1

Title

Divergence of olfactory receptors associated with the evolution of assortative mating and reproductive isolation in mice

Authors

Carole M. Smadja [1], Etienne Loire [1,2], Pierre Caminade [1], Dany Severac [3], Mathieu Gautier [4] and Guila Ganem [1]

[1] Institut des Sciences de l'Evolution de Montpellier ISEM, Univ. Montpellier, CNRS, IRD, Montpellier, France

[2] Current address : ASTRE, Cirad, INRAE, Univ. Montpellier, Montpellier, France

[3] MGX, Univ. Montpellier, CNRS, INSERM, Montpellier, France

[4] CBGP, INRAE, CIRAD, IRD, Montpellier SupAgro, Univ. Montpellier, Montpellier, France

Corresponding author: Carole M. Smadja, carole.smadja@umontpellier.fr

Abstract

Deciphering the genetic bases of behavioural traits is essential to understanding how they evolve and contribute to adaptation and biological diversification, but it remains a substantial challenge, especially for complex behavioural traits with polygenic architectures. In this study, we developed a population genomics approach coupled with functional predictions to address the evolution and genetic basis of a complex behavioural trait: olfactory-based assortative mate preferences in the house mouse, suspected to have evolved as a response to selection against hybridisation. We used whole genome resequencing data and the C_2 statistic of the program BAYPASS, which contrasts allele frequencies corrected for population structure, to characterize genetic differentiation between sets of populations with strong contrast in behaviour (expressing or not assortative mate preferences) and we identified some regions of the genome showing the expected significant and consistent association with behavioural divergence. A series of Olfactory and Vomeronasal Receptor genes, among the most differentiated genomic regions and in line with functional predictions, stand out as the prime candidates underlying this olfactory-based behavioural divergence. These genes form large gene clusters in the genome, with two main candidate clusters extending up to 1.8 Mb. Variant analyses indicate a potential dual role of regulatory and protein-coding changes in the evolution of choosiness. This study shows that combining expectations on the genomic patterns of divergence with functional expectations represents a promising route to unravelling the genetic architecture of complex trait variation and provides novel insights into the role of olfactory and vomeronasal receptors in mammal adaptation and speciation.

Keywords: behaviour, genomics, olfaction, mate choice, speciation, reinforcement, *Mus musculus*, mammals

    Introduction

The evolution of behaviours plays a fundamental role in biological diversification, adaptation and

speciation, but it remains a central challenge in biology to understand how behavioural traits

evolve and the genetic basis of behavioural differences (Arguello and Benton 2017; Niepoth and

Bendesky 2020; Jourjine and Hoekstra 2021). Behaviours involved in mate choice play a key role

during the evolution of new species, as they act as premating components of reproductive

isolation and can diverge rapidly through the action of direct and indirect selective effects (natural

selection, sexual selection, reinforcing selection (M R Servedio and Noor 2003; Smadja and Butlin

2011; Servedio and Boughman 2017; Kopp et al. 2018; Mendelson and Safran 2021). Some

progress has been made, often by using quantitative genetics approaches, in characterising genes

underlying assortative mate preferences in some biological systems (e.g. in *Drosophila* flies:

Laturney & Moehring 2012, Pardy et al. 2021; sticklebacks: Bay et al. 2017; *Heliconius* butterflies:

Merrill et al. 2019; European corn borer moths: Unbehend et al. 2021), but they represent cases

where the genetic basis of behavioural divergence is relatively simple. Determining the genetic

basis of behavioural divergence for more complex traits and identifying the signature of divergent

selection acting on these underlying genomic regions remains more challenging.

In this study, we developed a population genomics approach based on the analysis of genetic

differentiation between sets of populations with contrasted behaviours and selective pressures to

address the evolution and genetic basis of a complex behavioural trait: olfactory-based assortative

mate preferences in the house mouse. Population genomics has been successful in identifying

targets of selection in the genome (Hohenlohe et al. 2010; Haasl and Payseur 2015) but its

application to characterise the genetics of behavioural divergence remains largely unexplored

(Kent et al. 2019; Niepoth and Bendesky 2020). With information on phenotype divergence among

natural populations, on the proximal basis of the behavioural response, and on populations where

these behaviours should be under selection, the house mouse system provides a predictive

framework to address the evolution and genetics of behavioural divergence involved in

reproductive isolation.

The two European subspecies of the house mouse (*Mus musculus musculus* and *M. m. domesticus*)

diverged in allopatry ~350-500 kya from Central Asia/Middle East regions before coming into

secondary contact in Europe ~5 kya (Boursot et al. 1996; Geraldes et al. 2011). Some degree of

postzygotic isolation has been demonstrated in this hybrid zone, mostly in the form of reduced

hybrid fertility (Britton-Davidan et al. 2005; Albrechtova et al. 2012; Turner et al. 2012). However,

the two subspecies also display some degree of sexual isolation where they meet and form a

hybrid zone: assortative mate preferences (accompanied by a propensity to mate with the

preferred partner) have been evidenced in both sexes of both subspecies, though preference is

stronger in *M. m. musculus* (Smadja and Ganem 2002; Smadja et al. 2004; Smadja and Ganem

2005; Ganem et al. 2008; Bimova et al. 2011; Latour et al. 2014).

Several arguments suggest that these assortative mate preferences have evolved under selection,

as a result of a reinforcement process (Maria R Servedio and Noor 2003; Butlin and Smadja 2018).

Within each subspecies, assortative mate preferences are only displayed in populations from the

hybrid zone ('Choosy' populations) where selection against hybridization is known to act, while

populations from allopatry do not display any significant directional preferences ('Non-Choosy'

populations) (Smadja and Ganem 2005; Smadja and Ganem 2008; Bimova et al. 2011; Latour et al.

2014). This pattern of reproductive character displacement suggests a mechanism of

reinforcement, by which assortative mate preferences would have evolved as an adaptive

response to the existing postzygotic barriers in this hybrid zone. In this study, we used this

information to identify the genes underlying the evolution of assortative mate preferences by

articulating and testing predictions on the patterns of genomic divergence expected for loci

experiencing reinforcing selection. One key prediction is that genetic divergence will be

significantly elevated at loci underlying assortative mate preferences when sympatric (Choosy) and

allopatric (Non-Choosy) individuals of the same species are compared (Garner et al. 2018).

To identify loci showing this expected pattern of divergence, we leveraged the high-quality

reference genome available for this species (Waterston et al. 2002), produced whole-genome

resequencing data, and finely characterised genomic divergence between Choosy and Non-Choosy

populations within *M. m. musculus*, the subspecies where the contrast in behaviour is the

strongest between these two types of populations (Smadja et al. 2004; Smadja and Ganem 2005;

Ganem et al. 2008; Latour et al. 2014). To ensure the identification of genetic variation associated

with the observed behavioural divergence, we combined multiple population comparisons (focal

and control comparisons between groups of populations with or without contrasted behaviours), a

replicated design within each group compared and robust outlier inference methods based on the

recently implemented C_2 contrast statistic of the program BAYPASS which accounts for the possibly

complex evolutionary history of the different populations (Gautier 2015; Olazcuaga et al. 2021)

(Figure 1 and Methods).

We applied this combination of population comparisons for two types of outlier analyses at

different genomic scales: SNP-based differentiation across the whole genome (based on the

estimation of SNP-based C_2 contrast statistic), and gene-based differentiation across all annotated

genes. While most existing statistical methods for detecting outliers focus on analysing SNPs one-by-one, SNP-based analyses may have some limitations, among which a loss of power due to stringent correction applied to limit false positives in this large number of comparisons (millions of SNPs in a genome) and weak sensitivity to detecting multiple causal variants effects. Leveraging methods developed in the context of GWAS in humans (Neale and Sham 2004; Huang et al. 2011; Chung et al. 2019), we complemented SNP-based analyses with gene-based analyses to gain power in detecting outliers by aggregating disparate signals within a gene as well as to make more direct link of the outlier analyses with the phenotype of interest. To capture different potential underlying genetic architectures of adaptive divergence (single causal variant versus multiple weakly selected variants within a gene), we analysed two commonly used gene-based statistics representing the highest SNP-based differentiation value of a gene and the average differentiation value of a gene (Wang et al. 2017; Dickson et al. 2020), called respectively C_{2_max} and C_{2_mean} in our study.

Since functional expectations are also critical to further interpret genomic patterns of divergence and link phenotypic and genomic variation (Haasl and Payseur 2015; Ravinet et al. 2017; Wolf and Ellegren 2017), we additionally leveraged existing knowledge on the implication of olfaction in the expression of these assortative mate preferences in the house mouse to refine genomic differentiation analysis and interpretation. Previous behavioural assays and chemical analyses have shown that subspecies recognition and associated assortative mate preferences could be driven (at least partly) by olfactory cues present in the mouse urine (Smadja and Ganem 2007; Mucignat-Caretta et al. 2010; Hurst et al. 2017) and that urinary cues are sufficient to elicit mate choice between the two subspecies (Smadja and Ganem 2002; Smadja et al. 2004; Smadja and Ganem 2005; Ganem et al. 2008; Bimova et al. 2011). The olfactory system thus plays a major role in the expression of assortative mate choice between the two subspecies, and we expect some genes involved in odorant recognition to be associated with the evolution of sexual isolation in the house mouse hybrid zone. This includes olfactory receptor (OR) genes expressed in the main olfactory epithelium and primarily involved in the recognition of airborne chemicals present in the environment (odorants and pheromones), and vomeronasal receptor (VR) genes expressed in the vomeronasal organ and known to play a key role in both volatile and non-volatile kairomone and pheromone recognition (Isogai et al. 2011; Chamero et al. 2012; Hayden and Teeling 2014; Liberles 2014; Bear et al. 2016). These genes are organized in very large multi-gene families in the mouse genome (more than 1,200 ORs and 530 VRs (Zhang and Firestein 2002; Ibarra-Soria, M. Levitin, et al. 2014; Ibarra-Soria, M.O. Levitin, et al. 2014)). Here, we considered those genes as key candidates among the possible genetic determinants of assortative mate preferences and used

this list of candidate genes to interrogate outlier regions and narrow down regions of interest.

Patterns of genomic differentiation between Choosy and Non-Choosy populations confirmed that

some regions of the genome show the patterns of divergence expected under selection. Among

those, a handful of olfactory and vomeronasal receptors showed genetic divergence associated

with the observed behavioural divergence between hybrid zone and allopatric populations. Our

study thus provides new insights into the role of olfactory and vomeronasal receptors in mammal

adaptation and speciation. It also offers a novel experimental framework to identify loci showing

the expected patterns of divergence under reinforcement, and confirms that combining

expectations on the genomic patterns of divergence with functional expectations is a promising

route to decipher the genetic architecture of behavioural trait variation.

 Results

Sequence divergence between Choosy and Non-Choosy populations

Whole-genome resequencing of pools of individuals representing two Choosy and two Non-

Choosy populations of *M. m. musculus* (see Figure 1a and Table S1 for a detailed sample

description) identified a total of 28,500,265 SNPs in the dataset after stringent filtering. Genetic

dissimilarity indexes estimated from the scaled genome-wide covariance matrix of the population

allele frequencies (Ω matrix, produced by the program BAYPASS) indicated that the two Choosy

populations do not cluster together (Figure 1b), a situation that makes the identification of outlier

divergent loci in the Focal Test comparing Choosy and Non-Choosy populations (Figure 1c)

conservative. A Control Test was performed to remove outlier loci from the Focal Test

representing population-specific divergence and therefore not a consistent divergence between

both Choosy versus both Non-Choosy populations (Figure 1c and Methods).

Outlier SNPs

We confirmed, in both Focal and Control Tests, that the SNP-based C_2 contrast statistic follows a χ^2

distribution with one degree of freedom as expected under the null hypothesis (Figure S1). We

thus calculated χ^2-associated *p*-values and FDR to identify outlier SNPs showing extreme genetic

differentiation in each population comparison (Focal and Control). We identified 1,612,787 outlier

SNPs ($P < 0.05$) in the Focal Test before multiple testing corrections, reduced to 6546 outlier SNPs

after applying FDR correction. In the Control Test, 1,111,516 SNPs were identified as outliers

before multiple testing corrections. We retained as the final list of 'behavioural' outlier SNPs those

4818 SNPs showing both significant differentiation between Choosy and Non-Choosy populations

after FDR correction in the Focal Test and no significant differentiation in the Control Test (Table

S3).

Outlier genes

In the Focal Test, at the $P < 0.05$ threshold, we identified 999 C_{2_max} outlier genes (over 41,702

annotated genes included in this permutation test) (Table S4a) and 1756 C_{2_mean} outlier genes (over

39,598 annotated genes included in this analysis) (Table S4b). In the Control Test, comparable

numbers of outlier genes were found: 1108 C_{2_max} outlier genes (Table S4c) and 1612 C_{2_mean} outlier

genes (over 39,447 tested genes, among which 1472 genes with no permutation results due to

insufficient SNP number or too large gene size) (Table S4d). However, the large majority of genes

found significant in the Focal Test were not found significant in the Control Test: 77 genes had

significant C_{2_max} in both the Focal and the Control Tests (considered as non-consistently

associated with the behavioural contrast); as a result, from the 999 C_{2_max} initial outlier genes in

the Focal Test, 922 were retained as the final C_{2_max} outlier genes; similarly, out of the 1756 initial

C_{2_mean} outlier genes, 1622 were retained as the final C_{2_mean} outlier genes after removing 134

outliers not consistently associated with the behavioural contrast. The union of these two cured

outlier gene sets, composing the final and complete list of outlier genes, included 2118 genes,

among which 496 were C_{2_max} specific outliers, 1196 were C_{2_mean} specific outliers and 426 were

C_{2_max} and C_{2_mean} outlier genes (Table S5).

