

1 **TITLE**

2 Cytoplasmic-nuclear incompatibility between wild-isolates of *Caenorhabditis nouraguensis*

3 **AUTHORS**

4 Piero Lamelza^{*,†} and Michael Ailion^{*,†}

5 **AFFILIATIONS**

6 ^{*}Molecular and Cellular Biology Program, University of Washington, Seattle WA 98195

7 [†]Department of Biochemistry, University of Washington, Seattle WA 98195

8

9 **Running title:** Speciation genetics in *C. nouraguensis*

10 **Keywords:** Dobzhansky-Muller incompatibility, speciation, cytoplasmic, mitochondria,

11 *Caenorhabditis*

12 **Corresponding author:**

13 Michael Ailion

14 Department of Biochemistry

15 University of Washington

16 Box 357350

17 1705 NE Pacific St

18 Seattle, WA 98195

19 Phone: 206-685-0111

20 email: mailion@uw.edu

21

22

ABSTRACT

23

How species arise is a fundamental question in biology. Species can be defined as

24

populations of interbreeding individuals that are reproductively isolated from other such

25

populations. Therefore, understanding how reproductive barriers evolve between populations is

26

essential for understanding the process of speciation. Hybrid incompatibility (e.g. hybrid sterility

27

and lethality) is a common and strong reproductive barrier in nature, but few studies have

28

molecularly identified its genetic basis. Here we report a lethal incompatibility between two wild-

29

isolates of the nematode *Caenorhabditis nouraguensis*. Hybrid inviability results from the

30

incompatibility between a maternally inherited cytoplasmic factor from each strain and a recessive

31

nuclear locus from the other. We have excluded the possibility that maternally inherited

32

endosymbiotic bacteria cause the incompatibility by treating both strains with tetracycline and

33

show that hybrid death is unaffected. Furthermore, cytoplasmic-nuclear incompatibility commonly

34

occurs between other wild-isolates, indicating that this is a significant reproductive barrier within *C.*

35

nouraguensis. We hypothesize that the maternally inherited cytoplasmic factor is the mitochondrial

36

genome and that mitochondrial dysfunction underlies hybrid death. This system has the potential

37

to shed light on the dynamics of divergent mitochondrial-nuclear coevolution and its role in

38

promoting speciation.

39

40

INTRODUCTION

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

How species arise is a fundamental and still unanswered question in biology. Under the biological species concept, species consist of populations of interbreeding individuals that are reproductively isolated from other such populations (Mayr 1942). Thus, to understand speciation, we must learn how reproductive barriers evolve between populations. Post-zygotic reproductive barriers are commonly found in nature, and occur when hybrid progeny are relatively unfit in comparison to their parents and serve as inefficient bridges for gene flow between populations. Hybrids can be extrinsically unfit, in that they are maladapted to their environment (e.g. hybrids exhibit an intermediate phenotype which is unfit in parental environments) or intrinsically unfit, in that they are developmentally abnormal (e.g. hybrids are sterile or inviable) (Coyne and Orr 2004).

The Bateson-Dobzhansky-Muller (BDM) model hypothesizes that hybrids are intrinsically unfit due to incompatible gene combinations. In its simplest form, the model predicts that at least two genetic loci, each having evolved independently in one of two divergent lineages, have deleterious epistatic interactions in hybrids. This model has gained support by the molecular identification of genes required for hybrid dysfunction in several genera (Presgraves 2010). Identifying these genes and the natural forces that drive their evolution is one of the major objectives of speciation genetics. Darwin suggested that differential ecological adaptation by natural selection was the major driving force for speciation. Some of the molecularly identified “incompatibility genes” do indeed show signs of selection (Ting 1998; Presgraves *et al.* 2003; Barbash *et al.* 2004; Brideau *et al.* 2006; Oliver *et al.* 2009; Chae *et al.* 2014; Phadnis *et al.* 2015), but do not always have a clear role in promoting ecological adaptation (Tao *et al.* 2001; Ferree and Barbash 2009; Phadnis and Orr 2009; Seidel *et al.* 2011). However, there are currently only a handful of known incompatibility genes from a limited number of genera. Additional studies from a wider range of taxa are needed to gain a better understanding of the evolutionary forces that drive speciation.

65 Some studies on the genetic basis of hybrid incompatibility have focused on strong post-
66 zygotic reproductive barriers between well-defined species. These studies reveal that many
67 genetic variants contribute to dysfunction of hybrids (Coyne and Orr 1998), but provide little insight
68 into the dynamics of the accumulation of such variants or their relative roles in initiating speciation.
69 For example, theoretical work indicates that the number of genetic incompatibilities increases
70 greater than linearly with the number of genetic differences between two lineages (Orr 1995).
71 Therefore, a small number of genetic incompatibilities may initially reduce gene flow and promote
72 genetic divergence between populations, while others evolve after strong reproductive barriers
73 have already been established. Given this, studies of incomplete post-zygotic barriers between
74 young species or divergent populations within species are essential to understand the
75 evolutionary forces that may initiate speciation.

76 Despite the paucity of molecularly identified incompatibility genes, the segregation of
77 deleterious phenotypes in a number of interspecific hybridizations indicates that incompatibilities
78 between cytoplasmic and nuclear genomes occur frequently (Ellison and Burton 2008; Ellison *et al.*
79 *2008*; Sambatti *et al.* 2008; Arnqvist *et al.* 2010; Ross *et al.* 2011; Aalto *et al.* 2013).
80 Furthermore, several studies have definitively mapped these incompatibility loci to the
81 mitochondrial genome and nuclear genes with mitochondrial functions (Lee *et al.* 2008; Chou *et al.*
82 *2010*; Luo *et al.* 2013; Meiklejohn *et al.* 2013; Huang *et al.* 2015). Aerobic eukaryotic organisms
83 rely on mitochondria to generate energy required for diverse biological processes. The
84 mitochondrial genome encodes a small fraction of mitochondrial proteins, but nuclear genes are
85 required for proper replication, transcription, and translation of mtDNA as well as other
86 mitochondrial proteins (Gustafsson *et al.* 2016). Given the interdependence of the nuclear and
87 mitochondrial genomes, they are expected to coevolve by the accumulation of compatible
88 mutations that maintain mitochondrial function. By extension, distinct lineages that undergo unique
89 mitochondrial-nuclear coevolution may be incompatible and result in mitochondrial dysfunction.
90 Several theories have been proposed to explain what drives the rapid coevolution of these two

91 genomes, including adaptation to different carbon sources (Lee *et al.* 2008), arms races between
92 the genomes caused by genetic conflict over the relative fitness of males and females (Fujii *et al.*
93 2011), and the accumulation of deleterious mtDNA mutations and the evolution of compensatory
94 nuclear variants that rescue mitochondrial function (Rand *et al.* 2004; Oliveira *et al.* 2008; Osada
95 and Akashi 2012). However, given the scarcity of molecularly identified cases of mitochondrial-
96 nuclear incompatibilities, additional studies are required to form more complete theories regarding
97 the forces that drive their evolution.

98 Here we report incompatibility between the cytoplasmic and nuclear genomes of two
99 distinct wild-isolates of the male-female nematode *Caenorhabditis nouraguensis*. Cytoplasmic-
100 nuclear incompatibility is not specific to these two strains, but is also observed upon hybridization
101 of other distinct wild-isolates of *C. nouraguensis*, indicating that this is a naturally widespread
102 reproductive barrier within the species. The cytoplasmic-nuclear incompatibility we identify
103 between strains of *C. nouraguensis* may provide an excellent opportunity for a detailed study of
104 mitochondrial-nuclear incompatibility, the forces that drive the coevolution of these genomes, and
105 their possible role in speciation.

106

107

MATERIALS AND METHODS

108 ***Strain isolation and maintenance***

109 All strains of *C. nouraguensis* used in this study were derived from single gravid females
110 isolated in 2009 or 2011 from rotten fruit or flowers found in French Guiana (Kiontke *et al.* 2011),
111 and have not been subjected to further inbreeding. Strains were kindly provided by Marie-Anne
112 Felix (“JU” prefix) and Christian Braendle (“NIC” prefix). Strain stocks were stored at -80°C.
113 Thawed strains were maintained at 25°C on standard NGM plates spread with a thin lawn of OP50
114 bacteria (Brenner 1974).

