Imbalanced segregation of recombinant haplotypes in hybrid populations reveals inter- and intrachromosomal Dobzhansky-Muller incompatibilities

Juan Li [1,2, 3,#], Molly Schumer[4], Claudia Bank[1,2, 3,#]

1. Institute of Ecology and Evolution, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

2. Gulbenkian Science Institute, Oeiras, Portugal

3. Swiss Institute for Bioinformatics, Lausanne, Switzerland

4. Department of Biology, Stanford University, United States

[#]To whom correspondence should be addressed: juan.li@iee.unibe.ch, claudia.bank@iee.unibe.ch

Abstract

Dobzhansky-Muller incompatibilities (DMIs) are a major component of reproductive isolation between species. DMIs imply negative epistasis, exposed when two diverged populations hybridize. Mapping the locations of DMIs has largely relied on classical genetic mapping. Approaches to date are hampered by low power and the challenge of identifying DMI loci on the same chromosome, because strong initial linkage of parental haplotypes weakens statistical tests. Here, we propose new statistics to infer negative epistasis from haplotype frequencies in hybrid populations. When two divergent populations hybridize, the variance of the number of heterozygous sites at two loci decreases faster with time at DMI loci than at random pairs of loci. If two populations hybridize at near-even admixture proportions, the deviation of the observed variance from its expectation becomes negative for the DMI pair. This negative deviation enables us to detect intermediate to strong negative epistasis both within and between chromosomes. The detection window depends on the demographic scenario, the recombination rate, and the strength of epistasis. When the initial proportion of the two parental populations is uneven, only strong DMIs can be detected with our method unless migration prevents parental haplotypes from being lost. We use the new statistics to infer candidate DMIs from three hybrid populations of swordtail fish. We identify numerous new DMI candidates, some of which are inferred to interact with several loci within and between chromosomes. Moreover, we discuss our results in the context of an expected enrichment in intrachromosomal over interchromosomal DMIs.

Author Summary

Genetic incompatibility in the form of (Bateson-)Dobzhansky-Muller incompatibilities (DMIs) is an important component of reproductive isolation between species. However, the evolutionary role of DMIs during the process of speciation is contentious. One step towards addressing this question is to quantify the prevalence of DMIs in incipient and hybridizing species. DMIs occur when two or more genetic variants interact to reduce their carrier's fitness. Once recombination combines incompatible variants in hybrids, selection acts to remove these variants from the population. Here, we present statistics that are sensitive to the resulting recombinant imbalance and that can indicate the location of DMIs in hybrid genomes in various demographic scenarios. We use simulations to show that the time window during which a DMI is detectable depends on its genomic location, the severity of the DMI, and the population's demography. Importantly, our statistic distinguishes genetic associations that arise due to physical linkage

from those arising due to interacting genes, which allows for the inference of both inter- and
intrachromosomal DMIs. Applying our statistics to three hybrid populations of swordtail fish, we confirm
previous DMIs and identify new candidate incompatibilities.

Introduction

Hybrids between diverged populations often suffer from a fitness disadvantage caused by genetic
incompatibilities between two or more loci, called (Bateson-)Dobzhansky-Muller incompatibilities
(DMIs). As a result, hybrids may be less fit than their parental species, inviable, or sterile (reviewed in
Orr and Presgraves 2000, Fishman and Sweigart 2018). DMIs are common within and between species
(Presgraves 2010, Corbett-Detig 2013), often uncovered in crosses between diverged populations or
closely related species (reviewed in Wu and Ting 2004, Maheshwari and Barbash 2011).

Despite their biological importance, methods for detecting DMIs in natural hybrid populations tend to
have low power and statistical problems. Classical genetic mapping relies on a large sample size of hybrid
offspring (i.e., hundreds or thousands of individuals) or exceptionally strong selection and is only
designed to detect pairwise interactions. Examples of known hybrid incompatibilities reflect the biases
expected from statistical power limited to detecting loci with strong selection against hybrids, e.g., in the
case of malignant melanoma that reduce viability in two pairs of *Xiphophorus* species (reviewed in Orr
and Presgraves 2000; Powell et al. 2020). In another study, researchers mapped multiple non-independent
incompatibilities contributing to male sterility in a house mouse hybrid zone (Turner and Harr 2014).

Another commonly used approach to infer DMIs from hybrid genomes is to search for unexpected
statistical associations (linkage disequilibrium; LD) between physically unlinked regions of the genome.
Studies of DMIs that use LD signals between physically unlinked loci (interchromosomal DMIs) have
taken advantage of data from simulations and experiments (e.g., *Arabidopsis thaliana*, Simon et al. 2008,
and yeast, Li et al. 2013, *Drosophila melanogaster,* Corbett-Detig et al. 2013), and genomic data from
hybrid populations (e.g., swordtail fish, Schumer et al. 2014, Schumer and Brandvain 2016).
Unfortunately, LD-based methods are vulnerable to high false positive rates as a function of hybrid
population demographic history, especially ongoing gene flow from source populations (Schumer and
Brandvain 2016, Satokangas et al. 2020). Moreover, LD-based statistics are not well suited for detecting
interacting loci within chromosomes (intrachromosomal DMIs) in the absence of highly accurate
recombination maps. To detect intrachromosomal interactions with LD-based methods, researchers would
need to know the exact recombination rates between loci before they could distinguish expected LD
caused by physical linkage from excess LD caused by DMIs. The authors of this study are not aware of
any existing method that infers both inter- and intrachromosomal DMIs from hybrid genomic data.

Although intrachromosomal DMIs have not been well-studied in the hybrid incompatibility literature,
several lines of evidence suggest that they are at least as common as interchromosomal DMIs. First, from
a mechanistic perspective, gene order is not random in the genome. Genes tend to cluster on the same
chromosome when they are co-expressed, co-regulated, included in the same pathway, or part of a
protein-protein complex (reviewed in Hurst 2004). When sequencing and protein precipitation technology
(high-C, micro-C) were combined to profile the physical interactions (e.g., interactions mediated by
enhancers, insulators, cohesion binding sites, etc.) between DNA sequences, researchers found that most
of the interactions were intrachromosomal, manifesting as chromosome territories and topological
associated domains (reviewed in Szabo et al. 2019). This genomic architecture of gene regulation

suggests that DMIs within chromosomes are more common than DMIs between chromosomes from first
principles.

Second, from an evolutionary perspective, natural selection may favor reduced recombination between
loci that are under divergent selection or involved in epistatic interactions (reviewed in Ortiz-Barrientos et
al. 2016). Introgression is more common in high recombination rate regions of the genome where linkage
disequilibrium breaks down rapidly over physical distance (Brandvain et al. 2014, Schumer et al. 2018,
Martin et al. 2019, Chaturvedi 2020). One potential consequence is that high recombination rates
disassociate incompatible loci more quickly, whereas tight linkage may facilitate speciation in the face of
gene flow (gene coupling, e.g., Bay et al. 2017, Byers et al. 2020; inversions, e.g., Noor et al. 2001). In
line with this argument, theoretical studies indicated that hybrid populations isolated from their parent
populations are most likely to develop into isolated species (homoploid hybrid speciation) with
intermediate recombination rates between DMI loci (Blanckaert and Bank 2018). Given the predicted
importance of genome organization in adaptation and speciation, tools to identify intrachromosomal
DMIs are needed to understand the architecture of reproductive isolation between species.

Here, we present a new statistical approach to close this key knowledge gap and to infer both inter- and
intrachromosomal DMIs. We report that the imbalanced haplotype frequencies caused by selection
against DMIs can lead to a unique pattern of LD and heterozygosity. We capture these patterns in two
statistics that we name $X(2)$ and $\Delta D2$. We show that sensitivity and specificity of detecting DMIs are
high in a range of demographic scenarios and apply our statistics to infer candidate DMIs in three
swordtail fish hybrid populations. Based on this analysis, we find that putative DMIs are widespread and
complex across hybrid populations of swordtail fish.

Results

Reduced variance in two-locus heterozygosity indicates DMIs

Heterozygosity is the expectation of the number of heterozygous loci per individual across n loci, K,
where $K \in [0, 1, 2 \dots n]$. The variance in n-locus heterozygosity in this study is the variance of K, which
can be used to describe the overall extent of linkage disequilibrium (reviewed in Slatkin 2008). In the
presence of population structure, the normalized deviation of the variance of K at n loci from its expected
value under panmixia and neutrality, $X(n)$, is elevated (Sved 1968, Brown et al. 1980, Maynard Smith et
al. 1993, see Methods). That is because with population structure, individuals breed locally, which
increases the proportion of groups of homozygous individuals while maintaining polymorphism globally.
This, in turn, increases the variance of heterozygosity as compared to the panmictic expectation. Here, we
demonstrate that a pairwise DMI, where *n=2*, changes $X(2)$ at DMI loci to negative values in a hybrid
population, i.e., it creates a lower-than-expected variance in two-locus heterozygosity. Importantly, this
statistic distinguishes LD that occurs due to physical linkage from the specific association of alleles that is
caused by selection against a DMI.

To first understand the dynamics of $X(2)$ in the simplest scenario without having to consider dominance
of direct selection and epistasis, we used a haploid toy model of a DMI with recombination (Kimura
1965, see also Bank et al. 2012). Consider a haploid panmictic population with two biallelic loci, **A** and
B, with alleles *a*, *A*, and *b*, *B*, where *aB* and *Ab* represent the parental haplotypes and a hybrid
incompatibility exists between alleles *A* and *B*. We follow the haplotype frequency dynamics in a model

with discrete non-overlapping generations, ignoring genetic drift and assuming that recombination occurs
with probability c. We denote the fitness of the haplotypes by $w_{ab} = 1, w_{Ab} = 1 + \alpha$, $w_{aB} = 1 +$
β, $w_{AB} = (1 + \alpha)(1 + \beta)(1 + \gamma)$ (Figure S1). Throughout the paper, we assume that α and β are small
positive numbers, representing a weak beneficial effect of A and B (following Blanckaert and Bank 2018),
and that $-\gamma \gg \alpha, \beta$ (the incompatibility is much stronger than directional selection). We use this toy
model to analyze the dynamics of $X(2)$ and $D2_{ik}$ (defined below) upon formation of a new hybrid
population composed of a fraction f of aB parental individuals and a fraction of $1 - f$ of Ab parental
individuals (i.e., f denotes the initial admixture proportion).

The toy model highlights unique features of haplotype frequency dynamics in new hybrid populations in
the presence of a DMI (see also Blanckaert and Bank 2018 for the corresponding diploid model).
Recombinant haplotypes ab and AB appear from the second generation onwards. At first, their frequency
sharply increases (Figure S2) due to recombination. Then strong selection against the incompatibility sets
in that depletes the AB haplotype and gives the ab haplotype a marginal advantage because offspring of
ab individuals never harbor the incompatibility (Figure S2). Thus, the strong incompatibility drives
haplotype frequency dynamics after recombinants appear.

The two-locus heterozygosity is defined as the sum of heterozygosity over two loci, $h_A + h_B$, where $h_A =$
$1 - p_a^2 - p_A^2$, $h_B = 1 - p_b^2 - p_B^2$ (Nei and Roychoudhury 1974). The expected variance in two-locus
heterozygosity is $h_A + h_B - h_A^2 - h_B^2$ assuming binomial sampling (see Methods). The deviation of the
variance in two-locus heterozygosity from its expectation under linkage equilibrium in this model is
$\Delta_{var} = 2 \sum_i \sum_k (g_{ik}^2 - p_i^2 p_k^2)$, where p_j denotes the frequency of allele j and g_{ik} denotes the
frequency of haplotype ik, and where we define $D2_{ik} := g_{ik}^2 - p_i^2 p_k^2$ for $i \in \{a, A\}, k \in \{b, B\}$ (see
Methods). The normalized version of Δ_{var} is $X(2) = \Delta_{var}/exp(Var)$. In a newly-formed panmictic
hybrid population, $X(2)$ is initially positive because of the overrepresentation of parental haplotypes as
compared with recombinants. Importantly, $X(2)$ becomes negative if the haplotype frequencies are
imbalanced, for example if a lethal DMI causes absence of one recombinant haplotype and
overrepresentation of the other. Focusing on the two possible recombinants in the scenario described
above, this imbalance is captured by $\Delta D2 = D2_{AB} - D2_{ab}$.

The deviation of the variance in two-locus heterozygosity, Δ_{var}, can also be expressed as $\Delta_{var} =$
$4D(2g_{ab} + 2g_{AB} - 2D - 1)$, where $D = g_{AB}g_{ab} - g_{aB}g_{Ab}$ and $D < 0$ until the population reaches
linkage equilibrium or loses the polymorphism at one of the two loci. To fulfill $\Delta_{var} < 0$, the condition
$2g_{ab} + 2g_{AB} - 2D - 1 > 0$ must be met, which implies $g_{ab} + g_{AB} - D > \frac{1}{2}$ & $D < 0$. It follows that the
frequencies of four haplotypes must be $g_{ab} > g_{aB}, g_{Ab} > g_{AB}$ (Figure S3), indicating haplotype AB is
the most unfit haplotype.

152
Figure 1. Dynamics of $X(2)$ and $\Delta D2 = D2_{ab} - D2_{AB}$ in the deterministic haploid toy model for
different recombination rates and admixture proportions. The model parameters are $\alpha = 0.001, \beta =$
$0.002, \gamma = -0.5$. Black dots indicate the time with the largest $-X(2)$ or $-\Delta D2$ (i.e., strongest DMI
signal) in each trajectory. The values of $X(2)$ and $\Delta D2$ are represented by blue color intensity. Blank
areas represent either $X(2)>0$ (to the left of the blue area) or at least one locus close to fixation (minor
allele frequency <0.005, to the right of the blue area). A&B. Both $X(2)$ and $\Delta D2$ show more extreme
values at intermediate recombination rates. Here, we assumed equal admixture proportions. C&D.
Negative $X(2)$ and negative $\Delta D2$ show larger values when admixture proportions are more even. In these
two panels, the recombination probability between the two DMI loci is 0.1.

