Uncovering transposable element variants and their potential adaptive impact in urban populations of the malaria vector *Anopheles coluzzii*

Carlos Vargas-Chavez[1], Neil Michel Longo Pendy[2,3], Sandrine E. Nsango[4], Laura Aguilera[1], Diego Ayala[2,5]*, Josefa González[1]*

[1]Institute of Evolutionary Biology (CSIC-Universitat Pompeu Fabra), Barcelona, Spain.

[2]CIRMF, Franceville, Gabon.

[3] Ecole doctorale en infectiologie tropicale (EDR), Franceville, Gabon.

[4] Faculté de Médecine et des Sciences Pharmaceutiques, Université de Douala, BP 2701, Douala, Cameroun

[5]MIVEGEC, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, IRD, Montpellier, France

Emails: carlos.vargas@ibe.upf-csic.es, longo2michel@gmail.com, nsango2013@yahoo.fr, mlaura.aguilera@gmail.com, diego.ayala@ird.fr, josefa.gonzalez@csic.es

*Corresponding authors

ABSTRACT

Background

Anopheles coluzzii is one of the primary vectors of human malaria in sub-Saharan Africa.

Recently, it has colonized the main cities of Central Africa threatening vector control programs.

The adaptation of *An. coluzzii* to urban environments is partly due to an increased tolerance to

organic pollution and insecticides. While some of the molecular mechanisms for ecological

adaptation, including chromosome rearrangements and introgressions, are known, the role of

transposable elements (TEs) in the adaptive processes of this species has not been studied yet. To

assess the role of TEs in rapid urban adaptation, the first step is to accurately annotate TE

insertions in the genomes of natural populations collected in urban settings.

Results

We sequenced using long-reads six *An. coluzzii* genomes from natural breeding sites in two

major Central Africa cities. We *de novo* annotated the complete set of TEs in these genomes and

in an additional high quality *An. coluzzii* genome available and identified 64 previously

undescribed TE families. TEs were non-randomly distributed throughout the genome with

significant differences in the number of insertions of several superfamilies across the studied

genomes. We identified seven putatively active families with insertions near genes with

functions related to vectorial capacity. Moreover, we identified several TE insertions providing

promoter and transcription factor binding sites to insecticide resistance and immune-related

genes.

Conclusions

The analysis of multiple genomes sequenced using long-read technologies allowed us to generate

the most comprehensive TE annotations in this species to date. We identified several TE

insertions that could potentially impact both genome architecture and the regulation of

functionally relevant genes in *An. coluzzii*. These results provide a basis for future studies of the

impact of TEs on the biology of *An. coluzzii*.

KEYWORDS

52 Long-read sequencing, Insecticide resistance, Innate immunity, Comparative genomics,

53 Chromosome inversions

BACKGROUND

The deadly success of the malaria mosquito *Anopheles coluzzii* is rooted in its extraordinary

ecological plasticity, inhabiting virtually every habitat in West and Central Africa where it

spreads the human malaria parasite (1, 2). Noteworthy, the larvae of *An. coluzzii* exploit more

disturbed and anthropogenic sites than its sister species *An. gambiae*. *An. coluzzii* exhibits a

higher tolerance to salinity and organic pollution, and as a consequence, is the predominant

species in coastal and urban areas (2-4). However, this mosquito not only has a greater resilience

to ion-rich aquatic environments, but it has also become resistant to DDT and pyrethroid

insecticides used for vector control (5). Actually, insecticide resistant populations of this malaria

mosquito are present across its geographical range, driving *An. coluzzii* evolution across the

continent (6, 7). The adaptive flexibility of this mosquito has been also highlighted by its rapid

competence to expand its range of peak biting times in order to avoid insecticide treated bed-nets

(8). This extraordinary adaptative capacity makes this malaria vector a threat for malaria control.

Thus, elucidating the natural genetic variants underlying the ecological and the physiological

responses to fluctuating environments in this species is key for its control.

At the molecular level, a variety of genetic mechanisms have been related back to the myriad of

adaptation processes present in this mosquito. The most prominent and historically studied

examples are chromosomal inversions (9, 10). *An. coluzzii* exhibits a large number of

polymorphic chromosomal rearrangements (11, 12). Many of these inversions have been

associated to environmental adaptation through environmental clines and/or correlation with

specific climatic variables (10, 13), such as the inversion 2La associated with aridity tolerance

capacity in adults (14, 15). Other types of rearrangements, such as gene duplications, have been

involved in insecticide resistance. For example, the acetylcholinesterase (*Ace-1*) gene has been

duplicated, maintaining at least a sensitive and a resistance copy, in order to counteract the

fitness cost of the resistant phenotype (16-18). Moreover, a recent genome-wide analysis showed

that genes containing copy number variants were enriched for insecticide functions (19). Other

examples of gene selection due to anthropogenic activities have been found in genes related with

detoxification or immunity, particularly in new colonized urban settings (3, 20-22). These

adaptive processes have been repeated across West and Central African populations, reducing

the efficacity of vector control measures (6). However, while several of the candidate genes

responsible for the adaptive capacity of *An. coluzzii* have been identified, our knowledge of the

genetic variants underlying differences in these genes lags behind. In particular, very little is

known about natural variation in transposable element (TE) insertions in *An. coluzzii*.

TEs are key players in multiple adaptive processes across species, due to their capacity to

generate a wide variety of mutations and to contribute to rapid responses to environmental

changes (23, 24). TEs can disperse across the genome regulatory sequences such as promoters,

enhancers, insulators, and repressive elements thus affecting nearby gene expression (25).

Additionally, they can also act as substrates for ectopic recombination leading to structural

mutations such as chromosomal rearrangements (26-28). However, TEs are often ignored when

analyzing functional variants in genomes. This is because due to their repetitive nature, TE

insertions are difficult to annotate and reads derived from TEs are often discarded in genome-

wide analyses (29). Long-read sequencing techniques are needed to get a comprehensive view of

TE variation in genomes, as these technique allow the annotation of TE insertions in the genome

rather than inferring their position (30, 31).

Although TE insertions have been annotated genome-wide in several anopheline species

including *An. coluzzii*, most studies to date have characterized the TE repertoire in a single

genome for each species (32-40). To capture the full extent of TE natural variation and the

potential consequences of TE insertions, it is necessary to evaluate multiple genomes in order to

comprehensively assess diversity within a species (41-43). This becomes especially relevant

when attempting to identify recent TE insertions and their effect in the genome structure and

genome function, given that they might be restricted to local populations. So far, our knowledge

of *An. coluzzii* genome variation due to TE insertions is limited to a few well-characterized

families that have been found to vary across genomes (44-48).

In this work, we sequenced, using long-read technologies, and assembled the genomes of *An.*

coluzzii larvae collected in six natural breeding sites in two major cities in Central Africa:

Douala (Cameroon) and Libreville (Gabon). We performed a *de novo* TE annotation of the six

newly assembled genomes, and we also annotated the previously available *An. coluzzii* genome

from Yaoundé (Cameroon) (49). We identified 64 new anopheline TE families and showed that

the availability of multiple genomes substantially improves the discovery of TE variants. We

further analyzed individual TE insertions that could be acting as enhancers and promoters and

that are located nearby genes with functions relevant for the vectorial capacity of the mosquitoes.

RESULTS

Six new whole-genome assemblies of *An. coluzzii* from two major cities in Central Africa

To explore the TE diversity in *An. coluzzii*, we used long-read sequencing and performed whole

genome assemblies and scaffolding of larvae collected from six natural urban breeding sites:

three from Douala, Cameroon, and three from Libreville, Gabon, Central Africa (Figure 1A,

Additional File 1: Table S1A; see Material and Methods). Additionally, we performed a

reference-guided scaffolding of the available *An. coluzzii* reference genome *AcolN1* using the

chromosome level assembly *AgamP4* of *An. gambiae* (49). Although the genomes analyzed

varied in sequencing coverage and read length, these differences only had an effect on contig

N50 but did not affect other assembly and scaffolding metrics (Additional File 1: Table S1B).

Overall the number of scaffolds varied from 5 to 107, with the median being 20, however, the

scaffolds' N50 was similar across the seven genomes (Table 1).

We assessed the genomes completeness using BUSCO with the dipteran set of genes (50). We

obtained percentages of complete genes ranging from 94.2% to 96.6% except for the *DLA155B*

sample which had a lower completeness value (89.5%; Table 1). These completeness values for

most (5/6) of the samples were similar to those from the *AcolN1* genome assembly which

contained 98.9% complete genes (Table 1; Additional file 1: Table S1).

Overall the analyzed genomes are comparable in terms of scaffold contiguity and completeness

(Table 1 and Additional File 1: Table S1).

Table 1. Genome assemblies and scaffolds' statistics for the *An. coluzzii* genomes analyzed

in this work.

Genome	Long reads coverage	Illumina coverage	Assembly size (Mb)	Number of contigs	Number of scaffolds	Scaffolds N50 (kb)	Complete BUSCO genes	Genes transferred	TE families identified
DLA112	55X	59X	252	3,917	107	54,591	96.6%	13,469	244
DLA155B	28X	19X	236	2,081	24	52,031	89.5%	13,303	243
DLA146	28X	42X	247	2,036	14	54,960	95.1%	13,314	193
LBV88	31X	41X	245	2,576	19	54,450	94.5%	13,328	280
LBV136	34X	130X	236	2,911	28	52,053	95.2%	13,307	172
LBV11[a]	89X	61X	246	2,608	20	53,712	94.2%	13,393	294
AcolN1[b]	~270X	-	251	205	5	53,057	98.9%	13,487	283

145 Three genomes were collected in Douala (DLA) and three in Libreville (LBV). [a] *LBV11* was

146 sequenced using PacBio technologies, while the other five genomes were sequenced using

147 Oxford Nanopore Technologies. [b] Genome statistics for *AcolN1*, the high quality *de novo*

148 genome assembly reported by Kingan *et al*., (49) are also included.

64 new anopheline TE families discovered in *An. coluzzii*

To identify the TE families present in each of the genomes, we used the *TEdenovo* pipeline from

the REPET package (51). After several rounds of manual curation, we identified between 172

and 294 TE families for each genome (Table 1; Additional file 1: Table S2). Remarkably, while

using a single reference would have only allowed the identification of a median of 244 TE

families, clustering the TE libraries from an increasing number of genomes allowed the

identification of a total of 435 well supported TE families (Figure 1B; see Material and

Methods). Interestingly, 64 of these families (32 DNA, 9 LINEs and 23 LTRs) are described here

for the first time. The majority of the new families (43/64) had partial matches to other known

TEs, thus allowing us to classify them at the superfamily level (Additional file 1: Table S3). The

use of multiple references was especially relevant for identifying these previously undescribed

families given that using a single genome would have only allowed to identify a median of 37

(25-48) novel TE families (Figure 1B).

To further characterize these novel families, we estimated the average number of insertions in

the seven *An. coluzzii* genomes, and their distribution and abundance in other species from the

Anopheles genus (Figure 2; Additional file 3: Figure S2; Additional file 1: Table S3). To do this,

we first annotated individual TE insertions in the seven *An. coluzzii* genomes using the *TEannot*

pipeline from the REPET package (52). To ensure that our annotation was as complete as

possible, in addition to the 435 families identified using REPET *de novo* approach, we also

added to our library 85 TE families from the *TEfam* database that we found to also be present in

the *An. coluzzii* genomes reported in this work (see material and methods). Most probably, these

85 families were either not identified by REPET or were discarded during manual curation

(Additional file 1: Table S4; see Material and Methods) (53). The final total of 520 families were

classified into 23 superfamilies and then further grouped into four orders (DNA, LINE, LTR and

SINE; Figure 1C).

