the biomedical literature (e.g. sex-dependent, sex-opposite, men/women, boys/girls), which may have been missed in the first stage due to differences in terminology between the disciplines. The two searches gave very different results. The first stage returned 34 papers in total, none of which included evidence from humans of genetic loci with opposite effects on the two sexes. The second stage returned 881 papers, which after screening resulted in 70 papers, 32 were deemed eligible, and described 51 different genetic loci or haplotypes with sex-opposite effects on complex traits or disease. Of these, 22 loci increase disease risk or severity in one sex but are protective in the other. These loci may therefore be considered SA loci if the effects on disease risk translate into marginal effects on fitness through fecundity selection or mortality, although in no case were they referred to in terms of sexual

antagonism. As predicted, alleles with net positive effects across the sexes occurred at a higher frequency than those with net negative effects. Our review reveals that significant long-term barriers to communication are occurring between scientific fields as a result of discipline-specific terminology. Less specific search terms revealed evidence that SA variants are maintained at relatively high frequencies in humans, apparently because while they contribute to the propensity for one sex to develop a range of diseases and disorders, they protect the other.

495 words

Introduction

In species with separate sexes an evolutionary conflict at the level of individual genetic loci can occur, where alleles that are favoured by selection in one sex are selected against in the other (i.e intralocus sexual conflict, Parker, 1979). This sexually antagonistic (SA) form of selection is thought to be driven by differences in how the two sexes maximize their fitness and concomitant unequal variances in reproductive success. Research into SA selection has expanded recently with the recognition that it feeds into several important evolutionary processes. It is primarily thought to drive the evolution of sexual dimorphism and trait diversification (Lande, 1980; Pennell et al., 2016; Rice, 1984), including sex-biased gene expression (Ellegren and Parsch, 2007). As a potential driver of balancing selection, it has also been implicated in the maintenance of genetic variation (Connallon and Clark, 2013; Grieshop and Arnqvist, 2018) that would otherwise be eroded by directional selection. Most recently, it has been suggested that genetic variation at SA loci could contribute to the occurrence of a number of common human diseases (Morrow, 2015; Morrow and Connallon, 2013), which also show considerable variation between the sexes in terms of their prevalence, severity and age of onset (Ober et al., 2008; Rigby and Kulathinal, 2015).

Despite the interest in sexual antagonism as an evolutionary force, determining the identity of SA loci remains a major challenge (Ruzicka et al., 2020). An early empirical milestone in the field of sexual conflict was achieved by quantitative genetic studies demonstrating that genomes in a laboratory adapted population of *Drosophila melanogaster* harbour significant amounts of SA standing genetic variation (Chippindale et al., 2001; Rice, 1992). A number of other systems have shown similar results, albeit using different methods, including invertebrates and vertebrates from both lab and wild populations (Bonduriansky and Chenoweth, 2009; Foerster et al., 2007; Mills et al., 2011). With the advent of advanced genomic tools, two model systems report specific examples of SA genetic loci: in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) the VGLL3 locus (Barson et al., 2015), and in *D. melanogaster* the DDT-R locus (Rostant et al., 2015), the Ala-278-Thr polymorphism in the mitochondrial genome (Camus et al., 2015), and multiple candidate loci from a recent genome-wide association study (Ruzicka et al., 2019).

Although humans have also been shown to experience SA selection for some quantitative traits (Garver-Apgar et al., 2011; Stearns et al., 2012; Stulp et al., 2012), and there

are numerous reports of genetic loci with sex-specific effects (i.e. effects that differ in magnitude between the sexes) on multiple complex traits or disease phenotypes (Gilks et al., 2014; Winkler et al., 2015), there are apparently no clear examples of SA loci in humans, which is inconsistent with theoretical expectations (Connallon and Clark, 2014). One potential explanation is that sexual antagonism is a weak selective force in humans, with sexual dimorphism being rather limited (Dixson, 2009; Short, 1979). This may indicate that concordant selection pressures between the sexes have dominated our evolutionary history. But the recent quantitative genetic studies challenge this view (Stearns et al., 2012; Stulp et al., 2012), and indeed theory predicts there is an inevitability to SA loci occurring in organisms with separate sexes (Connallon and Clark, 2014; Parker et al., 1972). Thus, there is a clear disparity between, on the one hand, theoretical expectations and quantitative genetic evidence that SA selection does occur in humans, and on the other hand, a complete lack of specific examples of SA loci. All this in the context of decades of research into how individual genetic variants influence disease profiles.

An alternative explanation for the absence of documented SA loci in humans is that since biomedical science does not use the same terminology for SA effects that evolutionary biology uses, there may in fact be examples that have been misclassified and therefore remain hidden in the literature. For example, genetic loci with sex-specific effects are frequently referred to as *sex-dependent* effects in the biomedical literature. Other terms are also used for related concepts, including *sex-different* effects. Furthermore, *sex-opposite* effects (i.e. a positive effect in one sex and a negative in the other) could be SA effects if the phenotype in question is deleterious, as disease phenotypes often are, since they can influence an individual's survival or reproductive fitness. The biomedical literature also frequently uses the terms *sex* and *gender* interchangeably, with *males* and *females* more often than not referred to as *men and women*, or *boys and girls* (Khramtsova et al., 2019). There is therefore ample scope for discipline-specific terms to be used for describing the same concept, which may hinder communication between disciplines and obscure examples of SA loci. Moreover, although there has been some progress in introducing concepts from evolutionary biology into the field of medicine (Nesse and Williams, 1994), those inroads have been relatively recent. It is therefore likely that the concepts of (intralocus) sexual conflict and sexual antagonism are not generally well known within biomedical science, and variants that may have SA effects on disease risk may not be referred to as such. A secondary related hypothesis

is that SA effects, when discovered, are discounted as errors as they do not match expectations that sex-differences in phenotype or genetic architecture are not important (Clayton and Collins, 2014). As a result, that may also lead them to be misclassified or simply go unreported, leading to a general publication bias.

For these reasons, we propose that a systematic review of the biomedical literature to identify SA loci in humans requires a specific and targeted set of search terms that would not normally be used within the field of evolutionary biology. We test this assumption by dividing our systematic review into two stages. In the first stage, we search for papers identifying specific genetic loci using terms directly relating to the concept of sexual antagonism and others utilized in evolutionary biology. We supplement this search with a second stage, where we develop a set of terms that we hypothesize may capture the same concept as sexual antagonism within the biomedical literature, although not explicitly stated as such, as well as additional terminology relating to possible alternatives for describing the two sexes. From our searches we also extracted data on sex-specific effect sizes and allele frequencies. We were then able to explore how effect sizes varied for the same alleles between the sexes, and test the prediction that SA alleles experiencing net positive selection between the sexes may achieve higher equilibrium frequencies than alleles that experience more symmetric or net negative patterns of selection (Morrow and Connallon, 2013). Our systematic review aims to advance our understanding of SA genes in humans, which show considerable and largely unexplained diversity in sexual dimorphism for disease phenotypes (Ober et al., 2006; Rigby and Kulathinal, 2015), but we also highlight how and why interdisciplinary research (in this case between biology and medicine) can sometimes fail, impeding scientific advances over significant periods of time.

Methods

For this systematic review we followed PRISMA guidance where possible (Moher et al., 2009). PubMed (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/) was searched for articles on 2nd December 2020 with no time limit. The searches were carried out in two Stages, with the organism filter set to human in both stages. In Stage 1, eligible studies were required to report specific genetic variants or haplotypes that were referred to as sexually antagonistic or were an example of intralocus sexual conflict. To achieve this, we conducted a Boolean search for articles that used the terms “sexual antagonism” OR “sexually antagonistic” OR “intralocus sexual conflict”

156 AND “locus” OR “loci”, “gene” OR “snp” OR “polymorphism” OR “variant” OR “allele” in their
157 abstract or title. The Stage 1 search returned 34 articles in total (full search term in the
158 supplementary material; search output is accessible at
159 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/collections/60255050/?sort=pubdate).
160 In Stage 2, studies were required to report specific genetic variants or haplotypes in
161 humans with opposite effects in the two sexes on either complex traits, the outcome of a
162 medical intervention, or disease risk/severity. We define complex traits as likely with a
163 polygenic genetic architecture but are not directly related to a disease phenotype. In this
164 second stage search terms were specifically designed to include papers from the biomedical
165 literature that may have been missed in the first stage because they do not report their
166 findings with terms normally found within the evolutionary biology literature. Again, we
167 conducted a Boolean search for articles that used terms in their title or abstract to describe
168 an opposite or different effect in the two sexes (“sex dependent”, “sex different”, “gender-
169 dependent”, “sex AND opposite”, or “gender AND opposite”), or that capture this concept
170 with alternative words for sex ((“male AND female AND opposite” OR “men AND women AND
171 opposite” OR “boys AND girls AND opposite”) AND (“locus” OR “loci” OR “gene” OR “snp” OR
172 “polymorphism” OR “variant” OR “allele”)). Full details of the search terms used and the
173 numbers of articles returned are provided in the supplementary material. The Stage 2 search
174 returned 881 papers (Figure 1) (full search term in the supplementary material; search output
175 is accessible at https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/collections/60254985/?sort=pubdate).
176 The abstracts of the papers from Stage 1 were then examined by EM and from Stage
177 2 by JH, and any papers that had the possibility of reporting an opposite effect of a specific
178 genetic locus on a complex trait, medical intervention or on disease risk/severity were
179 considered for further screening. From Stage 1, no articles passed the screening. From Stage
180 2, this screening produced a shortlist of 70 candidate papers
181 (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/collections/57906298/?sort=pubdate) Both JH and EM
182 then reviewed all the full texts of these candidate papers in detail. Papers were included in
183 the final list if they described a sex-opposite or SA effect linked to a specific genetic locus or
184 loci, and reported the effect to be statistically significant (at a P-value cut-off of <0.05). One
185 additional paper was considered from an outside source.
186 We converted all reported sex-specific effects into a standard effect size (Cohen’s *d*)
187 quantifying the magnitude of how a given variant affects the studied trait expressed in the

