

Symbiont-driven male mating success in the neotropical Drosophila paulistorum superspecies

Daniela I Schneider, Lee Ehrman, Tobias Engl, Martin Kaltenpoth, Aurélie

Hua-Van, Arnaud Le Rouzic, Wolfgang J Miller

▶ To cite this version:

Daniela I Schneider, Lee Ehrman, Tobias Engl, Martin Kaltenpoth, Aurélie Hua-Van, et al.. Symbiont-driven male mating success in the neotropical Drosophila paulistorum superspecies. Behavior Genetics, 2019, 49, pp.83-98. 10.1007/s10519-018-9937-8. hal-02155257

HAL Id: hal-02155257 https://hal.science/hal-02155257

Submitted on 13 Jun2019

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.

1	Title: Symbiont-driven male mating success in the neotropical Drosophila paulistorum
2	superspecies
3	
4	Authors: Daniela I. Schneider ^{1‡} , Lee Ehrman ² , Tobias Engl ³ , Martin Kaltenpoth ³ ,
5	Aurélie Hua-Van ⁴ , Arnaud Le Rouzic ⁴ , Wolfgang J. Miller ^{1*}
6	
7	Affiliations: ¹ Laboratories of Genome Dynamics, Centre of Anatomy and Cell Biology,
8	Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; ² Natural Sciences, State University of
9	New York, Purchase College, Purchase, New York, USA; ³ Department for Evolutionary
10	Ecology, Institute for Zoology, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität, Mainz, Germany,
11	⁴ Évolution, Génomes, Comportement, Écologie, CNRS, Institut de Recherche pour le
12	Développement, Université Paris-Sud, Université Paris-Saclay, 91198 Gif-sur-Yvette,
13	France.
14	[‡] current address: Department of Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases, Yale School of
15	Public Health, New Haven CT 06511, United States of America.
16 17	
18	Running head: Symbiont-driven male mating success
19	
20	
21	*corresponding author: Wolfgang J. Miller
22	Centre of Anatomy and Cell Biology, Medical University of Vienna
23	Schwarzspanierstrasse 17, 1090 Vienna, Austria
24	Email: wolfgang.miller@meduniwien.ac.at
25	Phone: +43-1-40160-37750; Fax: 40160-37500
26	Email: wolfgang.miller@meduniwien.ac.at
27	

29 Abstract

30

31 Microbial symbionts are ubiquitous associates of living organisms but their role in 32 mediating reproductive isolation (RI) remains controversial. We addressed this 33 knowledge gap by employing the Drosophila paulistorum-Wolbachia model system. 34 Semispecies in the *D. paulistorum* species complex exhibit strong RI between each 35 other and knockdown of obligate mutualistic Wolbachia bacteria in female D. 36 *paulistorum* flies trigger loss of assortative mating behavior against males carrying 37 incompatible Wolbachia strains. Here we set out to determine whether de novo RI can 38 be introduced by Wolbachia-knockdown in D. paulistorum males. We show that 39 Wolbachia-knockdown D. paulistorum males (i) are rejected as mates by wild type 40 females, (ii) express altered sexual pheromone profiles, and (iii) are devoid of the 41 endosymbiont in pheromone producing cells. Our findings suggest that changes in 42 Wolbachia titer and tissue tropism can induce de novo premating isolation by directly 43 or indirectly modulating sexual behavior of their native *D. paulistorum* hosts.

44

45 Key words

46

47 *Wolbachia*, *Drosophila*, reproductive isolation, premating isolation, pheromones

48

49 Introduction

50

Potential impacts of microbial symbionts as drivers of host speciation have been discussed frequently (Bordenstein et al. 2001; Jaenike et al. 2006; Telschow et al. 2007; Brucker and Bordenstein 2012; Telschow et al. 2014; Gebiola et al. 2016), but their broader evolutionary significance fostering speciation remains controversial (Brucker and Bordenstein 2013, 2014; Chandler and Turelli 2014; Turelli et al. 2014; Najarro et al. 2015; Leftwich et al. 2017), and standard models of speciation commonly

57 disregard such impacts (Coyne and Orr 2004; Brucker and Bordenstein 2012; Miller 58 and Schneider 2012). Several theoretical models have nominated the maternally 59 transmitted reproductive tract endosymbiont Wolbachia as a candidate worthy of 60 consideration (Telschow et al. 2007; Telschow et al. 2014). The α -proteobacterium 61 Wolbachia is arguably the most prevalent intracellular invertebrate infection on the 62 planet, infecting as many as 40% of all terrestrial arthropods (Zug and Hammerstein 63 2012). Wolbachia have attracted attention as participants in arthropod symbioses 64 because they successfully manipulate host biology in manifold ways, ranging from 65 reproductive parasitism like cytoplasmic incompatibility (CI), male killing, feminization 66 and parthenogenesis to nutritional supplementation, fecundity and protection from 67 pathogens and parasites (Werren et al. 2008; Teixeira et al. 2008; Brownlie et al. 2009; 68 Fast et al. 2011; Moriyama et al. 2015). Although Wolbachia are mainly found as 69 facultative endosymbionts in most insect hosts (Martinez et al. 2015 and references 70 therein), they also can evolve fixed obligate associations such as in the parasitoid wasp 71 Asobara (Dedeine et al. 2001), bedbugs (Hosokawa et al. 2010), or neotropical fruit 72 flies belonging to the Drosophila paulistorum species complex (Miller et al. 2010).

73 In the latter case, this superspecies is under incipient speciation in the wild and 74 consists of six semispecies (Dobzhansky and Spassky 1959), named Amazonian 75 (AM), Andean Brazilian (AB), Centroamerican (CA) Interior (IN), Orinocan (OR) and 76 Transitional (TR) expressing strong RI at the pre- and postzygotic level in inter-77 semispecies crosses (reviewed in Ehrman & Powell 1982). As recently found they all 78 carry different loads of obligate mutualistic but distinctive Wolbachia strains (Miller et 79 al. 2010), which can cause strong cytoplasmic incompatibilities (embryonic mortality) plus complete hybrid male sterilities in reciprocal crosses between different 80 81 semispecies in the laboratory. Because Wolbachia are obligate endosymbionts in this 82 system, no uninfected flies can be generated (Ehrman 1968; Kernaghan and Ehrman 83 1970; Miller et al. 2010) to test for classic bidirectional CI as feasible in facultative

symbioses such as in *Culex pipiens* mosquitos (reviewed in Werren et al. 2008). The association between the obligate *Wolbachia* symbiont (earlier designated *Mycoplasma-like-organisms*, *MLOs*; reviewed in Ehrman and Powell 1982) and the induction of postmating isolation, however, is based on earlier and recent findings that hybrid lethality and male sterility are partly reversible upon mild antibiotic or heat treatments of the parents before mating (Ehrman 1968; Kernaghan and Ehrman 1970; Miller & Schneider, unpublished).

91 In two earlier publications, Dobzhansky and collaborators (Dobzhansky and Pavlovsky 92 1966, 1971) observed the spontaneous evolution of *de novo* postmating isolation as 93 some lines, which were originally fully compatible with the Orinocan reference strain 94 O11, were no longer compatible with this semispecies or any other semispecies of D. 95 *paulistorum*. This resulted in occurrence of high embryonic F_1 mortality and complete 96 male hybrid sterility, presumably because of drift and isolation in these lines in the 97 laboratory. However, the role of endosymbionts on the formation of premating 98 mechanisms has been less studied in the past (Dobzhansky and Pavlovsky 1966, 99 1971; Miller et al. 2010). Importantly, in facultative symbioses, where Wolbachia has 100 not reached fixation in their natural hosts as in D. melanogaster or D. yakuba group 101 species, the authors did not detect any Wolbachia effect on premating isolation 102 (Sharon et al. 2010; Arbuthnott et al. 2016; Cooper et al. 2017).

103 This current study is based on the recent observation that D. paulistorum semispecies 104 show strong premating isolation through female mate choice for intra-semispecific 105 (homogamic) males (Fig. 1A, left panel). Such behavior is lost upon Wolbachia-106 knockdown in females, i.e., significant titer reduction but not clearance, resulting in 107 random mating between per se incompatible, heterogamic mates (Miller et al. 2010; 108 Fig. 1A, right panel). Knockdown instead of clearance is performed because Wolbachia 109 is a fixed obligate mutualist in *D. paulistorum*, providing vital but still undetermined 110 functions for its native hosts (Miller et al. 2010). More recently, we could demonstrate 111 selective neurotropism (the affinity to nervous tissue) of native D. paulistorum

112 Wolbachia to defined female and male brain regions, known as functionally important 113 for mating behavior and memory (Strunov et al. 2017). In addition to governing 114 assortative mating behavior of *D. paulistorum* females, we speculate that perturbations 115 of the Wolbachia-Drosophila homeostasis in males might induce assortative mating 116 behavior between per se compatible, homogamic mates, at least under experimental 117 conditions (Fig. 1B). Finally we speculate that under certain conditions like obligate 118 mutualism and tropism of the endosymbiont to host organs associated with sexual 119 behavior, Wolbachia can act as an influential and dynamic factor for modulating sexual 120 behavior, which, because of their sensitivity to exogenous factors such as stress and 121 antibiotics (Reynolds and Hoffmann 2002; Mouton et al. 2006; Weeks et al. 2007), plus 122 their high innate mutability (Chrostek et al. 2013; Schneider et al. 2013; Newton and 123 Sheehan 2014), can possibly initiate the process of sexual isolation, at least under 124 experimental laboratory conditions. Their potential impact on speciation in nature, 125 however, remains elusive.

126 The key components of premating sexual isolation mechanisms are visual, acoustic, 127 and chemical courtship signals. In many insects, sexual pheromones play an important 128 role as olfactory signals influencing mate choice (Blomquist and Bagnères 2010; 129 Chung and Carroll 2015; Dembeck et al. 2015). In D. paulistorum, males from the six 130 semispecies exhibit characteristic sexual pheromone profiles (same compounds but 131 different quantities), including four male-specific long-chained ester compounds, which 132 are recognized by females (Kim et al. 2004; Chao et al. 2010). In contrast to other 133 Drosophila species such as D. melanogaster, no female-specific compounds are 134 present in this system. Hence, the authors of previous studies (Kim et al. 2004; Chao 135 et al. 2010) concluded that, based on chemical profiles, D. paulistorum females accept 136 homogamic (compatible), but reject heterogamic (incompatible) males as mates (Chao 137 et al. 2010). Forced mating between heterogamic mates carrying incompatible 138 Wolbachia strains is highly detrimental for both host and symbionts by triggering high 139 levels of embryonic lethality and complete male sterility among F₁ hybrids (Ehrman

140 1968; Kernaghan and Ehrman 1970; Miller et al. 2010). Hence strong selection should
141 act on both intimate partners to evolve or maintain such mechanisms for mate
142 recognition.

Here we experimentally investigated whether bacterial symbionts are capable of initiating artificial *de novo* reproductive isolation (RI) by targeting host-derived olfactory cues. Therefore, we have (*i*) transiently knocked down obligate *Wolbachia* in *D. paulistorum* males, (*ii*) assayed their mating success in homogamic choice assays with wild type females, (*iii*) monitored their sexual pheromone profiles, and (*iv*) investigated the presence of *Wolbachia* in putative pheromone-producing cells.

149

150 Methods

151

152 Fly strains and generation of *Wolbachia*-knockdown (kd), axenic (et), and 153 penicillin/streptomycin-treated (ps) flies

154

155 Reference strains for two semispecies from the Drosophila paulistorum superspecies 156 were chosen for this study (Amazonian, A28 and Orinocan, O11; originally described 157 in Burla et al. 1949; Dobzhansky and Pavlovsky 1966). The Wolbachia infection status 158 (wPau) of these D. paulistorum strains was previously described in Miller et al. 2010. 159 In brief, A28 carries very low densities of the Wolbachia wPauAM strain, and O11 is 160 infected with the high-titer wPauOR strain (Miller et al. 2010). Wolbachia positive 161 controls for Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) assays were D. willistoni P98 and JS6.3, 162 both lab strains carrying native high-titer Wolbachia (wWil; Miller and Riegler 2006). 163 The D. melanogaster H2-strain (wMel; Miller and Riegler 2006) was used as an 164 additional Wolbachia positive control. Wolbachia negative controls for PCR were D. simulans NouméaTC (Poinsot et al. 2000), D. melanogaster w¹¹¹⁸ (BDSC, USA), and 165 166 D. willistoni Willi3 (14030-0811.2 DSSC, USA). Flies were reared on Formula 4-24 167 Drosophila instant food (Carolina, USA) at 24-25°C on a 12 hour light-dark cycle.

