Original Article

Genomic islands of divergence between *Drosophila yakuba* subspecies predominantly

overlap with chromosomal inversions

Erina A. Ferreira[1,2], Cathy C. Moore[3], David Ogereau[1], Arnaud Suwalski[2], Stéphane R.

Prigent[2], Rebekah L. Rogers[3], Amir Yassin[1,2,*]

[1]Laboratoire Évolution, Génomes, Comportement et Écologie, CNRS, IRD, Université Paris-

Saclay – Institut Diversité, Ecologie et Evolution du Vivant (IDEEV), Gif-sur-Yvette, France.

[2]Institut Systématique, Evolution, Biodiversité (ISYEB), CNRS, MNHN, Sorbonne Université,

EPHE, Université des Antilles, 57 rue Cuvier, CP 50, 75005 Paris, France. [3]Department of

Bioinformatics and Genomics, University of North Carolina, Charlotte NC, USA.

* Corresponding author: amir.yassin@universite-paris-saclay.fr

Short title: Inversions in noni-specialist *Drosophila*

Authors contributions

E.A.F. sequenced and assembled new genome, conducted population genomics and structural

variation analyses, wrote the primary draft of the paper. C.C.M. sequenced individual lines.

D.O. sequenced and assembled new genome. A.S. collected flies. S.R.P. taxonomically sorted

flies. R.L.R. sequenced individual lines, obtained funds. A.Y. conceptualized the work,

collected flies, taxonomically sorted flies, supervised population genomics and structural

variation analyses, obtained funds, wrote the final version of the paper with inputs from all

authors.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Claire Golléty for help identifying noni plantation locations in

Mayotte. Our late colleague, Jean R. David (1931-2021), who initially discovered *D. y.*

mayottensis in 2013, participated to the 2017 expedition. This work was funded by the Agence

Nationale de la Recherche grant no. ANR-18-CE2-0008, a Richard Lounsbery Foundation grant

and an ATM bursary from the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle to AY, and a National

Institutes of Health grant NIH NIGMS R35 GM133376 to RLR.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data availability statement

Scripts   used   in   this   study   are   publicly   available   on   GitHub:

https://github.com/AmirYassinLab/Population_genomics_scripts.   Genome   sequences

generated for this study are available on NCBI BioProject: PRJNA972991, PRJNA973002 and

PRJNA973271.

Abstract

During the early stages of local adaptation and speciation, genetic differences tend to accumulate at certain regions of the genome leading to the formation of genomic islands of divergence (GIDs). This pattern may be due to selection and/or difference in the rate of recombination. Here, we investigate the possible causes of GIDs in *Drosophila yakuba mayottensis*, and reconfirm using field collection its association with toxic noni (*Morinda citrifolia*) fruits on the Mayotte island. Population genomics revealed lack of genetic structure on the island and identified 20 GIDs distinguishing *D. y. mayottensis* from generalist mainland populations of *D. y. yakuba*. The GIDs were enriched with gene families involved in the metabolism of lipids, sugars, peptides and xenobiotics, suggesting a role in host shift. We assembled a new genome for *D. y. mayottensis* and identified five novel chromosomal inversions. Twelve GIDs (~72% of outlier windows) fell close to or within subspecies-specific inversions. However, three GIDs were in collinear, high recombining regions indicating strong signal of hard selective sweeps. Unlike *D. y. mayottensis*, *D. sechellia*, the only other noni-specialist, is homosequential with its generalist relatives. Thus, both selection and rearrangements shape GIDs and striking convergences can occur between species with distinct genomic architectures.

Keywords: ecological speciation; structural variation; population genomics; genetic parallelism; insect-plant interactions.

Introduction

Introduction

The genomic landscape of inter-population differentiation is often heterogeneous, with

certain genomic regions, known as genomic islands of divergence (GIDs), emerging above the

average differentiation level (Feder and Nosil 2010; Wolf and Ellegren 2017). GIDs were

originally hailed as a result of divergent selection acting on genes that underlie adaptation to

distinct environment and/or reproductive isolation (Turner et al. 2005). However, a plethora of

mechanisms may also lead to the formation of such islands even in the absence of divergent

selection. Most importantly, variation in recombination rate, due to heterochromatin content or

structural variation, strongly affects the rate of admixture and the accumulation of genetic

differences in natural populations (Feder and Nosil 2010; Cruickshank and Hahn 2014;

Quilodrán et al. 2020). Chromosomal inversions are among the most common forms of

structural variation, and a number of studies has unraveled an overlap between inversions and

GIDs (Feder and Nosil 2009; Michel et al. 2010; Ellegren et al. 2012; Sodeland et al. 2016;

Huang et al. 2020). Inversions often suppress recombination, reducing the rate at which slightly-

deleterious mutations are purged from the population (Berdan et al. 2021; Jay et al. 2021, 2022).

Conversely, the reduction of recombination could conserve one or more favorable allelic

combinations for survival in contrasting environments, hence becoming targets of balancing or

diverging selection depending on the heterogeneity of the environment (Faria et al. 2019; Kapun

and Flatt 2019; Mérot et al. 2021; Hager et al. 2022; Harringmeyer and Hoekstra 2022;

Sanchez-Donoso et al. 2022; Tepolt et al. 2022). Untangling the complex interactions of

selection and inversions in driving GIDs and ultimately speciation therefore requires proper

understanding of the genomic architecture of the study model and its natural variation.

Host shifts or changes in the width of the ecological niche, e.g., specialization, are a

major source of diversification in herbivorous insects (Wiens et al. 2015; Forbes et al. 2017).

The complexity of this phenomenon, which should involve the simultaneous evolution of genes

underlying multiple behavioral and physiological phenotypes with an ultimate impact on

reproductive isolation, has long been a major area of research (Futuyma and Moreno 1988;

Vertacnik and Linnen 2017) . One of the best well-characterized systems at the genomic level

is the specialization of the fly *Drosophila sechellia* on toxic fruits of noni (*Morinda citrifolia*)

on the Seychelles islands in the Indian Ocean (Louis and David 1986; Auer et al. 2021).

Drosophila sechellia is a member of the *simulans* species complex, which comprises two

additional species, namely the cosmopolitan *Drosophila simulans* and *Drosophila mauritiana*,

an endemic to Mauritius. Unlike *D. sechellia*, both species are generalists and are repulsed by

the odor of and intolerant to noni main toxins, octanoic and hexanoic acids (R'Kha et al. 1991;

Amlou et al. 1997, 1998; Drum et al. 2022). The three species represent a sister clade to

Drosophila melanogaster. This facilitated the extension of the unique genetic and genomic

tools from this paradigmatic species to the study of *D. sechellia* specialization (Matsuo et al.

2007; Lavista-Llanos et al. 2014; Prieto-Godino et al. 2017; Auer et al. 2020). Besides, the three

species show partial reproductive isolation and are karyologically homosequential, making

them ideal for quantitative trait loci (QTLs) mapping through interspecific crosses (Earley and

Jones 2011; Hungate et al. 2013; Huang and Erezyilmaz 2015; Chakraborty et al. 2021). Despite

these numerous advantages, the divergence of *D. sechellia* from its generalist sister species *D.*

simulans is estimated at around 89.000-242,000 years ago (Garrigan et al. 2012; Schrider et al.

2018); its entire genome has accumulated so many differences that traces of possible GIDs

during the early stages of divergence may be difficult to observe. Besides, a particularly low

level of genetic diversity has been detected in this species (Legrand et al. 2009; Schrider et al.

2018), further complicating population genomics analyses.