Copies from all 64 new families were found in all seven *An. coluzzii* genomes, further suggesting

that these are *bona fide* families. Although the majority of families contain full-length copies in

at least one of the seven genomes analyzed, truncated copies were the most abundant (Figure 2B;

Additional file 1: Table S3). We identified a median of 72 insertions (ranging from 16 to 1445)

per family and genome (Figure 2B; Additional file 3: Figure S2B). Two out of the four TRIM

elements identified (*Acol_LTR_Ele 4* and *Acol_LTR_Ele 6*) are among the most abundant new

families, with more than 150 insertions (Figure 2B). TRIM elements are non-autonomous

retrotransposons flanked by LTRs and lacking coding capacity (Figure 2A). These elements have

not been previously described in anopheline genomes and are still underexplored in insect

genomes in general (54-56). However, they might be important players in insect genome

evolution: in plants there are some examples of TRIM elements showing the capacity to

restructure genomes by acting as target sites for retrotransposon insertions, alter host gene

structure, and transduce host genes (57, 58). While we found TRIM elements in *An. coluzzii*

genomes to be underrepresented in gene bodies (χ^2 test *p-value* > 0.05), they were

overrepresented in nested insertions (χ^2 test *p-value* < 0.05).

We also assessed the phylogenetic distribution of the 64 new TE families in 15 species of the

Anopheles genus, including the eight members of the *An. gambiae* complex, two more distantly

related mosquitoes species (*Culex quinquefasciatus*, *Aedes aegypti*) and *Drosophila*

melanogaster (Additional file 1: Table S3) (36, 59, 60). We found that the new families were

unevenly distributed among the members of the *Anopheles* genus (Figure 2C and Additional file

3: Figure S2C). Ten families were exclusively found in members of the Pyretophorus series,

suggesting that these elements emerged after the split of this series from the Cellia subgenus.

Moreover, 13 families were also found in at least one of the other three non-anopheline species

(Additional file 3: Figure S2C). The distribution of these 13 families was patchy, with some of

them present only in distantly related species while others were present in members of the

Anopheles genus or in members of the Pyretophorus series. These suggests that some of these

families might have been acquired through horizontal transfer events (Additional file 1: Table

S3) (40).

TE superfamily abundance varies across the seven genomes analyzed

The percentage of the genome represented by TEs across the seven genomes varied between

16.94% and 20.21% (Table 2). Note that differences across genomes in assembly and scaffolding

statistics did not explained the differences in TE content or superfamily abundance (Additional

File 1: Table S1B).

We found a positive correlation between TE content and genome size as has been previously

described in *Anopheles* and other species (Pearson's r = 0.90, significance = 0.007; Additional

file 4: Figure S3) (40, 61). As expected due to heterochromatin being a TE rich region and thus

challenging to assemble (62), most of the differences in TE content across genomes were found

in the heterochromatin compartment (Table 2; χ^2 test for variance, *p-value* = 3.57e-3).

To assess whether differences in TE content at the family and superfamily level existed among

the seven genomes, we focused on the TE copy number in euchromatic regions as we are mostly

interested in the potential functional impact of TE insertions. We found significant differences at

the order and superfamily levels (χ^2 test *p-value* = 1.07e-21 and *p-value* = 1.69e-14,

respectively). The largest differences were found in the LTR order: LTRs were more abundant in

the *DLA112* and *LBV88* genomes and less abundant in *AcolN1* (Figure 3A). At the superfamily

level, we found that the largest differences were in the *Gypsy* superfamily, which belongs to the

LTR order. We also observed an enrichment of the *RTE* superfamily in *LBV11*, of the *CR1* and

Bel-Pao superfamilies in *DLA112*, and a depletion of the *CR1* superfamily in *AcolN1* (Figure 3).

Therefore, most of the differences in TE content between the evaluated genomes appear to be in

retrotransposon families.

Table 2. TE content in the seven genomes analyzed.

Genome	Whole genome			Euchromatin			Heterochromatin		
	TE copy number	Mb	Genome %	Copy number	Mb	Region %	Copy number	Mb	Region %
DLA112	72901	48.00	19.02	49853	28.18	12.67	22930	19.74	70.34
DLA155B	62999	40.08	16.94	45592	25.39	11.86	17371	14.66	65.76
DLA146	68658	45.42	18.40	47874	27.22	12.36	20682	18.15	68.35
LBV88	68593	45.81	18.70	48922	28.06	12.81	19582	17.68	68.74
LBV136	64343	40.79	17.26	45792	24.97	11.73	18406	15.73	67.59
LBV11	71803	47.59	19.58	50187	28.95	13.40	21564	18.60	70.22
AcolN1	75745	50.81	20.21	48537	26.10	11.95	27205	24.70	74.77

TE copy number, TE content in megabases and percentage of the genome represented by TEs.

Values are given for the whole genome and for the euchromatin and heterochromatin

compartments separately.

TEs are nonrandomly distributed throughout the genome

As expected, we found that the percentage of TEs in euchromatin, 11.73%-13.40%, is much

lower than the percentage of TEs in heterochromatin, 65.76%-74.77% (χ^2 test *p-value* < 0.05;

Table 2 and Figure 4A). None of the TE families identified were exclusive to either the

euchromatin or heterochromatin. However, 45 families were enriched in the euchromatin (χ^2 test,

p-value < 0.01) including 12 out of the 32 *mTA* MITE families (Additional file 1: Table S5). This

is in line with what has been previously reported in *Ae. aegypti* (63). We also observed that the

TE distribution was uneven between the chromosomes, and as expected, the X chromosome had

a larger fraction of its euchromatin spanned by TEs (Figure 4B) (64).

Finally, we also determine the distribution of TE insertions regarding genes. We divided the

genome in five regions: 1 kb upstream, exon, intron, 1 kb downstream and intergenic (65). More

than half of the genes (7239) in *An. coluzzii* had TEs either in their body or 1 kb upstream or

downstream. Many of these genes (3888/7239) had insertions in all seven genomes, while 1065

genes have an insertion only in one genome. We found that the number of insertions in

intergenic regions was higher than expected by chance while the number of insertions in exons

was lower (χ^2 test *p-value* < 0.001; Figure 4C; Additional file 1: Table S6). The upstream and

downstream regions behaved differently: the downstream region had a smaller amount of TEs

than expected by chance and the upstream region was neither enriched nor depleted for TE

insertions (χ^2 test *p-value* = 0; Additional file 1: Table S6). This is possibly linked with the

chromatin state of these regions given that downstream regions are more commonly in a closed

chromatin state (65).

Focusing on the TE orders, we observed that LTR elements were more abundant on intergenic

regions while SINEs were more abundant on introns, and DNA elements were more abundant in

introns and in the upstream region (χ^2 test *p-value* < 2.03e-3; Figure 4C; Additional file 1: Table

S7A). MITEs, which are non-autonomous DNA elements have been reported to be more

abundant in the introns and flanking regions of genes (66). We observed the same behavior for

mTA and *m3bp* MITEs, which are more abundant in upstream regions and introns, and *m8bp*

MITEs which are more abundant in introns (Additional file 1: Table S7B).

Overall, TEs are not randomly distributed in the genome, as they are more abundant in

heterochromatic than in euchromatic regions, more abundant in the X chromosome than in

autosomes, and more abundant in intergenic regions than in gene bodies or gene flanking

regions.

MITE insertions are present in several inversion breakpoints

TEs have been suggested to be involved in chromosome rearrangements within the *An. gambiae*

complex. Indeed, TEs have been found in close proximity to the breakpoints of the 2La in *An.*

gambiae and *An. melas*, and to the breakpoints of the 2Rb inversions in *An. gambiae* and *An.*

coluzzii (67, 68). We thus explored the TE content in the breakpoints of the 2La and 2Rb, and

three other common polymorphic inversions in *An. coluzzii*: 2Rc, 2Rd, and 2Ru (69). We were

able to identify the two breakpoints regions in at least one genome for all the insertions except

for the inversion *2Ru* for which we could only identify the distal one (Figure 5). The analysis of

these breakpoint regions suggested that analyzed genomes have the standard conformation for all

five inversions (see Material and Methods; Additional file 1: Table S8). We identified several

TEs nearby the proximal and the distal breakpoints of 2La and 2Rb, in agreement with previous

studies (Figure 5) (26, 67, 68). For the standard 2La proximal breakpoint, Sharakhov et al. (67)

identified several DNA transposons and a SINE insertion. We also identified a cluster of MITE

insertions, which are DNA transposons; however, we additionally identified an *Outcast* (LINE)

element (Figure 5). Regarding the standard 2La distal breakpoint, we observed two MITEs

similar to one of the insertions in the proximal breakpoint, which was in agreement with the

findings by Sharakhov et al. (67) (Figure 5). We also observed similar behavior in the 2Rb

breakpoints, such as the one described by Lobo et al., (68): tandem repeats flanking the inversion

in the standard and inverted forms, and TEs in the internal sequences of both breakpoints (Figure

5). For the 2Rd inversion, we identified MITEs near both breakpoints. Finally, we have also

described here for the first time, TE insertions that are present in the distal breakpoint of

inversion 2Ru but not near the estimated proximal breakpoint; although in the latter case we

were able to identify reads spanning the breakpoints in the seven genomes (70).

Six of the seven potential active families are LTR insertions

To identify potentially active TE families, we first estimated their relative age by analyzing the

TE landscapes (71, 72). We observed an "L" shape landscape in all genomes which is indicative

of a recent TE burst (Additional file 5: Figure S4) (73). This "L" shape landscape, dominated by

retrotransposons, had previously been described for the sister species *An. gambiae* (72, 74),

where numerous Gypsy LTR Retrotransposons (up to 75%) might currently be active (75, 76).

We further investigated the families in the peak of the landscape and we identified eight families

with more than two identical full-length fragments and with more than half of their copies

identical to the consensus (Additional file 1: Table S9A). Additionally, we assessed the potential

ability of our candidates to actively transpose by identifying their intact open read frames

(ORFs), LTRs (in the case of LTR retrotransposons), and target site duplications (TSDs), and

determined that seven of these families are potentially fully capable of transposing. For the LTR

families, we further evaluated the identity between LTRs of the same copy. Mean identities

ranged from 97.38% to 99.44% across the six LTR families, with 17.64% to 40,35% of the

copies having identical LTRs (Additional File 1: Table S9B). These results further suggest that

these families might be responsible for the recent retrotransposon burst in *An. coluzzii*

(Additional file 1: Table S9A). Note that LTR elements accounted for most of the differences in

TE content across genomes (Figure 3).

As a first step towards assessing the potential functional consequences of the TE insertions from

these seven putatively active families, we focused on insertions that occurred in introns, exons,

and 1 kb upstream or downstream of a gene. We identified 66 genes with insertions from these

families, with four genes containing up to two insertions in the same gene region (Additional File

6: Figure S5; Additional File 1: Table S10 and Table S11). Six of the genes have functions

related to vectorial capacity: insecticide resistance, immunity, and biting ability (Table 3). We

checked whether the TE insertions nearby these genes contained binding sites for transcription

factors or promoter motifs (Additional file 1: Table S12; Additional file 1: Table S13). We

focused on identifying binding sites for three transcription factors that are known to be involved

in response to xenobiotics (cap'n'collar: *cnc*) and in immune response and development (dorsal:

dl and signal transducer and activator of transcription: *STAT*) given the availability of matrix

profiles from *D. melanogaster* (77, 78). We identified binding sites for either *dl*, *STAT* or both in

three insertions; interestingly the *Acol_gypsy_Ele18* and the *Acol_copia_Ele8* insertions have

more than three binding sites for the same transcription factors, suggesting that they might be

functional sites (Table 3) (79). Additionally, the genes that contained these TE insertions also

contained binding sites for the same transcription factors, which suggests that these transcription

factors already played a prior role in their regulation. We also identified a putative promoter

sequence in the *Acol_copia_Ele24* insertion found upstream of the CLIPA1 protease encoded by

AGAP011794 which could also potentially lead to changes in the regulation of this gene

(Additional file 1: Table S14).

Table 3. Seven TE insertions from putatively active families are located nearby genes

related with vectorial capacity.

