1 **Postzygotic barriers persist despite ongoing introgression in hybridizing *Mimulus* species**
2

3 Samuel J. Mantel[1*] and Andrea L. Sweigart[1]
4
5 [1]Department of Genetics, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, 30602, USA
6
7
8 [*]Corresponding author:
9 Samuel Mantel
10 120 E. Green St.
11 Athens, GA 30602
12 smantel1@uga.edu

13
14
15
16 Word Count: 6471
17   Introduction: 987
18   Materials and Methods: 1959
19   Results: 1603
20   Discussion: 1922
21
Number of Figures: 4
Number of Color Figures: 3
Number of Tables: 3
Number of Supplemental Figures: 18
Number of Supplemental Tables: 5

Summary

• The evolution of postzygotic isolation is thought to be a key step in maintaining species

boundaries upon secondary contact, yet the dynamics and persistence of hybrid

incompatibilities in sympatric species are not well understood.

• Here, we explore these issues using genetic mapping in three populations of

recombinant inbred lines between naturally hybridizing monkeyflowers *Mimulus*

guttatus and *M. nasutus* from the sympatric Catherine Creek population.

• The three *M. guttatus* founders differ dramatically in admixture history. Comparative

genetic mapping also reveals three putative inversions segregating among the *M.*

guttatus founders, two due to admixture. We observe strong, genome-wide

transmission ratio distortion, but patterns are highly variable among populations. Some

distortion is explained by epistatic selection favoring parental genotypes, but tests of

inter-chromosomal linkage disequilibrium also reveal multiple candidate Dobzhansky-

Muller incompatibilities. We also map several genetic loci for hybrid fertility, including

two interacting pairs coinciding with peaks of distortion.

• Remarkably, in this limited sample of *M. guttatus*, we discover abundant segregating

variation for hybrid incompatibilities with *M. nasutus,* suggesting this population harbors

diverse contributors to postzygotic isolation. Moreover, even with substantial admixture,

hybrid incompatibilities between *Mimulus* species persist, suggesting postzygotic

isolation might be a potent force in maintaining species barriers in this system.

Key Words: Introgression; transmission ratio distortion; hybrid Incompatibility; sterility;

reproductive isolation; *Mimulus*

Introduction

Despite often being conceptualized as a single event, it has long been understood that

speciation is a complex and dynamic process (Darwin, 1859; Dobzhansky, 1937). As new species

form (generally in allopatry), the cumulative impacts of adaptive divergence, genetic drift, and

the sorting of ancestral variation can lead to the evolution of reproductive isolation, which limits

gene flow between species when they come into secondary contact (Dobzhansky, 1937; Mayr,

1942; Coyne & Orr, 2004). Nevertheless, gene flow between recognized species – at rates high

enough to have substantial genomic consequences – is not uncommon, even when strong

reproductive isolating barriers exist (Nolte *et al.*, 2009; Teeter *et al.*, 2010; Ellegren *et al.*, 2012;

Renaut *et al.*, 2013; Larson *et al.*, 2014; Delmore *et al.*, 2015; Caeiro-Dias *et al.*, 2023). At the

extremes, hybridization can break down established barriers causing previously isolated

lineages to fuse (Taylor *et al.*, 2006) or strengthen reproductive isolation through reinforcement

(Servedio & Kirkpatrick, 1997; Jaenike et al., 2006; Hopkins & Rausher, 2012), but theory also

suggests partial reproductive isolation can sometimes evolve as a stable optimum (Servedio &

Hermisson, 2020). Studies of naturally hybridizing species can provide a window into the causes

of these alternative evolutionary outcomes, allowing us to identify and measure the impact of

the genetic loci involved in reproductive isolation.

One powerful approach to address these questions is experimental hybridization of

incompletely isolated species that occur together in secondary sympatry. In particular, the use

of late-generation hybrids such as recombinant inbred lines (RILs) can enable replication of wild,

admixed genotypes and facilitate genetic mapping of barrier loci under controlled,

environmental conditions. This approach should be especially fruitful for identifying loci

involved in postzygotic isolation because strongly incompatible allele combinations are likely to

be purged during RIL formation. Indeed, selection against hybrid incompatibilities can be a

major source of transmission ratio distortion (TRD) in RIL populations (Colomé-Tatché &

Johannes, 2016). Although there are often additional contributors to TRD in experimental

hybrid populations (reviewed in Fishman & McIntosh, 2019), hybrid incompatibilities are

expected to leave a particular signature of distortion, generating both local peaks and linkage

disequilibrium between unlinked loci caused by underrepresented or absent multi-locus

genotypes. This signature will likely be particularly apparent in RILs, which have the advantage

of multiple generations of recombination, increasing power to detect and localize

incompatibilities by amplifying their effects (and revealing recessive phenotypes) through

inbreeding (Moyle & Nakazato, 2008).

Despite the clear value of experimental hybridization, and RILs in particular, for

illuminating the genetic causes of reproductive isolation, inferences to natural populations can

be challenging because such studies are often based on crosses between only two individuals or

inbred lines. This limitation might be serious for investigations of postzygotic isolation between

species in the early stages of divergence, as hybrid incompatibilities are often polymorphic

(Sweigart *et al.*, 2007; Good *et al.*, 2008; Cutter, 2012), particularly in populations with ongoing

hybridization (Zuellig & Sweigart, 2018a). Variation in chromosomal structure is also a common

feature of natural populations (Hoffmann & Rieseberg, 2008), and polymorphic inversions are

often associated with adaptive differences (Feder *et al.*, 2003; Lowry & Willis, 2010; Jones *et al.*,

2012) and reproductive isolation (Noor *et al.*, 2001b; Sotola *et al.*, 2023). One way to capture a

more representative set of natural variation is to generate a multi-parent mapping population,

for instance by performing multiple biparental crosses to a common founder (Yu *et al.*, 2008).

Although this strategy is now routinely used in plant breeding programs (Scott *et al.*, 2020) and

to dissect the genetics of complex traits (Aylor *et al.*, 2011; Long *et al.*, 2014) it has rarely been

applied to studies of speciation.

In this study we investigate patterns and mechanisms of reproductive isolation in three

independent RIL populations constructed from crosses between *Mimulus guttatus* and *M.*

nasutus (also referred to as *Erythranthe guttata* and *E. nasuta*: see Lowry *et al.*, 2019 and

Nesom *et al.*, 2019). These two species are closely related (~200 KYA diverged: Brandvain *et al.*,

2014), and broadly allopatric across western North America, but occur in secondary sympatry at

many sites in their shared range. One such sympatric site occurs at Catherine Creek (CAC) in

Washington state, a system of ephemeral seeps and streams that flow into the Columbia River.

These *Mimulus* species have diverged in mating system (*M. guttatus* is large flowered and

predominantly outcrossing, whereas *M. nasutus* is a small flowered and primarily selfing), which

acts as a strong premating barrier where the two species co-occur (Martin & Willis, 2007). At

Catherine Creek, divergent flowering phenology (Fishman *et al.*, 2014a; Kenney & Sweigart,

2016) and microhabitat adaptation (Mantel & Sweigart, 2019) are also important contributors

to premating isolation. Despite these substantial barriers to interspecific mating, studies of

population genomic variation at Catherine Creek have revealed clear signatures of historical and

contemporary hybridization (Kenney & Sweigart, 2016), resulting in largely unidirectional

introgression from *M. nasutus* into *M. guttatus* (Sweigart & Willis, 2003; Brandvain *et al.*, 2014;

Kenney & Sweigart, 2016). Even in the absence of interspecific gene flow, *M. guttatus*

populations are exceptionally genetically diverse (Flagel *et al.*, 2014; Puzey *et al.*, 2017) and

maintain substantial variation for complex phenotypes (Troth et al., 2018).

Here, we attempt to capture and leverage this diversity at Catherine Creek to

understand the patterns and mechanisms of hybrid breakdown in naturally hybridizing species.

We generate three independent RIL populations by crossing distinct CAC *M. guttatus*

progenitors to a common *M. nasutus* parent. Using this powerful crossing design, we discover

that differences in admixture have cascading effects on structural variation and reproductive

barriers. Moreover, even in this small sample of three *M. guttatus* lines, we find segregating

variation for hybrid incompatibilities with *M. nasutus*, suggesting this population harbors

diverse contributors to postzygotic isolation. Finally, we discover that even with substantial

admixture, hybrid incompatibilities between *Mimulus* species persist, suggesting postzygotic

isolation might be a potent force in maintaining species barriers in the face of ongoing

hybridization.

Materials and Methods

Plant Material and Crossing Design

The plants used in this study are derived from a collection of inbred lines (>10

generations inbred, single seed decent) produced from wild-collected seeds from Catherine

Creek (CAC). We produced three parallel RIL populations from crosses between these inbred

lines of CAC *M. guttatus* and *M. nasutus*. We selected three previously studied CAC *M. guttatus*

inbred lines (CAC110, CAC162, and CAC415; TableS1; Mantel & Sweigart, 2019) with stereotypic

M. guttatus morphological and phenological characteristics and which produced fertile F1s with

M. nasutus (~72-99% viable pollen). One *M. nasutus* inbred line (CAC9) served as a common

maternal parent, which we emasculated before pollen development, and crossed by hand with

pollen from each of the *M guttatus* inbred lines, producing three F1 hybrids. For each of these

F1 hybrids, we self-fertilized a single plant to generate three corresponding F2 populations (*N* =

500 plants each). We performed several additional rounds of self-fertilization using single-seed-

descent to produce three populations of F6 or F7 recombinant inbred lines (RILs; Figure S1),

generating a total of 368 RILs (151 CAC110 RILs, 128 CAC162 RILs, and 89 CAC415 RILs), much

lower than the initial 1500 due to line extinction during the inbreeding process.

