The genomic landscape of transposable elements in yeast hybrids is shaped by structural variation and genotype-specific modulation of transposition rate

Mathieu Hénault[1245]*, Souhir Marsit[12345]†, Guillaume Charron[1345]‡ and Christian R. Landry[12345]

[1]Institut de Biologie Intégrative et des Systèmes (IBIS), Université Laval, Québec, QC, Canada

[2]Département de biochimie, microbiologie et bioinformatique, Université Laval, Québec, QC, Canada

[3]Département de biologie, Université Laval, Québec, QC, Canada

[4]Quebec Network for Research on Protein Function, Engineering, and Applications (PROTEO), Université Laval, Québec, QC, Canada

[5]Université Laval Big Data Research Center (BDRC_UL), Québec, QC, Canada

†Current address: Département de biologie, chimie et géographie, Université du Québec à Rimouski, Rimouski, QC, Canada

‡Current address: Centre de foresterie des Laurentides, Ressources naturelles Canada, Québec, QC, Canada

*Corresponding author

E-mail: mathieu.henault.1@ulaval.ca

Abstract

Transposable elements (TEs) are major contributors to structural genomic variation by creating interspersed duplications of themselves. In return, structural variants (SVs) can affect the genomic distribution of TE copies and shape their load. One long-standing hypothesis states that hybridization could trigger TE mobilization and thus increase TE load in hybrids. We previously tested this hypothesis by performing a large-scale evolution experiment by mutation accumulation (MA) on multiple hybrid genotypes within and between wild populations of the yeasts *Saccharomyces paradoxus* and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. Using aggregate measures of TE load with short-read sequencing, we found no evidence for TE load increase in hybrid MA lines. Here, we resolve the genomes of the hybrid MA lines with long-read phasing and assembly to precisely characterize the role of SVs in shaping the TE landscape. Highly contiguous phased assemblies of 127 MA lines revealed that SV types like polyploidy, aneuploidy and loss of heterozygosity have large impacts on the TE load. We characterized 18 de novo TE insertions, indicating that transposition only has a minor role in shaping the TE landscape in MA lines. Because the scarcity of TE mobilization in MA lines provided insufficient resolution to confidently dissect transposition rate variation in hybrids, we adapted an in vivo assay to measure transposition rates in various *S. paradoxus* hybrid backgrounds. We found that transposition rates are not increased by hybridization, but are modulated by many genotype-specific factors including initial TE load, TE sequence variants and mitochondrial DNA inheritance. Our results show the multiple scales at which TE load is shaped in hybrid genomes, being highly impacted by SV dynamics and finely modulated by genotype-specific variation in transposition rates.

Introduction

Structural variants (SVs) are a powerful source of genetic variation that fuels the evolution of genomes and species (Gorkovskiy and Verstrepen, 2021). SVs regroup a wide variety of large-scale sequence alterations that can have profound consequences for organismal phenotypes and genome evolution. For example, aneuploidies can underlie the emergence of antifungal resistance in fungal pathogens (Selmecki et al., 2006) and drive tumorigenesis in mammalian cells (Shoshani et al., 2021; Trakala et al., 2021). Polyploidization is frequently linked to speciation and adaptation, notably in plants (Otto and Whitton, 2000). Mitotic recombination can yield loss of heterozygosity (LOH) events that drive adaptation in heterozygous hybrid genomes (Smukowski Heil et al., 2017), but also the somatic fixation of oncogene mutations (Cavenee et al., 1983). Repeated sequences are known to play a leading role in the generation of SVs (Lower et al., 2019). Notably, transposable elements (TEs) are sequences capable of semi-autonomous replication, producing families of repeats spread within genomes (Bourque et al., 2018). Because of their replicative nature, TEs are major generators of SVs: not only do they create interspersed duplications of themselves, but they can also trigger genome rearrangements through ectopic recombination (Dunham et al., 2002; Petrov et al., 2003). While TEs can cause SVs, various types of SVs can also affect the genomic landscape of TEs by producing gains and losses of individual copies (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Examples of how SVs can impact the genomic landscapes of TEs in hybrids. An ancestral heterozygous genome is shown as an example, with two subgenomes (black and gray) harboring TEs (green boxes) in distinct copy numbers and at different positions. Examples of various types of SVs are shown in derived genomes: polyploidy (gain of haploid sets of chromosomes), aneuploidy (gain or loss of whole chromosomes), loss of heterozygosity (LOH, inter-homolog conversion of chromosome segments), and de novo transposition. The corresponding changes in TE copy numbers are shown at the right.

TEs are inherent components of virtually all Eukaryotic genomes and owe their evolutionary success to the fitness advantage of their own replicative ability. However, this selfish propagation conflicts with the fitness of the host, and can have profound deleterious impacts (Bucheton et al., 1984; Pasyukova et al., 2004; Wilke and Adams, 1992). The abundance of TEs per genome (or TE load) is an important population genetic parameter, as it is expected to correlate with the fitness cost for the host. TE load in a population is most often modeled as a quantity reflecting the balance between the gain of novel copies by transposition, and the decrease in copies by loss (e.g. by excision or sequence degeneration) and purifying selection against insertion alleles (Charlesworth et al., 1994; Charlesworth and Langley, 1989). However, TE load is not only defined by the copy number (CN) of TEs in the genome, but also where TE insertions fall and, consequently, how they interact with neighboring host sequences. The multidimensional nature

of TE load makes its full characterization a complex task. Recent advances in long-read

sequencing make it increasingly possible to decompose TE load by resolving the specific genomic

context in which TE insertions are found (Oggenfuss and Croll, 2023; Rech et al., 2022).

Additionally, accurate genome resolution opens unprecedented opportunities for a

comprehensive assessment of the role of SVs in shaping TE load.

One long-standing hypothesis postulates that hybridization can cause a genomic shock that

triggers TE mobilization and increases TE load in hybrids (McClintock, 1984), with major

implications for speciation and hybrid evolution. We previously tested this hypothesis in

Saccharomyces yeast hybrids by performing a large-scale evolution experiment by mutation

accumulation (MA) to investigate the near-neutral evolution of TEs in hybrid genomes (Hénault et

al., 2020). *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* genomes harbor five main long terminal repeat (LTR)

retrotransposon families named Ty1-Ty5 (Kim et al., 1998). Its undomesticated sister species

Saccharomyces paradoxus comprises related families Ty1, Ty3 and Ty5 (Yue et al., 2017), in

addition to Tsu4 which was horizontally transferred from *Saccharomyces uvarum* (Bergman,

2018). We generated a collection of MA lines comprising a set of 11 hybrid genotypes created by

crossing wild strains from North American populations of *S. paradoxus* and *S. cerevisiae* (Charron

et al., 2014a; Kuehne et al., 2007; Leducq et al., 2016, 2014) that are separated by a range of

evolutionary divergence, and by replicating each cross many dozen times independently (Charron

et al., 2019; Hénault et al., 2020). The resulting collection was evolved by subjecting each line to

periodical extreme bottlenecks by streaking for single colonies on plates of rich medium for ~770

mitotic generations, thus amplifying the power of random genetic drift. We previously sequenced

these MA lines with short reads and measured the changes in Ty load after evolution by producing

aggregate estimates of relative abundance for each family, and found no support for the TE

reactivation hypothesis (Hénault et al., 2020). However, the use of short reads alone precluded

the detailed resolution of hybrid genomes and the decomposition of their Ty load. For instance,

different SVs (including de novo transposition) may have changed Ty CNs in opposing directions,

yielding no significant change in net CN.

While producing collapsed assemblies for haploid or predominantly homozygous genomes is now

relatively straightforward, complex heterozygous genomes are much more difficult to

characterize. Recent studies demonstrated the feasibility of the approach (Heasley and Argueso,

2022; O'Donnell et al., 2022), but the task of resolving hybrid genomes across a range of parental

divergence under a unified comparative framework remains challenging. Here, we design a long-

read sequencing, phasing and assembly approach to resolve hybrid MA lines genomes. We find

that de novo transposition events play a minor role in shaping the Ty load in comparison to other

SV types. Since the number of de novo insertions gained during MA is low, we further dissect

transposition rate variation in *S. paradoxus* hybrids at a higher resolution with in vivo transposition

rate measurements. We identify many aspects of hybrid genotype specificity that shape

transposition rates, including initial Ty load, Ty sequence variation and mitochondrial DNA

(mtDNA) inheritance.

Results

The eleven MA crosses (Charron et al., 2019; Hénault et al., 2020) comprise five crosses within *S. paradoxus* populations (CC, within *SpC*; BB, within *SpB*), four crosses between *S. paradoxus* populations (BC, *SpB*✕*SpC*; BA, *SpB*✕*SpA*), and two interspecific crosses (BSc, *S. paradoxus* *SpB*✕*S. cerevisiae*) (Figure 2A). We previously selected 127 independently evolved MA lines (10-12 per cross) and sequenced their genome with Oxford Nanopore long reads (Hénault et al., 2022). To produce an accurate representation of the two distinct subgenomes of each evolved MA line, we designed a strategy consisting of 1) sorting long-read libraries using variants that discriminate the two parental genomes of each cross, and 2) performing separate de novo assembly on the sorted reads. The proportion of sequenced bases successfully classified into subgenomes varied substantially depending on the cross (Figure 2B). CC crosses had the lowest classification rate (median: 70.8%) due to the scarcity of variants that discriminate *SpC* genomes from each other. BB crosses had a median classification rate of 84.5%, while the remainder (BC, BA and BSc) reached a higher rate (median: 93.7%). Unclassified reads tended to be shorter than classified reads, but the difference was narrower for libraries with lower classification success (Supplemental Figure S1). The scarcity of discriminating variants in low-divergence crosses is likely causing the classification of increasingly longer reads to fail. However, unclassified reads showed no overrepresentation in specific genomic regions (Supplemental Figure S2) and their exclusion is thus unlikely to bias the resulting assemblies.