TE family	Insert size (bp)	TE Freq.	Gene	Function	Possible phenotype [Reference]	TFBS
Acol_copia_ Ele8	3230 (200)*	2/4	AGAP012466	cuticular protein RR-2 family 146	Development, insecticide resistance [2, 3]	*dl* (3) and *STAT* (5)
Acol_copia_ Ele24	167	4/4				-
Acol_gypsy_ Ele65	185	3/3	AGAP010620	Peptidase S1, PA clan	Immunity, digestion [4, 5]	-

Acol_gypsy_Ele18	4858	1/6	AGAP029191	Defective proboscis extension response	"Bendy" proboscis [6]	*dl* (3-7) and *STAT* (1-6)
Acol_copia_Ele24	168	1/6	AGAP011794	CLIPA1 protein	Digestion, immunity or development [7]	-
Acol_gypsy_Ele18	235	1/7	AGAP002633	Gustatory receptor 53	Vectorial capacity [8]	-
Acol_gypsy_Ele65	141	1/3	AGAP028069	Peptidase S1, PA clan	Immunity, digestion [5, 6]	*dl* (1)

TE Freq. specifies the number of genomes where the TE insertion was found and the number of

genomes where the gene structure was correctly transferred (genes where some exons were

missing were not taken into consideration in this analysis). References in the Phenotype column

are as follows: 1 (80), 2 (81), 3 (82), 4 (83), 5 (84), 6 (85), 7 (86), 8 (87). The number in

parenthesis in the transcription factor binding site (TFBS) column refers to the number (or range)

of TFBS found in the TE. *The insertion size in parenthesis refers to an insertion found in one of

the genomes corresponding to a solo-LTR insertion.

TE insertions could influence the regulation of genes involved in insecticide resistance

The usage of pyrethroids, carbamates, and DDT as vector control mechanisms has led to the

rapid dispersion of insecticide resistance alleles in natural populations (88-92). Among the best

characterized resistance point mutations are L1014F (*kdr-west*), L1014S (*kdr-east*), and N1575Y

in the voltage gated sodium channel *para* (also known as *vgsc*), and G119S in the

acetylcholinesterase *ace-1* gene (93-95). We first investigated whether the seven genomes

analyzed in this work contained these resistance alleles. We found the *kdr-west* mutation in the

six genomes from Douala and Libreville but not in *AcolN1* genome (49). None of the other

mutations were identified, however a previously undescribed nonsynonymous substitution

(L1688M) in the fourth domain of *para* was identified in the aforementioned six genomes.

Whether this replacement also increases insecticide resistance is yet to be assessed.

TEs have been hypothesized to play a relevant role specifically in response to insecticides (96-

98), and a few individual insertions affecting insecticide tolerance in anopheline mosquitoes

have already been described (99). Thus, we searched for TE insertions in the neighborhood of

insecticide-related genes that could potentially lead to differences in their regulation. We focused

on eight well-known insecticide resistance genes: *Ace1*, *Cyp6p3*, *Gstd1-6*, *para*, *rdl, Cyp6m2*,

Cyp6z1 and *Gste2*. We also considered genes that have been shown to be differentially expressed

in *An. gambiae* when exposed to insecticides (Additional file 1: Table S14; Additional file 7:

Figure S6) (3, 100-102). We found that 21 out of the 43 genes analyzed contained at least one TE

insertion. We also observed that *para* had the largest number of TE insertions (48 in average per

genome, mainly in its introns) from this set of genes. This is an exception, given that the average

number of insertions per gene is 2.95 for members of this set which falls within the expected

number of insertions per gene in all the genome (t-test, *p-values* > 0.2).

Only one of the insertions, a solo LTR element of *Acol_Pao_Bel_Ele43* from the *Pao-Bel*

superfamily and present in all the genomes analyzed, was located in the 3' UTR of *GSTE2*.

Interestingly, an upstream insertion possibly affecting the expression level of this gene has

previously been identified in *An. funestus* (99). To determine if TEs could influence the

regulation of insecticide-resistance genes, we focused on polymorphic (present in two or more

genomes) and fixed (present in all seven genomes analyzed) insertions located in introns or 1 kb

upstream or downstream of the gene. We searched for *cnc* binding sites, and for those insertions

located in gene upstream regions we also looked for promoter motifs (Additional file 1: Table

S12; Additional file 1: Table S13). We identified 15 insertions in 10 genes containing either *cnc*

binding sites or promoter sequences. One insertion located in *CYP4C28* and two insertions in

para contained binding sites for *cnc*, although the genes did not contain binding sites for this

transcription factor. Additionally, we identified 12 insertions containing promoter motifs and

located nearby nine genes (Figure 6). In some cases, such as the *Acol_m2bp_Ele10* MITE

insertion in *ABCA4* or the *tSINE* insertion in *GSTMS2*, while the same TE insertion was found in

six and seven genomes respectively, the promoter motifs were found only in four and one

genome respectively (Figure 6; Additional file 1: Table S13). We analyzed the consensus

sequence of these two families and we found that while the *Acol_m2bp_Ele10* had the promoter

motif, the *tSINE* did not, suggesting that some of the *Acol_m2bp_Ele10* elements lost the

promoter motifs while the *tSINE* copies acquired them.

Immune response genes could also be potentially affected by TEs

Mosquitoes breeding in urban and polluted aquatic environments overexpress immune-related

genes suggesting that immune response is relevant for urban adaptation (103). To assess the

potential role of TEs in immune response, we searched for TE insertions in genes putatively

involved in immunity according to ImmunoDB (104) (Additional file 1: Table S15). We

identified 466 TE insertions in 148 out of the 281 genes analyzed. The number of insertions in

each gene varied greatly going from 58 genes with a single insertion to AGAP000940, a gene

coding for a C-type lectin and spanning 107.2 kb, with 48 insertions. The frequency of these

insertions was also variable with 186 (41.1%) of the insertions being fixed, 202 (44.6%)

polymorphic and 65 (14.3%) unique. We further explored polymorphic and fixed insertions and

identified binding sites for *dl* and *STAT* and promoter motifs. We found that 19 TEs contained

bindings sites for *dl*, 21 TEs contained binding sites for *STAT* and 12 TEs contained binding sites

both for *dl* and *STAT* (Additional file 1: Table S15). Additionally, we identified 81 insertions, in

the upstream region of 56 genes, which carried putative promoter sequences.

We identified TE insertions in three different antimicrobial peptides (AMPs). AMPs form the

first line of host defense against infection and are a key component of the innate immune system,

however none had transcription factor binding sites (TFBS) for *dl* or *STAT*. It is important to

keep in mind that there are other TF that participate in the regulation of AMPs and that both *dl*

and *STAT* are also involved in other biological processes (105). Interestingly we also identified

TEs with TFBS for *dl* in the vicinity of *STAT1* and *STAT2* which might lead to novel regulatory

mechanisms of the JAK/STAT signaling pathway. Furthermore, 11 of the 156 genes containing

TE insertions are differentially expressed in response to a *Plasmodium* invasion. These genes

participate in several pathways of the immune response including the small regulatory RNA

pathway, pathogen recognition, the nitric oxide response and ookinete melanization (78, 106-

108). Four of the TEs affecting these genes added TFBS and promoter sequences, thus

suggesting that these TE insertions can potentially influence the response to this pathogen (109)

(Table 4).

Table 4. TE insertions in *Plasmodium* responsive genes from the immune system.

Gene ID	Gene symbol	Function	# of TE insertions	Family	Frequency	Promoter	TFBS
AGAP002625	CTL9	CTLs	1	-	-	No	-
AGAP003663	RM62B	SRRPs	2	*Acol_mTA_Ele11*	7/7	No	*dl* (1), *STAT* (1)
AGAP004845	SCRB8	SCRs	4	*Acol_otherMITEs_Eles16*	7/7	No	*STAT* (1)
				Acol_Pao_Bel_Ele35	7/7	Yes	*STAT* (1)
AGAP005203	PGRPLC1	PGRPs	1	-	-	No	-
AGAP008844	GALE1	GALEs	1	*Acol_m3bp_Ele11*	7/7	Yes	-
AGAP009033	HPX2	PRDXs	1	-	-	No	-
AGAP009887	R2D2	SRRPs	1	-	-	No	-
AGAP011204	AUB	SRRPs	3	-	-	No	-
AGAP011717	AGO1	SRRPs	16	*Acol_mTA_Ele31*	6/7	No	*dl* (1)
AGAP011780	CLIPA4	CLIPs	1	-	-	No	-
AGAP011792	CLIPA7	CLIPs	1	-	-	No	-

420   Family and frequency are only shown for TEs with TFBS or promoter sequences. In the Function

421   column the following abbreviations are used: C-Type Lectins (CTLs), Small Regulatory RNA

422   Pathway Members (SRRPs), Scavenger Receptors (SCRs), Peptidoglycan Recognition Proteins

423   (PGRPs), Galactoside-Binding Lectins (GALEs), Peroxidases (PRDXs), CLIP-Domain Serine

424   Proteases (CLIPs).

DISCUSSION

In this study, we *de novo* annotated transposable element (TE) insertions in seven genomes of

An. coluzzii, six of them sequenced here. A comprehensive genome-wide TE annotation was

possible because we used long-read technologies to perform the genome sequencing and

assembly. Long-reads allow identifying TE insertions with high confidence given that the entire

TE insertion sequence can be spanned by a single read (30, 31). While the genome-wide TE

repertoire has been studied in other anopheline species, particularly in *An. gambiae*, to our

knowledge there are no other studies that have explored TE variation in multiple genomes from a

single species (32, 33, 36, 40, 72, 110). We observed that increasing the number of available

genomes analyzed allowed us to increase the number of identified TE families from a median of

244 (172-294) to 435 (Figure 1B). Moreover, having the full sequences of seven genomes also

allowed us to discover 64 new TE families, including four TRIM families previously

undescribed in anopheline genomes. This might be relevant as TRIM elements have been shown

to be important players in genome evolution in other species (57, 58). The wide range of families

identified across genomes was not directly related to the quality of the genome assembly taking

into consideration the more generally used quality parameters such as read length, number of

contigs, and contig N50 (111). This suggests that there are possibly other characteristics of each

genome that affect the identification of high-quality TE families, such as biases in the location of

the TE insertions given that TE families are challenging to identify in regions with low

complexity or with numerous nested TEs. Nonetheless, the identification of TE families is

dependent on the methodology used to perform TE annotations, therefore different annotation

strategies could lead to the discovery of still undescribed families (60).

The availability of several genome assemblies also allowed us to determine that the majority of

the intraspecies differences in the TE content were in heterochromatic regions, most likely due to

differences in the quality of the genome assembly. Nevertheless, there were also significant

differences in the TE content in euchromatic regions, reflecting true intraspecific variability as

has been previously observed in several organisms including Drosophila (112, 113), mammals

(114, 115), maize (116) and Arabidopsis (117). TE insertions were not randomly distributed

throughout the genome and instead were consistently enriched in intergenic regions, most likely

due to purifying selection, as suggested in the wild grass *Brachypodium distachyon* (118). In

Drosophila, TE enrichment in intergenic regions was also observed in addition to enrichment in

the intronic region, which we did not observe in *An. coluzzii* (119). We also analyzed the TE

content in the breakpoints of five common polymorphic inversions, three of them analyzed here

for the first time. We found TE insertions in all but one of the inversion breakpoints, with MITE

elements being the most common TE family, as already described in the 2Rd' inversion in *An.*

arabiensis (26) (Figure 5).

As a first step towards identifying the potential role of TEs in rapid adaptation to novel habitats

(120), we focused on insertions from recently active families located near genes that are relevant

for the vectorial capacity of *An. coluzzii* (Table 3). Because adaptation can also happen from

standing variation, in the case of insecticide resistance genes, which have been shown to be

shaped by TE insertions in several organisms, and immune-related genes, we analyzed all

insertions independently of their age (Figure 6 and Table 4) (99, 121, 122). While the role of

nonsynonymous substitutions and copy number variation in resistance to insecticides commonly

used in urban environments has been studied, the potential role of TEs has not yet been

comprehensively assessed in *An. coluzzii* or any other anopheline species (19, 102, 123-125). In

the genomes we assessed, we identified several insertions that were polymorphic or fixed nearby

functionally relevant genes (Table 3, Table 4 and Figure 6). Some of the identified candidate

insertions contained binding sites for transcription factors related to the function of the nearby

genes and promoter regions. Besides adding regulatory regions, TEs can also affect the

regulation of nearby genes by affecting gene splicing and generating long non-coding RNAs

among many other molecular mechanisms (25, 126-129). Thus, it is possible that the candidate

TE insertions identified, which lack binding sites and promoters, could be affecting nearby genes

through other molecular mechanisms. Our results are a first approximation to the potential role

of TEs in *An. coluzzii* adaptation to the challenging environment that urban ecosystems entail.

