Multiple recent sex chromosome fusions in *Drosophila virilis* associated with elevated

satellite DNA abundance

Jullien M. Flynn*, Kevin B. Hu, Andrew G. Clark

Department of Molecular Biology and Genetics, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY

*Corresponding author: jmf422@cornell.edu

ABSTRACT

Repetitive satellite DNA is highly variable both within and between species, and is often located

near centromeres. However, the abundance or array length of satellite DNA may be

constrained or have maximum limits. *Drosophila virilis* contains among the highest relative

satellite abundances, with almost half its genome composed of three related 7 bp satellites. We

discovered a strain of *D. virilis* that has 15% more pericentromeric satellite DNA compared to

other strains, and also underwent two independent centromere-to-centromere sex

chromosome fusion events. These fusions are presumably caused by DNA breakage near the

pericentromeric satellites followed by repair using similar repetitive regions of nonhomologous

chromosomes. We hypothesized that excess satellite DNA might increase the risk of DNA

breaks and genome instability when stressed, which would be consistent with the apparent

high rate of fusions we found in this strain. To directly quantify DNA breakage levels between

strains with different satellite DNA abundances, we performed the comet assay after feeding

flies gemcitabine and administering low-dose gamma radiation. We found a positive correlation

between the rate of DNA breakage and satellite DNA abundance. This was further supported by

a significant decrease in DNA breakage in an otherwise genetically identical substrain that lost

the chromosome fusion and several megabases of satellite DNA. We find that the centromere-

to-centromere fusions resulted in up to a 21% nondisjunction rate between the X and Y

chromosomes in males, adding a fitness cost. Finally, we propose a model consistent with our

data that implicates genome instability as a critical evolutionary constraint to satellite

abundance.

33
34 **INTRODUCTION**
35
Satellite DNA consists of long arrays of tandemly repeated sequences, and is often located near

centromeres in heterochromatin (reviewed in Thakur *et al.* 2021). Satellite DNA varies greatly in

sequence and abundance within and between species (Subirana *et al.* 2015; Wei *et al.* 2018;

Cechova *et al.* 2019), and this can be partially explained by high rates of copy number mutation

(Flynn *et al.* 2017). Although previously assumed to be inert "junk," recent work has shown that

satellite DNA is involved in essential processes in the cell, thus variation in it may be biologically

important (Jagannathan *et al.* 2018; Mills *et al.* 2019). Although satellite DNA differences

between some species have been linked to reproductive incompatibilities (Ferree and Barbash

2009; Jagannathan and Yamashita 2021), the biological implications of intraspecies abundance

variation has not been explored. Satellite DNA can vary in abundance by several megabases

among individuals of the same species, including in flies and humans (Miga *et al.* 2014; Wei *et*

al. 2014; Flynn *et al.* 2020). Satellite DNA appears to be constrained by maximum limits, with no

species studied so far having more than about half of their genome made up of satellite DNA

(Gall and Atherton 1974a; Fry and Salser 1977; Petitpierre *et al.* 1995). The genomic abundance

of transposable elements (TEs), the other highly pervasive type of repetitive DNA, seems to be

less constrained than satellite DNA with many genomes over 50% and some containing up to

85% TE content (Anderson *et al.* 2019). The nature of satellite DNA with long tandem arrays of

the same sequence, may impose instability that prevents it from expanding beyond a threshold,

compared to more diverse sequences interspersed in the genome.

Drosophila virilis is an excellent model for studying satellite DNA variation. *D. virilis* has the

highest relative abundance of simple satellite DNA (defined as satellites with unit length <=20

bp) compared to any other studied species. Three 7 bp satellites, AAACTAC, AAACTAT, and

AAATTAC take up over 40% of the genome in *D. virilis*, and they form arrays tens of megabases

long in the pericentromeric region (Gall *et al.* 1971; Gall and Atherton 1974; Flynn *et al.* 2020).

The extremely high relative abundance of satellite DNA in *D. virilis* makes it an ideal system in

which to ask whether there are constraints or maximum limits on satellite abundance. One

strain in particular, vir00 (15010-1051.00), contains 15% more pericentromeric satellite DNA

compared to other *D. virilis* strains (Flynn *et al.* 2020 Figure 4B). In past modeling efforts,

satellite DNA arrays have been proposed to be weakly deleterious until they reach a maximum

length beyond which they are not tolerated by selection (Charlesworth *et al.* 1986). Slow DNA

replication or development time have been suggested as mechanisms to enforce strong

negative selection against long satellite arrays, however empirical evidence for this has been

limited (but see Bilinski *et al.* 2018). Here, we propose genome instability as a constraint on

excessively long or abundant satellite DNA arrays.

Genome instability is characterized by DNA damage that often results in large-scale mutations

or rearrangements, and is a fundamental driver of karyotype evolution, chromosomal

disorders, and cancer rearrangements (Black and Giunta 2018; Mayrose and Lysak 2021). The

first step is spontaneous DNA damage such as double-stranded DNA breaks, one of the most

dire events to occur in a cell (Featherstone and Jackson 1999). Even if DNA breaks are repaired,

they often result in large-scale genome rearrangements. Most DNA breaks leading to

rearrangements occur near the centromere and within or near satellite DNA, including in

human genomes (Black and Giunta 2018; Balzano *et al.* 2020). This may be due to intrinsic

instability of satellite DNA arrays caused by replication stress of polymerases progressing

through highly repetitive sequences, or the formation of unstable DNA topology (Barra and

Fachinetti 2018). Robertsonian translocations, one of the most common rearrangements in

medical genetics and evolution, occur when there are breaks near the centromere of

acrocentric chromosomes and when they are repaired they are fused to each other (Mayrose

and Lysak 2021). Robertsonian translocations are associated with multiple miscarriages in

humans and aneuploidy disorders like Patau and Down syndromes (Braekeleer and Dao 1990),

with increased rates of aneuploidy driven by increased nondisjunction of Robertsonian or fused

chromosomes (Schulz *et al.* 2006). We hypothesize that variation in pericentromeric satellite

DNA abundance influences the risk of genome instability events. Specifically, excess satellite

DNA might increase the risk of genome instability and genome rearrangements.

Sex chromosome evolution has been studied for decades, mainly making use of sex

chromosomes that have arisen in different time periods (Charlesworth and Charlesworth 2000).

In Drosophila, when an autosome fuses to either an X or Y chromosome, a so-called neo-Y

chromosome is formed. Because either the fused or unfused version of the chromosome will

only be present in males and male Drosophila do not undergo recombination, mutations

immediately begin to accumulate through Hill-Robertson interference and other linked-

selection processes (Charlesworth and Charlesworth 2000). In the genus Drosophila, autosomes

have fused to sex chromosomes multiple independent times (Nozawa *et al.* 2021): *D.*

pseudoobscura (10 million years), *D. miranda* (1 million years; Bachtrog 2013), *D. albomicans*

(0.24 million years; (Wei and Bachtrog), and *D. americana* (29 thousand years; (Vieira *et al.*

2006). Neo-sex chromosomes formed by *de novo* sex chromosome fusions are rare and actually

under-represented compared to autosomal fusions in *Drosophila* (Anderson *et al.* 2020), and

have never been discovered at their infancy before detectable divergence has occurred. How

new sex chromosome fusions become stable, and how they compete with the ancestral

karyotype within a species is unknown.