Wolbachia-knockdown lines A28^{kd} and O11^{kd} were generated by mass-treating wild 168 169 type flies with 0.2% (w/v) rifampicin (Duchefa, Netherlands) added to Formula 4-24 170 Drosophila instant food (Carolina, USA) over three sequential generations (T_1-T_3) . The 171 low dosage of the antibiotic is sublethal and allows for reduction of mutualistic Wolbachia in D. paulistorum (Miller et al. 2010). Offspring from T₃ parents were then 172 173 transferred onto antibiotic-free food for more than 10 generations under a mass-rearing regime designated as knockdown pools (A28^{kd}, O11^{kd}; Supporting Information Fig. S1). 174 In parallel, F₂^{kd} was used to initiate 8-10 isofemale lines per semispecies (A28^{kd-I}, 175 O11^{kd-I}; Supporting Information Fig. S1). Biological assays were performed at different 176 generations between F_4^{kd} and F_{13}^{kd} and their respective *Wolbachia* load was monitored 177 178 by qPCR (see below). Gut flora restoration (gfr) lines were generated by feeding the native gut microbiome to knockdown flies as follows: A28^{wt} and O11^{wt} virgin females 179 180 were kept on instant food for 2-3 days to collect feces. Flies were then removed and 181 the corresponding knockdown (kd) flies were transferred onto the feces-containing 182 food vials. After egg deposition adults were removed and emerging flies were 183 consequently used as gfr lines. Axenic ('gut microbe-free flies') were generated by consequently washing freshly collected eggs from A28^{wt} and O11^{wt} with 70% ethanol 184 185 for five minutes to surface-sterilize them. This treatment prevented larvae ingesting 186 microbes from the outer layer of the eggshell when hatching. Collected eggs were then 187 transferred into food vials and hatching F₁ and F₂ adults (A28^{et}, O11^{et}) were 188 consequently used for mate choice assays. Penicillin/streptomycin-treated (ps) flies 189 were generated by supplementing Formula 24 Drosophila instant food (Carolina, USA) 190 with a 1:100 dilution of a 100x pen/strep stock solution (10000 units/ml penicillin, 10000 µg/ml streptomycin). A28^{wt} and O11^{wt} were kept on this food for at least one week to 191 lay eggs and the hatching F₁ (A28^{ps}, O11^{ps}) was consequently used for mate choice 192 193 assays against the wt counterparts. Strains are reported in Table S1.

194

195 Quantification of wPau Wolbachia

197 DNA was extracted from a pool of ten three-day old flies using Gentra Puregene 198 chemistry (Qiagen, Germany). Concentrations of DNA were measured on a Nanodrop 199 2000 spectrophotometer. Consequently, diagnostic Wolbachia-PCR (quantitative real 200 time PCR) was performed using the Wolbachia outer surface protein gene wsp 201 (Yamada et al. 2007), and the Wolbachia-specific 16S rRNA gene (16SW RTf 5'-202 CCTGATCCAGCCATGCCGCAT-3', 5'-16SW RTr CGGCTGCTGGCACGGAGTTA-203 3'). The *wsp* primer set generates a 69 bp amplicon, and the 16S rRNA set produces 204 a 77 bp fragment. Wolbachia titers obtained with MxPro QPCR v4.10 Software (Agilent 205 Technologies, USA) were normalized against Drosophila ribosomal protein RPS17 206 (RPSmel f 5'-CACTCCCAGGTGCGTGGTAT-3', RPSwil r 5'-207 GGAAACGGCGGGCACGTA-3'). A temperature profile of 95°C for 3 sec, 60°C for 20 208 sec, and 72°C for 6 sec was used for 45 cycles. All samples were run in duplicates on 209 a Stratagene MxPro4000 cycler. Quantitative PCR with wsp was run to confirm results 210 obtained with the 16S rRNA primer set. Only results for the latter one are presented in 211 the manuscript.

212

213 Measuring sexual isolation *via* multiple mate choice assays

214

215 Mate choice assays between wild type, knockdown and control assays involved double 216 blind direct multiple-mating observations carried out mornings at room temperature in 217 daylight. Virgin flies were aged two to three days (females isolated from males), and 218 half were marked via distal wing clips before running the choice assay. These marks 219 were rotated (wing to wing and knockdown to wild type). Such minute abrasions have 220 tested neutral regarding behavioral influences in this superspecies (Dobzhansky and 221 Pavlovsky 1966; Leonard and Ehrman 1983). For each mate choice assay five replicas 222 and 120 mating events (240 individual flies) were scored (12A QQ + 12B QQ + 12A 223 33 + 12B 33 differentiated by alternating wing clips; Supporting information Fig. S2A,

224 B). Flies were placed (females first) in mating observation chambers (10 cm in 225 diameter) without anesthetization and the following parameters were scored until all 226 flies copulated in approximately 30-40 minutes: the time each mating took place (from 227 start of observations; each copulation approximately lasted 15-17 minutes); its 228 sequence among other copulae which occured; where in the chamber the mating pair 229 was located; the kind of female involved; and the kind of male involved. Recording the 230 location of copula, even upside down, prevented scoring a copula more than once. 231 Sexual isolation index (SII) was computed according to the following formula 232 (Malogolowkin-Cohen et al. 1965).

233 SII = (nho-nhe)/N, where *nho* is the number of homogamic matings, *nhe* is the number 234 of heterogamic matings, and N the total number of matings. SIIs range from -1.00235 (preference for unlikes, heterogamy) through 0 (random mating) to +1.00 (preference 236 for likes, homogamy). This experimental design is not devoid of bias. Indeed, when the 237 number of partners is finite and remating is limited, the choice of the last individuals is 238 conditioned by the choice of the previous ones. This could lead to erroneous signals 239 for assortative mating, e.g. when both males and females from the same population 240 tend to mate earlier than those from the other population (Ehrman and Parsons 1981). 241 However, unbiased rates of assortative mating could be estimated by accounting for 242 the order of mating pairs, using a statistical model described extensively in Supporting 243 Methods. This method provides the maximum-likelihood estimates of the assortative 244 mating coefficient (called eSII, or h in the model and Supporting Methods) and 245 accounts for the possibility of remating in males. Several remating rates were tested 246 and did not influence much the estimation of SII (see Figure S3), then in practice a 247 remating rate of 0.5 was chosen for the general analysis (Tables S2-S4). To avoid 248 convergence issues, the female remating rate was set to 0.001. Two additional parameters (biases in mating order for males and females) were also estimated by the 249 250 model (Table S5). However, their biological interpretation is not that straightforward as 251 they may correspond to either a general preference for one population of one sex, or

a different mating speed between both populations. The statistical departure of the SII
from 0 was estimated by a likelihood ratio test. Simulations showed that this procedure
efficiently corrects for such mating order biases, and was even slightly more powerful
than homogeneity (Fisher) tests when mating order was unbiased.

The model was implemented in R version 3.1.1 (R Core Team 2016), the code is available in Supporting Methods, along with the raw data. A comparison of the uncorrected SII and the model-estimated SII is provided in Supporting Information Fig. S3 and Tables S2-S4). Hereafter, we will refer only to the estimated SII that will be simply called eSII.

261

Analysis of cuticular hydrocarbons (CHCs) *via* gas chromatography-ion trap mass spectrometry (GC-MS)

264

265 Male virgin flies were collected, isolated from females, and aged to three days. Flies 266 were pooled in glass vials and submerged in 1 ml of HPLC-grade hexane (Carl Roth, 267 Germany). Replicates consisted of 10 males per sample. We did nine replicates for A28^{wt} and 10 replicates for each A28^{kd}, O11^{wt} and O11^{kd}. Two µg of octadecane (C18) 268 269 per sample was added as the internal standard for absolute quantification of CHCs. 270 Extraction of CHCs was performed for 10 minutes at room temperature under constant 271 agitation, after which the flies were removed. Extracts were evaporated to about 20-272 30 µl of hexane under a constant stream of argon, and then transferred to a 150 µl 273 GC-µ-vial (CZT, Germany). 1 µl aliquots were injected into a Varian 450GC gas 274 chromatograph coupled to a Varian 240MS mass spectrometer (Agilent Technologies, 275 Germany). A DB5-MS capillary column (30m x 0.25 mm diameter, film thickness: 0.25 276 µm, Agilent Technologies, Germany) was used and the GC was programmed from 277 150°C to 300°C at 15°C/min with a 27 min final isothermal hold. Helium, with a constant 278 flow rate of 1 ml/min, was used as carrier gas. Recording of mass spectra was 279 performed using electron ionization (EI-MS) in external ionization mode and data

280 acquisition plus quantifications were done with MS Workstation v6.9.3 Software (Agilent Technologies, Germany). Consequently, peaks were identified by their mass 281 282 spectra in comparison to previously published hydrocarbon profile analyses of D. 283 paulistorum (Kim et al. 2004; Chao et al. 2010) and D. melanogaster (Ueyama et al. 284 2005). Hydrocarbon quantities were calculated from peak areas and then centered log-285 ratio-transformed according to Aitchinson 1986. To test for differences in chemical 286 profiles between wild type and knockdown individuals, principal component analyses 287 (PCAs) based on eigenanalysis of covariances were performed to reduce numbers of 288 variables. Consequently, resulting PCs were used for discriminant analyses (DAs), to 289 test for among-group differences.

290

291 Fluorescence *in situ* hybridization (FISH) on *D. paulistorum* oenocytes

292

293 Ten to 15 female and male abdomen per semispecies were dissected in RNase-free 294 1x phosphate buffered saline (PBS). After removing inner organs, cuticles were fixed 295 in 3.7% formaldehyde in RNase-free PBS for 20 minutes at room temperature and 296 consequently washed with PBTX (1x PBS, 0.3% Triton-X 100). After permeabilization 297 with 70% ethanol over night at 4°C, samples were hybridized overnight in 10% 298 formamide, saline sodium citrate (SSC) and 0.5 nmol of CAL Fluor Red 590-labeled 299 customized Wolbachia 16-23S rRNA probe (Biosearch Technologies, USA; Schneider 300 et al., in press). Samples were then washed in 10% formamide and SSC, stained with 301 DAPI-SSC (1µg/ml) and mounted in Roti[®]-Mount FluorCare (Carl Roth, Germany) on 302 sterilized microscope slides. Cuticles were analyzed on an Olympus confocal 303 microscope. Beam paths were adjusted to excitation/emission peaks of used 304 fluorophores: 569/591 nm for CAL Fluor Red 590 (Wolbachia), and 350/450 nm for 305 4',6-Diamidin-2-phenylindol (DAPI). Images were processed with Fiji software 306 (http://fiji.sc). Staining was repeated twice and a minimum of 15 flies was assayed in 307 each experiment.

309 Results

310

311 Knockdown of obligate Wolbachia in Drosophila paulistorum semispecies is of

- 312 transient nature
- 313

314 To test whether manipulation of native Wolbachia titers and associated disruption of 315 the host-symbiont homeostasis can trigger de novo reproductive isolation (RI) in D. 316 paulistorum, we generated Wolbachia-knockdown (kd) males of two different 317 semispecies (Amazonian: A28, and Orinocan: O11) by mild rifampicin treatment for 318 three consecutive generations (T1-T3) and in the following generations on regular media without antibiotics ($F_1^{kd} - F_{14}^{kd}$) for restoration. For details see Supporting 319 Information Table S1, Fig. S1. Global Wolbachia titers of these males (A28^{kd}, O11^{kd}) 320 were tested against wild type (wt) controls (A28^{wt}, O11^{wt}) in guantitative real time PCR 321 322 (gPCR) assays targeting the Wolbachia 16S ribosomal RNA gene. Assays obtained from F_7^{kd} (knockdown generation 7) revealed massive titer reduction to about 5 and 323 324 14% of the average native wt Wolbachia titers (Fig. 2A,B).