Establishing a direct link between the TEs and the traits involved in urban adaptation will require

sampling a larger number of individuals and characterizing the phenotypes associated with the

insertions.

CONCLUSIONS

The long-read sequencing of seven *An. coluzzii* genomes from urban environments allowed us to

capture to a larger extent the diversity of TE families and TE insertions and to assess their

potential impact in the genome architecture and genome function in this species. While there was

an enrichment of TE insertions in intergenic regions, we found several insertions located in the 1

kb flanking regions or inside genes relevant for the vectorial capacity of this species.

Furthermore, we found that some of these TE insertions are adding regulatory regions suggesting

that they could influence the regulation of these genes. Further studies are needed to confirm the

potential functional effect of these insertions. The genomic resources and the results that we

present in this work provide a basis for future studies of the impact of TEs in the biology of *An.*

coluzzii. This will allow increasing our knowledge on a species which besides being interesting

from an evolutionary perspective, given its high levels of genetic diversity and the strong

anthropogenic pressures it faces, is of great importance to human health. A better understanding

of the biology of *An. coluzzii* and its ability to rapidly adapt to urban environments will further

facilitate the development of novel strategies to combat malaria. Better management strategies

can be implemented if we understand and are able to predict changes in the frequency of genetic

variants relevant for the vectorial capacity of this species.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sample collection and DNA isolation

We sampled *An. coluzzii* larvae in two cities of Central Africa: Libreville, Gabon, in January

2016 and Douala, Cameroon, in April 2018 (Additional File 1: Table S1). A systematic

inspection of potential breeding sites was conducted to determine the presence of *Anopheles*

larvae. We manually separated the anopheline from the culicine larvae based on morphological

recognition and positioning of their bodies on or under the water surface (Robert, 2017). We

collected immature 3rd and 4th stage larvae of *Anopheles* from water bodies using the standard

dipping method (Service, 1993). Larvae were stored in 1.5 ml of absolute ethanol. After each

daily sampling session, the samples were stored at -20 °C.

All the samples were PCR tested to differentiate *An. coluzzii* larvae from *An. gambiae* larvae

before library preparation, using primers SINE200_F (TCGCCTTAGACCTTGCGTTA) and

SINE200_R (CGCTTCAAGAATTCGAGATAC) (46). These primers target a single copy

SINE200 transposable element insertion that is fixed in *An. coluzzii* and absent in *An. gambiae*.

For PacBio sequencing, DNA from a single *An. coluzzii* larva from the *LBV11* site was extracted

using the MagAttract HMW DNA extraction kit (Qiagen) following manufacturer's instructions.

Briefly, the larva was air-dried and lysed in 240 µl of buffer ATL (proteinase K added) shaking

overnight at 56 ºC. Next, the DNA was isolated using the MagAttract magnetic beads and eluted

twice in 50 µl of buffer AE. The DNA concentration was measured using a Qubit fluorometer.

For Nanopore sequencing, DNA from six larvae from each of the five breeding sites was

extracted either with the QiaAMP UCP DNA kit (Qiagen) or MagAttract HMW DNA extraction

kit (Qiagen). We performed individual larvae extractions as our objective was to use the

minimum number of larvae possible to avoid the presence of excess polymorphisms that could

affect the genome assembly. For the QiaAMP UCP DNA kit, we followed the manufacturer's

instructions. Each larva was air-dried and lysed in 200 µl of buffer AUT (proteinase K added)

shaking overnight at 56 ºC, then DNA was isolated using a QIAamp UCP MinElute column and

eluted twice in 25 µl of buffer AUE. For the MagAttract HMW DNA extraction kit, we followed

manufacturer's instructions but using lower buffer amounts to increase DNA concentration.

Briefly, each larva was lysed in 120 µl of buffer ATL (proteinase K added) shaking overnight at

56 ºC, then DNA was isolated using the MagAttract magnetic beads and eluted twice in 25 µl of

buffer AE. The DNA concentration was measured using a Qubit fluorometer. Both elutions of

the same sample were mixed before library preparation. For Illumina sequencing, DNA from one

larva from each of the six different breeding sites was extracted following the same extraction

protocol as for Nanopore sequencing.

Library preparation and sequencing

Quality control of the DNA sample for PacBio sequencing (Qubit, NanoDrop and Fragment

analyzer) was performed at the Center for Genomic Research facility of the University of

Liverpool prior to library preparation. The library was prepared by shearing DNA to obtain

fragments of approximately 30 kb and sequenced on 2 SMRT cells using Sequel SMRT cell, 3.0

chemistry. Nanopore libraries were constructed using the Native Barcoding Expansion 1-12

(PCR-free) and the Ligation Sequencing Kit following manufacturer's instructions. A minimum

of 400 ng of DNA from each larva was used to start with the library workflow. For each

breeding site, six larvae were barcoded, and equal amounts of each barcoded sample were pooled

prior to sequencing. The samples from the same breeding site were ran in a single R9.4 flow cell

in a 48-hour run, except for sample *DLA112* which was run in two flow cells. The DNA

concentration was assessed during the whole procedure to ensure enough DNA was available for

sequencing.

The quality control of the samples, library preparation and Illumina sequencing was performed at

the Center for Genomic Research facility of the University of Liverpool. Low input libraries

were prepared with the NEBNext Ultra II FS DNA library kit (300 bp inserts) on the Mosquito

platform, using a 1/10 reduced volume protocol. Paired-end sequencing was performed on the

Illumina Novaseq platform using S2 chemistry (2x150 bp).

Genome Assemblies

The PacBio sequenced genome was assembled using *Canu* version 1.8 (130) with an estimated

genome size of 250Mb and parameters: '*stopOnLowCoverage*=5, *corMinCoverage*=0,

correctedErrorRate=0.105, *CorMhapFilterThreshold*=0.0000000002, *corMhapOptions="--

threshold 0.80 --num-hashes 512 --num-min-matches 3 --ordered-sketch-size 1000 --ordered-

kmer-size 14 --min-olap-length 2000 --repeat-idf-scale 50"* mhapMemory*=60g,

mhapBlockSize=500, *ovlMerDistinct*=0.975'. The parameter stopOnLowCoverage was set to 5 to

prevent fragmentation given that some of our samples had medium coverage. corMinCoverage

was set to 0 to conserve the full length of the reads during the correction stage.

correctedErrorRate was set to 0.105 following the recommendations in Canu's manual for low

coverage genome assemblies. All of the remaining parameters were set to reduce disk space and

run time following the recommendations for repetitive genomes.Next, we identified and removed

allelic variants using *purge_haplotigs* version 1.0.4 (131) with the "*-l 15 -m 100 -h 195*"

parameters.

The Nanopore genomes were assembled using *Canu* version 1.8 using the same parameters as

previously described, except for *correctedErrorRate* which was set to 0.16, followed by a round

of polishing using *racon* version 1.3.3 (132), followed by *nanopolish* version 0.11.1 (133) and

pilon version 1.23-0 (134) with the fix parameter set on '*bases*'. *Pilon* requires high coverage

short-read data to perform the polishing and these data came from the aforementioned single

larvae sequenced from each of the sites. Finally, *blobtools* version 1.1.1 (135) was used to

remove contamination from all six genome assemblies taking into consideration fragment sizes,

their taxonomic assignation and the coverage using the Illumina reads.

As a proxy of the completeness, the BUSCO values for the six newly assembled genomes plus

the *AcolN1* genome were obtained using BUSCO version 3.0.2 (50) with the *diptera_odb9* set as

reference. Finally, the contigs for all seven assemblies were ordered and merged with *RaGOO*

v1.1 (136) using the chromosome level *An. gambiae* AgamP4 assembly.

Gene annotation transfer

The *gff* for the genome annotation for AgamP4 was transferred into the newly assembled

genomes using *Liftoff* (137) with default parameters. The annotation was manually inspected

using *UGENE* version 35 (138) and whenever needed the annotation was accordingly corrected.

96% of the AgamP4 genes were correctly transferred.

Construction of the curated TE library and *de novo* TE annotation

We ran the *TEdenovo* pipeline (51) independently on each of the seven genomes with default

parameters. The obtained consensus in each genome were further filtered by discarding those

generated with (i) only one sequence; (ii) with less than one full-length fragment mapping to the

genome; (iii) with less than three full-length copies; and (iv) shorter than 100bp (Additional file

1: Table S2). The remaining consensuses were manually curated to remove redundant sequences

and artifacts by manual inspection of coverage plots generated using the *plotCoverage* tool from

REPET and visualization of the structural features on the genome browser IGV version 2.4.19

(139).

To ensure that we identified as much of the TE diversity as possible, the *TEfam*

(tefam.biochem.vt.edu) database, which contains the TE libraries for several species of

mosquitoes, was used to annotate the seven genomes using *RepeatMasker* version open-4.0.9

(Smit et al. 2015). Families with more than three matches longer than 90% in any genome were

selected and their hit with the highest identity from each genome was extracted. These sequences

were added to the REPET library and all the consensuses were clustered using CD-HIT version

4.8.1 (140) with the *-c* and *-s* parameters set to 0.8. These filters ensured that all TEs with an

identity greater than 80% throughout more than 80% of their sequence were grouped in the same

family. 85 clusters contained sequences only identified by *TEfam*. The sequences belonging to

the same cluster were used to perform a multiple sequence alignment and the consensuses were

obtained.

The consensuses were classified using PASTEC (141) with default parameters. Next their

bidirectional best-hits were calculated using BLAST (142) against the *TEfam*

(tefam.biochem.vt.edu), AnoTExcel (143) and Repbase (144) databases. When more than 80%

of a consensus matched to a feature from the databases with an identity higher than 80%, the

classification was transferred to the consensus. While not an order *per se*, MITEs were grouped

together for subsequent analysis. Additionally, we classified the families based on the

conservation of features characteristic of their orders into putative autonomous, putative

autonomous lacking terminal inverted repeats (TIRs) or long terminal repeats (LTRs), putative

non-autonomous, such as MITEs and TRIMs, and degenerated (Additional file 1: Table S4)

(Fonseca et al 2019). These classified consensuses were used to re-annotate the assembled

genomes with the *TEannot* pipeline using default parameters and we discarded copies whose

length overlapped >80% with satellite annotations (52).

Transfer of TE annotations to the *AcolN1* reference genome

We transferred the euchromatic TE annotations from the six genomes we sequenced to the

AcolN1 genome. First, we built a gff file composed by the coordinates of two 500 bp long

"anchors" adjacent to each TE. We transferred these features considering each pair of anchors as

exons from a single gene using the *Liftoff* tool with the -exclude_partial -overlap 1 -s 0.8

parameters (137). We conserved only transfers where both anchors were transferred to the

AcolN1 genome. When both anchors were separated by less than 10 bp we considered the TE to

be absent. This allowed us to identify most TE insertions, both present and absent in the AcolN1

genome. Next, following the same strategy we transferred these regions from the AcolN1

genome to the other six genomes. To summarize this information, we built a matrix containing

the status for all of the TE insertions transferred to the AcolN1 genome in every genome. When

the anchors were found more than 10 bp away the TE was considered to be present and this was

represented with a 1, when the distance was less than 10 bp the TE was considered to be absent

and it was represented with a -1. When any of the anchors was not transferred the TE was

considered to be not transferred and represented with a 0.

Overall, we were able to transfer to the AcolN1 genome 71.93% to 75.29% of the TEs present in

each of the six genomes leading to a total of 67,548 TEs transferred. We then attempt to

transferred back these 67,548 from the AcolN1 reference to the remaining six genomes and we

were able to confidently transfer 53,893 (79.78%) of these regions to at least three of the

genomes with 32,185 (47.65%) transferred to all six genomes. We checked whether the TEs that

failed to be transferred were enriched for nested TEs and we found that this was the case: while

68.58% and 51.18% of the TEs located more and less than 500 bp away from other TEs,

respectively, were transferred, only 38.26% of the TEs overlapping other TEs were transferred to

the six genomes.

