

## **Retinal specialization through spatially varying cell densities and opsin coexpression in cichlid fish**

Brian E. Dalton<sup>1</sup>, Fanny de Busserolles<sup>2</sup>, N. Justin Marshall<sup>2</sup>, and Karen L. Carleton<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biology, University of Maryland, College Park MD 20742 USA

<sup>2</sup>Queensland Brain Institute, University of Queensland, Brisbane 4072 Australia

**Corresponding author:** [kcarleto@umd.edu](mailto:kcarleto@umd.edu)

**Keywords:** opsin, retina, coexpression, visual acuity

### **Summary**

Cichlid retinas show spatial variation with an area centralis that has higher photoreceptor and ganglion cell density as well as less opsin coexpression. Visual modeling suggests this may reflect a trade off between colour discrimination and contrast detection.

## Abstract

The distinct behaviors and varied habitats where animals live place different requirements on their visual systems. A trade-off exists between resolution and sensitivity, with these properties varying across the retina. Spectral sensitivity, which affects both achromatic and chromatic (colour) vision, also varies across the retina, though the function of this inhomogeneity is less clear. We previously demonstrated spatially varying spectral sensitivity of double cones in the cichlid fish *Metriaclicma zebra* due to coexpression of different opsins. Here, we map the distributions of ganglion cells and cone cells and quantify opsin coexpression in single cones to show these also vary across the retina. We identify an area centralis with peak acuity and infrequent coexpression, which may be suited for tasks such as foraging and detecting male signals. The peripheral retina has reduced ganglion cell densities and increased opsin coexpression. Modeling of cichlid visual tasks indicates that coexpression might hinder colour discrimination of foraging targets and some fish colours. But, coexpression might improve contrast detection of dark objects against bright backgrounds, which might be useful for detecting predators or zooplankton. This suggests a trade off between acuity and colour discrimination in the central retina versus lower resolution but more sensitive contrast detection in the peripheral retina. Significant variation in the pattern of coexpression among individuals, however, raises interesting questions about the selective forces at work.

# 1. Introduction

For animals in a broad range of environments, vision mediates diverse behaviors, including navigation, foraging, territorial conflict and mate choice. Different visual tasks may place different demands on the visual system. The aquatic environment provides perhaps the greatest diversity of habitat types, certainly in terms of light level or spectral content differences. Within this watery realm, there are also a dazzling variety of feeding, mating, and territorial behaviors, many of which rely on colour vision to gather information. For example, avoiding a distant predator may require detecting its silhouette against the background, while choosing a mate might involve evaluating the patches of colour a suitor displays. The mate's gaze likely fixates on these colour patches, stabilizing their image on the central region of the retina. Meanwhile, if a predator approaches from above, its silhouette will move swiftly across the ventral retina. Thus, different types of behaviour and visual tasks may require different regions of the retina to specialize for different functions. How these regions of the retina are specialized for different tasks is not well understood in most animals despite a number of careful studies and reviews (Hughes, 1985, Temple, 2011). The cichlids from the African rift lake system are a diverse and fascinating group to study with a well characterized genetic and phylogenetic history. Here, using both genetic and anatomical tools, we examine how the visual tasks and visual environment of one of the best known cichlid species, *Metriaclima zebra*, have shaped its unique retinal design.

The acuity of many vertebrates is spatially inhomogeneous across the retina. In animals that move and fixate their eyes to examine specific objects, acuity often reaches its peak in a fovea or an area centralis, where retinal ganglion cell densities are highest (Land and Nilsson, 2001). Alternatively, there may be a visual streak of high acuity, especially for animals that interact with an extended horizon or water surface (Hughes, 1985, Land and Nilsson, 2001). In this way, the demands of the outside world are in some way mirrored in retinal design, both among photoreceptors and in other cells further down the neural pathway, such as ganglion cells. Ganglion cells ultimately transmit visual signals to the brain down the optic nerve, and therefore set the upper limit of spatial resolution. For a given eye size there is a trade-off required between resolution and absolute sensitivity (Land and Nilsson, 2001). While one retinal area,

such as a fovea, may be adapted for high resolution, other regions such as a ventral-viewing periphery, may show morphological or molecular adaptations for enhanced sensitivity.

Spectral sensitivity also varies across the retina in many animals, though the functional significance of this is generally unknown (Temple, 2011). In several cases intra-retinal variation in spectral sensitivities (and ganglion cell densities) has been shown to correlate with variation in the light environment (Baden et al., 2013, Briscoe et al., 2003, Owens et al., 2012, Temple et al., 2010, Dalton et al., 2014). The backgrounds viewed by different retinal regions differ spectrally, both for aquatic and terrestrial organisms (Dalton et al., 2014, Endler, 1993, Munz and McFarland, 1977). A simple example is the difference between the sky and the land, a dorsal-ventral difference that has a profound effect on the retinal design of most terrestrial animals (Baden et al., 2013).

Spectral sensitivity of a photoreceptor is primarily determined by its visual pigment, composed of an opsin protein bound to a chromophore. We previously showed that in the African cichlid fish *M. zebra*, spectral sensitivity of double cones is tuned across the retina by differential coexpression of two distinct pairs of opsins (Dalton et al., 2014). *M. zebra* double cones, which are paired cone cells common among vertebrates, consist of two spectrally distinct members, a medium wavelength sensitive (M) member and a long wavelength sensitive (L) member. M-cones express *RH2B* opsin ( $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 484 \text{ nm}$ ) and L-cones express *RH2Aalpha* (528 nm). M-cones can also coexpress *RH2Abeta* (519 nm) predominantly in the nasal retina, while L-cones can coexpress LWS (567 nm) in the ventral retina.

Here, we map expression of *SWS1* and *SWS2B* opsins (368 nm and 423 nm (Parry et al., 2005)) in short wavelength sensitive (S) single cones of this species to complete the picture of cone sensitivity across the retina. We also map cone cell and ganglion cell densities so that patterns of acuity and absolute sensitivity can be related to spectral sensitivity. Finally, using visual models we examine possible visual function across the retina in terms of the distributions of cone cells, ganglion cells, and opsin co-expression. We show that the retina of *M. zebra* has an area centralis with higher ganglion and photoreceptor densities and low coexpression in all three cone classes.

Modeling suggestions this region may be specialized for high acuity vision with good colour discrimination. Higher opsin coexpression might enhance sensitivity in regions of reduced ganglion cell density and spatial acuity. However, there is considerable variation among individuals in how much coexpression occurs. This raises the possibility that coexpression is more complex, possibly being either non-functional in the current evolutionary landscape or under relaxed selection (Wertheim et al., 2015).

## 2. Methods

All fish were reared in the same light environment which, compared to natural *M. zebra* habitat, is rich in long wavelength light and has no ultraviolet light (Dalton et al., 2015). Rearing and handling of fish were carried out in accordance with an approved IACUC protocol (University of Maryland R15-54). Retinas were obtained from laboratory-reared descendants of *M. zebra* collected from Mazinzi Reef in Lake Malawi.

### (a) Cell Densities

#### *Preparation of retinal wholemounts*

The eyes of four individuals of *M. zebra* were enucleated, the cornea and lens dissected out and the eye cups fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde in 0.1 M phosphate buffer (PBS) overnight at 4°C. Retinal wholemounts were then dissected according to standard protocols (Stone et al., 1981, Coimbra et al., 2006, Ullmann et al., 2012). The orientation of the retina was kept by referring to the position of the optic nerve head, which is directed ventrally but slightly rotated (15-30°) toward the nasal area, and the falciform process, which ends ventrally. Remnants of the retinal pigment epithelium, that could not be removed mechanically during dissection, were bleached overnight in a solution of 3% hydrogen peroxide in PBS (Coimbra et al., 2009).

To analyse photoreceptor cells, retinas were directly flatmounted with the photoreceptor layer facing up, and placed on a microscope slide in a solution of 80% glycerol in PBS. For the analysis of ganglion cells, the retinas were wholemounted, ganglion cell layer facing up, on a gelatinised slide and left to dry overnight in formalin vapour to improved fixation and cell differentiation (Coimbra et al., 2006, Coimbra et al., 2012, Ullmann et al., 2012). Wholemounts were then stained in 0.1 % cresyl violet

following the protocol of Coimbra et al. (2006) and finally mounted with Entellan New (Merck). Possible shrinkage during staining was considered negligible and if present confined to the retina margin, since the retinal wholemount was attached to the slide during the entire staining process (Coimbra et al., 2006).