Despite the variation in classification rates, the classified reads yielded highly contiguous subgenome-level assemblies, with a median of 22 contigs, a median N50 of 783 kb, and 95% of the assemblies having N50 values larger than 200 kb (Figure 2C, Supplemental Table S1). Only six assemblies were more fragmented (>100 contigs) and corresponded to the sorted libraries with the least sequenced bases (Supplemental Figure S3A), which are expected to complicate the assembly. Thus, our approach yielded chromosome-level representations of the two subgenomes of each MA line.

Figure 2. Subgenome-level resolution of hybrid yeast MA lines genomes using a long-read phasing and assembly approach. (A) Design of the MA crosses. Haploid derivatives of wild isolates used as parental strains for the MA crosses are shown on the Y-axis. Strains in bold are shared by multiple crosses. MA crosses are shown on the X-axis (left to right, from the least to the most divergent), with the number of lines randomly sampled for long-read sequencing shown in parentheses. The phylogenetic tree displays the evolutionary relatedness between wild populations of *S. paradoxus* and *S. cerevisiae*, based on genome-wide nucleotide variants (scale bar: substitutions per site) (Hénault et al., 2022). **(B)** Summary of the classification of long reads in two parental subgenomes. For each MA line library, the percent of sequenced bases classified as the *MAT*a and *MAT*α parental subgenomes are shown on the X and Y axes, respectively. Dotted lines indicate global classification rates. Full lines indicate expected subgenome classification ratios of 1:1 for diploid (circles) or tetraploid (squares) lines, and 2:1 or 1:2 for triploid

(triangles) lines. **(C)** Summary statistics of the de novo subgenome-level assemblies of the MA

lines.

We then integrated various data to infer the state of all loci containing Ty elements in the MA lines

subgenomes in relation to the corresponding parental genome. First, we produced whole-genome

assemblies of the 13 haploid parental strains from long reads. We annotated their Ty elements

and used whole-genome alignments to determine the orthology of Ty loci between the parental

strains of each cross (Supplemental Figure S4). Only 10 pairs of loci were found to be orthologous

in four of the lowest divergence crosses (CC1: 1, CC2: 5, CC3: 3, BB1: 1). We also annotated the

Ty elements in the MA lines subgenome assemblies and defined the orthology between Ty loci

by aligning subgenome assemblies against the corresponding parental assembly. We also

computed the depth of coverage of sorted long-read libraries mapped on the corresponding

parental genome assemblies to yield estimates of CN per genomic window. We then applied a

decision tree on this data to classify individual Ty loci by type of SV (Supplemental Figure S5).

89.8% of Ty loci were successfully classified, with low-contiguity assemblies contributing

disproportionately to classification failure (Supplemental Figure S3B). From the successfully

classified loci, 79.0% had no change compared to the parental genomes. The remainder had an

uneven distribution of SV classes (Figure 3A). The largest class was polyploidy, since many lines

within CC and BC crosses have become tetraploid or triploid (Charron et al., 2019; Marsit et al.,

2021). Triploidization was exclusive to six BC lines and was likely caused by the diploidization of

SpC parental cells (creating mating-competent pseudohaploids) prior to hybridization (Charron et

al., 2019), meaning that triploidization occurred before MA strictly speaking. LOH and aneuploidy

also accounted for large fractions of Ty loci affected by SVs. Notably, there was a substantial

impact of LOH events in low-divergence CC crosses. Ty1 is the most abundant family in *SpC*

genomes and despite a relatively constant load, Ty1 copies mostly occupy non-orthologous loci

(Supplemental Figure S4A), providing the substrate for LOH to affect Ty1 landscapes in CC

crosses. While LOH had a bidirectional effect on Ty CNs, causing gains and losses in

approximately equal proportions, aneuploidies had a strong bias towards gains (Figure 3B). The

distributions of net Ty CN change per MA line showed that most crosses had significant gains

(Figure 3C). The post-evolution Ty CNs quantified from relative depth of coverage of short-read

libraries (Hénault et al., 2020) and the net CN changes determined here were globally correlated

(mixed linear model with random intercepts for MA cross×Ty family combinations, P-

value=3.01×10^{-35}). In many individual cases, significant positive correlations were observed

(Supplemental Figure S6), indicating that our current analyses recapitulate previous results.

Figure 3. Distribution of the number of Ty loci affected by various SV classes. (A) Number of Ty loci affected by SVs per line for each cross. Dots represent individual MA lines and bars show the average count per cross. Polyploidy refers to increased ploidy level to triploidy or tetraploidy from the expected diploid initial state. LOH refers to the conversion of large chromosome segments (interstitial or terminal) from one parental genotype to the other. Aneuploidy refers to gains or losses of whole chromosomes. Truncation refers to partial deletion of a full-length Ty copy. De novo refers to the presence of a new full-length Ty copy not found in the parental background or any other MA line. Deletion refers to the local deletion of a full-length Ty copy without other SVs. Excision refers to the replacement of a full-length Ty copy with a matching solo LTR, consistent with intra-element LTR-LTR recombination. **(B)** Average gain and loss of Ty CN per line for each cross, for SV classes that can have bidirectional effects on Ty CN. **(C)** Distributions of net Ty CN change for individual MA lines. Symbols indicate FDR-corrected P-values for Wilcoxon signed-rank tests (*: p≤0.05, **: p≤0.01).

We identified 23 candidate de novo Ty insertions as loci occupied by one full-length Ty element
that was absent from the corresponding parental genome and any other MA line. From these
candidates, we used strict filtering criteria to narrow down confident loci that were compatible with
retrotransposition. First, we required the presence of characteristic target site duplications (TSDs)
of 5-6 nt (Supplemental Figure S7), consistent with the staggered dsDNA cut catalyzed by the
Ty1 integrase (Wilhelm et al., 2005). We further confirmed the uniqueness of Ty insertion junction
sequences by inspecting whole-chromosome alignments comprising the MA line subgenomes
and all parental genomes. We also ensured that all de novo TSD sequences were unique and
absent from the parental full-length Ty loci.

We determined that 18 de novo loci were compatible with all these criteria (Figure 4). The
quantitative impact of de novo insertions on Ty load evolution is thus minor in comparison to other
SV types, with 0.14 insertions per line on average (Figure 3A). All de novo loci belonged to the
Ty1 family of *S. paradoxus*. Eight out of 11 crosses exhibited de novo Ty1 retrotransposition
events, half of them being found in the CC crosses. Eight insertions were found at loci with
parental Ty1 elements (full-length or solo-LTR) in close proximity, highlighting the importance of
the de novo assembly approach to accurately resolve these complex loci. Two retrotransposition
events in BC2 lines inserted into the UWOPS-91-202 *SpB* subgenome that is natively devoid of
full-length elements, effectively re-colonizing a genome in which all Ty families had gone extinct.
We built a maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree comprising the de novo insertions and all
parental Ty1 and Ty2 full-length sequences (Supplemental Figure S8). This analysis revealed
that de novo copies originated from major Ty1 clades populating *SpC*, *SpB* and *SpA* genomes,
indicating that Ty1 is globally active in *S. paradoxus* populations. However, this tree had generally
poor branch support values from the bootstrap analysis. A phylogenetic network built from the
same dataset showed substantial signal for reticulate evolution between Ty1 families of
S. cerevisiae and *S. paradoxus SpA* (Supplemental Figure S9), in agreement with previous
studies that showed interspecific horizontal transfers (Bleykasten-Grosshans et al., 2021; Czaja
et al., 2020).

Figure 4. De novo retrotransposition events in the MA lines. Genome maps show the full-length Ty elements annotated in the subgenome assemblies of the MA lines that have de novo insertions. Gray boxes represent chromosomes, which are numbered at the figure top. Empty triangles represent the parental annotations present at a CN greater or equal to one. Full triangles correspond to the confident de novo retrotransposition events. Triangle orientation indicates whether the annotation is on the plus (right pointing) or minus (left pointing) chromosome strand. The cross corresponding to each MA line is labeled at the right, with the total count of de novo retrotransposition events shown between parentheses.

The sequence resolution of de novo loci also enabled the characterization of insertions that disrupted parental genomic features. One de novo Ty1 element inserted into the left LTR of a parental full-length Ty1 copy in the MSH-587-1 subgenome of the MA line J27 (CC1 cross,

Supplemental Figure S10A), resulting in a nested insertion. Additionally, in a single case, a de
novo Ty1 element inserted 37 bp downstream of the start codon of the host gene *AIM29* in the
LL2011_009 subgenome of the MA line L41 (CC3 cross, Supplemental Figure S10B), introducing
an early stop codon that yields a peptide of 36 amino acid residues.

The frequency of de novo Ty1 retrotransposition events per cross tends to support our previous
conclusion that TE mobilization does not scale positively with parental divergence in
Saccharomyces hybrids (Hénault et al., 2020). A similar conclusion was reached from
interspecific hybrids between *S. cerevisiae* and the more distantly related species *S. uvarum*
(Smukowski Heil et al., 2021). However, the number of de novo Ty1 insertions characterized by
MA are quite low (at most four per cross) making it difficult to confidently test for differences in
transposition rate between hybrid genotypes. Multiple aspects of natural genetic variation were
shown to impact the mobilization of Ty1 (Czaja et al., 2020; Smukowski Heil et al., 2021),
suggesting that some of these aspects could also contribute to modulate transposition rate in
S. paradoxus hybrids.

We investigated how multiple aspects of genotype specificity impact transposition rate in
S. paradoxus hybrids using an existing genetic assay developed in *S. cerevisiae* to measure the
retrotransposition rate of a single tester Ty1 element (Curcio and Garfinkel, 1991). This assay
relies on an antisense artificial intron (AI) that interrupts a copy of the *HIS3* gene, which is itself
inserted in antisense orientation at the 3' end of the internal ORF of a plasmid-borne Ty1 element.
The correct splicing of the AI is enabled by Ty1 transcription, following which the reverse
transcription of the Ty1 mRNA and the integration of the resulting dsDNA copy in the genome
restores the *HIS3* ORF. Selecting for histidine prototrophy in a fluctuation assay (Luria and
Delbrück, 1943) enables the estimation of the transposition rate of the tester element. We adapted
this assay to measure retrotransposition rates in multiple *S. paradoxus* backgrounds, and with
two Ty1 sequence variants sampled from *SpB* and *SpC* genomes as tester elements
(Supplemental Figure S11, Supplemental Tables S2-6).

