



**HAL**  
open science

# The Toxin–Antidote Model of Cytoplasmic Incompatibility: Genetics and Evolutionary Implications

John Beckmann, Manon Bonneau, Hongli Chen, Mark Hochstrasser, Denis Poinso, Mylene Weill, Mathieu Sicard, Sylvain Charlat

## ► To cite this version:

John Beckmann, Manon Bonneau, Hongli Chen, Mark Hochstrasser, Denis Poinso, et al.. The Toxin–Antidote Model of Cytoplasmic Incompatibility: Genetics and Evolutionary Implications. *Trends in Genetics*, 2019, 35 (3), pp.175-185. 10.1016/j.tig.2018.12.004 . hal-02009677

**HAL Id: hal-02009677**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02009677v1>**

Submitted on 28 Feb 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# The toxin-antidote model of cytoplasmic incompatibility: genetics and evolutionary implications

John F. Beckmann<sup>1\*</sup>, Manon Bonneau<sup>2\*</sup>, Hongli Chen<sup>3</sup>, Mark Hochstrasser<sup>3</sup>, Denis Poinso<sup>4</sup>,

Hervé Merçot<sup>5</sup>, Mylène Weill<sup>2</sup>, Mathieu Sicard<sup>2\*\*</sup> and Sylvain Charlat<sup>6\*\*</sup>

5

\*Equal contribution.

\*\* For correspondence: [mathieu.sicard@umontpellier.fr](mailto:mathieu.sicard@umontpellier.fr) / [sylvain.charlat@univ-lyon1.fr](mailto:sylvain.charlat@univ-lyon1.fr)

1. Auburn University, Department of Entomology and Plant Pathology, 301 Funchess Hall,  
Auburn, AL 36849, USA

2. ISEM, University of Montpellier, CNRS, EPHE, IRD, Montpellier, France.

3. Yale University, Department of Molecular Biophysics & Biochemistry, 266 Whitney  
Avenue, New Haven, Connecticut/Province: CT 06511, USA

4. Université Rennes 1, UMR IGEP, Campus Beaulieu, bat 25-4, 35042 Rennes, France

5. Sorbonne Université, UPMC Univ. Paris 06, CNRS, Institut de Biologie Paris Seine,  
Evolution Paris Seine (IBPS, EPS), 7-9 Quai St-Bernard, 75005 Paris, France

6. CNRS - University of Lyon, Laboratoire de Biométrie & Biologie Evolutive, 16, rue Raphael  
Dubois, 69622 Villeurbanne, France

**Keywords** : *Wolbachia*; Cytoplasmic Incompatibility; Deubiquitylase; Nuclease; Toxin-antidote  
systems; Selfish genetic elements

## Abstract

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 *Wolbachia* bacteria inhabit the cells of about half of all arthropod species, an unparalleled  
7  
8 25 success stemming in large part from selfish invasive strategies. Cytoplasmic incompatibility  
9  
10 (CI), whereby the symbiont makes itself essential to embryo viability, is the most common of  
11  
12 these and constitutes a promising weapon against vector-borne diseases. After decades of  
13  
14 theoretical and experimental struggle, major recent advances have been made toward a  
15  
16 molecular understanding of this phenomenon. As pieces of the puzzle come together, from  
17  
18 yeast and *Drosophila* fly transgenesis to CI diversity patterns in natural mosquito populations,  
19  
20 30 it becomes clearer than ever that the CI induction and rescue stem from a toxin-antidote  
21  
22 system. Further, the tight association of the CI genes with prophages provide clues to the  
23  
24 possible evolutionary origin of this phenomenon and the levels of selection at play.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34 35  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Every living organism is a chimera of different evolutionary lineages living in more or less tight  
2 association. Arthropods are emblematic of that rule and often carry bacteria within their own  
3  
4 cells, transmitted from mothers to offspring with the egg cytoplasm. These may offer  
5  
6 benefits, such as vital nutrients to hosts feeding exclusively on sap or blood [1,2], and thus  
7  
8  
9  
10 40 become essential parts of a new whole, but also often colonize host populations through  
11  
12 selfish strategies, maximizing their own fitness regardless of possible detrimental effects to  
13  
14 hosts [3,4]. Cytoplasmic incompatibility (CI, Figure 1, box 1) is one such strategy, which has  
15  
16 likely contributed in large part to the radiative success of *Wolbachia* bacteria, now present in  
17  
18 about half of all arthropod species [5–7].  
19  
20  
21  
22

## 23 45 24 25 26 27 CI genetics 28 29

30 While *Wolbachia* and CI were both discovered a long time ago in *Culex pipiens* mosquitoes [8–  
31  
32 11], the causal link between the two was only made decades later [12,13]. By that time, early  
33  
34 models had clarified the invasion dynamics of CI [14], that were later extended [15] and  
35  
36  
37 50 calibrated with empirical data [16,17], but only in the 1990s was a formal mechanistic model  
38  
39 proposed [18–20]. The fact that sperm from *Wolbachia*-carrying males kills uninfected but not  
40  
41 infected embryos upon fertilization is compatible with a toxin-antidote model (hereafter TA  
42  
43 model) (Figure 2, Key Figure). The toxin factor, deposited in maturing sperm, would kill the  
44  
45 embryos unless they are rescued by the antidote. Although concurrent explanations were also  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50 55 proposed [21,22], the discovery of *Wolbachia* strains capable of rescuing CI without inducing  
51  
52 it further supported the notion that this phenomenon should involve two distinct factors  
53  
54  
55 [23,24]. The observations of independent effects of distinct *Wolbachia* strains, either in the  
56  
57 context of multiple infections or mutual incompatibility between different *Wolbachia* strains,  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 further suggested the toxin and antidote should interact specifically, in a lock-and-key manner

2  
3 60 [25]. This framework generated a set of testable predictions that fueled the experimental  
4  
5 quest to identify the CI genes, which was recently achieved [26–30].  
6

7  
8 The first evidence pointing to the two genes later established as genuine CI factors  
9  
10 came from a sperm proteomic study based on the rationale that the hypothetical CI toxin  
11  
12 should be present in infected males' mature sperm, even though the bacterium itself is not  
13  
14 [26]. Inspired by earlier proteomic analyses of *Drosophila* sperm [31,32], this approach finally  
15 65  
16 pinpointed the candidate CI genes in the mosquito *Culex pipiens*, where the high penetrance  
17  
18 of CI associated with the *wPip Wolbachia* strain predicted a toxin protein detectable by mass  
19  
20 spectrometry. Here serendipity also played an essential role: the first CI protein identified in  
21  
22 sperm in this study was later revealed not as the toxin gene product, as predicted, but as the  
23  
24 antidote, the presence of which was not expected under the most parsimonious CI model  
25  
26 [25]. Nevertheless, its synteny and co-transcription with another *Wolbachia* gene, later  
27  
28 70 revealed as the CI toxin, was noted, as was the similarity of this locus with typical toxin-  
29  
30 antidote systems, usually composed of two genes, the first of which, the antidote, is  
31  
32 expressed at higher levels [33]. Proximity of these putative CI genes to prophages in the *wPip*  
33  
34 genome was also pointed out at that time [26].  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41 75  
42  
43