188 given sex. Specifically, Cohen's *d* was computed based on the reported descriptive statistics
189 (*N*, mean, standard error) or by conversion from other effect sizes (Odds ratio) and test
190 statistics (*F*-values, *t*-values) using formulas reported elsewhere (Borenstein, 2009; Gurevitch
191 et al., 2013, pp. 195–206; Lajeunesse, 2013). We sought information directly from the authors
192 where these metrics were not possible to extract from the papers themselves (12 authors
193 contacted, 5 responded, 3 responded with data, all later excluded as they did not fulfil the
194 criteria for eligibility). We also recorded the gene name, locus (with accession/rs number
195 where possible), trait affected and the frequency of the focal allele having the effect,
196 hereafter referred to as *effect allele frequency*. Identification for the variants were taken from
197 the studies where possible, but others necessitated searching the National Centre for
198 Biotechnology Information (NCBI) to find the Reference SNP cluster ID for the variants
199 described. Where effect allele frequencies were not reported, we used genotype frequencies
200 to calculate effect allele frequency. Not all studies reported allele or genotype frequencies
201 and so we attempted to supplement these data with allele frequencies from the 1000
202 genomes database (Auton et al., 2015), since these show a strong correlation with effect allele
203 frequencies reported in the studies reviewed (Pearson correlation: $N = 25$ $r = 0.94$, $P > 0.001$;
204 Figure S1). However, using this approach we were only able to supplement our allele
205 frequency data for one additional locus (rs7341475 in the *RELN* gene; Table 1).
206 If b_f and b_m represent the estimated effect of the focal allele in females and males
207 respectively, then positive values of b_f or b_m imply that the allele is positively associated with
208 disease expression, whereas negative values imply that the allele is negatively associated with
209 disease expression. SA alleles are therefore defined as those with opposite effects between
210 the sexes (i.e. $b_f < 0 < b_m$ or $b_m < 0 < b_f$). An evolutionary model of evolution at SA loci predicts
211 that as the magnitude of the positive effect that an SA allele has outweighs the negative
212 effect, the higher the frequency that allele can achieve (Morrow and Connallon, 2013). We
213 therefore expect a negative relationship between the ratio of positive to negative effect sizes
214 (hereafter referred to as the *effect size ratio*) and observed allele frequency. To investigate
215 this, we calculated the effect size ratio by dividing the positive standardized effect size by the
216 negative standardized effect size; when $b_f < 0 < b_m$ effect size ratio was calculated as b_m / b_f,
217 and when $b_m < 0 < b_f$ effect size ratio was calculated as b_f / b_m. Thus, SA alleles with a greater
218 beneficial effect will have a smaller, more negative effect size ratio (<-1), while SA alleles that
219 have a greater deleterious effect will have a larger effect size ratio (>-1), up to a maximum

220 value of 0 (positive values occur when the effect is positive or negative in both sexes, but the
221 allele would then no longer be defined as a SA allele).
222 We modelled how effect allele frequency changes with effect size ratio using a
223 generalized linear model (GLM), weighted by the inverse of the variance of the effect sizes
224 such that data points with smaller variance have a higher weight, since smaller sample sizes
225 were associated with larger and more variable effect sizes (Figure S2). We initially also
226 included trait class and its interaction with effect size ratio as a fixed factor with two levels
227 (complex trait and disease trait/severity), since alleles that influence complex traits in
228 opposite directions are not necessarily under SA selection and so may not behave in the way
229 predicted, whereas alleles influencing disease traits, unless very late acting, are more likely
230 to show a closer relationship with marginal effects on fitness. As a response variable, effect
231 allele frequency is limited between 0 and 1, so we looked at allele counts to allow allele
232 frequency to vary freely. GLMs with binomial error distribution showed substantial
233 overdispersion, so we used a quasibinomial function to address this issue (Payne et al., 2018).
234 We used a Chi-squared test to infer significance of the two predictor variables and their
235 interaction. The full model indicated that the interaction term and trait class have no
236 significant effect, so that we report the fit of the reduced model which only includes effect
237 size ratio. We also subsequently modelled the data for the two trait classes (complex traits
238 and disease risk/severity) separately, again using a quasibinomial distribution function, to see
239 if the result was replicated in these smaller subsets of the data. The raw data and R script is
240 available for replicating the analyses and figures we present (Supplementary Material).

241 Results

242 The Stage 1 search found no articles that described genetic loci in humans with effects that
243 were sexually antagonistic. In contrast, the Stage 2 search identified 32 articles that described
244 variants with statistically significant sex-opposite or SA effects (Figure 1;
245 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/collections/60278165/?sort=pubdate). From the studies
246 examined, 51 SA variants were identified (Table 1), affecting 21 different complex traits (30
247 loci) and 19 disease risk/severity traits (21 loci), with a large range of effect sizes. There were
248 no variants affecting medical intervention traits that passed the screening process. The
249 majority of alleles had effect sizes of similar absolute values in the two sexes, with larger
250 effects tending to show greater differences on absolute effect size (Figure S3).

We found 22 studies provided sufficient data to allow the relationship between effect size ratio and effect allele frequency to be explored by statistical modelling. Trait class and its interaction with effect size ratio were initially included in the model but neither were found to have a significant effect (GLM: trait class dfs = 1,35, deviance = 15.5×10^3, $P = 0.965$; interaction dfs = 1,34, deviance = 1476, P = 0.989) and were therefore excluded from the subsequent model in which effect size ratio was found to relate negatively to effect allele frequency, as predicted (GLM: estimate ± SE = -1.10 ± 0.50, dfs = 1,36, deviance = 38.7×10^6, $P = 0.024$; Figure 2). For three loci there were data on effect sizes for more than one trait (Table 1), which introduced a degree of non-independence between these values in the dataset. However, resampling the data with effect sizes for only one trait for these three loci in turn and modelling these datasets in the same way (18 individual GLMs, dfs = 1,31) did not change the results qualitatively (minimum, maximum: model estimate = -1.0963, -1.0964; deviance = 38.72×10^6, 38.73×10^6; $P = 0.03618, 0.03620$).

Although the interaction term between trait type and effect size ratio was not significant we wanted to investigate whether the negative relationship between effect size ratio and effect allele frequency across all loci was repeated when the data was divided according to trait class, since while opposite effects on disease risk/severity may show a direct relationship with SA fitness effects, complex traits may or may not be experiencing SA selection, even if effects are in opposite directions in the two sexes. However, although the trends were both again negative as predicted, the generalized linear models of these smaller datasets were only marginally significant (complex traits model estimate ± SE = -1.10 ± 0.61, dfs = 1,24, deviance = 38.7 × 106, P = 0.065; disease risk/severity model estimate ± SE = -1.34 ± 0.77, dfs = 1,10, deviance = 5.14 × 104, P = 0.053; Figure S4). As for the full dataset, there was some lack of independence for the complex traits subset which contained loci with effect sizes for more than one trait. Again, resampling and modelling these datasets in the same way (18 individual glms, dfs 1, 22) did not change the results quantitatively (minimum, maximum: model estimate = -1.0960, -1.0961; deviance = 38.669×10^6, 38.675×10^6; $P = 0.07774, 0.07776$).

Discussion

The Stage 1 literature search of our systematic review focussed on finding reports of specific genetic loci in humans with evidence for SA effects using terminology normally associated

282 with the evolutionary concepts of sexual conflict or sexual antagonism. The Stage 2 search
283 sought equivalent evidence, but used search terms that we anticipated would be used by
284 scientists outside the field of evolutionary biology, who may not use the same terminology.
285 Although the Stage 1 search did not find any examples of SA loci occurring in humans, the
286 Stage 2 search identified 51 genetic loci across 39 studies that had ostensibly SA effects, but
287 were not described as such. Clearly then the Stage 1 review failed to identify multiple relevant
288 reports going back some 20 years because the terminology used in those reports did not
289 match the conceptual framework of the search. The Stage 2 search may also be a lower limit
290 given searches of other larger databases may also harbour further examples (see below).
291 Although not yet validated, these reports nonetheless represent a substantial body of
292 evidence that humans, like other organisms with separate sexes (Bonduriansky and
293 Chenoweth, 2009), inevitably experience SA selection for a wide range of complex traits
294 (Connallon and Clark, 2014; Garver-Apgar et al., 2011; Stearns et al., 2012; Stulp et al., 2012),
295 as well as for a range of diseases.

