Evolutionary transition to XY sex chromosomes associated with Y-linked duplication of a

male hormone gene in a terrestrial isopod

Aubrie Russell[1], Sevarin Borrelli[1], Rose Fontana[1], Joseph Laricchiuta[1], Jane Pascar[1,2], Thomas

Becking[3], Isabelle Giraud[3], Richard Cordaux[3], Christopher H. Chandler[1*]

[1]Department of Biological Sciences, State University of New York at Oswego, Oswego, NY,

United States

[2]Current address: Center for Reproductive Evolution, Department of Biology, Syracuse

University, Syracuse, NY, United States

[3]Laboratoire Ecologie et Biologie des Interactions, Equipe Ecologie Evolution Symbiose,

Université de Poitiers, UMR CNRS 7267 Poitiers, France

*Corresponding author:

Christopher H. Chandler

Department of Biological Sciences

State University of New York at Oswego

christopher.chandler@oswego.edu

Key words: *Wolbachia*, Oniscidea, *Trachelipus*, androgenic gland hormone, AGH

Abstract

Sex chromosomes are highly variable in some taxonomic groups, but the evolutionary

mechanisms underlying this diversity are not well understood. In terrestrial isopod crustaceans,

interactions with *Wolbachia*, a vertically transmitted endosymbiont causing male-to-female sex

reversal, are thought to drive rapid evolutionary turnovers in sex chromosomes. Here, we use

surgical manipulations and genetic crosses, plus genome sequencing, to examine sex

chromosomes in the terrestrial isopod *Trachelipus rathkei*. Although an earlier cytogenetics

study suggested a ZZ/ZW sex chromosome system in this species, we surprisingly find that in

our study population, sex is determined by an XX/XY system. Consistent with a recent

evolutionary origin for this XX/XY system, the putative male-specific region of the genome is

small. The genome shows evidence of sequences horizontally acquired from past *Wolbachia*

infections, as well as evidence of Y-linked duplications of the androgenic gland hormone gene,

thought to be a possible target for sex reversal by *Wolbachia*. Overall, these results are

consistent with the hypothesis that reproductive endosymbionts such as *Wolbachia* can promote

quick turnover of sex determination mechanisms in their hosts.

Introduction

Although sexual reproduction is shared by most eukaryotes, a variety of different cues can trigger individuals to follow a male, female, or hermaphroditic developmental plan (Conover & Kynard 1981; Janzen & Phillips 2006; Ospina-Álvarez & Piferrer 2008; Tingley & Anderson 1986; Verhulst et al. 2010). In many eukaryotes, sex is primarily determined genotypically, and in most of those cases, sex chromosomes are the primary sex-determining factors, although some exceptions, including polygenic systems and haplodiploidy, are also known (Vandeputte et al. 2007; Heimpel & de Boer 2008). Sex chromosomes in animals are usually grouped into two main classes: XY systems, in which males are heterogametic (XY) and females are homogametic (XX); and ZW systems, in which females are heterogametic (ZW) and males are homogametic (ZZ). However, non-genetic cues can also play an important role in some species. For instance, environmental factors, such as temperature or population density, influence or determine phenotypic sex in reptiles, fishes, and invertebrates (Conover & Kynard 1981; Janzen & Phillips 2006; Tingley & Anderson 1986). In some cases, cytoplasmic factors, including sex-reversing endosymbionts, such as *Wolbachia*, microsporidia, and paramyxids can serve as a sex-determining signal (Bouchon et al. 1998; Pickup & Ironside 2018; Terry et al. 1998; Negri I et al. 2006; Kageyama et al. 2002).

Evolutionary theory holds that the formation of sex chromosomes begins when an autosome acquires a sex-determining locus (Rice 1996). Subsequently, recombination around the sex-determining locus is selected against because of sexually antagonistic selection (Bergero & Charlesworth 2009). For instance, selection should favor mutations that are beneficial in males but deleterious in females when those alleles are linked to a dominant male-determining allele; recombination, on the other hand, would break up this linkage and result in females that carry these male-beneficial alleles. The non-recombining region is then expected to spread in the

presence of continued sexually antagonistic selection, and may eventually span the whole sex

chromosome, except for the usual presence of a small recombining pseudo-autosomal region

(Charlesworth et al. 2005). Once recombination has ceased, the non-recombining sex

chromosome, such as the Y chromosome in mammals or the W chromosome in birds, is

expected to degenerate. Non-recombining genes frequently undergo pseudogenization,

acquiring nonsense mutations or transposable element insertions (Charlesworth & Charlesworth

2000). At the same time, gene trafficking can occur when selection promotes the translocation

of formerly autosomal genes to the sex chromosomes (Emerson et al. 2004).

Different species appear to be at different stages of sex chromosome evolution. For instance,

the sex chromosomes of therian mammals are highly conserved, having originated ~160 million

years ago (Potrzebowski et al. 2008; Veyrunes et al. 2008). The highly degenerated,

heteromorphic Y chromosome represents an advanced stage of sex chromosome evolution. In

other taxonomic groups, on the other hand, sex chromosomes appear to undergo more frequent

evolutionary turnovers (Pennell et al. 2018; Cioffi et al. 2013; Myosho et al. 2015; Jeffries et al.

2018; Ross et al. 2009; Vicoso & Bachtrog 2015). Such young sex chromosomes may have little

or no recombination suppression, differentiation in gene content, or sex chromosome dosage

compensation, and may not be detectable by traditional cytogenetic methods because they are

visually indistinguishable (homomorphic) (Vicoso & Bachtrog 2015; Gamble et al. 2014). Sex

chromosomes may even be polymorphic within a species, with different sex-determining loci

segregating within or among populations (Traut 1994; Meisel et al. 2016; Ogata et al. 2008;

Orzack et al. 1980).

Unfortunately, we still have a limited understanding of why evolutionary turnovers of sex

chromosomes are rare in some groups but frequent in others. A variety of models have been

proposed to explain why these turnovers occur, including sexual antagonism, deleterious

mutations, and the 'hot potato' model (van Doorn & Kirkpatrick 2007; Blaser et al. 2013, 2014).

In some organisms, interactions with vertically transmitted reproductive endosymbionts are also

thought to influence the evolution of their hosts' sex determination mechanisms (Rigaud et al.

1997; Cordaux et al. 2011). However, many of these models have been difficult to test in nature.

This problem is exacerbated by the fact that, while sex chromosomes have been extensively

studied in model organisms like *Drosophila*, studies are more sparse in non-model organisms.

One group that has received relatively little attention is crustaceans. Different crustacean

species show a variety of distinct sex determining mechanisms, yet there are very few

crustacean species in which candidate master sex-determining genes have been identified

(Chandler et al. 2018, 2017). Within crustaceans, perhaps one of the best-studied groups in

terms of sex determination is the terrestrial isopods (Oniscidea). Terrestrial isopod species have

a mix of XY and ZW systems, along with reports of a few parthenogenic species and

populations (Rigaud et al. 1997; Johnson 1986; Fussey 1984). The bacterial endosymbiont

Wolbachia also influences sex determination by causing male-to-female sex reversal in some

isopod hosts (Bouchon et al. 1998; Cordaux et al. 2004). In fact, interactions with *Wolbachia* are

thought to drive rapid evolutionary turnover of the sex chromosomes in terrestrial isopods. This

hypothesis is supported by multiple lines of evidence. For instance, in the common pillbug

Armadillidium vulgare, a copy of the *Wolbachia* genome horizontally integrated into the host

genome (formerly known as the *f* element) led to the origin of a new W chromosome (Leclercq

et al. 2016). A recent phylogenetic analysis also identified, at minimum, several transitions in

heterogametic systems along the isopod phylogeny, including closely related species pairs with

different sex chromosome systems (Becking et al. 2017). Moreover, only a few species of

terrestrial isopods are known to have heteromorphic sex chromosomes, in which the X and Y, or

Z and W, chromosomes are visually distinguishable in cytogenetics experiments (Rigaud et al.

1997), and WW or YY individuals are often viable and fertile (Juchault & Rigaud 1995; Becking

et al. 2019), suggesting that the W and Y chromosomes have not lost any essential genes in

these species.

In this study, we examined sex determination in the widespread species *Trachelipus rathkei*.

This species was previously established by cytogenetic methods to have heteromorphic, albeit

slightly, Z and W sex chromosomes (Mittal & Pahwa 1980). We sought to confirm female

heterogamety by crossing females to sex-reversed neo-males (which have female genotypes

but male phenotypes), and assessing the sex ratio of the resultant progenies. Surprisingly, we

found that, at least in our focal population, sex is determined by an XX/XY system, suggesting a

recent sex chromosome turnover. To test this hypothesis, we performed whole-genome

sequencing. Consistent with a recent origin of an XX/XY sex determination system, we find

evidence that the putative male-specific region of the genome is small, and we identified a male-

specific partial duplication of the androgenic gland hormone (AGH) gene, a rare example of a

candidate sex-determining gene in a crustacean. In addition, although our study population

does not appear to harbor current *Wolbachia* infections, we find genomic evidence of past

infections. Overall, our results are consistent with the hypothesis that sex-reversing

endosymbionts like *Wolbachia* can drive rapid evolutionary turnover of sex chromosomes in

their hosts.

