Reproductive isolation due to divergent ecological selection is accompanied by vast genomic

instability in experimentally evolved yeast populations

Running head: Ecological isolation barriers in yeast

Devin P. Bendixsen[1,2], Ciaran Gilchrist[1], Chloé Haberkorn[1], Karl Persson[3], Cecilia Geijer[3], Jonas Warringer[4],

Rike Stelkens[1]*

[1] Department of Zoology, Stockholm University, Svante Arrheniusväg 18 B, 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden

[2] Department of Genetics, Harvard Medical School, 77 Avenue Louis Pasteur, 02115, Boston, MA, USA

[3] Division of Industrial Biotechnology, Department of Life Sciences, Chalmers University of Technology,

Kemigården 1, 412 96 Göteborg, Sweden

[4] Department of Chemistry and Molecular Biology, University of Gothenburg, Medicinaregatan 9C,

41390 Göteborg, Sweden

* Corresponding author: Rike Stelkens, Department of Zoology Stockholm University, telephone: +46 (0)

816 4223; email: rike.stelkens@zoologi.su.se

Devin Bendixsen: 0000-0003-0831-7646; devin.bendixsen@gmail.com

Ciaran Gilchrist: 0000-0002-7639-6131; ciaran.gilchrist@umu.se

Chloé Haberkorn: 0000-0002-7371-9177; chloe.haberkorn@zoologi.su.se

Karl Persson: 0000-0002-2173-8165; karperss@chalmers.se

Cecilia Geijer: 0000-0002-4158-2938; cecilia.geijer@chalmers.se

Jonas Warringer: 0000-0001-6144-2740; jonas.warringer@cmb.gu.se

Rike Stelkens: 0000-0002-8530-0656; rike.stelkens@zoologi.su.se

Abstract

Populations evolving independently in divergent environments accumulate genetic differences and potentially evolve reproductive isolation as a by-product of divergence. The speed and mechanisms underlying this process are difficult to investigate because we rarely get the opportunity to witness them in natural settings, and histories of selection and gene flow between populations are often unknown. Here, we experimentally evolved yeast for 1000 generations of evolution in both divergent and parallel environments. At regular time points during experimental evolution, we made crosses between parallel- and divergent-evolving populations to measure postzygotic reproductive isolation (gamete viability). We used whole genome population sequencing to determine the mutational load, the number and types of structural variation, and other genomic features of the parent, F1, and F2 intraspecific hybrids. We found evidence for large scale phenotypic and genome-wide differentiation in response to divergent laboratory selection. Divergent-selected populations produced hybrids with reduced gamete viability - a classic signature of postzygotic reproductive isolation in the form of hybrid breakdown. Parallel-selected populations on the other hand remained more reproductively compatible (with exceptions). We found that F2 hybrid genomes contained vast genomic instability, i.e., new structural variants (especially insertions, deletions, and interchromosomal translocations) that were not observed in parent and F1 genomes, which is likely a result of chromosome missegregation and recombination errors in hybrid meiosis. Our results provide phenotypic and genomic evidence that partial reproductive isolation evolved due to adaptation to divergent environments, consistent with predictions of ecological speciation theory.

Keywords: experimental evolution, hybridization, mutational load, reproductive isolation, *Saccharomyces,* structural variation

Introduction

Ecological speciation implies a process by which adaptation to different ecological niches, in allopatry or sympatry, leads to the evolution of reproductive isolation between populations (Mayr 1947; Rice and Hostert 1993; Schluter 2001; McKinnon et al. 2004; Nosil 2012). Long-term monitoring of natural populations has been valuable in linking ecological traits with the emergence of reproductive barriers (e.g. (Filchak et al. 2000; Rundle et al. 2000; Grant and Grant 2003; Funk et al. 2006; Sawada et al. 2022)), providing convincing arguments for ecological factors to play a role in driving population divergence. However, ecological speciation remains difficult to demonstrate because it usually proceeds over extended evolutionary times (Hendry et al. 2007), trait divergence is often cryptic (Struck et al. 2018; Sparks et al. 2022), and the evolutionary histories of natural populations are challenging to reconstruct. It is usually unknown whether divergent selection was present, how long it lasted, and what the timing and amount of gene flow was between populations. Thus, it often remains unclear, especially between allopatric species pairs occupying different niches, whether divergent, ecology-based selection was the driving force underlying their divergence, eventually leading to speciation (Anderson and Weir 2022; Irestedt et al.; Müller et al.). Due to these constraints, studies have often relied on combinatorial approaches, using i) data on niche divergence in traits related to habitat use, such as resource utilization or foraging behavior (e.g. (Hatfield and Schluter 1999; Nosil and Crespi 2006; Munar-Delgado et al. 2024), ii) data on reproductive barriers, such as differences in mating behaviors or flowering times reducing gene flow between populations adapted to different ecological niches (e.g. (Dieckmann et al. 2004; Villa et al. 2019)), and iii) genetic data, detecting signatures of selection and divergence in genetic regions associated with ecological adaptation and reproductive isolation (e.g. (Nosil and Schluter 2011; Härer et al. 2021; Louder et al. 2024)).

Microbial experimental evolution provides a powerful tool for investigating questions in evolutionary biology. It has been used to describe the dynamics and genetic mechanisms underlying

adaptation to stable (Lenski et al. 1991; Good et al. 2017; Johnson and Desai 2022), heterogenous

(Rainey and Travisano 1998), or changing environments (Bell and Gonzalez 2011; Gorter et al. 2016;

Gorter et al. 2017) and to test theoretical predictions about adaptation rates in sexual versus asexual

populations (McDonald et al. 2016; Kosheleva and Desai 2018; Leu et al. 2020). Experimental evolution

with microbes can also provide insights on fundamental questions in speciation, especially about the

early stages of divergence, i.e. why, how and when lineages split (Stelkens 2024). Microbial genomes are

often small and generation times are short, allowing for evolve-and-resequencing approaches to capture

speciation and its underlying genetic basis in action. For instance, experimental evolution with a virus

(lambda bacteriophage) and its bacterial host (*Escherichia coli*) has demonstrated that divergent

ecological selection caused the phages to split into two genetically distinct lineages with different host

preferences, and that barriers to gene flow formed as a consequence of ecological specialization, which

resulted in reproductive isolation (Meyer et al. 2016). Experiments with yeast and other fungi have

shown that divergent selection can lead to phenotypic divergence and rapid ecological differentiation

(Dettman et al. 2007; Dettman et al. 2008; Ament-Velásquez et al. 2022), even under high rates of gene

flow (Tusso et al. 2021). But generally, there is a lack of studies that combine both organismal and

genetic approaches to measure reproductive isolation (Westram et al. 2022). Work investigating the

emergence and dynamics of reproductive isolation using repeated measures of hybrid viability across

generational time scales, from the beginning to later stages of parental divergence under controlled

environmental conditions, could significantly advance our understanding of what can drive the evolution

of reproductive isolation in the early stages of speciation.

Here, we used experimental evolution with the budding yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and

propagated replicate, asexually reproducing populations in both different and parallel (same)

environments for 1000 mitotic generations (**Figure 1**). At regular time points of population divergence,

we generated sexual F1 and F2 (hybrid) crosses between and within environments, to test whether

reproductive isolation evolved and increased with time. We evolved populations in four distinct

selective environments and profiled parental phenotypes in 90 different environments to test for

phenotypic divergence over time. We then used whole genome sequencing on parental, F1, and F2

hybrid populations to measure their mutational load and other measures of genomic stability. By the

endpoint of experimental evolution, we found that divergent-selected populations were up to 50%

reproductively isolated due reduced hybrid gamete viability, while most crosses made between parallel-

selected populations remained genetically compatible. We detected vast structural variation in the F2

hybrid genomes, including up to three times more deletions, insertions, inversions, tandem duplications,

and interchromosomal translocations than in the diploid parental and F1 hybrid genomes. Consistent

with predictions of ecological speciation theory, our results suggest that divergent adaptation has led to

partial reproductive isolation, accompanied by severe genomic instability in the hybrids. This instability

may be the result of structural genetic differences accumulating in parental populations causing

recombination errors and chromosome missegregation during hybrid meiosis, but further work is

needed to test if this genetic mechanism underlies the evolution of reproductive isolation in our system.

Materials and Methods

Founder populations

We generated large diploid, and genetically diverse, founder populations of yeast through mating and

mass sporulation of two related *S. cerevisiae* strains (SK1 and Y55; Figure 1) as previously described

(Ament-Velásquez et al. 2022), for which high quality reference genomes are available (Peter et al. 2018;

Bendixsen, Gettle, et al. 2021). Briefly, SK1 and Y55 were genetically modified to introduce

auxotrophies, which were used as selective markers to exclude non-mated haploids (non-hybrids). From

these strains, two founding populations were generated that only differed in the selective markers they

carried. These selective markers allowed us to mass-mate the NaCl-evolved populations with

populations evolving in the other three environments, while safely removing all non-hybrid parental

genotypes, using a selective growth medium. In the synthetic complete growth medium we used for

experimental evolution, these auxotrophic markers have no detectable fitness effect as all essential

amino acids are provided. The founders of populations evolving in NaCl (called "N founder" below) are

the diploid recombined offspring of a cross between SK1 (MATα ho:KanMX ura3::ClonNat) and Y55

(MATa ho leu2::HygMX ura3::ClonNat). Founders of the populations evolving in ethanol and two

different concentrations of lithium acetate (called "LE founder" below), are the diploid recombined

offspring of a cross between SK1 (MATα ho:KanMX lys2::ClonNat) and Y55 (MATa ho leu2::HygMX

lys2::ClonNat). Despite having different selective markers, it is important to note that both founders

maintain the same strain background and differ only in their fitness-neutral auxotrophic markers.

Experimental evolution of parental populations

From these founders, replicate populations (from here on 'parental´ populations) were experimentally

evolved in four divergent environments, each with four replicates (considered parallel-evolved) for up to

1000 asexual generations (**Figure 1**). The number of generations was estimated by counting cells after

48h growth in selective media in the highest stress environment (0.75M NaCl, see Ament-Velásquez et

al. 2022). This approach is conservative because it likely underestimates the number of generations in

the other, less stressful environments. All evolution environments contained synthetic complete (SC)

medium (2% glucose, 0.67% bacto-yeast nitrogen base without amino acids, 0.00079% Formedium CSM

powder (product code DCS0019), made up to 1L with sterilised deionised water) plus one of the

following substances to induce stress: 0.75M sodium chloride (from here on NaCl), 8% ethanol (C_2H_6O,

from here on EtOH), and two different concentrations of lithium acetate ($C_2H_3LiO_2$, from here on

LiAc0.01M and LiAc0.02M). The correct volume of EtOH was added to the test tube just before

inoculation to limit evaporation. We have previously demonstrated that these four media significantly

differ in how much they reduce the fitness of populations, and we have provided phenotypic and

genetic evidence that populations become differentially adapted to these environments (Ament-

Velásquez et al. 2022).