Here, we describe the discovery of two independent and extremely recent sex chromosome-

autosome fusions in one *D. virilis* strain, vir00. We hypothesize that this strain has been more

prone to DNA instability events, possibly caused by its excessive satellite DNA abundance. After

applying DNA replication and physical stressors, we measured DNA damage levels directly and

demonstrate that the DNA damage response is associated with satellite abundance. We use

two genetically identical strains that differ only by a chromosome fusion and satellite DNA

abundance, and demonstrate that the strain with more satellite DNA has significantly increased

DNA damage when stressed. Finally, we propose a model that genome instability may impose a

constraint on satellite abundance, a model that is entirely consistent with our data.

117
118   **RESULTS**
119
120   **Two novel sex chromosome Robertsonian translocations in *D. virilis* strain vir00**
121

In summer 2019, we performed DNA fluorescence in-situ hybridization (FISH) on larval

neuroblast nuclei of the vir00 strain that we had obtained several months earlier from the

National Drosophila Species Stock Center. We discovered it contained a Y-autosome fusion

(Figure 1A). The Y chromosome is recognizable in *D. virilis* because it has a distinct DAPI staining

intensity pattern, and contains a distinct arrangement of satellite DNA (Flynn *et al*. 2020).

However, all other chromosomes are difficult to distinguish in metaphase spreads, so we could

not immediately determine the fusion partner. We observed that the fused chromosome

contained the same centromere-proximal satellite as the Y chromosome, AAACTAT. To

determine if this chromosome fusion was present in other strains from similar geographical

locations, we imaged larvae from strains vir08, vir86, and vir48, which were collected from

different localities in California and Mexico (vir00 was collected from California). No larvae

screened in these other strains contained any chromosome fusions. We designate the vir00

substrain with the Y fusion as vir00-Yfus.

In Fall 2019, we obtained a second stock of vir00 from the National Drosophila Species Stock

Center. We set up single pair crosses and performed larval neuroblast squashes to karyotype

multiple male progeny of each cross. Surprisingly, we found that the Y-autosome fusion was not

present in any of the larvae karyotyped. However, 3/10 crosses karyotyped contained a

different fusion. This new fusion contained the brightly-dapi-staining AAATTAC satellite as the

centromere-proximal satellite, indicating that it is completely distinct from the Y fusion and

involved different chromosomes. We hypothesized that this new fusion involved the X

chromosome for several reasons; 1) based on centromere satellite identity, it had a 67%

probability (Flynn *et al.* 2020); 2) it was found only in single copy in male larvae, but sometimes

two copies in female larvae; 3) it was associated with observed X-Y nondisjunction events, such

as the presence of an XXYY female (Figure S1). We performed single-pair crosses and screened

the resulting progeny until we isolated a substrain fixed for the X fusion, and called this

substrain vir00-Xfus. We maintained one of the cross descendants from the 2019 stock that did

not have any evidence of the X fusion, which we designate vir00-Nofus. We inferred that both X

and Y fusions likely represent canonical Robertsonian translocations, in which two acrocentric

chromosomes that underwent DNA breakage were fused together at the centromere during

repair.

153
154
Figure 1. Discovery and genetic validation of two independent fusion events in vir00. A) DNA-
FISH in metaphase chromosome squashes demonstrating the Y fusion. B) DAPI staining of
metaphase chromosome squashes demonstrating the X-4 fusion. C) Genetic validation of the Y-
3 fusion and D) the X-4 fusion. Red chromosomes: *D. novamexicana*; orange: wildtype *D. virilis*
autosomes; green: autosome containing a GFP marker; light blue: X chromosome; dark blue: Y
chromosome.

161
162   **Genetic validation revealed Y-3 and X-4 fusions**

163
We designed two separate two-generation crossing experiments to validate the fusions

genetically and identify the autosome each sex chromosome is fused to. Both experiments

exploited autosomal markers which we could determine if they were segregating non-

independently of sex. The first experiment to validate the Y-autosome fusion used crosses

between vir00-Yfus and *D. novamexicana* and scoring of microsatellite loci on each candidate

autosome. We scored 82 F2 male progeny for the Chr3 marker, and 79/82 contained both

alleles, whereas the null hypothesis was 50% should contain both alleles (Figure 1C, Figure S2).

The three progeny that did not contain both alleles were determined to have nondisjunction

events and did not contain the Y chromosome (Figure S3). We concluded that the Y

chromosome is fused to Chr3, and that the fusion was fixed in this subline. The other markers

on Chr2, Chr4, and Chr5 segregated independently of sex and acted as negative controls (Table

S1). We also did a negative control with the same crossing scheme except with vir08 instead of

vir00 (Chr3 chi-square p = 0.39, N=22, Table S1).

The second experiment to validate the X-autosome fusion used crosses to *D. virilis* transgenic

lines containing GFP markers on one of each of the candidate autosomes. For the crosses to

Chr4-GFP (vir95), we phenotyped 304 F2 female progeny, and found that progeny containing a

GFP signal were significantly depleted compared to the Mendelian expectation of 50% (Figure

1D). This indicated that the X chromosome was fused to Chr4. This crossing scheme with two

other candidate autosomes did not show association of GFP signal with sex (Chi-square p-value

> 0.1, Table S2). We also performed a negative control with the *D. virilis* genome strain instead

of vir00-Xfus crossed to the Chr4-GFP line and found the GFP signal was independent of sex

(Chi-square p-value = 0.92, Table S2).

We validated that vir00-Yfus and vir00-Xfus are the same genetic line and not the result of

contamination from other lines either in our lab or the stock center. We made use of medium-

coverage whole genome sequencing from Flynn et al. (2020) to design primers to amplify

singleton insertion/deletion variants present only in vir00 (the version that was sequenced was,

in hindsight, vir00-Yfus) and not in any other wildtype *D. virilis* strain present in the stock center

(Table S3). We designed primers to amplify four loci on chromosomes 2, 3, 5, and 6 which

contain a homozygous 12-13 bp deletion in vir00 compared to the reference and the other

strains (Table S4). We found that both versions of vir00 contained the deletion at each of these

loci, confirming that these substrains are indeed the same strain and not a contamination

(Figure S4). Although we did the above indel experiment first, the whole genome resequencing

SNP analysis (below) was also concordant with these substrains being the same genetic line.