Among those 2118 outlier genes, we categorised the most strongly differentiated ones between

Choosy and Non-Choosy populations according to (1) their level of differentiation at one of the

two gene-based contrast statistics (*p*-value C_{2_max} < 0.01 or *p*-value C_{2_mean} < 0.01), hereafter called

highly significant outlier genes or (2) their level of differentiation at both gene-based statistics (see

Methods and Table S5 for details), hereafter called the 'top' outlier genes. We found a total of 479

highly significant outlier genes, among which 111 C_{2_max} specific outliers, 142 C_{2_mean} specific

outliers and 226 C_{2_max}+C_{2_mean} outlier genes (Table S5, bold gene_IDs). Among these highly

significant outlier genes, we further identified 95 outlier genes showing consistent signals of

strong differentiation at both C_{2_max} and C_{2_mean} gene-based contrast statistics, that were

consequently classified as 'top outlier genes' (Table S5, bold and underlined gene_IDs).

Functional impact and nature of candidate genomic regions associated with behavioural divergence

Genic and regulatory regions primarily associated with behavioural divergence

Using the ENSEMBL Variant Effect Predictor (VEP), we found that the 4818 outlier SNPs identified as

significantly differentiated between Choosy and Non-Choosy populations include 1390 novel

variants and 3428 already known variants (71.1%). Those outlier SNPs overlap 977 annotated

genes, 2878 transcripts and 412 regulatory features (Table S6). Genic variants represent a majority

of those outlier SNPs (54.03%), with 50.76% of intronic variants and the rest corresponding to

exonic (1.31%) and UTRs (1.96%) variants (Table S6, Figure 2a). Coding consequences include 64%

of synonymous variants, 32% of missense variants and 3% of stop-gained variants (respectively

0.48%, 0.24% and 0.02% of the total, Figure 2a). Non-genic variants are slightly less represented

(45.97%) but include a large number of variants (32.91% of all outlier SNPs) potentially involved in

gene regulation: down- and upstream variants as well as already known regulatory region variants

(Table S6, Figure 2a). Only 13% of all outlier SNPs fall in intergenic regions. In comparison,

consequences predicted on all SNPs (and not only outlier SNPs) in the dataset show fewer variants

potentially involved in gene regulation (24%), fewer UTR variants (0.70%), fewer synonymous and

missense variants (0.37% and 0.19% respectively) and 10 times less stop-gained variants (0.0022%).

In contrast, they show more intergenic and intronic variants (16.15% and 57.62%, respectively).

Olfactory and vomeronasal receptor genes as prime candidates

Functional enrichment analyses using the program DAVID were performed on four gene datasets:

genes within 5 kb of outlier SNPs (977 initial genes, 656 *Ensembl* gene IDs passing DAVID database

criteria), the complete list of outlier genes (2118 initial genes, 1181 DAVID gene IDs), the list of

highly significant outlier genes (479 initial genes, 291 DAVID gene IDs) and the list of 'top' outlier

genes (95 initial genes, 64 DAVID gene IDs) (see Table S5 for a complete list of outlier genes, with

their gene names and gene IDs). For the gene set within 5 kb of outlier SNPs, we found 14 highly

significant functional annotation terms (Table S7a) and 17 significant functional annotation

clusters (Table S7b). The three most enriched functional annotation clusters were membrane

proteins, trans-membrane region proteins and olfactory receptor activity; Golgi apparatus, SH3

domain, glycoproteins, reduction-oxidation process and synapse were also part of enriched

annotation clusters (Figure 2b). For outlier gene sets, olfactory receptor types of function were

systematically found the most significantly enriched and enrichment score increased as the set of

outlier genes is narrowed down to the most significant outlier genes (Figure 2b, Table S7c-h). For

the gene sets corresponding to the most promising candidates, we found a very highly significant

enrichment of only one group of functional categories corresponding to olfactory receptor

functions (olfactory receptor/ G-protein-coupled receptor/ GPCR family3 vomeronasal receptor

type2) (Figure 2b & Table S7e-f: highly significant outlier genes $p < 0.01$, Table S7g-h: 'top' outlier

genes).

A total of 127 Olfactory Receptor (*Olfr*) genes and 27 Vomeronasal Receptor (*Vmn*) genes were

identified as outlier genes (mostly on chromosomes 2, 7 and 9), and 55 *Olfr* and 13 *Vmn* are

among the highly significant ($p < 0.01$) outlier genes (Table 1 and Table S5). Consistent with DAVID

functional enrichment results, this corresponds to an over-representation of *Olfr* genes among the

complete list of outlier genes (hypergeometric test, $n_{Olf\ outliers} = 127$, $n_{Olf\ all} = 1356$; $n_{genes\ outliers} =$

2118; $n_{genes\ all} = 50942$, p-value = 1.90 e-17), and an over-representation of both *Olfr* genes (n_{Olf}

$_{outliers} = 55$, $n_{Olf\ all} = 1356$; $n_{genes\ outliers} = 479$; $n_{genes\ all} = 50942$, p-value = 1.37 e-19) and *Vmn* genes (n

$_{Vmn\ outliers} = 13$, $n_{Vmn\ all} = 543$; $n_{genes\ outliers} = 479$; $n_{genes\ all} = 50942$, p-value = 0.0021) among highly

significant outlier genes. Among Vomeronasal Receptor gene candidates, 10 belong to family 1 of

Vomeronasal Receptors and 17 to family 2 of Vomeronasal Receptors (Yang and Zhang 2007;

Zhang et al. 2007), the proportion of family 2 *Vmn* genes increasing when reducing the outlier

gene set to the most significant ones (number of family 1 *Vmn* genes = 1, number of family 2 *Vmn*

genes = 12) (Table 1 and Table S5). The majority of *Olfr* outlier genes are C_{2_mean} outliers while the

majority of *Vmn* outlier genes are C_{2_max} outliers (Table S5). Among the 'top' outlier genes defined

when combining information from the C_{2_mean} and C_{2_max} statistics, we found 23 *Olfr* and 4 *Vmn*

genes (Table 1 and Table S5).

Beyond the over-representation of Olfactory Receptor and Vomeronasal Receptor genes among

outlier gene sets, some of them appeared among the top most significantly differentiated outlier

genes: 10 *Olfr* and *Vmn* are among the 30 most differentiated C_{2_max} outlier genes (*Olfr304*,

Olfr907, *Olfr911-ps1*, *Olfr913*, *Olfr915*, *Olfr908*, *Olfr914*, *Olfr143*, *Olfr906* and *Vmn2r74*) and 8 *Olfr*

among the 30 most differentiated C_{2_mean} outlier genes (*Olfr906*, *Olfr908*, *Olfr914*, *Olfr907*, *Olfr143*,

Olfr151, *Olfr894* and *Olfr1265*) (Table S5). Five *Olfr* genes, all in a gene cluster on chromosome 9,

were common to these two lists and among the 10 most differentiated 'top' outlier genes: *Olfr906*,

Olfr907, *Olfr908*, *Olfr914* and *Olfr143,* with *Olfr906, Olfr907* and *Olfr908* among the 4 most

differentiated 'top' outliers (Table 1 and Table S5). Comparatively to *Olfr* genes, *Vmn* outlier genes

were less found in the very most significantly differentiated genes, but four of them were found in

the list of 'top' outlier genes: *Vmn2r74*, *Vmn2r76*, *Vmn2r70* and *Vmn2r12* (Table S5).

Table 1 also reports, when available from VEP results (Table S6), the functional impact of outlier

SNPs found in candidate outlier *Vmn* and *Olfr* genes. The large majority of reported functional

consequences corresponded to up- and down-stream variants, UTR variants, intronic variants and

synonymous variants. However, five *Olfr* genes on chromosome 9 (*Olfr906*, *Olfr908*, *Olfr915*,

Olfr916 and *Olfr250*) and two receptor genes on chromosome 7 (*Olfr304* and *Vmn2r76*)

additionally showed a missense mutation between Choosy and Non-Choosy populations, and

Olfr891 and *Olfr895* on chromosome 9 showed a stop-gain variant.

Genes that are not Olfactory or Vomeronasal Receptor genes were also among outlier genes

(Table S5). Most of them do not have a well-characterized function, and when they do, their link

with the behavioural phenotype of interest is unclear. We nevertheless noted some genes

involved in gene regulation (*Khsrp*, among the four most differentiated 'top' outlier genes),

regulation of neural genes (*Barhl2*), acting as transcription factor (*Gtf2f1*), or expressed in testes

and potentially inducing male infertility (*Tex21*, *Dazl*).

Genetic characteristics of regions associated with behavioural divergence

Association with some other genomic features

No association with regions of reduced genetic diversity and coldspots of recombination

Genetic diversity Π did not differ significantly between outlier and non-outlier gene regions (Table

S8), indicating that there is no global reduction in genetic diversity in outlier gene regions. To

assess how recombination rate correlates with candidate outlier gene regions, we used

recombination rate estimates provided by Morgan et al. 2017. We found that recombination rates

did not differ significantly between outlier and non-outlier gene regions (Table S8). Of 2118,

196 outlier genes occurred in a recombination coldspot (Figure 3), which did not correspond to an

over-representation of outlier genes in coldspots of recombination (10,000 permutations, Z-score

= -0.379, p = 0.663, Figure S2).

Genetic differentiation outliers do not show SFS-based signatures of selective sweeps

To test whether differentiation-based outlier regions also show a signature of selective sweeps

estimated from SFS-based methods, we run the program POOL-HMM (Boitard et al. 2013) on the

two Choosy populations, the expected targets of reinforcing selection. We found 936 annotated

genes within which at least one significant selective sweep window was detected in the Choosy1-

Borum population, among which 28 C_2 outlier genes (including *Olfr291* on chromosome 7, and

Olfr1328, *Olfr1339*, *Olfr1340* and *Olfr1342* on chromosome 4) (Table S9a). In the Choosy2-Låsby

population, we found 1247 genes with at least one significant selective sweep window, among

which 31 C_2 outlier genes (including *Olfr32*, *Olfr1258* and *Olfr1270* on chr2, and *Olfr62*, *Olfr1339*,

Olfr1340 and *Olfr1342* on chromosome 4) (Table S9b). Overall, we found 118 genes with

significant selective sweep windows in both Choosy populations (expected under a reinforcement

scenario), among which 3 C_2 outlier genes. Those three genes are *Olfr1339*, *Olfr1340* and *Olfr1342*.

No significant overlap between outlier genes and candidate hybrid sterility regions but some
punctual associations exist

We also tested whether outlier genes significantly co-localise with the 54 genomic regions

identified as candidates for hybrid sterility (postmating isolation candidates) between *M. m.*

musculus and *M. m. domesticus* (Turner and Harr 2014; Mukaj et al. 2020). We found that 143

outlier genes identified in our study overlap with candidate sterility regions (see Table S5 and

Figure 3), which is not more than expected by chance (10,000 permutations, Z-score = -2.686, p =

0.997; Figure S3a). However, we found that out of the nine highly supported candidate sterility

regions (i.e. showing concordant association with the two sterility phenotypes: relative testis

weight and testis expression, see (Turner and Harr 2014)), 8 contained at least one outlier gene.

The mean distance between outlier genes and sterility genomic regions was 23.70 Mb, which is

more distant than expected by chance (10,000 permutations, Z-score = 3.929, *p* = 0.0001, Figure

S3b). We note that PRDM9 gene, located on chromosome 17 and known as a major hybrid sterility

gene in the house mouse (Mukaj et al. 2020), is distant by ~ 5 Mb from the closest outlier gene

(*Vmn1r228*, see Table S5).

Clustered distribution of outlier loci in the genome

Signals of outlier SNPs accumulate in two main genomic regions on chromosomes 9 and 7

Data from 10-kb, 50-kb and 100-kb non-overlapping windows were examined, for each

chromosome separately, for autocorrelation in genetic differentiation associated with the

choosy/non-choosy trait, as measured by the BAYPASS C_2 contrast statistic. We found some

significant autocorrelation and partial autocorrelation between neighbouring windows (Figure S4),

with the autocorrelation parameter rho of a first-order autoregressive process estimated between

0.70 and 0.77 (e.g. 50-kb-windows, chr9: rho = 0.74, *p*-value = 0.039). These results indicated that

there is a long-range dependence in genetic differentiation measures (BAYPASS C_2 contrast statistic)

present over distances up to 100 kb. This dependence among C_2 measurements has a conservative

effect on the identification of outlier SNPs: using only FDR and not an adjusted α based on the

autocorrelation estimates, we corrected for an overinflated number of apparently independent

tests, making the *p*-value cut-off conservative. Given this autocorrelation affecting SNP-based C_2

measurements, we applied the local score approach (Fariello et al. 2017) to identify outlier

genomic segments cumulating signals from single SNP markers and characterize their distribution

along the genome. This analysis identified 557 significant local score genomic regions, distributed

on all chromosomes (Figure S5, Table S10 and Figure 3). Their mean size (+/- SE) is 99.139 kb (+/-

SE: 6.528 kb). Two regions stood out as the most significant ones: one 1-Mb long region on

chromosome 9 (peak value of the local score = 12769.03, coordinates: 9:37721717-38752579),

containing 52 outlier genes among which 40 outlier Olfactory Receptor genes (Table S5); one 0.8

Mb long region on chromosome 7 (peak value of the local score = 9260.49, coordinates:

7:85585560-86388933), containing 17 outlier genes, among which 10 Vomeronasal Receptor and

5 Olfactory Receptor outlier genes (Table S5).

Two ~ 2 Mb long Olfactory and Vomeronasal receptor gene clusters on chromosomes 9 and 7

represent the main candidate genomic regions underlying behavioural divergence

Using the expected number of genes per 500 kb and assuming a random genome-wide

distribution, a permutation test showed that outlier genes were not homogeneously distributed

along the genome (*p* = 2e−05, 50,000 permutations) (Figure S6). We, therefore, analysed this

pattern of genomic clustering in more detail, by investigating whether some outlier gene sets were

more clustered in the genome than expected by chance. We identified 63 outlier gene sets found

significantly clustered in the genome (Table S11 and Figure 3). The most significantly clustered

outlier gene sets were found on chromosome 1 (cluster #3, *p* = 9.37E-14), chromosome 5 (cluster

#20, *p* = 7.31E-05), chromosome 9 (cluster #39, *p* = 7.31E-05; cluster #35 (*Olfr* cluster), *p* = 5.24E-

04), chromosome 11 (cluster #49, *p* = 5.24E-04), chromosome 12 (cluster #52, *p* = 5.24E-04) and

chromosome 7 (cluster #28 (*Vmn+Olfr* cluster), *p* = 2.97E-03). The mean size of those significant

outlier gene clusters was 919.88 kb +/- SE: 66.10 kb. The largest gene clusters were found on

chromosome 2 (cluster #6: 3.7 Mb), chromosome 1 (cluster #3: 2.45 Mb), chromosome 7 (cluster

#28 (*Vmn+Olfr* cluster): 2.3 Mb; cluster #30 (*Olfr* cluster): 1.95 Mb) and chromosome 9 (cluster

#35 (*Olfr* cluster): 1.8 Mb). These cluster sizes extend far beyond the estimated mean

autocorrelation effect on each chromosome, present over distances up to 100 kb. Figure 3

recapitulates the distribution of significant local score regions, outlier genes including *Olfr* and

Vmn ones, and significant outlier gene clusters along the genome.