Library Preparation, Sequencing, and Processing

We grew one individual of each of the 368 RILs (F6 generation or later) for tissue

collection and DNA extraction in the greenhouse at the University of Georgia, conditions

described in Supporting Information Methods S1. We collected bud and meristem tissue from

each individual into 96-well plates on dry ice, stored them at -80°C, and extracted genomic DNA

using a modified CTAB method in a 96-well format

(dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.bgv6jw9e). We then constructed ddRADseq libraries using a

modified version of RAD Capture (Ali *et al.*, 2016), "BestRAD"

(dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.6awhafe, Supporting Information Methods S1). We prepared

libraries for, and sequenced the same RILs twice, each on two partial lanes of Illumina

HiSeq4000 for paired end 150-bp reads at the Genome Sequencing Facility at Duke University.

We also extracted genomic DNA from bud and leaf tissue of the three parental CAC *M. guttatus*

lines using a modified CTAB method as above. Whole genome sequence (WGS) libraries were

prepared and sequenced on a partial lane of Illumina HiSeq4000 for paired end 150-bp reads at

the Genome Sequencing Facility at Duke University.

159   We aligned WGS reads to the *Mimulus guttatus* IM62 v3 refence assembly

(phytozome.org, IM: Iron Mountain, an allopatric *M. guttatus* population in Oregon, ~200km

south of CAC), called SNPs, removed heterozygous calls and filtered sites to a minimum depth of

3x, and a maximum depth of 2 standard deviations above the mean. To aid in genotyping *M.*

guttatus and *M. nasutus* SNPs across the genome, we identified a full list of diagnostic SNPs

(i.e., those homozygous for different alleles in each of the parental pairs, CAC9 & CAC110, CAC9

& CAC162, and CAC9 & CAC415). We joint genotyped each pair of parental lines, quality filtered

the called SNPs, and retained only biallelic SNPs, extracting a list of high-quality, diagnostic SNPs

for each pair of parental lines. Details of sequence data processing are described in Supporting

Information Methods S1.

169   Following sequencing, we demultiplexed the ddRADseq data and aligned reads to the

Mimulus guttatus IM62 v3 reference assembly. At this stage, six samples were removed from

further analysis (4 from the CAC162 RILs, and 2 from the CAC415 RILs) due to low similarity

between duplicate BAMs produced from the two independent ddRAD library preparations. We

then merged the remaining duplicate BAMs for a total of 362 RIL individuals (151 CAC110 RILs,

124 CAC162 RILs, and 87 CAC415 RILs). We called SNPs, joint genotyped each RIL population

with its corresponding parental lines, and quality filtered called SNPs. Finally, we removed non-

diagnostic sites between each pair of parental lines.

To assess levels of residual heterozygosity in the RIL populations, we filtered the three

RIL VCFs as above and requiring a minimum depth of 10x. Heterozygosity was low and uniform

across the genome: CAC110 RILs: 1.95%, N=13,975; CAC162 RILs: 2.34%, N=33,340; CAC415

RILs: 2.79%, N=23,178 and consistent with the Mendelian expectation (~1.5-3%, in F6/F7 RILs).

Assessment of Introgression in Parental Lines

As previous studies have shown that admixture between *M. guttatus* and *M. nasutus* is

common at CAC (Brandvain *et al.*, 2014; Kenney & Sweigart, 2016) we first checked the selected

CAC *M. guttatus* parental lines for evidence of introgression from *M. nasutus*. To coarsely

identify putative regions of introgression in *M. guttatus* parental lines, we calculated *Dxy*

between CAC9 and the three parental *M. guttatus* lines in non-overlapping 50-kb windows

containing 5000 or more called sites. To more concretely assess evidence of *M. nasutus*

introgression in the parental CAC *M. guttatus* lines, we used the newly generated WGS data,

plus WGS data from 7 other inbred *Mimulus* accessions downloaded from the SRA

(https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sra, Table S1): the parental *M. nasutus* line CAC9, 3 non-CAC *M.*

nasutus lines, the 3 parental *M. guttatus* lines from CAC, 5 additional non-parental *M. guttatus*

lines from CAC, and 2 non-CAC *M. guttatus* lines). We processed reads from additional (non-

parental) lines as above and joint genotyped all lines together. We filtered called SNPs based on

quality as above, and retained only biallelic SNPs.

We identified putative regions of introgression using a Hidden Markov Model (HMM,

modified from Durbin *et al.*, 1998 and developed in Brandvain *et al.*, 2014. As an input for the

model, we identified fourfold degenerate sites and non-degenerate sites in the IM62 v3

reference assembly (https://github.com/tsackton/linked-selection/tree/master/misc_scripts).

With these lists and the VCF of high-quality filtered SNPs in parental and non-parental *Mimulus*

lines described above, we counted the total number of genotyped sites, genotyped non-

degenerate sites, and genotyped fourfold degenerate sites in 1-kb windows in each line. We

then counted the number of those sites that differed in their SNP call between each pairwise

comparison of lines. With these counts and the HMM, we calculated posterior probabilities of

M. nasutus and *M. guttatus* ancestry across the genomes of the parental CAC *M. guttatus* lines.

We considered 1-kb windows with a calculated posterior probability of *M. nasutus* ancestry

>0.95 to be windows showing evidence of introgression.

RIL Genotyping and Linkage Mapping

We genotyped the RILs in non-overlapping 50-kb windows; windows with >75% *M.*

guttatus calls were coded as *M. guttatus* homozygotes, 25-75% as heterozygotes, and <25% as

M. nasutus homozygotes. Windows with no SNP calls were coded as missing data. To fill these

gaps, we used Python scripts from the processing steps of the program GOOGA (Flagel *et al.*,

2019) to calculate genotype probabilities for each window in each RIL individual. In GOOGA, we

set the expected genotype frequencies to 1:1 for alternative parental homozygotes

(heterozygotes are excluded given that they are <3% of the genotypes in this advanced RIL

population). We then used the program to estimate genotype error rates and recombination

rates for each windowed genotype for each RIL. We dropped 39 RILs from the dataset due to

excessive missing data (stemming from low read coverage) because they produced high (e1 or

e2 > 0.2) estimated error rates in GOOGA (8 from the CAC110 RILs, 26 from the CAC162 RILs,

and 5 from the CAC415 RILs). Finally, we used GOOGA's HMM to estimate genotype

probabilities for each 50-kb window of the remaining RILs and converted to hard calls excluding

windows with probabilities <0.75. Of the original 368 RILs, this resulted in genotype data for 323

of them (143 of the original 151 from the CAC110 RILs, 98/128 from the CAC162 RILs, and 82/89

from the CAC415 RILs). We used LepMAP3 (Rastas, 2017) to construct a linkage map for each of

the three RIL populations. Linkage mapping details are described in Supporting Information

Methods S1 and Table S2. We produced three linkage maps containing 3,828, 4,389 and 4,379

markers, retaining 794, 606, and 690 that mapped to recombination-informative sites (for the

CAC110, CAC162, and CAC415 RIL populations, respectively).

Assessment of Transmission Ratio Distortion and Linkage Disequilibrium

232   Following linkage mapping, we calculated genotype frequencies at each marker in each

map and identified regions of transmission ratio distortion (TRD) by testing for deviations from

the Mendelian 1:1 expectation with χ^2 tests. We used both an uncorrected α = 0.01 and a more

stringent Bonferonni-corrected α (unique α for each chromosome in each RIL population

depending on the number of markers tested; Table S3). To investigate whether peaks of TRD

were associated with major two-locus hybrid incompatibilities we used the package pegas

(Paradis, 2010) to characterize pairwise linkage disequilibrium (LD) between all markers with

unique map positions. To minimize false positives driven by the large number of pairwise

comparisons, we identified putative interacting loci associated with inter-chromosomal LD

based on r values greater than the 95% percentile (CAC110 RILs: r > 0.37, CAC162 RILs: r > 0.41,

CAC415 RILs: r > 0.39). At these interacting loci we then performed likelihood ratio tests

comparing observed genotype ratios to expected ratios (calculated by cross tabulation of

observed allele frequencies), and describe epistatic interactions where $p<0.0001$.

Assessment of Hybrid Male and Female Sterility

To measure male fertility, we collected pollen from three flowers (second flower pair or

later) of each RIL individual. We suspended the pollen of each flower separately in lactophenol-

aniline blue stain (Kearns & Inouye, 1993) and inspected the pollen grains using a compound

microscope. For each flower, we estimated pollen fertility by calculating the proportion of darkly

stained (viable) pollen grains from a haphazardly selected group of >100 within a field of view in

of the microscope. When fertility estimates from flowers of the same plant differed by more

than 0.2, pollen from up to three more flowers was collected and counted. We then estimated

individual pollen viability as the average value from all collected flowers. Because the

distribution of pollen viability in each RIL population was left-skewed, we logit-transformed the

data to more closely match a normal distribution.