Figure 2. The time window of negative $X(2)$ for a DMI in the deterministic toy model. Generations with the largest $-X(2)$ values are indicated in bold. Time windows for which $X(2)$ is negative for a DMI pair are shown in parentheses. Values of the largest $-X(2)$ observed over that interval are represented by blue color intensity. The model parameters used here are $\alpha = 0.001$, $\beta = 0.002$, $\gamma = -0.5$. All trajectories were traced until one locus was near monomorphic (minor allele frequency <0.005 or up to 10000 generations). We considered two parameter sets. One is a range of admixture proportions (x axis) and recombination rates (y axis) without immigration (A) or with immigration from the minor parental population ($m = 0.005$, B). A. The DMI left the strongest signal in $X(2)$ for intermediate recombination rates, and the signal was not detected until later generations when recombination rates were lower and admixture proportions were more uneven. B. Immigration from the parental population can widen the detection window. The other parameter set is a range of admixture proportion (x axis) and immigration (y axis) from one (asymmetric, C) or both parental populations (symmetric, D) when the recombination probability is 0.1. C. Immigration from one parental population can narrow or widen the detection windows. D. Immigration from both parental populations could persist long-term DMIs. Note that the observed asymmetry in D stems from the effect of direct selection.

Unique dynamics of $-X(2)$ at DMI loci

We compared the dynamics of the $X(2)$ statistic at DMI loci in scenarios where the strength of epistasis was strong ($\gamma = -0.5$) relative to scenarios without epistasis (i.e., $\gamma = 0$). Without epistasis and with weak direct selection for A and B ($\alpha = 0.001, \beta = 0.002$), both the recombinant frequencies and their $D2_{ik}$ values are expected to be similar and independent of the admixture proportion, because recombinants are generated at equal proportions and because weak directional selection cannot drive significant imbalance in the recombinant haplotypes (Figure S4 A&B). Conversely, with a strong DMI, segregation of the two recombinants is imbalanced, as is evident from the $D2_{ik}$ trajectories of the two

recombinants (Figure S4 C&D). Interestingly, without epistasis, $X(2)$ rapidly decreases and converges to
zero over time (Figure S4 E&F). At equal admixture proportions, $X(2)$ for a DMI rapidly decreases to
negative values and then slowly increases over time, reaching 0 when one of the interacting alleles is lost
from the population. At intermediate recombination rates, $X(2)$ for a strongly selected DMI ($\gamma = -0.5$)
attains its minimal value after around 60 generations (Figure S4 E). In populations in which admixture
proportions are highly skewed, negative $X(2)$ values are never observed, even when DMIs are under
strong selection (Figure S4 F). One exception to this observation is when the admixture asymmetry is
counteracted by immigration from the minor parental population (discussed below). Overall, a DMI
causes negative $X(2)$ once the recombinant imbalance due to selection against the DMI overcomes the
residual linkage of parental haplotypes.

The signal of negative $X(2)$ generated by selection against a DMI is most pronounced when the
admixture proportions are even. In addition, -$X(2)$ and -$\Delta D2$ reach the largest values at low and
intermediate recombination rates (Figure 1 A&B). At the same time, the lower the recombination rate
between the interacting loci, the longer it takes for recombinants to emerge, resulting in a later appearance
of negative $X(2)$ (Figure 2). In theory, this phenomenon suggests that a DMI at any possible
recombination distance will be eventually detectable with our approach. An exception is when two loci
have vanishingly small recombination probabilities, such that direct selection and genetic drift undermine
the signal of the DMI in $X(2)$, because the DMI is purged from the population (by losing one of the
interacting partners) before detectable epistasis-induced recombinant imbalance appears. In practice,
variation in recombination probabilities will change the time period during which a DMI can be detected.

Regardless of the recombination rate, our toy model suggests that detecting a DMI in an isolated hybrid
population using $X(2)$ requires the initial admixture proportion to be near 0.5 (Figure 1 C&D, minor
parental frequency 0.3-0.5). Intuitively, this is because the recombinant imbalance $\Delta D2$ (which is $D \cdot$
$(g_{ab} - g_{AB} + p_a p_b - p_A p_B) \propto D \cdot (\gamma - \alpha\beta))$ reaches its largest value at equal admixture proportions
since $D = g_{AB} \cdot g_{ab} - g_{aB} \cdot g_{aB}$ is most extreme when $g_{Ab} = g_{aB} = 0.5$. As the recombinant imbalance
becomes extreme, $-X(2)$ becomes larger.

We were interested in evaluating whether $-X(2)$ is diagnostic of epistatic selection or sensitive to
selection in general. Without epistasis, only strong selection in the same direction acting on both A and B
can generate recombinant imbalance by means of Hill-Robertson interference (Hill and Robertson 1966,
Felsenstein 1974). To evaluate the dynamics of $-X(2)$ in this scenario, we assumed that A and B are
under strong negative selection and combine additively, such that haplotype AB is the least fit (but
without epistasis). Also here, recombinant imbalance results from selection differences between AB and
ab (Figure S1), which cause negative $X(2)$ (Figure S5C) and $\Delta D2$. However, even with strong selection
$X(2)$ remains negative only for a few generations at the very early stage of hybridization (before
generation 10, Figure S5C). With a DMI, negative $X(2)$ persists for much longer. The stronger the DMI
(i.e., the larger the epistasis parameter γ), the larger $-X(2)$ is observed (after generation 10, Figure 2 and
S5A). Altogether, non-epistatic strong selection results in less extreme values of $-X(2)$ and $\Delta D2$ that
occur – and fade – much earlier than in the presence of a DMI (Figure S5).
225

Migration can narrow or widen the detection window

Depending on the specific demographic scenario, we find that migration from one or both parental
populations can increase the time during which $X(2)$ indicates a DMI (Figure 2). If the minor parental
population contributes most migrants, incompatible haplotypes will be continually formed by
recombination between resident and immigrant types. Therefore, the DMI persists in the hybrid
population for a longer time period, which makes it possible to use $X(2)$ to detect DMIs in scenarios of
uneven admixture proportions (Figure 2 A&B). We note that immigration of the major parental
population, in turn, reduces our ability to detect a DMI (Figure 2C). When immigration occurs from both
parental populations, the recombinant imbalance can remain in the population for a very long time (Figure
2D). Here, depending on the parameters, a migration-DMI-drift balance can be reached which would
essentially make the DMI detectable for as long as the demographic scenario persists.
237

In simulated data $-X(2)$ robustly indicates intra- and interchromosomal DMIs

To demonstrate that detection of intrachromosomal DMIs in genomic data is feasible, we used
simulations with SLiM (Haller and Messer 2019, Figure 3). Throughout this paper, we implemented
"recessive" DMIs in our model by assuming that individuals that carry a single copy of two incompatible
alleles do not suffer from reduced fitness. We simulated evolution of a chromosome in a hybrid
population of 5000 individuals that is generated by a pulse of admixture between two parental populations
at equal frequencies. Two interacting loci generating a DMI were located at 10 centimorgan (cM) and 20
cM such that the recombination probability between the two loci was 0.1. For these parameters, the
deterministic trajectory indicated that a DMI should be detectable within a time window that spanned
from generation 25 to 509, with the strongest signal (i.e., largest $-X(2)$) at generation 58 (Figure 2A).
Figure 3 shows the distribution of normalized D, a commonly used measure of linkage disequilibrium,
(D', see Methods), $X(2)$ and $\Delta D2$ at generation 50. At generation 50, parental linkage has mostly broken
down between pairs of distant loci, resulting in a peak at $D' = 0$. $D' \neq 0$ only within small genetic
distances (Figure 3 A&D). Moreover, the distribution of $X(2)$ across all pairs of loci along the simulated
chromosome has decreased to near 0 by generation 50 (resulting in a peak of $X(2)$ at 0, Figure 3B). In
general, negative LD ($D = g_{ab} \cdot g_{AB} - g_{Ab} \cdot g_{aB}$) correlates with positive $X(2)$ (Figure 3C). However,
the selected pair of loci can be pinpointed by scanning for negative $X(2)$. Negative D' is also observed
between the DMI loci (Figure 3D&E). Importantly, whereas the D' signal is consistent with increased LD
– that may stem from residual linkage, population structure, or epistatic interaction (Figure 3D) – -$X(2)$ is
specifically associated with unexpected recombinant imbalance ($\Delta D2$) caused by the DMI (Figure 3E&F).
Interchromosomal DMIs show a similar pattern (Figure S6). As predicted by the toy model (Figure 1 &
2), interchromosomal DMIs show the recombinant imbalance earlier than intrachromosomal DMIs
(Figure 2 and S6).
261

262
Figure 3. Negative $X(2)$ pinpoints an intrachromosomal DMI in simulated data. The distribution of $X(2)$,
D', and $\Delta D2$ of a chromosome with a DMI pair at generation 50 under a Wright-Fisher model for one
simulation run using SLiM. The direct selection coefficients are $\alpha = 0.001, \beta = 0.002$. The strength of
epistasis is $\gamma = -0.5$. The interacting loci generating the DMI are located at 10 cM and 20 cM, such that
the recombination probability is $c = 0.1$ between the two loci. A-C. The distribution of $X(2)$ and D' and
their joint distribution within the chromosome. We observe negative $X(2)$ values and negative D' values
at the two loci involved in the DMI and in flanking regions that are tightly linked to the DMI. D-F.
Heatmaps of D', $X(2)$ and the $\Delta D2$ within the simulated chromosome. Only the DMI region and its 10
cM flanking regions are shown in D-F. The DMI is highlighted by a black arrow.

272
Since other metrics used to detect DMIs are sensitive to demographic parameters, we next used SLiM to
explore whether the same was true for $X(2)$. We first considered the effect of variable population size.
Negative $X(2)$ values still appear when the hybrid population size is as small as 300 (Figure 4A). At
smaller population sizes, genetic variation in the hybrid population is lost more quickly than for larger
populations, which leads to faster purging of the DMIs and thus shortens the detection window (Figure
4A). We further considered the effect of two demographic factors, population expansion and migration,
on the sensitivity of the $X(2)$ statistic to DMIs. Natural hybrid populations may suffer from low fertility
and high mortality in the early stages of hybridization, and the hybrid population may occupy a new niche
or geographical area. As hybrid incompatibilities are purged, mean population fitness increases and the
population may expand. To explore the possible effects of this phenomenon, we performed simulations
assuming that the hybrid population would expand within 35 generations and arbitrarily defining a 5%
growth rate per generation. We found that population expansion rarely affects the detection of a DMI
(Figure 4B) since it does not affect the relative genotype frequency dynamics.

Figure 4. Effect of demographic parameters on the dynamics of $X(2)$ for a DMI in a hybrid population.
Each line is one randomly chosen simulation run using SLiM, assuming equal admixture proportions of
the parental populations and a strong DMI ($\alpha = 0.001, \beta = 0.002, \gamma = -0.5$) under a Wright-Fisher
model. The recombination probability between the interacting loci was 0.1. 300 individuals were sampled
in each simulation independent of the population size. Individuals that contained <10% of their genome
from either parental population were excluded. Trajectories were plotted from generation 2 onwards. A.
$X(2)$ dynamics with variable population size. $X(2)$ indicates DMIs when the population size is as small
as 300. DMIs are purged more quickly from small populations due to genetic drift. B. $X(2)$ dynamics
with population expansion and migration. Immigration rates are $m1$ amd $m2$ from two parental
populations. The $X(2)$ signal is only mildly affected by population expansion, low asymmetric migration,
and symmetric migration from parental populations. Strong migration from one parental population
disrupts DMI detection by $X(2)$ (green curve).

We next considered continual immigration from the parental species into the hybrid population. As shown
in Figure 4B, high migration rates initially reduce our ability to detect negative $X(2)$ when admixture
proportions are even. However, depending on the specific migration scenario, migration can aid the
detection of a DMI. Generally, migration changes the haplotype frequencies and alters the time period
during which $X(2)$ is negative (Figure 4B). To quantify this effect, we studied three migration rates, no
($m = 0$), intermediate ($m = 0.005$), and strong ($m = 0.01$) migration from the minor parental population
into the hybrid population, and strong migration from both parental populations under even admixture
proportions. If the asymmetric migration rate is small to intermediate ($m < 0.005$) or migration rates
from two parental populations are symmetric, our simulations suggest that migration does not impede the
occurrence of negative $X(2)$ in the presence of a DMI (Figure 2C, 2D and 4B). Symmetric high migration
rates could sustain long-term DMIs (Figure 2D and S7).
311
With strong migration ($m \geq 0.005$), the linkage of parental haplotypes remains strong due to the
continuous reintroduction of these haplotypes (Figure S8). In such a scenario, $X(2)$ remains larger than 0

for an extended time. Thus, DMIs can only be detected with $X(2)$ at a later age of the hybrid population,
if the DMI alleles have not been purged from the population due to asymmetry of admixture or
immigration (Figure 4B & S8). Here, strong migration acts like strong selection for the immigrating
parental two-locus haplotypes, which hides the (still existing) recombinant imbalance.
318
Next, to evaluate the performance of $-X(2)$ in a natural population with overlapping generations, we
compared our results from Wright-Fisher simulations with those obtained under a Moran model. With
overlapping generations, the emergence of negative $X(2)$ is delayed because recombinant imbalance
builds up more slowly than in a model with non-overlapping generations (Figure S9A). At the same time,
alleles A and B segregate in the population for much longer with overlapping generations than with non-
overlapping generations (Figure S9B). This leads to a longer maintenance time of the interacting loci,
resulting in a longer window in which $-X(2)$ can be used to detect the DMI.