To further assess whether *Wolbachia* titers return to native levels in later generations post kd, we tested symbiont load by F_{14} and earlier generations. Whereas in O11 the global symbiont titer was close to wt-levels at F_{14} (90%; Fig 2B), A28 flies have gradually reached only 23% of their wt-titer at this time point (Fig. 2A).

329

330 Mate choice assays reveal *de novo* assortative mating phenotype of wild type

331 (wt) females towards *Wolbachia*-knockdown males

332

Among sympatric *D. paulistorum* semispecies, no hybrids are formed intersemispecifically in nature (Dobzhansky and Spassky 1959). When performing intersemispecific mate choice assays involving A28^{wt} and O11^{wt} semispecies, we observed strong RI, revealed by a high estimated Sexual Isolation Index (eSII) (Ehrman 1965;
Ehrman and Powell 1982; Supporting Information: Table S2, assays 1,2). In contrast,
intra-semispecific control assays showed no assortative mating in standard
interbreeding 'pool' lines (Fig. 3 A,B wt x wt (purple) and Supporting Information Table
S2, assays 3,4). Results of statistical testing are summarized in Table S2.

341 In order to test our hypothesis that manipulation of the native Wolbachia titer and the 342 associated disruption of the host-symbiont homeostasis in *D. paulistorum* might trigger 343 de novo premating isolation intra-semispecifically, we assayed mating behavior of 344 Wolbachia-kd pool lines towards wt flies of the same semispecies (Fig. 3A,B, orange, 345 and Table S3, assays 1-6). Assays run with knockdown flies at generation F₄ or F₅ post-treatment, consistently showed high eSII, i.e. mating between likes rather than 346 347 unlikes. This points towards de novo mate discrimination between wt and kd flies from 348 the same semispecies that significantly differ in their symbiont load (kd F_7 in Fig 2A,B;). 349 However, at generation F₁₃ homogamy was less pronounced among all of them, and 350 eSII did not differ significantly from what is expected under random mating. Importantly, 351 although O11 flies showed rapid increase of Wolbachia levels by kd F₁₄ (Fig. 2B), only 352 a slower, gradual titer increase was observed in A28 (Fig. 2A). Hence the restoration 353 of the random mating phenotype in O11 might directly correlate with the global 354 restoration of the symbiont level at faster pace, whereas the reversion to random 355 mating of A28 flies might depend on a critical titer threshold of Wolbachia and/or their 356 tropism to sensitive host tissues such as oenocytes (see discussion).

To rule out that drift effects were responsible for observed *de novo* sexual isolation, we additionally assayed wt and kd lines that were reared as ten isofemale lines per semispecies (A28^{wt-i}, O11^{wt-i} and A28^{kd-i}, O11^{kd-i}, respectively). First, two out of ten randomly picked control isofemale lines (wt-i) representing each semispecies were tested against each other (intra) in F_{10} in order to verify random mating between them (Fig. 3C,D wt-i x wt-i, purple, and Supporting Information Table S2, assays 5-8). The observed low eSIIs indicated the absence of any drift-dependent sexual isolation. To

test for emerging sexual isolation between kd-isofemale lines upon drift (as a response to *Wolbachia*-kd and consequent restoration) we performed intra-semispecific choice assays using independent F_8 isofemale knockdown lines (kd-i). Surprisingly in this case the assays revealed significant isolation between them (*p values* <10⁻⁴; Fig. 3C,D, pink, and Supporting Information Table S3, assays 7,8).

369 Taken together, control assays between independent wt isofemale lines rule out drift 370 as a potential factor for triggering de novo premating sexual isolation observed 371 between wt and kd lines, whereas independent knockdown lines have possibly drifted 372 apart from each other upon isolation having potentially different levels and/or individual tissue tropisms of Wolbachia during restoration at F₈. Overall, the emergence of high 373 374 eSIIs in intrastrain assays suggests that even slight perturbations of the native 375 Wolbachia - D. paulistorum homeostasis and/or tropism are sufficient to induce de 376 novo RI in this system, even between individual knockdown isofemale lines. This latter 377 and quite intriguing observation, however, will need further investigations, which are 378 beyond the scope of our current analyses (see discussion).

379

380 No evidence for influence of gut microbiota on *de novo* assortative mating 381 phenotype

382

383 Earlier and recent studies, however, have addressed the potential influence of diet and 384 consequently the gut microbiome on host sexual isolation not only in D. pseudoobscura 385 (Dodd et al. 1989), but also in highly inbred lines of *D. melanogaster* (Sharon et al. 386 2010; Ringo et al. 2011). Here, sexual isolation can be triggered by manipulating the 387 fly's gut microbiome, based on a certain dietary regime. However, two recent studies 388 have questioned the general role for gut bacteria or diet composition in driving 389 reproductive isolation in D. melanogaster (Najarro et al. 2015; Leftwich et al. 2017). In 390 the light of these still controversial findings obtained from inbred D. melanogaster 391 strains, we have tested *D. paulistorum* gut flora restored (gfr) lines, where kd lines

392 were fed with wt feces, in parallel with our unfed kd lines (see Methods section for 393 details). Assays with these lines and wt flies revealed almost complete SII suggesting 394 that gut flora restoration does not affect the *de novo* assortative mating phenotype (p values < 10⁻⁴, Fig. 3E, and Supporting Information Table S4, assays 1,2). To further 395 396 exclude an effect of the gut microbiome associated with the egg smear, we assayed 397 axenic flies, i.e., eggs washed with ethanol (et, Fig. 3F, and Supporting Information 398 Table S4, assays 3,4), and penicillin/streptomycin-treated flies (ps, Fig. 3G, purple, 399 and Supporting Information Table S4, assays 5,6). Mating behavior with both sets were 400 compatible with random mating (absence of assortative mating). Hence, in contrast to 401 rifampicin, which acts on Wolbachia levels, neither sterilizing eggs, nor treatments with 402 penicillin/streptomycin had any effect on mate choice behavior in this system. 403 Furthermore, to test whether penicillin/streptomycin affects mate behavior of females 404 we performed inter-semispecific control assay between wildtype A28 and 405 penicillin/streptomycin-treated O11 flies that still revealed high sexual isolation (ps, Fig. 3G, yellow, Supporting Information Table S4, assay 7, p value < 10⁻⁴), confirming that 406 407 penicillin/streptomycin-sensitive gut microbes in females have no effect on mating 408 behavior in this system.

409 Importantly, we are aware that none of our control assays on its own can exclude the 410 spurious presence of some hidden non-Wolbachia microbe affecting mate behavior. 411 However, the combination of three independent control assays, i.e., gut-flora 412 restoration, egg-surface sterilization and penicillin/streptomycin-treatment, strongly 413 supports our hypothesis that endosymbiotic Wolbachia, which are resilient to 414 penicillin/streptomycin and egg surface sterilizing treatments (Audsley et al. 2017; 415 Leclerq et al. 2017, Ye et al. 2017), are interfering with mate discrimination of D. 416 paulistorum in both sexes and not any other bacteria.

417 Concordantly, only rifampicin treatment massively reduces *Wolbachia* load and 418 induces *de novo* assortative mating behavior of wildtype females against knockdown 419 males from the same semispecies (this study) that also selectively triggers loss of

420 assortative mating behavior in knockdown females against males from a different
421 semispecies (Fig. 3G, yellow; Miller et al. 2010).

422

423 Sexual pheromone profiles are altered in *D. paulistorum* knockdown males

424

425 Based on the observed *de novo* assortative mating phenotype, we tested whether the 426 pheromone composition of Wolbachia-kd males was altered in comparison with wt 427 males. Males from all six D. paulistorum semispecies exhibit characteristic pheromone 428 profiles (all share the same 15 major compounds but in varying quantities), including 429 four male-specific long-chain esters, which are recognized by females as a 430 semispecific blend because of the differences in their relative concentrations 431 (Supporting Information Figure S4; Kim et al. 2004; Chao et al. 2010). In contrast to 432 other Drosophila species such as D. melanogaster, no female-specific compounds are 433 known in *D. paulistorum* (Chao et al. 2010) and mate decisions appear – to our current 434 knowledge - to be exclusively made by females (Ehrman 1965; Ehrman and Parsons 435 1981). Here we extended hydrocarbon profile analyses to a total of 27 compounds 436 found in all tested semispecies by adding two new, unknown compounds (Supporting 437 Information Table S6, compounds 9, 13) and by resolving the original C33, C35, and 438 C37 peak clusters (C = chain length of the compound; 33, 35, and 37 carbon atoms). 439 In full agreement with earlier reports (Chao et al. 2010; Kim et al. 2004), discriminant analyses of sex pheromone profiles from A28^{wt} and O11^{wt} males revealed major 440 441 differences among the semispecies (Supporting Information Figure S5A). In order to 442 test for differences in male pheromone profiles upon Wolbachia-kd, we compared 443 profiles between F7 kd males and wt males for each semispecies. Based on the 27 444 quantified components (Supporting Information Table S6), seven principal components were extracted capturing 87.7% of the total variance for A28^{kd} vs. A28^{wt} 445 and 86.2% for O11^{kd} vs. O11^{wt}. The discriminant analysis revealed statistically 446 significant differences between A28^{wt} and A28^{kd} males (Wilks' Lambda = 0.059, 447

448 X2=39.6, df=6, p < 0.0001) and also between O11^{wt} and O11^{kd} (Wilks' 446 Lambda = 0.117, X2=34.3, df=6, p < 0.001, Supporting Information Figure S5B).

450 To further analyze differences in pheromone profiles between wt and kd males, we 451 calculated the relative quantities of the four male-specific compounds in D. paulistorum 452 male profiles (11-docosenyl-acetate, DA, 19-triacontenyl-acetate, TA, di-unsaturated 453 acetate $C_{32}H_{60}O_2$, DU, and methyl-(Z)-tetradecanoate, MD). As shown in Figure 4, we observed most drastic changes in quantities of these compounds in A28^{kd} males. 454 455 where all four male-specific compounds were decreased between 9- and 23-fold when 456 compared to wt levels (Fig. 4A; p < 0.0001 for all four compounds). Although not as drastic as A28^{kd}, in O11^{kd} males at least one male-specific compound also showed 457 significant changes: compared to O11^{wt} males, MD was reduced 5-fold (Fig. 4B; p =458 459 0.0399).

460

461 Wolbachia colonize oenocytes in D. paulistorum

462

463 In insects, pheromone components are mainly synthesized in specialized cells located 464 under the fly's cuticle, the oenocytes (reviewed in Blomquist and Bagnères 2010; 465 Chung and Carroll 2015; Dembeck et al. 2015). We hypothesized that these 466 specialized cells could serve a primary somatic target for Wolbachia to manipulate host 467 pheromone profiles in D. paulistorum. Since male pheromone profiles were altered 468 upon Wolbachia kd, we tested the infection status of male oenocytes in both D. paulistorum wt and kd individuals. As shown in Fig. 5, oenocytes from O11^{wt} females 469 470 (Fig. 5A,A') and males (Fig. 5B,B') harbor Wolbachia. We could also detect the symbiont in oenocytes of A28^{wt} males (not shown). Post Wolbachia-kd oenocytes, 471 however, are cleared from the symbiont ($F_4 O11^{kd}$; males in Fig. 5C; females in 5C'). 472 473 Since our mate choice assays indicated reversion to wt mating behavior, i.e., loss of 474 de novo assortative mating, around F₁₃/₁₄ post Wolbachia-kd, we tested whether this 475 phenotype correlates with a potential recolonization of Wolbachia to oenocytes around

this generation post kd. As shown in Fig. 5D, oenocytes of F₁₃ O11^{kd} males are, at 476 477 least partially, recolonized by the endosymbiont. Oenocytes of other Drosophila hosts 478 like the wMel-infected D. melanogaster strain Harwich-2, (males in Fig. 5E, females in 479 5E') in which Wolbachia have evolved facultative symbiotic interactions and do not 480 affect mate behavior, are devoid of the symbiont. This is in contrast to *D. paulistorum*, 481 where wPau Wolbachia are obligate mutualists affecting host behavior (Miller et al. 482 2010 and this study). Oenocytes derived from the Wolbachia-uninfected D. willistoni 483 strain Willi3, a sister species of *D. paulistorum*, were used as negative controls (Fig. 484 5F). These data suggest that the oenocyte-tropism of wPau is a phenotypic specificity 485 for the Wolbachia-D. paulistorum system.

