Chromosomal inversions drive chromosome arm specific patterns

of polymorphism in the major African malaria vector, *Anopheles*

funestus

Colince Kamdem[1]*, Caroline Fouet[1], Bradley J. White[1,2]*

[1]Department of Entomology, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521

[2]Center for Disease Vector Research, Institute for Integrative Genome Biology,

University of California, Riverside, CA 92521

*Corresponding authors: colincek@ucr.edu; bradley.white@ucr.edu

Abstract

Chromosomal inversions facilitate local adaptation of beneficial mutations and modulate genetic polymorphism, but the extent of their effects within the genome is not fully resolved. The genome of *Anopheles funestus*, a malaria mosquito endemic to sub-Saharan Africa, contains an impressive number of paracentric polymorphic inversions, which are unevenly distributed among chromosomes and provide an excellent framework for investigating the genomic impacts of chromosomal rearrangements. Here we present results of a fine-scale analysis of genetic variation within the genome of two *Anopheles funestus* ecotypes present in Cameroon. Specifically, we used F_{ST} outlier and population genomic analyses to highlight the strong relationship that exists between the presence of inversions and the genomic patterns of divergence and polymorphism in this mosquito. We found evidence that local adaptation in this geographic area is driven by divergent selection within three polymorphic chromosomal inversions, which segregate between savannah and forest ecosystems. Importantly, in contrast to the 2L chromosome arm, which is collinear, nucleotide diversity is significantly reduced along the entire length of three autosome arms bearing multiple overlapping chromosomal rearrangements. These findings support the idea that interactions between reduced recombination and selection within chromosomal rearrangements contribute to sculpt nucleotide polymorphism across entire chromosomes in *An. funestus*.

Key words: Chromosomal inversion, *Anopheles funestus*, genetic differentiation, nucleotide diversity, local adaptation.

Introduction

Although much progress has been made in analyzing genetic variation among populations, less is known about the complex interactions between the different driving forces — including mutation, selection, recombination, gene flow, demography or incomplete lineage sorting — that shape nucleotide polymorphism across genomes (Begun & Aquadro 1992; Betancourt & Presgraves 2002; Nordborg & Tavar 2002; Comeron *et al.* 2008; Cutter & Payseur 2013; Gosset & Bierne 2013; Huber *et al.* 2014; Cruickshank & Hahn 2014). Most genetic variability is neutral or nearly so (Kimura 1983), but patterns of polymorphism are also greatly influenced by several types of natural selection whose signatures are heterogeneous in nature and within the genome (Hill & Robertson 1966; Maynard Smith & Haigh 1974; Hudson & Kaplan 1988; Charlesworth *et al.* 1993; Gillespie 1997). One fundamental, unresolved question is how the adaptation of different gene pools to different fitness conditions imposed by spatially varying natural selection in heterogeneous environments (local adaptation) affects their genomic variation (Williams 1966; Kawecki & Dieter 2004; Savolainen *et al.* 2013).

Population genetics theory and empirical models suggest that genomic regions exhibiting high divergence among populations, skewed polymorphism or an

extended correlation among alleles from different loci (linkage disequilibrium) are

candidate regions that harbor genes underlying responses to spatially

heterogeneous selection pressures (Lewontin & Krakauer 1973; Schlötterer 2002;

Beaumont 2005; Nielsen 2005; Storz 2005; Nosil *et al.* 2009). Because migration,

gene flow and recombination among diverging populations can break down locally

adapted allelic combinations, genetic targets of local adaptation often coincide with

genomic regions of reduced recombination – including chromosomal inversions

(Noor *et al.* 2001; Rieseberg 2001; Ortiz-Barrientos *et al.* 2002; Butlin 2005;

Kirkpatrick & Barton 2006; Joron *et al.* 2011; Roesti *et al.* 2012, 2013; Yeaman 2013;

Nishikawa *et al.* 2015).

Structural rearrangements known as chromosomal inversions, which occur

when a piece of DNA within a single chromosome breaks and rotates 180° before

being reinserted in the reversed orientation (Sturtevant 1921), are widespread in

plants and animals (Dobzhansky 1970). A large body of literature supports a major

implication of paracentric inversions (which do not encompass the centromere) in

evolutionary adaptation in a wide variety of species (see Krimbas & Powell 1992;

Powell 1997; Hoffmann *et al.* 2004; Hoffmann & Rieseberg 2008; Kirkpatrick 2010

for a review). This includes many examples of polymorphic inversions whose

frequencies are correlated with environmental variables and temporal changes

consistent with strong natural selection in dipteran species (Dobzhansky 1943;

Mettler *et al.* 1977; Coluzzi *et al.* 1979; Knibb 1982; Krimbas & Powell 1992; De Jong

& Bochdanovits 2003; Schaeffer *et al.* 2003; Anderson *et al.* 2005; Schaeffer 2008).

Experimental evolution and phenotypic studies also show a remarkable association

between inversions and several fitness-related traits (Wright & Dobzhansky 1946;

Dobzhansky 1948; Rako *et al.* 2006; Hoffmann & Weeks 2007; Kennington *et al.*

2007; Lowry & Willis 2010; Lee *et al.* 2011; Fouet *et al.* 2012; Kapun *et al.* 2014,

2016b). More recently, in-depth examinations of DNA sequence polymorphisms

have clearly demonstrated the existence of footprints of positive selection within

inversions in several species, providing another compelling evidence for the crucial

role of chromosomal rearrangements in local adaptation (e.g. Stefansson *et al.* 2005;

Corbett-Detig & Hartl 2012; Pool *et al.* 2012; Cheng *et al.* 2012; Marsden *et al.* 2014;

O'Loughlin *et al.* 2014; Rane *et al.* 2015; Kapun *et al.* 2016a; Kamdem *et al.* 2017).

Another important property of inversions concerns the significant part they

play in genome evolution as a whole. Recombination is strongly reduced between

two paired chromosomes that differ by an inversion through several mechanisms,

which impede crossing over (reviewed in Roberts 1976). Local recombination rates

are expected to affect a myriad of processes including selection, gene conversion,

diversity and divergence (Begun & Aquadro 1992; Kliman & Hey 1993; Andolfatto *et*

al. 2001; Nordborg *et al.* 2005; Haddrill *et al.* 2007; Kulathinal *et al.* 2008; Comeron

et al. 2012; Nachman & Payseur 2012; Roesti *et al.* 2013, 2012; Campos *et al.* 2014).

Since the pioneering work of Begun and Aquadro (1992), which first demonstrated

a strong positive correlation between local rates of recombination and nucleotide

diversity within the genome of *Drosophila melanogaster*, multiple studies have

provided empirical evidence that reduced crossing over alters genetic variation

along chromosomes in a wide variety of organisms (Hellmann *et al.* 2003, 2005;

Tenaillon *et al.* 2004; Begun *et al.* 2007; Kulathinal *et al.* 2008, 2009; Pegueroles *et*

al. 2010; Corbett-Detig & Hartl 2012; McGaugh *et al.* 2012; Pool *et al.* 2012). As

coldspots of recombination, inversions thus have the potential to modulate patterns

of genetic variation in more or less extended regions of the genome. More

specifically, the presence of one or several rearrangements may impede crossing

over and reduce diversity along an entire chromosome or chromosome arm, forcing

it to evolve differently from the rest of the genome. This scenario is best illustrated

by the nonrecombining part of the Y chromosome in mammals, which is maintained

by multiple inversions that have suppressed recombination over the entire length of

the chromosome (Lahn & Page 1999). The potential of inversions to reduce

recombination and diversity across large regions of the genome has long been

exploited, especially by *Drosophila* geneticists, to engineer "balancer chromosomes"

(Muller 1918; Sturtevant 1921; Hentges & Justice 2004). This consists in

chromosomes or chromosomal arms bearing multiple inversions that block

recombination, thus providing the possibility to maintain mutations in a

heterozygous state. Despite these clear examples, our understanding of how

inversions affect polymorphism over the entire length of a chromosome remains

limited in part due to a lack of empirical support across taxa. Targeted studies based

on fine-scale examinations of genomic variation in species with well-characterized

patterns of naturally occurring inversions are particularly important for assessing

both the genomic extent and the ubiquity of diversity reduction driven by

chromosomal rearrangements.

An excellent opportunity to evaluate the role of inversions in genome

evolution exists in *An. funestus*, the second most important vector of *Plasmodium*

parasites in the Afrotropical region, just behind the best known species, *An. gambiae*

(Gillies & De Meillon 1968; Gillies & Coetzee 1987; Sinka *et al.* 2010; Coetzee &

Koekemoer 2013). The two taxa share several characteristics, which reflect their

increased capacity to track their hosts and to vector malaria parasites, including a

near continental distribution, a marked preference for human hosts and

intradomicillary host-seeking and resting behavior. The widespread distribution of

An. funestus is largely due to ongoing adaptive divergence enabling its populations

to exploit a significant range of environmental conditions. This mosquito represents

at least two relatively differentiated ecotypes whose ecology, phenotypic

divergence, distribution range and role in malaria transmission remain obscure

(Green & Hunt 1980; Costantini *et al.* 1999; Dia *et al.* 2000; Kamau *et al.* 2002;

Boccolini *et al.* 2005; Cohuet *et al.* 2005; Michel *et al.* 2005; Ayala *et al.* 2011; Barnes

et al. 2017). Cytogenetic studies have identified an impressive number of

paracentric polymorphic chromosomal inversions in polytene chromosomes of *An.*

funestus (Green & Hunt 1980; Sharakhov *et al.* 2004). The existence of stable

inversion clines spanning large geographic areas as well as the significant deficit of

heterokaryotypes in different parts of the continent clearly indicate the adaptive

role of some of these rearrangements (Costantini *et al.* 1999; Dia *et al.* 2000; Kamau

et al. 2002; Boccolini *et al.* 2005; Ayala *et al.* 2011). Importantly, the non-uniform

distribution of chromosomal inversions within the genome of *An. funestus* provides

an ideal framework for cross-chromosomal comparison. Indeed, all the autosomal

arms are characterized by the presence of numerous large rearrangements except

2L, which is perfectly collinear (Sharakhov *et al.* 2004).