To estimate hybrid female sterility, we intercrossed random pairs of RILs in at least

duplicate, and collected all seeds produced. We counted the number of seeds produced per

fruit for each cross made and ran a linear mixed model (LMM, using the lmer command in the

'lme4' package). In addition to maternal parent genotype (fixed effect), the model included

average viable pollen proportion of the paternal parent (as calculated above, fixed effect), a

unique RIX identifier nested within RIX cross type (CAC110 RIL x CAC162 RIL, CAC162 RIL x

CAC415 RIL, etc.; random effect) and the year that the cross was made (crosses were made

during two separate grow-outs in separate years; random effect). We then calculated least

square means of female fertility (using seeds per fruit as a proxy) for each RIL genotype using

the 'emmeans' package. This method produced distributions with a long right tail, so we square

root transformed the data to more closely match a normal distribution.

QTL Mapping

Given the small sample sizes of each RIL population, we took a multistep approach to

genetically map hybrid male and female sterility. For each trait in each RIL population, we first

used r/QTL (Broman & Sen, 2009; Arends *et al.*, 2010) to perform 10 iterations of composite

interval mapping (CIM; Zeng, 1993, 1994; Jansen & Stam, 1994). Because CIM requires no

missing data, missing genotypes are imputed before the scan is run, leading to potential

differences among iterations. We set lenient LOD thresholds ($\alpha = 0.15$) for QTL significance, by

performing 5,000 permutations, and calculated 1.5-LOD intervals ('lodint' command) for each

significant peak position in any of the 10 iterations. We then performed single-QTL scans using

each QTL identified with CIM as an interactive covariate ('intcovar' option) in separate runs. We

again we set LOD thresholds ($\alpha = 0.15$, 10,000 permutations) for interacting QTL significance,

and calculated 1.5-LOD intervals for each significant peak position. With these identified peaks,

we then fit a multiple-QTL model ('fitqtl' command; HK method) and directly estimated additive

QTL effects (at each peak position) and identified epistatic effects. We then removed any

nonsignificant ($p > 0.05$) effects, and re-fit the model.

Results

Admixture in M. guttatus parental lines

All *M. guttatus* lines tested show clear evidence of admixture from *M. nasutus*, but the genomic location and proportion of introgression vary considerably across lines (Figure 1, Figure S2, Figure S3). Of the three parents, CAC110 is the most admixed with ~24% of its genome showing very low genetic divergence (*Dxy*) and a high posterior probability of recent coalescence with *M. nasutus* via probabilistic inference (HMM, see Methods; Brandvain *et al.*, 2014). At least some of this introgression in CAC110 appears to be recent, with large portions of entire chromosome arms showing evidence of introgression (Figure S2). Although the largest inferred contiguous blocks in CAC110 are only ~1.1Mb (Figure S4b), the HMM may sometimes break up true contiguous blocks of introgression (or incorrectly identify short regions with low *Dxy* as admixture blocks – see Brandvain et al. 2014). Given the improbability of inheriting a large number of small introgressions immediately adjacent to one another, we think it likely that several regions in CAC110 (on Chromosomes 1, 8, 11, and 13 – Figure 1 and Figure S2) represent true contiguous blocks of admixture. In both CAC162 and CAC415, the overall proportion of admixture is lower (~9% in each) and blocks are generally smaller and more evenly dispersed throughout the genome (Figure S2; Figure S4b), consistent with introgression events that occurred in the more distant past. Even in CAC110, however, there are many very small regions of inferred introgression (Figure S4b), suggesting *M. guttatus* genomes at Catherine Creek are shaped by a long history of introgression from *M. nasutus*.

304
Figure 1. Introgression from *M. nasutus* into sympatric *M. guttatus*. (a) *Dxy* calculated in 50kb
windows across the first two chromosomes of the IM62 v3 *Mimulus guttatus* reference genome,
between the parental lines of the three RIL populations (CAC9 v. CAC110, CAC9 v. CAC162, and
CAC9 v. CAC415). Blue shaded regions indicate putatively admixed regions in the three focal CAC
M. guttatus lines tested, diagnosed by a greater than a 95% posterior probability of *M. nasutus*
ancestry (in 1kb windows) as inferred via the HMM (i.e. more recent coalescence with included
M. nasutus samples than with included *M. guttatus* samples). Grey shaded regions indicate
missing data (fewer than 5000 genotyped sites within any 50kb window). Red heatmaps above
each chromosome indicate the density of centromeric repeats in the same 50kb windows. All
chromosomes are shown in Figure S2. **(b)** Heatmap showing the proportion of *M. nasutus*
ancestry in each chromosome, and across the genome, of each of the three CAC *M. guttatus*
lines used as parents of the RIL populations, as estimated as the proportion of 1kb windows
with a greater than a 95% posterior probability of *M. nasutus* ancestry as inferred via the HMM.
Darker blue shading indicates a higher proportion of *M. nasutus* ancestry.

Comparative linkage mapping

Across most of the genome, the three RIL linkage maps are colinear with similar lengths

(Table 1), and marker order generally follows the physical order of the *M. guttatus* IM62 v3

reference assembly (Figure 2; Figure S5). However, we identified three clear exceptions to this

pattern, where maps differ due to parental variation in putative inversions, characterized by a

large number of physically dispersed markers mapping to the same genetic position. Two of

these putative inversions are on LG1 (*inv1.1* and *inv1.2;* Figure S6) and are potentially unique to

Catherine Creek (or locally distributed), having not been reported in other crosses with these

Mimulus species (Fishman *et al.*, 2014b; Flagel *et al.*, 2019). In both cases, the CAC9 *M. nasutus*

parent carries the ancestral orientation and the *M. guttatus* parents segregate for the derived

variant. At *inv1.1*, recombination is suppressed in the CAC110 and CAC415 RILs, but not in the

CAC162 RIL, indicating collinearity between the CAC9 *M. nasutus* and CAC162 *M. guttatus*

parents (Figure 2; Figure S6). At *inv1.2*, on the other hand, the genetic maps suggest CAC9 is

collinear only with CAC110 (Figure 2; Figure S6). Remarkably, this *M. guttatus* parent also carries

a large block of introgression spanning this entire region (Figure 1), suggesting that gene flow

from *M. nasutus* has re-introduced the ancestral variant into CAC110. We discovered a similar

situation on LG13, where introgression from *M. nasutus* accounts for collinearity between CAC9

and CAC110 at *inv13* (recombination rates in the CAC110 RIL are much higher in this region than

in the CAC162 and CAC415 RILs; Figure S5). Additionally, *inv13* might have arisen in *M. nasutus*,

as it also appears to be present in the reference genome assembly of *M. nasutus* SF5 (an

accession derived from Shear's Falls, an allopatric *M. nasutus* population ~70 km from CAC), but

not in other recently assembled *M. guttatus* genomes (phytozome.org). Taken together, these

Table 1. Summary of linkage map length and intrascaffold recombination rate estimates. Total
map length and intrascaffold recombination rate estimates for each chromosome, plus total
map length and average recombination rate in each of the three RIL populations.

		CAC110 RILs		CAC162 RILs		CAC415 RILs	
Chromosome	Reference Length (Mb)	Map Length (cM)	cM/Mb	Map Length (cM)	cM/Mb	Map Length (cM)	cM/Mb
1	13.88	134.368	9.68	66.451	4.79	74.470	5.37
2	20.54	86.970	4.23	79.725	3.88	85.500	4.16
3	23.80	82.263	3.46	64.360	2.70	67.161	2.82
4	22.81	82.362	3.61	84.446	3.70	92.822	4.07
5	21.77	90.440	4.15	82.863	3.81	92.963	4.27
6	20.89	99.115	4.74	95.776	4.58	104.195	4.99
7	21.88	72.643	3.32	60.311	2.76	89.304	4.08
8	27.69	109.184	3.94	117.963	4.26	117.700	4.25
9	25.15	63.801	2.54	92.286	3.67	98.934	3.93
10	22.12	89.656	4.05	106.661	4.82	104.910	4.74
11	33.60	137.499	4.09	88.907	2.65	91.633	2.73
12	25.84	101.548	3.93	82.763	3.20	81.868	3.17
13	30.77	117.730	3.83	78.866	2.56	105.060	3.41
14	28.29	134.029	4.74	109.580	3.87	128.236	4.53
Global	339.04	1401.608	4.13	1210.958	3.57	1334.756	3.94

345
Figure 2. Map position (cM) versus physical marker positions (Mb) for the first two
chromosomes of the IM62 v3 *Mimulus guttatus* reference genome in the three RIL
populations. Red heatmaps below each curve indicate the density of markers, measured as the
distance in Mb to the nearest neighboring marker. Low SNP density, and the subsequent
inability to genotype markers in areas of the *M. guttatus* parental genomes showing evidence of
introgression from *M. nasutus,* manifests as regions of low marker density on some
chromosomes. All linkage groups are shown in Figure S5.

mapping results point to introgression from *M. nasutus* as a major source of large-scale

structural variation at Catherine Creek, responsible both for restoring ancestral variants and for

introducing new derived inversions into *M. guttatus*.