By counting the total number of outlier and 'top' outlier genes and applying weights to this

content (see Table S11 for details), we could identify the gene clusters showing the strongest

degree of genetic differentiation between Choosy and Non-Choosy populations. Three gene

clusters stood out as the most differentiated ones: gene cluster #35 on chromosome 9, gene

cluster #28 on chromosome 7, and to some extent gene cluster #5 on chromosome 2 (Table S11).

Strikingly, these 3 gene clusters correspond to the three main olfactory/vomeronasal receptor

outlier gene clusters: cluster #35 contains 43 *Olfr* outlier genes; cluster #28 contains 14 *Vmn* and 6

Olfr outlier genes; cluster #5 contains 11 *Olfr* outlier genes. These three outlier gene clusters stand

out from genome-wide patterns of differentiation in Figure 3 and the two most important ones on

chromosomes 9 and 7 are detailed in Figure 4. Cluster #35 on chromosome 9 contains the five *Olfr*

outlier genes identified among the 10 most differentiated 'top' outlier genes (Table 1 and Table

S5).

Discussion

In this study, we addressed the genetic basis of assortative mate preferences in the house mouse, expected to be evolving under the action of reinforcing selection, using a population genomics approach coupled with functional predictions. We identified some regions of the genome showing significant and consistent divergence between populations with contrasted behaviours (Choosy populations from the hybrid zone and Non-Choosy populations from allopatric areas). A series of Olfactory and Vomeronasal Receptor (OR and VR) genes, among the most differentiated regions and in line with functional predictions, stand out as the prime candidates potentially underlying this olfactory-based behavioural divergence. Those outlier genes form significantly clustered sets of genes in the genome, with two main candidate gene clusters on chromosomes 9 and 7, extending up to 1.8 Mb and containing several highly significant Olfactory and Vomeronasal receptor outlier genes.

Population genomics and the genetics of complex trait divergence

Population differentiation scans, between two or more populations that differ in a behaviour trait of interest, have rarely been applied to address the genetic basis of complex behaviours (but see (Toews et al. 2019)). However, they can be powerful for mapping genetic variation at a high resolution, can be applied to natural populations, and can additionally provide evidence of selection (Niepoth and Bendesky 2020). Potential drawbacks to these approaches include their agnosticism to phenotypic traits and the challenges to interpret signals of genetic differentiation (e.g. populations often differ in more than one trait, other factors than divergent selection can drive genetic differentiation - Cruickshank & Hahn 2014; Ravinet et al. 2017; Wolf & Ellegren 2017). In this study, we took advantage of this powerful population genomic approach but combined it with specific experimental and data analysis strategies as well as clear functional predictions to overcome its potential limitations and to refine interpretations of the results in terms of genetic variation associated with the observed behavioural divergence.

Our strategy to investigate population differentiation, with whole-genome resequencing data, at different genomic scales (SNPs, genes, different gene-based statistics) enabled us to identify highly supported candidate regions found consistently divergent regardless of the scales and the statistics used, while also characterising more comprehensively the catalogue of genomic regions and architectures potentially underlying this behavioural shift. Genome-wide SNP-based differentiation analyses, despite their limitations (Huang et al. 2011), informed about the respective role of genic versus non-genic regions (mostly regulatory regions) in population

differentiation, while confirming functional enrichment results obtained with gene-based analyses.

However, our study confirmed that genome-wide gene-based differentiation analyses are efficient

for gaining power and precision as well as for facilitating the link with the phenotype of interest

(Neale and Sham 2004; Huang et al. 2011; Chung et al. 2019). The identification of enriched

functional categories and the most promising individual genes was eased. Moreover, by capturing

different potential underlying genetic architectures of adaptive divergence (single causal variant

versus multiple weakly selected variants within a gene) (Wang et al. 2017), the two different gene-

based statistics (C_{2_max} and C_{2_mean}) provided two lists of outlier genes partially overlapping but also

complementary. For example, most Olfactory Receptor candidates are C_{2_mean} outlier genes, while

most Vomeronasal Receptor ones are C_{2_max} outlier genes.

The use of the C_2 contrast statistic of BAYPASS enabled us to assess genetic differentiation based on

contrasts of allele frequencies corrected for population structure (Olazcuaga et al. 2021). The

combination of biological replicates per behaviour group and multiple population comparisons

(Focal and Control tests) allowed us to identify the genomic regions consistently differentiated

between Choosy and Non-Choosy populations, beyond population-specific differentiation (Figure

1). These multi-way comparisons across populations had been advocated as a promising way

forward to separate processes acting similarly on all populations from processes that are specific

to a single population or population comparison (Wolf and Ellegren 2017) but are rarely

implemented (but see Roesti *et al.* 2014; Vijay *et al.* 2016). In our study, this procedure narrowed

down the list of genomic regions of interest, the control test removing respectively 26% and 7.65%

of the outlier SNPs and genes, with the final sets of outlier SNPs and genes eventually representing

0.017% and ~5 % of the total number of SNPs and annotated genes in the dataset. Yet, this

corresponds to a relatively large number of outlier SNPs and genes (4818 and 2118 respectively)

that show the expected patterns of genetic differentiation associated with behavioural divergence

and reinforcement.

Importantly, we do not expect all of these differentiated genomic regions between Choosy and

Non-Choosy populations to be involved in the observed behavioural divergence nor to be subject

to reinforcing selection. Because these sets of populations can differ in more than one trait and

selective regime, some differentiated regions may not affect the behaviour of interest. Moreover,

hitchhiking effects can induce genetic differentiation at variants in the vicinity of causal variants.

By selecting populations that are known to show distinct mating preferences despite being closely

related and inhabiting a similar environment (in Jutland Denmark, separated by no more than 50

km), we minimized the risk of confounding selective effects, but the list of outlier loci extends very

likely beyond the variants directly associated with the behavioural divergence. One key step of this

study was therefore to confront genome scan results with functional predictions, here available from a series of previous studies that had characterised the behaviour of interest in detail (Smadja and Ganem 2002; Smadja et al. 2004; Smadja and Ganem 2005; Ganem et al. 2008). Matching very clear functional analyses' results (functional enrichment, nature of outlier genes), indicating a prominent role of some olfactory and vomeronasal receptor genes, with information on the involvement of olfactory-based processes in the expression of assortative mate preferences, provides very strong support for considering these highly significantly differentiated olfactory and vomeronasal receptor genes as the prime candidates potentially associated with behavioural divergence and reinforcing selection (Table 1). Since our previous studies had shown that individuals from Non-Choosy populations can discriminate between mating signals of the two subspecies, but do not establish a directional mate choice (Smadja and Ganem 2005; Smadja and Ganem 2008), the genomic regions identified in our study likely underlie the evolution of choosiness rather than discrimination. Our study illustrates the importance of integrating detailed phenotypic characterisation with genomic data to gain power and accuracy in population genomic approaches that tackle the genetics of complex trait divergence.

Genetic architecture of candidate regions and selective regimes

Autocorrelation analyses indicated a long-range dependence in genetic differentiation measures present over distances up to 100 kb, consistent with previous estimates of background linkage disequilibrium in wild house mouse genomes (Laurie et al. 2007; Staubach et al. 2012) and that could inflate the number of outlier loci (Hahn 2006). However, local score analyses (Fariello et al. 2017), which take into account this autocorrelation and background linkage disequilibrium, consistently pointed to numerous outlier local score genomic segments spread across several chromosomes (Figure 3). Whatever the criteria we applied (significance, consistency across analyses and statistics) to stringently narrow down the list of candidate genes and genomic regions, evidence supports a highly polygenic basis underlying the mate preference shift. From the initial list of 2118 outlier genes containing 127 Olfactory receptor (*Olfr*) and 27 Vomeronasal receptor (*Vmn*) genes, the most restricted set of 'top' outlier genes still include 95 genes spread across several chromosomes and among which 23 are *Olfr* and 4 are *Vmn* genes. A highly polygenic basis is expected for this complex olfactory-based behaviour and is in line with the few studies addressing the genetics of variation in olfactory-mediated behaviours in insects (Swarup et al. 2013; Arya et al. 2015) and mammals (Santos et al. 2018).

Given the highly polygenic nature of genetic architecture underlying the behavioural shift and the apparent strong linkage disequilibrium among genes involved in this phenotypic divergence,

candidate loci are likely under polygenic selection, expected for such complex traits (Latta 1998;

Sella and Barton 2019). The fact that we did not find signatures of selective sweeps using SFS-

based methods in most candidate outlier regions may be another indication of polygenic

adaptation, known to be more detectable with pairwise tests for allelic differentiation (Stölting et

al. 2015; Schneider et al. 2021). This result may also suggest that those candidate regions are more

likely subject to soft sweeps than hard sweeps (Wang et al. unpublished data). Since outlier gene

regions are not associated with regions of reduced genetic diversity or reduced recombination

rate, a general effect of background selection inflating the levels of genetic differentiation in our

data seems unlikely. However, further analyses on individual data would be necessary to get fine-

scale estimates of recombination rate along these genomes. Interestingly, previous studies have

shown that polygenic adaptation can play a major role in the evolution of species-specific innate

behaviours through the modifications of pre-existing genetic networks (Anholt 2020) and in the

rapid evolution of chemosensory systems (Librado and Rozas 2016).

Another striking result is that outlier loci showed consistent signals clustered distributions in the

genome. While the signals of outlier SNPs via local score analyses accumulated in two main

genomic regions on chromosomes 9 and 7, clustering analyses of outlier genes consistently

identified numerous sets of genes significantly clustered in the genome, amongst which the two

most significant clusters pinpointing the same candidate regions on chromosomes 9 and 7. These

two clusters of outlier genes contain several candidate olfactory and/or vomeronasal receptor

genes and extend up to 1.8 Mb (Figure 4). These patterns suggest strong linkage disequilibrium in

these large candidate regions, potentially indicative of the strength of selection acting on its

targets or of complex correlations among loci belonging to the same gene regulatory network

(Fagny and Austerlitz 2021). Within these clusters, it is difficult to say which genes and nucleotides

are the direct targets of selection and pinpointing individual genes' contributions to the observed

behavioural shift in these genomic clusters will require additional experiments. Nevertheless,

some outlier genes are more significantly differentiated than others in those clusters and can be

considered prime candidates (*Vmn2r70*, *Vmn2r74*, *Vmn2r76*, *Olfr304* and *Olfr308* in the cluster on

chromosome 7; *Olfr143*, *Olfr906*, *Olfr907*, *Olfr908* and *Olfr914* in the cluster on chromosome 9).

The source of this genetic variation specific to the *M. m. musculus* Choosy populations is still

unknown. Considering our results, it may originate from standing variation present in allopatric

populations or differential introgression of *Mus musculus domesticus* alleles across the hybrid

zone. The large genomic clusters identified as outlier regions could fit the second scenario, which

echoes the recent evidence of adaptive introgression of OR and VR gene clusters across species

boundaries in the *Mus* genus (Baird et al. unpublished data; Ullrich et al. unpublished data; Banker

et al. 2022). This scenario would be compatible with the role of these genomic regions in

reproductive isolation with the nearby subspecies *M. m. domesticus*: the selective pressure of

reinforcement could have favoured the adaptive introgression of alleles conferring choosiness on

either side of the hybrid zone, the direction of the choice being expressed according to the

genomic background, including at the mating signal loci, of the individuals. It would correspond to

a case of one-allele mechanism (at the preference loci) and of a matching rule for assortative

mating, which is known to favour the evolution and maintenance of the barrier trait in the context

of gene flow (Kopp et al. 2018). Additional genomic data for *M. m. domesticus* populations from

the other side of the hybrid zone in Denmark would be needed to first test if variation comes from

introgression.

Overall, these results on the genetic architecture and selective regimes associated with the

divergence in mate preferences correspond to theoretical predictions for loci involved in

adaptation and reinforcement. Concentrated architectures of adaptive loci are expected in the

presence of gene flow (Yeaman and Whitlock 2011; Yeaman 2013), and fit with the few other

empirical studies testing for this pattern of clustering in natural systems (e.g. (Fustier et al. 2017;

Roda et al. 2017). Moreover, the selective regime of reinforcement corresponds to indirect

selection on prezygotic isolating traits in hybrid zone populations, usually from standing genetic

variation present in allopatry (Felsenstein 1981; Kirkpatrick and Servedio 1999) via linkage

disequilibrium between loci under direct selection (hybrid sterility genes) and assortative mating

loci. We did not find any significant co-localisation between known candidate hybrid sterility

genomic regions (Turner and Harr 2014) and outlier regions that could have facilitated the

maintenance of linkage disequilibrium among those co-adapted traits (mate preference and

hybrid sterility), but linkage disequilibrium can still evolve and be maintained between unlinked or

loosely linked and is not necessary under the scenario mentioned above of a case of one-allele

mechanism (Servedio 2009; Butlin and Smadja 2018; Hench et al. 2019). Our study, therefore,

provides an important addition to the rare studies that have investigated the genetics of

reinforcement (Ortiz-Barrientos et al. 2004; Hopkins and Rausher 2011; Ospina et al. 2021), by

testing predictions on expected genomic patterns of differentiation to characterize the genetic

basis of a complex premating isolating trait and the genomic signatures of reinforcing selection

acting on it.