Given these results, we next evaluated the sensitivity and specificity of $X(2)$ for DMI detection under a
range of models using non-overlapping generations (Figure 5). We simulated four chromosomes, two of
which contained the DMI loci and two of which evolved neutrally. We computed sensitivity as the
proportion of simulations in which the DMI loci showed $X(2) < -0.005$ & $D' < 0$, and specificity as one
minus the proportion of simulations in which a pair of loci on the neutral chromosomes showed $X(2) <$
-0.005 & $D' < 0$. We considered six scenarios by combining two admixture proportions ($f = 0.5$ and
$f = 0.3$) and three immigration rates (0, 0.005, 0.01) of the minor parental population. We also compared
the performance of $X(2)$ to the G test which has previously been used to detect DMIs (Li and Zhang
2013). The recombination probability in these simulations was set to $c = 0.5$ because the G test can only
be applied to unlinked loci.

336
Figure 5. Sensitivity and specificity of negative $X(2)$ for detecting a DMI, computed from 100
simulations of each parameter combination using SLiM, assuming a Wright-Fisher population of 5000
individuals. We considered two admixture proportions, $f = 0.5$ and $f = 0.3$, and three migration rates
from the minor parental population: 0, 0.01, and 0.05. A strong DMI ($\alpha = 0.001, \beta = 0.002, \gamma = -0.5$)
and no DMI ($\alpha = 0.001, \beta = 0.002, \gamma = 0$) were simulated under a Wright-Fisher model. The

recombination probability between the DMI loci was $c = 0.5$. To exclude sampling noise, any interaction
with $X(2) < -0.005$ & $D' < 0$ was taken as a putative DMI. Trajectories ended when one of the
interacting loci became monomorphic (indicated by large plot markers). Three hundred individuals were
sampled in each simulation. A. Sensitivity is high unless strong migration leads to swamping of the DMI
alleles. B. Specificity is high under all tested scenarios when no DMI locus is present on the sampled
chromosome. Vertical lines represent the 95% confidence interval (Wald test).

In simulations of hybrid populations with non-overlapping generations, equal admixture proportions, and
no or moderate levels of ongoing migration from the minor parental population, $X(2)$ allows for detection
of the DMI with high sensitivity and specificity (Figure 5, $f = 0.5$, $m = 0$ or 0.005). At high migration
rates ($m = 0.01$), migration from the parental population dominates the haplotype frequency dynamics
and the DMI cannot be detected with equal admixture proportions. In contrast, immigration can maintain
the minor parental alleles when the admixture proportions are uneven ($f = 0.3$). With continuous input of
the minor parental haplotype, the DMI remains in the population for longer, so the DMI can be detected
based on negative $X(2)$ values until one of the parental haplotypes is lost. Thus, $X(2)$ can be used to
detect DMIs in the case of uneven admixture proportions and intermediate migration rates, when
immigration counteracts selection against the DMI in the minor parental population. In all scenarios
explored here, $X(2)$ has very high specificity. In 300 simulations of a null model of neutral evolution,
$X(2)$ was always greater than -0.001, where negative $X(2)$ was caused by genetic drift and random
sampling of 300 individuals for the analysis. At low recombination rates, a similar pattern can be
observed (Figure S10).

We compared the performance of $X(2)$ with that of the G test, which was identified as one of the best
statistics to detect interchromosomal DMIs (Li and Zhang 2013). Figure S11 shows that the G test is
highly sensitive in the early stages of hybridization, but its sensitivity decreases after generation 20. There
is also an apparent tradeoff between sensitivity and specificity. Interestingly, unlike for the G test there is
no tradeoff between sensitivity and specificity for $X(2)$. We found that whereas significant hits using the
G test had negative $X(2)$, the opposite was not true, especially when the parental linkage has broken
down from generation 20 onwards (Figure 5, S11 and S12). Thus, $X(2)$ was sensitive to DMIs in
scenarios in which the G test was not.

Our analysis above relies on the use of phased genotyping data, which can be difficult to collect in
practice and can introduce inaccuracies via phasing errors. In contrast, pseudo-phased data are available
for many datasets, including the data analyzed below. In this case, only homozygous loci in each genome
are used for analyses where the phase can be inferred without computational phasing (e.g., genotyping
data reviewed in Davey et al. 2011). We calculated the sensitivity and specificity for the G test and $X(2)$
using only homozygous genotypes (same ancestry state at an ancestry informative site, see methods). The
performance for pseudo-phased data trends were similar to phased data with mildly increased sensitivities
of $X(2)$ and decreased sensitivities of G test (Figure 5, S11 and S13).

We next applied our detection method to simulated genomic data from a range of more general scenarios
with one and two standard DMIs, and a three-locus interaction in which two DMIs have one shared
interaction partner. Here, positions of the interacting loci were distributed randomly across four
chromosomes (resulting in both inter- and intrachromosomal DMIs), epistatic coefficients were drawn
from a uniform distribution ($\gamma \in [-1, -0.001]$), and the direct selection coefficients α and β were drawn

from an exponential distribution with mean 0.001. We further simulated two neutral chromosomes
without DMI loci.

On neutral chromosomes, negative $X(2)$ values were always larger than -0.025 (Figure 6A). On
chromosomes with DMIs, >75% of negative $X(2)$ were larger than -0.005 (Figure 6B). However, $X(2)$
values can take smaller values up to -0.12 at and close to DMI loci ($-log(X(2))$ close to 1, Figure 6B).
$X(2)$ at DMI loci tends to show extreme values (Figure 6C). Notably, under the same selection and
demographic parameters, when two DMIs share one locus (three-locus two-DMI model, see Methods),
the $X(2)$ distribution at the DMI loci is slightly closer to zero than the distributions for two separate
DMIs (Figure 6 and S14). In all cases, $X(2)$ distributions in both models can clearly separate DMI loci
from neutral loci (Figure 6 and S14). This indicates that $X(2)$ can still detect DMIs when interaction hubs
are present. When only homozygous loci (pseudo-phased data) were used for the inference (Figure S14),
the distribution of $X(2)$ values was similar but both the chromosomes with DMIs showed more extreme
values. This is because the reduction in sampling size due to pseudo-phasing stochastically results in
extremely low numbers or absence of incompatible haplotypes.

The proportion of pairs of loci that were incorrectly inferred as interacting partners (from here on referred
to as false positive rate) varied significantly between chromosomes with DMIs and neutral chromosomes
(Table S1-S3). For the neutral chromosomes, this proportion was almost 0 when $X(2) < -0.005$ was
used as a threshold (Table S2 and S3) for both phased and pseudo-phased data. However, on
chromosomes with DMIs, upwards of 2% of pairwise comparisons (from a total of $\binom{400}{2} = 79800$ pairs,
of which 2 pairs are true DMI pairs, corresponding to 0.005% of pairs) were identified as putative DMIs
based on the $X(2)$ statistic (threshold $X(2) < -0.005$) although the two loci were not involved in a DMI.
Most of this signal came from loci in the direct vicinity of the DMI. As expected, both true and false
positive rates on the chromosomes with DMIs decreased with a more stringent $X(2)$ threshold (Table S1-
S3). Comparing to simulations with a single DMI, the false positive rate increased noticeably but not
excessively when two DMIs were simulated (from ~1% to a maximum of 2.2% when $X(2) < -0.005$,
Table S1 and S2), indicating some interference between DMIs. When only homozygous loci (pseudo-
phased data) were used for the inference, the true positive rate remained similar, but the false positive rate
was elevated to 3.6-6.1%, presumably due to stochastic absence of haplotypes due to small sample sizes
(Table S2 and S3).

Figure 6. Distributions of negative $X(2)$ when $D' < 0$ for DMI detection under four demographic
scenarios. This figure represents two starting frequencies of the minor parental population, $f = 0.5$ and
$f = 0.3$, and different immigration rates from the two parental populations ($m1$ from minor parental
population, $m2$ from major parental population). Light green boxes show $X(2)$ distribution for the three-
locus two-DMI model (3-locus) and the other boxes for the four-locus two-DMI model. DMIs are
randomly distributed on four chromosomes. Direct selection coefficients on two incompatible alleles were
drawn from an exponential distribution with mean = 0.001. Epistatic coefficients were drawn from a
uniform distribution (-1, -0.001); for the three-locus two-DMI model. We calculate $X(2)$ statistics from a
sample of two hundred individuals for each simulation. We simulated each scenario 100 times with
SLiM. $X(2)$ were summarized at three types of genomic regions, neutral chromosomes (A),
chromosomes with DMIs (B), and individual DMI loci (C). Boxplots represent the interquartile range;
whiskers extend to minimal and maximal values. The dash line is $X(2) = -0.005$.

Figure 7. Propagation of the DMI signal into flanking regions in simulated data (sampled at generation 30, significance threshold: $X(2) < -0.005$ & $D' < 0$). Data resulted from 100 simulations using SLiM, in which two DMIs (i.e., four DMI loci) were randomly distributed on four chromosomes, thus resulting in inter- and intrachromosomal DMIs. The direct selection coefficients α and β were drawn from an exponential distribution with mean = 0.001. The strength of epistasis was drawn from a uniform distribution, $\gamma \in [-1, -0.001]$, which are represented by the blue color intensity in panel B. To resemble the demography of the studied hybrid swordtail fish populations, the admixture proportion was set to $f = 0.3$ and the migration rate was $m = 0.01$. Two hundred individuals were sampled from each simulation to obtain the statistics. A. The number of significant marker pairs decreases rapidly with distance to the nearest true DMI locus. B. Proportion of significant marker pairs when statistics were computed for all pairs between two increasingly large regions around the true interacting DMI loci. Red dots indicate the median obtained from 100 simulations. Both weak and strong DMIs can be detected, but weak DMIs tend to leave a weaker signal that did not extend as far as the signal of strong DMIs.

The great majority of false positives was caused by loci linked to DMIs (e.g., Figure 3E and S6). Markers within 10 cM of DMI loci showed a large number of significant $X(2)$ pairs in simulations of two DMIs that were distributed randomly across four chromosomes (Figure 7A). In the most extreme case observed in the simulations, one DMI locus was involved in significant pairwise interactions with over 200 markers of a total of 400 markers (Figure 7A). This case involved strong epistasis for both DMI pairs ($\gamma \approx$

−0.75), and two DMI loci that were located very close to each other on the same chromosome (DMI 1
between chromosome 1 (chr1) position 63 and chr4 position 100; DMI 2 between chr3 position 98 and
chr4 position 92, with the extreme signal emitted from chr3 position 98). Thus, the extreme signal was
likely caused by interference between the two DMIs, i.e., a distortion of the signal of one DMI due to
selection against the other one. At generation 30, the interaction signal of the two DMIs extends along a
large genomic window. Here, the proportion of significant pairs is high within 10 cM of the true DMI loci
(median ~35% vs. genomic median 1.1%, Figure 7B and Table S2), probably caused by hitchhiking or
limited sorting of large genomic blocks in the young hybrid populations.

In analyses of unphased genomic data, we can only rely on information from homozygous genotypes.
Therefore, we computed the same statistics for simulated data when only homozygous genotypes were
considered (Figure S15). Here, consistent with the lack of resolution suggested above, the proportion of
significant pairs between DMI regions decreased more slowly with window size than when the complete
data were considered (Figure S15C; see also Figure 7B). We then tested the approach with the strict
filtering criteria below to the genomic data from natural hybrid populations before analysis (see below
and Methods), for which a homozygous frequency of >0.05 and a frequency of heterozygotes <0.6 were
required. Because most strong DMIs are (nearly) purged by generation 30, few DMI loci pass the
filtering, and the signal therefore changes such that the highest proportion of significant pairs is observed
for genomic windows that span several cM around the true DMI (Figure S15 B&C). Here, only the
flanking regions of strong DMIs (and not the DMI loci themselves) indicate the DMI. The proportion of
significant pairs at up to 10cM distance from a true DMI locus is still higher than the genome-wide false
positive rate (>35% vs. genomic median up to 7.1%, Figure S15B and Table S3). Taken together, our
analysis indicates that, although greater precision could be obtained from phased data, our method can
identify selection in pseudo-phased data.

Using $X(2)$ to detect putative DMIs in swordtail fish hybrid populations

Two sibling species of swordtail fish, *Xiphophorus birchmanni* and *X. malinche*, were reported to
hybridize naturally in Mexico (Culumber et al. 2011, Schumer et al. 2014). Since these hybrid
populations formed recently and have been studied extensively, they represent an excellent opportunity
for using $X(2)$ and $\Delta D2$ to infer DMIs from natural populations. Three hybrid populations called CHAF,
TOTO and TLMC were sampled and genotyped in previous work (Table S4). All three hybrid
populations are estimated to have formed less than 100 generations ago: CHAF ~45 generations; TOTO
~35 generations; TLMC ~56 generations (Schumer et al. 2014 and Powell et al. 2020). However, these
admixture times may be underestimated due to ongoing migration (Schumer et al. 2017, 2018, Powell et
al. 2020). The estimated proportion of the genome derived from the minor parental population was ~0.25-
0.3. The minor parental species for the CHAF and TLMC populations is *X. birchmanni* and for TOTO it
is *X. malinche*. All three hybrid populations are known to experience some level of ongoing migration
from one parental population (CHAF, ~5%; TOTO, ~3%; TLMC, <<1%; Schumer et al. 2017 and Powell
et al. 2020; Table S4). Under the demographic parameters of these natural populations, we expect that in
CHAF and TOTO, immigration from the minor parental population counterbalances the asymmetric
admixture proportions such that we can infer DMIs with intermediate sensitivity and high specificity
(similar to Figure 2, 5, S10 & S13).

