Genomic Diversity Illuminates the Environmental Adaptation of

Drosophila suzukii

Running title: *Drosophila suzukii* Environmental Adaptation

Siyuan Feng[1*], Samuel P. DeGrey[2†], Christelle Guédot[2], Sean D. Schoville[2], John E. Pool[1*]

[1]Laboratory of Genetics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA

[2] Department of Entomology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA

[†]Present address: Kimberly Research and Extension Center, University of Idaho, Kimberly, ID,

USA

*Corresponding authors − E-mail:

Siyuan Feng, siyuanfeng.bio@outlook.com; John E. Pool, jpool@wisc.edu

Mailing address: 425G Henry Mall, Madison, WI, 53705, USA

Abstract

Biological invasions carry substantial practical and scientific importance, and represent natural evolutionary experiments on contemporary timescales. Here, we investigated genomic diversity and environmental adaptation of the crop pest *Drosophila suzukii* using whole-genome sequencing data and environmental metadata for 29 population samples from its native and invasive range. Through a multifaceted analysis of this population genomic data, we increase our understanding of the *D. suzukii* genome, its diversity and its evolution, and we identify an appropriate genotype-environment association pipeline for our data set. Using this approach, we detect genetic signals of local adaptation associated with nine distinct environmental factors related to altitude, wind speed, precipitation, temperature, and human land use. We uncover unique functional signatures for each environmental variable, such as a prevalence of cuticular genes associated with annual precipitation. We also infer biological commonalities in the adaptation to diverse selective pressures, particularly in terms of the apparent contribution of nervous system evolution to enriched processes (ranging from neuron development to circadian behavior) and to top genes associated with all nine environmental variables. Our findings therefore depict a finer-scale adaptive landscape underlying the rapid invasion success of this agronomically important species.

Keywords: environmental adaptation, genotype-environment association, *Drosophila suzukii*, invasion genomics

Introduction

One of the main goals of ecological and evolutionary genomics is to understand how organisms evolve in response to novel environments. Biological invasions, while often ecologically and economically damaging, represent unique opportunities to build our understanding of local adaptation, as natural experiments that expose introduced species to new biotic and abiotic factors on contemporary time scales (Lee 2002; Prentis et al. 2008; Colautti and Lau 2016). Invasive species can exhibit rapid phenotypic and genetic changes during the invasion process, driven by various evolutionary mechanisms such as selection, drift, mutation, and gene flow (Colautti and Lau 2016; Hodgins et al. 2018). These changes can result in the adaptive evolution of invasive populations to the novel environments they encounter (Colautti and Barrett 2013). Although there have been emerging studies on the evolutionary biology of invasive species in recent years, the source and nature of the genetic variation underlying such adaptation are still not well characterized (Reznick et al. 2019; Welles and Dlugosch 2019).

Drosophila suzukii, also known as spotted wing *Drosophila*, is a promising model for studying adaptive evolution during invasions. *Drosophila suzukii* is a highly polyphagous vinegar fly that originated from Asia (Peng 1937; Kanzawa 1939; Tan et al. 1949). It first expanded to Hawaii in 1980, and within the past 15 years, it has invaded North America and Europe, and subsequently Réunion Island (Indian Ocean) and South America (Asplen et al. 2015), then northern and sub-Saharan Africa (Boughdad et al. 2021; Kwadha et al. 2021). *Drosophila suzukii* differs from other *Drosophila* species in its unique ability to oviposit on both unripe and ripe fruits, using its serrated ovipositor to pierce the skin of soft-skinned fruits. This has allowed it to exploit a novel ecological niche and avoid competition with other vinegar flies that typically feed on overripe and rotting fruits (Cini et al. 2012; Atallah et al. 2014), causing severe economic losses to

fruit crops (Knapp et al. 2021). It also exhibits remarkable genetic diversity and phenotypic

plasticity in behavior, morphology, and physiology, e.g., temperature and desiccation tolerance

(Little et al. 2020; Olazcuaga et al. 2020), which may notably facilitate its adaptation to different

climatic conditions and host plants (Gibert et al. 2019; Little et al. 2020). To obtain a

comprehensive evolutionary genetic understanding of the invasion success of *D. suzukii*, we need

to understand the genetic basis and ecological drivers of adaptive evolutionary changes that have

allowed this species to occupy diverse worldwide environments.

Multiple genetic studies have investigated the demographic history of invasive

populations of *D. suzukii*. Such studies have found greater levels of genetic structure between

than within continents (Adrion et al. 2014; Lewald et al. 2021), suggesting independent invasions

into Europe and North America. These inferences were supported by an approximate Bayesian

analysis of microsatellite data, which also indicated that some invading populations had multiple

genetic sources (Fraimout et al. 2017). While minor differences are suggested in the specific

admixture events that have occurred (Fraimout et al. 2017; Lewald et al. 2021), and inferences of

the geographic origins of invading populations are limited by incomplete sampling from the

species' Asian range, these studies suggest some emerging consensus about the invasion history of

D. suzukii.

In contrast, the genetic basis of environmental adaptation in *D. suzukii* is still largely

unexplored. Among the few relevant studies is that of Olazcuaga et al. (2020), which used

genomic sequencing data from 22 worldwide populations to search for SNPs with greater

frequency differences between Asian (China, Japan) and non-Asian populations than are

observed at most loci due to founder event bottlenecks, in hopes of identifying genetic variants

that may underlie the invasion success of introduced populations. A subsequent study examining

this same data set also found a small number of transposon insertions with strong frequency

differences between American/European and Asian populations (Mérel et al. 2021). Another

study identified F_{ST} outliers among Hawaiian *D. suzukii* populations (Koch et al. 2020). Apart

from these limited comparisons, the genetic changes that may have helped *D. suzukii* to adapt to

specific environmental changes are entirely unknown.

With the increasing availability of multi-population genomic resources, genotype-

environment association (GEA), also known as environmental association analysis (EAA), is

becoming a widely-used approach to understand the potential relationship between specific

environmental factors and adaptive genetic variation (Rellstab et al. 2015). GEA is also useful in

identifying subtle changes in allele frequencies that are difficult to detect with outlier tests based

on traditional population genomic approaches, especially when the number of studied

populations is relatively large, and there is high gene flow counteracting patterns of local

adaptation (Kawecki and Ebert 2004). The capability of GEA to identify adaptive genetic

changes and environmental drivers of local adaptation has been demonstrated with whole-

genome pool-seq data from *Drosophila melanogaster* (Bogaerts-Márquez et al. 2021). Therefore,

GEA could be helpful in understanding the genotype-environment relationships underlying the

invasion success of *D. suzukii*. Performing GEA on this model system could also facilitate insights

into environment-driven genetic changes during rapid biological invasions, as well as

mechanisms driving insect adaptation to rapid climate shifts *in situ*.

In the present study, we perform population genomic analyses on whole-genome pool-seq

data of 29 population samples from native and invasive ranges to investigate the environmental

adaptation of *D. suzukii*. We investigate the geographic pattern of genetic diversity and

population structure, in part to inform our choice of GEA methodology. We then test the

association between SNP frequencies and nine environmental variables across sampling

locations, identifying both specific and shared functional signatures of adaptation to these diverse

selective pressures.

Results

Genomic Diversity and Population Structure of *D. suzukii*

To investigate the genetic diversity of *D. suzukii* and to examine the genetic input for

environmental association analysis, we summarized the genomic polymorphism of 29 *D. suzukii*

populations derived from Asia (n=8), Europe (n = 11), and North and South America (n = 10),

encompassing both newly reported and previously published samples (Figure 1A; Table S1;

Olazcuaga et al. 2020). Whole-genome sequences were obtained from 29 pooled samples

consisting of 50-212 female and male individuals. The depth of mapped reads after quality

control ranged from 23X to 66X among population samples, with an average of 45X (Table S1).

We first estimated nucleotide diversity (π_S) across synonymous SNPs to investigate the

effects of rapid invasions on neutral genetic diversity. The genome-wide π_S ranged from

averages of 0.045 (autosomes) and 0.025 (X chromosome) in introduced populations, to averages

of 0.051 (autosomes) and 0.034 (X chromosome) in Asian populations (Table S2). Previous

studies have hypothesized a relatively wide native range of *D. suzukii* in East and Southeast Asia

(Adrion et al. 2014; Fraimout et al. 2017), and the acute drop in π_S of introduced European and

American populations relative to that of the native Chinese and Japanese populations reflects

previously reported founder event bottlenecks (Figure 1B, diagonal; Figure S1, S2A). The

observed patterns were also recapitulated with SNPs at all types of sites (Figure S3). Lower

π_S and more contrasting among-population π_S differences in X chromosome reflect effectively

prolonged bottlenecks due to their lower effective population size (Pool & Nielsen, 2007; Figure

S1). We also observed a greater loss of rare alleles in the invasive populations as a typical

consequence of bottlenecks (Figure S4). These founder events also increased genetic

differentiation as measured by F_{ST}, especially between continents (Figure 1B; Figure S3), and

particularly for the X chromosome (Figure S2A).

Subsequent to our analysis, contamination in three of the published samples was

reported, involving reads from the closely-related *D. subpulchrella* and from *D. immigrans* (Gautier

2023), which can be estimated but not fully removed. The estimated level of *D. subpulchrella*-

sourced contamination for Tokyo, Japan (JP-Tok) was reduced from 4.47% to 3.58% after our

alignment and quality filtering pipeline (Table S3), which is slightly higher than the baseline noise

level of 1.14% to 2.78% from samples known to be pure *D. suzukii* (Gautier 2023). The published

DE-Jen sample's contamination from *D. immigrans* was reduced from 5.79% to 0.35%. Our

unpublished sample from the same area showed 0.28% *D. immigrans* contamination from mapped

reads, whereas the other unpublished samples showed no evidence for contamination (Table S3).

However, a higher proportion of reads from *D. subpulchrella* remained in the east Asian sample

CN-Nin (10.38%, versus 14.95% from raw reads). Hence, it is likely that the elevated π_S of CN-

Nin (and likewise its elevated D_{XY} values from the analysis described below) reflect an artefact of

this contamination.

We next analyzed genetic structure among the sampled populations, using the summary

statistics D_{XY} and F_{ST}, and via principal component analysis (PCA) of population allele

frequencies, particularly since the pattern of genetic structure present may influence the

performance of GEA methods (Rellstab et al. 2015). The top three principal components (PC 1-

3) explained 57.44% (autosomes, Figure 1C) and 72.35% (X chromosome, Figure S2B) of the

variance among populations. In both autosomes and X, three-dimensional PCA and matrices of

both D_{XY} and window F_{ST} recapitulated both continuous and hierarchical geographic structure,

which must be accounted for in GEA. These results together showed the expected clustering of

populations into four distinct ranges (East Asia, Hawaii, Americas, and Europe; Figure 1B, 1C;

Figure S2). Much of the observed population differentiation is most likely due to founder event

bottlenecks and admixture during worldwide expansion (Fraimout et al. 2017), whereas

migration following population establishment would need to be overwhelmingly high to have

significant impacts given the very brief time scale of the global invasion. The two more northerly

populations from the western US, Oregon (US-Sok) and central California (US-Wat), show an

affinity with the Hawaiian population, which aligns with the suggestion that these populations

received a genetic contribution from Hawaii in addition to East Asia (Fraimout et al. 2017), while

populations from southern California and the central and eastern US show less evidence of such

admixture.