The role of Olfactory and Vomeronasal Receptor genes in the evolution of mate choice divergence

Chemoreceptor genes are one of the most extensive and diverse multigene families in most

vertebrate and non-vertebrate genomes (Sánchez-Gracia et al. 2011; Ibarra-Soria, M. Levitin, et al.

2014; Benton 2015; Bear et al. 2016). Yet, their precise role in key evolutionary processes such as adaptation and speciation remains largely unknown, although chemosensory processes have been identified as key players at the phenotypic level (Smadja and Butlin 2009). Comparative analyses have provided great insights into the role of OR or VR repertoire evolution in diversification and ecological adaptations (e.g. dietary specialisation (Hayden et al. 2014; Yohe et al. 2021); adaptation to different life-styles (Shi and Zhang 2007; Hayden et al. 2010; Khan et al. 2015; Jiao et al. 2019). At microevolutionary scales, studies are scarce due to the difficulty of analysing these gene families and linking their genetic variation to relevant adaptive phenotypes and selective regimes (but see (Smadja et al. 2012; Li et al. 2015; Poelstra et al. 2018; Auer et al. 2020). Our study provides one of the clearest and most detailed examples of the involvement of olfactory and vomeronasal receptors in the evolution of an adaptive behavioural trait, assortative mate choice, and how natural selection drives their genetic divergence.

Our results indicated the highly significant enrichment of this category of receptor genes among outlier genomic regions (Figure 2B), in agreement with our functional prediction. Most Olfactory and Vomeronasal receptor outlier genes belong to OR class II and VR type 2 gene superfamilies, which can both be involved in odorant and pheromone recognition (Vargas-Barroso et al. 2017). Some Olfactory Receptors, all on chromosome 9, are among the 10 most differentiated 'top' outlier genes (*Olfr906*, *Olfr907*, *Olfr908*, *Olfr914* and *Olfr143*)*,* with *Olfr906, Olfr907* and *Olfr908* among the four most differentiated ones. Comparatively to Olfactory Receptors, Vomeronasal Receptors are slightly less differentiated but we identified four of them among the 'top' outlier genes: *Vmn2r74*, *Vmn2r76*, *Vmn2r70* and *Vmn2r12.* This indicates that divergence of these categories of receptor genes concerns both differences in the number of receptors involved and the degree of differentiation affecting some of them.

General variant effect predictor analyses pointed to the possible dual role of regulatory and protein-coding changes in the evolution of behavioural divergence, with the presence of missense and stop gained variants as well as variants in already known regulatory regions or putative regulatory regions in downstream / upstream gene regions (Figure 2A). For candidate *Olfr* and *Vmn* genes, many SNP variants fall within upstream or downstream gene regions, UTR regions or intronic regions potentially affecting gene regulation, but we identified a few protein-coding changes affecting *Olfr250*, *Olfr906*, *Olfr908*, *Olfr915*, *Olfr916* in the candidate cluster on chromosome 9, and *Olfr304* and *Vmn2r76* in the cluster on chromosome 7 (Table 1). Consistent with a putative role of regulatory changes are the results of two of our previous studies investigating the expression and copy-number divergence between the same Choosy and Non-Choosy populations. We found significant differential expression at some Vomeronasal Receptor

genes expressed in the vomeronasal organ (Loire et al. 2017), four out of five (*Vmn2r69*, *Vmn2r70*,

Vmn2r73, *Vmn2r75*) being among the *Vmn* outlier genes identified in the present study and all

belonging to the promising candidate gene cluster on chromosome 7. Similar investigations will

be needed on the main olfactory epithelium to test for changes in expression affecting *Olfr* genes.

We also identified deletions specific to the Choosy populations in upstream or intronic regions of

some Olfactory Receptor genes (*Olfr907* in the candidate cluster on chromosome 9, *Olfr301*, in the

candidate cluster on chromosome 7, *Olfr564* and *Olfr461* on chromosomes 7 and 6), that could

affect their expression or the expression of nearby *Olfr* genes (North et al. 2020). The combination

of nucleotide, structural and expression variation primarily at Olfactory and Vomeronasal Receptor

genes could therefore shape the evolution of this complex behavioural trait under selection

(Niepoth and Bendesky 2020; Fagny and Austerlitz 2021).

The Olfactory and Vomeronasal Receptor prime candidates are members of some specific

phylogenetic clades of closely-related receptors within the respective gene superfamilies: prime

candidate *Olfr* genes belong to clade 8 (chromosome 9), clade 4 (chromosome 2) and clades 6 and

14 (chromosome 7) of the OR class II superfamily, while prime candidate *Vmn* genes belong mostly

to clade 3 (and one to clade 6) of the V2R gene superfamily (Chamero et al. 2012; Olender et al.

2020). Although the molecular, neurogenetic and physiological bases of olfaction are the focus of

extensive research efforts in vertebrates, and in humans and mice in particular (Chamero et al.

2012; Hayden and Teeling 2014; Ibarra-Soria, M. Levitin, et al. 2014; Bear et al. 2016), very little is

known about the functional characterisation of individual receptors. The mouse ORs identified in

our study have not been functionally characterised (we just found that *Olfr913* is an ortholog to a

musk receptor in humans (Ahmed et al. 2018) and is a eugenol-responsive receptor in mice

(McClintock et al. 2014)). For VRs, most insights come from Isogai *et al.*'s study (Isogai et al. 2011).

They showed that individual V2Rs are specifically tuned to detect the nature of the signal emitter

(e.g., sex of conspecifics, heterospecifics, individual recognition), whereas individual V1Rs are

activated by cues from multiple species. They also found that distinct mouse VR receptor

subfamilies have evolved towards the specific recognition of certain animal groups (heterospecific

signals from predators or sympatric closely related species/subspecies, male or female conspecific

signals) or chemical structures (volatile steroids, non-volatile proteins). Interestingly, some

members of V2R clades 3 and 6 (our main VR candidate clusters) were shown to be involved in the

recognition of closely-related and sympatric species or conspecifics of the opposite sex, leading

the authors to suggest that "through the activation of specialized receptors, *M. musculus* may

readily discriminate scents emitted by closely related but reproductively incompatible species, a

property that could be linked to the reproductive isolation of these species". Considering the

results of our study, and if we extrapolate Isogai's results to ORs, we can hypothesize a

specialization of some VR and OR gene clusters towards the function of assortative mating in the

hybrid zone. An interesting follow-up from our work would be to apply the methods developed by

Isogai et al. to functionally characterize our candidate ORs and VRs in wild mice using stimuli from

the two subspecies.

 Material and Methods

Samples

We trapped *M. m. musculus* wild adult mice in Jutland, Denmark in several sites (indoor farms and

other human dwellings) and maintained them in the laboratory under controlled conditions before

being behaviourally tested and euthanized for dissection. Sampling sites represented two distinct

geographical areas in Jutland, which are characterised by populations with distinct mate

preference behaviours but sufficiently geographically close to avoid any geographical effect of

distant allopatry: (1) the border of the hybrid zone on the *M. m. musculus* side (50 km North to the

genetic centre of the hybrid zone (defined in Raufaste et al. 2005)) where strong assortative

mating was previously documented (Smadja et al. 2004; Smadja and Ganem 2005; Ganem et al.

2008) and confirmed on these newly sampled populations (Latour et al. 2014; Smadja et al. 2015)

('Choosy' populations), (2) another area in Jutland but further north from the hybrid zone, where a

previous study did not find any significant directional mate preference in these sampled

populations ('Non-Choosy' populations) (Latour et al. 2014; Smadja et al. 2015).

Two populations per geographical area were included as biological replicates, each composed of

several trapping sites (four populations in total, hereafter called « Borum Choosy1 », « Låsby

Choosy2 », « Hobro Non-Choosy1 » and « Randers Non-Choosy2) (see Figure 1a and Table S1 for a

detailed sample description). For all individuals from each of the four populations n_{Borum} = 33, $n_{Låsby}$

= 27, n_{Hobro} = 29, $n_{Randers}$ = 29), spleen was extracted rapidly after death by cervical dislocation,

immersed in ethanol and stored at -80°C. We extracted genomic DNA from individual mouse

spleens, using the Macherey-Nagel kit standard protocol.

Data generation and variant processing

Whole-genome re-sequencing. To assess genomic divergence in two independent comparisons of

Choosy and Non-Choosy populations, at the level of the whole genome (genome size: 2.7 Gb), we

carried out a pool-sequencing approach. Pooled samples representing each population were

obtained by mixing individual DNA extracts from each population in equimolar proportions.

Library preparation and sequencing were carried out at the MGX-Montpellier GenomiX platform

(Institut de Génomique Fonctionnelle - Institut de Génétique Humaine, Montpellier, France).

Sequencing libraries (average insert size: 478 bp (Borum Choosy1), 497 bp (Låsby Choosy2), 478 bp

(Hobro Non-Choosy1) and 445 bp (Randers Non-Choosy2)) were prepared using two methods to

increase sequence diversity: Illumina TruSeq DNA Sample Prep Kit v2 (three-quarters of samples),

and Illumina Nextera DNA sample preparation kit. Overall, ¾ of all sequence data was obtained

using the TruSeq protocol. All libraries were sequenced on an Illumina HiSeq2000 machine using a

paired-end 100-bp read-length protocol, targeting an average raw coverage per pool of 30X,

chosen as a cost-effective optimum given the large house mouse genome and pool size/pool

coverage balance recommendation for pool-seq sequencing (Futschik and Schlotterer 2010;

Gautier et al. 2013; Schlötterer et al. 2014). Sequencing reads were trimmed and cleaned of

adaptor sequences using Trimmomatic (Bolger et al. 2014).

Mapping, SNP identification and filtering. We applied stringent and optimized mapping and SNP

filtering conditions to obtain accurate allele frequency estimations from pool-seq data (Gautier et

al. 2013; Schlötterer et al. 2014). The program Bowtie2 v2.2.3 (Langmead and Salzberg 2012) was

used to map the reads against the house mouse reference genome (http://www.ensembl.org/,

version GRCm38.p2), with the –very-sensitive-local option to get a stringent alignment and a

fragment size limit of 600 (-X parameter) to increase the number of concordant mapping count

and reduce the discordant mapping count. The Samtools suite v1.3.1 (Li et al. 2009) was used to

sort, index and filter for read duplicates the resulting BAM files. An overview of sequencing and

mapping statistics can be found in Table S2. BAM files were combined into mpileup files and *sync*

files (using samtools mpileup and mpileup2sync.pl script from Popoolation2 package (Kofler et al.

2011)) and first filtered based on base quality (min-qual 20). We filtered out *sync* files for indels

using Popoolation2, and developed a custom Python script to further filter bi-allelic SNP variants

based on minimum coverage (= 10X), maximum coverage (= 100X, to avoid repeated/duplicated

regions of the genome), and minimum count of minor allele (= 3). Minimum and maximum

coverage filters were applied per population, and a minimum allele count filter was applied across

all populations. From this set of filtered SNPs, we estimated mean population genetic diversity Π

(NPSTAT package v1, Ferretti et al. 2013) and pairwise-population F_{ST} (Pool-Seq estimator

implemented in the *poolfstat* R package, Hivert et al. 2018; Gautier et al. 2022) to describe the

populations under study (Figure 1a).

Identification of SNPs and genes associated with behavioural divergence and under divergent selection

Population contrasts and BAYPASS procedure. We used the program BAYPASS v2.2 (Gautier 2015)

to identify Single-Nucleotide-Polymorphisms (SNPs) significantly and repeatedly divergent

between Choosy and Non-Choosy populations, i.e. associated with the observed behavioural

divergence between these populations. BAYPASS implements a method accounting for the neutral

correlation of allele frequencies across populations to detect loci under selection or associated

with covariables. We used BAYPASS to estimate the scaled covariance matrices (Ω) of the

population allele frequencies for autosomal and X-linked SNPs (Figure 1b). This matrix captures

information about the shared demographic history of the sampled populations which is expected

to differ between autosomes and the X chromosome (Clemente et al. 2018). Using our repeated

experimental design (two biological replicates per behavioural group), we relied on the recently

implemented C_2 statistic of BAYPASS (Olazcuaga et al. 2021) to contrast SNP allele frequencies

corrected for the global effect of the shared population history captured by the matrix Ω on their

covariance between the two groups of populations specified by the behavioural trait. This

approach allows correcting for population structure to identify SNP associated with binary co-

variables characterizing the populations under study which here consisted of two distinct

comparisons (Figure 1c). First, the Focal Test consisted in estimating the contrast statistic between

the two groups of populations with contrasted mating behaviours: Choosy1+Choosy2 versus Non-

Choosy1+Non-Choosy2 populations. This test aimed at identifying SNPs showing significant

association with the behavioural contrast between Choosy and Non-Choosy populations. To

further remove outlier loci from the Focal Test that would not show a consistent divergence

between both Choosy and both Non-Choosy populations, we carried out a Control Test. This

control test estimates the contrast statistic between two other combinations of the same

populations, this time not grouped by their behavioural profile (one Choosy and one Non-Choosy

population per group) (Figure 1c). We used the inference of genetic relationships among

populations based on the Ω matrix estimated by BAYPASS (see Figure 1b) to maximize the distance

between the control groups (i.e. comparing Choosy1+Non-Choosy2 versus Choosy2+Non-Choosy1)

to perform the most stringent control contrast. SNPs and genes found to be significantly divergent

in the Focal Test but also found to be significantly divergent in the Control Test (potentially

reflecting population-specific divergence in the Focal Test) were removed from the final list of

candidate loci.