296 A key prediction from a population genetic model of SA genetic variation is that SA
297 alleles are expected to achieve higher equilibrium frequencies, without necessarily going to
298 fixation, as the relative magnitude of the positive effect in one sex outweighs the negative
299 effect in the opposite sex i.e. an increasingly negative effect size ratio (Morrow and Connallon,
300 2013). We found clear support for this prediction, with a negative relationship between effect
301 size ratio and allele frequency when examining all complex traits and diseases together (Fig
302 2), although this relationship was only marginally significant when complex or disease trait
303 classes were modelled separately (Fig S3). These results lend support to the view that the loci
304 identified are genuinely experiencing SA selection, and although it is difficult to discern how
305 selection acts on trait size in males and females for complex traits we would not expect the
306 frequencies of disease-causing alleles to be so high under a mutation-selection balance. We
307 were not able to look at the evolutionary history or age of these alleles due to limited
308 information (n = 8) (Albers and McVean, 2018), it would nonetheless be valuable to examine
309 the population dynamics of these alleles over a broad timescale.

310 The loci showed a very broad range of effect sizes, from small to very large, with a
311 generally symmetrical inverse relationship between effect size in one sex and the other
312 (Figure S2), which is generally expected, since our screening process necessarily excluded
313 studies reporting effects in the same direction across the two sexes. Nonetheless, it is striking

314 just how large some of the effects were, with very large negative effects in one sex
315 simultaneously occurring with similarly large positive effects. Larger and more variable effect
316 sizes are expected when sample sizes are small, a pattern we also found, which motivates
317 further investigation of the traits and loci included in this review to elucidate more accurate
318 estimates of real effect sizes.

319 The loci themselves fall within genes that influence a broad range of phenotypes,
320 including morphological, physiological and behavioural complex traits, and a similarly diverse
321 range of disease types, including various cancers, neurological disorders and immune system
322 processes (see Table 1). For the most part, the diseases appear to be early-acting rather than
323 late-onset, with the exception of perhaps bone mineral density. As such, it seems reasonable
324 that an allele that increases disease risk or severity in these cases will indeed have a
325 concomitant reduction in marginal fitness. Although a single large study identified several loci
326 related to BMI adjusted waist-to-hip ratio, there is generally no overall bias towards one
327 particular trait or disease class. The total number of loci is relatively small however, which
328 may limit power to identify such biases if they exist. We also did not find any examples of SA
329 loci on the X-chromosome, which may or may not be a hotspot of sexual antagonism (Fry,
330 2010; Rice, 1984; Ruzicka and Connallon, 2020). This was expected given that it is commonly
331 not included in genome-wide analyses (Wise et al., 2013), although most of the papers we
332 reviewed were candidate gene studies. Nonetheless, we anticipate further examples may be
333 identified should data from the X-chromosome be included systematically in association
334 studies.

335 We also found evidence that some traits are influenced by more than one genetic
336 variant in sex-opposite or SA ways (n=8), or that some specific variants have pleiotropic
337 effects on more than one trait or disease in a sex-opposite or SA way (n=6; see Table 1). This
338 complexity in the genetic architecture of traits or diseases may make conflict resolution
339 particularly difficult, as a change in the allele at a single genetic locus experiencing SA
340 selection may simultaneously influence multiple genes or phenotypes in both sexes in
341 divergent ways (Fitzpatrick, 2004; Pennell and Morrow, 2013). Consequently, this may explain
342 the persistence of intralocus sexual conflict at these loci. It may be that some of the remaining
343 loci also have as yet unidentified pleiotropic effects with other traits or there are as yet
344 unidentified SA loci influencing those same traits or diseases. Of the 51 variants identified, 4
345 were confirmed to be haplotypes. Such variants, consisting of two or more SNPs in linkage

346 disequilibrium having a joint effect, could also present a problem for conflict resolution, since
347 the ability of selection to act on any individual locus independent of the others in the linkage
348 block is reduced for linked loci. This issue may also extend to other single variants reported
349 here if they also occur in linkage blocks.

350 Although we have identified multiple genetic loci with either sex-opposite or SA
351 effects these are likely outnumbered by those with either sex-specific (same direction but
352 different magnitude) or sex-limited effects. For instance, Winkler et al. (2015) report 44 loci
353 with sex-specific or sex-limited effects but only 11 with sex-opposite effects. Several other
354 genome-wide association studies report sex-specific effects in several human diseases
355 (Khramtsova et al., 2019), and a recent (non-systematic) review identified 37 SNPs with sex-
356 dependent effects (Gilks et al., 2014). Detection of loci with SA versus sex-specific or sex-
357 limited effects may differ systematically since we expect SA loci are more likely to persist at
358 intermediate frequencies than loci with sex-specific effects (i.e. that differ between the sexes
359 in magnitude but not sign). A larger systematic review that targeted variants with sex-specific
360 or sex-dependent effects would therefore be a valuable contribution and enable us to more
361 clearly understand how important SA alleles are relative to the broader context of genes with
362 non-identical effects in the two sexes.

363 A key gap in our knowledge is whether the putative examples of sex-opposite or SA
364 alleles presented here can be validated using independently derived datasets in the same or
365 different sub-populations. For this, focussing on those variants associated with sex-
366 differential disease risk would naturally be the most fruitful for advancing our knowledge of
367 sexual antagonism in human disease. We therefore encourage specialists for the particular
368 disease groups presented in Table 1 to include in the future the potential for SA genetic
369 effects to occur when designing studies and analysing data. It is also important for all studies
370 to report results in sufficient detail so that effect sizes can be calculated (if not given) as well
371 as allele frequency data. Unfortunately, 17 studies failed to do this, so could not be included
372 in our review and subsequent test of the evolutionary model. More generally, our study
373 reinforces the view that sex is an important factor in shaping genetic associations with human
374 traits and disease, even in divergent and contradictory ways, and so should always be
375 considered when investigators examine genetic associations with phenotypes (Lee, 2018;
376 Ober et al., 2008).

There is a possibility that some bias exists in the PubMed database against papers from the field of evolutionary biology, and if we had used another database then both stages would have returned valid papers. We subsequently (14th Dec 2020) sought to investigate this possibility with additional searches of Scopus and Web of Science. Repeating the Stage 1 search initially returned 85 papers in Web of Science (Basic search of Topic, refined by "Human" within results) and 71 papers in Scopus (include keywords "Human", exclude "Non-Human"), but again no papers made it through the screening process. Repeating the Stage 2 search returned a much larger number of studies in both Web of Science (4,573; Basic search of Topic, refined by "Human" within results) and Scopus (6,616; Advanced search of Title-Abstract, filter: include human and humans, exclude nonhumans, Articles only), with 8,604 unique records. This large number of records is too many to currently screen and may harbour further examples of SA loci in humans, but it is noteworthy that the majority of the initial list of studies found during Stage 2 using PubMed were also found in the other two databases (712 out of 881) as well as 28 out of the screened list of 32 studies identified in the current systematic review.

The disparity between the two stages of the review process provides a remarkable example of how discipline-specific terminology and concepts can hinder scientific communication between fields for substantial periods of time. For many of the studies identified in this review, the focus of the research was not on quantifying or even identifying sex-specific genetic effects in traits or disease, although they were tested for. The responses to such findings varied. Some framed these results as a major finding, others merely made note of them, with one suggesting that since the genetic associations were in opposite directions in the two sexes then it should be regarded as a false positive (Wong et al., 2005). It is possible, or even likely then that there exists a publication bias in the biomedical sciences against studies with apparently incongruous sex-opposite or SA effects, perhaps in part because the evolutionary framework that may provide a context for understanding those results is not generally appreciated or known. Of course, for evolutionary biologists interested in the role of SA selection on human traits and disease, this is clearly a problem. For many years no specific examples of SA loci were known in humans, and yet the first putative examples in fact appeared in the literature two decades ago. Our systematic review therefore provides a concrete illustration of how advances to both fields have likely been hampered by

a limited understanding of the theoretical framework and terminology used by the neighbouring field.

How can communication between the fields of medicine and evolutionary biology be facilitated? We do not have a comprehensive answer but clearly training in, or an increased awareness of, evolutionary medicine for scientists in both camps would probably be beneficial. The topic of evolutionary biology now forms a key part of the education for some biomedical scientists and clinicians. Similarly, evolutionary medicine is now frequently included in fundamental textbooks on evolution, and is being taught to students of evolutionary biology as part of their degree courses. These changes have been relatively recent, are far from being universally employed, but they should be encouraged. Funders of primary research are also now actively encouraging or obliging researchers to include sex as a factor when designing their studies (Clayton and Collins, 2014), although this may simply result in studies that aim to control for rather than investigate these effects explicitly. Consequently even this remedy may still preclude a deeper understanding of the origins of some human diseases.

Acknowledgements

We thank Jessica Abbott, Tim Connallon and Filip Ruzicka for comments on a previous version of the MS. Funding was provided by the Swedish Research Council (Grant number: 2019-03567) and by the Royal Society to EHM as a University Research Fellowship and Enhancement Award. TJ was funded by the Centre national de la recherche scientifique (CNRS) and the German Research Foundation (DFG grant number: JA 2653/2-1).