A mechanism of negative copy-number dependent self-regulation of retrotransposition was
characterized in the Ty1 family of *S. cerevisiae*, termed copy-number control (CNC) (Garfinkel et
al., 2003). This mechanism relies on the expression of an N-truncated Ty1 Gag protein (p22) from
two alternative downstream start codons (Nishida et al., 2015; Saha et al., 2015). p22 interferes
with the assembly of the viral-like particles essential for Ty1 life cycle completion (Cottee et al.,
2021; Saha et al., 2015). CNC yields a steep negative relationship between the retrotransposition

rate measured with a tester element and the number of p22-expressing Ty1 copies in the genome

(Garfinkel et al., 2003). We previously observed a negative relationship between Ty1 load change

after MA and the initial Ty1 load, and hypothesized that CNC-like regulation could be at play

(Hénault et al., 2020). While the scarcity of Ty1 mobilization in MA lines now refutes this

hypothesis, transposition rates could still be impacted by the initial load. We measured

transposition rates for Ty1 elements in eight different haploid backgrounds of *S. paradoxus* (one

SpA, four *SpB*, and three *SpC*; Supplemental Tables S5,7) that exhibit a wide variation in genomic

Ty1 CNs. The transposition rate in *SpB* backgrounds had a strong negative relationship with Ty1

CN (Figure 5). The transposition rate in a *SpB* background with a single Ty1 copy (UWOPS-79-

140, estimated CN: 1.2) reached 1.73×10^{-6} cell^{-1} gen^{-1}. In comparison, an *SpB* background

harboring a single additional Ty1 copy (MSH-604, estimated CN: 2.2) had a transposition rate

over an order of magnitude lower ($9,77 \times 10^{-8}$ cell^{-1} gen^{-1}). In *SpC* backgrounds, which all have

higher Ty1 CNs (20.7-32.4), the transposition rate was below 1×10^{-8} cell^{-1} gen^{-1}.

Figure 5. Ty1 transposition rate as a function of chromosomal Ty1 CN in *S. paradoxus*.
Transposition rates were measured in eight haploid *S. paradoxus* backgrounds, highlighted by
background gray bars at the corresponding CN. Black bars indicate the 95% confidence intervals.
Empty symbols represent upper bound transposition rate estimates obtained by artificially inflating
the mutant count by 1 when 0 was observed. Marker shapes indicate the sequence variant of the
tester Ty1 element, either *SpB* (circles) or *SpC* (squares). The *S. paradoxus* backgrounds and
estimated Ty1 CNs are, from left to right: UWOPS-79-140 (*SpB*, 1.2); MSH-604 (*SpB*, 2.2);
LL2012_021 (*SpB*, 4.6); LL2012_014 (*SpB*, 10.6); YPS744 (*SpA*, 14.4); LL2012_011 (*SpC*, 20.7);
LL2011_012 (*SpC*, 26.3); LL2011_009 (*SpC*, 32.4).

In each background, we tested two sequence variants of the tester Ty1 element: one derived from
a *SpB* genome (MSH-604), and one derived from a *SpC* genome (LL2011_012). We found that
the *SpC* variant generally yielded lower transposition rates (Figure 6A). In the UWOPS-79-140
SpB background, the transposition rate of the *SpB* variant (1.73×10^{-6} cell^{-1} gen^{-1}) was significantly

higher than the *SpC* variant, with a difference of over threefold (5.34×10^{-7} cell^{-1} gen^{-1}). We

crossed three of the haploid backgrounds, one from each population (*SpB*: UWOPS-79-140, *SpC*:

LL2011_012 and *SpA*: YPS744), to generate all the possible homozygous and heterozygous

diploid backgrounds (Supplemental Table S6), and measured their transposition rates (Figure 6B,

Supplemental Table S8). This experiment confirmed that transposition rates are lower with the

SpC Ty1 variant, with the difference being significant in three different backgrounds (*SpA*$\times$*SpB,*

SpB$\times$*SpB* and *SpB*$\times$*SpC*). Additionally, these measurements showed that transposition rates in

heterozygous hybrids are intermediate between their respective homozygous parental

backgrounds (Supplemental Figure S12), providing further evidence for the robustness of

transposition regulation in hybrids (Hénault et al., 2020; Smukowski Heil et al., 2021).

Figure 6. Ty1 transposition rate as a function of the sequence variant of the tester Ty1 element. Transposition rates of the *SpB* (X-axis) and *SpC* (Y-axis) Ty1 variants are shown for haploid backgrounds **(A)** and diploid backgrounds **(B)**. Black bars indicate the 95% confidence intervals. Empty symbols represent upper bound transposition rate estimates obtained by artificially inflating the mutant count by 1 when 0 was observed. The diagonal line indicates a 1:1 relation between transposition rates for the *SpB* and *SpC* Ty1 variants.

Like many other fungal species, mtDNA inheritance in *Saccharomyces* yeasts is biparental

(Wilson and Xu, 2012), yielding a transient state of heteroplasmy that is resolved with the fixation

of a single mtDNA haplotype by vegetative segregation (Birky, 2001). A recent study measured

the rate of Ty1 transposition in *S. cerevisiae*×*S. uvarum* hybrids while controlling mtDNA

inheritance and showed an effect of the parental mtDNA haplotype (Smukowski Heil et al., 2021).

The measured effect was quite strong, the transposition rate linked with the *S. uvarum* mtDNA

haplotype being approximately one order of magnitude lower than the *S. cerevisiae* mtDNA

haplotype. We investigated whether mtDNA inheritance also affected transposition rates at the

intraspecific level in hybrids between *S. paradoxus* natural populations. For each of the diploid

crosses described above, we tested reciprocal crosses with either parental haploid background

being depleted of its mtDNA (ρ^0). As expected, the reciprocal ρ^0 parents in the homozygous *SpC*

background yielded no significant difference in transposition rate (Figure 7). However, many

significant differences were observed in heterozygous backgrounds. In both *SpA*×*SpC* and

SpB×*SpC* hybrids with the *SpB* Ty1 tester variant, the transposition rate was significantly lower

when the mtDNA was inherited from the *SpC* (*MATα*) parent (Figure 7). Although not statistically

significant, the same trend was observed for the *SpC* Ty1 tester variant in the *SpB*×*SpC* hybrid.

These results indicate a moderate but consistent effect of the *SpC* mtDNA in lowering Ty1

transposition rate.

Figure 7. Ty1 transposition rate as a function of the inherited mtDNA haplotype.
Transposition rates in diploid backgrounds as a function of whether the inherited mtDNA is that
of the *MAT*a parent (X-axis) or the *MAT*α (Y-axis) are shown. Black bars indicate the 95%
confidence intervals. Empty symbols represent upper bound transposition rate estimates obtained
by artificially inflating the mutant count by 1 when 0 was observed. Marker shapes indicate the
sequence variant of the tester Ty1 element, either *SpB* (circles) or *SpC* (squares). The diagonal
line indicates a 1:1 relation between transposition rates for reciprocal mtDNA inheritance. Colored
arrows at the bottom left indicate the mtDNA haplotype that would correspond to a higher
transposition rate on that side of the diagonal for each hybrid background.

Discussion

The repetitive nature of TEs makes them notoriously difficult to resolve in genomes (Goerner-Potvin and Bourque, 2018). As such, studies investigating the TE reactivation hypothesis in hybrids have used a variety of methods for quantifying the activity of TEs at different levels, for instance in terms of genomic abundance (O'Neill et al., 1998; Ungerer et al., 2006) or expression level (Dion-Côté et al., 2014; Renaut et al., 2014). Not all methods enable the decomposition of TE load at the level of sequence-resolved insertion loci (Tusso et al., 2021), which is an especially challenging task in heterozygous genomes. A full mechanistic understanding of how TE load evolves in hybrids requires the ability to characterize how TE copies are gained and lost, through the action of de novo transposition and other types of SVs.

Here, we use long-read sequencing to yield accurate representations of the genomes of yeast hybrids experimentally evolved under a near-neutral MA regime, and investigate the mechanisms responsible for changes in the genomic landscape of Ty elements. We find that SV types like polyploidy, LOH and aneuploidy have the largest impact on Ty CN variation. While de novo Ty1 insertions compatible with retrotransposition were found in most of the MA crosses, their contribution to CN changes is very modest compared to the transposition-unrelated SVs. The scarcity of de novo insertions in the MA lines provides insufficient resolution to dissect subtle transposition rate variation between hybrid genotypes. We thus complement the genomic analysis of MA lines with in vivo Ty1 transposition assays to measure transposition rate in multiple genetic backgrounds. We find that initial Ty1 load, Ty1 sequence variation and mtDNA haplotype inheritance are factors that modulate transposition rates within *S. paradoxus*. In addition, our results confirm that unlike other yeasts (Tusso et al., 2021), Ty mobilization in *Saccharomyces* is not triggered by hybridization (Hénault et al., 2020; Smukowski Heil et al., 2021) and this, along a wide gradient of parental evolutionary divergence.

Our in vivo transposition assays revealed sharp contrasts in the dynamics of Ty1 mobilization. Multiple aspects of the *SpC* genotypes are associated with lower mobilization rates. Ty1 transposition occurs at a very low rate in *SpC* backgrounds compared to other *S. paradoxus* populations, and using a *SpC* Ty1 sequence variant as a tester element showed a much lower transposition rate compared to a *SpB* Ty1 variant in matched backgrounds. Moreover, reciprocal crosses with controlled mtDNA inheritance suggested an effect of *SpC* mtDNA in reducing Ty1 transposition rates. Despite the clear evidence for lower mobilization in vivo, half of the de novo transposition events in the MA lines genomes happened in intra-lineage *SpC* crosses. The *SpC*

population harbors a low level of genetic diversity compared to *SpB* (Eberlein et al., 2019; Leducq
et al., 2016), and have a fairly constant load of Ty1 (Hénault et al., 2020). Our new whole-genome
assemblies revealed that this apparent CN stability hides major variation in terms of Ty1 insertion
position, which explains how LOH events can drastically alter the Ty1 landscape in CC crosses.