Custom scripts were used to format filtered *sync* files into BAYPASS input files. We run BAYPASS

separately for the autosomes and the X chromosome and specified the pool haploid sample sizes

to activate the Pool-Seq mode of BAYPASS. For the autosomes, the pool haploid sizes were simply

based on sample sizes ($n_{\_aut\_Borum-Choosy1}$ = 66; $n_{\_aut\_Låsby-Choosy2}$ = 54; $n_{\_aut\_Hobro-NonChoosy1}$ = 58; $n_{\_aut\_Randers-NonChoosy2}$ = 58). For the X chromosome, we adapted the haploid pool size information to the

effective sex ratio of each pool (Table S1; $n_{\_chrX\_Borum-Choosy1}$ = 48; $n_{\_chrX\_Låsby-Choosy2}$= 41; $n_{\_chrX\_Hobro-NonChoosy1}$ = 45; $n_{\_chrX\_Randers-NonChoosy2}$ = 43). We used the BAYPASS core model with default options for

the MCMC algorithm to obtain estimates of the scaled covariance matrix (Ω) and the C_2 contrast

statistic. Following the BAYPASS manual instructions, the autosomal dataset was divided into sub-

datasets of 110,905 SNPs (by taking one SNP every 250 SNPs along each chromosome) and three

independent runs (using option -seed) were performed to assess the reproducibility of the MCMC

estimates. We found a fairly high correlation across the different independent runs for the

different estimators (Pearson's $r > 0.95$ for the C_2 estimator) and thus only presented results from

the first run. Similarly, a near-perfect correlation of the posterior means of the estimated Ω matrix

elements was observed across independent runs as well as within each run across SNP subsamples,

with the corresponding FMD distances (Gautier 2015) being always <0.4. We thus only reported

BAYPASS results that were obtained from a single randomly chosen sub-dataset analysed in the first

run.

Identification of outlier SNPs. For both the Focal and Control Tests, we computed SNP-based *p*-

values from the C_2 values, the C_2 statistic following a Chi-squared distribution with one degree of

freedom under the null hypothesis of no association (Olazcuaga et al. 2021). We identified outlier

SNPs in the Focal Test (Choosy versus Non-Choosy) after correcting for multiple testing (*FDR* <

0.05). Only outlier SNPs that were not significantly differentiated in the Control Test (*p*-values >

0.05 without correction for multiple testing) were retained for further analyses.

Identification of outlier genes. Gene annotations were obtained from ENSEMBL v90

(Mus_musculus.GRCm38.90.geneset). Using SNP-based C_2 estimates and the BEDTOOLS suite

v2.16.1 (Quinlan and Hall 2010) (*bedtools map*), we computed for each annotated gene in the

house mouse genome two gene-based differentiation statistics: C_{2_max} and C_{2_mean}, corresponding

to the highest SNP-based C_2 value of a gene and the average C_2 value of a gene, respectively.

These two gene-based statistics correspond to two groups of gene-based methods: C_{2_max} has the

advantage of detecting genes with a single main causal variant while reducing the total number of

tests, while C_{2_mean} appropriately captures the combined effect of multiple small-effect SNP

variants within a gene (Wang et al. 2017). Since we had no *a priori* knowledge of the genetic

architecture of our phenotype of interest (mate preference), nor on which one of the test statistics

was optimal for our analysis, we used those two different statistics and reported as outlier genes

those showing significant C_{2_max} or C_{2_mean} statistics. The significance of each gene-based

differentiation statistic was assessed using custom permutation procedures. C_{2_max} estimates are

influenced by the nucleotide diversity of each gene: the larger the number of SNPs it contains, the

more likely are extreme C_{2_max} values. Thus, our permutation procedure consisted in sampling SNP-

based C_2 values among gene sequences (including introns) in the genome equal to the number of

SNPs in the focal gene. We then recorded the maximum C_2 value of the sample and generated a

random distribution specific to the tested gene by repeating the resampling 10,000 times. C_{2_mean}

estimates are further influenced by gene length, a proxy for the degree of linkage disequilibrium

among SNPs occurring in a given gene. To control for polymorphism and gene length in this

permutation procedure, we thus sampled, for each gene, genomic fragments with satisfied two

conditions: i) the same number of SNPs and ii) a length in base pairs not deviating from more than

10% of the observed one. For each fragment that satisfied these conditions (and thus mimicked

the genomic properties of the gene), we calculated C_{2_mean}. Repeating this process 10,000 for each

gene allowed us to estimate an empirical p-value for the observed gene-based C_{2_mean} statistic.

Significant genes (for C_{2_max} or C_{2_mean}) in each population comparison (Focal, Control) were

therefore those with $p\text{-}values$ < 0.05 or 0.01 (see below).

Only outlier genes that were significantly differentiated in the Focal comparison (p-values < 0.05)

and not significantly differentiated in the Control comparison (p-values > 0.05) were retained. We

defined as the final and complete list of outlier genes the union of C_{2_max} and C_{2_mean} outlier genes

so that C_{2_max} specific and C_{2_mean} specific outlier genes are taken into account. All downstream

analyses were performed on this set of outlier genes (with two stringency categories: p-values <

0.05 or p-values < 0.01). However, we also defined a restricted list of outlier genes (hereafter

called 'top outlier genes'), identified as highly differentiated based on the combined information

from the two C_{2_max} and C_{2_mean} contrast statistics. To implement this classification, we first

assigned each outlier gene to a significance category for each gene-based statistic (1: most

significant; 5: least significant), assigned weights to these categories and calculated an overall

differentiation score as the sum of the weights obtained from C_{2_max} and C_{2_mean} information.

Genes were classified as 'top outlier genes' when showing a minimum overall differentiation score

of 10.

Functional and genomic characteristics of candidate genomic regions

Functional analyses of candidate genomic regions. The final set of outlier SNPs inferred from the

combination of the Focal and Control BayPass Tests was analysed using the ENSEMBL Variant Effect

Predictor (VEP) (McLaren et al. 2016) to annotate outlier SNPs in coding and non-coding genomic

regions as well as to determine their impact on the protein sequence or gene regulation. We used

the program DAVID v6.8 (Huang et al. 2009) to carry out functional annotation analyses on both

outlier SNP and gene sets. Enriched annotation terms were identified using a significance

threshold of 0.01 (EASE score) after Benjamini & Hochberg's correction. To reduce the functional

redundancy among annotation terms, we also carried out Functional Annotation Clustering

analyses provided by DAVID, which report functional groups with similar annotation terms

(significant enrichment score (i.e. the geometric mean of all the enrichment p-values (EASE scores)

for each annotation term associated with the gene members in the group) > 1.3). Over-

representation of some candidate gene families such as Olfactory Receptor (*Olfr*) and

Vomerosanal Receptor (*Vmn*) genes among outlier gene sets was tested using hypergeometric

tests (*phyper* R function).

Genomic features associated with outlier gene regions. We used the NPSTAT package v1 (Ferretti

et al. 2013) to estimate nucleotide diversity Π (Tajima 1983), measured as the average pairwise

nucleotide diversity for a given position across all reads and summing it over all positions, and

Watterson's theta θ (Watterson 1975) statistics in 5 kb and 50 kb non-overlapping windows across

all 20 chromosomes for each of the four studied populations. Using the BEDTOOLS (bedtools flank

and map) and custom scripts, we computed nucleotide diversity Π for all annotated gene regions

(gene sequence +/- 5 kb) and tested for differences between outlier and non-outlier gene regions

using Kruskall-Wallis tests. POOL-HMM v1.4.3 program (Boitard et al. 2013) was used to detect

selective sweep windows across the genome in each of the two Choosy populations, using

estimates of Watterson's θ provided by NPSTAT.

We tested for non-random co-localization of candidate outlier genes identified in this study with

(i) coldspots of recombination reported by Morgan et al. 2017 and (ii) candidate hybrid sterility

genomic regions between *M. m. musculus* and *M. m. domesticus* identified by Turner and Harr

2014. Candidate hybrid sterility regions correspond to the 53 GWAS genomic regions significantly

associated with relative weight testis variation (named RTW regions) and/or testis expression

variation (named PC regions) (Turner and Harr 2014). We added to this list of candidate genes the

gene *PRDM9* (chr17:15543079-15564354) known as a major hybrid sterility gene in the house

mouse. We counted the number of outlier genes overlapping these two genomic region sets

(coldspots of recombination and candidate sterility regions) and used permutations to assess

whether outlier genes overlap significantly more than by chance with these genomic elements

(outlier genes resampled 10,000 times among all annotated genes). To perform these permutation

tests, we used the bioconductor *RegioneR* (Gel et al. 2015) package in R version 3.6.2 (R Core

Team 2019). We also performed a Kruskall-Wallis test to investigate whether recombination rates

differ significantly between outlier and non-outlier gene regions.

Genomic distribution of outlier SNPs and genes

Outlier SNPs. We first estimated the autocorrelation between linked loci in the level of genetic

differentiation (BAYPASS SNP-based contrast statistics C_2) using a first-order autoregressive model

(Hahn 2006). For each chromosome, 10 kb, 50 kb and 100 kb non-overlapping windows were

analysed for autocorrelation and partial autocorrelation in C_2 (using the *acf* and *pacf* R functions

respectively). We then applied the local score approach (Fariello et al. 2017), which accounts for

linkage disequilibrium using autocorrelation information, to identify outlier genomic segments

cumulating signals from single SNP markers and characterize their distribution along the genome.

We looked at the distribution of $-\log_{10}(p\text{-value})$ to determine the tuning parameter ξ, which must

be comprised between mean($-\log_{10}(p\text{-value})$) (here equal to 0.425) and max($-\log_{10}(p\text{-value})$) (here

equal to 10.365). We chose a value of $\xi = 1$ to run the excursions of the Lindley process so that we

could expect cumulating a larger number of intermediate signals and the identification of wider

outlier regions, putting more emphasis on recent soft or incomplete sweeps. Although this

method does not provide absolute information about the number and the size of candidate

genomic regions since they depend on the tuning parameter ξ, it is useful to identify regions with

outstanding genetic differentiation between populations and the genomic range at which

cumulating effects at multiple differentiated SNPs spread.

Outlier genes. We first assessed whether outlier genes were distributed heterogeneously in the

genome (permutation procedure testing whether the observed number of outlier genes per 500

kb was larger or smaller than expected by chance). We then performed a cluster analysis

(developed by (Haque et al. 2016)) to identify the number, location and size of outlier gene

clusters in the genome. For the clustering approach, the window size used was 500 kb (basal

autocorrelation being non-significant at distance > 100 kb) and this 500-kb window was shifted 50

kb at a time in an overlapped fashion. For each sliding window, the number of outlier genes was

counted. The sliding window was used from the start of the chromosome until the end for each

chromosome separately. Once the number of outlier genes had been calculated for each window a

z-test was used to calculate the z-score for each window from which the p-value was calculated.

Any window with a p-value < 0.05 was taken as statistically significant in the over-representation

of outlier genes. Windows falling within 50,000 bases (consecutive windows) of each other were

merged to create final clusters. We graphically represented the distribution of significant local

score segments, outlier genes and outlier gene clusters along the genome using the Gtrellis v1.4.2

package (Gu et al. 2016).

Data accessibility

Raw mapping files (BAM files) and metadata have been uploaded to the Short Read Archive (SRA,

NCBI) under the bioproject ID PRJNA603262.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank very much Josette Catalan, Marco Perriat-Sanguinet, Yamin Latour for their help in collecting mice in Denmark, the Danish farmers for their hospitality, as well as Giveskud zoo personnel. We thank Janice Britton-Davidian, Josette Catalan and Marco Perriat-Sanguinet for their help in dissecting mice. We are very also grateful to Leslie Turner and Bettina Harr for sharing with us candidate hybrid sterility region genomic coordinates. This work was supported by the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme [FP7/2007-2013] – Marie Curie European Reintegration Grant (ERG), under Grant agreement n°PERG06-GA-2009-251008, as well as from the Agence Nationale pour la Recherche (ANR) under Grant agreement No. 2010BLAN171401-AssortMate.

Authors' Contributions

CMS: conceptualization, funding acquisition, data analyses, study and data analyses supervision, drafting the article; EL: bioinformatic developments and data analyses; PC: sampling and DNA sample preparation; DS: library preparation and sequencing; MG: BayPass analyses; GG: participation to research formulation, funding acquisition, sampling. All authors contributed to revising and editing the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors have declared that no competing interests exist

References

Ahmed L, Zhang Y, Block E, Buehl M, Corr MJ, Cormanich RA, Gundala S, Matsunami H, O'Hagan D, Ozbil M,
et al. 2018. Molecular mechanism of activation of human musk receptors OR5AN1 and OR1A1 by (R)-
muscone and diverse other musk-smelling compounds. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 115:E3950–E3958.

Albrechtova J, Albrecht T, Baird SJE, Macholán M, Rudolfsen G, Munclinger P, Tucker PK, Piálek J. 2012.
Sperm-related phenotypes implicated in both maintenance and breakdown of a natural species barrier
in the house mouse. *Proc. R. Soc. B*:rspb20121802.

Anholt RRH. 2020. Evolution of Epistatic Networks and the Genetic Basis of Innate Behaviors. *Trends Genet.*
36:24–29.

Arguello JR, Benton R. 2017. Open questions: Tackling Darwin's "instincts": the genetic basis of behavioral
evolution. *BMC Biol.* [Internet] 15:26. Available from:
http://bmcbiol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12915-017-0369-3

Arya GH, Magwire MM, Huang W, Serrano-Negron YL, Mackay TFC, Anholt RRH. 2015. The genetic basis for
variation in olfactory behavior in drosophila melanogaster. *Chem. Senses* 40:233–243.

Auer TO, Khallaf MA, Silbering AF, Zappia G, Ellis K, Álvarez-Ocaña R, Arguello JR, Hansson BS, Jefferis GSXE,
Caron SJC, et al. 2020. Olfactory receptor and circuit evolution promote host specialization. *Nature*
579:402–408.

Baird SJE, Petružela J, Jaroň I, Škrabánek P, Martínková N. Genome polarisation for detecting barriers to
geneflow. *bioRxiv* [Internet]:2022.03.24.485605. Available from:
https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.03.24.485605v2

Banker SE, Bonhomme F, Nachman MW. 2022. Bidirectional Introgression between Mus musculus
domesticus and Mus spretus.Eyre-Walker A, editor. *Genome Biol. Evol.* [Internet] 14. Available from:
https://academic.oup.com/gbe/article/doi/10.1093/gbe/evab288/6509516

Bay RA, Arnegard ME, Conte GL, Best J, Bedford NL, McCann SR, Dubin ME, Chan YF, Jones FC, Kingsley DM,
et al. 2017. Genetic Coupling of Female Mate Choice with Polygenic Ecological Divergence Facilitates
Stickleback Speciation. *Curr. Biol.* 27:3344-3349.e4.