### *Stereological analyses and topographic map construction*

Following the protocols described in de Busserolles et al. (2014a, 2014b), topographic distribution of single cones, double cones, total cones and ganglion cells were assessed using the optical fractionator technique (West, 1991) modified by Coimbra et al. for use in retinal whole mounts (Coimbra et al., 2009, Coimbra et al., 2012). Briefly, for each wholemount, the outline of the retina was digitized using a x5 objective (numerical aperture 0.16) mounted on a compound microscope (Zeiss Imager.Z2) equipped with a motorised stage (MAC 6000 System, Microbrightfield, USA), a digital colour camera (Microbrightfield, USA) and a computer running StereoInvestigator software (Microbrightfield, USA). Cells were randomly and systematically counted using a x40 air objective (numerical aperture 0.75) for cones, and x63 oil objective (numerical aperture 1.40) for ganglion cells.

The counting frame and grid size were carefully chosen to maintain the highest level of sampling and achieve an acceptable Schaeffer coefficient of error (CE). The CE is a measure of the accuracy of the total number of cell estimates and is considered acceptable below 0.1 (Slomianka and West, 2005, Glaser and Wilson, 1998). Since the four individuals analysed were of similar sizes, the same stereological parameters, that is a counting frame of 100 x 100  $\mu\text{m}$  and a grid size of 650 x 650  $\mu\text{m}$ , were used for all individuals to allow for comparison. For ganglion cells analysis, sub-sampling using the same counting frame but a smaller grid (325 x 325  $\mu\text{m}$ ) was also performed in the area of highest density to verify the peak density estimate. The total number of cells was estimated by multiplying the sum of total neurons counted by the area of the sampling fraction (i.e. ratio between the counting frame and the sampling grid).

Single cones and double cones were counted separately and simultaneously using two different markers to generate data for single cones alone, double cones alone, and the two cell types combined (total cones). Ganglion cells were arranged in a

single layer and were easily identified from other cell types (displaced amacrine cells and glial cells) using cytological criteria alone (Collin and Collin, 1988, Hughes, 1975). As a result, amacrine cells and glial cells were excluded from the analysis and only ganglion cells were counted in this study.

Topographic maps were constructed using the statistical program R v3.1.1 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2014) with the results exported from Stereo Investigator software according to Garza-Gisholt et al (2014). For each map we used the Gaussian Kernel Smoother from the Spatstat package (Baddeley and Turner, 2005) and adjusted the sigma value to the grid size (i.e. 650).

### *Spatial resolving power estimation*

The upper limit of spatial resolving power (SRP) in cycles per degree was estimated for three individuals of *M. zebra* using the peak density of ganglion cells, as described by Collin and Pettigrew (1989):

$$\text{SRP} = (\text{PDG}/\pm)/2 \quad (1)$$

where PDG is the peak linear density of ganglion cells in cells/mm and  $\pm$  is the angle subtending 1 mm on the retina, calculated using the following formula:

$$\pm = \arctan(1/f) \quad (2)$$

Here  $f$  is the lens focal length in teleost fishes, and taken to be 2.55 times the radius of the lens (Matthiessen, 1882). A visual element that has a width  $x$  and is  $y$  distance away, will subtend an angle,  $\theta$ :

$$\theta = \sin^{-1}(x/y) \quad (3)$$

If  $\theta$  is less than SRP/2 (since SRP depends on resolving two elements), then one element can be distinguished from its neighbor.

### **(b) *In situ* hybridization**

To map expression of opsins in single cones across the retina, we performed double labeling fluorescent *in situ* hybridization on whole retinas according to published methods (Allison et al., 2010, Barthel and Raymond, 2000, Dalton et al., 2014, Dalton et al., 2015). After euthanizing fish, we removed retinas and fixed them in 4% paraformaldehyde overnight. To detect *SWS1* and *SWS2B* expression we developed

coding sequence probes labeled with DIG and fluorescein. Cross-hybridization is not expected between *SWS1* (NCBI accession AF191219.1) and *SWS2B* (AF317674.1) probes because the coding sequences of these genes have only 59% identity. Furthermore, *SWS2A* is not expressed by *M. zebra* (Hofmann et al., 2009, Smith et al., 2011). Probe signals were enzymatically enhanced with sequential tyramide signal amplification, using Alexa Fluor 594 and 488 dyes (Invitrogen) for the DIG and fluorescein probes, respectively. These dyes have distinct excitation spectra, preventing crosstalk. We used a Leica DM 5500B epifluorescence microscope with L5 and TX2 filter cubes to view retinas.

We examined opsin expression at approximately 30 locations distributed across each retina, with a higher density of sampling locations in specific areas of interest. In each sampling location, fifty single cones were examined for the presence of *SWS1* and *SWS2B* opsin transcripts, and the frequency of coexpression was calculated. We also performed this whole-retina examination on two retinas that we had probed in our previous studies of double cone opsin expression. We used one retina that was probed for *RH2Aalpha* and *LWS* (individual RI1 in Supp Table S3 from Dalton et al., 2015) and one probed for *RH2B* and *RH2Abeta* (individual 15 in Fig 3c from Dalton et al., 2014).

We produced a topographic map of each retina showing the frequency of coexpression. Maps were generated in RStudio (Version 0.99.489) using a thin plate smoothing function (Garza-Gisholt et al., 2014). Dorsal and nasal directions within topographic maps were determined using the optic nerve head for reference.

### **(c) Colour discrimination and contrast detection**

To examine the possible effects of opsin coexpression on visual function, we modeled colour discrimination and contrast detection by the *M. zebra* visual system in Lake Malawi light environments. We modeled the ability of a *M. zebra* trichromatic visual system to discriminate *M. zebra* colours from different viewing backgrounds and its ability to discriminate between foraging substrates. Colour discrimination was evaluated with a receptor noise limited model (Siddiqi et al., 2004, Vorobyev et al., 2001). As described below, there is one region of the retina with minimal coexpression, along with the four retinal quadrants, which each differ in coexpression combinations.



We therefore model colour discrimination using pure (non coexpressing) pigments and compare that to coexpressing pigment combinations found in the four quadrants. Previous microspectrophotometry measurements of visual pigment mixtures in *M. zebra* double cones indicated coexpressing M-cones contained an average of 50% *RH2Abeta* mixed with *RH2B* and coexpressing L-cones contained an average of 30% *LWS* mixed with *RH2Aalpha* (Dalton et al., 2014). In addition, qPCR has suggested that gene ratios of *SWS2B* / *SWS1* can be as high as 50% in *M. zebra*. We therefore assume a 50/50 mixture of *SWS1* and *SWS2B* for coexpressing single cones.

In considering the visual tasks that are important to cichlids, we note that cichlids forage either by capturing zooplankton from the water column or by eating algae from rocks. During mating, males defend territories just above the rock substrate. As females swim above these territories, viewing males against the rocks, males will observe females above and ahead of them against the downwelling light. As females approach within a few meters, males will rise up to court females, with each sex then viewing the other against the background space light (Fig. 1). We therefore consider several scenarios: cichlid colours viewed against downwelling radiance at 30-60 degrees; cichlid colours viewed against space light of 75 to 105 degrees (with 90 degrees being horizontal), and cichlid colours viewed against the rocks. We also consider whether cichlids can discriminate between different algal covered rocks, different colours with a cichlid colour pattern, or zooplankton from space light.

Environmental light spectra as well as reflectance measurements of *M. zebra* and Lake Malawi viewing backgrounds and foraging substrates were taken from Dalton et al. (2010, 2014), where each spectrum is an average of 10 measurements (Table S1). In the modeling we used viewing conditions 3 m below the surface, a depth at which *M. zebra* are common. Radiance at different viewing angles (Table S1A) were previously quantified at several locations in the Southeast arm of Lake Malawi where *M. zebra* are common including Thumbi West Island (Dalton et al 2010); Mazinzi Reef (Dalton et al 2014) and Otter Point (Sabbah et al., 2011). Four different rock substrates were used to represent viewing backgrounds as well as foraging substrates (Table S1B). We used a set of cichlid colours that includes male blues, yellows, blacks and

white as well as female brown and green reflectance spectra taken for *M. zebra* (from Dalton et al., 2010; Table S1C).