44 The next major steps toward the demonstration that these genes and their homologs  
45  
46 in *Drosophila* are responsible for the induction and rescue of CI came from a combination of  
47  
48 approaches and model systems [27,28]. In line with the TA model, biochemical analysis and  
49  
50 transgenic expression of the putative *wPip* CI genes in yeast revealed that they encode a toxic  
51  
52 deubiquitylase (DUB) and an inhibitor of this toxicity (DUBs are enzymes that specifically  
53  
54 80 remove ubiquitin from ubiquitin-modified proteins). When transgenically expressed in  
55  
56 uninfected *Drosophila* males crossed with uninfected females, these factors recapitulate CI  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 induction during the first embryonic mitosis [27]. Importantly, the two proteins were also  
2 found to bind tightly to one another in a cognate-specific manner [27] consistent with prior  
3  
4  
5 85 lock-and-key predictions [25]. At the same time, independent experiments involving the  
6  
7 homologs of these genes from the *wMel Wolbachia* strain, naturally infecting *D.*  
8  
9  
10 *melanogaster*, confirmed and complemented these results: their dual expression in  
11  
12 uninfected *Drosophila* males induces a CI-like phenotype that, most importantly, is rescued by  
13  
14 the presence of *wMel* bacteria in females [28].  
15  
16

17  
18 90 Before discussing the many questions raised by these results, a brief note is needed to  
19  
20 avoid ambiguities stemming from different CI gene nomenclatures co-existing in the literature  
21  
22 [27,28] (Figure 3). One proposal is that the operon inducing a CI-like phenotype when  
23  
24 expressed in *Drosophila* should be called “*cid*”, for “CI-inducing DUB” [27]. This function-  
25  
26 based name was chosen to explicitly distinguish *cid* from *cin*, short for “CI-inducing nuclease”,  
27  
28 a paralogous operon in the *wPip* genome, encoding a nuclease and showing a similar TA-like  
29  
30  
31 95 behavior in yeast, as well as polycistronic transcription [26,27]. Within each operon, the first  
32  
33 gene, encoding the putative antidote, is labeled A (e.g., *cidA* or *cinA*) and the second,  
34  
35 encoding the putative toxin, is labeled B. A contrasting nomenclature proposes that all the  
36  
37 different CI-associated genes should be more neutrally noted as “CI factors” (*cif*), and that the  
38  
39 different paralogs should be distinguished on the basis of phylogeny [28,34]. The “operon”  
40  
41  
42 100 designation is also questioned by these authors, primarily because the two transcripts can be  
43  
44 measured at different levels, which could be indicative of different promoters [34]. Yet, no  
45  
46 such distinct promoters have been identified and different expression levels of the two genes  
47  
48 are not uncommon within bacterial operons [35]. In our view, the “operon” designation is  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56 105 thus appropriate in the present case. Regardless of this semantic debate, the two adjacent  
57  
58 genes within each potential CI locus are labeled A and B in both nomenclature proposals.  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Thus, *cidA* and *cidB* are synonymous with *cifA* and *cifB* (clade 1), respectively, and these  
2 constitute the major CI genes identified to date, recapitulating the phenotype in *Drosophila*.  
3  
4 We see pros and cons in both nomenclatures and suggest they should be merged into a single  
5  
6  
7 110 system to avoid further confusion. The “*cif*” term (for CI factor) seems appropriate to  
8  
9  
10 designate CI genes in general and we will use it in that sense. To denote their different  
11  
12 functional categories and evolutionary histories, we will distinguish *cid* (the DUB operon),  
13  
14 from *cin* (the nuclease operon) and use this dichotomy to designate specific *cif* genes from  
15  
16 any *Wolbachia* strain. Some operons have been predicted to carry both functions; we suggest  
17  
18 these should be called “*cnd*” (Figure 3) [27,36]. When necessary, we will append the  
19  
20 115  
21  
22 *Wolbachia* strain name as a superscript. In our opinion, this system merges positives of both  
23  
24 previously proposed nomenclatures and fairly acknowledges the concomitant discovery of  
25  
26 these gene pairs in two separate studies [27,28].  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 Following publication of the first two conclusive reports on *cif* genes, two major  
32  
33 120 unsettled points remained [28,34]. First, the antidote activity of the CidA protein, although  
34  
35 demonstrated for both CidA<sup>wPip</sup> and CinA<sup>wPip</sup> in yeast, was not established in *Drosophila*. A  
36  
37 more recent report has now clarified this point: if expressed in sufficient amount during  
38  
39 oogenesis, CidA<sup>wMel</sup> was found to restore the viability of uninfected embryos fertilized by  
40  
41 wMel-carrying *Drosophila* males [29]. A second major question, still not fully settled as of this  
42  
43  
44 writing, is whether CidB can act alone as the CI toxin or needs some interaction with CidA to  
45  
46 125  
47  
48 express toxicity. Transgenic expression in yeast indicates that the DUB activity of CidB<sup>wPip</sup> has  
49  
50 in itself a toxic effect, which is inhibited by co-expression of CidA<sup>wPip</sup>. However, *Drosophila*  
51  
52 lines expressing CidB<sup>wPip</sup> alone were never obtained, making it impossible to directly assess its  
53  
54 effect in this context [27]. A simple hypothesis, compatible with the idea that CidB alone is  
55  
56  
57 indeed the CI toxin, is that CidB<sup>wPip</sup> can exert deleterious effects outside of the first embryonic  
58  
59 130  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 135  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 145  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 150  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

mitosis, where CI is usually first realized, and therefore requires co-expression of CidA, the  
antidote, in any tissue where CidB is present, and at sufficiently high dosage. Such a model  
would also help explain the paradoxical observation that first turned the spotlight toward the  
CI operon: the high dosage of CidA protein in mature sperm [26]. If this interpretation is  
correct, CI would result from removal or inactivation of the paternal CidA protein just before,  
or just after, fertilization.