115

116 ***Hybridizing JU1825 and NIC59***

117 To quantify inviability, we crossed one virgin L4 female and male, with 10-15 replicates for
118 each cross. The edge of each plate was coated with a palmitic acid solution (10 mg/mL in 95%
119 ethanol) and allowed to air dry, resulting in a physical barrier that helps prevent worms from
120 leaving the plate’s surface. The plates were placed at 25°C overnight, during which the worms
121 matured to adulthood and began mating. The next day, each female-male couple was placed onto
122 a new plate streaked with OP50 and rimmed with palmitic acid. Each couple was then allowed to
123 mate and lay eggs for 5 hours at 25°C, and then were permanently removed. The embryos laid
124 within those 5 hours were counted immediately. Approximately 17 hours later, we counted the
125 number of embryos that failed to hatch per plate. These unhatched embryos were scored as dead
126 since *C. nouraguensis* embryogenesis is normally completed within 13 hours at 25°C (data not
127 shown). We defined the percentage of embryonic lethality as the number of unhatched embryos
128 divided by the total number of embryos laid. Approximately 20 hours later, we placed the plates at
129 4°C for an hour and then counted the number of healthy L4 larvae and young adults per plate. We
130 defined the percentage of viable progeny as the total number of L4 larvae and young adults
131 divided by the total number of embryos laid.

132

133 ***Determining cytoplasmic-nuclear compatibility between various strains of C. nouraguensis***

134 To test for an incompatibility between one strain's cytoplasm and another strain's nuclear
135 genome, we compared the viabilities of backcrosses that differ only in the F1 hybrid female's
136 cytoplasmic genotype (e.g. (NIC59); NIC59/JU1837 F1 female x JU1837 male vs (JU1837);
137 NIC59/JU1837 F1 female x JU1837 male, Figure 3A). The genotype is designated by the following
138 nomenclature: (cytoplasmic genotype); nuclear genotype. The cytoplasmic genotype indicates
139 genetic elements that are only maternally inherited, such as the mitochondrial genome. We
140 performed a Fisher's exact test to determine whether there were significant differences in the
141 proportions of viable and inviable F2 progeny between the two types of crosses. We also
142 calculated the relative viability of the two crosses (e.g. the percent viability of the (NIC59);
143 NIC59/JU1837 F1 female x JU1837 male cross divided by the percent viability of (JU1837);
144 NIC59/JU1837 F1 female x JU1837 male cross). Cytoplasmic-nuclear combinations that show a
145 statistically significant difference in viabilities between the two types of crosses and a relative
146 viability <1 were considered to be cytoplasmic-nuclear incompatibilities. Three biological replicates
147 were performed for each cytoplasmic-nuclear combination except for JU1825 cytoplasmic - NIC24
148 nuclear and JU1825 cytoplasmic - NIC54 nuclear, which have four replicates each. For each
149 biological replicate, 10 F1 hybrid L4 females were crossed to 10 L4 males on the same plate
150 overnight at 25°C. The next day, they were moved to a new plate and allowed to lay embryos at
151 25°C for 1 hour. The parents were then removed and the percent viable progeny and embryonic
152 lethality were calculated as described in the previous section of the Materials and Methods. The
153 heat map used to visualize the median relative viability for each cytoplasmic nuclear combination
154 was made using the heatmap.2 function from the gplot package in R.

155

156 ***Molecular Methods***

157 To determine if either JU1825 or NIC59 are infected with *Wolbachia*, we performed PCR on
158 crude lysates of both strains using degenerate primers targeted against two genes that are
159 conserved in *Wolbachia* (Baldo *et al.* 2006). Specifically, we attempted to detect *gatB* (*gatB_F1*
160 with M13 adapter, TGTAACGACGGCCAGTGAKTTAAAYCGYGCAGGBGTT, and *gatB_R1*
161 with M13 adapter, CAGGAAACAGCTATGACCTGGYAAAYTCRGGYAAAGATGA) and *fbpA*
162 (*fbpA_F3*, GTTAACCCTGATGCYYAYGAYCC, and *fbpA_R3*,
163 TCTACTTCCTTYGAYTCDCCRCC). As controls, we performed PCR on squash preps of
164 *Drosophila melanogaster* w¹¹¹⁸ mutant strains (Bloomington stock number 3605) that were
165 infected or not infected with *Wolbachia*. *Drosophila melanogaster* strains were kindly provided by
166 the laboratories of Harmit Malik and Leo Pallanck.

167

168 ***Tetracycline treatment of JU1825 and NIC59***

169 Both JU1825 and NIC59 were passaged on 50 ug/mL tetracycline NGM plates streaked
170 with OP50 for nine generations. Both strains were treated by placing 10 L4 females and 10 L4
171 males on a fresh tetracycline plate and allowing them to mate and produce the next generation of
172 L4 progeny, which were then moved to a fresh tetracycline plate. Tetracycline plates were made
173 by allowing NGM plates with OP50 lawns to soak up a mixture of tetracycline and 1x M9. The
174 plates were left uncovered at room temperature until dry, and then used the following day.

175

176 ***Statistics***

177 P values were determined using R (v 3.2.5). Several statistical tests were used (Kruskal-Wallis
178 test followed by Dunn's test, and Fisher's exact test). When we performed several comparisons on
179 the same dataset, we used the Bonferroni method to correct p-values for multiple testing. Most
180 plots were made using the ggplot2 package in R.

181

182 ***Data Availability***

183 The authors state that all data necessary for confirming the conclusions presented in the article
184 are represented fully within the article and Supplemental Material.
185

186

RESULTS

187 **Two strains of *C. nouraguensis* exhibit F2 hybrid breakdown**

188 Two strains of *C. nouraguensis*, JU1825 and NIC59, were derived from single gravid
189 females that were isolated approximately 112 kilometers apart in French Guiana (Kiontke *et al.*
190 2011). Both of these strains were designated as belonging to *C. nouraguensis* based on having
191 highly similar ITS2 rDNA sequences, which serves as a good species barcode within the
192 *Caenorhabditis* genus, and because they produced many viable F1 offspring when crossed
193 (Kiontke *et al.* 2011; Félix *et al.* 2014). We found that both strains produce high numbers of viable
194 progeny in intra-strain crosses. We have also confirmed the previous finding of F1 hybrid viability
195 by crossing NIC59 females to JU1825 males, and vice versa, showing that the F1 hybrids
196 resulting from these inter-strain crosses exhibit levels of viability comparable to those seen in
197 intra-strain crosses (Figure 1).

198 However, not all reproductive barriers act in the F1 generation. There are many cases of F2
199 hybrid breakdown, in which reduction of hybrid fitness begins to manifest itself in the F2
200 generation due to recessive incompatibility loci (Masly *et al.* 2006; Bikard *et al.* 2009; Stelkens *et*
201 *al.* 2015). To test for F2 hybrid inviability, we mated hybrid F1 siblings derived from either JU1825
202 female x NIC59 male crosses, or from NIC59 female x JU1825 male crosses, and assayed the F2
203 generation for reductions in fitness. These F1 hybrids are referred to as “(J); N/J” and “(N); N/J”
204 respectively, where the genotype is designated by the following nomenclature: (cytoplasmic
205 genotype); nuclear genotype. The cytoplasmic genotype indicates genetic elements that are only
206 maternally inherited, such as the mitochondrial genome. We found that both types of F1 sibling
207 crosses resulted in a significant decrease in the percentage of viable progeny, with on average
208 only 71% and 63% of F2 embryos maturing to the L4 or young adult stage (Figure 1). These
209 results indicate that there are divergent genomic loci between NIC59 and JU1825 that cause
210 inviability only when they become homozygous in F2 hybrids. Additionally, there is no difference in

211 sex-specific mortality in hybrids in comparison to intra-strain crosses which implies that these loci
212 are autosomally linked, as we show later (Figure 1).

213

214 **Incompatibilities between cytoplasmic and nuclear genomes cause F2 inviability**

215 To further understand the genetic architecture of hybrid breakdown between JU1825 and
216 NIC59, we tested whether maternally or paternally inherited factors are required for F2 inviability.
217 We reasoned that backcrossing F1 females to parental males would test whether maternal factors
218 are required for reduced hybrid fitness, while backcrossing F1 males to parental females would
219 test whether paternal factors are required. For example, backcrossing F1 hybrid females to
220 JU1825 males will result in an F2 population with a 50% chance of being heterozygous
221 (NIC59/JU1825) and a 50% chance of being homozygous (JU1825/JU1825) for any given
222 autosomal locus. Therefore, this cross will test for maternally deposited NIC59 factors that are
223 incompatible with homozygous JU1825 autosomal loci. The same logic can be applied to crosses
224 of F1 hybrid males to parental strain females.

