Patterns of transposable element accumulation at resistance loci: a comparative genomic analysis in aphids

Tobias Baril[1,2]*, Adam Pym[1,3], Chris Bass[1,4], Alex Hayward[1,5]*

[1] Centre for Ecology and Conservation, University of Exeter, Penryn Campus,

Cornwall, TR10 9FE, UK

[2] ORCID: 0000-0002-5936-7531

[3] ORCID: 0000-0001-8754-4016

[4] ORCID: 0000-0002-2590-1492

[5] ORCID: 0000-0001-7413-718X

* Corresponding Author information:

Tobias Baril: tb529@exeter.ac.uk

Alex Hayward: alex.hayward@exeter.ac.uk

Abstract

The evolution of resistance is a major challenge for the sustainable control of pests and pathogens. A deeper understanding of the evolutionary and genomic mechanisms underpinning resistance evolution is required. Several studies have implicated TEs in xenobiotic resistance evolution in insects. However, analyses are generally restricted to one insect species, and/or small numbers of xenobiotic resistance loci (XRL). We examine evidence for the accumulation of transposable elements (TEs) at XRL by performing a comparative genomic analysis across 21 aphid genomes. We consider major subsets of XRL involved in metabolic resistance to insecticides: Cytochrome P450s, glutathione S-transferases, esterases, UDP-glucuronosyltransferases, and ABC transporters. TEs are significantly enriched at XRL compared to other genes. XRL show similar levels of TE enrichment to housekeeping genes. But unlike housekeeping genes, XRL are not constitutively expressed in germline cells, supporting the selective enrichment of TEs at XRL, rather than enrichment due to chromatin availability. Hotspots of TE enrichment occur around certain XRL, whilst others are depleted. In aphids of agricultural importance, we find particular enrichment of TEs around cytochrome P450 genes with known functions in the detoxification of synthetic insecticides, compared to genes involved in other processes. Our results provide evidence supporting a general role for TEs as a source of genomic variation at host XRL, and highlight the existence of considerable variability in TE content across XRL and host species. These findings demonstrate the need for detailed functional verification analyses to clarify the significance of individual insertions and elucidate underlying mechanisms at TE-XRL hotspots.

Introduction

Xenobiotics are substances that are foreign to an organism, including naturally occurring plant allelochemicals and man-made insecticides (Li et al. 2007). Xenobiotic toxicity can present a strong selective pressure, leading to the rapid evolution of resistance via efficient

xenobiotic removal, metabolism, and tolerance (Chung et al. 2007; Li et al. 2007).

Consequently, numerous insects have evolved resistance to both plant allelochemicals,

produced for plant defence, and synthetic insecticides, developed to protect economically

important crops from insect pests, or humans and livestock from insect vectored diseases

(Sparks et al. 2021; Sternberg and Thomas 2018). The intensive use of numerous synthetic

insecticides has led to many insects evolving resistance to multiple insecticide classes (Li et

al. 2007; Bradshaw et al. 2016), severely affecting our ability to control target insects (Singh

et al. 2021). The emergence of multiple insecticide resistance is a major global challenge,

threatening global food security in the case of agricultural pests, and human and animal

health in the case of disease vectors (Worner and Gevrey 2006; Deutsch et al. 2018).

56   There is growing evidence that transposable elements (TEs) can play an important

role in the evolution of xenobiotic resistance in insects (Gilbert et al. 2021; Rostant et al.

2012), with examples from several major lineages: Diptera: *Drosophila* (Feyereisen 2005;

Bogwitz et al. 2005; Schmidt et al. 2010; Aminetzach et al. 2005; Remnant et al. 2013;

Mateo et al. 2014; Salces-Ortiz et al. 2020), *Culex (Itokawa et al. 2011; Darboux et al. 2007),*

Musca domestica (Li et al. 2007; Kasai and Scott 2001), *Anopheles funestus* (Weedall et al.

2020) Lepidoptera: *Heliothis (Gahan et al. 2001; Yang et al. 2007; Zhao et al. 2010; Chen*

and Li 2007), *Pectinophora gossypiella* (Fabrick et al. 2011; Wang et al. 2019) Hemiptera:

Myzus persicae (Singh et al. 2020; Panini et al. 2021). TEs are DNA sequences capable of

moving from one genomic location to another within the genome. TEs occur in nearly all

eukaryotic genomes, and are implicated in the evolution of host genomic novelty through

diverse processes including the modification of regulatory networks, chromosomal

rearrangements, exon shuffling, and donation of coding sequence (Bourque et al. 2018;

Wells and Feschotte 2020; Cosby et al. 2019; Sundaram et al. 2014). In the case of

xenobiotic resistance, TEs are reported to have contributed to evolvability via myriad

mechanisms, including: gene amplification and duplication (Singh et al. 2020; Remnant et al.

2013), knockout of a susceptible allele in heterozygous individuals (Panini et al. 2021),

increases in detoxification gene expression (Bogwitz et al. 2005; Itokawa et al. 2011), allelic

succession leading to increases in resistance gene copy number (Schmidt et al. 2010), and

alternative splicing and production of truncated proteins that prevent interactions with

xenobiotics (Darboux et al. 2007; Gahan et al. 2001; Yang et al. 2007; Zhao et al. 2010).

Studies examining the contribution of TEs to resistance evolution suggest that there

can be an additive effect of successive TE insertions at focal host loci over time. For

example, in the well-known case of the cytochrome P450 (CYP) gene *CYP6G1* and DDT

resistance in *Drosophila*, successive TE insertions are linked with an increasing ability to

detoxify the insecticide *(Catania et al. 2004; Daborn et al. 2002; Chung et al. 2007; Schmidt*

et al. 2010). A similar process involving the accumulation of TEs, in this case at *CYP6CY3,*

is implicated in the evolution of resistance to nicotine, following a host plant shift to tobacco

in the aphid *Myzus persicae nicotianae (Puinean et al. 2010; de Little et al. 2017)*. More

widely, there is evidence that the selective accumulation of TEs at rapidly evolving host loci

under strong selection may represent a general evolutionary process. For example, studies

have reported the enrichment of TEs at other gene classes, such as immune genes and

those involved in responses to external stimuli (van de Lagemaat et al. 2003; Song et al.

1998). However, patterns in TE accumulation remain poorly described, and it is unclear to

what extent TEs may be enriched at xenobiotic resistance loci (XRL) compared to other host

genes, or how much variability exists across XRL. Meanwhile, existing studies strongly

suggest that TEs are involved in individual cases of resistance to certain insecticides, but

there is currently very limited understanding of how associations with TEs vary among

different classes of xenobiotic resistance loci (XRL), or among whole clades of insects.

Here we consider patterns of TE accumulation at XRL in the genomes of 21 species

sampled from across aphid phylogeny, for which high-quality genome assemblies are

available. The aphid family is a relevant clade within which to explore the genomic bases of

insecticide resistance, as it includes numerous globally important crop pests responsible for

causing billions of US dollars of crop losses annually (Van Emden and Harrington 2017), and

members that have been intensively targeted with insecticides and evolved resistance. For

example, the severely damaging global crop pest *Myzus persicae* (the green peach aphid) is

resistant to at least 82 insecticides, via at least eight different resistance mechanisms (Bass

et al. 2014; Whalon et al.; Singh et al. 2021).

Since the TE landscapes of aphids are poorly described, we begin by characterising

patterns of TE content across our focal genomes. After this, we examine key fundamental

questions relating to the pattern of associations between TEs and XRL in aphid genomes. (i)

Firstly, we test whether XRL are enriched for TEs compared to other host genes, to evaluate

the overall signature of TE accumulation at XRL. (ii) Secondly, we examine the extent to

which TE content varies among individual XRL and among major XRL classifications, to

determine if contributions from TEs are more pronounced at certain types of XRL. (iii)

Thirdly, we consider if specific TE classifications are enriched at XRL (e.g DNA TEs, rolling

circles, *Penelope*-like elements, LINEs, SINEs, and LTRs), to explore if particular TEs are

predisposed to contribute to the evolution of host resistance. (iv) Fourthly, we assess

whether patterns of TE accumulation at XRL vary among aphid species to examine if

patterns vary across aphid phylogeny. (v) Fifthly, we investigate TE enrichment at XRL that

have demonstrated associations with the detoxification of synthetic insecticides, to test if

these show particularly strong signatures of TE recruitment. (vi) Lastly, we explore whether

our results suggest a selective role for patterns in TE accumulation at XRL versus the

alternative explanation of increased availability for TE insertion due to chromatin availability.

We find that XRL are enriched for TEs compared to the mean level for other gene

types in aphid genomes. Evidence from *Drosophila* suggests that XRL are not constitutively

expressed in germline cell types, and so are not more available to transposition than other

host genes, providing evidence supporting a role for the selective enrichment of TEs at XRL.

DNA TEs and SINEs show the highest enrichment at XRL, and we find that TE enrichment

at XRL varies among XRL types and across aphid species, both in terms of TE coverage

and count. We also find particularly high enrichment of TEs at cytochrome P450 genes with

known functions in the detoxification of synthetic insecticides in three aphids of major

agricultural importance (*A. pisum*, *M. cerasi*, and *M. persicae*). Overall, these findings are

consistent with a role for TE accumulation at strongly selected XRL, and highlight the

extremely high levels of TE enrichment (both in terms of TE coverage and copy number) that

can accumulate at certain XRL, in turn supporting an important and general role for TEs in

the evolution of insecticide resistance.

Results

Transposable Element Landscapes in Aphids

TEs make considerable contributions to genome size in eukaryotes (Kidwell 2002; Gregory

2005). In aphids, we find that TE content varies from 8.21% (*Melanaphis sacchari*) to

35.52% (*Metopolophium dirhodum*) of total genome size (Figure 1B, Supplementary Table

1). This is in accordance with levels of TE content identified among a large-scale survey of

196 insect species, where TE content varied from 0.08% to 53.93% of total genome size

(Peccoud et al. 2017). Similarly, consistent with findings in other eukaryotic lineages, we

report a significant strong positive association between genome size and TE content in

aphids (Linear regression, $F_{1,26}$=100.7, p<0.01, R^2=0.79, Supplementary Figure 1).