References

Albers, P.K., McVean, G., 2018. Dating genomic variants and shared ancestry in population-scale sequencing data (preprint). Genomics. https://doi.org/10.1101/416610

Auton, A., Abecasis, G.R., Altshuler, D.M., Durbin, R.M., Abecasis, G.R., Bentley, D.R., Chakravarti, A., Clark, A.G., Donnelly, P., Eichler, E.E., Flicek, P., Gabriel, S.B., Gibbs, R.A., Green, E.D., Hurles, M.E., Knoppers, B.M., Korbel, J.O., Lander, E.S., Lee, C., Lehrach, H., Mardis, E.R., Marth, G.T., McVean, G.A., Nickerson, D.A., Schmidt, J.P., Sherry, S.T., Wang, J., Wilson, R.K., Gibbs, R.A., Boerwinkle, E., Doddapaneni, H., Han, Y., Korchina, V., Kovar, C., Lee, S., Muzny, D., Reid, J.G., Zhu, Y., Wang, J., Chang, Y., Feng, Q., Fang, X., Guo, X., Jian, M., Jiang, H., Jin, X., Lan, T., Li, G., Li, J., Li, Y., Liu, S., Liu, X., Lu, Y., Ma, X., Tang, M., Wang, B., Wang, G., Wu, H., Wu, R., Xu, X., Yin, Y.,

Zhang, D., Zhang, W., Zhao, J., Zhao, M., Zheng, X., Lander, E.S., Altshuler, D.M., Gabriel, S.B., Gupta, N., Gharani, N., Toji, L.H., Gerry, N.P., Resch, A.M., Flicek, P., Barker, J., Clarke, L., Gil, L., Hunt, S.E., Kelman, G., Kulesha, E., Leinonen, R., McLaren, W.M., Radhakrishnan, R., Roa, A., Smirnov, D., Smith, R.E., Streeter, I., Thormann, A., Toneva, I., Vaughan, B., Zheng-Bradley, X., Bentley, D.R., Grocock, R., Humphray, S., James, T., Kingsbury, Z., Lehrach, H., Sudbrak, R., Albrecht, M.W., Amstislavskiy, V.S., Borodina, T.A., Lienhard, M., Mertes, F., Sultan, M., Timmermann, B., Yaspo, M.-L., Mardis, E.R., Wilson, R.K., Fulton, L., Fulton, R., Sherry, S.T., Ananiev, V., Belaia, Z., Beloslyudtsev, D., Bouk, N., Chen, C., Church, D., Cohen, R., Cook, C., Garner, J., Hefferon, T., Kimelman, M., Liu, C., Lopez, J., Meric, P., O'Sullivan, C., Ostapchuk, Y., Phan, L., Ponomarov, S., Schneider, V., Shekhtman, E., Sirotkin, K., Slotta, D., Zhang, H., McVean, G.A., Durbin, R.M., Balasubramaniam, S., Burton, J., Danecek, P., Keane, T.M., Kolb-Kokocinski, A., McCarthy, S., Stalker, J., Quail, M., Schmidt, J.P., Davies, C.J., Gollub, J., Webster, T., Wong, B., Zhan, Y., Auton, A., Campbell, C.L., Kong, Y., Marcketta, A., Gibbs, R.A., Yu, F., Antunes, L., Bainbridge, M., Muzny, D., Sabo, A., Huang, Z., Wang, J., Coin, L.J.M., Fang, L., Guo, X., Jin, X., Li, G., Li, Q., Li, Y., Li, Z., Lin, H., Liu, B., Luo, R., Shao, H., Xie, Y., Ye, C., Yu, C., Zhang, F., Zheng, H., Zhu, H., Alkan, C., Dal, E., Kahveci, F., Marth, G.T., Garrison, E.P., Kural, D., Lee, W.-P., Fung Leong, W., Stromberg, M., Ward, A.N., Wu, J., Zhang, M., Daly, M.J., DePristo, M.A., Handsaker, R.E., Altshuler, D.M., Banks, E., Bhatia, G., del Angel, G., Gabriel, S.B., Genovese, G., Gupta, N., Li, H., Kashin, S., Lander, E.S., McCarroll, S.A., Nemesh, J.C., Poplin, R.E., Yoon, S.C., Lihm, J., Makarov, V., Clark, A.G., Gottipati, S., Keinan, A., Rodriguez-Flores, J.L., Korbel, J.O., Rausch, T., Fritz, M.H., Stütz, A.M., Flicek, P., Beal, K., Clarke, L., Datta, A., Herrero, J., McLaren, W.M., Ritchie, G.R.S., Smith, R.E., Zerbino, D., Zheng-Bradley, X., Sabeti, P.C., Shlyakhter, I., Schaffner, S.F., Vitti, J., Cooper, D.N., Ball, E.V., Stenson, P.D., Bentley, D.R., Barnes, B., Bauer, M., Keira Cheetham, R., Cox, A., Eberle, M., Humphray, S., Kahn, S., Murray, L., Peden, J., Shaw, R., Kenny, E.E., Batzer, M.A., Konkel, M.K., Walker, J.A., MacArthur, D.G., Lek, M., Sudbrak, R., Amstislavskiy, V.S., Herwig, R., Mardis, E.R., Ding, L., Koboldt, D.C., Larson, D., Ye, K., Gravel, S., The 1000 Genomes Project Consortium, Corresponding authors, Steering committee, Production group, Baylor College of Medicine, BGI-Shenzhen, Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Coriell Institute for Medical Research, European Molecular Biology Laboratory, E.B.I., Illumina, Max Planck Institute for Molecular Genetics, McDonnell Genome Institute at Washington University, US National Institutes of Health, University of Oxford, Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute, Analysis group, Affymetrix, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bilkent University, Boston College, Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, Cornell University, European Molecular Biology Laboratory, Harvard University, Human Gene Mutation Database, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, Louisiana State University, Massachusetts General Hospital, McGill University, National Eye Institute, N., 2015. A global reference for human genetic variation. Nature 526, 68–74. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature15393

Barson, N.J., Aykanat, T., Hindar, K., Baranski, M., Bolstad, G.H., Fiske, P., Jacq, C., Jensen, A.J., Johnston, S.E., Karlsson, S., Kent, M., Moen, T., Niemelä, E., Nome, T., Næsje, T.F., Orell, P., Romakkaniemi, A., Sægrov, H., Urdal, K., Erkinaro, J., Lien, S., Primmer, C.R., 2015. Sex-dependent dominance at a single locus maintains variation in age at maturity in salmon. Nature 528, 405–408. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16062

488 Bonduriansky, R., Chenoweth, S.F., 2009. Intralocus sexual conflict. Trends Ecol Evol 24,
489 280–288.
490 Borenstein, M., 2009. Converting Among Effect Sizes, in: Introduction to Meta-Analysis. John
491 Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp. 45–49. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470743386.ch7
492 Camus, M.F., Wolf, J.B.W., Morrow, E.H., Dowling, D.K., 2015. Single Nucleotides in the
493 mtDNA Sequence Modify Mitochondrial Molecular Function and Are Associated with
494 Sex-Specific Effects on Fertility and Aging. Curr. Biol. 25, 2717–2722.
495 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2015.09.012
496 Carlson, J.C., Nidey, N.L., Butali, A., Buxo, C.J., Christensen, K., Deleyiannis, F.W.-D., Hecht,
497 J.T., Field, L.L., Moreno-Uribe, L.M., Orioli, I.M., Poletta, F.A., Padilla, C., Vieira, A.R.,
498 Weinberg, S.M., Wehby, G.L., Feingold, E., Murray, J.C., Marazita, M.L., Leslie, E.J.,
499 2018. Genome-wide interaction studies identify sex-specific risk alleles for
500 nonsyndromic orofacial clefts. Genet. Epidemiol. 42, 664–672.
501 https://doi.org/10.1002/gepi.22158
502 Chippindale, A.K., Gibson, J.R., Rice, W.R., 2001. Negative genetic correlation for adult
503 fitness between sexes reveals ontogenetic conflict in Drosophila. Proc. Natl. Acad.
504 Sci. USA 98, 1671–1675.
505 Cicchetti, D., Rogosch, F.A., Hecht, K.F., Crick, N.R., Hetzel, S., 2014. Moderation of
506 maltreatment effects on childhood borderline personality symptoms by gender and
507 oxytocin receptor and FK506 binding protein 5 genes. Dev. Psychopathol. 26, 831–
508 849. https://doi.org/10.1017/S095457941400042X
509 Clayton, J.A., Collins, F.S., 2014. Policy: NIH to balance sex in cell and animal studies. Nature
510 509, 282–283. https://doi.org/10.1038/509282a
511 Connallon, T., Clark, A., G., 2014. Evolutionary inevitability of sexual antagonism. Proc. R.
512 Soc. B Biol. Sci. 281, 20132123. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.2123
513 Connallon, T., Clark, A.G., 2013. Antagonistic Versus Nonantagonistic Models of Balancing
514 Selection: Characterizing the Relative Timescales and Hitchhiking Effects of Partial
515 Selective Sweeps. Evolution 67, 908–917. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-
516 5646.2012.01800.x
517 Dauvilliers, Y., Neidhart, E., Lecendreux, M., Billiard, M., Tafti, M., 2001. MAO-A and COMT
518 polymorphisms and gene effects in narcolepsy. Mol. Psychiatry 6, 367–372.
519 https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.mp.4000911
520 Dixson, A., 2009. Dixson, A. F. (2009) Sexual selection and the Origins of Human Mating
521 Systems. Oxford University Press, UK.
522 Ellegren, H., Parsch, J., 2007. The evolution of sex-biased genes and sex-biased gene
523 expression. Nat Rev Genet 8, 689–698. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg2167
524 Fillingim, R.B., Kaplan, L., Staud, R., Ness, T.J., Glover, T.L., Campbell, C.M., Mogil, J.S.,
525 Wallace, M.R., 2005. The A118G single nucleotide polymorphism of the mu-opioid
526 receptor gene (OPRM1) is associated with pressure pain sensitivity in humans. J. Pain
527 Off. J. Am. Pain Soc. 6, 159–167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpain.2004.11.008
528 Fitzpatrick, M.J., 2004. Pleiotropy and the genomic location of sexually selected genes. Am.
529 Nat. 163, 800–808. https://doi.org/10.1086/386297
530 Foerster, K., Coulson, T., Sheldon, B.C., Pemberton, J.M., Clutton-Brock, T., Kruuk, L.E.B.,
531 2007. Sexually antagonistic genetic variation for fitness in red deer. Nature 447,
532 1107–1110.
533 Franck, N., Lanne, T., Astrand, O., Engvall, J., Lindstrom, T., Ostgren, C.J., Nystrom, F.H.,
534 2012. Cardiovascular risk factors related to the PPARgamma Pro12Ala polymorphism