Satellite DNA decreased in vir00-Nofus compared to vir00-Yfus

We used Illumina to resequence the three vir00 substrains: vir00-Yfus, vir00-Xfus, and vir00-Nofus. We then used k-Seek to quantify the satellite abundance in each substrain (Wei *et al.* 2014). Assuming the most ancestral strain was vir00-Yfus, we found that satellite abundances decreased in the two derived lines vir00-Xfus and vir00-Nofus (Table S5). In vir00-Xfus, there was an 8% decrease only in the centromere proximal satellite of ChrX and Chr4 (AAATTAC). vir00-Nofus had an overall 12% loss of satellite DNA compared to vir00-Yfus (Figure 3b). vir00-Nofus had a similar 8% decrease in AAATTAC, in addition to a 10% loss in the pericentromeric satellite (AAACTAC) and a 13% loss in the centromere-proximal satellite of ChrY and Chr3 (AAACTAT). These data are consistent with our interpretation that vir00-Nofus is the result of breaking apart of the fusion chromosomes, and we conclude that significant satellite DNA was lost from all three pericentromeric and centromeric satellites in vir00-Nofus.

DNA damage levels in response to stress is related to satellite abundance in *D. virilis*

The vir00 strain, with the highest abundance of satellite DNA, contained two recent independent Robertsonian translocations. There are multiple steps required to detect a Robertsonian translocation: DNA breakage near the centromere, repair and fusion with another acrocentric chromosome, retention of a functional centromere, and intergenerational retention. To isolate the first step and the fundamental process in genome instability, we sought to measure DNA breakage directly. Since vir00-Yfus also contained the highest abundance of satellite DNA compared to the other strains, we wanted to test if variation in DNA breakage level after stress was associated with satellite DNA abundance. We therefore measured DNA damage levels in 7 different *D. virilis* strains, including vir00-Yfus and vir00-Nofus, with varying abundances of satellite DNA in response to replication stress and low-level radiation.

228
229
Figure 2. Comet assay images of nuclei isolated from *D. virilis* adult testes of the genome strain
vir87 (A/C) and from vir00-Yfus (B/D) with and without stress (gemcitabine + radiation). Blue
arrows point to the comet head and yellow brackets indicate the comet tails. The comet head
and tail distribution for GDvir are of similar size and intensity. In vir00-Yfus, the comet tail is
largely diffuse and expanded in the stress conditions compared to the control. These strains
represent the lowest and highest satellite DNA abundances which have the least and greatest
increase in DNA damage in response to stress, respectively.
237

Since spontaneous DNA breakage events are rare and we did not want to confound our data

with breaks that occur as part of meiotic crossing over, we used stressors to elevate the rate of

DNA damage. This would allow us to potentially detect a difference in the phenotype of interest

between strains and also amplify possible types of stress imposed by excess satellite DNA

content. We fed 0-1 day old adult flies the nucleoside analog gemcitabine for 8 days, which

stalls replication forks and acts as a sensitizer for radiation via the Rad51 pathway

(Kobashigawa *et al.* 2015). We then irradiated these sensitized flies with gamma rays at low

level radiation (10 Gy). For each of seven strains tested, we included a control which was fed

with the same liquid food with no gemcitabine and did not receive radiation treatment. We

used the comet assay or single-cell gel electrophoresis to measure DNA damage in the male

germline in each line (Figure 2). We quantified comets using OpenComet software and used the

olive moment measurement as the statistic representing DNA damage (Gyori *et al.* 2014) (Table

S6). To detect differences in DNA damage in response to stress between strains, we took the

mean difference in olive moments between the control and stress treatments (see Methods).

The strain with the lowest satellite abundance, the genome strain, contained the lowest DNA

damage response and this was significantly lower than all other strains tested (Figure 2A,C,

Figure 3A). The strain with the highest satellite abundance, vir00-Yfus, had among the highest

DNA damage responses (Figure 2B,D), but was not significantly different from two other strains

vir8 and vir48 (Figure 3A). Like most other phenotypes, there are likely multiple genetic factors

contributing to the variation we found. Ideally, to demonstrate that satellite DNA is a causal

factor, we would manipulate satellite DNA abundance and test the DNA damage phenotypes,

but multi-megabase long arrays of satellite DNA cannot be manipulated with traditional

genome editing. However, vir00-Yfus and vir00-Nofus differ only by a chromosome fusion and

12% satellite abundance. Thus, if there is a difference in DNA damage response between these

substrains, it may be caused by differing satellite abundance. vir00-Nofus, which contained 12%

less satellite DNA than vir00-Yfus, had a significantly reduced DNA damage response, which is

concordant with our expectations that satellite DNA plays a causal role (Figure 3B).

Figure 3. Satellite DNA is associated with DNA breakage in response to stress. A) Olive moment, a statistic of the comet assay, measuring DNA damage for 7 different strains paired with a control and stress treatment. N indicates the number of nuclei analyzed for each treatment. Flies treated with gemcitabine and radiation are suffixed with "rad" and control flies are suffixed with "con". The lower panel shows the unpaired mean difference between "rad" and "con" for each fly strain (black dot) and 95% confidence intervals (black line) produced from dabestr (5000 bootstrap method). Groups a, b, and c indicate samples with overlapping confidence intervals. B) The satellite DNA abundance of each *D. virilis* strain (x axis) and its unpaired mean difference between treatment and control (y axis). vir00-Nofus experienced a 12% loss in satellite DNA compared to vir00-Yfus, which is associated with a significantly decreased DNA damage in response to stress. C) Model that is consistent with our observations and data.

Extremely minimal degradation of the neo-Y chromosome

The Y-fused version of Chr3 is expected to accumulate mutations independently of the autosomal version of Chr3 over time because of the halt in recombination in male flies. This

would be represented in the mapping of short-read sequencing data by elevated heterozygosity

on Chr3. Specifically, if the mutations arose after the fusion of Chr3 to the Y, they would not be

present in any other strains of virilis, assuming no recurrent mutation. Thus, we used GATK

genotyping and found heterozygous singletons unique to vir00-Yfus compared to other non-

vir00 strains on each autosome (Table S3). We found that the number of heterozygous

singletons was modestly but significantly enriched on Chr3 in vir00-Yfus: 2.45 SNPs/Mb more

than other autosomes (permutation test, p < 0.001). We suggest this elevated density of

singleton heterozygous sites may be due to the fusion with the Y chromosome and lack of

recombination over several generations. Assuming the enrichment was caused only by the Y-

fusion and that the neo-Y (Chr3) evolved clonally in a single lineage, we roughly estimate the Y-

3 fusion occurred 1000-2000 generations ago.

Because the X-4 fusion was segregating with the no-fusion karyotype, recombination in

heterozygotes would prevent degeneration of the neo-Y version of Chr4. Furthermore, we

believe the X-4 fusion occurred between 2018-2019 since it was not present in the stock we

obtained in 2018. We did not observe an enrichment of heterozygous singletons on Chr4 in

vir00-Xfus. However, there was still a slight enrichment on Chr3 in vir00-Xfus (1.45 SNPs/Mb,

permutation test p = 0.031), supporting our assumption that vir00-Xfus is the result of the

breaking apart of the Y fusion and forming a new fusion.

