Genomic signals of admixture and reinforcement between two closely related species of

European sepsid flies

Athene Giesen[1], Wolf U. Blanckenhorn[1], Martin A. Schäfer[1], Kentaro K. Shimizu[1], Rie

Shimizu-Inatsugi[1], Bernhard Misof[2], Oliver Niehuis[2,3], Jeanne Wilbrandt[2], Malte Petersen[2],

Lars Podsiadlowski[2], Heidi E. L. Lischer[1,4], Simon Aeschbacher[1], Martin Kapun[1,5]

[1]Department of Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies, University of Zürich,
Switzerland

[2]Zoological Research Museum Alexander Koenig, Bonn, Germany

[3]Department of Evolutionary Biology and Ecology, Institute of Biology I (Zoology), Albert
Ludwig University, Freiburg, Germany

[4]Interfaculty Bioinformatics Unit, University of Bern, Switzerland

[5]Division of Cell & Developmental Biology, Medical University of Vienna, Austria

Corresponding author: Martin Kapun; Winterthurerstrasse 190, CH-8057 Zürich,

Switzerland; Tel.: +41 44 635 47 55; martin.kapun@ieu.uzh.ch

athene.giesen@gmx.net

martin.schaefer@ieu.uzh.ch

heidi.tschanz-lischer@bioinformatics.unibe.ch

kentaro.shimizu@ieu.uzh.ch

rie.inatsugi@ieu.uzh.ch

oliver.niehuis@biologie.uni-freiburg.de

b.misof@leibniz-zfmk.de

lars@cgae.de

simon.aeschbacher@ieu.uzh.ch

wolf.blanckenhorn@ieu.uzh.ch

Word count: Abstract 180; Introduction 642; Materials & Methods 885; Results 501;
Discussion 1551; 50 References 1105.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Re-sequencing of the genomes was performed at the Functional Genomics Center Zürich, where Jelena Kühn-Georgijevic was an important advisor. Thanks also to the Wolfpack at the University of Zürich for their support and help in maintaining fly cultures, and Patrick Rohner, Juan Pablo Busso, Nalini Puniamoorthy, Anders Kjaersgaard, Toomas Esperk and Cait Dmitriew for contributing samples. B.M., O.N. and L.P. thank the Leibniz association for granting funds to establish the Leibniz graduate school for Genomic Biodiversity Research, in which context the reference draft genomes of several fly species of the genus *Sepsis* explored in this study were sequenced and assembled. The University Research Priority Program 'Evolution in Action' of the University of Zürich, the Swiss National Science Foundation, and the Georges and Antoine Claraz-Donation funded the work of A.G., the Austrian Science Foundation (grant no. FWF P32275) of M.K.

ABSTRACT

Interspecific gene flow by hybridization may weaken species barriers and adaptive divergence, but also initiate reinforcement of reproductive isolation trough natural and sexual selection. The extent and consequences of interspecific gene flow in natural systems remain poorly understood. To assess genome-wide patterns of gene flow between the two closely related European dung fly species *Sepsis cynipsea* and *Sepsis neocynipsea* (Diptera: Sepsidae), we analyzed whole-genome resequencing data from pooled males of laboratory and field populations by means of the ABBA-BABA test. We contrasted genome-wide variation in DNA sequence differences between samples from sympatric populations of these two species in France and Switzerland with that of interspecific pairs of samples involving allopatric populations from Estonia and Italy. In the French Cevennes, we detected a relative excess of sequence identity suggesting interspecific gene flow in sympatry. In contrast, at two sites in Switzerland we observed a relative depletion of sequence identity compatible with reinforcement of species boundaries in sympatry. Our results suggest that the species boundaries between *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* in Europe are not fixed but depend on the eco-geographic context.

KEYWORDS: ABBA-BABA test, gene flow, hybridization, introgression, reproductive isolation, speciation, sepsid flies

 INTRODUCTION

According to the biological species concept, species represent groups of individuals that

are reproductively isolated from other groups of individuals (Mayr 1942). Speciation entails

the evolution of reproductive isolation among lineages derived from a common ancestral

population and is considered completed if the diverged populations remain reproductively

isolated, for example, after coming into secondary contact (Coyne & Orr, 2004; Dobzhansky,

1951; Mayr, 1963). However, many animal and plant species remain distinct entities in nature

even if they hybridize and exchange genes in parapatry or sympatry (Anderson, 1949; Barton

& Bengtsson, 1986; cf. DeMarais *et al.*, 1992; Gante *et al.*, 2016; Mallet, 2007; Nolte &

Tautz, 2010; Rieseberg *et al.*, 2003; Trier *et al.*, 2014). Research during the past decades has

indicated that hybridization not only has deleterious effects due to hybrid inferiority and

negative epistasis in admixed genomes, but that it may also fuel adaptive diversification and

speciation by facilitating novel combinations of alleles that become targets of divergent

selection (Arnold & Meyer, 2006; Berner & Salzburger, 2015; Fontaine *et al.* 2015;

Seehausen, 2004; Saetre, 2013). Thus, the genomes of recently diverged species may be

viewed as mosaics of genomic regions with significant differentiation (i.e., low to no

admixture) interspersed with more freely mixing regions of DNA (Nosil *et al.*, 2009; Wu,

2001).

Sepsid flies (Diptera: Sepsidae) have served as model organisms in various studies on

sexual selection and ecological adaptation (Blanckenhorn, 1999; Blanckenhorn *et al.*, 2000;

Eberhard, 1999; Kraushaar & Blanckenhorn, 2002; Parker, 1972a,b; Puniamoorthy *et al.*,

2009; Pont & Meier, 2002; Rohner *et al.*, 2015; Rohner, Blanckenhorn, & Puniamoorthy,

2016; Ward, 1983; Ward, Hemmi, & Rösli, 1992), and their phylogeny is well resolved (Su *et*

al., 2008, 2016). Pairs of closely related species with similar ecology provide excellent

opportunities to study the genomic consequences of hybridization and introgression during

early stages of speciation. *Sepsis cynipsea* and *Sepsis neocynipsea* are widespread species that

occur in sympatry across major parts of their natural range. While *S. cynipsea* is the most

abundant sepsid species in north-central Europe laying its eggs in fresh cow dung, *S.*

neocynipsea is common throughout North America, where its niche is complementary to that

of *S. cynipsea* in Europe. While overall very rare in Europe, *S. neocynipsea* can be locally

common at higher altitude sites, such as the Alps, where the species occurs in sympatry with

S. cynipsea (Ozerov, 2005; Pont & Meier, 2002; Rohner, Blanckenhorn, & Puniamoorthy,

2016). Despite strong similarities in morphology and behavior (Giesen, Blanckenhorn, &

Schäfer, 2017), the two species are genetically distinct. To a lesser extent this also holds for *S.*

neocynipsea populations in North America vs. Europe (Baur *et al.*, 2020). Previous studies

showed that *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* can hybridize under laboratory conditions despite

strong pre- and post-mating isolating barriers. These barriers are mediated by assortative

mating behaviors that are partly reinforced in areas where the two species occur in sympatry

(Giesen *et al.*, 2017, 2019). While these results imply that interspecific gene flow may occur

in nature and vary with eco-geographic context, we know little about actual levels historical

and ongoing gene flow between the two species in areas where they occur in sympatry or

parapatry. We therefore investigated the extent of gene flow between *S. cynipsea* and *S.*

neocynipsea in nature using comparative genomic methods.