We calculated the quantum catch of each cone class,  $i$ , following Dalton et al. (2010):

$$Q_i = K_i \int_{300}^{700} R_i(\lambda) L(\lambda) S(\lambda) I(\lambda) d\lambda \quad (4)$$

where  $R_i$  is receptor sensitivity,  $L$  is lens transmittance,  $S$  is surface reflectance,  $I$  is the illuminant, and  $K_i$  (Eq. 2) adjusts for von Kries colour constancy (Kelber et al., 2003):

$$K_i = \frac{1}{\int R_i(\lambda) L(\lambda) I(\lambda) d\lambda} \quad (5)$$

Receptor sensitivities are calculated using the equations of Govardovskii et al (2000) based on *M. zebra* microspectrophotometry (Table S1D). Lens transmission was measured in the field (Hofmann et al 2010). We assumed that sidewelling irradiance illuminated fish, downwelling irradiance illuminated rock substrates, and the visual system was adapted to sidewelling irradiance for colour constancy. When computing  $Q_i$  for particular angular radiance,  $S$  was omitted and the radiance spectrum replaced  $I$  in Eq. 4. The results of Eq. 4 were used for each cone class ( $i$ ) to calculate contrast between pairs of spectra,  $\Delta f_i$ :

$$\Delta f_i = \ln \left[ \frac{Q_i(\text{spec } 1)}{Q_i(\text{spec } 2)} \right] \quad (6)$$

Receptor noise for each cone class,  $w_i$ , was determined following Koshitaka et al. (2008) in which the L receptor is assumed to have a noise value of 0.05, as other studies have done (Cheney et al., 2009, Siddiqi et al., 2004, Vorobyev, 2003). The noise values for the other two cone classes are calculated using their relative abundance in the retinal mosaic:

$$w_i = 0.05 \sqrt{\frac{n_L}{n_i}} \quad (7)$$

*M. zebra* has a square cone mosaic (Dalton et al., 2014) in which the ratio of S:M:L cones is 1:2:2.

Discrimination between two colours ( $\Delta S$ ) was computed as

$$\Delta S = \sqrt{\frac{w_S^2(\Delta f_L - \Delta f_M)^2 + w_M^2(\Delta f_L - \Delta f_S)^2 + w_L^2(\Delta f_S - \Delta f_M)^2}{(w_S w_M)^2 + (w_S w_L)^2 + (w_M w_L)^2}} \quad (8)$$

The  $\Delta S$  units are just noticeable differences (JND), the smallest difference between two colours that can be discriminated by the visual system. To test for the effects of opsin coexpression (see results) and simplify the modeling of colour discrimination, we calculated JNDs for pure visual pigments and compared it with four common coexpression combinations found in four retinal areas. These include: a) coexpression in S-cones in the dorsal-temporal quadrant (50% *SWS2B* / 0% *RH2Abeta* / 0% *LWS*); b) coexpression in S- and M-cones in the dorsal-nasal quadrant (50% *SWS2B* / 50% *RH2Abeta* / 0% *LWS*); c) coexpression of S- and L- cones in the ventral-temporal quadrant (50% *SWS2B* / 0% *RH2Abeta* / 30% *LWS*); and d) coexpression of all three cones types in the ventral-nasal quadrant (50% *SWS2B* / 50% *RH2Abeta* / 30% *LWS*).

Achromatic contrast detection was examined by modeling the greatest distance at which a black object could be detected by single cones when viewed horizontally or directly overhead against the corresponding spacelight background. Calculations were performed according to Dalton et al. (2014) following the methods of Lythgoe (1968). The Weber contrast,  $C_r$  of a dark object viewed horizontally against a bright background is calculated from:

$$C_r = \frac{\int_{300}^{700} N_{Tr}(\lambda) Vp(\lambda) T(\lambda) d\lambda - \int_{300}^{700} N_B(\lambda) Vp(\lambda) T(\lambda) d\lambda}{\int_{300}^{700} N_B(\lambda) Vp(\lambda) T(\lambda) d\lambda} \quad (9)$$

where  $N_{Tr}$  is target radiance at viewing distance  $r$ ,  $Vp$  is visual pigment absorptance,  $T$  is lens transmittance, and  $N_B$  is radiance of the water background (horizontal spacelight), which we measured directly and is independent of  $r$ . The target radiance is altered by attenuation and by intervening light scattered into the visual path. It is quantified as

$$N_{Tr} = \int_{300}^{700} N_{T0} e^{-ar} d\lambda + \int_{300}^{700} N_B (1 - e^{-ar}) d\lambda \quad (10)$$

where  $N_{T0}$  is the target radiance when  $r=0$ , and  $a$  is the beam attenuation coefficient. For a black object, the target radiance, and hence the first term, is taken to be zero.

The second term of this equation corresponds to intervening light. For objects viewed horizontally, the amount and spectrum of light that enters the horizontal visual path between object and viewer is considered to be the same at all points along the visual path. However, this does not hold for objects viewed overhead. In this case, we estimated intervening light scattered into the visual path at a given viewing depth ( $r$ ) by subtracting the beam attenuated radiance ( $L_b$ ) from the diffuse attenuated radiance ( $L_d$ ). These can be determined from the radiance just below the water's surface,  $L_0$ , the diffuse attenuation coefficient,  $A$  (Sabbah et al., 2011) and the beam attenuation coefficient,  $a$  (Dalton et al 2010; Table S1E):

$$N_{Tr\_black\_object} = \int (L_{dr} - L_{br}) d\lambda = \int [L_0(1 - e^{-Ar}) - L_0(1 - e^{-ar})] d\lambda \quad (11)$$

Achromatic contrast and the distance at which contrast was at threshold (0.02) were compared for single cones expressing pure *SWS1* or a mixture with 50% *SWS2B*. We also compared individual double cones with 0 or 50% *RH2Abeta* mixed with *RH2B* and 0 or 30% *LWS* mixed with *RH2Aalpha*. Finally, we considered the sum of both double cones or the sum of all three cones acting as a single luminance channel. We assumed the horizontally viewed object was located 3 m below the water surface and the overhead object was just below the surface.

### 3. RESULTS

#### (a) Topographic distribution of ganglion cells and spatial resolving power

The density and topographic distribution of ganglion cells was assessed in three different individuals of *M. zebra*. Overall, the data obtained were very similar between the three individuals with a mean total number of cells of 456,046 and mean peak density of 16,333 cells/mm<sup>2</sup> (Table 1).

The topographic pattern of ganglion cell distributions revealed two retinal specializations (Fig. 2a and Fig. S1): an area centralis and a weak horizontal streak. The area centralis is located in the temporal part of the retina close to the optic nerve head, with a peak cell density ranging from 15,600 to 17,200 cells/mm<sup>2</sup> (Table 1). The iso-density lines in the area centralis are concentric and range from the peak density to about 9,000 cells/mm<sup>2</sup>. In the midperipheral retina, the iso-density lines become more

elliptical and elongated, forming a weak horizontal streak with cell densities ranging from 6,000 to 8,000 cells/mm<sup>2</sup>.

Based on the peak ganglion cell densities, the spatial resolving power (SRP) in *M. zebra* is 4.5 cycles per degree averaged across the three individuals (Table 1). We can use the SRP values to determine how far away cichlids can potentially resolve particular objects or patterns. *M. zebra* has a barred male colour pattern with bars that are 3-4 mm wide. For an SRP of 4.5 cycles per degree, where one cycle (one bright blue bar and one black bar) is approximately 7 mm wide, this pattern could be resolved at a distance of 1.8 m or less. This distance is consistent with distances at which females choose whether to engage courting males and males choose whether to defend their territory against neighboring males (1-2 m; pers. obs). Visual acuity is also key for capturing prey items, with some of the smallest being zooplankton. Zooplankton of Lake Malawi vary in size from 200 to over 1000 µm (Irvine and Waya, 1999). Similar acuity calculations can be used to determine that *M. zebra* can resolve a zooplankter from its background at distances of 10 to 50 cm. This distance seems reasonable, as cichlids have been observed moving over relatively short distances (2-5 cm; pers. obs) as they search for and pluck prey from the water column. Therefore, the spatial resolving power seems adequate to perform several key cichlid visual tasks.