Identification of newly described families in other species

We analyzed all 10 available fully sequenced species from the Pyretophorus series, which

belongs to the Cellia subgenus. We also included an additional five *Anopheles* species, three

from each of the other series from the Cellia subgenus and two from the other subgenera with

available fully sequenced species. As outgroups we included the genomes of *Cx.*

quinquefasciatus, *Ae. aegypti* and *D. melanogaster*. *RepeatMasker* version open-4.0.9 (Smit et

al. 2015) was run with default parameters using the 64 newly described families as the library on

the following genomes: *An. albimanus* (AalbS2), *An. atroparvus* (AatrE3), *An. farauti* (AfarF2),

An. funestus (AfunF3), *An. stephensi* (AsteS1), *An. epiroticus* (AepiE1), *An. christyi* (AchrA1),

An. merus (AmerM2), *An. gambiae* (AgamP4), *An. coluzzii* (AcolN1), *An. melas* (AmelC2), *An.*

arabiensis (AaraD1), *An. quadriannulatus* (AquaS1), *An. bwambae* (Abwa2) and *An. fontenillei*

(ASM881789v1), *Cx. quinquefasciatus* (CulPip1.0), *Ae. aegypti* (AaegL5.0) and *D.*

melanogaster (ISO1 release 6).

Identification of heterochromatin

The coordinates for the pericentric heterochromatin, compact intercalary heterochromatin, and

diffuse intercalary heterochromatin in *An. gambiae* AgamP3 were obtained from a previous work

(62). The *An. gambiae* AgamP3 genome assembly was mapped against the seven *An. coluzzii*

genome assemblies using *progressiveMauve* (145) and the corresponding coordinates on each of

the assemblies were retrieved (Additional file 1: Table S1C). To identify families enriched in

either euchromatin or heterochromatin a χ^2 test of independence was performed.

Transfer of known inversion breakpoints

The coordinates for inversions 2La, 2Rb, 2Rc and 2Rd were obtained from Corbett-Detig et al.

(2019) (69) and coordinates for 2Ru were obtained from White et al (2009) (70). 50 kb regions

flanking each side of the insertion were obtained and mapped using *minimap2* (146) against the

scaffolded genome assemblies to transfer the breakpoints. To validate the breakpoints, we

determined if long reads spanned the breakpoints using the genome browser IGV version 2.4.19

(139).

Detection of putatively active TE families

To identify potentially active TE families, we identified families with more than two identical

full-length fragment copies in at least six of the seven annotated genomes. We determined the

fraction of identical copies of these families by identifying all their insertions in the genome and

calculating the sequence identity of all their bases against the consensus by performing a

nucleotide BLAST. Given that long-read have a higher rate of sequencing errors that could affect

the age estimation (although we used Illumina reads for polishing), we also used dnaPipeTE

(147) to estimate the relative age of the TE families using the raw Illumina reads for the six

genomes that we sequenced. We compared the TE landscape obtained using dnaPipeTE with that

obtained using the BLAST procedure, using a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test corrected for multiple

testing using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure (Additional file 1: Table S16). Given that we

observed few significant differences, we continued using the landscape data obtained using the

BLAST procedure. We identified the families where the majority of the bases of their insertions

were on the peak of identical sequences in the TE landscape (>50% of the bases with >99% base

identity) in more than five of the seven genomes we analyzed. Finally, we assessed the ability to

actively transpose of strong candidates by identifying their intact ORFs, LTRs (in the case of

LTR retrotransposons) and target site duplication (TSD), and estimated the % identity between

the two LTR of each TE copy.

Classification of TEs by their genomic location

To determine the location of TEs we used the *findOverlaps* function from the

GenomicAlignments R package (148) using default parameters. Both the TE and the gene

annotation were converted to *GenomicRanges* objects ignoring strand information in the case of

TEs.

Insecticide resistance genes

A list with a total of 43 relevant insecticide resistance genes was generated taking several works

into consideration (3, 100-102) (Additional file 1: Table S14). To determine the position of the L

to M nonsynonymous substitution that we observed in AGAP004707 (*para*) we used the position

from the CAM12801.1 reference sequence.

Immune-related genes

The full list of 414 immune-related genes from *An. gambiae* was downloaded from ImmunoDB

(104). We conserved the 281 most reliable genes filtering by the STATUS field and conserving

only those with A or B scores (A refers to genes confirmed with high confidence and expert-

refined cDNA supplied, and B refers to genes confirmed with high confidence, no refinement

required).

TFBS and promoter identification

The matrices for *dl* (MA0022.1), *cnc::maf-S* (MA0530.1) and *Stat92E* (MA0532.1) were

downloaded from JASPAR (http://jaspar.genereg.net/) (149). The sequences for the TEs of

interest were obtained using *getSeq* from the *Biostrings* R package. The TFBS in the sequences

were identified using the web version of FIMO (150) from the MEME SUITE (151) with default

parameters. The ElemeNT online tool was used to identify promoter motifs (152).

DECLARATIONS

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials

All the genome sequencing data obtained in this work, as well as the genome assemblies are

available in NCBI SRA and NCBI Genbank respectively, under the BioProject accession number

PRJNA676011. TE annotations in each of the seven genomes are provided as a gff files available

at https://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/224416. Transferred annotations across the seven genomes

are also available at https://digital.csic.es/handle/10261/224416 as a txt file.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

This study was supported by the Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness of Spain

(BFU2017-82937-P) to JG. DA was supported by an ANR grant (ANR-18-CE35-0002-01 –

WILDING). NMLP was funded by AUF and CIRMF scholarships.

Authors' contributions

DA and JG conceived and designed the experiments. NMLP, SEN and LA generated data. CVC,

DA and JG performed the data analysis. CVC and JG wrote and revised the manuscript with

input from all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We thank members of the González Lab for comments on the manuscript. We thank the Ecology

of Vectorial Systems team at the CIMRF (Franceville, Gabon) for their support in field

collections. We thank Jean Pierre Agbor and Serge Donfanck for their commitment in larvae

collections in Douala (Cameroon).

Authors' information

Twitter handles: @VargasChavezC (Carlos Vargas-Chavez); @d_ayalag (Diego Ayala); @

GonzalezLab_BCN (Josefa González).

REFERENCES

1.   Fontaine MC, Pease JB, Steele A, Waterhouse RM, Neafsey DE, Sharakhov IV, et al.

Extensive introgression in a malaria vector species complex revealed by phylogenomics.

Science. 2015;347(6217).

2.   Tene Fossog B, Ayala D, Acevedo P, Kengne P, Ngomo Abeso Mebuy I, Makanga B, et

al. Habitat segregation and ecological character displacement in cryptic African malaria

mosquitoes. Evolutionary Applications. 2015;8(4):326-45.

3.   Fossog Tene B, Poupardin R, Costantini C, Awono-Ambene P, Wondji CS, Ranson H, et

al. Resistance to DDT in an Urban Setting: Common Mechanisms Implicated in Both M and S

Forms of Anopheles gambiae in the City of Yaoundé Cameroon. PLOS ONE. 2013;8(4):e61408.

4.   Kengne P, Charmantier G, Blondeau-Bidet E, Costantini C, Ayala D. Tolerance of

disease-vector mosquitoes to brackish water and their osmoregulatory ability. Ecosphere.

2019;10(10):e02783.

5.   Vontas J, Grigoraki L, Morgan J, Tsakireli D, Fuseini G, Segura L, et al. Rapid selection

of a pyrethroid metabolic enzyme CYP9K1 by operational malaria control activities. Proceedings

of the National Academy of Sciences. 2018;115(18):4619.

6.   Fouet C, Kamdem C, Gamez S, White BJ. Extensive genetic diversity among populations

of the malaria mosquito Anopheles moucheti revealed by population genomics. Infection,

Genetics and Evolution. 2017;48:27-33.

7.   Wiebe A, Longbottom J, Gleave K, Shearer FM, Sinka ME, Massey NC, et al.

Geographical distributions of African malaria vector sibling species and evidence for insecticide

resistance. Malaria journal. 2017;16(1):85-.

8.   Perugini E, Guelbeogo WM, Calzetta M, Manzi S, Virgillito C, Caputo B, et al.

Behavioural plasticity of Anopheles coluzzii and Anopheles arabiensis undermines LLIN

community protective effect in a Sudanese-savannah village in Burkina Faso. Parasites &

vectors. 2020;13(1):277-.

9.   Coluzzi M, Sabatini A, della Torre A, Di Deco MA, Petrarca V. A Polytene Chromosome

Analysis of the Anopheles gambiae Species Complex. Science.

2002;298(5597):1415.

10.   Ayala D, Acevedo P, Pombi M, Dia I, Boccolini D, Costantini C, et al. Chromosome

inversions and ecological plasticity in the main African malaria mosquitoes. Evolution.

2017;71(3):686-701.

11.   Costantini C, Ayala D, Guelbeogo WM, Pombi M, Some CY, Bassole IHN, et al. Living

at the edge: biogeographic patterns of habitat segregation conform to speciation by niche

expansion in Anopheles gambiae. BMC Ecology. 2009;9(1):16.

12.   Simard F, Ayala D, Kamdem GC, Pombi M, Etouna J, Ose K, et al. Ecological niche

partitioning between Anopheles gambiae molecular forms in Cameroon: the ecological side of

speciation. BMC Ecology. 2009;9(1):17.

13.   Coluzzi M, Sabatini A, Petrarca V, Di Deco MA. Chromosomal differentiation and

adaptation to human environments in the Anopheles gambiae complex. Transactions of The

Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 1979;73(5):483-97.

14.   Fouet C, Gray E, Besansky NJ, Costantini C. Adaptation to Aridity in the Malaria

Mosquito Anopheles gambiae: Chromosomal Inversion Polymorphism and Body Size Influence

Resistance to Desiccation. PLOS ONE. 2012;7(4):e34841.

15.   Ayala D, Zhang S, Chateau M, Fouet C, Morlais I, Costantini C, et al. Association

mapping desiccation resistance within chromosomal inversions in the African malaria vector

Anopheles gambiae. Molecular Ecology. 2019;28(6):1333-42.

16.   Labbé P, Berthomieu A, Berticat C, Alout H, Raymond M, Lenormand T, et al.

Independent Duplications of the Acetylcholinesterase Gene Conferring Insecticide Resistance in

the Mosquito Culex pipiens. Molecular Biology and Evolution. 2007;24(4):1056-67.

17.   Assogba BS, Djogbénou LS, Milesi P, Berthomieu A, Perez J, Ayala D, et al. An ace-1

gene duplication resorbs the fitness cost associated with resistance in Anopheles gambiae, the

main malaria mosquito. Scientific Reports. 2015;5(1):14529.

18.   Weetman D, Djogbenou LS, Lucas E. Copy number variation (CNV) and insecticide

resistance in mosquitoes: evolving knowledge or an evolving problem? Current opinion in insect

science. 2018;27:82-8.

19.   Lucas ER, Miles A, Harding NJ, Clarkson CS, Lawniczak MKN, Kwiatkowski DP, et al.

Whole-genome sequencing reveals high complexity of copy number variation at insecticide

resistance loci in malaria mosquitoes. Genome Research. 2019;29(8):1250-61.

20.   Mitri C, Markianos K, Guelbeogo WM, Bischoff E, Gneme A, Eiglmeier K, et al. The

kdr-bearing haplotype and susceptibility to Plasmodium falciparum in Anopheles gambiae:

genetic correlation and functional testing. Malaria Journal. 2015;14(1):391.

21.   Kamdem C, Fouet C, Gamez S, White BJ. Pollutants and Insecticides Drive Local

Adaptation in African Malaria Mosquitoes. Mol Biol Evol. 2017;34(5):1261-75.