In January 2013, a second case of *Drosophila* species associated with toxic noni was

discovered in Mayotte, another island in the Indian Ocean. This was a population of *Drosophila*

yakuba, which had higher preference for and survival on noni unlike its continental conspecifics

(Yassin et al. 2016). The noni-specialist population likely diverged from generalist continental

populations nearly 28,000 years ago and specialization was accompanied by precopulatory

isolation between Mayotte and continental flies, earning them subspecific status as

D. y. mayottensis and *D. y. yakuba*, respectively (Yassin et al. 2016; Yassin 2017). Genomic

comparisons between this single population of *D. y. mayottensis* and two *D. y. yakuba*

continental populations identified multiple GIDs, widespread across the genome, consistent

with theoretical expectations (Yassin et al. 2016). Many *D. y. mayottensis* GIDs overlap with

large noni survival QTLs in *D. sechellia* (Yassin et al. 2016). Despite those similarities, *D.*

yakuba is a species where, unlike the *simulans* species complex, multiple polymorphic

chromosomal inversions have been identified in continental populations (Lemeunier and

Ashburner 1976). Several GIDs in *D. y. mayottensis* may therefore be the result of such

inversions.

In this paper, we report the population genomics analysis of three additional populations

of *D. y. mayottensis* all associated with noni in Mayotte. We identified 20 GIDs distinguishing

the three populations from continental *D. y. yakuba*. We assembled a genome for *D. y.*

mayottensis and identified multiple inversions that predominantly overlap with the GIDs, hence

allowing the discrimination between GIDs presenting genuine signal of hard selective sweep

from those which may be mere results of structural variation.

Materials and methods

Fly collection and establishment of isofemale lines from Mayotte island

Flies were prospected in April 2017 from 14 localities on the Grande Terre and Petite

Terre islands of Mayotte. We particularly searched fruiting noni trees but also collected

drosophilids in places with no noni trees. Flies were collected by net sweeping and direct

aspiration over fallen fruits or using standard baits with fermented banana hung from tree

branches. Flies were also bred from ripe fruits brought back to the laboratory. *D. y. mayottensis*

isofemale lines were established by placing one female and one male in a small vial with instant

Carolina medium and the F_1 progeny was transferred to an axenic medium in the laboratory.

Fly species that were or could not be bred in the laboratory were killed in absolute ethanol and

taxonomically sorted in the laboratory. Data on *D. yakuba* seasonal abundance and attraction

to banana baits in West Africa was obtained from Vouidibio (1985).

Pooled and individual lines genome sequencing

Drosophila yakuba mayottensis were sequenced both as pooled (Pool-Seq) as well as individual

lines (Ind-Seq). For Pool-Seq analyses, we pooled single F_1 female per line in three pools

according to the populations, namely BE, MTS and SOU. Pools were sent in ethanol to End2end

Genomics LLC, Davis, California where DNA was extracted, PE library prepared using

NEBNext Protocol and 75x coverage double-paired Illumina NovoSeq sequencing was

conducted. For Ind-Seq analyses, DNA was extracted from single flies flash frozen in liquid

nitrogen following QIAamp Mini Kit (Qiagen) protocol without using RNase A. The resulting

DNA samples were quantified (Qubit dsDNA HS assay kit, ThermoFisher Scientific), assessed

for quality (Nanodrop ND-2000), and stored at -20°C. Illumina TruSeq Nano DNA libraries

were prepared manually following the manufacturer's protocol (TruSeq Nano DNA, RevD;

Illumina). Briefly, samples were normalized to 100ng DNA and sheared by sonication with

Covaris M220 (microTUBE 50; Sage Science). The samples were end repaired, purified with

Ampure XP beads (Agencourt; Beckman Coulter), adaptors adenylated, and Unique Dual

Indices ligated. Adaptor enrichment was performed using eight cycles of PCR. Following

Ampure XP bead cleanup, fragment sizes for all libraries were measured using Agilent

Bioanalyzer 2100 (HS DNA Assay; Applied Biosystems). The libraries were diluted 1:10 000

and 1:20 000 and quantified in triplicate using the KAPA Library Quantification Kit (Kapa

Biosystems). Equimolar samples were pooled, and the libraries were size selected targeting

400-700bp range to remove adaptor monomers and dimers using Pippen Prep DNA Size

Selection system (1.5% Agarose Gel Cassette #CDF1510; Sage Sciences). Library pools were

run on an Illumina HiSeq 4000 platform using the 150bp paired end (PE) Cluster Kit.

Population genomics analyses and delimitation of the genomic islands of divergence (GIDs) in

Drosophila yakuba

As in Yassin et al. (2016) and Ferreira et al. (2021), we used previously published

genomic sequences from two continental *D. y. yakuba* populations, namely Cameroon (CY)

and Kenya (NY) (Rogers et al. 2014), for comparisons with *D. y. mayottensis*. We also used

previous Pool-Seq reads from a single *D. y. mayottensis* population collected from Soulou in

2013 for temporal comparisons within the subspecies (Yassin et al. 2016). For all comparisons,

reads were mapped to the *D. yakuba* v.1.05 reference genome obtained from Flybase

(https://flybase.org/, Thurmond et al. 2019) using Minimap2 software package (Li 2018).

Minimap2-generated SAM files were converted to BAM format using samtools 1.9 software

(Li et al. 2009). The BAM files were then cleaned and sorted using Picard v.2.0.1

(http://broadinstitute.github.io/picard/). Popoolation 2 software package v.1.20162 (Kofler et

al. 2011) was used to generate a synchronized mpileup file, from which intra-population

polymorphism (π) and between-populations genetic differentiation (F_{ST}) were estimated using

customized perl scripts.

Delimitation of the genomic islands of divergence (GIDs) in D. y. mayottensis

We conducted Population Branch Excess (*PBE*) analysis (Yassin et al. 2016) to identify

GIDs specifically distinguishing *D. y. mayottensis* from the two continental populations CY

and NY. *PBE* is a standardized version of the Population Branch Statistic (*PBS*), which was

proposed to identify population-specific allelic changes from F_{ST} pairwise comparisons

between three populations (Yi et al. 2010). The standardization measures how PBS at a locus

deviates from the chromosome-wide median PBS divided by the median F_{ST} estimate from the

two non-focal populations. Therefore, PBE is less sensitive than PBS to genome-wide variation

in polymorphism levels. Due to the lack of genetic structure within *D. y. mayottensis* (see

below), Pool-Seq reads of the three populations were pooled into a single Pool of Pools (PoP).

PBS and PBE were made assuming an (CY,(NY,PoP)) tree. Genes with PBE values falling $\geq$

97.5 quantiles were considered outliers, and the width of a genomic island of divergence was

considered if two outlier windows did not fall more than 500-kb apart. Gene enrichment tests

were conducted for each GID as well as using the whole list of genes from all GIDs using the

online Database for Annotation, Visualization and Integrated Discovery (DAVID) (Sherman et

al. 2022).

De novo assembly of D. y. mayottensis *genome and identification of chromosomal*

rearrangements

A mass culture of *D. y. mayottensis* was used to assemble a reference genome for this

subspecies. Genomic DNA was extracted using the Nucleobond AXG20 kit and buffer set IV

from Macherey-Nagel (ref. 740544 and 740604, https://www.mn-net.com, Düren, Germany),

and size selection was conducted using the SRE XS kit from Circulomics

(https://www.circulomics.com/, Baltimore, Maryland, USA). Fragments less than 10 Kb were

eliminated. The SQK-LSK109 kit from Oxford nanopore technology (Lu et al. 2016),

https://nanoporetech.com/) was then used to prepare the samples for nanopore sequencing

following manufacturer's protocol. The library was then loaded on a R9.4 flow cell for

sequencing on MinION. Raw data were basecalled with Guppy v4.0.11.

Illumina short-read sequences have also been produced to reconstruct our genome, using

a hybrid assembly strategy, combining those short accurate Illumina reads to our long Nanopore

reads. Illumina sequencing was realized by Novogene Company Limited

(https://en.novogene.com, Cambridge, UK) on our previously extracted DNA. DNA sequences,

from Nanopore and Illumina technologies, were then assembled using MaSuRCA genome

assembler software v3.4.0 (Zimin et al. 2013). We aligned our newly constructed *D. y.*

mayottensis genome using minimap2 software package to the v.1.05 reference genome as well

as to a newly assembled genome of the reference *D. yakuba* strain (David et al. 2022) to correct

for early missassemblies in the v.1.05 reference genome (Miller et al. 2018). *D. y. mayottensis*

scaffolds were then ordered and oriented according to the reference genome, and chromosomal

rearrangements were visually detected from a dotplot constructed by R. We used the cytological

position of *D. melanogaster* orthologs of *D. yakuba* genes to delimit *D. y. yakuba*

rearrangements described by Lemeunier and Ashburner (1976).

