1 **Ecological correlates of gene family size in a pine-feeding sawfly genome and across**
2 **Hymenoptera**
3

4 Kim L. Vertacnik[1,2], Danielle K. Herrig[1], R. Keating Godfrey[3], Tom Hill[4,5], Scott M. Geib[6], Robert L.
5 Unckless[4], David R. Nelson[7], and Catherine R. Linnen[1]
6
[1]Department of Biology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506, USA
[2]Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, Hagerman, ID 83332, USA (current address)
[3]Department of Neuroscience, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA
[4]Department of Molecular Biosciences, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045, USA
[5]NIH Frederick National Laboratory for Cancer Research, Frederick, MD 21702, USA
[6]Tropical Crop and Commodity Protection Research Unit, United States Department of Agriculture:
Agriculture Research Service Pacific Basin Agricultural Research Center, Hilo, Hawaii 96720, USA
[7]Department of Microbiology, Immunology and Biochemistry, University of Tennessee Health Science
Center, Memphis, TN 38163, USA
16
17
18 Correspondence: kvertacnik@critfc.org

20 **Keywords:** evolutionary predictability, adaptation, chemosensation, detoxification, immunity,
21 Hymenoptera, draft genome

Abstract

A central goal in evolutionary biology is to determine the predictability of adaptive genetic changes. Despite many documented cases of convergent evolution at individual loci, little is known about the repeatability of gene family expansions and contractions. To address this void, we examined gene family evolution in the redheaded pine sawfly *Neodiprion lecontei*, a non-eusocial hymenopteran and exemplar of a pine-specialized lineage evolved from angiosperm-feeding ancestors. After assembling and annotating a draft genome, we manually annotated multiple gene families with chemosensory, detoxification, or immunity functions and characterized their genomic distributions and evolutionary history. Our results suggest that expansions of bitter gustatory receptor (GR), clan 3 cytochrome P450 (CYP3), and antimicrobial peptide (AMP) subfamilies may have contributed to pine adaptation. By contrast, there was no evidence of recent gene family contraction via pseudogenization. Next, we compared the number of genes in these same families across insect taxa that vary in diet, dietary specialization, and social behavior. In Hymenoptera, herbivory was associated with small GR and olfactory receptor (OR) families, eusociality was associated with large OR and small AMP families, and—unlike investigations in more closely related taxa—ecological specialization was not related to gene family size. Overall, our results suggest that gene families that mediate ecological interactions may expand and contract predictably in response to particular selection pressures, however, the ecological drivers and temporal pace of gene gain and loss likely varies considerably across gene families.

Introduction

Changes in gene family size are a potentially important source of evolutionary innovation. When gene families grow via duplication, for example, reduced functional constraints may facilitate the development of phenotypic novelty (Ohno 1970; Demuth and Hahn 2009). Reductions in gene family size can also enable novel traits. For example, the colonization of highly specialized niches like oligotrophic caves (Protas et al. 2006; Gross et al. 2009; Yang et al. 2016) and toxic host plants (Matsuo et al. 2007; McBride 2007; Good et al. 2014) is linked to rampant pseudogenization. Together, these observations suggest that gene families predictably expand or contract in response to specific selection pressures. Yet compared to the rich and growing literature on genetic convergence at individual loci (Martin and Orgogozo 2013), the repeatability and predictability of gene family evolution remains understudied.

The evolution of many gene families, defined here as groups of genes that share sequence and functional similarity from common ancestry (Dayhoff 1976; Demuth and Hahn 2009), is consistent with a birth-death model where genes arise via duplication (gene gain) and are lost via deletion or pseudogenization (gene loss) (Hughes and Nei 1992; Nei and Rooney 2005). When frequency rates of

duplication and deletion evolve primarily through genetic drift, over time gene family sizes contract and

expand via a process dubbed genomic drift (Nei 2007; Nozawa et al. 2007). Overall, the stochastic birth-

death process of genomic drift (which differs from Nei's conceptual birth-death model of gene family

evolution (Hahn et al. 2005)) sufficiently explains most gene family size distributions within genomes

(Karev et al. 2002) and between species (Hahn et al. 2007).

But during an ecological shift, natural selection can influence birth-death dynamics by promoting

the expansion or contraction of specific gene families. Thus, taxa adapted to a novel niche may have

genomic evidence of selective maintenance for gene duplications or deletions. For example, if selection

favors gene gain, novel gene duplicates will tend to persist in the population and form subfamilies of

recently diverged paralogs. If the mutational mechanism that generates new duplicate genes is unequal

crossing over during meiosis, these recently diverged paralogs will be arranged in tandem arrays across

the genome (Zhang 2003). Moreover, if duplicates experience positive selection for novel functions, they

can have elevated amino acid substitution rates. Conversely, some genetic functions may become obsolete

or even deleterious in the novel habitat. In this case, positive or relaxed purifying selection will cause

some gene families to accumulate loss-of-function mutations at an accelerated rate.

After an ecological shift, impacted gene families will eventually reach a new equilibrium state

where gene number evolves primarily through negative selection and genomic drift. Likewise, tandem

array lengths will reflect local recombination rates (Akhunov et al. 2003; Zhang and Gaut 2003; Rizzon et

al. 2006; Thomas 2006) and pseudogenes will fade into the genomic background (Petrov et al. 1996;

Petrov and Hartl 1997, 1998). Thus, within-genome signatures of adaptive changes in gene family size are

likely ephemeral and best detected in lineages that *recently* shifted to a novel niche. Plus, if selection

consistently favors the expansion or contraction of specific gene families in specific environments,

among-taxon correlations between gene family size and ecology should be maintained. Currently, the

extent to which different taxa converge at the level of gene family size changes is largely unknown.

Arguably, the genes most likely to expand and contract convergently in response to similar

selection pressures are those that mediate organismal interactions with their biotic and abiotic

environments. These "environmentally responsive genes" include chemosensory (e.g., olfactory and

gustatory receptors), detoxifying (e.g., cytochrome P450), and immunity (e.g., immunoglobulin and

MHC) genes. To cope with constantly changing pressures, environmentally responsive genes tend to be

characterized by elevated sequence diversity, duplication rates, substitution rates, and genomic clustering,

as well as tissue- or temporal-specific expression (Berenbaum 2002) and limited pleiotropy (Arguello et

al. 2016). Importantly, causal links between changes in environmentally responsive genes and adaptation

to novel niches have been established for multiple taxa (Després et al. 2007; Matsuo et al. 2007; Dobler et

al. 2012; Zhen et al. 2012; Sezutsu et al. 2013).

With exceptionally diverse ecologies and an ever-increasing availability of annotated genomes

(Consortium 2013; Poelchau et al. 2015), insects are a powerful system for investigating the predictability

of size changes in environmentally responsive gene families. To date, at least two ecological transitions

are hypothesized to have a predictable impact on gene family size in insect lineages. In plant-feeding

insects, the evolution of increased dietary specialization (i.e., smaller diet breadth) is associated with

reduced chemosensory and detoxifying gene family sizes (McBride 2007; McBride and Arguello 2007;

Good et al. 2014; Goldman-Huertas et al. 2015; Calla et al. 2017; Comeault et al. 2017) but see (Gardiner

et al. 2008). In hymenopteran insects, eusociality is associated with expansions of the olfactory-receptor

family and contractions of the gustatory-receptor family (Robertson and Wanner 2006; Zhou et al. 2015;

McKenzie et al. 2016; Brand and Ramírez 2017) but see (Fischman et al. 2011; Johnson et al. 2018).

Most of these studies, however, consider a single ecological characteristic or gene family (but see

Robertson and Wanner 2006) which is problematic since changes in social behavior may often be

accompanied by changes in other ecological characteristics and vice versa (Faulkes et al. 1997; Duffy and

Macdonald 2010; Ross et al. 2013). A better understanding of ecology and gene family size relationships

requires simultaneous consideration of multiple ecological characteristics and diverse gene families.

Here, we characterize multiple environmentally responsive gene families in the genome of the

redheaded pine sawfly, *Neodiprion lecontei* (Order: Hymenoptera; Family: Diprionidae). This species

provides an opportunity to examine both within-genome signatures of adaptive gene family contractions

and expansions, and among-lineage correlations between ecology and gene family size. First, for within-

genome signatures, *N. lecontei* is an exemplar of an herbivorous hymenopteran lineage (Diprionidae) that

underwent a drastic host shift: sometime within the last 60 million years, this lineage transitioned from

angiosperms to coniferous host plants in the family Pinaceae (Boevé et al. 2013; Peters et al. 2017). To

defend against herbivores and pathogens, Pinaceae produce viscous oleoresin secretions that are sticky

and have unique antimicrobial properties (Trapp and Croteau 2001; Gershenzon and Dudareva 2007). To

manage these toxic and extraordinarily sticky resins, *N. lecontei* and related diprionids evolved

specialized feeding and egg-laying traits (Figure 1). Beyond these traits, we hypothesize that pine

specialization likely resulted in pronounced changes to the selection pressures acting on multiple gene

families, especially those involved in chemosensation, detoxification, and immune function. Second, with

respect to among-lineage correlations between ecology and gene-family size, *N. lecontei* is an

herbivorous, non-eusocial insect from the Eusymphyta, a massively understudied hymenopteran clade

(Peters et al. 2017). Although many assembled and annotated hymenopteran genomes are currently

available, almost all have come from apocritans (bees, wasps, and ants, but see (Robertson et al. 2018)).

Thus, *N. lecontei* increases the ecological, behavioral, and taxonomic diversity of hymenopteran genomes

for evaluating ecological correlates of gene family size among taxa.

To evaluate the predictability of gene family evolution, we assembled a draft genome for *N.*
lecontei and manually annotated genes for five environmentally responsive gene families: olfactory
receptor (OR), gustatory receptor (GR), odorant binding protein (OBP), cytochrome P450 (CYP), and
antimicrobial peptide (AMP). For gene families that underwent a size change related to pine adaptation,
we expected one or more of the following patterns: (1) clusters of recently diverged paralogs in gene-
family trees, (2) a high proportion of genes in tandem arrays, (3) signatures of positive selection among
paralogs, and (4) elevated rates of pseudogenization. Then, for the same five gene families, we asked
whether gene-family size correlated with ecology among distantly related insect taxa. To do so, we
compiled published gene annotations and ecological variables (diet type, degree of ecological
specialization, presence/absence of eusociality) for hymenopteran taxa. Together, these analyses identify
possible candidate gene families underlying pine specialization and reveal that relationships between gene
family size and ecology differ among environmentally responsive gene families.
135

Results

Genome assembly and annotation

Sequencing and assembly

We sequenced one mate-pair and two small-insert Illumina libraries made from haploid male
siblings (see Methods). After read processing, we retained 268 billion PE100 reads with a combined read
depth of 112x (Table S1). ALLPATHS-LG (v47417) (Gnerre et al. 2011) produced a 239-Mbp assembly
consisting of 4523 scaffolds, with a scaffold N50 of 243 kbp (Table S2). Prior studies identified seven
chromosomes in *N. lecontei* (Smith 1941; Maxwell 1958; Sohi and Ennis 1981; Linnen et al. 2018). With
an estimated genome size (1C) of 331 ±9.6 Mbp, our assembly captured 72% of the genome. Overall,
these metrics are comparable to other hymenopteran assemblies (Table S2).

To measure assembly completeness and artificial sequence duplication, we used CEGMA (Parra
et al. 2007) and BUSCO (Simão et al. 2015). Both search the assembly for a set of single-copy, conserved
genes, however, the CEGMA software has been deprecated (http://korflab.ucdavis.edu/Datasets/cegma).
Of the 248 CEGMA core eukaryotic genes, 90% aligned as complete, single copies and 8% aligned
complete but duplicated. For BUSCO, we used the OrthoDB arthropod dataset, and out of 2675 groups
77% were complete, single copies and 3% were complete but duplicated. These metrics indicate the
presence of artificial duplicate sequences, but otherwise the assembly was reasonably complete and
suitable for annotation.

About 15.8% of the assembly consisted of repetitive elements, including 122 unknown
transposable elements that were mostly unique to *N. lecontei* (Table S3), and 212 other families of
transposable elements and simple repeats. This 15.8% corresponds to 11.4% of the actual 331-Mb

genome, of which we predict 27.6% is repetitive, suggesting that ~16.1% of the missing ~28% of the

genome is repetitive content (Table S3). For de novo gene prediction, we included the *N.*

lecontei transcriptome and protein-coding genes from *Atta cephalotes* (OGSv1.2), *Acromyrmex echinatior*

(OGSv3.8), *Apis melifera* (OGSv3.2), *Athalia rosae* (OGSv1.0), and *Nasonia vitripennis* (OGSv1.0) to

guide annotation. The official gene set (OGSv1) had 12,980 gene models while the transcriptome had an

average of 26,000 transcripts per tissue (Table S4).

Olfactory receptor

The OR gene family had 56 genes total, including the co-receptor *Orco*; one gene contained stop

codons, three were partial annotations, and 52 genes were intact (Table 1). In *D. melanogaster* most

olfactory sensory neurons (OSNs) express a single OR (along with the coreceptor, *Orco*), and OSNs

expressing a particular OR converge on a single glomerulus in the antennal lobe (Gao et al. 2000;

Vosshall et al. 2000; Couto et al. 2005) but see (Fishilevich and Vosshall 2005). This anatomy results in a

general one-to-one correspondence between the number of ORs and the number of glomeruli, a

correspondence also observed in the hymenopteran European honey bee (*Apis mellifera*, (Robertson and

Wanner 2006)). Based on these studies and examination of the antennal lobes of adult male and adult

female *N. lecontei*, we expected to find a minimum of 49 functional ORs (Table S5, Figure 2). The close

correspondence between our gene annotations and glomeruli counts suggests that we have located all or

most *N. lecontei* OR genes.