22.   King SA, Onayifeke B, Akorli J, Sibomana I, Chabi J, Manful-Gwira T, et al. The Role

of Detoxification Enzymes in the Adaptation of the Major Malaria Vector Anopheles gambiae

(Giles; Diptera: Culicidae) to Polluted Water. Journal of Medical Entomology. 2017;54(6):1674-

83.

23.   Casacuberta E, González J. The impact of transposable elements in environmental

adaptation. Molecular Ecology. 2013;22(6):1503-17.

24.   Schrader L, Schmitz J. The impact of transposable elements in adaptive evolution.

Molecular Ecology. 2019;28(6):1537-49.

25.   Chuong EB, Elde NC, Feschotte C. Regulatory activities of transposable elements: From

conflicts to benefits. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2017;18(2):71-86.

26.   Mathiopoulos KD, Della Torre A, Predazzi V, Petrarca V, Coluzzi M. Cloning of

inversion breakpoints in the Anopheles gambiae complex traces a transposable element at the

inversion junction. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of

America. 1998;95(21):12444-9.

27.   Gray YH. It takes two transposons to tango: transposable-element-mediated chromosomal

rearrangements. Trends Genet. 2000;16(10):461-8.

28.   Reis M, Vieira CP, Lata R, Posnien N, Vieira J. Origin and Consequences of

Chromosomal Inversions in the virilis Group of Drosophila. Genome Biology and Evolution.

2018;10(12):3152-66.

29.   Goerner-Potvin P, Bourque G. Computational tools to unmask transposable elements.

Nature Reviews Genetics. 2018;19(11):688-704.

30.   Logsdon GA, Vollger MR, Eichler EE. Long-read human genome sequencing and its

applications. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21(10):597-614.

31.   Shahid S, Slotkin RK. The current revolution in transposable element biology enabled by

long reads. Current Opinion in Plant Biology. 2020;54:49-56.

32.   Holt RA, Subramanian GM, Halpern A, Sutton GG, Charlab R, Nusskern DR, et al. The

Genome Sequence of the Malaria Mosquito <i>Anopheles gambiae</i>. Science.

2002;298(5591):129-49.

33.   Marinotti O, Cerqueira GC, De Almeida LGP, Ferro MIT, Da Silva Loreto EL, Zaha A,

et al. The Genome of Anopheles darlingi, the main neotropical malaria vector. Nucleic Acids

Research. 2013;41(15):7387-400.

34.   Jiang X, Peery A, Hall AB, Sharma A, Chen XG, Waterhouse RM, et al. Genome

analysis of a major urban malaria vector mosquito, Anopheles stephensi. Genome biology.

2014;15(9):459-.

35.   Zhou D, Zhang D, Ding G, Shi L, Hou Q, Ye Y, et al. Genome sequence of Anopheles

sinensis provides insight into genetics basis of mosquito competence for malaria parasites. BMC

Genomics. 2014;15(1).

36.   Neafsey DE, Waterhouse RM, Abai MR, Aganezov SS, Alekseyev MA, Allen JE, et al.

Highly evolvable malaria vectors: The genomes of 16 Anopheles mosquitoes. Science.

2015;347(6217).

37.   Lau YL, Lee WC, Chen J, Zhong Z, Jian J, Amir A, et al. Draft genomes of Anopheles

cracens and Anopheles maculatus: Comparison of simian malaria and human malaria vectors in

peninsular Malaysia. PLoS ONE. 2016;11(6):1-24.

38.   Chakraborty M, Ramaiah A, Adolfi A, Halas P, Kaduskar B, Ngo LT, et al. Hidden

features of the malaria vector mosquito, Anopheles stephensi, revealed by a high-

quality reference genome. bioRxiv. 2020:2020.05.24.113019.

39.   Compton A, Liang J, Chen C, Lukyanchikova V, Qi Y, Potters M, et al. The beginning of

the end: a chromosomal assembly of the New World malaria mosquito ends with a novel

telomere. bioRxiv. 2020:2020.04.17.047084.

40.   de Melo ES, Wallau GdL. Transposable elements are constantly exchanged by horizontal

transfer reshaping mosquito genomes. bioRxiv. 2020:2020.06.23.166744.

41.   Yang X, Lee WP, Ye K, Lee C. One reference genome is not enough. Genome Biology.

2019;20(1):19-21.

42.   Bayer PE, Golicz AA, Scheben A, Batley J, Edwards D. Plant pan-genomes are the new

reference. Nature Plants. 2020;6(8):914-20.

43.   Weissensteiner MH, Bunikis I, Catalán A, Francoijs K-J, Knief U, Heim W, et al.

Discovery and population genomics of structural variation in a songbird genus. Nature

Communications. 2020;11(1):3403.

44.   Quesneville H, Nouaud D, Anxolabéhère D. P elements and MITE relatives in the whole

genome sequence of Anopheles gambiae. BMC Genomics. 2006;7.

45.   Boulesteix M, Simard F, Antonio-Nkondjio C, Awono-Ambene HP, Fontenille D,

Biémont C. Insertion polymorphism of transposable elements and population structure of

Anopheles gambiae M and S molecular forms in Cameroon. Molecular Ecology.

2007;16(2):441-52.

46.   Santolamazza F, Mancini E, Simard F, Qi Y, Tu Z, Della Torre A. Insertion

polymorphisms of SINE200 retrotransposons within speciation islands of Anopheles gambiae

molecular forms. Malaria Journal. 2008;7:1-10.

47.   Esnault C, Boulesteix M, Duchemin JB, Koffi AA, Chandre F, Dabiré R, et al. High

genetic differentiation between the M and S molecular forms of Anopheles gambiae in Africa.

PloS one. 2008;3(4):e1968-e.

48.   Salgueiro P, Moreno M, Simard F, O'Brochta D, Pinto J. New Insights into the

Population Structure of Anopheles gambiae s.s. in the Gulf of Guinea Islands Revealed by

Herves Transposable Elements. PLoS ONE. 2013;8(4).

49.   Kingan SB, Heaton H, Cudini J, Lambert CC, Baybayan P, Galvin BD, et al. A high-

quality de novo genome assembly from a single mosquito using pacbio sequencing. Genes.

2019;10(1).

50.   Simão FA, Waterhouse RM, Ioannidis P, Kriventseva EV, Zdobnov EM. BUSCO:

assessing genome assembly and annotation completeness with single-copy orthologs.

Bioinformatics. 2015;31(19):3210-2.

51.   Flutre T, Duprat E, Feuillet C, Quesneville H. Considering Transposable Element

Diversification in De Novo Annotation Approaches. PLOS ONE. 2011;6(1):e16526.

52.   Quesneville H, Bergman CM, Andrieu O, Autard D, Nouaud D, Ashburner M, et al.

Combined evidence annotation of transposable elements in genome sequences. PLoS

computational biology. 2005;1(2):166-75.

53.   Platt RN, 2nd, Blanco-Berdugo L, Ray DA. Accurate Transposable Element Annotation

Is Vital When Analyzing New Genome Assemblies. Genome biology and evolution.

2016;8(2):403-10.

54.   Marsano RM, Leronni D, D'Addabbo P, Viggiano L, Tarasco E, Caizzi R. Mosquitoes

LTR retrotransposons: a deeper view into the genomic sequence of Culex quinquefasciatus. PloS

one. 2012;7(2):e30770-e.

55.   Zhou Y, Cahan SH. A Novel Family of Terminal-Repeat Retrotransposon in Miniature

(TRIM) in the Genome of the Red Harvester Ant, Pogonomyrmex barbatus. PLoS ONE.

2012;7(12).

56.   Elsik CG, Worley KC, Bennett AK, Beye M, Camara F, Childers CP, et al. Finding the

missing honey bee genes: lessons learned from a genome upgrade. BMC Genomics.

2014;15(1):86.

57.   Witte C-P, Le QH, Bureau T, Kumar A. Terminal-repeat retrotransposons in miniature

(TRIM) are involved in restructuring plant genomes. Proceedings of the National Academy of

Sciences. 2001;98(24):13778.

58.   Gao D, Li Y, Kim KD, Abernathy B, Jackson SA. Landscape and evolutionary dynamics

of terminal repeat retrotransposons in miniature in plant genomes. Genome Biology.

2016;17(1):7.

59.   Barrón MG, Paupy C, Rahola N, Akone-Ella O, Ngangue MF, Wilson-Bahun TA, et al.

A new species in the major malaria vector complex sheds light on reticulated species evolution.

Scientific Reports. 2019;9(1):1-13.

60.   Vargas-Chavez C, González J. Transposable elements in Anopheles species: refining

annotation strategies towards population-level analysis. In: Dupuis ORaJ, editor. Population

Genomics: Insects: Springer; 2021.

61.   Sessegolo C, Burlet N, Haudry A. Strong phylogenetic inertia on genome size and

transposable element content among 26 species of flies. Biology Letters. 2016;12(8):0-3.

62.   Sharakhova MV, George P, Brusentsova IV, Leman SC, Bailey JA, Smith CD, et al.

Genome mapping and characterization of the Anopheles gambiae heterochromatin. BMC

Genomics. 2010;11(1):459.

63.   Tu Z. Three novel families of miniature inverted-repeat transposable elements are

associated with genes of the yellow fever mosquito, Aedes aegypti. Proceedings of the National

Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 1997;94(14):7475-80.

64.   Xia A, Sharakhova MV, Leman SC, Tu Z, Bailey JA, Smith CD, et al. Genome landscape

and evolutionary plasticity of chromosomes in malaria mosquitoes. PLoS ONE. 2010;5(5).

65.   Ruiz JL, Ranford-Cartwright LC, Gómez-Díaz E. The regulatory genome of the malaria

vector *Anopheles gambiae*: integrating chromatin accessibility and gene expression.

bioRxiv. 2020:2020.06.22.164228.

66.   Tu Z. Eight novel families of miniature inverted repeat transposable elements in the

African malaria mosquito, Anopheles gambiae. Proceedings of the National Academy of

Sciences of the United States of America. 2001;98(4):1699-704.

67.   Sharakhov IV, White BJ, Sharakhova MV, Kayondo J, Lobo NF, Santolamazza F, et al.

Breakpoint structure reveals the unique origin of an interspecific chromosomal inversion (2La) in

the Anopheles gambiae complex. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the

United States of America. 2006;103(16):6258-62.

68.   Lobo NF, Sangaré DM, Regier AA, Reidenbach KR, Bretz DA, Sharakhova MV, et al.

Breakpoint structure of the Anopheles gambiae 2Rb chromosomal inversion. Malaria journal.

2010;9:293-.

69.   Corbett-Detig RB, Said I, Calzetta M, Genetti M, McBroome J, Maurer NW, et al. Fine-

Mapping Complex Inversion Breakpoints and Investigating Somatic Pairing in the

Anopheles gambiae Species Complex Using Proximity-Ligation Sequencing.

Genetics. 2019;213(4):1495.

70.   White BJ, Cheng C, Sangaré D, Lobo NF, Collins FH, Besansky NJ. The population

genomics of trans-specific inversion polymorphisms in Anopheles gambiae. Genetics.

2009;183(1):275-88.

71.   Smit A, Hubley R, Green P. *RepeatMasker Open-4.0* 2013-2015 [Available from:

http://www.repeatmasker.org

72.   Diesel JF, Ortiz MF, Marinotti O, Vasconcelos ATR, Loreto ELS. A re-annotation of the

Anopheles darlingi mobilome. Genetics and Molecular Biology. 2019;42(1):125-31.

73.   Fonseca PM, Moura RD, Wallau GL, Loreto ELS. The mobilome of Drosophila

incompta, a flower-breeding species: comparison of transposable element landscapes among

generalist and specialist flies. Chromosome Research. 2019;27(3):203-19.

74.   Petersen M, Armisén D, Gibbs RA, Hering L, Khila A, Mayer G, et al. Diversity and

evolution of the transposable element repertoire in arthropods with particular reference to

insects. BMC Evolutionary Biology. 2019;19(1):11-.

75.   Tubío JMC, Naveira H, Costas J. Structural and evolutionary analyses of the Ty3/gypsy

group of LTR retrotransposons in the genome of Anopheles gambiae. Molecular Biology and

Evolution. 2005;22(1):29-39.