The contrasted mobilization dynamics suggest that intraspecific variation affects not only the
potency of Ty1 transposition, but also the strength of its regulation. *SpB* genomes generally have
low Ty1 CNs, potent Ty1 sequence variants, and a steep negative relationship of Ty1
transposition rate as a function of standing genomic Ty1 CN. This latter pattern is entirely
consistent with the CNC mechanism identified for Ty1 in *S. cerevisiae,* although the functional
demonstration of CNC in our system remains to be done. On the other hand, the Ty1 load is
higher in *SpC* genomes, but *SpC* Ty1 variants and mtDNAs are linked to markedly lower
transposition rates. Still, our data suggest that transposition rates in *SpC* are much higher than
what would be predicted by extrapolating the steep CNC-like negative relationship of *SpB*
genomes (Figure 5). The less potent *SpC* Ty1 variant seems to have established a state that can
maintain substantial polymorphism in the population, perhaps enabled by lower or non-functional
CNC regulation. The first alternative start codon from which the p22 protein can be expressed in
S. cerevisiae is conserved in *SpB* and *SpC* Ty1 variants (M249, orthologous to M253 in the
S. cerevisiae Gag protein sequence alignment from Czaja et al., 2020), suggesting that both could
express p22. Despite recent structural insights into the mechanism of p22-mediated CNC (Cottee
et al., 2021), the molecular basis of the difference between CNC[+] and CNC[-] p22 variants in
S. cerevisiae remains unclear (Czaja et al., 2020). Variation outside of p22 is also likely to impact
CNC. For instance, the expression of CNC components in *S. cerevisiae* is affected by the
Mediator transcriptional regulator complex (Salinero et al., 2018), providing the host genome with
a mechanism to modulate the action of CNC (Curcio, 2019). We can hypothesize that intraspecific
differences in Ty1 mobilization rate may stem from complex interactions between Ty1 potency,
Ty1 self-regulation and host regulation.

In conclusion, our work provides a detailed account of the evolution of TE landscapes in the
genomes of hybrid yeast MA lines, through an accurate resolution of their subgenomes by phased
assembly. We highlight that retrotransposition is only a minor contributor to changes in TE load
compared to transposition-unrelated SVs. While transposition rate harbors substantial variation
that is underpinned by multiple sources of genetic diversity at the intraspecific level, its potential
for shaping the TE landscape in *Saccharomyces* hybrids is likely to be overpowered by other
forces of structural genome evolution.

Material and methods

Experimental evolution by MA and long-read sequencing

The MA evolution experiments used in this study were described previously (Charron et al., 2019; Hénault et al., 2020). Briefly, crosses were made between 13 haploid derivatives of wild yeast isolates (11 *S. paradoxus* isolates and two *S. cerevisiae* isolates). A total of 11 crosses were designed to span a range of evolutionary divergence between the parental strains, from very low divergence at the intraspecific level to very high divergence at the interspecific level. Each cross was replicated between 48 and 96 times with independent matings. The resulting collection was evolved under an MA regime for approximately 770 mitotic generations by streaking for single colonies on YPD agar medium (Supplemental Table S9) at 3-day intervals. Glycerol stock archives were made of the entire collection at regular intervals, and a subset of 10-12 MA lines per cross were randomly selected for long-read sequencing. Long-read library preparation and sequencing were described in (Hénault et al., 2022). Briefly, DNA was extracted using a standard phenol-chloroform protocol. Native (PCR-free) genomic DNA libraries were prepared using the SQK-LSK109 kit (Oxford Nanopore Technologies [ONT]) and multiplexed with the EXP-NBD104 barcoding kit (ONT). Sequencing was performed on a MinION sequencer (MIN-101B, ONT) with FLOMIN106 (revC) flowcells. The sequencing was run using MinKNOW v3.3.2 (ONT) and the basecalling was run using guppy v3.0.3 (ONT). Demultiplexing was done using guppy_basecaller v3.1.5.

Haploid genome assembly and annotation of the parental strains

De novo haploid genome assemblies for the 13 parental strains of the MA crosses were produced from basecalled long reads using wtdbg2 v2.5 (Ruan and Li, 2020) with parameters –p 0 –k 15 –AS 2 –s 0.05 –L 8000 –g 12m –X 120. Basecalled long reads were aligned to the draft assemblies using Minimap2 v2.17 (Li, 2018) with preset map–ont. Draft assemblies were polished with the long-read alignments and the linked raw nanopore signal data using nanopolish v0.13.3 (Loman et al., 2015) with parameter ––min–candidate–frequency 0.1. Short-read libraries from the corresponding 13 parental strains were retrieved from NCBI (accession number PRJNA515073). Reads were trimmed using Trimmomatic v0.33 (Bolger et al., 2014) with parameters ILLUMINACLIP:{custom adapters file}:6:20:10 MINLEN:40. The short-read libraries were mapped on the signal-level polished draft assemblies using BWA-MEM v0.7.17 (Li, 2013) and SAMtools

v1.15 (Li et al., 2009). The signal-level polished draft assemblies were polished with the short-
read alignments using Pilon v1.22 (Walker et al., 2014).

Polished de novo genome assemblies were scaffolded at the chromosome level using the
following procedure. Reference genomes for *S. paradoxus* strains LL2012_001 (*SpA*), MSH-604
(*SpB*) and LL2011_012 (*SpC*) (Eberlein et al., 2019) were scaffolded using RaGOO v1.1 (Alonge
et al., 2019), using the genome of *S. cerevisiae* strain S288c (Yue et al., 2017) as a reference.
For each of the MA parental strains, polished contigs were aligned against the scaffolded
reference of the corresponding species or population using the nucmer (with preset —mum) and
show-coords (with parameters –r –d –T) tools from the MUMmer v3.23 suite (Kurtz et al., 2004).
Contigs were sorted and merged into chromosomes using a custom Python v3.9.10 (Van Rossum
and Drake, 2009) script. We manually corrected for misassemblies that would yield dicentric or
acentric chromosomes, or that were incompatible with karyotypes determined by CHEF-PFGE
(Charron et al., 2014b). Chromosome-level assemblies were masked for rDNA repeats as follows.
Repeats from the S288c reference genome (release R64-2-1, downloaded from
www.yeastgenome.org) were extracted from chromosome XII (NC_001144, 451417-468931) and
searched against the chromosome-level assemblies using BLASTN v2.11.0 (Camacho et al.,
2009). Sequences corresponding to hits with alignment lengths over 200 bp were hard-masked
using a custom Python v3.9.10 script.

Final assemblies were annotated for families of Ty LTR retrotransposons using RepeatMasker
v4.1.2-p1 (Smit et al., 2015) with parameters –s –nolow –no_is –gccalc and a custom database
of reference Ty sequences from *S. paradoxus* (*lib_Sp.fasta*) or *S. paradoxus* and *S. cerevisiae*
combined (*lib.fasta*). RepeatMasker outputs were defragmented using REannotate version
26.11.2007 (Pereira, 2008) with parameters -s 15000 -d 10000. Final assemblies for the two
parents of each MA cross were aligned to each other using the nucmer (with preset —mum) and
show-coords (with parameters –r –d –T) tools from the MUMmer v3.23 suite. The orthology
between the full-length Ty annotations for each cross was scored from visual inspection of the
alignments.

Sorting of reads per MA line subgenome

For each of the 11 crosses of the MA experiment, genomic variants that distinguish the two
parental genomes were obtained from a variant call dataset previously generated (Hénault et al.,
2020) from short reads mapped on the reference genome of *S. paradoxus SpB* strain MSH-604

(Eberlein et al., 2019). Informative variants were identified with bcftools v1.16 (Li, 2011) using a

custom bash script. Long-read libraries were mapped against the MSH-604 genome (Eberlein et

al., 2019) and a custom Python v3.9.10 script was used to classify individual reads as one parental

genotype or the other. Each read had to have at least two informative variants. For a read to be

classified as originating from the subgenome of one parent, it had to be supported by a count of

informative variants at least twice as high as the count of informative variants supporting the

opposing parental subgenome. Lists of read IDs for reads successfully classified were used to

split MA lines libraries using Seqtk v1.3-r106 (https ://github.com/lh3/seqtk).

Subgenome-level assembly and annotation of MA line subgenomes

Basecalled long reads split by subgenome for each MA line were assembled separately using

wtdbg2 v2.5 with parameters –p 0 –k 15 –AS 2 –s 0.05 –g 12m. Draft assemblies were polished

with basecalled reads using medaka v1.4.4 (https://github.com/nanoporetech/medaka) with

model r941_min_high_g303. Polished assemblies were annotated for families of Ty LTR

retrotransposons using the same methodology as for haploid parental genomes (see above). To

enable the comparison of Ty annotations between the different assemblies, the following

procedure was designed to establish a common coordinate system and to define orthology

relationships. Subgenome-level assemblies were aligned against the corresponding haploid

parental genome using Minimap2 v2.20-r1061 with preset –x asm10. Ty annotation coordinates

were exported into BED format using a custom Python v3.9.10 script and lifted over to haploid

parental genome coordinates using paftools liftover v2.20-r1061 (Li, 2018). The resulting

annotation coordinates were merged in clusters (roughly corresponding to Ty orthogroups) in a

custom Python v3.9.10 script using the DBSCAN algorithm from the scikit-learn v1.1.3 Python

package (Pedregosa et al., 2011) with parameters eps=500 min_samples=1. Annotations within

one cluster were required to share the same Ty family and strand orientation. Clusters were

classified as complex or non-complex, depending on whether they contained more than one

annotation in any genome.