59% of ORs were in genomic clusters of two or more genes (Figure 3), a low proportion

compared to many other hymenopteran OR families (Robertson and Wanner 2006; Zhou et al. 2015;

McKenzie et al. 2016; Brand and Ramírez 2017). A phylogenetic analysis of OR protein sequences from

Neodiprion, six other hymenopterans, and *D. melanogaster* identified three *Neodiprion*-specific clades

with at least five genes (Figure S1a). These same three clades were also recovered in a phylogenetic

analysis of *Neodiprion* OR cDNA sequences (Figure S1b). For each *Neodiprion*-specific OR clade (and

Neodiprion-specific clades in other gene families, see below), we used the *Neodiprion* cDNA tree, the

codeml program in the PAML package (Yang 2007), and likelihood-ratio tests to ask: (1) whether the

ratio of non-synonymous to synonymous substitution rates (dN/dS or ω) for the focal OR clade differed

from the rest of the *Neodiprion* OR gene family and, if so, whether they exhibited evidence of positive

selection (ω>1) (branch tests); and (2) whether ω differed among sites across members of *Neodiprion*-

specific clades and, if so, which sites exhibited evidence of positive selection (site tests). For only one OR

clade (OR clade 1) did we detect evidence of branch-specific positive selection (i.e., rejection of both 1-

ratio and fixed-ω models), but this clade lacked evidence of site-specific positive selection (Table 2).

Gustatory receptor

The GR gene family had 44 genes total; two genes contained stop codons, two were partial

annotations (one annotation was both partial and pseudogenized), and 41 were intact (Table 1). 76% of

the GRs that could be placed on chromosomes were in genomic clusters (Figure 3) with three *Neodiprion*-

specific clades of at least five genes (Figures S2a and S2b). Only one clade (GR clade 3) had evidence of

branch-specific positive selection (Table 2). This clade also had evidence of positive selection at some

amino acid positions among paralogs (Table 2; sites with evidence of positive selection include: 77E,

79S, 146N, 275S, 301S). Notably, GR Clade 3 is an expansion of six paralogs orthologous to *DmGR66a*,

a bitter receptor specifically for caffeine (Moon et al. 2006). However, *N. lecontei* orthologs were not

found for *DmGR93a* (Lee et al. 2009) and *DmGr33a* (Moon et al. 2009), coreceptors possibly required

for caffeine detection. Together, these data suggest that caffeine-like GR receptors have been coopted for

novel functions in *N. lecontei*.

The GR family also had orthologs for sugar receptors *DmGR5a* (trehalose) (Dahanukar et al.

2001), *DmGR43a* (fructose) (Miyamoto et al. 2012), and *DmGR64a-f* (multiple sugars) (Slone et al.

2007) as well as carbon dioxide receptors *DmGR21a* and *DmGR63a* (Jones et al. 2007) (Figure S2a).

Orthologs to these carbon dioxide receptors have not been found in Apocrita but seem to be preserved in

Symphyta, like *N. lecontei* (Robertson and Kent 2009; Robertson et al. 2018).

Odorant binding protein

The OBP gene family had 13 genes total; none were pseudogenized or partial annotations (Table

1). In this family, 38% of genes were in genomic clusters, including a cluster of five genes on

chromosome 6 (Figure 3). *Neodiprion*-specific OBP clades were not found, even for the chromosome 6

cluster. We note, however, that the OBP phylogenies had low bootstrap support (Figure S3a,b), making it

difficult to infer relationships among paralogs.

Cytochrome P450

The CYP gene family had 107 genes total; twelve genes contained stop codons, two were partial

annotations, and 93 were intact (Table 1). In insects, CYPs belong to four major clades, which are

referred to as clans (Feyereisen 2012). When we split the CYP gene family by clan, the CYP2 clan had

nine intact genes; the CYP3 clan had 47 intact genes and eight pseudogenes; the CYP4 clan had 27 intact

genes, four pseudogenes, and two partial genes; and the mitochondrial CYP clan had 10 intact genes

(Table 1). Across all CYPs, 66% were in genomic clusters (Figure 3). Looking at the four major clans

separately, the percentage of clustered genes were: 33% for CYP2, 81% for CYP3, 55% for CYP4, and

50% for mitochondrial CYP.

The CYP gene family had five *Neodiprion*-specific clades with at least five genes (Figure S4a,b),

four of which were in the CYP3 clan. Of these, two clades that were both within the CYP3 clan (CYP

clades 3 and 5) had evidence of branch-specific, but not site-specific, positive selection (Table 2). CYP

clade 3 contained members of the CYP6 subfamily, and the CYP clade 5 contained members of the CYP336 subfamily. Several studies to date suggest that members of the CYP3 clan—and the CYP6 subfamily in particular—play an important role in detoxifying pesticides and host-plant allelochemicals (Feyereisen 2012).

Orthologs were found for all the Halloween genes (which include genes from both the CYP2 and mitochondrial CYP clans) of the 20-hydroxy ecdysone biosynthesis pathway: *CYP302A1* (disembodied), *CYP306A1* (phantom), *CYP307A2* (spookier), *CYP307B1* (spookiest), *CYP314A1* (shade), *CYP315A1* (shadow), and *CYP18A1* which turns over 20-hydroxy ecdysone (Rewitz et al. 2007; Feyereisen 2011; Guittard et al. 2011; Qu et al. 2015). The juvenile hormone biosynthesis gene *CYP15A1* was present as well (Helvig et al. 2004). Finally, *N. lecontei* had orthologs for the two CYP4G enzymes that synthesize the cuticular hydrocarbons used as external waterproof coating (Qiu et al. 2012).

Immunity

Antimicrobial peptides (AMPs) are expressed upon infection to kill or inhibit microbes. Based on hymenopteran sequences, the *N. lecontei* AMP gene family had 21 genes (Table 1; Table S6), including single copies of *Hymenoptaecin*, *Abaecin*, and *Tachystatin*, but no clear *Defensin* ortholog. Over 18 *Hisnavicin* genes were identified, including a *Neodiprion*-specific expansion of eight histidine-rich paralogs orthologous to *Hisnavicin-4*, which has been characterized as a larval cuticle protein and AMP, but not functionally tested (Tian et al. 2010). The *N. lecontei* Hisnavicins had a conserved 62 amino acid motif that appeared up to 19 times in a single protein; the purpose of this amplification is unknown. 95% of the AMPs were in genomic clusters (Figure 3). Due to low bootstrap support on many of the branches in our Hisnavicin protein tree, we could not identify unambiguous *Neodiprion*-specific clades (Figure S5a). However, our *Neodiprion* cDNA tree (Figure S5b) did reveal strong support for the monophyly of a cluster of 15 *Hisnavicins* on linkage group 5 (Figure 3), and this cluster had some evidence of positive selection (Table 2).

Outside of the AMP family, most immune pathways had direct orthologs between *N. lecontei* and *D. melanogaster* (Figure S6, Table S7). The basic viral siRNA response pathway was completely conserved between species. The immune deficiency (IMD) pathway was missing an ortholog for the peptidoglycan recognition receptor *PGRP-LC*, but it is likely that another *PGRP* replaced *PGRP-LC* in *N. lecontei*; assigning PGRP orthology was also difficult in ants (Gupta et al. 2015). Also missing is the *Drosophila* mitogen activated protein kinase kinase kinase, TGF-β activated kinase 1 (*Tak1*), but *N. lecontei* had a similar TGF-β activated kinase that is a close ortholog to several *Tak1-like D. melanogaster* proteins possibly involved in immune deficiency signaling. The encapsulation/melanization pathway was missing one of the two *Drosophila* GTPases (*Rak2*). The *N. lecontei Rak1* ortholog may be playing both roles, but again this is likely due to the difficulty of assigning one-to-one orthologs. The

Duox pathway was missing the top G-protein coupled receptor, but this is unknown in *D. melanogaster*

and unidentified in other Hymenoptera (Evans et al. 2006). Interestingly, *N. lecontei* had two copies of

Dual Oxidase (*Duox*), which regulates commensal gut microbiota and infectious microbes (Ha et al. 2005;

Lee et al. 2015); *Apis mellifera* had one copy. Finally, the Toll pathway *NF-kappaB* transcription factor,

Dorsal-related immunity factor (Dif) does not have a one-to-one ortholog in *N. lecontei*, but two copies of

its paralog, *Dorsal*, were present.

Within-genome signatures of adaptive expansions and contractions

Evidence of selection in Neodiprion-*specific gene family clades*

Massive gene family expansions with dozens of genes were not found in *N. lecontei* (in contrast

to (Smadja et al. 2009; Zhou et al. 2015)). Instead, the largest *Neodiprion*-specific clade had 22 genes

(CYP gene family) and the rest had fewer than 10 genes. Nevertheless, we did identify 11 *Neodiprion*-

specific clades containing at least 5 closely related paralogs and a monophyletic clade of 15 AMPs with

ambiguous ancestry (Table 1). Of these 12 clades, four had significant branch positive selection (OR

clade 1, GR clade 3, CYP clade 3, and CYP clade 5) (Table 2). Of these four clades, only one also had

significant site-specific positive selection (GR clade 3) (Table 2).

Clustering

Our five focal gene families varied in the proportion of genes that were found in clusters of two

or more genes (Fisher's exact test, $P = 0.002$; Table 1). Post-hoc tests revealed that much of this variation

was due to differences between the highly clustered AMP family and all other families except GR (AMP

vs. OR: $P = 0.0091$; AMP vs. OBP: $P = 0.0053$; AMP vs. CYP: $P = 0.024$, AMP vs. GR: $P = 0.12$; all p-

values are FDR-corrected). The only other difference in clustering that we detected was between the GR

and singleton-heavy OBP families (FDR-corrected $P = 0.045$).

Differences in clustering were even more pronounced when we separated the CYP family by clan

(Fisher's exact test, $P < 0.0001$; Table 1). In addition to the pairwise differences described above, we also

found that the proportion of CYP3 genes found in clusters differed significantly from ORs, CYP2s, and

CYP4s (all FDR-corrected $P < 0.05$), but not AMPs, GRs, and mitochondrial CYPs. Additionally, AMP

clustering differed from CYP2, CYP4, and mitochondrial CYP, while GR differed from CYP2 (all FDR-

corrected $P < 0.05$). Together, these analyses identified AMP, GR, and CYP3 as having an unusually high

proportion of genes found in clusters compared to other environmentally responsive gene families.

Pseudogenization

Overall, we found very few pseudogenes, and the proportion of pseudogenized genes did not

differ significantly among gene families (Fisher's exact test, $P = 0.12$; Table 1). The chemoreceptors had

one pseudogene each while CYP had 12, which is about 10% of the family, but this was also the largest

gene family. Although CYP3 had more pseudogenes than other CYP clans, the proportion of

pseudogenized genes still did not differ when we compared CYP clans (Fisher's exact test, $P = 0.10$).

Given these low rates of pseudogenization, it is unlikely that *N. lecontei* gene families underwent

substantial, recent contractions.

Ecological correlates of gene-family size across insects

We first examined broad-scale variation in the sizes of our five focal gene families and four CYP

clans among different insect orders (Figure S7). Not surprisingly, sample sizes were highly variable

across gene families and insect orders. Despite this variation, we observed some intriguing differences

among gene families and taxa. We detected significant differences in gene family size among orders for

OR (Kruskal-Wallas chisq = 48.2, df = 12, $P < 1 \times 10^{-5}$), GR (K-W chisq = 25.5, df = 9, $P = 0.0025$),

and OBP (K-W chisq = 37.6, df = 9, $P < 1 \times 10^{-4}$), but not CYP (K-W chisq = 10.3, df = 7, $P = 0.17$) or

AMP (K-W chisq = 7.93, df = 5, $P = 0.16$). We note, however, that the AMP sample size was

considerably smaller than the other gene families. When we looked at CYP clans individually, we found

differences among orders for CYP4 (K-W chisq = 19.0, df = 7, $P = 0.0083$) and mitochondrial CYP (K-W

chisq = 16.3, df =7, $P = 0.022$), but not CYP2 (K-W chisq = 9.19, df = 7, $P = 0.24$) or CYP3 (K-W chisq

= 8.76, df = 7, $P = 0.27$).

For the OR family, among-group differences in gene number were mostly attributable to an

unusually large number of OR genes in Hymenoptera (significant post-hoc tests include Diptera vs.

Hymenoptera: $P = 0.0018$; Hemiptera vs. Hymenoptera: $P = 0.00014$; and Odonata vs. Hymenoptera: $P =$

0.011; all p-values are FDR-corrected). By contrast, the size of the OBP family was larger in Diptera than

other orders (significant post-hoc tests include Diptera vs. Hymenoptera: $P = 0.00037$; Diptera vs.

Hemiptera: $P = 0.00092$; all p-values are FDR-corrected). Although none of the post-hoc tests were

significant for GR family size, the Blattodea appear to have more GRs on average than other insect orders

(Figure S7). For CYP clans, posthoc tests revealed that hymenopterans have fewer CYP4s than dipterans

(FDR-corrected $P = 0.010$) and fewer mitochondrial CYPs than both dipterans and lepidopterans (FDR-

corrected $P = 0.024$ and 0.023, respectively).

We next examined how gene family size correlated with ecology within the hymenopteran clade

(Figures 4 and 5). Once again, we observed differences among gene families. We found that the number

of ORs differed significantly among hymenopteran species that differed in diet (Kruskal-Wallas chisq =

15.8, df = 3, $P = 0.0012$) and sociality (Wilcoxon rank-sum test W = 115; $P = 0.00094$). For diet, we

found that herbivores had fewer ORs than all other diet types (fungivores vs. herbivores: $P = 0.015$;

omnivores vs. herbivores: $P = 0.015$; insectivores vs. herbivores: $P = 0.048$; all p-values are FDR-

corrected). We observed an even more striking difference between eusocial and non-eusocial

hymenopterans, with the former having larger OR families, on average. By contrast, GR family size was

related to diet (Kruskal-Wallas chisq = 11.8, df = 3, $P = 0.0082$), but not sociality (Wilcoxon rank sum

test W = 30; *P* = 0.65). And CYP family size was related to sociality (W = 2; *P* = 0.045), but not diet (*P* =
0.38). Finally, specialists and generalists did not differ significantly in gene family size in any of the gene
families and ecology was unrelated to gene family size for OBP and CYP (total CYP number and
individual CYP clans). Although these analyses have several limitations (see discussion), these results are
consistent with the hypothesis that environmentally responsive gene families may contract or expand
predictably in response to particular selection pressures.
332
Discussion

The predictability of gene family expansion or contraction in response to specific selection
pressures is still an open question. Here, we evaluated genomic signatures of adaptive gene family size
changes in five environmentally responsive gene families within the *N. lecontei* draft genome, a
hymenopteran exemplar of a pine-specialized lineage. Although we saw minimal evidence of recent gene
loss via pseudogenization, at least three gene families (AMP, GR, and CYP3) had genomic distributions
consistent with the selective maintenance of novel gene duplicates, and two of these families also had
evidence of positive selection within *Neodiprion*-specific clades (GR and CYP3). Next, we examined
these same gene families in other hymenopterans to see if family size correlated with diet, ecological
specialization, or eusocial behavior. Among Hymenoptera, we found that OR family size was correlated
with eusociality and diet type, but not dietary specialization; GR family size was correlated with diet type;
and AMP family size was associated with eusociality. These results suggest that ecology can have a
predictable impact on gene family size and that different selection pressures impact different gene
families. Below, we discuss both the implications and limitations of our analyses and suggest priorities
for future comparative work on gene family size evolution.
Within-genome signatures of gene-family size change
During a niche shift, new selective pressures can leave footprints in the genomes of evolving
lineages; such signatures of positive selection are well described for individual loci (Nielsen et al. 2005;
Vitti et al. 2013). Similarly, strong selection for increases or decreases in the size of a particular gene
family should also leave characteristic genomic footprints. We argue that these footprints include
monophyletic groups of closely related paralogs in gene-family trees (from the selective maintenance of
novel duplicates), genomic clustering (when novel genes arise via unequal crossing over), evidence of
positive selection among paralogs (given selection for sub- or neofunctionalization), and high rates of
pseudogenization (from the selective maintenance of loss-of-function mutations). Of the environmentally
responsive gene families we evaluated, none exhibited patterns consistent with selection for a decrease in
gene family size. By contrast, at least three families had characteristics consistent with selection for an
increase in gene family size. Two of these families, GR and CYP3, were highly clustered in the genome

and exhibited evidence of positive selection, making these especially promising candidates for expansions
related to a novel coniferous host. Additionally, although the AMP family lacked evidence of positive
selection, its unusually clustered distribution in the *Neodiprion* genome could be related to selection for
increased dosage of a conserved protein function (Perry et al. 2007). Below we discuss the functions of
these three candidate families in more detail.