76.   Tubío JMC, Tojo M, Bassaganyas L, Escaramis G, Sharakhov IV, Sharakhova MV, et al.

Evolutionary Dynamics of the Ty3/Gypsy LTR Retrotransposons in the Genome of Anopheles

gambiae. PLOS ONE. 2011;6(1):e16328.

77.   Ingham VA, Pignatelli P, Moore JD, Wagstaff S, Ranson H. The transcription factor Maf-

S regulates metabolic resistance to insecticides in the malaria vector Anopheles gambiae. BMC

genomics. 2017;18(1):669-.

78.   Osta MA, Christophides GK, Vlachou D, Kafatos FC. Innate immunity in the malaria

vector Anopheles gambiae: comparative and functional genomics. Journal of

Experimental Biology. 2004;207(15):2551.

79.   Xie D, Chen C-C, Ptaszek LM, Xiao S, Cao X, Fang F, et al. Rewirable gene regulatory

networks in the preimplantation embryonic development of three mammalian species. Genome

research. 2010;20(6):804-15.

80.   Bonizzoni M, Afrane Y, Dunn WA, Atieli FK, Zhou G, Zhong D, et al. Comparative

Transcriptome Analyses of Deltamethrin-Resistant and -Susceptible Anopheles gambiae

Mosquitoes from Kenya by RNA-Seq. PLOS ONE. 2012;7(9):e44607.

81.   Vannini L, Willis JH. Localization of RR-1 and RR-2 cuticular proteins within the cuticle

of Anopheles gambiae. Arthropod structure & development. 2017;46(1):13-29.

82.   Balabanidou V, Kefi M, Aivaliotis M, Koidou V, Girotti JR, Mijailovsky SJ, et al.

Mosquitoes cloak their legs to resist insecticides. Proceedings Biological sciences.

2019;286(1907):20191091-.

83.   Sriwichai P, Rongsiryam Y, Jariyapan N, Sattabongkot J, Apiwathnasorn C, Nacapunchai

D, et al. Cloning of a Trypsin-like Serine Protease and expression Patterns during *Plasmodium*

falciparum invasion in the mosquito, *Anopheles dirus* (Peyton and Harrison). Archives of Insect

Biochemistry and Physiology. 2012;80(3):151-65.

84.   Dias-Lopes G, Borges-Veloso A, Saboia-Vahia L, Domont GB, Britto C, Cuervo P, et al.

Expression of active trypsin-like serine peptidases in the midgut of sugar-feeding female

Anopheles aquasalis. Parasites & vectors. 2015;8:296-.

85.   Hughes GL, Ren X, Ramirez JL, Sakamoto JM, Bailey JA, Jedlicka AE, et al. Wolbachia

Infections in Anopheles gambiae Cells: Transcriptomic Characterization of a Novel Host-

Symbiont Interaction. PLOS Pathogens. 2011;7(2):e1001296.

86.   Cao X, Gulati M, Jiang H. Serine protease-related proteins in the malaria mosquito,

Anopheles gambiae. Insect biochemistry and molecular biology. 2017;88:48-62.

87.   Kent LB, Walden KKO, Robertson HM. The Gr Family of Candidate Gustatory and

Olfactory Receptors in the Yellow-Fever Mosquito Aedes aegypti. Chemical Senses.

2008;33(1):79-93.

88.   Dabiré RK, Namountougou M, Diabaté A, Soma DD, Bado J, Toé HK, et al. Distribution

and frequency of kdr mutations within Anopheles gambiae s.l. populations and first report of the

ace.1 G119S mutation in Anopheles arabiensis from Burkina Faso (West Africa). PloS one.

2014;9(7):e101484-e.

89.   Silva APB, Santos JMM, Martins AJ. Mutations in the voltage-gated sodium channel

gene of anophelines and their association with resistance to pyrethroids - a review. Parasites &

vectors. 2014;7:450-.

90.   Cheung J, Mahmood A, Kalathur R, Liu L, Carlier PR. Structure of the G119S Mutant

Acetylcholinesterase of the Malaria Vector Anopheles gambiae Reveals Basis of Insecticide

Resistance. Structure (London, England : 1993). 2018;26(1):130-6.e2.

91.   Elanga-Ndille E, Nouage L, Ndo C, Binyang A, Assatse T, Nguiffo-Nguete D, et al. The

G119S Acetylcholinesterase (Ace-1) Target Site Mutation Confers Carbamate Resistance in the

Major Malaria Vector Anopheles gambiae from Cameroon: A Challenge for the Coming IRS

Implementation. Genes. 2019;10(10):790.

92. Fadel AN, Ibrahim SS, Tchouakui M, Terence E, Wondji MJ, Tchoupo M, et al. A

combination of metabolic resistance and high frequency of the 1014F kdr mutation is driving

pyrethroid resistance in Anopheles coluzzii population from Guinea savanna of Cameroon.

Parasites & Vectors. 2019;12(1):263.

93. Santolamazza F, Calzetta M, Etang J, Barrese E, Dia I, Caccone A, et al. Distribution of

knock-down resistance mutations in Anopheles gambiae molecular forms in west and west-

central Africa. Malaria Journal. 2008;7(1):74.

94. Jones CM, Liyanapathirana M, Agossa FR, Weetman D, Ranson H, Donnelly MJ, et al.

Footprints of positive selection associated with a mutation (N1575Y) in the voltage-gated

sodium channel of Anopheles gambiae. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the

United States of America. 2012;109(17):6614-9.

95. Essandoh J, Yawson AE, Weetman D. Acetylcholinesterase (Ace-1) target site mutation

119S is strongly diagnostic of carbamate and organophosphate resistance in Anopheles gambiae

s.s. and Anopheles coluzzii across southern Ghana. Malaria Journal. 2013;12(1):404.

96. Wilson TG. Transposable Elements as Initiators of Insecticide Resistance. Journal of

Economic Entomology. 1993;86(3):645-51.

97. ffrench-Constant R, Daborn P, Feyereisen R. Resistance and the jumping gene.

BioEssays. 2006;28(1):6-8.

98. Rostant WG, Wedell N, Hosken DJ. Chapter 2 - Transposable Elements and Insecticide

Resistance. In: Goodwin SF, Friedmann T, Dunlap JC, editors. Advances in Genetics. 78:

Academic Press; 2012. p. 169-201.

99. Weedall GD, Riveron JM, Hearn J, Irving H, Kamdem C, Fouet C, et al. An Africa-wide

genomic evolution of insecticide resistance in the malaria vector Anopheles funestus involves

selective sweeps, copy number variations, gene conversion and transposons. PLOS Genetics.

2020;16(6):e1008822.

100.   Main BJ, Everitt A, Cornel AJ, Hormozdiari F, Lanzaro GC. Genetic variation associated

with increased insecticide resistance in the malaria mosquito, Anopheles coluzzii. Parasites &

vectors. 2018;11(1):225-.

101.   Adolfi A, Poulton B, Anthousi A, Macilwee S, Ranson H, Lycett GJ. Functional genetic

validation of key genes conferring insecticide resistance in the major African malaria vector,

Anopheles gambiae. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.

2019;116(51):25764.

102.   Bamou R, Sonhafouo-Chiana N, Mavridis K, Tchuinkam T, Wondji CS, Vontas J, et al.

Status of Insecticide Resistance and Its Mechanisms in Anopheles gambiae and Anopheles

coluzzii Populations from Forest Settings in South Cameroon. Genes. 2019;10(10):741.

103.   Cassone BJ, Kamdem C, Cheng C, Tan JC, Hahn MW, Costantini C, et al. Gene

expression divergence between malaria vector sibling species Anopheles gambiae and

An. coluzzii from rural and urban Yaoundé Cameroon. Molecular Ecology. 2014;23(9):2242-59.

104.   Waterhouse RM, Kriventseva EV, Meister S, Xi Z, Alvarez KS, Bartholomay LC, et al.

Evolutionary dynamics of immune-related genes and pathways in disease-vector mosquitoes.

Science (New York, NY). 2007;316(5832):1738-43.

105.   Clayton AM, Dong Y, Dimopoulos G. The <i>Anopheles</i> Innate Immune

System in the Defense against Malaria Infection. Journal of Innate Immunity. 2014;6(2):169-81.

106.   Volz J, Müller H-M, Zdanowicz A, Kafatos FC, Osta MA. A genetic module regulates

the melanization response of Anopheles to Plasmodium. Cellular Microbiology. 2006;8(9):1392-

405.

107.   Oliveira GdA, Lieberman J, Barillas-Mury C. Epithelial nitration by a peroxidase/NOX5

system mediates mosquito antiplasmodial immunity. Science (New York, NY).

2012;335(6070):856-9.

108.   Dennison NJ, BenMarzouk-Hidalgo OJ, Dimopoulos G. MicroRNA-regulation of

Anopheles gambiae immunity to Plasmodium falciparum infection and midgut microbiota.

Developmental & Comparative Immunology. 2015;49(1):170-8.

109.   Ruiz JL, Yerbanga RS, Lefèvre T, Ouedraogo JB, Corces VG, Gómez-Díaz E. Chromatin

changes in Anopheles gambiae induced by Plasmodium falciparum infection. Epigenetics &

Chromatin. 2019;12(1):5.

110.   Fernández-Medina RD, Ribeiro JMC, Carareto CMA, Velasque L, Struchiner CJ. Losing

identity: structural diversity of transposable elements belonging to different classes in the

genome of Anopheles gambiae. BMC genomics. 2012;13.

111.   Ou S, Liu J, Chougule KM, Fungtammasan A, Seetharam AS, Stein JC, et al. Effect of

sequence depth and length in long-read assembly of the maize inbred NC358. Nature

Communications. 2020;11(1):2288.

112.   Kofler R, Nolte V, Schlötterer C. Tempo and Mode of Transposable Element Activity in

Drosophila. PLOS Genetics. 2015;11(7):e1005406.

113.   Rech GE, Bogaerts-Márquez M, Barrón MG, Merenciano M, Villanueva-Cañas JL,

Horváth V, et al. Stress response, behavior, and development are shaped by transposable

element-induced mutations in Drosophila. PLOS Genetics. 2019;15(2):e1007900.

114.   Rishishwar L, Tellez Villa CE, Jordan IK. Transposable element polymorphisms

recapitulate human evolution. Mobile DNA. 2015;6:21-.

115.   Diehl AG, Ouyang N, Boyle AP. Transposable elements contribute to cell and species-

specific chromatin looping and gene regulation in mammalian genomes. Nature

Communications. 2020;11(1):1796.

116.   Haberer G, Kamal N, Bauer E, Gundlach H, Fischer I, Seidel MA, et al. European maize

genomes highlight intraspecies variation in repeat and gene content. Nature Genetics.

2020;52(9):950-7.

117.   Quadrana L, Bortolini Silveira A, Mayhew GF, LeBlanc C, Martienssen RA, Jeddeloh

JA, et al. The Arabidopsis thaliana mobilome and its impact at the species level. eLife.

2016;5:e15716.

118.   Stritt C, Wyler M, Gimmi EL, Pippel M, Roulin AC. Diversity, dynamics and effects of

long terminal repeat retrotransposons in the model grass Brachypodium distachyon. New

Phytologist. 2020;227(6):1736-48.

119.   Cridland JM, Macdonald SJ, Long AD, Thornton KR. Abundance and distribution of

transposable elements in two Drosophila QTL mapping resources. Molecular biology and

evolution. 2013;30(10):2311-27.

120.   Johnson MTJ, Munshi-South J. Evolution of life in urban environments. Science.

2017;358(6363):eaam8327.

121.   Mateo L, Ullastres A, González J. A Transposable Element Insertion Confers Xenobiotic

Resistance in Drosophila. PLOS Genetics. 2014;10(8):e1004560.

122.   Salces-Ortiz J, Vargas-Chavez C, Guio L, Rech GE, González J. Transposable elements

contribute to the genomic response to insecticides in Drosophila melanogaster. Philosophical

Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2020;375(1795):20190341.