At first sight, experiments involving transgenic expression of the *cid*<sup>wMel</sup> genes in  
*Drosophila* argue against a toxic effect of CidB<sup>wMel</sup> alone: lines expressing this protein were  
viable and the CI phenotype was recapitulated only by males expressing both CidB<sup>wMel</sup> and  
CidA<sup>wMel</sup> [28]. This result has been considered by some authors as arguing for a “two-by-one”  
model, in which CI induction would somehow rely on both CidA and CidB proteins, while  
rescue would rely on CidA only [29]. However, differences in the toxicity of CidB<sup>wMel</sup> and  
CidB<sup>wPip</sup> may reconcile these experimental results with a simple TA model. Although the wMel  
*Wolbachia* strain may induce very high CI in a permissive host background (e.g., upon artificial  
transfer into *Drosophila simulans*) [37], it is well established that it has a low penetrance in its  
natural host [38], possibly as a result of past coevolution [39]. A low toxicity of CidB<sup>wMel</sup> in *D.*  
*melanogaster* would explain why flies expressing this protein alone can survive. But why is CI  
not expressed in such transgenic lines? One possibility is that CidB<sup>wMel</sup> is toxic enough to kill  
those maturing sperm cells where it is most highly expressed. It would follow that the  
surviving mature sperm would be precisely those where CidB<sup>wMel</sup> is not sufficiently expressed  
to induce either sperm or embryonic death. This model could be tested by assessing if *D.*  
*melanogaster* males expressing CidB<sup>wMel</sup> alone show a reduced sperm production.

Notably, the hypothesis that *cidB* may be deleterious in various cell types and  
developmental stages does not imply that the *Wolbachia* themselves express this gene in



155 many tissues of their native hosts. In other words, the pattern of expression of *cidB* in  
1  
2 transgenic insects says nothing about its natural expression in *Wolbachia*-infected hosts. The  
3  
4 fact that viable uninfected offspring can often be obtained through imperfect *Wolbachia*  
5  
6 transmission or antibiotic curing actually suggests that in a natural context, the CI toxin is not  
7  
8 expressed in all tissues. At present, one cannot exclude a “two-by-one” model, where both  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13 160 CidA and CidB proteins would be required to produce a toxic effect, but this would imply  
14  
15 drastically different effects of CidA in sperm (where it would contribute to toxicity) and in the  
16  
17 eggs (where it is known to act as an antidote). In our view, and as discussed above, a model  
18  
19 where CidB and CidA act respectively as toxin and antidote is more likely correct and can be  
20  
21 reconciled with the data in hand. As we shall now discuss, comparative genomics of *cif* genes,  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 165 both at micro and macro-evolutionary scales, further support this conclusion [30,34].  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

## 32 CI evolution

33  
34  
35 Although *C. pipiens* provided the original CI model system, the simple pattern presented in  
36  
37 Figure 1, which best illustrates the invasiveness of CI, is never seen in natural populations of  
38  
39  
40 170 this species. Wherever they come from, *C. pipiens* mosquitoes are always infected by  
41  
42 *Wolbachia* (while uninfected specimens can occasionally be found in a cryptic species  
43  
44 [40,41]). As a consequence, infected males never encounter uninfected females in nature and  
45  
46  
47 CI is only expressed in its most elaborate form: infected males and females can only produce  
48  
49 offspring if they carry “compatible infections.” Indeed, *C. pipiens* has long been known for  
50  
51  
52  
53 175 harboring a large diversity of cross-incompatible mosquito lines [11], which are now known to  
54  
55 carry closely related yet incompatible *Wolbachia* strains [42,43]. These are said to be  
56  
57  
58 “bidirectionally incompatible” if both directions of crosses result in embryo death. By  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 contrast, crosses between “unidirectionally incompatible” strains produce effective CI in only  
2 one direction, producing a pattern similar to that illustrated in Figure 1, although all  
3  
4  
5 180 individuals are infected.

6  
7 How can this be? That different *Wolbachia* strains may harbor different compatibility  
8  
9  
10 types is easily explained in the framework of the TA model, especially in its lock-and-key  
11  
12 formulation: incompatible *Wolbachia* strains will carry incompatible locks and keys. In this  
13  
14 regard, *C. pipiens* is not unique: *Drosophila simulans*, among many other species, also carries  
15  
16 several distinct *Wolbachia* strains, each with its own compatibility type [38]. In this fruit fly,  
17  
18 185 compatibility relationships between lines can, at least in theory, be parsimoniously explained  
19  
20 by variations at a single TA locus [44] (although some *D. simulans* *Wolbachia* genomes appear  
21  
22 to include multiple *cif* paralogs [45]). In contrast, incompatibility patterns are so complex in *C.*  
23  
24 *pipiens* that they cannot be explained with a single TA pair per *Wolbachia* genome [42,46].  
25  
26  
27 Specifically, compatibility relationships are not all transitive in this system: two strains may be  
28  
29 190 mutually compatible although they harbor distinct compatibility patterns with other strains  
30  
31  
32 [44]. Focusing on compatibility relationships among 19 wild-type *C. pipiens* lines [43],  
33  
34 theoretical analyses grounded in the TA framework concluded that at least five TA pairs may  
35  
36 co-occur in one *wPip* genome [44]. Now that the CI genes have been identified, the time has  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 195 come to test such theoretical predictions.

45  
46 Although all infections from *C. pipiens* represent a monophyletic group of close  
47  
48 *Wolbachia* relatives, fine-scale phylogenetic markers allow one to distinguish five clades  
49  
50  
51 within which crosses are most often compatible and between which they are most often  
52  
53  
54 incompatible [42,47]. Based on this phylogenetic and phenotypic diversity, Bonneau et al. [30]  
55  
56  
57 200 selected multiple mosquito lines collected worldwide to assess molecular variation of the *cif*  
58  
59 genes and test their explanatory power with regard to compatibility patterns. Under the  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 hypothesis that these genes underlie CI diversity in *Culex*, they should be present in several  
2 distinct copies within each *Wolbachia* genome, and strains harboring different CI patterns  
3 should carry different *cif* repertoires. The *cid* data fully matched these predictions: in the  
4  
5  
6  
7 205 *Culex* populations studied, *cidA* and *cidB* show tremendous variation in both sequence and  
8  
9 copy number, resulting in large part from duplication and recombination events, possibly  
10 mediated by the prophage region where they occur. By contrast, the *cinA* and *cinB* genes  
11  
12 were found to be monomorphic in the *wPip* strains analyzed, indicating that incompatibilities  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 in *Culex* are the result of *cid* but not *cin* variations.

19  
20 210 While mutually incompatible strains should harbor different *cid* repertoires, as was  
21  
22 indeed observed, the TA model does not predict that mutually compatible strains should carry  
23  
24 exactly the same *cid* alleles. First, mutations may occur outside of the toxin / antidote  
25  
26 interaction sites, which should not affect compatibility patterns and would thus be neutral as  
27  
28 far as CI is concerned. Second, the TA model does not demand a strict one-to-one specificity  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 215 of toxin-antidote interactions: some antidotes may inhibit more than one toxin. Both of these  
34  
35 explanations may contribute to explain why a number of mutually compatible strains harbor  
36  
37 different *cid* repertoires. Nevertheless, these strains happen to always share a common *cidA*  
38  
39 variant that may represent a super-antidote, matching several distinct toxins [30]. Expressing  
40  
41 these different Cid variants in an experimentally flexible *in vivo* system such as yeast, together  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 220 with biochemical studies, should clarify this issue.