535 in patients with type 2 diabetes are gender dependent. Blood Press. 21, 122–127.
536 https://doi.org/10.3109/08037051.2011.623349
537 Fry, J.D., 2010. The Genomic Location of Sexually Antagonistic Variation: Some Cautionary
538 Comments. Evolution 64, 1510–1516. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-
539 5646.2009.00898.x
540 Garver-Apgar, C.E., Eaton, M.A., Tybur, J.M., Emery Thompson, M., 2011. Evidence of
541 intralocus sexual conflict: physically and hormonally masculine individuals have more
542 attractive brothers relative to sisters. Evol. Hum. Behav. 32, 423–432.
543 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2011.03.005
544 Gastaldi, M., Diziere, S., Defoort, C., Portugal, H., Lairon, D., Darmon, M., Planells, R., 2007.
545 Sex-specific association of fatty acid binding protein 2 and microsomal triacylglycerol
546 transfer protein variants with response to dietary lipid changes in the 3-mo Medi-
547 RIVAGE primary intervention study. Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 86, 1633–1641.
548 https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcn/86.5.1633
549 Gilks, W.P., Abbott, J.K., Morrow, E.H., 2014. Sex differences in disease genetics: evidence,
550 evolution, and detection. Trends Genet. 30, 453–463.
551 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tig.2014.08.006
552 Gloria-Bottini, F., Bottini, N., Renzetti, G., Bottini, E., 2007. ACP1 and Th class of
553 immunological disease: evidence of interaction with gender. Int. Arch. Allergy
554 Immunol. 143, 170–176. https://doi.org/10.1159/000099308
555 Grieshop, K., Arnqvist, G., 2018. Sex-specific dominance reversal of genetic variation for
556 fitness. PLOS Biol. 16, e2006810. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2006810
557 Gurevitch, J., Koricheva, J., Mengersen, K., 2013. Handbook of Meta-Analysis In Ecology and
558 Evolution, Handbook of Meta-analysis in Ecology and Evolution.
559 https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400846184
560 Herman, A.I., Conner, T.S., Anton, R.F., Gelernter, J., Kranzler, H.R., Covault, J., 2011.
561 Variation in the gene encoding the serotonin transporter is associated with a
562 measure of sociopathy in alcoholics. Addict. Biol. 16, 124–132.
563 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1369-1600.2009.00197.x
564 Khramtsova, E.A., Davis, L.K., Stranger, B.E., 2019. The role of sex in the genomics of human
565 complex traits. Nat. Rev. Genet. 20, 173–190. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41576-018-
566 0083-1
567 Kim, B., Kim, H., Joo, Y.H., Lim, J., Kim, C.-Y., Song, K., 2010. Sex-different association of DAO
568 with schizophrenia in Koreans. Psychiatry Res. 179, 121–125.
569 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2008.08.009
570 Kiy, A., Wilhelm, O., Hildebrandt, A., Reuter, M., Sommer, W., 2013. On the genetic basis of
571 face cognition and its relation to fluid cognitive abilities. Genes Brain Behav. 12, 438–
572 445. https://doi.org/10.1111/gbb.12034
573 Korner, A., Ma, L., Franks, P.W., Kiess, W., Baier, L.J., Stumvoll, M., Kovacs, P., 2007. Sex-
574 specific effect of the Val1483Ile polymorphism in the fatty acid synthase gene (FAS)
575 on body mass index and lipid profile in Caucasian children. Int. J. Obes. 2005 31,
576 353–358. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.ijo.0803428
577 Lajeunesse, M., 2013. Recovering missing or partial data from studies: A survey of
578 conversions and imputations for meta-analysis. pp. 195–206.
579 Lande, R., 1980. Sexual dimorphism, sexual selection, and adaptation in polygenic
580 characters. Evolution 34, 292–305.

581 Lang, U.E., Hellweg, R., Bajbouj, M., Gaus, V., Sander, T., Gallinat, J., 2008. Gender-
582 dependent association of a functional NGF polymorphism with anxiety-related
583 personality traits. Pharmacopsychiatry 41, 196–199. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0028-
584 1082070
585 Lauritzen, L., Sorensen, L.B., Harslof, L.B., Ritz, C., Stark, K.D., Astrup, A., Dyssegaard, C.B.,
586 Egelund, N., Michaelsen, K.F., Damsgaard, C.T., 2017. Mendelian randomization
587 shows sex-specific associations between long-chain. Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 106, 88–95.
588 https://doi.org/10.3945/ajcn.117.152595
589 Lee, S.K., 2018. Sex as an important biological variable in biomedical research. BMB Rep. 51,
590 167–173. https://doi.org/10.5483/BMBRep.2018.51.4.034
591 Liu, Y.-H., Chen, Y.-J., Wu, H.-H., Wang, T.-Y., Tsai, F.-J., 2014. Single nucleotide
592 polymorphisms at the PRR3, ABCF1, and GNL1 genes in the HLA class I region are
593 associated with Graves' ophthalmopathy in a gender-dependent manner.
594 Ophthalmology 121, 2033–2039. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ophtha.2014.04.027
595 Ljungberg, L.U., Ostgren, C.J., Nystrom, F.H., Lanne, T., 2014. Associations of genetic
596 polymorphisms in the renin-angiotensin system with central aortic and ambulatory
597 blood pressure in type 2 diabetic patients. J. Renin-Angiotensin-Aldosterone Syst.
598 JRAAS 15, 61–68. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470320312474052
599 McCarthy, J.J., Somji, A., Weiss, L.A., Steffy, B., Vega, R., Barrett-Connor, E., Talavera, G.,
600 Glynne, R., 2009. Polymorphisms of the scavenger receptor class B member 1 are
601 associated with insulin resistance with evidence of gene by sex interaction. J. Clin.
602 Endocrinol. Metab. 94, 1789–1796. https://doi.org/10.1210/jc.2008-2800
603 Mills, S.C., Koskela, E., Mappes, T., 2011. Intralocus sexual conflict for fitness: sexually
604 antagonistic alleles for testosterone. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. rspb20112340.
605 https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2011.2340
606 Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D.G., Group, T.P., 2009. Preferred Reporting
607 Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLOS
608 Med. 6, e1000097. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097
609 Morea, A., Cameran, M., Rebuffi, A.G., Marzenta, D., Marangon, O., Picci, L., Zacchello, F.,
610 Scarpa, M., 2005. Gender-sensitive association of CFTR gene mutations and 5T allele
611 emerging from a large survey on infertility. Mol. Hum. Reprod. 11, 607–614.
612 https://doi.org/10.1093/molehr/gah214
613 Morrow, E.H., 2015. The evolution of sex differences in disease. Biol. Sex Differ. 6, 5.
614 https://doi.org/10.1186/s13293-015-0023-0
615 Morrow, E.H., Connallon, T., 2013. Implications of sex-specific selection for the genetic basis
616 of disease. Evol. Appl. 6, 1208–1217. https://doi.org/10.1111/eva.12097
617 Nesse, R.M., Williams, G.C., 1994. Why we get sick: The new science of Darwinian medicine.
618 Vintage, New York.
619 Ober, C., Loisel, D.A., Gilad, Y., 2008. Sex-specific genetic architecture of human disease. Nat
620 Rev Genet 9, 911–922. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg2415
621 Ober, C., Pan, L., Phillips, N., Parry, R., Kurina, L.M., 2006. Sex-specific genetic architecture of
622 asthma-associated quantitative trait loci in a founder population. Curr. Allergy
623 Asthma Rep. 6, 241–246. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11882-006-0041-4
624 Ovadia, G., Shifman, S., 2011. The genetic variation of RELN expression in schizophrenia and
625 bipolar disorder. PloS One 6, e19955. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0019955
626 Padmanabhan, S., Menni, C., Lee, W.K., Laing, S., Brambilla, P., Sega, R., Perego, R., Grassi,
627 G., Cesana, G., Delles, C., Mancia, G., Dominiczak, A.F., 2010. The effects of sex and