In recent years, a number of novel genomic approaches have been employed in a variety of

taxa to explore this classic question of interspecific gene flow in sympatry vs. allopatry from

several angles (e.g. Nakazato, Warren, & Moyle, 2010; Nadeau *et al.*, 2013; Brandvain *et al.*,

2014; Bouchemousse *et al.*, 2016; Feulner & Seehausen, 2019; Kastally, Trasoletti, &

Mardulyn, 2019; Moran *et al.*, 2019). We here applied ABBA-BABA tests (Green *et al.*,

2010; Durand *et al.*, 2011; Soraggi et al., 2018) to genome-wide allele frequency data of

single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) to assess the extent of genome-wide admixture

between *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* in Europe. We sequenced pools of males from

laboratory and wild-caught populations of both species collected at several sites ranging from

southern France to Estonia. Some of these populations occur in sympatry (e.g., in the Swiss

Alps and the French Cevennes), others in allopatry (Pont & Meier, 2002). Based on

hybridization opportunity alone, we expected to find higher genome-wide levels of gene flow

between *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* in geographic areas of sympatry (e.g. Nadeau *et al.*,

2013, or Martin *et al.*, 2014, for *Heliconius* butterflies). In contrast, less gene flow in

sympatry than allopatry would indicate selection against gene flow and thus suggest

reinforcement of reproductive barriers at sites of sympatric co-occurrence (Butlin, 1995;

Noor, 1999; Coyne & Orr, 2004; e.g. Kulathinal & Singh, 2000; Massie & Makow, 2005;

Giesen *et al.* 2017, 2019).

MATERIALS & METHODS

Sample collection and treatment of fly cultures

To study inter- and intraspecific gene flow in S. *cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea*, we compared genomic data from two different sample sources. As a first source, we used laboratory populations established from single gravid females (i.e., iso-female lines) of sympatric *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* collected in summer 2013 at a site in the Swiss Alps (Sörenberg) and at a site in the Swiss lowlands (Zürich; Table 1). These populations were subsequently propagated in the laboratory for at least two years (>30 generations) at census population sizes ranging from 10 to 100 before whole-genome resequencing. Propagation in the laboratory resulted only in a moderate loss of genetic variation with respect to natural populations (Supporting Information). Conditions for laboratory culturing were previously described by Giesen *et al*. (2017). To obtain sufficient amounts of DNA for whole-genome resequencing, we pooled 50 males per laboratory population prior to DNA extraction. As a second source of samples, we additionally pool-sequenced 20 field-caught males from the sampling sites in Sörenberg and Zürich as well as some additional sites in Europe (Table 1). *S. cynipsea* samples from Petroia (Italy) and Pehka (Estonia) represent populations in allopatry to *S. neocynipsea*, whereas samples of the two species from Zürich, the Swiss Alps (Sörenberg, Hospental, Geschinen), and the Cevennes (Le Mourier) in France (Table 1) represent population where the two species occur in sympatry.

DNA library preparation and next generation sequencing

Genomic DNA was extracted from all samples using the UltraPure Phenol:Chloroform:Isoamyl alcohol (25:24:1, v/v) extraction kit (Thermo Fischer Scientific) according to the manufacturer's protocol. Quantification of genomic DNA was performed with a Qubit Fluorometer (Thermo Fischer Scientific; Table 1). Library preparation was carried out using the TruSeq DNA PCR-Free Library Preparation (Illumina) kit according to the manufacturer's protocol. Fragment-size distribution of all libraries was validated on a TapeStation 2200 (Agilent Technologies, Waldbronn, Germany). Sequencing on Illumina HiSeq 2500 version 4 was conducted after labeling and pooling the barcoded DNA representing the four laboratory populations onto one lane to achieve a genome-wide coverage of about 60x. All sequencing data are available at the short-read archive (SRA;

151 **Table 1:** Sampling sites and percentages of DNA reads mapping to the reference genome for

152 pool-sequenced laboratory populations (a) and field-collected flies (b). Sites where *S.*

153 *cynipeas* and *S. neocynipsea* co-occur in sympatry are printed in regular font. Sites where *S.*

154 *neocynipsea* does not occur to our knowledge are printed in italics.

Species	Sampling site	Country	Coordinates	Altitude (m)	% reads aligned to *S. thoracica*
a) Pooled laboratory males					
S. cynipsea	Sörenberg	Switzerland	46°24'8.2''N, 8°21'28.4''E	1200	48.2
	Zürich	Switzerland	47°24'0.6''N, 8°34'24.0''E	450	50.1
S. neocynipsea	Sörenberg	Switzerland	46°24'8.2''N, 8°21'28.4''E	1200	48.5
	Zürich	Switzerland	47°24'0.6''N, 8°34'24.0''E	450	50.0
b) Pooled field-collected males					
S. cynipsea	*Pehka*	*Estonia*	59°28'45.1''N, 25°44'52.3''E	5	50.6
	Petroia	*Italy*	43°15'06.4''N, 12°32'41.2''E	570	48.1
	Sörenberg	Switzerland	46°24'8.2''N, 8°21'28.4''E	1200	51.3
	Zürich	Switzerland	47°24'0.6''N, 8°34'24.0''E	450	51.3
	Cevennes	France	44° 3'30.5''N, 3°25'38.8''E	790	49.5
S. neocynipsea	Geschinen	Switzerland	46°49'23.7''N, 8°1'54.6''E	1350	50.5
	Hospental	Switzerland	46° 37'12''N, 8°34'12''E	1500	52.3
	Sörenberg	Switzerland	46°24'8.2''N, 8°21'28.4''E	1200	50.7
	Cevennes	France	44°3'30.5''N, 3°25'38.8''E	790	48.6
c) Outgroup population					
S. orthocnemis	Lenzerheide	Switzerland	46°43'45''N, 9°33'25''E	1470	46.9

Raw read processing

Qualitative validation of sequence data before and after trimming was done with FastQC

High Troughput Sequence QC Report version 0.11.4 (Andrews *et al.*, 2011). After removal of

Illumina-specific adapters and trimming with *Trimmomatic* (version 0.36; Bolger, Lohse &

Usadel, 2014), the *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* reads were mapped to the draft genome of

S. thoracica with *bwa mem* (version 0.7.12; Li & Durbin, 2009) using default parameters. The

assembly of this reference genome is part of a larger and ongoing comparative genomic study

of several *Sepsis* species (unpublished data*). S. thoracica* specimen used for genome

sequencing were originally collected from Capriasca, Ticino (CH). The draft genome, v0.1

was based on Oxford Nanopore long reads (app. 25x read depth), assembled with Canu

(Korner et al. 2017) and polished with Illumina short reads (app. 20x read depth). The

assembly used in this study is available under the rules of the Ford Lauderdale agreement

from www.cgae.de/seto_01_genome.fasta and www.cgae.de/seto_01_genome_masked.fasta.

PCR duplicates were removed and reads realigned around indels in each raw alignment

file; only reads with a PHRED-scaled mapping quality MQ of 20 and more were retained. We

applied the same procedure to map reads of a pool of ten inbred *S. orthocnemis* males to the

reference genome. We compiled the aligned reads from all population samples into a single

mpileup file using *samtools* (v. 1.3.1; Li *et al.*, 2009).