TEs have a non-random distribution within host genomes (Bourque et al. 2018). As

expected, given the predominantly deleterious effects of TE insertion into host genes

(Bourque et al. 2018; Sultana et al. 2017), exonic regions exhibit the lowest levels of TE

sequence content in aphid genomes (mean TE content in exons = 2.08% of total genome

size). Across 19 of the 21 aphid genomes considered here, the greatest TE coverage

(expressed as proportion of total genome size) is found in 5' and 3' gene flanking regions,

where it varies between 3.49% (*M. sacchari*) and 17.94% (*M. dirhodum*) (Figure 2).

However, this pattern is not universal across all aphid species. In *Sipha flava,* the majority of

TE coverage occurs in intronic regions (10.60%), while in *M. cerasi*, the majority occurs in

intergenic space (11.28%) (Figure 2).

The amount of TE sequence and the frequency of TE insertions in genic versus

intergenic regions in aphid genomes is not significantly correlated with genome

compactness, described as the ratio of genic (intron and exon) to intergenic (gene flanks and

intergenic space) base pairs (Spearman's Rank, S=1680, p>0.05, rho=-0.09, Supplementary

Figure 2, Supplementary Table 2). *S. flava* has the most compact genome, with a

genic:intergenic base pair ratio of 1.50:1 (250.0 Mb:166.8 Mb), and presumably a higher

likelihood of TE insertion into genic regions compared to intergenic space, leading to the

observation that the majority of TE insertions are found in intronic regions. In contrast, *M.*

cerasi has the least compact genome, with a much lower genic:intergenic base pair ratio of

0.13:1 (76.1 Mb:559.2 Mb). In less compact genomes such as *M. cerasi*, TEs can

accumulate in expanded intergenic regions that act as 'genomic safe havens', where

insertion is less likely to exert deleterious effects (Arkhipova 2018). For context, the human

genome (GCF_009914755.1), has a TE content of 44%-69% (Nurk et al. 2022; de Koning et

al. 2011) and a genic:intergenic base pair ratio of 0.55:1 (1717.7 Mb:3117.3 Mb), making it

several times more compact than *M. cerasi*, but much less compact than *S. flava*.

Figure 1. Summary of TE content and activity in aphid genomes, plotted in phylogenetic order. Nodes in the aphid phylogeny with bootstrap support <100 are labelled. Genome size is represented by the black bars. TE content is expressed as percentage of total genome size for each species, with major TE classifications represented by the colours indicated in the key. Kimura 2-parameter distance (CpG adjusted) from each TE family consensus is used as a proxy for TE activity, where a lower Kimura distance indicates more recent TE activity. Activity is organised such that recent TE activity is towards the RHS of the X axis.

Across all aphid species and in most individual genomes, the dominant TE

classification is DNA TEs, which comprise between 36.6% (*Schlechtendalia chinensis*) and

68.9% (*Aphis craccivora*) of total TE content (μ = 45.58%, SD = 17.74%, Figure 1B, Table 1,

Supplementary Table 1). SINEs are present only in the genomes of 7 of the 21 species

considered (Supplementary Table 1) and, where present, they comprise just 0.009% (*A.*

pisum) to 0.1% (*A. craccivora*) of total TE content.

TE Classification	Mean Share of TE Content (% of total TE content)	Standard Deviation of Share of TE Content (% of total TE content)
DNA	45.58%	17.74%
Unclassified	35.40%	14.67%
LINE	7.58%	3.70%
LTR	6.40%	7.93%
Rolling Circle	3.48%	2.12%
SINE	2.14%	5.24%
Penelope	0.39%	0.73%

Table 1. Means and standard deviations of the percentage of total TE content attributed to
each of the main TE classifications in the 21 aphid genomes included in this study.

There is little evidence of ancient TE activity in aphid genomes, as indicated by the

relatively low number of TEs showing high divergence from their respective TE consensus

models in repeat landscape plots (Figure 1C). On the other hand, there is considerable

evidence of relatively recent TE activity in most aphid species, with particular evidence of

very recent TE activity in *Myzus persicae*, *Dysaphis plantaginea*, and *M. dirhodum*, indicated

by large numbers of TEs with low genetic distance from their respective consensus

sequences (Figure 1C). The relative absence of ancient TE activity is presumably a

consequence of a relatively rapid genomic turnover rate in aphids, and contrasts strongly

with TE landscapes in mammals, where a low rate of genomic turnover leads to

considerable accumulations of ageing TEs (Blass et al. 2012). Instead, the dynamics we

observe for aphids are consistent with patterns reported for other insects, such as

lepidopterans (Lavoie et al. 2013; Baril and Hayward 2022).

The extent to which TE content differs among the genomes of closely related species

can vary greatly. We find no significant effect of phylogeny on TE abundance (No. of TEs

present in a genome) or diversity (No. distinct TE families present in a genome (Wicker et al.

2007)) in aphids (Phylogenetic GLMM, TE abundance: posterior mean = 0.599, 95% HPD =

0.005,0.999; TE diversity: posterior mean = 0.023, 95% HPD = 0.000,0.111). Thus, more

closely related aphid species do not possess similar numbers of TEs or a similar level of TE

diversity. We also find that the majority of TE families present in aphid genomes are species-

specific, with almost half of the TE families present in a particular aphid genome being

unique to that species (μ = 47.32%) (Figure 2). Considering TE families that occur in two or

more aphid species, the set containing the highest number of shared TEs is 21 (i.e. all

species considered) with a mean percentage of 9.92% of TE families (Figure 2). The

remaining 42.76% of TE families are shared in similar proportions among 2 to 20 aphid

species (i.e. μ = 2.38% per category, Figure 2). The strong signature of species-specificity

observed for aphid TE families suggests that the independent gain of new TE families is a

major factor driving aphid TE landscapes. Collectively, these findings suggest a dynamic

repeat landscape in aphid genomes, characterised by relatively frequent gain and turnover

of TEs.

Figure 2. Overview of the extent to which TE families are shared among aphid genomes, and their insertion locations. **A**. Quantification of shared and unique TE families in aphids. Main TE classifications are represented by the colours indicated in the key. **B**. TE genome compartment occupancy, expressed by TEs as a percentage of total genome size. Gene flanking regions are defined as 20kb directly upstream or downstream of the gene body

TEs are enriched at XRL compared to other host genes

Previous studies have implicated TEs in the evolution of xenobiotic resistance across a

range of insects and resistance loci (Li et al. 2007). However, the extent to which TE

association at XRL represents a general mechanism for the evolution of new resistance

phenotypes remains unclear.

Across all aphid genomes, we find significant enrichment of TEs, both in TE

coverage and TE count, at XRL in comparison to all other genes excluding XRL (TE

coverage: Wilcoxon Rank Sum, $W_{7095,439790}$ = 874,611,740, p<0.01; TE count: Wilcoxon Rank

Sum, $W_{7095,439790}$ = 931,410,344, p<0.01) (Figure 3, Supplementary Figure 3). Specifically,

aphids have a mean of 2.4x TE coverage and 2.1x TE count at XRL compared to all other

genes.

TE content varies among individual XRL

We observe an enrichment of TEs around all major XRL categories considered compared to

other host genes: Cytochrome P450s (CYPs), 2.4x TE coverage, 2.1x TE count; glutathione

S-transferases (GSTs), 2.7x TE coverage, 2.3x TE count; esterases, 2.0x TE coverage, 1.8x

TE count; UDP-glucuronosyltransferases (UGTs), 2.0x TE coverage, 1.7x TE count; ABC

transporters (ABCs), 2.8x TE coverage, 2.4x TE count (Figure 3, Supplementary Figure 3,

Supplementary Table 3). Whilst all major XRL categories are enriched for TEs, there is no

significant difference in relative enrichment among XRL types, suggesting relatively equal

levels of enrichment across XRL types (Kruskal-Wallis, TE sequence: χ^2_4 = 9.05, p = 0.06;

TE count: χ^2_4 = 4.98, p = 0.29). However, considerable variability in TE content is present

within XRL categories, attributable to extremely large accumulations of TEs at certain

individual XRL (Table 2, Figure 4). Some of these XRL are unusually large in terms of

sequence length compared to the mean size for the XRL type in question, as indicated by

gene size Z-scores > 3 (Table 2), which is potentially a consequence of the increased

presence of TEs in their intronic regions (Figure 4). To investigate this, we consider gene

sizes with genic TEs removed, finding that only 5/18 of the most TE-enriched XRL have

significantly inflated gene sizes, indicated by a Z-score of > 3. This suggests that these loci

were significantly larger than average before accounting for TE contributions. However, the

remaining 13 highly enriched XRL have gene sizes within the expected range in the absence

of TEs, suggesting that TEs are indeed responsible for the significant increases in gene size

at the majority of these loci.

Individual XRL with the greatest enrichment of TE coverage and TE count (i.e. >35kb

TE sequence and >80 TE insertions, compared to a non-XRL mean of 1.5kb TE sequence

and 1.48 TE insertions) are listed in Table 2. Whilst all XRL types are represented in the TE

hotspots listed in Table 2, there are markedly more hotspots at UGTs and CYP genes, and

fewer at ABCs, GSTs, and Esterases.

Figure 3. Differences in TE coverage and TE count at XRL compared to all other host genes. Coverage and count of genic (exon and intron)
XRL sequence plus flanking regions (20kb directly upstream or downstream of the gene body) is shown. Each point represents a single XRL.
Black lines indicate the expected TE coverage difference whereby XRL and other genes are equally enriched for TEs (i.e. 0 enrichment).
Coloured lines indicate species mean coverage and count for each XRL and TE type. Major TE classifications are indicated by the colours in
the key.