Nondisjunction between the X and Y chromosomes is highly elevated in chromosome fusion

lines

Nondisjunction occurs when homologous chromosomes fail to separate at meiosis, and results

in aneuploidy in the progeny. Autosomal and X chromosome aneuploidy is lethal in flies; but Y

chromosome aneuploidy is viable: females that have a Y chromosome (XXY) are fertile, males

with no Y chromosome (XO) are sterile, and males with two Y chromosomes (XYY) are fertile.

Elevated rates of X-Y nondisjunction represent a fitness cost because zygotes with infertile or

lethal karyotypes will form at increased frequency. We found some evidence of nondisjunction

in the vir00-Yfus genetic validation (Figure S3), and also common Y chromosome aneuploidy in

the stock of vir00-Xfus (Figure S1). Since both fusions involve the sex chromosomes, we tested

the rate of primary X-Y nondisjunction in males in all three versions of vir00, along with the *D.*

virilis genome strain as a control. We first fully isolated the vir00-Nofus strain to ensure no

fusion chromosomes were segregating, which even at low frequency could increase the rate of

nondisjunction in the line.

We crossed individual males of each strain to genome strain females and genotyped for the

presence or absence of the Y chromosome in progeny. Female progeny containing a Y

chromosome indicate XY sperm from the father, and male progeny lacking a Y chromosome

indicate nullisomic sperm from the father. Since nondisjunction was extremely high in vir00-

Xfus, 2/7 fathers tested were of XYY karyotype, which we could infer if more than half of his

female progeny contained a Y chromosome (Maggert 2014). We eliminated these fathers'

progeny from the primary nondisjunction rate calculation. No fathers tested from other

sublines were determined to be XYY. Males without a Y chromosome would not produce

progeny. We found that vir00-Yfus had a slightly elevated nondisjunction rate of 4.5%,

compared to the genome strain control of 1.2%, but it was not statistically significant with the

sample sizes we used (Table 1). vir00-Xfus had an extremely high primary nondisjunction rate of

21% (e.g. Figure S5), which was significantly higher than that of all other substrains ($p < 0.004$,

pairwise proportion test, Table 1). Surprisingly, vir00-Nofus had a significantly elevated

nondisjunction rate compared to the genome strain control, at 5.7%. This was not statistically

different from vir00-Yfus.

Table 1: Nondisjunction of the X and Y chromosomes in males is elevated in chromosome
fusion lines.

Line	Nondisjunction rate	Fathers with nondisjunction/ total fathers	Aneuploid progeny/ total progeny	Significance group
GDvir	1.2%	1 / 10	3 / 248	a
vir00-Yfus	4.5%	4 / 7	9 / 198	ab
vir00-Nofus	5.7%	4 / 6	11 / 192	b
vir00-Xfus*	21%	5 / 5	27 / 127	c

*only including primary nondisjunction

Discussion

D. virilis has the highest relative satellite DNA abundance of any studied species. Is there a

maximum limit of satellite DNA a genome can tolerate before there are negative

consequences? We found that vir00, the strain with 15% more pericentromeric satellite DNA

than other strains recently underwent two independent chromosome fusion events. vir00-Yfus

has the highest satellite DNA abundance and among the highest DNA damage level in response

to stress. vir00-Nofus, with 12% less satellite DNA, which was presumably lost in the breaking

apart of the chromosome fusions, has significantly lower DNA damage level in response to

stress. We propose a model that places a constraint on satellite DNA abundance and can

explain our findings with the vir00-line (Figure 3C). If satellite DNA expands, the risk of DNA

breakage and genome instability increases and chromosome fusions may occur. These

chromosome fusions may increase the nondisjunction rate and make the affected line less fit.

The chromosome fusions may later break apart; and as this occurs pericentromeric satellite

DNA may be lost (Figure 3C). This in turn results in a decreased risk of genome instability. The

question of whether satellite DNA abundance influences genome instability has had

considerable interest recently (Arora *et al.* 2021), however a convenient system in which to test

this question has been lacking.

There are several possible mechanisms that might cause excess satellite DNA to increase the

risk of DNA breakage. Satellite DNA may form complex structures, loops, or non-B DNA, and

increasing the length of the arrays may make these regions more unstable in cis (Barra and

Fachinetti 2018). It may be challenging for polymerases to replicate many megabases of

tandem satellite sequence, and longer arrays may have a higher risk of stalling polymerases and

thus DNA breaks in cis (Barra and Fachinetti 2018). Finally, increased satellite DNA may titrate

away binding proteins that maintain genome stability, in trans (Francisco and Lemos 2014;

Brown *et al.* 2020a; Giunta *et al.* 2021). Whether there is a maximum threshold of satellite

array length or abundance, as suggested in Charlesworth *et al.* (1986), or whether risk of

genome instability varies continuously with satellite abundance will require further study.

Chromosome rearrangements such as Robertsonian translocations are rare occurrences, but

are commonly the cause of karyotype evolution between species (Mayrose and Lysak 2021). In

humans, rearrangements resulting from breaks near the centromere are associated with

miscarriages and in the case of somatic rearrangements, cancer (Barra and Fachinetti 2018).

Previous studies have found repetitive element involvement in chromosome rearrangements in

multiple species (Paço *et al.* 2015; Reis *et al.* 2018). However, genetic variation of repetitive

DNA within species has never been associated with increased risk of genome instability. Here

our data suggests, at least in *D. virilis* strain vir00, that elevated satellite DNA may play a causal

role in increasing the risk of DNA breakage, which can lead to deleterious rearrangements.

We identified elevated nondisjunction rates as a cost of chromosome fusions. Surprisingly, the

rate of nondisjunction was 5-fold higher in vir00-Xfus compared to vir00-Yfus. With a

nondisjunction rate of 21%, a significant proportion of abnormal karyotypes will be produced,

such as XO (sterile), XYY (viable and fertile), and XXY or XXYY (viable and fertile), all of which we

found in cytological samples. Further mating between these abnormal karyotypes will produce

significant proportions of sterile or inviable karyotypes like XYYY or XXX, which will further

decrease the fitness of this line. Furthermore, karyotypes with extra Y chromosomes such as

XYY and XXY have been found to have decreased lifespan (Brown *et al.* 2020b). Although we did

not assay the nondisjunction rate of the fused autosome, it is possible the nondisjunction rate

of Chr4 is also elevated in vir00-Xfus, which would further decrease the fitness of the line

because Chr4 aneuploidy is expected to be lethal (Lindsley *et al.* 1972). The extreme

nondisjunction rate indicates X-Y pairing is severely disrupted due to the X-4 fusion, but only

slightly if at all due to the Y-3 fusion. When the Y fusion presumably broke apart and the X

fusion formed, it is possible other rearrangements on the X and/or Y occurred that disrupted

pairing. Furthermore, the nondisjunction rate did not decrease to a level similar to the genome

strain in vir00-Nofus. We believe this indicates a remaining rearrangement in vir00-Nofus

affecting the pairing and disjunction of the X-Y. We only found a modest difference in estimated

rDNA copy number between the substrains (Table S7), which has been found to mediate pairing

of the X and Y (McKee and Karpen 1990). Detailed analysis of structural rearrangements in the

heterochromatin will be required to determine the mechanism of the elevated nondisjunction

rates.