365   Shifts to pine feeding likely involved changes in the detection of and response to pine-specific
cues. Intriguingly, the one GR clade with evidence of positive selection—GR clade 3—is an expansion of
six paralogs (one is pseudogenized) orthologous to *DmGR66a*, a bitter receptor specifically for caffeine
(Moon et al. 2006). However, orthologs were not found for *DmGR93a* (Lee et al. 2009) and *DmGr33a*
(Moon et al. 2009), coreceptors possibly required for caffeine detection. Nevertheless, honeybees, which
also lack clear orthologs to these putative coreceptors (Wanner and Robertson 2008), can detect and even
prefer low concentrations of caffeine and nicotine (Singaravelan et al. 2005, but see de Brito Sanchez
2011). Although pines do not contain caffeine, they do synthesize alkaloids that could confer some
bitterness (Mumm and Hilker 2006). Thus, despite lacking caffeine coreceptor orthologs, members of GR
clade 3 may still be involved in the detection of pine-specific bitter compounds. Duplications of putative
bitter GRs are documented in other host-specialized insects, such as *Heliconius, Danaus,* and *Bombyx*
butterflies (Wanner and Robertson 2008; Briscoe et al. 2013). Our sawfly-specific GR expansion, coupled
with the finding that GR family size is associated with diet (see below), lends support to the hypothesis
that expansions of GR bitter receptors repeatedly contribute to changes in oviposition and feeding
behaviors in plant-feeding insects.

380   Because pines contain toxic components like terpenoids and phenolics, detoxifying gene families
are also promising candidates for pine adaptation. The mountain pine beetle (*Dendroctonus ponderosae*),
feeds on pine bark and wood and has gene "blooms" (species-specific gene gains) in the CYP3 and CYP4
clans (Keeling et al. 2013). Similarly, in *N. lecontei*, the CYP family had five blooms (Figure S4a): four
CYP3 and one CYP4. CYP3 blooms are also found in wood-feeding insects that do not use pine, such as
the emerald ash borer (*Agrilus planipennis*) (David Nelson, unpublished data) and the Asian longhorned
beetle (*Anoplophora glabripennis*) (McKenna et al. 2016). Notably, *N. lecontei* larvae frequently ingest
pine bark in addition to pine needles (Wilson 1992), suggesting that CYP3 may expand predictably in
wood feeders. Additionally, one of the two *Neodiprion*-specific CYP3 clades with evidence of positive
selection (Table 3) belongs to the CYP6 subfamily, which is linked to host plant adaptation in several
insect taxa (Li et al. 2003; Li et al. 2007; Feyereisen 2012; Mittapelly et al. 2019).

391   Because pine resin has antimicrobial (Himejima et al. 1992; Cowan 1999; Gershenzon and
Dudareva 2007) and fungicidal properties (Grayer and Harborne 1994), we hypothesized that *N. lecontei*
co-opted these compounds for its own defense, leading to relaxed selection on genes involved in

immunity and a reduced innate immune response. In other Hymenoptera, honeybees (*Apis mellifera*)

exposed to plant resin have reduced expression of immune-related genes (Simone et al. 2009) and wood

ants (*Formica paralugubris*) that use conifer resin as building material have slightly reduced inducible

immune system activity and nests with lower bacterial and fungal loads (Castella et al. 2008). In Diptera,

AMP loss is associated with herbivorous lineages that live within host tissue, a more sterile habitat than is

experienced by most dipterans (Hanson et al. 2019). Unexpectedly, we found a large species-specific

clade of *Hisnavicin*-like AMPs in *Neodiprion*. Although additional data are needed to confirm that

Hisnavicin orthologs act as AMPs in *N. lecontei*, one possible explanation for this putatively adaptive

expansion that lacked an accompanying change in non-synonymous substitution rate is that having large

numbers of *Hisnavicin*-like AMPs confers protection against pathogens unique to pine trees. That said,

our data do not rule out adaptive AMP loss. For example, *N. lecontei* lacks a clear *Defensin* ortholog, a

gene present in all dipterans tested to date (Hanson et al. 2019).

Limitations of within-genome analyses

One benefit to studying adaptive expansions/contractions within a single taxon is that gene

families have likely experienced similar demographic histories, which can also impact gene birth and

death rates. That said, each of our within-genome signatures of selection has limitations that should be

revisited with additional data. First, our analysis of genomic clustering does not account for local

recombination rate variation, which correlates with tandem array size in several taxa (Gaut et al. 2007). A

fine-scale recombination rate map, coupled with clustering analyses for many additional gene families,

would more rigorously test the extent to which individual gene family clustering deviates from the

genome-wide relationship between recombination rate and tandem array size.

Second, a lack of comparable data from other Eusymphyta meant that our gene family

phylogenies lacked orthologues from closely related sawfly taxa. Thus, the "*Neodiprion*-specific" clades

may not be unique to pine-feeding sawflies. If these paralogs were present prior to the shift to pine hosts,

this would not support a scenario in which new duplicates were selectively maintained in the novel niche.

Signatures of positive selection may still be related to pine adaptation but would indicate selection on

preexisting loci rather than selection favoring gene family expansion.

Third, signatures of adaptive gene family expansions and contractions may be ephemeral, and the

shift to pine use could have occurred too long ago to detect these signatures in *N. lecontei*. For example,

in *Drosophila*, pseudogenes have an estimated half-life of ~14.3 million years (Petrov et al. 1996; Petrov

and Hartl 1997, 1998). If the rate of gene decay is similar in *Neodiprion*, then pseudogenes that formed

after a shift to pine (up to 60 mya) may no longer be detectable in the genomes of extant sawflies.

Likewise, gene clustering patterns are likely to change over time from chromosomal rearrangements and

additional gene duplications and deletions. To investigate how the number and position of genes in these

focal families has changed over time, high quality gene annotations for diprionids and many additional

sawfly outgroups are needed. Fortunately, even if footprints of recent gene family size changes are too

ephemeral to be detected in most taxa, consistent relationships with ecology should still be detectable

given sufficient sampling of taxa differing in ecological traits of interest.

Ecological correlates of gene family size among hymenopteran taxa

The largest insect OR gene families are in eusocial Hymenoptera, leading to the hypothesis that

OR family size expansions were favored in these lineages because they facilitate complex chemical

communication (Robertson and Wanner 2006; LeBoeuf et al. 2013; Zhou et al. 2015). To date, evidence

in support of this hypothesis has been mixed (e.g., (Roux et al. 2014; Brand and Ramírez 2017).

Consistent with the OR-eusociality hypothesis, we found that, on average, eusocial hymenopterans had

larger OR families than non-eusocial hymenopterans. However, it is likely that eusocial taxa differ from

non-eusocial taxa in many other aspects of their ecology that should also impact OR evolution. Indeed,

we found that herbivorous hymenopterans tended to have fewer OR genes than non-herbivores.

Whereas all eusocial hymenopterans had relatively large OR families, some eusocial

hymenopterans had relatively small GR families (Figures 4, 5; (Zhou et al. 2015)). To explain the

strikingly small set of GR genes in honeybee, Wanner and Robinson (2006) proposed that a stable hive

environment and a mutualistic relationship with flowering plants resulted in a lack of selection for GR

expansions. Intriguingly, our data indicate that among hymenopterans, GR family size is associated with

diet, but not eusociality. Like the ORs, GR gene family size tends to be smaller in herbivores than in non-

herbivorous taxa, regardless of social behavior. The directionality of this change, however, is unclear: do

shifts to plant diets favor reductions in GR families, do shifts to non-plant diets favor GR expansions, or

is it both? Answering this question will require characterizing GR families across many independent

transitions to and from herbivory, as well as polarizing directions of change (i.e., distinguishing GR gains

from GR losses). Fortunately, there are many such diet transitions across diverse clades of insects (Wiens

et al. 2015).

Unlike sociality and diet, ecological specialization was not associated with gene family size in

any of the five gene families we evaluated. This result was unexpected because specialization-associated

reductions in gene family size are documented in diverse taxa and multiple gene families, including the

families examined here (McBride 2007; Smadja et al. 2009; Cao et al. 2014; Goldman-Huertas et al.

2015; Suzuki et al. 2018). One explanation for the lack of association between gene family sizes and

specialization in our data is that our "generalist" and "specialist" categories are not meaningful across

diverse diets (Forister et al. 2012). Additionally, within a particular diet, the degree of specialization may

be highly labile, with rapid fluctuations that are not captured in our broad, order-wide comparison.

Indeed, previous studies that reported correlations between gene family size and ecological specialization

focused on closely related species. Thus, to fully understand how changes in ecology shape gene family
evolution, it will be necessary to evaluate ecological correlates of gene family size at multiple time scales
of taxonomic divergence.

Compared to ORs and GRs, our other focal gene families had far less manual annotation data
available for analysis. This may explain, in part, why we did not detect strong ecological correlates for the
other gene families. It is also possible that by focusing on the sizes of entire gene families, we missed
relevant signals in particular subfamilies (Hahn et al. 2007). For example, as noted above, expansions of
CYP3 and CYP4 subfamilies are associated with wood-feeding insects and CYP3 clan subfamilies were
also linked to detoxification in honey bee (Berenbaum and Johnson 2015; Johnson et al. 2018). However,
we did not detect any correlations between ecology and CYP clan sizes. Despite these limitations, we did
uncover hints that AMP gene family size may be larger in non-eusocial lineages. If eusocial taxa tend to
inhabit more sterile environments (nests and hives) than non-eusocial taxa, this finding is consistent with
associations between habitat and AMP loss reported in dipterans (Hanson et al. 2019). Given that AMPs
were also implicated in our within-genome analysis, immune-related genes are especially promising
candidates for future manual annotation projects.

Limitations of among-taxon analyses

Comparative analysis is a powerful approach for evaluating the repeatability and predictability of
evolutionary outcomes. Although our comparison of candidate gene family sizes among ecologically
diverse hymenopterans hints at intriguing relationships between ecology and gene family size, it also had
several limitations that should be revisited in future work. First, because several taxa in our manual
annotation dataset are missing from published hymenopteran phylogenies (Peters et al. 2017), we were
unable to correct for phylogenetic non-independence and polarize gene gain/loss (e.g., as in (Hahn et al.
2005; Han et al. 2013) without losing unacceptable amounts of data. Without accounting for similarity in
ecology and gene family size due to recent common ancestry, our Type I error rate is likely inflated and
p-values should be interpreted with caution. Nevertheless, variation in patterns of association among
ecological traits and gene families suggest that phylogeny and ecology are, to some extent, decoupled.

The gene annotation and ecological datasets also had limitations. For example, across studies that
included manual annotations, we observed a lack of consistency in the methods and criteria for manually
curated gene family datasets. The most problematic inconsistency was in the criteria for delineating intact,
partial, and pseudogenized gene annotations. "Intact" could mean an exon-by-exon check against closely
related orthologs, a minimum amino acid length, or merely the presence of an expected domain.
Meanwhile, in reference publications, the number of pseudogenized and partial annotations were not
always reported or were conflated. This is in addition to variation in the methods used to search for genes.
Inconsistency in annotation methods and criteria across studies may introduce taxon-specific biases

unrelated to ecology. Regarding ecology, categorizations are somewhat subjective. For example, this
study and Rane et al. (2016) classified bees as generalists since they collect nectar and pollen from
multiple plant families (we defined specialization as the use of a single taxonomic family). But Johnson et
al. (2018) classified bees as specialists as their diet consists of only nectar and pollen.

Finally, our attempts to correlate the size of different gene families with ecology suffered from
sampling biases in which species had genome assemblies and which gene families were manually
annotated. Species skewed heavily towards *Drosophila* and apocritan Hymenoptera, and annotations
toward the OR and CYP families (Table S8). To evaluate ecological correlates of gene family expansions
and contractions, it is essential to expand both the taxonomic breadth and depth of annotation sampling.
Taxa that capture independent ecological transitions (e.g., between herbivory and other diets) would be
especially useful, as would replicated groups of closely related species that vary in ecological axes of
interest (e.g., specialization or social behavior). By systematically sampling different ranges of divergence
times, we can evaluate the extent to which the tempo of gene family size change varies across different
gene families. To do so, however, will require high quality, manually curated datasets produced using
consistent methods and standards for many different environmentally responsive gene families.