Bear DM, Lassance J-M, Hoekstra HE, Datta SR. 2016. The Evolving Neural and Genetic Architecture of
Vertebrate Olfaction. *Curr. Biol.* [Internet] 26:R1039–R1049. Available from:
http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0960982216310600

Benton R. 2015. Multigene Family Evolution: Perspectives from Insect Chemoreceptors. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*
[Internet] 30:590–600. Available from:
http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169534715001883

Bimova B, Macholan M, Baird SJE, Munclinger P, Dufkova P, Laukaitis CM, Karn RC, Luzynski K, Tucker PK,
Pialek J. 2011. Reinforcement selection acting on the European house mouse hybrid zone. *Mol. Ecol.*
20:2403–2424.

Boitard S, Kofler R, Françoise P, Robelin D, Schlötterer C, Futschik A. 2013. Pool-hmm: a Python program for
estimating the allele frequency spectrum and detecting selective sweeps from next generation
sequencing of pooled samples. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* [Internet] 13:337–340. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12063

Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. 2014. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data.
Bioinformatics [Internet] 30:2114–2120. Available from:
https://academic.oup.com/bioinformatics/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/bioinformatics/btu170

Boursot P, Din W, Anand R, Darviche D, Dod B, Von Deimling F, Talwar GP, Bonhomme F. 1996. Origin and
radiation of the house mouse: mitochondrial DNA phylogeny. *J. Evol. Biol.* 9:391–415.

Britton-Davidan J, Fel-Clair F, Lopez J, Alibert P, Boursot P. 2005. Postzygotic isolation between the two
European subspecies of the house mouse: estimates from fertility patterns in wild and laboratory-bred
hybrids. *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* 84:379–393.

Butlin RK, Smadja CM. 2018. Coupling, reinforcement, and speciation. *Am. Nat.* 191:155–172.

Chamero P, Leinders-Zufall T, Zufall F. 2012. From genes to social communication: molecular sensing by the
vomeronasal organ. *Trends Neurosci.* 35:597–606.

Chung J, Jun GR, Dupuis J, Farrer LA. 2019. Comparison of methods for multivariate gene-based association
tests for complex diseases using common variants. *Eur. J. Hum. Genet.* [Internet] 27:811–823.
Available from: http://www.nature.com/articles/s41431-018-0327-8

Clemente F, Gautier M, Vitalis R. 2018. Inferring sex-specific demographic history from SNP data. *PLoS Genet.*
14:e1007191.

Cruickshank TE, Hahn MW. 2014. Reanalysis suggests that genomic islands of speciation are due to reduced
diversity, not reduced gene flow. *Mol. Ecol.* [Internet] 23:3133–3157. Available from:
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24845075

Dickson LB, Merkling SH, Gautier M, Ghozlane A, Jiolle D, Paupy C, Ayala D, Moltini-Conclois I, Fontaine A,
Lambrechts L. 2020. Exome-wide association study reveals largely distinct gene sets underlying specific
resistance to dengue virus types 1 and 3 in Aedes aegypti.Sirugo G, editor. *PLOS Genet.* [Internet]
16:e1008794. Available from: https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1008794

Fagny M, Austerlitz F. 2021. Polygenic Adaptation: Integrating Population Genetics and Gene Regulatory
Networks. *Trends Genet.* 37:631–638.

Fariello MI, Boitard S, Mercier S, Robelin D, Faraut T, Arnould C, Recoquillay J, Bouchez O, Salin G, Dehais P,
et al. 2017. Accounting for Linkage Disequilibrium in genome scans for selection without individual
genotypes: the local score approach. *Mol. Ecol.* [Internet]. Available from:
http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/mec.14141

Felsenstein J. 1981. Skepticism towards Santa Rosali, or why are there so few kinds of animals? *Evolution (N.*
Y). 35:124–138.

Ferretti L, Ramos-Onsins SE, Pérez-Enciso M. 2013. Population genomics from pool sequencing. *Mol. Ecol.*
[Internet] 22:5561–5576. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/mec.12522

Fustier M-AM -A., Brandenburg J -T. J-T, Boitard S, Lapeyronnie J, Eguiarte LE, Vigouroux Y, Manicacci D,
Tenaillon MI. 2017. Signatures of local adaptation in lowland and highland teosintes from whole-
genome sequencing of pooled samples. *Mol. Ecol.* [Internet] 26:2738–2756. Available from:
http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/mec.14082

Futschik A, Schlotterer C. 2010. The Next Generation of Molecular Markers From Massively Parallel
Sequencing of Pooled DNA Samples. *Genetics* 186:207–218.

Ganem G, Litel C, Lenormand T. 2008. Variation in mate preference across a house mouse hybrid zone.
Heredity (Edinb). [Internet] 100:594–601. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/hdy.2008.20

Garner AG, Goulet BE, Farnitano MC, Molina-Henao YF, Hopkins R. 2018. Genomic Signatures of
Reinforcement. *Genes (Basel).* [Internet] 9. Available from:
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29614048

Gautier M. 2015. Genome-Wide Scan for Adaptive Divergence and Association with Population-Specific
Covariates. *Genetics* [Internet] 201:1555–1579. Available from:
http://www.genetics.org/content/201/4/1555.long

Gautier M, Foucaud J, Gharbi K, Cézard T, Galan M, Loiseau A, Thomson M, Pudlo P, Kerdelhué C, Estoup A.
2013. Estimation of population allele frequencies from next-generation sequencing data: pool-versus
individual-based genotyping. *Mol. Ecol.* [Internet] 22:3766–3779. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/mec.12360

Gautier M, Vitalis R, Flori L, Estoup A. 2022. f -Statistics estimation and admixture graph construction with
Pool-Seq or allele count data using the R package *poolfstat*. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* [Internet] 22:1394–1416.
Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1755-0998.13557

Gel B, Díez-Villanueva A, Serra E, Buschbeck M, Peinado MA, Malinverni R. 2015. regioneR: an
R/Bioconductor package for the association analysis of genomic regions based on permutation tests.
Bioinformatics [Internet] 32:btv562. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26424858

Geraldes A, Basset P, Smith KL, Nachman MW. 2011. Higher differentiation among subspecies of the house
mouse (Mus musculus) in genomic regions with low recombination. *Mol. Ecol.* 20:4722–4736.

Gu Z, Eils R, Schlesner M. 2016. Gtrellis: An R/Bioconductor package for making genome-level Trellis graphics.
BMC Bioinformatics [Internet] 17:169. Available from:
http://bmcbioinformatics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12859-016-1051-4

Haasl RJ, Payseur BA. 2015. Fifteen years of genome-wide scans for selection: trends, lessons, and
unaddressed genetic sources of complication. *Mol. Ecol.* [Internet]. Available from:
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26224644

Hahn MW. 2006. Accurate Inference and Estimation in Population Genomics. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* [Internet]
23:911–918. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/mbe/article-
lookup/doi/10.1093/molbev/msj094

Haque MM, Nilsson EE, Holder LB, Skinner MK. 2016. Genomic Clustering of differential DNA methylated
regions (epimutations) associated with the epigenetic transgenerational inheritance of disease and
phenotypic variation. *BMC Genomics* [Internet] 17:418. Available from:
http://bmcgenomics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12864-016-2748-5

Hayden S, Bekaert M, Crider TA, Mariani S, Murphy WJ, Teeling EC. 2010. Ecological adaptation determines
functional mammalian olfactory subgenomes. *Genome Res.* [Internet] 20:1–9. Available from:
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19952139

Hayden S, Bekaert M, Goodbla A, Murphy WJ, Dávalos LM, Teeling EC. 2014. A cluster of olfactory receptor
genes linked to frugivory in bats. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* [Internet] 31:917–927. Available from:
http://apps.webofknowledge.com/full_record.do?product=UA&search_mode=GeneralSearch&qid=11
&SID=U1vVqeywjOm39xSibWy&page=1&doc=7&cacheurlFromRightClick=no

Hayden S, Teeling EC. 2014. The molecular biology of vertebrate olfaction. *Anat. Rec. (Hoboken).* [Internet]
297:2216–2226. Available from:
http://apps.webofknowledge.com/full_record.do?product=UA&search_mode=GeneralSearch&qid=11
&SID=U1vVqeywjOm39xSibWy&page=1&doc=4&cacheurlFromRightClick=no

Hench K, Vargas M, Höppner MP, McMillan WO, Puebla O. 2019. Inter-chromosomal coupling between
vision and pigmentation genes during genomic divergence. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* 3:657–667.

Hivert V, Leblois R, Petit EJ, Gautier M, Vitalis R. 2018. Measuring Genetic Differentiation from Pool-seq Data.
Genetics [Internet] 210:315–330. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30061425

Hohenlohe PA, Phillips PC, Cresko WA. 2010. Using population genomics to detect selection in natural
populations: key concepts and methodological considerations. *Int. J. Plant Sci.* 171:1059–1071.

Hopkins R, Rausher MD. 2011. Identification of two genes causing reinforcement in the Texas wildflower
Phlox drummondii. *Nature* 469:411.

Huang DW, Sherman BT, Lempicki RA. 2009. Systematic and integrative analysis of large gene lists using
DAVID bioinformatics resources. *Nat. Protoc.* [Internet] 4:44–57. Available from:
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19131956

Huang H, Chanda P, Alonso A, Bader JS, Arking DE. 2011. Gene-Based Tests of Association.McCarthy MI,
editor. *PLoS Genet.* [Internet] 7:e1002177. Available from:
https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1002177

Hurst JLJL, Beynon RJRJ, Armstrong SDSD, Davidson AJAJ, Roberts SASA, Gómez-Baena G, Smadja CMCM,
Ganem G. 2017. Molecular heterogeneity in major urinary proteins of Mus musculus subspecies:
potential candidates involved in speciation. *Sci. Rep.* [Internet] 7:44992. Available from:
http://www.nature.com/articles/srep44992

Ibarra-Soria X, Levitin M, Logan D. 2014. The genomic basis of vomeronasal-mediated behaviour. *Mamm.*
Genome [Internet] 25:75–86. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00335-013-9463-1

Ibarra-Soria X, Levitin MO, Saraiva LR, Logan DW. 2014. The Olfactory Transcriptomes of Mice.Zhang J, editor.
PLoS Genet. [Internet] 10:e1004593. Available from: http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1004593

Isogai Y, Si S, Pont-Lezica L, Tan T, Kapoor V, Murthy VN, Dulac C. 2011. Molecular organization of
vomeronasal chemoreception. *Nature* [Internet] 478:241–245. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature10437

Jiao H, Hong W, Nevo E, Li K, Zhao H. 2019. Convergent reduction of V1R genes in subterranean rodents.
BMC Evol. Biol. [Internet] 19:176. Available from:
https://bmcevolbiol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12862-019-1502-4

Jourjine N, Hoekstra HE. 2021. Expanding evolutionary neuroscience: insights from comparing variation in
behavior. *Neuron* 109:1084–1099.

Kent CF, Tiwari T, Rose S, Patel H, Conflitti IM, Zayed A. 2019. Studying the genetics of behavior in the
genomics era. In: Encyclopedia of Animal Behavior. Elsevier. p. 223–233.

Khan I, Yang Z, Maldonado E, Li C, Zhang G, Gilbert MTP, Jarvis ED, O'Brien SJ, Johnson WE, Antunes A. 2015.
Olfactory Receptor Subgenomes Linked with Broad Ecological Adaptations in Sauropsida. *Mol. Biol.*
Evol. [Internet] 32:2832–2843. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/mbe/article-
lookup/doi/10.1093/molbev/msv155

Kirkpatrick M, Servedio MR. 1999. The reinforcement of mating preferences on an island. *Genetics* 151:865–
884.

Kofler R, Pandey R V, Schlotterer C. 2011. PoPoolation2: identifying differentiation between populations

using sequencing of pooled DNA samples (Pool-Seq). *Bioinformatics* 27:3435–3436.

Kopp M, Servedio MR, Mendelson TC, Safran RJ, Rodríguez RL, Hauber ME, Scordato EC, Symes LB,

Balakrishnan CN, Zonana DM, et al. 2018. Mechanisms of Assortative Mating in Speciation with Gene

Flow: Connecting Theory and Empirical Research. *Am. Nat.* [Internet] 191:1–20. Available from:

http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/694889

Langmead B, Salzberg SL. 2012. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. *Nat. Methods* [Internet] 9:357–

359. Available from: http://www.nature.com/articles/nmeth.1923

Latour Y, Perriat-Sanguinet M, Caminade P, Boursot P, Smadja CMCM, Ganem G. 2014. Sexual selection

against natural hybrids may contribute to reinforcement in a house mouse hybrid zone. *Proc. R. Soc.*

London B Biol. Sci. [Internet] 281. Available from:

http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/281/1776/20132733.abstract

Latta RG. 1998. Differentiation of allelic frequencies at quantitative trait loci affecting locally adaptive traits.

Am. Nat. 151:283–292.

Laturney M, Moehring AJ. 2012. The Genetic Basis of Female Mate Preference and Species Isolation in

Drosophila . *Int. J. Evol. Biol.* 2012:1–13.

Laurie CC, Nickerson DA, Anderson AD, Weir BS, Livingston RJ, Dean MD, Smith KL, Schadt EE, Nachman MW.

2007. Linkage disequilibrium in wild mice. *Plos Genet.* 3:1487–1495.

Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, Marth G, Abecasis G, Durbin R, 1000 Genome

Project Data Processing Subgroup. 2009. The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools.

Bioinformatics [Internet] 25:2078–2079. Available from:

http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19505943

Li K, Hong W, Jiao H, Wang G-D, Rodriguez KA, Buffenstein R, Zhao Y, Nevo E, Zhao H. 2015. Sympatric

speciation revealed by genome-wide divergence in the blind mole rat Spalax. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.*

A. [Internet] 112:11905–11910. Available from: http://www.pnas.org/content/112/38/11905.short

Liberles SD. 2014. Mammalian Pheromones. *Annu. Rev. Physiol.* [Internet] 76:151–175. Available from:

http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-physiol-021113-170334

Librado P, Rozas J. 2016. Weak polygenic selection drives the rapid adaptation of the chemosensory system:

Lessons from the upstream regions of the major gene families. *Genome Biol. Evol.* 8:2493–2504.