In this study, we have used Restriction site Associated DNA Sequencing

(RAD-Seq) (Baird *et al.* 2008) to examine the effects of inversions on the genetic

architecture of selection and diversity across the genome of *An. funestus* ecotypes

present in Cameroon. We detected signatures of spatially varying selection affecting

large structural variants on chromosomes 2R and 3R. Ecotypic differentiation in this

geographic area is driven primarily by genetic divergence within the 3R*a*, 3R*b* and

2R*h* rearrangements. Strikingly, genome scans reveal that, in contrast to the

collinear 2L arm, the amount of polymorphic sites is drastically reduced along the

entire length of three autosomal arms bearing multiple polymorphic inversions.

These findings suggest that the combined effects of suppressed recombination and

selection within paracentric polymorphic inversions drive diversity reduction at the

chromosomal level in *An. funestus*.

Materials and methods

Mosquito samples

Two ecotypes of *An. funestus* are present in Cameroon: one in the northern

savannah area and the other across the southern rainforest biome (Cohuet *et al.*

2005; Ayala *et al.* 2011). We sequenced 132 mosquitoes collected from two

locations representative of these two ecogeographic domains and separated by

~500km (Fig. 1A and Table S1). In Mfou, a small city of the southern forest region,

An. funestus breeds in an artificial lake and maintains abundant populations

throughout the year. In Tibati, which lies within the forest-savannah transition zone,

several artificial lakes also provide abundant breeding sites for dense and perenial

populations of *An. funestus*. From August to November 2013, we used several

sampling methods (Service 1993) to collect *An. funestus* mosquitoes at distinct

stages of their life cycle, from different microhabitats and from different time points

during the nocturnal biting cycle (Fig. 1A and Table S1). This approach aimed at

maximizing the chances that our sample represents a good approximation of the

genetic diversity within populations of *An. funestus*. This species is a member of a

large taxonomic group comprising at least seven related taxa that are

distinguishable by slight morphological variations and a diagnostic PCR, which

targets mutations of the ribosomal DNA (Gillies & De Meillon 1968; Gillies & Coetzee

1987; Cohuet *et al.* 2003). All samples included in this study were identified as *An.*

funestus.

Library preparation, sequencing and SNP identification

We extracted genomic DNA of larvae and adult specimens with the DNeasy

Blood and Tissue kit (Qiagen) and the Zymo Research MinPrep kit, respectively.

Double-digest Restriction-site Associated DNA (ddRAD) libraries were prepared as

described in Kamdem *et al.* (2017) following a modified protocol of Peterson *et al.*

(2012) and single-end sequenced to 100 base reads on Illumina HiSeq2000.

Illumina sequences were sorted according to barcode tag and filtered using

the *process_radtags* program of the Stacks v 1.35 software (Catchen *et al.* 2013).

Reads with ambiguous barcode, inappropriate restriction site or low sequencing

quality score were removed. We checked the depth of sequencing coverage of the

final data set after all filtering steps using VCFtools (Danecek *et al.* 2011). To call and

genotype SNPs, we aligned the remaining high-quality reads to the *An. funestus*

reference sequence with GSNAP (Wu & Nacu 2010) and used Stacks to identify SNPs

within each RAD locus. Following assembly and genotyping, the polymorphism data

was further filtered to maximize data quality. We retained only one randomly

selected SNP per RAD locus scored in every population and in at least 60% of

individuals within population for further analyses. SNP files in different formats

used for downstream analyses were created with the *populations* program in Stacks,

PLINK v 1.09 and PGDSpider v 2.0.8.2 (Purcell *et al.* 2007; Lischer & Excoffier 2012;

Catchen *et al.* 2013).

Population structure and genetic divergence

We examined the genetic relatedness among individuals with a Principal

Component Analysis (PCA), a neighbor-joining (NJ) tree and the STUCTURE v 2.3.4

software using SNPs identified in Stacks (Pritchard *et al.* 2000). We utilized the R

package *adegenet* to implement the PCA and *ape* to construct individual-based NJ

networks using allele frequencies of SNPs and the Euclidian distance (Paradis *et al.*

2004; Jombart 2008; R Development Core Team 2016). In STRUCTURE, we ran five

replicates of 1 to 10 assumed clusters (k). Each run consisted of 200000 iterations,

and the first 50000 iterations were discarded as burn-in. CLUMPP v1.1.2 (Jakobsson

& Rosenberg 2007) was used to aggregate results across multiple STRUCTURE runs

and the clustering results were visualized graphically using DISTRUCT v1.1

(Rosenberg 2004). To find the number of genetically distinct clusters, we used both

the Discriminant Analysis of Principal Component (DAPC) implemented in *adegenet*

and the ad hoc statistic DeltaK of Evanno *et al.* (2005) (Evanno *et al.* 2005; Earl &

VonHoldt 2012).

To assess the level of genetic differentiation between ecotypes, we estimated

the overall F_{ST} (Weir & Cockerham 1984) in Genodive v1.06 (Meirmans & Van

Tienderen 2004) using a subset of 2000 randomly selected SNPs. Additionally, to

quantify the contribution of regional and micro-spatial distributions of samples on

the genetic variance, we conducted a hierarchical analysis of molecular variance

(AMOVA) (Excoffier *et al.* 1992) in GenoDive. We used 10000 permutations to

assess the statistical significance of F_{ST} and AMOVA.

Genomic targets of selection

The current *An. funestus* draft genome assembly consists of 12243 scaffolds

ranging from 2334 to 3334433bp in length (Giraldo-Calderon *et al.* 2015).

Therefore, to perform genome scans and to identify footprints of selection

throughout the genome, we ordered and concatenated 104 long scaffolds that had

been physically mapped to chromosomes (Neafsey *et al.* 2015) to create "pseudo-

chromosomes" corresponding to the five *An. funestus* chromosome arms. Mapped

scaffolds accounted for 33% in length of the approximate size of the *An. funestus*

genome (Fig. S1 and Table S2).

To detect signatures of selection within the genome of *An. funestus*, we

examined the distribution of genetic diversity, allele frequency spectrum and

genetic differentiation on RAD loci located on mapped scaffolds. We calculated

pairwise nucleotide diversity (θ_{π}), Watterson's estimator of segregating sites (θw)

and Tajima's *D* in ANGSD v 0.612 (Korneliussen *et al.* 2014) using aligned reads in

BAM format as input files (Li *et al.* 2009). ANGSD derives diversity and allele

frequency spectrum statistics using genotype likelihoods without SNP calling,

thereby alleviating the uncertainty and biases associated with SNP calling in low

coverage Next Generation Sequencing (Korneliussen *et al.* 2013). To gain genome-

wide view and identify genomic regions of exceptional diversity and/or skewed

allele frequency spectra, average values of θ_π, θw and Tajima's *D* were plotted in

non-overlapping 90-kb windows along pseudo-chromosomes.

To identify highly differentiated genomic regions that are candidate regions

under divergent selection among ecotypes, locus-specific F_{ST} values were estimated

with the *populations* program in *Stacks.* The distribution of pairwise genetic

differentiation throughout the genome was visualized using SNPs located on

mapped scaffolds. SNPs with F_{ST} values above the top 1% of the empirical

distribution were considered as outliers of genetic differentiation. Loci with

unusually low or high F_{ST} values relative to neutral expectations were also detected

using the coalescence-based method FDIST2 (Beaumont & Nichols 1996) as

implemented in LOSITAN (Antao *et al.* 2008). The mean neutral F_{ST} across all SNPs

was approximated by choosing the "neutral mean F_{ST} option" with 99% confidence

interval in LOSITAN. We ran LOSITAN with 100000 simulations and assumed a false

discovery rate of 0.1 to minimize the number of false positives. F_{ST} values are

dependent on within-population genetic diversity, which may bias estimates of the

level of divergence among populations (Noor & Bennett 2009; Cruickshank & Hahn

2014). We used two additional statistics to further assess the degree of genetic

divergence across the genome — the absolute sequence divergence (d_{xy}) and the

proportion of fixed differences between populations (d_f). Both statistics were

estimated in ngsTools using genotype likelihood without SNP calling (Fumagalli *et*

al. 2014), and kernel smoothed values were visualized in non-overlapping 90-kb

windows along pseudo-chromosomes in R.

Demographic history of *An. funestus*

Estimates of genetic diversity within mosquito populations can be used as a proxy

for their adaptive potential and their resilience against vector control measures. To

this end, we used the diffusion approximation method implemented in the software

package ∂a∂i v 1.6.3 (Gutenkunst *et al.* 2009) to model the genetic variation and

infer the demographic history of *An. funestus*. Using 9412 filtered SNPs, we fitted

one-population models describing simple demographic scenarios without migration

or recombination events to the folded allele frequency spectrum of our samples. The

best model was selected using the highest composite log-likelihood, the lowest

Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and the lowest uncorrelated residuals. We used

the built-in bootstrap function implemented in ∂a∂i to derive 95% bootstrap

confidence intervals for the different demographic parameters.