Conclusions

Gene families that mediate ecological interactions may predictably expand and contract in
response to changing selection pressures. These adaptive changes in gene family size should leave
detectable genomic footprints in recent niche colonists and across taxa with convergent niche shifts.
Consistent with these predictions, (1) our analysis of gene family evolution in a derived pine feeder
suggests that expansions of GRs, CYP3s, and AMPs may have accompanied pine adaptation, and (2) our
comparison among ecologically diverse hymenopterans links two of these families to variation in diet
(GR) and eusociality (AMP). In the order Hymenoptera, the OR gene family was associated with ecology
(eusociality), however, the size of all five candidate gene families was not linked to other ecological axes
of variation (specialization/generalization); they were in other comparisons of closely related species
(McBride 2007)). Together, these results suggest that the size changes of environmentally responsive
gene families vary in both temporal dynamics (shallow vs. deep divergence times) and in ecological
drivers. Teasing apart these relationships will require high quality annotation data across diverse gene
families, ecologies, and divergence times. For hymenopterans, increased effort in understudied
symphytan, parasitoid, and herbivorous taxa would be especially useful for disentangling different axes of
ecological variation contributing to gene family size change.

Materials and methods

Biological material

To minimize the confounding effects heterozygosity has on genome assembly, we sequenced haploid siblings. Like all Hymenoptera, sawflies have haplodiploid sex determination in which males (haploid genomes) emerge from unfertilized eggs and females (diploid genomes) from fertilized eggs. A virgin female will bear a clutch of all-male offspring with haploid recombinants of the maternal genome. But the individual genomes are not identical, so an assembly derived from a single clutch is akin to a diploid assembly made from a single individual.

All insects were reared in custom, climate-controlled environmental chambers (18:6 light cycle, 22˚C, 70% RH) on jack pine (*Pinus banksiana*) foliage. Our laboratory line of *N. lecontei* was established from multiple larval colonies collected from a mugo pine (*P. mugo*) in Lexington, Kentucky, USA (37°59'01.6"N 84°30'38.8"W; population ID: RB017). For the transcriptome, adults and larvae were collected from the first lab-reared generation; both were stored at -80˚C. For the genome assembly, the founding population was propagated in the lab for two generations, followed by brother-sister matings for an additional two generations. At this point, a single, virgin, adult female (I2G2-V, 4th generation in the lab) was allowed to lay unfertilized eggs onto jack pine seedlings. The offspring (haploid male brothers from an inbred mother) were reared until the eonymph (prepupal) life stage, at which point they were isolated without food for 24 hours prior to preservation in absolute ethanol at -20˚C. Although eonymphs are non-feeding, they were starved to ensure the gut contents were completely voided.

Sample preparation and sequencing

Genomic DNA

Whole eonymph bodies were individually frozen inside microcentrifuge tubes with liquid nitrogen and ground with pestles made from 1-mL micropipette tips; the resulting powder was incubated in CTAB buffer supplemented with proteinase K and RNase A. After PCI extraction and ethanol precipitation, the precipitate was dried overnight before being resuspended in TE buffer. DNA integrity was assessed with 0.7% agarose gel, purity was measured with the 260/280 ratio, and concentration was measured with a Quant-iT dsDNA High-Sensitivity fluorescence assay (Thermo Fisher Scientific).

The HudsonAlpha Genomic Services Lab (Huntsville, AL, USA) prepared and sequenced the DNA libraries. Two small-insert, barcoded libraries with average fragment sizes of 337 bp and 864 bp were made from a single individual. A 4.6-kbp mate-pair, barcoded library was made from 25 pooled individuals. All individuals were brothers from the same I2G2-V mother. The libraries were sequenced on Illumina HiSeq 2000 with paired-end, 100 bp (PE100) reads: the small-insert libraries each had ¼ of a flow cell lane and the mate-pair library had an entire lane.

mRNA

The RNeasy Mini extraction kit (Qiagen) was used to collect total RNA from adult female body,

adult female head, adult male body, adult male head, eonymph body, feeding larval body, and feeding

larval head. RNA from eonymph head was extracted but not sequenced due to insufficient yield. Each

tissue was represented with one replicate that had equal RNA contributions from eight individuals, except

for eonymph body which was comprised of three individuals. RNA integrity and concentration were

measured with a 2100 Bioanalyzer (Agilent).

The HudsonAlpha Genomic Services Lab (Huntsville, AL, USA) handled library preparation and

sequencing. Non-stranded, barcoded libraries were made for each of the seven tissue samples; on average,

mRNA was sheared to 200 bp. The libraries were combined and sequenced on an entire flow cell of

Illumina MiSeq with PE250 reads in addition to one lane of Illumina HiSeq 2000 with PE50 reads.

Read processing and assembly

De novo genome assembly

Sequencing reads were chastity-filtered and adaptor-trimmed with fastq-mcf (ea-utils v1.04.803)

(Aronesty 2011), and quality-filtered with fastq_quality_filter (FASTX Toolkit v0.0.13.2) (Gordon and

Hannon 2019). The 337-bp small-insert reads and the 4.6-kbp mate-pair reads were quality-filtered to

retain reads where at least 80% of the bases had a quality score of 20 or higher (parameters: `-q 20 -p`

`80`). Due to sequencing quality, the 864-bp small-insert reads were filtered to retain reads where at least

70% of the bases had a quality score of 20 or higher (R1) or 60% (R2) (parameters: `-q 20 -p`

`60/70`). In situations where only one end of the paired-end reads passed filtering, the passed reads were

kept and treated as single-end data. Kmer counting was used to measure read depth before and after

filtering (Jellyfish v1.1.11) (Marçais and Kingsford 2011). Finally, reads were screened for sequencing

contamination by mapping the reads (BWA v0.7.12-r1039) (Li and Durbin 2009) to reference genomes

for *Escherichia coli* (K12 substr. DH10B uid58979), human (v37), loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*, v0.8), and

Wolbachia (endosymbiont of Dmel uid57851).

The genome was assembled with ALLPATHS-LG (v47417) (Gnerre et al. 2011) using default

settings, including a minimum scaffold size of 1000 bp. The error-correction module was run on the reads

prior to assembly. After assembly, GapFiller (v1.11) (Boetzer and Pirovano 2012) was used to help close

intra-scaffold gaps. Spurious scaffolds were identified with SOAP.coverage (v2.7.7) (Li et al. 2009):

reads were mapped to the assembly scaffolds and scaffolds with a read depth < 15 and nucleotide

percentage < 40 were removed. The completeness of the final assembly was measured with CEGMA

(v2.5) (Parra et al. 2007) and BUSCO (v1.22) (Simão et al. 2015) benchmarks. BUSCO was run with the

arthropoda-25oct16 database (parameters: `--long`).

De novo transcriptome assembly

For both the PE250 MiSeq and the PE50 HiSeq reads, fastq-mcf (ea-utils v.1.04.803) (Aronesty

2011) was used for chastity filtering and Trimmomatic (v0.32) (Bolger et al. 2014) was used to adaptor

clip, trim, and quality-filter. The PE250 MiSeq reads were processed with the Trimmomatic parameters

`ILLUMINACLIP: 2:15:5, HEADCROP: 10, CROP: 60, MINLEN: 60, AVGQUAL: 25`

whereas the PE50 HiSeq reads were processed with `ILLUMINACLIP: 2:15:5, HEADCROP: 15,`

`MINLEN: 35, AVGQUAL: 25`. Because the mRNA libraries had an average insert size of 200 bp, the

MiSeq reads required extensive adaptor trimming. Reads were screened for contamination as described in

De novo genome assembly.

For each tissue, transcriptomes were assembled with Trinity (r2013_08_14) (Grabherr et al. 2011;

Haas et al. 2013) using default settings and the `--jaccard_clip` option. Spurious sequences were

identified by mapping the sequencing reads to the assembled transcripts with RSEM (v1.2.18) (Li and

Dewey 2011); transcripts with either FPKM or TPM values < 1 were removed. After filtering, the

transcriptomes were combined, and duplicate sequences were removed.

Genome size estimation

Flow cytometry was described in (Harper et al. 2016). For this analysis, we used adult

males and females from a lab line of *N. lecontei* established from a colony collected in Auburn,

GA (33°59'22.4" N, 83°47'44.6"W; population ID: RB027). Briefly, cell nuclei were collected

from the heads of 7 individuals (4 female, 3 male) and stained with propidium iodide. Mean

fluorescence for each sample was measured with a BD FACSCalibur flow cytometer (BD

Biosciences) and compared to two external standards: *Drosophila melanogaster* (adult female

heads, 1C = 175 Mbp) and *Gallus gallus domesticus* (CEN singlets from BioSure, Grass Valley,

CA, 1C = 1222.5 Mbp). To correct for ploidy differences between haploid males and diploid

standards, we multiplied the *N. lecontei* male estimates by 2. To obtain a single size estimate for

each N. lecontei sample, we averaged values obtained for the two standards.

Repeat annotation

The N. lecontei genome assembly was masked with a custom repeat library. A lineage-

specific de novo repeat library was made with RepeatModeler (v1.0.7) (Smit and Hubley 2008-

2015) and combined with the hymenopteran repetitive element database (Nov. 2013) from

Repbase (Jurka et al. 2005). The custom library was used by RepeatMasker (v4.0.3) (Smit et al.

2013-2015) (parameters: `-cutoff 250 -s -pa 15 -gc 40 -a -poly`) to identify and

mask repetitive elements in the genome, including low-complexity DNA and simple repeats.

Transposable element (TE) family consensus sequences were identified by rerunning

RepeatModeler (Smit and Hubley 2008-2015) on the genome assembly using the "ncbi" search engine.

The resulting sequences were provided to RepeatMasker (Smit et al. 2013-2015) as a custom library to

locate associated TE copies in the genome (parameters: `-gc 40 -cutoff 250 -gff -gccalc -`

`norna -nolow -no_is -poly`). TE families with at least 10 fragments longer than 100 bp were

extracted for further analysis.

The sequencing reads were mapped to a concatenation of the masked genome and the consensus

TE sequences (BWA MEM (parameters: `-M`) (Li and Durbin 2009)). Families that had at least 1x the

median coverage to the reference genome for at least 80% of their sequence (to support at least one full

insertion found by RepeatModeler) and at least 2x the maximum coverage of the reference genome (to

support multiple insertions of the family) were extracted with genomeCoverageBed (BEDtools (Quinlan

and Hall 2010)). We attempted to identify the consensus sequences with BLASTN and BLASTX

(Altschul et al. 1990) searches against a database of repeat elements, but the only hits were to the lineage-

specific elements identified by RepeatModeler. Sequences were also filtered for BLAST hits to rRNA or

mitochondrial sequences.

We also used dnaPipeTE (Goubert et al. 2015) to identify what proportion of our short reads was

composed of repetitive content, we used a random subset of reads corresponding to 1-fold coverage of the

genome (331Mb) and took the total for three separate random samplings of reads (parameters: genome

size = 331000000 genome coverage = 1 samples number = 3). We then compared this annotation to the

RepeatModeler annotation.

Gene and functional annotation

Automated gene annotation

RNA-Seq data for *N. lecontei* was used to generate training models for gene prediction along with

utilization of peptide sequences from other species. PASA (r20130425beta) was used to build a

comprehensive transcriptome set from Trinity assembled transcripts along with RNA-Seq read mapping

predictions generated from the Tuxedo pipeline. To improve annotation quality, in addition to this *N.*

lecontei transcriptome, annotated proteins from *Atta cephalotes* (OGSv1.2), *Acromyrmex echinatior*

(OGSv3.8), *Apis melifera* (OGSv3.2), *Athalia rosae* (OGSv1.0), and *Nasonia vitripennis* (OGSv1.0) were

provided to Maker (2.09) (Cantarel et al. 2008) as evidence for structural gene prediction. Prior to

annotation, the genome was masked using a custom repeat database built using RepeatModeler (v1.0.8)

and the annotation was run using the *ab initio* gene predictors Augusts, Genemark-ES and snap in

addition to the evidence provided. The functions of the predicted protein-coding genes were putatively

established with BLASTP alignments (Altschul et al. 1990) to the Swiss-Prot database (accessed 20 Apr

12) (Apweiler et al. 2004). In cases of multiple matches, the top-ranked alignment was assigned to the

gene annotation. Protein motifs and functional domains within the annotations were also identified with
an InterProScan (v5.3.46.0) (Jones et al. 2014) search against the InterPro database with gene ontology
and IPR lookup (Finn et al. 2016). For the official gene set (OGS), the Maker annotations were filtered by
hits to the reference databases and/or a minimum eAED score of 0.1. A second set of gene annotations
was generated with the NCBI GNOMON pipeline (annotation release 100 on Nlec1.0 assembly,
GCF_001263575.1) (Souvorov et al. 2010).

As the genome was annotated prior to submission to NCBI, we encountered a problem when the
NCBI contamination software flagged vector/adaptor sequences for removal; this would disrupt the
coordinates provided by Maker. We used a modified version of GAG (Hall et al. 2014) that could accept
the flagged coordinates from NCBI to edit the assembly and update annotation coordinates accordingly.

Chemoreceptor genes

The olfactory (OR) and gustatory (GR) receptor genes were manually curated following
Robertson et al. (2003, 2006). Amino acid sequences of manually curated chemoreceptor genes from *Apis*
mellifera (Robertson and Wanner 2006; Smith et al. 2011), *Bombus terrestris* (Sadd et al. 2015) and
Cephus cinctus (Robertson et al. 2018), *Drosophila melanogaster* (Flybase release FB2017_04), and
Nasonia vitripennis (Robertson et al. 2010) were used as queries in TBLASTN (v2.2.19) (Altschul et al.
1990) searches against the *N. lecontei* draft genome (parameters: `-e 100000 -F F`). Gene models
were manually built in TextWrangler (v5.5) (Bare Bones Software), using protein alignment to identify
exons and refine the gene structures; alignments were visualized with Clustal X (v2.1) (Larkin et al.
2007). The Neural Network Splice Predictor program from the Berkeley *Drosophila* Genome Project was
used to help identify intron splice sites (http://www.fruitfly.org/seq_tools/splice.html). New gene models
were added to TBLASTN searches and this process continued iteratively until new chemoreceptors were
no longer found. The gene models were checked against RNAseq reads from tissue-specific
transcriptomes (adult antennae, mouthparts, heads, legs, genitalia, and larval heads (Herrig et al. 2019))
and against orthologs in the *N. pinetum* draft genome assembly (NCBI accession GCA_004916985.1).