Methods

<u>Animal collection and husbandry</u>

We sampled wild isopods from Rice Creek Field Station (RCFS) at SUNY Oswego in Oswego,

NY. We captured animals using a combination of methods. First, we haphazardly searched

through leaf litter, logs, and rocks. We also used "potato traps", made by carving out a 1-2 cm

diameter core from a potato and placing it in the litter for 1-2 weeks. Finally, we constructed

pitfall traps from plastic cups buried in the ground with the rim of the cup flush with the ground.

The primary species captured were *Oniscus asellus* and *Trachelipus rathkei*, but we also

captured *Philoscia muscorum*, *Hyloniscus riparius*, *Trichoniscus pusillus*, and occasionally

Cylisticus convexus. Species identification was performed in the field and confirmed in the lab,

where we also determined the phenotypic sex of specimens.

Isopods were housed in plastic food storage containers with holes in the lids for air exchange,

on a substrate of moistened soil. Containers were checked twice weekly. Animals were fed

carrots and dried leaves *ad libitum*. The photoperiod was kept on a schedule of 18:6 light

hours:dark hours in the summer and and 14:10 in the winter. We isolated ovigerous females in

individual containers, and separated offspring from their mothers upon emergence from the

marsupium. We initially sexed offspring at six to eight weeks old, and separated males from

females to prevent sibling mating. We then double-checked offspring sex at roughly two week

intervals thereafter until four months of age to watch for individuals that might have shown late

signs of sexual differentiation. Terrestrial isopods are known to store sperm from a single mating

to fertilize future broods. Therefore, for experimental crosses we only used *T. rathkei* females

that were born in the lab, separated from brothers as soon as they could be sexed, and which

had not produced any offspring by 12 months of age.

Wolbachia testing

We used PCR assays to detect *Wolbachia* in *T. rathkei* individuals. DNA was extracted from

one or two legs, depending on the size of the animal. We ruptured the leg tissue in 400 μL

deionized water along with a few 0.5 mm zirconia/silica beads (enough to cover the bottom of

the tube) using a bead beater machine. Samples were lysed following a protocol of 2500 RPM

for 10 seconds, followed by 4200 RPM for 10 seconds, and finally 4800 RPM for 10 seconds.

The tube was then visually inspected to confirm the leg was sufficiently pulverized. We then

transferred the lysate to a new tube, added 60 µL of a 5% Chelex® 100 molecular biology grade

resin suspension, and incubated for 15 minutes at 100° C. After incubation, we centrifuged the

extract at 16,000g for 3 minutes, and reserved 80 µL of supernatant for PCR testing. We

confirmed successful DNA extraction using the mitochondrial primers HCO2198/LCO1490

(Folmer et al. 1994). We performed PCRs in 10 µL reactions, using 4.95 µL of molecular biology

grade water, 2 µL NEB OneTaq Buffer, 1 µL of mixed dNTPS at a final concentration of 2mM for

each dNTP, 1 µL of a 5 µM solution of each primer, and 0.05 µL of NEB OneTaq. For the

mitochondrial primer set, PCR conditions included an initial denaturation of 94° C for 1 minute; 5

cycles of 94° C denaturation for 30s, 45° C annealing for 90s, and 68° C extension for 60s. The

samples then underwent 35 cycles of 94° C for 30s, 51° C for 90s, and 68° C for 60s. This was

followed by a final extension step of 68° C for 5 minutes. To test for *Wolbachia*, we performed

PCR using *Wolbachia*-specific primers targeting the *wsp* (81f/691r) and *ftsZ* (ftsZf1/ftsZr1)

genes (Braig et al. 1998; Werren John H. et al. 1995). We performed PCRs in 10 µL reactions,

using 4.95 µL of molecular biology grade water, 2 µL NEB OneTaq Buffer, 1 µL of mixed dNTPs

at a final concentration of 2mM for each dNTP, 1 µL of either *wsp* or *ftsZ* primers, and 0.05 µL

of NEB OneTaq. PCR conditions contained an initial denaturation of 95°C for 5 minutes,

followed by 36 cycles of 95° C for 60s, 54° C for 60s, and 68°C for 3 minutes. This was followed

by a final extension step at 68° C for 10 minutes.

<u>Androgenic gland implantation and crosses</u>

To test whether sex is determined by a ZZ/ZW or XX/XY system of sex determination in our

population of *T. rathkei*, we performed crosses between females and experimentally sex-

reversed neo-males. Juvenile female *T. rathkei* were implanted with live androgenic glands,

according to (Becking et al. 2017). Male donors and female recipients were selected from large

lab-reared broods with even (~1:1) sex ratios. An adult male was sacrificed by decapitation, and

live androgenic glands were dissected into Ringer solution (393 mM NaCl, 2 mM KCl, 2 mM

$CaCl_2 \cdot 2H_2O$, 2 mM $NaHCO_3$). Female recipients were between 5 and 8 weeks old, an age at

which males and females begin to become distinguishable, but at which sexual development is

not complete. The gland was injected using a pulled glass pipette into a hole pierced with a

dissecting needle in the 6th or 7th segment of the juvenile female's pereon. Recipients were

isolated in a small plastic container with a moist paper towel for recovery and observation.

Experimental animals were monitored for signs of male development. Any animal that failed to

develop male genitalia by 4 months post-implantation was considered to be a failed injection.

After maturation, adult neo-males were placed in individual containers with 1-3 previously

unmated females. Crosses were monitored twice weekly to check for signs of reproduction in

females. Gravid females were then isolated into their own containers until parturition.

Genome sequencing

All raw sequencing data and the draft genome assembly are available under NCBI BioProject

PRJNA633105. Data analysis scripts are available at

https://github.com/chandlerlab/trachelipus_genome.

We performed whole-genome sequencing using a combination of Illumina, PacBio, and Oxford

Nanopore sequencing, with multiple sequencing samples of each sex (Table 1). Because we

expected the *T. rathkei* genome to be large, repetitive, and highly polymorphic, and because we

expected to need to isolate DNA from multiple individuals, we established a partially inbred

laboratory line using offspring from a single female collected from RCFS. We mated brothers

and sisters from this female for two generations in the lab prior to collecting genetic samples

from the third generation for sequencing. DNA was collected for sequencing using the Qiagen

DNEasy Blood and Tissue Kit following the manufacturer's instructions. DNA was quantified

using the Qubit DNA Broad Range assay kit, and the A260/280 value was checked with a

Nanodrop spectrophotometer. Samples were stored at -80°C prior to being shipped to the

sequencing center. Illumina sequencing was performed at the State University of New York at

Buffalo Genomics and Bioinformatics Core Facility.

For PacBio sequencing, we had to pool DNA from multiple individuals to obtain sufficient

quantities of DNA for library preparation. We performed separate DNA extractions from three

individuals of each sex as above. Then, we pooled the DNA from the three individuals of each

sex and concentrated it using Ampure XP beads (Beckman-Coulter). Briefly, we washed the

beads three times in molecular biology grade water, once in Qiagen buffer EB, and finally re-

suspended the beads in their original buffer. We then added equal volumes of Ampure XP

suspension to the DNA samples, mixed them on a shaker for 15 minutes, placed the tubes on a

magnetic bead separator, and removed the supernatant. We washed the beads twice with 1.5

mL of 70% ethanol, and finally eluted the DNA samples in 30 µL of Qiagen buffer EB.

Sequencing libraries were prepared and sequenced at the University of Delaware Sequencing &

Genotyping Center on a PacBio RSII.

We also supplemented our PacBio dataset with Oxford Nanopore sequencing data. We isolated

DNA from a single *T. rathkei* female and two separate males using a Qiagen DNEasy Kit as

described above. We then performed sequencing on Oxford Nanopore Minion flowcells (R9.4)

with the Rapid Sequencing Kit (SQK-RAD004) following the manufacturer's instructions.

Genome assembly

We performed a hybrid assembly combining the short- and long-read sequence data. We first

removed adapters and trimmed the Illumina sequencing data using Trimmomatic v. 0.36 (Bolger

et al. 2014); we removed leading and trailing bases, as well as internal windows of at least 4bp,

with a quality score of 5 or lower, and discarded any reads shorter than 36bp after trimming. We

then used SparseAssembler (Ye et al. 2012) to assemble the cleaned Illumina data from sample

Mpool (to minimize the number of sequence polymorphisms that would be present in the data

with additional samples), using two different kmer sizes (k=51 and k=61). After performing

preliminary quality checks using Quast (Gurevich et al. 2013), we decided to proceed with the

k=61 assembly, which had the longer total length and N50 (Supplementary Table 1). However,

because we suspected the genome might still contain high levels of heterozygosity despite two

generations of inbreeding, we used Redudans (Pryszcz & Gabaldón 2016) to remove putative

allelic contigs from the Illumina-only assembly; we set identity and overlap thresholds of 95%.

Prior to performing hybrid assembly, we used the short reads to correct sequencing errors in the

long reads using FMLRC (Wang et al. 2018) with the default settings, except requiring a

minimum count of 3 to consider a path (-m 3). PacBio and Oxford Nanopore reads derived from

female isopods were corrected using Illumina sample Fpool, while long reads from male

samples were corrected using sample Mpool.

We next performed hybrid assembly using DBG2OLC (Ye et al. 2016), which accepts a short-

read assembly (rather than raw short-read sequence data) and long-read sequence data (in this

case, our PacBio and Oxford Nanopore reads) as input. We tested out a range of different

parameter values: from the Redundans-filtered assembly, we first removed contigs less than

100bp or 200bp; we tested kmer sizes of 17 and 19; for the kmer coverage threshold, we tried

values of 2 and 5; and for the minimum overlap, we tried values of 10 and 30. We used an

adaptive threshold of 0.01. These assemblies ranged in size from ~5.2 Gb to 8.5 Gb; we

selected three assemblies across the range of total sizes for further processing.