Using the variant-caller Pool-SNP (Kapun *et al.*, 2018), we identified high-confidence

SNPs with the following combination of SNP-calling parameters: coverage of each sample ≥

10x; coverage of each sample ≤ 95 % percentile of coverage distribution across contigs and

samples; minimum allele count of a minor allele at a SNP across all samples pooled > 20x;

minor allele frequency at a SNP across all samples pooled > 0.01. We only retained SNPs

when all samples fulfilled the above coverage threshold criteria. In addition, we removed

SNPs located within a 5-bp distance to indel polymorphisms that occurred in more than 20

copies at a given site across all pooled samples, and we ignored SNPs located within

repetitive regions. The resulting VCF file was converted to the SYNC file format (Kofler *et*

al., 2011), and a custom Python script was used to calculate sample-specific allele frequencies

for major alleles at each SNP.

Testing for introgression

To test for introgression, we used the so-called ABBA-BABA test for historical gene flow in the presence of incomplete lineage sorting (Green *et al.*, 2010; Durand *et al.*, 2011). We provide a brief motivation of the approach in the following and refer to the Supporting Information for details. Imagine a rooted phylogeny with four species (P1 to P4) and a topology of (((P1, P2), P3), P4) as illustrated in Fig. 1B. In an alignment of one haploid genome from each species, incomplete lineage sorting under neutral evolution leads to two mutational configurations of the ancestral (A) and derived (B) allele, ABBA and BABA, that under the infinite-sites model of mutation (Kimura, 1969) are incompatible with the species topology (Fig. 1B). In the absence of gene flow between P2 and P3, ABBA and BABA configurations occur with equal probability (Hudson, 1983; Tajima, 1983). In contrast, historical gene flow between P2 and P3 causes an excess of ABBA configurations (Green *et al.*, 2010; Durand *et al.*, 2011). This logic is captured by the D-statistic, a scaled difference across a set of bases between counts of ABBA and BABA configurations bounded by –1 and 1 (Green *et al.*, 2010). The ABBA-BABA test examines significant deviations of D from 0. A significant excess of ABBA suggests evidence for gene flow between P2 and P3. A significant depletion of ABBA is equivalent to an excess of ABBA if the positions of P1 and P2 in the species topology are swapped, and hence either suggests gene flow between P1 and P3, or a reduction in gene flow between P2 and P3 relative to gene flow between P1 and P3.

The original version of the ABBA-BABA test, and modifications of it, have been widely applied to different types of genome-scale polymorphism data obtained with various sequencing strategies, including whole genome sequencing (e.g. Green *et al.*, 2010), RAD sequencing (e.g., Eaton & Ree, 2013; Meier *et al.*, 2017; Streicher *et al.*, 2014), and exon capture data (e.g., Heliconius Genome Consortium, 2012). More recently, Durand *et al.* (2011) and Soraggi *et al.* (2018) extended the scope of the original test to allele frequency data, and hence to unphased sequencing data (including pool-sequencing data; Schlötterer *et al.* 2014). We implemented the extensions by Durand *et al.* (2011) and Soraggi *et al.* (2018) in a Python script (https://github.com/capoony/ABBABABA-4AF), and refer to the respective test statistics as D_D and D_S. Our script also computes jack-knifing z-scores based on a matrix of allele frequencies for previously defined high-confidence SNPs (see Supporting Information for details). We adopted the commonly used significance threshold of $|z| > 3$

(Reich *et al.*, 2011; Jeong *et al.*, 2016; Novikova *et al.*, 2016) to identify significant

deviations of D_S and D_D from zero.

We were concerned that using the genome of a given species both as the mapping

reference as well as the outgroup would bias ABBA-BABA tests. We therefore mapped the

three ingroup and the outgroup species against the reference genome of yet another species, *S.*

thoracica. A phylogenetic analysis based on CO-II sequences by Su *et al.* (2008) indicated

that *S. thoracica* is approximately equally related to *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* as it is to

the outgroup species *S. orthocnemis* (Fig. 1A). We therefore expected that reads of both the

ingroup and the outgroup species would map equally well to the reference species, which is

indeed what we observed (Table 1).

Fig. 1. Putative phylogeny of sepsid species studied. (A) Species phylogeny inferred from

alignments of nucleotide sequences at the Cytochrome Oxidase – Subunit II (CO-II)

mitochondrial locus (Genbank sequences from Su *et al.*, 2016) with the Neighbor-Joining

method implemented in CLC Main Workbench (v. 8.1.2; https://

https://www.qiagenbioinformatics.com/products/clc-main-workbench/). The tree topology is

consistent with the phylogeny presented by Su *et al.* (2016) based on a combined

phylogenetic analysis of multiple nuclear and mitochondrial markers. *Sepsis orthocnemis* was

used as the outgroup to the focal species *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea*. Whole-genome

sequencing reads from all three species were aligned to the *S. thoracica* reference genome

(dashed red branches). Branch lengths are proportional to the mean number of pairwise

sequence differences. (B) Generic species tree assumed in all our ABBA-BABA tests for gene

flow among triplets of *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* populations from various sites in

Europe.

We focused our analyses on the three sampling sites: Sörenberg, Zürich and Cevennes. At

all three sites *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* occur in sympatry. In all ABBA-BABA tests for

interspecific gene flow among sympatric populations of *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea*, we

positioned the two focal populations as P2 and P3 ingroups in the phylogeny (in both possible

orders) and used various P1 ingroup populations (Fig. 1B) assumed to occur in allopatry with

P2 populations. We performed these permutations because Durand *et al.* (2011) showed that

the choice of the ingroup P1 can influence test results. All reported analyses are based on non-

overlapping windows of 500 consecutive SNPs, unless stated otherwise.

RESULTS

Genetic diversity in laboratory and natural populations

We first analyzed whole-genome resequencing data from sympatric *S. cynipsea* and *S.*

neocynipsea populations in Sörenberg and Zürich, Switzerland, two sites roughly 70 km

linear distance apart without obvious barriers to gene flow. At both of these sites, DNA was

obtained from pooled samples of males from outbred natural populations (Sörenberg *S.*

cynipsea, SoC; Sörenberg *S. neocynipsea*, SoN; Zürich *S. cynipsea*, ZuC) as well as from

pools of males derived from laboratory populations (Sörenberg *S. cynipsea*, ISoC; Sörenberg

S. neocynipsea, ISoN; Zürich *S. cynipsea*, IZuC; Zürich *S. neocynipsea*, IZuN). We expected

the genetic diversity in the laboratory populations to be strongly reduced relative to the one in

the respective field-caught flies. While we did observe significantly lower levels of expected

heterozygosity (Nei 1987) in laboratory population samples than in respective field-caught

flies (Mann Whitney U test, $p < 0.001$ for all three sampling sites; Fig. S1), reductions in

heterozygosity were much lower than expected under strong inbreeding. Specifically,

population genetic analyses showed that the effective population size in our laboratory

populations must have been on the order of 100 flies, i.e. at the upper bound of estimated

census sizes, to be compatible with observed reductions in heterozygosity (see "Reduction of

genetic diversity in laboratory populations" in the Supporting Information; Fig. S2). Our

laboratory populations were therefore not highly inbred and we decided to treat the

sequencing data from laboratory and natural populations equally in all our analyses.