In addition to the effects of structural variation, we observed some instances of map

length variation that appear to be associated only with parental differences in introgression. In

the CAC110 RILs, introgressed regions on LGs 1, 11, 12, and 13 have elevated genetic distances

relative to the same (non-introgressed) regions in the other two RIL populations (Table 1, Figure

2, Figure S5). Rather than reflecting a biological difference in recombination frequency between

introgressed and non-introgressed regions, we attribute this effect to technical differences

arising from the much lower marker densities in introgressed regions, which are highly similar

to the CAC9 parent (Table 1, Figure 2, Figure S5).

Genome-wide patterns of transmission ratio distortion (TRD)

With the exception of LG9, we observed strong TRD in at least one RIL population on all

linkage groups (Figure 3, Figure S7, Table S3). Globally, patterns of TRD are highly variable across

RIL populations. In the CAC110 and CAC415 RILs, the majority of distorted markers show an

excess of *M. guttatus* genotypes (~59% in CAC110 and ~80% in CAC415), whereas in the CAC162

RILs, there is a strong deficit of *M. guttatus* across the genome (~89% of distorted markers show

an excess of *M. nasutus*). In a few cases, the same region is even distorted in opposite directions

(e.g., at the beginning of LG4: *M. guttatus* excess in CAC110 RILs, *M. nasutus* excess in CAC162

RILs; Figure 3, Figure S7). Despite this general variability, there are a few instances of shared

distortion in multiple RIL populations, potentially implying the same causal mechanisms. Most

376
Figure 3. Transmission ratio distortion by map position, (a) Linkage group (LG) 1-7, (b) LG8-LG14. Genotype frequencies in
windowed 50kb markers across the 14 linkage groups of the three RIL populations. Red dots indicate homozygous *M. guttatus*
genotypes, yellow dots, homozygous *M. nasutus* genotypes. Bars at the top of each plot indicate regions showing significant
transmission ratio distortion from the Mendelian 1:1 expectation by χ^2 tests at α = 0.01 (thin bars), and a more stringent Bonferonni-
corrected α (thick bars, unique α for each chromosome in each RIL population depending on the number of markers tested, see Table
S3 for values). Bar color indicates an excess of *M. guttatus* (red), or *M. nasutus* (yellow) genotypes. Markers are ordered by genetic
position within each map (cM).

notably, the proximal end of LG14 shows an excess of *M. guttatus* alleles in all three

populations. There is also an excess of *M. guttatus* alleles on LGs 1 and 4 and an excess of *M.*

nasutus alleles on LGs 8, 12, and 13 in two of the three RIL populations (CAC110 and CAC162).

These regions of shared distortion are largely confined to segments of the genome that are non-

introgressed in parental lines. In addition to local peaks of TRD among homozygous marker

genotypes, we also investigated levels of residual heterozygosity in the three RIL populations. At

the SNP level (RIL windowed genotypes exclude heterozygous calls; see Methods), we observed

low levels of heterozygosity (~1.5-3%) consistent with Mendelian expectations in F6/F7 RILs.

Residual heterozygosity was broadly uniform across the genome, with no clear regions enriched

for heterozygous SNP calls.

Hybrid incompatibilities as a source of TRD

In each RIL population, we identified several instances of two-locus epistasis (10 in the

CAC110 RILs, 4 in the CAC162 RILs, 9 in the CAC415 RILs: Table 2; Table S5). All but one of these

23 cases are due to a deficit of heterospecific allele combinations, consistent with the action of

hybrid incompatibilities reducing viability or fertility during RIL formation. In 16 of these cases,

the underlying mechanism seems to be epistatic selection favoring the same parental genotypes

– that is, we observed either an excess of *M. guttatus* genotypes or *M. nasutus* genotypes at

both loci. In six cases, however, there are clear deficits of only one of the two heterospecific

genotype combinations *and* the expected single-locus distortion stemming from selection

against the incompatible genotype at each locus (Table 2). This asymmetry is a hallmark of

Dobzhansky-Muller incompatibilities. In four of the six cases, loci involved in these

Table 2. Positions of two-locus epistasis. Physical (Mb) positions of pairs of loci on each linkage group (LG) in the three RIL populations that show LD (r) in the 95th percentile, as well as Chi-Square statistics from likelihood ratio tests with p<0.0001. Counts of each genotypic class in the population are shown. Loci marked with an asterisk have peak r and χ^2 values at adjacent markers. Single locus proportions of *M. guttatus* alleles (G Prop.) were used to determine if the pattern of TRD at each epistatic locus could be explained by a two-locus hybrid incompatibility (NG- or GN-), or if epistatic selection favoring the same parental genotypes better explains the pattern (GG or NN). The best candidates for two locus hybrid incompatibilities are shaded grey. See Table S5 for full list of epistatic loci in LD 95th percentile.

Population	Locus 1 LG	Locus 1 Mb	Locus 2 LG	Locus 2 Mb	r	GG	GN	NG	NN	N	χ2	p	Locus 1 G Prop.	Locus 2 G Prop.	Pattern
	03	20.40 - 22.65	13	3.05 - 5.20	0.56	64	3	17	19	103	32.552	<0.0001	0.65	0.79	GG
	05	3.10 - 20.75	11	2.55 - 4.90	0.54	39	21	1	22	83	29.035	<0.0001	0.72	0.48	NG-
	01	11.15 - 12.85	04	1.20 - 19.65	0.46	73	13	12	19	117	22.858	<0.0001	0.74	0.73	GG
	02	2.85 - 18.95	13	21.75 - 23.65	0.45	54	1	26	14	95	21.079	<0.0001	0.58	0.84	GG
CAC110	09	0.80 - 0.90	11	26.30 - 26.60	0.38	29	37	6	54	126	19.359	<0.0001	0.52	0.28	NG-
	05	2.40 - 20.90	11	5.05 - 10.20*	0.50	43	14	5	17	79	18.697	<0.0001	0.72	0.61	GG
	03	0.15 - 18.95	11	24.35 - 25.30	0.40	29	24	12	56	121	18.567	<0.0001	0.44	0.34	NN
	11	8.80 - 24.40	12	1.00 - 19.2	0.44	18	12	12	59	101	17.988	<0.0001	0.30	0.30	NN
	01	3.30 - 5.50	11	4.00 - 5.75	0.47	29	9	10	24	72	16.515	<0.0001	0.53	0.54	GG
	05	2.25 - 3.50	13	24.00 - 25.00	0.44	54	13	7	14	88	15.846	<0.0001	0.76	0.69	GG
	04	19.90 - 22.80	14	2.35 - 18.15	0.50	29	10	14	44	97	24.708	<0.0001	0.40	0.44	NN
CAC162	01	1.40 - 5.55	10	19.65 - 19.95	0.54	27	9	8	31	75	23.571	<0.0001	0.48	0.47	NN
	06	6.30 - 15.10	12	6.20 - 7.75	0.47	9	50	23	15	97	21.637	<0.0001	0.61	0.33	-
	01	2.35 - 5.45	03	0.00 - 20.65	0.45	28	21	7	42	98	20.628	<0.0001	0.50	0.36	NG-
	04	1.90 - 22.30	14	2.15 - 25.60	0.61	34	9	7	31	81	31.85	<0.0001	0.53	0.51	GG
	06	17.00 - 19.25	10	19.50 - 20.25	0.43	38	0	22	13	73	22.217	<0.0001	0.52	0.82	GG
	05	3.50 - 20.40	14	16.50 - 23.00	0.49	26	5	17	32	80	19.799	<0.0001	0.39	0.54	GN-
	07	13.20 - 21.80	08	22.30 - 27.70	0.48	23	7	14	38	82	19.719	<0.0001	0.37	0.45	NN
CAC415	13	22.05 - 25.55	14	0.00 - 3.00	0.47	41	6	15	20	82	18.738	<0.0001	0.57	0.68	GG
	06	9.65 - 16.00	08	23.60 - 25.55	0.44	22	10	12	37	81	15.892	<0.0001	0.40	0.42	NN
	01	5.85 - 7.40	04	4.10 - 16.55	0.43	32	6	18	24	80	15.338	<0.0001	0.48	0.63	GN-
	01	7.70 - 11.70	13	24.20 - 25.15	0.42	24	4	22	30	80	15.279	<0.0001	0.35	0.58	GN-
	05	20.85 - 21.75	06	7.10 - 16.05	0.43	20	11	11	40	82	15.242	<0.0001	0.38	0.38	NN

incompatibilities occur exclusively in non-introgressed regions. However, in two of the pairs, one

or both loci reside in introgressed blocks, suggesting there may also be segregating

incompatibilities within CAC *M. nasutus*. As with overall patterns of TRD, regions involved in

two-locus epistasis are largely population specific (although in some cases, we likely have

limited power to detect shared epistasis due to small sample sizes and genetic background

effects).