We used $X(2)$, $\Delta D2$ and D' to identify putative DMI pairs and to infer the most strongly depleted
genotypes in these three populations. To roughly count the DMIs in a fashion that is comparable between
populations, we sliced the genome into fragments of 1 Megabase (Mb), which we will refer to as a locus
in the following analyses. To increase our confidence in the candidates, we performed bootstrapping to
ensure that the locus pair was consistently inferred to have negative $X(2)$ and $D' < 0$ (Table S5, see
Methods). The number of inferred DMIs is quite robust to different $X(2)$ criteria (from 0 to -0.015, Table
S5). A putative DMI was identified if homozygous markers at this locus showed $X(2) < -0.005$ and
$D' < 0$ (see also Methods), based on the observation that neutral and DMI loci can be separated by
negative $X(2)$ at -0.005 from simulations (Figure 6 and S14).

In total, we detected 2203, 2039 and 1442 putative DMIs in the three hybrid populations CHAF, TLMC
and TOTO with false discovery proportion <0.001 (15.2%, 12% and 6% of tests, respectively, Table S5).
As highlighted by the simulations in the previous section, these numbers may include many genomic
blocks that are close to DMIs but do not themselves carry a DMI locus (Figure 7 and S15, Table S5).
Given the moderate false positive rate estimated from the simulations, we view this as a preliminary set of
candidate DMIs for further investigation. In each population, 200-400 1Mb bins (out of the total 711 1Mb
bins, Table S5) were involved in at least one putative DMI. If the putative DMIs were randomly
distributed across the genome, the occurrences of the 1Mb bins would fit a Poisson distribution ($\lambda = 2 \cdot$
number of putative DMIs / number of 1Mb bins involved in interactions). In contrast to this expectation,
1Mb bins with very small and vast numbers of putative interacting partners were greatly overrepresented
among the DMI candidates (One-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, $p < 2.2e - 16$, Figure S16, Figure
S17). We speculate that the 1Mb bins that appear in many putative DMIs are likely to contain true DMI
loci in pairwise or complex DMIs, whereas many of the 1Mb bins that occur only once or twice may be
noise caused by the true DMI loci. For example, the noise could stem from negative $X(2)$ between two
flanking regions of a DMI pair, which is weak but observable. More than 99.5% of putative DMIs are
caused by a small number of 1Mb bins that are each involved in >10 putative DMIs (54 in CHAF, 61 in
TLMC and 66 in TOTO). Among these putative DMI hubs, CHAF and TLMC share 8 loci, CHAF and
TOTO share 2, and TLMC and TOTO share 2 (Table S6). Altogether, these results suggest that the signal
we observe is driven by a small set of loci that are involved in complex DMI interactions in the hybrid
population at a time point.

Although our overall false positive rate is low, given the large number of tests performed in our
evaluation of the real data, we can be most confident in putative DMIs that are detected in multiple
populations. Across three hybrid populations we found 17 putative DMI pairs shared between TLMC and
CHAF, which are the two populations that have the same minor parental population (*X. birchmanni*) and
are therefore expected to share more detectable DMIs (Table S7). There were no shared DMI pairs
between TOTO and the two other populations. The overlapping proportions are lower than expected by
chance with randomly distributed DMIs per population (binominal test, $p < 0.05$). Among all putative
interaction partners, 14 loci were shared by three populations, out of which four were previously
identified (Table S8). This set of loci are exciting candidates for future work. Out of all putative
interactions identified in the swordtail hybrid populations, about 4% were intrachromosomal (CHAF:
81/2203; TLMC: 67/2039; TOTO: 55/1442). Notably, none of the inferred intrachromosomal interactions
overlapped between any two populations.

The small number of overlapping DMI candidate pairs between the populations most likely results from
the individual demography of the hybrid populations. Firstly, as we reported above, the $X(2)$ signal of
weaker DMIs and more closely linked DMIs appears later. Therefore, differently aged hybrid populations
are not expected to display the same set of detectable DMIs. Secondly, the hybrid populations have
different admixture proportions and immigration rates (Table S4). These likely result in different sets and
directions of purging of DMIs. For example, Figure S18 shows a putative intrachromosomal DMI in
TLMC (between chr20:9M and chr20:10M). In the $\Delta D2$ heat plot of this genomic region, the candidate
recombinant from TLMC (composed of *X. birchmanni* ancestry at chr20:9M and *X. malinche* ancestry at
chr20:10M) also showed a weak signal of elimination in CHAF. However, in TOTO, which has opposite
admixture proportions, no such recombinant imbalance is visible. Another interchromosomal DMI also
has a similar pattern in TLMC and CHAF, but with less residual recombinant imbalance in the flanking
regions in TOTO, where the focal locus is already fixed (Figure S19).

In comparisons between TLMC and CHAF, which share a minor parent species, two loci stood out with
respect to their many inferred interaction partners. Both chr20:23Mb (specifically, between 23Mb and
23.4Mb) and chr15:15M (specifically, between 15.6Mb and 16Mb) are putatively involved in 8
interchromosomal interactions. At both loci, alleles from *X. malinche* are incompatible with alleles at
several loci from *X. birchmanni* (Table S7). Interestingly, there was no signal of an interaction between
these two loci. However, chr18:19Mb is putatively interacting with both chr20:23Mb and chr15:15Mb in
both TLMC and CHAF. *X. malinche* is the major parental population in TLMC and CHAF, leading to the
expectation that homozygous *X. malinche* alleles would be in the majority. In contrast to this expectation,
few alleles from *X. malinche* remained in these regions when combined with several *X. birchmanni*
backgrounds. In TOTO, where *X. malinche* is the minor parental population, many *X. malinche* alleles
were already lost from the population or are segregating at very low frequencies. This leads to a power
reduction for detecting *X. malinche*-specific interacting partners hinting at why the two strong DMI
candidates may not be detectable in TOTO. For example, at locus chr20:23M, frequencies of
homozygous *X. malinche* genotypes were found at a median frequency of 0.004, which is much smaller
than our filtering criteria 0.05. No DMIs remained detectable in TOTO at locus chr15:15M, at which the
frequencies of homozygous *X. malinche* genotypes were found at a median frequency 0.009. Together,
our results point at chr20:23Mb and chr15:15Mb as strong DMI candidates at which *X. malinche* alleles
are deleterious in combination with certain (and possibly several) loci from *X. birchmanni*.

In addition to comparing our candidates with a list of previously identified DMIs (Table S6 and S8), we
specifically analyzed genomic regions involved in a well-studied DMI that is known to induce melanoma
in hybrids. Powell et al. recently found a DMI between chr5:10-11Mb (*cd97*) and chr21:16.5-17.5Mb
(*Xmrk,* Powell et al. 2020). A previous QTL assay predicted that another gene, *cdkn2a/b* (~chr5:16-17Mb;
reviewed in Patton et al. 2010) interacted negatively with *Xmrk*. Previous work studying the interaction
between *Xmrk* and *cd97* has focused on CHAF, where melanoma frequency is high (interactions
generating melanoma appear to have been purged in the other hybrid populations). Interestingly, in
CHAF, it appears that both homozygous hybrid haplotypes are depleted in a part of this region. Thus, the
Xmrk-cd97 interaction could be a hybrid incompatibility in which both recombinant haplotypes are
deleterious, in which case no negative $X(2)$ signal is expected (since the signal is driven by recombinant
imbalance as caused by classical DMIs). Regarding the potential DMI between *Xmrk* and *cdkn2a/b*, we
found negative $X(2)$ in at least two hybrid populations that support this interaction (Figure S20, Table
S9). In CHAF and TOTO, markers linked to *Xmrk* passed the filtering criteria, but none in TLMC (Table

S9). In CHAF, $X(2)$ of 49.5% of marker pairs was negative but only 0.2% of these passed the threshold
$X(2) < -0.005$. In TOTO, which is of intermediate age, 25.9% of all marker pairs showed $X(2) <$
-0.005, which is much higher than the expectation obtained for a DMI from bootstrapping
(median=5.7%, Table S5). This is consistent with our expectation of the signal of an intermediate-strength
DMI that does not display strong negative $X(2)$ until later generations.

Discussion

DMIs play an important role in maintaining reproductive isolation between species. Despite their crucial
importance, existing methods to identify DMIs are underpowered and susceptible to high false positive
rates. Here, we show that the deviation of the variance in two-locus heterozygosity from its expectation,
$X(2)$, can allow us to identify intra- and interchromosomal DMIs in hybrid genomes. Specifically, a
negative $X(2)$ statistic is indicative of the presence of a DMI, because epistatic selection transiently leads
to an imbalance of the recombinant haplotypes. A second measure that we develop, $\Delta D2$, quantifies this
recombinant imbalance more explicitly. After showing the expected sensitivity and specificity of these
statistics in simulations, we used $X(2)$, $\Delta D2$ and D' to infer candidate DMIs from three hybrid
populations of swordtail fish. Although the detection power with these statistics is strongly dependent on
the age and demographic history of the hybrid population, false positive rates across simulations of
various scenarios were low and are expected to be especially low among interactions detected in multiple
populations. Encouraged by this result, we found that natural hybrid populations of swordtail fish
harbored many potential DMIs, and our analysis detected known DMI pairs. Interestingly, putative DMI
pairs tended to include the same loci more often than expected by chance, which is suggestive of the
presence of interaction hubs in these data.

DMIs cause distinctive patterns of LD and variance in two-locus heterozygosity

Linkage disequilibrium (LD) between physically unlinked loci has been frequently used to identify
candidate DMIs. However, LD is influenced by many factors including selection, population structure,
population differentiation, genetic drift, and epistasis. Sved first proposed the variance in two-locus
heterozygosity as a measure of multi-locus LD (Sved 1968). Generally, LD tends to raise the variance in
heterozygosity above its expected value at linkage equilibrium. This deviation from the expectation
(called $X(n)$, where n is the number of loci considered) was used to infer population structure within
species, e.g., in natural populations of *Hordeum spontaneum* and bacteria (Brown et al. 1980, Maynard
Smith et al. 1993). These studies assumed that the focal loci are independent and that any disruption of
independence would cause LD and a positive deviation from the expected variance in n-locus
heterozygosity (positive $X(n)$). Our study shows that selection against DMIs generates a unique pattern
of LD and $X(2)$, where LD is strong but $X(2)$ becomes negative. The conditions for negative $X(2)$ are
met when the imbalance happens between a pair of repulsive haplotypes (here, ab and AB) and this pair
of haplotypes is in deficiency (linkage disequilibrium, $D = g_{ab} - p_a p_b < 0$).

DMI inference with $X(2)$ does not rely on recombination rate estimates

One advantage of our statistics is that they do not rely on knowledge of recombination rates, which are
often unknown or estimated with error and may also differ between the parental and the hybrid
populations. For example, the protein PRDM9 specifies the locations of recombination hotspots in many

mammalian species (reviewed in Smukowski and Noor 2011, Penalba and Wolf 2020). Traditional
methods of intrachromosomal DMI detection are strongly affected by recombination rate variation,
whereas in the case of $X(2)$ it solely affects the temporal scale over which DMIs are detected. At the
same time, incorporating recombination rate information into DMI detection with $X(2)$ is an exciting
direction for future work. That is because if the recombination map was known, our statistics could be
incorporated in a simulation-based framework to estimate not only the location but also the strength of
selection against the DMI (i.e., the size of the epistasis coefficient γ).

Detection time window strongly depends on population demography

The ability to detect a DMI based on negative $X(2)$ and $\Delta D2$ statistics is transient. The time window
during which a DMI is detectable with these statistics depends on the demographic history of the
population and the strength of the incompatibility and the recombination probability between the two loci
involved (Figure 2). Specifically, the less recombination there is between two DMI loci and the weaker
the incompatibility, the longer it takes for their recombinant imbalance to be exposed. Moreover, since an
intrachromosomal (or weak interchromosomal) DMI is purged more slowly, it is detectable for a longer
time period, unless one of the interacting alleles is lost by other forces (such as genetic drift). This
interaction between population history and power to detect a DMI must be considered when interpreting
$X(2)$ results from real data.

Interestingly, certain migration scenarios improve the power to detect DMIs over long time periods. In
isolated hybrid populations, DMIs can only be detected within a limited time window, while the DMI loci
are still segregating in the population. With the aid of migration from the minor parental population or
balanced migration from both parental populations, DMI loci become monomorphic much later.
Specifically, continual immigration from both parental populations can maintain both weak and strong
DMIs at a steady state in a hybrid population. Negative $X(2)$ could show those segregating DMIs.
Considering that LD-based methods are vulnerable to high false positive rates when there is migration
from parental populations (Schumer and Brandvain 2016, Satokangas et al. 2020), $X(2)$ could be an
excellent addition to DMI detection in such scenarios.

Blanckaert and Payseur 2021 discussed the hitchhiking effect that is caused by strong DMIs. Even if DMI
loci are already monomorphic or at low frequency beyond the detection limit, linked polymorphic loci
could still carry the imbalance signal. Although our study considers this case as a false positive,
considering such linked variation could extend the time window for DMI detection.