Our study has several limitations. First, the vir00-Nofus flies we used for resequencing and for

DNA damage assays had the X-4 fusion segregating at low frequency (<15%), which was

unknown to us until we were able to correct it for the nondisjunction assays. However, we

believe our results hold firmly because the main comparison was with vir00-Yfus, the substrain

with the most satellite DNA. For testing our hypothesis, the fusion status in the other substrains

matters less than the satellite DNA abundance, which was markedly lower in the vir00-Nofus

substrain we used. Furthermore, the increase in damage level between the control and stressed

flies may not be directly applicable to the risk of DNA breaks and genome instability in natural

conditions. Although we find a difference in the DNA damage in response to stress between

vir00 substrains with different abundances of satellite DNA, their fusion status is also different.

We cannot eliminate the possibility that the presence of the Y fusion itself increased the rate of

DNA damage instead of the abundance of satellite DNA. Finally, we cannot eliminate the

possibility that satellite DNA increased in vir00-Yfus after the fusion occurred and not prior to as

we suggest in our model.

We believe the system we discovered will be useful for a variety of future studies. The vir00

fusion substrains will be useful for studying centromere identity. In both the Y-3 and X-4

fusions, two spherical regions of satellite DNA are present at the centromere of these fusions,

representing one from each acrocentric chromosome (Figure 1). We note that the X-4 fusion in

vir00 is homologous to an independent X-4 fusion in *D. americana* 29 thousand years ago, a

species only 4.5 million years diverged. In the X-4 fusion of *D. americana*, there is only one

discrete region of centromeric satellite (Flynn *et al.* 2020), unlike what we found here. In female

meiosis where chromosomes can compete to get into the oocyte rather than the polar body,

"stronger" centromeres with more satellite may have an advantage. A "supercentromere"

resulting from a centromere-centromere fusion is one way to do this, and in *D. americana* the

X-4 fusion has biased transmission into the egg (Stewart *et al.* 2019). Finally, since both

centromere-centromere fusions had matching centromere-proximal satellites (AAACTAT for Y-3

and AAATTAC for X-4), we suggest that the centromeric satellite identity is important for DNA

repair for Robertsonian translocations, or for stability and retention of the centromere.

METHODS

Scripts required to reproduce the computational results are available here:

https://github.com/jmf422/D-virilis-fusion-chromosomes

Neuroblast squashes and satellite DNA FISH

We dissected brains from wandering 3rd-instar larvae and performed the fixation steps as in

(Larracuente and Ferree 2015). Specifically, we placed brains in sodium citrate solution for 6

minutes before fixation. After fixation and drying of slides, we applied Vectashield dapi

mounting medium. We performed DNA-FISH on vir00-Yfus, which allowed us to confidently

identify the Y chromosome based on its unique satellite DNA composition. We used the same

fixation and staining protocol as Flynn *et al.* (2020). We imaged metaphase cells using a 100x oil

objective on an Olympus fluorescent microscope and Metamorph capture system at the Cornell

Imaging Facility.

Y-autosome fusion validation

We designed an experiment that would both validate the Y chromosome fusion and to

distinguish which autosome is fused. We first designed primers flanking microsatellite loci on all

four autosomes that met the following criteria: 1) had 100% conserved non-repetitive and

unique priming sites between *D. virilis* and *D. novamexicana*; 2) amplicon length differed

between the species by at least 15 bp as to be distinguished on an agarose gel; 3) locus

contained a mono or tri nucleotide repeat; 4) locus length ~200 bp. We next set up a two-

generation crossing scheme (Figure 1A). We crossed *D. novamexicana* virgin females with vir00-

Yfus males and selected the male progeny, which we backcrossed to *D. novamexicana* virgin

females. We then genotyped the male F2 progeny from this cross at the 4 sets of primers

corresponding to the four non-dot autosomes (Chr2, 3, 4, 5) (Table S4). We performed single-fly

DNA extraction in strip tubes with Tris-EDTA buffer and 0.2 mg/mL proteinase K. We did 12 uL

standard PCR reactions (3 min at 95, 30 cycles of 30 sec 95, 30 sec 55, 50 sec 72, final extension

5 min). Each primer on each PCR plate had a homozygous (*D. novamexicana*) and heterozygous

(*D. novamexicana-D.virilis* F1 hydrid) control. We then ran the PCR product on 2.5% agarose

gels. If there was indeed an autosome fused to the Y chromosome, we would expect to see

100% of the male progeny being heterozygous for the *virilis* and *novamexicana* alleles (except

for rare cases of non-disjunction). For the autosomes that are not fused, we would expect to

see 50% of the progeny being homozygous for the *novamexicana* allele, and half heterozygous,

due to Mendel's law of random segregation. We successfully validated the existence of the Y

fusion, and found that it is fused to chromosome 3 (Muller D) (Table S1, Figure 1). There were 3

male progeny that were homozygous for the Chr3 *novamexicana* allele. We verified that these

were cases of nondisjunction (opposed to the Y fusion not being fixed in this subline) by finding

that the Y chromosome was absent in controlled Y chromosome PCR assays (Figure S3).

Isolation of vir00-Xfus and vir00-Nofus

The X fusion was found to be segregating with a no fusion substrain in the 2019 stock of vir00.

We wanted to isolate these into two separate substrains where the karyotype is fixed. From the

progeny of the three original crosses in which we found the X fusion, we made 10 single pair

crosses and did neuroblast squashes of 6-8 larval progeny per cross, including both sexes. By

chance, we should be able to find a cross in which the mother had two copies of the fusion and

the father had a single copy – in which the derived line would be fixed for the fusion. If all

progeny imaged contained the fusion (and females contained two copies of the fusion), then it

is likely that this was the case. We created this line, and call it vir00-Xfus. We maintained a line

isolated from the 2019 stock that had no evidence of the X fusion and called it vir00-Nofus. We

later found that vir00-Nofus still had the X fusion segregating at low frequency. We isolated a

fixed Nofus version in the same way as above for nondisjunction assays, because a low

frequency fusion could increase the nondisjunction rate greatly.