Aphid Species	Gene ID	XRL Type	Mean Gene Size (by gene type)	Gene Size in bp (Z-score)	XRL associated TE Coverage (bp)	Fold-increase above aphid-wide enrichment (XRL-type specific)	Fold-increase above aphid-wide enrichment (non-XRL genes)	XRL associated TE Count	Fold-increase above aphid-wide enrichment (XRL-type specific)	Fold-increase above aphid-wide enrichment (non-XRL genes)	Gene Size after removing genic TEs (Z-score)
Greatest Enrichment of TE Coverage											
Acyrthosiphon pisum	**2399_UGT344E8_v2**	**UDP-glucuronosyltransferase**	**8,302**	**55,119 (4.63)**	**55,257**	**9.05**	**36.38**	**118**	**9.08**	**79.73**	**24,991 (2.45)**
Acyrthosiphon pisum	**2354_UGT344D11_v2**	**UDP-glucuronosyltransferase**	**8,302**	**57,143 (4.83)**	**45,208**	**7.40**	**29.76**	**96**	**7.38**	**64.86**	**26,620 (2.68)**
Myzus persicae	**125_CYP380C52**	**Cytochrome P450**	**7,221**	**100,885 (9.70)**	**44,205**	**6.28**	**29.10**	**102**	**6.00**	**68.92**	**56,825 (5.97)**
Myzus persicae	**109_CYP380C31**	**Cytochrome P450**	**7,221**	**99,455 (9.55)**	**42,790**	**6.08**	**28.17**	**94**	**5.53**	**63.51**	**57,937 (6.10)**
Myzus persicae	352_gst_g525.t1	Glutathione S-Transferase	3,450	16,231 (2.65)	40,940	5.02	26.95	45	2.50	30.41	10,854 (1.54)
Myzus persicae	**105_CYP380C19**	**Cytochrome P450**	**7,221**	**61,287 (5.60)**	**39,133**	**5.56**	**25.76**	**100**	**5.88**	**67.57**	**34,033 (3.17)**
Metopolophium dirhodum	2360_UGT344A13	UDP-glucuronosyltransferase	8,302	18,807 (1.04)	38,003	6.22	25.02	45	3.46	30.41	8,327 (0.11)

Metopolophium dirhodum	1793_UGT345A3	UDP-glucuronosyltransferase	8,302	6,504 (-0.18)	37,746	6.18	24.85	29	2.23	19.59	4,684 (-0.40)
Sitobion miscanthi	690_UGT341A5_v2	UDP-glucuronosyltransferase	8,302	4,437 (-0.38)	36,666	6.00	24.14	42	3.23	28.38	3,950 (-0.50)
Sitobion miscanthi	687_UGT341A5	UDP-glucuronosyltransferase	8,302	4,456 (-0.38)	36,179	5.92	23.82	39	3.00	26.35	3,969 (-0.50)
Metopolophium dirhodum	13_abc_g2222.t1	ABC Transporter	11,211	14,244 (0.32)	35,841	4.30	23.60	35	1.84	23.65	12,513 (0.06)
Sitobion miscanthi	1630_UGT344E8_v2	UDP-glucuronosyltransferase	8,302	3,249 (-0.50)	35,637	5.84	23.46	57	4.38	38.51	2,150 (-0.75)
Sitobion miscanthi	72_est_g6279.t1	Esterase	10,888	35,579 (1.82)	35,569	5.90	23.42	63	4.50	42.57	23,910 (1.03)
Greatest Enrichment of TE Count											
Acyrthosiphon pisum	**2399_UGT344E8_v2**	**UDP-glucuronosyltransferase**	**8,302**	**55,119 (4.63)**	**55,257**	**9.05**	**36.38**	**118**	**9.08**	**79.73**	**24,991 (2.45)**
Myzus persicae	**125_CYP380C52**	**Cytochrome P450**	**7,221**	**100,885 (9.70)**	**44,205**	**6.28**	**29.10**	**102**	**6.00**	**68.92**	**56,825 (5.97)**
Myzus persicae	**105_CYP380C19**	**Cytochrome P450**	**7,221**	**61,287 (5.60)**	**39,133**	**5.56**	**25.76**	**100**	**5.88**	**67.57**	**34,033 (3.17)**
Acyrthosiphon pisum	**2354_UGT344D11_v2**	**UDP-glucuronosyltransferase**	**8,302**	**57,143 (4.83)**	**45,208**	**7.40**	**29.76**	**96**	**7.38**	**64.86**	**26,620 (2.68)**

Myzus persicae	**109_CYP380C31**	**Cytochrome P450**	**7,221**	**99,455 (9.55)**	**42,790**	**6.08**	**28.17**	**94**	**5.53**	**63.51**	**57,937 (6.10)**
Acyrthosiph on pisum	2423_abc_g11808.t1	ABC Transporter	11,211	25,566 (1.53)	25,867	3.11	17.03	84	4.42	56.76	19,631 (0.83)
Sitobion avenae	1033_UGT344A27	UDP-glucuronosyltransfer ase	8,302	62,310 (5.34)	33,066	5.41	21.77	82	6.31	55.41	45,645 (5.35)
Acyrthosiph on pisum	1088_CYP380C8	Cytochrome P450	7,221	10,900 (0.38)	28,620	4.07	18.84	82	4.82	55.41	5,975 (-0.27)
Sitobion miscanthi	911_UGT344A27	UDP-glucuronosyltransfer ase	8,302	64,596 (5.57)	27,402	4.49	18.04	81	6.23	54.73	38,974 (4.41)
Acyrthosiph on pisum	1_abc_g11808.t1	ABC Transporter	11,211	39,350 (3.00)	31,743	3.81	20.90	81	4.26	54.73	25,849 (1.50)

261   Table 2. XRL with the greatest enrichment for TE coverage and TE count in aphids. Z-scores indicate the number of standard deviations away
262   from mean gene size for individual genes. Z-scores <-3 or >3 indicate statistically unusually small or large genes compared to mean XRL size,
263   respectively. Entries in bold are XRLs that are highly enriched for both TE coverage and TE count.

Figure 4. Karyoplots illustrating the most TE-dense XRL, corresponding to the XRL highlighted in bold in Table 2. For comparison, the gene region represented in the shaded box (gene10004) shows a non-XRL from *M. persicae* with representative TE coverage close to the mean for non-XRL (1,519bp). XRLs 125_CYP380C52 and 105_CYP380C19 are not shown, as these are gene isoforms in the same region as 109_CYP380C31. Sea green shaded regions indicate gene flanking regions. Grey bars represent gene bodies, and black bars show exonic regions. TEs are annotated above their respective gene tracks, with colours indicating the main TE classifications, as depicted in the key at the bottom of the figure.

Specific TE types are enriched at XRL

While most TE types contribute to enrichment at XRL, overall enrichment is primarily driven by increases in DNA TE content, due to the high frequency of DNA TEs in aphid genomes, where they comprise almost half of total TE content (Table 3).

The TE type with the greatest degree of enrichment in coverage around XRL in comparison to other genes is SINEs, although there is a slight non-significant reduction in SINE count at XRL (**TE coverage**, 3.2x enrichment: XRL μ = 1,144bp, all other genes μ = 358bp; Wilcoxon Rank Sum, $W_{9,482}$ = 439, p < 0.01; **TE count,** 0.82x enrichment: XRL μ = 1.00, all other genes μ = 1.22; Wilcoxon Rank Sum, $W_{9,482}$ = 2592, p = 0.14). This is notable, since SINEs are generally very scarce in aphid genomes, and suggests a particular retention of SINE sequence at XRL (Figure 1, Figure 3, Table 1, Supplementary Table 1). However, given their scarcity, the relative contribution that SINEs make to TE enrichment at XRL compared to other TE types is extremely low. Conversely, DNA TEs are the most abundant TE type in aphid genomes, and they are significantly enriched at XRL both in TE coverage and TE count (**TE coverage**, 2.1x enrichment: XRL μ = 4,225bp, all other genes μ = 1,970bp; Wilcoxon Rank Sum, $W_{6703,368474}$ = 732,223,460, p < 0.01; **TE count**, 6.2x enrichment: XRL μ = 10.04, all other genes μ = 1.61; Wilcoxon Rank Sum, $W_{6703,368474}$ = 1,538,514,776, p < 0.01) (Figure 3). Rolling circle TEs show significant, but lower levels of enrichment (**TE coverage**, 1.2x enrichment: XRL μ = 851bp, all other genes μ = 735bp; Wilcoxon Rank Sum, $W_{2013,61439}$ = 57,121,576, p<0.01; **TE count**, 1.7x enrichment: XRL μ = 2.15, all other genes μ = 1.24; Wilcoxon Rank Sum, $W_{2013,61439}$ = 70,189,210, p < 0.01). LINEs also show significant but lower levels of enrichment at XRL (**TE coverage**, 1.2x enrichment: XRL μ = 1,154bp, all other genes μ = 978bp; Wilcoxon Rank Sum, $W_{2866,110685}$ = 152,229,422, p < 0.01; **TE count**, 1.3x enrichment: XRL μ = 1.79, all other genes μ = 1.43; Wilcoxon Rank Sum, $W_{2866,110685}$ = 203,186.510, p < 0.01). In contrast, we find only a slight, non-significant, enrichment of LTR TE coverage at XRL, but we do identify a significant

enrichment of LTR TE count (**TE coverage**, 1.4x enrichment: XRL μ = 1,853bp, all other

genes μ = 1,319bp; Wilcoxon Rank Sum, $W_{1127,58711}$ = 32,412,424, p = 0.24; **TE count**, 1.7x

enrichment: XRL μ = 2.54, all other genes μ = 1.53; Wilcoxon Rank Sum, $W_{1127,58711}$ =

41,974,654, p < 0.01). Only PLEs show a depletion, albeit insignificant, in TE coverage

around XRL, but they also show significant enrichment in count around XRL (**TE coverage**,

0.7x enrichment: XRL μ = 472bp, all other genes μ = 621bp; $W_{49,7075}$ = 197,672, p = 0.09; **TE**

count, 1.3x enrichment: XRL μ = 1.43, all other genes μ = 1.12; Wilcoxon Rank Sum,

$W_{49,7075}$ = 190,634, p < 0.05). However, like SINEs, PLEs account for a very small proportion

of total TE content (Supplementary Table 1).

TE Type	Non-XRL	All XRL	CYPs	GSTs	Esterases	UGTs	ABCs
DNA	1,969bp (2)	4,225bp (10)	4,481bp (11)	4,757bp (11)	3,489bp (8)	3,748bp (8)	4,651bp (11)
Rolling Circle	735bp (1)	851bp (2)	823bp (2)	814bp (2)	1,115bp (3)	706bp (2)	798bp (2)
Penelope	621bp (1)	505bp (1)	841bp (1)	175bp (1)	848bp (2)	185bp (1)	477bp (1)
LINE	978 (1)	1,154bp (2)	1,089bp (2)	1,217bp (2)	1,408bp (2)	944bp (2)	1,114bp (2)
SINE	358 (1)	1,144bp (1)	-	-	-	1,686bp (1)	602bp (1)
LTR	1,319bp (2)	2,055bp (3)	1,214bp (1)	2,635bp (3)	1,443bp (2)	1,264bp (2)	3,718bp (5)
Unclassified	1,294 (1)	2,163bp (5)	2,079bp (5)	2,248bp (6)	1,718bp (4)	2,392bp (6)	2,380bp (6)

313 Table 3. Mean base pair coverage of each TE classification at XRL among aphids. Numbers
314 in brackets indicate mean TE copy number at each XRL for each TE classification.