47  
48  
49 What does the *cid* polymorphism tell us about the evolutionary process of CI  
50  
51 diversification? In other words, can *cid* molecular variations reveal how bidirectionally  
52  
53 incompatible *Wolbachia* evolved? Past theoretical work has highlighted how much the  
54  
55 genetic architecture of CI should affect this process [39,44,48,49]. The experimental  
56  
57  
58  
59 225 confirmation that CI genes can occur in multiple copies [30] greatly simplifies the problem

1 from a theoretical standpoint: following duplication of a TA pair, redundancy between loci  
2 may allow new antidotes to emerge without compromising self-compatibility. This first step  
3  
4 could be followed by the occurrence of matching mutations of the toxin, producing two  
5  
6 distinct CI operons in a genome [44]. The possibility that some antidotes may inhibit more  
7  
8  
9  
10 230 than one toxin opens yet other possible scenario, where either side may diversify first if the  
11  
12 process goes through a broad spectrum phase before further restriction of specificity, as has  
13  
14  
15 been suggested in other TA systems [50].  
16

17  
18 The absence of polymorphism in the *cin* operon (the nuclease paralog of *cid*) rules out  
19  
20 this locus as a driver of CI diversity in *Culex*. However, could this operon or other *cid* paralogs  
21  
22  
23 235 operate in other species? Comparative genomics among *Wolbachia* lineages indicate that  
24  
25 some CI-inducing strains do not contain *cid* genes but only the *cin* paralogs [28,34]. Moreover,  
26  
27 neither *cid* nor *cin*-related paralogs were found in a close relative of *wMel* that does not  
28  
29 induce CI [34,51], or in nematode *Wolbachia* strains that have become obligate mutualists  
30  
31  
32 [26,34]. These results support the involvement of both *cid* and *cin* operons in CI induction by  
33  
34  
35  
36 240 *Wolbachia*, with evidence still emerging. Further, these two loci seem sufficient so far to  
37  
38 explain all CI cases associated with *Wolbachia*.  
39  
40

41  
42 This conclusion does not hold when symbiont lineages distant from *Wolbachia* are  
43  
44 considered. Notably, *Cardinium* bacteria can induce CI but do not carry identifiable *cid* or *cin*  
45  
46 genes, suggesting convergent evolution of CI [34,52]. However, a recent study suggested that  
47  
48  
49 245 TA-like systems showing a putative DUB activity can be found in a diverse array of  
50  
51 endosymbionts, not only in *Cardinium* (albeit in a lineage where CI itself was not  
52  
53 demonstrated), but also in other intracellular symbionts, such as *Rickettsia* and *Spiroplasma*,  
54  
55 that are also known as manipulators of host reproduction [36]. Also notable is the presence of  
56  
57  
58  
59 *cin* genes in non-CI but parthenogenesis-inducing *Wolbachia* strains [34]. Although these  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

250 results do not provide direct evidence that distant *cif* homologs are involved in CI or other  
1  
2 forms of reproductive manipulation, they make this hypothesis worth exploring. Finally, the  
3  
4 discovery of CI associated with a non-*Wolbachia* Alphaproteobacterium [53] provides another  
5  
6 system where *cif* gene relatives should be sought.  
7  
8  
9

## 12 *Cui bono?* Levels of selection and the origin of CI

13  
14  
15 From Cicero to the detective Columbo, asking “*Cui bono?*” (Who benefits?) has been a useful  
16  
17 avenue of criminal and sociological investigation. This question is also relevant in a Darwinian  
18  
19 framework and has prompted novel explanations of evolutionary oddities such as altruism  
20  
21 and selfish genetic elements [54–56]. Applying this question to CI led early theorists to  
22  
23 highlight the benefit it provides to *Wolbachia* itself, rather than its host, suggesting that the  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

260 highlight the benefit it provides to *Wolbachia* itself, rather than its host, suggesting that the  
bacterium represents the right level of selection to understand how this phenomenon came  
to be [19]. Remarkably, the same early study was visionary in suggesting that the CI genes  
may be associated with mobile genetic elements: the discovery that they sit in a prophage  
supported this hypothesis [26–28,34,57]. In our view, this finding also makes it relevant to  
revisit the question of the adaptive significance of CI, and ask whether this phenomenon may  
have evolved in the first place for the benefit not of *Wolbachia*, but of the bacterium’s own  
intragenomic parasites.

The hypothesis that TA systems, including restriction-modification systems or  
bacteriocins, constitute fundamentally selfish genetic elements has received ample support in  
the field of microbial evolution [58–63]. In brief, the idea is that TA systems make themselves  
addictive as soon as they enter a cell: the toxin molecule is typically more stable than the  
antidote, so that removing the source of both results in cell death. Although this property is  
not necessarily invasive (an element killing a host once it is lost increases its effective

1 transmission rate but will not, by itself, increase its frequency), it can promote invasion under  
2 275 certain circumstances, especially if the TA system is part of a horizontally transmitted mobile  
3 genetic element [64].  
4  
5  
6

7 With regard to *Wolbachia*, it seems reasonable to assume that the nearly universal  
8 positioning of the CI genes within prophages [57,65] is not mere chance, but rather has some  
9 adaptive significance. So, who benefits from the CI genes, and more specifically, from their  
10 association with prophages? This particular location is not *a priori* adaptive at the *Wolbachia*  
11 level, but it may well be at the phage level: horizontally transmitted phages should more  
12 readily invade *Wolbachia* populations if they carry a TA system. The occurrence of distant *cif*  
13 relatives in several other bacterial lineages, where they sit in plasmids rather than prophages,  
14 argues against a purely viral origin of this gene family [36], and so does their relatedness to  
15 280 typical eukaryotic sequences [26,36,57]. However, the association of *cif* genes with phages in  
16 the *Wolbachia* lineage opens the possibility that they first invaded this clade as a phage  
17 adaptation, and only later became “CI genes.”  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 285  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 As previously pointed out [66], the elimination of *Wolbachia* from maturing sperm  
37 establishes conditions for the evolution of such a selfish phage TA system toward genuine CI.  
38  
39  
40  
41 290 If one simply assumes that the toxin is exported outside of the bacterium and can exert its  
42 deleterious effects on the host (eukaryotic) cell, then CI could easily arise. In particular, the  
43 paternal pronucleus, threatened by a stable toxin, would need fresh antidote from an  
44 infected egg to be able to participate to the first embryonic division. Such a situation would in  
45 turn make the bacterium invasive through CI, generating a convergence in the evolutionary  
46 interests of the phage and its bacterial host.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54 295  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Concluding remarks and future perspectives