Odorant binding proteins

Custom scripts were used to identify Maker gene annotations (see *Automated gene annotation*)
that contained the classic/6C, Plus-C, Minus-C, or atypical odorant binding protein (OBP) motif (Xu et al.
2009). These as well as OBPs from *Apis mellifera* and *Nasonia vitripennis* were used as queries for
TBLASTN searches against the *N. lecontei* genome; searches did not yield any new OBPs. All genomic
regions identified as potential OBPs were manually curated as described for chemoreceptor genes. After
manual annotation, duplicate annotations or genes that lacked OBP motifs were removed.

Cytochrome P450 genes

A broad set of 52 insect CYP genes (covering the diversity of insect CYP families) were

searched against the *N. lecontei* genome assembly (E-value cutoff 1e3). Scaffolds with hits were then

searched against 8782 known insect CYPs. The top 10 hits were returned (later increased to 15 to recover

more sequences) and filtered for duplicates. An alternative search of the NCBI GNOMON predictions

("Neodiprion lecontei[orgn] AND P450 NOT reductase") was also performed and new sequences were

added to the dataset. This approach found all the loci identified by the initial search, indicating that the

GNOMON annotation tool was able to comprehensively search for CYP sequences. Finally, the candidate

N. lecontei CYP sequences were manually curated based on comparison to the best BLAST hits.

Immune-related genes

Because of the relative completeness of its immune annotation, *Drosophila melanogaster*

immunity genes were used to guide annotation. Reference immune genes from *D. melanogaster* tagged

with the gene ontology term "GO:0002376 – Immune system process" were compiled from Flybase

(release 6.13). Orthology with *N. lecontei* proteins was assigned initially with reciprocal BLASTP

(Altschul et al. 1990) searches (E-value cutoff 1e-10). Reference *D. melanogaster* genes without obvious

one-to-one orthologs in *N. lecontei* were examined individually to determine whether closely related

paralogs in one or both species interfered with the inference of orthology. If not, they were searched

against the *N. lecontei* genome assembly using TBLASTN (Altschul et al. 1990) in an attempt to identify

unannotated orthologs.

Since antimicrobial peptides (AMP) are unlikely to be conserved between *D. melanogaster* and

N. lecontei, AMPs from three representative hymenopterans *Apis mellifera* (Danihlík et al. 2015),

Nasonia vitripennis (Tian et al. 2010), and *Camponotus floridanus* (Ratzka et al. 2012; Zhang and Zhu

2012; Gupta et al. 2015) were used for BLAST queries. Furthermore, since AMP copy number is fast

evolving, we attempted to find all the *N. lecontei* orthologs of each hymenopteran AMP instead of

focusing on one-to-one orthology. Once again, BLASTP searches were performed against the annotated

proteins and TBLASTN searches were performed against the assembled genome; the TBLASTN search

did not reveal additional AMPs. Putative *N. lecontei* orthologs were reciprocally blasted against the

appropriate hymenopteran proteome to assure that the best hits were indeed AMPs.

Amino acid and cDNA sequences for all manual annotated genes are available in File S1.

Glomeruli counts

Antennal lobe histology

Whole heads of adult *N. lecontei* of both sexes were fixed in 2% paraformaldehyde, 2%

glutaraldehyde in PBS for 5 days. Heads were rinsed for 40 minutes three times and the brains dissected

out in cold PBS. Following blocking with goat serum, brains were permeabilized with 1% Triton X-100

in PBS (Electron Microscopy Supply, Fort Washington, PA; PBS-TX), rinsed with 0.1% PBS-TX, and

incubated on a shaker at 25°C for three nights in primary antibody (1:500 in 2% goat serum in 0.2% PBS-

TX). Monoclonal *Drosophila* synapsin I antibody (SYNORF1, AB_2315426) from the Developmental

Studies Hybridoma Bank (catalog 3C11) was used to label synapsin. Subsequently, brains were washed

in 0.1% PBS-TX and incubated for two nights in Alexa Fluor 568 (ThermoFisher) goat anti-mouse

secondary antibody (1:100 in PBS) in the dark at room temperature on a shaker. After secondary

incubation, brains were rinsed with distilled water, dehydrated in increasing concentrations of ethanol,

and mounted in custom-made aluminum well slides. Brains were cleared by removing ethanol and

replacing it with methyl salicylate. Brains were imaged on an inverted Zeiss 880 Laser Scanning

Confocal Microscope with a 20X plan-Apochromat 20x 0.8 aperture objective and optically sectioned in

the horizontal plane at 3-micron intervals.

Glomeruli segmentation

Whole-brain images of one female and one male were manually segmented using the TrakEM2

software package in ImageJ (Cardona et al. 2012; Schindelin et al. 2012). Individual glomeruli were

traced in both brain hemispheres. Glomeruli near the center of the antennal lobe can be difficult to

distinguish, meaning counts are biased toward fewer glomeruli and the largest number of glomeruli

confidently detected represents a minimum of the number of expected glomeruli. Male *Neodiprion* have a

collection of smaller synaptic clusters in their antennal lobe (Dacks and Nighorn 2011), but the functional

significance of this anatomy is not known. There are more than 50 of these smaller synaptic clusters and

we suspect they do not represent the traditional one-to-one OR-to-glomerulus organization. Therefore,

these structures were not included in counts. Male glomeruli number may be lower if particular OSNs

contribute to these clusters instead of forming traditional glomeruli.

Within-genome signatures of adaptive expansions and contractions

Clustering and pseudogene analyses

To evaluate the extent to which members of our five focal gene families were located in tandem

arrays, we placed our annotated genes on a linkage-map anchored version of the *N. lecontei* genome

assembly described in Linnen et al. 2018. We considered genes to be clustered if they were located within

a genomic region of 20(n - 1) kilobases, where n is the number of genes in the cluster under

consideration. This criterion was chosen based on average gene densities in *Nasonia* (Niehuis et al. 2010)

and clustering criteria described *Drosophila* (Vieira et al. 2007). For scaffolds that could not be placed on

linkage groups, we evaluated clustering only if genes were more than 20 kb from either scaffold end.

To evaluate whether the five focal gene families differed in (1) the proportion of genes found in

clusters of two or more or (2) the proportion of pseudogenized genes, we performed Fisher's exact tests in

R v3.5.0 ("fisher.test" function) (R-Core-Team 2018). For significant Fisher's exact tests, we performed

additional posthoc tests using the "fisher.multcomp" function (from R package RVAideMemoire v. 0.9-

72) with FDR correction (Benjamini-Hochberg method) for multiple comparisons.

Identification of Neodiprion-*specific clades and tests of positive selection*

First, we identified clades unique to *N. lecontei*. For each gene family, a multi-species, amino

acid phylogeny was constructed with manually curated annotations from *N. lecontei*, select Hymenoptera,

and *D. melanogaster*. Sequences were size filtered (350≥ for GR, OR, CYP; 100≥ for histnavicin and

OBP), but pseudogenes and partial annotations that met the length requirement were retained. MAFFT

alignments (v7.305b) (Katoh et al. 2002) (parameters: `--maxiterate 1000 –localpair`) were

visually inspected to remove sequences with large alignment gaps, and sites with more than 20% gaps

were removed with trimAl (v1.4.rev15 build[2013-12-17]) (Capella-Gutiérrez et al. 2009) (parameters:

`-gapthreshold 0.8`). Maximum likelihood phylogenies were made in RAxML (v8.2.4) (Stamatakis

2014) (parameters: `-f a -x 12345 -p 12345 -# autoMRE`) using protein substitution models

chosen from ProtTest3 (v3.4.2) (Abascal et al. 2010; Darriba et al. 2011).

Neodiprion-specific clades were defined as those with at least five *N. lecontei* genes (not

including partial and pseudogenes) and a bootstrap score ≥70 (Engsontia et al. 2015). Second, the clades

were confirmed with cDNA phylogenies for each *N. lecontei* gene family. Amino acid sequences were

aligned as above, however, after alignment TranslatorX (Abascal et al. 2010) was used to map cDNA

sequences to the amino acid alignment. After trimming, the cDNA alignments were passed to RAxML to

construct maximum likelihood gene family trees with the nucleotide substitution model `-m GTRGAMMA`.

Site tests were conducted with codeml (part of the PAML package (PAML v4.9e) (Yang 2007))

using the cDNA phylogenies and sequences as inputs. For each *Neodiprion*-specific clade, the gene

family cDNA phylogeny was pruned to remove all branches except for that clade. Codeml models M7,

M8, and M8a were fitted to the cDNA sequence and phylogeny data. Likelihood-ratio tests were

performed for the nested models M7-M8 (null model M7 that equally distributes amino acid sites across

10 classes of ω parameter values (p, q) against alternative model M8 that has an 11th class for positively

selected sites) and M8-M8a (null model M8a that has 11 classes and does not allow positive selection

against alternative model M8). Bonferroni correction was applied to the likelihood-ratio test probability

values; each value was multiplied by two since two tests that used M8 as the alternative model were

performed on each clade. For clades with significant likelihood-ratio tests, sites under selection were

identified by looking at the Bayes Empirical Bayes analysis within the alternative models.

For branch tests, the cDNA phylogenies for each *N. lecontei* gene family were used to compare

the lineage-specific clade to the rest of the gene family. To determine if the foreground branch dN/dS

(i.e., the branch with the species-specific expansion) was significantly different from the background (i.e.,

the rest of the gene family), in codeml we ran a two-ratio model (Model=2, fix_omega=0) and a one-ratio

model (Model=0, fix_omega=0) for that clade and performed a likelihood-ratio test comparing the two

models. To determine if the foreground branch is under positive selection (dN/dS>1), we performed a

likelihood-ratio test comparing the two-ratio model to a neutral model (fix_omega=1).

Ecological correlates of gene family size among insects

All the insect genome assembly projects we could find (published and unpublished) were

searched for manually curated OR, GR, OBP, CYP, and AMP gene annotations. If fasta sequence files

were available, the number of intact, partial, and pseudogenized genes was determined by gene names

(e.g., labels with "pse" or "partial") and compared to values reported in the publication. Otherwise, we

relied on reported values. If gene family size was reported but not broken down into intact, partial, and

pseudogenized, and sequence files were unavailable, we assumed that the reported number referred to

intact genes. Splice variants were not included in the gene count. It is important to note that different

authors likely used different criteria for these categories.

Only putatively functional (intact) gene were used in gene family size comparisons. Species were

classified according to taxonomic order, diet type, dietary specialization, and sociality. An order needed at

least two species to be included. Specialization was defined as the use of a single taxonomic family and

only referred to the realized diet niche, ignoring reports of feeding under laboratory conditions. If a

species had a preferred host or both specialist and generalist life stages, it was classified as specialist.

Comparisons were made in R (v3.5.0) where species were grouped by the different classifications.

Because both gene family size and ecology are likely to correlate with phylogeny, the ideal

approach to identifying ecological correlates of gene family evolution is to use statistical methods that

account for phylogenetic relationships (Hahn et al. 2005; De Bie et al. 2006; Han et al. 2013).

Unfortunately, a lack of overlap between species with manual annotations for our focal gene families and

species included in published hymenopteran genomes precluded us from such an analysis without a

substantial loss of sample size. Therefore, as a first step to evaluating ecological correlates of gene family

size, we used non-parametric tests to determine whether gene family size differed among taxa. For

sociality and specialization, we used two-tailed Wilcoxon rank-sum tests ("wilcox.exact" function in the

exactRankTests v0.8-30 package). For taxonomic order and diet, both of which have more than two

categories, we used Kruskal-Wallis tests ("kruskal.test" function) followed by Dunn's post-hoc tests of

multiple comparisons ("dunnTest" function in the FSA v0.8.23 package).

Acknowledgements

We thank Linnen lab members for insect collection, insect reading, and reading earlier

manuscripts; Jeramiah Smith, Erin Scully, and Romain Studer for advice. We are especially grateful to

Hugh Robertson for his guidance on manual chemoreceptor gene annotation. This work was supported by

the University of Kentucky Center for Computational Sciences and the Lipscomb High Performance

Computing Cluster, the United States Department of Agriculture National Institute of Food and

Agriculture (2016-67014-2475; CRL), the Kentucky Science and Engineering Foundation (KSEF-3492-

RDE-019; CRL), and the University of Kentucky (Lyman T. Johnson Fellowship; KV).

Data availability

The genome assembly, official gene set (OGS), and transcriptome described in this paper (v1

versions) can be found at https://i5k.nal.usda.gov/neodiprion-lecontei

On GenBank (NCBI), the genome assembly is labeled whole genome shotgun sequencing project

accession PRJNA28045 and the genomic sequencing reads are RefSeq accession PRJNA312506. The

transcriptome is transcriptome shotgun assembly accession GEDM00000000; this is a combined

transcriptome of all seven tissue types. The mRNA sequencing reads for each tissue type was submitted

separately under BioSample and short read archive accessions SAMN04302192 (adult female head),

SAMN04302193 (adult female body), SAMN04302194 (adult male head), SAMN04302195 (adult male

body), SAMN04302196 (feeding larval head), SAMN04302197 (feeding larval body), and

SAMN04302198 (eonymph body). The predicted gene annotations on NCBI are from Gnomon, the NCBI

annotation pipeline, and were not described in this paper. Finally, the clustering analysis was based on a

linkage-map anchored version of the genome assembly described in Linnen et al. 2018. This anchored

assembly is denoted as v1.1 in NCBI and the *N. lecontei* i5k Workspace@NAL (USDA).

References

Abascal F, Zardoya R, Telford MJ. 2010. TranslatorX: multiple alignment of nucleotide sequences guided

by amino acid translations. Nucleic Acids Res 38(suppl 2):W7-W13.

Akhunov ED, Goodyear AW, Geng S, Qi L-L, Echalier B, Gill BS, Gustafson JP, et al. 2003. The

organization and rate of evolution of wheat genomes are correlated with recombination rates along

chromosome arms. Genome Res 13(5):753-763.

Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ. 1990. Basic local alignment search tool. J Mol

Biol 215(3):403-410.

Apweiler R, Bairoch A, Wu CH, Barker WC, Boeckmann B, Ferro S, Gasteiger E, et al. 2004. UniProt:

the universal protein knowledgebase. Nucleic Acids Res 32(suppl 1):D115-D119.

Arguello JR, Cardoso-Moreira M, Grenier JK, Gottipati S, Clark AG, Benton R. 2016. Extensive local

adaptation within the chemosensory system following Drosophila melanogaster's global expansion.

Nat Commun 7(1):1-12.

Aronesty E. 2011. ea-utils : "Command-line tools for processing biological sequencing data".