XRL enrichment varies among aphid genomes

We find no significant difference in TE enrichment among different XRL types (i.e CYP genes, esterases, UGTs, GSTs, ABCs) (Kruskal-Wallis, TE coverage: χ^2_4 = 9.05, p = 0.06; TE count: χ^2_4 = 4.98, p = 0.29, Figure 3). However, we do find significant variation in the magnitude of TE enrichment at XRL among aphid species (linear regression, TE coverage: $F_{20,82}$ = 35.28, p < 0.01, adjusted R^2 = 0.87, TE count: $F_{20,82}$ = 27.19, p < 0.01, adjusted R^2 = 0.84). Specifically, in terms of TE coverage, *C. cedri* shows the highest levels of enrichment across all XRL, with a mean enrichment of 15.9x compared to non-XRL (Figure 5, Supplementary Table 3). This is considerably higher than the lowest level of mean TE coverage enrichment, which was found in *M. sacchari* with 1.9x TE coverage enrichment at XRL compared to non-XRL (Figure 5, Supplementary Table 3). In terms of TE count, the highest level of enrichment at XRL compared to non-XRL was also found in *C. cedri*, with a mean TE count enrichment of 28.5x the number of TE insertions, whilst the lowest level was found in *A. craccivora*, with a mean enrichment of 4.6x the number of TE insertions at XRL compared to non-XRL (Figure 5, Supplementary Table 3)

Overall, whilst we observe enrichment in both TE coverage and TE count at XRL compared to non-XRL in aphid genomes, fold-change increases are larger for TE count. High enrichment for TE count combined with lower increases in TE coverage suggest that enrichment is driven by the presence of large numbers of TE fragments at XRL, as opposed to full-length TEs (Figure 6). Indeed, mean TE length at XRL across aphids is just 444bp, which is much shorter than most full length TEs, excluding SINEs (Wells and Feschotte 2020; Wicker et al. 2007). Further, 90.23% of TEs across XRL are below 1,000bp in length (Figure 6). Therefore, it is likely that a general pattern in TE accumulation at XRL is the truncation of TEs with retention of specific TE domains, as previously observed for certain individual cases of TE co-option during the evolution of host insecticide resistance (Singh et al. 2020; Remnant et al. 2013; Panini et al. 2021; Bogwitz et al. 2005; Itokawa et al. 2011;

342   Schmidt et al. 2010; Darboux et al. 2007; Gahan et al. 2001; Yang et al. 2007; Zhao et al.

343   2010).

347 Figure 5. TE enrichment at XRL compared to genome-wide levels. Fold-change enrichment
348 for TE coverage and TE count at XRL compared to within-genome levels at non-XR genes
349 across 21 aphid species.

Figure 6. Fragmented TEs at XRL across all aphid species, presented as TE count by TE length with a bin width of 250bp. TE count is presented on a $\log_{10}$ scale. The main TE classifications are indicated by the colours indicated in the key. Mean TE length across all TEs at XRL is 444bp.

TEs are enriched at XRL associated with the detoxification of synthetic insecticides in certain aphid species

Cytochrome P450 genes (CYP genes) are a highly important gene family for the detoxification of xenobiotics, including insecticides (Katsavou et al. 2022; Feyereisen 2005). Indeed, increases in the expression of certain CYP genes can provide dramatic increases in insecticide resistance (Nauen et al. 2022). Additionally, several cases of TE interactions with CYP genes have been characterised (Chung et al. 2007; Chen and Li 2007; Daborn et al. 2002; Itokawa et al. 2011; Schmidt et al. 2010; Karunker et al. 2008; Nauen et al. 2022). Therefore, we undertook a targeted analysis to examine evidence for the accumulation of TEs at CYP genes with putative functions in xenobiotic resistance. For this, aphid CYP

genes were labelled based on the availability of evidence to support their xenobiotic

resistance functions (Katsavou et al. 2022), as some CYP gene family members play other

roles, such as hormone breakdown, resulting in the assignment of 2-29 CYP genes per

aphid genome to the xenobiotic detoxification category (Supplementary Table 5). In *S. flava*,

C. cedri, and *M. cerasi*, we find significant enrichment of TEs surrounding CYP genes in

CYP gene (sub)families frequently implicated in the breakdown of xenobiotics compared to

those with other functions (Figure 7B). However, we found the opposite pattern in *S.*

graminum, *M. dirhodum*, *D. plantiginea*, and *M. persicae*, where overall there is significant

depletion of TEs surrounding CYP genes associated with xenobiotic resistance (Figure 7B).

Next, we considered patterns of TE accumulation at CYP genes specifically involved

in resistance to synthetic insecticides, rather than resistance to xenobiotics more generally.

For this, CYP genes associated with xenobiotic resistance functions were labelled to reflect

the compounds to which they confer resistance. CYP genes that confer resistance to

insecticides were then considered separately from CYP genes associated with the

detoxification of other xenobiotics, such as those offering resistance to naturally occurring

plant allelochemicals. We find a significant enrichment of TEs around CYP genes associated

with resistance to synthetic insecticides in *P. nigronervosa*, *A. pisum*, *M. cerasi*, and *M.*

persicae (Figure 7C). Of these four aphid species, the latter three are all species of "*most*

agricultural importance" (Van Emden and Harrington 2017), and are therefore likely to have

experienced particularly high exposure to synthetic insecticides, and extremely strong

selection to evolve resistance. The significant enrichment of TEs at XRL associated with

resistance to synthetic insecticides in these species is thus consistent with their selective

recruitment for resistance evolution. However, no significant enrichment of TEs around CYP

genes associated with resistance to synthetic insecticides was found in the other 8 species

of "*most agricultural importance*" included in our analysis: *A. craccivora, A. gossypii, D.*

noxia, *M. dirhodum, R. padi, S. graminum,* and *S. avenae (Van Emden and Harrington*

2017).

Figure 7. TE association with cytochrome P450 genes in aphids. **A**. Midpoint-rooted phylogeny of CYP genes identified in aphid genomes in this study. Individual genes are coloured by their CYP clan. **B**. TE coverage around CYP genes linked to xenobiotic resistance versus those with other functions. Numbers on the right indicate the number of genes in each group being compared. **C**.TE coverage around CYP genes linked to resistance to synthetic insecticides versus those conferring resistance to natural xenobiotics. Numbers on the right indicate the number of genes in each group under comparison.

Evidence for the selective enrichment of TEs at XRL

We hypothesised that TE enrichment at resistance loci could arise through two distinct processes: (i) Chromatin availability, whereby XRL may be surrounded by open chromatin due to frequent transcriptional activity or constitutive expression, and so represent locations that are more accessible for transposition; (ii) Selective retention of beneficial TE insertions. Given that XRL are essential for the detoxification of harmful plant metabolites and insecticides, and so are of key importance for survival and reproduction, TE insertions that modify XRL in beneficial ways may be selectively retained and so spread through host populations. Consequently, the combined effects of XRL as selective hotspots (especially considering the extremely strong selection mediated by intensive insecticide regimes), and the demonstrated evolutionary potential of TEs, could result in the selective retention of TE insertions surrounding XRL over time. Such effects may be magnified by the influence of host stress under insecticide exposure, which has been implicated in increases in TE activity (Chénais et al. 2012; Stapley et al. 2015; Horváth et al. 2017). Specifically, increased TE activity may result in a higher likelihood of TE insertions occurring at any genomic location, including XRL. However, TE insertions at XRL may be more likely to be selectively retained, if they offer host benefits in the form of resistance mutations, due to their capacity to contribute to host evolvability through diverse genetic mechanisms (Bourque et al. 2018; Rebollo et al. 2012).

Only germline TE activity, as opposed to somatic TE activity, is relevant from the perspective of TE accumulation at XRL, since only TE insertions that occur in the germline have the potential to be transmitted to the next generation (novel TE insertions in the genomes of somatic cells are an evolutionary dead-end). TE density at a gene, defined as the proportion of its sequence occupied by TEs, is positively correlated with germline gene expression, suggesting that TEs preferentially insert into regions that are actively transcribed in the germline (McVicker and Green 2010). Therefore, a key question to distinguish

between alternative hypotheses that explain TE enrichment at XRL is, to what extent are

XRL expressed in the germline? We addressed this question using data obtained from the

Drosophila gene expression atlas, FlyAtlas2 (Krause et al. 2022), to examine gene

expression in testes and ovaries for XRL and a large panel of housekeeping genes.

Housekeeping genes are constitutively expressed in all cell types and so represent a

'maximally accessible' case with which to examine TE enrichment (Butte et al. 2001)

(Supplementary Table 4). We find that germline housekeeping gene expression is

significantly higher compared to XRL considering mean FPKM (fragments per kilobase of

transcript per million base pairs sequenced) data derived from FlyAtlas2 (Wilcoxon Rank

Sum, $W_{456,51}$ = 1105, p < 0.01, Figure 8). Consistent with chromatin availability as an

explanation for TE enrichment, we find that TEs are significantly enriched at housekeeping

genes compared to all other host genes, excluding XRL (TE coverage: Wilcoxon Rank Sum,

$W_{573,518117}$ = 250,570,019, p < 0.01; TE count: Wilcoxon Rank Sum, $W_{573,518117}$ =

194,478,652, p < 0.01), to a similar level as that observed for XRL versus all other host

genes (Figure 8, Supplementary Figures 3 and 4). However, given that germline expression

of XRL is consistently low across all XRL types (Figure 8), we conclude that germline

expression cannot explain the observed enrichment of TEs at XRLs. Instead, our findings

support the alternative explanation for the enrichment of TEs at XRLs, which is selective

retention of TE sequences due to genetic contributions towards the evolution of xenobiotic

resistance mutations. There is no mechanistic basis to suggest that TEs specifically target

the regions surrounding XRLs as insertion sites, compared to other genomic locations.

Instead, under this model TE insertions at XRLs are more likely to be retained and spread

through the host population (compared to TE insertions at other loci), due to the combination

of their capacity to contribute to host evolvability, and the extremely strong selection

pressure imposed by insecticide treatment.