628 method of blood pressure measurement on genetic associations with blood pressure
629 in the PAMELA study. J. Hypertens. 28, 465–477.
630 https://doi.org/10.1097/HJH.0b013e32833594d7
631 Parker, G.A., 1979. SEXUAL SELECTION AND SEXUAL CONFLICT, in: Sexual Selection and
632 Reproductive Competition in Insects. Elsevier, pp. 123–166.
633 https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-108750-0.50010-0
634 Parker, G.A., Baker, R.R., Smith, V.G.F., 1972. The origin and evolution of gamete
635 dimorphism and the male-female phenomenon. J. Theor. Biol. 36, 529–553.
636 Payne, E.H., Gebregziabher, M., Hardin, J.W., Ramakrishnan, V., Egede, L.E., 2018. An
637 empirical approach to determine a threshold for assessing overdispersion in Poisson
638 and negative binomial models for count data. Commun. Stat. Simul. Comput. 47,
639 1722–1738. https://doi.org/10.1080/03610918.2017.1323223
640 Peng, Y.-M., Lei, S.-F., Guo, Y., Xiong, D.-H., Yan, H., Wang, L., Guo, Y.-F., Deng, H.-W., 2008.
641 Sex-specific association of the glucocorticoid receptor gene with extreme BMD. J.
642 Bone Miner. Res. Off. J. Am. Soc. Bone Miner. Res. 23, 247–252.
643 https://doi.org/10.1359/jbmr.071017
644 Pennell, T.M., Haas, F.J.H. de, Morrow, E.H., Doorn, G.S. van, 2016. Contrasting effects of
645 intralocus sexual conflict on sexually antagonistic coevolution. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.
646 113, E978–E986. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1514328113
647 Pennell, T.M., Morrow, E.H., 2013. Two sexes, one genome: the evolutionary dynamics of
648 intralocus sexual conflict. Ecol. Evol. 3, 1819–1834.
649 https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.540
650 Press, O.A., Zhang, W., Gordon, M.A., Yang, D., Haiman, C.A., Azuma, M., Iqbal, S., Lenz, H.-
651 J., 2011. Gender-related survival differences associated with polymorphic variants of
652 estrogen receptor-beta (ERbeta) in patients with metastatic colon cancer.
653 Pharmacogenomics J. 11, 375–382. https://doi.org/10.1038/tpj.2010.45
654 Price, J.S., Strong, J., Eliassen, J., McQueeny, T., Miller, M., Padula, C.B., Shear, P., Lisdahl, K.,
655 2013. Serotonin transporter gene moderates associations between mood, memory
656 and hippocampal volume. Behav. Brain Res. 242, 158–165.
657 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbr.2012.11.013
658 Rice, W.R., 1992. Sexually antagonistic genes: experimental evidence. Science 256, 1436–
659 1439. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1604317
660 Rice, W.R., 1984. Sex chromosomes and the evolution of sexual dimorphism. Evolution 38,
661 735–742.
662 Rigby, N., Kulathinal, R.J., 2015. Genetic Architecture of Sexual Dimorphism in Humans. J.
663 Cell. Physiol. 230, 2304–2310. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcp.24979
664 Rostant, W.G., Kay, C., Wedell, N., Hosken, D.J., 2015. Sexual conflict maintains variation at
665 an insecticide resistance locus. BMC Biol. 13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12915-015-
666 0143-3
667 Ruzicka, F., Connallon, T., 2020. Is the X chromosome a hot spot for sexually antagonistic
668 polymorphisms? Biases in current empirical tests of classical theory. Proc. R. Soc. B.
669 https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2020.1869
670 Ruzicka, F., Dutoit, L., Czuppon, P., Jordan, C.Y., Li, X.-Y., Olito, C., Runemark, A., Svensson,
671 E.I., Yazdi, H.P., Connallon, T., 2020. The search for sexually antagonistic genes:
672 Practical insights from studies of local adaptation and statistical genomics. Evol. Lett.
673 4–5, 398–415. https://doi.org/10.1002/evl3.192

674 Ruzicka, F., Hill, M.S., Pennell, T.M., Flis, I., Ingleby, F.C., Mott, R., Fowler, K., Morrow, E.H.,
675 Reuter, M., 2019. Genome-wide sexually antagonistic variants reveal long-standing
676 constraints on sexual dimorphism in fruit flies. PLoS Biol. 17, e3000244.
677 Sainz, J., Rudolph, A., Hoffmeister, M., Frank, B., Brenner, H., Chang-Claude, J., Hemminki,
678 K., Forsti, A., 2012. Effect of type 2 diabetes predisposing genetic variants on
679 colorectal cancer risk. J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab. 97, E845-851.
680 https://doi.org/10.1210/jc.2011-2565
681 Sangalli, A., Orlandi, E., Poli, A., Maurichi, A., Santinami, M., Nicolis, M., Ferronato, S.,
682 Malerba, G., Rodolfo, M., Gomez Lira, M., 2017. Sex-specific effect of RNASEL
683 rs486907 and miR-146a rs2910164 polymorphisms' interaction as a susceptibility
684 factor for melanoma skin cancer. Melanoma Res. 27, 309–314.
685 https://doi.org/10.1097/CMR.0000000000000360
686 Schneider, K.K., Hule, L., Schote, A.B., Meyer, J., Frings, C., 2015. Sex matters! Interactions of
687 sex and polymorphisms of a cholinergic receptor gene (CHRNA5) modulate response
688 speed. Neuroreport 26, 186–191. https://doi.org/10.1097/WNR.0000000000000313
689 Schuurhof, A., Bont, L., Siezen, C.L.E., Hodemaekers, H., van Houwelingen, H.C., Kimman,
690 T.G., Hoebee, B., Kimpen, J.L.L., Janssen, R., 2010. Interleukin-9 polymorphism in
691 infants with respiratory syncytial virus infection: an opposite effect in boys and girls.
692 Pediatr. Pulmonol. 45, 608–613. https://doi.org/10.1002/ppul.21229
693 Shalev, I., Lerer, E., Israel, S., Uzefovsky, F., Gritsenko, I., Mankuta, D., Ebstein, R.P., Kaitz,
694 M., 2009. BDNF Val66Met polymorphism is associated with HPA axis reactivity to
695 psychological stress characterized by genotype and gender interactions.
696 Psychoneuroendocrinology 34, 382–388.
697 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2008.09.017
698 Short, R.V., 1979. Sexual selection and its component parts, somatic and genital selection, as
699 illustrated by man and the great apes. Adv. Study Behav. 9, 131–158.
700 Sjoberg, R.L., Nilsson, K.W., Nordquist, N., Ohrvik, J., Leppert, J., Lindstrom, L., Oreland, L.,
701 2006. Development of depression: sex and the interaction between environment
702 and a promoter polymorphism of the serotonin transporter gene. Int. J.
703 Neuropsychopharmacol. 9, 443–449. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1461145705005936
704 Stearns, S.C., Govindaraju, D.R., Ewbank, D., Byars, S.G., 2012. Constraints on the
705 coevolution of contemporary human males and females. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 279,
706 4836–4844. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2012.2024
707 Stulp, G., Kuijper, B., Buunk, A.P., Pollet, T.V., Verhulst, S., 2012. Intralocus sexual conflict
708 over human height. Biol. Lett. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2012.0590
709 Winkler, T.W., Justice, A.E., Graff, M., Barata, L., Feitosa, M.F., Chu, S., Czajkowski, J., Esko,
710 T., Fall, T., Kilpeläinen, T.O., Lu, Y., Mägi, R., Mihailov, E., Pers, T.H., Rüeger, S.,
711 Teumer, A., Ehret, G.B., Ferreira, T., Heard-Costa, N.L., Karjalainen, J., Lagou, V.,
712 Mahajan, A., Neinast, M.D., Prokopenko, I., Simino, J., Teslovich, T.M., Jansen, R.,
713 Westra, H.-J., White, C.C., Absher, D., Ahluwalia, T.S., Ahmad, S., Albrecht, E., Alves,
714 A.C., Bragg-Gresham, J.L., Craen, A.J.M. de, Bis, J.C., Bonnefond, A., Boucher, G.,
715 Cadby, G., Cheng, Y.-C., Chiang, C.W.K., Delgado, G., Demirkan, A., Dueker, N.,
716 Eklund, N., Eiriksdottir, G., Eriksson, J., Feenstra, B., Fischer, K., Frau, F., Galesloot,
717 T.E., Geller, F., Goel, A., Gorski, M., Grammer, T.B., Gustafsson, S., Haitjema, S.,
718 Hottenga, J.-J., Huffman, J.E., Jackson, A.U., Jacobs, K.B., Johansson, Å., Kaakinen, M.,
719 Kleber, M.E., Lahti, J., Leach, I.M., Lehne, B., Liu, Y., Lo, K.S., Lorentzon, M., Luan, J.,
720 Madden, P.A.F., Mangino, M., McKnight, B., Medina-Gomez, C., Monda, K.L.,