Results

Drosophila yakuba mayottensis *is strictly associated with noni in Mayotte*

In April 2017, we investigated the association between *D. y. mayottensis* and noni

across the two main islands of Mayotte, *i.e* Grande Terre and Petite Terre. Out of 14 collection

sites, we identified noni trees in 9 locations, mostly near the coastline. However, the trees were

not always at the same fruiting stage, with fallen ripe fruits found at only three locations, namely

Soulou (the same locality for the 2013 sample, hereafter SOU), M'tsangamouji (MTS) in the

humid northwest and Bambo Est (BE) in the arid southeast (Figure 1A). *D. y. mayottensis* flies

were collected through net sweeping or direct aspiration over fallen, rotting noni fruits only at

those three locations. No single *D. y. mayottensis* fly was collected using fermenting banana

traps at those sites or at any other site on the island, although the noni trees at Bambo Est were

present amid a banana plantation (Figure 1B). In West Africa, such traps often collect tens or

hundreds of *D. y. yakuba* (Rio et al. 1983; Vouidibio 1985; Llopart et al. 2005; Prigent et al.

2013; Turissini and Matute 2017) (Figure 1B; χ^2 $P < 0.001$ for comparison with data from

Vouidibio (1985)). The total number of collected *D. y. mayottensis* was low, ~200 flies

throughout the 10-days duration of the expedition, compared to ~600 flies that were collected

during the last 2 days of the January 2013 at a single location (David et al. 2014). This indicates

a strong seasonality in the abundance of the species, consistent with other observations on

D. y. yakuba on the continent (Vouidibio 1985; Prigent et al. 2013), and highlights the necessity

of year-round investigations. We also observed that flies were more abundant on noni fruits that

have been nibbled and thrown to the ground by the brown lemur (*Eulemur fulvus*) than on intact

fallen fruits (Figure 1C).

Pooled and isofemale line sequencing of the three Mayotte populations reveal low level of

differentiation on the island

We established 26, 22 and 29 isofemale lines from wild-caught flies from the three

collection sites, *i.e.,* BE, SOU and MTS, respectively. As in Yassin et al. (2016), we sequenced

a single F_1 fly per line in three pools according to the populations. The level of genetic

differentiation estimated in 10-kb windows in SOU between the 2013 and 2017 samples was

low ($F_{ST} = 0.0262 \pm 0.0001$; Figure 2A), as well as the level of differentiation between the three

2017 geographical samples ($F_{ST} = 0.0283 \pm 0.0001$; Figure 2B; Supplementary Table S1).

Because F_{ST} estimates from Pool-Seq data could be slightly biased (Hivert et al. 2018), we also

sequenced 7, 6 and 6 individual isofemale lines from BE, SOU and MTS, respectively. We

found a strong correspondence between F_{ST} estimates from both approaches, with Ind-Seq data

producing higher estimates probably due to their smaller sample size and higher ascertainment

bias (F_{ST} = 0.0352 ± 0.0001 between the 2013 and 2017 of SOU, and 0.0426 ± 0.0001 between

the three Mayotte populations; Supplementary Table S1). Nonetheless, whether Pool- or Ind-

Seq analyses were conducted, the genetic differentiation among *D. y. mayottensis* populations

was significantly lower than that between the two *D. y. yakuba* populations from Cameroon

(CY) and Kenya (NY) (F_{ST} = 0.0671±0.0002; Student's *t*-test *P* < 2.2 x 10^{-16} for both analyses).

Differentiation between the two D. yakuba *subspecies differed among chromosomal arms*

To quantify the level of genetic differentiation between Mayotte and mainland

populations, we estimated F_{ST} in 10-kb windows across the genome. Because of the lack of

genetic structure among the three populations of *D. y. mayottensis*, we pooled either the Ind-

Seq or the Pool-Seq sequences of the three populations in a single population, referring to them

as Pool of Individuals (PoI) and Pool of Pools (PoP), respectively (Supplementary Table S2).

Results did not greatly differ between the two methods, and we will show here analyses on the

PoP data due to its larger sampling size and consequently reduced ascertainment bias.

Surprisingly, the average genome-wide differentiation between the subspecies differed whether

we used CY and NY, being higher for the former case (0.0731 ± 0.0003 and 0.0638 ± 0.0001,

respectively; Student's *t*-test *P* < 2.2 x 10^{-16}). However, differentiation greatly depended on

chromosomal arms (Figure 3A). Whereas for most chromosomal arms, differentiation between

the two mainland populations CY and NY were significantly lower than between each from *D.*

y. mayottensis, only for chromosomal arm 2R differentiation between CY and the island was

the highest (Figure 3A). Differentiation among the three *D. y. mayottensis* populations did not

show any chromosomal effect and for all chromosomal arms was significantly lower than

differentiation between the two subspecies or within *D. y. yakuba* (Figure 3A; Supplementary

Table S1).

Twenty Genomic Islands of Divergence (GIDs) differentiate D. y. mayottensis

The *PBE* analysis showed 20 GIDs falling above the 97.5% quantiles in *D. y.*

mayottensis (Figure 3B; Table 1). As in Yassin et al. (2016), we used the number of

polymorphic sites found in 10-kb windows to delimit low recombining regions that are close to

chromosomal arms extremities at the telomeres and centromeres (shaded areas in Figure 3B).

These regions strongly concorded with fine-scale recombination rate variation in *D. yakuba*

(Pettie et al. 2022). Half of the identified GIDs fell within these regions. Of the remaining 10

GIDs falling in high recombining regions, seven were on chromosome 2.

Eight GIDs were enriched for specific gene families (Table 1). Gene families that were

enriched for the whole list of genes from all GIDs included LITAF (LPS-induced TNF-

activating factor) endosome-associated membrane proteins, glucose-methanol-choline (GMC)

oxidoreductases, cytochrome P450, UDP-glycosyltransferases, and maltose-alpha-glucosidases

at $P < 0.05$, and serine-type endopeptidases and glutathione-S-transferases at $P < 0.10$

(Supplementary Table S3). All these gene families have major roles in the metabolism of

ecdysteroids, lipids, sugars, proteins and xenobiotics, as it would be expected in cases of major

dietary shifts.

GIDs in D. y. mayottensis *predominantly overlap with chromosomal inversions*

Our hybrid assembly of the *D. y. mayottensis* genome yielded 563 fragments with an

N50 of 6.9Mb, and a BUSCOv5 score of 99.5%. Comparing the assembly to the v.1.05

reference genome assembly v.1.05 of *D. yakuba* identified 9 large structural variations with the

characteristic V-shape of inversion breakpoints (Figure 4A). The first breakpoint was found on

the X chromosome and indicated a ~1 Mb-long inversion between X:8,648,348..9,652,060.

Lemeunier and Ashburner (1976) did not detect any inversion on chromosome X in *D. y.*

yakuba. Following their nomenclature, we call this new subspecies-specific inversion *Xto*, and

note that it overlaps with GID2. We also noted a collinear connection between X:

13,477,771..17,070,823 on a single scaffold (grey) that could have resulted from double

inversions, but do direct evidence for breakpoints was observed at this region (Figure 4A).