Figure 8. TE occupancy at XRL, housekeeping genes, and all other genes, and expression of XRL and housekeeping genes in *D. melanogaster*. **A**. TE coverage around XRL, housekeeping genes, and all other genes. Box limits indicate upper and lower quartiles, whilst central lines indicate mean TE coverage. **B**. TE count around XRL, housekeeping genes, and all other genes. Box limits indicate upper and lower quartiles, whilst central lines indicate mean TE count. **C**. Expression of XRL and housekeeping genes in germline tissues (testis and ovary) in *D. melanogaster* from FlyAtlas2, expressed as fragments per kilobase of transcript per million base pairs sequenced (FPKM), to determine expected expression of XRL in germline cell types. Gene types are indicated by colours in the key.

Discussion

Resistance evolution remains a major societal challenge that greatly affects efforts to control harmful pests and pathogens (Van Emden and Harrington 2017). To develop new approaches to overcome the challenge of resistance evolution, a deeper understanding of the genomic mechanisms leading to the repeated emergence of resistant phenotypes is required. Whilst isolated examples of TE involvement in the evolution of xenobiotic resistance exist, the extent to which TEs act as a source of genomic novelty for resistance evolution, and host evolution more generally, remains an open question.

We examine whether genes implicated in xenobiotic resistance are enriched for TE insertions, potentially due to the generation of novel advantageous mutations for resistance evolution. We find an enrichment of TEs, both in terms of TE sequence coverage and number of TE insertions, at XRL across all aphids and all XRL types. Further, we provide evidence that this enrichment is the consequence of selection at XRL, as opposed to elevated insertion rates due to chromatin availability at XRL in the germline.

Our results also uncover considerable variability in the enrichment of TEs around XRL both within and among aphid species and XRL types. This demonstrates that TEs are not globally enriched at every XRL, but instead are enriched only at certain XRL and depleted at others. Consequently, the patterns we observe are driven by hotspots of TE enrichment around certain XRL types, and in some cases individual XRL, which show extremely high levels of enrichment compared to other XRL. For example, considering all aphid species examined, we identify significant enrichment of TEs around GSTs. However, this result is driven by a subset of aphids, with 11 of the 21 species showing no evidence of significant enrichment around this XRL class (Supplementary Figure 3). This is consistent with varying levels of selection acting on particular detoxification genes and particular aphid species. Meanwhile, we find markedly more TE hotspots at UGTs and CYP genes, whereby certain XRL are massively enriched for TE fragments. These observations demonstrate the

nuances involved in patterns of TE accumulation at XRL, and underline a need for functional

validation analyses to test the impact of individual TE insertions on XRL expression.

Important crop pests are likely to experience much higher levels of insecticide stress

than non-target species, demonstrated by the increased number and diversity of insecticide

resistance mutations in target species, compared to non-target species (Whalon et al.).

Consequently, variability in TE enrichment is expected among aphid species and XRL,

depending on variation in the degree of insecticide exposure. This prediction is confirmed

when considering CYP genes, for which data clarifying the relationship to specific

insecticides is available (rather than just to xenobiotics in general). Specifically, we find that

TE enrichment is significantly higher around CYP genes that are implicated in the

detoxification of synthetic insecticides, compared to those involved in the detoxification of

natural xenobiotics, but only in three out of ten aphids of "*major agricultural importance*" (Van

Emden and Harrington 2017) included in our study (*A. pisum, M. cerasi*, and *M. persicae*).

Consequently, either CYP genes are less important for survival in the other species (perhaps

due to differences in pest control strategies, such as a greater reliance on forms of non-

insecticide based control, for instance the use of biocontrol strategies), or there are genomic

mechanisms that limit the co-option of TEs for resistance evolution in these species.

Demonstrated contributions of TEs to xenobiotic resistance often involve small

fragments of the original TE insertions, and contain motifs that act as host regulatory

elements (Singh et al. 2020; Remnant et al. 2013; Panini et al. 2021; Bogwitz et al. 2005;

Itokawa et al. 2011; Schmidt et al. 2010; Darboux et al. 2007; Gahan et al. 2001; Yang et al.

2007). Meanwhile, the emergence of a resistant phenotype frequently appears to result from

a single, or up to a few, TE insertions at each specific XRL, rather than large accumulations

of TE DNA (Schmidt et al. 2010; Daborn et al. 2002; Chung et al. 2007; Panini et al. 2021).

This presumably occurs due to genomic and selective processes that act to retain the core

TE regions that convey a selective benefit, while purging long repetitive and potentially

deleterious regions (e.g. that promote non-homologous recombination with similar repetitive

elements). Meanwhile, the impacts of these TE insertions can occur via complex multistep

processes including the retention of several truncated TE fragments (such as for CYP6G1,

Schmidt *et al.* (2010)). Thus, a key consideration is that TE-associated resistance

mechanisms go beyond simple enrichment at specific loci.

We find that DNA TEs are highly enriched at XRL, despite the more widely

acknowledged role of TEs with more complex cis-regulatory elements, such as LTR

retrotransposons, in altering host gene expression (Chung et al. 2007). This may suggest

that other processes beyond TE-mediated increases in expression are involved in the

patterns of enrichment we uncover. Although, it is entirely possible that the DNA TEs

involved also contain sequences relevant for the recruitment of transcription factors that

increase expression. Meanwhile, at present we cannot currently explain the repeated cases

whereby certain XRL are massively enriched in terms of TE coverage and TE count

compared to other XRL. Thus, unravelling the influence of TEs at these loci represents a key

target for future research.

Additional data are required to elucidate the potential underlying mechanisms

through which the TE sequences identified here may play a role in resistance phenotypes,

such as: information on chromatin conformation and the availability of DNA within TE

sequences at XRL, screening to investigate if TE sequences contain key transcription factor

binding sites, and the results of functional validation experiments. This will ultimately allow

the evaluation of the extent to which TEs are utilised in resistance mutations, versus the

contributions arising from other classes of genetic variation such as SNPs and CNVs.

Materials and Methods

Estimating Host Phylogeny

The genome assemblies of 21 aphid species, and 7 diverse hemipteran outgroup species (*Ericerus pela*, *Maconellicoccus hirsutus*, *Phenacoccus solenopsis, Bemisa tabaci, Sogatella furcifera, Diaphorina citri, Pachypsylla venusta*), were obtained along with gene annotations where available (Supplementary Table 6). To estimate host phylogeny, a supermatrix approach was used. Specifically, for each genome assembly, BUSCO (version 5.2.2) (Manni et al. 2021a, 2021b) was used with the hemiptera_odb10 geneset to identify conserved gene orthologs in each genome assembly. The identifiers for all complete genes were extracted and those present in less than three genomes were removed. The amino acid sequences for each gene from all species were extracted and saved in individual fasta files. For each gene, sequences were aligned using MAFFT (version 7.453) (Katoh and Standley 2013) (--auto). The subsequent alignments were concatenated using Phykit create_concat (Steenwyk et al. 2021) to generate a supermatrix. To generate the species phylogeny, we performed 1,000 ultrafast bootstrap repetitions (-bb 1000) in IQ-tree (version 1.6.12)(Nguyen et al. 2015), using the best fit amino acid model identified by Modelfinder (Kalyaanamoorthy et al. 2017) (Supplementary File 1).

Transposable Element Annotation

To curate and annotate TEs, each genome assembly was annotated with the Earl Grey TE annotation pipeline (version 1.3) (https://github.com/TobyBaril/EarlGrey) (Baril et al. 2022). Briefly, known TEs from Arthropoda (-r arthropoda) were first annotated using both the Dfam 3.4 (Hubley et al. 2016) and RepBase RepeatMasker Edition (version 20181026) (Jurka et al. 2005; Kapitonov and Jurka 2008) TE databases. Following this, Earl Grey identified *de*

novo TE families and refined these using an iterative 'BLAST, Extract, Extend' process (Platt

et al. 2016). Following final annotation with the combined library of known and *de novo* TE

families, annotations are processed to remove overlapping annotations and to defragment

annotations likely to originate from the same TE insertion. TE annotation GFF files are

provided in Supplementary File 2.

To characterise TEs as either shared or species-specific, *de novo* TE libraries from

each genome assembly were clustered to the TE family definition of (Wicker et al. 2007),

implemented as described by (Goubert et al. 2022) using cd-hit-est (-d 0 -aS 0.8 -c 0.8 -G 0 -

g 1 -b 500 -r 1) (Li and Godzik 2006; Fu et al. 2012). Sequences within each cluster were

designated a number between 0 and 20 to determine the number of other species that the

TE family was shared with, with 0 identifying TEs unique to a species, and 20 identifying TEs

shared across all 21 aphid species considered in this study. For known TE families from

Dfam and RepBase, each TE was labelled using the same system based on the number of

species the TE family was identified in.

Genetic distance from TE consensus sequence is used as a proxy for estimated

timing of TE activity (i.e TE age). Using genetic distance from TE consensus as a proxy for

insertion time should be taken with caution, as this can be influenced by the methodology

used to generate TE consensus sequences, and whether known TE sequences from other

organisms are used as a reference or purely *de novo* TE consensus sequences from the

species of interest. However, this metric can still be used to provide a rough relative estimate

of TE activity.

Heritability of TE Abundance and Diversity

To determine the heritability of TE abundance, expressed as total TE count, and TE

diversity, expressed as total number of distinct TE families, we measured the amount of

variation explained by phylogenetic relationships using Bayesian phylogenetic mixed models

with Markov chain Monte Carlo estimations, with an intercept fitted as a fixed effect and the

phylogeny fitted as a random effect, in the MCMCglmm package (Hadfield 2010) in R

(version 4.2.1) (Team 2013) using the Rstudio IDE (Team 2015; Racine 2013). A poisson

error distribution and log link function were used, and inverse gamma priors were specified

for all R and G-side random effects (V = 1, v = 0.002). Models were run for 11,000,000

iterations with a burn-in of 1,000,000 and a thinning interval of 1,000. This approach

generated 10,000 posterior samples from which posterior mode and 95% CIs were

calculated. The proportion of between-species variation explained by phylogeny was

calculated from the model using the equation $V_p / (V_p + V_s)$ where V_p and V_s represent the

phylogenetic and species-specific components of between-species variance (Freckleton et

al. 2002), which is equivalent to phylogenetic heritability.