Results

Genetic differentiation among *An. funestus* ecotypes

Using alignments to the *An. funestus* draft reference genome, we assembled

490871 unique RAD loci. We identified 10687 high-quality biallelic markers across

loci that were present in all populations and in at least 60% of individuals within

every population while randomly selecting one SNP per locus. A NJ tree and the first

three PCA axes based on these variants clearly distinguished two genetic clusters

corresponding presumably to the two ecotypes previously described in Cameroon

and across the continent with a diversity of genetic markers (Costantini *et al.* 1999;

Dia *et al.* 2000; Kamau *et al.* 2002; Boccolini *et al.* 2005; Cohuet *et al.* 2005; Michel *et*

al. 2005; Ayala *et al.* 2011; Barnes *et al.* 2017) (Fig. 1B and 1C). Both the method of

Evanno *et al.* (2005) and DAPC confirmed the existence of only two to three distinct

gene pools reflecting the ecological divergence known between forest and savannah

populations in Cameroon (Fig. 1D and 1E). However, despite this clear geographic

segregation, the overall genetic differentiation is low between the two putative

subgroups (F_{ST} = 0.033, p < 0.005). In support of weak genetic divergence,

STRUCTURE analyses reveal a single admixed population rather than two distinct

genetic clusters at k = 2 (Fig. 1F). The moderate genetic differentiation is also

illustrated by the results of an AMOVA, which show that the most significant

proportion of the genetic variance (98.2%, p < 0.005) among our samples is

explained by within-individual variations. The geographic origin accounts for less

than 2% of the genetic variance, confirming that extensive gene flow among

populations likely overwhelms ongoing local adaptation.

Strong divergent selection within chromosomal inversions

First, we observed a non-random distribution of highly differentiated loci

across 10687 SNPs, characterized by an aggregation of the highest F_{ST} values in

genomic regions bearing known polymorphic chromosomal inversions (Fig. 2 and

Fig. S1). We identified a total of 107 outliers that fell above the 99th percentile of the

empirical distribution of F_{ST} throughout the genome. Among these outliers, 31 SNP

loci were successfully mapped to concatenated scaffolds and were confirmed as

statistical outliers in LOSITAN. Importantly, highly differentiated loci were located

exclusively on two chromosomes (3R and 2R), which both harbor at least 20

polymorphic inversions (Fig. 2 and Fig. S1) (Sharakhov *et al.* 2004). Precisely, in

contrast to chromosomes 2L, 3L and X, which have no discriminatory power, SNPs

of 3R and to a lesser extent 2R reproduce the segregation observed between

ecotypes at the genome level consistent with the hypothesis that genomic regions

that have the greatest impact on local adaptation are located on these two

chromosome arms (Fig. 3). The number of SNPs with F_{ST} values above the 1%

threshold also varies between the 2R and 3R (9 against 22) implying that mutations

or structural variants of the 3R arm are more strongly correlated with genetic

differentiation in this geographic region.

We looked further into the role of inversions located respectively on 2R and

3R in adaptive divergence by examining the population structure separately for four

large chromosomal rearrangements present on these two chromosomes. Figure 3

shows the genetic relatedness among samples inferred from SNPs located on

scaffolds that mapped to the three inversions present on 3R (3R*a*, 3R*b* and 3R*d*) and

the 2R*h* that occurs on 2R. Although several inversions coexist and overlap

extensively along 2R, six out of nine F_{ST} outliers identified on this chromosome

mapped to scaffolds specific to portions of the 2R*h* inversion, making it an

interesting candidate locus under divergent selection. SNPs located within the 3R*a*

inversion assign more that 90% of individuals to their respective ecotypes, and the

3R*b* also separates a significant proportion of individuals between both sampling

sites (Fig. 3). These results corroborate the genomic pattern of differentiation,

which indicates that 83% of F_{ST} outliers map within these two inversions (Fig. 2). In

addition, consistent with the F_{ST} values, the genome-wide distribution of d_{xy} and

fixed differences shows clear peaks within these two large inversions, which

provides further support for their significant contribution to ecological divergence

(Fig. 4). The population structure of 2R*h* is comparable with that of 3R*b*, indicating

that this inversion also contributes to the savannah-forest segregation of

mosquitoes. Conversely, SNPs located outside the 3R*a* and 3R*b*, or within the 3R*d*

have no discriminatory power (Fig. 3). In summary, the population structure of

inversions located on 2R and 3R largely reflects the genomic distribution of

differentiated loci, which suggests that signatures of divergent selection between *An.*

funestus ecotypes in Cameroon are particularly strong within two polymorphic

inversions (3R*a* and 3R*b*) and to a lesser extent the 2R*h* rearrangement. This strong

divergent selection translates into F_{ST} values, which increase dramatically, from

0.033 at the genome level to 0.053, 0.08 and 0.22 within the 2R*h,* 3R*b* and 3R*a*

inversions, respectively. Similarly, the proportion of the genetic variance explained

by the geographic origin of samples rises from 1.8% for the genome-wide SNPs to

3.2%, 4.7% and 12.9% when only variants present within the 2R*h*, 3R*b* and 3R*a*

rearrangements, respectively, are included.

Chromosome arm-specific diversity associated with inversions

We further explored patterns of polymorphism across the genome using

genome scans based on estimates of nucleotide diversity ($\theta\pi$ and θw) (Fig. 5).

Surprisingly, nucleotide diversity is not particularly depressed within the 3R*a*, 3R*b*

or 2R*h* inversions relative to the rest of the genome as expected due to the strong

divergent selection observed across these loci. Instead, we noted that the amount of

polymorphic sites (θw) varies substantially between chromosome arms (Fig. 5 and

Fig. 6). The highest values of θw are found on the single chromosome arm that

harbours no known inversion (2L). In addition, the average value of θw differs

significantly between 2L and each of the three other autosomes (Wilcoxon rank sum

test, $p < 0.001$) (Fig. 6). More precisely, θw is reduced by 34.1% on 3R, 24.0% on 2R

and 13.2% on 3L relative to the 2L arm, regardless of the sampling location. The

amount of polymorphic sites is also significantly different along each of the five

chromosome arms (Wilcoxon rank sum test, $p < 0.001$) consistent with a different

demographic history between the two ecotypes. Forest populations from Mfou are

fixed for the major polymorphic chromosomal inversions (notably 3R*a* and 3R*b*)

whose frequencies fluctuate in Tibati (savannah) (Cohuet *et al.* 2005; Ayala *et al.*

2011). This may at least in part contribute to the stronger reduction of nucleotide

diversity on inverted autosomes observed in Mfou. The drop of the average θw on

inverted autosomes relative to 2L is 34.7% on 3R, 29.2% on 2R and 13.2% on 3L in

Mfou compared with 33.5% on 3R, 18.8% on 2R and 13.2% on 3L in Tibati (Fig. 5

and Table 1). The X chromosome harbours no known chromosomal rearrangement,

but presumably because of its particular divergence and its distorted effective

population size, the average θw diversity is also weak compared with 2L (21.1%

reduction relative to 2L) regardless of the sampling site. A significant reduction in

pairwise nucleotide diversity (θ_π) relative to the 2L is also detected on

chromosomes 3R, X and 2R to a lesser extent (Fig. 5, Fig. 6 and Table 1). However,

the specificity of the collinear chromosome arm compared with the rest of the

genome is less evident, and at the exception of 2R, there is no statistically significant

difference in the distribution of θ π at the level of chromosomes between ecotypes.

Local recombination rates are known to be strongly correlated with genetic

diversity and the effective population size (Begun & Aquadro 1992). Therefore, it is

possible and parsimonious that the chromosome-bias polymorphism observed

among autosomes in *An. funestus* is due to the presence of multiple overlapping

inversions that are under selection in different geographic contexts throughout the

species' range. These inversions block meiotic crossover and depress genetic

variation along the 2R, 3R and 3L autosomes, which contain multiple

rearrangements. On the 3R arm for instance, three inversions (3R*a*, 3R*b* and 3R*d*)

account for at least 75% of the length of this chromosomal arm (Fig. S1). Similarly,

at least 80% of the length of 2R and 3L are affected by chromosomal

rearrangements, likely leading to minimal crossover rates over the entire

chromosome arm. The hypothesis that the combined effects of suppressed

recombination and selection within multiple inversions drive polymorphism

reduction throughout the three autosomal arms is clearly supported by the diversity

pattern exhibited by the collinear chromosome arm 2L, which acts as a negative

control. Conceivably, polymorphism is highest on this chromosome arm due to the

absence of inversions, which preserves substantial levels of recombination.

Demographic history

The overall diversity falls in the range described in other highly polymorphic

Anopheles populations with RADseq markers (θw = 0.0083 and θ π = 0.0042 in

Mfou; θw = 0.0097 and θ π = 0.0043 in Tibati) (O'Loughlin *et al.* 2014; Fouet *et al.*

2017; Kamdem *et al.* 2017). To infer the demographic history of our populations, we

first examined the genome-wide distribution of Allele Frequency Spectra (AFS),

summarized as Tajima's *D* (Tajima 1989). The range of values of Tajima's *D* (from -

2.47 to -1.58 among Tibati samples and from -2.20 to -1.19 in Mfou) was shifted

towards negative values suggestive of recent population expansion leading to an

accumulation of low-frequency variants (Fig. 5) (Donnelly *et al.* 2001).

Unsurprisingly, Tajima's *D* is more negative on the collinear 2L chromosome, which

exhibits the greatest difference between the amount of polymorphic sites and the

pairwise nucleotide diversity in both ecotypes. We next modeled the AFS to infer the

demographic history of populations in ∂a∂i. We used 9412 genome-wide SNPs while

excluding variants located on the X chromosome to prevent the confounding effects

due to the smaller population effective size of this chromosome. Also, to avoid

strong disparities in sample sizes that may affect our results, we selected 35

individuals from each sampling site, prioritizing, whenever possible, individuals

with high sequencing depths. As suggested by the genome-wide distribution of

Tajima's *D*, the autosomal polymorphism in both Tibati and Mfou samples reflects

population expansion models. Precisely, the best-fit model shows exponential

growth in Tibati and two-epoch growth in Mfou (Table S3). Consistent with the

greater genome-wide diversity observed in savannah populations, model

parameters also reveal more substantial population growth in Tibati (Table S3).