Loire E, Tusso S, Caminade P, Severac D, Boursot P, Ganem G, Smadja CM. 2017. Do changes in gene

expression contribute to sexual isolation and reinforcement in the house mouse? *Mol. Ecol.* 26:5189–

5202.

McClintock TS, Adipietro K, Titlow WB, Breheny P, Walz A, Mombaerts P, Matsunami H. 2014. In vivo
identification of eugenol-responsive and muscone- responsive mouse odorant receptors. *J. Neurosci.*
34:15669–15678.

McLaren W, Gil L, Hunt SE, Riat HS, Ritchie GRS, Thormann A, Flicek P, Cunningham F. 2016. The Ensembl
Variant Effect Predictor. *Genome Biol.* [Internet] 17:122. Available from:
http://genomebiology.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13059-016-0974-4

Mendelson TC, Safran RJ. 2021. Speciation by sexual selection: 20 years of progress. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*
[Internet]. Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0169534721002512

Merrill RM, Rastas P, Martin SH, Melo MC, Barker S, Davey J, McMillan WO, Jiggins CD. 2019. Genetic
dissection of assortative mating behavior.Siegal M, editor. *PLOS Biol.* [Internet] 17:e2005902. Available
from: https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.2005902

Morgan AP, Gatti DM, Najarian ML, Keane TM, Galante RJ, Pack AI, Mott R, Churchill GA, de Villena FP-M.
2017. Structural Variation Shapes the Landscape of Recombination in Mouse. *Genetics* [Internet]
206:603–619. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28592499

Mucignat-Caretta C, Redaelli M, Orsetti A, Perriat-Sanguinet M, Zagotto G, Ganem G. 2010. Urinary Volatile
Molecules Vary in Males of the 2 European Subspecies of the House Mouse and Their Hybrids. *Chem.*
Senses 35:647–654.

Mukaj A, Piálek J, Fotopulosova V, Morgan AP, Odenthal-Hesse L, Parvanov ED, Forejt J. 2020. Prdm9 inter-
subspecific interactions in hybrid male sterility of house mouse | Molecular Biology and Evolution |
Oxford Academic. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* [Internet]:msaa167. Available from:
https://academic.oup.com/mbe/article/doi/10.1093/molbev/msaa167/5869047

Neale BM, Sham PC. 2004. The future of association studies: gene-based analysis and replication. *Am. J.*
Hum. Genet. [Internet] 75:353–362. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15272419

Niepoth N, Bendesky A. 2020. How Natural Genetic Variation Shapes Behavior. *Annu. Rev. Genomics Hum.*
Genet. 21:437–463.

North H, Caminade P, Severac D, Belkhir K, Smadja C. 2020. The role of copy-number variation in the
reinforcement of sexual isolation between the two European subspecies of the house mouse. *Philos.*
Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.

Olazcuaga L, Loiseau A, Parrinello H, Paris M, Fraimout A, Guedot C, Diepenbrock LM, Kenis M, Zhang J, Chen
X, et al. 2021. A whole-genome scan for association with invasion success in the fruit fly drosophila
suzukii using contrasts of allele frequencies corrected for population structure. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*
37:2369–2385.

Olender T, Jones TEM, Bruford E, Lancet D. 2020. A unified nomenclature for vertebrate olfactory receptors.
BMC Evol. Biol. [Internet] 20:42. Available from:
https://bmcevolbiol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12862-020-01607-6

Ortiz-Barrientos D, Counterman BA, Noor MAF. 2004. The genetics of speciation by reinforcement. *Plos Biol.*
2:e416.

Ospina OE, Lemmon AR, Dye M, Zdyrski C, Holland S, Stribling D, Kortyna ML, Lemmon EM. 2021.
Neurogenomic divergence during speciation by reinforcement of mating behaviors in chorus frogs
(Pseudacris). *BMC Genomics* [Internet] 22:711. Available from:
https://bmcgenomics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12864-021-07995-3

Pardy JA, Lahib S, Noor MAF, Moehring AJ. 2021. Intraspecific genetic variation for behavioral isolation loci
in drosophila. *Genes (Basel).* 12.

Paudel Y, Madsen O, Megens H-J, Frantz LAF, Bosse M, Crooijmans RPMA, Groenen MAM. 2015. Copy
number variation in the speciation of pigs: a possible prominent role for olfactory receptors. *BMC*
Genomics [Internet] 16:330. Available from: http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2164/16/330

Poelstra JW, Richards EJ, Martin CH. 2018. Speciation in sympatry with ongoing secondary gene flow and a
potential olfactory trigger in a radiation of Cameroon cichlids. *Mol. Ecol.* 27:4270–4288.

Quinlan AR, Hall IM. 2010. BEDTools: a flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic features.
Bioinformatics [Internet] 26:841–842. Available from:
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20110278

R Core Team. 2019. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.

Raufaste N, Orth A, Belkhir K, Senet D, Smadja C, Baird SJEJE, Bonhomme F, Dod B, Boursot P. 2005.
Inference of selection and migration in the danish house mouse hybrid zone. *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* 84:593–
616.

Ravinet M, Faria R, Butlin RK, Galindo J, Bierne N, Rafajlović M, Noor MAF, Mehlig B, Westram AM. 2017.
Interpreting the genomic landscape of speciation: a road map for finding barriers to gene flow. *J. Evol.*
Biol. [Internet] 30:1450–1477. Available from: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/jeb.13047

Roda F, Walter GM, Nipper R, Ortiz-Barrientos D. 2017. Genomic clustering of adaptive loci during parallel
evolution of an Australian wildflower. *Mol. Ecol.* 26:3687–3699.

Roesti M, Gavrilets S, Hendry AP, Salzburger W, Berner D. 2014. The genomic signature of parallel
adaptation from shared genetic variation. *Mol. Ecol.* [Internet] 23:3944–3956. Available from:
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24635356

Sánchez-Gracia A, Vieira FG, Almeida FC, Rozas J. 2011. Comparative Genomics of the Major Chemosensory

Gene Families in Arthropods. In: eLS. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470015902.a0022848

Santos PSC, Mezger M, Kolar M, Michler F-U, Sommer S. 2018. The best smellers make the best choosers: mate choice is affected by female chemosensory receptor gene diversity in a mammal. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* [Internet] 285:20182426. Available from: https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rspb.2018.2426

Schlötterer C, Tobler R, Kofler R, Nolte V. 2014. Sequencing pools of individuals — mining genome-wide polymorphism data without big funding. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* [Internet] 15:749–763. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrg3803

Schneider K, White TJ, Mitchell S, Adams CE, Reeve R, Elmer KR. 2021. The pitfalls and virtues of population genetic summary statistics: Detecting selective sweeps in recent divergences. *J. Evol. Biol.* [Internet] 34:893–909. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jeb.13738

Sella G, Barton NH. 2019. Thinking About the Evolution of Complex Traits in the Era of Genome-Wide Association Studies. *Annu. Rev. Genomics Hum. Genet.* [Internet] 20:461–493. Available from: https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-genom-083115-022316

Servedio MR. 2009. The role of linkage disequilibrium in the evolution of premating isolation. *Heredity (Edinb).* [Internet] 102:51–56. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/hdy.2008.98

Servedio MR, Boughman JW. 2017. The Role of Sexual Selection in Local Adaptation and Speciation. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* [Internet] 48:85–109. Available from: http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110316-022905

Servedio M R, Noor MAF. 2003. The role of reinforcement in speciation: Theory and Data. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* 34:339–364.

Servedio Maria R, Noor MAF. 2003. The role of reinforcement in speciation: theory and data. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 34:339–364.

Shi P, Zhang JZ. 2007. Comparative genomic analysis identifies an evolutionary shift of vomeronasal receptor gene repertoires in the vertebrate transition from water to land. *Genome Res.* 17:166–174.

Smadja C, Butlin RK. 2009. On the scent of speciation: the chemosensory system and its role in premating isolation. *Heredity (Edinb).* 102:77–97.

Smadja C, Catalan J, Ganem G. 2004. Strong premating divergence in a unimodal hybrid zone between two subspecies of the house mouse. *J. Evol. Biol.* 17:165–176.

Smadja C, Ganem G. 2002. Subspecies recognition in the house mouse: a study of two populations from the border of a hybrid zone. *Behav. Ecol.* 13:312–320.

Smadja C, Ganem G. 2005. Asymmetrical reproductive character displacement in the house mouse. *J. Evol.*
Biol. 18:1485–1493.

Smadja C, Ganem G. 2008. Divergence of odorant signals within and between the two European subspecies
of the house mouse. *Behav. Ecol.* [Internet] 19:223–230. Available from:
http://www.beheco.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/doi/10.1093/beheco/arm127

Smadja CM, Butlin RK. 2011. A framework for comparing processes of speciation in the presence of gene
flow. *Mol. Ecol.* 20:5123–5140.

Smadja CM, Canbäck B, Vitalis R, Gautier M, Ferrari J, Zhou J-J, Butlin RK. 2012. Large-scale candidate gene
scan reveals the role of chemoreceptor genes in host plant specialization and speciation in the pea
aphid. *Evolution (N. Y).* 66:2723–2738.

Smadja CM, Ganem G. 2007. Divergence of odorant signals within and between the two European
subspecies of the house mouse. *Behav. Ecol.* 19:223–230.

Smadja CM, Loire E, Caminade P, Thoma M, Latour Y, Roux C, Thoss M, Penn DJDJ, Ganem G, Boursot P.
2015. Seeking signatures of reinforcement at the genetic level: a hitchhiking mapping and candidate
gene approach in the house mouse. *Mol. Ecol.* [Internet] 24:4222–4237. Available from:
http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/mec.13301

Staubach F, Lorenc A, Messer PW, Tang K, Petrov DA, Tautz D. 2012. Genome Patterns of Selection and
Introgression of Haplotypes in Natural Populations of the House Mouse (*Mus
musculus*). *PLoS Genet* [Internet] 8:e1002891. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1002891

Stölting KN, Paris M, Meier C, Heinze B, Castiglione S, Bartha D, Lexer C. 2015. Genome-wide patterns of
differentiation and spatially varying selection between postglacial recolonization lineages of Populus
alba (Salicaceae), a widespread forest tree. *New Phytol.* 207:723–734.

Swarup S, Huang W, Mackay TFC, Anholt RRH. 2013. Analysis of natural variation reveals neurogenetic
networks for Drosophila olfactory behavior. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 110:1017–1022.

Tajima F. 1983. Evolutionary relationship of DNA sequences in finite populations. *Genetics* [Internet]
105:437–460. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6628982

Toews DPL, Taylor SA, Streby HM, Kramer GR, Lovette IJ. 2019. Selection on VPS13A linked to migration in a
songbird. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 116:18272–18274.

Turner LM, Harr B. 2014. Genome-wide mapping in a house mouse hybrid zone reveals hybrid sterility loci
and Dobzhansky-Muller interactions. *Elife* [Internet] 3:e02504. Available from:
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25487987

Turner LM, Schwahn DJ, Harr B. 2012. Reduced male fertility is common but highly variable in form and
severity in a natural jouse mouse hybrid zone. *Evolution (N. Y).* [Internet] 66:443–458. Available from:
http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2011.01445.x

Ullrich KK, Linnenbrink M, Tautz D. Introgression patterns between house mouse subspecies and species
reveal genomic windows of frequent exchange. *doi.org* [Internet]:168328. Available from:
https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/168328v1

Vargas-Barroso V, Peña-Ortega F, Larriva-Sahd JA. 2017. Olfaction and pheromones: Uncanonical sensory
influences and bulbar interactions. *Front. Neuroanat.* 11:108.

Vijay N, Bossu CM, Poelstra JW, Weissensteiner MH, Suh A, Kryukov AP, Wolf Jochen B. W., Wolf J. B. W.,
Lindell J, Backstrom N, et al. 2016. Evolution of heterogeneous genome differentiation across multiple
contact zones in a crow species complex. *Nat. Commun.* [Internet] 7:13195. Available from:
http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/ncomms13195

Wang M, Huang J, Liu Y, Ma L, Potash JB, Han S. 2017. COMBAT: A Combined Association Test for Genes
Using Summary Statistics. *Genetics* [Internet] 207:883–891. Available from:
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28878002

Wang Y, Reddiex AJ, Allen SL, Chenoweth SF. Direct and indirect impacts of positive selection on genomic
variation in Drosophila serrata. *bioRxiv* [Internet]:2022.03.31.486660. Available from:
https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.03.31.486660v1

Waterston RH, Lindblad-Toh K, Birney E, Rogers J, Abril JF, Agarwal P, Agarwala R, Ainscough R,
Alexandersson M, An P, et al. 2002. Initial sequencing and comparative analysis of the mouse genome.
Nature 420:520–562.

Watterson GA. 1975. On the number of segregating sites in genetical models without recombination. *Theor.*
Popul. Biol. [Internet] 7:256–276. Available from:
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0040580975900209

Wolf JBW, Ellegren H. 2017. Making sense of genomic islands of differentiation in light of speciation. *Nat.*
Rev. Genet. [Internet] 18:87–100. Available from:
http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nrg.2016.133

Yang H, Zhang YP. 2007. Genomic organization and sequence analysis of the vomeronasal receptor V2R
genes in mouse genome. *Chinese Sci. Bull.* 52:336–342.

Yeaman S. 2013. Genomic rearrangements and the evolution of clusters of locally adaptive loci. *Proc. Natl.*
Acad. Sci. U. S. A. [Internet] 110:E1743–E1751. Available from:
http://www.pnas.org/content/110/19/E1743.abstract

Yeaman S, Whitlock MC. 2011. The genetic architecture of adaptation under migration–selection balance.