Three to four replicate populations were evolved in separate test tubes containing 5mL of SC

media with one of the four substances. Then, we serially transferred 10µL of yeast culture every 48

hours to fresh media (approximately seven generations, estimated by counting cells after 48 hours).

Every five transfers (10 days, i.e. ~35 generations), a 900µL sample of each population was frozen in 44%

glycerol at -70°C for later use. The experiment was run for a total of ~300 days. After some cross-

replicate contamination was detected using sequencing data (Ament-Velásquez et al. 2022), we

excluded two NaCl-evolved replicate populations (R1 and R4) at 1000 generations, all LiAc0.01M and

LiAc0.02M-evolved populations at 1000 generations, and one LiAc0.01M-evolved population (R3) at all

generations. No crosses were generated from these contaminated populations. Retained populations

showed no signs of cross-contamination in terms of shared single nucleotide variants.

157
Figure 1: Overview of experimental approaches. A) Experimental Evolution: A founder population was
generated by the mating of two *S. cerevisiae* strains (SK1 and Y55), followed by mass sporulation
(meiosis). This genetically diverse, diploid founder was split into four different environments, containing
growth medium with either 0.75M NaCl, 8% EtOH, 0.01M lithium acetate, or 0.02M lithium acetate, and

evolved for up to 1000 asexual generations by serial transfer, in three or four independent biological
replicates per environment (Ament-Velásquez et al. 2022). 2N indicates diploid, 1N indicates haploid
genotypes. **B) Crossing design**: At seven points of parental divergence (indicated by the curved grey lines
in A), sexual hybrid crosses were made between NaCl-populations and populations from all other
environments (with replication). Control crosses were made between parallel-evolved, replicate
populations from the same environment. Crosses from five time points were then sporulated and the
viability of the haploid F2 offspring was assessed after tetrad dissection. **C) High throughput**
phenotyping: To assess phenotypic divergence, the growth of parental populations sampled from five
time points of experimental evolution was measured in 90 non-selection environments using colony
image scans. **D) Comparative genomics** using pool sequencing of parental, F1, and F2 populations
sampled at seven time points of experimental evolution.
173
174

Hybridization at increasing timepoints of parental divergence

We generated hybrid crosses at 100, 300, 500, 700, and 1000 generations of parental divergence,

between all four replicate NaCl-populations (excluding R1 and R4 at 1000 generations due to

contamination) and up to four replicate populations from each of the three other environments (LiAc

0.01M (3 replicates), LiAc 0.02M (4 replicates) and EtOH (4 replicates); **Figure 1**). Due to the selectable

markers present in the parents, NaCl- populations could be mass-crossed with the other three

populations while safely removing all non-hybrid parental genotypes using a selective medium

(described below). First, we mass-sporulated the diploid parental populations. For this, 500µL of

saturated culture were added to 50mL of sporulation medium (1% potassium acetate, 0.05% glucose,

0.1% yeast extract, and H_2O to 1L) and left for 5 days with gentle shaking at room temperature. We then

mixed 500µL of each of the two parent spore cultures together in a 1.5mL Eppendorf tube, and

centrifuged the culture down to a pellet to induce mating. To select for F1 hybrids, we inoculated 25µL

of the pellet in 5mL of -lys SD medium with G418 (0.67% bacto-yeast nitrogen base without amino acids,

2% glucose, dropout powder (-lys), G418 400mgL^{-1} and H_2O to 1L). This selects for F1 hybrid genotypes

in bulk, which are heterozygous for both selective markers (-lys and G418). Note that this mass mating

and sporulation protocol permitted F1 hybrid populations to contain genetic diversity, depending on

how many different parental genotypes participated in the mass mating. To generate F2 hybrid

populations, we put F1 hybrid populations through one round of meiosis by mass sporulating them in

50mL of sporulation medium for 5 days with gentle shaking at room temperature. F1 AND F2 hybrid

populations were stored at -70°C in 22% glycerol solution for whole genome sequencing.

Assessing parental phenotypic divergence

We phenotypically profiled all parent populations (i.e. populations evolved in NaCl, LiAc 0.01M, LiAc

0.02M, and EtOH) in 90 different environments, at five time points of divergence (at 100, 300, 500, 700,

and 1000 generations), using the Scan-o-Matic system for high-throughput microbial phenotyping

(Zackrisson et al. 2016; Li et al. 2019; Alalam et al. 2020; Mukherjee et al. 2021; Persson et al. 2022;

Stenberg et al. 2022) version 2.2 (https://github.com/Scan-o-Matic/scanomatic.git). Parental

populations were precultured in SC media for 48h in 96-well plates at 30°C without shaking and frozen.

Then, cultures were pinned directly from thawed cryo-stocks in 96-format for preculturing on agar

plates (for more detailed methods see (Persson et al. 2024)). Samples were split into duplicates (two 96-

well plates). A third plate was used for propagation of a spatial control, containing a Y55 diploid strain.

After preculture, populations were pinned onto 1536 colony arrays on agar plates robotically (Singer

ROTOR HDA), allowing for accurate measuring of colony growth using the Scan-o-matic software. The

spatial control was placed in every fourth position (in total 384 colonies per plate) to remove any spatial

bias, irregularities in the plates, or other bias from the local area. In total, 52 distinct stressors were used

in different concentrations, resulting in 90 distinct environments, including superoxidative stress (e.g.

paraquat), heavy metals (e.g. $CuSO_4$), different carbon sources (e.g. maltose), antifungal drugs (e.g.

Clotrimazole). Phenotypic data, i.e. growth measurements, are reported in Table S1, with the full list of

environments in Table S2. Cultivation plates were maintained undisturbed and without lids for the

entire duration of the assay (72h) in high-resolution desktop scanners (Epson Perfection V800 PHOTO

scanners, Epson Corporation, UK) at 30°C, in moisture-controlled thermostatic cabinets with air

circulation. We imaged plates at 20-minute intervals using transmissive scanning at 600 dpi and

extracted intensities for pixels included in, and outside, each colony. We estimated the sum pixel

intensity for each colony, subtracted the median pixel intensity of the local background, and

transformed the remaining cell-associated pixel intensity to cell counts by using a pre-established

calibration function, established using both spectrometry and flow cytometry (Zackrisson et al. 2016).

We smoothed and quality-controlled growth curves, rejecting approximately 0.3% of growth curves as

erroneous, blind with respect to sample identities. Based on the number of cells after 72h, we used the

yield normalized against the spatial control (Y55 diploid).

A custom 'ParentalDivergence' function was generated in R, using normalized yield, the number

of generations in experimental evolution, and the type of population comparison. Mean and double

standard deviations of normalized yields were first computed for each of the 90 environments for each

of the replicate parent 1 (P1) and 2 (P2) populations. This was done for each type of population

comparison, i.e. divergent-environment comparisons (NaCl x EtOH, NaCl x LiAc0.01, NaCl x LiAc0.02) and

parallel-environment comparisons (NaCl x NaCl, EtOH x EtOH, LiAc0.01 x LiAc0.01, LiAc0.02 x LiAc0.02).

We considered fitness to be higher if the normalized mean yield of P2 was larger than the normalized

mean yield of P1 plus P1's double standard deviation (i.e. mean P2 > mean P1 + 2σ). We considered

fitness to be lower if the normalized mean yield of P2 was lower than the normalized mean yield of P1

minus P1's double standard deviation, following previous protocols (i.e. mean P2 < mean P1 - 2σ; see

(deVicente and Tanksley 1993; Brice et al. 2021). Parental phenotypic divergence is thus defined as the

proportion of the 90 environments in which there was a large difference in yield between the two

populations compared.

Assessing reproductive isolation

To measure productive isolation between the parental yeast populations evolving in divergent and

parallel environments, we mated together individual parent genotypes to produce F1 crosses, after 100,

300, 500, 700 and 1000 generations of experimental evolution. F1 were then sporulated to produce F1

spores (gametes), which are their recombined, haploid F2 offspring, and reproductive isolation was

measured as the fraction of unviable F2 gametes. For this, F1 crosses were plated onto solid YPD agar

medium (1% yeast extract, 2% peptone, 2% glucose, 2% agar made up to 1L with sterilized deionized

H_2O) and grown for 2 days, followed by replica plating onto solid KAc medium (1% potassium acetate,

0.05% glucose, 0.1% yeast extract and H_2O to 1L) for sporulation. Populations were left for 2-7 days,

until tetrads were identified under the microscope. Yeast tetrads usually contain four spores (gametes),

which are the recombined haploid products of meiosis. Sporulated cultures with tetrads were incubated

for one hour at room temperature in 10μL of filter sterilized zymolyase solution (1mg of zymolyase per

1mL of 1M sorbitol solution) to kill vegetative (unsporulated) cells and digest the outer membrane of the

tetrads, surrounding the ascospores. Cell lysis was terminated by adding 500μL of sterilized H_2O. To

assess the fertility of F1 hybrid crosses, we dissected 10-20 individual F1 tetrads, and measured the

survival rates of their haploid F2 offspring. Tetrads were dissected on YPD plates using a Singer MSM

400 robot. Individual spores were then left to germinate and grow for 72h at 30°C, at which point spore

viability was assessed. Spores were counted as viable based on the presence of colonies visible to the

eye. Thus, gamete viability was assessed as the capacity to germinate and show sufficient growth to

form macroscopic colonies, which is a standard method in yeast genetics. The total proportion of

unviable spores per cross was calculated from 20 dissected tetrads (80 spores) at 100, 700, and 1000

generations, and 10 tetrads (40 spores) at 300 and 500 generations of parental divergence.

To assess the F1 fertility of the control crosses, i.e. crosses between replicate parental

populations that evolved in parallel environments, we used the same mating, sporulation and dissection

protocols as described above. The total proportion of unviable spores (gametes) per cross was

calculated from 10 dissected tetrads (40 spores) at 100, 500, 700 and 1000 generations of parental

divergence.