Berenbaum MR. 2002. Postgenomic chemical ecology: from genetic code to ecological interactions. J
Chem Ecol 28(5):873-896.
Berenbaum MR, Johnson RM. 2015. Xenobiotic detoxification pathways in honey bees. Curr Opin Insect
Sci 10:51-58.
Boetzer M, Pirovano W. 2012. Toward almost closed genomes with GapFiller. Genome Biol 13(6):R56.
Boevé J-L, Blank SM, Meijer G, Nyman T. 2013. Invertebrate and avian predators as drivers of chemical
defensive strategies in tenthredinid sawflies. BMC Evol Biol 13(1):198.
Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. 2014. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data.
Bioinformatics 30(15):2114-2120.
Brand P, Ramírez SR. 2017. The evolutionary dynamics of the odorant receptor gene family in
corbiculate bees. Genome Biol Evol 9(8):2023-2036.
Briscoe AD, Macias-Munoz A, Kozak KM, Walters JR, Yuan F, Jamie GA, Martin SH, et al. 2013.
Female behaviour drives expression and evolution of gustatory receptors in butterflies. PLoS Genet
9(7):e1003620.
Calla B, Noble K, Johnson RM, Walden KKO, Schuler MA, Robertson HM, Berenbaum MR. 2017.
Cytochrome P450 diversification and hostplant utilization patterns in specialist and generalist moths:
Birth, death and adaptation. Mol Ecol 26(21):6021-6035.
Cantarel BL, Korf I, Robb SMC, Parra G, Ross E, Moore B, Holt C, Alvarado AS, Yandell M. 2008.
MAKER: an easy-to-use annotation pipeline designed for emerging model organism genomes.
Genome Res 18(1):188-196.
Cao D, Liu Y, Walker WB, Li J, Wang G. 2014. Molecular characterization of the Aphis gossypii
olfactory receptor gene families. PLoS One 9(6):e101187.
Capella-Gutiérrez S, Silla-Martínez JM, Gabaldón T. 2009. trimAl: a tool for automated alignment
trimming in large-scale phylogenetic analyses. Bioinformatics 25(15):1972-1973.
Cardona A, Saalfeld S, Schindelin J, Arganda-Carreras I, Preibisch S, Longair M, Tomancak P,
Hartenstein V, Douglas RJ. 2012. TrakEM2 software for neural circuit reconstruction. PLoS One
7(6):e38011.
Castella G, Chapuisat M, Moret Y, Christe P. 2008. The presence of conifer resin decreases the use of the
immune system in wood ants. Ecological Entomology 33(3):408-412.
Comeault AA, Serrato-Capuchina A, Turissini DA, McLaughlin PJ, David JR, Matute DR. 2017. A
nonrandom subset of olfactory genes is associated with host preference in the fruit fly Drosophila
orena. Evolution Letters 1(2):73-85.
Consortium iK. 2013. The i5K Initiative: advancing arthropod genomics for knowledge, human health,
agriculture, and the environment. J Hered, 104(5):595-600.

Couto A, Alenius M, Dickson BJ. 2005. Molecular, anatomical, and functional organization of the
Drosophila olfactory system. Curr Biol 15(17):1535-1547.

Cowan MM. 1999. Plant products as antimicrobial agents. Clin Microbiol Rev 12(4):564-582.

Dacks AM, Nighorn AJ. 2011. The organization of the antennal lobe correlates not only with
phylogenetic relationship, but also life history: a basal hymenopteran as exemplar. Chem Senses
36(2):209-220.

Dahanukar A, Foster K, Carlson JR. 2001. A Gr receptor is required for response to the sugar trehalose in
taste neurons of Drosophila. Nat Neurosci 4(12):1182-1186.

Danihlík J, Aronstein K, Petřivalský M. 2015. Antimicrobial peptides: a key component of honey bee
innate immunity: Physiology, biochemistry, and chemical ecology. Journal of Apicultural Research
54(2):123-136.

Darriba D, Taboada GL, Doallo R, Posada D. 2011. ProtTest 3: fast selection of best-fit models of protein
evolution. Bioinformatics 27(8):1164-1165.

Dayhoff MO. 1976. The origin and evolution of protein superfamilies Federation Proceedings
35(10):2132-2138.

De Bie T, Cristianini N, Demuth JP, Hahn MW. 2006. CAFE: a computational tool for the study of gene
family evolution. Bioinformatics 22(10):1269-1271.

de Brito Sanchez MG. 2011. Taste perception in honey bees. Chem Senses 36(8): 675-692.

Demuth JP, Hahn MW. 2009. The life and death of gene families. Bioessays 31(1):29-39.

Després L, David J-P, Gallet C. 2007. The evolutionary ecology of insect resistance to plant chemicals.
Trends Ecol Evol 22(6):298-307.

Dobler S, Dalla S, Wagschal V, Agrawal AA. 2012. Community-wide convergent evolution in insect
adaptation to toxic cardenolides by substitutions in the Na, K-ATPase. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA
109(32):13040-13045.

Duffy JE, Macdonald KS. 2010. Kin structure, ecology and the evolution of social organization in shrimp:
a comparative analysis. Proc Royal Soc B 277(1681):575-584.

Engsontia P, Sangket U, Robertson HM, Satasook C. 2015. Diversification of the ant odorant receptor
gene family and positive selection on candidate cuticular hydrocarbon receptors. BMC Res Notes
8(1):380.

Evans JD, Aronstein K, Chen YP, Hetru C, Imler JL, Jiang H, Kanost M, Thompson GJ, Zou Z, Hultmark
D. 2006. Immune pathways and defence mechanisms in honey bees Apis mellifera. Insect Mol Biol
15(5):645-656.

Faulkes CG, Bennett NC, Bruford MW, O'Brien HP, Aguilar GH, Jarvis JU. 1997. Ecological constraints
drive social evolution in the African mole–rats. Proc Royal Soc B 264(1388):1619-1627.

Feyereisen R. 2011. Arthropod CYPomes illustrate the tempo and mode in P450 evolution. Biochimica et
Biophysica Acta (BBA)-Proteins and Proteomics 1814(1):19-28.

Feyereisen R. 2012. Insect CYP genes and P450 enzymes. In. Insect Mol Biol and Biochemistry:
Academic Press. p. 236-316.

Finn RD, Coggill P, Eberhardt RY, Eddy SR, Mistry J, Mitchell AL, Potter SC, et al. 2016. The Pfam
protein families database: towards a more sustainable future. Nucleic Acids Res 44(D1):D279-D285.

Fischman BJ, Woodard SH, Robinson GE. 2011. Molecular evolutionary analyses of insect societies.
Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 108(suppl 2):10847-10854.

Fishilevich E, Vosshall LB. 2005. Genetic and functional subdivision of the Drosophila antennal lobe.
Curr Biol 15(17):1548-1553.

Forister ML, Dyer LA, Singer MS, Stireman III JO, Lill JT. 2012. Revisiting the evolution of ecological
specialization, with emphasis on insect–plant interactions. Ecology 93(5):981-991.

Gao Q, Yuan B, Chess A. 2000. Convergent projections of Drosophila olfactory neurons to specific
glomeruli in the antennal lobe. Nat Neurosci 3(8):780-785.

Gardiner A, Barker D, Butlin RK, Jordan WC, Ritchie MG. 2008. Drosophila chemoreceptor gene
evolution: selection, specialization and genome size. Mol Ecol 17(7):1648-1657.

Gaut BS, Wright SI, Rizzon C, Dvorak J, Anderson LK. 2007. Recombination: an underappreciated factor
in the evolution of plant genomes. Nat Rev Genet 8(1):77-84.

Gershenzon J, Dudareva N. 2007. The function of terpene natural products in the natural world. Nat
Chem Biol 3(7):408-414.

Gnerre S, MacCallum I, Przybylski D, Ribeiro FJ, Burton JN, Walker BJ, Sharpe T, et al. 2011. High-
quality draft assemblies of mammalian genomes from massively parallel sequence data. Proc Natl
Acad Sci USA 108(4):1513-1518.

Goldman-Huertas B, Mitchell RF, Lapoint RT, Faucher CP, Hildebrand JG, Whiteman NK. 2015.
Evolution of herbivory in Drosophilidae linked to loss of behaviors, antennal responses, odorant
receptors, and ancestral diet. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 112(10):3026-3031.

Good RT, Gramzow L, Battlay P, Sztal T, Batterham P, Robin C. 2014. The molecular evolution of
cytochrome P450 genes within and between Drosophila species. Genome Biol Evol 6(5):1118-1134.

Gordon A, Hannon GJ. 2019. "Fastx-toolkit" FASTQ/A short-reads preprocessing tools (unpublished).

Goubert C, Modolo L, Vieira C, Claire ValienteMoro, Mavingui P, Boulesteix M. 2015. 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 Biol Evol 7(4):1192-1205.

Grabherr MG, Haas BJ, Yassour M, Levin JZ, Thompson DA, Amit I, Adiconis X, et al. 2011. Full-
length transcriptome assembly from RNA-Seq data without a reference genome. Nat Biotechnol
29(7):644-652.

Grayer RJ, Harborne JB. 1994. A survey of antifungal compounds from higher plants, 1982–1993.
Phytochemistry 37(1):19-42.

Gross JB, Borowsky R, Tabin CJ. 2009. A novel role for Mc1r in the parallel evolution of depigmentation
in independent populations of the cavefish Astyanax mexicanus. PLoS Genet 5(1):e1000326.

Guittard E, Blais C, Maria A, Parvy J-P, Pasricha S, Lumb C, Lafont R, Daborn PJ, Dauphin-Villemant
C. 2011. CYP18A1, a key enzyme of Drosophila steroid hormone inactivation, is essential for
metamorphosis. Dev Bio l349(1):35-45.

Gupta SK, Kupper M, Ratzka C, Feldhaar H, Vilcinskas A, Gross R, Dandekar T, Förster F. 2015.
Scrutinizing the immune defence inventory of Camponotus floridanus applying total transcriptome
sequencing. BMC Genom 16(1):1-21.

Ha E-M, Oh C-T, Bae YS, Lee W-J. 2005. A direct role for dual oxidase in Drosophila gut immunity.
Science 310(5749):847-850.

Haas BJ, Papanicolaou A, Yassour M, Grabherr MG, Blood PD, Bowden J, Couger MB, et al. 2013. De
novo transcript sequence reconstruction from RNA-seq using the Trinity platform for reference
generation and analysis. Nat Protoc 8(8):1494-1512.

Hahn MW, de Bie T, Stajich JE, Nguyen C, Cristianini N. 2005. Estimating the tempo and mode of gene
family evolution from comparative genomic data. Genome Res 15(8):1153-1160.

Hahn MW, Han MV, Han S-G. 2007. Gene family evolution across 12 Drosophila genomes. PLoS Genet
3(11):e197.

Hall B, DeRego T, Geib SM. 2014. GAG: the genome annotation generator (version 1.0).

Han MV, Thomas GW, Lugo-Martinez J, Hahn MW. 2013. Estimating gene gain and loss rates in the
presence of error in genome assembly and annotation using CAFE 3. Mol Biol Evol 30(8):1987-1997.

Hanson MA, Lemaitre B, Unckless RL. 2019. Dynamic evolution of antimicrobial peptides underscores
trade-offs between immunity and ecological fitness. Front Immunol 10:2620.

Harper KE, Bagley RK, Thompson KL, Linnen CR. 2016. Complementary sex determination, inbreeding
depression and inbreeding avoidance in a gregarious sawfly. Heredity 117(5):326-335.

Helvig C, Koener JF, Unnithan GC, Feyereisen R. 2004. CYP15A1, the cytochrome P450 that catalyzes
epoxidation of methyl farnesoate to juvenile hormone III in cockroach corpora allata. Proc Natl Acad
Sci USA 101(12):4024-4029.

Herrig DK, Vertacnik KL, Linnen CR. 2019. Testing the adaptive decoupling hypothesis in a
hypermetamorphic and sexually dimorphic insect. bioRxiv 2019.12.20.882803.

Himejima M, Hobson KR, Otsuka T, Wood DL, Kubo I. 1992. Antimicrobial terpenes from oleoresin of
ponderosa pine tree Pinus ponderosa: A defense mechanism against microbial invasion. J Chem Ecol
18(10):1809-1818.
Hughes AL, Nei M. 1992. Maintenance of MHC polymorphism. Nature 335:402–403.
Johnson RM, Harpur BA, Dogantzis KA, Amro Z, Berenbaum MR. 2018. Genomic footprint of evolution
of eusociality in bees: floral food use and CYPome "blooms". Insectes Soc 65(3):445-454.
Jones P, Binns D, Chang H-Y, Fraser M, Li W, McAnulla C, McWilliam H, et al. 2014. InterProScan 5:
genome-scale protein function classification. Bioinformatics 30(9):1236-1240.
Jones WD, Cayirlioglu P, Kadow IG, Vosshall LB. 2007. Two chemosensory receptors together mediate
carbon dioxide detection in Drosophila. Nature 445(7123):86-90.
Jurka J, Kapitonov VV, Pavlicek A, Klonowski P, Kohany O, Walichiewicz J. 2005. Repbase Update, a
database of eukaryotic repetitive elements. Cytogenet Genome Res 110(1-4):462-467.
Karev GP, Wolf YI, Rzhetsky AY, Berezovskaya FS, Koonin EV. 2002. Birth and death of protein
domains: a simple model of evolution explains power law behavior. BMC Evol Biol 2(1):18.
Keeling CI, Yuen MMS, Liao NY, Docking TR, Chan SK, Taylor GA, Palmquist DL, et al. 2013. Draft
genome of the mountain pine beetle, Dendroctonus ponderosae Hopkins, a major forest pest. Genome
Biol 14(3):R27.
Larkin MA, Blackshields G, Brown NP, Chenna R, McGettigan PA, McWilliam H, Valentin F, et al.
2007. Clustal W and Clustal X version 2.0. Bioinformatics 23(21):2947-2948.
LeBoeuf AC, Benton R, Keller L. 2013. The molecular basis of social behavior: models, methods and
advances. Curr Opin Neurobiol 23(1):3-10.
Lee K-A, Kim B, Bhin J, Kim DH, You H, Kim E-K, Kim S-H, Ryu J-H, Hwang D, Lee W-J. 2015.
Bacterial uracil modulates Drosophila DUOX-dependent gut immunity via Hedgehog-induced
signaling endosomes. Cell Host Microbe 17(2):191-204.
Lee Y, Moon SJ, Montell C. 2009. Multiple gustatory receptors required for the caffeine response in
Drosophila. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 106(11):4495-4500.
Li B, Dewey CN. 2011. RSEM: accurate transcript quantification from RNA-Seq data with or without a
reference genome. BMC Bioinform 12(1):323.
Li H, Durbin R. 2009. Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows–Wheeler transform.
Bioinformatics 25(14):1754-1760.
Li R, Yu C, Li Y, Lam T-W, Yiu S-M, Kristiansen K, Wang J. 2009. SOAP2: an improved ultrafast tool
for short read alignment. Bioinformatics 25(15):1966-1967.