Evolution (N. Y). [Internet] 65:1897–1911. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-

5646.2011.01269.x

Yohe LR, Leiser-Miller LB, Kaliszewska ZA, Donat P, Santana SE, Dávalos LM. 2021. Diversity in olfactory

receptor repertoires is associated with dietary specialization in a genus of frugivorous bat. *G3*

Genes|Genomes|Genetics [Internet] 11. Available from:

https://academic.oup.com/g3journal/article/doi/10.1093/g3journal/jkab260/6325508

Zhang XH, Zhang XM, Firestein S. 2007. Comparative genomics of odorant and pheromone receptor genes in

rodents. *Genomics* 89:441–450.

Zhang XM, Firestein S. 2002. The olfactory receptor gene superfamily of the mouse. *Nat. Neurosci.* 5:124–

133.

1230

1231

1232

 Figure legends

Figure 1: **Sampling and experimental design. A)** Populations of *Mus musculus musculus* sampled

in localities in the *M. m. musculus - domesticus* hybrid zone (dark blue points) or further away

from the centre of the hybrid zone (light blue points). Mean nucleotide diversity: Låsby ($n=27$, Π

= 0.002 +/- 1.136e-05), Borum ($n=33$, Π = 0.003 +/- 1.151e-05), Randers ($n=29$, Π = 0.002 +/-

1.027e-05), Hobro ($n=29$, Π = 0.002 +/- 1.159e-05); pairwise F_{ST} estimates between Choosy and

Non-Choosy populations: $F_{ST\ \text{Borum-Choosy1}\ -\ \text{Randers-NonChoosy2}}$ = 0.057; $F_{ST\ \text{Låsby-Choosy2}\ -\ \text{Randers-NonChoosy2}}$ =

0.087; $F_{ST\ \text{Hobro-NonChoosy1}\ -\ \text{Borum-Choosy1}}$ = 0.089; $F_{ST\ \text{Hobro-NonChoosy1}\ -\ \text{Låsby-Choosy2}}$ = 0.114); F_{ST} within

behavioural groups: $F_{ST\ \text{Borum-Choosy1}\ -\ \text{Låsby-Choosy2}}$ = 0.065; $F_{ST\ \text{Hobro-NonChoosy1}\ -\ \text{Randers-NonChoosy2}}$ = 0.076. **B)**

Relatedness among populations based on the genome-wide covariance matrix (Ω) across

population allele frequencies for autosomal chromosomes (similar results for the X chromosome).

C) The two series of population comparisons were used to identify loci showing an association

with behavioural divergence. The Focal Test compared replicated sets of Choosy and Non-Choosy

populations to identify loci showing significant divergence (as measured by the contrast statistic C_2

from the BAYPASS program) between populations with contrasting behaviour. The Control Test

compared two other combinations of the same populations, this time not grouped by their

behavioural profile. Only loci found divergent specifically in the Focal Test were retained as the

final list of candidate loci.

1251

Figure 2: **Functional analysis results. A)** Summary of Ensembl *VEP* analysis performed on all outlier

SNPs. The pie chart shows the proportions of the different variant consequences found in this set

of outlier SNPs. Consequences include information on the location and possible functional effect

of each variant (e.g. intergenic, within 5k up-/down-stream of annotated genes, UTRs, intronic,

exonic, synonymous, missense, stop_gained, as well as known regulatory regions). **B)** *DAVID*

functional enrichment analyses. Up to top 10 functional annotation clusters (enrichment score >

1.3) are shown for analyses performed on (i) genes found within 5 kb of outlier SNPs (ii) genes

identified as outlier genes (C_{2_max} and/or C_{2_mean}) at 0.05 threshold, (iii) genes identified as outlier

genes at 0.01 threshold.

1261

Figure 3: **Genome-wide distribution of candidate regions showing significant genetic**

differentiation between Choosy and Non-Choosy populations. Track 1 (top): chromosomes; Track

2: local score values for significant genomic segments based on information on outlier SNPs;

Tracks 3 & 4: C_{2_max} and C_{2_mean} values of outlier genes (922 and 1622 C_{2_max} and C_{2_mean} outlier

genes shown respectively over 41,702 annotated genes); vomeronasal (*Vmn*) and olfactory (*Olfr*)

outlier genes are shown in blue and purple respectively; Track 5: significant outlier gene clusters;

Track 6: recombination cold spots observed in the Diversity Outbred hybrid mouse population by

Morgan et al. 2017; Track 7 (bottom): candidate hybrid sterility genes identified by Turner & Harr

2014. The three most significant outlier gene clusters are highlighted, on chr9, chr7 and to some

extent chr2.

1272

Figure 4: **The two main candidate gene clusters composed of Olfactory and Vomeronasal**

Receptor genes on chromosomes 9 and 7. *Ensembl* protein-coding names and locations are

shown within these two 1.8 Mb long genomic regions. Non-outlier genes are in grey and outlier

genes are in colours (purple: Olfactory Receptor genes; blue: Vomeronasal Receptor genes; green:

any other outlier genes). For outlier genes, different levels of significance are indicated as follows:

regular text: C_{2_max} or C_{2_mean} outlier genes at $p < 0.05$; bold text: C_{2_max} or C_{2_mean} outliers at $p < 0.01$;

bold and underlined: top significant outlier genes, based on the combined information from C_{2_max}

and C_{2_mean} statistics.

Tables

Table 1: list of significantly differentiated Olfactory (Olfr) and Vomeronasal (Vmn) Receptor genes between Choosy and Non-Choosy populations

Chr	Gene_names*	Types of SNP variant consequences identified by VEP (see Table S6 for details)
1	**Olfr1406**, **Olfr258-ps1**, **Olfr421-ps1**, Olfr420, Olfr419, Olfr417	
2	Olfr1235-ps1, Olfr1258, **Olfr1259**, **Olfr1260**, **Olfr1261**, **Olfr1262**, Olfr1263, **Olfr1264, Olfr1265**, **Olfr140**, Olfr32, **Olfr1270**, Olfr1275, Olfr1276	Olfr: up-/down-stream; intron; synonymous; 3'_UTR;
4	Olfr273, Olfr62, Olfr1343-ps1, **Olfr1342,** Olfr1340, Olfr1339, Olfr1328	Not in Table S6
5	**Vmn2r12**, Vmn2r-ps24	Not in Table S6
6	Olfr435, Vmn1r22, Vmn1r-ps24	Not in Table S6
7	Vmn1r62, Vmn1r63, **Vmn1r64**, Vmn1r74, Vmn1r-ps55, Vmn1r-ps65, **Vmn2r-ps62**, Olfr291, **Vmn2r65**, Vmn2r66, Vmn2r69, Vmn2r-ps70, **Vmn2r70**, **Vmn2r71**, **Vmn2r73**, **Vmn2r-ps78**, **Vmn2r74**, **Vmn2r-ps79**, Vmn2r75, **Vmn2r-ps85**, **Vmn2r-ps86**, **Vmn2r76**, **Olfr310**, **Olfr309**, **Olfr308**, **Olfr305**, **Olfr304**, **Olfr303**, Olfr520, Olfr521, Olfr556, Olfr557, Olfr558, Olfr33, Olfr561, Olfr562-ps1, Olfr563-ps1, Olfr566, Olfr567-ps1, **Olfr568**, Olfr570, Olfr571, Olfr595-ps1, Olfr597, Olfr598, Olfr599, Olfr601, Olfr611, Olfr618, Olfr621-ps1, Olfr624, Olfr628, Olfr66, Olfr639	Vmn: up-/down-stream; intron; synonymous; 3'_UTR; Vmn2r76: missense Olfr: up-/down-stream; intron; synonymous; 3'_UTR; 5'_UTR; Olfr304: missense;
9	**Olfr151**, **Olfr874**, **Olfr875**, **Olfr876**, **Olfr877**, **Olfr145**, **Olfr878**, Olfr880-ps1, **Olfr881**, **Olfr885**, Olfr886-ps1, Olfr887, Olfr889, **Olfr891**, **Olfr892-ps1**, **Olfr893**, **Olfr894**, **Olfr143**, **Olfr895**, **Olfr897-ps1**, **Olfr25**, **Olfr898**, **Olfr250**, **Olfr251**, **Olfr147**, **Olfr901**, **Olfr902**, **Olfr1543-ps1**, **Olfr904**, **Olfr905**, **Olfr906**, **Olfr907**, **Olfr908**, **Olfr911-ps1**, **Olfr912**, **Olfr913**, **Olfr914**, **Olfr915**, **Olfr916**, **Olfr917**, **Olfr918**, Olfr919, Olfr920	Olfr: up-/down-stream; intron; synonymous; 3'_UTR; 5'_UTR; Olfr891: stop_gained; Olfr895: stop_gained; Olfr250: missense x2; Olfr906: missense; Olfr908: missense; Olfr915: missense; Olfr916: missense
10	Olfr803, Olfr806, Olfr814, Olfr818, Olfr819	Not in Table S6
11	Olfr10, Olfr1387, Olfr1385, Olfr1384, Olfr1383, Olfr1378	Not in Table S6
13	Olfr1367, Olfr1360	Not in Table S6
15	**Olfr282**	Not in Table S6
17	Vmn1r228, Vmn1r-ps149, Olfr761, Olfr132, Olfr133, Olfr135, Olfr137, Olfr136	Olfr136: down-stream, 3'_UTR
19	Olfr1444, **Olfr1446**, Olfr1460-ps1, Olfr1492-ps1, Olfr1495, Olfr1497	Not in Table S6

* Regular: C_{2_max} or C_{2_mean} outliers at p<0.05; **Bold**: C_{2_max} or C_{2_mean} outliers at p<0.01; **bold underlined**: top outliers genes based on the combined

information from C2_max and C2_mean statistics; **red**: among the 10 most differentiated 'top' outlier genes (see Methods and Table S5 for details)

Figure 1: **Sampling and experimental design. A)** Populations of *Mus musculus musculus* sampled in localities in the *M. m. musculus - domesticus* hybrid zone (dark blue points) or further away from the centre of the hybrid zone (light blue points). Mean nucleotide diversity: Låsby (n=27, Π = 0.002 +/- 1.136e-05), Borum (n=33, Π = 0.003 +/- 1.151e-05), Randers (n=29, Π = 0.002 +/- 1.027e-05), Hobro (n=29, Π = 0.002 +/- 1.159e-05); pairwise F_{ST} estimates between Choosy and Non-Choosy populations: $F_{ST\ Borum\text{-}Choosy1\ -\ Randers\text{-}NonChoosy2}$ = 0.057; $F_{ST\ Låsby\text{-}Choosy2\ -\ Randers\text{-}NonChoosy2}$ = 0.087; $F_{ST\ Hobro\text{-}NonChoosy1\ -\ Borum\text{-}Choosy1}$ = 0.089; $F_{ST\ Hobro\text{-}NonChoosy1\ -\ Låsby\text{-}Choosy2}$ = 0.114); F_{ST} within behavioural groups: $F_{ST\ Borum\text{-}Choosy1\ -\ Låsby\text{-}Choosy2}$ = 0.065; $F_{ST\ Hobro\text{-}NonChoosy1\ -\ Randers\text{-}NonChoosy2}$ = 0.076. **B)** Relatedness among populations based on the genome-wide covariance matrix (Ω) across population allele frequencies for autosomal chromosomes (similar results for the X chromosome). **C)** The two series of population comparisons were used to identify loci showing an association with behavioural divergence. The Focal Test compared replicated sets of Choosy and Non-Choosy populations to identify loci showing significant divergence (as measured by the contrast statistic C_2 from the BᴀʏPᴀss program) between populations with contrasted behaviour. The Control Test compared two other combinations of the same populations, this time not grouped by their behavioural profile. Only loci found divergent specifically in the Focal Test were retained as the final list of candidate loci.

Figure 2: **Functional analysis results. A)** Summary of Ensembl *VEP* analysis performed on all outlier SNPs. The pie chart shows the proportions of the different variant consequences found in this set of outlier SNPs. Consequences include information on the location and possible functional effect of each variant (e.g. intergenic, within 5k up-/down-stream of an annotated genes, UTRs, intronic, exonic, synonymous, missense, stop_gained, as well as known regulatory regions). **B)** *DAVID* functional enrichment analyses. Up to top 10 functional annotation clusters (enrichment score > 1.3) are shown for analyses performed on (i) genes found within 5 kb of outlier SNPs (ii) genes identified as outlier genes (C_{2_max} and/or C_{2_mean}) at 0.05 threshold, (iii) genes identified as outlier genes at 0.01 threshold.

Figure 3: **Genome-wide distribution of candidate regions showing significant genetic differentiation between Choosy and Non-Choosy populations.** Track 1 (top): chromosomes; Track 2: local score values for significant genomic segments based on information on outlier SNPs; Tracks 3 & 4: C_{2_max} and C_{2_mean} values of outlier genes (922 and 1622 C_{2_max} and C_{2_mean} outlier genes shown respectively, over 41,702 annotated genes); vomeronasal (*Vmn*) and olfactory (*Olfr*) outlier genes are shown in blue and purple respectively; Track 5: significant outlier gene clusters; Track 6: recombination cold spots observed in the Diversity Outbred hybrid mouse population by Morgan et al. 2017; Track 7 (bottom): candidate hybrid sterility genes identified by Turner & Harr 2014. The three most significant outlier gene clusters are highlighted, on chr9, chr7 and to some extent chr2.

Chromosome 9, Olfactory Receptor (*Olfr*) outlier gene cluster

Chromosome 7, Vomeronasal Receptor (*Vmn*) and Olfactory Receptor (*Olfr*) outlier gene cluster

Figure 4: **The two main candidate gene clusters composed of Olfactory and Vomeronasal Receptor genes on chromosomes 9 and 7**. *Ensembl* protein-coding names and locations are shown within these two 1.8 Mb long genomic regions. Non-outlier genes are in grey and outlier genes are in colours (purple: Olfactory Receptor genes; blue: Vomeronasal Receptor genes; green: any other outlier genes). For outlier genes, different levels of significance are indicated as follows: regular text: C_{2_max} or C_{2_mean} outlier genes at $p < 0.05$; bold text: C_{2_max} or C_{2_mean} outliers at $p < 0.01$; bold and underlined: top significant outlier genes, based on the combined information from C_{2_max} and C_{2_mean} statistics.