DNA extraction and whole-genome sequencing

DNA was extracted as described in (Ament-Velásquez et al. 2022). We extracted DNA from whole

parental, F1, and F2 hybrid populations, respectively, at seven time points each (0, 100, 200, 300, 400,

500, 700, and 1000 generations). Extraction was carried out on overnight culture, with ~1mL of culture

used. Library preparation and sequencing were performed at the Science for Life Laboratories

(Stockholm, Sweden), using the Illumina Nextera Flex protocol. Sequencing was done using either

NovaSeq S4-300 (2x150bp) or NovaSeq S-Prime (2x150bp) to an estimated median depth of coverage

per sample of around 30x to 780x. The raw sequences were deposited in the European Nucleotide

Archive, parental populations are available at accession number PRJEB46680, while hybrids are available

at accession number PRJEB83568.

Sequencing read quality and genome alignment

FastQC v.0.11.9 (Andrews 2010) was used to assess the quality of raw sequencing reads and reads were

trimmed using Trimmomatic v0.36 (Bolger et al. 2014). Sequencing reads were aligned to a S288C

reference genome (R64; GenBank accession GCA_000146045.2) using BWA mem v0.7.17-r1188 (Li and

Durbin 2009) and SAMtools v1.11 (Danecek et al. 2021) was used to sort and index the resulting

mapping file. Duplicated reads were flagged and removed using Picard v3.1.0

(http://broadinstitute.github.io/picard/), followed by quality assessment using Qualimap v2.3

(Okonechnikov et al. 2016).

Assessing the genomic mutational landscape

To assess the mutational landscape of each experimentally evolved, parental yeast population and the

F1 and F2 crosses made between them, we measured the amount of variants detected across

mutational scales, ranging from single nucleotide variants to entire chromosome aneuploidies. To

identify small mutational variants (SNV and indels), we used freebayes v1.3.6 (Garrison and Marth 2012)

with default parameters. Identified variants were filtered using VCFtools v0.1.16 (Danecek et al. 2011) to

include only variants with minimum quality (minQ) >30 and sequencing read depth (minDP) >5. SnpEff

v5.2 (Cingolani et al. 2012) was used to assess and annotate the effect of identified mutational variants

on genes using the database of the reference genome R64-1-1.105 with canonical transcripts. To

identify structural variants including insertions, deletions, inversions, tandem duplications and

interchromosomal translocations we used Manta v1.6.0 (Chen et al. 2016) with default parameters.

Structural variant detection is limited by the read pair fragment size. To more comprehensively assess

the genome-wide copy number variation (amplifications and deletions), we used Control-FREEC v11.6

(Boeva et al. 2011; Boeva et al. 2012) with baseline ploidy = 2, a break-point threshold = 0.8 and

coefficient of variation = 0.5 (Scopel et al. 2021). We further optimized the CNV detection by limiting the

expected GC content to between 0.35 and 0.55. Variants were further filtered to only include copy

number calls that were statistically significant ($p<0.05$) using Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test and a Kolmogorov

Smirnov Test. Two metrics of CNVs were assessed for differences across time and between populations:

CNV load and the fraction of the genome altered. CNV mutational load is the number of CNV events

(amplification or deletion) detected within a population. The fraction of genome altered incorporates

the size of each CNV event to determine the amount of the genome that is altered by CNVs. We also

differentiated between small (<10kb) and large (>10kb) CNVs. Chromosomes were further considered

aneuploid if >60% of the chromosome was identified as amplified or lost. To better assess the

differences that might have existed between the two founding populations and potentially their lasting

effects through time, we re-analyzed sequencing data from the original study (Ament-Velasquez et al.

2022), which was focused on the genetic basis of evolutionary adaptation of these founders. This study

included sequencing data collected at shorter time-points, in particular within the first 100 generations

(30 and 60 generations). We analyzed the relative sequencing read depth to determine how persistent

the aneuploidies identified in the founding populations (generation 0) were during adaptation.

Calculating population differentiation (F_{st}) and genome similarity (Jaccard index)

We calculated pairwise F_{st} between all divergent- and parallel-evolving parental populations at each of

the sampled timepoints, based on single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). We first combined the vcf

files generated from freebayes using bcftools v1.19 (Danecek et al. 2011), with parallelization of file

compression by gnuparallel v20230422 (Tange 2011), using the default parameters of bcftools merge

and the R package poolfstats v2.2.0 (Gautier et al. 2022) on R v3.4 (R Core Team 2023). First the vcf files

were converted to pooldata objects, using vcf2pooldata with the default parameters. F_{st} was then

calculated using pairwiseFST with the nsnp.per.bjack.block = 150 to calculate the Block-Jackknife

estimation of standard error, using an ANOVA framework (Hivert et al. 2018). Similarities between copy

number variation calls in different populations and through time were assessed based on the Jaccard

similarity coefficient using CNVmetrics R package v3.20 (Belleau et al. 2021; Deschênes et al. 2022).

Results

We experimentally evolved yeast populations for 1000 generations in divergent and parallel

environments. The four selection environments contained either salt, ethanol, or two different

concentrations of lithium acetate, and significantly differed in the degree to which they reduced the

fitness of the founder populations. We have previously provided phenotypic and genetic evidence that

these populations become differentially adapted to these environments (Ament-Velásquez et al. 2022).

At five time points during experimental evolution, we made crosses between the parallel- and divergent-

evolving populations (the 'parents') to measure postzygotic reproductive isolation (F1 spore viability). At

seven time points, we used whole population genome sequencing on parents, F1, and F2 hybrids, to assess

their mutational load, i.e. the number and types of structural variation, and other genomic features.

Parental phenotypic divergence

We phenotypically profiled the evolving parent populations in 90 non-selection environments. These

environments contained the same medium (SC) as the selective environments used for experimental

evolution, but they also each contained an additional growth limiting substance (Table S2). Thus, our

measure of phenotypic divergence between populations is likely a conservative estimate. Note that we

only assessed the phenotypic divergence of evolving parent populations here (not the F1 or F2 crosses),

to test for adaptation as a result of divergent ecological selection in the parents.

As expected, with increasing generations of experiment evolution in different environments,

divergent-selected parent populations significantly diverged in phenotype (regression across all

divergent-evolved populations: R = 0.14, p = 0.007; when removing the outliers at G1000: R = 0.09, p =

0.036; **Figure 2A**). Regression of individual environment comparisons resulted in significantly increasing

phenotypic divergence in the NaCl vs. EtOH-evolved populations (R = 0.41, p=0.004), but not for the

other two comparisons.

In contrast, parent populations evolving in parallel in the same environment did not diverge

phenotypically (R = 9.34e-04, p = 0.81; when removing the outliers at G1000: R = 0.002, p = 0.768; **Figure**

2B). Here, individual regression of the EtOH vs. EtOH-evolved populations resulted in a significant

decrease of phenotypic divergence with generations (R = 0.51, p = 0.006) but this trend was no longer

significant when removing the outlier at G1000 (R = 0.30, p = 0.066). This suggests that the phenotypic

divergence of populations evolving under different selection pressures was caused by ecological

differences between the four selection environments.

360
Figure 2: **Phenotypic divergence of evolving parental populations.** Parental phenotypic divergence (the
proportion of 90 environments, in which populations significantly differed in yield) at five time points
(number of generations) of experimental evolution. **A)** Comparisons between divergent-evolved
populations in different environments. **B)** Comparisons between parallel-evolved populations in the
same environment. Solid line indicates significant regression, dashed line shows non-significant
regression across all comparisons.

Genetic population differentiation

When comparing parental populations, genetic population differentiation (genome-wide F_{st}) was

generally larger (mean = 0.25) in pairwise comparisons between divergent-selected (grey boxes in **Figure**

3A) than between parallel-selected populations (mean = 0.19, colored boxes). The only exception were

comparisons between parallel-selected LiAc0.01 populations (purple), which produced slightly higher F_{st}-

values but were not significantly larger than the divergent-selected populations. F_{st} -values increased

with the number of generations of evolution in both divergent and parallel environments (**Figure 3A**,

Figure S1), except for comparisons between divergent-selected NaCl and LiAc0.02 populations. NaCl and

LiAc0.02 populations tended to decrease in F_{st} over time. This may be the result of populations losing

genetic variation overall, which was particularly the case for LiAc0.02 populations as discussed below.

Importantly, the two founding populations with compatible selective markers were found to have a very

low pairwise F_{st}-value suggesting a high level of genetic similarity and low amount of differentiation

(Figure S2).

Consistent with their lower F_{st}-values overall, the genomes of parallel-selected populations

remained significantly more similar (using the Jaccard similarity index) than the genomes of divergent-

selected populations (gray boxes in **Figure 3B**). Together, this suggests that the larger genetic divergence

of populations evolving under different selection pressures was caused by ecological differences

between the four selection environments.

387
Figure 3: Parental genomic population differentiation. **A)** Genetic population divergence (F_{st}) at seven
time points (n of generations) of experimental evolution. . Boxplots indicate the first and third quartiles
with whiskers extending to the furthest point not exceeding 1.5 x the interquartile range and outliers
beyond this are shown as dots. The solid line indicates the median value. **B)** Genomic similarity (Jaccard
similarity index) at seven time points (n of generations) of experimental evolution. Box plots show
means (thick horizontal line) across all generations of each population type. Circles indicate the mean
measurement and the vertical line indicates the standard error of the mean. 'Divergent' indicates
comparisons between divergent-selected populations. Asterisks indicate statistical significance using
Kruskal-Wallis and pairwise Wilcoxon post hoc tests with Bonferroni corrections (adjusted p-values <
0.001 = ***, < 0.01 = **, < 0.05 = *). Dashed horizontal lines indicate the measured differentiation
between the founder populations at the beginning of evolution.
399

F2 hybrid viability

The viability of F1 spores made between divergent-selected populations was significantly lower than the

viability of crosses made between parallel-selected populations on average, when analysed across all

cross types and all time points (Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction; W = 1395.5, p =

0.046; **Figure 4**, top left hand boxplot). Analyzing cross types separately, the viability of offspring from

parallel-selected populations was significantly higher than the viability of hybrids made from divergent-

selected parents in two of the three cross types, when averaged across all time points (Kruskal-Wallis:

NaCl x EtOH: X^2 = 7.6216, p = 0.022; NaCl x LiAc0.02: X^2 = 14.209, p = 0.001). In the NaCl x LiAc0.01 cross

type, the viability between parallel-selected populations was similar to that between divergent-selected

populations (X^2 = 5.834, p = 0.054).