The second breakpoint was found on chromosomal arm 2L and corresponded to a large,

~12 Mb-long inversion between 2L: 8423810..20352247. This large inversion encompassed the

misassembled portion of this chromosomal arm in the reference genome between 8,586,415

and 11,101,068 (Figure 4A,B; cf. Supplementary Figure S1 for alignment with a correct

assembly). Lemeunier and Ashburner (1976) found four polymorphic inversions in mainland

D. y. yakuba, namely *2Lh*, *2Ll*, *2Lm* and *2Ln*, with *2Lh* being ancestral to *2Ll*, and *2Lm* and *2Ln*

independently derived from *2Ll*. We found the large inversion in *D. y. mayottensis* to be

independently derived from *2Ll* too, and called it *2Lo* (Figure 4B). Remarkably, the proximal

end of this inversion falls within the large subcentromeric region of 2L. Compared to the two

most common inversions of the mainland, *i.e. 2Lh* and *2Ll* (Lemeunier and Ashburner 1976),

four GIDs (5 to 8) fall in an inverted order in *2Lo* and one was close to its proximal,

subcentromeric breakpoint (GID9) (Table 1).

The third breakpoint fell in the subcentromeric region of chromosomal arm 2R at

2R:182,816..436,892 but did not overlap with a major GID. However, the fourth to the seventh

breakpoints all fell within the high recombining region of 2R. Their cytogenetic positions

corresponded to the breakpoints separating chromosomal inversions *2Rn* and *2Rj* (Lemeunier

and Ashburner 1976). The reference genome has the *2Rn* order indicating that *2Rj*, the most

common inversion in *D. yakuba* (Lemeunier and Ashburner 1976), is fixed in *D. y. mayottensis*.

Both inversions independently derived from a hypothetical *2Ri* order that has never been

observed in natural populations (Figure 4B; Lemeunier and Ashburner 1976). Two GIDs, 11

and 14, fell in the flanking region separating *2Rj* from *2Ri*, whereas GID12 and 13 overlapped

with the breakpoints separating *2Rn* from *2Ri*. Remarkably, the large GID13 is inverted in

inversion *2Rk*, another common 2R inversion in *D. y. yakuba* that was not detected in *D. y.*

mayottensis.

The eighth and ninth breakpoints were found in the subcentromeric regions of

chromosomal arms 3L and 3R, respectively. Each corresponded to ~0.2 and 0.8 Mb-long

inversions and overlapped with GIDs 15 and 16, respectively. These small subcentromeric

inversions were not detected by Lemeunier and Ashburner (1976) and we denoted them *3Lk*

and *3Ri*, respectively.

Discussion

By combining field observation with population and structural genomics, we were able

to draw a clearer picture of the mechanisms underlying the evolution of genomic islands of

divergence (GIDs) in the noni-specialist subspecies *Drosophila yakuba mayottensis*. First, we

showed that *D. y. mayottensis* GIDs were subspecies-specific. There was no different pattern

of divergence whether F_{ST} was inferred by comparing mainland populations to the Soulou

population collected in January 2013 or April 2017, or to any other noni-associated *D. y.*

mayottensis population collected in 2017 across the island. Second, we found that the two

subspecies had distinct inversions. Of the 20 GIDs distinguishing *D. y. mayottensis* from two

mainland populations, 12 fell close to or within subspecies-specific chromosomal inversions,

corresponding to ~72% of the outlier windows in the *PBE* analysis.

Chromosomal inversions can play an important role in promoting local adaptation,

either through reducing gene flow at selected genomic regions or through bringing to a new

habitat an advantageous allelic combination segregating at the ancestral range (Faria et al. 2019;

Mérot et al. 2020; Schaal et al. 2022). The two scenarios could have contributed to *D. y.*

mayottensis specialization on noni in Mayotte. For example, GIDs falling in the subspecies-

specific inversions *Xtb* and *2Lo* include several ecologically-relevant candidates that are

involved in the metabolism of ecdysone, lipids and carbohydrates (GMC oxidoreductases (Iida et al. 2007; Glaser-Schmitt and Parsch 2018); maltases (Inomata et al. 2019)), ethanol tolerance (*Adh* (Siddiq and Thornton 2019)), and hexanoic acid sensing (*pdm3* (Arguello et al. 2021)). The *2Rj* inversion that is fixed in *D. y. mayottensis* is, on the other hand, widespread in *D. y. yakuba*, and it is ancestral to three 2R inversions that are specific to the mainland subspecies (Lemeunier and Ashburner 1976). GIDs near the breakpoints of this ancestral inversion contain important clusters of detoxification genes of cytochrome P450 oxidases and glutathione-S-transferases, which are involved in basal resistance to noni toxins in *D. sechellia* and its close relatives (Peyser et al. 2017; Lanno and Coolon 2019). Alternatively, both derived and shared inversions might have been fixed by drift, although demographic models do not suggest major bottlenecks during *D. y. mayottensis* colonization of Mayotte (Yassin et al. 2016). Testing the potential role of derived and shared inversions would require experimental isolation of each karyotype and comparison of the effect of each on different noni use traits, but the large breadth of these inversions would complicate fine-scale QTL mapping or genome-wide association studies (GWAS) in *D. yakuba*.

High levels of differentiation in collinear, high recombining regions constitute strong signals of hard selective sweeps. Only 3 GIDs (4, 19 and 20) satisfied these conditions. Most notably, GID20 consisted of syntenic members of the *Osiris* gene family. The role of those genes in conferring resistance against noni's main toxin, octanoic acid, has been demonstrated through genetic mapping (Hungate et al. 2013) and transcriptomic analyses in *D. sechellia* (Lanno et al. 2017), as well as functional gene silencing in *D. melanogaster* (Andrade López et al. 2017; Lanno et al. 2019). The two other GIDs also involve some genes with a potential role in resistance to plant chemical defenses in other insects, such as *acetylcholine esterase* (*Ace*) or serine-type endopeptidases (Hoang et al. 2015; Alyokhin and Chen 2017; Lanno and Coolon 2019). Those genes therefore are best candidates for future functional genetics analyses.

However, hard selective sweeps indicate a particular mode of selection wherein the selected

alleles were absent or had low frequency at the onset of selection. Alternatively, incomplete

selective sweeps wherein the selected alleles may have not reached fixation yet or soft selective

sweeps on alleles segregating at intermediate frequencies in the ancestral range could also be

important factors, although loci under these patterns of sweeps will hardly be detected by GID

analyses. A signal of soft selective sweep on the odorant receptor *Or22a*, a gene that controls

D. sechellia attraction to methyl hexanoate, the main noni volatile (Auer et al. 2020), was

recently demonstrated in *D. y. mayottensis* (Ferreira et al. 2021). However, the efficiency of

this approach will be limited to collinear, high recombining regions, which constitute a

relatively small proportion of the *D. yakuba* genome.

In many cases, shared polymorphic inversions had promoted parallel adaptations in

different geographical populations (Mérot et al. 2018; Lucek et al. 2019; Morales et al. 2019;

Matschiner et al. 2022). This situation cannot explain the recurrent specialization on toxic noni

fruits in distinct islands of the Indian Ocean between *D. yakuba* and *D. sechellia*. Despite their

striking phenotypic convergence (Yassin et al. 2016; Ferreira et al. 2021), the divergence

between the two species is deep and their genomic architectures are quite different. Nearly

35.3% of the genome in *D. yakuba* has low number of segregating sites extending from the

telomeres and centromeres (Yassin et al. 2016; Pettie et al. 2022). In *D. simulans* and *D.*

mauritiana, only 10.5% of the genome has low number of segregating sites (Brand et al. 2018).

The three species of the *simulans* clade are homosequential and chromosomal inversions were

very rarely reported in *D. simulans* (Chakraborty et al. 2021). As functional genetics analyses

will continue to be undergone in both species, the degree of genic parallelism underlying the

recurrent specialization on a toxic resource despite distinct genomic architectures will be

clarified.

References

Alyokhin, A., and Y. H. Chen. 2017. Adaptation to toxic hosts as a factor in the evolution of insecticide resistance. Current Opinion in Insect Science 21:33–38.

Amlou, M., B. Moreteau, and J. R. David. 1998. Genetic Analysis of Drosophila sechellia Specialization: Oviposition Behavior Toward the Major Aliphatic Acids of Its Host Plant. Behav Genet 28:455–464.