225 All instances of backcrossing F1 hybrid males to parental strain females resulted in levels
226 of F2 viability similar to those observed in parental strains. Therefore, paternal factors do not have
227 a major effect on F2 inviability (Figure 2A). Only two crosses consistently resulted in significantly
228 reduced viability. The first is when (N); N/J F1 females were crossed to JU1825 males, with on
229 average only 36% of F2 hybrids maturing to the L4 or young adult stage. This cross implies that
230 there are maternally derived NIC59 factors distributed to F2 embryos, and these factors are
231 incompatible with recessive JU1825 nuclear loci. The second is when (J); N/J F1 females are
232 crossed to NIC59 males, with on average only 52% of the F2 hybrids maturing to the L4 or young
233 adult stage (Figure 2B). This cross implies that there are also maternally derived JU1825 factors
234 distributed to F2 embryos, and these factors are incompatible with recessive NIC59 nuclear loci.
235 The viability of (J); N/J F1 female x JU1825 male crosses can also be significantly reduced in
236 comparison to intra-strain crosses, but varies within and between experiments (Figure S1).

237 Interestingly, the F1 female backcross experiments show that almost identical crosses,
238 which differ only in the cytoplasmic genotype of the F1 female, have significantly different rates of
239 F2 viability. For instance, (N); N/J F1 female x JU1825 male crosses consistently have
240 significantly lower F2 viability than (J); N/J F1 female x JU1825 male crosses (Figure 2, Figure
241 S1). Similarly, (J); N/J F1 female x NIC59 male crosses consistently have significantly lower F2
242 viability than (N); N/J F1 female x NIC59 male crosses (Figure 2). These F1 hybrid females are
243 expected to be genotypically identical at all nuclear loci, suggesting that something other than the
244 F1 nuclear genome encodes maternal factors that lead to F2 inviability. One possible model to
245 explain the differences in these backcrosses is that the mitochondrial genome is the maternally
246 inherited factor that is incompatible with recessive nuclear loci in the F2 generation. For example,
247 all F2 progeny from (N); N/J F1 female x JU1825 male crosses will inherit only NIC59 mtDNA,
248 which may be incompatible with nuclear loci homozygous (or hemizygous) for JU1825 alleles
249 resulting in inviability (Figure 6A). In comparison, all F2 progeny from (J); N/J F1 female x JU1825
250 male crosses will inherit only JU1825 mtDNA, which should be compatible with the JU1825
251 nuclear genome and therefore not result in the same inviability. The same logic can be applied to
252 the (J); N/J F1 female x NIC59 male and (N); N/J F1 female x NIC59 male crosses. Therefore, we
253 hypothesize that F2 inviability is the result of two distinct cytoplasmic-nuclear incompatibilities, one
254 between the NIC59 mitochondrial genome and recessive JU1825 nuclear loci, and another
255 between the JU1825 mitochondrial genome and recessive NIC59 nuclear loci.

256

257 **The nuclear incompatibility loci are linked to autosomes**

258 Nematodes commonly have an XX (female) and XO (male) sex determining mechanism
259 (Pires-daSilva 2007). The F1 hybrid female backcross experiments reveal that there is no
260 difference in sex-specific mortality in hybrids in comparison to intra-strain crosses (Figure 2B).
261 However, given the expected genotypes of their F2 populations, these backcrosses on their own
262 do not allow us to determine whether the nuclear incompatibility loci are autosomally or X-linked.

263 In the previous section, we concluded that the inviability of the F2 progeny derived from (N); N/J
264 F1 female x JU1825 male crosses is the result of a genetic incompatibility between the NIC59
265 mitochondrial genome and nuclear loci homozygous (or hemizygous) for JU1825 alleles. If this is
266 true, it is reasonable to assume that the same genetic incompatibility occurs in (N); N/J F1 female
267 x (N); N/J F1 male crosses (Figure 1). In this F1 sibling cross, if the JU1825 nuclear incompatibility
268 locus were autosomally linked, both sexes would suffer equal rates of inviability. However, if the
269 nuclear incompatibility locus were linked to the X-chromosome, then we would expect a significant
270 decrease in the proportion of viable males in comparison to intra-strain crosses (Figure S2).
271 However, we observe no significant difference in the proportion of viable males for the (N); N/J F1
272 female x (N); N/J F1 male cross (Figure 1). Therefore, given the data from the F1 female
273 backcrosses and the F1 sibling crosses, we conclude that the JU1825 nuclear incompatibility
274 locus is autosomally linked. A similar line of reasoning indicates that the NIC59 nuclear
275 incompatibility locus is also autosomally linked.

276

277 **Endosymbiotic bacteria do not cause hybrid inviability**

278 We hypothesize that mitochondrial genomes are responsible for the cytoplasmic
279 component of the hybrid incompatibility between NIC59 and JU1825. However, we also
280 considered whether endosymbiotic bacteria of the *Rickettsiales* order could be involved. Within
281 this order, bacteria of the *Wolbachia* genus are known to infect certain species of nematodes, and
282 are transmitted to host progeny through female gametes (Werren *et al.* 2008). Furthermore, hybrid
283 lethality in inter-strain and interspecies crosses is sometimes caused by infection with divergent
284 *Wolbachia* strains (Bourtzis *et al.* 1996; Bordenstein *et al.* 2001). However, we failed to detect
285 conserved genes typically used to genotype diverse strains of *Wolbachia* in either JU1825 or
286 NIC59 using PCR with degenerate primers (Figure S3A). Additionally, treatment of both strains
287 with tetracycline for nine generations failed to rescue hybrid inviability (Figure S3B).
288 Endosymbiotic bacteria within the *Rickettsiales* order are typically susceptible to tetracycline

289 (McOrist 2000; Darby *et al.* 2015). Thus, endosymbiotic bacteria are unlikely to cause the
290 reproductive barrier between NIC59 and JU1825.

291

292 **Cytoplasmic-nuclear incompatibility is common within *C. nouraguensis***

293 We hybridized additional wild-isolates to determine whether cytoplasmic-nuclear
294 incompatibilities represent a common reproductive barrier within *C. nouraguensis*, or whether they
295 are an unusual phenotype only observed in hybridizations between NIC59 and JU1825.
296 Specifically, we tested the compatibility of four cytoplasmic genotypes with seven nuclear
297 genotypes (Figure 3). To test for an incompatibility between one strain's cytoplasm and another
298 strain's nuclear genome, we again compared the viabilities of backcrosses that differ only in the
299 F1 hybrid female's cytoplasmic genotype (Figure 3A). Specifically, we compared the viability of the
300 backcross that combines heterotypic cytoplasmic and nuclear genotypes to the viability of the
301 backcross that combines homotypic cytoplasmic and nuclear genotypes. We calculated the
302 relative viability of the two crosses (i.e. heterotypic combination / homotypic combination), and
303 tested for statistically significant differences (see Materials and Methods). Using the same logic as
304 for our JU1825 x NIC59 crosses, we reasoned that lower viability of the heterotypic cytoplasmic-
305 nuclear combination in comparison to the homotypic cytoplasmic-nuclear combination indicates a
306 cytoplasmic-nuclear incompatibility. Three or four biological replicates were performed for each
307 cytoplasmic-nuclear combination.

308 Of the 74 cytoplasmic-nuclear tests performed, 50 (67%) exhibited significant
309 incompatibilities (Figure 3B). Additionally, each cytoplasmic genotype was consistently
310 incompatible with at least one heterotypic nuclear genotype (i.e. all replicates for a particular
311 cytoplasmic-nuclear combination indicate a significant incompatibility). However, there are a
312 number of cytoplasmic-nuclear combinations whose replicates are inconsistent with one another
313 (e.g. some replicates indicate a significant incompatibility while others do not) (Figure 3C and
314 Figure S4). This may indicate that the genetic loci required for hybrid inviability are not fixed

315 between the strains, but rather are polymorphisms segregating within each strain. This is
316 consistent with the fact that none of these strains have been formally inbred. Regardless, given
317 their common occurrence in hybridizations between strains of *C. nouraguensis*, we hypothesize
318 that cytoplasmic-nuclear incompatibilities are a significant reproductive barrier within the species.