410   Following the breakdown of hybrid viability over time, the viability between divergent-selected

parents was still relatively high at early time points of divergence (on average 89.1% ± 0.02 at 100

generations), but then decreased substantially between 250 and 500 generations to on average 66% ±

0.08 (**Figure 4**, top left hand line plot) below that of parallel-selected crosses. This pattern was not

consistent among all cross types. The viability of two parallel-selected cross types (LiAc0.01 x LiAc0.01,

EtOH x EtOH) was higher than that of the divergent-selected crosses on average (although not all within-

time point comparisons were significant), but a notable exception were the crosses made between the

parallel-selected LiAc0.02 x LiAc0.02 populations, which dropped in viability after 500 generations, to a

similar extent as that of the divergent-selected NaCl x LiAc0.02 hybrids. We discuss potential

explanations for this below.

Figure 4: Analysis of reproductive isolation. The viability of F1 spores (i.e. the recombined haploid F2 offspring), which is an inverse measure of reproductive isolation, at five time points (number of generations) of experimental evolution. Circles indicate the mean measurement and the vertical line indicates the standard error of the mean. Crosses made between parallel-selected populations evolving in the same environment are coloured (or white in the top left hand plot), crosses made between divergent-selected populations, evolving in different environments, are grey. Box plots show means (thick horizontal line) across all generations of each cross type. 'Divergent' are the crosses between divergent-selected populations (NaCl vs LiAc0.01, NaCl vs LiAc0.02, NaCl vs EtOH). Black asterisks indicate statistical significance using Kruskal-Wallis and pairwise Wilcoxon post hoc tests with Bonferroni correction (adjusted $p < 0.001$ = ***, < 0.01 = **, < 0.05 = *). White asterisks inside circles indicate significantly lower viability in divergent- than in parallel-selected crosses, using one-sided Wilcoxon tests with Bonferroni corrections (adjusted $p < 0.05$ = *).

The genome-wide mutational landscape of adaptation and hybridization

In an effort to find the genetic mechanisms potentially underlying postzygotic reproductive isolation, we

assessed the genome-wide mutational landscape of the divergent-evolved parental populations, and the

F1 and F2 hybrid crosses made between them, at all seven sampled timepoints. We focused on three

major mutational classes: single nucleotide variants (SNVs), large structural variants (SVs), and copy

number variants (CNVs).

As might be expected from selective sweeps during directional selection, we found that all

populations showed reduced SNV mutational diversity compared to the founder population within the

first 100 generations of evolution (dashed black lines in Figure S3A). Most identified mutations were

single nucleotide variants, fewer were insertions and deletions (indels) (Figure S4). The mutational SNV

load in LiAc0.02 populations was consistently lower than in populations evolving in NaCl and in their F1

and F2 hybrids, and remained low through time (Kruskal-Wallis: X^2 = 44.95, p <0.001, Figure S3A). This

pattern remained after filtering for mutational variants estimated by SnpEff to have high impact

(Kruskal-Wallis: X^2 = 13.07, p=0.004, **Figure 5A**). LiAc0.02 populations also showed a lower SNV

mutational load than the populations evolving in the weaker concentration of lithium acetate (LiAc0.01).

It is possible that this is the result of stronger purifying selection in LiAc0.02 populations from the start.

But since populations evolving in the stronger concentration of lithium acetate have likely also

undergone fewer mitotic generations, this may also reflect mutations accumulating primarily as a

function of reproductive time. In the other three parental population types (NaCl, LiAc0.01 and EtOH),

SNV mutational load decreased over time (**Figure 5B**) and the pattern stayed consistent when filtering

for only mutations with high impact on fitness (Figure S5A). Conversely, in the F1 (R = 0.48, p < 0.01, in

grey) and F2 hybrid populations (R = 0.57, p < 0.01, in yellow), we found a total increase in mutational

load over time (**Figure 5B**). Thus, the more the parental populations diverged phenotypically and

genetically over time, the more single nucleotide mutational variants were detected in their resulting F1

and F2 hybrid populations.

Figure 5: The genome-wide mutational landscape of hybridization at seven time points of experimental
evolution. **A)** Single nucleotide variant (SNV) mutational load after filtering for high impact mutations
on gene function using SnpEff v5.2 (Cingolani et al. 2012). The mutational load is averaged across all
timepoints for each hybrid cross. The mean mutational load of the founder population is indicated by
the dashed black line. Boxplots indicate the first and third quartiles with whiskers extending to the
furthest point not exceeding 1.5 x the interquartile range and outliers beyond this are shown as dots.
The solid line indicates the median value. Different letters (A, B and C) indicate statistically significant
differences using Kruskal-Wallis and pairwise Wilcoxon post hoc tests with Bonferroni corrections. **B)**
Linear regression (Pearson R) of SNV mutational load at seven time points (n of generations) of
experimental evolution. Only significant linear relationships are shown (p ≤ 0.05). The gray plot includes

F1 and F2 hybrids across all crosses. **C)** Structural variant (SV) mutational load averaged across all

sampled timepoints (TOTAL) for the three types of hybrid crosses. SV mutational load consists of the

number of deletions, insertions, inversions, tandem duplications and interchromosomal translocations

(> 8bp) detected in the population. Colors, boxplots, and statistical significance are consistent with panel

A. **D)** Linear regression (Pearson R) between SV mutational load and increasing timepoints of parental

divergence (number of generations). Only significant linear relationships are shown (p ≤ 0.05). The gray

plot includes F1 and F2 hybrids from all crosses. **E)** Mean structural variant count of each type of

structural variant (deletion, insertion, breakend, inversion and duplication) for each environment and

cross. Node color and size indicates the mean count of each variant type across all timepoints. **F)** Copy

number variant (CNV) mutational load consisting of amplifications, deletions and aneuploidies. CNV

mutational load averaged across all sampled timepoints (TOTAL) for the three types of hybrid crosses.

Colors, boxplots, and statistical significance are consistent with panel A. **G)** Linear regression (Pearson R)

between CNV mutational load and increasing timepoints of parental divergence (number of

generations). Only significant linear relationships are shown (p ≤ 0.05). The gray plot includes F1 and F2

hybrids from all crosses. **H)** The distribution of large (>10kb) CNVs, small (< 10kb) CNVs and chromosome

aneuploidy (> 60% amplified or deleted) across all sampled timepoints for the three types of hybrid

crosses. Colors, boxplots, and statistical significance are consistent with panel A.

488   Analysis of structural variants (i.e. insertions, deletions, duplications, inversions and

interchromosomal translocations that are > 8bp) showed that the total number of SVs found in the

evolving parental populations remained comparable to the levels in the founder population (dashed

black lines in **Figure 5C**). Unlike the pattern we found in SNV mutational load, the number of SVs

harbored in parental populations increased over time (**Figure 5D**). This positive linear relationship was

consistent for populations evolving in NaCl (R = 0.72, p < 0.01), LiAc0.01 (R = 0.6, p < 0.01), and LiAc0.02

(R = 0.61, p < 0.01), but not for EtOH populations, which already had elevated levels of SVs (p < 0.001)

early on but then decreased over time (R = -0.7, p < 0.01; Figure S6A).

496   Strikingly, we found very high levels of SVs in all types of F2 hybrid crosses, right from the

beginning of parental population divergence (Kruskal-Wallis: NaCl x LiAc0.01: X^2 = 22.87, p <0.001; NaCl x

LiAc0.02: X^2 = 30.28, p <0.001; NaCl x EtOH: X^2 = 34.45, p <0.001). In most cases, F2 hybrid populations

harboured almost twice as many structural variants compared to the corresponding parental

populations and the F1 hybrids. This pattern was seen across SV types collectively, but was particularly

prominent for insertions, deletions and interchromosomal translocations (breakend mutations, **Figure**

5E, Figure S7-S11). Duplications were rare compared to deletions and insertions and are therefore not

driving the elevated levels of SVs observed in F2 hybrid genomes (**Figure 5E**). Because F2 hybrids are

distinguished from F1 hybrids and the parent populations only by having passed through one round of

meiosis, the additional load of structural variants we found in F2 hybrids likely arose due to meiotic

errors.

In addition to structural variants, we also more comprehensively assessed copy number

variations (CNV) across the genome, which are a subtype of structural variation. In the structural

variation analysis, detection of variants was limited by the read pair fragment size. However, copy

number variants can range from small focal amplifications or deletions to chromosome arm, or whole

chromosome aneuploidies. Therefore, we used an approach that employs sequencing read depth and

allelic imbalances to estimate segmented copy number uniformly throughout the genome. On average,

parental populations, F1 and F2 hybrids had a lower CNV mutational load compared to the founder

population (dashed black lines in **Figure 5F**), suggesting that directional adaptation has reduced CNV

load in all environments. This pattern remained consistent when including the size of each copy number

variant to estimate the fraction of altered genome content (Figure S12B). Most populations showed

moderate levels (< 10%) of total alteration (amplification + deletion) of the genome by CNV (Figure

S12B). However, NaCl populations had a larger fraction of their genomes altered in copy number than

parental populations evolved in LiAc and EtOH (pairwise Wilcoxon test: vs LiAc0.01: p <0.001; vs

LiAc0.02: p <0.001; vs EtOH: p =0.012). This is due to three parallel-evolved NaCl populations that had a

large fraction of genome alterations (> 20%) at three different time points of evolution.

Strikingly, the F2 hybrid genomes of all three crosses contained significantly fewer CNVs than

parental populations and most F1 hybrids (**Figure 5F**; Kruskal-Wallis: NaCl x LiAc0.01: X^2 = 30.1, p <

0.001; NaCl x LiAc0.02: X^2 = 24.4, p < 0.001; NaCl x EtOH: X^2 = 37.7, p < 0.001) and F2 hybrid genomes of

all crosses were significantly less altered by CNVs (in % genome) than the parental populations (Figure

S12B). Overall, we found that amplifications were more common than deletions across populations and

through time (Figure S13).

Similar to SNVs and SVs, we found consistent patterns of increase or decrease in CNVs with the

number of parental generations of evolution in divergent environments (**Figure 5G**). In the parental NaCl

(R = -0.59, p < 0.01) and LiAc0.02 (R = -0.56, p < 0.01) populations, the CNV mutational load decreased

with the number of generations. In the LiAc0.01 parents, the same pattern was seen but was not

significant (R = -0.37, p = 0.08). Interestingly, CNV mutational load was often relatively stable until

approximately 500 generations, followed by a steep decrease (**Figure 5G,** Figure S12A). In the EtOH

parents, we found the opposite pattern, with CNV load increasing with the number of generations

(R=0.72, p <0.01), affecting the F1 hybrid genomes between NaCl and EtOH in the same way (R = 0.73, p

= 0.01).