Our focus above on diversity and differentiation at synonymous sites was motivated by

the low selective constraint expected at these sites, as confirmed by our analysis of divergence

between *D. suzukii* and its relative *D. biarmipes* (Ometto et al. 2013; Suvorov et al. 2022; Figure

S5). We also note that compared to the divergence between *D. melanogaster* and *D. simulans*

(Begun et al. 2007; Lange and Pool 2018), *D. suzukii* and *D. biarmipes* show relatively higher ratios

intergenic (or intronic) divergence to non-synonymous divergence (Figure S5). Compared with *D.*

melanogaster, the genome of *D. suzukii* contains a notable expansion of repetitive sequences (Paris et

al. 2020), which could reflect a lower long-term effective population size (N_e) in the *D. suzukii*

lineage. However, the greater π of *D. suzukii* than *D. melanogaster* (Figure S1; Lack et al. 2016a;

Lewald et al. 2021) could instead indicate a greater N_e for *D. suzukii* within the past $4N_e$

generations.

Figure 1. *Drosophila suzukii* populations show maximal diversity in eastern Asia and continent-level genetic structure.

(A) The geographic locations of the studied 29 natural populations are depicted as dots. In addition to the 22

populations sampled by Olazcuaga et al. (2020), populations newly sampled at independent locations are circled in

black. Populations newly sampled at nearby locations are circled and center-dashed in black, with the number of

total population samples in brackets. The year of the first recorded occurrence in each geographic range (colored

grey in the map) is given in brackets in the color legend. Further information about each sample is presented in

Table S1. (B) Population differentiation in allele frequencies (F_{ST}; lower triangle), between-population sequence

distances (D_{XY}; higher triangle), and within-population nucleotide diversity (π_S; diagonal) across autosomal

synonymous SNPs are displayed as a heatmap. Population names are colored by their geographic region. Asterisks

indicate samples contaminated by other *Drosophila* species, which may affect estimation of these statistics. (C)

Autosomal genetic structure is shown by three-dimensional principal components analysis (PCA) based on allele

frequencies of the two most frequent alleles across all populations. Each dot represents a population. Labeled are

Hawaii and western coastal US populations. See the X chromosome version of (B) and (C) in Figure S2.

Figure 2. Chromosomal distribution of genetic polymorphism in *D. suzukii* informs the ordering and orientations of

contigs, as well as levels of centromeric and telomeric repression. Window nucleotide diversity (π_w) values are

displayed across (A) the X chromosome and major autosomal arms (B) 2L, (C) 2R, (D) 3L, (E) 3R. Chromosome 4 is

not shown as it only contains 12 windows. Each window is a continuous genomic region that includes 125,000

analyzed sites. Each dot represents the average π_w across populations within their geographic range as colored.

Only populations from major continental ranges are shown for chromosomal patterns to be clear. Within each

chromosome arm, contigs are ordered by length. Separate contigs are indicated by grey or white shading.

Polymorphism and the Genomic Locations of *D. suzukii* Contigs

If extensive genomic regions of low recombination are present in a genome-wide scan for

local adaptation, then because of the larger-scale influence of natural selection on linked sites in

such regions (Smith and Haigh 1974; Charlesworth et al. 1993), the precision of outlier

identification will be reduced (Lotterhos and Whitlock 2015; François et al. 2016). Although we

do not have recombination rate estimates for *D. suzukii*, we can begin to assess the genomic

abundance of low recombination regions through an examination of nucleotide diversity, in light

of its expected correlation with recombination rate (Begun and Aquadro 1992). Fortunately, we

observe that regions of low nucleotide diversity (which probably coincide with regions of low

recombination) cover a relatively small fraction of the genome (Figure 2). These patterns are

more similar to those in *D. simulans* than to *D. melanogaster* – which has broader centromeric

regions of low crossing over on the autosomes (Langley et al. 2012) – potentially suggesting a

relatively weaker suppression of crossing over in the centromere-proximal regions in *D. suzukii*.

Population genomic data may also provide clues regarding genome structure. The *D.*

suzukii reference assembly (Paris et al. 2020) is somewhat fragmented, with two or more contigs

assigned to each major chromosome arm, but with unknown orientation with respect to each

other. In other examined *D. melanogaster* group species, crossing-over rate and window nucleotide

diversity (π_w) are reduced in centromere- and telomere-proximal regions (*e.g.,* True et al. 1996).

When we examined the chromosomal distribution of π_w (Figure 2), we noticed that certain

arrangements of contigs would result in the expected patterns of reduced diversity at the ends of

each arm, and relatively smooth shifts in the diversity of large windows. For instance, the second

longest contig in chromosome arm 3L is likely to the left of the longest contig in a reverse

orientation, potentially with the smaller high diversity contig in between, (Figure 2D), although

either of the low diversity contig end could be centromeric or telomeric. Similarly in

chromosome arm 3R, although the assembly was more fragmented and the centromere- or

telomere-proximal regions consist of multiple contigs, the second and third longest contigs

appeared to contain the transitions between the high diversity mid-arm region and the

centromeric/telomeric zones (Figure 2E). Therefore, genome-wide polymorphisms could serve

as useful information to aid the ordering and orienting of contig-level genome assemblies

(Nakabayashi and Morishita 2020), although a combination of both systematic neighbor-

matching approaches and manual correction would be needed, and integration with other forms

of evidence (*e.g.,* comparative genomic or experimental data) would be preferable.

We next leveraged our large pooled sequencing data set to improve inferences about

which contigs map to the X chromosome, in part so that X-linked and autosomal contigs could

be more accurately partitioned in our subsequent GEA. Out of a total of 546 contigs, 313 were

previously assigned to autosomes and X chromosome through either direct mapping or

comparing a female-to-male read depth ratio (Paris et al. 2020). We added to these annotations

by implementing an approach based on correlations in sequencing depth of coverage across

population samples that included varying numbers of females and males (see Materials and

Methods). Based on this analysis, we assigned 170 contigs as autosomal or X-linked (Table S4).

Our classification of previously-assigned contigs was 96% consistent with past inferences, but we

corrected four previous assignments that were based on female-to-male read depth ratio, whereas

our method did not assign eight previously-assigned contigs.

Selection of Robust Methodology and Distinct Environmental Variables for GEA

The worldwide expansion of *D. suzukii* has exposed this species to selection pressures from

varying local environmental conditions (Olazcuaga et al. 2020; Mérel et al. 2021). To identify

environmental factors that have contributed to adaptive genetic differentiation at various levels

and loci under positive selection, we performed a whole-genome scan using GEA analysis

between environmental and genetic differentiation (see Materials and Methods). We focused on

the method BayeScEnv because it has been reported to produce fewer false positives in the

presence of hierarchical genetic structure such as the continental-scale patterns documented here

(de Villemereuil and Gaggiotti 2015). We excluded SNPs with a global average minor allele

frequency (MAF) below 5%, which should minimize the influence of the contamination

documented above. No alleles specific to contaminating species should meet that threshold, so

the only remaining effect should be a slight bias in allele frequency estimation toward ancestral

variants in contaminated samples at genuine *D. suzukii* SNPs. Given the low levels of

contamination present and the small number of samples affected, this effect may represent a

modest source of noise, but it should not lead to spurious adaptation signals.

Our selection of environmental variables for GEA started with a preliminary set of 26

candidate variables that are potentially relevant in the adaptation process of *D. suzukii* (Figure

3A), based on data availability and prior knowledge of *Drosophila* ecology (Kellermann et al. 2012;

Hamby et al. 2016; Bogaerts-Márquez et al. 2021). Among common strategies of performing

GEA with a large set of relevant environmental variables, univariate association with all

environmental variables could increase the number of statistical tests, thus increasing the

difficulty of controlling rates of false discovery. On the other hand, including multiple variables

might cause a multicollinearity issue (Rellstab et al. 2015). We opted to retain nine of the least

correlated environmental variables for univariate tests, representing altitude, wind speed, as well

as multiple aspects of temperature, precipitation, and human land usage for GEA analysis (Figure

3B). Although the temperature of the coldest quarter had a significant negative correlation with

wind speed, we kept both variables for GEA, as cold stress and wind-related factors are known to

be potential drivers of local adaptation in *Drosophila* (Bogaerts-Márquez et al. 2021). As indicated

by their coefficients of variation (CVs), the selected environmental variables had moderate

($15\% \leq CV < 30\%$) to high ($CV \geq 30\%$) variability across our sampling locations (Table S4).

Figure 3. Identification of least-correlated environmental variables for genotype-environment association (GEA) analysis in *D. suzukii*. (A) Pairwise correlations among a preliminary set of 26 environmental variables that are potentially impactful on *D. suzukii*. (B) A final set of nine of the most relevant and least correlated environmental variables that were chosen for GEA analysis. The Pearson correlation coefficients are colored from -1 (perfect negative correlation) to 1 (perfect positive correlation). Significance correlations (p < 0.05) are indicated by asterisks. See Table S4 for environmental values used to calculate correlation coefficients.

Widespread Signals of Recent Adaptation to Diverse Environments

From 5,752,156 genome-wide SNPs with a global average MAF higher than 5%, we identified an average of 3,033 (SD = 823.4) unique candidate variants that were significantly

(genome-wide $q < 0.05$) associated with each of the nine candidate environmental variables

(Table S6). These variants corresponded to an average of 3,345 overlapping or neighboring

genes (Table S6), suggesting that selection pressures from the tested environmental variables (or

correlated factors) have meaningfully contributed to adaptive genetic variation in *D. suzukii*, even

on the brief time scale of its worldwide expansion. Among all tested environmental factors, mean

temperature of the coldest quarter was associated with the greatest number of putatively adaptive

variants (4,250 SNPs). Two precipitation-related variables, annual precipitation (4,141 SNPs)

and precipitation seasonality (3,389 SNPs), have the next largest loci count. The ratio of built

area to vegetation (i.e., crops and forests) and the ratio of crops to forests were associated with the

fewest genetic variants (2,369 and 1,608 SNPs, respectively).

To reveal the potential genetic and functional basis of invasion success under multiple

environmental challenges throughout the species' range, we first examined the functions of genes

linked to the top 10 environment-associated loci for each variable as ranked by association q-

value, and then by the g parameter estimating the sensitivity to environmental differentiation as

a tie-breaker. We found many of these genes have known functions that could facilitate

adaptation to the associated environmental factor (Table S7).