Signals of reinforcement at the Sörenberg site

The majority of our tests for gene flow at the Sörenberg site revealed a genome-wide deficiency of derived-allele sharing (i.e. ABBA patterns) among the local *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* populations (Table 2), suggesting that interspecific gene flow in sympatry (among P2 and P3) is lower than interspecific gene flow among putatively allopatric populations (P1 and P3). This observation was robust to our choice of the P1 ingroup population, but sensitive to the version of *D*-statistic used (D_S vs. D_D), and, in the case of D_D, to whether we used field or laboratory samples as P2. We first conducted tests involving two *S. neocynipsea* populations from the Swiss Alps (Geschinen *S. neocynipsea*, GeN; Hospental *S. neocynipsea*, HoN; Table 1) as putatively allopatric P1, and all four possible sympatric interspecific pairs of field and laboratory samples from Sörenberg as P2 (*S. neocynipsea*) and P3 (*S. cynipsea*). We observed a deficiency of ABBA patterns in all eight configurations (D_S > 0; positive *z*-scores ranging from 0.8 to 21.2). Deviations of D_S from 0 were significant in six of these eight configurations (Table 2, upper part), suggesting overall evidence for higher gene flow among putatively allopatric than sympatric interspecific population pairs. While GeN and HoN are both separated by high mountains (altitudes ranging from ca. 600 m asl to ca. 3,200 m asl) from the Sörenberg site, they are nevertheless geographically close (ca. 67.5 km and ca. 46.7 km Euclidean distance for GeN and HoN, respectively), and they occur in sympatry with other sepsid species, including *S. cynipsea*. We were therefore concerned that our assumption of no gene flow between P1 and P3 was violated because GeN and HoN are parapatric, rather than allopatric, to our focal populations in Sörenberg.

To address the above concern, we conducted additional ABBA-BABA tests involving P1 populations from geographically more remote sites in Europe. Specifically, we performed a second series of tests with two alternative *S. cynipsea* populations as allopatric P1 ingroups (Fig. 1B), one from Pehka, Estonia (EsC), and one from Petroia, Italy (PeC; Table 1). As before, we used all possible sympatric interspecific pairs of field and laboratory samples from Sörenberg as P2 (*S. cynipsea*) and P3 (*S. neocnipsea*). Contrary to our expectation based on the much larger geographical distance between P1 and P3 (ca. 1,850 km and ca. 550 km for EsC and PeC, respectively) than between P2 and P3 in these configurations, we still found a significant deficiency of ABBA patterns in all eight tests (D_S > 0; *z*-scores from 4.9 to 23.4; Table 2 lower part). In agreement with our previous tests involving GeN and HoN as P1, we thus found consistent evidence for higher interspecific gene flow among allopatric (P1 and

P3) than among sympatric populations (P2 and P3). As we are much more confident that EsC

and PeC represent truly allopatric P1 ingroups, deficient ABBA patterns at the sympatric

Sörenberg site suggest a local reduction in interspecific gene flow, likely due to

reinforcement.

When repeating the ABBA-BABA tests with the D-statistic (D_D) suggested by Durand *et*

al. (2011), we obtained results that qualitatively agree with those obtained with the D_S statistic

only when using EsC and PeC as P1 ($D_D < 0$; z-scores from –2.3 to –9.7; significant for six of

eight population configurations in Table S1, lower part). With GeN and HoN as P1, in

contrast, we observed a deficiency of ABBA patterns ($D_D < 0$) only with the laboratory *S.*

neocynipsea samples (ISoN) as P2 (z-scores from –4.0 to –1.3), but not with the field-derived

S. neocynipsea samples (SoN) as P2 (z-scores from 1.4 to 2.6: Table S1, upper part).

Moreover, ABBA deficiencies with ISoN as P2 were significant only if we used field-derived

S cynipsea samples (SoC), but not if we used laboratory *S cynipsea* samples (ISoC) as P3.

Besides the above qualitative differences between tests based on D_S vs. D_D, we observed

that variances of D_D estimated by jackknifing were about one order of magnitude larger than

the corresponding values of D_S. The qualitatively similar results obtained with the two

versions of D-statistics makes us confident that our findings are robust. We further observed

that windows of elevated D_S (Fig. 2, top) were not homogeneously distributed along the

genome, but aggregated in clusters in several contigs. Such clustering might suggest that these

regions contain genomic variation involved in reinforcement caused by divergent selection

against gene flow between the two species.

Fig. 2. Variation of D_S along the genome. Points indicate D_S (Soraggi *et al*. 2018) for genomic windows of 500 consecutive SNPs, oriented by contigs of the *S. thoracica* reference genome with a length ≥ 50,000 bp (highlighted by alternating black and grey colors). Rows correspond to population topologies used to test for interspecific gene flow at the three focal sites in Sörenberg (SoC-ISoN; top), Zürich (ZuC-IZuN; center) and the French Cevennes (CeC-CeN; bottom). For illustrative purposes, we depict mixed combinations of natural and laboratory (with prefix "I") samples that yielded the clearest results when using the *S. cynipsea* population from Petroia as P1. The horizontal dashed red and blue lines indicate the neutral expectation ($D_S = 0$) and the mean genome-wide jackknife estimate, respectively. Blue shading delimits mean $D_S \pm 2$ standard deviations (based on windows of 500 SNPs).

Table 2: Results of ABBA-BABA tests applied to samples originating from sympatric populations of *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* in Sörenberg as P2 and P3 (and *vice versa*), based on D_S. The upper half of the table shows tests with two European *S. neocynipsea* populations from Geschinen (GeN) and Hospental (HoN) as P1 ingroups, and the bottom half shows the reciprocal approach with two *S. cynipsea* populations from Pehka, Estonia (EsC) and Petroia, Italy (PeC) as P1 ingroups. The first three columns indicate the phylogeny assumed in the test, with P4 always being *S. orthocnemis*; columns 4 to 6 give the genome-wide average of Ds, its jackknifed standard deviation $SD(D_S)$, and the corresponding z-score. Significant tests are shown in bold. The prefix "I" indicates pooled samples from laboratory populations.

P1	P2	P3	D_S	$SD(D_S)$	z
GeN	**ISoN**	**ISoC**	**0.018**	**2.40E−03**	**7.4**
GeN	**ISoN**	**SoC**	**0.053**	**2.51E−03**	**21.2**
GeN	SoN	ISoC	0.001	1.27E−03	0.8
GeN	**SoN**	**SoC**	**0.008**	**1.35E−03**	**5.8**
HoN	**ISoN**	**ISoC**	**0.019**	**2.34E−03**	**8.2**
HoN	**ISoN**	**SoC**	**0.051**	**2.48E−03**	**20.5**
HoN	SoN	ISoC	0.002	1.24E−03	1.9
HoN	**SoN**	**SoC**	**0.006**	**1.34E−03**	**4.2**
EsC	**ISoC**	**ISoN**	**0.013**	**2.68E−03**	**4.9**
EsC	**ISoC**	**SoN**	**0.040**	**2.62E−03**	**15.2**
EsC	**SoC**	**ISoN**	**0.039**	**1.88E−03**	**20.5**
EsC	**SoC**	**SoN**	**0.026**	**1.92E−03**	**13.4**
PeC	**ISoC**	**ISoN**	**0.023**	**2.60E−03**	**8.7**
PeC	**ISoC**	**SoN**	**0.052**	**2.77E−03**	**18.8**
PeC	**SoC**	**ISoN**	**0.047**	**2.02E−03**	**23.4**
PeC	**SoC**	**SoN**	**0.039**	**1.97E−03**	**19.8**

Convergent patterns of reinforcement in Zürich

Complementary to the Sörenberg site, where *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* co−occur in an alpine environment, we analyzed gene flow between sympatric *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* populations from a lowland site in Zürich. These analyses were based on pooled laboratory samples of both species (as defined above) and one pool-sequenced field sample of *S. cynipsea* (Table 1). Using the *S. neocynipsea* populations of Geschinen and Hospental as P1 ingroups, we obtained weakly but significantly positive D_S values ranging from 0.016 to 0.055 (Table 3), indicating a deficiency of ABBA patterns. These findings are qualitatively consistent with the results obtained when analyzing samples from Sörenberg in suggesting reinforcement in sympatry. However, only when using the allopatric Italian Petroia (but not the Estonian) *S. cynipsea* population as P1 ingroup did we also find a significant, albeit even smaller deficiency of ABBA patterns (Table 3).