X-autosome fusion validation

We obtained transgenic strains with GFP (or Blue) insertions which are expressed in the eye and

larval brain from the National Drosophila Species Stock Center (vir95, vir121, vir117). Stern *et*

al. (2017) found the insertion sites of these lines. We chose lines which contained the GFP

marker on candidate autosomes Chr2, Chr4, and Chr5. Chr3 was not a candidate because it is

fused to the Y in vir00-Yfus and contains a different centromeric satellite. Before setting up

crosses, we screened 10-20 larvae of each line with a fluorescent microscope to ensure the

transgene had not drifted to low frequency. Larvae containing the transgene demonstrated the

GFP signal in their brain. We chose to phenotype at the larval stage since we would be crossing

GFP strains to wildtype red-eyed flies and the visibility of GFP in the adult eye would be low. We

then designed a crossing scheme which would allow us to both validate that the X chromosome

was fused and distinguish which autosome it was fused to (Figure 1B). We crossed GFP-line

males to vir00-Xfus virgin females. We then selected the male F1 progeny and crossed them to

virilis genome strain virgin females. We then phenotyped F2 larvae, classifying each as either

GFP positive or negative. When the phenotyped flies emerged, we sexed and counted them. If

the candidate autosome is fused to the X, we would expect sex to segregate with the GFP

marker: all female progeny will be GFP negative, and all male progeny will be GFP positive

(except for phenotyping errors or rare nondisjunction events). For all other lines, sex should not

segregate with GFP status. We performed negative control crosses in which the parental cross

was replaced by genome strain virgin females, to ensure the crossing scheme produced the

expected results (Table S2). We found that the X chromosome is fused to Chr4 (Muller B).

Validation of the three versions of vir00 with private fixed indels

We used GATK recommended practices to do genotyping of our low-coverage whole genome

sequencing data from Flynn et al. (2020). We used vcftools to subset singletons present only in

vir00, which was, in hindsight, vir00-Yfus. We then used GATK's SelectVariants to select only

non-reference homozygous indels 12 bp or more with a depth of at least 10 in vir00 and at least

2 in the other strains. We then manually inspected each potential candidate in IGV to ensure:

no reads in other strains supported the indel, all reads in vir00 supported the indel, and there

were no nearby indels in other strains. We then designed primers for the four loci (on Chr 2, 3,

5, 6) that met these criteria and also had enough SNP-free sequence flanking the indel in order

to design primers that would amplify a locus 100-200 bp equally in all strains. We performed

PCR and gel electrophoresis (2.5% gel, 98 V, 90 min).

DNA damage assays

We chose two stressors that would moderately increase the rate of DNA breaks and allow us to

potentially detect differences between strains. Gemcitabine is a nucleoside analog that induces

replication stress by stalling polymerases, and also sensitizes cells to radiation via the RAD51

pathway (Kobashigawa *et al.* 2015). We selected dosage and a fly-feeding regime based on

(Kislukhin *et al.* 2012). Ionizing radiation has long been used to increase the rates of DNA breaks

in flies for mutagenesis. We chose a dose ¼ - ½ of what has been typically used in mutagenesis

(Carlson and Southin 1962).

We collected male flies 0-1 days old and fed them gemcitabine (0.718 mM) mixed with liquid

food in vials with 8-12 adult flies as in (Kislukhin *et al.* 2012). Liquid food consisted of 12.5g

sucrose, 17.5 g dry yeast, 5 mL corn syrup, and 95 mL PBS (autoclaved for 30 min immediately

after adding the yeast). Flies were fed the drug for 7-9 days before radiation. Controls were fed

with the same liquid food for 7-9 days, except no gemcitabine was added. Flies were moved to

fresh vials every 3-4 days. For radiation treatment, we transferred flies into 50 mL conical tubes

with 5 mL agar because these tubes were compatible with the radiation source. Control flies

were also transferred to new tubes. We used a J.L. Shepherd & Associates Mark I Irradiator with

1,100 Ci of Cs-137, and flies were irradiated at approximately 400 rad/min for a total of 10 Gy.

In one case, for the GDvir stress treatment, the radiation was not stopped on time so 4 extra Gy

were applied. We believe this did not affect our results, especially because the GDvir strain had

the lowest DNA damage increase with gemcitabine and radiation stress. We did comet assays

to measure DNA damage (Angelis *et al.* 1999) over three different dates (Table S6), but ensured

experimental conditions were practically identical each time. For some samples we had to

combine results from two different dates to have enough nuclei for statistical analysis (Table

S6). We dissected testes from approximately 8 flies from each treatment within one hour of

radiation treatment to minimize the opportunity for breakage repair (Shetty *et al.* 2017). We

then homogenized the testes tissue using a dounce, filtered the homogenate through a 40

micron filter to remove debris, and centrifuged and resuspended the cells to approximately 10^5

cells/mL.

We next performed the alkaline comet assay as directed by the Enzo comet kit (ADI-900-166),

which provides higher sensitivity than the neutral comet assay (Angelis *et al.* 1999). We imaged

slides on a metamorph imaging system at 10x magnification using a fluorescent green filter to

detect the CyGreen dye included in the comet kit. We quantified damage levels using the

software OpenComet as a plugin in ImageJ (Gyori *et al.* 2014). We filtered called nuclei that

were not comet shapes or contained background interference. We used the measure of "olive

moment," which is the product of the percent of DNA in the tail and distance between

intensity-weighted centroids of head and tail (Gyori *et al.* 2014) as the statistic to compare

between strains and treatments.

Resequencing sublines to determine differences in their satellite abundance.

Pools of 6 male flies were DNA extracted with Qiagen DNeasy blood and tissue kit. PCR-free

libraries were then prepared with Illumina TruSeq PCR-free library prep. Libraries were

sequenced on a NextSeq 500 single end 150 bp. We removed adapters and poly-G signal with

fastp and then ran k-Seek to count satellite abundances (Wei *et al.* 2014). We used average

read depth to normalize the kmer counts. We also mapped the reads to the *D. virilis* rDNA

consensus sequence (http://blogs.rochester.edu/EickbushLab/?page_id=602) to estimate the

rDNA copy number in the three vir00 substrains as well as a vir08 as a control (Table S3, S7).

Using sequencing data to estimate the age of the Y-3 fusion

Scripts for this section are available here: https://github.com/jmf422/D-virilis-fusion-

chromosomes/tree/main/simulate_degradation. We used the sequencing data from Flynn et al.

(2020) in addition to data produced here for vir00-Yfus, vir00-Xfus, and vir00-Nofus and 10

other *D. virilis* strains. We mapped the data to the RS2 genome assembly using bowtie2. We

then genotyped with GATK following standard procedures (McKenna *et al.* 2010). We extracted

heterozygous singleton sites for vir00, and counted how many occurred on each autosome. We

calculated the enrichment on Chr3 in vir00-Yfus based on the difference from the average SNP

density on the other autosomes (excluding the dot chromosome Chr6). To determine whether

this enrichment of SNPs was significant based on the size of the chromosome and the number

of mutations, we randomly permuted the total number of heterozygous singleton SNPs on all

autosomes and calculated the proportion falling on Chr3, and repeated this 1000 times.