Among genes linked to altitude-associated loci, the second-ranked candidate *ab* is known

to control wing size in *Drosophila* (Simoes da Silva et al. 2019). Interestingly, wing size was found

to have increased in a highland Ethiopia *D. melanogaster* population, potentially assisting flight in

thin, cool air (Lack et al. 2016b). Ranked next to *ab* is *Gbs-70E*, which plays roles in glycogen

metabolism and the development of eggs inside the maternal ovary (Kerekes et al. 2014).

Another top gene, the lysine demethylase *Kdm2*, is upregulated in response to hypoxia (Batie et al.

2017).

With wind speed, the top first candidate *Ttc30* is an essential gene in the biogenesis of

sensory cilia, which are key to both chemosensory and mechanosensory functions in *Drosophila*

(Avidor-Reiss et al. 2004; Avidor-Reiss and Leroux 2015). Another top candidate, *Arr2*, is

involved in olfaction, hearing, and vision (Alloway and Dolph 1999; Elaine Merrill et al. 2005;

Senthilan et al. 2012). In light of the relevance of wind for insect flight, we also noted that a third

top candidate, *vn*, is a developmental gene named for its wing phenotype (Wang et al. 2000).

There is also some evidence for precipitation-related local adaptation. The top gene *mmy*

associated with precipitation seasonality (i.e., annual range of precipitation) was shown to

regulate chitin synthesis and cuticle production. Since precipitation is correlated with desiccation

resistance across the *Drosophila* phylogeny (Kellermann et al. 2012), *D. suzukii* may have

developed adaptive strategies of modifying chitin biosynthesis under conditions of desiccation

(Rezende et al. 2008; Clark et al. 2009), which was also implied in seasonal plasticity of natural

Drosophila populations (Shearer et al. 2016; Horváth et al. 2023). In addition, the gene *osy*

(*CG33970*) contributes to the formation of the outer cuticle layer and is expressed more highly in

D. suzukii than in *D. melanogaster* (Wang et al. 2020). Furthermore, two of the top genes associated

with annual precipitation (*Abd-B* and *bab1*) regulate cuticle pigmentation (Rogers et al. 2013),

which may or may not correlate with desiccation tolerance in *Drosophila* species (Wang et al.

2021). We also note that although environmental fitness effects on these testes-expressed genes

are not known, the same SNP near *CG17944* and *nxf4* was among the highest-scoring variants for

both annual precipitation and precipitation seasonality (variables that have a non-significantly

negative correlation between them; Figure 3).

Another important environmental barrier to invasion success is temperature. For the

mean temperature of the coldest quarter, a top gene was *Ac78C*, which has roles in circadian

regulation and taste (Ueno and Kidokoro 2008; Duvall and Taghert 2013). With the mean

temperature of the warmest quarter, the top genes *crp*, *Mrtf*, and *Ubx* help control the

development of trachea (Han et al. 2004; Guha and Kornberg 2005; Wong et al. 2015), which

may be important in limiting water loss in hot environments (Gibbs et al. 2003).

For the ratio of built to vegetated area, a different variant near the cuticle-related gene *osy*

(which was also indicated above for precipitation seasonality) was detected. Another top outlier

was the nervous system gene *trv*, which is involved in thermosensitivity (Honjo et al. 2016). For

the relative levels of crop and forest cover, the first-ranked variant was near *Mtk*, which encodes

an antifungal and antibacterial peptide (Levashina et al. 1995), and we note that mushrooms

(which are more available in forest) have been proposed as overwintering food sources for *D.*

suzukii (Wallingford et al. 2018), and the evolution of immune genes has been found to differ

strongly between mushroom-feeding and human commensal *Drosophila* species (Hill et al. 2019).

With regard to the differential light environments entailed by forest versus farm habitats, we note

that the next highest gene, *CadN2*, helps connect photoreceptor neurons to their targets (Prakash

et al. 2005).

Beyond the top candidate genes that have related functions to specific types of

environmental changes, we also found a wide range of nervous system genes associated with

multiple environmental factors. For instance, among the top five altitude-associated loci, three

have known functions in the nervous system of *Drosophila*, including the first-ranked gene *Cmpy*,

which enables proper growth control at neuromuscular junctions (James and Broihier 2011), *ab*,

which regulates dendritic complexity (Li et al. 2004; Sugimura et al. 2004), and *not*, which is

essential for stabilizing synaptic homeostasis within glia (Wang et al. 2020). Such genes were also

linked to top-10 loci associated with wind speed (*dpr6*), precipitation (*Msp300*, *Tusp*, *5-HT2A*),

temperature (*ATP6AP2*, *CG13579, D*), and land use variables (*Bsg*, *Mp*, *velo*). Different variants

associated with *scrt*, a regulator of neuronal cell fate, were among the top results for both mean

diurnal range and the ratio of crop to forest cover.

Functional Commonalities in the Adaptation to Diverse Selective Pressures

Next, we examined environment-specific adaptation on a more comprehensive basis

through a gene ontology (GO) enrichment analysis of the top 500 genes associated with each

environmental variable (Figure 4). As correlates of temperature in the coldest quarter, cAMP

metabolic process was the top enriched category, followed by two other related purine

metabolism groupings. We note that cAMP is important in circadian regulation (*e.g.*, Palacios-

Muñoz & Ewer, 2018), which is known to play an important role in *Drosophila* environmental

adaptation (*e.g.,* Helfrich-Förster et al. 2020), as also implicated by the presence of "entrainment

of circadian clock" on our top GO category list for altitude. More broadly, purine metabolism

was inferred as a strategy of cold acclimation in *D. suzukii* (Enriquez and Colinet 2019). For

diurnal temperature range, the top category was "regulation of growth", and we note that some

drosophilids have evolved to have larger body sizes in more challenging thermal environments

(Gilchrist and Partridge 1999; Calboli et al. 2003; Lack, Yassin, et al. 2016).

With precipitation, we identified "chitin metabolic process" as the top GO term

associated with annual precipitation, as well as "chitin-binding" with precipitation seasonality.

Together with the chitin synthesis genes we described above for precipitation, adaptation to the

overall intensity and seasonal variation of precipitation by modifying cuticular chitin may be

implied. For crop to forest ratio, the category "antimicrobial humoral response" included the top

gene *Mtk* listed above.

GO classes
- 🟥 Biological process
- 🟦 Molecular function
- 🟧 Cellular component

	GO description	p-value	# genes
Altitude	nucleus localization	1.35e-03	7
	R7 cell fate commitment	1.89e-03	7
	R7 cell differentiation	2.44e-03	12
	sensory organ precursor cell fate determination	2.51e-03	6
	synaptic vesicle	2.67e-03	8
	intracellular protein-containing complex	2.76e-03	24
	endomembrane system	4.40e-03	53
	entrainment of circadian clock	4.99e-03	5
	translation initiation factor activity	5.85e-03	5
	centrosome duplication	6.85e-03	5
Ann. precip.	chitin metabolic process	9.70e-04	5
	transferase complex	1.84e-03	24
	I band	3.19e-03	8
	nucleoplasm	3.36e-03	24
	cellular protein-containing complex assembly	3.39e-03	23
	single fertilization	3.63e-03	5
	supramolecular fiber organization	3.84e-03	24
	cytoplasm	4.18e-03	145
	hydrolase activity, acting on glycosyl bonds	4.24e-03	8
	actin cytoskeleton organization	4.32e-03	27
Ann. mean wind speed	centrosome	2.40e-03	11
	ligand-gated sodium channel activity	2.61e-03	5
	cellular protein catabolic process	5.34e-03	19
	spindle	6.26e-03	9
	triglyceride lipase activity	7.07e-03	6
	nitrogen compound metabolic process	9.00e-03	167
	primary metabolic process	1.08e-02	175
	protein ubiquitination	1.19e-02	16
	organic substance metabolic process	1.26e-02	182
	actin cytoskeleton reorganization	1.39e-02	5
Mean temp. coldest qtr.	cAMP metabolic process	5.00e-04	6
	purine nucleotide metabolic process	1.35e-03	16
	oxidoreductase activity, acting on the aldehyde or oxo group of donors	6.18e-03	6
	seveless signaling pathway	9.82e-03	5
	positive regulation of JNK cascade	1.03e-02	6
	positive regulation of cell projection organization	1.44e-02	8
	identical protein binding	1.54e-02	15
	cation transport	1.71e-02	32
	organic hydroxy compound metabolic process	2.35e-02	12
	locomotion	3.01e-02	60
Ratio crop to forest	cell-substrate junction	3.90e-04	9
	cell surface	1.15e-03	14
	extrinsic component of cytoplasmic side of plasma membrane	2.46e-03	5
	signaling receptor binding	5.99e-03	24
	positive regulation of filopodium assembly	7.48e-03	5
	cell-matrix adhesion	9.53e-03	5
	antimicrobial humoral response	1.05e-02	10
	cortical actin cytoskeleton organization	1.16e-02	6
	germ-band shortening	1.67e-02	5
	cell fate determination	1.85e-02	16

	GO description	p-value	# genes
Precip. Seasonality	response to sucrose	2.45e-03	5
	signaling receptor activity	5.59e-03	48
	detection of chemical stimulus involved in sensory perception	8.82e-03	12
	exopeptidase activity	9.20e-03	9
	chitin binding	1.45e-02	8
	positive regulation of response to external stimulus	1.65e-02	11
	hindgut development	1.68e-02	10
	gastrulation involving germ band extension	1.81e-02	6
	positive regulation of response to biotic stimulus	2.01e-02	10
	histone binding	2.20e-02	6
Mean diurnal temp. range	regulation of growth	1.70e-04	33
	regulation of cellular component organization	1.74e-03	49
	cell growth	2.39e-03	18
	R3/R4 cell differentiation	2.52e-03	7
	dorsal/ventral pattern formation, imaginal disc	3.20e-03	11
	embryo development	3.22e-03	48
	post-embryonic animal organ development	3.92e-03	46
	regulation of developmental process	4.26e-03	56
	compound eye morphogenesis	4.81e-03	33
	generation of neurons	5.56e-03	79
Mean temp. warmest qtr.	extracellular matrix structural constituent	1.00e-03	7
	spindle pole	1.19e-03	6
	regulation of neurogenesis	1.64e-03	18
	centrosome	2.73e-03	11
	regulation of dendrite development	3.16e-03	9
	regulation of neuron projection development	3.26e-03	14
	cellular macromolecule biosynthetic process	3.73e-03	95
	sex differentiation	4.97e-03	17
	pattern specification process	6.56e-03	47
	brain development	7.22e-03	17
Ratio built to vegetation	appendage morphogenesis	3.88e-03	38
	adenylate cyclase-inhibiting G protein-coupled receptor signaling pathway	5.49e-03	6
	positive regulation of synaptic transmission	5.64e-03	5
	carbohydrate biosynthetic process	5.93e-03	6
	anterior Malpighian tubule development	5.97e-03	5
	wing disc morphogenesis	6.41e-03	32
	cleavage furrow	8.33e-03	5
	neuroblast differentiation	9.56e-03	11
	late endosome	1.02e-02	8
	carbohydrate derivative biosynthetic process	1.20e-02	17

Figure 4. GO enrichment analysis of candidate genes from the gene-environment association analysis of *D. suzukii*.