319 We generated a heat map to help visualize the median relative viability for each
320 cytoplasmic-nuclear combination (Figure 3C). Strikingly, the NIC59 cytoplasmic genotype exhibits
321 a distinct response to hybridization, being strongly incompatible (i.e. having a low median relative
322 viability) with all of the nuclear genotypes tested. By comparison, the other cytoplasmic genotypes
323 can be relatively compatible with some heterotypic nuclear genotypes or exhibit incompatibilities
324 that are typically weaker than those involving the NIC59 cytoplasmic genotype. Specifically,
325 incompatibilities involving the JU1837 or JU1854 cytoplasmic genotypes have significantly higher
326 relative viability (median=0.72 and 0.71, respectively) in comparison to incompatibilities with the
327 NIC59 cytoplasmic genotype (median=0.45) (Figure 3B). Incompatibilities involving the JU1825
328 cytoplasm exhibit an intermediate level of relative viability (median=0.64) that is statistically
329 indistinguishable from the other cytoplasmic genotypes ($P=0.057$ in comparison to NIC59; $P=1.0$
330 in comparison to both JU1837 and JU1854). We conclude that the NIC59 cytoplasmic genotype is
331 distinct in terms of the nuclear genotypes it is incompatible with and how severe those
332 incompatibilities are.

333

334 **A single BDM incompatibility between a NIC59 cytoplasmic locus and a JU1825 nuclear** 335 **locus causes embryonic lethality**

336 As previously discussed, the backcross that combines the NIC59 cytoplasmic genotype
337 with JU1825 nuclear genotype (i.e. (N); N/J F1 female x JU1825 male, Figure 2B) results in only
338 ~36% of F2 offspring maturing to the L4 or young adult stage. A more detailed characterization of
339 F2 inviability shows that ~50% of F2 offspring fail to complete embryogenesis (Figure 4A). Of the
340 remaining half that complete embryogenesis, ~33% fail to mature to the L4 or young adult stage

341 (data not shown). In comparison, (J); N/J F1 female x JU1825 male crosses result in low levels of
342 embryonic lethality, similar to parental crosses. These data are consistent with F2 embryonic
343 lethality resulting from a single BDM incompatibility between a NIC59 cytoplasmic locus and a
344 single homozygous JU1825 autosomal locus.

345 To test the hypothesis of a single BDM incompatibility, we crossed viable F2 females to
346 JU1825 males and assayed F3 viability. Under this hypothesis, the surviving F2 females are
347 expected to have inherited NIC59 mtDNA and be heterozygous (i.e. JU1825/NIC59) at the
348 JU1825 nuclear incompatibility locus (Figure 6A). Therefore, crossing these F2 females to JU1825
349 males should also result in ~50% embryonic lethality in the F3 generation. This pattern should
350 also be true for additional backcross generations (e.g. F4, F5 etc.). Thus, we generated 15
351 independent backcross lineages, each consisting of matings between single surviving hybrid
352 females and JU1825 males, and monitored each lineage's viability for four backcross generations.
353 Indeed, the approximately 50% embryonic lethality observed in the F2 generation is also observed
354 in the subsequent backcross generations in all lineages (Figure 4B). These results are consistent
355 with the hypothesis that embryonic lethality is the result of a simple two-locus BDM incompatibility
356 between a purely maternally inherited cytoplasmic NIC59 locus and a single nuclear locus
357 homozygous for JU1825 alleles. We hypothesize that the post-embryonic inviability may be a
358 genetically separable phenotype.

359

360 **The JU1825 cytoplasm appears to be heteroplasmic**

361 As previously discussed, the backcross that combines the JU1825 cytoplasmic genotype
362 with the NIC59 nuclear genotype (i.e. (J); N/J F1 female x NIC59 male crosses) results in ~50%
363 F2 viability on average (Figure 2B). Thus, the total F2 inviability could be the result of a single
364 BDM incompatibility between a JU1825 cytoplasmic locus and a single autosomal locus
365 homozygous for NIC59 alleles.

366 To test this hypothesis, we generated 15 independent backcross lineages, each consisting
367 of matings between single surviving hybrid females and NIC59 males, and monitored each
368 lineage's viability for four backcross generations. To our surprise, while some lineages continued
369 to exhibit low levels of viability similar to the F2 generation average (~50%), others began to
370 exhibit and maintain significantly increased viability for multiple backcross generations (Figure
371 5A). For example, in this particular experiment we found that in the F2 generation a majority of
372 lineages (13/15) had a total viability ranging from 18-50%, while only two exhibited higher viability
373 (68% and 85%). However, by the F5 backcross generation, we found that of the fourteen
374 remaining lineages only four exhibited 50% viability or less. Strikingly, by the F5 generation, 5/14
375 backcross lineages exhibited nearly 100% viability.

376 The rescue of hybrid inviability for some lineages via several generations of backcrossing is
377 peculiar. One hypothesis to explain this phenomenon is that the JU1825 cytoplasmic and/or
378 NIC59 nuclear incompatibility loci are not fixed within their respective strains, but rather are
379 segregating polymorphisms. As a specific example, the JU1825 cytoplasmic incompatibility locus
380 could be heteroplasmic for alleles that are either incompatible or compatible with the NIC59
381 nuclear genome. The mitochondrial genome is present at a high copy number within a single cell,
382 and it is thought that individual mtDNAs are randomly replicated and segregated to daughter cells
383 during cell division. Studies on the inheritance of various mtDNA heteroplasmies show that their
384 frequency amongst siblings from the same mother can be highly variable due to the random
385 sampling of mtDNAs and genetic bottlenecks during female germline development (Wallace and
386 Chalkia 2013). Therefore, it is possible that a NIC59-compatible cytoplasmic allele has increased
387 in frequency in some backcross lineages and rescued inviability.

388 To gain a better understanding of the genetic composition of the JU1825 cytoplasm, we
389 also monitored the viability of (J); N/J female x JU1825 male lineages over four backcross
390 generations. Because this cross combines homotypic JU1825 cytoplasmic and JU1825 nuclear
391 genotypes, we originally predicted that the relatively high rates of F2 viability would persist or

392 possibly increase with additional backcross generations. However, we instead observed that some
393 backcross lineages showed a striking decrease in viability after the F2 generation (Figure 5B). For
394 example, in this particular experiment, lineages in the F2 generation exhibited a uniform
395 distribution of viability, with an average of 74%. By the F5 generation we find two distinct
396 populations of lineages, those with a high viability ranging from 85-96% (6/14 lineages) and those
397 with an astonishingly low viability ranging from 29-55% (8/14 lineages) (Figure 5B). The latter
398 population has an average viability of 39%, which is quite similar to that observed in (N); N/J F1
399 female x JU1825 male crosses (~36%, Figure 2B), indicating that although these lineages
400 inherited their cytoplasm from JU1825 mothers, they now seem to exhibit low levels of viability
401 similar to those observed in the NIC59 cytoplasmic – JU1825 nuclear incompatibility. One
402 hypothesis to explain these data is that the JU1825 cytoplasm harbors a NIC59-like allele which at
403 a certain threshold frequency can mimic the NIC59 cytoplasmic-JU1825 nuclear incompatibility in
404 certain (J); N/J F1 female x JU1825 male backcross lineages.

405 In support of this hypothesis, the rate of embryonic lethality for some (J); N/J female x
406 JU1825 male backcross lineages also increases to levels observed in the NIC59 cytoplasmic –
407 JU1825 nuclear incompatibility (i.e. 50%) and can be stably inherited for several backcross
408 generations (Figure 5C). Specifically, most lineages (12/14) in the F2 generation exhibited only 0-
409 19% embryonic lethality, while only two lineages exhibited higher rates (38 and 47%). However,
410 by the F5 backcross generation, only about half of the lineages (6/14) exhibited 0-8% embryonic
411 lethality, while 8/14 lineages exhibited 35-65% embryonic lethality. Taken together, the results
412 from the two backcross experiments are consistent with the hypothesis that the JU1825 cytoplasm
413 is heteroplasmic and harbors both JU1825-like and NIC59-like incompatibility loci (Figure 6B and
414 C).

415

416

DISCUSSION

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

We discovered a lethal cytoplasmic-nuclear incompatibility between two wild isolates of *C. nouraguensis*, JU1825 and NIC59, and find that such incompatibilities may be widespread between other wild-isolates within the species. We show that maternally inherited endosymbiotic bacteria are not the cause of hybrid inviability, making the mitochondrial genome the most likely candidate for harboring the cytoplasmic incompatibility factor(s). We also propose that the JU1825 cytoplasm is heteroplasmic, and harbors both JU1825-like and NIC59-like incompatibility loci.