Classification of orthologous Ty clusters

For each cluster of orthologous Ty annotations in each MA line subgenome assembly, we

assigned an SV class, if applicable. Unless otherwise stated, all the steps of the classification

procedure were performed using custom Python v3.9.10 scripts.

Basecalled long reads split by subgenome were mapped against the corresponding parental
assembly using Minimap2 v2.20-r1061 with preset map–ont, and alignments were filtered using
SAMtools v1.16.1 to remove secondary alignments. Depth of coverage values from these
alignments were extracted using SAMtools v1.16.1. Tracts of discrete relative depth of coverage
along each genome were defined as follows. Assemblies were subdivided into 30 kb-wide non-
overlapping windows, and the median depth of coverage value of each window was divided by
the genome-wide median. Adjacent windows having the same value were merged to generate
tracts that reflect major CN changes along the genome (i.e. polyploidy, aneuploidies and LOH
events).

In addition to the discrete estimates of relative depth of coverage along each subgenome, the
existence of a subgenome-level assembly was inferred for each parental Ty cluster using a
reverse liftover procedure as follows. The parental genomes were aligned against the
corresponding subgenome-level assemblies using Minimap2 v2.20-r1061 with preset –x asm10.
For each Ty cluster, the two 500 bp-wide windows immediately flanking the annotation were
exported into BED format and lifted over to subgenome-level assembly coordinates using paftools
liftover v2.20-r1061. For the downstream steps, the clusters having inconsistent depth of
coverage-based CN estimates and assembly alignment-based presence (i.e. having a CN of zero
and assembly presence, or a CN greater than zero and assembly absence) were excluded.

These data were organized as boolean variables as follows. At the level of the individual
orthologous cluster, the variables included were: whether the cluster is complex (comprising more
than a single annotation per genome); and whether the cluster contains an annotation in the
corresponding parental genome. At the level of the individual orthologous cluster in individual MA
line subgenomes, the variables included were: whether the cluster contains an annotation;
whether there is the presence of an assembly based on assembly alignment; whether the content
of the cluster is the same as the parent; and whether the CN of the cluster is the same as the
parent. The CN of the cluster and the types of annotations in the cluster are non-boolean variables
that were also included at this level.

Using these variables, a decision tree (Supplemental Figure S5) was used to attribute one of the
following SV classes for each orthologous cluster in each MA line subgenome. The majority of
clusters were identical to the corresponding cluster in the parental genome, and were called "No
change". The clusters which had identical contents to the parental genome, but in a different CN,
were called "Polyploidy/aneuploidy/LOH". The clusters which had a full-length annotation in the

parent and a truncated annotation in the MA line subgenome were called "Truncation". The
clusters which had a full-length annotation in the parent and a solo LTR in the MA line subgenome
were called "Excision". The clusters which had a unique additional full-length annotation in the
MA line subgenome compared to the parent were called "De novo". The clusters which had an
annotation in the parental genome, but no annotation in the MA line subgenome despite having
support for MA line subgenome assembly presence, were called "Deletion".

We manually classified loci from the class "Polyploidy/aneuploidy/LOH" using the mappings of
long read libraries against parental assemblies. Genome-wide relative depth of coverage profiles
were generated by binning values in non-overlapping windows of 10 kb. Profiles were individually
examined to determine if CN changes were due to polyploidy, aneuploidy or large tracts of LOH.

Identification of de novo transposition events

From the classification produced by the decision tree, the loci identified as "De novo" were curated
to identify confident loci corresponding to retrotransposition events. We extracted the sequences
immediately flanking the insertion loci and looked for short repeated motifs in direct orientation,
corresponding to TSDs. TSDs of five or six nucleotides were found, and loci with no identifiable
TSD were discarded. We produced chromosome alignments comprising the MA line
subgenome(s) with de novo loci and all parental strains using Mauve v2015-02-26 (Darling et al.,
2010) with the progressiveMauve algorithm and default parameters. Alignments were inspected
to confirm that the junctions of de novo loci were unique to the corresponding MA line subgenome.
Finally, we compared the TSD motifs of candidate de novo retrotransposition to TSD motifs of all
parental full-length copies to filter out non-unique ones. The remaining loci (all from the Ty1 family)
were classified as de novo retrotransposition events.

A phylogenetic analysis of the de novo Ty1 insertions was performed by extracting the sequences
of de novo loci and of all full-length Ty1 and Ty2 parental elements. We added the sequences of
representative Ty1 and Ty2 elements identified by (Bleykasten-Grosshans et al., 2021) as
references. We included the 50 bp flanking sequences in 5' and 3' of all extracted sequences and
ran a multiple sequence alignment using MUSCLE v3.8.31 (Edgar, 2004). The alignment was
trimmed manually using MEGA v11.0.11 (Tamura et al., 2021). A maximum likelihood
phylogenetic tree was computed on the trimmed alignment using RAxML-NG v1.1.0 (Kozlov et
al., 2019) with the GTR+G model initiated with 10 parsimony trees and 200 bootstraps. The
phylogenetic tree was visualized using FigTree v1.4.4 (http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/figtree/).

Additionally, we built a phylogenetic network from the same trimmed alignment using SplitsTree
v4.18.3 (Huson and Bryant, 2006) with default parameters.

Plasmids used and constructed in this study

Plasmids used and constructed in this study are listed in Supplemental Table S2. Oligonucleotide
sequences are detailed in Supplemental Table S3. PCR reactions and cycles are detailed in
Supplemental Table S4. Media recipes are detailed in Supplemental Table S9. All the PCRs used
for cloning were performed using the KAPA HiFi HotStart DNA polymerase (Roche). All the PCRs
used for cloning confirmations were performed using the Taq DNA Polymerase (BioShop).
Plasmid minipreps were performed on overnight cultures in 5 mL 2YT+Amp or 2YT+Kan medium,
depending on the plasmid, using the Presto Mini Plasmid Kit (GeneAid).

Gibson cloning reactions were performed as follows. A Gibson assembly master mix was
prepared with the following components (for 1.2 mL): 360 µL of 5X ISO buffer (500 mM Tris-Cl,
50 mM MgCl2, 4 mM dNTPs mix, 50 mM DTT, 250 mg mL^{-1} PEG 8000, 5 mM NAD$^+$), 0.64 µL
10 U µL^{-1} T5 exonuclease (New England Biolabs), 20 of 2 U µL^{-1} Phusion High-Fidelity DNA
Polymerase (New England Biolabs), 160 µL of 40 U µL^{-1} Taq DNA ligase (New England Biolabs)
and 700 µL of PCR-grade H$_2$O. Gibson reactions were assembled by adding all the components
to 7.5 µL of Gibson master mix, and completing the volume to 10 µL with PCR-grade H$_2$O. Gibson
reactions were incubated at 50°C for 60 min.

Competent cells of *Escherichia coli* were prepared as detailed in Green and Rogers (Green and
Rogers, 2013). *E. coli* transformations were performed by combining 100 µL of competent cells
with 5 µL of mutagenesis or Gibson assembly reaction and incubating the mixture on ice for
15 min. Heat shock was done at 42°C for 1 min, followed by incubation on ice for 5 min. 900 µL
of 2YT medium was added and the mixture was incubated for 45 min at 37°C with agitation. Cells
were plated on 2YT+Amp agar or 2YT+Kan agar medium, depending on the plasmid, and
incubated at 37°C for 24 hrs.

Construction of Ty1 retrotransposition marker plasmids

Retrotransposition rate measurement assays were developed based on the plasmid-borne assay
designed by Curcio and Garfinkel (Curcio and Garfinkel, 1991) with several modifications. First,
we replaced the *S. cerevisiae* Ty1 sequence with variants sampled from wild *S. paradoxus*
genomes. To measure transposition rates at a transcription rate closer to the natural genomic

context and prevent potential biases arising from galactose induction in multiple wild genetic
backgrounds, we opted for the native promoter of Ty1 variants instead of the *GAL1* promoter.
Finally, we opted for a low CN centromeric plasmid backbone instead of a high CN plasmid
backbone in order to increase the mitotic stability and reduce the CN variance of the system.

Plasmid pRS31N was constructed as follows. Using a pFA6-natNT2 (Janke et al., 2004) miniprep
as a template, we amplified the natNT2 resistance cassette against nourseothricin (Nat). Using a
pRS316 (Sikorski and Hieter, 1989) miniprep as a template, we amplified the backbone excluding
the *URA3* selection marker. A Gibson assembly mix was prepared by adding 1 μL of natNT2
cassette and 1 μL of backbone to the Gibson master mix. After incubation for 60 min at 50°C, the
Gibson reaction was digested with DpnI (New England Biolabs). Competent cells of *E. coli*
MC1061 (Casadaban and Cohen, 1980) were transformed with 5 μL of the Gibson reaction.
Cloning was confirmed by PCR by testing the 5' junction. A miniprep was migrated by agarose
gel electrophoresis and transformed into yeast, selecting on both YPD+Nat agar medium and SC-
ura agar medium.