The top 10 GO categories enriched by the top 500 genes associated with each environmental variable are shown in

each panel (labelled on the left), with permutation p-values and the number of associated genes in each GO

category.   Descriptions of GO categories are colored by their GO class (see legend at top right). Only GO

categories including more than five associated genes are listed here. For a full list of enriched GO categories, see

Table S8.

As broader evidence for a shared (or biologically similar) underlying genetic basis of

adaptation to multiple environmental factors, we examined the overlap of the most significant

genes and most enriched GO categories between different environmental variables. We found

the top candidate genes to be mostly associated with both temperature and precipitation. The

gene sets showed relatively greater overlap among climatic variables (including altitude), whereas

the two land usage variables had less overlap with climatic variables or with each other (Figure

5A). Since the patterns of shared genes cannot be fully explained by correlations between

environmental values (Figure 3B), at least some of the genes may have been responding to

multiple selective pressures. The overall proportions of shared GO categories were lower than

those of shared genes, indicating that the shared genes do not necessarily lead shared functional

categories between environmental variables. Relatively higher GO term sharing was observed

between altitude and either wind speed or precipitation, and between diurnal temperature range

and temperature of the warmest quarter (Figure 5B). Based on the shared genes and GO terms

observed, it is possible that during the rapid range expansion of *D. suzukii*, pleiotropy may have

facilitated local adaptation to multiple selective pressures (Hämälä et al. 2020; Kinsler et al.

2020).

Consistent with our gene-based analyses of universal adaptive function, we found three of

the top shared biological processes clearly related to nervous system functions, including the

topmost "synaptic transmission, glutamatergic" (shared by altitude, wind speed, diurnal

temperature range, and temperature of the warmest quarter), "regulation of neurogenesis"

(altitude, diurnal temperature range, temperature of the warmest quarter, and ratio of built area

to vegetation), and "central nervous system development" (precipitation seasonality, diurnal

temperature range, and temperature of the warmest quarter) (Figure 5C). Further, as mentioned

above, "cAMP metabolic process" (shared by temperature of the coldest quarter, precipitation

seasonality and ratio of built area to vegetation) could entail neurologically modulated changes in

circadian behavior. Each of these traits was associated with at least three environmental

variables, which suggests a multifaceted role for nervous system evolution in facilitating the

invasion success of *D. suzukii* under multiple environmental challenges.

Figure 5. Overlapping genes and GO categories among environmental factors reveal the shared genetic and

functional basis of environmental adaptation in *D. suzukii*. The numbers and proportions of shared (A) environment-

associated genes and (B) enriched GO categories among environmental factors are shown in heatmaps. Here, joint

proportion represents the fraction of the genes or GO terms associated with either of two environmental variables

that are associated with both variables. (C) Top GO categories of each type are depicted as bubbles. Bubbles are

colored by the negative logarithm of the combined p-value of enrichment across all environmental variables, and are

scaled by the number of enriched genes. The number of environmental variables that enrich a given GO category is

indicated by the top horizontal axis.

Discussion

We performed population genomic analyses of 29 population samples of *D. suzukii* to investigate the genomic diversity and environmental adaptation of this highly invasive species across its worldwide distribution. Our data supported a genetic grouping of these populations into four primary geographic regions: eastern Asia (containing the native range), Hawaii, the Americas, and Europe. We also confirmed that all non-Asian populations have reduced diversity, consistent with moderate founder event bottlenecks in introduced populations.

Our analyses also added to our knowledge of the *D. suzukii* genome and its evolution. We used population genomic data to improve the classification of X-linked and autosomal contigs. We determined that relatively few contigs showed strongly reduced nucleotide diversity, implying that only a small fraction of the genome experiences minimal crossing-over. And we documented the influence of an expanded repeatome on non-coding divergence.

The above analyses placed us in a more confident position to perform a robust analysis of genotype-environment association (GEA). We selected nine distinct environmental variables, including altitude, wind speed, precipitation, temperature, and human land usage. Our results suggested extensive local adaptation in response to specific environmental challenges, along with appreciable sharing of genes and functional pathways underlying invasion success across multiple environmental pressures, which were most obvious with nervous system genes.

Environmental Drivers of Adaptation in *D. suzukii*

Here, we presented a GEA analysis that investigated the most geographically and genetically diverse set of *D. suzukii* populations and the most comprehensive set of environmental

factors to date, which enabled unprecedented power to capture even minor adaptive genetic

differentiation in response to distinct environmental challenges during the species' rapid

invasions. In addition to our identification of climatic factors including temperature,

precipitation-related variables and wind speed as the most frequently correlated with putatively

local adaptative variants (consistent with previous GEA analysis in *D. melanogaster*, *e.g.,* Bogaerts-

Márquez et al. 2021), we also for the first time identified large numbers of genome-wide variants

associated with altitude and human land usage-related variables (Table S6), which were not

included in most GEA studies despite their potential significance to local adaptation. In

particular, the detected associations with ratios of developed land to vegetation and of cropland

to forests highlights the ecological impacts of urbanization and agriculture on natural populations

of insects. Since the prior selection of environmental variables is critical for successful GEA

analyses, we also provided an instructive example for correlation-based selection to identify the

most relevant and least redundant environmental factors (Rellstab et al. 2015).

Nervous System Evolution is Ubiquitous in Environmental Adaptation of

Drosophila

In *D. suzukii*, we found nervous system and related sensory and behavior annotations

associated with top genes for all nine environmental variables studied. Concordantly, we found

that GO categories related to the nervous system were among the most shared across

environmental variables (Figure 5C). In *D. melanogaster*, related GO categories like 'neuron

development', 'nervous system development' and 'eye development' were also enriched among

genes associated with environmental variation among natural populations within North America

or Europe, and across seasons within Europe (Bogaerts-Márquez et al. 2021). GO categories

associated with the nervous system have also shown evidence of positive selection in various

genome scans of *D. melanogaster* (Langley et al. 2012; Pool et al. 2012; Pool 2015), including a

study of parallel evolution in cold-adapted populations (Pool et al. 2017). Given the

morphological evidence of neuron-muscular junction evolution across the entire *Drosophila*

phylogeny (Campbell and Ganetzky 2012), we therefore propose a broad adaptive importance of

the nervous system in *Drosophila* species and potentially other insects. Such evolutionary

processes may have either maintained ancestral neural functions in novel challenging

environments, or created novel phenotypes that better fit the new optima arising from complex

combinations of environmental factors.

Cautions with Interpretations of Association Results and Future Directions

477   While we have generated intriguing hypotheses about gene functions that may underlie

the environmental adaptation of *D. suzukii*, it is difficult to distinguish between correlated

environmental selective pressures that may have driven the detected associations, including not

only the 17 environmental factors that were excluded in the process of variable reduction, but

also correlated biotic or abiotic factors not represented in global databases. As an intrinsic

limitation of GEA analysis that cannot be accounted for by applying stricter thresholds,

associations observed with a particular environmental factor might stem from adaptation to other

covarying factors (Rellstab et al. 2015). For example, the two tracheal branching genes *crp* and

Mrtf (Han et al. 2004; Wong et al. 2015) associated with mean temperature of the warmest

quarter could represent adaptations to reduce water loss under conditions of elevated water

vapor pressure (Telonis-Scott et al. 2012), which is closely related to humidity and has a

significant positive correlation with mean temperature of the warmest quarter (Figure 3B).

Therefore, expanded characterization of the relationships between genotype, phenotype,

and fitness in this species is needed to further clarify the functional and phenotypic

interpretations associated with certain environmental factors and genes. Experimental

validations that leverage RNA interference (Boutros and Ahringer 2008) and/or transgenic

overexpression (Prelich 2012) to modify the expression of associated genes, and/or genome

editing techniques (Stern 2014; Turner 2014; Shalem et al. 2015) to target putatively adaptive

variants would also bring a more solid understanding about the invasive biology of this species in

distinct environments. Such functional studies could be complemented by population

experiments under controlled laboratory environments or field conditions (*e.g.,* Behrman et al.

2015; Rudman et al. 2022), in order to more clearly demonstrate the connections between

specific selective pressures and alleles or traits of interest.

Broader Impacts and Significance

Our work integrates genetic and environmental data to improve the reconstruction of the

invasion genomics of a crop pest carrying significant economic costs (Knapp et al. 2021), which

will hopefully inspire future studies on developing diverse pest control methods given the

adaptive and neutral genetic differentiation among *D. suzukii* populations. Understanding the

extent of local adaptation and its potential environmental drivers will also help predict the spread

and future distributions of invasive species (Colautti and Lau 2016). More broadly, the enhanced

understanding of how organisms may adapt to geographical, climatic and artificial selective

pressures from this study will also be of value in assessing the susceptibility of natural populations

to climate change (Kellermann et al. 2012) and human activities (Barange et al. 2010).

Materials and Methods

Fly Collection, DNA Preparation, and Pooled Sequencing

515   Fly samples from 29 populations were used, seven of which were sequenced for the

present study. The fly samples sequenced in this study were collected from wild *D. suzukii*

populations in two states of the USA, two provinces of Japan, and three European countries

(Figure 1; Table S1). Pooled whole adult flies (n = 100 ~ 183) from each population (Table S1)

were used for DNA extraction as previously described (Langley et al. 2011).   Library

preparations were conducted at the Next Generation Sequencing Core of University of

Wisconsin Madison Biotechnology Center (https://dnaseq.biotech.wisc.edu), where pair-end

(PE) reads at the length of 150bp were then generated for each of seven pooled DNA samples on

an Illumina NovaSeq 6000.

524   Pool-sequenced reads of 22 additional *D. suzukii* population samples, including from

525   Europe, the Americas, and Asia, were obtained from public data provided by Olazcuaga et al.

526   (2020) at EBI's SRA (Figure 1; Table S1). Taken together, we formed a comprehensive dataset

527   of 29 populations sampled from native and invasive ranges of *D. suzukii*.

529   **Quality Control, Alignment, Contamination Analysis, and Variant Calling from**

530   **Pool-seq Data**

531   To maximize the quality of our analyzed data, we built a high-throughput assembly and

quality control pipeline *poolWGS2SNP* with optimized performance, stringent filtering,

compatibility with large numbers of genomic contigs, and customized functions to call high-

confidence single-nucleotide variants from pool-sequenced data in *D. suzukii* (Figure S6), in part

by utilizing resources from the DrosEU bioinformatics pipeline (Kapun et al. 2020).

As an initial quality control of raw PE reads, adapters were removed, and the 3' end of

reads with base quality < 20 were trimmed using *fastp* (Chen et al. 2018). Further trimming was

performed using a self-developed python program *filter_PE_length_mem.py* (see Data Availability),

where any pair of forward and reverse reads with less than a total of 150 bases with base quality

(BQ) ≥ 20, as well as any individual reads with less than 25 bases with BQ ≥ 20 were discarded.