### **(b) Topographic distribution of cone photoreceptors**

The density and topographic distribution of cone photoreceptors were assessed in three individuals of *M. zebra*. In two of these retinas (Mz 124 and Mz 126) we mapped both photoreceptors and ganglion cells (e.g. Fig. 2a and b). *M. zebra* had cones arranged in a regular fashion forming a mosaic composed of single cones each surrounded by 4 double cones with a double to single cone ratio of 2:1. This mosaic pattern was consistent over the entire retina resulting in similar topographic distributions for each cell type (Fig. S2). As a result, we will only describe in detail the distribution pattern for total cones.

The topographic distribution of cones was similar between individuals, though cell density did vary, with Mz 124 possessing higher densities than the other two individuals (Fig. S2). This slightly higher density for Mz 124, most likely reflects the

somewhat smaller size of this particular individual. As the eye grows in larger teleost individuals, some cells are added in the retinal margin. However, overall the existing retina is stretched resulting in a decrease in absolute cell densities, and constant visual capabilities (Fernald, 1985). The average number of cones was 780,906 (Table 2). In contrast to ganglion cells, the highest cone densities were found in the nasal and temporal periphery. In addition, there was a general increase in cell density towards the periphery resulting from the presence of smaller cells. This was most marked for individual Mz124 (Fig 2) but occurred to a lesser degree for the other two individuals (Fig S2). The peak density was between 17,800 and 19,400 cells/mm<sup>2</sup> (Table 2). However, cone densities were similar to the ganglion cell pattern in having an area centralis in the temporal part of the retina close to the optic nerve head, with a peak cone cell density ranging from 12,000 to 14,000 cells/mm<sup>2</sup>, (Fig. S2). A weak horizontal streak, analogous to the one formed by the ganglion cells, could also be identified, although it was slightly obscured by the increase in cell density present toward the periphery.

### **(c) Coexpression of opsins in single cones and double cones**

#### *Coexpression in Single Cones*

Using fluorescent *in situ* hybridization of whole retinas, we found *SWS1* and *SWS2B* were expressed in single cones but never in double cones (Fig. 3). *SWS1* was essentially always expressed in single cones (99.8% +/- 0.2% of all the single cones examined in five of the six individuals (single cone n=8,150)). However, one individual (I6) had one region of the retina where *SWS2B* expression predominated, (dorso-nasal margin where 81.0% of single cones expressed only *SWS2B* (n=200 cells)). This individual still had high *SWS1* expression in single cones overall (90.7% (n=1,900)).

In contrast to *SWS1*, the level of *SWS2B* expression varied considerably among individuals, from 20.7% to 95.6%. Although it varied in extent, the spatial distribution of *SWS2B* was consistent across the retinas of all individuals (Fig. 4). *SWS2B* was most likely to be expressed in the nasal retina and less likely in a region that was located slightly temporally from the center of the retina, extending temporally and dorsally (Fig. 4). Therefore the area centralis region had less coexpression than other parts of the

retina. The extensive individual variation in single cone coexpression is similar to what we found previously for opsin coexpression variation in double cones (Dalton et al., 2014).

### *Coexpression in Double Cones*

We showed previously that *RH2B* and *RH2Aalpha* are expressed in opposite members of nearly every double cone across the retina. Combining this with the single cone results we find that each unit of the retinal mosaic has *SWS1* in the central single cone and *RH2B* and *RH2Aalpha* in opposite members of each double cone. Previously we also found spatially varying coexpression in double cones (Dalton et al., 2014). In the nasal retina *RH2Abeta* is often coexpressed with *RH2B*, but this becomes less common toward the middle retina and is rare in temporal regions. The *RH2Aalpha* members coexpress *LWS* frequently in the ventral retina but rarely in the dorsal retina. Thus coexpression in double cones is low in the dorsotemporal retina. To further characterize this infrequent dorsotemporal coexpression, we re-examined previously fixed retinal samples from two fish shown to have unusually high coexpression in the more dorsal and temporal regions (Dalton et al., 2014, Dalton et al., 2015). This extended the five regions transected previously to more globally sample opsin expression across the entire retina similarly to what we did for the single cones in the current study. For coexpression of *LWS* with *RH2Aalpha*, the expansion of *LWS* coexpression into the dorsal hemisphere was limited to the mid and nasal retina and did not occur in the temporal retina (Fig. 5a). Likewise, for coexpression of *RH2Abeta* with *RH2B*, the extension of *RH2Abeta* coexpression into the temporal hemisphere was greater in the ventral than in the dorsal retina (Fig. 5b). Thus, there is minimal opsin coexpression in both single and double cones in the dorsotemporal retina, including the area centralis.

## **(d) Effects of opsin coexpression on visual function**

### *Colour Discrimination*

To examine the possible effects of coexpression on colour vision, we modeled the ability of *M. zebra* to discriminate *M. zebra* colours from different viewing



backgrounds as well as to discriminate between foraging rock substrates. This compared the visual system typical of the area centralis based on pure *SWS1*, *RH2B* and *RH2Aalpha* visual pigments ( no coexpression: 0% *SWS2B* / 0% *RH2Abeta* / 0% *LWS* in S / M / L cones) with four common coexpression combinations found in the four retinal quadrants. When colour discrimination is calculated for pure visual pigments without any coexpression, most colour comparisons are above 5 “just noticeable differences,” or JNDs (Table S2A). Coexpression decreased JNDs of most colour-background comparisons quite significantly, though JNDs of other colour comparisons showed slight increases (Fig. 6, Table S2A). These changes are only important if JNDs are close to threshold (less than 5) and so we have grayed out JNDs which are above this value (Kemp et al., 2015). This still leaves many of the fish colours when viewed against the space light or rocks being less well discriminated as a result of coexpression. The only exceptions where coexpression did not hinder discrimination of colour combinations were for horizontal viewing against two broader spacelight spectra (Thumbi West Island and Otter Point) and a few of the rock backgrounds (Table S2A). Coexpression in single cones (adding *SWS2B* to *SWS1*) caused a substantial decrease in JNDs in comparisons between rock substrates, regardless of the degree of coexpression in the double cone cells (Fig. 6, Table S2A). This suggests that coexpression would hinder algal foraging among the aufwuchs by reducing colour discrimination between different aufwuchs covered rock surfaces.

We also considered colour discrimination among different cichlid colours (Table S2B). Surprisingly, when coexpression had an effect, more than half of those within cichlid colour comparisons benefited from coexpression, increasing their JND. Although many of these improvements occurred for comparisons well above the JND threshold, this still suggests that coexpression does not always decrease colour discrimination. This likely is a result of colours that are well separated (blue versus yellow) benefitting from an increase in coexpression. These are common cichlid colour combinations suggesting that coexpression might help with discriminating bars or egg spots from their surrounding colours (Dalton et al., 2010).



### *Achromatic Contrast Detection*

Coexpression of *SWS1/SWS2B* greatly increased absorbance of spacelight and extended detection distances for contrast detection of dark objects. A 50:50 mixture of *SWS1:SWS2B* absorbs 133% to 177% more of all background radiances, as measured every 15° from zenith to nadir (see Dalton et al., 2014). The increase in absorption was 166% for overhead radiance (downwelling) and 162% for horizontal spacelight. Coexpression increased contrast of a dark object viewed horizontally at all distances modeled, however the largest absolute gains in contrast occurred at shorter viewing distances (Table 3). The detection distances at which single cones were able to distinguish a dark object from the bright background illumination were also substantially increased by pigment mixtures. Compared to pure *SWS1*, a 50:50 mix of *SWS1/SWS2B* increased the detection distance of a horizontally viewed dark object by 24.7% (from 8.7 m to 10.8 m; Table 3). For a dark object viewed overhead, the detection distance increased from 17.0 m (for pure *SWS1*) to 18.35 m (7.9% increase; Table 4). When the signals of S-cones are summed with those of M- and L-cones, the improvement of S-cone coexpression on horizontal detection distance increases only 0.15%. However, it is unknown whether the S channel is processed independently or summed with the M and L channels. We previously showed that coexpression in M and L cones improves contrasts (1 - 8.5%) and detection distances (0.5 - 2%) and those results are again included in Table 3 and 4 (Dalton et al 2014).