Amlou, M., E. Pla, B. Moreteau, and J. R. David. 1997. Genetic analysis by interspecific crosses of the tolerance of Drosophila sechellia to major aliphatic acids of its host plant. Genet Sel Evol 29:511.

Andrade López, J. M., S. M. Lanno, J. M. Auerbach, E. C. Moskowitz, L. A. Sligar, P. J. Wittkopp, and J. D. Coolon. 2017. Genetic basis of octanoic acid resistance in Drosophila sechellia: functional analysis of a fine-mapped region. Mol Ecol 26:1148–1160.

Arguello, J. R., L. Abuin, J. Armida, K. Mika, P. C. Chai, and R. Benton. 2021. Targeted molecular profiling of rare olfactory sensory neurons identifies fate, wiring, and functional determinants. eLife 10:e63036. eLife Sciences Publications, Ltd.

Auer, T. O., M. A. Khallaf, A. F. Silbering, G. Zappia, K. Ellis, R. Álvarez-Ocaña, J. R. Arguello, B. S. Hansson, G. S. X. E. Jefferis, S. J. C. Caron, M. Knaden, and R. Benton. 2020. Olfactory receptor and circuit evolution promote host specialization. Nature 579:402–408.

Auer, T. O., M. P. Shahandeh, and R. Benton. 2021. Drosophila sechellia: A Genetic Model for Behavioral Evolution and Neuroecology. Annual Review of Genetics 55:527–554.

Berdan, E. L., A. Blanckaert, R. K. Butlin, and C. Bank. 2021. Deleterious mutation accumulation and the long-term fate of chromosomal inversions. PLOS Genetics 17:e1009411. Public Library of Science.

Brand, C. L., M. V. Cattani, S. B. Kingan, E. L. Landeen, and D. C. Presgraves. 2018. Molecular Evolution at a Meiosis Gene Mediates Species Differences in the Rate and Patterning of Recombination. Current Biology 28:1289-1295.e4.

Chakraborty, M., C.-H. Chang, D. E. Khost, J. Vedanayagam, J. R. Adrion, Y. Liao, K. L. Montooth, C. D. Meiklejohn, A. M. Larracuente, and J. J. Emerson. 2021. Evolution of genome structure in the Drosophila simulans species complex. Genome Res. 31:380–396.

Cruickshank, T. E., and M. W. Hahn. 2014. Reanalysis suggests that genomic islands of speciation are due to reduced diversity, not reduced gene flow. Molecular Ecology 23:3133–3157.

David, J. R., E. A. Ferreira, L. Jabaud, D. Ogereau, H. Bastide, and A. Yassin. 2022. Evolution

References

Alyokhin, A., and Y. H. Chen. 2017. Adaptation to toxic hosts as a factor in the evolution of insecticide resistance. Current Opinion in Insect Science 21:33–38.

Amlou, M., B. Moreteau, and J. R. David. 1998. Genetic Analysis of Drosophila sechellia Specialization: Oviposition Behavior Toward the Major Aliphatic Acids of Its Host Plant. Behav Genet 28:455–464.

Amlou, M., E. Pla, B. Moreteau, and J. R. David. 1997. Genetic analysis by interspecific crosses of the tolerance of Drosophila sechellia to major aliphatic acids of its host plant. Genet Sel Evol 29:511.

Andrade López, J. M., S. M. Lanno, J. M. Auerbach, E. C. Moskowitz, L. A. Sligar, P. J. Wittkopp, and J. D. Coolon. 2017. Genetic basis of octanoic acid resistance in Drosophila sechellia: functional analysis of a fine-mapped region. Mol Ecol 26:1148–1160.

Arguello, J. R., L. Abuin, J. Armida, K. Mika, P. C. Chai, and R. Benton. 2021. Targeted molecular profiling of rare olfactory sensory neurons identifies fate, wiring, and functional determinants. eLife 10:e63036. eLife Sciences Publications, Ltd.

Auer, T. O., M. A. Khallaf, A. F. Silbering, G. Zappia, K. Ellis, R. Álvarez-Ocaña, J. R. Arguello, B. S. Hansson, G. S. X. E. Jefferis, S. J. C. Caron, M. Knaden, and R. Benton. 2020. Olfactory receptor and circuit evolution promote host specialization. Nature 579:402–408.

Auer, T. O., M. P. Shahandeh, and R. Benton. 2021. Drosophila sechellia: A Genetic Model for Behavioral Evolution and Neuroecology. Annual Review of Genetics 55:527–554.

Berdan, E. L., A. Blanckaert, R. K. Butlin, and C. Bank. 2021. Deleterious mutation accumulation and the long-term fate of chromosomal inversions. PLOS Genetics 17:e1009411. Public Library of Science.

Brand, C. L., M. V. Cattani, S. B. Kingan, E. L. Landeen, and D. C. Presgraves. 2018. Molecular Evolution at a Meiosis Gene Mediates Species Differences in the Rate and Patterning of Recombination. Current Biology 28:1289-1295.e4.

Chakraborty, M., C.-H. Chang, D. E. Khost, J. Vedanayagam, J. R. Adrion, Y. Liao, K. L. Montooth, C. D. Meiklejohn, A. M. Larracuente, and J. J. Emerson. 2021. Evolution of genome structure in the Drosophila simulans species complex. Genome Res. 31:380–396.

Cruickshank, T. E., and M. W. Hahn. 2014. Reanalysis suggests that genomic islands of speciation are due to reduced diversity, not reduced gene flow. Molecular Ecology 23:3133–3157.

David, J. R., E. A. Ferreira, L. Jabaud, D. Ogereau, H. Bastide, and A. Yassin. 2022. Evolution

of assortative mating following selective introgression of pigmentation genes between two

Drosophila species. Ecology and Evolution 12:e8821.

David, J. R., A. Yassin, N. Gidaszewski, and V. Debat. 2014. Drosophilids (Diptera) from

Mayotte island: an annotated list of species collected in 2013 and comments on the colonisation

of Indian Ocean Islands. Annales de la Société entomologique de France (N.S.) 50:336–342.

Drum, Z., S. Lanno, S. M. Gregory, S. Shimshak, W. Barr, A. Gatesman, M. Schadt, J. Sanford,

A. Arkin, B. Assignon, S. Colorado, C. Dalgarno, T. Devanny, T. Ghandour, R. Griffin, M.

Hogan, E. Horowitz, E. McGhie, J. Multer, H. O'Halloran, K. Ofori-Darko, D. Pokushalov, N.

Richards, K. Sagarin, N. Taylor, A. Thielking, P. Towle, and J. Coolon. 2022. Genomics

analysis of Drosophila sechellia response to Morinda citrifolia fruit diet. G3

Genes|Genomes|Genetics 12:jkac153.

Earley, E. J., and C. D. Jones. 2011. Next-Generation Mapping of Complex Traits with

Phenotype-Based Selection and Introgression. Genetics 189:1203–1209.

Ellegren, H., L. Smeds, R. Burri, P. I. Olason, N. Backström, T. Kawakami, A. Künstner, H.

Mäkinen, K. Nadachowska-Brzyska, A. Qvarnström, S. Uebbing, and J. B. W. Wolf. 2012. The

genomic landscape of species divergence in Ficedula flycatchers. Nature 491:756–760. Nature

Publishing Group.

Faria, R., K. Johannesson, R. K. Butlin, and A. M. Westram. 2019. Evolving Inversions. Trends

in Ecology & Evolution 34:239–248.

Feder, J. L., and P. Nosil. 2009. Chromosomal inversions and species differences: when are

gene affecting adaptive divergence and reproductive isolation expected to reside within

inversions? Evolution 63:3061–3075.

Feder, J. L., and P. Nosil. 2010. The efficacy of divergence hitchhiking during ecological

speciation. Evolution 64:1729–1747.