The trimmed and qualified reads were then mapped against the recently released near-

chromosome level *D. suzukii* genome assembly Dsuz-WT3_v2.0 that covers autosomes and the X

chromosome (Paris et al. 2020) using *bwa mem* (Li 2013). Reads with a mapping quality below 20

were then removed using *Samtools* (Li et al. 2009). We used Picard's *SortSam* to sort BAM files,

and used Picard's *MarkDuplicates* to mark PCR duplicates to avoid false variant calls

(http://broadinstitute.github.io/picard). Indel identification and realignment around indels were

performed using GATK's *RealignerTargetCreator* and *IndelRealigner* (Auwera and O'Connor 2020).

Finally, alignments in BAM format were checked for formatting errors using Picard's

ValidateSamFile. Summary statistics for quality checking of BAM files were generated using *bamdst*

(https://github.com/shiquan/bamdst).

We then checked sample contamination for both newly and previously reported pool-seq

data (Table S3), by estimating the proportion of pool-seq reads from different *Drosophila* species as

the proportion of reads assigned to species-discriminating *k-mers* (i.e., unique sequences of each

species' reference genome assembly) using the approached described by Gautier (2023). Although

the estimation should be reliable, to fully eliminate contaminated reads is not currently practical

because substantial proportion of reads can not be confidently assigned to any species (up to 42%

of total pool-seq reads), due to the sequence similarity among genomes within the *Drosophila*

family (Gautier 2023). Therefore, we focus on identifying samples with contamination and

interpreting results these samples with caution.

To call SNPs, we merged the quality-checked BAM files of all population samples into

one file using Samtools *mpileup*, only retaining alignments with mapping quality no less than 20

and sites with base quality no less than 20. Variant calling was then performed on the mpileup

file using the heuristic SNP caller *PoolSNP* (Kapun et al. 2020). We used a nominally low value

for the parameter miss-frac (0.001) to require for each population sample individually, that depth

of coverage at a given site be 12 or greater (min-cov = 12), and that this site not be in the top 1%

of sites genome-wide for depth of coverage (max-cov = 0.99; calculated separately for each

population and for autosomal and X-linked contigs), in order to filter sites subject to copy

number variation. In the initial data set used for analysis of genome-wide diversity, we avoided

potential biases from allele frequency filters by using min-count = 1 and min-freq = 0. We

termed the resulting high-quality sites as 'analyzed sites' for brevity.

Identifying Autosomal and X-linked Contigs

We chose to perform all population genomic analyses and whole-genome scans separately

for SNPs from autosomes and the X chromosome for the following reasons: 1) autosomal and X-

linked variants have different allelic sample sizes as samples were obtained from both male and

female flies; 2) autosomes and the X chromosome could reflect different demographic histories

and outcomes of natural selection, *e.g.*, the lower effective population size of the X chromosome

than autosomes could lead to a higher impact of bottlenecks and selection on genomic diversity;

3) unbalanced sex ratios and male-biased dispersal could further differentiate autosomal versus X

chromosome variation (Clemente et al. 2018; Olazcuaga et al. 2020).

Since the assembly of *D. suzukii* reference genome is still at the contig level, chromosomal

identities of each contig are needed to perform separate analyses. However, 497 contigs that

represent ~43% of the assembly length have not been unambiguously mapped onto chromosome

arms of the *D. melanogaster* dm6 genome assembly. Although 264 of the unplaced contigs had

been assigned to autosomes and the X chromosome based on a female-to-male read depth ratio,

233 contigs that represent ~5% of the genome remained unassigned due to the lack of statistical

power (Paris et al. 2020).

Given our interest in accurately analyzing a larger proportion of the euchromatic

genome, we identified ~70% of these 233 unassigned contigs as autosomal and X-linked based

on the correlation between the mean read depth of each contig (among population samples) and

that across unambiguously aligned autosomal or X-linked contigs. We chose Spearman's rank

correlation instead of the Pearson correlation, as the distribution of depth data failed the

assumption of bivariate normality. A contig that has mean depth significantly correlated with

that of either known autosomal or X-linked contigs was assigned to the chromosome with a

higher correlation coefficient. Our method completely confirmed all prior mapping-based

assignments and had a ~96% consistency with the previous assignment based on female-to-male

read depth ratios. Inconsistent assignments for four contigs were corrected according to our

method (Table S4). The eight previously-assigned contigs that could not be assigned using our

method, as well as other unassigned contigs using all methods (totaling ~2.7 mb), were excluded

from downstream GEA analyses, because the assignment information is needed for estimating

effective sample size that were used to correct allele count data as an input to GEA.

Annotating Genomic Features and Estimating Divergence

To explore genomic diversity at synonymous sites and selective constraint for other site

types in *D. suzukii*, we classified the reference genome into nine exclusive categories of site

degeneracy and function (Lange and Pool 2018), including: non-degenerate (i.e.,

nonsynonymous) sites, two-, three-, and four-fold degenerate (i.e., synonymous) sites, 3' and 5'

UTRs, RNA-coding genes, introns, and intergenic regions. From input files including the

eukaryotic codon table, the published genome sequence and GFF3 annotation obtained at NCBI

RefSeq, we generated a letter-coded annotation (in FASTA format) mirroring both strands of the

whole genome sequence of *D. suzukii* and a coordinate-based annotation (in BED format) that

combines adjacent sites of the same category into a single row. Degeneracy was determined

based on the standard codon table. 5' UTRs were defined as regions between the start of the

first exon and the start of the first coding sequence (CDS), while 3' UTRs were defined as regions

between the end of the last exon and the end of the last CDS. In cases of overlapping genes and

alternative splicing that raise annotation conflicts, we followed an annotation priority in the

category order listed above.

We then estimated the divergence between *D. suzukii* and its close relative *D. biarmipes* in

each of these categories (Suvorov et al. 2022). We obtained results of multiple sequence

alignment between the current reference genomes of *D. suzukii* and *D. biarmipes* (Paris et al. 2020).

For each site category of *D. suzukii*, the unpolarized divergence was estimated as the number of

substitutions over the total number of sites within aligned blocks of reference genome sequences.

Estimating Nucleotide Diversity, F_{ST} D_{XY}

To compare genome-wide polymorphism among populations, we estimated nucleotide

diversity (π) across SNPs at four-fold degenerate sites (π_S) in addition to that at all categories of

sites (π_A), as π_S estimation is relatively less affected by sequencing errors than nucleotide diversity

estimated from other site categories (due to a higher ratio of real variation to errors). To

calculate π for each population sample, we adopted an unbiased estimator of nucleotide diversity

($\hat{\theta}_\Pi$) based on heterozygosity (Π), which has been optimized for pool-seq data (Ferretti et al.

2013). Numerically,

$\pi_S = \hat{\theta}_\Pi = \frac{n_c}{n_c-1}\frac{\Pi}{L} = \frac{n_c}{n_c-1}\frac{1}{L}\sum_l \frac{2}{n_r(l)(n_r(l)-1)} m_l(n_r(l) - m_l)$ (1)

Here, L represents the total number of genome-wide analyzed sites. Of a given

population sample, $n_r(l)$ represents the read depth of the top two alleles at the lth site (i.e., SNP)

and m_l represents the minor allele count. n_c as a normalization factor represents the haploid

sample size for either autosomes or X chromosome in a pool (Table S1). Strictly speaking, n_c as

a normalization factor should represent equally contributing chromosomes in a pool.

Nevertheless, for our data it is sufficient to use haploid sample size for either autosomes or X

chromosome to approximate n_c in the above equation, as the estimation of $\hat{\theta}_\Pi$ is not substantially

affected by the precise value of n_c when the number of individuals in the pool is large. The

above formula is a simplified version for SNP data, based on equation 3 in Ferretti et al. (2013).

To examine patterns of polymorphism across chromosome arms, we also estimated

window nucleotide diversity (π_W) for all polymorphic sites. Each window was defined as a

continuous genomic region that includes 125,000 analyzed sites (Figure 2). Since chromosomal

identity was required in this analysis, we only took windows from 32 major contigs that contain

at least one full-size window and were unambiguously mappable to a chromosome arm of the *D.*

melanogaster dm6 genome assembly. Although such contigs only make up 57% of the *D. suzukii*

genome assembly, they contain a relatively larger proportion of all identified SNPs (72%), and

thus are still representative of genome-wide polymorphism.

To estimate genome-wide pairwise F_{ST} between populations, we adopted an unbiased

multi-loci estimator known as Reynolds' estimator of the coancestry coefficient, which accounts

for unequal sample sizes among populations and is applicable for more than two alleles at a site

(Reynolds et al. 1983). We first heuristically partitioned the genome into windows that exceeded

a cross-sample average accumulated heterozygosity threshold of 100. The genome-wide F_{ST} was

then calculated as an average of window-F_{ST} $F_{ST}(w)$ weighted by the number of analyzed sites

within each window ($L(w)$), where $F_{ST}(w)$ was calculated as a weighted average of single-site

ratio estimators. Numerically,

$F_{ST} = \frac{1}{L}\sum_w L(w)\, F_{ST}(w)$ (2)

$F_{ST}(w) = \left(\sum_l a_l\right)/\sum_l (a_l + b_l)$ (3)

where

$a_l = \frac{1}{2}\sum_u (\tilde{p}_{1lu} - \tilde{p}_{2lu})^2 - \frac{(n_{1l}+n_{2l})(n_{1l}\tilde{\alpha}_{1l}+n_{2l}\tilde{\alpha}_{2l})}{4n_{1l}n_{2l}(n_{1l}+n_{2l}-1)}$ (4)

$a_l + b_l = \frac{1}{2}\sum_u (\tilde{p}_{1lu} - \tilde{p}_{2lu})^2 + \frac{(4n_{1l}n_{2l}-n_{1l}-n_{2l})(n_{1l}\tilde{\alpha}_{1l}+n_{2l}\tilde{\alpha}_{2l})}{4n_{1l}n_{2l}(n_{1l}+n_{2l}-1)}$ (5)

At the lth site in each population, $\tilde{p}_{1lu}$ and $\tilde{p}_{2lu}$ represent the frequency of the uth allele at the

lth site; $\tilde{\alpha}_{1l}$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_{2l}$ represent the heterozygosity; n_{1l} and n_{2l} represent the sample size. Unlike

the sequencing of individual genomes, pool-seq induces an uncertainty in the number of

individual alleles actually sequenced at a locus (i.e., effective sample size), and this uncertainty

decreases slowly even at high read depth (Ferretti et al. 2013). Since the sample size is an

important parameter for F_{ST} estimation, we took measures to obtain an estimate of the effective

sample size, n_{il}, at each given site (Ferretti et al. 2013). Numerically,

$n_{il} = \sum_{j}^{n_c} j P_c(j \mid n_r, n_c)$ (6)

where

$P_c(j \mid n_r, n_c) = \frac{n_c! S(n_r, j)}{(n_c - j)! n_c^{n_r}}$ (7)

Here, we explicitly estimated the probability of the number of j unique lineages sampled at a site

given n_r sampled reads and n_c equally contributing chromosomes in a pool, where $S(n_r, j)$ are

the Stirling numbers of the second kind, defined as the number of ways to partition n_r reads into

j non-empty sets (Ferretti et al. 2013). We then estimated n_{il} as the expected number of lineages

for each n_r and n_c. Ideally, n_c should be estimated as $2n_e$, where n_e is the effective pool size

representing the number of diploid individuals contributing the same amount of reads to a pool

(Gautier et al. 2013; Lange et al. 2022). Although we lack sample replicates to estimate n_e and

therefore used haploid sample size for n_c as an approximation, the probability estimation is still

reasonable given that our number of lineages for each pool is large (Table S1) (Ferretti et al.