486

487 **Discussion**

488

489 *Wolbachia*-knockdown provokes a *de novo* assortative mating phenotype

490 D. paulistorum semispecies are very sensitive to standard antibiotic treatments 491 (Ehrman 1968; Kernaghan and Ehrman 1970) since in this symbiosis, Wolbachia is a 492 fixed obligate mutualist providing vital, but still undetermined functions for its native 493 hosts (Miller et al. 2010). Similar Wolbachia-dependencies were found in the parasitoid 494 wasp Asobara tabida (Dedeine et al. 2001; Pannebakker et al. 2007), bedbugs of the 495 genus Cimex (Hosokawa et al. 2010; Nikoh et al. 2014; Moriyama et al. 2015), and in 496 the rice water weevil Lissorhoptrus oryzophilus (Chen et al. 2012). Furthermore, even 497 partial depletion of fixed mutualistic Wolbachia from filarial nematodes affects host 498 fitness and fecundity but also triggers overexpression of host nuclear and 499 mitochondrial genes in order to partially compensate the loss of some gene functions 500 provided by Wolbachia (Pfarr et al. 2008; Strübing et al. 2010).

Here we have assayed for behavioral consequences of symbiont knockdowns in males
of two different *D. paulistorum* semispecies, i.e., *Wolbachia* low-titer Amazonian (A28)
and high titer Orinocan (O11) strains. Our data strongly suggest that in both systems

504 partial knockdown of the endosymbiont in males significantly affects their 505 attractiveness for homogamic wt-females, which seems to correlate with global titer 506 levels. However, restoration to random mating in later generations post treatment (Fig. 507 3A,B) seems to correlate with the gradual quantitative reconstitution of global symbiont 508 titers that are fast in O11 (Fig. 2B), but not in A28 (Fig. 2A). In our assays, A28 flies 509 expressing random mating at F13 still show significantly lower global Wolbachia levels 510 than wt flies. We speculate that reversion to random mating of A28 flies observed at 511 later generations post-treatment might not depend on the global restoration of the 512 symbiont titer in this semispecies to wt, but possibly because of a critical titer threshold 513 and/or the symbiont's tropism to sensitive tissues and organs associated with mating 514 behavior. In order to test this hypothesis, however, detailed temporal and spatial in situ 515 quantifications of the symbiont in different host tissues during the restoration phase 516 are required, which were beyond the scope of our current study.

517 As shown by this and earlier studies, under laboratory conditions different D. 518 paulistorum semispecies express strong assortative mating behavior against each 519 other, which is sensitive to rifampicin and tetracycline (Miller et al. 2010), but 520 insensitive to penicillin and streptomycin that do not target the Wolbachia 521 endosymbiont (this study). It seems feasible although not tested that strict female mate 522 choice might prevent mating between incompatible members of different D. 523 paulistorum semispecies also in nature. If true, this behavior has most likely coevolved 524 in conjunction with the obligate endosymbiont to avoid detrimental reproductive 525 phenotypes like hybrid mortality and male sterility in crosses between inter-526 semispecies (Ehrman 1968; Kim and Ehrman 1998). Here we have evaluated the 527 potential of Wolbachia to trigger assortative mating behavior in D. paulistorum towards 528 per se compatible mates under laboratory conditions. Our results suggest that kd-529 males appear sexually less attractive for their wt-female counterparts in mate choice 530 assays upon manipulation of the native wPau-Wolbachia titer since they were 531 expressing high SIIs in all assays. Such high SIIs were previously found only between

532 members of different D. paulistorum semispecies (Ehrman 1965; Malogolowkin-Cohen 533 et al. 1965) or between Drosophila species that are sexually isolated from each other 534 (reviewed in Spieth and Ringo 1983; Martin and Hosken 2003; Anderson and Kim 535 2005; Castrezana and Markow 2008). Our data also indicate that de novo sexual 536 isolation in D. paulistorum under our experimental conditions is transient as eSIIs 537 reverted to random mating around generation F_{13} post kd (only 45-57% homogamy) 538 together with the observed re-colonization of male oenocytes. However, experimental 539 reduction of native D. paulistorum-Wolbachia titers was sufficient to alter males so that 540 they were subsequently rejected by wt-females in the two semispecies tested, at least 541 transiently. Interestingly we observed significant assortative mating between 542 independently established kd-isofemale lines of the same semispecies, a finding most 543 likely caused by drift. In such, heterogeneity of kd isolines could be a result of different 544 temporal and spatial dynamics of Wolbachia recolonization of behavioral important 545 tissues in the individual lines post knockdown. To test this drift hypothesis for kd lines, 546 however, detailed quantitative and qualitative analyses of global symbiont titer levels, 547 but also their in situ tropism and densities will be necessary from multiple staged flies 548 and tissues of the same generation. In our current study, extensive analyses like these 549 were not possible due to limitations of fly material at this time point.

550

551 Host pheromonal signatures may be a target for *Wolbachia* to signal the 552 infection state and to impact mate choice

553

In many insects, sexual pheromones serve as recognition cues for mate choice between and within species and are hence important players in reproductive isolation (Coyne et al. 1994; Savarit et al. 1998; Ferveur 2005). Moreover, such cues might even be prone to manipulation by pathogenic bacteria, as recently shown in *D. melanogaster* (Keesey et al. 2017).

559 In our study, the observed alteration of pheromone blends in kd-males may explain 560 why females prefer wt-mates carrying the intact native profile. This finding is 561 corroborated by studies showing that in lekking sandflies (Lutzomya), female mate 562 choice is influenced by the amount of pheromones released by males before potential 563 mating (Jones and Hamilton 1998; Jones et al. 2000). Another study demonstrated the 564 influence of Wolbachia on host odor-linked mate preference in the terrestrial isopod Armadillidium vulgare (Richard 2017). In A28^{kd} and O11^{kd} males, relative guantities of 565 566 pheromone compounds were affected differently, suggesting that the quantitative 567 change in at least one of the male-specific components, but possibly also in 568 conjunction with some other non-sex-specific CHCs, might be sufficient to trigger 569 rejection of kd-males by wt-females in choice experiments. Importantly, our findings are in line with a recent study suggesting that Wolbachia can influence pupal 570 571 communication between females and males in Drosophila melanogaster by 572 modulating CI levels (Pontier and Schweissguth 2015, 2017; but also see Jacquet et 573 al. 2017). However, as shown earlier, facultative Wolbachia symbionts of D. 574 melanogaster adults do not affect mate choice behavior in this system at all, but 575 possibly other gut microbes (Sharon et al. 2010; Ringo et al. 2011; Arbuthnott et al. 576 2016). Importantly, a very recent study has severely questioned the potential impact 577 of the gut microbiome on reproductive isolation since the microbiome of D. 578 melanogaster is not fixed but reported as flexible and environmental determined 579 (Leftwick et al. 2017). In the mutualistic D. paulistorum-Wolbachia system, however, 580 where the endosymbiont is fixed by serving vital but still undetermined functions to 581 their native host (Miller et al. 2010) we suggest that these obligate Wolbachia have 582 also a direct or indirect impact on adult cuticular hydrocarbon (CHC) profiles, where 583 male-specific and sex-unspecific compounds change quantitatively upon Wolbachia-584 kd in adult males.

585 The presence of *Wolbachia* in oenocytes of O11^{wt} males implies a direct or indirect 586 interaction of the symbiont with host pheromone production and mate choice behavior

587 as a consequence. The potential effects of the endosymbiont in oenocytes on female 588 pheromone blending, however, await elucidation. If the presence of Wolbachia in male 589 oenocytes is essential to express the semispecies-specific pheromone profile, loss of 590 the symbiont from male oenocytes (F_4 post kd) might explain why pheromone profiles 591 are altered and knockdown males are consequently rejected as mate partners from 592 homogamic wt-females. Based on our mate choice assays, the de novo assortative 593 mating phenotype behavior is transient and results in reversion to a wt-like situation 594 around F₁₃/F₁₄ post knockdown. Assuming a direct link between Wolbachia tropism in 595 the oenocytes and expression of the male pheromone profile, we expected a 596 recolonization of oenocytes in parallel with reversion to random mating phenotype. We 597 could confirm such recolonization, and thus potentially explain reversion to random mating, in oenocytes of F₁₃ O11^{kd} males. Our finding is particularly interesting in the 598 599 light of the contrasting situation in D. melanogaster, where Wolbachia do not play a 600 role in mate choice (Sharon et al. 2010; Ringo et al. 2011; Arbuthnott et al. 2016). In 601 our experimental setup, we did not detect Wolbachia in D. melanogaster oenocytes, 602 which most likely explains why the symbiont does not affect mate choice and 603 pheromone expression in this model system (Sharon et al. 2010). Finally, in contrast 604 with the strict neurotropism of obligate Wolbachia to defined brain regions of D. 605 paulistorum, (Strunov et al. 2017) native Wolbachia are randomly dispersed at low 606 densities in D. melanogaster brains (Albertson et al. 2009). However, it remains to be 607 elucidated how Wolbachia manipulate male pheromone expression and female mate 608 choice in *D. paulistorum*.

To conclude, our combined data strongly imply that artificial reduction of the obligate *Wolbachia* endosymbiont of *D. paulistorum* males significantly reduces mating success with homogamic wildtype females belonging to the same semispecies. Although these and earlier findings in *D. paulistorum* lead to interpretations based on associations rather than causation and their functional and molecular bases are still undetermined, we propose the following model for the potential impact of the *D*.

615 paulistorum endosymbiont on RI and host speciation in this system. In contrast to most 616 facultative Wolbachia-insect associations, where the symbiont is not fixed and does 617 not serve vital host functions, D. paulistorum semispecies have evolved vital 618 mutualistic associations with their endosymbiont (Miller et al. 2010) as well as strict 619 tissue tropisms to reproductive host organs, such as the primordial germline cells of 620 embryos and adult gonads (Miller et al. 2010), but also to defined larval and adult brain 621 regions associated with sexual behavior (Strunov et al. 2017) and pheromone 622 producing oenocytes (this study). As implicated from the results of this study even 623 partial depletions of the mutualist from their primary somatic host targets, such as 624 oenocytes, might directly or indirectly alter pheromone signatures of males, which are 625 no longer accepted as mates from stress-free wt females.

626 It appears likely that spontaneous symbiont knockdowns might also happen in the wild 627 by stochastic exposure of the host to natural antibiotics or heat stress. This de novo 628 assortative phenotype expressed by females against aberrant homogamic males can 629 significantly disrupt gene flow within populations via premating isolation, at least 630 transiently. As shown earlier, however, Wolbachia-kd males are accepted by kd 631 females, which randomly mate even with heterogamic males under lab conditions 632 (Miller et al. 2010). Under this scenario two sexually isolated reproductive groups 633 would emerge and coexist next to each other. Since population sizes of Wolbachia 634 have dropped significantly upon such external stresses, it seems quite likely that 635 genetic drift (Chrostek et al. 2013; Schneider et al. 2013; Newton et al. 2014) can 636 cause disruptive diversification of earlier-compatible Wolbachia variants that 637 consequently trigger high cytoplasmic incompatibilities plus complete male sterility at 638 postmating levels.

Hence it seems plausible that in Dobzhansky's earlier studies (Dobzhansky and Pavlovsky 1966; 1971) where spontaneous emergence of strong post mating incompatibilities between long term isolated sub lines of the same *D. paulistorum* semispecies were observed, he had actually detected the final outcome of this

643 symbiotic stress and drift effect, observed in our current experimental study. Planned 644 studies, however, should elucidate the mechanistic basis of *Wolbachia*-influence on 645 male pheromone production and whether similar scenarios observed under lab 646 conditions also take place in nature.

647

648 Acknowledgments

649

650 We thank Bertha Inocencio Green and Traude Kehrer for fly work and Dr. Taina Chao 651 for help with analyses of *D. paulistorum*. We also thank the Max Planck Society for

652 supporting this study.