Li W, Schuler MA, Berenbaum MR. 2003. Diversification of furanocoumarin-metabolizing cytochrome

P450 monooxygenases in two papilionids: specificity and substrate encounter rate. Proc Natl Acad

Sci USA 100(suppl 2):14593-14598.

Li X, Schuler MA, Berenbaum MR. 2007. Molecular mechanisms of metabolic resistance to synthetic and

natural xenobiotics. Annu Rev Entomol 52:231-253.

Linnen CR, O'Quin CT, Shackleford T, Sears CR, Lindstedt C. 2018. Genetic basis of body color and

spotting pattern in redheaded pine sawfly larvae (Neodiprion lecontei). Genetics 209(1):291-305.

Marçais G, Kingsford C. 2011. A fast, lock-free approach for efficient parallel counting of occurrences of

k-mers. Bioinformatics 27(6):764-770.

Martin A, Orgogozo V. 2013. The loci of repeated evolution: a catalog of genetic hotspots of phenotypic

variation. Evolution 67(5):1235-1250.

Matsuo T, Sugaya S, Yasukawa J, Aigaki T, Fuyama Y. 2007. Odorant-binding proteins OBP57d and

OBP57e affect taste perception and host-plant preference in Drosophila sechellia. PLoS Biology

5(5):e118.

Maxwell DE editor. Proceedings of the 10th International Congress of Entomology. 1958 Montreal,

Canada.

McBride CS. 2007. Rapid evolution of smell and taste receptor genes during host specialization in

Drosophila sechellia. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 104(12):4996-5001.

McBride CS, Arguello RJ. 2007. Five Drosophila genomes reveal nonneutral evolution and the signature

of host specialization in the chemoreceptor superfamily. Genetics 177(3):1395-1416.

McKenna DD, Scully ED, Pauchet Y, Hoover K, Kirsch R, Geib SM, Mitchell RF, et al. 2016. Genome

of the Asian longhorned beetle (Anoplophora glabripennis), a globally significant invasive species,

reveals key functional and evolutionary innovations at the beetle–plant interface. Genome Biol

17:227

McKenzie SK, Fetter-Pruneda I, Ruta V, Kronauer DJC. 2016. Transcriptomics and neuroanatomy of the

clonal raider ant implicate an expanded clade of odorant receptors in chemical communication. Proc

Natl Acad Sci USA 113(49):14091-14096.

Mittapelly P, Bansal R, Michel A. 2019. Differential expression of cytochrome P450 CYP6 genes in the

brown marmorated stink bug, Halyomorpha halys (Hemiptera: Pentatomidae). J Econ Entomol

112(3):1403-1410.

Miyamoto T, Slone J, Song X, Amrein H. 2012. A fructose receptor functions as a nutrient sensor in the

Drosophila brain. Cell 151(5):1113-1125.

Moon SJ, Köttgen M, Jiao Y, Xu H, Montell C. 2006. A taste receptor required for the caffeine response

in vivo. Curr Biol 16(18):1812-1817.

Moon SJ, Lee Y, Jiao Y, Montell C. 2009. A Drosophila gustatory receptor essential for aversive taste
and inhibiting male-to-male courtship. Curr Biol 19(19):1623-1627.

Mumm R, Hilker M. 2006. Direct and indirect chemical defence of pine against folivorous insects. Trends
Plant Sci 11(7):351-358.

Nei M. 2007. The new mutation theory of phenotypic evolution. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 104(30):12235-
12242.

Nei M, Rooney AP. 2005. Concerted and birth-and-death evolution of multigene families. Annu Rev
Genet 39:121-152.

Niehuis O, Gibson JD, Rosenberg MS, Pannebakker BA, Koevoets T, Judson AK, Desjardins CA, et al.
2010. Recombination and its impact on the genome of the haplodiploid parasitoid wasp Nasonia.
PLoS One 5(1):e8597.

Nielsen R, Williamson S, Kim Y, Hubisz MJ, Clark AG, Bustamante C. 2005. Genomic scans for
selective sweeps using SNP data. Genome Res 15(11):1566-1575.

Nozawa M, Kawahara Y, Nei M. 2007. Genomic drift and copy number variation of sensory receptor
genes in humans. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 104(51):20421-20426.

Ohno S. 1970. The enormous diversity in genome sizes of fish as a reflection of nature's extensive
experiments with gene duplication. Trans Am Fish Soc 99(1):120-130.

Parra G, Bradnam K, Korf I. 2007. CEGMA: a pipeline to accurately annotate core genes in eukaryotic
genomes. Bioinformatics 23(9):1061-1067.

Perry GH, Dominy NJ, Claw KG, Lee AS, Fiegler H, Redon R, Werner J, et al. 2007. Diet and the
evolution of human amylase gene copy number variation. Nat Genet 39(10):1256-1260.

Peters RS, Krogmann L, Mayer C, Donath A, Gunkel S, Meusemann K, Kozlov A, et al. 2017.
Evolutionary history of the Hymenoptera. Curr Biol 27(7):1013-1018.

Petrov DA, Hartl DL. 1997. Trash DNA is what gets thrown away: high rate of DNA loss in Drosophila.
Gene 205(1-2):279-289.

Petrov DA, Hartl DL. 1998. High rate of DNA loss in the Drosophila melanogaster and Drosophila virilis
species groups. Mol Biol Evol 15(3):293-302.

Petrov DA, Lozovskaya ER, Hartl DL. 1996. High intrinsic rate of DNA loss in Drosophila. Nature
384(6607):346-349.

Poelchau M, Childers C, Moore G, Tsavatapalli V, Evans J, Lee C-Y, Lin H, Lin J-W, Hacket K. 2015.
The i5k Workspace@ NAL—enabling genomic data access, visualization and curation of arthropod
genomes. Nucleic Acids Res 43(D1):D714-D719.

Protas ME, Hersey C, Kochanek D, Zhou Y, Wilkens H, Jeffery WR, Zon LI, Borowsky R, Tabin CJ.
2006. Genetic analysis of cavefish reveals molecular convergence in the evolution of albinism. Nat
Genet 38(1):107-111.

Qiu Y, Tittiger C, Wicker-Thomas C, Le Goff G, Young S, Wajnberg E, Fricaux T, Taquet N, Blomquist
GJ, Feyereisen R. 2012. An insect-specific P450 oxidative decarbonylase for cuticular hydrocarbon
biosynthesis. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 109(37):14858-14863.

Qu Z, Kenny NJ, Lam HM, Chan TF, Chu KH, Bendena WG, Tobe SS, Hui JHL. 2015. How did
arthropod sesquiterpenoids and ecdysteroids arise? Comparison of hormonal pathway genes in
noninsect arthropod genomes. Genome Biol Evol 7(7):1951-1959.

Quinlan AR, Hall IM. 2010. BEDTools: a flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic features.
Bioinformatics 26(6):841-842.

R-Core-Team. 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R
Foundation for Statistical Computing.

Ratzka C, Förster F, Liang C, Kupper M, Dandekar T, Feldhaar H, Gross R. 2012. Molecular
characterization of antimicrobial peptide genes of the carpenter ant Camponotus floridanus. PLoS
One 7(8):e43036.

Rewitz KF, O'Connor MB, Gilbert LI. 2007. Molecular evolution of the insect Halloween family of
cytochrome P450s: phylogeny, gene organization and functional conservation. Insect Biochem Mol
Biol 37(8):741-753.

Rizzon C, Ponger L, Gaut BS. 2006. Striking similarities in the genomic distribution of tandemly arrayed
genes in Arabidopsis and rice. PLoS Comput Biol 2(9):e115.

Robertson HM, Gadau J, Wanner KW. 2010. The insect chemoreceptor superfamily of the parasitoid
jewel wasp Nasonia vitripennis. Insect Mol Biol 19:121-136.

Robertson HM, Kent LB. 2009. Evolution of the gene lineage encoding the carbon dioxide receptor in
insects. J Insect Sci 9(1):19.

Robertson HM, Wanner KW. 2006. The chemoreceptor superfamily in the honey bee, Apis mellifera:
expansion of the odorant, but not gustatory, receptor family. Genome Res 16(11):1395-1403.

Robertson HM, Waterhouse RM, Walden KKO, Ruzzante L, Reijnders MJMF, Coates BS, Legeai F, et
al. 2018. Genome sequence of the wheat stem sawfly, Cephus cinctus, representing an early-
branching lineage of the Hymenoptera, illuminates evolution of hymenopteran chemoreceptors.
Genome Biol Evol 10(11):2997-3011.

Ross L, Gardner A, Hardy N, West SA. 2013. Ecology, not the genetics of sex determination, determines
who helps in eusocial populations. Curr Biol 23(23):2383-2387.

Roux J, Privman E, Moretti S, Daub JT, Robinson-Rechavi M, Keller L. 2014. Patterns of positive
selection in seven ant genomes. Mol Biol Evol 31(7):1661-1685.

Sadd BM, Barribeau SM, Bloch G, de Graaf DC, Dearden P, Elsik CG, Gadau J, et al. 2015. The
genomes of two key bumblebee species with primitive eusocial organization. Genome Biol 16(1):1-
32.

Schindelin J, Arganda-Carreras I, Frise E, Kaynig V, Longair M, Pietzsch T, Preibisch S, et al. 2012. Fiji:
an open-source platform for biological-image analysis. Nature Methods 9(7):676-682.

Sezutsu H, Le Goff G, Feyereisen R. 2013. Origins of P450 diversity. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol
Sci 368:20120428.

Simão FA, Waterhouse RM, Ioannidis P, Kriventseva EV, Zdobnov EM. 2015. BUSCO: assessing
genome assembly and annotation completeness with single-copy orthologs. Bioinformatics
31(19):3210-3212.

Simone M, Evans JD, Spivak M. 2009. Resin collection and social immunity in honey bees. Evolution
63(11):3016-3022.

Singaravelan N, Nee'man G, Inbar M, Izhaki I. 2005. Feeding responses of free-flying honeybees to
secondary compounds mimicking floral nectars. J Chem Ecol 31(12):2791-2804.

Slone J, Daniels J, Amrein H. 2007. Sugar receptors in Drosophila. Curr Biol 17(20):1809-1816.

Smadja C, Shi P, Butlin RK, Robertson HM. 2009. Large gene family expansions and adaptive evolution
for odorant and gustatory receptors in the pea aphid, Acyrthosiphon pisum. Mol Biol Evol
26(9):2073-2086.

Smit AFA, Hubley R. 2008-2015. RepeatModeler Open-1.0.

Smit AFA, Hubley R, Green P. 2013-2015. RepeatMasker Open-4.0.

Smith CR, Smith CD, Robertson HM, Helmkampf M, Zimin A, Yandell M, Holt C, et al. 2011. Draft
genome of the red harvester ant Pogonomyrmex barbatus. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 108(14):5667-
5672.

Smith SG. 1941. A new form of spruce sawfly identified by means of its cytology and parthenogenesis. J
Agric Sci 21(5):245-305.

Sohi SS, Ennis TJ. 1981. Chromosomal characterization of cell lines of Neodiprion lecontei
(Hymenoptera: Diprionidae). Proc Entomol Soc Ont 112:45–48.

Souvorov A, Kapustin Y, Kiryutin B, Chetvernin V, Tatusova T, Lipman DJ. 2010. Gnomon–NCBI
eukaryotic gene prediction tool. National Center for Biotechnology Information.

Stamatakis A. 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of large
phylogenies. Bioinformatics 30(9):1312-1313.

Suzuki HC, Ozaki K, Makino T, Uchiyama H, Yajima S, Kawata M. 2018. Evolution of gustatory
receptor gene family provides insights into adaptation to diverse host plants in nymphalid butterflies.
Genome Biol Evol 10(6):1351-1362.

Thomas JH. 2006. Analysis of homologous gene clusters in Caenorhabditis elegans reveals striking
regional cluster domains. Genetics 172(1):127-143.

Tian C, Gao B, Fang Q, Ye G, Zhu S. 2010. Antimicrobial peptide-like genes in Nasonia vitripennis: a
genomic perspective. BMC Genom 11(1):187.

Trapp S, Croteau R. 2001. Defensive resin biosynthesis in conifers. Annu Rev Plant Biol 52(1):689-724.

Vieira FG, Sánchez-Gracia A, Rozas J. 2007. Comparative genomic analysis of the odorant-binding
protein family in 12 Drosophila genomes: purifying selection and birth-and-death evolution. Genome
Biol 8(11):R235.

Vitti JJ, Grossman SR, Sabeti PC. 2013. Detecting natural selection in genomic data. Annu Rev Genet
4797-120.

Vosshall LB, Wong AM, Axel R. 2000. An olfactory sensory map in the fly brain. Cell 102(2):147-159.

Wanner KW, Robertson HM. 2008. The gustatory receptor family in the silkworm moth Bombyx mori is
characterized by a large expansion of a single lineage of putative bitter receptors. Insect Mol Biol
17(6):621-629.

Wiens JJ, Lapoint RT, Whiteman NK. 2015. Herbivory increases diversification across insect clades. Nat
Commun 6(1):1-7.

Wilson LF, Wilkinson RC, Averill RC. 1992. Redheaded pine sawfly: its ecology and management. US
Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, editor. Agriculture Handbook No. 694. Washington, DC.

Xu Y-L, He P, Zhang L, Fang S-Q, Dong S-L, Zhang Y-J, Li F. 2009. Large-scale identification of
odorant-binding proteins and chemosensory proteins from expressed sequence tags in insects. BMC
Genom 10(1):632.

Yang J, Chen X, Bai J, Fang D, Qiu Y, Jiang W, Yuan H, et al. 2016. The Sinocyclocheilus cavefish
genome provides insights into cave adaptation. BMC Biol 14(1):1-13.

Yang Z. 2007. PAML 4: phylogenetic analysis by maximum likelihood. Mol Biol Evol 24(8):1586-1591.