Recent research has provided a firm answer to the first of many critical questions regarding the molecular biology of CI (Outstanding Questions Box). There is indeed a general agreement that the principal *Wolbachia* CI genes have been found [26–29], and our present analysis concurs with past predictions that they encode toxins and antidotes interacting in a lock-and-key fashion [25]. Nevertheless, significant revisions of the basic TA model are needed to account for all observations. First, we suggest that CifB toxins may exert their deleterious effects not only in incompatible crosses during the first embryonic mitosis, but also in maturing sperm and other cell types, in which the presence of CifA antidotes would also be required. This hypothesis would explain why dual transgenic expression of the two genes in uninfected *Drosophila* males is required for them to survive (in the case of *cid*<sup>W<sup>Pip</sup>), or for CI to be transgenically expressed (in the case of *cid*<sup>W<sup>Mel</sup>) [27,28]. Patterns of molecular variation of the *cidA* and *cidB* genes [30] also suggest that some antidotes may match several toxin products, a conjecture that could be tested by direct assessments of CidA-B interactions in simplified *in vivo* or *in vitro* systems. Furthermore, these genetic data confirm the earlier speculation that single *Wolbachia* strains may carry multiple active CI operons, not only in *Culex* [67] but also in *Drosophila* [68].</sup></sup>

While the genetics of CI have been clarified, its molecular mechanisms remain to be worked out (Box 2). Furthermore, the exact nature of the interaction between toxin and antidote proteins remains to be determined, although there are some indications of which residues might be involved [30]. Clarification of these issues will be needed to design artificial CI systems that may be used in biological control. Comparative genomics will provide a valuable complement to experiments to understand how CI actually works, and to investigate how it evolves. At a microevolutionary scale, further exploration of the *Culex* system will

1 clarify how different *Wolbachia* strains become mutually incompatible. On a  
2  
3 macroevolutionary scale, genomic comparisons may further reveal which *cif* genes can  
4  
5 actually induce CI, and what are the commonalities and specificities between these systems.  
6

7 Building on the observation that the CI genes lie in a mobile genetic element (the WO  
8  
9 prophage), we suggested they might have originally been selected as a phage invasive  
10 325 strategy and were later domesticated by the bacterium. In line with this hypothesis, distant  
11  
12 homologues of the *cid* genes are present in other bacterial symbionts, and nearly always in  
13  
14 association with phages or plasmids [36]. Pushing the reasoning one step further, one may  
15  
16 envisage that the TA operon was initially costly for the phage, and only later became  
17  
18 domesticated as an effective invasive strategy. CI would then be a case of a parasitic operon  
19  
20 within a parasitic phage within a parasitic symbiont, each relying today on its past inner  
21  
22 enemy. The observation that some insects, and many filarial nematodes, cannot live without  
23 330 *Wolbachia* [69–71] reinforces the idea that such “evolution through addiction” constitutes a  
24  
25 never-ending process, producing the Russian dolls that all organisms seem to be.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

## 36 335 Acknowledgments

37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 This work benefited from funding by the United States Department of Agriculture (grant  
44  
45 USDA-1015922 to JB), the National Institutes of Health (grant GM046904 to MH) and the  
46  
47 French “Agence Nationale de la Recherche” (CIAWOL grant to MS: ANR-16-CE02-0006-01,  
48  
49 340 HORIZON grant to SC: ANR-17-CE02-0021-02).  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



345 Boxes

Box 1: *Wolbachia* and Cytoplasmic Incompatibility

Perhaps the most crucial aspect of *Wolbachia* biology is the fact it is transmitted from mothers to offspring through the egg cytoplasm [72] although horizontal transfer may also occur [7,45]. Vertical transmission through the female germline will select *Wolbachia* traits that increase the fitness of infected females, or more technically, the number or the fitness of their infected daughters. CI can be interpreted within such a framework: by protecting infected embryos from the lethal effect of infected males' sperm, *Wolbachia* increases the relative brood size of infected females. Infected males pay a heavy price for CI (mating with uninfected females drastically reduces their own fertility) but this is costless for *Wolbachia* because males do not transmit the symbiont to future generations. Notably, only few uninfected females are sterilized through CI when *Wolbachia* is rare in the host population, so that a low frequency infection has low chances of invasion, unless it combines CI with other traits, such as protection of the host against pathogens [73]. Such protective effects are actually observed [74] and can also block the passage of human pathogens through insect vectors [75]. The ongoing "World Mosquito Program" makes use of this property: the massive release of CI-inducing mosquitoes allows the spread of the infection, which should reduce overall viral transmission rates [76] although the implementation and evolutionary outcome of this approach remain uncertain [77,78].

365

## Box 2: CI molecular mechanisms

1  
2  
3 Whilst the CI effectors have been identified, the question of how they induce embryo death  
4  
5 or rescue remains largely unanswered, and can be divided in two: how do *cif* toxins impede  
6  
7 paternal chromosomes, and how do *cif* antidotes impede the toxins? Functional properties of  
8 370 the *cifB* genes are obviously relevant to the first question, as are characterizations of the CI  
9  
10 phenotype at the cytological level. The earliest detected abnormality in CI crosses is improper  
11  
12 deposition of maternal H3.3 histones on the paternal genome after protamine removal [79].  
13  
14 This deposition defect could be responsible for improper paternal chromosome condensation  
15  
16 in prophase [22,80–82]. How could these features be related to *cif* genes activities? While  
17  
18 bioinformatics predict a number of potential enzymatic properties for the various *cif* paralogs,  
19  
20 the DUB domain of CidB stands at the moment as the strongest CI effector candidate: active-  
21 375 site mutations in CidB eliminate CI in transgenic insects as well as toxicity in yeast models [27].  
22  
23 Furthermore, different CidB repertoires induce different levels of CI defects at the cellular  
24  
25 level [82]. Although the DUB activity may affect upstream components of the CI causal chain,  
26  
27 interference with the ubiquitylation status of key chromatin or cell cycle regulators appears as  
28  
29 an obvious hypothesis to link CidB to CI cytology.  
30  
31  
32  
33 380  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41  
42 However, the observation that some *Wolbachia* strains may lack *cid* genes but still  
43  
44 induce CI suggests the DUB function is just one tool in a larger *cif* arsenal [26,28,34,36]. CinB  
45  
46 385 appears as the most likely source of CI in this case, since active-site mutations block CinB  
47  
48 toxicity in yeast [27]. But why and how would different enzymes generate the same CI  
49  
50 phenotype? One hypothesis would be that the DUB and nuclease activities are two upstream  
51  
52 components of a common causal chain. Simply put, cutting DNA and cleaving ubiquitin may  
53  
54 constitute alternative ways to disturb paternal chromosome condensation. Definitive  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13 390 demonstrations that CinB can induce CI, as well as identification of the CidB and CinB targets  
14 will be crucial to resolving these issues.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 395 The fact that CI may be mediated by two distinct effectors, involving DUB or nuclease  
27 activities, is also relevant to investigate how CI antitoxins may function. CidA and CinA may  
28 inhibit DUB and nuclear activities, respectively, either through distinct pathways or  
29 alternatively, through a single mechanism, such as protein sequestration or relocalization. The  
30 latter hypothesis may explain why CidA can inhibit the toxicity of CidB without specifically  
31 reducing its DUB activity against model substrates [27]. Further characterization of the Cid  
32 and Cin protein structures and identification of the residues involved in the interaction  
33 between cognate partners of both operons appear as promising avenues of research to better  
34 understand how infected embryos get rescued from CI.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Figure captions