Lastly, we sought to understand if these patterns of CNV load were driven by small focal variants

or larger multi-kilobase alterations, including whole chromosomal aneuploidies. We found that the

majority of variants were small (< 10kb) and contributed significantly to the global pattern found in CNV

load (compare upper row of plots in **Figure 5H** to **Figure 5F**). A closer examination of the number of

larger alterations (> 10kb; middle row of plots in **Figure 5H**), revealed that the F2 hybrid genomes of two

hybrid crosses (NaCl x LiAc0.01, NaCl x LiAc0.02), showed significantly fewer large alterations (on

average 12.1) than their respective parents (on average 20.8) and F1 hybrids (on average 19.4). This

pattern is further emphasized when examining exclusively the number of aneuploid chromosomes

(>60% amplified or deleted) found in each sample (lower row of plots in **Figure 5H**). On average, F2

hybrid genomes carried fewer aneuploidies (mean=0.24 chromosomes) compared to parent

(mean=0.67) and F1 hybrid genomes (mean=0.64).

The distribution of mutational events across the genome

After assessing the genome-wide mutational landscape in terms of SNVs, SVs, and CNV mutational load,

we determined the distribution of these mutational events across the genome. We found that the rate

of SNVs was not uniformly distributed, but instead showed chromosomal biases (Kruskal-Wallis: $X^2 =$

147.28, p <0.001, **Figure 6A**). Chromosomes VI and VIII had significantly higher frequencies of SNVs (16.7

and 14.1 mutations/kb, respectively). Chromosome I and IX also showed slightly elevated SNV

frequencies (10.8 and 9.35 mutations/kb, respectively). Chromosome VII on the other hand showed a

significantly lower frequency of SNVs (2.29 mutations/kb). The remaining chromosomes had

approximately equal frequencies of SNVs (6.39-7.34 mutations/kb). These chromosomal biases in SNV

distribution already existed in the founder population and remained consistent across all parental

lineages and all F1 and F2 hybrids (**Figure 6A**).

560   The distribution of structural variant (SV) events were also not uniformly distributed throughout

561   the genome (Kruskal-Wallis: $X^2 = 60.06$, p <0.001, **Figure 6B**). Similar to the SNV distribution, we found

562   highly elevated rates of SVs on chromosome VI (0.03 mutations/kb). We also found peaks in the rate of

563   SVs in chromosomes I, III, and IX in most parental and hybrid populations.

564   The proportion of whole chromosomes altered by copy number variants was not consistent

across environments and hybrid crosses (**Figure 6C**). Interestingly, F2 hybrids of all crosses showed the

lowest levels of copy number alterations, and aneuploidy (defined as > 60% of chromosome

amplification) was consistently rare across all F2 hybrid chromosomes. We discuss the implications of

the near absence of aneuploidies and large genome alterations in F2 hybrid genomes below. Our

analysis shows that the two founding populations each carried aneuploid chromosomes. The NaCl

founder population (N founder, **Figure 6C**) had an extra chromosome X, while the LE founder population

had three aneuploid chromosomes (I, III and VI). It is important to note that deeper analysis of

sequencing read depth of early generational timepoints from an earlier study (Ament-Velásquez et al.

2022) revealed that these aneuploidies were lost in the population within the first 30 or 60 generations

of adaptation (Figure S14). Parental NaCl populations subsequently lost the extra chromosome X over

the course of experimental evolution, but evolved an aneuploid chromosome I and underwent

alterations of large portions of chromosome III and VI. Chromosome I was also heavily altered in parent

populations evolving in LiAc 0.01 (40%), LiAc 0.02 (37%), and EtOH (25%). Similarly, F1 hybrid crosses

between NaCl and the two LiAc populations (to a lesser extent the NaCl x EtOH F1 hybrids) also showed

large copy number alterations in chromosomes I, III, and VI (**Figure 6C**). Confirming our previous result

(Ament-Velásquez et al. 2022), we also recovered a chromosome X aneuploidy in two parental EtOH

populations and the chromosome XI aneuploidy in one parental EtOH population here.

The 16 chromosomes of *S. cerevisiae* range widely in size from 270kb (chrVI) to 1,531kb (chrIV;

Figure 6D). As might be expected, larger chromosomes are larger targets for SNVs, SVs and CNVs and

therefore have higher overall mutational load for each mutational class. However, after correcting

mutational load for chromosome size, either by reporting SNVs and SVs as mutations per kilobase or

reporting CNVs as the percentage of chromosome altered, we found a strong negative relationship

between chromosome size and SNV, SV and CNV mutational rate (**Figure 6D**). Smaller chromosomes had

elevated rates of mutation while larger chromosomes were rarely affected. This pattern is most striking

in CNVs where, as previously mentioned, chromosomes I, III and VI were disproportionately altered. This

is interesting because chromosomes I, III, and VI are the smallest chromosomes in the yeast genome and

have been frequently reported to carry aneuploidies in other yeast studies as well (reviewed in (Gilchrist

and Stelkens 2019), likely because aneuploidies of smaller chromosomes cause fewer deleterious gene

dosage effects and can be compensated for at the proteome level (Muenzner et al. 2024). This pattern

of chromosome size bias for CNVs extends beyond intraspecific crosses and has been found across

interspecific yeast hybrids with diverse ancestries (Bendixsen, Peris, et al. 2021).

596
Figure 6: The distribution of mutational events across the genome. A) The mean number of events
(mutations/kb) for each chromosome across all available timepoints. The top graph shows the
distribution of mean SNV counts for each chromosome, while the right graph shows the distribution for
each environment and hybrid cross. Boxplots indicate the first and third quartiles with whiskers
extending to the furthest point not exceeding 1.5 x the interquartile range and outliers beyond this are
shown as dots. The solid line indicates the median value. Different letters (A, B, C, D) indicate statistically
significant differences using Kruskal-Wallis and pairwise Wilcoxon post hoc tests with Bonferroni
corrections. **B)** The mean number of structural variant (SV) events (mutations/kb). **C)** The mean amount
of genome altered (%) by copy number variants (losses and gains), including whole chromosome
aneuploidies. **D)** The relationship between chromosome size and SNVs, SVs or CNVs. The barplot
indicates the size of each of the 16 chromosomes in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* reported in kilobases. The
linear correlations show the mean SNV (muts/kb), SV (muts/kb) or CNV (% genome altered) for each
population and for each chromosome as shown in the top graphs of panels A, B and C. The colors of
each node indicate the populations (NaCl, LiAc0.01, LiAc0.02, EtOH, Hybrid F1, Hybrid F2).

Discussion

We used experimental evolution with budding yeast to test for the evolution of reproductive isolation as

a result of ecologically divergent selection, a process called ecological speciation (Mayr 1947; Schluter

2001; McKinnon et al. 2004; Nosil 2012; Jarrett et al. 2025). Previous studies with yeast have tested for

reproductive isolation between species that have diverged millions of years ago, which translates into

billions of generations (Greig et al. 2002; Shapira et al. 2014; Stelkens et al. 2014; Bernardes et al. 2017;

Eberlein et al. 2019; Gallone et al. 2019; Zhang et al. 2020; Bautista et al. 2021; Brice et al. 2021;

Bautista et al. 2023). Here, instead of starting with already divergent species, separated by billions of

generations, each with a complex evolutionary history of selection, genetic drift, recombination, and

gene flow, we generated phenotypic and genetic divergence over only a few hundred generations. We

evolved replicate populations in allopatry, in four different environments, under both ecologically

divergent and parallel selection. Hence, we controlled the type and degree of selection, minimized

genetic drift and recombination, and excluded gene flow. We systematically produced hybrid crosses

between these populations at increasing time points of experimental evolution, to test whether

reproductive isolation evolved between the divergent-selected populations, as predicted by ecological

speciation theory.

Divergent ecological selection leads to partial reproductive isolation

First, we confirmed that populations when evolved in different environments, increasingly diverged in

phenotypic traits that were not directly under selection. The parallel-selected (control) populations on

the other hand remained phenotypically similar (**Figure 2**). This provides evidence for large scale

phenotypic differentiation under divergent selection. Second, the genomes of divergent-selected

populations became more genetically differentiated over time, showing higher F_{st} - values and lower

similarity (Jaccard index) than those of the parallel-selected populations (**Figure 3**). Third, we found that

divergent-selected populations produced hybrid gametes with reduced viability, which is a classic

signature of postzygotic reproductive isolation in the form of hybrid breakdown (**Figure 4**). Zygotes

generated from parallel-selected populations on the other hand remained reproductively more

compatible, with some exceptions (**Figure 4**). Together, our results suggest that partial reproductive

isolation evolved due to divergent ecological selection in our experiment. Alternative processes, such as

mutation-order effects (Schluter 2009; Ono et al. 2017), may have contributed to the build up of

reproductive barriers, but since most parallel-selected populations remained compatible, neither the

timing nor the order in which mutations occurred likely played a large role.

Recombination errors may cause genomic instability in hybrids

Early experiments, e.g. in fruit flies with similar set-ups of divergent- and parallel-selected lines on

different media (Dodd 1989) and a large body of theory (reviewed in Kirkpatrick and Ravigné 2002) have

demonstrated the evolution of reproductive isolation as a consequence of adaptive divergence (Nosil

2012). Here, we have taken additional steps to understand the genetic basis of this hybrid breakdown.

Our population genomic analyses show that, as parental populations diverged phenotypically and

genetically over time, the mutational load of single nucleotide variants (SNVs) steadily increased in F1

and F2 hybrids (**Figure 5B**), with a bias for chromosomes I, VI, and VIII (**Figure 6A**). We speculate that the

sudden breakdown of hybrid viability between 250 and 500 generations (**Figure 4**) may be a threshold

effect of mutational load, where mutations have only small, non-linear effects on viability until a critical

point is reached, after which DNA repair pathways are increasingly defective in hybrid genomes.

Even more strikingly, F2 hybrid populations harboured more than twice as many structural

variants (SVs) than their respective parental populations and the F1 hybrids. This pattern was seen

across all SV types (**Figure 5C**), but was particularly strong for insertions, deletions, and

interchromosomal translocations (breakend mutations, Figure S7-S11) with strong chromosomal biases

for chromosomes I, III, VI, and IX (**Figure 6B**). Because F2 hybrids differ from F1 hybrids only by one

meiotic event (and a few mitotic generations before and after sporulation that are negligible), the

increase in structural variants seen in F2 hybrids can only reasonably be explained by errors during

meiosis. This suggests that ecological divergence has led to hybrid offspring with higher genomic

instability due to meiotic recombination errors (e.g. unequal or incorrect crossing overs), resulting in

frequent chromosomal rearrangements (SVs). However, additional sequencing data from crosses

between parallel-selected populations (not available to us yet) would be needed for comparison, to

conclusively test for causality between divergent selection and genome instability.