In eukaryotes, the mitochondrial genome typically contains a very small fraction of the gene content of a cell, yet it seems to be involved in a disproportionate number of genetic incompatibilities across a diverse range of taxa (Rand *et al.* 2004; Burton and Barreto 2012) . However, there are relatively few cases in which incompatibility loci have been definitively mapped to the mitochondrial genome, and therefore a larger sample is required to better understand what drives the evolution of mitochondrial-nuclear incompatibility. Additionally, all of the molecularly identified cases of mitochondrial-nuclear incompatibility have been found between species rather than within species (Lee *et al.* 2008; Chou *et al.* 2010; Luo *et al.* 2013; Meiklejohn *et al.* 2013; Ma *et al.* 2016). Some of these inter-species hybridizations harbor additional genetic incompatibilities or chromosomal rearrangements that cause inviability and sterility (Hunter *et al.* 1996; Fischer *et al.* 2000; Brideau *et al.* 2006; Ferree and Barbash 2009; Mihola *et al.* 2009; Davies *et al.* 2016), making it difficult to discern whether mitochondrial-nuclear incompatibility was instrumental in initiating speciation or evolved after strong reproductive isolation occurred. The incompatibility we describe here provides an excellent opportunity to study the evolutionary genetics and cell biology of incipient speciation as well as mitochondrial-nuclear incompatibility. The ease of breeding, large brood sizes, and short generation time of *C. nouraguensis* should facilitate the mapping and identification of the genes that contribute to hybrid inviability.

Asymmetric cytoplasmic-nuclear incompatibilities

442 Most molecularly characterized BDM incompatibilities are asymmetric, in that only one of
443 two divergent alleles at a locus is incompatible with heterospecific alleles at other loci (e.g.
444 Brideau *et al.* 2006; Ferree and Barbash 2009). This is also true of the mitochondrial-nuclear
445 incompatibilities seen in *Saccharomyces* species hybridizations (Lee *et al.* 2008; Chou *et al.*
446 2010). For example, an intron of the *COX-1* gene in the *Saccharomyces bayanus* mitochondrial
447 genome fails to be correctly spliced by the nuclearly encoded *S. cerevisiae MRS-1* gene, resulting
448 in hybrid inviability presumably due to a failure of respiration on non-fermentable media. However,
449 a similar incompatibility does not occur between *S. cerevisiae COX-1* and *S. bayanus MRS-1*. At
450 first glance it may seem as though the cytoplasmic-nuclear incompatibility between JU1825 and
451 NIC59 is symmetric, since both strains have a cytoplasm that is incompatible with the other
452 strain's nuclear genome. However we currently cannot determine whether the JU1825 or NIC59
453 cytoplasmic and nuclear incompatibility loci are allelic, leaving open the possibility that different
454 genes cause hybrid inviability in the reciprocal crosses.

455

456 **Cytoplasmic-nuclear incompatibility: both sexes are equally inviable**

457 J.B.S Haldane noted that the heterogametic sex more often suffers from inviability or
458 sterility in inter-species hybridizations than the homogametic sex (Delph and Demuth 2016). It is
459 not known whether “Haldane’s rule” also applies in intra-species hybridizations. The lethal
460 cytoplasmic-nuclear incompatibility we identified between the NIC59 and JU1825 wild isolates of
461 *C. nouraguensis* affects females and males equally, suggesting that the two sexes share the
462 same disrupted developmental pathway(s). However, we have not carefully studied other aspects
463 of sex-specific fitness, such as female and male F2 hybrid fertility. Because the mitochondrial
464 genome is inherited only through females, theory predicts that evolution will lead to the
465 accumulation of mtDNA variants that are neutral or increase female fitness, but that are neutral or
466 possibly deleterious to male fitness (Gemmell *et al.* 2004). Because of this, male-specific functions
467 may be more adversely affected during the hybridization of heterotypic mitochondrial and nuclear

468 genomes. This is indeed the case for some known mitochondrial-nuclear incompatibilities. For
469 example, when swapping the mitochondrial genomes between mouse subspecies via pronuclear
470 transfer, one mitochondrial-nuclear combination resulted in reduced male fertility while females
471 had relatively normal fertility (Ma *et al.* 2016). Therefore, further studies of *C. nouraguensis* hybrid
472 male fertility are required to more fully address whether this system follows Haldane's rule, as well
473 as to determine whether there are male-specific mitochondrial-nuclear incompatibilities.

474

475 **JU1825 heteroplasmy**

476 We hypothesize that the JU1825 cytoplasm is heteroplasmic and contains mitochondrial
477 genomes that are both compatible (JU1825-like) and incompatible (NIC59-like) with the JU1825
478 nuclear incompatibility locus. If the JU1825 cytoplasm is naturally heteroplasmic, we predict the
479 NIC59-like mtDNAs are kept at a low frequency within JU1825 by selection. This selection would
480 be relaxed in (J); N/J F1 hybrids and the frequency of NIC59-like mtDNA can increase, reducing
481 incompatibility in backcrosses to NIC59 males and increasing incompatibility in backcrosses to
482 JU1825 males. However, our data cannot rule out the possibility that NIC59-like mtDNA is
483 introduced into F1 females by incomplete degradation and inheritance of paternal NIC59 mtDNA.
484 Interestingly, indirect evidence suggests that paternal mtDNA can be inherited when hybridizing
485 different wild isolates of *Caenorhabditis briggsae* (Hicks *et al.* 2012; Chang *et al.* 2015).

486 The hypothesized heteroplasmy of the JU1825 cytoplasm may explain the greater variance
487 of F2 viability in crosses with (J); N/J F1 females in comparison to those with presumably
488 homoplasmic (N); N/J F1 females. Stochastic segregation and genetic bottlenecking events from
489 JU1825 mothers may result in F1 females with a wide range of frequencies of the NIC59-like
490 cytoplasmic allele, and therefore a wide range of F2 viability when backcrossed to either NIC59 or
491 JU1825 males. This stochastic inheritance may also explain why the degree of F2 viability of (J);
492 N/J F1 female x JU1825 male backcrosses can also vary significantly from experiment to
493 experiment (Figure S1).

494

495 **Acknowledgments**

496 We thank Marie-Anne Félix and Christian Braendle for providing the *Caenorhabditis nouraguensis*
497 strains used in this study. We also thank the labs of Harmit Malik and Leo Pallanck for providing
498 *Drosophila melanogaster* strains with and without *Wolbachia*. We thank Janet Young, Harmit
499 Malik, Maitreya Dunham and Irini Topalidou for helpful discussions and comments on the
500 manuscript. P.L. was supported in part by an NIH Institutional Training Grant (PHS, NRSA,
501 T32GM007270 from NIGMS). This work was supported by an NSF CAREER award to M.A.
502

503 **Figure Legends**

504 **Figure 1. JU1825 and NIC59 exhibit F2 hybrid breakdown.** Crosses are listed on the y-axis.

505 Letters in parentheses to the left of a semi-colon denote the cytoplasmic genotype of an individual
506 (e.g. "(J)" individuals have a JU1825 cytoplasmic genotype), while letters to the right of a semi-
507 colon denote the genotypes of all autosomal loci (i.e. "N/J" individuals are heterozygous
508 NIC59/JU1825 throughout the autosomes). Only (J); N/J F1 x (J); N/J F1 and (N); N/J F1 x (N);
509 N/J F1 crosses exhibit a significant decrease in the percentage of viable progeny ($P < 0.01$ and
510 $P < 0.001$, respectively). There are no significant differences in the percentages of viable males
511 between crosses ($P > 0.05$). $N = 14$ or 15 plates per cross. All p-values were calculated by a
512 Kruskal-Wallis test followed by Dunn's test.

513

514 **Figure 2. F2 inviability involves a maternal cytoplasmic effect. (A)** There is no significant
515 difference in the percentage of viable progeny between any of the F1 hybrid male backcrosses
516 and intra-strain crosses ($P > 0.05$). **(B)** Backcrossing hybrid females to parental strain males
517 reveals that only (N); N/J F1 female x JU1825 male crosses and (J); N/J F1 female x NIC59 male
518 crosses exhibit a significant decrease in the percentage of viable progeny in comparison to intra-
519 strain crosses ($P < 0.001$). (N); N/J F1 female x JU1825 male crosses have significantly decreased
520 viability in comparison to (J); N/J F1 female x JU1825 male crosses ($P < 0.001$). Additionally, (J);
521 N/J F1 female x NIC59 male crosses consistently have significantly decreased viability in
522 comparison to (N); N/J F1 female x NIC59 male crosses ($P < 0.05$). The viability of (J); N/J F1
523 female x JU1825 males can differ significantly between experiments (Figure S1). There are no
524 significant differences in the proportion of viable males between the crosses ($P > 0.05$). $N = 14$ or 15
525 plates per cross. All p-values were calculated by a Kruskal-Wallis test followed by Dunn's test.