Analyzing the same data as presented in the preceding paragraph with Durand *et al.'s* (2011) D_D statistic, we found only one significant result indicating a deficiency of ABBA patterns ($D_D = 0.03$) with the *S. neocynipsea* population from Geschinen as P1 ingroup (Table S2). However, we found a significant, yet small excess of ABBA patterns ($D_D = 0.019$) with *S. cynipsea* from Pehka, Estonia, as P1. Therefore, the putative signal of reinforcement among the sympatric Zürich populations is much weaker than among the sympatric populations in Sörenberg. Consistent with these observations, we did not find pronounced genomic clusters of elevated D_S (Fig. 2, center) as for the Sörenberg populations, which corroborates that reinforcement in Zürich was weaker.

Table 3: Results of ABBA−BABA tests applied to samples originating from sympatric populations of *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* in Zürich as P2 and P3 (and *vice versa*) based on D_S. As in Table 2, the upper half of the table summarizes tests involving two *S. neocynipsea* populations from Geschinen (GeN) and Hospental (HoN) as P1 ingroups, and the bottom half summarizes tests involving *S. cynipsea* populations from Pehka, Estonia (EsC) and Petroia, Italy (PeC) as P1. Other details as in Table 2.

P1	P2	P3	D_S	SD(D_S)	z
GeN	**IZuN**	**IZuC**	**0.016**	**2.63E−03**	**6.1**
GeN	**IZuN**	**ZuC**	**0.055**	**2.79E−03**	**19.6**
HoN	**IZuN**	**IZuC**	**0.017**	**2.68E−03**	**6.5**
HoN	**IZuN**	**ZuC**	**0.055**	**2.69E−03**	**20.4**
EsC	IZuC	IZuN	0.001	3.89E−03	0.3
EsC	ZuC	IZuN	−0.002	1.54E−03	−1.4
PeC	**IZuC**	**IZuN**	**0.012**	**3.74E−03**	**3.3**
PeC	**ZuC**	**IZuN**	**0.009**	**1.66E−03**	**5.3**

Signals of introgression in the French Cevennes populations

We investigated a population pair of *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* from the Cevennes in France (790 m asl), approximately 450 km southwest of the two sampling sites in Switzerland. Since no laboratory population samples were available from this site, we used pool-sequenced field samples for our analyses. Interestingly, we found opposite patterns to those obtained when analyzing samples from the Zürich and Sörenberg sites in Switzerland (Table 4). Specifically, all tests based on D_S showed highly significant *negative* values of the test statistic, suggesting an excess of ABBA patterns, and hence *more* interspecific gene flow among the sympatric population pairs than among the allopatric population pairs. However, none of the corresponding tests based on D_D were significant (Table S3). We nevertheless consider our results robust, as we found in all four tests a corresponding trend towards negative D_D, i.e. an excess of ABBA patterns consistent with results based on D_S. As for the Zürich site, we did not observe genomic clustering of extreme values of D_S (Fig. 2, bottom).

Table 4: Results of ABBA-BABA tests applied to samples originating from sympatric

populations of *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* in the French Cevennes as P2 and P3 (and *vice*

versa) based on D_S. As in Tables 2 and 3, the upper half of the table summarizes tests

involving two *S. neocynipsea* populations from Geschinen (GeN) and Hospental (HoN) as P1

ingroups, and the bottom half of the table summarizes tests involving *S. cynipsea* populations

from Pehka, Estonia (EsC) and Petroia, Italy (PeC) as P1. Other details as in Table 2,

P1	P2	P3	D_S	SD(D_S)	z
GeN	**CeN**	**CeC**	**−0.014**	**1.30E−03**	**−11.0**
HoN	**CeN**	**CeC**	**−0.014**	**1.36E−03**	**−10.6**
EsC	**CeC**	**CeN**	**−0.030**	**1.84E−03**	**−16.2**
PeC	**CeC**	**CeN**	**−0.016**	**1.93E−03**	**−8.3**

DISCUSSION

We applied the ABBA-BABA approach (Green *et al*., 2010; Durand *et al*., 2011; Soraggi

et al., 2018) to investigate natural patterns of admixture between a pair of closely related

sister species of sepsid flies for which we have detailed information on ecology, morphology,

life history, and behavior (Blanckenhorn, 1999; Blanckenhorn *et al*., 2000; Eberhard, 1999;

Ozerov, 2005; Parker, 1972a,b; Pont & Meier, 2002; Puniamoorthy *et al*., 2009; Rohner,

Blanckenhorn & Puniamoorthy, 2016; Ward, 1983; Ward, Hemmi & Rösli, 1992; Giesen *et*

al., 2017, 2019). Previous population genetic analyses of microsatellite markers (Baur *et al*.,

2020) and laboratory hybridization experiments (Giesen *et al*., 2017, 2019) suggested that *S.*

cynipsea and *S. neocynipsea* are genetically distinct but may occasionally hybridize in nature

when occurring in sympatry. Here we investigated this possibility by analyzing patterns of

DNA sequence variation among pools of laboratory as well as field-caught specimens from

various sampling sites across Europe where the two species occur in sympatry vs. allopatry.

Our study revealed qualitatively opposite, i.e. mixed patterns of interspecific gene flow in

sympatry depending on the sampling sites, which are discussed in detail below. Previous

studies of other taxa, using different genomic methods but with essentially the same logic

behind their approach, provided the full spectrum of potential results that we here obtained for

one species pair. Martin *et al*. (2014; see also Nadeau *et al*., 2013) observed *more* inter-

specific gene flow in sympatry than allopatry in *Heliconius* butterflies; in contrast, less gene

flow in sympatry than allopatry, suggesting reinforcement by natural or sexual selection

(Butlin, 1995; Noor, 1999; Coyne & Orr, 2004), was observed for *Drosophila*

arizonae/mojavensis (Massie & Makow, 2005), the monkey flower pair *Mimulus*

nasutus/guttatus (Brandvain *et al.*, 2014; see also Grossenbacher & Whittall, 2011), and two

sea squirt species (Tunicata: Bouchemousse *et al.*, 2016), while no geographic variation in

admixture between sym- vs. allopatric populations was found for wild tomatoes (Nakazato *et*

al., 2010).