We next corrected errors in these assemblies, caused by the relatively high error rates in long-

read sequence data. In the standard DBG2OLC pipeline, the resulting contigs are corrected

using the contigs from the short-read assembly and from the long reads using Sparc (Ye & Ma

2016); however, in our initial attempts, large portions of the assemblies went uncorrected,

perhaps because we had relatively low-coverage long-read data. Therefore, instead we

performed three rounds of error correction using Pilon (Walker et al. 2014), by mapping the raw

Illumina sequence reads to each assembly using bbmap (first two rounds; (Bushnell et al.

2017)) and bwa mem (third round; with the parameters -A 1 -B 1 -O 1 -E 1 -k 11 -W 20 -d 0.5 -L

6 for mapping to an error-prone assembly; (Li 2013)).

Finally, we assessed the quality of each assembly using BUSCO v.3.0.2 (Simão et al. 2015),

with the arthropod reference gene set, and selected the assembly with the greatest number of

BUSCO reference genes present for further analysis.

To remove contaminants from the final assembly, we generated blob plots using Blobtools v.1.0

(Laetsch & Blaxter 2017). To accomplish this, we BLASTed all contigs against the NCBI

nucleotide (nt) database using megablast (Morgulis et al. 2008) and against Uniprot reference

proteomes using diamond blastx (Buchfink et al. 2015). We then removed any contigs that were

identified as coming from plants, fungi, viruses, or bacteria, except for those matching

Wolbachia.

Genome annotation

We used RepeatModeler v.1.0.10, which uses RECON (Bao & Eddy 2002), RepeatScout (Price

et al. 2005), and Tandem Repeat Finder (Benson 1999), to construct a custom repeat library for

T. rathkei. Because we were unable to run RepeatModeler successfully using the full assembly,

we ran RepeatModeler on a random subset 40% of the contigs; this should still successfully

identify most repetitive elements in the genome as long as all repeat families are still well

represented in the subset. We then masked the assembly using RepeatMasker 4.0.7 (Tarailo-

Graovac & Chen 2009).

We annotated coding sequences using the MAKER pipeline (Cantarel et al. 2008). We initially

ran MAKER using assembled transcript sequences (est2genome=1) from previously available

data from one wild-caught male and one wild-caught female *T. rathkei* from the same population

(Becking et al. 2017) (SRR5198727, SRR5198726), along with protein alignments against

Uniprot-Swissprot (version March 2020) and used the resulting output to train SNAP (Korf

2004). To train AUGUSTUS (Stanke et al. 2006) we used the output from the BUSCO quality

assessment described earlier. We then completed a final round of MAKER using the trained

gene models.

Development of sex-linked PCR markers

We used multiple approaches to develop male-specific, putatively Y-linked PCR markers. Initial

attempts to perform a genomic assembly with male samples and then identify contigs with zero

coverage in females were unsuccessful. We therefore developed a complementary approach by

looking for male-specific k-mers in the raw sequencing reads. We used kmc v.3.1.0 (Kokot et al.

2017) to count all the canonical 21-mers in each of the Illumina sequencing datasets (in other

words, each 21-mer and its reverse complement were considered to be the same k-mer during

counting). We then searched for k-mers that occurred at least 8 times in the Mpool Illumina

sequencing dataset and a total of at least 3 times combined across the lower coverage M2, M5,

M6, and wildM samples, but which were completely absent from all female samples. We then

extracted all sequence reads containing these candidate male-specific k-mers using mirabait

v.4.0.2 (Chevreux et al. 1999), and assembled them using Spades v.3.11.1 (Bankevich et al.

2012).

To test male-specificity of these contigs, we used polymerase chain reaction (PCR). We

developed PCR primers for a subset of candidate male-specific contigs. To identify the best

candidates, we first mapped raw sequencing reads from all male and female samples to the full

genome sequence plus the candidate male-specific contigs, and identified contigs that had

coverage in male samples but not female samples; we also avoided contigs that showed

evidence of containing repeat elements, after BLAST searches against the whole genome

assembly. We designed primers using PRIMER3 (Untergasser et al. 2012, 3). In these PCRs,

primers were initially screened using template DNA from two male samples and two female

samples; primers that showed evidence of sex specificity after this first PCR were re-tested

using a larger number of samples. PCR primers were initially tested using a cycle of 98°C for 3

minutes, followed by 40 cycles of 98°C for 15s, 50°C for 35s, and 68°C for 60s; this was

followed by a final extension step of 68°C for 10 minutes. For samples that did not amplify under

this program, a gradient PCR was run to determine optimal annealing temperature. All PCRs

were performed using the same recipe and reaction conditions as the *Wolbachia* PCRs

described above.

We also identified open reading frames (ORFs) in these candidate male-specific contigs using

Transdecoder v.4.0.0 (Haas & Papanicolaou 2016), and annotated the ORFs using Trinotate

v.3.1.1 (Bryant et al. 2017). Subsequently, we designed additional primers targeting these

ORFs.

Results

<u>No *Wolbachia* and balanced sex ratios in *T. rathkei*</u>

Among the 100+ individuals captured and tested between 2015 and 2017, no *T. rathkei* from

RCFS conclusively tested positive for *Wolbachia*. This was not due to inadequate testing

protocols; for instance, a captive population of *Porcellio laevis* housed in our lab shows nearly a

100% infection rate using the same methods (not shown). Approximately 150 *T. rathkei* broods

were raised in the lab from either mated, wild-caught females or first-generation crosses. The

mean and median brood sizes of this species in our lab were 27.1 and 22.5 offspring,

respectively, and the vast majority of these broods had a balanced sex ratio (Supplementary

Table 2). Thus, the prevalence of *Wolbachia* and other sex ratio distorters is at most very low in

this population of *T. rathkei*. In addition, some wild-caught females produced broods even after

several months to a year in isolation in the lab (Supplementary Table 2), confirming that this

species is capable of long-term sperm storage.

<u>Crossing sex-reversed individuals indicates an XY sex determination system</u>

Five juveniles implanted with androgenic glands survived to mature into males; they were

crossed with virgin females from families with normal sex ratios. Each putative neo-male was

paired with 2 to 3 females, and each female produced 1-3 broods of offspring. Two of these

males sired broods with balanced sex ratios (not significantly different from a 1:1 ratio of males

to females; Table 2); these were likely individuals that would have developed into males even

without the AG implantation, and thus are uninformative with respect to the sex determination

system (Becking et al. 2017). However, three other males produced only female offspring,

consistent with an XX/XY system (XX neo-male × XX female yields all XX and therefore 100%

female offspring) but not a ZZ/ZW system (ZW neo-male × ZW female expected to produce 1/4

ZZ, 1/2 ZW, and 1/4 WW offspring, thus 75% female or 66.7% female depending on whether

WW genotypes are viable).

<u>Genome assembly</u>

The draft genome assembly of *T. rathkei* is approximately 5.2 Gb in total length. The genome is

highly repetitive, consisting of approximately 70% repetitive elements. Transposable elements

constitute the largest repeat category, with LINEs, followed by DNA elements and LTRs, being

the most represented (Figure 1). All repeat families seem to have a single divergence peak of

around 7-10% (Figure 1).

Despite its large size, the draft assembly is likely only partially complete, with ~25% of arthropod

BUSCO genes missing (Table 3). There were 15,805 transcripts assembled from the previously

available transcriptome dataset whose best hits in blastn searches against the NCBI nt

database and diamond blastx searches against Uniprot-Swissprot were from other arthropods;

of those, only 53% had nearly full-length matches in the genome (≥ 90% of the transcript length

at ≥ 90% sequence identity), suggesting some missing data and/or remaining uncorrected

sequencing errors in the draft assembly as well.

We screened the *T. rathkei* genome for *Wolbachia* nuclear insertions by BLASTing the

assembled contigs against a collection of *Wolbachia* genome sequences, and then BLASTing

the matching regions against all representative bacterial genomes from RefSeq to rule out false

positives. After this filtering step, we were left with 1010 high confidence matches (best BLAST

hit in a *Wolbachia* genome, e-value < 1 x 10^{-6}) spread across 719 contigs, with a total length of

~350 kb for the matching sequences (Supplementary Table 3), much smaller than a typical full

Wolbachia genome of about 1 - 1.6 Mb on average (Sun et al. 2001). These likely horizontally

acquired sequences clustered closely with *Wolbachia* strain *wCon* from the isopod *Cylisticus*

convexus (Badawi et al. 2018) with 100% bootstrap support, in a group sister to *wVulC* and the *f*

element of *Armadillidium vulgare* (Leclercq et al. 2016) (Figure 2). Moreover, there were

multiple insertions carrying sequences similar to the cytoplasmic incompatibility genes *cifA* and

cifB genes (LePage et al. 2017; Beckmann et al. 2017; Lindsey et al. 2018). These *cifA*- and

cifB-like sequences probably represent nonfunctional pseudogenes, however, as they show

evidence of being broken up by insertions (Supplementary Figure 1).