2013).

Lastly, we estimated genome-wide pairwise D_{XY} as an absolute measure of population

differentiation that is independent of levels of within-population diversity. It was calculated as

pairwise differences per site between two populations, divided by L total analyzed sites (Nei 1987;

Hahn 2018). Numerically,

$D_{XY} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_l \sum_{ij} x_i y_j k_{ij}$ (8)

where x_i and y_j represent frequencies of the ith allele from population X and the jth allele

from population Y, and k_{ij} is either 1 or 0, depending on whether or not the alleles differ at the

lth site.

Calculations in this section were all implemented with Python and Shell scripts (see Data

Availability).

Preparing Environmental Data

To generate environmental data for GEA, we selected a preliminary set of 26 candidate

environmental variables representing geographic, climatic and land cover-related factors (Figure

3A) that may be relevant in the adaptation process of *D. suzukii* based on prior knowledge

(Kellermann et al. 2012; Bogaerts-Márquez et al. 2021). With R packages 'raster' (v. 3.5.2) and

'SpatialPoints' (v. 1.4.6), we retrieved environmental data of high spatial resolution ($\sim$100 km^2)

in batch for the sampling locations of our 29 populations from online databases WorldClim (Fick

and Hijmans 2017) and Esri 2020 Land Cover (Karra et al. 2021). Annual mean values of

monthly climatic variables, including mean wind speed, solar radiation, and water vapor

pressure, were derived by averaging across 12 months of data.

Due to the large number of statistical tests that would result from running GEA on all the

environmental variables one by one, there is an increased difficulty in controlling rates of false

discovery. Additionally, including multiple highly correlated variables in a model would lead to

multicollinearity issues (Rellstab et al. 2015). To avoid these problems, we calculated a pairwise

Pearson correlation matrix from values of environmental factors across sampled locations (Figure

3A; Table S5), and then selected a subset of nine least correlated environmental variables for

one-by-one GEA analyses (Figure 3B). To avoid scale inconsistencies between estimated GEA

statistics, the environmental differentiation of each population was calculated as the absolute

difference between the environmental value of that population and the average across all

populations, standardized by the standard deviation (de Villemereuil and Gaggiotti 2015). This

standardized differentiation was then input to GEA (Table S5).

Environmental Association Analyses

To characterize the environmental adaptation of *D. suzukii*, we scanned the whole

genome for adaptive loci using the F_{ST}-based GEA method BayeScEnv (de Villemereuil and

Gaggiotti 2015). We chose this specific approach over other GEA methods mainly because it has

a lower false positive rate than other GEA approaches in the presence of hierarchical population

structure (de Villemereuil et al. 2014; de Villemereuil and Gaggiotti 2015). It also allows for

detecting patterns of allele frequency that are not linearly dependent on environmental factors

(Rellstab et al. 2015; de Villemereuil and Gaggiotti 2015).

For each environmental variable, the association analyses tested the relationship between

environmental and genetic differentiation among populations, for 5,752,156 genome-wide SNPs

with a MAF higher than 5%. To control for false positives, we chose stringent model parameters

expected to yield extremely conservative results, setting the prior probability of non-neutral

models as 0.02 (-pr_jump 0.02) and the prior probability of the competing environment-

unrelated locus-specific model as 0.9 (-pr_pref 0.9). These parameters correspond to assumptions

that genetic differentiation reflects the action of natural selection in just 2% of the genome, and

the focal environmental variable is only expected to be involved at 10% of the non-neutral loci.

To make this GEA analysis computationally feasible with our large SNP set, while still

analyzing all qualifying SNPs, we applied a split-run strategy: we subsampled SNPs across

concatenated sequences of contigs within the autosomes and the X chromosome separately, and

then ran subsamples with BayeScEnv in parallel. Since the null model of population structure is

estimated separately in each run, we subsampled non-adjacent SNPs at a fixed interval to limit

locus-specific biases in that estimation, where the length of the interval between jointly analyzed

SNPs was equal to the total number of subsamples. With a targeted subsample/interval size of

up to 10,000 SNPs, we divided the concatenated autosomal contigs into 490 subsamples (with

actual subsample sizes of 9982-9983 SNPs), and the concatenated X-linked contigs into 87

subsamples (with actual subsample sizes of 9893-9894 SNPs). Hence, the first autosomal

subsample contained SNP #1, SNP #491, and so on.

Convergence of each run was confirmed with the R package 'CODA'. Individual runs

were then merged across autosomes and X chromosome to calculate the genome-wide q-value

(q) of locally-estimated posterior error probability (PEP) across all sites, where we targeted a false

discovery rate (FDR) of 5% by setting the q threshold at 0.05 (Storey 2003; Muller et al. 2006).

For downstream analyses, to remove redundancy due to linkage disequilibrium, we pared down

closely linked candidate sites by maintaining the site with the lowest q within each 20 kb genomic

window. To assess the relative levels of support for associations between SNPs and a given

environmental variable, we ranked all candidate loci first by q and then by the estimated g

parameter as a tie-breaker, which measures the sensitivity of a locus to environmental

differentiation.

Identifying Candidate Genes

For each candidate SNP, the closest gene in each direction within a 200-exon flanking

region that overlapped with it was considered to be associated with that variant, in order to

encompass both potential coding and regulatory adaptation. To facilitate clear comparisons

among environmental variables with different numbers of significant variants, we focused on the

top 500 candidate genes that were linked to variants with the lowest significant q and highest g

within each environmental variable (Table S7).

GO Enrichment and Semantic Clustering

Gene ontology (GO) enrichment of the top 500 candidate genes associated with

candidate SNPs was performed via genomic permutation of outlier SNP positions (100,000,000

replicates), which accounts for the variability of gene length and the clustering of functionally

related genes, as described in previous work (Pool et al. 2017). For each GO category, a p-value

indicated the proportion of permutation replicates in which an equal or greater number of genes

was implicated.

We then prioritized the most informative and significant GO terms and removed

redundant terms that potentially share similar groups of genes by clustering GO terms based on

their semantic similarity and ranking representative terms of each cluster by their p-value

(Reijnders and Waterhouse 2021). For GO terms that were shared among associations with

multiple environmental variables, a combined p-value was calculated from the p-values of

independent enrichment tests using Fisher's method (Fisher 1938).

Author contributions

SF, JEP, SDS, and CG designed the research. SPD collected data for the project. SF analyzed

the data. SF, JEP, and SDS wrote the paper. SDS, JEP, and CG obtained funding for the

research.

Acknowledgments

We thank members of the Pool lab for helpful comments on this manuscript. We also

thank Masahito Kimura, Samantha Tochen, and Carandale Farms for assistance with fly

collection. We also thank Mathilde Paris for providing a multiple alignment file across *Drosophila*

species and updated genomic annotations, as well as Martin Kapun for assistance with SNP

calling, and Pierre de Villemereuil for helping with our GEA analyses. The UW-Madison

Center for High Throughput Computing provided computational assistance and resources for

this work.

Funding

This work was funded by USDA Hatch grant WIS01900 (to SDS, CG, and JEP) and by

National Institutes of Health grant R35 GM13630 (to JEP).

Conflict of interest

All authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability

All sequence data generated for this project are available from the NIH Short Read

Archive under project PRJNA973110, with specific sample information given in Table S1,

Supplementary Material online. All computational scripts created for this study have been

uploaded to https://github.com/Sfeng666/poolWGS2SNP (for WGS data processing and

variant calling) and https://github.com/Sfeng666/Dsuz_popgen_GEA (for population genetics

analyses and GEA).

Supplementary Material

806   Supplementary figures S1–S6 and tables S1–S7 are available at Evolution online.

References

Adrion JR, Kousathanas A, Pascual M, Burrack HJ, Haddad NM, Bergland AO, Machado H,
Sackton TB, Schlenke TA, Watada M, et al. 2014. *Drosophila suzukii*: the genetic footprint
of a recent, worldwide invasion. *Mol Biol Evol* 31:3148–3163.

Alloway PG, Dolph PJ. 1999. A role for the light-dependent phosphorylation of visual arrestin.
Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 96:6072–6077.

Asplen MK, Anfora G, Biondi A, Choi D-S, Chu D, Daane KM, Gibert P, Gutierrez AP,
Hoelmer KA, Hutchison WD, et al. 2015. Invasion biology of spotted wing *Drosophila*
(*Drosophila suzukii*): a global perspective and future priorities. *J Pest Sci* 88:469–494.

Atallah J, Teixeira L, Salazar R, Zaragoza G, Kopp A. 2014. The making of a pest: the
evolution of a fruit-penetrating ovipositor in *Drosophila suzukii* and related species. *Proc Roy*
Soc B 281:20132840.

Auwera GAV der, O'Connor BD. 2020. Genomics in the cloud: using Docker, GATK, and
WDL in Terra. O'Reilly Media.

Avidor-Reiss T, Leroux MR. 2015. Shared and distinct mechanisms of compartmentalized and
cytosolic ciliogenesis. *Curr Biol* 25:R1143–R1150.

Avidor-Reiss T, Maer AM, Koundakjian E, Polyanovsky A, Keil T, Subramaniam S, Zuker CS.
2004. Decoding Cilia Function: Defining specialized genes required for
compartmentalized cilia biogenesis. *Cell* 117:527–539.

Barange M, Cheung WWL, Merino G, Perry RI. 2010. Modelling the potential impacts of
climate change and human activities on the sustainability of marine resources. *Curr Opin*
Environ Sustain 2:326–333.

Batie M, Druker J, D'Ignazio L, Rocha S. 2017. KDM2 family members are regulated by HIF-1
in hypoxia. *Cells* 6:8.

Begun DJ, Holloway AK, Stevens K, Hillier LW, Poh Y-P, Hahn MW, Nista PM, Jones CD,
Kern AD, Dewey CN, et al. 2007. Population genomics: whole-genome analysis of
polymorphism and divergence in *Drosophila simulans*. *PLOS Biol* 5:e310.