Previous simulations showed that DMIs could only be identified with large sample sizes (800~1600
individuals suggested, Li and Zhang 2013). We showed that $X(2)$ can indicate DMIs with sample sizes as
low as 200 individuals. In the future, phased data or improved phasing approaches will further improve
the power of detecting DMIs with $X(2)$.

No evidence for enrichment in intrachromosomal DMIs in swordtail population data

Two lines of evidence led us to hypothesize that intrachromosomal DMIs may be overrepresented as
compared with interchromosomal DMIs. From first principles, systems and molecular biology have
established that genes in the same biological pathway tend to cluster physically in the genome. DMIs may
be more likely to arise from disruption or modification of such pathways (reviewed in Hurst 2004). This

predicts an enrichment in intrachromosomal DMIs under any scenario of speciation. Secondly,
evolutionary theory has predicted that tightly linked DMIs are more likely to accumulate and be
maintained in the presence of gene flow (Bank et al. 2012). Thus, both factors should contribute to an
enrichment (or reduced purging) of intrachromosomal DMIs. In contrast, in the set of DMI candidates
inferred from empirical data in this paper, interchromosomal DMIs were slightly overrepresented as
compared to intrachromosomal DMIs (<4% intrachromosomal DMIs compared with the expectation of
4.2% given an average chromosome length 29.2 ± 4.63 Mb; permutation test, $p < 0.02$). However, given
so many unknowns about the true architecture of selection, we are currently not able to conclude whether
this is a biological result, or a pattern caused by the limits of our inference method combined with the
demographic history of the populations studied here. Although our method is the first that can be applied
to detect intrachromosomal DMIs, it is limited to pairs of loci that are at a sufficiently large distance on
the chromosome such that recombination occurs with appreciable frequency, thus making the
recombinants visible to selection. Therefore, we are likely to miss local interactions, such as those
between neighboring genes. Moreover, intrachromosomal DMIs are detected on a different timescale than
interchromosomal DMIs, making the two classes not directly comparable. Altogether, our analysis does
not allow for a firm statement about the true proportion of intra- to interchromosomal DMIs.

The challenge of inferring and understanding complex DMIs

We find based on simulations that our statistics are robust to various demographic scenarios such as
population expansions and overlapping generations. However, in the modeling and simulation parts of
this paper, we mainly study the dynamics of one or two DMI pairs. This is because considering multiple
or complex DMIs would generate an intractably large parameter space to explore. Thus, we implicitly
assume that DMIs are independent of other incompatible loci in the genome. However, our results
indicate that some DMI candidates are involved in many interactions. For example, one locus may
interact with multiple loci (e.g., Brideau et al. 2006, Tang et al. 2015). Moreover, DMIs generate fitness
costs in hybrids, but these costs can express themselves through different fitness-related phenotypes. This
makes it difficult to study DMIs in the same way one would study a quantitative trait. For example,
previous studies suggest that *cdkn2a/b* and *Xmrk* interact in some species of swordtail fish (reviewed in
Patton et al. 2010). However, Powell et al. 2020 recently showed that *Xmrk* interacts with a previously
unidentified locus (*cd97*) to cause melanoma in other swordtail fish species (Powell et al. 2020). Our
results also indicate an interaction between *Xmrk* and a genomic block with *cdkn2a/b* in swordtail fish,
which might cause unfit phenotypes other than melanoma. Lu et al. 2020 reported that *rad3d*, a gene
upstream of *cdkn2a/b,* interacted with *Xmrk* mapped in hybrids between *X. maculatus* and *X. helleri*.
Taken together, this suggests the simultaneous presence of multiple hybrid incompatibilities caused by
Xmrk. This finding is not specific to this study system; recent GWAS and QTL mapping studies in a
house mouse hybrid zone also suggested multiple, non-independent genetic incompatibilities (Turner and
Harr 2014, Turner et al. 2014). In addition to the presence of true hubs of hybrid incompatibilities, other
types of selection and interference could contribute to the signal at these loci. For example, there could be
interference between different DMIs (analogous to Hill-Roberson interference), or strong negative
interactions may cause local stratification of the genome (e.g., Pool 2015).

Moreover, it is important to note that the sensitivity of the $X(2)$ statistic is specific to the recombinant
imbalance caused by classical DMIs (Orr 1995, Gavrilets 1997), where only one recombinant haplotype
suffers from the incompatibility, whereas the other has similar fitness to the parental genotype. The

evolution of this type of hybrid incompatibility is easy to explain without invoking multi-locus interactions (Orr 1995). However, hybrid populations may carry hybrid incompatibilities beyond classical DMIs, where both recombinant haplotypes suffer from reduced fitness (e.g., Moran et al. 2021). These tend to be less easily purged by gene flow (Bank et al 2012, Lindtke and Buerkle 2015, Blanckaert et al 2020), and they may cause distinct patterns in the genome such as inflated single-locus heterozygosity. To date, we are far from understanding the relative prevalence of hybrid incompatibilities of different types and their overall role during hybridization and speciation.

According to analysis of hybrid data in swordtail fish, many of the genomic regions analyzed are predicted to be involved in DMIs. While possible, this is likely driven by linkage and analysis choices made for these data. Specifically, based on our simulations, we observe four phenomena that generate negative $X(2)$: true DMI interactions, interaction signals from a flanking region with a DMI locus, interaction signals from two flanking regions and interference between DMIs. However, we suspect that we can be confident in loci which we inferred to be involved in DMIs in multiple populations or interactions. Based on this, we speculate that we may have detected 50-70 loci involved in DMIs per swordtail fish hybrid population. In other species, at least 100 loci were experimentally identified among closely related species (reviewed in Wu and Palopoli 1994, Matute et al. 2010, Moyle and Nakazato 2010, Guerrero et al. 2017). Previous genetic mapping studies and our study of natural hybrid populations have inferred DMIs at the resolution of large genomic blocks. Because speciation genes and genes involved in the same pathway are expected to cluster, the actual number of incompatible genes might be larger than the estimations.

Concluding remarks

In this paper, we take a step towards genome-wide identification of inter- and intrachromosomal DMIs, providing a powerful new tool for researchers in speciation genetics. However, the complexity of potential interactions in the genotype-fitness map of an organism is vast (Fragata et al. 2019), and DMIs are only one specific kind of pairwise epistatic interaction that is characterized by the fitness deficit of one recombinant genotype. Even if this type of (negative) epistasis between two loci is inferred, drawing conclusions about the functional underpinnings of this epistasis is difficult. For example, Kryazhimskiy (2021) recently presented theoretical models that demonstrate how epistasis can propagate across modules of a metabolic network, with negative epistasis at lower levels possibly resulting in amplified negative epistasis at a higher level, and positive epistasis at a lower level possibly turning into negative epistasis at a higher level. These findings reinforce the expectation of widespread negative epistasis (including DMIs) for fitness. Mapping and functionally understanding complex interactions and their consequences for genome evolution will require new interdisciplinary approaches that combine the tools and expertise from genomics, systems and molecular biology and population genetics in the future.

Materials and methods

A toy model illustrates DMI dynamics.

We first consider a toy model of a single DMI pair, similar to Bank et al. 2012, that is purged from an isolated hybrid population. Consider two divergent loci resulting in parental haplotypes *aB* and *Ab* (Figure S1). Hybridization and recombination generate two recombinant haplotypes, *ab* and *AB*. We

assume a DMI between A and B, and that direct selection acts on the incompatible alleles A and B. We
denote the fitness of the haplotypes as $w_{ab} = 1, w_{Ab} = 1 + \alpha, w_{aB} = 1 + \beta, w_{AB} = (1 + \alpha)(1 +$
$\gamma)$. Throughout the manuscript, we usually set these coefficients to $\alpha = 0.001, \beta = 0.002, \gamma = -0.5$,
representing weak direct selection and a strong DMI. To gain an intuition of the purging process and the
statistics, we first compare the frequency dynamics with and without DMIs by assuming haploid hybrid
populations with recombination in a deterministic model.

Dynamics of the variance in heterozygosity for a two-locus DMI

735 In the model described above, we denote g_{ik} as the frequency of haplotype ik, where $i \in \{A, a\}$ and $k \in$
736 $\{B, b\}$. The allele frequency of allele i at locus $\mathbf{A}$ is p_i, and the allele frequency of allele k at locus $\mathbf{B}$ is
737 p_k. The heterozygosity h at a locus is $h_{\mathbf{A}} = 1 - p_a{}^2 - p_A{}^2$, $h_{\mathbf{B}} = 1 - p_b{}^2 - p_B{}^2$. The heterozygosity h is
738 the expectation of the number of heterozygous loci per individual across two loci, K, where $K = 0,1,2$.
739 This can be written as the sum of the heterozygosity at $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ is (Nei and Roychoudhury 1974),

$$740 \qquad h = h_{\mathbf{A}} + h_{\mathbf{B}}.$$

741 We define the variance of K as in Sved 1968, summing over the contributions of numbers of
742 heterozygous loci (see Table S10), as

$$743 \quad \sigma_{het} = (0 - h)^2 \left(g_{Ab}{}^2 + g_{aB}{}^2 + g_{ab}{}^2 + g_{AB}{}^2 \right) + (1 - h)^2 (2g_{ab}g_{Ab} + 2g_{ab}g_{aB} + 2g_{AB}g_{Ab} + 2g_{AB}g_{aB})$$
$$744 \qquad + (2 - h)^2 (2g_{aB}g_{Ab} + 2g_{ab}g_{AB})$$
$$745 \qquad = h_{\mathbf{A}} + h_{\mathbf{B}} - h_{\mathbf{A}}{}^2 - h_{\mathbf{B}}{}^2$$
$$746 \qquad + 2\sum_i \sum_k (g_{ik}{}^2 - p_i{}^2 p_k{}^2)$$
$$747 \qquad = h_{\mathbf{A}} + h_{\mathbf{B}} - h_{\mathbf{A}}{}^2 - h_{\mathbf{B}}{}^2 + 4\sum_i \sum_k p_i p_k D_{ik} + 2\sum_i \sum_k D_{ik}{}^2,$$

748 where $D_{ik} = g_{ik} - p_i p_k$ is the LD for each haplotype.

749 If there is no LD, the alleles that segregate at different loci in an individual are independent, so the
750 expected value of the variance of K is $\sigma_2^{exp} = h_{\mathbf{A}} + h_{\mathbf{B}} - h_{\mathbf{A}}{}^2 - h_{\mathbf{B}}{}^2$.

751 The deviation of the variance from the independent expectation is therefore

$$752 \qquad \Delta_2 = 4\sum_i \sum_k p_i p_k D_{ik} + 2\sum_i \sum_k D_{ik}{}^2.$$

753 Its relative deviation from the expectation is

$$754 \qquad X(2) = \frac{\Delta_2}{\sigma_2^{exp}},$$

which is the focal statistic of this paper. Similar to LD, $X(2)$ indicates the association between alleles at
two loci. The association is created by recombination, genetic drift, and negative epistasis between alleles.

The LD of recombinants is $D = g_{ab} \cdot g_{AB} - g_{aB} \cdot g_{Ab}$.

Normalizing D to D' we obtain

$$D' = \frac{D}{D_{max}},$$

where

$D_{max} = min(-p_A \cdot p_B, -p_a \cdot p_b)$ when $D < 0$;

$D_{max} = max(p_A \cdot p_b, p_a \cdot p_B)$ when $D > 0$.

We use D' as a classical measure of LD throughout the manuscript.

$\Delta D2$ quantifies imbalanced segregation of recombinant haplotypes

We also rewrote the deviation of the variance of K from its expectation in the form of haplotype
frequencies (g_{ik}) and allele frequencies (p_i, p_k)

$$\Delta_2 = 2\sum_i \sum_k (g_{ik}^2 - p_i^2 p_k^2)$$

We propose $D2_{ik} = g_{ik}^2 - p_i^2 p_k^2$ as a measure of the imbalance of haplotype frequencies, which is a
key indicator of a DMI.

In a deterministic model without selection, we expect the recombinant haplotypes to be generated at the
same frequency after hybridization. It follows that $D2_{ab}$ and $D2_{AB}$ of recombinant haplotypes are
expected to be equal initially, independent of the initial admixture proportions. When there is a DMI, the
recombinant haplotype *AB* is depleted, and this expectation does not hold. We use the *D2* difference
between the two recombinants to refer to DMI-indicating recombinant imbalance and from now on refer
to this as $\Delta D2 \coloneqq D2_{AB} - D2_{ab}$ (Figure S4 A-D).

$D2_{ik}$ can also be written as linkage disequilibrium D times a factor, $D2_{ik} = (g_{ik} - p_i p_k)(g_{ik} + p_i p_k) =$
$D \cdot (g_{ik} + p_i p_k)$. Therefore, we expect $D2_{ik}$ to be 0 when the population approaches linkage equilibrium
(D approaches 0; Figure S4 A-D). The total deviation of $D2_{ik}$ from 0, $\sum_i \sum_k |D2_{ik}|$, is an indicator of
linkage disequilibrium. The proportion of $\Delta D2$ over the sum of all $|D_{ik}|$, $(D2_{AB} - D2_{ab})/\sum_i \sum_k |D2_{ik}|$,
can also be written as $|1 - p_A - p_B|$, showing the relationship between the recombinant imbalance and
the elimination of the two alleles that interact negatively in the DMI.