Interestingly, F2 hybrids showed the lowest levels of copy number alterations, and aneuploidy

rates were consistently low across all chromosomes in F2 hybrid genomes (**Figure 5F, Figure 6C**).

Meanwhile, all parent and F1 hybrid populations contained various aneuploidies, especially in

chromosomes I, III, and VI, which are the smallest chromosomes in the yeast genome and frequently

reported to carry aneuploidies (reviewed in Gilchrist and Stelkens 2019). Note, that the aneuploidies

originally present in the founder populations (Figure S14) had disappeared from the evolving parental

populations before we made the first hybrid cross at 100 generations, hence all aneuploidies arose *de*

novo over the course of experimental evolution, or after meiosis in the F2 genomes. The absence of

aneuploidies in F2 hybrids is surprising and contrasts with the high SV load found in hybrid genomes. We

expected errors during meiosis to also lead to increased chromosome non-disjunction and aneuploidy. A

plausible explanation is that, by default, we only sequenced viable genotypes that had successfully

passed through meiosis and germinated. Average mortality due to lethal aneuploidies is likely high in the

recombined haploid gametes, where copy number imbalances imposed by aneuploidies are more

pronounced, and lethality has additional opportunities to manifest when strains are pushed through

germination. As a result, aneuploidies may have been efficiently purged from F2 hybrid genomes before

the sequencing stage.

A putative genetic mechanism for reproductive isolation

Experimental and genetic work in interspecific yeast crosses, made from species separated by billions of

generations and high nucleotide divergence (>10%), has shown that the main reason for hybrid

breakdown in yeast is antirecombination (Hunter et al. 1996; Rogers et al. 2018; Bozdag et al. 2021).

Antirecombination suppresses crossovers during meiosis when nucleotide divergence along

chromosomes is too high. The ensuing mispairing of homologous chromosomes causes missegregation

into the hybrid gametes, leading to lethal aneuploidies and typically > 90% spore mortality in

interspecific yeast crosses. This process has also been shown to cause hybrid sterility in mice, where it is

controlled by the Prdm9 gene (Forejt and Jansa 2023). However, antirecombination due to genome-

wide nucleotide divergence is unlikely to have played a role in the hybrid breakdown we observed here,

given the short evolutionary time span of our experiment. Instead, we suggest that the following

process underlies the build-up of reproductive barriers here: First, divergent ecological selection in the

parent populations has led to SVs with positive (adaptive) fitness effects and additional neutral SVs

hitchhiking along with them. These parental SVs then interfered with hybrid meiosis, causing additional

SVs to emerge in the hybrid genomes, due to unequal or incorrect crossing over. Cumulatively, the high

SV load of the hybrid genomes then negatively affected gamete viability, germination, and colony

formation, disrupting cell function and homeostasis (Chang et al. 2013; Liu et al. 2022). In short, we

suggest that the most likely genetic mechanism underlying hybrid breakdown in our experiment is the

high structural variant load of the hybrid genomes, which was jump-started by the increasing number of

SVs accumulating in the divergent-selected parent populations (**Figure 5D**). Whether the accumulation

of SVs in parent populations under divergent selection may be a common mechanism leading to

genomic instability in hybrids needs to be tested in other species and systems.

We found an interesting exception in crosses between parallel-selected LiAc0.02 populations

where, against our expectations, gamete viability decreased over time (**Figure 4**). We previously found

that three of four replicate populations evolving in LiAc0.02 had turned (functionally) haploid early on in

experimental evolution (Ament-Velásquez et al. 2022). In haploid populations, beneficial mutations can

sweep to fixation faster and deleterious mutations are more quickly purged by purifying selection, as

they are not masked by heterozygosity (Gerstein et al. 2011; Cervantes et al. 2023). This is consistent

with our finding that the mutational SNV load in LiAc0.02 populations was consistently lower than in

other populations, which may be the result of stronger purifying selection in this environment. These

processes are particularly efficient in large populations exposed to stressful environments with strong

selection, which the LiAc0.02 environment represents (Ament-Velásquez et al. 2022). Propelled by

clonal interference, this may have affected the adaptive dynamics (the rate and direction of allele

frequency changes) in the LiAc0.02 populations in idiosyncratic ways, leading to substantial genetic

differentiation and incompatibilities between them, despite parallel selection pressures.

Although we may speculate on the mechanisms causing reproductive isolation in our

experiment, the underlying genetic architecture of reproductive isolation remains unidentified. The

pattern of decreasing genomic similarity and increasing F_{st} between divergent-selected populations

(while parallel-selected populations remained similar), and the vast genome-wide instability found in

hybrid genomes, does suggest that reproductive isolation is based on (or at least accompanied by)

multiple genomic regions and that 'continents' rather than 'islands' of differentiated loci are operating

together (Michel et al. 2010). However, due to the absence of sexual recombination during the

evolution of the parent populations in our experiment, other evolutionary mechanisms may have also

caused large genomic regions to become differentiated. Effects of clonal interference and linked

selection for example, i.e. the competition between multiple beneficial mutations arising independently

in the same population leading to only one lineage sweeping through the population, may have caused

genetic differentiation between populations that is not due to ecological selection alone. Although our

previous work has identified the number and types of adaptive mutations segregating and fixing in the

evolving parental populations (Ament-Velásquez et al. 2022), our pool-seq approach does not provide

haplotype information. Thus, we cannot infer which and how many genes are causing reproductive

isolation, how large their effect sizes are, and whether they are genomically clustered (Nosil and Feder

2012). Directed crosses between parents with known genotypes, and dissecting and genotyping a large

number of recombined F2 gametes, could identify incompatible chromosomes, chromosomal regions, or

individual genes causing reproductive isolation in this system.

Conclusions

Selection against hybrids due to ecological factors, when hybrid phenotypes are ill-adapted to existing

ecological niches, has often been considered as being different from selection arising from epistatic

(Dobzhansky-Muller) incompatibilities (Thompson et al. 2023). There is a recent push to close this gap

between evolutionary ecology and speciation genetics, and to focus more on the role of the

environment and ecological adaptation in driving what we traditionally think of as 'intrinsic' genetic

isolation barriers (Anderson et al. 2023; Thompson et al. 2023). Our study contributes to bridging this

gap by synthesizing phenotypic and whole genome data, and demonstrating that divergent ecological

adaptation can indeed promote intrinsic reproductive isolation, consistent with predictions of ecological

speciation theory. Our population genomics results show that divergent ecological selection, even for

relatively few mitotic generations, was accompanied by vast genomic instability in F2 hybrids, including

deletions, inversions, and interchromosomal translocations. Our multifaceted approach of combining

experimental evolution with sexual microbes, hybridization at increasing time points of divergence,

high-throughput phenotyping, and comparative genomics, confirms the ability of ecology to drive

reproductive isolation and speciation. Our approach can be further developed to provide a

comprehensive empirical framework to test different concepts in speciation research. This includes, for

instance, i) testing if the speciation continuum is a 'continuum of reproductive isolation' (Stankowski

and Ravinet 2021) and whether reproductive isolation barriers accumulate linearly or, as predicted by

theory, exponentially (Orr 1995), the 'missing snowball' controversy); ii) testing if the 'speciation

hypercube' captures the complexity of species divergence (Dieckmann et al. 2004; Bolnick et al. 2023),

by including more phenotypic and genetic variables, and iii) to better understand the evolution of hybrid

fitness during speciation by including additional data sets (e.g. gene interaction networks (Dagilis et al.

2019), which could reconcile the contrasting outcomes of epistatic genetic interactions leading to

hybrids with both increased (heterosis) and decreased fitness (hybrid inviability) during different stages

of speciation.

Acknowledgements

We thank Maria de la Paz Celorio Mancera, Viktoria Köppä, and Zebin Zhang for helping with serial

transfers and media preparation, and Lorena Ament-Velásquez for bioinformatics advice. We also thank

three anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments on an earlier draft. Computation was

performed on resources provided by SNIC through Uppsala Multidisciplinary Center for Advanced

Computational Science (UPPMAX) under Projects NAISS2023/23-519 (Small Storage) and NAISS2023/22-

62 and NAISS2023/22-924 (Small Compute). We acknowledge support from Science for Life Laboratory,

the National Genomics Infrastructure, NGI, and Uppmax for providing assistance in massive parallel

sequencing and computational infrastructure. This work was supported by Swedish Research Council

Project Grants (2022-03427 to R.S. and 2022-03024 to J.W.), a Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation

Grant (2017.0163 to R.S.), and the Wenner-Gren Foundations (UPD2018-0196, UPD2019-0110 to D.B.).

References

Alalam H, Graf FE, Palm M, Abadikhah M, Zackrisson M, Boström J, Fransson A, Hadjineophytou C, Persson L, Stenberg S, et al. 2020. A High-Throughput Method for Screening for Genes Controlling Bacterial Conjugation of Antibiotic Resistance. *mSystems* 5:e01226-20.

Ament-Velásquez SL, Gilchrist C, Rêgo A, Bendixsen DP, Brice C, Grosse-Sommer JM, Rafati N, Stelkens R. 2022. The Dynamics of Adaptation to Stress from Standing Genetic Variation and de novo Mutations. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 39:msac242.

Anderson SAS, López-Fernández H, Weir JT. 2023. Ecology and the Origin of Nonephemeral Species. *The American Naturalist* 201:619–638.

Anderson SAS, Weir JT. 2022. The role of divergent ecological adaptation during allopatric speciation in vertebrates. *Science* 378:1214–1218.

Andrews S. 2010. FastQC: A Quality Control tool for High Throughput Sequence Data. Available from: https://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/

Bautista C, Gagnon-Arsenault I, Utrobina M, Fijarczyk A, Bendixsen DP, Stelkens R, Landry C. 2023. Hybrid adaptation is hampered by Haldane's sieve. *bioRxiv*:2023–12.

Bautista C, Marsit S, Landry CR. 2021. Interspecific hybrids show a reduced adaptive potential under DNA damaging conditions. *Evolutionary Applications* 14:758–769.