Behrman EL, Watson SS, O'Brien KR, Heschel MS, Schmidt PS. 2015. Seasonal variation in
life history traits in two *Drosophila* species. *J Evol Biol* 28:1691–1704.

Bogaerts-Márquez M, Guirao-Rico S, Gautier M, González J. 2021. Temperature, rainfall and
wind variables underlie environmental adaptation in natural populations of *Drosophila*
melanogaster. *Mol Ecol* 30:938–954.

Boughdad A, Haddi K, El Bouazzati A, Nassiri A, Tahiri A, El Anbri C, Eddaya T, Zaid A,
Biondi A. 2021. First record of the invasive spotted wing *Drosophila* infesting berry crops in
Africa. *J Pest Sci* 94:261–271.

Boutros M, Ahringer J. 2008. The art and design of genetic screens: RNA interference. *Nat Rev*
Genet 9:554–566.

Calboli FCF, Gilchrist GW, Partridge L. 2003. Different cell size and cell number contribution in
two newly established and one ancient body size cline of *Drosophila subobscura*. *Evolution*
57:566–573.

Campbell M, Ganetzky B. 2012. Extensive morphological divergence and rapid evolution of the
larval neuromuscular junction in *Drosophila*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 109:E648–E655.

Charlesworth B, Morgan MT, Charlesworth D. 1993. The effect of deleterious mutations on
neutral molecular variation. *Genetics*. 34:1289-1303.

Chen S, Zhou Y, Chen Y, Gu J. 2018. fastp: an ultra-fast all-in-one FASTQ preprocessor.
Bioinformatics 34:i884–i890.

Cini A, Ioriatti C, Anfora G. 2012. A review of the invasion of *Drosophila suzukii* in Europe and a
draft research agenda for integrated pest management. *Bull Insectology* 65:149–160.

Clark MS, Thorne MA, Purać J, Burns G, Hillyard G, Popović ŽD, Grubor-Lajšić G, Worland
MR. 2009. Surviving the cold: molecular analyses of insect cryoprotective dehydration in
the Arctic springtail *Megaphorura arctica* (Tullberg). *BMC Genomics* 10:328.

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

Colautti RI, Barrett SCH. 2013. Rapid adaptation to climate facilitates range expansion of an
invasive plant. *Science* 342:364–366.

Colautti RI, Lau JA. 2016. Contemporary evolution during invasion. In: Invasion Genetics. John
Wiley & Sons, Ltd. p. 101–121.

Duvall LB, Taghert PH. 2013. E and M circadian pacemaker neurons use different PDF
receptor signalosome components in drosophila. *J Biol Rhythms* 28:239–248.

Elaine Merrill C, Sherertz TM, Walker WB, Zwiebel LJ. 2005. Odorant-specific requirements
for arrestin function in *Drosophila* olfaction. *J Neurobiol* 63:15–28.

Enriquez T, Colinet H. 2019. Cold acclimation triggers lipidomic and metabolic adjustments in
the spotted wing drosophila *Drosophila suzukii* (Matsumara). *Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp*
Physiol 316:R751–R763.

Ferretti L, Ramos-Onsins SE, Pérez-Enciso M. 2013. Population genomics from pool
sequencing. *Mol Ecol* 22:5561–5576.

Fick SE, Hijmans RJ. 2017. WorldClim 2: new 1-km spatial resolution climate surfaces for global
land areas. *Int J Climatol* 37:4302–4315.

Fisher RA. 1938. Statistical methods for research workers. Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh.

Fraimout A, Debat V, Fellous S, Hufbauer RA, Foucaud J, Pudlo P, Marin J-M, Price DK,
Cattel J, Chen X, et al. 2017. Deciphering the routes of invasion of *Drosophila suzukii* by
means of ABC random forest. *Mol Biol Evol* 34:980–996.

François O, Martins H, Caye K, Schoville SD. 2016. Controlling false discoveries in genome
scans for selection. *Mol Ecol* 25:454–469.

Gautier M, Foucaud J, Gharbi K, Cézard T, Galan M, Loiseau A, Thomson M, Pudlo P,
Kerdelhué C, Estoup A. 2013. Estimation of population allele frequencies from next-
generation sequencing data: pool-versus individual-based genotyping. *Mol Ecol* 22:3766–
3779.

Gautier M, Vitalis R, Flori L, Estoup A. 2022. f-Statistics estimation and admixture graph
construction with Pool-Seq or allele count data using the R package poolfstat. *Mol Ecol*
Resour 22:1394–1416.

Gibbs AG, Fukuzato F, Matzkin LM. 2003. Evolution of water conservation mechanisms in
Drosophila. *J Exp Biol* 206:1183–1192.

Gibert P, Debat V, Ghalambor CK. 2019. Phenotypic plasticity, global change, and the speed of
adaptive evolution. *Curr Op Insect Sci* 35:34–40.

Gilchrist AS, Partridge L. 1999. A comparison of the genetic basis of wing size divergence in
three parallel body size clines of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 153:1775–1787.

Guha A, Kornberg TB. 2005. Tracheal branch repopulation precedes induction of the
Drosophila dorsal air sac primordium. *Devel Biol* 287:192–200.

Hahn MW. 2018. Molecular population genetics. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates.

Hämälä T, Gorton AJ, Moeller DA, Tiffin P. 2020. Pleiotropy facilitates local adaptation to
distant optima in common ragweed (Ambrosia artemisiifolia). *PLOS Genet* 16:e1008707.

Hamby KA, E. Bellamy D, Chiu JC, Lee JC, Walton VM, Wiman NG, York RM, Biondi A.
2016. Biotic and abiotic factors impacting development, behavior, phenology, and
reproductive biology of *Drosophila suzukii*. *J Pest Sci* 89:605–619.

Han Z, Li X, Wu J, Olson EN. 2004. A myocardin-related transcription factor regulates activity
of serum response factor in *Drosophila*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 101:12567–12572.

Helfrich-Förster C, Bertolini E, Menegazzi P. 2020. Flies as models for circadian clock
adaptation to environmental challenges. *Eur J NeuroSci* 51:166–181.

Hill T, Koseva BS, Unckless RL. 2019. The genome of *Drosophila innubila* reveals lineage-specific
patterns of selection in immune genes. *Mol Biol Evol* 36:1405–1417.

Hodgins KA, Bock DG, Rieseberg LH. 2018. Trait evolution in invasive species. In: Annual
Plant Reviews online. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. p. 459–496.

Honjo K, Mauthner SE, Wang Y, Skene JHP, Tracey WD. 2016. Nociceptor-enriched genes
required for normal thermal nociception. *Cell Rep* 16:295–303.

Horváth V, Guirao-Rico S, Salces-Ortiz J, Rech GE, Green L, Aprea E, Rodeghiero M, Anfora
G, González J. 2023. Gene expression differences consistent with water loss reduction
underlie desiccation tolerance of natural *Drosophila* populations. *BMC Biol* 21:35.

James RE, Broihier HT. 2011. Crimpy inhibits the BMP homolog Gbb in motoneurons to
enable proper growth control at the *Drosophila* neuromuscular junction. *Development*
138:3273–3286.

Kanzawa, T. 1939. Studies on *Drosophila suzukii* mats. Yamanashi Agricultural Experimental
Station, Kofu, Japan.

Kapun M, Barrón MG, Staubach F, Obbard DJ, Wiberg RAW, Vieira J, Goubert C, Rota-
Stabelli O, Kankare M, Bogaerts-Márquez M, et al. 2020. Genomic analysis of European
Drosophila melanogaster populations reveals longitudinal structure, continent-wide selection,
and previously unknown DNA viruses. *Mol Biol Evol* 37:2661–2678.

Karra K, Kontgis C, Statman-Weil Z, Mazzariello JC, Mathis M, Brumby SP. 2021. Global
land use / land cover with Sentinel 2 and deep learning. In: 2021 IEEE International
Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium IGARSS. p. 4704–4707.

Kawecki TJ, Ebert D. 2004. Conceptual issues in local adaptation. *Ecol Let* 7:1225–1241.

Kellermann V, Loeschcke V, Hoffmann AA, Kristensen TN, Fløjgaard C, David JR, Svenning J,
Overgaard J. 2012. Phylogenetic constraints in key functional traits behind species'
climate niches: patterns of desiccation and cold resistance across 95 *Drosophila* species.
Evolution 66:3377–3389.

Kerekes É, Kókai E, Páldy FS, Dombrádi V. 2014. Functional analysis of the glycogen binding
subunit CG9238/Gbs-70E of protein phosphatase 1 in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Insect*
Biochem Mol Biol 49:70–79.

Kinsler G, Geiler-Samerotte K, Petrov DA. 2020. Fitness variation across subtle environmental
perturbations reveals local modularity and global pleiotropy of adaptation. *eLife* 9:e61271.

Knapp L, Mazzi D, Finger R. 2021. The economic impact of *Drosophila suzukii*: perceived costs
and revenue losses of Swiss cherry, plum and grape growers. *Pest Manag Sci* 77:978–1000.

Koch JB, Dupuis JR, Jardeleza M-K, Ouedraogo N, Geib SM, Follett PA, Price DK. 2020.
Population genomic and phenotype diversity of invasive *Drosophila suzukii* in Hawai'i. *Biol*
Invasions 22:1753–1770.

Kwadha CA, Okwaro LA, Kleman I, Rehermann G, Revadi S, Ndlela S, Khamis FM, Nderitu
PW, Kasina M, George MK, et al. 2021. Detection of the spotted wing drosophila,
Drosophila suzukii, in continental sub-Saharan Africa. *J Pest Sci* 94:251–259.

Lack JB, Lange JD, Tang AD, Corbett-Detig RB, Pool JE. 2016. A thousand fly genomes: an
expanded *Drosophila* Genome Nexus. *Mol Biol Evol* 33:3308–3313.

Lack JB, Yassin A, Sprengelmeyer QD, Johanning EJ, David JR, Pool JE. 2016. Life history
evolution and cellular mechanisms associated with increased size in high-altitude
Drosophila. *Ecol Evol* 6:5893–5906.

Lange JD, Bastide H, Lack JB, Pool JE. 2022. A population genomic assessment of three decades
of evolution in a natural *Drosophila* population. *Mol Biol Evol* 39:msab368.

Lange JD, Pool JE. 2018. Impacts of Recurrent Hitchhiking on Divergence and Demographic
Inference in *Drosophila*. *Genome Biol Evol* 10:1882–1891.

Langley CH, Crepeau M, Cardeno C, Corbett-Detig R, Stevens K. 2011. Circumventing
Heterozygosity: Sequencing the Amplified Genome of a Single Haploid *Drosophila*
melanogaster Embryo. *Genetics* 188:239–246.

Langley CH, Stevens K, Cardeno C, Lee YCG, Schrider DR, Pool JE, Langley SA, Suarez C,
Corbett-Detig RB, Kolaczkowski B, et al. 2012. Genomic variation in natural populations
of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 192:533–598.

Lee CE. 2002. Evolutionary genetics of invasive species. *Trends Ecol Evol* 17:386–391.