Genetics of hybrid fertility traits

Despite six generations of selfing, all three RIL populations exhibited substantial

variation in male fertility. Some of this variation may be due to inbreeding depression in *M.*

guttatus parental lines, which showed lower pollen viability than the *M. nasutus* parent (Figure

S14). However, heterospecific interactions are likely also involved, as all three RIL populations

include a considerable fraction of individuals (~10-22%) with pollen viability <50% (well below

the *M. guttatus* average of 72%; Figure S14). In the CAC110 RIL population, we mapped five

pollen viability QTLs accounting for ~36% of variance, including two separate epistatic pairs

(Table 3; Figure 4). One of these epistatic pairs leads to reduced male fertility in RILs with *M.*

nasutus alleles on LG4 and *M. guttatus* alleles on LG14 (Figure S15a). The pattern of TRD at

these same loci (excess of *M. guttatus* on LG4 and *M. nasutus* alleles on LG14; Figure 3) might

suggest the action of a gametic incompatibility that reduces pollen viability, but other genetic

mechanisms are also possible (e.g., a sporophytic incompatibility that reduces pollen viability to

the point of preventing effective self-fertilization/seed production). The second epistatic pair in

the CAC110 RIL population – between QTLs on LG12 and LG14 – also arises due to a negative

Table 3. Male and female fertility QTL locations and effects in each mapping population. Linkage group (LG), map (cM), and physical
(Mb) position of each significant QTL is shown. Additive effects (a) are negative when the *M. guttatus* allele has the lower value,
indicated in the summary column. QTLs with significant epistatic effects are shaded together. Percentage of RIL population variance
(PVE) is shown for each additive and epistatic effect. The 1.5-LOD interval of the QTLs underlying female fertility on LG10 in the
CAC415 RILs, marked with an asterisk, spans a breakpoint of the known derived inversion in the reference *M. guttatus* line IM62,
leading to a disjunct interval. Effect plots are shown in Figures S15-S18.

Population	Trait	LG	cM Position (1.5 LOD)	Mb Position (1.5 LOD)	Additive effect				Epistatic effect			
					a	PVE (%)	p	Summary	a x a	PVE (%)	p	Summary
CAC110 RILs	Male Fertility	4	26.975 (21.030 - 36.595)	16.70 - 16.75 (4.50 - 19.65)	-0.145	7.746	0.0008	G+	0.347	6.786	0.0004	NN+ (NG-)
		14	42.717 (37.467 - 48.317)	3.40 - 3.85 (3.05 - 4.30)	0.474	13.876	<0.0001	N+				
		11	132.951 (131.376 - 137.499)	26.65 - 26.70 (26.60 - 32.20)	-0.278	4.054	0.0059	G+				
		12	87.711 (80.538 - 101.548)	24.45 - 24.55 (23.25 - 25.80)	0.080	5.620	0.0055	N+	0.302	5.037	0.0022	NN+ (NG-)
		14	114.441 (112.343 - 116.889)	25.20 - 25.40 (25.00 - 25.60)	0.230	10.317	<0.0001	N+				
	Female Fertility	2	71.214 (62.399 - 86.970)	18.90 - 18.95 (18.40 - 20.55)	0.991	9.736	0.0001	N+				
		3	15.741 (11.890 - 20.758)	18.95 - 19.10 (18.40 - 19.95)	0.747	6.820	0.0012	N+				
		4	21.030 (16.833 - 26.101)	4.50 - 4.75 (3.85 - 16.70)	0.968	10.245	<0.0001	N+				
CAC162 RILs	Male Fertility	6	95.776 (90.673 - 95.776)	20.70 - 20.90 (19.25 - 20.90)	0.490	10.010	0.0011	N+				
		14	57.509 (54.192 - 61.594)	15.90 - 16.20 (7.05 - 16.80)	0.680	19.320	<0.0001	N+				
	Female Fertility	NA										
CAC415 RILs	Male Fertility	NA										
	Female Fertility	10	51.596 (48.660 - 53.554)	5.70 - 5.75 (4.50 - 5.75, 1.40 - 1.80)*	1.473	12.439	0.0022	N+				

Figure 4. Male and female fertility QTL locations in each mapping population. Physical position (Mb) of the 1.5-LOD interval of each significant QTL is shown. Phenotype and RIL population indicated in key. Arrows indicate the position of peak marker(s). Arrows pointing left indicate the *M. guttatus* allele has the lower value, arrows pointing right indicate the *M. nasutus* allele has the lower value. QTLs with significant epistatic effects are indicated with shared symbols. The 1.5-LOD interval of the QTL underlying female fertility on Chr10 in the CAC415 RILs spans a breakpoint of the known derived inversion in the reference *M. guttatus* line IM62, leading to a disjunct interval. Centromere locations are indicated in black.

heterospecific interaction (RILs homozygous for *M. nasutus* alleles on LG12 and *M. guttatus* on

LG14 have the lowest fertility; Figure S15c), although *M. nasutus* genotypes have higher pollen

fertility at each QTL individually (Table 3). At the remaining QTL for male fertility on LG11, *M.*

nasutus alleles result in lower pollen viabilities (opposite to parental values), suggesting there

could be additional unmapped loci that interact with this QTL to decrease male fertility. In the

CAC162 RIL population, we mapped two QTLs for pollen viability (accounting for ~28% of the

variance), but because we detected no epistasis between them and *M. nasutus* alleles increased

fertility at both, these effects might be due to inbreeding depression or to incompatibilities with

additional loci below our detection thresholds. We mapped no QTLs for male fertility in the

CAC415 RIL population.

For female fertility, all three *M. guttatus* parents had much lower fruit production than

the *M. nasutus* parent, suggesting substantial inbreeding depression affecting this trait (Figure

S14). Accordingly, all QTLs we identified – three in the CAC110 RIL and one in the CAC415 RIL –

were additive with *M. nasutus* alleles increasing fertility (Table 3).

Discussion

Closely related species living in secondary sympatry, especially those displaying

incomplete reproductive isolation and still experiencing gene flow, provide an opportunity to

investigate the evolution and maintenance of reproductive barriers in nature. Here we construct

three RIL populations in one such system: hybridizing sister species *Mimulus guttatus* and *M.*

nasutus from the sympatric site Catherine Creek. Our multi-parent crossing design allows for a

uniquely powerful assessment of postzygotic barriers in a naturally admixed and highly

genetically diverse population. Overall, patterns of TRD and long-range LD, along with

interacting QTLs for hybrid sterility, provide evidence of multiple segregating hybrid

incompatibilities between these naturally hybridizing species. Additionally, these RILs are now a

permanent resource to be used in research on adaptation and speciation in *Mimulus*, facilitating

future experiments to identify the genes involved in hybrid incompatibilities and understand

their ecological context across environmental conditions.

Introgression in sympatry: M. nasutus ancestry in CAC M. guttatus

Consistent with previous work showing signatures of ongoing and historical

introgression at Catherine Creek (Brandvain *et al.*, 2014; Kenney & Sweigart, 2016), we

identified many clear tracks of admixture from *M. nasutus* across the genomes of the *M.*

guttatus parental lines (despite having chosen these lines for their species-diagnostic traits).

Despite pervasive admixture, these studies also showed a genome-wide, negative correlation

between recombination rate and divergence between species at Catherine Creek (Brandvain *et*

al., 2014; Kenney & Sweigart, 2016). This same negative correlation has been discovered in

several other systems (Begun & Aquadro, 1993; Takahashi *et al.*, 2004; Keinan & Reich, 2010)

and is evidence that, in general, natural selection acts against *M. nasutus* ancestry in *M.*

guttatus genetic backgrounds. Consistent with this idea, many regions of introgression in the

three *M. guttatus* are unique to a single line. Despite this general pattern, two regions of

introgression, at the ends of chromosomes 3 and 4, are present in all three *M. guttatus* lines.

These same two regions also show elevated levels of gene flow (relative to the genome-wide

average) in wild admixed individuals at CAC (Figure 4, Kenney & Sweigart, 2016) suggesting they

might carry loci that are universally adaptive (Suarez-Gonzalez *et al.*, 2018) or that spread

through selfish processes (Lindholm & Price, 2016).

A key question at Catherine Creek is whether introgression is continuously renewed

through recent hybridization or instead reflects the remnants of past events. Nearly one-quarter

of the CAC110 genome shows evidence of *M. nasutus* ancestry, the expectation for a second-

generation (backcross) hybrid. Although this line does contain large genomic regions with

primarily *M. nasutus* ancestry (Figure S4), the largest actual block of introgression detected by

the HMM is only ~1.1 Mb, much smaller than what is expected in an early hybrid. In some

cases, there might be technical reasons for these breaks in introgression – genotyping errors, for

instance, or underestimates by the HMM (see Brandvain *et al.*, 2014, Text S1). However, we

note that use of variants in these regions largely improves the RIL genetic maps, indicating that

the breaks might often have biological causes. For example, crosses between hybrid individuals

might combine previously independent admixture events into larger, nearly contiguous blocks.