Bell G, Gonzalez A. 2011. Adaptation and Evolutionary Rescue in Metapopulations Experiencing Environmental Deterioration. *Science* 332:1327–1330.

Belleau P, Deschênes A, Beyaz S, Tuveson DA, Krasnitz A. 2021. CNVMetrics package: Quantifying similarity between copy number profiles. *F1000Research* [Internet] 10. Available from: https://f1000research.com/slides/10-737

Bendixsen DP, Gettle N, Gilchrist C, Zhang Z, Stelkens R. 2021. Genomic Evidence of an Ancient East Asian Divergence Event in Wild Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Genome Biology and Evolution* 13:evab001.

Bendixsen DP, Peris D, Stelkens R. 2021. Patterns of Genomic Instability in Interspecific Yeast Hybrids With Diverse Ancestries. *Frontiers in Fungal Biology* [Internet] 2. Available from: https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/ffunb.2021.742894

Bernardes JP, Stelkens RB, Greig D. 2017. Heterosis in hybrids within and between yeast species. *J Evol Biol* 30:538–548.

Boeva V, Popova T, Bleakley K, Chiche P, Cappo J, Schleiermacher G, Janoueix-Lerosey I, Delattre O, Barillot E. 2012. Control-FREEC: a tool for assessing copy number and allelic content using next-generation sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* 28:423–425.

Boeva V, Zinovyev A, Bleakley K, Vert J-P, Janoueix-Lerosey I, Delattre O, Barillot E. 2011. Control-free
calling of copy number alterations in deep-sequencing data using GC-content normalization.
Bioinformatics 27:268–269.

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

Bolnick DI, Hund AK, Nosil P, Peng F, Ravinet M, Stankowski S, Subramanian S, Wolf JBW, Yukilevich R.
2023. A multivariate view of the speciation continuum. *Evolution* 77:318–328.

Bozdag GO, Ono J, Denton JA, Karakoc E, Hunter N, Leu J-Y, Greig D. 2021. Breaking a species barrier by
enabling hybrid recombination. *Current Biology* 31:R180–R181.

Brice C, Zhang Z, Bendixsen D, Stelkens R. 2021. Hybridization Outcomes Have Strong Genomic and
Environmental Contingencies. *The American Naturalist* 198:E53–E67.

Cervantes S, Kesälahti R, Kumpula TA, Mattila TM, Helanterä H, Pyhäjärvi T. 2023. Strong Purifying
Selection in Haploid Tissue–Specific Genes of Scots Pine Supports the Masking Theory.
Molecular Biology and Evolution 40:msad183.

Chang S-L, Lai H-Y, Tung S-Y, Leu J-Y. 2013. Dynamic Large-Scale Chromosomal Rearrangements Fuel
Rapid Adaptation in Yeast Populations. *PLOS Genetics* 9:e1003232.

Chen X, Schulz-Trieglaff O, Shaw R, Barnes B, Schlesinger F, Källberg M, Cox AJ, Kruglyak S, Saunders CT.
2016. Manta: rapid detection of structural variants and indels for germline and cancer
sequencing applications. *Bioinformatics* 32:1220–1222.

Cingolani P, Platts A, Wang LL, Coon M, Nguyen T, Wang L, Land SJ, Lu X, Ruden DM. 2012. A program for
annotating and predicting the effects of single nucleotide polymorphisms, SnpEff: SNPs in the
genome of Drosophila melanogaster strain w1118; iso-2; iso-3. *Fly (Austin)* 6:80–92.

Dagilis AJ, Kirkpatrick M, Bolnick DI. 2019. The evolution of hybrid fitness during speciation. *PLOS
Genetics* 15:e1008125.

Danecek P, Auton A, Abecasis G, Albers CA, Banks E, DePristo MA, Handsaker RE, Lunter G, Marth GT,
Sherry ST, et al. 2011. The variant call format and VCFtools. *Bioinformatics* 27:2156–2158.

Danecek P, Bonfield JK, Liddle J, Marshall J, Ohan V, Pollard MO, Whitwham A, Keane T, McCarthy SA,
Davies RM, et al. 2021. Twelve years of SAMtools and BCFtools. *GigaScience* 10:giab008.

Deschênes A, Belleau P, Tuveson DA, Krasnitz A. 2022. Quantifying similarity between copy number
profiles with CNVMetrics package. *F1000Research* [Internet] 11. Available from:
https://f1000research.com/posters/11-816

Dettman JR, Anderson JB, Kohn LM. 2008. Divergent adaptation promotes reproductive isolation among
experimental populations of the filamentous fungus Neurospora. *BMC Evol Biol* 8:35.

Dettman JR, Sirjusingh C, Kohn LM, Anderson JB. 2007. Incipient speciation by divergent adaptation and
antagonistic epistasis in yeast. *Nature* 447:585–588.

deVicente MC, Tanksley SD. 1993. Qtl Analysis of Transgressive Segregation in an Interspecific Tomato Cross. *Genetics* 134:585–596.

Dieckmann U, Doebeli M, Metz JAJ, Tautz D eds. 2004. Adaptive Speciation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press Available from: https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/adaptive-speciation/A2413E0B1E5DDAB5C5848F0666468A35

Dodd DMB. 1989. Reproductive Isolation as a Consequence of Adaptive Divergence in Drosophila pseudoobscura. *Evolution* 43:1308–1311.

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

Filchak KE, Roethele JB, Feder JL. 2000. Natural selection and sympatric divergence in the apple maggot Rhagoletis pomonella. *Nature* 407:739–742.

Forejt J, Jansa P. 2023. Meiotic Recognition of Evolutionarily Diverged Homologs: Chromosomal Hybrid Sterility Revisited. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 40:msad083.

Funk DJ, Nosil P, Etges WJ. 2006. Ecological divergence exhibits consistently positive associations with reproductive isolation across disparate taxa. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103:3209–3213.

Gallone B, Steensels J, Mertens S, Dzialo MC, Gordon JL, Wauters R, Theßeling FA, Bellinazzo F, Saels V, Herrera-Malaver B, et al. 2019. Interspecific hybridization facilitates niche adaptation in beer yeast. *Nat Ecol Evol* 3:1562–1575.

Garrison E, Marth G. 2012. Haplotype-based variant detection from short-read sequencing. *arXiv* 1207.

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.

Gerstein AC, Cleathero LA, Mandegar MA, Otto SP. 2011. Haploids adapt faster than diploids across a range of environments. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 24:531–540.

Gilchrist C, Stelkens R. 2019. Aneuploidy in yeast: Segregation error or adaptation mechanism? *Yeast* 36:525–539.

Good BH, McDonald MJ, Barrick JE, Lenski RE, Desai MM. 2017. The dynamics of molecular evolution over 60,000 generations. *Nature* 551:45–50.

Gorter FA, Derks MF, van den Heuvel J, Aarts MG, Zwaan BJ, de Ridder D, de Visser JAG. 2017. Genomics of adaptation depends on the rate of environmental change in experimental yeast populations. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 34:2613–2626.

Gorter FA, Scanlan PD, Buckling A. 2016. Adaptation to abiotic conditions drives local adaptation in bacteria and viruses coevolving in heterogeneous environments. *Biol. Lett.* 12:20150879.

Grant RB, Grant PR. 2003. What Darwin's Finches Can Teach Us about the Evolutionary Origin and

880     Regulation of Biodiversity. *BioScience* 53:965–975.

881 Greig D, Louis EJ, Borts RH, Travisano M. 2002. Hybrid Speciation in Experimental Populations of Yeast.
882     *Science* 298:1773–1775.

883 Härer A, Bolnick DI, Rennison DJ. 2021. The genomic signature of ecological divergence along the
884     benthic-limnetic axis in allopatric and sympatric threespine stickleback. *Molecular Ecology*
885     30:451–463.

886 Hatfield T, Schluter D. 1999. ECOLOGICAL SPECIATION IN STICKLEBACKS: ENVIRONMENT-DEPENDENT
887     HYBRID FITNESS. *Evolution* 53:866–873.

888 Hendry AP, Nosil P, Rieseberg LH. 2007. The speed of ecological speciation. *Functional Ecology* 21:455–
889     464.

890 Hivert V, Leblois R, Petit EJ, Gautier M, Vitalis R. 2018. Measuring Genetic Differentiation from Pool-seq
891     Data. *Genetics* 210:315–330.

892 Hunter N, Chambers SR, Louis EJ, Borts RH. 1996. The mismatch repair system contributes to meiotic
893     sterility in an interspecific yeast hybrid. *EMBO J* 15:1726–1733.

894 Irestedt M, Müller I, Thörn F, Joseph L, Nylander J, Guinet B, Valk TV der, Jønsson K. Reticulate and
895     hybrid speciation is promoted by environmental instability in an Indo-Pacific species complex of
896     whistlers (Aves: Pachycephala). Available from:
897     https://www.authorea.com/doi/full/10.22541/au.173053090.08198521?commit=f442f52dffaef
898     d5b78602e94558c1591a8dff4e5

899 Jarrett BJM, Downing PA, Svensson EI. 2025. Meta-analysis reveals that phenotypic plasticity and
900     divergent selection promote reproductive isolation during incipient speciation. *Nat Ecol Evol*
901     9:833–844.

902 Johnson MS, Desai MM. 2022. Mutational robustness changes during long-term adaptation in laboratory
903     budding yeast populations.Cooper VS, Walczak AM, Miller C, editors. *eLife* 11:e76491.

904 Kirkpatrick M, Ravigné V. 2002. Speciation by natural and sexual selection: models and experiments. *Am*
905     *Nat* 159 Suppl 3:S22-35.

906 Kosheleva K, Desai MM. 2018. Recombination Alters the Dynamics of Adaptation on Standing Variation
907     in Laboratory Yeast Populations. *Mol Biol Evol* 35:180–201.

908 Lenski RE, Rose MR, Simpson SC, Tadler SC. 1991. Long-Term Experimental Evolution in Escherichia coli.
909     I. Adaptation and Divergence During 2,000 Generations. *The American Naturalist* 138:1315–
910     1341.

911 Leu J-Y, Chang S-L, Chao J-C, Woods LC, McDonald MJ. 2020. Sex alters molecular evolution in diploid
912     experimental populations of S. cerevisiae. *Nat Ecol Evol* 4:453–460.

913 Li H, Durbin R. 2009. Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows–Wheeler transform.
914     *Bioinformatics* 25:1754–1760.

915   Li J, Vázquez-García I, Persson K, González A, Yue J-X, Barré B, Hall MN, Long A, Warringer J, Mustonen V,
916   et al. 2019. Shared Molecular Targets Confer Resistance over Short and Long Evolutionary
917   Timescales. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 36:691–708.