526

527 **Figure 3. Cytoplasmic nuclear incompatibility is widespread within *C. nouraguensis*. (A)**

528 To determine whether a particular cytoplasmic-nuclear combination is incompatible, we tested for
529 statistical differences in viability between the F1 female backcross that combines heterotypic
530 cytoplasmic and nuclear genotypes (top cross) and the backcross that combines homotypic
531 cytoplasmic and nuclear genotypes (bottom cross, see Materials and Methods). We also
532 calculated the relative viability of the first cross to the second. **(B)** A scatter plot depicting all the
533 cytoplasmic-nuclear compatibility tests performed. Each point corresponds to a single replicate of
534 a certain cytoplasmic-nuclear combination. Points above the horizontal dashed gray line indicate
535 statistically significant differences in viability between the two types of crosses mentioned in (A)
536 ($P < 0.0006$ after Bonferroni correction, Fisher's exact test). Points above the horizontal dashed
537 gray line that have a relative viability < 1 are considered statistically significant cytoplasmic-nuclear
538 incompatibilities. The color of a point corresponds to the cytoplasmic genotype being tested. All
539 cytoplasmic genotypes tested show an incompatibility with one or more heterotypic nuclear
540 genotypes. See Figure S4 for separate graphs of all combinations. Above the scatterplot are
541 boxplots depicting the relative viabilities of statistically significant cytoplasmic-nuclear
542 incompatibilities. The color corresponds to cytoplasmic genotype tested. Incompatibilities involving
543 the NIC59 cytoplasmic genotype have reduced viability compared to those involving the JU1837
544 and JU1854 cytoplasmic genotypes ($P < 0.001$, Kruskal-Wallis test followed by Dunn's test). **(C)** A
545 heatmap depicting the median relative viability for each cytoplasmic-nuclear combination. Each
546 cytoplasmic-nuclear combination shows the proportion of replicates that exhibit significant
547 incompatibilities (e.g. 3 out of 3 replicates exhibit significant incompatibilities for the NIC59
548 cytoplasm – JU1854 nuclear combination, while only 1 out of 3 replicates exhibit significant
549 incompatibilities for the JU1837 cytoplasm – JU1854 nuclear combination). Each cytoplasmic
550 genotype is consistently incompatible with at least one heterotypic nuclear genotype. The NIC59
551 cytoplasm has a distinct response to hybridization than the others tested.

552

553 **Figure 4. A single BDM incompatibility between a NIC59 cytoplasmic locus and a JU1825**
554 **nuclear locus causes embryonic lethality. (A)** Approximately 50% of the F2 progeny from (N);
555 N/J F1 female x JU1825 male crosses arrest during embryogenesis, significantly higher than that
556 seen in intra-strain crosses ($P < 0.001$). In contrast, (J); N/J F1 female x JU1825 male and parental
557 strain crosses exhibit low and similar levels of embryonic lethality ($P > 0.05$). **(B)** Initially, fifteen (N);
558 N/J F1 females were independently backcrossed to single JU1825 males. For each independent
559 lineage, a single surviving F2 female was again backcrossed to a JU1825 male. This
560 backcrossing scheme was repeated until the F5 generation (11 lineages remain). Each colored
561 line represents a single backcross lineage. All backcross lineages exhibit ~50% embryonic
562 lethality throughout the backcross generations, consistent with the hypothesis that an
563 incompatibility between a NIC59 cytoplasmic locus and a single JU1825 nuclear locus causes
564 embryonic lethality. **(C)** Both parental strains were “backcrossed” as a negative control (JU1825
565 = 14 backcross lineages in the F1 generation, 11 lineages by the F4 generation; NIC59 = 15
566 backcross lineages in the F1 generation, 11 lineages by the F4 generation). All p-values were
567 calculated by a Kruskal-Wallis test followed by Dunn’s test.

568

569 **Figure 5. The JU1825 cytoplasm is heteroplasmic for JU1825-like and NIC59-like alleles. (A)**
570 The viability of 15 independent (J); N/J female x NIC59 male backcross lineages were followed
571 until the F5 generation. Surprisingly, in some lineages, multiple generations of backcrossing
572 resulted in increased viability (similar to that seen in intra-strain crosses). **(B)** The viability of 15
573 independent (J); N/J female x JU1825 male backcross lineages were also followed until the F5
574 generation. Interestingly, multiple generations of backcrossing results in some lineages with
575 significantly reduced viability, similar to that seen in (N); N/J F1 female x JU1825 male crosses.
576 We also examined embryonic lethality, finding that some lineages exhibit the ~50% embryonic
577 lethality seen in (N); N/J F1 female x JU1825 male crosses upon additional generations of

578 backcrossing. These results are consistent with the hypothesis that the JU1825 cytoplasm is
579 heteroplasmic and contains JU1825-like and NIC59-like alleles.

580

581 **Figure 6. Mitochondrial-nuclear incompatibility model. (A)** We hypothesize that F2 hybrid
582 breakdown is the result of a Bateson-Dobzhansky-Muller incompatibility between the NIC59
583 mitochondrial genome and a nuclear locus homozygous for the JU1825 allele, and vice versa. As
584 a specific example, when NIC59 females are crossed to JU1825 males, the resulting F1 hybrid
585 females are expected to be heterozygous at all autosomal loci while inheriting only NIC59 mtDNA.
586 When F1 females are backcrossed to JU1825 males, F2 inviability results from an incompatibility
587 between NIC59 mtDNA and an autosomal locus homozygous for the JU1825 nuclear allele. **(B)**
588 We hypothesize that the JU1825 cytoplasm is heteroplasmic in F1 females and contains at least
589 one NIC59-like allele. Backcrossing hybrid females with a JU1825 cytoplasm (i.e. (J); N/J females)
590 to NIC59 males for multiple generations can allow the NIC59-like cytoplasmic allele to increase in
591 frequency and dilute out the effects of the incompatible JU1825-like mtDNA (e.g. top right F2
592 female). This eventually may allow the NIC59 nuclear locus to become homozygous and restore
593 the viability of a lineage. On the other hand, the NIC59-like mtDNA can stay at a low frequency in
594 viable F2 females (e.g. bottom right F2 female). Backcrossing these F2 females to NIC59 males
595 results in levels of inviability similar to the F2 generation. **(C)** By a similar line of reasoning,
596 backcrossing hybrid females with a JU1825 cytoplasm to JU1825 males for multiple generations
597 can allow the NIC59-like mtDNA to increase in frequency, where it can mimic the same genetic
598 incompatibility seen in (N); N/J F1 female x JU1825 male crosses (Figure 6A).

599

600 **Supplemental Figure 1. Variability of (J); N/J F1 female x JU1825 male crosses across**
601 **experiments.** Three biological replicates of the same type of backcross experiment. (J); N/J F1
602 female x JU1825 male crosses can either exhibit similar or significantly decreased rates of viability
603 in comparison to intra-strain crosses across experiments (Experiment 1, non-significant, $P > 0.05$;

604 Experiment 2, non-significant, $P > 0.05$; Experiment 3, $P > 0.05$, non-significant in comparison to
605 JU1825 x JU1825 crosses, $P < 0.05$ significant in comparison to NIC59 x NIC59 crosses).
606 However, (J); N/J F1 female x JU1825 male crosses consistently exhibit significantly increased
607 rates of viability in comparison to (N); N/J F1 female x JU1825 male crosses (Experiment 1, **,
608 $P < 0.01$; Experiment 2, **, $P < 0.01$; Experiment 3, *, $P < 0.05$). Experiments 1 and 2 are data from
609 Figures 2 and 5, respectively. All p-values were calculated by a Kruskal-Wallis test followed by
610 Dunn's test.

611

612 **Supplemental Figure 2. Nuclear incompatibility loci are linked to autosomes, not sex**
613 **chromosomes.** F1 intercrosses allow us to infer that the nuclear incompatibility loci are
614 autosomal, not X-linked. From the (N); N/J F1 x JU1825 male backcross experiment (Figure 2),
615 we concluded that F2 inviability was the result of a genetic incompatibility between the NIC59
616 mitochondrial genome and nuclear loci homozygous or hemizygous for JU1825 alleles. It is
617 reasonable to assume that the same genetic incompatibility contributes to F2 inviability in (N); N/J
618 F1 female x (N); N/J F1 male crosses. If the nuclear incompatibility locus were X-linked, F2 males
619 would have a 50% chance of being hemizygous for the JU1825 nuclear incompatibility locus while
620 F2 females can only be heterozygous or homozygous for NIC59 alleles. Therefore, if the locus
621 were X-linked, half of F2 males would be inviable while females would be unaffected. If the
622 nuclear incompatibility locus were autosomally linked, then both sexes have an equal chance of
623 being homozygous for the JU1825 nuclear incompatibility locus. Therefore, both sexes are
624 expected to suffer equal rates of inviability. We do not observe a significant decrease in the
625 proportion of viable F2 males (Figure 1), so we conclude that the JU1825 nuclear incompatibility
626 locus or loci are linked to autosomes. The same line of reasoning can be used to show that the
627 NIC59 incompatibility locus or loci are also autosomally linked.