Haploid and diploid populations and the dominance of epistasis in our model

Modeling DMIs in a diploid population is more complicated than suggested by the toy model, which
assumes a haploid population with recombination. In a diploid population, the epistatic interaction
depends on the dominance of each incompatible allele (Table S11). To avoid this complexity, we
assumed a haploid population with recombination to demonstrate the dynamics of DMI in a deterministic
way with a minimal number of parameters. We can understand the haploid model in a way to assume that
selection acts on the gamete pool. Here, heterozygosity is the proportion of heterozygous sites observed
when two haplotypes are randomly selected. Figure S21 shows that $X(2)$ trajectories have similar shapes
but with different detection time windows ($X(2) < 0$) when a DMI is in either recombining haploid

population or diploid populations with various scenarios of dominance. Because dominant incompatible
alleles are exposed to negative epistasis more strongly, higher dominance results in shorter detection
windows.
794

Simulation of a DMI under Wright-Fisher and Moran models

In our simulations, implemented in SLiM (version 3.5, Haller and Messer 2019), we assumed a
population size of 5000 diploid individuals, with selection occurring at the juvenile stage, followed by
random mating and recombination. For simplicity and computational speed, we ignored mutation (similar
to Blanckaert & Bank 2018). At the beginning of the simulation, two fully diverged parental populations
of adults are combined at admixture proportions f and $1 - f$, which mate randomly. When considering
immigration, we assume that migrants from one parental population enter the hybrid population at the
juvenile stage after selection. Direct fitness is multiplicative and heterozygous-heterozygous individuals
do not suffer from the DMI, similar to the "recessive" DMI scenario in Turelli and Orr 2000 and
Blanckaert & Bank 2018, where the DMI affects homozygous-homozygous genotypes ($w_{AB/AB} =$
$(1 + \alpha)^2(1 + \beta)^2(1 + \gamma)^4$) and homozygous-heterozygous genotypes ($w_{AB/aB} = (1 +$
$\alpha)(1 + \beta)^2(1 + \gamma)^2$ and $w_{AB/Ab} = (1 + \alpha)^2(1 + \beta)(1 + \gamma)^2$). Individuals were excluded from sampling
if they were nearly purely parental in their ancestry (i.e., <10% of genomes from either parental
population).

To represent the demography of the studied swordtail fish populations that have overlapping generations,
we compared the DMI dynamics and the difference in the time period in which DMIs can be detected
between a non-overlapping generation model (Wright-Fisher) and an overlapping generation model
(Moran), both of which operate in discrete time. In the Moran model, mortality rates for each age
determined the age structure [0.2, 0.2, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0] from age 0 to 9 in every
generation. Age 0 is the new generation of juveniles. Probability of death for each individual was
determined according to these mortality rates and individuals that experienced mortality were replaced by
juveniles after selection.

Sensitivity and specificity

Before applying the statistics to real data, we used simulations under a Wright-Fisher model with variable
admixture proportions and migration rates to estimate the sensitivity and specificity of our method in
detecting DMIs (Figure 2). We designed these simulations to correspond to realistic conditions for its
application to swordtail fish data. According to empirical estimates, the migration rate m ranges from
<<0.01 to ~0.05 in the natural hybrid populations studied here. To roughly explore these dynamics in our
simulations, we included no ($m = 0$), intermediate ($m = 0.005$) and strong ($m = 0.01$) migration from
minor parental populations, and two admixture proportions $f \in \{0.3, 0.5\}$. We used the proportion of
successful DMI detection under our model to estimate sensitivity, or the true positive rate. Specificity was
estimated by the proportion of pairs that were correctly classified not to be DMIs under a null model of
neutral evolution. Since $X(2)$ was always larger than -0.001 in the 300 simulations we performed on
neutrally evolving pairs, DMI detection criteria were set to $X(2) < -0.005$ & $D' < 0$. $D' < 0$ ensures
that the depleted haplotype is a recombinant but not a parental haplotype. The population size was 5000
in each simulation, and the recombination probability was set to 0.5 f or each pair of loci. We simulated

each scenario 100 times and randomly sampled 300 individuals for further analysis. Sensitivity and

specificity were calculated from generation 10 onwards. 95% Confidence intervals were estimated using

the Wald test (Agresti and Coull 1998).

False and true positive rates with one and two DMI pairs

To generalize the performance analyses, we simulated genomes with one DMI or two DMIs on two or

four chromosomes (chromosomes with DMIs are referred to as DMI chromosomes below). In the same

genome, two additional neutral chromosomes were simulated to estimate the false positive rate. One

hundred markers were simulated on each chromosome, and the population size was set to 5000. The

position of the DMI loci were distributed randomly on the DMI chromosomes such that DMIs could be

either intra- or interchromosomal. Epistatic coefficients were drawn from a uniform distribution ($\gamma \in$

$[-1, -0.001]$)). Direct selection coefficients were drawn from an exponential distribution (mean=0.001,

α, β). Here, the fitness was computed as the product of the respective fitness of the two DMIs. Due to the

large parameter space, we only considered three demographic scenarios, equal admixture proportions

without migration ($f = 0.5, m1, m2 = 0$), equal admixture proportion with migration from both parental

population ($f = 0.5, m1 = m2 = 0.005$) and uneven admixture proportions with high migration rates

from the minor parental population ($f = 0.3, m = 0.01$). We simulated each scenario 100 times, such that

100 DMIs in the one-DMI scenario and 200 DMIs in the two-DMI scenario could be used to determine

the true positive rates. We also studied the distribution of the total number of retained two-locus

haplotypes when only homozygous loci were considered for varying sample sizes ($n \in \{100, 200, 300\}$)

in the two-DMI model. At least 200 individuals had to be sampled to obtain >50 homozygous-

homozygous haplotypes (Figure S22). The mean and 95% confidence interval of the false positive rate

was estimated by resampling 2000 interactions from all pairwise statistics of 100 simulations 1000 times.

To represent interaction hubs, we implemented a three-locus two-DMI model that directly extends the

two-locus implementation. Here, two loci (**A** and **B**) are interacting with a third locus (**C**). In our

implementation, this results in two pairwise DMIs between alleles A and C, and B and C (Table S12).

With multiplicative fitness, haplotype ABC then suffers the lowest fitness in the population. Among the

three DMI alleles (A, B and C), allele C on average suffers the lowest fitness because three of the four

haplotypes that contain allele C (AbC, aBC, ABC, not abC) are under strong negative epistasis. Allele C

would thus be eliminated very quickly in the population. Here, the true and false positive rates are

surveyed under equal admixture without migration ($f = 0.5, m = 0$). Five chromosomes were analyzed,

including three chromosomes with randomly distributed DMI loci and two neutral chromosomes.

Fish data availability, quality control and bias control

Previous work has described our approach for local ancestry inference in *X. birchmanni* x *X. malinche*

hybrids in detail (Powell et al. 2020, Schumer et al. 2020). Ancestry informative sites were defined based

on a combination of low and high coverage sequenced individuals from two allopatric *X. birchmanni*

(N=150) and two allopatric *X. malinche* populations (N=33). The difference in sequencing effort reflects

a large difference in genetic diversity and the expected number of segregating sites between the two

species (*X. birchmanni* π per basepair is 0.1%, *X. malinche* is 0.03%). Based on observed allele

frequencies at these sites, we excluded any ancestry informative site that had less than a 98% frequency

difference between the two samples. We used observed frequencies at these ancestry informative sites, in

combination with counts for each allele from low-coverage whole genome sequence data to infer local

ancestry using a hidden Markov model (HMM) based approach. The expected performance of this
approach was evaluated in simulations, on pure parental individuals not used in the definition of ancestry
informative sites and on early generation F_1 and F_2 hybrids where small switches in ancestry can
confidently be inferred to be errors. A subset of simulations also included genetic drift between the
reference panels and parental populations that form the hybrid populations (Schumer et al. 2020). Based
on these analyses we estimated error rates to be ≤0.2% errors per ancestry informative site in all tested
scenarios (Powell et al. 2020, Schumer et al. 2020). Thus, given the high expected accuracy of ancestry
inference in *X. birchmanni* x *X. malinche* hybrids, we do not expect that errors will cause the patterns
observed in the empirical data from natural populations.
881
For convenience in downstream analysis, posterior probabilities from the HMM for ancestry state were
converted to hard calls. Sites with a posterior probability greater than >0.95 for a particular ancestry state
(homozygous *X. malinche*, heterozygous, homozygous *X. birchmanni*) were converted to a hard call for
that ancestry state. This resulted in 629112, 629582, and 629101 calls at ancestry informative sites for
analysis across populations. Individuals were excluded from this dataset if they were nearly pure parental
in their ancestry (i.e., <10% of genomes from either parental population).
888
To avoid biases, we filtered ancestry informative sites (makers) in the three populations independently
using the same criteria. Here, we defined homozygous genotype when the same ancestry state is at one
ancestry informative site in one individual; heterozygous genotype when the different ancestry state is at
one ancestry informative site in one individual. In each population, we retained a locus for analysis if its
frequency of each homozygous genotype was >0.05, and if the locus was missing (or heterozygous) in
fewer than 60% of individuals. Ancestry informative sites were thinned by LD ($r^2 > 0.9$) within a 10kb
window, with 1-marker step size by PLINK (v1.9, Chang et al. 2015). The thinning resulted in 18,188,
7,244, and 7,415 markers for CHAF, TLMC, TOTO respectively.
897
We then sampled 700 markers and calculated the statistics (including $X(2)$, D', $\Delta D2$ and haplotype
frequencies) pairwise in this data set. If $X(2) < -0.005$ and $D' < 0$ (Table S1-S3), we considered a pair
of markers as a candidate DMI pair. To compare the DMI locations among bootstrap replicates and
between hybrid populations, we next split the genome into 1Mb bins (based on the reference genome
of *X. maculatus*; Schartl et al. 2013). This window size was inspired by our simulations and two examples
in three hybrid populations, which showed that the signal of selection at DMI loci could extend to at least
1-2Mb (Figure 3, S6, S18 & S19). Any two bins that contained pairwise interaction candidates were
finally considered a putative DMI. We repeated this procedure 20 times.
906
The proportion of putative DMIs in all pairwise comparisons was very similar to the expected false
positive rate obtained from our simulations, and the proportion of putative DMIs was elevated when
markers were assigned to 1Mb bins (Table S3 and S5). To be conservative, given this result, we used
several approaches. We used the median proportion p of candidate bins with negative $X(2)$ over 20
bootstrap samples as a baseline false positive rate. We then computed the probability of sampling the
same candidate interaction between bins (based on choosing different markers in each round) multiple
times; this should be binomially distributed with parameter p. Using a binomial test, we determined k as
the least number of times that an interaction candidate should be observed to be retained as a putative
DMI, using a p value of 0.05 corrected for a false discovery rate of 0.001 (following the Benjamini-

Hochberg procedure). We obtained values of k between 6 and 10 for the three hybrid populations (see
Table S5). As a second approach to reduce false positives, we also limited our focus to interactions that
were observed in multiple populations. Independent observation of interactions in two or more
populations provides strong evidence that these interactions are not expected by chance.

Code availability

All simulation and analysis code that was developed to obtain the results presented in this paper will be
deposited in an open archive upon publication of the manuscript and is currently available at
https://github.com/banklab/DMI-inference-X2.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful for helpful discussions and comments on the manuscript provided by the IGC-FCUL-
unibe journal club and Milan Malinsky. We thank Vitor Sousa for extensive feedback and discussions and
Alexandre Blanckaert for simulation code and discussions. We thank Kali Tal for her editorial
suggestions. CB and JL are grateful for support by EMBO Installation Grant IG4152 and by ERC Starting
Grant 804569 - FIT2GO. CB and MS are grateful for support by the HFSP Young Investor Grant
RGY0081/2020. MS is also supported by Sloan, Searle, and Pew fellowships. Calculations were
performed on UBELIX (http://www.id.unibe.ch/hpc), the HPC cluster at the University of Bern. This
study was greatly improved by insightful comments from two anonymous reviewers and Hilde
Schneemann.

References

Bank C, Bürger R, Hermisson J. The limits to parapatric speciation: Dobzhansky–Muller
incompatibilities in a continent–island model. Genetics. 2012;191(3):845–863.

Bay RA, Arnegard ME, Conte GL, Best J, Bedford NL, McCann SR, et al. Genetic coupling of female
mate choice with polygenic ecological divergence facilitates stickleback speciation. Current Biology.
2017;27(21):3344–3349.

Blanckaert A, Bank C, Hermisson J. The limits to parapatric speciation 3: Evolution of strong
reproductive isolation in presence of gene flow despite limited ecological differentiation. Philosophical
Transactions of the Royal Society B. 2020;375(1806):20190532.

Blanckaert A, Bank C. In search of the Goldilocks zone for hybrid speciation. PLoS genetics. 2018;14(9):
e1007613.

Blanckaert A, Payseur BA. Finding hybrid incompatibilities using genome sequences from hybrid
populations. Molecular Biology and Evolution. 2021; 38(10):4616-4627.

Brandvain Y, Kenney AM, Flagel L, Coop G, Sweigart AL. Speciation and introgression between
Mimulus nasutus and Mimulus guttatus. PLoS Genet. 2014;10(6): e1004410.

Brideau NJ, Flores HA, Wang J, Maheshwari S, Wang X, Barbash DA. Two Dobzhansky-Muller genes
interact to cause hybrid lethality in Drosophila. science. 2006;314(5803):1292–1295.

Brown A, Feldman M, Nevo E. Multilocus structure of natural populations of Hordeum spontaneum.
Genetics. 1980;96(2):523–536.

Byers KJ, Darragh K, Fernanda Garza S, Abondano Almeida D, Warren IA, Rastas PM, et al. Clustering
of loci controlling species differences in male chemical bouquets of sympatric Heliconius butterflies.
Ecology and evolution. 2021;11(1):89–107.