653

654 **Compliance with Ethical Standards**

655

656 **Funding:** This study was funded by two grants (P22634-B17, P28255-B22) from the

Austrian Science Fund to W.J.M., and by a grant (FA0701-9528) from the COST Action

to D.I.S. The Max Planck Society was also supporting this study (T.E., M.K.) and L.E.

659 was awarded an E+E grant (E2 Grant 331-15).

660

661 **Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

662 **Ethical Approval:** For this type of study formal consent is not required. This article 663 does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of 664 the authors.

665

666 **Informed Consent:** Not applicable.

667

668 **References**

670	Aitchinson, J. 1986. The statistical analysis of compositional data. Monographs on
671	statistics and applied probability. Chapman and Hall Ltd., London, UK.
672	Albertson, R., Casper-Lindley, C., Cao, J., Tram, U., and Sullivan, W. 2009.
673	Symmetric and asymmetric mitotic segregation patterns influence Wolbachia
674	distribution in host somatic tissue. J Cell Sci. 122:4570-4583.
675	Anderson, W. W., and Kim, Y. K. 2005. Sexual isolation between sympatric and
676	allopatric populations of Drosophila pseudoobscura and D. persimilis. Behav.
677	Genet. 35:305-312.
678	Arbuthnott, D., Levin, T. C., and Promislow, D. E. 2016. The impacts of Wolbachia
679	and the microbiome on mate choice in Drosophila melanogaster. J. Evol. Biol.
680	29:461-468.
681	Audsley, M. D., Ye, Y. H., and McGraw, E. A. 2017. The microbiome composition of
682	Aedes aegypti is not critical for Wolbachia-mediated inhibition of dengue virus.
683	PLoS_Negl. Trop. Dis. 11(3):e0005426.
684	Blomquist, G. J., and Bagnères, A. G. 2010. Insect Hydrocarbons: Biology,
685	Biochemistry, and Chemical Ecology. Cambridge University Press,
686	Cambridge.
687	Bordenstein, S. R., O'Hara, F. P., and Werren, J. H. 2001. Wolbachia-induced
688	incompatibility precedes other hybrid incompatibilities in Nasonia. Nature
689	409:707-710.
690	Brownlie, J. C., Cass, B. N., and Riegler, M. 2009. Evidence for metabolic
691	provisioning by a common invertebrate endosymbiont, Wolbachia pipientis,
692	during periods of nutritional stress. <i>PLoS Pathog</i> . (4):e1000368.
693	Brucker, R. M., and Bordenstein, S. R. 2012. Speciation by symbiosis. Trends Ecol
694	Evol. 27:443-451.
695	Brucker, R. M., and Bordenstein, S. R. 2013. The hologenomic basis of speciation:
696	gut bacteria cause hybrid lethality in the genus Nasonia. Science 341:667-
697	669.

- Brucker, R. M., and Bordenstein, S. R. 2014. Response to Comment on "The
 hologenomic basis of speciation: gut bacteria cause hybrid lethality in the
 genus *Nasonia*". *Science* 345:1011.
- Burla, H., Brito da Cunha, A., Cordeiro, A. R., Dobzhansky, T., Malogolowkin, C.,
 Pavan, C. 1949. The *willistoni* group of sibling species of *Drosophila*. *Evolution* 3:300-314
- Castrezana SJ, and Markow TA. 2008. Sexual isolation and mating propensity
 among allopatric *Drosophila mettleri* populations. *Behav Genet*. 38:437-445.
- 706 Chandler, J. A., and Turelli, M. 2014. Comment on "The hologenomic basis of
- speciation: gut bacteria cause hybrid lethality in the genus *Nasonia*". *Science*345:1011.
- 709 Chao, T. H., Ehrman, L., Permaul, A., Vincent, R., Sattaur, L., and Brandt, D. 2010.
- 710 Male-specific cuticular compounds of the six *Drosophila paulistorum*
- 711 semispecies: structural identification and mating effect. *J. Chem. Ecol.*
- 712 36:933-942.
- Chen, S. J., Lu, F., Cheng, J. A., Jiang, M. X., and Way, M. O. 2012. Identification
 and biological role of the endosymbionts *Wolbachia* in rice water weevil
- 715 (Coleoptera: Curculionidae). Environ. Entomol. 41:469-477.
- 716 Chrostek, E., Marialva, M. S., Esteves, S. S., Weinert, L. A., Martinez, J., Jiggins, F.
- and M., Teixeira, L. 2013. *Wolbachia* variants induce differential protection to
 viruses in *Drosophila melanogaster*: a phenotypic and phylogenomic analysis. *PLoS Genet*. 9(12):e1003896.
- Chung, H., and Carroll, S. B. 2015. Wax, sex and the origin of species: Dual roles of
 insect cuticular hydrocarbons in adaptation and mating. *Bioessays* 37:822830.
- Cooper, B. S., Ginsberg, P. S, Turelli, M., and Matute, D. R. 2017. *Wolbachia* in the
 Drosophila yakuba complex: pervasive frequency variation and weak

725	cytoplasmic incompatibility, but no apparent effect on reproductive isolation.
726	<i>Genetics</i> 205:333-351.
727	Coyne, J. A., Crittenden, A. P., and Mah, K. 1994. Genetics of a pheromonal
728	difference contributing to reproductive isolation in Drosophila. Science
729	265:1461-1464.
730	Coyne, J. A., Orr, H. A. 2004. Speciation. Sunderland: Sinauer Associates,
731	Sunderland, MA.
732	Dedeine, F., Vavre, F., Fleury, F., Loppin, B., Hochberg, M. E., and Bouletreau, M.
733	2001. Removing symbiotic Wolbachia bacteria specifically inhibits oogenesis
734	in a parasitic wasp. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. 98:6247-6252.
735	Dembeck, L. M., Böröczky, K., Huang, W., Schal, C., Anholt, R. R., and Mackay, T.
736	F. 2015. Genetic architecture of natural variation in cuticular hydrocarbon
737	composition in Drosophila melanogaster. Elife 4. pii: e09861.
738	Dobzhansky, T., and Spassky, B. 1959. Drosophila paulistorum, a cluster of species
739	in statu nascendi. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. 45:419-428.
740	Dobzhansky, T., and Pavlovsky, O. 1966. Spontaneous origin of an incipient species
741	in the Drosophila paulistorum complex. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. 55:727-
742	733.
743	Dobzhansky, T., and Pavlovsky, O. 1971. Experimentally created incipient species of
744	Drosophila. Nature 230:289-292.
745	Dobzhansky, T., and Pavlovsky, O. 1975. Unstable intermediates between Orinocan
746	and Interior semispecies of Drosophila paulistorum. Evolution 29:242-248.
747	Dodd, D. M. B. 1989. Reproductive isolation as a consequence of adaptive
748	divergence in Drosophila pseudoobscura. Evolution 43:1308-1311.
749	Ehrman, L. 1965. Direct observation of sexual isolation between allopatric and
750	between sympatric strains of the different Drosophila paulistorum races.
751	Evolution 19:459-464.

- 752 Ehrman, L. 1968. Antibiotics and infections hybrid sterility in *Drosophila paulistorum*.
 753 *Mol. Gen. Genet.* 103:218-222.
- Ehrman, L., and Parsons, P. A. 1981. Behavior Genetics and Evolution. New York:
 McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Ehrman, L., and Powell, J. R. 1982. The Drosophila willistoni species group. Pp. 192-
- 225, *in* M. Ashburner, H. L. Carson, and J. N. Thompson, eds. *The genetics and biology of Drosophila*. New York: Academic Press; 1982. p. 192-225.
- 759 Fast, E. M., Toomey, M. E., Panaram, K., Desjardins, D., Kolaczyk. E. D., and
- Frydman, H. M. 2011. *Wolbachia* enhance Drosophila stem cell proliferation
 and target the germline stem cell niche. *Science* 334:990–992.
- Ferveur, J. F. 2005. Cuticular hydrocarbons: their evolution and roles in *Drosophila* pheromonal communication. *Behav. Genet.* 35:279-295.
- 764 Gebiola, M., Kelly, S. E., Hammerstein, P., Giorgini, M., and Hunter, M. S. 2016.
- 765 "Darwin's corollary" and cytoplasmic incompatibility induced by *Cardinium*
- 766 may contribute to speciation in Encarsia wasps (Hymenoptera: Aphelinidae).
 767 *Evolution* 70:2447-2458.
- Hosokawa, T., Koga, R., Kikuchi, Y., Meng, X. Y., and Fukatsu, T. 2010. Wolbachia
- as a bacteriocyte-associated nutritional mutualist. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*.
 107:769-774.
- Jacquet, A., Horard, B., and Loppin, B. 2017. Does pupal communication influence *Wolbachia*-mediated cytoplasmic incompatibility? *Curr. Biol.* 27:R55-R56.
- Jaenike, J., Dyer, K.A., Cornish, C., and Minhas, M. S. 2006. Asymmetrical
- reinforcement and *Wolbachia* infection in *Drosophila*. *Plos Biol*. 4(10):e325.
- Jones, T. M., and Hamilton, J. G. C. 1998. A role for pheromones in mate choice in a
 lekking sandfly. *Animal Behav.* 56:891-898.
- Jones, T. M., Balmford, A., and Quinnell, R. J. 2000. Adaptive female choice for
 middle-aged mates in a lekking sandfly. *Proc. R. Soc B*. 267:681-686.

779	Keesey, I. W., Koerte, S., Khallaf, M. A., Retzke, T., Guillou, A., Grosse-Wilde, E,
780	Buchon, N., Knaden, M., and Hansson, B. S. 2017. Pathogenic bacteria
781	enhance dispersal through alteration of Drosophila social communication. Nat.
782	<i>Commun.</i> 8:265.
783	Kernaghan, R. P., and Ehrman, L. 1970. Antimycoplasmal antibiotics and hybrid
784	sterility in Drosophila paulistorum. Science 169:63-64.
785	Kim, Y. K., and Ehrman, L. 1998. Developmental isolation and subsequent adult
786	behavior of Drosophila paulistorum. IV. Courtship. Behav. Genet. 28:57-65.
787	Kim, Y. K., Phillips, D. R., Chao, T., and Ehrman, L. 2004. Developmental isolation
788	and subsequent adult behavior of Drosophila paulistorum. VI. Quantitative
789	variation in cuticular hydrocarbons. Behav. Genet. 34:385-394.
790	Leclerq, S., Mian, F. M., Stanisz, A. M., Bindels, L. B., Cambier, E., Ben-Amram, H.,
791	Koren, O., Forsythe, P., and Bienenstock, J. 2017. Low-dose penicillin in early
792	life induces long-term changes in murine gut microbiota, brain cytokines and
793	behavior. Nat. Commun. 8:15062.
794	Leftwich, P. T., Clarke, N. V. E., Hutchings, M. I., and Chapman, T. 2017. Gut
795	microbiomes and reproductive isolation in Drosophila. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.
796	USA. 114:12767-12772.
797	Leonard, J., and Ehrman, L. 1983. Does the rare male advantage result from faulty
798	experimental design? Genetics 104:713-716.
799	Malogolowkin-Cohen, C., Simmons, A. S., and Levene, H. 1965. A study of sexual
800	isolation between certain strains of Drosophila paulistorum. Evolution 19:95-
801	103.
802	Martin, O. Y., and Hosken, D. J. 2003. The evolution of reproductive isolation through
803	sexual conflict. Nature 423:979-982.
804	Martinez, J., Ok, S., Smith, S., Snoeck, K., Day, J. P., and Jiggins, F. M. 2015.
805	Should symbionts be nice or selfish? Antiviral effects of Wolbachia are costly
806	but reproductive parasitism is not. PLoS Pathog. 11(7):e1005021.