## **4. Discussion**

### *Cichlids have sufficient visual acuity*

We have shown that *M. zebra* has an area centralis with maximal ganglion cell density and high cone cell density located in the temporal retina near the optic nerve head (Fig. 2). The area centralis has higher visual acuity and is likely important for looking forward for object recognition and discrimination. The estimated spatial resolving power of 4.5 cycles per degree in a Lake Malawi cichlid is similar to values obtained from Lake Victorian cichlids (SRP = 3.3 to 3.9 cycles per degree, van der Meer and Bowmaker, 1995). These data suggest that cichlid visual acuities are poorer than those observed for some coral reef fish (*Choerodon albigena* (SRP=15) or

*Gymnocranius bitorquatus* (SRP=27)) but similar to others (*Dasson variabilis* (SRP=4) and *Amblyglyphidodon curacao* (SRP=7); Collin and Pettigrew, 1989). Although cichlids do not appear to have particularly high spatial resolution, our calculations indicate that the visual acuity of *M. zebra* is sufficient for key tasks involved in recognizing colour pattern elements for communication and discriminating prey items in foraging.

#### *Opsin coexpression is highly variable*

Individuals varied in the amount of single cone opsin coexpression. For one individual, there was very little coexpression. In four of the five retinas with significant coexpression, single cone coexpression followed a consistent pattern, being low in the area centralis and higher in the rest of the retina. The fifth individual showed high levels of coexpression across most of the retina (Fig. 4). Coexpression in double cones was also rare in the area centralis region, instead being concentrated in the nasal and ventral retina (Dalton et al., 2014). Thus coexpression in all cone types tends to be lowest in the retinal region that is capable of the highest spatial resolution.

#### *Coexpression variation may result from tradeoffs between contrast detection and colour discrimination*

Coexpression in particular regions and avoidance in others raises questions about specialization of retinal regions for different visual tasks and the role of coexpression in those specializations. Our modeling indicates that coexpression in all three cone classes could enhance achromatic contrast detection. Although these changes can be significant (>20%), in other cases those enhancements are only a few % (Tables 3 and 4). While it is difficult to know what effects a 1-2 % change in contrast or detection distance would be, such subtle changes could have large fitness effects if they enable females that are mouth brooding their young to protect them from egg predators even a small fraction of the time. Such contrast advantages are offset by coexpression interfering with colour discrimination. Coexpression likely hinders colour discrimination between different foraging substrates and between at least some cichlid colour signals and viewing backgrounds. Thus, the area centralis has the highest acuity and consistently good colour vision due to its low frequency of opsin coexpression.

In contrast to some of these results, we also find that increasing coexpression would actually increase the JNDs between some cichlid colours (Fig 6; Table S2B). This may be because the reflectance spectra of some cichlid colours are spectrally broad and therefore better matched by broader visual pigments. Or it may be that coexpression spaces out the visual pigments to better match spectrally well separated colours. However, these colour comparisons already have quite large JNDs well above the 5 JND threshold. Therefore, it may be that colour discrimination in the area centralis is already sufficiently large for female mate choice or male recognition of conspecific challengers. Further modeling is required to determine when and why these differences occur.

In addition to good colour vision, the area centralis may also have good contrast vision for certain targets. The area's high density of ganglion cells and S-cones exclusively expressing the UV-sensitive *SWS1* opsin may optimize detection of plankton that are transparent to longer wavelengths but less so to UV light. Ecological studies of cichlids add support to this hypothesis. *SWS1* expression in Lake Malawi cichlids is strongly correlated with zooplanktivory, as well as foraging on algae that grow on rocks (Carleton et al., 2016). The visual streak, which runs across the middle of the retina from nasal to temporal, also has relatively high acuity with higher coexpression towards the nasal margin favoring contrast detection and lower coexpression towards the temporal margin favoring colour discrimination. In the nasal retina, the increases in acuity and detection distance from coexpressing M-cones may both contribute to enhanced detection of dark objects, such as predators, approaching from behind. The dorsal and ventral retinal margins have slightly elevated acuity (density) while maintaining roughly a 1:3 ratio of retinal ganglion cells to photoreceptors.

Combined with our previous work (Dalton et al., 2014), we have shown that *M. zebra* has three spectrally distinct classes of cone cells, one single cone (S cone) and two double cone members (M and L cones). In addition to expressing one opsin in nearly every instance, each class also coexpresses the opsin that is its spectral neighbor and sensitive to longer wavelengths (Fig. 6). These opsins are not the genes that are nearest in the genome ruling out a random sharing of promoters leading to random coexpression (O'Quin et al., 2011). Our results indicate that coexpressing single

cones may enhance contrast detection of dark objects over a range of viewing distances less than 10.5 m (Fig. S3). It has not been demonstrated whether single cones contribute to achromatic tasks in cichlids. Another study showed that archerfish have single cones that match the background spectrum, suggesting they might be important for achromatic contrast detection (Temple et al., 2010).

#### *Individual genetic variation as a possible cause for phenotypic variation*

Our results suggest that selection for colour vision for cichlid colours against backgrounds would decrease coexpression while selective forces that favor achromatic contrast detection of dark objects would increase coexpression. We have recently shown that genetic control of certain cichlid opsins has a relatively simple genetic basis centered on variation of just a few key transcription factors (O'Quin et al., 2012, Schulte et al., 2014). If coexpression in a given cone class is controlled by two different alleles of a transcription factor, the opposing selective forces of colour discrimination versus contrast detection might result in a balanced polymorphism for that locus. Maintenance and alternative sorting of these alleles through the population would explain some of the variation in opsin expression observed between individuals in the wild and the lab. Those animals inheriting two alleles for low coexpression would have more cones expressing a single opsin, those with two alleles for high coexpression would have many coexpressing cones, and most of the individuals being heterozygous would have an intermediate number of coexpressing cones.

This large predicted individual variation is indeed what we see. Although *SWS2B* expression was most common in the nasal retina and least common in the area centralis, we found significant variation in the spatial extent and overall level of *SWS2B* expression by different individuals. In the extreme individual (I6), *SWS2B* completely replaced *SWS1* in most of the cells in the nasal retina. In spite of the individual variation, coexpression in each cone class has a frequency gradient that follows a consistent spatial pattern across the retina.

It is worth noting that within regions where many cells are coexpressing, there are also many cells that express only one opsin. Thus coexpression shows patchiness on a fine scale. This is different from what has been reported in the mouse, where the

relative amount of a coexpressed opsin changes across the retina, but in a given region the individual cells all have similar amounts of the two opsins (Applebury et al., 2000, Applebury et al., 2007). Because variation in coexpression results in variation in  $\lambda_{\max}$ , the patchiness of coexpression raises the possibility that there are more than three spectrally distinct cone types at different locations in the retina. Though it seems unlikely, this could lead to enhanced colour vision capabilities. Further experiments involving electrophysiology or behavior would be required to test for any increases in colour discrimination.

## 5. Conclusion

Regions of the cichlid retina differ in cell density and opsin expression. It is possible that these regions are specialized for different visual tasks. Individuals show consistent visual acuity, as determined by both photoreceptor and ganglion cell densities, that are well matched to finding food and finding mates. Opsin coexpression is reduced in the area centralis where it could impede colour discrimination important for object recognition and high visual acuity tasks. Coexpression occurs frequently in both single and double cones in the retinal periphery where it could enhance tasks involving contrast detection. One obvious alternative to the functional role of opsin coexpression, is that it may have no effect on visual tasks and just vary randomly between individuals. It might also have contrasting effects that are working against each other. Indeed, we found in modeling that coexpression is sometimes favorable for colour discrimination (comparisons between cichlid colours) and sometimes not (comparison of cichlid colours against backgrounds or rock substrates from each other). Further work is required to better understand how opsin coexpression is controlled as well as how the cichlid retina is wired for colour vision.