Chang CC, Chow CC, Tellier LC, Vattikuti S, Purcell SM, Lee JJ. Second-generation PLINK: rising to
the challenge of larger and richer datasets. Gigascience. 2015;4(1): s13742–015.

Chaturvedi S, Lucas LK, Buerkle CA, Fordyce JA, Forister ML, Nice CC, et al. Recent hybrids
recapitulate ancient hybrid outcomes. Nature communications. 2020;11(1):1–15.

Corbett-Detig RB, Zhou J, Clark AG, Hartl DL, Ayroles JF. Genetic incompatibilities are widespread
within species. Nature. 2013;504(7478):135–137.

Culumber Z, Fisher H, Tobler M, Mateos M, Barber P, Sorenson M, et al. Replicated hybrid zones of
Xiphophorus swordtails along an elevational gradient. Molecular ecology. 2011;20(2):342–356.

Davey JW, Hohenlohe PA, Etter PD, Boone JQ, Catchen JM, Blaxter ML. Genome-wide genetic marker
discovery and genotyping using next-generation sequencing. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2011;12(7):499–
510.

Felsenstein J. The evolutionary advantage of recombination. Genetics. 1974;78(2):737–756.

Fishman L, Sweigart AL. When two rights make a wrong: the evolutionary genetics of plant hybrid
incompatibilities. Annual review of plant biology. 2018; 69:707–731.

Fragata I, Blanckaert A, Louro MAD, Liberles DA, Bank C. Evolution in the light of fitness landscape
theory. Trends in ecology & evolution. 2019;34(1):69–82.

Gavrilets S. Hybrid zones with Dobzhansky-type epistatic selection. Evolution. 1997;51(4):1027–1035.

Guerrero RF, Muir CD, Josway S, Moyle LC. Pervasive antagonistic interactions among hybrid
incompatibility loci. PLoS genetics. 2017;13(6): e1006817.

Haller BC, Messer PW. SLiM 3: forward genetic simulations beyond the Wright–Fisher model.
Molecular biology and evolution. 2019;36(3):632–637.

Hurst LD, Pál C, Lercher MJ. The evolutionary dynamics of eukaryotic gene order. Nature Reviews
Genetics. 2004;5(4):299–310.

Kimura M. Attainment of quasi linkage equilibrium when gene frequencies are changing by natural
selection. Genetics. 1965;52(5):875.

Kryazhimskiy S. Emergence and propagation of epistasis in metabolic networks. Elife. 2021;10: e60200.

Li C, Wang Z, Zhang J. Toward Genome-Wide Identification of Bateson–Dobzhansky–Muller
Incompatibilities in Yeast: A Simulation Study. Genome biology and evolution. 2013;5(7):1261–1272.

Lindtke D, Buerkle CA. The genetic architecture of hybrid incompatibilities and their effect on barriers to
introgression in secondary contact. Evolution. 2015;69(8):1987–2004.

Lu Y, Sandoval A, Voss S, Lai Z, Kneitz S, Boswell W, et al. Oncogenic allelic interaction in
Xiphophorus highlights hybrid incompatibility. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.
2020;117(47):29786–29794.

Maheshwari S, Barbash DA. The genetics of hybrid incompatibilities. Annual review of genetics. 2011;
45:331–355.

Martin SH, Davey JW, Salazar C, Jiggins CD. Recombination rate variation shapes barriers to
introgression across butterfly genomes. PLoS biology. 2019;17(2): e2006288.

Matute DR, Butler IA, Turissini DA, Coyne JA. A test of the snowball theory for the rate of evolution of
hybrid incompatibilities. Science. 2010;329(5998):1518–1521.

Nei M, Roychoudhury AK. Sampling variances of heterozygosity and genetic distance. Genetics.
1974;76(2):379–390.

Moyle LC, Nakazato T. Hybrid incompatibility "snowballs" between Solanum species. Science.
2010;329(5998):1521–1523.

Moran BM, Payne CY, Powell DL, Iverson ENK, Banerjee SM, Langdon QK, et al. A Lethal Genetic
Incompatibility between Naturally Hybridizing Species in Mitochondrial Complex I. bioRxiv. 2021;
doi:10.1101/2021.07.13.452279.

Noor MA, Grams KL, Bertucci LA, Reiland J. Chromosomal inversions and the reproductive isolation of
species. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2001;98(21):12084–12088.

Orr HA, Presgraves DC. Speciation by postzygotic isolation: forces, genes and molecules. BioEssays.
2000;22(12):1085–1094.

Orr HA. The population genetics of speciation: the evolution of hybrid incompatibilities. Genetics.
1995;139(4):1805–1813.

Ortiz-Barrientos D, Engelstädter J, Rieseberg LH. Recombination rate evolution and the origin of species.
Trends in ecology & evolution. 2016;31(3):226–236.

Patton EE, Mitchell DL, Nairn RS. Genetic and environmental melanoma models in fish. Pigment cell &
melanoma research. 2010;23(3):314–337.

Penãlba JV, Wolf JB. From molecules to populations: appreciating and estimating recombination rate
variation. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2020;21(8):476–492.

Pool JE. The mosaic ancestry of the Drosophila genetic reference panel and the D. melanogaster reference
genome reveals a network of epistatic fitness interactions. Molecular biology and evolution.
2015;32(12):3236–3251.

Powell DL, García-Olazábal M, Keegan M, Reilly P, Du K, Díaz-Loyo AP, et al. Natural hybridization
reveals incompatible alleles that cause melanoma in swordtail fish. Science. 2020;368(6492):731–736.

Presgraves DC. The molecular evolutionary basis of species formation. Nature Reviews Genetics.
2010;11(3):175–180.

Satokangas I, Martin S, HelanteräH, Saramäki J, Kulmuni J. Multi-locus interactions and the build-up of
reproductive isolation. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B. 2020;375(1806):20190543.

Schartl M, Walter RB, Shen Y, Garcia T, Catchen J, Amores A, et al. The genome of the platyfish,
Xiphophorus maculatus, provides insights into evolutionary adaptation and several complex traits. Nature
genetics. 2013;45(5):567–572.

Schumer M, Brandvain Y. Determining epistatic selection in admixed populations. Molecular Ecology.
2016;25(11):2577–2591.

Schumer M, Cui R, Powell DL, Dresner R, Rosenthal GG, Andolfatto P. High-resolution mapping reveals
hundreds of genetic incompatibilities in hybridizing fish species. Elife. 2014;3: e02535.

Schumer M, Powell DL, Corbett-Detig R. Versatile simulations of admixture and accurate local ancestry
inference with mixnmatch and ancestryinfer. Molecular ecology resources. 2020;20(4):1141–1151.

Schumer M, Powell DL, Delclós PJ, Squire M, Cui R, Andolfatto P, et al. Assortative mating and
persistent reproductive isolation in hybrids. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.
2017;114(41):10936–10941.

Schumer M, Xu C, Powell DL, Durvasula A, Skov L, Holland C, et al. Natural selection interacts with
recombination to shape the evolution of hybrid genomes. Science. 2018;360(6389):656–660.

Seehausen O. Hybridization and adaptive radiation. Trends in ecology & evolution. 2004 ; 19(4) :198–
207.

Simon M, Loudet O, Durand S, Bérard A, Brunel D, Sennesal FX, et al. Quantitative trait loci mapping in
five new large recombinant inbred line populations of Arabidopsis thaliana genotyped with consensus
single-nucleotide polymorphism markers. Genetics. 2008;178(4):2253–2264.

Slatkin M. Linkage disequilibrium—understanding the evolutionary past and mapping the medical future.
Nature Reviews Genetics. 2008;9(6):477–485.

Smith JM, Smith NH, O'Rourke M, Spratt BG. How clonal are bacteria? Proceedings of the National
Academy of Sciences. 1993;90(10):4384–4388.

Smukowski C, Noor M. Recombination rate variation in closely related species. Heredity.
2011;107(6):496–508.

Sved J. The stability of linked systems of loci with a small population size. Genetics. 1968;59(4):543.

Szabo Q, Bantignies F, Cavalli G. Principles of genome folding into topologically associating domains.
Science advances. 2019;5(4): eaaw1668.

Tang S, Presgraves DC. Lineage-specific evolution of the complex Nup160 hybrid incompatibility
between Drosophila melanogaster and its sister species. Genetics. 2015;200(4):1245–1254.

Turelli M, Orr HA. Dominance, epistasis and the genetics of postzygotic isolation. Genetics.
2000;154(4):1663–1679.

Turner LM, Harr B. Genome-wide mapping in a house mouse hybrid zone reveals hybrid sterility loci and
Dobzhansky-Muller interactions. Elife. 2014;3: e02504.

Turner LM, White MA, Tautz D, Payseur BA. Genomic networks of hybrid sterility. PLoS Genet.
2014;10(2): e1004162.

Wu CI, Palopoli MF. Genetics of postmating reproductive isolation in animals. Annual review of
genetics. 1994;28(1):283–308.

Wu CI, Ting CT. Genes and speciation. Nature Reviews Genetics. 2004;5(2):114–122.

1062

Supporting Information

Figure S1. Illustration of the genomic composition and the fitnesses in the haploid model. A. In our toy
model of hybridization with a single DMI pair, two recombinant haplotypes (*ab* and *AB*) are generated
from the parental haplotypes (*Ab* and *aB*) from the F2 onwards. In the following generations, all four
haplotypes are segregating. In the Dobzhansky-Muller incompatibility (DMI) model, the recombinant
haplotype *AB* is strongly selected against. Throughout the paper we allow for weak direct selection for the
derived alleles (here, $\alpha = 0.001$ for *A* and $\beta = 0.002$ for *B*) and an intermediate to strong fitness interaction
between *A* and *B* (here, $\gamma = -0.5$). B. Recombinant imbalance caused by a DMI as compared with Hill-
Robertson interference (HRI). Alleles *A* and *B* under strong selection in the same direction can lead to
recombinant imbalance between *ab* and *AB*. The arrows show the intensity of the absolute reduction of
each haplotype frequency in one generation.

Figure S2. Deterministic frequency dynamics of the four haplotypes in a new hybrid population in the
deterministic haploid model. Alleles *A* and *B* are under weak direct selection ($\alpha = 0.001$ for *A* and $\beta =$
0.002 for *B*). The epistatic interaction between alleles *A* and *B* is γ. The recombination probability *c* is
0.1. The admixture proportion is 0.5. A. The haplotype frequencies approach linkage equilibrium soon
after hybridization without a DMI ($\gamma = 0$). B. With a strong DMI ($\gamma = -0.5$) the emerging recombinant
haplotype *AB* is eliminated quickly, whereas the *ab* haplotype has a marginal advantage that drives it to
high frequencies.

Figure S3. Haplotype frequencies that create negative $X(2)$. The three panels represent three different
admixture proportions for *Ab* and *aB*. The frequencies of four haplotypes (f_{aB}, f_{Ab}, f_{ab}, f_{AB}) were
plotted. Haplotype frequency of *ab* (f_{ab}) is shown on the x axis and the frequencies of other three
haplotypes are shown on the y axis. The ratio of f_{aB} and f_{Ab} stays the same as their initial ratio for every
combination of haplotype frequencies (f_{aB}, f_{Ab}, f_{ab}, f_{AB}). Haplotype *ab* has always the largest frequency
and *AB* has always the smallest frequency.

Figure S4. Dynamics of $D2_{ik}$ and $X(2)$. A-D. $D2_{ik}$ in four scenarios combining equal/unequal admixture proportions and with/without DMIs, obtained from the deterministic haploid model. E-F. $X(2)$ trajectory with (blue dashed line) and without (red line) DMIs. The direct selection coefficients are $\alpha = 0.001$, $\beta = 0.002$. The strength of epistasis is $\gamma = -0.5$ (strong DMI) and $\gamma = 0$ (no DMI). The recombination probability is 0.1.

Figure S5. Comparison of the dynamics of $X(2)$ and $\Delta D2 = D2_{ab} - D2_{AB}$ for a DMI (A&B) compared with strong direct selection (Hill-Roberson interference, HRI, C&D) in the deterministic haploid model. The direct selection coefficients acting on A and B are α, β. The admixture proportion is $f = 0.5$. Black dots highlight the generation with the largest $-X(2)$ or $-\Delta D2$ for each trajectory. The values of $X(2)$ and $\Delta D2$ are represented by blue color intensity. Blank areas represent either $X(2) > 0$ (to the left of the blue area) or at least one locus close to fixation (minor allele frequency <0.005, on the right of the blue area). The recombination probability between the two DMI loci is 0.1. A&B. DMIs ($\alpha = 0.001$, $\beta = 0.002$, $\gamma < 0$ varies on the y axis) exist for a longer longer time in the population than HRI (C&D). C&D. HRI ($\gamma = 0$, $\alpha \& \beta < 0$, y axis) can briefly induce weak negative $X(2)$ and $\Delta D2_{ik}$ earlier than a DMI, but the two-locus polymorphism is quickly purged from the population.

Figure S6. Negative $X(2)$ pinpoints an intrachromosomal DMI in simulated data. The distribution of $X(2)$, D', and $\Delta D2$ of a chromosome with a DMI pair at generation 50 under a Wright-Fisher model for one simulation run using SLiM. The direct selection coefficients are $\alpha = 0.001$, $\beta = 0.002$. The strength of epistasis is $\gamma = -0.5$. The interacting loci generating the DMI were located at chromosome 1 (chr1):15 cM and chr2: 15 cM, such that the recombination probability was $c = 0.5$ between the two loci. A-C. Heatmaps of D', $X(2)$ and the $\Delta D2$ within the simulated chromosome at generation 20 (G20). D-F. Heatmaps of D', $X(2)$ and the $\Delta D2$ within the simulated chromosome at generation 50 (G50). Only the DMI loci and their 10 cM flanking regions were shown in D-F. Black arrows highlight the location of the DMI.