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **Figure 1.** Cytoplasmic incompatibility in its simplest form: infected females are compatible  
7  
8 405 with both infected and uninfected males, whereas uninfected females produce viable  
9  
10 offspring only if they mate with uninfected males.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 **Figure 2.** A schematic view of the toxin-antidote model. In immature sperm, *Wolbachia* (in  
17  
18 pink) produces both a toxin (yellow particles) and its specific antidote (green particles). As  
19  
20 410 *Wolbachia* is removed from maturing sperm into waste bags (w.b), the antidote, presumably  
21  
22 unstable, is lost faster than the toxin. Upon fertilization of an uninfected egg (left part), the  
23  
24 toxin is thus present and active, impeding the paternal chromosomes through direct or  
25  
26 indirect interactions with chromatin or DNA, which results in embryo death. In infected eggs,  
27  
28 antidotes of maternal origin bind the toxin and thus maintain embryo viability. Alternative CI  
29  
30 mechanisms have been envisaged [21,22,83,84] but the model depicted here best accounts  
31  
32 for all CI features [25], including its recently discovered genetic architecture [26–29].  
33  
34 415  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 **Figure 3.** A nomenclature proposal and schematic view of the putative CI operons structures.  
43  
44 In this naming system, the *cif* (and Cif) terms designate CI genes (and proteins) in general,  
45  
46 420 while genes from specific operon categories are called according to the enzymatic activity of  
47  
48 the putative toxin (DUB, nuclease or both). The first and second gene within each operon are  
49  
50 denoted A and B, respectively, and the *Wolbachia* strain is indicated as a superscript when  
51  
52 relevant. The structure of several CI operons is shown to illustrate this system, with active-site  
53  
54 residues labeled.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59

60 425  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## References

- 1 Moran, N.A. (2006) Symbiosis. *Curr. Biol.* 16, R866-71
- 2 Kirkness, E.F. *et al.* (2010) Genome sequences of the human body louse and its primary  
3 endosymbiont provide insights into the permanent parasitic lifestyle. *Proc. Natl. Acad.*  
4 *Sci.* 107, 12168–12173
- 5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 430
- 12  
13 3 Hurst, G.D.D. and Crystal, L. (2015) Reproductive Parasitism : Maternally Inherited  
14 Symbionts in a Biparental World. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol* 7, a017699
- 15  
16  
17  
18 4 Charlat, S. *et al.* (2003) Evolutionary consequences of *Wolbachia* infections. *Trends*  
19 *Genet* 19, 217–223
- 20  
21  
22  
23  
24 435 5 Werren, J.H. *et al.* (2008) *Wolbachia*: master manipulators of invertebrate biology. *Nat.*  
25 *Rev. Microbiol.* 6, 741–51
- 26  
27  
28  
29 6 Weinert, L.A. *et al.* (2015) The incidence of bacterial endosymbionts in terrestrial  
30 arthropods. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 282, 20150249–20150249
- 31  
32  
33  
34 7 Bailly-Bechet, M. *et al.* (2017) How Long Does *Wolbachia* Remain on Board? *Mol. Biol.*  
35 *Evol.* 34,
- 36  
37 440
- 38  
39 8 Hertig, M. and Wolbach, S.B. (1924) Studies on *rickettsia*-like microorganisms in  
40 insects. *J. Med. Res.* 44, 329–374
- 41  
42  
43  
44 9 Marshall, J.F. (1938) *The british mosquitoes*, British Museum.
- 45  
46  
47 10 Roubaud, E. (1941) Phénomènes d'amixie dans les intercroisements de Culicides du  
48 groupe pipiens. *Comptes Rendus l'Academie des Sci. Paris* 212, 257–259
- 49  
50 445
- 51  
52 11 Laven, H. Crossing experiments with *Culex* strains. , *Evolution*, 5. Dec-(1951) , 370–375
- 53  
54  
55 12 Yen, J.H. and Barr, A.R. (1971) New hypothesis of the cause of cytoplasmic  
56 incompatibility in *Culex pipiens* L. *Nature* 232, 657–658
- 57  
58  
59  
60 13 Yen, J.H. and Barr, a R. (1973) The etiological agent of cytoplasmic incompatibility in  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 450 *Culex pipiens*. *J. Invertebr. Pathol.* 22, 242–250
- 1  
2  
3 14 Caspari, E. and Watson, G.S. (1959) On the evolutionary importance of cytoplasmic  
4  
5 sterility in mosquitoes. *Evolution (N. Y.)*. 13, 568–570  
6  
7  
8 15 Fine, P.E.M. (1978) On the dynamics of symbiont-dependent cytoplasmic  
9  
10 incompatibility in Culicine mosquitoes. *J. Invertebr. Pathol.* 30, 10–18  
11  
12  
13 455 16 Hoffmann, A.A. *et al.* (1986) Unidirectional incompatibility between populations of  
14  
15 *Drosophila simulans*. *Evolution (N. Y.)*. 40, 692–701  
16  
17  
18 17 Turelli, M. and Hoffmann, A.A. (1995) Cytoplasmic incompatibility in *Drosophila*  
19  
20 *simulans*: dynamics and parameter estimates from natural populations. *Genetics* 140,  
21  
22 1319–1338  
23  
24  
25 460 18 Werren, J.H. (1997) Biology of *Wolbachia*. *Annu Rev Entomol* 42, 587–609  
26  
27  
28 19 Hurst, L.D. (1991) The evolution of cytoplasmic incompatibility or when spite can be  
29  
30 successful. *J. Theor. Biol.* 148, 269–277  
31  
32  
33 20 Breeuwer, J.A. and Werren, J.H. (1990) Microorganisms associated with chromosome  
34  
35 destruction and reproductive isolation between two insect species. *Nature* 346, 558–  
36  
37 560  
38  
39 465  
40  
41 21 Kose, H. and Karr, T.L. (1995) Organization of *Wolbachia pipientis* in the *Drosophila*  
42  
43 fertilized egg and embryo revealed by an anti-*Wolbachia* monoclonal antibody. *Mech*  
44  
45 *Dev* 51, 275–288  
46  
47  
48 22 Callaini, G. *et al.* (1997) *Wolbachia*-induced delay of paternal chromatin condensation  
49  
50 does not prevent maternal chromosomes from entering anaphase in incompatible  
51  
52 470 crosses of *Drosophila simulans*. *J Cell Sci* 110 ( Pt 2, 271–280  
53  
54  
55  
56 23 Merçot, H. and Poinso, D. (1998) *Wolbachia* of the third kind was overlooked... ..and  
57  
58 discovered on Mount Kilimanjaro. *Nature* 391, 853  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2 475  
3  
4  
5 24 Bourtzis, K. *et al.* (1998) Rescuing *Wolbachia* have been overlooked. *Nature* 391, 852–  
6 853  
7  
8 25 Poinot, D. *et al.* (2003) On the mechanism of *Wolbachia*-induced cytoplasmic  
9 incompatibility: Confronting the models with the facts. *BioEssays* 25,  
10  
11 26 Beckmann, J.F. and Fallon, A.M. (2013) Detection of the *Wolbachia* protein WPIP0282  
12 in mosquito spermathecae: Implications for cytoplasmic incompatibility. *Insect*  
13  
14 480 *Biochem. Mol. Biol.* 43, 867–878  
15  
16  
17 27 Beckmann, J.F. *et al.* (2017) A *Wolbachia* deubiquitylating enzyme induces cytoplasmic  
18 incompatibility. *Nat. Microbiol.* 2, 17007  
19  
20  
21 28 LePage, D.P. *et al.* (2017) Prophage WO genes recapitulate and enhance *Wolbachia*-  
22 induced cytoplasmic incompatibility. *Nature* 543, 243–247  
23  
24  
25 485 29 Shropshire, J.D. *et al.* (2018) One prophage WO gene rescues cytoplasmic  
30 incompatibility in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 115, 4987–4991  
31  
32  
33 30 Bonneau, M. *et al.* (2018) *Culex pipiens* crossing type diversity is governed by an  
34 amplified and polymorphic operon of *Wolbachia*. *Nat. Commun.* 9, 319  
35  
36  
37 31 Karr, T.L. (2007) Fruit flies and the sperm proteome. *Hum. Mol. Genet.* 16, R124–R133  
38  
39  
40 41 490 32 Wasbrough, E.R. *et al.* (2010) The *Drosophila melanogaster* sperm proteome-II (DmSP-  
42 II). *J. Proteomics* 73, 2171–2185  
43  
44  
45 33 Yamaguchi, Y. *et al.* (2011) Toxin-Antitoxin Systems in Bacteria and Archaea. *Annu. Rev.*  
46 *Genet.* 45, 61–79  
47  
48  
49 34 Lindsey, A.R.I. *et al.* (2018) Evolutionary Genetics of Cytoplasmic Incompatibility Genes  
50 cifA and cifB in Prophage WO of *Wolbachia*. *Genome Biol. Evol.* 10, 434–451  
51 495  
52  
53  
54 35 Güell, M. *et al.* (2011) Bacterial transcriptomics: What is beyond the RNA horiz-ome?  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5 500 36 Gillespie, J.J. *et al.* (2018) A tangled web: origins of reproductive parasitism  
Evolutionary Insight into Reproductive Parasitism 2. 10, 2292–2309  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13 37 Poinot, D. *et al.* (1998) *Wolbachia* transfer from *Drosophila melanogaster* into *D.*  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 505 *simulans*: Host effect and cytoplasmic incompatibility relationships. *Genetics* 150, 227–  
19  
20  
21  
22 237  
23  
24  
25  
26 38 Merçot, H. and Charlat, S. (2004) *Wolbachia* infections in *Drosophila melanogaster* and  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 510 *D. simulans*: polymorphism and levels of cytoplasmic incompatibility. *Genetica* 120, 51–  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 515 59  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57 520 39 Turelli, M. (1994) Evolution of incompatibility-inducing microbes and their hosts.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000
- 40 Rasgon, J.L. and Scott, T.W. (2003) *Wolbachia* and cytoplasmic incompatibility in the  
California *Culex pipiens* mosquito species complex: parameter estimates and infection  
dynamics in natural populations. *Genetics* 165, 2029–2038  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000