Competing Interests: We have no competing interests.

Authors contributions: BD performed in situ hybridization and visual modeling. FdB performed the retinal whole mounts. KC and JM refined the visual modeling. All authors participated in the writing of the manuscript and approved its final form.

Funding and acknowledgements: This work was supported by funding from the National Eye Institute of the National Institutes of Health 1R01EY024639 (KC) and the Australian Research Council (JM). Stereology work was performed in the Queensland Brain Institute's Advanced Microscopy Facility and generously supported by ARC LIEF LE10010074.

Data availability. Data for visual modeling are provided as supplementary information. This includes irradiance and radiance light spectra (Table S1A), reflectance spectra of substrates (Table S1B), reflectance spectra of cichlid colours (Table S1C), visual system characterization including lens transmission and visual pigment absorption (Table S1D), and light attenuation in Lake Malawi (Table S1E). Calculated JNDs for fish colours against backgrounds or other fish colours across a range of scenarios are given in Table S2A and B. Retinal whole mounts for all individuals are given in Fig S1 and S2. Contrast values for particular visual scenarios are given in Fig S3.

## References

- Allison, W. T., Barthel, L. K., Skebo, K. M., Takechi, M., Kawamura, S. & Raymond, P. A. 2010. Ontogeny of cone photoreceptor mosaics in zebrafish. *J Comp Neurol*, 518, 4182-95.
- Applebury, M. L., Antoch, M. P., Baxter, L. C., Chun, L. L., Falk, J. D., Farhangfar, F., Kage, K., Krzystolik, M. G., Lyass, L. A. & Robbins, J. T. 2000. The murine cone photoreceptor: a single cone type expresses both S and M opsins with retinal spatial patterning. *Neuron*, 27, 513-23.
- Applebury, M. L., Farhangfar, F., Glosmann, M., Hashimoto, K., Kage, K., Robbins, J. T., Shibusawa, N., Wondisford, F. E. & Zhang, H. 2007. Transient expression of thyroid hormone nuclear receptor TRbeta2 sets S opsin patterning during cone photoreceptor genesis. *Dev Dyn*, 236, 1203-12.
- Baddeley, A. & Turner, R. 2005. spatstat: An R Package for Analyzing Spatial Point Patterns. *Journal of Statistical Software*.
- Baden, T., Schubert, T., Chang, L., Wei, T., Zaichuk, M., Wissinger, B. & Euler, T. 2013. A tale of two retinal domains: near-optimal sampling of achromatic contrasts in natural scenes through asymmetric photoreceptor distribution. *Neuron*, 80, 1206-17.
- Barthel, L. K. & Raymond, P. A. 2000. In situ hybridization studies of retinal neurons. *Methods Enzymol*, 316, 579-90.
- Briscoe, A. D., Bernard, G. D., Szeto, A. S., Nagy, L. M. & White, R. H. 2003. Not all butterfly eyes are created equal: rhodopsin absorption spectra, molecular identification, and localization of ultraviolet-, blue-, and green-sensitive rhodopsin-encoding mRNAs in the retina of *Vanessa cardui*. *J Comp Neurol*, 458, 334-49.
- Carleton, K. L., Dalton, B. E., Escobar-Camacho, D. & Nandamuri, S. P. 2016. Proximate and ultimate causes of variable visual sensitivities: Insights from cichlid fish radiations. *Genesis*, 54, 299-325.
- Cheney, K. L., Grutter, A. S., Blomberg, S. P. & Marshall, N. J. 2009. Blue and yellow signal cleaning behavior in coral reef fishes. *Curr Biol*, 19, 1283-7.
- Coimbra, J. P., Marceliano, M. L., Andrade-Da-Costa, B. L. & Yamada, E. S. 2006. The retina of tyrant flycatchers: topographic organization of neuronal density and size in the ganglion cell layer of the great kiskadee *Pitangus sulphuratus* and the rusty margined flycatcher *Myiozetetes cayanensis* (Aves: Tyrannidae). *Brain Behav Evol*, 68, 15-25.
- Coimbra, J. P., Nolan, P. M., Collin, S. P. & Hart, N. S. 2012. Retinal ganglion cell topography and spatial resolving power in penguins. *Brain Behav Evol*, 80, 254-68.
- Coimbra, J. P., Trevia, N., Marceliano, M. L., Da Silveira Andrade-Da-Costa, B. L., Picanco-Diniz, C. W. & Yamada, E. S. 2009. Number and distribution of neurons in the retinal ganglion cell layer in relation to foraging behaviors of tyrant flycatchers. *J Comp Neurol*, 514, 66-73.
- Collin, S. P. & Collin, H. B. 1988. Topographic analysis of the retinal ganglion cell layer and optic nerve in the sandlance *Limnichthyes fasciatus* (Creeiidae, Perciformes). *J Comp Neurol*, 278, 226-41.



- Collin, S. P. & Pettigrew, J. D. 1989. Quantitative comparison of the limits on visual spatial resolution set by the ganglion cell layer in twelve species of reef teleosts. *Brain Behav Evol*, 34, 184-92.
- Dalton, B. E., Cronin, T. W., Marshall, N. J. & Carleton, K. L. 2010. The fish eye view: are cichlids conspicuous? *J Exp Biol*, 213, 2243-55.
- Dalton, B. E., Loew, E. R., Cronin, T. W. & Carleton, K. L. 2014. Spectral tuning by opsin coexpression in retinal regions that view different parts of the visual field. *Proc Biol Sci*, 281, 20141980.
- Dalton, B. E., Lu, J., Leips, J., Cronin, T. W. & Carleton, K. L. 2015. Variable light environments induce plastic spectral tuning by regional opsin coexpression in the African cichlid fish, *Metriaclichia zebra*. *Mol Ecol*, 24, 4193-204.
- De Busserolles, F., Fitzpatrick, J. L., Marshall, N. J. & Collin, S. P. 2014a. The influence of photoreceptor size and distribution on optical sensitivity in the eyes of lanternfishes (Myctophidae). *PLoS One*, 9, e99957.
- De Busserolles, F., Marshall, N. J. & Collin, S. P. 2014b. Retinal ganglion cell distribution and spatial resolving power in deep-sea lanternfishes (Myctophidae). *Brain Behav Evol*, 84, 262-76.
- Endler, J. A. 1993. Some general comments on the evolution and design of animal communication systems. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*, 340, 215-25.
- Escobar-Camacho, D. & Carleton, K. L. 2015. Sensory modalities in cichlid fish behavior. *Curr Opin Behav Sci*, 6, 115-124.
- Fernald, R. D. 1985. Growth of the teleost eye: novel solutions to complex constraints. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, 13, 113-123.
- Garza-Gisholt, E., Hemmi, J. M., Hart, N. S. & Collin, S. P. 2014. A comparison of spatial analysis methods for the construction of topographic maps of retinal cell density. *PLoS One*, 9, e93485.
- Glaser, E. M. & Wilson, P. D. 1998. The coefficient of error of optical fractionator population size estimates: a computer simulation comparing three estimators. *Journal of Microscopy*, 192, 163-171.
- Govardovskii, V. I., Fyhrquist, N., Reuter, T., Kuzmin, D. G. & Donner, K. 2000. In search of the visual pigment template. *Vis Neurosci*, 17, 509-28.
- Hofmann, C. M., O'Quin, K. E., Marshall, N. J., Cronin, T. C., Seehausen, O. & Carleton, K. L. 2009. The eyes have it: Regulatory and structural changes both underlie cichlid visual pigment diversity. *PLoS Biol*, 7, e1000266.
- Hughes, A. 1975. A quantitative analysis of the cat retinal ganglion cell topography. *The Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 163, 107-128.
- Hughes, A. 1985. New perspectives in retinal organisation. *Progress in retinal research*, 4, 243-313.
- Irvine, K. & Waya, R. 1999. Spatial and temporal patterns of zooplankton standing biomass and production in Lake Malawi. *Hydrobiologia*, 407, 191-205.
- Kelber, A., Vorobyev, M. & Osorio, D. 2003. Animal colour vision--behavioural tests and physiological concepts. *Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc*, 78, 81-118.
- Kemp, D. J., Herberstein, M. E., Fleishman, L. J., Endler, J. A., Bennett, A. T., Dyer, A. G., Hart, N. S., Marshall, J. & Whiting, M. J. 2015. An integrative framework for the appraisal of coloration in nature. *Am Nat*, 185, 705-24.