Zhang J. 2003. Evolution by gene duplication: an update. Trends Ecol Evol 18(6):292-298.

Zhang L, Gaut BS. 2003. Does recombination shape the distribution and evolution of tandemly arrayed
genes (TAGs) in the Arabidopsis thaliana genome? Genome Res 13(12):2533-2540.

Zhang Z, Zhu S. 2012. Comparative genomics analysis of five families of antimicrobial peptide-like
genes in seven ant species. Dev Comp Immunol 38(2):262-274.

Zhen Y, Aardema ML, Medina EM, Schumer M, Andolfatto P. 2012. Parallel molecular evolution in an
herbivore community. Science 337(6102):1634-1637.

Zhou X, Rokas A, Berger SL, Liebig J, Ray A, Zwiebel LJ. 2015. Chemoreceptor evolution in

hymenoptera and its implications for the evolution of eusociality. Genome Biol Evol 7(8):2407-2416.

1198

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Like other diprionids, *N. lecontei* has multiple morphological and behavioral adaptations

to *Pinus* foliage. A. An egg-laying *N. lecontei* female demonstrating several adaptations for dealing with

thick, resinous pine needles, including: a robust saw-like ovipositor (visible within the needle), a tendency

to lay many closely spaced eggs per needles, and a tendency to cut resin-draining slits on egg-bearing

needles (circled). **B.** Prior to hatching, *N. lecontei* eggs absorb water from the host, causing the eggs to

swell and the pockets to open. Throughout development, embryos are in close contact with living host

tissue. **C.** Early-instar larvae have skeletonizing feeding behavior in which only the outer needle tissue is

consumed, leaving the resinous interior intact. This strategy prevents small larvae from being

overwhelmed by sticky resin. **D.** Mid- and late-instar larvae consume the entire pine needle. Larvae

sequester pine resin in specialized pouches for use in self-defense (All photos by R.K. Bagley).

1210

1211 **Figure 2. Optical sections through the antennal lobes of adult female (left) and male (right) *N.***

1212 ***lecontei*.** White arrows indicate regions of male-specific synaptic clusters. Scale bars = 500 µm.

1213

Figure 3. Position of genes belonging to five environmentally responsive gene families along seven

***N. lecontei* linkage groups.** Linkage groups (LG) are drawn to scale and ordered as in the linkage-group

anchored assembly described in Linnen et al. 2018 (GenBank accession numbers are as follows: LG1 =

CM009916.1; LG2 = CM009917.1; LG3 = CM009918.1; LG4 = CM009919.1; LG5 = CM009920.1;

LG6 = CM009921.1; LG7 = CM009922.1). Gene family abbreviations: OR (olfactory receptor), GR

(gustatory receptor), OBP (odorant binding protein), CYP (cytochrome P450), AMP (antimicrobial

protein). Each gene family is represented by a different color. Horizontal lines indicate the approximate

locations of genes within LG; diagonal lines that connect to horizontal lines are used to highlight groups

of genes that met our clustering criteria. Genes that were found on scaffolds that have not been placed on

linkage groups are indicated on the bottom left, with abbreviated scaffold names given in parentheses

(e.g., S-210 = scaffold_210 = LGIB01000210.1 in the assemblies available on NCBI).

1225

1226 **Figure 4. Number of intact genes in hymenopteran genomes for each of five environmentally**

1227 **responsive gene families.** Phylogenetic relationships are as in Moreau et al. (2006); Hedtke et al. (2013);

1228 Roux et al. (2014); Brand et al. (2017); Branstetter et al. (2017); Peters et al. (2017). Branch lengths are

1229 arbitrary. Gene family abbreviations are as in Figure 3.

1230

Figure 5. Ecological correlates of gene family size in Hymenoptera. Each point represents the number

of intact genes for a hymenopteran species for which both manually curated gene annotations and

ecological data are available. Asterisks indicate that gene number varies significantly among the

ecological categories under consideration; for significant categories with >2 groups, letters indicate

significance in post-hoc tests (groups that do not share a letter are significantly different). Gene number

and ecological data for all taxa are provided in Table S8.

Table 1. Summary of within-genome signatures of adaptive expansions and contractions for five environmentally responsive gene families.

Gene family[*]	Gene family size					Genomic Clustering		Molecular evolution		
	Intact genes	Partial	Pseudo	Total genes	Prop. pseudo	Prop. in clusters[†]	Largest cluster	*Neodiprion-*specific clades[‡]	Significant branch tests[§]	Significant site tests[**]
OR	52	3	1	56	0.02	0.59	8	3	1	0
GR	41	2	2	44[††]	0.05	0.76	10	3	1	1
OBP	13	0	0	13	0	0.38	3	0	n/a	n/a
CYP (all)	93	2	12	107	0.11	0.66	16	5	2	0
CYP2 clan	9	0	0	9	0	0.33	2	0	0	0
CYP3 clan	47	0	8	55	0.15	0.81	16	4	2	0
CYP4 clan	27	2	4	33	0.12	0.55	3	1	0	0
mito CYP clan	10	0	0	10	0	0.50	3	0	0	0
AMP	21	0	0	21	0	0.95	15	?[‡‡]	0	0

---

[*] Abbreviations: OR = olfactory receptor genes; GR = gustatory receptor genes; OBP = odorant binding protein genes; CYP = cytochrome P450 genes ("clans" refer to four major clades of CYPs present in insects); AMP = antimicrobial peptide genes.

[†] Calculated as: (number of genes in clusters of 2 or more)/(genes for which clustering could be evaluated).

[‡] Defined as monophyletic clusters of 5 or more *Neodiprion* paralogs with a bootstrap support ≥ 70% in an amino acid phylogeny constructed with gene annotations from *Neodiprion*, select Hymenoptera, and *Drosophila melanogaster.*

[§] To be counted, clades had to reject both 1-ratio and fixed-ratio models in dN/dS branch tests (see Table 2).

[**] To be counted, clades had to reject both M7 and M8a models in dN/dS site tests (see Table 2).

[††] One gene was both a partial annotation and a pseudogene.

[‡‡] Low bootstrap support precluded the identification of *Neodiprion*-specific clades.

Table 2. Likelihood-ratio tests (LRTs) of positive selection on *Neodiprion*-specific clades (branch models) and on amino acid sites within these clades (site models).

Clade Names[*]	n[†]	Model comparison[‡]	LRT statistic[§]	df	P-value[**]
Olfactory Receptor					
Clade 1	6	M8 vs M7	2.932	2	0.231
		M8 vs M8a	0.748	1	0.387
		2 ratio vs 1 ratio	5.408	1	**0.020**
		2 ratio vs neutral	7.800	1	**0.005**
Clade 2	5	M8 vs M7	3.941	2	0.139
		M8 vs M8a	1.525	1	0.217
		2 ratio vs 1 ratio	1.426	1	0.232
		2 ratio vs neutral	0.050	1	0.822
Clade 3	5	M8 vs M7	0	2	1
		M8 vs M8a	0	1	1
		2 ratio vs 1 ratio	2.395	1	0.122
		2 ratio vs neutral	6.371	1	**0.012**
Gustatory Receptor					
Clade 1	7	M8 vs M7	0.809	2	0.667
		M8 vs M8a	0.379	1	0.538
		2 ratio vs 1 ratio	0.003	1	0.954
		2 ratio vs neutral	0.645	1	0.422
Clade 2	8	M8 vs M7	6.049	2	**0.049**
		M8 vs M8a	2.654	1	0.103
		2 ratio vs 1 ratio	0.003	1	0.959
		2 ratio vs neutral	0.781	1	0.377
Clade 3	5	M8 vs M7	39.328	2	**2.884e-09**
		M8 vs M8a	35.167	1	**3.026e-09**
		2 ratio vs 1 ratio	14.789	1	**1.202e-04**
		2 ratio vs 2 ratio neutral	27.810	1	**1.338e-07**
Cytochrome P450					
Clade 1 (CYP4 clan)	8	M8 vs M7	0.615	2	0.735
		M8 vs M8a	0.866	1	0.352
		2 ratio vs 1 ratio	0.658	1	0.417
		2 ratio vs 2 ratio neutral	0.089	1	0.766
Clade 2 (CYP3 clan)	19	M8 vs M7	0	2	1
		M8 vs M8a	0	1	1
		2 ratio vs 1 ratio	2.077	1	0.149

[*] Clade names are as in Figures S1a,S1b,S2a,S2b,S3a,S3b,S4a,S4b, and S5a.
[†] Putatively functional genes. Pseudogenes and partial annotations were excluded from analysis.
[‡] Site models unshaded; neutral M7 and M8a do not allow for positive selection. Branch models shaded; 1 ratio estimates a single ω value for all branches, 2 ratio estimates a separate ω value for the foreground branch, 2 ratio neutral fixes $\omega=1$ for all branches.
[§] Likelihood ratio test statistic, calculated twice the difference in model log likelihoods.
[**] Bolded values are significant at critical value 0.05.

		2 ratio vs 2 ratio neutral	0.076	1	0.783
Clade 3 (CYP3 clan)	6	M8 vs M7	7.152	2	**0.028**
		M8 vs M8a	0.649	1	0.421
		2 ratio vs 1 ratio	6.325	1	**0.012**
		2 ratio vs 2 ratio neutral	14.261	1	**1.59 e-04**
Clade 4 (CYP3 clan)	6	M8 vs M7	0	2	1
		M8 vs M8a	0.151	1	0.697
		2 ratio vs 1 ratio	0.002	1	0.964
		2 ratio vs 2 ratio neutral	0.936	1	0.333
Clade 5 (CYP3 clan)	5	M8 vs M7	0	2	1
		M8 vs M8a	0	1	1
		2 ratio vs 1 ratio	5.327	1	**0.021**
		2 ratio vs 2 ratio neutral	12.286	1	**4.56 e-04**
Hisnavicin (Antimicrobial Peptide)					
Clade 1[††]	15	M8 vs M7	2.388	2	0.665
		M8 vs M8a	0	1	1
		2 ratio vs 1 ratio	7.908	1	**0.010**
		2 ratio vs 2 ratio neutral	0.999	1	0.635

[††] Although this clade did not meet the bootstrap criteria for species-specific clades (>70), it was included in this analysis because it contained almost all *N. lecontei* hisnavicin paralogs.

Figure 1. Like other diprionids, *N. lecontei* has multiple morphological and behavioral adaptations to *Pinus* foliage. A. An egg-laying *N. lecontei* female demonstrating several adaptations for dealing with thick, resinous pine needles, including: a robust saw-like ovipositor (visible within the needle), a tendency to lay many closely spaced eggs per needles, and a tendency to cut resin-draining slits on egg-bearing needles (circled). **B.** Prior to hatching, *N. lecontei* eggs absorb water from the host, causing the eggs to swell and the pockets to open. Throughout development, embryos are in close contact with living host tissue. **C.** Early-instar larvae have skeletonizing feeding behavior in which only the outer needle tissue is consumed, leaving the resinous interior intact. This strategy prevents small larvae from being overwhelmed by sticky resin. **D.** Mid- and late-instar larvae consume the entire pine needle. Larvae sequester pine resin in specialized pouches for use in self-defense (All photos by R.K. Bagley).

Figure 2. Optical sections through the antennal lobes of adult female (left) and male (right)
N. lecontei. White arrows indicate regions of male-specific synaptic clusters. Scale bars = 500
μm.

Figure 3. Position of genes belonging to five environmentally responsive gene families along seven *N. lecontei* linkage groups. Linkage groups (LG) are drawn to scale and ordered as in the linkage-group anchored assembly described in Linnen et al. 2018 (GenBank accession numbers are as follows: LG1 = CM009916.1; LG2 = CM009917.1; LG3 = CM009918.1; LG4 = CM009919.1; LG5 = CM009920.1; LG6 = CM009921.1; LG7 = CM009922.1). Gene family abbreviations: OR (olfactory receptor), GR (gustatory receptor), OBP (odorant binding protein), CYP (cytochrome P450), AMP (antimicrobial protein). Each gene family is represented by a different color. Horizontal lines indicate the approximate locations of genes within LG; diagonal lines that connect to horizontal lines are used to highlight groups of genes that met our clustering criteria. Genes that were found on scaffolds that have not been placed on linkage groups are indicated on the bottom left, with abbreviated scaffold names given in parentheses (e.g., S-210 = scaffold_210 = LGIB01000210.1 in the assemblies available on NCBI).

	OR	GR	OBP	P450	AMP
Bee					
Bombus terrestris	151	21	16	44	
Melipona quadrifasciata	142	10	6		
Apis mellifera	169	10	21	46	6
Apis cerana	119	10		41	
Apis dorsata				42	
Apis florea	159			44	
Habropoda laboriosa	100			38	
Euglossa dilemma	123	13	15		
Eufriesea mexicana	111	16	13	45	
Megachile rotundata				49	
Osmia bicornis bicornis				47	
Lasioglossum albipes	158	23			
Dufourea novaeangliae	77			45	
Ant					
Solenopsis invicta	333	219	18		7
Cardiocondyla obscurior	232	34			
Monomorium pharaonis	240	159			
Pogonomyrmex barbatus	274	58	16	72	10
Acromyrmex echinatior	375	116		73	
Atta cephalotes	341	89		52	
Camponotus floridanus	352	46	13	128	6
Linepithema humile	301	93	13	111	6
Cerapachys biroi	256	20	15	69	6
Harpegnathos saltator	347	17	13	95	8
Wasp					
Nasonia vitripennis	217	47	82	92	44
Ceratosolen solmsi	56	5	7	34	8
Microplitis demolitor	203	79			
Sawfly					
Neodiprion lecontei	52	41	13	94	21

Figure 4. Number of intact genes in hymenopteran genomes for each of five environmentally responsive gene families. Phylogenetic relationships are as in Moreau et al. (2006); Hedtke et al. (2013); Roux et al. (2014); Brand et al. (2017); Branstetter et al. (2017); Peters et al. (2017). Branch lengths are arbitrary. Gene family abbreviations are as in Figure 3.

Figure 5. Ecological correlates of gene family size in Hymenoptera. Each point represents the number of intact genes for a hymenopteran species for which both manually curated gene annotations and ecological data are available. Asterisks indicate that gene number varies significantly among the ecological categories under consideration; for significant categories with >2 groups, letters indicate significance in post-hoc tests (groups that do not share a letter are significantly different). Gene number and ecological data for all taxa are provided in Table S8.