- 807 Miller, W. J., and Riegler, M. 2006. Evolutionary dynamics of wAu-like Wolbachia 808 variants in Neotropical Drosophila species. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 72:826-809 835.
- 810 Miller, W. J., Ehrman, L., and Schneider, D. 2010. Infectious speciation revisited: 811 impact of symbiont-depletion on female fitness and mating behavior of 812 Drosophila paulistorum. PLoS Pathog. 6(12):e1001214.
- 813 Miller, W. J., and Schneider, D. 2012. Endosymbiotic microbes as adaptive
- 814 manipulators of arthropod behaviour and natural driving sources of host
- 815 speciation. Pp 119-139 in D. Hughes, J. Brodeur J. and F. Thomas, eds. Host 816 Manipulation by Parasites. Oxford: University Press, Oxford, UK.
- 817 Moriyama, M., Nikoh, N., Hosokawa, T., and Fukatsu, T. 2015. Riboflavin 818 provisioning underlies Wolbachia's fitness contribution to its insect host. mBio. 819 6(6):e01732-15.
- 820
- 821 Wolbachia density and impact on cytoplasmic incompatibility. Parasitology 822 132(Pt):49-56.

Mouton, L., Henri, H., Bouletreau, M., and Vavre, F. 2006. Effect of temperature on

- Najarro, M. A., Sumethasorn, M., Lamoureux, A., and Turner, T. L. 2015. Choosing 823
- 824 mates based on the diet of your ancestors: replication of non-genetic 825 assortative mating in Drosophila melanogaster. PeerJ. 3:e1173.
- 826 Newton, I. L., Sheehan, and K. B. 2014. Passage of Wolbachia pipientis through 827 mutant Drosophila melanogaster induces phenotypic and genomic changes. 828 Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 81:1032-1037.
- 829 Nikoh, N., Hosokawa, T., Moriyama, M., Oshima, K., Hattori, M., and Fukatsu, T.
- 830 2014. Evolutionary origin of insect-Wolbachia nutritional mutualism. Proc.
- 831 Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. 111:10257-10262.
- 832 Pannebakker, B. A., Loppin, B., Elemans, C. P., Humblot, L., and Vavre, F. 2007.
- 833 Parasitic inhibition of cell death facilitates symbiosis. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.
- 834 USA. 104:213-215.

- 835 Pfarr, K. M., Heider, U., Schmetz, C., Buttner, D. W., and Hoerauf, A. 2008. The
- 836 mitochondrial heat shock protein 60 (HSP 60) is up-regulated in *Onchocerca*837 *volvulus* after the depletion of *Wolbachia*. *Parasitology* 135:529-538.

838 Pontier, S. M., and Schweissguth, F. 2015. A *Wolbachia*-sensitive communication

- between male and female pupae controls gamete compatibility in *Drosophila*. *Curr. Biol.* 25:2339-2348.
- Pontier, S. M., and Schweissguth, F. 2017. Response to "Does pupal communication
 influence *Wolbachia*-mediated cytoplasmic incompatibility? *Curr. Biol.*
- 843 27(2):R55-R56.
- Richard, F.-J. 2017. Symbiotic bacteria influence the odor and mating preference of
 their hosts. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* doi:10.3389/fevo.2017.00143.

846 Reynolds, K. T., and Hoffmann, A. A. 2002. Male age, host effects and the weak

847 expression or non-expression of cytoplasmic incompatibility in *Drosophila*

strains infected by maternally transmitted *Wolbachia*. *Genet. Res.* 80:79-87.

Ringo, J., Sharon, G., and Segal, D. 2011. Bacteria-induced sexual isolation in
 Drosophila. Fly 5:310-315.

851 Savarit, F., Sureau, G., Cobb, M., and Ferveur, J. F. 1998. Genetic elimination of

- known pheromones reveals the fundamental chemical bases of mating and
 isolation in *Drosophila*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*. 96:9015-9020.
- Schneider, D. I., Riegler, M., Arthofer, W., Merçot, H., Stauffer, C., and Miller, W. J.

855 2013. Uncovering *Wolbachia* diversity upon artificial host transfer. *PLoS One*.
856 8(12):e82402.

- Schneider, D. I., Parker, A.G., Abd-Alla, A. M., Miller W. J. 2018 High-sensitivity
 detection of cryptic *Wolbachia* in the African tsetse fly (*Glossina spp.*). *BMC Microbiology in press.*
- 860 Sharon, G., Segal, D., Ringo, J. M., Hefetz, A., Zilber-Rosenberg, I., and Rosenberg,
- 861 E. 2010. Commensal bacteria play a role in mating preference of *Drosophila*862 *melanogaster. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*. 107:20051-20056.

863	Spieth, H. T., and Ringo, J. M. 1983. Mating behavior and sexual isolation in
864	Drosophila. Pp. 345-384, In: M. Ashburner, H. L. Carson, and J. N.
865	Thompson, eds. The genetics and biology of Drosophila. London, Academic
866	Press, London, UK.
867	Strübing, U., Lucius, R., Hoerauf, A., and Pfarr, K. M. 2010. Mitochondrial genes for
868	heme-dependent respiratory chain complexes are up-regulated after depletion
869	of Wolbachia from filarial nematodes. Int. J. Parasitol. 40:1193-1202.
870	Strunov, A., Schneider, D. I., Alberston, R., and Miller, W. J. 2017. Restricted
871	distribution and lateralization of mutualistic Wolbachia in the Drosophila brain.
872	Cell. Microbiol. 19(1). doi: 10.1111/cmi.12639.
873	Teixeira, L., Ferreira, Å., and Ashburner, M. (2008). The bacterial symbiont
874	Wolbachia induces resistance to RNA viral infections in Drosophila
875	melanogaster. PLoS Biology 6:2753–2763.
876	Telschow, A., Flor, M., Kobayashi, Y., Hammerstein, P., and Werren, J. H. 2007.
877	Wolbachia-induced unidirectional cytoplasmic incompatibility and speciation:
878	mainland-island model. PLoS One 2(8):e701.
879	Telschow, A., Hilgenboecker, K., Hammerstein, P., and Werren, J. H. 2014.
880	Dobzhansky-Muller and Wolbachia-induced incompatibilities in a diploid
881	genetic system. PLoS One 9(4):e95488.
882	Turelli, M., Lipkowitz, J. R., and Brandvain, Y. 2014. On the Coyne and Orr-igin of
883	species: effects of intrinsic postzygotic isolation, ecological differentiation, X
884	chromosome size, and sympatry on Drosophila speciation. Evolution 68:1176-
885	1187.
886	Ueyama, M., Chertemps, T., Labeur, C., and Wicker-Thomas, C. 2005. Mutations in
887	the desat1 gene reduces the production of courtship stimulatory pheromones
888	through a marked effect on fatty acids in Drosophila melanogaster. Insect.
889	Biochem. Mol. Biol. 35:911-920.

- 890 Weeks, A. R., Turelli, M., Harcombe, W. R., Reynolds, K. T., and Hoffmann, A. A.
- 891 2007. From parasite to mutualist: rapid evolution of *Wolbachia* in natural
 892 populations of *Drosophila*. *PLoS Biology* 5(5): e114.
- Werren, J. H., Baldo, L., and Clark, M. E. 2008. *Wolbachia*: master manipulators of
 invertebrate biology. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 6:741-751.
- Yamada, R., Floate, K., Riegler, M., and O'Neill, S. 2007. Male development time
- 896 influences the strength of *Wolbachia*-induced cytoplasmic incompatibility
 897 expression *in Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 177:801-808.
- Ye, Y. H., Seleznev, A., Flores, H. A., Woolfit, M., and McGraw, E. A. 2017. Gut
- 899 microbiota in *Drosophila melanogaster* interacts with *Wolbachia* but does not 900 contribute to *Wolbachia*-mediated antiviral protection. *J. Invertebr. Pathol.*
- 901 143:18-25.
- Zug, R., and Hammerstein, P. 2012. Still a host of hosts for *Wolbachia*: analysis of
 recent data suggests that 40% of terrestrial arthropod species are infected.
 PloS One 7(6), e38544.
- 905
- 906
- 907 Figure Legends

909 **Figure 1**

910 Impact of Wolbachia on mate choice in D. paulistorum. (A) Mate choice in D. 911 paulistorum: Wolbachia-knockdown females lose assortative mating behavior against 912 heterogamic wild type males. Left: wild type females (blue) infected with Wolbachia A 913 (wA) express strong assortative mating behavior (red block) against males of a 914 different semispecies (red) carrying a different, incompatible Wolbachia (wB). Right: 915 Wolbachia kd females (symbolized with red flash) with reduced titers of wA lose 916 assortative mating behavior (grey arrows) and hence mate randomly with males from 917 same (blue) but also from different/incompatible (red) semispecies. Female

918 knockdown phenotype: loss of assortative mating behavior. Data taken from (Miller et 919 al. 2010). (B) Mate choice in D. paulistorum: Wolbachia-knockdown males are rejected 920 by homogamic wildtype females. Left: wild type males are accepted randomly (grey 921 arrows) for mating by females of the same semispecies (all blue), carrying the 922 same/compatible Wolbachia (both wA). Right: Wolbachia kd males (indicated by red 923 flash) with reduced titers of wA are rejected as mate partners (red block) from wild type 924 females of the same semispecies. Thickness of arrows indicates strength of mate 925 choice between partners: thick black arrow = high mate preference, red block = 926 assortative mating, and grey medium arrow = lack of mate choice, i.e., random mating. 927 Abbreviations: kd knockdown.

928

929 **Figure 2**

930 Quantitative analysis of Wolbachia titers in wild type (wt) and knockdown (kd) D. 931 paulistorum males. Bars represent Wolbachia titers measured via quantitative real time 932 PCR on DNA from whole body extracts of A28 (A), and O11 (B) using Wolbachia 16S 933 rRNA normalized against Drosophila ribosomal protein 17 (RPS17). Each purple bar 934 represents the mean Wolbachia titer in wt males (mean from 8-10 biological replicates 935 is plotted). Orange bars represent titers in F₇/F₁₄ kd males (post treatment); individual 936 biological replicates are shown as black dots. In addition, for A28^{kd}, F₁₀ titers were 937 tested. Kd-titers are relative to wt ones (set to 1). Each sample was run in technical 938 duplicates. Error bars represent the standard deviation of the biological replicates. 939 Asterisks indicate significance of differences between titer levels. P values were 940 calculated using Fisher's exact test. Abbreviations: wt wild type, F7, F10, F14 fly 941 generations 7, 10 and 14.

942

943 **Figure 3**

Violin plots showing estimated sexual Isolation Index (eSII) in multiple choice assays
between *D. paulistorum* wild type (wt), *Wolbachia*-knockdown (kd), axenic (et), and

946 penicillin/streptomycin-treated (ps) flies. (A,B) Intra-semispecific mate choice assays 947 with pool lines. Wild type (wt) flies (control, in purple) or knockdown (kd) flies (in 948 orange) were assayed at generations F₄, F₅, F₁₃, against wt flies, for A28 and O11. 949 (C,D) Intra-semispecific mate choice assays with isofemale lines. wt vs. wt (purple), 950 and kd vs. kd (pink) mating choice assays were performed between different isofemale 951 lines, respectively at generation F_{10} and F_{8} . (E) Intra-semispecific assays between wt 952 and gut-flora-restored flies (gfr) performed at generation F₁₀ for A28 and O11. (F) Intra-953 semispecific assays between wt and ethanol-washed wt flies (et) performed at 954 generation F₂ for A28 and O11. (G) Intra-semispecific assays between wt and 955 penicillin/streptomycin-treated flies (ps), performed at generation F₃ for the A28 and 956 O11. The last assay (yellow) is an additional inter-semispecific assay between wt and 957 ps flies. For all assays, the model-estimated SII was used on either individual replicates 958 (dots), or considering the 5 replicates (horizontal bars). Asterisks denote assays for which the likelihood ratio test (LRT) is highly significant (p values $< 10^{-4}$), the null model 959 960 being random mating (SII = 0). All the p values are reported in table S2-S4).

961

962 **Figure 4**

963 Quantitative changes in D. paulistorum male-specific pheromone compounds upon 964 Wolbachia-knockdown. Violin plots show percentage of the four male-specific ester 965 compounds of the total pheromone profiles (27 compounds) of A28 (A) and O11 (B). 966 Individual replicates for wild type controls (wt) are shown in purple, and in orange for 967 F_7 knockdown males (kd). Horizontal bars correspond to the mean. Tables below violin 968 plots list corresponding percent change of compounds plus n-fold increase ([↑]) or 969 decrease (1) between wt and kd. Asterisks indicate statistical significance based on 970 two-tailed P values from Student's t tests. Abbreviations: DA 11-docosenyl-acetate, TA 971 19-triacontenyl-acetate, MD methyl-(Z)-tetradecanoate, DU di-unsaturated acetate 972 $C_{32}H_{60}O_2$.