Searching for candidate sex-determining genes

We identified ~6.04 x 10^6 21-mers as potentially male-specific, suggesting there is

approximately 6 Mb of male-specific sequence content in the genome. However, when we

isolated the raw sequencing reads containing those 21-mers and assembled them, we obtained

89.4 Mb of assembled sequences, suggesting the male-specific region may be as large as ~90

Mb, but still shares significant similarity with the X chromosome. Even if up to 90 Mb of

sequence is partially sex-linked, this represents just 1.7% of the genome, consistent with an

evolutionarily young Y chromosome in this species.

Of the initial 16 candidate Y-linked PCR markers designed from anonymous sequences, none

showed the expected pattern of male-specific amplification in our early tests (Supplementary

Table 4). This may be due to the highly repetitive nature of the *T. rathkei* genome, despite our

best efforts to target primers to non-repetitive sequences.

Because the candidate male-specific contigs were assembled from Illumina data only and thus

short and fragmented, we were unable to screen them for annotated candidate sex-determining

genes using the typical MAKER pipeline. However, we were able to identify open reading

frames (ORFs) and annotate them like transcripts using Trinotate (Bryant et al. 2017). Two

contigs in the male-specific assembly showed homology to the androgenic gland hormone

(AGH) gene upon annotation, suggesting there may be a Y-linked duplication of the AGH gene.

Therefore, we designed PCR primers specifically targeting one of the Y-linked AGH-like

sequences (AGHY1 on NODE_44048_length_535; F: 5'-ATTCTTGACTCTCCCCACGA-3'; R:

5'-TCTCCAACTACGATTTCGTTAATT-3'). These primers resulted in a PCR product of the

expected size (195 bp) in all male samples screened (7/7), but not in any of the female samples

(0/7), all of which were unrelated wild-caught individuals, confirming the male-specificity of this

AGH allele.

This AGH sequence could be either a male-specific duplication of the AGH gene, or a Y-linked

allele that has diverged from an X-linked copy (in other words, gametologs). To distinguish

between these possibilities, we examined the sequencing depth of these genes and of other

putatively single-copy genes (identified in the BUSCO analysis) in male and female sequencing

samples. If the male-specific AGH sequence is a gametolog of an X-linked sequence, we would

expect the total sequencing depth of all AGH sequences (putative autosomal and putative Y-

linked) to be the same in both the pooled male and pooled female samples, with the female

sample having a higher average sequencing depth for the putative X-linked AGH sequences

(since they would be homozygous for the X-linked gametologs, while males would be

hemizygous for the X-linked gametologs). If, on the other hand, the male-specific AGH

sequences are Y-linked duplicates, and not allelic to the other AGH sequences in our assembly,

we would expect the shared autosomal AGH sequences to have similar sequencing depth in

both male and female samples, and the combined sequencing depth of all AGH sequences

(putative autosomal and putative Y-linked) would be higher in the male sample. Our results

were consistent with the latter scenario, suggesting these are Y-linked duplicates rather than

gametologs (Figure 3). Note that sequencing depth of AGHY1 and AGHY2, though much lower

in the female sample than in the male sample, is still non-zero in the female sample, probably

because of ambiguously mapped reads due to high similarity between the Y-linked and

autosomal copies.

Because the male-specific AGH sequences were found only in our Illumina data, we were

unable to assemble them into long contigs, even after repeated attempts to assemble them

individually with different assemblers and parameter values (not shown); all these contigs were

~600bp or less in length. Thus we are unable to determine whether these are complete

duplicates of the whole gene, or fragments. Nevertheless, a phylogenetic analysis suggests that

one of the Y-linked duplicates is a copy of the other, rather than an independent duplication of

an autosomal copy, and based on branch lengths they are as divergent from one another as

AGH orthologs in different species (Figure 3). In addition, these Y-linked copies seem to lack an

intron that is present in the autosomal copies (Figure 4), suggesting they may have originated

via retrotransposition.

We also find some evidence of additional autosomal duplicates of the androgenic gland

hormone (AGH) gene. Two contigs in the full assembly contained annotated transcripts with at

least partial homology to the expressed transcript identified as the AGH sequence, and a third

contained no annotated genes but still showed high sequence similarity to AGH in BLAST

searches. However, not all of the annotated exons in the first two copies matched the expressed

transcript, and there were unannotated portions of the same contigs that did show sequence

similarity to the transcript (Figure 4). Moreover, some of the matching portions of the assembled

contigs had less than 90% sequence identity to the expressed transcript, and analysis of the

sequencing depth of these regions reveals that one has very low coverage, suggesting it may

be an assembly artifact (see below). Thus, we cannot rule out the possibility that some of these

possible autosomal duplicates represent assembly and/or annotation artifacts. If they are real,

these autosomal duplicates appear to be specific to *Trachelipus*, occurring after its divergence

from *Porcellio* (Figure 3), but they may still be nonfunctional.

Discussion

<u>Possible sex chromosome polymorphism and recent transition to XY sex chromosomes in</u>

<u>*Trachelipus rathkei*</u>

We have shown that, at least in our upstate New York population, sex determination in the

terrestrial isopod *Trachelipus rathkei* is based on an XX/XY sex chromosome system. Two

independent lines of evidence support this finding: first, crosses between females and sex-

reversed neo-males yielded all female offspring (Table 2), consistent with an XX/XY system but

not a ZZ/ZW system (Becking et al. 2017); second, we have identified PCR primers that only

amplify a product in male samples, indicating the presence of a male-specific genomic region,

i.e., a Y chromosome.

Our findings run counter to a previously published study showing evidence of female

heterogamety in this species based on cytogenetics; in that study, female germ cells contained

one set of unpaired chromosomes (presumably, the Z and W sex chromosomes), while male

germ cells did not (Mittal & Pahwa 1980). There are multiple possible explanations for this

contradiction. First, it is possible that the previous study incorrectly identified the species of

study specimens, as no information on identification is given in the paper; however, *T. rathkei* is

relatively easy to distinguish from other cosmopolitan terrestrial isopod species by its five pairs

of pleopodal "lungs" (most superficially similar species such as *Porcellio scaber* have only two

pairs; (Hatchett 1947; Shultz 2018)). In addition, that study was published before feminizing

Wolbachia was widely recognized in terrestrial isopods. It is therefore theoretically possible that

the females used in that study carried an XY genotype but were feminized by *Wolbachia*, while

the males in that study might have carried a YY genotype, perhaps resulting from a cross

between an XY father and a sex-reversed XY or YY mother which failed to transmit *Wolbachia*

(Becking et al. 2019). However, we found no evidence of sex-reversing *Wolbachia* in our *T.*

rathkei population.

Perhaps the most likely explanation is sex chromosome polymorphism. Indeed, this would not

be unprecedented, as sex determination in terrestrial isopods is thought to evolve rapidly

(Rigaud et al. 1997; Cordaux et al. 2011; Becking et al. 2017), and within-species sex

chromosome polymorphisms are documented in a few other species. For instance, two

subspecies of *Porcellio dilatatus*, *P. dilatatus dilatatus* and *P. dilatatus petiti* have XX/XY and

ZZ/ZW systems, respectively (Juchault & Legrand 1964; Legrand et al. 1974; Becking et al.

2017). In addition, multiple sex determining elements segregate in populations of the common

pillbug *Armadillidium vulgare* (Juchault et al. 1992), including a novel W chromosome that

resulted from the integration of an almost entire *Wolbachia* genome into the host genome

(Leclercq et al. 2016). Outside terrestrial isopods, sex chromosome polymorphisms are also

documented in a range of other arthropods and vertebrates (Rodrigues et al. 2013; Orzack et al.

1980; Franco et al. 1982; Ogata et al. 2008). *T. rathkei* is probably non-native in North America

where this study was conducted (Jass & Klausmeier 2000), as well as perhaps in India where

the prior study on cytogenetics was done (Mittal & Pahwa 1980). Given its cosmopolitan

distribution, and the fact that other terrestrial isopods have moderate to high levels of genetic

diversity (Romiguier et al. 2014), it might not be especially surprising for *T. rathkei* to harbor

multiple polymorphic sex-determining loci. Hopefully future follow-up work can further

characterize geographic variation in sex determination in this species.

Regardless of whether or not sex determination is polymorphic in *T. rathkei*, the sex

chromosomes in this species are likely evolutionarily young because it is nested within a clade

that mostly consists of ZZ/ZW species (Becking et al. 2019). In addition, the putative male-

specific region of its genome is relatively small, displaying only moderate divergence from

candidate gametologous sequences, similar to other terrestrial isopods examined so far (Chebbi

et al. 2019; Becking et al. 2019). Given that we found genomic evidence of a past association

with *Wolbachia* in this species and that infection by *Wolbachia* has been found in other *T.*

rathkei populations (Cordaux et al. 2012), this observation is consistent with the hypothesis that

transitions in sex determination mechanisms may be triggered by *Wolbachia* and other

endosymbionts that manipulate host reproduction (Rigaud et al. 1997; Cordaux et al. 2011). If

other populations of *T. rathkei* with different sex determination mechanisms can be identified, it

may be possible to leverage this system to further study the mechanisms and selective forces

influencing transitions in sex determination mechanisms. In addition, studies of sex

determination in a phylogenetic context involving other members of the family Trachelipodidae

would shed further light on the origins of the X and Y chromosomes in *T. rathkei*.