Gene Predictions and Transposable Element Association with Genomic

Compartments

For genome assemblies lacking a gene annotation GFF file (*A. gossypii*, *H. cornu*, *M.*

dirhodum, *P. nigronervosa*, *R. padi*, *S. graminum*, *S. chinensis*, *S. avenae*, *S. miscanthi*),

genes were annotated using Augustus (version 3.3.3) (Stanke et al. 2008; Keller et al. 2011)

using the pea aphid reference gene set (--species=pea_aphid --strand=both --

genemodel=partial --introns=on --exonnames=on --gff3=on).

To prepare genome annotation files for intersection with TE loci, each gene

annotation GFF was processed to generate a GFF file containing coordinates of exons,

introns, 5' and 3' flanking regions, and intergenic space. Gene flanking regions are defined

here as 20 kb directly upstream or downstream of the gene body. These flanking regions are

determined to identify TEs at a distance that could be described as the proximate promoter

region, rather than just accounting for the core promoter region, to include both promoter

and more distal enhancer regions for genes (Lenhard et al. 2012). Intergenic space

coordinates were generated using bedtools complement (Quinlan and Hall 2010), to

generate inverse coordinates to those of genic compartments and flanking regions. To

quantify TE occupation in different genomic compartments (introns, exons, 5' and 3' flanking

regions, and intergenic space), bedtools intersect was used to calculate overlap (-wao)

between all compartments and TEs.

Identification of Xenobiotic Resistance Genes and Housekeeping Genes

Two major mechanisms are frequently implicated in conferring xenobiotic resistance in a

wide range of arthropods (Li et al. 2007; Kliot and Ghanim 2012): (i) 'target-site resistance',

involving structural changes (mutations) in the gene encoding the insecticide target protein,

that make it less sensitive to the toxic effect of the insecticide; (ii) 'metabolic resistance',

involving the increased production or activity of metabolic enzymes that break down or

sequester the insecticide. Regarding the latter, several major gene types are associated with

metabolic resistance, which act during three distinct phases of xenobiotic metabolism

(Kennedy and Tierney 2013): (i) Cytochrome P450 monooxygenases (CYP genes); (ii)

glutathione S-transferases (GSTs), esterases, and UDP-glucuronosyltransferases (UGTs);

(iii) ATP-binding cassette transporters (ABC transporters). We briefly summarise these three

phases below. During phase I, CYP genes catalyse functionalisation reactions, where

hydrophobic xenobiotics are typically converted to more water-soluble metabolites through

the addition of functional groups (Kennedy and Tierney 2013). CYP genes are diverse

enzymes involved in several purposes from biosynthesis to metabolism, and are sometimes

referred to as 'nature's blowtorch', due to their high-valence iron chemistry oxidation

mechanism (Guengerich 2009). CYP genes can mediate resistance to all classes of

insecticides due to their broad substrate specificity and versatility, whilst they are also

638 involved in several other processes, such as juvenile hormone and ecdysteroid metabolism,

639 and fatty acid biosynthesis (Feyereisen 2005; Kennedy and Tierney 2013; Feyereisen 1999).

640 During phase II, GSTs, UGTs, and esterases catalyse conjugation reactions between phase

641 I substrates and endogenous molecules to form water-soluble metabolites (Kennedy and

642 Tierney 2013). During phase III, ABC transporters, which are cell membrane transport

643 proteins that efflux toxins and modified toxins from the cell, export xenobiotics and products

644 of phase I and II (Gott et al. 2017). In addition, ABC transporters can also block the cellular

645 import of xenobiotics to protect the host, which is termed phase 0. (Gott et al. 2017).

646 Insecticide resistance can arise via mutations acting on the genes involved in the processes

647 described above through various genetic mechanisms, including upregulation, changes to

648 coding sequence, and gene amplification (Li et al. 2007).

649   The gene identities for all ABC transporters, cytochrome P450s, UDP-

650 glucuronosyltransferases, esterases, and glutathione S-transferases were manually curated

651 from the functional annotation of the *M. persicae* G006v2 genome (Singh et al. 2021). Using

652 these identifiers, exon coordinates were obtained from the *M. persicae* gene annotation

653 GFF3 file, and corresponding nucleotide sequences were extracted from the genome

654 assembly. The resulting exon sequences from *M. persicae* were used as queries to identify

655 XRL in all other aphid assemblies using blastn (Camacho et al. 2009) with an e-value

656 threshold of 1×10^{-10}. Blast hits for each species were manually inspected to extract those

657 that best represented each XRL, with the inclusion of gene duplications where appropriate.

658 Following this, a bed file of XRL coordinates for each species was generated including the

659 annotation of flanking regions as described above (Supplementary File 3).

660   Housekeeping genes (HKGs) are required for basic cellular functions and are

661 typically expressed in all cell types (Butte et al. 2001). Amino acid sequences of 28 HKGs

662 characterised for aphids (Bansal et al. 2012; Koramutla et al. 2016; Li et al. 2020; Kang et al.

663 2017; Yang et al. 2015, 2014) were obtained from GenBank (Benson et al. 2013) for *M.*

664 *persicae* (Supplementary File 4). Subsequently, a blastx search was performed, with default

parameters, against each aphid genome to identify HKG loci in the other 20 species. For

each species, HKGs were manually curated and a bed file of HKG coordinates, including the

annotation of flanking regions, was generated (Supplementary File 5). To quantify TE

occupation around XRL and HKGs, bedtools intersect was used to calculate overlap (-wao)

between annotated TEs and XRL.

Estimation of Aphid Cytochrome P450 Phylogeny

For each aphid species, the sequence of each CYP exon was extracted using the

appropriate XRL bed file and the bedtools command getfasta. Each exon was translated in

all six reading frames using EMBOSS transeq (Rice et al. 2000). To determine the correct

frame for each exon, each exon was used as a query in a blastp search, with default

parameters, against the amino acid sequences of *M. persicae* CYP genes from (Dermauw et

al. 2020). Blast hits were manually inspected to determine the correct frame for each exon

and the amino acid sequences for each gene were appended to generate a single fasta

entry for each gene from each species (Supplementary File 6). Sequences were aligned

using MAFFT (--auto) and the CYP phylogeny was generated using 1,000 ultrafast bootstrap

repetitions (-bb 1000) in IQ-tree, using the best fit amino acid model identified by Modelfinder

(Kalyaanamoorthy et al. 2017) (Supplementary File 1). The resultant tree was midpoint

rooted and each sequence was annotated based on the CYP clan it clustered with using

figtree (http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/figtree/). Individual CYP genes were also labelled

based on their implication in resistance functions, including compounds they confer

resistance to, as described by (Katsavou et al. 2022) (Supplementary Table 4).

Data Access

All data generated and used in this study is provided as supplementary files.

690
691
Competing Interests

693   The authors declare no competing interests.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND FUNDING

TB was supported by a studentship from the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences

Research Council-funded South West Biosciences Doctoral Training Partnership

(grant number BB/M009122/1).

AP was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European

Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement number

646625).

CB was supported by a Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council

(BBSRC) grant (grant number BB/S006060/1) and the European Research Council

(ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program

(grant agreement number 646625)

AH was supported by a Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council

(BBSRC) David Phillips Fellowship (grant number BB/N020146/1).

Myzus cerasi DNA sequencing data were downloaded from AphidBase. Funding for

the sequencing was provided by ERC Starting Grant APHIDHOST-310190 awarded

to Jorunn Bos at the James Hutton Institute, United Kingdom.

Dysaphis plantaginea DNA sequencing data were kindly provided by Amandine

Cornille from Université Paris-Saclay.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

TB performed TE annotation and downstream analyses, produced the figures, and

drafted the manuscript. AP manually curated xenobiotic resistance genes from *M.*

persicae. CB and AH contributed to the analytical design and data analysis, and

participated in writing the manuscript. AH conceived and coordinated the study. All

authors read and approved the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

Aminetzach YT, Macpherson JM, Petrov DA. 2005. Pesticide resistance via transposition-mediated adaptive gene truncation in Drosophila. *Science* **309**: 764–767.

Arkhipova IR. 2018. Neutral theory, transposable elements, and eukaryotic genome evolution. *Mol Biol Evol* **35**: 1332–1337.

Bansal R, Mamidala P, Mian MAR, Mittapalli O, Michel AP. 2012. Validation of reference genes for gene expression studies in Aphis glycines (Hemiptera: Aphididae). *J Econ Entomol* **105**: 1432–1438.

Baril T, Hayward A. 2022. Migrators within migrators: exploring transposable element dynamics in the monarch butterfly, Danaus plexippus. *Mob DNA* **13**: 5.

Baril T, Imrie RM, Hayward A. 2022. Earl Grey: a fully automated user-friendly transposable element annotation and analysis pipeline. https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-1812599/latest.pdf.

Bass C, Puinean AM, Nauen R, Gutbrod O, Denholm I, Williamson MS, Slater R, Field LM, Zimmer CT, Foster SP. 2014. The evolution of insecticide resistance in the peach potato aphid, Myzus persicae. *Insect Biochem Mol Biol* **51**: 41–51.

Benson DA, Cavanaugh M, Clark K, Karsch-Mizrachi I, Lipman DJ, Ostell J, Sayers

EW. 2013. GenBank. *Nucleic Acids Res* **41**: D36–42.

Blass E, Bell M, Boissinot S. 2012. Accumulation and rapid decay of non-LTR retrotransposons in the genome of the three-spine stickleback. *Genome Biol Evol* **4**: 687–702.

Bogwitz MR, Chung H, Magoc L, Rigby S, Wong W, O'Keefe M, McKenzie JA, Batterham P, Daborn PJ. 2005. Cyp12a4 confers lufenuron resistance in a natural population of Drosophila melanogaster. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **102**: 12807–12812.

Bourque G, Burns KH, Gehring M, Gorbunova V, Seluanov A, Hammell M, Imbeault M, Izsvák Z, Levin HL, Macfarlan TS, et al. 2018. Ten things you should know about transposable elements. *Genome Biol* **19**: 199.

Bradshaw CJA, Leroy B, Bellard C, Roiz D, Albert C, Fournier A, Barbet-Massin M, Salles J-M, Simard F, Courchamp F. 2016. Massive yet grossly underestimated global costs of invasive insects. *Nat Commun* **7**: 12986.

Butte AJ, Dzau VJ, Glueck SB. 2001. Further defining housekeeping, or "maintenance," genes Focus on "A compendium of gene expression in normal human tissues." *Physiol Genomics* **7**: 95–96.

Camacho C, Coulouris G, Avagyan V, Ma N, Papadopoulos J, Bealer K, Madden TL. 2009. BLAST+: Architecture and applications. *BMC Bioinformatics* **10**: 1–9.