628

629 **Supplemental Figure 3. Endosymbiotic bacteria do not cause cytoplasmic-nuclear**
630 **incompatibility. (A)** PCR on both JU1825 and NIC59 crude lysates (10 adult worms per lysate, 5
631 females and 5 males) with degenerate primers against the *Wolbachia fbpA* or *gatB* loci fails to
632 amplify the expected products. w^{1118} (wol+) and w^{1118} (wol-) *D. melanogaster* flies serve as
633 positive and negative controls, respectively. PCR on crude lysates of OP50 (bacterial food source
634 of NIC59 and JU1825) also fails to amplify the expected products. PCR on JU2079, an inbred
635 strain derived from JU1825, also fails to amplify the expected *gatB* product. **(B)** Both tetracycline-
636 treated (J);N/J F1 female x NIC59 male and (N);N/J F1 female x JU1825 male crosses exhibit
637 significantly decreased levels of viability in comparison to tetracycline treated intra-strain crosses
638 ($P < 0.01$). Additionally, there are no statistical differences in viability between NIC59 x NIC59 and
639 JU1825 x JU1825 tetracycline treated intra-strain crosses ($P > 0.05$). $N = 14$ or 15 for each cross. All
640 p-values were calculated by a Kruskal-Wallis test followed by Dunn's test.

641
642 **Supplemental Figure 4. Cytoplasmic-nuclear tests separated by nuclear genotype.** Each
643 graph depicts all the cytoplasmic-nuclear tests performed between four cytoplasmic genotypes
644 and a single nuclear genotype. This is the same data that is grouped into a single graph in Figure
645 3B. Each cytoplasmic-nuclear combination has three biological replicates (except for JU1825
646 cytoplasm – NIC24 nuclear and JU1825 cytoplasm – NIC54 nuclear combinations, which have
647 four replicates). Although there appear to be many cases of significant cytoplasmic-nuclear
648 incompatibility (relative viability < 1 and $P < 0.0006$ after Bonferroni correction), there can be
649 discrepancies between replicates (e.g. one replicate of the JU1825 cytoplasm – NIC24 nuclear
650 combination indicates a significant incompatibility, while the other three do not).

651

652 **LITERATURE CITED**

- 653 Aalto E. A., Koelewijn H.-P., Savolainen O., 2013 Cytoplasmic Male Sterility Contributes to Hybrid
654 Incompatibility Between Subspecies of *Arabidopsis lyrata*. *G3*. 3: 1727–1740.
- 655 Arnqvist G., Dowling D. K., Eady P., Gay L., Tregenza T., Tuda M., Hosken D. J., 2010 Genetic
656 architecture of metabolic rate: Environment specific epistasis between mitochondrial and
657 nuclear genes in an insect. *Evolution* (N. Y). 64: 3354–3363.
- 658 Baldo L., Hotopp J. C. D., Jolley K. A., Bordenstein S. R., Biber S. A., Choudhury R. R., Hayashi
659 C., Maiden M. C. J., Tettelin H., Werren J. H., 2006 Multilocus sequence typing system for the
660 endosymbiont *Wolbachia pipientis*. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 72: 7098–7110.
- 661 Barbash D. A., Awadalla P., Tarone A. M., 2004 Functional Divergence Caused by Ancient
662 Positive Selection of a *Drosophila* Hybrid Incompatibility Locus. *PLoS Biol.* 2: e142.
- 663 Bikard D., Patel D., Mett  C. Le, Giorgi V., Camilleri C., Bennett M. J., Loudet O., 2009 Divergent
664 evolution of duplicate genes leads to genetic incompatibilities within *A. thaliana*. *Science* 323:
665 623–626.
- 666 Bordenstein S. R., O’Hara F. P., Werren J. H., 2001 *Wolbachia*-induced incompatibility precedes
667 other hybrid incompatibilities in *Nasonia*. *Nature* 409: 707–710.
- 668 Bourtzis K., Nirgianaki A., Markakis G., Savakis C., 1996 *Wolbachia* infection and cytoplasmic
669 incompatibility in *Drosophila* species. *Genetics* 144: 1063–1073.
- 670 Brenner S., 1974 The genetics of *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Genetics* 77: 71-94.
- 671 Brideau N. J., Flores H. A., Wang J., Maheshwari S., Wang X., Barbash D. A., 2006 Two
672 Dobzhansky-Muller genes interact to cause hybrid lethality in *Drosophila*. *Science* 314: 1292–
673 1295.
- 674 Burton R. S., Barreto F. S., 2012 A disproportionate role for mtDNA in Dobzhansky-Muller
675 incompatibilities? *Mol. Ecol.* 21: 4942–4957.
- 676 Chae E., Bomblies K., Kim S. T., Karelina D., Zaidem M., Ossowski S., Mart n-Pizarro C., Laitinen
677 R. A. E., Rowan B. A., Tenenboim H., Lechner S., Demar M., Habring-M ller A., Lanz C.,

- 678 Rätsch G., Weigel D., 2014 Species-wide genetic incompatibility analysis identifies immune
679 genes as hot spots of deleterious epistasis. *Cell* 159: 1341–1351.
- 680 Chang C.-C., Rodriguez J., Ross J., 2015 Mitochondrial-Nuclear Epistasis Impacts Fitness and
681 Mitochondrial Physiology of Interpopulation *Caenorhabditis briggsae* Hybrids. *G3*. 6: 209–19.
- 682 Chou J.-Y., Hung Y.-S., Lin K.-H., Lee H.-Y., Leu J.-Y., 2010 Multiple molecular mechanisms
683 cause reproductive isolation between three yeast species. *PLoS Biol.* 8: e1000432.
- 684 Coyne J. A., Orr H. A., 1998 The evolutionary genetics of speciation. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond.*
685 *B. Biol. Sci.* 353: 287–305.
- 686 Coyne J.A., Orr H.A., 2004 *Speciation*, Sinauer Associates, Sunderland MA.
- 687 Darby A. C., Gill A. C., Armstrong S. D., Hartley C. S., Xia D., Wastling J. M., Makepeace B. L.,
688 2015 Integrated transcriptomic and proteomic analysis of *Wolbachia* to doxycycline-induced
689 stress. *Mol. Cell. Proteomics* 14: 1038–53.
- 690 Davies B., Hatton E., Altemose N., Hussin J. G., Pratto F., Zhang G., Hinch A. G., Moralli D.,
691 Biggs D., Diaz R., Preece C., Li R., Bitoun E., Brick K., Green C.M., Camerini-Otero R.D.,
692 Myers S. R., Donnelly P., 2016 Re-engineering the zinc fingers of PRDM9 reverses hybrid
693 sterility in mice. *Nature* 530: 171–176.
- 694 Delph L. F., Demuth J. P., 2016 Haldane's rule: Genetic bases and their empirical support. *J.*
695 *Hered.* 107: 383–391.
- 696 Ellison C. K., Burton R. S., 2008 Interpopulation hybrid breakdown maps to the mitochondrial
697 genome. *Evolution (N. Y.)*. 62: 631–638.
- 698 Ellison C. K., Niehuis O., Gadau J., 2008 Hybrid breakdown and mitochondrial dysfunction in
699 hybrids of *Nasonia* parasitoid wasps. *J. Evol. Biol.* 21: 1844–1851.
- 700 Félix M. A., Braendle C., Cutter A. D., 2014 A streamlined system for species diagnosis in
701 *caenorhabditis* (Nematoda: Rhabditidae) with name designations for 15 distinct biological
702 species. *PLoS One.* 9: e94723.
- 703 Ferree P. M., Barbash D. A., 2009 Species-specific heterochromatin prevents mitotic chromosome