Discussion

Recombination, inversions and genetic divergence

Our analysis based on 10687 genome-wide SNPs confirms the weak genetic

differentiation previously described between *An. funestus* ecotypes that are adapted

respectively to moist habitats typical of the southern forest region and to more xeric

areas in the North of Cameroon (Cohuet *et al.* 2005; Ayala *et al.* 2011). As also

suggested by previous studies from different parts of the continent, divergence

between ecotypes is limited to a few loci bearing structural rearrangements, which

segregate along latitudinal clines in certain countries (Green & Hunt 1980;

Costantini *et al.* 1999; Dia *et al.* 2000; Cohuet *et al.* 2005; Ayala *et al.* 2011). Our

conclusions come with caveats due to the potential limitations of the sampling

scheme, the reference genome and the RAD sequencing approach we used. For

instance, it is likely that some genomic signatures of selection remain undetected

because of the limited genomic coverage of RAD tags and pseudo-chromosomes

(Arnold *et al.* 2013; Tiffin & Ross-Ibarra 2014). Bearing in mind these caveats, the

clustering of genetic differentiation within the 3R*a*, 3R*b* and 2R*h* inversions appears

to be consistent with the fact that these rearrangements are the major genetic

targets of local adaptation in Cameroon. The 3R*a* and 3R*b* inversions in particular

have long been suspected to be the most important drivers of divergent selection

due to the clinal distribution of alternative karyotypes and the significant deficit in

heterokaryotypes observed in several countries (Costantini *et al.* 1999; Dia *et al.*

2000; Ayala *et al.* 2011).

The phenotypic, behavioral or ecological variations associated with

inversions under divergent selection remain unclear. In principle, the segregation

between the arid zone and the humid forest may potentially involve fitness traits

and phenotypes contributing to thermal tolerance. Indeed, examples of inversions

whose alternative karyotypes provide selective advantages in different moisture

conditions are well known in dipteran species (e.g. the 2L*a* inversion and to a lesser

extent the 2R*b* in *An. gambiae*) (Coluzzi *et al.* 1979; Gray *et al.* 2009; Lee *et al.* 2009;

Fouet *et al.* 2012; Cheng *et al.* 2012). Coincidentally, comparative cytogenetic

studies also showed a high proportion of conserved genes between the 3R*b* in *An.*

funestus and the 2L*a* in *An. gambiae* and between the 2R*h* in *An. funestus* and the

2R*b* in *An. gambiae* (Sharakhova *et al.* 2011). Although this hypothesis awaits

thorough investigation, the two pairs of inversions may have evolved similar

phenotypic patterns through shared ancestry or convergent evolution between *An.*

funestus and *An. gambiae*.

Theoretical models and empirical data support the idea that, at early stages

of divergence as in the case of *An. funestus* ecotypes, genetic differentiation is

restricted to a few genomic regions because the effects of natural selection at this

step are very localized (Feder *et al.* 2012; Nosil & Feder 2012; Andrew & Rieseberg

2013; Seehausen *et al.* 2014). Also, selection at a locus affects the level of genetic

differentiation among populations and reciprocally the degree of subdivision within

a population impacts patterns of variation at selected loci (Lewontin & Krakauer

1973; Charlesworth *et al.* 1997; Slatkin & Wiehe 1998; Majewski & Cohan 1999; Kim

& Maruki 2011; Schneider & Kim 2013). In fact, it has been proposed that selection

modulates levels of divergence locally and globally across the genome through two

types of genetic hitchhiking — divergence hitchhiking and genomic hitchhiking

(Feder *et al.* 2012). Divergent hitchhiking (the spread of a mutation and linked

neutral sequences within a population) (Maynard Smith & Haigh 1974) causes the

diffusion of favorable alleles at loci important for local adaptation and ecological

differentiation. Limited gene flow that occurs between divergent lineages can

naturally give rise to genomic hitchhiking, which reflects the global accumulation of

differences at the genome level through different selective or demographic

mechanisms (Feder *et al.* 2012). In *An. funestus*, it is plausible that divergent

hitchhiking within the three important inversions, 3R*a*, 3R*b* and 2R*h*, is so far

strongly counterbalanced by extensive gene flow and the weak overall number of

selected loci across the genome, leading to minimal genomic divergence among

ecotypes.

Although some controversy persists (see McGaugh *et al.* 2012), the idea that

strongly differentiated genomic regions between species or between populations

within the same species accumulate disproportionately in regions of low genetic

recombination including chromosome centers and chromosomal rearrangements

has been strongly supported in many species notably humans, *Drosophila* flies,

stickleback fish and maize (Hellmann *et al.* 2003, 2005; Tenaillon *et al.* 2004;

Kulathinal *et al.* 2008; Cai *et al.* 2009; Keinan & Reich 2010; Nachman & Payseur

2012; McGaugh & Noor 2012; Roesti *et al.* 2012, 2013). This coincidence can be

explained by a mechanical effect of recombination, which reduces genetic

polymorphism within populations and thereby generates sequence divergence

between populations as a byproduct of diversity reduction (Begun & Aquadro 1992;

Roesti *et al.* 2012). Concordance between limited rate of crossing over and increased

divergence may also be directly correlated with more pronounced effects of

divergent selection in genomic regions in which recombination is less frequent

(Charlesworth *et al.* 1997; Charlesworth 1998; Nachman 2002; Cutter & Payseur

2013; Cruickshank & Hahn 2014). Within inversions in particular, reduced

recombination enhances divergent selection acting on locally adapted gene

complexes, which co-segregate with or without epistatic interactions (Dobzhansky

1950; Kirkpatrick & Barton 2006).

Recombination, inversions and genetic polymorphism

We have observed chromosome arm specific patterns of polymorphism in *An.*

funestus characterized by a significant difference between collinear and inverted

chromosomes. We first conducted several tests to insure that uncertainties

associated with our sequencing and analytical approach cannot account for the

observed disparities in genetic polymorphism between chromosomes. We

compared the distribution and the length of mapped scaffolds and confirmed that

each chromosome arm is represented by a substantial number of long scaffolds

(Table S2 and Fig. S1). The length of pseudo-chromosomes is also proportional to

the length of chromosome arms, ranging from 6.8 Mb on X (the smallest) to 27.4 Mb

on 2R (the largest). Therefore, we can reasonably rule out the possibility that the

chromosome-bias diversity is due to a systematic error associated with our

reference sequence. Additionally, mapped scaffolds are evenly distributed along the

length of chromosomes, suggesting that such important variations in the amount of

polymorphism between chromosome arms are not due to centromere- and/or

telomere-proximal effects (Fig. S1) (Aguade *et al.* 1989; Stephan & Langley 1989).

Finally, we noted that the mean depth of sequencing coverage per mapped scaffolds

was consistent across the five chromosome arms (Fig. S2), implying that

chromosome-specific diversity is not simply a covariate of sequencing biases.

As estimates of the number of segregating sites (θw) also known as the

population-scaled mutation rate (Watterson 1975) are the most drastically affected

by between-chromosome variations observed in *An. funestus*, the stark contrast in

the amount of polymorphism among inverted and collinear autosomes may in

theory be due to lower mutation rates on inverted chromosomes. However, as

shown in other insect species, such a variability in mutation rates between

chromosomes or between large segments of the genome is unlikely (Begun *et al.*

2007; Keightley *et al.* 2015). Instead, the occurrence of chromosome-specific

patterns of diversity in *An. funestus* is consistent with the presence of weakly

recombining   autosomes   bearing   multiple   overlapping   chromosomal

rearrangements. These same causes produce similar effects along the non-

recombining portion of the Y chromosome in mammals (Lahn & Page 1999) or along

balancer chromosomes described in *Drosophila* and rodent species (Muller 1918;

Hentges & Justice 2004). Indeed, population genetic analyses across genomes of

diverse taxa have found a positive correlation between the rate of recombination

and genetic variation (Aguade *et al.* 1989; Stephan & Langley 1989; Begun &

Aquadro 1992; Hellmann *et al.* 2003, 2005; Tenaillon *et al.* 2004; Begun *et al.* 2007;

Kulathinal *et al.* 2008, 2009). This correlation translates into specific patterns of

diversity that can be observed at the species, genomic or chromosomal levels. At the

species level, plants and some animal species, which reproduce by self-fertilization

have reduced overall genomic diversity due to low genetic recombination

(Nordborg *et al.* 1996; Akhunov *et al.* 2010; Cutter & Choi 2010; Andersen *et al.*

2012; Thomas *et al.* 2015). The local effects of recombination on genetic

polymorphism are also particularly evident across centromere and telomeres of

chromosomes and within genomic regions bearing structural rearrangements

(Aguade *et al.* 1989; Stephan & Langley 1989; Andolfatto *et al.* 2001; Corbett-Detig &

Hartl 2012; Pool *et al.* 2012).

The relationship between diversity and crossing over has been ascribed to

two processes: selection and mutagenesis. Recombination may influence

polymorphism because of new mutations created during crossing over, which

increase diversity (the mutagenic effect of recombination) (Magni & Von Borstel

1962). However, multiple studies that have analyzed fine-scale recombination in

humans, yeast, *Arabidopsis*, *Anopheles*, *Drosophila*, and *Caenorhabditis* have

undermined the notion that recombination, or some correlate, generally exerts

mutagenic effects on genomes (Betancourt & Presgraves 2002; Stump *et al.* 2005;

Spencer *et al.* 2006; Wright *et al.* 2006; Begun *et al.* 2007; Noor 2008; Denver *et al.*

2009; Cutter & Choi 2010; Mcgaugh *et al.* 2012). Alternatively, recombination may

affect diversity indirectly by modulating the effects of positive or negative selection

across the genome. Indeed, the hitchhiking of favorable alleles (selective sweep) or

the removal of recurrent deleterious mutations (background selection) affect linked

neutral sequences more strongly in low-recombination genomic regions, which

gives rise to a positive correlation between diversity and recombination rate

(Maynard Smith & Haigh 1974; Kaplan *et al.* 1989; Begun & Aquadro 1992;

Charlesworth *et al.* 1993, 1997; Nordborg *et al.* 1996; Andolfatto 2001; Nachman

2002). Another indirect effect of recombination on genetic diversity may be driven

by the Hill-Roberston interference, which occurs when two sites under weak

selection are in physical linkage and as a result, selection at one site interferes with

selection at another site (Hill & Robertson 1966; Felsenstein 1974). Hill-Roberston

interference can also be thought of as a reduction in the effective population size

(N_e) caused by selection at linked loci (Comeron *et al.* 2008; Cutter & Payseur 2013;

Castellano *et al.* 2016). Recombination, by alleviating interference between linked

sites, alleviates this reduction in N_e leading to a positive correlation between

recombination rate and levels of neutral polymorphism. Because of the relationship

between recombination and polymorphism, measures of the skew in the allele

frequency spectrum (AFS), such as Tajima's *D* values (Tajima 1989), are expected to

positively correlate with the rate of recombination (Braverman *et al.* 1995). The *An.*

funestus genome shows a strong relationship between Tajima's *D* values and

recombination, and as expected, the chromosome 2L, which recombines freely,

exhibits the sharpest skew in the AFS.