Catania F, Kauer MO, Daborn PJ, Yen JL, Ffrench-Constant RH, Schlötterer C. 2004. World-wide survey of an Accord insertion and its association with DDT resistance in Drosophila melanogaster. *Mol Ecol* **13**: 2491–2504.

Chénais B, Caruso A, Hiard S, Casse N. 2012. The impact of transposable elements on eukaryotic genomes: From genome size increase to genetic adaptation to stressful environments. *Gene* **509**: 7–15.

Chen S, Li X. 2007. Transposable elements are enriched within or in close proximity to xenobiotic-metabolizing cytochrome P450 genes. *BMC Evol Biol* **7**: 46.

Chung H, Bogwitz MR, McCart C, Andrianopoulos A, Ffrench-Constant RH, Batterham P, Daborn PJ. 2007. Cis-regulatory elements in the accord retrotransposon result in tissue-specific expression of the Drosophila melanogaster insecticide resistance gene Cyp6g1. *Genetics* **175**: 1071–1077.

Cosby RL, Chang N-C, Feschotte C. 2019. Host–transposon interactions: conflict, cooperation, and cooption. *Genes Dev* **33**: 1098–1116.

Daborn PJ, Yen JL, Bogwitz MR, Le Goff G, Feil E, Jeffers S, Tijet N, Perry T, Heckel D, Batterham P, et al. 2002. A single p450 allele associated with insecticide resistance in Drosophila. *Science* **297**: 2253–2256.

Darboux I, Charles J-F, Pauchet Y, Warot S, Pauron D. 2007. Transposon-mediated resistance to Bacillus sphaericus in a field-evolved population of Culex pipiens (Diptera: Culicidae). *Cell Microbiol* **9**: 2022–2029.

de Koning APJ, Gu W, Castoe TA, Batzer MA, Pollock DD. 2011. Repetitive
elements may comprise over Two-Thirds of the human genome. *PLoS Genet* **7**.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1002384.

de Little SC, Edwards O, van Rooyen AR, Weeks A, Umina PA. 2017. Discovery of
metabolic resistance to neonicotinoids in green peach aphids (Myzus persicae)
in Australia. *Pest Manag Sci* **73**: 1611–1617.

Dermauw W, Van Leeuwen T, Feyereisen R. 2020. Diversity and evolution of the
P450 family in arthropods. *Insect Biochem Mol Biol* **127**: 103490.

Deutsch CA, Tewksbury JJ, Tigchelaar M, Battisti DS, Merrill SC, Huey RB, Naylor
RL. 2018. Increase in crop losses to insect pests in a warming climate. *Science*
361: 916–919.

Fabrick JA, Mathew LG, Tabashnik BE, Li X. 2011. Insertion of an intact CR1
retrotransposon in a cadherin gene linked with Bt resistance in the pink
bollworm, Pectinophora gossypiella. *Insect Molecular Biology* **20**: 651–665.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2583.2011.01095.x.

Feyereisen R. 2005. Insect cytochrome P450. *Comprehensive molecular insect*
science.

Feyereisen R. 1999. Insect P450 enzymes. *Annu Rev Entomol* **44**: 507–533.

Freckleton RP, Harvey PH, Pagel M. 2002. Phylogenetic analysis and comparative
data: a test and review of evidence. *Am Nat* **160**: 712–726.

Fu L, Niu B, Zhu Z, Wu S, Li W. 2012. CD-HIT: accelerated for clustering the next-
generation sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* **28**: 3150–3152.

Gahan LJ, Gould F, Heckel DG. 2001. Identification of a gene associated with Bt
resistance in Heliothis virescens. *Science* **293**: 857–860.

Gilbert C, Peccoud J, Cordaux R. 2021. Transposable Elements and the Evolution of
Insects. *Annu Rev Entomol* **66**: 355–372.

Gott RC, Kunkel GR, Zobel ES, Lovett BR, Hawthorne DJ. 2017. Implicating ABC
Transporters in Insecticide Resistance: Research Strategies and a Decision
Framework. *J Econ Entomol* **110**: 667–677.

Goubert C, Craig RJ, Bilat AF, Peona V, Vogan AA, Protasio AV. 2022. Correction: A
beginner's guide to manual curation of transposable elements. *Mob DNA* **13**: 15.

Gregory TR. 2005. Synergy between sequence and size in large-scale genomics.
Nat Rev Genet **6**: 699–708.

Guengerich FP. 2009. Cataloging the Repertoire of Nature's Blowtorch, P450. *Chem*
Biol **16**: 1215–1216.

Hadfield JD. 2010. MCMC Methods for Multi-Response Generalized Linear Mixed
Models: The MCMCglmm R Package. *J Stat Softw* **33**: 1–22.

Horváth V, Merenciano M, González J. 2017. Revisiting the Relationship between
Transposable Elements and the Eukaryotic Stress Response. *Trends Genet* **33**:
832–841.

Hubley R, Finn RD, Clements J, Eddy SR, Jones TA, Bao W, Smit AFA, Wheeler TJ.
2016. The Dfam database of repetitive DNA families. *Nucleic Acids Res* **44**:
D81–D89.

Itokawa K, Komagata O, Kasai S, Masada M, Tomita T. 2011. Cis-acting mutation
and duplication: History of molecular evolution in a P450 haplotype responsible
for insecticide resistance in Culex quinquefasciatus. *Insect Biochem Mol Biol* **41**:
503–512.

Jurka J, Kapitonov VV, Pavlicek A, Klonowski P, Kohany O, Walichiewicz J. 2005.
Repbase Update, a database of eukaryotic repetitive elements. *Cytogenet*
Genome Res **110**: 462–467.

Kalyaanamoorthy S, Minh BQ, Wong TKF, Haeseler A von, Jermiin LS. 2017.
ModelFinder: fast model selection for accurate phylogenetic estimates. *Nature*
Methods 2017 14:6 **14**: 587–589.

Kang Z-W, Liu F-H, Tian H-G, Zhang M, Guo S-S, Liu T-X. 2017. Evaluation of the
reference genes for expression analysis using quantitative real-time polymerase
chain reaction in the green peach aphid, Myzus persicae. *Insect Sci* **24**: 222–
234.

Kapitonov VV, Jurka J. 2008. A universal classification of eukaryotic transposable
elements implemented in Repbase. *Nat Rev Genet* **9**: 411–412.

Karunker I, Benting J, Lueke B, Ponge T, Nauen R, Roditakis E, Vontas J, Gorman
K, Denholm I, Morin S. 2008. Over-expression of cytochrome P450 CYP6CM1
is associated with high resistance to imidacloprid in the B and Q biotypes of
Bemisia tabaci (Hemiptera: Aleyrodidae). *Insect Biochem Mol Biol* **38**: 634–644.

Kasai S, Scott JG. 2001. Cytochrome P450s CYP6D3 and CYP6D1 are part of a
P450 gene cluster on autosome 1 in the house fly. *Insect Mol Biol* **10**: 191–196.

Katoh K, Standley DM. 2013. MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version
7: Improvements in performance and usability. *Mol Biol Evol* **30**: 772–780.

Katsavou E, Riga M, Ioannidis P, King R, Zimmer CT, Vontas J. 2022. Functionally
characterized arthropod pest and pollinator cytochrome P450s associated with
xenobiotic metabolism. *Pesticide Biochemistry and Physiology* **181**: 105005.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pestbp.2021.105005.

Keller O, Kollmar M, Stanke M, Waack S. 2011. A novel hybrid gene prediction
method employing protein multiple sequence alignments. *Bioinformatics* **27**:
757–763.

Kennedy CJ, Tierney KB. 2013. Xenobiotic Protection/Resistance Mechanisms in
Organisms. In *Environmental Toxicology: Selected Entries from the*
Encyclopedia of Sustainability Science and Technology (ed. E.A. Laws), pp.

689–721, Springer New York, New York, NY.

Kidwell MG. 2002. Transposable elements and the evolution of genome size in
eukaryotes. *Genetica* **115**: 49–63.

Kliot A, Ghanim M. 2012. Fitness costs associated with insecticide resistance. *Pest*
Manag Sci **68**: 1431–1437.

Koramutla MK, Aminedi R, Bhattacharya R. 2016. Comprehensive evaluation of
candidate reference genes for qRT-PCR studies of gene expression in mustard
aphid, Lipaphis erysimi (Kalt). *Sci Rep* **6**: 25883.

Krause SA, Overend G, Dow JAT, Leader DP. 2022. FlyAtlas 2 in 2022:
enhancements to the Drosophila melanogaster expression atlas. *Nucleic Acids*
Res **50**: D1010–D1015.

Lavoie CA, Ii RNP, Novick PA, Counterman BA, Ray DA. 2013. Transposable
element evolution in Heliconius suggests genome diversity within Lepidoptera.
Mob DNA **21**: 1–10.

Lenhard B, Sandelin A, Carninci P. 2012. Metazoan promoters: emerging
characteristics and insights into transcriptional regulation. *Nat Rev Genet* **13**:
233–245.

Li W, Godzik A. 2006. Cd-hit: a fast program for clustering and comparing large sets
of protein or nucleotide sequences. *Bioinformatics* **22**: 1658–1659.

Li X, Gong P, Wang B, Wang C, Li M, Zhang Y, Li X, Gao H, Ju J, Zhu X. 2020.
Selection and validation of experimental condition-specific reference genes for
qRT-PCR in Metopolophium dirhodum (Walker) (Hemiptera: Aphididae).
Scientific Reports **10**. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-78974-z.

Li X, Schuler MA, Berenbaum MR. 2007. Molecular mechanisms of metabolic
resistance to synthetic and natural xenobiotics. *Annu Rev Entomol* **52**: 231–253.

Manni M, Berkeley MR, Seppey M, Simão FA, Zdobnov EM. 2021a. BUSCO Update:
Novel and Streamlined Workflows along with Broader and Deeper Phylogenetic
Coverage for Scoring of Eukaryotic, Prokaryotic, and Viral Genomes. *Mol Biol*
Evol **38**: 4647–4654.

Manni M, Berkeley MR, Seppey M, Zdobnov EM. 2021b. BUSCO: Assessing
Genomic Data Quality and Beyond. *Curr Protoc* **1**: e323.

Mateo L, Ullastres A, González J. 2014. A transposable element insertion confers
xenobiotic resistance in Drosophila. *PLoS Genet* **10**: e1004560.