Similar to *Heliconius* (Martin *et al.*, 2014), we found evidence for an excess of

interspecific gene flow in sympatry compared to allopatry in flies from the French Cevennes,

based on pool-sequenced field-caught specimens (Table 4; Table S3). In contrast, at two sites

in Switzerland where the two species also occur in sympatry, we observed reduced

interspecific gene flow relative to interspecific pairs of parapatric and allopatric populations,

similar to patterns in monkey flower, *Drosophila* and sea squirt as explained above. The

reduction of interspecific gene flow was more pronounced at the Sörenberg site in the Alps

(Table 2; Table S1) than at the lowland site in Zürich (Tables 3; Table S2). Consistent with a

previous study showing behavioral reinforcement after enforced hybridization in the

laboratory (Giesen *et al.*, 2017), the genomic data we analyzed here suggest natural selection

against interspecific gene flow might also occur in nature at the two Swiss sites where both

species occur in sympatry (Noor, 1999). However, as evidenced by our contrasting findings

for the site in the French Cevennes, reinforcement may not be a necessary outcome where *S.*

cynipsea and *S. neocynipsea* occur in sympatry. The extent of gene flow between these two

dung fly sister species thus appears to covary with local environmental conditions. Well-

documented differences in climate between southern France and the northern edge of the Alps

might provide an ecological explanation for the contrasting patterns we observed (cf. Doebeli

& Dieckmann, 2003; Rohner *et al.*, 2015), but future studies are needed to confirm this

hypothesis and explore alternatives.

Laboratory hybridization experiments have shown that interspecific mating between *S.*

cynipsea and *S. neocynipsea* may result in viable and fertile F_1 hybrid females and offspring

in backcrosses with the parental species (Giesen *et al.*, 2017, 2019). Together with

morphological and behavioral similarities among the two species, these laboratory

experiments suggest that hybridization may well take place in areas of co-occurrence, such as

in the French Cevennes. In other areas, including our sampling site in the Swiss Alps, the

subtle premating behavioral barriers and the reductions in fecundity and fertility documented

in the laboratory by Giesen *et al*. (2017, 2019) may combine with micro-ecological niche

differences that mediate spatio-temporal divergence in reproductive timing to effectively

prevent hybridization in nature and ultimately reinforce species boundaries. This

interpretation is strengthened by a recent study on Central American *Archisepsis diversiformis*

flies showing that mating between two disjunct populations is only evident under forced

laboratory conditions, while under conditions of free mate choice flies from the different

populations do not interbreed (Puniamoorthy 2014). Behavioral mating barriers therefore

seem to evolve comparatively fast (Gleason & Ritchie, 1998; Puniamoorthy *et al*., 2009;

Puniamoorthy, 2014), especially if species occur in sympatry and reinforcement by natural or

sexual selection can operate (Coyne & Orr, 2004; Seehausen, 2004; Ritchie, 2007).

We found a weaker signal of reinforcement between *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* at the

lowland Zürich site than at the high-altitude Sörenberg site in the Swiss Alps. This difference

might be related to the fact that *S. neocynipsea* is rare around Zürich, in fact in European

lowlands in general, while it is more common at higher altitudes. If based primarily on

behavioral mate choice, reinforcement is expected to be stronger, and hence its evolution

more likely, where interspecific encounter frequencies are higher. Regardless, why *S.*

neocynipsea remains rare and restricted to highland sites in Europe, whereas it is common in

dry and warm lowland areas in North America, cannot be answered by our study. *Sepsis*

cynipsea is abundant around fresh dung all over Europe north of the Alps (Pont & Meier,

2002). It therefore might outcompete and ultimately relegate *S. neocynipsea* towards higher

altitudes. However, *S. cynipsea* also readily populates cold high-altitude sites (Rohner *et al*.,

2015), and some degree of altitudinal molecular (allozyme) differentiation can also be

observed (Kraushaar *et al*., 2002). It consequently remains unclear why *S. neocynipsea* can

better persist at high altitudes in Europe.

Our study on introgression among sympatric *S. cynipsea* and *S. neocynipsea* populations

relied on the ABBA-BABA approach, which was initially designed for the analysis of haploid

genotypes of one individual from each of four lineages (Green *et al*., 2010). Recent

extensions of this original approach to allele frequency data (Durand *et al*., 2011; Soraggi *et*

al., 2018) enabled us to apply the method to pool-sequenced laboratory and field-caught

specimens (see also Deitz *et al*. 2016). We have here provided a Python implementation of

the ABBA-BABA approaches by Durand *et al*. (2011) and Soraggi *et al*. (2018) that takes a

simple 2D matrix of allele frequencies as input. This implementation allows restricting the ABBA-BABA analysis to high-confidence SNPs that pass a set of user-defined filters in order to reduce artefacts of pool-sequencing (Schlötterer *et al*. 2014) that may produce false polymorphisms due to sequencing errors (Futschik & Schlötterer 2011; Cutler & Jensen 2012). In addition, and in contrast to the software package ANGSD (Korneliussen *et al*. 2014), our implementation accommodates an outgroup (P4) taxon different from the one used as a reference to call the SNPs. This distinction reduces a potential reference bias that could affect sequence variation if the ingroup taxa (P1, P2, P3) strongly differed from an outgroup that also served as reference (Ballouz *et al*. 2019). Our script and detailed instructions for how to use it are available on GitHub (https://github.com/capoony/ABBA-BABA-4-AF; see also Supporting Information).

In summary, our genomic study provided evidence that the extent of interspecific gene flow between two closely related species of sepsid flies in sympatry relative to allopatry varies geographically. Interspecific gene flow appears to be very limited at sites in the Swiss Alps where the two species have perhaps locally adapted to different (micro-)ecological niches, such as different breeding times or phenologies, and/or where pre- and postmating reproductive barriers (Giesen *et al*., 2017) have been and are subject to stronger reinforcement. It however remains unclear, if ecological and sexual selection are mediating these effects. We note in closing that North American and European *S. neocynipsea* populations also differ substantially based on neutral genetic markers (microsatellites), as can be expected by genetic drift alone due to definitive inter-continental allopatry (Baur *et al*., 2020). It is currently also unclear whether European *S. neocynipsea* are remnants of an ancient Holarctic population or whether they (re-)invaded Europe from North America, where the species is much more common and fills the niche that *S. cynipsea* has in Europe. Future genomic research should analyze patterns of genomic differentiation across allopatric populations from Europe and North America (Baur *et al*., 2020). Such analyses would provide further insights into introgression patterns across the species' entire natural range, as well as into the role of local (e.g. latitudinal) adaptation in shaping genome-wide patterns of differentiation.

LITERATURE CITED

Anderson M.B. (1949). Sexual selection. *Princeton University Press*.

Andrews, S., Lindenbaum, P., Howard, B., & Ewels, P. (2011). FastQC High throughput
sequence QC report v. 0.10. *Babraham Bioinformatics, Cambridge, UK*.

Arnold M.L. & Meyer A. (2006). Natural hybridization in primates: one evolutionary
mechanism. *Zoology*, 109(4): 261–276.

Ballouz, S., Dobin, A. & Gillis, J.A. (2019). Is it time to change the reference genome? *Genome*
Biology 20: 159.

Barton N., & Bengtsson B.O. (1986). The barrier to genetic exchange between hybridising
populations. *Heredity*, 57(3): 357–376.

Baur J., Schäfer M.A., Blanckenhorn W.U., & Giesen A. (2020). Patterns of genetic
differentiation in sexual and neutral morphological traits among species and populations of dung
flies (Diptera: Sepsidae). *Journal of Zoological Systematics and Evolutionary Research* 58: 159–
173.

Berner D. & Salzburger W. (2015). The genomics of organismal diversification illuminated by
adaptive radiations. *Trends in Genetics*, 31: 491–499.

Blanckenhorn W.U. (1999). Different growth responses to temperature and resource limitation
in three fly species with similar life histories. *Evolutionary Ecology*, 13: 395–409.