Conclusions and perspectives

Our results reveal that *An. funestus* has a large effective population size and

consequently a significant adaptive potential necessary to buffer the stochastic

effects of population declines often associated with large-scale vector controls such

as the programs that are currently underway in most Sub-Saharan Africa (WHO

2016). We found evidence that three chromosomal rearrangements among the

many identified in *An. funestus* are the primary targets of local adaptation among

ecotypes present in Cameroon. The other rearrangements are likely either

cosmopolitan or endemic inversions under selection at various geographic extents

that have yet to be resolved. Our data support the idea that interactions between

recombination and selection — which amplify the effects of selective sweeps or

background selection within genomic regions where recombination is blocked by

multiple chromosomal inversions — account for the strong disparity in nucleotide

diversity observed between autosomes in this mosquito.

To deepen our understanding of the adaptive role of inversions and their

contribution to chromosome-scale diversity patterns, a complete reference genome

assembly and extensive sampling across the species range are needed to conduct

more sensitive tests including the functional characterization of footprints of

selection and their detailed signatures among individuals and populations. The

presence of hallmarks of both reduced recombination and linked selection across

large genomic sequences in *An. funestus* highlights the important contribution of

multiple aspects of linkage in genome evolution. These aspects have significant

implications for the detection of genomic signatures of natural selection in species

whose genome contains multiple polymorphic chromosomal inversions.

Acknowledgements

Funding for this project was provided by the University of California Riverside and

NIH grants 1R01AI113248 and 1R21AI115271 to BJW.

Author contributions

CK, CF and BJW conceived, designed and performed the experiments, analysed the

data and wrote the paper.

Data Archiving Statement

Data for this study are available at: to be completed after manuscript is accepted for

publication

References

Aguade M, Miyashita N, Langley CH (1989) Reduced variation in the yellow-achaete-

scute region in natural populations of Drosophila melanogaster. *Genetics*, **122**,

607–15.

Akhunov ED, Akhunova AR, Anderson OD *et al.* (2010) Nucleotide diversity maps

reveal variation in diversity among wheat genomes and chromosomes. *BMC*

genomics, **11**, 702.

Andersen EC, Gerke JP, Shapiro J a *et al.* (2012) Chromosome-scale selective sweeps

shape Caenorhabditis elegans genomic diversity. *Nature genetics*, **44**, 285–90.

Anderson AR, Hoffmann AA, McKechnie SW, Umina PA, Weeks AR (2005) The

latitudinal cline in the In (3R) Payne inversion polymorphism has shifted in

the last 20 years in Australian Drosophila melanogaster populations. *Molecular*

Biology and Evolution, **14**, 851–858.

Andolfatto P (2001) Adaptive hitchhiking effects on genome variability. *Current*

Opinion in Genetics and Development, **11**, 635–641.

Andolfatto P, Depaulis F, Navarro A (2001) Inversion polymorphisms and nucleotide

variability in Drosophila. *Genetical research*, **77**, 1–8.

Andrew RL, Rieseberg LH (2013) Divergence is focused on few genomic regions

early in speciation: incipient speciation of sunflower ecotypes. *Evolution;*

international journal of organic evolution, **67**, 2468–82.

Antao T, Lopes A, Lopes RJ, Beja-Pereira A, Luikart G (2008) LOSITAN: a workbench

to detect molecular adaptation based on a Fst-outlier method. *BMC*

bioinformatics, **9**, 323.

Arnold B, Corbett-Detig RB, Hartl D, Bomblies K (2013) RADseq underestimates

diversity and introduces genealogical biases due to nonrandom haplotype

sampling. *Molecular Ecology*, **22**, 3179–3190.

Ayala D, Fontaine MC, Cohuet A *et al.* (2011) Chromosomal inversions, natural

selection and adaptation in the malaria vector Anopheles funestus. *Molecular*

biology and evolution, **28**, 745–758.

Baird NA, Etter PD, Atwood TS *et al.* (2008) Rapid SNP Discovery and Genetic

Mapping Using Sequenced RAD Markers. *PLoS ONE*, **3**, e3376.

Barnes KG, Weedall GD, Ndula M *et al.* (2017) Genomic Footprints of Selective

Sweeps from Metabolic Resistance to Pyrethroids in African Malaria Vectors

Are Driven by Scale up of Insecticide-Based Vector Control. *PLoS Genetics*,

13(2): e10, 1–22.

Beaumont MA (2005) Adaptation and speciation : what can F st tell us ? *Trends in*

Ecology & Evolution, **20**, 435–440.

Beaumont MA, Nichols RA (1996) Evaluating loci for use in the genetic analysis of

population structure. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*,

263, 1619–1626.

Begun D, Aquadro C (1992) Levels of naturally occurring DNA polymorphism

correlate with recombination rates in D. melanogaster. *Nature*, **356**, 519–520.

Begun DJ, Holloway AK, Stevens K *et al.* (2007) Population genomics: whole-genome

analysis of polymorphism and divergence in Drosophila simulans. *PLoS biology*,

5, e310.

Betancourt AJ, Presgraves DC (2002) Linkage limits the power of natural selection in

Drosophila. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States*

of America, **99**, 13616–20.

Boccolini D, Carrara GC, Dia I *et al.* (2005) Chromosomal differentiation of

Anopheles funestus from Luanda and Huambo Provinces, western and central

Angola. *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, **73**, 1071–1076.

Braverman JM, Hudson RR, Kaplan NL, Langley CH, Stephan W (1995) The

hitchhiking effect on the site frequency spectrum of DNA polymorphisms.

Genetics, **140**, 783–796.

Butlin RK (2005) Recombination and speciation. *Molecular Ecology*, **14**, 2621–2635.

Cai JJ, Macpherson JM, Sella G, Petrov DA (2009) Pervasive hitchhiking at coding and

regulatory sites in humans. *PLoS Genetics*, **5**.

Campos JL, Halligan DL, Haddrill PR, Charlesworth B (2014) The relation between

recombination rate and patterns of molecular evolution and variation in

drosophila melanogaster. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **31**, 1010–1028.

Castellano D, Coronado-Zamora M, Campos JL, Barbadilla A, Eyre-Walker A (2016)

Adaptive evolution is substantially impeded by hill-Robertson interference in

drosophila. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **33**, 442–455.

Catchen J, Hohenlohe P a., Bassham S, Amores A, Cresko W. (2013) Stacks: An

analysis tool set for population genomics. *Molecular Ecology*, **22**, 3124–3140.

Charlesworth B (1998) Measures of divergence between populations and the effect

of forces that reduce variability. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **15**, 538–543.

Charlesworth B, Morgan MT, Charlesworth D (1993) The effect of deleterious

mutations on neutral molecular variation. *Genetics*, **134**, 1289–1303.

Charlesworth B, Nordborg M, Charlesworth D (1997) The effects of local selection,

balanced polymorphism and background selection on equilibrium patterns of

genetic diversity in subdivided populations. *Genet. Res., Camb*, **70**, 155–174.

Cheng C, White BJ, Kamdem C *et al.* (2012) Ecological genomics of Anopheles

gambiae along a latitudinal cline: a population-resequencing approach.

Genetics, **190**, 1417–32.

Coetzee M, Koekemoer LL (2013) Molecular systematics and insecticide resistance

in the major African malaria vector Anopheles funestus. *Annual Review of*

Entomology, **58**, 393–412.

Cohuet A, Dia I, Simard F *et al.* (2005) Gene flow between chromosomal forms of the

malaria vector Anopheles funestus in Cameroon, Central Africa, and its

relevance in malaria fighting. *Genetics*, **169**, 301–311.

Cohuet A, Simard F, Toto J-C *et al.* (2003) Species identification within the Anopheles

funestus group of malaria vectors in Cameroon and evidence for a new species.

The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene, **69**, 200–205.

Coluzzi M, Sabatini A, Petrarca V, Di Deco M (1979) Chromosomal differentiation

and adaptation to human environments in the Anopheles gambiae complex.

Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg, **73**, 483–97.

Comeron JM, Ratnappan R, Bailin S (2012) The Many Landscapes of Recombination

in Drosophila melanogaster. *PLoS Genetics*, **8**, 33–35.

Comeron JM, Williford a, Kliman RM (2008) The Hill-Robertson effect: evolutionary

consequences of weak selection and linkage in finite populations. *Heredity*, **100**,

19–31.

Corbett-Detig RB, Hartl DL (2012) Population Genomics of Inversion

Polymorphisms in Drosophila melanogaster. *PLoS Genetics*, **8**.

Costantini C, Sagnon N, Ilboudo-Sanogo E, Coluzzi M, Boccolini D (1999)

Chromosomal and bionomic heterogeneities suggest incipient speciation in

Anopheles funestus from Burkina Faso. *Parassitologia*, **41**, 595–611.