- 704 segregation to cause hybrid lethality in *Drosophila*. *PLoS Biol.* 7: e1000234.
- 705 Fischer G., James S. A., Roberts I. N., Oliver S. G., Louis E. J., 2000 Chromosomal evolution in
706 *Saccharomyces*. *Nature* 405: 451–454.
- 707 Fujii S., Bond C. S., Small I. D., 2011 Selection patterns on restorer-like genes reveal a conflict
708 between nuclear and mitochondrial genomes throughout angiosperm evolution. *Proc. Natl.*
709 *Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 108: 1723–1728.
- 710 Gemmell N. J., Metcalf V. J., Allendorf F. W., 2004 Mother’s curse: The effect of mtDNA on
711 individual fitness and population viability. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 19: 238–244.
- 712 Gustafsson C. M., Falkenberg M., Larsson N.-G., 2016 Maintenance and Expression of
713 Mammalian Mitochondrial DNA. *Annu. Rev. Biochem.* 85: 9.1-9.28
- 714 Hicks K. A., Howe D. K., Leung A., Denver D. R., Estes S., 2012 In Vivo Quantification Reveals
715 Extensive Natural Variation in Mitochondrial Form and Function in *Caenorhabditis briggsae*.
716 *PLoS One* 7: e43837.
- 717 Huang W., Yu C., Hu J., Wang L., Dan Z., Zhou W., He C., Zeng Y., Yao G., Qi J., Zhang Z., Zhu
718 R., Chen X., Zhu Y., 2015 Pentatricopeptide-repeat family protein RF6 functions with
719 hexokinase 6 to rescue rice cytoplasmic male sterility. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 112:
720 14984–9.
- 721 Hunter N., Chambers S. R., Louis E. J., Borts R. H., 1996 The mismatch repair system contributes
722 to meiotic sterility in an interspecific yeast hybrid. *EMBO J.* 15 VN-r: 1726–1733.
- 723 Kiontke K. C., Félix M.-A., Ailion M., Rockman M. V., Braendle C., Pénigault J.-B., Fitch D. H.,
724 2011 A phylogeny and molecular barcodes for *Caenorhabditis*, with numerous new species
725 from rotting fruits. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 11: 339.
- 726 Lee H. Y., Chou J. Y., Cheong L., Chang N. H., Yang S. Y., Leu J. Y., 2008 Incompatibility of
727 Nuclear and Mitochondrial Genomes Causes Hybrid Sterility between Two Yeast Species.
728 *Cell* 135: 1065–1073.
- 729 Luo D., Xu H., Liu Z., Guo J., Li H., Chen L., Fang C., Zhang Q., Bai M., Yao N., Wu H., Wu H., Ji

- 730 C., Zheng H., Chen Y., Ye S., Li X., Zhao X., Li R., Liu Y.-G., 2013 A detrimental
731 mitochondrial-nuclear interaction causes cytoplasmic male sterility in rice. *Nat. Genet.* 45:
732 573–577.
- 733 Ma H., Gutierrez N. M., Morey R., Dyken C. Van, Kang E., Hayama T., Lee Y., Li Y., Tippner-
734 Hedges R., Wolf D. P., Laurent L. C., Mitalipov S., 2016 Incompatibility between Nuclear and
735 Mitochondrial Genomes Contributes to an Interspecies Reproductive Barrier Article
736 Incompatibility between Nuclear and Mitochondrial Genomes Contributes to an Interspecies
737 Reproductive Barrier. *Cell Metab.* 24: 283-294.
- 738 Masly J. P., Jones C. D., Noor M. A. F., Locke J., Orr H. A., 2006 Gene transposition as a cause
739 of hybrid sterility in *Drosophila*. *Science* 313: 1448–1450.
- 740 Mayr E., 1942 *Systematics and the Origin of Species*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- 741 McOrist S., 2000 Obligate intracellular bacteria and antibiotic resistance. *Trends Microbiol.* 8:
742 483–486.
- 743 Meiklejohn C. D., Holmbeck M. A., Siddiq M. A., Abt D. N., Rand D. M., Montooth K. L., 2013 An
744 Incompatibility between a Mitochondrial tRNA and Its Nuclear-Encoded tRNA Synthetase
745 Compromises Development and Fitness in *Drosophila*. *PLoS Genet.* 9: e1003238.
- 746 Mihola O., Trachtulec Z., Vlcek C., Schimenti J. C., Forejt J., 2009 A Mouse Speciation Gene
747 Encodes a Meiotic Histone H3 Methyltransferase. *Science.* 323: 373–5.
- 748 Oliveira D. C. S. G., Raychoudhury R., Lavrov D. V., Werren J. H., 2008 Rapidly evolving
749 mitochondrial genome and directional selection in mitochondrial genes in the parasitic wasp
750 *Nasonia* (Hymenoptera: Pteromalidae). *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 25: 2167–2180.
- 751 Oliver P. L., Goodstadt L., Bayes J. J., Birtle Z., Roach K. C., Phadnis N., Beatson S. A., Lunter
752 G., Malik H. S., Ponting C. P., 2009 Accelerated evolution of the Prdm9 speciation gene
753 across diverse metazoan taxa. *PLoS Genet.* 5: e1000753.
- 754 Orr H. A., 1995 The population genetics of speciation: The evolution of hybrid incompatibilities.
755 *Genetics* 139: 1805–1813.

- 756 Osada N., Akashi H., 2012 Mitochondrial-nuclear interactions and accelerated compensatory
757 evolution: Evidence from the primate cytochrome c oxidase complex. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 29:
758 337–346.
- 759 Phadnis N., Orr H. A., 2009 A single gene causes both male sterility and segregation distortion in
760 *Drosophila* hybrids. *Science*. 323: 376–379.
- 761 Phadnis N., Baker E. P., Cooper J. C., Frizzell K. A., Hsieh E., la Cruz A. F. A. de, Shendure J.,
762 Kitzman J. O., Malik H. S., 2015 An essential cell cycle regulation gene causes hybrid
763 inviability in *Drosophila*. *Science* 350: 1552–5.
- 764 Pires-daSilva A., 2007 Evolution of the control of sexual identity in nematodes. *Semin. Cell Dev.*
765 *Biol.* 18: 362–370.
- 766 Presgraves D. C., Balagopalan L., Abmayr S. M., Orr H. A., 2003 Adaptive evolution drives
767 divergence of a hybrid inviability gene between two species of *Drosophila*. *Nature* 423: 715–
768 719.
- 769 Presgraves D. C., 2010 The molecular evolutionary basis of species formation. *Nat. Rev. Genet.*
770 11: 175–180.
- 771 Rand D. M., Haney R. A., Fry A. J., 2004 Cytonuclear coevolution: The genomics of cooperation.
772 *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 19: 645–653.
- 773 Ross J. A., Koboldt D. C., Staisch J. E., Chamberlin H. M., Gupta B. P., Miller R. D., Baird S. E.,
774 Haag E. S., 2011 *Caenorhabditis briggsae* recombinant inbred line genotypes reveal inter-
775 strain incompatibility and the evolution of recombination. *PLoS Genet.* 7: e1002174.
- 776 Sambatti J. B. M., Ortiz-Barrientos D., Baack E. J., Rieseberg L. H., 2008 Ecological selection
777 maintains cytonuclear incompatibilities in hybridizing sunflowers. *Ecol. Lett.* 11: 1082–1091.
- 778 Seidel H. S., Ailion M., Li J., Oudenaarden A. van, Rockman M. V., Kruglyak L., 2011 A novel
779 sperm-delivered toxin causes late-stage embryo lethality and transmission ratio distortion in
780 *C. elegans*. *PLoS Biol.* 9: e1001115.
- 781 Stelkens R. B., Schmid C., Seehausen O., 2015 Hybrid breakdown in cichlid fish. *PLoS One* 10:

782 e0127207.

783 Tao Y., Hartl D. L., Laurie C. C., 2001 Sex-ratio segregation distortion associated with
784 reproductive isolation in *Drosophila*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 98: 13183–8.

785 Ting C., Tsaur S.-C., Wu M.-L., Wu C.-I, 1998 A Rapidly Evolving Homeobox at the Site of a
786 Hybrid Sterility Gene. *Science*. 282: 1501–1504.

787 Wallace D. C., Chalkia D., 2013 Mitochondrial DNA genetics and the heteroplasmy conundrum in
788 evolution and disease. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* 5: a021220.

789 Werren J. H., Baldo L., Clark M. E., 2008 *Wolbachia*: master manipulators of invertebrate biology.
790 *Nat. Rev Microbiol* 6: 741–751.

791

Figure 1

A

♀ x ♂






Figure 2





Figure 3**A****B****C**





Figure 4

Figure 5