Blanckenhorn W.U., Mühlhäuser C., Morf C., *et al*. (2000). Female choice, female reluctance to
mate and sexual selection on body size in the dung fly *Sepsis cynipsea*. *Ethology*, 106: 577–593.

Bolger A.M., Lohse M., & Usadel B. (2014). Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina
sequence data. *Bioinformatics*: btu170.

Bouchemousse S., Liautard-Haag C., Bierne N., & Viard F. (2016) Distinguishing
contemporary hybridization from past introgression with postgenomic ancestry-informative SNPs
in strongly differentiated *Ciona* species. *Molecular Ecology,* 25: 5527-5542.

Brandvain Y., Kenney A.M., Flgel L., Coop G., & Sweigart A.L. (2014). Speciation and
introgression between *Mimulus nasutus* and *M. guttatus*. *Plos Genetics*, 10:
doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1004410

Butlin R. K. 1995. Reinforcement: an idea evolving. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 10, 432-
434.

Coyne J.A., & Orr H.A. (2004). Speciation. *Sinauer Associates*.

Cutler, D.J. & Jensen, J.D. (2010). To Pool, or Not to Pool? *Genetics* 186: 41–43.

Deitz, K.C., Athrey, G.A., Jawara, M., Overgaard, H.J., Matias, A. & Slotman, M.A. (2016).
Genome-Wide Divergence in the West-African Malaria Vector Anopheles melas. *G3: Genes,*
Genomes, Genetics 6: 2867–2879.

DeMarais B.D., Dowling T.E., Douglas M.E., *et al.* (1992). Origin of Gila seminude (Teleostei:
Cyprinidae) through introgressive hybridization: implications for evolution and conservation.
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 89(7): 2747–2751.

Dobzhansky T. (1951). Genetics and the origin of species (3rd ed.). *Columbia University Press*.

Doebeli M, & Dieckmann U. (2003) Speciation along thermal gradients. Nature 421: 259–264.

Durand E.Y., Patterson N., Reich D., & Slatkin M. (2011). Testing for ancient admixture

between closely related populations. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 28(8): 2239–2252.

Eaton D.A. & Ree R.H. (2013). Inferring phylogeny and introgression using RADseq data: an
example from flowering plants (Pedicularis: Orobanchaceae). *Systematic Biology*, 62(5): 689–706.

Eberhard W.G. (1999). Mating systems of sepsid flies and sexual behavior away from
oviposition sites by *Sepsis neocynipsea* (Diptera: Sepsidae). *Journal of the Kansas Entomological*
Society, 72(1): 129–130.

Feulner P.G.D & Seehausen O. (2018). Genomic insights into the vulnerability of sympatric
whitefish species flocks. *Molecular Ecology,* 28: 615-629.

Futschik A. & Schlötterer C. (2010). The next generation of molecular markers from passively
parallel sequencing of pooled DNA samples. *Genetics*, 186(1): 207–218.

Gante H.F., Matschiner M., Malmstrom M., Jakobsen K.S., Jentoft S., & Salzburger W. (2016).
Genomics of speciation and introgression in Princess cichlid fishes from Lake Tanganyika.
Molecular Ecology, 25: 6143–6161.

Giesen A, Blanckenhorn W.U., & Schäfer M.A. (2017). Behavioural mechanisms of

reproductive isolation between two hybridizing dung fly species. *Animal Behaviour*, 132: 155–166.

Giesen A., Schäfer M.A., & Blanckenhorn W.U. (2019). Geographic patterns of postzygotic

isolation between two closely related widespread dung fly species (*Sepsis cynipsea* and *Sepsis*

neocynipsea; Diptera: Sepsidae). *Journal of* Zoological Systematics and Evolutionary Research,

57: 80–90

Gleason, J.M. & Ritchie, M.G. 1998. Evolution of courtship song and reproductive isolation in

the *Drosophila willistoni* species complex: Do sexual signals diverge the most quickly? *Evolution*,

52: 1493–1500.

Green R.E., Krause J., Briggs A.W., *et al*. (2010). A draft sequence of the Neanderthal genome.

Science, 328(5979): 710–722.

Grossenbacher D.L. & Whittall J.B. (2011). Increased floral divergence in sympatric

monkeyflowers. *Evolution*, 65: 2712-2718.

Haldane J.B.S. (1922). Sex ratio and the unisexual sterility in animal hybrids. *Journal of*

Genetics 12: 101–109.

Heliconius Genome Consortium (2012). Butterfly genome reveals promiscuous exchange of

mimicry adaptations among species. *Nature*, 487(7405): 94–98.

Hudson R.R. (1983). Testing the Constant-Rate Neutral Allele Model with Protein Sequence

Data. *Evolution* 37: 203–217.

Jeong C., Nakagome S., Di Rienzo A. (2016). Deep History of East Asian Populations Revealed

Through Genetic Analysis of the Ainu. *Genetics*, 202: 261–272.

Kapun, M., Barron Aduriz, M.G., Staubach, F., *et al*. (2018). Genomic analysis of

European *Drosophila* populations reveals major longitudinal structure, continent-wide selection,

and unknown DNA viruses. *bioRxiv*, DOI: 10.1101/313759.

Kastally Ch., Trasoletti M., & Mardulyn P. (2019). Limited gene exchange between two sister

species of leaf beetles within a hybrid zone in the Alps. *Journal of evolutionary Biology,* 32: 1406-

1417.

Kimura, M. (1969). The Number of Heterozygous Nucleotide Sites Maintained in a Finite

Population Due to Steady Flux of Mutations. *Genetics* 61: 893–903.

Kofler, R., Pandey, R.V. & Schlötterer, C. (2011). PoPoolation2: identifying differentiation
between populations using sequencing of pooled DNA samples (pool-seq). *Bioinformatics* 27:
3435–3436.

Koren S., Walenz, B.P., Berlin, K., Miller, J.R., Bergman, N.H. & Phillippy, A.M. (2017).
Canu: scalable and accurate long-read assembly via adaptive *k*-mer weighting and repeat
separation. *Genome Research* 27: 722–736.

Kulathinal R.J. & Singh R.S. (2000). A biogeographic genetic approach for testing the role of
reinforcement: the case of *Drosophila pseudoobscura* and *D. persimilis*. *Evolution*, 54: 210-217.

Kraushaar U. & Blanckenhorn W.U. (2002). Population variation in sexual selection and its
effect on size allometry in two dung fly species with contrasting sexual size dimorphism.
Evolution, 56(2): 307–321.

Kraushaar U., Goudet J., & Blanckenhorn W.U. (2002). Geographical and altitudinal population
genetic structure of two dung fly species with contrasting mobility and temperature preference.
Heredity, 89: 99-106.
607
Korneliussen T.S., Albrechtsen A., & Nielsen R. (2014). ANGSD: analysis of next generation
sequencing data. *BMC bioinformatics*, 15(1): 356.

Li H., Handsaker B., Wysoker A., *et al*. (2009). The sequence alignment/map format and
SAMtools. *Bioinformatics*, 25(16): 2078–2079.

Li H. & Durbin R. (2009). Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler
transform. *Bioinformatics*, 25(14): 1754–1760.

Mallet J. (2007). Hybrid speciation. *Nature*, 446: 279–283.

Martin S.H., Dasmahapatra K.K., Nadeau N.J., *et al*. (2014). Genome-wide evidence for
speciation with gene flow in *Hiliconius* butterflies. *Genome Research*, 23: 1817-1828.