123. Kamgang B, Tchapga W, Ngoagouni C, Sangbakembi-Ngounou C, Wondji M, Riveron

JM, et al. Exploring insecticide resistance mechanisms in three major malaria vectors from

Bangui in Central African Republic. Pathogens and global health. 2018;112(7):349-59.

124. Grau-Bové X, Tomlinson S, O'Reilly AO, Harding NJ, Miles A, Kwiatkowski D, et al.

Evolution of the Insecticide Target Rdl in African Anopheles Is Driven by Interspecific and

Interkaryotypic Introgression. Molecular Biology and Evolution. 2020;37(10):2900-17.

125. The Anopheles gambiae Genomes Consortium. Genome variation and population

structure among 1142 mosquitoes of the African malaria vector species Anopheles gambiae and

Anopheles coluzzii. Genome Research. 2020;30(10):1533-46.

126. Sundaram V, Cheng Y, Ma Z, Li D, Xing X, Edge P, et al. Widespread contribution of

transposable elements to the innovation of gene regulatory networks. Genome research.

2014;24(12):1963-76.

127. Jiang J-C, Upton KR. Human transposons are an abundant supply of transcription factor

binding sites and promoter activities in breast cancer cell lines. Mobile DNA. 2019;10:16-.

128. Villanueva-Cañas JL, Horvath V, Aguilera L, González J. Diverse families of

transposable elements affect the transcriptional regulation of stress-response genes in Drosophila

melanogaster. Nucleic Acids Research. 2019;47(13):6842-57.

129. Sundaram V, Wysocka J. Transposable elements as a potent source of diverse cis-

regulatory sequences in mammalian genomes. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society

B: Biological Sciences. 2020;375(1795):20190347.

130. Koren S, Walenz BP, Berlin K, Miller JR, Bergman NH, Phillippy AM. Canu: scalable

and accurate long-read assembly via adaptive k-mer weighting and repeat separation. Genome

research. 2017;27(5):722-36.

131.   Roach MJ, Schmidt SA, Borneman AR. Purge Haplotigs: allelic contig reassignment for

third-gen diploid genome assemblies. BMC Bioinformatics. 2018;19(1):460.

132.   Vaser R, Sović I, Nagarajan N, Šikić M. Fast and accurate de novo genome assembly

from long uncorrected reads. Genome research. 2017;27(5):737-46.

133.   Loman NJ, Quick J, Simpson JT. A complete bacterial genome assembled de novo using

only nanopore sequencing data. Nature Methods. 2015;12(8):733-5.

134.   Walker BJ, Abeel T, Shea T, Priest M, Abouelliel A, Sakthikumar S, et al. Pilon: An

Integrated Tool for Comprehensive Microbial Variant Detection and Genome Assembly

Improvement. PLOS ONE. 2014;9(11):e112963.

135.   Laetsch DR, Blaxter ML. BlobTools: Interrogation of genome assemblies.

F1000Research. 2017;6(1287).

136.   Alonge M, Soyk S, Ramakrishnan S, Wang X, Goodwin S, Sedlazeck FJ, et al. RaGOO:

fast and accurate reference-guided scaffolding of draft genomes. Genome Biology.

2019;20(1):224.

137.   Shumate A, Salzberg SL. Liftoff: an accurate gene annotation mapping tool. bioRxiv.

2020:2020.06.24.169680.

138.   Okonechnikov K, Golosova O, Fursov M, the Ut. Unipro UGENE: a unified

bioinformatics toolkit. Bioinformatics. 2012;28(8):1166-7.

139.   Robinson JT, Thorvaldsdóttir H, Winckler W, Guttman M, Lander ES, Getz G, et al.

Integrative genomics viewer. Nature biotechnology. 2011;29(1):24-6.

140.   Fu L, Niu B, Zhu Z, Wu S, Li W. CD-HIT: accelerated for clustering the next-generation

sequencing data. Bioinformatics (Oxford, England). 2012;28(23):3150-2.

141.   Hoede C, Arnoux S, Moisset M, Chaumier T, Inizan O, Jamilloux V, et al. PASTEC: An

Automatic Transposable Element Classification Tool. PLOS ONE. 2014;9(5):e91929.

142.   Camacho C, Coulouris G, Avagyan V, Ma N, Papadopoulos J, Bealer K, et al. BLAST+:

architecture and applications. BMC bioinformatics. 2009;10:421-.

143.   Fernández-Medina RD, Struchiner CJ, Ribeiro JMC. Novel transposable elements from

Anopheles gambiae. BMC Genomics. 2011;12(1):260-.

144.   Bao W, Kojima KK, Kohany O. Repbase Update, a database of repetitive elements in

eukaryotic genomes. Mobile DNA. 2015;6(1):4-9.

145.   Darling AE, Mau B, Perna NT. progressiveMauve: Multiple Genome Alignment with

Gene Gain, Loss and Rearrangement. PLOS ONE. 2010;5(6):e11147.

146.   Li H. Minimap2: pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences. Bioinformatics.

2018;34(18):3094-100.

147.   Goubert C, Modolo L, Vieira C, ValienteMoro C, Mavingui P, Boulesteix M. De novo

assembly and annotation of the Asian tiger mosquito (Aedes albopictus) repeatome with

dnaPipeTE from raw genomic reads and comparative analysis with the yellow fever mosquito

(Aedes aegypti). Genome biology and evolution. 2015;7(4):1192-205.

148.   Lawrence M, Huber W, Pagès H, Aboyoun P, Carlson M, Gentleman R, et al. Software

for Computing and Annotating Genomic Ranges. PLOS Computational Biology.

2013;9(8):e1003118.

149.   Sandelin A, Alkema W, Engström P, Wasserman WW, Lenhard B. JASPAR: an open-

access database for eukaryotic transcription factor binding profiles. Nucleic Acids Research.

2004;32(suppl_1):D91-D4.

150.   Grant CE, Bailey TL, Noble WS. FIMO: scanning for occurrences of a given motif.

Bioinformatics. 2011;27(7):1017-8.

151.   Bailey TL, Boden M, Buske FA, Frith M, Grant CE, Clementi L, et al. MEME SUITE:

tools for motif discovery and searching. Nucleic Acids Res. 2009;37(Web Server issue):W202-8.

152.   Sloutskin A, Danino YM, Orenstein Y, Zehavi Y, Doniger T, Shamir R, et al. ElemeNT:

a computational tool for detecting core promoter elements. Transcription. 2015;6(3):41-50.

1198

1199

1200

1201

1202

1203

1204

1205

1206

1207

1208

1209

1210

1211

1212

1213

1214

 FIGURES

 Figure 1. Transposable elements in *An. coluzzii*.

 A) Geographic location of the six breeding sites analyzed (in red) and of the place of origin of

 the Ngousso colony (in grey) which was used to generate the *AcolN1* genome. B) Number of TE

 families identified when using a single genome or when using all possible combinations of more

 than one genome. The red line shows the total number of TE families and the blue line shows the

 number of newly described families. Note that 76% of all the TE copies where already identified

 when analyzing a single genome (Additional File 2). C) Classification of all TE families and

 newly described families in *An. coluzzii*. The three most abundant superfamilies from each order

 are shown.

Figure 2. Structure, abundance and phylogenetic distribution of novel TE families.

The four newly identified TRIMs families are shown, for the remaining 60 novel families see

Additional file 3: Figure S2. A) The structure of each new family is displayed: the light blue box

represents the full extension of the TE and the red arrows represent LTRs. B) All insertions for

each TE family were identified and are shown as a coverage plot in which each lines represents a

copy in the genome. Note that the large number of stacked horizontal lines in the extremes of the

plot represent and abundance of solo LTRs. C) Phylogenetic distribution of the TE family

insertions in 15 members of the *Anopheles* genus, *Culex quinquefasciatus, Ae. Aegypti* and *D.*

melanogaster. The number of insertions with more than 80% identity and spanning at least 80%

of the consensus, in each species is shown using a black and white gradient. Species with no

insertions are shown in white while species with 15 or more insertions are shown in black.

1242

1243

Figure 3. Differences in TE content between the seven *An. coluzzii* genomes.

Differences are shown at the (A) order and (B) superfamily levels. χ^2 tests were performed for the number of insertions and the Person's residuals are shown. Note that MITEs are divided into the m3bp, m4bp, m8bp and mTA superfamilies.

Figure 4. TE insertions distribution throughout the genomes.

A) Percentage of euchromatin and heterochromatin occupied by TEs in each of the seven

analyzed genomes. Each order is shown in a different color. B) Boxplots of the percentage of the

euchromatin of each chromosome covered by TEs. Autosomes are shown in blue and the X

chromosome in red. C) Percentage of TE insertions in each genome that fall in a specific

genomic region. A red line is used to display the expected percentage that should be covered by

TEs taking in consideration the size of the genomic region. Each order is shown in a different

color as in A).

1259

1260

1261

1262

1263

1264

Figure 5. TE insertions near known inversion breakpoints.

Diagram of chromosome 2 with the analyzed inversions. For each inversion both breakpoints,

proximal (closer to the centromere) and distal (farther from the centromere), plus 2.5 kb to each

side are shown. When the position of a breakpoint was not identified at the single base pair level,

the interval where the breakpoint is predicted to be is shown in a grey box. Genes are shown as

blue boxes while TEs are shown as pink boxes. Below each TE, the family of the TE is shown

and below the family name the number of genomes where the insertion was found and the

number of genomes where the breakpoint region was identified. Note that breakpoints are shared

among some of the inversions.

Figure 6. TE insertions in the neighborhood of genes involved in insecticide resistance.

The gene structure is shown in black with arrows representing the exons. TE insertions are

depicted as red boxes. When containing a TFBS for *cnc* or a promoter they are filled in red,

otherwise they are empty. The red color is darker on fixed TEs and lighter on polymorphic TEs.

Promoters are shown as arrows while *cnc* binding sites are shown in blue. Resistance alleles are

shown for *para* (*kdr*).

1283

1284

1285

1286

1287

1288

1289

1290

1291

1292

1293

ADDITIONAL FILES

File name: Additional file 1

File format: Microsoft Excel Binary File format (xls)

Title of data: Supplementary Tables

Description of data: Supplementary Tables

File name: Additional file 2

File format: Portable document format (pdf)

Title of data: Figure S1. Number of TE copies identified when using the TE libraries from an

increasing number of genomes.

Description of data: Number of TE copies identified when using the TE library of a single

genome or when using all possible combinations of more than one genome.

File name: Additional file 3

File format: Portable document format (pdf)

Title of data: Figure S2. Novel TE families

Description of data: Newly described families. A) The structure of each new family is displayed:

the light blue box represents the full extension of the TE and the red arrows represent LTRs. B)

All insertions for each TE family are shown as a coverage plot where each line represents a copy

in a genome. C) Phylogenetic distribution of the TE family insertions in 15 members of the

Anopheles genus, *Culex quinquefasciatus, Ae. Aegypti* and *D. melanogaster*. The number of

insertions with more than 80% identity and spanning at least 80% of the consensus, in each

1317 species is shown using a black and white gradient. Species with no insertions are shown in white

1318 while species with 50 or more insertions are shown in black.

1319

1320 File name: Additional file 4

1321 File format: Portable document format (pdf)

1322 Title of data: Figure S3. Number of TE insertions vs genome size

1323 Description of data: Comparison of the bases spanned by TEs in each genome with their full

1324 genome sizes.

1325

1326 File name: Additional file 5

1327 File format: Portable document format (pdf)

1328 Title of data: Figure S4. TE landscapes

1329 Description of data: TE landscapes for the six genomes sequenced in this work generated using

1330 dnaPipeTE

1331

1332 File name: Additional file 6

1333 File format: Portable document format (pdf)

1334 Title of data: Figure S5. Genes with TE insertions from active families

1335 Description of data: Diagrams of TE insertions closer than 1 kb to genes showing the gene

1336 structure and the TE insertion

1337

1338 File name: Additional file 7

1339 File format: Portable document format (pdf)

1340   Title of data: Figure S6. Genes associated with insecticide resistance with TE insertions

1341   Description of data: Diagrams of genes associated with insecticide resistance showing the gene

1342   structure and the TE insertions closer than 1 kb to gene.