- Koshitaka, H., Kinoshita, M., Vorobyev, M. & Arikawa, K. 2008. Tetrachromacy in a butterfly that has eight varieties of spectral receptors. *Proc Biol Sci*, 275, 947-54.
- Land, M. F. & Nilsson, D.-E. 2001. *Animal Eyes*, Oxford, U.K., Oxford University Press.
- Lythgoe, J. N. 1968. Visual pigments and visual range underwater. *Vision Res*, 8, 997-1011.
- Matthiessen, L. 1882. Ueber die beziehungen, welche zwischen dem brechungsindex des kerncentrums der krystalllinse und den dimensionen des auges bestehen. *Pflugers Arch.*, 27, 510-523.
- Munz, F. W. & Mcfarland, W. N. 1977. Evolutionary adaptations of fishes to the photic environment. In: CRESCITELLI, F. (ed.) *The visual system in vertebrates*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- O'Quin, K. E., Schulte, J. E., Patel, Z., Kahn, N., Naseer, Z., Wang, H., Conte, M. A. & Carleton, K. L. 2012. Evolution of cichlid vision via trans-regulatory divergence. *BMC Evol Biol*, 12, 251.
- O'Quin, K. E., Smith, D., Naseer, Z., Schulte, J., Engel, S. D., Loh, Y. H., Streelman, J. T., Boore, J. L. & Carleton, K. L. 2011. Divergence in cis-regulatory sequences surrounding the opsin gene arrays of African cichlid fishes. *BMC Evol Biol*, 11, 120.
- Owens, G. L., Rennison, D. J., Allison, W. T. & Taylor, J. S. 2012. In the four-eyed fish (*Anableps anableps*), the regions of the retina exposed to aquatic and aerial light do not express the same set of opsin genes. *Biol Lett*, 8, 86-9.
- Parry, J. W., Carleton, K. L., Spady, T., Carboo, A., Hunt, D. M. & Bowmaker, J. K. 2005. Mix and match color vision: tuning spectral sensitivity by differential opsin gene expression in Lake Malawi cichlids. *Curr Biol*, 15, 1734-9.
- Sabbah, S., Gray, S. M., Boss, E. S., Fraser, J. M., Zatha, R. & Hawryshyn, C. W. 2011. The underwater photic environment of Cape Maclear, Lake Malawi: comparison between rock- and sand-bottom habitats and implications for cichlid fish vision. *J Exp Biol*, 214, 487-500.
- Schulte, J. E., O'Brien, C. S., Conte, M. A., O'Quin, K. E. & Carleton, K. L. 2014. Interspecific Variation in Rx1 Expression Controls Opsin Expression and Causes Visual System Diversity in African Cichlid Fishes. *Mol Biol Evol*, 31, 2297-308.
- Siddiqi, A., Cronin, T. W., Loew, E. R., Vorobyev, M. & Summers, K. 2004. Interspecific and intraspecific views of color signals in the strawberry poison frog *Dendrobates pumilio*. *J Exp Biol*, 207, 2471-85.
- Slomianka, L. & West, M. J. 2005. Estimators of the precision of stereological estimates: an example based on the CA1 pyramidal cell layer of rats. *Neuroscience*, 136, 757-67.
- Smith, A. R., D'annunzio, L., Smith, A. E., Sharma, A., Hofmann, C. M., Marshall, N. J. & Carleton, K. L. 2011. Intraspecific cone opsin expression variation in the cichlids of Lake Malawi. *Mol Ecol*, 20, 299-310.
- Stone, J., Rapaport, D. H., Williams, R. W. & Chalupa, L. 1981. Uniformity of cell distribution in the ganglion cell layer of prenatal cat retina: implications for mechanisms of retinal development. *Brain Res*, 254, 231-42.
- Temple, S., Hart, N. S., Marshall, N. J. & Collin, S. P. 2010. A spitting image: specializations in archerfish eyes for vision at the interface between air and water. *Proc Biol Sci*, 277, 2607-15.

- Temple, S. E. 2011. Why different regions of the retina have different spectral sensitivities: a review of mechanisms and functional significance of intraretinal variability in spectral sensitivity in vertebrates. *Vis Neurosci*, 28, 281-93.
- Ullmann, J. F., Moore, B. A., Temple, S. E., Fernandez-Juricic, E. & Collin, S. P. 2012. The retinal wholemount technique: a window to understanding the brain and behaviour. *Brain Behav Evol*, 79, 26-44.
- Van Der Meer, H. J. & Bowmaker, J. K. 1995. Interspecific variation of photoreceptors in four co-existing haplochromine cichlid fishes. *Brain Behav Evol*, 45, 232-40.
- Vorobyev, M. 2003. Coloured oil droplets enhance colour discrimination. *Proc Biol Sci*, 270, 1255-61.
- Vorobyev, M., Brandt, R., Peitsch, D., Laughlin, S. B. & Menzel, R. 2001. Colour thresholds and receptor noise: behaviour and physiology compared. *Vision Res*, 41, 639-53.
- Wertheim, J. O., Murrell, B., Smith, M. D., Kosakovsky Pond, S. L. & Scheffler, K. 2015. RELAX: detecting relaxed selection in a phylogenetic framework. *Mol Biol Evol*, 32, 820-32.
- West, R. A. 1991. Optical properties of aggregate particles whose outer diameter is comparable to the wavelength. *Appl Opt*, 30, 5316-24.

**Table 1.** Summary of the ganglion cell data obtained using the optical fractionator method for three individuals of *M. zebra*. CE = Schaeffer coefficient of error, Ø = diameter, SRP = spatial resolving power.

Individual	Standard length (mm)	Total number	Peak density, cells/mm <sup>2</sup>	CE	Lens ø (mm)	SRP (cycles/degree)
Mz 124	99	470,453	16,200	0.033	3.00	4.34
Mz 126	102	430,316	15,600	0.036	3.18	4.51
Mz 127	96	467,369	17,200	0.037	3.20	4.76

**Table 2.** Summary of the photoreceptor cell quantitative data obtained using the optical fractionator method for three individuals of *M. zebra*. Standard length for Mz 125 was 112 mm, lengths for others given in Table 1. DC = double cones, SC = single cones, TC = total cones. CE = Schaeffer coefficient of error.

Indiv	Total DC	Peak DC cells/mm <sup>2</sup>	Total SC	Peak SC cells/mm <sup>2</sup>	Total cones	Peak TC cells/mm <sup>2</sup>	CE
Mz 124	520,266	13,300	248,979	6,100	769,245	19,400	0.036
Mz 125	530,744	12,900	256,626	5,600	787,371	18,200	0.027
Mz 126	530,955	12,600	248,979	5,300	786,103	17,800	0.030

**Table 3.** Contrast detection comparing pure pigments and coexpressing pigments for detecting a dark object against the side welling spacelight. Contrast improvement is the increase in contrast of the mixed pigment at the distance at which the pure pigment reaches detection threshold, compared to the pure pigment contrast (2%). Distance improvement is the increase in the detection distance of the mixed pigments (at 2% contract) relative to the pure pigment(s). \*Data for M and L cones similar to results in Dalton et al 2014.