We then performed simple simulations to determine approximately how many generations of

mutation accumulation without recombination or selection would result in the enrichment we

observed. Since heterozygous singletons are challenging for the genotyper to call with

moderate coverage sequencing data, we incorporated this into our simulation. First, we made

the genome assembly diploid then used mutation-simulator (Kühl *et al.* 2020) to simulate

random mutations (transition/transversion ratio 2.0) at a rate of 2×10^{-9} per bp per generation

for 500, 1000, 2000, and 5000 generations on one copy of Chr3 only. We then simulated

Illumina reads with ART (Huang *et al.* 2012) at the same depth as we have for vir00-Yfus in our

real data (23 x haploid or 11.5 x diploid). We next used standard GATK genotyping and selected

out heterozygous singletons on Chr3. We repeated the simulation 10 times for each number of

generations to get a range of values. The empirical enrichment fell in between what we found

in the simulations for 1000 and 2000 generations.

Nondisjunction assays

We crossed a single male from vir00-Yfus, vir00-Xfus, vir00-Nofus (fixed), and GDvir (control) to

one or two GDvir (genome strain vir87) females. We collected the virgin progeny from each

cross, extracted DNA with a squish-proteinase K prep, and genotyped with PCR and gel

electrophoresis for the presence or absence of the Y chromosome in up to 16 female and 16

male progeny. We amplified a locus unique to the Y chromosome (primers designed by Yasir

Ahmed-Braimah for a different project, Table S4). For a subset of individuals, we also

performed multiplex controls with an autosomal locus. Otherwise, we performed DNA

extractions in large batches with the same proteinase K mixture to minimize the chance of DNA

extraction failure. A very small quantity of DNA is required for a standard PCR with robust

primers. To control for the completeness of the PCR mastermix, we included male samples in

the same batch as female samples. If a male lacked a Y chromosome, we inferred the father's

sperm was missing the Y chromosome (nullisomic), and if a female contained a Y chromosome,

we inferred the father's sperm contained both X and Y. We used R prop.test to evaluate

whether there were any differences between nondisjunction proportions for the different

strains. After finding this highly significant, we used pairwise.prop.test in R with Holm-

Bonferroni multiple test correction to determine which pairs of substrain nondisjunction rates

were significantly different from each other.

Acknowledgements

We thank Yasir Ahmed-Braimah for discussions and use of primers. We greatly appreciate the

use of the Cs-137 irradiator from the Robert Weiss lab and to Amanda Loehr for operating the

device. Asha Jain prepared sequencing libraries for this project, and Yassi Hafezi provided

advice on the nondisjunction assays. We also thank members of the Clark lab for discussions

and encouragement on this project.

638
639   **References**
640

Anderson S. N., M. C. Stitzer, A. B. Brohammer, P. Zhou, J. M. Noshay, *et al.*, 2019 Transposable

elements contribute to dynamic genome content in maize. Plant J. 100: 1052–1065.

Anderson N. W., C. E. Hjelmen, and H. Blackmon, 2020 The probability of fusions joining sex

chromosomes and autosomes. Biol. Lett. 16: 20200648.

Angelis K. J., M. Dusinská, and A. R. Collins, 1999 Single cell gel electrophoresis: detection of

DNA damage at different levels of sensitivity. Electrophoresis 20: 2133–2138.

Arora U. P., C. Charlebois, R. A. Lawal, and B. L. Dumont, 2021 Population and subspecies

diversity at mouse centromere satellites. BMC Genomics 22: 279.

Bachtrog D., 2013 Y-chromosome evolution: emerging insights into processes of Y-chromosome

degeneration. Nat. Rev. Genet. 14: 113–124.

Balzano E., F. Pelliccia, and S. Giunta, 2020 Genome (in)stability at tandem repeats. Semin. Cell

Dev. Biol. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.semcdb.2020.10.003

Barra V., and D. Fachinetti, 2018 The dark side of centromeres: types, causes and consequences

of structural abnormalities implicating centromeric DNA. Nat. Commun. 9: 4340.

Bilinski P., P. S. Albert, J. J. Berg, J. A. Birchler, M. N. Grote, *et al.*, 2018 Parallel altitudinal clines

reveal trends in adaptive evolution of genome size in Zea mays. PLoS Genet. 14: e1007162.

Black E. M., and S. Giunta, 2018 Repetitive Fragile Sites: Centromere Satellite DNA As a Source

of Genome Instability in Human Diseases. Genes 9. https://doi.org/10.3390/genes9120615

Braekeleer M. D., and T.-N. Dao, 1990 Cytogenetic studies in couples experiencing repeated

pregnancy losses. Hum. Reprod. 5: 519–528.

Brown E. J., A. H. Nguyen, and D. Bachtrog, 2020a The Drosophila Y Chromosome Affects

Heterochromatin Integrity Genome-Wide. Mol. Biol. Evol. 37: 2808–2824.

Brown E. J., A. H. Nguyen, and D. Bachtrog, 2020b The Y chromosome may contribute to sex-

specific ageing in Drosophila. Nat Ecol Evol 4: 853–862.

Carlson E. A., and J. L. Southin, 1962 Comparative mutagenesis of the dumpy locus in

Drosophila melanogaster. I. X-ray treatment of mature sperm--frequency and distribution.

Genetics 47: 321–336.

Cechova M., R. S. Harris, M. Tomaszkiewicz, B. Arbeithuber, F. Chiaromonte, *et al.*, 2019 High

satellite repeat turnover in great apes studied with short- and long-read technologies. Mol.

Biol. Evol. https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msz156

Charlesworth B., C. H. Langley, and W. Stephan, 1986 The evolution of restricted recombination

and the accumulation of repeated DNA sequences. Genetics 112: 947–962.

Charlesworth B., and D. Charlesworth, 2000 The degeneration of Y chromosomes. Philosophical

Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences 355: 1563–1572.

Featherstone C., and S. P. Jackson, 1999 DNA double-strand break repair. Curr. Biol. 9: R759–

R761.

Ferree P. M., and D. A. Barbash, 2009 Species-specific heterochromatin prevents mitotic

chromosome segregation to cause hybrid lethality in Drosophila. PLoS Biol. 7: e1000234.

Flynn J. M., I. Caldas, M. E. Cristescu, and A. G. Clark, 2017 Selection Constrains High Rates of

Tandem Repetitive DNA Mutation in Daphnia pulex. Genetics 207: 697–710.

Flynn J. M., M. Long, R. A. Wing, and A. G. Clark, 2020 Evolutionary Dynamics of Abundant 7-bp

Satellites in the Genome of Drosophila virilis. Mol. Biol. Evol. 37: 1362–1375.

Francisco F. O., and B. Lemos, 2014 How Do Y-Chromosomes Modulate Genome-Wide

Epigenetic States: Genome Folding, Chromatin Sinks, and Gene Expression. Journal of

Genomics 2: 94–103.

Fry K., and W. Salser, 1977 Nucleotide sequences of HS-alpha satellite DNA from kangaroo rat

Dipodomys ordii and characterization of similar sequences in other rodents. Cell 12: 1069–

1084.