Figure S7. Negative X(2) dynamics a DMI persist for long times if there is ongoing immigration from both parental populations. Each line is one simulation run using SLiM, assuming a strong DMI ($\alpha = 0.001$, $\beta = 0.002$, $\gamma = -0.5$) under a Wright-Fisher model. The recombination probability between the interacting loci was 0.1. 300 individuals were sampled in each simulation. Trajectories were plotted from generation 2 onwards. DMIs can be maintained by symmetric migration from two parental populations ($m1$, $m2 = 0.01$) for a long time, and not affected by the initial admixture proportions (Admix. Pro.).

Figure S8. Proportion of hybrid individuals under five demographic scenarios. Here, hybrids are defined as individuals that derived at least 10% of their genome from each parental population. Each line is one simulation run using SLiM, assuming equal admixture proportions of the parental populations and a strong DMI ($\alpha = 0.001$, $\beta = 0.002$, $\gamma = -0.5$) under a Wright-Fisher model. The recombination probability between the interacting loci was 0.1. Three hundred individuals were sampled in each simulation.

Figure S9. Dynamics of haplotype frequencies and $X(2)$ for a DMI under diploid Wright-Fisher (WF; dash-dotted line) and Moran (solid line) models for one simulation run using SLiM, assuming a population size of 5000. The model parameters were $\alpha = 0.001$, $\beta = 0.002$, $\gamma = -0.5$, with recombination probability $c = 0.1$ between the DMI loci. Three hundred individuals were sampled in

each simulation. A. Negative $X(2)$ appears ~50 generations earlier under a Wright-Fisher model than
under a Moran model. B. Haplotype frequencies change more quickly in the Wright-Fisher model than
that in the Moran model. Lines indicate the haplotype frequencies of *AB* (red), *ab* (black), *Ab* (blue) and
aB (green).

Figure S10. Sensitivity and specificity of negative $X(2)$ for detecting a DMI, computed from 100
simulations of each parameter combination using SLiM, assuming a Wright-Fisher population of 5000
individuals. We considered two admixture proportions, $f = 0.5$ and $f = 0.3$, and three migration rates: 0,
0.01, and 0.05. A strong DMI ($\alpha = 0.001, \beta = 0.002, \gamma = -0.5$) and no DMI ($\alpha = 0.001, \beta = $
$0.002, \gamma = 0$) were simulated under a Wright-Fisher model. The recombination probability between the
DMI loci was $c = 0.1$, and the population size was 5000. Here, any interaction with $X(2) < $
$-0.005 \& D' < 0$ was taken as a putative DMI. Trajectories ended when one of the interacting loci
became monomorphic (indicated by large plot markers). 300 individuals were sampled in each
simulation. Vertical lines indicate the 95% confidence interval (Wald method). A&B Sensitivity and
specificity using phased data. C & D. Sensitivity and specificity when only homozygous genotypes were
used at each locus. A&C. Sensitivity is high unless strong migration leads to swamping of the DMI
alleles. B&D. Specificity is high under all tested scenarios. Vertical lines are 95% confidence interval
(Wald test).

Figure S11. Sensitivity and specificity of the G test that indicates DMIs ($p < 0.05$). We considered two
admixture proportions, $f = 0.5$ and $f = 0.3$, and three migration rates: 0, 0.005, and 0.01. A strong DMI
($\alpha = 0.001, \beta = 0.002, \gamma = -0.5$) and no DMI ($\alpha = 0.001, \beta = 0.002, \gamma = 0$) were simulated under a
diploid Wright-Fisher model. The recombination probability was 0.5. For each parameter combination,
we ran 100 simulations with SLiM. Sensitivity (A) was the proportion of successful DMI detections with
the strong DMI. Specificity (B) was the proportion of true negative detections without DMI. Trajectories
ended when one of the interacting loci became monomorphic or at generation 150 (indicated by large
markers). Vertical lines are 95% confidence interval (Wald test).

Figure S12. The distribution of $X(2)$ plotted against p values from the G test. Data were obtained from
100 simulations of a single DMI under a diploid Wright-Fisher model. Here, we used the same data as in
Figure 5 and S11 with equal admixture proportions and no migration within 150 generations, i.e., the data
points represent the $X(2)$ and G test statistics at the DMI loci, pooled across all sampling points. A strong
DMI ($\alpha = 0.001, \beta = 0.002, \gamma = -0.5$) was simulated under a diploid Wright-Fisher model. The
recombination probability was 0.5. The distribution was zoomed into two areas by two independent
criteria for detecting DMI: (A) small p values by G test ($p < 0.05$); (B) negative $X(2)$ values. Red dots
indicate DMIs that are observed before Generation 5 with a significant p value by the G test in panel A.
Black dots indicate DMIs after Generation 5 in panel A and B. Only 9.9% of the simulations showed a
significant p value by the G test ($p < 0.05$) in panel B.

Figure S13. Sensitivity and specificity of negative $X(2)$ (A&B) and G test (C&D) indicating DMIs when
only homozygous genotypes were used at each locus. We considered two admixture proportions, $f = $
0.5 and $f = 0.3$ and three migration rates (m): 0, 0.005 and 0.01. A strong DMI ($\alpha = 0.001, \beta = $
$0.002, \gamma = -0.5$) for sensitivity and no DMI ($\alpha = 0.001, \beta = 0.002, \gamma = 0$) for specificity were
simulated under a diploid Wright-Fisher model. The recombination probability was 0.5. For each
parameter combination, we ran 100 simulations using SLiM. In panel A&B, any interaction with $X(2) < $

$-0.005 \,\& \, D' < 0$ was taken as a putative DMI. In panel C&D, any interaction with p<0.05 was taken as a
putative DMI. Sensitivity (A&C) was the proportion of successful DMI detections with the strong DMI.
Specificity (B&D) was the proportion of true negative detections without DMI. Trajectories end when
one of the interacting loci became monomorphic or at generation 150 (indicated by large markers).
Vertical lines are 95% confidence interval (Wald test).

Figure S14. Distributions of negative $X(2)$ when $D' < 0$ for DMI detection under four demographic
scenarios. This figure represents two starting frequencies of the minor parental population, $f = 0.5$ and
$f = 0.3$, and different immigration rates from the two parental populations ($m1$ from minor parental
population, $m2$ from major parental population). Light green boxes show the $X(2)$ distribution for the
three-locus two-DMI model (3-locus) and the other boxes for the four-locus two-DMI model. DMIs are
randomly distributed on four chromosomes. Direct selection coefficients on two incompatible alleles were
drawn from an exponential distribution with mean = 0.001. Epistatic coefficients were drawn from a
uniform distribution [-1, -0.001). We calculated $X(2)$ statistics using homozygous genotypes from a
sample of two hundred individuals for each simulation. We simulated each scenario for 100 times with
SLiM. $X(2)$ values were summarized for three types of genomic regions, neutral chromosomes (A),
chromosomes with DMIs (B), and individual DMI loci (C). Boxplots represent the interquartile range;
whiskers extend to minimal and maximal values. The dash line is $X(2) = -0.005$.

Figure S15. Propagation of the DMI signal into flanking regions in simulated data (sampled at generation
30, significance threshold: X(2)<-0.005 & D'<0) when only homozygous genotypes were sampled
(sampling criteria for panels A&B: homozygous genotype frequency >0.05, heterozygosity<0.6; panel C
shows homozygous data without further filtering). Data resulted from 100 simulations using SLiM, in
which two DMIs (i.e., four DMI loci) were randomly distributed on four chromosomes, thus resulting in
inter- and intrachromosomal DMIs. The direct selection coefficients α and β were drawn from exponential
distribution with mean value 0.001. The strength of epistasis was drawn from a uniform distribution, γ∈[-
1, -0.001], which is represented by the blue color intensity in panels B&C. To resemble the demography
of the studied hybrid swordtail fish populations, the admixture proportion was set to f=0.3 and the
migration rate was m=0.01. 200 individuals were sampled from each simulation to obtain the statistics. A.
The number of significant marker pairs decreases rapidly with distance to the nearest true DMI locus.
B&C. Proportion of significant marker pairs when statistics were computed for all pairs between two
increasingly large regions around the true interacting DMI loci, with (B) and without (C) strict sampling
criteria. Red dots indicate the median obtained from 100 simulations.

Figure S16. The observed occurrence spectra of detected DMI candidates in the hybrid populations is
skewed towards low and high frequencies compared to the expected distribution. The bar plot shows the
frequency of occurrence of loci in the putative DMIs for each population. The blue line shows the
expected occurrence distribution under a Poisson distribution.

Figure S17. Chromosomal illustration of putative DMIs in three hybrid populations (CHAF, TLMC and
TOTO). Some loci have many putative interacting partners. Each line is colored by the number of
putative partners of the two involved candidate loci. In TOTO, loci show a smaller number of interactions
than in CHAF and TLMC.

Figure S18. Example of an intrachromosomal DMI candidate in hybrid swordtail fish on chromosome 20.
The values of $X(2)$, linkage disequilibrium (D'), and recombinant imbalance ($\Delta D2 = D2_{MB} - D2_{BM}$) are

presented by color intensity. As highlighted by an arrow, the candidate DMI was detected in TLMC
between locus chr20:9Mb (B alleles) and chr20:10Mb (M alleles). In CHAF, the residual parental linkage
is still so strong that $X(2) > 0$, but $\Delta D2$ shows a weak recombinant imbalance. In TOTO, a stronger
interaction presumably happened between chr20:8Mb and chr20:11Mb such that we see no significant
signal between locus chr20:9Mb and chr20:10Mb.

Figure S19. Example of an interchromosomal DMI candidate in hybrid swordtail fish between
chromosome 19 and 20. The values of $X(2)$, linkage disequilibrium (D') and recombinant imbalance
(Recomb. $\Delta D2 = D2_{MB} - D2_{BM}$) are presented by color intensity. As highlighted by an arrow, the
candidate DMI was inferred in TLMC between locus chr19:8-9Mb (B alleles) and chr20:23Mb (M
alleles). We suspect that negative $X(2)$ is due to linkage and that the true DMI locus has been fixed in all
three populations. Most of the homozygous M alleles at chr20:22-24Mb have been purged in TOTO but
not at chr19:8-9Mb. CHAF shows a larger genomic region involved in DMI than TLMC, which might be
due to the recombination map at the first several generations after hybridization.

Figure S20. Scatterplot of $X(2)$ and D' for markers occurring at *Xmrk* and its interacting locus *cdkn2a/b*.
Markers were extracted from the focal genes and their flanking regions (*cdkn2a/b at* chr5:15.7Mb-16Mb,
Xmrk at chr21:16.5Mb-17.5Mb). No pairs of markers in TLMC passed the filtering criteria. A large
proportion of pairs are $D' < 0$ & $X(2) < 0$ in both CHAF and TOTO between *Xmrk* and *cdkn2a/b*.
Negative $X(2)$ values are larger in TOTO (age, ~35 generations) than in CHAF (age, ~25 generations).
In TOTO, $D' = -1$ & $X(2) < 0$ indicates the absence of genotypes that are linked to DMIs, possibly due
to sampling at low frequencies or completed purging of incompatible alleles. Colouring indicates point
density.

Figure S21. Dominance effects on $X(2)$ dynamics of DMIs. The four DMI scenarios are a DMI in the
haploid model, homozygous-homozygous DMI (h0<<h1), homozygous-heterozygous DMI (recessive),
and heterozygous-heterozygous DMI (codominant). All trajectories were generated with the same
parameters. Incompatible alleles *A* and *B* are under weak direct selection ($\alpha = 0.001$ for *A* and $\beta = 0.002$
for *B*). The strength of the epistatic interaction between alleles *A* and *B*, γ, is -0.5. The recombination
probability *c* is 0.1. The admixture proportion is 0.5.

Figure S22. The number of two-locus homozygous-homozygous haplotypes for different sampling sizes
($n = 100, 200, 300$), obtained from a set of 100 simulations for each parameter combination using
SLiM. Simulations were performed assuming a diploid Wright-Fisher population with 5000 individuals.
In each simulation, two DMIs were randomly distributed on four chromosomes (Chr w DMI). Two
additional neutral chromosomes (Chr w/o DMI) were also simulated in the same genome. The number of
two-locus homozygous-homozygous haplotypes for each pair loci were counted at generation 30 and 50
(G30 & G50). Neutral chromosomes contain fewer two-locus homozygous-homozygous haplotypes on
average than chromosomes with DMIs. Boxes represent the interquartile range, and whiskers extend to
95% confidence interval.

Table S1. False positive rate under three filtering criteria in simulations of a single DMI

Table S2. False positive rate under three filtering criteria in simulations of two DMIs

Table S3. False positive rate under three filtering criteria simulations of two DMIs when only
homozygous loci are used for analyses

Table S4. Characteristics of the three hybrid swordtail fish populations and the corresponding genomic
data

Table S5. Bootstrapping statistics to define putative DMI in the three hybrid populations

Table S6. 1Mb bins involved in >10 negative interactions

Table S7. DMIs supported by >1 hybrid populations

Table S8. Single interacting bins shared by all three populations

Table S9. Summary of $X(2)$ values between *Xmrk* and its interacting genes, *cd97* and *cdkn2a/b*

Table S10. The number of heterozygous loci in a pair of haplotypes

Table 11. Selection forces (epistasis and direct selection) and dominance at a DMI. Each field in the table
indicates the fitness of the corresponding genotype

Table S12. Parameterization of the two- and three-locus DMI models