Contributing cone	Pigment	Distance (m)	Contrast	Contrast improvement	Distance improvement
S	<i>SWS1</i>	8.68	0.02		
	<i>50/50 SWS1 / SWS2B</i>	8.68 10.81	0.042 0.02	110%	24.5%
M*	<i>RH2B</i>	12.95	0.02		
	<i>50/50 RH2B/ RH2Abeta</i>	12.95 13.23	0.0217 0.02	8.6%	2.1%
L*	<i>RH2Aalpha</i>	13.585	0.02		
	<i>70/30 RH2Aalpha/ LWS</i>	13.585 13.63	0.0205 0.02	1.2%	0.45%
M+L	<i>RH2B + RH2Aalpha</i>	13.29	0.02		
	<i>50/50 RH2B/RH2Abeta + 70/30 RH2Aalpha/LWS</i>	13.29 13.43	0.0208 0.02	4.2%	1.0%
S+M+L	<i>SWS1 + RH2B + RH2Aalpha</i>	13.13	0.02		
	<i>50/50 SWS1/SWS2B + 50/50 RH2B/RH2Abeta 70/30 RH2Aalpha/LWS</i>	13.13 13.15	0.02018 0.02	0.9%	0.15%

**Table 4.** Contrast detection comparing pure pigments and coexpressing pigments for detecting a dark object against the downwelling radiance. Contrast improvement is the increase in contrast of the mixed pigment at the distance at which the pure pigment reaches detection threshold, compared to that limiting pure pigment contrast (2%). Distance improvement is the increase in the detection distance of the mixed pigments relative to the pure pigment(s).

Contributing cone	Pigment	Distance (m)	Contrast	Contrast improvement	Distance improvement
S	<i>SWS1</i>	17	0.02		
	50/50 <i>SWS1</i> / <i>SWS2B</i>	17 18.35	0.0267 0.02	33.3%	7.9%
M*	<i>RH2B</i>	17.22	0.02		
	50/50 <i>RH2B</i> / <i>RH2Abeta</i>	17.22 17.29	0.204 0.02	1.65%	0.41%
L*	<i>RH2Aalpha</i>	17.47	0.02		
	70/30 <i>RH2Aalpha</i> / <i>LWS</i>	17.47 17.71	0.0207 0.02	3.25%	1.37%
M+L	<i>RH2B</i> + <i>RH2Aalpha</i>	17.37	0.02		
	50/50 <i>RH2B</i> / <i>RH2Abeta</i> + 70/30 <i>RH2Aalpha</i> / <i>LWS</i>	17.37 17.47	0.0205 0.02	2.27%	0.58%
S+M+L	<i>SWS1</i> + <i>RH2B</i> + <i>RH2Aalpha</i>	17.36	0.020		
	50/50 <i>SWS1</i> / <i>SWS2B</i> + 50/50 <i>RH2B</i> / <i>RH2Abeta</i> + 70/30 <i>RH2Aalpha</i> / <i>LWS</i>	17.36 17.505	0.0207 0.020	3.21%	0.84%

\* Dalton et al 2014

## Figures




Figure 1. Cichlid visual tasks. (a) Cichlids feed from the water column or eat aufwuchs / algae off rock substrates. (b) For mating, females initially view males against rocks, while males view females against the downwelling light. (c) If males decide to court, they will rise up into the water column where males and females will view each other against the background space light. Drawings by D. Escobar-Camacho (modified from Escobar-Camacho and Carleton, 2015).






Figure 2. Topographic distribution of ganglion cell densities, cone cell densities, and opsin coexpression levels, in the same individual. (a) Density of retinal ganglion cells. (b) Density of all cone cells (single cones + double cones). (c) Percent of single cones coexpressing *SWS2B* with *SWS1*. Scale bars in (a) and (b) in thousands of cells per  $\text{mm}^2$ , (c) in % of single cones coexpressing opsins. All retinas oriented as in (a); right eye used for (a) and (b), left eye for (c). Black area in (c) indicates location of optic nerve head and falciform process.




Figure 3. *SWS1* and *SWS2B* are coexpressed in single cones. (a) *In situ* hybridization shows *SWS1* (cyan) is expressed in single cones but not in double cones. (b-c) Nearly all single cones express *SWS1* (b, cyan). Single cones may also express *SWS2B* (c, violet, and merged image d). Gray arrow indicates a coexpressing single cone (b-d). Some single cones (cyan arrow) express *SWS1* only. Scale bar = 25  $\mu\text{m}$ .




Figure 4. Frequency of opsin coexpression in single cones across the retina of *M. zebra* in six individuals. (a-e) Percent coexpressing *SWS2B* with *SWS1*. Non-coexpressing single cones expressed *SWS1* only. (f) Percent coexpressing *SWS1* with *SWS2B*. Non coexpressing single cones expressed *SWS2B* only (grey scale).






Figure 5. Frequency of opsin coexpression in double cones across the retina of *M. zebra* in two individuals previously sampled at only five retinal locations. (a) Percent coexpression of *LWS* with *RH2Aalpha* (reanalyzed from (Dalton et al., 2015)) and (b) percent coexpression of *RH2Abeta* with *RH2B* (reanalyzed from (Dalton et al., 2014)).




We compare pure pigments to four different coexpression combinations where we note the % coexpression in S, M and L cones. The four quadrants have the following visual pigment combinations (a) coexpressing S cones with 50/50 mix of *SWS1/SWS2B* (S1/S2b): 50 / 0 / 0; (b) coexpressing S and M cones with 50/50 mix of both *SWS1/SWS2B* and of *RH2B/RH2Abeta* (B/β): 50 / 50 / 0; (c) coexpressing S and L cones with 50/50 mix of *SWS1/SWS2B* and 70/30 mix of *RH2Aalpha/LWS* (α/LWS): 50 / 0 / 30; (d) coexpression in all three cone types: 50 / 50 / 30. Also shown are absorbance spectra of the corresponding visual pigments found in each quadrant. The thin lines are the pure pigments. The actual visual pigment combinations are shown as a dotted line if coexpressed or a thicker solid line if a pure pigment. The central figure summarizes the coexpression combinations considered in the four quadrants in comparison to the temporal area centralis region containing pure pigments. Single cones are shown as one circle and double cones are shown as the joined half ovals. Genes expressed in these cones are listed with cones colour coded to correspond to the visual pigment spectra.




Supp. Fig. S1. Topographic distribution of retinal ganglion cell densities in three individuals. Ganglion cell density for individual in (a) also appear in Fig. 2. Density scales in thousands of cells per  $\text{mm}^2$ . Scale bars = 1 mm.





Supp. Fig. S2. Topographic distribution of single cones (a-c), double cones (d-f), and total cones (g-i) in three individuals. a, d, and g pertain to the individual from Fig. 2 (Mz 124); b, e, and h correspond to individual Mz 126; and c, f, and i correspond to individual Mz 127. Density scales in thousands of cells per mm<sup>2</sup>. Scale bars = 1 mm.






Supp. Fig. S3. Calculated apparent contrast of a dark object viewed horizontally against spacetlight by S-cones expressing *SWS1* opsin only (circles) and by S-cones also coexpressing 30% *SWS2B* (triangles). Calculations used light spectra measured in Lake Malawi and assumed that viewer and object were 3 m below surface and that contrast threshold was 2%. Threshold was reached at viewing distance of 8.7 m for non-coexpressing S-cones and at 10.5 m for coexpressing S-cones.

**Table S1**


[Click here to download Table S1](#)

**Table S2**


[Click here to download Table S2](#)



Supp. Fig. S1. Topographic distribution of retinal ganglion cell densities in three individuals. Ganglion cell density for individual in (a) also appear in Fig. 2. Density scales in thousands of cells per  $\text{mm}^2$ . Scale bars = 1 mm.



Supp. Fig. S2. Topographic distribution of single cones (a-c), double cones (d-f), and total cones (g-i) in three individuals. a, d, and g pertain to the individual from Fig. 2 (Mz 124); b, e, and h correspond to individual Mz 126; and c, f, and i correspond to individual Mz 127. Density scales in thousands of cells per  $\text{mm}^2$ . Scale bars = 1 mm.



Supp. Fig. S3. Calculated apparent contrast of a dark object viewed horizontally against spacielight by S-cones expressing *SWS1* opsin only (circles) and by S-cones also coexpressing 30% *SWS2B* (triangles). Calculations used light spectra measured in Lake Malawi and assumed that viewer and object were 3 m below surface and that contrast threshold was 2%. Threshold was reached at viewing distance of 8.7 m for non-coexpressing S-cones and at 10.5 m for coexpressing S-cones.

## **Table S1**

[Click here to download Table S1](#)

## **Table S2**

[Click here to download Table S2](#)