Genome size, structure, and repetitive elements

The draft genome assembly of *T. rathkei* is especially large, at around 5.2 Gb, with

approximately 29% GC content. The actual genome is likely to be even larger, given that ~25%

of the BUSCO arthropod orthologs were missing in our assembly. By comparison, genomes of

pillbugs in the genus *Armadillidium* tend to be smaller at around 1.2 - 2 Gb in size (Chebbi et al.

2019; Becking et al. 2019), but other terrestrial isopods have genomes ranging to over 8 Gb

(Gregory 2020), and other crustacean relatives such as amphipods also have large genomes

(Rees et al. 2007; Rivarola-Duarte et al. 2014; Kao et al. 2016), so *T. rathkei* is not out of the

ordinary for this group.

The *T. rathkei* genome contains a large proportion of repetitive elements, in particular

transposable elements (Figure 1). The most common transposable element families are LINEs,

DNA elements, and LTRs, similar to *Armadillidium vulgare* and *A. nasatum* (Chebbi et al. 2019;

Becking et al. 2019). The distribution of divergence values, with a single mode around 7-10%

divergence, suggests that most repeat families expanded around the same time as in *A. vulgare*

and *A. nasatum*; however, unlike in *A. vulgare*, *T. rathkei* shows no evidence of a second more

recent burst in DNA element activity. Simple repeats also comprise a substantial portion of the

genome; even manually looking through the assembled contigs reveals a high abundance of

(TA)x repeats.

Wolbachia insertions

We found many contigs with high similarity to the *Wolbachia* genome (Supplementary Table 3),

even though we were unable to detect current *Wolbachia* infections in our population using

PCR. This is not surprising given that *Wolbachia* is relatively common in terrestrial isopods and

arthropods in general (Cordaux et al. 2012; Pascar & Chandler 2018; Medina et al. 2019), has

been found in other populations of *T. rathkei* (Cordaux et al. 2012), and that horizontal transfers

of *Wolbachia* DNA into host genomes is also common (Dunning Hotopp 2011). These

Wolbachia insertions seem to be most closely related to strain *wCon* from *C. convexus*, which

does not induce male-to-female sex reversal, but rather causes cytoplasmic incompatibility

(Moret et al. 2001; Badawi et al. 2018). Consistent with this, we find that several copies of the

cytoplasmic incompatibility genes *cifA* and *cifB* among these insertions in the *T. rathkei* genome

(Supplementary Figure 1). Thus, these past *T. rathkei* infections may have caused cytoplasmic

incompatibility rather than host sex reversal, but it is possible that the same *Wolbachia* strain

may have multiple effects on host phenotypes.

Candidate sex-determining genes and repeated duplication of the AGH gene

Male differentiation in terrestrial isopods is controlled by the androgenic gland hormone, AGH.

AGH is a peptide hormone similar in structure to insulin, and is secreted by the androgenic

gland (Martin et al. 1999). AGH expression is sufficient to transform juvenile female isopods into

fertile males (Martin et al. 1999). Presumably, in wild-type males, the primary sex-determining

signal triggers the differentiation of the androgenic glands during development, which then

secretes AGH. Interestingly, the draft genome of *T. rathkei* contains multiple AGH-like

sequences. While some of these may be assembly artifacts, there is evidence three at least

partial Y-linked sequences, of which one was confirmed by PCR to be male-specific. These

duplications seem to be specific to *T. rathkei* (Figure 5), though other members of the genus

Trachelipus or the family Trachelipodidae have yet to be examined. Consistent with this, a past

study found no evidence of any expressed AGH duplications in other terrestrial isopod species

except *Porcellio gallicus* (Cerveau et al. 2014).

In many other species, novel sex chromosomes have arisen via duplication of a sex-determining

gene. For instance, duplicates of the vertebrate gene *Dmrt1* have evolved into master sex-

determining signals on the W and Y chromosomes, respectively, in the frog *Xenopus laevis*

(Yoshimoto et al. 2008) and the medaka *Oryzias latipes* (Nanda et al. 2002; Matsuda et al.

2002, 2007), while a Y-linked duplicate of the anti-Müllerian hormone gene is a candidate

master sex-determining gene in the teleost fish *Odontesthes hatcheri* (Hattori et al. 2012). The

presence of Y-linked AGH copies in *T. rathkei*, and no other obvious open reading frames

homologous to known sex determination or sex differentiation genes, makes these genes

obvious candidates for the master male-determining signal in *T. rathkei*. Unfortunately, we were

unable to assemble full copies of these Y-linked AGH homologs because they only showed up

in our Illumina data, not in our low-coverage long read data. Future deep sequencing using long

reads should further clarify the molecular evolution of these genes. In addition, expression

studies should determine which of these genes are expressed, in what tissues, and at what

stages.

If one of these AGH duplicates is indeed the master sex-determining signal in *T. rathkei*, this

could support the idea of a transition in sex determination mechanisms triggered by *Wolbachia*

and other reproductive endosymbionts (Rigaud et al. 1997; Cordaux et al. 2011). AGH may be a

primary molecular target by which *Wolbachia* causes male-to-female sex reversal in isopod

hosts, as injection with AGH does not cause female-to-male sex reversal in individuals infected

by *Wolbachia* (Juchault & Legrand 1985; Cordaux & Gilbert 2017). Thus, *Wolbachia* may

impose strong selection (via female-biased sex ratios) favoring duplication and divergence of

the AGH gene to escape this sex reversal. The finding that *T. rathkei* may have historically been

infected by a *Wolbachia* strain causing cytoplasmic incompatibility does not necessarily negate

this finding, as the same *Wolbachia* strain can have multiple effects on host phenotypes.

Conclusions

We have shown that the terrestrial isopod *Trachelipus rathkei* uses an XX/XY sex chromosome

system, at least in upstate New York, in contrast to a past cytogenetic study suggesting a

ZZ/ZW mechanism (Mittal & Pahwa 1980). In line with this, whole-genome sequencing and

follow-up PCRs demonstrate the existence of male-specific, Y-linked copies of the androgenic

gland hormone gene in this species. These findings highlight the role of gene duplication in the

evolution of sex chromosomes and support the possibility that reproductive endosymbionts like

Wolbachia may favor evolutionary transitions in host sex determination mechanisms.

Acknowledgments

This work was funded by National Science Foundation grant NSF-DEB 1453298 to CHC.

Table 1. *Trachelipus rathkei* DNA samples used for genomic sequencing.

Sample name	Sex	Notes	Platform/ read length	Total data (Gb)	Ref.	Accession Number
M-pool	M	Pool of three brothers, lab-reared	Illumina, 2x100	191.6	This study	SRR11797365
F-pool	F	Pool of three sisters, lab-reared	Illumina, 2x100	191.9	This study	SRR11797364
M2	M	One male, lab-reared	Illumina, 2x250	22.3	This study	SRR11797360
M5	M	One male, lab-reared	Illumina, 2x250	20.6	This study	SRR11797359
M6	M	One male, lab-reared	Illumina, 2x250	23.6	This study	SRR11797358
F3	F	One female, lab-reared	Illumina, 2x250	131.5	This study	SRR11797357
F4	F	One female, lab-reared	Illumina, 2x250	26.8	This study	SRR11797356
Wild-M	M	One male, wild-caught	Illumina, 2x100	14.1	(Chandler et al. 2015)	SRR4000567
Wild-F	F	One female, wild-caught	Illumina, 2x100	14.4	(Chandler et al. 2015)	SRR4000573
PB-F1	F	Pool of three sisters, lab-reared	PacBio	22.2	This study; (Peccoud et al. 2017)	SRR11797355
PB-F2	F	Pool of three sisters, lab-reared	PacBio	1.3	This study; (Peccoud et al. 2017)	SRR11797354
PB-M	M	Pool of three brothers, lab-reared	PacBio	3.9	This study; (Peccoud et al. 2017)	SRR11797353
ONT-F	F	One female	ONT	0.4	This study	SRR11797363
ONT-M1	M	One male	ONT	3.9	This study	SRR11797362
ONT-M2	M	One male	ONT	3.3	This study	SRR11797361

647 **Table 2.** Sex ratios from crosses between putative neo-males (juvenile females implanted with

648 an androgenic gland) and females. *p* gives the probability of the observed or a more extreme

649 result (pooling the data for each neo-male) under a balanced sex ratio (i.e., assuming each

650 individual offspring has an equal probability of being male or female).

Neo-male	Female	Number of female offspring	Number of male offspring	*p*
D-4-7	1	23	0	5.7×10^{-14}
	2	14	0	
	3	7	0	
G-4-22	1	16	8	0.13
	2	17	14	
	3	13	13	
F-4-9	1	36	0	1.7×10^{-18}
	2	23	0	
10-8	1	24	35	0.19
	2	40	40	
AGS169-2	1	45	0	2.1×10^{-25}
	2	37	0	

654   **Table 3.** Assembly statistics for the *T. rathkei* draft genome.

Total length	5,181,251,014 bp
Number of contigs	421,784
N50	39,761 bp
GC content	29.0%
Complete BUSCO genes	533 single copy (51.9%); 39 duplicated (3.7%)
Fragmented BUSCO genes	203 (19.0%)
Missing BUSCO genes	271 (25.4%)

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Distribution of divergence levels for repetitive elements in the *Trachelipus rathkei*

genome.

Figure 2. Phylogenetic tree showing the position of candidate horizontally transferred

Wolbachia segments in the *Trachelipus rathkei* genome. Numbers by nodes indicate bootstrap

support. The tree was generated by concatenating all candidate *Wolbachia* insertions in *T.*

rathkei longer than 1000 bp, along with the best-matching regions in the reference *Wolbachia*

genomes, aligning with MUSCLE v. 3.8.31 (Edgar 2004), filtering alignments with trimal v.