Massie K.R. & Markow T.A. (2005). Sympatry, allopatry and sexual isolation between
Drosophila mojavensis and *D. arizonae*. *Hereditas*, 142: 51-55.

Mayr E. (1942). Systematics and the origin of species from the viewpoint of a zoologist.
Columbia University Press.

Mayr E. (1963). Animal and species evolution. In: Animal species and their evolution, *Harvard*
University Press.

Meier J.I., Marques D.A., Selz O.M., *et al*. (2017). Ancient hybridization fuels rapid cichlid fish
adaptive radiations. *Nature Communications*, 8: 14363.

Moran, P.A., Hunt J., Mitchell Ch., Ritchie M.G., & Bailey N.W. 2019. Behavioural
mechanisms of sexual isolation involving multiple modalities and their inheritance. *Journal of*
evolutionary Biology, 32: 243-258.

Nadeau N.J., Martin S.H., Kozak K.M., *et al*. (2013). Genome-wide patterns of divergence in
gene flow across a butterfly radiation. *Molecular Ecology,* 22: 814-826.

Nolte A. W., & Tautz D. (2010). Understanding the onset of hybrid speciation. *Trends in*
Genetics, 26(2): 54–58.

Nakazato T., Warren D.L., & Moyle L.C. (2010). Ecological and geographic modes of species
divergence in wild tomatoes. *American Journal of Botany*, 97: 680-693.

Nei M. (1987). *Molecular Evolutionary Genetics*. Columbia University Press.

Noor M.A.F. (1999). Reinforcement and other consequences of sympatry. *Heredity,* 83: 503-
508.

Nosil P. (2009). Adaptive population divergence in cryptic color-pattern following a reduction
in gene flow. *Evolution*, 63(7): 1902–1912.

Novikova Y.P. *et al*. (2016). Sequencing of the genus *Arabidopsis* identifies a complex history
of non-bifurcating speciation and abundant trans-specific polymorphism. Nature Genetics 48:
1077–1082.

Ozerov A.L. (2005). World catalogue of the family Sepsidae (insect: Diptera).*Zoologicheskie*
Issledovania (Zoological Studies), 8: 1–74.

Parker G.A. (1972a). Reproductive behaviour of Sepsis cynipsea (L.) (Diptera: Sepsidae) I. a
preliminary analysis of the reproductive strategy and its associated behaviour patterns. *Behaviour*,
41(1): 172–205.

Parker G.A. (1972b). Rerpductive behaviorur of Sepsis cynipsea (L.) (Diptera: Sepsidae) II. the
significance of the precopulatory passive phase and emigration. *Behaviour*, 41(3): 242–250.

Pont A.C., & Meier R. (2002). *The Sepsidae (Diptera) of Europe*. Leiden, N.E.: *Fauna*
Entomologica Scandinavia, 37.

Puniamoorthy N, Ismail M.R.B., Tan D.S.H., & Meier R. (2009). From kissing to belly
stridulation: Comparative analysis reveals surprising diversity, rapid evolution, and much
homoplasy in the mating behaviour of 27 species of sepsid flies (Diptera: Sepsidae). *Journal of*
Evolutionary Biology, 22(11): 2146–2156.

Puniamoorthy N. (2014). Behavioural barriers to reproduction may evolve faster than sexual
morphology among populations of a dung fly (Sepsidae). *Animal Behaviour*, 98: 139–148.

Reich, D., N. Patterson, M. Kircher, F. Delfin, M. R. Nandineni et al., 2011 Denisova admixture
and the first modern human dis- persals into Southeast Asia and Oceania. *American Journal of*
Human Genetics, 89: 516–528.

Rieseberg L.H., Raymond O., Rosenthal D.M., *et al*. (2003). Major ecologocial transitions in
wild sunflowers facilitated by hybridization. *Science*, 301(5637): 1211–1216.

Ritchie M.G. (2007). Sexual selection and speciation. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution and*
Systematics, 38: 79–102.

Rohner P.T., Bächli, G., Paltrinieri, L.P., Duelli, P., Obrist, M.K., Jochmann, R., &
Blanckenhorn, W.U. (2015). Distribution, diversity gradients and Rapoport's elevational rule in the
black scavenger flies of the Swiss Alps (Diptera: Sepsidae). *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, 8,
367–376.

Rohner P.T., Blanckenhorn W.U., & Puniamoorthy N. (2016). Sexual selection on male size
drives the evolution of male-biased sexual size dimorphism via theprolongation of male
development. *Evolution*, 70(6): 1189–1199.

Dafu R., Kangshan M., Lei Z., *et al*. (2016). Genomic evidence for polyphyletic origins and
interlineage gene flow within complex taxa: a case study of *Picea brachytyla* in the Qinghai-Tibet
Plateau. *Molecular Ecology*, 25: 2373–2386.

Saetre G.P. (2013). Hybridization is important in evolution, but is speciation? *Journal of*
Evolutionary Biology, 26(2): 256–258.

Schlötterer, C., Tobler, R., Kofler, R. & Nolte, V. (2014). Sequencing pools of individuals —
mining genome-wide polymorphism data without big funding. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 15: 749–
763.

Seehausen O. (2004). Hybridization and adaptive radiation. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*,

19(4): 198–207.

Soraggi, S., Wiuf, C. & Albrechtsen, A. (2018). Powerful Inference with the D-Statistic on
Low-Coverage Whole-Genome Data. *G3: Genes, Genomes, Genetics* **8**: 551–566.

Streicher J.W., Devitt T.J., Goldberg C.S., *et al*. (2014). Diversification and asymmetrical gene
flow across time and space: lineage sorting and hybridization in polytypic barking frogs. *Molecular*
Ecology, 23(13): 3273–3291.

Su, K.F.Y., S. N. Kutty, & R. Meier (2008). Morphology versus molecules: the
phylogenetic relationships of Sepsidae (Dptera: Cyclorrhapha) based on morphology and
DNA sequence data from ten genes. Cladistics 24:902-916.

Su, K.F.Y., Puniamoorthy, J., Özsu, N., A. Srivathsan, & R. Meier (2016). Evolutionary
analysis identifies multiple genome expansions and contractions in Sepsidae (Diptera) and suggests
targets for future genomic research. *Cladistics* 32: 308–316.

Tajima, F. (1983). Evolutionary Relationship of DNA Sequences in Finite Populations.
Genetics 105: 437–460.

Trier C. N., Hermansen J. S., Sætre G. P., & Bailey R. I. (2014). Evidence for mitonuclear and
sex-linked reproductive barriers between the hybrid Italian sparrow and its parent species. *PLoS*
Genet, 10(1): e1004075.

Via S. & West J. (2008). The genetic mosaic suggests a new role for hitchhiking in ecological
speciation. *Molecular Ecology*, 17(19): 4334–4345.

Ward P.I. (1983). The effects of size on the mating behaviour of the dung fly *Sepsis cynipsea*.
Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology, 13(1): 75–80.

Ward P.I., Hemmi J., & Rösli T. (1992). Sexual conflict on the dung fly Sepsis cynipsea.
Functional Ecology, 6(6): 649–653.

Wood H.M., Grahame J.W., Humphray S., *et al*. (2008). Sequence differentiation in regions
identified by a genome scan for local adaptation. *Molecular Ecology*, 17(13): 3123–3135.

Wu C.I. (2001). The genic view of the process of speciation. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*,
14(6): 851–856.