918   Liu Y, Ma G, Gao Z, Li J, Wang J, Zhu X, Ma R, Yang J, Zhou Y, Hu K, et al. 2022. Global chromosome
919   rearrangement induced by CRISPR-Cas9 reshapes the genome and transcriptome of human cells.
920   *Nucleic Acids Research* 50:3456–3474.

921   Louder MIM, Justen H, Kimmitt AA, Lawley KS, Turner LM, Dickman JD, Delmore KE. 2024. Gene
922   regulation and speciation in a migratory divide between songbirds. *Nat Commun* 15:98.

923   Mayr E. 1947. Ecological Factors in Speciation. *Evolution* 1:263–288.

924   McDonald MJ, Rice DP, Desai MM. 2016. Sex speeds adaptation by altering the dynamics of molecular
925   evolution. *Nature* 531:233–236.

926   McKinnon JS, Mori S, Blackman BK, David L, Kingsley DM, Jamieson L, Chou J, Schluter D. 2004. Evidence
927   for ecology's role in speciation. *Nature* 429:294–298.

928   Meyer JR, Dobias DT, Medina SJ, Servilio L, Gupta A, Lenski RE. 2016. Ecological speciation of
929   bacteriophage lambda in allopatry and sympatry. *Science* 354:1301–1304.

930   Michel AP, Sim S, Powell THQ, Taylor MS, Nosil P, Feder JL. 2010. Widespread genomic divergence
931   during sympatric speciation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107:9724–9729.

932   Muenzner J, Trébulle P, Agostini F, Zauber H, Messner CB, Steger M, Kilian C, Lau K, Barthel N, Lehmann
933   A, et al. 2024. Natural proteome diversity links aneuploidy tolerance to protein turnover. *Nature*
934   630:149–157.

935   Mukherjee V, Lind U, St. Onge RP, Blomberg A, Nygård Y. 2021. A CRISPR Interference Screen of Essential
936   Genes Reveals that Proteasome Regulation Dictates Acetic Acid Tolerance in Saccharomyces
937   cerevisiae. *mSystems* 6:10.1128/msystems.00418-21.

938   Müller I, Thörn F, Rajan S, Olsen R-A, Ericson P, Peona V, Smith B, Maiah G, Koane B, Iova B, et al.
939   Ephemeral speciation in a New Guinean honeyeater complex (Aves: Melidectes). Available from:
940   https://www.authorea.com/doi/full/10.22541/au.173639442.28305532?commit=c6fffa9cc0ca7
941   1d3e44f2de72f5001a07ea2ab20

942   Munar-Delgado G, Pulido F, Edelaar P. 2024. Performance-based habitat choice can drive rapid adaptive
943   divergence and reproductive isolation. *Current Biology* 34:5564-5569.e4.

944   Nosil P. 2012. Ecological Speciation. Oxford University Press Available from:
945   https://academic.oup.com/book/5499

946   Nosil P, Crespi BJ. 2006. Experimental evidence that predation promotes divergence in adaptive
947   radiation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103:9090–9095.

948   Nosil P, Feder JL. 2012. Genomic divergence during speciation: causes and consequences. *Philosophical*
949   *Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 367:332–342.

Nosil P, Schluter D. 2011. The genes underlying the process of speciation. *Trends Ecol Evol* 26:160–167.

Okonechnikov K, Conesa A, García-Alcalde F. 2016. Qualimap 2: advanced multi-sample quality control
for high-throughput sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* 32:292–294.

Ono J, Gerstein AC, Otto SP. 2017. Widespread Genetic Incompatibilities between First-Step Mutations
during Parallel Adaptation of Saccharomyces cerevisiae to a Common Environment. *PLOS*
Biology 15:e1002591.

Orr HA. 1995. The population genetics of speciation: the evolution of hybrid incompatibilities. *Genetics*
139:1805–1813.

Persson K, Onyema VO, Nwafor IP, Peri KVR, Otti C, Nnaemeka P, Onyishi C, Okoye S, Moneke A, Amadi
O, et al. 2024. Lactose-assimilating yeasts with high fatty acid accumulation uncovered by
untargeted bioprospecting. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 0:e01615-24.

Persson K, Stenberg S, Tamás MJ, Warringer J. 2022. Adaptation of the yeast gene knockout collection is
near-perfectly predicted by fitness and diminishing return epistasis. *G3*
Genes|Genomes|Genetics 12:jkac240.

Peter J, De Chiara M, Friedrich A, Yue J-X, Pflieger D, Bergström A, Sigwalt A, Barre B, Freel K, Llored A, et
al. 2018. Genome evolution across 1,011 Saccharomyces cerevisiae isolates. *Nature* 556:339–
344.

R Core Team. 2023. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Available from:
https://www.R-project.org/

Rainey PB, Travisano M. 1998. Adaptive radiation in a heterogeneous environment. *Nature* 394:69–72.

Rice WR, Hostert EE. 1993. Laboratory Experiments on Speciation: What Have We Learned in 40 Years?
Evolution 47:1637–1653.

Rogers DW, McConnell E, Ono J, Greig D. 2018. Spore-autonomous fluorescent protein expression
identifies meiotic chromosome mis-segregation as the principal cause of hybrid sterility in yeast.
PLOS Biology 16:e2005066.

Rundle HD, Nagel L, Wenrick Boughman J, Schluter D. 2000. Natural selection and parallel speciation in
sympatric sticklebacks. *Science* 287:306–308.

Sawada A, Iwasaki T, Akatani K, Takagi M. 2022. Mate choice for body size leads to size assortative
mating in the Ryukyu Scops Owl Otus elegans. *Ecology and Evolution* 12:e9578.

Schluter D. 2001. Ecology and the origin of species. *Trends Ecol Evol* 16:372–380.

Schluter D. 2009. Evidence for Ecological Speciation and Its Alternative. *Science* 323:737–741.

Scopel EFC, Hose J, Bensasson D, Gasch AP. 2021. Genetic variation in aneuploidy prevalence and
tolerance across Saccharomyces cerevisiae lineages. *Genetics* 217:iyab015.

Shapira R, Levy T, Shaked S, Fridman E, David L. 2014. Extensive heterosis in growth of yeast hybrids is
explained by a combination of genetic models. *Heredity (Edinb)* 113:316–326.

Sparks MM, Kraft JC, Blackstone KMS, McNickle GG, Christie MR. 2022. Large genetic divergence
underpins cryptic local adaptation across ecological and evolutionary gradients. *Proceedings of*
the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 289:20221472.

Stankowski S, Ravinet M. 2021. Defining the speciation continuum. *Evolution* 75:1256–1273.

Stelkens R. 2024. A microbial perspective on speciation. *Evolutionary Journal of the Linnean Society*
3:kzae023.

Stelkens RB, Brockhurst MA, Hurst GDD, Miller EL, Greig D. 2014. The effect of hybrid transgression on
environmental tolerance in experimental yeast crosses. *J. Evol. Biol.* 27:2507–2519.

Stenberg S, Li J, Gjuvsland AB, Persson K, Demitz-Helin E, González Peña C, Yue J-X, Gilchrist C, Ärengård
T, Ghiaci P, et al. 2022. Genetically controlled mtDNA deletions prevent ROS damage by
arresting oxidative phosphorylation.Gruber J, Tyler JK, Toledano MB, editors. *eLife* 11:e76095.

Struck TH, Feder JL, Bendiksby M, Birkeland S, Cerca J, Gusarov VI, Kistenich S, Larsson K-H, Liow LH,
Nowak MD, et al. 2018. Finding Evolutionary Processes Hidden in Cryptic Species. *Trends in*
Ecology & Evolution 33:153–163.

Tange O. 2011. Gnu parallel-the command-line power tool. *Usenix Mag* 36:42.

Thompson KA, Brandvain Y, Coughlan JM, Delmore KE, Justen H, Linnen CR, Ortiz-Barrientos D,
Rushworth CA, Schneemann H, Schumer M, et al. 2023. The Ecology of Hybrid Incompatibilities.
Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol:a041440.

Tusso S, Nieuwenhuis BPS, Weissensteiner B, Immler S, Wolf JBW. 2021. Experimental evolution of
adaptive divergence under varying degrees of gene flow. *Nat Ecol Evol* 5:338–349.

Villa SM, Altuna JC, Ruff JS, Beach AB, Mulvey LI, Poole EJ, Campbell HE, Johnson KP, Shapiro MD, Bush
SE, et al. 2019. Rapid experimental evolution of reproductive isolation from a single natural
population. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116:13440–13445.

Westram AM, Stankowski S, Surendranadh P, Barton N. 2022. What is reproductive isolation? *Journal of*
Evolutionary Biology 35:1143–1164.

Zackrisson M, Hallin J, Ottosson L-G, Dahl P, Fernandez-Parada E, Ländström E, Fernandez-Ricaud L,
Kaferle P, Skyman A, Stenberg S, et al. 2016. Scan-o-matic: High-Resolution Microbial Phenomics
at a Massive Scale. *G3 Genes|Genomes|Genetics* 6:3003–3014.

Zhang Z, Bendixsen DP, Janzen T, Nolte AW, Greig D, Stelkens R. 2020. Recombining Your Way Out of
Trouble: The Genetic Architecture of Hybrid Fitness under Environmental Stress. *Molecular*
Biology and Evolution 37:167–182.

1016

Data Accessibility and Benefit-Sharing Section

Phenotypic data are available in Table S1. The raw sequences were deposited in the European

Nucleotide Archive, parental populations are available at accession number PRJEB46680, while hybrids

are available at accession number PRJEB83568. The code used for analyses and plotting are available at

https://github.com/devinbendixsen/EvolvingRI. Benefits from this research accrue from the sharing of

our data and results on public databases as described above.

1023

Author Contributions

Conceived research: Rike Stelkens; Designed research: Rike Stelkens, Ciaran Gilchrist; Performed

research: Devin P. Bendixsen, Ciaran Gilchrist, Chloé Haberkorn, Karl Persson; Contributed new reagents

or analytical tools: Karl Persson, Jonas Warringer; Data analysis: Devin P. Bendixsen, Chloé Haberkorn,

Karl Persson; Writing: Rike Stelkens, Devin P. Bendixsen, Chloé Haberkorn, Ciaran Gilchrist; Funding

acquisition: Rike Stelkens, Devin P. Bendixsen, Cecilia Geijer, Jonas Warringer.