At Catherine Creek, we find evidence of a stable admixed population in certain microsites over a

period of more than 10 years (Farnitano et al., unpublished results), suggesting such mating

events might be quite frequent. Additionally, some of these apparent breaks in introgression

could be due to variation in *M. nasutus*, which has an average nucleotide diversity of ~1%

(Brandvain et al. 2014). Although most of this *M. nasutus* genetic variation is likely segregating

between rather than within populations (Sweigart & Willis, 2003), the long history of

introgression at Catherine Creek (Brandvain *et al.*, 2014; Kenney & Sweigart, 2016) might inflate

diversity between contemporary and remnants of past CAC *M. nasutus* samples (the latter

contained in introgressions). Finally, although introgression at Catherine Creek is highly

asymmetric, interspecific gene flow does occasionally go in the opposite direction, introducing

M. guttatus alleles into *M. nasutus* (Brandvain *et al.*, 2014). Such variation in *M. nasutus* could

also contribute to small blocks of *M. guttatus* ancestry identified within larger blocks of

introgression.

M. nasutus as a source of structural variation in sympatric M. guttatus

From this small sample of only three *M. guttatus* lines*,* we identified three previously

unknown structural variants segregating within *M. guttatus* at CAC, two of which appear to have

been introduced into *M. guttatus* from *M. nasutus.* Unlike reciprocal translocations, which can

cause F1 fertility problems through direct impacts on chromosomal segregation (Stathos &

Fishman, 2014; Sotola *et al.*, 2023), inversions often do not directly induce underdominant

hybrid sterility in plants (Fishman & Sweigart, 2018; Huang & Rieseberg, 2020; Zhang *et al.*,

2021). Nevertheless, loci for reproductive isolation have often been shown to map to inversions

(Noor *et al.*, 2001a,b; Livingstone & Rieseberg, 2004; Huang & Rieseberg, 2020; Todesco *et al.*,

2020), potentially because, in species still connected by some degree of gene flow, they prevent

selection from purging incompatibilities (Noor et al. 2001b) or lock together multiple linked

variants involved in divergent adaptation (Rieseberg et al. 2001, Kirkpatrick & Barton 2006).

Although none of the hybrid sterility QTLs we discovered map to any of the three inversions,

several putative incompatibilities do (Table 2, Figure S6), suggesting structural variation might

play a role in maintaining postzygotic isolation at Catherine Creek. Going forward, it will also be

important to determine whether traits involved in divergent ecological adaptation between CAC

M. nasutus and *M. guttatus* (Mantel & Sweigart, 2019) map to any of these inversions as has

been shown in ecotypes of *M. guttatus* (Lowry & Willis 2010) and sunflowers (Todesco et al.

2020).

Whatever their functional and fitness effects may be, the three inversions are likely to

have a large impact on patterns of admixture at Catherine Creek. In the most admixed of the

three *M. guttatus* parents (CAC110), roughly one-quarter of the introgression is within the

boundaries of the *inv1.2* and *inv13* inversions (Figure S2, Figure S6). An open question is

whether inverted regions display elevated levels of divergence as expected if they

disproportionately contribute to reproductive isolation and adaptive divergence (Noor et al.

2001, Rieseberg et al. 2001). If so, taking these regions into account might actually strengthen

the previously discovered negative relationship between absolute divergence and local

recombination (Brandvain *et al.*, 2014; Kenney & Sweigart, 2016), which relied on estimates of

recombination from genetic maps between non-CAC accessions.

Variation in transmission ratio distortion and postzygotic isolation across experimental hybrid

populations

Previous comparisons of TRD in *Mimulus* crosses between a common *M. guttatus* parent

(the annual line IM62) and either an allopatric *M. nasutus* line (SF) or a perennial *M. guttatus*

line (DUN) showed strong, but largely non-overlapping patterns of TRD (Hall & Willis 2005). In

this study, too, we find that patterns of TRD are highly variable across the three RIL populations,

although differences here can be attributed only to diversity within CAC *M. guttatus*. It is well

known that individual populations of *M. guttatus* contain a tremendous amount of genetic

variation (Flagel *et al.*, 2014; Puzey *et al.*, 2017) often with important phenotypic effects (Willis,

1992; Mojica *et al.*, 2012; Monnahan & Kelly, 2017). This study suggests this variation might

also have profound effects on reproductive barriers between species.

Although TRD may arise through several mechanisms (Fishman & McIntosh 2019), only

some of them are expected to produce the polymorphism we observe among RIL populations. A

consistent signal of TRD is expected in regions affected by purifying selection against weakly

deleterious *M. nasutus* alleles (i.e., hybridization load: Moran *et al.*, 2021) or by environmental

selection favoring *M. nasutus* alleles at loci responsive to the greenhouse growth conditions. On

the other hand, environmental selection favoring *M. guttatus* alleles (including epistatic

selection – see Table 2) will produce a consistent signal only if all three CAC *M. guttatus* parents

share the same functional alleles at causal loci. Similarly, inbreeding depression in *M. guttatus*

might be expected to produce variable patterns of TRD given that it is often caused by rare

deleterious alleles (Willis, 1999a,b). Because meiotic drivers are generally expected to fix rapidly

in the absence of associated fitness costs (Burt & Trivers, 1998), they might seem unlikely to

contribute to variable TRD. However, one such well-characterized driver – the centromeric *D*

allele in *M. guttatus* – is polymorphic in the Iron Mountain population where it was discovered,

and linked to alleles that reduce ferility (Fishman & Saunders, 2008). Thus, even selfish

segregation distorters might contribute to the variable patterns of TRD we observe in the CAC

RILs.

577   Another well-known cause of distortion – and the one with the most relevance for

speciation – is the reduced viability of gametes or zygotes due to hybrid incompatibilities

(Leppälä *et al.*, 2013; Kerwin & Sweigart, 2017). During RIL construction, gametic

incompatibilities may be particularly likely to persist, as even RILs with fewer viable ovules or

pollen grains can be successfully self-fertilized. Gametic incompatibilities affecting male and

female fertility have been identified in crosses between *M. guttatus* and *M. nasutus* (Kerwin &

Sweigart 2017) and between *M. parishii* and *M. cardinalis* (Sotola *et al.*, 2023), and the

genotypic ratios observed at many putative two-locus incompatibilities at CAC (Table 2) are

consistent with this mechanism of action. On the other hand, given that QTLs associated with

reductions in pollen viability (Table 3) do not map to distorted regions, it seems likely that these

incompatibilities disrupt male fertility in the diploid sporophyte. Whatever their mechanism, a

key point for this study is that hybrid incompatibilities between closely related species are often

polymorphic (López-Fernández & Bolnick, 2007; Cutter, 2012; Corbett-Detig *et al.*, 2013;

Charron *et al.*, 2014; Servedio & Hermisson, 2020). Moreover, in *Mimulus*, hybrid

incompatibility loci often vary *within* populations (Christie & Macnair, 1987; Sweigart *et al.*,

2007; Sweigart & Flagel, 2015; Zuellig & Sweigart, 2018a). In one case of duplicate genes that

cause hybrid seedling inviability between sympatric *M. guttatus* and *M. nasutus* at Don Pedro

Reservoir (DPR) in California (Zuellig & Sweigart, 2018b), at least some of the polymorphism

seems to be due to introgression from *M. nasutus* into *M. guttatus* (Zuellig & Sweigart, 2018a).

Given the large amount of admixture observed in CAC *M. guttatus*, it seems highly probable

that, like at DPR, interspecific gene flow contributes to polymorphism in hybrid incompatibilities

at Catherine Creek.

599   Despite this general variability, there is one region at the end of chromosome 14

consistently distorted in all three RIL populations (with an excess of *M. guttatus* alleles), which

may point to a conserved mechanism. This same region actually showed the opposite pattern of

distortion (an excess of *M. nasutus* alleles) in F_2 hybrids between IM62 *M. guttatus* and SF *M.*

nasutus (Fishman *et al.*, 2001, 2008), suggesting the underlying mechanism is not shared

species-wide and might be unique to CAC.

Conclusions

607   Overall, these RIL populations provide evidence of diverse contributors to postzygotic

isolation between *Mimulus* species, suggesting long-term persistence of hybrids at Catherine

Creek may be unlikely. Even highly admixed *M. guttatus* individuals carry alleles at multiple loci

that are incompatible with *M. nasutus*. This substantial load of hybrid incompatibilities may help

explain the observed cline of *M. nasutus* introgression in wild admixed individuals at Catherine

Creek (Kenney & Sweigart, 2016), which seems to suggest persistent backcrossing to *M.*

guttatus and purging of *M. nasutus* ancestry. Moreover, our findings of genome-wide TRD and

several retained fertility QTLs in the RILs supports previous evidence for broad, genome-wide

selection against *M. nasutus* ancestry in an *M. guttatus* background (Brandvain *et al.*, 2014;

Kenney & Sweigart, 2016). Thus, despite a long history of admixture at Catherine Creek,

intrinsic barriers between *Mimulus* species remain pervasive, limiting the homogenizing effects

of gene flow and, potentially, playing a key role in the maintenance of species.

Author Contributions

Research conceived and designed by SJM and ALS. Data collected and analyzed by SJM.

Manuscript written by SJM and ALS.

Data Accessibility

All whole genome sequence data of inbred lines and RADseq data of RILs will be

deposited at the NCBI Sequence Read Archive upon acceptance. Other data and scripts will be

made available from the Dryad Digital Repository.