cytoplasmic incompatibilities in *Culex pipiens* mosquito populations. *Mol. Ecol.* 20, 286–

298

47 Atyame, C.M. *et al.* (2011) Diversification of *Wolbachia* Endosymbiont in the *Culex*  
525 *pipiens* Mosquito. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 28, 2761–2772

48 Charlat, S. *et al.* (2001) On the mod resc model and the evolution of *Wolbachia*  
compatibility types. *Genetics* 159, 1415–1422

49 Charlat, S. *et al.* (2005) Exploring the evolution of *Wolbachia* compatibility types: a  
simulation approach. *Genetics* 170, 495–507

530 50 Aakre, C.D. *et al.* (2015) Evolving New Protein-Protein Interaction Specificity through  
Promiscuous Intermediates. *Cell* 163, 594–606

51 Sutton, E.R. *et al.* (2014) Comparative genome analysis of *Wolbachia* strain wAu. *BMC*  
*Genomics* 15, 928

52 Penz, T. *et al.* (2012) Comparative Genomics Suggests an Independent Origin of  
535 Cytoplasmic Incompatibility in *Cardinium hertigii*. *PLoS Genet.* 8, e1003012

53 Takano, S. *et al.* (2017) Unique clade of alphaproteobacterial endosymbionts induces  
complete cytoplasmic incompatibility in the coconut beetle. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 114,  
6110–6115

54 Burt, A. and Trivers, R. (2006) *Genes in Conflict: The Biology of Selfish Genetic Elements*,  
540 Belknap Press.

55 Hamilton, W.D. (1963) The evolution of altruistic behavior. *Am. Nat.* 97, 354–356

56 Hickey, D. a (1982) Selfish DNA: a sexually-transmitted nuclear parasite. *Genetics* 101,  
519–31

57 Bordenstein, S.R. and Bordenstein, S.R. (2016) Eukaryotic association module in phage  
545 WO genomes from *Wolbachia*. *Nat. Commun.* 7, 1–10