1.2rev59 (Capella-Gutiérrez et al. 2009), selecting a model using ModelTest-NG v. 0.1.6

(Darriba et al. 2020), and running the analysis in RAxML-NG v. 0.9.0 (Stamatakis 2014) with

100 bootstrap replicates.

Figure 3. Distribution of sequencing depth for single-copy BUSCO genes in male and female

Illumina sequencing datasets (M-pool and F-pool). Labeled dots indicate the sequencing depth

for the different AGH copies in each sample.

Figure 4. Possible duplicates of the androgenic gland hormone gene in the *Trachelipus rathkei*

genome. The green bars represent the sequence of the expressed AGH sequence, assembled

from previously available transcriptome data. Gray bars represent contigs in the draft genome

assembly, and the pink bars on contigs represent annotated exons. Purple segments

connecting portions of the transcript to portions of contigs represent BLAST hits. The

incongruence between annotated exons and BLAST matches between the transcript and

contigs suggests the annotation still contains some errors.

Figure 5. Phylogenetic tree showing relationships among AGH sequences from terrestrial

isopods. AGH2 and AGHY3 are missing from this phylogeny because those sequences were

omitted because of their short length. The tree was generated using all AGH-like sequences

from *T. rathkei* of at least 100 bp, along with reference AGH nucleotide sequences from other

species, aligning them with MUSCLE v. 3.8.31 (Edgar 2004), selecting a model using

ModelTest-NG v. 0.1.6 (Darriba et al. 2020), and running the analysis in RAxML-NG v. 0.9.0

(Stamatakis 2014) with 100 bootstrap replicates.

References

Badawi M, Moumen B, Giraud I, Grève P, Cordaux R. 2018. Investigating the molecular genetic
basis of cytoplasmic sex determination caused by Wolbachia endosymbionts in terrestrial
isopods. Genes. 9:290. doi: 10.3390/genes9060290.

Bankevich A et al. 2012. SPAdes: A New Genome Assembly Algorithm and Its Applications to
Single-Cell Sequencing. Journal of Computational Biology. 19:455–477. doi:
10.1089/cmb.2012.0021.

Bao Z, Eddy SR. 2002. Automated de novo identification of repeat sequence families in
sequenced genomes. Genome Res. 12:1269–1276. doi: 10.1101/gr.88502.

Becking T et al. 2017. Diversity and evolution of sex determination systems in terrestrial
isopods. Sci Rep. 7:1084. doi: 10.1038/s41598-017-01195-4.

Becking T et al. 2019. Sex chromosomes control vertical transmission of feminizing Wolbachia
symbionts in an isopod. PLOS Biology. 17:e3000438. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.3000438.

Beckmann JF, Ronau JA, Hochstrasser M. 2017. A Wolbachia deubiquitylating enzyme induces
cytoplasmic incompatibility. Nat Microbiol. 2:17007. doi: 10.1038/nmicrobiol.2017.7.

Benson G. 1999. Tandem repeats finder: a program to analyze DNA sequences. Nucleic Acids
Res. 27:573–580. doi: 10.1093/nar/27.2.573.

Bergero R, Charlesworth D. 2009. The evolution of restricted recombination in sex
chromosomes. Trends in Ecology & Evolution. 24:94–102. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2008.09.010.

Blaser O, Grossen C, Neuenschwander S, Perrin N. 2013. Sex-chromosome turnovers induced
by deleterious mutation load. Evolution. 67:635–645. doi: 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2012.01810.x.

Blaser O, Neuenschwander S, Perrin N. 2014. Sex-Chromosome Turnovers: The Hot-Potato
Model. The American Naturalist. 183:140–146. doi: 10.1086/674026.

Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. 2014. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence
data. Bioinformatics. 30:2114–2120. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btu170.

Bouchon D, Rigaud T, Juchault P. 1998. Evidence for widespread Wolbachia infection in isopod
crustaceans: molecular identification and host feminization. Proceedings of the Royal Society of
London. Series B: Biological Sciences. 265:1081–1090. doi: 10.1098/rspb.1998.0402.

Braig HR, Zhou W, Dobson SL, O'Neill SL. 1998. Cloning and Characterization of a Gene
Encoding the Major Surface Protein of the Bacterial Endosymbiont Wolbachia pipientis. J
Bacteriol. 180:2373–2378.

Bryant DM et al. 2017. A Tissue-Mapped Axolotl De Novo Transcriptome Enables Identification
of Limb Regeneration Factors. Cell Reports. 18:762–776. doi: 10.1016/j.celrep.2016.12.063.

Buchfink B, Xie C, Huson DH. 2015. Fast and sensitive protein alignment using DIAMOND.
Nature Methods. 12:59–60. doi: 10.1038/nmeth.3176.

Bushnell B, Rood J, Singer E. 2017. BBMerge – Accurate paired shotgun read merging via
overlap. PLOS ONE. 12:e0185056. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0185056.

Cantarel BL et al. 2008. MAKER: An easy-to-use annotation pipeline designed for emerging
model organism genomes. Genome Res. 18:188–196. doi: 10.1101/gr.6743907.

Capella-Gutiérrez S, Silla-Martínez JM, Gabaldón T. 2009. trimAl: a tool for automated
alignment trimming in large-scale phylogenetic analyses. Bioinformatics. 25:1972–1973. doi:
10.1093/bioinformatics/btp348.

Cerveau N, Bouchon D, Bergès T, Grève P. 2014. Molecular evolution of the androgenic
hormone in terrestrial isopods. Gene. 540:71–77. doi: 10.1016/j.gene.2014.02.024.

Chandler CH, Badawi M, Moumen B, Grève P, Cordaux R. 2015. Multiple Conserved
Heteroplasmic Sites in tRNA Genes in the Mitochondrial Genomes of Terrestrial Isopods
(Oniscidea). G3: Genes, Genomes, Genetics. 5:1317–1322. doi: 10.1534/g3.115.018283.

Chandler JC, Elizur A, Ventura T. 2018. The decapod researcher's guide to the galaxy of sex
determination. Hydrobiologia. 825:61–80. doi: 10.1007/s10750-017-3452-4.

Chandler JC, Fitzgibbon QP, Smith G, Elizur A, Ventura T. 2017. Y-linked iDmrt1 paralogue
(iDMY) in the Eastern spiny lobster, Sagmariasus verreauxi: The first invertebrate sex-linked
Dmrt. Developmental Biology. 430:337–345. doi: 10.1016/j.ydbio.2017.08.031.

Charlesworth B, Charlesworth D. 2000. The degeneration of Y chromosomes Charlesworth, B.
& Harvey, PH, editors. Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B. 355:1563–1572. doi:
10.1098/rstb.2000.0717.

Charlesworth D, Charlesworth B, Marais G. 2005. Steps in the evolution of heteromorphic sex
chromosomes. Heredity. 95:118–128. doi: 10.1038/sj.hdy.6800697.

Chebbi MA et al. 2019. The Genome of Armadillidium vulgare (Crustacea, Isopoda) Provides
Insights into Sex Chromosome Evolution in the Context of Cytoplasmic Sex Determination. Mol
Biol Evol. 36:727–741. doi: 10.1093/molbev/msz010.

Chevreux B, Wetter T, Suhai S, others. 1999. Genome sequence assembly using trace signals
and additional sequence information. In: German conference on bioinformatics.Vol. 99 Citeseer
pp. 45–56.

Cioffi MB, Liehr T, Trifonov V, Molina WF, Bertollo L a. C. 2013. Independent Sex Chromosome
Evolution in Lower Vertebrates: A Molecular Cytogenetic Overview in the Erythrinidae Fish
Family. CGR. 141:186–194. doi: 10.1159/000354039.

Conover DO, Kynard BE. 1981. Environmental Sex Determination: Interaction of Temperature
and Genotype in a Fish. Science. 213:577–579. doi: 10.1126/science.213.4507.577.

Cordaux R et al. 2012. Widespread Wolbachia infection in terrestrial isopods and other
crustaceans. Zookeys. 123–131. doi: 10.3897/zookeys.176.2284.

Cordaux R, Bouchon D, Grève P. 2011. The impact of endosymbionts on the evolution of host
sex-determination mechanisms. Trends in Genetics. 27:332–341. doi:
10.1016/j.tig.2011.05.002.

Cordaux R, Gilbert C. 2017. Evolutionary Significance of Wolbachia-to-Animal Horizontal Gene
Transfer: Female Sex Determination and the f Element in the Isopod Armadillidium vulgare.
Genes (Basel). 8:186. doi: 10.3390/genes8070186.

Cordaux R, Michel-Salzat A, Frelon-Raimond M, Rigaud T, Bouchon D. 2004. Evidence for a
new feminizing Wolbachia strain in the isopod Armadillidium vulgare: evolutionary implications.
Heredity. 93:78–84. doi: 10.1038/sj.hdy.6800482.

Darriba D et al. 2020. ModelTest-NG: A New and Scalable Tool for the Selection of DNA and
Protein Evolutionary Models Crandall, K, editor. Molecular Biology and Evolution. 37:291–294.
doi: 10.1093/molbev/msz189.

van Doorn GS, Kirkpatrick M. 2007. Turnover of sex chromosomes induced by sexual conflict.
Nature. 449:909–912. doi: 10.1038/nature06178.