Ferreira, E. A., S. Lambert, T. Verrier, F. Marion-Poll, and A. Yassin. 2021. Soft Selective

Sweep on Chemosensory Genes Correlates with Ancestral Preference for Toxic Noni in a

Specialist Drosophila Population. Genes 12:32. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.

Forbes, A. A., S. N. Devine, A. C. Hippee, E. S. Tvedte, A. K. G. Ward, H. A. Widmayer, and

C. J. Wilson. 2017. Revisiting the particular role of host shifts in initiating insect speciation.

Evolution 71:1126–1137.

Futuyma, D. J., and G. Moreno. 1988. The Evolution of Ecological Specialization. Annual

Review of Ecology and Systematics 19:207–233.

Garrigan, D., S. B. Kingan, A. J. Geneva, P. Andolfatto, A. G. Clark, K. R. Thornton, and D.

C. Presgraves. 2012. Genome sequencing reveals complex speciation in the Drosophila

simulans clade. Genome Res. 22:1499–1511.

Glaser-Schmitt, A., and J. Parsch. 2018. Functional characterization of adaptive variation

within a cis-regulatory element influencing Drosophila melanogaster growth. PLOS Biology

16:e2004538. Public Library of Science.

Hager, E. R., O. S. Harringmeyer, T. B. Wooldridge, S. Theingi, J. T. Gable, S. McFadden, B.

Neugeboren, K. M. Turner, J. D. Jensen, and H. E. Hoekstra. 2022. A chromosomal inversion

contributes to divergence in multiple traits between deer mouse ecotypes. Science 377:399–

405. American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Harringmeyer, O. S., and H. E. Hoekstra. 2022. Chromosomal inversion polymorphisms shape

the genomic landscape of deer mice. Nat Ecol Evol 6:1965–1979. Nature Publishing Group.

Hivert, V., R. Leblois, E. J. Petit, M. Gautier, and R. Vitalis. 2018. Measuring Genetic

Differentiation from Pool-seq Data. Genetics 210:315–330.

Hoang, K., L. M. Matzkin, and J. M. Bono. 2015. Transcriptional variation associated with

cactus host plant adaptation in Drosophila mettleri populations. Molecular Ecology 24:5186–

5199.

Huang, K., R. L. Andrew, G. L. Owens, K. L. Ostevik, and L. H. Rieseberg. 2020. Multiple

chromosomal inversions contribute to adaptive divergence of a dune sunflower ecotype.

Molecular Ecology 29:2535–2549.

Huang, Y., and D. Erezyilmaz. 2015. The Genetics of Resistance to Morinda Fruit Toxin During

the Postembryonic Stages in Drosophila sechellia. G3: Genes, Genomes, Genetics 5:1973–

1981.

Hungate, E. A., E. J. Earley, I. A. Boussy, D. A. Turissini, C.-T. Ting, J. R. Moran, M.-L. Wu,

C.-I. Wu, and C. D. Jones. 2013. A Locus in Drosophila sechellia Affecting Tolerance of a Host

Plant Toxin. Genetics 195:1063–1075.

Iida, K., D. L. Cox-Foster, X. Yang, W.-Y. Ko, and D. R. Cavener. 2007. Expansion and

evolution of insect GMC oxidoreductases. BMC Evolutionary Biology 7:75.

Inomata, N., K. R. Takahasi, and N. Koga. 2019. Association between duplicated maltase genes

and the transcriptional regulation for the carbohydrate changes in Drosophila melanogaster.

Gene 686:141–145.

Jay, P., M. Chouteau, A. Whibley, H. Bastide, H. Parrinello, V. Llaurens, and M. Joron. 2021.

Mutation load at a mimicry supergene sheds new light on the evolution of inversion

polymorphisms. Nat Genet 53:288–293. Nature Publishing Group.

Jay, P., E. Tezenas, A. Véber, and T. Giraud. 2022. Sheltering of deleterious mutations explains

the stepwise extension of recombination suppression on sex chromosomes and other

supergenes. PLOS Biology 20:e3001698. Public Library of Science.

Kapun, M., and T. Flatt. 2019. The adaptive significance of chromosomal inversion polymorphisms in Drosophila melanogaster. Molecular Ecology 28:1263–1282.

Kofler, R., R. V. Pandey, and C. Schlötterer. 2011. PoPoolation2: identifying differentiation between populations using sequencing of pooled DNA samples (Pool-Seq). Bioinformatics 27:3435–3436.

Lanno, S. M., and J. D. Coolon. 2019. Derived esterase activity in Drosophila sechellia contributes to evolved octanoic acid resistance. Insect Molecular Biology 28:798–806.

Lanno, S. M., S. M. Gregory, S. J. Shimshak, M. K. Alverson, K. Chiu, A. L. Feil, M. G. Findley, T. E. Forman, J. T. Gordon, J. Ho, J. L. Krupp, I. Lam, J. Lane, S. C. Linde, A. E. Morse, S. Rusk, R. Ryan, A. Saniee, R. B. Sheth, J. J. Siranosian, L. Sirichantaropart, S. R. Sternlieb, C. M. Zaccardi, and J. D. Coolon. 2017. Transcriptomic Analysis of Octanoic Acid Response in Drosophila sechellia Using RNA-Sequencing. G3: Genes, Genomes, Genetics 7:3867–3873.

Lanno, S. M., S. J. Shimshak, R. D. Peyser, S. C. Linde, and J. D. Coolon. 2019. Investigating the role of Osiris genes in Drosophila sechellia larval resistance to a host plant toxin. Ecology and Evolution 9:1922–1933.

Lavista-Llanos, S., A. Svatoš, M. Kai, T. Riemensperger, S. Birman, M. C. Stensmyr, and B. S. Hansson. 2014. Dopamine drives Drosophila sechellia adaptation to its toxic host. eLife 3:e03785.

Legrand, D., M. I. Tenaillon, P. Matyot, J. Gerlach, D. Lachaise, and M.-L. Cariou. 2009. Species-Wide Genetic Variation and Demographic History of Drosophila sechellia, a Species Lacking Population Structure. Genetics 182:1197–1206.

Lemeunier, F., and M. Ashburner. 1976. Relationships within the melanogaster species subgroup of the genus Drosophila (Sophophora) - II. Phylogenetic relationships between six species based upon polytene chromosome banding sequences. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B. Biological Sciences 193:275–294. Royal Society.

Li, H. 2018. Minimap2: pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences. Bioinformatics 34:3094–3100.

Li, H., B. Handsaker, A. Wysoker, T. Fennell, J. Ruan, N. Homer, G. Marth, G. Abecasis, and R. Durbin. 2009. The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics 25:2078–2079.

Llopart, A., D. Lachaise, and J. A. Coyne. 2005. An Anomalous Hybrid Zone in Drosophila. Evolution 59:2602–2607.

Louis, J., and J. R. David. 1986. Ecological specialization in the Drosophila melanogaster

species subgroup: a case study of D. sechellia. Acta oecologica. Oecologia generalis 7:215–

229.

Lu, H., F. Giordano, and Z. Ning. 2016. Oxford Nanopore MinION Sequencing and Genome

Assembly. Genomics, Proteomics & Bioinformatics 14:265–279.

Lucek, K., Z. Gompert, and P. Nosil. 2019. The role of structural genomic variants in population

differentiation and ecotype formation in Timema cristinae walking sticks. Molecular Ecology

28:1224–1237.

Matschiner, M., J. M. I. Barth, O. K. Tørresen, B. Star, H. T. Baalsrud, M. S. O. Brieuc, C.

Pampoulie, I. Bradbury, K. S. Jakobsen, and S. Jentoft. 2022. Supergene origin and

maintenance in Atlantic cod. Nat Ecol Evol 6:469–481. Nature Publishing Group.

Matsuo, T., S. Sugaya, J. Yasukawa, T. Aigaki, and Y. Fuyama. 2007. Odorant-Binding

Proteins OBP57d and OBP57e Affect Taste Perception and Host-Plant Preference in

Drosophila sechellia. PLOS Biology 5:e118.