McVicker G, Green P. 2010. Genomic signatures of germline gene expression.
Genome Res **20**: 1503–1511.

Nauen R, Bass C, Feyereisen R, Vontas J. 2022. The Role of Cytochrome P450s in
Insect Toxicology and Resistance. *Annu Rev Entomol* **67**: 105–124.

Nguyen L-T, Schmidt HA, von Haeseler A, Minh BQ. 2015. IQ-TREE: A Fast and
Effective Stochastic Algorithm for Estimating Maximum-Likelihood Phylogenies.
Mol Biol Evol **32**: 268–274.

Nurk S, Koren S, Rhie A, Rautiainen M, Bzikadze AV, Mikheenko A, Vollger MR,
Altemose N, Uralsky L, Gershman A, et al. 2022. The complete sequence of a
human genome. *Science* **376**: 44–53.

Panini M, Chiesa O, Troczka BJ, Mallott M, Manicardi GC, Cassanelli S, Cominelli F,
Hayward A, Mazzoni E, Bass C. 2021. Transposon-mediated insertional
mutagenesis unmasks recessive insecticide resistance in the aphid Myzus
persicae. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **118**.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2100559118.

Peccoud J, Loiseau V, Cordaux R, Gilbert C. 2017. Massive horizontal transfer of
transposable elements in insects. *Proceedings of the National Academy of
Sciences* **114**: 4721–4726.

Platt RN, Blanco-Berdugo L, Ray DA. 2016. Accurate transposable element
annotation is vital when analyzing new genome assemblies. *Genome Biol Evol*
8: 403–410.

Puinean AM, Foster SP, Oliphant L, Denholm I, Field LM, Millar NS, Williamson MS,
Bass C. 2010. Amplification of a cytochrome P450 gene is associated with
resistance to neonicotinoid insecticides in the aphid Myzus persicae. *PLoS
Genet* **6**: 1–11.

Quinlan AR, Hall IM. 2010. BEDTools: A flexible suite of utilities for comparing
genomic features. *Bioinformatics* **26**: 841–842.

Racine JS. 2013. RSTUDIO: A PLATFORM-INDEPENDENT IDE FOR R AND
SWEAVE. *J Appl Econometrics* **27**: 167–172.

Rebollo R, Romanish MT, Mager DL. 2012. Transposable Elements: An Abundant
and Natural Source of Regulatory Sequences for Host Genes. *Annu Rev Genet*
46: 21–42.

Remnant EJ, Good RT, Schmidt JM, Lumb C, Robin C, Daborn PJ, Batterham P.
2013. Gene duplication in the major insecticide target site, Rdl, in Drosophila
melanogaster. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **110**: 14705–14710.

Rice P, Longden L, Bleasby A. 2000. EMBOSS: The European Molecular Biology
Open Software Suite. *Trends Genet* **16**: 276–277.

Rostant WG, Wedell N, Hosken DJ. 2012. Transposable Elements and Insecticide
Resistance. *Advances in Genetics* 169–201. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-
12-394394-1.00002-x.

Salces-Ortiz J, Vargas-Chavez C, Guio L, Rech GE, González J. 2020.
Transposable elements contribute to the genomic response to insecticides in
Drosophila melanogaster. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* **375**: 20190341.

Schmidt JM, Good RT, Appleton B, Sherrard J, Raymant GC, Bogwitz MR, Martin J,
Daborn PJ, Goddard ME, Batterham P, et al. 2010. Copy number variation and
transposable elements feature in recent, ongoing adaptation at the Cyp6g1
locus. *PLoS Genet* **6**: e1000998.

Singh KS, Cordeiro EMG, Troczka BJ, Pym A, Mackisack J, Mathers TC, Duarte A,
Legeai F, Robin S, Bielza P, et al. 2021. Global patterns in genomic diversity
underpinning the evolution of insecticide resistance in the aphid crop pest
Myzus persicae. *Commun Biol* **4**: 847.

Singh KS, Troczka BJ, Duarte A, Balabanidou V, Trissi N, Carabajal Paladino LZ,
Nguyen P, Zimmer CT, Papapostolou KM, Randall E, et al. 2020. The genetic
architecture of a host shift: An adaptive walk protected an aphid and its
endosymbiont from plant chemical defenses. *Sci Adv* **6**: eaba1070.

Song WY, Pi LY, Bureau TE, Ronald PC. 1998. Identification and characterization of
14 transposon-like elements in the noncoding regions of members of the Xa21
family of disease resistance genes in rice. *Mol Gen Genet* **258**: 449–456.

Sparks TC, Storer N, Porter A, Slater R, Nauen R. 2021. Insecticide resistance
management and industry: the origins and evolution of the Insecticide
Resistance Action Committee (IRAC) and the mode of action classification
scheme. *Pest Manag Sci* **77**: 2609–2619.

Stanke M, Diekhans M, Baertsch R, Haussler D. 2008. Using native and syntenically
mapped cDNA alignments to improve de novo gene finding. *Bioinformatics* **24**:
637–644.

Stapley J, Santure AW, Dennis SR. 2015. Transposable elements as agents of rapid
adaptation may explain the genetic paradox of invasive species. *Mol Ecol* **24**:
2241–2252.

Steenwyk JL, Buida TJ, Labella AL, Li Y, Shen X-X, Rokas A. 2021. PhyKIT: a
broadly applicable UNIX shell toolkit for processing and analyzing phylogenomic
data. *Bioinformatics*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btab096.

Sternberg ED, Thomas MB. 2018. Insights from agriculture for the management of
insecticide resistance in disease vectors. *Evol Appl* **11**: 404–414.

Sultana T, Zamborlini A, Cristofari G, Lesage P. 2017. Integration site selection by
retroviruses and transposable elements in eukaryotes. *Nat Rev Genet* **18**: 292–
308.

Sundaram V, Cheng Y, Ma Z, Li D, Xing X, Edge P, Snyder MP, Wang T. 2014.
Widespread contribution of transposable elements to the innovation of gene
regulatory networks. *Genome Res* **24**: 1963–1976.

Team R. 2015. RStudio: integrated development for R. *RStudio, Inc, Boston, MA*
URL http://www rstudio com.

Team RC. 2013. R: A language and environment for statistical computing.

van de Lagemaat LN, Landry J-R, Mager DL, Medstrand P. 2003. Transposable
elements in mammals promote regulatory variation and diversification of genes
with specialized functions. *Trends Genet* **19**: 530–536.

Van Emden HF, Harrington R. 2017. *Aphids as crop pests*. Cabi.

Wang L, Wang J, Ma Y, Wan P, Liu K, Cong S, Xiao Y, Xu D, Wu K, Fabrick JA, et
al. 2019. Transposon insertion causes cadherin mis-splicing and confers
resistance to Bt cotton in pink bollworm from China. *Sci Rep* **9**: 7479.

Weedall GD, Riveron JM, Hearn J, Irving H, Kamdem C, Fouet C, White BJ, Wondji
CS. 2020. An Africa-wide genomic evolution of insecticide resistance in the
malaria vector Anopheles funestus involves selective sweeps, copy number
variations, gene conversion and transposons. *PLoS Genet* **16**: e1008822.

Wells JN, Feschotte C. 2020. A Field Guide to Eukaryotic Transposable Elements.
Annu Rev Genet **54**: 539–561.

Whalon, Mota-Sanchez, Hollingworth. Arthropod pesticide resistance database.
Michigan State University.

Wicker T, Sabot F, Hua-Van A, Bennetzen JL, Capy P, Chalhoub B, Flavell A, Leroy
P, Morgante M, Panaud O, et al. 2007. A unified classification system for
eukaryotic transposable elements. *Nat Rev Genet* **8**: 973–982.

Worner SP, Gevrey M. 2006. Modelling global insect pest species assemblages to
determine risk of invasion. *J Appl Ecol* **43**: 858–867.

Yang C, Pan H, Liu Y, Zhou X. 2014. Selection of Reference Genes for Expression
Analysis Using Quantitative Real-Time PCR in the Pea Aphid, Acyrthosiphon
pisum (Harris) (Hemiptera, Aphidiae). *PLoS ONE* **9**: e110454.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0110454.

Yang C, Pan H, Liu Y, Zhou X. 2015. Temperature and Development Impacts on
Housekeeping Gene Expression in Cowpea Aphid, Aphis craccivora (Hemiptera:
Aphidiae). *PLoS One* **10**: e0130593.

Yang Y, Chen H, Wu Y, Yang Y, Wu S. 2007. Mutated cadherin alleles from a field
population of Helicoverpa armigera confer resistance to Bacillus thuringiensis
toxin Cry1Ac. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **73**: 6939–6944.

Zhao J, Jin L, Yang Y, Wu Y. 2010. Diverse cadherin mutations conferring resistance
to Bacillus thuringiensis toxin Cry1Ac in Helicoverpa armigera. *Insect Biochem*
Mol Biol **40**: 113–118.

1010

1011

Supplementary File Captions

1012

1013 Supplementary Figure 1. The relationship between TE content and genome size in

1014 aphids. Blue line indicates the relationship calculated using linear regression. Grey

1015 area indicates 95% confidence intervals.

1016

1017 Supplementary Figure 2. Correlation between genic:intergenic base pairs ratio and

1018 TE content in aphids.

1019

1020 Supplementary Figure 3. TE abundance around xenobiotic resistance genes

1021 compared to all other genes and housekeeping genes, split by xenobiotic resistance

1022 gene type.

1023

1024 Supplementary Figure 4. TE coverage around xenobiotic resistance genes

1025 compared to housekeeping genes.

1026

1027 Supplementary File 1. Midpoint-rooted phylogenetic tree of CYP genes identified in

1028 aphids in NEXUS format.

1029

1030 Supplementary File 2. Tar archive containing TE annotations in GFF format for all

1031 aphid genomes in this study.

1032

1033 Supplementary File 3. Tar archive containing XRL coordinates in GFF format for all

1034 aphid genomes in this study.

1035

1036 Supplementary File 4. *Myzus persicae* housekeeping amino acid sequences for each

1037   aphid genome in FASTA format.

1038

1039   Supplementary File 5. Tar archive containing housekeeping gene coordinates in

1040   GFF format for all aphid genomes in this study.

1041

1042   Supplementary File 6. Cytochrome P450 amino acid sequences for each aphid

1043   genome in FASTA format.

1044

1045   Supplementary File 7. Supplementary Tables 1-6, including contents page.

1046