Dunning Hotopp JC. 2011. Horizontal gene transfer between bacteria and animals. Trends in
Genetics. 27:157–163. doi: 10.1016/j.tig.2011.01.005.

Edgar RC. 2004. MUSCLE: a multiple sequence alignment method with reduced time and
space complexity. BMC Bioinformatics. 5:113. doi: 10.1186/1471-2105-5-113.

Emerson JJ, Kaessmann H, Betrán E, Long M. 2004. Extensive Gene Traffic on the Mammalian
X Chromosome. Science. 303:537–540. doi: 10.1126/science.1090042.

Folmer O, Black MB, Hoeh WR, Lutz R, Vrijenhoek RC. 1994. DNA primers for amplification of
mitochondrial cytochrome c oxidase subunit I from diverse metazoan invertebrates. Molecular
marine biology and biotechnology. 3:294–299.

Franco MG, Rubini PG, Vecchi M. 1982. Sex-determinants and their distribution in various
populations of Musca domestica L. of Western Europe. Genetics Research. 40:279–293. doi:
10.1017/S0016672300019157.

Fussey GD. 1984. The distribution of the two forms of the woodlouse Trichoniscus pusillus
Brandt (Isopoda: Oniscoidea) in the British Isles: a reassessment of geographic
parthenogenesis. Biol J Linn Soc. 22:309–321. doi: 10.1111/j.1095-8312.1984.tb01681.x.

Gamble T, Geneva AJ, Glor RE, Zarkower D. 2014. Anolis Sex Chromosomes Are Derived from
a Single Ancestral Pair. Evolution. 68:1027–1041. doi: 10.1111/evo.12328.

Gregory TR. 2020. Animal Genome Size Database. http://www.genomesize.com/ (Accessed
January 21, 2020).

Gurevich A, Saveliev V, Vyahhi N, Tesler G. 2013. QUAST: quality assessment tool for genome
assemblies. Bioinformatics. 29:1072–1075. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btt086.

Haas B, Papanicolaou A. 2016. TransDecoder (find coding regions within transcripts).
http://transdecoder.github.io.

Hatchett SP. 1947. Biology of the Isopoda of Michigan. Ecological Monographs. 17:47–80. doi:
10.2307/1948613.

Hattori RS et al. 2012. A Y-linked anti-Müllerian hormone duplication takes over a critical role in
sex determination. PNAS. 109:2955–2959. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1018392109.

Heimpel GE, de Boer JG. 2008. Sex Determination in the Hymenoptera. Annual Review of
Entomology. 53:209–230. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ento.53.103106.093441.

Janzen FJ, Phillips PC. 2006. Exploring the evolution of environmental sex determination,
especially in reptiles. Journal of Evolutionary Biology. 19:1775–1784. doi: 10.1111/j.1420-
9101.2006.01138.x.

Jass J, Klausmeier B. 2000. Endemics and Immigrants: North American Terrestrial Isopods
(Isopoda, Oniscidea) North of Mexico. Crustaceana. 73:771–799.

Jeffries DL et al. 2018. A rapid rate of sex-chromosome turnover and non-random transitions in
true frogs. Nat Commun. 9:4088. doi: 10.1038/s41467-018-06517-2.

Johnson C. 1986. Parthenogenetic Reproduction in the Philosciid Isopod, Ocelloscia floridana
(Van Name, 1940). Crustaceana. 51:123–132.

Juchault P, Legrand J. 1964. Démonstration de l'homogamétie femelle par croisement de deux
femelles génétiques chez les Oniscoïdes Porcellio dilatatus et Helleria brevi-cornis. Comptes
Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences de Paris. 258:2685–2686.

Juchault P, Legrand JJ. 1985. Contribution à l'étude du mécanisme de l'état réfractaire à
l'hormone androgène chez les Armadillidium vulgare Latr, (crustacé, isopode, oniscoïde)
hébergeant une bactérie féminisante. General and Comparative Endocrinology. 60:463–467.
doi: 10.1016/0016-6480(85)90082-6.

Juchault P, Rigaud T. 1995. Evidence for female heterogamety in two terrestrial crustaceans
and the problem of sex chromosome evolution in isopods. Heredity. 75:466–471. doi:
10.1038/hdy.1995.163.

Juchault P, Rigaud T, Mocquard J-P. 1992. Evolution of sex-determining mechanisms in a wild
population of Armadillidium vulgare Latr. (Crustacea, Isopoda): competition between two
feminizing parasitic sex factors. Heredity. 69:382–390. doi: 10.1038/hdy.1992.138.

Kageyama D, Nishimura G, Hoshizaki S, Ishikawa Y. 2002. Feminizing Wolbachia in an insect,
Ostrinia furnacalis (Lepidoptera: Crambidae). Heredity. 88:444–449. doi:
10.1038/sj.hdy.6800077.

Kao D et al. 2016. The genome of the crustacean Parhyale hawaiensis, a model for animal
development, regeneration, immunity and lignocellulose digestion VijayRaghavan, K, editor.
eLife. 5:e20062. doi: 10.7554/eLife.20062.

Kokot M, Długosz M, Deorowicz S. 2017. KMC 3: counting and manipulating k-mer statistics.
Bioinformatics. 33:2759–2761. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btx304.

Korf I. 2004. Gene finding in novel genomes. BMC Bioinformatics. 5:59. doi: 10.1186/1471-
2105-5-59.

Laetsch DR, Blaxter ML. 2017. BlobTools: Interrogation of genome assemblies. F1000Res.
6:1287. doi: 10.12688/f1000research.12232.1.

Leclercq S et al. 2016. Birth of a W sex chromosome by horizontal transfer of Wolbachia
bacterial symbiont genome. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 113:15036–15041. doi:
10.1073/pnas.1608979113.

Legrand J, Juchault P, Artault J, Mocquard J, Picaud J. 1974. Le statut systématique de la
«forme» petiti Vandel de Porcellio dilatatus Brandt, récoltée à l'île Saint-Honorat (Alpes-
Maritimes). Critères morphologiques, génétiques et physiologiques. Bull. Soc. Zool. Fr. 99:461–
471.

LePage DP et al. 2017. Prophage WO genes recapitulate and enhance Wolbachia -induced
cytoplasmic incompatibility. Nature. 543:243–247. doi: 10.1038/nature21391.

Li H. 2013. Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM.
arXiv:1303.3997 [q-bio]. http://arxiv.org/abs/1303.3997 (Accessed April 27, 2020).

Lindsey ARI et al. 2018. Evolutionary Genetics of Cytoplasmic Incompatibility Genes cifA and
cifB in Prophage WO of Wolbachia. Genome Biol Evol. 10:434–451. doi: 10.1093/gbe/evy012.

Martin G et al. 1999. The structure of a glycosylated protein hormone responsible for sex
determination in the isopod, Armadillidium vulgare. European Journal of Biochemistry. 262:727–
736. doi: 10.1046/j.1432-1327.1999.00442.x.

Matsuda M et al. 2007. DMY gene induces male development in genetically female (XX)
medaka fish. PNAS. 104:3865–3870. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0611707104.

Matsuda M et al. 2002. DMY is a Y-specific DM-domain gene required for male development in
the medaka fish. Nature. 417:559–563. doi: 10.1038/nature751.

Medina P, Russell SL, Corbett-Detig R. 2019. Deep data mining reveals variable abundance
and distribution of microbial reproductive manipulators within and among diverse host species.
bioRxiv. 679837. doi: 10.1101/679837.

Meisel RP et al. 2016. Is Multifactorial Sex Determination in the House Fly, Musca domestica
(L.), Stable Over Time? J Hered. 107:615–625. doi: 10.1093/jhered/esw051.

Mittal OP, Pahwa S. 1980. Cytogenetical studies on two terrestrial isopods (Crustacea),
Philoscia lodnensis Ramakrishna and Porcellio rathkei Brandt. Cytobios. 29:17–24.

Moret Y, Juchault P, Rigaud T. 2001. Wolbachia endosymbiont responsible for cytoplasmic
incompatibility in a terrestrial crustacean: effects in natural and foreign hosts. Heredity. 86:325–
332. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2540.2001.00831.x.

Morgulis A et al. 2008. Database indexing for production MegaBLAST searches. Bioinformatics.
24:1757–1764. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btn322.

Myosho T, Takehana Y, Hamaguchi S, Sakaizumi M. 2015. Turnover of Sex Chromosomes in
Celebensis Group Medaka Fishes. G3: Genes, Genomes, Genetics. 5:2685–2691. doi:
10.1534/g3.115.021543.

Nanda I et al. 2002. A duplicated copy of DMRT1 in the sex-determining region of the Y
chromosome of the medaka, Oryzias latipes. PNAS. 99:11778–11783. doi:
10.1073/pnas.182314699.

Negri I, Pellecchia M, Mazzoglio P.J, Patetta A, Alma A. 2006. Feminizing Wolbachia in
Zyginidia pullula (Insecta, Hemiptera), a leafhopper with an XX/X0 sex-determination system.
Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 273:2409–2416. doi:
10.1098/rspb.2006.3592.

Ogata M, Hasegawa Y, Ohtani H, Mineyama M, Miura I. 2008. The ZZ/ZW sex-determining
mechanism originated twice and independently during evolution of the frog, *Rana rugosa*.
Heredity. 100:92–99. doi: 10.1038/sj.hdy.6801068.