974 **Figure 5**

975 Fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH) on Drosophila oenocytes. (A, A') Wolbachia are present in *D. paulistorum* O11^{wt} females, and (B, B') in O11^{wt} males. (C) Symbionts 976 are lacking from oenocytes of O11 F_4^{kd} males and from F_4^{kd} females (C'). (D) In F_{13} 977 978 post kd, oenocytes seem recolonized by Wolbachia. (E, E') Oenocytes from 979 Wolbachia-infected D. melanogaster Harwich strain (H2) tested also negative. (F) 980 Wolbachia-uninfected D. willistoni (Willi3) was used as negative control. Wolbachia are 981 shown in red (16-23S rRNA-specific probe); Drosophila nuclei are stained in blue 982 (DAPI). Grey dashed lines mark borders of oenocyte cells. Abbreviations: Wol 983 Wolbachia, kd knockdown. Scale bar is 10µm.





B Mate choice in *D. paulistorum*: *Wolbachia*-knockdown males are rejected by homogamic wild type females (this study)



В



Α





СНС	A28 ^{wt}	A28 ^{kd}	fold change
DA	10.06%	0.44%	22.7
TA	8.44%	0.41%	20.6 🗸
MD	20.87%	0.89%	23.4
DU	1.76%	0.19%	9.3 🖡

СНС	O11 ^{wt}	O11 ^{kd}	fold change
DA	14.65%	17.94%	1.2 🕇
TA	11.65%	13.54%	1.2 🕇
MD	97.22%	20.74%	4.7 ↓
DU	1.60%	2.41%	1.5 🕇



host generations

Figure S1. Generation of *D. paulistorum* knockdown (kd) lines. Wild type (wt) *D. paulistorum* individuals (A28^{wt}, O11^{wt}) were treated with 0.2% rifampicin during generations T_1 - T_3 to reduce native *Wolbachia* titers followed by restoration phases during generations F_1^{kd} - F_2^{kd} . F_2^{kd} was used to start isofemale lines or proceed in mass-mated pool lines. Assays were then performed between generations F_4^{kd} and F_{13}^{kd} . Asterisks mark generations, which were actually tested in diverse assays. Post antibiotic treatment, *Wolbachia* titers are assumed to be variable, *i.e.*, remain decreased, drop back to or maybe even exceed native titer levels (gray triangles). Abbreviations: T_1 - T_3 treatment generation 1-3, kd *Wolbachia*-knockdown.



Figure S2. Schematic presentation of setting up multiple-mating choice assays. (A) Each completed assay consists of 5 replicates, totalling 240 individual flies. Each replicate consists of 48 individuals, *i.e.*, 12 females and 12 males from A (wild type); 12 females and 12 males from B (*Wolbachia*-knockdown). (B) In each replicate, scored mating events can be either homogamic-like (between A only and B only) or heterogamic-like (mixed between A and B). Flies are differentiated by alternated wing clips; QQ, dd represents female and male virgin flies (Dobzhansky and Pavlovsky 1966; Leonard and Ehrman 1983).

Figure S3 : Effect of the remating rate (male) on the estimation of the SII.

Application to the data. In all, a fixed rate of 0.01 was used for female remating rate. Fisher's test have been used for uncorrected SII. Likelihood Ratio Test (LRT) have been used for estimated SII.



Assay	Cross	Table	Assay	Uncorrected SII	Estimated SII (remating=0.8)	Estimated SII (remating=0.5)	Estimated SII (remating=0.05)
1	AxO_control	S2	2	0.7	0.70 0.71		0.78
2	AxA_control	S2	3	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04
3	OxO_control	S2	4	-0.12	-0.13	-0.16	-0.24
4	ISOA28_wt_vs_wt_I	S2	5	-0.03	-0.01	0.02	0.12
5	ISOA28_wt_vs_wt_II	S2	6	0.07	0.08	0.11	0.16
6	ISOO11_wt_vs_wt_I	S2	7	0.13	0.11	0.07	-0.01
7	ISOO11_wt_vs_wt_II	S2	8	-0.1	-0.12	-0.15	-0.21
8	A28_wt_vs_kd_F4	S3	1	0.93	0.94	0.94	0.95
9	A28_wt_vs_kd_F5	S3	2	0.77	0.76	0.75	0.77
10	A28_wt_vs_kd_F13	S3	3	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.14
11	O11_wt_vs_kd_F4	S3	4	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.94
12	O11_wt_vs_kd_F5	S3	5	0.7	0.70	0.71	0.79
13	O11_wt_vs_kd_F13	S3	6	-0.1	-0.08	-0.05	0.03
14	ISOA28_kd_vs_kd_F8	S3	7	0.5	0.50	0.51	0.55
15	ISOO11_kd_vs_kd_F8	S3	8	0.48	0.47	0.46	0.46
16	A28_wt_vs_gfr_F10	S4	1	0.88	0.88	0.88	0.90
17	O11_wt_vs_gfr_F10	S4	2	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.96
18	A28wtxA28et_control	S4	3	0.13	0.15	0.18	0.26
19	O11wtxO11et_control	S4	4	-0.03	-0.03	-0.02	0.01
20	A28wtxA28ps_control	S4	5	-0.02	-0.02	-0.03	-0.05
21	O11wtxO11ps_control	S4	6	0.1	0.07	0.02	-0.10
22	A28wtxO11ps	S4	7	0.93	0.93	0.92	0.92

At high remating rate, the estimated SIIs (eSII) fit quite well the uncorrected SII (uSII), since the last matings are not as constrained as in case of no remating. With decreasing remating rate, the estimated SII remain quite similar to uncorrected ones for high level of homogamy. For low level of homogamy (close to random mating), more discrepancies are observed between eSII and uSII.



Figure S4. Male-specific long-chain ester compounds in the six *D. paulistorum* semispecies. Pie charts show presence of the same male specific compounds (Methyl-(z)-tetradeceonate, 11-Docosenyl-acetate, $C_{_{32}}H_{_{60}}O_{_{6}}$, and 19-Triacontenyl-acetate), but in differing proportions in all six semispecies (Chao et al. 2010; Kim et al. 2014). Ouantities are relative amounts in precent. Each semispecies is represented by a fly in a different color.



Figure S5. Discriminant analyses (DA) of CHC-profiles in *D. paulistorum* males upon symbiont knockdown based on six principal components derived from centered log-ratio transformed relative amounts of all 27 detected compounds. The plot of canonical discriminant functions shows that semispecies A28^{wt} and O11^{wt} are different in their CHC profiles and that the CHC profiles knockdown groups (A28^{kd}, O11^{kd}) differ from the corresponding wildtypes (A28^{wt}, O11^{wt}). Abbreviations: wt wild type, kd *Wolbachia*-knockdown. X-axis shows discriminant function, y-axis plots how data points are distributed in intervals of the discriminant function.

Abbreviation	Line name	Semispecies	Description
A28 ^{wt}	control line A28	Amazonian	wild type
O11 ^{wt}	control line O11	Orinocan	wild type
A28 ^{wt-i}	control line A28	Amazonian	wild type, isofemale line
O11 ^{wt-i}	control line O11	Orinocan	wild type, isofemale line
A28 ^{kd}	knockdown line A28	Amazonian	0.2% rifampicin for 3 gen plus restoration for 3 gen, pool line
O11 ^{kd}	knockdown line O11	Orinocan	0.2% rifampicin for 3 gen plus restoration for 3 gen, pool line
A28 ^{kd-i}	knockdown line A28	Amazonian	0.2% rifampicin for 3 gen plus restoration for 3 gen, isofemale line
O11 ^{kd-i}	knockdown line O11	Orinocan	0.2% rifampicin for 3 gen plus restoration for 3 gen, isofemale line
A28 ^{gfr}	gut flora restored line A28	Amazonian	0.2% rifampicin for 3 gen plus restoration for 3 gen, gut flora restoration, pool line
O11 ^{gfr}	gut flora restored line O11	Orinocan	0.2% rifampicin for 3 gen plus restoration for 3 gen, gut flora restoration, pool line
A28 ^{et}	axenic line A28	Amazonian	eggs washed with 70% ethanol before establishment of line
O11 ^{et}	axenic line O11	Orinocan	eggs washed with 70% ethanol before establishment of line
A28 ^{ps}	pen/strep line A28	Amazonian	0.01% penicillin/streptomycin for 1 gen
O11 ^{ps}	pen/strep line O11	Orinocan	0.01% penicillin/streptomycin for 1 gen

Table S1. Detailed information on experimental *Drosophila paulistorum* **lines.** Pool lines were maintained *via* sibling mating. Rifampicin and penicillin/streptomycin concentration is w/v final concentration in fly food. Abbreviations: gen generation(s), wt wildtype, kd *Wolbachia* knockdown, wt-i wildtype isofemale line, kd-i *Wolbachia* knockdown isofemale line, gfr gut flora restored, et axenic (ethanol-washed) flies, ps penicillin/streptomycin-treated flies.

Assay		Semispecies	Strain	Year	eSII (CI 95%)	LRT p value	uSII ± SE	Fisher's test p value
Wildtyp	Wildtype control assays (pool)							
1*	Ļ	Amazonian/Orinocan	A28 ^{wt} x O11 ^{wt}	1965	NA	NA	+0.61 ± 0.07	NA
2	inte	Amazonian/Orinocan	A28 ^{wt} x O11 ^{wt}	this study	+0.71 (0.58 – 0.82)	0	+0.70 ± 0.07	< 10 ⁻⁴
3	en en	Amazonian/Amazonian	A28 ^{wt} x A28 ^{wt}	this study	+0.03 (-0.15 - 0.21)	0.7337	+0.03 ± 0.09	0.8552
4	intra	Orinocan/Orinocan	O11 ^{wt} x O11 ^{wt}	this study	-0.16 (-0.33 – 0.02	0.0796	-0.12 ± 0.09	0.2716
Wildtyp	e control	assays (isofemale)		·				
5		Amazonian/Amazonian	A28 ^{wt-i4} x A28 ^{wt-i1}	this study	+0.02 (-0.14 – 0.18)	0.7661	-0.03 ± 0.09	0.8523
6	g	Amazonian/Amazonian	A28 ^{wt-i2} x A28 ^{wt-i5}	this study	+0.11 (-0.07 – 0.29)	0.2195	+0.07 ± 0.09	0.5839
7	int	Orinocan/Orinocan	011 ^{wt-i1} x 011 ^{wt-i8}	this study	+0.07 (-0.1 – 0.25)	0.4239	+0.13 ± 0.09	0.2001
8		Orinocan/Orinocan	011 ^{wt-i4} x 011 ^{wt-i8}	this study	-0.15 (-0.32 - 0.03)	0.1102	-0.10 ± 0.09	0.3590

Table S2. Control mate choice assays between (inter) and within (intra) wild type *D. paulistorum* semispecies. Estimated and uncorrected Sexual Isolation Index (eSII and uSII) in intra or interspecific control assays. The eSII has been estimated for a male remating rate of 0.5. Other estimated parameters are shown in Table S5. The uSIIs (and associated Fisher's tests) are indicated for comparison. The assay marked with an asterisk (1) was performed by L. Ehrman in a previous study (Kim et al. 2004). Inter-specific assays (Amazonian (A28) *vs.* Orinocan (O11; assays 1,2)) show high SIIs. Assays 3-4 correspond to mate choice assays performed between members of the same semispecies (intra-semispecific assays). As expected, no isolation is observed when testing A28 *vs.* A28 (assay 3) and O11 *vs.* O11 (assay 4). Assays 5-8 are intra-semispecific assays between independent isofemale lines of A28 (assays 5, 6) and O11 (assays 7, 8), which show no sexual isolation. Abbreviations: wt wildtype, wt-i wildtype isofemale line, CI confidence interval, LRT Likelihood Ratio Test, ±SE standard error of the mean. Fisher's tests are two-tailed tests. Raw data are available in the supplementary file Raw_Data.