Plasmids pRS31N-Ty1-*SpB*-*HIS3*AI and pRS31N-Ty1-*SpC*-*HIS3*AI were constructed as follows.
The plasmid pGTy1-H3*HIS3*AI was a gift from David Garfinkel (Addgene plasmid # 62228 ;
http://n2t.net/addgene:62228 ; RRID:Addgene_62228) (Curcio and Garfinkel, 1991). Using a
pGTy1-H3m*HIS3*AI miniprep as a template, we amplified the retrotransposition indicator gene
(RIG) *HIS3*AI. We treated the *HIS3*AI RIG amplicon with DpnI followed by purification using solid-
phase reversible immobilization (SPRI) beads. We digested the plasmid pRS31N with SacII (New
England Biolabs), treated the digestion with calf intestinal alkaline phosphatase (CIP, New
England Biolabs) and purified the digested plasmid using SPRI beads. We extracted genomic
DNA from two *S. paradoxus* wild diploid strains (MSH-604, *SpB*; and LL2011_012, *SpC*) by
following a standard phenol-chloroform extraction protocol on overnight cultures in 5 mL YPD
medium incubated at 30°C with agitation. A genomic region of ~10 kb containing a single full-
length Ty1 element was amplified from the MSH-604 (chrXV) and LL2011_012 (chrVII) genomic
DNA extractions using unique primers. The full-length element chosen from the LL2011_012
genome was identical to five other full-length Ty1 elements in the same genome, and one of the
two full-length Ty1 elements in MSH-604 was chosen at random. From each genomic region
amplicon, the full-length Ty1 element was amplified in two segments: a first segment spanning
the left LTR and complete internal ORF (Ty1 5' segment), and a second segment spanning the
right LTR (Ty1 3' segment). The Ty1 segment amplicons were purified with SPRI beads. A first
Gibson assembly reaction was performed by combining 40 fmol each of the digested pRS31N

backbone, the Ty1 5' segment amplicon and the *HIS3*AI RIG amplicon. Competent cells of
Escherichia coli MC1061 were transformed with 5 µL of the Gibson assembly reaction. Cloning
was confirmed by PCR by testing the 5' and 3' junctions. We prepared a miniprep of the first
Gibson assembly and validated its restriction profile with EcoRV (New England Biolabs). The
miniprep of the first Gibson assembly was digested with NotI (New England Biolabs), and the
digestion was treated with CIP and purified using SPRI beads. A second Gibson assembly
reaction was performed by combining 40 fmol each of the first Gibson assembly digestion and
the Ty1 3' segment amplicon. Cloning was confirmed by PCR by testing the 5' and 3' junctions.
We prepared a miniprep of the second Gibson assembly and validated its restriction profile with
EcoRV. We confirmed the final clones with long-read whole-plasmid sequencing at
Plasmidsaurus (http://www.plasmidsaurus.com).

Yeast strains used and constructed in this study

S. paradoxus strains used and constructed in this study are listed in Supplemental Table S5.
Oligonucleotide sequences are detailed in Supplemental Table S3. PCR reactions and cycles are
detailed in Supplemental Table S4. Media recipes are detailed in Supplemental Table S9. All the
PCRs for plasmid mutagenesis and cassette amplification were performed using the KAPA HiFi
HotStart DNA polymerase. All the PCRs used for confirmations or diagnostics were performed
using the Taq DNA Polymerase.

S. paradoxus competent cells were prepared from 25 mL cultures in YPD medium incubated at
30°C with agitation until they reached an optical density at 600 nm (OD_{600} mL^{-1}) of 0.5-0.7.
Cultures were centrifuged at $500{\times}g$ for 5 min. Cells were washed once in 5 mL in H_2O and once
in 5 mL SORB solution (1 M sorbitol, 100 mM lithium acetate, 10 mM Tris-Cl, 1 mM EDTA). Cells
were resuspended in 180 µL of SORB solution and 20 µL of salmon sperm DNA that was
previously boiled for 5 min and cooled on ice. Competent cells were stored at -70°C until use.

S. paradoxus transformations were performed by combining 20 µL of competent cells, 250 ng of
plasmid or 8 µL cassette amplicon, and 100 µL of Plate Mixture solution (40% PEG 3350, 100 mM
lithium acetate, 10 mM Tris-Cl, 1 mM EDTA). The mixture was incubated at room temperature for
30 min. 7.5 µL of DMSO were added and a heat shock was performed at 37°C for 30 min. Cells
were centrifuged at 2000 rpm for 3 min and resuspended in 100 µL of YPD medium for 2 hrs in
the case of plasmid transformations, or 5 hrs in all other cases.

 Generation of histidine auxotroph strains

Short placeholder sequences (hereafter referred to as stuffers) (Dionne et al., 2021) to be used

as donor DNA in CRISPR-Cas9 mediated deletion of *HIS3* (YOR202W) were amplified using the

following reactions: 2 µL of Taq 10X Buffer (BioShop), 1.2 µL of 25 mM MgCl$_2$, 0.4 µL of 10 mM

dNTPs mix, 0.4 µL of 10 µM 5' primer, 0.4 µL of 10 µM 3' primer, 2 µL of 0.01 µM template primer,

0.12 µL of Taq DNA Polymerase and 13.5 µL of PCR-grade H$_2$O. The following PCR cycle was

run: 3 min at 94°C; 35 cycles of 30 sec at 94°C, 30 sec at 68°C, and 15s at 72°C; 25 sec at 72°C;

hold at 10°C.

A plasmid encoding CRISPR-Cas9 and a guide RNA (gRNA) sequence targeting the *HIS3* coding

sequence in *S. paradoxus* was designed as follows. The plasmid pCAS was a gift from Jamie

Cate (Addgene plasmid # 60847 ; http://n2t.net/addgene:60847 ; RRID:Addgene_60847) (Ryan

et al., 2014). pCAS was used as a template to mutagenize the gRNA sequence to target the

coding sequence of the *PEX11* gene (YOL147C). Mutagenesis PCRs were treated with DpnI and

transformed in *E. coli* MC1061. The mutagenesis was confirmed by Sanger sequencing of the

gRNA locus from a miniprep. pCAS-*PEX11* was used as a template to mutagenize the gRNA

sequence to target the coding sequence of *HIS3*. Mutagenesis PCRs were treated with DpnI and

transformed in *E. coli* MC1061. The gRNA locus was amplified for confirmation, and the

mutagenesis was confirmed by digesting the amplicon with HinfI (New England Biolabs) (the

PEX11 gRNA sequence contains a HinfI restriction site, while the *HIS3* gRNA doesn't) and by

Sanger sequencing.

CRISPR-Cas9 mediated deletion of *HIS3* was done following the method of Ryan et al. (Ryan et

al., 2016) with pCAS-*HIS3* and the corresponding stuffer amplicon in eight different haploid

S. paradoxus strains derived from wild isolates (Charron et al., 2014b; Leducq et al., 2016). Gene

deletion was confirmed by PCR and growth on SC-his agar medium.

To enable crosses among three of the *his3*::stuffer strains, one per population (*SpA*: YPS744,

SpB: UWOPS-79-140, *SpC*: LL2011_012), the hphMX resistance cassette against hygromycin B

(HygB) at the *HO* locus was replaced by the kanMX resistance cassette against geneticin (G418),

and the mating types were switched.

The plasmid pUG6 (Güldener et al., 1996) was obtained from Euroscarf

(http://www.euroscarf.de). pUG6 was used as a template to amplify the kanMX cassette with

flanking homology to the HO locus. Competent cells were transformed with the cassette and

plated on YPD+G418 agar medium. Cassette switch was confirmed by PCR.

The plasmid pHS3 was a gift from John McCusker (Addgene plasmid # 81038 ;

http://n2t.net/addgene:81038 ; RRID:Addgene_81038). Competent cells from the mating type

switched strains were transformed with pHS3 and plated on YPD+G418+Nat agar medium.

Colonies were grown in 3 mL YPD medium at room temperature with agitation for two days to

allow for pHS3 segregation, diluting cultures ~1000X after 24 hrs. Cultures were streaked on YPD

plates and incubated at room temperature for five days. Single colonies were checked for the loss

of pHS3 by making patches on YPD+Nat agar medium and for autodiploidization by PCR (Huxley

et al., 1990). Strains were sporulated as described in Plante and Landry (Plante and Landry,

2020) and tetrads were dissected on YPD agar medium using a SporePlay microscope (Singer

Instruments). Dissection plates were incubated at room temperature for five days. The mating

types of spores were confirmed by PCR (Huxley et al., 1990).

To enable crosses with reciprocal mtDNA inheritance, we generated strain derivatives devoid of

mtDNA (ρ^0) as described in Fox et al. (Fox et al., 1991). The loss of respiration ability was

confirmed by spotting the strains on YPEG agar medium.

Crosses with reciprocal mtDNA inheritance

Histidine auxotroph strains and their *HO* cassette-switch, mating type-switch and ρ^0 derivatives

were crossed as detailed in Supplemental Table S6. For each parental strain, an overnight

preculture was grown in 1 mL of YPD medium at room temperature. 100 µL of each preculture

were combined in 1 mL YPD medium and incubated at room temperature without agitation for

4 hrs. 10 µL of mating cultures were streaked on YPD+G418+HygB agar medium and incubated

for three days at room temperature. Two single colonies per streaking were used to inoculate

1 mL of YPD medium and the strains were tested for respiratory proficiency by spotting on YPEG

agar medium. The strains were also tested for diploidy by cellular DNA staining and fluorescence

measurement by flow cytometry using a Guava easyCyte 8HT flow cytometer (EMD Millipore) as

described in Marsit et al. (Marsit et al., 2021).

Measurement of retrotransposition rates

Fluctuation assays were performed to measure retrotransposition rates. Competent cells of the

corresponding haploid strains and diploid crosses were transformed with minipreps of either

pRS31N-Ty1-*SpB-HIS3*AI or pRS31N-Ty1-*SpC-HIS3*AI, and plated on YPD+Nat agar medium.

Transformation plates were incubated at 30°C for three days. From the transformation plates,

single colonies were picked and resuspended in 10 mL of YPD medium. Cell densities were

estimated by measuring the OD_{600} of the resuspensions, and dilutions at 2×10^{-3} OD_{600} mL^{-1} were

prepared in YPD medium. 96-well plates were filled with 225 μL of YPD+Nat 1.1X medium. 25 μL

of cell dilutions were added to each well for a final concentration of 2×10^{-4} OD_{600} mL^{-1} (~500 cells

per well). Each combination of background and Ty1 variant was replicated in 48 independent

cultures (half a plate). Plates were covered with breathable rayon films and incubated at 20°C for

three days. Final cultures were centrifuged at $500\times g$ for 5 min and resuspended in 200 μL of

H_2O. The entire resuspensions were spotted in groups of 7 or 9 on SC-his agar plates that were

previously dried at 37°C for three days. Plates were incubated at room temperature and His$^+$

colonies were counted after five days.