Acknowledgements

We thank Amanda Kenney for seed collection at Catherine Creek. We are also grateful to

Aaliyah Stoudemire, Violet Iyahne, Suni Thakur, Brennen Anderson, and Selma Kajtazovic for

assistance with RIL creation, and Michaela Yarbough, Inam Jameel, and Mohamed Elgallad for

help with RIL crossing and fertility phenotyping. We thank greenhouse staff, Greg Cousins, Kevin

Tanner, Noah Hentherinton, and Mike Boyd for plant care. Jill Anderson, Lisa Donovan, Bob

Schmitz, and Mike White provided helpful discussions and guidance. Makenzie Whitener, Matt

Farnitano, and Natalie Gonzalez provided valuable comments on a previous draft. This work was

supported by a National Science Foundation grant [IOS-1827645 to ALS]; [DEB-1856223 to ALS];

funds from the University of Georgia Research Foundation [to ALS]; the National Institute of

General Medical Sciences of the National Institute of Health [T32GM007103 to SJM]; and the

UGA Genetics Jan and Kirby Alton Graduate Fellowship [to SJM].

Competing Interests

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

ORCID

Samuel J. Mantel https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6392-4022

References

Ali OA, O'Rourke SM, Amish SJ, Meek MH, Luikart G, Jeffres C, Miller MR. **2016**. RAD Capture
(Rapture): Flexible and Efficient Sequence-Based Genotyping. *Genetics* **202**: 389–400.

Arends D, Prins P, Jansen RC, Broman KW. **2010**. R/qtl: high-throughput multiple QTL mapping.
Bioinformatics **26**: 2990–2992.

Aylor DL, Valdar W, Foulds-Mathes W, Buus RJ, Verdugo RA, Baric RS, Ferris MT, Frelinger JA,
Heise M, Frieman MB, *et al.* **2011**. Genetic analysis of complex traits in the emerging
Collaborative Cross. *Genome Research* **21**: 1213–1222.

Barker WR, Nesom GL, Beardsley PM, Fraga NS. **2012**. A taxonomic conspectus of Phrymaceae:
A narrowed circumscription for Mimulus, new and resurrected genera, and new names and
combinations. *Phytoneuron* **2012–39**: 1–60.

Begun DJ, Aquadro CF. **1993**. African and North American populations of Drosophila
melanogaster are very different at the DNA level. *Nature* **365**: 548–550.

Brandvain Y, Kenney AM, Flagel L, Coop G, Sweigart AL. **2014**. Speciation and Introgression
between Mimulus nasutus and Mimulus guttatus. *PLOS Genetics* **10**: e1004410.

Broman KW, Sen S. **2009**. *A Guide to QTL Mapping with R/qtl*. New York, NY: Springer New York.

Burt A, Trivers R. **1998**. Selfish DNA and breeding system in flowering plants. *Proceedings of the*
Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences **265**: 141–146.

Caeiro-Dias G, Brelsford A, Meneses-Ribeiro M, Crochet P-A, Pinho C. 2023. Hybridization in
late stages of speciation: Strong but incomplete genome-wide reproductive isolation and 'large
Z-effect' in a moving hybrid zone. *Molecular Ecology* **32**: 4362–4380.

Charron G, Leducq J-B, Landry CR. **2014**. Chromosomal variation segregates within incipient
species and correlates with reproductive isolation. *Molecular Ecology* **23**: 4362–4372.

Christie P, Macnair MR. **1987**. THE DISTRIBUTION OF POSTMATING REPRODUCTIVE ISOLATING
GENES IN POPULATIONS OF THE YELLOW MONKEY FLOWER, MIMULUS GUTTATUS. *Evolution* **41**:
571–578.

Colomé-Tatché M, Johannes F. 2016. Signatures of Dobzhansky–Muller Incompatibilities in the
Genomes of Recombinant Inbred Lines. *Genetics* **202**: 825–841.

Corbett-Detig RB, Zhou J, Clark AG, Hartl DL, Ayroles JF. **2013**. Genetic incompatibilities are
widespread within species. *Nature* **504**: 135–137.

Coyne JA, Orr HA. **2004**. *Speciation*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Cutter AD. **2012**. The polymorphic prelude to Bateson–Dobzhansky–Muller incompatibilities. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **27**: 209–218.

Darwin C. **1859**. *On the Origin of Species*.

Delmore KE, Hübner S, Kane NC, Schuster R, Andrew RL, Câmara F, Guigó R, Irwin DE. **2015**. Genomic analysis of a migratory divide reveals candidate genes for migration and implicates selective sweeps in generating islands of differentiation. *Molecular Ecology* **24**: 1873–1888.

Dobzhansky T. **1937**. *Genetics and the Origin of Species*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Durbin R, Eddy SR, Krogh A, Mitchison G. **1998**. *Biological Sequence Analysis: Probabilistic Models of Proteins and Nucleic Acids*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellegren H, Smeds L, Burri R, Olason PI, Backström N, Kawakami T, Künstner A, Mäkinen H, Nadachowska-Brzyska K, Qvarnström A, *et al.* 2012. The genomic landscape of species divergence in Ficedula flycatchers. *Nature* **491**: 756–760.

Feder JL, Roethele JB, Filchak K, Niedbalski J, Romero-Severson J. **2003**. Evidence for Inversion Polymorphism Related to Sympatric Host Race Formation in the Apple Maggot Fly, Rhagoletis pomonella. *Genetics* **163**: 939–953.

Fishman L, Aagaard J, Tuthill JC. **2008**. TOWARD THE EVOLUTIONARY GENOMICS OF GAMETOPHYTIC DIVERGENCE: PATTERNS OF TRANSMISSION RATIO DISTORTION IN MONKEYFLOWER (MIMULUS) HYBRIDS REVEAL A COMPLEX GENETIC BASIS FOR CONSPECIFIC POLLEN PRECEDENCE. *Evolution* **62**: 2958–2970.

Fishman L, Kelly AJ, Morgan E, Willis JH. **2001**. A Genetic Map in the Mimulus guttatus Species Complex Reveals Transmission Ratio Distortion due to Heterospecific Interactions. : 16.

Fishman L, McIntosh M. **2019**. Standard Deviations: The Biological Bases of Transmission Ratio Distortion. *Annual Review of Genetics* **53**: 347–372.

Fishman L, Sweigart AL. **2018**. When Two Rights Make a Wrong: The Evolutionary Genetics of Plant Hybrid Incompatibilities. *Annual Review of Plant Biology* **69**: 707–731.

Fishman L, Sweigart AL, Kenney AM, Campbell S. **2014a**. Major quantitative trait loci control divergence in critical photoperiod for flowering between selfing and outcrossing species of monkeyflower (Mimulus). *The New Phytologist* **201**: 1498–1507.

Fishman L, Willis JH, Wu CA, Lee Y-W. **2014b**. Comparative linkage maps suggest that fission, not polyploidy, underlies near-doubling of chromosome number within monkeyflowers (Mimulus; Phrymaceae). *Heredity* **112**: 562–568.

Flagel LE, Blackman BK, Fishman L, Monnahan PJ, Sweigart A, Kelly JK. **2019**. GOOGA: A
platform to synthesize mapping experiments and identify genomic structural diversity. *PLOS*
Computational Biology **15**: e1006949.

Flagel LE, Willis JH, Vision TJ. **2014**. The Standing Pool of Genomic Structural Variation in a
Natural Population of Mimulus guttatus. *Genome Biology and Evolution* **6**: 53–64.

Good JM, Handel MA, Nachman MW. **2008**. ASYMMETRY AND POLYMORPHISM OF HYBRID
MALE STERILITY DURING THE EARLY STAGES OF SPECIATION IN HOUSE MICE. *Evolution* **62**: 50–
65.

Hoffmann AA, Rieseberg LH. **2008**. Revisiting the Impact of Inversions in Evolution: From
Population Genetic Markers to Drivers of Adaptive Shifts and Speciation? *Annual Review of*
Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics **39**: 21–42.

Huang K, Rieseberg LH. **2020**. Frequency, Origins, and Evolutionary Role of Chromosomal
Inversions in Plants. *Frontiers in Plant Science* **11**.

Jansen RC, Stam P. **1994**. High resolution of quantitative traits into multiple loci via interval
mapping. *Genetics* **136**: 1447–1455.

Jones FC, Grabherr MG, Chan YF, Russell P, Mauceli E, Johnson J, Swofford R, Pirun M, Zody
MC, White S, *et al.* **2012**. The genomic basis of adaptive evolution in threespine sticklebacks.
Nature **484**: 55–61.

Kearns C, Inouye D. **1993**. *Techniques for Pollination Biologists*. Niwot, CO: University of
Colorado Press.

Keinan A, Reich D. **2010**. Human Population Differentiation Is Strongly Correlated with Local
Recombination Rate. *PLOS Genetics* **6**: e1000886.

Kenney AM, Sweigart AL. **2016**. Reproductive isolation and introgression between sympatric
Mimulus species. *Molecular Ecology* **25**: 2499–2517.