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 550 58 Van Melderer, L. and De Bast, M.S. (2009) Bacterial toxin-Antitoxin systems: More than  
11 selfish entities? *PLoS Genet.* 5,  
12  
13  
14  
15 59 Kobayashi, I. (2001) Behavior of restriction-modification systems as selfish mobile  
16 elements and their impact on genome evolution. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 29, 3742–3756  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 60 Mruk, I. and Kobayashi, I. (2014) To be or not to be: Regulation of restriction-  
22 modification systems and other toxin-antitoxin systems. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 42, 70–86  
23 555 61 Inglis, R.F. *et al.* (2013) The role of bacteriocins as selfish genetic elements. *Biol. Lett.* 9,  
24 8–11  
25  
26  
27 62 Rankin, D.J. *et al.* (2011) What traits are carried on mobile genetic elements, and why.  
28 *Heredity (Edinb).* 106, 1–10  
29  
30  
31 63 Kusano, K. *et al.* (1995) Restriction-modification systems as genomic parasites in  
32 competition for specific sequences. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 92, 11095–11099  
33  
34  
35  
36 560 64 Rankin, D.J. *et al.* (2012) The coevolution of toxin and antitoxin genes drives the  
37 dynamics of bacterial addiction complexes and intragenomic conflict. *Proc. R. Soc. B*  
38 *Biol. Sci.* 279, 3706–3715  
39  
40  
41 65 Klasson, L. *et al.* (2008) Genome Evolution of *Wolbachia* Strain wPip from the *Culex*  
42 *pipiens* Group. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 25, 1877–1887  
43  
44  
45 66 Poinot, D. (1997) , Infection par *Wolbachia* chez *Drosophila simulans* : etude des  
46 interactions hote-symbiote, PhD thesis. , University Paris 6  
47  
48  
49 565 67 Atyame, C.M. *et al.* (2011) Multiple *Wolbachia* determinants control the evolution of  
50 cytoplasmic incompatibilities in *Culex pipiens* mosquito populations. *Mol. Ecol.* 20, 286–  
51 98  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56 68 Zabalou, S. *et al.* (2008) Multiple rescue factors within a *Wolbachia* strain. *Genetics*  
57 178, 2145–2160  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 570 69 Dedeine, F. *et al.* (2001) Removing symbiotic *Wolbachia* bacteria specifically inhibits  
1 oogenesis in a parasitic wasp. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 98, 6247–6252  
2  
3  
4  
5 70 Hosokawa, T. *et al.* (2010) *Wolbachia* as a bacteriocyte-associated nutritional  
6 mutualist. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 107, 769–74  
7  
8  
9  
10 71 Taylor, M.J. *et al.* (2005) *Wolbachia* bacterial endosymbionts of filarial nematodes. *Adv*  
11  
12  
13 575 *Parasitol* 60, 245–284  
14  
15 72 O’Neill, S.L. *et al.* (1997) *Influential Passengers : Inherited Microorganisms and*  
16  
17 *Arthropod Reproduction*, Oxford University Press.  
18  
19  
20 73 Fenton, A. *et al.* (2011) Solving the *Wolbachia* Paradox: Modeling the Tripartite  
21  
22 Interaction between Host, *Wolbachia*, and a Natural Enemy. *Am. Nat.* 178, 333–42  
23  
24  
25 580 74 Teixeira, L. *et al.* (2008) The bacterial symbiont *Wolbachia* induces resistance to RNA  
26  
27 viral infections in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *PLoS Biol.* 6, 2753–2763  
28  
29  
30 75 Moreira, L.A. *et al.* (2009) A *Wolbachia* Symbiont in *Aedes aegypti* Limits Infection with  
31  
32 Dengue, Chikungunya, and Plasmodium. *Cell* 139, 1268–1278  
33  
34  
35 76 Flores, H.A. and O’Neill, S.L. (2018) Controlling vector-borne diseases by releasing  
36  
37 modified mosquitoes. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 16, 508–518  
38  
39 585  
40  
41 77 Vavre, F. and Charlat, S. (2012) Making (good) use of *Wolbachia*: What the models say.  
42  
43 *Curr. Opin. Microbiol.* 15,  
44  
45  
46 78 Kamtchum-Tatuene, J. *et al.* (2017) The potential role of *Wolbachia* in controlling the  
47  
48 transmission of emerging human arboviral infections. *Curr. Opin. Infect. Dis.* 30, 108–  
49  
50  
51 590 116  
52  
53  
54 79 Landmann, F. *et al.* (2009) *Wolbachia*-mediated cytoplasmic incompatibility is  
55  
56 associated with impaired histone deposition in the male pronucleus. *PLoS Pathog* 5,  
57  
58 e1000343  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

80 Reed, K.M. and Werren, J.H. (1995) Induction of paternal genome loss by the paternal-  
595 sex-ratio chromosome and cytoplasmic incompatibility bacteria (*Wolbachia*): a  
comparative study of early embryonic events. *Mol Reprod Dev* 40, 408–418


81 Ryan, S.L. and Saul, G.B. (1968) Post-fertilization effect of incompatibility factors in  
Mormoniella. *Mol. Gen. Genet.* 103, 29–36

82 Bonneau, M. *et al.* (2018) The cellular phenotype of cytoplasmic incompatibility in  
600 *Culex pipiens* in the light of *cidB* diversity. *Plos Pathog.* DOI:  
10.1371/journal.ppat.1007364

83 Pontier, S.M. and Schweisguth, F. (2015) A *Wolbachia*-Sensitive Communication  
between Male and Female Pupae Controls Gamete Compatibility in *Drosophila*. *Curr.*  
*Biol.* 25, 1–10


605 84 Jacquet, A. *et al.* (2017) Does pupal communication influence *Wolbachia*-mediated  
cytoplasmic incompatibility? *Curr. Biol.* 27, R53–R55

Figure 1




Accepted Manuscript

Figure 2



Accepted Manuscript

Figure 3



Accepted Manuscript

## Highlights

*Wolbachia* are maternally inherited intracellular bacteria of many Arthropod species. They can invade populations through various strategies, including Cytoplasmic Incompatibility (CI), whereby the symbionts protect eggs from the lethal effect of infected males' sperm.

It has long been proposed that this phenomenon may rely on a toxin deposited by the bacterium before its elimination from maturing sperm, and an antidote, provided in an infected egg by the maternal symbiont.

Recent research toward the molecular basis of CI have turned the spotlight on two syntenic loci in a prophage region which recapitulate the CI phenotype and are organised in a typical toxin-antidote fashion.

This genetic architecture, archetypal of toxin-antidote systems promoting the spread of selfish mobile elements in free living bacteria, provides clues to the possible evolutionary origin of CI.



## Outstanding questions

- What are the genes behind CI? Do they encode a toxin-antidote system?
- Among the various paralogs of the putative CI genes (*cif*, for CI factors) are only *cid* operons (including a DUB toxin) involved in CI, or also those including a nuclease toxin (*cin*) or toxins combining the two functions (*cnd*)?
- Is CI induced by CifB proteins alone? Why then is CI not recapitulated by sole transgenic expression of the main putative toxin gene (*cidB*) in *Drosophila*? Could this be explained by toxic effects of CidB outside of the first embryonic division, making the presence of its cognate antidote (CidA) required for fly survival or CI expression?
- How would CifB proteins induce embryo death? What targets are affected by the DUB activity of CidB? Are these in direct interaction with paternal chromosomes, or affecting upstream regulators of the cell-cycle? Do CidB and CinB proteins affect the same pathway?
- How do CifA proteins inhibit CifB toxicity without necessarily affecting their enzymatic activity? Could CifB sequestration or relocalization be involved?
- Can variation in *cid* genes, both in copy number and sequence variation, explain on their own the complex CI patterns in natural populations of the mosquito *C. pipiens*?
- How do mutually incompatible *Wolbachia* strains evolve? What is the contribution of gene duplication to this process? How specific is the *cifA* / *cifB* interaction, and does this vary across *cif* loci?
- Are all CI cases involving *cif* operons? What are the functions of their numerous distant homologues in other intra-cellular bacteria?
- How did CI evolve? Why are *cif* genes located in a prophage? Could CI derive from a selfish phage invading system?