Mérot, C., E. L. Berdan, C. Babin, E. Normandeau, M. Wellenreuther, and L. Bernatchez. 2018.

Intercontinental karyotype–environment parallelism supports a role for a chromosomal

inversion in local adaptation in a seaweed fly. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological

Sciences 285:20180519. Royal Society.

Mérot, C., E. L. Berdan, H. Cayuela, H. Djambazian, A.-L. Ferchaud, M. Laporte, E.

Normandeau, J. Ragoussis, M. Wellenreuther, and L. Bernatchez. 2021. Locally Adaptive

Inversions Modulate Genetic Variation at Different Geographic Scales in a Seaweed Fly.

Molecular Biology and Evolution 38:3953–3971.

Mérot, C., R. A. Oomen, A. Tigano, and M. Wellenreuther. 2020. A Roadmap for

Understanding the Evolutionary Significance of Structural Genomic Variation. Trends in

Ecology & Evolution 35:561–572.

Michel, A. P., S. Sim, T. H. Q. Powell, M. S. Taylor, P. Nosil, and J. L. Feder. 2010. Widespread

genomic divergence during sympatric speciation. Proceedings of the National Academy of

Sciences 107:9724–9729. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.

Miller, D. E., C. Staber, J. Zeitlinger, and R. S. Hawley. 2018. Highly Contiguous Genome

Assemblies of 15 Drosophila Species Generated Using Nanopore Sequencing. G3

Genes|Genomes|Genetics 8:3131–3141.

Morales, H. E., R. Faria, K. Johannesson, T. Larsson, M. Panova, A. M. Westram, and R. K.

Butlin. 2019. Genomic architecture of parallel ecological divergence: Beyond a single

environmental contrast. Science Advances 5:eaav9963. American Association for the

Advancement of Science.

Pettie, N., A. Llopart, and J. M. Comeron. 2022. Meiotic, genomic and evolutionary properties

of crossover distribution in Drosophila yakuba. PLOS Genetics 18:e1010087. Public Library

of Science.

Peyser, R. D., S. M. Lanno, S. J. Shimshak, and J. D. Coolon. 2017. Analysis of cytochrome

P450 contribution to evolved plant toxin resistance in Drosophila sechellia. Insect Molecular

Biology 26:715–720.

Prieto-Godino, L. L., R. Rytz, S. Cruchet, B. Bargeton, L. Abuin, A. F. Silbering, V. Ruta, M.

D. Peraro, and R. Benton. 2017. Evolution of Acid-Sensing Olfactory Circuits in Drosophilids.

Neuron 93:661-676.e6.

Prigent, S. R., P. Le Gall, S. W. Mbunda, and M. Veuille. 2013. Seasonal and altitudinal

structure of drosophilid communities on Mt Oku (Cameroon volcanic line). Comptes Rendus

Geoscience 345:316–326.

Quilodrán, C. S., K. Ruegg, A. T. Sendell-Price, E. C. Anderson, T. Coulson, and S. M. Clegg.

2020. The multiple population genetic and demographic routes to islands of genomic

divergence. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 11:6–21.

Rio, B., G. Couturier, F. Lemeunier, and D. Lachaise. 1983. Evolution d'une spécialisation

saisonnière chez Drosophila erecta (Dipt., Drosophilidae). Ann. Soc. entomol. Fr 19:235–248.

R'Kha, S., P. Capy, and J. R. David. 1991. Host-plant specialization in the Drosophila

melanogaster species complex: a physiological, behavioral, and genetical analysis. PNAS

88:1835–1839.

Rogers, R. L., J. M. Cridland, L. Shao, T. T. Hu, P. Andolfatto, and K. R. Thornton. 2014.

Landscape of Standing Variation for Tandem Duplications in Drosophila yakuba and

Drosophila simulans. Mol Biol Evol 31:1750–1766.

Sanchez-Donoso, I., S. Ravagni, J. D. Rodríguez-Teijeiro, M. J. Christmas, Y. Huang, A.

Maldonado-Linares, M. Puigcerver, I. Jiménez-Blasco, P. Andrade, D. Gonçalves, G. Friis, I.

Roig, M. T. Webster, J. A. Leonard, and C. Vilà. 2022. Massive genome inversion drives

coexistence of divergent morphs in common quails. Current Biology 32:462-469.e6.

Schaal, S. M., B. C. Haller, and K. E. Lotterhos. 2022. Inversion invasions: when the genetic

basis of local adaptation is concentrated within inversions in the face of gene flow.

Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 377:20210200. Royal

Society.

Schrider, D. R., J. Ayroles, D. R. Matute, and A. D. Kern. 2018. Supervised machine learning

reveals introgressed loci in the genomes of Drosophila simulans and D. sechellia. PLOS

Genetics 14:e1007341. Public Library of Science.

Sherman, B. T., M. Hao, J. Qiu, X. Jiao, M. W. Baseler, H. C. Lane, T. Imamichi, and W.

Chang. 2022. DAVID: a web server for functional enrichment analysis and functional

annotation of gene lists (2021 update). Nucleic Acids Research 50:W216–W221.

Siddiq, M. A., and J. W. Thornton. 2019. Fitness effects but no temperature-mediated balancing

selection at the polymorphic Adh gene of Drosophila melanogaster. Proceedings of the National

Academy of Sciences 116:21634–21640. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.

Sodeland, M., P. E. Jorde, S. Lien, S. Jentoft, P. R. Berg, H. Grove, M. P. Kent, M. Arnyasi, E.

M. Olsen, and H. Knutsen. 2016. "Islands of Divergence" in the Atlantic Cod Genome

Represent Polymorphic Chromosomal Rearrangements. Genome Biology and Evolution

8:1012–1022.

Tepolt, C. K., E. D. Grosholz, C. E. de Rivera, and G. M. Ruiz. 2022. Balanced polymorphism

fuels rapid selection in an invasive crab despite high gene flow and low genetic diversity.

Molecular Ecology 31:55–69.

Thurmond, J., J. L. Goodman, V. B. Strelets, H. Attrill, L. S. Gramates, S. J. Marygold, B. B.

Matthews, G. Millburn, G. Antonazzo, V. Trovisco, T. C. Kaufman, B. R. Calvi, N. Perrimon,

S. R. Gelbart, J. Agapite, K. Broll, L. Crosby, G. dos Santos, D. Emmert, L. S. Gramates, K.

Falls, V. Jenkins, B. Matthews, C. Sutherland, C. Tabone, P. Zhou, M. Zytkovicz, N. Brown,

G. Antonazzo, H. Attrill, P. Garapati, A. Holmes, A. Larkin, S. Marygold, G. Millburn, C.

Pilgrim, V. Trovisco, P. Urbano, T. Kaufman, B. Calvi, B. Czoch, J. Goodman, V. Strelets, J.

Thurmond, R. Cripps, and P. Baker. 2019. FlyBase 2.0: the next generation. Nucleic Acids Res

47:D759–D765.

Turissini, D. A., and D. R. Matute. 2017. Fine scale mapping of genomic introgressions within

the Drosophila yakuba clade. PLOS Genetics 13:e1006971.

Turner, T. L., M. W. Hahn, and S. V. Nuzhdin. 2005. Genomic Islands of Speciation in

Anopheles gambiae. PLOS Biology 3:e285.

Vertacnik, K. L., and C. R. Linnen. 2017. Evolutionary genetics of host shifts in herbivorous

insects: insights from the age of genomics. Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci. 1389:186–212.

Vouidibio, J. 1985. Ecologie des populations et biologie évolutive des drosophiles en Afrique

équatoriale (Congo). Université Paris XII Val-de-Marne, France.

Wiens, J. J., R. T. Lapoint, and N. K. Whiteman. 2015. Herbivory increases diversification

across insect clades. Nature Communications 6:8370.

Wolf, J. B. W., and H. Ellegren. 2017. Making sense of genomic islands of differentiation in

light of speciation. Nat Rev Genet 18:87–100.