Kerwin RE, Sweigart AL. **2017**. Mechanisms of Transmission Ratio Distortion at Hybrid Sterility
Loci Within and Between Mimulus Species. *G3 Genes|Genomes|Genetics* **7**: 3719–3730.

Larson EL, White TA, Ross CL, Harrison RG. **2014**. Gene flow and the maintenance of species
boundaries. *Molecular Ecology* **23**: 1668–1678.

Leppälä J, Bokma F, Savolainen O. **2013**. Investigating Incipient Speciation in Arabidopsis lyrata
from Patterns of Transmission Ratio Distortion. *Genetics* **194**: 697–708.

Lindholm AK Guest Editors, Price TAR. **2016**. The evolutionary consequences of selfish genetic
elements. *Current Zoology* **62**: 655–658.

Livingstone K, Rieseberg L. **2004**. Chromosomal evolution and speciation: a recombination-
based approach. *New Phytologist* **161**: 107–112.

Long AD, Macdonald SJ, King EG. **2014**. Dissecting complex traits using the Drosophila Synthetic
Population Resource. *Trends in Genetics* **30**: 488–495.

López-Fernández H, Bolnick DI. **2007**. What Causes Partial F1 Hybrid Viability? Incomplete
Penetrance versus Genetic Variation. *PLOS ONE* **2**: e1294.

Lowry DB, Sobel JM, Angert AL, Ashman T-L, Baker RL, Blackman BK, Brandvain Y, Byers KJRP,
Cooley AM, Coughlan JM, *et al.* 2019. The case for the continued use of the genus name
Mimulus for all monkeyflowers. *TAXON* **68**: 617–623.

Lowry DB, Willis JH. **2010**. A Widespread Chromosomal Inversion Polymorphism Contributes to
a Major Life-History Transition, Local Adaptation, and Reproductive Isolation. *PLOS Biology* **8**:
e1000500.

Mantel SJ, Sweigart AL. **2019**. Divergence in drought-response traits between sympatric species
of Mimulus. *Ecology and Evolution* **9**: 10291–10304.

Martin NH, Willis JH. **2007**. Ecological Divergence Associated with Mating System Causes Nearly
Complete Reproductive Isolation between Sympatric Mimulus Species. *Evolution* **61**: 68–82.

Mayr E. **1942**. *Systematics And The Origin Of Species*.

Mojica JP, Lee YW, Willis JH, Kelly JK. **2012**. Spatially and temporally varying selection on
intrapopulation quantitative trait loci for a life history trade-off in Mimulus guttatus. *Molecular*
Ecology **21**: 3718–3728.

Monnahan PJ, Kelly JK. **2015**. Naturally segregating loci exhibit epistasis for fitness. *Biology*
Letters **11**: 20150498.

Monnahan PJ, Kelly JK. **2017**. The Genomic Architecture of Flowering Time Varies Across Space
and Time in Mimulus guttatus. *Genetics* **206**: 1621–1635.

Moran BM, Payne C, Langdon Q, Powell DL, Brandvain Y, Schumer M. **2021**. The genomic
consequences of hybridization (PJ Wittkopp, Ed.). *eLife* **10**: e69016.

Moyle LC, Nakazato T. **2008**. Comparative Genetics of Hybrid Incompatibility: Sterility in Two
Solanum Species Crosses. *Genetics* **179**: 1437–1453.

Nesom GL, Fraga NS, Barker WR, Beardsley PM, Tank DC, Baldwin BG, Olmstead RG. **2019**.
Response to "The case for the continued use of the genus name Mimulus for all
monkeyflowers". *TAXON* **68**: 624–627.

Nolte AW, Gompert Z, Buerkle CA. **2009**. Variable patterns of introgression in two sculpin hybrid
zones suggest that genomic isolation differs among populations. *Molecular Ecology* **18**: 2615–
2627.

Noor MAF, Grams KL, Bertucci LA, Almendarez Y, Reiland J, Smith KR. **2001a**. The Genetics of
Reproductive Isolation and the Potential for Gene Exchange between Drosophila pseudoobscura
and D. persimilis via Backcross Hybrid Males. *Evolution* **55**: 512–521.

Noor MAF, Grams KL, Bertucci LA, Reiland J. **2001b**. Chromosomal inversions and the
reproductive isolation of species. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **98**: 12084–
12088.

Paradis E. **2010**. pegas: an R package for population genetics with an integrated–modular
approach. *Bioinformatics* **26**: 419–420.

Puzey JR, Willis JH, Kelly JK. **2017**. Population structure and local selection yield high genomic
variation in Mimulus guttatus. *Molecular Ecology* **26**: 519–535.

Rastas P. **2017**. Lep-MAP3: robust linkage mapping even for low-coverage whole genome
sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* **33**: 3726–3732.

Renaut S, Grassa CJ, Yeaman S, Moyers BT, Lai Z, Kane NC, Bowers JE, Burke JM, Rieseberg LH.
2013. Genomic islands of divergence are not affected by geography of speciation in sunflowers.
Nature Communications **4**: 1827.

Scott MF, Ladejobi O, Amer S, Bentley AR, Biernaskie J, Boden SA, Clark M, Dell'Acqua M,
Dixon LE, Filippi CV, *et al.* **2020**. Multi-parent populations in crops: a toolbox integrating
genomics and genetic mapping with breeding. *Heredity* **125**: 396–416.

Servedio MR, Hermisson J. **2020**. The evolution of partial reproductive isolation as an adaptive
optimum. *Evolution* **74**: 4–14.

Servedio MR, Kirkpatrick M. **1997**. The Effects of Gene Flow on Reinforcement. *Evolution* **51**:
1764–1772.

Sotola VA, Berg CS, Samuli M, Chen H, Mantel SJ, Beardsley PA, Yuan Y-W, Sweigart AL,
Fishman L. **2023**. Genomic mechanisms and consequences of diverse postzygotic barriers
between monkeyflower species. : 2023.04.21.537885.

Stathos A, Fishman L. **2014**. Chromosomal rearrangements directly cause underdominant F1
pollen sterility in Mimulus lewisii–Mimulus cardinalis hybrids. *Evolution* **68**: 3109–3119.

Sweigart AL, Flagel LE. **2015**. Evidence of Natural Selection Acting on a Polymorphic Hybrid
Incompatibility Locus in Mimulus. *Genetics* **199**: 543–554.

Sweigart AL, Mason AR, Willis JH. **2007**. NATURAL VARIATION FOR A HYBRID INCOMPATIBILITY
BETWEEN TWO SPECIES OF MIMULUS. *Evolution* **61**: 141–151.

Sweigart AL, Willis JH. **2003**. Patterns of Nucleotide Diversity in Two Species of Mimulus Are
Affected by Mating System and Asymmetric Introgression. *Evolution* **57**: 2490–2506.

Takahashi A, Liu Y-H, Saitou N. **2004**. Genetic Variation Versus Recombination Rate in a
Structured Population of Mice. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **21**: 404–409.

Taylor EB, Boughman JW, Groenenboom M, Sniatynski M, Schluter D, Gow JL. **2006**. Speciation
in reverse: morphological and genetic evidence of the collapse of a three-spined stickleback
(Gasterosteus aculeatus) species pair. *Molecular Ecology* **15**: 343–355.

Teeter KC, Thibodeau LM, Gompert Z, Buerkle CA, Nachman MW, Tucker PK. **2010**. The
Variable Genomic Architecture of Isolation Between Hybridizing Species of House Mice.
Evolution **64**: 472–485.

Todesco M, Owens GL, Bercovich N, Légaré J-S, Soudi S, Burge DO, Huang K, Ostevik KL,
Drummond EBM, Imerovski I, *et al.* **2020**. Massive haplotypes underlie ecotypic differentiation
in sunflowers. *Nature*: 1–6.

Willis JH. **1992**. Genetic analysis of inbreeding depression caused by chlorophyll-deficient
lethals in Mimulus guttatus. *Heredity* **69**: 562–572.

Willis JH. **1999a**. The contribution of male-sterility mutations to inbreeding depression in
Mimulus guttatus. *Heredity* **83**: 337–346.

Willis JH. **1999b**. Inbreeding Load, Average Dominance and the Mutation Rate for Mildly
Deleterious Alleles in Mimulus guttatus. *Genetics* **153**: 1885–1898.

Yu J, Holland JB, McMullen MD, Buckler ES. **2008**. Genetic Design and Statistical Power of
Nested Association Mapping in Maize. *Genetics* **178**: 539–551.

Zeng ZB. **1993**. Theoretical basis for separation of multiple linked gene effects in mapping
quantitative trait loci. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **90**: 10972–10976.

Zeng ZB. **1994**. Precision mapping of quantitative trait loci. *Genetics* **136**: 1457–1468.

Zhang L, Reifová R, Halenková Z, Gompert Z. **2021**. How Important Are Structural Variants for
Speciation? *Genes* **12**: 1084.

Zuellig MP, Sweigart AL. **2018a**. A two-locus hybrid incompatibility is widespread, polymorphic,
and active in natural populations of Mimulus*. *Evolution* **72**: 2394–2405.

Zuellig MP, Sweigart AL. **2018b**. Gene duplicates cause hybrid lethality between sympatric
species of Mimulus. *PLOS Genetics* **14**: e1007130.