Montasser, M.E., Müller, G., Müller-Nurasyid, M., Nolte, I.M., Panoutsopoulou, K., Pascoe, L., Paternoster, L., Rayner, N.W., Renström, F., Rizzi, F., Rose, L.M., Ryan, K.A., Salo, P., Sanna, S., Scharnagl, H., Shi, J., Smith, A.V., Southam, L., Stančáková, A., Steinthorsdottir, V., Strawbridge, R.J., Sung, Y.J., Tachmazidou, I., Tanaka, T., Thorleifsson, G., Trompet, S., Pervjakova, N., Tyrer, J.P., Vandenput, L., Laan, S.W. van der, Velde, N. van der, Setten, J. van, Vliet-Ostaptchouk, J.V. van, Verweij, N., Vlachopoulou, E., Waite, L.L., Wang, S.R., Wang, Z., Wild, S.H., Willenborg, C., Wilson, J.F., Wong, A., Yang, J., Yengo, L., Yerges-Armstrong, L.M., Yu, L., Zhang, W., Zhao, J.H., Andersson, E.A., Bakker, S.J.L., Baldassarre, D., Banasik, K., Barcella, M., Barlassina, C., Bellis, C., Benaglio, P., Blangero, J., Blüher, M., Bonnet, F., Bonnycastle, L.L., Boyd, H.A., Bruinenberg, M., Buchman, A.S., Campbell, H., Chen, Y.-D.I., Chines, P.S., Claudi-Boehm, S., Cole, J., Collins, F.S., Geus, E.J.C. de, Groot, L.C.P.G.M. de, Dimitriou, M., Duan, J., Enroth, S., Eury, E., Farmaki, A.-E., Forouhi, N.G., Friedrich, N., Gejman, P.V., Gigante, B., Glorioso, N., Go, A.S., Gottesman, O., Gräßler, J., Grallert, H., Grarup, N., Gu, Y.-M., Broer, L., Ham, A.C., Hansen, T., Harris, T.B., Hartman, C.A., Hassinen, M., Hastie, N., Hattersley, A.T., Heath, A.C., Henders, A.K., Hernandez, D., Hillege, H., Holmen, O., Hovingh, K.G., Hui, J., Husemoen, L.L., Hutri-Kähönen, N., Hysi, P.G., Illig, T., Jager, P.L.D., Jalilzadeh, S., Jørgensen, T., Jukema, J.W., Juonala, M., Kanoni, S., Karaleftheri, M., Khaw, K.T., Kinnunen, L., Kittner, S.J., Koenig, W., Kolcic, I., Kovacs, P., Krarup, N.T., Kratzer, W., Krüger, J., Kuh, D., Kumari, M., Kyriakou, T., Langenberg, C., Lannfelt, L., Lanzani, C., Lotay, V., Launer, L.J., Leander, K., Lindström, J., Linneberg, A., Liu, Y.-P., Lobbens, S., Luben, R., Lyssenko, V., Männistö, S., Magnusson, P.K., McArdle, W.L., Menni, C., Merger, S., Milani, L., Montgomery, G.W., Morris, A.P., Narisu, N., Nelis, M., Ong, K.K., Palotie, A., Pérusse, L., Pichler, I., Pilia, M.G., Pouta, A., Rheinberger, M., Ribel-Madsen, R., Richards, M., Rice, K.M., Rice, T.K., Rivolta, C., Salomaa, V., Sanders, A.R., Sarzynski, M.A., Scholtens, S., Scott, R.A., Scott, W.R., Sebert, S., Sengupta, S., Sennblad, B., Seufferlein, T., Silveira, A., Slagboom, P.E., Smit, J.H., Sparsø, T.H., Stirrups, K., Stolk, R.P., Stringham, H.M., Swertz, M.A., Swift, A.J., Syvänen, A.-C., Tan, S.-T., Thorand, B., Tönjes, A., Tremblay, A., Tsafantakis, E., Most, P.J. van der, Völker, U., Vohl, M.-C., Vonk, J.M., Waldenberger, M., Walker, R.W., Wennauer, R., Widén, E., Willemsen, G., Wilsgaard, T., Wright, A.F., Zillikens, M.C., Dijk, S.C. van, Schoor, N.M. van, Asselbergs, F.W., Bakker, P.I.W. de, Beckmann, J.S., Beilby, J., Bennett, D.A., Bergman, R.N., Bergmann, S., Böger, C.A., Boehm, B.O., Boerwinkle, E., Boomsma, D.I., Bornstein, S.R., Bottinger, E.P., Bouchard, C., Chambers, J.C., Chanock, S.J., Chasman, D.I., Cucca, F., Cusi, D., Dedoussis, G., Erdmann, J., Eriksson, J.G., Evans, D.A., Faire, U. de, Farrall, M., Ferrucci, L., Ford, I., Franke, L., Franks, P.W., Froguel, P., Gansevoort, R.T., Gieger, C., Grönberg, H., Gudnason, V., Gyllensten, U., Hall, P., Hamsten, A., Harst, P. van der, Hayward, C., Heliövaara, M., Hengstenberg, C., Hicks, A.A., Hingorani, A., Hofman, A., Hu, F., Huikuri, H.V., Hveem, K., James, A.L., Jordan, J.M., Jula, A., Kähönen, M., Kajantie, E., Kathiresan, S., Kiemeney, L.A.L.M., Kivimaki, M., Knekt, P.B., Koistinen, H.A., Kooner, J.S., Koskinen, S., Kuusisto, J., Maerz, W., Martin, N.G., Laakso, M., Lakka, T.A., Lehtimäki, T., Lettre, G., Levinson, D.F., Lind, L., Lokki, M.-L., Mäntyselkä, P., Melbye, M., Metspalu, A., Mitchell, B.D., Moll, F.L., Murray, J.C., Musk, A.W., Nieminen, M.S., Njølstad, I., Ohlsson, C., Oldehinkel, A.J., Oostra, B.A., Palmer, L.J., Pankow, J.S., Pasterkamp, G., Pedersen, N.L., Pedersen, O., Penninx, B.W., Perola, M., Peters, A., Polašek, O., Pramstaller, P.P., Psaty, B.M., Qi,

L., Quertermous, T., Raitakari, O.T., Rankinen, T., Rauramaa, R., Ridker, P.M., Rioux, J.D., Rivadeneira, F., Rotter, J.I., Rudan, I., Ruijter, H.M. den, Saltevo, J., Sattar, N., Schunkert, H., Schwarz, P.E.H., Shuldiner, A.R., Sinisalo, J., Snieder, H., Sørensen, T.I.A., Spector, T.D., Staessen, J.A., Stefania, B., Thorsteinsdottir, U., Stumvoll, M., Tardif, J.-C., Tremoli, E., Tuomilehto, J., Uitterlinden, A.G., Uusitupa, M., Verbeek, A.L.M., Vermeulen, S.H., Viikari, J.S., Vitart, V., Völzke, H., Vollenweider, P., Waeber, G., Walker, M., Wallaschofski, H., Wareham, N.J., Watkins, H., Zeggini, E., Consortium, C., Consortium, D., Consortium, G., Consortium, G.-Bpg., Consortium, I., Consortium, M., Chakravarti, A., Clegg, D.J., Cupples, L.A., Gordon-Larsen, P., Jaquish, C.E., Rao, D.C., Abecasis, G.R., Assimes, T.L., Barroso, I., Berndt, S.I., Boehnke, M., Deloukas, P., Fox, C.S., Groop, L.C., Hunter, D.J., Ingelsson, E., Kaplan, R.C., McCarthy, M.I., Mohlke, K.L., O'Connell, J.R., Schlessinger, D., Strachan, D.P., Stefansson, K., Duijn, C.M. van, Hirschhorn, J.N., Lindgren, C.M., Heid, I.M., North, K.E., Borecki, I.B., Kutalik, Z., Loos, R.J.F., 2015. The Influence of Age and Sex on Genetic Associations with Adult Body Size and Shape: A Large-Scale Genome-Wide Interaction Study. PLOS Genet. 11, e1005378. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1005378

Wise, A.L., Gyi, L., Manolio, T.A., 2013. eXclusion: Toward Integrating the X Chromosome in Genome-wide Association Analyses. Am. J. Hum. Genet. 92, 643–647. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajhg.2013.03.017

Wong, S.Y.S., Lau, E.M.C., Li, M., Chung, T., Sham, A., Woo, J., 2005. The prevalence of Apo E4 genotype and its relationship to bone mineral density in Hong Kong Chinese. J. Bone Miner. Metab. 23, 261–265. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00774-004-0593-0

Wu, K., Chen, C., Moyzis, R.K., Greenberger, E., Yu, Z., 2016. Gender Interacts with Opioid Receptor Polymorphism A118G and Serotonin Receptor Polymorphism -1438 A/G on Speed-Dating Success. Hum. Nat. Hawthorne N 27, 244–260. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12110-016-9257-8

Youssef, S.S., Abd El Aal, A.M., Nasr, A.S., el Zanaty, T., Seif, S.M., 2013. Interleukin-12B gene polymorphism frequencies in Egyptians and sex-related susceptibility to hepatitis C infection. J. Interferon Cytokine Res. Off. J. Int. Soc. Interferon Cytokine Res. 33, 415–419. https://doi.org/10.1089/jir.2012.0161

Table 1. Genetic loci in humans showing sexually antagonistic effects on trait expression. EAF, effect allele frequency (* indicates allele frequency derived from 100 genomes database); M, male; F, female. Background colours denote instances where genes and/or variants appear more than once in the list.