Yassin, A. 2017. Drosophila yakuba mayottensis, a new model for the study of incipient
ecological speciation. Fly 11:37–45.

Yassin, A., V. Debat, H. Bastide, N. Gidaszewski, J. R. David, and J. E. Pool. 2016. Recurrent
specialization on a toxic fruit in an island Drosophila population. PNAS 113:4771–4776.

Yi, X., Y. Liang, E. Huerta-Sanchez, X. Jin, Z. X. P. Cuo, J. E. Pool, X. Xu, H. Jiang, N.
Vinckenbosch, T. S. Korneliussen, H. Zheng, T. Liu, W. He, K. Li, R. Luo, X. Nie, H. Wu, M.
Zhao, H. Cao, J. Zou, Y. Shan, S. Li, Q. Yang, Asan, P. Ni, G. Tian, J. Xu, X. Liu, T. Jiang, R.
Wu, G. Zhou, M. Tang, J. Qin, T. Wang, S. Feng, G. Li, Huasang, J. Luosang, W. Wang, F.
Chen, Y. Wang, X. Zheng, Z. Li, Z. Bianba, G. Yang, X. Wang, S. Tang, G. Gao, Y. Chen, Z.
Luo, L. Gusang, Z. Cao, Q. Zhang, W. Ouyang, X. Ren, H. Liang, H. Zheng, Y. Huang, J. Li,
L. Bolund, K. Kristiansen, Y. Li, Y. Zhang, X. Zhang, R. Li, S. Li, H. Yang, R. Nielsen, J.
Wang, and J. Wang. 2010. Sequencing of 50 Human Exomes Reveals Adaptation to High
Altitude. Science 329:75–78.

Zimin, A. V., G. Marçais, D. Puiu, M. Roberts, S. L. Salzberg, and J. A. Yorke. 2013. The
MaSuRCA genome assembler. Bioinformatics 29:2669–2677.

 Figure legends

Figure 1 – Association of *Drosophila yakuba mayottensis* with noni (*Morinda citrifolia*) on the

island of Mayotte. A) Frequency of *D. yakuba* (blue) among drosophilids (red) collected on the

island of Mayotte in January 2013 (after David et al. (2014)) and April 2017. Locations with

fruiting noni trees are indicated with a star. The size of the pie charts reflects the total number

of collected flies per site. B) Abundance of *D. yakuba* flies among drosophilids collected using

standard fermenting banana traps in Congo (after Vouidibio (1985) and in Mayotte. C) A brown

lemur (*Eulemur fulvus*) eating a noni fruit in Mayotte (© Amir Yassin).

Figure 2 – Low temporal and spatial genetic differentiation among *D. y. mayottensis*

populations on the island of Mayotte. A) Pairwise F_{ST} values for 10-kb windows between Pool-

Seq data from Soulou collected in January 2013 and April 2017. B) Average pairwise F_{ST} values

for 10-kb windows between Pool-Seq data from the three populations collected in Mayotte in

April 2017. Gray areas reflect subtelomeric and subcentromeric regions with low recombination

rate (Yassin et al. 2016; Pettie et al. 2022). Each chromosomal arm according to the v.1.05

reference genome is represented by different color.

Figure 3 – High genetic differentiation among the two *D. yakuba* subspecies. A) Boxplot of

pairwise F_{ST} values for 10-kb windows between the two mainland *D. y. yakuba* populations

(pale red), between each and a pool-of-pooled flies from *D. y. mayottensis* (pale blue and

orange), and between the three Pool-Seq populations of *D. y. mayottensis* (yellow). Significance

estimated from Student's *t* pairwise-tests. B) Population Branch Excess (*PBE*) identification of

the genomic islands of divergence (GIDs), enumerated in red, distinguishing *D. y. mayottensis*

from the two *D. y. yakuba* populations. Color code as in Figure 2.

Figure 4 – Genomic islands of divergence (GIDs) predominantly overlap with major

chromosomal inversions. A) Dot plot comparing *D. y. mayottensis* hybrid assembly with the *D.*

yakuba reference genome v1.05. Each *D. y. mayottensis* scaffold is given in different color with

the position of the GIDs indicated by their number. Shaded areas indicate subtelomeric and

subcentromeric regions with low recombination rate. Red arrows indicate inversion

breakpoints. B) Schematic presentation of major inversions on chromosomal arms *2L* (left) and

2R (right). Inversion names, breakpoints and geographical distribution into West Africa (W),

East Africa (E) and Mayotte (M) are given following Lemeunier and Ashburner (1976) and this

study.

709 Table 1 – Position, structural features and candidate genes or families of the 20 genomic islands

710 of divergence (GIDs) distinguishing noni-specialist *Drosophila yakuba mayottensis* from

711 generalist mainland species. *P* levels from DAVID gene ontology enrichment analyses for each

712 GID.

GID	Coordinates (Mb)	Architecture	Candidate genes
1	X:3.63-3.98	Subtelomeric region	
2	X:8.68-9.23	Subspecies-specific *Xtb* inversion	*Flo2*; Glucose-methanol-choline oxidoreductase (ecdysteroid metabolic process, $P < 1 \times 10^{-20}$)
3	X:21.22-21.77	Subcentromeric region	
4	2L:2.21-2.27		Serine-type endopeptidase activity ($P < 3 \times 10^{-5}$)
5	2L:14.51-14.83	Subspecies-specific *2Lo* inversion	*Adh*
6	2L:16.59-17.15	Subspecies-specific *2Lo* inversion	*pdm3*; maltose alpha-glucosidase activity (sugar metabolism and transport, $P < 5 \times 10^{-13}$), cytochrome P450 ($P < 0.10$)
7	2L:18.24-18.83	Subspecies-specific *2Lo* inversion; subcentromeric region	
8	2L:20.37-20.23	Subspecies-specific *2Lo* inversion; subcentromeric region	*EcR*
9	2L:21.08-21.57	Close to subspecies-specific *2Lo* inversion; subcentromeric region	
10	2R:5.01-5.57	Subcentromeric region	*Catsup*; UDP-glycosyltransferases (metabolism of xenobiotics by cytochrome P450, $P < 0.01$)
11	2R:6.85-6.93	Close to species-common *2Rj* inversion	
12	2R:10.42-10.77	Species-common *2Rj* inversion; subspecies-specific *2Rk* inversion	Cytochrome P450 ($P < 1 \times 10^{-5}$)
13	2R:14.79-17.61	Species-common *2Rj* inversion; subspecies-specific *2Rk* inversion	LITAF ($P < 3 \times 10^{-14}$); glutathione S-transferase ($P < 0.05$); destabilase ($P < 0.05$); malic enzyme ($P < 0.10$)
14	2R:19.54-19.63	Close to species-common *2Rj* inversion	
15	3L:23.56-24.20	Subspecies-specific *3Lk* inversion; subcentromeric region	

16	3R:0.00-0.33	Subspecies-specific *3Ri* inversion; subcentromeric region	
17	3R:4.39-4.57	Subcentromeric region	
18	3R:10.82-11.92	Subcentromeric region	UDP-glucuronosyl/UDP-glucosyltransferase ($P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$)
19	3R:13.38-13.42		*Ace*, *Osi22*
20	3R:17.96-17.98		*Osi2*, *Osi3*, *Osi4*, *Osi5* (Proteins of unknown function DUF1676, $P < 1 \times 10^{-8}$)

A

M'Tsangamouji

Soulou

2013   2017

Mt Combani

2013   2017

Bambo Est

• < 50   ● < 500   ⬤ < 5,000   ☐ 2013   ○ 2017   ▲ Both

5 km

B

Banana bait	Not *yak* 🔴	*yak* 🔵
Mayotte	210	0
Congo	6531	383

C

A   Soulou 2017 vs. Soulou 2013

B   Average 3 *D. y. mayottensis* 2017 populations

A

D. y. mayottensis assembly

D. y. yakuba reference genome v.1.05

B

D. yakuba chromosome 2