For each haploid background, 42 cultures were spotted on SC-his agar plates and six were

pooled. Serial dilutions were prepared by diluting pools twice 200X and 100 μL of final dilutions

were plated on YPD agar plates. Plates were incubated at room temperature for 3 days and

colonies were counted to estimate final population sizes. Colony counts are detailed in

Supplemental Table S7. For each diploid background, 36 cultures were spotted on SC-his agar

plates and 12 were pooled. Serial dilutions were prepared by diluting pools twice 12X and cell

densities of the final dilutions were measured by flow cytometry using a Guava easyCyte 8HT

flow cytometer to estimate final population sizes. Colony counts are detailed in Supplemental

Table S8.

The number of mutations (retrotransposition events) in each culture and associated 95%

confidence intervals were estimated using the newtonLD and confintLD functions from the Python

implementation of the R package rSalvador (Zheng, 2017) (https://github.com/eeeeeric/

rSalvador/blob/master/pysalvador/pysalvador.py). Retrotransposition rates were computed by

dividing mutation count estimates by the estimates of final population sizes.

Data accessibility

Nanopore long-read sequencing data (basecalled reads) and parental genome assemblies are available at NCBI under accession number PRJNA828354. Illumina short-read sequencing data of the MA lines is available at NCBI under accession number PRJNA515073. Custom scripts, custom databases of reference Ty sequences and subgenome-level assemblies of MA lines used in this study are available at GitHub (https://github.com/Landrylab/lrma).

Competing interests

We declare no competing interest.

Acknowledgements

We thank Alexandre Dubé for helpful comments on the manuscript and contributions to plasmid constructions. We thank Anna Fijarczyk and Hélène Martin for contributions to sequencing data preprocessing. We thank the members of the Landry laboratory for helpful discussions on the project. This project was supported by funding to C.R.L. from an NSERC discovery grant (RGPIN-2020-04844) and an FRQNT team grant (2019-PR-254415), and an NSERC Alexander Graham Bell doctoral scholarship to M.H. C.R.L. holds the Canada Research Chair in Cellular Systems and Synthetic Biology.

Author contributions

C.R.L. and M.H. designed the project. M.H. performed the analyses and experiments. M.H., S.M., and G.C. performed the MA evolution experiment and short-read sequencing as cited. M.H. wrote the manuscript with input from all authors.

References

Alonge M, Soyk S, Ramakrishnan S, Wang X, Goodwin S, Sedlazeck FJ, Lippman ZB, Schatz MC. 2019. RaGOO: fast and accurate reference-guided scaffolding of draft genomes. *Genome Biol* **20**:224.

Bergman CM. 2018. Horizontal transfer and proliferation of Tsu4 in Saccharomyces paradoxus. *Mob DNA* **9**:18.

Birky CW Jr. 2001. The inheritance of genes in mitochondria and chloroplasts: laws, mechanisms, and models. *Annu Rev Genet* **35**:125–148.

Bleykasten-Grosshans C, Fabrizio R, Friedrich A, Schacherer J. 2021. Species-Wide Transposable Element Repertoires Retrace the Evolutionary History of the Saccharomyces cerevisiae Host. *Mol Biol Evol* **38**:4334–4345.

Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. 2014. Trimmomatic: A flexible trimmer for Illumina sequence data. *Bioinformatics* **30**:2114–2120.

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

Bucheton A, Paro R, Sang HM, Pelisson A, Finnegan DJ. 1984. The molecular basis of I-R hybrid dysgenesis in Drosophila melanogaster: identification, cloning, and properties of the I factor. *Cell* **38**:153–163.

Camacho C, Coulouris G, Avagyan V, Ma N, Papadopoulos J, Bealer K, Madden TL. 2009. BLAST+: architecture and applications. *BMC Bioinformatics* **10**:421.

Casadaban MJ, Cohen SN. 1980. Analysis of gene control signals by DNA fusion and cloning in Escherichia coli. *J Mol Biol* **138**:179–207.

Cavenee WK, Dryja TP, Phillips RA, Benedict WF, Godbout R, Gallie BL, Murphree AL, Strong LC, White RL. 1983. Expression of recessive alleles by chromosomal mechanisms in retinoblastoma. *Nature* **305**:779–784.

Charlesworth B, Langley CH. 1989. The population genetics of Drosophila transposable elements. *Annu Rev Genet* **23**:251–287.

Charlesworth B, Sniegowski P, Stephan W. 1994. The evolutionary dynamics of repetitive DNA in eukaryotes. *Nature* **371**:215–220.

Charron G, Leducq JB, Bertin C, Dubé AK, Landry CR. 2014a. Exploring the northern limit of the distribution of Saccharomyces cerevisiae and Saccharomyces paradoxus in North America. *FEMS Yeast Res* **14**:281–288.

Charron G, Leducq JB, Landry CR. 2014b. Chromosomal variation segregates within incipient species and correlates with reproductive isolation. *Mol Ecol* **23**:4362–4372.

Charron G, Marsit S, Hénault M, Martin H, Landry CR. 2019. Spontaneous whole-genome duplication restores fertility in interspecific hybrids. *Nat Commun* **10**:4126.

Cottee MA, Beckwith SL, Letham SC, Kim SJ, Young GR, Stoye JP, Garfinkel DJ, Taylor IA.
2021. Structure of a Ty1 restriction factor reveals the molecular basis of transposition copy
number control. *Nat Commun* **12**:5590.

Curcio MJ. 2019. Border collies of the genome: domestication of an autonomous retrovirus-like
transposon. *Curr Genet* **65**:71–78.

Curcio MJ, Garfinkel DJ. 1991. Single-step selection for Ty1 element retrotransposition. *Proc*
Natl Acad Sci U S A **88**:936–940.

Czaja W, Bensasson D, Ahn HW, Garfinkel DJ, Bergman CM. 2020. Evolution of Ty1 copy
number control in yeast by horizontal transfer and recombination. *PLoS Genet*
16:e1008632.

Darling AE, Mau B, Perna NT. 2010. progressiveMauve: multiple genome alignment with gene
gain, loss and rearrangement. *PLoS One* **5**:e11147.

Dion-Côté AM, Renaut S, Normandeau E, Bernatchez L. 2014. RNA-seq reveals transcriptomic
shock involving transposable elements reactivation in hybrids of young lake whitefish
species. *Mol Biol Evol* **31**:1188–1199.

Dionne U, Bourgault É, Dubé AK, Bradley D, Chartier FJM, Dandage R, Dibyachintan S,
Després PC, Gish GD, Pham NTH, Létourneau M, Lambert J-P, Doucet N, Bisson N,
Landry CR. 2021. Protein context shapes the specificity of SH3 domain-mediated
interactions in vivo. *Nat Commun* **12**:1597.

Dunham MJ, Badrane H, Ferea T, Adams J, Brown PO, Rosenzweig F, Botstein D. 2002.
Characteristic genome rearrangements in experimental evolution of Saccharomyces
cerevisiae. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **99**:16144–16149.

Eberlein C, Hénault M, Fijarczyk A, Charron G, Bouvier M, Kohn LM, Anderson JB, Landry CR.
2019. Hybridization is a recurrent evolutionary stimulus in wild yeast speciation. *Nat*
Commun **10**:923.

Edgar RC. 2004. MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high
throughput. *Nucleic Acids Res* **32**:1792–1797.

Fox TD, Folley LS, Mulero JJ, McMullin TW, Thorsness PE, Hedin LO, Costanzo MC. 1991.
Analysis and manipulation of yeast mitochondrial genes. *Methods Enzymol* **194**:149–165.

Garfinkel DJ, Nyswaner K, Wang J, Cho JY. 2003. Post-transcriptional cosuppression of Ty1
retrotransposition. *Genetics* **165**:83–99.

Goerner-Potvin P, Bourque G. 2018. Computational tools to unmask transposable elements.
Nat Rev Genet **19**:688–704.

Gorkovskiy A, Verstrepen KJ. 2021. The Role of Structural Variation in Adaptation and Evolution
of Yeast and Other Fungi. *Genes* **12**. doi:10.3390/genes12050699

Green R, Rogers EJ. 2013. Chapter Twenty Eight - Transformation of Chemically Competent E.
coli In: Lorsch J, editor. Methods in Enzymology. Academic Press. pp. 329–336.

Güldener U, Heck S, Fielder T, Beinhauer J, Hegemann JH. 1996. A new efficient gene

disruption cassette for repeated use in budding yeast. *Nucleic Acids Res* **24**:2519–2524.

Heasley LR, Argueso JL. 2022. Genomic characterization of a wild diploid isolate of
Saccharomyces cerevisiae reveals an extensive and dynamic landscape of structural
variation. *Genetics* **220**. doi:10.1093/genetics/iyab193

Hénault M, Marsit S, Charron G, Landry CR. 2022. Hybridization drives mitochondrial DNA
degeneration and metabolic shift in a species with biparental mitochondrial inheritance.
Genome Res **32**:2043–2056.

Hénault M, Marsit S, Charron G, Landry CR. 2020. The effect of hybridization on transposable
element accumulation in an undomesticated fungal species. *Elife* **9**.
doi:10.7554/eLife.60474

Huson DH, Bryant D. 2006. Application of phylogenetic networks in evolutionary studies. *Mol
Biol Evol* **23**:254–267.

Huxley C, Green ED, Dunham I. 1990. Rapid assessment of S. cerevisiae mating type by PCR.
Trends Genet **6**:236.

Janke C, Magiera MM, Rathfelder N, Taxis C, Reber S, Maekawa H, Moreno-Borchart A,
Doenges G, Schwob E, Schiebel E, Knop M. 2004. A versatile toolbox for PCR-based
tagging of yeast genes: new fluorescent proteins, more markers and promoter substitution
cassettes. *Yeast* **21**:947–962.

Kim JM, Vanguri S, Boeke JD, Gabriel A, Voytas DF. 1998. Transposable elements and
genome organization: a comprehensive survey of retrotransposons revealed by the
complete Saccharomyces cerevisiae genome sequence. *Genome Res* **8**:464–478.

Kozlov AM, Darriba D, Flouri T, Morel B, Stamatakis A. 2019. RAxML-NG: a fast, scalable and
user-friendly tool for maximum likelihood phylogenetic inference. *Bioinformatics* **35**:4453–
4455.