Cruickshank TE, Hahn MW (2014) Reanalysis suggests that genomic islands of

speciation are due to reduced diversity, not reduced gene flow. *Molecular*

ecology, **23**, 3133–57.

Cutter AD, Choi JY (2010) Natural selection shapes nucleotide polymorphism across

the genome of the nematode Caenorhabditis briggsae Natural selection shapes

nucleotide polymorphism across the genome of the nematode Caenorhabditis

briggsae. *Genome Research*, 1103–1111.

Cutter AD, Payseur BA (2013) Genomic signatures of selection at linked sites:

unifying the disparity among species. *Nature reviews. Genetics*, **14**, 262–74.

Danecek P, Auton A, Abecasis G *et al.* (2011) The variant call format and VCFtools.

Bioinformatics, **27**, 2156–2158.

Denver DR, Dolan PC, Wilhelm LJ *et al.* (2009) A genome-wide view of

Caenorhabditis elegans base-substitution mutation processes. *Proceedings of*

the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, **106**, 16310–4.

Dia I, Lochouarn L, Boccolini D, Costantini C, Fontenille D (2000) Spatial and

temporal variations of the chromosomal inversion polymorphism of Anopheles

funestus in Senegal. *Parasite*, **7**, 179–184.

Dobzhansky T (1943) Genetics of natural populations. IX. Temporal changes in the

composition of populations of Drosophila pseudoobscura. *Genetics*, **28**, 162–

186.

Dobzhansky T (1948) Genetics of natural populations .XVIII. Experiments on

chromosomes of Drosophila pseudoobscura from different geographic regions.

Genetics, **33**, 588–602.

Dobzhansky T (1950) Genetics of natural populations. XIX. Origin of heterosis

through natural selection in populations of Drosophila pseudoobscura. *Genetics*,

35, 288–302.

Dobzhansky T (1970) *Genetics of the evolutionary process*. New York.

Donnelly MJ, Licht MC, Lehmann T (2001) Evidence for recent population expansion

in the evolutionary history of the malaria vectors Anopheles arabiensis and

Anopheles gambiae. *Molecular biology and evolution*, **18**, 1353–1364.

Earl DA, VonHoldt BM (2012) STRUCTURE HARVESTER: a website and program for

visualizing STRUCTURE output and implementing the Evanno method.

Conservation Genetics Resources, **4**.

Evanno G, Goudet J, Regnaut S (2005) Detecting the number of clusters of

individuals using the software structure: a simulation study. *Molecular Ecology*,

14, 2611–2620.

Excoffier L, Smouse PE, Quattro JM (1992) Analysis of molecular variance inferred

from metric distances among DNA haplotypes: Application to human

mitochondrial DNA restriction data. *Genetics*, **131**, 479–491.

Feder JL, Egan SP, Nosil P (2012) The genomics of speciation-with-gene-flow. *Trends

in Genetics*, **28**, 342–350.

Felsenstein J (1974) The evolutionary advantage of recombination. II. Individual

selection for recombination. *Genetics*, **78**, 737–756.

Fouet C, Gray E, Besansky NJ, Costantini C (2012) Adaptation to aridity in the

malaria mosquito Anopheles gambiae: chromosomal inversion polymorphism

and body size influence resistance to desiccation. *PloS one*, **7**, e34841.

Fouet C, Kamdem C, Gamez S, White BJ (2017) Extensive genetic diversity among

populations of the malaria mosquito Anopheles moucheti revealed by

population genomics. *Infection, Genetics and Evolution*, **48**, 27–33.

Fumagalli M, Vieira FG, Linderoth T (2014) ngsTools : methods for population

genetics analyses from Next-Generation Sequencing data. *Bioinformatics*.

Gillespie JH (1997) Junk ain't what junk does: Neutral alleles in a selected context.

Gene, **205**, 291–299.

Gillies MT, Coetzee M (1987) *A supplement to the Anophelinae of Africa south of the*

Sahara. The South African Institute for Medical Research, Johannesburg.

Gillies MT, De Meillon B (1968) *The Anophelinae of Africa South of the Sahara*.

Publications of the South African Institute for Medical Research, Johannesburg.

Giraldo-Calderon GI, Emrich SJ, MacCallum RM *et al.* (2015) VectorBase: an updated

bioinformatics resource for invertebrate vectors and other organisms related

with human diseases. *Nucleic Acids Research*, **43**, D707–D713.

Gosset CC, Bierne N (2013) Differential introgression from a sister species explains

high FST outlier loci within a mussel species. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*,

26, 14–26.

Gray EM, Rocca K a C, Costantini C, Besansky NJ (2009) Inversion 2La is associated

with enhanced desiccation resistance in Anopheles gambiae. *Malaria journal*, **8**,

215.

Green CA, Hunt RH (1980) Interpretation of variation in ovarian polytene

chromosomes of Anopheles funestus Giles, A. parensis Gillies, and A. aruni ?

Genetica, **51**, 187–195.

Gutenkunst RN, Hernandez RD, Williamson SH, Bustamante CD (2009) Inferring the

joint demographic history of multiple populations from multidimensional SNP

frequency data. *PLoS genetics*, **5**, e1000695.

Haddrill PR, Halligan DL, Tomaras D, Charlesworth B (2007) Reduced efficacy of

selection in regions of the Drosophila genome that lack crossing over. *Genome*

biology, **8**, R18.

Hellmann I, Ebersberger I, Ptak SE, Pääbo S, Przeworski M (2003) A Neutral

Explanation for the Correlation of Diversity with Recombination Rates in

Humans. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, **72**, 1527–1535.

Hellmann I, Prüfer K, Ji H *et al.* (2005) Why do human diversity levels vary at a

megabase scale? *Genome Research*, **15**, 1222–1231.

Hentges KE, Justice MJ (2004) Checks and balancers : balancer chromosomes to

facilitate genome annotation. *Trends in Genetics*, **20**.

Hill WG, Robertson A (1966) The effect of linkage on the limits of artificial selection.

Genetical Research, **8**, 269–294.

Hoffmann A a, Rieseberg LH (2008) Revisiting the Impact of Inversions in Evolution:

From Population Genetic Markers to Drivers of Adaptive Shifts and Speciation?

Annual review of ecology, evolution, and systematics, **39**, 21–42.

Hoffmann AA, Sgro CM, Weeks AR (2004) Chromosomal inversion polymorphisms

and adaptation. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **19**, 482–488.

Hoffmann AA, Weeks AR (2007) Climatic selection on genes and traits after a 100

year-old invasion : a critical look at the temperate-tropical clines in Drosophila

melanogaster from eastern Australia. *Genetica*, **129**, 133–147.

Huber CD, Nordborg M, Hermisson J, Hellmann I (2014) Keeping It Local: Evidence

for Positive Selection in Swedish Arabidopsis thaliana. *Molecular Biology and*

Evolution, **31**, 3026–3039.

Hudson RR, Kaplan NL (1988) The coalescent process in models with selection and

recombination. *Genetics*, **120**, 819–829.

Jakobsson M, Rosenberg N (2007) CLUMPP: a cluster matching and permutation

program for dealing with multimodality in analysis of population structure.

Bioinformatics, **23**, 1801– 1806.

Jombart T (2008) adegenet: a R package for the multivariate analysis of genetic

markers. *Bioinformatics*, **24**, 1403–1405.

De Jong G, Bochdanovits Z (2003) Latitudinal clines in Drosophila melanogaster :

body size , allozyme frequencies , inversion frequencies , and the insulin-

signalling pathway. *Journal of Genetics*, **82**, 207–223.

Joron M, Frezal L, Jones RT *et al.* (2011) Chromosomal rearrangements maintain a

polymorphic supergene controlling butterfly mimicry. *Nature*, **477**, 203–206.

Kamau L, Hunt RH, Coetzee M (2002) Analysis of the population structure of

Anopheles funestus (Diptera: Culicidae) from western and coastal Kenya using

paracentric chromosomal inversion frequencies. *Journal of Medical Entomology*,

39, 78–83.

Kamdem C, Fouet C, Gamez S, White BJ (2017) Pollutants and insecticides drive local

adaptation in African malaria mosquitoes. *Molecular Biology and Evolution,* **34**,

1261–1275.

Kaplan NL, Hudson RR, Langley CH (1989) The "hitchhiking effect" revisited.

Genetics, **123**, 887–899.

Kapun M, Fabian DK, Goudet J, Flatt T (2016a) Genomic Evidence for Adaptive

Inversion Clines in Drosophila melanogaster. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*,

33, 1317–1336.

Kapun M, Van Schalkwyk H, McAllister B, Flatt T, Schlötterer C (2014) Inference of

chromosomal inversion dynamics from Pool-Seq data in natural and laboratory

populations of Drosophila melanogaster. *Molecular Ecology*, **23**, 1813–1827.

Kapun M, Schmidt C, Durmaz E, Schmidt PS, Flatt T (2016b) Parallel effects of the

inversion In (3R) Payne on body size across the North American and

Australian clines in Drosophila melanogaster. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*,

29, 1059–1072.

Kawecki TJ, Dieter E (2004) Conceptual issues in local adaptation. *Ecology Letters*, **7**,

1225–1241.

Keightley PD, Pinharanda A, Ness RW *et al.* (2015) Estimation of the Spontaneous

Mutation Rate in Heliconius melpomene. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **32**,

239–243.

Keinan A, Reich D (2010) Human population differentiation is strongly correlated

with local recombination rate. *PLoS Genetics*, **6**.

Kennington WJ, Hoffmann AA, Partridge L (2007) Mapping Regions Within

Cosmopolitan Inversion In(3R)Payne Associated With Natural Variation in

Body Size in Drosophila melanogaster. *Genetics*, **177**, 549–556.

Kim Y, Maruki T (2011) Hitchhiking effect of a beneficial mutation spreading in a

subdivided population. *Genetics*, **189**, 213–226.

Kimura MK (1983) *The Neutral Theory of Molecular Evolution*. Cambridge, UK.