Trait	Gene	Locus	EAF	M Effect	M Effect SE	F Effect	F Effect SE	Reference
Complex traits								
Concentration performance score	FADS1/2	rs1535	0.672	0.2275	0.1065	-0.2394	0.1116	(Lauritzen et al., 2017)
Reading speed, number of sentences	FADS1/2	rs174448	0.642	0.5511	0.1069	-0.6074	0.1129	(Lauritzen et al., 2017)
Reading speed, number of sentences	ELOVL5	rs2397142	0.695	-0.1963	0.1042	0.2364	0.1095	(Lauritzen et al., 2017)
Reading speed, correct sentences	FADS1/2	rs174448	0.642	0.6599	0.1077	-0.3451	0.1112	(Lauritzen et al., 2017)
Speed-dating success	OPRM1	rs1799971	0.922	0.4697	0.2275	-0.53	0.2856	(Wu et al., 2016)
Speed-dating success	HTR2A	rs6311	0.418	-0.4826	0.1982	0.4702	0.1964	(Wu et al., 2016)
Waist-hip-ratio (BMI adjusted)	SIM1	rs17185536	0.76	-0.0166	0.008	0.0264	0.0067	(Winkler et al., 2015)
Waist-hip-ratio (BMI adjusted)	NMU	rs3805389	0.28	-0.0139	0.0067	0.0261	0.006	(Winkler et al., 2015)
Waist-hip-ratio (BMI adjusted)	GNPNAT1	rs4898764	0.53	0.0208	0.0066	-0.0165	0.0059	(Winkler et al., 2015)
Waist-hip-ratio (BMI adjusted)	SGCZ	rs17470444	0.71	0.0345	0.0081	-0.0149	0.0068	(Winkler et al., 2015)
Waist-hip-ratio (BMI adjusted)	IQGAP2	rs2069664	0.53	0.0244	0.0078	-0.0183	0.0067	(Winkler et al., 2015)
Waist-hip-ratio (BMI adjusted)	SLC2A3	rs741361	0.6	0.0272	0.0079	-0.0196	0.0067	(Winkler et al., 2015)
Waist-hip-ratio (BMI adjusted)	IRS1	rs2673140	0.38	0.022	0.0066	-0.0209	0.0059	(Winkler et al., 2015)
Waist-hip-ratio (BMI adjusted)	TTN	rs2042995	0.23	0.0198	0.0066	-0.022	0.0078	(Winkler et al., 2015)
Waist-hip-ratio (BMI adjusted)	RXRA	rs10881574	0.07	0.0268	0.008	-0.0191	0.0067	(Winkler et al., 2015)
Waist-hip-ratio (BMI adjusted)	PTPRD	rs7042428	0.98	0.0244	0.0071	-0.0166	0.0063	(Winkler et al., 2015)
Waist-hip-ratio (BMI adjusted)	CECR2	rs17809093	0.04	0.0294	0.0091	-0.024	0.0077	(Winkler et al., 2015)
Reaction time (RT) in the Stroop task, congruent condition	CHRNA5	rs3841324	0.406	-1.5421	0.3857	0.9945	0.2517	(Schneider et al., 2015)
Reaction time (RT) in the Stroop task, incongruent condition	CHRNA5	rs3841324	0.406	-1.6215	0.389	1.0215	0.2521	(Schneider et al., 2015)
Reaction time (RT) in the Negative priming task	CHRNA5	rs3841324	0.406	-1.675	0.3912	0.6299	0.247	(Schneider et al., 2015)

Borderline personality traits after maltreatment	OXTR	rs53576	0.738	-0.3429	0.0881	0.2066	0.0857	(Cicchetti et al., 2014)
Borderline personality traits after maltreatment	FKBP5	CATT haplotype	-	0.2041	0.0877	-0.195	0.0857	(Cicchetti et al., 2014)
fluid intelligence	C16orf62 (OXTR)	rs226849	0.46	-0.3949	0.1869	0.494	0.1814	(Kiy et al., 2013)
face perception	C16orf62 (OXTR)	rs226849	0.46	-0.5819	0.1909	0.3498	0.1788	(Kiy et al., 2013)
face memory	C16orf62 (OXTR)	rs226849	0.46	-0.3679	0.1864	0.3562	0.1789	(Kiy et al., 2013)
Hippocampal volume	SLC6A4	rs25531	0.39	-		-		(Price et al., 2013)
Sociopathy (in alcoholics)	SLC6A4	rs25531	0.51	-		-		(Herman et al., 2011)
systolic blood pressure S_NIGHT	PON1	rs3917542	-	-0.1047	0.0637	0.1129	0.0645	(Padmanabhan et al., 2010)
systolic blood pressure S_NIGHT	PON3	rs17884563	-	-0.1482	0.0637	0.1061	0.0645	(Padmanabhan et al., 2010)
systolic blood pressure S_CLIN	EDNRB	rs1335803	-	-0.1308	0.0637	0.1129	0.0645	(Padmanabhan et al., 2010)
diastolic blood pressure D_NIGHT	DRD1	rs265974	-	-0.1482	0.0637	0.1502	0.0646	(Padmanabhan et al., 2010)
diastolic blood pressure D_HOME	SLC4A2	rs2303933	-	-0.1482	0.0637	0.1325	0.0646	(Padmanabhan et al., 2010)
diastolic blood pressure D_CLIN	LPL	rs17410577	-	-0.1047	0.0637	0.1775	0.0647	(Padmanabhan et al., 2010)
Psychological Stress	BDNF	rs6265	0.149	-		-		(Shalev et al., 2009)
BMI standard deviation score (children)	FAS	rs2228305	0.0312	-0.552	0.2259	0.4427	0.2075	(Korner et al., 2007)
Pain sensitivity	OPRM1	rs1799971	0.8817	-		-		(Fillingim et al., 2005)
Central DBP	REN	rs6693954	0.22	-0.4444	0.2132	1.1052	0.3923	(Ljungberg et al., 2014)
Disease risk/severity								
Graves opthalmopathy in GD	PRR3	rs2074503	0.3586	0.4397	0.1682	-0.2185	0.0851	(Liu et al., 2014)
Colorectal cancer	LTA	rs1041981	0.32	-0.0722	0.0368	0.1027	0.0453	(Sainz et al., 2012)
Arterial blood pressure	PPAR	rs1801282	0.1213	-		-		(Franck et al., 2012)
Schizophrenia risk	RELN	rs7341475	0.851*	1.2396	0.2819	-0.762	0.3662	(Ovadia and Shifman, 2011)
Colon cancer survival	ESR2	(CA)n repeats	-	0.2272	0.0962	-0.2046	0.1205	(Press et al., 2011)
Schizophrenia risk	DAO	rs2070586	0.2729	0.1982	0.0888	-0.2537	0.0908	(Kim et al., 2010)

T2DM, fasting glucose	SCARB1	rs9919713	0.04	0.1865	0.0853	-0.2515	0.0697	(McCarthy et al., 2009)
Depression	SLC6A4	rs25531	0.4586	0.5404	0.2277	-0.3996	0.1859	(Sjoberg et al., 2006)
Infertility in cystic fibrosis	CFTR	rs213950	0.417931	-		-		(Morea et al., 2005)
Bone mineral density	APOE	rs429358	0.0798	-		-		(Wong et al., 2005)
Narcolepsy severity	COMT	Long allele	0.4588	1.3596	0.3878	-2.2152	0.4871	(Dauvilliers et al., 2001)
Nonsyndromic cleft lip	IMPK	rs11142081	0.863	1.2156	0.0937	-1.1161	0.0783	(Carlson et al., 2018)
Nonsyndromic cleft lip	IMPK	rs72804706	0.898	-0.816	0.0906	2.0665	0.0908	(Carlson et al., 2018)
Nonsyndromic cleft lip	IMPK	rs77590619	0.744	-0.8577	0.0904	1.2291	0.0804	(Carlson et al., 2018)
Allergy	ACP1	A* allele (CG haplotype)	-	-		-		(Gloria-Bottini et al., 2007)
Hepatitis C susceptability	IL-12B	rs3212227	0.3463	-		-		(Youssef et al., 2013)
RSV severity	IL-9	rs2069885	0.15	0.1888	0.0933	-0.2794	0.0957	(Schuurhof et al., 2010)
CV risk marker (plasma fatty acid composition)	FABP2	rs1799883	0.287	-		-		(Gastaldi et al., 2007)
Bone mineral density	NR3C1	GCAG haplotype	-	0.6854	0.3676	-0.9029	0.4311	(Peng et al., 2008)
Anxiety	NGF	rs6330	0.451	0.4562	0.18	-0.4674	0.1817	(Lang et al., 2008)
Melanoma risk	RNASEL, miR-146a	AG/AA and C haplotype	-	0.4525	0.1564	-0.3553	0.174	(Sangalli et al., 2017)

Figure legends

Figure 1. Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram for systematic review of sexually antagonistic loci in humans.

Figure 2. The relationship between effect allele frequency and effect size ratio. Point size varies according to the variance of effect size ratio - larger points have smaller variance and therefore a larger weighting in the model. The vertical dotted line represents the switch point between a net-negative effect of a particular locus (effect size ratio >-1) and a net positive effect (effect size ratio <-1). The blue line represents the predicted values derived from the generalized linear model fitted to the data (see Results).


Identification
Screening
Eligibility
Included
Records identified through database searching (n = 881 using PubMed keywords)
Additional records identified through other sources (n = 1)
Records after duplicates removed (n = 882)
Records screened (n = 882)
Records excluded (not in humans, did not describe a SA effect (n = 812)
Full-text articles assessed for evidence of SA (n = 70)
Full-text articles excluded (did not describe SA, results insignificant) (n = 38)
Studies included in qualitative synthesis (n = 32)
Studies not included in quantitative synthesis (insufficient data to calculate effect size, allele frequency) (n = 10)
Studies included in quantitative synthesis (meta-analysis) (n = 22)


Net Positive Effects
Net Negative Effects
Effect allele frequency
0.9
0.6
0.3
0.0
−2.5
−2.0
−1.5
−1.0
−0.5
Effect size ratio (positive effect over negative)