Gall J., E. Cohen, and M. Polan, 1971 Repetitive DNA sequences in Drosophila. Chromosoma 33.

https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00284948

Gall J. G., and D. D. Atherton, 1974 Satellite DNA sequences in Drosophila virilis. J. Mol. Biol. 85:

633–664.

Giunta S., S. Hervé, R. R. White, T. Wilhelm, M. Dumont, *et al.*, 2021 CENP-A chromatin prevents

replication stress at centromeres to avoid structural aneuploidy. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.

A. 118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2015634118

Gyori B. M., G. Venkatachalam, P. S. Thiagarajan, D. Hsu, and M.-V. Clement, 2014 OpenComet:

an automated tool for comet assay image analysis. Redox Biol 2: 457–465.

Huang W., L. Li, J. R. Myers, and G. T. Marth, 2012 ART: a next-generation sequencing read

simulator. Bioinformatics 28: 593–594.

Jagannathan M., R. Cummings, and Y. M. Yamashita, 2018 A conserved function for

pericentromeric satellite DNA. Elife 7. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.34122

Jagannathan M., and Y. M. Yamashita, 2021 Defective satellite DNA clustering into

chromocenters underlies hybrid incompatibility in Drosophila. bioRxiv 2021.04.16.440167.

Kislukhin G., M. L. Murphy, M. Jafari, and A. D. Long, 2012 Chemotherapy-induced toxicity is

highly heritable in Drosophila melanogaster. Pharmacogenet. Genomics 22: 285–289.

Kobashigawa S., K. Morikawa, H. Mori, and G. Kashino, 2015 Gemcitabine Induces

Radiosensitization Through Inhibition of RAD51-dependent Repair for DNA Double-strand

Breaks. Anticancer Res. 35: 2731–2737.

Kühl M. A., B. Stich, and D. C. Ries, 2020 Mutation-Simulator: Fine-grained simulation of

random mutations in any genome. Bioinformatics.

https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btaa716

Larracuente A. M., and P. M. Ferree, 2015 Simple method for fluorescence DNA in situ

hybridization to squashed chromosomes. J. Vis. Exp. 52288.

Lindsley D. L., L. Sandler, B. S. Baker, A. T. Carpenter, R. E. Denell, *et al.*, 1972 Segmental

aneuploidy and the genetic gross structure of the Drosophila genome. Genetics 71: 157–

184.

Maggert K. A., 2014 Reduced rDNA Copy Number Does Not Affect "Competitive" Chromosome

Pairing in XYY Males of Drosophila melanogaster. G3 Genes|Genomes|Genetics 4: 497–

507.

Mayrose I., and M. A. Lysak, 2021 The Evolution of Chromosome Numbers: Mechanistic Models

and Experimental Approaches. Genome Biol. Evol. 13.

https://doi.org/10.1093/gbe/evaa220

McKee B. D., and G. H. Karpen, 1990 Drosophila ribosomal RNA genes function as an X-Y pairing

site during male meiosis. Cell 61: 61–72.

McKenna A., M. Hanna, E. Banks, A. Sivachenko, K. Cibulskis, *et al.*, 2010 The Genome Analysis

Toolkit: a MapReduce framework for analyzing next-generation DNA sequencing data.

Genome Res. 20: 1297–1303.

Miga K. H., Y. Newton, M. Jain, N. Altemose, H. F. Willard, *et al.*, 2014 Centromere reference

models for human chromosomes X and Y satellite arrays. Genome Res. 24: 697–707.

Mills W. K., Y. C. G. Lee, A. M. Kochendoerfer, E. M. Dunleavy, and G. H. Karpen, 2019 RNA from

a simple-tandem repeat is required for sperm maturation and male fertility in Drosophila

melanogaster. Elife 8. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.48940

Nozawa M., Y. Minakuchi, K. Satomura, S. Kondo, A. Toyoda, *et al.*, 2021 Evolutionary

trajectories of three independent neo-sex chromosomes in Drosophila. Cold Spring Harbor

Laboratory 2021.03.11.435033.

Paço A., F. Adega, N. Meštrović, M. Plohl, and R. Chaves, 2015 The puzzling character of

repetitive DNA in Phodopus genomes (Cricetidae, Rodentia). Chromosome Res. 23: 427–

440.

Petitpierre E., C. Juan, J. Pons, M. Plohl, and D. Ugarkovic, 1995 Satellite DNA and constitutive

heterochromatin in tenebrionid beetles, pp. 351–362 in *Kew Chromosome Conference IV.*

London: Royal Botanic Gardens,.

Reis M., C. P. Vieira, R. Lata, N. Posnien, and J. Vieira, 2018 Origin and Consequences of

Chromosomal Inversions in the virilis Group of Drosophila. Genome Biol. Evol. 10: 3152–

3166.

Schulz R., L. A. Underkoffler, J. N. Collins, and R. J. Oakey, 2006 Nondisjunction and transmission

ratio distortion ofChromosome 2 in a (2.8) Robertsonian translocation mouse strain.

Mamm. Genome 17: 239–247.

Shetty V., N. J. Shetty, S. R. Ananthanarayana, S. K. Jha, and R. C. Chaubey, 2017 Evaluation of

gamma radiation-induced DNA damage in Aedes aegypti using the comet assay. Toxicol.

Ind. Health 33: 930–937.

Stern D. L., J. Crocker, Y. Ding, N. Frankel, G. Kappes, *et al.*, 2017 Genetic and Transgenic

Reagents for Drosophila

Stewart N. B., Y. H. Ahmed-Braimah, D. G. Cerne, and B. F. McAllister, 2019 Female meiotic

drive preferentially segregates derived metacentric chromosomes in Drosophila. bioRxiv

638684.

Subirana J. A., M. M. Albà, and X. Messeguer, 2015 High evolutionary turnover of satellite

families in Caenorhabditis. BMC Evol. Biol. 15: 218.

Thakur J., J. Packiaraj, and S. Henikoff, 2021 Sequence, Chromatin and Evolution of Satellite

DNA. Int. J. Mol. Sci. 22. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms22094309

Vieira C. P., A. Almeida, J. D. Dias, and J. Vieira, 2006 On the location of the gene(s) harbouring

the advantageous variant that maintains the X/4 fusion of Drosophila americana. Genet.

Res. 87: 163–174.

Wei K. H.-C., J. K. Grenier, D. A. Barbash, and A. G. Clark, 2014 Correlated variation and

population differentiation in satellite DNA abundance among lines of Drosophila

melanogaster. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 111: 18793–18798.

Wei K. H.-C., S. E. Lower, I. V. Caldas, T. J. S. Sless, D. A. Barbash, *et al.*, 2018 Variable Rates of

Simple Satellite Gains across the Drosophila Phylogeny. Mol. Biol. Evol. 35: 925–941.

Wei K. H.-C., and D. Bachtrog, Male recombination produced multiple geographically restricted

neo-Y chromosome haplotypes of varying ages that correlate with onset of neo-Y decay in

Drosophila albomicans