Orzack SH, Sohn JJ, Kallman KD, Levin SA, Johnston R. 1980. Maintenance of the Three Sex
Chromosome Polymorphism in the Platyfish, Xiphophorus maculatus. Evolution. 34:663–672.
doi: 10.2307/2408020.

Ospina-Álvarez N, Piferrer F. 2008. Temperature-Dependent Sex Determination in Fish
Revisited: Prevalence, a Single Sex Ratio Response Pattern, and Possible Effects of Climate
Change. PLOS ONE. 3:e2837. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0002837.

Pascar J, Chandler CH. 2018. A bioinformatics approach to identifying Wolbachia infections in
arthropods. PeerJ. 6:e5486. doi: 10.7717/peerj.5486.

Peccoud J et al. 2017. Untangling Heteroplasmy, Structure, and Evolution of an Atypical
Mitochondrial Genome by PacBio Sequencing. Genetics. 207:269–280. doi:
10.1534/genetics.117.203380.

Pennell MW, Mank JE, Peichel CL. 2018. Transitions in sex determination and sex
chromosomes across vertebrate species. Mol Ecol. 27:3950–3963. doi: 10.1111/mec.14540.

Pickup J, Ironside JE. 2018. Multiple origins of parasitic feminization: thelygeny and
intersexuality in beach-hoppers are caused by paramyxid parasites, not microsporidia.
Parasitology. 145:408–415. doi: 10.1017/S0031182017001597.

Potrzebowski L et al. 2008. Chromosomal Gene Movements Reflect the Recent Origin and
Biology of Therian Sex Chromosomes. PLOS Biology. 6:e80. doi:
10.1371/journal.pbio.0060080.

Price AL, Jones NC, Pevzner PA. 2005. De novo identification of repeat families in large
genomes. Bioinformatics. 21:i351–i358. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/bti1018.

Pryszcz LP, Gabaldón T. 2016. Redundans: an assembly pipeline for highly heterozygous
genomes. Nucleic Acids Res. 44:e113–e113. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkw294.

Rees DJ, Dufresne F, Glémet H, Belzile C. 2007. Amphipod genome sizes: first estimates for
Arctic species reveal genomic giants. Genome. 50:151–158. doi: 10.1139/G06-155.

Rice WR. 1996. Evolution of the Y Sex Chromosome in Animals. BioScience. 46:331–343. doi:
10.2307/1312947.

Rigaud T, Juchault P, Mocquard J-P. 1997. The evolution of sex determination in isopod
crustaceans. BioEssays. 19:409–416. doi: 10.1002/bies.950190508.

Rivarola-Duarte L et al. 2014. A first Glimpse at the genome of the Baikalian amphipod
Eulimnogammarus verrucosus. Journal of Experimental Zoology Part B: Molecular and
Developmental Evolution. 322:177–189. doi: 10.1002/jez.b.22560.

Rodrigues N, Betto-Colliard C, Jourdan-Pineau H, Perrin N. 2013. Within-population
polymorphism of sex-determination systems in the common frog (Rana temporaria). Journal of
Evolutionary Biology. 26:1569–1577. doi: 10.1111/jeb.12163.

Romiguier J et al. 2014. Comparative population genomics in animals uncovers the
determinants of genetic diversity. Nature. 515:261–263. doi: 10.1038/nature13685.

Ross JA, Urton JR, Boland J, Shapiro MD, Peichel CL. 2009. Turnover of Sex Chromosomes in
the Stickleback Fishes (Gasterosteidae). PLOS Genetics. 5:e1000391. doi:
10.1371/journal.pgen.1000391.

Shultz JW. 2018. A guide to the identification of the terrestrial Isopoda of Maryland, U.S.A.
(Crustacea). ZooKeys. 801:207–228. doi: 10.3897/zookeys.801.24146.

Simão FA, Waterhouse RM, Ioannidis P, Kriventseva EV, Zdobnov EM. 2015. BUSCO:
assessing genome assembly and annotation completeness with single-copy orthologs.
Bioinformatics. 31:3210–3212. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btv351.

Stamatakis A. 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of
large phylogenies. Bioinformatics. 30:1312–1313. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btu033.

Stanke M et al. 2006. AUGUSTUS: ab initio prediction of alternative transcripts. Nucleic Acids
Res. 34:W435–W439. doi: 10.1093/nar/gkl200.

Sun LV et al. 2001. Determination of Wolbachia Genome Size by Pulsed-Field Gel
Electrophoresis. Journal of Bacteriology. 183:2219–2225. doi: 10.1128/JB.183.7.2219-
2225.2001.

Tarailo-Graovac M, Chen N. 2009. Using RepeatMasker to Identify Repetitive Elements in
Genomic Sequences. Current Protocols in Bioinformatics. 25:4–10. doi:
10.1002/0471250953.bi0410s25.

Terry RS, Smith JE, Dunn AM. 1998. Impact of a Novel, Feminising Microsporidium on its
Crustacean Host. Journal of Eukaryotic Microbiology. 45:497–501. doi: 10.1111/j.1550-
7408.1998.tb05106.x.

Tingley GA, Anderson RM. 1986. Environmental sex determination and density-dependent
population regulation in the entomogenous nematode Romanomermis culicivorax. Parasitology.
92:431–449. doi: 10.1017/S0031182000064192.

Traut W. 1994. Sex determination in the fly Megaselia scalaris, a model system for primary
steps of sex chromosome evolution. Genetics. 136:1097–1104.

Untergasser A et al. 2012. Primer3—new capabilities and interfaces. Nucleic Acids Res.
40:e115–e115. doi: 10.1093/nar/gks596.

Vandeputte M, Dupont-Nivet M, Chavanne H, Chatain B. 2007. A Polygenic Hypothesis for Sex
Determination in the European Sea Bass Dicentrarchus labrax. Genetics. 176:1049–1057. doi:
10.1534/genetics.107.072140.

Verhulst EC, Beukeboom LW, Zande L van de. 2010. Maternal Control of Haplodiploid Sex
Determination in the Wasp Nasonia. Science. 328:620–623. doi: 10.1126/science.1185805.

Veyrunes F et al. 2008. Bird-like sex chromosomes of platypus imply recent origin of mammal
sex chromosomes. Genome Res. 18:965–973. doi: 10.1101/gr.7101908.

Vicoso B, Bachtrog D. 2015. Numerous Transitions of Sex Chromosomes in Diptera. PLOS
Biology. 13:e1002078. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.1002078.

Walker BJ et al. 2014. Pilon: An Integrated Tool for Comprehensive Microbial Variant Detection
and Genome Assembly Improvement. PLOS ONE. 9:e112963. doi:
10.1371/journal.pone.0112963.

Wang JR, Holt J, McMillan L, Jones CD. 2018. FMLRC: Hybrid long read error correction using
an FM-index. BMC Bioinformatics. 19:50. doi: 10.1186/s12859-018-2051-3.

Werren John H., Zhang Wan, Guo Li Rong. 1995. Evolution and phylogeny of Wolbachia:
reproductive parasites of arthropods. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B:
Biological Sciences. 261:55–63. doi: 10.1098/rspb.1995.0117.

Ye C, Hill CM, Wu S, Ruan J, Ma Z. 2016. DBG2OLC: Efficient Assembly of Large Genomes
Using Long Erroneous Reads of the Third Generation Sequencing Technologies. Sci Rep.
6:31900. doi: 10.1038/srep31900.

Ye C, Ma Z (Sam). 2016. Sparc: a sparsity-based consensus algorithm for long erroneous
sequencing reads. PeerJ. 4:e2016. doi: 10.7717/peerj.2016.

Ye C, Ma ZS, Cannon CH, Pop M, Yu DW. 2012. Exploiting sparseness in de novo genome
assembly. BMC Bioinformatics. 13:S1. doi: 10.1186/1471-2105-13-S6-S1.

Yoshimoto S et al. 2008. A W-linked DM-domain gene, DM-W, participates in primary ovary
development in Xenopus laevis. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 105:2469–
2474. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0712244105.

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

AGH1, contig113427

AGHY1, NODE_44048_length_535_cov_2.969828

AGH2, contig14679

AGHY2, NODE_38289_length_618_cov_5.647166

AGH3, contig67161

AGHY3, NODE_65428_length_363_cov_4.945205

500 bp

Figure 5

JQ304799.1_Armadillidium_maculatum

JQ304808.1_Armadillo_officinalis

55   JQ304801.1_Armadillidium_nasatum

JQ304798.1_Armadillidium_granulatum

23   AB029615.1_Armadillidium_vulgare

JQ304800.1_Armadillidium_depressum

contig113427 (AGH1)

61   Expressed_transcript

contig67161 (AGH3)

NODE_44048_length_535_cov_2.969828 (AGHY1)

NODE_38289_length_618_cov_5.647166 (AGHY2)

JQ304803.1_Porcellio_dispar

JQ304804.1_Porcellio_gallicus_L

24   96

JQ304805.1_Porcellio_gallicus_S

JQ304802.1_Porcellio_dilatatus

41   93

AB089811.1_Porcellio_dilatatus

JQ304806.1_Porcellio_laevis

59   93

AB089810.1_Porcellio_scaber_2

AY169973.1_Porcellio_scaber_1

JQ304807.1_Porcellionides_pruinosus

JQ304810.1_Oniscus_asellus

JQ304809.1_Cylisticus_convexus

0.2