Levashina EA, Ohresser S, Bulet P, Reichhart J-M, Hetru C, Hoffmann JA. 1995.
Metchnikowin, a novel immune-inducible proline-rich peptide from *Drosophila* with
antibacterial and antifungal properties. *Eur J Biochem* 233:694–700.

Lewald KM, Abrieux A, Wilson DA, Lee Y, Conner WR, Andreazza F, Beers EH, Burrack HJ,
Daane KM, Diepenbrock L, et al. 2021. Population genomics of *Drosophila suzukii* reveal
longitudinal population structure and signals of migrations in and out of the continental
United States. *G3* 11:jkab343.

Li H. 2013. Aligning sequence reads, clone sequences and assembly contigs with BWA-MEM,
http://arxiv.org/abs/1303.3997, last accessed May 31, 2023.

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.

Li W, Wang F, Menut L, Gao F-B. 2004. BTB/POZ-zinc finger protein abrupt suppresses
dendritic branching in a neuronal subtype-specific and dosage-dependent manner. *Neuron*
43:823–834.

Little CM, Chapman TW, Hillier NK. 2020. Plasticity is key to success of *Drosophila suzukii*
(Diptera: Drosophilidae) invasion. *J Insect Sci* 20:5.

Lotterhos KE, Whitlock MC. 2015. The relative power of genome scans to detect local
adaptation depends on sampling design and statistical method. *Mol Ecol* 24:1031–1046.

Mérel V, Gibert P, Buch I, Rodriguez Rada V, Estoup A, Gautier M, Fablet M, Boulesteix M,
Vieira C. 2021. The worldwide invasion of *Drosophila suzukii* is accompanied by a large
increase of transposable element load and a small number of putatively adaptive
insertions. *Mol Biol Evol* 38:4252–4267.

Muller P, Parmigiani G, Rice K. 2006. FDR and Bayesian multiple comparisons rules. *JHU*
Biostatistics 115.

Nakabayashi R, Morishita S. 2020. HiC-Hiker: a probabilistic model to determine contig
orientation in chromosome-length scaffolds with Hi-C. *Bioinformatics* 36:3966–3974.

Nei M. 1987. Molecular evolutionary genetics. *New York: Columbia University Press.*

Olazcuaga L, Loiseau A, Parrinello H, Paris M, Fraimout A, Guedot C, Diepenbrock LM, Kenis
M, Zhang J, Chen X, et al. 2020. A whole-genome scan for association with invasion
success in the fruit fly *Drosophila suzukii* using contrasts of allele frequencies corrected for
population structure. *Mol Biol Evol* 37:2369–2385.

Ometto L, Cestaro A, Ramasamy S, Grassi A, Revadi S, Siozios S, Moretto M, Fontana P,
Varotto C, Pisani D, et al. 2013. Linking genomics and ecology to investigate the
complex evolution of an invasive *Drosophila* pest. *Genome Biol Evol* 5:745–757.

Palacios-Muñoz A, Ewer J. 2018. Calcium and cAMP directly modulate the speed of the
Drosophila circadian clock. *PLOS Genet* 14:e1007433.

Paris M, Boyer R, Jaenichen R, Wolf J, Karageorgi M, Green J, Cagnon M, Parinello H, Estoup
A, Gautier M, et al. 2020. Near-chromosome level genome assembly of the fruit pest
Drosophila suzukii using long-read sequencing. *Sci Rep* 10:11227.

Peng FT. 1937. On some species of *Drosophila* from China. *Annot zool jap* 16:20–27.

Pool JE. 2015. The mosaic ancestry of the *Drosophila* Genetic Reference Panel and the *D.*
melanogaster reference genome reveals a network of epistatic fitness interactions. *Mol Biol*
Evol 32:3236–3251.

Pool JE, Braun DT, Lack JB. 2017. Parallel evolution of cold tolerance within *Drosophila*
melanogaster. *Mol Biol Evol* 34:349–360.

Pool JE, Corbett-Detig RB, Sugino RP, Stevens KA, Cardeno CM, Crepeau MW, Duchen P, Emerson JJ, Saelao P, Begun DJ, et al. 2012. Population genomics of sub-Saharan *Drosophila melanogaster*: African diversity and non-African admixture. *PLOS Genetics* 8:e1003080.

Pool JE, Nielsen R. 2007. Population size changes reshape genomic patterns of diversity. *Evolution* 61:3001–3006.

Prakash S, Caldwell JC, Eberl DF, Clandinin TR. 2005. *Drosophila* N-cadherin mediates an attractive interaction between photoreceptor axons and their targets. *Nat Neurosci* 8:443–450.

Prelich G. 2012. Gene overexpression: uses, mechanisms, and interpretation. *Genetics* 190:841–854.

Prentis PJ, Wilson JRU, Dormontt EE, Richardson DM, Lowe AJ. 2008. Adaptive evolution in invasive species. *Trends Plant Sci* 13:288–294.

Reijnders MJMF, Waterhouse RM. 2021. Summary visualizations of Gene Ontology terms with GO-Figure! *Front Bioinform* 1:6.

Rellstab C, Gugerli F, Eckert AJ, Hancock AM, Holderegger R. 2015. A practical guide to environmental association analysis in landscape genomics. *Mol Ecol* 24:4348–4370.

Reynolds J, Weir BS, Cockerham CC. 1983. Estimation of the coancestry coefficient: basis for a short-term genetic distance. *Genetics* 105:767–779.

Rezende GL, Martins AJ, Gentile C, Farnesi LC, Pelajo-Machado M, Peixoto AA, Valle D. 2008. Embryonic desiccation resistance in *Aedes aegypti*: presumptive role of the chitinized Serosal Cuticle. *BMC Devel Biol* 8:82.

Reznick DN, Losos J, Travis J. 2019. From low to high gear: there has been a paradigm shift in our understanding of evolution. *Ecol Let* 22:233–244.

Rogers WA, Salomone JR, Tacy DJ, Camino EM, Davis KA, Rebeiz M, Williams TM. 2013. Recurrent modification of a conserved cis-regulatory element underlies fruit fly pigmentation diversity. *PLOS Genet* 9:e1003740.

Rudman SM, Greenblum SI, Rajpurohit S, Betancourt NJ, Hanna J, Tilk S, Yokoyama T, Petrov DA, Schmidt P. 2022. Direct observation of adaptive tracking on ecological time scales in *Drosophila*. *Science* 375:eabj7484.

Senthilan PR, Piepenbrock D, Ovezmyradov G, Nadrowski B, Bechstedt S, Pauls S, Winkler M, Möbius W, Howard J, Göpfert MC. 2012. *Drosophila* auditory organ genes and genetic hearing defects. *Cell* 150:1042–1054.

Shalem O, Sanjana NE, Zhang F. 2015. High-throughput functional genomics using CRISPR–Cas9. *Nat Rev Genet* 16:299–311.

Shearer PW, West JD, Walton VM, Brown PH, Svetec N, Chiu JC. 2016. Seasonal cues induce
phenotypic plasticity of *Drosophila suzukii* to enhance winter survival. *BMC Ecol* 16:11.

Simoes da Silva CJ, Sospedra I, Aparicio R, Busturia A. 2019. The microRNA-306/abrupt
regulatory axis controls wing and haltere growth in *Drosophila*. *Mech Dev* 158:103555.

Smith JM, Haigh J. 1974. The hitch-hiking effect of a favourable gene. *Genet Res* 23:23–35.

Stern DL. 2014. Identification of loci that cause phenotypic variation in diverse species with the
reciprocal hemizygosity test. *Trends Genet* 30:547–554.

Storey JD. 2003. The positive false discovery rate: A Bayesian interpretation and the q-value. *Ann*
Stat 31:2013–2035.

Sugimura K, Satoh D, Estes P, Crews S, Uemura T. 2004. Development of Morphological
Diversity of Dendrites in *Drosophila* by the BTB-Zinc Finger Protein Abrupt. *Neuron*
43:809–822.

Suvorov A, Kim BY, Wang J, Armstrong EE, Peede D, D'Agostino ERR, Price DK, Waddell PJ,
Lang M, Courtier-Orgogozo V, et al. 2022. Widespread introgression across a phylogeny
of 155 *Drosophila* genomes. *Curr Biol* 32:111-123.e5.

Tan CC, Hsu TC, Sheng TC. 1949. Known *Drosophila* species in China with descriptions of
twelve new species. *Univ Texas Publ* 4929:196–206.

Telonis-Scott M, Gane M, DeGaris S, Sgrò CM, Hoffmann AA. 2012. High resolution mapping
of candidate alleles for desiccation resistance in *Drosophila melanogaster* under selection. *Mol*
Biol Evol 29:1335–1351.

True JR, Mercer JM, Laurie CC. 1996. Differences in crossover frequency and distribution
among three sibling species of *Drosophila*. *Genetics* 142:507–523.

Turner TL. 2014. Fine-mapping natural alleles: quantitative complementation to the rescue. *Mol*
Ecol 23:2377–2382.

Ueno K, Kidokoro Y. 2008. Adenylyl cyclase encoded by AC78C participates in sugar
perception in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Eur J Neurosci* 28:1956–1966.

de Villemereuil P, Frichot É, Bazin É, François O, Gaggiotti OE. 2014. Genome scan methods
against more complex models: when and how much should we trust them? *Mol Ecol*
23:2006–2019.

de Villemereuil P, Gaggiotti OE. 2015. A new F_{ST}-based method to uncover local adaptation
using environmental variables. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 6:1248–1258.

Wallingford AK, Rice KB, Leskey TC, Loeb GM. 2018. Overwintering behavior of *drosophila*
suzukii, and potential springtime diets for egg maturation. *Environ Entomol* 47:1266–1273.

Wang S-H, Simcox A, Campbell G. 2000. Dual role for *Drosophila* epidermal growth factor
receptor signaling in early wing disc development. *Genes Dev* 14:2271–2276.

Wang T, Morency DT, Harris N, Davis GW. 2020. Epigenetic signaling in glia controls
presynaptic homeostatic plasticity. *Neuron* 105:491-505.e3.

Wang Y, Farine J-P, Yang Y, Yang J, Tang W, Gehring N, Ferveur J-F, Moussian B. 2020.
Transcriptional control of quality differences in the lipid-based cuticle barrier in *Drosophila*
suzukii and *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Front Genet* 11:887.

Wang Y, Ferveur J-F, Moussian B. 2021. Eco-genetics of desiccation resistance in *Drosophila*. *Biol*
Rev 96:1421–1440.

Welles SR, Dlugosch KM. 2019. Population genomics of colonization and invasion. In: Rajora
OP, editor. Population genomics: concepts, approaches and applications. *Population*
Genomics. Cham: Springer International Publishing. p. 655–683.

Wong MM-K, Liu M-F, Chiu SK. 2015. Cropped, *Drosophila* transcription factor AP-4, controls
tracheal terminal branching and cell growth. *BMC Devel Biol* 15:20.