Assay		Semispecies	Strain	Generation post treatment	eSII (CI 95%)	LRT <i>p</i> value	uSII ± SE	Fisher's test p value
knockdown assays (pool)								
1		Amazonian/Amazonian	A28 ^{kd} x A28 ^{wt}	4	+0.94 (0.87 - 0.98)	< 10 ⁻⁴	+0.93 ± 0.03	< 10 ⁻⁴
2		Amazonian/Amazonian	A28 ^{kd} x A28 ^{wt}	5	+0.75 (0.62 - 0.86)	< 10 ⁻⁴	+0.77 ± 0.06	< 10 ⁻⁴
3	a	Amazonian/Amazonian	A28 ^{kd} x A28 ^{wt}	13	+0.13 (-0.05 - 0.31)	0.1473	+0.13 ± 0.09	0.2008
4	int	Orinocan/Orinocan	O11 ^{kd} x O11 ^{wt}	4	+0.92 (0.83 - 0.97)	< 10 ⁻⁴	+0.92 ± 0.04	< 10 ⁻⁴
5		Orinocan/Orinocan	O11 ^{kd} x O11 ^{wt}	5	+0.71 (0.57 - 0.82)	< 10 ⁻⁴	+0.70 ± 0.07	< 10 ⁻⁴
6		Orinocan/Orinocan	O11 ^{kd} x O11 ^{wt}	13	-0.05 (-0.21 - 0.12)	0.6008	-0.10 ± 0.09	0.3571
knockdown assays (isofemale)								
7	ra	Amazonian/Amazonian	A28 ^{kd-i3} x A28 ^{kd-i4}	8	+0.51 (0.34 - 0.65)	< 10 ⁻⁴	+0.50 ± 0.08	0.0000
8	int	Orinocan/Orinocan	011 ^{kd-i1} x 011 ^{kd-i4}	8	+0.46 (0.28 - 0.61)	< 10 ⁻⁴	+0.48 ± 0.08	0.0000

Table S3. Induction of *de novo* assortative mating in *D. paulistorum* semispecies upon *Wolbachia* knockdown. Estimated and uncorrected Sexual Isolation Index (eSII and uSII) in intraspecific assays between wildtype and knockdown strains or between different isofemale knockdown strains. The eSII has been estimated for a male remating rate of 0.5. Other estimated parameters are shown in Table S6. Assays were performed with pool lines (1-6) and isofemale lines (7-8) from A28 and O11. Intra-semispecific pool assays in generations F_4 and F_5 show high SIIs, whereas in F_{13} , SIIs are significantly lower. Intra-semispecific assays between kd-i lines show moderate levels of sexual isolation. Abbreviations: wt wildtype, kd *Wolbachia* knockdown, kd-i *Wolbachia* knockdown isofemale line, CI confidence interval, LRT Likelihood Ratio Test, ±SE standard error of the mean. Fisher's tests are two-tailed tests (on SII). Raw data are available in the supplementary file Raw_Data.

Assay		Semispecies	Strain	Generation post treatment	eSII (CI 95%)	LRT <i>p</i> value	uSII ± SE	Fisher's test <i>p</i> value
Gut	flora-rest	ored assays (gfr)						
1	ra	Amazonian/Amazonian	A28 ^{gfr} x A28 ^{wt}	10	0.88 (0.78 - 0.95)	< 10 ⁻⁴	+0.88 ± 0.040	< 10 ⁻⁴
2	int	Orinocan/Orinocan	O11 ^{gfr} x O11 ^{wt}	10	0.92 (0.83 – 0.97)	< 10 ⁻⁴	+0.92 ± 0.040	< 10 ⁻⁴
Axenic (ethanol-washed) assays (et)								
3	ra	Amazonian/Amazonian	A28 ^{et} x A28 ^{wt}	2	0.18 (0 – 0.35)	0.0523	+0.13 ± 0.090	0.2008
4	int	Orinocan/Orinocan	O11 ^{et} x O11 ^{wt}	2	-0.02 (-0.18 - 0.15)	0.8262	-0.03 ± 0.090	0.8564
Penicillin/streptomycin-treated assays (ps)								
5	ra	Amazonian/Amazonian	A28 ^{ps} x A28 ^{wt}	1	-0.03 (-0.21 – 0.15)	0.7468	-0.02 ± 0.090	1.0000
6	int	Orinocan/Orinocan	O11 ^{ps} x O11 ^{wt}	1	0.02 (-0.15 – 0.18)	0.8272	+0.10 ± 0.090	0.3546
7	inter	Amazonian/ Orinocan	A28 ^{wt} x O11 ^{ps}	1	0.92 (0.83 - 0.98)	< 10 ⁻⁴	+0.93 ± 0.030	< 10 ⁻⁴

Table S4. Mate choice assays with gut flora restored (gfr), axenic (et), and penicillin/streptomycin-treated *D. paulistorum* semispecies. Estimated and uncorrected Sexual Isolation Index (eSII and uSII) in assays between wildtype and treated lines. The eSII has been estimated for a male remating rate of 0.5. Other estimated parameters are shown in Table S5. Intra-semispecific assays with gfr lines (assays 1-1: gfr x wt) show high SIIs (similar to assays with knockdown lines). Gfr lines came from direct treatment with faeces of naturally infected flies to consequently restore the gut flora.

	Cross	Table	Assay	eSII	p value (eSII)	рМ	p value (pM)	pF	<i>p</i> value (pF)
1	AxO_control	S2	2	0.71 (0.58 - 0.82)	0.0000	0.35 (0.17 - 0.57)	0.1773	0.65 (0.54 - 0.74)	0.0055
2	AxA_control	S2	3	0.03 (-0.15 - 0.21)	0.7337	0.46 (0.36 - 0.55)	0.3750	0.57 (0.47 - 0.67)	0.1660
3	OxO_control	S2	4	-0.16 (-0.33 - 0.02)	0.0796	0.60 (0.50 - 0.70)	0.0590	0.58 (0.47 - 0.68)	0.1573
4	ISOA28_wt_vs_wt_I	S2	5	0.02 (-0.14 - 0.18)	0.7661	0.69 (0.61 - 0.78)	0.0000	0.32 (0.23 - 0.41)	3e-04
5	ISOA28_wt_vs_wt_II	S2	6	0.11 (-0.07 - 0.29)	0.2195	0.48 (0.38 - 0.58)	0.6589	0.45 (0.35 - 0.55)	0.3392
6	ISOO11_wt_vs_wt_I	S2	7	0.07 (-0.1 - 0.25)	0.4239	0.59 (0.49 - 0.68)	0.0733	0.66 (0.56 - 0.75)	0.0013
7	ISOO11_wt_vs_wt_II	S2	8	-0.15 (-0.32 - 0.03)	0.1102	0.44 (0.33 - 0.54)	0.2533	0.40 (0.31 - 0.50)	0.0501
8	A28_wt_vs_kd_F4	S2	1	0.94 (0.87 - 0.98)	0.0000	0.00 (0 - 0)	0.0334	0.75 (0.66 - 0.82)	0.0000
9	A28_wt_vs_kd_F5	S3	2	0.75 (0.62 - 0.86)	0.0000	0.32 (0.14 - 0.57)	0.1492	0.45 (0.35 - 0.55)	0.2971
10	A28_wt_vs_kd_F13	S3	3	0.13 (-0.05 - 0.31)	0.1473	0.48 (0.38 - 0.58)	0.6915	0.50 (0.40 - 0.59)	0.9352
11	O11_wt_vs_kd_F4	S3	4	0.92 (0.83 - 0.97)	0.0000	0.78 (0.35 - 0.99)	0.1985	0.35 (0.25 - 0.45)	0.0034
12	O11_wt_vs_kd_F5	S3	5	0.71 (0.57 - 0.82)	0.0000	0.65 (0.44 - 0.83)	0.1609	0.57 (0.47 - 0.66)	0.1749
13	O11_wt_vs_kd_F13	S3	6	-0.05 (-0.21 - 0.12)	0.6008	0.35 (0.26 - 0.44)	0.0012	0.67 (0.57 - 0.75)	7e-04
14	ISOA28_kd_vs_kd_F8	S3	7	0.51 (0.34 - 0.65)	0.0000	0.48 (0.33 - 0.64)	0.8103	0.58 (0.49 - 0.67)	0.0970
15	ISOO11_kd_vs_kd_F8	S3	8	0.46 (0.28 - 0.61)	0.0000	0.60 (0.45 - 0.74)	0.1787	0.65 (0.55 - 0.74)	0.0041
16	A28_wt_vs_gfr_F10	S4	1	0.88 (0.78 - 0.95)	0.0000	0.29 (0.06 - 0.64)	0.2447	0.59 (0.50 - 0.68)	0.0599
17	O11_wt_vs_gfr_F10	S4	2	0.92 (0.83 - 0.97)	0.0000	0.56 (0.18 - 0.91)	0.7770	0.38 (0.28 - 0.48)	0.0157
18	A28wtxA28et_control	S4	3	0.18 (0 - 0.35)	0.0523	0.45 (0.34 - 0.56)	0.3547	0.74 (0.65 - 0.81)	0.0000
19	O11wtxO11et_control	S4	4	-0.02 (-0.18 - 0.15)	0.8262	0.66 (0.57 - 0.75)	5e-04	0.52 (0.42 - 0.63)	0.6406
20	A28wtxA28ps_control	S4	5	-0.03 (-0.21 - 0.15)	0.7468	0.53 (0.43 - 0.62)	0.5538	0.68 (0.59 - 0.77)	3e-04
21	O11wtxO11ps_control	S4	6	0.02 (-0.15 - 0.18)	0.8272	0.67 (0.58 - 0.75)	3e-04	0.73 (0.62 - 0.81)	0.0000
22	A28wtxO11ps	S4	7	0.92 (0.83 - 0.98)	0.0000	0.00 (0 - 0)	0.0098	0.51 (0.42 - 0.61)	0.7707

Table S5. Estimation of SII (Sexual Isolation Index), pM ('Male preference') and pF ('Female preference'). pM and pF reflect the bias in the mating order. No bias corresponds to a value of 0.5. The *p* values are computed from likelihood ratio test, the null hypothesis being random mating (for e SII) and no bias in the mating order (for pM and pF).

No	Compound name	Retention time (min)	Retention index	Specificity
1	11-Docosenyl-acetate (C ₂₄ H ₄₆ O ₂)	18.816	25.79	male-specific
2	19-Triacontenyl-acetate (C ₃₂ H ₆₂ O ₂)	28.670	33.86	male-specific
3	2-Methyl-triacontane (C ₃₁ H ₆₄)	24.465	30.63	male-specific
4	a di-unsaturated acetate (C ₃₂ H ₆₀ O ₂)	28.175	33.54	male-specific
5	Methyl-(Z)-9-tetradecanoate (C ₁₅ H ₂₈ O ₂)	6.5920	17.13	none
6	Ethyl-9-tetradecenoate (C ₁₆ H ₃₀ O ₂)	7.5420	17.80	none
7	MethylC28	22.228	28.62	none
8	MethylC29	23.349	29.61	none
9*	unknown compound	26.797	32.60	none
10	C31:1	24.619	30.78	none
11	C33:1A	26.577	32.43	none
12	C33:1B	26.683	32.51	none
13*	C33:2A+unknown	26.795	32.60	none
14	C33:2B	26.915	32.69	none
15	C33:2C	27.038	32.78	none
16	C33:2D	27.173	32.88	none
17	C33:2E	27.320	32.99	none
18	C35:1A	29.581	34.37	none
19	C35:1B	29.736	34.45	none
20	C35:2A	29.922	34.55	none
21	C35:2B	30.069	34.63	none
22	C35:2C	30.250	34.73	none
23	C35:2D	30.409	34.81	none
24	C35:2E	30.590	34.91	none
25	C37:2A	34.569	36.57	none
26	C37:2B	34.783	36.64	none
27	C37:2C	35.017	36.73	none

Table S6. Full list of compounds from GC/MS analysis of *D. paulistorum* **males.** Retention times determined *via* gas chromatography coupled to mass-spectrometry are given in minutes for each of the 27 compounds. Retention indices were calculated based on an external alkane standard. Asterisks mark two additional compounds that were not included in the previous studies by (Kim et al. 2004; Chao et al. 2010).