Kirkpatrick M (2010) How and why chromosome inversions evolve. *PLoS Biology*, **8**,

e1000501.

Kirkpatrick M, Barton N (2006) Chromosome inversions, local adaptation and

speciation. *Genetics*, **173**, 419–434.

Kliman R, Hey J (1993) Reduced natural selection associated with low

recombination in Drosophila melanogaster. *Molecular biology and evolution*, **10**,

1239–1258.

Knibb WR (1982) Chromosome inversion polymorphisms in Drosophila

melanogaster II. Geographic clines and climatic associations in Australasia ,

North America and Asia. *Genetica*, **58**, 213–221.

Korneliussen T, Albrechtsen A, Nielsen R (2014) ANGSD: Analysis of Next

Generation Sequencing Data. *BMC Bioinformatics*, **15**, 356.

Korneliussen TS, Moltke I, Albrechtsen A, Nielsen R (2013) Calculation of Tajima's D

and other neutrality test statistics from low depth next-generation sequencing

data. *BMC bioinformatics*, **14**, 289.

Krimbas C, Powell JR (1992) Introduction. In: *Drosophila inversion polymorphism*

(eds Krimbas C, Powell JR), p. . London.

Kulathinal RJ, Bennett SM, Fitzpatrick CL, Noor MAF (2008) Fine-scale mapping of

recombination rate in Drosophila refines its correlation to diversity and

divergence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **105**, 10051–

10056.

Kulathinal RJ, Stevison LS, Noor MAF (2009) The genomics of speciation in

Drosophila: Diversity, divergence, and introgression estimated using low-

coverage genome sequencing. *PLoS Genetics*, **5**, e1000550.

Lahn BT, Page DC (1999) Chromosome Four Evolutionary Strata on the Human X

Chromosome. *Science*, **286**, 964–967.

Lee SF, Chen Y, Varan AK *et al.* (2011) Molecular Basis of Adaptive Shift in Body Size

in Drosophila melanogaster : Functional and Sequence Analyses of the Dca Gene

Research article. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **28**, 2393–2402.

Lee Y, Meneses CR, Fofana A, Lanzaro GC (2009) Desiccation Resistance Among

Subpopulations of Anopheles gambiae s.s. From Selinkenyi, Mali. *Journal of*

medical entomology, **46**, 316–320.

Lewontin RC, Krakauer J (1973) Distribution of gene frequency as a test of the

theory of the selective neutrality of polymorphisms. *Genetics*, **74**, 175–195.

Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A *et al.* (2009) The Sequence Alignment/Map format

and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics*, **25**, 2078–2079.

Lischer HEL, Excoffier L (2012) PGDSpider: An automated data conversion tool for

connecting population genetics and genomics programs. *Bioinformatics*, **28**,

298–299.

Lowry DB, Willis JH (2010) A Widespread Chromosomal Inversion Polymorphism

Contributes to a Major Life-History Transition , Local Adaptation , and

Reproductive Isolation. *PLoS Biology*, **8**, e1000500.

Magni GE, Von Borstel RC (1962) Different Rates of Spontaneous Mutation during

Mitosis and Meiosis in Yeast. *Genetics*, **47**, 1097–1108.

Majewski J, Cohan FM (1999) Adapt globally, act locally: The effect of selective

sweeps on bacterial sequence diversity. *Genetics*, **152**, 1459–1474.

Marsden CD, Lee Y, Kreppel K *et al.* (2014) Diversity, Differentiation, and Linkage

Disequilibrium: Prospects for Association Mapping in the Malaria Vector

Anopheles arabiensis. *G3 (Bethesda, Md.)*, **4**, 121–31.

Maynard Smith J, Haigh J (1974) The hitch-hiking effect of a favourable gene.

Genetical research, **23**, 23–35.

Mcgaugh SE, Heil CSS, Manzano-winkler B *et al.* (2012) Recombination Modulates

How Selection Affects Linked Sites in Drosophila. *PLoS Biology*, **10**, e1001422.

McGaugh SE, Noor M a F (2012) Genomic impacts of chromosomal inversions in

parapatric Drosophila species. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of*

London. Series B, Biological sciences, **367**, 422–9.

Meirmans P, Van Tienderen P (2004) GENOTYPE and GENODIVE: two programs for

the analysis of genetic diversity of asexual organisms. *Molecular Ecology Notes*,

4, 792–794.

Mettler LE, Voelker RA, Mukai T (1977) Inversion clines in populations of

Drosophila melanogaster. *Genetics*, **87**, 169–176.

Michel a. P, Ingrasci MJ, Schemerhorn BJ *et al.* (2005) Rangewide population genetic

structure of the African malaria vector Anopheles funestus. *Molecular Ecology*,

14, 4235–4248.

Muller HJ (1918) Genetic variability, twin hybrids, and constant hybrids, in a case of

balanced lethal factors. *Genetics*, **3**, 422–499.

Nachman MW (2002) Variation in recombination rate across the genome: Evidence

and implications. *Current Opinion in Genetics and Development*, **12**, 657–663.

Nachman MW, Payseur BA (2012) Recombination rate variation and speciation :

theoretical predictions and empirical results from rabbits and mice.

Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, **367**, 409–

421.

Neafsey DE, Waterhouse RM, Abai MR *et al.* (2015) Highly evolvable malaria vectors:

The genomes of 16 Anopheles mosquitoes. *Science*, **347**, 1258522–1258522.

Nielsen R (2005) Molecular Signatures of Natural Selection. *Annual review of*

genetics, **39**, 197–218.

Nishikawa H, Iijima T, Kajitani R *et al.* (2015) A genetic mechanism for female-

limited Batesian mimicry in Papilio butterfly. *Nature genetics*, **47**, 405–9.

Noor MAF (2008) Mutagenesis from meiotic recombination is not a primary driver

of sequence divergence between Saccharomyces species. *Molecular Biology and*

Evolution, **25**, 2439–2444.

Noor M a F, Bennett SM (2009) Islands of speciation or mirages in the desert?

Examining the role of restricted recombination in maintaining species. *Heredity*,

103, 439–444.

Noor MAF, Grams KL, Bertucci LA, Reiland J (2001) Chromosomal inversions and the

reproductive isolation of species. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*

Sciences, **98**, 12084–12088.

Nordborg M, Charlesworth B, Charlesworth B (1996) Increased levels of

polymorphism surrounding selectively maintained sites in highly selfing

species. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **263**, 1033–1039.

Nordborg M, Hu TT, Ishino Y *et al.* (2005) The pattern of polymorphism in

Arabidopsis thaliana. *PLoS Biology*, **3**, 1289–1299.

Nordborg M, Tavar S (2002) Linkage disequilibrium : what history has to tell us.

Trends in Genetics, **18**, 83–90.

Nosil P, Feder JL (2012) Widespread yet heterogeneous genomic divergence.

Molecular Ecology, **21**, 2829–2832.

Nosil P, Funk DJ, Ortiz-Barrientos D (2009) Divergent selection and heterogeneous

genomic divergence. *Molecular Ecology*, **18**, 375–402.

O'Loughlin SM, Magesa S, Mbogo C *et al.* (2014) Genomic Analyses of Three Malaria

Vectors Reveals Extensive Shared Polymorphism but Contrasting Population

Histories. *Molecular biology and evolution*, **31**, 889-902.

Ortiz-Barrientos D, Reiland J, Hey J, Noor MAF (2002) Recombination and the

divergence of hybridizing species. *Genetica*, **116**, 167–178.

Paradis E, Claude J, Strimmer K (2004) Analyses of Phylogenetics and Evolution in R

language. *Bioinformatics*, **20**, 289–290.

Pegueroles C, Ordóñez V, Mestres F, Pascual M (2010) Recombination and selection

in the maintenance of the adaptive value of inversions. *Journal of Evolutionary*

Biology, **23**, 2709–2717.

Peterson BK, Weber JN, Kay EH, Fisher HS, Hoekstra HE (2012) Double Digest

RADseq: An Inexpensive Method for De Novo SNP Discovery and Genotyping in

Model and Non-Model Species. *PLoS ONE*, **7**, e37135.

Pool JE, Corbett-Detig RB, Sugino RP *et al.* (2012) Population Genomics of Sub-

Saharan Drosophila melanogaster: African Diversity and Non-African

Admixture. *PLoS Genetics*, **8**, e1003080.

Powell JR (1997) *Progress and prospects in evolutionary biology: the Drosophila*

model. New York.

Pritchard JK, Stephens M, Donnelly P (2000) Inference of population structure using

multilocus genotype data. *Genetics*, **155**, 945–959.

Purcell S, Neale B, Todd-Brown K *et al.* (2007) PLINK: a toolset for whole-genome

association and population-based linkage analysis. *American Journal of Human*

Genetics, **81**, 559-75.

R Development Core Team (2016) *R: A language and environment for statistical*

computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

Rako L, Anderson AR, Sgro CM, Stocker AJ, Hoffmann AA (2006) The association

between inversion In (3R) Payne and clinally varying traits in Drosophila

melanogaster. *Genetica*, **128**, 373–384.

Rane AR V, Rako L, Lee SF, Hoffmann A a (2015) Genomic evidence for role of

inversion 3RP of Drosophila melanogaster in facilitating climate change

adaptation Abstract : *Molecular Ecology*, **24**, 2423–2432.

Rieseberg LH (2001) Chromosomal rearrangements and speciation. *Trends in*

Ecology and Evolution, **16**, 351–358.

Roberts P (1976) The genetics of chromosomal aberration. In: *The genetics and*

biology of Drosophila (eds Ashburner M, Novitski E), pp. 67–184. London.

Roesti M, Hendry AP, Salzburger W, Berner D (2012) Genome divergence during

evolutionary diversification as revealed in replicate lake-stream stickleback

population pairs. *Molecular ecology*, **21**, 2852–62.