Kuehne HA, Murphy HA, Francis CAA, Sniegowski PD. 2007. Allopatric Divergence, Secondary
Contact, and Genetic Isolation in Wild Yeast Populations. *Curr Biol* **17**:407–411.

Kurtz S, Phillippy A, Delcher AL, Smoot M, Shumway M, Antonescu C, Salzberg SL. 2004.
Versatile and open software for comparing large genomes. *Genome Biol* **5**:R12.

Leducq J-B, Charron G, Samani P, Dubé AK, Sylvester K, James B, Almeida P, Sampaio JP,
Hittinger CT, Bell G, Landry CR. 2014. Local climatic adaptation in a widespread
microorganism. *Proc Biol Sci* **281**:20132472.

Leducq JB, Nielly-Thibault L, Charron G, Eberlein C, Verta JP, Samani P, Sylvester K, Hittinger
CT, Bell G, Landry CR. 2016. Speciation driven by hybridization and chromosomal plasticity
in a wild yeast. *Nature Microbiology* **1**:1–10.

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

Li H. 2013. Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM
00:1–3.

Li H. 2011. A statistical framework for SNP calling, mutation discovery, association mapping and
population genetical parameter estimation from sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* **27**:2987–
2993.

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* **25**:2078–2079.

Loman NJ, Quick J, Simpson JT. 2015. A complete bacterial genome assembled de novo using
only nanopore sequencing data. *Nat Methods* **12**:733–735.

Lower SE, Dion-Côté A-M, Clark AG, Barbash DA. 2019. Special Issue: Repetitive DNA
Sequences. *Genes*   **10**. doi:10.3390/genes10110896

Luria SE, Delbrück M. 1943. Mutations of Bacteria from Virus Sensitivity to Virus Resistance.
Genetics **28**:491–511.

Marsit S, Hénault M, Charron G, Fijarczyk A, Landry CR. 2021. The neutral rate of whole-
genome duplication varies among yeast species and their hybrids. *Nat Commun* **12**:3126.

McClintock B. 1984. The significance of responses of the genome to challenge. *Science*
226:792–801.

Nishida Y, Pachulska-Wieczorek K, Błaszczyk L, Saha A, Gumna J, Garfinkel DJ, Purzycka KJ.
2015. Ty1 retrovirus-like element Gag contains overlapping restriction factor and nucleic
acid chaperone functions. *Nucleic Acids Res* **43**:7414–7431.

O'Donnell S, Yue J-X, Saada OA, Agier N, Caradec C, Cokelaer T, De Chiara M, Delmas S,
Dutreux F, Fournier T, Friedrich A, Kornobis E, Li J, Miao Z, Tattini L, Schacherer J, Liti G,
Fischer G. 2022. 142 telomere-to-telomere assemblies reveal the genome structural
landscape in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *bioRxiv*. doi:10.1101/2022.10.04.510633

Oggenfuss U, Croll D. 2023. Recent transposable element bursts are associated with the
proximity to genes in a fungal plant pathogen. *PLoS Pathog* **19**:e1011130.

O'Neill RJ, O'Neill MJ, Graves JA. 1998. Undermethylation associated with retroelement
activation and chromosome remodelling in an interspecific mammalian hybrid. *Nature*
393:68–72.

Otto SP, Whitton J. 2000. Polyploid incidence and evolution. *Annu Rev Genet* **34**:401–437.

Pasyukova EG, Nuzhdin SV, Morozova TV, Mackay TFC. 2004. Accumulation of transposable
elements in the genome of Drosophila melanogaster is associated with a decrease in
fitness. *J Hered* **95**:284–290.

Pedregosa F, Varoquaux G, Gramfort A, Michel V, Thirion B, Grisel O, Blondel M, Prettenhofer
P, Weiss R, Dubourg V, Vanderplas J, Passos A, Cournapeau D, Brucher M, Perrot M,
Duchesnay E. 2011. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. *J Mach Learn Res* **12**:2825–
2830.

Pereira V. 2008. Automated paleontology of repetitive DNA with REANNOTATE. *BMC*
Genomics **9**:1–21.

Petrov DA, Aminetzach YT, Davis JC, Bensasson D, Hirsh AE. 2003. Size matters: non-LTR
retrotransposable elements and ectopic recombination in Drosophila. *Mol Biol Evol* **20**:880–
892.

Plante S, Landry CR. 2020. Purification of Yeast Spores to Investigate Their Dynamics of
Activation. *Curr Protoc Microbiol* **59**:e123.

Rech GE, Radío S, Guirao-Rico S, Aguilera L, Horvath V, Green L, Lindstadt H, Jamilloux V,
Quesneville H, González J. 2022. Population-scale long-read sequencing uncovers
transposable elements associated with gene expression variation and adaptive signatures
in Drosophila. *Nat Commun* **13**:1–16.

Renaut S, Rowe HC, Ungerer MC, Rieseberg LH. 2014. Genomics of homoploid hybrid
speciation: diversity and transcriptional activity of long terminal repeat retrotransposons in
hybrid sunflowers. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* **369**:20130345–20130345.

Ruan J, Li H. 2020. Fast and accurate long-read assembly with wtdbg2. *Nat Methods* **17**:155–
158.

Ryan OW, Poddar S, Cate JHD. 2016. Crispr–cas9 genome engineering in Saccharomyces
cerevisiae cells. *Cold Spring Harb Protoc* **2016**:525–533.

Ryan OW, Skerker JM, Maurer MJ, Li X, Tsai JC, Poddar S, Lee ME, DeLoache W, Dueber JE,
Arkin AP, Cate JHD. 2014. Selection of chromosomal DNA libraries using a multiplex
CRISPR system. *Elife* **3**. doi:10.7554/eLife.03703

Saha A, Mitchell JA, Nishida Y, Hildreth JE, Ariberre JA, Gilbert WV, Garfinkel DJ. 2015. A
trans-dominant form of Gag restricts Ty1 retrotransposition and mediates copy number
control. *J Virol* **89**:3922–3938.

Salinero AC, Knoll ER, Zhu ZI, Landsman D, Curcio MJ, Morse RH. 2018. The Mediator co-
activator complex regulates Ty1 retromobility by controlling the balance between Ty1i and
Ty1 promoters. *PLoS Genet* **14**:e1007232.

Selmecki A, Forche A, Berman J. 2006. Aneuploidy and isochromosome formation in drug-
resistant Candida albicans. *Science* **313**:367–370.

Shoshani O, Bakker B, de Haan L, Tijhuis AE, Wang Y, Kim DH, Maldonado M, Demarest MA,
Artates J, Zhengyu O, Mark A, Wardenaar R, Sasik R, Spierings DCJ, Vitre B, Fisch K,
Foijer F, Cleveland DW. 2021. Transient genomic instability drives tumorigenesis through
accelerated clonal evolution. *Genes Dev* **35**:1093–1108.

Sikorski RS, Hieter P. 1989. A system of shuttle vectors and yeast host strains designed for
efficient manipulation of DNA in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Genetics* **122**:19–27.

Smit AFA, Hubley R, Green P. 2015. RepeatMasker.

Smukowski Heil C, Patterson K, Shang-Mei Hickey A, Alcantara E, Dunham MJ. 2021.
Transposable element mobilization in interspecific yeast hybrids. *Genome Biol Evol* **13**.
doi:10.1093/gbe/evab033

Smukowski Heil CS, DeSevo CG, Pai DA, Tucker CM, Hoang ML, Dunham MJ. 2017. Loss of

Heterozygosity Drives Adaptation in Hybrid Yeast. *Mol Biol Evol* **34**:1596–1612.

Tamura K, Stecher G, Kumar S. 2021. MEGA11: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis
Version 11. *Mol Biol Evol* **38**:3022–3027.

Trakala M, Aggarwal M, Sniffen C, Zasadil L, Carroll A, Ma D, Su XA, Wangsa D, Meyer A,
Sieben CJ, Zhong J, Hsu P-H, Paradis G, Ried T, Holland A, Van Deursen J, Amon A.
2021. Clonal selection of stable aneuploidies in progenitor cells drives high-prevalence
tumorigenesis. *Genes Dev* **35**:1079–1092.

Tusso S, Suo F, Liang Y, Du L-L, Wolf JBW. 2021. Reactivation of transposable elements
following hybridization in fission yeast. *Genome Res* **32**:324–336.

Ungerer MC, Strakosh SC, Zhen Y. 2006. Genome expansion in three hybrid sunflower species
is associated with retrotransposon proliferation. *Curr Biol* **16**:R872–3.

Van Rossum G, Drake FL. 2009. Python 3 reference manual. Scotts Valley, CA: CreateSpace.

Walker BJ, Abeel T, Shea T, Priest M, Abouelliel A, Sakthikumar S, Cuomo CA, Zeng Q,
Wortman J, Young SK, Earl AM. 2014. Pilon: An Integrated Tool for Comprehensive
Microbial Variant Detection and Genome Assembly Improvement. *PLoS One* **9**:e112963.

Wilhelm F-X, Wilhelm M, Gabriel A. 2005. Reverse transcriptase and integrase of the
Saccharomyces cerevisiae Ty1 element. *Cytogenet Genome Res* **110**:269–287.

Wilke CM, Adams J. 1992. Fitness effects of Ty transposition in Saccharomyces cerevisiae.
Genetics **131**:31–42.

Wilson AJ, Xu J. 2012. Mitochondrial inheritance: Diverse patterns and mechanisms with an
emphasis on fungi. *Mycology* **3**:158–166.

Yue JX, Li J, Aigrain L, Hallin J, Persson K, Oliver K, Bergström A, Coupland P, Warringer J,
Lagomarsino MC, Fischer G, Durbin R, Liti G. 2017. Contrasting evolutionary genome
dynamics between domesticated and wild yeasts. *Nat Genet* **49**:913–924.

Zheng Q. 2017. rSalvador: An R Package for the Fluctuation Experiment. *G3* **7**:3849–3856.