Roesti M, Moser D, Berner D (2013) Recombination in the threespine stickleback

genome - Patterns and consequences. *Molecular Ecology*, **22**, 3014–3027.

Rosenberg N (2004) DISTRUCT: a program for the graphical display of population

structure. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, **4**, 137–138.

Savolainen O, Lascoux M, Merilä J (2013) Ecological genomics of local adaptation.

Nature Reviews Genetics, **14**, 807–820.

Schaeffer SW (2008) Selection in heterogeneous environments maintains the gene

arrangement polymorphism of drosophila pseudoobscura. *Evolution*, **62**, 3082–

3099.

Schaeffer SW, Goetting-minesky MP, Kovacevic M *et al.* (2003) Evolutionary

genomics of inversions in Drosophila pseudoobscura : Evidence for epistasis.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, **100**, 8319–8324.

Schlötterer C (2002) Towards a molecular characterization of adaptation in local

populations. *Current Opinion in Genetics and Development*, **12**, 683–687.

Schneider KA, Kim Y (2013) Genetic Hitchhiking under Heterogeneous Spatial

Selection Pressures. *PLoS ONE*, **8**, e61742.

Seehausen O, Butlin RK, Keller I *et al.* (2014) Genomics and the origin of species.

Nature reviews. Genetics, **15**, 176–92.

Service MW (1993) *Mosquito ecology: field sampling methods* (UK Elsevier Applied

Science, London, Ed,).

Sharakhova M V, Xia A, Leman SC, Sharakhov I V (2011) Arm-specific dynamics of

chromosome evolution in malaria mosquitoes. *BMC evolutionary biology*, **11**,

91.

Sharakhov I, Braginets O, Grushko O *et al.* (2004) A Microsatellite Map of the African

Human Malaria Vector Anopheles funestus. *Journal of Heredity*, **95**, 29–34.

Sinka ME, Bangs MJ, Manguin S *et al.* (2010) The dominant Anopheles vectors of

human malaria in Africa, Europe and the Middle East: occurrence data,

distribution maps and bionomic précis. *Parasites & vectors*, **3**, 117.

Slatkin M, Wiehe T (1998) Genetic hitch-hiking in a subdivided population. *Genetical*

Research, **71**, 155–160.

Spencer CCA, Deloukas P, Hunt S *et al.* (2006) The influence of recombination on

human genetic diversity. *PLoS Genetics*, **2**, 1375–1385.

Stefansson H, Helgason A, Thorleifsson G *et al.* (2005) A common inversion under

selection in Europeans. *Nature genetics*, **37**, 129–137.

Stephan W, Langley CH (1989) Molecular genetic variation in the centromeric region

of the X chromosome in three Drosophila ananassae populations. I. Contrasts

between the vermilion and forked loci. *Genetics*, **121**, 89–99.

Storz JF (2005) Using genome scans of DNA polymorphism to infer adaptive

population divergence. *Molecular Ecology*, **14**, 671–688.

Stump AD, Fitzpatrick MC, Lobo NF *et al.* (2005) Centromere-proximal

differentiation and speciation in Anopheles gambiae. *Proceedings of the*

National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, **102**, 15930–5.

Sturtevant A (1921) A case of rearrangement of genes in Drosophila. *Proceedings of*

the National Academy of Sciences, **7**, 235–237.

Tajima F (1989) Statistical method for testing the neutral mutation hypothesis by

DNA polymorphism. *Genetics*, **123**, 585–595.

Tenaillon MI, U'Ren J, Tenaillon O, Gaut BS (2004) Selection versus demography: A

multilocus investigation of the domestication process in maize. *Molecular*

Biology and Evolution, **21**, 1214–1225.

Thomas CG, Wang W, Jovelin R *et al.* (2015) Full-genome evolutionary histories of

selfing , splitting , and selection in Caenorhabditis. *Genome Research*, **25**, 667–

678.

Tiffin P, Ross-Ibarra J (2014) Advances and limits of using population genetics to

understand local adaptation. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **29**, 673–680.

Watterson GA (1975) On the number of segregating sites in genetical models

without recombination. *Theoretical Population Biology*, **7**, 256–276.

Weir BS, Cockerham CC (1984) Estimating F-statistics for the analysis of population

structure. *Evolution*, **38**, 1358–1370.

WHO (2016) *World malaria report 2016*. pp 186 (ISBN: 978 92 4 151171 1)

Williams GC (1966) *Adaptation and Natural Selection: A Critique of Some Current*

Evolutionary Thought. Princeton, NJ.

Wright S, Dobzhansky T (1946) Genetics of natural populations. XII. Experimental

reproduction of some of the changes caused by natural selection in certain

populations of Drosophila pseudoobscura. *Genetics*, **31**, 125–156.

Wright SI, Foxe JP, DeRose-Wilson L *et al.* (2006) Testing for effects of

recombination rate on nucleotide diversity in natural populations of

Arabidopsis lyrata. *Genetics*, **174**, 1421–1430.

Wu TD, Nacu S (2010) Fast and SNP-tolerant detection of complex variants and

splicing in short reads. *Bioinformatics*, **26**, 873–881.

Yeaman S (2013) Genomic rearrangements and the evolution of clusters of locally

adaptive loci. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **110**, E1743-51.

1060

Figure legends

Figure 1: Geographic origin and genetic relatedness of *An. funestus* ecotypes in Cameroon. (A) Map showing Mfou and Tibati, the two locations where *An. funestus* mosquitoes were collected. A delimitation of the approximate distribution ranges of the two ecotypes found in Cameroon is shown (continuous line in the middle of the map). (B) and (C) Population genetic structure as revealed respectively by a neighbor-joining tree and a PCA. The percentage of variance explained is indicated on each PCA axis. (D) and (E) Confirmation of the presence of two *An. funestus* ecotypes with DAPC and the delta k method of Evanno *et al.* (2005). The lowest Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) and cross-validation error and the highest delta k indicate the most probable number of clusters (2-3). (F) Bayesian clustering in STRUCTURE.

Figure 2: Estimates of pairwise population differentiation (F_{ST}) based on SNPs ordered by position along pseudo-chromosomes representing the five chromosome arms of *An. funestus*. F_{ST} values on top of the red line are above the 99th percent of the empirical distribution. Arrows indicate the genomic coordinates of the 3R*a* and 3R*b* inversions.

Figure 3: Population genetic structure revealed by each chromosome arm and by four polymorphic chromosomal inversions (2R*h*, 3R*a*, 3R*b* and 3R*d*). The number of SNPs is indicated in parenthesis.

Figure 4: Genome-wide distribution of d_{xy} and fixed differences (d_f) across 90-kb non-overlapping windows along the five pseudo-chromosomes among Mfou and

Tibati populations. Strong divergent selection within the 3R*a* and 3R*b* inversions is characterized by the presence of peaks of d_{xy} and d_f at these loci.

Figure 5: Estimates of nucleotide diversity ($\theta\pi$ and θw) and allele frequency spectrum (Tajima's *D*) across 90-kb non-overlapping windows illustrating the uneven distribution of genetic diversity along the five chromosome arms. The collinear autosome (2L) is the most polymorphic in both Mfou and Tibati populations. In contrast, autosomes bearing multiple inversions exhibit a significant reduction in the amount of polymorphic sites.

Figure 6: Box plot depicting the distribution of $\theta\pi$ and θw among chromosomes in Mfou and Tibati.

Supplemental Figure Legends

Figure S1: The positions of the 104 scaffolds that were placed on the *An. funestus* physical map are indicated by red rectangles (modified from Sharakhov *et al.* 2004).

Figure S2: Distribution of the average coverage depth along mapped scaffolds.

Tables

Table 1: Reduction in nucleotide diversity relative to the 2L chromosome arm (%).

		2R	3L	3R	X
Mfou	θw	29.22 *	13.24 *	34.69 *	23.35 *
	$\theta \pi$	7.92 *	-3.23	19.23 *	13.92 *
Tibati	θw	18.79 *	13.24 *	33.54 *	18.94 *
	$\theta \pi$	3.23	-4.84	15.61 *	11.86 *

*Statistically significant (Wilcoxon rank sum test, $p < 0.001$)

Supplemental Tables

Table S1: Description of *An. funestus* samples included in this study.

Ecogeographic region	Sampling location	Geographic coordinates	Sampling method				Total	Gender		
			HLC-OUT	HLC-IN	LC	SPRAY		Female	Male	NA
Savannah	Tibati	6°28'08"N, 12°37'44"E	8	7	0	32	47	43	4	0
Forest	Mfou	3°58'00"N, 11°56'00"E	2	8	22	53	85	55	8	22
	Total						132	98	12	22

HLC-OUT, human landing catches performed outdoor; HLC-IN, human landing catches performed indoor; LC, larval collection; SPRAY, spray catches; NA, not available

Table S2: Characteristics of the five pseudo-chromosomes of *An. funestus* used for genome scans.

Chromosome	Number of mapped scaffolds	Total length (bp)	Number of SNPs
2R	30	27 415 570	1 587
2L	18	19 110 819	987
3R	24	15 197 945	745
3L	22	12 545 136	652
X	10	6 812 527	296

Table S3: Parameters of the best-fit demographic models in $\partial a \partial i$.

Population	Best model	Log Likelihood	Final population size[b] (95% CI)		Time[c] (95% CI)	
Tibati	*Growth*	-88.8	77.6	(51.8 - 138.1)	3.8	(1.8 - 8.0)
Mfou	*Two-epoch*	-84.7	13.6	(12.2 - 15.7)	1.4	(1.2 - 1.7)

[b]Relative to ancestral population size.

[c]Expressed in units 2Ne generations from start of growth to present

Figures

Figure1

Figure 2

Figure 3

2R 2L 3R 3L X

● Mfou
● Tibati

2R*h*
(259)

3R*a*
(195)

3R*d*
(164)

3R*b*
(168)

3R outside inversion
(248)

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure S1

Figure S2